AUG 31 1950

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 96—PART 1

JANUARY 3, 1950, TO FEBRUARY 2, 1950
(PAGES 1 TO 1406)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1950

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

LAW
LIBRARY
GENERAL
SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

LAW
LIBRARY

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 3, 1950

The 3d day of January being the day prescribed by the Constitution of the United States for the annual meeting of Congress, the second session of the Eighty-first Congress commenced this day.

The Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol.

ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky, Vice President of the United States, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., of the city of Washington, offered the following

PRAYER

Our Father God, with the gateway of an old year having noiselessly closed behind us, we come this noontide to open a new volume of personal and national responsibility. We humbly bow, this hallowed moment, with the solemn realization that no changes in calendars or sessions or chambers of debate and decision alter the fact of facts that until we find Thee and art found of Thee we begin at no beginning and come to no ending.

In an hour when such vast issues are at stake may those here called to high places of state, conscious of the great tradition in which they stand and the desperate times of which they are the servants, rise to greatness of vision and soul as the anxious eyes of all the earth are upon this Capital. Maintain in us the fidelity of those to whom much has been given and from whom much will be required. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Knowland
Anderson	Graham	Langer
Brewster	Green	Leahy
Bricker	Gurney	Lodge
Butler	Hayden	Long
Chapman	Hendrickson	Lucas
Connally	Hickenlooper	McCarran
Cordon	Hill	McCarthy
Donnell	Hoey	McClellan
Douglas	Humphrey	McKellar
Downey	Hunt	McMahon
Dworshak	Ives	Magnuson
Ecton	Jenner	Malone
Ellender	Johnson, Tex.	Martin
Ferguson	Johnston, S. C.	Millikin
Flanders	Kefauver	Morse
Frear	Kem	Murray
Fulbright	Kerr	Myers
George	Kilgore	Neely
O'Conor	Sparkman	Tydings
O'Mahoney	Stennis	Vandenberg
Robertson	Taft	Watkins
Russell	Taylor	Wherry
Saltonstall	Thomas, Utah	Williams
Schoeppel	Thye	Young
Smith, N. J.	Tobey	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of a death in his family.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

DEATH OF SENATOR REED, OF KANSAS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I rise to announce the death of the former senior Senator from Kansas, CLYDE M. REED. I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 192), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. CLYDE M. REED, late a Senator from the State of Kansas.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, do adjourn.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, CLYDE REED and I were elected to the Senate at the same time 11 years ago, and were reelected at the same time in 1944. We were close friends during all the time he served here.

The Senate has lost one of its most able and determined leaders. He was a man who, at all times, by his character and actions, assisted in maintaining the tone of the Senate as it ought to be.

CLYDE REED had had great experience in public life. After a long period in which he served with the railroads, he became a member of the Public Utilities Commission of Kansas. He was thoroughly familiar with the entire transportation problem. He served as Governor of Kansas. When he became a Member of the Senate he was made a member of the Interstate Commerce Committee and for a time its chairman. His advice and assistance on transportation questions were relied upon to such a degree that it can be said, I think, that he determined the transportation policy of the country during the time he was here.

He was a man of absolute impartiality. I believe he approached every legislative problem and every question of personalities with a desire to be absolutely and completely fair, and it came to be generally recognized that he was a man of sound and impartial judgment.

He was at all times, of course, a hard fighter when dealing with those problems in which he was particularly interested and on which he was an authority. He was always a diligent worker. He was always unassuming, and never sought a position to which he was not entitled.

The Senate has lost a very able Member. The Nation and the State of Kansas have lost a great citizen. I myself have lost a very dear and intimate friend.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Kansas will not be acted upon finally until routine matters incumbent upon the Senate to act on today have been disposed of. Senators may address themselves to the resolution, either now or later.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I wish to pay my tribute of respect and high regard to the late senior Senator from Kansas, my friend of many years, CLYDE REED, of whom I have many fine memories. BOB TAFT has spoken intimately and finely of him, and I add my voice to supplement that testimony.

I knew him before he came to the Senate, and in this great body I was privileged to serve as a comember with him on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

A marked feature of his life in that committee and the work he did there was his truly prodigious supply of factual information respecting the railroads and all matters affecting transportation. His counsel and aid will be sorely missed as we carry on.

I go back in memory to September 29, which I think was the last day he appeared with us on the floor of the Senate in the old Supreme Court room. He turned to me and said, "Charlie, my wife has had a fall at home and injured herself. We have been married 60 years. I am going back to Kansas tonight to be with her, and I am not coming back."

That was a man speaking, a husband speaking his feelings born of great and true and abiding affection down through the years, after 60 years of married life. He expressed the sentiments of love and affection of a good man for a good wife. He paid that tribute to her, then wended his way back, and joined her in that family circle.

On November 8 the Lord took him and he is now but a memory. How prophetic were those words, "I am not coming back." He is not coming back in the flesh, but CLYDE REED will live for days and years to come so long as we who were his colleagues are a part of the Senate of the United States.

And so in the mystic presence of the body and the soul and the spirit of CLYDE REED I take his hand today in behalf of my fellow Members, and I say "Thy hand, good friend."

May the service of our days, in various moods and ways,
Prove to those who follow in our train, not valueless nor vain.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I remember vividly the day CLYDE REED was sworn in as a Member of the Senate. The news of his death came as a great shock to me. He was a man of wisdom and of great knowledge. He was a citizen of principle. He was a public servant of influence because he had courage and devotion to duty. I shall miss him personally, and we shall all miss him here as a valuable Member of the Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Senate in general, and the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in particular, will greatly miss the wise counsel of Senator CLYDE REED, of Kansas. A public servant, unique in some respects because of his long experience in the development of the regulation of public utilities, one of the major problems of the last three decades, and later as Governor of Kansas, in his long service in the Senate he earned the respect and confidence of his colleagues and of the country.

As a junior member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I considered it a privilege and an opportunity to consult him on the varied and complex problems which confronted our country, and I count it a great loss that we shall not have his continued service in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, although I did not have the good fortune to have known CLYDE REED quite so long as had some of my colleagues, nevertheless, when I came to the Senate in 1945 and was assigned to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, in a few short years I learned to know him quite well, indeed, quite intimately. I had a deep affection for CLYDE REED. We served and worked together on subcommittees. There was never any sort of partisanship in the work we did in those subcommittees during the Eightieth Congress, or in the work we did in many subcommittees in the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. President, in the death of CLYDE REED I have suffered a real personal loss, because he was serving with me on a subcommittee which was studying the surface transportation of the country. He was a great American sent forth from his great State of Kansas. I am sure he earned for himself the respect, the admiration, and the esteem and affection of every Member of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I join my colleagues of the Senate in honoring the man and paying tribute to the memory of our recently departed colleague the senior Senator from Kansas, CLYDE MARTIN REED.

I rise to speak because Senator REED was a neighbor of mine and a friend of mine. Our friendship dated back to the year 1927, in connection with matters pending in the Legislatures of Nebraska and Kansas.

As we begin a new session of the Congress in these critical times, we shall miss his counsel and advice, for truly it may be said of Senator REED that he was a man who served his country well.

He devoted his entire career to the public interest.

He contributed much to the American heritage.

He was a builder for the good of our country.

To few men out of our population comes the opportunity to devote themselves to well-nigh full-time service to their country.

Senator REED was, in many respects, a pioneer and as such contributed to the American way of life. It is for those who follow to preserve this American heritage in a world convulsed by clashing ideologies and, indeed, threatened by a revival of philosophies of the Dark Ages.

When CLYDE MARTIN REED was born in Champaign, Ill., on October 19, 1871, he joined the pioneers of the West. Four years later he moved with his family to Labette County, Kans., and, after receiving a common-school education, began a career of public service in which he was giving his all up to the very moment of his passing away.

He taught school for a year and then began 28 years of effort in building and improving transportation service in the Railway Mail Branch of the Post Office Department, rising through all grades to be field superintendent of divisions in many cities. He served as Superintendent of the Railway Adjustment Division in the Post Office Department.

He turned to publication and active management of a newspaper in his home town of Parsons, Kans., and, as such, contributed to the enlightenment of the people. Through many Kansas State offices, he carried on, constantly seeking to improve the lot of his fellow countrymen, as a member of the Kansas Court of Industrial Relations, as chairman of the Kansas Public Utilities Commission, and from 1929 to 1931, as Governor of Kansas.

We all appreciate the importance of transportation, the linking of distant places together, in building and unifying our country. In this important field, Senator REED was an expert with few equals.

He was an authority on transportation systems and procedures. Many of them, which have been adopted and are now a part of our Nation's great system of transportation, were initiated by him. They are now a part of our daily lives and our daily customs. They are taken for granted.

Upon entering this body in 1938, he carried on, specializing in the problems of transportation that have become very complex as our population has increased. But Senator REED's vision for a better America went beyond providing the means for movement of our people and goods from place to place.

In the whole range of public problems, he left his imprint.

Mr. President, I join in the sentiment so eloquently expressed by my colleague the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] when he said that though CLYDE REED in the flesh has left us, his spirit is with us still.

For my part, and drawing upon the many years it was my privilege to know him and admire his kindly, friendly feeling toward all men, I like to think of him as a great pioneer in our beloved land, as one who has contributed to the American heritage. And as our beloved Nation enters upon a new year, and our Congress begins a new session—to which all of us are looking forward—I shall strive to draw upon the works and words of CLYDE REED for inspiration and guidance.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, before action shall be had on the resolution with respect to the death of our esteemed friend and colleague from Kansas, I desire to add a few words of comment and of tribute to his memory. It was my good fortune to serve with him on one of the committees of the Senate some few years ago, namely, the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. In his service on that committee the Senator from Kansas, Mr. REED, demonstrated a unique knowledge of the subject of post offices, of the postal transportation system, and of allied matters. I think it therefore appropriate that his peculiar knowledge along these lines should be emphasized in addition to his grasp of the other subjects to which reference has been made by other Senators.

Mr. President, I observed also his thoroughness. Whatever Senator REED did, he did well. To him it was no mere figure of speech that whatever is worth doing is worth doing well.

It was my privilege, Mr. President, to be present at the funeral services of our distinguished friend. There I learned, from the beautiful and appropriate remarks which were made by an old friend of his, something of the feeling entertained for him by his fellow citizens in Kansas. My State is a neighbor State of Kansas. We of Missouri realized much of the greatness of Senator REED by reason of our nearness to his own commonwealth. As I heard, however, in his home city of Parsons, Kans., on Armistice Day, 1949, the recital of how his friends and neighbors regarded him, how they venerated and loved him for his integrity, for his fearlessness, for his ruggedness, and for his independence of character, I realized more than ever before the innate greatness of CLYDE REED, of Kansas.

Today, Mr. President, as a Member of this body and, as a friend of his, I express my deep sense of personal loss and join with other Senators in mourning his departure.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I rise to make a few remarks, having announced a few moments ago the passing of the senior Senator from Kansas, CLYDE M. REED. It touches me profoundly as I hear the Members of the Senate of the United States speak words of commendation in his behalf. In his home State of Kansas, CLYDE REED was known as a man who never compromised or shirked a responsibility in a public trust. He was fearless. He was courageous. He was independent. He was respected.

When he passed away, November 8, my State suffered a great loss. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] has just remarked about the occasion of his funeral, on Armistice Day last, in my State. On that occasion Frederick W. Brinkerhoff, who was a lifetime friend of Senator REED, a fellow editor, and prominent citizen of Kansas, delivered an address. It typifies the esteem and respect in which the late Senator was held in my home State. I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to place in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the complete address by Mr. Brinkerhoff.

I close by referring to the closing words of Mr. Brinkerhoff, when he so stirringly said:

CLYDE M. REED is absent—absent on leave. CLYDE M. REED, the most romantic political leader of his generation in Kansas, the most colorful warrior in the battles of the ballots by means of which democracy chooses its spokesmen and defines its course, the statesman of profound mind, restless energy and rugged honesty, the man unafraid.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Kansas to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Mr. Brinkerhoff is granted.

The address is as follows:

To CLYDE M. REED the people of Kansas gave their assignments for highest public service and their endowment of supreme confidence. They made him the chief executive of their State. They made him a Senator of the United States. They committed to his hands these stations of loftiest honor and greatest responsibility. They could do no more in recognition of ability and willingness for public service. The commission which he received from the people of Kansas, CLYDE M. REED now has returned to them. The record thereon inscribed is unsullied. It is the story of substantial achievements. It tells of official tasks that were performed with matchless skill. It shows a zealous and persistent loyalty to the obligations of his oaths of office. Everywhere on it are the imprints that are the unimpeachable evidence of dauntless courage, high intelligence, amazing ability, hard work and constant fidelity to the sound principles upon which he based and built his career.

No other statesman ever had a keener appreciation of the obligations which a public official owes to those who either directly or indirectly have put him in official station. There were fundamentals in his conception of public service. These included courage, independence, industry, integrity, veracity, and candor. Strict adherence to them throughout his entire career in public office brought to CLYDE REED time after time difficult and discouraging situations, the harsh words of enemies, the kindly criticism of friends and with less frequency than should have been true, the outspoken approval of the public. But no words of condemnation, no challenge of his sagacity and no charge of incompetency ever bothered him in the discharge of official obligations. Following the line of duty as he saw it, he was never affected by the assaults of those who would have had him do otherwise. He went straight ahead. It would not be exactly correct to assert that he did not pay attention to unkind things that were said, for he did. It would not be proper to say that attacks on what he did or what he said did not disturb him, for they did. CLYDE REED was human. He was affected by all of the things that touch men generally in their relations with other men. But Mr. REED had an uncanny appreciation of the factors controlling situations. He had a tremendous gift for weighing items to determine their importance. He could detect promptly the shoddy things that appeared daily in the affairs around him. He had an acute understanding of the influences that caused men to do certain things. He had the power to overcome any tendency to devote too much attention to adversaries. One of his type—vigorous, dynamic, positive, and unrestrained by any concern for self-preservation—could easily have been ruined. Giving attention to every attack that came would have done that.

And so a glance at the manner in which he met these situations reveals the towering, enduring greatness of CLYDE M. REED.

Mr. REED was as courageous as he was intelligent. There was no false bravery in the manner in which he met his enemies. There was no insincerity in his fearlessness. He faced every incident that challenged his courage in the same way. There was real valor in the manner in which he made his decisions.

He never was frightened into doing what he did not believe was right. He never changed a public act because of the possibility of a defeat that others would have called humiliating. He assumed that there was no such thing as a humiliating defeat in a just cause. Certain that some action would alienate supporters, nevertheless he proceeded to follow the precise dictations of his own mind. Threatened by those who demanded support for some cause he believed wrong, CLYDE REED never hesitated in his denunciation of those who made the threats. There was never any compromising on principles. Kansans long ago learned that they could not negotiate a compromise with him. He never yielded a particle to achieve peace for himself. His was the courage of a man who had faith in his own judgment. CLYDE REED fought many a battle that he could have evaded. On occasion after occasion he could have avoided fighting without seeming to have lost anything worth while. Thus he gave the impression of inviting conflict. In politics there is a tendency, unfortunately it might be called a predominating tendency, to carry on by strategy and, through concessions, to avoid frontal clashes. CLYDE REED had no sympathy for this political practice. As a result many believed him belligerent because he was aggressively steadfast. He was called contentious because he would not yield to avoid conflict. No prospect of influencing voters of a certain group by doing something for which he had no heart, because he did not believe it right, interested him. Gifted with a shrewdness everywhere acknowledged for these many years and skilled in appraising that which we call public thinking, CLYDE REED could have steered his own course into quiet waters. That he never did so is the highest tribute to the depth of his sincerity upon which was founded his intrepid courage.

Linked to this gorgeous crowning virtue was the independence which Mr. REED possessed and used constantly. He was entirely free of any influence, save that quality of zealous devotion to duty. He was his own man in public office—as he was outside of public office. He would listen to others but the decisions that were made were his decisions. His utterances were his own utterances. The course he pursued was his own course. This principle of independence he took with him into the governorship and into the United States Senate. It was one of the basic virtues of his character.

Wherever he was, CLYDE REED persisted in maintaining his freedom of thinking and his freedom of action. He avoided every semblance of an alliance that would embarrass him in the exercise of his liberty. This policy of independence did not have the approval of many who would have been glad to support him. But on the other hand it appealed to great sections of people. It won for him the admiration of unnumbered Kansans who recognized his honesty and sincerity and his determination to follow his own judgment. CLYDE REED may have been impatient with those who found fault with the freedom he maintained for himself. But he conceded their right to criticize him. He was willing to pay the costs if costs there were to be. And this course gave him complete satisfaction. He could have this satisfaction because his personal fortunes in politics were largely a matter of indifference to him. He had no selfish interest in office. Whether he obtained official station or remained in one was something he considered comparatively unimportant. But what he did when he had authority was of the utmost importance. It was how he used his powers that counted. This attitude toward public service and his own personal fortunes gave him that self-reliance and assurance which always predominated in his official conduct.

Senator REED was a hard worker. He bent to every job he undertook with a relentless energy and a boundless enthusiasm. He never spared himself. He had little time for play in his lifetime. He turned out an amazing amount of work on his public assignments. Long ago he became deeply interested in one of the major puzzling problems of the Nation, that of transportation. No subject has bothered the brains of administrators and legislators on the domestic scene more than the subject of transportation costs. The progress of the Nation has been involved. Confusion and complexity have characterized the matter of rates. But the questions presented were a challenge to CLYDE REED. He drilled deeply for complete information. He studied with an earnestness that was matched by his tremendous capacity for tabulation and analysis. And from his labors came to him recognition as one of the Nation's foremost authorities on transportation rates. The knowledge he obtained and the information he had always ready made him an outstanding legislator on the subject of interstate commerce with respect to transportation and transportation rates. All of this involved work that took days and nights and held his close attention.

In all other phases of Senator REED'S career in public life he displayed through all the years a stern devotion to hard work. He would not have been happy had he not been busy. When he played it was under orders. When he relaxed, it was against his own wishes. His tireless industry contributed vitally toward making CLYDE REED an invaluable servant, both to his own State and to the Nation.

CLYDE REED'S integrity was never questioned. It was revealed in his courage and independence. He had supreme contempt for dishonesty whether in private life or in public service. Once convinced of a display of dishonesty or fraud, he blasted with his full power. He was not a seeker after wealth. Obtaining money was not his ambition. He was not interested in riches for himself. Certainly in his political life he was not concerned about emoluments. Most of the dishonesty in public place involves obtaining public money or in obtaining legislation favorable to individuals or to groups of individuals who would profit thereby. This was a form of dishonesty which CLYDE REED despised. He was merciless in dealing with it. He believed that the private individual was

bad unless he had integrity. He believed that the public man was bad unless he had integrity. Simple honesty was a fundamental thing with him.

High on CLYDE REED's list of attributes of priceless worth was veracity. Those who dealt recklessly with the truth, as well as those who premeditatedly misrepresented were enrolled in his book as persons to be discarded. He wanted no dealings with those who could not or would not tell the truth. Through his years in politics he was continuously confronted by men who were not devoted to veracity. Here again his wonderful mentality served him well. He had the unusual faculty of determining whether he was hearing the truth. No contemporary of his in Kansas politics came near him in avoiding the disasters which always follow the exercising of unrestrained credulity. The long record of his contacts would show an astonishingly small number of those who misled CLYDE REED. Political foes without number will testify that he was a public man who told the truth, who had the courage to do so and who demanded that others show him the same respect. He had an undying hatred for sham and hypocrisy, falsehood's affiliated evils. His treatment of falsifiers and hypocrites was ruthless. He punished them to the fullest extent of his ability.

CLYDE REED spoke and wrote with complete candor. Many of those who called on him took his frankness in expression for bluntness. He possessed the faculty of simple but forceful utterance. When he had spoken or written, there could be no doubt as to what he meant. He found no delight in playing with language. Although he loved good literature, he was not one who employed or cared to employ artistry in words. The simple parlance of the people among whom he had lived and who had honored him was the language of CLYDE REED. His rugged personality was reflected unerringly in what he said. He was not one who resorted to finesse, either in conversation or in public speech. He never sought to be diplomatic. He drove straight to the point and was prepared to take the consequences.

When he had spoken, without any attempt to charm his listeners with eloquence, his meaning was clear. He did not want to be misunderstood. He was not misunderstood. Here again came in those other vital elements which governed his daily life. He demonstrated courage and independence as he expressed himself. The results of his hard work were apparent in his correspondence and in his public and conversational talking. His integrity and his veracity were necessary parts of his candor.

On this point of frankness, of unreserved comment, CLYDE REED commanded respect because he always knew his own mind and was never afraid to speak it. For 30 years no one had authority to speak for CLYDE REED. He spoke for himself.

We are thinking of CLYDE REED today as we take leave of him as a great public servant, a towering figure in Kansas public life and affairs. But there was another side to his life connecting him with the public. He was a newspaper man. He believed that his newspaper was a public institution. He believed that it also should do its full duty as a newspaper, that it should have integrity, that it should be truthful, and that it should be candid. With that resolute determination which governed his conduct in public life, CLYDE REED proposed and supported a newspaper policy based on these fundamental objectives of a free press. He interpreted his obligation as a newspaper man to be that of faithful, honest, and truthful service to the public. If the public had placed its confidence in his newspaper, CLYDE REED believed, the public was entitled to receive honest service. He realized that the newspaper which has these virtues necessarily must expect to suffer whatever punishment may be visited upon it by those who oppose these principles.

Kansas, which adopted CLYDE REED when he was a boy of 4, reared him through adversity and built self-reliance, determination, integrity, and sincerity into his character, bids farewell to this loyal son today. Kansas, which recognized his gifts of mind and heart and installed him in its most exalted posts and gained heavily from his virtues and talents and his devotion to his people for more than a third of his long life, must take leave of him. The sense of loss which Kansas feels today is offset by the pride it has in the career that is closed and the solemn realization of the magnitude of his public service.

CLYDE M. REED is absent—absent on leave. CLYDE M. REED, the most romantic political leader of his generation in Kansas, the most colorful warrior in the battles of the ballots by means of which democracy chooses its spokesmen and defines its course, the statesman of profound mind, restless energy, and rugged honesty, the man unafraid.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL].

The resolution (S. Res. 192) was unanimously agreed to.

RESIGNATION OF SENATOR BALDWIN

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letter, which was read:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., December 12, 1949.

His Excellency CHESTER BOWLES,
Governor of Connecticut,
State Capitol, Hartford, Conn.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: Having been nominated and appointed to be an associate justice of the Supreme Court of Errors of the State of Connecticut, I hereby tender my resignation as a Member of the United States Senate to take effect on December 17, 1949.

Yours respectfully,
RAYMOND E. BALDWIN.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letter of resignation will be placed on file with the Secretary of the Senate.

SENATOR FROM NEW YORK

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I present the certificate of election of the Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN as Senator from New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The certificate of election will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK, *ss:*

We, the Attorney General, State senators, and members of assembly, constituting the State board of canvassers, having canvassed and estimated the whole number of votes given for the office of United States Senator (unexpired term) at the general election held in said State on the 8th day of November 1949, according to the certified statements of the said votes received by the Secretary of State, in the manner directed by law, do hereby determine, declare, and certify that HERBERT H. LEHMAN was, by the greatest number of votes given at the said election, duly elected United States Senator (unexpired term) of the said State.

Given under our hands, at the department of state in the city of Albany the 14th day of December in the year of our Lord 1949.

NATHANIEL L. GOLDSTEIN,
Attorney General.
ARTHUR H. WICKS,
State Senator.
LEE B. MAILLER,
Member of Assembly.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
Department of State, ss:

I certify that I have compared the foregoing with the original certificate filed in this office, and that the same is a correct transcript therefrom and of the whole of such original.

Given under my hand and seal of office at the city of Albany this 14th day of December 1949.

[SEAL] RUTH M. MINER,
Deputy Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The certificate will be placed on file with the Secretary of the Senate.

SENATOR FROM KANSAS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I have the honor of presenting the certificate of appointment to the United States Senate of the Honorable HARRY DARBY by Gov. Frank Carlson, of Kansas. I send the certificate to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The certificate will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

STATE OF KANSAS,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

CERTIFICATE OF NOMINATION

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Kansas, I, Frank Carlson, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint HARRY DARBY a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the death of Clyde M. Reed, is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor Frank Carlson, and our seal hereto affixed at Topeka, Kans., this 1st day of December, in the year of our Lord 1949.

By the Governor:

FRANK CARLSON,
Governor.
[SEAL] LARRY RYAN,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The certificate will be placed on file with the Secretary of the Senate.

SENATOR FROM CONNECTICUT

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I take great pleasure in presenting the certificate of appointment of WILLIAM BENTON to be a Senator from the State of Connecticut, signed by the Honorable Chester Bowles, Governor of the State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The certificate will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Connecticut, I, Chester Bowles, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint WILLIAM BENTON, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the resignation of Raymond E. Baldwin, is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor Chester Bowles, and our seal hereto affixed at

Hartford, this 17th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1949.

CHESTER BOWLES,
Governor.

[SEAL] WINIFRED MCDONALD,
Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The certificate will be placed on file with the Secretary of the Senate.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the new Senators will come forward, the oath of office will be administered to them.

Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. DARBY, and Mr. BENTON, escorted, respectively, by Mr. IVES, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, and Mr. MCMAHON, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

LIST OF SENATORS BY STATES

Alabama.—Lister Hill and John Sparkman.

Arizona.—Carl Hayden and Ernest W. McFarland.

Arkansas.—John McClellan and J. William Fulbright.

California.—Sheridan Downey and William F. Knowland.

Colorado.—Edwin C. Johnson and Eugene D. Millikin.

Connecticut.—Brien McMahon and William Benton.

Delaware.—John J. Williams and J. Allen Frear.

Florida.—Claude Pepper and Spessard L. Holland.

Georgia.—Walter F. George and Richard B. Russell.

Idaho.—Glen H. Taylor and Henry C. Dworshak.

Illinois.—Scott W. Lucas and Paul H. Douglas.

Indiana.—Homer E. Capehart and William E. Jenner.

Iowa.—Bourke B. Hickenlooper and Guy M. Gillette.

Kansas.—Andrew F. Schoeppel and Harry Darby.

Kentucky.—Virgil Chapman and Garrett L. Withers.

Louisiana.—Allen J. Ellender and Russell B. Long.

Maine.—Owen Brewster and Margaret Chase Smith.

Maryland.—Millard E. Tydings and Herbert R. O'Conor.

Massachusetts.—Leverett Saltonstall and Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.

Michigan.—Arthur H. Vandenberg and Homer Ferguson.

Minnesota.—Edward J. Thye and Hubert H. Humphrey.

Mississippi.—James O. Eastland and John C. Stennis.

Missouri.—Forrest C. Donnell and James P. Kem.

Montana.—James E. Murray and Zales N. Ecton.

Nebraska.—Hugh Butler and Kenneth S. Wherry.

Nevada.—Pat McCarran and George W. Malone.

New Hampshire.—Styles Bridges and Charles W. Tobey.

New Jersey.—H. Alexander Smith and Robert C. Hendrickson.

New Mexico.—Dennis Chavez and Clinton P. Anderson.

New York.—Irving M. Ives and Herbert H. Lehman.

North Carolina.—Clyde R. Hoey and Frank P. Graham.

North Dakota.—William Langer and Milton R. Young.

Ohio.—Robert A. Taft and John W. Bricker.

Oklahoma.—Elmer Thomas and Robert S. Kerr.

Oregon.—Guy Cordon and Wayne Morse.

Pennsylvania.—Francis J. Myers and Edward Martin.

Rhode Island.—Theodore Francis Green and Edward L. Leahy.

South Carolina.—Burnet R. Maybank and Olin D. Johnston.

South Dakota.—Chan Gurney and Karl E. Mundt.

Tennessee.—Kenneth McKellar and Estes Kefauver.

Texas.—Tom Connally and Lyndon B. Johnson.

Utah.—Elbert D. Thomas and Arthur V. Watkins.

Vermont.—George D. Aiken and Ralph E. Flanders.

Virginia.—Harry Flood Byrd and A. Willis Robertson.

Washington.—Warren G. Magnuson and Harry P. Cain.

West Virginia.—Harley M. Kilgore and Matthew M. Neely.

Wisconsin.—Alexander Wiley and Joseph R. McCarthy.

Wyoming.—Joseph C. O'Mahoney and Lester C. Hunt.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LUCAS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 193), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. LUCAS and Mr. WHERRY the committee on the part of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE

Mr. WHERRY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 194), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING

Mr. MYERS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 195), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian, unless otherwise ordered.

WILLIAM H. KING

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I am sensible of the custom of the Senate not to prolong the meeting of the first day of a session, and to adjourn out of respect for a Member who has died. But I deem it not out of place at this time to say a few words out of respect for one of our former colleagues who also has left this earth.

My former colleague, the Honorable William H. King, who for so long was a senior Senator from my State, has passed away since the Senate last met. Senator King lived a long time, and all of it most fully. Most of his life was given to service in behalf of his people, his State, and his Nation. That he served well, his record proves. That he was honored in that service, his life also proves.

Senator King can be regarded as Utah's favorite son. His early life reflected well the ideals of his people in developing trained citizens. He was a missionary, a student traveler in Europe, and a graduate of the University of Michigan Law School, before he started his life's work. His public career started when he was a very young man, and I can remind my colleagues of that fact when I state that he was appointed a Territorial supreme court judge in Utah by President Grover Cleveland. Service as a Territorial judge, as a State supreme court judge, as a Representative, and as a Senator for four full terms, is a record which few citizens of our country have equaled. I would emphasize, however, not the mere length of service, but the sincere, honest, painstaking service he rendered. He was a stickler for what he deemed right, to the extent that at times some lost patience with him. He always prided himself as being what we Americans describe as a State's rights man, but his record shows that in his actions he was thinking of America and the world. The value of his foresight in regard to the vital importance of America's interests in Greece, Persia, and the Near East has been proved by what has taken place since. Senator King had a grasp of world affairs and an understanding of the worth of our great Federal system and a sincere belief in the purposefulness of the establishment of our Nation and its destiny. He served his country under nine different Presidents. His devotion to the District of Columbia will long remain a monument to his leadership. What he did for the District will long continue to be a great blessing for the people who live here.

Senator William H. King was an intensely religious man, and his actions were consistent with his beliefs. It was a great privilege to have served with him, and I deem it an honor to be able to utter these few words in tribute to his memory.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before the Senate adjourns, I desire to make a brief announcement as to the business of the Senate tomorrow. The President of the United States will deliver his message on the state of the Union before a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives. The Senate will meet here

and, as we always do, will march in a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives. After the President concludes his message, Senators will return to the Senate Chamber.

We shall then proceed to the consideration of a measure which is now on the calendar, known as Order No. 288, a bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes. I thought I should make this announcement, because I am certain that nearly all Senators are very much interested in that bill. It will be the order of business tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the resolution offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], when the Senate concludes its business today, it will adjourn out of respect to the late Senator from Kansas, Mr. REED.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the distinguished majority leader whether it is intended to continue the sessions of the Senate this week, after the bill is taken up tomorrow?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Nebraska is correct. We shall proceed to discuss and debate the oleomargarine bill through Friday. When we conclude the business of the day on Friday, we shall then take an adjournment until Monday.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to congratulate the majority leader on the wisdom of his choice of a program.

Mr. LUCAS. I felt sure the Senator from Arkansas would agree to that program.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MILLIKIN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from next Friday for a week or 10 days thereafter.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FLANDERS, because of official business, was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of this week.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in accordance with the terms of Senate Resolution 192, agreed to earlier today, and as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator REED, of Kansas, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 4, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 3, 1950

This being the day fixed by the twentieth amendment to the Constitution for the meeting of the Congress, the Members of the House of Representatives met in their Hall for the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, and at 12 o'clock noon were called to order by the Speaker, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following

PRAYER

Our Heavenly Father, as we stand in the foreglow of a new year, be pleased to hear our humble prayer. Touch Thou the sacred silences of our souls, and make us to feel that what we do today will shape our national life and action of tomorrow. Thou hast set before us an open door and no man can shut it.

We pray for Thy richest blessings to rest upon our beloved country, upon its Representatives in Congress, and upon him who presides over its deliberations. Enable us always to subject ourselves to the blessed influences of Thy spirit, free from discord and intolerance. May there be essential unity of high purpose throughout our land, and the blessing of peace in all the earth.

Let us now all unite in praying the Lord's Prayer:

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory for ever and ever.

Amen.

RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 9, 1949.*

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives, United States.

SIR: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Governor of New Jersey my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Seventh District of New Jersey, such resignation to take effect on the 2d day of January 1950.

J. PARNELL THOMAS.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll to determine whether or not a quorum is present.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members answered to their names:

[Roll No. 1]

Abbitt	Andresen, August H.	Barrett, Wyo.
Abernethy	Andrews	Bates
Addonizio	Angell	Battle
Albert	Arends	Beall
Allen, Calif.	Auchincloss	Beckworth
Allen, La.	Bailey	Bennett, Fla.
Andersen, H. Carl	Baring	Bentsen
Anderson, Calif.	Barrett, Pa.	Biemiller
Bishop	Harvey	Norton
Blackney	Havenner	O'Brien, Ill.
Boggs, Del.	Hays, Ark.	O'Hara, Ill.
Boggs, La.	Hays, Ohio	O'Hara, Minn.
Bolling	Heffernan	O'Sullivan
Bolton, Md.	Heller	O'Toole
Bolton, Ohio	Herlong	Passman
Bonner	Herter	Patman
Boykin	Heselton	Patten
Bramblett	Hill	Patterson
Breen	Hinshaw	Perkins
Brehm	Hobbs	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Brown, Ga.	Hoffman, Ill.	Philbin
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman, Mich.	Phillips, Calif.
Bryson	Holmes	Phillips, Tenn.
Buchanan	Hope	Pickett
Buckley, N. Y.	Horan	Plumley
Burdick	Howell	Poage
Burke	Huber	Polk
Burnside	Hull	Potter
Byrnes, Wis.	Jacobs	Preston
Camp	James	Price
Canfield	Javits	Priest
Cannon	Jenkins	Quinn
Carlyle	Jensen	Rabaut
Carnahan	Johnson	Rains
Case, N. J.	Jones, Mo.	Ramsay
Cavalcante	Jones, N. C.	Rankin
Chatham	Judd	Redden
Chelf	Karst	Reed, N. Y.
Chesney	Karsten	Rees
Chiperfield	Kean	Regan
Church	Kearney	Rhodes
Clemente	Kearns	Rich
Clevenger	Keating	Richards
Cole, Kans.	Kee	Riehlman
Cole, N. Y.	Kelley, Pa.	Rodino
Colmer	Kennedy	Rogers, Fla.
Cooley	Keogh	Rogers, Mass.
Cooper	Kilburn	Rooney
Corbett	Kilday	Sadlak
Cotton	Kirwan	Sadowski
Cox	Klein	St. George
Crawford	Kruse	Sanborn
Crook	Kunkel	Sasscer
Crosser	Lane	Saylor
Cunningham	Lanham	Scott, Hardie
Curtis	Latham	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Dague	LeCompte	Scrivner
Davis, Ga.	LeFevre	Scudder
Davis, Wis.	Lemke	Secrest
Deane	Lesinski	Sheppard
DeGraffenried	Lichtenwalter	Short
Delaney	Lind	Simpson, Ill.
Denton	Linehan	Simpson, Pa.
Dingell	Lodge	Smith, Kans.
Dollinger	Lovre	Smith, Va.
Dolliver	Lucas	Smith, Wis.
Donohue	Lyle	Spence
Doughton	Lynch	Staggers
Eaton	McCarthy	Steed
Elliott	McConnell	Stefan
Ellsworth	McCormack	Stigler
Elston	McCulloch	Stockman
Engel, Mich.	McDonough	Sullivan
Engle, Calif.	McGrath	Sutton
Evins	McGregor	Taber
Fallon	McGuire	Tackett
Fellows	McKinnon	Talle
Fenton	McMillan, S. C.	Tauriello
Fisher	McMillen, Ill.	Taylor
Forand	McSweeney	Teague
Ford	Mack, Wash.	Thomas
Frazier	Macy	Thornberry
Fugate	Magee	Tollefson
Fulton	Mahon	Underwood
Gamble	Mansfield	Velde
Garmatz	Marcantonio	Vinson
Gary	Marsalis	Vursell
Gathings	Marshall	Wadsworth
Gillette	Martin, Mass.	Wagner
Golden	Mason	Walsh
Gordon	Merrow	Walter
Gore	Meyer	Weichel
Gorski	Michener	Welch
Gossett	Miles	Wheeler
Graham	Miller, Calif.	Whitaker
Granahan	Miller, Md.	White, Calif.
Granger	Miller, Nebr.	Whitten
Grant	Mills	Wickersham
Green	Mitchell	Wigglesworth
Gross	Monroney	Williams
Gwinn	Morgan	Willis
Hagen	Morris	Wilson, Ind.
Hale	Morton	Wilson, Tex.
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Moulder	Withrow
Hall, Leonard W.	Multer	Wolcott
Halleck	Murdock	Wolverton
Hand	Murphy	Woodruff
Harden	Murray, Tenn.	Worley
Hardy	Murray, Wis.	Yates
Hare	Nelson	Young
Harris	Noland	Zablocki
Harrison	Norblad	
	Norrell	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 336 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

DECEMBER 16, 1949.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law showing the election of EDNA F. KELLY as a Representative-elect to the Eighty-first Congress from the Tenth Congressional District of the State of New York, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. Andrew L. Somers is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

JANUARY 3, 1950.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law showing the election of JOHN F. SHELLEY as a Representative-elect to the Eighty-first Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of the State of California, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. Richard J. Welch is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

Mrs. KELLY of New York and Mr. SHELLEY appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

PROVIDING FOR A RECESS TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, January 4, 1950, it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 406) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of three Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has assembled and Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MCCORMACK, the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. DOUGHTON, and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN.

NOTIFICATION TO THE SENATE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 407) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House inform the Senate that a quorum of the House is present and that the House is ready to proceed with business.

The resolution was agreed to.

DAILY HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 408) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered, the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives shall be at 12 o'clock meridian in the Hall of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

NOVEMBER 15, 1949.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith an envelope from the President of the United States, addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, said to contain the Fifth Report to Congress of the Economic Cooperation Administration, received in the office of the Clerk at 10:25 a. m., November 15, 1949.

Very truly yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

FIFTH REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the Fifth Report of the Economic Cooperation Administration created by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress, approved April 3, 1948.

The report covers activities under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 (title I of Public Law 472, as amended) as well as the programs of economic aid to China under section 12 of Public Law 47, Eighty-first Congress, and to the Republic of Korea under the provisions of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act of 1949 (Public Law 793, 80th Cong.). There is also included in the appendix a summary of the status of the United States foreign relief program (Public Law 84, 80th Cong.) and the United States foreign aid program (Public Law 389, 80th Cong.).

This report is for the period April 3 through June 30, 1949.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 15, 1949.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

NOVEMBER 28, 1949.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith an envelope from the President of the United States, addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, said to contain the Eighth Report to Congress on Assistance to Greece and Turkey, received in the office of the Clerk at 11:40 a. m., November 28, 1949.

Very truly yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Transmitted herewith is the eighth quarterly report on United States military assistance to Greece and Turkey. This report covers the period from April 1, 1949, to June 30, 1949. Military assistance to Greece and Turkey was inaugurated under the authority of Public Law 75, Eightieth Congress, and was continued under the authority of title III of Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress, known as the Greek-Turkish Assistance Act of 1948. Responsibility for United States assistance in the economic rehabilitation of Greece begun under Public Law 75 was transferred to the Economic Cooperation Administration on July 1, 1948, pursuant to Public Law 472, title I.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 28, 1949.*

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, your committee on the part of the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and is ready to receive any communications that he may be pleased to make has performed that duty. The President asked us to report that he will be pleased to deliver his message at 1 o'clock p. m. January 4, 1950, to a joint session of the two Houses.

PROVIDING FOR JOINT SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Con. Res. 150) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, January 4, 1950, at 1 o'clock in the afternoon,

for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

TAX REFORMS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a tax bill to provide for increased production and employment through a reduction in some of our war taxes.

The key to general tax reduction lies, of course, in the budget, which will shortly be presented by the President. Unfortunately, however, all the indications are that the President's budget will be in excess of $42,000,000,000 and that another deficit of approximately $5,000,000,000 will be piled on by the end of fiscal 1951. Under such fiscal mismanagement the people of this country can look forward to only higher taxes or an eventual 10-cent dollar. As everyone knows, higher taxes would be disastrous at this time when already at least 30 percent of our national income is being siphoned off to run the Government and pay for the cold war. Just as unthinkable is the continuation of the administration's ruinous course of deficit financing in these prosperous times. I am convinced that an analysis of the President's forthcoming budget will show that it can be reduced by at least five or six billion dollars without the impairment of a single program necessary for either the effective operation of our Government at home or the fulfillment of our obligations abroad.

Not only is a substantial reduction of Government expenditures imperative for the survival of our liberties and the preservation of our free-enterprise system, but immediate attention must also be given to the correction of certain of our tax laws which are already hampering a sound expansion of our economy and if left unchanged will shortly be a major factor in the curtailment of our present high productivity and employment. By timely, wise, and far-sighted tax policies the Government can give encouragement to the full resourcefulness, initiative, and incentive of its citizens. Under such policies this Nation can go forward to unrealized progress and expansion. My bill is designed to aid in achieving this goal by the elimination and modification of our tax laws which are causing the bottlenecks in our economy.

As a result of the bold action taken by Canada in providing similar tax relief, the Canadian economy is continuing to function at a high level and its incipient recession has been averted. Although there was some doubt in Canada as to the economic wisdom of tax relief, subsequent events there have shown the merit of such a course. Not only are tax revenues now exceeding expenditures by even greater amounts than had been predicted, but unemployment has been cut in half.

The following is a summary of the provisions contained in my bill, together with a short analysis of the reason for each proposed amendment:

TITLE I. INCOME TAX—PART I. INDIVIDUALS

Increase in per capita exemption: My bill raises the personal exemption of all individual taxpayers, including fiduciaries, from $600 to $700 and increases the amount of the credit for dependents from $600 to $700.

Although I believe that every economic group should bear its fair share of the tremendous cost to Government, the gradual shrinkage of the purchasing power of the dollar, together with the increased burden of Federal, State, and local excise and sales taxes, has imposed an undue burden on our low-income families. In fact, the truth of the matter is that many hard-working and conscientious American citizens are actually being deprived of the very necessities of life as the result of the excessive tax burden. Such excessive taxation is not only a barrier to responsible citizenship, but operates as a major obstacle in the path of a higher standard of living for all our people. Particularly is this so for our approximately 10,000,000 families with incomes below $2,000 a year on whom the burden of our hidden taxes falls most heavily. It is imperative, therefore, that we provide immediate tax relief to our low-income groups. In Canada, where government economy has been translated from words into reality, the basic exemptions have already been raised since the war to $1,000 for a single person and $2,000 for a married couple. Only back in 1939, our exemptions were $1,000 for a single person and $2,500 for married taxpayers. I hope that eventually our fiscal picture will permit us to return to our prewar level of exemptions. My bill is a forward step in that direction.

Surtax reduction: Just as vital to the continuation of our national well-being as mitigating the excessive tax burden on our lower income groups is the provision in my bill which imposes a 50-percent tax limitation. In my opinion, and in the opinion of many distinguished Americans of both political parties, every taxpayer should have at least an even break with the tax collector so that no more than one-half of the financial rewards of his efforts are taken from him during his life. The high rate of the Federal estate tax, together with State inheritance and estate taxes, make the passage of substantial fortunes from one generation to the next now impossible. Moreover, and aside from any considerations of equity and fairness and the just relationship of the Government to its citizens, there is the real and practical consideration that a 50-percent tax limitation will unquestionably result in increased revenue for the Government within a year's time. Past experience bears this out. You will recall that in 1921, when we had a top surtax rate of 65 percent, the tax yield from the approximately 330 individuals in this group was just a little over $88,000,000. In 1924, when the top rate was only 40 percent on similar incomes, the number of taxpayers in this category had more than doubled and the revenues collected from them was over $135,000,000. In 1928, when the rate was down to 20 percent, the number of high income taxpayers was over 3,000 and their share of the tax load was $414,814,319. In 1921 the number of people with incomes in the highest bracket paid only 12 percent of the total of individual income taxes, but by 1929 the tax collections from this group had risen to 39 percent of the total individual income-tax burden. A similar and just as striking example of how rate reduction can actually increase revenues by energizing and stimulating the national economy is shown by the effect of the reduced tax rates between 1921 and 1929 on individuals having annual net incomes of $25,000 and over:

Annual income-tax liabilities of individuals reporting net incomes of $25,000 a year and over in tax returns filed with U. S. Treasury [1]

Year:	
1922	$572,000,000
1923	423,000,000
1924	550,000,000
1925	627,000,000
1926	626,000,000
1927	724,000,000
1928	1,045,000,000
1929	928,000,000

[1] Statistics of Income, pt. I, Historical Summaries, 1938 (U. S. Bureau of Internal Revenue).

Relief to shareholder from double tax on dividends: In order to sustain full employment, which together with high productivity is essential for a stable economy and continued prosperity, some 750,000 jobs must be created each year for younger workers entering the labor force. This means new industries, new plants, tools, and new equipment must be provided. This in turn depends on a steady flow of equity capital into industry. But the facts are that the once steady stream of venture capital has dried to an almost imperceptible trickle as the result of unfavorable tax policies. Postwar expansion has accordingly been financed largely by retained profits and bank and insurance company loans. Undoubtedly relief from the double taxation of corporate dividends is a further and most necessary tax revision to encourage needed capital formation and to revive the flow of venture capital. As an initial step in this direction my bill provides that every taxpayer, other than a corporation, shall be entitled to a deduction from his gross income of the amount of dividends received up to an aggregate maximum amount of $500. I am frank to admit that this provision is not a complete solution to the problem, but pending a time when the fiscal situation of the Government permits the double taxation of dividends to be eliminated entirely, this provision is a recognition at least of the inequity of this tax

and the beginning of a solution to the problem.

Canada has again taken the lead in this field, and I call your attention to the statement made by the Canadian Minister of Finance, Douglas Abbot, when he told the Canadian Parliament last March:

> Today we find governments in this country, as well as in most other countries, taxing away at least a third of corporate profits. In addition, the personal income-tax rates apply in full to what is distributed out of the remaining two-thirds. The tax may be as high as 80 percent upon distributions to shareholders. It seems to me that under a system of private enterprise which depends for its existence on a steady flow of venture capital, we cannot afford to neglect the implication of this defect in our tax system, which has been accentuated by the increase in both corporate and personal income-tax rates. * * * It is a matter of concern for the future under a system where we depend, and must depend, for full employment and the creation of new wealth on the willingness of our people to risk their money in constructive enterprises.

Reduction of tax on capital gains: Another tax revision which is sorely needed to energize the flow of equity capital needed for an expanding economy and full employment is a modification of the present tax treatment of capital gains. Accordingly, my bill amends the present law by providing that only 40 percent instead of 50 percent of a long-term capital gain will be subjected to taxation and reduce the maximum tax rate on this portion from 50 percent to 40 percent. This modification is designed particularly to alleviate the burden of the capital-gains tax on all taxpayers both large and small. This is achieved by reducing from 50 percent to 40 percent the amount of the gain subjected to the tax. By reducing the rate from 50 percent to 40 percent, the maximum tax to be imposed will be only 16 percent instead of 25 percent, as under present law. Not only will the easing of the burden of the capital-gains tax encourage new venture capital but it will undoubtedly result in increased revenue to the Government. This is so because at this present time of inflated money when there may be gain as measured in money but no increment in value, many persons are prevented from selling or disposing of property because of the present capital-gains tax. For example, most persons find that their houses which they purchased some years ago have increased in value. If, however, they sell their houses, they have to pay a capital-gains tax on the profit but the cost to them of a new house will generally be as high or higher than the price received for the house they sold. In other words, they are forced to pay a tax on phantom profits. I have carefully weighed the many other proposals suggested for alleviating the inequity and deterrent effect of the present capital-gains tax but believe the provisions in my bill which will benefit the lower- and middle-income groups primarily are the most equitable and will serve as the soundest foundation for subsequent modifications.

Election as to taxation of unincorporated business as a corporation: Under present law any business enterprise operated by an individual or by a partnership is compelled to pay the full normal and surtax on any earnings left in the business. As a result many small businesses are unable to accumulate earnings for expansion and increased production. My bill contains a provision which will permit unincorporated businesses to be taxed like corporations. It provides that any business enterprise operated by an individual or a partnership consisting of not more than 20 individuals, other than a nonresident alien or a foreign partnership, may be treated, for tax purposes, as if such business enterprise were a corporation subject to certain conditions and limitations. In the cases of a partnership each partner must concur in the election. If the owner or owners of the business so elect to be treated as if they were doing business in the corporate form, then the amounts received by them from the business enterprise will be regarded as corporate dividends. By treating such business enterprises as a corporation, many small business enterprises will be permitted to accumulate the necessary earnings for expansion and increased production. If, however, the earnings are accumulated beyond the reasonable needs of business enterprise, then the provisions of section 102 relating to unreasonable accumulation of earnings, for the purpose of avoiding individual surtaxes will be applicable. My bill contains certain amendments to section 102, discussed later in this statement, which, if enacted, will make section 102 operate more equitably, and will prevent any misinterpretation of it from defeating the purpose of this provision.

PART II. CORPORATIONS

Repeal of 2-percent penalty tax for filing consolidated returns: My bill eliminates the present 2-percent penalty tax levied against corporations for the privilege of filing consolidated income-tax returns. Inasmuch as consolidated tax returns for corporations are admittedly essential to an accurate statement of the corporate accounts and contribute both to the compliance and accuracy of the income-tax returns, the law should encourage and not discourage by an additional tax the use of consolidated accounts and tax returns. The present 2-percent tax levied against corporations for filing consolidated returns is inequitable and illogical and accordingly my bill removes this tax.

Specific exemption of corporations: My bill provides that a corporation shall be entitled to the same $700 exemption as is provided for individual taxpayers. This provision will be of particular assistance to small corporations. A corporation exists only for the benefit of its stockholders, management, and employees, and a provision which will assist small corporations will give incentive to these groups and assist in expanding the national economy and the national income.

Surtax on corporations improperly accumulating surplus: Much-needed tax revision for the encouragement of new capital and to assist in expanding production facilities is a revision of section 102 of the code. Under this present law, penalties are imposed on corporations which are found to have accumulated reserves in excess of the reasonable needs of their business. The tax imposed is in addition to the regular corporate income tax. The fear of subjecting earnings to this tax has in many instances resulted in the distribution of funds badly needed by businesses for expansion, protection against possible business set-backs, and other valid purposes. Accordingly my bill makes three amendments to the present law which are designed to reduce the pressure on taxpayers to distribute earnings needed for real business purposes and to remove some of the harsher aspects of the present tax treatment under this law. The law is continued as a safeguard against the improper accumulation of surplus. In general the three amendments made by my bill provide that the burden of proof in section 102 cases is shifted from the taxpayer to the Treasury; that corporations in computing income for purposes of this section be allowed to deduct dividends paid within 75 days after the end of the tax year; and that profits from the capital gains now included as income for purposes of section 102 be exempt from the penalty tax if they are long-term gains. In regard to this last point, such gains may be taken into consideration by the Treasury in determining whether other income was accumulated beyond the reasonable needs of the business.

TITLE II. ESTATE TAX

Estate tax payment bonds: As the direct result of the present high Federal estate and inheritance taxes, small businesses are fast becoming a relic of our American economy. Their extinction not only represents a grave threat to our whole competitive system, but is a glaring manifestation of how our tax laws can have an injurious impact on our economy. Unfortunately, too much time has been spent in investigating and prosecuting big business for ruthlessly swallowing its small competitors and not enough time has been devoted to attacking the real problem—that many small businesses are forced to either sell out, merge or face extinction by liquidation upon the death of the owner in order to pay the high estate and inheritance taxes. Accordingly, my bill contains a provision specifically designed to meet this problem. It provides in general that an individual may anticipate and prepare for the estate tax by buying estate tax payment bonds up to an amount not in excess of $200,000. These bonds are tax exempt to the extent of the estate tax computed on the net estate excluding the value of such bonds. Any excess of bonds over the tax will be included in the estate and accordingly subjected to tax. The bonds, which are noninterest bearing, must have been purchased prior to 2 years before the decedent's death and be held by him at the time of death. This provision is necessary in order to prevent the use of these bonds as an escape from the estate tax through contemplation of death transactions, and will give the Government the use of the money, interest free, for a minimum period of 2 years.

As a result of this provision, persons owning small businesses will have an

opportunity to prepare for the estate taxes and will therefore not be under the pressure to either sell their businesses before death or to merge with other companies. It seems to me that this approach to the problem will be far more beneficial than the alternate course of imposing greater Government restrictions and controls on the business community.

EXCISE TAXES

The excise tax relief provisions contained in my bill are for the most part identical with the provisions contained in the two bills I introduced early last year and which I urged the Congress to speedily enact at that time. As I pointed out last year, and which point now has finally been grasped by the administration, rates of tax in themselves do not bring in revenues. On the contrary, too high rates may and are at this time actually decreasing revenues from our excise taxes. Apart from this purely fiscal aspect of the problem is the fact that many of the excise taxes imposed during the war are acting as a deterrent to business activity and fuller employment. This, as I have pointed out on many occasions, is perfectly natural because the primary objective of many of these taxes was in discouraging civilian consumption and civilian production which competed with the defense program for men and materials. There is also the most significant factor that the hidden taxes are now bearing more heavily than ever on our lower income groups as the result of increasing State and local sale and excise taxes. Relief from these taxes is long overdue, and I cannot fail to comment on the fact that even those strongest advocates on the "hand-out state" who have blocked the lifting of the excise-tax burden from the backs of the consumers are now attempting to curry political favor by urging the repeal of these taxes. There was ample opportunity to repeal these taxes last year but my efforts, and the efforts of others who have long advocated the removal of many of these taxes, was effectively blocked by the administration.

The proposals for excise-tax relief contained in my bill cover a broad field and are designed not as a permanent solution but as an initial step in the complete removal of these taxes, which can be accomplished by this administration if it were sincere in its desire to encourage the free-enterprise system and not destroy it.

The excise-tax reductions provided for in my bill are as follows:

TITLE III. EXCISE TAXES—PART I. RETAILERS' EXCISE TAXES

Luggage: Elimination of the tax on ladies' handbags, pocketbooks, billfolds, and key cases, and reduction of the retail tax on the remaining articles of luggage from 20 percent to 15 percent.

Jewelry: Elimination of the tax on fountain pen gold points and rhinestone buttons and reduction of the retail tax on jewelry from 20 percent to 15 percent.

Furs: Reduction of the tax from 20 percent to 15 percent.

Toilet preparations: Elimination of the tax on baby oils, lotions, and powders, and reduction of the tax on other toilet articles from 20 percent to 15 percent.

Elimination of the tax on toilet articles sold to barber shops and beauty parlors for the use in operation thereof.

PART II. MANUFACTURERS' EXCISE TAXES

Tires and inner tubes: Under existing law the tax on tires has been construed to apply to tires used on children's toys, ordinary lawn mowers, and bicycles. I do not believe that the Congress ever intended to collect a tax on articles of this type. Accordingly my bill remedies this situation by exemption from the tax on tires, tires manufactured, produced, or imported to retail at not more than $5 each.

Automobiles, and so forth; exemptions:

(a) Trailer coaches. The application of the automobile tax to house trailers discriminates against one type of house as compared with another and places an undue hardship on many of our veterans who, during the housing shortage are purchasing for houses a large number of trailer coaches. My bill corrects this inequity by exempting trailer coaches from the automobile tax.

(b) Rebuilt, and so forth, parts or accessories: In connection with the tax on automotive parts and accessories, the Treasury rulings have been very conflicting with respect to the taxation of rebuilt, reconditioned and repaired parts or accessories. These rebuilt, reconditioned, and repaired parts should not be subjected to the tax which is intended to apply only to new parts. The bill corrects this inequity by exempting from the tax on automotive parts or accessories, rebuilt, reconditioned, or repaired parts.

Musical instruments: Another wartime tax which has been particularly harmful with respect to schools, churches, and juvenile clubs, is the tax on musical instruments. The revenue from this source is not large and musical instruments are used in many cases for educational, religious, and character-building purposes. My bill repeals the tax on musical instruments.

Electric, gas, and oil appliances: Under existing law, if a farmer buys a direct motor-driven fan for use in a barn or poultry house or for the ventilation of potato storage, apple storage, or other types of storage, he is required to pay the 10-percent tax applicable to electrical appliances. On the other hand, if he buys a belt-driven fan for the same purposes, no excise tax is applicable. Electric direct motor-driven fans are not luxury items but are used in industry, on the farm and in commercial establishments for the protection, health, and comfort of workers. My bill corrects this inequity by amending the law to confine the tax to electric direct motor-driven fans of the ceiling, wall-bracket, desk, pedestal, and air-circulator types.

Photographic apparatus: Reduction of the tax to 10 percent.

Lubricating oils: The present law imposes a tax of 6 cents per gallon on lubricating oils. Lubricating oil has been construed by the Treasury and the courts to apply to cutting oils, a much cheaper grade of oil than motor oils and which is not used primarily as a lubricant but to carry away chips and cuttings, and to cool cutting machine tools. My bill removes from the tax on lubricating oils, oils designed primarily for use in cutting and machining operations on metals and known commercially as cutting oils.

Electric light bulbs and tubes: Reduction from 20 percent to 10 percent.

Matches: Elimination of the tax except as to fancy colored matches.

PART III. TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION

Telegraph, telephone, radio, and cable facilities: Elimination of the war tax rates on long-distance and local telephone service and on wire and equipment service; reduction from 25 percent to 20 percent on domestic telegraph, cable, and radio dispatches, leased wire, and so forth.

Transportation of persons: Reduction of the rate of tax from 15 percent to 10 percent.

Transportation of property: The present tax is at the rate of 3 percent upon the price paid for the transportation of property except in the case of the transportation of coal, where the rate is 4 cents per short ton. This is another tax which is a distinct burden on the farmer, the businessman, and the shipper. My bill cuts the rate from 3 percent to 1½ percent, and in the case of coal from 4 cents per short ton to 2 cents per short ton.

PART IV. MISCELLANEOUS

Admissions: During the war the exemption from the admissions tax to religious, education, or charitable entertainments, county fairs, and concerts conducted by civilian or community member associations was removed. The admissions tax from these sources results in very little revenue and imposes a burdensome administrative duty on these worth while and deserving groups which should be encouraged. My bill restores the exemptions existing before the war to these groups. It also eliminates the admissions war tax rates on general admissions, permanent use or lease of boxes or seats, dues or membership fees, sales of tickets outside the box office, and reduces the cabaret tax from 20 percent to 10 percent.

Safe-deposit boxes: Reduction from the present 20-percent rate to 15 percent on the rental of safe-deposit boxes.

Cigarettes: The present Federal tax on cigarettes is $3.50 per thousand for regular-size cigarettes (those weighing not more than 3 pounds per thousand) and $8.40 per thousand for those cigarettes weighing more than 3 pounds per thousand. A most unfair aspect of the present tax is that the tax applied gives no consideration to the actual price charged for the cigarettes. Economy cigarettes are taxed the same rate per pack as the expensive brands. This is an unfair discrimination against the independent manufacturers, and my bill corrects this discrimination by providing a tax of $2.45 per thousand on cigarettes manufactured or imported to retail at the rate of not more than 12 cents per 20 cigarettes.

Chewing tobacco: The heavy tax of 18 cents per pound now imposed on chewing tobacco is greatly reducing the demand and resulting in injury to the tobacco farmer and the chewing-tobacco manu-

facturer. My bill reduces the rate from 18 cents to 8 cents per pound.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 192

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. CLYDE M. REED, late a Senator from the State of Kansas.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, do adjourn.

Senate Resolution 193

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

Senate Resolution 194

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

Senate Resolution 195

Resolved, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be at 12 o'clock meridian, unless otherwise ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'BRIEN] is detained on account of official business and cannot be here today or tomorrow. He wishes this fact to appear in the RECORD of today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in one to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Commercial Appeal of Memphis of Sunday, May 29, 1949.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Buffalo Courier-Express of January 1, together with a dispatch of the same date to the same newspaper, both in connection with the introduction of a bill by the gentleman from New York, Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER, relating to the naming of a hospital in Buffalo in honor of the late Congressman Andrews.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

REPORT TO CONGRESS FROM THE PEOPLE OF THE NINTH DISTRICT OF ALABAMA

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Ninth District of Alabama have a message which I feel Congress and the Nation should hear. For the past 2 months it has been my privilege to report to the people of my district about Congress and national affairs. Now I am taking the opportunity to give this report to Congress from the people of my district.

Today marks the start of one of history's most crucial sessions of the United States Congress. The world is tense. Our way of life is challenged. Deep and far-reaching decisions must be made. Therefore this message is important.

During the brief recess of Congress, I made an earnest attempt to talk to as many people in my district as possible—a district composed of approximately 600,000 people in a highly industrialized area. In doing this, I visited over 35 post offices, attended many community gatherings, addressed civic groups, visited schools and PTA meetings, talked with grocers, miners, steel workers, and as many other groups and individuals as I could possibly reach. I asked the people of my district many questions and found that they had given serious thought to our country's problems. Here are the opinions and ideas I have gathered from a cross section of my people back home on a few of the main issues before us.

The citizens of my district are violently opposed to Federal intervention in local policies and customs. They believe in making their own decisions in such matters. They strongly object to the administration's use of executive power to force the so-called civil rights program on us, as in the recent Executive order abolishing segregation in housing programs based on Government loans. The administration is clearly going against the will of Congress when it forces such policies through, after Congress has rejected them. It is my strong belief that our racial problems must be solved at home and not by force from outside. I will continue my determined efforts to protect the rights of the individual and to prevent invasion by the Federal Government in matters which are clearly the right of local people and local government.

The people of the Ninth District of Alabama are deeply concerned over the ever increasing tax burden. They do not believe that taxes should be raised, but that some adjustments should be made. The majority of the people want to abolish the high tax on oleomargarine and the excessive wartime excise tax on so-called luxuries, such as baby oils, telephones, telegrams, and transportation. I believe we have reached the danger point in taxes, where additional tax burden would mean less return for the Government.

The people of the Ninth District want to eliminate the wasteful expenditures of our Federal Government and give essential services in a more proficient manner. Most of those I have talked with are strongly in favor of the purpose of the Hoover Commission recommendations and most of the individual reports. I have actively supported this drive for economy and efficiency in government.

I feel that we can help bring about needed economies and get on a sound financial basis through a one-package appropriation bill. By this I mean we should consider all money bills at the same time and judge them on their individual and relative merit—putting first things first. When we reach the limit of our income we should stop spending until more money comes into the Federal Treasury. We cannot afford to continue overspending beyond our income or we will bankrupt the people's confidence in our Government—which would be disastrous.

The prevention of war and the defense of our country are uppermost in the minds of most of the citizens of the Ninth Alabama District. My district has some of the best and most active Reserve groups in the country. They and the veterans' organizations are vitally interested in seeing the defenses of our country adequately maintained, as are our other citizens. There is plenty of room for economy in government without wrecking our Reserve programs which are so vital to our defense. There have been threats that the very life line of our Reserves will be cut. I feel that it is long-term economy to keep our citizen soldiers well trained, even if our foreign-aid program must be scaled down to do so. Most of our people realize that our foreign-aid program has paid dividends to us in helping to maintain world peace, but now the European countries are in a much better position to help themselves, and we are less able to continue such large scale expenditures. Our people feel that we should now gear our future commitments accordingly. A great many people at home are particularly concerned over our weak policy in the Far East. They believe that our country, the outstanding world power, should take a firmer stand in the Far East, so that we can demand the respect we are entitled to receive out there. We certainly should not allow any further outrageous episodes as have recently occurred in China, where our citizens have been jailed for no cause. Also many of our people cannot understand why the United States has given

such feeble support to rebuilding the United Nations since Russia has killed its effectiveness to prevent a major war.

As a veteran, a reservist, and a Congressman, I realize the wisdom of our people at home in wanting to keep the defenses of our country strong, to build a foreign policy based on understanding, respect, and mutual aid and to make the United Nations strong enough to prevent war. It is my purpose to continue working diligently to achieve these goals.

These are of course only a few of the more immediate issues expected to come up early in this second session of Congress. There are many other vital problems which I have discussed with the people at home that may come up later in the year. Time prevents me from going into all of these issues now—but I am going to continue to study these problems and devote my every effort to representing the people of my district fairly, wisely, and with an open mind on all issues.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks in four instances, in three of them to include speeches by the President of the United States, and in the other to include an editorial entitled "A Divided Ireland," from the Boston Globe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BROOKLYN IS PROUD OF REPRESENTATIVE EDNA F. KELLY

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Brooklyn is proud indeed of its many "firsts." I feel certain that the induction of Mrs. EDNA F. KELLY today as a Member of this House, representing the Tenth Congressional District of New York, will go down in Brooklyn's history as one of the more important "firsts." She comes here as the first woman elected out of the Borough of Brooklyn, and indeed the first out of the entire city of New York. Her service also marks the first time that the State of New York has had two women in this body serving simultaneously.

She is a charming, intelligent, gentle lady, who brings to her work a vast experience gained from serving her community in all of its worth-while endeavors.

Those of us who knew her late husband, City Court Justice Edward L. Kelly, and his late father, William E. Kelly, who served for many years as president of the National Association of Letters Carriers, as postmaster of Brooklyn, and as county clerk of Kings County, see reflected in her their talents for devotion to the ideal that one gets most out of life by giving his all in service to mankind.

Welcome, Representative KELLY. Congratulations and best wishes. May your stay with us be long, pleasant, and fruitful.

AUTOMOBILES FOR CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a bill which I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to wish you and all Members of the House a very happy and a very successful new year. Certainly this will be one of the most important years in the history of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced a bill to provide automobiles for certain disabled veterans. A similar bill was vetoed by President Truman last summer. In my opinion, the President misunderstood the provisions of the bill. He received very bad advice on it. It was a very cruel veto, and if he could have an opportunity to reconsider the bill I believe he would not veto it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from a country newspaper in northern New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter to a constituent.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a poem.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S WELFARE STATE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have it on my mind to say and to prophesy today that the extent to which the present Congress shall refuse to be blindly led in adopting the proposed presentations and programs of the President for the continuation under the Fair Deal of a welfare state will mark the beginning or the end of an era.

God save the United States of America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by John Tope, chairman of the Young Republican National Federation, on the state of the Union for young men and women.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in each to include extraneous material.

POSSIBLE RECOGNITION OF THE COMMUNIST REGIME IN CHINA BY GREAT BRITAIN OR OTHER COUNTRIES

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, if, as is being predicted, Great Britain gives official recognition and thereby enormous assistance to the Communist puppet regime in China, an avowed enemy of the west and a partner of the Kremlin, it will be very difficult for the Congress to support aid programs for Britain in the future as in the past. I say this as one who has supported since 1938 every proposal for aid to Britain because I believed that to be in our own country's interest.

But now either we are in a cold war against a common enemy, world communism, or we are not. If we are, then what excuse can there be for England or any other country aiding and abetting that common enemy?

If we are not in a cold war, then what adequate reason is there for continuing the taxation of the overburdened American people to aid Britain?

How can we justify helping any nation against the common enemy if that nation helps the common enemy against us?

COTTON LEGISLATION

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, when the cotton-allotment legislation was written last year it was an agreed-on bill. I believe the RECORD will bear out this statement.

I quote from page 10712 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 3, 1949. The remarks are those of the distinguished chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, Representative COOLEY:

> Now we bring before the committee a bill that was unanimously reported by the subcommittee and unanimously approved by the full committee, a bill that is highly technical and difficult to understand.
>
> This bill makes rather liberal provisions for both little growers and new growers, and I hope that none of the provisions will be disturbed.

None of the provisions was disturbed.

However, it is being shown from day to day that the legislation is threatening to injure badly and perhaps to disrupt the economy of a number of counties throughout the Cotton Belt. Certainly it is a very serious situation. Between 1942 and now, it will be remembered, a great world war was fought. There were many dislocations during this period of time. I have one county, for example,

that had 74,000 acres of cotton allotted in 1942. It has a little over 16,000 acres now, or one-fifth. There are counties in Texas, on the other hand, that have nearly twice as much allotted cotton acreage in 1950 as were allotted to the same counties in 1942.

There has been a great deal said about a 5-acre minimum provision in the bill as passed. I quote this discussion that took place August 3 between the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] and me. It appears on page 10723 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask some of the Members who are sponsoring this bill this question. It is in the form of an assumption, but I think a very real assumption.

Assume that a veteran 25 or 26 years of age never did anything except grow cotton on a cotton farm until 1942, when he went into the Army; assume he remained in the Army until 1946; assume that he took GI training to be a mechanic for 2 years and while doing so he did not farm; assume that he owns a 60-acre cotton farm which has had no cotton on it since 1942; assume that today he loses his job and goes back to that cotton farm which has not had cotton grown on it since 1942. The question is: Will he be privileged to get 5 acres of cotton?

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. PACE. That depends, and I have tried to explain it to the gentleman, that depends entirely upon the State PMA Committee of the State of Texas, and the county PMA Committee in which that farm is located. He can, and will very likely get considerably more than 5 acres. It depends upon the amount of acreage the State committee allocates to that county for new farms. If the State committee gives the county, for example, 500 acres for new farms every acre of it must go to new farms. Then in addition to that 500 acres, the county committee may reserve 10 percent that can be used for new farms. So the allotment could be identical with like farms in the same area.

Mr. BECKWORTH. May I ask this further question: however, is it true or is it not true that the definite 5-acre minimum applies to him?

Mr. PACE. It does not.

My amendment, introduced on page 10728 of the August 3 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to give genuine cotton farmers a 5-acre minimum was defeated. I include at this point some proceedings from the RECORD about the amendment:

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. BECKWORTH: Page 16, line 3, after the period, insert the following subsection:

"'(f) The penalty provided for in this section shall not apply with respect to cotton produced by any person who is recognized by the county committee as being a cotton farmer if his total acreage does not exceed 5 acres.'"

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this makes it definite that if the county committee recognizes a person as being a cotton farmer that person shall have 5 acres of cotton. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] spoke about 16,000,000 veterans. If he will read my amendment he will find that I said "if they are recognized by the county committee as being cotton farmers." Those from New York, for instance, could not be recognized by the county committee as being cotton farmers.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] spoke about 6,000,000 bales. On July 25 the Department of Agriculture wrote me a letter as to the number of farmers growing 5 bales or less on the average, and there were 601,273. If every one of them grew 4 bales of cotton that would be 2,405,092 bales, and not 6,000,000. I would appreciate it if in the gentleman's remarks he would show where he got this 6,000,000 figure. It would be interesting indeed when we consider the fact that I have here a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, written on July 5, with the particular figures I have given.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. How could the gentleman determine and how could the county committee determine whether a man is a cotton farmer?

Mr. BECKWORTH. How did the 6,000,000 bales come in?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman does not provide any way of determining whether a man grows cotton or not.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The county committee would know. I repeat, they are knowing men, and would, to the extent they have authority under the law, be fair and just in their decisions.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BECKWORTH) there were—ayes 12, noes 56.

So the amendment was rejected.

The cotton acreage bill was changed again October 19. I quote my remarks about the amendment. They appeared on pages 15075 and 15076 of the October 19 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Thank you, Mr. MURRAY, for yielding to me. This is, indeed, considerate of you.

It was my contention as the debate on the cotton quota legislation August 3, 1949, proceeded that not enough consideration was given to the small family-sized farmer such as the veteran who had been away or the small family-sized farmer who had worked in a defense plant or the successor of the defense plant. I refer, of course, to a genuine farmer found so to be by the county agricultural committee of the respective county. Many of these farmers, genuine farmers they are, are at home now. They deserve a fair deal as to peanuts and cotton and other crop quotas. This fair deal they must have. I offered several amendments August 3. They were opposed. I quote some of the statements made about changing the cotton quota bill then.

I quote Representative PACE, one who has worked on the cotton quota bill diligently. His remarks are on page 10711:

"Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, the sentiments expressed here by the distinguished gentleman from Texas have motivated his entire service in the Congress. That is, his interest in the family-sized small farm. It gives me pleasure to tell him that there has never been a bill, such as that now before the House, which concerns itself so much with the welfare of the family-size farm.

"I may also say there has never been a bill presented to the House that is as liberal in authorizing allowances for new farms and small farms."

I quote again Representative PACE. His remarks appear on page 10714 of the same CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 3, 1949:

"I said a while ago to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] that there never has been a bill brought to the Congress giving more consideration to the small operator than does this bill. We have gone just as far as we can go, because every man who has been growing cotton, big or little, has some rights that must be protected."

Now I quote the distinguished chairman of the House Agriculture Committee; his remarks appear on page 10712.

"To talk about the little grower and about protecting and providing for the little fellow, to talk about the new grower, as the matter has been discussed here, seems to me to indicate a lack of understanding of the measure that has been presented.

"This bill makes rather liberal provision for both little growers and new growers."

Already the cotton-quota bill is being amended—less than 3 months after the passage of the 1949 cotton-quota bill. I am not surprised. My remarks of August 3 establish clearly that I would not be surprised. To give the small family-size cotton farmer a fair deal, it should be amended some more—at least to the extent he can earn a living. I refer only to genuine cotton farmers, cotton farmers found so to be by their county agricultural committees. Be it recalled, I emphasized this when I spoke several times August 3, 1949. My amendments of that date disclose this as my meaning.

Yes; the 1949 cotton-quota bill is being amended today.

The amendment was offered originally in the Senate by Senator ANDERSON. It is on page 14324, in the middle of the first column, of the October 12, 1949, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Here is the amendment—it was not explained:

"Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have an amendment, which is on the desk and which I ask to have stated.

"The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

"The amendment was, on page 23, after line 4, to insert the following:

"'SEC. —. Section 344 (f) (3) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by Public Law 272, Eighty-first Congress, is amended (i) by striking the figure "10" in the first sentence and inserting therefor the figure "15", and (ii) by striking the figure "30" in the proviso and inserting therefor the figure "20".'"

I have not heard it explained today; it is found on the last page of the conference report we have before us today. The report is not numbered, but accompanies H. R. 5345.

I sought an explanation and include the explanation at this point:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., October 17, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is with reference to your letter of October 13, 1949, relating to an amendment being submitted pertaining to subsection (f) (3) of section 344 of Public Law 272, Eighty-first Congress.

This amendment proposed to increase the reserve which county committees may withhold for specified use and adjustments from 10 to 15 percent and changing the percentage of any such reserve withheld for use in adjusting allotments otherwise computed between 5 and 15 acres from 30 to 20 percent.

The Department, in its work this year with the Congress pertaining to the cotton-acreage allotment and marketing-quota legislation, has consistently recommended greater flexibility in the allotment procedures by providing adequate reserves for the State and county production and marketing administration committees to use in making specified adjustments which mathematical formulas so often fail to recognize.

This amendment does provide additional flexibility to the county committee by making it possible for them to have more acreage to adjust allotments below 5 acres and above 15 acres and does not alter the acreage that they would have for adjustments for allotments between 5 and 15 acres. Also, such amendment, by increasing the reserve from which new farm allotments may be made, would, if the committees so provided, make more acreage available for this use. The Department, therefore, feels that such an amendment is desirable.

Sincerely yours,

K. T. HUTCHINSON,
Acting Secretary.

I am glad to note that among others to benefit under the terms of the amendment are those farmers who grow 5 bales or less.

Again I assert for peanut quotas to endure, for cotton quotas to endure, they both must be fair to the family-size peanut or cotton farmer. In this direction we must move forward. All types of farmers must receive their fair share of the agricultural income.

I quote a letter I recently received from a constituent of mine:

MINEOLA, TEX.

Hon. Mr. BECKWORTH.

DEAR SIR: See, I am a renter and I want to know how much cotton I will be allowed to plant next year before I start farming cotton. I am enclosing a letter from the Quitman AAA office.

Will say under the new law you fellows have made instead of putting more fellows on the farm you all are fixing laws to put them off the farm. Me and my son have now about $900 worth of peanuts we can't sell because there wasn't any allotment on these farms, and there are thousands of farms that don't have allotments, so you can see cotton will be on the same order the farms have been laying out during the war and can't get allotments in Wood County.

So let me know how much cotton I will be allowed. If I am cut very bad I will be forced off the farm. I am 60 years old, and farming is all I know and can do, but when you fellows make laws to stop me and others from farming it is too bad. So let me hear from you at once.

I could write a book of how the farmers are being pressed off the farm, and you can see, can't you?

Yours respectfully.

At this point, I desire to include some figures that pertain to cotton acreage, county by county, in Texas:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., December 5, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: As requested in your letter of December 2, I am attaching a list of 1950 county cotton allotments on which the 1942 county cotton allotments are also shown. We have not entered the 1941 and 1940 county cotton allotments since there is very little difference, county by county, in these and the 1942 allotments.

It should be remembered in making comparisons that the 1942 State allotment was slightly more than 2,000,000 acres larger than the 1950 State allotment.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

[Enclosure.]

DECEMBER 2, 1949.

1950 COUNTY COTTON ALLOTMENTS

The 1950 cotton acreage allotments for Texas counties were announced today by B. F. Vance, chairman of the State PMA committee. These allotments with the 1947 and 1948 county planted acreages are listed below. County allotments were computed on the basis of the 1947–48 average acreage with adjustments being made for trends and abnormal conditions affecting cotton plantings.

The 1950 State cotton allotment is 7,637,029 acres—about 11 percent less than the 1947–48 average acreage standing on July 1 and about 4 percent less than the 1945–49 average State acreage.

County PMA committees are now completing the establishment of 1950 farm cotton allotments and will mail notices to farm operators about December 10.

All cotton producers who shared in the proceeds of the 1948 crop of cotton are eligible to vote in a cotton marketing quota referendum on December 15. If two-thirds or more of the ballots cast are in favor of marketing quotas on the 1950 crop, quotas will be effective, with the result that the price of 1950 production will be supported at 90 percent of parity to cooperating producers. If more than one-third of those voting oppose quotas, the price of the 1950 crop will be supported at only 50 percent of parity and only to cooperating producers.

Texas—1950 county cotton allotments with comparison

County	1947 acreage standing July 1	1948 acreage standing July 1	1950 allotment	1942 allotment
Anderson	6,500	16,700	14,516	45,761
Andrews	2,500	1,000	1,641	3,752
Angelina	4,500	4,160	4,772	19,121
Aransas	1,150	1,000	1,029	2,034
Archer	960	1,200	1,554	11,001
Armstrong	1,000	1,000	956	2,882
Atascosa	5,880	3,500	5,677	31,583
Austin	25,200	27,000	23,124	35,352
Bailey	103,000	96,000	85,910	73,111
Bastrop	15,200	19,200	16,140	40,528
Baylor	14,200	13,800	13,421	32,186
Bee	10,400	6,100	8,887	33,951
Bell [1]	93,400	98,500	83,195	124,535
Bexar	4,820	4,850	5,425	26,727
Blanco	100	200	467	3,455
Borden	18,000	26,000	19,512	14,934
Bosque	17,200	17,900	16,090	43,905
Bowie	31,000	33,800	29,338	53,900
Brazoria	10,750	13,000	11,083	20,330
Brazos	29,100	30,000	26,195	37,300
Briscoe [1]	21,200	20,700	18,346	26,136
Brooks	1,445	5,000	3,396	7,417
Brown	3,200	5,000	5,412	27,803
Burleson	40,000	43,700	36,535	53,215
Burnet	7,300	9,000	8,038	23,411
Caldwell	33,000	30,500	28,128	56,220
Calhoun	21,400	20,700	18,034	21,115
Callahan	4,690	5,300	5,655	24,513
Cameron	167,000	202,000	161,395	65,405
Camp	4,460	8,000	6,941	16,395
Cass	20,400	25,200	24,260	63,376
Castro [1]	5,850	8,500	6,731	16,433
Chambers	150	150	258	2,019
Cherokee	9,100	13,800	15,440	57,695
Childress	55,200	64,500	51,247	64,651
Clay	17,200	16,000	16,306	46,008
Cochran	100,000	90,000	81,434	50,180
Coke	3,800	3,570	4,492	21,409
Coleman	16,600	19,000	19,009	77,722
Collin [1]	153,300	149,000	129,813	131,664
Collingsworth	89,400	82,000	73,425	82,392
Colorado	14,000	14,300	13,123	28,936
Comal	150	320	670	6,054
Comanche	1,920	3,640	4,936	28,676
Concho	18,000	35,000	24,499	43,473
Cooke	10,200	15,000	13,953	43,473
Coryell	23,900	25,000	23,136	70,151
Cottle	64,600	69,500	57,262	66,926
Crockett	20	150	106	5
Crosby	116,000	118,000	99,905	90,699
Culberson	----------	----------	191	----------
Dallas	62,600	59,500	53,178	86,679
Dawson	266,000	270,000	228,755	126,188
Deaf Smith	1,230	2,100	1,563	696
Delta	63,000	65,000	54,762	45,931
Denton	35,100	39,800	33,600	67,120
DeWitt	22,900	23,000	21,484	55,138
Dickens [1]	63,500	61,500	53,595	60,363
Dimmit	650	750	633	655
Donley [1]	33,700	30,900	28,496	45,167
Duval	20,500	20,000	17,867	31,344
Eastland	960	1,860	2,512	12,821
Ector	320	330	315	495
Ellis	199,000	191,000	166,909	180,494
El Paso	49,300	52,300	44,103	31,383
Erath [1]	5,400	10,000	9,244	39,114
Falls	115,000	110,000	96,785	127,309
Fannin	139,000	130,000	116,025	112,705

[1] Final county allotment not determined.

Texas—1950 county cotton allotments with comparison—Continued

County	1947 acreage standing July 1	1948 acreage standing July 1	1950 allotment	1942 allotment
Fayette	38,900	44,200	36,466	60,689
Fisher	101,000	96,000	84,219	99,158
Floyd	50,000	57,500	46,069	53,604
Foard	20,700	18,800	17,193	26,524
Fort Bend	83,000	85,000	72,476	80,919
Franklin	7,550	10,000	8,766	20,174
Freestone	25,400	32,000	26,934	51,866
Frio	670	1,000	832	2,321
Gaines [1]	45,000	30,000	33,061	23,181
Galveston	15	15	30	328
Garza [1]	52,000	62,000	48,771	38,131
Gillespie	50	150	787	6,912
Glasscock [1]	5,200	8,000	4,911	4,399
Goliad	4,940	4,850	5,420	24,197
Gonzales	21,900	26,200	22,155	61,896
Gray	3,230	3,100	3,117	8,213
Grayson [1]	70,100	75,000	63,273	96,631
Gregg	1,950	2,730	3,108	14,537
Grimes	19,800	20,400	19,260	47,539
Guadalupe	28,600	28,500	27,134	66,457
Hale [1]	85,000	96,000	77,396	81,370
Hall	122,000	120,000	103,327	89,812
Hamilton	9,800	12,500	10,813	37,721
Hardeman	40,000	43,000	36,192	59,860
Hardin	5	10	62	534
Harris	4,690	4,500	5,061	20,171
Harrison	21,800	25,400	24,840	70,672
Haskell	150,000	139,000	123,445	108,197
Hays	12,000	12,200	10,930	23,116
Hemphill	1,260	900	1,549	10,773
Henderson	7,800	9,700	12,542	53,337
Hidalgo	113,500	189,500	141,259	95,242
Hill [1]	171,000	197,000	158,392	157,888
Hockley [1]	226,000	250,000	203,939	123,388
Hood	1,320	3,420	2,788	10,987
Hopkins	51,200	50,500	45,572	79,743
Houston	20,700	30,600	26,738	71,291
Howard	105,000	101,000	87,927	64,560
Hudspeth	15,370	18,100	14,935	8,031
Hunt	178,300	170,000	149,162	136,439
Irion [1]	500	1,100	842	1,332
Jack	2,400	3,150	2,744	9,661
Jackson	19,700	20,200	17,413	30,593
Jasper	280	460	966	6,292
Jefferson	210	200	359	2,310
Jim Hogg	1,200	1,880	1,912	7,873
Jim Wells	24,100	16,500	20,350	44,422
Johnson [1]	50,600	50,000	44,276	71,883
Jones [1]	112,000	110,000	96,908	138,365
Karnes	46,000	35,300	38,007	89,127
Kaufman	110,000	104,000	93,995	117,134
Kendall [1]	5	5	14	131
Kenedy	----------	5	11	57
Kent	22,750	29,700	23,174	28,224
Kimble	----------	40	252	1,798
King [1]	14,050	12,900	11,571	11,760
Kinney	----------	----------	290	30
Kleberg	8,900	9,200	7,926	14,326
Knox [1]	88,500	81,500	72,618	67,698
Lamar	117,400	114,000	99,213	93,970
Lamb	220,000	222,000	188,709	136,532
Lampasas	1,700	2,320	2,790	15,742
La Salle	1,240	1,600	1,458	8,374
Lavaca	47,400	50,000	42,003	53,735
Lee	11,100	12,000	11,085	26,801
Leon	11,700	15,300	13,685	42,779
Liberty	3,200	3,800	3,406	10,845
Limestone	110,300	123,000	100,073	129,870
Live Oak	21,000	12,500	15,835	36,853
Llano	30	100	338	3,548
Loving [1]	500	500	460	170
Lubbock	292,000	290,000	248,699	175,123
Lynn	238,000	240,000	203,782	146,899
McCulloch	8,350	10,000	10,207	48,405
McLennan	127,600	129,000	111,755	151,206
McMullen	1,550	1,100	1,349	4,000
Madison	8,100	10,400	9,750	33,078
Marion	3,090	4,110	5,104	16,405
Martin	130,000	103,000	99,435	58,278
Mason	295	350	809	5,410
Matagorda	19,300	19,200	16,742	21,175
Maverick	7,000	7,600	7,287	2,662
Medina	10	300	494	4,559
Menard	150	300	396	3,138
Midland	31,500	23,000	23,297	23,964
Milam	72,100	75,500	64,386	110,734
Mills [1]	1,450	2,650	2,556	17,637
Mitchell	75,800	81,000	67,009	73,612
Montague	3,800	5,980	5,700	26,790
Montgomery	800	900	1,519	9,792
Morris	6,800	6,350	7,062	18,301
Motley [1]	47,700	43,100	38,826	41,610
Nacogdoches	9,000	12,000	12,704	48,001
Navarro [1]	160,000	164,000	139,408	162,234
Newton	230	590	714	4,104
Nolan	46,500	43,800	38,641	48,567
Nueces	114,000	91,000	92,081	147,388
Palo Pinto	1,870	2,980	2,385	7,965
Panola	14,600	17,300	17,367	52,883
Parker	1,000	2,930	2,670	14,499
Parmer [1]	4,650	4,950	5,020	24,522
Pecos	12,500	23,000	17,145	7,766
Polk	4,100	5,200	4,718	15,396
Presidio	2,110	2,500	2,175	3,708

[1] Final county allotment not determined.

Texas—1950 county cotton allotments with comparison—Continued

County	1947 acreage standing July 1	1948 acreage standing July 1	1950 allotment	1942 allotment
Rains	10,700	15,600	12,363	22,000
Reagan [1]	100	800	511	-------
Red River	56,000	60,500	50,129	70,531
Reeves	9,330	30,000	20,268	6,432
Refugio	11,400	10,700	10,021	19,583
Robertson	42,800	45,100	39,279	72,679
Rockwall [1]	38,000	39,500	23,222	29,381
Runnels	91,600	108,000	85,314	111,742
Rusk	15,000	25,500	23,763	71,397
Sabine	2,560	2,800	3,250	12,685
San Augustine	6,350	8,800	7,798	19,763
San Jacinto	2,290	3,520	3,402	11,715
San Patricio	74,500	76,500	67,581	93,843
San Saba [1]	4,600	5,500	5,446	22,238
Schleicher	5,650	5,850	4,999	10,733
Scurry [1]	96,800	102,000	85,005	75,337
Shackelford	1,860	1,910	2,169	9,769
Shelby	11,800	15,400	15,687	50,941
Smith	9,450	14,300	16,595	74,680
Somervell	850	1,710	1,521	4,937
Starr	23,500	32,000	24,934	23,472
Stephens	360	960	888	3,408
Sterling	-------	-------	52	929
Stonewall	24,000	23,400	21,608	39,712
Swisher	5,000	10,600	7,319	14,544
Tarrant [1]	16,000	18,000	15,137	27,962
Taylor	27,200	31,900	28,188	73,468
Terrell [1]	75	100	102	27
Terry	145,000	133,000	118,937	99,224
Throckmorton	4,510	5,430	4,831	14,785
Titus	8,700	10,700	10,465	28,592
Tom Green	61,500	72,000	56,978	50,997
Travis	53,300	55,000	46,595	67,653
Trinity	4,280	3,600	4,417	15,780
Tyler	290	320	542	4,872
Upshur	6,150	8,850	10,169	40,496
Uvalde	-------	80	252	2,132
Van Zandt	32,500	42,300	36,387	84,486
Victoria	30,300	29,400	25,824	36,143
Walker	6,500	8,050	7,410	21,693
Waller	6,600	6,550	6,652	17,371
Ward [1]	15,200	12,000	11,712	11,012
Washington	38,500	38,700	34,387	54,809
Webb	570	1,950	1,391	4,432
Wharton	91,000	97,000	81,285	83,604
Wheeler [1]	33,500	33,500	30,125	57,934
Wichita	9,800	10,000	10,067	30,462
Wilbarger	80,000	75,000	66,345	76,198
Willacy	105,300	141,000	109,444	50,338
Williamson	162,000	164,000	140,272	153,082
Wilson	6,000	4,400	6,734	33,159
Wise	900	1,700	3,248	22,506
Wood	5,280	10,400	10,404	42,003
Yoakum [1]	11,000	9,500	9,723	12,660
Young	9,350	8,350	9,050	35,178
Zapata	800	2,065	1,611	3,850
Zavala	2,500	6,000	6,019	1,104
Total	8,425,000	8,801,400	7,633,383	-------

[1] Final county allotment not determined.

Something is wrong. I urge every Member who represents a cotton district to pay very close attention to this legislation as it will be rewritten this time. It is important to the economy of the South that it be rewritten. In my opinion many Texas counties are seriously affected.

I include at this point some letters I have recently received:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., December 23, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress, Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I appreciate your sending me a copy of your letter to Mr. Trigg.

With reference to the correspondence with Judge Roy Selman, of Crockett, I am sure that many farmers in east Texas will be severely penalized under the present cotton allotments that have been issued for their farms. I am not in position to say just how many farms are adversely affected, but most of the cotton farms are affected to some extent. I am hoping that Congress will see fit to enact an amendment to the present law that will relieve the situation in that section of the State. As it now stands, it simply means that many of the cotton farmers in east Texas will not be able to produce very much cotton.

Sincerely yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Carthage, Tex., December 29, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will acknowledge your letter of December 19, 1949, requesting certain data relative to cotton allotments in Panola County, Tex.

In comparing 1950 with 1942 allotments we note that Panola had an allotment of approximately 52,700 acres in 1942 and 17,367 for 1950. These figures include the allotment for new growers also.

You ask about release and reapportionment of unused cotton acreage allotment. We expect very few acres from this source. We estimate 150 for the county. Farmers anticipate changes in procedures and fear that the surrender of cotton allotment may affect any future allotment that would be established on the farm.

We are in bad shape on new grower farms (those who did not grow cotton in any of the years 1946, 1947, or 1948); 1,300 such farms, and only 1,000 acres to distribute. Of this 1,300, at least 400 will apply for a portion of this acreage.

I hesitate to estimate the number of tenants that will be without homes as a result of the small allotments in this county. The big move will start in the spring and after Congress has considered giving some relief. They still have hopes that something better will come their way. No doubt the gentleman from Wills Point, Tex., was about right in his estimates. For an example, in Panola County, in 1942, 0.3145 percent of the cropland was allowed for cotton while in 1950 only 0.1398 percent is allowed.

We appreciate your interest and will gladly furnish any additional information upon request.

With kindest regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

T. L. VINCENT,
Administrative Officer, PMA, Panola County, Tex.

JOAQUIN, TEX., *December 17, 1949.*

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

DEAR SIR: I got my cotton-acreage allotment the other day. I have been cut down on my cotton acreage to 7 7/10 acres, on a 100-acre farm. They cut the acreage like it was cut in the thirties, by the allowance I had in the thirties.

I have been planting from 35 to 45 acres in cotton for the last 7 or 8 years, and it will be impossible for me to make a living on not less than 20 or 25 acres. For farming is all I know to do. I have 10 children besides my wife and I. And it would be impossible for me to make a living at that small rate of acreage. Farming is the only way I have to pay my debts. For I have had an operation in my family, besides other sickness, which amounts to about $700 this fall.

These men in this office in Panola County has had it in for me since years back, and they will not give me any more acreage. I know of a place just above my place that has not farmed for several years, and he is allowed to plant 10 acres next year. And the family is just the man and wife with two very small children.

I'm trying to educate my children and I cannot educate them or make a living at this rate. I made 14 bales this year, and it takes about 3 acres of my land to make a bale. I made this 14 bales on 45 acres this year. I can prove this statement by my neighbors all over this country.

Please give this letter personal attention so I can make a living, for everyone in this community says I have not been treated fair. My place is cut at about 95 percent. If they cut the whole Nation over at my rate there will not be but about 6,500,000 acres of cotton another year.

I farmed for the Government all the time during the war and lost money on it raising potatoes, tomatoes, and beans. So why can't I have a chance now to make some back? Please give this personal attention and let me know by return mail.

Hoping you all have a merry Christmas and a happy new year.

Yours truly,

ZAN R. MAY.

Please note the answer I received about the May case:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., December 28, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your memorandum of December 22 with which you enclosed a copy of a letter from Mr. Zan R. May, route 2, Joaquin, Tex. Mr. May had complained about the 1950 cotton allotment for his 100-acre farm in Panola County.

If Mr. May is dissatisfied with his allotment and can offer facts to substantiate his claim, he may file an application for review of his farm acreage allotment and marketing quota with the county administrative officer, Mr. Tom Vincent, at Carthage. A review of the allotment and quota will be made in due time by a committee of farmers from neighboring counties to determine if Panola County and community committeemen have determined his allotment and quota in accordance with existing regulations and instructions.

It is my opinion that the Panola County committee has determined his allotment correctly. As previously explained, the county allotment seems adequate in view of the acreage of cotton that has been planted on all farms in the county in recent years. However, in making 1950 allotments, the State and county committees were required to apportion the county allotment among farms on which cotton was planted in one or more of the years 1946–48 and also on other farms on which no cotton was planted during these 3 years but on which cotton war-crop credits were determined in 1946 or 1947. I feel that this requirement of law is the reason for the very low allotment established for Mr. May.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

GLADEWATER, TEX.,
December 14, 1949.

Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR LINDLEY: I have a farm in Shelby County and my allotment in 1936, 1937, and 1938 was 23 or 24 acres of bottom but during the war I was unable to have anyone on the farm to farm it. Now I have a renter, Clarence Green, Joaquin, Tex. His allotment is only one acre and I cannot see how this boy can live with a family of six dependents—five children and wife—because there is no kind of public work and there is no market for any produce you can sell on this farm. It looks to me like this boy is either going to have to give up trying to farm or get our cotton acreage raised.

Whoever may this concern, how would you feel in this poor fellow's condition? In other words, there is no job available for the man, nowhere for him to go. Not only this man,

but hundreds of others that are in the same situation.

Your friend,

W. M. TAYLOR.

P. S.—In other words, Lindley, during wartimes and say up until the present people could grow stuff on the farms such as hogs, cattle, chickens, and other things and they could grow feed to grow this stuff out. But our markets are beginning to fade away and people cannot get anything out of hogs at the present price. People who have been on the farm have pretty well got the market flooded with any kind of produce you might mention. Furthermore, this poor man on my farm has just come back to the farm without anything and there are others in the same community or in east Texas. LINDLEY, any information you can give me on this matter will be appreciated. In my way of thinking, instead of sending delegates to Europe checking on the situation, they are going to send them to east Texas and Texas.

Please note the answer about the Taylor case:

COLLEGE STATION, TEX., *December 23, 1949.*
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
United States Representative,
Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your memorandum of December 16 with which you included an exact copy of a letter from Mr. W. M. Taylor, of route 2, Gladewater, Tex. Mr. Taylor had complained about the 1.2-acre cotton allotment established for his farm.

I feel sure the county PMA committee has established the 1950 cotton allotment for this farm in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 272 passed by the Congress in August. However, it may be that there were errors made on the report of crop acreages and land uses for the years 1945–49 that all farmers made to county committees during the summer of 1949. Mr. Taylor should check these figures with his local county committee.

This law provides among other things that each eligible farm shall have an allotment of not less than the smaller of (a) 5.0 acres or (b) the highest cotton acreage and war-crop credit during the years 1946–48. In all probability no cotton was planted on the farm during the 3 years but a cotton war-crop credit of 1.0 acres was computed. If this assumption is correct, then the allotment has been correctly determined and the farm is not entitled to a larger allotment. Also, if the assumption given above is correct, the farm would not receive a larger allotment under the proposed amendments to existing cotton legislation that were recommended by the House committee on December 13.

I regret that we are unable to give more specific information about this farm since we do not have any records in this office.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

GRAND SALINE, TEX., *December 12, 1949.*
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR LINDLEY: I did not plant any cotton in 1946, 1947, or 1948. This year I had a crop and bought a tractor. I have to make special application before I will get to grow any cotton. I owe on my tractor and won't be able to pay for it according to the allotment. I have had the cotton land all the time. I don't think I should be penalized now because I didn't grow cotton the past 3 years.

There are a lot of people around me who are in the same shape I am in. It has been beneficial to our farms and to the price of cotton for us to let land lay out. To restrict the allotment to the last 3 years will certainly penalize the farmers in Van Zandt County. We are wondering if you can help. We have either let our land lay out or have utilized it for something else. We don't see why we can't grow cotton the same as the man who did not diversify and who did not sacrifice in order to reduce the cotton acreage in the first place.

We have already done what the Government is trying to force farmers to do now. We should not be penalized for voluntarily doing that which the Government is now forcing upon us. The fellow who should be favored—instead of favoring him the Government is penalizing him.

Since 1942 I have been in bad health and couldn't farm until this year. Instead of renting I let my land lay out. Now I am being penalized because of the bad condition of my health from 1943 to 1948.

Sincerely yours,

OSIE L. SWAIN.

P. S.—I am also informed that those who did not grow cotton in 1946–47–48 will not be allowed to vote in an election scheduled Deceber 15 in the marketing-quota referendum.

MOUNT SYLVAN, TEX., *December 21, 1949.*
Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR LINDLEY: Your letter received. Was glad to hear from you in regard to our cotton allotment here in Smith and adjoining counties. I do hope that Congress will make some kind of relief for the east Texas farmers when they meet in January. What is going to become of the tenant farmer? They have taken the very smallest acreage that east Texas ever had to figure the acreage by. I have a farm that had planted 20 acres of cotton in 1948, 1947, and 1946. Will be allowed nine-tenths acre in 1951. Everybody can't go in the cattle business, potato, and watermelons. I do not understand why they are cutting east Texas out on the cotton business.

Lindley, I am going to depend on your doing your best to get Congress to modify this law so that east Texas country can have their just rights.

Hoping you a merry Christmas and a happy New Year.

Your friend,

W. H. BOYNTON.

GRAND SALINE, TEX., *December 26, 1949.*
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Washington, D. C.

KIND FRIEND: I am writing you in regard to our farm program.

To me it seems unjust as I have 435 acres of land and 300 acres of this is cropland. When World War II came on all of the tenants left my farm and went to airplane factories and shipyards and me not being able to rent any of my land I went into the stock business a year ago. I was forced by my health to go out of the stock business so I began to try to rent my land and in 1949 I did succeed in getting some of my land worked. However now they tell me because I failed to have any cotton and such like in 1946 and 1947, I am not eligible for any cotton. I do think that they have promised me 4 acres of cotton, and as you know as a farm boy, I cannot rent my land without some cotton acreage. I do not believe that it was the intention of Congress for all of this land to lay out.

Lindley, as you know this is my only source of income to exist and I was wondering if anything can be done at this late hour, so I thought it best that you should know how this set-up is going.

Hoping that you and your family are enjoying the best of health, I am

Sincerely yours,

HENRY A. GODWIN.

GRAND SALINE, TEX., *December 27, 1949.*
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you in regard to my cotton allotment.

I borrowed the money to buy my farm and tractor through the FHA. I can't pay for this without any cotton. The only 3 years that I did not plant cotton was in 1945, 1946, and 1947.

I raised truck and feed. I have one neighbor who got 9 acres. He has not planted any cotton in 10 years. There is plenty of that over the county.

I hate to bother you with this letter, but I sure would appreciate it if you could help me get some cotton.

I have supported you in every campaign that you have made.

Hoping to hear from you soon.

Your friend,

E. J. HALE.

BEN WHEELER, TEX., *December 26, 1949.*
Mr. BECKWORTH.

DEAR SIR: I am a farmer, have farmed in Van Zandt County all of my life, and am 36 years old. Was raised on a 495-acre farm here in this part of the county. My father sold our farm in 1937 and have rented ever since. You might say I was raised in the cotton patch. In the past 3 years I have lived on a place where the landlord worked in town, but he is going to work his place himself next year (1950), so I bought a nearby farm of 460 acres—some 175 in cultivation in 1942. It had 57 acres of cotton allotment in 1941. It had planted 54 acres of cotton on it. (I owe for most of it.) But for the past few years (as the owner was old) he leased it to a man who put cows on it and did not farm it. The place where I have been working has an allotment on the record of my farming, but I have not got any allotment on the farm I bought, where I am moving, because it had no cotton on it in the past 3 or 4 years.

We are calling for help for farms which do not have allotments while others have allotments. Mr. BECKWORTH, the only fair way is to treat everybody alike. I am a farmer. If my neighbor is allowed a certain percent of his cultivation acres, I want the same percent of my cultivation acres. If a cotton renter has to move on a farm where there has been no cotton previously, he can't get any cotton; therefore, he cannot borrow money on his crop. If we don't get the same percent of our cultivation acres of allotment on cotton as our neighbor (who probably doesn't have to change farms), there certainly will be unrest and dissatisfaction.

Your cooperation and help will be appreciated.

Yours truly,

S. C. HUFF.

DECEMBER 22, 1949.
Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I am writing you this letter in behalf of the farmers of East Texas. I shall use myself for example: I live 12 miles east of Tyler on a 175-acre farm. I have farmed all of my life except for the 2 years spent in World War I. During the years 1946, 1947, 1948 I did public work. This year I went back to farming. I have 165 acres in cultivation of which I planted 20 acres to cotton.

The new law which was voted into existence prohibits me from planting any cotton because I haven't any cotton history.

I went to the triple-A office to enter my application for the allotment of the cotton acreage. I was informed that there would be only an acre or so; therefore, I withdrew my application. I have no alternative but try to get a public job, unless I grow cotton regardless of the law.

I am obligated to my family. I have a daughter in college, which I had hopes of seeing finish. I believe that if our lawmakers had experience in farming we would have better laws for the interest of the farmers.

As I see the situation they are penalizing the wrong man; they should penalize the man planting 3,000 acres instead of the man with only 30 acres. The large planter is causing the surplus, not the one that has only a minimum number of acres. Seems to me that the lawmakers are too busy taking care of the big producers and not giving the small producer any consideration at all.

Don't you believe that there is discrimination in this law? In your honest opinion don't you believe it is unconstitutional? The farmers do not need a dole, what they need is a dependable market.

I shall expect you to do the utmost in your power to relieve us of these difficulties. To support my family properly I shall need at least 20 acres of cotton.

Cordially yours,

F. P. BOULTER.

BEN WHEELER, TEX.

L. BECKWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you to see if you can help me get some cotton acreage on this place.

I live on the Paul Gigler's place, and it has about 175 acres in cultivation. I raised cotton on this place this year. The 1949 cotton crop was the first cotton crop since 1941. I had 23 acres this year and made 9 bales of cotton. If I could be allowed about 20 acres this year I could make it fine.

I have 8 children at home and I have to feed and clothe them.

There are several farmers around me that were allowed good cotton acreage, and yet they haven't planted any cotton in 10 or 12 years.

The banks will not loan money if you don't have some cotton acreage. I have plenty of security to put up to the bank but they will not loan any money unless you have a cotton crop.

Mr. BECKWORTH, I need some cotton acreage bad, and I will deeply appreciate your cooperation.

Yours truly,

W. H. HOPSON.

P. S.—I have no other means of supporting my family other than raising cotton. Thank you.

GRAND SALINE, TEX.,
December 23, 1949.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

DEAR SIR: I did not get any cotton acreage for the year of 1950. I wonder just why. Seems to me like it was an unfair thing. They tell me it was because I did not have cotton in 1946–47–48.

I had truck crops and seems they did not give me credit for any war crops. Way things are going to be next year we may not can sell truck stuff, and we have a farm to pay for. I am expecting you to do all you can to help me get an allotment. I think each farm should have a few acres don't you?

We have 112½ acres and 75 acres in cultivation and are not allowed any cotton at all.

I appreciate whatever you can do to help me.

ARLIE E. HOLLOWELL.

GRAND SALINE, TEX.,
December 15, 1949.

Mr. BECKWORTH,
Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR SIR AND FRIEND: Us farmers are greatly disturbed over this cotton allotment. We are in favor of governmental control of cotton acreage, but us little farmers are not in it at all. I have a little 100-acre farm. Have been in bad health for 5 years. 1947 and 1948 I didn't have 1 acre on my place in cotton, so I am not allowed to vote, or have any cotton either. I am wondering if our Government has completely turned on us little farmers. It seems like the ones that owns thousands of acres of wheat and cotton lands are fully protected. Has our Government forgot the Golden Rule and have they forgot equal rights to all men, special privileges to none?

I have one neighbor who has bought a tractor and the farm he owns didn't have any cotton on it at all in 1947 and 1948. So what is he to do? He is not allowed but very little cotton, if any. I have several neighbors in the same shape. They are poor, hard-working people and good people.

Mr. BECKWORTH, can you get Congress, you and Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. JOHNSON, to have this cotton allotment changed some so the little farmers can live through it? If the farmers all have to plant cabbage, potatoes, tomatoes, and sweet corn for living, there won't be any market for it.

Hoping there can be something done and with best wishes.

W. I. CREW AND WIFE.

GRAND SALINE, TEX., *December 16, 1949.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Gilmer, Tex.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I imagine you are hearing from quite a few dissatisfied cotton farmers about Government control of acreage. They are all for price supports, however. I see no possible way of having price support without some kind of production control, but the method of determining allotments is very unfair. If we had a law that would prevent a man planting more than 50 percent of his acreage to cotton and preventing planting cotton 2 years in succession on the same land, we would have very little need for price support and no need for any other control of cotton production and such a law would be fair to everybody. Furthermore such a law would be justified as a soil-conservation measure.

If this suggestion meets with your approval, will you please give it your immediate attention at the coming session of the Congress?

Very truly yours,

HOMER E. TUNNELL,
A retired cotton farmer.

Mr. Speaker, note at this point the answer to the Tunnell letter:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., December 28, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of December 22, with which you enclosed a copy of a letter from Mr. Homer E. Tunnell, a retired cotton farmer of Grand Saline, Tex. Mr. Tunnell had suggested that the cotton-acreage allotment and marketing-quota program should prevent a farm allotment in excess of 50 percent of the cropland and should require the rotation of cotton acreage each year.

In general, we agree with the suggestion that a farm allotment should not exceed 50 percent of the cropland in the farm. However, some exceptions need to be made, especially for small farms where a larger acreage of cotton needs to be produced in order that the people depending on the small farm for a living can have sufficient cash crop acreage for this purpose. Also, we agree with the suggestion that cotton acreage should be rotated on the farm each year, but do not feel that such a provision need be written into law. It is the job of the Extension Service, Soil Conservation Service, and others who work with farmers to show that crop rotation is desirable and profitable.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Newton, Tex., December 30, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: The following information is in reply to your request of December 19, 1949:

County cotton-acreage allotment for 1942, 4,096.7 acres. County cotton-acreage allotment for 1950, 714.2 acres.

Since the county allotment for 1950 is so small it is felt that only a small acreage of perhaps 50 would be released for reapportionment.

Our allotments are all very small, which means that landlords who farm themselves will not be able to have any tenants. If each acre of war crops were considered as an acre of cotton, our allotment would probably double, which would be quite a relief over the present situation.

Under the present law we will have an estimated 75 farmers who will not be able to grow any cotton because of the lack of an acreage allotment.

Yours very truly,

T. H. INMAN,
Chairman, Newton County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Livingston, Tex., December 30, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress, Third District, Texas, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In accordance with your request of recent date the following information is furnished for and by Polk County for cotton and war crops.

The cotton allotment for Polk County in 1941 was 16,384.3 acres. (Reference 504 GA.)

The cotton-acreage allotment for 1950 is 4,754.4 acres.

The following information is taken from a tabulation of the 532–C as filed by farm operators and owners in the spring of 1949:

Year 1945:	
Cotton planted	5,901
War crops	3,258
Year 1946:	
Cotton planted	4,777
War crops	3,414
Year 1947:	
Cotton planted	4,919
War crops	3,409
Year 1948:	
Cotton planted	6,556
War crops	-----

According to our interpretation of the instructions for establishing allotments credit for war crops was given credit just the same as if the farmer had planted the acreage of cotton. On the other hand it is our understanding that when allotments were issued to each county, only the acreages of cotton for the various years were considered and no consideration given to the war crops grown for the years in question.

Furthermore, your attention is called to the acreages of cotton reported for Polk County by the BAE.

Year 1945: Cotton	5,050
Year 1946: Cotton	2,940
Year 1947: Cotton	4,100
Year 1948: Cotton	5,200

In accordance with instructions for computing cotton allotments for the county the committeemen were compelled to adjust the acreages of cotton on the farms down to the point where the acreage would agree with the BAE estimate. It is the opinion of the county committee that the community committeemen did a very good job in securing acreage history and that their knowledge of the plantings of cotton was far more accurate than that of the BAE.

An examination of the foregoing figures will indicate that Polk County has diverted approximately 50 percent of its cotton land to other crops since 1941. The present allotment as now established will work extreme hardships on those who have continued throughout the years to produce cotton. As the situation is now, there will be a number of tenant farmers displaced. Where will these tenant farmers go? They cannot go to another farm because the other cotton farms cannot absorb them as the allotment is not sufficient.

The county factor for Polk County is 16 percent. That means that no farm, whatever the amount of cotton planted each year, could receive more than 16 acres of cotton for each 100 acres of cropland. A number of farmers have consistently planted from 50 to 80 percent of their cropland to cotton. When the county factor is applied to such farms it practically means that this type of farmer is ruined.

As the situation now stands it seems that we are encouraging unemployment or asking for another WPA. None of us have use for parasites. There is only one real wealth. It is the product of man's mind and skill and sweat.

Very truly yours,

JETT G. BROCK,
Chairman, Polk County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., December 28, 1949.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of December 23 in which you have raised two questions as to how the cotton allotment and marketing quota program will affect cotton farmers.

Section 344 (f) of the AAA Act of 1938, as amended, provides that "the county acreage allotment less not to exceed the percentage provided for in paragraph 3 of this subsection shall be apportioned to farms on which cotton has been planted (or regarded as having been planted) in any one of the 3 years immediately preceding the year for which such allotment is determined."

As we understand this provision, 1950 cotton allotments are determined for farms and not for farmers. Also, for 1950 the allotment is based on the history of the farm during the years 1946, 1947, and 1948, as well as the amount of cropland in the farm. Conceivably then, there might be genuine cotton farmers who will operate farms in 1950 for which allotments cannot be established under the provisions of the law. Even in these few cases, it is possible for county committees to establish group II or new farm allotments to the extent that the county reserve acreage set aside for this purpose will permit.

It is my opinion that very few, if any, genuine cotton farmers will be denied the privilege of growing some cotton during the 1950 crop year.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. I want to say that the gentleman's predictions that amendments are necessary to be made to the cotton-acreage allotment legislation have no doubt come to pass, and I congratulate the gentleman on his very fine fight to remove any inequities which might exist. I recall that you were the only Member to take the floor and state that the legislation on cotton-acreage allotments as contained in the Agricultural Act of 1949 was unworkable.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I predicted it, and I predict this, that if this legislation is not materially changed now, it will be changed again in the future because people have to be given a live and let live situation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Texas that when he made his protest, when the bill was before the House, I joined him.

This is one of the most dangerous steps toward regimentation of the farmers of this country that has ever been taken, and if it is carried to its ultimate you will not only drive the little cotton farmer from his field, as you are doing now; but you will tell a man how much corn he can raise, how much wheat he can raise, how many cows he can milk, how many beef cattle and hogs he can sell, and how many chickens and eggs he can sell. The law ought to be repealed.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I do recall the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] warned of the serious effects of the legislation if it were not changed.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I have just introduced a resolution to correct some of the inequities that have resulted from the application of the law enacted in the last session, and I hope the gentleman will avail himself of the opportunity to read this resolution.

Mr. BECKWORTH. When will the hearings begin?

Mr. COOLEY. We hope we will not have to have hearings, but we will consider it on the 10th of the month in the committee.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I think that is a most significant statement, the fact that perhaps we shall not have hearings. In my opinion there was never a piece of legislation on which hearings are needed worse than this. The people certainly need to have a chance to have their story told.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman realizes that we have already heard enough to know that the bill needs to be amended. Now, if the gentleman wants to be heard before the committee, perhaps I can arrange to hear the gentleman.

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is very considerate, and I am sure I shall want to be heard.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

CHAMBER DECORATIONS

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to comment shortly on something that is vital to everybody sitting here, and that is these decorations which have just been installed.

I think the new decorations in the Chamber now bring it up to the level of the average movie house. But I cannot understand why in heaven's name the committee gave us all paint and decorations and did not do anything about these hard seats. I have been sitting here for 5 years on these very same board seats, and some of us are not born with the proper cushions. Certainly we people who were not precushioned should have some consideration.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee that has charge of the remodeling of this Chamber, I might say to the distinguished gentleman and my friend from Pennsylvania that I appreciate his remarks relative to the seating, the lighting, the acoustics, and I beg to advise the seating arrangements will be taken care of this coming summer. It was impossible for the contractor to complete all the remodeling between the period that Congress adjourned and the time that we reconvened. But, under the program established, the remodeling will continue after Congress has adjourned this coming year and we hope by January 1951 the project will be completed as per plans.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I certainly trust that the gentleman will confine his remarks to the decorations in the Chamber and not mention the Rose Bowl game yesterday.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the capable gentleman from California and am glad to bring to the attention of the House that great feat of yesterday when Ohio State University defeated the University of California. A contest of real sportsmanship exemplified by two great universities from two great States——

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. What became of the State seals?

Mr. McGREGOR. Replicas of the State seals are in the ceiling.

Mr. STEFAN. What became of the old ones?

Mr. McGREGOR. They are being repaired and are in storage. The com-

mittee is giving consideration as to what to do with them and we certainly will be glad to receive suggestions from any of the Members on how to dispose of them. No definite plan of action has yet been decided upon. We certainly are open to suggestions and your recommendations will be considered by the committee and then final action will be taken with full approval of the leadership and we hope to the satisfaction of as many Members as possible.

Mr. STEFAN. My State of Nebraska had two seals in the ceiling here, a State seal and a Territorial seal. Have they been replaced?

Mr. McGREGOR. I cannot answer the gentleman, but I will say that there will be a replica of each State and each Territorial seal. We will have the same number of seals, both of States and Territories, in the ceiling as prior to the remodeling.

Mr. STEFAN. However, some States had two seals. We had two seals.

Mr. McGREGOR. We will be very glad to check it for the gentleman and I recognize his interest and helpful suggestion.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain excerpts from various publications.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE LATE CLYDE M. REED

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad and painful duty to inform the House of the death of CLYDE M. REED, late a Senator from Kansas, at his home in Parsons, Labette County, Kans., on November 8.

CLYDE REED came to Labette County, Kans., at the age of 4 and remained a resident of that county for the rest of his life. Most of his adult years were spent in the public service. He was appointed to the railway mail service while quite a young man and spent 28 years in the Post Office Department. During that time he advanced rapidly to positions of responsibility and at the time of his resignation in 1910, had risen to one of the highest positions in the career service of the Department.

He resigned from the Government service to take over the active management of the Parsons (Kans.) Sun and remained the editor and publisher of that paper until his death. He made it one of the leading newspapers in a State which is noted for the high quality of its public press.

CLYDE REED did not reenter public life until 1919 when he became secretary to Gov. Henry J. Allen, who in 1920 appointed him as a member of the new Kansas Court of Industrial Relations. In 1921 Governor Allen appointed him as chairman of the Kansas Public Utilities Commission in which capacity he served until 1924. In 1928 CLYDE REED was elected Governor of Kansas and served from 1929 to 1931. In 1938 he became a candidate for the United State Senate and was successful in both the primary and general election at a time when many people felt that a Republican candidate had little chance to win.

During and between his periods of public service CLYDE REED made an intense and thorough study of transportation and became one of the country's greatest authorities in that very complex and difficult field. As a transportation expert both in and out of public life, he rendered a great service to the Middle West in bringing about more equitable transportation rates.

In the Senate of the United States CLYDE REED was a most active and effective Member. His preeminence in the field of transportation was quickly recognized. Much of his work was done as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but he was active in other fields, notably agriculture and appropriations. CLYDE REED was outstanding both because of his industry and ability. He went to the bottom of every problem he considered. These qualifications were matched only by his courage and it is perhaps this latter quality which will be remembered longest both by his friends and his enemies. By his very nature CLYDE REED was destined to have strong friends and strong enemies. It was not in him to compromise. When he reached a conclusion he stood by it and both his friends and his enemies can testify that he never ducked a fight. Sometimes he won and sometimes he lost, but in either case the opposition always knew there had been a fight. There was rarely if ever anything personal about CLYDE REED's fights and many of his enemies in one battle might very well be his friends in the next one.

CLYDE REED lived a full life. He died in harness just as he would have wished. Very few men crammed into 78 years as much effort and activity as he did. His life typifies the opportunity which exists in America. Starting out as a poor boy, his intelligence, industry, and courage carried him to the top. He and Mrs. Reed had a family of seven children, all of whom have distinguished themselves in various activities of life, and who with his gracious wife survive him. Our heartfelt sympathy goes to all of them in their loss of a husband and father.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Senator CLYDE M. REED, the State of Kansas, as well as the country at large, has sustained the loss of one of its outstanding public servants.

Senator REED was an ardent student of public affairs. He was a hard worker and devoted his time and attention to dealing with problems affecting his State and his country. He was one of those men who had a rare—a keen sense of justice. He did not hesitate to express and defend his views on public questions.

Senator REED spent many years in public service. He was in the postal service for a considerable period of time. He served with distinction on the Public Utilities Commission of Kansas. As Governor of the State, he made an outstanding record. I know of no one who worked harder and gave more of his energy and his time to service of the people than did Senator REED.

Senator REED disagreed frequently, but he disagreed honestly and honorably.. He was courageous in his stand for what he believed to be right. To his devoted family, we desire to extend our deepest sympathy. The Congress of the United States has suffered a great loss in his passing.

The words of a familiar poem are especially appropriate on this occasion:

God give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor—men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagog
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking!
Tall men, sun crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Senator CLYDE M. REED, Kansas lost one of its colorful political figures.

Though many did not agree with him on some issues, everyone admired him for his direct, courageous, outspoken convictions. Wherever and whenever Kansans gather and talk politics, the name of Senator CLYDE REED will be heard—it will be long remembered and highly respected.

The family, to whom heartfelt sympathy is extended, lost a fine father. Kansas lost an outstanding citizen, one who will always be among the State's great men.

May the memory of his courage and his loyalty long be an inspiration to Americans everywhere.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the Kansas motto is "To the stars, through difficulty." Senator CLYDE M. REED, of Kansas, was a man whose able, conscientious and courageous life symbolized the path trod in arriving at the stars through difficulty. To Senator REED barriers were merely paving stones in his path to great accomplishments. He never chose the easy way, but the one he believed right. He thrived on opposition and, on the other hand, was a loyal friend.

Kansas mourns the passing of its statesman. Kansas is proud of his record and the State will always, in the future, as it has in the past, remember Senator REED as one of its favorite sons.

I feel a distinct personal loss in his passing, because of his exceptional courtesies and kindnesses to me since I have been in Washington.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MEYER].

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the late Senator REED.

In the passing of Senator REED the State and Nation have lost a great and fearless leader who was uncompromising

in battling for the preservation of our American way of life. He was my good personal friend and always an inspiration to me in my congressional work. He has left a lasting imprint for good in our national well-being. He was a warrior for integrity in the public service.

Although Senator REED is no longer with us the principles for which he stood and the prodigious work which he did in the Senate will always leave a lasting impression.

Mr. KEOGH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve with the late distinguished Senator REED from Kansas as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Maritime Academy. In that service I came to know and respect him for his application to his duty, his intimate grasp of the details of the operations of an institution of that type. I am sure that I bespeak the sentiments of the members of the Board that the Senate has lost a great man and the country a great public servant.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and character of Senator CLYDE M. REED.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

THE LATE CLYDE M. REED

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 409), which I send to the desk, and I move its adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. CLYDE M. REED, a Senator of the United States from the State of Kansas.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and also to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the life of his father by Clyde M. Reed, Jr.

THE LATE HONORABLE GEORGE J. BATES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 410), which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. GEORGE J. BATES, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and in that extension that I may include a eulogy by Archbishop Cushing, of Boston.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad duty that I have today, to offer this resolution concerning the death of an old and honored colleague, and a friend whose friendship I had cherished for many years.

It was with great sorrow and a distinct shock that we heard a few short weeks ago of the death of our colleague, GEORGE J. BATES, of Massachusetts. Mr. BATES had been at his home in Massachusetts when he received a call to attend a meeting of the Armed Services Committee. In order that he might attend that session of the committee, he was obliged to take an airplane. We all know the terrible story; as the ship was entering the Washington Airport, a tragedy ensued which caused his death. Thus died a fine, Christian gentleman; a leader of men and a man who served his country devotedly and with great distinction.

The career of Mr. BATES was one of the outstanding careers of Massachusetts. It resembled very much the old Horatio Alger stories; a story possible only in America. Born in Salem of humble parentage, he had a distinguished public career, and was honored and respected, not only by all those who knew him but everywhere throughout the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the country.

He worked in early manhood in the shops of Salem. His neighbors and friends came to appreciate his ability and manly qualities, and he was selected to become a member of the State legislature. Here he served creditably for 7 years, then served as mayor of the city of Salem for 14 years, and as one of our colleagues in this House for 14 years. In every instance he gave complete satisfaction and left an enviable record of achievement. He was a man who had a passion for service. He liked to serve the people. He liked to make his country a stronger and a better country. Perhaps few men ever had a greater loyalty for the Navy than did he. In his district, history records, was the birthplace of the American Navy.

He realized the greatness of America's past had been largely due to the strength and the prowess of its Navy. He devoted his fine talents to making the American Navy so strong that it would be superior to the navy that any other nation might put afloat.

He fought vigorously for the industries of New England, to improve the position of the workers from whom he came and whom he loved.

So this man of peace served the people most of his adult life.

It was quite appropriate, if death had to come, that it should come while traveling to attend a committee meeting. He died serving a cause he had loved.

GEORGE BATES was a family man. He had a charming wife and a large family of boys and girls who had been reared with his own fine characteristics of honesty, integrity, and love of country.

Today we honor a great man, a splendid son of Massachusetts, a man who, had he lived, would unquestionably have been called by the people to serve in a higher post. Fate decided otherwise. He is dead. We have all lost a fine friend, one whom we honored and respected. This earth is poorer for his departure but richer for his contributions.

To his wife and family go, I am sure, the heartfelt sympathy of all of us privileged to know him.

May he find in the other world above that reward he so abundantly earned.

Mr. Speaker, I think it most fitting on this occasion to extend at this point in my remarks the eulogy of Archbishop Richard J. Cushing for our late colleague:

It is not usual to pronounce eulogies at the funerals in our churches. A profound Catholic instinct impels us to commend our blessed dead to the judgment of God with the prayerful hope that they may be numbered among His saints. It is our belief that from the moment of the change which removes our loved ones from our sight to give them the blessed vision of God, all their earthly titles, qualities, and renown become of little or no importance. He who has God totally and perfectly, as we pray that our dead possess Him, no longer has need of our praise. He who loses God cannot be helped by any words of ours. So we pray for our dead, but we do not presume to praise them in the hour of their passing.

This abstention from eulogies, therefore, conforms with the spirit of the church. It is also consistent with the humble, quiet character of most of our people. It is particularly consistent with the whole tenor of the life and personality of the God-fearing, self-effacing Christian gentleman and public servant for whom we are met to pray this morning.

Congressman BATES would have been the last to ask a eulogy. In fact, it would never have occurred to him to request that there be no eulogy, since it would not have entered his mind that words of praise would be spoken in his regard from this sacred place.

If only for that reason, I pause this morning before the church gives him her final absolution and her blessing to bespeak our admiration for him, our sympathy with his family and friends, and our confidence that their spouse, father, and leader is truly and safely in the hands of God.

I did not know Congressman BATES personally. I had met him many times on public occasions where our respective duties brought us together. But it is a proof of his retiring simplicity that far more people, myself among them, knew his merits than knew the man himself. That is at once the most accurate and the most enviable tribute to him: that even without knowing him personally, many, many thousands knew his high worth and the tremendous good that he did.

Congressman BATES was born in nearby Peabody, and all the days and the deeds of his life in Salem were identified with the service of this New England city. As a member of the Massachusetts Great and General Court, he represented Salem when first he entered public life, more than 30 years ago. He was mayor of Salem for many years until 1937. Since that year until now he represented the area which includes Salem in the Congress of the United States. He never outgrew his home town. Though all the Nation and even the world benefited from him and mourns his passing, Salem especially is the poorer for his death.

A public servant and therefore obliged to live no small part of his life before the public eye, the Congressman remained nonetheless a retiring personality and he did not obtrude his personal preferences or his family life upon public notice.

The son of parents both born in Ireland, he was indebted to that same holy place for

the devoted wife who holds first place in our sympathy today. God gave them nine children, of whom seven have survived to be the fairest monument to their father and the sweetest consolation of his spouse. Despite his great love for his family and his pride in them, the Congressman gave a magnificent example in the objectivity with which he subordinated family affection to public responsibility in his use of the power which went with his office.

I have heard him frequently praised for the fact that his sons and his daughters volunteered for naval service and neither expected nor received from their father special consideration or undue pressure in their behalf. That fact should be a great consolation to them now that he is dead; it is a great tribute to his memory.

Long before World War II the Congressman was prudently concerned about national strength and about the moral obligation of national preparedness. He was conservative by character and in his political and social opinions, but his conservatism had sane and sound roots in his own background. That background included his descent from hard-working people, frugal, conscientious, self-reliant, and self-respecting. His own first job as a young man was in a foundry where he early made his acquaintance with hard work and with the true problems of those who labor.

Congressman BATES did not have unusual opportunities for education, but he acquired great wisdom. He was not a joiner or socially ambitious in any sense, yet he made many and firm friends in every class. He did not use his race or his religion or his fraternal connections to advance his personal or political interests, though I am told that he originally sought public office at the urging of his brothers in division 18, of the Ancient Order of Hibernians. They trusted him—and he did not betray their trust.

No scandal attached to his name. Great good was patiently, quietly, persistently promoted by this man through all the years of his public life. His official success and public progress did not corrupt his private integrity or personal character. He labored hard for the city of man but he did not forfeit his place in the city of God. He has worked hard. He deserves the eternal rest, the peace and the life in God which we beg for him before God's altar here this morning.

Just before he left on his journey to Washington the other morning he knelt as did all Catholics, to hear mass for the feast of All Saints. Before the journey could reach its earthly destination he was, as we confidently pray, himself among the saints, enjoying that clear vision of God, the desire for which prompted him to be present at mass on that fateful day. It was almost the last act of his life. It was a beautiful symbol of the holiness of his death.

Eternal rest grant unto him. O Lord! May his soul and all the souls of the faithful departed through the mercy of God rest in peace. Amen.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, my memories of service in public life with and friendship for GEORGE BATES go back to 1920 when we both served in the House of Representatives of the Massachusetts Legislature. George Bates was one of the most dynamic members of the legislature, and served in that body for a number of years. During part of that time he also served as mayor of his city. He was one of the most remarkable men I have ever met, a man of great ability, of deep faith, a man of courage, and a man of loyalty. As the years went by between 1920 and the time of his tragic death, our paths in public service came together again in the halls of Congress. As Members of this body our friendship became stronger and stronger. I have said on several occasions, and I repeat now, that the middle aisle is meaningless in the friendships that we form. I am in politics a Democrat; GEORGE BATES in politics was a Republican, but that meant nothing to us in our friendship, and it means nothing to those of us who serve now and who will serve in the future; friendship transcends everything else, particularly that which relates to political considerations. GEORGE BATES was a true friend. His family life was outstanding; a good husband, a good father, a good legislator, a good friend. God in His Wisdom took him in the tragic way He did and I have every confidence that his soul is with his Maker now.

I attended the funeral of our late colleague, and the people of the city of Salem gave him one of the greatest tributes I have ever seen.

In the death of GEORGE BATES, Massachusetts has lost one of its outstanding sons, the Nation one of its great citizens.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, in the tragic death of our colleague, the Honorable GEORGE J. BATES, the Congress has lost an able legislator; the Armed Services have lost a stanch advocate; the American people have lost an outstanding statesman; and I have lost a very close personal friend.

Words alone cannot express my feeling nor can they possibly convey to his family my sorrow.

GEORGE J. BATES represented all that is good in man. His personal life was exemplary. His public life was beyond reproach. He devoted himself to his family, his church, and his country. I know of no man in many years as a Member of this body who dedicated himself so unselfishly to the American people, without regard to his own welfare.

The majority of the years of his life were spent in public service as a member of the Massachusetts State Legislature, as mayor of Salem, and as a Representative in this body since the Seventy-fifth Congress, when he became a member of the Naval Affairs Committee. When that committee and the Military Affairs Committee were combined into the Armed Services Committee, he continued to contribute to the Congress and to the American people the wisdom and zeal which characterized him throughout his public service.

Possessed of amazing energy, endowed with a keen mind, blessed with a sense of humor, he lived a full life in the time allotted to him. Tenacious in his conviction, but lovable in his reasonableness, always devoted to the large view of public affairs—he demonstrated all of the characteristics of statesmanship.

GEORGE BATES' death was truly a tragedy, a tragedy the Nation can ill afford. It was typical of his life that his death occurred while in the performance of his official duties. He would not have been a passenger on the ill-fated airliner that carried him to his death had he not been en route to an official orientation conference in the office of the Secretary of Defense, pursuant to the Secretary's invitation.

GEORGE BATES died while on active duty. He was not only a member of the Armed Services Committee, he was a part of our armed services.

At his funeral he was surrounded by the people he loved best, his family and his thousands of friends in the city of Salem. Our committee—his committee—arranged for a military escort. It was fitting that members of services he so ably represented should have accompanied him to his last resting place.

While we pay him today this passing tribute, his contributions to the Nation's defense will everlastingly stand as his fitting memorial.

Mr. Speaker, I miss him more than I can say.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is most fitting that GEORGE BATES be eulogized on this opening day of Congress. He was so much a part of our work and so willing always to take his share of the sometimes tedious labor of legislation. He never shirked his duty, and it was this devotion to his job that was responsible for his being aboard that fateful airplane flight that ended so disastrously. He was on his way to Washington for conferences in connection with the national defense investigation. He died in line of duty just as much as any soldier who fell before the enemy.

Massachusetts has lost a loyal son, a most capable legislator, and a fearless fighter for her interests. His long service as mayor of his home city of Salem, his equally fine record in the Massachusetts Legislature, and his 13 years of faithful service in this House of Representatives gave him a national prominence that was justly earned and richly deserved. He was a power in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He was a power in the Congress. He was a power in the Nation. He was exceptionally kindly, always ready to help those who needed the benefit of his wide experience and his good judgment. I remember so well his kindness to me, his generosity, at the time of the redistricting in Massachusetts of the congressional districts. My friends and others felt that the district as mapped by the committee was such that it would be very difficult for a Republican to carry. GEORGE BATES gave over the historic old town of Andover to me to have in my congressional district. Later on he was requested by the committee on redistricting to give it back; that is, to take it away from me. But GEORGE BATES stood firm. As a result, I have the town of Andover in my district, for which I am very grateful.

He will be sorely missed by all of us. In his work upon the Committee on Armed Services he fought valiantly for the rights and prestige of our Navy. He showed great anxiety and distress because he felt the weakening of the Navy would prove disastrous to the security of our Nation. Essentially just himself,

he felt that the action against the Navy was unwise, unjust, and very dangerous.

To his gracious and lovely widow and helpmate and his fine family go the condolences of all of his host of friends. Through the years to come we shall not forget him, and we shall miss greatly his cheerful, kindly presence here in Congress. We shall miss the inspiration of his deeply religious character and his sterling qualities of mind and heart. I personally shall miss him tremendously because I knew that he was a friend who could always be depended upon to be helpful, to be generous, to be patriotic, and to be a statesman.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, GEORGE JOSEPH BATES was the highest type of public servant. He was clean, courageous, capable, and though one could doubt the wisdom of his judgment or disagree at times with the conclusions he reached, no one could ever question the honesty of his purpose, the sincerity of his motive or the unimpeachable integrity of his unsullied soul. He wore no man's collar and could not be bought or sold by any power on this earth.

Serving with distinction and ability in the Massachusetts Legislature for 7 years, a period long enough to test the mettle of any man, he was honored by the people of his home city, who knew him best, by being elected mayor of that city for 14 consecutive years. This long experience gave him a lasting interest in municipal government. It is significant to note that immediately after coming to Congress, Mr. BATES was placed on the Committee for the District of Columbia and devoted much time and energy, without any hope of reward back home, to the affairs of our Nation's Capital. He was always alert and appreciative of the complex, difficult problems that confront the city of Washington, and was the ranking Republican member of the Committee on the District of Columbia at the time of his death.

It was my privilege the year after GEORGE BATES was first elected to this body to speak at a huge political gathering in his home town of Salem, and the year following at another town, Haverhill, in his district. I learned then why GEORGE BATES was elected not only to the Legislature of Massachusetts and mayor of his home town, but also as a Member of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. It was because he loved people and people loved him.

I do not believe there is any man I have ever met who was more accommodating or who would go out of his way to render assistance not only to the people in his own district, regardless of political affiliations, but to his colleagues in this body, than GEORGE BATES. In former years he served under the able and distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], chairman of the old Committee on Naval Affairs, and contributed much to making the Navy of the United States during this recent war far more powerful than all the other combined navies in the world, and since the unification of the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs into the Committee on the Armed Services, GEORGE BATES has given the same unselfish service, the same unstinted energy, the same complete devotion to building up not only the Navy, but equally the Air Force and the Army, because he realized that in modern mechanized warfare each branch of the service is indispensable to victory.

So, we are going to miss him sorely as a member of our committee. He was a man of such tremendous energy, dynamic personality, and restless spirit; never satisfied with present accomplishments but always striving to do more. He had strong convictions and was not timid in expressing them. Independent as he was he could cooperate with others. I was on the S. S. *America* in mid-Atlantic when the radio brought the shocking news of his sudden and tragic death. My heart sank within me because I knew that this country had lost a great, honest, courageous, and constructive statesman, but more personal than that, I knew I had lost a very dear and loyal friend. Never have I, as ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, asked GEORGE BATES to do one thing that he did not willingly and gladly welcome the opportunity, and he always performed his task well. He was a glutton for work. Industry was a virtue to him; he practiced it.

In closing, I wish to say this. I am glad it was mentioned by the distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] who knew him so well, that GEORGE BATES was a man of deep faith. Ordinarily I do not suppose many people would have guessed offhand that GEORGE BATES was a deeply religious man, because he did not wear his heart on his sleeve; but I recall how deeply he was moved when he heard of the death of his son-in-law who served in the Navy in the Pacific during the recent war.

I recall more clearly the two different occasions when we visited his holiness Pope Pius at his summer retreat at Castel Gandolfo on the outskirts of Rome. I remember how deeply GEORGE BATES was moved. No one can have an audience with the present Pope without leaving a much bigger and a better person. Twice I had an audience with His Holiness and I know how GEORGE BATES was moved, as all of us were moved, by the Pope's piety, learning, humility, and genuine desire for permanent peace in this world.

I am a Protestant and a Mason, but I think the Roman Catholic Church has been one of the greatest stabilizing influences in this modern war-torn world. Mr. BATES, though he was a Catholic and I am a Methodist, knew that the deep undercurrent of men's faith, whether religious or political, transcends minor differences that men's minds might entertain.

So I want to join with my colleagues in paying my humble and altogether too feeble tribute to a great and good man. I have been in his home. I know what a devoted father and what a loyal and faithful husband he was. To really know a man one must associate with him intimately for some time. For several years I have been in almost daily contact with GEORGE BATES in our labors together, but even a better opportunity was afforded me to learn what he was, on the long trips we have taken together. We have flown literally thousands of miles, across continents and over oceans, visiting strange lands in far-away places, under the most trying conditions. I know the courage and faith he exhibited when we were in perilous positions. The irony of his death is that he should be killed at such a time and place after we had faced greater dangers. My prayer is that the faith that was GEORGE BATES' will help comfort and sustain his loved ones in this hour of irreparable loss.

He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die.

GEORGE BATES is not dead. He still lives, and the exemplary life that he lived, the faith that was his, the service that he rendered, will always be a source of inspiration to those of us who had the pleasure and good fortune of associating with him.

May God rest his soul, and may the comforting spirit of the Holy Trinity rest upon and abide with his loved ones even unto the perfect day.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, those of us who had the privilege of paying tribute to GEORGE BATES at the requiem mass in Salem can never forget the demonstration of respect and love for him on the part of his close friends and neighbors. Not only was the church crowded but also the streets in the immediate vicinity and thousands more waited patiently along the mile and a half between the church and the cemetery.

As has been so eloquently said here today, all who knew GEORGE respected and admired him. His forthright courage, his intelligent loyalty to his country, his State, and his district, and his intelligent discharge of his responsibilities won for him an outstanding place in the history of this body. We all miss him today and shall continue to miss him. I, too, wish to express in these words my deep sympathy for his wife and his children.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

CONGRESSMAN GEORGE BATES, WHO DIED IN LINE OF DUTY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, characteristic of the man is the fact that he modestly devoted only five lines to himself in the Congressional Directory.

This bare and unassuming report fails to give true recognition to the notable record of public service given by GEORGE BATES to his city, his State, and to the Nation.

His 31 years of distinguished stewardship in the executive and legislative branches of government began in 1918 when he was elected to the Massachusetts House of Representatives where he served continuously until 1924. His ability was soon recognized, and it was not long before he became chairman of the committee on municipal finance. His sound grasp of local problems won the endearing respect of the many officials who sought his advice and assistance.

With this excellent preparation, it was logical that he would be summoned to serve as an executive of city government. His fellow citizens elected him as mayor of Salem, Mass., where he made one of the most remarkable records in the history of the State. The esteem in which he was held is evidenced by the fact that he was reelected to that office time and again, over a period of 14 consecutive years. This was largely during the depression when municipalities were challenged by problems such as they will never face again. GEORGE BATES was that happy combination of an efficient and humane administrator. He was able to secure large Federal grants to create work for the unemployed of his community by the soundness of the proposals which he advanced. The number of serviceable and enduring public projects which were constructed during his tenure as mayor will be a monument for many years to come, of his outstanding ability in the field of municipal government. So well did the people think of him that he was returned to office a number of times without any opposition.

In 1936, he was asked to run for Congress, which he did—winning handily. He was in his seventh term when sudden death struck him down.

The late Congressman traveled widely and was a keen student of all phases of the Federal Government. As a member of the important Armed Services Committee in the House, he became an expert on national security.

The United States Navy had no greater advocate than GEORGE BATES. He knew that any plan for unification of the armed forces which would reduce the Navy to a secondary role would be dangerous to the defense of our Nation. He came from a city that was one of the great seaports in the days of our maritime glory. He was reared in an environment that is still rich with the memory of those fabulous sea captains who opened up the vast uncharted reaches of the Pacific to American commerce. A New Englander by birth and by character, he was endowed with its love of the sea, its pioneering spirit, and its hardy realism. Coming from that section of the Nation which is nearest to Europe, he understood the mobile strength of sea power and the major role it must play in our defense. The United States is a world leader with strategic interests all over the globe. GEORGE BATES never lost sight of the elemental fact that most of this earth's surface is covered by water which can be traveled on, above, and below. For this we need a Navy with aircraft, ships, and submarines.

Summoning every resource of his being, he fought to save the Navy. Congress had adjourned, but GEORGE BATES did not give up the fight. He was traveling to the Capital by plane to attend a national defense conference and his "ship" was about to land when his life was claimed by the carelessness of others and the Nation thus lost one of its most diligent and devoted public servants.

His own family served the Navy well in World War II—out on the seas which develop brave men. There was something of its clean and honest strength in GEORGE BATES. He did not ask safety for himself or his own, and, with such sincerity, he did not expect that others would seek privileged comforts in a time of national emergency. GEORGE BATES thought that every man should do his duty. One of the few times when I saw him angry was when some misguided persons sought his influence to have their sons in the Navy transferred to an inland assignment halfway between the Atlantic and the Pacific.

They came to the wrong man but got the right answer.

When GEORGE BATES got through talking with them they were ready for their sons to do sea duty like every other mother's son who got the call, and I am sure that they thank him for restoring their self-respect, wherever they may be today.

His private life was exemplary. He was a man of deep faith who was devoted to his wife and his seven sons and daughters. The love for his family, his country, and his God was the trinity which inspired a life that was rich in its accomplishments.

His home town is only a score of miles away from my own. Many a time I rode down to Washington with him, and so I came to know him as a fine man and as a splendid representative of the people.

It is my earnest hope that this Nation, through the United States Navy, will soon dedicate a lasting memorial to its faithful son who gave up his life in the line of duty—the late Congressman GEORGE JOSEPH BATES, of Salem, Mass.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of GEORGE BATES, one of the Members of the House whose services can never be properly eulogized and properly recorded by what we say here.

GEORGE BATES was one of those rare individuals who commanded the respect and affection of all of his colleagues because of his absolute integrity, both in his public and in his private life. Beginning under the most humble circumstances, he made his mark by being chosen by larger and larger groups to represent them in public affairs. He had great energy, great loyalty and kindliness, and the courage to speak and act in accordance with his convictions whether he knew those convictions to be popular or not.

His tragic death has taken from the House one of the ablest Members it possessed—a man whom I am proud to think of as a close friend. His splendid wife and seven children must feel the deepest satisfaction in the superb record that GEORGE BATES achieved. Our deepest sympathy goes out to them in their personal bereavement and to the Nation in its public bereavement.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I join very sadly with my colleagues in the tribute being paid to Congressman BATES this afternoon by so many friends and colleagues of this House in which he served so honorably and faithfully. We keenly and deeply feel the loss of GEORGE BATES. His tragic passing has saddened all of us.

He was a good, dear, and generous friend. We will not look upon his like again.

He was a courageous and fearless public servant.

He was devoted to his family—a loving father and a devoted husband.

In every sense he was a great American statesman; a great, clean heart, a lively intellect and a noble soul.

Brilliant as were his civic achievements, outstanding his patriotic contributions, commanding his force of personality and courage of conviction, these qualities were all overshadowed by the spirit of deep humility and profound spirituality which seemed to move this great American in his every thought, word, and deed. He was a man of heartfelt, unshakable faith, a man of unflinching loyalty to every cause which he believed just, a man of perseverance and determination in pursuing what he deemed to be right.

He was forceful, but never malicious. He was dynamic, but never unkind. He was persevering, but never ruthless. He was exacting in his standards, but always humane and considerate of others.

I was privileged to serve with him for some time on the great and distinguished Armed Services Committee of this House, which is headed by our beloved and able friend the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable CARL VINSON, who has just spoken so feelingly and so eloquently his tribute of respect, esteem, and affection for our departed colleague. I came to know GEORGE BATES as an indefatigable worker, tireless in his application, unselfish in his devotion, strong of mind and character, and militant in his attachment to what he thought was best for the Nation. He was a hard hitter, but he never struck below the belt. He was a respected adversary who never bore ill will or animosity to those who opposed him. His kindliness of heart, his sincercity of purpose, his purity of motive, and his generosity of impulse endeared him to all who knew him. He was a true Christian gentleman.

I shall never forget the great demonstration of affection by the people of his home city of Salem upon the sorrowful occasion of his funeral. Thousands of people from the shops and factories, farms and fields, and offices and homes of his district converged upon the beautiful church where the services were held. The military which he loved and served so well, his colleagues who so deeply mourned him, and his own friends

among the people, filled the spacious edifice to overflowing. The services were of unusual solemnity and beauty. The eulogy by the beloved, outstanding prelate, one of the great princes of the Catholic Church, Archbishop Cushing, of Boston, was an eloquent and extraordinary tribute to a great but humble and clean-living man whose life was a model of virtue and devotion. And when the services were over and the sorrowful cortege moved slowly through the streets of his beloved city, thousands of people gathered to pay by their presence a last mark of respect for their esteemed civic leader and public servant. The cadence of marching feet, the roll of muffled drums, the soft, muted strains of his favorite religious hymns played by the Marine Band, the long procession winding through the historic streets lined with his own people, the impressive prayers at the spot where his mortal remains were laid—these scenes will be long remembered by those who attended his final rites.

GEORGE BATES has gone from our midst, but his indomitable spirit, noble work, warm friendship, and patriotic example live on as inspiration and encouragement to those who would serve the Nation. GEORGE BATES exemplified the best there is in American public and private life. No tributes which we pay him so sincerely today could possibly measure the worth and nobility of his character and the substance of his contributions. Having known him and served with him has enriched our lives. The Nation is the richer for his life. For his goodness and virtue, he will find rest and peace with our Heavenly Father.

I ask that I may be permitted to include in my remarks a humble tribute which I paid him at the time of his tragic passing and which appeared in the illustrious Boston Post:

REPRESENTATIVE PHILBIN LAUDS BATES—SAYS DEATH OF SOLON REAL LOSS TO NATION

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN yesterday mourned the air-crash death of Congressman GEORGE J. BATES as a cruel loss to his family, his friends, and the Nation.

In his statement Congressman PHILBIN said:

"I am inexpressibly shocked to learn of the tragic passing of my dear and valued personal friend, Congressman GEORGE J. BATES. Able and conscientious, he was a true and great American. Of strong convictions and determined purpose, he never wavered once he believed he was right. He had a deep sympathy for the underdog.

"His career was an inspiration to young and old alike because he worked and battled his way to high public trust by virtue of his own great natural ability and force of character. Deeply interested in the people of his district and sincerely devoted to promoting the prosperity and welfare of Massachusetts and New England, his broad horizons embraced all State, National, and international questions.

"As my esteemed colleague on the House Armed Services Committee, he rendered invaluable contributions for many years to building up the national defense. He was a believer in a balanced armed system and a staunch loyal friend of the Navy, as well as other services. His views always commanded the great respect of his colleagues. He was not only esteemed but loved, by all who knew him. He was a good, sincere, and profoundly spiritual man vitally and energetically interested in every worth-while cause, active and painstaking in his work, and tremendously devoted to the institutions of our country.

"He has been stricken down at a time when he was at the height of his powers—rich in experience—mature in judgment—with years of usefulness ahead of him. The Nation has lost a stalwart public figure, the people of his district, a faithful servant, his family, a loving father, his colleagues a true and considerate friend, the House, one of our great contemporary Americans.

"I am personally very deeply moved by his untimely death and join prayerfully with his family and many friends in mourning him. GEORGE BATES will long be sorely missed; his achievements long remembered.

"To his devoted wife and lifelong helpmate, Mrs. Bates, and the fine family he leaves behind so sorrowfully afflicted in sudden bereavement, I extend my deepest sympathy. May Almighty God comfort and strengthen them in their hour of sorrow."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, when the news came over the air late in October that GEORGE BATES was the victim of a terrible airplane accident, I was stunned. The people of Des Moines, Iowa, were shocked, and deep sympathy for his family was felt by all of us. He was highly regarded in Iowa. A few years ago he was instrumental in having a cruiser named for the city of Des Moines. He was very sympathetic to all of his colleagues. He was always ready and willing to aid a colleague, no matter how pressing his own affairs. I considered him one of my very best friends in the Congress. Iowa has lost a real friend, and the Nation a great statesman.

I deeply regret his passing. I shall remember him always.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE].

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I rise reverently to join with the Members of this House in expressing my esteem, respect, and regard for our late colleague, GEORGE BATES.

A state and a nation are only great because of the accomplishments of their citizens. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the United States of America are greater because of the high character of such services as were rendered by our beloved colleague. The finest thing that can be said of any man is that the world is a much better place because he lived. I know we can all sincerely say that about GEORGE BATES. Each of us is the beneficiary of his greatness and his patriotic services.

My deepest sympathy and condolences go out to his family in their bereavement.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I met GEORGE BATES when I first came to Congress but I came to know him intimately in 1947, when I was a member of a committee to which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] referred, which traveled into Europe, the Near East, and around the Mediterranean.

I was one of those who twice had the privilege of appearing before the Pope. On both occasions I was greatly impressed with this simple man who typifies the world roadblock we are trying to erect in the path of a dictator who is bent on accomplishing the disintegration of the American family, the destruction of personal freedom, and the subversion of everything that we call the democratic way of life in the United States of America.

That evening after the audience with the Pope, GEORGE BATES took me aside and told me of the profound impression which an audience with the Pope makes upon a Catholic, and I added on a Protestant also. I had never realized until then that Mr. BATES was a very religious individual. He explained to me how much it meant to a member of that faith to have the privilege of talking to and shaking hands with the head of his church.

GEORGE BATES was one of the kindest men I ever met. You had to know him and live with him on a trip such as we were on to thus understand him. He was always trying to find some way to do something for a friend.

In my opinion, his family life reflects his religious training. He had a large family and a very devoted wife. In my book the most successful thing that a man can do is to have a happy married life and have a family. I consider that a successful husband and father is the acme of American success. He projects his ideas, his ideals, his hopes, and his aspirations, as lived in his life, into the lives of others who will carry on afterward. This is exactly what GEORGE J. BATES did with his life.

Mr. BATES was the kind of legislator that I think makes the American Congress great. Why? Because he studied a problem, and once he found out what he thought was the correct thing to do about it, he did that very thing. He did not measure the political influences. He did not measure any personal success. He wanted to know what was the right answer to the problem, and he talked and acted accordingly.

It was my privilege to sit next to him during this last session of Congress. We had very long, exhaustive hearings on some of the most basic problems in security before the Nation today; upon problems on the solution of which may depend the stability and the peace of the entire world. I found that he worked as hard as or harder than anybody else on our committee. He had an inquisitive mind; he was continually laboring to find out what were the facts and how we should apply the facts to the decisions we had to make. As I said, in my opinion GEORGE BATES was the kind of Congressman that makes the American House of Representatives great; in other words, his actions reflected truly his studied and deliberate conclusions on the great questions that were before the country.

His was a tragic loss; but his family, in my opinion, can find comfort in the fact that in every part of his life he was a true American, he was an excellent father, he was a fine citizen, he was an able legislator. It will be a long time before we have another character like GEORGE J. BATES. As I say, I believe that he typified about the best of everything

that I consider worth while in a man, in both private and public life.

I am sorry that I have lost a friend; I am sorry that the Congress has lost such a fine Member; and I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his family at the loss of such a fine husband and father.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] and ask unanimous consent that he may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in extending to the family of the late GEORGE J. BATES my deepest and most sincere sympathy.

As a member of the old Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, I was closely associated with GEORGE BATES and knew him well. I do not believe I ever knew a man who was so sincerely interested in the work of his committee and in the security of his country. GEORGE was a tireless worker, he had a highly retentive mind, and he was conscientious to the extreme in everything he did.

The Armed Services Committee will not be the same without him. His district has lost an able Representative and the country has lost a loyal and patriotic public servant.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I find it impossible to keep silent while men are praising GEORGE BATES. He was a friend of mine. While his district did not quite adjoin mine, it was very close, and the two districts had many problems in common, notably those of the fisheries, in which GEORGE BATES was deeply interested. Indeed the fishermen never had a better friend.

However, I do not propose today to explore GEORGE BATES' legislative record. Others know much more intimately than I the work which he did on the Committee on Armed Services. This was probably his major contribution as a national legislator. I wish simply to speak of the man, of his qualities as a man, of the friendship I felt for him, and of the friendship he gave to me. The death of such a man under such peculiarly tragic circumstances is a great blow to the Congress and to the country. All I can say is that I shall always miss GEORGE BATES, shall always mourn him. I have the utmost sympathy for his bereaved family.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend and revise their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and untimely death of my very dear friend and colleague, GEORGE J. BATES, was a tragic loss to his State and to the Nation.

His life reflected the great American tradition which makes it possible for one with the humblest start in life to rise to high position by force of character, ability, and industry.

Beginning work at the age of 7 on a part-time basis in a tannery in order to help out at home; ending his formal education with the seventh grade and finding employment as an iron molder; he was destined to serve his fellow citizens 7 years in the Massachusetts House of Representatives, 14 years as mayor of the city of Salem, Mass., and 12 years as a Member of the Congress, with fidelity, ability, and distinction.

Those who served with him in the legislature can testify to his contribution in terms of municipal finance. Those who served with him here know the great part he played as a member of the House Committee on Naval Affairs and the House Committee on Armed Services.

Years of close association in the Congress gave me for him both high regard and deep affection.

Able, experienced, honest, and fearless, he was one of the finest public servants that I have known. He would have made a splendid Governor of his State.

He was a devout Catholic and a devoted father. Seven children survive him, several of whom volunteered for service in World War II. A son-in-law gave his life in that service.

The unparalleled tribute paid to his memory in the city of Salem after his death spoke in eloquent terms of the love and respect in which he was held in his native city.

Store windows throughout the city carried his picture draped in black. The local newspaper, on the day of the funeral services, devoted the entire front page to his photograph and to tributes received throughout the Nation. Thirty thousand people, it was estimated, lined the streets from his humble home to the church and thence to the grave.

Archbishop Richard J. Cushing delivered a beautiful eulogy at the requiem mass which forms a part of our tribute here today.

Far more people, myself among them, knew his merits—

He said—

than knew the man himself.

That is at once the most accurate and most enviable tribute to him.

He added:

That even without knowing him personally many, many thousands knew his high worth and the tremendous good he did.

I shall miss him more than I can say.

I know that the heartfelt sympathy of all who served with him here in this House goes out today to his widow and to each member of the fine family which he loved so dearly.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my tribute to the others that have been paid to our beloved friend, the distinguished Member from Massachusetts. Mr. BATES and I were neighbors on the third floor in the west corridor of the Old House Office Building throughout the 7 years that I have been a Member of the House. Ours was a friendship that I shall always cherish, and I have many fine memories of our associations.

I think it was Woodrow Wilson who laid down one test of greatness. It was rather negatively stated, but appropriate for this occasion.

He said:

No man is great who thinks himself so, and no man is even good who does not strive for the comfort and happiness of others.

One of the elements of greatness in GEORGE BATES was his modesty and certainly one of the outstanding things about him was the vigorous way in which he sought to add to the comfort and the happiness of others. He seemed to derive great pleasure from those activities that were related to the well-being of his people.

He was a man of expansive sympathies, of broad vision, truly a great American, and I am glad to join with my colleagues in praise of his service and his character.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my word of tribute to the life and service of the Honorable George Bates, of Massachusetts. George Bates and I entered Congress in January 1937 and were two of the small band of new Republicans who were elected in 1936. We never organized a club. There were so few of us no formal organization was needed.

During 13 years I have seen the devoted, selfless service of this sturdy American. Sometimes we found ourselves differing in method or approach, but never did we differ on the foundamental aims to be accomplished. He fought so hard, so intensely for whatever he advocated that he impressed everyone with his sincerity and forthrightness of purpose.

Yes, he could flash a smile; he could take a joke, but his first impulse was to take things seriously. One gained the impression that he thought time was short, that he must be about the main business of the day immediately. Perhaps he had that premonition that life would be shortened for him, that death might come prematurely.

Certainly death did come prematurely to this patriotic American, for he was still a man of vigor and endless energy. I am sure that he knew many things he wanted to accomplish but we will have to say he did more for his country than most men who live longer. His death in a needless airplane accident has caused us all to wonder "Why?" but that is a question we cannot answer now. Some day, perhaps, we shall know.

Now we only know that this man's life is remembered for the good he did and the patriotic ardor which drove him on, even when his concept of duty carried him to his death.

THE LATE HONORABLE MARTIN GORSKI

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 411).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. MARTIN GORSKI, a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, no one of us will ever understand the fittings of the pattern of life. A year ago from the State of Illinois came to this House 12 Democratic Congressmen. We have returned at the opening of the second session, 11. During the days we have been away grief came to us. As a body, the surviving 11 attended the funeral services of our friend, MARTIN GORSKI, and mourning with us at that church in his district in Chicago were hundreds and hundreds of women and men and children. In their eyes were tears. They had lost a friend.

MARTIN GORSKI was a man. He was a man of strength and simplicity and with a heart that felt for every human being. There was no pretense about MARTIN GORSKI. Seldom was his voice lifted in this Chamber, yet his influence was felt in the Seventy-ninth and the Eightieth and the Eighty-first Congresses tremendously.

To me has been given this sad mission in the absence of our beloved dean, Mr. SABATH, and at the request of our next senior Member from Chicago, Mr. O'BRIEN, and a friend of MARTIN GORSKI who cannot speak at length on account of the grief that is in his heart. He came to this Chamber in the Seventy-ninth Congress with MARTIN GORSKI, a lifelong friend of the same Polish blood extraction. They were close bosom friends. When the gentleman from Illinos [Mr. GORDON] returned from Europe on a mission for his country and at the airport here heard of MARTIN GORSKI's passing, it was a man with a broken heart who returned to the Chicago that both had represented in three Congresses.

MARTIN GORSKI was born in Poland. He was brought to Chicago as a boy of three. He came up the hard way. He was the child of poverty and he remained in this Chamber throughout his life the champion of the oppressed. When in this Chamber the matter of slum clearance was being discussed I watched the play of expression on the face of MARTIN GORSKI. I saw the gleam of happiness in his eyes when that bill to clear the slums and the bill for public housing was passed, because that marked another triumph in the achievements of this immigrant boy who had given his life to making his adopted country a richer and a finer place in which to live.

I cannot speak at greater length because the grief that I feel is filling my eyes with tears and is closing my voice.

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHESNEY].

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Sixth District of Illinois have lost a great statesman and a fine public servant. I, too, have felt the loss of this great friend. I remember when I first came to the Eighty-first Congress I went to MARTIN GORSKI's office to ask him for advice. He told me what problems would be encountered by a Congressman during his first term in office. It was through the able guidance and sage counsel given me by MARTIN GORSKI that I was able to firmly meet my new responsibilities.

MARTIN GORSKI was born in Poland of very poor parents. He came to this country at an early age, and through his diligent efforts he rose to great heights in public life. It is only in the United States that an immigrant who faced persecution and the oppression of human rights would be able to rise to the dignity of being a Representative of a congressional district in his adopted country. The Sixth District of Illinois will miss MARTIN GORSKI. He served his people well. He was efficient and capable. He did not seek personal glory. He seldom spoke in the great halls of this Chamber, but he always served the cause of true democracy. He had friends on both sides of the aisle. He may have differed politically, but his mind and heart were for the salvation of true democratic ideals.

MARTIN GORSKI has gone to the Great Beyond. He is probably today gazing upon this great Chamber and upon his friends with deep satisfaction in the knowledge that his work was well done. The city of Chicago, the great State of Illinois and his district will feel keenly the loss of MARTIN GORSKI, but the ideals which he held uppermost in life and for which he fought will always remain in the hearts of the people of his district.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing my profound regret at the sudden passing of our beloved colleague, MARTIN GORSKI. To me, MARTIN GORSKI's life epitomizes the great and wonderful tradition that is peculiarly that of our great Nation, the poor immigrant boy who through only hard effort and hard work rose to represent in the halls of this Congress people from all walks of life, the rich as well as the poor, in his district in the city of Chicago.

I came to know MARTIN GORSKI last year when I was elected to this great body. He was a quiet person, yet his genial personality, his kindness, his sympathy, the untold amount of time he took in listening to the problems of one who was confronted with a new way of life, endeared him very much to me. I came to know his great desire to help his fellow man, and the wonderful facets of his personality, which was an inspiration to all of us.

He was simple in his habits. His life was an example for all to follow. He was a true friend. We from the State of Illinois, particularly those in his congressional delegation, will miss him very much.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, my heart was very much saddened on learning of the sudden passing of my close, dear friend and colleague, MARTIN GORSKI. His death has made a deep wound in my heart and is a great loss to his loved ones and many friends. He will be missed by all of us and may Almighty God have mercy on his soul.

Mr. Speaker, the selection of Members of Congress to represent the people of this great Nation is not only a distinctive honor but a tremendous and weighty responsibility that demands the best faculties we can master to cope with national and world-wide problems that especially confront us at this time. MARTIN GORSKI can be classed in this category of man, for his background as a lawyer, a civic-minded leader whose understanding, through his many years of experience, demonstrated his ability to lend a helping hand whenever the opportunity presented itself and his good judgment was necessary. MARTIN was not a man who sought headlines or front-page publicity or sought fame. He was a man that devoted himself diligently, conscientiously, and earnestly in the task with which he was entrusted by his constituents. He never had an unkind thought in his mind. He always was pleasant, courteous, agreeable, and attempted in every way he possibly could to give other Members the benefit of his experience and advice. It is most regrettable that he should pass from us so suddenly and without any warning whatsoever. I know that all the Members of the House join with me in conveying to the people of his district our appreciation that they sent him to this body to serve them and our country during the trying years he was a Member. They have sustained a great loss, the State of Illinois has sustained a great loss, and our beloved country has sustained a great loss. Every one of us, particularly I, who knew him for his sterling character and remarkable personality, has sustained a personal loss.

He was brought to this country from Poland at an early age; learned our American ways in our parochial schools in Chicago, and sought higher education, through his own efforts, bearing in mind the need of helping his fellow man who asked for guidance and advice. He has left a splendid background of his progress, showing through perseverance and hard work, what can actually be accomplished through one's own unselfish endeavors.

Before coming to Congress in 1942, MARTIN was an assistant State prosecutor, later he became a master of chancery of the city of Chicago, where he served the people with honesty, integrity, an open mind at all times.

The only regret I have is that it was not my privilege to be in this country at the time of his passing to pay my beloved respects to my close friend. Through our friendship and inseparable companionship in Congress, as we both came here at the same time, we were affectionately called by our many friends of the House "the Chicago twins." The news was given me by my secretary when our plane landed at the Washington Airport on December 13 that my "twin" colleague, MARTIN GORSKI, had gone to his

last reward. It was a great shock that I can never get over.

He has added through his services here in the House of Representatives another name to that long list of eminent and distinguished Illinoisans who have served the Nation in times of need from the day of its founding down to the present time.

May God be gracious to his family and to the people whom he served.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

MARTIN GORSKI: REPRESENTATIVE AMERICAN

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, he came from a great city, deep in the heart of the United States, a city where many different races come together and learn the American way of enterprise and good fellowship, far removed from the ancient fears and suspicions that inhibit the people of the Old World.

Chicago is a big city—energetic, bold, and still rough in spots. It is a live city, the nerve center of a railroad system which links the Atlantic with the Pacific and brings to it the riches of a continent to be manufactured into the comforts and conveniences of modern life. From this pulsating and diversified city come typical Americans who are willing to tackle any problem no matter how complex. From the Great Lakes and the Great Plains that meet at Chicago is born the vision and adventuresome spirit of leadership.

MARTIN GORSKI was one of its finest products. He brought the sturdy qualities of diligence and faith to his work as a Representative in Congress from the Fourth Illinois District.

Some observers, on seeing the United States for the first time, are impressed by the massive size and sinews of the things we build. More penetrating students, seeking the reason for these achievements, discern the men who really make America.

And the secret of this miracle is that we offer the most encouraging environment to all who live here, providing that freedom of opportunity which is like the sun and the air and the rain that nourish man's spirit and his energies.

What the United States offers, men of ability and character repay with the joy of fulfillment.

MARTIN GORSKI was such a man.

He was born in Poland. His parents brought him to the New World at an early age. He took root and he flourished in the bustling metropolis of Chicago where he lived in the same district for over 50 years. Through grammar and high school, business college, and law school, he learned not only the technique for earning a living in the service of an honorable profession. To him came the ever-expanding knowledge of his fellow men, partners with him in the enthusiastic job of building a better society.

He served as their Representative in the Congress from 1942 until 1949 where I came to know him well as a colleague on the Judiciary Committee. I was impressed with his great love for the country of his adoption. He did not take it for granted as some of our native-born do. In him was the profound belief that only in a free community can men resolve their differences with justice and decency as they move through this brief life toward their immortal goal.

His personal faith in the greater meaning of life's journey was a living reality that guided his consideration of every legislative issue. He was not a self-seeker because he gave service far greater in return than the honors which came to him. Behind the external necessities to which every man in public life must accommodate himself, was an integrity that was unimpeachable. He knew the law, he served it, and he loved the principles which guide it in its finest expression.

His next of kin have suffered an irretrievable loss and to them we extend our tender consolation. When the shock of grief is mellowed by time, may they treasure the memory of his accomplishments and take heart from the fact that his life on this earth has earned him eternal happiness.

The neighborhood in which he grew up and which sent him as its most distinguished son to represent it at Washington, will mourn him for a long time to come. His example will serve as an inspiration to the man or woman who is chosen to fill the seat which he left vacant in answer to a higher call.

We in Washington will miss this able and highly respected colleague. We learned much from him and this most of all: The high standard of duty to which he dedicated the years of his life.

In the great and growing tradition of those who have served in the Congress, and by their contributions have proved the wisdom of representative government, MARTIN GORSKI will be remembered as a true servant of the people.

It was my privilege to know him as a friend who shared the hope and confidence of his boundless human heart.

Like so many others I am indebted to the memory of a real American: MARTIN GORSKI.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I arise at this time to pay a very brief but sincere tribute to the memory of MARTIN GORSKI. It was my pleasure to have been associated with him, at times rather closely, during the time he served as a Member of the House of Representatives.

He would come over frequently to have lunch before the time for the House to begin its daily session.

That has been a part of my routine when possible so that I could have lunch out of the way before the session of the House started.

On many such occasions it was my privilege to have lunch in the restaurant with MARTIN GORSKI. I came to know how the man thought and felt. Just a few days before his death I was in the great city of Chicago to address a luncheon meeting. MARTIN GORSKI was present on that occasion. Again, I was impressed by the genuineness and the warmth of his great friendship. As I think of him today, I think of some lines that Henry Van Dyke wrote, which might well be considered as the measure of a man, and I think how modest, hard-working, and unassuming MARTIN GORSKI, with his very fine sentiment and spirit, has measured up to those tests which Van Dyke set forth in the lines he wrote quite a number of years ago when he said:

Four things a man must learn to do,
If he would write his record true;
To think without confusion, clearly;
To love his fellowman sincerely;
To act from honest motives purely;
To trust in God's help securely.

I shall greatly miss the presence in this Chamber of MARTIN GORSKI, a devoted public servant and a true and understanding friend.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker—

Friends are in life's exchange
True tender for all the rarest forms of joy;
The only pauper is the friendless man.

The eulogies in these memorial services make it crystal clear that, measured by this standard, MARTIN GORSKI was a wealthy man. Those who have spoken have correctly portrayed the life and character of this kindly, efficient, and worth-while legislator.

It was my privilege to serve on the Judiciary Committee and its Bankruptcy Subcommittee with Mr. GORSKI. To know him was not only to respect and admire him, but to love him. He was one of those rare men who, if he could not say good of his colleagues, said nothing. I am not familiar with his education or his background before he entered the House, but I do know that he had a splendid mind, that he was a good lawyer, and that he was one of those optimists who saw the doughnut rather than the hole in the doughnut.

Many a law on the statute books is a better law because MARTIN GORSKI helped write it. We shall all miss him and this is especially true of the Committee on the Judiciary of which he was such an outstanding member. My sympathy goes out to his immediate family and his close friends.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DEANE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we all mourn the death of Congressman MARTIN GORSKI, of Illinois. Whatever tribute I may pay him would be as much a tribute to a man and citizen of Chicago and Illinois as it would be to a Member of Congress. I had the pleasure of knowing Congressman GORSKI and knowing him personally, long before he became a Member of the House of Representatives. He was a highly respected citizen of Chicago and the State of Illinois, and ever a friend of the people. He was loyal and kind to his personal friends and held their loyalty during the years I knew him, and he held their respect as well.

In the Halls of Congress, Representative GORSKI voted his convictions without regard to the popularity of his position. He had a keen judicial mind, a sense of justice, an innate endowment of statesmanship. The people of Chicago paid their highest tribute to Congressman GORSKI in life, by electing him to Congress four consecutive terms, and he will live in the hearts of his friends.

Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, when word came to me of the sudden death of my good friend, MARTIN GORSKI, I was stunned. During my association with him I had always found him to be a man of excellent character, most congenial, and possessed of considerable ability. He devoted many years of his life to serving the public and we have all suffered a great loss in his passing—his family, his colleagues, and the people of his district whom he served so faithfully, as well as his host of friends.

I feel it is fitting that we pause at this time in respect to his memory.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, again the hand of fate has taken from our midst a beloved colleague. We, in Chicago, who were privileged to know MARTIN GORSKI throughout the years felt a deep sense of shock upon learning of his untimely passing.

To have known MARTIN GORSKI was to love him. Quiet, unassuming, ever friendly, he worked diligently and unceasingly for the people of his district. He was a man of real ability, courageous, honest, and sincere, and I have always been impressed by the fairness he always displayed and his friendly attitude toward all things.

Mr. GORSKI resided for over 50 years in the district which he so ably represented here. As a lawyer and State's attorney he established an enviable reputation during his early years. Elevated to the post of master in chancery of the Superior Court of Cook County, Ill., he served with distinction for 13 years, when he was elected to the Seventy-eighth Congress in 1942. His passing is a distinct loss to his district, Illinois, and the Nation, and a great personal loss to those of us who knew him and loved him.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and untimely death of my dear friend and cherished mentor, MARTIN GORSKI, was a tragic loss to all of us who knew and loved him.

There are many who have known him longer and more intimately than I: they will attest to his laudable public service, his honesty and courage, his unshaken devotion to the principles which he always upheld.

I knew him personally but a year. Yet in this short span of time, while we met daily on this floor and in our offices, I have gained a profound respect and deep affection for this modest and considerate man, to whom the welfare of others was of utmost concern, and who devoted his life to the service of his people.

His character and kindly personality radiated warmth and affection wherever he went, and left an indelible impression on all who came in contact with him. I do not believe that I have ever met a man who was more accommodating and who would go out of his way to render assistance, regardless of political affiliations, not only to the people of his district, but to his colleagues in this body as well, than MARTIN GORSKI. I shall always cherish the memories of our fine associations and of his friendship.

In his death, the people of his district have lost not only a representative of unimpeachable integrity, but also, and primarily, a faithful servant and a friend. His benevolence, charity and kindness have earned him an enviable reward in heaven.

I wish to extend my sincere condolence and sympathy to his family and host of friends, whose consolation must be great in the knowledge that Almighty God has chosen our friend MARTIN among His very own.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GILMER (at the request of Mr. HOBBS), indefinitely, on account of his own illness.

To Mr. THOMPSON (at the request of Mr. KILDAY), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. BLATNIK (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), through January 17, 1950, on account of official business.

To Mr. JONES of Alabama (at the request of Mr. HAYS of Ohio) for an indefinite period, on account of death in the family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, as a further mark of respect to the memory of our beloved departed colleagues, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 4, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1004. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Inland Waterways Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948, pursuant to House Resolution 405, Eighty-first Congress (H. Doc. No. 423); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1005. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the year ended June 30, 1948, pursuant to House Resolution 405, Eighty-first Congress (H. Doc. No. 424); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1006. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Gorgas Memorial Laboratory—Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948, pursuant to House Resolution 405, Eighty-first Congress (H. Doc. No. 427); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1007. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report listing the contracts negotiated by the military departments under exceptions provided for by sections 2 (c) (11) and 2 (c) (16) of Public Law 413, Eightieth Congress, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1008. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 27, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Scajaquada Creek and its tributaries, New York, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

1009. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 3, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Rehoboth Beach, Bethany Beach, Lewes, and Fenwick Island, Del., and other points along the Delaware coast, with a view to providing protection against damage resulting from erosion and from floods due to wind and tide, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

1010. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 29, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Arkansas River and tributaries with a view to constructing dam and reservoir projects in the interest of flood control, water supply, and other allied uses, with special reference to the south fork of Fourche La Fave River in Perry County, Ark., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on March 20, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1011. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 27, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Sawmill River and tributaries, New York, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

1012. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 28, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Susua River and tributaries, Puerto Rico, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

1013. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 20, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Cayuga, Buffalo, and Cazenovia Creeks, N. Y., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on April 23, 1942, February 2, 1944, and September 18, 1944, and also a resolution of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted on April 22, 1942; to the Committee on Public Works.

1014. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 26, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of report on the Tennessee River, with a view to improvement of the Obed River in the interest of flood control and allied purposes, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on August 2, 1939, and a preliminary examination and survey of Emory River and tributaries, Tennessee, which includes the Obed River, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

1015. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 27, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Absecon Island, N. J., with a view to the protection of Atlantic City, Ventnor, Margate City, Longport, and other areas on the New Jersey coast that have been affected from floods due to tide and wind, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

1016. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 1, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of report on Cattaraugus Creek, N. Y., with a view to determining the need for flood control at and in the vicinity of Gowanda, N. Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on December 8, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

1017. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 28, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Susquehanna River, at and in the vicinity of Sidney, N. Y., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

1018. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for an agricultural program in the Virgin Islands"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1019. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Annual Report of the Farm Credit Administration, covering its operations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 408); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1020. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, transmitting the 1949 annual report of the activities of, funds used by, and donations to the regional research laboratories established pursuant to section 202 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1021. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease for the month of October 1949, pursuant to Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1022. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease for the month of September 1949, pursuant to Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1023. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of claims paid under the Federal Tort Claims Act by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year 1949; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1024. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Sgt. Blaine W. Hughes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1025. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the annual report of the United States Soldiers' Home for the Fiscal Year 1949, together with a photostatic copy of the Report of Annual Inspection, 1949, of the home by the Inspector General of the Army, pursuant to the law of March 3, 1883; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1026. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the report of the American National Red Cross for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1027. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the status of permanent residence to Josef Weinberg and Pilvi Laine Leoke, subjects of such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1028. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation, with a list of the persons involved; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1029. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the United States Air Force Flying Pay Report; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1030. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Hatch Political Activities Act of August 2, 1939, as amended, in order to grant Federal officers and employees in certain communities in Alaska the same type of privileges as are now granted under section 16"; to the Committee on House Administration.

1031. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes' "; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1032. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certified copy of franchise No. 830, entitled "An ordinance granting a franchise to Western Sugar Refining Co., the right to operate a sugar refinery in the municipality of Mayaguez, P. R."; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1033. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior, transmitting a report of all tort claims paid by the Department of the Interior in the fiscal year 1949; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1034. A letter from the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, transmitting additional information in connection with report of the Department of the Interior entitled "Comprehensive Plan for Water Resources Development, Central Valley Basin, Calif."; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1035. A letter from the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, transmitting copies of legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly and the Municipal Council of St. Croix and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1036. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting certified copies of franchises enacted by the Public Service Commission of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1037. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Ervin Haas and Leno Vescovi"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1038. A letter from the Secretary, Department of State, transmitting reports on the operations of the international information and educational exchange program covering the three semiannual periods from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1039. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1040. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting information on licensed hydroelectric projects and on personnel of the Federal Power Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1041. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the Twenty-first Quarterly Report on Contract Settlement, covering the period July 1 through September 30, 1949; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1042. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to establish and continue offices in the Republic of the Philippines"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1043. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the sixteenth annual report, covering activities of the Authority during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Public Works.

1044. A letter from the Chairman, Displaced Persons Commission, transmitting the Second Semiannual Report of the Displaced Persons Commission, pursuant to section 8 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1045. A letter from the Director, Washington office of the Philippine War Damage Commission, transmitting the Sixth Semiannual Report of the United States Philippine War Damage Commission for the period ending June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1046. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report of personnel ceilings as determined and fixed pursuant to section 607 of Public Law 106, Seventy-ninth Congress, and as amended by Public Law 390, Seventy-ninth Congress, for the quarter ending September 30, 1949; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1047. A letter from the secretary, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, transmitting a list of land acquisitions for parks, parkways, and playgrounds, cost of each tract, and method of acquisition for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Public Works.

1048. A letter from the director, national legislative commission of the American Legion, transmitting the financial statement of the American Legion up to and including October 31, 1949, pursuant to Public Law 47, Sixty-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1049. A letter from the Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting an introduction to the Annual Report of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service pursuant to the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1050. A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Information, transmitting the second semiannual report of the United States Advisory Commission on Information, covering the international information activities, pursuant to Public Law 402, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1051. A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, transmitting the second semiannual report on the educational exchange activities conducted under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 431); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1052. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Martha P. Matthews"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1053. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certified copy of

Joint Resolution 1, which was recently enacted by the Legislature of Hawaii, petitioning the President of the United States to name the Territory of Hawaii as an emergency unemployment region and requesting that he order Federal agencies to assign Federal orders to Hawaiian industry; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1054. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the annual report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiary, the Federal National Mortgage Association, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1055. A letter from the Director, Division of Territories and Island Possessions, Department of the Interior, transmitting a certified copy of Act 63 as enacted by the Legislature of Hawaii during its 1949 special session, which authorizes, subject to the approval by the United States Congress, the establishment of a civilian conservation corps in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1056. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a request for withdrawal of the case of Felipe Dominquez Hurtado, file No. A-6509198, CR 23103, from those now pending before the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1057. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to prohibit arming aircraft against friendly powers, delivering aircraft to a belligerent nation, and for the forfeiture of such aircraft, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1058. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit the transportation of obscene phonograph records in interstate commerce"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1059. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 10, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Alhambra Creek and tributaries, California, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

1060. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 2, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of waterway connecting Lake Superior and Lake Michigan from Au Train Lake to Little Bay De Noc, Mich., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1061. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Panama Railroad Company for the year ended June 30, 1948 (H. Doc. No. 432); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1062. A letter from the adjutant and quartermaster general, Grand Army of the Republic, transmitting the Journal of Proceedings of the Eighty-third and Final Encampment, held at Indianapolis, Ind., August 28 to September 1, 1949, pursuant to Public Law 249, Seventy-seventh Congress (H. Doc. No. 387); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1063. A letter from the national adjutant, Disabled American Veterans, transmitting the Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the Disabled American Veterans, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 385); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1064. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the report of operations of the Postal Savings System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949, pursuant to section 1 of the act approved June 25, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 399); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

1065. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the inspection of coal mines by the Bureau of Mines for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, pursuant to the Coal Mine Inspection and Investigation Act of May 7, 1941 (Public Law 49, 55 Stat. 177, 30 U. S. C., sec. 4–F to 4–O); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1066. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to return to the public domain a tract of land known as the Battle Mountain Sanitarium Reserve, S. Dak."; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1067. A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting a statement of all judgments rendered by the United States Court of Claims for the year ended September 30, 1949, pursuant to section 143 of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1136); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1068. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation's operations for 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1069. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease under the terms of that law for the month of November 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1070. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Edgar F. Russell, Lillian V. Russell, his wife, and Mrs. Bessie R. Ward, employees of the United States, who suffered losses of personal property when a fire destroyed a Government-owned building in Hoonah, Alaska"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1071. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Lawrence B. Williams and his wife, Viva Craig Williams, employees of the United States, who suffered losses of personal property when a fire destroyed a Government-owned school and quarters building at Savoonga, Alaska"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1072. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a report relative to 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1073. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a tabulation showing the number of envelopes, labels, wrappers, cards, and other articles bearing penalty indicia procured or accounted for through this Department during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949, by the executive departments, independent establishments, organizations, and persons authorized by law to use the penalty privilege; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1074. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 5 of the act of February 26, 1944, entitled 'An act to give effect to the provisional fur seal agreement of 1942 between the United States of America and Canada, to protect the fur seals of the Pribilof Islands, and for other purposes' "; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1075. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Security Agency on the program of vocational education pursuant to section 18 of 39 Statutes 929, approved February 23, 1917, as amended by 60 Statutes 775, approved August 1, 1946; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1076. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to act of December 18, 1942 (56 Stat. 1056), on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Bureau of Mines Anthracite Research Laboratory constructed at Schuylkill Haven, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1077. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a list of reports which it is the duty of any officer or department to make to Congress in compliance with the requirements of rule III, clause 2, of the Rules of the House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 415); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

1078. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a report for the period from July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949, both inclusive, giving names of statutory and contingent-fund employees of the House and their respective compensations; to the Committee on House Administration.

1079. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report from certain departments and independent establishments relative to moneys received during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949, which were not paid into the general fund of the United States Treasury, and payments, if any, which were made from such moneys; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1080. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an itemized report covering transactions during the fiscal year 1949 for account of the Pershing Hall memorial fund; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1081. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to repeal certain laws relating to timber and stone on the public domain"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1082. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report showing the amount of moneys credited to the helium-production fund and the amount of disbursements made during the preceding fiscal year and the unexpended and unobligated balances on hand in such fund at the end of the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1083. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a combined statement of receipts, expenditures, and balances of the United States Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 6533. A bill to provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 6534. A bill to repeal the excise tax on telegraph, telephone, radio, and cable facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 6535. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the centennial of the founding of the Goodland Indian Orphanage, Hugo, Okla.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 6536. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points

in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committe on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 6537. A bill to provide funds for cooperation with the Territorial school authorities of Nome, Alaska, in the construction, extension, improvement, and equipment of school facilities, to be available to both native and nonnative children; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio:

H. R. 6538. A bill to make unlawful certain transportation of minors in interstate or foreign commerce where such transportation is connected with the sale of parental rights and duties with respect to such minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6539. A bill to amend Public Law 626, Eightieth Congress, relating to the Army Institute of Pathology Building; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6540. A bill to provide for the erection of a monument at the grave of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 6541. A bill to reincorporate the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 6542. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Henry W. Grady; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 6543. A bill to provide greater retention preference for severely disabled war veterans in reductions in force; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 6544. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVENPORT:

H. R. 6545. A bill to repeal the excise taxes on jewelry, furs, luggage, toilet preparations, and transportation of persons, and to terminate the war taxes on admissions, telephone, and telegraph; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 6546. A bill to implement the commitments of the United States Government under the provisions of Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress, and to make sure that such commitments are recognized in the allocation of cotton acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 6547. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to provide additional preference for amputees and seriously disabled veterans; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 6548. A bill to provide for the issuance of paid-up Government life-insurance policies to holders or former holders of 5-year level-premium Government life-insurance policies; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 6549. A bill to repeal the taxes on transportation of persons and property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6550. A bill to repeal the excise taxes on electric-light bulbs, toilet preparations, purses, handbags, wallets, and toilet cases, and to terminate the war tax rates on furs and jewelry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 6551. A bill authorizing the construction of a multipurpose reservoir on the Kootenai River, near Jennings, Mont., for flood control, power development, and other beneficial purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 6552. A bill to correct a clerical error in section 2 of the act of January 16, 1883, an act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States, as amended by Public Law 425, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6553. A bill to provide for the promotion of carriers in the rural-delivery service in recognition of longevity of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER:

H. R. 6554. A bill to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Buffalo, N. Y., as the "Walter Gresham Andrews Veterans' Memorial Hospital"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PICKETT:

H. R. 6555. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 6556. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 6557. A bill to implement the commitments of the United States Government under the provisions of Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress, and to make sure that such commitments are recognized in the allocation of cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 6558. A bill to amend paragraph 1798 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 6559. A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide a minimum rate of compensation for World War II veterans who have arrested tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6560. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize provisions in national service life insurance policies for increased monthly disability benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 6561. A bill to extend certain veterans' benefits to or on behalf of dependent husbands and widowers of female veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6562. A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide additional compensation for the loss or loss of the use of a creative organ; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 6563. A bill to provide for incentives, increased production, and employment through reduction in war taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 6564. A bill to provide for the promotion of carriers in the rural delivery service in recognition of longevity of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6565. A bill to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 6566. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize donations of certain surplus property for public-health purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 6567. A bill to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 6568. A bill to permit widows of officers and enlisted men of the armed forces to purchase from Army, Navy, and Air Force commissaries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. R. 6569. A bill to provide additional benefits for certain postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service with respect to annual and sick leave, promotion, and longevity pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6570. A bill to provide for the promotion of carriers in the rural-delivery service in recognition of longevity of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 6571. A bill to repeal the Alaska railroads tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 6572. A bill to extend the period for filing applications for lump-sum death payments under the Social Security Act in the case of individuals who were insured under such act and who died outside the United States during World War II; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 6573. A bill to provide for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of Old St. Louis, Mo., in accordance with the plan approved by the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. J. Res. 383. Joint resolution to investigate any abuses of the pay-roll privileges of Members of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. J. Res. 384. Joint resolution relating to cotton-acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVENPORT:

H. J. Res. 385. Joint resolution to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a memorial plaque to the memory of Stephen Collins Foster, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. J. Res. 386. Joint resolution relating to the pledge of allegiance to the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. J. Res. 387. Joint resolution authorizing the return to Mexico of the flags, standards, colors, and emblems that were captured by the United States in the Mexican War; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

H. Res. 412. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the economic and social effects of certain wartime and postwar developments in the States of California, Oregon, and Washington; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to requesting that the San Francisco Naval Shipyard be maintained in operation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, relative to requesting favorable consideration of and to enact into law Senate bill 2246, entitled "A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, relative to amending the Hawaiian Organic Act to provide for the contingency of the death of a judge of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 6574. A bill for the relief of Edward F. Knasin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 6575. A bill for the relief of Mack Burch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 6576. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to Kenneth B. Laughlin, of Anchorage, Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio:

H. R. 6577. A bill for the relief of Haruko Teramoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EOYKIN:

H. R. 6578. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gunnborg Janzon Hamilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 6579. A bill to grant permanent residence in the United States to Jan Januaz Wojciechowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6580. A bill to grant permanent residence in the United States to Spyridon V. Karavitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 6581. A bill for the relief of Roy S. Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6582. A bill for the relief of Mordeche Horowitz and Mrs. Regina Horowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 6583. A bill for the relief of Paul G. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6584. A bill for the relief of Nellie A. Ridings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINEHAN:

H. R. 6585. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Fenton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6586. A bill for the relief of Stamatie Amersonis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6587. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hamako Amano Schneider; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6588. A bill for the relief of Antanas Satunas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 6589. A bill for the relief of Mitsue Miyamoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 6590. A bill for the relief of Manuel Jose Besteire; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 6591. A bill for the relief of Corrado Parisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 6592. A bill for the relief of Michael Krzyzanowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAURIELLO:

H. R. 6593. A bill for the relief of Miss Rachel David; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 6594. A bill for the relief of Ludmilla Jungbauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 6595. A bill for the relief of Nabih El Khouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1544. By Mr. JUDD: Petition of Mrs. Maude Teigen and other citizens of Minneapolis, urging consideration and support of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2428, and a Senate counterpart of that measure; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1545. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of citizens and voters of Morrisville, Vt., urging passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2428, and the Langer bill, S. 1847, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic-beverage advertising and stop its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1546. Also, petition of some 84 citizens and voters of Plainfield, Vt., urging passage of House bill 2428 and Senate bill 1847, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic-beverage advertising and stop its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1547. By the SPEAKER: Petition of general board chairman, Los Angeles County Housing Expediter, requesting Congress to provide funds and personnel for a survey and study of rental and vacancy conditions in Los Angeles County; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1548. Also, petition of Irene B. Reidy, president, Republican Businesswomen's Club, Chicago, Ill., requesting that the members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives support legislation which will expedite the purchase of voluntary health insurance and to oppose all legislation to promote compulsory health insurance in America; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1549. Also, petition of the president, Baltimore City Dental Society, Baltimore, Md., requesting Congress not to enact any legislation containing the principle of compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1550. Also, petition of the president, Corydon Palmer Dental Society, Youngstown, Ohio, requesting Congress not to enact any legislation containing the principle of compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1551. Also, petition of the president, Tennessee State Dental Association, Memphis, Tenn., requesting Congress not to enact any legislation which will hamper that freedom, such as the current proposals for compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1552. Also, petition of Miss Mabel C. Galey, president, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Mount Hermon, Calif., requesting passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2428, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1553. Also, petition of John J. Mikulski, Polish National Alliance of North America, Buffalo, N. Y., relative to the tenth anniversary of the invasion of Poland and the establishment of peace on earth, and recommending that criminal acts of nations be referred to the tribunal of all nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1554. Also, petition of the secretary, American Federation of Musicians, Newark, N. J., relative to old-age and survivors' insurance, and that it be extended to include all wage earners and self-employed persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1555. Also, petition of W. P. Lamar, Atlanta, Ga., requesting consideration of his plan for bringing permanent peace in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1556. Also, petition of A. L. Chaney and others, Jacksonville, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1557. Also, petition of Augusta I. Boyer and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1558. Also, petition of T. S. Kinney and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1559. Also, petition of Mrs. Mattie Hester and others, Sanford, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1560. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Foster and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1561. Also, petition of J. H. Rensser and others, Boise, Idaho, requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 4, 1950

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we thank Thee for new years and for new days and for new thoughts of God and for new hopes for a redeemed humanity and a cleansed earth. With the dim lamps of our own devices we cannot find a sure and clear path through the tangled maze of this stricken generation. Awaiting are solemn responsibilities of public welfare, decisions which make our wisdom or our folly affect the daily lives of untold millions. Who among us is sufficient for these things? Our needs of enlightenment are deep and inward. We pray that our personal record may be kept unstained by any word or act unworthy of our best. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

JAMES O. EASTLAND, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, a Senator from the State of Florida, BURNET R. MAYBANK, a Senator from the State of South Carolina, ERNEST W. MCFARLAND, a Senator from the State of Arizona, CLAUDE PEPPER, a Senator from the State of Florida, and ALEXANDER WILEY, a Senator from the State of Wisconsin, appeared in their seats today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 3, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that a quorum of the House was present and that the House was ready to proceed with business.

The message also informed the Senate that a committee of three Members had been appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had assembled, and that Congress was ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The message announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 150) providing for a joint session of the two Houses at 1 o'clock p. m. today (January 4, 1950) for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President may be pleased to make to them, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House of Representatives adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Clyde M. Reed, late a Senator from the State of Kansas.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. George J. Bates, late a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message further communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Martin Gorski, late a Representative from the State of Illinois, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. WHERRY advanced in the center aisle, and

Mr. LUCAS said: Mr. President, as a member of the committee appointed on yesterday to notify the President of the United States that the Congress is in session and ready to proceed to business, I wish to report back to the Senate that the committee has performed that duty. The President advised the committee that at 1 o'clock today, in the Hall of the House of Representatives, he will deliver in person his annual message on the state of the Union.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming over from the House of Representatives.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 150) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, January 4, 1950, at 1 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Butler	Donnell
Anderson	Chapman	Douglas
Benton	Connally	Downey
Brewster	Cordon	Dworshak
Bricker	Darby	Eastland
Ecton	Kem	Myers
Ellender	Kerr	Neely
Ferguson	Kilgore	O'Conor
Frear	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Fulbright	Langer	Pepper
George	Leahy	Robertson
Gillette	Lehman	Russell
Graham	Lodge	Saltonstall
Green	Long	Schoeppel
Gurney	Lucas	Smith, N. J.
Hayden	McCarran	Sparkman
Hendrickson	McCarthy	Stennis
Hickenlooper	McClellan	Taft
Hill	McFarland	Taylor
Hoey	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Holland	McMahon	Thye
Humphrey	Magnuson	Tobey
Hunt	Malone	Tydings
Ives	Martin	Watkins
Jenner	Maybank	Wherry
Johnson, Tex.	Millikin	Wiley
Johnston, S. C.	Morse	Williams
Kefauver	Murray	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of a death in his family.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12:40 p. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 12:40 o'clock p. m.

On the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Vice President.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the time has now arrived for the Senate, under the previous order, to proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives to listen to the address of the President of the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder if the Senator from Illinois will make an announcement with reference to the Senate marching in a body on its return to the Chamber.

Mr. LUCAS. I made that announcement yesterday, but I shall repeat it. I believe it would be the better part of wisdom to march back in a body.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That would be automatic, unless an order to the contrary were entered, because the Senate has to resume its session following the President's message.

The Senate, preceded by the Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), the Secretary (Leslie L. Biffle), and the Vice President, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

ANNUAL ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 389)

The address this day delivered by the President of the United States at the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress appears on pages 60–64 of the House proceedings as contained in today's RECORD.

TRANSACTION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The Senate having returned to its Chamber, it reassembled at 1 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m., when called to order by the Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rules, 10 minutes remain for the transaction of morning business.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate continue the morning hour until morning business is concluded, in the event that it is not concluded by 2 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 416)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the Fifth Report of the Economic Cooperation Administration created by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress, approved April 3, 1948.

The report covers activities under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 (title I of Public Law 472, as amended) as well as the programs of economic aid to China under section 12 of Public Law 47, Eighty-first Congress, and to the Republic of Korea under the provisions of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act of 1949 (Public Law 793, 80th Cong.). There is also included in the appendix a summary of the status of the United States foreign relief program (Public Law 84, 80th Cong.) and the United States foreign aid program (Public Law 389, 80th Cong.).

This report is for the period April 3 through June 30, 1949.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 15, 1949.*

REPORT ON ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Transmitted herewith is the eighth quarterly report on United States military assistance to Greece and Turkey. This report covers the period from April 1, 1949, to June 30, 1949. Military assistance to Greece and Turkey was inaugurated under the authority of Public

Law 75, Eightieth Congress, and was continued under the authority of title III of Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress, known as the Greek-Turkish Assistance Act of 1948. Responsibility for United States assistance in the economic rehabilitation of Greece begun under Public Law 75 was transferred to the Economic Cooperation Administration on July 1, 1948, pursuant to Public Law 472, title I.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 28, 1949.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the operations of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for the year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, United States and Mexico, for the month of November 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM FOR VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide an agricultural program in the Virgin Islands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the months of September and October 1949 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON REGIONAL RESEARCH LABORATORIES

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of, funds used by, and donations to the Regional Research Laboratories, for the fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 126)

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, president, National Forest Reservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

STATEMENT OF JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 127)

A letter from the Clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of all judgments rendered by the Court of Claims for the year ended September 30, 1949 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report listing the contracts negotiated by the military departments, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the United States Soldiers' Home, for the fiscal year 1949 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON AIR FORCE FLYING PAY

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the Air Force flying pay, by rank and age group, for all officers above the rank of major, for the period January 1 to July 1, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON HELIUM-PRODUCTION FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, the amount of moneys credited to and disbursements from the helium-production fund, for the year ended June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PERSHING HALL MEMORIAL FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering transactions during the fiscal year 1949, for the account of the Pershing Hall Memorial Fund (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Corporation and its subsidiary, the Federal National Mortgage Association, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AUDIT REPORT OF INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Inland Waterways Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AUDIT REPORT OF FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AUDIT REPORT OF GORGAS MEMORIAL LABORATORY—GORGAS MEMORIAL INSTITUTE OF TROPICAL AND PREVENTIVE MEDICINE, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory—Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AUDIT REPORT OF PANAMA RAILROAD COMPANY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Panama Railroad Company, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN OFFICES IN THE PHILIPPINES BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to establish and continue officers in the Republic of the Philippines (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

A letter from the director, National Legislative Commission, the American Legion, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the financial statement of the American Legion up to and including the period ended October 31, 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operations of the International Information and Educational Exchange Program covering the three semiannual periods from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE COMMISSION

A letter from the Director, Washington Office, of the Philippine War Damage Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Advisory Commission on Information, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission dated September, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ORDINANCES ENACTED BY PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF PUERTO RICO

Two letters from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of ordinances granting franchises enacted by the Public Service Commission of Puerto Rico (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. CROIX AND ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislative Assembly and the Municipal Councils of St. Croix and St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT, CENTRAL VALLEY BASIN, CALIF.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, referring to his letter of August 29, 1949, concerning a report of the Interior Department entitled "Comprehensive Plan for Water

Resources Development, Central Valley Basin, Calif"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON ANTHRACITE RESEARCH LABORATORY, BUREAU OF MINES, SCHUYLKILL HAVEN, PA.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Bureau of Mines, Anthracite Research Laboratory, constructed at Schuylkill Haven, Pa.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON COAL MINE INSPECTION BY BUREAU OF MINES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to law, a report on the inspection of coal mines by the Bureau of Mines, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TRIBAL FUNDS OF CONFEDERATED TRIBES, COLVILLE RESERVATION, WASH.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposition of tribal funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, Wash. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO TIMBER AND STONE

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal certain laws relating to timber and stone on the public domain (with an accompanying paper); to the Commitee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAW ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF HAWAII

A letter from the Director, Division of Territories and Island Possessions, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of Act 63 of the Legislature of Hawaii, providing employment and vocational training to certain unemployed; creating the Hawaiian Civilian Conservation Corps within the Board of Agriculture and Forestry, and making an appropriation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROVISIONAL FUR SEAL AGREEMENT OF 1942

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5 of the act of February 26, 1944, entitled "An act to give effect to the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942 between the United States of America and Canada; to protect the fur seals of the Pribilof Islands; and for other purposes" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation as well as a list of persons involved, together with a detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law to each alien and the reason for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENT OF ADJUDICATIONS RENDERED BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE IN CERTAIN CASES OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of all adjudications rendered during the year 1949 in cases of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the status of permanent residence to Josef Weinberg and Pilvi Laine Leoke (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CONTRACT SETTLEMENT

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first report on contract settlement by that Administration for the period July 1 through September 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LAWRENCE B. WILLIAMS AND HIS WIFE, VIVA CRAIG WILLIAMS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Lawrence B. Williams and his wife, Viva Craig Williams (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EDGAR F. RUSSELL ET AL.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Edgar F. Russell; Lillian V. Russell, his wife; and Bessie R. Ward (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF TORT CLAIMS PAID BY INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on all tort claims by the Department of the Interior under the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act for the fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on all tort claims paid by the Department of the Army under the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act, for the fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman and members of the Displaced Persons Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the second semiannual report of that Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MRS. MARTHA P. MATTHEWS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Mrs. Martha P. Matthews (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PAUL D. BANNING

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Paul D. Banning, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMERICAN ELEVATOR & MACHINE CO.

A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 251, dated June 10, 1948, an order of the court dismissing the defendant's claim in the case of *American Elevator & Machine Co.* v. *The United States* (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON PROGRAM OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the program of vocational education, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PENALTY MAIL MATERIAL

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to section 302, title III, Public Law 785, approved June 25, 1948, a report showing the quantity of penalty inscribed material on hand and on order for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON PERSONNEL CEILINGS

A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of personnel ceilings for the quarter ended September 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON PUBLIC-WORKS PROJECTS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 136, Eighty-first Congress, a report of public-works projects in process and under consideration by that Department (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of the Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF LAND ACQUISITIONS, NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on land acquisitions for parks, parkways, and playgrounds, cost of each tract, and method of acquisition, fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF HATCH POLITICAL ACTIVITIES ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Hatch Political Activities Act of August 2, 1939, as amended, in order to grant Federal officers and employees in certain communities in Alaska the same type of privileges as are now granted under section 16 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

A letter from the secretary, National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifty-second annual report of that society for the year ended April 1, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Congress of the United States, to maintain in operation the San Francisco Naval Shipyard

"Whereas the San Francisco Naval Shipyard, commonly known as Hunters Point Naval Shipyard is a valuable and strategically located shipyard; and

"Whereas the Navy for many years sought deep-water facilities on the San Francisco water front, and when they obtained Hunters Point, spent huge sums of money in developing the shipyard; and

"Whereas the announcement has been made that the Navy contemplates the shutting down of the San Francisco Naval Shipyard in the near future; and

"Whereas the shut-down of the San Francisco Naval Shipyard would result in the unemployment of many thousands of skilled civilian workers in the San Francisco area; and

"Whereas in case of national emergency the shipyard would be of invaluable aid to the preservation and security of the west coast and of the entire United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully memorialized and requested to take such steps as may be necessary to maintain the San Francisco Naval Shipyard in operation to the fullest possible extent consistent with national economy; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Congress of the United States, to maintain in operation the Long Beach Naval Shipyard

"Whereas the Long Beach Naval Shipyard at Terminal Island is a valuable and strategically located shipyard; and

"Whereas the Navy for many years sought deep-water facilities on the Long Beach water front, and when they obtained the Terminal Island site spent huge sums of money developing the shipyard; and

"Whereas the Long Beach Naval Shipyard bears the reputation of having been the most efficient and economically administered yard of the Nation during the war years, receiving the most coveted Navy E; and

"Whereas the announcement has been made that the Navy contemplates the shutting down of the Long Beach Naval Shipyard in the near future; and

"Whereas the shut-down of the Long Beach Shipyard would result in the unemployment of many thousands of skilled civilian workers in the Long Beach area; and

"Whereas in the case of a national emergency the Long Beach Naval Shipyard would be of invaluable aid to the preservation and security of the west coast and of the entire United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully memorialized and requested to take such steps as may be necessary to maintain the Long Beach Naval Shipyard in operation to the fullest possible extent; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Defense, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Senate Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution relative to the United States Naval Shipyard at Mare Island

"Whereas the Navy Yard, Mare Island, Calif., was established by the illustrious Admiral Farragut, then a Commodore, in the year 1854 at Vallejo, Calif., as the first navy yard on the Pacific coast, and during the past 96 years through war and through peace this navy yard, now known as the United States Naval Shipyard, Mare Island, Vallejo, Calif., has grown in importance and scope to be one of the largest naval shipyards in the United States and in the world; and

"Whereas during the recent war all 27 private shipyards in the San Francisco Bay area were under the complete or partial control, or direction of the then Navy Yard, Mare Island, and all naval activities centered under the Ferry Building at San Francisco, and the annex of Mare Island at Hunters Point, now known as the San Francisco Naval Shipyard, were also under Mare Island direction; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States recognizing the importance of Mare Island provided by Federal law that San Francisco activities at Hunters Point must be an annex and operated as such to Mare Island, and approximately 60 percent of all naval shipbuilding and repair work on the Pacific Ocean, under the control of the United States, was accomplished at Mare Island or in activities under the control or direction of Mare Island; and

"Whereas proud of this great heritage and responsibility the city of Vallejo supports and works in close harmony with its one large industry, that it may proudly carry on the high traditions of this heritage, and any serious cut in the present level of employees at the Mare Island Naval Shipyard would seriously hamper the traditions, the stability, and the defense of the west coast of the United States and the Orient and would bring disaster and ruin to Mare Island and Vallejo: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully memorialized and requested to take such steps consistent with national economy as may be necessary to assure that the defenses of the Pacific and west coast areas not be weakened or hampered by reducing the personnel or otherwise impairing the efficiency of United States Naval Shipyard, Mare Island, Vallejo, Calif., which has always been and in the future will be the most important of all west-coast shipyards capable of rendering the type of support to the defenses of the United States which has been so ably rendered in the past; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be hereby directed to prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to enact legislation providing for the distribution of funds belonging to California Indians

"Whereas there is now on deposit in the United States Treasury an amount of over $6,000,000 belonging to California Indians as a result of an award made by the United States Court of Claims on December 4, 1944; and

"Whereas the distribution of such funds to their rightful owners, the California Indians, would result in a distribution of an amount of approximately $150 to each California Indian; and

"Whereas such distribution would aid in the alleviation of the present great need of California Indians; and

"Whereas this fund cannot be distributed until Congress so provides; and

"Whereas there was pending at the recent session of the Congress of the United States, S. 1354, which would authorize the distribution of such funds to California Indians: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact into law S. 1354 or any other bill or bills which would accomplish the same purpose; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relative to memoralizing the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Maritime Commission of the United States, to reduce the tolls of the Panama Canal

"Whereas vessels passing through the Panama Canal are now required to pay tolls which are greatly in excess of the cost of operating and maintaining the Panama Canal and are oppressive and destructive to the intercoastal shipping industry; and

"Whereas such tolls have been a most important factor in reducing the number of privately owned vessels in the intercoastal shipping service from 170 before World War II to 18 at the present time; and

"Whereas this decline in intercoastal merchant shipping has resulted in a corresponding reduction in the volume of cargo handled by all ports on the west coast of the United States with a consequent loss of business and pay rolls by the ports of California, Oregon, and Washington; and

"Whereas a number of chambers of commerce and civic organizations have emphatically urged a reduction of Canal toll rates; and

"Whereas an active and prosperous intercoastal shipping service is vital to national defense and the welfare of the Pacific coast: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Maritime Commission of the United States are hereby respectfully memorialized and requested to take such steps as may be necessary to reduce Panama Canal tolls to

fair and equitable rates which will encourage and stimulate intercoastal shipping; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Defense, the Maritime Commission of the United States, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Congress of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution relative to the designation of the year 1950 as the year for the observance of an American Free Enterprise Centennial

"Whereas the year 1950 will mark a century of great progress in the advance of mechanization in manufacturing and in the production of devices, materials, and services that have provided the highest living standards for human beings, strengthening and enriching the mind and body; and

"Whereas the world's center of this advance has been within the United States of America and has flourished under the American system of government and had its inspiration from the culture, institutions, and political ideals conceived by the founders of this Republic; and

"Whereas this miracle of industrial achievement with its national economy of plenty for all is the exclusive product of the American private-enterprise system and the joint possession and expression of coordinated American labor and management; and

"Whereas in these times of menacing economic onslaughts from within and beyond our borders it becomes vitally important that a Nation-wide reaffirmation and recognition of the superlative service, worth, and American character of the free-enterprise system be enunciated: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the President and Congress of the United States be memorialized to take such steps as may be necessary to designate 1950 as the year for the observance of an American Free Enterprise Centennial; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution relative to hospital facilities for veterans in California

"Whereas there are insufficient beds in Government hospitals for veterans in California as evidenced by waiting lists and by the large number of tubercular and mentally ill veterans now adding to the overcrowded conditions of California State and county hospitals; and

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration has announced plans for a future building program for hospitals to meet this need; and

"Whereas the United States Naval Hospital at Corona, built by the Navy since 1941 at an expenditure of $19,000,000, has been abandoned by the Navy and is now idle but in every way suitable and desirable for the care of veterans by the Veterans' Administration; and

"Whereas the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and other ex-service organizations have recommended the Corona Naval Hospital for transfer to the Veterans' Administration: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Veterans' Administration be, and hereby is, requested to take over at once the Corona Naval Hospital as a major veterans' facility for the care of sick and disabled veterans in California; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is memorialized to bring about the transfer of the Corona Naval Hospital to the Veterans' Administration and to enact any legislation which may be needed for this purpose; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall immediately be dispatched by the secretary of the senate to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from the State of California, and to the Veterans' Administrator."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 6

"Joint resolution relative to the continuance of payment of nonresident fees by the Veterans' Administration to the Hastings College of Law, San Francisco, Calif.

"Whereas there is in San Francisco, Calif., the Hastings College of Law, which is the law department of the University of California; and

"Whereas the Hastings College of Law, by operating at 300 percent of normal capacity, is contributing greatly to the education and welfare of student veterans; and

"Whereas the attendance of Hastings College of Law has increased from 44 students on May 8, 1945, to 915 students in September 1949; and

"Whereas the growth and development of Hastings College of Law since 1945 has been made possible by payment to its directors of the same Veterans' Administration fees as those which have been paid for the training of students on other campuses of the University of California, including those at Berkeley and Los Angeles; and

"Whereas on November 9, 1949, the Director, Training Facilities Service for Vocational Rehabilitation and Education, ruled that a nonresident fee of $150 per semester may not hereafter be paid by the Veterans' Administration to the Hastings College of Law; and

"Whereas the adoption of such a nonresident fee was approved by the Veterans' Administrator in January 1945 and payment thereof has been made throughout the last 4½ years; and

"Whereas the Director has ruled that payment of the fee may continue to be made for students enrolled at the School of Jurisprudence of the University of California at Berkeley, Calif., and the School of Law of the University of California at Los Angeles, although the combined enrollment of those institutions is approximately one-third of the enrollment at the Hastings College of Law; and

"Whereas the effect of such ruling is to unjustly and arbitrarily penalize the Hastings College of Law, reducing its gross income by more than $100,000 during the academic years 1949–50 and 1950–51; and

"Whereas the enforcement of the ruling will make it necessary for the Hastings College of Law to discontinue its present policy of accepting a number of student veterans far in excess of the normal capacity of its facilities; and

"Whereas the resultant limitation on the number of student veterans who may be accepted for enrollment will seriously interfere with the continued education of the student veterans affected by the ruling: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President, Vice President, and Congress of the United States, the Director, Training Facilities Service for Vocational Rehabilitation and Education, and Veterans' Administration to take such steps as may be necessary to permit the Veterans' Administration to continue to pay to the Hastings College of Law the nonresidence fees of student veterans enrolled therein; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Director, Training Facilities Service for Vocational Rehabilitation and Education, the Veterans' Administration, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the appropriate congressional committees."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House Concurrent Resolution 15

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-fifth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, in special session assembled (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby respectfully requested to give favorable consideration to and to enact into law Senate 2246 entitled "A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes," introduced by the Honorable JOHN J. SPARKMAN, and which is now pending before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, and the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution petitioning the President of the United States to name the Territory of Hawaii as an emergency unemployment region and requesting that he order Federal agencies to assign Federal orders to Hawaiian industry, approve Federal public works projects for Hawaii, and maintain the national defense establishments within the Territory at a high level of readiness

"Whereas general economic conditions in the United States have deteriorated to an extent requiring Federal cognizance of the growing unemployment problem; and

"Whereas a combination of deflationary factors, including sharp curtailment in recent months of activities in the Territory of Hawaii by the Army, Navy, and Air Forces, a 4-month tie-up of shipping between the Territory of Hawaii and the Pacific coast late in 1948, and a tie-up of all island ports in the Territory of Hawaii since May 1, 1949, have caused a severe economic decline and an alarming increase in unemployment in the Territory of Hawaii; and

"Whereas on the island of Oahu alone, where the bulk of the population of the Territory of Hawaii resides, there are over 18,000 unemployed persons out of a working population of 136,000 (about 13½ percent of the total); and

"Whereas for the Territory of Hawaii as a whole there are over 25,000 unemployed out

of a working population of 200,000 (about 12½ percent of the total); and

"Whereas this economic decline in the Territory of Hawaii is substantially more severe than for the United States as a whole, causing a curtailment of reserves of private business in the Territory; and

"Whereas the Territory's lack of mineral or other extractive natural resources, its distance from markets, and the physical limitations of its productive capacity make adjustment to economic change more difficult than in other areas of more diversified economic activity; and

"Whereas the Federal policy of special action to ameliorate such conditions by a judicious channeling of Federal orders, authorizations for new Federal public works, and maintenance of national defense establishments is being developed in other areas of the United States faced with similar difficulties: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. That the President of the United States be respectfully requested to declare the Territory of Hawaii as an emergency unemployment region; direct appropriate Federal agencies and officials to take action to encourage employment in the Territory of Hawaii by channeling Government contracts to Hawaiian firms where possible; direct that any transfers of military installations take advantage of the suitability and strategic location of Hawaii for such installations; and request the Congress of the United States to enact legislation now pending for certain Federal public works projects in the Territory.

"SEC. 2. That a certified copy of this joint resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Defense, the Maritime Commission, the Secretary of Labor, the Veterans' Administration, and the Economic Cooperation Administration.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 4th day of October A. D. 1949.

"INGRAM M. STAINBACK,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution 19

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act to provide for the contingency of the death of a judge of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii

"Whereas the Hawaiian Organic Act provides that provision may be made by law for the filling of the place of any justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii in case of his 'disqualification or absence' but grants no such authority in the event of the death of any justice; and

"Whereas the death of the Honorable Albert M. Cristy, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, has created the very contingency for which there is no provision in law: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-fifth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in special session assembled (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby respectfully requested to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act by amending the proviso to section 82 thereof to read as follows: *'Provided, however,* That in case of the death, disqualification, or absence of any justice thereof, in any cause pending before the court, on the trial and determination of said cause his place shall be filled as provided by law'; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States of America, and the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by the International Association of Machinists, Washington, D. C., favoring an investigation of the plans of the Department of Defense to disperse defense industries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the General Board Chairman, Los Angeles (Calif.) Rent Advisory Board, embodying a resolution adopted by that Board, favoring the furnishing of personnel and funds for a survey and study of rental and vacancy conditions in Los Angeles County, Calif.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., supporting the findings of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the States of Iowa, Maryland, and New York, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 2181, providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A petition signed by sundry citizens of the cities of Niles, Buchanan, and Dowagiac, all in the State of Michigan, favoring the enactment of legislation to reduce the excise tax on alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Philippine Veterans Legion, Manila, Philippine Islands, favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the payment of allowances and bonuses to Philippine veterans on the same basis as American veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by the American Federation of Musicians, A. F. of L., Newark, N. J., and the Citizens Economic Council of Northern Kentucky, Covington, Ky., relating to pensions under the social security law; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by Ford Local 600, United Auto Workers, CIO, Dearborn, Mich., favoring an investigation of the tax rate under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Harry Rapport, Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation providing a pension for all World War I veterans who have no means of support; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of H. B. Mahurin and sundry other citizens of Gibbon, Nebr., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 2181, providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Mrs. E. V. Brown, relating to the recognition of any nation or people opposed to democracy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the American Eretz-Israel Association, Inc., New York, N. Y., relating to the claim of the Republic of Israel to the city of Jerusalem; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Unico National, assembled at Bridgeport, Conn., August 14, 1949, favoring the establishment of a national academy of political science; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The memorials of Clare Fahey, New York, N. Y., and Mary McShane, of Peter Cooper Village, New York, N. Y., remonstrating against the recognition of the Communist regime in China; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., favoring the prompt ratification of the Genocide Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Hawaii Baptist Convention, Honolulu, T. H., favoring the enactment of legislation providing statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the St. Croix (V. I.) Civic Association, favoring the appointment of Joseph Alexander of St. Croix, V. I., as governor of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition signed by J. L. Francis, president, Air and Steam Train Line Coupler Co., Fort Worth, Tex., relating to the adoption of a new safety automatic air train line connector; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Kiwanis Club of Lufkin, Tex., relating to communism, and so forth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the Syrian and Lebanese American Federation of the Eastern States, Fitchburg, Mass., and the National Jewish Youth Conference, of New York, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to liberalize the Displaced Persons Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A telegram in the nature of a petition, signed by Archbishop Vitaly, chairman of the Diocesan Convention of the American and Canadian Diocese of the Russian Orthodox Greek-Catholic Church, assembled in New York, N. Y., relating to displaced persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A telegram in the nature of a petition signed by John H. Clayborn, Bishop, and sundry ministers of the Thirteenth Episcopal District Headquarters, East Tennessee Annual Conference Bethel, African Methodist Episcopal Church, Knoxville, Tenn., relating to the appointment of William H. Hastie to the position of Federal Judge of the United States Court of Appeals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Mrs. V. J. Over , of Chalmers, Ind., relating to communism and the waste of public funds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A memorial signed by certain members of the Kiwanis Club of Oak Cliff, Dallas, Tex., remonstrating against deficit spending, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Kentucky State Building and Construction Trades Council, Louisville, Ky., favoring the reestablishment of the regional office of the Wage and Hour and Public Contract Division in Nashville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The petition of John W. Aubert, chairman, and sundry other members of the committee of the Retired Railroad Men's Association of Terre Haute, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to liberalize the pensions of railroad men and their widows under the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the general convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, New York, N. Y., favoring the separation of church and state and religious instruction in public schools; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Republican Business Women's Club, of Chicago, Ill., protesting the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Philippine Veterans' Legion, Manila, P. I., favoring the enactment of legislation providing funds for the construction and maintenance of hospitals for veterans in the Philippines; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Resolutions adopted by sundry medical and civic organizations of the United States, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by John D. Montgomery, president of district No. 2, National Association of Post Office Maintenance Employees, Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the confirmation of the nomination of Raymond A. Thomas to be permanent postmaster of the city of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., Washington, D. C., favoring the adoption of Senate Resolution 58, providing for the establishment of a permanent small business committee as a safeguard for the preservation of independent enterprise; ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING—PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from Mrs. Harry Achee, of Woodward, Okla., transmitting a petition signed by sundry citizens of that city. I present the petition for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures, as follows:

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We respectfully request that you use your influence and vote for the passage of a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio. The most pernicious effect of this advertising is the constant invitation and enticement to drink. The American people spent $9,640,000,000 for alcoholic beverages in 1947 as compared with $7,770,000,000 in 1945. During the same time there was a corresponding increase each year in crime, juvenile delinquency, broken homes, deaths, and injuries due to intoxicated drivers. There is every reason why this waste of money and human values should not be increased but rather greatly decreased.

BUILDING PROGRAM FOR UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by a committee composed of members of the United States Soldiers' Home, Washington, D. C., relating to the building program for the United States Soldiers' Home.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME,
Washington, D. C., December 31, 1949.

To the Senators and Representatives of the United States Congress, Washington, D. C.:

We, the members of the United States Soldiers' Home, assembled in mass meeting in Stanley Hall, hereby resolve to protest against the unfair way we are being treated by the Bureau of the Budget, for they have been holding up the building program for the United States Soldiers' Home and we do not see why. We have $36,000,000 in the trust fund of which the Congress of the United States is the custodian and we need new buildings and facilities to accommodate a waiting list of over 400 veterans who have applied for admission to the home. We further desire an investigation to find out just why the appropriations are being held up for the building program of the United States Soldiers' Home.

We further protest the cut in our rations from 74 cents to 61 cents. We see no good reason for this cut since the money comes out of home funds and not out of public funds of the United States and we know that the enlisted men of the Regular Army who pay for our rations do not want the members of the home underfed.

We further state that we know that the Board of Commissioners of the Home has asked for appropriations in their budgets, from 1948 to 1951 inclusive, but to this date nothing has been done owing to the Budget Bureau.

We also urge the passage of the Teague appropriation bill for the relief of United States Soldiers' Home building program.

We further state that we are in urgent need of new buildings and facilities to take care of the needs of the members in the future, and request that appropriations for that purpose be authorized as soon as possible.

JASON B. CHAMBERS,
Chairman, Scott Building,
EMIL F. K. SCHROEDER,
King Building,
SCHLEY C. WILLIAMSON,
King Building,
LACEY MOORE,
Sheridan Building,
THOMAS MCDONALD,
Grant Building,
AMOS F. JACKSON,
Anderson Building,
WILBER W. LANGDALE,
Sherman Building,
The Committee for the Members.

(All replies to First Sgt. Jason B. Chambers, box 1907, Washington, D. C.)

DAIRY INDUSTRY OF THE MIDWEST

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Rochester (Minn.) Dairy Cooperative, relating to the dairy industry of the Midwest.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE ROCHESTER DAIRY COOPERATIVE DECEMBER 7, 1949, IN ACCORDANCE WITH MOTION ADOPTED AT ANNUAL MEETING OF PATRONS DECEMBER 3

Whereas the great dairy industry of the Midwest historically, over half a century, has sold the bulk of the products of its dairy farms in other areas, particularly the East; and

Whereas the agricultural welfare of the Midwest is dependent on livestock enterprises, of which dairying is the major project, by virtue of consumption of forage crops, soil conservation, and revenue; and

Whereas the original intent of the law authorizing marketing orders was to correct local fluid milk market abuses and not to discriminate against any dairy farmer; and

Whereas the high prices received in milk sheds under Government-administered order has so stimulated milk production in those areas that huge surpluses above current needs are created; and

Whereas these surpluses have been thrown into channels of trade formerly served by products of the Midwest farms; and

Whereas this distortion of normal marketing procedures has forced the dairy production of the Midwest, which formerly went into commercial channels, to now be diverted to the Government support program, resulting in accumulation of huge stocks of butter, cheese, and nonfat powder in Government possession at the expense of the taxpayers; and

Whereas this forcing of the Midwest on Government support has resulted in the dairy farmer receiving a price considerably less than parity, while at the same time the producer under marketing orders is receiving a price far above parity; and

Whereas this situation definitely discriminates against the Midwest dairy producer and is contrary to public welfare: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the Rochester Dairy Cooperative, located in the States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Iowa, in annual meeting assembled at Rochester, Minn., on December 3, 1949, hereby instruct the board of directors of this cooperative to convey their protests of this dangerous situation to the Members of Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture and other interested parties; and be it further

Resolved, That action be instituted immediately to correct this situation by the elimination of all Federal milk marketing orders or the modification of their administration.

Adopted at Rochester, Minn., this 7th day of December 1949.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
ROCHESTER DAIRY COOPERATIVE,
ROBERT H. BADGER,
President.
E. D. GRASKAMP,
Secretary.

THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION POLICY

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Iowa Department of Agriculture, relating to the national transportation policy.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 6

Whereas the farmers of the United States are vitally concerned in the maintenance and preservation of a sound, efficient, and economical national transportation system; and

Whereas freight rates are now at the highest levels in all history, but nevertheless the railroads are, as a whole, not prospering and, unless efficient national transportation service by rail and other means can be maintained, with fair return to the carriers, at lower than the present levels of charges, it is apparent that the country may be heading toward a national transportation crisis which may force the Government to take over the ownership and operation of the railroads; and

Whereas the national transportation policy, as adopted by the Congress of the United States, places responsibility directly on the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate all modes of transportation subject to the Interstate Commerce Act to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each; to promote safe, adequate, economical, and efficient service and foster sound economic conditions in transportation and among the several carriers; to encourage the establishment and maintenance of reasonable charges for transportation services without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices; to cooperate with the several States and the duly authorized officials thereof; and to encourage fair wages and equitable working conditions—all to the end of developing, coordinating, and preserving a national transportation system by water, highway, and rail, as well as other

means, adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense; and

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission has adopted no methods of developing, coordinating, and preserving a national transportation system as contemplated by the national transportation policy, other than by permitting increases in charges of the railroads to the point of imposing such burdens upon agricultural and other commerce as to diminish the total volume of traffic and freight revenues of the railroads; and

Whereas agriculture, because of its economic importance to the country, has been given recognition in laws governing the membership of Federal boards, such as the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (see title 12, sec. 241 of the U. S. Code): Be it

Resolved by the National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture, That it call to the attention of the President of the United States the need for appointment to the Interstate Commerce Commission of men of the highest qualifications, and particularly the desirability of including on the membership of the Commission at least one member especially qualified to deal with the transportation problems of agriculture.

FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS BRANCHES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution which I have received from G. V. Markey, secretary-treasurer of the National Association of State Savings, Building and Loan Supervisors. The resolution was adopted at the tenth annual conference of the association which was held in the capital of my State, Madison, Wis. It endorses Senate bill 2006, for facilitating new branches for Federal savings and loan associations which was reported to the Senate on September 30 by the Banking and Currency Committee. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRANCHES OF FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

Whereas the Committee on Banking and Currency in the United States Senate has favorably reported S. 2006 which, if enacted, will permit a Federal savings and loan association, with the approval of the Home Loan Bank Board, to establish and operate new branches, if such establishment and operation are at the time in conformity with the practice within the State with respect to branches of State building, savings and loan associations; and

Whereas the Committee on Banking and Currency in the House of Representatives is considering a similar bill, H. R. 4710; and

Whereas S. 2006 would place Federal and State savings and loan associations on an equal basis as to branches in every State in the Union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Association of State Savings, Building and Loan Supervisors endorses S. 2006 and urges its prompt passage by the Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That to expedite completion of this legislation the Committee on Banking and Currency in the House of Representatives be respectfully asked to conform the language of H. R. 4710 to that of S. 2006 as amended, and to report H. R. 4710 favorably as early as may be practicable in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the association be instructed to send copies of this resolution to every United States Senator and to every member of the Committee on Banking and Currency in the House of Representatives.

APPOINTMENT OF MILES D. KENNEDY AS NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the announcement made by national commander of the American Legion, George N. Craig, relating to the appointment of Miles D. Kennedy as national legislative director of the American Legion.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the body of the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 25, 1949.

KENNEDY SUCCEEDS TAYLOR AS LEGION LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR

Appointment of Miles D. Kennedy, New York City attorney, as national legislative director of the American Legion, effective January 1, was announced today by Legion National Commander George N. Craig.

Kennedy succeeds John Thomas Taylor, who has reached retirement age after piloting American Legion legislation in Congress for 31 years. Taylor will remain in harness as legislative consultant during the second session of the Eighty-first Congress. Retention of Taylor in a special capacity was authorized by the Legion's national executive committee last month.

In his new post Director Kennedy will work closely with Elmer W. Sherwood, of Indianapolis, Ind., newly appointed chairman of the national legislative commission of the American Legion. Kennedy has been a commission member for 4 years and served as its vice chairman in 1948–49.

Born at Dover Plains, N. Y., Kennedy attended high school at Poughkeepsie and studied law at Fordham University. He received his law degree in June 1922. A practicing attorney in New York City since 1923, he leaves a partnership in the firm of Darcy, Loughman & Bailey to take the Legion assignment.

LONG LEGION RECORD

Kennedy interrupted his education to enlist in the Army for World War I military service. Assigned to the Eighteenth United States Infantry, he later was transferred to the Five Hundred and Fourth Aero Squadron, Aviation Section, Signal Corps. He served as a sergeant until his discharge in December 1918.

Joining the James C. Sullivan Post, No. 75, of the American Legion in New York City, Kennedy served three terms as post commander. He was treasurer and commander of the Bronx County Legion, district commander, and in 1945 department commander of New York. He is also a member of Bronx Voiture 33 of the Forty and Eight.

Married to Agnes McCabe, of Poughkeepsie, January 11, 1924, Kennedy is the father of a daughter, Ann, now 19.

REPORT OF PERSONNEL AND FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following report was received by the Secretary of the Senate:

DECEMBER 31, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Robert H. Mollohan, chief clerk	$10,846.00	$2,123.29
A. L. Wheeler, acting counsel and assistant clerk	10,846.00	5,250.98
J. George Stewart, professional staff	10,846.00	5,250.98
Thomas S. Henderson, professional staff	8,273.03	4,005.18
Edna L. Ward, assistant clerk	5,197.21	2,516.08
Ruth W. Bryant, assistant clerk	4,849.61	2,347.82
Anna H. Monat, assistant clerk	4,415.10	2,137.44

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended (from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1949)	2,574.53
Balance unexpended	7,425.47

MATTHEW M. NEELY,
Chairman.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2766. A bill to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Buffalo, N. Y., as the "Walter Gresham Andrews Veterans' Memorial Hospital"; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 2767. A bill for the relief of Yoshiko Fukuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2768. A bill for the relief of Chang Han Wen; and

S. 2769. A bill for the relief of Pieter Mathias Pennings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 2770. A bill for the relief of Thomas (Toma) Moldoveanu and Constance Moldoveanu (his wife); and

S. 2771. A bill for the relief of Mircea Niculescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 2772. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Thomas N. Cole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 2773. A bill to amend the peanut marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 2774. A bill to redefine the term "bank" as used in section 2113 of title 18 of the United States Code, dealing with bank robbery and incidental crimes, so as to include within the meaning of such term any savings and loan association the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 2775. A bill directing the conveyance of certain property to the city of Rupert, Idaho; and

S. 2776. A bill authorizing the establishment and operation of a memorial museum and shop at Spalding, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 2777. A bill to provide for the promotion of carriers in the Rural Delivery Service in recognition of longevity of service;

S. 2778. A bill to provide credit for postal field service of custodial employees and mail-equipment shops' employees for promotion to meritorious or longevity grades; and

S. 2779. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional compensation and other benefits for postmasters, officers, and employees," approved October 28, 1949, so as to provide meritorious-service grades for hourly employees of the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and Mr. WILEY):

S. 2780. A bill for the relief of Jaime Riel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating May 30, Memorial Day, as a day for a Nation-wide prayer for peace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PAY OF SENATE PAGES

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 196), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate at the basic rate of $1,800 per annum the salaries of 19 pages employed by the Sergeant at Arms for duty in the Senate Chamber from December 27 to 31, 1949.

CONTINUATION ON PAY ROLL OF CERTAIN SENATE EMPLOYEES

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 197), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That in the case of the resignation of a Senator during his term of office, his clerical and other assistants on the pay roll of the Senate on the date of such resignation shall be continued on such pay roll at their respective salaries for a period of not to exceed 30 days: *Provided*, That any such assistants continued on the pay roll, while so continued, shall perform their duties under the direction of the Secretary of the Senate, and he hereby is authorized and directed to remove from such pay roll any such assistants who are not attending to the duties for which their services are continued: *Provided further*, That this shall not operate to continue such assistants on such pay roll beyond the expiration of their Senator's term of service.

CROP PRODUCTION INVESTIGATIONS—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURE BY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Mr. GILLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 198), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolved, That the subcommittee authorized by Senate Resolution 36, Eighty-first Congress, first session, hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-first Congress, $38,000 in addition to the amount and for the same purposes as specified in said resolution.

Resolved further, That section 3 of Senate Resolution 36, Eighty-first Congress, first session, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the duly authorized subcommittee is authorized, during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable and, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of all agencies in the executive branch of the Government. The expenses of the subcommittee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the subcommittee."

TOWARD WORLD STABILITY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Toward World Stability—An Attack on One Is an Attack on All," delivered by him at the Institute of World Affairs, held under the auspices of the University of Southern California, in the Mission Inn, Riverside, Calif., December 13, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LODGE

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the organization of the executive branch, delivered by him at the Hotel Astor, New York, N. Y., on December 1, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPUBLICAN RESURGENCE—ARTICLE BY SAMUEL SHAFFER

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Republican Resurgence," written by Samuel Shaffer, and published in Newsweek for January 9, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROBLEMS CONFRONTING MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS—ADDRESS BY R. RAY SHUTE

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of problems confronting municipal governments, delivered by R. Ray Shute, mayor of Monroe, N. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

KEEP OUR FREEDOM—SERMON BY REV. EARLE B. JEWELL

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a sermon entitled "Keep Our Freedom," delivered by Rev. Earle B. Jewell, rector of St. Andrews Episcopal Church, Kansas City, Mo., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS—ADDRESS BY COL. MELVIN J. MAAS

[Mr. McCARTHY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the keynote address delivered by Col. Melvin J. Maas, president, United States Marine Corps Reserve Officers' Corps, at the national conference held on October 21 and 22, 1949, in Philadelphia, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOCIALISM BY DEFAULT—ADDRESS BY CECIL PALMER

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Socialism by Default," delivered by Cecil Palmer, English publisher, author, and journalist, at the fifty-fourth annual congress of American industry in New York, N. Y., December 9, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF RATIFICATION OF FEDERAL CONSTITUTION BY DELAWARE—ADDRESS BY HON. E. PAUL BURKHOLDER

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by State Senator E. Paul Burkholder, of Delaware, on the occasion of the one hundred and sixty-second anniversary of the ratification of the Federal Constitution by the State of Delaware, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT IS THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES WORTH TO AMERICAN WOMEN?—ADDRESS BY HELEN ELIZABETH BROWN

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "What Is the Constitution of the United States Worth to American Women?" delivered by Helen Elizabeth Brown before the Lawyers' Civil Association of Maryland, on Wednesday, November 2, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRIZE ESSAY BY MISS NATALIE SNYDER ON CONSERVATION OF SOIL RESOURCES

[Mr. HENDRICKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the second prize essay by Miss Natalie Synder, of Pittstown, N. J., in the Nation-wide contest on conservation of our soil resources, sponsored by the National Grange and American Plant Food Council, Inc., which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED STATES CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM—ARTICLE BY BENJAMIN FINE

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to the United States cultural exchange program, by Benjamin Fine, from the New York Times of December 25, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRIVATELY SUPPORTED HOSPITALS AND THE PUBLIC HEALTH—ARTICLE FROM THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to a study of New York hospitals, from the Reconstructionist of December 16, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

POINT FOUR'S HUMAN GOALS

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Point Four's Human Goals," from the New York Times of December 5, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXAMPLES FOR THE WESTERN WORLD—ARTICLE BY THOMAS L. STOKES

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Examples for the Western World," by Thomas L. Stokes, from the Chicago Sun-Times of December 27, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

STEEL PRICES AND STEEL PENSIONS

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Steel Prices and Steel Pensions," from Minnesota Labor for December 30, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is concluded.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I offer for the RECORD at this point the report of the Senate Finance Committee on this bill. It is not a very voluminous report, but it is a very carefully considered report, dealing with all of the amendments offered to the bill which passed the House some time ago and which was considered by the Senate Finance Committee during the first session of this Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The report (No. 309) is as follows:

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND OF REGULATION OF OLEOMARGARINE THROUGH THE TAXING POWER

The act of August 2, 1886 (24 Stat. 209), defined "butter" and "oleomargarine" and imposed the following taxes on oleomargarine: Manufacturers, $600; wholesalers, $480; retailers, $48; domestic oleomargarine, 2 cents per pound; and imported oleomargarine, 15 cents per pound. This tax statute contained packaging and labeling provisions and, in addition to providing for the forfeiture of unstamped oleomargarine, it provided for the forfeiture of oleomargarine which was adjudged to be deleterious to the public health.

It was clear from its inception that this exercise of the taxing power was primarily designed to achieve certain regulatory effects in the field of competition between oleomargarine and butter. In opening the Senate debate on this 1886 act, Senator Miller said:

"I resort to no subterfuges in this case, Mr. President. My object in bringing forward this bill and supporting it is, not to secure a large increase to the revenue of our Government; but I have sought to invoke the taxing power of the Government in order that under it the Government might take absolute control of this manufacture, might properly regulate it, and so regulate and control it that it should be carried on in a legitimate way and that the product should be sold to the consumer in all cases for what it is, and it is for that purpose that the friends of this measure have invoked the taxing power of the Government" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 17, 1886, p. 7073).

The present difference in tax treatment between yellow oleomargarine and other oleomargarine was inserted in the law by the act of May 9, 1902 (32 Stat. 193). The purpose of this differential tax treatment was to regulate further the competition of oleomargarine and butter. This act imposed a 10-cents-per-pound tax on oleomargarine artificially colored to look like butter.

By the act of March 4, 1931 (46 Stat. 1549), the 10-cent tax was made to apply to all oleomargarine which met a statutory definition of "yellow," whether or not colored artificially.

REVENUES

Total collections under all of the internal-revenue taxes on oleomargarine have been estimated by the Bureau of the Budget for the fiscal years 1949 and 1950 at $16,000,000 for each year. Actual collections for the first 9 months of the fiscal year 1949 amount to $13,401,608. The following table gives a break-down of the various internal-revenue taxes on oleomargarine for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948:

Internal-revenue taxes on oleomargarine

	Rates, present law	Collections (thousands of dollars) (actual), fiscal years—	
		1947	1948
Excise taxes:			
Colored oleomargarine	10 cents per pound	2,132	5,290
Uncolored oleomargarine	¼ cent per pound	1,441	2,066
Total excise taxes		3,573	7,356
Special taxes:			
Manufacturers	$600 per year	34	23
Wholesale dealers:			
Colored oleomargarine	$480 per year	74	132
Uncolored oleomargarine	$200 per year	364	424
Retail dealers:			
Colored oleomargarine	$48 per year	224	411
Uncolored oleomargarine	$6 per year	1,604	1,460
Total special taxes		2,301	2,450
Total oleomargarine taxes		5,874	9,806

POWERS OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION TO REGULATE COMPETITION BETWEEN OLEOMARGARINE AND BUTTER

Competition between yellow oleomargarine and butter in interstate commerce falls within the scope of the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission to prevent unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices. Section 5 (a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (title 15; U. S. C., sec. 45 (a)) states:

"Unfair methods of competition in commerce, and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce, are hereby declared unlawful."

Misrepresentation of oleomargarine as butter is prohibited by this section, and in the past the Federal Trade Commission has proceeded against labeling and advertising practices which were deceptive in confusing oleomargarine with butter.

PROTECTION AGAINST ADULTERATION AND MISBRANDING OF OLEOMARGARINE THROUGH THE FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in its present form prohibits the introduction of any adulterated or misbranded food in interstate commerce, and proffered delivery or receipt in interstate commerce of any adulterated or misbranded food.

On the basis of the testimony presented to your committee on this bill there does not appear to be any doubt but that the standards provided by the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (Public Law 717, 75th Cong., 3d sess., June 23, 1939; U. S. C., title 21, sec. 301 et seq.) are adequate to protect against adulterated oleomargarine in interstate commerce.

With respect to the misbranding of food the act prohibits, in section 301 (k), "the alteration, mutilation, destruction, obliteration, or removal of the whole or any part of the labeling of, or the doing of any other act with respect to, a food, drug, device, or cosmetic, if such act is done while such article is held for sale after shipment in interstate commerce and results in such article being misbranded."

The United States Supreme Court held, in *U. S.* v. *Sullivan* (332 U. S. 689), with reference to section 301 (k) that—

"The language used by Congress broadly and unqualifiedly prohibits misbranding articles held for sale after shipment in interstate commerce, without regard to how long after the shipment the misbranding occurred, how many intrastate sales had intervened, or who had received the articles at the end of the interstate shipment (332 U. S. 689, 696)."

Under the provisions of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act the Federal Security Administrator, who is charged with its administration, has assumed jurisdiction over oleomargarine moving in interstate commerce. The administrator has established a standard of identity for oleomargarine in accordance with provisions of section 401 of the act, and oleomargarine in interstate commerce is regulated in accordance with this standard of identity.

EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The House bill (H. R. 2023) repeals the internal-revenue taxes on oleomargarine and permits the oleomargarine interests to sell their product in harmless colors of their own choice in free competition with butter unhindered by the burden of discriminatory Federal taxation. However, the bill eliminates any possibility that the consumer of table spreads will not know what he is getting. The competition between the two principal table spreads for consumer preference is to be free of confusion as to identity. At the present time oleomargarine which has moved in interstate commerce is required to meet the exacting requirements of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to labeling. There is little danger that the consumer of interstate oleomargarine will be confused as to the product he obtains. There remain however two principal levels at which confusion of identity may occur: One is at the restaurant level where the applicability of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is uncertain, and the other exists with respect to oleomargarine produced and sold in the same State. The House bill (H. R. 2023) brings the regulation of colored oleomargarine squarely within the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, irrespective of the source of the oleomargarine, and specifically regulates the restaurant transaction of serving colored oleomargarine. Thus, intrastate colored oleomargarine would be held to the same standards respecting purity and labeling as colored

oleomargarine which is shipped in interstate channels.

Of perhaps even greater importance than the elimination of the possibility for confusion of identity between colored oleomargarine and butter, the bill makes possible the effective regulation of colored oleomargarine and butter moving in interstate channels.

Oleomargarine is not dependent upon local supply of raw materials as is butter, which depends upon an adequate supply of fluid milk and cream, and it would be entirely feasible and practicable to establish manufactories in each of the several States to avoid the effects of the Federal law. It is clear that close regulation of colored oleomargarine from interstate producers, while oleomargarine of local production is left free of control, would in practical effect give local producers a great competitive advantage. The substitute for butter or sale as butter of colored oleomargarine not clearly identified as such, or which is otherwise adulterated or misbranded, would not only depress the interstate market in butter but would also bring colored oleomargarine which fully complies with Federal regulation into disrepute and depress the interstate market for it.

Without regulation of colored oleomargarine from all sources there cannot be effective regulation of that part of the colored oleomargarine which comes from out-of-State sources. As a matter of enforcement it would be difficult, and in some cases impossible, to prove that colored oleomargarine substituted or sold for butter had been previously in interstate commerce. The regulation of the whole is necessary in order to provide effective regulation of that part which originates from outside the State of consumption.

The regulation by Congress under the commerce power of purely intrastate transactions is constitutionally permissible if such regulation is reasonably necessary to protect interstate commerce and to make its regulation effective.

Following the *Shreveport Rate cases* (234 U. S. 342), in which it was held that railroad rates of an admittedly intrastate character and fixed by authority of the State might still be revised by the Federal Government because of the economic effects which they had upon interstate commerce, the Supreme Court has frequently sustained Federal regulations under the commerce power when applied to intrastate transactions (*Mulford* v. *Smith*, 307 U. S. 38; *United States* v. *Darby*, 312 U. S. 100; *Currin* v. *Wallace*, 306 U. S. 1; *United States* v. *Wrightwood Dairy Co.*, 315 U. S. 110; *Wickard* v. *Filburn*, 317 U. S. 102).

In *United States* v. *Wrightwood Dairy Co.*, supra (1942), the issue was raised as to whether a Chicago milk dealer who purchased milk within the State and sold it locally could be properly subjected to the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 for the purpose of setting minimum prices. The Court in upholding this exertion of the Federal power states:

"The national power to regulate the price of milk moving interstate into the Chicago, Ill., marketing area extends to such control over intrastate transactions as is necessary and appropriate to make the regulation of the interstate commerce effective; and that it includes authority to make like regulations for the marketing of intrastate milk whose sale and competition with interstate milk affects its price structure so as in turn to affect adversely the congressional regulation" (p. 121).

In defining the scope of the commerce power the Court had this to say:

"The commerce power is not confined in its exercise to the regulation of commerce among the States. It extends to those activities intrastate which so affect interstate commerce or the exertion of the power of Congress over it, as to make regulation of them appropriate means to the attainment of a legitimate end, the effective execution of the granted power to regulate interstate commerce" (p. 119).

TECHNICAL PROVISIONS OF THE BILL WITH EXPLANATION OF THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The first section of the bill (H. R. 2023) repeals section 2301 of the Internal Revenue Code, which sets the rate of tax on oleomargarine at one-fourth cent per pound and at 10 cents per pound if yellow in color, declares by whom and how the tax shall be paid, and the manner of assessment.

Section 2 repeals the occupational taxes on oleomargarine manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers and provides that such repeal shall not entitle any manufacturer, wholesaler, or retailer to a refund of any occupational tax heretofore paid.

The committee makes no amendments to the first two sections of the bill.

Section 3 (a) comprises a declaration and finding that the sale, or the serving in public eating places, of colored oleomargarine or colored margarine without clear identification as such, or which is otherwise adulterated or misbranded, burdens interstate commerce by depressing the market for butter and for oleomargarine or margarine which is clearly identified and which is neither adulterated nor misbranded. This burden exists irrespective of whether such oleomargarine originates from an interstate source or from the State or Territory in which it is sold. The committee makes no amendment to the declaration and finding contained in this subsection.

Section 3 (b) amends section 301 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by adding a new paragraph thereto which prohibits the serving of colored oleomargarine or colored margarine in violation of the new section 407 (b) of such act. Section 407 (b) regulates not only the public eating place transaction of serving colored oleomargarine or colored margarine but also places certain requirements upon public eating places which possess colored oleomargarine or colored margarine in a form ready for serving. A violation therefore can occur without an actual serving if the public eating place has in its possession colored oleomargarine or colored margarine in a form ready for serving without complying with the provisions of 407 (b). The committee amendment to section 3 (b) clarifies this point and brings the amendment made in section 3 (b) in line with the new section 407 (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Paragraph (m) of section 301 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act without the committee amendment reads as follows:

"(m) The serving of colored oleomargarine or colored margarine in violation of section 407 (b)."

With the committee amendment it will read:

"(m) The serving or the possessing in a form ready for serving of colored oleomargarine or colored margarine in violation of section 407 (b)."

Section 3 (c) amends chapter IV of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by adding thereto a new section (sec. 407). Subsection (a) of section 407 subjects colored oleomargarine or colored margarine which is sold in the same State or Territory in which it is produced to the same controls under the act as if it had been introduced in interstate commerce. Thus, intrastate oleomargarine or margarine, if it is colored as defined in 407 (d), will be held to the same standards respecting labeling and purity as colored oleomargarine or colored margarine which is shipped in interstate channels. The committee makes no amendments to this subsection.

Subsection (b) of section 407 specifically regulates the use of colored oleomargarine or colored margarine by public eating places. Subsection (b), as it passed the House, appears to require persons who possess colored oleomargarine or colored margarine in a form ready for serving at public eating places to (1) post a notice that oleomargarine or margarine is served in a prominent and conspicuous place in the establishment, or (2) to place such a notice on the menu in type or lettering not smaller than that normally used to designate other food items, or (3) to keep such oleomargarine or margarine only in a form which is molded and shaped so as to have three sides (exclusive of the ends). Subsection (b) of section 407 would appear further to require that persons who serve colored oleomargarine or margarine at a public eating place (1) cause each separate serving thereof to bear labeling, or to be accompanied by labeling, identifying it as oleomargarine or margarine, or (2) cause each separate serving thereof to be triangular in shape.

The committee feels that subsection (b) in the form in which it passed the House is somewhat ambiguous. Although the foregoing would appear to be what the language of the subsection says, other interpretations are possible and have been offered. The committee amendment seeks therefore to clarify subsection (b), to make its terms explicit, and eliminate the possibility for misinterpretation and confusion. Since the requirements of 407 (b) are enforceable by criminal actions as well as suits for injunction (secs. 302 and 303, Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act), it is very essential that the language of this subsection be clear and unmistakable.

Subsection (b) as amended by your committee requires persons who possess colored oleomargarine or colored margarine in a form ready for serving at public eating places to (1) post a notice that oleomargarine or margarine is served in a prominent and conspicuous place in the establishment, or (2) place such a notice on the menu in type or lettering not smaller than that normally used to designate other food items. Persons who shall serve colored oleomargarine or colored margarine at a public eating place are required to (1) cause each separate serving thereof to bear labeling, or to be accompanied by labeling, identifying it as oleomargarine or margarine, or (2) cause each separate serving thereof to be triangular in shape.

Subsection (c) of section 407 exempts colored oleomargarine or margarine from most of the labeling requirements of section 403 of the act at the time of service at public eating places, provided compliance is had with the requirements of subsection (b) discussed above. Exception is made of section 403 (a) and 403 (f). By section 403 (a) a food becomes misbranded if its labeling is false or misleading in any particular. Section 403 (f) specifies that identifying marks shall be prominently placed on the food "with such conspicuousness (as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices, in the labeling) and in such terms as to render it likely to be read and understood by the ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase and use."

These provisions would require that the word "oleomargarine" or "margarine" appear in some contrasting color either on the receptacle, or on a wrapping, or on a slip placed upon the individual pat or serving. The requirement that each separate serving bears labeling identifying it as oleomargarine or margarine is not met by imprinting the word oleomargarine or margarine on the individual pat constituting the serving. The yellow color makes it difficult to read the imprint and such pats tend to melt at room temperature. The committee makes no amendment to this subsection.

Subsection (d) of section 407 defines colored oleomargarine or colored margarine.

The definition is drawn from the Oleomargarine Tax Act. If it is any color other than one within the defined ranges, the provisions of the amendment will not apply. The committee makes no amendment to this subsection.

Section 4 of the bill provides for the transfer of funds available for enforcement of the Oleomargarine Tax Act to the Food and Drug Administration. These funds will be made available to that Administration in an amount determined to be proper by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. There is to be no lapse of time between repeal of the tax statute and enforcement of the controls provided in the amended Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. The committee makes no amendment to this section.

Section 5 of the bill, as it passed the House, declares that "this act shall not abrogate or nullify any statute of any State or Territory now in effect or which may hereafter be enacted."

The committee feels that as a matter of policy this section seeks to and should accord to the various States and Territories the right to ban the possession, sale, or serving of colored oleomargarine or colored margarine, or to place upon its use or sale additional requirements not in conflict with the Federal law. The language of section 5, however, as it passed the House is sufficiently broad to permit a State or Territory to circumvent the Federal law entirely and to permit the completely unregulated use and sale of colored oleomargarine or colored margarine within its jurisdiction. To permit this would defeat the policy and purpose upon which the Federal regulation is predicated. The committee amends section 5, therefore, to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the possession, sale, or serving of colored oleomargarine or colored margarine in any State or Territory in contravention of the laws of such State or Territory."

The committee feels that section 5, as amended, reserves to the States and Territories the power to regulate colored oleomargarine or colored margarine in harmony with the Federal law but does not grant to the States and Territories the power to destroy the effectiveness of the Federal law which is designed to provide a minimum of protection to consumers of butter and colored oleomargarine, and to assure honesty, fair dealing, and an absence of all deception in the competitive sale of such products.

The committee amendment to section 6 of the bill makes the act effective on July 1, 1949. The provisions of section 6 as it passed the House made the repeal of the special occupational taxes on manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers of oleomargarine effective 30 days after enactment, or July 1, 1949, which ever date is earlier, and denies refund of taxes previously paid. This might produce inequitable results. The special-tax year commences July 1, and the tax is due for the whole year in case of one in business during the month of July, and for the balance of the year in case of one commencing business after the month of July. Therefore, if the special taxes should be repealed as of June 1, 1949, a person who prior thereto paid the tax for the current special-tax year ending June 30, 1949, will have paid a tax (which is not refundable) for the month of June; whereas a person commencing business in June would not incur any special-tax liability for the remainder of the current special-tax year. In order to avoid this type of inequity the committee feels that the act should have one effective date and that it should be July 1, 1949.

In the opinion of your committee the bill (H. R. 2023), as amended, is in the public interest and should be enacted without delay.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at this time I offer in the nature of a substitute for H. R. 2023, an amendment on which appear the names of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted by Mr. WILEY for himself and other Senators is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"DEFINITIONS

"SECTION 1. (a) The term 'oleomargarine' as used in this act includes—

"(1) all substances, mixtures, and compounds, known as oleomargarine, margarine, oleo, or butterine;

"(2) all substances, mixtures, and compounds which have a consistency similar to that of butter and which contain any edible oils or fats other than milk fat if (A) made in imitation or semblance of butter, or purporting to be butter or a butter substitute, or (B) commonly used, or intended for common use, in place of or as a substitute for butter, or (C) churned, emulsified, or mixed in cream, milk, skim milk, buttermilk, water, or other liquid and containing moisture in excess of 1 percent and commonly used, or suitable for common use, as a substitute for butter.

"(b) For the purposes of this act, 'yellow oleomargarine' is oleomargarine, as defined in subsection (a) of this section, having a tint or shade containing more than one and six-tenths degrees of yellow, or of yellow and red collectively, measured in terms of the Lovibond tintometer scale read under conditions substantially similar to those established by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, or the equivalent of such measurement.

"(c) The term 'commerce' as used in this act, means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States, or between the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States and any State or other Territory or between any foreign country and any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or within the District of Columbia or any Territory, or between points in the same State but through any other State or any Territory or the District of Columbia or any foreign country.

"PROHIBITED ACTS

"SEC. 2. The manufacture, transportation, handling, possession, sale, use, or serving of yellow oleomargarine in commerce, or after shipment in commerce as yellow oleomargarine, or in connection with the production of yellow oleomargarine for shipment in commerce, is hereby declared unlawful: *Provided, however,* That yellow oleomargarine manufactured or colored within the borders of a State or Territory in which it is to be consumed shall not be subject to the provisions of this act but shall be subject to the laws and regulations of such State or Territory. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to limit in any way the applicability of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

"ENFORCEMENT

"SEC. 3. The Administrator of the Federal Security Agency is authorized and directed to administer and enforce this act and to prescribe and enforce rules and regulations to carry out its purposes and policies. The enforcement provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, including the provisions relating to injunctions and seizure, shall be available for the enforcement of this act.

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 4. Any person, firm, or corporation violating any of the provisions of this act, or of the rules and regulations issued in connection therewith, and any officer, agent, or employee thereof who directs or knowingly permits such violations, or who aids or assists therein, shall upon conviction thereof be subject to punishment in the same manner and to the same extent as persons who violate the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

"APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the adequate enforcement of this act.

"REPEAL

"SEC. 6. The following sections of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to taxes on colored and uncolored oleomargarine, to special occupational taxes on manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers of oleomargarine, and to packaging, reporting, and other regulations of oleomargarine) are hereby repealed: Sections 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2313, 3200, 3201, (26 U. S. C., secs. 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2313, 3200, 3201)."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who is one of the proponents of the measure, will now address the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate is House bill 2023, which passed the House during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress by a vote of 287 to 89. I may say that a very similar bill was approved by the House of Representatives in the second session of the Eightieth Congress by a vote of 260 to 106.

The measure was unanimously reported by the Senate Finance Committee on April 28, 1949, with the recommendation that "in the opinion of your committee the bill, H. R. 2023, as amended, is in the public interest and should be enacted without delay," and has been pending on the Senate Calendar since that time. Late in the last session the Democratic policy committee voted unanimously to make this bill the first order of business in this session.

In response to that decision, the able senior Senator from Georga [Mr. GEORGE] has called up House bill 2023, and I wish to thank him for his action.

The time has come for the Senate to express itself on this matter. The House not only passed this bill by an overwhelming vote in the last session but approved a similar bill during the last session of the Eightieth Congress. The Senate Finance Committee reported that measure in late May 1948, but the Senate did not vote on the bill.

I should like to describe briefly the provisions of House bill 2023. It is a bill which repeals the Federal antimargarine laws that have existed in one form or another for more than 60 years. Specifically, House bill 2023 would repeal Federal taxes imposed on margarine annually as follows: Retailers handling colored margarine, $48, uncolored margarine, $6; wholesalers handling colored margarine, $480, uncolored margarine, $200; a 10-cent-a-pound tax on colored margarine, a tax of one-fourth cent a pound on uncolored margarine, and a tax on manufacturers of $600.

The measure also provides that a public eating place serving yellow margarine must post a notice to that effect, or print such a notice on the menu. In addition, each separate serving of yellow margarine must be identified as such when it is served, or, as an alternative, it must be served in a triangular shape. Violation of this provision is a Federal offense, and enforcement is in the hands of the Federal Food and Drug Administration.

On that point I wish to quote one paragraph from page 3 of the report, as follows:

> On the basis of the testimony presented to your committee on this bill there does not appear to be any doubt but that the standards provided by the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (Public Law 717, 75th Cong., 3d sess., June 23, 1939; U. S. C., title 21, sec. 301, et seq.) are adequate to protect against adulterated oleomargarine in interstate commerce.

The bill reported by the Senate Finance Committee is almost identical with that approved by the House on April 1, 1949; the differences result from a committee amendment which changes the effective date, and from three minor clarifying amendments.

Before discussing the issues involved in this matter, I should like to remind the Senate that repeal of the Federal antimargarine laws was a plank in the 1948 Democratic platform. The President has said that he will sign a repeal bill if he has the opportunity.

Mr. President, the question of repealing the antimargarine laws has been talked about a great deal during the past few years. Many of my colleagues are familiar with the arguments for eliminating the taxes and restrictions, as well as the arguments for their retention.

Margarine today is a perfectly good food product, whose nutritive value is fully equal to that of butter.

In this connection, I refer the Senate to studies and reports by the New York Academy of Medicine, by the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council, and by Dr. Harry Leichenger, Dr. George Eisenberg, and Dr. Anton J. Carlson, of the University of Illinois College of Medicine. Those reports are contained in the hearings.

The principal ingredients of margarine are domestic fats and oils, cottonseed and soybean oils being used for the most part, although some peanut and corn oil also are utilized. About 16 percent of margarine is pasteurized, cultured skim milk, and over 99 percent of all margarine is fortified with 15,000 units of vitamin A.

The only basic difference between margarine and butter is that margarine is vegetable fat and butter an animal-fat product.

Margarine competes with butter and has sold, on the average over the years, for about half the price of butter. This competition was the reason for the enactment of the first Federal antimargarine laws, and is the reason why there is strong opposition today to repeal.

The first Federal antimargarine law was imposed in 1886, years before there was any protective pure-food Federal legislation. At the time margarine was made primarily from oleo fat and beef or animal fat. No Federal standard of identity for margarine had been established, and margarine and many other foods were inferior to the present-day products.

Significantly, the issues of color and fraud, now primary concerns with those fighting margarine, were almost ignored in the 1886 debates. The law enacted then imposed a tax of 2 cents a pound on all margarine, both white and yellow. Senator Miller, of New York, one of the principal proponents of the bill, frankly described the purpose of that first measure. He said on the Senate floor:

> I want no money from this bill in the Treasury. I want protection to the dairy industry of New York. I want it to go so far as to exterminate the rival industry, if necessary.

After the passage of that first punitive bill, it seemed for a time that margarine had been put out of existence. Production dropped sharply at first, only to rise again. The foes of margarine decided they had their work to do all over again.

The second Federal antimargarine bill was enacted in 1902. It reduced the tax on white margarine to one-fourth cent a pound and raised the tax on colored margarine to 10 cents a pound. As I have stated, there was little or no reference to color, or fraud, in the 1886 discussions. In 1902 margarine's opponents stressed the color and fraud angles.

However, Representative John Sharp Williams, who later became Senator from Mississippi, quoted the Commissioner of Internal Revenue as saying that even in those days, before pure-food legislation, very little margarine was sold as butter. Representative Williams charged that the aim of the legislation was to destroy margarine.

After 1902 margarine sales dropped, only to increase once more. Furthermore, margarine manufacturers developed a process for making naturally colored margarine by using palm oil and some beef fat. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue ruled in 1929 that margarine made with these natural oils could be sold without the payment of the 10-cent tax.

The butter forces tried once more. In 1931 the 1902 act was amended by placing a tax of 10 cents a pound on all colored margarine, whether naturally or artificially colored. I wish to emphasize the point that the act of 1931 prohibited the making of naturally colored margarine, that is, margarine which got its color from the natural color of the ingredients. Colored margarine was described as margarine having a tint or shade containing more than 1.6° of yellow, or yellow and red collectively. In 1931 considerable quantities of imported fats and oils were used in margarine, but today the product is made almost exclusively from domestic fats and oils.

I have sketched this history of the antimargarine acts in an effort to substantiate my belief that the real aim of antimargarine legislation is to destroy, if possible, the margarine industry and, if that object could not be achieved, to cripple it as much as possible. As late as June 18, 1941, the Dairy Record, which represents the dairy industry, said:

> The dairy industry must set as its goal the complete extermination of margarine. It must never rest until the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine has been outlawed in this country.

The butter industry has shifted its arguments to meet changing situations, and has shifted them again only recently. Always, however, these arguments plead for legislative discrimination against margarine. The butter industry does not want to compete fairly and squarely in the market place, and has used the Congress and the State legislatures to prevent that competition.

The butter industry claims that repeal of the antimargarine laws would ruin, or injure gravely, the dairy industry. This is the crux of butter's case, and undoubtedly will be stressed over and over again during this debate.

I do not believe that repeal will injure the dairy industry, much less destroy it. There is not even proof that repeal will do any great amount of damage to butter. Regardless of that question, however, any industry is on very shaky ground when it asks the Congress for legislation aimed at a domestic competitor because it fears damage from competition. There should be some weighty and urgent reasons indeed if we enact, or continue, punitive legislation against an industry on the plea of a competitive industry.

The dairy industry tries to make the case that its existence is inextricably involved with the national welfare. I regard the dairy industry as highly important. Yet, there are many other highly important industries, farm industries among them, which have keen competition, and which meet it without asking for legislation that hamstrings that competition. There are, for example, almost one and a half million farm families that grow cotton. The entire economy of the South depends to a great extent upon cotton. Nevertheless, cotton meets severe competition from the synthetics without asking that we tax or discriminate legislatively against rayon, or nylon.

The broad point of view on this question was expressed before the Senate Finance Committee last spring by a dairyman, Merritt M. Nash, of Fall City, Wash. He was asked by the Senator

from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] what his attitude would be if a good synthetic substitute for fluid milk came along. This is a part of his answer:

I will say this: I will never stand in the road of progress, not if it puts me out of business. You know, my grandfather, among other things, manufactured carriages, buggies, horse buggies. And when my father bought a Ford, back in 1909, my grandfather disowned him and cut him off with a dollar in his will. "Because," he said, "this is going to be the ruination of this country. It is putting me out of business, and it is putting 25 people who work for me out of business."

But do you think, over the long pull, it was a bad thing to have the automobile industry come in? Every time there is an economic change or a phase of development in this country, it means that a certain segment of our society will be damaged or hurt while we are making that transformation.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the Chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from Arkansas referred to a question which the Senator from Nebraska asked of a witness from Washington State at the time of the hearing. I wonder if the Senator from Arkansas considers the reply made by the witness to be a fair reply to the question asked of the witness by the Senator from Nebraska? The witness in his answer made use of the "horse-and-buggy days," which has been succeeded by the day of the automobile, and so forth, as an illustration of what he would do in case a substitute was found for fluid milk. Personally I do not think the example is a very good one, because fluid milk is a product of nature. The horse and buggy, the carriage, and such conveyances, resulted from a process of manufacture. In my opinion the illustration used by the witness is not a very good one.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is clarified a little by the remainder of the witness' answer. I had not completed the reading of his answer. I doubt, however, that a horse would be considered a manufactured article any more than milk is. It was an integral part of the analogy, which seems to me to be quite a good one. Let me conclude the reading of the witness' answer.

Mr. BUTLER. The reference by the witness, however, was not to the horse, but to the vehicle which the horse drew.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The horse accompanied the buggy. It is just as much a part of the picture, I think, as the buggy itself. I will say that later on we may have an analogy to the horse. I do not understand why the dairy industry has not attempted to outlaw tractors, because dairymen rely very heavily on the kind of fertilizer which the cow produces, which is not substantially greater than a horse produces under the same conditions.

I wish to continue reading the answer of Mr. Merritt Nash. I desire to emphasize that this witness is a dairyman. He is not a manufacturer of oleomargarine. He appeared before the committee as a practicing, practical dairyman. He said further in answer to the question asked of him by the senior Senator from Nebraska:

If we were, Senator, ever able to produce a synthetic product that had all of the wonderful qualities of fluid milk and could promote the health of our Nation in the way that fluid milk and butter can, I would be among the first to say, "Mister, if you can produce it with less effort and less cost than I can produce milk, tomorrow I will sell every cow I have got and get into your business or some other one."

It seems to me that answer is a very direct answer to the question propounded to him by the Senator from Nebraska as to what he would do.

This is the broad and statesmanlike point of view, but we do not need to weigh it here. The facts show clearly that there is little danger to dairying from repeal of the antimargarine laws. And there is good ground for thinking that repeal may actually help the dairy industry.

In the first place, butter is the least profitable use for milk. This explains, more than any competition from margarine, the decline in butter production during the past few years.

For example, a hundred pounds of milk, when used for distribution as milk or cream, averaged $5.40 per hundred pounds in the January–November period this year. For all whole milk uses, the average for the period was $3.98 per hundred pounds, but the butterfat in the milk used for butter during this period averaged only $2.46 per hundred pounds. Data on the value of milk used for butter, including an allowance for the value of the byproduct skim milk, are available for only 3 years of this period.

The milk sold as milk and cream was worth more than twice as much as the milk sold only for the manufacture of butter.

I ask at this point unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an exhibit showing comparative prices received for the different major uses of milk in the 1939–49 period.

There being no objection, the table marked "Exhibit I" was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT I.—*Comparative prices received for milk for the different major uses, 1939–49*

(All on national average butterfat basis)

Year	Average price per 100 pounds		
	For fluid milk or cream (approximate)	For all whole milk uses (including fluid)	For butter (butterfat)[1]
1939	$2.45	$1.68	$0.94
1940	2.51	1.82	1.11
1941	2.72	2.18	1.36
1942	3.16	2.57	1.57
1943	3.69	3.12	1.99
1944	3.78	3.21	2.00
1945	3.81	3.19	2.00
1946	4.46	3.96	2.56
1947	5.36	4.26	2.86
1948	5.88	4.86	3.17
1949 (January to November)	5.40	3.98	2.46

[1] On a basis of sale for butterfat only. Data on sale as whole milk would show some increase, but these data are fragmentary

Source: U. S. Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, butter, to repeat, is the least profitable use for milk. It aptly has been called a loss leader for the dairy industry.

Butter production has declined about one-fourth over the past 10 years. Total butter production in 1940 was 2,240,000,000 pounds and the estimate for 1949 is 1,700,000,000 pounds, and 1949 was one of butter's best recent years. I may add that the production in 1948 was not so great. The estimate for 1949 is 200,000,000 pounds greater than was the actual production in 1948.

The decline in butter production, however, has not been accompanied by the disruption of the dairy industry. The industry's most prosperous years have accompanied falling butter production. Total cash receipts from the sale of dairy products rose from $1,345,000,000 in 1939 to approximately $4,433,000,000 in 1948. Total cash receipts from dairying probably will show a decline in 1949 but the figure still will be substantially above the prewar years.

Some of the extra cash in the dairymen's pockets has been due to the general rise in prices, but much of it has been due to the fact that the demand for fluid milk has gone up so sharply. People had money to buy more fluid milk; they wanted it and they bought it. The dairymen sold less of their product as butter, an unprofitable use, and more of it as fluid milk and for the other more profitable uses.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks tables showing butter as a source of dairy income in the 1940–48 period and the use of milk in butter during this same period. (Exhibits II and III.)

There being no objection, the tables marked "Exhibit II" and "Exhibit III" were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT II.—*Percent of dairy cash income from butter*

State	1940	1947	1948
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Maine	12.15	8.86	8.06
New Hampshire	2.88	2.18	1.99
Vermont	4.11	.82	.69
Massachusetts	.63	.59	.49
Rhode Island	.43	.08	.08
Connecticut	.46	.20	.23
New York	1.66	1.04	.91
New Jersey	.14	.11	.11
Pennsylvania	3.03	2.04	1.83
North Atlantic	2.31	1.44	1.28
Ohio	14.61	7.18	6.16
Indiana	21.80	10.24	8.96
Illinois	18.92	11.15	10.28
Michigan	25.65	12.75	11.24
Wisconsin	14.45	1.58	1.77
East North Central	17.95	6.69	5.99
Minnesota	72.93	38.20	39.68
Iowa	75.28	69.92	68.55
Missouri	38.85	17.48	16.99
North Dakota	84.18	87.70	87.90
South Dakota	80.19	79.78	79.81
Nebraska	66.04	63.28	61.42
Kansas	54.44	41.57	42.41
West North Central	67.58	49.13	48.42
Delaware	1.92	.49	.37
Maryland	2.22	1.02	.93
Virginia	14.19	12.05	10.67
West Virginia	17.32	17.64	15.67
North Carolina	14.55	8.32	7.25

EXHIBIT II.—*Percent of dairy cash income from butter*—Continued

State	1940	1947	1948
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
South Carolina	10.71	8.91	8.21
Georgia	14.02	10.79	9.56
Florida	1.64	.70	.61
South Atlantic	9.73	7.49	6.70
Kentucky	26.53	19.47	18.56
Tennessee	21.87	8.69	8.18
Alabama	15.19	10.32	9.78
Mississippi	18.97	6.51	5.82
Arkansas	36.10	24.53	23.14
Louisiana	6.48	2.37	2.10
Oklahoma	50.78	35.00	34.18
Texas	26.37	13.79	12.56
South Central	28.39	16.35	15.37
Montana	43.97	46.43	46.47
Idaho	37.71	11.30	9.91
Wyoming	36.93	33.12	31.54
Colorado	33.35	28.66	29.12
New Mexico	29.63	18.74	18.90
Arizona	13.66	2.61	2.71
Utah	19.57	9.13	8.86
Nevada	40.26	20.01	19.49
Washington	25.45	9.81	9.54
Oregon	30.87	12.84	14.35
California	10.41	.82	.92
West	21.28	8.59	8.63
United States	24.30	14.79	14.03

Source: U. S. Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

EXHIBIT III.—*Proportion of milk production used for butter*

State	1940	1947	1948
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Maine	22.93	16.46	16.31
New Hampshire	6.37	4.69	4.84
Vermont	5.41	1.53	1.38
Massachusetts	1.85	1.68	1.46
Rhode Island	1.47	.77	.76
Connecticut	1.94	1.01	1.05
New York	3.60	2.23	2.04
New Jersey	.93	.74	.74
Pennsylvania	7.56	4.38	4.04
North Atlantic	5.27	3.16	2.95
Ohio	22.33	10.76	10.04
Indiana	30.26	13.74	12.66
Illinois	28.39	15.78	15.13
Michigan	34.21	16.82	15.28
Wisconsin	15.60	1.89	2.22
East North Central	23.33	8.94	8.51
Minnesota	74.49	40.86	42.62
Iowa	76.34	69.11	67.81
Missouri	49.68	24.13	24.31
North Dakota	83.74	81.34	81.10
South Dakota	80.99	75.49	75.09
Nebraska	72.73	65.77	64.54
Kansas	63.78	47.92	48.85
West North Central	71.75	52.63	52.38
Delaware	5.56	1.69	1.70
Maryland	6.94	2.99	2.74
Virginia	37.96	28.20	26.73
West Virginia	39.48	30.61	29.31
North Carolina	45.07	31.52	29.33
South Carolina	42.49	34.57	33.73
Georgia	48.15	39.02	36.67
Florida	11.95	6.02	5.47
South Atlantic	35.15	25.50	24.11
Kentucky	43.02	29.44	28.98
Tennessee	43.46	25.96	24.34
Alabama	52.06	43.33	42.48
Mississippi	45.69	29.49	28.32
Arkansas	56.55	39.51	38.70
Louisiana	22.13	16.11	15.85
Oklahoma	58.49	41.74	40.80
Texas	43.18	28.10	26.48
South Central	46.92	31.94	30.78
Montana	62.79	53.79	54.02
Idaho	43.97	14.71	13.61
Wyoming	53.08	43.10	41.70
Colorado	47.05	39.20	38.82
New Mexico	50.52	31.93	31.09
Arizona	25.43	8.08	7.94
Utah	25.64	13.24	13.01
Nevada	58.49	29.00	28.43
Washington	33.93	15.35	14.94
Oregon	40.46	18.24	19.92
California	17.15	1.88	2.01
West	32.27	13.97	13.95
United States	37.60	22.88	22.18

Source: U. S. Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not propose to attempt to analyze these exhibits in detail, but some of the data shown are very interesting and significant. In 1940, for example, Wisconsin sold 15.60 percent of its milk as butter. In 1948, 2.22 percent of Wisconsin's milk went into butter. In 1940, 14.45 of Wisconsin's dairy cash income came from butter. In 1948 only 1.77 of Wisconsin's dairy cash income came from butter.

In view of this trend I wonder a bit at the concern manifested by the able senior Senator from Wisconsin over the possibility that the antimargarine laws may be repealed.

It seems to me that the dairymen of his State have comparatively little interest in this matter. As progressive and foresighted dairymen should, Wisconsin dairymen are selling their milk where it will bring the most money, and as I have repeatedly pointed out, butter is not one of these uses.

The able senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is listed as one of the cosponsors of the amendment to H. R. 2023, submitted a few moments ago by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], to confine the manufacture and sale of yellow margarine within State lines. So is his distinguished colleague [Mr. FLANDERS]. I shall refer to this as the Wiley amendment for purposes of reference, using the name of one of its distinguished sponsors. The measure referred to is an antimargarine amendment, and I propose to discuss it in more detail later. Just the same, I am wondering why Vermont's Senators are fighting butter's battle. Even as far back as 1940, only 4.11 percent of Vermont's dairy cash income came from butter. In 1948 this percentage was a puny 0.69 percent. Less than 1 percent of the dairy cash income came from butter.

On November 8, 1949, Ohio voters, by a majority of 483,000, legalized the manufacture and sale of yellow margarine in that State. I plan to refer to the Ohio election later in this discussion, but, in passing, I might comment that only 6.16 percent of Ohio's dairy cash income came from butter in 1948, as compared to 14.61 percent in 1940. These figures may help to explain why so many dairy farmers voted for repeal in Ohio.

Summed up, the exhibits tell us what I have already stated—that butter has steadily declined in importance to dairying during a period of extraordinary prosperity to the industry.

I am not a dairyman, but I doubt, in this period of high labor costs and high feed costs, that there is any money to be made if milk is sold only for the production of butter at an average of $2.46 per hundred pounds. I strongly suspect that the dairy industry as a whole would be better off if some dairymen did not have an obsession about butter, an obsession created and maintained by propaganda. The dairymen, to make money, must concentrate upon the sale of milk where it will bring the highest return. At the risk of belaboring a point, let me say that this highest return is not from butter.

One factor, which deserves special mention in the dairy-industry high income in recent years has been the increase in the production of milk. This, mind you, has taken place during the very years when less and less butter was being manufactured. The production of milk has risen from 106,792,000,000 pounds in 1939 to an estimated production of 118,000,000,000 pounds in 1949, a tremendous increase indeed.

Margarine production registered large increases during these 11 years also. In 1939, for example, about 301,000,000 pounds of margarine were made in this country; the estimate for 1949 is 850,000,000 pounds. Surely, if margarine represents the threat to dairying that some contend, the big jump in the output of margarine over the past 11 years already would have had its effect. Instead, both dairy income and milk production also have gone on upward.

I ask permission to insert in the RECORD at this point tables showing the production of milk, butter, and margarine in the 1939–49 period—exhibit IV.

There being no objection, the table marked "Exhibit IV" was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT IV.—*Milk, butter, and margarine production, 1939–49*

Year	Total milk production on farms	Butter production			Margarine production
		Creamery	Farm [1]	Combined	
	(*Million pounds*)	(*Thousand pounds*)	(*Thousand pounds*)	(*Thousand pounds*)	(*Thousand pounds*)
1938	105,807	1,786,172	453,990	2,240,162	385,233
1939	106,792	1,781,737	486,015	2,267,752	300,856
1940	109,502	1,836,826	402,690	2,239,516	320,402
1941	115,268	1,872,183	395,476	2,267,659	367,587
1942	118,884	1,764,054	366,370	2,130,424	425,749
1943	117,785	1,673,788	341,120	2,014,908	614,144
1944	117,992	1,488,502	329,148	1,817,650	588,214
1945	121,504	1,363,717	336,990	1,700,707	614,028
1946	119,713	1,171,339	333,780	1,505,119	572,520
1947	119,065	1,329,094	315,840	1,644,934	745,940
1948	115,511	1,210,042	298,520	1,508,562	908,712
1949 (estimate)	118,000	1,400,000	300,000	1,700,000	850,000

[1] In 1948, about 10 percent of farm butter was sold into consumption off the farm.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But, Mr. President, the butter interests argue there has been a decline in the number of dairy cattle in the past few years, and that this demonstrates the adverse effect upon dairying of margarine's upturn.

I find no substance in these charges. From 1944 to 1948, there was a decrease in the number of milk cows on farms from 25,775,000 to 22,935,000. The butter industry uses these figures in an attempt to prove its point. However, this is an instance, in my opinion, of fitting the figures to the case, and not the case to the figures. In doing so, several important factors are ignored.

First of all, as all students of the livestock industry will agree, there is a cycle in cattle and dairy cow numbers. I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks a table which illustrates this cycle.

There being no objection, the table marked "Exhibit V" was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT V.—*Milk cow numbers and production per cow, 1924–49*

Year	Number of cows [1]	Production per cow [2]
	Thousands	*Pounds*
1924	21,417	4,167
1925	[3] 21,503	4,218
1926	21,312	4,379
1927	[4] 21,191	4,491
1928	21,223	4,516
1929	21,618	4,579
1930	22,218	4,508
1931	23,108	4,459
1932	24,105	4,309
1933	25,062	4,189
1934	[3] 25,198	4,033
1935	24,187	4,184
1936	23,727	4,316
1937	23,340	4,366
1938	[4] 23,215	4,558
1939	23,273	4,589
1940	23,677	4,625
1941	24,312	4,741
1942	25,081	4,740
1943	25,574	4,606
1944	[3] 25,775	4,578
1945	25,329	4,797
1946	24,475	4,891
1947	23,825	4,997
1948 [5]	22,935	5,036
1949 [5]	[6] 22,700	5,150

[1] Average number on farms during year, heifers that have not freshened excluded.
[2] Excludes milk sucked by calves and milk produced by cows not on farms.
[3] High point.
[4] Low point.
[5] Estimated.
[6] Estimated low point.
Source: U. S. Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For example, Mr. President, there were 21,191,000 milk cows in 1927, a so-called low point. This number rose to 25,198,000 in 1934, a high point; but in 1938, a low-point year, the total had declined to 23,215,000. Another high-point year ensued in 1944, and 1949 may have been a low-point year. The trend now is upward, and will be, in the ordinary course of events, for several years.

This cycle is overlooked by those serving butter's cause, but it cannot be ignored if we want to be fair and objective. Also, there are additional forces, other than the cycle, which accentuated the drop in milk cow numbers from 1944 to 1948. The rise in meat prices over this period has been rapid. This resulted in the close culling of dairy herds and the sale of many cows for slaughter. Furthermore, feed and labor costs have been high; and dairying, and in particular the manufacture of butter, requires a good deal of farm labor.

In the 1938–49 period, total milk production rose 10 percent, but the number of milk cows decreased by only 1.3 percent. This bears out my view that the least efficient dairy cows have been culled, and dairymen also have been following more efficient farming practices generally. Production per dairy cow reached an all-time high in 1949, and still is climbing. It is very significant to note in those tables the increase in production per cow. I simply wish to call attention to the increase from 1924, when the production per cow was 4,167 pounds, to 1949, when the production per cow was 5,150 pounds—an increase which is very significant, in terms of production per cow.

There is nothing to show that the decline in butter output and the rise in margarine production have injured dairying in any way. Nor does the experience of other dairy countries which place no taxes or restrictions on the sale of margarine, or at least no burdensome restrictions, indicate that the repeal of the antimargarine laws would hurt the dairy industry.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table showing the per capita consumption of butter and yellow margarine in four dairy countries for the 1938–46 period, no figures being available for the years after 1946.

There being no objection, the table marked "Exhibit VI" was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT VI.—*Per capita consumption of butter and margarine in countries where yellow margarine is sold*

	1938		1946	
	Butter	Margarine	Butter	Margarine
	Pounds	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*
Netherlands	11.9	15.7	11.9	15.4
Belgium	16.8	16.2	14.3	16.3
	1936		1946	
United Kingdom	25.0	8.7	10.7	15.3
	1939		1946	
Sweden	24.0	21.0	34.0	8.0

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce and private surveys.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Actually, the data for the four countries—the Netherlands, Belgium, the United Kingdom, and Sweden—do not indicate any damage to butter in the absence of burdensome legislative restrictions on its competitor.

Similarily, the available data do not bear out the fears of those who foresee a drastic downward trend in butter consumption if we do away with the antimargarine laws.

I request permission to put into the RECORD at this point a table showing margarine and butter per capita consumption, by years, in the 1924–49 period.

There being no objection, the table marked "Exhibit VII" was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT VII.—*Consumption of margarine and butter, per capita, 1924–49*

Year	Margarine	Butter	Total
1924	2.0	17.8	19.8
1925	2.0	17.9	19.9
1926	2.0	18.4	20.4
1927	2.3	18.0	20.3
1928	2.6	17.4	20.0
1929	2.9	17.2	20.1
1930	2.6	17.2	19.8
1931	1.8	18.0	19.8
1932	1.6	18.1	19.7
1933	1.9	17.8	19.7
1934	2.1	18.2	20.3
1935	3.0	17.1	20.1
1936	3.0	16.4	19.4
1937	3.1	16.4	19.5
1938	2.9	16.4	19.3
1939	2.3	17.3	19.6
1940	2.4	16.9	19.3
1941	2.7	16.0	18.7
1942	2.7	15.8	18.5
1943	3.9	11.8	15.7
1944	3.8	11.9	15.7
1945	4.0	10.9	14.9
1946	3.8	10.5	14.3
1947	5.0	11.2	16.2
1948	6.1	10.0	16.1
1949 (Estimate)	5.7	10.3	16.0

Source: U. S. Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This shows that in 1932, for example, the average per capita consumption of butter was 18.1 pounds, and that of margarine, 1.6 pounds. In 1949, the consumption of butter is estimated at 10.3 pounds per capita, and that of margarine at 5.7 pounds. There has been a slight decrease in margarine consumption by comparison with 1948, and a slight increase in butter consumption. I mention this simply as an aside, for the real significance of the exhibit is that while butter's consumption has declined and that of margarine has gone up, the over-all consumption has declined and that of margarine has gone up, but the over-all consumption of table fat has dropped. The gap left by the fact that not as much butter is being eaten has not been filled by margarine. The nutritionists tell us that the Nation needs more table fat. There is room in our economy for both margarine and butter, and many persons will continue to prefer butter. However, the fight the butter industry has made and still is making on margarine is poor public relations for butter. The butter industry, as the American Milk Review said in an editorial this year, is "doing itself more harm than good" by its attitude toward margarine. As a substitute for the margarine fixation, the Review recommended aggressive salesmanship and enlightened and dynamic merchandising—a substitute which I heartily endorse.

To repeat, the fundamental basis of the butter industry's attitude toward margarine is fear of competition. Even if this fear is well founded—and certainly it is not justified where dairying is concerned—it is an exceedingly poor excuse for the enactment or continuance of punitive legislation against margarine.

Let us now examine some other contentions that the butter industry puts forward to support its plea for protection. Two of these contentions are closely interrelated: The claim that but-

ter has a right to ban, or discriminate, against yellow margarine, and the claim that much margarine will be sold as butter if we remove the restrictions against yellow margarine.

"Why," the butter interests ask, "does margarine insist upon using butter's color, yellow? Let margarine be colored green, or blue, or purple, any color but yellow, which is butter's natural color. That is all we want."

Before I discuss the color and fraud angles of this question, I should point out that the appeal for a ban on yellow margarine does not jibe with the Wiley amendment, previously mentioned, which would confine the manufacture and sale of yellow margarine to intrastate commerce. The Senate should know the reasons for this contradiction. In reality, it is the difference between what the butter industry wants and what it feels it may be able to get.

The butter interests tell us they no longer are opposed to the repeal of the Federal taxes and existing restrictions on margarine. But there is a gimmick in their apparent acquiescence.

After House passage in the Eightieth Congress of a bill which would have repealed the antimargarine laws, the butter interests took stock of their situation. Apparently, they felt that the taxes no longer could be maintained, and that a change of front was needed. This change of front took the form, late in 1948, of a new platform—repeal of the taxes, in return for an outright ban on yellow margarine.

This was the butter interests' "party line" for the margarine fight in the Eighty-first Congress.

Before the House Agriculture Committee, in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, the butter interests argued for the ban on yellow. But they could not even get that proposal through the House committee, which is one of the friendliest to butter of any committee in the Congress.

The bill reported by the House committee was identical with the Wiley amendment. The amendment, as I see it, is a most curious animal, something like a cross between a zebra and a giraffe. Under it, if a State permits the manufacture and sale of yellow margarine—and 32 States permit this today—yellow margarine could be made and sold in the State, but the margarine so produced could not be shipped across State lines.

On the floor of the House this proposal was soundly defeated, but later it was introduced in the Senate under the sponsorship of the 26 or 27 Senators mentioned a moment ago.

I propose to analyze the Wiley amendment, but first I should like to get back to the color issue. Bear in mind that the butter industry will admit frankly that it would like a complete Federal ban on the manufacture and sale of yellow margarine. Apparently, the only reason for putting the Wiley amendment forward is the feeling that the Senate will not vote that complete ban.

The butter interests' claim to a copyright on yellow rests on the flimsiest of foundations.

Rest assured that if the butter interests could go to the courts and prevent margarine from being colored yellow, they would have done so long ago.

In this connection I refer the Senate to a memorandum on this subject introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] in the record of the Senate Finance Committee hearings on margarine, in April 1949, page 238. The memorandum states:

> Furthermore, the law has been long settled that color alone may not be the subject of a trade-mark. To be a valid trade-mark, the device, design, or other combination to be sustained as a trade-mark must be capable of indicating origin or ownership of the goods. This is true under both the common law and the statutes which provide for registration of trade-marks.

The memorandum cites numerous court decisions bearing on this matter. In *Leschen Rope Company* v. *Broderick* (201 U. S. 166), decided almost half a century ago by the Supreme Court, the Court said:

> It is the plain intention of the act that, where the distinction of a mark depends upon color, that will not do.

The butter industry, then, has no right in law to prevent margarine from being colored yellow. But does it have a moral right, or any other right, for exclusion? I think it has none.

A great deal of butter is artificially colored. Spring and summer butter is likely to be yellow; fall and winter butter, practically white. Generally, cows feed on green grass in the spring and summer. The grass is full of the sunshine vitamin, vitamin A, and carotene, which imparts the yellow hue to butter.

Few people, however, know that much butter is artificially colored. The butter makers are not required to state that they use artificial coloring. That is a specific exemption written into the law, which I mentioned a moment ago, passed in 1931. The manufacturers of margarine are required to state that they use artificial coloring if, of course, artificial coloring is added.

The butter makers deceive their customers. The real effect of the artificial coloring is to try to make people believe that it is spring and summer butter, which, of course, is better and superior to the white butter; otherwise they would not use the yellow color. White butter has a lower vitamin A content than yellow butter. The vitamins add healthgiving properties, as I have said, 99 percent of all margarine contains 15,000 units of vitamin A per pound and all margarine, under its Federal standard of identity, must contain not less than 9,000 units.

During the 1902 debate on margarine in Congress, the late Representative Wadsworth, of New York, the father of the present able House member, summed up this whole question:

> It is claimed by the extreme butter men that yellow is the natural butter color and practically no other food product has the right to use it. If that claim is true, what shade of yellow is it entitled to? * * * It is only in the months of May and June, and I speak as a practical butter maker myself when I make the assertion, that creamery butter, and that, of course, is the butter of commerce, has a decided yellow color, or tint, and that color disappears entirely or almost so when the fall and winter sets in. * * * Here are samples of butter purchased by me this morning and no two are alike. As a matter of fact, every sample is artificially colored.
>
> I deny that butter has the copyright, patent right, or any other right to any particular color, whether yellow or otherwise.
>
> If coloring oleomargarine a shade of yellow helps to perpetuate a fraud, then the coloring of butter is actually a fraud, because it makes the consumer believe, and necessarily, that fall or winter, or white butter of any season of the year is June butter which generally is considered the best.

Margarine resembles butter in many ways. It is a table spread and would resemble butter if it were colored green, or red, for it is like butter in texture and taste and is used for the same purposes. We assert, therefore, that it should have the right to resemble butter in color.

We deny that margarine tries, or wants to masquerade as butter. We say furthermore that similarity to other products in color, in design, in texture, in use, and in many other ways, is characteristic of thousands upon thousands of domestic products.

Synthetic dyes have almost put natural dyes out of business. The similarity in this case is purely one of color.

If we say, by law, that similarity is prohibited, or is to be penalized, we had better close up our laboratories and turn our backs upon technical and scientific progress.

Over and over again, I have stated that the case of rayon and cotton is analogous to that of butter and margarine. The same thing could be said of rubber and the new synthetic rubbers, or of plastics used for wood or steel, and so on.

If today I proposed an amendment which would tax rayon for its imitation of cotton in color and dozens of other ways, I would be laughed at and rightly so.

I am glad to be able to state that no cotton producer, so far as I know, has ever seriously proposed a tax on rayon, or nylon, or any other competitor of cotton.

Yet, for more than 60 years there has been a Federal tax on margarine. This, it is obvious, is a tax on cottonseed oil, soybean oil, and the other vegetable oils which go into the end product.

There is no way to estimate the loss to the farmers who produce these vegetable oils. Margarine is the second largest single outlet for cottonseed oil; the largest in 1948. In 1948, more than 450,000,000 pounds of cottonseed oil were used in the manufacture of margarine, the equivalent of one and a half million tons of cottonseed. And cottonseed oil accounts for more than half the value of cottonseed, which accounts for about 14 percent of the farmers' gross cash income from the cotton crop.

Margarine is the second largest outlet for soybean oil, shortening being the first. In 1948, margarine consumed 253,000,000 pounds of soybean oil. About 16

percent of all soybean oil produced in this country goes into margarine. This 16 percent, obviously, is very influential in determining the price received for the entire production, since margarine is a high-value usage and the soybean oil which goes into margarine raises the entire price structure of the oil.

The importance of soybean oil to the agricultural economy should not be underestimated. Soybeans are grown on approximately 12 or more million acres of land. In 1948, total production of soybeans approximated 223,000,000 bushels and the cash value of soybeans for beans approximated $506,000,000. Today, soybeans are rated from first to third crop in cash importance in half a dozen States.

The processor makes two commodities from soybeans; one is soybean oil and the other is meal. The prices which the processor receives for the oil and meal determine the price which he can pay the farmer for his soybeans. If the processor sells his soybean oil at a reduced price, he must either increase the price of meal, or decrease the price paid the farmer. He has no alternative.

It is elementary to state that legislation which decreases the use of the vegetable oils is taking money directly from the pockets of the cottonseed and soybean producers and the other producers of vegetable oils.

At this point in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to insert an exhibit showing the relative value of soybean oil and butter in the six principal soybean-producing States, which also are great dairy States—exhibit VIII.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table marked "Exhibit VIII" was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT VIII.—*Cash income from soybean oil and from butter, principal soybean States, 1948*

State	Rank in soybean production	Estimated cash income from soybean oil [1]	Cash income from butter [2]
Illinois	1	$96, 883, 000	$19, 872, 000
Iowa	2	46, 779, 000	125, 333, 000
Indiana	3	37, 347, 000	12, 999, 000
Ohio	4	23, 325, 000	14, 369, 000
Missouri	5	16, 930, 000	24, 775, 000
Minnesota	6	20, 258, 000	103, 403, 000

[1] Estimated at 50 percent of cash income from soybeans.
[2] Including sales of cream (butterfat) and farm butter.
Source: U. S. Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have referred to the Ohio referendum on margarine last November 8. Aside from the overwhelming victory for margarine in this election, it is extremely interesting to note that margarine won in 26 counties out of 48 counties where dairy products are the chief source of cash farm income. The butter forces carried only 23 such counties.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD an analysis of the margarine referendum in Ohio:

There being no objection, the table marked "Exhibit IX" was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT IX. THE 1949 OHIO ELECTION AND ITS IMPLICATIONS

Proposals to legalize the manufacture and sale of yellow margarine in Ohio were rejected at the last two sessions of the Ohio Legislature, having once died in committee, and having in 1949 gained approval of the Ohio senate only to be beaten in the Ohio house.

Ohio consumers decided to carry the issue to the voters under the Ohio initiative law. Petitions were signed by more than 426,000 qualified voters and filed with the Ohio secretary of state, who gave the margarine proposal the top position on the special questions and issues ballot for the November 8 election.

The movement was spearheaded by 32,000 Ohio housewives who banded together in an organization named the Association of Voters for Yellow Margarine.

Not to be overlooked, however, was the inherent political strength of Ohio's 92,000 milk-producing farm families (of whom, however, fewer than 39,000 sold cream for butter) and the fact that Ohio's gross cash income from dairy products in 1948 amounted to $233,344,000, or $22.24 of each $100 of Ohio farm cash income.

The complete and official result of the November 8 election as announced by the Ohio secretary of state was:

For yellow margarine	1, 282, 606
Against yellow margarine	799, 473
Majority favoring yellow margarine	483, 133

Surprising to no one were the substantial majorities accorded yellow margarine in seven of nine metropolitan areas, with Cincinnati giving the proposal a 4 to 1 ratio; Cleveland, almost 3 to 1; Columbus, almost 3 to 1; Dayton, 2 to 1; Akron, 2 to 1; Toledo, 2 to 1, and Canton, 4 to 3.

One unexpected development was that yellow margarine carried 44 of Ohio's 88 counties.

But the truly surprising element came in the voting record of 24 of Ohio's most highly agriculturalized counties, 14 of which derive more income from dairy products than from any other farm crop, and in 8 of which dairying is the second most important source of farm income.

ALL 24 OF THESE COUNTIES FAVORED YELLOW MARGARINE

The voting record of the 24 counties in question, together with the percentage of total cash farm income accounted for by dairy products, and a listing of the relative importance of dairy products, follows:

County	For	Against	Percentage of farm income from dairying (1945)	Relative importance of dairying (1948)
Athens	6, 964	5, 845	48	First.
Clermont	6, 300	4, 905	27	Do.
Coshocton	5, 094	4, 750	34	Do.
Crawford	6, 407	5, 324	14	Second.
Defiance	3, 585	3, 508	19	First.
Erie	8, 111	4, 830	18	Do.
Fairfield	7, 680	6, 061	24	Second.
Greene	6, 318	4, 977	14	Do.
Hocking	3, 023	2, 593	28	First.
Huron	4, 781	3, 691	19	Do.
Jackson	4, 569	3, 966	30	Do.
Lawrence	8, 838	5, 036	28	Do.
Marion	7, 221	6, 356	16	Second.
Miami	8, 739	6, 470	24	First.
Ottawa	3, 839	3, 201	16	Second.
Perry	4, 672	4, 003	25	First.
Portage	9, 355	7, 809	43	Do.
Ross	7, 010	6, 275	14	Second.
Sandusky	6, 982	5, 972	20	First.
Seneca	7, 402	7, 110	19	Second.
Van Wert	4, 532	4, 376	15	Third.
Warren	4, 321	3, 781	25	Second.
Washington	8, 754	5, 168	33	First.
Wood	7, 823	7, 587	12	Fifth.

Dairying also is a highly important source of farm income in 13 other counties which favored yellow margarine; each of which, however, includes a town or city of substantial importance, but none of which includes a large city. Their voting record, together with the percentage of cash income from dairy products, and a listing of the relative importance of dairy products, follows:

County	For	Against	Percent of farm income from dairying (1945)	Relative importance of dairying (1948)
Allen	13, 427	8, 818	18	Second.
Belmont	13, 582	12, 548	54	First.
Butler	23, 872	12, 750	29	Second.
Clark	13, 849	6, 513	24	Do.
Columbiana	13, 239	12, 733	45	First.
Jefferson	14, 188	13, 384	50	Do.
Lake	9, 328	4, 556	9	Fourth.
Licking	9, 680	8, 104	33	First.
Lorain	16, 029	11, 517	32	Do.
Muskingum	12, 697	10, 181	32	Do.
Richland	13, 030	8, 691	25	Do.
Scioto	13, 813	9, 831	32	Do.
Tuscarawas	9, 430	8, 809	46	Do.

Lumping the two groups of counties together, it is seen that yellow margarine was favored by 23 in which dairy products are the No. 1 source of farm cash income, and by 11 in which dairy products are the No. 2 source of farm cash income.

Carrying the projection still further, dairying is the principal source of farm revenue in Hamilton (Cincinnati), Stark (Canton), and Summit (Akron) Counties, and is the second most important source of farm income in Franklin (Columbus) and Montgomery (Dayton) Counties. All of the latter also favored yellow margarine.

Thus, in over-all total, yellow margarine won out in 26 counties where dairy products rank first, and in 13 where they rank second.

(Sources of data: Election results, Ohio secretary of state; percent farm income from dairying, based on United States census of 1945; relative importance of dairying, Ohio State University, department of rural economics, Bulletin No. 206 (1948).)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It bears out an assertion I have made time and time again that dairymen, themselves, are beginning to understand that they have no interest in the attempt to perpetuate the Federal and State antimargarine laws.

I have shown that butter has no right at law, or no moral right, to prevent margarine from being colored yellow at the factory. But what about the assertion that wholesale fraud will result if we take away legislative restrictions on the manufacture and sale of yellow margarine?

This argument can be disposed of fairly quickly. The danger of fraud if we legalize tax-free yellow margarine is negligible.

Under existing law which would not be changed by repeal of the taxes on margarine, margarine must be labeled as such. The labeling requirements are so strict and so well enforced that no nouseholder is in danger of being deceived.

Margarine is not sold in loose, or unpackaged form, as is some butter. It is not sold in tubs. A merchant could take the wrapper off margarine sticks and perhaps palm them off as butter. Few grocers in their right minds would attempt such a thing. The penalty is all out of proportion to the risk involved. The penalty is the standard one for fraud in the sale of food, and for an intentional

offense, or repeated offenses, can be a maximum of 3 years in prison and a $10,000 fine. That, I may say, is the existing law, which will not be disturbed. I refer to the existing Food and Drug Act.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. The penalty to which the distinguished Senator alludes is the penalty under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for violation of the prohibitions therein set forth, is it not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. The removal of the label by the retailer certainly would constitute such a violation and subject him to the penalty.

About 93 percent of all margarine sold goes to homes. I have heard no instance where a housewife complained that she asked for butter, paid for butter, and got margarine instead. There may be a few such instances but they are very few indeed. Nor have I ever heard anyone seriously insist that there is any real danger of deception in margarine sales to homes. By "homes" I mean through the regular retail outlets for home consumption.

Sales to bakers, confectioners, and the like amount to about 3½ percent of the margarine sold. These purchasers do not care whether the margarine they buy is white or yellow. They use it in cooking and in the making of their products.

There is then no real danger of fraud in the case of 96½ percent of all margarine sold, whether that margarine be yellow or white. This leaves 3½ percent of the margarine consumed unaccounted for. Most of this 3½ percent is sold in public eating places. Charges have been made that many restaurants are substituting margarine for butter. I think the average restaurant operator is an honest and law-abiding citizen, and I doubt that he wishes either to deceive his customers or to violate the law.

However, H. R. 2023 covers the small area where repeal might increase the prospects of fraud. As I have previously said, the bill before the Senate requires that a public eating place which serves yellow margarine must post a notice to that effect, or print, in type not smaller than that used to describe any other article of food, such a notice on the menu itself. It also requires that each separate serving of yellow margarine in a public eating place must be identified as such, or served in a triangular shape which would be a form of identification. If the individual serving was not brought to the table in a triangular shape, the identification must conform to regulations to be prescribed by the Food and Drug Administration. The Administration might require the identification to be carried on the plate, or to be marked on the paper on which the margarine was placed. Undoubtedly it would be adequate.

The Wiley substitute bill provides no additional protection whatever against the sale of margarine as butter in public eating places, the only area where there is any real danger of fraud.

We have not answered the question by the butter industry as to why margarine wants to use the color yellow, but that answer is fairly obvious.

The butter industry knows very well that consumers want their table spread, whether margarine or butter, served yellow. Imagine, for example, eating green margarine, or green butter, even if it were just as nutritious and tasty as yellow margarine, or yellow butter. Imagine drinking red milk, even though the coloring which made it so was perfectly harmless. We are all familiar with the common practice with respect to oranges. I do not think the coloring of an orange improves it any, but, for the same kind of reason, everyone colors oranges today in the markets. It is merely a habit.

We develop a set of food habits, which include eye appeal, as well as taste appeal, just as we develop other habits. We have been taught to like our butter served yellow and our margarine served yellow. That is why millions of housewives, and quite a few husbands also, go to the trouble of mixing yellow coloring into margarine before they put it on the table. This is a messy and time-consuming chore and I do not wonder that millions of consumers are angry because we force them to do it. Repeal would do away with that nuisance task in 32 States and the District of Columbia and, I am fully confident, eventually in all 48 States.

I have sketched the history of the Wiley amendment and have called it a curious animal. It represents still a new party line for the butter interests. It is completely at variance with the previous contention of the industry that there should be a Federal ban upon the manufacture and sale of all yellow margarine.

If we are going to legalize the sale of yellow margarine, why confine that manufacture and sale within State lines? If there is danger of fraud in the sale of yellow margarine, the Wiley amendment does nothing to avert that danger. If the dairy industry is threatened by the repeal of the antimargarine laws, the Wiley amendment does not dissipate that threat.

Eventually, if the current trend against the antimargarine laws continues, every State will permit the manufacture and sale of yellow margarine. Under the Wiley amendment, every State, to have yellow margarine, must have a plant within the State. Undoubtedly, almost every State would have a plant, or plants, in the future, although some of the poorer and more thinly populated States might not be able to support such a factory.

There is a certain selfish appeal in the prospect of a margarine plant, or plants, in every State. Nevertheless, if we are going back to the articles of confederation, there is much more to be done. We should, for example, confine the manufacture and sale of automobiles to intrastate commerce. We should confine the manufacture and sale of farm machinery to State lines, and so on down the almost interminable list of our products.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator will yield once more to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. If I correctly understood the able Senator from Arkansas a few moments ago, in mentioning the safeguards which his bill places on the use of oleomargarine in eating places, he stated that the bill required both the clear labeling of the article and also that an individual serving be cut in a triangular form.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. First, there must be notice that oleomargarine is being served. That is absolute. Then there must be individual labeling, or the article must be in a triangular shape. There must be one or the other.

Mr. GILLETTE. Then I misunderstood the Senator. I understood him to say that both were required.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. One or the other, but there must be notice.

Mr. GILLETTE. The alternatives are labeling of the serving and serving the article in triangular shape.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Individual labeling, yes, but that is not an alternative to the general requirement that notice be given.

Mr. GILLETTE. I should like to ask the Senator, also, if his statement means that each individual serving must be in triangular form. I submit that the language of the bill does not so provide. As the Senator well knows, there are many eating places which serve the bread spread in a dish. It may be a pound, a half-pound, or a quarter-pound, to which the diner can help himself. That would be a separate serving; it would not be an individual serving. I am sure the Senator does not believe that the language which is contained in the bill would provide that an individual serving must be triangular in shape——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I had not thought of that. Generally speaking, there are very few places which are so free with their butter or margarine as to put a whole pound of it on the table.

Mr. GILLETTE. In Iowa it is quite common to put a pound of butter on the table.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In Iowa, the land of plenty, that may be true. Very few of us are favored by coming from that State.

I will say to the Senator that I have never taken the position of objecting to any reasonable, practical way of giving notice, because those of us who are interested in margarine have no desire that one ounce of margarine be disguised and sold as butter. We think it has sufficient merits to stand on its own feet. As I told the committee twice, I should be willing to support any kind of a plan that is calculated to be workable.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator has just stated that he is in favor of any practical method of protection. But there are alternative proposals. One proposal is that the article be labeled, and the

other proposal is that the article be cut in triangular form. Has the Senator in mind any way in which an individual serving of butter can be labeled? Would the label have to be printed on it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. My idea is that the little oiled paper plate on which it is served should carry the identification.

Mr. GILLETTE. Then the Senator would identify the plate and not the margarine.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The plate on which it is served. The committee discussed the question of having the margarine itself bear an imprint, but both butter and margarine melt quite quickly, so that that would not be a practical way of handling the situation. It was deemed, and, I think, correctly, by the committee, that that would not be a practical way. The most practical, easiest, and surest way is to make the identification on the plate on which the butter or margarine is served.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. WILEY. I was interested a few moments ago in the Senator's comment that the producers of oleomargarine would not want to accept any other color than yellow. I listened to his reasoning in that connection. He did not mention the fact that ice creams are made of practically every color of the rainbow. There is red, white, and blue ice cream; ice cream may be of various shades of red. I assume that the very objective is to give oleo the right to enter into the field so that it can take over the spread market. Is that not the very purpose of it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should certainly not deny that one of the objectives of the persons interested in margarine is its sale. We are interested in its free sale in competition with any other food article. That certainly is one of the motives. I tried to make the point that as a matter of habit the American people are accustomed to their spread being yellow, just as in the case of oranges they are accustomed to a certain tint. Some of the very best oranges are tinted with artificial color. It is for the same reason that the butter producers tint and color winter butter to make it look like summer butter. They have exactly the same motive—to make it acceptable.

Mr. WILEY. There used to be only one kind of ice cream. Now, as I say, every kind of color is used in ice cream. There are different kinds of tinted ice cream, orange, lemon, and other colors.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Vanilla ice cream is still white, is it not? I have never seen any black vanilla ice cream.

Mr. WILEY. All ice cream usually has some vanilla in it. It is clearly demonstrated that the producers of oleomargarine do not want to try any of those colors.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The American people prefer yellow color for their spread. They do not seem to care for any other color. I do not know why that is true. Why do they prefer oranges to be a certain color? Ninety percent of all oranges are artificially colored. That was not so in the past. I cannot explain why, but now it is a general practice.

Mr. WILEY. Then the purpose is to take over the spread market. That is what the proponents of the bill seek to do.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The purpose is to sell margarine. I had hoped I had made it clear that that was the principal interest not only of those who make margarine, but of those who produce soybean oil, and so on. I hope I have never left the impression that there is any other purpose than to have a free, open, untrammeled market in which oleomargarine can compete, just as in all other fields. In the case of cotton, nylon and rayon compete freely with cotton. That is an analogous case. If we had attempted to impose a restriction to the effect that no nylon could be sold unless it were colored black, what would the reaction have been? Why is it that we like white shirts? Why do we not wear black shirts, as men in Italy did at one time? I do not know why we like white shirts. They are very uneconomical. It takes twice as much money to keep them presentable as if we wore black shirts, but Senators know we do wear white shirts.

The same observations apply to artificial leather, which is made to look like real leather. I do not know why the growers and producers of livestock, the source of leather—hogs and cattle—did not have a law passed prohibiting the sale of artificial leather; but they did not. Of course, the oleomargarine law is a unique act. No similar act has ever been passed by the Congress. It completely contradicts the whole idea of a free, competitive market. I challenge any butter advocate to cite a precedent in our laws, or a similar case, when we undertook by governmental action to throttle competition in a legitimate article of commerce. I do not think there is any such case.

Of course, the suggestion that the making and sale of automobiles, or farm machinery, or any other legitimate product, be confined within State lines, is absurd. Yet, these suggestions are no more absurd than the proposal that we confine the making and sale of yellow margarine within State lines—for it, too, is a perfectly good and legitimate product.

The Wiley amendment would disrupt the entire margarine industry, and would sharply raise costs to consumers. The margarine industry, like other mass-production industries, has been built in line with the factors which make for efficiency and a good, inexpensive product. The amendment would disrupt the distribution pattern of margarine, which has been built up on the availability of fats and oils, the consumer demand for margarine, the availability of labor, and many other factors. What would happen, for example, to Wisconsin's great cheese industry if we passed a Federal law confining the manufacture and sale of cheese to intrastate limits?

Frankly, I am surprised that it is necessary to take the time of the Senate to argue the merits and demerits of the Wiley amendment. Nevertheless, 25 Senators, all able and earnest men, are sponsoring the measure. It is necessary, then, to deal with it seriously.

I regard the Wiley amendment as thoroughly mischievous in nature. I believe that its approval would put the Senate in a ridiculous and indefensible position.

The Wiley amendment represents the spirit of the Articles of Confederation, which almost wrecked this country in its early days. The Wiley amendment harks back to the era of dirt roads, oxcarts, carriages, flatboats, and sailing vessels. It is a return to the thinking which prevailed when State after State levied taxes and embargoes upon the products of other States.

Even an agrarian economy could not get along under the Articles of Confederation and the trade wars which accompanied the shaky union of the fledgling States. If Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, and other great men of that day had not had the vision of a great free-trade territory, this country would have split into a number of quarreling and belligerent States. The interminable wars of Europe might have been paralleled in the history of North America.

Today, we are insisting that western Europe unite economically and establish a free-trade area which would promote stability and prosperity. At the same time, we find Senators insisting that we limit the manufacture and sale of a perfectly good food product, made in this country from domestic materials, to State limits.

Testifying before the Senate Finance Committee last April, I reviewed in some detail the circumstances which led to the adoption of the commerce clause of the Constitution. This clause was an indispensable accompaniment for a real union of the States.

The late Mr. Justice Rutledge of the Supreme Court has pointed out that the adoption of the principle of free trade among the States even preceded the adoption of the indispensable domestic freedoms secured by the first amendment. He said:

> Only later were they added, by popular demand. It was rather to secure the freedom of trade, to break down the barriers to its free flow, that the Annapolis convention was called, only to adjourn with a view to Philadelphia. Thus the generating source of the Constitution lay in the rising volume of restraints upon commerce which the Confederation could not check. These were the proximate causes of our national existence down to today.

That quotation is found in Rutledge's A Declaration of Legal Faith, page 25.

Congress has the power to prohibit the movement of goods in interstate commerce, but that authority has been used gingerly and sparingly. Almost exclusively, that power has been in the case of products which were considered harmful, dangerous, and deleterious. Some instances are: Stolen motor vehicles, the white-slave traffic, kidnaped persons, adulterated and misbranded foods under

the pure-food laws, diseased livestock and plants. Margarine does not fall into any of these categories.

The Wiley amendment meets none of the real questions involved in our consideration of the antimargarine laws.

The Senate should face this matter squarely. If margarine should not be allowed to use yellow coloring, we should say so. If it is to be allowed to use yellow coloring, we should remove all restrictions upon the product, and let butter and margarine compete squarely and fairly in the market place.

Still another argument used against repeal of the antimargarine laws is that removal of the restrictions upon yellow margarine would not benefit the consumer. The assertion is that the manufacturers, or the retailers, or both, would mark up the price of yellow margarine until there would be comparatively little difference between it and the price of butter.

During the hearings before committees, and in debates on the floors, this matter has risen time and time again. Data purporting to show profiteering already in yellow margarine have been inserted in the record of hearings. I am told that the butter industry relied heavily upon this price argument during the recent contest in Ohio, obviously not a very persuasive argument, however.

The price phase of this controversy has interested me very much. If consumers are not to benefit by repeal, there certainly is a question about scrapping the antimargarine laws. Consequently, I have investigated this to the limit of my ability.

Before going further into the actual spreads today between yellow and white margarine and the prospective spreads in the future, I should like to say that profiteering in yellow margarine after repeal is highly improbable in the face of a keenly competitive margarine industry.

No margarine company, I am reliably informed, products more than 10 or 12 percent of the margarine made in the United States, and certainly there is the keenest of competition for margarine sales. If the industry operated on monopolistic lines, there would have been profiteering long ago.

To come back to the question of existing price spreads between white and yellow margarine, I recently queried the manufacturers of margarine about their pricing policies with regard to white and yellow. In every instance, the manufacturers have formally advised me, they charge 10 or 11 cents more for yellow, only enough to cover the Federal tax and additional packaging costs. I have a fully documented case that there is no profiteering at the manufacturer's level.

But what about retail spreads? Within the past month, I sent out 8,700 questionnaires to retail grocers who handle yellow margarine in the 32 States and the District of Columbia which permit its sale. These covered the pricing practices of far more than 8,700 stores, since about 200 of the queries were sent to heads of chain stores. I asked the stores to give me detailed information on the spread between the prices charged for white and yellow, brand by brand, on the day preceding receipt of the questionnaire.

I ask permission to insert at this point in the RECORD a copy of my letter, a copy of the questionnaire, and a summary of the results of the survey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., December 19, 1949.
To the Grocer Addressed:

As sponsor in the Senate of a bill to repeal the Federal antimargarine laws, I am writing to ask a small favor. Would you kindly fill out and return to me at your very earliest convenience the enclosed form listing average retail prices in stores within your jurisdiction for the same brands of white and yellow margarine on the day before you receive this letter?

Perhaps you wonder why I seek this information. The reason is very simple. My bill would repeal the 10-cent-per-pound tax on yellow margarine and the $48 annual license fee now required of grocers who handle the product. This bill, which would also repeal all the other Federal margarine taxes and fees, is scheduled to be considered by the Senate early in January. During the early discussions of this measure the following question has arisen:

"What is the difference between the retail price of white and yellow margarine?"

My hope is to have the facts available. This can best be done by surveying actual margarine prices in representative stores and then letting the truth and the facts speak for themselves.

In filling out the enclosed questionnaire I ask that you be completely frank and honest in setting down your price quotations. I am interested only in the general statistical results, and I am not concerned with your pricing operations, taken individually. After being recorded, your reply will be destroyed and the survey results will not be otherwise used.

Thanking you in advance for your cooperation, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT.

QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO GROCERS

(Please return this via air mail)

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: Retail prices on same brands of yellow and white margarine at my store on December —, 1949 (the day before I received your inquiry), were as follows:

Brand name	Price per pound yellow	Same brand price per pound white
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		

Sincerely yours,

Name _____
Store _____
Address _____
City _____
State _____

EXHIBIT X.—*Differentials between retail prices of yellow and white margarine, December 1949* [1]

State	Average differential	Percentage of total differentials: 10 cents or less	11 cents or less	12 cents or less	13 cents or less
	Cts.	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
Alabama	10.9	36.7	65.3	81.0	88.2
Arizona	11.1	44.9	55.1	83.8	92.0
Arkansas	11.4	41.8	61.5	70.8	84.5
California	10.4	51.0	75.1	89.5	92.6
Colorado	11.2	45.1	62.6	82.1	88.7
District of Columbia	10.9	72.9	73.4	82.9	83.4
Florida	10.9	45.2	73.7	88.0	94.3
Georgia	12.4	34.1	39.7	52.7	60.1
Indiana	10.4	72.2	76.8	89.2	92.8
Kansas	11.5	28.7	39.4	70.7	80.3
Kentucky	10.9	46.7	64.7	82.0	84.9
Louisiana	10.7	47.0	65.8	95.0	97.5
Maine	11.3	45.0	49.0	84.3	86.6
Maryland	12.0	34.9	43.3	60.5	69.5
Massachusetts	10.7	51.8	54.0	97.0	98.4
Mississippi	10.8	48.8	54.0	92.3	95.6
Missouri	12.2	28.2	38.3	49.0	61.0
Nebraska	11.3	37.4	50.3	76.5	91.4
Nevada	12.0	29.5	45.5	65.9	93.2
New Hampshire	10.5	58.8	59.3	98.7	98.3
New Jersey	10.5	53.5	78.4	93.0	95.9
New Mexico	11.6	50.0	57.4	66.0	74.5
North Carolina	12.0	27.3	37.0	67.3	77.3
North Dakota	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]
Ohio	9.3	74.3	89.4	97.7	98.8
Oklahoma	10.8	53.4	58.4	84.0	90.2
Rhode Island	10.5	63.6	63.6	98.7	98.7
South Carolina	11.5	25.4	51.2	82.3	89.9
Tennessee	11.7	20.5	32.7	73.0	97.6
Texas	11.3	28.8	60.8	84.8	94.3
Utah	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]
Virginia	11.2	52.8	57.7	76.4	80.3
West Virginia	11.9	40.0	43.7	54.3	80.3
32 States and District of Columbia	10.8	48.4	62.0	82.6	89.6

[1] Determined from 26,210 comparisons of retail prices of white and yellow margarine of the same brand in 6,829 stores on 1 day.
[2] No retail dealers in yellow margarine because of State tax of 20 cents a pound, and other restrictions.
[3] Not computed. Only 18 retailers licensed as of October 1949 from whom insufficient data were received to constitute a reliable sample.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senators will examine the letter and the questionnaire, I think they will agree with me that I made an effort to get an absolutely unbiased report on this matter.

The queries were sent to stores, large and small, chain and independent, city, town, and rural; and the returns gave a thoroughly representative sample from these groups. They covered the operations of 6,829 stores, or about 17 percent of the stores selling yellow margarine. This constitutes, as anyone familiar with surveys knows, a very heavy sample.

The survey showed that the average retailer selling yellow margarine simply charges enough for the product to cover his extra costs. As a matter of fact, the retail spread between yellow and white margarine could well be more than 11 cents and still not be out of line. Evidently a good many retailers are absorbing some of the extra costs of yellow margarine.

For example, replies from Ohio retailers showed that the average spread between white and yellow of the same brand in that State, which legalized the sale of margarine last November 8, was only 9.3 cents.

The average spread in 32 States between white and yellow margarine was 10.8 cents per pound.

Let me briefly sum up some other facts shown by the survey.

Approximately 48 percent of the spreads were 10 cents per pound or less.

About 62 percent, including the 48 percent, were 11 cents or less.

Similarly, about 83 percent were 12 cents or less, and nearly 90 percent were 13 cents or less.

As I have stated, many retailers are absorbing some of the extra cost of yellow margarine. The grocers who are charging 10 or 11 cents more are simply passing on the extra direct costs of yellow to their customers. Those who are charging 12 or 13 cents extra for yellow are only trying to get back the $48 license fee.

Judged by any standard, 90 percent of the spreads reported are completely reasonable. Few instances were reported where the spreads between white and yellow seem out of line. There are logical explanations for most of these instances. It is a common practice for many grocers to reduce prices on white to attract customers; in other words, to make loss leaders of certain brands of white. In these cases, and there were a good many in this survey, a wide spread was created, not by advancing the price of yellow, but rather by cutting the price of white to a loss, or no profit level.

Many grocers also went to some pains to explain their wider margins as an attempt to recover the $48 license fee. These were small retailers who sell only limited amounts of margarine, and their spread between yellow and white had to be relatively high to enable them to get their money back. Finally, as in all commodities, there are prices which seem high and which can be explained only by the fact that the grocer, whatever his reason, saw a chance to make an extra profit and took it. As any one of us knows, we can find an occasional high price for almost any article in trade.

In the case of yellow margarine, one of the reasons why some grocers have an opportunity to charge extra is the fact that only about one grocer in eight holds a license to sell the product. Some grocers are the only ones in their area who sell yellow and have what amounts to a local monopoly. This affords an opportunity for petty profiteering.

The repeal of the Federal antimargarine laws will put an end to this kind of thing, and very quickly. All retailers, or almost all, in the States which permit the sale of yellow will deal in the product. With every retailer selling yellow margarine, he must compete or see the business go to his rivals.

If the Senate is really concerned about the danger of profiteering in yellow margarine—and there is no reason for that concern even now—the way to deal with that concern is to repeal the Federal antimargarine laws.

Before leaving this subject I should like to point out that the argument that repeal will do the consumer no good because of high prices charged for yellow is out of line with the allegation that repeal will injure the dairy industry.

If the price charged for yellow margarine is raised sharply, more people will buy butter, fewer people will buy margarine. The butter industry is well aware of this situation. The price scare story simply is propaganda to frighten the consumers, who have been the real impetus behind the drive for repeal.

Finally I would like to ask the Senate to consider this issue on its merits and to express the hope that amendments which deal with other subjects will be rejected.

This matter has been waiting its turn for a long, long time. We should dispose of it and not allow it to be sidetracked any longer. We ask, in all fairness, that the Senate be allowed to vote on this question without beclouding the issue. The people have a right to know where we stand.

In March 1948 I tried to repeal the antimargarine laws by an amendment to a pending tax bill. I had been unsuccessful in my appeals to the Senate leadership to allow a vote on the margarine bill directly.

The then chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], made the point that the margarine amendment should not be attached to the tax bill. For the information of the Senate I should like to quote some of his remarks at the time. He said:

> Neither the majority nor the Senate Finance Committee is taking any position on the policy involved in the merits of the amendment.

That was my amendment to repeal the antimargarine laws.

> A Senator may vote to keep this amendment out of the bill, without prejudicing his position in favor of removing the taxes from oleomargarine. We are not going into the merits of that. Our position is that it has no place in the pending bill, and that if it were put in the bill, it would necessarily be dropped in the conference; that it is unwise to put it in this bill, because if we opened the door to extraneous matters, we would wind up here in a state of complete scatteration, instead of getting the kind of bill we wish to get.

I have no doubt that his cogent and forceful plea had a great effect upon the Senate, for my amendment was defeated by a vote of 45 to 33. I felt, and still feel, that a substantial majority of the Senate favored repeal when that vote was taken, just as I feel that a heavy majority of the Senate favors repeal today.

Almost 2 years have gone by since the Senate vote referred to and to this day the Senate has not expressed itself directly on the question of repeal. Following the line of reasoning so aptly stated in 1948 by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], I ask the Senate, whatever their views on extraneous amendments, to reject them and to vote upon repeal of the Federal antimargarine laws.

To summarize, I sincerely believe that repeal of the antimargarine laws would not injure the dairy industry; butter has no copyright, or trade-mark, on the color yellow; there is no danger of fraud if we repeal the antimargarine laws, nor is there any danger of profiteering in yellow margarine if we scrap these outmoded and antiquated statutes.

Perhaps, I should have devoted more time to talking about the public interest in this matter. As I have said, the strong and incessant drive toward repeal of these laws has come from the consumers. They see no reason why we should continue legislation which increases the costs of a perfectly good food and which forces housewives to waste time and food in coloring margarine. They want something done about this matter. They intend to have something done about it.

Public sentiment is clamoring for repeal of the antimargarine laws. More than 90 percent of the newspapers of the country are asking for repeal. Most of the leading radio commentators are asking for the same thing. Labor and church groups want repeal, as do many other organizations whose only interest in this matter is the public interest.

A little reflection should convince anyone that the margarine laws are wrong in principle and that they constitute barriers to free trade and fair competition.

The trend, and a most decisive one, all over this country is toward an end to antimargarine legislation. In 1901, 32 States prohibited the manufacture and sale of yellow margarine. Today, as I have repeated, 32 States permit the sale of yellow margarine. Five States, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, and New Jersey, abolished their yellow margarine prohibitions in 1948. Last year New Hampshire, California, Tennessee, and Ohio joined the parade.

If anyone has any doubt about what the people think I again call his attention to the results of the Ohio election where a great dairy State, by an overwhelming margin, voted in November to scrap its antimargarine laws.

The people have told us what they think. It is time for us to tell them what we think.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not know whether other proponents of the measure wish to address the Senate this afternoon, or whether any of the opponents of the measure wish to address the Senate this afternoon. Has the Senator from Arkansas finished his address?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator will yield, Mr. President, I will say I have finished my opening remarks on the subject. I had thought that the committee amendments might be adopted this afternoon. I understand they are noncontroversial.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I was going to ask if we could dispose of the committee amendments this afternoon, because the fight in the Senate, of course, is on the merits of the proposal.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. It was the expectation of the Senator from Iowa to speak on this measure today, but I have conferred with some of the cosponsors of the substitute measure, and it would now seem to me to be advisable to adopt the committee amendments, if that can be done, and then let the question of debate on the substitute measure be taken up tomorrow.

Mr. GEORGE. That is agreeable to me, if it is agreeable to the majority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have no objection to that procedure. I defer to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. After the committee amendments are adopted we can then hold everything in abeyance until tomorrow.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not believe any of the committee amendments are controversial. The first committee amendment is one that those opposed to the bill will naturally favor. The Finance Committee was of the opinion that the possession of oleomargarine in a form ready for serving should likewise be controlled. That is a matter dealt with by the first committee amendment which appears on page 2 of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 2, line 15, after the word "serving", to insert "or the processing in a form ready for serving."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 5, after the word "unless", to strike out "(1)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 11, after the word "food", to strike out "items; and no" and insert "items."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 14, after the word "unless", to insert "(1)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 16, after "(2)", to strike out "such colored oleomargarine or colored margarine is molded and shaped in such manner so as to have three sides (exclusive of the ends) and no person shall serve colored oleomargarine or colored margarine at a public eating place, whether or not a charge is made therefor, unless."

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, before that amendment is acted upon I wish to be heard.

The amendment we are now considering, as I understand, is on page 3, line 16, to strike out "such colored oleomargarine or colored margarine is molded and shaped in such manner so as to have three sides (exclusive of the ends) and no person shall serve colored oleomargarine or colored margarine at a public eating place, whether or not a charge is made therefor, unless."

I should like to have an explanation of the amendment. The language was apparently in the original bill, and is now proposed to be taken out.

Mr. GEORGE. That language was in the House bill.

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. The language was a bit confusing to the Finance Committee. The Finance Committee was of the opinion that retention of the language would result in confusion. In an effort to clarify, the committee offered the amendment to strike. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin that the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and I believe the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] also participated in this amendment.

Our whole purpose was to make certain precisely what this section meant. If this amendment should be adopted and the bill as thus amended should finally pass, the whole question of difference between the original House language and the new language which we have suggested by way of substitution would be in conference, and it could there be ironed out, if we were laboring under a misapprehension that there was some confusion in the section.

If the Senator will look at the committee report, it will be seen that this matter is fully explained. I refer now to page six of the committee report, at which point there is a discussion of subsection (b) of section 3:

> Subsection (b) as amended by your committee requires persons who possess colored oleomargarine or colored margarine in a form ready for serving at public eating places to (1) post a notice that oleomargarine or margarine is served in a prominent and conspicuous place in the establishment, or (2) place such a notice on the menu in type or lettering not smaller than that normally used to designate other food items. Persons who shall serve colored oleomargarine or colored margarine at a public eating place are required to (1) cause each separate serving thereof to bear labeling, or to be accompanied by labeling, identifying it as oleomargarine or margarine, or (2) cause each separate serving thereof to be triangular in shape.

The discussion preceding that clearly indicates that the whole purpose of the committee was not to weaken the House language, but, rather, to clarify it and make certain and definite what the Senate Finance Committee regarded as a confusing expression.

Mr. WILEY. I understand that.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me say that on page 5 the following will be found, under the discussion of section 3 (b):

> Section 3 (b) amends section 301 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by adding a new paragraph thereto which prohibits the serving of colored oleomargarine or colored margarine in violation of the new section 407 (b) of such act. Section 407 (b) regulates not only the public eating place transaction of serving colored oleomargarine or colored margarine but also places certain requirements upon public eating places which possess colored oleomargarine or colored margarine in a form ready for serving.

I should be very glad to answer any further questions which I can answer. I point out that in this instance the purpose was to amend this section so as to meet the objection which was raised very largely by the opponents of the bill. They thought it confusing. The committee was quite willing to clarify it, and the amendment was presented for that purpose. I think the distinguished Senator from Colorado was very largely responsible for the amendment, although all of us concurred in adopting the amendment in the committee.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this time?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WILEY. It seems to me that by striking out this language, we shall be doing away with what I thought was one of the peculiar features of the argument made by the Senator who spoke before the Senator from Georgia addressed the Senate, when he mentioned that colored oleomargarine would have to be molded in some such shape as that stated here.

But now we have this language:

> No person shall serve colored oleomargarine or colored margarine at a public eating place, whether or not any charge is made therefor, unless (1) each separate serving bears or is accompanied by labeling identifying it as oleomargarine or margarine, or.

Then the committee recommends striking out the following:

> (2) such colored oleomargarine or colored margarine is molded and shaped in such manner so as to have three sides (exclusive of the ends) and no person shall serve colored oleomargarine or colored margarine at a public eating place, whether or not a charge is made therefor, unless.

I understand the argument, namely, that by striking out subdivision (2), the remaining subdivision (1), as previously read, together with the language at the conclusion of the paragraph—namely, "each separate serving thereof is triangular in shape"—will make more clear the idea that is embodied in subparagraphs (1) and (2).

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly. In that connection, let me point out that the following appears at the middle of page 6 of the committee report:

> The committee feels that subsection (b) in the form in which it passed the House is somewhat ambiguous. Although the foregoing would appear to be what the language of the subsection says—

And we have discussed it—

> other interpretations are possible and have been offered. The committee amendment seeks therefore to clarify subsection (b), to make its terms explicit, and eliminate the possibility for misinterpretation and confusion. Since the requirements of 407 (b) are enforceable by criminal actions as well as suits for injunction (secs. 302 and 303, Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act), it is very essential that the language of this subsection be clear and unmistakable.

This amendment is not made for the purpose of changing the meaning of the language adopted by the House, as we interpret its meaning to be; but since some different interpretation was suggested by way of argument, the distinguished Senator from Colorado, who is a very able lawyer, was of the opinion that it should be clarified in this way. I can assure the Senator that is the whole purpose.

If we should subsequently discover any real reason for wishing to reopen it, I should be very glad to do so, if the amendment is now agreed to.

Mr. WILEY. Let me ask the Senator to interpret for me the meaning of the words "each separate serving."

A few moments ago there was some discussion between the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator who previously spoke, in relation to this terminology.

Mr. GEORGE. It means each square or piece of oleomargarine actually served, whether it is served to the same customer or to different customers, whether they are at the same table or different tables, or whether to a multitude of customers in the same restaurant. It means that each serving, whether it consists of one triangular

piece or two or more, shall be identified as this proposed act requires.

The alternative identification is, of course, serving in the triangular shape, which will preclude the possibility of cutting it into squares, as butter is usually cut, or into balls, as butter sometimes is molded.

Mr. WILEY. It does not necessarily mean each individual serving; does it?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I think it does. That was our interpretation of it, namely, each individual serving has to be so marked.

Mr. WILEY. In other words, if there were four people sitting at one table and served separately from four people who were at another table, the Senator from Georgia would feel that each serving would have to be marked separately, would he?

Mr. GEORGE. If margarine is served to the four people or to any of the four people, it must be so marked and identified. It cannot be identified wholesale.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. In the interpretation the Senator from Georgia has just placed on this language, the Senator from Georgia certainly would not assert that if this bill becomes law and if a plate of oleomargarine is placed upon a table in an eating place, each individual would have to cut a triangular piece out of it before he could partake of it; would he?

Mr. GEORGE. No; I would not contend that. But the manner in which it is served to the individual must clearly indicate that it is margarine. If the alternative—of serving it in triangular form or shape—is used by the restaurant keeper or the hotel keeper, then my own judgment is that it must be a separate serving and must be triangular in shape when served.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that is a definite alternative.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I say that is the alternative. If he wishes to adopt that alternative, then he must identify it in the way the law prescribes. That was my understanding of the language when we passed on it.

Mr. WILEY. I have no further objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3, beginning in line 16 and ending in line 21.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next committee amendment was on page 4, after line 19, to strike out:

SEC. 5. This act shall not abrogate or nullify any statute of any State or Territory now in effect or which may hereafter be enacted.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 5. Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the possession, sale, or serving of colored oleomargarine or colored margarine in any State or Territory in contravention of the laws of such State or Territory.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, that amendment was made in order to make it abundantly sure that nothing in this act shall be so construed as to authorize the possession, sale, or serving of colored oleomargarine or colored margarine in any State or Territory in contravention of the laws of such State or Territory. I think it is clear enough.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 3, after the word "effective", to strike out "thirty days after its enactment except that section 2 of this act shall become effective 30 days after its enactment or July 1, 1949, whichever date is earlier" and insert "on July 1, 1949."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, that amendment should be further amended. I move that in line 6, page 5, in the date "July 1, 1949," the figure "1949" be stricken out, and in lieu thereof "1950" be inserted.

I offer that as an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if the majority leader desires to do so, I have no objection to laying this bill aside until tomorrow morning, so the opponents of the measure may then proceed with their arguments.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, for myself and a number of other Senators, I have offered an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin has been offered, printed in the RECORD, and is the pending question.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] wishes to be recognized so that he may speak to the amendment. I understand we have an understanding that it will then go over until tomorrow.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask recognition so that I may speak on this amendment the first thing tomorrow. I understand that consent has been given and that the pending subject will go over until tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Iowa may have the floor on the convening of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I inquire if the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin is identical with the one which was originally offered?

Mr. GILLETTE. It is.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There has been no change in it?

Mr. GILLETTE. There has been no change.

COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT OF INTERSTATE STREAMS

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the critical water situation which now exists in New York City and, even to a greater extent, in northeastern New Jersey, has aroused the interest of the entire country.

As might be expected, it did not escape the attention of our ambitious Department of the Interior. On December 20 last, Assistant Secretary William Warne, in an interview with representatives of the International News Service, let it be known that the Department is interested in extending its activities in river development programs into the East.

The Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin, popularly known as Incodel, of which I have been a member since its creation by the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware in 1936, took strenuous exception to this proposition.

It informed Mr. Warne, in letter of protest that, in the East, interstate agencies such as Incodel and its counterparts in the Ohio, Potomac, Hudson, and Connecticut River watersheds are doing a fully effective job in water conservation.

This whole subject is of national importance. In fact, in my judgment, the pattern which these interstate agencies are cutting out should constitute the basis for a new, and sound, national water policy.

Because of its implications, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the following material:

First. International News Service's account of interview with William Warne.

Second. Incodel's letter of December 22, 1949, in protest of William Warne's suggestions for extension of the Department of the Interior's river planning activities into the East.

Third. Editorial in Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, December 28, 1949, entitled "No Need for Federal Control."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRITICAL WATER SITUATION SEEN IN EAST IN 15 YEARS

WASHINGTON.—Assistant Interior Secretary William Warne predicted today that available water supplies will become critical in the East and require ambitious conservation programs within 15 years or less.

Warne forecast that the programs, mostly under Federal sponsorship, will be aimed at controlling large rivers and distributing greater supplies of water in much the same manner as western reclamation projects.

The final goal will be different, however, according to Warne. In the West, he said, Federal reclamation projects are designed primarily to boost irrigation for agriculture.

In the East, he said, the chief object will be to keep up with increased demands for human consumption and municipal requirements, including power.

Warne outlined the prospects of extensive Federal river development over the eastern half of the United States in an interview. He told International News Service:

"We don't have any new programs formulated yet for river-development programs in the East. Consideration of Federal projects in New England is still in the talk stage.

"But there will be more of them. The present situation is leading inevitably to that. Only through comprehensive development of eastern streams can you solve the problem of water supplies which will become critical."

As examples of the types of eastern rivers that might be better developed for their water resources, Warne cited the Ohio, the Potomac, the Hudson, and the Connecticut.

The Assistant Interior Chief also predicted that added emphasis will be placed soon on collecting more data about eastern water supplies and the need for flood control and control of stream pollution.

THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION
ON THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN,
Philadelphia, Pa., December 22, 1949.

DEAR SIR: I enclose herewith a copy of letter mailed today to Hon. William Warne, Assistant Secretary, United States Department of the Interior, taking exceptions to statements made by him in interview in Washington with representatives of the International News Service. A copy of the INS story is also enclosed for your information.

It occurred to me that you would find this subject of interest and news value.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. ALLEN,
Executive Secretary.

DECEMBER 22, 1949.

Hon. WILLIAM WARNE,
Assistant Secretary, United States Department of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WARNE: This letter is in regard to statements reported in the press as being made by you in an interview with representatives of the International News Service, apparently on December 20.

According to the news item, you maintain it is only through ambitious conservation programs for the comprehensive development of eastern streams, mostly under Federal sponsorship, that municipal water-supply problems of the East can be solved. There is a clear inference in the story that you believe this job should be entrusted to the Department of the Interior.

I wish to register a strong objection to these theories.

I would call your attention to the fact that, in the Delaware River Basin, the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware have delegated the task of formulating programs for the control, utilization, and conservation of the water resources of the all-important Delaware River system to the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin. I know you have heard of this agency. It is popularly known as Incodel.

We are proud of the accomplishments being made under this procedure in the field of stream pollution, water-supply development, flood control, and conservation of soils and forests. Within a few weeks we shall submit to the governors of the three upper States a sound, not ambitious plan designed to meet the future water-supply requirements of the Nation's first and third largest cities, New York and Philadelphia, and the fast-growing metropolitan area in northeastern New Jersey. The areas served contain more than 10 percent of the entire population of the country. The project will have tremendous incidental benefits, some of which, under present standards used by Federal agencies, are in the national interest and would be paid for out of the Federal budget.

We welcome any advice or assistance which your Department may be in a position to offer on a cooperative basis, but we resent any impression on your part that States and their political subdivisions in this region do not have the capacity to solve their own problems.

Similarly, although on a more limited basis, existing interstate agencies are doing an effective job in water conservation in other eastern rivers such as the Ohio, Potomac, Hudson, and Connecticut.

You should agree that we here in the East, being closer to our people, are in a better position to feel the pulse of affairs than you in Washington. Nowhere have we heard any clamor for Federal intrusion in the matter of water development, either by agencies patterned after TVA or by longer established departments such as yours or the Army engineers. In fact, from what we hear, the reverse applies. The cry is for less, not more, federalism, whatever its form.

Incidentally, we would be very much interested to learn the basis for your apparent belief that the Department of Interior has the authority to exercise jurisdiction in the matter of the developmen of eastern streams. We are aware of the fact that congressional laws delegate powers to your Bureau of Reclamation in certain Western States in respect to the planning and construction of water projects for the irrigation of arid lands. Significantly, we have heard numerous complaints from these areas to the effect that this essential use is being subordinated and penalized economically in favor of an obsession by the Bureau to produce cheap public power.

I trust that the information in this letter will permit you to rest assured that any impending critical water situations in the East will be faced squarely by the agencies of Government, Federal, State, and local, upon which the responsibility falls.

I am sending a copy of this letter to the press.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. ALLEN,
Executive Secretary.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of December 28, 1949]

NO NEED FOR FEDERAL CONTROL

The Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin has a solid foundation for its opposition to the suggestion of William Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior Department, that the East's water problem can be solved only through on ambitious conservation program under Federal sponsorship.

The Commission properly questions the authority of the Interior Department to inaugurate such a program, and points out that the States, through cooperative endeavor, are already doing the job along the Delaware. The cost, too, is probably less than under Federal control.

The Interior Department has little to boast about in its water policies. Its refusal to prevent pollution of Monocacy Creek where it flows through the Gettysburg Battlefield has delayed a clean-up of the Potomac, to cite only one instance.

The Interior Department does have a water job to do, but its record in the East indicates that it already has its hands full. On the other hand, effective work in water conservation and clean-up is being done by interstate agencies along such rivers as the Delaware, Ohio, Potomac, Hudson, and Connecticut.

The Interior Department can accomplish more by cooperating in such undertakings than by attempting to run the show.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE BATES, OF MASSACHUSETTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution (H. Res. 410) coming over from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
UNITED STATES,
January 3, 1950.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. GEORGE J. BATES, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I offer a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 199) was read, and by unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to its consideration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. GEORGE J. BATES, late a Representative from the State of Massachusetts.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in connection with the resolution I desire to say a few words. I knew the late GEORGE BATES for a great many years. I worked with him first as a member of the Massachusetts House of Representatives in the statehouse on Beacon Hill in Boston. He became an authority on municipal law. He showed courage and firmness in advocating and working for measures designed to better the conditions of and to place on a sounder basis the municipalities of our Commonwealth. He then became the mayor of the city of Salem, in which capacity he served for 10 years before becoming a Member of Congress. He served in the office of mayor with such distinction and gained the confidence of the people of his city to such an extent that he was elected as their Representative in Congress with very little opposition; in fact, as I recall, for the last two terms he served he was unopposed for the office because of the high regard in which he was held by the people of his district.

As a Representative in Congress he was very active in naval affairs. He had a very full understanding of the power and strength and influence of the Navy, and the necessity for its maintenance. He was well informed on every subject that came before Congress.

He was a devoted husband and father; and a loving wife and seven children survive to mourn his loss. A son-in-law was killed in the service of his country in World War II.

We who come from Massachusetts miss him grievously, both as a friend and as a public servant of high ideals.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I never thought it would be my lot to rise on

this floor to speak about the death of the late GEORGE J. BATES. He was the Representative in Congress from the district in which I live. He was not only a public official with whom I was closely associated, but also a lifelong neighbor and close personal friend.

He started out in life under conditions of difficulty. He had to tread a hard road. His family had little in the way of worldly goods. He had to educate himself and make his way in the world by the force of his own intellect and the sweetness and the strength of his own character. He rendered a fine service in the Massachusetts Legislature, where he became recognized as an authority on different questions of government. He had a unique tenure of office as mayor of the city of Salem. He then was elected to the House of Representatives from the Sixth Congressional District, taking the seat which had been occupied before him by the late A. Piatt Andrew and the late Augustus P. Gardner, men of the highest standing, who were always able to represent that district, supported by the overwhelming suffrage of the people who lived in that section of Massachusetts.

His untimely death in an airplane accident in November cut short a career which I am convinced had a tremendous and brilliant future still ahead of it, as well as a most inspiring past. He is mourned not only by his family and friends but by the whole community of which he was a part.

The State of Massachusetts is enriched by a citizenry which traces its roots to many different ancestries and worships in many different faiths. GEORGE J. BATES was able to unite all the people of that part of the State, because he took the broad view, he took the national view, and he was never animated by small or petty prejudices. He was not only a man of intellect and of great mental force, but he was also a man of extraordinary public and civic courage. There are many occasions which I can remember when he took positions long before it became the popular or the expedient thing to do so, when he expressed opinions which cost him something, but which he felt it right to do in order to be true to his duty as a public servant.

Mr. President, we can ill afford to lose a man of his caliber, and I heartily echo the sentiments of my colleague. I hope that God may rest his soul in peace and that the memory of the service of GEORGE J. BATES will be green here in the National Capital for many, many years to come.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE GORSKI OF ILLINOIS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution (H. Res. 411), coming over from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S., *January 3, 1950.*

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. MARTIN GORSKI, a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it had been my good fortune to know the late MARTIN GORSKI for a great number of years. Representative GORSKI, a native of the city of Chicago, had an excellent background and fine legal qualifications and attainments. He served the people of Cook County as assistant State's attorney and as master in chancery. In those offices of public trust he discharged his duties with unusual integrity and fidelity, which brought the plaudits of the people of the community.

Mr. President, Representative GORSKI has been in the Congress for the past 8 years. As a Member of the House of Representatives he attended faithfully to his duties and obligations, respected his oath to uphold the Constitution, and was ever aware of the problems of the people of the district which he represented. The democracy of Cook County and of the entire State of Illinois has lost a great Democrat and a true friend of the ideals of the Constitution of the United States. He was a faithful and respected member of the Cook County democratic organization. We in Cook County and Illinois mourn his loss and send to his bereaved family tributes of respect from the Members of the Senate and the House who knew him best.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 200) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. MARTIN GORSKI, late a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Representative BATES, of Massachusetts, and of the late Representative GORSKI, of Illinois, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, January 5, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 4, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Edward Gardiner Latch, D. D., minister, Metropolitan Memorial—the National Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, who art the creator and the sustainer of life, Thou in whom we live and move and have our being, we are the creatures of Thy hand and the children of Thy love. As we enter a new year together, we pause in Thy presence to acknowledge our dependence upon Thee and to offer unto Thee once again the devotion of our hearts. If we ever needed the leading of Thy spirit, we need it now. Grant unto us clear minds, clean hearts, and a creative faith that with real courage we can face the tasks that lie ahead. May we be equal to the trust the people have placed in us and ready for every responsibility which comes our way.

Save us from unworthy discords, keep us from perpetual motion, restrain our unruly desires. Make us worthy of the high positions we hold, give direction to our desires, develop within us understanding minds and loving hearts that the influence of our lives may always be for Thy good. Grant us wisdom, grant us courage that we fail not man nor Thee.

With all Thy blessing bless Thou our President, his Cabinet, every Member of Congress, and all their families. Fill our hearts with such loyalty to Thee and to all that is right and good that this Nation of ours may be exalted and forever be the land of the free and the home of the brave. We pray in Jesus' name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 150. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress on January 4, 1950.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE (HELD PURSUANT TO H. CON. RES. 150) TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Senate, preceded by the Vice President and its Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT took the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House, the Chair appoints the following members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber: The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints as

members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

The Doorkeeper announced the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments, who were escorted to the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the members of the President's Cabinet, who were escorted to the seats reserved for them.

At 1 o'clock p. m. the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the distinguished honor of presenting to you the President of the United States. [Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 389)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress, a year ago I reported to this Congress that the state of the Union was good. I am happy to be able to report to you today that the state of the Union continues to be good. [Applause.] Our Republic continues to increase in the enjoyment of freedom within its borders, and to offer strength and encouragement to all those who love freedom throughout the world. [Applause.]

During the past year we have made notable progress in strengthening the foundations of peace and freedom, abroad and at home.

We have taken important steps in securing the North Atlantic community against aggression. We have continued our successful support of European recovery. We have returned to our established policy of expanding international trade through reciprocal agreement. We have strengthened our support of the United Nations.

While great problems still confront us, the greatest danger has receded—the possibility which faced us 3 years ago that most of Europe and the Mediterranean area might collapse under totalitarian pressure. Today, the free peoples of the world have new vigor and new hope for the cause of peace. [Applause.]

In our domestic affairs, we have made notable advances toward broader opportunity and a better life for all our citizens.

We have met and reversed the first significant downturn in economic activity since the war. In accomplishing this, Government programs for maintaining employment and purchasing power have been of tremendous benefit. As the result of these programs, and the wisdom and good judgment of our businessmen and workers, major readjustments have been made without widespread suffering.

During the past year, we have also made a good start in providing housing for low-income groups; we have raised minimum wages; we have gone forward with the development of our natural resources; we have given greater assurance of stability to the farmer; and we have improved the organization and efficiency of our Government.

Today, by the grace of God, we stand a free and prosperous Nation with greater possibilities for the future than any people have ever had before in the history of the world. [Applause.]

We are now, in this year of 1950, nearing the midpoint of the twentieth century.

The first half of this century will be known as the most turbulent and eventful period in recorded history. The swift pace of events promises to make the next 50 years decisive in the history of man on this planet.

The scientific and industrial revolution which began two centuries ago has, in the last 50 years, caught up the peoples of the globe in a common destiny. Two world-shattering wars have proved that no corner of the earth can be isolated from the affairs of mankind. [Applause.]

The human race has reached a turning point. Man has opened the secrets of nature and mastered new powers. If he uses them wisely, he can reach new heights of civilization. If he uses them foolishly, they may destroy him.

Man must create the moral and legal framework for the world which will insure that his new powers are used for good and not for evil. [Applause.] In shaping the outcome, the people of the United States will play a leading role.

Among all the great changes that have occurred in the last 50 years, none is more important than the change in the position of the United States in world affairs. Fifty years ago, we were a country devoted largely to our own internal affairs. Our industry was growing, and we had new interests in the Far East and in the Caribbean, but we were primarily concerned with the development of vast areas of our own continental territory.

Today our population has doubled. Our national production has risen from about $50,000,000,000, in terms of today's prices, to the staggering figure of $255,000,000,000 a year. We have a more productive economic system and a greater industrial potential than any other nation on the globe. Our standard of living is an inspiration for all other peoples. Even the slightest changes in our economic and social life have their effect on other countries all around the world.

Our tremendous strength has brought with it tremendous responsibilities. We have moved from the outer edge to the center of world affairs. Other nations look to us for a wise exercise of our economic and military strength, and for vigorous support of the ideals of representative government and a free society. We will not fail them.

Our objective in the world is peace. Our country has joined with others in the task of achieving peace. We know now that this is not an easy task, or a short one. But we are determined to see it through. Both of our great political parties are committed to working together—and I am sure they will continue to work together—to achieve this end. We are prepared to devote our energy and our resources to this task, because we know that our own security and the future of mankind are at stake.

And right here I want to say that no one appreciates more than I the bipartisan cooperation in foreign affairs which has been enjoyed by this administration. [Applause.]

Our success in working with other nations to achieve peace depends largely on what we do at home. We must preserve our national strength. Strength is not simply a matter of arms and force. It is a matter of economic growth, and social health, and vigorous institutions, public and private. We can achieve peace only if we maintain our productive energy, our democratic institutions, and our firm belief in individual freedom.

Our surest guide in the days that lie ahead will be the spirit in which this great Republic was founded. We must make our decisions in the conviction that all men are created equal, that they are equally entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that the duty of government is to serve these ends.

This country of ours has experienced many blessings, but none greater than its dedication to these principles. At every point in our history, these ideals have served to correct our failures and shortcomings, to spur us on to greater efforts, and to keep clearly before us the primary purpose of our existence as a nation. They have enshrined for us, as a principle of government, the moral imperative to do justice, and the divine command to men to love one another.

These principles give meaning to all that we do.

In foreign policy, they mean that we can never be tolerant of oppression or tyranny. [Applause.] They mean that we must throw our weight on the side of greater freedom and a better life for all peoples. These principles confirm us in carrying out the specific programs for peace which we have already begun.

We shall continue to give our wholehearted support to the United Nations. [Applause.] We believe that this organization can ultimately provide the framework of international law and morality without which mankind cannot survive. It has already set up new standards for the conduct of nations in the Declaration of Human Rights and the Convention on Genocide. It is moving ahead to give meaning to the concept of world brotherhood through a wide variety of cultural, economic, and technical activities.

The events of the past year again showed the value of the United Nations in bringing about the peaceful adjustment of tense international controversies. In Indonesia and in Palestine, the efforts of the United Nations have put a stop to bloodshed and paved the way to peaceful settlements.

We are working toward the time when the United Nations will control weapons of mass destruction and will have the forces to preserve international law and order. While the world remains unsettled, however, and as long as our own security and the security of the free world require, we will maintain a strong and well-balanced defense organization.

[Applause.] The selective service system is an essential part of our defense plans, and it must be continued.

Under the principles of the United Nations Charter, we must continue to share in the common defense of free nations against aggression. At the last session, this Congress laid the basis for this joint effort. We now must put into effect the common defense plans that are being worked out.

We shall continue our efforts for world economic recovery, because world prosperity is the only sure foundation for permanent peace.

As an immediate means to this end, we must continue our support of the European recovery program. [Applause.] This program has achieved great success in the first 2 years of operation, but it has not yet been completed. If we were to stop this program now, or cripple it, just because it is succeeding, we should be doing exactly what the enemies of democracy want us to do. We should be just as foolish as a man who, for reasons of false economy, failed to put a roof on his house after building the foundation and the walls.

World prosperity also requires that we do all we can to expand world trade. As a major step in this direction, we should promptly join the International Trade Organization. The purpose of this organization, which the United States has been foremost in creating, is to establish a code of fair practice, and an international authority for adjusting differences in international commercial relations. It is an effort to prevent the kind of anarchy and irresponsibility in world trade which did so much to bring about the world depression in the 1930's.

An expanding world economy requires the improvement of living standards and the development of resources in areas where human poverty and misery now prevail. Without such improvement, the recovery of Europe and the future of our own economy will not be secure. I urge that the Congress adopt the legislation now before it to provide for increasing the flow of technical assistance and capital investment to underdeveloped regions. [Applause.]

It is more essential now than ever, if the ideals of freedom and representative government are to prevail in these areas, and particularly in the Far East, that their people experience, in their own lives, the benefits of scientific and economic advances. This program will require the movement of large amounts of capital from the industrial nations, and particularly from the United States, to productive uses in the underdeveloped areas of the world. Recent world events make prompt action imperative.

This program is in the interest of all peoples—and it has nothing in common with either the old imperialism of the last century or the new imperialism of the Communists.

Our aim for a peaceful, democratic world of free peoples will be achieved in the long run, not by force of arms, but by an appeal to the minds and hearts of men. If the peace policy of the democratic nations is to be successful, they must demonstrate that the benefits of their way of life can be increased and extended to all nations and all races. [Applause.]

In the world today, we are confronted with the danger that the rising demand of people everywhere for freedom and a better life may be corrupted and betrayed by the false promises of communism. In its ruthless struggle for power, communism seizes upon our imperfections, and takes advantage of the delays and set-backs which the democratic nations experience in their effort to secure a better life for their citizens. This challenge to us is more than a military challenge. It is a challenge to the honesty of our profession of the democratic faith; it is a challenge to the efficiency and stability of our economic system; it is a challenge to our willingness to work with other peoples for world peace and world prosperity.

For my part, I welcome the challenge. [Applause.] I believe that our country, at this crucial point in world history, will meet that challenge successfully. I believe that, in cooperation with the other free nations of the world, we shall extend the full benefits of the democratic way of life to millions who do not now enjoy them, and preserve mankind from dictatorship and tyranny. [Applause.]

I believe that we shall succeed in our struggle for peace, because I have seen the success we have had in our own country in following the principles of freedom. Over the last 50 years, the ideals of liberty and equal opportunities to which our Nation is dedicated have been increasingly realized in the lives of our people.

The ideal of equal opportunity no longer means simply the opportunity which a man has to advance beyond his fellows. Some of our citizens do achieve greater success than others as a reward for individual merit and effort, and this is as it should be. At the same time, our country must be more than a land of opportunity for a select few. It must be a land of opportunity for all of us. In such a land, all can grow and prosper together.

The simple truth that we can all go forward together is often questioned by selfish or short-sighted persons. It is strange that this is so, for this proposition is so clearly demonstrated by our national history. During the last 50 years, for example, our Nation has grown enormously in material well-being. This growth has come about, not by concentrating the benefits of our progress in the hands of a few, but by increasing the wealth of the great body of our citizens.

In the last 50 years the income of the average family has increased so greatly that its buying power has doubled. The average hours of work have declined from 60 to 40 a week, while the hourly production of the average worker has tripled. Average wages, allowing for price changes, have increased from about 45 cents an hour to $1.40 an hour.

We have accomplished what to earlier ages of mankind would have been a miracle—we work shorter hours, we produce more, and we live better.

Increasing freedom from poverty and drudgery has given a fuller meaning to American life. Our people are better educated; we have more opportunities for travel and recreation and enjoyment of the arts. We enjoy more personal liberty in the United States today than ever before.

If we can continue in the spirit of cooperative adventure which has marked the recent years of our progress, we can expect further scientific advances, further increases in our standard of living, and a still wider enjoyment of democratic freedom.

No one, of course, can foretell the future exactly. However, if we assume that we shall grow as fast in the future as we have grown in the past, we can get a good idea of how much our country should grow over the next 50 years.

At present our total national production is $255,000,000,000 a year. Our working population and our output per worker are increasing. If our productive power continues to increase at the same rate as it has increased for the past 50 years, our total national production 50 years from now will be nearly four times as much as it is today. Allowing for the expected growth in population, this would mean that the real income of the average family in the year A. D. 2000 would be about three times what it is today.

These are estimates of what we can do in the future, but we can reach these heights only if we follow the right policies. We have learned by bitter experience that progress is not automatic—that wrong policies lead to depression and disaster. We cannot achieve these gains unless we have a stable economy and avoid the catastrophes of boom and bust that have set us back in the past.

These gains cannot be achieved unless our businessmen maintain their spirit of initiative and enterprise and operate in a competitive economic system. They cannot be achieved unless our working men and women and their unions help to increase productivity and obtain for labor a fair share of the benefits of our economic system. [Applause.] They cannot be achieved unless we have a stable and prosperous agriculture. They cannot be achieved unless we conserve and develop our natural resources in the public interest. Our system will not work unless our people are healthy, well-educated, and confident of the future. It will not work unless all citizens can participate fully in our national life.

In achieving these gains, the Government has a special responsibility to help create and maintain the conditions which will permit the growth we know is possible. Foremost among these conditions is the need for a fair distribution of our increasing prosperity among all the great groups of our population who help to bring it about—business, labor, and agriculture.

Businessmen must continue to have the incentives necessary for investment and for the development of new lines of enterprise. In the future growth of this country lie possibilities for hundreds of thousands of new and independent businesses. As our national production increases, as it doubles and redoubles in the next 50 years, the number of independent and competing enterprises should also increase. If the number does not increase, our constantly

growing economy will fall under the control of a few dominant economic groups whose powers will be so great that they will be a challenge to democratic institutions.

To avoid this danger, we must curb monopoly and provide aids to independent business so that it may have the credit and capital to compete in a system of free enterprise. I recommend that the Congress complete action at this session on the pending bill to close the loopholes in the Clayton Act which now permit monopolistic mergers. I also hope before this session is over to transmit to the Congress a series of proposals to strengthen the antimonopoly laws, to assist small business, and to encourage the growth of new enterprises. [Applause.]

In the case of labor, free collective bargaining must be protected and encouraged. Collective bargaining is not only a fundamental economic freedom for labor. It is also a strengthening and stabilizing influence for our whole economy.

The Federal statute now governing labor relations is punitive in purpose and one-sided in operation. This statute is, and always has been, inconsistent with the practice of true and effective collective bargaining. It should be repealed and replaced by a law that is fair to all and in harmony with our democratic ideals. [Applause.]

A full understanding of the problems of modern labor relations is of such importance that I recommend the establishment of a Labor Extension Service to encourage educational activities in this field.

Another essential for our continued growth is a stable and prosperous agriculture. For many years we have been building a program to give the farmer a reasonable measure of protection against the special hazards to which he is exposed. That program was improved at the last session of the Congress. However, our farm legislation is still not adequate.

Although the Congress has properly declared as a matter of national policy that safeguards must be maintained against slumps in farm prices, there are serious shortcomings in the methods now available for carrying out this policy. Mandatory price supports should be provided for the commodities not now covered which are major sources of farm income.

Moreover, we should provide a method of supporting farm income at fair levels which will, at the same time, avoid piling up unmanageable surpluses and allow consumers to obtain the full benefit of our abundant agricultural production. A system of production payments gives the greatest promise of accomplishing this purpose. I recommend that the use of such a system be authorized. [Applause.]

One of the most important factors in our continued growth is the construction of more good, up-to-date housing. In a country such as ours, there is no reason why decent homes should not be within the reach of all. With the help of various Government programs, we have made great progress in the last few years in increasing the number of homes.

Despite this increase, there is still an acute shortage of housing for the lower- and middle-income groups, especially in large metropolitan areas. We have laid the ground work for relieving the plight of lower-income families in the Housing Act of 1949. To aid middle-income families, I recommend that the Congress enact new legislation authorizing a vigorous program to help cooperatives and other nonprofit groups build housing which these families can afford. [Applause.]

Rent control has done a great deal to prevent the housing shortage from having had worse effects during this period of postwar adjustment. Rent control is still necessary to prevent widespread hardship and sharp curtailment of the buying power of millions of consumers in metropolitan areas. I recommend, therefore, that rent control be continued for another year. [Applause.]

If we are to achieve a better life for all, the natural resources of the country must be regarded as a public trust. We must use our precious assets of soil, water, forest, and grassland in such a way that they become constantly more productive and more valuable. Government investment in the conservation and development of our resources is necessary to the future economic expansion of the country.

We need to enlarge the production and transmission of public power. This is true not only in those regions which have already received great benefits from Federal power projects, but also in regions such as New England where the benefits of large-scale public power development have not yet been experienced [Applause].

In our hydroelectric and irrigation undertakings, as well as in our other resource programs, we must continue policies to assure that their benefits will be spread among the many and not restricted to a favored few.

Important resource legislation which should be passed at this session includes the authorization of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project [applause], and the establishment of the Columbia Valley Administration.

Through wise Government policies and Government expenditures for the conservation and development of our natural resources, we can be sure of transmitting to our children and our children's children a country far richer and more productive than the one we know today.

The value of our natural resources is constantly being increased by the progress of science. Research is finding new ways of using such natural assets as minerals, sea water, and plant life. In the peaceful development of atomic energy, particularly, we stand on the threshold of new wonders. The first experimental machines for producing useful power from atomic energy are now under construction. We have made only the first beginnings in this field, but in the perspective of history they may loom larger than the first airplane, or even the first tools that started man on the road to civilization.

To take full advantage of the increasing possibilities of nature, we must equip ourselves with increasing knowledge. Government has a responsibility to see that our country maintains its position in the advance of science. As a step toward this end, the Congress should complete action on the measure to create a National Science Foundation. [Applause.]

Another duty of the Government is to promote the economic security, the health, and the education of its citizens. By so doing, we strengthen both our economy and the structure of our society. In a nation as rich as ours, all citizens should be able to live in decency and health.

Our social-security system should be developed into the main reliance of our people for basic protection against the economic hazards of old age, unemployment, and illness. I earnestly hope that the Congress will complete action at this session on legislation to increase the benefits and extend the coverage of old-age and survivors insurance. [Applause.] The widespread movement to provide pensions in private industry dramatizes the need for improvements in the public-insurance system.

I also urge that the Congress strengthen our unemployment-compensation law to meet present-day needs more adequately. The economic downturn of the past year was the first real test that our system of unemployment insurance has had to meet. That test has proved the wisdom of the system, but it has also made strikingly apparent the need for improving its operation and increasing its coverage and its benefits. [Applause.]

In the field of health, there are immense opportunities to extend to more of our people the benefits of the amazing advances in medical science. We have made a good beginning in expanding our hospitals, but we must go on to remedy the shortages of doctors, nurses, and public-health services, and to establish a system of medical insurance which will enable all Americans to afford good medical care. [Applause.]

We must take immediate steps to strengthen our educational system. In many parts of our country, young people are being handicapped for life because of a poor education. The rapidly increasing number of children of school age, coupled with the shortage of qualified teachers, makes this problem more critical each year. I believe that the Congress should no longer delay in providing Federal assistance to the States so that they can maintain adequate schools. [Applause.]

As we go forward in achieving greater economic security and greater opportunity for all our people, we should make every effort to extend the benefits of our democratic institutions to every citizen. The religious ideals which we profess, and the heritage of freedom which we have received from the past, clearly place that duty upon us. I again urge the Congress to enact the civil rights proposals I made in February 1948. [Applause.] These are proposals for the enactment of Federal statutes which will protect all our people in the exercise of their

democratic rights and their search for economic opportunity, grant statehood to Alaska and Hawaii, provide a greater measure of self-government for our island possessions, and accord home rule to the District of Columbia. Some of those proposals have been before the Congress for a long time. Those who oppose them, as well as those who favor them, should recognize that it is the duty of the elected representatives of the people to let these proposals come to a vote. [Applause.]

Our democratic ideals, as well as our own best interests, require that we do our fair share in providing homes for the unfortunate victims of war and tyranny. In so doing, we shall add strength to our democracy through the abilities and skills which these men and women will bring here. I urge the prompt enactment by the Congress of the legislation now before it to extend and broaden the existing displaced persons law and remove its discriminatory features. [Applause.]

The measures I am recommending to the Congress concerning both our foreign and our domestic policies represent a carefully considered program to meet our national needs. It is a program which necessarily requires large expenditures of funds. More than 70 percent of the Government's expenditures are required to meet the costs of past wars and to work for world peace. This is the dominant factor in our fiscal policy. At the same time, the Government must make substantial expenditures which are necessary to the growth and expansion of the domestic economy.

At present, largely because of the ill-considered tax reduction of the Eightieth Congress, the Government is not receiving enough revenue to meet its necessary expenditures.

To meet this situation, I am proposing that Federal expenditures be held to the lowest levels consistent with our international requirements [applause] and the essential needs of economic growth and the well-being of our people.

I think I had better read that over; you interrupted me. To meet this situation, I am proposing that Federal expenditures be held to the lowest levels consistent with our international requirements and the essential needs of economic growth and the well-being of our people. Do not forget that last part. [Applause.]

At the same time, we must guard against the folly of attempting budget slashes which would impair our prospects for peace or cripple the programs essential to our national strength. [Applause.]

The budget recommendations I shall shortly transmit to the Congress show that we can expect a substantial improvement in our fiscal position over the next few years, as the cost of some of the extraordinary postwar programs declines, and as Government revenue rises as a result of growth in employment and national income. To further improve our fiscal outlook, we should make some changes in our tax system which will reduce present inequities, stimulate business activity, and yield a moderate amount of additional revenue. [Applause.] I expect to transmit specific recommendations to the Congress on this subject at an early date.

The fiscal policy I am recommending is the quickest and safest way of achieving a balanced budget.

As we move forward into the second half of the twentieth century we must always bear in mind the central purpose of our national life. We do not seek material prosperity for ourselves because we love luxury. We do not aid other nations because we wish to increase our power. We have not devised programs for the security and well-being of our people because we are afraid or unwilling to take risks. This is not the meaning of our past history or our present course.

We work for a better life for all, so that all men may put to good use the great gifts with which they have been endowed by their Creator. We seek to establish those material conditions of life in which, without exception, men may live in dignity, perform useful work, serve their communities, and worship God as they see fit. [Applause.]

These may seem simple goals, but they are not little ones. They are worth a great deal more than all the empires and conquests of history. They are not to be achieved by military aggression or political fanaticism. They are to be achieved by humbler means—by hard work, by a spirit of self-restraint in our dealings with one another, and by a deep devotion to the principles of justice and equality.

It should make us truly thankful, as we look back to the beginnings of this country, that we have come so far along the road to a better life for all. It should make us humble to think, as we look ahead, how much farther we have to go to accomplish at home and abroad the objectives that were set out for us at the founding of this Nation.

As we approach the halfway mark in the twentieth century we should ask for continued strength and guidance from that Almighty Power who has placed before us such great opportunities for the good of mankind in the years to come. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m. the President, accompanied by the Committee of Escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The Members of the President's Cabinet.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess until 1:55 p. m.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1:55 o'clock p. m.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Friday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, January 6, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 6596. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 6597. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to permit the expeditious naturalization of adopted children irrespective of place of adoption; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 6598. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 6599. A bill to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 6600. A bill to provide automatic annual pay increases for postmasters; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 6601. A bill to make certain provisions for the regulation of steam vessels inapplicable to vessels operated exclusively for the training of officers and seamen for the United States merchant marine or the United States Navy; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 6602. A bill to implement the commitments of the United States Government under the provisions of Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress, and to make sure that such commitments are recognized in the allocation of cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 6603. A bill to provide that certain service performed in the custodial service and in the mail-equipment shops of the Post Office Department shall be credited toward promotion to the meritorius and longevity

grades established for the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 6604. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 6605. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to undertake a project under the Federal Airport Act for the development and improvement of Ontario International Airport at Ontario, Calif., during the fiscal year 1950; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 6606. A bill to provide that the district judge for the eastern, middle, and western districts of Pennsylvania shall become a district judge for the middle district of Pennsylvania alone when the first vacancy occurs in that district; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6607. A bill to provide for the modification or cancellation of certain free licenses granted to the Government by private holders of patents and rights thereunder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. J. Res. 388. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1950, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. J. Res. 389. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1950, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. J. Res. 390. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. Res. 413. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of American military government in Germany and the civilian administration which succeeded it; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. Res. 414. Resolution providing for the employment of one additional laborer (cloakroom), Doorkeeper's department; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLTON of Maryland:

H. R. 6608. A bill for the relief of Victoria Rolando; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 6609. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Minnie Macbeth Lent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 6610. A bill for the relief of Jaime Riel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 6611. A bill for the relief of Harley Eugene Squire; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 6612. A bill for the relief of Maximilian Otto Ricker-Huetter and Mrs. Eugenia Ricker-Huetter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6613. A bill for the relief of Solomon Jacob and Mrs. Helen Jacob; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 6614. A bill for the relief of Inger Werner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 6615. A bill for the relief of Dr. Gerzson Warga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1562. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of citizens of La Fayette, Ind., opposing recognition by the United States of the Communist regime in China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1563. Also, petition of citizens of Brook, Ind., favoring legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and to prohibit the broadcasting of such advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1564. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of members of the congregation of the First Christian Church, Pratt, Kans., requesting the passage of a bill to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through the newspapers and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1565. Also, petition of members of the congregation of the First Christian Church, Pratt, Kans., requesting the passage of a bill to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through the newspapers and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1566. Also, petition of members of the congregation of the First Christian Church, Pratt, Kans., requesting the passage of a bill to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through the newspapers and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1567. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of sundry citizens of Milton, Wis., urging support of a bill to prohibit alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio and also the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1568. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Evansville, Wis., urging the passage of a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1569. Also, petition of the Delavan Women's Club, of Delavan, Wis., protesting against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1570. Also, petition of the Saturday Club, of Beloit, Wis., unanimously opposing compulsory health education or national bureaucratic control of medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1571. Also, petition of the Federated Woman's Club, of Union Grove, Wis., urging favorable consideration of the world federation resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1572. Also, resolution of the County Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County, Wis., providing that Congress be requested to establish the proposed Academy of the Air for the training of air-force personnel at General Mitchell Field, located at the birthplace of Gen. William Mitchell, the military pioneer and prophet of aviation as a dominant military weapon; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1573. By Mr. TAYLOR: Resolution of the City Council of the City of Mechanicville, N. Y., recommending and favoring the establishment of a proposed National Air Force Academy at the Ballston Spa Airport, Saratoga County, N. Y.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 5, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace and glory, so teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom. In a confused day keep our minds clear and clean and uncluttered by prejudice. In a clamorous day filled with angry accents of hatred and falsehood give us ears to hear the voices that speak of justice and freedom and world brotherhood. In a mad and sad day grant us sanity of mind and spirit, purity of heart, and a glad hope which sees a shining ray far down the future's broadening way. And Thine shall be the kingdom and the power and the glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. GILLETTE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 4, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

HARRY F. BYRD, a Senator from the State of Virginia, appeared in his seat today.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, the Chair designates the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] to read Washington's Farewell Address to the Senate on February 22 next.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. GILLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Downey	Hayden
Anderson	Dworshak	Hendrickson
Benton	Eastland	Hickenlooper
Brewster	Ecton	Hill
Bricker	Ellender	Hoey
Butler	Ferguson	Holland
Byrd	Frear	Humphrey
Chapman	Fulbright	Hunt
Connally	George	Ives
Cordon	Gillette	Jenner
Darby	Graham	Johnson, Tex.
Donnell	Green	Johnston, S. C.
Douglas	Gurney	Kefauver

Kem	McMahon	Schoeppel
Kerr	Magnuson	Smith, N. J.
Kilgore	Malone	Sparkman
Knowland	Maybank	Stennis
Langer	Millikin	Taft
Leahy	Morse	Taylor
Lehman	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Lodge	Myers	Thye
Long	Neely	Tobey
Lucas	O'Conor	Vandenberg
McCarran	O'Mahoney	Watkins
McCarthy	Pepper	Wherry
McClellan	Robertson	Wiley
McFarland	Russell	Williams
McKellar	Saltonstall	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of a death in his family.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order entered yesterday, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is entitled to the floor. He is, therefore, recognized.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of introducing a bill?

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to yield to the Senator from Alabama and to other Senators who wish to introduce bills and present routine matters for the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Iowa has yielded for the purpose of transaction of routine business. It will not be necessary for individual Senators to ask the Senator from Iowa to yield for such purpose.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the year 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

RETURN OF CERTAIN LAND TO PUBLIC DOMAIN

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to return to the public domain a tract of land known as the Battle Mountain Sanitarium Reserve, South Dakota (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to repeal the excise tax on admission tickets to amusements; to the Committee on Finance.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the States of Georgia, Illinois, Pennsylvania, and New York, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 2181, providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, relating to amendments of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by the Sixth District Dental Society of Montana, and the Seattle (Wash.) District Dental Society, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING—PETITION

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from Mrs. C. J. Schjoll, of Monmouth, Oreg., transmitting a petition signed by sundry citizens of that city, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce. I present the petition for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures, as follows:

Senator GUY CORDON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We respectfully request that you use your influence and vote for the passage of S. 1847, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio.

The most pernicious effect of this advertising is the constant invitation and enticement to drink. The American people spent $8,770,000,000 for alcoholic beverages in 1946 as compared with $3,700,000,000 in 1942. During the same period there was a corresponding increase each year in crime. There is every reason why this expenditure should not be increased, but decreased.

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM OF ELECTRONIC RESEARCH—RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF ROME, N. Y.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Rome, N. Y., relating to a long-range program of electronic research.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the United States Government has made plans as part of a long-range program of electronic research to move to the Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N. Y., the Watson Laboratories, Red Bank, N. J.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Rome does hereby approve of such a program and pledges the cooperation of said city of Rome to said air base as it may be from time to time enlarged; and be it further

Resolved, That the common council does hereby request the Congress of the United States and the United States Military Establishment, in the interest of economy and national defense, to effectuate the transfer of the said Watson Laboratories as soon as possible; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be, and he hereby is, directed to send a copy of this resolution to the following: Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense; W. Stuart Symington, Secretary of the Air Force; Congressman John C. Davies; and Senator Irving M. Ives, and Hon. Herbert Lehman.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT—RESOLUTION OF BUFFALO (N. Y.) SEWER AUTHORITY

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Buffalo (N. Y.) Sewer Authority, favoring an amendment of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, relating to controlling pollution of interstate and boundary waters.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Niagara River has been described by the International Joint Commission as one of the most seriously polluted streams in the country and as such is now being surveyed by the United States Public Health Service under orders of said Commission; and

Whereas Niagara frontier communities and the Buffalo Sewer Authority are faced with the public obligation to take such actions as may serve to reduce the pollution reaching the Niagara River, and in connection therewith the Buffalo Sewer Authority has developed plans for reducing the effect of industrial wastes in the Buffalo River tributary to the Niagara River; and

Whereas the financial needs to construct the works essential to pollution abatement are of such magnitude as to impose a terrific burden upon and even invite financial crisis for the interested public bodies of this community: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Buffalo Sewer Authority, created by act of the New York State Legislature, petitions the Congress of the United States to amend Federal Water Pollution Control Act, Public Law No. 845, controlling pollution of interstate and boundary waters, and that the Congress of the United States appropriate such sums as the act and amendments would require so that funds will be available to Niagara frontier communities and the Buffalo Sewer Authority under the following provisions:

1. Change the section of the act which at present provides for loans up to $250,000 to cities, villages, and other political units to allow loans of at least $5,000,000 at an interest rate of 1 percent.

2. Change the provisions of the act to include under the term "treatment works" all works directly contributing to the abatement of an existing pollution problem in interstate or boundary waters; and be it further

Resolved, That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation be instructed to loan money at the rate of 1 percent for the above purpose; and be it further

Resolved, That the Representatives of Congress from this community and the United States Senators from the State of New York be presented with copies of this resolution and respectfully requested to see that the same receives consideration by the Congress.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 2781. A bill relating to cotton acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2782. A bill to provide for the promotion of carriers in the rural-delivery service in recognition of longevity of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 2783. A bill for the relief of the Reverend Aron Elek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. MARTIN, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 2784. A bill to provide for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., in accordance with the plan approved by the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 2785. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the acceptance by Lt. Comdr. Henry L. De Give of appointment as honorary Belgian consul at Atlanta, Ga.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. O'CONOR (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 2786. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2787. A bill to provide for the coinage of a 7½-cent piece; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 2788. A bill authorizing an appropriation for reprinting the 1949 Department of Agriculture Yearbook; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 2789. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gloria Pearl Crockett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 2790. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jen Yen Tchou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CONSERVATION AND INCREASE OF WATER RESOURCES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOWNEY (for himself, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. MCFARLAND) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1300) to conserve and increase the Nation's water resources, for promotion of irrigation in arid areas, by research and demonstration of practical means of producing, from sea or other saline waters, water suitable for beneficial consumptive use, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR CLYDE M. REED, OF KANSAS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 201), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed to arrange for and attend the funeral of Hon. Clyde M. Reed, late a Senator from the State of Kansas, on vouchers to be approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

INVESTIGATION OF INTERSTATE GAMBLING AND RACKETEERING ACTIVITIES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I submit a resolution providing for an investigation of interstate gambling and racketeering activities, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me in explanation thereof be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 202) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of interstate gambling and racketeering activities and of the manner in which the facilities of interstate commerce are made a vehicle of organized crime. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER ON RESOLUTION TO INVESTIGATE INTERSTATE GAMBLING AND RACKETEERING

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, today I am filing a resolution to authorize and direct the Committee on the Judiciary to make a full investigation of interstate gambling and to make recommendations for such legislation as may be deemed necessary.

Responsible and nationally known reporters and magazine writers have for the past several years been writing of a national crime syndicate which they allege is slowly but surely through corruption gaining control of, or improper influence in, many cities throughout the United States.

On September 14, 1949, Mayor deLesseps S. Morrison, as president of the American Municipal Association, and speaking for that association, asked the Federal Government to investigate the encroachment by organized national racketeers on municipal governments throughout the United States with the intent to control their law-enforcement agencies.

The Chicago and California crime commissions in 1949 reported the insidious influence wielded by this crime syndicate through corruption of public officials and its political and financial control.

Also, Mr. President, the mayors of several large cities, such as Los Angeles, New Orleans, and Portland, and many others, have complained in the past year of attempts being made by national crime syndicates to control and corrupt the local political affairs of their respective cities, and that they do not have adequate means to cope with this well-organized and powerful criminal organization, and have asked the Federal Government for assistance in coping with this alleged criminal aggression.

There appears to be no adequate Federal statutes which can be invoked against the activities of this organized syndicate. The resolution I am filing today would authorize and direct the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate to make investigation to determine whether there is an organized syndicate operating in interstate commerce which is menacing the independence of free municipal governments, for the benefit of the criminal activities of the syndicate, and determine and report to the Senate their findings on whether the States and municipalities can, without Federal assistance, adequately cope with this organized crime movement. The committee would also be directed to investigate the jurisdiction of the Federal Government over the activities of any criminal syndicate, and make recommendations for any necessary legislation.

The resolution is as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of interstate gambling and racketeering activities and of the manner in which the facilities of interstate commerce are made a vehicle of organized crime. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

"SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund

of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee."

ONE JOB FOR 1950—EDITORIAL FROM THE CLEVELAND PLAIN DEALER

[Mr. SCHOEPPEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "One Job for 1950," published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of January 1, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS AT HAVANA, ILL.

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator LUCAS at Havana, Ill., on December 27, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL POWER POLICY—RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a pamphlet entitled "Federal Power Policy," issued by the American Public Power Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

CAPT. JOHN D. CROMMELIN—TRIBUTE BY WALTER WINCHELL

[Mr. MCCARTHY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article paying tribute to Capt. John D. Crommelin, by Walter Winchell, which appears in the Appendix.]

AID TO PERSONS IN THE UNITED STATES DESIROUS OF MIGRATING TO LIBERIA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD Senate bill 1880, to provide aid to persons in the United States desirous of migrating to the Republic of Liberia, and for other purposes, together with a letter dated July 5, 1949, from Ernest A. Gross, Assistant Secretary of State, to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1880) introduced by Mr. LANGER on May 18, 1949, and the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill to provide aid to persons in the United States desirous of migrating to the Republic of Liberia, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to cooperate with the Republic of Liberia in furthering the interests and welfare of large numbers of persons who are residing in the United States and who desire to emigrate to and settle permanently in the Republic of Liberia. It is the intent of Congress that the benefits and provisions of this act shall apply to citizens of the United States, and aliens who are lawful residents in the United States, who may qualify as eligible for citizenship in the Republic of Liberia, and who by character, physical fitness, and climatic adaptability may qualify as migrants to be permanently settled in the Republic of Liberia, and who shall have voluntarily expressed a desire to become migrants under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. The President is hereby authorized and directed to enter into negotiations with the Government of the Republic of Liberia for the purpose of obtaining the consent of that country to the migration and permanent settlement of individuals assisted in accordance with the provisions of this act. The President shall further negotiate with the Government of the Republic of Liberia to secure reasonable guaranties that safety of life and limb and freedom of action for the migrants while under Liberian rule will be assured; that the Government of the Republic of Liberia will earnestly prohibit and punish any act or acts of intolerance or persecution, either political, social, or economic, of the migrants because of their condition as migrants; and that the migrants while aliens in the Republic of Liberia shall enjoy all the privileges and immunities of any other aliens resident in the Republic of Liberia, and that, after naturalization, they shall enjoy all the privileges and immunities of other citizens of the Republic of Liberia. The provisions of this section shall be a condition precedent to other provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. There is hereby created a commission to be known as the Liberian Migration Commission, consisting of three members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice of the Senate, for a term ending June 30, 1954, and one member of the Commission shall be designated by him as Chairman. Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary at the rate of $10,000 per annum. The Commission may employ necessary personnel, including technicians, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and make provision for necessary supplies, facilities, and services to carry out the provisions and accomplish the purposes of this act. It shall be the duty of the Commission to formulate and issue regulations, necessary under the provisions of this act, and in compliance therewith, for the migration of eligible persons to the Republic of Liberia. It shall also be the duty of the Commission to report on February 1, 1950, and semiannually thereafter to the President and to the Congress on the situation regarding the migration of eligible persons to Liberia. At the end of its term the Commission shall make a final report to the President and to the Congress.

SEC. 4. (a) Under such regulations as the Commission may prescribe, any citizen of the United States, and any alien who is a lawful resident of the United States; who is in good physical condition and is capable by reason of his training, adaptability, intelligence, and ambition of becoming a self-sustaining settler in the Republic of Liberia, and who desires to become a migrant and settler in such country, may file an application on blanks prepared and supplied by the Commission requesting assistance in migrating to and permanently settling in the Republic of Liberia. Such application shall furnish such information as will enable the Commission to properly assess and evaluate the qualifications of the applicant. If the applicant is a householder, he may make application for all the members of his household as a unit. The application of a person responsible for the support and maintenance of children under the age of 16 years shall not be favorably acted upon unless such children are to accompany such applicant on his migration, or unless he has made adequate provision for their support and maintenance pending their transfer to join the applicant in the Republic of Liberia.

(b) The following persons shall not be eligible for migration under this act: Escaped convicts or fugitives from justice, persons under indictment and awaiting trial, persons who by reason of past criminal offenses are poor risks of becoming law-abiding and self-sustaining settlers in the Republic of Liberia, persons applying for migration for the purpose of defrauding creditors, and such other persons as the Commission may reasonably believe are likely to become public charges or social liabilities in the Republic of Liberia or who are otherwise unacceptable to the Government of the Republic of Liberia. The findings of the Commission with respect to the eligibility of any person for migration under this act shall be final.

SEC. 5. (a) The Commission is authorized to lease, furnish, and equip such office space in the District of Columbia and elsewhere as it may deem necessary; order goods and services from private individuals or concerns in the ordinary course of trade; requisition any department, board, or agency of the United States for any available goods, services, or facilities which may be necessary in carrying out the provisions of this act, without affecting the proper operation of such department, board, or agency; provide transportation by land and by sea to qualified applicants migrating under the provisions of this act, and to their households, from the initial point of departure in the United States to the point of settlement in the Republic of Liberia, and to contract with land and maritime transportation companies for such purposes to the extent necessary by reason of the fact that such transportation facilities are not available from the Government of the United States; and provide adequate subsistence, medical care, and other necessities of life for the migrants during transit and until finally settled at the point of settlement.

(b) With the consent of the Government of the Republic of Liberia, the Commission is authorized to select or approve suitable sites for settlement of migrants in the Republic of Liberia; to establish and operate reception and disembarkation centers, supply depots, commissaries, temporary housing at points of settlement, dispensaries, pharmacies, and first-aid stations, and such other buildings and facilities as are necessary and proper to safeguard the health of the migrants and to carry out the purposes of this act, together with all necessary equipment and personnel.

(c) The Commission is further authorized, within the limits of such funds as may be appropriated to it, to supply tools, equipment, materials, and technical assistance and advice, to the migrants when necessary to assist them in becoming self-sustaining members of their communities; to make loans to individuals, partnerships, or corporations composed of migrants, in meritorious cases, not to exceed $1,000 in any case, on reasonably liberal terms and conditions, as initial capital for business and industrial enterprises in Liberia; and to cooperate with and render technical and other assistance to the Government of the Republic of Liberia, or its responsible agencies, in the establishment of towns and rural districts, improvement of conditions of public sanitation, construction of public works and facilities, reclamation of land, development and improvement of utilities, schools, hospitals, and transportation facilities, encouragement of business enterprise and capital investments in the Republic of Liberia, and the construction, development, or encouragement of such other public works or projects as will tend to raise the standard of living and increase the productivity of the Republic of Liberia.

SEC. 6. Such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

SEC. 7. The authority conferred by this act shall expire on June 30, 1954. This act shall become effective upon the date of its enactment.

JULY 5, 1949.

MY DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: Reference is made to a letter received from the Committee on Foreign Relations under date of May 19, 1949, requesting the views of the Department in connection with S. 1880, introduced by Senator LANGER, proposing aid to persons desirous of emigrating to the Republic of Liberia.

The bill, designed as it is to encourage the movement of large numbers of persons

to Liberia, would seem to be contrary to the existing immigration policy of the Liberian Government of limiting entry to selected persons of special training or skills. This policy has been established for the very sound reason that the country is incapable of assimilating large numbers of immigrants in its present backward state of economic and social development.

In recent years, the Government of the United States has supplied, and is continuing to supply, financial and other assistance to Liberia in an effort to improve economic and social conditions in the country. Considerable progress is being made in this regard, but much more needs to be accomplished, in the opinion of the Department, before the country will be in a position to absorb any large number of immigrants.

During the past year or so, there has been a movement of small groups of West Indians to Liberia. Reports received in the Department indicate that many of these immigrants have quickly become disillusioned at conditions existing in the country and are anxious to return to their homeland or to emigrate elsewhere. It seems reasonable to assume that much the same situation would arise if large numbers of persons emigrated to Liberia under the provisions of S. 1880.

Until such time as there is a change in the existing immigration policy of the Liberian Government and a substantial improvement in the social and economic conditions in that country, the Department is of the opinion that it is highly inadvisable to encourage the movement of any large numbers of persons to Liberia as is the intent of S. 1880.

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST A. GROSS,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

Mr. LANGER. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in full in the RECORD one-hundred-and-some-odd telegrams sent to me in behalf of Senate bill 1880. The telegrams are all worded differently.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Let's love our neighbor as ourself. Cast a vote for S. 1880.

Miss RUTH SIMONS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Prayers will do its part if you will do your part. Please vote for it, bill S. 1880.

Mrs. ARZULA EVERETTE,
Hazelwood, Pa.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: To cast a vote for bill S. 1880 is playing a part of a friend.

NELLIE D. READIE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Let us reason together. Let us vote the same vote for bill S. 1880.

EARL PARRON.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We live for right, we fight for right, we vote for right. Please vote for bill S. 1880.

JAMES FLOYD KING.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Give your best and the best will come back to you. Please vote for the passage of bill S. 1880.

JAMES KEMPT.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Let us strive for our country making her the kingdom of reason and justice. Vote for bill S. 1880.

LORENNA RANDALL.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a fisherman cast his line upon the water please cast your vote for S. 1880.

Mrs. LOLA LLOYD.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Let your line spread democracy then our nets will reap an abundance of good will from nations.

MAGGIE LASTER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Liberia is an open door for a minority group. Vote for bill S. 1880.

LONNIE LASTER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You can depend on us. We believe we can depend on you. Vote for bill S. 1880.

ROSEVELT JONES.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We believe in our Senators. We know they believe in us. Vote for bill S. 1880.

CARRIE FORD.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A great work has been done, but a greater work will be done by passing S. 1880. Vote for it.

Mrs. CORA INGRAM.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Bill S. 1880 entails a good move by our country to open backward areas. Vote for it.

GEORGE INGRAM.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: To our Representative as we remembered you, now remember us to bill S. 1880.

WM. HACKETT.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: An opportunity that is made possible for settlers is the bill S. 1880. Please vote for it.

ODESSA HILL.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It takes votes to pass the bill. Please vote in favor of bill S. 1880.

THEODORE MARTIN.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our goal is a better life. Let us carry the ball to the frontiers of Liberia. Vote for bill S. 1880.

LOUISE HARTWELL,
Grindstone, Pa.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Qualified persons appeal for a vote. Please cast a vote for bill S. 1880.

HORACE WELLMAN.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our representative is a light for the people. Please turn your light on; when S. 1880 comes up vote for it.

BEATRICE HEART.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: When bill S. 1880 comes before you support and vote for it. Thanks a million.

McREE JACKSON.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Nations who have shown their greatness are the nations who have opened up new frontiers. Please vote for bill S. 1880.

RALPH JOHNSON.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please vote for bill S. 1880 when it comes before you and thanks 2,000 times.

BERTHA McMILLER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As we sow, so shall we reap. Cast a vote for bill S. 1880.

JOHN CRAMPTON.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a fellow citizen will you please cast a vote for bill S. 1880.

THOMAS BROWN.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Please let bill S. 1880 be real and not imaginative. Vote for it.
JIMMY LEE RAINES.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: A pilgrim traveler wants to go back home, please vote for bill S. 1880.
CRISTINE PATRICK.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Please give your full support to bill S. 1880. It is an answer to prayer.
GEORGE PASSMORE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: The biggest favor a Senator could do is vote for the bill S. 1880.
RAYMAN MCCORKLE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Please vote for bill S. 1880. It is an open door to new life.
JAMES MCMILLER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Thousands would appreciate the opportunity given through the passage of bill S. 1880.
HUBBARD MILLER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Since bill S. 1880 is so important please play the important part, vote for it.
RAY MATHEW.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Be a good samaritan, cast a vote for bill S. 1880.
VERA NICHOLS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: The voice of the people is the voice of God; the people say vote for bill S. 1880.
NANNIE OAKS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: The building of Liberia lies within your vote. Please vote S. 1880.
WILMER HUGHS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Where there is strength there is power. The power is in the bill, S. 1880, please vote for it.
JOEL COBB.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
If you were in my place and I were in yours, I would do you a favor. Vote for bill S. 1880.
JUDGE ANDREW SMITH.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: My heart and my prayers are backing the movement. Please back it with your vote S. 1880.
WILLIAM WHITE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Right has always won. We believe that bill S. 1880 is right from the depths of our hearts. Please vote for it.
FLOYD JACKSON.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Long may our Government prosper. Let us vote for bill S. 1880.
HENRY RILEY.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Unselfish work for others will be shown through your vote for bill S. 1880.
EARL WRIGHT.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: If we have your cooperation, bill S. 1880 will pass. Vote for it.
MRS. EVAN F. WASHINGTON.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: We are seeking to lift humanity. Please join the band. Vote for bill S. 1880.
MRS. ELLA FULLER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: We are our brother's keeper. Let's act the same. Vote for bill S. 1880.
MRS. ERNESTINE BOYD.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Let's act in fellowship. Cast your vote for bill S. 1880.
ROOSEVELT TURNER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Be practical and vote for the material things of life. Vote for bill S. 1880.
JOHNY LEE RAINES.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: When it comes to doing a favor this is your opportunity. Vote for bill S. 1880.
BENNIE WILKIN.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: To keep democracy spreading through the world our Nation must lead in opening new frontiers. It is important. Vote for bill S. 1880.
MRS. ALICE BOYD.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: What our chances are to keep our country great lies in our opening up these new frontiers. Vote for bill S. 1880.
MRS. JESSIE LOUISE BRYANT.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
What a friend we have in Jesus and what a friend we have in Washington when you vote for bill S. 1880.
MARGIE CARREER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: A thousand minds join me in asking you to vote for bill S. 1880.
MRS. ALBERTA EVANS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Please don't forget to vote for bill S. 1880.
LEE WILSON.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: I am interested in man's progress. Bill S. 1880 is progress. Vote for it.
JAMES SIMMON.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Liberia is a land opportunity for settlers of our country. Please help pass bill S. 1880.
SAM BOWDEN.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: If you do your part by casting a vote, I will do my part by praying a prayer. Please vote for bill S. 1880.
JERALDINE WHITE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Please give your full support to bill S. 1880. We opened Alaska. Now let us open Liberia.
MRS. ROSETTA FISHER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Please cast your vote for bill S. 1880. It's a favor bigger than words can tell.
Mrs. ALICE MALLETT.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: As God is the ruler of the universe so is our representative our spokesman. Give your support to bill S. 1880.
SALLIE HALL.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Please, your vote for bill S. 1880; it is a favor to one who wants to pioneer.
Mrs. ANNIE JOHNSON.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: I am doing my best; if you do your best the bill will go through.
NETTIE WEBB.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 5, 1950.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
HONORABLE SIR: It is my request for you to press passage of bill S. 1880.
Z. M. PATTON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
HONORABLE SIR: May God give you the power to enact bill S. 1880.
BENJAMIN RUSSELL.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
HONORABLE SIR: I am in favor of passage of your bill S. 1880.
STANLEY A. DAVIS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
HONORABLE SIR: I am interested in passage of bill S. 1880 early this session.
B. O. WHITE.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
HONORABLE SIR: I am encouraging passage of bill S. 1880.
WILLIAM SERRISS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
HONORABLE SIR: Please rush this magnificent bill, S. 1880, for passage.
JOSEPH THOMPSON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
HONORABLE SIR: Please do what you can to pass bill S. 1880.
ORA WARE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Life is a race we all must. A race will be won when bill S. 1880 is passed.
MARY MATHIS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Two thousand words would not show the appreciation given to the passing of bill S. 1880.
Mrs. ANN MATHEW.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Please give us a break by casting a vote for S. 1880.
W. M. MARSHALL.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: As our representative, please cast your vote for bill S 1880.
ANNIE BOWDEN.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: The uplift of humanity is to cast a vote for bill S. 1880.
ALICE SPARKMAN.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Do me a favor so I can do one for you, vote for the bill S. 1880.
AMOS MCCORKLE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: When we work for one another we are working together. Please vote for bill S. 1880.
LEONARD OAKS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Help us to pass bill S. 1880 by voting for it in United States Senate. Please vote for it.
MARVIN EOYD.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Bill S. 1880 is giving the people a chance to keep spreading our way of life. Please vote for it.
WILL COOK.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: A thousand words cannot express how much I thank you for a vote to S. 1880.
LUCY MCCORKLE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: The height of my ambition is to know that bill S. 1880 has passed. Please give it your full support.
JOSEPH LLOYD.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: The strength of a million lies within the hands of the men who vote for the bill S. 1880.
NELLIE SCOTT.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Let us unite and vote for bill S. 1880.
ETHEL WIGGINS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Be a friend. Cast a vote for bill S. 1880.
Mrs. ALLICE SIMONS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: All the votes you can get with yours to pass bill S. 1880 will be appreciated.
ELDER I. W. ALBRIGHT.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Do all in your power to pass bill S. 1880.
WILLIE FORD.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Bill S. 1880 will be passed, Senator, if you will support it for your voters.
Mrs. JANIE LU BARNES.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
HONORABLE SIR: I request early enactment of bill S. 1880.
ROSE WARREN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
HONORABLE SIR: I am requesting passage of bill S. 1880.
JESSIE STOCKETT.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
HONORABLE SIR: We are sincerely hopeful bill S. 1880 will pass soon.
Mr. and Mrs. C. A. WALTERS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 5, 1950.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
HONORABLE SIR: I am praying that you secure passage of bill S. 1880.
CLARENCE G. THOMAS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Please try to have bill S. 1880 passed early this year.

JOHN HENRY BELL.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
The Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Thanks for presenting bill S. 1880. Hope for its early passage.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH WEST.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Being interested in bill S. 1880 and its passage, I hope for early enactment.

PERCY CUNNINGHAM.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Give your aid to bill S. 1880. It is a chance we long for to colonize Liberia.

JAFUS BOYD, Jr.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This bill provides the required visibilities to enable us to go to Liberia. Please vote for it.

Mrs. BLANCHE HOLMES.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My sincere prayers and desires is for the passage of bill S. 1880. Please vote for it.

Mrs. MYRTLE GANDY.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Let our own actions be good ones. Please cast a vote for bill S. 1880.

CHARLES HICKS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I want to go to Liberia. Please vote in favor of bill S. 1880.

Mrs. LILLIE WADDELL.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It's a long time since consideration has been given a minority group, such as this opportunity. Vote for bill S. 1880.

Mrs. WILLAMAY JONES.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Do unto others as you would they do unto you. Vote for bill S. 1880.

ARCHIE WADDELL.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Bill S. 1880. I am desirous to see it passed. Vote for it.

Mrs. MAMIE B. WALKER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: God is for us. If you vote for us our hearts will rest at ease. Vote for S. 1880.

WAVERLY WEBB.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Let us advance in humanity by extending democracy to backward areas.

LOCKETT WALKER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It will pay for itself many times over through commerce and trade. Vote for bill S. 1880.

Mrs. HATTIE E. WALKER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I hope bill S. 1880 will pass. Will you please vote for it.

LAURANCE R. WHITE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Let us look for better fields and a greater expansion of our way of life. Vote for bill S. 1880.

ROBERT C. WALKER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Let's vote for bill S. 1880 so man's next step in achievement may be unfolded. Vote for bill S. 1880.

AARON BOYD.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Let us not sleep but cooperate with the President's point-4 program. Vote for bill S. 1880.

RUSSELL PALMER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Let's bring creative power to men in backward areas. Vote for bill S. 1880.

Mrs. ESTELLE PALMER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Let's progress and not draw back when we lift humanity. Vote for bill S. 1880.

Mrs. HATTIE BELL BROWN.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Don't let us down because we have not let you down. Vote for bill S. 1880.

Mrs. FLORA MARIE GREEN.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I want you to please cooperate with bill S. 1880. Vote for it.

MELVIN WRIGHT.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: From sympathizing friends let's back the following bill. Vote for S. 1880.

LEO GRAVES.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Vote for bill S. 1880. We want to go to Liberia.

MARY WILSON.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a voter of our Commonwealth I beseech you to do all you can for getting bill S. 1880 passed.

LUCY BLAIR.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. EDWARD MARTIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Qualified persons appeal for a vote. Please cast a vote for bill S. 1880.

HORACE WELLMAN.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please give your full support to pass bill S. 1880.

Mrs. LOUISE WINSTEAD.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Give full support to bill S. 1880 in getting it passed through the Senate.

Mrs. CATHERINE BOYD.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: All I can do for you is vote when your time comes. Do the same for me. Vote for bill S. 1880.

LAVENIA MCCORKLE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We believe our Senator will help pass bill S. 1880. Please cast your vote for its passage.

EMMETT BOYD.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your attention to bill S. 1880 is an opportunity our Government is giving us. Please support the bill.

CORA PEARL BROWN.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Don't deny your voters of this opportunity. Give your vote in the passing of bill S. 1880.

Mrs. ERNESTINE BOONE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. EDWARD MARTIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please don't forget to vote for bill S. 1880.

LEE WILSON.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: If our Government are happy in opening backward areas, let's back her by voting for bill S. 1880.

JAMES RODGERS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Give the people a break who want to colonize Liberia. Vote for bill S. 1880.

Mrs. CARRIE HODGE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: When the bill S. 1880, is discussed please vote for it. We want to go to Liberia.

HENRY BOONE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: God bless you, Senator, if you cast a vote for bill S. 1880.

SOLOMON ESTELLE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please vote for bill S. 1880. So many would like to pioneer in new areas.

Mrs. IDA BOYD.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please vote for bill S. 1880 when it comes before your group.

Mrs. ANNIE BANKS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our chance for colonization of Liberia, west Africa, lies in your support of bill S. 1880.

HERCHEL BOYD.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: God loves a cheerful giver. Give your vote to S. 1880.

Mrs. GERTRUDE RAINES.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The passage of bill S. 1880 is necessary. Please give it your support by voting for it.

JAFUS FRANKLIN BOYD, Jr.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are backing you with prayers. Please give your full support to bill S. 1880.

Mrs. LOLA FOSTER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Prayers will do its part, if you will do your part. Please vote for it.

Mrs. ARZULA EVERETT.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please open the doors of Liberia by casting a vote for bill S. 1880.

ADELL RICHARDSON.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please pass bill S. 1880. It is an opportunity for our people.

LLOYD FOSTER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The bill S. 1880 is passed. The battle is won for opening backward areas.

Mrs. ELIZABETH KAYE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: God is backing us. We are backing you. Give your support to bill S. 1880.

GURTLE HODGE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In regards to bill S. 1880, please give it your full support.

Mrs. ROSETTA ELLIOT.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: To cast a vote for S. 1880 is an open door to Liberia.

WASH ALLEN REODIE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: An open door to Liberia will be an opportunity for our children of tomorrow. Vote for bill S. 1880.

KATE FRANCIS ELLIS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *January 5, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My desire is to emigrate to Liberia. Vote for bill S. 1880.

AMZIAH RAINES.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] for himself and other Senators. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] has the floor.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, we have just passed through the Christmas holidays, and one of the fine customs of this season is the sending of greetings to our friends and receiving them from our friends. But, Mr. President, in the last week I have received over 200 Christmas cards with this type of message:

MY DEAR SENATOR: We extend to you the season's greetings: Merry Christmas and happy New Year. Hark the herald angels sing; peace on earth, good will to men—and please give your support to the removal of restrictions on the oleomargarine sale.

[Laughter.]

Mr. President, that is a prostitution of the joys and purposes of the Christmas season and is somewhat indicative of the methods being used in the consideration and the attempt to whip up public support for the pending measure.

I came to Washington 17 years ago next March. I understand that this question in its various phases has been debated some 64 times. I personally have heard debates on this question more than 30 times. I did not think there was anything new which could be offered. But yesterday the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] offered a new argument in support of the bill, calling attention to a recent election in the State of Ohio, in which the people of Ohio, exercising their right and privilege as electors, decided in favor of giving permission for the sale of colored oleomargarine. The Senator from Arkansas took great comfort from that. I also call his attention to the fact that the people of Ohio, in expressing their viewpoint at the polls, decided in support of candidate Dewey. Whether in the opinion of the Senator that is a conclusion he supports, I do not know.

The point is that the people of Ohio and the people of Arkansas and the people of Iowa have, and should have, the right to determine what sort of articles they wish to sell in commerce, and to regulate them under the authority

they have, not under an authority imposed upon them by the Federal Government.

I have been astonished, Mr. President, at the misconception which appears in the public press, editorially and otherwise, and also in the broadcasts of news commentators, as to what this issue is. My only purpose in rising at this time and discussing this matter is, if I can do so, to fix the issues which are to be determined here.

The proponents of the bill and the advocates of the sale of yellow oleomargarine say they have a palatable product. They have; it is definitely palatable; I use it frequently, and I like it.

They say they have a wholesome product—and they have. No one questions that.

They say they have a nutritious product filled to the brim with vitamins P, D, Q, and B, V, D, and vitamins of all other kinds. [Laughter.] They have; there is no question about it.

They say they have, and can put on the market, an article which can sell at a price less than the price of butter. They have; there is no question about it.

They say they should have a right to sell their product in an untrammeled way in the market place. There is no question about that, provided they sell it on its merits.

They say it can stand on its own feet, can stand alone on its merits, and should have a right to do so.

Very well; then why do not they go ahead and sell it? They say the taxes on oleomargarine ought to be repealed, and some of them have been; and our substitute measure provides that all of them shall be repealed. That is not the issue. Hundreds of letters which I have received ask me to support a repeal of the excise taxes on oleomargarine. But that is not at issue. There is no Senator on this floor or in this body who will vote at this session for a retention of the taxes on oleomargarine. We say, "Go ahead and sell your product on its merits, which it undoubtedly has. No one is preventing that."

But they say, "Oh, but we want to go ahead and color it."

We reply, "Go ahead and color it; color it pink or red or green; give it all the hues of the rainbow, if you want to."

But they reply, "No, but we want to color it yellow."

Why is that, Mr. President? Is it so that it can stand on its own merits? No.

They say, "We want to color it yellow so that it can usurp the good will and the market butter has built up over scores and scores of years."

Mr. President, there is no other purpose. For what other purpose, I ask my fellow Senators, are advertisements of oleomargarine printed in yellow—as we observe when we pick up a copy of the Saturday Evening Post or of Collier's magazine or of any other national magazine, in which there appear full-page advertisements, printed in yellow, of oleomargarine, and on which there also appear pictures of pastures, with cows peacefully grazing. Why is that done? Is it done so that oleomargarine may stand on its own merits? No, Mr. President, it is done for the sole and only purpose—and the Senator from Arkansas admitted it yesterday in his very scholarly and able address—of trying to take over a market by deluding and deceiving the people.

Mr. President, I have a formal address which I have prepared, and which I shall deliver if I ever get to it; but at the moment I wish to call attention to this bill. If ever I have seen—and I say this in all kindness—a unique bill, and one almost ridiculous to the point of absurdity, it is the proposal to which we have offered the amendment.

Let me call attention to the provisions of the bill.

The first paragraph reads:

That section 2301 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the tax on oleomargarine) is repealed.

Fine; we are for it; our substitute provides for it.

Next:

SEC. 2. Part I of subchapter A of chapter 27 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the occupational tax on manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers of oleomargarine) is repealed.

Fine; our substitute proposes to repeal it.

Then what does the bill say?

SEC. 3. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that the sale, or the serving in public eating places, of colored oleomargarine or colored margarine without clear identification as such or which is otherwise adulterated or misbranded within the meaning of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act—

Is unlawful? Oh, no. Is punishable under the penalty provisions of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act? Oh, no; not unlawful; but—

depresses the market in interstate commerce for butter and for oleomargarine or margarine clearly identified and neither adulterated nor misbranded, and constitutes a burden on interstate commerce in such articles.

All right; how is anyone going to be punished for a violation of that provision? Will the punishment be under the authority of the penalty provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act? Oh, no. Listen to this statement at the bottom of the page:

SEC. 407. (a) Colored oleomargarine or colored margarine which is sold in the same State or Territory in which it is produced shall be subject in the same manner and to the same extent to the provisions of this act as if it had been introduced in interstate commerce.

Let me digress here to say to the States' rights Democrats from the South that if ever I have seen a bold, bald, inexcusable instance of an attempt to violate States' rights by some sort of regulation within their borders, it is that language. Shades of John C. Calhoun, Alexander Stephens, Kirby Smith, and Sam Houston.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Iowa knows that these provisions were included in an effort, so to speak, to satisfy the complaint which had been made by the butter interests, and constitute no protection against the sale of margarine in a local sense.

The Senator says he is for the repeal of the taxes. I will go along with the Senator for nothing more than the repeal of the taxes, and will forget about all the rest, if the Senator and his colleagues who oppose the proposed legislation are agreeable to that. My point is that these provisions were included in an effort to satisfy the complaint—which I think was not altogether genuine—that there might be some deception in the local sales, in a restaurant. That is the only purpose of this provision. Personally, the proponents of this measure would be entirely agreeable to go along with a complete repeal of all present legislation on this subject, and nothing more, if the Senator will agree to that.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am very glad that the penitent has come to the rail; but I may remind him that the bill we are considering, of which he is one of the proponents, came to us from the House of Representatives, under the name of Representative POAGE, of Texas, that it has been considered by the Finance Committee, and reported to the Senate with these provisions. I submit to him that I have never offered them, neither have I had an opportunity to offer them. I do have an opportunity to call attention to their impracticability, their inapplicability, and their utterly ridiculous nature, as I see them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me say that I assume that he would not wish to leave the impression that he would be in favor of an outright repeal of all Federal laws regarding margarine; would he?

Mr. GILLETTE. A repeal of all laws?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of the Federal laws relating to margarine. Would the Senator leave that impression?

Mr. GILLETTE. That is too comprehensive a question. I do not have in my mind at the present time the provisions of all the Federal laws relating to the sale of oleomargarine.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am referring only to section 2301; that is the first one, and section 2 of the pending bill. I merely want it to be made clear to the Senate that the Senator is not in favor of the repeal of those laws. Am I correct in that?

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes. I call the Senator's attention to our substitute, which in section 6 provides:

REPEAL

SEC. 6. The following sections of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to taxes on colored and uncolored oleomargarine, to special occupational taxes on manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers of oleomargarine, and to packaging, reporting, and other regulations of oleomargarine) are hereby repealed: Sections 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2313, 3200, 3201 (26 U. S. C., secs. 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2313, 3200, 3201).

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator willing to stand on that provision, and omit the remainder of his substitute?

Mr. GILLETTE. Certainly not.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is all I want to know.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator knows. The question I believe is just as ridiculous as the proposal which the Senator is supporting now in the Senate. Let me go on. If the pending bill should become law, when, and under what circumstances would oleomargarine become subject to a penalty, when, in the State of Arkansas, or in the State of Iowa, or in the State of Texas, or in the State of North Dakota, it is sold in public eating places, whether produced within the State or not? I shall digress to say that, other than this, there is not a penalizing provision in the entire bill. In the first paragraph it is exempted. Section 301 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act contains 12 provisions, each one referring to a violation by misbranding or adulterating; but there is not a single one of the 12 which applies under this bill. The proponents of the bill, recognizing that, did not attempt to work within the penalizing provisions, but said they would add something to it. Moreover, admitting under the old legal plea of confession and avoidance, that there were people who would use it as a means of fraud, the proponents of the bill wanted to avoid the penalty, and so they said, "We will add to section 301, the provision: 'The serving or the possessing in a form ready for serving of colored oleomargarine or colored margarine in violation of section 407 (b).'"

That would bring it within the penalizing provision of section 301 of the Internal Revenue Code and section 407 (b) of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. It means that if colored oleomargarine is being sold in Mississippi, whether produced within the State or not, anyone who sells it in a public eating place must post in a public place a notice that can be read, along with the cigarette license, the soft-drink permit, the permit for the selling of beer, and the sanitary code permit of the State, county, or municipality. They should all be displayed so that every customer entering the place would stop to read them. We know the customer will not do it. It is utterly foolish.

Proponents of the bill then do two other things that would exempt oleomargarine from a penalty. They provide that "each separate serving bears or is accompanied by labeling identifying it as oleomargarine or margarine." Yesterday I asked the distinguished Senator from Arkansas what he meant by "labeling." How is it proposed to label oleomargarine that is going to be served to prevent its coming within the penalizing clause? The Senator stated it would be very difficult to make an imprint on the oleomargarine because, by their very nature, butter and oleomargarine are prone to soften, thus obliterating the imprint. The Senator suggested it might be possible to use the label on the plate on which it was to be served. The plate might be made in China, and over the name "Royal Doulton china," or "Wedgewood china" perhaps there would be imprinted the word "oleomargarine"; or if the oleomargarine were served on a little butter patty, under the patty there would be placed on the plate so the user could clearly see it the word "oleomargarine." The user would then see that it was oleomargarine before he tried to use it. Can Senators conceive of anything more ridiculous, more impossible of enforcement?

It is further provided, alternatively, that each separate serving thereof shall be triangular in shape. I emphasize, "each separate serving." I called the Senator's attention yesterday to a custom which was formerly more widespread than it is today, of placing a plate of butter on the table along with the plate of potatoes and the plate of meat, and passing it to the guests, letting the guests help themselves. The practice is not so widespread now as it once was, but it is still followed. Does the provision of the bill mean that the oleomargarine shall be put into triangular form when placed on the table, or does it mean that as it is passed each guest shall help himself to it and shall be expected to cut a triangular piece for himself, on pain of subjecting himself to the tax? [Laughter.] I am not joking. I ask, if it were attempted to enforce such a ridiculous provision, whether Federal inspectors would go into the restaurants in Arkansas and into the restaurants in Georgia and Texas, as an army of Federal inspectors, to snoop around and watch to see whether under each little butter patty there was stamped the word "oleomargarine" or to determine whether it had first been cut into triangular form before being used in order that they might file an information under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act? How far would they get? A survey was made in the State of Arkansas, which showed that more than 60 places within the State were violating the State provision against the sale of oleomargarine.

I turn my attention for a moment to States' rights Democrats. I sat in the Senate when we were debating FEPC, the repeal of the poll tax, and similar measures, and I have supported the States' rights Democrats. I have supported the southern Senators. I sat in that particular chair to my right when the Senators would pat me on the back as they went by and say, "GUY, you are a statesman. You are a statesman because you do not believe that the Federal Government has any right to tell Iowa that it cannot make the payment of a poll tax a condition precedent to voting any more than it can say you must make it a condition precedent. You are a hero, GUY. We are for you for standing up with the southern boys." I was here supporting the States' rights Democrats—a Democrat from Iowa, where a States' right Democrat was outside the pale of human decency—because I believed in this measure of local control. I have lived to see brother Senators—and I love them—and brother Representatives—and I know many of them and love them—come here and ask that a Federal law be placed on the statute books to authorize turning loose, if necessary, an army of Federal snoopers in the States to prosecute and convict, if possible, under such preposterous and amorphous language as that proposed, to find them guilty of selling within their own State an article which was permitted to be manufactured and sold. I did not think I would live to see it. I am disappointed that I have lived to see it. But let us go on.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator remember a dictum of Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, in one of the celebrated cases, in which Justice Holmes said, "Abstract considerations have nothing to do with concrete policies"?

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator. I do not recall the passage, but I may say it has extreme applicability to the present situation.

Let us go on with the reference to the Senators who drafted this bill; and I really should have liked to sit with them when they drafted it. Not only did they, as I have said, propose these ridiculous provisions; they went further. Mind you, Mr. President, the only way oleomargarine can be brought under a penalty provision is by subsection (b). But the proponents of the measure added subsection (c), reading as follows:

> Colored oleomargarine or colored margarine when served with meals at a public eating place shall at the time of such service be exempt from the labeling requirements of section 403 (except (a) and 403 (f)) if it complies with the requirements of subsection (b) of this section.

There was to be a labeling requirement, or it was to be required that the oleomargarine be cut into a three-cornered piece before serving. It is now to be exempted from the labeling requirement, bringing it under section 403 of the Internal Revenue Code, if it complies with subsection (b). In other words, it is unnecessary to label, as has been said. It is unnecessary to label in any way, if the oleomargarine is served in triangular form. It is a ridiculous proposal. Section 403 is the penalizing provision, which I shall read.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, while the Senator is turning to that section, will he yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not sure whether the junior Senator from Illinois was here a moment ago, but I should not want him to be under the misapprehension that it is the purpose of the Senator from Iowa to protect States' rights. I wanted to call his attention to section 5, on page 4, reading as follows:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the possession, sale, or serving of colored oleomargarine or colored margarine in any State or Territory in contravention of the laws of such State or Territory.

That, in other words, expressly reserves the right of each State to do as it likes about the whole matter. But the point on which the Senator from Iowa is, I think, leaving a false impression, is that the proponents of the measure are proposing Federal laws for the control

of margarine. That creates a completely false impression in the minds of people who are not familiar with the legislation. We did not initiate the legislation. What we are struggling to do is to remove the existing discriminatory laws which have been maintained for 64 years by the persons who take the attitude taken by the Senator from Iowa. I mean the Senator has completely reversed the purposes.

So far as I am concerned, and, I think, so far as those who are proposing the pending measure are concerned, we should be perfectly willing to eliminate every law on the statute books relating to oleomargarine. I want to make that perfectly clear. We are not simply proposing Federal legislation in this field. We already have such legislation, which is completely unjustified. We are seeking to modify the impact of it. I think the Senator should not leave the impression that he is a States' rights man and is seeking to eliminate the Federal influence in this bill. That is not correct.

Mr. GILLETTE. In reply to the Senator from Arkansas, I will say that the junior Senator from Iowa is not seeking to leave the impression that he is a States' rights man. He is asserting that he is a States' rights man.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], from his question, had received a wrong impression as to my position and that of the proponents of this bill.

Mr. GILLETTE. I absolve the Senator from any ulterior purpose. What I have tried to do in my very inadequate way has been to point to the utter absurdity of the language of the bill as it is proposed at the present time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator very clearly left the implication that the Senator from Arkansas is not a States' rights man.

Mr. GILLETTE. If I have left that impression, I apologize, because there have been ample manifestations of the position of my southern friends and colleagues, and I assume there will be other manifestations in the further weeks of the Congress. But I am saying that in the pending legislation, in my opinion, in my judgment, and for the reasons which I have pointed out, and others which I hope to point out, there is a clear support of the right of the Federal Government and its agents to penalize, if they can be brought within the provisions, the people of Arkansas if they do not comply with the provisions as to labeling and as to cutting the product in triangular form.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask the Senator if he would be willing to offer an amendment to strike that particular provision and any other similar provision from this bill?

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator has asked me that question previously. I have no desire to perfect the Senator's bill, because I think it is absolutely ridiculous and absurd. I am joining with 25 of my colleagues in offering a substitute for it. The Senator will recall that on yesterday, when there was a suggestion of cutting the product in triangular pieces and labeling the plate on which it was served, it was said that it would be almost impossible of enforcement, and the suggestion was made that we might be willing to accept an amendment. That amendment was pending as a committee amendment at the time; and if the Senator wanted it eliminated he had a most glorious opportunity to do so at that time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Arkansas has just made a very interesting proposal, which I think the dairy interests might be inclined to consider very seriously. That is the proposal to eliminate from the books all laws relating to oleomargarine. The first law to be eliminated is that which gives domestic oleomargarine a protection of 22 cents a pound against imported oleomargarine. The next to consider for purposes of elimination would probably be the law which gives producers of oleomargarine the right to fortify it, to put in flavor to make it taste like butter, and particularly the law permitting the use of benzoate of soda or other embalming materials so that oleomargarine can be made to look like butter indefinitely. No doubt there are several other laws which probably could be eliminated from the books and in which the dairy interests might show a great deal of interest.

I hope the Senator from Iowa will consider seriously the proposition of the Senator from Arkansas when he proposes to eliminate all laws on the books relating to oleomargarine.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator. I may say that the esteemed Senator from Arkansas rather anticipated me by quoting the amendment which the Senate Finance Committee put into the bill, which provides as follows:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the possession, sale, or serving of colored oleomargarine or colored margarine in any State or Territory in contravention of the laws of such State or Territory.

Why was that amendment inserted? In the first place, we are authorizing it. In the second place, we are attempting to bring it under the penalty provisions of the law, and in the third place, we strike out the provision put in by the House, which was as follows:

> This act shall not abrogate or nullify any statute of any State or Territory now in effect or which may hereafter be enacted.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sorry to interrupt the Senator, but he pointed to the Senator from Texas, and I want to ask the Senator what his attitude would be if the situation were turned around and this were a bill to limit the sale of milk or any other food product. Would he be in favor of it?

Mr. GILLETTE. Certainly not. I will answer that question categorically.

Mr. CONNALLY. If it referred to milk or any other food product except oleomargarine, would the Senator favor such a bill?

Mr. GILLETTE. I would not favor such a bill. Neither would I favor such a bill with reference to oleomargarine. I would not favor any restriction on any food product excepting a product which is being used to deceive the public, under laws the purpose of which is to permit the public to be defrauded. Yesterday the question was asked, "What about white cotton? What about using rayon as a substitute for white cotton?" No one can object to the sale of oleomargarine anywhere in the United States, provided the States permit it, if it is sold on its own merits. But the producers of it refuse to let it stand on its own merits. They insist on selling it as an imitation of something else, for the purpose of deceiving the public.

The esteemed Senator from Texas, whom I love, shakes his head in disappointment at my temerity in making such a suggestion. But what other purpose is there in the Food and Drug Act? What other purpose is there in any of our protective enactments than to protect the public from mislabeling, misadvertising, and misbranding? Every one of the the provisions of section 301 of the act deal with the question of misbranding and misrepresenting to the public. That is where the penalizing provisions are imposed. But because of the fact that there is not a single one which would apply to this situation, an attempt is made to bring it in by means of this abortive proposed legislation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator knows very well that margarine was made yellow by natural ingredients, but the dairy interests were instrumental in preventing its being made in its natural color. In many parts of the country, in the Senator's own State, at this time of the year every pound of butter is colored in an attempt to deceive the people and to make them believe that the butter was produced in the summer time when it is naturally yellow. The Senator knows that very well. If that line of argument be used, it is just as applicable to butter as it is to margarine, because butter is not naturally yellow in the winter time.

Mr. GILLETTE. Butter is naturally yellow in the winter time. Before I came to Congress I milked 12 cows every morning and every evening, and sold milk and butter. I know a little about the dairy business. Butter is colored, if it is colored, for the purpose of uniformity, and not for the purpose of deceiving the public or misrepresenting the product as being something other than what it is. Of course, when cows are turned out after feeding all winter on dry hay, and they are permitted to eat new green grass, the butter is intensified in color. When the cows are fed on dry feed the butter is lighter in color. Some of the farmers do color it, especially where they have regular customers, in order to maintain uniformity. It is not for the purpose of deceiving the public, it

is for the purpose of maintaining uniformity of the product.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is apparently basing his argument on the pure motives of those producing butter. The fact is the people are deceived into thinking the product they are getting is butter produced by a cow eating green grass which gives it the color. The Senator says, "if it is colored." The testimony in every one of the hearings of the committee leaves no doubt that butter is colored. I do not know why the Senator would say "if it is colored." All the experts from the Butter Institute admitted under cross-examination that it is colored. There is no doubt about that, and I do not think the Senator wants to leave the impression that there is doubt about butter being colored.

The Senator should also make it clear that it is the only product which by special act of Congress is expressly exempted from having the statement made that it is artificially colored, which obviously leaves a doubt in people's minds as to the motives. Why do not those who produce it say on the carton that it is colored for purposes of uniformity? To be frank about it, why do not the producers of butter do as the producers of other commodities do? It is the only commodity which, merely because it has the votes in the Congress, and because it has great numbers of people back of it, imposes its will on the Congress and has itself exempted from proper labeling, a requirement which every other food product must observe.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator in his zeal propounded several questions to me, and I shall have to take them up one at a time. In the first place, he states that butter is colored. There is no question about that. When he says that all butter is colored, he does not state a fact.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not say "all butter."

Mr. GILLETTE. When he says that some butter is colored, I agree. When he makes the statement that I am supporting the contention that all dairymen are pure, I must say I am not. Being a dairyman myself, I never claimed purity even for myself. I have referred to two and a half million factories in the United States, small factories on the farms, such as the one on the farm home where I was raised, where my mother made butter and took it to town and sold it to customers every Saturday, 10 pounds. We got 20 cents a pound because of the superior quality of the butter, and that $2 was used to help dad to pay for a new harvester when he got it.

I know mother did not color the butter. We did not have any color. I know she probably would have if we had had it at that time. But what is said about the coloring is no argument and no answer. We are not trying to deceive anyone. I am merely saying that two and a half million factories throughout the United States are competing with 50 or 60 manufacturers like the Lever Bros., or Jelke, who sell 75 percent of the world product of oleomargarine. When their attempt to usurp the market is going to interfere with these two and a half million small factories, I am not willing to go to the point of letting them deceive the public.

The pending proposal would eliminate all discriminatory taxes on oleomargarine. I am for that. I am merely saying that I am not willing by my vote to permit one group of people to continue to usurp the market under the guise of legislation that does not carry within it one scintilla of possibility of prosecution and conviction.

The Senator asked if I would be willing to amend the bill. If I were going to support such a proposal, I would certainly amend it so that it would have some teeth in it. It does not even have one rotten molar with which the law could be enforced, not one, and I defy any man supporting the bill to point to how it could be enforced, and how a conviction could be secured.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I am very much impressed with the sublime belief of the Senator from Arkansas that oleomargarine manufacturers would not attempt to have the public believe that their product was very closely related to butter, if not equally as good as or identical with butter. I wonder if the Senator from Iowa or the Senator from Arkansas, or any other Senator, can give an explanation as to why certain west-coast manufacturers sell their product in packages having on the outside a picture of something that looks like a dairy barn. Does not the Senator think it would be much more appropriate to have on the package a picture of a coconut tree, a cotton field, or even a school of menhaden or herring, or possibly a picture of a tub of lard on the outside? Would that not be more informative to the consumer? As a matter of fact, they are not required to tell the consumer what ingredients are used in the manufacture of synthetic butter.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator, but I am afraid he has drawn a wrong conclusion. I am sure that the picture of the dairy cow which is on the package and the pictures of the dairy cow in the oleomargarine advertisement are used simply because of their artistic beauty and have no reference to deception, to make people think they are buying a substitute for butter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think what was stated was not a fact. I do not think any cartons carry any pictures of cows on them, and I am positive that all the cartons containing margarine carry a complete statement of their ingredients, which is not true as to butter.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I desire to hurry on. I have not even gotten to my speech yet.

I have said there was nothing new in the discussion yesterday, but there was. My dear friend, the Senator from Arkansas, was concerned to point out to the dairy people that they were conducting their business in an uneconomic way. He produced statistics to show that the selling of milk in the form of butter, saving the cream and selling it as butter, brought less return, and that they should sell it as fluid milk in the market place. I was interested in that, and I know that the hundreds of thousands of dairymen in the Middle West will be much interested to learn that they have been conducting their affairs in such a disastrous way, and to learn that they should sell their product as fluid milk.

I would ask the Senator from Arkansas or any other Senator to supplement his statement by showing how it could be done; how, for instance, in the little town in which I live, of six or seven thousand people, with an agricultural county around it, and the limited market those families afford for fluid milk, the producers can sell their surplus milk as fluid milk.

The very thing the Senator referred to, the heavy production of milk in the spring, brings about the necessity for saving the excess production during the time of heavy production, and the adoption of the means these 2,500,000 farmers use of making it into butter, in the main, though not entirely, because some of it goes into cheese.

Again that brings us back to the main purpose of the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, did the Senator ask me a question about a suggestion as to what they might do?

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator made such a suggestion yesterday; but I would welcome a statement from him.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If they would spend on ascertaining how to can fluid milk half the money they spend on attempting to maintain the present legislation, I have no doubt they would find a way by which they could keep their fluid milk and sell it when there was a demand later.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I am sure that if the Senator had turned that thought over in his mind a couple of times he would not have given expression to it. A man who would stand on the floor of the Senate and call attention to the money that is being spent by the butter producers, in view of the record of the oleomargarine people, the representatives of Lever and the 50 or 60 men referred to, I do not believe would have referred to it if he had given it mature consideration. That is not what we would expect from the Senator from Arkansas, because he is keen and clear, but often mistaken, as he is now.

I was about to call attention to the restrictions on the sale of oleomargarine. The Senator yesterday pointed with pride to the tremendous growth in the sale of oleomargarine, so that it was the second outlet for cotton. Yet he said it was being restricted.

I wish to call the attention of the Senators from the New England States to the fact that the report of the Bureau of the Census as given to our subcommittee, of which the Senator from Vermont is an honored member, showed that in the city of Manchester butter prices between 1934 and 1948 dropped 40 percent, while the sale of oleomargarine increased 8,150 percent.

Who is objecting to the sale of oleomargarine at a lower price? I know that much of the support for this type of legislation comes from people who say, "We are being prevented by discriminatory taxes from buying an article at a cheaper figure, and our purchasing power is limited. Why can we not buy oleomargarine if we want it?" They have been deluded by the same sort of campaign to which the Senator has referred, heavily financed by oleomargarine interests who want to take over the whole market. No one is preventing people buying oleomargarine if they want it. Nothing would prevent people of the State of Mississippi doing so, under the substitute we propose. I started to comment on that a moment ago, and I wish to refer to it at this time. Listen, you States' rights men, to this language contained in the amendment in the nature of a substitute:

Provided, however, That yellow oleomargarine manufactured or colored within the borders of a State or Territory in which it is to be consumed shall not be subject to the provisions of this act—

Which declares such manufacturing or coloring to be unlawful—

but shall be subject to the laws and regulations of such State or Territory.

That is the language of the substitute. It does not apply the proposed law to oleomargarine manufactured and sold within the borders of a State. But the language of the bill provides that colored oleomargarine or colored margarine which is sold within the State or Territory in which it is produced, shall be subject to Federal law in the same manner and to the same extent as though it came into the State in interstate commerce, regardless of the laws and regulations of the local State.

There is the difference between the two provisions. Enjoy yourselves, you States' rights men, but I say to you that what you now propose to do will later slap you in the face.

Mr. President, I shall never be a party to the bringing into the States a group of Federal employees in an effort to prevent the people of my State, or of other States, from enjoying something which is perfectly legal and perfectly proper to be sold within my State. I shall never be a party to penalizing my people for doing such a thing.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a sheet in which reference is made, in parallel columns, to the main provisions of the pending Poage bill and the amendment in the nature of a substitute. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, for the information of Senators.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Gillette-Wiley substitute amendment versus H. R. 2023

Subject	Gillette-Wiley	H. R. 2023
Federal taxes and license fees	Removes	Removes.
Reporting requirements for manufacturers and wholesalers.	Would repeal	Would not repeal.
Movement of yellow oleo in interstate commerce.	Flat prohibition	No prohibition.
States rights	States rights protected. Leaves regulation of store sale and eating places solely to the States. Each State is free to ban or not, as its desires and interests dictate.	Interferes with States rights by providing for Federal inspection and regulation of eating places in every city and town of the Nation.
Enforceability	Proven constitutional control of interstate shipments could be easily policed. Under Gillette-Wiley provisions, States could settle their own enforcement problems.	Requires expensive inspection and policing of many thousands of eating places (return to Volstead liquor law conditions inevitable).
Food and Drug Act applicability	No change	Puts jurisdiction of restaurant policing under Food and Drug Administration.
Cost of enforcement	Little or no additional cost	Estimated cost of effective Federal enforcement ranges to $60,000,000 a year or more.
Prevention of fraud	States are free to protect their consumers from fraud.	Federal Government usurps right of States to regulate sale of oleo without itself having complete power to prevent fraud.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to place in the RECORD some figures which appear in a statement I have prepared, and which I do not believe I have covered fully in my extemporaneous remarks.

The effect of oleomargarine on butter sales has been severe. In 1938 our national per capita consumption of butter was 16.4 pounds and of oleo only 2.9 pounds. Five years later, in 1943, only 11.7 pounds of butter per capita were being consumed, as against 3.9 pounds of oleo. In 1948 butter consumption had dropped to 10.2 pounds and per capita consumption of oleo had risen to 6.1 pounds.

More than 2,500,000 dairy-farm families are affected by lost butter outlets for surplus milk. More than 3,500 local creameries and 40,000 other dairy plants suffer when milk prices are disturbed, and so do their 150,000 employees. The results are felt by local merchants, businessmen, and bankers in every town, village, and hamlet in the United States.

By contrast, five giant corporations sell 68.4 percent of all the oleomargarine produced in the United States. A few months ago their total share of the business was only 61 percent, proving that these five big corporations are growing even larger. Four new oleo plants were opened between January and March 1949.

The purchase of the John Jelke Co. by Unilever, Ltd., of London, England, foreshadows still vaster concentration of oleo sales in the hands of an international cartel. Unilever manufactures 75 percent of all the oleomargarine eaten in Europe, outside of Russia, and about 40 percent of the world's entire consumption. Spokesmen of the company freely state that they plan to make the Jelke Co. the world's biggest oleo producer and to expand its operations to all 48 States.

Obviously, restrictions on the manufacture and sale of yellow oleomargarine have not handicapped free enterprise or restrained the growth of giant corporations.

Mr. President, in that connection it is interesting to note that Unilever—the Lever Bros. Co.—which has taken over the Jelke Co. and handles 75 percent of the sales in Europe and 68 percent of the sales in the United States, is the same concern which went into a United States court and asked for protection against imitation of their product, Lifebuoy soap, through coloring and shaping. The people who invoked the protection of the court of their soap product, because it was being imitated by others in color and shape, are now endeavoring to take over the market for butter.

Mr. President, again I call attention to a matter to which I adverted a short while ago, that in the State of Arkansas a survey made by Benson & Benson of New Jersey of 100 eating places showed that 68 of the 100 were violating the State law against sales of oleomargarine. The proponents of the pending bill, realizing that they are leaving a door open for fraud, have attempted to do what? Have they attempted to close the door? No, but they have attempted to shove the door a little way toward closing, and are leaving a crack through which the law can be violated, and at the same time they are jeopardizing the main outlet for a huge portion of our dairy products.

Mr. President, I am, of course, interested in expanding the market for soybeans, for cottonseed oil, for peanut oil. I happen to be a member of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which has spent weeks and weeks, and will spend further weeks and weeks in an endeavor to broaden the market for these farm products. But I will not be a party to an attempt to take from a portion of our people the market for their product, butter, nor will I be a party in aiding the Federal Government to infringe on the prerogatives of our local administrative agencies.

Mr. President, I urge all Senators to consider the merits of the two measures now pending before the Senate. There is no question as to the palatability, the cheapness, the wholesomeness, the nutrition of oleomargarine. There is no question that it is a product which has a right to come into the market and be sold on its merits. There is no question that the discriminatory taxes on oleomargarine ought to be repealed. We ask for their repeal. That, however, is not the main question. The main question is the protection or destruction of the outlet for small butter-manufacturing plants. The proponents of the pending bill advocate retention of means by which they can still further destroy the outlet for the small butter-manufacturing plants. I shall vote and work for the expansion of large manufacturing plants, but I shall vote even harder for the preservation and maintenance of

market for our small local manufacturing and marketing plants.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. GURNEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Malone
Anderson	Hill	Maybank
Benton	Hoey	Millikin
Brewster	Holland	Morse
Bricker	Humphrey	Murray
Butler	Hunt	Myers
Byrd	Ives	Neely
Chapman	Jenner	O'Conor
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Darby	Kefauver	Robertson
Donnell	Kem	Russell
Douglas	Kerr	Saltonstall
Downey	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Dworshak	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Langer	Sparkman
Ecton	Leahy	Stennis
Ellender	Lehman	Taft
Ferguson	Lodge	Taylor
Frear	Long	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	Lucas	Thye
George	McCarran	Tobey
Gillette	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Graham	McClellan	Watkins
Green	McFarland	Wherry
Gurney	McKellar	Wiley
Hayden	McMahon	Williams
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). A quorum is present.

AMERICAN POLICY IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President and Members of the Senate, within the last 90 days two catastrophic events have taken place. These are the Soviet success in atomic development, as announced by the President of the United States on September 23, 1949, and the establishment of a Soviet-recognized Communist regime in China. Only in retrospect will we be able to finally determine which event will have the most far-reaching influence. Both have set off chain reactions that have not yet run their full course.

Fifty years of friendly interest on the part of our people and our Government in a free and independent China and the overwhelming contribution made by our Army, Navy, and Air Force in the Pacific during World War II gave us the power, the prestige, and the opportunity for constructive action no western nation had ever before possessed. We could have pioneered in exporting the ideals that inspired men who loved freedom everywhere following our own breakaway from colonial status.

All this opportunity has been frittered away by a small group of willful men in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department who had the backing of their superiors.

In Europe where the record of Soviet aims was clearly outlined in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia we finally stood up to communism in Greece, Turkey, Iran, Berlin, and western Germany.

Knowing that communism thrives on economic and political chaos we gave economic aid through the ECA and with the North Atlantic Pact and the arms-implementation legislation, we have given moral and material support for the protection of western Europe and the Middle East from overt aggression. In that area we have given hope and support to those advancing the cause of a free world of freemen.

Munich certainly should have taught us that appeasement of aggression, then as now, is but surrender on the installment plan. Mr. Chamberlain, Prime Minister of Great Britain 10 years ago, may have sincerely thought that he was gaining "peace in our time" by consenting to the destruction of a free and independent Czechoslovakia by Nazi Germany. We know now that paying such international blackmail only increased later demands that made World War II inevitable.

The men in the Kremlin are as power hungry as the Nazis, and their system is as destructive of human liberty as was Hitlerism with which they were bedfellows while Poland was being dismembered in 1939. They have, however, learned some new techniques.

Communism is destructive of human liberty everywhere in the world. It is no less destructive in China or Korea than it is in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Hungary, Rumania, or Bulgaria. The pattern may differ slightly. In Poland the opposition leader, Mikolajczyk, was forced to flee; in Bulgaria Petkov was hanged; in Rumania the King was given a 2-hour ultimatum to change the government regardless of the constitution; in Czechoslovakia Masaryk's life was forfeited when it became apparent that coalition with communism would not work.

A Chinese official put it clearly by saying to me recently that there can be no real coalition with a tiger unless you are inside the tiger.

The President's state of the Union message of January 4 was notable for its silence on the question of China. In what we hope will be a free world of freemen does the administration have less concern with human liberty in Asia than it does in Europe? On what basis does the administration write off freemen in China?

Let me reread the cold type of the President's message to the Congress:

> While great problems still confront us, the greatest danger has receded—the possibility which faced us 3 years ago that most of Europe and the Mediterranean area might collapse under totalitarian pressure. Today the free peoples of the world have new vigor and new hope for peace.

Why no concern regarding the 400,000,000 people of China who have been dragged behind the iron curtain? International communism has already gained more in manpower and resources in Asia than it has lost in Europe, and it is on the march to even greater victories.

At a press conference this morning, the President made it clear that he backs the Far Eastern Division and Acheson policy of stopping further military aid to the Republic of China.

In Europe we have had a foreign policy in which the Republicans and the Democrats have contributed to the initiation and formulation of doctrines that are understandable. In the Far East there has been no bipartisan foreign policy. The Republicans in Congress have not been consulted in the moves leading up to the bankrupt policy which now stands revealed in all its sorry detail. The administration, and it alone, has the full responsibility for the debacle which has taken place on the continent of Asia and which day by day and hour by hour is endangering the future peace of the world and the security of this country.

As late as December 23, 1949, the State Department sent a memorandum to its overseas personnel in which they gave a clear indication that the defeatist attitude the administration has had in the past in relation to the Far East still continues.

On January 3 the wire services carried extracts of the State Department document circulated for the information of Department personnel. On the same day I requested by telephone to Under Secretary of State Webb and by letter to Secretary Acheson that a copy of the document be sent to me as a member of the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees of the Senate.

I was informed by Under Secretary Webb that the document was classified and the request to forward a copy could not be complied with at the time, but that the matter would be discussed further in the Department.

Quoting now from the wire-service report:

> Formosa has no special military significance.
>
> It said there are groups in the United States "who are inclined to be critical of the United States for failure to act to prevent the loss of the island to the Communists." This is "largely because of a mistaken popular conception of its strategic importance to United States defense in the Pacific," the document added.

This raises the following serious questions, to which the Congress and the American people are entitled to full and frank answers:

First. Was the American commander in the Far East, Gen. Douglas MacArthur consulted relative to Formosa's strategic importance before the State Department came to this strange conclusion?

Second. Was Admiral Radford, naval commander in the Pacific, consulted on the strategic importance of the island?

Third. Was Secretary of National Defense Johnson consulted on the strategic importance of Formosa to United States defense in the Pacific and does he concur in these State Department views?

Fourth. Is there some State Department committee now determining the strategic defense needs of the Nation and are there representatives on said committee from the Far Eastern Division which has been responsible for our bankrupt policy in China? Who are the members constituting such a committee and upon whose reports did they arrive at such conclusions?

Fifth. Were the members of the National Security Council advised of the December 23 memo when they met to consider the far eastern situation on December 29?

Sixth. If Formosa and free China were already written off on December 23, who were the State and Defense Departments trying to fool by sending Dr. Jessup on a slow boat to China and announcing that the Joint Chiefs of Staff were going out to consult with General MacArthur in February? Are both of these trips intended to be post mortems rather than consultations?

Seventh. Has the Defense Establishment or the State Department asked for or received the views of General MacArthur or Admiral Radford on the strategic importance of Formosa? If not, why not? If such views have been received, will the Secretary of State bring them to the Foreign Relations Committee when it meets in executive session next Tuesday? If not, why not?

We stood up to communism in Europe and took substantial risks in doing so in Greece, Turkey, and Berlin. Certainly for the faint-hearted the putting into operation of the Berlin airlift presented much greater risks than giving aid to the legal government of China to enable them to hold the islands of Formosa and Hainan. During the airlift we were flying our planes across territory controlled by one of the great military powers of the world. This Government supported the Berlin airlift at a cost of $254,568,800. This was not the only cost, for accidents took the lives of 31 of our men. Nevertheless, had we backed down in Berlin the Soviet Union today would have that city firmly within its grasp and might even have western Germany, if not all of western Europe. Certainly the yielding to international blackmail then would have increased the demands and made more arrogant the men in the Kremlin as an earlier yielding to Hitler at Munich increased his demands.

Our bankrupt policy has taken us to such a low point that prior to his return to the United States our Ambassador, Leighton Stuart, was confined to the Embassy compounds for weeks by the Communists. A consular official was beaten up by the Red police in Shanghai. Our consul general, Angus Ward, was restricted to the compound in Mukden for a year and more recently thrown into a common jail. Our military attaché at Nanking, General Soule, has been trying for over 4 months to get out of the Communist area and has not had any success to date.

William C. Smith, chief electrician's mate, United States Navy, of Long Beach, Calif., and Elmer C. Bender, sergeant, United States Marine Corps, of Cincinnati, Ohio, have been held captive for over 13 months. Yes; we have waited for the dust to settle, and the American people can now see the wreckage of the position once held by this great Nation in the Far East.

Our long-standing far eastern policy was first compromised at Yalta. We gave to the Soviet Union vital rights in Manchuria which were not ours to give. It was done without the consent or approval of the American Congress or the American people. It was done in violation of the open-door policy of John Hay and of Woodrow Wilson's concept of "open covenants, openly arrived at." The Yalta agreement made Soviet domination of Manchuria and other border provinces inevitable. It made possible Chinese Communist domination of the balance of continental China and has opened the door to bringing the entire continent of Asia, with more than a billion people and vast resources, into the orbit of international communism. Sitting with our American delegation at Yalta was Alger Hiss.

Following VJ-day the representatives of our Department of State persistently tried to get the Government of the Republic of China to form a coalition with the Communists. When they refused we placed an embargo against the shipments of any arms or ammunition to the legal government of the country while during those same months the Soviet army of occupation in Manchuria, as the result of the Yalta agreement, was turning over to the Communist forces large amounts of captured Japanese war stocks.

Like a person with a bad conscience, the State Department on August 6 released the China white paper. All the blame was placed on the National Government, then with its back to the wall. It was apparently issued with the hope that our own sorry part and share of responsibility might be overlooked.

That the National Government of China made mistakes, has had more than their share of Benedict Arnolds, and men who betrayed their trust needed no underscoring from us in the way and at the time it was done. Our own history also has examples of men who have betrayed their trust from Cabinet members down to ward bosses. We have also been plagued with racketeers, highwaymen, and 5-percenters at various times.

The basic objective the United States should have kept constantly in mind was to preserve a free, independent, united non-Communist China. In the postwar illness of that nation we prescribed that the strychnine of communism be taken. The State Department having contributed greatly to the Chinese disaster, still proclaims that we must follow a hands-off policy, or that we must wait for the dust to settle, or we must investigate some more. Are they preparing for a post mortem rather than a consultation?

Had China been a former enemy, like Japan and Germany, we would have been giving large amounts of supervised material help and sending many of our ablest military and civilian leaders to stabilize her currency, improve her economy, rebuild her cities, feed her people, and protect her from Communist aggression. But the State Department policy has been to abandon free China, our wartime ally and friend, to the vultures of international communism.

In and out of Government one hears the argument that the National Government of China still has a reserve of from $100,000,000 to $200,000,000 left and that they should use that rather than expect help from the United States.

Any such policy would result in the complete collapse of Chinese Taiwan or Formosa currency, for without gold or dollar backing it would have little value. A good job has been done to date in stabilizing this currency.

Britain has gold reserves of $1,500,000,000, according to Chancellor of the Exchequer Cripps, and has been receiving our aid. Does the administration have one yardstick for Europe and another for China? Are the Chinese to be required to use every ounce of gold?

In a very well-written article in the January 7 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, Joseph Alsop has this to say about State Department excuses as contained in the China white paper:

> But there is also one carefully concealed defect in the State Department argument. If you have kicked a drowning friend briskly in the face as he sank for the second and third times, you cannot later explain that he was doomed anyway because he was such a bad swimmer. The question that must be answered is not whether the Chinese did their best to save themselves, which they most certainly did not. The question is whether we did our best to save China.
>
> The answer to this question is contained in the strange, still secret inner history of our China policy. And this true history for which the State Department could find no room in all the 1,054 pages of the white paper may be simply, if grimly, summarized:
>
> Throughout the fateful years in China, the American representatives there actively favored the Chinese Communists. They also contributed to the weakness, both political and military, of the National Government. And in the end they came close to offering China up to the Communists, like a trussed bird on a platter, over 4 years before the eventual Communist triumph.

We have been getting much misinformation about Formosa. Governor Chen Cheng, who was the executive head of Formosa, otherwise known as Taiwan when I was there, had done an outstanding job. Considerable progress had been made in land reform, increase in agricultural and industrial production, and stabilization of the Taiwan currency.

There was no visible indication of insurrection or fear of it on the island. I went about the city of Taipeh both at night and in the daytime without either Chinese or American escorts. Frankly, I felt safer there than I did later in the Philippines. There were fewer police or armed soldiers doing police duty than will be seen today in most western European nations, with the exception of Great Britain.

The Governor drove about without any police or military escort. He did not act like a man who feared either revolution or an attempt on his life.

The new civilian Governor, K. C. Wu, is a graduate of Princeton. He has had an excellent record as an administrator, as mayor of Shanghai, and as wartime mayor of Chungking.

Gen. Sun Leh Jen, the ground force commander on Formosa, is also in charge of their training centers which I visited. He is a graduate of the Virginia Military Institute. I did not meet an American officer who had had experience in China and who is now in this country or overseas who did not speak in the highest terms of Gen. Sun Leh Jen. The morale of the men is excellent. The training program is very good. They do lack a sufficient supply of arms and ammuni-

tion for defense against the ultimate assault upon the island.

The people of Formosa are ably represented by a provincial legislature. Governor Wu has broadened his administration and consults with the representatives of the people of the island.

In meeting with acting President Li Tsung-jen, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, Premier Yen, General Pai Chung-hsie, and the other responsible leaders of the Republic of China, I found no difference of opinion as to the importance of holding Formosa, Hainan, and the smaller islands, and without exception they indicated they would welcome supervision of such aid as we might send them in the same way it is supervised in Greece and in Korea.

Though there are some in the State Department who have been willing to encourage a division within the non-Communist forces of China when we should be encouraging them to pull together instead of apart, I can state that there is no rift at the present time between the acting President Li Tsung-jen and the Generalissimo.

The weakness of free China may now be her strength. By now all the Benedict Arnolds, the band-wagon jumpers, the faint of heart, and the opportunists have departed. Those who are left are determined to preserve a free, independent, non-Communist Republic of China with our help if possible, without it if necessary.

It is my firm belief that, despite the Far Eastern Division, despite the Secretary of State and the President, the Republic of China continues to have the good will and prayers of the American people in the struggle against communism.

It is a sad commentary that Britain, which itself was in such a desperate plight after Dunkerque, which joined us in complaining of Mussolini's stab in the back when France was down but not quite out, should now be contemplating abandoning the Republic of China and giving recognition, aid, and comfort to the Communists who are so closely allied with the same international Communist conspiracy that threatens human freedom in Europe.

Like Mr. Chamberlain at Munich, there are some in this country and in Great Britain who believe that by appeasing the Communists they may change their way of life. This is naive, and such a viewpoint is dangerous to the peace of the world and the security of this country.

First, the Communists will not be satisfied with mere de facto recognition. That will merely be the opening wedge for full de jure approval. When that happens, China's seat in the United Nations and on the Security Council becomes a Communist one. Every Chinese embassy and consulate in this and other western nations will become centers of Communist espionage and fifth-column activity as in the case of similar Soviet establishments. At the peace conference with Japan, the Soviet bloc will have another voice and vote to help destroy the job Gen. Douglas MacArthur has so ably done in that country.

If or when the British or the United States give them full recognition, the Chinese Communists will then consider it unfriendly unless their economic rehabilitation is financed. Such action would, of course, also increase their war potential, for electric-power development, railroads, mines, ports, and factories are important in both peace and war. The United States is the only nation capable of such financing.

Are we to be called upon to pay out substantial sums to help stop communism in Europe while financing communism in Asia—and with serious budget problems of our own? Are we to give arms and guaranties to western Europe to save that area from going behind the iron curtain while we or they accelerate the spread of communism in Asia?

It is my judgment that history will record the recognition of Communist China as being as great a betrayal of human freedom as was the pact of Munich.

I am pleased that the United States was not a participant in the Munich Pact with Great Britain. If other nations want to take that responsibility, let them do it with their eyes open. They cannot for long play both sides of the street.

Since the time the Government of China refused our suggestion to form a coalition with the Communists, the policy of the State Department has been to divide rather than to unite the non-Communist elements in that country.

It was strongly indicated through Americans holding official positions who were in China that no help could be expected while Chiang Kai-shek remained President. After he retired, the new President, Li Tsung-jen, fared no better.

The Far Eastern Division of the State Department has had no intention, in my opinion, of helping the non-Communist government of the Republic of China survive. Since it refused to collapse when they predicted it would some 4 years ago they have been more interested in saving face than they have been in saving freedom.

No group could so operate in the Far Eastern Division without the approval of the Secretary of State and no Secretary of State could follow such a policy without the approval of the President of the United States. The ultimate responsibility is there. It cannot be otherwise under our constitutional system.

But the American people should know that when the last desperate negotiations were going on, before the Yangtse River line was crossed, it was the hope of moderate Chinese elements that if a modus vivendi could be worked out with the North China Communists the troops on both sides could be demobilized except for internal security purposes, and the soldiers returned to their farms. The Communists insisted on maintaining an army of over 3,000,000 men under arms. This convinced even the moderate Chinese that this could only be for the purpose of aggression against southeast Asia or for war against the West.

There are some American and British firms that are today sending oil and other supplies to the Communist regime which strengthens it in the effort to destroy what remains of the Republic of China. I well remember, as my colleagues no doubt do also, that there were firms, with State Department approval, which supplied scrap iron and oil to Japan in 1939, 1940, and 1941. It was used against our friends in China and ultimately against the American Battle Fleet at Pearl Harbor. While at Pearl Harbor 8 years after December 7, 1941, I visited the wreck of the *Arizona*, which is now on the bottom of Pearl Harbor. In her hull there are still 900 American sailors. Commercial transactions paid in blood money should not set our foreign policy.

I have been deeply shocked by what I have found in the Pacific. On my responsibility as a Senator of the United States, I say to the Senate that we are far weaker in the Pacific today, 90 days after the Soviet atomic development and the Chinese debacle, than we were on the eve of the Pearl Harbor attack 8 years ago. If Formosa gets into unfriendly hands our defense Japan-Okinawa-Philippines is pierced and the Pacific coast may have to become our first line of defense.

For that to happen with the full approval of the people of the United States is one thing. For it to take place without the full facts being laid before them is quite another. Already there are those in Washington who advocate moving some of our large industries out of the States of Washington, Oregon, and California. If we are to make the Pacific coast our outpost line, this is understandable.

I do not favor such a concept when with a proper consideration of the importance of the Pacific basin and with Alaska, Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, and the Philippines properly defended and in friendly hands, we will then have the bases for a striking power with which to discourage any potential aggressor nation from taking the calculated risk of attacking us in this age of the airplanes and the atom. The administration's arms-implementation bill allocated 98 percent to Europe and 2 percent to the Pacific. This did not make sense to me when it was done, and it does not make sense to me now.

It is long past the time when the Government of the United States must give to the Pacific region the attention it deserves. It is, of course, of vital importance that western Europe with its great industrial complex and its western civilization not fall into Communist hands. It is no less important that nations containing more than a billion people in Asia not become part of the Soviet orbit. The future peace of the world and the security of this Nation may well depend upon what happens in the Far East while most of our attention is being diverted to Europe.

The question is asked "Can anything be done at this late date?" I believe that it can. While desperate, the situation is not more desperate than it was at the time of Dunkerque or Valley Forge.

First, of course, we need a foreign policy in the Far East. We have none there today. As a basis for such a foreign policy, I suggest the following:

First. That we make clear that we have no intention of recognizing the Communist regime in China at this time nor in the immediate future and that we make known to the powers associated with us that we do not look with favor upon such recognition by others.

It is of course not sufficient merely to delay our own recognition if, with a wink of the eye or tongue in cheek the State Department leaves doubt in the minds of others as to the course of action we may pursue.

Second. That we have a major shake-up in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department. We cannot expect to get inspired leadership for a new policy in the Far East from those who have been receivers of the bankrupt policy we have been following.

Third. Our policy itself, of course, will have to be set by our constitutional officers, the President, his advisers, and the Congress. Once we have a foreign policy there is great need for it to be coordinated in both its economic and defense phases. As coordinator, either Gen. Douglas MacArthur or some other comparable figure should be selected so that in that area of the world the right hand will know what the left is do' g.

Fourth. We should give supervised aid to the legal Government of China in the same way we gave it to the legal Governments of Greece and Korea when they were threatened by communism. I have never favored giving unsupervised assistance. A mission headed by a man of the caliber of General Wedemeyer could supervise the requests for aid, be sure that the Chinese Government was properly training the troops in the use of equipment, and make certain from a logistical point of view that the supplies were received at the points where they were needed.

Fifth. Unfreeze the remaining ECA funds that are available for use in non-Communist China. Much could be done to bolster the economy of Formosa and Hainan Islands with the $106,000,000 remaining unexpended. On both of those islands there is a very fine joint Chinese rural-rehabilitation program which should be continued and enlarged, as well as other steps that would strengthen the civilian morale behind the defending troops. The funds and the authority are there until February 1. It only needs implementation by the President.

Sixth. Make use of the $75,000,000 authorized and appropriated by the Congress for aid in the immediate area of China. Even this relatively small amount in the arms-implementation bill, if promptly and effectively used, could increase greatly the capacity to resist and strengthen the morale of those who want to maintain a non-Communist Republic of China. If there is a will to help there is also available excess equipment in addition to the $75,000,000 amount.

Seventh. Strengthen the American Navy in the Far East. The addition of at least two carriers, and possibly three, would do much to restore confidence in that part of the world. Just as the visit of American vessels to Greece and Turkey while the war of nerves was at its height, restored confidence in that area of the world 2 years ago. Even the executive department now realizes there has been an overdraft in our Pacific defenses.

Eighth. Make it clear that this Government will not sit back for more than a year and do nothing but send a series of notes when people representing this Government are illegally held by the Communist regime in China. Certainly, until they are all released we should undertake to see to it that no traffic was permitted into or out of Communist-held ports. They would have the choice of releasing American personnel or finding that they could not be strengthened in their war efforts through their seaports.

If we use the same courage and common sense that motivated the men who sat in the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia there is no foreign foe we need fear, there is no domestic problem we cannot solve.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a dispatch in the December 23 memorandum by the State Department to its representatives overseas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDERSON in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOKYO.—The United States State Department has notified its attachés that the loss of Formosa, island redoubt of the Chinese Nationalists, to the Communists was to be anticipated.

The Department said the public must be sold on the idea that the island is of no strategic value in order to prevent the loss of prestige at home and abroad.

This is "largely because of a mistaken popular conception of its strategic importance to United States defense in the Pacific," the document added.

"The loss of the island is widely anticipated, and the manner in which civil and military conditions there have deteriorated under the Nationalists adds weight to the expectation," it said.

The fall of Formosa, it continued, would threaten a loss of prestige by the United States at home and abroad "to the extent that we have become committed in the public mind to hold it.

The fall, it continued, also would threaten damage to the morale of other nations, "particularly in the Far East, which are disturbed by Communist gains and fear its possible further advances."

The document said Formosa—politically, geographically, and strategically—is a part of China and "in no way especially distinguished or important."

"Politically and militarily it is a strictly Chinese responsibility," the document said. "It is true that the technical status of the island remains to be determined by the Japanese peace settlement, but the Cairo agreement and Potsdam declaration and (Japanese) surrender terms of September 2, 1945, looked to its return to China, and the United States facilitated its take-over by Chinese troops shortly after VJ-day.

"United States public opinion has concerned itself primarily with the question of the island's strategic importance; there has been an insistent demand from a few sources for military action by the United States, but it has not assumed significant proportions."

The document said that all available material should be used "to counter false impressions" that the retention of Formosa would save the Chinese Government, and that its loss would damage seriously the interests of either the United States or of other countries opposing communism.

"Without evidencing undue preoccupation with the subject," it continued, "emphasize as appropriate any of the following main points:

"Formosa is exclusively the responsibility of the Chinese Government. Formosa has no special military significance."

Under the latter point the document mentioned that Formosa is "only approximately 100 miles off the China coast," that other potential objects of Communist aggression are closer to points on the Chinese mainland than Formosa, and that "China has never been a sea power, and the island is of no special strategic advantage to the Chinese Communist armed forces.

"In the areas of insistent demand for United States action, particularly in the United States itself, we should occasionally make clear that seeking United States bases on Formosa, sending troops, dispatching naval units, or taking any similar action would—

"(A) Accomplish no material good for China or its Nationalist regime.

"(B) Involve the United States in a long-term venture producing at best a new area of bristling stalemate and at worst possible involvement in open warfare."

Those receiving the document were cautioned to "avoid" speculation which would show "undue concern with whether the Nationalists can hold the island," references which would indicate "strategic significance or that the island is a political entity," and "statements that Formosa's final status is to be determined by the Japanese peace treaty."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed a tabulation I have received from the United States Air Force showing the total cost of the Berlin airlift.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. S. Air Force—Estimated cost of Operation Vittles, June 26, 1948, through Sept. 3, 1949

Item of cost:	*Estimated cost*[1]
Civilian personnel	$27,932,700
Aircraft fuel and oil	26,749,100
Aircraft maintenance matériel	21,500,800
Communications equipment	20,000
Civilian 1,000-hour inspection	23,084,700
Subsistence	7,246,100
Clothing and equipage	1,478,900
Transportation of things	5,966,200
Engineer field operations	1,480,900
TDY, per diem and travel	384,900
Troop movements	869,400
Pay of the Air Force	48,062,200
Commercial communications	41,400
Subtotal	164,817,300
Reserve (for costs of terminating the operation and inventories)	63,856,200
Aircraft wrecked (23 C–54's and 2 R5D's at $310,000; 8 C–47's at $110,000; and 1 C–82 at $442,000)	9,072,000
Depreciation of aircraft (based on 10,321 hours life, no salvage value)	16,823,300
Grand total	254,568,800

[1] Reflects actual operating cost through July 31, 1949; estimated operating cost Aug. 1 to date and estimate for all other costs.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask to have printed at this point a letter addressed to me under date of December 31, 1949, by Hon. Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *December 31, 1949.*

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have your request for my views on the China situation.

There is merit in the contention that the continuous pressures upon the anti-Communist National Government of China, beginning in 1943, to take the Communists into that Government contributed to the break-down of prestige and strength of Chiang Kai-shek, and the encouragement of Mao Tse-tung. Despite all this, your question still remains. What to do next?

It is my strong belief that we should not recognize the Communist Government of China; that we must continue to recognize and support the National Government; that we should, if necessary, give it naval protection to the possessions of Formosa, the Pescadores, and possibly Hainan Islands.

Among many reasons are:

(1) A wall against communism in the Pacific;

(2) The defense of Japan and the Philippines.

(3) The prevention of the Chinese legations and consulates in the United States (and such other countries as agree with us) becoming nests of Communist conspiracies;

(4) The prevention of another Communist permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, with its dangerous implications to that body;

(5) The dangers of Chinese Communist participation in formulating peace with Japan;

(6) By maintaining at least a symbol of resistance, we would have a better basis for salvation of southeastern Asia; and

(7) There would be at least a continued hope of sometime turning China in the paths of freedom again.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD a cablegram dated November 20, 1949, which I sent to the President of the United States from Taipei, Taiwan—Formosa.

There being no objection, the cablegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAIPEI, TAIWAN, *November 20, 1949.*

President HARRY TRUMAN,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge that notes of protest in Angus Ward case be implemented by action that will be understood by the law-abiding nations of the world.

First, I suggest we notify Chinese Communists via Voice of America, with information copy of broadcast to Soviet Embassy in Washington, that unless Ward and all other civilian and military personnel of the United States are released and returned to our jurisdiction within 48 hours our Government will institute an effective sea and air blockade along the entire coast line now held by Chinese Communists. Second, inform United Nations of our contemplated action and invite other member nations to join in action to restore respect for international law and order. Third, make it clear that while we welcome other law-abiding nations sharing the responsibility we are prepared, alone if necessary, to make the air and sea blockade effective against commercial ships and planes of all sizes and all nationalities. Fourth, if our responsible commanders in the Pacific do not at the moment have sufficient vessels or planes in the immediate area to carry out their mission there are plenty in Fleet and Air Reserve status to further implement what we do have in the Far East and the Pacific. If we continue to let Ward and others to be held as hostages by international blackmailers without more than words on our part we will lose what standing we have left in this important part of the world and our own self-respect as well.

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed a letter I received under date of December 30, 1949, from the Economic Cooperation Administration showing their estimate of the balance of the China economic aid funds available to be $106,100,000.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., December 30, 1949.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: In accordance with your request for the present balance of funds available for the purposes of the China Aid Act of 1948, as extended by section 12 of Public Law 47 (81st Cong.), I am sending you the enclosed table which shows both the present unobligated balance of these funds and additional funds expected shortly to be made available by the reduction of certain outstanding procurement authorizations.

The procurement authorizations which will be reduced were among those issued for commodities such as cotton and rice that were programed for delivery to the Chinese mainland when, as the result of the fall, first of Shanghai and later of Canton, it became impossible to deliver these commodities to their destination. Appropriate action was taken to halt procurement, or in the case of goods already purchased or shipped, to divert them from their original destination and dispose of them by sale. Parenthetically, the greater part of the reductions which resulted from the fall of Shanghai and Canton has already been completed, and is reflected in the present unobligated balance.

The total of funds available for obligation will, of course, be reduced by any procurement authorizations issued between now and February 15, 1950. Current shipments of fertilizer and small amounts of cotton, however, are against outstanding procurement authorizations and will not further reduce the balance.

If there is any further information you wish on this subject, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. FOSTER,
Deputy Administrator.

ECA China aid program—Estimate of available funds

	Millions of United States dollars
Unobligated balance, Dec. 22, 1949	94.5
Less: Transfer to State Department for Chinese student aid, Public Law 327, 81st Cong	4.0
	90.5
Estimated additional deobligation of funds	15.6
Estimated balance of funds available	106.1

BREAK-DOWN OF ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL DEOBLIGATION OF FUNDS

	Millions of United States dollars
Unused balances in outstanding procurement authorizations	13.0
Proceeds from sales of diverted commodities	1.5
Proceeds from claims against shippers	1.1
Total	15.6

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask to have printed at this point a press dispatch from the Associated Press which appeared in the Washington Post on January 4, 1950, showing that Sir Stafford Cripps says that the British gold reserve is now $1,500,000,000.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH GOLD RESERVE GAINS $100,000,000

LONDON, January 3.—Britain has reversed the ruinous drain on her gold and dollar reserves since devaluation of the pound, an informed source said today.

The reserve fund which had fallen to $1,404,000,000 on September 30, 12 days after devaluation, has jumped nearly $100,000,000 to $1,500,000,000, the informant said.

The news, which is expected to be announced officially Wednesday by Sir Stafford Cripps, Chancellor of the Exchequer, increased the likelihood of an early general election.

Prime Minister Attlee could now call an election and point to the figures as proof that the economic situation is better and that Britain is over the hump.

If he delays, the recovery trend might be reversed. Already the cost of living is on the rise and is likely to go still higher as the result of the increased cost of importing food from dollar countries. Steep increases could affect the Government's popularity with the British laboring man.

Attlee's 5-year term is up at the end of July, and he must call a general election before then.

Also, other members of the sterling area—most of the Commonwealth countries, Burma, Iraq, and Iceland—have stepped up their campaigns to earn more dollars. They cheapened their money the same time Britain did. Their dollar earnings go into the British reserve fund, a common pool over which Britain presides as banker.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask to have printed an item which appeared on page 4 in Labor's Monthly Survey for October-November, a publication issued by the American Federation of Labor, under the heading "Will peoples of the Far East lose their freedom?" I ask to have the item printed in its entirety.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL PEOPLES OF THE FAR EAST LOSE THEIR FREEDOM?

The Communist military conquest of China, now almost complete, is of immense consequence to all freedom-loving people. On the maps on page 5, the gray area shows the territory taken over by Communist armies under Soviet guidance since January 1947. On the November 1949 map, arrows show the present Communist drive to complete the conquest of China, and to penetrate and take over other countries to the south and east. Their method in these countries is to stir up discontent, promise the people great benefits under a so-called "workers'

democracy," get control of unions, infiltrate the government and military forces, with the final goal of seizing complete control. In practically every country of the Far East Communist cells are at work, under the Kremlin's direction. The Communist conquest of China immensely strengthens the Communist movements throughout this entire area. The map on page 7 shows the Far East and its resources. Communist movements are at work in India, Burma, Indochina, Indonesia, the Philippines, Japan, the South Korean Republic, and elsewhere.

This area is immensely important to the entire world. These countries, overshadowed by Russia on the north and stretching from Pakistan on the far west to (but not including) Australia on the southeast, cover a land area almost four times that of United States of America and contain more than half the world's entire population. Seven times as many people live there as in United States of America. A longing for freedom and self-government has been growing among these people and in the last few years great strides toward independence have been made. In 1939, all of these countries except China, Japan, and Siam—that is, countries in which 570,000,000 people live today—were part of the British, French, Dutch, and Japanese empires. Today nearly all these peoples (537,000,000) are free and independent. India, Pakistan, Ceylon, and Burma, with their 428,000,000 people, were part of the British Empire and today are independent dominions or countries; Indonesia, with 69,000,000, was part of the Dutch Empire and today is a free nation; the Philippines, with 20,000,000, belonged to United States of America and is now independent; South Korea, with 21,000,000, was temporarily part of the Japanese Empire and is now again a free republic. Only some 33,000,000 people, in Indochina (French), Malaya and North Borneo (British), and New Guinea (Dutch and British), are still under protectorates of foreign powers. This progress toward self-government is truly remarkable.

Most of the people of these countries live under the most primitive conditions. The majority cannot read or write, so that information must be taken to them by word of mouth. Newly formed governments, lacking experience and military strength, find it difficult to deal with the Communist cells fomenting revolution and armed uprisings among their people. So the area offers a fertile field for Communist activities, which are intensified as the conquest of China proceeds. Promises of great benefits from the "workers' democracy" sound inviting to workers with such low living standards, and they cannot know what other millions have learned—that these Communist promises are false and that those who swallow the Communist bait end in slavery, poverty, and the police state controlled by Moscow.

To help these people raise their living standards and keep their freedom is an immediate responsibility, not only for the United States but for other free peoples. Otherwise they will fall victim to the Kremlin's imperialist drive.

The rich resources of this region provide the means for raising living standards there and are also vital to the entire world as raw materials. The map on page 7 shows for each country the resources which are most important in world trade. By exchanging these products for textiles, clothing, machinery, etc., from industrial countries these people are improving their living standards and can greatly increase their progress in the years ahead. They would be impoverished if this trade were broken off. On the other hand, industrial countries which send them manufactured goods cannot do without the raw materials produced there. For some materials, such as tin and tungsten, the world's main resources are in this region. For each country the map shows in bold face those products which are vital or indispensable in world trade and for which that country is the main far eastern source; in light face are shown other important products.

These materials are of great strategic importance to the United States. For instance, tungsten is indispensable for the high-speed tools on which mass production depends; 80 percent of our supply comes from China. The region where the word "tungsten" appears on the map contains the world's main resources; adequate supplies do not exist anywhere else. This region will fall into Communist hands if the Chinese Nationalist Government is defeated. Tin is essential because there is no other unbreakable material which can replace it for preserving food—a necessity for an army and for civilians. It is necessary, too, for solder and brass and bronze alloys needed to resist corrosion in machines. There are no tin deposits in United States of America; 75 percent of our supply comes from the Far East which has the world's greatest unused reserves, and without which we could not get the tin we need.

For many other products far eastern resources are an immediate need for our industries and indispensable in time of war. Steel cannot be made without manganese; radio, radar, electronics require the highest grade of mica; castor beans make an oil which will resist the low temperatures of Arctic flying and is also necessary for certain types of plastics, paints, and enamels. We depend on India for vital quantities of these products, and India in turn depends on us for machinery, autos and trucks, drugs, chemicals, hardware, and electrical equipment which we send her in return. Bauxite is the raw material for aluminum; chromite is essential for heat-resistant steels and alloys which maintain their strength at high temperatures, and cannot be replaced by any other product; graphite is indispensable for crucibles which will stand the many heatings and coolings necessary in making high-grade steel; hemp is the only known material strong and elastic enough to make high-tension ropes. Natural rubber is essential for heavy-duty tires and many other purposes, and also because we cannot afford to use up our petroleum resources in making artificial rubber. For all of these products we depend on the Far East for indispensable supplies, and these countries depend on us for machinery, iron and steel, chemicals, medicines, tobacco, fertilizers, textiles, canned milk, and other foods. Some of their mineral resources do not exist in adequate quantities anywhere else in the world. For many of the agricultural products, such as rubber and hemp, the Far East is by soil and climate especially adapted to their production. They could be produced elsewhere only after huge expenditure of capital and a period of development requiring many years.

Trade with the Far East is vital to us because we need the best materials and must have a steady supply in the immediate future. If these young nations are to keep their freedom, they need the products we send them in return and our help in developing their own industries and resources. To permit Soviet Russia to close them into her walled-off economic system, would mean poverty and slavery for them, for Russia can neither help them toward freedom and self-government nor toward the use of their resources to raise living standards.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed an item appearing in the Weekly Summary of Developments, issued by the Economic Cooperation Administration, under the heading "China program." I ask to have printed what appears in paragraph (b), which shows the difficulties the Chinese Communists are now running into behind their own lines.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(b) The Communists were reported experiencing serious difficulties in effecting a smooth economic take-over of the large areas being brought so rapidly under their control. Considerable unrest was reported in Canton and other south-coast areas. Meanwhile, in the large cities of north and central China a sharp inflationary spiral in commodity prices was taking place. Rice, cotton cloth, and flour were the leading items in this rise, which soon spread to other commodities and was reflected in rising rates for the parity deposit unit, foreign exchange, and bank interest. Strenuous efforts by the authorities, particularly in Shanghai, to control this rise by dumping through state trading organizations seemed only to slow but not to check, the price rise. Poor food harvests, increased demands for commodities in newly captured areas of south China, and speculative activities of city merchants seemed to be the chief factors in the inflationary trend.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the other papers and documents I have placed in the RECORD, the letter of resignation of Ambassador Hurley, as well as copy of a letter written by me to Secretary of State Dean Acheson under date of January 3, 1950.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am grateful to both you and the Secretary of State for the support you have given me and for your kind offer in requesting me to return to China as Ambassador.

In one capacity or another I have been on the perimeter of America's influence since the beginning of the war. During the war I have served in Java, Australia, New Zealand, and generally in the Southwest Pacific, in Egypt, Palestine, the Lebanon, Syria, Transjordan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Russia, Afghanistan, India, Ceylon, Burma, and China. Of all of the assignments China was the most intricate and the most difficult. It is a source of gratification to me that in all my missions I had the support of President Roosevelt, Secretary Hull, Secretary Stettinius, yourself, Mr. President, and Secretary Byrnes.

In the higher echelon of our policy-making officials American objectives were nearly always clearly defined. The astonishing feature of our foreign policy is the wide discrepancy between our announced policies and our conduct of international relations. For instance, we began the war with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and democracy as our goal. Our associates in the war at that time gave eloquent lip service to the principles of democracy. We finished the war in the Far East furnishing lend-lease supplies and using all our reputation to undermine democracy and bolster imperialism and communism. Inasmuch as I am in agreement with you and the Secretary of State on our foreign policy, I think I owe it to you as well as to the country to point out the reasons for the failure of the American foreign policy in reaching the objectives for which we said we were fighting the war.

I will confine my remarks in this letter to Asia, although I wish to assure you that I will be at your service in discussing frankly other phases of our international relations. I was assigned to China at a time when statesmen were openly predicting the collapse of the National Government of the Republic of China and the disintegration of the Chinese Army. I was directed by President Roosevelt to prevent the collapse of the Government and to keep the Chinese Army in the war.

From both a strategical and diplomatic viewpoint the foregoing constituted our chief objective. The next in importance was the directive to harmonize the relations between the Chinese and American Military Establishments and between the American Embassy in Chungking and the Chinese Government. It will readily appear that the former objective could not be accomplished without the accomplishment of the secondary objective as a condition precedent. Both of these objectives were accomplished. While these objectives had the support of the President and the Secretary of State, it is no secret that the American policy in China did not have the support of all the career men in the State Department. The professional Foreign Service men sided with the Chinese Communist-armed party and the imperialist bloc of nations whose policy it was to keep China divided against herself. Our professional diplomats continuously advised the Communists that my efforts in preventing the collapse of the National Government did not represent the policy of the United States. These same professional diplomats advised the Communist-armed party to decline unification of the Chinese Communist Army with the National Army unless the Chinese Communists were given control.

Despite these handicaps we did make progress toward unification of the armed forces of China. We did prevent civil war between the rival factions, at least until after I had left China. We did bring the leaders of the rival parties together for peaceful discussions. Throughout this period the chief opposition to the accomplishment of our mission came from the American career diplomats in the Embassy at Chungking and in the Chinese and Far Eastern Divisions of the State Department.

I requested the relief of the career men who were opposing the American policy in the Chinese theater of war. These professional diplomats were returned to Washington and placed in the Chinese and Far Eastern Divisions of the State Department as my supervisors. Some of these same career men whom I relieved have been assigned as advisers to the supreme commander in Asia. In such positions most of them have continued to side with the Communist-armed party and at times with the imperialist bloc against American policy. This, Mr. President, is an outline of one of the reasons why American foreign policy announced by the highest authority is rendered ineffective by another section of diplomatic officials.

JANUARY 3, 1950.

HON. DEAN G. ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I understand that under date of December 23 or thereabouts, the State Department issued a memorandum to various military attachés and others, indicating that Formosa could not be held for long and to do evetrything possible to prepare the public for the loss of the island and to stress the fact it was not needed for the strategic defense of the United States.

As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee, I desire to have a copy of this memorandum at the earliest possible date.

With best personal regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I first want to commend my distinguished colleague for his splendid presentation of this difficult problem which is facing us. I may say further that I plan to follow the Senator with a presentation next week of my own observations based on my trip to the Far East.

At this moment, however, I should like to ask the Senator a question. Does the Senator share the view with me, which I got very strongly from my study of the whole question, and especially from my trip and contacts out there, that this Communist-Chinese movement originated in Moscow some 20 years ago with a plan which was then conceived; that Chinese were taken to Moscow and trained for this very leadership; that the leadership today are Moscow-trained agents, directed now from Moscow, supplied by Moscow, and that the plan in China follows the plan under the Moscow program of the new kind of Russian infiltration into various countries of the world?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to say to the able Senator from New Jersey, who is a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and who has done such yeoman service in support of our policy in western Europe, and in the Americas, that I believe he is absolutely correct, that the Communist leader Mao Tse-tung and the other leaders are taking their direction from the Kremlin; they are part and parcel of the international Communist conspiracy, and that the bill of goods which had been sold to some people for a period of years that the Communists were only agrarian liberals now stands exposed, particularly in view of the statements of Mao Tse-tung himself in July, and in earlier and later statements, and his more recent meeting with Premier Stalin in Moscow.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Would the Senator then agree with me further that while, as he has pointed out, we have taken yeoman steps in dealing with the western European situation; while we have put through the Atlantic Pact; while we have put through our program there to halt the spread of communism; in other words while we have locked the door against its further spread in Europe; yet we have left the back door wide open in Asia, and if today we should be led into the fatal error of recognizing the Communist regime in China, our far eastern policy would be completely at variance with what has been our policy in western Europe?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct in saying that while we have closed the door to communism in Europe we have not only left the door open in Asia, but by our policies we have accelerated the spread of communism in Asia, so that today gains for communism there have far more than offset the losses suffered by communism in Europe.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Does the Senator agree further that the recognition of Communist China, which is the key to the whole situation, would be the signal for the other nations of Asia that are wobbling on the brink to join in the procession, so that all the nations of Asia may turn to communism at our own back door?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it would put a premium on insurrection and revolution. It would say to those connected with the international conspiracy of communism, "If you can seize power by force of arms you will get the blessings of Great Britain and any other country that may follow her, and, perhaps, if you just hold out a little while until the heat cools off you may even get the blessing of the United States of America." I say that any such policy of recognizing the Communist regime in China either by ourselves or by those associated with us in the North Atlantic Pact undermines a basic policy we have tried to formulate to protect and to give to the world a place in which free men in a free world may live. We cannot dam up the tide of communism in Europe and let it run over its banks in Asia. Communism is just as destructive of human liberty in Asia as it is in Europe.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree completely with the Senator from California. I thank him for his statement. As I announced a moment ago, I hope next week to continue this debate based upon my experience obtained from my recent trip to Asia.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. May I inquire of the Senator if when he was in the Far East he visited Formosa?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; the Senator did.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did the Senator have a personal conference with Chiang Kai-shek?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from California not only met Premier Yen, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, but Acting President Li Tsung-jen, who at that time was in a hospital in Hong Kong; the government and provincial officials in Formosa, and the municipal officials in Chungking and Nanning and the members of their Congress, what they call the legislative Yuan in China.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very glad the Senator saw those parties, but I was inquiring about the Generalissimo particularly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I met him.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did the Senator go over with him all the questions he has discussed here today?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I did not go over with him all these questions; no.

Mr. CONNALLY. What did the Senator go over with him?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from California, when he has had private conversations with individuals who hold responsible positions in government, is not in the habit of giving a stenographic report on such conversations any more than is the able Senator from Texas. I am prepared at a later date to document any of the statements that have been made, and I shall do so.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not quarrel with the Senator's statement now, but in the course of his remarks he referred to having seen all these people.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. And inferences might be drawn from that, whether or not they are true, that the views expressed by the Senator reflected their views.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. I think the Senator from California and other Senators on the floor have for some considerable period of time been interested in our foreign policy. I happen to speak as one who has supported the foreign policy in Europe, because I thought we had a policy which made sense and which was understood by Congress and the country. It was to try to maintain human freedom. It was to give economic rehabilitation to the war-torn nations, recognizing that communism thrives on economic and political collapse. We recognized that economic aid alone might not be sufficient. So for the first time in our history we entered the North Atlantic Pact, because we recognized in this day and age of the airplane and the atom that an act of aggression there must be of concern to the law-abiding nations everywhere, and because we have a policy in Europe that has made some sense, I have supported it.

But we have had no such policy in Asia, and to the contrary, the record is very clear that the policies followed by this Government have run counter to the policies we follow in Europe. We have actually urged on the Republic of China to take Communists into their Government. We tried to force them to do it by withholding arms and ammunition from them at the very time the Soviet army of occupation was giving arms and ammunition to the Communist forces there. We issued the white paper when they had their backs to the wall. We have followed a policy in Asia which is destructive of our policy in Europe.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did the Senator oppose the mission of General Marshall when he was in China?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from California was not a Member of the Senate of the United States all of that time. He happened to have been in the Army, in the European theater of operations.

Mr. CONNALLY. He had some views on the subject, did he not? He did not stay in the Army? He came out of the Army.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I came into the Senate in September 1945.

Mr. CONNALLY. But General Marshall was over there at a later period, was he not?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I did not favor the views of General Marshall in trying to form a coalition with the Communists.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wonder if the Senator could shed some light on a certain subject. I read in a local newspaper a short time ago that the man in charge of promotions or placements in one branch of the State Department is named John Service, the same John Service who in 1944, according to Gen. Patrick Hurley's papers, advocated that we torpedo Chiang Kai-shek, and who officially as a representative of the State Department said that the only hope of Asia was communism. The same John Service was later picked up by the FBI on charges of espionage. He was not tried, he was not convicted, but was brought home, promoted, and put in charge of personnel and placement in the State Department.

As I said, I read this in a local newspaper, the Times-Herald, and I wonder if the Senator could shed any light on that particular situation, as to whether or not the situation still exists, in other words, whether this man, John Service, who in 1944 said, "Let us scuttle Chiang Kai-shek" and who said the only hope of Asia is communism, this man who was picked up by the FBI, for espionage, who was accused of having had a sizable number of secret documents in his possession which he was handing over to the Communists, is still in charge of personnel and placement, as he apparently was about a month ago when the article appeared in the newspaper?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I cannot throw any light on the Senator's statement at this time. I should like to have printed in the RECORD, however, a letter of resignation submitted by Ambassador Hurley at the time, in which he points out that some of the persons he had removed from the China area in the State Department he later found to be issuing instructions from the Far Eastern Division. I do that without any relation to the Senator's statement, but I think the letter of Mr. Hurley will speak for itself.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDERSON in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish first to compliment the Senator from California for giving this timely report on some of his findings in the Pacific. Having spent some time in some of the same places the Senator from California has visited, I should like to make certain inquiries.

The Senator has indicated that our policy, as announced at the time of sending General Marshall to China, was that China was to take into its Government certain Communists and make a coalition of the Communists and the National Government. I wish to ask the Senator whether he found evidence in the Far East that we had the same policy in relation to Korea, namely that the Koreans, too, were advised that the policy of the United States was that they should and must take Communists into their Government when it was formed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator that I have been advised, on what I believe to be reliable authority, that the American authorities in Korea, at the time when a provisional government was getting ready to be established there, urged that Communists be taken into the Korean Government, and even went to the extent of offering to give the Communists 40 percent of the strength in the Government. However, I understood that the Communists rejected that offer, because they wanted at least 51 percent. I think that is a matter to which the Foreign Relations Committee and other proper committees should give further study in order to get the facts.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to ask another question. Is the Senator satisfied, from evidence received, that that was our policy?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Based upon information which the Senator from Michigan has, and which I received while I was there, I think it has a substantial foundation in fact.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to ask a few more questions?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from California has indicated that he has a memorandum from the United Press as to a memorandum dated December 23, sent to our various embassies and Foreign Service officials in the Far East; and he has offered that press release as a part of the RECORD. He also has indicated that he has asked the State Department for a copy of the original document, so that he and the Senate as a whole might be advised regarding the exact text of that memorandum. Can the Senator advise whether up to this time the State Department has furnished that document to him or has given him evidence on that point?

Mr. KNOWLAND. In answer to the Senator's question, I say that on January 3, the day the wire services carried the story from Tokyo, I wrote Secretary Acheson the following letter:

> DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I understand that under date of December 23, or thereabouts, the State Department issued a memorandum to various military attachés and others indicating that Formosa could not be held for long, and to do everything possible to prepare the Americans for the loss of the island, and to stress the fact that it was not needed for the strategic defense of the United States. As a member of the Senate Armed Service Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee, I desire to have a copy of this memorandum at the earliest possible date.
>
> With best personal regards, I am,
> Sincerely yours.

I will say that in addition to that, I talked with Under Secretary Webb over the telephone. Under Secretary Webb, as I mentioned in my remarks a few minutes ago, said that he believed the document was a classified document for the information of Foreign Service and other official personnel overseas. He did not undertake to say that I could not have the document, but at the same time he did not say that I could have it.

Subsequent to that, I had a call from Mr. Webb, saying that he thought he could arrange for me to see the document, but that it could not be sent. I told him that would not satisfy my request, under the circumstances.

This morning the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and I had a conference lasting an hour and a half with the Secretary of State. I do not intend to go into that at this time, obviously. But I think that is indicative of the history of this matter.

I have not yet received a copy of the document. I wish to compliment the American wire services, because I think they have done more to keep the American public informed about foreign policy and other matters upon which they are entitled to information than the policy followed by the State Department—the

policy of lowering an iron curtain between their activities and the Congress and the country—has done. Based upon that document and upon what I believe to be an accurate representation of what was in it—in which it is flat-footedly stated that Formosa has no strategic value—I have raised this question on the floor of the Senate, and I shall raise it again and again: Upon what do they base the statement that Formosa has no strategic value? Have they received any such information from General MacArthur? Have they received any such information from Admiral Radford? Have they received any such information, indeed, from the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

It is my opinion that they have received no such information, and that to that extent it is a misleading document, which has been sent to our State Department representatives overseas.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from California has indicated that he has spoken to certain men in the Pacific, including the general in charge of Japan, General MacArthur; and the Senator has also named Admiral Radford and others with whom the Senator has conferred. Would the Senator be able to state to the Senate whether, so far as his knowledge is concerned, we had, at the time when the Senator spoke to those men, a foreign policy in the Pacific?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say to the Senator that there is no doubt in my mind that the responsible commanders in the Pacific are greatly concerned lest Formosa fall into unfriendly hands.

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, not wishing to quote or not quoting exactly the language of the men who are in charge of our defense of the Pacific, the Senator from California would say to the Senate today that he did not find in the Pacific evidence, as indicated in the document dated December 23, that Formosa is not of any strategic value to the United States of America?

Mr. KNOWLAND. To the contrary, upon my responsibility as a Senator of the United States, it is my judgment that the responsible commanders in that area of the world feel that Formosa is a very strategic island and that its loss into unfriendly hands would be detrimental to the American defense in the Pacific.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is that the reason why the Senator from California has stated that if Formosa is lost, then we might expect that the defense line would move to the Pacific coast, as the Senator has indicated?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It would certainly greatly weaken the American defense position in that part of the world, if Formosa should fall into unfriendly hands.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to commend the Senator from California for his very well phrased and carefully thought out statement on a subject of the highest importance. Without necessarily agreeing with all the Senator's contentions or his conclusions, I should like to assure him that, as one Member of the Senate and as one member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I feel that his contentions are entitled to categorical answers by the State Department, and I shall do whatever I can to see that those categorical answers are obtained.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, I was very much interested in what the Senator from California had to say, because on many occasions he and I have come to some area of agreement on these matters. But it seems to me that, even agreeing with the conclusions reached by the Senator, we somewhat miss the point in regard to this question of international policy. I wish to ask the Senator a very serious question in regard to the enigma of China. I know a little, personally, about the Orient. Is the Senator from California convinced that this upheaval in China is not literally a civil war?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course it is a civil war, in the sense that there have been Chinese fighting Chinese, with one group of Chinese led by Moscow-trained Communist leaders——

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is no question about that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. And the other group under the Nationalist Government of China. To that extent, if that is a definition of civil war, certainly there has been civil war going on there.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then I wish to ask the Senator another question: Is he convinced that if it were possible to leave Russia out of the equation——

Mr. KNOWLAND. But it is not possible to leave Russia out of it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is the Senator convinced that this would not have happened in China, regardless of Russia or regardless of the communistic influences the Senator has suggested in his speech?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I would not say that in that country or any other countries there would not have been certain upheavals, as there have been from time to time in certain South American countries and in Mexico and other countries, before stability reached those areas of the world. But I say there is a vast difference between a fight between two local groups, each trying to obtain control, and finally one of those groups triumphs and obtains the possession of power in that country, and the kind of fight we have witnessed in China. A fight between two strictly local or strictly national groups is one thing, but it is quite another thing when communism is on the march and is using, not the tactics of Hitler but the new technique of taking a country from within. The people of Czechoslovakia are just as enslaved under the Communist regime as they were under the Hitlerian regime. Of course, I say that under the Communists there were not to date any overt Soviet invasions across the border; but a man like Petkov, who was hanged, is just as dead as if he had been hanged by the Nazis. So in that respect there is no difference.

Yet international communism has been able to make its advance, so that now international communism has an aggregate of power just as great, if not considerably greater, than Hitler, Tojo, and Mussolini had at the height of their power.

It has been the viewpoint of the Senator from California, who has supported the United Nations and the international effort to preserve the peace of the world, that our best chance of preserving the peace of the world would be to assure the law-abiding nations a sufficient amount of power so that no potential aggressor nation would feel that his calculated risk of winning was greater than his calculated risk of losing. But, once the 13 men of the Kremlin, who are not dependent upon public opinion, feel that their chance of winning is greater than that of losing, that period is, I think, a great danger period for the peace of the world, and certainly the attitude we have taken in Asia of constantly retreating before communism does not serve the cause of world peace anymore than Mr. Chamberlain's position at Munich served the peace of the world, because appeasement, then and now, as I pointed out, and as was so ably demonstrated by the Senator from Michigan, is but surrender on the installment plan. So, I think those facts must be kept in mind, and we must realize that we are dealing with an international conspiracy to destroy the liberty of free people everywhere.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not disagree with the Senator on that at all, but it seems to me again we are missing the real issue here. If the conclusion of the Senator is correct that we have retreated, the decision might have been that we were retreating from the frying pan into the fire, no matter which way we moved in China, affirmatively or negatively. It seems to me even granting all the Senator says to be correct—and I know the facts he states are correct—we may disagree on conclusions, but we have got to talk about the other side when we make a decision. I presume that facts could be gathered—in fact I know they could be—which would be just damning of the nationalistic government as of the Communist government.

I think we face a problem in connection with which we must consider both sides, and what they have done. I recommend to the Senator a book that has just been published called China Shakes the World, by a very noted Chinese oriental correspondent by the name of Jack Belden, in which the same damning evidence appears. Of course, we do not want a Communist-dominated government anywhere in the world, but it is a question of making a choice in some instances, when we have to determine a policy.

What bothers me seriously is that in this matter we are between the devil and the deep blue sea. I assume the facts to be as stated in both instances. I do not disagree with the Senator. He and I have agreed on many things. I do not disagree with him in regard to the military importance of the Pacific. I know a little bit about that, too. But the

question of policy in the Far East must necessarily involve a discussion of those who now have control of the great geographical areas of China. I think that is the meat of the coconut.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not quite agree with the Senator that that is the meat of the coconut. I tried to stress in the remarks I previously made——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, may I interrupt further?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know; I am not so positive in my conclusions as is the Senator from California. I wish I knew. Probably Mr. Truman would make me Secretary of State if I knew the answer. But it seems to me that in any discussion, anyone who knew the answer would be valuable to this country in respect to its foreign policy. I do not know, but it seems to me that all our discussions are one-sided on this matter.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator that certainly the Senator from California recognizes that this is a very complex problem.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; I know that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Far East has always been a very complex problem. But we also are faced with the fact that communism is overrunning the land mass of Asia. I do not happen to believe that that is in the best interests of the peace of the world or of the security of this Nation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Nor do I.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator and I live on the Pacific coast. We saw a nation of about 75,000,000 people—Japan—which is relatively small compared with the land mass of Asia, drive the United States out of the Philippines, out of Guam, out of Wake; strike us almost a mortal blow at Pearl Harbor; move in through the Aleutians, and take some of our own territory, and actually occupy a position where they could make some minor raids upon the Pacific coast. That same nation of 75,000,000 people chased the British Empire completely out of the Pacific, except for Australia; moved the Dutch out; moved the French out; and drove China, which was then a relatively strong nation and an ally of ours, clear back into the mountains.

Now, what do we have? We already have international communism, that has taken, not 75,000,000 people, but more than 400,000,000 people of China, behind the iron curtain. Most of the responsible government officials of that area of the world, representing the Governments in Korea, the Philippines, and other places, recognize that the problem of holding southeast Asia, Burma, Indochina, and Siam is rendered very much more difficult by letting the Chinese Communists reach the borders of those countries, because there is the opportunity for a Greek situation, multiplied 10 times. In other words, with large Chinese populations in those countries, the opportunity of running arms, of having an incursion of agitators, of stirring up revolt, is greatly increased, and there are some people who believe, and I think with good reason, that if we lose all of China, with her 450,000,000 people, and southeast Asia, with some 100,000,000 more, the problem of ultimately holding India and Pakistan will be greatly complicated. So certainly at some point along the line we are going to have to adopt a policy.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If I may say so to the Senator, I do not agree with that at all. I think it is one of the most regrettable things in history that this has happened, but I do say that in any discussion of this matter we must discuss the alternative. The Senator has recommended some alternatives, with which I may or may not agree. But I think that in any discussion of this matter we must consider the alternative.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Obviously.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It happens that in China there is a peg on which we are hanging our hat—an alternative that also must be investigated. That is what is bothering me about the matter.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course we had that same problem in Greece.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; we did.

Mr. KNOWLAND. We entered the situation when there was a civil war in Greece, and we supported the legal government against the Communists, because we felt the Communist international conspiracy was trying to take away the liberties of the people of Greece. We may not have agreed 100 percent with the Greek Government, as then constituted——

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think we did, at the time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But we felt it was important to the peace of the world and to the security of this Nation not to permit Greece to become communistic.

We took a considerable calculated risk in Berlin. Very recently we were flying our planes over territory controlled by the greatest—and I say it advisedly—the greatest land military power in the world today, the Soviet Union. At any time some of those planes might have been shot down. Had they been, we would have faced a very difficult alternative. But, had we backed down, all Berlin would today be Communist, probably all of western Germany, and perhaps all of western Europe.

So we stood up to communism in Europe, and communism itself has receded. In every nation where a free election has been held the Communist strength has diminished since we undertook to stand up to communism in that area of the world. But in Asia, what did we do? There we cringed before communism. We permitted our Ambassador to be held in his compound. We permitted an American vice consul to be beaten up by the Communist police. We permitted Mr. Angus Ward to be held in confinement for 13 months and thrown into a common jail. A young man from Long Beach, Calif., wearing the uniform of the American Navy, and a sergeant of the United States Marine Corps have been held prisoners of the Communists for 13 months, and we have done nothing about it but send them notes, to slap them on the wrist, and to ask them will they not please let them out. A man wearing the uniform of a general of the United States, General Soule, and his assistant for 4 months had been trying to get out of the country, and every obstacle was thrown in their path. So I say advisedly we cringed before communism there.

When I was in the Far East last, in January 1946, this Nation stood at the peak of its power and prestige in that area of the world, and it almost brings tears to one's eyes, I say to the Senator from Washington, when he sees the low estate into which we have fallen today by the bankrupt policy we have followed in the Far East.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I do not disagree with the statement of the cases the Senator makes. We are all trying to seek an intelligent answer, and my only point was that in these discussions there should be some mention of the alternative. If we do what the Senator says, perhaps that is the wise thing to do; but in arriving at that policy we must consider the alternative.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There has been no discussion on this floor and, I think, too little in the press of the alternative. That is all I suggest. I do not disagree with the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator not admit, however, that this is a pretty late date for us to send Dr. Jessup on a slow boat to China, and for us to announce that we are waiting until February 1, to send our Joint Chiefs to talk with our Supreme Commander in the Pacific about what should be done in Formosa, when as a matter of fact today, prior to any of the discussions, the President of the United States writes off any further military assistance to the Republic of China, which was our wartime ally and friend. Whom are they trying to kid? What kind of consultations were they going to have? Was it merely to take the heat off in Congress? Was this merely window dressing they were going through, or do they sincerely mean to try to find a new policy? I say, based on the record, which cannot be disputed, including the memorandum of December 23, and the President's statement today at his press conference, they had no intention of helping the Republic of China to resist the Communist invasion there.

The responsibility is solely and exclusively on the shoulders of the administration. The Republican Party has not been consulted; it has not been called into any bipartisan consultation on foreign policy. This debacle solely and exclusively rests upon the administration which initiated and tolerated it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator has said that Dr. Jessup has been sent out there. That is correct. We have sent all sorts of persons to China, while the war was still in progress and even prior to the war. They have all come back with different answers and conclusions. There have been three or four missions which I recall. I do not know the objective of Dr. Jessup's visit. But surely the information we have received has been well examined by those who have gone there long prior to this time. Again I say that there is much confusion, and it may be that the Senator's conclusions are correct; but, nevertheless, the alternative has never been discussed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me call the Senator's attention to a dispatch from the Associated Press which appears in tonight's Washington Star:

Roving United States Ambassador Philip C. Jessup arrived today in Japan, first stop on an Asian survey trip that will take him to Formosa—new focal point of American controversy on far-eastern policy.

The tall, lanky envoy said he will confer with General MacArthur on the matter of the big island. Formosa is the last-stand bastion of Chiang Kai-shek's Chinese Nationalist Government.

It seems to me to be a little futile to have him out there preparing to discuss with our supreme commander the importance of Formosa while, at the same time, the President is announcing that we do not intend to do anything about Formosa.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We have had many missions to Formosa.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The President says, in a statement issued today:

Similarly, the United States Government will not provide military aid or advice to Chinese forces on Formosa.

Does not the Senator feel that that is entirely inconsistent with the position this country took in Greece, under almost the same circumstances?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Not only in Greece, but it is also inconsistent with what we are doing in Korea, where we have a very able mission. I met with them myself last month. Under General Roberts, they are training the Korean Army, who have been subject to incursions across that territory.

Mr. TAFT. This statement of the President is absolutely contrary to every other policy pursued by the Government throughout the world today.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct—where we have a will to prevent communism from going beyond the iron curtain.

Mr. TAFT. The President continues:

In the view of the United States Government, the resources on Formosa are adequate to enable them to obtain the items which they might consider necessary for the defense of the island.

Does the Senator regard that as an implication in any way that if we consider they are not sufficient, we shall then provide aid, or is it merely an excuse?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I regret to say that, based on the information I have, I think that is window dressing because I think it is clearly indicated that there is no intention of giving any support other than the $75,000,000 for military aid appropriated by the Congress at the last session.

Mr. TAFT. The last sentence of the President's statement is as follows:

The United States Government proposes to continue under existing legislative authority the present ECA program of economic assistance.

Does the Senator know of any economic assistance now being rendered to Formosa?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; a very limited amount, primarily the joint Chinese rural rehabilitation program. We sent last month, I think, four shiploads of fertilizer. We want to increase production. But fertilizer will not stop communism. That is not, basically, what the people want who are trying to defend their island against the same type of Communist aggression which has occurred in other sections of the world.

Mr. TAFT. The President's statement says:

Nor does it—

The United States—

have any intention of utilizing its armed forces to interfere in the present situation.

Are we not bound by treaty to use our armed forces to interfere with Communist invasion of Denmark or of the islands in the Baltic, or of Norway, or any of the other parties to the North Atlantic Treaty?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would merely say that this is the difference. This is a point which I was discussing with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. In the case of an overt aggression, I think the situation is very clear. I think it is less clear in a locally inspired rebellion, though I am inclined to believe that even there we would have, in the North Atlantic community, some considerable interest in a Communist attempt to attack. But it is not quite so clear a point as would be the marching of Russian troops across a frontier.

Mr. TAFT. The Greek situation is similar.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. The rejection of any idea of using our armed forces to stop the advance of communism in the area in question is wholly inconsistent with what we have agreed to do in stopping the advance of communism in Europe.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct. The legal Government of China is now being attacked.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to suggest to the distinguished Senator from California that we make a mistake when we say the executive department has no policy in China. I think there has been a very definite policy there. I should like to suggest that putting communism into Manchuria resulted from a definite agreement to which we were a party, and this gave communism a perfect springboard to go into the rest of China. I suggest that a second policy was the effort of the administration to persuade the nationalists of China to take Communists into their Government. The result which has occurred is therefore the desired result. The only difference is that the Communists had to fight for what they got, while our executive policy was to give it to them without a fight.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think, based on the cold record, the Senator has substantial grounds for his statement, and I believe they are correct grounds for saying that we have accelerated the spread of communism in China by the policies followed by our Government.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It has been suggested that we have not considered the alternatives sufficiently. I think the choice of alternatives is made very clear by the fact that one of them, the maintenance of the Chinese Nationalist Government did not involve the maintenance of an enemy against the United States, whereas the other alternative comes to that very thing. I suggest that the choice of alternatives is very simple for any citizen of the United States to make.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the able Senator from Colorado that when the whole story is revealed to the people of the United States I think they will react very strongly to the policy which their Government has followed, which, while calling upon them to give aid and assistance to stop communism in Europe, has, in fact, been aiding, abetting, and giving support to the spread of communism in Asia.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. The Senator has been reading much in the press about America winning the cold war. From what the Senator has just reported, I should like to ask him to state frankly to the American people whether we are winning the cold war.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As a Senator of the United States, I may say to the Senator from Indiana, and I say it reluctantly, that after having been in the Far East I am personally convinced that internationally communism has made gains in Asia which many times offset the losses of communism in Europe.

Mr. JENNER. Are not the figures something like this? In January, 1945, at the end of World War II, the Communists dominated 190,000,000 people on the world's surface. Today, less than 4 years from the end of World War II, the Communists dominate 800,000,000 people, almost half of the world's population. Is not that a correct statement?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not know precisely the population figures. I think they are substantially that ratio. Certainly more than that number of persons are now jeopardized by international communism.

Mr. JENNER. In other words, the Marshall plan to stop the spread of communism in Europe has been merely a holding action while communism ran rampant in the East. After communism consolidates her gains in the East what is to prevent her from coming back and picking up where she left off in the West?

Mr. KNOWLAND. When she has consolidated her position, I think she will do precisely that.

Mr. JENNER. I think the Senator has done the American people a great service in bringing out his report on this very timely subject, though I think he does the American people an injustice when he states it can all be charged to the present administration, because the Senator took the assumption that we, as a party, the Republican Party, were invited to participate in a bipartisan foreign

policy on western Europe, but the Democrats did not extend us the courtesy of inviting us in on a bipartisan foreign policy on the Far East. Therefore I do not blame the present administration for this debacle of the world which we face today. I blame the Republican Party as much if not more than I blame the Democratic Party, because bipartisanism in one part of the world affecting the foreign policy cannot be separated from any other part of the world. If we are to have bipartisanism in the foreign policy, we must be bipartisan all over the world.

My suggestion to the Republicans and to America is to have a rebirth of the two-party system of government, so that when things are going on as they have been going on for 4 years in China, we as a party can stand up and do what we are obligated to do, be a party of opposition, draw the issues, and give the American people a choice.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I speak as one who has supported the American foreign policy in Europe, and I say to the Senator from Indiana that I have proudly supported the American foreign policy in Europe, because I do not believe it was in the interest of the peace of the world or the security of this Nation to have western Europe overrun by Soviet Russia. Had we not had a foreign policy that stood up to communism in Europe—while it is somewhat of an academic question, of course, and we cannot prove it—my personal judgment is that, with the possible exception of Great Britain, all of western Europe would today be under Communist domination. I do not happen to think that would be in the best interest of the peace of the world or the security of this Nation.

I believe that the Republican Party made a substantial contribution to our foreign policy. I believe it did it by correcting mistakes which had been suggested by the administration. I believe it did it by improving legislation, and in many other ways. But my point is that we have had no such policy in the Far East. The administration has followed a contrary policy in that area of the world.

Mr. JENNER. Why have we not had such a policy in the Far East? If we had a bipartisan foreign policy in Europe, why did the Republican leaders, who were exponents of a bipartisan foreign policy in Europe, stand by and not say anything about our having a say, at least, in the Far East?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Indiana—and there is no need of the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from California differing with each other in this——

Mr. JENNER. Not at all, but I want the American people to see this picture. I want the Republicans to know what is going on.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In my opinion the Senator cannot merely with a wave of his hand eliminate the constitutional process in the United States. Basically the President of the United States has control of the foreign policy, under the Constitution.

Mr. JENNER. Wait a moment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The President has direction of the day-by-day operation of our foreign policy.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Unfortunately—and I think the Senator from Indiana will agree with me—the Democratic Party has been in control of the Presidency for, lo, these many years, so under the Constitution it has had primary responsibility for the Nation's foreign policy. The only place where the Republican Party can make itself felt, of course, in such matters is the Congress of the United States as the questions come before it. I believe that the Republican Party has made a substantial contribution to saving western Europe from communism and in improving the programs that were offered. But, unfortunately, the President of the United States, who under the Constitution has the primary responsibility for our foreign policy, came forth with no such policy in the Far East. To the contrary, under his day-by-day direction, for which he has the sole responsibility, he either permitted or induced the representatives of our country in the Far East Commission and in the State Department and in the diplomatic forces overseas to follow this contrary policy.

I do not say that the Congress has not some responsibility, because, as the able Senator from Indiana knows, for some considerable period of time I have been trying, along with other Senators on the floor of the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, to arouse some interest in the Far East. I have objected to the lowering of an iron curtain between the doings of our diplomatic representatives overseas in China and elsewhere, and the American Congress and the American people, who I believe are entitled to information. I am sure the able Senator knows that in numerous instances it has been most difficult for the Congress of the United States to get the information we wanted. Take the Wedemeyer report as an example. Had we had the Wedemeyer report when General Wedemeyer issued it, it would have given us a basis on which to go to work on some of these problems.

Mr. JENNER. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt. I understand that General MacArthur makes a biweekly report to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He certainly knows what has been going on in the Far East, being the supreme commander in that area. Yet, I understand that the Committee on Foreign Relations of this body has never had access to those reports. I say it is deplorable that under the bipartisan system we should accuse the President of the United States for what has been going on, when the Republicans—though I have not—have closed their eyes and have said, "We will cooperate in a bipartisan foreign policy in western Europe, but if you do not want to tell us what is going on in the Far East, it is all right, and when you get ready to take us in on your program, we will come in to 'bipartisan' some more with you."

I repeat the prediction, which I first made on this floor a year ago when we were debating the North Atlantic Pact, that that is only the first pact. As the result of the very information the Senator from California has brought before us today, I say there is going to be another international grab bag in the Pacific. They all have their hands out. Senators know what this administration did recently in Indonesia, before that country became an independent government. They shoveled in several million dollars of ECA aid so that they could do it legally. As one travels around the world, as I have recently done, we find that those who have gotten millions and billions of dollars are wanting millions and billions more. Those who are not getting any say, "You gave it to others, you had better give it to us or we are going communistic, too."

We are making an international grab bag out of this country. Stalin is winning the cold war. He does not have to fire a shot or spend a ruble. All he has to do is to keep doing what he has been doing, and he will bankrupt us.

So far as Europe is concerned, the most the Marshall plan has done has been holding the line. Why? Most of those in Europe seem to be either socialistic or communistic; there is only a degree of color between them, and so far as I am personally concerned, I am color blind. One out of every four Frenchmen is a Communist, and the others of them are either Fascist or Socialist. We will not speak to Franco, yet we are playing "footsy" with Tito, who is a Communist. We sent him $20,000,000 from the Export-Import Bank, and he has his snoopers in Washington trying to get more, and he will get it.

I talked to Bevin. I said, "Are you not concerned with your situation in Hong Kong, with the spread of communism in China and their success there?" He smiled—and there are other Senators on this floor who will verify this statement—and said, "Don't you worry about Hong Kong." He already had his deal made.

Mr. President, the Senator from California has made a magnificent contribution today toward awakening the American people to what is going on. We now have to follow through by returning the two-party system of government to America before we strangle ourselves in continuing bipartisan support of foreign isms.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before I yield to the Senator from Michigan, I merely wish to say that I happen to differ to some considerable degree on the point raised by the Senator from Indiana, for whom I hold a high personal regard. I do not believe that this Nation can return to isolationism any more than an adult can return to childhood, no matter how pleasant our childhood recollections may be.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President——

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator will permit me to finish; I did not interrupt the able Senator. In my responsibilities, in addition to being a member of the Committee on Armed Services and of the Committee on Appropriations, I have served since its inception on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Perhaps that association has made me realize that we do live in the age of the airplane and the atom.

As the able Senator from Indiana has done, I have flown the Pacific and the Atlantic on numerous occasions. This world is a much different world from what it was when General Washington was President and made his Farewell Address to the country. The distance over the polar ice cap is much shorter than the distances covered over former routes of travel. While I hope it will never happen, I personally believe that in the event some overt aggressor nation decides to move in the future, never again will the United States of America have 3 or 4 years to prepare itself. I think the United States of America will be the first target of any potential aggressor, because the Germany of the Kaiser and the Germany of Hitler both saw how the industrial potential and the manpower resources of this Nation turned the tide and snatched victory out of their hands.

Mr. President, no man can look into a crystal ball and discover what the future may bring forth; no man can be certain or dogmatic respecting these things; but, based on the information at my disposal, I believe that the first notice of an outbreak of another war will be when the major industrial and communication centers of America have been subjected to an atomic bomb attack to paralyze this Nation. The attack will not necessarily be on our coastal cities of Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland, or Seattle, or Boston, or New York. The interior cities are really on the coast lines of America, because the polar ice cap is the shortest distance across. So every American must form his judgment based on the facts as they exist today in this age of the airplane and the atom bomb.

The reason the Senator from California has supported the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]—and I say I have proudly supported the Senator from Michigan in trying to make a Republican contribution to world affairs—is because I think it is urgent that we maintain a free world of free men; that we try to develop a community of nations so that the law-abiding countries will always have a greater aggregation of power than the potential aggressor nations and the dictatorship states, whether they be Nazi or Communist.

I say again that I do not believe it is in the interest of the peace of the world, I do not believe it is in the interest of the security of my own country to permit 240,000,000 Europeans to go behind the iron curtain, with the great industrial complex which exists in that part of the world.

I admit that men may honestly differ with that point of view. Each of us as a Senator of the United States must search his conscience to determine how he will vote on those questions. But based on the information at my disposal I pursued the course I did. I am just as critical, however, of what I believe has been a misguided policy in Asia, because I say, regretfully, that I think it has undone in Asia most of what has been accomplished in Europe.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I wish to comment on what the able Senator from California said respecting western Europe. I think the Senator has stated the case most clearly as to what we achieved and accomplished in western Europe. I am indeed happy to say that I fully concur with him. The mistakes we made in Asia were mistakes made only in Asia. I do not believe we have made the same kind of mistakes in western Europe. A sad state of affairs would now exist had we not stepped into western Europe and done what we did there. What we have achieved there has given us a great amount of security insofar as the aggressiveness of the ideology of communism is concerned. We can more fully understand what that security means to us when we consider what the Communists could have achieved and accomplished had they gained possession of the industrial section of the entire western Europe.

Mr. President, I am very happy to say that I fully concur with what the Senator from California has said respecting western Europe. If we made a mistake in Asia, that, in my opinion, is something entirely separate from western Europe.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. I agree with what the Senator from California has said. There is no need to talk about isolation. Isolation is about as extinct as the Pharaohs of Egypt.

The Senator from California said, and I agree with him, that when the next conflict comes, if it shall come, our vital centers will be the targets for the first attack. But the world being in the condition the Senator from California has described, with communism having made its greatest gains during the past 4 years, during peacetime years, what are we doing about our own defense? This year, in order to proceed with our grandiose international schemes we are cutting down, by an estimated $2,000,000,000, the amount to be spent for the defense of our own country. At the same time we are increasing the defenses of nations thousands of miles away by probably another $1,000,000,000. Then if we are to assume an additional load in the Pacific and place it on the American taxpayers we are going to play right into the hands of Joe Stalin. Communism will take over in our very home country when we become economically and militarily weak.

I agree with the Senator from California that we must keep our Nation strong in order to be able to befriend peoples all around the world.

I do not know what the answer to the Chinese situation is now. I agree with the Senator from California that there has been a betrayal of the Chinese people, our traditional allies. But I do know that one-sixteenth of the world's population, representing the United States of America, cannot continue to do for themselves, do for the Marshall plan countries, do for the Middle East, the Near East, and the Far East, what all those nations are expecting and are going to continue to expect—and I address myself particularly to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] who just spoke—and still remain solvent both economically and militarily at home.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say to the Senator from California that in my opinion it is very helpful to have this debate on the floor of the Senate because, I think, it will enable the American people to learn, through the discussion here, what some of these problems are. It is going to be very helpful, too, to some of us on the floor of the Senate who need a good deal of information about Formosa and the rest of Asia. It is in that spirit that I rise to ask the Senator from California a few questions in regard to Formosa.

First, I am not certain that I have clearly in mind the legal status of Formosa at the present time. I would appreciate it very much if the Senator from California would briefly explain to me what the legal status of Formosa is in international law today, and what rights, if any, we have in Formosa.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have a specific statement giving the actual quotation from the various agreements that will be helpful, and if I cannot find it in the brief case I have here I will have it added to the RECORD. That will give the precise language.

My understanding of the situation is that at the Cairo Conference, attended by President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Winston Churchill, and Chiang Kai-shek, it was agreed that following the defeat of Japan, Formosa, which historically had been a part of China up to the time it was taken away from China in the Sino-Japanese War, would be returned to China. I think that is the first time we determined precisely what should be done respecting Formosa, though there may have been preliminary discussions.

Then later in the Potsdam declaration there is a paragraph which also states that Japan will be stripped of her war-gained conquests, and they will be returned to the people from whom she received them.

I have the memorandum, and I shall read it.

By the Treaty of Shimonoseki, signed April 17, 1895, by Japanese Count Ito and Li Hung-chang, Chinese Ambassador Extraordinary, China recognized the full independence of Korea and ceded to Japan the Pescadores, Formosa, and the Liaotung Peninsula, paid an indemnity to Japan, and negotiated a new commercial treaty.

Recognition took place, in effect, by the United States in the Root-Takahira agreement of November 30, 1908, and the Lansing-Ishii agreement of November 2, 1917. Both agreements proposed to maintain the status quo, and by acquiescence, therefore, recognized Japan's position in Formosa.

Published documents of World War II do not mention Formosa until the Cairo declaration.

The Cairo declaration of December 1, 1943, had this to say:

Japan shall be stripped of all the islands in the Pacific which she has seized or occupied since the beginning of the First World War in 1914, and * * * all the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China.

There are a couple of items I left out, which I am sure do not change the intent or purpose of the language.

Second. Formosa was not mentioned in the official protocol of Tehran or Yalta.

Third. The Potsdam ultimatum of July 26, 1945, had this to say:

The terms of the Cairo declaration shall be carried out and Japanese sovereignty shall be limited to the islands of Honshu, Hokkaido, Kyushu, Shikoku, and such minor islands as we determine.

That is the Potsdam powers speaking.

Fourth. Statement of White House on occupation policy in Japan, September 21, 1945, which I also understand was in a directive to General MacArthur, and also, I think, by him issued in a directive as commander in chief in the far Pacific, stated:

Japan's sovereignty will be limited to the islands—

And it gives the same islands I have just mentioned—

and such minor outlying islands as may be determined, in accordance with the Cairo declaration and other agreements to which the United States is or may be a party.

So far as I know, those are the only mentions made of Formosa.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to thank the Senator for the information.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may add this statement, in replying to the Senator from Oregon: Pursuant to those declarations, the Republic of China, with our consent, became the occupying power in Formosa, pending the ultimate treaty. As I understand, from a legal point of view, the Republic of China organized Formosa, which previously had been the Japanese province of Taiwan, but then became a part of the Republic of China, with a legislature.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator because I think his discussion gives us a clear picture of the problem of Formosa.

My second question is this: Does the Senator have an opinion about what is the attitude of the Formosans in regard to the three parties which it seems to me are involved in this controversy, namely, first, the Nationalist Chinese; second, the Communist Chinese; and, third, the Americans? What is the attitude of the Formosans about these groups occupying their island? Is it a case in which they would prefer to have all three stay out, and let them go ahead on some basis of self-determination of their own destiny? Or do they want the Nationalist Chinese in control? Or the Communists in control? Or the Americans in control? Or all three groups out of Formosa?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I say to the Senator, on the basis of having been there, that that is a question on which many persons honestly differ. While I was there, I made an effort to talk, not only to the Chinese who were there but also to the members of the provisional legislature, who are Taiwanese, as they call themselves, rather than Formosans, and to educators, newspapermen, and to students. In those cases I tried to go to the universities and schools where they were, in order to have as wide a contact as possible. I think this is historically true: Following the defeat of Japan and the occupation of Formosa by the Chinese, as I mentioned earlier in my remarks, the first governor who was sent there was not a competent official; at least, the economy of the country did not improve. Of course, one of the difficulties in both Formosa and Korea was that during the period of Japanese occupation of both those countries, the Japanese did not permit any Korean or any Formosan to hold a position of responsibility, either in government or in business. I am told that the Japanese did not even allow the Koreans to be railroad engineers, although they would allow some of the Koreans to shovel coal, as firemen on the trains. As a result, when the Japanese departed from both Formosa and Korea, they took out of those countries all of the managerial echelon, from both government and business.

At any rate, the first governor did not get the economy back into good condition; and there was dissatisfaction, and insurrection took place, and there was some bloodshed. The Government of China removed the then governor; and since that time, as most of the Formosans with whom I talked told me, I believe they have made an effort to remedy the difficult and bad situations which previously had existed. The more recent governor, who was governor when I was there—and who since has been succeeded by K. C. Wu, a civilian, so that today they have gotten back to a civilian governor—was Gen. Chen Cheng. He made, I believe, a strenuous effort to improve conditions. They had a land reform—one which unfortunately had not taken place on the continent of Asia. Had it occurred on the continent of Asia early enough, it might have remedied the situation there. But that was not done. The then governor of Formosa did that. As a result, food production has greatly increased, because the farmer can now keep a much greater proportion of his crop. As a matter of fact, Formosa now has a surplus of agricultural products. Our ECA officials have told me that on the island there has been an improvement both agriculturally and from an industrial point of view.

I think it fair to say that the overwhelming number of the people of Formosa do not look with favor upon the Communists. I think it might also be fair to say that, as the Senator from Oregon and I might find in our respective States of Oregon and California—and it would apply to many other States of the Union—with the influx of additional people, there has been some overcrowding, some lack of housing, and some competition for jobs. To that extent, perhaps, I think some Taiwanese might look back to the good old days when they were not so overcrowded. But to me, that is not bordering on insurrection.

However, as I stated to the Senate earlier—and I think the Senator from Oregon heard me say it—I made an effort to get around, both at night and during the daytime; and there was no indication of the police-state methods such as I saw in Poland before Mikolajczyk had to flee for his life, when there were police armed with carbines, and in armored cars, going around.

So I believe there was not such a state of insurrection, and that information to that effect has been misleading.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from California believe that the reports to the effect that the majority of the Formosans are just as much opposed to the Nationalist Chinese as they are to the Communist Chinese are correct? Is that an accurate statement?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I do not think that is an accurate statement. I think they want, and are entitled to, a larger voice in their own affairs. Having been a member of the California Legislature some 14 or 16 years ago, I made a point to visit the provisional legislature leaders there, and I talked with them. They were critical, in many cases, of some of the policies which had been followed in the past by the Government of China; but I found no indication that they want to be freed by the Communists. To the contrary, what they wanted was for the National Government to give them as much local autonomy as possible and to give them as great a voice as possible in the handling of their affairs, and to cooperate with them in the day-to-day control of the activities on the island.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from California has been very courteous to me in permitting me to ask questions. I should like to ask this further question: Does the Senator believe the Formosans would welcome American intervention in Formosa, backing up the Chinese National Government?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad the Senator has asked that question. I would say that I have not felt that the proper procedure for our Government is to intervene in the sense of sending troops to the island. There are the islands of Formosa and of Hainan, but taking Formosa alone for the moment, which is the last bastion of the Republic of China, which is fighting with its back to the wall—to be perfectly frank, as all of us know—against the Communist wave which has swept over the mainland. For us to go in ourselves without invitation to the island and establish some kind of temporary control, to my mind, would be precisely what the Soviet Union did to Poland when the Poles were fighting with their backs to the wall against Germany; and then, as all of us remember, the Russians moved in from the rear and completely eliminated the government and the freedom of Poland. I do not believe that is a course which we should pursue. I do not believe that the people of Formosa or the remaining people of free China would want that.

The second thing I think we should keep in mind is that we do not need Formosa either as an air base or as a naval

base, because we have others in that area of the world.

But the thing which is vitally important to us is that Formosa not get into unfriendly hands. As for the people of Taiwan, I never saw a more friendly people than the people of that island, both the Chinese and the native Taiwanese. They are friendly to this country. We know they are our friends. So long as they control the island, there is no danger that a potential aggressor enemy will get bases there. So the primary thing, in my opinion, and, I think, in the opinion of many of our responsible persons in that part of the world, is to prevent Formosa from getting into unfriendly hands.

Question may arise, Is the Communist regime in China friendly to the United States? People may honestly differ on that point. Personally, I think that they have displayed their attitude on sufficient occasions so that, so far as I am concerned, I do not want to take the calculated risk of having in Formosa Chinese Communists who may be unfriendly to us. So I can answer the question best by saying that, in my opinion—and let me say at this point that there is a high morale among the troops on that island, and they have some good leadership—what they primarily want is some type of supervised assistance, not by combat troops, but the same supervised assistance that we have given in Greece and Korea.

Mr. MORSE. One more question, please: Assuming that our policy would not be one of intervention by way of sending our own troops over there, but would be one of assistance to the National Chinese Government by way of providing American military advisers and war matériel, might not that type of intervention lead to war? Assuming my hypothesis, in an armed struggle between the Communists and the Nationalist Chinese in Formosa, does the Senator from California feel that even that type of a contest, backed up with American war matériel and military advisers, has in it any inherent danger of an open conflict between the Chinese Communists and the United States with Russia eventually backing the Chinese Communists?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is one of the questions which we must face. I may say to the Senator that I think the risk of a conflict is far less than the risk involved in doing nothing and waiting until we are pushed from place to place, out into the Pacific. That is No. 1.

Secondly, I think that the risk is much less than it was in Greece or at the time of the Berlin airlift. Certainly I think the Senator from Oregon will agree with me that we ran risks in both those instances.

Mr. MORSE. We ran risks with the Russians in countries the populations of which were not Russian. But in Formosa we are running a risk, it seems to me, with a population which is oriental, at least, if not entirely out-and-out Chinese. If I am right in my assumption—I am not sure that I am—that the Chinese Communists intend to take Formosa if they possibly can take it, are we then not running a serious danger, if our intervention takes even the form of military advisers or the supplying of war matériel, of an open conflict with the Chinese Communists over Formosa, a conflict which might be interpreted as an act of war on our part?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I say to the Senator from Oregon that I do not believe so, although certainly no prudent man would say that was not a possibility to be reckoned with. I say "no" for two reasons, at the moment: One, up to now—we do not know what the British and some of the other Atlantic Pact nations may do in the next few days—but up to now the overwhelming number of the nations of the world—and I say reluctantly that I think that will change very shortly—are recognizing the present Republic of China. There are very few nations outside the Soviet Union and her satellites who have recognized the Communist regime in China, so that what arms and assistance we are giving would be given at the request of the legal, constitutional government of the country which was our wartime ally and friend, and which is, as of today, a member of the Security Council of the United Nations. I think we would be on perfectly sound legal grounds to comply with their request, just as we have a mission in Korea at the request of the constitutional Korean government, in the southern part of the country south of the thirty-eighth parallel.

I should like to mention a second thing in order to amplify the answer. Some people have said to me, "Is it not true that the equipment which has been sent there has been easily lost to those fighting on the other side?" In the first place, I can say—and I have the figures to support it—that of the $125,000,000 arms program supported by the Eightieth Congress for aid to China, very little of that equipment, perhaps not more than 10 percent—and that would be a high figure—fell into the hands of the Communists. Secondly, I personally flew from Formosa Island to Kingmen Island, where there had been, on October 25, 26, and 27, a major battle between the Navy and amphibious Communist forces and the Chinese Government forces. The Kingmen battle is very important for Senators to know about, because Kingmen probably would be taken first—it would have to be taken first—before a successful assault upon Formosa, though that would not necessarily follow, but it would certainly be desirable from the Communist point of view. Under the covering of an artillery barrage from a neighboring island which they control—and Kingmen is only a mile from the mainland of China, whereas Formosa is 100 miles from the mainland of China—they landed 10,000 Communist troops. The defending forces were those that had been trained by Sun Leh Jen in this training center to which I have already referred. Despite the fact that the Communists infiltrated their lines, and on the morning of the 26th of October were firing on the Government's strong points from both front and rear, the Government forces held their positions. They so delayed the Communists that the Government was able to land another division from Formosa, and move it into position. They moved some tanks which they had had on Formosa to Kingmen. They outflanked the Communists. They inflicted 3,000 casualties upon them and captured over 6,000 Communists, with all their arms and equipment. We hear about the Government losing equipment; we seldom hear about the Communists losing it.

Mr. MORSE. That was about October 12; was it not?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It was October 25 to 27. They had enough captured equipment left over—I saw much of it myself; it was a hodgepodge of stuff, some American, some Russian, some Japanese—but they had enough left over to send back to Formosa, to equip two more Chinese divisions. The men of Kingmen fought very hard. When I got there, of course, they had been stimulated by the victory. I stopped at 10 or 15 different units across the island. As I went by jeep from one end of the island to the other, the morale was very good. They have a very able commander, General Hu Lien, who was an excellent field soldier, and as a result, that victory, plus the victory on the Chosen Islands, plus seeing personally the high morale of the men that are being trained by Sun Li Jen, leads me to believe that with some moral support, plus some of the equipment they need, they can withstand an amphibious assault over 100 miles of open water.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say to the Senator from California I think he has been exceedingly fair and frank in his colloquy, and in his last remarks he raises the final question I want to ask him. I think we might just as well recognize that in the near future several nations will recognize the government of the Communists in China. That is my opinion for whatever it is worth, and it certainly needs to be supplemented a great deal by much information that I intend to try to get into my head in the days immediately ahead. Of great concern to me is that a struggle over Formosa, if I am correct in the assumption that the Chinese Communists intend to take it, if they can take it——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Oh, I think that is a fair assumption the Senator is making, that they will try to take it.

Mr. MORSE. Granting that assumption, I fear that our intervention in Formosa might endanger a third world war. If we find ourselves engaged in any form of intervention in Formosa, even by supplying military advisers and war matériel, may we be misjudged by other nations? If, as the Senator from California says, he fears the Chinese Communists will try to take Formosa—and I fear it too—with India, which has already recognized the Communist government; with Great Britain, in my opinion, soon to recognize her; with other countries to follow suit, are we not likely to find ourselves in the months immediately ahead in a position where we will be supporting, through military advisers and war materials, a dying National Chinese Government? Will we not be supporting a government that is not recognized by a great many of the other powers of the world to our own international embarrassment? Will we not soon find ourselves out of caste so to speak in the

fraternity of the nations by supporting a government that no longer represents the Chinese people? Will that not likely lead to war?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say to the Senator from Oregon that the observations he has made are certainly pertinent to the discussion of our foreign policy. It is the view, however, of the Senator from California that sooner or later some decisions must be made by this Nation in the Far East. I admit that any position that may be taken entails some risk, but I repeat, while it is not necessarily a parallel case, I certainly think we took some substantial risks at Berlin; I think we took some substantial risks in Greece; I think we have taken some substantial risks in the North Atlantic Pact and in the arms-implementation program, and if somebody wanted to make something of it, I think they could find the modus vivendi for stirring up trouble, if they were determined to do it. But I think we have to look over the long period of history. Here we are, a relatively small nation, 140,000,000 people, and I think it is fair to say, as was pointed out in the colloquy with the Senator from Indiana, that if there is in the future another conflict or a potential aggressor nation gets on the loose, we will be target No. 1. Therefore I think we have to take a look across the years and determine whether the very defenses of this country will be improved or made weaker by all of Asia going behind the iron curtain.

An argument can be made that we should not make the stand at Formosa, even though there is a movement of communism into the Pacific Ocean, but perhaps we should make it some place else. To me it would be far more difficult to make it at Hong Kong than it would be at Formosa, because I think that is a fairly easy city be taken from within, not necessarily by aggression from without. I think it would be far more difficult to draw the line in French Indo-China, or in Burma, because there there is a land border with a stream that one can wade across, so the same argument could be made there with far greater force.

The next question is, Supposing not only all of China but Burma and Indochina and Siam are lost to communism—and all of that is possible now, in view of what has happened, and we must face realities—then we have communism up against the borders of India. I did not go to India on my recent trip, but I went there in 1946. India has many internal problems of her own. She has a very able leader in Mr. Nehru, a man for whom I have the highest respect and regard. I have been informed that in the past on one or two occasions attempts have been made to assassinate him. The third attempt or the fourth might succeed. If Nehru's leadership were removed, with the internal problems of India, there is some doubt whether India and Pakistan might ultimately remain outside the Communist orbit. Are we to draw the line there, or should we draw it when the Communists move out into the Pacific, into the Philippines, or into the Dutch Indies, now Indonesia? Somewhere along the line we are going to have to make some decisions, and I do not think by postponing the decisions, hoping the evil day will never come, as, of course, all of us do, we are solving any problems, nor are we doing so by brushing the question under the carpet and failing to face the realities. The Senator comes from a Pacific coast State, as I come from a Pacific coast State, and, as I pointed out before, when it is considered what Japan, a nation of some 75,000,000 people, was able to do in driving us clear back on our Pacific coast defenses, I do not think the Senator from Oregon would contemplate with much pleasure 1,000,000,000 people of Asia tied into the Soviet orbit, when the men in the Kremlin have time after time said that in their judgment the free world and their world cannot exist side by side.

Mr. MORSE. I say to the Senator from California that it is because I contemplate with great fear the spread of communism, that I am so disturbed about this development in Asia.

Mr. KNOWLAND. One further point I may make at this time, after which I shall not interrupt the Senator again. As of today, January 5, 1950, we know there has been a change in the world situation with respect to atomic energy. No one knows how far the Russian development has taken them, but that they have made progress has been announced by the President of the United States himself. Let us assume the best side of the picture, and say that the announcement of the President related to a Russian equivalent of the Alamorgordo test explosion. At any rate the Russians know the secret. They have the wherewithal, but they have not stock-piled. Time runs in their favor in the matter of stock piling atomic weapons from now on. A year from now they will be much stronger than they are today. Two years from now they will be much stronger than they will be 1 year from now, and so on. Are we going to be less able, a year or 2 years from now, of drawing a line than we are today? I do not know the answer to that question. I do not think the Senator from Oregon knows it, but I think the American people are entitled to have a full discussion of the implications of what is taking place in the world, because I do not believe we can have a sound foreign policy unless not only the American Congress but the American people are adequately informed. After all, the responsibility is ultimately theirs. We are not doing our job adequately if we do not contribute, to the best of our ability, to inform the American public at a time when, I reluctantly say, I do not think the State Department and the administration have been as frank as they should be on a question of this kind.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to make this very brief comment. I am so greatly concerned about the spread of communism in Asia, and, may I say, incidentally, about the weakness of our west coast defenses, that, as a Senator from a west coast State I intend to make this particular problem in the months immediately ahead my major concern in the Senate. But I would point out to the Senator from California, that today, at least, if I have correct information, the Chinese civil war has been limited to Chinese territory. The Senator from California says, "Where are we going to draw the line?" Formosa is still Chinese territory. A civil war is going on in China, the implications of which I do not like, but I think there is a serious question, particularly in view of the prospects of other free governments recognizing the Communist government of China, of getting ourselves into a position of seeking to intervene in protecting a segment of Chinese soil in favor of one party to a civil war against another party. Because of the effect that would have on us in the eyes of other free governments, and particularly the other peoples of Asia, I am very fearful of what their attitude will be in regard to that type of American intervention.

In the Greek situation we moved in on the invitation of the Greek people themselves, to protect them against what was considered to be a threatened invasion by Russia. In the Berlin situation we were seeking to protect such American and German rights as we believed——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If I may interrupt at that point, I should like to say that we were not protecting Greece against a threatened invasion by Russia. On the contrary, there was going on in Greece a civil war of the same kind and character as that which has been going on in China. There was an armed insurrection against the legal government, which had a long history. As a matter of fact, right after the wartime period it will be remembered that in Athens there had been a Communist coup d'état, which almost succeeded in capturing the city of Athens, and all of Greece. It was at that moment that Mr. Winston Churchill, then Prime Minister of Great Britain, gave the order to the British troops to help to support the legal government of Greece against a Communist attack. Had it not been for the intervention of the British troops at that time, it is undeniable, I think, that Athens would have fallen to communism, followed, undoubtedly, by their taking Greece. This country got into it when the British announced that they could no longer support the occupation and had to withdraw. That was approximately the time of the establishment of the Greek-Turkish aid program. We sent supplies to Greece and we later sent a mission there. It was a matter of an attack on the country from within rather than an overt aggression across the borders.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is perfectly correct. However, I think there was great fear in this country—there was great fear, I know, in the Senate, as the debates at that time will show—that there would be a Russian movement into Greece if the Russian support of the Greek Communists was permitted to gain headway. Likewise we feared, I think, back in 1946 and the beginning of 1947, a similar possibility developing in Italy.

But the point I wanted to make in concluding the colloquy I have had with the Senator—and he has been exceedingly kind to me in giving me this time—was that when we deal with the Greece

incident and the Berlin incident we are dealing with a situation in which governments generally throughout the world recognized the then-existing government of Greece and recognized the supposed American and German rights created by the Potsdam agreement so far as Berlin was concerned.

I am one who is critical of our policy in China. I do not think we moved in at the proper time with sufficient help administered under proper conditions when there was a strong Chinese national Government. The Nationalist Chinese Government is now almost nonexistent. China is torn by a Chinese civil war. Let that war extend beyond Chinese territory—on this point the junior Senator from Oregon is certain as to his position—let it extend beyond Chinese territory, let the Chinese Communists seek to invade another country, then the Senator from Oregon will take the position that "the chips are down," and we should make it perfectly clear to the Communist Chinese Government that we are not going to let any other country, not a part of China, be invaded by a Chinese Communist Government. That would be my position, whether it were the Chinese Nationalist Government or the Chinese Communist Government.

I am trying to raise problems this afternoon which show, at least, my perplexity and my great fear that we are dealing with a situation which is so hot that the course of action which America takes in respect to it may determine the difference between peace and war, not in Asia alone, but in the world. I add to that conviction a statement which the Senator from California has heard me express in the Armed Services Committee, that I happen to be one who believes America cannot win a third world war. We have won our last world war. We will win great military victories, but if we do not win this peace, then I think America is due for a great decline, because the winning of a military victory in a third world war would of itself, in my judgment, with the difficult problems that would arise, prostrate America economically for decades to come.

So, as one Member of this body, I want to join with the Senator from California in his sincere desire, although we may differ on the procedures, to accomplish the objective of maintaining the peace. I want to do all I can to save our country and our people from a third world war. I think we must win the peace, for the costs of war would be too great, materially as well as spiritually. We cannot afford another war not only from an economic standpoint but from the standpoint of protecting liberty and freedom for all. If forced to fight we will fight to preserve freedom from Russian aggression, but I think we can win the peace if we keep our defenses strong and continue to urge the following of peaceful procedures of international law for the settlement of individual disputes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to say in reply to the Senator that, of course, we are all deeply interested in preserving the peace and establishing a system of international law and order, so that the peace of the world will be secure for ourselves and for our children. Unfortunately, there are sometimes lawless elements loose in communities and a police force is needed. I sometimes question very much the policy of permitting lawless elements to move in and take over a community on the theory that because it is happening in the business district it does not affect a person who lives in the residential district. I think lawlessness in a community concerns all the people. I think lawlessness anywhere in the world must be the concern of the entire world. I know the Senator from Oregon is as sincere as he always is in connection with this problem. But I do ask that when he gives consideration to this problem he also contemplate that the Chinese Communists may not proceed to move a Chinese Communist army across the borders of Burma and Indochina, but rather they will do as the Bulgarians and the Yugoslavs did before the break took place between Tito and Stalin, and move guerrillas into those countries and armies into those bordering countries, and perhaps in the not too distant future we will be discussing an international Communist-inspired revolt in Burma, Indochina, and in time ultimately in India and in Pakistan. When that happens, and if that happens, and if it is successful, as it is today in China, I submit to the able Senator from Oregon that the loss of Asia will be just as complete as if the Chinese Communists or the Soviet Union had actually moved their troops across those borders.

It is a new technique which I respectfully say I do not think the law-abiding nations, the free people of the world, have yet found a way to meet. If they move troops in an aggressive war, everybody can understand it, but the men of the Kremlin are pretty wise; they are cold; they are ruthless. They know that would immediately disturb Senators such as the able Senator from Oregon, and other people throughout the world. It is merely my personal judgment that they will move in the way I have suggested. They will attempt to take each of these countries as they have almost succeeded in taking all of China, certainly all the mainland of China. I hope that in his discussions and in his questions the Senator will also try to help devise some way by which the world can meet this new threat of Communist aggression.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me first commend the Senator for the clarity and the sincerity of his statement, to which I have listened with a great deal of interest.

I desire to understand the Senator correctly with respect to Formosa, which is the important immediate problem. The Senator from Washington stated that there was always an alternative, and that we must consider the alternative. As I understand the Senator from California, he makes himself very clear that, so far as Formosa is concerned, there really is no alternative, in this respect, that the foreign policy of the United States must be based on what is best for the security of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. And the peace of the world.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And that with respect to Formosa there are two reasons why Formosa should not fall into the hands of the Communists: First, from a military point of view, Formosa is necessary to make Japan, the Philippines, and Okinawa worth while; and, secondly, from the point of view of the spread of communism, there is a danger to the United States, as well as from the military point of view.

Is it a fair summation of the Senator's statements and of his answers in colloquies to say that, so far as he is concerned, Formosa should not be allowed to fall into the hands of the Communists, for the two reasons to which I have just referred?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The two reasons would be included, but the Senator from California would add one more, and it is in line with my discussion with the Senator from Oregon on the question of the new technique and what international communism is doing.

It seems to me that if we give recognition to the Chinese Communist regime, as apparently Britain is going to do in the next few days, we put our stamp of approval upon a police state, which is just as much a police state in China as it is in any of the satellite countries of eastern Europe.

It so happens that the people who have been overrun in China are not all cheering for communism. They have been overrun by force of arms. I have personally talked to people who stayed in Nanking, Shanghai, and Pekin, thinking that conditions could not be much worse economically than they had been under the National Government, with inflation, and so forth, who, after having lived under communism for 6 months or a year, as the case may be, have been desperately striving to get out from behind the Chinese Communist iron curtain. They report that there is more discontent behind the lines, that inflation in Communist China, as was indicated in the ECA report which I put into the RECORD today, is very great, that unemployment is very great, that there is great dissatisfaction among the farmers, whose crops are being taken away from them by the Communist armies, who are living off the land.

So long as the nations of the world recognize the legal government of China, which has its headquarters in Formosa, the people of China who have been overrun still have a hope left as we go through the psychological warfare, that ultimately they will be free and will not be abandoned behind the iron curtain. But once we give our stamp of approval to the Communist regime we say to them, in effect, "We now abandon you and write you off, as men who believe in the same type of freedom as the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from California believe in."

Mr. President, that is why I think the question of recognition is very important. I think we have to devise new techniques in the new era in which we live. I believe it is just as important that we hold

out hope to men like Masaryk, as we did before he died; like Petkov, before he was hanged; and like others who still remain in Poland, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, and other countries, that we do not give our stamp of approval to police-state methods.

So far as I am concerned, it may be a drastic step, but perhaps the time has come when this Government should take the initiative and withdraw its recognition from the Communist police states which are destroying the freedom and the religious liberty of the people behind the iron curtain.

I do not think we can go on with eighteenth century methods to meet this twentieth century aggression, which is a threat to freemen everywhere. That is why I say that, in addition to the points raised by the Senator from Massachusetts, I think it is vitally important that the free people of China behind the iron curtain should know there is a legal government of the Republic of China which still exists on the island of Formosa, and that ultimately once again they may be free.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So, from the point of view of the Senator from California, it is a calculated risk, to employ a term that is very frequently used, from our point of view, that we should give our moral support to the Nationalist Government in Formosa, and that we should give them our economic support, but does the Senator go so far as to say we should send military equipment, or possibly arms, if necessary?

Mr. KNOWLAND. By all means, I think so, in addition to giving them the economic support which is available under the ECA, title IV. I do not think they would need more than the amount already afforded, the $75,000,000 made available by the Congress, and which has never been used. I have never been in favor of giving unsupervised aid. I think that was the mistake made in Greece and in other places. In my opinion, a commission should be appointed so that the people could be trained in the use of the equipment, and I believe we can do that on sound legal grounds. But I think we must also meet the issue now before us. From what I have seen, I personally believe the Chinese will defend their own freedom on the island of Formosa and that the Communists are going to have rough going. It was difficult for the Nazis to devise means for getting across the little English Channel, and Formosa is a hundred miles from the mainland. But at the same time I think we should be giving some thought, through the United Nations or otherwise, to serving notice that we do not think it is in the interest of world peace and the security of this Nation to permit destruction to be visited upon the people of Taiwan, for whom we have some responsibility, because it has been under Japanese rule, and we ourselves put them under Chinese rule; I think it is up to us to see that they are not visited with destruction and death. Unless we are to abandon the leadership which we have assumed, in the United Nations, we should issue a declaration that there shall not be any invasion of any type or character.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. On the exact point the Senator has raised about the people of Formosa, who were for some 50 years under Japanese rule, does not the Senator feel that even though it involves peril, we should indicate that the Nationalist Government of China, which was a party to the war, one of our allies, was placed in temporary custody of the people of Formosa, and that we should not, prior to the consummation of a peace treaty involving the whole Far East, turn these people over to a Red Chinese Government which was not in existence and was not an ally to the American cause?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it would be very detrimental not only to the people of free China, but most detrimental to the strategic defense of the United States, to permit Formosa to fall into Communist hands.

Mr. FERGUSON. And is not one of the big factors in this whole Formosa case the fact that it should remain as it is until a peace treaty is signed and a determination is made, when the Senate of the United States would have something to say about the disposal not only of the island, but of the people of Formosa?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will ask the Senator if it is not true that the announcement made by the President of the United States would indicate that we do not have a bipartisan foreign policy so far as the Pacific is concerned?

Mr. KNOWLAND. We have never had a bipartisan foreign policy in the Pacific.

Mr. FERGUSON. But the President has made a declaration that we do not have a bipartisan policy. The newspapers have announced that the Secretary of State is to appear before the Foreign Relations Committee next Tuesday, but it will then be too late for Congress to enter into the question of what our policy should be so far as Formosa is concerned.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not quite agree with the able Senator from Michigan on that point. I may be wrong, no one knows, but my personal observation, from meeting with various groups of people, is that there is an intuitive reaction on the part of the American public that under American policy things have not gone well in the Far East. I do not say that the American public, or a majority of it, has come to any conclusion as of today as to the policy that should be followed, but I do believe there is a growing feeling throughout the Nation that the administration's policy in the Far East has become bankrupt, that it has not been consistent with the policy we have tried to follow in Europe, and that public opinion in this country, if properly aroused, may even be able to change the viewpoint of a small group of willful men in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department who have been largely responsible for the debacle which has taken place in China.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will say to the Senator from California that I share that hope. It is true that hope springs eternal in the human breast. We should encourage the men who are on Formosa today to stand by and defend Formosa not only against internal revolution but against external aggression. Let us hope that the time may come when the Congress and the people of America will see fit to aid these people who fought on the side of the Americans in the Pacific. We should encourage them to hold on, for things may change. The policy announced today, while very encouraging to the Reds should not cause them to give up. It must be encouraging to the Chinese Reds, who have Russia on their side and, as the evidence shows, are receiving direct aid from Russia, to feel that the United States has said, "There will be no intervention so far as America is concerned." While that is true, and it is very discouraging to those who are now on Formosa trying to defend it, I am satisfied, after talking to the men in charge there, that theirs will be a stand to the death, and that they will not, even though we have forsaken them today according to the announcement from the White House, fail to stand by to defend that island until sometime when peace may come and justice may be brought to them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that if today a message can go to the embattled island of Formosa to make up for the tremendous discouragement which those defending it must feel as the result of the President's announcement that he is to abandon them and follow the policy laid down by the Far Eastern Division of the State Department, it is my personal conviction that the men on that island who want human freedom will continue to make use of that secret weapon which is not understood by Communists any place in the world, and that is the desire of men to be free. On numerous occasions in China on the continent, and in Formosa, I told the Chinese the story of George Washington at Valley Forge; how we in the early times of our history had men who were poorly equipped, whose feet were bare in the snow, who did not have either shelter or the proper arms, and that no doubt there were great and proud nations in Europe at that time who were willing to write off the Americans after that winter at Valley Forge. But I told them that with the determination to be free they carried on until we were able to found this Republic and become one of the great nations of the world.

I am convinced that today there are men in China and on the island of Formosa, who love human freedom no less than we love human freedom, and whose battle to keep outside of the Communist orbit is entitled to the help and respect of freemen everywhere, and although they may have been sold down the river into slavery by the President of the United States and the State Department, I believe there is still a tremendous reservoir of good will for the free people of China among the American people, who are not going to sit complacently by with-

out at least giving the Chinese their moral support in the great battle they now face to keep outside the iron curtain.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true also that in a republic such as ours public opinion should have something to do with the framing of our foreign policy, as to what it is and should be, and that, therefore, if we in America will raise our voices, if the public will express its opinion, we will encourage those who are standing with their backs to the wall on little Formosa, who have a desire for freedom and liberty, and that our moral support will encourage them to stand as Washington and his men stood at Valley Forge? Numbers do not always resolve a struggle. The determination to do or die for the cause may bring victory. Does not the Senator believe public opinion in America can make itself felt in such a way as to bring encouragement to those defending Formosa?

Mr. KNOWLAND. There have been other dark days so far as human freedom is concerned. Dunkerque was one of them. There have been many others in the history of the world. We did not abandon our friends in Great Britain because the going looked tough. We did not abandon the free people of Europe because the Dutch had been overrun in 5 days, the Belgians had been overrun in 7 days and had lost all their equipment, the mighty French Army had completely surrendered with all their equipment in a matter of a few weeks. We did not lose our interest in human freedom at that time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to commend the able Senator from California for the position he has followed in the Senate of the United States respecting the foreign policy affecting the western democracies of Europe.

I have listened to most of the able address delivered by the Senator today. I agree with some of the things he has said, and disagree with other things he has said.

One of the themes running through the debate is the statement that we cannot permit Formosa to fall into the hands of the Chinese Communists. I certainly hope that Formosa will not fall into the hands of the Chinese Communists. But in view of the trip the Senator from California took to the Orient last year, and in view of the fact that he must have talked to military leaders and prominent governmental officials over there, I wish to ask him, What is the minimum amount of military strength we would have to furnish in order to keep the Communists out of Formosa? That is what I should like to know.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that that is a pertinent question and is entitled to an answer. It is the belief of the Senator from California that the needs of the Chinese National Government, in order to prevent a successful Communist assault certainly during the year of 1950, could be met within the limits of the existing legislation on the statute books. If, in addition to that aid, the people there knew that they had some moral support from this great Republic across the seas, that we feel now, as we have historically felt, that we have very close and friendly ties with the Chinese people, they would be encouraged.

Responsible soldiers in the Army of China told me that the greatest blow to the morale of the Nationalist Army of China was the issuance of the American white paper. They said it did more to undermine morale, and destroy the confidence of the people in their Government at a time when they were with their backs to the wall, than anything else that had happened. So if they receive some moral encouragement, plus the funds which are already available under existing statutes, I believe that during the year 1950 at least Formosa could be defended by the Chinese themselves.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I know the Senator is quite tired, but I should like to ask one or two more questions, if I may. Can the Senator tell me, from the information he obtained on the island of Formosa, how many troops they have there at the present time, and what the nature of the military equipment is, and so forth?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I could tell the Senator, but I have no intention here in the public session of the Senate, which is open to the representatives of Tass and the Russian Government, who would pass it on to the Chinese Communists to reveal what the defense potentials are on the island of Formosa. I am sure the Senator will excuse me.

Mr. LUCAS. No, I would not want the Senator to do that. But the Senator has told a number of things here this afternoon which I thought might just as well have been said next Tuesday before the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. The Senator has served in the Army. I think I know the problems of security. I think I know the line between reasonable security and an attempt merely to lower an iron curtain, so as to keep the Congress of the United States, the representatives of the American people, from having information to which it is entitled.

But when it comes to giving out statements as to the number of troops, the weapons they have, or the weapons they need, I think that is a security matter which I would not undertake on my own responsibility to discuss in an open meeting.

Mr. LUCAS. I wholly agree with the Senator.

One more question, if I may ask it of the Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield further to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand the distinguished Senator from California, he is not in favor of sending any substantial military force into the island of Formosa to defend it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from California has never advocated sending any force into the island of Formosa to defend it. I have been advocating that the legal Government of China be given the aid which will permit them to defend that island.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of that answer, let me say that in the letter which the Honorable Herbert Hoover, the distinguished former President of the United States, wrote to the Senator from California—Mr. Hoover says:

> It is my strong belief that we should not recognize the Communist Government of China; that we must continue to recognize and support the National Government; that we should, if necessary, give naval protection to the possessions of Formosa, the Pescadores, and possibly Hainan Islands.

What does the Senator understand the former President of the United States, Mr. Hoover, means by the words "giving naval protection"—to the three islands described in the letter, which the Communists of China are threatening to conquer?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say to the Senator from Illinois—and of course the former able President of the United States can speak for himself as to what he means—that I think his letter is clear. Apparently he may have in mind that in a matter which affects the strategic defense and future security of the American people, it is not the part of wisdom to permit the strategic defense of this Nation to be jeopardized; and I rather imagine that Mr. Hoover would feel—although I am not authorized, of course, to speak for him—as some of the rest of us might feel, that in a matter dealing with the strategic defense of this country, the viewpoint of General MacArthur, the supreme commander in the Far East, and of Admiral Radford and of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and of others, should be followed when it comes to the question of the strategic defense of this country, rather than to follow an anonymous committee in the State Department who may have very little knowledge of the strategic needs affecting the defense of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. That hardly answers the question, but I am not going to get into a discussion with the able Senator from California about what General MacArthur thinks should be done in the Pacific, because I do not know. Perhaps the Senator from California does know what General MacArthur thinks about Formosa.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would not the Senator from Illinois think that it would be wise for the State Department to find out what he thinks? Would not the Senator from Illinois think it would be wise for for the State Department to find out what Admiral Radford, the CWCPAC—the commander in chief in the Pacific—thinks about Formosa? Would not the Senator from Illinois think it would be wise for the State Department to base its decision upon what the Joint Chiefs of Staff may think, rather than to send to all our embassy employees and State

Department employees the flat-footed statement that Formosa has no strategic value?

I say, on my responsibility as a Senator of the United States, that that is a misleading statement and it is purely the statement of men who are not charged with the strategic defense of the United States of America; and I say it is a rather sad day in the history of our country when people can send out a message such as that, and completely ignore those who are charged with the responsibility of the strategic defense of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not sure that I can answer the Senator's statement, because the Senator from California may know more about what General MacArthur has said and what Admiral Radford has said and what the Joint Chiefs of Staff have said than I do; he may know more about that than the State Department does or the President of the United States does.

But I will say, on my own responsibility, that any decision the President of the United States has made has been made after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It may be different from what Admiral Radford or General MacArthur thinks about what should be done in the Pacific, but the decision made was based upon consultation with the best military men in the Government.

Mr. President, I rose primarily to find out whether the Senator from California agrees with former President Hoover that a naval force should be sent to those islands in the Pacific, and also whether the Senator agrees with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who has made a similar statement. These suggestions by such prominent Americans have caused much consternation throughout the country. I was very happy to find the Senator from California speaking of sending only a token force, or perhaps some sort of a mission over there to help the Chinese, if we send anybody at all. The Senator says he does not want to send a military force, and that he certainly does not want to send the Navy over there.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask the Senator from Illinois to wait a moment, please. If he will permit me to interrupt, let me say that, to the contrary, I think the Navy of the United States in the Pacific has been degutted. I think one of the reasons why we are at such a low point in prestige in the Pacific is because of the fact that we have permitted our Navy to get down to such a small force.

Mr. LUCAS. That has nothing at all to do with the point I am discussing. The question of whether our Navy has been degutted has nothing to do with my question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It certainly has.

Mr. LUCAS. The sole question is whether the Senator from California believes the President of the United States should send a force to protect the island—a force which Mr. Hoover in his letter says should be sent. It is not a question of whether the Senator thinks the Navy has been degutted.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will answer the question, if the Senator will permit me to do so: I think the Senate should know, and the entire Congress should know, whether it is the judgment of the supreme commander in the Far East, and the judgment of our other officials charged with the national defense, that the loss of Formosa into unfriendly hands would jeopardize the security of this country.

I am in favor of our having the Navy out there and serving notice that we will not permit carnage and destruction on the island of Formosa, and will not permit the island to be occupied by an unfriendly power. I have said that I think we should proceed to do that through the United Nations, because I think the United Nations has a responsibility in not permitting the spread of carnage to the island of Formosa, when that island's final, legal disposition depends upon the Japanese peace treaty. But certainly if it adversely affects the strategic defense of the United States, I am not in favor of letting the strategic defense of the United States be adversely affected.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I claim the floor for just a moment in my own time.

I wish to reiterate what I said a moment ago about my distinguished friend, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], with respect to his adherence to the foreign policy of this country, so far as concerns the many, many battles we have had on the floor of the Senate in connection with aid to the democracies of western Europe; and I do not for a moment question the sincerity of the Senator from California with respect to the position he now takes regarding Formosa.

But, Mr. President, I wish to say that in my opinion the letter which was written by a former President of the United States, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, advocating that we send our Navy to protect Formosa, the Pescadores, and the Hainan Islands, the letter which the able Senator from California made a part of the RECORD, has stirred up a tremendous amount of consternation in this Nation in regard to what should be done in respect to those islands. The able senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], supports the same thing which the former President of the United States advocates. People are alarmed as a result of statements by such responsible persons that we ought to send our Navy to protect those islands. These spokesmen do not want to send a small military mission to these islands to help the remaining Chinese who are now on Formosa, in the civil war that is going on over there; they desire to send substantial aid.

Mr. President, any time we send any part of the United States Fleet to any of those islands, to protect them, we can prepare to send more auxiliary military and naval equipment. It is agreed here by the Senator from California, by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and by other Senators that the Communists are bound and determined to take over Formosa. If that is their plan, Mr. President, I undertake to say that this country by even intimating that it is going to send its fleet there to protect those islands would be following a most dangerous course. If we send the Navy over there, we must send more. If we are going to follow the course the former President of the United States suggests, we must augment that force with at least 10 crack divisions to be garrisoned on the island of Formosa. If we are going to send the Navy over there, we had better get ready to send hundreds of airplanes also and all the equipment that is necessary to take care of them. That is exactly what we must do if we are going to protect and defend the island, as suggested by the former President of the United States and by the senior Senator from Ohio.

I undertake to say that if we pursue such a dangerous policy we must admit that we will become a participant in the civil war now raging in China. Mr. President, if we intervene with military force in the present civil war in China, we should prepare for world war III.

Mr. President, I am more interested in undertaking to work out these matters through the United Nations, for if there is another war both the victor and the vanquished will go down to defeat.

We have had a foreign policy in the Pacific, notwithstanding the position to the contrary taken by some Senators. We have had a foreign policy in Japan. We have had it in Indonesia. We have had it in Korea. We have had it all through the East. It has not worked out in China as we should have liked, of course; but we have had a foreign policy, and those who say we have not, those who say it is bankrupt, do not realize the progress which has been made in the East as the result of our foreign policy. It is apparent in the Philippines, in Japan, in Korea, in Indonesia, and in other spots in that section of the world.

I did not expect to speak upon this subject, Mr. President, but when the saying is repeated, "Formosa must not fall into the hands of an unfriendly foe," something more than talking about it must be done, if we want to keep it from falling into the hands of the Communists. I do not know what the military strength of the island is. Perhaps the Senator from California knows. Perhaps the committee can find out. Perhaps they can find out when they go into session next Tuesday, when the Secretary of State appears before the committee. The Foreign Relations Committee ought to find out, of course, and it will. But someone knows that the military strength of Formosa is not very great; someone has been told that is so; otherwise men like former President Hoover and the Senator from Ohio would not be advocating sending the Navy, or part of the Navy, to protect it from communism. Any time the Navy goes to Formosa, Mr. President, you can be certain that if the Communists start across some ships are going down. The chances are they will go down because of some Russian submarine that will be there, because the Communists are all together, as everyone knows. That is what I fear, Mr. President. If that should happen, we would be involved, and that could mean war—and no one is going to win the next war. I think the President of the United States followed the right course in the action he took

today, in expressing the position he did in the statement. I am not so sure that the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle are right in the advocacy of the policy they have been proposing. Time alone will tell.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. I should like to ask the Senator, since he has made the statement that the administration has a foreign policy in the Far East, if he could give me and also give the public an answer to the question of why we have not had a bipartisan foreign policy in the Far East.

Mr. LUCAS. A bipartisan policy?

Mr. JENNER. Yes—why the bipartisan foreign policy that has applied to western Europe has not been applied to the Far East.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Texas would be in a better position to answer that question than am I; but I think perhaps his Committee on Foreign Relations has been advised from time to time as to what is going on in the Far East. I am not fully advised as to what department officials the committee has called before it and the extent of the information elicited. But I want to say to my friend from Indiana that the Senator from Illinois has advocated from time to time, and still does, the maximum amount of consultation and conference between the executive branch of the Government and members of the Foreign Relations Committee, both in the Senate and in the House. That is the position I have taken from the beginning. I still take that position.

I think my friend, the great Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], has made a valuable contribution toward world peace, as a result of the position he has taken and his efforts here in promoting the bipartisan foreign policy as he has done and is doing now. He and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] have been the architects of the bipartisan foreign policy. They have worked together all these years. The results of their work have become evident in Europe. But what happened in the Chinese situation I am not in a position to say. I shall leave that to the experts on the subject.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The able majority leader has stated that America has a foreign policy in the East. I wonder whether the Senator would place in the RECORD today or tomorrow a statement of what that policy is. The Senator from Michigan spent some time in the East, and he endeavored to obtain from those who are in charge of formulating the policy of America in the East, those who are in charge of the naval forces in the East, and so forth, that information. He was unable to find anyone who could state what the foreign policy of America was in relation to the East. That being true, I should like to have the able majority leader state to the Senate what the foreign policy of America is in the East.

Mr. LUCAS. The junior Senator from Michigan is a very valuable Member of the Senate. He understands the situation as well as I do. I suggest to the able Senator that he ask permission to go before Secretary Acheson next Tuesday and ask him that question. The Secretary of State can give him the proper answer. The Senator from Illinois could not lay out on a blueprint as to what the foreign policy is, unless he conferred with the Secretary and with State Department officials. But I know, and the Senator knows, that we have a foreign policy there. I am satisfied from the accounts I read in the newspapers as to where the Senator went on the last trip he took, that he was not trying very hard to find out exactly what our foreign policy was in the Far East, but that he was trying to find something wrong with it. The Senator did not go over there to find out anything good about the Democratic administration.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Any question the Senator would ask me would not be favorable to the Democratic administration. I know that from my long experience with the Senator's activities.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator give me his aid, that I may appear before the Foreign Relations Committee, and that I may ask that question?

Mr. LUCAS. Why, certainly. I know his distinguished senior colleague from Michigan would be delighted to have the junior Senator from Michigan appear in the committee meeting and ask all the questions he wants to ask. It has been done before. Former Senator Dulles was here last year. He was a sort of roving member of the committee. There will not be any trouble about that at all, and I think the Senator ought to do it. Of course, no one will ever satisfy the Senator with respect to his questions, but at least he will have the opportunity to interrogate Secretary Acheson. He ought to do it. I know the Secretary would welcome it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator was critical of the statement of former President Hoover, as supported by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I assume without any question that the Senator did not mean by his criticism that those men, or any other prominent men, or even men who are not so prominent, do not have the right to speak out and give their views with relation to the policies of the Government of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, not at all. I may say to my dear friend from Massachusetts that the Senator from Ohio would be the last man in the world anyone would attempt to keep from speaking out. They have that right, of course, as citizens, and the Senator from Ohio has that right as a Senator. I do not say that Mr. Hoover or the Senator from Ohio wants to get this country into war. I do not say that at all, but I do definitely and unequivocally say that, once we send the Navy to Formosa to keep the Communists away, as was clearly suggested in that letter and in the statement that was made by the distinguished Senator, it is certainly placing the American people and the American Government in a dangerous position, so far as war is concerned.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for one more question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator will agree with me, I am sure, that it is for the best interests of all the Members of the United States Senate and of the American people as a whole to have men like President Hoover, the Senator from California, the Senator from Ohio, and others, who have some knowledge of the subject, and who have definite views, to express their views in order that all of us can get better information. The Senator agrees with me about that, does he not?

Mr. LUCAS. That is absolutely correct. I agree to that, that the more debate we have upon the subject, the more opportunity we shall have of giving the American people the opportunity to listen in and to hear both sides of the question, and of finding a proper solution.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And that is not on a partisan basis, I take it.

Mr. LUCAS. Not at all, not at all.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate at this time. I shall probably address some remarks to this subject at a little later date. The hour is far advanced. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the able speech by the Senator from California, and to the running debate.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] has pointed out the statements of former President Hoover and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] advocating the sending of a naval fleet to Formosa. I have a press release before me from New Brunswick, N. J., quoting a statement by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who was recently in the Far East. I quote from the press release:

> This country should lose no time in adopting an aggressive policy in the Far East, including the occupation of Formosa to forestall a possible Communist sweep southward out of China.
>
> Senator ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, declared tonight in a recorded broadcast:
>
> "I am hoping we will find a formula for occupying Formosa," said Mr. SMITH. "I think that it would be very simple to work out a program with the Nationalist Government there and with Taiwan"—

That is, Formosa—

> "with the people themselves, whereby we would go into a joint occupation and help them to recover."

Why, of course, it would be a simple operation—much simpler than this debate here today—if we would cooperate with the forces occupying Formosa, and tell them that we are going to come over and help occupy it. Occupy it how? With an army, with a navy, with all the military might this Government possesses?

Mr. President, I was somewhat amazed at the Senator from California when,

after his long address about the terrible conditions in the Far East and the threat of communism, he did not go further into the aggressive measures which he thought might be adopted in order to stop communism. Of course, we are all against communism. The Senator denounces the methods of the Communists. But because we are against communism must we send an army into all the Communist states, to conquer communism, extirpate it, and liberate the peoples from communism? What are we going to do, if we follow that sort of policy? When are we going to invade Hungary, to free it from communism? Rumania? Bulgaria? Czechoslovakia? Yugoslavia? And Russia itself? Shall we say we will not permit communism to exist anywhere on earth?

Mr. President, the Communists have taken possession of China. We should not blind ourselves to that fact. They are in de facto possession of all the land area of China excepting certain outlying islands. The great nations of the earth are about to recognize the Communists as de facto rulers of China. What good will it do us, even if we could—and we should not—to intervene in the civil war between the Communists on the one hand and the Nationalist Government of China on the other hand?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In view of the statement made by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that the great nations of the earth are about to recognize the Communist government of China, may I inquire if it is the intention of the Government of the United States to recognize the Communist government of China?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is a matter which must await developments. It will not be determined at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to get into any quarrel with the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. All right. The State Department has repeatedly informed the committee that there will be no recognition until the matter is discussed with the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me further answer the Senator's question. It is not the custom to recognize a government until it gives assurances that it will respect international law. That is applicable to all governments.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate now tell us what great nations of the earth are going to recognize Communist China?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know them all. I know some of them. India has recognized Communist China. Great Britain, I think——

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know that Great Britain will recognize Communist China?

Mr. CONNALLY. I feel sure that she will recognize it. She has vast business interests in China and wants to protect them. I understand that within a very short period of time she will recognize the Communist government of China.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator think the United States of America should recognize a country which will be governed by Communist Russia, with all its banditry, which has infiltrated itself not only into China but into many other countries? Can it ever become so stabilized that the United States of America will recognize that kind of government?

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the Senator is getting a little far afield from the absolute question which we are supposed to be discussing here.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator made the statement that great nations of the earth were about to recognize Communist China.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not say they all would recognize China.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator because I believe in him. I think he believes in fair play. I ask him now as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, does he think the Senate of the United States can agree to ratification by the State Department of recognition of Communist China if this administration shall decide to recognize Communist China?

Mr. CONNALLY. The State Department cannot recognize it. No one except the President of the United States can extend recognition.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not sufficiently acquainted with all the facts regarding conditions in China to make a definite statement, but I do not favor recognizing China at this time. As I have said, it depends on conditions and developments. Ultimately, if they show themselves as properly administering the affairs of China, we shall probably recognize them. What good would it do not to recognize them? If other countries of the world recognize them, do business with them, and have ministers and ambassadors stationed there, how would it benefit us not to have ambassadors and ministers there also? We do not send ambassadors to foreign countries to please the people of those countries. We do not send ministers and consuls to serve the convenience or the pleasure of foreign governments. We send them to represent and serve the Government of the United States. We want to know what is going on in those countries. We have no other way of ascertaining, without establishing an elaborate spy system. We refused to recognize Russia for approximately 15 years after the First World War. What difference did it make? The rest of the nations of the world traded and did business with Russia, and so did we, but we had no formal diplomatic representation. Finally we did recognize Russia, and she was then absolutely a Communist government. If the Senator would not recognize any Communist government at all, and that were our policy, we would soon be in a very small minority, judging by the way in which communism is spreading over the world.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. How can the distinguished Senator from Texas ask the junior Senator from Nebraska to vote appropriations to stop the expansion of communism in western Europe while at the same time this administration recognizes Communist China?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have not yet asked the Senator to support any appropriations.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator has been on the floor of the Senate and, in an impassioned plea, has asked us to approve this, that, or the other thing to stop the expansion of communism in Europe. This afternoon we are informed by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that the great nations of the earth are about to recognize Communist China. I ask once again how the Senator can ask that we spend the taxpayers' money to stop communism in Europe. How can I be asked to approve an appropriation to stop the expansion of communism in Europe, when, at the same time the Government advocates the recognition of Communist China or any other nation where bandits infiltrate and completely subjugate the people?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Nebraska has answered the question. He has asked it and answered it, so I shall not pay any more attention to that particular question. But let me ask the Senator this: What are the nations of the earth which we have recognized? Do not rise until I have completed my question. I want a little time, myself. I have never made a plea on the floor of the Senate for appropriations to stop communism. I have made appeals for appropriations to protect free nations of the earth from armed attack from without, regardless of communism——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment. Be patient, please. The clock is running on. Let me say to the Senator, seriously, that this is a free country, is it not?

Mr. WHERRY. I hope so.

Mr. CONNALLY. If a man wants to be a Communist, has he not the right to be a Communist? In a free land if a citizen honestly and sincerely believes in the principles of communism but violates no law he has a right to his belief.

Mr. WHERRY. The oath of the Communist Party provides for the overthrow of the United States Government by force.

Mr. CONNALLY. If a Communist violates the law, of course he is guilty—he is responsible for his own conduct. He may not be a member of the party.

Mr. WHERRY. He is guilty of treason.

Mr. CONNALLY. Not necessarily.

Mr. WHERRY. If he advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States, it is treason. I shall not support appropriations for anyone who believes in that.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will bet a dollar that if we should send an FBI investigator into Nebraska he would find some

Communists. I do not mean armed Communists.

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment——

Mr. CONNALLY. I have the floor, and I propose to keep it until I get ready to yield it.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is charging that there are Communists in Nebraska. Nebraska has the finest citizenship on the face of the earth. They are honest-to-goodness Americans. They are not Communists.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not mean that all of them are Communists.

Mr. WHERRY. Nebraska is the best State in the Union, and the Senator will find more Americans to the square inch in Nebraska than in any other State of the Union.

Mr. CONNALLY. They are getting pretty small if they can be compressed into a square inch.

Mr. WHERRY. They are doing pretty well.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, what I meant to say was that if men honestly believe in those doctrines—and there are plenty of such men in every State—they are not going around with a bomb in one hand and a six-shooter in the other. They really believe in the principle of the common ownership of property.

Mr. WHERRY. But the Senator does not sanction those beliefs.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course I do not.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator and I agree on most questions.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have answered the question of the Senator from Nebraska. But I want the gentlemen who are complaining so bitterly and so eloquently and so vigorously about Formosa to tell us what they want to do about it.

Mr. JENNER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. What do they propose to do? Do they want to send an army there with guns in their hands? Do they want to send the Navy, with its flags unfurled, to protect Formosa in a civil war? Both sides in this contest are Chinese. The Nationalist Government is Chinese, and the Communist forces are Chinese. It is a civil war, and we do not intervene in civil wars unless our interests are directly affected.

I now yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. I desire to ask the distinguished Senator from Texas whether or not the President of the United States consulted with the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate in regard to this recently announced policy on the abandonment of Formosa.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say that the President did not personally, but the Secretary of State did.

Mr. JENNER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. And he is in constant touch with the President.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, did I correctly understand the Senator to say they consulted with the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. CONNALLY. Members of it. They consulted with me.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I never heard anything about this decision until I saw it in the newspapers.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations if he does not think it somewhat strange that some of the Senators who have so bitterly opposed our efforts to assist western Europe now seem to be in the forefront in behalf of some policy, which they do not define, which they do not delimit, and which they cannot explain. Has the Senator observed that?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not like to reflect on my colleagues. The Senator is entitled to his opinion on the subject.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to say to the Senator also that the effort that has been made here today to prove that we have had no policy in the Far East does not comport with the facts.

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly it does not.

Mr. McMAHON. As the Senator well knows, we poured hundreds of millions of dollars into the Philippines.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. We started right after the end of the war to see that they maintained their independence, and became a free republic among the nations of the world.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator knows we did our job in Japan, and I think have done it very well, and that we are working on a peace treaty with Japan.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Texas knows, and the Senate knows, that we have rendered invaluable assistance to the Indonesian Republic, and for the first time in years there is now a cessation of hostilities in Indonesia.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Texas knows, and the Senate knows, that we have taken the lead in composing the differences between Pakistan and India. Last of all, the Senator of course knows well that we have poured more than $2,000,000,000 into the effort to maintain the Nationalist Government in China.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. McMAHON. Let us acknowledge the corn, as the saying goes. Do gentlemen want us to go into Formosa with a full-fledged attack? Do they want us to go to war over China, or do they not?

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator for his question. What he implies is very true. Let us consider the case of China. We are talking about China and Formosa. We poured out more than $2,000,000,000, and sent the Chinese food and raiment. We sent arms and munitions to Nationalist China, the government which is being discussed here today. We sent them all these things. If they did not use them successfully, it is not the fault of the United States.

What we did for Indonesia has been well suggested by the Senator. What about Japan? We have occupied Japan. We have fed the Japanese, we have sent them money, we have sent them resources. Yet, we have no policy! I have heard that kind of talk from across the aisle for some years, that we have no foreign policy. It is ridiculous on its face.

We poured hundreds of millions of dollars into the Philippines? And what occurred in the case of Korea? We are making appropriations for Korea. It is making great advancement and progress. Yet, we have no foreign policy!

Mr. President, when war was on, did we have a foreign policy? Did we not send troops to China? Did we not send troops to Burma? Did we not send troops to India? Did we not send troops to Japan? Did we not send them to practically all the governments in Asia that had any contact at all with the war? We sent American troops, American resources, American arms and munitions. Yet, we have no foreign policy!

Aid to China is still proceeding. Even with all the disturbance China is causing us, we are still continuing to administer money for relief purposes in China.

Mr. WHERRY. Through ECA.

Mr. CONNALLY. Through ECA; yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. For a short question.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator about the ECA appropriations, but I should like to inquire whether we allocated any of the $75,000,000 Congress appropriated for aid in China. Have we spent any of that $75,000,000?

Mr. CONNALLY. I cannot tell the Senator how much has been spent, but aid is being extended.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the aid about which the Senator from California has been talking.

Mr. CONNALLY. We gave them $125,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. One hundred and seventy-five million dollars has been spent of the ECA funds out of $275,000,000.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am speaking about another appropriation.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator that that is being spent, but, as I understand from all the reports I can get from the State Department, not one dime or penny of the $75,000,000 that was appropriated, the bill passing the Senate without much debate, has been spent, and if I understood the remarks of the Senator from California correctly, it is my understanding that out of the authorization, the aid they need so much could be given without any further legislative action.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. For just a moment let me answer. This seems to be a squad attack. We appropriated $125,000,000 for aid to China in the way of arms, ammunition, and munitions.

I now yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I asked the distinguished majority leader a question a while ago, and he said he thought the Senator from Texas might be in a better position to answer.

I agree with the distinguished Senator, we have a foreign policy in the Far East, and we have a bipartisan foreign policy in western Europe. Will the Senator be kind enough to explain to me why we do not have a bipartisan foreign policy in the Far East?

Mr. CONNALLY. So far as I know, there has been no concealment from members of the Committee on Foreign Relations on the Republican side about any fact in issue as to China. The Senator from Nebraska, the leader on the other side, pretends to know more about these things than many of the rest of us know.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not get my information from the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I did not get it from the State Department. I cannot find out anything from the State Department.

Mr. CONNALLY. He got it from one of his secret agents, then.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what one has to have around here to get any information.

Mr. CONNALLY. One of his secret agents, paid for by Government money.

Mr. JENNER. Then the distinguished Senator from Texas is telling me that we have the same bipartisan policy in the Far East that we have in Europe, that it is bipartisan all through?

Mr. CONNALLY. So far as I have been able to observe. The two-billion-dollar appropriation made for China was voted for on this floor. Were the Republicans so blind that they did not inquire into it, that they did not know what the $2,000,000,000 was being spent for? Was the $175,000,000 about which the Senator from Nebraska speaks—and I hope he will keep his seat until I get to a stopping point—covered up? Was it not passed on the floor of the Senate, and are not the Republicans smart enough to inquire and to know about it in years when there is no election, as well as in years when there is an election?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator recall that there were consistent and persistent attempts made by members of the Committee on Foreign Relations to get hold of the Wedemeyer report and see what was in it?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. And that we were met with full and unconditional refusal by the State Department?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is a vivid illustration of the bipartisan nature of the policy. The Democrats did not get the Wedemeyer report any more than the Republicans got it. So there is no point to that.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Bipartisan secrecy, I take it.

Mr. CONNALLY. No. The Wedemeyer report touched a great many matters of a highly technical, military, and diplomatic nature, so that the President did not think it wise to give it publicity, and he knew that if he gave it to as many as three Republicans, it would be published all over the world.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I wish to say for the RECORD that, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, it is a great regret to me to be compelled to announce here that I was in no way consulted about the action taken by the President today. Furthermore, I had understood distinctly, in my conversations with the members of the State Department, that no action would be taken on these important questions, such as the recognition of China and the problem of Formosa, without consultation with the Committee on Foreign Relations. I want the RECORD to show that.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I wish to say also, in answer to the distinguished chairman of the committee, for whom I have the highest affection and regard, with respect to his question to me about what I would do regarding Formosa, that I expect to address the Senate early next week, reporting on my trip, and making suggestions about how the Formosa matter might be handled without the danger of war. Possibly it is too late. Possibly the barn door has been locked after the horse is gone, because I understand the question has been settled unilaterally by the President on the advice of the Department today, much to my regret.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know where or when the President gave assurances to the Senator from New Jersey that action respecting China would be revealed to him. He told all of us in the committee, through the Secretary of State, that recognition—and we are not discussing recognition here today—that recognition of the Communist regime in China would not be made until the Foreign Relations Committee was thoroughly conversant with and was advised of the situation. That stands, and continues to stand.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. From discussion of the bipartisan approach to this matter and talking with members of the State Department, I understood distinctly that these issues would be considered in a bipartisan way, and that no action would be taken without consultation with the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. I, as one Senator at least, had that understanding. I think it is a dangerous attack upon our bipartisan cooperation for this unilateral decision by the President to have been made. I greatly regret it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to ask what we would have done respecting the foreign policy of the United States when the Senator from New Jersey was away in India, in China, and Formosa? What would be the result if no action could be taken until he and the other Senators who were away returned and were consulted?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think the RECORD will show that I said that, from talking with members of the State Department, I understood that no action would be taken on these important questions, such as the recognition of China and the problem of Formosa without consultation with the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CONNALLY. There are many men in the State Department who have no authority to make such a statement. The Senator from New Jersey did not consult the President or the Secretary of State about the statements he handed out about what ought to happen to Formosa, did he?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I certainly did. On my return I immediately tried to get in touch with the Secretary of State, and was told that he was leaving for Paris. He asked me to submit a memorandum to him on the subject of my observations in the Far East. I did so. He acknowledged receipt of the memorandum. I immediately sent to the other members of the State Department involved in far eastern affairs a copy of my report to the Foreign Relations Committee and asked for a consultation with them. I did have lunch with Mr. Butterworth. I went to Flushing and had lunch with Messrs. Jessup and Fosdick and reported my recommendations to them. I felt I was entitled to some opportunity of discussing with the entire State Department group what should be done in deciding these important questions. I cannot feel that any of my observations or recommendations were given any serious consideration.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Texas if he can advise the Senate whether, in consideration of Chinese affairs, including the possibility of recognition of the present powers in control of China, the island of Formosa is regarded as a part of China?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say "Yes." It has not been confirmed by a treaty of peace with Japan, but insofar as they can make these agreements short of a treaty with Japan, the powers agreed that Formosa should go back to China, because Japan seized it 50 or 60 years ago. However, the treaty ratifying that agreement must be made.

Mr. AIKEN. Was that agreement made since the conclusion of World War II?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes. It was made during the war, at the Cairo Conference.

Mr. AIKEN. I assume the Government of China was one of the major powers that agreed to that decision.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. And probably would not agree to it at this time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator mean that China would rather Japan would keep Formosa than that Japan return it to China?

Mr. AIKEN. I imagine that China would not, that is that Chiang Kai-shek's

government would not desire to have Formosa regarded as a part of China.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is a speculation I am not able to answer.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator did answer my question, that, so far as he knows, the island of Formosa is regarded as a part of China.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The statement has been made that my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who has taken such an important part in foreign relations, had personally been consulted in relation to Formosa. My colleague issued a statement which I think should be made a part of the RECORD to show whether or not there was consultation with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I should like to read into the RECORD the statement issued by my distinguished colleague and released to the press this afternoon.

Mr. CONNALLY. Has the Senator the permission of the senior Senator from Michigan to place the statement in the RECORD?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; but I think it ought to become a part of the RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not going to object. I merely wanted to know.

Mr. FERGUSON. The senior Senator from Michigan delivered to the press a statement. It came over the teletype service. I read a copy of the statement, as follows:

Senator VANDENBERG. I regret that the administration has found it necessary to announce conclusions regarding Formosa ahead of a realistic consultation on the subject with the appropriate committees of Congress. Like Yalta and Potsdam, and like many other unhappy chapters in China policy, congressional advice is precluded. I regret that these conclusions also precede the factual reports which have been anticipated from the Jessup mission and particularly from the Far East conference between our Chiefs of Staff and General MacArthur. It is at least useful that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will explore the subject with Secretary Acheson next week because many critical decisions remain to be made.

Every practical discouragement to Communist conquest, short of active American military participation, should be pursued in China and throughout the Far East, which must be totally encompassed in our comprehensive view. The rights of Formosans themselves must be consulted. The permanent status of Formosa must be recognized as dependent on the ultimate Japanese peace treaty. The vital interest of the United Nations must be recognized.

The Formosan question is presently clarified but it is not settled by today's executive statements. I withhold my own discussion until the belated hearings next week.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am very glad to have that statement from the senior Senator from Michigan. The senior Senator from Michigan is a very able man. He has rendered very distinguished service. He is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I want to say, however, that the Committee on Foreign Relations has had Mr. Acheson before it numerous times. He has never shown any disposition not to come when any member of the committee felt that we ought to invite him, and when the committee had acted favorably upon such a suggestion. He has been frank. He has been free to discuss any foreign questions. I think it is a little unfair to charge the State Department, through Mr. Acheson, with lack of willingness to reveal anything that is known about the subject.

Now some say that we ought to wait until we receive the report from Mr. Jessup.

Many persons have traveled over eastern Asia, including Japan, who have given out statements respecting what they thought ought to be done in Formosa, and what ought to be done in Korea. After a while the issuance of such statements becomes an old matter, and I assume that the Secretary of State and the President concluded that it was about time that one or the other of them should make a public statement in regard to our policy toward Formosa. One cannot blame them.

We have heard speeches on the Senate floor, not only during the present session but during the last session, about China, and particularly we have heard complaints respecting our policy toward China. Yet, the same persons who have complained the loudest about our neglect of China voted for the appropriations, liberal appropriations, which we made for assistance to China. We sent General Marshall to China. He spent a year there trying to compose the Government of China, to keep it a going concern. Yet, now some say we have not done enough for China. Senators know what happened. They know what General Marshall told us. He told us about the corruption in the Government of China, and that it was unable really in good faith to carry out measures which would utilize the funds we had so lavishly given them.

I shall at a later time make a more comprehensive speech on this subject and try to be prepared to brief anyone who wants to ask questions.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, it is certainly not my intention to enter into any extended discussion of this matter except to say I think it would be unfortunate if we were to close the debate without pointing out that we do have, in a very real sense, a bipartisan policy respecting China. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee I have sat hour after hour and listened to exactly the same witnesses as has the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. Every suggestion that could possibly be made by the admirals, by the generals, by the ambassadors, by the special ambassadors, and by the Secretary of State, was received and examined, and out of all that testimony has come unified action by the Foreign Relations Committee. If that is not bipartisan I do not know the meaning of the term. It seems to me the Republican members of the Foreign Relations Committee have truly represented their party, have amply represented their party, and have wisely represented their party in the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. In regard to the issuance of the statement by the President, I wish to say that I am reliably informed, beyond any question, that last night the Secretary of State tried to reach the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]; that he had gone home, and was not available; but that the Secretary of State was going to reach him and was going to discuss the very thing about which complaint has been made, namely, that the Senator was not consulted about the issuance of the statement by the President. I intervene simply to make that statement.

Mr. McMAHON. I regret very much that that mischance occurred.

But in regard to the issuance of the statement, I also point out that it was in the possession of the Foreign Relations Committee for months and months and months. I have not heard made in the executive meetings of that committee any positive, constructive suggestion which would have eventuated in a single difference in action or in thought in relation to this problem.

So I say to the Senator from Indiana that in a very real sense we do have, and have had up to this time, a bipartisan policy in regard to China. It might have been different if the Senator from Nebraska had been on the committee; in that case we might have taken a different position. But I would not say that it would have resulted in his taking a different position than that which he has taken in regard to ECA and the Atlantic Pact, or different from the action he has taken on this floor in regard to their implementation which, if I remember the record correctly, he was opposed. I suspect that his action on those matters would have been no different if he had been a member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. President, I want a bipartisan foreign policy. I truly believe, from the bottom of my heart, that the position the United States of America occupies in the world today—the most important position any nation has ever occupied in relation to the other powers of the earth in the history of all mankind—is such, today, and is fraught with such danger, that never before have we needed unity in our foreign policy as we need it today.

Mr. President, I hope that we shall not become unduly acrimonious. I hope I have not offended the Senator from Nebraska in what I have said. I hope we can go on to develop and support a policy which will indicate to the world that we here are united and are determined that freedom shall not perish from the earth.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that the memorandum which has been read into the RECORD this afternoon by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], giving the observation of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], corroborates entirely the charges I have made in the past few days, namely, that we do not have a bipartisan foreign policy. Furthermore, it completely vindicates me in the statement I made, that, from now on, certainly no commitments ought to be made by the State

Department on the theory of bipartisanship, until those commitments have been brought to the Foreign Relations Committee and then to the Senate of the United States and then to the American people, for debate and open discussion.

That was not done in regard to Yalta; that was not done in regard to Potsdam. If it had been done in those cases, we would not be in the trouble we are in today. There was no bipartisanship about those secret agreements; and the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has said so time and time again on the floor of the Senate.

There has not been any bipartisanship on the coalition-Communist policy in the southeast of Asia for 6 years. Certainly when I voted against confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Acheson the first time, I did so because he wanted to inject a coalition Communist commission, or at least a representation of Communists in such a commission, in Japan. I did so alongside of the able former Senator Chandler, of Kentucky, who made a very forceful speech on that very proposition, on which we were in agreement at that time.

Mr. President, I opposed the ECA authorization; I thought it took the wrong approach. But I wish to tell my distinguished friend, the Senator from Connecticut, that once it was authorized, I supported the appropriations for it. I wish to say that I did not agree with the approach taken by the Atlantic Charter. I said I was in favor of the extension of the Monroe Doctrine, and that I would go along with the Atlantic Charter if that was what it was to be. But after it was authorized, when I sat on the Appropriations Committee, I attempted to justify the expenses for it, and I shall do so again.

I said then, and I now repeat, that it seems impossible to commit ourselves to a land army, to the tune of billions of dollars, to stop the expansion of communism in western Europe, when at the same time we recognize Communist China. Why are we to be expected to make those appropriations, and at the same time leave the barn door wide open to communism in China? That is my whole record on those issues, and I am proud of it.

The observations made today by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the observations made by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who has been one of the most active and apt members of the Foreign Relations Committee, completely justify my position so far as a bipartisan policy is concerned.

So, Mr. President, I myself hope—and I wish to agree with the distinguished Senator from Connecticut—that when these matters come to the Senate, as they should come to it, there will be full discussion of them. Certainly there was no bipartisanship in regard to Formosa or in regard to the question of defending it. Certainly it was not my policy; I had no chance to express myself about it, and I shall not have. But I say now that if we can have open discussions and can have the Senate advised as to what the policy shall be, then we shall have a bipartisan foreign policy which I shall be glad to uphold as forcefully as will any other Member of the Senate. But I was not consulted about Formosa. I do not know about the policy regarding it. I think some very challenging questions have been asked about what our policy should be.

But I wish to say now that, whatever that policy is, it should be arrived at after open discussion, without any commitments being made by either the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee or by the committee itself, until it can be discussed on the floor of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, perhaps it is not inappropriate that a freshman Member of the Senate should make a few observations in regard to the very enlightening discussion which has occurred today on the floor of the Senate. I am very sorry it was not my privilege to hear all the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I wish to say that it is not my purpose to argue or debate in any way with him the subject which has been under discussion.

However, as one who long has been interested in our international policy, particularly the problems of the Far East, as one who used to have the privilege of lecturing to a few students on international problems, particularly those in the Far East, I have been interested to note the lack of interest on the part of the United States Senate in what could be done for tomorrow. Everyone seems to be quite sure about what went wrong yesterday. I have heard almost continuous debate and argument about China; but China has been a lost cause ever since the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress, and even before that time. The Communist troops have been on the march; it was perfectly obvious what would happen in China.

Now we are considering Formosa, which consists of some 13,000 square miles. Perhaps it would be well for us to pick up the World Almanac and read what it states about what Formosa consists of and what articles it produces. From the almanac we learn that Formosa has an area of 13,800 square miles and a population of 5,212,426. We also learn that the Pescadores, the other islands which have been mentioned in connection with this debate, have an area of 50 square miles and a population of approximately 60,000.

But now the great question is whether we should send our fleet to Formosa or whether at least we should do something to save Formosa from communism.

Frankly, Mr. President, the issue, as has been stated, is one of civil war. One side happens to have Communist leadership; the other side happens to have corrupt leadership. Of course, corrupt leadership is still corrupt and still filled with corruption, whether it be communistic leadership or other leadership.

Now the question is whether we should do something in this civil war.

Since our policy in the Far East is in question, I should like to commend to the Foreign Relations Committee interrogations and inquiries in regard to what we are doing, not only for Formosa and about Formosa, but also about Korea, where the government is tottering. Let us also say a word about India. For about 9 months the junior Senator from Minnesota has been digging into the facts and testimony and figures about India. Even when the great Nehru, one of the greatest leaders of all time, a disciple of Gandhi, and a saint of India, came to the United States, not one Member of the Senate of the United States rose in the Senate to give him a greeting—not even when he, a man of peace, came to our country. We have had many speeches about the United States fleet and about war, but not one speech about Nehru.

At this time I wish to talk about food. I happen to think that we stop communism more with food than we do with fleets. I think we stop the Communists in Europe more with economic aid and food than we do by supplying guns. Our program of economic aid in western Europe has been more successful than has our program of supplying guns to Greece.

Mr. President, what has happened in Asia? In Asia there is poverty such as none of us can realize. I wish the Senator from California had talked to us about the unbelievable poverty which exists in Asia. Poverty is a fertile ground for communism. The Communists have made their way in China not only because of the strength of their arms and the mismanagement of the nationalist government, but because of the abject poverty of the people of China, poverty such as is inconceivable to the western mind.

There is the nation by the name of India. How about India? Let us compare it with Formosa. Formosa has 13,000 square miles. India has 1,581,410 square miles. Formosa has 5,000,000 people, and the Formosans do not like the Nationalist Government of China. The Nationalist Government of China treated the people of Formosa so badly that they literally hate the Government of China. How about the population of India? Three hundred and eighty-eight million, nine hundred and ninety-seven thousand, nine hundred and fifty-five is the estimate of 1940. It is now openly estimated that India's population is in excess of 400,000,000, with a government friendly to us, with a government headed by the great Prime Minister Nehru, who recently visited this country, with a government that has been able to deal with communism within its own borders by stringent efforts and drastic measures. Yet how many Senators have brought to the attention of this body the fact that the Indian Government has been wanting food from America, and has not been able to get a crumb. We talk about sending a fleet, we have the saber out, and, frankly, the people of the island cannot save Formosa, as has been pointed out so well, unless we are willing to send airplanes and an Army there, and unless we are willing to have World War III.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota declines to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appeal to this body to look into the facts. Everyone is concerned because the Secretary of State did not discuss Formosa. Everyone is concerned because the President did not discuss Formosa. How many Senators on the floor of the Senate are concerned about the fact that India wants 1,000 tons of wheat from America, and has not been able to get it?

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. For the information of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, I may say I visited India only a few weeks ago. I think the situation will be found about as the Senator has described it. So far as poverty is concerned, it is indescribable. There is misery and pitiable suffering. I think the population will be found as the Senator has described it. It will also be found that it is increasing at the rate of 5,000,000 a year. But the people have just gone through an internal conflict based upon a religious disagreement. The Hindus, being the prominent people, could not get along with the Moslems, or vice versa, and, therefore, since England left, the new nation of Pakistan has been created.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator does not want to prolong the debate. I stand ready for a question.

Mr. JENNER. The Senator is interested in the question of food. I want to say that in Pakistan the Senate committee saw literally thousands of tons of food. The Pakistanians have been the agricultural people of that great subject nation for many hundreds of years. Nehru wanted to enter into an agreement for the purchase of grain from Pakistan. It was refused by reason of differences in Kashmir. If we send food to Nehru, we are going to destroy and starve to death 80,000,000 Pakistanians who produce the food that India should be consuming.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate the information the Senator from Indiana has furnished. I shall simply say there is no amount of agricultural production in all Asia that can feed the 400,000,000 people of India. If we should take the food that is in Pakistan and add the 500,000,000 bushels of wheat we have in surplus in the United States, there still would be hungry people in India.

Mr. JENNER. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Most of the Indian people are getting along on less than one-half the subsistence diet that the United Nations has established as necessary in Europe.

Mr. President, I shall not belabor the point. I merely want to say that five times during the past year the junior Senator from Minnesota has placed in the RECORD material on the subject of our relationships, or lack of relationships, with the Dominion of India. I ask anyone who is a student of geopolitics to get his mind off Formosa—little old Formosa—and think of the great mass of land in south Asia that is India, with the upper stretches of this land literally butting into the underbelly of the Soviet Union. On the one side, there is the Arabian Sea, on the other side, the Bay of Bengal, and on the south, the Indian Ocean. If one looks at the geopolitics, India makes out a good case. We ought to be doing something to maintain their freedom and to maintain a democratic government in that country. But we in this country do not seem to become much enthused about feeding somebody who wants to live the democratic way of life. We seem to become enthused in the United States Senate about Chiang Kai-shek, or about opposition to the Communists. We have enthusiasm now for Formosa. There are those who voted against the Atlantic Pact, which was nothing more or less than a commitment for national defense and national security, who are the very first to want to send a fleet to Formosa. Why? To stop communism.

Mr. President, I want to stop communism, and I say that if we lose the south part of Asia, if we lose the Malay Peninsula, if we lose Burma, if we lose India, we shall have lost every hope that we ever had of being able to maintain free institutions in any part of the eastern world. So I commend to the members of the Foreign Relations Committee a study, and I give them a slogan: Rather than fleets for Formosa, let us have some food for India.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether the Senator realizes that in the solution of the problems of India, Pakistan, Siam, Burma, Indonesia, and Indochina, the question of Formosa and the recognition of China are vital and can be the heavy last straw which will cause those countries to go Communist. I have just traveled through the countries, and I talked to the prime ministers, the foreign ministers, the finance ministers, and the various other ministers, and the people, and those are the things that can change the whole southern part of Asia.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota has not had the privilege of being in Asia. As a matter of fact, I may say very candidly I do not think a 2 months' trip would really inform anyone very much. It helps, but it takes a long time to become a good student of a particular area. It takes many years even for a man to know his own State, much less to know a State that he cannot even communicate with, because of differences in languages. But there are people who have spent a lifetime studying these areas. There are those who have read hundreds and hundreds of volumes, and people who have made it their life's work to know. I submit that an issue in the Asiatic world today that is much more prominent in the minds of the people of Asia than communism, is food. Hunger is consuming them, and hungry people do not think well. Hungry people do not have rational minds. They do not have healthy bodies.

There are other things we could do. Since there has been mention of what the other nations will do if we recognize Communist China, that issue will have to be discussed in terms of the facts. I am not prepared to make any statement as to whether or not we ought to recognize Communist China. I do not like Communists. I wish we did not have to recognize any of them. But I may say that the Communists in Europe and the Communists in Asia are making millions of converts on the basis of one thing we are doing in America. The Congress of the United States can do something about it, and it will not cost a penny. It can be made bipartisan or strictly one party. I refer to the passage of civil-rights legislation. Wherever one goes in the world, my colleagues, it so happens that the one tool and the one weapon the Communists have against us is the way we treat our own people. In India, south Asia, Africa, and everywhere else in the world, the one weapon the Communists have against us is that we talk freedom, we talk human rights, we talk equal rights, but we discriminate against our own people.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am sorry that Members on the Senator's side of the aisle are not present when he is arguing the civil-rights issue. The Senator from Michigan spent many hours getting a civil-rights bill, the antilynching bill, out of committee, but he has been unable to have it considered on the floor. I want to join the Senator in trying to obtain the passage of this civil-rights bill, and even the other bills which are on the calendar today. I hope the Senator will help in getting them up for consideration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know of the sincerity of the Senator from Michigan, and I surely want to congratulate him on his good work, but I say here is where we need a bipartisan policy. This is indeed where we need it. I listened to the broadcast of Ed Murrow over CBS on Sunday, with all his correspondents over the world, reporting on the first half of the century. Thirteen men, I believe it was, reported to the American people, with the greatest ensemble of celebrated news commentators that we have had in 50 years. What was the substance of the news commentaries? The substance was that our moral armor plate is weak. We have the fleets, but it takes something more than fleets to win this struggle for the minds of men. What is going on in Asia now is a struggle for the minds of men. Our armor plate is weak as we struggle for human freedom in Asia and generally for the freedom of the human race. It is weak in the fact that we think somehow or other we can buy peace with dollars. We need to recognize that it is not only the gift but it is the spirit of the giver that counts. We in the Congress should say to the American people we are prepared to help feed those people who today have the whiplash of the Communist standing over them. India is within 50 or 60 miles of the Soviet Union, with the Communist agents working in every village and town in an attempt to overthrow democratic government. What is the most important problem of the Government of India today? It is food.

Who has the food? We talk about ships. I say we are immoral. We are almost anti-Christian. We ought to get down on our knees and pray to God to forgive us for our sins, for here on the eastern coast of our land are Liberty ships, 10,000-ton freighters loaded with wheat which the Commodity Credit Corporation has purchased, and the wheat is rotting. The wheat is stored up, and here are people who are dying of hunger, with the Communists on top of them, with their government almost tottering. What are we doing? We are sitting around saying we cannot get along with Pakistan, or with this country or with some other country.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Did I understand the Senator to say that the wheat is rotting?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not imply that all the wheat is rotting. Undoubtedly some of the wheat is rotting.

Mr. THYE. Did I understand the Senator correctly?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I withdraw the statement.

Mr. THYE. I hope the Senator will withdraw it, because I hope the administrators of the Commodity Credit Corporation are not so negligent that they are permitting wheat to rot merely by reason of the fact that the wheat has not been turned or has not been properly aired. I hope the Senator will withdraw the statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be more than happy to withdraw the statement. However, I may say that if we needed to find some rotting wheat in storage, I think we could find it. Rotten wheat or no rotten wheat, all I want to point out to the Senate, which is so interested in our foreign policy, is that one of the important measures which can be taken, as has been developed in the last 3 or 4 months, is to let the people of India get some of the Commodity Credit Corporation wheat on a price-concession basis. They cannot pay for it. At any rate, they cannot pay the market price for it. I still say, Mr. President, rather than fleets for Formosa, how about a little food for humanity?

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the problem of India is not so simple as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota would have us believe. After all is said and done, so far as food is concerned, I do not believe I saw as much food at any other place on my trip as I saw in India. One-third of all the cattle of the world are in India, but a religious belief of the people prohibits them from killing the cattle and eating the beef. I do not think we should go into India and tell the people to change the religious beliefs which they have held for thousands of years, long before Christianity was ever heard of. I do not think that would be our province. We can ship all the wheat we have to India, and the people will feed it to their cattle, and a little child or an old man will be starving to death within 5 feet of the cargo ship which transported the wheat. Furthermore, if we take the surplus food from this country and try to buy the hearts and minds of the people of India, to bribe them from going communistic, we shall starve 80,000,000 inhabitants of Pakistan. They, too, are in the underbelly of Russia.

With reference to democracy in India, we talked to the leaders there, and did not find one who believed in democracy. I found them all to be Socialists. So far as I am concerned, I cannot see any sense in fattening socialism when we are trying to starve communism, because both socialism and communism end in exactly the same spot. There is no such thing as communism. Marx and Lenin were Socialists, not Communists. When we think one-sixteenth of the world's population can feed, industrialize, arm, and defend, not only western Europe but the Middle East, the Near East, and the Far East, and still maintain our standard of living, we are kidding ourselves; we are deluding ourselves. We would destroy and bankrupt the Nation both economically and militarily, and then the thing of which peoples all over the world are afraid will take over on our very streets.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. It was very difficult to find anyone who was interested in the form of government or the economic system of America. Is it not true that we found no one who was actually trying to sell the American form of government, which consists of a political system and an economic system, a political system which protects the life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness of its people, and the property of its people through a three-dimension system, executive, judicial, and legislative? We found no one who believed in such a system, nor did we find any American, outside of members of the committee, and those who were accompanying the committee, trying to sell the American system or trying to tell the people that any aid they received from us, be it food, economic aid, or military aid, was being bought by the sweat and the brawn of the American people under a system which has operated successfully in America and which would successfully operate there, if they would try it. Is not that a fact?

Mr. JENNER. That is exactly the fact. We talk about lifting those people up. In every country we entered, countries which have been in existence for thousands of years, with a basic economy of agriculture, we found the people talking about being industrialized. They said, in effect, "You have got to furnish the money, the materials, and the machinery to industrialize us." Every nation is wanting to become self-sufficient.

Mr. FERGUSON. And nationalistic.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. The most outstanding isolationist in America, if that is what we call them, is an evangelist compared with the nationalism we found in other countries. Is not that a correct statement?

Mr. JENNER. That is true.

RECESS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, January 6, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 5 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Edward W. Barrett, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Oscar L. Chapman, of Colorado, to be Secretary of the Interior, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

John F. Floberg, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of admiral, for a term of 4 years.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

James E. Webb, of North Carolina, to be United States alternate governor of the International Monetary Fund, and United States alternate governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 5 years.

William McChesney Martin, Jr., of New York, to be United States executive director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years and until his successor has been appointed, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

John S. Hooker, of Maryland, to be United States alternate executive director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 2 years and until his successor has been appointed, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

CONCILIATION COMMISSION FOR PALESTINE

Ely E. Palmer, of Rhode Island, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Conciliation Commission for Palestine which was established by resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations, December 11, 1948, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION FOR THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE FOUNDING OF PORT-AU-PRINCE, REPUBLIC OF HAITI

John Shaw Young, of New York, to be United States Commissioner to the International Exposition for the Bicentennial of the Founding of Port-au-Prince, Republic of Haiti, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Maj. Gen. James H. Burns, United States Army, retired, to be Assistant to the Secretary of Defense, Mutual Defense Assistance, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

John Hallowell Ohly, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director, Mutual Defense Assistance, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Gerald A. Drew, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, now United States representative on the United Nations Special Balkan Committee, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United

States of America to the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan.

Jefferson Patterson, of Ohio, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Special Balkan Committee established by the General Assembly of the United Nations October 21, 1947, vice Gerald A. Drew.

George V. Allen, of North Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Yugoslavia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

H. Merle Cochran, of Arizona, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the United States of Indonesia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Irving Florman, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bolivia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Avra M. Warren, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Pakistan, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Glenn A. Abbey, of Wisconsin, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Eugene H. Clay, of New York.

H. Gerald Smith, of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Frederick T. Merrill, of the District of Columbia.

Edward W. Mill, of Illinois.

Angier Biddle Duke, of New York, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, to which offices he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Hyman Bloom, of New York.

William Kane, of New York.

Fred M. Wren, of Maine.

MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION

Frank E. Hook, of Michigan, to be a member of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Francis A. O'Neill, Jr., of New York, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1953. (Reappointment.)

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Josh Lee, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for a term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1955, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate. (Reappointment.)

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF LOCOMOTIVE INSPECTION

James E. Friend, of Texas, to be Assistant Director of Locomotive Inspection, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Edward T. McCormick, of Arizona, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1952, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Donald C. Cook, of Michigan, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1954, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

MUNITIONS BOARD

Hubert E. Howard, of Illinois, to be Chairman of the Munitions Board.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Denis J. McMahon, of New York, N. Y., to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of New York, to fill an existing vacancy. Mr. McMahon is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

George T. Cromwell, of Ferndale, Md., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 13, with headquarters at Baltimore, Md. (Reappointment.)

James J. Connors, of Juneau, Alaska, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 31, with headquarters at Juneau, Alaska. (Reappointment.)

Harry A. Zinn, of Denver, Colo., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo. (Reappointment.)

JUDGES, UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

Hon. David L. Bazelon, of Illinois, to be judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Charles Fahy, of New Mexico, to be a judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. George Thomas Washington, of the District of Columbia, to be a judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. William Henry Hastie, of the Virgin Islands, to be judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. H. Nathan Swaim, of Indiana, to be judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Hon. James R. Kirkland, of Delaware, to be United States district judge for the District of Columbia. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Charles F. McLaughlin, of Nebraska, to be United States district judge for the District of Columbia. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Burnita Shelton Matthews, of the District of Columbia, to be United States district judge for the District of Columbia. She is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Frank A. Hooper, of Georgia, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Georgia. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. M. Neil Andrews, of Georgia, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Georgia. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Carroll O. Switzer, of Iowa, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Iowa. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Delmas C. Hill, of Kansas, to be United States district judge for the district of Kansas. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. J. Skelly Wright, of Louisiana, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Irving R. Kaufman, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. John F. X. McGohey, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Gregory F. Noonan, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Sidney Sugarman, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Gus J. Solomon, of Oregon, to be United States district judge for the district of Oregon. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Thomas J. Clary, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Allan K. Grim, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Owen McIntosh Burns, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Robert L. Taylor, of Tennessee, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Tennessee. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Willis W. Ritter, of Utah, to be United States district judge for the district of Utah. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Clarence U. Landrum, of Minnesota, to be United States attorney for the district of Minnesota. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

John J. Sheehan, of New Hampshire, to be United States attorney for the district of New Hampshire. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

John Joseph Hickey, of Wyoming, to be United States attorney for the district of Wyoming. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Louis F. Knop, Jr., of Louisiana, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Louisiana. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Earl R. Burns, of Wyoming, to be United States marshal for the district of Wyoming. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 6, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of love and hope, through all the length of changing years, Thy goodness faileth never. Lead us this day in the paths of righteousness, for Thy name's sake. In these confused times save us from any panic of spirit, because

we draw our inner strength from deep wells. Enable us to fill swift hours with mighty deeds; to bear the fret of care, the sting of criticism, the drudgery of unapplauded toil; to think clearly; to act kindly; to strike our blow for the preservation of freedom and keeping to the end of our brief day the unbroken vigil of the inner light, to leave the world better for our sojourn in it. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

ELMER THOMAS, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 5, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. PEPPER was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until Wednesday next.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Public Works has scheduled public hearings on various flood-control and public-works projects to be held in New Mexico next week. As a member of the subcommittee which will hold the hearings, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to be absent after today until such time as I can conclude my work on the subcommittee in connection with such hearings. I hope to return to the Senate by Thursday of next week. I ask unanimous consent to be absent until that time, or such additional time as necessary to conclude this official duty.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Anderson	Hill	Morse
Benton	Hoey	Murray
Brewster	Holland	Myers
Bricker	Humphrey	Neely
Butler	Hunt	O'Conor
Byrd	Ives	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Jenner	Robertson
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Darby	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Donnell	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kerr	Sparkman
Downey	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Langer	Taft
Eastland	Leahy	Taylor
Ecton	Lehman	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Long	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Lucas	Thye
Frear	McCarran	Tobey
Fulbright	McCarthy	Vandenberg
George	McClellan	Watkins
Gillette	McFarland	Wherry
Graham	McKellar	Wiley
Green	McMahon	Williams
Gurney	Magnuson	Young
Hayden	Malone	
Hendrickson	Martin	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, submit petitions and memorials, and present routine matters for the RECORD, as though we were in the morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 388)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., January 6, 1950.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,

The honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am presenting herewith my Economic Report to the Congress, as required under the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report, I have had the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers, members of the Cabinet, and heads of independent agencies.

Together with this report, I am transmitting a report, the Annual Economic Review: January 1950, prepared for me by the Council of Economic Advisers in accordance with section 4 (c) (2) of the Employment Act of 1946.

Respectfully,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON RENOVATION OF EXECUTIVE MANSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion, reporting, pursuant to law, on the question of disposing of the surplus material which will not be required for reuse in the building; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXPRESSION OF GRATITUDE BY FINNISH GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, informing the Senate that the Minister of Finland had expressed the gratitude of the Finnish Government and its people to the Government of the United States on its expression of good will and cooperation toward Finland manifested by the enactment of Public Law 265, providing that future Finnish debt payments shall be devoted to educational exchange between the two countries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON LEASES ENTERED INTO BY DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to a law, a report on leases entered into by the Navy Department, for the period July 1, 1949, through December 31, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON AVERAGE MONTHLY FLIGHT PAY OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air, reporting, pursuant to law, the average monthly flight pay authorized by law of officers above the rank of lieutenant commander of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Extension Service, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF OPERATIONS UNDER THE SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of operations, expenditures, and obligations under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the agricultural experiment stations, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN CORPORATIONS IN THE PRODUCTION OF HOUSING

A letter from the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for families of moderate income (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD AND NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National Mediation Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, including a report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accom-

panying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

A letter from the Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, an introduction to the second annual report of that Service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON DISMISSAL OF CLAIM OF ELIZABETH RANDOLPH PENDLETON

A letter from the clerk of the United States Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to a resolution of the Senate of June 18, 1948, a copy of the order of that court dismissing the claim of Elizabeth Randolph Pendleton (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the California Wildlife Conservation Board, Sacramento, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation providing an appropriation to the Department of the Interior for the construction of levees and other works at the Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Appropriations.

The petition of the Orlando Townsend Club, No. 2, Orlando, Fla., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 2181, providing old-age insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

A petition signed by the directors of the American China Policy Association, Inc., relating to the Communist armed conquest of China; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the York (Pa.) City Council, the Delaware State Dental Hygienists Association, Wilmington, Del., the Chambersburg (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce, and the Cleveland (Ohio) Dental Society, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the American Society for the Study of Sterility, adopted at Atlantic City, N. J., favoring the issuance of a commemorative stamp to honor James Marion Sims; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter in the nature of a petition signed by Mrs. Al xander Stewart, National Legislative Secretary, Women's International League For Peace and Freedom, Washington, D. C., relating to certain legislation pending before the Congress; ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING—PETITIONS

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have received two petitions, identical in verbiage, one from Mrs. Armenia T. Carver, secretary of the Rockwell City, Iowa, WCTU, and signed by a number of citizens of Rockwell City and Calhoun County, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; the other petition comes from Mrs. Ann E. Currie, president of the WCTU of Schaller, Iowa, and signed by a number of citizens of that city. Each of the petitions has been signed by approximately 40 persons, and is accompanied by the request that the petition be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Because the verbiage of the two petitions is identical, I ask that only one of the petitions be printed in the RECORD, without the full number of signatures, but that a notation be made that two petitions are presented, with numerous signatures to each.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, one of the petitions will be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached, as requested by the Senator from Iowa. The Chair hears no objection.

The petitions from Mrs. Armenia T. Carver, secretary, WCTU, and sundry other citizens of Rockwell City and Calhoun County, and Mrs. Ann E. Currie, president, WCTU, and sundry other citizens of Schaller, all in the State of Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, presented by Mr. HICKENLOOPER, were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and one of the petitions was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We respectfully request that you use your influence and vote for the passage of a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio. The most pernicious effect of this advertising is the constant invitation and enticement to drink. The American people spent $9,640,000,000 for alcoholic beverages in 1947 as compared with $7,770,000,000 in 1945. During the same time there was a corresponding increase each year in crime, juvenile delinquency, broken homes, deaths, and injuries due to intoxicated drivers. There is every reason why this waste of money and human values should not be increased but rather greatly decreased.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING—RESOLUTION OF WASHINGTON COUNTY POMONA GRANGE, NO. 58, PEKIN, IND.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from Ralph C. Willis, chief deputy clerk, Jefferson Circuit Court, of Louisville, Ky., transmitting a resolution adopted by the officers and members of Washington County Pomona Grange, No. 58, Pekin, Ind., favoring the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF CLERK,
JEFFERSON CIRCUIT COURT,
Louisville, Ky., January 3, 1950.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: I was in attendance at our Pomona Grange last night and the matter of your efforts relative to the curtailing of obnoxious advertising by press and radio was discussed at length. Our body took action and have so expressed the same by preparing a form of resolution which I am enclosing herewith.

We are interested in any plan or action whereby the harmful array of advertising and appeals may be kept from the eyes and ears of our youth.

Trusting you may succeed in getting this out on the floor for action, I am,

Yours very truly,
RALPH C. WILLIS,
Chief Deputy Clerk.

OFFICE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY
POMONA GRANGE,
Pekin, Ind.

We, the officers and members of Washington County Pomona Grange, No. 58, do hereby approve, by unanimous vote, your bill which is now in committee regarding the advertising of any alcoholic beverages, either written or verbal, crossing State lines. We trust that you will be able to get this bill out of committee and that action may be had thereon.

Yours very truly,
DELBERT A. SHORT,
Master.
LILLIAN OMSLEY,
Secretary.
ARTHUR S. LOVELL,
E. E. ANDREW,
IVIS V. CHASTAIN,
EARL DOAN,
Committee.

Signed and sealed January 2, 1950.

IMMIGRATION OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF PANAMA CANAL ZONE TO REPUBLIC OF LIBERIA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a communication on the stationery of the Universal African Nationalist Movement, Inc. It is a very interesting communication and reads as follows:

We the undersigned employees of the United States Government in the Panama Canal Zone with 10, 20, and some 30 years of service and descendants of the African slaves who were brought to the Western Hemisphere during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, desire sincerely to immigrate to the Republic of Liberia. We have cause to believe that there we might develop ourselves in any field of endeavor without restraint of any kind and thereby be able to contribute to true world progress.

Because we believe that we of the Western World can offer technical assistance to the development of the natural resources of the Republic of Liberia and thereby enable this valuable ally of the United States Government to develop these resources to the benefit of world peace and trade, we therefore urge the speedy enactment of bill S. 1880, and hereunder we subscribe our names in support of said bill.

The petition is signed by 182 employees of the United States Government in the Panama Canal Zone.

In connection with Senate bill 1880, I also wish to present for the RECORD a petition signed by one individual in the Canal Zone. The petition is as follows:

Wishing the passage of bill 1880 success.
THE CANAL ZONE COLORED COMMUNITY,
R. A. AUSTIN, *Secretary.*
ANCON, CANAL ZONE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The communication and petition will be received, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 2585. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for exemption from duty

of certain metallic impurities in tin ores and concentrates when such impurities are not recovered; without amendment (Rept. No. 1205);

H. R. 5486. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to permit the use of additional means, including stamp machines, for payment of tax on distilled spirits, modify loss allowances for distilled spirits, for the transfer and redistillation of spirits, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1206); and

H. R. 6212. A bill to amend section 5 of the Federal Firearms Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1207).

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THYE:

S. 2791. A bill for the relief of Jarmila Zitnikova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 2792. A bill for the relief of the Plymouth Manufacturing Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2793. A bill for the relief of Shunafor Ullah and certain other aliens; and

S. 2794. A bill for the relief of Abdul Whab; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2795. A bill for the relief of Fortunato Giulio Torre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2796. A bill for the relief of Midori Ohta (also known as Mary Stephen); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2797. A bill relating to the second seamen's war-risk policy of Victor Gmeiner; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2798. A bill authorizing the appointment of an additional district judge for the middle district of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2799. A bill for the relief of Johan Wilhelm Adriaans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2800. A bill to extend Letters Patent No. 1,901,992; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 2801. A bill to give effect to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, signed at Washington under date of February 8, 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2802. A bill to equalize the rates of compensation payable for wartime and peacetime service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE):

S. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1950, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the reprinting of the 1949 Department of Agriculture Yearbook Trees; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. LEHMAN) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 203), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator John Foster Dulles for service in his office who were carried on the Senate pay roll on November 8, 1949, salary for the period November 9, 1949, through November 30, 1949, at their respective rates of salary as of November 8, 1949.

INVESTIGATION OF THE CAUSES OF HIGH PRICES OF EYEGLASSES

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 204), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That a subcommittee composed of three Senators to be appointed by the chairman of the appropriate committee of the Senate is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation to determine the causes of the high prices of eyeglasses and to ascertain whether manufacturers of eyeglasses are sharing profits with oculists and optometrists. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

SEC. 2. (a) The subcommittee is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The subcommittee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for comparable duties.

(c) The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to speak for a few minutes and to submit an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am submitting a substitute amendment to title III of S. 2246, Senate Calendar 897, to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes. It would authorize a program to help cooperatives and other nonprofit groups build housing which moderate income groups can afford.

Yesterday I conferred with the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, concerning the hearings on the amendment. He agreed that we should begin hearings on Wednesday, January 11, and continue them for about a week. I have therefore requested the chairman of the subcommittee, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], to begin hearings on next Wednesday.

Since certain titles of the Federal housing legislation will expire in March, I am hopeful that the committee will be able to report the bill promptly after the completion of the hearings.

I should like to emphasize that the substitute amendment differs primarily from title 3 of S. 2246 in that, instead of the Government making loans directly to the cooperatives or nonprofit organizations as now provided for in title III of S. 2246, we have provided a system whereby private capital will be utilized.

The proposed legislation is in accord with the recommendation on housing made by the President in his state of the Union message last Tuesday.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief summary and a section by section analysis of the amendment, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, lie on the table, and be printed, and, without objection, the summary and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary and analysis were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY ON MAYBANK AMENDMENT TO S. 2246

The Senate Banking and Currency Committee, in favorably reporting title III of the pending Sparkman bill, has already approved in principle this recommendation of the President for a program of aid to housing cooperatives as an effective means of making good housing available for families of moderate income. The legislation introduced today would perfect the pending legislation by making it possible to carry out this program through the investment of private capital, on a long-term basis and at a low rate of interest, in housing projects undertaken by cooperatives, thus eliminating the necessity for direct Federal loans. It makes the investment of private capital in this program possible by an adaptation of the type of guaranty which has been so successfully used in the mortgage-insurance system of the Federal Housing Administration.

The legislation authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to furnish technical advice and assistance in the organization of nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporations or nonprofit corporations authorized to construct and operate housing projects, and in the planning, financing, development, construction, acquisition, and operation and management of their housing projects. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is also authorized to make preliminary advances of funds to such housing cooperatives and nonprofit housing corporations to assist in the formulation of proposed housing projects eligible for mortgage loans under the legislation. Such preliminary advances of funds are limited to the amounts required for necessary work preliminary to construction, usually 3 percent but

in no event may it exceed an amount equal to 5 percent of the estimated development cost of the proposed housing project. For such preliminary advances of funds, a revolving fund of $25,000,000 is provided.

The legislation would also establish, under the supervision of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, a mixed-ownership corporation known as the National Mortgage Corporation for Housing Cooperatives, and would authorize this corporation to make long-term mortgage loans at low interest rates to housing cooperatives.

The initial funds of the Corporation would be supplied by Government subscription to preferred stock of the Corporation up to $100,000,000. However, this would eventually be replaced with private capital supplied through stock purchases of borrowing cooperatives, each of which would be required to subscribe to capital stock in an amount equal to 7½ percent of any loans made to them. After paid-in capital stock subscribed by borrowing cooperatives equals $50,000,000 the Corporation would retire dollar for dollar, out of such privately paid capital, the stock held by the Secretary of the Treasury at par plus accrued dividends. No such stock would be retired, however, if the net capital, reserves, and surplus of the Corporation would thereby be reduced to an amount less than $150,000,000.

The Corporation would be authorized to obtain additional private capital by issuing and selling in the private investment market its debentures which would be guaranteed by the United States. The aggregate amount of such debentures outstanding at any one time could not exceed (1) 15 times the aggregate par value of the Corporation's outstanding capital stock, reserves, and surplus, or (2) the unpaid principal of mortgage loans contracted for or held by the Corporation.

The Corporation could issue and have outstanding on and after July 1, 1950, its debentures in an aggregate amount not to exceed $300,000,000. However, with the approval of the President, such aggregate amount may be increased at any time or times on or after July 1, 1951, by additional amounts aggregating not more than $1,700,000,000.

The Corporation would be authorized to make mortgage loans at maturities of up to 50 years to housing cooperatives and nonprofit housing corporations constructing housing for families of moderate income. The interest rate on the mortgage loans from the Corporation to the cooperatives would reflect the cost of the money obtained by the Corporation, out of initial capital stock or on its debentures, plus a charge to cover administrative expenses and necessary reserves, and a charge of one-eighth of 1 percent on the declining balance of the loan as a specific reserve for possible losses. Currently, this would mean an effective interest rate of about 3 percent.

Section-by-Section Analysis of Proposed Amendment to S. 2246

SECTION 301—PURPOSE

This section sets forth the major purpose of the title to provide a means whereby good housing can be produced and made available for families of moderate income by furnishing technical and other assistance to cooperative ownership housing corporations or other nonprofit corporations authorized to provide housing and by facilitating investment of private capital in such housing.

SECTION 302—TECHNICAL AID TO COOPERATIVES

This section would authorize and direct the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to furnish technical advice and assistance in the organization of nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporations and other nonprofit corporations authorized to provide housing, in the development and management of housing projects by such corporations, and in the development and use of practical means for members of cooperatives to acquire cooperative ownership of their individual dwellings.

SECTION 303—PRELIMINARY ADVANCES OF FUNDS

This section would authorize the Administrator to make preliminary advances of funds to nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporations and other nonprofit corporations authorized to provide housing, for planning and performing work preliminary to construction on proposed housing projects eligible for mortgage loans under this title. Such advances would be limited to the amounts required for necessary work preliminary to construction and in no event could exceed 5 percent of the development cost of the projects, would bear interest at the going Federal rate plus one-half of 1 percent, and would be repaid out of any subsequent loans for the projects.

SECTION 304—PROVISION OF FUNDS

Subsection (a)

This subsection would authorize the Administrator, with the approval of the President, to obtain funds for preliminary advances by issuing notes and other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury. The outstanding amount of such obligations could not exceed at any one time $25,000,000.

Subsection (b)

This subsection would provide that the form, denominations, maturities, and terms and conditions of the notes or other obligations to be purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be determined by the Administrator with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The interest on such obligations would be at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the then current average rate on obligations of the United States. Funds would be secured by the Secretary for such purchases by using, as a public-debt transaction, the proceeds from the sale of securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended.

Subsection (c)

This subsection would provide the methods to be used by the Administrator in handling funds made available to him under this title, and would authorize appropriations of funds for administrative expenses necessary for carrying out his functions and duties under the title.

SECTION 305—POWERS OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

This section would make the Housing and Home Finance Administrator responsible for the administration of this title and for the supervision of the National Mortgage Corporation for Housing Cooperatives created by the title. The board of directors of such Corporation would act as an advisory board to the Administrator in his performance of such responsibilities. This section would also set forth the general powers and duties of the Administrator in performing the functions which would be vested in him under the title. Among these would be the appointment of a director to exercise the Administrator's powers, functions, and duties under this title subject to his direction and supervision, such director to receive the same compensation as that established for the heads of the constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

SECTION 306—CREATION AND POWERS OF NATIONAL MORTGAGE CORPORATION FOR HOUSING COOPERATIVES

Subsection (a)

This subsection would provide for the creation of the National Mortgage Corporation for Housing Cooperatives, a mixed-ownership corporation, to make and service mortgage loans, to issue its obligations, and to exercise its other powers and duties under this title, and would give the Corporation the technical powers necessary for the performance of its functions and duties.

Subsection (b)

This subsection would give the Corporation power, with the approval of the Administrator, to select its officers and employees without regard to civil service and other laws covering officers or employees of the United States although rates of compensation would be comparable to those prescribed in the Classification Act of 1949. The Corporation would not be entitled to free use of the mails. The Corporation would be authorized to determine the necessity for and character of its obligations and expenditures, subject to the provisions of this title, provisions of law relating specifically to mixed-ownership Government corporations, and to the rules and regulations of the Administrator.

SECTION 307—CAPITAL STOCK

Subsection (a)

This subsection would provide for the issuance of preferred capital stock of the Corporation for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not exceeding at any one time $100,000,000. Appropriation of funds for such purchases would be authorized. This stock would be entitled to cumulative dividends at a rate determined each year by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the probable term of the stock investment and the then current average rate received on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States.

Subsection (b)

This subsection requires that each nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation or nonprofit corporation obtaining a mortgage loan under the title subscribe to capital stock of the Corporation. To assure direct participation by such nonprofit corporations, each corporation would be required, before securing a mortgage loan, to subscribe for such stock in an amount equal to 7½ percent of the loan to be made. The method of payment for the stock so subscribed would be provided. Such stock would be required to be held by such borrower until the unpaid balance of the loan is reduced to an amount equal to the value of such stock.

Subsection (c)

This subsection would provide that after paid-in capital stock of subscribers other than the United States equals $50,000,000 the Corporation would retire dollar for dollar, out of such privately paid capital, the stock held by the Secretary of the Treasury at par plus accrued dividends, provided that no such stock could be retired if the net capital reserves, and surplus of the Corporation would thereby be reduced to an amount less than $150,000,000.

Subsection (d)

This subsection would provide that the preferred stock of the Government, in addition to its preferment as to dividends and assets would upon liquidation of the Corporation, share with other stockholders in any distribution of profits.

SECTION 308—BOARD OF DIRECTORS

This section would provide that the Corporation would have a board of five directors with terms ending in successive years, each member after the first appointees to serve for a period of 5 years. The Administrator would appoint all directors, but after the first appointees two of the five directors would be appointed by the Administrator from members of stockholding corporations or other representatives of housing cooperatives. The

Administrator would have the power to designate a chairman, and to remove directors for cause. Directors could receive reasonable compensation for services and necessary expenses.

SECTION 309—MORTGAGE LOANS

Subsection (a)

The Corporation would be authorized under this subsection to make mortgage loans (including advances during construction) to a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation or other nonprofit corporation authorized to provide housing if the Administrator certifies (1) that the borrower is a bona fide corporation of this character, (2) that the proposed housing project will meet a need for housing for families of moderate income, (3) that the proposed project will meet sound standards of design, construction, livability, and size for adequate family life, and (4) that the development and management of the project will be such as to promote the economies contemplated under the title. The borrower must also agree to establish and maintain rent schedules, satisfactory to the Corporation, which will permit the dwellings to be made available to families of moderate income, and to comply with other prescribed terms and conditions. If the borrower is a nonprofit corporation proposing to rent the dwellings in the project, it must agree to give certain prescribed preferences to families displaced by low-rent public housing or slum clearance projects and to families of veterans and servicemen of World War I or II.

Subsection (b)

This subsection would provide that the mortgage loan could not exceed the development cost of the housing project nor the amount which the Administrator determines to be the upper limit within which housing can be provided for families of moderate income in the locality at rentals or other charges within their means.

Subsection (c)

This subsection would require that the mortgage loan provide for complete amortization within 50 years by periodic payments, except that, in the case of projects refinanced within a period prescribed by the Corporation, the total period could be extended to 60 years. Interest would be at a fixed rate on unpaid balances, such rate to take into account the cost to the Corporation of its capital and borrowings plus its costs of operation and its reserves. Provisions could be made in the loan for deferment of principal and interest payments thereunder provided that such deferments could not extend the maturity of the loan for more than 3 years.

Subsection (d)

This subsection would permit the Corporation, subject to the provisions of this section, to determine the form, security, repayment, redemption, and other terms and conditions of the mortgage loan. In the case of a loan to a cooperative ownership housing corporation, the borrower would be required to have, to the extent permitted by State and local law, a priority in the purchase of the interest of each of its members in the event of sale of such interest.

Subsection (e)

This subsection would permit the borrower, with the consent of the Corporation, to pledge the contract or commitment of the Corporation to make a mortgage loan as security for a construction loan from private or other sources.

Subsection (f)

This subsection would authorize the Corporation to charge (in addition to any interest charges) up to 2½ percent of the principal amount of the mortgage loan for inspection and other services rendered the project during construction.

SECTION 310—OBLIGATIONS OF CORPORATION

This section would provide for the issuance by the Corporation on and after July 1, 1950, of obligations, guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States, in an amount not exceeding $300,000,000, which amount could be increased on or after July 1, 1951, with the approval of the President, by additional amounts aggregating not more than $1,700,000,000. The total outstanding obligations of the Corporation could not in any event, however, exceed 15 times its capital stock, reserves, and surplus or the amount of the unpaid balance of the mortgages contracted for or held by it plus its cash on hand and on deposit and its investments.

SECTION 311—RESERVES, DIVIDENDS, AND INVESTMENT OF FUNDS

This section contains provisions for the establishment of reserves, including payments to a special reserve account for losses equal to one-eighth of 1 percent per annum of outstanding mortgage loans; for the payment of dividends; and for the investment of reserves and other funds of the Corporation.

SECTION 312—TAXES

This section would provide that real property and tangible personal property of the Corporation would be subject to State and local taxes and real property of the Corporation would be subject to special assessments for local improvements. The Corporation itself and its other property of all kinds would be exempt from Federal, State, and local taxes. Obligations of the Corporation would be exempt both as to principal and interest from State and local taxes except surtaxes, estate, inheritance, and gift taxes.

SECTION 313—PROTECTION OF LABOR STANDARDS

This section would require that not less than the salaries prevailing in the particular locality, as determined or adopted by the Administrator, be paid to all architects, technical engineers, etc., employed in the development, and to all maintenance laborers and mechanics employed in the administration, of the housing project. It would also provide that not less than the wages prevailing in the locality, as predetermined by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to the Bacon-Davis Act, should be paid to all laborers and mechanics employed in the development of the housing project, would make applicable the provisions of the kick-back statute, and would require that certain reports be made to the Secretary of Labor by contractors and subcontractors on the work.

SECTION 314—PENALTIES

This section contains appropriate criminal and penal provisions in connection with operations under the provisions of this act.

SECTION 315—DEFINITIONS

This section sets forth the necessary definitions of terms.

SECTION 316—GOVERNMENT CORPORATION CONTROL ACT

This section would make the necessary changes in the Government Corporation Control Act to include the National Mortgage Corporation for Housing Cooperatives as a mixed-ownership corporation thereunder.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION ACT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I had intended introducing, at this same time, my bill concerned with the assessment to insured banks of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation which has been drafted in the Banking and Currency Committee. Now I intend to hold this bill and introduce it on Tuesday of next week.

After a careful study of the statutes under which the FDIC functions, it is clear that some of them are in need of modernization. I have discussed these changes with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the FDIC. They have agreed to give the committee their recommendations for these technical changes in order that we may incorporate them in the bill which we have ready.

For the advance information of all those who may be interested, the complete bill will be introduced on Tuesday, and Senator ROBERTSON has agreed to hold hearings before his subcommittee beginning on Wednesday.

RESOLUTIONS OF SENATE DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE ON DEATHS OF SENATOR BROUGHTON, OF NORTH CAROLINA, AND SENATOR MILLER, OF IDAHO.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD resolutions adopted by the Democratic Conference of the United States Senate on January 5, 1950, expressing deep appreciation of the distinguished service and great sense of loss at the passing of the Honorable J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON, of North Carolina, and the Honorable BERT H. MILLER, of Idaho.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE, EXPRESSING DEEP APPRECIATION OF THE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AND THE GREAT SENSE OF LOSS AT THE PASSING OF J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON

Whereas Almighty God in His infinite wisdom has taken from us our colleague, the Honorable J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina; and

Whereas throughout his long career in the United States Senate he rendered to our Nation and to his State a most distinguished service; and

Whereas as our trusted friend and close associate, he was ever ready to lend his judgment and his efforts in behalf of the Democratic Party: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, his Democratic colleagues in the United States Senate, express our deep sense of loss at his passing; and

Further, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the family of the deceased, that they may be assured of our deep respect for the late Senator and of our condolences upon the passing of our friend.

Adopted by the conference of the majority, this 5th day of January, 1950.

RESOLUTION OF THE DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE EXPRESSING DEEP APPRECIATION OF THE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AND THE GREAT SENSE OF LOSS AT THE PASSING OF BERT H. MILLER

Whereas Almightly God in His infinite wisdom has taken from us our colleague, the Honorable BERT H. MILLER, late a Senator from the State of Idaho; and

Whereas throughout his long career in the United States Senate he rendered to our Nation and to his State a most distinguished service; and

Whereas as our trusted friend and close associate, he was ever ready to lend his judgment and his efforts in behalf of the Democratic Party: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, his Democratic colleagues in the United States Senate, express our deep sense of loss at his passing; and

Further, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the family of the deceased,

that they may be assured of our deep respect for the late Senator and of our condolences upon the passing of our friend.

Adopted by the conference of the majority, this 5th day of January 1950.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. McCLELLAN, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was granted permission to meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS AT CONVENTION OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTMASTERS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator LUCAS at the convention of the National Association of Postmasters, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVIC PROBLEMS, CIVIC BODIES—ARTICLE BY JESSE C. SUTER

[Mr. NEELY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Civic Problems, Civic Bodies," written by Jesse C. Suter, and published in the Washington (D. C.) Star of December 18, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN OIL—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST AND STATEMENT BY A. A. CARMICHAEL

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "American Oil," published in the Washington Post of January 6, 1950, together with a statement by Hon. A. A. Carmichael, attorney general of Alabama, which appear in the Appendix.]

UPSWING IN RENTS IS FOUND WHERE CONTROLS ARE ENDED—ARTICLE BY LEE E. COOPER

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Upswing in Rents Is Found Where Controls Are Ended," written by Lee E. Cooper, and published in the New York Times, January 2, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEHRU, ASIA, AND AMERICA—ARTICLE BY MR. J. J. SINGH

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Nehru, Asia, and America," written by Mr. J. J. Singh, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED REPEAL OF WARTIME EXCISE TAXES—EDITORIAL FROM COLLIER'S MAGAZINE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from Collier's magazine for January 7, 1950, regarding the proposed repeal of wartime excise taxes, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISPLACED PERSONS: FACTS VERSUS FICTION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in the late summer of 1949 I received permission from the Senate to go to Europe on a mission to investigate displaced persons. The facts which were adduced during the numerous hearings conducted in various places in Europe will be most enlightening to the people of the United States, and, indeed, to the Congress of the United States. They will not only be enlightening, but in some respects they will be startling. They will set at naught many of the statements which have been made with reference to this highly controversial subject.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a preliminary statement based on my study and investigation of the question of displaced persons, as that subject is before the Congress at the present time.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 6, 1950.

DISPLACED PERSONS: FACTS VERSUS FICTION

(Statement by Senator PAT MCCARRAN, chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary)

(Foreword)

As chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, which has jurisdiction over immigration legislation, I have recently returned from a European investigation of the displaced-persons situation. The facts verify the information gathered by a special subcommittee of the Senate, of which I am chairman, which has over the course of the last 2½ years been studying our entire immigration and naturalization system. These facts point to the inescapable conclusion that the floodgates of this Nation are being pried open for the entrance of millions of aliens, from the turbulent populations of the entire world, who are seeking admission into the United States under the guise of displaced persons.

This movement is being facilitated by certain pressure groups in this country, which over the years have had as their ultimate objective the destruction of our immigration barriers. One pressure group has, during the course of the last 3 years, registered with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, lobby expenditures of approximately $1,000,000. This money has not, of course, been spent for the relief of displaced persons but solely for dissemination of propaganda designed to influence legislation to repeal the safeguards of our immigration laws. Unless the rank and file of the American people express themselves promptly and forthrightly to their representatives in the Congress, it is a certainty that the objective of these pressure groups will be accomplished.

WHO IS A DISPLACED PERSON?

At the end of the war the Allied armies in central Europe became the guardians of approximately 8,000,000 persons who had been displaced during the war. Within a few months after the war approximately 7,000,000 of these persons were repatriated to their native countries, leaving about 1,000,000 persons, who, because of fear of persecution, refused to return to their homelands. By the expiration date of our present displaced-persons law (June 30, 1950) there will remain only a few thousand such war-displaced persons in central Europe, other than the so-called hard core who because of social or physical disqualifications are ineligible for resettlement.

The constitution of the International Refugee Organization, however, embraces not only displaced persons who were displaced by the war in central Europe, but in addition, it embraces all persons in the entire world who are, or who may hereafter be, out of their country of nationality or former residence and who are unwilling to return. Some year or two after the war in central Europe there began and continues until the present time, a general migration from eastern Europe into the occupied areas of western Europe of hundreds of thousands of persons who, because of political and economic turmoil, have been leaving their homelands. The potential number of persons embraced in this second category has been estimated to be in the millions.

In addition to the displaced persons who are embraced by the International Refugee Organization, there are between fifteen and twenty million persons who are de facto displaced but who are not presently embraced by the International Refugee Organization. These persons include:

1. The German expellees, who were forcibly expelled from the countries of eastern Europe pursuant to the Potsdam agreement of August 1, 1945, and driven into Germany and Austria. These German expellees number from ten to fifteen million. Under the constitution of the International Refugee Organization the German expellees are expressly excluded from the concern of the International Refugee Organization.

2. The Greek displaced persons who were displaced from their homes by the Nazis in World War II or by the Communists in the Greek civil war. These Greek displaced persons number approximately 500,000 but are ineligible under the constitution of the International Refugee Organization because they are in their native land.

3. The Palestinian displaced persons, who were displaced from their homes in the Palestine War. These Palestinian displaced persons number approximately 1,000,000.

4. The Pakastanian displaced persons, who were displaced from their homes in the partition of India. It is estimated that these Pakastanian displaced persons number approximately 10,000,000.

5. Displaced persons in China, who are being displaced in the course of the civil war in China. The number of such persons is unknown but it is probable that they number several million.

HAS THE UNITED STATES TAKEN ITS FAIR SHARE OF DISPLACED PERSONS?

Unlike most countries of the world the United States operates under an immigration quota system whereby approximately 154,000 quota immigrants may be received annually for permanent residence, chiefly from European countries. In addition, immigrants are received for permanent residence on a nonquota immigration basis without any numerical limitation. This latter group consists chiefly of immigrants from the Western Hemisphere and of relatives of citizens of the United States. During the fiscal year 1948 there were admitted for permanent residence, 92,506 quota immigrants and 78,044 nonquota immigrants.

1. Displaced persons during the war years: Although our general immigration laws do not provide specific categories for displaced persons, reliable official and semiofficial estimates are that during the Nazi regime we received into the United States between 250,000 and 300,000 displaced persons for permanent residence and approximately 200,000 displaced persons for temporary stay.

2. Displaced persons under Presidential directive: Pursuant to a Presidential directive of December 22, 1945, approximately 44,000 displaced persons were admitted into the United States for permanent residence during the period ending on the effective date of the present displaced-persons law.

3. Displaced persons under the present displaced-persons law: The present law provides for the admission of an additional 205,000 displaced persons over a 2-year period, and also provides for adjusting the status to permanent residence of 15,000 displaced persons who have gained admission into the United States on a temporary basis.

4. Displaced persons under the general immigration law: Displaced persons are, of course, eligible, along with other aliens, for immigration into the United States under our general immigration laws. No reliable estimates are available concerning the number of displaced persons who have been admitted into the United States, since the Nazi regime, who have applied for admission not as displaced persons but as regular immigrants.

DOES OUR DISPLACED-PERSONS PROGRAM DISCRIMINATE AGAINST JEWS AND CATHOLICS?

1. Displaced persons during the war years: Of the hundreds of thousands of displaced persons who were admitted into the United States during the war years, it is reliably estimated that approximately four-fifths were of the Jewish faith.

2. Displaced persons under the Presidential directive: Under the President's directive of December 22, 1945, visas were issued to 23,594 displaced persons of the Jewish faith; 5,924 visas were issued to displaced persons of the Catholic faith, and 3,906 visas were issued to displaced persons of the Protestant faith.

3. Displaced persons under the displaced-persons law: As of November 30, 1949, there had been issued 127,866 visas pursuant to the displaced-persons law. Fifty-three thousand four hundred and two of the visas were to displaced persons of the Catholic faith; 33,479 were to displaced persons of the Jewish faith; 20,279 were to displaced persons of the Protestant faith; 19,283 were to displaced persons of the Greek Orthodox faith; and 1,423 were to displaced persons of unknown faith.

IS THE PRESENT CUT-OFF DATE FAIR?

The present displaced-persons law was designed to afford maximum relief to those persons who were displaced as a direct result of the war or shortly thereafter. Accordingly, the law prescribes a cut-off date of December 22, 1945, for eligibility. This is some 7 months after the termination of the war and is the same cut-off date which was used in the administration of the Presidential directive in order to distinguish between the war-displaced persons and the hundreds of thousands of persons who have voluntarily displaced themselves by migrating into the occupied areas since that date. It is obvious that any extension of the cut-off date will work to the detriment of those persons who were displaced by the war because their chances of immigration into the United States will be diluted by several hundred thousand. The Celler bill (H. R. 4567), which the pressure groups are trying to drive through the Senate, not only advances this cut-off date to January 1, 1949, but provides for the admission into the United States of some 15,000 displaced persons from behind the iron curtain who have not yet been displaced but may be displaced in the future. An official of our principal intelligence agency which is operating abroad has expressed the opinion that this provision of the Celler bill would constitute a dangerous threat to the security of the United States and would be another loophole for the infiltration of Communist agents.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE PRESENT DISPLACED-PERSONS LAW

I am confident, on the basis of my investigation, that there is a complete break-down in the administration of the law. Inadequate screening of applicants, with little or no regard for background, political beliefs, and predilections of applicants, has opened the gates to persons who will not become good citizens and who will become ready recruits in subversive organizations to tear down the democracy of the United States. My investigation has brought to light innumerable instances of wholesale fraud, misrepresentation, fictitious documents, and perjury resorted to by persons seeking displaced-persons status in order to qualify within the terms of the law. Let it be remembered that the Attorney General of the United States recently testified that an analysis of 4,984 of the more militant members of the Communist Party in the United States showed that 91.4 percent of the total were of foreign stock or were married to persons of foreign stock.

The present law contains provisions as a prerequisite to eligibility that there be job and housing assurances without displacing other persons from jobs and housing. The Displaced Persons Commission, in administering these provisions of the law, has been validating "blanket" assurances to certain groups with no independent check whatsoever in order to ascertain the validity of the assurances. The Displaced Persons Commission has even validated assurances for displaced persons which were made by other displaced persons already admitted into the United States.

Notwithstanding repeated evidences of fraud and misrepresentation, not a single displaced person who has thus far been admitted into the United States by virtue of such fraud and misrepresentation has been returned to Europe.

PROVISIONS OF H. R. 4567

H. R. 4567, which the pressure groups are trying to drive through the Senate:

1. Expands the definition of a displaced person so as to admit into the United States certain select groups from all over the world, but excludes Greek displaced persons, displaced persons of German blood, and other equally deserving groups, irrespective of their location.

2. Provides for the admission of 18,000 displaced persons who presently reside in the British Isles.

3. Extends the cut-off date to January 1, 1949, and thus dilutes the number of the present war-displaced-persons category by several hundred thousand.

4. Provides for the admission into the United States of 15,000 persons from behind the iron curtain, who have not yet been displaced but may be displaced in the future.

5. Provides that anyone who left the occupied areas of central Europe may return at any time and gain eligibility for immigration into the United States.

6. Sets aside 50 percent of the nonpreference portion of certain quotas for the exclusive use of displaced persons who have already been admitted into other countries of the world.

7. Removes from the present law the priority which is given to agricultural workers and their families. Although the statistics reveal that aliens generally, and displaced persons in particular, are congested in the large cities, H. R. 4567 would further intensify this problem.

8. Increases the number to be admitted to 339,000. This number is, of course, in addition to the number admissible under our general immigration system.

IMMIGRATION PROBLEMS OF THE UNITED STATES

Since the end of the war there has been a tremendous increase in the influx into the United States, both legally and illegally, of people from all over the world. There is at present a backlog of registered demand against the immigration quotas of over one million. During the fiscal year 1948, over 170,000 aliens were admitted into the United States for permanent residence. In addition, approximately one-half million persons were admitted into the United States from overseas presumably on a temporary basis, but many thousands of these persons have overstayed their periods of admission and are seeking to remain here permanently.

During the last session of the Congress, the Senate approved the adjustment of the status to permanent residence of over 3,000 cases of aliens who were admitted temporarily.

An indication of the scope of the problem of illegal entries is the fact that on the Mexican border alone apprehensions during the first 6 months of the 1949 fiscal year were at a rate of 25,000 a month. During the fiscal year 1948, there were apprehended on the Mexican border 193,852 illegal entrants.

During the fiscal year 1948, there were apprehended in the United States 4,353 seamen who had jumped ship and it is estimated by United States immigration officials that stowaways are arriving at the rate of approximately 100 per month. During the last year 412 smugglers of aliens were arrested, but, of course, the number which were actually smuggled into the United States is unknown.

The scope of the problem of illegal aliens is clearly set out by the fact that the number of forced departures from the United States for the last 5 years has exceeded the number of immigrants entering the country legally dur!_g that period.

Officials of the Immigration and Naturalization Service testified in the course of our investigation of the immigration and naturalization system, that if the manpower were available there would be over 500,000 investigations of potential illegal aliens in the United States in the present fiscal year.

Typical of the comments of the Immigration and Naturalization Service officers respecting investigations of illegal aliens is the following:

"We have little or no what we might call free-lance investigations; that is, to go out and try to find aliens who are illegally in the country."

A former American consul on the Canadian border estimated the number of illegal aliens in the United States to be from 3,000,000 to 5,000,000. The Immigration and Naturalization Service officials estimate that there are approximately 50,000 Cubans illegally in the United States in the Miami, Fla., immigration district. The immigration and naturalization officials in the Los Angeles area estimate that there are approximately 50,000 illegal aliens in the general vicinity of Los Angeles and that they are unable to keep control of them due to the lack of manpower.

WHAT CAN YOU DO ABOUT THE SITUATION?

The pressure groups have already succeeded in getting H. R. 4567 passed by the House of Representatives and the bill will be scheduled for debate in the Senate soon. The pressure groups are using a relatively few war-displaced persons, virtually all of whom are being resettled or repatriated, for the purpose of destroying our immigration barriers, to the end that this country will be inundated with a flood of aliens. With seemingly unlimited money these well-knit determined groups will suceed unless the patriotic American groups and the rank and file of the American people speak their minds firmly and promptly to the Congress. Your opinion and the opinion of your group, if expressed to your Senators, will help hold the dikes of our protective immigration system.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to say, Mr. President, that I shall have further and more particular statements, fully documented, to insert in the RECORD, and that I shall present the facts in speeches made on the floor of the Senate before very long.

DIFFICULTY IN OBTAINING INFORMATION FROM THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as being indicative of some of the problems which the legislative branch of the Government has in obtaining information from the executive branch, I wish to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter dated August 24, 1949, which I wrote to the Attorney General, asking for certain information relative to the Federal judiciary; a copy of the acknowledgment of my letter, dated August 30; a letter dated September 16, which I addressed to the Library of Congress Reference Service, seeking the information; their reply of September 21, saying that they were taking it up with the Attorney General's office; and a letter of January 4, 1950, from the Library

of Congress Reference Service, saying that they still have not received the information from the Attorney General. I have not received the information to date.

I think it is high time that the legislative branch of the Government should receive some service in regard to information which it requests from the executive branch of the Government.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 24, 1949.

Hon. J. HOWARD MCGRATH,
The Attorney General,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I would greatly appreciate your furnishing me with answers to the following questions:

1. Total number of Federal judges having life appointments.

2. Total number of present incumbent judges who have been appointed since the close of 1932, to include—

(a) United States.

(b) Territories.

(c) Lower courts of District of Columbia.

3. Total number of Republicans appointed to judgeships since the close of 1932, to include—

(a) United States.

(b) Territories.

(c) Lower courts of District of Columbia.

4. The number and names of the Republican judges appointed since 1933 to the Federal appeals courts.

5. The total number of Federal judicial vacancies created by act of Congress since March 1933.

With best personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, August 30, 1949.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This will acknowledge your letter requesting the Attorney General to furnish you with certain information concerning the Federal judiciary.

Please be advised that these statistics are now being prepared, and they will be furnished to you as soon as they are completed.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
The Assistant to the Attorney General.

SEPTEMBER 16, 1949.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Library of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I would greatly appreciate your furnishing me with the answers to the following questions:

1. Total number of Federal judges having life appointments.

2. Total number of present incumbent judges who have been appointed since the close of 1932, to include—

(a) United States.

(b) Territories.

(c) Lower courts of the District of Columbia.

3. Total number of Republicans appointed to judgeships since the close of 1932, to include—

(a) United States.

(b) Territories.

(c) Lower courts of the District of Columbia.

4. The number and names of the Republican judges appointed since 1933 to the Federal appeals courts.

5. The total number of Federal judicial vacancies created by act of Congress since March 1933.

Thanking you for this information, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C., September 21, 1949.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: With reference to your letter of September 16, 1949, requesting five items of information relating to Federal judges, we have requested, without disclosing your name, that the Department of Justice compile the answers. We will transmit the report to your office as soon as it is received.

In past instances where requests of this nature have been made by Members and committees of Congress, we have suggested that the inquiry be sent to the Department of Justice as that office has the pertinent files and information with which to prepare an official statement or report. Your questions relate to matters which are not available through public records and can only be answered by reference to the private files maintained by the Department of Justice.

Partial information relating to appointees to the Federal judiciary who were confirmed could be compiled by checking the pages listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD index under the heading "Executive Nominations and Confirmations—Judiciary—Confirmed." In the event that the Department of Justice declines to furnish the complete and accurate information as requested, do you wish us to do what we can as indicated?

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,
Director, Legislative Reference Service.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C., January 4, 1950.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: With further reference to your letter of September 16, 1949, requesting five items of information relating to Federal judges and our reply of September 21, 1949, we wish to state that we are still awaiting a report from the Department of Justice.

By letter of October 3, 1949, we were advised by the Office of the Assistant to the Attorney General that statistics were in the process of being compiled and that we would be furnished the requested information as soon as possible. In view of the lapse of time, do you wish us to send an additional request to the Department of Justice requesting that the compilation be expedited if possible?

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,
Director, Legislative Reference Service.

THE COAL SHORTAGE

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, were it not for the urgency of the situation, I would be loathe to consume, the time of the Senate to make these remarks. But, Mr. President, the people of my State, and perhaps those in other States, are in a desperate plight. They are urgently in need of coal.

From every section of Indiana, from public officials, from coal dealers, from hospitals, and from public institutions have come urgent pleas that I give them assistance in obtaining coal.

Mr. President, while this condition needs immediate and decisive action, yet to me the situation is so needless. One directive from the office of the President of the United States or one action on the part of the National Labor Relations Board could bring immediate termination of this desperate lack of coal, which daily is further endangering the health and the lives of the people of my State.

I wish to read just a few of the telegrams which have come to me. From one of the largest coal dealers in Indianapolis:

> Entirely out of coal with customers in dire need. Please give coal situation priority over less important matters.

From the mayor of Indianapolis, Mayor Al Feeney, comes the following:

> Coal situation this city critical. Prompt action necessary if acute suffering is to be avoided. Respectfully urge you to exert every effort to see that coal problem is given priority as emergency and all less important matters shelved until definite action is forthcoming to relieve coal shortage.

A retail coal dealer who provides St. Catherine's Hospital in East Chicago, Ind., informed me in a telegram Wednesday that that institution that day had a 5-day supply of coal on hand, with no prospect of obtaining more.

The president of the Illinois Central Railroad has telegraphed me repeatedly about the dangerous conditions facing numerous cities along the route of his railroad because of the lack of coal.

Mr. President, this condition is entirely unnecessary. The Eightieth Congress in 1947 placed at the disposal of the President of the United States of America a means of avoiding just such a situation as the one which confronts the Nation today.

I am not debating the merits or demerits of the controversy existing between the United Mine Workers of America and the mine operators. That is a matter which can be and should be settled across the bargaining table. But, to paraphrase an old saying, "Somebody seems to be fiddling while the people of this Nation are freezing to death."

I do not know what action the Congress of the United States can take, other than that provided for by the Taft-Hartley Act. I am not concerned about the constitutionality of that act; but the fact remains that the law is on the statute books, and it is the duty of the President of the United States to administer the laws of the United States until such time as they are declared unconstitutional by the courts.

I am informed that the general counsel for the National Labor Relations Board is conducting an investigation to determine the advisability of invoking the injunction provision of the Taft-Hartley law in order to alleviate this critical condition. Why should such an investigation be necessary? We face the fact that people of this Nation are cold, and they are cold because they have no coal. They have no coal because one man in this great country has sent out word that the miners shall not produce the coal which is so vitally needed, not only for the health of the people of our country but to keep the wheels of industry running.

Frankly, I do not know the answer; but I think it is time the Congress of the United States does something to correct the situation.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which has been submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], in behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the question pending before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in considering the pending proposed legislation, we should attempt to determine who, if anyone, will be benefited if the bill before us is enacted; who, if anyone, will be injured; and whether the benefits to be derived from its passage will outweigh any injuries incurred.

The interested parties in the case before us are, first, the producers of raw materials for the manufacture of both oleomargarine and dairy products; second, the manufacturers; third, the consumers of oleomargarine and dairy products. And then we must consider the effect of such legislation on our national economy and our national welfare. For the purpose of this discussion, I shall leave the manufacturers and processors pretty much out of the picture.

It goes without saying that the real backers of this bill, the oleo interests, seek to capture that part of the consumer's market which has heretofore been enjoyed by the butter producers. On one side we have a compact group of a half dozen oleo manufacturers enjoying a near monopoly, and closely associated by a common purpose. On the other hand, we have several hundred thousand manufacturers of dairy and creamery butter, very loosely organized in an endeavor to retain a market for their products, of which they have already lost a considerable part.

Let me say at the outset that my State depends upon the production of dairy products for approximately 78 percent of its entire agricultural income. If I do what I can to protect the largest single industry of my State from a totally unfair attempt to injure it, I shall be responding to a perfectly natural human instinct.

In considering this legislation, several facts stand out as being axiomatic.

First, oleo as manufactured these days is not harmful to human beings.

It doubtless has some food value, although a comparison of the food values of oleo and butter is still a matter of dispute.

Oleo can be sold much cheaper than butter, and its sale should not be prohibited by law.

Many farmers, including dairy farmers in the fluid milk area, use oleo on their own tables, largely because of its lower cost.

Last of all, in holding back huge supplies of cream during the early spring and summer months of 1948, thereby forcing the price of butter to nearly $1 a pound, the dairy interests themselves provided the oleo manufacturers with the most potent argument they have had in the campaign to secure the passage of the bill before us. It does not matter that the dairy interests took a severe loss on the cream which was withheld. The fact is that the consumer was aroused sufficiently to support questionable proposed legislation, not because the consumer preferred oleo on the table, but because it appeared to be the only means of bringing the price of butter within reach of even the middle-income groups.

Now that the price of butter has dropped to a reasonable level, the pressure for the passage of this legislation has largely abated, so far as consumers are concerned. As a matter of fact, I have had only one communication, this year favoring the enactment of the pending measure, and that came from an oleomargarine dealer.

I fear that the consumer has been badly misled by the proponents of oleo. A great many consumers believe that oleo could be purchased much cheaper if the Federal tax were removed and if it were given a free and unbridled market. This belief is, of course, contrary to the facts.

Except in a few States which have a high or prohibitive tax on the sale of oleo, the consumer has been paying one-fourth of a cent a pound tax. There is also a tax of 10 cents a pound on colored oleo, but this does not apply to that which is colored by the housewife herself. Altogether, the taxes on oleo paid to the Federal Government amount to approximately $16,000,000 a year. Probably the tax on transportation alone amounts to more on a pound of oleo than the tax on the oleo itself.

There is no assurance that if the 10 cents a pound tax on colored oleo is removed, the consumer will benefit thereby. In fact, just the opposite is indicated.

I hold in my hand a copy of an advertisement appearing in the El Paso Times, in which a local provision store offers uncolored oleo at 25 cents a pound and colored oleo at 55 cents a pound or 30 cents a pound above the price of the uncolored product, even though the Federal tax amounts to only 10 cents.

This is an indication of what Mrs. Consumer may expect in the event that oleomargarine is permitted to be sold unrestricted, uncontrolled, and in the exact color and appearance of butter. She may expect that the price of colored oleomargarine will be held just as near the price of butter as competitive conditions will allow. In view of the fact that the oleomargarine market is dominated by only a half dozen concerns, that competitive situation is not likely to become acute.

In other words, while the untrammelled traffic in oleo or synthetic butter may and probably will result in a sharp decline in the sales of butter, it will also probably result in an increase in the price of the oleo.

It is also entirely possible that pure butter will be driven from a large part of the market just as it has been in certain sections of the country today and been supplanted by blends of various fats and oils.

It is entirely possible that dairy interests themselves may engage in the manufacture of blended table fats in an effort to retain part of the market which they now have.

We may discount completely any arguments that the pending bill is proposed in behalf of the consumer.

If the Congress sincerely desires to lower consumer costs, it would do far better to remove the tax on transportation of food commodities which today amounts to many, many times the tax on oleomargarine.

However, it is not the removal of the tax on oleomargarine which concerns us here.

The dairy interests have readily agreed to the removal of all taxes and I, myself, believe that excise taxes affecting food commodities should be removed at the earliest possible moment, including the tax on oleomargarine itself.

What concerns me is that the oleo manufacturing interests are determined to secure the enactment of such legislation as will enable them to palm off their product for genuine butter on an unsuspecting public.

It is true that any law Congress may enact will require the package containing oleo to plainly show it, but it is also true that as soon as that product is removed from the package a great majority of the consuming public will never know whether they were being served oleo or butter.

Already the manufacturers are putting up the oleo product to look exactly like the dairy product in each area of the country in which it is sold.

If butter is put up in thin packages, then oleo is sold in thin packages.

If the market demands deep yellow butter, oleo is colored deep yellow.

If the market demands uncolored butter, as much of the country does today, then the oleo is colored to look exactly like uncolored butter.

The law permits oleomargarine to be flavored to taste like butter, to be artificially fortified by vitamins and finally to be preserved or embalmed as some might say with benzoate of soda or other preservative.

Furthermore, the oleo manufacturer of today is not required to put upon the package a statement of the ingredients contained in the product.

Certainly, the consumer is entitled to know what is in the oleo upon her table.

It may be made of pure cottonseed oil. It may be made from soybean oil. It may be made from coconut oil. It may be made from fish oil, or it may be made from lard, for the oleo law permits the use of almost any kind of fat in its manufacture.

Certainly, no legislation should be passed permitting the promiscuous and unrestricted sale of synthetic or imitation butter without a requirement for naming the ingredients used in its manufacture.

Furthermore, if this bill were promoted in the interest of the consumer, we should first remove the almost absolute protec-

tion which the oleo manufacturer has against any imported product. This amounts to a tariff of 7 cents a pound and a special import tax of 15 cents a pound. Thus, the oleo manufacturing monopoly is protected to the extent of 22 cents a pound as compared with a tariff protection of 7 cents a pound given the butter producer.

Moreover, if a low-cost product for the consumer's table is the objective of this bill, its promoters should advocate the removal of the tax on coconut oil. Coconut oil is probably the cheapest material from which good oleo can be made.

It is today selling for 14 cents a pound as compared with 11 cents for cottonseed oil, but the coconut industry has not recovered from the ravages of the war, and, furthermore, coconut oil, except that from the Philippines which takes a lower rate, is subject to a 6 cents a pound levy before it can be used in the manufacture of oleomargarine.

If the professed champions of the consumer really had her interest at heart, they would be seeking now to remove the coconut oil tax of 6 cents a pound.

Four pounds of coconut oil will make 5 pounds of oleomargarine.

In other words, with the tax removed, the ingredients for the manufacture of a pound of oleomargarine from coconut oil today would cost in the neighborhood of 8 cents. As the coconut industry recovers from the effects of the war, this cost will be considerably lower. I am almost certain that if the oleo manufacturing interests gain the advantages which they seek through the pending legislation, their next step will be to seek the removal of import taxes on raw materials, so that still cheaper oils can be used.

I am not advocating the removal of the coconut oil tax. I am simply pointing out that if the promoters of this bill were operating in the behalf of the consumer, that they could find better ways of promoting her interest than they are now using.

The purpose of the exceptionally high tax on coconut oil imports is primarily to protect the producers of cottonseed oil.

There is nothing wrong in undertaking to protect the interests of our agricultural producers, but let us not masquerade under the guise of promoting consumer interest in this case.

I desire now to consider briefly the effect of the proposed legislation on the American dairy farmer.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. FULLRIGHT. I am not quite clear concerning the Senator's statement. It is a fact, is it not, that margarine today sells in retail stores at approximately one-half the price of butter?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is entirely correct. It is selling for 35 cents. While I do not know what the retail price of butter is, I assume it is in the neighborhood of from 68 to 70 cents, with the Government floor of 60 cents.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So there is some advantage, at least moneywise, to the consumer in the purchase of oleomargarine, is there not?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not deny for an instant that there are families who do not have money with which to buy butter, who ought to be able to purchase oleomargarine. What I am protesting against is the sale of oleomargarine in such form that most of the consumers will think they are actually getting butter.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I think the facts are not exactly as the Senator has agreed. As I recall, the evidence showed that recently in California, depending upon where the oleo interests could impact the market, they sold oleomargarine at prices ranging from 15 to 55 cents a pound.

Mr. AIKEN. Cottonseed oil is selling for 11 cents a pound today. I understand that 4 pounds of oil will make 5 pounds of oleomargarine. That would make the cost of the raw materials entering into the manufacture of oleo between 9 and 10 cents a pound; so it probably could be sold for less.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. It has been sold for less. In fact in California it has been sold for as low as 15 cents a pound, giving an extra coupon for another pound. The purpose of that, of course, is to take over the market. At one place when a pound of oleo was sold what they called a fountain pen was given as a bonus. That represents recent tactics in California.

Mr. AIKEN. I have heard that one company in California sold a pound of oleo and a $1 fountain pen for 30 cents, and that in the pound of oleo the customer found a coupon entitling him to another pound of oleo. Whether it included another fountain pen, I was not informed. The competitive situation is very acute in California and it was to the California trade to which I referred yesterday when I mentioned the report that certain manufacturing concerns were actually placing on the oleo boxes pictures of dairy barns. I can readily understand that, because I know of many cases in which imitation maple sirup is sold in containers bearing the picture of a sugar house or a maple grove.

Mr. TOBEY rose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator just said that 4 pounds of coconut oil will make 5 pounds of oleo; did he not?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. TOBEY. What other items besides coconut oil are used in its manufacture?

Mr. AIKEN. Oleomargarine is required to contain 80 percent of fat. The other items would be skimmed-milk powder, water, salt, and flavoring. Butter is permitted to contain a certain percentage of water and salt, but not flavoring. I think water and salt only are permitted to be used in butter. Of course, the water could not well be taken out of it, for there would be left nothing but a brick, which people would not like.

Mr. WILEY. Skimmed milk is used; is it not?

Mr. AIKEN. Some skimmed milk is used in the manufacture of oleo. The manufacturers, however, are not required to indicate on the package that skimmed-milk powder is used in its manufacture.

I was saying I should like to consider the effect of this legislation on the American dairy farmer.

Including meat products, the dairy herd accounts for about 22 percent of the agricultural income of the United States. It is far and away the most important branch of agriculture. For the year 1948 the dollar value of the dairy industry of the United States was almost exactly the same as that of the automobile industry, which was in the neighborhood of $7,000,000,000. It is far and away the most important market for industrial manufactured goods. It has been repeatedly said on the floor that 20 percent of the persons who live on the farms of the United States purchase approximately 40 percent of the industrial output of the Nation. The dairy farmer, of course, purchases far more in proportion to his numbers than do other types of farmers.

Twenty-six and one-tenth percent of the milk produced on dairy farms goes into the manufacture of butter. Perhaps I should more properly say that the cream from that amount of milk goes into the manufacture of butter. In some sections of the country most of the milk is produced for the purpose of providing cream for the manufacture of butter and skim milk for the production of veal, pork, poultry, and other animal products.

Approximately two and a half million American farmers are milk producers. That is nearly a million more than the number of farmers engaged in any other agricultural production.

Dairying is the most stable field of employment for farm labor. It provides an enormous business for transportation companies, and is, as I have indicated, the greatest consumer market for industrial products, including manure spreaders, tractors, fertilizers, and other industrial products. Dairy farmers also purchase and consume a large percentage of the grain production of the Nation. Whatever affects the dairy industry of the United States affects the entire domestic economy.

Dairying is a soil-building branch of agriculture, not a soil-depleting crop, such as soybeans or cotton.

The most prosperous agricultural areas of America are those areas where dairying is generally practiced. I refer to those areas or regions as a whole, and not solely to the dairy farmer, for the local merchant, the doctor, the school teacher, the garage man, and the local laboring people are all interdependent, and their fortunes rise or fall with the fortunes of the dairying communities in which they are located.

In many areas the primary purpose of dairying is not the production of cream for butter, but the production of fluid milk for the consumer market.

In most parts of the country, health regulations promulgated by city officials require extraordinary expenditures on the part of the farmer in order to produce milk of the highest quality and under sanitary conditions. For instance, in the New England and New York milk shed, which includes my State, stables must have window space equal to 10 percent of the total wall space in the stable.

Milk must be cooled before 9 o'clock in the morning, which necessitates the installation of expensive electric refrigeration machinery on the farm.

Separate milk houses must be constructed at a specified distance from the stable.

All cows must be tested for diseases, so that no disease can be transmitted to the consumer through milk.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What percentage of the income from dairying in the Senator's State comes from the production of butter?

Mr. AIKEN. Very little of it. Vermont is not a butter-manufacturing State. We are affected seriously by the price of butter in other States, however.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What the Senator is really talking about is the conditions required to be observed in the production of fluid milk.

Mr. AIKEN. I shall come to that subject very shortly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it not true that the percentage of the dairy income from butter is less than 1 percent of the total dairy income?

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator is probably correct. I do know that when the price of butter in the Midwest goes to pieces, the producers there dump their cream on the New England market to break our price for fluid milk.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I noticed this morning that the Senator from Iowa was objecting to restrictions against the transportation of milk here. Perhaps the answer to the question is to restrict any interstate shipment of milk, in order to protect the market.

Mr. AIKEN. Those restrictions are not imposed by law, but are imposed by regulations of the city boards of health, such as New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and, I assume, Washington, and most of the other principal markets in the fluid-milk-producing area.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator would not think, I suppose, that it would be a good thing for our economy as a whole to restrict the shipment of fluid milk; in other words, to prohibit its interstate shipment.

Mr. AIKEN. That would be impracticable.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And undesirable.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Is it not true that the Senator from Vermont, in presenting this subject this morning, is not motivated by the fact that he is a Senator from Vermont, but that he has a deep interest in the dairying industry of the country, and is speaking for the entire industry?

Mr. AIKEN. I stated at the start that I represent, with due respect to the Senator from Wisconsin, the most intensive dairy State in the Union, a State which depends upon dairy products for approximately 78 percent of its agricultural income. I may be prejudiced. Let us admit that. We are all prejudiced. Let us agree to that, also, so that it will not sound one-sided.

Mr. TOBEY. It was Edmund Burke who stated that a Senator was primarily a Senator of the United States rather than a Senator from the particular State which elects him. Does the Senator from Vermont concur in that statement?

Mr. AIKEN. I concur in that statement of Edmund Burke, but I also maintain that there never was a Member of the Senate who forgot where his home was.

Mr. TOBEY. If he stayed here more than one term.

Mr. AIKEN. If he did forget, he ceased to be a Senator.

Mr. TOBEY. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. I have here a copy of the regulations of the Boston board of health, consisting of approximately 12 pages, which regulations must be observed in the production of fluid milk for the Boston market. In addition to the regulations which I have already mentioned, there are others. All utensils used in a dairy barn must be clean and must be sterilized, or the milk cannot be sold. The manure must be moved a specified distance. The persons who work in the dairy must always wear clean clothing and be free from contagious diseases themselves. If one has tuberculosis he cannot even be employed in the handling of milk from the producer to the consumer.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the Senator if he knows whether the same restrictive measures are imposed upon those persons who produce the oils, vegetable fats, or any of the animal fats going into the production of oleomargarine?

Mr. AIKEN. Not that I know of. I suppose the manufacturers themselves have to comply with sanitary regulations, but so far as the producers of the raw materials are concerned, I do not know of any such regulations.

Mr. THYE. The restrictions about which the Senator has spoken are very much like the regulations covering the production of milk for the Twin Cities. The producers of fats and oils which go into the manufacture of oleomargarine up until the time they are concentrated and processed have no such restrictive measures imposed upon them comparable to those which are imposed in connection with the production of dairy products. Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know of any.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think there is any question about the regulations with regard to fluid milk, and it seems to me the discussion is wholly irrelevant to butter, because the Senator knows very well that in those States which are primarily producers of butter, of which the Senator's State is not one, there are no regulations controlling the production of milk for butterfat. There are no regulations whatever in regard to the conditions under which the cream, which goes into the butter, is produced. The Senator has admitted that less than 1 percent of the milk produced under such fine conditions goes into butter.

Mr. AIKEN. There is more than that today, because each year a greater part of the country is coming under the regulations of the city boards of health. In other words, they are reaching out in different directions to get fluid milk, and in the area represented by the able Senator from Minnesota, the able Senator from Wisconsin, and in other great producing States, I think it will be found that the dairy farmers must produce cream for butter under the same conditions, because they produce for the manufacture of butter and also for the fluid milk market. There are some areas, I believe, in which they produce cream to be manufactured into butter, but I know that they do not come under such strict regulations as they would if they were producing for both the fluid milk market and the butter market.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator will yield, that is exactly correct, wherever they can sell it in the fluid milk market, and they do more and more, as I think I have pointed out, because that is where the profit is. There is no one attacking the dairy industry. Its real progress is through the sale of fluid milk, not butter. That is the whole point I made day before yesterday. I think the Senator is correct in his statement.

Mr. AIKEN. Two years ago the Senator's statement might have been accurate, but today the dairy farmers are producing less and less for the fluid-milk market, and produce a larger percentage of milk which has to be used in byproducts. I shall point that out very soon.

I have mentioned the regulations merely to show the expensive costs in equipping a dairy farm for the production of dairy products. I wish to point out what this means to the manufacturing interests of the country, the transportation interests, the truck manufacturers, and so on.

After having gone to an expense of several thousand dollars to qualify a dairy farm for the production of fluid milk for the city market, the producer must then try to gage his production as nearly as possible to meet the consumer demand.

No one so far has devised any means of keeping cows, even those which freshen in the fall, from giving more milk during the spring months than they do during November and December.

Therefore, if the city consumer is to be assured an adequate supply of milk through the fall and winter months, it is necessary for the farmer to keep enough cows so that a considerable surplus is produced during spring and early summer. In fact, a surplus is being produced right now in the Boston milk area. Only about 60 percent of the production is being consumed in the form of fluid milk. There has been an exceptionally favorable season, as there was a year ago, for the production of milk, with late fall pasturing, good grain, and warm weather. So, ordinarily, the farmer must keep more cows than he needs during the spring and summer in order to supply the consumer with what milk she needs during the fall months.

The consumer will not buy this surplus, because she does not need and does not see why she should buy twice as much milk during May as she does in November. Therefore, other markets have to be found for the surplus produced during the flush season.

This surplus is used in manufacturing powdered milk, cheese, ice cream, and chocolate, but the most important market for it is in the manufacture of butter.

As the Senator from New Hampshire has said, that is not true of New England, where the surplus is used in the manufacture of powdered milk and other products.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEAHY in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Referring to the percentage that goes into fluid milk, as well as manufactured products, in the area of the Twin Cities, Minneapolis and St. Paul, in Minnesota—and they are fairly good-sized cities—we need only about 25 or 30 miles of an area about the two cities to supply all the fluid milk that is consumed in those cities. The balance of the producers in the State are dependent entirely upon the creameries to process the butterfat into butter and sell it in that manner, and then to process the skim milk into skim milk powder and sell the powder. That is their only outlet. That is true of Minnesota, and the same is true of Wisconsin to some extent, and wherever there is only one outlet, namely, through the manufacture of butterfat into powder. If the butter market is destroyed, it will result in stopping the dairy operations on all those farms, and they are going to have to turn to some other type of crop.

While I do not wish to impose upon the time of the Senator from Vermont, I would say to the very able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] that he knows of the splendid growth of dairy farms in his own State and in the deep South, because they have recognized that the dairy industry is the best type of soil conserving in which any farmer can engage, and I am quite surprised that some of his good diversified farm operators in his State have not taken him to task for sponsoring the legislation he is sponsoring.

Mr. AIKEN. No doubt they have.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator's description of conditions in Wisconsin is simply not accurate. Statistics from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics were introduced a few days ago. The Senator from Wisconsin is present and does not deny that less than 2 percent of the milk referred to goes into butter. The reason why Wisconsin is so prosperous in the dairy business is not because the producers sell the milk in the form of butter, but sell it in the form of cheese and fluid milk. That is all brought out in the testimony. They ship it to New York and as far south as Houston in tank cars.

The Senator certainly does not want any interstate restriction on the shipment of cheese or fluid milk. The fact is that those engaged in the dairy industry, as distinguished from the butter industry, want to promote the sale of it in the most profitable way, that is, fluid milk, cheese, dried milk, ice cream. The least profitable way in which a farmer can sell his milk is in the form of butter. In only a few States, such as Minnesota and Iowa—they are the outstanding two States—has there been an apparent refusal to see the benefits which arise from the sale of milk in forms other than as butter. Practically every other State has sought to emphasize the sale of fluid milk, and I am for that. In my State the most profitable way to sell milk is to such industries as Pet Milk, Carnation Milk, Avoset Cream, in the form of cheese, in the form of ice cream, and in the form of dried milk. We have Carnation factories and Pet Milk factories. That is the way to have a profitable dairying industry. In Minnesota and Iowa, apparently, they have not been able to market their milk in the forms which are most profitable to the farmers.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if we listen to the Senator from Arkansas long enough we will come to the conclusion that there is not any butter in the United States, because nobody makes from the milk he produces more than 1 or 2 percent of butter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is too much butter at the present high price. The Government has had to buy a hundred million dollars' worth.

Mr. AIKEN. The Department of Agriculture advises me that 26.1 percent—I do not know how they figure the one-tenth of a percent—of all the milk produced in the United States goes into the manufacture of butter, or at least that the cream from the milk does.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I should like to make reply to the reference made by the able Senator from Arkansas to the small percentage of butterfat that is made into butter in the State of Wisconsin. Wisconsin is a very short distance from the Twin Cities in Minnesota, and the Wisconsin producers have qualified themselves to produce grade-A milk, and they are constantly begging the Twin City Milk Producers' Association to allow them to become either a part of the Twin City Milk Producers' Association as a group, or that they might supply milk.

Oftentimes in the short production season of the year the Twin City Milk Producers' Association, which does supply the milk for the Twin Cities, do buy from Wisconsin producers, because fluid milk sales are by far the most profitable. But with reference to Wisconsin's having made so much money in the sale of cheese, there was a time when cheese was a drug on the market in the entire United States. Up until the war demands, cheese was not profitable. When one went into many communities he found the cheese factories with their doors shut and their windows boarded up, and the vats had already deteriorated or been taken out and used for water tanks, or some other use. Those cheese factories were no longer producing cheese. That was true in Minnesota and Wisconsin. Everyone was clamoring for the fluid milk market. Wisconsin was in a more favorable position than some of the other States, because the great metropolitan center of Chicago is bounded by water on one side, and therefore Wisconsin could sell a great deal of its milk to the Chicago milk market.

So the fact of the matter is that butter is the end sale of such a large portion of our milk in the United States that if we destroy the butter market, we do tremendous damage. I call attention to the wisdom of our forefathers some half a century ago, when they imposed the tax, which has withstood the arguments that have been made in the Senate Chamber since 1902; and there have been some able men arguing for the oleomargarine industry since it was first produced and since the tax was imposed. But the wisdom of our forefathers was able to withstand the pressure, and if we are instrumental in removing the tax and permitting oleomargarine to go into the market unrestricted as a free competitor with the butter, we will regret the day.

I am not speaking this way because I myself am a producer of butter products, but any Senator can go into his own State—and I beg the Senator from Vermont to forgive me for taking so much of his time——

Mr. AIKEN. That is all right.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Arkansas can go into his own splendid State, or he can go down into Tennessee, Alabama, or any of those States, and he will find that the extension people, the soil conservationists, will all point to farm units where they have successfully been able to reestablish the growth of grass, legume crops, on soils that have been so badly eroded or depleted by the growing of row crops, such as soybeans, cotton, and tobacco that the land will no longer produce as it should. Here is the educational branch of the Department of Agriculture, such as the Extension Service or the PMA, which have successfully built up depleted lands by the use of fertilizer, and secured a catch of grass, and then they proudly point to

the dairy herds that consume the grass in the form of pasturage or in the form of hay, and they say, "We have rebuilded this land, we have given it a rebirth, so to speak, and look at that fine dairy herd that is out there."

Well, what are they going to do with that dairy herd if the butter market is destroyed? They cannot find a market that will take the fluid milk. There will simply be no expansion in their dairy operations if the butter market is destroyed. That is the argument, as I see it. It is not a question of food value. There is just as much nutritive value in a pound of white oleomargarine as there is in the colored.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield briefly. I should like to continue with my arguments.

Mr. WILEY. I shall be very brief.

Some mention has been made of Wisconsin. While we do produce twice as much milk as the next two milk-producing States, we also produce 8 percent of the butter produced in the Nation. But, as suggested by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], practically one-third of all the milk produced in the United States goes into butter. Just think of that, Mr. President. The figures are from 30 percent to 31 percent. There we have the nub of the whole question. If the butter market is taken over, economic and political chaos will result.

Mr. AIKEN. I think we had better have a reconciliation of figures. The Senator from Wisconsin says that from 30 to 31 percent of the milk produced goes into butter, whereas I have stated that the Department of Agriculture says that 26.1 percent of the milk produced goes into butter. I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin is using the annual figures, whereas I am using the present-time figures.

Mr. WILEY. The figures come from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the difference results from the fact that the Senator from Wisconsin uses the annual figures, whereas I use the current percentage figures.

Before I proceed with my argument again, I should like to say, although it is probably not important to do so, that 1.2 percent of the Vermont dairy farmers' income comes from butter manufactured within the State, but by far the greater part of Vermont cream used in manufacturing butter is processed outside the State after it is delivered to the city market, and is found to be surplus or class 2 milk.

But this bill, Mr. President, I believe, strikes a solar-plexis blow at the use of surplus cream for the manufacture of butter. Consequently, if this market is destroyed or a major part of it taken away, the farmer will then be confronted with the alternative of reducing his production so as to only meet the demand during the flush season of the year, leaving the market short of fluid milk for the fall and early winter or else dumping the surplus on whatever market he can find, depending upon Government to make up the loss through subsidization.

If the first alternative is used, the consumer may look forward to definitely higher prices for milk during the months of shortage.

If the second alternative is resorted to, then certainly the consumer may look forward to increased tax bills in order to subsidize an adequate production of milk during these short months.

May I point out, too, another way in which a blow at the butter market will hit the consumer squarely in the pocketbook?

According to figures just given me by the Department of Agriculture, 42 percent dressed weight of the beef and veal produced in the United States comes from milk-producing animals.

Mr. WILEY. How much?

Mr. AIKEN. Forty-two percent is the figure given me by the Department of Agriculture day before yesterday.

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. That varies.

Mr. AIKEN. It varies from time to time I suppose, but those figures are 2 days old.

If we eliminate a considerable part of the meat production now coming from milk-producing herds, the consumer will be faced with a dwindling supply of beef and veal as well as a dwindling supply or much higher prices for pork and poultry products which are raised to a considerable extent on the skim milk from the dairy farms.

I wish every consumer knew these facts, but it is almost impossible to counteract the multi-million-dollar campaign of misrepresentation by the oleo interests.

I now come to the final phase of my argument against this bill as it comes from the committee.

I know the proponents say that the bill protects butter against the sale of the synthetic product.

They claim that an adequate appropriation will be made to enforce the law so that oleo cannot be sold and served as butter.

I take little stock in such claims.

I know that if oleo is permitted to be sold as an exact imitation of butter, without restriction, any attempt to control the situation by law is doomed to failure.

At present the Food and Drug Administration has approximately $4,000,000 a year to enforce the laws coming under its jurisdiction. Under the pending bill it is proposed to give this agency $5,000,000 more to enforce the oleomargarine law.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Could the Senator foresee how the Federal Government would police all the public eating places in Washington as of today noon, to determine if there were any infraction of the law which is now proposed to be passed, which would eliminate all restrictions, and which would provide that those serving oleomargarine must serve it in a certain shape? How would the authorities be able to go about policing all of the eating places in the city of Washington and in all other large cities, to determine whether a plain square pat of spread which was served was butter, or whether it was in fact oleomargarine served in place of butter?

Mr. AIKEN. It is proposed to inspect each eating place once a year. To think that such provision will amount to anything in preventing widespread fraud on the American people is absurd.

When all the agencies of law enforcement which the Government possesses fail to keep the leading hotels of Washington from serving corn sirup as pure maple sirup, what hope is there that these agencies will be any more effective in preventing the serving of oleo as butter in a million eating places of the Nation?

I know what has happened in the case of maple sirup. Exactly the same thing that will happen if the indiscriminate sale of oleo in exact imitation of butter is permitted.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to make a comment respecting the violation of certain food laws. I wonder how many persons have gone to the food laboratory of any one of the States and have seen the samples of food that had been adulterated that have been picked up by the food inspectors? State food inspectors or Federal food inspectors often find that violations of the law have occurred, and attempts made to defraud the public in respect to the food it consumes.

Having been connected with one of the regulatory bodies in my State, and having been in charge of food inspectors for several years, and having had problems of adulteration and fraud in connection with food brought to my desk, I do know that there are many violations of the food laws, and I would say that a law requiring serving oleomargarine in a triangular-shaped pat and requiring that a sign be placed on the wall of the restaurant stating that oleomargarine is served in that manner, would have no more regulatory force or be no more of a safeguard to the consuming public against the serving to them of oleomargarine when they think they were being served butter, than a snap of my finger.

Mr. AIKEN. I think we cannot discount right now any claim that this bill affords any effective protection against the fraudulent serving of imitation butter.

Now for the most important part of my argument against the bill, as I see it, I want to speak of the effect of the proposed legislation on the national economy.

We may assume without question that oleomargarine will make heavy inroads on the butter market if this legislation is passed unamended. That is the purpose of the bill.

We may assume without question that the price of oleomargarine to the consumer will increase. That has been proved in areas where competition from butter has been lacking.

We may assume without question a reduction in the number of dairy cattle in the United States and a cessation of

expansion of the dairy industry in those States where it is badly needed.

There are many groups in this country supporting legislation proposed by the oleo interests that would not do so if they had full possession of the facts. These groups are those which generally seek to promote higher living standards and higher incomes among American working people and consumers. Yet what they unwittingly propose is to furnish their tables from the labors of the lowest paid agricultural workers in the United States, if not indeed the 16-cent-a-day labor of the Pacific islands.

Assuming that oleo will be manufactured principally from cottonseed oil, which is the lowest-priced oil on the market today because of the high import tax on coconut oil, I would like to point out the effect on the income of American agricultural labor which this bill, if unamended, will have.

I was informed yesterday by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, that the average hourly farm wage rate in three important cotton-producing States is as follows: Mississippi, 40 cents an hour; Arkansas, 47 cents an hour; Georgia, 37 cents an hour.

In contrast to these very low rates, we find the great dairy State of Washington paying its agricultural labor 93 cents an hour; Iowa pays its labor 71 cents an hour, and Minnesota, 68 cents an hour.

But this hourly wage comparison is not the whole story. The worker on the dairy farm has to work every day of the year, including Sundays. Whether he wants to work or not, he has to work every day.

The worker on the cotton farm has a seasonal proposition to deal with.

Therefore, the yearly earnings of the dairy worker are still further out of proportion to those of the cottonfield worker than a comparison of the hourly earnings would indicate.

If the materials used in manufacturing oleo were produced by as highly paid labor as that employed on dairy farms, there would be little difference between the cost of oleo and the cost of butter.

Even with these low wage rates, the cotton grower of the South is in trouble. He is trying to produce and continue to produce cotton on land which has been producing cotton for 150 years.

He is continuing to grow a soil-depleting crop and doing the best he can to make up for that depletion by adding chemical fertilizer.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not the Senator from Vermont think that if oleomargarine had the same kind of monopolistic protection which butter has had for 64 years, the producers of oleomargarine might be able to pay high wage rates, too? Of course, the producers of butter have been drawing money from the public by means of this method of artificial, legislative restriction of competition. So, of course, they can pay high wage rates; can they not? If this restriction upon the South is removed, the producers of oleomargarine will be able to pay just as high wage rates as those paid in Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I fail to see where any monopolistic protection comes in, with two and one-half million producers of milk and several hundred thousand producers of butter, as compared with the seven controlling companies engaged in the oleomargarine industry. I think the Senator from Arkansas is a little out of order in discussing monopolies in connection with the controversy between oleomargarine and butter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Vermont will admit, will he not, that in all our history there has been no other commodity which has had a similar protection from a legitimate competitor?

Mr. AIKEN. I have already pointed out that the oleomargarine monopoly has the protection of a tariff of 22 cents a pound which is applied against imported oleomargarine, as against 7 cents a pound protection given the butter industry.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to point out that the oleomargarine producers did not put that into effect. The butter interests put in that restriction. The oleomargarine producers have not been able to get votes for any such protection, since I have been in the Senate, and long before that. If such a tax was brought about by anyone, it was brought about by the butter producers; it was not brought about by the oleomargarine producers.

Mr. AIKEN. I would hardly say that butter was in a position of enjoying a monopoly. I do not have the figures before me; but the sales of oleomargarine in the United States are rapidly approaching the sales of butter. That does not indicate a monopoly in any sense of the word.

Now the Senator from Arkansas has made it fairly plain that it is the ambition of the oleomargarine interests to take over the rest of the butter market. It is my purpose to point out how disastrous that would be to the general economy of the country.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator's argument is correct, why does he not propose legislation to prohibit the raising of row crops? Then all of us would be very well off, indeed, no doubt. If there is any logic at all in his argument, we should outlaw the production of soybeans, and especially the production of corn and cotton, because they deplete the soil.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Arkansas is saying that if this bill is passed, the farm-labor wage rate in the South will be raised to a level comparable with that in the North. I wonder whether the Senator from Arkansas would be willing to join me in proposing a minimum farm wage for farm labor of, let us say, 75 cents an hour.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I much prefer that these matters result from a natural economic condition, rather than to be brought about by planning done in Washington.

The Senator from Vermont said a few moments ago that the people do not know anything about this question. That remark by the Senator from Vermont leaves the impression that here in the United States only the Senate possesses wisdom. However, the fact is that since 1901, 16 States have eliminated the prohibition against yellow margarine. Within the last 2 months, Ohio, by a vote of its people, removed the restriction on yellow margarine. The people themselves have spoken. Now 32 States, a majority of the States of the Union, do not have these restrictions. So the idea that the only knowledge of this matter reposes here in the Senate seems to me to be completely contrary to the facts.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas is making a good argument in favor of the enactment of anti-poll-tax legislation, anyway.

But I wish to point out that it is not only agricultural labor which is much cheaper in the South; it is also industrial labor. The average factory worker in Arkansas is paid 90 cents an hour, as compared with $1.16 an hour which is paid to the average factory worker in Michigan.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am perfectly willing to agree to that, for the South has for so long been exploited by the Yankees that it is very difficult for us to get the means with which to live. There is no question about that. That is what has been done by freight-rate policies and other policies. This question is just another example of the policies which have been imposed upon the South for many years. I am perfectly willing to admit that. We are struggling to have a free, equal access to the markets of this country. That is all we want.

Mr. AIKEN. No; the Senator from Arkansas is trying to take over the butter market.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to say that I think the South is exploited in the matter of freight rates. But one of the very startling features of that problem is that we do not find much protest coming from the southern Representatives and Senators about the freight rates; and when Governor Arnall some years ago started a fight before the Interstate Commerce Commission to get the discriminatory freight rates reduced, nearly all the southern businessmen and southern Representatives in Congress lined up with the railroads, and not in favor of the reduction of freight rates.

When the southern Representatives in Congress really wish to join in the fight for a reduction of the freight rates, we will join them in that fight. But they will not get very far unless they themselves join in that fight.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, if the Senator from Arkansas does not go too far away from the pending question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall not.

I wish to state that long before the junior Senator from Illinois came to the Senate, this battle went on for a long time. The Governor of my State and its representatives in the House of Representatives and in the Senate did everything they could. However, after they obtained a ruling from the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Governor of the great State of New York

resorted to the courts. In such matters our opponents have a way, outside of the Senate, of stalling and putting off, so as to prevent action. They do that outside of the Senate.

The same tactics have been followed in the Senate with regard to margarine. We never have been able to get a vote here on the question of removing the taxes on margarine or on removing the other discriminations which have been practiced against us, although various Senators have interested themselves in those matters, and although great efforts have been made to obtain such votes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, let me say for the benefit of the junior Senator from Illinois, who has just recently entered the Chamber, that the statement I made which precipitated this most recent discussion was that if the materials used in manufacturing oleomargarine were produced by as highly paid labor as that which is employed on the dairy farms and in the dairy industry, there would be little difference between the price of oleomargarine and the price of butter. But even with such low wage rates, the cotton growers are in trouble. They are trying to produce and to continue to produce cotton on land which has been producing cotton for 150 years. They are continuing to grow a soil-depleting crop, and are doing the best they can to make up for that depletion by adding chemical fertilizer.

These old cotton States of the South are just now getting under way toward conversion to other more profitable types of agricultural production. The one greatest opportunity which lies before them is that of converting to an animal industry, and particularly to a dairy industry.

Under the false pretense of protecting their income, this bill is striking a blow at the greatest hope which would otherwise lie before them.

If we undertake to increase the cottonseed production to meet the demands for unrestricted invasion of oleo into the butter market, we must remember that while we are increasing the production of cottonseed, we are also increasing the production of cotton fiber, which is already in such tremendous surplus that the cotton market would collapse today were it not for payments and loans from the Federal Treasury.

Why do we undertake to encourage the continuance of uneconomic conditions for the benefit of a handful of oleo manufacturers?

Why do we not take a long-range view of the situation, and protect the income of American agricultural workers, protect the market for American industrial goods, protect the wage level of American workers, and protect the economy of the Nation, by amending this bill so that it will be impossible for the oleo interests to partially destroy the branch of our American economy upon which the greatest number of our people depend.

Mr. McCARTHY obtained the floor.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk (Emery L. Frazier) called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	O'Mahoney
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Russell
Butler	Holland	Saltonstall
Connally	Hunt	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Dworshak	Kerr	Stennis
Eastland	Knowland	Taft
Ellender	Lehman	Taylor
Ferguson	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
George	McKellar	Thye
Gillette	McMahon	Vandenberg
Green	Maybank	Wherry
Gurney	Neely	Wiley
Hayden	O'Conor	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk (Edward E. Mansur, Jr.) proceeded to call the names of the absent Senators.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The Chair rules that the suggestion of the absence of a quorum cannot be withdrawn.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I abide by the decision of the Chair, Mr. President.

Mr. WILEY. I insist, Mr. President, that the clerk continue to call the roll.

The Chief Clerk resumed calling the names of the absent Senators.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of a quorum, the Senate cannot give unanimous consent.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded calling the names of absent Senators, and Mr. BENTON, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. DARBY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. ECTON, Mr. FREAR, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JENNER, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KEM, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LONG, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MYERS, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YOUNG answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to H. R. 2023 and ask that it be allowed to lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD. I wish to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

SEC. 4. (a) Section 15 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, is amended by inserting "(1)" after the letter "(a)" in subsection (a) thereof, and by adding at the end of such subsection the following new paragraph:

"(2) In the case of oleomargarine or margarine an advertisement shall be deemed misleading in a material respect if in such advertisement representations are made or suggested by statement, word, grade designation, design, device, symbol, sound, or any combination thereof, that such oleomargarine or margarine is a dairy product."

(b) Such section 15 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The term 'oleomargarine or margarine' includes—

"(1) All substances, mixtures, and compounds known as oleomargarine, margarine, oleo, or butterine;

"(2) All substances, mixtures, and compounds which have a consistence similar to that of butter and which contain any edible oils or fats other than milk fat if (A) made in imitation or semblance of butter, or purporting to be butter or a butter substitute, or (B) commonly used, or intended for common use, in place of or as a substitute for butter, or (C) churned, emulsified, or mixed in cream, milk, skim milk, buttermilk, water, or other liquid and containing moisture in excess of 1 percent and commonly used, or suitable for common use, as a substitute for butter."

On page 4, line 11, strike out "Sec. 4" and insert "Sec. 5."

On page 4, line 23, strike out "Sec. 5" and insert "Sec. 6."

On page 5, line 3, strike out "Sec. 6" and insert "Sec. 7."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to have the Senator state whether he wishes to have the amendment considered the pending question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand there is a very good possibility that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who is in charge of the pending bill, may accept the amendment. I understand also that my cosponsors of the Wiley amendment may possibly accept it as an amendment to the Wiley substitute. For the time being I believe I shall have to request that it be the pending question, although I am not at all concerned about whether it is the pending question or not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. While this is not technically presented as an amendment to the Wiley substitute, I should like to have it so considered and inserted in the proper place in the Wiley substitute, so that it will be offered both as an amendment to the Wiley substitute and to the Fulbright bill.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. WILEY. I have not seen the particular amendment which has been suggested as an amendment to the substitute amendment, but I did hear it read, and it seemed to me that it had merit. So far as I am personally concerned, while I am only one of the 25 or 26 sponsors of the proposed substitute, I am inclined to accept the amendment to the substitute, if that would be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] can modify his proposed substitute by accepting the

amendment offered by the junior Senator from Wisconsin, if he so desires.

Mr. WILEY. I do so desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed substitute is so modified.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I am still offering it as an amendment to the original Fulbright bill, and I ask to have it printed and to lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as offered to the original bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Simply stated, Mr. President, the amendment is for the purpose of making illegal the unfair and dishonest advertising of oleomargarine. I have before me some unusual examples of the attempts of the oleomargarine interests to try to pass their product off as butter. I believe that is unfair, not only to the dairy farmer, but also to the consumer. The only individuals who can gain by this type of dishonest advertising are the oleomargarine interests.

In order to show what I am discussing, I have before me, for example, a paper dated December 1, 1949, with big headlines, "Dairy products for holiday goodies," showing a bottle of milk, beside it a piece of cheese, and a pound of butter. Underneath appears "Pak Delrich, lb. pkg. 27 cents." It is oleomargarine. That is in a New York newspaper.

I have before me a newspaper from Memphis, the Memphis Press-Scimitar, dated February 24, 1949, advertising Durkee's oleomargarine, beside what looks like a pound of butter. There is pictured a dairy farm. This is advertised as "country fresh." Obviously the purpose of it is to create the impression that this is a dairy product.

I have before me, Mr. President, a newspaper from San Francisco, the San Francisco Call-Bulletin, advertising Wilson's oleomargarine as "churned fresh daily." As we know, "churning" means separating the butterfat from the milk. That is the common conception of it. There are of course other conceptions of churning, but in the public mind "churning" means taking the cream and removing the butter. They advertise this as "churned fresh daily," and they mention the word "milk" in it also.

I have before me also a newspaper from White Plains, N. Y., the Reporter Dispatch, dated December 1, 1949, in which again appears a very good drawing of dairy products. Underneath are the words "Dairy products, margarine, Numaid, 2 pounds 45 cents," under the heading of "Dairy products."

Mr. President, I have before me also the Cleveland Press, dated Thursday, December 15, 1949, advertising Durkee's products. I might say that this outfit, Durkee's, which is a division of the Glidden Corp., seems to be one of the principal offenders. They have embarked upon a deliberate campaign to try to palm off their oleomargarine as butter.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is that the same company which makes paint?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is the same company which makes paint.

Mr. AIKEN. Out of the same material? [Laughter.]

Mr. McCARTHY. Perhaps out of the same material. If the Senator from Arkansas were in the Chamber, I should like to ask him a question about that.

As Senators know, since 1943 the Department of Agriculture has administered and promoted a consumer-grading program, insofar as butter is concerned. The first grade is AA, which is the highest grade of butter. The next grade is A, and then are B and C. There is no such grading of oleomargarine.

I find in this newspaper, the Cleveland Press, a large advertisement "Durkee's Oleomargarine." Then there is a huge arrow pointing from a package that resembles a package of butter to a large yellow circle entitled "Grade AA Fortified." Also "Look for this Quality Seal."

When they advertise this they know that people do look for quality seal, AA, in butter, and they know that it means something in butter. They know, for example, that the manufacturer who has a grade-A butter cannot list it as grade AA. But Durkee and the Glidden Corp. can put grade AA on their product because it is not regulated. That, however, will be controlled, if my amendment is adopted.

I have before me also, Mr. President, a New York newspaper dated Thursday, November 17, 1949. It is the Reporter Dispatch of White Plains. Again we find the same type of deliberately dishonest advertising. There appear drawings of cheese and butter, very excellent and very appetizing in appearance, and a huge banner saying "Remember, Dairy Products Are Vital to Good Health." Underneath that it says "Nucoa, pound package 27 cents."

I have before me also, Mr. President, but unfortunately it cannot be reproduced in the RECORD, the Durkee package in which they pack the oleomargarine, very deliberately made to appear exactly as a butter package, even down to the grade AA, which only butter manufacturers should be entitled to use under the rules and regulations of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, there is another amendment which I intend to offer, but which I have not yet prepared, which would go hand in hand with the amendment which I have submitted. That amendment will provide that all oleomargarine must be labeled in letters at least one-half inch high "This is not a dairy product."

Mr. President, I believe both amendments, if adopted, will do a great deal for the consumer, in protecting him against this type of dishonest, misleading advertising, and also, of course, will protect the dairy farmers from the dishonest competition which they are now encountering.

I may say that I am sure the dairy farmers of my State—and Wisconsin has the greatest production of dairy products of any State in the Union—are not worried about any honest competition from any other product. I am sure that the dairy farmers of my State feel that if the housewife would prefer to buy oleomargarine, she should be able to buy it, but she ought to know what she is buying when she does so.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to do so.

Mr. WILEY. I presume this particular amendment has been carefully studied, to make sure there is no African in the woodpile. The whole purpose of the amendment is clearly to indicate that it would be illegal for the oleo interests to advertise their products as dairy products. That is the sum and substance of the amendment, is it not?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; the purpose of the amendment is to prevent any form of advertisement which gives the impression, directly or by inference, that the consumer is buying butter.

Mr. WILEY. In other words, the amendment would place no limitation upon the legitimate advertising of oleomargarine or margarine?

Mr. McCARTHY. None whatsoever. I might say that there should not be. If the oleo interests can sell their product on its merits I do not think we should in any way try to resist them. But I do think we should make sure that they advertise it solely as what it is.

Mr. WILEY. I thank my colleague. Mr. President, if my colleague has completed his statement, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum. Before I do so I will say that I had expected that a Senator on the other side of the aisle and one on our side of the aisle would speak, in addition to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who has spoken, and that the afternoon would thus be consumed in discussing the unfinished business. The Senator from the Democratic side who was to speak, however, has been taken ill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, if the Senator wants time consumed, I will say I have an amendment I can offer, the purpose of which is to repeal the poll tax. I am sure discussion of it would consume some time. I shall be glad to submit it.

Mr. WILEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum. I hope my colleague will remain in the Senate Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. LONG in the chair]. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to propound this inquiry: What question is now pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the McCarthy amendment which has been proposed to the original bill, on page 4, after line 10.

A moment ago the absence of a quorum was suggested.

Mr. GEORGE. Has that amendment already been offered to the Wiley substitute?

Mr. WILEY. That is correct, and it has been accepted, and is now a part of the Wiley substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has requested unanimous consent to withdraw his suggestion of the absence of a quorum. Is there objection? The Chair hearing none, it is so ordered.

The question now is on agreeing to the McCarthy amendment proposed to the original bill, on page 4, after line 10.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer and send to the desk two amendments to the pending oleomargarine bill. I ask that they be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. LANGER. The first amendment, Repeal of War-tax Rates of Certain Miscellaneous Taxes, would repeal the war-tax rates of the following taxes: Admissions; use or lease of boxes or seats; sales of tickets outside box office; cabarets, roof gardens, and so forth; dues or membership fees; initiation fees; jewelry; furs; toilet preparations; distilled spirits; imported perfumes containing distilled spirits; still wines; sparkling wines; liqueurs and cordials; fermented malt liquors; billiard and pool tables and bowling alleys; electric-light bulbs and tubes; telephone, long-distance; domestic telegraph, cable, or radio dispatches; leased wires, and so forth; wire and equipment service; local telephone service; transportation of persons; seats, berths, and so forth; and luggage, purses, and so forth.

The second amendment, Repeal of Certain Excise Taxes, would repeal all of the excise taxes on the articles and services listed in the following subsection by subsection analysis:

Subsection (a) removes all excise taxes from admissions and dues.

Subsection (b) removes the so-called retailers' excise taxes which includes taxes on jewelry, furs, and toilet preparations.

Subsection (c) removes manufacturers' excise taxes which includes taxes on tires and inner tubes; toilet preparations; automobiles and parts; radios, phonographs, and musical instruments; mechanical refrigerators and air-conditioning units; sporting goods; luggage; electric, gas, and oil appliances; photographic apparatus; electric signs; business and store machines; rubber articles; washing machines; optical equipment; electric-light bulbs and tubes; firearms, shells, and cartridges; matches; electrical energy for domestic and commercial consumption; gasoline; and lubricating oils.

Subsection (d) removes the excise taxes on transportation and communication which includes taxes on transportation of oil by pipe line; telegraph, telephone, radio, and cable facilities; transportation of persons; and transportation of property.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Does it include any suggested legislation in relation to income taxes?

Mr. LANGER. No.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate finishes its business of today it take a recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to House bill 2023, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment for the information of the Senate. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin to the fact that he has already pending one amendment to this bill, which the Senate has not yet acted upon.

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand that, Mr. President, but I have discussed this with the cosponsors of the substitute bill, and I believe it will be accepted, as will also, I believe, the original amendment. I understand the sponsor of the Fulbright measure will consider this and let us know at some later time whether or not he will accept both of my amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator propose to withdraw the earlier amendment?

Mr. McCARTHY. The earlier amendment has been accepted by the——

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GEORGE. Is there not already pending an amendment to the original bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. That is what the Chair has just called to the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. GEORGE. Then I make the point of order that another amendment to the original bill is not now in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I understand that, but there is nothing which prevents my explaining to the Senate the purpose of this amendment and having it lie on the table. I ask that the amendment be stated and that it lie upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will be in order. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On the first page, between lines 10 and 11, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 3. Section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is amended by adding thereto a new paragraph as follows:

"(l) If it is oleomargarine or margarine unless there shall appear on the label thereof in letters not less than one-half inch in height the words 'This is not a dairy product.'"

On the first page, line 11, strike out "SEC. 3" and insert "SEC. 4."

On page 4, line 11, strike out "SEC. 4" and insert "SEC. 5."

On page 4, line 23, strike out "SEC. 5" and insert "SEC. 6."

On page 5, line 3, strike out "SEC. 6" and insert "SEC. 7."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed amendment will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I discussed this amendment in some detail when I discussed my original amendment, which was designed to prevent fraudulent, dishonest advertising. I believe the amendment is self-explanatory and needs no discussion. I understand that my cosponsors of the Wiley-Gillette substitute will accept this amendment and also the pending amendment. I hope the Senator from Arkansas will also accept as a part of his original bill both my first amendment and the amendment that is lying on the table, and I certainly should be happy to hear from him on that point later in the afternoon.

Mr. GEORGE. I shall have to insist that one amendment be offered at a time. If the Senator wishes to withdraw his amendment to the pending bill, he may offer any other amendment to it that he wishes.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the Senator from Georgia misunderstands what I have done. I offered an amendment to the pending bill. I have sent to the desk a second amendment, to have it printed and lie on the table until such time as I may, under the rules of the Senate, call it up.

Mr. GEORGE. I have no objection to that.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have not attempted to call up my second amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not want to have the issue confused by several amendments, all pending at one time. I did not understand the Senator. If that is the case, I beg his pardon.

Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator whether he asks that the first amendment offered, the amendment to the pending bill, not to the substitute but to the pending bill, be printed?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, I did.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as I stated before, there were several Senators who were going to speak. We have had a number of quorum calls today, and we have never had a bona fide quorum. The reasons are very evident. I think most Senators figured there would be no vote, there would be no real action taken on the bill or on any of the amendments. I personally had planned to speak Monday. The three Senators who I know are going to speak have requested that the matter go over so they can speak Monday. That would mean, I think, that as far as the substitute amendment is concerned, unless we were to take up amendments to the amendment, we would be practically through

speaking on the substitute amendment, Monday or Tuesday. However, today, two amendments have been suggested, and I heard some talk a few minutes ago about a poll-tax amendment; so I have no assurance how far the discussion may go. But in view of the fact that there has not been a bona fide quorum present, I am going to ask the majority leader to agree to a motion at this time to adjourn or recess in accordance with his previous statement to the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. It is now a quarter of three. I had hoped we might run along until approximately 5 o'clock before we adjourned or recessed today. I am sure a number of promargarine Senators and prodairy Senators have good speeches in their systems which are bound to come out sooner or later.

Mr. WILEY. Is that true of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I did not yield to the Senator for that question.

Mr. WILEY. It is only a suggestion.

Mr. LUCAS. I dislike very much to have the Senate adjourn in the middle of the afternoon, although I must admit we have gone along pretty well since we convened last Tuesday. Does the Senator from Wisconsin not have someone in the dairy camp who could entertain the Senate for another hour or so? The only thing I am trying to do is to move the Senate along with all possible expedition. I know my distinguished friend from Wisconsin is a candidate for reelection this year, I know he wants to get back to the hustings as soon as he can, and I should think it would be in his interest to move all legislation along as speedily as possible. He and I both understand what it is to go over a large State in a campaign, and I was trying really to help the Senator from Wisconsin by my effort to expedite this legislation and all other legislation.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from the North.

Mr. WILEY. I do not think there is any question of entertainment in this case, as suggested by the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall change the word.

Mr. WILEY. It is a pretty serious matter, as I believe, to a large segment of the country, and I feel that in view of the bill of goods which has been sold through the newspapers, through the radio, and through other channels, the whole issue has become rather befogged. I feel it is important that we have a quorum in the Senate when we discuss a measure which is, I think, calculated to affect vitally the economic and political structure of the country. That is the only reason for my suggestion.

I trust that Senators who are away from Washington traveling, and those who have gone home over the week-end, will be here Monday. I myself, am very serious, in my own conviction. So far as the hustings are concerned, I am sure all of us will do the best we can to look after them. If the Senator should insist on the Senate proceeding, I should raise the question of there being no quorum; we would find no quorum present, and we would then go over until Saturday, unless the order entered a while ago applies. I do not want to delay the matter; I want to facilitate it. I have never been accused of engaging in filibustering tactics. I think, however, that if we adjourn or recess now, and Senators are on notice that they are supposed to be here Monday to speak, we shall really accelerate action on this whole measure. That is the way I feel.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Wisconsin, I wish to assure him that I was not being facetious when I used the word "entertain." If the Senator objects to that word, I shall be glad to apply a different word, because I agree with him that this is a very serious question for many different interests throughout the United States of America. What I do not quite understand is the fact that the Senator states that certain Senators are out of the city and will not be present until next Monday. I had thought that all Senators would be remaining in or around Washington pretty closely, in view of the fact that the Senate returned to the Capitol only last Tuesday. I am certain that we have today as large a group present as any Senator could reasonably expect to find to talk to on either the margarine or the butter question. If the Senator wants a recess until Monday, I shall not insist to the contrary, although I think it is probably wrong to take a recess at this time.

Mr. WILEY. Perhaps there are other Senators present who would like to speak on some other subjects that would be of interest or would be entertaining to the galleries and the Members who are present. I am sure that any one of us, including the majority leader, can provide the entertainment or wisdom that may be necessary. On the other hand, the issue before the Senate is the oleomargarine bill, and I feel that we shall accelerate action on it if we do as I have suggested.

I am perfectly willing to go on, if the majority leader insists on that course. A matter of a couple of hours should not trouble any Senator who has been in the Senate a few years.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if I agree with my good friend from Wisconsin that we take a recess until Monday, could I obtain from him any unanimous-consent agreement with respect to when we might finally vote on the oleomargarine bill?

Mr. WILEY. If I were in a position in which I could express the sentiments of all those who joined in the substitute amendment, I should be glad to say "yes" to that question, but I will say to the Senator that one of my objectives is to try to get a meeting tomorrow of the Senators who oppose the pending bill, and to see if we cannot come to some definite understanding with relation to procedure, particularly in relation to suggested amendments. There are approximately 26 names attached to the substitute amendment, and I have had no opportunity to speak with any of those Senators since the first of January. I am in no position to enter into any agreement.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to accommodate the Senator from Wisconsin and other Senators who are interested in the cause, and, in view of the very persuasive plea which my friend from Wisconsin makes regarding taking a recess, and with the full realization that he has much to do between now and Monday in order to get together the group of Senators whom he has mentioned, for the purpose of ascertaining how long it will take to debate the bill, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, January 9, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 6 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Everett W. Hepp, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 4, district of Alaska, vice Harry O. Arend, resigned.

Irving H. Saypol, of New York, to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York, vice John F. X. McGohey, elevated.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Henry Robert Bell, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Tennessee. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired July 2, 1949.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 6, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Frank B. Burress, pastor, Fountain Memorial Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, Thou who hast been our dwelling place in all generations, we call upon Thee because Thou hast promised to answer our petitions. We are grateful that Thou hast not answered as we have always prayed, because Thine infinite judgment knew that we had asked amiss. Thy will be done in our lives today. Teach us how to pray.

Bless the Members of this assembly, in their deliberations today, with wisdom from on high for Thou has said, "If any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God."

For the great host of people who are employed by our Government in its various branches here in the homeland, and those who represent us in countries afar, on the islands and at sea, we ask Thy divine favor and wisdom today. May the Speaker of the House be especially blessed with good health and happiness on this his birthday, and for many years to come. We ask these petitions in the name of our Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 4, 1950, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 199

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. GEORGE J. BATES, late a Representative from the State of Massachusetts.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

Senate Resolution 200

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. MARTIN GORSKI, late a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 50–12.

BIRTHDAY GREETINGS, MR. SPEAKER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, without excluding other human activities, one of the activities of life that brings forth the greatness of a man is elective public service. Each and every one of us is aware of the many factors which enter into our own life and which tend to influence us in the rendering of our service to our people and our country and to develop the greatness that lies within us. One of those men who have developed the greatness and nobility of character both as individuals and as public officials was born some few years ago in Tennessee. When he was a child his parents went to Texas, and he went with them; and Texas, for all practical purposes, is his native State. His people recognized his greatness by electing him to the legislature of that great State, and his colleagues in the legislature in those years recognized his greatness of character and leadership by electing him speaker.

His people later recognized his outstanding qualities and elected him to Congress. He has been here many years. He has always commanded the respect of every person who has ever served with him and he commands the respect of all of his colleagues who serve with him now.

His public service has been outstanding, as we all know. He is loyal to his friends. He is patient, he is tolerant, he has consistently adhered to principle. He is a man of complete intellectual honesty and of the highest integrity. He is a man of simple taste, close to the soil and close to the people, a true representative of democratic institutions of government, a keen appraiser of human qualities. He possesses great faith in people and believes good in most people excels, by far, the bad.

I refer to one whose birthday is today, our beloved and distinguished Speaker, and may God bless him for many, many future birthdays to come, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas. [Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Like my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and all Members of this House on both sides of the aisle, I join in wishing the present occupant of the chair, Speaker RAYBURN, all good luck and good wishes for health and happiness in the years that lie ahead.

During the 15 years I have been a Member of this body I have learned, just as you have, to love the Speaker and to respect him for the fine American citizen he is and for the outstanding contribution he is making to government, has made in the past, and will, we hope, continue to make in the future.

The Speaker as I see him grows no taller, the Speaker does not get any fatter, as I have noticed in the past 15 years, and, may I say, his hair is as usual. He keeps young, he looks ahead and not backward. So those of us who are here today and who have this opportunity wish him Godspeed and all the good things in life. As a Republican, may I say there is one little item I wish he might consider and do for us of the minority, and that is to relinquish the chair to our side of the aisle at least once in a while. However, in the spirit of comradeship and with real personal warmth we wish him all the better things in life to which he so richly deserves.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Texas delegation and those great folks back home in Bonham and those fine counties the Speaker has so ably represented for a good many years, may I say that the best of everything is not good enough for our Speaker.

I know of no man in this House or in any other body who has stood closer to his people back home than has our Speaker. We all love him and we all admire him. He is one of us and we all hope and pray that he may live to be 110. Of course, we all want to be there with him on that day.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be privileged to join with others in paying tribute to a great man who has exercised and is now exercising a stabilizing influence in these turbulent times through which the country is passing. The friendship which the occupant of the chair gives those in whom he has confidence is the kind of solder that holds human society together. The solidity of his character, the rightness of his perspective, the soundness of his judgment, his ability to hold the scales with equal justice as between contending forces, make him a very extraordinary man. I have tested every piece of timber used in the structure of this great American, and I know every piece is sound and unyielding to the corroding influences of selfishness and greed.

It is my prayer that he shall have the continued guidance of the Good Master.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to join my distinguished colleagues congratulating my friend SAM RAYBURN on attaining his sixty-eighth birth date. It has also been my honor and privilege to serve in the same State delegation with the Speaker for nearly 22 years. It happens that my district adjoins his in Texas. Long before I came here I knew of the great record made by my neighbor from Bonham in the House since he entered this Chamber as a Member on March 4, 1913.

When I came to the House as a new Member in 1929, SAM RAYBURN gave me advice I have treasured ever since. He said when a man entered Congress he had to serve two constituencies. The first being his constituents in his district and the second the constituents in the House. By the latter he meant that one had to get along with his colleagues in order to be effective in the Chamber and for his constituency at home. The second point was that accomplishments are achieved through party loyalty. That is, that by adhering to party principles, insofar as conscience and pledges permit, accomplishments are achieved.

We all know the Speaker's spirit of fair play, his love of service, his great ability to lead, his friendliness, loyalty, and personality; his alertness, strength of character, tolerance, and modesty combine to make him the great character of American legislative history for which he is renowned.

My personal wish is that for years to come that the Speaker celebrates his birthday anniversary in the chair he now occupies.

I know I express the feelings of untold millions of Texans and people from other States when I wish our beloved Speaker great happiness in public service and personal life on this day and all the days to come.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege of expressing my affection and regard and respect for a friend of many years and in joining with my colleagues in this richly deserved tribute to our distinguished Speaker.

One of the chief rewards of membership in this body is the friendships which we enjoy, even though our highly intelligent constituents back home are sometimes puzzled to find that party lines and loyalties do not interfere in any degree with our personal friendships.

I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to thank you for your friendship, which has been a guiding star to me for 25 years; for your helpful words of advice and counsel; and for the splendid example you have set me and all of us in your fine Americanism. I pray God that you may have many years of blessedness and happiness. While I do not join with wild enthusiasm in the hope expressed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], that you will occupy your present position indefinitely, whether you are on the throne or down among us common people, I am going to love you with all my heart and thank God for you every day.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker—

Speakers may come, and Speakers may go,
But there's one thing of which I am sure:
None have been better nor more beloved
Than the one who found his place in our hearts,
And who will always have his place in the sun;
Of course, I do not have to say that I mean SAM RAYBURN.

He rides herd here like he does in Texas,
And as he goes down the trail and passes one who vexes,
Playfully he clips him on the hip with his whip,
And no one dares give him any lip.

Speaking for 435 Members in fantasia,
We all hope to be back with him next January;
But come what may, this is his day,
And we today, and always, will
Wish SAM RAYBURN a happy birthday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REDDEN].

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, I heartily concur in all that has been said about the fine statesman who is our Speaker. I rise principally to keep the record straight. North Carolina does not claim all the great men who have occupied the chair of this House, but since we do claim that many great men emanate from that State, I should like to refresh the memory of some of those here today to say that Tennessee was formed from North Carolina and consequently the Speaker emanated from that great State.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, Speaker RAYBURN is a man concerning whom the simple truth is the highest encomium, a man who enjoys the esteem, the friendship, the confidence, and the affectionate regard of every Member of this House, a great statesman, a great Speaker, a great American, a truly great man.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, as the senior Member from the State of New York I, too, offer my felicitations to our worthy and honored Speaker. I am sure what I say is an expression of all the members of the New York delegation.

I have served with the Speaker for a very long period of time. I have served with him for almost 28 years. During that period I have come to have an affectionate regard for him and an appreciation of his sturdiness and worthwhileness as a Member of this House.

May divine providence ever endow him with good health and happiness. During the long time that I have served with him I have had occasion to watch him—his hand has never faltered, particularly in handling the gavel. Ever alert, ever prudent, ever humane, he has given us indeed a wise and sagacious leadership. He is a statesman of high caliber. He is indeed a tower of strength in our legislative branch.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, today is the birthday of our distinguished and beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN. He has been Speaker longer than anyone else who ever held the position. It is our hope that he will continue as our Speaker for many, many more years, so that no one will ever equal his years of service in this position. We know that the House never has been and never will be presided over by a more capable, understanding, or fair-minded person than SAM RAYBURN.

Again, happy birthday to our Speaker.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with so many others in this House today in wishing you a happy birthday. Few men in life have been accorded the honor and have had the privilege of rendering public service to the extent that you have. To state that your success has been phenomenal is to state something that everybody in the country knows.

But we who have associated with you in this House for many years have come to know you better and more intimately than most other Americans, and we have learned to appreciate the fine qualities of statesmanship and leadership which you possess. Qualities which have carried you to the pinnacle of fame and which have made for you an enduring place in history. You have held the Speakership in this august body during one of the most trying times in American history. We all wish for you continued health, happiness, and success, and may God guide you as you continue to fill such a high place in the destinies of this Nation.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I would not be true to my inner feelings if I did not join with the others in congratulating you, our distinguished Speaker, on this your natal day.

I came to Congress many years ago and even then SAM RAYBURN was a common name in Congress. He was respected, admired, and loved by all who served with him. I soon became acquainted with him and joined the general procession of admirers and friends.

I am a Republican from the Canadian border and SAM RAYBURN is a Democrat from the Mexican border. There is no Mason and Dixon's line so far as we are concerned. We do not always agree, but when I cannot agree with the Speaker I sometimes begin to doubt as to the correctness of my position. The Speaker is a tolerant man. He does not assume to be a Solomon in wisdom, and he does and can disagree without being disagreeable. In all my life I have never come in contact with a man whom I thought tried harder to be fair and just in his dealings with his fellow man and in wielding the great power that is his as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of party affiliations, we like you and wish you well down through the years that are to come.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr Speaker, I just wish to add a few words to the many eulogies you are receiving, this day, from your colleagues in the House, in observance of your birthday. I sincerely believe that you truly desire to see an actual era of peace on earth and good will toward men, and that you will continue to work, to the best of your ability, to help bring it about. Your influence in this respect is great.

I think that you are inherently just, fair, and tolerant. You possess great intelligence and bigness of heart, as well. You are, in my judgment, a good man as well as a great one. I think it is very probable that you will live in history as the greatest Speaker the United States House of Representatives has had. You most certainly are among the greatest.

It is an inspiration to watch, almost daily, your staying on the job and patiently working out intricate and knotty problems in behalf of better government and in high service to our great Nation. May God bless you and keep you in robust health for many years to come.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. It has been an inspiration, certainly strengthening to one's faith in our American democracy, to be here today and listen to the tributes which have come from both sides of the aisle to the stature and the character of the distinguished gentleman from Texas who is our beloved and respected Speaker. My colleagues, both Democratic and Republican, who have served with him in this Chamber for years running into the decades, have spoken of him in the language of real affection and have testified to his tolerance and his fairness under all circumstances and under the stress of all demands upon his understanding and his patience.

I can speak, and with deference to those in much seniority to whom happy fortune has given the richness of long association with our Speaker, merely as one who came to serve with and under him but 1 year ago. I know that I speak the sentiment of all my colleagues of the "class of 1949" when I say that no one in all the world could have made us feel more at home than did Speaker SAM RAYBURN, and on this glad anniversay of his birth we would wish him to know how our hearts are overfilled with appreciation of all that he has done, in his graciousness, his kindliness, and his human understanding to help us, the newcomers, fit into this pattern of democracy in function which in its highest expression is presented by the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, the observance of Speaker SAM RAYBURN'S birthday is an event participated in by Members of Congress, individually and collectively. In this, we are joined by his people in Texas and by his countless friends and admirers all over this land of ours. We hear well-deserved tributes to his leadership, his statesmanlike conduct, his broad vision, and many other traits of high character.

As I listen to all of these appropriate evidences of the high regard of his fellow men, my mind keeps going back to the days when I first came to Congress as a very young man and one wholly unschooled in the affairs of Washington. The Speaker, even in those days, was recognized as a leader. Certainly, he was one to whom a young man would instinctively turn for advice. The habit of going to him with my problems has continued through the years even during the time when I was not a Member of this body. He has patiently listened in every instance and has invariably given me thoughtful counsel, oftentimes guiding my steps along wise paths where they might not otherwise have gone.

I have watched this generous characteristic of his in the case of a great many other young Members of Congress. I believe that what has happened to me has happened to hundreds of others, and I have no doubt that many a public career has gone on to great heights because of the guidance, in early stages, of Speaker RAYBURN, who is always anxious to push younger Members to the front, to give them responsibilities, and to use their abilities to the fullest possible extent.

He has a God-given knack of imparting knowledge, and he has a completely unselfish desire to share his own great store with those of us who seek it.

These are the traits which remain uppermost in my mind when I think of our beloved Speaker. These are the traits which, I believe, make him one of the great men of our day and of the Nation.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, may I as the newest Member of the delegation from Texas add my word of congratulations and best wishes to Speaker RAYBURN on this, his birthday.

During the short time I have been here, it has meant much to me to have known Mr. RAYBURN and to have had the benefit of his generous friendship, his kindly and considerate advice, and his great and inspiring leadership.

In the district which I am privileged to represent we honor SAM RAYBURN as a noble Texan and a great American. I am sure the people of the Tenth District would want me to express for them the wish for many happy birthdays and a continuation of his great service in their behalf and in behalf of the people of this Nation and of the world.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, permit me to join with my colleagues in extending to you my heartiest congratulations and best wishes on your birthday. I know that Members are grateful for this opportunity to offer you our felicitations on your birthday because we admire and esteem you greatly—our distinguished Speaker.

I am sure I will not detract from the natural pride with which the great State of Texas holds one of her most distinguished sons when I point out to my colleagues that my own great State of Tennessee considers Speaker RAYBURN as one of her own. We in Tennessee are proud that our State gave this great and polished statesman, legislator, and parliamentarian to Texas and the Nation. Speaker RAYBURN had the good fortune to be born in Roane County, Tenn., in the majestic hills of the Cumberland Mountain chain. While it was fate's inscrutable verdict that he should live most of his life on the vast plains and sweeping ranges of Texas, we in Tennessee like to feel that he has taken with him something of the towering strength and wisdom of our hills—his native heath. And to that extent we hold great pride of possession toward this great Texan.

On your birthday anniversary, Mr. Speaker, from the people of my district, the Fifth District of Tennessee, who hold you in high esteem, and from myself personally, I wish to extend to you the sincerest felicitations of the day.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, it is not possible to pay adequate tribute to the man whom we honor today. Yet, I cannot refrain from joining with other friends in extending greetings and congratulations to Speaker SAM RAYBURN upon this occasion of his birthday. Moreover, in my capacity as a friend of the Speaker and as a Representative from Texas, I want to thank the House for the tribute which is being paid our distinguished friend from Texas today. The Speaker has made a wonderful record which has made its imprint upon national and international affairs and we cannot add to or detract from it today. For more than 34 years he has been an inspiration to those who have served with him in this body. Members in the House from Texas are especially indebted to the Speaker. His wise leadership and his friendly counsel and advice have been invaluable to us through the years.

Mr. Speaker, may you have many more happy birthdays and may the blessings of heaven be upon you all the days of your life.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the fine people of my district would want to join me in expressing to you every good wish on this, your birthday anniversary. We wish for you all of the rich rewards to which your life of service has so eminently entitled you.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, as I came into this Chamber a little while ago, I noticed the House was in a gaysome mood. I learned that this is the birthday of our beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN; and naturally, we Members wanted to have something to say on this occasion.

SAM RAYBURN comes from that portion of Texas which is very near to the borders of the State of Louisiana. He lives on the banks of the same river—the Red River—which truantly passes the doors of my own home city of Shreveport, La. We people of Louisiana feel that we have much in common with our beloved Speaker. We know a lot about him and what we know is all to the good. As a neighbor, we have the habit of rising on occasions such as to pay tribute to the character and personality of this great American, who presides over this House with great firmness and with gentle dignity.

Mr. Speaker, several years ago, I had occasion to visit the home of SAM RAYBURN, at Bonham, Tex. It is located on the plains of this great State near the city of Bonham, Tex. It is a home sturdily built, intended to last a long time, and with heavy colonial columns in front of it. Inside, there is all of the warmth and welcome of a typical Texas home. Somehow, the home place with its strength and character on the outside, and on the inside the warmth and mellowness of the home, which is typical of the Southwest, impressed me as portraying the character and personality of our Speaker.

Serving as he has as Speaker for many years, SAM RAYBURN has shown both courage and kindness in handling the affairs of the Nation. In Washington, he has carried on the traditions of the Alamo, meeting opposition with a fierce courage and yet with fairness and impartiality. At the same time, he has brought to Washington a new standard of geniality and hospitality with a strong touch of the great Southwest to light the drab life of an otherwise blasé Washington. America and the world have learned to know him and to accept him as the great leader which he is in pointing the way to the dawn of a new day in the affairs of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, we honor you on this your natal day; and wish you many, many happy returns of this occasion.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to join in paying tribute to our friend and distinguished colleague and Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, on the occasion of his sixty-eighth birthday.

We of the Texas delegation are proud not only of this personal honor which has come to him in recognition of his outstanding service and qualities of leadership, but also of the honor to our great State of Texas.

We Texans who are privileged to serve in Congress with SAM RAYBURN have for him a warm affection and high esteem.

Let me wish for him many years more of the enjoyment of the true blessings of life to be found in good health, true and warm friendships, and the respect and admiration of one's fellow men.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the Speakership of the House of Representatives occupies a unique position in the Constitution of the United States and in the history of our country. The long line of able and distinguished men who have occupied that high position have exerted a more profound influence in the development of our form of government and on legislative and administrative procedures thereunder, and their contribution to the progress of the country and the welfare of our people than any other group of men with the single exception possibly of the Presidents of the United States.

As a matter of fact, the Speakership has exercised such extraordinary power that, under one Speaker at least, the President of the United States had to come hat in hand to the Speaker, in order to secure consideration of any legislation in which he was interested or which he might advocate.

The result of the election in 1910 pivoted solely upon the functions and prerogatives of the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and when the Democratic Party came into power with the Sixty-second Congress again the Speakership, its powers and administrations and prerogatives, was an important and determining factor in the election and the campaign preceding it.

But in the discussion here this morning complimentary to our Speaker, one fact was not mentioned which impresses me as constituting the most outstanding feature in his career and in the history of the Speakership itself. For many years the Speakership of Henry Clay has been the high light in length of incumbency in the Speaker's chair. Henry Clay resigned, I think, four times and was reelected four times; he is the only man ever to be elected Speaker on the first day he served in the House; but in the aggregate he served longer than any other Speaker in the history of the American Congress.

With the close of this session of Congress, Speaker RAYBURN will have broken that record and will have served in that eminent and influential position longer than any other man has ever served in the history of the Nation.

Furthermore, he has served through one of the most critical periods in American history. Probably no man has occupied the Speaker's chair during a period more significant, more fraught with peril to the Nation, during a period in which greater growth and progress was made in power and importance, both at home and abroad, so far as the American Republic is concerned than has our present Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, of Texas. He stands today at the pinnacle, both in length of service and in the significance of the time in which he has served and in service rendered his people. His term and magnitude of service is outstanding when measured by that of any of his predecessors since Speaker Muhlenberg first occupied the chair in 1789.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, respecting the fact that you might have wished to enjoin us from these public manifestations of our respect and esteem for you, although fortunately for us under the rules you cannot, I shall take up no more time, in order to relieve you from the position of being in the chair while a recipient of these utterances of respect for you.

The SPEAKER. From the bottom of a grateful heart, I thank you.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

THE LATE EWIN LAMAR DAVIS, OF TENNESSEE, DEVOTED HIMSELF TO A LIFE OF PUBLIC SERVICE AS JUDGE, CONGRESSMAN, AND FEDERAL ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, on this day we are happy to observe the birthday of our beloved Speaker, but it is with mixed emotion that I report the passing of a former Member of the House, one who served in Congress for 18 years.

During the adjournment of the last session of the Congress—on October 23, 1949—Tennessee lost one of her distinguished sons and the Nation an able and devoted public servant. I refer to the passing of my friend and predecessor in Congress from the Fifth District, Judge Ewin L. Davis, of Tennessee. Judge Davis was a member of the Federal Trade Commission at the time of his death and for 18 years was a Member of this distinguished body.

The passing of Judge Davis followed a long illness and interrupted with tragic untimeliness one of the most distinguished careers of devoted public service that this Nation has produced.

At the time of his passing, Judge Davis—as he was known throughout his career because of his service, while still a young man, as judge of the Seventh Judicial Circuit of Tennessee—was in his third term as a member of the Federal Trade Commission. He was originally appointed to the Commission by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1933 shortly after that great statesman entered upon his duties as Chief Executive. President Roosevelt subsequently honored him once again by reappointment to this high post. President Truman, recognized, as did his predecessor, the sterling qualities and abilities of this distinguished Tennessean by calling upon him in 1946 to serve for a third 7-year term on the Commission.

Judge Ewin Lamar Davis was born in Bedford County, Tenn., February 5, 1876, one of a number of distinguished sons of Maclin H. Davis and Christina Shoffner Davis. Among his able and distinguished brothers was the late Norman H. Davis, one time Ambassador and chairman of the American Red Cross.

Judge Davis attended that fine old educational institution, Webb School at Bell Buckle, Tenn., and was graduated from Vanderbilt University at Nashville. He obtained his law degree from Columbian University, now known as George Washington University here in Washington.

Judge Davis started his career in public life in the city of Tullahoma, Coffee County, in the Fifth District of Tennessee, as an attorney. The rare qualities which make for unique and exceptional stature in public life and with which he was natively endowed came quickly to the forefront as he entered upon his law career and he was soon elected to the bench of the Seventh Judicial Circuit of Tennessee where he served from 1910 to 1918. In 1918 he was honored with election as Representative to Congress from the Fifth District of Tennessee. In Congress, Judge Davis served for a number of years as a member of the Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries Committee and as chairman of that committee during the Seventy-second Congress. He was also a member of other important committees of this body.

When, upon the request of President Roosevelt, Judge Davis entered upon a new career in administrative service, he brought to a close 18 years of able and productive years as a Member of Congress.

In 1946, George Washington University conferred upon him its alumni achievement award for notable attainment in the field of law. During the course of World War II, Judge Davis was presented with an award and medal for patriotic service in war finance during the years 1941–45 by the United States Department of the Treasury.

During the 18 years in which he represented the fifth district of Tennessee in Congress, Judge Davis' interests were devoted not only to his home district, but to the entire country in a high purpose of service to our country. I have often been told by older Members of this body that he held the affection of his colleagues and their high admiration—this regard having been earned by his own lovable nature, his probity and his brilliant energies.

In the FTC he became respected for his vigorous insistence upon the enforcement of antitrust laws and in the maintenance of free and fair competition in business and industry. Throughout his life, on the bench, in Congress, and as commissioner, he maintained an interest in young lawyers and their growth and development.

If I may have the indulgence of this body, I should like to speak in a personal vein about this man to whose memory we are pleased to pay tribute today. I was highly privileged, not many years after I had completed my law studies, to become a member of the staff of the Federal Trade Commission. Although I had

known Judge Davis for many years of my life, it was in this capacity that I came to know fully the measure of this man. He was a tower of strength as a member of this great Commission. He served as chairman of the Commission three times. His judicial impartiality, his integrity, his friendliness and interest in the affairs of all who were employed by the Commission made him beloved and respected by all who knew him.

It was my sad privilege to join with hundreds of other Tennesseans when Judge Davis was laid to rest in the soil of his beloved native section of middle Tennessee and it came to my mind that this deep and sincere outpouring of friendship and admiration, which came so deeply and spontaneously from the hearts of his multitude of friends in Tennessee was a fitting manifestation of the devotion in which the judge was held by the people whom he had served so ably and with such distinction for so many years.

The memory of Judge Davis—jurist, legislator, administrator, will be cherished by all of his friends.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a brief biographical summary of the career of Judge Ewin Lamar Davis:

Ewin Lamar Davis, of Tennessee; member of the Federal Trade Commission, Washington; born, Bedford County, Tenn., February 5, 1876; educated in various schools, including the famous Webb School and Vanderbilt University; graduated from Columbian (now George Washington) University Law School in 1899 with degree of bachelor of laws; began active practice of law in 1899; married Carolyn Windsor, of Americus, Ga., in 1898, and has five children; Presidential elector in 1904; judge of the seventh judicial circuit of Tennessee (nine counties), 1910–18; chairman of the district exemption board for the middle district of Tennessee, 1917–18; elected to the Sixty-sixth, Sixty-seventh, Sixty-eighth, Sixty-ninth, Seventieth, Seventy-first, and Seventy-second Congresses of the United States, 1919 to 1933; chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio and Fisheries during Seventy-second Congress; appointed by President Roosevelt as a member of the Federal Trade Commission, May 23, 1933, for term ending September 25, 1939; promptly confirmed by Senate and entered on duty May 26, 1933; reappointed by President Roosevelt, July 14, 1939, and promptly and unanimously confirmed by the Senate for term commencing September 26, 1939, and ending September 25, 1946; reappointed by President Truman, July 23, 1946, and unanimously confirmed by the Senate the next day, for term commencing September 26, 1946, and ending September 25, 1953; Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, 1935, 1940, and 1945; member of National Emergency Council, 1935; member of American National Committee, Third World Power Conference, 1936; alternate member, Temporary National Economic Committee, 1938–41, Democrat; member of bar, all courts of Tennessee, District of Columbia, and United States Supreme Court; American, District of Columbia, Federal, and George Washington Bar Association; received the George Washington University Alumni achievement award for notable achievement in law, 1945; Phi Delta Phi Legal Fraternity, Alpha Tau Omega Fraternity; Mason (thirty-second degree); legal residence, Tullahoma, Tenn.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I served in this body during the time that Judge Davis was a Member. I soon learned to love and appreciate him as a sweet, gentle, and fine man. He was clean and wholesome. He was strong in character, loving and sympathetic in his relationships, and a credit to his State and to this body. He was a great soul, and I join with others in grieving his passing.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the eulogy just rendered by my friend from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] is not only a splendid one but a deserving one in relation to Judge Davis, one of the outstanding Members of the House during his long years of devoted and faithful service in the Congress of the United States.

It was only a few months ago that I saw Judge Davis when he visited me in my office. It is with deep regret that I heard of his death, which is a personal loss to me.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the dean of the Tennessee delegation.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I heartily concur in the great tribute paid our distinguished Speaker on this occasion in conveying congratulations and felicitations on his birthday and wishing for him many years of continued happiness in public service.

I am also glad to have this opportunity to join with my colleague from Tennessee and others in paying brief but sincere tribute to the life, character, and public service of our warm friend and former colleague, Judge Ewin L. Davis, of Tennessee.

I attended his funeral services at his home in Washington a few days after the adjournment of the last session of Congress. It was my privilege to share the friendship of Judge Davis for many years and to serve with him as a Member of this body. He was a man who possessed the highest tributes of Christian character and all of the sterling qualities of manhood; a man who had a great and distinguished record as a lawyer, judge, and statesman. I join with others in conveying sincere sympathy to the members of his bereaved family.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to my colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I also concur in all of the statements that have been made about Judge Davis. I never had the opportunity of serving with him in the House. I knew him well as a very able Representative of a great district in Tennessee.

During the time I have served as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Judge Davis appeared many times before that committee when legislation affecting the Federal Trade Commission was before the committee. I do not believe I know of any other person whom I consider more devoted to the public interest than Judge Ewin L. Davis.

I join with others who mourn his passing and in extending sympathy to his family.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, the passing of the late Ewin L. Davis took from the active stage of life a man whose life had been remarkably singularly devoted to the public welfare.

The late Honorable Ewin L. Davis served well his community, his family, his State, his Nation, mankind. I believe the earth is better because of his life. This, I believe, was the aim of his life.

It was my sad duty to attend his funeral in Tennessee, but my heart was warmed to see the outpouring of distinguished citizenry to mourn his passing and do honor to his memory. It is now my honor and privilege to join in the great tributes that have already been given this worthy, distinguished, and honored citizen, whose passing we now mourn.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, someone has said that "An honest man is the noblest work of God."

Never have I met a man in all my career for whose integrity I had a higher regard than I did for that of Ewin L. Davis, of Tennessee.

I not only served with him in the House, but I lived next door to him many years in the same apartment building and was well acquainted with his noble wife and his lovely daughters. I can safely say that Tennessee or any other State has never sent to this body a finer character, a man who lived more thoroughly and consciously by the standards of rectitude that should guide us all than this great man who served the State of Tennessee so well in this body and on the Federal Trade Commission.

His name will live long in the history of his State, and the principles for which he stood will live—

Till the sun grows cold,
And the stars are old,
And the leaves of the Judgment Book unfold.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life, character, and public service of Ewin L. Davis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, you Members of the House who served with Judge Ewin L. Davis knew his great ability as a legislator and his loyal de-

votion to the great principles in which he believed.

I knew Judge Davis best as a Tennessean and as a friend who was loyal and devoted, and was honored and esteemed by all who knew him. He was a Tennessean of whom we were all proud.

Judge Davis had a long and distinguished career in each of the branches of our Government. He was elected judge of the seventh judicial circuit of Tennessee in 1918, when quite a young man and served with distinction as a judge in this circuit for 16 years. Later, he was elected to Congress from the Fifth District of Tennessee, which district he served for 18 years.

Judge Davis had a distinctive record in Congress and was known as being the author of the Radio Act of 1925, and much other important legislation.

It is rare that a public official has the privilege of serving in the three great branches of our Government. In addition to serving in Congress and on the bench, he served for a number of years as member of the Federal Trade Commission.

In the passing of Judge Davis, Tennessee has lost a beloved son and the Nation a valuable public servant.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, our Nation mourns the loss of a great American, a distinguished statesman, a learned jurist, an able legislator and an exemplary Christian citizen in the death of Judge E. L. Davis, of Tennessee. He served the judiciary of Tennessee with honor and credit and was a member of the House of Representatives in the United States Congress where he served with great distinction prior to his appointment as a member of the Federal Trade Commission where he rendered outstanding service until his passing away.

Our State of Tennessee was justly proud of his record. He was a faithful, conscientious, industrious public servant. It was my pleasure and privilege to know Judge Davis for many years and my association with him was delightful and inspiring. His constructive record in life will stand as a lasting monument to his memory. We have truly lost one of God's noblemen in the departure of Judge Davis.

ECONOMIC REPORT TO THE CONGRESS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 388)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., January 6, 1950.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

The honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am presenting herewith my Economic Report to the Congress, as required under the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report, I have had the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers, members of the Cabinet, and heads of independent agencies.

Together with this report, I am transmitting a report, the Annual Economic Review: January 1950, prepared for me by the Council of Economic Advisers in accordance with section 4 (c) (2) of the Employment Act of 1946.

Respectfully,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will the gentleman tell us what is on the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. The budget message will be sent up here on Monday. There is no further legislative business for next week. If this unanimous consent request is granted I expect to ask unanimous consent for adjournments next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday next it adjourn to meet on the following Thursday, and that when it adjourns on that Thursday it adjourn to meet on the following Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts tell us what the program will be for the following week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to state that now. That depends mainly on what the gentleman's committee does in cooperation with his leadership in getting rules out.

Mr. COLMER. Of course, the gentleman who reserved the right to object does not control that situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand that, but the gentleman is a member of that committee. It will depend on what rules come out next week.

Mr. COLMER. May I ask if the distinguished majority leader will not defer the last part of his request until next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Why, there is no business next week. All I am asking is that we adjourn until Thursday and from Thursday to Monday.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman anticipates the House will meet on Thursday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, we have to.

Mr. COLMER. All I am asking the gentleman is that he withhold his unanimous-consent request from Thursday to Monday until we meet on Thursday of next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Do I understand the gentleman would like me to withhold the request so far as adjourning from Thursday until the following Monday is concerned?

Mr. COLMER. I am asking the gentleman to withhold that particular request until Thursday next.

Mr. McCORMACK. Why, of course. If the gentleman asks me or if any Member asks me to do that, I would be glad to do it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Hon. Oscar Ewing.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in Harper's magazine. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $410, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MONRONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Post on the death of Sir Willmott Lewis.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two statements.

Mr. LINEHAN (at the request of Mr. O'HARA of Illinois) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD paying tribute to the memory of the late Honorable Martin Gorski.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a broadcast delivered by Mr. Herbert Gaston.

Mr. TAURIELLO (at the request of Mr. McGUIRE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by Michael Joseph, editor, Labor Beacon.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks

in the RECORD and include an address delivered by him.

Mr. STEED asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by Gov. M. S. Szymczak, Federal Reserve Board, delivered on December 9, notwithstanding the fact that it may exceed the cost stipulated under the rule.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. LYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. KEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the permanent RECORD of the last session of Congress reflects that I was absent on roll call No. 19—a quorum call—on February 21, 1949. This is in error. The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that I was present and answered to my name on each and every roll call of the session.

This error was not discovered until my voting record, as supplied by the Clerk of the House, was delivered to my office a few weeks ago and after final adjournment.

The permanent RECORD having been printed and realizing it is now too late to correct same, I have requested an opportunity to make this statement so that this record might reflect that the aforesaid RECORD is in error and that I was present and so answered when my name was called on roll call No. 19 on February 21, 1949.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each a newspaper article.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in regard to war claims.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in regard to the late Martin Gorski.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RICH (at the request of Mr. JENSEN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three editorials.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in one to include a memorial address delivered by Representative DOLLIVER to the Elks at their annual memorial services at Rapid City, S. Dak., the second extension being an appreciation of the service of the late George Bates, of Massachusetts.

Mr. COLE of New York (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each a statement and an editorial.

Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in one to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an essay by a student from Glidden, Iowa.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each an editorial.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. Walter Johnson, of Heathsville, Va.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a highly appreciated speech that was made by a young high-school student in a radio broadcast at a Lions Club program in my district on the subject of democracy in social science, the name of the young lady being Miss Sally Jo Wade; and in the other to include a talk by a fine young high-school student by the name of Miss Nona Dalton on the subject of democracy in the student council.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

TRAGIC SITUATION IN COAL INDUSTRY

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of the tragic situation in the coal industry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the President or Congress to act in the coal strike. Right now John L. Lewis is more powerful than the Government of the United States. Mr. Truman says there is no emergency. Can this be true when the Government orders a one-third slash in service on coal-burning railroads? Can it be true when surveys of coal supplies in my district show that there is only enough coal available in coal yards to supply needs for a few days in the event of severe winter weather? In one of my large industrial cities—Janesville—I am informed the hospital has a 1-week supply of coal on hand, that manufacturers and public institutions are going along on a hand-to-mouth daily basis. Then there is the coal that is used for heating homes and millions of consumers will feel the pinch when severe winter weather sets in. All of the States in the north will be affected. Yet, the President says there is no emergency.

Mr. Speaker, no one in this Nation will escape the crisis in coal under the dictatorship of John L. Lewis who is exercising a monopolistic control over this vital commodity. Lewis has a stranglehold on the jugular vein of our economy. He is ruthless in his decree that the miners who are in his union can work only 3 days a week. It amounts to a criminal offense against the public interest. This is a situation that calls for action by Congress in view of the President's refusal to act.

Mr. Speaker, it is reported that there is about a 40-day supply of coal on hand—too little for safety. This is a conspiracy against the public and it is time that Congress started an investigation with John L. Lewis as the first witness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes to discuss the agricultural state of the Union in general and the oleo situation in particular.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, following any special orders heretofore granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALLEN of California asked and was given permission to extend his re-

marks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include some resolutions and other extraneous matter.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the very serious and critical coal situation affecting Mount Vernon, Ill., and the Twenty-fourth Congressional District of Illinois.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following the reading of the message of the President, and after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk, and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 15 minutes, to discuss the budget.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in two instances to include editorials.

1950 COTTON ALLOTMENTS

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper item.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, the cotton farmers and producers of our Nation find themselves faced with a most serious situation with respect to their planting and crop for the coming season.

Planting time will soon be upon them, and confusion, misunderstanding, and rank discriminations are coming to the attention of most every Member of Congress and particularly to those from cotton-growing areas.

No section, county, or State is without inequities, uncertainties, and confusion.

Most all of this has been brought about by a series of laws, directives, interpretations, and the jockeying about by various individuals and organizations seeking the age-old custom of self-preservation to the point, in many instances, of utter selfishness.

Obviously, this situation needs and demands the immediate consideration of the Congress to the end that the air may be cleared, the confusion eliminated, and the Department of Agriculture have a definite, foolproof, simplified formula to proceed on for the 1950 season which is fair and equitable to every cotton planter in the Nation and would not adversely affect the economy of any community, county, or State that depends on the growing of cotton for their livelihood.

Fortunately, when a calamity hits our country a man rises to the occasion to point the way, not as Mark Twain said about the weather—people talk about it but never do anything about it.

This crisis in the cotton situation is answered by the plan outlined by my good friend, George B. Hall, of Pecos, Tex., which is submitted for the RECORD, and which was presented to the Secretary of Agriculture some 3 weeks ago, and so far as I know the Secretary has not offered an objection to it.

It should simplify the whole matter, permit deserving veterans to stay on their farms, to which they have but recently returned, and save thousands of deserving farmers from bankruptcy with which they are now faced, with the multiple conflicting laws and regulations respecting this year's planting, and, I repeat, this simple formula would be fair to all; no one could possibly be hurt, no slick operator would have a distinct and wholly selfish advantage, and our 1950 cotton crop would be held well within demand.

(The newspaper item is as follows:)

PECOS MAN OFFERS SOLUTION TO COTTON ALLOTMENT QUARREL

PECOS.—George B. Hall, Pecos, believes he has the solution to the cotton-allotment program which is causing many farmers, especially those who first produced cotton in 1949, so much worry.

In a letter addressed to Charles B. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, released to the press, Hall gives a 10-point program of how the cotton-acreage program can be handled.

Copies of the letter were sent to the Senators and Congressmen from Texas and the press.

In a meeting of some 50 farmers and businessmen here last week, Congressman KEN REGAN promised he would do his best to get the Department of Agriculture to help those farmers whose allotments had been severely slashed. Since that time, REGAN has made an appeal to the Department and to members of the House Agriculture Committee for changes.

In the meantime, Congressman BOB POAGE, Waco, a members of the Agriculture Committee, has said he will attempt to get changes made in the law. Senator TOM CONNALLY, visiting in Marlin, said Tuesday, "There is hope the Agriculture Department will do something about the cotton allotments."

LETTER FOLLOWS

Hall's letter to the Secretary of Agriculture follows in part:

"During the past 12 months there has been much weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth among farmers, Congressmen, Senators, and all connected with the cotton industry in regard to the cotton-acreage control. Now that allotments have been announced, turmoil is even worse. There are certain facts that we should face fairly and squarely with open minds and lack of selfishness. I offer a 10-point program which is fair to everyone connected with the cotton industry and that will solve the cotton-reduction program as well as get Production and Marketing Administration out of a ticklish situation.

"First. We must admit the present plan of cotton allotment, as interpreted by the Department of Agriculture, is unfair, discriminating, and unworkable.

"Second. We much recognize that the bill was made to pacify certain selfish whims and must be revised. There is nothing reasonable in giving one farm a 1950 allotment of only 7 percent of the acres planted in 1949, while other farms will receive more than planted in 1949."

ACREAGE MONOPOLY

"Third. We must recognize that any locality or section which tries to monopolize future cotton acreage is acting as a restraint of trade and should be dealt with as any other monopolistic tactic.

"Fourth. We must recognize that Public Law 12, as applied, completely unbalances the natural trend of cotton production and must be repealed. Farmers grew the supposedly called war crops because it was economical to grow them and for no other reason.

"Fifth. 1949 is the only true barometer of cotton production trends. All sections where it is economical and logical to plant cotton planted it in 1949.

"Sixth. Why not attempt a plan that is simple, fair, and equitable instead of a long, complicated formula which people do not understand and which is loaded with secret clauses and gadgets to get more acres for a given area than is deserving just to satisfy selfish interests.

"Seventh. The only plan that will work without wrecking the economy of some sections, that is fair and equitable to all cotton producers, is a plan based on a percentage reduction of 1949 cotton acres."

WOULD WRECK ECONOMY

"Eighth. The national acreage has been reduced only approximately 23 percent. This reduction, if equally distributed, would wreck the economy of no locality and should be acceptable to all concerned. A simple solution to the complicated affair is to take 1949 acres planted in cotton, allocate 70 percent of the acres planted in cotton in 1949 to the different States, counties, and farms. This would leave 7 percent in the national pool to be allocated to States for hardship cases, farms that normally have grown cotton but were prevented from so doing due to catastrophe, such as drought, hail or storm, and new acres and small farms.

"Ninth. It should be recognized that some sections can grow cotton and cotton only, while there are other sections which can grow other crops just as profitably and successfully as cotton. The economy of these sections which can grow cotton and cotton only should not be wrecked to give acres to sections which will only grow cotton to preserve their acreage allotment.

"Tenth. It must be recognized that something must be done and quickly to prevent disaster to the cotton industry as a whole, and more especially to the individual farmers who are threatened with annihilation. Why not be practical for just this case and expedite legislation early in January as outlined above to alleviate this acute situation?"

1950 COTTON ALLOTMENTS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman has just indicated, the cotton situation is very acute at this time in certain sections of the Nation. I have a letter written by the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, dated January 4, 1950. He says:

I have your letter of December 30, 1949. You request me to have prepared such amendments to the present cotton quota law as will bring it into agreement with the

ideas of the Department of Agriculture. I have come to the conclusion—

And this is the important part—

as you were tentatively informed by me on the telephone that the provisions of the present cotton quota law are so integrated that it is impossible to so change the law by particular amendments as to bring it into accord with the views of the Department.

I have another letter by Mr. Frank Wooley, of the Cotton Division. He says:

We are making a study of the allotment apportionments which have been made for 1950 to farms, but have not formulated as yet any specific recommendations for changes in Public Law 272.

Just the other day I talked at length with Mr. Brannan, the Secretary of Agriculture. I asked him what they proposed to do about this situation, a situation where, for example, in one of my counties we have 1,300 of what is called "new farms" with only a thousand acres to distribute among 1,300 farms. At least 400 farms will likely make a request for acreage. This is a regrettable situation. Something must be done.

Here is what I want to request —whatever is done—that we have a record of the attitude and the feeling of the Department of Agriculture on whatever recommendation comes before the Congress to help correct these inequities. I think it is fair to have this.

I include the two letters referred to in full:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
Washington, D. C., January 4, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I have your letter of December 30, 1949. You request me to have prepared such amendments to the present cotton quota law as will bring it into agreement with the ideas of the Department.

I have come to the conclusion, as you were tentatively informed by me on the telephone, that the provisions of the present cotton quota law are so integrated that it is impossible to so change the law by particular amendments as to bring it into accord with the views of the Department.

The Department's views as to cotton marketing quotas were presented in two drafts of legislation for consideration prior to the passage of the present cotton quota law. I enclose these drafts for your consideration.

There is, of course, to be considered the extremely important question of the advisability of undertaking completely to rewrite the law so as to make it applicable to the 1950 crop of cotton. The administration of the present law has reached such a stage that an entirely new approach would cause great confusion.

Sincerely,

W. CARROLL HUNTER, *Solicitor*

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 4, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your telephone request of December 29, 1949, to Mr. Wilson C. Tucker of the Cotton Branch, relative to the Department's recommendations made to the Eighty-first Congress concerning cotton acreage allotments and marketing quotas, present recommendations pertaining to Public Law 272, Eighty-first Congress, and replies to your letters to the Department dealing with cotton allotments for 1950.

The Department's basic recommendations made to the Eighty-first Congress, relative to certain acreage allotments and marketing quotas for 1950 and subsequent years are contained in S. 1971, a bill introduced in the Senate on May 31, 1949, by Senator ELMER THOMAS.

For information concerning the Department's recommendations relative to Public Law 272, Eighty-first Congress, we refer you to the following:

1. Hearings before the Committee on Agriculture and the Special Cotton Subcommittee, House of Representatives, Eighty-first Congress, first session, January 7, 11, 12, 13, 15, 19, 25, 26, 28, 31, and February 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, and 11, 1949, serial E.

2. Hearings before a subcommittee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate, Eighty-first Congress, first session, on S. 1962 held on June 14, 15, 22, and 27, 1949.

3. Hearings before the Special Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Eighty-first Congress, on H. R. 5392, on June 29, 30, and July 1, 5, 6, 7, and 15, 1949.

We are making a study of the allotment apportionments which have been made for 1950 to farms, but have not formulated as yet any specific recommendation for changes in Public Law 272, Eighty-first Congress, concerning this matter. During recent weeks representatives of the Production and Marketing Administration, particularly the Cotton Branch, have been very hard pressed in formulating the necessary regulations, instructions, forms, and performing field work associated with meeting the December 15, 1949, date, required by law, in connection with cotton allotments for 1950. This legislation, being new in many of its provisions and quite complex in its application, has also resulted in an unusually large number of congressional letters, as well as direct mail from individual farmers. Thus, the replies to mail concerning this subject have been delayed much longer than we would normally expect. We will expedite the handling of all this corespondence, including your letters, as rapidly as possible.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK WOOLLEY,
Deputy Administrator.

SUMMARY

TABLE I.—*1950 cotton crop: State acreage allotment bases, acreage allotments, and acreage reserves*

State	Initial State acreage allotment base [1]	Estimated additional acreage for small allotments [2]	Additional acreage required for minimum State acreage allotment base [3]	Acreage deductions from initial base [4]	State acreage allotment base [5]	1950 State acreage allotment [6]	State acreage reserve established by the State committee	Percent State acreage reserve of State acreage allotment
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	Acres	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Percent*
Alabama	1,666,202	40,930		24,063	1,683,069	1,570,863	106,725	6.8
Arizona	252,066	431		3,640	248,857	232,266	4,645	2.0
Arkansas	2,005,344	17,765	35,541		2,058,650	1,921,405	86,887	4.5
California	580,973	2,940	104,587		688,500	642,599	19,278	3.0
Florida	41,170	3,964		595	44,539	41,570	4,157	10.0
Georgia	1,509,718	23,980		21,803	1,511,895	1,411,100	100,000	7.1
Illinois	4,400	102		64	4,438	4,142	290	7.0
Kansas	161	3		2	162	151	15	9.9
Kentucky	13,554	540		196	13,898	12,972	1,297	10.0
Louisiana	927,776	21,299		13,399	935,676	873,297	87,330	10.0
Mississippi	2,453,629	41,321		35,435	2,459,515	2,295,545	38,082	1.7
Missouri	469,732	3,883	22,285		495,900	462,839	13,437	2.9
Nevada	28		66		94	110		
New Mexico	166,092	1,457	14,521		182,070	169,932	16,993	10.0
North Carolina	720,227	64,983		10,402	774,808	723,153	72,315	10.0
Oklahoma	1,347,482	4,083		19,460	1,332,105	1,243,297	186,495	15.0
South Carolina	1,089,906	24,827		15,741	1,098,992	1,025,725	76,929	7.5
Tennessee	737,382	27,182		10,649	753,915	703,653	70,365	10.0
Texas	8,296,529	5,665		119,654	8,182,540	7,637,029	229,111	3.0
Virginia	26,115	4,639		377	30,377	28,352	2,835	10.0
United States	22,308,486	289,994	177,000	275,480	22,500,000	21,000,000		

[1] 1945–48 average acreage planted or regarded as planted to cotton, except for Oklahoma such average is for the 5-year, 1944–48, period.

[2] Acreage allotted or which would have been allotted had the 4 percent State acreage reserve been sufficient under subsec. 344 (g) (1) and (2) of the 1938 Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, prior to the enactment of Public Law 272, 81st Cong., for establishing allotments under subsec. 344 (d) (1) of such Act.

[3] Larger of 95 percent of the 1947–48 average acreage actually planted to cotton or 85 percent of the acreage actually planted to cotton in 1948 less the sum of the acreages in columns (2) and (3).

[4] Since the United States totals of columns (2), (3), and (4) equals 22,775,480 acres, 275,480 acres were deducted to provide a national acreage allotment base of 22,500,000 acres. Such amount was deducted pro rata on the basis of the initial State acreage allotment bases in column (2) for each State for which the total of columns (2) and (3) exceeds the larger of 95 percent of the 1947–48 average acreage actually planted to cotton or 85 percent of the acreage actually planted to cotton in 1948. On first trial, it was determined that a straight pro rata deduction based on the initial State acreage allotment bases in column (2) would cause the State acreage allotment base for Texas to be less than 95 percent of the 1947–48 average acreage actually planted to cotton. Consequently, the deduction in column (5) was limited to 119,654 acres for that State, thereby causing the State acreage allotment base in column (6) to equal 95 percent of such 1947–48 average acreage. The remaining acreage of 155,826 acres (275,480–119,654) was deducted pro rata from the initial base acreages for other applicable States as follows:

(a) A total was obtained of the initial acreage allotment bases in column (2) for Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee and Virginia. Such total equals 10,789,788 acres.

(b) A deduction factor of 1.44420 percent was obtained by dividing 155,826 by 10,789,788.

(c) The deduction factor was applied to the initial acreage allotment base in column (2) for each State listed in item (a). Such product is shown in column (5) for each of the applicable States.

[5] Sum of column (2), (3) and (4) minus column (5).

[6] Pursuant to section 344 (k) of the act, a minimum 1950 State acreage allotment for Nevada of 110 acres equaling the acreage actually planted to cotton in that State in 1948, which was the largest for the three years, 1946, 1947, and 1948, was established for the State. The remainder of the 1950 national acreage allotment was apportioned to the remainder of the States as follows:

(a) An apportionment factor of 0.9333323 was obtained by dividing 20,999,890 (21,000,000–101) by 22,499,906 (22,500,000—94, which is the State acreage allotment base in column (6) for Nevada).

(b) The apportionment factor was applied to the State acreage allotment base in column (6) for each remaining State. The product is shown in column (7) as the 1950 State acreage allotment.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 4, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Under date of December 19, 1949, Mr. A. J. Loveland, Under Secretary, transmitted to you a table showing the official cotton acreage allotments for the years 1940, 1941, 1942, and 1950 for counties in the State of Texas. A copy of his letter is attached.

There is also attached the same type of information for the cotton-producing counties in the other States for the year 1942 as you had requested of the Secretary's office.

Very truly yours,

JOHN H. DEAN,
Assistant Director.

DECEMBER 19, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This acknowledges your letter of December 2 requesting county cotton acreage allotments for Texas for the years 1940, 1941, 1942, and 1950.

There is attached a tabulation showing the official county acreage allotments for the years requested. It should be noted, however, that these figures do not include the entire acreage allotted to farms in the counties for such years. The additional acreages to be allotted for new farms, for small-farm increases, and for adjustments in small-farm allotments are not shown for 1950, and similar acreages are not shown for the years 1940, 1941, and 1942. The attached data for the respective years, however, are comparable.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. LOVELAND,
Under Secretary.

TABLE II.—*1950 cotton crop: county acreage allotments and reserves and State acreage reserves for adjustments in small farm allotments and for establishing acreage allotments for new cotton farms*

ALABAMA

County	County acreage allotments	Committee acreage reserve
(1)	(2)	(3)
Autauga	14,249	588
Baldwin	1,458	175
Barbour	18,723	494
Bibb	5,996	200
Blount	28,500	350
Bullock	15,910	850
Butler	12,433	1,200
Calhoun	11,472	1,122
Chambers	19,176	500
Cherokee	33,598	1,325
Chilton	13,545	677
Choctaw	6,678	923
Clarke	5,530	600
Clay	8,291	200
Cleburne	7,557	460
Coffee	23,753	3,000
Colbert	31,875	300
Conecuh	12,258	925
Coosa	3,257	489
Covington	20,241	500
Crenshaw	16,552	2,482
Cullman	58,142	1,942
Dale	9,395	1,309
Dallas	36,420	0
De Kalb	51,999	3,000
Elmore	25,617	2,400
Escambia	11,879	1,604
Etowah	21,030	1,944
Fayette	14,324	500
Franklin	22,980	250
Geneva	24,199	1,500
Greene	19,831	200
Hale	21,337	0
Henry	19,206	1,506
Houston	32,808	800
Jackson	39,033	0

TABLE II.—*1950 cotton crop: county acreage allotments and reserves and State acreage reserves for adjustments in small farm allotments and for establishing acreage allotments for new cotton farms*—Con.

ALABAMA—continued

County	County acreage allotments	Committee acreage reserve
(1)	(2)	(3)
Jefferson	4,629	300
Lamar	18,965	130
Lauderdale	41,743	150
Lawrence	59,173	1,650
Lee	14,149	1,300
Limestone	67,516	3,000
Lowndes	16,987	100
Macon	24,014	1,951
Madison	80,151	1,500
Marengo	24,704	1,828
Marion	21,842	200
Marshall	50,909	1,500
Mobile	2,111	270
Monroe	21,364	150
Montgomery	17,288	747
Morgan	45,009	800
Perry	17,450	100
Pickens	24,680	700
Pike	25,896	1,500
Randolph	18,743	100
Russell	15,249	500
St. Clair	9,847	700
Shelby	7,719	150
Sumter	20,668	1,200
Talladega	19,706	1,000
Tallapoosa	13,716	1,246
Tuscaloosa	26,442	200
Walker	11,594	900
Washington	1,871	250
Wilcox	17,546	0
Winston	14,000	800
a. State total	1,474,933	
b. State acreage for additional allotments to small farms	38,201	
c. State acreage reserves for new farms and small farms	57,729	
d. State acreage allotment	1,570,863	

1942 COUNTY COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS IN ALABAMA

County	Acres
Autauga	29,101
Baldwin	5,753
Barbour	39,929
Bibb	11,602
Blount	31,196
Bullock	29,259
Butler	30,561
Calhoun	27,038
Chambers	38,276
Cherokee	34,673
Chilton	25,387
Choctaw	16,016
Clarke	19,449
Clay	17,904
Cleburne	12,625
Coffee	39,772
Colbert	31,871
Conecuh	26,564
Coosa	11,135
Covington	40,792
Crenshaw	33,118
Cullman	48,344
Dale	24,431
Dallas	66,193
De Kalb	43,149
Elmore	44,081
Escambia	19,536
Etowah	28,076
Fayette	22,181
Franklin	26,046
Geneva	39,179
Greene	28,792
Hale	37,696
Henry	33,365
Houston	50,187
Jackson	36,010
Jefferson	8,726
Lamar	26,824
Lauderdale	46,467
Lawrence	48,325
Lee	38,026
Limestone	61,093
Lowndes	28,004
Macon	40,166

TABLE II.—*1950 cotton crop: county acreage allotments and reserves and State acreage reserves for adjustments in small farm allotments and for establishing acreage allotments for new cotton farms*—Con.

1942 COUNTY COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS IN ALABAMA—continued

County	Acres
Madison	77,438
Marengo	48,237
Marion	24,887
Marshall	48,917
Mobile	6,505
Monroe	38,098
Montgomery	31,681
Morgan	41,734
Perry	38,464
Pickens	36,419
Pike	42,606
Randolph	29,308
Russell	30,952
St. Clair	16,933
Shelby	14,351
Sumter	33,077
Talladega	38,857
Tallapoosa	29,573
Tuscaloosa	36,916
Walker	17,509
Washington	5,448
Wilcox	28,942
Winston	15,637
State total	2,129,407

ARIZONA

County	County acreage allotments	Committee acreage reserve
(1)	(2)	(3)
Cochise	5,011	500
Graham	15,684	156
Greenlee	1,448	15
Maricopa	83,387	2,594
Pima	11,189	326
Pinal	110,687	2,700
Santa Cruz	928	13
Yuma	3,530	384
a. State total	231,864	
b. State acreage for additional allotments to small farms	402	
c. State acreage reserve for new farms and small farms	0	
d. State acreage allotment	232,266	

1942 COUNTY COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS IN ARIZONA

County	Acres
Cochise	12
Gila	12
Graham	12,858
Greenlee	971
Maricopa	111,090
Mohave	18
Pima	6,551
Pinal	44,594
Santa Cruz	564
Yuma	13,055
State total	189,725

ARKANSAS

County	County acreage allotments	Committee acreage reserve
(1)	(2)	(3)
Arkansas	10,061	1,509
Ashley	27,953	3,000
Baxter	337	45
Boone	74	10
Bradley	9,431	1,000
Calhoun	6,627	944

TABLE II.—*1950 cotton crop: county acreage allotments and reserves and State acreage reserves for adjustments in small farm allotments and for establishing acreage allotments for new cotton farms*—Con.

ARKANSAS—continued

County (1)	County acreage allot ments (2)	Committee acreage reserve (3)
Chicot	43,261	2,678
Clark	11,198	1,344
Clay	44,996	4,066
Cleburne	8,835	1,325
Cleveland	8,376	1,200
Columbia	22,579	2,930
Conway	18,877	1,888
Craighead	84,052	12,000
Crawford	2,806	400
Crittenden	110,500	1,000
Cross	43,031	645
Dallas	4,845	700
Desha	57,028	3,000
Drew	17,506	2,625
Faulkner:		
Administrative area I	4,775	477
Administrative area II	26,224	3,671
Franklin:		
Administrative area I	1,152	140
Administrative area II	1,146	140
Fulton	2,858	286
Garland	311	42
Grant	2,534	350
Greene:		
Administrative area I	32,340	323
Administrative area II	11,066	110
Hempstead	17,442	2,180
Hot Spring	2,632	375
Howard:		
Administrative area I	400	60
Administrative area II	2,168	325
Administrative area III	4,668	700
Independence:		
Administrative area I	2,845	142
Administrative area II	12,650	1,012
Izard	8,734	1,310
Jackson	64,989	9,748
Jefferson	90,836	1,700
Johnson:		
Administrative area I	2,186	172
Administrative area II	754	113
Lafayette	21,757	2,720
Lawrence:		
Administrative area I	29,085	2,758
Administrative area II	4,984	648
Lee	66,972	8,037
Lincoln	47,023	4,000
Little River	11,900	1,785
Logan:		
Administrative area I	3,239	486
Administrative area II	4,114	617
Lonoke	69,984	9,953
Marion	188	25
Miller	22,885	2,288
Mississippi	228,607	4,572
Monroe	39,824	4,000
Montgomery	576	86
Nevada	11,780	1,472
Newton	60	9
Ouachita	6,578	800
Perry	4,569	250
Phillips	83,181	7,818
Pike	1,275	191
Poinsett	96,376	13,492
Polk	724	105
Pope:		
Administrative area I	6,430	964
Administrative area II	5,063	759
Prairie	14,053	1,908
Pulaski	31,265	2,300
Randolph:		
Administrative area I	14,391	2,050
Administrative area II	4,535	630
St. Francis	86,345	8,634
Saline	480	60
Scott	813	117
Searcy	839	112
Sebastian	2,109	316
Sevier	2,447	347
Sharp	9,259	1,000
Stone	613	90
Union	6,047	850
Van Buren	5,920	800
White	44,301	4,000
Woodruff	47,888	4,788
Yell:		
Administrative area I	8,576	225
Administrative area II	7,671	470

TABLE II.—*1950 cotton crop: county acreage allotments and reserves and State acreage reserves for adjustments in small farm allotments and for establishing acreage allotments for new cotton farms*—Con.

1942 COUNTY COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENT IN ARKANSAS

County	Acres
Arkansas	14,645
Ashley	37,448
Baxter	2,848
Benton	
Boone	568
Bradley	17,983
Calhoun	14,848
Carroll	1
Chicot	49,942
Clark	23,345
Clay	39,667
Cleburne	14,347
Cleveland	23,444
Columbia	52,268
Conway	38,878
Craighead	64,830
Crawford	9,339
Crittenden	99,316
Cross	40,104
Dallas	10,343
Desha	45,825
Drew	26,944
Faulkner	45,250
Franklin	10,181
Fulton	6,558
Garland	2,536
Grant	9,289
Greene	34,249
Hempstead	44,846
Hot Spring	9,508
Howard	20,540
Independence	23,996
Izard	14,333
Jackson	55,669
Jefferson	81,006
Johnson	9,515
Lafayette	34,696
Lawrence	33,358
Lee	56,450
Lincoln	47,919
Little River	27,310
Logan	22,977
Lonoke	70,178
Madison	
Marion	2,950
Miller	40,322
Mississippi	179,566
Monroe	40,847
Montgomery	6,043
Nevada	39,332
Newton	712
Ouachita	17,141
Perry	10,542
Phillips	68,832
Pike	10,296
Poinsett	51,300
Polk	5,827
Pope	33,289
Prairie	17,347
Pulaski	41,190
Randolph	20,602
St. Francis	66,979
Saline	3,929
Scott	9,017
Searcy	1,985
Sebastian	10,877
Sevier	11,484
Sharp	12,370
Stone	3,180
Union	27,028
Van Buren	11,786
Washington	80
White	53,818
Woodruff	43,424
Yell	33,040
State total	2,153,432

CALIFORNIA

County (1)	County acreage allot ments (2)	Committee acreage reserve (3)
Fresno:		
Administrative Area I	75,499	7,500
Administrative Area II	93,819	12,500
Imperial	922	138

TABLE II.—*1950 cotton crop: county acreage allotments and reserves and State acreage reserves for adjustments in small farm allotments and for establishing acreage allotments for new cotton farms*—Con.

CALIFORNIA—continued

County (1)	County acreage allot ments (2)	Committee acreage reserve (3)
Kern	165,487	24,823
Kings	88,164	13,224
Madera	50,106	5,011
Merced	19,767	2,000
Riverside	4,047	608
San Benito	46	7
San Bernardino	31	5
Stanislaus	46	7
Tulare	128,712	19,307
a. State total	626,646	
b. State acreage for additional allotments to small farms	2,744	
c. State acreage reserve for new farms and small farms	13,209	
d State acreage allotment	642,599	

1942 COUNTY COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS IN CALIFORNIA

County	Acres
Fresno	85,274
Imperial	8,371
Kern	75,839
Kings	40,750
Madera	50,126
Merced	28,127
Riverside	12,140
San Benito	180
San Bernardino	43
San Diego	36
San Joaquin	42
Stanislaus	1,267
Tulare	89,470
State total	391,665

FLORIDA

County (1)	County acreage allot ments (2)	Committee acreage reserve (3)
Alachua	2	0
Bay	40	5
Bradford	1	0
Calhoun	96	14
Columbia	291	40
Escambia	1,558	225
Gadsden	10	1
Hamilton	1,348	200
Holmes	5,378	800
Jackson	7,153	1,050
Jefferson	2,074	305
Lafayette	167	23
Lake	1	0
Leon	1,802	267
Liberty	1	0
Madison	3,236	480
Marion	3	0
Okaloosa	2,222	325
Polk	1	0
Santa Rosa	4,738	711
Suwannee	730	107
Taylor	1	0
Union	4	0
Walton	2,596	375
Washington	884	133
a. State total	34,337	
b. State acreage for additional allotments to small farms	3,700	
c. State acreage reserve for new farms and small farms	3,533	
d. State acreage allotment	41,570	

TABLE II.—*1950 cotton crop: county acreage allotments and reserves and State acreage reserves for adjustments in small farm allotments and for establishing acreage allotments for new cotton farms*—Con.

1942 COUNTY COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS IN FLORIDA

County	Acres
Alachua	421
Baker	188
Bay	91
Bradford	8
Calhoun	655
Clay	1
Columbia	2,554
Dixie	33
Escambia	4,125
Flagler	1
Gadsden	305
Gilchrist	42
Gulf	5
Hamilton	3,329
Holmes	9,404
Jackson	14,955
Jefferson	3,101
Lafayette	689
Leon	4,428
Levy	145
Liberty	2
Marion	18
Nassau	5,693
Okaloosa	4,813
Putnam	3
Santa Rosa	8,774
Sumter	69
Suwannee	3,877
Taylor	156
Union	41
Volusia	1
Wakulla	91
Walton	5,059
Washington	2,420
State total	75,497

GEORGIA

County (1)	County acreage allotments (2)	Committee acreage reserve (3)
Appling	5,627	717
Atkinson	756	77
Bacon	2,576	328
Baker	2,877	400
Baldwin	4,516	652
Banks	6,633	795
Barrow	12,175	1,750
Bartow	24,041	3,410
Ben Hill	5,835	723
Berrien	2,562	275
Bibb	1,145	162
Bleckley	9,861	1,400
Brantley	21	2
Brooks	6,399	900
Bryan	277	39
Bulloch	21,719	3,152
Burke	48,065	7,110
Butts	8,835	1,138
Calhoun	5,304	745
Candler	8,266	1,215
Carroll	26,736	3,827
Catoosa	2,733	385
Charlton	7	
Chatham	29	4
Chattahoochee	211	20
Chattooga	9,481	1,303
Cherokee	5,537	753
Clarke	4,057	608
Clay	4,295	600
Clayton	3,554	473
Clinch	89	10
Cobb	8,509	1,206
Coffee	7,653	800
Colquitt	17,603	2,540
Columbia	4,663	674
Cook	2,517	350
Coweta	13,891	1,963
Crawford	2,769	393
Crisp	11,275	1,600
Dade	955	120
Dawson	1,157	165
Decatur	2,156	300
De Kalb	2,006	251
Dodge	19,505	2,726
Dooly	23,649	2,010
Dougherty	1,948	253
Douglas	4,291	563
Early	14,592	2,007
Echols	74	6
Effingham	2,064	299

TABLE II.—*1950 cotton crop: county acreage allotments and reserves and State acreage reserves for adjustments in small farm allotments and for establishing acreage allotments for new cotton farms*—Con.

GEORGIA—continued

County (1)	County acreage allotments (2)	Committee acreage reserve (3)
Elbert	15,487	2,168
Emanuel	22,213	2,900
Evans	4,048	575
Fayette	10,270	1,349
Floyd	18,157	2,653
Forsyth	10,170	1,000
Franklin	15,830	1,583
Fulton	8,024	1,161
Gilmer	85	10
Glascock	7,390	1,058
Gordon	16,726	2,387
Grady	2,351	325
Greene	7,753	1,113
Gwinnett	17,036	2,300
Habersham	1,720	206
Hall	10,610	1,450
Hancock	12,577	1,836
Haralson	7,116	959
Harris	3,822	420
Hart	21,727	2,125
Heard	8,138	1,117
Henry	19,554	2,849
Houston	8,729	1,084
Irwin	10,655	1,069
Jackson	21,589	1,000
Jasper	8,143	1,186
Jeff Davis	2,069	250
Jefferson	27,149	2,710
Jenkins	16,278	2,391
Johnson	20,347	1,000
Jones	1,320	192
Lamar	5,298	693
Lanier	436	55
Laurens	37,413	5,400
Lee	2,664	354
Liberty	51	6
Lincoln	6,115	875
Long	424	41
Lowndes	2,416	262
Lumpkin	558	80
McDuffie	10,433	1,515
Macon	18,227	2,186
Madison	16,172	2,264
Marion	4,492	500
Meriwether	17,558	2,530
Miller	5,283	750
Mitchell	12,295	1,700
Monroe	3,923	581
Montgomery	5,581	800
Morgan	21,501	2,150
Murray	6,920	929
Muscogee	352	50
Newton	13,231	1,934
Oconee	11,111	1,033
Oglethorpe	13,074	1,574
Paulding	9,709	1,368
Peach	3,264	488
Pickens	2,835	376
Pierce	2,414	300
Pike	10,879	1,565
Polk	12,651	1,805
Pulaski	10,876	1,500
Putnam	3,664	525
Quitman	1,864	252
Randolph	8,901	1,237
Richmond	4,405	636
Rockdale	7,129	1,019
Schley	5,645	705
Screven	24,198	3,530
Seminole	4,152	575
Spalding	6,768	945
Stephens	2,676	363
Stewart	4,217	600
Sumter	13,875	1,886
Talbot	2,518	378
Taliaferro	4,307	621
Tattnall	6,683	925
Taylor	9,850	1,424
Telfair	6,206	875
Terrell	13,013	1,854
Thomas	3,551	450
Tift	6,636	950
Toombs	9,896	1,425
Treutlen	5,453	775
Troup	5,220	668
Turner	6,526	900
Twiggs	4,833	680
Upson	2,818	392
Walker	6,979	845
Walton	29,230	4,384
Ware	660	70
Warren	16,459	2,419
Washington	22,068	3,260
Wayne	3,291	450
Webster	2,124	255

TABLE II.—*1950 cotton crop: county acreage allotments and reserves and State acreage reserves for adjustments in small farm allotments and for establishing acreage allotments for new cotton farms*—Con.

GEORGIA—continued

County (1)	County acreage allotments (2)	Committee acreage reserve (3)
Wheeler	5,391	750
White	2,121	275
Whitfield	5,368	707
Wilcox	14,819	2,000
Wilkes	10,273	1,450
Wilkinson	4,333	600
Worth	15,594	2,200
a. State total	1,314,449	
b. State acreage for additional allotments to small farms	22,381	
c. State acreage reserve for new farms and small farms	74,270	
d. State acreage allotment	1,411,100	

1942 COUNTY COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS IN GEORGIA

County	Acres
Appling	8,771
Atkinson	2,875
Bacon	4,763
Baker	8,412
Baldwin	8,582
Banks	10,925
Barrow	16,562
Bartow	28,501
Ben Hill	10,044
Berrien	7,168
Bibb	4,090
Bleckley	13,822
Brantley	237
Brooks	15,070
Bryan	1,194
Bulloch	35,261
Burke	63,982
Butts	10,448
Calhoun	10,687
Camden	19
Candler	12,349
Carroll	44,036
Catoosa	4,466
Charlton	37
Chatham	211
Chattahoochee	3,129
Chattooga	11,873
Cherokee	13,237
Clarke	7,626
Clay	8,638
Clayton	6,967
Clinch	313
Cobb	18,523
Coffee	13,069
Colquitt	27,284
Columbia	12,157
Cook	5,239
Coweta	20,636
Crawford	7,379
Crisp	18,551
Dade	1,422
Dawson	2,555
Decatur	7,274
De Kalb	3,995
Dodge	32,650
Dooly	34,031
Dougherty	4,662
Douglas	9,114
Early	25,928
Echols	379
Effingham	4,237
Elbert	21,990
Emanuel	40,217
Evans	6,468
Fannin	None
Fayette	13,072
Floyd	24,337
Forsyth	15,409
Franklin	23,237
Fulton	15,877
Gilmer	569
Glascock	8,515
Glynn	10
Gordon	20,055
Grady	6,469
Greene	11,084
Gwinnett	29,312
Habersham	3,393
Hall	17,923
Hancock	14,267
Haralson	12,307
Harris	9,383

TABLE II.—*1950 cotton crop: county acreage allotments and reserves and State acreage reserves for adjustments in small farm allotments and for establishing acreage allotments for new cotton farms*—Con.

1942 COUNTY COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS IN GEORGIA—continued

County	Acres
Hart	28,106
Heard	13,661
Henry	27,365
Houston	15,082
Irwin	16,384
Jackson	28,397
Jasper	10,865
Jeff Davis	4,021
Jefferson	35,208
Jenkins	23,668
Johnson	24,322
Jones	4,599
Lamar	9,437
Lanier	1,255
Laurens	54,720
Lee	6,220
Liberty	1,198
Lincoln	9,894
Long	1,317
Lowndes	6,655
Lumpkin	1,637
McDuffie	14,736
McIntosh	11
Macon	27,917
Madison	22,670
Marion	9,533
Meriwether	26,592
Miller	9,836
Mitchell	24,004
Monroe	8,153
Montgomery	12,659
Morgan	20,585
Murray	9,236
Muscogee	3,778
Newton	15,593
Oconee	14,138
Oglethorpe	20,405
Paulding	14,036
Peach	9,653
Pickens	4,887
Pierce	4,469
Pike	16,900
Polk	17,396
Pulaski	15,406
Putnam	6,426
Quitman	4,170
Rabun	None
Randolph	20,095
Richmond	10,733
Rockdale	7,820
Schley	8,950
Screven	32,494
Seminole	7,054
Spalding	10,931
Stephens	6,680
Stewart	10,850
Sumter	25,598
Talbot	6,200
Taliaferro	7,872
Tattnall	10,109
Taylor	14,885
Telfair	15,106
Terrell	21,016
Thomas	11,356
Tift	11,515
Toombs	17,520
Towns	None
Treutlen	17,063
Troup	15,046
Turner	11,869
Twiggs	9,452
Union	None
Upson	7,475
Walker	10,024
Walton	32,476
Ware	2,132
Warren	20,618
Washington	30,358
Wayne	6,285
Webster	6,092
Wheeler	14,302
White	2,971
Whitfield	9,506
Wilcox	25,153
Wilkes	19,391
Wilkinson	8,632
Worth	26,540
State total	2,104,700

TABLE II.—*1950 cotton crop: county acreage allotments and reserves and State acreage reserves for adjustments in small farm allotments and for establishing acreage allotments for new cotton farms*—Con.

ILLINOIS

County	County acreage allotments	Committee acreage reserve
(1)	(2)	(3)
Alexander	2,070	207
Johnson	15	0
Massac	1	0
Pulaski	1,960	196
Union	1	0
a. State total	4,047	
b. State acreage for additional allotments to small farms	95	
c. State acreage reserve for new farms and small farms	0	
d. State acreage allotment	4,142	

1942 COUNTY COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS IN ILLINOIS

County	Acres
Alexander	3,390
Jackson	2
Massac	1
Pulaski	1,556
Randolph	1
State	4,950

KANSAS

County	County acreage allotments	Committee acreage reserve
(1)	(2)	(3)
Cowley	11	0
Montgomery	117	17
Sumner	5	0
a. State total	133	
b. State acreage for additional allotments to small farms	3	
c. State acreage reserve for new farms and small farms	15	
d. State acreage allotment	151	

1942 COUNTY COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS IN KANSAS

County	Acres
Chautauqua	39
Cowley	3
Montgomery	688
State	730

KENTUCKY

County	County acreage allotments	Committee acreage reserve
(1)	(2)	(3)
Ballard	0	3
Calloway	327	49
Carlisle	169	24
Fulton:		
Administrative area I	1,543	170
Administrative area II	7,673	425
Graves	175	23
Hickman	1,608	100
McCracken	8	0
Marshall	103	15
a. State total	11,606	
b. State acreage for additional allotments to small farms	204	
c. State acreage reserve for new farms and small farms	862	
d. State acreage allotment	12,972	

TABLE II.—*1950 cotton crop: county acreage allotments and reserves and State acreage reserves for adjustments in small farm allotments and for establishing acreage allotments for new cotton farms*—Con.

1942 COUNTY COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS IN KENTUCKY

County	Acres
Ballard	23
Barren	4
Calloway	1,637
Carlisle	643
Christian	
Fulton	10,144
Graves	652
Hickman	3,977
Hopkins	1
McCracken	30
Marshall	724
Metcalfe	4
Trigg	6
State	17,845

LOUISIANA

County	County acreage allotments	Committee acreage reserve
(1)	(2)	(3)
Acadia	19,575	998
Allen	1,671	251
Ascension	397	60
Avoyelles	26,345	2,634
Beauregard	291	44
Bienville	14,224	1,991
Bossier	32,465	4,870
Caddo	54,441	2,178
Calcasieu	800	120
Caldwell	6,365	89
Cameron	1,157	174
Catahoula	13,889	972
Claiborne	25,800	3,870
Concordia	11,859	1,542
De Soto	20,071	401
East Baton Rouge	1,625	244
East Carroll	32,635	4,243
East Feliciana	7,631	1,145
Evangeline	22,694	3,404
Franklin	56,975	5,128
Grant	5,639	846
Iberia	2,086	271
Iberville	688	0
Jackson	2,401	360
Jefferson Davis	3,084	432
Lafayette	23,532	1,883
Lafourche	379	0
La Salle	504	76
Lincoln	14,278	1,428
Livingston	423	63
Madison	21,960	439
Morehouse	33,578	672
Natchitoches	38,857	3,497
Orleans	8	0
Ouachita	17,977	126
Pointe Coupee	12,067	1,810
Rapides	18,254	2,190
Red River	21,591	0
Richland	49,802	7,470
Sabine	5,804	871
St. Helena	1,943	194
St. James	2	0
St. Landry	44,153	4,857
St. Martin	10,149	1,522
St. Mary	55	0
St. Tammany	491	49
Tangipahoa	1,909	286
Tensas	24,658	986
Union	14,427	2,164
Vermilion	12,478	1,872
Vernon	1,716	257
Washington	9,660	1,449
Webster	13,988	1,399
West Baton Rouge	1,295	194
West Carroll	25,288	253
West Feliciana	3,237	486
Winn	2,344	328
a. State total	791,615	
b. State acreage for additional allotments to small farms	19,879	
c. State acreage reserve for new farms and small farms	61,803	
d. State acreage allotment	873,297	

TABLE II.—*1950 cotton crop: county acreage allotments and reserves and State acreage reserves for adjustments in small farm allotments and for establishing acreage allotments for new cotton farms*—Con.

1942 COUNTY COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS IN LOUISIANA

Parish	Acres
Acadia	24,627
Allen	3,908
Ascension	1,085
Assumption	20
Avoyelles	33,619
Beauregard	2,915
Bienville	42,927
Bossier	42,623
Caddo	71,570
Calcasieu	4,793
Caldwell	9,531
Cameron	4,648
Catahoula	17,054
Claiborne	54,724
Concordia	16,219
De Soto	49,182
East Baton Rouge	7,432
East Carroll	31,709
East Feliciana	13,318
Evangeline	30,679
Franklin	58,304
Grant	9,650
Iberia	2,167
Iberville	1,030
Jackson	13,379
Jefferson	18
Jefferson Davis	7,378
Lafayette	30,062
Lafourche	1,221
La Salle	2,413
Lincoln	38,628
Livingston	2,335
Madison	24,455
Morehouse	38,321
Natchitoches	49,653
Orleans	21
Ouachita	22,550
Plaquemines	
Pointe Coupee	16,522
Rapides	27,169
Red River	33,442
Richland	50,036
Sabine	20,953
St. Bernard	
St. Charles	2
St. Helena	5,742
St. James	84
St. John the Baptist	5
St. Landry	56,245
St. Martin	9,933
St. Mary	215
St. Tammany	2,076
Tangipahoa	6,926
Tensas	27,852
Terrebonne	5
Union	34,719
Vermilion	18,913
Vernon	8,391
Washington	20,211
Webster	36,691
West Baton Rouge	1,313
West Carroll	29,589
West Feliciana	5,968
Winn	9,761
State total	1,186,931

MISSISSIPPI

County (1)	County acreage allotments (2)	Committee acreage reserve (3)
Adams	5,725	686
Alcorn	20,337	1,017
Amite	14,743	1,769
Attala	22,124	2,879
Benton	13,769	200
Bolivar	163,031	415
Calhoun	18,053	2,250
Carroll:		
Administrative area I	16,708	300
Administrative area II	5,422	35
Chickasaw	20,364	1,800
Choctaw	6,354	750
Claiborne	8,467	1,000
Clarke	6,217	699
Clay	14,413	1,300

TABLE II.—*1950 cotton crop: county acreage allotments and reserves and State acreage reserves for adjustments in small farm allotments and for establishing acreage allotments for new cotton farms*—Con.

MISSISSIPPI—continued

County (1)	County acreage allotments (2)	Committee acreage reserve (3)
Coahoma	109,161	400
Copiah	11,824	1,300
Covington	14,718	1,800
De Soto:		
Administrative area I	35,170	1,413
Administrative area II	11,474	80
Forrest	1,692	203
Franklin	4,382	657
George	876	115
Greene	982	122
Grenada	14,437	1,607
Hancock	58	8
Harrison	72	10
Hinds	40,527	1,000
Holmes:		
Administrative area I	25,807	1,174
Administrative area II	24,435	733
Humphreys	63,614	400
Issaquena	19,065	713
Itawamba	19,160	2,300
Jackson	12	1
Jasper	11,048	1,160
Jefferson	9,076	1,076
Jefferson Davis	21,881	2,625
Jones	14,204	1,704
Kemper	19,030	2,330
Lafayette	21,340	550
Lamar	4,341	520
Lauderdale	8,872	798
Lawrence	12,420	1,490
Leake	25,602	3,400
Lee	39,113	2,100
Leflore	97,470	704
Lincoln	14,033	1,684
Lowndes	23,583	2,830
Madison	43,820	2,000
Marion	15,913	2,000
Marshall	38,859	584
Monroe	39,132	4,696
Montgomery	11,389	900
Neshoba	25,657	3,248
Newton	16,419	1,700
Noxubee	29,426	3,000
Oktibbeha	9,058	1,087
Panola:		
Administrative area I	30,175	1,500
Administrative area II	21,967	650
Pearl River	159	19
Perry	1,718	205
Pike	12,542	1,573
Pontotoc	28,472	2,800
Prentiss	23,649	1,865
Quitman	72,441	366
Renkin	15,598	1,560
Scott	16,720	1,536
Sharkey	38,629	193
Simpson	18,205	2,200
Smith	15,354	1,750
Stone	201	24
Sunflower	156,072	945
Tallahatchie:		
Administrative area I	7,257	770
Administrative area II	62,518	475
Tate	21,764	2,541
Tippah	23,316	1,050
Tishomingo	14,289	1,071
Tunica	66,905	470
Union	25,535	2,200
Walthall	21,313	2,558
Warren:		
Administrative area I	3,621	241
Administrative area II	5,713	550
Washington	114,395	750
Wayne	7,807	937
Webster	11,633	1,400
Wilkinson	7,489	898
Winston	18,472	2,350
Yalobusha	14,822	1,625
Yazoo:		
Administrative area I	31,391	550
Administrative area II	26,958	300
a. State total	2,231,979	
b. State acreage for additional allotments to small farms	38,566	
c. State acreage reserve for new farms and small farms	25,000	
d. State acreage allotment	2,295,545	

TABLE II.—*1950 cotton crop: county acreage allotments and reserves and State acreage reserves for adjustments in small farm allotments and for establishing acreage allotments for new cotton farms*—Con.

1942 COUNTY COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS IN MISSISSIPPI

County	Acres
Adams	10,861
Alcorn	20,671
Amite	24,697
Attala	26,620
Benton	13,465
Bolivar	166,082
Calhoun	20,207
Carroll	26,235
Chickasaw	24,433
Choctaw	10,797
Claiborne	13,718
Clarke	13,542
Clay	18,632
Coahoma	107,620
Copiah	19,915
Covington	23,377
De Soto	51,182
Forrest	5,158
Franklin	9,722
George	4,021
Greene	3,005
Grenada	18,739
Hancock	414
Harrison	504
Hinds	54,779
Holmes	59,650
Humphreys	58,468
Issaquena	20,010
Itawamba	20,767
Jackson	330
Jasper	21,044
Jefferson	13,924
Jefferson Davis	26,370
Jones	24,646
Kemper	25,878
Lafayette	23,668
Lamar	8,758
Lauderdale	21,154
Lawrence	18,531
Leake	27,860
Lee	42,465
Leflore	95,828
Lincoln	24,702
Lowndes	28,090
Madison	54,513
Marion	23,016
Marshall	39,371
Monroe	46,039
Montgomery	17,773
Neshoba	34,274
Newton	27,896
Noxubee	34,222
Oktibbeha	13,133
Panola	54,946
Pearl River	4,155
Perry	4,859
Pike	22,237
Pontotoc	28,341
Prentiss	22,768
Quitman	59,858
Rankin	20,253
Scott	21,270
Sharkey	37,616
Simpson	23,835
Smith	22,276
Stone	1,263
Sunflower	162,313
Tallahatchie	69,394
Tate	32,292
Tippah	24,646
Tishomingo	15,665
Tunica	61,943
Union	26,053
Walthall	27,067
Warren	13,438
Washington	108,881
Wayne	13,346
Webster	16,197
Wilkinson	10,425
Winston	22,425
Yalobusha	17,551
Yazoo	66,710
State total	2,552,800

TABLE II.—*1950 cotton crop: county acreage allotments and reserves and State acreage reserves for adjustments in small farm allotments and for establishing acreage allotments for new cotton farms*—Con.

MISSOURI

County (1)	County acreage allotments (2)	Committee acreage reserve (3)
Bollinger	60	9
Butler	19,214	1,921
Cape Girardeau	220	0
Carter	6	0
Dunklin:		
Administrative area I	72,944	1,259
Administrative area II	4,831	261
Administrative area III	5,093	409
Administrative area IV	7,441	916
Howell	66	9
Mississippi	30,452	2,300
New Madrid	122,546	1,700
Oregon	149	22
Ozark	55	5
Pemiscot	127,158	3,000
Ripley:		
Administrative area I	1,838	275
Administrative area II	1,343	201
Scott	18,325	2,600
Stoddard:		
Administrative area I	3,423	200
Administrative area II	38,542	1,898
a. State total	453,706	
b. State acreage for additional allotments to small farms	3,624	
c. State acreage reserve for new farms and small farms	5,509	
d. State acreage allotment	462,839	

1942 COUNTY COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS IN MISSOURI

County	Acres
Barton	2
Bollinger	94
Butler	11,793
Cape Girardeau	124
Carter	13
Dunklin	83,342
Howell	475
Laclede	1
Mississippi	29,366
New Madrid	88,412
Oregon	1,035
Ozark	592
Pemiscot	109,441
Reynolds	1
Ripley	4,537
Scott	17,494
Stoddard	32,042
Taney	200
Wayne	32
State	378,996

NEW MEXICO

County (1)	County acreage allotments (2)	Committee acreage reserve (3)
Chaves	36,674	2,667
Curry	71	0
De Baca	35	5
Dona Ana	52,780	1,275
Eddy	27,798	1,800
Harding	35	3
Hidalgo	2,383	103
Lea	15,333	2,100
Luna	10,197	350
Otero	659	32
Quay	4,752	701
Roosevelt	7,983	600
Sierra	2,047	184
Socorro	178	10
a. State total	160,925	
b. State acreage for additional allotments to small farms	1,360	
c. State acreage reserve for new farms and small farms	7,647	
d. State acreage allotment	169,932	

TABLE II.—*1950 cotton crop: county acreage allotments and reserves and State acreage reserves for adjustments in small farm allotments and for establishing acreage allotments for new cotton farms*—Con.

1942 COUNTY COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS IN NEW MEXICO

County	Acres
Chaves	24,799
Curry	987
De Baca	73
Dona Ana	35,561
Eddy	24,544
Grant	24
Harding	184
Hidalgo	340
Lea	1,196
Luna	1,737
Otero	457
Quay	3,142
Roosevelt	16,244
Sierra	696
Socorro	66
State total	110,050

NORTH CAROLINA

County (1)	County acreage allotments (2)	Committee acreage reserve (3)
Alamance	207	31
Alexander	2,112	255
Anson:		
Administrative area I	5,839	800
Administrative area II	15,471	2,074
Beaufort	1,944	292
Bertie	6,320	892
Bladen	4,632	668
Brunswick	262	35
Burke	688	90
Cabarrus	7,255	966
Caldwell	124	19
Camden	1,176	176
Carteret	209	25
Caswell	31	5
Catawba	7,377	1,079
Chatham	1,586	238
Chowan	2,567	313
Cleveland	50,171	1,750
Columbus	2,131	319
Craven	735	88
Cumberland	15,558	2,264
Currituck	718	108
Davidson	1,176	167
Davie	2,941	409
Duplin	4,688	654
Durham	167	24
Edgecombe	16,038	2,289
Forsyth	167	25
Franklin	11,676	1,687
Gaston	7,965	1,195
Gates	3,094	417
Granville	728	95
Greene	4,043	563
Guilford	219	31
Halifax	27,945	4,192
Harnett	16,210	2,232
Hertford	4,242	572
Hoke	16,640	1,299
Hyde	1,943	291
Iredell	15,246	2,197
Johnston	25,209	3,493
Jones	532	73
Lee	2,083	295
Lenoir	3,278	461
Lincoln	14,006	1,778
McDowell	12	0
Martin	3,298	455
Mecklenburg	13,160	1,750
Montgomery	1,671	251
Moore	1,498	154
Nash	15,601	2,214
New Hanover	18	3
Northampton	21,172	3,085
Onslow	354	53
Orange	293	44
Pamlico	933	140
Pasquotank	892	124
Pender	312	41
Perquimans	3,181	477
Pitt	6,635	994
Polk	3,446	493
Randolph	238	35
Richmond	7,945	1,165
Robeson	47,679	6,452
Rockingham	20	0
Rowan	9,227	1,384
Rutherford	17,431	2,179
Sampson	25,607	3,841

TABLE II.—*1950 cotton crop: county acreage allotments and reserves and State acreage reserves for adjustments in small farm allotments and for establishing acreage allotments for new cotton farms*—Con.

NORTH CAROLINA—continued

County (1)	County acreage allotments (2)	Committee acreage reserve (3)
Scotland	22,892	240
Stanly	4,883	667
Tyrrell	374	56
Union	29,671	4,105
Vance	2,627	277
Wake	9,205	1,379
Warren	10,846	1,587
Washington	873	131
Wayne	14,058	1,914
Wilkes	115	17
Wilson	10,109	1,111
Yadkin	139	21
a. State total	593,764	
b. State acreage for additional allotments to small farms	60,651	
c. State acreage reserve for new farms and small farms	68,738	
d. State acreage allotment	723,153	

1942 COUNTY COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS IN NORTH CAROLINA

County	Acres
Alamance	971
Alexander	3,292
Anson	31,290
Beaufort	5,435
Bertie	8,086
Bladen	6,695
Brunswick	525
Burke	1,010
Cabarrus	13,649
Caldwell	242
Camden	2,481
Carteret	862
Caswell	106
Catawba	12,078
Chatham	5,210
Chowan	4,442
Cleveland	49,768
Columbus	3,508
Craven	2,518
Cumberland	22,330
Currituck	1,474
Davidson	2,788
Davie	5,087
Duplin	9,724
Durham	624
Edgecombe	25,627
Forsyth	430
Franklin	18,167
Gaston	14,795
Gates	4,656
Granville	1,998
Greene	8,820
Guilford	559
Halifax	36,281
Harnett	23,490
Hertford	5,093
Hoke	18,245
Hyde	3,095
Iredell	21,805
Johnston	41,448
Jones	2,843
Lee	4,784
Lenoir	9,476
Lincoln	17,706
McDowell	24
Martin	5,955
Mecklenburg	25,630
Montgomery	4,647
Moore	3,647
Nash	22,444
New Hanover	57
Northampton	25,439
Onslow	2,646
Orange	1,160
Pamlico	3,229
Pasquotank	2,569
Pender	2,002
Perquimans	5,442
Person	8
Pitt	14,140
Polk	4,892
Randolph	979
Richmond	14,506
Robeson	51,255
Rockingham	12
Rowan	16,247

TABLE II.—*1950 cotton crop: county acreage allotments and reserves and State acreage reserves for adjustments in small farm allotments and for establishing acreage allotments for new cotton farms*—Con.

1942 COUNTY COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS IN NORTH CAROLINA—continued

County	Acres
Rutherford	23,628
Sampson	35,169
Scotland	24,670
Stanly	9,091
Tyrrell	851
Union	40,819
Vance	4,126
Wake	17,833
Warren	16,741
Washington	1,975
Wayne	24,023
Wilkes	212
Wilson	17,035
Yadkin	423
State total	877,039

OKLAHOMA

County (1)	County acreage allotments (2)	Committee acreage reserve (3)
Adair	53	7
Atoka	4,819	673
Beckham	65,500	9,170
Blaine	12,156	1,720
Bryan	26,700	3,900
Caddo	61,340	8,956
Canadian	12,600	1,701
Carter	4,139	550
Cherokee	1,103	149
Choctaw	13,400	1,900
Cleveland	5,334	700
Coal	8,000	1,100
Comanche	16,883	2,364
Cotton	18,900	2,800
Craig	140	21
Creek	16,804	2,370
Custer	18,226	2,643
Delaware	4	0
Dewey	6,994	1,014
Ellis	452	63
Garfield	78	12
Garvin	15,495	2,200
Grady	33,575	4,900
Greer	52,000	7,700
Harmon	55,822	1,700
Haskell	10,000	1,450
Hughes	16,379	2,395
Jackson	67,123	9,900
Jefferson	27,000	4,050
Johnston	5,336	784
Kay	500	60
Kingfisher	1,572	200
Kiowa	52,238	7,545
Latimer	1,400	210
Le Flore	15,800	2,300
Lincoln	11,802	1,670
Logan	8,142	1,150
Love	15,700	1,570
McClain	20,737	3,000
McCurtain	21,767	3,150
McIntosh	33,500	4,900
Major	700	75
Marshall	7,988	1,150
Mayes	2,946	412
Murray	2,288	330
Muskogee	49,232	7,288
Noble	2,400	350
Nowata	777	92
Okfuskee	28,136	4,000
Oklahoma	2,758	315
Okmulgee	32,500	4,775
Osage	11,412	1,600
Ottawa	2	0
Pawnee	11,200	1,568
Payne	7,038	915
Pittsburg	18,500	2,700
Pontotoc	4,993	699
Pottawatomie	7,284	993
Pushmataha	2,057	300
Roger Mills	19,300	2,795
Rogers	3,320	490
Seminole	7,546	1,100
Sequoyah	6,247	887
Stephens	18,613	2,705
Tillman	60,091	8,787
Tulsa	7,877	1,103
Wagoner	29,403	4,410
Washington	236	25

TABLE II.—*1950 cotton crop: county acreage allotments and reserves and State acreage reserves for adjustments in small farm allotments and for establishing acreage allotments for new cotton farms*—Con.

OKLAHOMA—continued

County (1)	County acreage allotments (2)	Committee acreage reserve (3)
Washita	85,000	11,694
Woodward	143	20
a. State total	1,190,070	
b. State acreage for additional allotments to small farms	3,811	
c. State acreage reserve for new farms and small farms	49,416	
d. State acreage allotment	1,243,297	

1942 COUNTY COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS IN OKLAHOMA

County	Acres
Adair	274
Alfalfa	68
Atoka	13,682
Beaver	
Beckham	87,628
Blaine	25,815
Bryan	45,581
Caddo	104,059
Canadian	20,744
Carter	18,607
Cherokee	4,257
Choctaw	26,578
Cimarron	
Cleveland	14,223
Coal	14,579
Comanche	37,068
Cotton	41,417
Craig	777
Creek	29,890
Custer	33,174
Delaware	93
Dewey	17,459
Ellis	3,830
Garfield	316
Garvin	43,177
Grady	69,275
Grant	55
Greer	73,813
Harmon	57,836
Harper	55
Haskell	20,270
Hughes	30,644
Jackson	99,499
Jefferson	46,351
Johnston	16,663
Kay	552
Kingfisher	8,353
Kiowa	83,264
Latimer	3,819
Le Flore	32,835
Lincoln	31,064
Logan	18,171
Love	22,656
McClain	46,132
McCurtain	37,089
McIntosh	44,915
Major	2,289
Marshall	14,865
Mayes	5,868
Murray	9,599
Muskogee	51,571
Noble	4,293
Nowata	1,688
Okfuskee	41,119
Oklahoma	11,767
Okmulgee	33,878
Osage	8,316
Ottawa	35
Pawnee	7,895
Payne	15,099
Pittsburg	29,570
Pontotoc	18,197
Pottawatomie	27,243
Pushmataha	7,009
Roger Mills	44,706
Rogers	5,518
Seminole	21,307
Sequoyah	18,949
Stephens	39,634
Tillman	103,322
Tulsa	7,985
Wagoner	29,019
Washington	244

TABLE II.—*1950 cotton crop: county acreage allotments and reserves and State acreage reserves for adjustments in small farm allotments and for establishing acreage allotments for new cotton farms*—Con.

1942 COUNTY COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS IN OKLAHOMA—continued

County	Acres
Washita	101,294
Woodward	1,313
State total	1,990,199

SOUTH CAROLINA

County (1)	County acreage allotments (2)	Committee acreage reserve (3)
Abbeville	15,724	125
Aiken	31,747	0
Allendale	13,518	100
Anderson	54,507	545
Bamberg	17,022	170
Barnwell	24,649	0
Beaufort	1,009	50
Berkeley	9,067	0
Calhoun	19,769	0
Charleston	490	24
Cherokee	21,787	0
Chester	15,862	300
Chesterfield	40,388	0
Clarendon	37,091	100
Colleton	9,314	0
Darlington	31,733	500
Dillon	24,480	0
Dorchester	11,704	0
Edgefield	13,233	0
Fairfield	9,727	200
Florence	25,469	1,300
Georgetown	1,319	0
Greenville	33,268	0
Greenwood	9,815	0
Hampton	8,350	0
Horry	4,863	729
Jasper	1,978	240
Kershaw	23,502	0
Lancaster	14,080	0
Laurens	20,857	0
Lee	35,826	0
Lexington	12,875	0
McCormick	7,289	0
Marion	11,952	0
Marlboro	46,570	0
Newberry	14,203	0
Oconee	16,617	0
Orangeburg	77,067	0
Pickens	13,713	0
Richland	10,221	102
Saluda	12,207	0
Spartanburg	46,357	0
Sumter	44,921	0
Union	11,908	0
Williamsburg	30,002	3,600
York	25,745	0
a. State total	972,795	
b. State acreage for additional allotments to small farms	23,172	
c. State acreage reserve for new farms and small farms	29,758	
d. State acreage allotment	1,025,725	

1942 COUNTY COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS IN SOUTH CAROLINA

County	Acres
Abbeville	26,536
Aiken	41,691
Allendale	16,549
Anderson	81,811
Bamberg	22,146
Barnwell	31,594
Beaufort	1,696
Berkeley	9,521
Calhoun	24,331
Charleston	1,981
Cherokee	28,678
Chester	27,329

TABLE II.—*1950 cotton crop: county acreage allotments and reserves and State acreage reserves for adjustments in small farm allotments and for establishing acreage allotments for new cotton farms*—Con.

1942 COUNTY COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS IN SOUTH CAROLINA—continued

County	Acres
Chesterfield	43,708
Clarendon	30,668
Colleton	16,828
Darlington	34,062
Dillon	25,154
Dorchester	13,113
Edgefield	18,934
Fairfield	18,029
Florence	28,410
Georgetown	1,720
Greenville	49,203
Greenwood	22,690
Hampton	13,750
Horry	2,965
Jasper	3,490
Kershaw	34,762
Lancaster	21,992
Laurens	44,540
Lee	38,610
Lexington	20,471
McCormick	12,095
Marion	11,291
Marlboro	49,631
Newberry	26,323
Oconee	26,470
Orangeburg	80,762
Pickens	22,530
Richland	17,879
Saluda	19,043
Spartanburg	75,765
Sumter	44,525
Union	21,485
Williamsburg	25,609
York	38,976
State total	1,269,346

TENNESSEE

County (1)	County acreage allotments (2)	Committee acreage reserve (3)
Bedford	2,401	240
Benton	4,370	320
Blount	2	0
Bradley	2,355	100
Cannon	39	6
Carroll	19,424	1,024
Chester	13,136	800
Coffee	1,573	204
Crockett	28,152	1,870
Davidson	30	4
Decatur	6,201	650
De Kalb	43	5
Dickson	2	0
Dyer	39,459	1,000
Fayette	52,216	2,600
Franklin	6,577	890
Gibson	43,308	2,000
Giles	11,367	1,150
Grundy	229	34
Hamilton	1,095	90
Hardeman	24,735	801
Hardin	11,914	800
Haywood	47,214	2,978
Henderson	22,141	1,328
Henry	7,316	800
Hickman	40	4
Humphreys	8	0
Knox	23	2
Lake	27,045	1,000
Lauderdale	35,494	524
Lawrence	24,064	0
Lewis	359	35
Lincoln	13,774	1,653
Loudon	6	0
McMinn	2,588	100
McNairy	23,163	2,500
Madison	36,658	2,017
Marion	789	70
Marshall	486	61
Maury	217	22
Meigs	978	40
Monroe	820	40
Moore	82	7
Obion	13,484	1,500
Perry	262	25
Polk	3,389	150
Rhea	25	4
Roane	2	0

TABLE II.—*1950 cotton crop: county acreage allotments and reserves and State acreage reserves for adjustments in small farm allotments and for establishing acreage allotments for new cotton farms*—Con.

TENNESSEE—continued

County (1)	County acreage allotments (2)	Committee acreage reserve (3)
Rutherford	7,549	755
Sequatchie	4	0
Shelby	62,334	1,600
Stewart	17	3
Tipton	49,152	3,000
Van Buren	34	4
Warren	539	80
Wayne	4,575	500
Weakley	11,104	904
White	96	7
Williamson	137	13
Wilson	57	6
a. State total	664,653	
b. State acreage for additional allotments to small farms	25,370	
c. State acreage reserve for new farms and small farms	13,630	
d. State acreage allotment	703,653	

1942 COUNTY COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS IN TENNESSEE

County	Acres
Bedford	2,708
Benton	5,515
Blount	2
Bradley	3,932
Cannon	101
Carroll	23,989
Chester	13,961
Coffee	2,314
Crockett	27,863
Davidson	26
Decatur	7,784
De Kalb	52
Dickson	13
Dyer	41,073
Fayette	58,737
Franklin	6,535
Gibson	47,642
Giles	15,315
Grundy	202
Hamilton	2,008
Hardeman	25,450
Hardin	13,192
Haywood	47,096
Henderson	23,128
Henry	10,841
Hickman	61
Humphreys	118
Knox	32
Lake	27,528
Lauderdale	33,920
Lawrence	24,469
Lewis	495
Lincoln	15,187
Loudon	15
McMinn	4,003
McNairy	23,815
Madison	38,834
Marion	773
Marshall	822
Maury	523
Meigs	1,307
Monroe	976
Moore	195
Obion	17,588
Overton	8
Perry	387
Polk	4,001
Rhea	29
Roane	9
Rutherford	12,451
Sequatchie	12
Shelby	70,868
Stewart	35
Tipton	50,359
Van Buren	12
Warren	1,286
Wayne	4,627
Weakley	13,327
White	292
Williamson	342
Wilson	206
State total	728,393

TABLE II.—*1950 cotton crop: county acreage allotments and reserves and State acreage reserves for adjustments in small farm allotments and for establishing acreage allotments for new cotton farms*—Con.

VIRGINIA

County (1)	County acreage allotments (2)	Committee acreage reserve (3)
Brunswick	2,565	256.0
Charlotte	45	3.1
Dinwiddie	264	21.0
Greenville	4,551	455.1
Halifax	7	0
Isle of Wight	583	38.0
Lunenburg	293	20.5
Mecklenburg	2,393	167.5
Nansemond	2,602	130.0
Norfolk	42	4.2
Nottoway	5	0
Prince George	81	6.1
Princess Anne	20	.5
Southampton	5,676	350.0
Surry	21	1.0
Sussex	1,977	158.0
a. State total	21,125	
b. State acreage for additional allotments to small farms	4,330	
c. State acreage reserve for new farms and small farms	[1] 2,897	
d. State acreage allotment	28,352	

[1] Includes 62 acres erroneously allotted to Halifax County which was recovered by the State committee and was prorated to counties for establishing small-farm allotments.

NEVADA

County (1)	County acreage allotments (2)	Committee acreage reserve (3)
Nye	110	0
a. State total	110	
b. State acreage for additional allotments to small farms	0	
c. State acreage reserve for new farms and small farms	0	
d. State acreage allotment	110	

1942 COUNTY COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS IN VIRGINIA

County	Acres
Amelia	6
Brunswick	6,941
Charlotte	582
Chesterfield	29
Dinwiddie	946
Greensville	7,428
Halifax	244
Isle of Wight	2,314
Lunenburg	1,160
Mecklenburg	7,337
Middlesex	2
Nansemond	5,427
New Kent	48
Norfolk	1,027
Northampton	1
Nottoway	176
Pittsylvania	22
Prince Edward	8
Prince George	233
Princess Anne	262
Southampton	12,643
Surry	320
Sussex	3,123
State total	50,279

MISS ELIZABETH A. McGEE

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, Miss Elizabeth A. McGee, one of South Carolina's fair teen-agers, a resident of Spartanburg in my district, has been chosen under keen competition to represent all the Cotton States as Maid of Cotton.

It is entirely fitting that Miss McGee should reign as queen since her home is in the largest textile district in the world. Having won this distinction in Tennessee recalls to mind that one of South Carolina's sons blazed the trail for her by going to Tennessee and after accomplishing many outstanding feats, became one of our great Democratic Presidents. As President he not only balanced the budget but left office without a national debt.

I am sure my colleagues join me in extending heartiest congratulations to Miss McGee, and look forward to meeting her personally when she visits the Nation's Capital.

"THE SUN HAS SET"

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the New York Evening Sun has set, never to rise again. It was a paper famous in the annals of New York journalistic history, and it was a paper to reckon with.

Unfortunately, however, latterly it catered only to the carriage trade, and as the aristocrats in New York grew fewer in number, its circulation grew smaller. Its hard-shelled conservatism, the ferocity of its hatred for Franklin D. Roosevelt, the violence of its opposition to the New Deal, could not save it.

The World-Telegram, an exemplary paper with excellent coverage, has swallowed it. The World-Telegram calls itself an independent and liberal paper. There is no doubt about its independence, but there is about its liberalism. It, too, played the wrong horses. It bet on the illiberal Dewey and on the illiberal Dulles. It, too, resents the Fair Deal.

However, we wish the World-Telegram and its publisher, Roy Howard, and its editor, Lee Wood, and their colleagues good fortune in the merger with the Sun. They are able men. May they see the light of real liberalism.

THE FUEL SITUATION

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, events of our time make it absolutely necessary that we face with reality the critical state of the Nation's petroleum reserves, and that we take immediate steps for the conservation of those reserves.

Our military security is threatened by the critical state of our petroleum reserves, and we are also faced with the situation that oil and gas-heated homes will be cold in a national emergency.

Our domestic oil industry now has almost no reserve productive capacity such as existed at the outbreak of World War II and without which victory would have been in doubt.

I have today introduced a resolution calling for an investigation into the Nation's fuel reserves, and particularly into the critical state of our reserve supply of petroleum and natural gas.

I am convinced that such an investigation will bring out publicly that first, this Nation will soon face a shortage of domestic petroleum production; second, we are needlessly wasteful in the use of oil and natural gas; third, we cannot rely on increased imports in the event of war; fourth, we cannot rely for years to come, and then only at a cost of billions of dollars, on the development of synthetic fuels, except from natural gas; fifth, many coal mines are being abandoned, "drowned out," and permanently lost as a natural resource; sixth, our railroads will be endangered both financially and physically, and there will be a shortage of locomotives and railroad cars.

In the event of a military emergency our survival will inevitably depend on oil. Estimates indicate that the defense forces will need double the crippling amounts they required in World War II, or 3,500,000 barrels a day. Without this oil, they will not be able to move planes, ships, tanks, guns or men on a global front. I estimate that home owners will get less than half of their oil requirements. That means cold homes. Natural gas may be shut off entirely in the eastern territory.

The general public must be told again and again of the seriousness of this situation and made aware of the consequences to the individual. Home owners' needs will have to compete sharply with those of national defense, air lines, factories, mechanized farms, trucks, railroads, water carriers, and other mobile users.

Considering the dangerous shortage of fuel oil which the country will certainly experience if there is any national emergency, I was shocked to discover that the Army and Navy, for example, are using many millions of gallons of this military essential to heat buildings in areas which are abundantly supplied with nearby coal. Veterans' Administration buildings use millions more. Many of these buildings were originally designed to burn coal. New Federal housing projects use fuel oil almost exclusively.

Heating of Government buildings with irreplaceable fuel oil and natural gas is increasing. Although this is only one element in the situation, it is important not only in terms of millions of gallons of oil and billions of cubic feet of gas, but equally important in setting a bad national example.

If it were possible to produce our estimated reserves of oil and natural gas at the current rate, we would have no oil in 12 years—no natural gas in about 25 years. We have almost limitless reserves of coal.

Many thousands of new homes have been constructed to burn gas or oil, and cannot be converted to the use of solid fuel without practically rebuilding the entire structure.

The impact of these developments on our railroad transportation system must also be considered. World War II demonstrated beyond a doubt the absolute necessity for maintaining our railroads at or near peak efficiency. During these critical years, these roads handled 97 percent of all military and naval personnel within the country, and 90 percent of all war freight.

A serious decline in solid-fuel traffic, which now amounts to more than a third of all rail freight, will be followed by a corresponding decline in equipment, and will impair the ability of the railroads to meet a military or other transportation emergency.

The present situation with regard to depletion of oil and natural gas reserves in this country is too serious to be allowed to continue without taking corrective measures. An investigation by a Joint Committee on Fuel Policy to ascertain the facts and to inform the public of them, I believe, will prove the necessity for remedial legislation and a national fuels policy.

THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday the President appeared before us and had much to say about advancing the welfare of all the people. He professed adherence to the American ideal of the greatest happiness for the greatest number and equal justice to all. With an apparently new-found fluency of language, he sought to clothe his ruinous socialistic program with all the blessings of the proven American principles of freedom and opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, if President Truman really seeks to serve all the people and to protect the many from the arrogant greediness of a selfish few, he would have intervened in the current coal strike. If President Truman really wishes to curb monopolies he deems so dangerous to our system of free enterprise, he would use the power vested in him under existing law to curb the abuses of a labor monopoly depriving people of employment and our American homes of heat from the winter cold.

The coal-shortage situation in my State of Illinois is acute. For instance, a large coal dealer on the west side of

Chicago, who serves many hundreds of customers, has on hand and in transit only 1,800 tons of coal. A year ago his inventory was 11,800. In other words, he has on hand only a 4 days' supply for his customers as against a normal 30 days' supply.

I could cite innumerable other examples. I can cite a number of small communities in Illinois that are entirely out of coal: Mount Morris, the little village of Malta, the village of Forreston, and the village of Genoa. And so on through the list.

This crisis in which homes, schools, and hospitals are without heat, and in which thousands of coal miners are unwillingly deprived of work, has been created by one man—John L. Lewis. And the responsibility for its continuation is that of one man—President Truman.

Last September I appealed to the President to exercise the authority vested in him by the emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. By using the machinery provided by that act for such emergencies as this, where our national health and safety are imperiled, the President can obtain the continued production of coal for at least a period of 80 days. Within that time there will be opportunity to obtain a peaceful settlement of the dispute and, in the meantime, our people will not suffer from the winter cold for the lack of fuel.

I introduced at that time a resolution calling upon the President to exercise his authority. But it was allowed to lie in the committee with no consideration whatever.

Mr. Speaker, it may be that President Truman feels he owes a political debt to certain labor union monopolists. But no political debt to any minority pressure group should be paid at the expense of the American people as a whole.

In refusing to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act the excuse is used that no emergency exists. The question is: What constitutes an emergency? As one of my friends has aptly asked: "Must we wait until people are herded into heating centers and businesses and public buildings shut down before action is taken?"

Mr. Speaker, as representatives of the people we have a direct responsibility to the people. I call upon the Committee on Education and Labor to institute an immediate investigation of the facts. Such an investigation will reveal the very critical situation that exists. Such an investigation will show that a real emergency exists in which any President, if he honestly seeks to serve all the people and not just a selfish monopolistic few, cannot fail to act.

If the committee would merely hold a hearing on the resolution I introduced last September, it would obtain the factual evidence of the existing emergency that would, I am sure, persuade the Committee to report my resolution that the Congress as a whole may express itself for the people as a whole.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HINSHAW, for 10 days.

To Mr. SMITH of Kansas (at the request of Mr. HOPE), indefinitely, on account of death in his family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, January 9, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1084. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air, transmitting by rank and age groups, the number of such officers above the rank of major in the Army or lieutenant commander of the Navy with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law to be paid to such officers during the 6-month period preceding the date of report, pursuant to Public Law 301, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1085. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report of operations, expenditures, and obligations under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1086. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949, covering the receipts, expenditures, and work of the agricultural experiment stations in the States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico under the Hatch, Adams, Purnell, and supplementary acts, title 1 of the Bankhead-Jones Act of June 29, 1935; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1087. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for families of moderate income"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1088. A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a letter expressing the deep gratitude of the Finnish Government and people to the Government and people of the United States for the expression of good will and cooperation toward Finland manifested in Public Law 265, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1089. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting the Fifteenth Annual Report to Congress of the National Mediation Board, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1090. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Fourth Annual Report of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, describing the operations under the Federal Airport Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1091. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a statement of the adjudications rendered during the year 1949 under the act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1231); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1092. A letter from the executive secretary, the American National Theater and Academy, transmitting a report of accomplishments and finances for the 18 months ended June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1093. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the disposition of tribal funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, Wash."; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1094. A letter from the chairman, Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion, transmitting, in compliance with Public Law 377, Eighty-first Congress, first session, which empowers the Commission, with the approval of the President, "to determine the details of and to execute a suitable plan for the preservation or other appropriate disposition of all the materials removed from the Executive Mansion in connection with the renovation thereof and consistent with their symbolical value and without commercial exploitation," stating the subject remains under study and a satisfactory plan will be adopted in the near future; to the Committee on Public Works.

1095. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 26, 1949, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Crisfield Harbor, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 435); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1096. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 4, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of report on the Blackstone River, Mass. and R. I., with a view to improvement on Scott's Brook in Massachusetts in the interest of flood control, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on May 25, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1097. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting recommendations for the enactment of legislation to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, by providing for treble-damage actions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1098. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting the Thirty-third Annual Report of the United States Tariff Commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1099. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1100. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the semiannual report, for the period ending December 31, 1949, of leases entered into by the Department of the Navy under the authority of Public Law 364, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Report on study of immigration and nationality problems pursuant to House Resolution 238, Eighty-first Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1469). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 6616. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens

of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 6617. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 6618. A bill to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for families of moderate income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 6619. A bill to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for families of moderate income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 6620. A bill declaring Little River, La Salle and Catahoula Parishes, La., to be a nonnavigable waterway; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 6621. A bill to provide for the construction of administration and public meeting structures and facilities at Moores Creek National Military Park, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 6622. A bill to amend section 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit the transportation of obscene phonograph records in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 6623. A bill to amend section 1073, title 18, United States Code, with respect to indecent molestation of minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 6624. A bill to authorize the construction of a Federal building at Jamaica, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 6625. A bill relating to cotton-acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 6626. A bill to prohibit the payment of awards of annuity under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, in the case of Government officers and employees convicted of a felony; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6627. A bill to establish licensing and bonding requirements for certain building contractors in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 6628. A bill to provide for a 20-percent increase in the annuities and pensions payable to retired railroad employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 6629. A bill to provide increased retired pay or disability retirement pay for certain warrant officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 6630. A bill to increase the period of education or training to which veterans of World War II are entitled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6631. A bill to amend the income limitation governing the granting of pension to veterans and death-pension benefits to widows and children of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 6632. A bill to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to establish and continue offices in the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 6633. A bill to provide that certain services performed in the custodial service and in the mail-equipment shops of the Post Office Department shall be credited toward promotion to the meritorious and longevity grades established for the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 6634. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize donations of certain surplus property for public-health purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 6635. A bill to grant free postage to members of the armed forces while confined for treatment in a military or naval hospital and to veterans while being furnished hospital treatment or institutional care in institutions operated by or under contract with the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 6636. A bill to repeal the taxes on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

H. R. 6637. A bill to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended, with respect to the transportation of certain portable stevedoring gear and tackle by vessels of foreign registry; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. R. 6638. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 6639. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 6640. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the disposition of public lands of the United States situated in the State of Oklahoma between the Cimarron base line and the north boundary of the State of Texas," approved August 7, 1946, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 6641. A bill to reduce or repeal certain excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. J. Res. 391. Joint resolution to declare July 4, 1950, as the date of the cessation of hostilities in the present war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. J. Res. 392. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating May 30, Memorial Day, as a day for a Nation-wide prayer for peace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. Con. Res. 151. Concurrent resolution to create a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Fuel Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 415. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEE:

H. Res. 416. Resolution granting 6 months' salary and $350 funeral expenses to the estate of Lillian Van Steenburgh, late an employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 6642. A bill for the relief of Frank Sokolich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 6643. A bill for the relief of Isabel Tabit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 6644. A bill for the relief of Edwin F. Rounds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 6645. A bill for the relief of the estate of Robert W. Hewitt, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6646. A bill for the relief of Khodaraham Sourshian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6647. A bill for the relief of George H. Zwick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 6648. A bill for the relief of Archbishop Athanasius Yeshue Samuel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 6649. A bill for the relief of Antranik Ayanian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6650. A bill for the relief of Basil Vasso Argyris and Mrs. Ailine Argyris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6651. A bill for the relief of William B. Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 6652. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fujiko Chichie Imbert, wife, and Robert Imbert, Jr., son of an American soldier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 6653. A bill for the relief of the Plymouth Manufacturing Co., Inc., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 6654. A bill for the relief of Jess J. Henson and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6655. A bill for the relief of Taeko Suzuki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 6656. A bill or the relief of Peter Michael El-Hini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6657. A bill for the relief of Georges Jules Louis Sauvage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 6658. A bill for the relief of Francis J. Kase; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 6659. A bill for the relief of Joseph Hendrykowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 6660. A bill for the relief of Esa Matuk Zacharia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 6661. A bill for the relief of Judy Fukuyo Nishiyama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1574. By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Petition of George Thompson, Ezzell Wilson, George M. Scroggins, and others, of Jerusalem, Ark., opposing Senate bill 1103 and House bill 2945, lowering the weight of parcel-post service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1575. By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: Petition of Wyoming residents, in re legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1576. Also, petition of Wyoming residents, in re legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1577. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition of 22 residents of Schenectady, N. Y., indicating their support of Senate bill 1847, which will prohibit liquor advertising on the radio and in the press, and advocating early passage by the Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1578. Also, petition of 103 residents of Schenevus, Worcester, Westford, Oneonta, and Edmeston, in the Thirty-first Congressional District, New York, advocating passage of a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1579. By Mr. PETERSON: Petition of Mrs. E. P. Peabody, of Clearwater, Fla., with reference to the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1580. Also, petition of Mrs. F. C. Fearmen, of Lake City, Fla., and others, and also one signed by Mrs. Beulah E. Taylor-Fritz, of Miami, Fla., to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1581. Petition of Mrs. Anna E. Baxter, Walden, N. Y., favoring the prohibition of transportation of alcoholic beverages and the prohibition of the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1582. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Delaware State Dental Hygienists Association, Wilmington, Del., requesting Congress not to enact any legislation which will hamper freedom such as the current proposals for compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1583. Also, petition of the secretary, Cleveland Dental Society, Cleveland, Ohio, requesting Congress not to enact any legislation containing the principle of compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1584. Also, petition of the secretary, Chamber of Commerce, Chambersburg, Pa., requesting that the Chambersburg Chamber of Commerce be placed on record as being against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1585. Also, petition of Edmond C. Fletcher, lawyer, Washington, D. C., relative to redress of grievances and praying for the impeachment of the Honorable Donnell Gilliam, district judge of the United States for the eastern district of North Carolina, for gross misbehavior in office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1586. Also, petition of the adviser, Hopi Indian Nation, Shungopovy, Ariz., calling attention to several important matters with regards to the Navajo-Hopi long-range program which was recently vetoed by the President; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1587. Also, petition of the president, Wetzel County Classroom Teachers Association, Pine Grove, W. Va., requesting that legislation favoring Federal aid to education be enacted providing that State and local control of educational policies and programs be retained; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1588. Also, petition of the chairman, American China Policy Association, Inc., New York, N. Y., requesting recognition of the disaster that has befallen the free peoples of the world and the danger to American security as a result of the Communist armed conquest of China—between one-fourth and one-fifth of all humanity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 9, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God who hath taught us to pray for the coming of Thy kingdom, strengthen all who are striving after true brotherhood and who are working for justice and peace. Restrain in us and in all men every temper which makes for war, all ungenerous judgments, all presumptuous claims, all promptings of self-assertion. Make us ready to recognize the needs and aspirations of other peoples and grant us the will to do what we can to remove misunderstanding and suspicion, at home and abroad. Give us courage and strength for the vast task of social rebuilding that needs to be dared if life for all men, under all skies, is to be made full and free. We ask it in the name that is above every name. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

HARRY P. CAIN, a Senator from the State of Washington, and HOMER E. CAPEHART, a Senator from the State of Indiana, appeared in their seats today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. FULBRIGHT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 6, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], that he be granted leave of the Senate for today, Monday, tomorrow, Tuesday, and Wednesday, to be absent on official business. He has left the city as a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works which will hold hearings in the State of New Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the leave is granted.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Magnuson
Anderson	Hendrickson	Martin
Benton	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Brewster	Hill	Morse
Butler	Hoey	Murray
Byrd	Holland	Neely
Cain	Humphrey	O'Conor
Capehart	Hunt	Robertson
Chapman	Ives	Russell
Connally	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Darby	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Kefauver	Sparkman
Douglas	Kem	Stennis
Downey	Kerr	Taft
Dworshak	Kilgore	Taylor
Eastland	Knowland	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	Leahy	Thye
Ferguson	Lehman	Tobey
Flanders	Lodge	Tydings
Frear	Long	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Lucas	Watkins
George	McCarran	Wherry
Gillette	McCarthy	Wiley
Graham	McFarland	Williams
Green	McKellar	Young
Gurney	McMahon	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

THE BUDGET—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 405)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying budget, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on pp. 207–231.)

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

REPORT ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 436)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Twenty-ninth Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations, for the quarter ending June 30, 1949.

This report contains in appendix I a Report on Lend-Lease Fiscal Operations, prepared by the Treasury Department and submitted to the Secretary of State in accordance with Executive Order 9726. This fiscal report covers the period from March 11, 1941, through June 30, 1949.

In April 1949 the Dominican Republic and Venezuela completed payment of their accounts under their respective lend-lease agreements.

A settlement agreement was signed with Ethiopia on May 20, 1949, and appears in this report as appendix II.

On September 27, 1949, understanding was reached with Soviet representatives as to the dates and procedures for the return of 3 icebreakers and 27 frigates of the United States Navy which had been made available to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics under lend-lease. Negotiations with the Soviet Union on other lend-lease matters have resulted in some progress but as yet there has been no substantial agreement on several of the major issues.

Other lend-lease activities during the period covered by this report included the continuation of final settlement negotiations and other winding-up activities, described more fully in the report itself.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 9, 1950.*

(Enclosure: Twenty-ninth Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations.)

REPORT ON OPERATIONS OF UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 437)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Twentieth Quarterly Report of expenditures and operations under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Joint Resolution, Public Law 267, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 28, 1944. This report covers the period from April 1, 1949, through June 30, 1949.

In view of the fact that the United States appropriations for participation in UNRA expired for expenditure purposes on June 30, 1949, this is the last report which will be submitted.

The unexpended balance of $2,642,209.08 remaining under the United States appropriations will revert to the surplus fund in the United States Treasury. Any unpaid claims against this balance are subject to presentation to the General Accounting Office for direct settlement in the usual manner.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 9, 1950.*

(Enclosure: Twentieth Quarterly Report.)

REPORT ON FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 438)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, showing all receipts and disbursements on account of refunds, allowances, and annuities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949, in connection with the Foreign Service retirement and disability system as required by section 862, Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724).

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 9, 1950.*

(Enclosure: Report concerning retirement and disability fund, Foreign Service.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

DIPLOMATIC STATUS FOR REPRESENTATIVES ON COUNCIL OF ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend certain privileges to representatives of member states on the Council of the Organization of American States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION ENTITLED "A PROPOSAL TO SAFEGUARD INVESTORS IN UNREGISTERED SECURITIES"

A letter from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a supplemental report of that Commission entitled "A Proposal to Safeguard Investors in Unregistered Securities" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president and comptroller of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that company for the year 1949 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred, as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Resolutions adopted by the St. Petersburg Townsend Club No. 1, and the South Miami Townsend Club No. 1, both in the State of Florida, favoring the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan, providing old-age insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

A petition signed by more than 600 citizens of the State of Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution adopted by the Pine Crest Citizens' Association, of Prince Georges County, Md., favoring the enactment of House bill 4476, to provide for a commission to determine the need for coordinated regional planning and action in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia with respect to tax legislation, and other matters; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A resolution adopted by the Maryland League of Building, Savings and Loan Associations, Baltimore, Md., favoring a reduction in Federal expenditures and elimination of waste and duplication in government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A petition signed by sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the adoption of Senate Resolution 125, authorizing an inquiry into the progress of the denazification program in the American zone in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Annual Convention of the Military Order of the World Wars, San Francisco, Calif., relating to the protection of the United States against subversive Communist activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the Maryland State Dental Association, of Baltimore, Md. (with an accompanying paper), and the Baltimore (Md.) Dental Society, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. GREEN:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to pass legislation repealing excise taxes, or luxury taxes, so-called

"Whereas jewelry manufacturing is a major source of employment for the people of this State, since Rhode Island stands first throughout the United States in output of production in this field; and

"Whereas luxury taxes, so-called, were applied against this industry in time of war for the laudable purpose of preventing inflation and so that employment might be diverted to the war industries; and

"Whereas the war is now over and the retention of these taxes has the effect of reducing employment in Rhode Island by reason of sales resistance to our jewelry products: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations hereby memorializes and petitions the Congress of the United States of America to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, legislation repealing excise taxes, or luxury taxes, so-called; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the President of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States earnestly requesting the latter to use every effort to have the present legislation repealed which now provides for such taxes."

STUDY OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS WITH STATES AND MUNICIPALITIES AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 205), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (g) (2) (D) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 16, 1950, and ending on February 15, 1951, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution (which shall not exceed $15,000 for studying intergovernmental relations with the States and municipalities or $18,000 for studying relations with international organizations) shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

STUDY OF OPERATION OF GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES

Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 206), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or any other duties imposed upon it, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1950, and ending on January 31, 1951, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, in addition to any unexpended balance under Senate Resolution 52, Eighty-first Congress, first session, agreed to February 10, 1949, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 2803. A bill for the relief of Angela Maria Pisano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2804. A bill for the relief of Armando Neri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 2805. A bill authorizing the naturalization of George Aeton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2806. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2807. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Blaine W. Hughes; and

S. 2808. A bill for the relief of Ervin Haas and Leno Vescovi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma (by request):

S. 2809. A bill to provide for an agricultural program in the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2810. A bill for the relief of Walter Ziffer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2811. A bill to amend section 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code, with respect to the importation or transportation of obscene matters; and

S. 2812. A bill to prohibit the transportation of obscene matters in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES—EXCISE TAX REDUCTION AMENDMENT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, at this time I submit an amendment to the measure under consideration, H. R. 2023, and ask that my proposed amendment be printed.

By way of explanation, the amendment would reduce excise taxes and is identical with section 3 of H. R. 3905, a bill which was reported favorably by the Senate Finance Committee last July and is now Order No. 644 on the Senate Calendar. I want to emphasize that in preparing this amendment, I have made no changes whatever from the language as it appears in section 3 of H. R. 3905. Although I have several other amendments to present at the appropriate time, I have limited this amendment to those reductions in excises which have been approved by the Senate Finance Committee.

In brief, the amendment would repeal the war tax rates imposed by the Revenue Act of 1943 on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, electric light bulbs and tubes, communications, transportation of persons and admissions, and restore the rates which were imposed prior to that act. It would also repeal the retail tax on luggage and restore the former manufacturers' tax, and would reduce the tax on photographic apparatus, including films, to a uniform rate of 10 percent. Restoration of the manufacturers' tax on luggage would apply to fewer articles than the present retail tax and would remove the tax entirely from ladies' handbags, for example. The Senate report on H. R. 3905, Report No. 646, explains this matter clearly, and I ask that section 3 of the report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, section 3 of the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION 3

Section 3 of the bill repeals the war tax rates imposed by the Revenue Act of 1943 on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, electric light bulbs and tubes, communications, transportation of persons, and the retail tax on luggage. The repeal of the retail tax on luggage will restore the manufacturers' tax of 10 percent.

The manufacturers' tax on luggage applies to fewer articles than the retail tax. The manufacturers' tax applies only to trunks, valises, traveling bags, suitcases, hat boxes for use by travelers, fitted toilet cases (not including contents), and other travelers' luggage, and leather and imitation leather brief cases. Section 3 also provides for the reduction of the tax on photographic apparatus. The tax on cameras and camera equipment is reduced from 25 percent to 10 percent, and on films from 15 percent to 10 percent.

In the case of jewelry, watches selling at retail for not more than $65, and alarm clocks selling at retail for not more than $5 continue to be taxed at 10 percent.

The following table shows the reductions in rates and the loss in revenue involved on a full-year basis:

Estimated loss in revenue from excise-tax reductions under sec. 3[1]

[Amounts in millions of dollars]

	Section of code	Present rates	Rates under sec. 3	Estimated revenue, full year		Estimated reduction in revenue, full year
				Present rates	Rates under sec. 3	
Admissions	1700 (a)	1 cent for each 5 cents or major fraction.	1 cent for each 10 cents or fraction.	384	211	173
Electric-light bulbs	3406 (a) (10)	20 percent	5 percent	27	7	20
Furs	2401	do	10 percent	58	32	26
Jewelry	2400 [2]	do [2]	do	200	121	79
Luggage:						
Retailers' excise tax	1651	do	None	75		75
Manufacturers' excise tax	304	None	10 percent		9	+9
Toilet preparations	2402	20 percent	do	93	49	44
Telephone, telegraph, radio, etc.:						
Local telephone	3465 (a)	15 percent	do	225	158	67
All other	3465 (a)	8 to 25 percent	5 to 20 percent	310	246	64
Transportation of persons	3469	15 percent	10 percent	240	168	72
Photographic apparatus	3406 (a) (4)	15 to 25 percent.	do	42	25	17
Total				1,654	1,026	628

[1] Amounts shown represent estimated reductions in excise-tax collections. These estimates take account of increased consumption resulting from the reduced rates. They do not reflect any increases in income taxes because of lower business deductions. If effect is given to this factor the loss may be reduced by about $50,000,000. Larger profits which might result from increased sales could reduce the revenue loss still further.

[2] Except watches selling at retail for not more than $65 and alarm clocks selling at retail for not more than $5, the rate on both of which is 10 percent.

The war excise-tax rates were imposed along with the excess-profits tax and heavy corporation income taxes and individual income taxes. The excess-profits tax has been repealed, and individual and corporate income taxes reduced. It is believed only fair that some reduction should be made in the war excise-tax rates, which are interfering with consumer purchasing power and are increasing the cost of doing business.

Mr. BUTLER. The estimated loss in revenue from these reductions, as shown by the table in the Senate report, would amount to $628,000,000 on a full year's basis, and I suspect that even that figure is exaggerated since for some of these industries sales have dropped off so sharply because of the tax that the anticipated revenue from present rates is not being realized.

Mr. President, in my judgment, these excise-tax reductions are long overdue. When these taxes were imposed, the Nation and the industries concerned were promised that they were temporary and would be removed after the war. The wartime excess-profits tax has been repealed, and the high wartime individual and corporate income-tax rates have been reduced. Excise-tax payers are the only category who have had no relief from the high wartime rates. Since the Senate Finance Committee has favorably recommended these reductions, I very earnestly believe that the Senate should approve my amendment.

The amendment is offered on behalf of myself and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

CONSULAR CONVENTION RELATING TO NONAPPLICATION OF CONVENTION TO NEWFOUNDLAND—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate remove the ban of secrecy with regard to the consular convention relating to the nonapplication of the convention to Newfoundland and Newfoundland citizens, Executive A, Eighty-first Congress, second session, which was sent to the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the ban of secrecy is removed from the convention, and the convention, together with the President's message of transmittal, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the consular convention, with an accompanying protocol of signature, between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, signed at Washington on February 16, 1949, and an exchange of notes dated October 12, 1949, relating to the nonapplication of the convention to Newfoundland and Newfoundland citizens.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the convention.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 9, 1950.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) consular convention with the United Kingdom; (3) protocol of signature accompanying the convention; (4) exchange of notes.)

PROTOCOL AMENDING INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT FOR SUPPRESSION OF WHITE SLAVE TRAFFIC—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate remove the ban of secrecy with regard to the protocol amending the international agreement for the suppression of the white slave traffic, Executive B, Eighty-first Congress, second session, which was sent to the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the ban of secrecy is removed from the protocol, and the protocol, together with the President's message of transmittal, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of a protocol amending the international agreement for the suppression of the white slave traffic signed at Paris on May 18, 1904, and the international convention for the suppression of the white slave traffic signed at Paris on May 4, 1910.

The protocol was opened for signature at Lake Success, N. Y., on May 4, 1949, and was signed on behalf of the United States of America on that date. Its object is the transfer to the United Nations of the functions exercised by the French Government under the 1904 agreement and 1910 convention.

I also transmit herewith, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Secretary of State regarding the protocol, and a copy, in English translation, of the annex to the protocol.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 9, 1950.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) certified copy of protocol; (3) copy of annex in English translation.)

PROTOCOL AMENDING AGREEMENT FOR SUPPRESSION OF CIRCULATION OF OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate remove the ban of secrecy with regard to the protocol amending the agreement for the suppression of the circulation of obscene publications, Executive C, Eighty-first Congress, second session, which was sent to the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the ban of secrecy is removed from the protocol, and the protocol, together with the President's message of transmittal, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of a protocol amending the agreement for the suppression of the circulation of obscene publications signed at Paris on May 4, 1910.

The protocol was opened for signature at Lake Success, N. Y., on May 4, 1949, and was signed on behalf of the United States of America on that date. Its object is the transfer to the United Nations of the functions exercised by the French Government under the agreement of May 4, 1910.

I also transmit herewith, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Secretary of State regarding the protocol, and a copy, in English translation, of the annex to the protocol.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 9, 1950.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) certified copy of protocol; (3) copy of annex in English translation.)

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT AT THE SAMUEL GOMPERS CENTENNIAL DINNER

[Mr. NEELY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the President at the Samuel Gompers centennial dinner, Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., January 5, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT AT THE SAMUEL GOMPERS CENTENNIAL DINNER

[Mr. NEELY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the Vice President at the Samuel Gompers centennial dinner held in Washington, D. C., January 5, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECOGNITION OF COMMUNISTS IN CHINA—EDITORIAL FROM THE GREENVILLE (S. C.) NEWS

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Needn't Follow Britain," from the Greenville (S. C.) News of January 7, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PROBLEM OF FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID AND FEDERAL TAXES

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Independence of State Agencies Is Shrinking Under Federal Authority," written by John Wyngaard and published in the Janesville (Wis.) Daily Gazette of January 6, 1950, and an article entitled "Federal Hand-Outs Tangle Tax Picture," written by Sanford Goltz and published in the Wisconsin State Journal of recent date, which appear in the Appendix.]

LOBBYING MONEY—ARTICLE BY JOSEPH HARSCH

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Lobbying Money," written by Joseph Harsch, published in the Christian Science Monitor, and republished in the Leader, of Bismarck, N. Dak., which appears in the Appendix.]

HOW FALSEHOODS SPREAD—EDITORIAL FROM THE BISMARCK LEADER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "How Falsehoods Spread," published in the Leader, of Bismarck, N. Dak., January 5, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES—ARTICLE FROM THE READER'S DIGEST

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Reader's Digest relating to Government expenditures, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey obtained the floor.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Let the Chair first state the question before the Senate. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], inserting certain language after line 10, on page 4 of the House bill 2023.

The Senator from New Jersey has the floor and yields to his colleague the junior Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Magnuson
Anderson	Hendrickson	Martin
Benton	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Brewster	Hill	Morse
Butler	Hoey	Murray
Byrd	Holland	Neely
Cain	Humphrey	Robertson
Capehart	Hunt	Russell
Chapman	Ives	Saltonstall
Connally	Jenner	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Darby	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Donnell	Kefauver	Stennis
Douglas	Kem	Taft
Downey	Kerr	Taylor
Dworshak	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	Knowland	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	Langer	Thye
Ellender	Leahy	Tobey
Ferguson	Lehman	Tydings
Flanders	Lodge	Vandenberg
Frear	Long	Watkins
Fulbright	Lucas	Wherry
George	McCarran	Wiley
Gillette	McCarthy	Williams
Graham	McFarland	Young
Green	McKellar	
Gurney	McMahon	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I desire to take this occasion to report personally to my colleagues on my recent trip to the Far East and to make certain observations on conditions as I found them there and certain recommendations for consideration in the development of a sound far-eastern foreign policy. I am aware there are some matters I shall bring up that may be controversial, and my colleagues may wish to interrupt. I am going to request that I not be interrupted until after I have finished my address, at which time I shall be more than happy to answer questions of my colleagues.

My distinguished colleague the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] made a memorable address on the floor of the Senate last Thursday, in which he reviewed in some detail the developments leading up to the present debacle in China and pointed out what seemed to him, and I may add to a number of other Members of the Senate, to be the mistakes of policy, or, perhaps better stated, the lack of policy, of the administration in the far-eastern situation.

While I have been one of the severe critics of the administration on far-eastern policy, it is not my purpose in my remarks today to take the critical side, except, incidentally, as it may be relevant in making my points in my effort to develop a positive program. At the moment I am not interested in the answer to the question as to who has been wrong in this controversy, but I am profoundly interested in what may be the right answer to the legitimate question pressing us on all sides as to our future course and policy in the Far East if we are to stop the creeping paralysis of communism in that area.

It was because of my complete feeling of frustration after studying the China white paper, and after discovering the wide divergence of opinion among experts whom I had consulted, that I felt the urge, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, to go in person as soon as possible to the area affected and to get the "feel" of the situation on the ground. With the unanimous consent of the Senate, which I asked for and received on September 9, I made my plans to go to Japan first, after checking with General MacArthur and receiving his invitation to come. Mrs. Smith and I visited Japan, Okinawa, the Philippines, Hong Hong, Korea, Formosa, and on our flight home the island of Guam, the trusteed islands in the Pacific, and the Hawaiian Islands.

During this trip we interviewed many people, including the United States high command—military, naval, and air; our State Department officials—Ambassadors, consuls, and their staffs; native Japanese, Filipinos, Chinese, Koreans, and the inhabitants of the various islands. We also had the privilege of interviewing many Americans and British who for years have been living in these areas.

Immediately upon my return, which was about the end of October, and before I had had time to prepare my report to my committee in detail, I endeavored to contact the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, in order to make my recommendations directly to him. Of course, as we know, he at that time was about to start for his important conferences in Paris, and although he could not see me, he expressed interest in my trip, and at his suggestion I sent him a preliminary memorandum in the form of a letter to take with him on his journey to Paris, which contained two vitally important recommendations which I felt I should make immediately to the Department of State and to my committee.

That letter is dated November 4. I again want to emphasize the date. It was the first communication I made to anybody on the subject of my trip. I ask unanimous consent that this first communication to the Secretary of State after my return be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 4, 1949.

HON. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DEAN: I had hoped to see you before this to have a chance to talk to you personally about my experience in the Far East. I see by the papers this morning that you may be called suddenly to Paris for a conference with the British and French on policies generally, and therefore the chances of my seeing you before you return do not appear to be too bright. I realize the pressure you are under and want to send you my very best wishes as you undertake these important deliberations.

There are just two matters I wanted particularly to emphasize in my talk with you and I can state them in this letter, with the hope that I can elaborate my reasons at a later date:

1. I am strongly of the conviction that under no conditions should we recognize the Chinese Communist government at this time, and furthermore I hope it will be possible for you with your eloquence and diplomacy to persuade the British not to do so. Whether or not it ultimately has to be done remains to be seen, but I think it would be tragically fatal at the moment. From my talks with the British authorities in Hong Kong, I was convinced that they were thinking exclusively in terms of (a) defense of Hong Kong, or at any cost retaining it in British possession, and (b) the pressure of their commercial interests in Shanghai and Hong Kong to recognize the Commies, so that traditional British trade can go on as before.

I was also impressed, however, with the argument from the British that they felt whatever stand was taken should be taken with the United States and not apart from the United States. I feel, therefore, that our strong stand against recognition would have a weighty effect upon the British position. In any event, however, I urge that we do not make the mistake, as I see it, of recognizing the Chinese Communist government at this time. Many things can happen in the next few months.

2. The second important conviction that came to me from my trip was that under no conditions should we let Formosa fall into the hands of the Chinese Communists or under the domination of Russia. This, of course, presents a very difficult question, and it is problematical whether the Nationalist Government could defend Formosa without further aid from us. From the standpoint of our own national security, however, I was convinced from my visit on the ground and getting the feel of our strategical island bases that the occupation of Formosa by hostile forces would definitely threaten our security. I did not arrive at this conclusion from any strategical knowledge of my own,

which I make no claim to, but from the insistence of our military and naval forces wherever I went that this was a very dangerous issue and that we could not afford to pass it up.

Without raising the question of whether or not we should back up the Nationalist forces in their defense, the feeling seems to be among many of our people in Japan and in other places that in light of the fact that the peace treaty has not as yet been signed with Japan, Formosa today is technically part of Japan, even though because of the Cairo agreement we permitted the Nationalists to take it over. If we can still take the position that technically it is part of Japan, and that as we are occupying Japan we have a responsibility for all Japanese possessions, we could, I believe, perfectly consistently take it over by our occupancy, with notice to the UN that it might be made a trusteeship area. This should be done in collaboration with the Nationalist Government that is there and with the Taiwan people themselves, who I believe would be anxious to have us take such a step. If this were done, the Chinese Communists would be faced with the responsibility of attacking the United States if they attacked Formosa under these conditions.

I am sending you this line at this time because of your contemplated trip to Europe, and as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, who feels he has a personal responsibility to express to our representative his convictions on these important points. I am working now on a more complete report to my committee, based on my observations, and to you as Secretary of State.

With kindest personal regards and assurances to you of my eagerness to work these problems out on a completely cooperative basis, having in mind the legislative as well as the executive responsibilities of all of us, I remain,

Always cordially yours,

H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
United States Senator.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In this letter I made two points which I shall develop later—first, the importance of nonrecognition of Communist China and of efforts to prevail on the British to join us in that course; and second, the strategic importance of preventing Communist seizure of Formosa.

Shortly thereafter the discussion of the far-eastern situation became very prominent in the public press. In light of the special interest that had arisen with regard to the Formosa problem especially, I wrote to the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, under date of December 27—and I again emphasize the date, December 27—submitting to him some further suggestions. These will appear later in this address.

Mr. President, at this point I desire to comment on certain parts of the report which I made to the Foreign Relations Committee, and copies of which went to the Secretary of State and others in the State Department concerned with far-eastern affairs. I ask unanimous consent that there appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of my address the full text of this report with the letter of transmittal in order that the RECORD may be complete.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In part II of the report, namely, Comments on Specific Areas, I made a brief summary of those areas covered by the trip other than China and its problems; particularly, I discussed briefly the situation in Japan, where it will be noted my report is very positive and very optimistic, and particularly points out the magnificent work which has been done by the American occupation under the brilliant leadership of General MacArthur.

Part III of my report was a separate treatment of the problem of China. Here I was dealing with the real purpose of my trip, and, as I pointed out in my report, we were handicapped because of the difficulty and practical impossibility of getting inside China. General MacArthur came to our rescue by making it possible for us to go to Hong Kong, and later to Formosa, where we did have a first-hand opportunity of studying some of the difficult problems involved in those areas. Everywhere we went in the Far East, China was a primary subject of discussion. People with whom I talked were divided into two main groups; first, those who follow the general line of our United States policy and look upon the Nationalist cause as completely "washed up"; second, those who are sharply critical of the United States policy and feel we are largely to blame for the let-down of morale of the Nationalists and who feel there is still salvage in the existing situation, desperate though it is.

As I stated in my opening remarks, it is not my purpose to seek to place blame. What I am seeking to do is to find, if possible, some formula for the future and see if there is any salvage in the existing Chinese situation.

It was my privilege in my visits to Hong Kong and Formosa to talk with many American-trained Chinese who have the vision of our western Christian tradition, and who, I believe, would sincerely make any personal sacrifice to save China from the dangers that now threaten her. I had the privilege of conferring at some length with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, who in spite of all the mistakes he has admittedly made in dealing with this situation, is nevertheless, in my judgment, one of the most important figures World War II produced, and who may still have much to contribute to the salvation of his country. In my conference with him—and I want to emphasize this—I purposely avoided discussion of any further military assistance. I made it as clear as I could that I was not thinking in military terms so that there could be no possible implication that further military aid might be forthcoming. I knew the feeling of the administration on that subject, and I did not want to be put in the position of seeming to be promising any military aid. This was not because I did not hope we might decide to give them further military aid for the defense of Formosa, but because I wanted to highlight my own conviction that there was another approach to the Chinese problems from the ideological side which had been too much neglected. What I did stress, therefore, was that the Nationalist Government had not offered the Chinese people any program of reform and rehabilitation which could compete adequately with the Russian-inspired Communist promises. We pointed out that even on the island of Formosa which had been Japanese territory, the Nationalists, when they took over, could have made the island an ideal Chinese province with all the reforms that the Chinese people were yearning for. Unfortunately, the island has had Nationalist governors who had the purely militaristic point of view, and who unfortunately treated the Formosan people not as liberated Chinese, but as a conquered population.

When I was in Formosa an eminent and high-minded Chinese was governor, namely, Gen. Chen Cheng. My criticisms are not aimed at him, because he was seeking reforms in that area about which complaints had been made. I was convinced from my talks with him that he saw the need of the reforms which we had been discussing, and in fact had taken some steps to put them into effect. He was a military man, however, and unfortunately the atmosphere of militarism was resented by the people. Since that time Gen. Chen Cheng has been put in command of a part of the Nationalist forces elsewhere, and Mr. K. C. Wu, an American-trained civilian Chinese, has been made governor of the island.

I had personally known of Mr. K. C. Wu prior to my trip to China, because he was educated at Princeton, with which I have been connected, and took a Ph. D. degree there. I can say from my knowledge of Ph. D. degrees that that was an accomplishment for a foreigner. He had the reputation of being a brilliant student and a man of the highest integrity. During my stay in Formosa I had very important talks with Mr. Wu. I was convinced of his ability and his vision, and it was he who explained best to me some of the problems which had handicapped the Generalissimo in his administrative duties.

To sum up the situation as I saw it there, the morale and leadership and the strength of the Nationalist Government, which was the foundation of Chiang Kai-shek's brilliant leadership in the war against Japan, has collapsed because of military mistakes and internal jealousies. It has also collapsed because of the thread of misunderstanding and, I regret to say, the ineptness on the part of our Government which runs through the whole post VJ-day story. My own judgment is that we did not thoroughly understand the Chinese psychology.

Let me add here that from my personal contacts and my knowledge over a number of years of some of these Chinese individuals, I am prepared to deny the unfortunate propaganda that all Chinese in the Nationalist ranks are corrupt. Of course there is some corruption in China, as there is in other parts of the world. But many of the fine Chinese we met still stand by the Nationalist cause and have been struggling hard to reform the Nationalist leadership.

I have gone at some length into this phase of the situation in China because I wish to emphasize that we have overlooked a far more important factor than mere military aid. That factor is what might be called the psychological or ideological factor which could have

meant support and backing for those high-minded Chinese whom we well knew and who were seeking reform and who should never have been given the discouragement that came from the feeling that their old traditional friend, the United States, had abandoned them in their time of greatest crisis.

After I had discussed in my report the problem of China, I took up part IV, which I called over-all observations, and under this head I made seven points.

My first observation was the yearning among all peoples in the far-eastern areas to express their own nationalism and to be free from external controls. That is literally in the air. This yearning for freedom and self-expression was so strong that it must inevitably impress any visitor, even for a short time. It certainly exists in Japan where General MacArthur has recognized it and is trying to give it expression. It certainly exists in the Philippines, where in spite of gratitude to the United States there is rejoicing over freedom and independence. It certainly exists in Korea where the South Koreans are ready to die in order to preserve the freedom they have won, and it certainly exists in Formosa where the natives are demanding freedom and are even suggesting that they might set up an independent state protected from the Communists on the one hand and not left under the subjection of the Nationalists on the other hand.

I wish to express the view at this point that there are Formosans who are between the two forces. We have been speaking in terms of those who are in this picture, and who are innocent bystanders and onlookers in the holocaust that is going on.

My second observation was that the people in the Far East were yearning for economic reform and rehabilitation. There are distinct protests in the air against old-fashioned colonialism on the one hand, and totalitarian controls on the other. The Chinese Communist movement is fooling the people by false promises of freedom and reform. Unfortunately we of the western democracies have failed adequately to explain and interpret the foundations of true liberty which are deeply spiritual in their nature and which through a thousand years of "sweet, blood and tears" have made possible the building of a great country such as the United States.

My third observation was that we Americans are not sufficiently Far-East minded. We come from European stock and therefore because of our ancestral influences, we think in terms of the problems of Europe rather than the problems of the Orient. Those who are representing us in the Far East, whether in the defense groups or in the State Department groups, all indicated to me a sense of loneliness in that the problems of Europe were being highlighted and the problems of the Far East were being neglected. They felt that the men on the ground who were in daily contact with these problems were not being considered, but that questions of policy were being decided in Washington, 10,000 miles away, by some who had never even been to the Far East, or who certainly had not been there recently.

My fourth observation was that our representatives in the Far East were handicapped in the handling of problems because we appear to be dealing with those problems in compartments rather than as one composite whole. General MacArthur and the Army have general jurisdiction over our island defenses running from Alaska through Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines, but have nothing whatever to do with the mainland of Asia. The mainland of Asia is under the jurisdiction of our Navy, and while I have never seen anywhere better cooperation between our Army and Navy than in this area, everyone with whom I talked, both Army and Navy men, admitted there should be a unification of authority in the entire area and that an over-all ideological as well as purely military approach to the problems was necessary if we are to meet the challenge that communism is making. Unfortunately, our policy of "letting the dust settle" completely ignores this ideological approach. I came away with a strong conviction that there should be some one guiding hand covering all these far-eastern problems, either in the form of an individual or in the form of a closely coordinated group. Certainly from the military and general strategical point of view, the fact that there is no one finger on the pulse of all these problems is a critical weakness.

We are going to have to consider not only China, but Burma, and Indochina, and Siam, and Korea, and the new Indonesian Republic, and so forth. There is no one finger on the pulse of events in the Far East. When I say "one finger," I do not necessarily mean one man, but one man or a coordinated group.

My fifth observation was with regard to the military situation with which we are all familiar and the collapse of the Nationalist armies. It might be noted here that this situation in China is paralleled by threatened situations in other far-eastern areas to which we must give our immediate attention. When I say "immediate," I wish to emphasize that word. Time is passing very rapidly, and we have no policy.

My sixth observation had to do with the morale factor. In talking with people whose views represent both sides of the Chiang Kai-shek controversy, I came to the conclusion that there was a tendency to think the alternative to further military aid to the Nationalist Government was the abandonment of China entirely, that there must be military aid or nothing, that when one makes an argument against military aid, his conclusion is abandonment. In talking with prominent Chinese who I found had ideals for China other than mere military victory for the Nationalist Government, I sensed a feeling of despair because of their abandonment by the United States in this crisis in their history. Since the days of the Boxer indemnity scholarships, the "open door" and our strong stand for China's territorial integrity, advanced Chinese thinkers have looked to the United States for leadership in the areas of educational and spiritual advancement.

These Chinese leaders with whom I had many conversations, and whom I characterize as advanced thinkers on Chinese problems, have emphasized to me that as serious as the loss of our military support was, it was even more serious to the Chinese people to lose those morale-building factors which Americans and American-trained Chinese had contributed. It seemed to me as I talked with these people as though in our dealings with the Chinese during the past few years that we have underestimated this distinction between morale-building factors and mere military might.

Finally among my observations, my point 7 had an optimistic touch and expressed a hope for the future. I suggested that the morale factor which I had discussed with these Chinese leaders and which is very hard to define and lay our hands on in a practical way, offers us a latent salvage in the situation which we cannot afford to neglect. We must find some way to salvage these Chinese leaders, who, to my mind, are the hope of the future of China, and who today are primarily identified with the Nationalist cause. I talked with them in Hong Kong, Formosa, and have talked to them in New York and elsewhere in America. Figuratively speaking, these men are holding out their hands to us with a plea to continue to believe in their basic objectives and help them maintain their courage against the tremendous odds of military defeat. These are the real standard bearers against the creeping paralysis of Russian-inspired communism. These individuals might well be described as oases in the vast desert of China, and I have no doubt that throughout the entire "curtain" area there are those who would rally to a courageous ideological approach aimed at Chinese rehabilitation.

The fact must be faced that the conquest of China has been, first of all, an ideological penetration. Twenty-five years ago men were being prepared in Sun Yat-sen's university in Moscow for this strategy. They stole the Sun Yat-sen name at that time and gave it to a university in Moscow, and took these young men over there. And they succeeded in their design. The military phase was important, but the winning of Chinese to the philosophy of communism came first. We in this country are slow to understand that we live in an ideological age. And we have been slow to realize that this is a cold war for men's minds. We try to meet that ideological penetration with economic aid and with "business as usual." We have sent educators and missionaries, but as a nation we must face the tragic result that the ideas of Marx and Lenin have taken over this vast territory and that the Christian heart of our democratic faith, the spirit that has brought us liberty in political form after thousands of years of struggle will be slowly strangled in the life of China. If we recognize this tragic fact, we shall begin to create a new kind of strategy. We shall fight to insure that along with economic and military strength, we are ideologically prepared.

In his press conference, as it appears in the New York Times of Friday, January 6, the Secretary of State in supporting the President's "hands off Formosa" policy is quoted as saying:

> It is not the function of the United States, nor will it nor can it attempt, to furnish a will to resist and a purpose for resistance for those who must provide for themselves. That is the background of this statement.

Mr. President, I cannot describe how shocked I was when I read that; but it made me understand the point of view that brought us to where we are.

I do not wish to quote the Secretary of State out of his context, but it seems to me that such a conclusion lays us open to the charge of bankruptcy of policy. If America cannot provide the motive and impulse that will enable the free peoples of the world to fight for democracy, how can we possibly expect material means to do the job alone? How can we expect mere dollars to solve this problem? How can we expect it to be solved unless something more than dollars is used?

Regardless of our economic, political, and military policies for the Orient, the key to the democratic future of the Far East lies in this field, the training of a truly democratic leadership now, much as Moscow started to train Communist leadership from China and far-eastern countries years ago. Moscow simply outwitted us. Moscow simply moved first, and now we are the victims.

After making the foregoing observations, which in a slightly different form appear in my report to the committee, I made certain immediate specific recommendations which appear in part V of the report, and in making those recommendations I said I was pleading for an attitude of mind by us which will give hope and courage to those who are still willing to remain faithful to what they believe in. Frankly, it is the attitude of mind that I found in discussing this matter with some of our leaders in the State Department which has given me discouragement, and this sense of frustration. The administration's attitude seems to be that we cannot think of aid of any kind because it might mix us up in the so-called Chinese civil war. Yet, we have examples of extending aid which might mix us up. I am thinking of the Atlantic Pact countries, and our recent set-up there; I am thinking of our policy affecting Greece and Turkey; yet when it comes to the Far East it is contended we will become mixed up in war if we give any kind of aid.

This attitude seems to exclude our full participation in the kind of ideological approach through an understanding with these high-minded Chinese leaders which alone can bring an ultimate recovery of China. There are so many instances in history where the spirit of the people, even without powerful backing has saved situations that I do not need to elaborate here more on this particular matter. We need only to think of Valley Forge in our own history and Dunkerque in recent British history, as my distinguished colleague from California pointed out last Thursday, to realize the possibilities in the spirit and courage of human beings. Irrespective of what the situation is in the Far East, irrespective of all other considerations with regard to our Chinese policy, I urge with all the force at my command that we seek and find a formula to preserve what I truly believe today is alive in China—this courageous spiritual heritage.

In my conclusion, after my recommendations, I emphasized particularly that the United States of America in its foreign policy must not let down the small and weak nations of the Far East in their yearning for self-expression and nationalism, and especially their yearning for freedom from dictatorial controls. Certainly we cannot stand by and see them released from the old type of colonialism and then sold into the slavery of the new totalitarian, atheistic communism.

Now, Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I shall proceed to a discussion of the most urgent question facing us today, namely, the action which should be taken with respect to the remaining core of Nationalist resistance about which I have been talking, whose vital center is Formosa. I am going to examine the Formosan problem.

Before I examine the alternatives before us, as I see them, let me restate certain points which I developed in my report of December 1.

First. We need a single coordinated far-eastern policy. Therefore, our action with respect to Formosa must fit in with our whole military and political position in the Far East.

Second. From the strategic standpoint, we have ample expert testimony that the passing of Formosa into Communist hands would seriously weaken our whole position in the Pacific. That, of course, is one of the great controversial issues to which I shall refer again in a moment.

Third. From the political and ideological standpoint, American recognition of the Chinese Communists, whose conquest of China is a major element in Soviet world strategy, would deal a heavy blow to the cause of freedom throughout the Far East. To oppose this Communist movement it is vital not only that we should refuse recognition to the Mao Tze-tung regime, but also that a strong center of free Chinese survival should be maintained somewhere.

In the light of these points, let me review our possible alternatives of action in Formosa.

First. The first and easiest course is hands off—which means handing Formosa to the Communists. That is inevitable if we keep hands off. This is the course the President intends to pursue, according to his announcement of January 5. Without in anyway questioning his sincerity or that of his advisers, I suggest that this decision, taken, unfortunately without consulting with Members of the Congress, who are deeply concerned with this question, is no policy at all but an admission of defeat. It means abandoning hope for a free China in this generation. If it remains our policy, the cause of freedom everywhere will suffer immeasurable damage, and the security of American defenses in the Pacific will receive a heavy blow. This is the course of despair, and, personally, I reject it utterly.

Second. A second alternative would be for the United States to seek a United Nations trusteeship over Formosa, or a joint trusteeship with the Chinese Nationalists, to continue until the precise status of the island is settled by the peace treaty with Japan. This peaceful and constructive approach would be important to explore if it were feasible, but obviously any such proposal would be defeated by a Russian veto. Although I believe we should keep the United Nations informed of any steps we take with respect to Formosa, it is clear that we cannot possibly work effectively through the United Nations at this time.

Third. A third alternative was very ably presented in the remarks of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] last Thursday. In essence, he suggests that we send the Nationalists on Formosa and Hainan both ECA aid, from some $106,000,000 which remains available, and military aid to bolster their defenses, from the President's $75,000,000 discretionary flexible fund and from surplus military equipment available in this country. The Senator from California further suggests that the military assistance be effectively supervised by an able American military mission.

These were among the eight recommendations of the Senator from California, who is interested, as I am, in an active American policy now in support of Chinese freedom. Unfortunately, it seems clear from the remarks of the President and the Secretary of State last Thursday that these recommendations will not be carried out. Therefore, it behooves us if possible to seek another alternative.

I may say that was entirely in support of the Senator from California in his suggestions, in spite of the difficulties that appeared, but I feel the suggestion I am going to make now may be an alternative which we might all consider carefully, and approach with the spirit of seeing whether it cannot be made effective.

In seeking to formulate such an alternative, I have had constantly in mind my belief, already reiterated, that an exaggerated emphasis on the military aspects of the China situation has led us—and the Nationalist Government too—into a neglect of the all-important economic, political, and ideological aspects. I may say that in my view the Nationalist neglect of political, economic, and ideological opportunities, as I discussed them with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, in particular their failure to do anything effective in the realms of political democracy and land reform, enormously eased the path of Communist victory in China.

Fortunately, as I have noted, there has recently been in Formosa a considerable change in the prevailing attitude toward this matter of reform. Important steps have been taken to liberalize the administration of the island and to give the Taiwanese people a larger voice in their affairs. Steps are being taken with ECA cooperation to improve the economy of the island. I agree emphatically with

the Senator from California that those economic steps should continue with our strong support. It appears that this ECA aid will continue with the President's approval. I wish to emphasize that point because the very last sentence of his statement the other day, which appeared to wipe off Formosa, did leave the ECA road open.

These economic and political trends in Formosa deserve the strongest support we can give them. In my approach to this subject I am seeking to emphasize them and to subordinate the military aspects of our commitment in Formosa as much as it is possible to do so. I have two reasons for this.

First, it seems clear to me that we cannot expect any great economic or political progress on Formosa so long as the overriding preoccupation is with military preparation and military operation. It is my hope, as I shall explain in a moment, that with American support Formosa can become a truly democratic going concern—a testing ground of free Chinese democracy. I think Senators will generally agree with me that Formosa cannot move far in that direction and at the same time be maintained as an armed camp. The two descriptions are to a large extent mutually exclusive; we must choose one or the other, certainly, for our main emphasis.

My second reason is even more persuasive, because it touches directly the security of the American people. My able colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] stated my concern very clearly—the concern of all of us, I know—when last Thursday in this Chamber he asked this question:

> Are we then not running a serious danger, if our intervention takes even the form of military advisers or the supplying of war matériel, of an open conflict with the Chinese Communists over Formosa, a conflict which might be interpreted as an act of war on our part?

To this the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] replied that he did not think so, but that certainly no prudent man would say that was not a possibility to be reckoned with.

I myself think that open war between ourselves and the Chinese Communists, leading possibly to a wider and still more terrible conflict, would be a distinct possibility if we committed ourselves in an unlimited military way to the Nationalist cause in Formosa. And that would be a tragedy to which none of us would wish to expose the United States.

Fourth. That is why I have taken it upon myself to try and seek still another alternative of action in Formosa. It should be a course which the President could accept in the light of his statement of last Thursday barring direct military aid to the Nationalists in their prosecution of the war from Formosa. It should be a course of action which is predominantly peaceful and constructive. It should demonstrate for all the peoples of the Far East the true nature of American aims in the world—our desire to promote peace, personal freedom, democracy, and economic well-being. I realize fully the difficulties imposed by the imminence of Communist assault on Formosa. But I desire in all seriousness to share with my colleagues in the Senate my thoughts on this matter, so far as they have developed.

My first suggestion along this line was made in a letter which I sent to the Secretary of State on December 27, 1949. That was quite a number of days before the President's decision. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter in full inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

DECEMBER 27, 1949.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Following up my previous suggestion to you and the recommendation made in my report to the foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, I desire to submit some further suggestions with regard to the Formosan situation.

In light of the fact that the United Nations by resolution in which the United States joined, referred the matter of the Nationalist complaint against Russia to the Little Assembly, I assume that recognition of the Chinese Communist Government by the United States will be postponed for the present.

Since the Nationalist Government is now headquartered on the island of Formosa, we have a situation that demands the immediate attention not only of the United States but also of the United Nations.

The following factors seem to me necessary for consideration in this matter:

A. Understanding was given to the Nationalist Government of China at the Cairo Conference that Formosa would be returned to China in the eventual settlement of the peace with Japan;

B. The Chinese Communists have conquered practically the entire Chinese mainland and can be expected to demand that Formosa be turned over to them, with threat of military aggression if the demand is not complied with;

C. From a strategic standpoint Formosa must not be allowed to fall into hands that are hostile to the United States, since such an occupation would seriously threaten our island defense line running from Japan south through the Okinawa group and through the Philippines;

D. Since the Japanese peace treaty has not as yet been signed, Formosa is still legally a part of Japan where the United States, representing the conquerors of Japan are now in occupation.

With these factors in mind I respectfully suggest the following procedure:

I. The United States should immediately engage in informal conversations with Mr. K. C. Wu, the new Governor of Formosa, with the purpose of arranging for the occupation of the island by the United States. Since the United States, representing the conquerors of Japan, is now in occupation of Japan the logic of the situation would seem to suggest that the United States should also be in friendly and peaceful occupation of Formosa until such time as the ultimate sovereignty of the island is determined. Inasmuch as the Chinese Nationalist Government was our ally in the last war and is still recognized as the legitimate government of China, we might consider a joint occupation pending the conclusion of the Japanese peace treaty.

II. The United States should explore with the Nationalist Government the possibility during the occupation of either (a) the suspension of aggressive hostilities against the Communists, including the blockade, or (b) carrying on such activity from some base other than Formosa, such as Hainan. The success of any further aggressive action on the part of the Nationalist Government appears extremely doubtful and the Nationalist Government might welcome the opportunity for the temporary cessation of hostilities during the period of this occupation. The Nationalist Government would be supported by the United States if necessary against aggression by any outside force, but it should preferably not be used during the period of occupation as a base for aggressive operations against the Communists on the mainland.

III. The period of occupation of Formosa by the United States alone or jointly with the Nationalist Government should envisage the establishment of a form of democratic government participated in by the Formosan people themselves, and the building up of a democratic and socially just economy. From my conversations with Mr. Wu when I was in Formosa last October, I am convinced that he is one of those Chinese Nationalist leaders who has been advocating a reform and rehabilitation program for the Chinese people and who feels that on the island of Formosa such a program could be put into effect with the cooperation of the Formosan people themselves. Such a development would contemplate the ultimate economic self-sufficiency of the island. Our own ECA funds have already been used in initiating such a development, and I note in the papers that our ECA officials on Formosa after consultation with Mr. Wu, are recommending the use of additional ECA funds on the island.

Such a development in Formosa might well become a pattern of reform and reconstruction for the provinces on the Chinese mainland, if and when that territory is eventually liberated.

IV. A full report of this action, if taken, should be made to the United Nations, stating that our purpose is to maintain the peace until the ultimate sovereignty of the island can be determined.

The course suggested seems to me to be the sound approach to this difficult problem, having in mind the best interests of the existing Government of Formosa, the Formosan people themselves, and the strategical importance of the island as far as the interests of the United States are concerned.

Always cordially yours,

H. ALEXANDER SMITH.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Let me repeat here the four recommendations I made in that letter, without reading the entire letter:

I. The United States should immediately engage in informal conversations with Mr. K. C. Wu, the new Governor of Formosa, with the purpose of arranging for the occupation of the island by the United States. Since the United States, representing the conquerors of Japan, is now in occupation of Japan the logic of the situation would seem to suggest that the United States should also be in friendly and peaceful occupation of Formosa until such time as the ultimate sovereignty of the island is determined. Inasmuch as the Chinese Nationalist Government was our ally in the last war and is still recognized by us as the legitimate government of China, we might consider a joint occupation pending the conclusion of the Japanese peace treaty.

That was the first point I made in my letter of December 27 to the Secretary of State.

Here I wish to make it clear, Mr. President, that by the word "occupation" I do not mean to imply the sending of American troops to Formosa, but simply the establishment of a joint political

authority and responsibility there between ourselves, the Nationalists, and the Formosan people. I do not think it is necessary to send one soldier there. I think this matter can be approached from the other angle.

My letter continues with the second point, and this I wish to emphasize:

II. The United States should explore with the Nationalist Government the possibility during the occupation—

By occupation, I mean the period until the peace treaty is settled and the final disposition of the island can be determined—

of either (a) the suspension of aggressive hostilities against the Communists, including the blockade, or (b) carrying on such activity from some base other than Formosa, such as Hainan. The success of any further aggressive military action on the part of the Nationalist Government appears extremely doubtful and the Nationalist Government might welcome the opportunity for the temporary cessation of hostilities during the period of this occupation. The Nationalist Government would be supported by the United States if necessary against aggression by any outside force, but Formosa should preferably not be used during the period of occupation as a base for aggressive operations against the Communists on the mainland.

III. The period of occupation of Formosa by the United States alone or jointly with the Nationalist Government should envisage the establishment of a form of democratic government participated in by the Formosan people themselves, and the building up of a democratic and socially just economy. From my conversations with Mr. Wu when I was in Formosa last October, I am convinced that he is one of those Chinese Nationalist leaders who has been advocating a reform and rehabilitation program for the Chinese people and who feels that on the island of Formosa such a program could be put into effect with the cooperation of the Formosan people themselves. Such a development would contemplate the ultimate economic self-sufficiency of the island. Our own ECA funds have already been used in initiating such a development, and I note in the papers that our ECA officials on Formosa after consultation with Mr. Wu are recommending the use of additional ECA funds on the island.

And, of course, the President in his recent statement expressed apparently his desire to go ahead with ECA funds on the island.

Such a development in Formosa might well become a pattern of reform and reconstruction for the provinces on the Chinese mainland, if and when that territory is eventually liberated.

My fourth recommendation in my letter to Secretary Acheson was this:

IV. A full report of this action, if taken, should be made to the United Nations, stating that our purpose is to maintain the peace until the ultimate sovereignty of the island can be determined.

That, of course, is the most difficult one in the approach which I tried to develop in my letter to Secretary Acheson.

Let me expand on the second point in this approach which I tried to develop in my letter to Secretary Acheson, that—

II. The United States should explore with the Nationalist Government the possibility during the occupation of either (a) the suspension of aggressive hostilities against the Communists, including the blockade, or (b) carry on such activity from some base other than Formosa, such as Hainan—

Or some of the other islands they have been using for their aggressive activities.

My purpose in proposing such a policy is twofold: to avoid the antidemocratic and antiprogressive influence of the armed camp on Formosa, so that reasonable hope may be entertained for political and economic progress; and—even more vital from the standpoint of American interests—to avoid the possibility that our intervention in Formosa would draw us into an unlimited military commitment and an eventual shooting match with the Communists and even the Russians.

For this purpose the United States might well go beyond the above suggestion. I believe the United States could and should make the following stipulations, or should at least expore them, as a prior condition of our giving aid to the Formosa regime:

First. All aggressive action against the Communists from Formosa shall cease. Remaining military activity on Formosa shall be restricted entirely to a defensive state of readiness against the possibility of Communist assault on the island from the mainland.

Second. Formosa shall be governed by a regime jointly agreed upon by the Chinese Nationalists and by representatives of the native population. The policy of this regime shall be to develop the economy of the island for the benefit of the population, and to establish firmly the institutions and practices of democratic self-government.

I ask my colleagues to note this point, because this is one, of course, which has controversial features, but I submit it as a sound approach:

Third. Under its authority as the occupying power in Japan, the United States will supervise the carrying out of these conditions and will guarantee the nonaggressive status of the island. American authority over Formosa will continue, on the terms laid down, until further determination of the island's status under the Japanese peace treaty. All these steps, and the policy underlying them, would be reported by us at once to the United Nations. I am thinking not only of the fact that there are two warring factions in China; but on the island of Formosa there are 7,000,000 natives, natives of Taiwan or Formosa, who would be subject to a slaughterhouse if, for example, an air war should be carried on over that island.

Under such a formula, in my judgment, the United States could still pursue its historic policy of friendship and support for a free Chinese people without assuming a dangerous and unlimited military commitment, and without giving aid and comfort to any Nationalist leaders who may entertain the foolish notion that American aid will help them reconquer China from Formosa by force of arms. I think such a formula, by granting an adequate defense to the Nationalists on Formosa—because that is what we would do—while committing them to forswear any aggressive intentions, would go far to deter the Communists from an invasion attempt. But at that point, we can think in terms of the suggestion by former President Hoover and by our colleague the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], namely, that on the defensive side it might be well or necessary to send a few warships into the area. I am thinking only in terms of defense, and eliminating all possibility of aggressive warfare on the island. If in spite of this the Communists should attempt an invasion, I am sure that American support would inspire the very capable Nationalist forces to give a very good account of themselves. With a change in policy designed to give the Formosan people—that is the natives—a real stake in the peaceful future of the island, any invading Communist army would have to reckon not only with the Nationalist defenders but with the determined resistance of the Taiwan people themselves. I refer to the Taiwan people, with whom I made contact. I am receiving letters from some of them today, wanting us to do something to prevent their being taken over by the Communist regime of China. They are critical of the Nationalist regime, but they want to be taken care of, they want to be protected against the Communists, too.

But in forming a correct policy we must do more than simply consider the avoidance of pitfalls and the avoidance of risks. I do not for a moment deny that risks would be involved in a policy such as I have described. What I maintain is that they are limited risks and that they are worth taking many times over in view of the positive good which would flow from such a step.

While it is true that there are the limited risks, it is essential for us to realize that the alternative risks are far, far greater. Three of these come to mind at once, and these risks we take when we write off China and Formosa, as we have up to date:

First. The extinction of hope for the democratic cause that will spread like a plague through the world if our policy continues to be one of negative reaction. We always hear it said, "No; that cannot be done; that cannot be done." We ask, "What are you going to do?" There is no answer. "Let the dust settle." I should like to point out in this connection especially that this is true of Europe as well as Asia. We are not simply dealing here with the Asiatic problem but with the world problem. What will it mean to the countries of eastern Europe if we have no adequate counterstrategy for the countries of eastern Asia?

Second. The second alternative risk is the lowering of American prestige which will follow such an extinction of hope. And the hope there is. One cannot go into those areas without finding hope. Think of the Koreans. Think of all the people there who are trembling because of what may happen next, since, as they feel, we suppressed the Nationalists. They want to find freedom. They look to the United States to show the way.

Third. The third is the endangering of our own security which in spite of confident pronouncements from the State Department is painfully obvious

from a glance at the map. It must deeply concern the mind of the American people that the advice of the men who are chiefly responsible for our victory in the Far East, the men who have lived with the military strategy of that area over a decade, should be discounted in these critical decisions.

Let me enumerate some of the good consequences which I believe would flow from this policy of promoting a peaceful, nonaggressive, democratic Formosa under American and free Chinese auspices.

First. We would effectively protect the line of American strategic defenses in the Pacific.

Second. We would make possible the establishment of a non-Communist Chinese Government which would become a model for all China politically, economically, and socially. It would be a testing ground and show place for the values of true democracy in China. For the people of the mainland it would offer a revealing contrast to the oppressive character of the Communist regime.

Third. We would set up a rallying point for all the Chinese who desire a peaceful and democratic evolution for their country. From my own acquaintance I know how many Chinese leaders there are who have not lost hope for the fulfillment of this ideal. Once enabled to work for democracy without the overwhelming disadvantages of militarism and dictatorial suppression of liberty, these moderate, prodemocratic Chinese could find in the new Formosa a testing ground and workshop for the carrying out of their ideals.

There are many instruments that could be directed to this end. There are thousands of men and women—I am hearing from them all the time—who are looking to America to give to the world a new faith in democracy and a new insight into its moral implication. The opportunities for such training are wide open to us in Formosa through the University of Formosa, through the schools, through films, radio, lecture programs and the setting up of training centers for selected leadership. We would have a new mission for our Voice of America, which needs a new mission so far as the Far East is concerned, a new point of view, to be given from America, of what we are driving at.

Some may question, in view of the record of the government of Chiang Kai-shek on the mainland, whether it is prudent to expect that he will lend himself to any such effort to develop democracy. From my knowledge of his personal career and from the interview I had with him on Formosa, I am convinced that he would gladly join in such a program. Of course, I did not develop this program fully with him; I did not have the opportunity; and I had not gone through it, but his whole attitude was one of sincere interest in the challenge I gave him that the Nationalist Government, or that the leaders in his group had not offered anything to the Chinese people in the way of reform and rehabilitation in competition with the Communists' promises. Away from preoccupation with and demoralization of war, I have strong hope that he will accept the American democratic challenge and exert his leadership to put into effect the principles of democracy and economic construction which he inherited from Sun Yat-sen. I think he feels that is something he would like to have an opportunity to undertake before he is deposed, or before he goes down to defeat.

Fourth. Finally, by adopting this policy toward Formosa, we will give great faith and hope to the non-Communist peoples of the Far East. As I observed in reporting on my travels in that area, the urgent aspirations of all the far-eastern peoples, with whom we will be dealing more and more in the near future, are for national independence, democratic self-government, and economic development. These are goals which they must largely achieve on their own initiative. But the way in which the United States uses its influence and example may well be decisive. It is for us to show the Asiatic peoples that the west does not oppose communism simply for the sake of power or prestige, but opposes communism because we of the west have values that we cherish, values which are essentially the same as theirs, values which communism does not fulfill but on the contrary destroys. A policy of peaceful democratic and economic development in Formosa, under American auspices, would offer a living example of the positive values which we support throughout the world.

A wisely conceived, peaceful American initiative in Formosa would not only be the starting point of a positive policy for China, rallying all those Chinese of good will who believe in the cause of Chinese freedom and democracy. It would not only place a negative barrier against the expansion of world communism into the Pacific. Let me say there that there must be a negative barrier pretty soon or we shall have lost all of Asia. Beyond this, it would stand as a symbol of American policy for all of Asia—a living symbol of our interest in peace, democracy, and material growth.

To me it is vitally important that we achieve not only a positive policy for Asia but a unified policy. Formosa could help greatly in that direction. I believe, as I stated in my earlier report, that we should work for an over-all, unified supervision of American policy in the Far East—a supervision which would embrace all the aspects of our policy, including military strategy, economic strategy, and ideological strategy. I have endeavored to develop my ideas on our proper course in Formosa in the light of this concept of a unified policy.

In conclusion let me emphasize that, reports to the contrary notwithstanding, I never have advocated the forceful seizure of Formosa. Any action that we take there must be with the full cooperation and approval of all concerned. I would be strongly opposed to any policy that might threaten a third world war. I plead for a new approach to this Formosan problem because I see in it an opportunity to turn the tide against communism in Asia and to develop and extend the kind of free government of free nations which we Americans believe in. If a better approach can be developed to this end, I shall support it wholeheartedly. But let us by all means develop an approach which will effectively implement our human values in Asia and throughout the world.

If we continue to hesitate in Asia, if we take the attitude that the cause of a free China is lost and gone in our time, then free men not only in China, not only in Asia, but everywhere will lose their faith in us and in the free life we stand for. The United States today does not have an Atlantic responsibility or a hemispheric responsibility—it has a world responsibility. I urge that we accept this challenge now and that we move.

EXHIBIT A

FAR EASTERN PROBLEMS FACING THE UNITED STATES

(Report of visit to the Far East, September and October 1949, by H. ALEXANDER SMITH, member, Committee on Foreign Relations of United States Senate)

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
November 29, 1949.

To the Chairman and Members of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate:

I am submitting herewith for the consideration of the Foreign Relations Committee and others interested a report of the trip to the Far East which I took with the consent of the Senate, leaving Washington on September 13 last. In this report I have endeavored to indicate the scope of the trip, to present certain over-all observations, and finally to make certain recommendations with regard to our far eastern foreign policy.

I am fully aware of the danger of individuals or groups visiting areas of the world for a short period of time and then claiming to have all the answers. I hope I have avoided this danger.

I do feel, however, as I stated to the committee before I left, that it is vitally important for the members of appropriate committees of the Congress to visit in person the areas in the world where these critical situations have developed. Only by a personal visit can we get the "feel" of a situation and have that independence of judgment which we should have in dealing with the recommendations of policy that come from the Executive.

I sincerely hope that the members of the committee will have the time and opportunity to consider this report.

Always cordially yours,
H. ALEXANDER SMITH.

PART I. REASONS FOR AND SCOPE OF THE TRIP

As I stated on the floor of the Senate in asking consent to take this trip, I felt that the situation in the Far East was so critical that some members of the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees should go there as promptly as possible in order to obtain first-hand information which might be of value in dealing with issues of future policy determination.

I am one of those who, since before the close of World War II, has supported our bipartisan foreign policy and has voted for every measure reported to the Senate aimed to bring about the collaboration of the nations of the world to insure the peace. I was an ardent supporter of the United Nations Charter, and have been deeply concerned over its temporary set-back because of the misuse of the veto by Communist-dominated Russia. From the first announcement of the so-called Marshall plan I supported that policy, which was aimed to accomplish the economic recovery and rehabilitation of Europe. During the first years of its operation it has been most effective in halting the creeping paralysis of communism.

For the same reason that I supported the Marshall plan, I have supported the North Atlantic Pact and military implementation of that pact to the end that in the Atlantic area at least we can say, "So far and no farther." We have said clearly to the world that an attack on one of the Atlantic Pact nations would be considered as an attack on all. And we have served notice that the United States will be a participant if there is any breach of the peace in the North Atlantic area. I believe that what we have accomplished this year in setting up the North Atlantic Pact will be another important milestone on the road to world peace.

But at the very moment last summer when this was being accomplished I, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, felt completely frustrated because it seemed to me that while we were barring our front door (the Atlantic area), the back door (by which I mean the door to the Far East) was being left unlocked. The iron curtain is quietly being lowered over Asia.

It has been a great surprise to me that, while the administration and the Department of State took our Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees completely into their confidence and collaborated with us in developing both the Marshall plan a year ago and the North Atlantic Pact this year, we have never been consulted about policy in the Far East. In spite of the great concern of many of us over the future of that area we have been practically told there is nothing to do and that we must wait and let nature take its course—or to use another expression, "let the dust settle." The splendid bipartisan approach which characterized the Marshall plan, the Truman doctrines for Greece and Turkey, and the North Atlantic Pact negotiations, has been completely lacking insofar as the Far East is concerned, and those of us who have felt alarmed over this unfortunate situation have been given the feeling that we were unwelcome meddlers in matters of policy that has already been settled. This was why I felt that someone from our committee should go and try to get the facts first hand.

In order to be certain that my trip would not be an embarrassment to anyone on the ground, I wrote to General MacArthur in Tokyo and asked for his judgment on the matter. He not only invited me to come but expressed the hope that every member of the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees could come and see first hand what the responsibilities of the United States are in this critical area. Upon my arrival he thanked me personally for coming. He and others with whom I talked pointed out that while we in the United States naturally are more concerned with Europe because our ancestry is practically entirely European, we seem to be neglecting an area of the world that may well be the decisive factor as to whether there will be a world war III.

Our trip was a rapid one. Mrs. Smith accompanied me and through the courtesy of the Department of Defense our travel and hotel accommodations were splendidly taken care of. Everywhere we went I can testify to the fact that in the Far East at least there is a definite and splendid unification of the armed services, and the men in the field who are responsible for the security of the United States cannot be commended too highly for the effective and inspirational discharge of their duties. From the time that we landed in Tokyo we were enabled to cover an enormous amount of territory because of the full cooperation of General MacArthur and his associates in the military, naval, and air forces.

We visited Japan, Okinawa, the Philippines, Hong Kong, Korea, Formosa, and, on our flight home, the island of Guam, the Trusteed Islands in the Pacific, and the Hawaiian Islands. During this trip we interviewed many people including, of course, the United States high command—military, naval, and air, our State Department officials—ambassadors, consuls and their staffs, native Japanese, Filipinos, Chinese, Koreans, and inhabitants of the various islands. We also had the privilege of interviewing many Americans and British who for years have been living in these areas.

PART II. COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC AREAS

While it is the purpose of this report to comment particularly on the situation in China, I desire to sum up briefly my observations on other specific areas.

A. Japan

Of all the areas we visited Japan stands out as a beacon of light and hope in an otherwise alarming picture. No one could be in Japan for even a short period without realizing that an entirely new chapter in the history of the world is being written.

The cold war with Russia has been described as a war of ideologies—the battle for men's minds. That is definitely true as I will comment later in this report. While we in America have been theorizing about it, Russia has won the cold war in China and in other areas up to date. But in Japan General MacArthur and his splendid group of associates are carrying on this war for men's minds and are demonstrating practically what the western Christian tradition is. General MacArthur is not only commander in chief of our military forces in the island areas but is also supreme commander of the allied powers (SCAP). For the first time in history the victor in a great, devastating war has raised the vanquished to their feet and has not only taught them how to recover and take care of themselves, but has contributed to the cost of their recovery. It is too early, of course, to draw any final, definite conclusions, but I would like to emphasize now that this ideological war is being constructively carried on in Japan. A new Japan may well arise to be the spearhead of a revitalized western Christian tradition in the Far East. We have a long way to go before this can be accomplished, and we, of course, face in Japan, as in other parts of the world, the subversive influences of communism, but Japan under MacArthur is moving ahead and in the right direction.

Another aspect of the Japanese situation impressed us. From our interviews with local Japanese, as well as our own Americans who have been in Japan for some years, we were left with a feeling that an opportunity may be presented to the religious and educational workers who have heretofore been interested in Japan to make a real contribution now. It seems to be admitted that, generally speaking, Buddhism is not increasing, and Shintoism, which involves the worn-out idea of emperor worship, is being discarded. This situation leaves a vacuum for those who have what might be called spiritual yearnings, and this vacuum could well now be filled by aggressive, practical, and inspiring Christianity. This would unquestionably be the best bulwark against the further spread of communism. And it is interesting to note in this connection that an aggressive and positive leadership in this matter is being taken by Japanese women. Women in Japan are free for the first time in Japanese history, and their new freedom is releasing the hidden resources of feminine idealism and fundamental spiritual aspirations.

B. Our strategic line of defense—Japan, the Ryukyu Islands, and the Philippines

We had the privilege of traveling by air as the guest of Admiral Turner Joy of our Pacific Fleet from Japan to Okinawa in the Ryukyu group of islands, and to the Philippines. In making this trip and studying our maps we became aware of the critical importance of the line of islands running north and south and making a bastion of defense in the western Pacific to defend the Pacific islands for which we are responsible and our own American mainland. Certainly I would urge that the members of our Armed Services Committees of both House and Senate should visit this area, confer with our Army and Navy leaders and study the relationship of the western Pacific defense to the Formosan problem, which I will discuss later.

C. The Philippines

As we passed through the Philippines on our way to the China area we were conscious of the "growing pains of a new republic." I wish we could have had more time there because here as well as elsewhere the serious threat of communism is present. We were in the Philippines while the election campaign was getting under way, which involved the reelection of President Quirino. I am happy to note in the recent press that President Quirino was reelected by a substantial majority.

President Quirino was strongly pro-American and a supporter of the independent governmental structure which we in America had helped to create, while one of his opponents particularly was violently anti-American and as a matter of fact had been a Japanese quisling in the late war. The result of the election seems to indicate that the Filipino people as a whole desire to be a part of what we call the western tradition, and for the present at least have their faces set against the Communist menace. But it is clear that their economic situation is serious and will be a problem for us for some years ahead.

D. Korea

After our trip to Okinawa, the Philippines, and Hong Kong, we returned to Tokyo where we made our second journey by air through the courtesy of General MacArthur to Korea, Formosa, Guam, and then home. We went to Korea on General MacArthur's special advice in order to see the young, struggling, new republic on the ground.

As a member of the so-called ECA watchdog committee, I felt a special responsibility to visit Korea inasmuch as our Foreign Relations Committee had authorized an ECA appropriation of $150,000,000 for the rehabilitation of Korea's industries. Before I left Tokyo I had conferred with representatives of our Government who had been in Korea and who gave me a very favorable description of what had happened during this last year. These reports were reassuring because on the transport from Seattle to Japan I had been led to believe by those who were familiar with the situation that it might not be possible to save Korea from the Communist wave. The question that was presented, of course, was whether the United States would be justified in investing an additional $150,000,000 in South Korean rehabilitation if there was imminent danger of South Korea being taken over by North Korea, which is under direct Russian control.

In Korea we were welcomed by our Ambassador, Mr. John J. Muccio and Dr. A. C. Bunce, who is in charge of our ECA operations. In conversations with these representatives and their staffs, and additional conferences which we had with President Syngman Rhee, I came to the conclusion that a further ECA investment in Korea is a justifiable calculated risk. During the Japanese control many important industries were started which give promise, if they can be continued, of making Korea an important industrial area. Unfortunately, while the Japanese were in control, Japanese industrial experts held all the higher jobs, so it is necessary for Koreans who are now taking over to have special training to qualify them for executive leadership. This means that the United States has had to furnish technical experts to train the natives to run these

plants. A year or so ago this situation looked difficult, and coupled with the threat that Northern Korea, dominated by Russia, might take over the entire peninsula, we took a risk in giving Korea our initial ECA aid. Developments during this past year, however, have justified our confidence. As is well known, the new Korean Republic has been recognized by the United Nations and, therefore, in a sense is under United Nations care as well as United States. The Koreans have developed a well-trained army of their own of some 100,000 men, which army it is believed is thoroughly capable of taking care of Southern Korea in any possible conflict with the north.

I was advised that the Northern Koreans had endeavored to enlist the aid of the Chinese Communists in order to take over and conquer the Southern Koreans, but the Chinese Communists turned them down on the ground that they had too many responsibilities in other parts of China. I was also advised that the Northern Koreans tried to get the Russians to intervene directly in taking over Southern Korea but the Russian reply was that they did not wish to initiate world war III by creating an incident in a minor area like Korea. Whether or not this is true, the fact remains that all those I talked with in Korea, which included our people and natives, felt that there was no immediate danger of the absorption of Southern Korea by the north. After all that we have done for the Southern Koreans and our public statements to the effect that we are endeavoring to support the urge for nationalism and freedom of these areas in the Far East, we would be definitely letting down all of the far-eastern peoples if we did not carry through on this Korean project.

I was most favorably impressed by Dr. Bunce and his advisers who are carrying on the ECA operations and I feel that we should give them a vote of confidence by an early appropriation for this further Korean development. While I did not have time to go into all the details of the proposed $150,000,000 authorization, I feel that a substantial sum should be authorized and appropriated so that there will be no stoppage of the pipe line which is taking supplies and materials to the Koreans at the present time.

E. Guam and the Pacific trusteed islands

On our way home by air we stopped at Guam, which is today an American possession, and also in the Pacific trusteed islands, which the United States holds as trustee under action by the United Nations. In Guam we were entertained by Governor and Mrs. Skinner and our military and naval people there, and in our short stay were presented with the problem facing the people of Guam; namely, some sort of organic act to give them status as a Territory of the United States. It is contemplated that the Guamanian Parliament will send representatives to Washington early in 1950 to discuss with us their present status and the kind of legislation they would like to see adopted in order to give them the new status they aspire to.

The Pacific trusteed islands, of course, are a study in themselves, but I took occasion when I was in Guam and Honolulu to discuss the responsibilities we have assumed in this trusteeship. I am happy to note that a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is visiting the islands this fall and doubtless will come back with specific recommendations. We can get some idea of the size of the problem when we realize that the area covered by this group of islands is about the same as the entire United States. These islands are of great importance to us strategically and for our air service to the Pacific, and certainly they cannot again be permitted to fall into hostile hands.

F. Hawaii

On our way home we stopped in Hawaii where we had the privilege of conferring with Admiral Ginrich, Chief of Staff for Admiral Radford (who was in the United States at the time, and Admiral Fiske, who has the immediate responsibility for the trusteed islands. Again we were given the opportunity to see all that there was to see in the limited time at our disposal, and to get the reflections of opinion from these experienced and able representatives of the United States.

PART III. THE PROBLEM OF CHINA

As I stated in an earlier part of this report our main objective in taking this difficult trip was to get the feel of the Chinese situation. We were handicapped in this because of the difficulty and practical impossibility of getting inside China. Again General MacArthur came to our rescue by making it possible for us to go to Hong Kong and later to Formosa, where we had the opportunity of studying some of the problems that exist there. Everywhere we went in the Far East, China is a primary subject of discussion. People with whom we talked are divided into two main classes: first, those who follow the general line of United States policy and look upon the Nationalist cause as completely washed up; second, those who are sharply critical of the United States policy, who feel that we are largely to blame for the let-down of morale of the Nationalists and who feel that there is still salvage in the existing situation, desperate though it is. We are compelled to face the fact that the situation is desperate and without seeking to lay the blame as to where the fault lies at the moment, our immediate objective is to find a formula for the future.

In Hong Kong in addition to conferring with members of our American consulate we had the privilege of talking with the British authorities. It is interesting to note that the attitude of the British has been and probably will continue to be fundamentally different in its approach to the problem than ours. The British have a commercial stake in the Far East that we have never had and in their present precarious financial condition they have every incentive to preserve that stake and save what they can. I fear that this commercial pressure on them will prevent their taking the long range view and may lead them to immediate policies of appeasement and conciliation, which may well be a threat to the entire future of the Far East. Hong Kong is a British colony and the British intend to defend it at all costs. They have increased their military forces, their air forces and their navy, and probably from a purely military standpoint they would out-match the Chinese Communists. The great danger of their position, however, is that Hong Kong is an island with an inadequate food and water supply, and with an over population at the time because of the influx of refugees from other parts of China. As food and water would have to be brought in from the outside and as the Chinese population itself might be led by subversive influences to revolt, it is readily conceivable that Hong Kong might fall just as it did in World War II, and as Singapore did in that war.

This suggests that the British would be prepared to recognize the Chinese Communist Government in exchange for a hands-off policy in Hong Kong, and in exchange for trade relationships which are being pressed on the British by their business interests in Singapore, Hong Kong, and other Chinese cities. It is my judgment that the British are desirous of taking the step of recognition in order to calm down the difficulties of the moment, but they would hesitate to do so unless we join them in this move. As I will point out later in the recommendations of my report I am strongly opposed to recognition of the Chinese Communist Government because I feel that the movement was inspired in Moscow, the present Chinese leaders were trained in Moscow, they are now being directed by Moscow, and they are being supplied by Moscow. We should no more recognize the Chinese Communist Government than we should recognize Russia itself if she was the foreign invader of China and had conquered China.

It was our privilege to talk with American-trained Chinese who have the vision of the Western Christian tradition and who, I believe, would sincerely make any personal sacrifice to save China from the dangers that now threaten it. We had the privilege of conferring at some length with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, who in spite of all the mistakes that he has admittedly made in dealing with this situation, is nevertheless, in my judgment, one of the most important figures that World War II produced, and who still has much to contribute to the salvation of his country. In our conference with him we purposely avoided discussion of any further military assistance. We made it as clear as we could that we were not thinking in military terms so that there could be no possible implication that further military aid would be forthcoming. What we did stress was that the Nationalist Government had not offered the Chinese people any program of reform and rehabilitation which competed adequately with the Communist promises. We pointed out that even on the island of Formosa which had formerly been Japanese territory the Nationalists, when they took over, could have made the island an ideal Chinese province with all the reforms that the Chinese people were yearning for. Unfortunately the island has had two Nationalist governors, both of whom had the purely militaristic point of view, and who treated the Formosan people not as liberated Chinese but as a conquered population. It is to be hoped that the new governor, by whom we were entertained and who impressed us very favorably, may show a complete about-face in this tragically erroneous policy.

A difficulty with the Nationalists today is that there are two groups competing for control. One is a military group, thinking only in military terms, and the other is a civilian group which is laying more emphasis on agrarian and other reforms. The United States has been handicapped in its effort up to some months ago to give military aid because the aid that we turned over to the Nationalist Government apparently quickly found itself in Communist hands. The mistake that we made in this respect was in not having an American controlled set-up, which could insure that the aid reached its ultimate intended destination. There has unfortunately been serious mismanagement and inefficiency by the Nationalists, and these are the dangers which have determined our policy to furnish no further military aid under present conditions.

The facts of the Chinese situation can be fairly simply stated. The morale and leadership and the strength of the Nationalist Government, which was the foundation of Chiang Kai-shek's brilliant leadership in the war against Japan, has collapsed because of military mistakes and internal jealousies. It has also collapsed because of the thread of misunderstanding and ineptness on our part which runs through the whole post VJ-day story. My own judgment is that we did not thoroughly understand the Chinese psychology and we seemed to come to the conclusion that the only alternative to further military aid was complete abandonment or at least temporary inaction, which to them was the same as abandonment, and contributed to the break-down of whatever morale was left.

From our personal contacts I am prepared to deny the unfortunate propaganda that

all Chinese in the Nationalist ranks are corrupt. Many of the finest Chinese that we met still stand by the Nationalist cause. They were not able to prevail probably because democratic processes have not yet been set up in China. The Nationalist Government has remained too military. We were advised that many honest men did all they could to induce the "Gimo" (Chiang) to bring in essential reforms. But the Gimo's experience has unfortunately been with the sword and he finds difficulty in really taking the "reform" approach seriously. The weakness of the Nationalists has not primarily been corruption, as so often and, I believe erroneously charged, but a leadership that has not really understood Western democracy.

And that is why I want to stress that in my judgment, we have overlooked a far more important factor in this situation than mere military aid. That factor is what might be called the psychological or ideological factor which could have meant support and backing for those high-minded Chinese whom we well knew and who were seeking reform and who should never have been given the discouragement that came from the feeling that their old traditional friend, the United States, had abandoned them in their time of greatest crisis.

PART IV. OVER-ALL OBSERVATIONS

The situation in the Far East is admittedly very complicated with currents and cross-currents making it difficult for any complete diagnosis. On such a short trip as we took I would hesitate to try and draw any final conclusions, and I agree with those who have stated that our attitude must remain flexible because of the constant day to day changes in the picture. With this emphasis on flexibility I would like to make the following general observations:

1. Nationalism and freedom

It is immediately obvious to anyone visiting the Far East that there is a widespread yearning among all peoples in this area to express their own nationalism and to be free from external controls. There is definitely a revolt against imperialism in any form and the traditional colonialism. This leads to a propaganda of hatred toward foreigners which, of course, the Chinese Communists have capitalized on. The Russians, being familiar with the Far Eastern psychology and the traditional opposition to foreign invaders in the China area, have been smart enough not to open themselves to that attack. Consequently, as they have also done in the satellite countries of Europe, they have made their penetration by training nationals to carry the torch for them. Whatever policy we adopt in the future must recognize this normal and commendable urge for self-expression.

2. Economic reform and rehabilitation

In addition to this yearning for nationalism and freedom there appears to be an urge for economic reform and rehabilitation. The threat of famine and hunger is always before these masses in the Far East. Here, again, the Chinese Communists have sensed the need and furthermore their promises of agrarian and other reforms have had great weight in weaning the people away from the Nationalist government, which failed to offer any reforms when it had the opportunity.

3. Need of American "Far East-mindedness"

In talking with representatives of the United States it seemed apparent to me that those who are on the firing line in that area feel that the people back home whom they represent are more concerned with the problems of Europe and the Near East than with the far-eastern problems. This is understandable and explained by the fact that practically all of us in the United States come from European ancestry and, therefore, we naturally think in terms of the type of problems that Europe presents. Europe is so much nearer to us in our thinking that the threats coming from Europe are more realistic than the far distant Asia. In spite of this fact, however, it is clear that in Asia we have an area comprising an enormous part of the entire world's surface, with a population of upward of a billion people, and that while we are preoccupied with Europe the real threat of world war III may be approaching us from the Asiatic side.

4. A divided authority

I discovered in the areas visited a feeling that our United States representatives were handicapped in their handling of Far East problems because we are dealing with them in compartments rather than as a whole. There is a divided command. General MacArthur has general supervision of Japan and the islands lying south of Japan and running through the Philippines. This is today our Pacific line of defense in the Far East. In addition he is doing an outstanding job in Japan in the difficult role of conqueror occupying the land of the conquered. But he is in the embarrassing position of having nothing whatever to do with the mainland of Asia, which is under the jurisdiction of our naval forces. Our military and naval commanders with whom I talked seemed to be agreed that there should be a unification of authority in the entire area, and also that an over-all ideological as well as purely military approach to the problems was necessary if we were to meet the challenge that communism is making to millions of these people. The policy of "let the dust settle" completely ignores this other and more important approach.

I was left with the definite impression that in the Far East there is no one finger on the pulse of all the problems in which all of these countries are so intimately related. Certainly from the military and general strategical point of view this is a critical weakness.

5. The military future

While the final chapter has not yet been written so far as the military operations in China are concerned, it seems clear that at the present moment the military phase of the so-called Chinese Civil War is critical. The Chinese Nationalist government, which had received our support and on which we pinned our hopes, and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, whom we believed would be the bright shining star in the Far Eastern firmament, have both shown serious weaknesses so far as military operations are concerned. Whether what is left of the China mainland can be held by the Nationalists, or whether Formosa can be defended are questions not yet answered.

These are problems that should be given immediate attention by whatever agency is set up by us to determine the most effective use to be made of the $75,000,000 flexible fund. This was the special fund appropriated by the Congress to be used by the President to stop the spread of communism in China and the Far East.

6. The morale factor

In talking with people whose views represent both sides of the Chiang Kai-shek controversy I came to the conclusion that there was a tendency to think that the only alternative to further military aid to the Nationalist government was the abandonment of China entirely. In talking with prominent Chinese leaders, whom I found had ideals for China other than mere military victory for the Nationalist government, I sensed a feeling of despair because of their abandonment by the United States at this crisis in their history. Since the days of the Boxer indemnity scholarships, the open door, and our strong stands for China's territorial integrity, advanced Chinese thinkers have looked to the United States for advanced Chinese thinkers have looked to the United States for leadership in the areas of education and in spiritual advancement. These thinkers emphasized the point that as serious as the loss of our military support was, there was even more serious loss to the Chinese people of those morale-building factors which Americans and American-trained Chinese had heretofore contributed. It would seem as though in our dealings during the last few years with the Chinese we underestimated the importance of this distinction between morale-building factors and mere military might. Consequently our most recent contributions of military supplies, and especially the last $125,000,000 under the ECA bill of last year, were of no value whatever since prior to the turning over of those supplies the morale of the people had collapsed.

7. "Salvage" in the situation

Because of this morale factor, which it is very hard to define and lay our hands on in a practical way, I feel that there is a "latent salvage" right now in the situation which we cannot afford to neglect. There are Chinese leaders with whom I talked in Hong Kong, in Tokyo and in Formosa who are, figuratively speaking, holding out their hands to us with a plea to continue to believe in their basic objectives and to continue to help them maintain their courage against these tremendous odds of military defeat. These are the real standard bearers against the creeping paralysis of Russian-inspired Chinese communism. These individuals might well be described as oases in the vast desert of China, and I have no doubt that through the entire area there are those who would dally to a courageous ideological approach aimed at Chinese rehabilitation.

PART V. SPECIFIC IMMEDIATE RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of these general observations what recommendations can be made for positive, constructive action at this time?

In considering this question I want to emphasize again that I have no final and conclusive answers and, therefore, what I am suggesting is simply an approach to the whole problem and an honest recognition of its difficulty and immensity.

What I am pleading for is an attitude of mind by us which will give hope and courage to those who are still willing to remain faithful to what they believe in. In this spirit I make the following specific recommendations:

1. A united far eastern command

Our over-all command in the development of our policy in the Far East should be unified in one control such as General MacArthur has so ably demonstrated in Japan, which will recognize not only the strategic military problems of the area from the standpoint of the security of the United States, but also and especially will appreciate the fact that we are engaged in an ideological war—a war to capture the minds of men.

2. The $75,000,000 flexible fund

In order to make the most effective use of the $75,000,000 flexible fund, there should immediately be appointed a committee or agency, familiar with the situation from experience on the ground. This agency would advise the President as to the practicability of military projects which might be developed to carry out the fund's objectives.

Specifically I suggest that such a committee be made up of such outstanding men as General MacArthur, Admiral Badger, General Wedemeyer, Admiral Berkey, General

Chennault, and Ambassador Leighton Stewart.

Such a committee would certainly have the united approval of the American people.

3. No recognition of Chinese Communist Government

Inasmuch as the practically unanimous opinion of all those with whom I talked was that the present Communist movement was originally initiated in Moscow, its leaders were trained in Moscow, and it is now being directed from Moscow, I am opposed to any recognition of the Chinese Communist Government by the United States. The Chinese Communist advance is definitely an alien invasion and is undermining the aspirations for nationalism and freedom which all of these far eastern countries are struggling to attain.

4. Program of reform and rehabilitation—No military aid

While I would recommend that we continue our present recognition of the Nationalist Government as long as it survives, I would leave the question of further military aid to the discretion of the President, acting with advice of the agency to be set up under recommendation 2 above. As a policy we should emphasize primarily the importance of the development of an ideological program of reform and rehabilitation, which should be practically applied immediately in the areas still occupied by the Nationalists.

What I mean by this is that there should be developed such a reform program in the non-Communist western provinces, in the area of Chungking (until and unless Chungking falls), on the island of Hainan, and particularly on the island of Formosa. On the island of Formosa there is an outstanding opportunity to develop for the Formosan people themselves a program which would mean the assurance of their freedom and the rehabilitation of their industries, and especially their agriculture. I believe that this possibility should be explored immediately with the Nationalist Government now in control of Formosa and with the Taiwan people themselves, who are opposed both to the Chinese Communists and also to the Nationalists. I believe that the Taiwan people would cooperate with the Nationalist Government in setting up through our ECA operations a type of recovery which might be an example to other provinces in China now in desperate need. Furthermore, Formosa is ideally located for the development of our Voice of America program which, however, I would not call the "Voice of America," but rather the "Voice of the New China."

5. Formosa must not fall into hostile hands

I recognize that because of the unsettled conditions on the island of Formosa today, the previous proposal might be difficult of accomplishment. But whether or not that proposal could be accomplished, it is my urgent recommendation that under no circumstances must we let the island of Formosa fall into hands hostile to the United States. This is not only because Formosa might be the last bastion opposing the Communist wave in China, but also because Formosa, if in hostile hands, would threaten the island bases in the eastern Pacific from Japan to the north and down through Okinawa and the Philippines in the south.

At the present moment Formosa has an uncertain legal status. It was a part of Japan prior to World War II. It is occupied today by the Chinese Nationalist forces because it was agreed at Cairo that it would be returned to China at the conclusion of the Japanese war. Technically, however, until the peace with Japan is ratified the area is still a part of Japanese territory and could be included in our Japanese military occupation. I recommend that this situation be carefully explored with the further recommendation that any possible steps taken should be reported at once to the United Nations with an expression of determination on our part to keep the island out of the war area and to assist in its economic development. We might explore the possibility of a United Nations trusteeship pending such time as the ultimate sovereignty of the island could be determined.

6. Admit and correct mistakes

I recommend the following moves to correct what appear to be mistakes of policy:

(a) Discontinue making Chiang Kai-shek and other Nationalist leaders "political lepers." With all their alleged mistakes they merit our interest and help. They can help build the New China.

(b) Discontinue our present policy of watchful waiting and become positive in our support of anti-Communist resistance in the Far East.

(c) Do not permit short range financial pressures to outweigh long range ideological objectives.

7. Over-all advisory group

I recommend that in order that we may keep our hands on the day-to-day changes in the far-eastern situation, that we continue the advisory committee appointed by the Secretary of State: Ambassador-at-Large Philip Jessup; Raymond B. Fosdick, former president of the Rockefeller Foundation; and Everett Case, president of Colgate University; and that we support this advisory committee by the appointment of a subcommittee of the Congress chosen on a bipartisan basis from the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the corresponding committees in the House.

Should such a group of continuing advisers be appointed, I would recommend that the whole group or at least a subcommittee thereof proceed immediately to the Far East to observe conditions on the ground and to make specific recommendations for positive action.

8. Areas other than China

The foregoing recommendations are directed primarily to the difficult Chinese problem, but I would not limit our investigation and consideration to that single area. We have the problem of Korea to which I referred earlier in this report and which I had the privilege of visiting, and I feel that we are justified in carrying out an ECA rehabilitation program in light of the splendid progress the Koreans have made during the past year.

In addition to Korea, however, and the other areas which I have discussed earlier in this report, we must give consideration to the area bordering on China on the southwest, particularly Burma, Thailand (Siam), and French Indochina.

When Congress authorized the flexible $75,000,000 fund for military aid to be used in the area of China where the Communist advance might be threatening, it was definitely realized that there might be trouble in these spots and that prompt military aid might be justified. During my trip I was advised that there are at the present time real disturbances in Burma and French Indochina, but I was also advised that Thailand (Siam) is in the best shape politically and is strongly anti-Communist. All these areas need our immediate careful study and probable aid. The advisory agency provided for in recommendation 2 should make a study of these areas at once.

CONCLUSION

The time for effective action is now. America united on a far-eastern policy can and must definitely halt this creeping paralysis of communism, which today threatens every freedom that our forefathers fought, bled, and died for on this continent. A firm stand now is a way by which we can avert the horrors of a third world war.

Throughout our entire trip whether we were in Japan, in the Philippines, in Korea, or in parts of China, we could seem to sense the deep yearning of people for a new leadership which would mean freedom from superimposed controls and an end of war and fighting. This is an obviously difficult ideal to be attained, and it can only be attained if the powerful, peace-loving nations of the world courageously stand together against aggression and the rule of might. This may call for an early reconsideration of the United Nations Charter and a new approach to international cooperation to establish the rule of law and the protection of the weak against the aggression of the strong.

As we traveled and talked to people with different viewpoints we felt that this yearning for nationalism and freedom was bringing people closer together in an understanding in the truest sense of the brotherhood of man. People were meant by the great design to be free and to live together. It was never meant that any people on this globe should be subjected to the domination and control of any other people. The yearnings in the Far East and in other parts of the world for freedom is an expression of the recognition of these eternal truths.

The sympathy of the United States for these yearnings and the determination of our people to aid in this eternal quest for freedom must continue to be the foundation of our foreign policy.

NOVEMBER 29, 1949.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a few questions?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I first want to commend the able Senator from New Jersey, who is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, for having presented a very thoughtful discussion of this subject relative to the Far East although I see some very practical difficulties in the way of his so-called alternative, not the least of which, I am fearful, is the fact that it might be in effect like taking the Sudetenland away from the Czechs. In other words, their hope today of resisting communism rests pretty largely in the island of Formosa, and it would probably be most difficult for Hainan to be supported by the National Government of China if Formosa became jeopardized; so we cannot completely dissociate Hainan Island from the Formosan problem. But, at least, the Senator has presented a suggestion which is worthy of consideration.

I should like to ask the able Senator, since he is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relation and is familiar with the fact that on the 23d of last December the State Department sent out to its representatives abroad a memorandum which stated flatfootedly that Formosa had no strategic value, if he can give the names of the members of the committee within the State Department who drafted such memorandum.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I regret to say that I cannot. I have tried to find out who they were. I have been advised that the document was prepared by some of those members of the State Department who, a few years ago, were in the Far East and who, in approximately 1943 or 1944, sent back the first messages apparently supporting the new Communist agrarian reform movement, and apparently depreciating the Nationalist

Government, forgetting that that government was carrying the load of the war against Japan, forgetting that it was doing the best it could against terrific odds, and especially in light of the fact the Senator brought out so ably last Thursday that our own policy certainly let down the Nationalist Government at Yalta, where the Manchurian question was disposed of without giving the Chinese any credit or voice.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say, if the Senator will yield further, that I made a request on the day the press association carried the report from Tokyo of the December 23 memorandum, that, as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and of the Senate Appropriations Committee, a copy be furnished to me. That request was denied at the time and it has not as yet been complied with. I then submitted, under date of January 7, the following letter to the Honorable Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, which I should like to read into the RECORD at this time, because I think it is appropriate to the Senator's remarks:

JANUARY 7, 1950.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
State Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ACHESON: I called the State Department this morning to request the names of the committee which had been responsible for drafting the December 23 memorandum advising the State Department personnel that Formosa had no strategic value.

I first attempted to get Mr. Peurifoy in the Personnel Division, but he was out of the city so I talked with Mr. Bryan and made the request of him. He said he had to take it up with higher authority. At about 11:15 this morning I received a call from Mr. George Kennan who stated that both Secretary Acheson and Under Secretary Webb were out of the city. However, he stated that the State Department itself assumed responsibility for any such information sent out and that he felt that he must decline to give me the names of the persons constituting the committee which drafted the document.

I emphasized to him that I felt that as a Member of the Senate of the United States, I was entitled to this information and while there might be some basis for the Department's position to decline to release a document which they themselves had classified, I could see no excuse for not furnishing a Member of Congress the names of such committee.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

I should like to say to the able Senator, who has done much to bring to the floor of the Senate facts which I think the Senate and the country desperately need, that it seems to me the continued effort on the part of the State Department to lower the iron curtain between its own activities and the Congress of the United States and the public can be best expressed as running counter to Woodrow Wilson's concept of open covenants openly arrived at, in being secret diplomacy secretly arrived at. This is the public's business, and certainly it is a pertinent factor as to who constituted the committee which drafted a policy statement which said that Formosa had no strategic value, when I have every reason to believe that that is not the judgment of our responsible military and naval commanders and, indeed, it is my judgment that it is not the viewpoint of the Joint Chiefs themselves.

If the Senator will permit me further, let me say that I am not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, but I have asked the very able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] if I might attend a meeting of that committee in executive session tomorrow. With his usual courtesy he said that he would take the matter up with the committee, that it is possible that the committee might decide to permit visitors, but that he doubted very much the practicability of permitting questioning by some Senator who is not a member of the committee.

I have submitted to the able Senator from New Jersey, as I have to other Senators on the committee, and I desire to submit now to the Senate, certain questions which I believe are pertinent and to which I hope the Foreign Relations Committee may gain answers. If the committee is not successful in doing so, it will be the purpose of the junior Senator from California, since I feel that this question affects the strategic defense of the United States, to ask, through the Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, and the Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, the answers to those questions. I should like to get the answers, however, as soon as possible. The questions are as follows:

1. Who are the members of the policy group that drafted the December 23 memo stating that Formosa had no strategic value? Are John P. Davies and/or John S. Service members of this group?

2. Does the State Department or the National Defense Establishment have the views of General MacArthur or Admiral Radford on the strategic value of Formosa? Do either of them support the State Department's contention? Will any such views be made available to the Foreign Relations Committee in executive session?

3. Has the State Department any statement from the Joint Chiefs of Staff indicating they support the contention that Formosa in unfriendly hands is of no strategic importance to us?

4. Were the members of the National Security Council, when they met on December 29, informed regarding:

(a) The State Department memo of December 23 discounting the strategic value of Formosa;

(b) The request of the Chinese Government for aid which was received by the State Department on December 23?

5. What was the extent of the Chinese request of December 23 and any supplemental requests made since that date? Were they within the limits of existing legislation and appropriations? Will copies of such requests be made available to the Foreign Relations Committee in executive session?

6. Was the amount and scope of the Chinese requests made between December 23, 1949, and January 4, 1950, known to the President at the time of his press conference on January 5? Were such requests also made known to the Joint Chiefs of Staff; and if so, on what date were the Joint Chiefs informed?

7. Has the State Department information that the Chinese Communists are exercising an effective censorship on American citizens who have been allowed to leave China by holding responsible their Chinese friends not only for their financial obligations but also for any statements they may make regarding conditions in China?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I can say to the Senator that if he requests me to do so, I shall be glad to present those questions, if it is not possible for him to attend the meeting of the committee. I think he has a perfect right to have those questions answered; and I join him in my expression of interest in the answers.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I hope the Senator will do so. I want to make them available now, so that the State Department will be amply advised and have ready the information requested, because I think the members of the Foreign Relations Committee are entitled to categorical replies to the questions as well as are other Members of the Senate.

I may say to the able Senator, because I know of his deep interest in this matter, that the last question grows out of a communication which I received recently from a man who had been for 4 years in Peking. He remained behind the Communist lines at the time the Communists occupied that city. He has only recently been able to get out. For obvious reasons I shall not use his name, but I think the Senate should be advised of what I believe is a very effective means of censorship which the Chinese Communists are using on American citizens. I read:

One good reason why I have been inarticulate about present conditions in China is the fact that, in order to leave, I had to produce two guarantors who were willing to certify my reliability, etc. It would hardly be cricket to jeopardize them by rushing into print with an unfavorable report on the present administration and it would be impossible to write any other kind.

Then, to bear out what he has said, he goes on as follows:

The only trouble with my theory is that nobody seems willing to accept it. I have some good arguments, most or all of which you already know, but none are immediate enough to make a strong point and, in any case, I run into a lot of people with preconceived notions which contradict my own observed facts. The idea that the KCT is a benevolent group of agrarian reformers, for example, is dying very hard. I know that conditions in the Chinese countryside under the KCT are worse than under the KMT because I have seen and talked to any number of refugees fleeing from the areas taken over by the new government. I knew one case in detail where a family had some 25 mu of land (about 4 acres) and a bicycle. The new authorities took all but 14 mu (2 mu for each member of the family), and the bicycle, which was regarded as a capitalistic luxury. Taxes are heavy, the rates are a little difficult to estimate but seem to be calculated to take all but enough to keep the taxpayer alive. And, in addition, the public is subjected to a constant stream of propaganda and elaborate courses of instruction in party ideals which take up the spare time which was the peasant's only luxury. Much the same thing goes on in the cities. Attendance at celebrations and school sessions is controlled through the pao-chia system; the press and radio become outlets for pure propaganda, school curricula are dictated by politicians and enforced by policy, business comes to a virtual stop and every normal function of the economy is stifled by regulation and bureaucratic control. Much of the latter is idiotic and the administrators thereof are selected apparently because they know nothing whatever about the field with which they are concerned. I could go on for pages outlining the

defects of the system as I found them, but suffice it to say I tried it out and it was too much for me.

Mr. President, that is not the only letter of that type I have received. I hope the Senator will press very diligently in the committee to see how long the State Department has been informed, if they are informed, that this type of censorship is being exercised on Americans who have gotten out of there, in an effort to prevent the American public being advised of the true conditions.

One final point I hope the Senator will bear in mind, namely, that as early as 1944 and 1945, as will be found by an examination of the China white paper, starting on page 564 and running through for some subsequent pages, Mr. Davies and Mr. Service were in China. As long ago as 1944, almost 6 years ago, they were predicting the immediate downfall of the National Government of China. They were urging, as will be found by a reading of the letter, a coalition of the Communists in China, and they were urging that the Government of the United States might start playing "footsy" with the Communists in China, even at that early date. So, I think my question as to whether either or both of these gentlemen had anything to do with this memorandum of December 23, saying that Formosa had no strategic value, is a pertinent question. If it is not answered tomorrow, I intend to press it in other places until we do get an answer to the question.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did the Senator find any evidence in the Pacific that, from a military viewpoint, Formosa was not of strategic value to the United States?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I will say that very definitely I did not.

A suggestion has been made in some of the press that General MacArthur in a way was propagandizing me. I will say that General MacArthur never said anything to me until I asked him the explicit question. The first apprehension I had about Formosa I got in the Philippines. I did not talk to General MacArthur about it, but I went to the Philippines almost immediately, where some people said I might get information in Japan. So, when I returned to Japan I asked MacArthur about the Formosa situation. I initiated the inquiry. He did not ask me, as was suggested in some of the newspapers and in some of the comments.

Mr. FERGUSON. I compliment the Senator on the remarks he has made today, because I think they have been of great benefit to the Senate. I notice the Senator started out with the statement that there was a lack of policy. Was the Senator able to discover just what our policy was in the Far East?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Not only could I not discover it, but I was very much disturbed by having members of our Defense Establishment, and even members of the State Department Establishment—cautiously, of course, because they did not want to put themselves in an embarrassing position, and, of course, I would not quote them—indicate their great appreciation of my coming, for instance, from the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, so that they could say what they felt they had to say to someone about the lack of policy in that area and the embarrassment they were having because we did not have any policy in our dealings with the peoples there. I got the distinct impression from our own representatives there that they were concerned, first, over the lack of policy, and, second, over Formosa, and I did not hear any dissenting voice.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I understand, at least one of the purposes of our having military forces in the Pacific is to carry out the foreign policy of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is, to implement it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Was the Senator able to discover what our policy in the Pacific was that was to be implemented?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think that in Japan, where a reasonably free hand has been given to General MacArthur and where I am sure he is acting as the State Department would have him act, we have indicated a policy for that particular responsibility.

I think that in the Philippines Ambassador Cowan, to whom I want to pay the highest tribute, is doing a most constructive job in a difficult situation, seeking to help a young republic with its growing pains, a new nation coming into its own, trying to assist them in their economic problems. I felt that he had a program he was working on. But the important consideration with everybody was: Here we are stymied because there is no policy for China, and China is the key to this whole situation. If China goes communistic, the whole area will be in jeopardy. That is the feeling I got, though the Senator from Michigan, who was there himself, may have gotten a different feeling.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to ask the Senator if possibly he and I cannot agree on the thesis that we have had a policy of appeasement in the Far East, and that we are in effect carrying out that policy. Let us say that it is partly open and partly secret.

Is it not true that it was the feeling of some in the State Department at the close of the war, and prior to the close of the war that Russia was entitled to have on her borders in the west friendly nations, and we knew, prior to the close of the war, that Russia was setting up communistic governments for Poland and various other countries in the west? Is it not also true that, being desirous of having at least some signs of democracy in those governments, we asked for free elections, having in mind that Russia wanted to have friendly governments on her borders in the west? Is it not further true that finally we discovered that what she had in mind by "free elections" was the installation of Communist governments and that we waked up to the sorry fact that although Russia agreed to free elections, as we called them or asked for them, they were absolutely controlled elections, as she desired?

Is it not true that the American policy in the east was identical? Was it not understood that Korea was to have a government free from communism, but the American policy was to dictate to the Koreans that in their government they had to take in so many Communists? In other words, the policy was that Russia was entitled to a friendly government on her border, and we insisted on Communists going into the government. Is it not true that that was secret, that it was unknown to the American people? But in December of 1945, when we sent General Marshall to China, we instructed him, as is shown by the instructions, to demand in China the identical thing we demanded in Korea, namely, that the government of China take Communists into it.

Therefore we had a policy in the Pacific identical with the policy in the European theater, that Russia was to have friendly governments on her borders, and to this day America has had a policy of allowing her that privilege.

This is the difficulty: These friendly governments are entirely different from what the Senator and I understand as friendly governments on our borders. We ask only that on our borders we have free and independent people, not controlled by a foreign power, whereas to Russia, to communism, a friendly government is one that is controlled from Moscow. Therefore, a friendly government which attempts to take into its bosom Communists, will end up with nothing but communism, as occurred in the west. I ask the Senator whether or not he found such facts to exist in the east?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I will not say that I found all those facts in detail. I did find that there had been, as the Senator says, the endeavor to bring about a coalition in the early stages of the Korean picture. I did find that the south Koreans were very strongly against that, and I believe Dr. Rhee himself told me definitely that he was opposed to a coalition. I am not sure about that, however.

So far as the remainder of the Senator's statement is concerned, while I cannot say that I found collaboration difficult, a sequence of documents, and so forth, certainly shows a trend or pattern. The history of the satellite states in the west, that is in the east of Europe but in the western part of the world today, and the trend today in China, indicate a pattern which has been followed very definitely by the Communists. In the beginning, I think, we were misled by that pattern and went along in the hope of bringing about peace, as the Senator intimated. But after we had seen the terrible things that happened in the satellite states in eastern Europe, some of which I saw personally; after we had seen what happened in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, in Hungary, in Bulgaria, and in Rumania, where purges of mem-

bers of the existing governments took place, and harsh conditions were imposed on the existing governments, we should have realized what would happen in China; that the same pattern would be followed in China, and that China would be lost to the Communists in the same way as the satellite countries of western Europe were lost to them.

Mr. FERGUSON. When our Nation deals with what we believe to be, or what we hope is a "friendly government," meaning thereby a free as well as a friendly government, and when our Nation later discovers that the nation with which we are dealing has an entirely different conception of the meaning of the term "friendly government," and considers another government to be "friendly" only if that government is communistic, does not the Senator from New Jersey believe we should be released from any understandings or agreements based on our belief that we are dealing with a "friendly" government?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If there was any such understanding I should certainly say that what has since happened releases us from such understanding or agreement as we have entered into, because we have now found that Russia, by the method of infiltration used by her, has brought about Communist conquest of her satellite nations.

The suggestion has been made that there is danger of some of the Asian countries bordering on China being invaded and conquered by the Chinese armies. I do not believe such a thing will happen. I think the Moscow Communists are too smart for that. I believe they will hold the Chinese Communists away from the borders of the surrounding countries, but that the Communist movement will come from within the bordering countries, as it did in China itself. I do not believe there will be external aggression into the surrounding countries, from across the border of China. The Chinese Communists will keep away from that because they know that that is something which will be rejected by the Asian people themselves.

What I am hoping for is to give the small Asian countries the knowledge that the United States is interested in their yearnings for their own nationalism, without interference by any outside power, and when I say that, I mean by Russia, with the methods she has used in obtaining control in China. I say further that any recognition by us, de jure or de facto, should not mean that we are in favor of such a policy as that which is now being followed by the Communists in China.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did the Senator obtain information in the east, and on the island of Formosa, leading him to the conclusion that the Formosan people were of the opinion that in effect America was instigating a revolution on the island of Formosa?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I heard that stated in various quarters, but I do not have sufficient evidence to be sure that there is anything to it. I did hear it stated that some Americans there had stirred up some Formosans to revolt against the Nationalists. I do not have any evidence to substantiate that, however. It was simply common talk.

Mr. FERGUSON. It was common talk.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator believe that such common talk tends to instigate a revolution under the circumstances, particularly in view of the fact that America is following a policy of giving no financial or military aid toward the defense of Formosa?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes, it might very well do so, and I think the writing off of Formosa by the United States might mean a revolution there in a very short time. That is one of the reasons I gave for the plea I made the other day for the other approach and a different kind of a solution for the Formosan people.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has the Senator any evidence that prior to January 1, 1950, America had decided not to give any military aid to the Nationalist Government, as announced on January 5 by the President? Prior to that time did the Senator know that such a policy was our policy but had not been announced, so far as the American public was concerned?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I had no evidence of it, but, of course, from talking, as I did, with the Secretary of State, and with men like Mr. Fosdick and others, I knew that they were seriously considering denying any further military aid of any sort to the Nationalist Government of Formosa. I knew it was being considered. That is why I sent my letter of November 27 to the Secretary suggesting an alternative approach to the Formosan question, if we did not give them any military assistance.

Mr. FERGUSON. But was the Senator familiar with the fact that as early as last October the United States Government advised the Nationalist Government of China that we would not give any military aid to nor defend Formosa, which is in terms what was said on January 5, 1950?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I was not aware that it had been done on that particular date. I thought that about that time the decision was being arrived at, and one reason I was concerned over this approach was because those of us who had been to Formosa and had a chance to learn of some of these issues felt we were entitled to sit down with members of the State Department and discuss the possible solution of the Formosan problem without the problem being prejudged. That was my thought respecting the approach to the Formosan problem. However, we were not even considered.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask the distinguished Senator whether the instructions, dated December 23, respecting the Pacific situation, at least as released by the press associations, did not indicate that so far as the State Department was concerned they had charged off Formosa as not being strategically necessary in America's scheme of things, and also whether they did not indicate clearly that we had then decided, that is, as early as December 23, that Formosa would receive no military aid, nor other assistance, and instructions were given to officials in the Far East that when the fall of Formosa came, they would have an excuse, or at least an alibi to give as the reason why Formosa had fallen?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think that is true; and that is why we were all surprised that on December 29, as I recall the date, there was a meeting of the National Security Council, as though that Council would determine the disposition of Formosa. The question had been settled and determined long before that, and those who wanted to have the matter reconsidered, as I understand the Defense Department did, were simply told, apparently, that the matter had been decided, and that they did not need the advice of our experts.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point, because what I have to say fits in with what is now being said.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask the Senator from New Jersey, who serves very ably on the Foreign Relations Committee, whether, when the new committee to study the Far East, headed by Dr. Jessup, and including the other two gentlemen the Senator names, was set up, his impression was that before any final decision was made in regard to our far-eastern policy that committee would presumably make its report; that the report would not only be available to the State Department for study, but presumably would be available at least to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for study, so that there could be joint discussions prior to any final decision relative to writing off of China?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes; I am sure that was the original intention. But I was advised when I returned, that the committee of three was to be a continuing committee, and while they had discussed policy with the President, nothing was to go to the public until Mr. Jessup, who was chairman of the committee, had gone to the Far East and made his report. Another thing that came as a great surprise was that these decisions were made while Mr. Jessup was still in the Far East. We expected that nothing would be done at least until he had come back and told what he had found. That was an extraordinary action.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Could the able Senator from New Jersey enlighten the Senate as to what good was to be expected, so far as our Chinese policy is concerned, by sending Dr. Jessup to China, and by announcing that on February 1 the Joint Chiefs were going to the Far East to discuss with General MacArthur the general strategic situation in that area of the world, if before either group, that is either Dr. Jessup or the Joint Chiefs have had a chance to carry on their consultations or bring back their reports, the country and the Senate had already been presented with a fait accompli?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the implications of the Senator's question entirely, and I was as much at a loss as he is to understand why we need to have Mr. Jessup go to the Far East, or why we need to have the Joint Chiefs go there, if all the strategic questions are to be decided in Washington without consultations whatsoever with those on the ground in the Far East. That is one of the puzzles we have been troubled by, and which brought up the debate, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Along the same line as that just suggested by the Senator from California, we have the sending of Mr. Jessup to the Far East, and the proposal to send the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the Far East, and then we have the announcement of policy on January 5. In October the United States Government advised the Nationalist Government that we would not give military or any other help toward the defense of the island of Formosa, which was followed on the 23d day of December by instructions to the State Department officials in the Far East respecting policy. In view of what occurred in October and December, I ask the Senator from New Jersey why Dr. Jessup should have been sent to the Far East to look into the making of a policy in relation to the strategic value and the importance of Formosa and its defense, so far as America is concerned? Why would we send him, even by airplane, after the fact was already announced by the Nationalist Government?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is a difficult question to answer. I will say for Mr. Jessup, whom I have known for many years, and for whom I have the highest regard; that he went to the Far East not only for the matters we are discussing, but also to discuss some other matters relative to the Far East, in connection with which the Communist problem arises. So he went for that additional reason.

But I understand the reason he went there to discuss the Formosan question—I understand he is there for that purpose now—was so that he might obtain information on the scene and might get advice from the Joint Chiefs, and all that sort of thing.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the Chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield further to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator from New Jersey believe now that the announcement by the President on January 5 forecloses the question of the strategic value of Formosa in the scheme of things, so far as the United States is concerned? Is that now a closed book?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. As a Member of the United States Senate, I certainly hope it is not, because I feel the enormous responsibility all of us have to be sure that our country is safe. If our Chiefs of Staff and our military men generally, especially those in the Far East whom I saw, still think Formosa a strategic area—and they know more about it than I do—then it is very difficult for me to reconcile myself, I regret to state, with the decision of the administration, because the safety of the United States means more to me than agreeing with the decision of the administration. I think we must get the best advice and information we can obtain on this matter, before the door is finally locked. That question should be asked.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then, is it the view of the Senator from New Jersey, that if it is the opinion of our best brains, so far as military matters are concerned, that Formosa is of strategic value, that decision should be held in abeyance?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes; because from the standpoint of defense, I feel that we would be justified in defending Formosa from an attack from the mainland.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the distinguished Senator from New Jersey believe that if the Reds in China, either through infiltration and revolution from within or by outside direct attack, obtain Formosa, there will then be on the island of Formosa a government unfriendly to the United States of America?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no doubt about that in the Senator's mind; is there?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Not a bit. Furthermore, if the Chinese Communists move in and take over Formosa and make it a part of China, there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that if those in Moscow want to set up bases there, even if they do not make any noise about it, they will be definitely able to set up bases that will be a threat to our lifeline, including Okinawa. Therefore, I think it may be necessary for every member of our Armed Services Committee to go there. It is a serious threat to the peace of the world today.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to agree with the Senator that it is so vital and so important that we should not consider it a closed book, so far as the message of January 5 is concerned.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I hope we will not have to.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Jersey whether he feels it would alter the very wise course he has proposed if we should suddenly learn that the administration had recognized the Communist government of China. What difference would it make to the proposals the Senator from New Jersey has made?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If we still considered that the Formosan status was in abeyance pending the signing of the Japanese peace treaty—and very good lawyers have argued to me that that is the position it is in since the agreement of the Cairo Conference, that Formosa was to go to China, has not been carried out legally, and will not be until the peace treaty is signed—if that is the position, we still would be able to deal with Formosa after the Chinese Reds were recognized, if they were. But their recognition would put us in a very difficult position. I assume that the Senator from Vermont would agree with me as to that.

Mr. FLANDERS. I would agree; but if our Government recognized the Chinese Communist Government, I am still a little concerned about how the matter might work out in this respect——

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator will understand that the Senator from New Jersey is definitely opposed to the recognition of the Communist Chinese Government by the Government of the United States.

Mr. FLANDERS. I say to the Senator from New Jersey that that makes two of us.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think something more I shall say along that line will be agreed to by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I would not be surprised.

But so long as our recognition remains, by sorry default, with the Nationalist Government of China, it would seem that the position we would be in if we followed the Senator's suggestion as to what we should do about Formosa in the meantime, would be more unpalatable to the Russian Government than would be the case if the Communist Government in China were recognized. Would there not then be, on the part of the Russian Government, a tendency, with the recognition of the Communist Government in China, to hurry up the conclusion of the Japanese peace treaty, to speed up the whole process so that we would have little chance to accomplish the things the Senator from New Jersey is suggesting be undertaken in the case of the Island of Formosa?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am not entirely clear about the question the Senator has asked, because certainly I am not endeavoring to find a conclusion or an alternative that is palatable to Russia or to Moscow.

Mr. FLANDERS. No; we are not. However, if our Government is to make an effective psychological beachhead in Formosa, and at the same time should recognize the Chinese Communist Government, I wonder how long it would be before we arrived at a conclusion of the peace treaty, so far as Japan is concerned, and before that island fell into the Communists' hands. It would seem to me that the recognition of Communist China becomes that much more dangerous.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Oh, I agree entirely with the Senator. I did not quite understand the point of his question. I agree entirely. It would bolster up my position and my suggestion if we refrain from recognizing Communist China. Of course, if we recognize Communist China, we are going to be in a very difficult position in this whole matter.

Mr. FLANDERS. However, so far as we can judge, that is a possibility to be reckoned with, because it is in line with our experience on this floor, of being faced with a series of unpleasant, unwise faits accompli. It would be another of them.

I do not expect to be free from the fear of waking up some morning and finding that the Communist Chinese Government has been recognized.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that not only I, but other members of the committee, have had assurance from the Secretary of State that recognition will not be accorded without full consultation with the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. But the difficulty of that is that the decision which may be made with respect to Formosa may put us in a position where we shall be following the band wagon in the wrong direction, whereas we should be leading the procession in the right direction.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to conclude by complimenting the Senator from New Jersey on the broader definition he has given to the word "strategic." I think he is of the opinion that Formosa is of strategic value from the military standpoint; but he has also given a truly wise and truly broad and truly practical extension of the word "strategic" into the style of warfare in which the Russian Government is preeminently skillful, and that is the strategy of psychological and spiritual warfare. I wish to express my gratitude to the Senator from New Jersey for displaying that kind of strategy, in which we are so deficient, and in which the opposing side has been so extremely effective at so little monetary cost.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator. I merely state in that connection that it is my distinct feeling that we have missed the whole possibility in Asia because we have not realized that there is going on all over the world a cold war to capture the minds of men, and that it may be well worth considering having an immediate cessation of hostilities in the hot war—if we can hold Formosa while we do it—if we can turn our psychological guns on the cold war, to capture the minds of men and teach them the great values of the western Christian tradition.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It will be my final question of the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Relative to the statement the Senator just made, in answer to the question of the Senator from Vermont, regarding the commitments to discuss the matter with the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee, prior to recognition, has the able Senator from New Jersey any assurances that such discussion with the two committees dealing with foreign relations in the two Houses of Congress will be any more than the Secretary's coming in, some morning, and saying, "We have determined to recognize the Communist regime in China; we wanted you to be notified before the statement was given to the press"?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I said what I did because at this stage of the game, I am going to give the Secretary of State the benefit of the doubt. He must realize what we feel is meant by charting and formulating these decisions, and if it is another case of merely handing us something to sign on the dotted line, he will know perfectly well that there will be some very strong dissents.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I am sorry I had to be absent from the floor. I am simply going to ask a very brief question, but I shall preface it by saying that tomorrow we of the Foreign Relations Committee are going to have the privilege of catechizing the Secretary and getting his views and interpretations as to the subject known as the foreign policy in the Far East. I should like to have the distinguished Senator state very briefly—perhaps it will be by way of recapitulation; I do not know—if he were Secretary of State, or President, what policy he would initiate on behalf of this Government in the Far East, from here on in, or from here on out. In other words, we have as it were a patient. What is the remedy the Senator would prescribe? I should like to have a categorical reply. First, I understood the Senator would not recognize the Communists.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. Second, I understand that, in relation to Formosa, instead of occupying it, the Senator would provide some sort of economic aid, so that the present forces themselves could effectively handle the situation. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I recommend that we think in terms of keeping Formosa from getting into any hands hostile to the United States. In my discussion today, which was built around my thought about Formosa, I explored four alternative approaches, which will appear in the RECORD.

Mr. WILEY. I understand. Which one would the Senator suggest?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The last one was the one I suggested.

Mr. WILEY. And what was that?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It was on the theory that we had a responsibility, because Formosa legally is still a part of Japan.

Mr. WILEY. I understand. What was the last one, briefly?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I preferred to have an arrangement with the Nationalists and the Formosan people, which I think they would be very glad to sit in with us to work out, for the peaceful occupation of the island, the development of its economics, and so forth. I realize that if we did that at this time and the word was being carried over the island, it would make complications in which our people would not want to become involved. We are not willing to give any military aid or take any aggressive action; so I limited the suggestion by saying there should be no aggressive warfare carried on from Formosa by the Nationalists or anyone else. If they wanted to carry on aggressive warfare, they must go to some other base, but we would be prepared to back them up in the defense of Formosa against its being taken over by hostile hands.

Mr. WILEY. But does the plan contemplate a partial trusteeship or a partial occupancy by this Government?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. An occupancy in the sense of a peaceful occupancy because of our responsibility to Taiwan's people, until the Japanese peace treaty is signed.

Mr. WILEY. Does that mean that we would have to put military forces in possession?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No; I should not put a soldier in there.

Mr. WILEY. What does the Senator mean then by occupation?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. We would have no trouble at all about that, because we have bases in Japan, we have bases in Okinawa, and we have a base in Manila, which could be used, if they had to be, and, as I tried to explain in my statement, I would recommend a peaceful occupation so as to set up a democratic government, to make a symbolic Chinese province there on a democratic basis, by getting the people who were interested in its future—who would be the Nationalists, the Formosans, and so on—to work with us. Either we would be there joining them in the Government, or preferably, we would be advising and helping them to set up a democratic government of their own. But we would protect them against being taken over by the Communists.

Mr. WILEY. Then, am I to understand by occupancy that the Senator means something of the sort of occupancy that occurred in Greece, to which we sent advisers and a few military officers?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No; I would not even go so far as that. I would not send a military man. I would have nothing to do with the military end, at all. I do not think it is necessary.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator has in mind, then, merely some political advisers?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Political advisers, or whatever they might want to have.

Mr. WILEY. Then, would the Senator enter into an arrangement whereby, if there were a joint set-up, if they were attacked, we would be at war?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No; we would not be at war.

Mr. WILEY. We would be making a guaranty?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No; I am not proposing to guarantee anything. I am saying we would back them up, if they were attacked from the mainland, but we would not be at war in any aggressive sense.

Mr. WILEY. What does the Senator mean by the expression "backing them up"?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It would be in the sense that, if necessary, as former President Hoover said, our Navy should be used to prevent Formosa's being taken over; the sense in which the suggestion was made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that our Navy might be used to prevent its being taken over; not that we would get into an

active war at all; but simply take such action if the contingency mentioned should happen. I do not think it would happen under the program I have proposed, because we would not be putting any military force there, or any military mission. I have no interest in that. I am interested in turning our attention to ideological warfare, and in my own expression, moving from a hot shooting war to a cold war, with the minds of men as our chief objective in setting up this picture in Formosa.

Mr. WILEY. First, there is no recognition of Communists.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No.

Mr. WILEY. Second, the Senator has in mind some kind of joint arrangement to give some political form of government to Formosa, with the idea of a protectorate, so that we would protect them in case they were attacked?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Let us use that expression.

Mr. WILEY. Very well; we can use that. Is there anything else in the Senator's policy? Would there be any economic advancement of any kind? I should like to find out concretely.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. There would probably be the working out of an ECA program for developing the island, since the President in writing off Formosa has approved that. We should continue to give them ECA aid. I think that is legitimate, and we should continue it.

Mr. WILEY. But in the present situation in the Far East—and I do not want to be facetious—I think it is plainly evident that either the Nationalist Government has to be competent militarily to resist attack, or have some assistance from an outside power that will give it that competency. I now come to the other question: Would the Senator see to it that they were given assistance in the nature of military aid?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Not in the first instance; not in setting up this picture, as I visualize it. I think it will take the Communists at least 6 months to get moving in that direction. If it appears they are moving in that direction, we shall be faced with the question then of a possible threat to our island defenses, and we shall have had a chance to consult our boards of strategy and our Joint Chiefs of Staff as to what we should do in that case. What would we do tomorrow if the Communists tried to take one of the Japanese islands? Suppose the Communists tried to take one of the Japanese islands under General MacArthur's care. I say that Formosa should be under the same kind of care that MacArthur exercises with respect to the Japanese against any foreign assault.

Mr. WILEY. Then, the Senator would recommend sending military advisers there to lay out some adequate plan?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I personally do not think it necessary.

Mr. WILEY. I thought the Senator said something about following the judgment of the Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. For our own guidance as to whether we should move in, as President Hoover suggested, with the Navy, or as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] suggested.

Mr. WILEY. Is there any other facet to the Senator's policy?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes. If the distinguished Senator by any chance, who is a member of the committee, read my report to the committee, it goes into other matters with which I did not deal today.

Mr. WILEY. Were they matters dealing with the question of policy?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes; I went into the question of our far-eastern policy, because I said we must have a unified over-all finger on the pulse, which we do not have today. We have MacArthur in Japan, taking care of the island, and the Navy taking care of the mainland, and while they work beautifully, it is not a unified command over the whole. Personally I should like to see MacArthur in charge of the whole area.

Mr. WILEY. That is what the Senator means by keeping a finger on the pulse?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. MacArthur over all?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to see that.

Mr. WILEY. That is another point.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It does raise some difficulties, because he is what is called SCAP, the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers in that area, and he might be ineligible. But I have discussed with the Secretary of State the possibility of having what might be called an ambassador at large, going down into French Indochina, to Siam, to Burma, to Malay, and to Indonesia to deal with all the issues which will come up in the Far East. They ought to be under one hat, so we can deal with one head and not have them under scattered commands. I think it is most important.

Mr. WILEY. Assuming we had in Formosa the set-up the Senator suggests and it became evident that it would be the wise thing to see to it that the roving Nationalist bands in China, the guerrillas, should receive adequate arms, the Senator would recommend that arms be given to them?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No, we would be entirely out of that.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator would not have anything to do with that?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. We should have nothing to do with that, under the approach I am making to this problem.

Mr. WILEY. I thought the Senator said something about other places, Burma, and so on.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In Burma, Indochina, and Siam, there is the problem of uprisings.

Mr. WILEY. The problem of containing the Communists?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. Very well.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. There is a $75,000,000 flexible fund which the President was given through the legislation enacted last year. I recommended in my report where that was to be used. It might be used for spots in China, as well as Indochina, or somewhere else, but I am not raising in connection with the Formosan question, the spots in which it ought to be used. In my judgment that question ought to be determined by men of the caliber of MacArthur, Wedemeyer, Badger, Berkey, both military and naval officers who are on the ground, and who are constantly studying the problems involved. I am told they are being asked for their advice, but there is not a follow-up of anything.

Mr. WILEY. But if the policy recommended by the Senator contemplates that this over-all group of master-minds felt that to contain the Communists it was necessary that this fund be used to procure arms to be furnished the guerrillas so that they could make constant opposition to the onrush of the Communists, that would be a part of the plan, would it?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think it would be, yes. In answering the Senator's question, and before I yield the floor, I should like to add a further word. Another recommendation I made in my report was that a committee of three, composed of Jessup, Fosdick, and Case be continued, and that there be added an advisory group made up members of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, and the Armed Services Committees of both bodies, to keep in constant touch with this rapidly developing situation. I recommended that a subcommittee of that joint group, which should have the responsibility, should go to that area immediately to see whether those who have come back from there have reported the truth, or whether we are merely alarmists, as we are accused in some quarters of being, and whether there is really such a critical situation there as may bring about a world crisis at almost any time. I feel that strongly about it. I think we ought not to be caught unprepared.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New Jersey suggests that we should not, under any circumstances, recognize the Communist regime in China. From what the Senator understands is taking place in both countries at the present time, is there any difference between being a Communist in China and being a Communist in Russia?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Frankly, I think there is very little, if any, difference. I think the pattern in China is exactly the same as that in Czechoslovakia and in all other places where the turn-over comes through infiltration without an aggressive conquest. I am sure the Senator from Illinois would not be even considering recognition if Russia had conquered China and had said, "We are de facto conquerers and want to be recognized."

Mr. LUCAS. Would the Senator suggest that we withdraw recognition from other Communist nations?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. We may have to do so. Certainly if there should be a continuation of what is now going on in Hungary, where they have taken an American citizen and have declined to account for him, we must either act

very forcefully or sever all relations with that nation.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not at all disagree with the position of the Senator so far as individual American citizens are concerned, but I am speaking solely with regard to the ideology of communism and whether we should recognize communism in one place and fail to recognize it in another place. That is the only point I make. I presume, from the Senator's argument as to refusing recognition of Communist China, he would be willing to withdraw recogition from other Communist countries.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think we may be faced with that situation. At the time when we were considering recognition, for example, of the Communist regime of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, and other countries, I yielded to the argument that it might be better to recognize them and have some observers behind the iron curtain than to be kept out entirely. But as I have seen the situation progress and have seen the implications of the Chinese picture indicating communism for all Asia, I do not want the United States to be in the position of saying, "We cannot help it, so we are going to leave it."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In the colloquy which the able Senator had with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from New Jersey went so far as to say, as I understood him, that if it should be necessary ultimately to defend Formosa from domination by the Chinese Communists, he would agree with former President Hoover and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that the American Fleet should be used to try to forestall the conquering of Formosa by the Chinese Communists. Is that a fair statement of what the Senator said?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No. What I tried to say was that I felt it was the defensive side which former President Hoover and the Senator from Ohio had in mind. I wish the Senator from Ohio were here at this time. No aggressive war against the Communists would be carried on from Formosa. I want to take it out of the war and give the people a chance to recover as an active Chinese province, protecting the people who are the victims of the fight on both sides.

Mr. LUCAS. I certainly agree with the Senator that we do not want to carry on any aggressive war, but I fear that if we surround Formosa with our fleet or go into Formosa with any troops, we shall be charged with an act of war.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I would not send a single soldier there. I do not want any soldiers there at all. I take the position that General MacArthur today is the trustee for Japan, to keep Japan from any aggressions from an outside source. We certainly would move our troops into Japan in case Japan were threatened. I would put Formosa in the same classification until the peace treaty is signed.

Mr. LUCAS. A number of other Senators may differ with the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, that they are in the same classification.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am not saying it is not a controversial question.

Mr. LUCAS. I think it is a very interesting question and one with which the American people are vitally concerned, as to how far Members of the Senate are willing to go in the way of sending our Navy to Formosa to defend it from the onrushing of the Communists of China, and how far we are willing to go in sending troops there. My own position is that we cannot be fooling around with our Navy over in the Pacific and getting ready to defend Formosa from the onrushing of the Communists across the sea without having a little more than the Navy to help take care of the situation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Let me say to the distinguished Senator that the Secretary of State, in his introduction to the white paper, says distinctly that if the Chinese Communists move over the borders of China, they will have to reckon with the United States. I ask the Senator from Illinois, as representing the administration, where are we going to stop? Formosa is an ideal place to stop. We cannot stop at the Indonesian border, the China border, or at Burma, without sending in troops. Formosa is an ideal place to stop.

Mr. LUCAS. That, again, brings up the question as to what is the border, whether Formosa is a part of China, or whether it would be after the treaty is signed. I seriously doubt whether we should undertake a trusteeship, as the Senator suggests. Certainly we could not do it under the United Nations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I said in my remarks that that was impracticable, and I threw it out. I said it might be desirable to explore the question, but that it did not seem to me to be practicable, because Russia would veto it. But there is a point which the administration must decide as to what we are going to do with the funds. Are we going to dribble them out to help the local armies? We shall lose Asia if we do not decide where to stop.

Mr. LUCAS. That may be correct. The Senator from Illinois is just as desirous of stopping communism at the borders as is any other Senator. The Senator from Illinois has always seen eye to eye with the Senator from New Jersey in the foreign policy of this country in the European sector of the world. But I cannot follow the argument being made by my distinguished friends as to the foreign policy they suggest with respect to the Asiatic situation. I cannot go that far. I do not question any Senator's sincerity. I know my friend from New Jersey has been in the Far East and has spent a considerable amount of time in talking to persons there and trying to ascertain for his own benefit and for the benefit of the Senate and the country the situation. He has made a very interesting address, but I cannot quite go along with my friend, because I am definitely afraid that the charge of imperialism which will be hurled at us may be sustained if we follow the policy laid down by former President Hoover and by my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. TAFT.]

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do not think we are going to get to that point, because I do not believe the Communists will dare to take the initiative in such aggression if we take the proper position.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the able Senator from Illinois has stated a situation which I think is a pertinent one, and I greatly respect him, as the majority leader knows. I desire to call his attention to the letter of transmittal by Dean Acheson in connection with the white paper, in which this language appears:

> Should the Communist regime lend itself to the aims of Soviet Russian imperialism and attempt to engage in aggression against Chinese neighbors, we and other members of the United Nations would be confronted by a situation violative of the principles of the United Nations Charter and threatening international peace and security.

If we take the words of the Secretary to mean what he apparently means, they would apply to any Communist aggression across the borders of Indochina or Burma, or, presumably, the borders of the Republic of Korea, which would be immediately of concern to us as one of the law-abiding nations of the world, and we would be called upon to send a fleet and our armed forces, or our air forces, as the case might necessitate, to protect from aggression. Can the Senator from Illinois read anything else into that statement by the Secretary of State?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not care to read anything into the statement made by the Secretary of State with respect to what he said last year. I have not examined what he said. I should want to read the whole content of the statement before I gave a definite conclusion as to what he meant in any particular paragraph. It was written last May, I think the Senator said, before the Chinese Communists had the great victories in their own country in the civil war which they have been carrying on. But the State Department takes the position that Formosa is a part of China. If that is the position they take, I imagine the civil war could continue on into Formosa. What will happen if the Communists go into Malay and Indonesia is an entirely different question. We will meet that problem when it arises. Now we are talking about Formosa, and Formosa alone.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I might say to the able Senator from Illinois, because we have on many issues seen eye to eye together, I think this is a very pertinent question, to which the American Senate and the public and the Congress must give some attention. In view of the position we have now taken in China, of turning our back on a wartime ally and friend, and saying that because it is a civil disturbance, albeit one inspired by international communism, we cannot become involved in a civil war, and therefore say, "We write you off." What is that going to put into the minds of the people of Korea, who are sitting under the gun? What is that going to put into the minds of the people

of Indochina, or Burma, or Siam, or Pakistan, or India?

The great danger the world faces today is not that a Soviet Army may move across the border, or that a Chinese Communist Army may move across the border, but suppose they multiply 10 times the situation with which we were faced in Greece, and begin to infiltrate arms and infiltrate agitators and stir up dissension, and one by one take the nations of Asia behind the iron curtain? That will be just as effective, in the long run, as though an army went across the borders and occupied the countries. So I say very sincerely to the Senator from Illinois, unless we are "kidding" these free people in that part of the world, sooner or later someone will have to make up his mind as to whether freedom is any less important in Asia than it is in Europe.

I think that if the Communists moved across the border into Turkey or into Greece there would be a situation which would be very easy for the American people to understand, namely, that an aggression had taken place. But what happens if the Communists do as they did in Greece, and attempt to take the country from within? In that nation our answer was that we would get into the civil war situation, because we recognized that international communism was an international conspiracy. We did inject ourselves into the situation in order to prevent the people of Greece from being taken behind the iron curtain from within.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is a rather long and involved question the Senator has asked, if it was a question. But in response primarily to the statement he made, I should like to make merely one reply. I think the agitation which is going on now with respect to what we ought to do in the Far East, in view of the definite policy which has been laid down by the State Department, is serving no useful purpose, so far as helping the eastern situation is concerned.

Speaking of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, if the leadership of China had followed the directions of the military leadership of General Marshall when he was there, as the Koreans have done in the northern section of the area, they would not be in the position today in which they find themselves.

The point I make is that we spent pretty close to $3,000,000,000 there in an effort to help the Nationalist Government, and what happened to the money everyone knows. That Government simply did not perform. It did not follow orders as they were followed in Greece and in Turkey, in France and in Italy, where we have had military missions helping out. They would not take orders from Marshall or anyone else. They were going to do as they pleased, and they did so, and they came to their ruination and downfall.

I have not too much sympathy with the Generalissimo at present, if the Senator desires to know my personal feelings, because of his failure to follow the instructions laid down by the best military men of this country, including Marshall, Wedemeyer, Barr, and others who were on the scene trying to give aid and comfort to those people when they desperately needed it, but they failed to follow the orders.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. First, let me say one word in answer to the Senator from Illinois The Senator from Illinois mentioned General Wedemeyer. We did not follow the Wedemeyer recommendations, and there was no issue with the Generalissimo about his recommendations. I do not care to go into that, because it is a very controversial subject, but I will say to the Senator from Illinois, with my great regard for him, with his brilliant mind and his ability to dig into things, that I only wish he could have been with me on my trip, because I know he would have had a contribution to make in this debate, which one cannot make who has not been on the scene. A breadth of view is acquired by talking with people on both sides of the controversy. There are many on the same side the Senator occupies. There is a breadth of view which many in this body should attain if we are to solve this problem to the satisfaction of the American people. What I regret is that there are too many people having to do with the matter in Washington who have not been in the Far East. It has been a very difficult situation, and in trying to solve the problem, I hope we can work it out on some kind of intelligent basis.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I now yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is it the Senator's understanding that the Nationalist Government of China is still the de jure government of China, recognized by the United States?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It is at this moment, yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then Formosa is still under the control of the recognized government of China?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct. That is why in my recommendation I said we ought to deal with that Government and with the Taiwan people.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. One step further. The Government of China which we recognize today, and which is in control of Formosa, has requested aid from us by way of military advice and supplies, and matters of that kind.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator see any difference whatsoever in the legal status, so far as the international situation is concerned, between the situation in Formosa, where the legally constituted government, which was recognized by this country, is requesting aid and advice and certain equipment from us, and the situation which existed in Greece and Turkey, when the excuse used by the administration—and I voted for the policy—for going into Greece and Turkey with advice and missions and certain equipment, was that the legally constituted, recognized governments of those two countries were requesting that aid, and that we had a perfect right, under international law, to go in with the aid and suppress the Communist uprising? Does the Senator see any substantial difference in principle between those two situations?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Not in the situation in which we are. Of course, as I have tried to point out, there is some little doubt as to the exact legal status of Formosa today; that is, as to whether it is Chinese territory with the Nationalist Government as it is, or whether that matter is still in abeyance, somewhat, because the Japanese peace treaty has not been signed. With that qualification, I would say the Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We are facing a dilemma. Either Formosa is a part of China or it is still part of the territory that we took from Japan, the status of which has not been finally and completely settled, so far as international recognition is concerned, as a result of any peace treaty being made.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. So that we either deal with it as an ally, or the ward of some nation, until its status has been determined as a result of a Japanese peace treaty, or we deal with it as a part of China. If we deal with it as a part of China, then the recognized Government of China has control of it and has troops there.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think it was United States troops that liberated it, I think there is no dispute about that, and if we deal with it as the ward of either the Allies or some other group, then the revolutionary government in China should keep out of it, for that reason. I mean, their status should not be recognized, and perhaps we would have some obligation to preserve its integrity until it is finally settled legally.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am concerned about the 7,000,000 people who are interested and who are to be sacrificed unless something is done to protect them, and who are entitled to be protected.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the Senator one more question if he will yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Did the Senator make up his mind as to whether there was any ethnic difference between the people of Formosa and the people on the mainland—in China? In other words, are they the same people, or are they a substantially different people in the matter of race, culture, and background?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I would not say that they are substantially different. They have a background, of course, very much the same, but they have been independent of, or away from China so long, under Japanese control, that there has been intermarriage with Japanese. Of course, there is much business back and forth between the main-

land and Formosa, which has brought the people together, and probably there is considerable intermixture. But fundamentally the Taiwanians think at least that they are not the same as the Chinese. As I said earlier today, I am receiving petitions from different groups which are urging that the United Nations take steps to secure for the Taiwanians independence from either of the warring groups. I do not believe the movement to be a strong one, but I think we have some responsibility along that line, in view of the fact that Taiwan was a conquered Japanese territory.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from New Jersey has looked into this matter more carefully than I have, and I should like to ask him this question: Does the Senator understand that Formosa was ceded to Japan by China about 50 years ago, as the result of a peace treaty?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think it was ceded to Japan by the peace treaty following the Sino-Japanese War of 1895.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. So that so far as international recognition is concerned, Japan obtained title to Formosa and ownership to Formosa as a result of cession?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. And during this period of time Formosa has been a part of Japan, either as a colony or in some other way?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It has been completely under Japanese authority?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The people of Formosa were treated as a subjugated people.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But so far as international law is concerned, Formosa was recognized as having been transferred to Japan as the result of the settlement of the Sino-Japanese War?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. By conquest.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. So that Formosa, then, actually is a country which was legally the property of Japan under international law until the surrender of Japan at the end of World War II?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. And Formosa then is still actually in a rather uncertain status because there has been no peace treaty and no final agreement among the Allies and the Japanese nation?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I may say to the Senator that there was an agreement at Cairo, to which we were a party, which did not cover all the countries concerned, but it did cover us; we agreed at that time that after the defeat of Japan one of the conditions of the peace would be the return of Formosa to China.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Who agreed to that? Did that ever come before the Senate of the United States as a treaty, or has it ever come before the Congress as an agreement?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do not think it came before the Senate. I have the text of the agreement. It was read by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] during his address last Thursday. The Senator then said:

> The Cairo declaration of September 1, 1943, had this to say—
>
> With regard to Formosa—
>
> Japan shall be stripped of all the islands in the Pacific which she has seized or occupied since the beginning of the First World War in 1914, and * * * all the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China.

Because of that we cooperated in letting the National Government of China move into Formosa after the war was over, but before the peace treaty was signed.

The query now is: Legally has Formosa now moved into the Chinese Republic classification which the Cairo declaration calls for, or will it have to await the signing of the peace treaty? I say it will have to await the signing of the peace treaty, and that therefore we have a responsibility we cannot legally avoid.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The agreements at Cairo probably are more in the nature of proposals than of binding agreements. Does the Senator believe that the proposals at Cairo are per se binding on this country, without having been submitted as treaties, or perhaps, I should say, without having been submitted in international agreement form?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I have been trying to secure the full text of the Cairo declaration. I do not think I can answer the distinguished Senator's question. It is possible the Senator from California can do so. The Senator from California placed in the RECORD the matter I just read, which makes it clear that we had at least committed ourselves to this kind of an adjustment. Whether, as the Senator suggests, that commitment ought to be ratified by the Senate, I will say that I think it probably should in the final Japanese peace treaty that will come to us some day for ratification. It will contain this provision. I have maintained that all along. I do not think the declaration is legal until we have ratified it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the Senator a question based on a point raised by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] a moment ago. The Senator from Illinois expressed great apprehension of what would happen if we were to send war vessels to the waters around Formosa. Is it not true that we did not hesitate to send aircraft carriers and destroyers and other war vessels into the Adriatic when there was some tension between Yugoslavia and Italy? Is it not true that we did not hesitate to send war vessels, including carriers into Grecian waters and Turkish waters when there was some need for reassurance to those countries of our program there? Does the Senator agree that we did so on those two occasions?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. There are many instances in our history when we did that very thing.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will say that I am not advocating the sending of armed forces to Formosa. I believe the Formosan people and the Chinese can take care of their own affairs without the necessity of our sending armed forces there to work out their problems for them.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is in line with what I suggested earlier today.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Will the Senator indulge me for one more moment for an observation in the nature of a question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Reference was made a moment ago to the fact that we did not follow the advice of General Marshall and General Wedemeyer. I believe the Senator from Illinois made that suggestion. The Senator from New Jersey very properly pointed out immediately that we did not follow the advice of General Wedemeyer because we did not know what that advice was in the first place, so far as the Congress was concerned. I suggest to the Senator from New Jersey that had we followed the advice of General Marshall, or adopted the program he proposed while over there, we would have had a Communist government in China long since, because, as I understand, his efforts were directed toward bringing Communists into the National Government of China.

The history of every nation, so far as I know, which has opened the door to let in Communist members to its government, is that it has found before very long that the camel, having gotton its nose under the tent, eventually has crowded out the occupants of the tent and made the government completely communistic government by capture.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I will say that is the technique of the Russian method of conquest. I consider that the Chinese situation today is a conquest by Russia through her new, very clever technique.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But I am speaking of the proposal that General Marshall advanced in China. If there is a policy in China by the administration that seems to be the policy that has been turning over great segments of the government for the past several years to Communist dominion by way of Communist deputies and Communist members of the Chinese Government. But if we can rely on experience of the countries in eastern Europe, where the policy has been followed of allowing Communists to infiltrate into important positions in government, we are justified in believing that had such a policy been followed in China the Chinese Nationalist Government would have been completely captured by the Communists long before this.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree. I think the record shows that to be so.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I merely wish to address a question to the distinguished majority leader the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. In view of the importance of the pending legislation, that is the legislation respecting oleo, which is so close to the heart of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I understand it is the intention of the administration leaders to hold the Senate in session for a night

session until final action is taken on that legislation. Is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. In reply to my friend the Senator from New Hampshire I will say that he is not correct. I know the Senator from Wisconsin would like to have the Senate stay in session tonight and vote on the unfinished business. Some Members of the Senate, however, have arranged for a dinner tonight, so obviously we cannot have a night session.

Mr. TOBEY. I regret very much to hear the Senator say that, in view of the feelings of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. This is the first time I have known that the Senator's feelings toward me were so tender.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall consume very little time of the Senate. The debate respecting the island of Formosa has covered almost every aspect of foreign policy during recent years. The Senator from New Jersey made a very interesting speech concerning his travels, and his conferences with General MacArthur and his conferences with Chiang Kai-shek, and his conferences with various other individuals, with Formosans, and with Chinese. I cannot understand how he could have had so many conferences with so many individuals in the short time he was in the Far East.

Mr. President, one of the amazing things about travel is that a Senator or a Representative can go to a foreign country and within a week or 10 days come back with more information than had ever before been gathered respecting such foreign country or that had been theretofore known to exist respecting the particular nation.

I am at a loss to know what those who are complaining about Formosa want to do about it. I want to know what they think the policy ought to be. The Senator from New Jersey says he does not want to send a single soldier to Formosa. Yet, I hold in my hand a newspaper account, coming from New Brunswick, N. J., on January 3. It is headed: "Aggressive policy asked."

This is the newspaper statement; I shall quote the Senator from New Jersey later. I read further from the newspaper account:

> This country should lose no time in adopting an aggressive policy in the Far East, including the occupation of Formosa—

Occupation, Mr. President—an aggressive policy! "Go in and occupy it, regardless of the consequences. We want some aggression!"

I read further:

> An aggressive policy, including the occupation of Formosa, to forestall a possible Communist sweep southward, out of China, Senator ALEXANDER SMITH (Republican), of New Jersey, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, declared tonight in a recorded broadcast.

That was not any ad lib speech, but it was a recorded broadcast. The record is available in the radio station; they have the words of the Senator from New Jersey, in which he said he wants us to occupy Formosa.

How are we going to occupy it if we do not send an army there? We cannot occupy it with a few tourists; we cannot occupy it with the two or three Senators who went there, who, at the firing of the first gun, would go into a hole somewhere. [Laughter.] We cannot occupy it with them; neither can we occupy it with the few Members of Congress who visit there.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not yield at the moment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wanted to observe that one of the Senators who went there did not crawl into a hole in World War II.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have a high regard for the Senator. I was not personalizing the Senators who went there. I am talking about any Senator who went there. He would be a fool if he did not go into a hole. [Laughter.]

Senators talk about having us go there and intervene in a civil war in Formosa. I said when the shooting started, they would go into a hole, and I repeat it. If I were over there, that is exactly where I would go. [Laughter.] I would not want to shed my blood to determine a civil war in Formosa, in which the United States has no direct interest.

So that is that. I apologize to the Senator from California; I had no personal reference to him. I know of his fine war record, and I admire it, and I pay my tribute to it. But I was merely discussing the general proposition of tourists and Senators.

Here is where the Senator from New Jersey himself begins to talk; this is his own language, as quoted by the New Brunswick newspaper:

> I am hoping we will find a formula—

Mr. President, whenever a man undertakes to find a formula, he usually finds one, but he has usually had it in his pocket all the time. Yes, find a formula. I read further:

> I am hoping we will find a formula for occupying Formosa.

Occupy it, Mr. President. What does "occupy" mean? Everyone knows what the word "occupy," as used in the English language means. It means to seize it, to take it, to sit down there and boss it and govern it and control it.

I read further:

> "I am hoping we will find a formula for occupying Formosa," said Mr. Smith. "I think it would be very simple to work out a program with the Nationalist Government there and with the Formosan people, themselves, whereby we would go into a joint occupation and help them to recover."

Going to occupy it, Mr. President. That was the Senator's view when he made that statement. But today he would not send a single soldier there. I want to ask Senators who have been so eloquent on the floor, where is the Senator who now favors sending an army to Formosa? If such there be, let them rise; I yield to permit their answer. Is there any Member of the Senate who wishes to send an army to Formosa? Mr. Hoover wants to send the Navy there. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], so the newspapers say, wants to send the Navy there. But they do not have a single spokesman on the floor of this body who will rise and tell the Senate and the country that, "I favor sending an army to Formosa."

What do they want to send an army there for? They want to occupy it; they want to take over Formosa. They would say, "According to my formula, in the final analysis we want to intervene in the civil war; we want to run the chance of a war; we want to run the risk of a third world war, on account of Formosa."

The testimony is, as best I can get it, that the Formosans do not want either one of these groups in control. They do not want the Communists; they do not want the Nationalists. They want to be left alone. Yet all the gentlemen who are looking for formulas—every one of them—want to occupy Formosa: Mr. Hoover, with the Navy; the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], on the other side of the island with another navy; and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] wants to occupy it, although I do not know with what he would occupy it, except with oratory and with conferences.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; I yield. Of course, there has been so much yielding this afternoon that I have been waiting all afternoon to get rid of yielding. But I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Inasmuch as the Senator has made some statements, I am sure, of course, that he wishes to be accurate in his statements on the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to be accurate off the floor, too.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Well, off the floor, too.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not make any bones about being accurate only on the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The junior Senator from California has not advocated sending American troops to occupy Formosa. In that respect, I disagree with other points of view.

I have suggested that it is of concern to the people of the United States that the free people of Asia not be taken behind the iron curtain; and I have advocated that assistance should be given to the legal Government of China to defend their islands of Formosa and Hainan in the same way that we have given military assistance to the legal Government of Greece, and as we are today giving assistance to the Government of Greece, and as today we are giving assistance to the Government of Korea, which also is subject to Communist pressure.

I think that if the Government of China receives such help in its bastions of Formosa and Hainan, it can defend its own islands. I am sure the able Senator from Texas recognizes the fact that under our treaty obligations and

under the United Nations obligations, if there is aggression against the Atlantic Pact nations, we are going to have to go to their defense. I do not think liberty and freedom are any less important to the people of Korea and the free people of China than they are to the people of Austria or France or of Belgium.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

Mr. President, the Senator has adverted to our obligations to help China defend itself. Senators here on this floor today have said that we have had no policy in Asia, and that we have never had any policy in China. That is a slander upon the record of this Government; it is a slander upon the record of the Senate. What did we do when China was beleaguered by the Communist uprising, by this civil war? We called in Gen. Chiang Kai-shek and said to him, "It is true that we have no policy regarding China, but here is $3,000,000,000. Take this $3,000,000,000, wrung from the taxpayers of the United States by law, and provide yourself with arms and with resources in resisting the attacks of the Communist hordes."

What went with many of those arms? The reports from our own military officers—I heard one of them, a general, testify to that effect—are, "No battle was lost by the Chinese Nationalists because of a lack of arms or of munitions or of supplies." He said, "Those battles were lost because they did not want to fight."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator will permit me to conclude.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say that I hope this will be the last interruption.

Mr. CONNALLY. Can the Senator from California speak for his entire side of the Senate? The hour is growing late, and I wish to conclude. However, I will yield. The Senator from California has had the floor half the time today, by being yielded to. He forced the Senator from New Jersey to yield to him a great deal. Nevertheless, let him go ahead now.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The freedom of 400,000,000 people is involved, so I think we are warranted in taking a little time to discuss the question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not think the Senator's speech will determine that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Perhaps it will not; but at least the public is entitled to some information.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to have the Senator from Texas—and I say this in all sincerity—through his staff on the Foreign Relations Committee, present for the RECORD a break-down of the so-called $3,000,000,000 to which he has referred, which he says has been given to the Nationalist Government of China since the civil war started, subsequent to VJ-day.

The fact of the matter is that the most recent publication——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, has the Senator from California asked the question he had in mind?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I simply wish to give the Senator the figures.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let the Senator ask a question; let him not make a speech in my time. The Senator from California has been speaking half the day thus far. Let him go ahead and ask the question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Very well. The figures I now ask to be put into the RECORD, Mr. President, were furnished by the Department of Commerce of the United States, and they show that the amount received by China has been $1,774,000,000 since VJ-day, which is not $3,000,000,000. At the proper time I shall show that that includes a great deal of surplus equipment charged at original cost, whereas the British figures are drawn up on the basis of 10 cents on the dollar. In contrast to the amount furnished China, the United Kingdom has received $6,247,000,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire list which I now hold in my hand be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Total grants	$28,171,000,000
Less amount paid to International Bank monetary fund	3,385,000,000
	24,786,000,000
Subtotal for ERP participants	17,651,000,000
United Kingdom	6,247,000,000
Germany	2,438,000,000
France	3,487,000,000
Netherlands	823,000,000
Italy	1,786,000,000
Greece	1,036,000,000
Belgium-Luxemburg	485,000,000
Austria	604,000,000
Turkey	164,000,000
Denmark	137,000,000
Norway	163,000,000
Others, including unallocated ERP	297,000,000
Other, Europe	1,581,000,000
American Republics	380,000,000
Japan	1,622,000,000
Philippines	521,000,000
China	1,774,000,000
International organizations	619,000,000

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, considering the vast knowledge the Senator from California possesses and the information possessed by his staff and as a result of his researches, I do not think I am called upon to give him the figures. As a matter of fact, the record shows that since 1937 we have given China slightly more than $3,500,000,000. In addition, China has received surplus property which has had a procurement value in excess of $1,000,000,000. Our total assistance to China since VJ-day has been between $2,000,000,000 and $2,500,000,000. I make that statement in defending the administration against the charge that we have had no policy in China. We had the policy of aiding China. We had the policy of pouring out our treasure, extorted from the taxpayers of the United States, many of whom were in worse condition than some of the Chinese. Yet it is said we have no policy there. We called in Chiang Kai-shek and said, "Mr. Chiang, we want to give you some arms. We want to give you some munitions. We want to give you some supplies in order that you may carry on your resistance to the Communists who are attacking you." Yet it is said we have no policy. It is said we have no policy in Asia except the policy of giving and giving. Yet we sent General Marshall to China, who remained there over a year. He had no ambitions in China. He went at the behest of the President of the United States to try to work out peace and stability in China. Did Chiang Kai-shek follow his suggestions or advice? He did not. He had no policy in China except the policy of building up the ambitions of Chiang Kai-shek. We had the policy there of composing differences, of stopping war, of bringing about peace and stability in that great area.

We have been a friend of China throughout all the years. We gave up our extraterritorial claims there. We have given extensive loans, through the RFC and other agencies, millions upon millions of dollars, to aid the Chinese, and yet Senators say on the floor of the Senate we have had no policy in Asia, we have had no policy in China. What have we had? We did not give money to anyone else in that area as we poured it out in China.

What became of the arms? Our troops, when they got up into the northern areas, found Communist armies with United States guns in their hands, guns that our money had purchased. They found in possession of the Communists dumps of ammunition and supplies which our money had purchased. Yet it is said we have had no policy and have not tried to aid Asia. What kind of aid was it that permitted these supplies and these arms to be found in the hands of the enemies of the Chinese people?

Mr. President, some of us are becoming rather weary of the repeated charge that we have had no foreign policy, that we have had none in China, and that we have had none in Asia. Yet there is not a Senator on the floor who says he would vote to send an army to Formosa. What do we want to send to Formosa? What should we send, if not an army? It is impossible to whip the Communists with wind. It would be necessary to send men with guns in their hands, supported by aircraft and artillery and all the ordnance of war. That is what would be necessary. And what would that mean? If we intervene, if we go in with arms in our hands it would mean that we might be plunged into world war III.

Mr. President, I am sorry for the people of Formosa. I am sorry for the people of China. I am sorry for Asiatic peoples, but I am not so sorry for them as I would be for the widows that a war would leave in the United States. I love American boys and American mothers and American fathers more than I love the people of Formosa and more than I love the people of China. I am not in favor of casting a single vote that may risk plunging this country into world war III and the sending of bright-faced American boys to die in the jungles of Formosa.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to point out to the able Senator from Texas that our Navy consists not alone of ships and sailors. The marines are well trained in amphibious landing. The Navy also has aviation. Thus the Navy has in effect the Army in the form of the marines, the Air Force in the form of naval aviation, and the Navy proper in the form of ships and guns. So I should like to have someone who advocates the Navy's being sent to Formosa tell me what the Navy is to do after it arrives at Formosa.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sorry to say I have not had an opportunity to contact ex-President Hoover or the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] as to what they meant by the reference to the Navy. President Hoover was quoted in the press as saying he wanted to send the Navy, and he wanted to build up in Formosa a wall against communism with the Navy, with the marines, with aviation, and with all the components of the Naval Establishment. I do not want to do that. I am not going to vote to do it. The American people do not want it done. They do not want us to send an army to Formosa to intervene in a civil war between two Chinese factions, the factions of Chiang Kai-shek and of the Communist Government of China, which has already been recognized by five or six of the nations of the earth.

What the Senator from New Jersey meant by joint occupation I do not know. We would not get very far with joint occupation with Chiang Kai-shek. He would either run the outfit or he would not play, that is all. Joint occupation. We cannot have a joint occupation. If there is a military force, it is necessary to have someone at the head of it, a general, an admiral, or a director of the military force.

The Senator from California made much ado about the December 23 statement issued by the Department of State. He wants to know who were the men who wrote it. Who is the man who, with pencil in hand, wrote some of this statement? Yes; who did? The State Department took responsibility for it. That means the Secretary of State vouches for it. It does not mean that he wrote it with his own hand, but it means that he sponsored it, that he stood for it. I think it is ridiculous to call upon any department to do down the line, and keep on going until they find out the person who actually wrote it on a typewriter. Who did it? Then they will want to know what kind of typewriter it was written on—what the number of the typewriter was, as in the trial of Mr. Hiss in New York. Yes; we want to know the clerk's name, the name of the stenographer, and the name of the man who dictated it, probably. Is that something the Senate of the United States should be bothering about? The statement is sponsored by the Secretary of State, and when the Secretary issued it, it became his statement, not that of the clerk, not that of the typist. A typist cannot be punished for what the Secretary of State did.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator agree with me that it is rather a strange coincidence that distinguished Senators are so vigorously intent upon finding out who wrote this message to the diplomats in the eastern section of the world, yet they do not say one word about the individual on MacArthur's staff who leaked the information to the press?

Mr. CONNALLY. There is no condemnation here of General MacArthur that I have heard. It has been verified, as I understand, that the statement gained currency through someone on the staff of General MacArthur in Tokyo. Today's newspapers state the general has a large staff of military personnel, public-relations officers, and newspaper folk who are working in a military capacity, and the presumption is that some of them gave it to their favorite reporter.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Whether the statement is right or whether it is wrong, it is a statement coming from one who has the authority to issue the statement.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. The individual on MacArthur's staff who leaked it to the press did something that was certainly contrary to military orders. If the individual who was so anxious to leak this information to Senators, or to the press, wanted to do that, he should have taken off his military uniform and donned civilian clothes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think General MacArthur, in the exercise of the authority which he possesses, ought to find out who the officer or who the man was who leaked the information. Here is a highly important State Department document. It was sent as a protection and as a guide to our foreign officers. It was sent to prepare them for any eventuality, yet we find it made public through a military man who gave it to the press of the entire world.

Mr. President, I now wish to advert to another subject. The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has used the expression "turning our backs on China," because we do not go into Formosa, because we do not go around to salute Chiang Kai-shek and to say, "We report for orders, Mr. Chiang Kai-shek," and because we do not take his side and supply him with an army and with the munitions and things of the kind. The Senator from California calls it turning our backs on a wartime ally. Mr. President, as allies in the war, who did the most? Did we do more for China or did she do more for us? We did all in the world we could for China. After the war she was assailed by the Communist Army. We did everything in the world we could do for China except to send an army. We gave her money, supplies, equipment, ECA aid, and all such benefits. What we did not do was to send an army from the United States to intervene in the war. Yet the Senator from California pours opprobrium on that program; he piles abuse on it and says we are turning our backs on a wartime ally. Ah, Mr. President, it is shameful to pervert the policy of this Government and its generosity toward China.

The junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], whom I do not see on the floor at the moment, spent a large part of the afternoon instructing the rest of us by questions to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. But he has left the floor. I wanted to interrogate him as to whether he favors sending an army to Formosa, or whether he favors sending the Navy to Formosa. He stated that we have no policy as to China, and he attacked our lack of policy.

Mr. President, those charges are baseless, they are unsubstantiated, and they are unworthy of being made by a Senator of the United States.

I shall not take up more of the time of the Senate except to say that I want to know who the Senators are, and I shall revive the question from time to time, who want to plunge this country, not directly, but possibly, into world war III, in the name of Formosa, but principally in the name of a bitter attack upon the President of the United States and upon the Department of State. Assaults have been made on the President of the United States and the Secretary of State.

Mr. President, communism is something which is distasteful to us, but that does not mean that we are obligated to send an army to fight Communists wherever we find them. If that be the case, we should start in eastern Europe, in Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia, all of which are Communist countries. Is there any obligation on our part to send an army to subjugate them on the plea that we want to give liberty to the world? After we have liberated all the countries which I have named, then there is Russia. We must liberate Russia. She is a Communist nation, and we must liberate her people. We cannot stand for a Communist government anywhere in the world.

No, Mr. President, we are not obligated to do all these things for every country on earth. We have done a great deal for many of the countries of the world, and we should do much for them in the future. I hope we shall continue a liberal policy toward promoting free government and liberty and the use of economic systems which will benefit the great masses of the people, but I do not subscribe to the doctrine that there is any obligation on us to take a sword in our hand and, wherever we find a Communist government, undertake to subjugate it and liberate its people. We could not do it if we wanted to do it. That is not the function of the United States.

The Senator from New Jersey talked about Communists. He said that we must rout them out, hunt them down. Would he say to them, "Come out of your holes, you Communists"? It is like hunt-

ing a squirrel in a hollow log. "If there is a Communist element in your country, we are going to suppress you, liquidate you; we are going to destroy you."

No, Mr. President; we cannot do that.

What other country in the world has done as much for other nations as has the United States? What other country has given China as much as has the United States? The Senator from New Jersey—if I am in error, I should like him to correct me—spoke about the abandonment of China, I believe. It may have been the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. He uses that kind of term.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think I was guilty.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. If that is the only guilt that attaches to him, he is a very fortunate man. How did we abandon China? Did we have a treaty with China providing that we would protect her regardless of who attacked her? Did we send her a note saying, "Go to it. We will stand by you regardless of who attacks you"?

I will tell the Senate who abandoned China. Chiang Kai-shek abandoned her when he failed to give the Chinese people the reforms which they desired. The testimony of every witness whom I have heard discuss the subject has been that Chiang Kai-shek's government did not give to the Chinese people, the masses of the people, the reforms which they expected and desired. The testimony further is that he was surrounded by groups of corrupt officials from whom the people were unable to realize their ambitions and hopes. If anyone abandoned China it was Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. When we went to his aid he was in control of all China except a few small territories in the extreme north. He was in possession of a great, rich, powerful nation, with large armies, several millions of men, armed with our guns, supplies, and equipment. Yet he could not maintain his position. He could not successfully resist the army which was recruited against him. From the pictures of them which I have seen, most of them were boys. Yet Chiang Kai-Shek could not maintain his position.

The Senator from New Jersey was asked whether he admitted that armed aid might provoke war——

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I admitted that if we gave armed aid there was danger of war occurring, but I was not advocating armed aid. I would support the thesis of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] by doing what we did for the Greeks and Turks. That was turned down by the President, and that is the reason why I took this other approach.

Mr. CONNALLY. The sending of armed aid might provoke war. Did not the Senator advocate sending the Navy?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I did not advocate sending the Navy. I said the thesis I was presenting, in which I felt we might be called upon to defend those people in case the Communists did make an attack, was in line with what President Hoover had said with regard to the Navy and that which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] had said. It was a defense against attack, but not in the sense of carrying on an aggressive war.

Mr. CONNALLY. There is not much difference between a navy and an army. Either one can kill. If we are killed by either one, it does not make much difference which one does it.

Do I misunderstand the Senator? Does he now say he did not favor joining the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and ex-President Hoover, both of whom advocated the sending of a navy there? Does the Senator repudiate that statement?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In case of an attack by the Communist government I would favor protecting Formosa, if our plan was adopted of trying to make an independent Chinese province there, as I have advocated. Certainly I would want to protect it from being destroyed. Just as we would use the Navy to protect Korea if it were attacked, or would protect any of the islands of Japan.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from New Jersey did not say a word about defending Korea in his statement in the press. He sided with the Senator from Ohio and former President Mr. Hoover, in wanting to send the Navy. For what purpose? Our Navy has guns, it has airplanes, it has all the armament that goes to make up a great battle machine. Why does the Senator want to send it over there? Is it to play ping-pong? No; he wants to send it over there to fight somebody, he wants to send it over there to kill somebody, he wants to send the Navy over there to fight Communists, and thereby run the risk of plunging this Nation into world war III—world war III, with all its horrors, with all its misery, and all the wreck and ruin which would come to our people if they were provoked in any way to plunge the United States again into a world war.

No, Mr. President, I shall not favor sending a single American boy with a gun in his hand to Formosa to settle a civil war six or seven thousand miles away from his home, in order to appease the political ambitions and the oratorical frothings of Senators in the United States Senate. I am not going to favor that, and I know the American people do not want us to do it.

Mr. President, it is my belief that if we did what certain Senators propose, if we should go into Formosa and occupy it, we would have a liability on our hands instead of an asset. The Chiefs of Staff have found that Formosa would be of no strategic value to us. We have Japan at the north, then Okinawa, then the Philippines. That is our line of defense to the east of Formosa, and none of those places involve the question of Communist government or Communist attack. Formosa would be a liability and not an asset.

Mr. President, I want the Senators who are so violent in their views, who are so prolific in their statements, who are so verbose in their oratory about Formosa, to tell us what they would do, what they ask the United States Government to do, what they ask the people to do. I want them to tell us what American boys they want to send to Formosa. I want them to tell the parents of those boys how many American boys they would send to Formosa to bleed and to die and to be buried in the jungle soil 7,000 miles away.

Mr. President, I am not for sending them. I shall fight such a proposal, and I know that the American people will fight it. Therefore I shall propound to every Senator who speaks on this question hereafter the question whether he favors that sort of a policy or whether he does not.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, following the remarks by the Senator from Texas, from the statement issued by President Truman on United States relations with China, under date of December 18, 1946, the two paragraphs I have marked, in which it is clearly pointed out that the so-called surplus equipment which constitutes a great part of the amount mentioned by the Senator from Texas is, under the words of the President of the United States himself, "Aircraft, all nondemilitarized combat material, and fixed installations outside of China were excluded. Thus, no weapons which could be used in fighting a civil war were made available through this agreement." That referred to the surplus sales agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Assistance took the form of goods and equipment and of services, such as those involved in air and water transportation of troops. According to the latest figures reported, lend-lease assistance to China up to VJ-day totaled approximately $870,000,000. From VJ-day to the end of February, shortly after General Marshall's arrival, the total was approximately $600,000,000—mostly in transportation costs. Thereafter, the program was reduced to the fulfillment of outstanding commitments, much of which was later suspended.

* * * * *

China agreed to buy all surplus property owned by the United States in China and on 17 Pacific islands and bases with certain exceptions. Six months of negotiations preceded the agreement finally signed in August. It was imperative that this matter be concluded in the Pacific as had already been done in Europe, especially in view of the rapid deterioration of the material in open storage under tropical conditions and the urgent need for the partial alleviation of the acute economic distress of the Chinese people which it was hoped this transaction would permit. Aircraft, all nondemilitarized combat material, and fixed installations outside of China were excluded. Thus no weapons which could be used in fighting a civil war were made available through this agreement.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me that the statement made by the Senator from Texas is one which Mr. Chamberlain might have made to the British Parliament in the time of Munich, that the distant country of Czechoslovakia was of no concern to the people of Britain, and though their liberty and their freedom were sold down the river to Nazi Germany, it was of no concern to

the people of the British Empire. Of course, we know that was not true, that he made almost inevitable World War II, and I think that those of us who sincerely believe that the question of the Communist menace in China is a vital problem, feel that we are trying to prevent that type of appeasement which would inevitably lead to war.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, perhaps there is no more appropriate time than now to ask to have printed in the RECORD the text of Madame Chiang Kai-shek's farewell address to the American people. Some of us who were privileged to hear that little bit of humanity as she stood on the rostrum in the Senate a few years ago and delivered an extemporaneous address, appreciated her voice and her spirit as she addressed the American people over the radio yesterday. No matter how we feel about the Nationalists or the Communists in China, we can recognize a great character, a great soul, and a great patriot.

Tomorrow, Mr. President, I shall attend the meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and after that I shall also have something to say in relation to what I think should be our foreign policy. I shall do it, not with the idea of seeking to instruct, because after all the Constitution recognizes the President as the spearhead in foreign relations, but I do think that the Senate and each individual Senator is under an obligation, especially in this stage of the world's history, when there is a conflict between two great ideologies, communism and what I call the American way of life.

At this time I ask that the farewell address to America by Madame Chiang Kai-shek be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends, I speak to you today to say good-by, to thank you for your kind hospitality, and to hope that perhaps my next visit to the United States will be in a happier atmosphere when my country will again be free from the ponderous hooves of an alien invader.

Naturally it is always sad for me to leave this country to which I come not only as a visitor but also as one who here spent many years of my girlhood, where I received all of my schooling and much of the inspiration for whatever I have been able to do for my people.

In a few days I shall be returning to China. Not to Nanking, Chungking, Shanghai, or Canton. Not to the soil of our mainland. I shall return to my people on the island of Formosa, the fortfess of our hopes, the citadel of our battle against an alien power which is ravaging our country.

With or without help we shall fight. We are not defeated. Millions of my countrymen are yet dedicated to the long fight. As long as a breath remains in us, and with faith in the Almighty, we shall continue the struggle. Not a day, not an hour, will pass which will not be devoted to our struggle for freedom.

PLEDGES UNREMITTING FIGHT

We shall fight fire with fire. Unremittingly and with the tenacity of life, we shall fight and bleed the enemy. Everywhere in China's mainland our guerrillas will keep kindled the torch of liberty. The enemy's lies and deceit, their treachery and propaganda will be defeated not only with bullets but also with truth.

The oppressed people on the mainland will be prepared so that at a given signal they will rise up simultaneously and overthrow the yoke of Communist domination with our returning armies.

To this we are dedicated with our lives.

It is possible that we shall give every appearance of failure. It is possible that those who take a short view of life and no view at all of moral principles will write China off as a failure.

I hope that wherever my voice carries, to whatever free corner of the world, I can help awaken liberty-loving peoples to the realization that China, abandoned and alone, now shoulders the only rifle in the defense of liberty. The world is divided between liberty and communism. In a day not too far distant millions of others will have to make the choice between fighting for their liberty or surrendering to enslavement.

Let no one be deceived. Ours is the cause of freedom. It is not, and the world should know it is not, our struggle alone. China's struggle now is the initial phase of a gigantic conflict between good and evil, between liberty and communism.

For more than 20 years my husband has led his people in the fight against communism. He alone was responsible for China's break with the Communists in 1926 when he became convinced that Russia was laboring even then to steal our country. He saw that China was being made an experiment for all the wiles and tricks which Russia since has used against the world.

TIMES HAVE CHANGED

Chiang Kai-shek, of all the world's statesmen, was first to perceive the treachery of the Communists. He was the first to fight them. A few years ago he was exalted for the courage and tenacity of the fight he waged. Now he is pilloried. Times have changed, but the man has not changed. My husband remains resolute, to lead his people against the alien invaders and their alien ideas.

Our people will continue to fight for our country from some place, from such an island as Formosa, or from the fastness of some mountain, as long as we live, or as long as there is an alien enemy on China's soil. I say that to you not in the spirit of dramatic political assertion, but as a statement of fact.

Already the moral weaklings are forsaking us. It is with heavy heart that I note that a former ally, Britain, which sacrificed millions of lives on the altar of freedom, has now been taken by its leaders into the wilderness of political intrigue. Britain has bartered the soul of a nation for a few pieces of silver. I say "for shame" to Britain. One day these pieces of silver will bear interest in British blood, sweat, and tears on the battleground of freedom. For that which is morally wrong can never be politically right.

NEVER GIVE UP

Truth requires that each people live according to its own traditions in a climate of human liberty and dignity. That has been the soul of Chinese civilization. That my people will never give up—not in the face of alien power, not even if their bodies are enslaved to alien might, so long as their eyes behold the beacon of freedom from the Formosan bastion. Our souls, our hearts will be free, and we shall act accordingly as best we can.

Should it be that some of us are killed in this battle for freedom, others will rise to take our places. There will not be a day of peace for the invader. No great powers can arrange treaties, no statesmen can write contracts, that will stifle the Chinese yearning for liberty.

Mothers will sing of it in lullabies, fathers will speak of it at the table, young schoolboys will give each other secret signs of liberty, the farmer will suffer, but the earth will grow for the enemy, not grapes and figs, but thorns and thistles.

It was out of a mass movement to free China from an earlier alien conqueror that the great revolutionary movement of Dr. Sun Yat-sen developed—a movement which expelled those invaders and established a Chinese Republic.

CITES FRIENDSHIP WITH UNITED STATES

No force will prevail to alter that. We live not by the sword but by our principles of life. Others for the sake of expediency may desert them, but in time of adversity, when the hour is dark, we cling to our principles with even greater tenacity, and that, perhaps, accounts for our having the longest continuous history of any people on earth.

The United States and China have a long friendship, as long as the history of the American Republic. Many of your citizens have lived in our country. Your people have come to our aid and have given us comfort. Yours has been a contribution of affection. You have asked for no quid pro quo. Your name among us will always be cherished for its friendship and friendliness.

I can ask the American people for nothing more. During the many months that I have been in this country I have made no speeches, I have made no appeals. I did not enter into the competition for your aid, although my country sorely needs your aid.

I shall tell you why I have been so silent. When a nation, like a man, does an act of justice it must be of his conscience and not by request or demand. There are acts of mercy, acts of charity, acts of justice. And justice is right because it is right.

Perhaps you will think me proud. My friends, my country is humbled. Our Government is on an island in the ocean. Bruce of Scotland remained with his people from a cave. We remain with our people from an island.

A MATTER OF THE HEART

At such a time no pleading can be with dignity. It is either in your hearts to love us, or your hearts have turned from us. It is either in your mind and your will to aid China in her struggle for liberty, or you have abandoned liberty.

What promise can we make to you? What guaranties can we give you? Shall we compete with those who promise more than they can ever deliver?

We stand with empty but willing hands. We stand humble, tired, crying for peace and rest, even more than for rice and bread—but we cannot give up the fight for liberty. We shall not give up the fight for liberty. With or without help, China shall fight for liberty. Alone it will take longer and cost more lives. With help our gains will be swifter. But free we shall be.

Resolute in spirit and confidence that man's inherent love of freedom and justice will emerge victorious our forces will fight on. History records with devastating truth that right will prevail.

Russia will never know one day of peace in China. Russia will never own China. China will remain free.

Good-by, my friends. I thank you.

INFORMATION AS TO BIDS ON DEFENSE DEPARTMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to advise the Senators of a new policy which has just been announced by the Secretary of Defense. This policy relates to a plan designed to give distribution to bid information which will particularly and materially aid small businesses. This

policy was formulated for the Secretary and the Munitions Board by the Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the statement I have prepared be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the remainder of Mr. FREAR's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In a recent release, Trilane Associates, an organization devoted to accurate, factual reporting of Government procurement, it was stated therein, in part, as follows:

"Designed to give all business a better chance 'to window shop' for a larger share of Army, Navy, and Air Force defense contracts, a new policy resolution was approved by the Secretary of Defense Johnson and the Munitions Board in Washington today (January 6, 1950), it was revealed today in an inside story by Henry Scharf, publisher of the Government Procurement Daily Bulletin.

"In a bylined story mailed to subscribers of his publication this evening (January 6, 1950) Mr. Scharf declares that the action by the Munitions Board 'delivers a final blow to 5-percenters and offers a strong helping hand to all business—especially small business.'

"The publisher points out that the new policy resolution is 'the direct result of a 7 months' fight' initiated by his staff and carried to its final conclusion by Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK's Small Business Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

"The new resolution makes possible for the first time, says Mr. Scharf, the accurate, timely, and complete dissemination of news concerning available invitations to bid on unclassified military procurement. The Board's action, he adds, is completely in the public interest and 'restores the intent of Public Law 413, passed by the Eightieth Congress, to permit American businessmen, large and small, to openly and publicly compete for contracts estimated at close to $20,000,000,000 for 1950.'

"With further reference to the part played by his staff in helping to shape the resolution, Mr. Scharf reveals that his publication furnished 'documented evidence' on June 17, 1949, to the Senate Small Business Subcommittee. 'This evidence,' he adds, 'brought to a head the elimination of restrictive conditions prevalent heretofore.'

" 'The effect of the resolution,' concludes Mr. Scharf, 'is to lift the clouds of secrecy from public information, and to pull the foundations from under 5 percenters'."

In another statement the publisher of the above daily bulletin released the following, in part, as follows:

"As we go to press we learn from authoritative sources that the 'open door' policy is in the form of a resolution approved by the Munitions Board in Washington yesterday and signed this morning by the Secretary of Defense. The resolution, anticipated to become effective February 1, is the direct result of a 7-month's-old fight initiated by this staff and carried to its final conclusion by Senator MAYBANK's Small Business Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. It offers a strong helping hand to all business—especially small business—while it delivers the final blow to the '5 percenters.'

"For the first time, since record-breaking procurement budgets have harassed small-business men with the urge to participate in this gigantic spending, the resolution now makes possible the accurate, thorough, timely, and complete dissemination of news concerning available invitations for bid. Of necessity this applies only to unclassified military procurement.

"All procurement defined by this resolution offers small business—manufacturers, dealers, and distributors alike—a chance to window-shop for a larger share of Army, Navy, and Air Force business.

"We learn that the Munitions Board order, which is to be implemented by a directive on or about February 1, will make it mandatory upon the major military procurement agencies to open their doors to 'competitive bidding.'

"The Board's order successfully consummates 7 months of hard work by this staff and other members of the Trade Press working with the Small Business Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

"Trilane started the ball rolling—the writer can now reveal that this publication played an important part in protecting the rights of both the small-business man and the trade press. In fact, it was this publication's documented evidence, furnished the Senate Small Business Subcommittee on June 17, 1949, that brought to a head the elimination of restrictive conditions that have prevailed heretofore.

"The Senate Committee invited the opinions of other publishers who soon joined in the battle.

"Prior to the passing of this resolution the House Select Committee on Small Business joined forces with the Senate Banking and Currency Committee's Small Business Subcommittee. Jointly with the counsel for the Munitions Board, counsel for the subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee and the Director for Military Supply for the Munitions Board, Rear Adm. M. L. Ring, they in conference agreed upon the terms of the resolution as it was passed today in its final form.

"The statements made to the Munitions Board by the congressional committee's chairman, lauded the achievements of these publications as follows: 'It is of the utmost importance to small business that procurement information be expanded instead of curtailed.' Pointing out the impossible task of smaller manufacturers and contractors to maintain staffs at procurement centers and the dependence of small business upon individual listing and publications of procurement information, the committees urged the Munitions Board to make 'available to small business institutions more information on prime and prospective subcontracts—to provide greater opportunity and freer competition, with resultant lower prices to the Federal Government.'

"The intent of the resolution is to lift the clouds of secrecy from public information; thus it virtually pulls from under the foundations on which '5 percenters' have thrived for so long.

"The resolution, when implemented, will bring at the year's start new opportunities to manufacturers, dealers, and distributors, large and small alike, wherever located, for each coming year."

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared in relation to the President's budget.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The President's budget message just read to the Senate today is startling for it is the first time he has failed specifically at least to propose a balanced budget, and it is extremely dangerous because at a time of peace and highest prosperity the President apparently would embark this Nation on a policy of heavy deficit spending for an indefinite period.

Last year he proposed to offset an estimated $800,000,000 deficit with a recommendation for $4,000,000,000 in new taxes.

This year he estimates a $5,100,000,000 deficit but in carefully framed language there is no promise that new taxes he will propose would balance the 1951 budget even if the tax increases were adopted.

History will record that the President has proposed another indefensible failure to balance the Federal budget in another year of peace and greatest prosperity in history.

In fact, although giving lip service to a balanced budget at some future date, the 1951 budget message fails even in an estimate of when that might occur.

The President's message on the economic report Friday placed great emphasis on a crystal-ball prediction as to a great increase in national income 5 to 50 years from now, but in the budget message today the President turns this prospect away from the rosy aspect of individual prosperity to the anticipation that higher incomes will bring in more taxes.

His statement that, "as our economy grows, tax revenue will grow also," seems to be a prediction that as income increases it will be the signal for increased Government expenditures.

There seems to be no place in this budget or in the fiscal situation it anticipates for the old rule of balanced budgets, reduced debt, and reduction in taxes. This of course high lights the fallacy in the Friday economic report which challenged American taxpayers to engage in more capital investment.

The budget message just read to the Senate estimates 1951 expenditures will be approximately $42,500,000,000. But analysis of proposals reveals that they will be close to $43,000,000,000 unless postal rates are increased by $400,000,000.

The President estimates 1951 revenue will be less than $37,500,000,000 exclusive of later tax adjustment proposals increasing revenue. And it should be noted that any general revenue tax increases proposed in the later message will be in addition to $1,500,000,000 of new social-security and socialized-medicine pay-envelope deductions which are proposed in the message today.

The President estimated that the deficit in 1951 will be $5,100,000,000. This time last year he estimated that the deficit in the current year would be $800,000,000. He could be as wrong this year as he was last. The latest estimate on the current year deficit is $5,500,000,000—an error of nearly five billion in the original estimate. A slight recession in business of 10 percent immediately would be reflected in tax revenue which would decline nearly $5,000,000,000.

As to when we may expect a balanced budget he merely says, "In preparing this budget I have carefully evaluated the possible alternatives in the light of the realities of our present situation. The soundness of a fiscal program cannot be properly changed simply by the year to year change in the expected margin between receipts and expenditures. A prudent program must meet much broader tests if it is to serve the long-range needs of our people."

The President's refusal to retrench should be viewed in the light that the budget he proposes is $8,200,000,000 more than expenditures in fiscal year 1948 which ended only 18 months ago. He makes great capital of the fact that his expenditure proposals are $860,000,000 less than estimated expenditures in the current year (2 percent). But this dwindles to lower insignificance if Congress fails as it did this year to enact an increase in postage rates of nearly $500,000,000. And

if this postal increase is not enacted the estimated deficit for 1951 automatically surpasses the estimate for the current year.

Under the President's proposals domestic-civilian expenditures (exclusive of veterans and interest) would total $12,250,000,000 as compared with $6,900,000,000 in 1948, and $11,400,000,000 estimated for the current year. This expenditure for non-war-connected purposes is far more than the total budget (including defense, foreign, veterans, and interest) in any peacetime year before World War II.

In this budget foreign expenditures are reduced by $1,300,000,000 and domestic expenditures are increase by nearly $1,000,000,000, indicating that as expenditures for foreign relief and recovery programs are decreased expenditures are to be increased for domestic boondoggling in such fields as housing, works, federalized education and socialized welfare, health, and security.

Under the glare of publicity to the steady and tremendous increase in these domestic-civilian items the President suggests that atomic-energy and merchant-marine costs might be considered in the defense category, but this would be in contradiction to the existing civilian policies which have been emphasized for these functions.

As it stands, the proposed program for the military in 1951 will cost more than any year since demobilization was completed in 1948. This is despite the fact that this will be the third year of unification. It will be despite Secretary Johnson's civilian employment reduction order. And it will be despite the improved budgetary procedures enacted for the Military Establishment last year. And it should be noted further that the 13½ billion dollar expenditure program for the Military Establishment in 1951 contemplates only a 48-group air force, which is less than Congress authorized last year.

The form of the budget has been modernized to conform with Hoover Commission recommendations, and it includes a supplement which the deficit-spending advocates will hail as a summary of capital investments, but its tendency toward socialistic programs and its deficit-spending recommendations are unchanged.

Close analysis of the budget will reveal a renewal of the advocacy of a trend toward the use of trust fund techniques to avoid budgetary revenue and expenditures. This will be found in the proposal to increase pay-envelope deductions for socialized medicine and expanded social security. If these proposals should be adopted the revenue from these taxes would not show in the budget totals and neither would the expenditures. But the assessments would be in the nature of taxes just the same and the payments would be in the nature of expenditures, although they would not affect the deficit or surplus.

Frankly, I am opposed to many of the policies and programs financed in this budget, but I know they cannot be withdrawn suddenly. However, in view of the imminent danger to our economic system inherent in the present fiscal situation—marked by constant deficits and the towering debt, which under 1951 budget proposals soon will approach the all-time war peak—something must be done now.

Therefore, we must resort to the alternative of seeking practicable retrenchment within the bounds of existing policies which at least would reverse the trend.

I have demonstrated by my own budget calculations that in this period of peace and highest prosperity failure to balance the budget is indefensible.

It is the responsibility of Congress alone to appropriate money for. Federal expenditures, and I trust that even without the support of the President, Congress will balance the budget by retrenchment and avoid the necessity for additional taxes. With the facilities of the new single appropriation bill I am confident this can be done without the impairment of any essential function.

To this end, I am submitting for the consideration of Congress an expenditure budget of $36,000,000,000, which I believe would turn the tide away from state socialism—the inevitable result of continued deficit spending—and put this Nation on a road to democratic progress unsurpassed in history.

It is apparent that under the President's recommendations the Federal Government would be headed toward an extended era of chronic deficit spending which might continue until the public debt crushes us into national insolvency.

We ended fiscal year 1949 last June 30 with a deficit of nearly $2,000,000,000. Next June 30 we shall end the current fiscal year with a deficit of from $5,000,000,000 to $8,000,000,000 (thus far this year, from July 1 through December 30, the cumulated deficit is $3,299,798,921).

In the 2-year period of peace and high income from July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1950, we shall have raised the public debt by at least $8,000,000,000, and it then will total more than $260,000,000,000.

At the present income level, with neither retrenchment nor increased taxes, the momentum of present Federal spending will pile up another deficit of more than $5,000,000,000 in the fiscal year beginning next July 1. Then the debt in peacetime would be close to its wartime peak.

THE YEAR OF CRISIS

Congress in its present session must make the vital decision of whether to:

1. Increase taxes by more than $5,000,000,000;

2. Retrench, and, as I shall show in this statement, this can be done within a balanced budget, without impairing either our security or any essential function; or

3. Authorize expenditures totaling more than $5,000,000,000 in excess of revenue and go gayly along the economic primrose path of indefinite deficit financing.

Deliberate adoption by Congress of the deficit spending course in an era of peace and highest prosperity will shatter public confidence in Federal securities at a time when the debt is more than a quarter of a trillion dollars.

The deliberate embracing of deficit financing in a period of near-peak national income is even more alarming in view of the Administration's apparent determination to urge upon Congress the adoption of still more new Federal spending ventures of huge and unpredictable cost.

NEW TAXES

New taxes were proposed by the President last year and a recession followed until the proposal was withdrawn.

We are now paying more than 5 times the total tax receipts collected in the year before the war. Although personal income from nearly full employment is close to its peak it is still less than two and a half times its total in the year before the war.

To impose new taxes on top of the existing burdensome and, in many instances, almost confiscatory taxation would put us in a position where any minor business decline could easily be accelerated into a major recession.

And to assume that revenue will remain at its present level under the existing tax structure would be to assume that the present high personal income would remain at the current level. If, in a period of recession, income should drop 10 percent below its present figure (it would still be greater than in 1948), the loss in Federal revenue would be $5,000,000,000.

To see the effect of new taxes on business it should be noted that the total Federal tax take from all corporate income is $12,000,000,000. If $5,000,000,000 additional taxes were levied on corporations it would be an increase of around 40 percent.

To see how new taxes would affect individuals it should be noted that the Federal Government takes $18,000,000,000 in taxes on individual income (exclusive of excise taxes paid by all who buy). To add $5,000,000,000 in new taxes to individual income assessments would increase them by nearly 30 percent.

To see how new taxes would affect the combined tax payments by individuals and corporations, $5,000,000,000 additional would be an average increase of more than 16 percent on the two.

The only remaining principal source of Federal revenue is excise taxes which are now costing us $7,000,000,000 to $8,000,000,000. Many of these excise taxes are still on a wartime basis and could not be increased.

It is easily possible and, in fact, probable that an effort to collect $7,000,000,000 additional taxes by increasing Federal rates actually would result in diminishing dollar returns.

In my considered judgment any substantial increase in taxation at this time would deal a savage blow to the private enterprise system and our continued prosperity.

HOW TO BALANCE THE NEW BUDGET

When the President, with the assistance of the Bureau of the Budget and the Treasury Department, was preparing the Federal budget for the fiscal year 1951, which begins July 1, and I respectfully submitted to the President, to the Congress, and to the country that—

1. If he, with the full influence of his office and his personal support, would submit an expenditure budget not in excess of $36,000,000,000 (which would be nearly $2,000,000,000 more than expenditures in fiscal year 1948).

2. If the public would give it sympathetic approval.

3. If Congress would not enact a budget in excess of that maximum.

4. Revenue would cover expenditures; no essential function of the Government need be impaired; and there would be no need for recommendation by the President, enactment by Congress, or payment by the public, of new taxes.

SOUND GOVERNMENT AND SUSTAINED PROSPERITY

On the basis of more than 16 years spent in closely analyzing and studying Federal fiscal policies and the Nation's economy, I am unable to escape the conclusion that a balanced budget within the ability of the people to pay is an absolute requirement for the preservation of the Government's solvency and the stability of our economy. Without solvency and stability, our form of government cannot survive.

At the same time I am confident that achievement of a sound balanced budget would reaffirm the confidence of the public in prospects for our continued solvency and strengthen the private enterprise system which is basic to our form of government.

This confidence is based upon the conviction that a sound and reasonable budget would—

1. Balance with a surplus sufficient to justify correction of tax inequalities and injustices which admittedly exist, and this might provide a business stimulus to pave the way for further tax reduction in response to the growing demand.

2. Break the momentum of deficit financing policies.

3. Dispell the fear of private enterprise inherent in Government encroachment through public debt and by Federal controls which lead to socialism.

4. Stimulate constructive investment, development, and expansion in industry and agriculture for the production of more of the still tremendous backlog of things people everywhere need and desire at prices they can pay.

5. Put savings to work through private enterprise creating the wealth which is required to lift the great millstone of debt from our backs and leave us erect with the dignity of a sufficient and creative people, free and unregimented in the pursuit of happiness.

THIRTY-SIX BILLION DOLLARS WOULD BE A BUDGET OF PROGRESS

A $36,000,000,000 expenditure budget would be four times the maximum expenditures in the highest prewar budget, and it need not represent a single element of reaction.

Personally I believe it could be less, but a $36,000,000,000 budget would be nearly $2,000,000,000 more than all Federal expenditures in fiscal year 1948, which ended only 18 months ago, and it should be sufficient to cover the demands of all reasonable people.

It can be achieved without superhuman effort. It can be reached principally by foregoing nonessential increases and elimination of administrative inefficiency, extravagance, and waste.

I repeat for emphasis that a $36,000,000,000 budget would be $2,000,000,000 greater than the Federal expenditure budget in fiscal year 1948, which ended only 18 months ago, when farm and industrial production was at or near its peak, when agricultural, business, and personal income, in general, were at or near their peak, when the cold war was neither colder nor hotter than it is now, when the budget was balanced, and when a rare reduction in the Federal debt was accomplished.

Thirty-six-billion-dollar budget for progress, with comparisons

[In billions of dollars]

Expenditure categories	Fiscal year 1948 (which ended June 30, 1948), actual	Fiscal year 1950 (which will end next June 30), estimated Jan. 9, 1950, revision	Fiscal year 1951 (which begins next July 1)	
			Byrd $36 billion budget	President's Jan. 9 proposals
I. Domestic-civilian (exclusive of veterans and interest)	6.9	11.4	8.9	12.2
Social welfare, health, and security	1.9	2.3	1.9	2.7
Housing and community facilities (including RFC secondary mortgages)	.1	1.0	1.0	1.3
Education and general research	.1	.1	.1	.4
Agriculture and agricultural resources (including CCC)	.6	2.7	2.2	2.2
Natural resources	1.1	1.8	1.2	2.2
Transportation and communication (including postal deficit)	1.3	1.9	1.2	1.7
Finance, commerce, and industry	.1	.2	.1	.2
Labor	.2	.2	.2	.2
General government	1.5	1.2	1.0	1.3
II. National defense	11.0	13.1	11.3	13.5
III. Veterans	6.6	6.9	5.3	6.1
IV. Foreign	4.8	6.0	4.8	4.7
V. Interest on the Federal debt	5.2	5.7	5.7	5.6
Grand total expenditure budget [1]	34.2	43.3	36.0	42.4
Revenue	[2] 42.2	[3] 37.5	[3] 37.5	[3] 37.5
Deficit or surplus	[2] +8.0	[4] −5.5	[3] +2.0	[4] −5.1

[1] Detailed figures may not add precisely to totals due to rounding and omission of reserves.
[2] Actual.
[3] Maximum estimate.
[4] Minimum estimate.

CHAPTERS AND VERSES OF A $36,000,000,000 BUDGET FOR PROGRESS

In general

The greatest increases in Federal expenditures since 1949 have occurred in domestic-civilian items. There have been others, of course, in veterans, foreign, defense, and interest categories.

By the standards of the 1948 budget, which no one could regard as niggardly, no over-all reduction would be necessary to achieve a $36,000,000,0000 budget of progress. In fact there would be an increase of $2,000,000,000.

But if the Budget Bureau's latest estimate of the current 1950 rate of spending is to be used as a standard, reductions of $5,500,000,000 would be required.

For those to whom places to retrench in the 1950 budget are not obvious I would suggest the place to start would be the submission to Congress, and its enactment, of all the Hoover Commission Report recommendations looking toward economy and efficiency which Mr. Hoover estimated would save $3,000,000,000.

On the basis of the President's 1950 budget recommendations, there were 300 run-of-the-mill items, exclusive of veterans, foreign, defense, interest, claims, judgments, and all other nondeferrable commitments, imperative obligations and fixed charges, in which increases over 1949 expenditures were requested.

Civilian employment in the executive branch is still more than double the prewar emergency peak, and civilian payroll and administrative costs are running to approximately $7,500,000,000.

There are still 60 principal departments and agencies in the Government with more than a thousand component units, many of which are engaged in duplicated and overlapping activities.

There is a growing and costly tendency among all concerned with Federal spending programs toward the practice of authorizing program expenditures without annual limitation, over which there can be little or no control.

All of these are areas where general retrenchment should be required.

Specifically

In order that there may be no question about the suggestions in my proposed $36,000,000,000 budget of progress for fiscal year 1951, beginning next July 1 (previously set forth in tabular form), it is analyzed item by item, first by comparison with expenditures in fiscal year 1948, which ended June 30, 1948, and then by comparison with the estimated current rate of expenditure in the present fiscal year 1950, which ends next June 30.

Domestic-Civilian

Compared with 1948

In 1948 expenditures for domestic-civilian items (exclusive of veterans and interest) totaled $6,900,000,000.

A $36,000,000,000 budget for progress for fiscal year 1951 would allow a $2,000,000,000 increase in these items, or more than 25 percent, over the 1948 total for sound advancement in social welfare, health and security, housing and community facilities, education and general research, agriculture and agricultural resources, natural resources, transportation and communication, finance, commerce and industry, labor, and general government.

On the basis of 1948 expenditures substantial increases would be allowed for housing, agriculture and public works. Decreases would occur primarily in the postal deficit and the so-called general government item.

Compared with 1950

In the current fiscal year 1950 domestic-civilian expenditure items (exclusive of veterans and interest) are estimated to total $11,900,000,000.

For those who wish to consider the $36,000,000,000 budget of progress proposal as a reduction from 1950 instead of an increase over 1948, it is pointed out that there are more than 50 principal departments and agencies with hundreds of component units—all with pay rolls and administrative expenses—in the domestic-civilian category.

With this background in view the following suggestions can be justified:

The pay roll and administrative costs in these agencies are now running at nearly $4,000,000,000 a year. Their employment is approximately 1,000,000. Spread over 50 principal agencies and their hundreds of component units, with advantage taken of seasonal adjustments, this employment could be reduced by 250,000. This would still leave their employment total at 750,000, which would be approximately 15 percent more than the aggregate employment in this category at the prewar-emergency peak in 1939. The savings, including those in administrative costs which necessarily would come down, would be approximately $900,000,000. This would be spread over the agencies in the nine functional groups comprising the domestic-civilian category.

In addition to pay roll and administrative reductions, at least $400,000,000 should be saved by tightening up the open-end mortgage purchase program of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This would require new legislation, but it would still leave more than the amount originally recommended by the President for the current year, which he revised upward by $1,100,000,000 in November.

In addition to pay roll and administrative reductions in the Department of Agriculture, at least $200,000,000 could be saved by new legislation based on a reexamination of the open-end Commodity Credit Corporation authorization and this would still leave more than the amount originally recommended by the President for this program for the current year, which he revised upward by $800,000,000 in November.

In addition to pay roll and administrative reductions, the $500,000,000 postal deficit should be at least partially saved by new legislation which would compensate for the loss in those classes of mail which are now being handled on a deficit basis, but elimination of glaring inefficiency in the Post Office Department, criticized sharply in the Hoover Commission Report, should largely offset increases in rates which could not be absorbed by users.

After reductions in pay roll and administrative costs in the natural resources group, there would be a considerable reduction to be absorbed primarily by nonessential public-works projects which could be postponed or slowed down, but there still would be as much remaining to be spent on public works as there was in 1948.

These reductions would total $3,000,000,000 in comparison with November estimates of

expenditures in the current fiscal year 1950, ending next June 30, and they would leave $8,900,000,000 to be spent on domestic-civilian functions in fiscal year 1951, beginning next July 1. This would be $2,000,000,000 more than was spent in fiscal year 1948.

Veterans

Compared with 1948

In 1948 expenditures for veterans totaled $6,600,000,000.

A $36,000,000,000 budget of progress for fiscal year 1951 would allow $5,300,000,000 for all activities of the Veterans' Administration which, although slightly less than the amount available in 1948, would be accounted for entirely by reduction in excessive payroll and administrative costs and the normal tapering off of the GI benefit programs as contemplated, and it still would be within 4 percent of the amount originally recommended by the President for the current 1950 fiscal year.

For those who wish to consider this proposal as a reduction from 1950 instead of comparing it with 1948, the following suggestions can be justified:

The pay-roll and administrative costs of the Veterans' Administration are now running to approximately three-quarters of a billion dollars a year. This could be reduced by $175,000,000 and still leave employment by the Administration at 150,000. This would be five times greater than its 1939 employment. The veterans' population of the United States (including many who are receiving no service from the Administration) is 19,000,000. This is far less than five times the 4,300,000 veterans' population of 1939.

If the readjustment-benefits program expenditures were reduced by $1,300,000,000 there would still remain $1,750,000,000 for this program. This would be a reduction of $500,000,000 under the President's original estimate for these programs for 1950. In fiscal year 1951 the war will have been over more than 5 years, and most veterans will have been out of the service approximately 4 years. This reduction would not apply to pensions, hospitalization, etc., but the time has come for the majority of those still receiving "readjustment" benefits to regard that part of their country's debt to them as paid. And this applies also to business and educational institutions which have been profiting by the program as well. It does not seem unreasonable to start tapering this program down sharply.

Compared with 1950

These reductions would total approximately $1,500,000,000 in comparison with estimated 1950 expenditures, most of which would be absorbed in programs which normally might be expected to be reaching the end of their intended usefulness.

Foreign

Compared with 1948

In 1948 expenditures in all international affairs and foreign-assistance programs totaled $4,800,000,000.

Under a $36,000,000,000 budget for progress for fiscal year 1951 $4,800,000,000 would still be available for all international affairs and foreign assistance programs and no reduction under 1948 would be necessary despite the fact that the war will have been over 5 years and we shall have spent nearly $35,000,000,000 for this purpose. It is generally conceded that reduction in some of the programs is due and justified, and any reductions indicated could be absorbed in these programs.

Compared with 1950

For the benefit of those who wish to consider this proposal as a reduction from the $6,300,000,000 1950 expenditures instead of an amount equal to expenditures in 1948, the $1,500,000,000 reduction could be absorbed in programs which are nearing the expiration of their usefulness.

National Defense

Compared with 1948

In 1948 expenditures for national defense and supporting activities (including stock piling) totaled $11,000,000,000.

A $36,000,000,000 budget of progress for fiscal year 1951 would allow $11,300,000,000 despite the fact that our troops have been evacuated from many foreign lands, our military government activities have been substantially reduced, the draft and UMT have been suspended, and we will have had nearly 3 years of unification in which economy was supposed to have been a prime objective.

Compared with 1950

For the benefit of those who wish to consider this as a reduction from 1950 instead of an increase over 1948, it is pointed out that the Hoover Commission estimated that at least a billion dollars could be saved under unification of the armed services, and former Secretary of the Army Royall and Secretary of the Air Force Symington agreed.

Secretary of Defense Johnson recently said he was preparing a "scientific defense budget" and added that, "We are not only trying to get along on less; we will get along on a whole lot less." All of his recent statements have indicated that substantial reductions can be made in the military expenditures without impairing the national defense.

He has already sharply reduced civilian employment in the National Military Establishment despite the fact that funds appropriated for 1950 were based on original personal service appropriation requests providing for 865,000 civilian employees.

With this background in view the following suggestions can be justified:

The civilian pay roll and administrative costs of the National Military Establishment are running at approximately $3,500,000,000. The defense budget item for civilian personnel in fiscal year 1950 was based on employment requests for 865,000. The Secretary of Defense has already found that he can reduce the civilian employment by more than 125,000. If the civilian employment were reduced by 200,000 there would still remain about 1 civilian employee for each 2½ men in uniform. This would be approximately the same ratio which prevailed in fiscal year 1939 when the preparedness effort began to get underway. The saving in pay roll and administrative costs would be $1,000,000,000.

Another billion dollars should be saved in other aspects of military requirements, in view of the postwar evacuation of troops from many foreign areas, the substantial reduction in military government activities, the suspension of the draft and UMT, and nearly 3 years of unification in which economy was supposed to have been a primary objective.

These reductions would total $2,000,000,000 in comparison with 1950 expenditure estimates and still would leave an increase of $300,000,000 over 1948 expenditures for inauguration of the European Military Arms program.

Compared with current 1950 fiscal year estimates the grand total of reductions in a $36,000,000,000 budget for progress in 1951 would be $7,500,000,000, and the grand total of increases in comparison with actual expenditures in 1948 would be nearly $2,000,000,000.

SUMMARY

Under such a program, there would be no reduction in interest on the debt as compared with either 1950 or 1948. Actually there would be an increase over both years.

There would be no reduction in the essentials of the uniformed military forces or contractual obligations of the National Military Establishment as compared with either 1950 or 1948. There would be an increase for the European military arms program.

There would be no reduction in the veterans' programs for hospitals, pensions, etc. There would be no reduction in essential public works.

The reductions would occur principally in the "open-end" programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, veterans' (readjustment), and in the postal deficit which appear to be subject to abuse and lax administration. And, in addition, a start would be made in eliminating waste, extravagance, and inefficiency in administration and excesses in employment of manpower which would be more useful elsewhere.

I submit such a budget would be one of progress which would return the Federal Government to its traditional role of fostering and stimulating our system of free enterprise—the secret to our standard of living, our productive genius, and the fulfillment of our responsibilities in world leadership.

I submit that adoption of a policy of indefinite deficit financing, and the debt which it will incur, in times of peace and high income will irrevocably commit this Nation to ultimate socialism, and together these would be instruments for the destruction of our form of government.

THE GOVERNMENT BUDGET

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take just a few minutes to discuss certain aspects of the budget problem which confronts the United States as I see the problem. Today we listened to a very interesting budget message from the President of the United States. In respect to a great many of the recommendations in the message I find myself in complete agreement. In respect to the over-all objectives of the President of the United States, insofar as his sincere desire to promote the general welfare of the American people, in seeking to raise their standard of living, and carry out one of the commandments, I think, of our form of government, namely, making possible an ever greater pursuit of happiness on the part of the American people, I also find myself in agreement.

I find myself in disagreement, Mr. President, in respect to some of the administration's mechanics, procedures, and proposals for accomplishing what I think can generally be agreed are desirable over-all social and economic objectives.

Hence in the closing minutes of this session today I wish to raise a few budget problems, particularly for the attention of my Republican colleagues of the Senate. In recent weeks I have heard a great deal of discussion among Republicans in and out of the Senate of the United States in regard to a restatement of already existing Republican principles or the formulation of new Republican policies.

I think in the main the principles enunciated in the 1948 platform of the Republican Party are as sound today as they were when they were adopted in Philadelphia. They happen to constitute the only official statement of Republican policy which can be enunciated by the Republican Party until our next national convention. As I understand the organization of my party, our policies

are determined in conventions assembled by properly appointed or elected delegates of the party sent to such conventions.

I recommend to my party the putting into legislative form the recommendations of the 1948 Republican platform. The great principles laid down in the Republican platform of 1948, of which platform committee the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] was chairman are sound political policy for the Republican Party. I think they should be adopted by the Republicans in Congress as outlining our legislative program.

I raise here, as I have elsewhere, the questions: What is wrong with those principles? Why do we not go about putting them into legislative practice?

Thus, in respect to the principle of that platform in regard to a sound fiscal policy for our Government I want to suggest to the Republican Party today that we have a great opportunity to put into legislative form in this session of Congress a sound economy program for our Government.

A sound fiscal program is a dry subject for many people, because economy and taxes seem to be something from which many people like to retreat or ignore. Yet the need for a sound fiscal program for our Federal Government is one issue on which there is almost uniformity of opinion on the part of the American people. The issue of developing a sound budget and a sound fiscal program for the Federal Government is uppermost in the political thinking of the American people today. On that issue I suggest to the Republican Party it should take clear issue with the administration, because irrespective of how desirable some of the budgetary and legislative objectives of the administration may be, as stated by the President in the State of the Union message and in his budget message today, I am satisfied that those objectives can never be accomplished by the present fiscal policy of the administration.

Thus, in conformity with the Republican platform of 1948, I make to my Republican colleagues in the Senate of the United States today some specific recommendations on the budget and on taxes. Not only Republican voters, but the great mass of independent voters of this country who would like to vote for the Republican Party if we would give them a reason for voting for the Republican Party, are crying aloud these days for a specific, constructive, affirmative plan which will give greater assurance to the American taxpayer of a stabilized economy and a sound dollar.

Mr. President, three times I have offered to the Senate of the United States the tax-reform program of the Committee for Economic Development. It is presently pending before the Senate in the form of Senate bill 2627.

I am perfectly aware of the fact, Mr. President, that revenue legislation should come from the House, but there is nothing that stops in advance of a tax bill coming from the House of Representatives some thinking—yes, Mr. President, even some committee consideration of the tax problem in the Senate of the United States. Therefore I again raise my voice in plea this afternoon to our Committee on Finance to proceed at the earliest possible date in giving careful consideration to the budget and tax recommendations of the Committee for Economic Development. These recommendations are not mine, because I am not a tax expert and do not claim to be one, but I do believe my job in the Senate is to try to be a student of government and not a politician. I do not believe that any student of government can take the budget and tax recommendations of the Committee for Economic Development and not reach the conclusion that they constitute a sounder program than any program that has come from the House of Representatives or the Senate of the United States in either the Seventy-ninth, the Eightieth—yes, or the Eighty-first Congresses.

Just recently, Mr. President, the Committee for Economic Development has brought forth its latest report, a report which reached our hands over the week end, entitled "Tax and Expenditure Policy for 1950." Because I wish to address some of my remarks to this report, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX AND EXPENDITURE POLICY FOR 1950

1. There will almost certainly be a large deficit—probably around $5,000,000,000—in the Federal budget [1] for the fiscal year 1949–50.[2] Even if high employment had been continuously maintained throughout 1949, there would be a deficit for 1949–50.

2. Because of its size—over $40,000,000,000—and its composition, the present Federal tax burden is a serious impediment to economic growth and a source of important inequities among individual taxpayers and among industries.

3. Federal outlays increased $10,000,000,000 from fiscal 1948 to fiscal 1950.[3] While particular items of expenditure will certainly decline in the next year, there are strong pressures for increases in many parts of the budget.

These facts form the background against which decisions about the Federal budget for 1950–51 will be made in the next few months. The budgetary problem is how to manage the budget so as to promote national security and general welfare most effectively. This is a problem involving both sides of the budget; both spending and taxing vitally affect our security and welfare. More specifically, the problem is how to do these three things:

(a) Provide the Government services and expenditures that are required by the world position of the United States and to meet the needs of the American people;

(b) Adjust the Federal tax system to make it fairer and less restrictive of efficiency and progress;

(c) Adhere to a sound budgetary policy that will contribute to continuing stability in the American economy.

This is the problem to which this policy statement is addressed.

There is no ideal solution to the budget problem. We cannot have, at the same time, all the expenditures that might be desirable, all the tax reforms and reductions that might be desirable and a sound budget policy. The possibilities of solving the budget problem are limited by the productivity of the American economy. As the productivity of the American economy grows, we shall be able to have both necessarily large expenditures and a lower tax burden without abandoning prudent budgetary principles. But today we must manage the budget within the limits set by today's productivity and we should seek to manage the budget in a way that will interfere least with the future growth of productivity.

Recognizing that there is no ideal solution to the budget problem of 1950, we believe that the best solution, the one most consistent with the demands upon the Federal budget, with the requirements of sound finance, and with the conditions of economic growth, would be:

(a) Provide for a moderate budget surplus to be realized under conditions that make a surplus possible and desirable, namely, conditions of high employment.

(b) Reduce or postpone expenditures that are not immediately essential to the national security or general welfare, and operate all programs more economically and efficiently.

(c) Revise the tax system in ways that will yield the most benefit to the whole economy from the small net revenue reduction that seems possible with the achievable expenditure reductions.

This is, in our opinion, a feasible program. Examination of the budget reveals large items that will automatically decline in the next year, other expenditures that have far outgrown the purposes for which they were intended, and numerous opportunities for greater economy. In section II of this statement we suggest specific ways in which expenditures may be reduced next year by from $6,600,000,000 to $6,800,000,000. If this were done, it would be possible to reduce taxes by about $2,225,000,000.[4] This is not a large amount in relation to the whole Federal tax burden—less than 5 percent. But it is large enough, if wisely used, to permit a significant improvement of the tax system.

We recommend that the following steps toward tax reform be taken in 1950:

1. Require payment of Federal income tax on interest income from future State and local security issues.

2. Permit businesses to deduct the losses of one year from the profits of the five following years in computing taxable net income (extending the carry-forward from 2 to 5 years).

(3) Revise Federal excise taxes, reducing their net yield in the order of $1 billion.

(4) Reduce the discriminatory taxation of dividend income.

(5) Correct the present provisions of the law under which corporate profits from $25,000 to $50,000 are taxed at a much higher rate than profits above or below that bracket.

[1] We refer here, and throughout this statement, to the cash-consolidated budget. This concept is explained on page 11 and in appendix B.

[2] Each fiscal year runs from July 1 through June 30 of the following year, and is labeled by its termination year. Fiscal 1950, therefore, is July 1, 1949, through June 30, 1950.

[3] See appendix A.

[4] Footnote by Beardsley Ruml: It would be possible to reduce taxes in the order of $3 billion if the purchase of FHA and Veterans' Administration guaranteed mortgages by the Federal National Mortgage Association (FNMA) were not considered an expenditure for budget purposes. A $3,000,000,000 reduction in taxes is significantly larger than the $2,225,000,000 suggested by the committee when applied to tax reform.

(6) Revise the present procedures under the legal provisions (sec. 102 of the Internal Revenue Code) relating to accumulation of corporate surplus, in order to reduce taxpayers' uncertainty.

(7) Improve the administration of present policy with respect to charging-off capital assets for tax purposes, to make its application more reasonable and clear.

These recommendations, and the reasons for them, are explained in subsequent sections of this report.

I. THE NEED FOR TAX REFORM AND THE NEED FOR TAXES

The need for tax reform

Our Federal tax system needs revision. A few simple illustrations will show what we mean.

Example 1: Suppose a group of men set up a corporation to manufacture a new product. They have design and production troubles at the start and lose $200,000 the first year. Next year they do a little better, losing only $150,000. In year three they finally break even. In the fourth year they make $50,000 and in each of the next three years they make $100,000. At the end of seven years their total profit has been zero; the losses of the first two years were just equal to the profits of the next five years. But at the end of these seven years the corporation will have paid $114,000 of Federal profits taxes on its zero profits.

This is unfair to the investors, obviously. But they don't have to go into this new business. If they think the risks are too great, that the taxes may eat up their capital before they start making money, they can stay out—and they probably will. Then who is the loser? Suppose the new product is a $15 device that can be attached to the side of the kitchen sink and left to wash the dishes. Millions of housewives lose. Suppose the new product is a machine that would enable the shoe worker to turn out more shoes and so to earn higher wages. Thousands of workers lose. The whole Nation loses because the tax system increases the risks of productive investment by narrowly limiting the period during which losses may be balanced against profits in computing taxable income.

Example 2: The Federal Government imposes a 3 percent excise tax on the transportation of freight. If a California fruit grower ships oranges to Chicago, the freight charge is raised 3 percent to cover this excise tax. This tax is paid either by the consumer in higher prices, or by the farmer in lower receipts or, most likely, shared by both. Thus we have in some combination a tax upon the consumption of food and a tax upon the production of food. Such taxes would be called an unfair burden upon persons least able to bear them, and so would the transportation tax, if it were seen to be what it is. Of course, the freight tax affects many commodities other than food, and with similar bad effects. In some cases the effect of the tax may be to raise prices to consumers by more than the amount of the tax, as the tax may be pyramided at numerous stages of fabrication and distribution.

Example 3: Interest on State and local government security issues is not subject to individual income tax. If a person receives $5,000 on interest on State bonds, he pays no tax on it, but if a person receives $5,000 income from salaries or dividends, he does pay a tax. This is unfair discrimination in favor of the holder of State and local securities. And this unfairness has a serious economic effect. For an individual with a taxable income of $200,000, a common stock paying dividends of 13 percent yields less net return after taxes than a municipal bond yielding 2½ percent. Our tax system creates a positive incentive for those individuals best able to bear the risks of investing in productive enterprise not to invest in productive enterprise.

These illustrations show only a few of the defects of our present Federal tax system. There are many others:

1. Insofar as the corporate income tax is not passed on in higher prices or lower wages, dividend income is taxed twice, once at the corporate level and once at the individual level. This is not only unfair to the stockholder. It is also an obstacle to equity investment.

2. Insofar as the corporate income tax is passed on in higher prices or lower wages, it is a haphazard and uneven turn-over tax or pay-roll tax.

3. High rates of excise taxation on particular commodities discriminate against producers and consumers of those commodities. In addition, they distort the pattern of production, reducing the output of things consumers want and would be willing to pay for—without the tax.

4. Corporations with incomes of $50,000 and over pay 38 percent tax on ever dollar of income. But a corporation with an income less than $50,000 pays 53 percent tax on ever dollar it earns between $25,000 and $50,000. This is an obstacle to the growth of small and medium-size businesses.

5. Present limitations on depreciation allowances may prevent the reduction in the value of capital assets from being fully charged off against taxable earnings, or from being charged off in a reasonable period. As a result, tax may be imposed when there are no net earnings. This is unfair, and a deterrent to investment.

6. Under present law an individual with a fluctuating income pays more tax than an individual with the same income spread evenly through time, since, with limited exceptions applying to certain professions, good years cannot be averaged with the bad. This is unfair and a penalty upon kinds of economic activity, like small business, that are likely to result in fluctuating incomes.

7. Present high rates of corporate profits tax and steep progression of individual income tax rates reduce particularly the supply of savings available for venturesome, productive investment. Especially when combined with other features of our tax system, these rates weaken the incentive to invest even when funds are available.

We have explained the economic effects of the Federal tax system more fully in an earlier policy statement.[5] All of the defects of the system cannot be corrected in 1950, but it is important to keep in mind the goal to be achieved as rapidly as possible.

The faults of the present tax system can be briefly summarized:

The Federal tax system contains many inequities.

The Federal tax system interferes with economic growth and efficiency.

Everyone stands to gain from more fairness, more efficiency, and more rapid economic growth. Whatever taxes he pays personally and directly, everyone stands to gain from tax reform.

Any taxes reduce the private incomes available for consumption and savings; high taxes do this more than low taxes. But this is not the point of our analysis of the Federal tax system. The points are these:

(a) Many of the inequities and adverse effects of the present tax system are not necessitated by revenue considerations. We could collect just as much money without many of these bad effects.

(b) The burden of a tax system yielding the present revenue is heavier than could be justified by any but the most urgent Federal expenditures. The Nation would be better off with lower Federal expenditures and lower taxes. This is a judgment involving not only the effects of taxes but also the effects of particular expenditures. In section II of this statement we examine the expenditure side of the budget and show that specific expenditures can be reduced without serious loss to the Nation—so that reduction of the expenditures and reduction of taxes would be a net benefit to the American people.

The need for taxes

We have emphasized the need for tax reform and tax reduction. We should also emphasize the need for adequate taxes. Taxes perform certain important functions in the economic system:

(a) Adequate taxes help prevent inflation and instability. If the Government makes expenditures and does not reduce, by taxation, the incomes available for individuals and businesses to spend, the competition of private and Government expenditures may cause inflation.

(b) Adequate taxes help to reduce the burden of the debt. In part, we pay taxes now to avoid the higher taxes that would be needed if we allowed the interest burden of the debt to rise.

(c) Adequate taxes help to promote economy in Government. The need for raising tax rates if expenditure programs are increased helps to bring the need for restraint into the forefront of budgetary decisions.

How high should taxes be to be adequate? In 1947 this committee recommended the following budgetary principle:

"Set tax rates to balance the budget and provide a surplus for debt retirement at an agreed high level of employment and national income."

This principle does not mean that the budget should or can be balanced in every year. Under this principle, when the national income is low there would be a deficit, because the tax rates high enough to yield a surplus at high employment will yield much less at low employment. Similarly, when the national income is above the agreed level, the surpus will be larger.

Tax rates set under this principle would serve the three functions of adequate taxation. To help prevent inflation, tax collections should be higher in boom conditions, when the danger of inflation is great, than in conditions of depression. To help reduce the burden of the debt, budget policy should provide for a surplus under conditions of reasonably high employment, when debt reduction is most in keeping with economic conditions. To promote economy, a close connection should be maintained between the decision to spend and the decision to tax. These three conditions are satisfied by the principle we have suggested.

Under this principle, we would look at the budget as it would be under conditions of high employment when we make decisions about the over-all levels of taxation and expenditure. Any planning for future budgets necessarily involves some assumption about future economic conditions. We do not believe this assumption can reliably be based on a forecast of what economic conditions will be. In suggesting the assumption of high employment, we are not forecasting that there will be high employment. Rather we suggest it because looking at the budget in this way permits us to answer the relevant question: Are tax rates high enough to yield a moderate surplus under conditions of high employment? The fact that tax rates are not high enough to prevent a deficit in a depression does not mean that tax rates are too low.

In order to make our recommendation more specific we have suggested that tax rates should be high enough to produce a three-billion-dollar surplus in the cash-consolidated budget at a level of national income consistent with employment of about 96 percent of the labor force. With the present population, when 96 percent of the labor force is employed, there would be about two and a half million unemployed.

[5] Taxes and the Budget, a statement on national policy by the Research and Policy Committee of the CED, November 1947.

Attention should be called to the fact that we recommend use of the cash-consolidated budget in making over-all budget policy. All budget figures presented in this statement are on the cash-consolidated basis. The cash-consolidated budget is a Federal financial statement which has come into increasing use in recent years as an improved picture of the economic effects of the budget. It differs from the administrative budget, which is used, and should be used, for administrative control purposes, chiefly in two respects:

(a) It includes the receipts and expenditures of the social security and other trust accounts.

(b) Certain expenditures included in the administrative budget when they accrue—such as interest on savings bonds—are included in the cash-consolidated budget only when cash payments are made.

A fuller description of the cash-consolidated budget is presented in appendix B.

The Budget Bureau issued a statement in November 1949 estimating that there would be a deficit of $5,500,000,000 in the administrative budget in the fiscal year 1949–50. Under the conditions of 1949–50 this would imply a deficit of $5,000,000,000 in the cash-consolidated budget. This $5,000,000,000 estimated deficit is not directly comparable with our target of a $3,000,000,000 surplus. The target is a target to be reached under conditions of high employment. The $5,000,000,000 estimated deficit, on the other hand, reflects the fact that during calendar 1949 unemployment has averaged about 1,000,000 above the 2,500,000 we have defined as consistent with high employment. We estimate that under conditions of high employment in 1949–50 present tax rates and expenditure programs would have resulted in a deficit of about $2,500,000,000.[6]

The goal is to get from a 1949–50 situation in which at high employment there would have been a deficit of $2,500,000,000 to a 1950–51 situation in which at high employment there would be a surplus of $3,000,000,000. This goal can be achieved by increasing taxes, by reducing expenditures, or by both. On the basis of our consideration of both sides of the budget, we believe that, barring unforeseen international developments, the only acceptable course is to reduce expenditures, and to reduce them enough to make some tax reduction possible. We believe that this result is achievable—if balanced, simultaneous consideration is given to both sides of the budget. The President, with the assistance of the Budget Bureau and the cooperation of the departments, has made important contributions to expenditure control, especially in the fields of national defense, public works, and foreign aid. The Budget Bureau has made notable steps in clarifying the budget presentation. Many Congressmen and Senators have shown great courage in their approach to the budget problem. But the task is a formidable one, involving not only control of existing programs but also restraint in dealing with dozens of proposals that would greatly increase Federal expenditure. Sound budget policy will be achieved only by vigorous effort on the part of the administration and the Congress and active support from the public. It is, after all, the security and welfare of the American people that are at stake.

The recommendations for 1950 presented in this policy statement fall far short of the whole tax-reform program that needs to be achieved. The preferred route to further tax reform is by further reduction of Federal expenditures. But if it should appear that further progress along this route after 1950 will be long delayed, either by the requirements of the international situation or by insistent public demands for Government services, we should not conclude that tax reform must be similarly delayed.

The prospect of Federal budgets persistently running in the neighborhood of 20 percent or more of the national income would create a situation new in American experience except during war. It would be necessary to consider how it might be possible to revise the principles of budgetary, debt, and tax policy appropriate to normal circumstances in order to minimize the impact of such large budgets upon the growth and strength of the economy. It is the intention of the committee to examine this and other basic questions growing out of our present budgetary outlook in a later policy statement. However, recognition that there are many unsettled questions should not deter us from making now the urgent tax reforms that will be possible with the practice of reasonable economy in the budget for fiscal 1951.

II. THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL 1951

It is the purpose of this section to indicate the amount of expenditure reduction that might be accomplished in the fiscal 1951 budget. We believe that the urgency of tax reform and tax reduction is so great that the budget for fiscal year 1951 should weight tax reduction and reform just as fully as socially desirable expenditures. In each case the social and economic gain from expenditures must be balanced against the social and economic loss resulting from the taxation required to finance it. If this is done, the postponement or abandonment of projects of marginal value will be required.

It is our belief that there could be made available for tax reform and reduction approximately $2,250,000,000 in the fiscal year 1951. This estimate suggests that with reasonable effort and resistance to pressure groups the possibility of tax reform is not so distant as generally believed. Further reforms are desirable and should be achieved within the near future but a start can and should be made at once.

The estimates and recommendations contained in this section are intended as suggestions for consideration by the public, the Congress and the administration. They indicate the areas to which we may most hopefully look for economies that will permit tax reduction in 1950. This committee does not have the complete information, and cannot make all the judgments, necessary to determine precisely how much must be spent for each government program. In some cases, further investigation may show that some of our suggestions cannot be fully carried out; in other cases, economies in excess of our estimates may prove to be possible. We believe that our suggestions show that determined effort can so adjust the budget as to make tax reduction feasible, despite the acknowledged existence of a hard core of irreducible expenditures.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 established a procedure for making a congressional decision on the over-all size of expenditures and revenues at the same time. The failure of this procedure to work well so far is not, in our opinion, the result of inherent defects in the principle. It has resulted in part from lack of time, lack of staff and excesssive size of the budget committees. Also it reflects the great difficulty in recent years of reconciling our objectives with respect to expenditures taxation and the debt. We believe that the Legislative Budget procedure can and should be made to work. Congress, having before it the President's Budget and other information, should decide upon over-all expenditure and revenue figures for 1950–51 early in the session. The expenditure figure would serve as a guide to Congress in making appropriations. The revenue figure will indicate to Congress the limits within which it may operate in tax revision.

We should emphasize that the calculations presented in this section are designed to test whether, and how much, taxes can be reduced in 1950. For this purpose, as we have suggested, the relevant standard is how the budget would look under conditions of high employment. Accordingly, our estimates of 1950–51 expenditures and revenues, under existing or suggested programs, are estimates of what expenditures and revenues would be if we had high employment. We are not forecasting whether or not there will be high employment. Forecasts of economic conditions for 1950 and 1951, and estimates of what the budget picture would be under the forecast conditions, may be useful for some purposes. But under the logic of the position briefly explained in section I, and more fully developed in earlier policy statements, such forecasts are not relevant for deciding how high tax rates should be.

Expenditures

1. Unemployment compensation: Unemployment compensation payments for fiscal 1950 are now estimated at about $1,700,000,000. Under the standard high-employment conditions on which the CED budget is calculated, unemployment compensation payments would be about $1,200,000,000.[7]

2. Veterans life-insurance dividend: The fiscal 1950 cash-consolidated budget estimates include an expenditure of $2,800,000,000 for veterans' life-insurance dividends. This represents the dividends cumulated since the beginning of the program. No expenditure will be required for this purpose in fiscal 1951.

3. European Cooperation Administration: The Marshall plan carried out by the ECA is designed to give aid to European countries in the period of transition from a war to a peacetime basis. Our Government has advised the participating countries that the program will be terminated in 1952. The level of assistance has been cut already. If the original plan is followed, further cuts must be made in fiscal 1951. The economic recovery of western Europe indicates that this is possible. Expenditures for this purpose are estimated at $4,100,000,000 for fiscal 1950. Fiscal 1951 is the next to last year of the program. It seems reasonable, therefore, to reduce ECA expenditures for fiscal 1951 by at least $1,000,000,000.

4. Government and relief in occupied areas: Expenditures for government and relief in occupied areas in the fiscal year 1950 are estimated at about $1,000,000,000. This program is a declining one and must eventually be terminated. It is estimated that fiscal 1951 expenditures can be reduced $650,000,000 below fiscal 1950 levels. So large a reduction is possible because the cost of the German program will be paid for by ECA. For both ECA and government and relief in occupied areas reduction in expenditure levels depends upon the maintenance of stability in international affairs and the absence of a crisis requiring additional American aid.

5. Veterans' readjustment expenditures: The veterans' readjustment program in fiscal 1951 should cost less money than it did in fiscal 1950. If the program is confined to its original purpose of assisting veterans in their adjustment to civilian life, expenditures will decline as veterans complete the school, college, and on-the-job training provided for by the law. We believe that the program should be administered in accordance with a reasonable interpretation of this original, wise conception of its purpose. Certainly if this is done the program should not continue, after 5 years and $14,000,000,000 of expenditure, to cost the $3,000,000,000 it is

[6] Revenues would be about $2,000,000,000 higher and unemployment compensation about $500,000,000 lower than in the Budget Bureau figures.

[7] This $1,200,000,000 was likewise the unemployment compensation figure in the budget in January 1949 which assumed sustained high employment in the succeeding year.

costing in fiscal 1950. We believe that veterans' readjustment expenditures in fiscal 1951 should be about $2,200,000,000, approximately the figure originally estimated for fiscal 1950 in the President's January 1949 budget message. To some extent, expenditures for veterans' readjustment benefits go up when unemployment increases. Our $2,200,000,000 estimate, like the other 1951 estimates in this section, are estimates of expenditures under high-employment conditions.

6. Postal deficit: The November budget estimates set the postal deficit for fiscal 1950 at $600,000,000. We believe that there is no reason for the general revenue to support a deficit of this size. The post office is a business-type operation and should pay its way. Substantial economies in the administration and operation of the postal system should be effected. With such economies and some increase in rates, $500,000,000 of the estimated $600,000,000 deficit can be eliminated for the fiscal year 1951. The $100,000,000 deficit would cover the costs of air-mail subsidies and governmental mail not properly chargeable against other users of the mails.

7. Home-mortgage purchases: The Federal National Mortgage Association (FNMA) was established to serve as a secondary market for the purchase of Federal-guaranteed home-mortgage loans from private lenders. In the last year, purchases of mortgages by FNMA have skyrocketed beyond anything contemplated at the beginning of the year. In the January 1949 budget, total purchases for fiscal 1950 were estimated at $200,000,000. The revised November 1949 estimates set the figure at $1,300,000,000. Although there has also been some increase in FNMA purchase of FHA guaranteed mortgages, the sharpest increase has been in the purchase of veterans' mortgages guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration. This is mainly the result of the fact that the present 4 percent interest rate on veterans' mortgages is out of line with interest rates prevailing in the market.

We believe that the flow of mortgages, especially veterans' mortgages, into FNMA could be greatly reduced without seriously restricting the supply of credit available for the purchase of houses. The most important step would be to increase the interest rate on new veterans' loans to bring it more in line with market rates and so to induce private lenders to hold more of the loans. Congress provided for the guaranty of veterans' home loans in order to help veterans get credit, and get it on favorable terms in relation to the market. The interest rate was set at 4 percent, but the Veterans' Administrator was given authority to raise the rate in the light of market conditions. We believe that it is not sound policy to hold this rate unchanged at 4 percent without regard to the market or the budget outlays required to assure a flow of credit at that rate.

A moderate increase in the interest rate on new mortgages, possibly accompanied by other technical changes in the system, would probably reduce the FNMA to a minor, emergency function, and greatly reduce budget outlays for the program. However, because of the large volume of FNMA commitments outstanding and the time that may be required for private lending institutions to take FNMA's place, we are calculating only that FNMA expenditures will be cut 50 percent—by $650,000,000—in fiscal 1951.[8]

[8] Footnote by Beardsley Ruml: The purchase of Government-guaranteed mortgages is a budget item of a peculiar character in that the principal of the mortgages is amortized and the interest rate paid to the Government is higher than the Federal Government pays on its own obligations. These outlays should either be refunded or considered part of the $3,000,000,000 surplus provided for in the CED stabilizing budget policy. There is no justification for taxes to provide the wherewithal to purchase Government-guaranteed mortgages.

8. National defense: By far, the largest single item in the Federal budget is the expenditure for national defense. Estimated in January 1949 to run at the level of $13,700,000,000[9] for the fiscal year 1950, the revised November estimates have lowered the sums to be spent in fiscal 1950 to $12,900,000,000. This is the result of praiseworthy efforts by the President, the Budget Bureau and the Department of National Defense. There are still opportunities for economy in the direct military budget; many of them have been pointed out by the Hoover Commission. We believe that realization of these economies would more than offset the rising expenditures for procurement already authorized, reducing total expenditures somewhat from fiscal 1950 to fiscal 1951. Achievement of $1,000,000,000 of additional savings, which we believe is feasible, would reduce total expenditures about $300,000,000, given the probable magnitude of increased procurement expenditures. Further economies beyond this should certainly be sought. However, it does not seem to us prudent to count on them until further information is available.

9. Farm price supports: In January 1949, the President estimated fiscal 1950 expenditures for farm price supports at $563,000,000. This estimate was revised in November to $1,400,000,000. This large increase in the estimate was attributed to the fact that 1949 crops were abnormally large. Since there is no basis for assuming above-normal crops in 1950, particularly with acreage reductions recommended by the Department of Agriculture, it might be reasonable to expect fiscal 1951 expenditures to fall below the $1,400,000,000 figure. However, the effect of the new farm legislation is raising support levels, and the possible reduction of foreign demands, may offset or more than offset this expectation. Also the extent to which farm production controls will be used to reduce the burden of price supports on the budget is uncertain. In view of these uncertainties, the most reasonable course seems to be to include in the 1951 budget the same $1,400,000,000 figure that is estimated for 1950.

The problem of farm price policy, of course, involves many considerations in addition to the budgetary costs. The farmer, like the veteran and others, has more to gain in the long run from sound fiscal and economic policies of Government to maintain high employment than from large subsidies. The committee is now studying the agricultural problem as a whole and expects to issue a statement on the subject in the spring of 1950.

10. Relatively fixed major items: Expenditures for interest, veterans' pensions, and benefits under the old-age, railroad retirement, and civil service retirement trust funds will total $7,600,000,000 in fiscal 1950. Minimum expenditures under these programs are controlled by existing legal and contractual commitments. It is estimated that expenditures in this area will rise by about $300,000,000 in the next year because of increased numbers of the aged drawing pensions and benefits. No allowance is made in this figure for expansion of the social security insurance program. During the past 4 years this committee has repeatedly urged broadening of the social security insurance program. However, it is likely that the additional costs of an expanded program would be matched, at least during the first year, by additional receipts from the social-security pay-roll tax. There are a number of proposals that would greatly increase Federal expenditures for assistance to the aged and other categories, by grants to States, or in other ways outside the social security insurance system. However, it is assumed and recommended that the insurance system will be our main reliance for increasing social security.

[9] Excluding the costs of the proposed universal military training program, which was not adopted by the Congress.

11. Economy in administration: Total expenditures can, in our opinion, be reduced $200,000,000 to $400,000,000 in fiscal 1951 by greater economy and efficiency in the administration of programs other than national defense, which we have already discussed. The reports of the Hoover Commission have called the attention of the public and the Government to possible expenditure reductions through reorganization, elimination of duplication, and tighter expenditure controls. Some of the Commission's recommendations have been put into effect and should begin to yield significant results in fiscal 1951. An outstanding example has been the establishment of the General Services Administration to centralize purchasing and other "housekeeping" functions. Other recommendations have still to be carried out. In addition, new fields need to be studied. For example, opportunities for economy may be revealed by a reconsideration of the privileges, such as leave, of Government, civilian, and military personnel, in the light of prevailing private standards.

12. Public works: The public-works program is one of the major problems in the budget, not only for next year but also for the longer future. The Budget Bureau has done commendable work, within the limits of its authority, in controlling public-works expenditures. Nevertheless, expenditures for this purpose about doubled—rising from $1,600,000,000 to $3,000,000,000—from fiscal 1946 to fiscal 1950 and there is a strong tendency for them to grow still further. An alarming aspect of this situation is that it threatens a repetition of the old pattern in which the volume of public works rises parallel to private construction, pushing boom trends higher and unstabilizing total construction activity.

We consider it of great importance that every effort should be made to hold down the rate of public-works expenditure in fiscal 1951. We believe that the whole public-works area should be resurveyed, with the immediate object of deciding which projects already authorized or even already started should be postponed.

In part the tendency for public-works expenditure to rise reflects pressure from local groups for projects which need to be held back in the national interest, however meritorious they may be when viewed locally. Many of these groups clearly recognize the need for sound budgetary policy. In this situation there is an opportunity for these groups to contribute directly to sound policy by self-restraint.

13. Reserve for emergency requirements: This policy statement is being written at the end of 1949, at the beginning of the annual budget-making season. We do not now foresee urgent need for expenditures in excess of those we have already recommended. If such a need should arise, every effort should be made to effect offsetting reductions in other expenditures. Nevertheless, in calculating how much tax reduction is feasible in 1950, it is the course of prudence to make allowance for expenditure requirements which are not now foreseen but which may have to be met. For this purpose we include an unallocated amount of $500,000,000 in our 1950–51 expenditure total. We are not recommending that this amount be spent. It should certainly not be spent unless absolutely necessary. We merely suggest that in thinking about the possibilities of tax reduction we should not regard this $500,000,000 as available until the expenditure picture is clearer.

Revenues

1. Calculation of yield under high employment conditions: Estimates of the revenue yield of the existing tax system as it would be under conditions of sustained high

employment are the relevant figures for calculating the possibilities of tax reduction. Our objective is tax rates high enough to yield a moderate cash surplus at high employment. Inflation or depression would result in higher or lower revenues, but variations in revenues resulting from inflation or depression should not affect our decision about the proper level of tax rates.[10]

The November 1949 Budget Bureau estimate stated that 1950 revenues would be $3,000,000,000 below the revenue estimated in January 1949 because of "the moderate drop in prices, money incomes, and corporate profits since the original estimate was made." However, it appears that the entire $3,000,000,000 revision in the revenue estimates may not be legitimately ascribed to the decline from high employment. That is, it seems probable that the January 1949 estimates would have been somewhat too high even if employment had not fallen in 1949. We estimate that revenues in fiscal 1950 at a sustained level of high employment would have been $2,000,000,000 above the November 1949 Budget Bureau estimates.

2. Growth factor: The current tax rates would have yielded $43,700,000,000 in fiscal 1950 had conditions of high employment prevailed. The economy of the United States is dynamic and should continue to expand. Growth can be expected to result both from increases in productive efficiency and population during the next fiscal year. We estimate that at high employment current tax rates would yield $1,000,000,000 more in fiscal 1951 than in fiscal 1950 because of this factor.[11] Offsetting increases in expenditures resulting from population increase have been taken account of in the expenditure estimates.

3. Social-security program: Increases in the combined employer-employee tax under the old-age and survivors insurance program will take effect automatically on January 1, 1950. The combined employer-employee rate increased from 2 to 3 percent. The full effect of this increase will not be felt until the fiscal year 1951 as the higher rate will have been in force for only half the fiscal year 1950. It is estimated that the cash receipts from this source in fiscal 1951 will be $450,000,000 higher than in fiscal year 1950.

4. Enforcement: The Bureau of Internal Revenue has added or been authorized to add 6,000 persons to its staff. In addition, the Bureau is conducting a sampling study to determine the major areas of tax evasion. A conservative estimate of the additional revenue obtainable by stricter enforcement of tax laws indicates that from $200,000,000 to $400,000,000 can be obtained in fiscal 1951. This would be from one-half to 1 percent of total revenue collections.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing analysis of the 1950–51 budget is summarized in the table on page 27. If the suggestions made here are followed, cash expenditures under conditions of high employment would be about $40,000,000,000 in fiscal 1951—about $6,700,000,000 less than the current estimate for fiscal 1950. It should be pointed out that $2,800,000,000 of the decline represents completion of the nonrecurrent veterans' life insurance dividend and $500,000,000 is the estimated lower level of unemployment compensation payments. Of the remaining $3,400,000,000, half is accounted for by planned decline in foreign-aid programs. In the total reduction we suggest, restraining the increase of certain programs, such as public works, is just as important as reducing others, and often more difficult to accomplish.

We estimate revenues, at high employment, in excess of $45,000,000,000 in fiscal 1951. The excess of almost $4,000,000,000 over fiscal 1950 reflects mainly the higher yields that would be realized under conditions of high employment.

In total, our recommendations to this point would yield a cash-consolidated surplus under high employment conditions of $5,000,000,000 or a little more. As we have already pointed out, we believe that tax rates should be set high enough to yield a cash-consolidated surplus of $3,000,000,000 available for debt retirement under conditions of high employment. Accordingly, these suggestions point to the feasibility and desirability of a net revenue reduction of about $2,250,000,000. A tax reform program within this limit is developed in section III of this statement. If we do not have high employment in 1950 and 1951, following our recommendations will not yield a $3,000,000,000 surplus in fiscal 1951. If we have more than 3,500,000 to 4,000,000 unemployed, we would have a deficit. On the other hand, if we have high employment and rising prices, we would have a surplus larger than $3,000,000,000.

The Federal budget, fiscal years 1950 and 1951 cash-consolidated basis

[In millions of dollars]

	1950 estimate based on Budget Bureau	Recommended or estimated change, 1951	1951 calculated at high employment	Explanation of changes
Expenditures:				
Veterans' life insurance dividend	2,800	−2,800	0	One-time dividend.
Veterans' readjustment program	3,000	−800	2,200	Less unemployment, declining program.
Economic Cooperation Administration.	4,100	−1,000	3,100	Planned tapering off.
Government relief, occupied areas	1,000	−650	350	Germany under ECA, declining program.
Home mortgage purchases	1,300	−650	650	Encouragement for private lenders, higher interest rates, if necessary.
Postal deficit	600	−500	100	Economies, higher postal rates, if necessary.
Unemployment insurance	1,700	−500	1,200	Calculated at high employment, under CED budget principle.
National defense	12,900	−300	12,600	Economies to offset authorized rise in procurement.
Agricultural price supports	1,400	(?)	1,400	Crop yields and other factors highly uncertain.
Relatively fixed major items:				
Interest	4,050			
Retirement trust funds	1,350			
Veterans' pensions	2,200			
Total	(7,600)	+300	7,900	Increase in number of aged drawing pensions and benefits.
Other items:				
International, other	1,400			
Veterans, other	1,600			
Agriculture, other	1,100			
Transportation	1,400	−200 to −400	9,900 to 10,100	Reorganization, greater efficiency.
Natural resources	1,900			
Social welfare, other	1,600			
General government	1,000			
Other	300			
Total	(10,300)			
Reserve for emergencies		+500	500	If necessary for unanticipated requirements.
Expenditures, total	46,700	−6,600 to −6,800	39,900 to 40,100	
Revenues:				
1950 total	41,700		41,700	
High employment assumption		+2,000	2,000	Calculated at high employment, under CED budget principle.
Growth of national income		+1,000	1,000	Secular growth, larger population, better technology.
Higher rates, social-security taxes		450	450	Full year of rate increase effective Jan. 1, 1950.
Stricter enforcement		+200 to 400	200 to 400	More revenue agents, better enforcement methods.
Revenues total	41,700	+3,650 to +3,850	45,350 to 45,550	
Surplus	−5,000		5,250 to 5,650	
Debt retirement			3,000	Called for at high employment under CED budget principle.
Tax reduction			2,250 plus	

III. TAX REVISION FOR FISCAL 1951

More than tax reduction is needed at the present time. We need to remove inequities in the system and to achieve a better distribution of the burden of taxation. Tax reform should be the guiding principle in making any tax reductions that are possible.

In view of the limited reduction that is possible in fiscal 1951, a choice must be made among many reforms that are desirable. Reforms increasing revenues or costing little or no revenue have high priority, but the selection among the others which involve revenue reductions is difficult. However, differences over the favored first step toward revision should not prevent some steps being taken. The opportunity for revision and reform should not be lost through rate reductions of an expedient nature.

[10] Because of the lag in tax collections—particularly collections of corporate profits tax—revenues in fiscal 1951, even if that year is a year of high employment, will be reduced by the lowered national income of 1949. The yields revelant to decisions on tax policy, however, are the yields that would be realized in a sustained period—longer than a year—of high employment.

[11] This estimate is based on a 2 to 2½ percent annual growth in the national income. This would raise the national income by $4,500,000,000 to $5,500,000,000 in fiscal 1951 should high employment prevail. With the present tax system taking about 20 percent of the national income, an increase of $5,000,000,000 will yield $1,000,000,000 additional revenue.

Two classes of reforms are suggested. First, reforms involving little or no revenue loss. Second, reforms which are possible assuming around $2,250,000,000 of revenue reduction is available.

1. Reforms involving little or no revenue loss

Whatever pattern of expenditure evolves in fiscal 1951, reforms which provide increased receipts or do not decrease receipts should be enacted.

High on the list of this type of revision is the taxation of future issues of State and local bonds. Additional Federal revenues, possibly around $35,000,000, would be obtained in the first year and increasing sums thereafter. On the other hand, the cost of borrowing would rise for State and local governments. However, these considerations are minor by comparison with the gain in fairness and stimulus to private enterprise.

A second item is the revision of the treatment of business losses by both corporate and noncorporate businesses. Instead of the current provision permitting a 2-year carry-forward and a 2-year carry-back, a more equitable system would extend the period of carry-forward against subsequent earnings to 5 years. This would greatly benefit a new business which faces losses in its beginning years. This change would cost nothing for the first 2 years and little in the third year although revenue losses would follow at the rate of approximately $500,000,000 a year thereafter.[12] The benefit to small business and the encouragement to the risk taker makes such a revision worthy of immediate attention. To minimize the administrative problem of unsettled tax returns the period of carry-back should be limited to the previous year.

A third item on the list of reforms costing little or nothing is the revision of section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code applying a penalty tax to corporations that accumulate profits for the purpose of avoiding payment of individual income tax by stockholders. The law as it now stands has caused some uncertainty and confusion. Reasonable application of this principle should not interfere with the normal operations of businesses. The law should be amended to create a presumption that in the case of operating companies, profit accumulations are reasonable unless the Treasury shall prove the contrary. However, the unreasonableness of the accumulation, once established, should continue to be considered proof of purpose to avoid tax unless the taxpayer shall prove the contrary.

Fourth, the provision of the corporate income tax granting lower rates to corporations with incomes below $50,000 should be revised to eliminate the 53 percent "notch rate" on incomes between $25,000 and $50,000. This could be accomplished by applying a gradually rising scale of rates to the first $50,000 of income of all corporations.

Fifth, although revenue requirements will probably not permit any basic change in policy with respect to charging off capital assets for tax purposes, we believe the administration of the present policy could be improved to make its application more reasonable and clear, without significant loss of revenue.

Various other provisions of the Federal tax law should be carefully studied to determine whether it may be possible to improve the fairness of the tax system, prevent tax avoidance, and increase revenue. An important example is presented by the special optional allowances for percentage depletion which are granted to oil and gas wells; sulfur, coal and metal mines; and certain other mineral resource industries.

[12] There would be no cost in the first 2 years because a 2-year carry-forward is already in effect; there would be little cost in the third year because of the 1-year lag of corporate tax payments behind liabilities.

Another example is that of the uses made by exemptions granted to educational, charitable, and certain other types of organizations.

2. Reforms suggested assuming that about $2,250,000,000 of revenue reduction is possible

We believe that, barring a national emergency, about $2,250,000,000 can be made available for tax reform and revision in fiscal 1951. The immediate benefit to the economy will be greatest if the total reduction is applied to lowering excise tax rates and reducing the severity of the double taxation of corporate dividends.

Excise tax reduction: The committee has previously recommended elimination of all excise taxes except those on liquor, tobacco, and gasoline. Excise tax reduction cannot be carried this far under present revenue requirements. However, an important step can be taken next year by the repeal in whole or in part of the wartime excise rates that were designed to meet wartime necessities. We believe that in the order of $1,000,000,000 of net revenue reduction can be made available for revision of excise taxes.[13]

In selecting which excise taxes to reduce or eliminate in 1950 consideration should be given to the following factors:[14]

(a) Some of the taxes discriminate unfairly against particular industries.

(b) Taxes which enter into the costs of doing business—such as the taxes on transportation and communications—raise the prices of almost all commodities, including the necessities of life, and therefore particularly affect persons with small incomes. Moreover, such taxes may raise prices by more than the amount of the tax, resulting in a burden to the consumer out of proportion to the revenue yield.

(c) Many of the present tax rates were imposed or raised during the war to aid the war program and with the clear intention that they would be eliminated or reduced when the special need had passed. They should be eliminated as rapidly as revenue requirements permit.

The reduction of excise taxes according to these principles would reduce the extent of discrimination in the Federal tax system. Consumers would benefit from excise-tax reductions, as would workers, employers, and investors in the industries affected.

Reduction of double taxation of dividends: The reduction of double taxation of corporate income is recommended as the best means of encouraging risk-taking and enterprise. We recommend that the first 16.6 percent of the corporate income tax be considered a withholding tax on distributed profits, comparable to the present withholding of the income tax on wages. This 16.6 percent is the rate applied to the first bracket income under the individual income tax. When the stockholder computes his individual income-tax liability, he would include in his income his cash income plus the tax withheld by the corporation. The amount of the tax he pays would then be the tax on this total income, calculated in the ordinary way, less the amount of tax that had been withheld. The revenue cost of such a plan is approximately $1,000,000,000 at high employment levels.[15]

The benefits to be derived from such a revision will be spread widely throughout the Nation. In part, the benefits would be passed on in lower prices or higher wage rates. The stimulus to productive investment and equity financing would also benefit all persons in the country. It would raise the output of goods and services and strengthen the economy against instability—gains in which all would share.

[13] A clear distinction must be noted between the gross and net cost of excise tax reduction. The net revenue reduction from reducing an excise tax rate will be less, and may be much less, than the current yield of the tax. The reduction of the tax may increase employment and incomes, and so raise the yields of income taxes and reduce the costs of unemployment compensation.

[14] Footnote by Beardsley Ruml: The wartime excises and wartime increased excise rates of 1941, 1942, and 1943 should be taken as a package, excluding tobacco, gasoline, and alcoholic beverages. These rates were put on as a measure of wartime necessity; they are discriminatory, punitive, and employment-reducing—as they were intended to be. They have no place in a peacetime tax structure.

The Future of the Budget

The tax reforms we have recommended for 1950 would be only a step, although a long step, in the direction of tax improvement. There would still remain on the tax agenda further reduction of excise taxation, liberalization of the rules covering depreciation allowances, provision for averaging in the individual income tax, elimination of the taxes on intercorporate dividends and consolidated returns, and reduction of rates of individual and corporate income tax.

It may be possible to reduce expenditures in 1950–51 by more than we have suggested, and so to achieve some of these important additional reforms. If so, the possibility should certainly be grasped. Equally essential, we should look beyond 1950–51, and plan for the future tax reductions that wise policy will permit.

Real opportunities do exist for creating the conditions that will permit further tax reduction in the next few years. Present policy contemplates continued reduction of foreign aid expenditures. The veterans' readjustment program should soon have completed its major functions. Existing farm legislation provides for a gradual reduction of minimum price support levels and so would permit reduction of expenditures. The drive for greater efficiency in governmental operations should yield increasing results. Finally, growth of the economy would permit the same revenues to be collected with lower tax rates.

We should not make the mistake of assuming that because a future decline of expenditures can be visualized we can sit back and wait for the passage of time to drop tax reform into our laps. Opportunities exist; affirmative action will be needed to realize them.

1. We must make sure that the "declining programs" actually do decline. This is partly a matter of vigilance, to overcome the presumption that often exists in favor of last year's expenditure level, and the interests that build up around going programs. It is partly a matter of correcting conditions that give rise to expenditure requirements. For example, continued cooperation by the United States in measures to improve world economic conditions—by means other than financial aid—will help to assure further reduction of foreign aid expenditures.

2. We must exercise restraint in the expansion of new or growing expenditure programs. This does not mean no new programs. Declines in old programs and growth of productivity would permit some new programs. But it does mean that new programs must be introduced with moderation—with due regard for the capacity of the budget and of the economy. New programs often cost little at first but soon mushroom into huge expenditures—and once the expenditures have risen it becomes very difficult to reduce them. Expenditure proposals must be appraised in terms of their long-run consequences.

Restraint in the expansion of the budget is self-restraint. Many groups in the Nation are large and strong enough to make successful demands upon the budget—veterans, the aged, farmers, workers, businessmen. But all have more to gain from growth and stability

[15] This plan is explained in appendix C.

of the economy than from excessive government expenditures in their behalf. Self-restraint is economic self-interest. But it is more than that. It is the duty of the citizen.

3. We must promote the growth of the economy. Increasing productivity—expanding the output of the economy—is the source from which we can get not only relief from our budget problems but also improved living standards, increased leisure and greater opportunities for work and development for all. The record of increasing productivity in the United States in the past hundred years is remarkable. But increasing productivity is not a law of nature, even in the United States. It is the product of certain economic and social conditions, that can be strengthened or can be destroyed. We have pointed out earlier in this statement that the present tax system greatly weakens the forces making for economic growth. It is because the American people have a great interest in rising productivity, as well as a great interest in elementary fairness, that tax reform is so vitally in the interest of the American people today.

APPENDIX A

Federal expenditures, 1948–50—cash-consolidated basis

[Billions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		
	1948	1950	Change
National defense, excluding terminal-leave payments	10.7	12.8	+2.1
Terminal-leave payments	1.5	.1	−1.4
International affairs and finance	5.8	6.5	+.7
Veterans', excluding life-insurance dividend	6.8	6.8	-------
Veterans' life-insurance dividend	-------	2.8	+2.8
Interest	3.9	4.0	+.1
Total of above	28.7	33.0	+4.3
Agriculture	.6	2.5	+1.9
Natural resources	1.1	1.9	+.8
Social welfare, health, and security	2.1	3.0	+.9
Transporation and communication	1.3	2.0	+.7
Mortgage purchases and other housing	.2	1.4	+1.2
Unemployment compensation	.9	1.7	+.8
All other	1.6	1.2	−.4
Total of above	7.8	13.7	+5.9
Grand total	36.5	46.7	+10.2

APPENDIX E

THE CASH-CONSOLIDATED BUDGET

Since 1942 the annual budget document has contained a table entitled "Receipts From and Payments to the Public—Excluding Major Intragovernmental and Noncash Transactions.[16] This statement of Federal financial transactions is what is referred to as the cash-consolidated budget throughout this document.

As the title implies, the cash-consolidated budget is—

(a) A consolidated statement for the "whole Government"; and

(b) A statement of cash receipts and payments.

CONSOLIDATING THE ACCOUNTS

For purposes of defining the cash-consolidated budget, the "whole Government" includes the following accounts:

1. General and special accounts.

2. Wholly owned Government corporations.

3. Trust accounts (such as social security trust accounts).

4. Partially owned Government corporations and other special deposit accounts.

5. Clearing account for outstanding checks (excess of checks issued over checks paid).

6. Exchange stabilization fund.

The "administrative budget"—the budget now in most common use—is a statement of the general and special accounts and wholly owned Government corporations only. However, the budget document includes data for all the accounts listed.

THE CASH BASIS

The general meaning of the statement that the cash-consolidated budget is on a cash basis whereas the administrative budget is not may be shown by illustration.

In fiscal year 1947 the Federal Government issued $2,000,000,000 of armed forces leave bonds in payment of terminal leave to ex-servicemen. This was considered an expenditure in the administrative budget, but it was not considered an expenditure in the cash-consolidated budget because it was not a cash payment. In fiscal 1948, $1,200,000,000 of these armed forces leave bonds were redeemed for cash. This was an expenditure in the cash-consolidated budget but not in the administrative budget. From the standpoint of the administrative budget the redemptions in fiscal 1948 were simply debt retirement. In general, in the case of payments made by the issue of Federal securities, the administrative budget records an expenditure when the securities are issued and the cash-consolidated budget records an expenditure when the securities are redeemed for cash.

In fiscal 1948 Federal trust funds and corporations invested $3,000,000,000 in Federal securities. As the administrative budget is defined, these investments would be considered expenditures. However, these investments are not considered expenditures in the cash-consolidated budget. They do not involve payments to the public, but either—

(a) a transaction exclusively between the Treasury and a Government agency; or

(b) a purchase of Government securities in the market by a Federal agency, which is a transaction similar to debt retirement in its effects.

The main factors contributing to the net difference between the administrative budget and the cash-consolidated budget in fiscal 1948 are shown in table I.

TABLE I.—*Main factors of difference between administrative surplus and cash-consolidated surplus, fiscal 1948*

[Millions of dollars]

Surplus in administrative budget	8,420
Excess of receipts over cash expenditures, main trust accounts [1]	+2,725
Net accrual of interest on savings bonds	+536
Net redemption of terminal-leave bonds	−1,221
Net redemption of notes issued to International Bank and Monetary Fund	−913
Net reduction in clearing account for outstanding checks	−507
All other factors, net	−192
Surplus in cash-consolidated budget	8,848

[1] Old-age and survivors, unemployment, railroad retirement, veterans' life insurance.

The surplus in the cash-consolidated budget was $428,000,000 larger than the surplus in the administrative budget in 1948. This excess was much smaller than usual because of the large payments for the redemption of noncash securities—the terminal-leave bonds and notes issued to the International Bank and Monetary Fund. These payments were expenditures in the cash-consolidated budget, but not in the administrative budget. In the previous year, 1947, this situation had been reversed. The excess of the cash-consolidated surplus over the administrative surplus was unusually large in that year because the issuance of these same noncash securities was an expenditure in the administrative budget and not in the cash-consolidated budget. Table II compares the annual surpluses in the two budgets from 1937 to 1950.

TABLE II.—*Budget surplus or deficit (—)*

[Billions of dollars]

	Administrative budget	Cash-consolidated budget	Excess of cash-consolidated surplus
Fiscal year—			
1937	−2.8	−2.8	----------
1938	−1.2	−.1	1.1
1939	−3.9	−2.9	1.0
1940	−3.9	−2.7	1.2
1941	−6.2	−4.8	1.4
1942	−21.5	−19.4	2.1
1943	−57.4	−53.8	3.6
1944	−51.4	−46.1	5.3
1945	−53.9	−45.0	8.9
1946	−20.7	−18.2	2.5
1947	.8	6.6	5.8
1948	8.4	8.8	.4
1949	−1.8	1.0	2.8
1950, estimated	−5.5	−5.0	.5

Derivation of the cash-consolidated budget from the administrative budget: The relation of the cash-consolidated budget to the administrative budget may be shown more precisely by tracing the derivation of the cash-consolidated budget through three steps:

(a) Adding the other Government accounts to the administrative budget.

(b) Eliminating intra-Government receipts and expenditures.

(c) Converting expenditures and receipts to the cash basis.

The first step is shown in table III.

TABLE III.—*Fiscal year 1948*

[Millions of dollars]

	Receipts	Expenditures	Balance
1. General and special accounts and wholly owned corporations (the administrative budget)	42,211	33,791	8,420
2. Trust accounts	6,515	6,742	−227
3. Partially owned corporations and other special deposit accounts	-------	68	−68
4. Clearing account for uncollected checks	-------	507	−507
5. Exchange stabilization fund	-------	-------	-------
Combined total	48,726	41,108	7,618

The addition of these accounts does not give the cash-consolidated budget because the expenditures and receipts figures are neither on a consolidated basis nor on a cash basis. Consolidation of the accounts removed from the figures certain wash transactions within or between accounts, leaving the balance unchanged, as follows:

TABLE IV.—*Fiscal year 1948*

[Millions of dollars]

	Receipts	Expenditures	Balance
Combined total, from table III	48,726	41,108	7,618
Less:			
Interest paid to U. S. Treasury by Government enterprises	113	113	-------
Payments of capital and surplus to U. S. Treasury by partially owned enterprises	270	270	-------
Reimbursements for expenses	14	14	-------
Interest paid by U. S. Treasury to trust accounts	746	746	-------

[16] See for example, p. A123 of the Budget for Fiscal Year 1950.

TABLE IV.—*Fiscal year 1948*—Continued

[Millions of dollars]

	Receipts	Expenditures	Balance
Less—Continued			
Transfers from general and special accounts to trust accounts	1,167	1,167	--------
Receipts of special deposit accounts transferred to miscellaneous receipts	750	750	--------
Deductions for Federal employees' retirement funds	239	239	--------
Consolidated total	45,427	37,809	7,618

To arrive at the "cash-consolidated" budget totals it is necessary to put the consolidated totals of table IV on a "cash" basis. The difference between the "cash-consolidated" budget and the budget of table IV, which is consolidated but not cash, relates (with one small exception) entirely to the treatment of certain public-debt transactions. In both budgets the distinction between debt transactions and other transactions is fundamental. Receipts from the issuance of debt are not considered budget receipts in either budget, and payments for the retirement of debt are not considered budget expenditures in either budget. Also debt issued for no cash issue price is not considered part of the debt. In both budgets an expenditure is a transaction that increases the total "debt minus cash balance" and a receipt is a transaction that reduces that total. The net surplus in either budget for any period is the amount by which the sum "debt minus cash balance" is decreased during that period. The difference between the two budgets relates to the definition and valuation of the debt.

There are three differences between the concept of debt as used in the "cash" budget and the debt concept of the "not cash" budget.

1. In the cash budget only debt held outside the Government, its trust accounts and corporations is considered as debt, whereas in the administrative budget all Federal debt outstanding is included, regardless of ownership. As a consequence, in the administrative budget the purchase of Government securities by a Government agency—even by a wholly owned corporation—is an expenditure. If the security is purchased directly from the Treasury there is an increase in the debt and no change in the cash balance; if the security is purchased in the market the cash balance declines and there is no change in the debt. However, under the "cash" budget definition of the debt, neither of these transactions is an expenditure. The direct purchase from the Treasury changes neither the debt nor the cash balance, while the purchase from the market reduces the cash balance and the debt equally. Because of the large investments of the social security and veterans' life insurance trust funds in Government securities, this factor is the most important continuing source of difference between the cash budget and the administrative budget.

2. In the cash budget debt is valued at its cash issue price whereas in the administrative budget debt is valued at face. For example, the terminal-leave bonds issued in fiscal 1947 were not issued for cash and are not part of the debt in the cash budget sense. The issuance of these bonds was an expenditure in the administrative budget, but not in the cash budget. The redemption of the bonds was an expenditure in the cash budget, but not in the administrative budget, where it was simply a debt-retirement transaction. Similarly, the accrual of interest on savings bonds is an expenditure in the administrative budget, and increases the debt in the administrative sense, but the accrual results in no expenditure and no debt increase in the cash budget. However, when the bonds are redeemed the cash payment for the accrued interest becomes an expenditure in the cash budget, and is debt retirement in the administrative budget.

3. In the cash budget, obligations of Government corporations sold in the market are part of the debt. Proceeds from the sale of such obligations are therefore not a budget receipt but a receipt from borrowing. However, since these obligations are not considered part of the public debt in the administrative budget, proceeds from their sale are considered budget receipts just like proceeds from the sale of any commodities the Government may own.

Table V shows how these differences in the treatment of the debt lead to the difference between the consolidated totals, given in table IV, and the cash-consolidated totals:

TABLE V.—*Fiscal 1948*

[Millions of dollars]

	Receipts	Expenditures	Balance
Consolidated totals (from table IV)	45,427	37,809	7,618
(1) Difference due to treatment of Government-owned debt	----------	−2,990	+2,990
Investments in United States securities (−)	----------	−2,990	+2,990
(2) Differences due to treatment of securities not issued for cash	−18	+1,598	−1,616
Redemption of armed forces leave bonds (+)	----------	+1,455	−1,455
Issuance of armed forces leave bonds (−)	----------	−234	+234
Cash interest on savings bonds redeemed (+)	----------	+268	−268
Accrued interest on savings bonds (−)	----------	−804	+804
Redemption of Bretton Woods notes (+)	----------	+913	−913
Other	−18	----------	−18
(3) Differences due to treatment of securities of Government enterprises	----------	+107	−107
Redemption of obligations in market (−)	----------	+107	−107
(4) Differences due to treatment of monetary transactions [1]	−37	----------	−37
Seigniorage on silver (−)	−37	----------	−37
Cash-consolidated total	45,372	36,524	8,848

[1] The small annual amount of seigniorage on silver is included as a receipt of trust accounts in the administrativ budget but is not considered a cash receipt from the public in the cash budget.

The nature of the differences between the administrative budget and the cash-consolidated budget may be summarized as follows:

TABLE VI.—*Fiscal 1948*

[Millions of dollars]

	Receipts	Expenditures	Balance
1. Administrative budget	42,211	33,791	+8,420
Plus other accounts	+6,515	+7,317	−802
2. Combined budget	48,726	41,108	+7,618
Less internal transactions	−3,299	−3,299	--------
3. Consolidated budget	45,427	37,809	+7,618
Less investment in United States securities	----------	−2,990	+2,990
Plus redemption of noncash securities (net)	−18	+1,598	−1,616
Plus sale of obligations of Government securities (net)	----------	+107	−107
Less seigniorage on silver	−37	----------	−37
4. Cash-consolidated budget	45,372	36,524	8,848

APPENDIX C

The withholding plan for the taxation of corporate profits involves two changes from present practice:

1. The corporation would get a credit against its corporate income tax equal to a fraction of dividends paid by it.

2. The corporation would serve as an agent for collecting at the source part of the stockholders' individual income tax on their dividends. The corporation would withhold part of the dividends it pays, and remit them to the Treasury.

Under the plan suggested on page 33, both the credit and the withholding would be at the same rate, i. e., 16.6 percent of dividends. Thus the credit received by the corporation would be exactly equal to the amount it withholds for the stockholders' tax liabilities. Consequently, the total amount paid to the Treasury by the corporation would be the same as under present law, regardless of dividend payments. But the corporation's payment would be made up of two parts—payment on its own account and payment on its stockholders' accounts. The proportion in which the total payment is divided between the corporation's account and the stockholders' account would depend upon the proportion of the total profits distributed as dividends.

The table shows total taxes paid by the corporation on $1,000,000 of profits, under varying assumptions as to amounts of dividends paid:

Dividends paid	Tax paid by corporation			
		Withholding plan		
	Present law (all for own account)	Total	Own account	Withheld for stockholders' account
0	$380,000	$380,000	$380,000	0
$100,000	380,000	380,000	363,400	$16,600
$200,000	380,000	380,000	346,800	33,200
$500,000	380,000	380,000	297,000	83,000
$620,000	380,000	380,000	277,080	102,920
$743,405 [1]	380,000	380,000	256,595	123,405

[1] Represents full distribution of earnings after tax and therefore minimum tax for corporation's own account.

For any given amount of dividends, the stockholders' individual income tax would be the same as under present law. However, the stockholders' cash receipts would be less (since part of his dividend has been withheld for tax) and his direct cash tax payments would be less (for the same rea-

son). For any given amount of dividends the stockholders' income after tax, and cash receipts after direct cash tax payments, would be the same as under present law.

In summary, for any given amount of profits and dividends:

(a) The corporation's tax payment is unchanged but its own tax liability is less, because part of its payment is withholding for the stockholder.

(b) The stockholders' tax liability is unchanged, but his own payment is less, because part of his tax has already been paid by withholding.

(c) The combined payments, which will equal the combined liabilities, will be less by 16.6 percent of the amount of dividends.

The way in which the withholding plan would work may be illustrated by considering the case of a corporation that earns $1,000,000 and pays $500,000 of dividends.

	Present law	Withholding plan
COMPUTATION OF CORPORATE PROFITS TAX		
A. Corporate profits before tax	$1,000,000	$1,000,000
B. Dividends paid	500,000	500,000
C. Tax at 38 percent of profits	380,000	380,000
D. Credit for dividends paid (16.6 percent of B)		83,000
E. Corporate tax (C–D)	380,000	297,000
PAYMENT OF DIVIDENDS		
F. Total dividend declared	500,000	500,000
G. Withheld for stockholders' tax (16.6 percent)		83,000
H. Dividend paid in cash	500,000	417,000

The computation of the stockholders' tax in the above case may be illustrated by the case of a single individual, without dependents, who receives one-tenth of the dividends of the corporation and has no other income.

	Present law	Withholding plan
I. Cash dividend received	$50,000	$41,700
J. Dividend withheld at source		[1] 8,300
K. Taxable income (I+J)	50,000	50,000
L. Tax on K at individual rates	22,568	22,568
M. Paid by withholding		8,300
N. To be paid directly by stockholder	22,568	14,268

[1] Stockholder may either receive notice from corporation telling how much has been withheld, or compute amount of withholding at 19.9 percent (16.6/83.4) of cash dividend received.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a very excellent editorial which was published in this morning's Washington Post, entitled "CED Budget Plan."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CED BUDGET PLAN

The Committee for Economic Development has outlined a budget program that would cut Government expenditures by 6.7 billion dollars, making it possible to reduce taxes about two and twenty-five one-hundredths billion and create a surplus of three billion for debt retirement in a year of high employment. The recommendations for reductions in Government outlays appear to be entirely feasible, though in some cases legislative authorization would be required to effect them. As the CED report explains, $5,000,000,000 of the proposed reduction in expenditures would be brought about by elimination of nonrecurrent outlays for veterans' life-insurance dividends, planned declines in foreign aid, and lower unemployment compensation payments, assuming employment reaches maximum levels next year.

Tax reduction recommendations, including revision of excise-tax rates, partial elimination of double taxation of dividends, and changes in methods of computing taxable corporate net income are high on the priority list of most advocates of tax reform. Although any substantial reductions in tax burdens should be deferred until Government spending has been drastically curtailed, the CED's emphasis on the imperative need for lightening the burden of taxation at an early date is calculated to spur economy efforts, and underline the importance of a cautious and selective tax reform program aimed primarily at removal of inequities.

The CED program is based on a novel principle of budget planning that makes it seem somewhat unrealistic from the viewpoint of the average man. For 1950–51 receipts and expenditures figures are based on estimates of what income and outgo would be at very high levels of employment (specifically with only 2,500,000 of the labor force unemployed). If unemployment is above 2,500,000, actual budget receipts may diverge widely from the estimated returns and deficits may result. That would not necessitate changing the CED recommendations, since under its so-called stabilizing budget policy, the surpluses of years of maximum employment are expected to cancel out the deficits of bad years.

The policy of annual budget balancing unquestionably accentuates business fluctuations, deepening depressions and encouraging tax reduction or extravagant spending in boom years. Consequently, the CED advocates setting tax rates at levels that would produce surpluses in years of high employment. It favors retention of those rates, regardless of the state of business, unless there are compelling reasons for reducing taxes or major changes in national policies or in economic conditions that require tax increases. This stabilizing budget policy is, in our opinon, a sound theoretical approach to solution of long-range budgetary problems, though the political obstacles to its acceptance as a guiding principle for budget making are formidable.

CED budget figures are also based on the cash budget instead of the administrative budget. Since the latter includes many interagency transactions that do not affect the amount of money held by the public, it cannot be relied on to measure the inflationary or deflationary effects of fiscal operations on the general economy. To be sure, the administrative budget will always be indispensable as an administrative control agency; it also provides information that is essential to an understanding of the long-range financial position of the Government. Without such a guide, spending projects whose initial cost is slight might develop into burdensome future commitments. The cash budget, however, showing the actual amount of money received from and paid to the public in any given year, including payments into and out of insurance trust funds, gives a much clearer picture of the immediate effect of Government spending and taxing on the general economy.

The CED's stabilizing budget policy and its use of the cash budget method of presentation are innovations that Congress may well study as an aid to better understanding of budgetary problems. Moreover, the CED suggestions for curtailing expenditures and correcting tax inequities deserve consideration on their merits, regardless of whether budget estimates are fitted into the framework of a stabilizing cash budget or the administrative budget.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in offering this editorial for the RECORD I do so with my sincere compliments to the Washington Post, because I think here is an editorial analysis of the Federal budget problem that deserves the careful reading and study of every Member of the Senate. I wish to read a paragraph or two from the editorial and make brief comments thereon. The editorial says:

Tax-reduction recommendations, including revision of excise-tax rates, partial elimination of double taxation of dividends, and changes in methods of computing taxable corporate net income are high on the priority list of most advocates of tax reform. Although any substantial reductions in tax burdens should be deferred until Government spending has been drastically curtailed, the CED's emphasis on the imperative need for lightening the burden of taxation at an early date is calculated to spur economy efforts, and underline the importance of a cautious and selective tax-reform program aimed primarily at removal of inequities.

The CED program is based on a novel principle of budget planning that makes it seem somewhat unrealistic from the viewpoint of the average man. For 1950–51 receipts and expenditures figures are based on estimates of what income and outgo would be at very high levels of employment (specifically with only 2,500,000 of the labor force unemployed). If unemployment is above 2,500,000, actual budget receipts may diverge widely from the estimated returns and deficits may result. Tha would not necessitate changing the CED recommendations, since under its so-called stabilizing budget policy, the surpluses of years of maximum employment are expected to cancel out the deficits of bad years.

The policy of annual budget balancing unquestionably accentuates business fluctuations, deepening depressions, and encouraging tax reduction or extravagant spending in boom years. Consequently, the CED advocates setting tax rates at levels that would produce surpluses in years of high employment. It favors retention of those rates, regardless of the state of business, unless there are compelling reasons for reducing taxes or major changes in national policies or in economic conditions that require tax increases. This stabilizing budget policy is, in our opinion, a sound theoretical approach to solution of long-range budgetary problems, though the political obstacles to its acceptance as a guiding principle for budget making are formidable.

Mr. President, in its latest report the Committee for Economic Development simply restates its position on a so-called stabilized budget that is set forth in such great clarity in its earlier reports. Without taking further time to discuss the principles of a stabilized budget, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a brief excerpt from a speech I made on this general subject of taxes in the Senate on September 30, 1949, on the subject of a stabilized budget—what is it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALTONSTALL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The key to a program that will promote stability, Government economy, and debt reduction without requiring impossible accuracy of forecasting business fluctuations is this:

Set tax rates to balance the budget and provide a surplus for debt retirement at an agreed high level of employment and national income. Having set these rates, leave them alone unless there is some major change in national policy or condition of national life.

Tax rates, by themselves, do not determine how much revenue will be collected.

The rates merely say, for example, that revenue will be $9 per gallon of liquor sold, $38 per $100 of corporate profits, $50 per $100 of individual taxable income within a certain bracket, and so on. How much will be collected with these rates depends upon the amount of liquor sold, the amount of corporate profits, and the amount of individual incomes. Since all of the important elements of the tax base are closely related to the national income, collections under any system of unchanging tax rates will be larger as the national income rises and smaller as the national income falls.

Some kinds of Government expenditures also tend to vary automatically with economic conditions. Unemployment compensation payments are the outstanding case. When unemployment rises these payments also rise, and when unemployment drops the payments decline. In addition, some expenditures—such as public works—may be advanced or held back to meet changing economic conditions within the limits of an agreed total expenditure program.

With tax rates set to yield a moderate surplus at high-employment national income larger surpluses will result when the national income is above that level. At lower national incomes the surplus will be smaller and below some point there will be deficits.

Under this system surpluses arising when national income goes above the standard high-employment level should not be used to increase expenditures. Likewise, a reduction of tax rates without a corresponding reduction of expenditures would be contrary to the policy, regardless of the actual surplus at the actual national income (subject to exceptions that will be stated below).

A direct consequence of the stabilizing budget principle is that fluctuations in the national income do not call for fluctuations in tax rates, or in expenditures except for the automatic response of some expenditure items. However, changes in tax rates or expenditures will be appropriate under some circumstances. If, for example, improvement of the international situation should lead to a substantial reduction in annual expenditure for defense, a lowering of tax rates would be appropriate. Similarly, if a new program is to be adopted that will substantially raise the annual level of Federal spending, higher tax rates will be required.

Three exceptions should be noted to the general principle that tax rates and expenditures should only change up or down in step with each other:

1. With a growing population and rising productivity, the national income at high employment will gradually rise. Therefore, the yield of a constant system of tax rates at the standard high-employment national income will also slowly and steadily increase. This gradual increase of tax yield will permit, without higher tax rates, some gradual increase in normal Government expenditure that may accompany the growth of the population and the national income. Moreover, as the economy grows into higher income levels, the amount of debt reduction consistent with high employment and stable prices may increase also; if so, the increased yield of the tax system should be retained for that purpose. Any readjustment of tax rates made possible by the long-time growth of the tax base should be made at reasonable intervals, say, 5 years, in order to avoid the unsettling effects of annual rate changes.

2. From time to time an urgent need may arise for an extraordinary expenditure that is large in amount but known to be temporary. It would probably be undesirable to raise tax rates sharply in order to finance such expenditures currently, and then to cut tax rates when the expenditure ceases. A plan for meeting these expenditures over a somewhat longer period would therefore be appropriate. This plan might take the form of a smaller tax-rate increase, extended over a longer period.

If the expenditure is in the form of loans, the repayments may provide the source from which the expenditure will, in the end, be met. Whatever the plan for ultimately financing the expenditure, any immediate inflationary consequences of the expenditure should be offset by anti-inflationary borrowings. Outlays under a program for foreign rehabilitation may fall within this exception.

3. The recommendations of this report are presented in the belief that, if they are combined with appropriate measures in other fields, economic fluctuations can be confined to moderate departures from a high level. Yet it would be foolhardy to ignore the possibility that we may again confront an economic crisis of great magnitude—either severe depression or major inflation. Some extraordinary action must and will be taken if such a crisis appears. An emergency congressional reduction or increase in tax rate (perhaps with a fixed, automatic termination date) would then be one of the most effective and least dangerous of the available courses.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to point out that we cannot have a stabilized budget unless we have a fair and just tax structure. We have a great many inequities in our existing tax system. In this matter of inequities in our present tax structure we find two general types of inequities that appear many times in the Federal tax structure as of today. First, taxes that are not based upon ability to pay, and, second, taxes that are based upon the principle of economic vulnerability. We cannot justify a tax structure which fails to carry out in a fair, equitable, impartial way the principle of ability to pay. We cannot justify the maintaining in our tax structure of tax principles or inequities based upon economic vulnerability. The wartime excise taxes at least, roundly criticized by the Committee for Economic Development in its latest report, are a good example of taxes based upon economic vulnerability. They are not based in many instances upon a fair application of the principle of ability to pay. One need only read the report of the committee which I have inserted in the RECORD to see how sound are the arguments which call for drastic revisions of most of our excise taxes.

I would call the Senate's attention to the fact that in its latest report the Committee for Economic Development restates its position for the elimination of many of the excise taxes and the reduction of many of the excise taxes not completely eliminated. Excessive excise taxes on liquor and tobacco are good examples of a tax based upon economic vulnerability. There has been a tendency on the part of the Congress, as well as on the part of State legislatures and some municipal councils, to take advantage of certain economic groups in the country who manufacture a product to which some persons are opposed. In those instances the power to tax has been abused to the point that the tax is almost a device for prohibiting manufacture or consumption. Of course, I refer to liquor and tobacco taxes. As one who neither smokes nor drinks, I think I am at least in a position to pass judgment on the question of whether the principle of economic vulnerability is applied to an excessive degree in the case of excise taxes on liquor and tobacco. In all fairness, Mr. President, we cannot justify, from the standpoint of a comparison of taxes placed on other goods, the exceedingly high taxes now imposed upon liquor and tobacco. The situation is so bad that recently, at a political meeting, a representative of the WCTU arose—I am not in a position to say whether she spoke officially for the organization—and proceeded to argue for a substantial reduction in the excise taxes on liquor because she claimed that they have become so unreasonably high and are producing such a large income for the Federal Government that they are setting back the movement for prohibition in this country. It was a rather novel argument, I thought. I present it here, however, to illustrate that we have gone so far with our Federal taxes and our State and municipal taxes on both liquor and tobacco that even those who would like to prohibit the consumption of liquor and tobacco entirely are apparently coming to recognize the unfairness of the taxes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The same argument might be applicable to the taxes on oleomargarine.

Mr. MORSE. I am going to vote for the elimination of the oleomargarine tax, I am glad to tell my friend the Senator from Arkansas. I shall support an amendment which will protect the public from misrepresentations in the sale of oleomargarine.

Mr. President, I have referred to excise taxes in order to show that many of them do illustrate the fixing of taxes on the principle of economic vulnerability rather than ability to pay. Many of our transportation taxes are based on economic vulnerability and not ability to pay. The same goes for excise taxes on baby oil, cosmetics, and similar items.

I would personally go further than the latest report of the Committee for Economic Development goes with respect to the elimination of excise taxes. I do not think its present recommendations go far enough. I think more of the excise taxes should be entirely eliminated; I think more of them than the committee recommends should be reduced substantially.

But at least the committee has given a specific proposal, one which is affirmative and constructive, and one which I think should outline the least my party should advocate by way of tax reform with respect to excise taxes.

In its report, released just this week end, the committee, on page 1, says this:

1. There will almost certainly be a large deficit—probably around $5 billion—in the Federal budget for the fiscal year 1949–50. Even if high employment had been continuously maintained throughout 1949, there would be a deficit for 1949–50.

2. Because of its size—over $40 billion—and its composition, the present Federal tax burden is a serious impediment to economic growth and a source of important in-

equities among individual taxpayers and among industries.

3. Federal outlays increased $10,000,000,000 from fiscal 1948 to fiscal 1950. While particular items of expenditure will certainly decline in the next year, there are strong pressures for increases in many parts of the budget.

I think in 1950, with our national income what it is, and with the very heavy tax load the American people are already carrying, we, as a Congress, cannot justify a budget which involves a deficit of $5,000,000,000.

I happen to be one who believes that the budget can be balanced without doing any serious damage or detriment to the desirable objectives the President of the United States has in mind, so far as advancing the welfare of the people of this country is concerned. I happen to be one who believes that the Republicans on this side of the aisle cannot justify going before the American people in the 1950 elections unless at this session of Congress they lay down a specific, affirmative program showing how the $5,000,000,000 can be saved without doing serious detriment to the standard of living and the welfare of the American people.

Mr. President, I am of the opinion that it is up to the Republicans in the Senate to "put up or shut up" in regard to this matter of fighting for a sound economy. I am satisfied that we can put up a sound budget program that will balance the budget, will not jeopardize desirable social and economic programs that should be carried on by this Government for the welfare of the people, and will demonstrate to the American people that we are a party that has a constructive program for stabilizing the economy and protecting the value of the dollar.

I wish to say that the first part of that program, the first affirmative proposal we should offer, is the adoption of this report of the Committee for Economic Development, which has come to the desk of each Member of the Senate over the week end. As one Republican, I shall ask time and time again in the Senate during this session, of my Democratic colleagues on the other side of the aisle, What is wrong with the specific recommendations of the Committee for Economic Development in the field of budget making and tax revision?

Mr. President, the time has come to carry this fight to the Democrats. The time has come for the Republicans to ask the Democrats, "What is wrong with adopting the specific recommendations of the Committee for Economic Development?"

We have dillied and dallied, Mr. President, ever since the Seventy-ninth Congress, on this question of taxation. We let the Democrats in the Seventy-ninth Congress proceed with what I think was a very unsound budget-making program. Then we Republicans took over, in the Eightieth Congress. But we did not do one whit better when it came to the development of a sound tax program and a sound budget-making program. In the Eightieth Congress we had before us the scholarly, sound report of the Committee for Economic Development; but those of us who proposed it and offered legislation to carry out its terms did not even get a hearing in the Eightieth Congress. We received the same treatment in respect to these tax recommendations as we had received in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Of course, that is water over the dam and under the bridge.

Now the time has come, in this Eighty-first Congress, to make very clear to the American people that the Republican Party stands against continuation, in times of great prosperity and high income, of a deficit-spending program which characterizes the budget proposals of the administration today.

So, Mr. President, I repeat, what is wrong with these recommendations of the Committee for Economic Development? Let the Democratic administration tell us what is wrong with them. Let it carry its case for deficit spending against a tax revision and budget-making program so sound that I have yet to hear an outstanding tax economist in America raise any valid criticism against the tax revision and budget-making programs of the Committee for Economic Development.

Mr. President, we have to do more than that, as a party, if we are to demonstrate to the American people that we propose to see to it that our economy is stabilized, that the value of the United States dollar is protected, that the injustices, unfairnesses, and inequities of our tax structure are removed. We are also going to have to demonstrate to them that we will operate on a business-like budget in conducting the business affairs of the Federal Government.

In addition to the so-called stabilized budget, which for some years now has been recommended by the Committee for Economic Development, I point out that another specific recommendation the Republican Party should adopt at this session of Congress is a budget which separates administrative costs of government from capital investments.

Mr. President, no great business in this country attempts to operate on the type of budget set-up upon which the Federal Government presently is operating. No great corporation in the United States mingles into a hodgepodge form operating costs and capital investments. This afternoon the President of the United States in his budget made, in my judgment, some exceedingly excellent recommendations in regard to capital investments. His recommendations for the construction of great, self-liquidating, wealth-creating projects in the United States are economically sound, and the Republican Party should grasp those recommendations and should give the President the support to which he is entitled when he makes sound recommendations, just as I would have the Republican Party oppose him with the same vigor when he makes suggestions which cannot be justified on their economic facts.

Mr. President, the solution of the fiscal problems which confront this country is not to be found in higher and higher rates of taxes. The solution is not to be found in new taxes imposed upon existing wealth and existing income. Part of the solution for our fiscal problems is to proceed with those capital investments necessary to create the new wealth that will expand this economy of ours, out of which we can get the new taxes, and the new jobs and the new sources of income created by these new capital investments.

So, Mr. President, I think another thing the Republican Party should stand for as a part of a stabilized budget is a budget which separates capital investments from operating costs. A budget which makes clear to the American people that when they consider the problem of deficit spending, they should eliminate from their calculations all self-liquidating, wealth-creating projects which will return to the Treasury of the United States, over the years, many times their original cost. Such projects should not be considered in terms of balancing a budget dealing with operating costs of Government because they create Government income far in excess of their original costs.

The next thing I would suggest is that the Republicans in this session of the Congress recognize that the Hoover Commission's recommendations are consistent with one of the basic planks of the 1948 platform of our party. The program of that platform calls for the reorganization of this Government of ours on a sound economic basis. The platform principles are in keeping with the Hoover Commission's aims. Therefore I recommend to my party this afternoon the adoption of the major Hoover Commission recommendations for the reorganization of the executive branch of our Government in the interests of promoting greater economy in the operation of the Government.

I have been a little at a loss to understand how some of my Republican colleagues have not been so enthusiastic about the Hoover Commission reports as I think they should be. I wonder whether it is because they are strong for economy in every other fellow's State or district but their own. I suspect that whenever any specific recommendation of the Hoover Commission might step on some economic toes in their own State or district, some of my associates in the Senate on both sides of the aisle lose their ardor for economy. I wonder whether that is part of the explanation for their lack of enthusiasm in joining some of us who would like to make the Hoover Commission recommendations a part of the Republican Party's economy program for the Federal Government. Oh, I am not committed to those reports in the sense that I shall advocate their adoption without change. If the evidence can be brought forward that shows that some particular section of the reports needs to be modified in the interest of economic fact and sounder policy I shall vote for such amendments. But I think, Mr. President, that my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle have delayed too long in making clear to the American people that the Republican Party intends to stand, as a matter of policy, with the major recommendations

of the Hoover Commission reports, subject only to such modifications as evidence clearly presented to the Senate shows should be made in the interests of economic soundness.

Next I suggest that we make clear—and it may not be politic to do this, but I still believe that the American people expect Members of the Senate of the United States to act on the basis of the facts, not on the basis of political expediency—that we intend to cut budgets wherever savings can be made without injuring the public interest. I would have the Republican Party tell the American people that they must make use of a leather punch right in the middle of their economic belts. They must punch some new holes in those belts, to make way for a belt buckle that will permit of a greater tightening of Government expenditures. I use that figure of speech to illustrate a very deep economic conviction of mine, namely, the debt that presently plagues the American people is a debt which must be paid in much more substantial amounts than we have been willing to pay it in the last few years. I know there are those economists—in my judgment, false economists—who are trying to sell the American people a bill of economic goods, that it is a good thing to have this very high national debt. They argue that the amount of the debt is not of great significance, if the national income continues to increase. But, of course, there is income and income. There is money or dollar-sign income, and there is real income. In all these discussions of national income I would have my colleagues in the Senate think and talk in terms of real income, as we talk in terms of real wages. When we speak of real wages we talk not in terms of money wages, but in terms of what the income of the worker will buy.

We have got to pay the debt in much greater amounts than we have been willing to pay it to date if we are to increase the real income of the Nation and the individual taxpayer. One only has to read this report of the Committee for Economic Development in order to see the direct economic relationship between the debt, taxes, and the take-home money that is left to the individual citizen. If we further cheapen the American dollar—and that is what we are doing with it by not paying off this debt—if we further cheapen the American dollar so that it will not be even the 49-cent dollar that it presently is, according to the latest figures that I have seen based on 1939 values—we will be guilty of defrauding the American people. Debasing the value of the American dollar by deficit spending amounts to a form of confiscation of property values. It amounts to a form of repudiation of governmental obligations by sleight-of-hand budget making manipulations. It does not set well with the American people and they are protesting it all over this Nation today. So I recommend to the Republican Party this afternoon the very sound recommendation of the Committee for Economic Development, that we proceed to pay the debt, even though it means new holes in our economic belts, even though it means somewhat of an economic squeeze that may not be particularly comforting to the American people for a time. Some men in high office ought to be willing to take whatever political chances are involved in carrying this point of view to the American people, and tell them quite frankly that in this time of high prosperity and high income the American people ought to be willing to pay a larger share of the debt than has been paid to date.

Further, I ask the Republican Party to be willing to tell the American people the specific types of tax changes that they would make. Oh, I have been told that it is not good policy to suggest that double taxation of stock dividends should be removed, because after all the average man and woman does not own any stocks, and that they are perfectly willing to permit double taxes on the stock dividends of those who do own them. But let me say to those Republicans who would even argue from that political standpoint, that they are overlooking the fact that the average American citizen is characterized by a sense of fairness. Once he is made to understand the injustice and unfairness of double taxation on stock dividends, he will say to the Congress, "Remove that injustice." Incidentally, once he understands the restrictive effect of these tax inequities on his own wages, on his own farm prices, on his own personal income; once he comes to understand the effects of these inequities pointed out in this excellent report upon our economy, he will react against any political party which has failed to try to correct such tax injustices. Once he sees the throttling effect upon incentive, the tendency to restrict the investment of venture capital, the tendency for investors to bury their money in tax-exempt securities, I can hear him say all over this land: "Of course, not only the Republican Party but the Democratic Party as well ought to proceed to remove these tax inequities."

Let me mention one or two others, Mr. President. Let me mention this proposal of the committee for a substitution of 5 years carry-forward on losses for the present confused system of carry-backs. I want to say, if the Republican Party would take this tax issue to the American people, dry as the subject is supposed to be, and let the average voter see the relationship for example of the present tax provisions in respect to carry-backs and the benefits that would flow into the economy by the adoption of a 5-year carry-forward on losses, we would find great political support for adopting this particular recommendation of the Committee for Economic Development. The American people will recognize the economic soundness of the program which the Committee for Economic Development has been recommending if we as a political party have the wisdom to adopt it as party policy.

Then, Mr. President, there is the abuse of two types of escape from taxes. There is escape from taxes through tax-exempt securities which the Committee for Economic Development recommends should be eliminated, on the theory that where American citizens enjoy the economic benefits of our capitalistic system and our political democracy, they should be willing, as good citizens, to put their money to work for the benefit of that economy. They should not seek to escape from their full and fair share of the tax load by being allowed to invest in tax exempt securities.

Thus, Mr. President, I recommend to the Republican Party that we take a valiant stand in opposition to a continuation of this type of tax evasion loophole known as the tax-exempt security loophole.

Then there is another tax-evasion loophole, Mr. President, which has been enlarging itself at a very rapid rate in recent years. It is the charitable trust. I say, Mr. President, that the charitable trust has become actually a tax-evasion racket in America. Of great charitable institutions with great social objectives I find myself in as much ardent support as could be any Member of this body. But when any charitable institution uses the corporate charitable trust primarily for the purpose of evading taxes and through this tax-evasion legal device cheats the rest of the American taxpayers by escaping a reasonable tax load, then it is time for the Congress to call a halt to such a practice. The time has come for the Congress of the United States to have courage enough to step in and say, "We are going to look behind the veil of these charitable trusts; we are going to pierce the veil and see what the purpose of the charitable trust really is."

I say it is not fair, Mr. President, to permit these great charitable trusts, under existing tax laws, to operate competitive businesses with free-enterprise businesses and be exempt from paying their fair share of the tax load necessary to support this Government.

I recommend to the Republican Party, Mr. President, that it take a forthright stand on this proposition and in this session of Congress support legislation which makes perfectly clear that tax exemptions for charitable institutions shall be narrowed to the operation of the institution itself and shall not extend to a business conducted by the institution in competition with private enterprises.

I am perfectly willing to take all the criticism that may flow from the statement I made a moment ago, and I repeat it so everyone will know I spoke advisedly. I say that the charitable trust is being used by many institutions in this country as a legal device to avoid tax obligations. It has come to constitute a tax-evasion racket which should be eliminated by legislative action.

There is another great loophole of tax evasion in this country. Authorities seem to differ as to the extent of tax evasion which goes on by those persons who just deliberately evade paying their taxes on one pretext or another. We are advised that there are many who just do

not file accurate tax statements. They are gambling on the fact that the internal-revenue officials will never catch up with them.

I have in my hand, Mr. President, an excellent editorial on the subject of tax loopholes, published in the Denver Post for December 20, 1949, entitled "Tax Loopholes Drain Our Business Strength." I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX LOOPHOLES DRAIN OUR BUSINESS STRENGTH

We again are being told that Congress is about to resurvey the whole question of Federal taxation with a view to plugging the loopholes through which billions of dollars of income are escaping taxes each year.

Since 1943, when Congress first showed a genuine interest in the question of legal tax-dodging, we have been told the same thing many times. We can only hope that this time it really is true. The growth of tax-exempt business in recent years has been phenomenal. It has put an added and unfair burden on competing businesses which do not enjoy exemptions. Coupled with the system of double taxation on business profits, it constitutes a growing threat to national welfare.

Tax loopholes are of many kinds. A number of them arise from a section of Federal law which excepts from income taxes the net income of various corporations, funds, and foundations operated for religious, charitable, scientific, and educational purposes.

The original intention of that provision was laudable enough but in recent years that special exemption has come to cover many activities not originally contemplated. For example, many businesses ranging from department stores to piston-ring-manufacturing companies now are owned nominally by colleges and universities.

Supposedly the tax-exempt incomes from those businesses is to go for educational purposes. Actually, the colleges and universities may receive some income from those sources but by escaping Federal taxes those companies often are able to lay aside large amounts for plant expansion and are able to pay handsome salaries to their executives. Competition from such tax-exempt firms is difficult for purely commercial tax-paying companies to meet.

Some churches also own businesses now and the number of private foundations and trusts which support various charitable and scientific endeavors in order to escape taxes and pay good-sized salaries has increased by leaps and bounds.

Cooperatives and labor unions control other businesses, ranging all the way from oil wells to retail stores, which enjoy a tax-free income of more than $10,000,000,000 a year, an income gained in competition with tax-paying businesses.

Still another loophole—created by a tax formula adopted in 1943—has made it possible for insurance companies to escape taxes on about $4,500,000,000 worth of earnings on such things as real estate in the last 3 years.

In these times of high taxes, when legitimate business is having difficulty finding the money for needed expansions, a heavy obligation rests on Government to see that taxes are distributed fairly and justly.

Experts vary in their estimates of the amount which might be collected if all tax loopholes were plugged. The estimates run from $1,000,000,000 a year upward. It is high time for Congress to tackle this problem seriously regardless of whose toes may be trampled.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, here is a way to save money. I do not know whether the estimates of possible savings are accurate. I have no way of knowing. I have read estimates from reliable sources, from Government officials who have testified before our Appropriations Committee in times gone by, when they wanted more appropriations for more personnel in the tax-collecting divisions of the Government. Some of these witnesses have told us there is a great amount of tax evasion in this country. Some of the estimates, Mr. President, run from one billion to two billions of dollars which could be collected if we paid more attention to providing more adequate machinery for the collection of taxes due this Government.

I say, Mr. President, that the Republican Party ought to make it one of its planks of policy that it is unalterably opposed to any form of tax evasion, and that it stands for the strictest administration of existing tax laws. If the Government would crack down on all kinds of tax evasion we would find a great saving could be accomplished thereby. As much possibly, as two billion dollars could be saved if we collected all the taxes due the Government.

I close, Mr. President, by saying that here is an opportunity for the Republican Party to take a constructive, affirmative stand so that no one in respect to the tax, at least, would have any justification for saying, "Well, I should like to vote for the Republican Party, because I think we need a change of administration in Washington, but I just do not know what the party stands for."

In the Eighty-first Congress let us, by legislative action, Mr. President, make very clear to the American voters exactly what we stand for in terms of specific proposals in connection with each one of the great issues confronting the American people.

I have spoken this afternoon only on the tax issue, but as the session proceeds I intend to suggest to the Republican Party some other specific programs and proposals which should be adopted into law. We cannot afford to let the Eighty-first Congress close its session without having written on the floor of the United States Senate a specific legislative program on each one of the great issues which confront the American people. I suggest that a good place to start is with the tax program of the Committee for Economic Development. I repeat my question to the Democrats. "What is wrong with that program?"

To the Republicans I say, let us get busy and support it in the Senate of the United States. The people want action in bringing about economy—not just talk about economy. If the Republican Party in the Congress, if we Republicans who are on the firing line in this session of Congress will give the people some action by doing our best to get the Congress to adopt a sound tax-revision and budget program as recommended by the Committee for Economic Development we will provide part of the answer to the question, "What does the Republican Party stand for?" Then if we will offer equally sound proposals on each of the other issues facing the American people we will not have to worry about which party will win in the 1950 elections. I think it is up to us. I think the Republican Party can and must meet this great political challenge.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I merely wish to observe at this point that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] did not speak today, as he intimated on last Friday he would speak, on the oleomargarine bill. I am very interested in hearing what he has to say about that bill, and I hope he will find it possible to speak on it tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has been attempting all day long to obtain the floor to discuss the unfinished business, the oleomargarine measure. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes tomorrow the Senator from Minnesota may be recognized by the occupant of the chair at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 10, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 9, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, the source of all that makes life useful and hopeful, we thank Thee that Thy providence continues through this, another day. Be with us, that we may walk in Thy favor and in the ways of Thy commandments, and comfort us with Thy approval.

We bless Thee for the shelter and the hallowed associations of the home; for our country, so rich in privilege and so broad in opportunities. Bless all institutions that sustain and support our national life, and may we never fail in our loyalty to the land that honors us.

Through the years, blessed Lord, give good health and great wisdom to our honored Speaker, that he may continue to serve our Nation with wise statesmanship. We pray in the Master's name. Amen

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 6, 1950, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 417).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Armed Services, JAMES T. PATTERSON, of Connecticut.

Committee on Un-American Activities, BERNARD W. (PAT) KEARNEY, of New York.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COTTON ACREAGE QUOTAS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, let me congratulate the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives on the speed with which it is moving to amend the 1949 act which established cotton acreage quotas. This is extremely important. Many complaints are reaching the Congress daily regarding the enforcement of this act. I am satisfied that the inequities and injustices created are not defendable and that if the program is to work properly some immediate changes are demanded. Unfreezing the unused cotton acreage and stipulating a requirement that no farmer should be cut more than 30 percent of his normal cotton acreage are changes which will be welcomed by farmers who now feel that the act is harsh, unfair, and very unjust.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances; to include in one an article by Francis Douglas appearing in the Sunday Washington Star; in one a letter from Homer Brinkley, manager of the American Rice Growers Association, and newspaper articles; and in one a copy of a letter from one of his constituents.

Mr. CAVALCANTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Morning Herald, Uniontown, Pa.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a press release.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram from Mr. Kline and a reply from the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. KEE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include statements and excerpts.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes following any special orders heretofore entered.

RECORD SHOWS WE ARE LOSING THE COLD WAR

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, are we winning the cold war? Let us take a look at the score:

In January 1945, Moscow ruled 190,000,000 people.

In June 1948, Moscow ruled 450,000,000 people.

In November 1949, Moscow ruled 800,000,000 people.

The 1949 figure was proudly proclaimed by Commissar Malenkoff at Stalin's birthday celebration last December.

Now I ask you again, are we winning the cold war? The answer is obviously "No." Right now we are on the losing team.

Under a bankrupt foreign policy, in that same period, we have lost face, prestige, and position, but more it has cost the American people the staggering sum of $33,070,200,648. I have secured these figures from the Library of Congress.

The total postwar aid from July 1, 1945, to January 1, 1950:

July 1, 1945–June 30, 1949	$26,725,320,619
July 1, 1949–Jan. 1, 1950	6,344,880,029
Total	33,070,200,648

And now we are about to recognize the Chinese Communist Government. This must not be, and the American people should rise up and be heard. Let the British appease but not the United States.

Are we winning the cold war?

The letter referred to is as follows:

QUEENS COUNTY CHAPTER,
CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS,
Jamaica, N. Y., January 3, 1950.

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: At the start of the new Congress we bring to your consideration two matters of vital importance to the welfare and security of the United States.

There is agitation by Communists, fellow travelers, and appeasers that the United States should recognize the communistic government of China. Would this not be a betrayal of the people of China and the Far East? What a blow to the great patriotic and statesmanlike work Gen. Douglas MacArthur has been doing to hold the bridge from communism in Japan and other far eastern outposts. What a blow or betrayal it would be to the security of the United States and the Philippines.

Regarding Spain, we have the same agitators by Communists, their fellow travelers, and even socialistic Government of England and France against the recognition of this friendly country which has been and is today a bulwark against communism in Europe. Is it not time that our own State Department stop being influenced in their foreign policy by the socialistic and communistic countries or by trying to appease them?

There are reports that these communistic and socialistic groups, realizing they cannot bring about the recognition of communistic China, and realizing they cannot stop the recognition of the Spanish Government, will throw their forces to bring about a compromise by recognizing the communistic China Government and also the Spanish Government. We know you will agree that any such compromise would be a betrayal of principle and what is right. We hope you will do all in your power to stop any such appeasement of these alien groups and fellow travelers.

We would appreciate your early views on these two matters which are so vital to our welfare and national security. Is it not high time that the State Department make their decision and act in accordance with what is right and what is in the interest of the United States?

Hoping you will give these paramount matters your consideration and attention,

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM H. O'NEILL,
Commander.

BE NIFTY AND THRIFTY IN FIFTY

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, for years I have been trying to associate with the membership here and get them to follow me on one thing, economy in government. I asked the question many, many times during past years when I saw how fast we were spending money, as to where we are going to get the money. I never got a favorable reply.

Then I changed the theme last year, and I said the thing to do now is to try something else on the membership, and maybe I can get them to stop spending. And I said many times, "Be wise and economize." But you kept on spending and spending.

Now this year I want to make a new motto, and I hope that I will get a little aid and assistance, especially on my right here in the House, "Be nifty and thrifty in fifty."

I hope this brings results in economy in operation of our Government.

Help me out; will you? Our country needs it; wise government demands it. Act accordingly.

DEFICIT SPENDING

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, as the year 1950 opens the national debt of the United States stands at $257,000,000,000. Indications are that debt by next June will exceed $260,000,000,000.

Federal Government spending during the present year is at the rate of $43,500,000,000 annually. The President says he wants to reduce this spending to about $42,000,000,000 for the year which starts next July 1. Even if this modest goal is attained, spending still will be about four billions a year, or about $12,000,000 a day, above the Government's tax income.

The end of deficit, red-ink financing is not yet in sight. A government, like a private family, that constantly goes further and further into debt, inevitably meets up with disaster. With the family, that disaster is bankruptcy. With a government, the end is either national bankruptcy or ruinous runaway inflation.

A national debt of $257,000,000,000 is a sum so astronomical that it defies human understanding. In simpler terms that debt is an average of $1,800 a person for every man, woman and child in these United States. It is equivalent to a debt of $7,200 for every average family of four in this Nation.

Yet, despite the staggering financial burden of this enormous debt and the heavy burden even payment of the interest on that debt imposes on every American family in added income, excise and other taxes and in the increased costs of living, we continue to spend profligately more than $42,000,000,000 a year.

HOW MUCH IS $42,000,000,000?

Federal expenditures under George Washington averaged $4,261,000 a year. The $42,000,000,000 which President Truman wants to spend next year would have operated this Government at the George Washington rate of spending for 10,000 years. What the Truman administration now spends in a day would have operated the Federal Government in George Washington's time for 25 years.

Federal expenditures under Abraham Lincoln, including all of the cost of the Civil War, were $838,000,000 a year. The $42,000,000,000 which President Truman proposes to spend next year would have operated our Federal Government for about 50 years at the Lincoln administration rate of spending. The Truman administration in one peacetime week of 1950 spends as much as the Lincoln administration did during an entire 12 months during the Civil War years.

Federal expenditures during the Woodrow Wilson administration, including all the costs of World War I, averaged $5,867,000,000 a year. This year's $42,000,000,000 budget of President Truman would have operated this Government for 7½ years at the Woodrow Wilson World War I rate of spending.

As recently as 1930, only 20 years ago, Federal taxes were only $29.54 a year per capita. Today under the Truman "spend, spend, spend and tax, tax, tax program," Federal taxes, income and hidden, average $315 a year for every man, woman, and child in the Nation.

Is it not time to stop and to consider where we are going? Tax dollars can be obtained only from the sweat and toil of those who work. All taxes must come from the production of farm and factory, trade and transportation. We cannot spend ourselves into prosperity. We can tax ourselves into ruin, for the power to tax, unwisely used, destroys. History is filled with examples of nations that were impoverished, weakened, and destroyed by unsound fiscal policies. We should profit by these examples.

I once asked a banker to measure the height of a pile of 1,000 $1 bills. The pile was 4 inches high.

Now had those bills been of $1,000 denomination, there would have been $1,000,000 in that pile and it would have been 4 inches tall.

A billion dollars is one thousand million. Therefore a billion dollars in $1,000 bills would be a pile 1,000 times 4 inches in height or 4,000 inches or 333 feet tall.

We will spend this year $42,000,000,000. It, therefore, would require a pile of $1,000 bills 42 times 333 feet tall or 13,986 feet high to contain enough $1,000 bills to provide the money to meet the President's spending program for the coming year.

The national debt, now $257,000,000,000, is approximately six times the amount the President asks for his coming year's spending program. To pay off that national debt would require a pile of $1,000 bills six times 2½ miles tall or a pile of $1,000 bills that would extend 15 miles into the sky.

A friend suggested that I should have worked out my figures with $1 bills thereby showing that to pay off the present national debt would require a pile of $1 bills that would be 15,000 miles high.

The top of that pile is still not in sight for we are increasing our Federal spending, not decreasing it, and our Federal debt will continue to mount higher and higher unless we change our present dangerous course toward bankruptcy or inflation.

Biggest battles of the present session of Congress will be waged over the appropriation bills. This is as it should be. Maintenance of wartime spending and wartime taxes in peacetime just does not make sense. The demand for greater efficiency and greater economy in Government is coming from every section and segment of our American population.

Even Trumanites who throughout the Eightieth Congress and in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, resisted all efforts at economy and fought all demands for tax reduction, have been impressed by the growing demand for more Government efficiency and less Government spending. Some of them now say they will go along with a curtailment of spending if it is kept within modest limits.

Most of these, however, would confine their reductions in expenditures to foreign aid and to the military. Reductions in these two activities, unquestionably, are in order. One of the best places, however, to cut spending is in the ever-multiplying Federal agencies with their ever-expanding number of employees. The Hoover Commission report recommends this. I was disappointed that the President in his state of the Union address made no mention of the Hoover report or its recommendations or of the possibility of curbing the size and cost of our Gargantuan bureaucracy.

Twenty years ago, according to the Hoover report, we had 300 bureaus and commissions in our Federal Government. Today, says the Hoover report, there are 1,816. Twenty years ago, says the Hoover report, there were 570,000 civilian employees on the Federal pay rolls. Now we have 1,988,600.

The General Accounting Office of the Federal Government about a year ago reported no less than 29 Federal agencies engaged in loaning money, 3 in insuring bank deposits, 34 engaged in acquiring land, 16 in wildlife preservation, 10 in Government finance and credit, 12 in home and community planning, 28 in welfare matters, 4 in bank examinations, and 65 in gathering statistics.

No sensible person surely can believe that all of these overlapping agencies are either necessary or desirable. The multiplicity of these agencies can lead only to confusion, chaos, and inexcusable waste.

Some of our colleagues on the Democratic side, when anyone suggests reducing Federal spending, inquire skeptically, "Where would you cut expenditures?" My answer is, I would cut them everywhere waste in Government can be found and waste can be found today almost everywhere in Government.

OUR PRESENT-DAY COAL SHORTAGE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, coal is essential for American industry. Without coal there can be no coke; without coke, very little steel; without steel, no autos. And so it goes. Every vital industry in America depends very largely upon a coal supply.

When a strike develops in the coal fields the results are first felt by the railroads with the loss of freight revenues; next by the steel and cement companies that require great quantities of coal for their conversion processes; then by the auto industry, the largest users of steel in the Nation; and finally by the public utilities who furnish heat, light, and power. When the coal shortage hits the public utilities in our metropolitan

centers, it means brown-outs and black-outs, and so forth.

John L. Lewis and his 500,000 miners, therefore, have a stranglehold upon practically all of American industry. When the 500,000 miners go on strike several million other workers are made idle for lack of coal, and the whole economic life of the Nation becomes disrupted and disorganized.

WHAT CAN BE DONE ABOUT IT?

Mr. Speaker, under the Taft-Hartley Act the President has the authority and the responsibility to protect the national health and safety of the general public when those rights are threatened by any labor controversy that creates a national emergency.

The President must decide first whether or not the strike affects the national health or safety. If in his judgment it does, then he must appoint a Board of Inquiry to investigate the dispute and report back to him. He may then, if he deems it necessary, obtain a temporary injunction against the strike, lock-out, or walk-out. After the injunction is secured the parties involved in the labor dispute must continue production for 60 days during which period the original Board of Inquiry makes a new study of the dispute, and furnishes a complete report which is made public. Within 15 days after the report is made public the National Labor Relations Board is required to take a secret ballot among the workers to determine whether the rank and file want to accept the employer's last offer. After the secret ballot is taken, then if the controversy is not settled, the President must report the matter to Congress with a recommendation for new and more stringent legislation to control labor controversies in which the Nation's health and safety are threatened. What is wrong with this provision of the Taft-Hartley Act?

Mr. Speaker, my people want to know why the President does not act in the present emergency? Why he does not use the machinery the Congress gave him to use for just such an emergency—a shortage of coal that is causing untold suffering, and threatens the national health and safety?

MENTAL PATIENTS IN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include two editorials and a statement by the Veterans' Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal about what should be done for the veterans. I call the attention of the House to a report issued by the Washington Office of the Veterans' Administration which states that one-third of the more than 52,000 veterans who are mental patients in Veterans' Administration hospitals have not been visited by members of their own families or friends in a year or more.

According to this report, preliminary results of a survey being conducted by the Psychiatry and Neurology Division of the Veterans' Administration's Department of Medicine and Surgery show that in some hospitals nearly half the mental patients had not had a visitor in a year, and in one hospital only 219 patients out of 785 had visitors during the same period.

As you all know, interest in the mental cases, particularly by the families, in many instances means a cure. If the families have not enough love and appreciation of what their own soldiers did, it is a great pity. I shall introduce a resolution in the House of Representatives and I shall ask Gen. Carl R. Gray, Jr., Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, to continue the work in behalf of the mental patients in Veterans' Administration hospitals by making a report to Congress concerning the financial accounts of the patients and how much each individual patient was allowed for his own personal benefit during the past year and how much of the patient's money went to relatives, guardians, conservators, and others. I shall also ask that the Veterans' Administration take steps to interest the relatives and friends of the patients to visit them at regular and frequent times when it would be advisable and helpful.

The failure of relatives and friends to visit the patients is most hard-hearted and the newspapers throughout the country in news items and editorials have called the neglect of the veteran patients pitiful, earnestly asking help for them.

I shall read the following editorials:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Traveler of December 29, 1949]

THE LIVING DEAD

Have you, in your family, one of the living dead? Have you in some mental hospital for veterans one who is comfortably out of sight and out of mind—your mind? There are 52,000 such veterans in America and one in three has not seen a member of his family this year.

We know there are explanations and excuses, sometimes valid ones. But in the name of human decency and charity, put your explanation and excuse to the acid test. If they will not stand it, admit that you have failed of charity. Admit it, before it is too late. Make a new year's visit, and make it subject to regular and frequent renewal.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of December 29, 1949]

THEY LIVE ALONE

More than one-third of the 50,000 patients in mental hospitals under the supervision of the Veterans' Administration have not been visited by anyone in the past year.

These men who lost their minds through shock or injury while fighting for their country have been left entirely alone by the outside world; they have been completely forgotten by relatives and erstwhile friends. They are truly the forgotten men of the times.

The VA has made a detailed study of all patients in veterans' hospitals and has produced this startling revelation. There are many patients in this group who frequently have rational periods but who are not well enough to be released; what must they think, in the brief periods that they are able to work their minds clearly, about this neglect on the part of their friends and relatives?

The VA believes that in many instances an occasional visitor might help mend the minds of these unfortunate men who certainly deserve greater consideration.

This may help many people to remember these isolated veterans when making up their new year resolutions.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
INFORMATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., December 28, 1949.

One-third of the more than 52,000 veterans who are mental patients in Veterans' Administration hospitals have not been visited by members of their family or friends in a year or more, Veterans' Administration said today

Preliminary results of a survey being conducted by the Psychiatry and Neurology Division of the Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery showed that in some hospitals nearly half the mental patients hadn't had a visitor in a year, and in one hospital only 219 patients out of 785 had a visitor during the same period.

Dr. Harvey J. Tompkins, Chief of the Psychiatry and Neurology Division, said that while some of the patients have no known close relatives, most of those covered by the survey have families.

Visitors might be disturbing to some patients, Dr. Tompkins explained. However, in the vast majority of mental cases in Veterans' Administration hospitals visits by relatives and friends are beneficial to the patients.

Long periods of isolation from the outside world may be detrimental to a patient, not only while he is in the hospital but also when he leaves the hospital and attempts to reestablish himself in the community, Dr. Tompkins said.

In many cases, Veterans' Administration said, there was a tragic lack of interest on the part of the patients' relatives. Many patients had been hospitalized for extended periods—some had been in Government hospitals since World War I—and their families have just drifted away from them. In other cases, the families want nothing to do with "crazy" men.

Files of the hospital psychiatric social workers are full of case histories of the Nation's "forgotten" veterans. Some of these records reveal instances where the families refuse to accept the veterans back into the home even after they have recovered. Thus, there are men in Veterans' Administration hospitals who are mentally and physically capable of returning to a normal life and, in some cases, earning a living if they could return to their homes and families.

Typical of the case of the "forgotten" veteran is Mr. Y. Diagnosed as a dementia praecox case, Mr. Y has been in a Veterans' Administration hospital since 1944, and during that time he has had but one visitor, an older brother. He has been on "full privileges" for a long time and works diligently at any treatment activity prescribed for him.

More than a year ago a trial visit to his home was recommended for him by the doctors at the hospital, but Mr. Y's relatives could not be persuaded to accept him, although the hospital and the patient have continued to write to them many times since then. His mother has written a few times, but the letters are gloomy and simply emphasize the fact that no one wants him. Despite such letters, Mr. Y still dreams of some day returning to his few acres of land where he can once again see his family and friends.

Then there is the case of Mr. X, a man of 58, who was admitted to a Veterans' Administration hospital in the fall of 1944. He was married and the father of several children. During the years he has been hospitalized, Mr. X has been ignored by his family. They have neither written to him nor visited him.

Sensitive about this disinterest on the part of his relatives, Mr. X has adopted a family. It consists of the ward physician, whom he foundly calls "Dad" or "Uncle George," and the social worker handling his case who is either "Baby" or "Baby Dear." If Mr. X doesn't see one member of his family every day, he becomes depressed and reveals his feeling of being unwanted.

Veterans' Administration hospital managers and staffs are generally in agreement that visits by relatives and friends to most of the forgotten men would have some therapeutic value. Here's what happened when the Veterans' Administration social worker in the hospital decided to do something about the situation.

At one large Veterans' Administration hospital where the survey on visits was made, a patient, who is always friendly to the hospital personnel, had seen no relatives since his admission to the hospital 12 years ago. The Veterans' Administration worker learned from him that he had a brother, and she began attempts to locate him. The brother was located in Florida and wrote to the patient, enclosing a $10 bank note. They exchanged photographs and letters. Hospital attachés said the patient valued the signature on his brother's first letter more than he did the money which had been sent to him.

At another Veterans' Administration hospital, where 600 of the 1,700 patients had not been visited in a year, a World War I veteran who had not had a visitor in 12 years, asked the social worker if it would not be possible to contact a relative or friend and request them to visit him. His case file showed his wife had divorced him and remarried. His three sons are grown, but the social worker located two of the sons in a nearby city. Their response was enthusiastic. One wrote immediately:

"I received your most welcome letter concerning my father. I have been led to believe that he remembers nothing or any person from his past. I have been told it would be useless to see him or write him. I will be there to visit him, Saturday, the 17th, in the morning."

When the son arrived, the ward doctor introduced father to son. The reunion, the doctor said, was truly heartwarming, and as a result of this first visit alone, the patient has made a better hospital adjustment.

In an attempt to interest families of patients in one VA hospital, the social-service department contacted the families of a selected group of 16 patients by mail or through the VA regional office. Fourteen families responded with visits.

As a result of the survey, Veterans' Administration announced it would intensify its efforts with the cooperation of the voluntary services committee at the hospital level with the objective of further stimulating the interest of families and friends in Veterans' Administration's forgotten men.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous material. He was informed by the Public Printer that the material in one of the extensions would exceed two pages of the RECORD at an estimated cost of $191.34, but was given permission to print it notwithstanding that fact.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and in one to include an appreciation of Gen. John Thomas Taylor by the National Tribune, and in another the speech made yesterday by Mme. Chiang Kai-shek.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include a letter and a newspaper article.

Mr. RIEHLMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and a letter.

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short resolution by North Dakota veterans.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JACOBS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by William Green at the centennial celebration of the birth of Samuel Gompers.

Mr. NORRELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Millard D. Gibbs entitled "Your President and Mine."

COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Friday and last Wednesday, I included tabulations of the cotton acreage allotments of 1942 compared with the cotton acreage allotments of 1950. I invite all of you who have any cotton problems to study carefully those tabulations. They show, for example, some of the counties—nearly 100 counties—have more acreage allotment than they did in 1942, whereas others have lost 80 percent or more of their allotment since 1942.

Some of our problems are very serious. I read from a letter which was written on January 3 by the Secretary of the county PMA committee of Smith County, in my district. This is what he says:

Number of genuine cotton farmers that will be forced to quit farming in Smith County, due to the 1950 cotton allotment formula—500.

That is, it is estimated Smith County, Tex., is going to lose about 500 farmers. Van Zandt County is perhaps losing 600 farmers. I quote one sentence:

The committee feels that approximately 600 farmers will be forced to quit farming because of the reduced cotton allotments.

We hear talk about full employment. If you think such conditions as these are going to be conducive to full employment, you have another think coming. I repeat what I have said before—unless this cotton acreage law is materially changed, there is to be serious difficulty in some sections. The Congress is going to hear a great deal about this. I do not refer to myself, but to the farmers in many of the cotton areas of this country.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., January 6, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: As requested in your letter of December 21, I am attaching a tabulation showing by Texas counties the estimated additional cotton-acreage allotment that would be required if present legislation were amended so that no 1950 farm allotment would be less than the larger of 70 percent of the 1946–48 average acreage actually planted as determined by the county committee, or 50 percent of the highest cotton acreage and war crop credits in the years 1946, 1947, and 1948. The summary also shows the estimated acreage allotment that farmers would willingly release to the county committee for reapportionment to other farms in the county if such authority was given the Secretary.

The tabulation shows the estimated additional acreage allotment that would be required if only the 70-percent plan was authorized and if only the 50-percent plan was authorized, in addition to the larger of the two plans.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

Proposed amendments to Public Law 272

County	Acres required			Estimated acres for relocation or reapportionment
	70-percent plan	50-percent plan	Higher of 70 to 50 percent	
Anderson	2,892	4,401	4,540	250
Andrews	114	148	198	
Angelina	196	127	223	200
Aransas	38	1	39	30
Archer	114	148	198	0
Armstrong	70	43	75	60
Atascosa	1,288	3,371	3,715	600
Austin	1,712	515	1,814	700
Bailey	2,020	4,997	5,665	0
Bastrop	1,471	1,548	2,229	680
Baylor	1,048	446	1,231	0
Bee	1,569	4,911	4,911	200
Bell	13,306	2,342	13,405	400
Bexar	582	1,468	1,627	300
Blanco		59	59	167
Borden				100
Bosque	963	934	1,260	250
Bowie	2,192	1,270	2,240	400
Brazoria	2,109	973	1,900	450
Brazos	324	84	328	1,500
Briscoe	400	800	1,000	
Brooks		169	169	500
Brown	891	1,533	1,736	300
Burleson	1,246	343	1,276	150
Burnet	1,053	1,619	1,902	1,165
Caldwell	3,029	1,288	3,492	1,000
Calhoun	675	152	725	800
Callahan	948	2,296	2,487	100
Cameron	6,081	148	6,219	0
Camp	57	104	104	1,500
Cass	996	1,148	1,615	750
Castro	383	1,895	1,935	700
Chambers	8	109	111	65

Proposed amendments to Public Law 272—Continued

County	Acres required			Estimated acres for relocation or reapportionment
	70-percent plan	50-percent plan	Higher of 70 to 50 percent	
Cherokee	241	1,771	1,844	285
Childress	1,996	3,882	4,444	0
Clay	3,913	3,648	5,055	500
Cochran	25	703	728	0
Coke	2,702	1,913	3,795	0
Coleman	3,003	12,405	12,609	100
Collin	12,097	4,025	12,717	1,000
Collingsworth	3,496	1,622	3,963	500
Colorado	1,439	1,205	1,908	1,564
Comal	149	163	168	200
Comanche	372	1,635	1,689	125
Concho	965	2,050	2,295	100
Cooke	1,420	1,867	2,220	500
Coryell	977	1,440	1,861	100
Cottle	37	-------	37	0
Crockett	-------	-------	-------	0
Crosby	884	3,989	4,374	100
Dallas	3,410	2,612	5,053	450
Dawson	154	-------	154	1,000
Deaf Smith	69	250	265	500
Delta	322	103	413	146
Denton	5,178	3,795	6,003	400
De Witt	2,965	2,252	3,699	600
Dickens	780	401	970	100
Dimmit	75	83	83	0
Donley	3,058	1,675	3,596	250
Duval	976	390	1,025	0
Eastland	638	1,116	1,144	150
Ector	41	38	48	0
Ellis	4,050	558	4,166	350
El Paso	380	0	380	0
Erath	238	2,591	2,591	200
Falls	4,225	891	4,347	3,000
Fannin	8,582	1,428	8,687	2,000
Fayette	1,633	645	1,847	500
Fisher	2,759	4,215	4,886	300
Floyd	6,458	8,483	10,245	-------
Foard	2,055	769	2,273	275
Fort Bend	651	285	785	4,200
Franklin	877	651	988	175
Freestone	703	572	863	1,500
Frio	168	180	241	0
Gaines	1,665	3,902	4,172	150
Galveston	-------	-------	-------	-------
Garza	225	267	422	0
Gillespie	-------	253	253	350
Glasscock	21	1,210	1,210	30
Goliad	1,066	1,446	1,827	700
Gonzales	2,378	2,089	3,118	2,500
Gray	137	649	649	75
Grayson	5,140	3,071	6,183	750
Gregg	7	17	24	100
Grimes	905	867	1,220	1,000
Guadalupe	3,244	1,529	3,813	3,000
Hale	5,702	8,876	10,074	2,000
Hall	286	55	331	0
Hamilton	1,186	3,041	3,114	100
Hardeman	1,694	552	1,892	0
Hardin	0	0	0	30
Harris	160	407	488	800
Harrison	749	768	1,214	1,000
Haskell	850	1,222	1,654	1,000
Hays	842	359	924	475
Hemphill	26	274	289	16
Henderson	599	3,404	3,454	0
Hidalgo	2,576	2,570	4,663	250
Hill	4,816	322	4,920	200
Hockley	20	60	80	100
Hood	622	784	1,093	100
Hopkins	2,984	1,801	3,310	300
Houston	1,112	1,885	2,312	1,542
Howard	272	26	287	500
Hudspeth	110	12	110	0
Hunt	8,855	1,648	9,657	500
Irion	223	95	223	143
Jack	312	533	583	550
Jackson	574	941	1,081	1,800
Jasper	11	17	22	300
Jefferson	-------	122	122	50
Jim Hogg	147	506	530	25
Jim Wells	2,743	6,148	6,957	1,100
Johnson	2,632	2,165	4,077	100
Jones	4,552	3,161	5,855	300
Karnes	7,240	5,649	9,266	500
Kaufman	6,922	1,285	6,937	150
Kendall	0	0	0	0
Kenedy	-------	-------	-------	0
Kent	473	837	1,003	0
Kimble	1	112	112	100
King	-------	-------	-------	71
Kleberg	1,020	1,530	1,665	25
Knox	1,501	479	1,877	0
Lamar	2,412	490	2,438	-------
Lamb	3,502	3,302	5,391	200
Lampasas	80	766	766	500
La Salle	350	284	400	100
Lavaca	1,333	187	1,389	350
Lee	907	1,795	2,171	500
Leon	1,761	1,708	2,151	120

Proposed amendments to Public Law 272—Continued

County	Acres required			Estimated acres for relocation or reapportionment
	70-percent plan	50-percent plan	Higher of 70 to 50 percent	
Liberty	263	118	278	150
Limestone	2,430	190	2,528	1,000
Live Oak	2,769	3,067	4,052	1,600
Llano	31	210	210	-------
Loving	13	2	13	0
Lubbock	1,858	199	2,062	100
Lynn	5,029	685	5,517	500
McCulloch	2,512	8,058	8,414	150
McLennan	4,318	537	4,455	0
McMullen	464	441	566	200
Madison	242	154	304	400
Marion	25	76	86	125
Martin	72	21	88	0
Mason	88	600	600	25
Matagorda	729	375	912	300
Maverick	619	413	806	100
Medina	-------	71	71	50
Menard	392	554	588	-------
Midland	400	800	1,000	-------
Milam	3,505	470	3,570	200
Mills	101	497	541	100
Mitchell	1,038	428	1,461	0
Montague	1,664	1,805	2,299	750
Montgomery	22	94	100	265
Morris	249	249	655	500
Motley	547	538	917	120
Nacogdoches	1,146	1,598	1,839	437
Navarro	5,602	1,065	5,887	1,000
Newton	14	38	48	40
Nolan	2,747	676	2,872	250
Nueces	11,114	5,368	12,384	0
Palo Pinto	336	443	513	400
Panola	515	1,396	1,570	150
Parker	80	515	520	100
Parmer	38	390	390	1,500
Pecos	72	1,857	1,913	-------
Polk	103	321	340	40
Presidio	228	478	694	30
Rains	1,588	1,263	2,005	0
Reagan	-------	98	98	0
Red River	3,349	1,163	3,571	100
Reeves	396	1,211	1,343	0
Refugio	1,875	1,325	2,172	200
Robertson	3,131	2,072	3,636	1,933
Rockwall	191	5	191	100
Runnels	5,371	6,330	9,472	300
Rusk	639	933	1,364	75
Sabine	196	157	240	100
San Augustine	347	269	443	0
San Jacinto	107	84	145	0
San Patricio	3,836	1,385	4,063	50
San Saba	948	2,296	2,487	100
Schleicher	635	352	771	0
Scurry	2,495	739	2,554	125
Shackelford	531	1,099	1,145	50
Shelby	781	676	995	125
Smith	319	680	829	1,000
Somervell	123	568	568	200
Starr	861	2,281	2,353	90
Stephens	96	514	514	25
Sterling	-------	39	39	0
Stonewall	2,789	1,571	3,295	300
Swisher	952	4,018	4,138	500
Tarrant	2,539	1,634	2,962	200
Taylor	4,036	9,844	10,000	115
Terrell	0	0	0	0
Terry	1,556	6,195	6,220	200
Throckmorton	502	860	990	50
Titus	451	461	686	250
Tom Green	1,296	2,273	2,730	100
Travis	2,523	399	2,591	2,000
Trinity	627	1,316	1,442	70
Tyler	10	0	10	100
Upshur	85	202	230	1,500
Uvalde	-------	203	203	0
Van Zandt	3,212	1,821	3,604	1,000
Victoria	1,359	514	1,583	0
Walker	765	447	888	300
Waller	407	379	496	850
Ward	767	169	802	1,180
Washington	1,970	617	2,014	2,500
Webb	31	600	600	275
Wharton	4,298	1,880	5,098	1,000
Wheeler	3,338	4,248	5,147	4,000
Wichita	673	702	1,089	325
Wilbarger	2,534	594	2,730	400
Willacy	1,906	43	1,949	0
Williamson	3,391	161	3,406	0
Wilson	1,288	3,372	3,760	400
Wise	241	1,902	1,902	750
Wood	270	795	806	500
Yoakum	673	702	1,089	325
Young	782	2,075	2,185	150
Zapata	15	248	264	1,300
Zavala	103	768	768	1,600
Total	343,960	302,523	508,398	97,034

Please note the letters I am including:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Tyler, Tex., January 3, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of a few days ago, in which you requested information relative to the cotton allotment situation in Smith County, the following is submitted:

1. 1942 Smith County cotton allotment: 58,000 acres.

2. Number of acres we would have to redistribute, if the unused 1950 allotment could be used: It is estimated that about 1,000 acres would be released by farmers for redistribution.

3. Number of acres that would come from genuine cotton farmers who cannot continue to farm because of too little acreage: It is doubtful if any acres would be released by such farmers, as they would merely reduce the number of tenants on the farm, so that a reasonable crop could be had by each tenant.

4. War crop credit: Smith County would receive about 3,000 additional acres if this credit were granted.

5. Number of genuine cotton farmers that will be forced to quit farming in Smith County due to the 1950 cotton allotment formula (including tenants): It is estimated that at least 500 will be forced off of farms due to insufficient cotton acreage.

Hoping this to be the desired information, and should additional information be needed don't fail to call on us.

For the county committee:

DAN G. OWEN,
Secretary, Smith County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Tyler, Tex., January 3, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of December 29, 1949, in which you made inquiry relative to the number of acres available for allotting to new cotton farms the following information is submitted:

1. Number of acres available for new farms: 600.

2. Number of farmers that have requested this acreage: 250.

3. Number of cotton farms requesting this acreage: 250.

The number of farmers and farms requesting this 600 acres are figures as of today. It is expected by the dead-line date from 500 to 1,000 farms and farmers will have made application for a part of this allotment set aside for new farms.

Yours very truly,

DAN G. OWEN,
Secretary, Smith County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Tyler, Tex., January 6, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH:
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of January 3, 1950, this is to inform you that the county committee of Smith County did set aside a reserve for those farms that were not eligible for cotton allotments, due to lack of cotton or war crop history during the years of 1948, 1947, or 1946. Inasmuch as the total allotment granted this county was only 14,510 acres, the reserves set aside for upward adjustments on hardship cases, cor-

rections of errors, lates, and for new farms are very small.

In Smith County there were 2,190 known cotton farms eligible to share in the regular allotment. In Smith County there are about 5,600 farms, which means that approximately 3,400 farms were not eligible to share in the regular allotment.

Prior to the war about 3,600 farms grew cotton in Smith County and planted yearly about 56,000 acres.

Your question as to the number of old farms and new farms that are making application for the reserves set aside for farms not eligible for regular allotments is not clear; however, it is estimated that by the final date for making such application at least 500 to 1,000 farms will have applied for a part of the reserve set aside for new-grower allotments.

The total reserve set aside in Smith County was 1,616 acres; of this 438 acres were used to adjust upward hardship cases whose allotment was from 5 to 15 acres, 570 acres were used to adjust upward hardship cases whose allotment was 15 acres and above. This left only 608 acres for those that may apply as new-grower farms. One hundred and one acres were reserved to take care of lates and for correction of errors.

Trusting this to be the desired information, I am

Sincerely,

DAN G. OWEN,
Secretary, Smith County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Canton, Tex., January 3, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: The county committee would like to make the following answers to your recent questions regarding the cotton allotment in Van Zandt County.

1. Total 1942 cotton allotment: 84,580 acres.

2. Total 1950 cotton allotment: 36,388.9 acres.

3. Distribution of unused acreage—The county committee feels that unless some special incentive be given for release of unused acreage prior provision would only release approximately 300 acres for redistribution. They feel that too many farmers will hold their allotments hoping to be able to rent them until it is too late to do anyone much good. If a special incentive such as credit for cotton history were given to the person releasing the acreage and this was done early enough, a considerable acreage would be released. Approximately 700 acres.

4. The committee feels that approximately six hundred farmers will be forced to quit farming because of the reduced cotton allotments. We also know that there will be several hundred others who will be forced to rent other farms with small allotments or no allotments at all. They will be forced to divert their acreage from cotton to some other cash crop. This of course will be truck crops in this area and you can imagine what will happen to the market for these crops due to the increased production all over east Texas.

5. War-crop credit: In 1945, 785 farms received credit for 577.4 acres war crops and 69 farms received credit for 905.7 acres GI credits. In 1946, 908 farms received credit for 7,019.3 acres war crops and 40 farms received credit for 552.9 acres GI credits. In 1947, 933 farms received credit for 7,625.1 acres war crops and 24 farms received credit for 250.3 acres of GI credits.

We have been told that our county allotment was figured by taking 95 percent of the 1947–48 average cotton acreage. If our 1947 war crop and GI credits were added to our 1947 cotton acreage and the procedure followed our allotment would be increased by approximately 3,740 acres. This of course would help, but would on an average increase cotton allotments at the rate of only 2 acres per 100 acres of crop land. It would help the county as a whole, but the individual farmer would scarcely realize that he had received any increase.

6. The committee feels that approximately 600 farmers will be forced to quit because of decreased cotton acreage; they also feel that several hundred more will be forced to divert to other crops, causing over-production of these crops.

7. The county reserves of new-grower farms is 427.7 acres. We are sure that at least 500 farmers will make application for new-grower allotments. You can see from this that only a token allotment can be given to these farmers.

The committee feels that the individual farm allotment in the county should have been set by the same procedure that the county allotment was set. That is, a percentage of cotton history instead of a percentage of cropland. They feel that a limit of not over 40 percent of cropland in cotton should have been added to the law as they know that no farmer in this county needs or wants more than 40 percent of his land in cotton each year. They feel that the allotments set up in east Texas on a percentage of cropland figure were not only harmful, but ridiculous. Adjoining counties in the blackland and in west Texas got more than they expected or needed while we were cut almost below the point where we can exist and counties joining us on the east and south were cut clear out of the cotton business. We do not believe that this was the intention of Congress or that it is the purpose of the marketing quota program.

R. W. BROWN,
NED L. CHEATHAM,
J. M. STEPHENS,
County Committee,
Van Zandt County PMA.
JAMES C. HODGE,
Secretary, Van Zandt County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Gilmer, Tex., January 3, 1950.

Hon. Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is in answer to your letter dated December 29, 1949.

The county committee set aside 250 acres out of the original allotment of 8,843 acres, for new growers. However, the total allotment for the county finally was 10,173.5 acres compared to 31,300 planted acreage in 1941 on 2,744 farms. Allotments were set up on 1,438 farms in 1950. These are farms that either grew cotton or war crops in 1946, 1947, and 1948 out of a total of 3,459 farms for Upshur County.

According to our records that were obtained from farmers in the spring of 1949 we have 211 farms that grew cotton in 1949 for the first time in several years and for that reason, according to the law, no cotton allotments were set up for these farms. To date, we do not have forms to take application for new growers' allotment. We are of the opinion that most of the farmers who grew cotton for the first time in 1949 will want a cotton allotment for 1950 and no doubt there will be farmers that have not grown cotton since 1941, 1942, or 1943. Compared to the number of allotments set up for 1950 and the number of farms which grew cotton in 1941, the acreages for Upshur County are out of line.

According to reports in newspapers, I have noticed that a bill is planned to be introduced in Congress, whereby no farm would get less than 70 percent of the average acreage grown on the farm in the years 1946, 1947, and 1948, or 50 percent of the highest acreage in either of the above 3 years whichever is the largest. This provision will not help this country but a very little; because we had to adjust the reported acreages that the farmers reported to this office downward so much to come within the acreage given by the so-called BAE figures.

The following is how the reported acreage compared with the acreages given for each of the years by BAE:

	Acres
1946:	
Farmers reported	9,998
BAE acreages	3,880
Difference in acreage	6,118
1947:	
Farmers reported	12,095
BAE acreages	6,150
Difference in acreage	5,945
1948:	
Farmers reported	13,113
BAE acreages	8,850
Difference in acreage	4,263

You can readily see that where these acreages were adjusted down to within the figures given by BAE, we did not have very much acreages left. We did not think and still do not think that the farmers made that big a mistake in reporting the acres of cotton grown in the county.

The cotton allotment for this county is so small that it is going to be hard for many farmers to get financial help from banks or other loan agencies. Numbers are coming in daily saying that they cannot possibly get by on the allotment set up for them. Also, numbers of owners are telling their tenants they will have to find another place if they want to farm as they will be unable to furnish them money on the small acreage given to their farm.

The people are looking to you, as their Congressman for relief of some kind in this cotton acreage allotment for 1950. We think something has got to be done, and at once to relieve the tight situation in regards to 1950 cotton allotments. We are looking to you to help correct whatever it takes to make things better for the cotton farmers in Upshur County.

If I, or this office can be of any further help, please advise.

Thanking you.

Very truly yours,

LEWIS E. STRACENER, Jr.,
Administration Officer,
Upshur County, PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Gilmer, Tex., January 4, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Yours of December 31, 1949, received. War crop credits given Upshur County farmers for 1946 was 3,426 acres and 1947 was 3,164 acres.

The mentioned "dead acreage" referred to, we estimate will yield about 1,500 acres if the ones holding the allotment will release it. And further, there are more people coming back to the farm than we first estimated, and our reserve of 250 acres for new farms is not sufficient to give anything like a substantial allotment.

It looks now like there will be about 200 new farms asking for some acreage; also, looks like we will need 2,000 acres to take care of war crop credit and new farms.

Very truly yours,

W. B. HOLLINSHEAD,
R. L. WHITE,
E. C. PALMER,
Members of Upshur County PMA Committee.

GILMER, TEX., *October 27, 1949.*

To: Hon. Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of of United States Department of Agriculture.

From: Upshur County PMA Committee.

Subject: Consideration of an increase in cotton acreage allotments for 1950 in east Texas area.

1. We would appreciate very much, when county cotton acreage allotments are set up, that special consideration be given this east Texas area, due to the fact, in war years most of the young men were drafted into the armed services, since they could not have the necessary 20 war units which were necessary for deferment, due to most farms being small.

2. Therefore, when these boys were drafted off the farms, most farms went out of cotton production, due to the overage of parents left to do farm work, being 60 or more years of age, not much cotton farming was done during these years, after their sons were taken into armed services. Now some of these farms are wanting cotton acreage.

3. In areas where farming operations were on a larger scale, like in west Texas, most boys had the 20 war units to get deferments.

4. We as a county committee would like to see that the farmers of this area get a fair share of the cotton acreage allotment. We feel that the figures given this county to adjust down to, was not a fair acreage. We think more acreages of cotton were actually grown in these years, than those supposed to have been given by BAE.

W. B. HOLLINSHEAD,
R. L. WHITE,
E. C. PALMER,
Members, Upshur County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., December 16, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will acknowledge your letters of October 28 and November 5 with which you enclosed certain correspondence regarding the establishment of county cotton acreage allotments, especially in Upshur County.

Section 344 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, including amendments made by Public Laws 272 and 439, Eighty-first Congress, reads as follows:

"SEC. 344. (c) The national acreage allotments for cotton for the years 1950 and 1951 shall be apportioned to the States on the basis of a national acreage allotment base of 22,500,000 acres, computed and adjusted as follows:

"(1) The average of the planted acreages (including acreage regarded as planted under the provisions of Public Law 12, 79th Cong.) in the States for the years 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1948 shall constitute the national base; except that in the case of any State having a 1948 planted cotton acreage of over 1,000,000 acres and less than 50 percent of the 1943 allotment, the average of the acreage planted (or regarded as planted under Public Law 12, 79th Cong.) for the years 1944, 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1948 shall constitute the base for such State and shall be included in computing the national base; to this is to be added (A) the estimated additional acreage for each State required for small farm allotments under subsection (f) (1) of this section; (B) the acreage required as a result of the State adjustment provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection; (C) the additional acreage required to determine a total national allotment base of 22,500,000 acres, which additional acreage shall be distributed on a proportionate basis among States receiving no adjustment under paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the acreage allotment base for 1950 and 1951 for any State (on the basis of a national acreage allotment base of 22,500,000 acres) shall not be less than the larger of (1) 95 percent of the average acreage actually planted to cotton in the State during the years 1947 and 1948, or (2) 85 percent of the acreage planted to cotton in the State in 1948.

"(3) If the national acreage allotment for 1950 and 1951 is more or less than 22,500,000 acres, horizontal adjustments shall be made percentagewise by States so as to reflect the ratio of the national acreage allotment for 1950 and 1951 to 22,500,000 acres."

In applying the above formula for establishing State cotton acreage allotments, Texas received its share of the national allotment base of 22,500,000 acres on the basis of 95 percent of the average acreage actually planted to cotton in 1947 and 1948. On this basis it also received its share of the national allotment of 21,000,000 acres for 1950.

Section 344 (e) of the act provides that the State acreage allotment, less a reserve not to exceed 10 percent, shall be apportioned to counties on the same basis as to years and conditions that the State receives its allotment. Accordingly, the counties in Texas will receive their initial allotments based on 95 percent of the 1947–1948 average acreage actually planted to cotton in the county.

Therefore, under the provisions of sections 344 (c) (2) and 344 (e) of the Act, war crop and armed forces credits determined under Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress, and Public Law 272, Eighty-first Congress, were not included in the cotton acreage history in determining the State and county allotments.

The State committee may use the State acreage reserve to adjust (1) for trends in acreage, (2) for counties adversely affected by abnormal conditions affecting plantings, and (3) for small or new farms.

In view of the fact that you have presented this matter to the Texas State PMA committee for their consideration we are sure they will give it proper consideration insofar as legislation and facts will support.

We regret that we cannot comply with your request for a representative of the Department to visit you in Texas at this time; however, the volume of work in the Cotton Branch in connection with allotments precludes it. Perhaps Mr. B. F. Vance, chairman, Texas State PMA committee could send someone to assist you if you so requested him.

Sincerely yours,
K. T. HUTCHINSON,
Assistant Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Quitman, Tex., January 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Third District, Texas,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is in regard to both of your letters, dated December 29, 1949, and December 30, 1949.

Wood County reserved 300 acres for both old cotton farms, which have not grown cotton in several years, and new farms.

Approximately 30 producers have let it be known that they are interested in securing a new grower allotment for 1950. We are unable to determine the exact number because a date will be set, I am sure, by the State PMA committee, at which time applications for new grower allotments will be filed.

We could not reserve any more than 300 acres for the above type of farms without hurting the old grower.

Hoping the above is the desired information, I am

Yours very truly,
ROY E. BARNETT,
Secretary, Wood County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Pittsburg, Tex., January 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: With reference to your letter dated December 23, 1949, we hereby give the following information:

Our records show that the 1942 cotton allotment for Camp County was 16,307 acres compared to slightly over 6,900 acres for 1950.

If it was possible to distribute the unused 1950 alloted acres we feel that we could possibly distribute 1,500 acres. However, due to the disturbance among the cotton farmers as to the cotton history and other factors pertaining to cotton allotments, it is not possible to know how many would be willing to risk giving up their allotment or a part thereof for redistribution.

The acres we estimate that might be unused and redistributed would not come from any genuine cotton farmers in the county.

Our records show that Camp county as a whole has 1,491 acres of war crop credits of which we estimate 1,000 acres will be added to the county if credits given.

We estimate that approximately 75 genuine cotton farmers might be compelled to cease to farm under the 1950 allotment formula.

Very truly yours,
JAMES C. DAVIS,
Chairman, Camp County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Longview, Tex., January 6, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: With reference to your letter of January 3, 1950, we would like to give you the following acreage reserves for Gregg County, Tex. We have a total of 146 acres to be divided among the old cotton farms which have not been growing cotton recently and the new cotton growers. We believe that approximately 50 to 100 farmers in this classification will make an application for some of this acreage.

Yours truly,
J. W. BULLOCK,
Secretary, Gregg County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Henderson, Tex., January 4, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
United States Congressman,
Third District,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This in in reply to your letters of December 23, 29, and 30, 1949 requesting information on the 1950 cotton allotment situation in Rusk County.

There was set up in this county a reserve of 1,349.7 acres to distribute the new growers. We now estimate that between nine hundred and one thousand farmers will request this acreage. The demand for farms with any kind of cotton allotment is enormous.

We estimate that there will be approximately two hundred farms with two or more tenants and only enough cotton allotment for one of them. Also, there probably will be over one hundred farms with one tenant, who will be forced to cease farming under the present 1950 allotment formula.

Texas probably has enough acres if it could be redistributed more equitably between counties and also within the county.

Trusting this information will be of use to you and with best wishes, we are,

Respectfully yours,

E. D. MANSINGER, *Chairman,*
Rusk County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Henderson, Tex., January 6, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
United States Congressman, Third District, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in connection with any proposed legislation to correct inequalities of the 1950 cotton allotment procedure.

It has been proposed that allotments be figured on a basis of 70 percent of the average planted acres on a farm for 1946, 1947, and 1948. Since all counties were required to adjust the total planted acre history downward for these 3 years to the level set by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the procedure adopted by most counties was to make a downward adjustment to an individual farm on only 2 years out of the 3 basic years. In that way the farm would receive an allotment of either the highest planted year or the county factor, whichever the smaller, and would not be penalized by any arbitrary adjustment by the county committee. In many instances a drastic adjustment was made in the reported acreage on a farm for 1 or 2 years, while leaving the high year as it was reported.

Now the point we wish to make is that any average of these 3 years, as adjusted, is not the average farm history and in most cases would lower the present allotment to a farm. Furthermore, the farmers were advised by us that any arbitrary adjustment (of which he was advised) in only one or two of the base years would not effect any cotton allotment he might receive. Any amendment to the law based on the above procedure would not afford any relief to this county, would be difficult to administer and would cause a real hardship to many producers as well as this county committee.

It is our opinion that the war crop credit for a county should be added to the cotton history for those years. Under the present system of allocation to the counties, it would give us about 2,000 acres additional allotment. That increase, together with a flexible system of recalling "frozen" acres on farms going out of the cotton business, would enable us to set up reasonable allotments to all cotton farms.

Respectfully yours,

E. D. MANSINGER,
Rusk County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Pittsburg, Tex., January 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: The Camp County PMA committee reserved 100 acres from the county acreage allotment which are available to distribute to new cotton farms in the county. About 45 cotton farmers have requested this acreage for 36 farms through owners and operators.

Regarding your letter of December 30, 1949, in which you quoted a letter in part from Mr. B. F. Vance, State director, PMA, College Station, the county committee has received a portion of the total county allotment for use in establishing 1950 allotments for those farms that were not eligible for regular allotments as stated in Mr. Vance's letter; however, this reserve, according to our understanding, is only for the new-grower farms—the 100 acres mentioned.

The committee has reserved 72 acres to be used on late reported and reconstituted farms. There is no reserve for any farm other than the ones mentioned above since a farm would either come under the category of a regular, late, or reconstituted, or a new grower which had planted no cotton in the base years 1946, 1947, and 1948.

About 50 farmers have requested additional acres on the 42 regular cotton farms.

If we can be of any further assistance, please call on us.

Very truly yours,

ELBERT O. DISMAN,
Secretary, Camp County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Marshall, Tex., January 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I would like to reply to your letter of December 23, 1949, on cotton allotments with answers to each question in sequence.

The 1942 Harrison County allotment was 75,000 acres. We believe if we could distribute the unused 1950 allotment we would have 1,500 to 2,000 acres to distribute.

If we can allot unused acres not many genuine cotton farmers would have to abandon farming although some larger farms might drop some tenants before their allotments are corrected.

War crop credits in this county amounted to approximately 2,000 acres.

Under the 1950 allotment formula up to 300 and 400 farmers will be forced to cease farming as their acreage is too small to obtain credit.

The Negro farmers with large families on farms with 20 to 50 acres of cropland are the hardest hit by this method of calculating allotments.

Yours very truly,

WALCOTT S. BLACK,
Administrative Officer,
Harrison County PMA.

MARSHALL NEWS MESSENGER,
Marshall, Tex., January 4, 1950.

The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: We have made a study of the cotton-acreage situation in Harrison County, in answer to your query, and find these answers:

(a) County allotment in 1942, 75,000 acres.

(b) Additional acres for distribution, 2,000 the first week, and upward from there, according to the county PMA supervisor.

(c) Of this amount, how many from genuine cotton farmers no longer able to operate, a sizable fraction, but no guess possible as yet.

(d) War-crop credit about 2,000 acres. However, the PMA supervisor feels this was included in the county's quota of 24,839 acres.

(e) How many farmers may be compelled to cease farming—an estimated 300 to 400 families.

I hope this gives you the requested information.

Sincerely,

MAX S. LALE.

Mr. Speaker, I enclose at this point a news item which appeared in the Marshall News Messenger, January 4, 1950:

PMA OFFICIAL SAYS HUNDREDS OF FAMILIES TO BE DRIVEN OFF THE LAND BY COTTON ALLOTMENTS

(By Max S. Lale)

A minor revolution is in the making for Harrison County's whole farm economy.

Its outlines are being sketched in by disgruntled cotton farmers keeping up a steady traffic into the offices of the Production and Marketing Administration.

This minor revolution is a creature of the Federal Government's new cotton allotment scheme which Harrison County farmers approved, in company with cotton growers in other parts of the country, by decisive margins last month.

One of the most serious consequences of the scheme is that as many as 400 families, and possibly more, may be driven from the land.

It is not taking place, however, without vigorous protest.

For 3 weeks, a steady stream of cotton farmers, most of them Negroes and almost all of them tenants, has eddied into the PMA office, protesting reduced acreage allotments.

The new cotton scheme sets county acreage totals. The total for Harrison County is 24,839, a reduction of approximately 5,000 acres from the 1949 planting.

The difficulty is in the scheme's application to individual farms. It comes about because of the way in which the acreage allowable is determined.

ACREAGE PLAN

The Department of Agriculture says that the acreage shall be 16.27 percent of the crop land in the farm, or the highest number of acres planted to cotton in any one of the years 1946, 1947, or 1948, whichever is the smaller.

On large farms, where there has been steadily high acreage planted to cotton, the allotment is working out satisfactorily. It's the small tracts, where plantings have been small during the three base years, which are giving the trouble. Take this case:

A Negro family has been living on a tract of family size.. The husband has been working part time at a sawmill, and one or more of the sons has been working in town or going to school under th GI bill. The family worked a few acres of cotton, more out of tradition than as a means of making the family living.

Now, the GI school money is about exhausted, something happens to one of the jobs. The family decides cotton is the answer. But there isn't enough acreage to make a living.

Multiply this by four or five, as in the case of large farms occupied by a number of tenant families. Their owners are telling the PMA that there just won't be enough acreage to support all the families. Some of them will have to go.

SMALL TRACTS

Another difficulty is trying to consolidate small tracts with reduced acreage into a feasible operation for one tenant family. A few acres here, a few more there—whether a family can be secured to work the tracts is the problem.

These are some of the situations which W. S. Black, PMA supervisor in the county, says will force three or four hundred families off the land.

The result of such a migration will be felt in every part of the country's life. It will mean reduced farm values. It will mean reduced taxes. It will mean less farm production and less money in trade channels. And it will mean, in all probability, an increased charity burden.

As a result of fragmentary allocations which will be wasted by not being planted, the county's total acreage probably will be well below the figure set for the county.

CAN'T REDISTRIBUTE

PMA officials had hoped that they would be allowed to redistribute unused acreage. But that has been ruled out, at least for the time being.

The PMA supervisor says he could find 2,000 acres in a week, if they'd let him. "The figure goes from there on up," he adds.

And what if a disgruntled farmer decides he doesn't want any part of the scheme?

First off, the county committee will set a penalty average of lint production, and the farmer will be charged this penalty average on all cotton raised in excess of authorized allotments. He must pay this fine, in cash, or it becomes a first lien on his entire crop.

Furthermore, even with payment of the penalty, he is ineligible for support payments, and must sell his entire production on the open market. He can't even do this unless he pays his fine, for the ginner will require PMA certificates before he gins the cotton.

The whole system is virtually escape-proof. For many families caught in sharply restricted acreage allotments, it means economic eviction from their homes.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Groveton, Tex., December 30, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Gilmer, Tex.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: We have your letter of December 23, 1949, related to cotton allotments in Trinity County.

The 1942 cotton allotment was 15,062.7 acres. Of this amount 8,995 was planted on 1,104 farms.

If we could distribute unused acres this would not help much, because tenants from other farms are trying to rent surplus cotton acres on all farms. Landlords and operators would not release many acres because of the possible effect on future allotments. We have 175 acres to be used on farms that have no allotments and have had at least 325 applications for these acres. Most of these applicants are producers that shifted during the war to other crops and livestock. If something is not done at least 20 or 30 veterans will have to leave the farm along with others. Some of these boys bought tractors and farms and started in the spring of 1949.

If we received war-crop credits an additional 853 acres would be given to our county.

In 1942 we had 1,400 farms growing cotton as compared to 516 farms receiving allotments under the new law. You can see from these figures what the cotton situation is in our county.

We hope something can be done. If farmers lose their buying power we are right back where we were after the First World War. We hope you might be able to help change the present allotment laws.

Please call on us any time this office can be of help to you.

Very truly yours,
DAVID C. BAILEY,
Chairman, Trinity County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Hemphill, Tex., January 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: In answer to your questionnaire of December 23, 1949, the following information can be furnished:

The official cotton allotment for Sabine County was 2,920 acres.

Final allotment was 3,272.7 acres.

If we could distribute the unused 1950 allotment in this county we would gain approximately 100 acres. Very little of this would come from genuine cotton farmers who could not continue to farm because of small allotments, but from small farms being taken out of cultivation.

The type of war-crop credits being talked about would probably help this county very little.

Probably 12 families may be compelled to cease cotton farming because of allotments. Most of these will be tenants.

What this county needs is additional acreage for establishing allotments on new farms having operators who have been released from wartime jobs and having no other ready means of livelihood. We have only 115.3 acres for the purpose, and approximately 200 farmers have requested this acreage on that many farms.

There are also many GI's who were not operators of farms when called into service because they were still unmarried boys with no family responsibilities.

These boys were able to purchase farms in 1948 and 1949 and are now able to cultivate them.

Because of acreage history they can get no cotton, except new allotments. Can they be helped?

Thanks for your interest.

Yours truly,
HARRIS H. MINTON,
Secretary, Sabine County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Palestine, Tex., January 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congressman, Third District, Texas,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: In reply to your inquiry of December 23, 1949, relating to 195 cotton acreage allotments, we submit the following:

The 1942 cotton acreage allotment for Anderson County was 46,182.3.

We estimate the unused acreage allotment at 1,000 acres that could be released and would be released for redistribution provided history be retained so as not to affect future allotments of the farm releasing same. We estimate that none of this released acreage will come from genuine cotton farmers.

The genuine cotton farmer regardless of his allotment will prefer to retain it, large or small.

We estimate the number of tenants in our county displaced on account of the small-acreage formula at 400. We feel our farmers cannot complain about war-crop credits. The individual farms got credit, but our county did not. Our county had allotted 12,630 acres for 1950 cotton. This amount included war-crop credits.

We estimate approximately 5,000 of this acreage was allotted to peanut growers and came off the regular cotton growers acreage. This 12,630 acres had to be allotted to 121,446 acres of cropland. This of course caused the county to get a low factor. Our factor is .0955.

It all sums up to this: the allotment was based on the BAE estimated acres 1946, 1947, and 1948. Since the war began and on through this period our farmers grew peas, melons, tomatoes, and other crops instead of cotton.

We want to assure you we appreciate your interest and assure you if we can be of further assistance we will expect you to call on us.

We are sending a copy of this to our Congressman, TOM PICKETT.

Yours very truly,
A. LEE PRICE,
RAY GRASTY,
CLARENCE CHAMBERS,
Anderson County Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Huntsville, Tex., January 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The cotton acreage allotment to Walker County in 1942 was 20,604 acres. For 1950, 7,023 acres. If we could distribute the unused 1950 allotment, we would have approximately 300 acres. None of this unused acreage will come from genuine cotton farmers but will come from cattlemen who have rented, leased, or purchased farms which were eligible for allotments. Since the allotments are made to the farm and not to the individual, there are many landlords who will have to let their tenants go because the allotments are not large enough to support all, and cotton is the only cash crop in our county. There will be approximately 150 tenants compelled to leave the farms because of too little acreage. Our allotments were based on 15 percent of the cropland, limited by the highest planted in 1946, 1947, or 1948. This is about half of what the average cotton grower would plant to cotton, under normal conditions.

We have 600 acres available to new cotton farms in Walker County and applications from 400 farms requesting an allotment.

Thanking you for your interest, I remain,

Sincerely yours,
SETH W. DORRELL,
Chairman, Walker County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Groveton, Tex., January 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress, Third District, Texas,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH: This is with reference to your letter of inquiry, date of December 12, 1949, on the cotton situation in Trinity County. We have 175 acres of cotton to be distributed to new grower cotton farms. To date there has been at least 320 applicants for this acreage. The applicants for the acreage are from farmers who shifted during the war to other crops, and GI's returning from the war. A few of the applicants, approximately six or eight, are people who have been working in defense industry, but have returned to the farm because they are too old and are being laid off from work, due to their age.

Several applicants are tenants from the farm having allotments so low the landlord will work the entire crop of cotton: example, tenant owning 80 acres of land, approximately 45 acres in cultivation, has worked peanuts (for market) and cotton on the adjoining farms for the years 1946, 1947, 1948, and feed crops on his own farm. Under the present law the tenant is a new grower and the landlord has a small allotment, which necessitates the tenant requesting new grower allotment.

To clarify the situation in this county, we would like to point out that in 1942, 1,400 farms were growing cotton, compared to 516 allotment farms in 1950. You can imagine the number of requests this office will have for new grower allotments.

May I make a personal observation and state that we are 12 months behind on cotton. Everyone realizes there is a surplus of cotton, due to bumper crops in 1949, thereby necessitating a reduction in acreage. However, if we, or the farmers, have to accept a drastic reduction, the buying power of the farmer will be reduced so much that industry,

labor, etc., will be affected to such an extent as to drive our country back to a depression.

In a recent meeting with the local merchants in our small town, everyone, without an exception, has already felt the effects of this program. The farmers are holding their money and doing without everything except the absolute necessities.

I wish that you, as well as Mr. PICKETT and the others, could be in our office and get the reaction of the farmers that visit this office. Then you would have a clearer picture of the whole situation. The farmers are not as critical as you would expect, but are disturbed.

It is hard for us to write the story as it actually is in our county, but hope this will help you in your fight for better farm programs. Please call upon us for any information you need and we shall work day and night to supply you with the information.

Very truly yours,

FRANK N. CATES,
Secretary, PMA, Trinity County.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Daingerfield, Tex., January 3, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: We are in receipt of your letter of December 29, requesting the number of acres of cotton available to distribute to new cotton farms in this county and the number of farmers requesting this acreage. I wish to advise that we have 216 acres to be distributed to new cotton farms and approximately 35 farmers requesting such acreage.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM B. LESLIE,
Secretary, Morris County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Athens, Tex., January 4, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Third District, Texas,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: The 1942 cotton allotment for Henderson County is 50,000 acres. We do not think producers of this county would release acreage in time to redistribute for 1950.

Henderson County's allotment will only support one tenant per farm. Some farms will reduce their tenants as much as 10. For example in east part of county three tenants on one farm have 7-acre allotment. Ninety percent of our cropland will have to be planted to some other crops than cotton.

1946 war credits: 4,530 acres on 649 farms.
1947 war credits: 4,277 acres on 646 farms.

Three hundred and thirty-four acres are available to distribute to new growers. Approximately 1,000 producers are requesting this acreage.

Yours sincerely,

RAYMOND G. MAGERS,
Chairman, Henderson County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Center, Tex., January 6, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congressman of Third District of Texas, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of January 3, 1950, in which you quote a portion of Mr. B. F. Vance's letter in regard to a reserve set aside by the county committee for adjustment purposes, I wish to advise.

In answer to the first question as to how many acres the county committee reserved for old farms which have not been growing cotton recently, and the second question, "How many new farms", we wish to say that new farms and old cotton farms, as well, are put under one classification as "new grower" farms. These farms are eligible to apply for a "new grower" cotton allotment. The county committee set aside 1,041 acres as a reserve for "new grower" cotton allotments. We have in Shelby County 2,242 farms which come under the above classification. It is estimated that approximately 50 percent of these farms will apply for a new grower allotment.

We hope that this information will clarify these questions for you.

Very truly yours,

JOHN A. KIMMEY,
Secretary, Shelby County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Coldspring, Tex., December 30, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congressman, Third District, Texas,
Tyler, Tex.

DEAR SIR: The allotment for San Jacinto County in 1942 was approximately 6,500 acres.

I have been unable to find anyone that will release any acreage for redistribution in the county.

From a canvass of the county, if farms with two tenants and up do not get additional acreage, at least 40 percent of tenants will be released.

The war-crop credits for 1946 were 718 acres and for 1947 were 466 acres. If we could get additional cotton acreage according to our war-crop credits, I think that everyone will have enough acreage to get by with, but if we do not get additional acreage, I estimate that at least 100 farm families that raised cotton in 1949 will be left without any cotton acreage and nothing else to do. The pulpwood and sawmill work is just about over in this county and you know that they cannot move to town.

I hope this information will be a help to you in getting something done about the acreage allotments.

Yours very truly,

JIM P. COUNTS,
Secretary, San Jacinto County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Jefferson, Tex., January 3, 1950.

Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In answer to your letter of December 29, 1949, there are 99 available acres to distribute to new farms in Marion County.

There are 38 new cotton farms that have requested this acreage, 29 through their owners and 9 through their operators.

There is an average of eight new farms daily making application for acreage.

Very truly yours,

WALTER C. RALPH,
Secretary, Marion County ACA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Newton, Tex., January 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Replying to your inquiry of December 29, 1949, this will advise that Newton County has 69.7 acres available for distribution to new cotton farms.

As of this date, a total of 28 owners or operators have made application for allotments on their farms.

Yours very truly,

CHARLIE L. CARTER,
Secretary, Newton County PMA.

MOUNT PLEASANT, TEX., *January 3, 1950.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This acknowledges your letter of December 29.

Question No. 1: How many acres available for new cotton farms? Approximately 171 acres.

Question No. 2: How many cotton farmers have requested this acreage? Between 50 and 100 farmers have requested this acreage, and they are still coming in.

Question No. 3: How many acres would be needed for these requests? From 300 to 500 acres.

Yours very truly,

HARRIS GREEN.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Mount Vernon, Tex., January 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Franklin County has 196 acres available for distribution to new cotton farms. We have had 19 requests for new cotton allotments thus far.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT W. ESPY,
Secretary, Franklin County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Sulphur Springs, Tex., January 4, 1950.

The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: This is in reply to your letters of December 23 and 29 in which you requested information concerning cotton allotments in Hopkins County.

The 1942 cotton allotment for this county was approximately 62 to 68 thousand acres.

We feel that if the unused 1950 allotment were redistributed there would be around 1,000 acres for redistribution, but none of this would come from genuine cotton farmers.

If we are given war-crop credits, it will probably mean about 900 acres for this county. It is possible that we might lose 25 cotton farmers, including tenants, under the 1950 allotment formula.

There have been 75 farmers in to ask about the 400 acres which we have available for new farms in this county.

Yours very truly,

VERNON TURLEY,
Chairman, Hopkins County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Richmond, Tex., January 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference is made to your letter of December 29, 1949, in regard to new grower cotton acreage under the 1950 PMA cotton program.

Our county committee set up 810 acres for new growers.

It is anticipated that some 60 new growers, including veterans, will take up this acreage which will average thirteen and five-tenths acres per farm.

We are hoping Congress will give some relief to farmers in regard to "frozen" acres, also to farmers who were severely reduced below 50 percent of their cropland for cotton.

Yours very truly,

JAMES R. ATKINS,
Secretary, Fort Bend County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Bowie, Tex., January 4, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress, Third District of Texas, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LINDLEY: Please refer to your letter of December 29, 1949, relative to the number of acres of cotton available for distribution to new cotton farms in Bowie County.

Our county has 987 acres available for new growers. To date 24 farm operators have asked that new-grower allotments be established for their farms. This number is increased each day however, and some 150 applications are expected.

Yours very truly,

HARMON W. JONES,
Administrative Officer, Bowie County PMA.

CARTHAGE, TEX., *December 6, 1949.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LINDLEY: I know that you are a busy man and for that reason I have made it a point not to bother you during your stay in Washington, but there is a matter of great importance facing all east Texans that I want to discuss with you briefly.

East Texas has never been looked on as a cotton-producing area, and as a result our interest is not considered when it comes to formulating cotton-control programs. On the other hand cotton has and still is one of the means of providing the requirements of life for those living on farms here in Panola County. Farmers are now faced with a grave problem if the cotton-control program which is now being considered goes into effect.

One reason we are having a control program is because we have a surplus of cotton, but the little 3-to-10-bale farmer of this county had nothing to do with the surplus we now have. It has been brought about by the 100-to-1,000-bale farmer, and, if I understand the program, he will not be affected as will the little man here. My idea about any program that has to do with the national economy should be a fair and just one for all those who participate in it.

Prewar, we had farmers in Panola, and it is the same all over east Texas, who worked small farms and most of their farm income was from small cotton acreage. During the war they left the farms to go into the shipyards and war plants because they could make more money. All this is past history now, and they have returned to the farm to find out that because they did not work large cotton acreage during the past few years that they are not qualified to work the same acreage as before. In some cases I have talked to farmers who state that they would like to farm but that it takes money to farm and that the proposed farm-control program as now explained to them would not permit the planting of a cash crop to assure them a living.

I understand that we are to have only about 21,000,000 acres to be planted in cotton next year. Why not find out what percent this is of the total tilled acreage and if it is 20 or 30 percent then allow each farm that amount of cotton. In many cases it would not be planted as all farmers do not want cotton and if they did not then we would have just that much less to worry us next year. Give all an equal chance and leave it up to the individual to decide if he wants cotton or not. If the farmers the country over raised as little cotton as do the farmers of Panola County then we would not be faced with cotton-control programs. Even at that they should be allowed to have their just share.

Not only has it affected the farmer but the merchant as well. His business is suffering now and will suffer more next fall if farmers do not have some type of cash crop. Any time you cut the farmers' income off you cut off the merchants because farmers have always spent what they have made, but if they do not have it then they cannot spend it. This would be a sure way of bringing about a recession or depression. To have a better condition I think the income from cotton should be spread out and not confined to a select few. These farmers who have by overplanting during the past few years brought about a surplus of cotton have made more money than at any time before so why should not they be penalized like the man who did not plant at all or but little?

I may be talking through my nose but this matter has to do with the future welfare of all farmers of this any many other counties of east Texas and in my way of thinking should come in for its just share of consideration. Personally I do not intend to plant 1 acre of cotton but I have about 500 acres of farmland and if I did want to plant some cotton I should be given that right. It so happens that I have not had any cotton on my farm for the past few years and I am told that I could not plant any cotton if I wanted to.

I could say much more but the more I say the less likely it will be read so I will call it a day by saying that you have always taken problems of east Texas to heart and I am sure you will be in there punching on this matter. Seriously, though, LINDLEY, this is more than a laughing matter and just this week we are carrying out a program of democracy beats communism but the farmers cannot wholeheartedly take part in it when they are being discriminated against as they are in this cotton-control program.

Thanking you for any and all consideration you may see fit to give the above, I beg to remain,

Sincerely yours,

FORREST E. ROBERTS.

TYLER, TEX., *January 2, 1950.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I entered the armed service in December 1943—Thirtieth Division, Infantry—came out in September 1945. As an aid man I saw many men pay the supreme price for freedom. I entered as a farmer and came out as one according to my discharge papers, and I have grown cotton as my chief money crop all my life.

Following my discharge I took my $300 mustering-out pay and began farming again.

Living close and saving every penny I paid a first payment on my 69-acre farm in 1948 and planted 30 acres of cotton and made 20 bales of cotton in 1949.

Now since there was no cotton planted on this farm in 1947 or 1948 the AAA tells me there will be no cotton acreage allotted to my farm at all.

Do you think that is right for the ex-servicemen to be left out of the farm program or should he share equal rights with the men who were not in the service?

Would like to hear from you as to how you voted on this farm bill.

Yours truly,

J. R. HANSON.

TYLER, TEX., *January 2, 1950.*

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Texas Representative,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you in regards of the cotton allotment (acreage). I am a farmer with six other working hands on the farm, and my cotton-acreage allotment has been cut to 5 acres on one of the farms that I have rented. The other farm that we are to work has not been worked in several years. I understand that no acreage allotment will be given for this farm. So I am writing you to see what can be done in my case. I am a renter without a farm of my own and I have to work land where I can get it. I was unable to rent the land I worked last year because the landlord is farming himself. Therefore I had to rent another farm but if no cotton allotment is given on that farm I do not see how I will be able to support my family with only 5 acres of cotton.

I hope you will be able to change this allotment.

Yours truly,

MONROE ARNOLD.

MINEOLA, TEX., *January 2, 1950.*

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

DEAR SIR AND FRIEND: I'm writing you in regard about my cotton allotment. I was given only 15 acres for my quota. I have 175 acres in cultivation and I have three share croppers. So you see this would give them five acres each. They can't get by with this and live and neither can I. If I can't get more than this I guess my renters will have to quit farming and go to public jobs or the Government will have to help them some way. If I can get 35 acres my renters can get by.

My son has two farms adjoining me and they didn't give him any at all and he has the land rented. I just don't know what his renter will do.

I just don't approve of this kind of business. Anything you can do to help my son and me will be appreciated. Hope we can get a few more acreages. If I can't, just well let the farm lay out.

You know east Texas farmers can't cultivate as much as west Texas, so therefore this will surely hurt them. I'm in hope you may be able to help us. So wishing you a Happy New Year.

Always your friend.

R. G. MACLIN.

P. S.—Hoyt and family joins in best regards to you and yours.

LONGSTREET, LA., *January 2, 1950.*

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I am writing you on behalf of my mother and other cotton farmers of Panola County whose cotton acreage has been cut entirely too low for the county. Most of the farmers depend on their cotton crop for their spending money. This cut will work quite a hardship on them. Some may have to hunt work elsewhere, especially the tenant farmer. Panola County had a fair cotton crop this past year, but as you probably know, this county, as other east Texas counties, were quite hard hit for several years prior to 1949 by the drought and cotton pests. They haven't recovered yet from their losses and now comes this decrease in acreage.

Something should be done about this if it is humanly possible, and I do believe it is. The small cotton farmer suffers most, you see.

In another way these farmers are hurt is this: They have bought tractors and other farming implements. Now they will have to sell them at a great loss for they can't possibly pay for them with this cut in their cotton acreage. This certainly isn't fair.

I don't believe the cotton committee fully understands the true condition that exists among the small cotton farmers. If they don't, they should get busy immediately and

familiarize themselves with the true conditions and then try to give aid where it is so badly needed.

Many of these borrow money to make their crop, and with these cuts the banks aren't going to loan money with no chance of getting it. Another hardship, you see.

Mr. BECKWORTH, use your influence in trying to get some relief for the small farmer if you possibly can. I feel sure you will do your best for them.

Thanking you, I remain,

Very sincerely,

(Miss) CORA JOHNSON.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 6, 1950.*

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
Washington, November 30, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of November 20, 1949.

Except for landlords all of the five groups of farmers mentioned are considered as farm operators by the census. Therefore a count of census farms which report cotton provides a count of farmers producing cotton with the exception mentioned.

Special tabulations based on a sample of the farms enumerated in the 1945 Census of Agriculture provide a classification of farms reporting cotton by tenure of the farm operator, as follows:

Farms in United States reporting cotton, 1944

All farms	1,201,438
Full owners	395,608
Part owners	79,412
Managers	3,743
All tenants	722,675
Cash tenants	105,024
Share-cash tenants	16,292
Share tenants	229,499
Croppers (South only)	313,800
Other and unspecified	58,060

No information on the number of landlords who produce cotton with the assistance of share tenants or croppers is available from the 1945 census.

The 1950 census will provide a classification of farms similar to that of 1945. Note that in this classification owner-operators who rent additional land from others (part owners) are shown separately from those who own all the land they operate (full owners). Managed farms are also shown separately. Cash tenants, share tenants, and croppers are each shown as a separate group. Tenants paying both cash and a share make up an additional group (share-cash tenants). The 1945 questionnaire called for reporting "cash," "share," "share-cash," and "other" methods of rental only. Presumably standing-rent or fixed-rent tenants are included with "other" tenants. In 1950 standing rent or fixed rent is grouped on the questionnaire with other miscellaneous rental arrangements. The rental arrangements included in this group are "A fixed quantity of any product, upkeep of land and buildings, payment of taxes, keep of landlord, rent free, etc." Hence, standing-rent or fixed-rent tenants cannot be shown as a separate group in 1950, but will be included with "other" tenants.

Tentative plans call for a tabulation similar to that for 1945 which will show for the 1950 census, farms reporting cotton classified by tenure of the farm operator.

A special questionnaire, the Landlord-Tenant Operations Questionnaire, which will be used in most of the cotton areas, will obtain information for a part of the landlord group. This questionnaire is required, in the designated areas, for each landlord who retains some land himself and has one or more tenants or croppers, also for landlords who retain no land themselves and have two or more tenants or croppers. The first group of landlords, of course, will be counted with the owner-operator group. The second group of landlords would not be included in the census count of farm operators. The Landlord-Tenant Operations Questionnaire should make it possible to obtain a count of that portion of this second group of landlords who grow cotton with the assistance of share tenants or croppers. A third group of landlords will not require Landlord-Tenant Operations Questionnaires. These are landlords who have all their land rented to or worked by one tenant or cropper. A rough estimate of the number of landlords in this group who grow cotton with the help of share tenants and croppers might be obtained by subtracting from the total number of share tenants, croppers, and share-cash tenants who report cotton those listed on the Landlord-Tenant Operations Questionnaires. This estimate would not take into account a number of considerations, including the fact that some tenants will have two or more landlords.

Please let us know if we can be of any further assistance.

In accordance with your request we are returning the letter of the Under Secretary of Agriculture which was enclosed with your letter.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP M. HAUSER,
Acting Director, Bureau of the Census.

Mr. Speaker, according to some figures I have taken from records of the Department of Agriculture and from the 1949 Texas Almanac, a publication of the Dallas Mornings News, some very interesting county cotton acreage comparisons exist in Texas. In 1942 the cotton acreage allotment of some 14 east Texas counties I refer to was 720,501; the 1950 cotton acreage allotment of the same 14 counties is 225,953 acres—less than one-third of the number of acres they had in 1942. The 1940 total population of the 14 counties was 494,004. They have more people now, I would estimate. The 1949 Texas Almanac shows the 14 east Texas counties to have some 43,127 farms.

I think it can be shown, on the other hand, there are counties in Texas individually having in them considerably less than 100,000 people and individually less than 2,500 farms that have more allotted cotton acreage than all the 14 counties with their over 40,000 farms and almost one-half million people—whereas the latter counties referred to individually had less than one-fourth of the cotton acreage then allotted the 14 counties in 1942.

At this point I desire to include a table which I feel is reasonably accurate based on the sources referred to:

Some cotton allotment comparisons

County	1950 cotton allotment (acres)	1942 cotton allotment (acres)	Population, 1940	Number of farms
Wood	10,404	42,003	24,360	2,431
Van Zandt	36,387	84,486	31,155	4,432
Upshur	10,169	40,496	26,178	2,856
Smith	16,595	74,680	69,090	5,313
Rusk	23,762	71,397	51,023	4,294
Panola	17,367	52,883	22,513	2,540
Gregg	3,108	14,537	58,027	1,460
Camp	6,941	16,395	10,285	1,300
Anderson	14,516	45,761	37,092	3,096
Cherokee	15,440	57,695	33,970	4,490
Henderson	12,542	53,337	31,822	2,896
Houston	26,758	71,291	31,137	3,884
Nacogdoches	12,704	48,001	35,392	2,854
Grimes	19,260	47,539	21,960	1,864
Total	225,953	720,501	494,004	43,127

Mr. Speaker, let us look at some other States:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Magnolia, Ark., January 6, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The information requested in your letter of December 24 is listed below:

1942 cotton allotment: 53,783.5 acres.

1950 cotton allotment: 22,579 acres.

Estimated number of acres that would be released for reapportionment if a provision was made by law: 200 acres.

Estimated acreage which will come from genuine cotton farmers who cannot continue to farm because of too little acreage: None.

Estimated number of cotton farmers in the county who might be compelled to cease to farm under the 1950 allotment formula: 400.

Arkansas as well as Columbia County received its allotment based upon 95 percent of the 1947 and 1948 average planted acreage with adjustment for war-crop credits.

The county committee set aside 700 acres for new allotment farms in 1950. This will include farms which did not plant cotton during the period 1946, 1947, and 1948 and farms which planted cotton in 1949 and 1950 for the first time. Most of the farms in this county are small-type farms. About 90 percent of the total farms have allotments of 15 acres or less.

Yours very truly,

COLUMBIA COUNTY PMA COMMITTEE,
J. C. GUNNELS, *Chairman.*

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Camden, Ark., January 6, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter concerning cotton acreage, we do not have any cotton to distribute to old farms that have not grown cotton recently. We have 250 acres to distribute to new farms. In 1942 the allotment for this county was approximately 18,000 acres. If we could distribute the unused 1950 allotment we feel that we could distribute 300 acres. We feel that the war-crop credit, that you mentioned in your letter, would not affect us in any appreciable way. We do not know how many, if any, cotton farmers will be unable to continue farming, however, at this point we would like to say that sharecroppers on a number of farms in the county will be dismissed and have to move onto other farms or else be unable to continue farming but that the landlord will go ahead and use the acreage allotted to his farm.

Yours very truly,

WELDON B. ABBOTT,
County Administrative Officer,
Ouachita County.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Nashville, Ark., January 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are submitting herein the information requested in your letter of December 24, 1949:

1. The 1942 cotton allotment (Howard County), 15,890 acres.[1]

2. We feel that there will be 1,000 acres allotted to farms that will not be used. If the farmer would release this acreage it would

[1] 1950 allotted acreage for Howard County, 7,236.

take care of our situation—but, as past experience shows, farmers do not release their unused acreage.

3. There will be no genuine cotton farmers who will have unused acreage.

4. The war-crop credits do not seem to be a point of contention here—the credits given under Public Law 12 seem to be satisfactory. War-crop credits are one of the factors detrimental to proper distribution of cotton acreage in this county. Some farms going out of cotton production, such as stock farming and fruit growing, obtained acreages not needed. This acreage will not be released in a lot of cases.

5. The number of farmers being out of a home on account of the reduction of cotton acreage in the county will be confined to tenants and sharecroppers, and the number "100" is only an estimate but considered conservative.

6. (a) We have 100.2 acres to distribute to old farms which have not grown cotton recently and (b) 222 acres for new farms.

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR R. JOHNSON,
County Administrative Officer.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Arkadelphia, Ark., January 5, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The cotton acreage allotment for Clark County, Ark., in 1942 was 21,000 acres. The allotment for 1950 is 11,198 acres.

I estimate that if farmers could turn back cotton acreage that will not be planted in 1950 and be assured that the allotment would be returned to that farmer for 1951 there would be 700 acres released for reapportionment.

None of the genuine cotton farmers will turn back present acreage allotments.

If this county received total war-crop credit it would increase the county allotment approximately 1,300 acres. No cotton farmers who are owners will be forced to cease farming because of the 1950 allotment formula, but I would estimate that 100 tenant farmers will be forced out of cotton production under the present farm acreage allotment.

The committee reserved 125 acres for distribution to farmers which have not grown cotton recently and new farms.

Release of frozen acreage on farms which will not plant cotton in 1950 will result in satisfactory allotments on most farms.

Farmers with allotments which will not be planted in 1950 will release this acreage if they are assured that the allotment will be returned to their farm in 1951.

Yours very truly,

J. K. GALBRAITH,
Secretary to County PMA Committee,
Clark County, Ark.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
El Dorado, Ark., January 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is with reference to your letter requesting information about cotton allotments for Union County, Ark. The cotton allotment for Union County in 1942 was approximately 21,000 acres. The allotment we received for 1950 for the county is 6,042 acres.

I estimate that we would pick up approximately 400 acres if we could pick up the unused 1950 acres. Cotton allotments are averaging approximately 50 percent of the allotments established on the individual farms in 1942. In 1942 the county factor was 27 percent. Our factor for 1950 is 11.58.

We have 22 acres in the county reserve to use for new growers' allotments. In 1949 we had 150 farms planting 1,296 acres of cotton. As you know, these farms, plus all other farms requesting new growers' allotments, must be established out of reserve established for new growers.

If there is any additional information you desire, I will be pleased to furnish it to you.

Yours very truly,

CLINTON E. HENSON,
County Administrative Officer.

MURFREESBORO, ARK., *January 4, 1950.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Pike County is not a genuine cotton county as is no doubt the area which you represent. Few renters are in this county. Each owner cultivates his own small farm but the allotment for more than one-half of the farms is less than 5 acres.

The allotment for 1942 was 6,750 acres. The additional acreage with the distribution of the unused 1950 allotment could be well 500.

No genuine cotton farmer will pool his allotment but will cut his renters from 5 to 2 or 4 to 2.

The war-crop credit would not help this county very much.

There will be at least 200 farmers compelled to quit farming because of the 1950-allotment formula.

To old farms without allotment and "new farm," I have 50 acres. I have 200 requests for cotton allotments. This would mean at least 600 acres.

Thanking you for your interest and wishing you the best of success in your untiring efforts, I remain,

Yours very truly,

REEDER DILDY,
County Administrative Officer.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Aberdeen, Miss., January 4, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your inquiry dated December 24, 1949 pertaining to cotton acreages, we are attempting to give you the best information we can as follows:

1. Our 1942 cotton allotment was about 50,000 acres.

2. I do not feel that there would be many unused acres to distribute. It would be much better to estimate the unused acreage and issue an additional acreage to be distributed for the following reasons:

(a) If a farmer thought he would have to give up his acreage he would try to plant same although he could not half work it.

(b) Most farmers would release their acreage too late to do anyone any good.

(c) There would be a chance that a cotton acreage blackmarket would result.

3. Most farmers will work their cotton regardless of how small their acreage.

4. The war crop credits as talked about now would help us very little as a whole, as I see it.

5. There will probably be four or five hundred families who will have to cease farming in our county on account of allotments.

6. We have not received instructions on old cotton farms which have not grown cotton lately.

7. We have 450 acres for new farms.

Very truly yours,

M. L. ENGLISH,
County Administrative Officer.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
West Point, Miss., January 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your request of December 24, 1949, I wish to give the following report for Clay County, Miss.: The cotton acreage allotment for Clay County in 1942 was 18,632 acres. Our 1950 allotment is 14,420 acres. We feel that if we could distribute the unused 1950 allotment that we would have 100 acres or more to distribute—the acreage released by farmers who do not intend to plant.

A minimum number of acres will be available for distribution as a result of war crop credits being talked about. It will give our county no more acres. It is estimated that 60 tenant farmers might be compelled to move away from the farm as the result of 1950 allotment formula.

Our county has 375 acres to distribute to old cotton farms who have not grown cotton recently. There is 150 acres available for distribution to new farms.

Yours truly,

BELON S. PIERCE,
County Administrative Officer.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Raleigh, Miss., January 4, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MR. BECKWORTH: Reference is made to your letter dated December 24, 1949, in regard to some information you need concerning the cotton allotment. This information is as follows:

1. The allotment for Smith County in 1942: Approximately 23,000 acres.

2. Additional unused 1950 allotment that could be distributed: 700 acres.

3. Of this unused acreage, this amount will come from genuine cotton farmers who cannot continue to farm because of too little acreage: 200.

4. Number of war-crop credits which is being talked about which will mean more acres to Smith County: 100 acres.

5. Number of genuine cotton farmers in Smith County that might be compelled to cease to farm in Smith County under the 1950-allotment formula: 200.

6. Number of acres to be distributed to farms which have not grown cotton recently including new farms: 350.

Yours very truly,

ELLIS E. ROBINSON,
County Administrative Officer,
Smith County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINIETRATION,
Natchitoches, La., January 4, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of December 24, this is to advise that the 1942 cotton-acreage allotment for Natchitoches Parish, La., was 50,233.7 acres.

If we could distribute the unused 1950 allotments to other farms within the parish, I believe that we could pick up between 2,500 to 3,000 acres. I do not think that any of this acreage will come from genuine cotton farmers who cannot continue to farm because of the reduced acreage.

I am not familiar with the type of war-crop credit that is being talked about; therefore I cannot answer this question.

There may be about 300 farm families in Natchitoches Parish displaced because of reduction of acreage.

As to the acreage to be distributed to old farms which have not grown cotton recently and to new farms which have recently come into production, we do not have any acreage in the parish for this purpose.

I understand that there are 35,000 acres set aside at the State level to take care of new-grower allotments.

We believe that if we can pick up unused acreage and distribute it to farms where additional cotton acreage is needed, many of our problems will be solved. Cotton-acreage allotments have been computed for quite a few farms where no cotton at all will be planted in 1950.

If you are in need of any additional information on this subject or any other phase of the PMA program at the parish level, please feel free to call upon me at any time.

Yours very truly,

H. L. SISSON,
Parish Administrative Officer.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Colfax, La., January 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference is made to your memorandum of December 24, 1949, regarding 1950 cotton acreage allotments:

1. In 1942 the cotton acreage allotment in Grant Parish was 10,179.9 acres.

2. If the committees could distribute the acreage allotment that will not be used in 1950, it is estimated that it would amount to 60 acres. (This is taking for granted that the acreage release would remain in the parish and not be returned and distributed from the State level.)

3. None of the 60 acres would be returned from genuine cotton farms because of too small an acreage to justify farming. The farmers intend to plant even the smallest allotments, even though it would be too small to sustain them, and subsidize their income from public work if available.

4. The 60 acres that would be returned will be from farms on which allotments were issued on which no cotton will be planted in 1950 (i. e. farms planting cotton one or more years 1946, 1947, or 1948, or having war crop credit and had not planted cotton since 1941).

5. I am at a loss to make an estimate on the "war crop credit which is being talked about" sentence in your memorandum, as it is not clear just how it would work out in this parish.

6. It is the estimate of the parish committee and myself that at least 72 farm families will be compelled to cease farming operations in this parish during 1950 due to 1950 cotton acreage allotments.

Our 1950 cotton acreage allotment is 5,917.8 acres.

Hoping this is the information you desired, I am,

Yours very truly,

VICTOR A. ADAMS,
Parish Administrative Officer.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Homer, La., January 5, 1950.

The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
United States Representative,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in answer to your letter of December 24, 1949.

As you may know the questions referred to in your letter are very difficult to answer in view of the fact that most of these questions can only be answered in the form of estimates.

Members of the Claiborne Parish committee were contacted and the following information is given:

1. The Claiborne Parish cotton allotment for 1942 was 56,000 acres. This figure taken from our office records.

2. It is the opinion of this committee that 300 acres of unused cotton allotment acres would be available for redistribution. This is an estimate.

3. This committee believes that no acreage would be released on genuine cotton farms.

4. Under the present law our parish has received about 1,500 acres additional allotment due to war crop credits.

5. It is estimated that 50 genuine cotton farmers may be compelled to cease farming due to 1950 cotton allotments. Of this number it is the opinion of this committee that practically all would be tenants.

6. We have been advised by our State office that 35,000 cotton allotment acres will be available for noncotton farms for the State. This acreage will be used for old farms, not planting cotton in one of the years 1946, 1947, or 1948, and for new farms.

As stated before the estimates used are purely estimates and are taken from general talk and discussion with farmers.

We trust, however, this information may answer your questions in part.

Very truly yours,

JAMES R. GARLAND,
Parish Administrative Officer, Claiborne Parish.

ARKANSAS STATE HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Little Rock, Ark., November 21, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Your letter of November 17, 1949, asking whether, in the opinion of this headquarters, any agricultural section of Arkansas sent a higher percentage of its farmers to work in war plants than other sections, has been received.

The answer to your question is yes. The areas of our State where the soil was least productive sent a much larger percentage of the farmers to industry during the war than those areas where the soil was fertile and very productive. In the northwestern section of our State we have a rather large area of mountainous terrain where the soil is not very fertile. When you go south to the Arkansas River bottom area you find very fertile lands. In those unfertile lands in the northwestern area a large percentage of the farmers left the farms for industry. The same situation is true to some extent in the southwestern section of the State, south of the Arkansas River. It would be difficult for me to designate the specific counties from which the farm population went largely to industry, but it would be generally in the unfertile lands in northwestern Arkansas and the unfertile lands in southwestern Arkansas.

The Delta areas, along the Mississippi River side of the State and along the Arkansas River, did not lose many of its farm population to industry. In the latter part of the war a good many Negroes left the Delta section, particularly after they had been rejected for service in the armed forces. They went north and west to those points where they could make more money than they could make on the farms. But generally speaking, we did not lose such a large proportion of men to industry from the productive Delta area.

I trust this will give you the information desired.

Yours very truly,

E. L. COMPERE,
State Director.

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., December 16, 1949.

The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I have your note of December 2, 1949, appended to the copy of your letter from the director of selective service for the State of Arkansas relative to the farmers going to work in defense plants during the late war.

Director Compere seems to have given you a very good picture of what took place on Arkansas farms during the late war. It is reasonable to assume that similar movements of farmers occurred in other States. Furthermore, it was a common practice among some defense plants to operate bus lines as far out as 50 miles into poor farming areas for the purpose of bringing in workers to the plants each day.

In the Northeastern States, it was observed that many of the small-sized-farm operators increased the size of their enterprises by taking over the operation of small farms under rental agreements or by purchases. This brought some idle farms back into production and released some operators for work elsewhere.

While I have no data on the relative movements of farmers from different types of farming areas, it is reasonable to believe that a larger percentage left the subsistence and marginal type farming areas due to better remunerations offered elsewhere.

I hope this will be of some assistance to you and that you will feel free to call upon me at any time. Your communication is being returned as requested.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

SELECTIVE SERVICE,
LOUISIANA STATE HEADQUARTERS,
New Orleans, La., December 22, 1949.

The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: We have read with interest copy of General Compere's letter of November 21.

Undoubtedly Louisiana subsistence farmers were quicker to migrate to the better-paying war-industry employment than the agriculture worker in more productive farmland areas. You will probably find this true of all States with agricultural areas of low productivity.

We are returning herewith copy of General Compere's letter as requested.

With kindest regards and best holiday wishes, I am,

Yours very truly,

W. D. SHAFER,
Colonel (Retired), Deputy Director
(For the State Director).

STATE HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Jackson, Miss., December 19, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congressman, Third District, Texas,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: I have your letters from General Compere and also from Colonel Howell concerning the position of agricultural workers during World War II. The same situation as outlined by General Compere and Colonel Howell existed in the State of Mississippi, as indicated by all the records and from all information that I can obtain from the people who were with Selective Service during the war.

The records indicate that there was a much higher percentage of farmers who left the farm to go to industry from the hill sections and the most nonproductive agricultural sections than there were from the

rich Delta section of the State. The reason for this, we think, was that where a farmer was not producing a creditable amount of foodstuff, he was not allowed exemption. Also, in the poorer sections the high salaries paid by industry were more attractive than in the richer sections where the farmers were making more money. We do not have any definite figures on this.

If we can furnish you any further information, we will be very glad to do so.

Cordially yours,

J. W. PATTON, Jr.,
Colonel, CE, State Director.

STATE HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Montgomery, Ala., December 7, 1949.

The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your handwritten note of December 2, 1949, on a copy of my letter of November 22, concerning disposition of agricultural workers during World War II. I also have a copy of the letter, dated November 21, 1949, from the Arkansas State Director of Selective Service on which you have appended a further note of December 5, 1949, on the same subject. In compliance with your request, I am returning both of these letters with this communication.

In further reply to your question, I believe that the experience in Alabama is very similar to that described by Gen. E. L. Compere, State director of selective service for Arkansas. In those areas in the State of Alabama where the soil was less productive, such areas sent a larger comparative number of men into war plants than those areas where the soil was more fertile. This movement of manpower was due, not only to the inducement of higher wages to those employed on submarginal lands, but also was due in part to the policy of selective service which granted deferment to agricultural workers only when they were producing an amount of foodstuff in excess of that required to feed the personnel and animals on the farm. Naturally, therefore, more deferments were granted for agricultural purposes in the more productive agricultural areas.

This headquarters will be glad to furnish you any other information which might possibly be of assistance to you in the matter now under consideration. Please do not hesitate to call on us for any assistance you may require.

Sincerely,

ERNEST W. HOWELL,
Colonel, AGD, State Director.

SELECTIVE SERVICE,
OKLAHOMA STATE HEADQUARTERS,
Oklahoma City, November 28, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Third District, Texas,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of November 17, 1949, in which you ask for an opinion as follows:

"In your opinion, did any agricultural section of your State send a higher percentage of its farmers into service than other sections?"

In reply to your request I should like to suggest that Oklahoma was slightly below the national average of men in the service who listed agriculture as their principal occupation. In general it appears that the better agricultural districts of Oklahoma did induct a lower percentage of men claiming to be farmers than other sections of the State where the farming activities appeared to be of a submarginal nature.

As a whole, I am inclined to believe that Selective Service was considerate of the farmers as a group.

Sincerely yours,

CLIVE E. MURRAY,
Colonel, AGD, State Director.

SELECTIVE SERVICE,
OKLAHOMA STATE HEADQUARTERS,
Oklahoma City, December 9, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of December 5, 1949, I will say that your assumption is correct that the movement of agricultural workers from the farm to war industry did follow the same pattern as was reported by General Compere, of Arkansas.

In general, we may say, the eastern part of Oklahoma—that is, from the north and south line running through Oklahoma City—contains most of the industry of the State and a good part of all of the ranch land. In this part of the State we also find the timberland and only a small amount of rich, fertile land.

The western part of the State, particularly the northwestern region, is primarily the winter wheat belt of the State, and naturally is the fertile land. The same may be said of the southwestern part of the State, but normally a more diversified type of farming.

The heavy loss in population from the farms occurred primarily in the eastern and southeastern and southern part of the State of Oklahoma.

Hoping this will be of some assistance to you in the study of movement of farm labor to industry, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CLIVE E. MURRAY,
Colonel, AGD, State Director.

STATE HEADQUARTERS FOR
SELECTIVE SERVICE,
Atlanta, Ga., December 6, 1949.

Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: It is true that a larger number of agricultural workers left the sections of the State where farm land was less productive. This exodus from poor farms commenced in 1934 when the WPA was established.

Sincerely yours,

J. H. SKELTON, Jr.,
Deputy State Director.

STATE HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Austin, Tex., December 5, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LINDLEY: I have delayed in answering your notes of November 17 until I could exhaust all resources outside our office in trying to secure for you the information on the breakdown of agricultural workers during World War II in Texas. Am sorry to say I have had no success.

Our records in this headquarters were not maintained in such a manner that this information is available and could be furnished. I did think, however, that our good friend, E. F. Vance, might have this, but as you will see by his attached letter, they were unable to be of assistance in this wise.

Although we cannot say for other States, we do feel the same situation prevailed as is reflected in the letter from the State director, Brig. Gen. E. L. Compere, of Arkansas.

It was good to see you in Washington in June, and I do hope if you come this way you will give me the pleasure of buying your lunch.

With best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely,

PAUL L. WAKEFIELD,
Colonel, AGD, State Director.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., December 14, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress, Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: While I have no figures to substantiate the statement, I am quite sure that the same thing happened in Texas that happened in Arkansas. Farm people from the less-productive soils went into industry to a much greater extent than those from the fertile soils of the State. Observation in this connection would indicate that more than 50 percent of the people in the less-productive areas went into industry. Of course, since many of the jobs have been terminated, a large percent of the people have returned to the farm.

I am returning the copy of your letter from Mr. Compere as you requested.

Sincerely yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State PMA Committee.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
MISSOURI STATE HEADQUARTERS,
Jefferson City, January 4, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: The situation that existed in Arkansas as described by Gen. E. L. Compere in his letter of November 21, 1949, is comparable to the situation in Missouri. The subsistence farmers who were not contributing to the war effort were used in war plants, and greater percentages of these farmers left the farm than those who were employed in a more fertile area.

If we can be of further assistance to you, please advise.

R. T. FINKS,
Deputy State Director
(For the State Director).

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial written by Mr. W. C. Lasseter, of the Progressive Farmer. I think all Members of the House would enjoy reading it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances.

ADJOURNMENT OVER FROM THURSDAY TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Thursday next, it adjourn to meet on the following Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the

House for 5 minutes today, following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted; and also to address the House for 5 minutes on Thursday next.

THE LATE HONORABLE STEPHEN A. DAY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce the passing of our good friend and former colleague, Stephen A. Day. After an illness of several weeks he answered the call to the Great Beyond last Thursday.

He is survived by his widow, four daughters, and two sons. It is as fine a family as anyone could possibly know. They have our deepest sympathy.

Steve was the distinguished son of a distinguished father. His father, William Rufus Day, was Secretary of State in the Cabinet of President McKinley and for 20 years was justice of the United States Supreme Court.

Like his father, Steve was an ardent scholar. He was a recognized authority on the United States Constitution. During his period of service here in the House, from 1940 to 1944, when he represented Illinois as a Member at Large, many of us who served with him will recall the contribution he made to a better understanding of the constitutional questions that arose. Those who differed with his views always had the greatest respect for his sincerity and his legal knowledge.

Steve was born in Canton, Ohio. He attended the public schools there, and subsequently went to University School in Cleveland and Asheville School in North Carolina. He graduated from the University of Michigan in 1905, and since 1908 practiced law in Chicago. For a period, after graduation from college, he served as secretary to Chief Justice Fuller and later as special counsel to the Comptroller of the Currency.

In the fullest sense of the word Steve Day, like his father before him, devoted his life to serving the people. Although an ardent Republican, he always placed his country above any political consideration. And he has made an immeasurable contribution to his party and to his country. I have taken great pride in the fact that this fine and great man lived in my home town of Evanston, that it has been my privilege to have him as a personal friend and a constituent.

With the passing of Steve Day, I have lost a real friend, and the Nation has lost a most outstanding citizen. We shall miss him. His words and deeds in the service of the people for a freer, richer, and happier life constitute "footprints on the sands of time" which remain as a constant inspiration to all of us.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was with sadness last Friday that I read in the daily press of the passing, on the day previous, of Hon. Stephen A. Day, a former Member of the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses, elected at large from the State of Illinois.

While I was acquainted with Stephen Day, prior to his first election to Congress in 1940, it was not until he had served here for several months that I really came to know him. He was quiet, friendly, and unassuming. He cared little for social life but invariably attended those functions wherein the welfare of his State was involved or the principles of government in which he was deeply concerned were likely to be discussed. Stephen Day was a graduate of the University of Michigan and practiced law in the city of Chicago for 41 years. He was the son of Hon. William R. Day, who was Secretary of State in the Cabinet of President McKinley and later an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court. For several years prior to Stephen Day's Chicago law practice, he was secretary to Chief Justice Melville W. Fuller. No doubt his close association with the Chief Justice of the Court, of which his own father was a distinguished member, influenced Stephen Day to become an ardent student of the United States Constitution. He was likewise intensely interested in social problems and the rights of those who must earn their sustenance by manual labor. He was unswerving in his devotion to those principles and during his two congressional terms, no colleague of his had a more consistent record for urging adherence to the Constitution or for support of labor legislation than did he.

Prior to his election in 1940 he was a candidate for Congress five times and five times he was defeated. The fact that each time he chose to run for Congressman at Large, with the whole State as his district, and during election years when the political party with which he was affiliated had little or no hope of success, is evidence that he was not a seeker of public office, but a crusader for the principles of government for which he stood and that that was his method of bringing those principles to the attention of the public. He was the author of several books, the most well known being, The Constitutionalist, and We Must Save the Republic. During his congressional career he served on the Committee on Revision of the Laws and the Committee on Labor—committees that formulated legislation that was nearest to his heart. He was faithful and diligent in his committees and a conscientious Member of the House.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of the late Stephen Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WAGNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—THE BUDGET FOR 1951 (H. DOC. NO. 405)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting my recommendations for the Budget of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951.

This Budget is a statement of the financial program for the United States Government, under both existing laws and new legislation which I am recommending to the Congress. It is an expression, in financial terms, of the actions this Government can and should take at this time to build toward economic growth and the expansion of human freedom, in our own country and in the world.

For the fiscal year 1951, Budget expenditures under this financial program are estimated at 42.4 billion dollars, about 860 million dollars below estimated expenditures for the current year. Budget receipts under existing tax laws are estimated to be 37.3 billion dollars, a decrease of about 460 million dollars below the present year. The estimated Budget deficit for the fiscal year 1951 is thus 5.1 billion dollars under present tax laws, compared with an anticipated deficit of 5.5 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1950.

I shall shortly recommend to the Congress certain adjustments in our tax laws which will produce some net additional revenue in 1951, not reflected in this Budget. These adjustments will result in a larger revenue increase in subsequent years.

A reduction, greater than that in expenditures, has been made in the requests for new appropriations and other obligational authority in 1951. Expenditures occur when the Government pays its obligations, and the Congress grants authority to incur obligations when it enacts appropriations, contract authorizations, and authorizations to borrow from the Treasury. The authority to incur new obligations which I am recommending for the fiscal year 1951 totals 40.5 billion dollars, considerably below the 1950 level. This fact is significant as an indication that the downward trend in expenditures from 1950 to 1951 may be expected to continue.

Budget totals

[Fiscal years. In millions]

	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Receipts	$38,246	$37,763	$37,306
Expenditures	40,057	43,297	42,439
Deficit	−1,811	−5,534	−5,133

NOTE.—Estimated receipts exclude new tax proposals.

This financial program provides a sound basis on which to proceed. It will properly support the extraordinary

responsibilities of the Federal Government, both at home and abroad, and at the same time meet our obligation to pursue a policy of financial prudence and restraint. Such a policy must be directed at producing a surplus as soon as possible under favorable economic conditions. The reductions in expenditures, which I recommend, can be achieved and still permit our Government to carry on its necessary operations effectively. The moderate increase in revenue, which I shall recommend in conjunction with specific tax reforms, can be achieved without impairing continued economic progress.

In preparing this Budget, I have carefully evaluated the possible alternatives in the light of the realities of our present situation. The soundness of a fiscal program cannot properly be judged simply by the year-to-year change in the expected margin between receipts and expenditures. A prudent program must meet much broader tests, if it is to serve the long-range interests of our people.

The soundness of a fiscal program must first of all be judged by whether it allows the people, through their Government, to meet the demands which the foreign and domestic situations put upon them. The necessary functions of the Government in our complex society are varied and widespread. They require large expenditures but they are vital to our security, to the protection of our liberties, to continued social and economic progress, and to the welfare of our people. I have reviewed the expenditure programs in the Budget, one by one, and found them necessary to achieve these purposes. I am confident that the Congress will come to essentially the same conclusion.

The soundness of the Government's fiscal program must also be judged by its impact on the economy. The Federal Budget is a substantial part of the total flow of incomes and expenditures in our country each year. Federal receipts and expenditures must both be planned to encourage the prosperity of the economy and keep it healthy and growing. Irresponsible and short-sighted budgetary action could contribute to a worsening of the world situation and to a decline in production and employment in the United States. Under either of these circumstances, we would find ourselves faced by the necessity of Budget outlays much larger than those I am proposing, while the prospect for increased revenues would be much less encouraging. I am convinced that the recommendations I am making, both for expenditures and for revenues, will contribute to continued economic development.

The soundness of a fiscal program must be judged, finally, in the light of where that program will take us over a period of years. This is partly a matter of necessity: most Government programs are based on a time schedule extending over a number of years, and a large part of the Budget in any one year represents binding commitments to spend established in previous years on the one hand, and tax liabilities already incurred on the other. It is primarily a matter of wisdom: sharp and arbitrary changes in Government programs, even where feasible, involve economic loss and dislocations, and may cause serious damage to parts of the economy. I am confident that the fiscal recommendations provide a solid basis for moving toward budgetary balance in the next few years. My confidence is based on three main considerations.

First, it has been possible to reduce anticipated expenditures for the fiscal year 1951 by close to 1 billion dollars below the estimated level for 1950, and an even greater reduction has been made in the request for new obligational authority. Thus, the policies followed in preparing this Budget will permit further reductions in subsequent years. Specifically, the largest item in the Budget, national defense expenditures, is expected to approximate the 1951 level in the next few years; and the costs of our foreign aid and veterans' programs should continue the decline already expected between 1950 and 1951. It should also be possible in future years to reduce the cost of programs which have helped to meet the postwar transition problems of specific major areas of our economy, notably the support of agricultural prices and the creation of an adequate secondary market for housing mortgages. Finally, if the Congress enacts the proposed increase in postal rates, the burden of the postal deficit on recent Budgets will be largely eliminated.

The programs mentioned above constitute the bulk of the Federal Budget. With respect to other programs, relating primarily to domestic activities, Federal responsibilities will increase as the Nation grows. But the additional budgetary requirements for these programs, under a prudent fiscal policy, should be substantially less than the decline to be expected in the extraordinary postwar programs. In this connection it should be emphasized that the urgently needed insurance measures which are recommended in the fields of unemployment compensation, old-age security, and medical care will be primarily financed by special taxes designed to defray their costs.

Thus, assuming continued favorable economic and international developments, it is possible to plan on further reductions in total expenditures after 1951.

The second major consideration supporting my confidence in this fiscal program is the fact that our economy is a dynamic and growing one. Each year our population and the productivity of our labor force rise, and our total national output must rise also if we are to fulfill our obligation to maintain high employment. As our economy grows, tax revenues will grow also. The effects of this growth are not fully reflected in the receipts estimates for 1951, because the temporary decline in incomes during this past year will affect some tax yields in 1951.

Federal expenditures are themselves of fundamental importance to our prospects for steady economic growth. Programs for such purposes as national defense and international recovery are essential to maintain a favorable international situation. In addition, many Federal expenditures constitute direct supports for important sectors of our economy, or direct investments in assets such as power facilities or in better education and other services, which add to the productive capacity of the Nation. Thus this Budget is not only consistent with an expanding economy, but will make a substantial contribution to that objective.

In analyzing the economic impact of Federal financial operations on our economy, increasing attention is also being paid to the aggregate of Federal cash transactions with the public, which are not fully reflected in the totals of Budget expenditures and receipts. Primarily important is the fact that, as long as the social insurance trust funds are building reserves to cover liabilities in future years, they show a substantial excess of receipts over payments. Therefore, the current economic impact of Federal financial activities, as reflected in the net difference between all cash receipts from and all cash payments to the public, is usually different from that indicated by the Budget surplus or deficit. In 1951, for example, the excess of cash payments over receipts is estimated at 2.7 billion dollars, 2.4 billion dollars less than the estimated Budget deficit. Continuing improvement in our fiscal position, which our present plans should achieve, will therefore probably result in an excess of total cash income over cash outgo before the Budget will show a surplus. This aspect of our over-all fiscal position is important in supporting the basic economic soundness of the fiscal program, although it does not lessen the need for the greatest possible prudence in the conduct of our financial operations as reflected in the Budget, which is the proper instrument of Executive and Legislative control.

The third major consideration supporting the soundness of this fiscal program is the fact that the tax recommendations which I shall transmit to the Congress will both improve our tax structure and place us in a better position to meet our continuing fiscal requirements. It is highly important that we begin to make the basic changes in the tax system which are needed to make it more equitable and to provide better incentives for producing the amounts and types of investment, consumption, and savings which will contribute to an expanding economy. The large and badly devised tax reduction of 1948 sharply limits the extent to which we can make changes at the present time. Nevertheless, we can and should make now some of the changes which are needed in our tax laws, and bring nearer the time when the Budget can be balanced. Because of the time lag in tax collections after changes in the law, and the fact that some of the changes will result in an immediate loss in revenue, the tax recommendations which I shall submit to the Congress will produce less additional revenue in 1951 than in subsequent years, when the changes will be fully effective.

For all these reasons, the financial program which I am recommending represents a sound, long-range basis on which to plan our governmental operations at this time. It is directed at

achieving a budgetary balance in the only way in which it can be achieved—by measures which support rather than impair the continued growth of our country. It is based on expenditure plans which can be sustained in the years following 1951 without embarrassment to our fiscal position. Its accomplishment does, however, depend upon our continued self-control in holding expenditure programs to no more than necessary levels.

As in all recent years, the Budget for 1951 is dominated by financial requirements to pay the costs of past wars and to achieve a peaceful world. Estimated expenditures for these purposes are 30 billion dollars, or about 71 percent of the total Budget. This is a reduction of 1.8 billion dollars from estimated expenditures for the same purposes in 1950. National defense and international programs, designed to insure our security and to create the economic and political conditions necessary for world peace, will require about 18 billion dollars. Veterans' programs and interest on the public debt, commitments arising mainly from the last war, will require about 12 billion dollars.

Our unprecedentedly large expenditures in recent years for international programs have been undertaken to assist free peoples to recover from the devastation of the war and to restore their capacity for future growth both in material things and in the practice of democratic principles. These programs are proving to be an investment paying dividends, far beyond their cost, in enhancing our own security and in providing a basis for world peace and prosperity. The job is not yet done, the goals are not yet reached; but the progress so far achieved makes possible in 1951 a substantial reduction in the dollar costs of these programs. Total expenditures for international affairs and finance are estimated at 4.7 billion dollars, a reduction of 1.3 billion dollars from 1950. This amount reflects the minimum requirements for these programs, and their success to date emphasizes the compelling need to carry them through on the planned basis.

As progress is made toward achieving the short-range objectives of recovery and relief, two other international activities assume increasing importance. First, I am renewing the recommendation for a program of technical and capital assistance to underdeveloped countries. The Budget expenditures in 1951 will be relatively small but they represent a step of great significance in the encouragement of world economic expansion and the growth of world trade, which are essential to our national prosperity. Second, I am recommending additional funds in 1951 for the mutual defense assistance program, authorized by the Congress last year, and now getting under way. This program is a necessary supplement to economic growth as a bulwark against aggression, and is an integral part of the cooperative effort to assure the continued independence of free nations.

Expenditures for national defense must be sufficient to provide us with the balanced military strength we must maintain in the present world situation, at a level which can be sustained over a period of years. In 1951, expenditures for national defense are estimated at 13.5 billion dollars, an increase of about 400 million dollars over 1950. The present level of expenditures is substantially less than was anticipated a year ago, and is the result of careful Budget planning and vigorous administrative action.

Expenditures for veterans' services and benefits are estimated at 6.1 billion dollars in 1951, a decline of 825 million dollars from 1950. Our veterans' programs represent commitments which the Government has made to those who have served in its armed forces, and these commitments must be met. While that part which represents pensions, medical care, and similar services will continue to rise gradually, the program of readjustment benefits was intended to be transitional, and we should plan on a continued reduction in its cost during the next few years.

Interest on the public debt is estimated at 5.6 billion dollars in 1951, slightly lower than in 1950. This is, of course, a fixed commitment of the Government, and represents predominantly the cost of financing the last war.

All expenditures, other than those for international, national defense, and veterans' programs, and interest on the debt, total 12.5 billion dollars, about 29 percent of the total Budget. This is an increase of about 1 billion dollars from estimated expenditures for these purposes in 1950. They include many important activities such as the Atomic Energy Commission and the Maritime Commission, which are closely related to our national security. Furthermore, they represent those positive functions which Government must fulfill if we are to have a healthy and growing economy. Federal expenditures for these purposes in 1951 are expected to constitute a substantially lower percentage of the total national income than the corresponding percentage in 1939.

The 12.5 billion dollars which this Budget provides for these domestic programs, viewed item by item, reflects—and has been generally recognized by the Congress to reflect—the necessary contributions of the Federal Government in our modern economy. The major question in my mind is not whether we are doing too much, but whether the budgetary requirements of the major national security and war-connected programs have constrained us to undertake too little toward supporting and stimulating the realization of our country's great potential development. It must be recognized that failure to support essential Federal activities would impede the continued expansion upon which the well-being of our economy and the soundness of the Government's fiscal position alike depend.

Expenditures in this Budget, designed to assist economic development in the categories of housing and community development, agriculture, natural resources, transportation and communication, finance, commerce, and industry, and labor, together amount to 7.9 billion dollars, 19 percent of total estimated expenditures.

We must push ahead, for example, with atomic energy development, and the Budget provides 817 million dollars for this purpose. We must maintain and develop adequate aviation facilities and services, for which 230 million dollars is included. The Federal Government should continue to assist States in developing an adequate national highway system; Federal expenditures for this purpose are estimated at 507 million dollars in 1951. The development of our rivers for flood control, navigation, reclamation, power, and other uses is of fundamental importance for economic growth, and is largely a Federal responsibility, for which this Budget includes 1.4 billion dollars. The Government is substantially aiding private industry and local communities in producing more and better housing at prices people can afford; 1.3 billion dollars is included for these purposes. Over 800 million dollars is provided to further the conservation of farm lands and to make loans for extending electricity to farms.

There is one aspect of these expenditures which has properly received widespread attention by the Congress and the public as having an important bearing on the long-run fiscal position of the Government. Many expenditures represent the acquisition of assets which are recoverable or will give continuing returns in future years, and which in normal business accounting would not usually be considered as current expense. It is estimated that in the 1951 Budget such expenditures, excluding military public works and equipment, amount to about 5.6 billion dollars, of which about 4 billion dollars is anticipated to be in the recoverable category. In the case of the Federal Government, in contrast to private business, these investment expenditures cannot properly be financed differently from other items in the Budget. But their size and nature are important in evaluating the strength of our fiscal position. A special analysis of the nature and extent of investment expenditures is included in part III of the Budget this year for the first time.

Economic growth must be matched by comparable development in the social well-being and living standards of all our people. Continued progress depends in large part upon the increasing fulfillment of the responsibilities of Government in such fields as social welfare, education, and public health. In addition to the transfer of 594 million dollars of pay-roll taxes to the railroad retirement trust fund, the Budget proposes total funds of 2.1 billion dollars for social welfare, health, and security, and 434 million dollars for education and general research, about one-sixteenth of total Federal expenditures. These, too, are investments in the future of our country. Over 80 percent of these funds is for grants to States and localities.

The remaining programs, classified under general government, are estimated to cost 1.3 billion dollars. These funds provide for over-all legislative, judicial, and executive operations of the Government, and for various central services such as the maintenance of public buildings. Included in this total are 424 million dollars for tax collection and other

financial operations, and 333 million dollars for the Government's payment to the civil service retirement fund.

The detailed activities of Government agencies in all fields have been closely reviewed to eliminate all but the minimum operations required. This has made necessary the denial of request after request for additional funds which—taken by themselves and in the judgment of particular groups affected—are highly meritorious. The progress made in this Budget in reversing the trend toward higher expenditures and in achieving a substantial reduction has been made possible only by the most vigorous application, in every area, of a policy of holding the numerous activities to essential levels.

In a very few cases—mainly middle-income housing—the exigencies of particular situations justify the recommendation of limited new domestic programs. In addition, I am renewing proposals previously made for aid to education and expanded public assistance, primarily in the form of grants to States, and for the enactment of certain social insurance legislation which would be financed primarily by special taxes. Beyond this, however, I am recommending no new programs which would require large expenditures in future years, above the amounts included in this Budget. In the case of existing programs, while vigorous effort is being devoted to improving their efficiency, they must in the public interest be given sufficient funds to allow effective operation.

The rise from 2.5 billion dollars in 1950 to 3.1 billion dollars in 1951 in estimated civil public works expenditures, including grants and loans, reflects almost entirely the minimum requirements of projects and programs now under way. With respect to Federal public works in such fields as reclamation, flood control, and rivers and harbors, this Budget does not provide for starting any new projects, despite the pressures that exist for initiating construction of a large number of additional projects which are already authorized. Federal grants to States for public works have also been generally limited to the necessary costs required to carry forward continuing construction programs, primarily those for highways, airports, and hospitals.

Our policies with respect to expenditures must of course remain flexible to meet shifts in international or economic conditions. The policies I have outlined represent the sound and necessary basis for Budget programs in the light of the outlook at this time.

MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

The past year has been one of outstanding achievement in improving the organization and operating methods of the executive branch. This is an important fact to note in the Budget Message as the accomplishment of better management in Government is essential to the fulfillment of our established fiscal goals. It is also a responsibility to which every official must give increased attention if the public is to receive a full return on its tax dollar. Action has been taken on many fronts. To cite but a few: the Department of State has been reorganized; improved operating methods have been installed in the Treasury Department; further progress toward unification has been made with the creation of a Department of Defense; central service functions of the Government have been reorganized in the General Services Administration; significant reorganizations have occurred in the Post Office Department, the Department of Commerce, and the Civil Service Commission.

In cooperation with the Congress, I intend to continue a vigorous program to achieve further improvements in governmental management.

One phase of this program requires the enactment of legislation and the approval of reorganization plans. During the coming year I recommend that the Congress enact basic personnel legislation to make possible further improvements in the way the Government recruits, trains, and supervises its employees. I also recommend that the Congress take action to allow the Post Office to maintain its own accounts and conduct its financial affairs on a businesslike basis and to permit appointment of postmasters by the Postmaster General.

During the session I shall transmit to the Congress a number of reorganization plans. The objective of these plans will be the establishment of clear lines of responsibility and authority for the management of Government activities and the more effective grouping of Government programs within departments and agencies.

A second phase of the management improvement program includes Government-wide activities in which all agencies participate. Major undertakings in this area are the installation of more efficient property and records management practices under the leadership of the General Services Administration; strengthening of personnel management activities under the leadership of the Civil Service Commission; and institution, under the sponsorship of the Bureau of the Budget, of systematic review by all agencies of operating effectiveness and economy as required by the Classification Act of 1949. In addition, more modern accounting practices are being installed throughout the Government under the guidance of a joint committee consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller General, and the Director of the Budget.

In the field of programing and budgeting, the progress made toward presentation of this 1951 Budget on a "performance" basis is an example of results stemming from the improvement program. An examination of the body of this document will indicate a substantial change from that of previous years. The activities for which funds are recommended are described so that the Congress and the citizens may see more clearly the relationship between the activities to be performed and the costs of those activities. Future Budget documents will include additional improvements. Some of these will reflect current efforts both to strengthen and simplify Government accounting and to develop better measures of work performance. Others will provide additional kinds of analyses to enable examination and understanding of the Budget from different standpoints.

The third aspect of the management improvement program is the work being done by individual departments and agencies. I have instructed each department and agency head to inaugurate an aggressive program of management improvement in his department. These departmental programs have been reviewed in terms of their relation to financial requirements and their contribution to the solution of known problems. I will announce shortly certain areas to which priority will be given in the management improvement work of the executive branch during the year 1950. The special fund for management improvement which was authorized by the Congress last year will be utilized to carry out some of the specific projects. In following through to secure results from this entire program I will have the assistance and advice of my Advisory Committee on Management Improvement.

Under our Federal form of government, many public services are the common concern of Federal, State, and local government. Continuing attention needs to be given by all levels of government to the problems arising from the interrelations of our tax systems and the administration of common governmental functions. Federal and State and local officials are currently studying the possibilities of further cooperative arrangements in tax administration in order to reduce costs and improve coordination. We are also cooperating in developing legislative proposals to deal with several current problems of mutual concern: provision of certain local services to Federal personnel, application of local taxes to personnel and transactions on Federal reservations, and the establishment of a general system of payments to State and local governments whose property-tax base has been reduced by Federal acquisitions of real estate.

The reports of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government have provided the framework for much of the improved organization and management which has been achieved and which I hope to achieve during the coming year. While work has been started in a number of the areas containing the greatest potential for economy and improved operations, many further legislative and administrative actions are needed. It should be realized that the greater effectiveness and economy and better service to the public, which come from improved management, are the cumulative result of a great many individual actions. Realization of those goals requires the coordinated and unrelenting efforts of all Federal officials and employees. We must continue to emphasize the achievement of better management as an important part of the job of public service in which the Congress and the executive branch are engaged.

BUDGET RECEIPTS

Budget receipts in the fiscal year 1951 are estimated at 37.3 billion dollars un-

der existing tax legislation, 457 million dollars below the estimate for the current year. Decreased collections from corporation income taxes account for the principal decline in receipts between the 2 years, reflecting the fact that the reduction in corporate profits from the calendar year 1948 peak does not have its full effect on tax receipts until the fiscal year 1951. The estimates of receipts assume economic activity at approximately the same level as at the present time.

I will shortly transmit to the Congress my recommendations for changes in our tax laws to provide a more balanced and equitable tax structure and to increase Federal revenues. The net increase in revenues during 1951 will be substantially smaller than in subsequent years, owing to the time required for some of the changes to become fully effective.

Budget receipts

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Source	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Direct taxes on individuals:			
Individual income taxes	$17,929	$17,971	$18,246
Estate and gift taxes	797	697	692
Direct taxes on corporations:			
Corporation income taxes	11,343	11,075	10,458
Excess profits taxes	211	100	60
Excises	7,551	7,631	7,642
Employment taxes:			
Existing legislation:			
Federal Insurance Contributions Act	1,690	2,245	2,515
Federal Unemployment Tax Act	223	223	224
Railroad Retirement Tax Act	564	570	594
Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act	10	10	10
Proposed legislation:			
Medical care insurance			250
Improvement of old-age and survivors insurance			1,200
Customs	384	375	375
Miscellaneous receipts:			
Existing legislation	2,072	1,288	1,096
Proposed legislation			60
Deduct:			
Appropriation to trust funds:			
Existing legislation	−1,690	−2,245	−2,515
Proposed legislation:			
Medical care insurance			−250
Improvement of old-age and survivors insurance			−1,200
Refunds of receipts	−2,838	−2,177	−2,151
Budget receipts	38,246	37,763	37,306

NOTE.—Estimated receipts for 1951 exclude new tax proposals, except for recommended changes in employment taxes and miscellaneous receipts.

Direct taxes on individuals: Receipts from the income tax on individuals exceed those from any other tax. The total of 18.9 billion dollars estimated for 1951 for direct taxes on individuals is practically unchanged from the 1950 total, and reflects continued high levels of employment and income.

Direct taxes on corporations: The fiscal year 1951 estimate of receipts from taxes on corporations is 10.5 billion dollars. During the fiscal year 1951 corporations will pay income tax on the profits earned during the calendar years 1949 and 1950. The decline in profits from the peak level of 1948 will therefore adversely affect these receipts for the fiscal year 1951.

Excises and customs: Under present laws, very little change is anticipated in collections of excise taxes and customs.

Employment taxes: The tax rate for old-age and survivors insurance was increased from 1 to 1½ percent on the first of this month; hence the receipts estimate for 1950 includes taxes based upon both the old rate and the new. Receipts for 1951 under existing legislation represent a full year's collection at the new higher rate.

I have recommended expansion and improvement of the old-age and survivors insurance system and a new program of medical care insurance. It is estimated that the additional taxes to be collected for these programs will amount to 1.4 billion dollars in 1951. Since these sums will be transferred immediately to trust accounts, Budget receipts will not be increased.

Miscellaneous receipts: Miscellaneous receipts have been declining steadily since 1947, primarily because of the drop in sales of surplus property originally acquired for war purposes. During 1951 receipts from surplus property will be only about 0.1 billion dollars compared to the peak of 2.9 billion dollars in 1947.

There are other decreases in the estimates of miscellaneous receipts which are in the nature of changes in reporting. Certain receipts, notably of the Farmers' Home Administration and of the public housing program, were formerly deposited into miscellaneous receipts, but are now deducted from the expenditures of the programs involved. These changes, of course, have no effect on the surplus or deficit.

The estimate of miscellaneous receipts for 1951 reflects my recommendation that legislation be enacted to permit the acceleration of capital repayment by the Federal home-loan banks. An increase in patent fees is also necessary to make the Patent Office more nearly self-supporting.

Refunds of receipts: Refunds for 1951 are estimated at about the same level as for the current year, 0.7 billion dollars less than in 1949. The decline is the result of the fact that 1949 refunds were unusually high because of the retroactive features of the Revenue Act of 1948.

PUBLIC DEBT

The public debt amounted to 252.8 billion dollars on June 30, 1949. Estimated Budget deficits of 5.5 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1950 and 5.1 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1951, together with certain minor adjustments, will cause the debt to increase to 263.8 billion dollars by the end of 1951. In 1951, about 2.5 billion dollars of the increase in the debt will be financed by new investments in Federal securities by trust accounts and other Government agencies.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES AND AUTHORIZATIONS

A summary of Budget expenditures according to the broad programs or functions for which the money is spent is set forth in the table below. This table includes all expenditures from the general and special funds of the Treasury and the net expenditures of wholly owned Government corporations. Expenditures from the trust funds are excluded.

Budget expenditures and authorizations by major function

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Function	Expenditures			New obligational authority for 1951	
	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated	Appropriations	Other
International affairs and finance	$6,462	$5,964	$4,711	$4,505	$530
National defense	11,914	13,148	13,545	[1] 11,359	[1] 1,441
Veterans' services and benefits	6,669	6,905	6,080	5,847	------
Social welfare, health, and security	1,907	2,297	2,714	2,625	165
Housing and community development	282	1,006	1,329	117	704
Education and general research	70	125	434	455	7
Agriculture and agricultural resources	2,512	2,671	2,206	875	580
Natural resources	1,512	1,845	2,218	1,594	370
Transportation and communication	1,622	1,894	1,682	973	673
Finance, commerce, and industry	120	225	212	60	250
Labor	193	219	243	266	------
General government	1,170	1,223	1,267	1,231	[3]
Interest on the public debt	5,352	5,725	5,625	5,625	------
Reserve for contingencies	------	50	175	200	------
Adjustment to daily Treasury statement	272	------	------	------	------
Total	40,057	43,297	42,439	[2] 35,731	4,723

[1] In addition, 851 million dollars of reserved 1950 contract authorizations and 22 million dollars of 1950 appropriations will be available for 1951 programs.

[2] This Budget also includes 4,514 million dollars of appropriations to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

All expenditures flow from obligational authority enacted by the Congress. The net new appropriations and other authorizations recommended for the fiscal year 1951 total 40.5 billion dollars. Of this total, 33.1 billion dollars is now formally recommended for action by the Congress, while 7.4 billion dollars is tentatively estimated for later submission. In addition, this Budget includes appropriations of 4.5 billion dollars to liquidate obligations incurred under prior year contract authorizations, more than half in programs for the national defense.

Since contracts with industry must be let well ahead of deliveries, a considerable lead time is required for the economical operation of many Government programs. This is especially true for public works and military procurement. Financial obligations incurred in prior years, therefore, will have already fixed a substantial part of the estimated Budget expenditures for 1951. Of the total Budget expenditures of 42.4 billion dollars estimated for 1951, about 12.1 billion dollars, 29 percent, will be payments for obligations incurred in 1950 or in earlier years; the remainder will be for 1951 obligations.

Net new appropriations recommended for 1951 are 1.6 billion dollars less than those estimated for 1950. They represent total appropriations (including permanent appropriations) less those to be used to liquidate prior year contract authorizations. New contract authorizations (which will require later appropriations to liquidate) totaling 3.4 billion dollars are also included in this Budget, also about 1.6 billion dollars less than the estimated new contract authority for 1950.

Special authorizations to use the proceeds of Treasury borrowing in the financing of certain Government programs are included in the 1951 recommendations to the amount of 1.4 billion dollars. This represents a decline of 6 billion dollars from the 1950 estimate for this type of authorization. The estimate for 1950, however, anticipates action by the Congress in providing supplemental public debt authorizations of 2 billion dollars for the Commodity Credit Corporation, one-half billion dollars for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and stand-by borrowing authority of 1.7 billion dollars for the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and the Federal home loan banks.

PROGRAMS

The following sections describe the programs undertaken in each of the major functions of the Government and the new proposals I am making in this Budget. In addition, this year for the first time the Budget contains (in part II) improved presentations showing in detail the programs and performance of all Government agencies.

International affairs and finance

In 1951, as in every year since the war, the cost of our international programs will be large because far-reaching problems remain to be solved. Notable progress has been made toward foreign economic recovery, but some of the most difficult steps lie ahead. The threat of aggression still exists, requiring continued efforts to bolster the defenses of free nations. The economic underdevelopment of great areas of the world deprives their peoples of the adequate living standards in which free institutions can flourish, and deprives other peoples of needed resources which expanded world trade could bring.

The 1951 Budget provides for 4.7 billion dollars of expenditures on our international activities. This is 1.3 billion dollars, or more than 20 percent, below estimated expenditures in 1950. This very substantial reduction reflects the declining costs of our recovery and relief programs as they have stimulated and supported economic reconstruction, rising living standards, and growing political stability. My recommendations for 1951 represent the minimum amount required to carry our plans forward toward a successful conclusion. The continuing and grave uncertainties which remain in the world situation make it imperative that we be prepared to adjust our efforts to accord with developments. If, however, we make at this time the investment necessary to achieve continued economic recovery, I expect the trend in total expenditures for our international activities to continue downward in subsequent years.

Recovery and relief costs, which in 1951 will be over 75 percent of international expenditures, will diminish rapidly as recovery programs near completion, although new measures may become necessary to attain specific objectives in particular areas. At the same time, our programs for stimulating foreign economic development assume increasing importance, and expenditures for this purpose should increase somewhat in future years as political conditions stabilize and opportunities for mutually advantageous technological improvement and productive investment abroad increase. Furthermore, expenditures for foreign military assistance will remain substantial for several years as shipments are made under the programs authorized in 1950 and proposed for 1951.

International affairs and finance

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			New obligational authority for 1951	
	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated	Appropriations	Other
Conduct of foreign affairs:					
State Department	$134	[1] $187	[1] $190	$175	-------
Participation in international organizations (present programs and proposed legislation)	38	58	49	31	-------
Other	1	1	1	(2)	-------
International recovery and relief:					
European recovery program and other foreign aid (present programs and proposed legislation)	4,040	[1] 4,062	3,250	3,100	-------
Aid to occupied areas	1,349	831	279	320	-------
Aid to Korea (present programs and proposed legislation)	[1] 6	[1] 93	[1] 111	115	-------
Reconstruction Finance Corporation (loan repayment)	−41	−38	−38	-------	-------
Aid to refugees:					
International Refugee Organization	73	70	25	25	-------
Displaced persons program (present programs and proposed legislation)	1	5	4	4	-------
Palestine refugees (present programs and proposed legislation)	8	15	20	-------	-------
Other	288	23	3	-------	-------
Foreign economic development:					
Export-Import Bank loans	−57	71	48	-------	-------
Inter-American development	12	11	8	7	$30
Technical assistance to underdeveloped areas (proposed legislation)	-------	-------	25	35	-------
Foreign military assistance:					
Mutual defense assistance program (present programs and proposed legislation)	-------	160	645	648	500
Greek-Turkish aid (acts of 1947 and 1948)	289	195	-------	-------	-------
Assistance to China (act of 1948)	125	-------	-------	-------	-------
Philippine aid	197	221	91	45	-------
Total	6,462	5,964	4,711	[3] 4,505	530

[1] Includes transfer from funds for aid to occupied areas.
[2] Less than one-half million dollars.
[3] This Budget also includes 518 million dollars of appropriations to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

Conduct of foreign affairs: Expenditures in 1951 for the State Department, through which we conduct our foreign affairs, will be about the same as for the current year. The decline of war claims payments will be about offset by increased requirements in other programs, notably the Department's recent assumption of responsibilities in Germany. The international information and education program will continue at the expanded level to be reached this year.

Our Government also participates in many international agencies, principally the United Nations and its affiliates. Through such participation we are actively engaged in a cooperative and world-wide effort to build the foundations for continued peace and the social and economic betterment of all peoples. One important aspect of this effort has been the development of a set of principles and a mechanism, through the proposed International Trade Organization, for facilitating the growth of world trade on a multilateral basis. I again urge that Congress approve the charter of the International Trade Organization and pass the necessary implementing legislation.

European recovery program: A major problem of foreign policy today is the fact that certain key areas of the world, principally western Europe, are faced with the necessity of making fundamental and complex adjustments to the far-reaching changes in their trade and financial relationships which resulted from the war. The great achievement of the European recovery program to date has been to help these countries to recover from the devastation of war, to restore living standards, and to maintain political stability, and thus to place them in a position to make the adjustments that are required.

As a consequence of their situation, these countries have experienced an extraordinary need in recent years for commodities and equipment which could, for the most part, be supplied only by this country, but for which they were not able to pay by the export of goods and services. If we had permitted their imports to sink to the temporarily reduced level which they could finance, it would have drastically reduced their living standards and invited unrest and destructive economic nationalism. Instead, we have undertaken a planned and mutual effort designed to achieve, during a relatively short period of United States assistance, expanded foreign production and trade, an increase in exports yielding dollars and a lessening need for imports requiring dollars, and an increased international flow of investment capital, thus establishing the basis for economic growth and prosperity.

The European recovery program has made notable progress toward these objectives since its inception almost 2 years ago. As a result, 1951 appropriation requirements for all segments of the program, including that portion of our aid to western Germany which has previously been provided separately from funds for aid to occupied areas, will be more than 1 billion dollars below the

amounts provided by the Congress for the same purposes in 1950. Serious obstacles, however, remain to be surmounted. A substantial expansion in international trade and investment is necessary if the remaining adjustments are to be completed without involving serious economic and political dislocation.

The past year has shown that this task will not be easy. To achieve an increased flow of trade and investment will require far-sighted and vigorous steps by the European countries, and by other nations as well, including our own, if international economic relationships are to be established on a sound basis. The funds included in this Budget for continuing our participation in the European recovery program are an essential element for further progress.

Other international recovery and relief programs: Our economic aid to occupied areas similarly takes the form of recovery programs designed to balance their trade at levels adequate to maintain stability without continued United States assistance. During the current fiscal year, responsibility for economic aid to western Germany has been transferred from the Department of the Army to the Economic Cooperation Administration, and these costs will be met in 1951 from European recovery program funds. Army-administered aid to occupied areas in 1951 will therefore be limited almost wholly to Japan and the Ryukyu Islands. The substantial sums invested in Japanese recovery since the end of the war are yielding results which permit a reduction in 1951 outlays for this purpose, and bring us nearer to termination of this program.

Although I have urged the Congress to authorize a similar recovery program for the Republic of Korea, funds provided to date permit operation at only a relief level. Early enactment of the legislation now pending will permit recovery to proceed and hasten the date when our aid can be concluded. The estimates in this Budget anticipate a start toward recovery in the remainder of the current fiscal year and substantial further progress in 1951.

Our remaining international requirements for purposes of relief, as contrasted with recovery, are chiefly those for assistance to refugees. The work of the International Refugee Organization will extend through 1951; its remaining work load, however, is substantially reduced, allowing a 65 percent reduction in our contribution below the 1950 level. The estimate for the Displaced Persons Commission reflects my recommendation that the present Displaced Persons Act be speedily amended to make it fair and workable. The provision for aid to Palestine refugees is the present estimate of our share of the cost of the proposed United Nations' program for restoring to productive activity the several hundred thousand persons displaced during the recent conflict in Palestine.

Foreign economic development: Since the end of the war, the urgent, though temporary, requirements for international recovery and relief have of necessity taken priority over longer-range efforts to promote world economic development. The devastation left by war had to be overcome. The restoration of economic strength to the world's principal industrial areas necessarily had to precede any real economic progress in the less-developed parts of the world.

Now that recovery is well under way, we must increasingly turn our attention to measures for the gradual and permanent expansion of world production, trade, and living standards which are necessary for enduring world peace. Great potentialities for such expansion lie in the underdeveloped areas of the world, with resulting benefits to the peoples of these areas and to other countries, including our own.

I again urge the Congress to authorize a program of technical assistance to enable the peoples of these areas to learn, and to adapt to their own needs, modern technological and scientific knowledge in such fields as agriculture, health, education, transportation, and industry. The achievements of our present technical assistance activities in the American Republics and in Europe attest to the success and practicability of this approach. This budget provides for expenditures of 25 million dollars for the new program. This includes the United States share in the cost of the program for technical assistance recently approved by the United Nations.

A second basic requirement for economic progress in underdeveloped areas is a substantial increase in the inflow of capital for productive investment. These areas should offer opportunities for private capital and private enterprise, if there is assurance of fair and equitable treatment for foreign capital such as is contained in the commercial treaties which are now being negotiated with many nations. Nevertheless, there will remain certain abnormal risks which deter potential investors, and I again urge the enactment of legislation authorizing an experimental program by the Export-Import Bank to guarantee private developmental investments against such risks.

In many cases the flow of private capital may not be available or adequate, or particular circumstances may make governmental action preferable. In such cases, the investment of public funds may be needed, through such institutions as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the Export-Import Bank. These institutions are currently directing their emphasis to loans for developmental purposes.

Foreign military assistance: Although economic recovery is the most essential condition to the maintenance of freedom and stability in western Europe and other regions of vital importance to our own security, economic vitality alone will not suffice to prevent aggression. Stronger military defenses are required, but these nations cannot unaided strengthen their defenses to a point sufficient to deter aggression without seriously retarding their recovery efforts. To solve their dilemma and to strengthen our own defenses, we agreed last year to unite with our neighbors of the North Atlantic community in developing and putting into effect an integrated defense plan for that area.

We have implemented that decision through the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, which provides for the supply of arms to the Treaty nations to supplement their own defense measures. The act also continues our previous program of assistance to Greece and Turkey, which has already achieved substantial success in ending the guerrilla threat to Greek independence and in strengthening Turkish defenses. In addition the act provides for military aid to certain other areas in the Middle and Far East.

The North Atlantic Treaty nations are now proceeding with the development of an integrated defense plan, the translation of that plan into equipment and supply needs, and a realistic determination of what each participant can do, both for itself and for the others, in meeting those requirements. For the current year the Congress provided 1 billion dollars for military assistance to the Treaty nations, and 359 million dollars for the other nations covered by the act. For the fiscal year 1951 I am recommending new obligational authority of 1.1 billion dollars, including 500 million dollars new contract authority.

Except for the previously authorized Greek-Turkish program, expenditures in 1950 will be relatively low, owing to late enactment of the new program and the time required for agreement on joint plans and for the subsequent determination of detailed requirements. Expenditures in 1951 for foreign military assistance will be almost twice as great as in 1950, and may rise somewhat further thereafter, owing to the long delivery time characteristic of military procurement.

Philippine aid: The special concern and responsibility we feel for the progress of the Philippine Republic have taken the principal form, since the war, of assistance in the physical rehabilitation of damaged facilities and the payment of war damage claims. The cost of both of these programs will decline sharply in 1951 as they approach completion. We will continue to follow with sympathetic interest the achievements of the Philippine people and to assist them in making their contribution to our common objectives.

National defense

Our expenditures for national defense continue to be the largest item in the budget. Under current world circumstances, in which the strength of the United States is making such a vital contribution toward world peace, we must continue to make the expenditures necessary to maintain a position of relative military readiness. At the same time, we must plan our expenditures for national defense so that we will achieve our purpose at a reasonable cost, well within our capacity to sustain over a period of years.

This budget represents a further step toward these objectives. It provides for active forces in a high state of training, available for immediate use if necessary and as a nucleus for rapid expansion in the event of an emergency, and for reserve forces, organized and trained for early mobilization if necessary. This budget contemplates the continued development of planning for industrial mobilization and the accumulation of a

stockpile of strategic and critical materials. It continues to emphasize research and development to keep our military technology abreast of scientific developments, and procurement of newly developed weapons to improve the equipment of the ready forces. At the same time this program is sufficiently flexible to provide a basis for rapid changes should developments in technology or international conditions make them necessary.

The recommendations for national defense in this budget take into account the progress which has been made and can reasonably be anticipated in the programs now being developed for the effective integration of our defense plans and organizations with those of other North Atlantic Treaty nations. These defense plans, together with our assistance in strengthening the forces of these countries through the mutual defense assistance program, should provide an increasing measure of security to free peoples on both sides of the Atlantic as well as elsewhere in the world.

For the past 2 years we have been adjusting our military programs to achieve a balanced structure which can be maintained over a period of years without an undue use of national resources. The National Security Act of 1947 and the amendments to that act in 1949 have provided a sound organizational framework within which to work toward this objective. Vigorous actions have been taken to reduce overhead, to improve efficiency, to eliminate activities of low priority, and to realine our armed forces in accordance with a unified strategic concept. As a result, the estimate of obligational authority for the 1951 program of the Department of Defense, including certain obligations in 1951 from 1950 authority, is 13 billion dollars, as compared with 14.2 billion dollars recommended for 1950 in the budget a year ago.

My recommendations in this budget provide for balanced land, naval, and air forces. In order to avoid the creation of forces involving commitments over a period of years beyond what we could reasonably expect to provide, I have had placed in reserve certain authorizations for the current year which were provided primarily for the expansion of the Air Force. These recommendations for the Defense Department for 1951 contemplate substantially the continuation of the revised 1950 program.

The estimated obligational authority of 13.7 billion dollars for 1951 includes 4.0 billions for the Army, 3.9 billions for the Navy, and 4.4 billions for the Air Force. In addition the recommendations include 0.8 billion for other Department of Defense activities, including retired pay and proposed legislation; and 0.6 billion for other national defense activities, mainly stockpiling of strategic and critical materials. Of this obligational authority expected to be required in 1951, 11.4 billion dollars is appropriations and 1.4 billion dollars is contract authorizations, both requiring action by the Congress. In addition, 873 million dollars is to come from appropriations and contract authorizations which were placed in reserve in 1950 and are available for 1951 needs.

The estimated expenditures for national defense in 1951 of 13.5 billions, including stock piling and other defense items, are an increase of about 400 million dollars from estimated expenditures for 1950. The increase results almost entirely from procurement and other commitments made under authorizations previously approved by the Congress. Expenditures in subsequent years will reflect the reduction of new obligational authority for 1951.

Military strength: Extension of authority for selective service, for which I plan to submit legislation, is vital as a positive demonstration of our resolve to maintain the strength of the free world. With it we will retain our ability to expand our armed forces rapidly in an emergency and will also insure adequate replacements to maintain the required strength of our active forces.

The extension of selective service authority will provide a temporary solution to the military manpower problem of the active forces, but will leave unsolved the problem of trained manpower for our reserve forces. I point out again the necessity of a program of universal training, if we are to provide on a continuing basis sufficient numbers of men for the reserve forces, adequately trained to use effectively the increasingly complex machines of war.

National defense

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			New obligational authority for 1951	
	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated	Appropriations	Other
Department of Defense, military functions:					
Pay and support of active duty military personnel	$4,435	$4,590	$4,287	$4,292	-------
Operation and maintenance of equipment and facilities	3,418	3,224	3,294	3,406	-------
Civilian components	539	705	740	757	-------
Research and development	688	630	606	[1] 594	-------
Aircraft procurement	1,230	1,656	2,081	81	[2] $1,937
Construction of ships	295	314	298	-------	-------
Major procurement other than aircraft and ships	198	455	678	755	-------
Military public works	151	299	182	-------	-------
Industrial mobilization, service-wide administration and finance, interservice projects, and Office of Secretary of Defense	390	487	491	535	-------
Tentative estimate for proposed legislation (including military public works)	-------	-------	70	132	240
Unexpended reimbursements from mutual defense assistance program	-------	−50	−225	-------	-------

See footnotes at end of table.

National defense—Continued

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			New obligational authority for 1951	
	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated	Appropriations	Other
Department of Defense, civil functions:					
Pay of retired military personnel	$191	$241	$345	$356	-------
Other	13	9	5	-------	-------
Subtotal, Department of Defense	11,548	12,560	12,852	[1] 10,908	[2] $2,177
Activities supporting defense:					
Stock piling of strategic and critical materials	299	580	650	400	100
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	49	56	65	48	15
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	−17	−81	−48	-------	-------
Other	35	33	22	21	-------
Tentative estimate for proposed legislation: Selective Service System	-------	-------	4	4	-------
Subtotal	11,914	13,148	13,545	[1] 11,381	[2] 2,292
Deduct 1950 obligational authority deferred to 1951	-------	-------	-------	−22	−851
Total	11,914	13,148	13,545	[3] 11,359	1,441

[1] Includes appropriations of 22 million dollars made for the fiscal year 1950 which will be available for obligation in the fiscal year 1951.

[2] Includes contract authorizations of 851 million dollars made for the fiscal year 1950 which will be available for obligation in the fiscal year 1951.

[3] This budget also includes 2,533 million dollars of appropriations to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

The total personnel assigned to combat forces will be the greatest since the completion of the demobilization following World War II, although the amounts recommended for 1951 will provide about 3 percent fewer officers and enlisted personnel on full-time active duty than at present. In 1951, it is planned to continue the organized units of the reserve forces at approximately the strength which is expected to be achieved by the end of the current year, but with better equipment, facilities, and training.

Military pay strength

[In thousands]

	Regulars and Reserves on full-time active duty			Reserves in drill-pay status	
	Mar. 31, 1948	Dec. 31, 1949 (estimate)	1951 average (estimate)	October 1949	1951 average (estimate)
Army	538	639	630	565	605
Navy and Marine Corps	488	492	461	213	256
Air Force	368	416	416	82	118
Total	1,394	1,547	1,507	860	979

Under these recommendations for the Army, this budget will provide 10 divisions, 48 antiaircraft battalions, and other combat and service units. Complementing the active Army will be the National Guard with 350,000 personnel

and the Organized Reserves with 255,000 in regular training.

The Navy under these recommendations will operate an active naval fleet of 652 ships including 238 combatant ships. Six Marine Corps battalion landing teams will be maintained. A total of 5,900 aircraft will be operated by the active forces, and 2,500 by the reserve forces. Supplementing the Navy and Marine Corps will be 204,850 members of the Naval Reserve and 50,772 of the Marine Corps Reserve in regular training.

It is contemplated that the active Air Force will be organized into 48 groups and 13 separate squadrons, approximately its present strength. The Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve will be organized into 27 groups and 25 base wings, respectively. A total of 8,800 airplanes, from trainers to heavy bombers, will be operated by the active Air Force, and in addition 3,400 by the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve.

Pay and support of active duty military personnel: The services of the officers and enlisted men and women on active duty will require 4.3 billion dollars, over one-third of Defense Department military expenditures. This will provide for pay, allowances, subsistence, travel, and clothing for the active forces at the new rates of pay and allowances set by the Career Compensation Act of 1949.

Operation and maintenance of equipment and facilities: Estimated expenditures of 3.3 billion dollars will provide for operating and maintaining the aircraft, ships and vehicles, the airfields, training centers, hospitals, depots, various headquarters, ports, and other stations. Most of this amount will be required for the pay of civilian employees in these activities. These employees constitute the bulk of the approximately 725,000 civilian employees expected to be engaged in the military functions of the Defense Department in 1951. This represents a substantial reduction from the 865,000 provided for in the 1950 budget.

Civilian components: I have consistently stressed the importance of the civilian components of our armed forces. The Army and Air National Guard and the Air Force, Army, Navy, and Marine Corps Reserves will require estimated expenditures of 696 million dollars in 1951, as compared with the 663 million dollars estimated for 1950. This will provide for the training of forces totaling 979,000, which approximates the number expected to be in regular training by the end of the current year. Continued improvements are planned in the equipment available to these forces and in the effectiveness of their training programs. In order to overcome a major deficiency in the program for these forces, I recommend that the Congress authorize the construction of additional armories and similar training facilities. Funds for this purpose are included in the amount estimated for proposed legislation.

In addition the Reserve Officers' Training Corps of the Air Force, Army, and Navy will necessitate expenditures of 44 million dollars in 1951 to provide a continuing source of junior officers for the reserve forces and a portion of the junior officers required by the active forces. This will provide an estimated 19,000 new junior officers in 1951, an increase of 2,000 over the estimate for 1950.

Research and development: The experiences of the last war clearly demonstrated the decisive importance in modern warfare of superior weapons and equipment and of the application of scientific research to the production of new weapons and techniques of combat. In peacetime, as well as war, scientific and technical advances here and abroad make possible continuing improvements in the performance of military weapons, and open to us and to other nations the possibilities of new types of weapons which can profoundly affect military concepts and tactics.

We must continue a broad and active program of military research and development. The research and development programs of the Department of Defense, together with the related programs of the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and other agencies of the Government, have as their objectives to develop improved weapons and equipment for the modernization of our military forces, to exploit the possibilities of new types of weapons and devise defenses against them, and to stimulate scientific research likely to have future military applications.

Expenditures of the Department of Defense for research and development in 1951 are estimated at 606 million dollars, slightly less than in the current year. This amount includes the principal costs of the research and development activities, except for the construction of research facilities and the pay and support of military personnel engaged in research and development activities.

Aircraft procurement: Procurement of complete aircraft will require expenditures of 2.1 billion dollars in 1951 for approximately 2,300 airplanes, compared with 1.7 billion dollars for approximately 2,800 airplanes in 1950. The change in average unit cost reflects the increasing complexity and cost of individual airplanes.

The recommendations in this budget will provide for new contracts to be made in 1951 totaling 2.0 billion dollars, compared with 1.9 billion dollars in 1950. This contemplates that 851 million dollars of 1950 authorizations being held in reserve will be applied against requirements for aircraft to be contracted for in 1951.

Approximately 3.3 billion dollars of unexpended authorizations contracted for in 1950 and prior years will be carried forward into 1951. This carry-over, together with the contracts to be made in 1951, will provide 5.3 billion dollars of complete aircraft to be delivered and paid for in 1951 and subsequently. Under present procurement plans it is estimated that, in addition to the 1951 deliveries of 2,300 airplanes, approximately 3,100 airplanes will be delivered in 1952 and later years from authorizations provided prior to that time.

Construction of ships: Naval ship construction will require 293 million dollars of estimated expenditures in 1951. While no new obligational authority is recommended in this budget, the 1951 expenditures will be only slightly less than the 314 million dollars estimated for 1950. Various substitutions and adjustments have been made during the past year in the uncompleted portion of the shipbuilding program. In addition to work completed in 1951, 467 million dollars of presently authorized naval ship construction will remain to be completed in 1952 and later years.

Major procurement other than aircraft and ships: Major procurement other than aircraft procurement and ship construction, will require expenditures of 678 million dollars, a 50-percent increase over the estimate for the current year and more than three times as much as in 1949. This will provide, mainly, combat equipment for Army and Marine Corps troops, equipment for modernizing the fleet, noncombat vehicles for the three military departments and ammunition, torpedoes, and guided missiles. The substantial increase in expenditures in 1951 results largely from the sizable expansion in this program during the past 2 years. The new obligational authority recommended for 1951, totaling 755 million dollars, will be at a moderately higher level than 1950. This will continue the larger procurement program embarked on in 1949 and continued with increases in 1950.

Amounts included for combat vehicles, artillery, guns, and other equipment for Army and Marine Corps troops will permit substantial modernization of the equipment for the ready forces, and will reflect the progress of our research and development efforts. It will provide an orderly step in the replacement of the equipment left over from World War II which by the end of 1951 will be at least 6 years old and therefore in need of substantial improvements in design as a result of technical and scientific developments. The equipment for modernizing the fleet will give emphasis to the role of antisubmarine warfare.

Military public works: Construction of military public works will result in considerably smaller expenditures in 1951 than in 1950. This is largely because only part of the authorizations proposed in my 1950 budget were enacted. Exclusive of the construction for which legislative authorization will need to be made, 1951 expenditures are estimated at 182 million dollars compared with 299 million dollars for 1950. This will provide for such construction as housing for troops and their families, operational facilities, and facilities for research and development. The obligational authority necessary for additional projects not yet authorized by legislation are included in the tentative estimate for proposed legislation.

Industrial mobilization, service-wide projects, and office administration and finance, interservice of the Secretary of Defense: The Defense Department's part in industrial mobilization planning will provide for maintaining machine tools and stand-by industrial plants, for tooling of pilot production lines, and for placing educational orders, as well as for continuing industrial mobilization planning studies with industry. Expenditures for this purpose are estimated at

109 million dollars in 1951 compared with 117 million dollars in 1950.

Other Defense Department activities, largely of service-wide nature, will result in expenditures estimated at 382 million dollars, a slight increase from 1950.

Proposed legislation (including military public works): In order to provide for early starts on projects and activities for which legislation is proposed I am including an estimate of 372 million dollars for new obligational authority, the largest part of which is for military public works for both regular and reserve forces.

Unexpended reimbursements from mutual defense assistance program: The Defense Department receives reimbursements for some of the equipment which it takes from its stocks to ship to other countries under the mutual defense assistance program. The manufacture and delivery of equipment out of these reimbursements will, for the most part, not be possible before the following year. Hence these reimbursements will appear as credits in Defense Department expenditures in 1950 and 1951. As deliveries from these funds are made in future years, compensating increases in Defense Department expenditures will result.

Pay of retired military personnel: Amounts are appropriated annually to provide the cost of pay for retired military personnel. The expenditures of 345 million dollars estimated for 1951 provide this retirement pay for persons whose services were for the most part rendered prior to World War II. The Government is at present incurring obligations for future payments at a rate two and one-half times the current retired pay expenditures.

Stockpiling of strategic and critical materials: The stockpile program will provide the means for augmenting the supplies of materials expected to be available to us in time of emergency. Accelerated progress toward present objectives will be made during the year since available supplies have increased somewhat, partly as a result of orders placed previously to encourage new development.

I recommend 500 million dollars of new obligational authority for this program in 1951. This amount when added to the authority already available will provide total authority for deliveries in 1951 and later years of 1.1 billion dollars. Expenditures are expected to rise from 580 million dollars in 1950 to 650 million dollars in 1951.

The recommended new obligational authority will bring the funds for the stockpile to within 729 million dollars of the present total objective of 3.3 billion dollars. By the end of 1951, 65 percent of the stockpile will be delivered, and an additional 13 percent will be under contract for delivery after 1951. We will be nearer to our goals for the materials the supply of which would be the most susceptible to interruption, than for the stockpile as a whole.

National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and other activities supporting defense: Expenditures for all other activities supporting defense will total 43 million dollars, after deducting 48 million dollars of net receipts in the defense activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Slight increases in funds will be necessary for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to move forward with its basic research activities in aeronautics. The funds for the National Security Resources Board will be maintained at about the present level, and the cost of maintaining industrial reserve plants by the General Services Administration will decline slightly. Other activities provided for include the Selective Service System as well as various defense activities of other agencies. The defense activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, having to do with rubber, tin, and fibers, will result in larger receipts than expenditures, mainly as a result of reduction of inventories.

Veterans' services and benefits

Expenditures of 6.1 billion dollars are estimated for veterans' programs, one-seventh of all budget expenditures estimated for 1951. The size of these requirements reflects the fivefold increase since 1939 in the number of living veterans and the new readjustment benefits provided for the World War II veterans, as well as the increases in rates of benefits and in services to veterans generally.

Most of the expenditures for veterans' benefits and services are not controllable by the ordinary appropriation process. Expenditures depend largely on how many of our 19,000,000 living veterans, and how many dependents of deceased veterans, apply and qualify for aid under some 300 laws. The variable impact of veterans' programs on the budget is indicated by the fact that expenditures for the fiscal year 1950 are now estimated 1.4 billion dollars higher than they were estimated a year ago. As a result, it now is necessary not only to request restoration of the appropriations for the Veterans' Administration eliminated by the last session of the Congress, but also to recommend additional supplemental appropriations for 1950.

Expenditures in the fiscal year 1951 are estimated to decline 825 million dollars from the level for the current year. In the next few years we should be able to see a further substantial reduction in budget expenditures for veterans' programs, as the temporary readjustment benefit programs taper off or expire under existing legislation. On the other hand, it should be recognized that permanent veterans' laws will necessitate high expenditures for many years. In particular, expenditures for pensions and for hospital and medical care will continue to increase from year to year.

I have called attention in previous messages to the responsibilities which our Nation has toward its veterans and to our efforts to assist them to resume as nearly as possible their normal places in our society. We have provided a comprehensive and complete program of special Government benefits for veterans of all wars—including extensive economic aids, education and training assistance, job reinstatement and preference rights, as well as extensive medical and other services. Veterans, as citizens, of course, are also benefited under the general programs developed in the last 15 years to maintain high employment and to advance the Nation's economic welfare.

Almost 2,000,000 veterans with disabilities incurred in the service, and over 300,000 families of veterans deceased from service causes, are now being assisted under the veterans' programs. Our primary long-run obligations in providing veterans' benefits and services are to this group. We must give them timely help to surmount the economic and physical handicaps sustained as the result of military service and to assist them to assume the full responsibilities of civilian life. In the last 2 years, substantial additional increases in compensation rates to dependents and to veterans of World Wars I and II have brought the rates to this group reasonably into line with the rise in the cost of living since 1939.

The remaining 17,000,000 veterans are practically all without service disabilities. The Government has made available liberal benefits to help all veterans of the two world wars make the transition from military to civilian life. The veterans of World War II, in particular, have received readjustment benefits to assist them in obtaining education, training, jobs, businesses, and homes. Most of the citizen-soldiers of World War II returned to civilian life 4 years ago and have had adequate opportunity to reestablish themselves in their communities. The original, sound purposes of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act have largely been served. Some of the benefits under the act have already terminated and the need for others, such as education and training benefits, is drawing to a close.

Veterans without service disabilities will continue to be eligible for liberal benefits under the permanent veterans' laws after the termination of temporary programs. At the same time, these veterans are eligible in many cases for benefits under the general social security programs of the Government. We now seek to improve and to broaden the general social security programs to provide protection against the economic hazards of old age, disability, illness, and unemployment. The social security proposals pending in the Congress apply to all the people, including veterans. In the pending bill to improve the old-age and survivors insurance system, veterans would receive credit for the period of military service during World War II toward benefits under the system. On the other hand, proposals are also pending in the Congress to increase greatly the special programs for veterans, who with their dependents now comprise about two-fifths of our total population. There is real cause for concern that we may overlook the close relationship of these two systems and superimpose on the general system of benefits an overlapping and unwarranted series of special benefits for veterans.

I again urge that in considering new or additional aids for veterans without

service disabilities, the Congress judge their necessity not merely from the standpoint of military service, but also on the basis of benefits under the general social security, health, and education programs available to all the people, including veterans. Our objective should be to make our Social Security System more comprehensive in coverage and more adequate, so that it will provide the basic protection needed by all citizens. We should provide through the veterans' programs only for the special and unique needs of veterans arising directly from military service.

I am sure that our veterans are willing to share with other citizens in the benefits which can be gained for all through a positive program of economic and social advancement. They recognize that their best interest is inseparable from the best interest of the Nation. For a democratic Nation like ours can thrive only as all its citizens—veterans and nonveterans alike—are enabled through fair and equal opportunties to live as self-respecting, self-reliant men and women in a free and prosperous country.

Veterans' services and benefits

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			New obligational authority for 1951	
	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated	Appropriations	Other
Readjustment benefits (Veterans' Administration):					
Education and training	$2,697	$2,718	$2,481	2,681	-------
Unemployment and self-employment allowances	510	153	61		
Loan guaranties	40	61	68		
Other	87	105	78		
Compensation and pensions (Veterans' Administration)	2,154	2,243	2,237	2,237	-------
Insurance (Veterans' Administration)	95	518	39	39	-------
Hospitals, other services, and administrative costs:					
Construction:					
Veterans' Administration	34	82	157	(1)	-------
Corps of Engineers (Army)	108	141	97		
General Services Administration	3	2	1		
Current expenses:					
Veterans' Administration:					
Hospital and medical care	595	584	590	607	-------
Other activities	345	296	269	281	-------
All other agencies	2	2	2	2	-------
Total	6,669	6,905	6,080	[1] 5,847	-------

[1] This budget also includes 160 million dollars of appropriations to liquidate prior year contract authorizations for hospital construction.

Readjustment benefits: By the end of the fiscal year 1951 it is estimated that under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act 8,000,000 veterans will have received education and training benefits at a cost of 12.9 billion dollars, and that 9,000,000 will have drawn unemployment and self-employment allowances totaling 3.9 billion dollars. In addition 2,400,000 veterans will have obtained 13 billion dollars in loans for homes, farms, and businesses under the Government loan guarantee program for veterans.

The average enrollment in school, job, and farm training courses under the education and training provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act is expected to decline from 1,986,000 in the current year to 1,837,000 in 1951 and to require expenditures of 2.5 billion dollars.

The education and training program, however, is now considerably bigger than had been expected. The average number of participants in 1950 is estimated at 400,000 above the level anticipated a year ago. Largely because of this unexpected increase I shall soon transmit to the Congress a supplemental appropriation estimate of about 700 million dollars to cover the higher expenditures now estimated for the current fiscal year. The bulk of the increase is in schools below the college level, particularly in trade and vocational schools. While enrollment in other courses is decreasing, enrollment in these courses is still increasing and in 1951 is estimated to average 936,000—41 percent higher than in 1949 and 14 percent higher than estimated for the current fiscal year.

The continued expansion of enrollment in schools below college level, more than 4 years after most veterans have been returned to civilian life, raises the question whether this program still conforms to the original sound objectives of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act—to enable veterans to resume education or training interrupted by the war or to restore skills lost during military service. There is some question whether large numbers of veterans enrolled in these schools are in fact being trained for occupations for which they are suited and in which they will be able to find jobs when they finish their training. I have asked the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to study this situation thoroughly and to recommend to me any corrective measures, administrative or legislative, which should be taken to assure that our expenditures for this program yield a proper return both to the veterans and to the Nation as a whole.

Since July 1949, under the terms of the "GI bill," veterans discharged from service remain eligible for unemployment and self-employment allowances for only 2 years after date of discharge. On the average 59,000 claimants are expected to draw allowances, estimated at 61 million dollars in the fiscal year 1951. This compares with an average of 1,400,000 veterans receiving allowances in the peak year of this program, fiscal year 1947.

Under the Government loan guarantee program, it is expected that 386,000 veterans will obtain loans, almost all for homes, amounting to over 2 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1951. The estimated outlays of 68 million dollars for this program are chiefly for the payment of the first year's interest on the guaranteed portion of the loans. Expenditures for losses on defaulted loans are now relatively small, although the contingent liability is sizable since the amount of the Government guarantees is now about 48 percent of the total loans. In addition to guaranteeing veterans' loans, the Government also purchases guaranteed mortgages held by financing institutions. (Mortgage purchases are classified under housing and community development.)

The "other" expenditures for readjustment benefits cover allowances for burial expenses of veterans, tuition and supplies for disabled veteran trainees, and Government grants for special housing for certain seriously disabled veterans.

Compensation and pensions: It is estimated that an average of 3,058,000 individuals and families will receive compensation and pension payments totaling more than 2.2 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1951. Beginning in 1951 disability retirement payments of 78 million dollars to 31,000 Reserve officers, shown in this item in prior years, have been transferred to the military retired pay account of the Department of Defense. Apart from this reclassification to national defense, there is an estimated net increase in 1951 of 99,000 in the average number of cases, and of 71 million dollars in expenditures over the current year, entirely for cases without service disabilities.

The 1951 expenditure estimate of 2.2 billion dollars includes 1.5 billion dollars in compensation for service-connected cases, covering an average of 344,000 families of deceased veterans and 1,981,000 veterans with disabilities. The compensation and pension total also includes 160 million dollars for subsistence allowances to service-disabled veterans in the vocational education and training program. Pension payments to an average of 732,000 non-service-connected cases in 1951 are estimated to total 553 million dollars, about two-thirds to living veterans and one-third to survivors of deceased veterans.

Insurance: The Government reimburses the veterans' life insurance trust funds for payments on account of deaths traceable to war hazards, and also pays directly certain claims to veterans who failed to meet the regular standards of insurability. The expenditures in the fiscal year 1950 include nonrecurring transfers of 413 million dollars to the national service life insurance fund arising from a resurvey of the Government's liability for such contributions. Expenditures in 1951 for insurance claims payable by the Government are estimated at 39 million dollars.

Hospital and domiciliary construction: Construction of hospitals to provide 37,000 new beds and additional domiciliary facilities, costing 872 million dollars, is now about one-third completed. By June 1951 it is estimated that three-fourths of the work will have been done. When this program is finished, there will be sufficient beds to provide adequately for foreseeable needs for all service-connected cases and a more liberal allowance of beds than at present for non-service-connected cases. Obligational

authority already available is more than adequate to meet the needs of the program now under way.

Hospital and other services and administration: Current expenses for hospital and medical care are estimated at 590 million dollars in the fiscal year 1951. About four-fifths of these expenditures are for the in-patient care program, and in this program two-thirds of the cases currently are nonservice connected. A daily average of 138,000 patients in hospitals and homes is estimated for 1951, about 9,000 more than were cared for in 1949 and 4,000 more than in the current year. The other one-fifth of the expenditures is largely for the out-patient medical and dental care programs.

Other current expenses, which are chiefly the costs of administering and operating the nonmedical benefits programs and of general administration of the Veterans' Administration, are estimated to decline in 1951 to 269 million dollars.

Trust accounts: The national service life insurance and Government life insurance trust funds operate as mutual insurance systems on a commercial pattern, except that no administrative expenses are paid by them and the amounts held in reserve and as surplus are invested in Government obligations by the Secretary of the Treasury. Veterans of World Wars I and II and present servicemen now hold about 6,800,000 active policies in these two systems. Premiums and earnings, supplemented by Government payments of over 4 billion dollars for claims involving deaths and disabilities resulting from extra hazards of military service, have built up assets in these two funds to an estimated 9.7 billion dollars at the present time.

The Government life insurance fund has been on a dividend-paying basis since 1921. A special dividend of 40 million dollars was paid early in the fiscal year 1950. The first national service life insurance dividend, amounting to an estimated 2.8 billion dollars and payable to all servicemen of World War II who hold or have held policies, has been declared. Payments are now scheduled to begin shortly. It is estimated that 2.2 billion dollars will be disbursed in the current fiscal year and the balance in 1951 or later, as applications are filed. In the next few years a regular dividend schedule is to be established for national service life insurance. These dividends are not a budget expenditure since they are paid from the trust funds.

Veterans' life insurance fund (trust accounts)

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Item	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Receipts:			
Transfers from general and special accounts	$89	$487	$33
Interest on investments	255	261	210
Premiums and other	431	446	465
Total	775	1,194	708
Expenditures:			
Dividends to policyholders	11	2,303	563
Benefits and other	382	427	436
Total	393	2,730	999
Net accumulation	382	−1,536	−291

Social welfare, health, and security

The coming year will be an extremely significant one for the Nation's social security program. The decisions of the Congress on pending legislation will determine the direction which this country will follow in providing basic protection against the major economic hazards of old age, unemployment, illness, and disability. It is my strong belief that it is a responsibility of the Government to provide this protection, and to provide it in a manner that is consistent with our ideals of independence and self-reliance—through the already established and tested principle of contributory social insurance. This was the basic philosophy of the Social Security Act, in which the major role was given to social insurance, financed mutually by employers and employees, with benefits available as a matter of right without a means test. Public assistance was given only a supplementary role to fill in the diminishing gaps in insurance protection.

The effects of our failure in recent years to carry out this philosophy are already dramatized by the increase in the public assistance rolls. Because the protection of social insurance is so limited and inadequate, far too many people have been forced to seek public relief. In some States, for example, half the aged people are on the relief rolls. Approximately 2,700,000 aged people and 1,500,000 dependent children now receive public assistance. By contrast, only 1,900,000 aged persons receive insurance benefits and 800,000 children and their mothers receive survivors benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance system. Average old-age insurance benefits are only 26 dollars a month compared with average old-age public assistance benefits of 45 dollars.

Public demand for some form of basic financial protection against loss of earning power is evident in the keen interest of wage earners in industrial pension and insurance plans. There can be no question that our society can and should provide such protection. What I wish to emphasize is that the basic approach should be through a comprehensive public program of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance, rather than through a multiplicity of unrelated private plans, which would inevitably omit large numbers of the working population and treat others unequally. Private plans and voluntary insurance can then provide desirable supplemental protection.

I urge that the Congress enact legislation to expand and improve the old-age and survivors insurance system in accordance with the recommendations made last spring. Specifically, nearly all gainfully employed people, including farmers and the self-employed, should be covered; benefits should be increased sharply; and disability should be added to the risks covered. It is also important that the tax base be raised to the first 4,800 dollars of earned income, not only to reflect changes in wage levels since 1939, but also to bring both receipts and benefits to proper levels.

The recommended program will cover about 85 percent of all employed people, and will thus gradually reduce the need for public assistance. In the meantime, however, it is necessary to provide some help for those persons not yet protected by social insurance, as well as for those who would need public aid even with an adequate social insurance system. I therefore renew my recommendation of last year that the program of Federal grants to States for public assistance be extended and improved. The proposal that I submitted to the Congress last spring was designed to permit Federal sharing in the cost of aid to needy persons excluded from the present program, as well as in the cost of essential medical and welfare services. It was also designed to make Federal grants more responsive to the financial resources of each State. Within the framework of general policy under the Social Security Act, the States are responsible for determining the size of benefit payments and the eligibility of individuals for assistance. In adopting amendments to the present program, we should continue to rely on the States to bear a considerable share of the financial responsibility.

In the field of health, I presented a set of recommendations to the Congress on April 22, 1949, outlining in some detail a program for the Nation, centering in a national system of medical care insurance. Since that time, the extension and enlargement of the hospital construction program which I recommended has been enacted, and considerable headway has been made on some of my other recommendations. I hope that the Congress will soon complete action on legislation to increase Federal assistance to local health services. Strengthening of these is fundamental to our national health. In addition, legislation should be enacted to provide financial aid to medical and related schools to encourage the training of additional medical personnel. In the case of nurses, tuition scholarships and subsistence aids should be made available for training graduate nurses, and grants should be made to States for vocational education for practical nurses, to encourage more young women to enter the profession.

To fill in a major gap in our social security system. I again strongly urge the adoption of legislation providing for a comprehensive system of prepaid medical care insurance. This should be geared in with our other social insurance programs and financed predominantly by employer and employee contributions.

Action on these measures should no longer be delayed. We cannot in good conscience let our social security system remain in the blueprint stage, and allow relief programs to become our primary defense against want.

This budget contains estimates for all of my proposals. The greater part of them would be financed through special taxes, with receipts going into Government trust funds and payments being made directly from the funds. Social insurance benefits, by providing support for the aged and disabled and their de-

pendents, help to relieve individual families, employers, and communities of this burden. At the same time, by replacing the present haphazard arrangements with a comprehensive pattern of social insurance, we promote the stability of the economy and preserve the self-respect of all our citizens.

My proposals will add an estimated 271 million dollars to budget expenditures in 1951, principally in the form of grants to States. Of this amount, 200 million dollars is for improvement of public assistance and 67 million dollars for health programs. These items, plus increases under existing legislation in these two fields, are expected to cause Budget expenditures for social welfare, health, and security to rise in the fiscal year 1951 to a level of 2.7 billion dollars, an increase of 417 million dollars over the current year. Aside from proposed legislation, the primary cause of the increase is a rise in grants to States for public assistance and hospital construction. Included in the total is 594 million dollars representing the transfer of pay-roll tax receipts to the railroad retirement trust fund.

Social welfare, health, and security

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			New obligational authority for 1951	
	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated	Appropriations	Other
Assistance to the aged and other special groups:					
Federal Security Agency:					
Public assistance:					
Present programs	$922	$1,146	$1,201	$1,201	-------
Proposed legislation	------	------	200	250	-------
Vocational rehabilitation:					
Present programs	15	26	24	24	-------
Proposed legislation	------	------	4	4	-------
Other	4	2	2	2	-------
School lunch (Department of Agriculture)	75	83	83	84	-------
Retirement and dependents' insurance:					
Railroad Retirement Board	579	603	594	594	-------
Federal Security Agency and other	5	10	7	7	-------
Promotion of public health:					
Federal Security Agency:					
Present programs	161	259	334	190	$163
Proposed legislation:					
Aid to medical education	------	------	30	45	-------
Local health services	------	------	5	5	-------
Children's Bureau grants	------	------	7	10	-------
School health services	------	------	25	35	-------
General Services Administration and other	10	21	32	6	-------
Crime control and correction (Department of Justice and other)	88	93	99	101	1
Indian welfare (Interior) and other	32	29	39	39	1

Social welfare, health, and security—Con.

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			New obligational authority for 1951	
	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated	Appropriations	Other
Accident compensation (Federal Security Agency)	$15	$25	$28	$28	-------
Total	1,907	2,297	2,714	[1] 2,625	$165

[1] This Budget also includes 151 million dollars of appropriations to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

I recommend again that the Federal Security Agency be given departmental status; its functions are so important to the domestic policies of the Government that the head of this Agency should be a member of the President's Cabinet.

Assistance to the aged and other special groups: Grants-in-aid to States for public assistance to the needy aged, the blind, and dependent children are expected to reach 1.2 billion dollars in 1951 under the present program, with the Federal share averaging about 52 percent of total payments by State and local governments to these groups. For some time, the number of recipients has been increasing and now exceeds 4,000,000 persons; it is expected to average 4,600,000 during 1951. Average benefits are also expected to continue their rise. As a result, Federal expenditures will exceed those for the current year by an estimated 55 million dollars. The budget contains an additional 200 million dollars as the first-year expenditure estimated for proposed legislation to cover all the needy and to put the program on a variable grant basis. The revised formula which I have recommended would relate grants to the financial resources of the individual States and would also permit the Federal share to be held within reasonable limits.

I am also proposing legislation to strengthen the Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation and to provide additional opportunities for rehabilitation of the more severely handicapped. By enabling these people to become productive workers, instead of liabilities to their families and communities, we are enhancing our national supply of skills and productive ability. The budget includes 4 million dollars for the first year under the proposed legislation.

Railroad retirement insurance: The amount of 594 million dollars included as an expenditure in the budget is actually the transfer of special tax receipts to a trust account for payment of benefits to retired railroad workers and their survivors. Apart from credits for military service, the program is financed by taxes on railroad wages, shared equally by employees and employers. Under present law, the transfers of tax receipts to the fund must be made in advance of collection and thus interest begins to accrue to the fund before the taxes are collected. To avoid this payment of interest on money not yet received, the Congress should direct that these taxes be transferred to the trust fund when received, as is now done with the old-age and survivors insurance taxes.

I recommend also that the Congress revise the procedure for making Federal Government payments for military service credits allowed to railroad employees. Such payments to the railroad retirement trust fund should be made annually in the years ahead on the basis of claims actually approved as workers retire. As the law now stands, these payments are made in advance, without adequate relationship to eventual requirements for actual benefits. To cover such future claims, 193 million dollars has already been advanced to the trust fund. Unless the law is amended as recommended in this budget, further payments of approximately 33 million dollars will be required in each of the next four fiscal years.

Promotion of public health: Federal expenditures for public health are mainly for grants-in-aid to States and for research. Of the 334 million dollars estimated for existing programs in the fiscal year 1951, 213 million dollars is for financial assistance to the States for general public health services and for a wide variety of special State and local programs, including hospital construction, maternal and child health, tuberculosis control, and mental health. The increase of 75 million dollars in expenditures over 1950 for existing programs is caused largely by a rise in grants to liquidate prior years' hospital construction authorizations. This program is helping communities throughout the Nation to reduce the hospital shortage.

Because adequate general public health services are basic in our health program, I am recommending that grants for this purpose be increased by 9 million dollars, bringing them up to 23 million dollars, the maximum authorized under existing law. An additional 5 million dollars is included for proposed legislation to increase these grants beyond the existing ceiling. At the present time, most of the counties of this Nation lack, either wholly or in part, the basic local public health services which must form the foundation for our efforts to improve the Nation's health. The increase permitted by existing law will provide only a start toward meeting this serious deficiency. New legislation is, therefore, needed to remove the existing statutory ceiling and provide a sound basis for aiding States in the future development of adequate local health services.

Other proposed legislation is expected to add 62 million dollars to expenditures, of which 30 million dollars is for aid to medical education to increase enrollments in schools of medicine, nursing, dentistry, and public health, and 7 million dollars is for expansion of health and welfare services to mothers and children. Expenditures under pending legislation authorizing special health services to school children are estimated at 25 million dollars.

The direct research activities of the Public Health Service and the grants to individuals and institutions for research,

teaching, and training, will require an estimated 47 million dollars in 1951, a moderate increase over 1950. No provision is made in this budget for further expansion of Public Health Service grants to medical schools for undergraduate teaching and for construction of additional research facilities on the basis of special disease categories. This anticipates early enactment of legislation for general aid to medical education, which would contain adequate provisions for aid to medical schools in meeting their costs of teaching and in constructing additional facilities. Such legislation would permit an integrated program of research and teaching at medical schools, which should be far more conducive to good results than separate financing for each major type of disease.

Trust accounts: Under the old-age and survivors insurance, railroad retirement, and Federal employee retirement programs, benefit disbursements are made from the trust funds and are not included in budget expenditures. On the receipts side, the pay-roll contributions for old-age and survivors insurance are transferred directly to the trust fund and not included in total budget receipts. Receipts and payments under the proposed health insurance program would also be handled in this manner. Railroad retirement taxes, on the other hand, are included in total budget receipts and are transferred to the trust account as a budget expenditure. The Government contribution to its employee retirement funds is, of course, a budget expenditure (classified under general government).

Social welfare, health, and security (major trust accounts)

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Fund and item	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund:			
Receipts:			
Appropriation from general receipts	$1,690	$2,245	$2,515
Interest and other	233	261	303
Proposed legislation extending coverage, raising tax base, and adding disability benefits	-------	-------	1,200
Payments of benefits and administrative expenses:			
Present programs	−660	−783	−867
Proposed legislation	-------	-------	−1,433
Net accumulation (including proposed legislation)	1,263	1,723	1,718
Railroad retirement account:			
Receipts:			
Transfers from budget accounts	574	602	594
Interest on investments	51	61	64
Payments of benefits, salaries, and expenses	−278	−314	−346
Net accumulation	347	349	312
Federal employees' retirement funds:			
Receipts:			
Employee contributions	328	374	353
Transfers from budget accounts and other	230	306	337
Interest	124	140	163
Payments of annuities and refunds, and expenses	−221	−255	−276
Net accumulation	460	566	578
Medical care insurance trust fund (proposed legislation):			
Receipts from pay-roll contributions	-------	-------	250
Payments for initial expenses	-------	-------	−35
Net accumulation	-------	-------	215

The money in these trust funds is invested in Government securities, and the interest earned is added to the principal of each trust fund. Accumulated assets now total 18 billion dollars.

Under present law, the old-age and survivors insurance tax rate advanced on January 1, 1950, to 1½ percent each for employers and employees. In view of the recommended increase in benefits and addition of disability coverage, I propose that the further tax increase to 2 percent each, presently scheduled for January 1, 1952, be moved up to January 1, 1951. The proposed legislation would raise benefits in the fiscal year 1951 from about 800 million dollars under existing law to approximately 2.2 billion dollars. Thereafter disbursements for benefits can be expected to climb gradually as claims mature. The 4 percent combined tax should produce revenues of approximately 5 billion dollars a year with employment at a high level, so that for the next several years reserves would continue to accumulate.

A period of preparation will be required to set up the health insurance system. I am proposing that in the meantime a small pay-roll tax of one-fourth of 1 percent each on employers and employees become effective January 1, 1951, to defray initial expenses. Setting up this tax will also make possible the establishment of eligibility and other administrative records.

Housing and community development

Last year the Congress adopted as the declared objective of national housing policy "a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family." Real progress has been made toward achieving this goal. Private enterprise, with extensive Government assistance, built a million new houses last year, more than ever before, and at generally reduced prices. Far-sighted new legislation was enacted, which gives practical support to private and local initiative in clearing slums and developing our cities, in providing special assistance for low-income families in cities and on farms, and in promoting better methods and lower costs for all types of housing construction.

Our task this year is twofold. We must continue to push ahead rapidly in carrying out these major new programs. We must also further improve Federal housing legislation. In particular, to close the biggest remaining gap, I am recommending legislation which will aid middle-income groups to obtain adequate housing they can afford.

Budget expenditures for housing and community development are estimated at 1.3 billion dollars in 1951. Of this total, almost 1 billion dollars, or about 75 percent, represents the current estimate of expenditures for mortgage purchases by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to support the private mortgage market. The Corporation will subsequently be reimbursed for its expenditures in buying these mortgages, either through collections or through sale to private institutions.

Housing and community development

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			New obligational authority for 1951	
	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated	Appropriations	Other
Aids to private housing:					
Housing and Home Finance Agency:					
Federal Housing Administration (present programs and proposed legislation):					
Current operations	−$33	−$34	−$30	-------	-------
Investments in United States securities	30	42	31	-------	-------
Home Loan Bank Board:[1]					
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	−119	−198	−134	-------	-------
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation:					
Current operations	−15	−16	−18	-------	-------
Investments in United States securities	15	17	18	-------	-------
Loans to middle-income cooperatives (proposed legislation)	-------	-------	50	$35	$25
Reconstruction Finance Corporation:					
Mortgage purchases	407	940	990	-------	25
Loans to prefabricators and builders, and other	25	52	45	-------	-------
Loans to housing cooperatives (proposed legislation)	-------	10	30	-------	-------
Department of Agriculture	-------	20	45	-------	50
Public housing program:					
Housing and Home Finance Agency:					
Public Housing Administration:					
Low-rent housing	−11	99	136	41	-------
War housing and other	53	19	−3	-------	-------
Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other	−1	−1	−1	-------	-------
General housing aids: Housing and Home Finance Agency	1	7	8	6	-------
Slum clearance and community development (including community facilities):					
Housing and Home Finance Agency	-------	11	58	-------	325
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	−83	18	48	-------	-------
General Services Administration and other	12	20	50	30	54
Disaster relief (proposed legislation)	-------	-------	5	5	-------
Total	282	1,006	1,329	[2] 117	704

[1] Stand-by borrowing authority of 1,750 million dollars is recommended to become available in 1950.

[2] This budget also includes 18 million dollars of appropriations to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

Most of the Federal expenditures for housing and community development, including mortgage purchases, are financed by public debt authorizations rather than by appropriations. The public housing and urban redevelopment programs will require relatively small appropriations in the early years, with substantial increases in later years. The Federal Housing Administration insures each year about 3 billion dollars in private home mortgages, but since this is an insurance operation it has only a minor effect on current Budget expenditures.

Federal Housing Administration: Almost half the record volume of private new housing now under construction is being financed with mortgages insured or guaranteed by the Federal Government, largely by the Federal Housing Administration, and also by the Veterans Administration (classified under veterans' services and benefits). By removing all major risks from mortgage lending, these insurance and guarantee programs make it possible for American families to buy housing on substantially better terms than they could obtain otherwise. About 350,000 other families now live in rental housing which was financed by Government-insured mortgages. In the case of both sales and rental housing, established procedures of the Federal Housing Administration, including inspections, provide assurance that recognized housing standards are met.

As long as favorable economic conditions continue, income from premiums and other sources will exceed expenses and permit substantial investment in Government securities to build up reserves against possible later losses.

In the past year the mortgage insurance program has successfully stimulated construction of rental housing and lower-cost housing for sale. I have already recommended additional legislation to encourage further the construction of lower-cost housing for sale. I shall shortly transmit recommendations to provide, on a permanent rather than an emergency basis, a more effective stimulus to lower rental housing. For both rental and sales housing, the new proposals would also provide needed incentives to construction of units of adequate size for family living.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation: Since last spring, the Federal National Mortgage Association, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, has been making heavy purchases of mortgages from private lenders, of which the major portion is guaranteed by the Veterans Administration. These purchases have made it possible for veterans in all parts of the country to buy houses on the advantageous terms offered under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. Substantial commitments to purchase mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration have also been particularly helpful in assuring the availability of adequate funds for rental housing construction.

The continuing need for a stand-by secondary market does not mean that Government purchases should be regarded as a permanent substitute for private financing. Accordingly, the administration of this program will be directed toward encouraging private lenders to hold a larger portion of these mortgages as well as to repurchase the mortgages previously sold to the Federal Government. Important administrative steps are being taken but they can be only gradually effective, and substantial future expenditures will be necessary to carry through on the large volume of commitments already outstanding. Estimated commitments will exhaust the present authorization of 2.5 billion dollars shortly after the close of the current fiscal year. Because the rate of commitment is uncertain, I am recommending an additional 500 million dollars in public debt authorizations in fiscal year 1950 and 250 million dollars in 1951.

Prospective expenditures for mortgage purchases cannot be estimated accurately, since their amount depends largely on whether private lenders decide to hold the mortgages as permanent investments or to sell them to the Government. For example, the initial estimate a year ago of 200 million dollars in such purchases for the fiscal year 1950 was later revised upward to 1.3 billion dollars and is now reduced to 940 million dollars.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation also has special authority to lend up to 50 million dollars to producers of prefabricated housing and large-scale builders using advanced construction methods. I recommend that the Corporation be authorized to lend an additional 25 million dollars for these and related purposes. The accomplishments of this program to date have been below our expectations, but the potential benefits from the development of new housing production methods are so great that I believe a further limited investment of Federal funds, building upon the experience already gained, will yield good returns.

Cooperative housing for middle-income families: Even with these various Federal aids, enough private housing of the right types is not yet being produced generally throughout the country at prices which families with modest incomes can afford. As a necessary supplement to our other housing programs, I am recommending new legislation to authorize Federal assistance to cooperatives and nonprofit corporations in building and managing housing projects. Under the plan I am proposing, the Federal Government would provide technical assistance in organizing housing cooperatives and adequate arrangements for their financing. Through financial and other savings, material reductions in rents or charges are anticipated.

Because of the limited American experience with housing cooperatives, this program initially must be viewed as experimental, and cannot be expected to attain a large volume in 1951. With proper Federal leadership and assistance, however, it offers real promise that middle-income families will be able to help themselves obtain good housing at costs within their means.

Home Loan Bank Board: This Board supervises the operation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Federal home-loan banks, and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation is rapidly liquidating the remainder of its mortgages by selling them to private lenders. During the depression years, the Corporation made more than 3 billion dollars in loans, thus enabling over 1,000,000 families to keep their homes. By the end of the fiscal year 1951, all of these loans will be repaid or sold.

Savings and loan associations supervised by the Federal home-loan banks provide roughly a third of all home-mortgage financing. The share accounts of most of these associations are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. The favorable experience of these associations in recent years has permitted the Corporation to build up reserves against possible future losses. To further protect investors in these associations in the event of future emergency, I again recommend legislation to provide, on a stand-by basis, authority for both the Federal home-loan banks and the Insurance Corporation to borrow from the Treasury. These provisions, which should become effective in 1950, would be roughly comparable to the Federal assistance already available for the commercial banking system. As in the case of the banking system, moreover, they should be accompanied by measures to authorize more rapid repayment of the Federal Government's investment in these institutions, and to provide more effective and specific authority for the Home Loan Bank Board to regulate lending by the member institutions.

Farm housing: During the first 2 years of the new farm housing program, about 40,000 low-income farmers will receive help in obtaining better housing. In 1951, the Department of Agriculture will lend an estimated 45 million dollars, as well as provide general technical assistance and some direct grants for farm repairs and improvements.

Public housing programs: The Public Housing Administration and local housing authorities throughout the country have been taking the steps necessary to get the new low-rent public housing program promptly under way. Preliminary loans have already been authorized to assist 227 communities plan projects which will comprise an estimated 220,000 dwelling units.

Our goal is to have 175,000 units under construction or completed by the end of the fiscal year 1951. Most of the Federal expenditures during this period will be for temporary loans for planning, site acquisition, and initial construction. Private funds will be used for much of the construction financing and nearly all of the permanent financing. The Federal Government indirectly guarantees the local housing authority obligations issued for these purposes by contracting to pay annual contributions sufficient to maintain the low rents required for the projects.

In addition, the Public Housing Administration supervises the management and disposition of 450,000 permanent and temporary housing units constructed to meet emergency war and veterans' needs. In the fiscal year 1951,

an estimated 20,000 permanent units will be sold and 38,000 temporary units will be transferred to local agencies or demolished. This disposition of both types of housing can be accelerated if the Congress enacts the amendments to basic legislation which I have previously recommended. Expenditures of these programs are more than covered by receipts from sales and rentals; in addition to covering current expenses, receipts from sales and rentals will result in 62 million dollars in miscellaneous receipts to the Treasury in the fiscal year 1951.

General housing aids: Under recent legislation, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is initiating the comprehensive program of housing research which I have long advocated as a necessity to achieve our national housing objective. The long-range objective of this program is to improve knowledge about housing in order to aid in cost reduction and in stimulating the increased and sustained production of housing. Emphasis is being placed upon development of research plans with full participation by other interested public and private groups, so as to assure the maximum possible utilization of existing information and research facilities.

Slum clearance and community development: Orderly development and redevelopment of our cities and metropolitan areas is essential if we are to realize the full potential growth in production and living standards in the decades to come. Each city clearly has the primary responsibility for initiating and carrying through the far-reaching reconstruction plans required to meet its peculiar needs.

Under the provisions of the new slum clearance and community redevelopment program, the Federal Government now can provide financial assistance needed to augment local resources. Actual development will necessarily proceed gradually, area by area, with carefully planned provision for the housing of families displaced from slum areas and for the uses most appropriate for the redeveloped areas. For the first 2 years of the program, Federal expenditures will comprise loans to local public agencies to help them prepare plans and begin acquisition of sites. When acceptable local project plans are presented, the Federal Government contracts to pay a maximum of two-thirds of all net project costs. Contracts for loans and grants up to 325 million dollars for the fiscal year 1951 are authorized in the basic statute. The grants will not actually be paid until several years hence when the land assembly projects are completed, the redeveloped land sold or leased, and net project costs finally determined.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation will continue to lend to public agencies for transit lines, tunnels, and other self-liquidating projects in cases where private financing is not initially available on reasonable terms. Private refinancing last year of the large outstanding loan to the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority has made sufficient funds available to finance the new commitments currently anticipated.

Under legislation enacted last year, the General Services Administration is again making advances to State and local governments for public works planning. These advances are repayable when the actual construction occurs. The 2-year program of 100 million dollars will permit preparation of plans for public works estimated to cost more than 3 billion dollars. Every effort is being made to achieve proper coordination in the planning of Federal, State, and local public works and to emphasize projects most appropriate in the event of possible economic emergencies.

Major disasters in the future as in the past will from time to time require prompt Federal assistance to stricken communities. I again urge enactment of pending legislation to provide in advance adequate funds to meet such needs.

Education and general research

If education and research are to play their full role in strengthening our democratic society, we must expand our basic research, we must devise types of education that will prepare youth more effectively for participation in modern society, and we must provide better educational opportunities for more of our people.

It is predominantly a responsibility of all government—local, State, and Federal—to provide for the education of our citizens. The Federal Government for many years has given financial aid to special aspects of education, such as vocational education, and to institutions for special groups, such as Howard University. It has become increasingly evident that Federal support of a more general character is needed if satisfactory educational opportunities are to be made available for all. The Nation cannot afford to waste human potentialities, as we are now doing, by failing to provide adequate elementary and secondary education for millions of children and by failing to help hundreds of thousands of young people who could benefit from higher education.

The importance of this need requires that we provide substantial Federal assistance to States for general educational purposes and for certain other important programs in this field.

To progress toward these objectives, this Budget includes expenditures for education and general research (not including large amounts in veterans, national defense, and other categories) of 434 million dollars in the fiscal year 1951, compared with 125 million dollars in 1950. More than three-fourths is for grants to States. The increase is entirely accounted for by the additional expenditures in 1951 resulting from the new legislation I am recommending. This legislation will entail a further moderate increase in later years.

Promotion of education—Elementary and secondary: The high mobility that characterizes our people means that no State is immune to the effects of ignorance and illiteracy in other States. The welfare of the Nation as a whole demands that the present educational inequalities be reduced. Educational inequalities are primarily due to differences in the financial resources of States and localities. Income per capita in some States is less than half as great as in others. The States with the lowest incomes have the greatest proportion of school-age children and are unable to finance a fair educational opportunity even with greater effort in terms of tax burden.

School enrollments in practically every State have risen recently and will continue to rise owing to the increased birth rate. Millions of our children are now taught in overcrowded classrooms. For others education is provided only on a part-time basis. At the very time when we need more and better teachers, schools must still employ tens of thousands whose qualifications do not meet the standards necessary to provide a satisfactory quality of teaching. Because salaries are generally inadequate, too few capable young people are preparing to enter the teaching profession.

For these reasons I urge the Congress to complete legislative action to permit the Federal Government to aid the States in support of the maintenance and operation costs of a basic minimum program of elementary and secondary education. The Budget provides for beginning this aid in the fiscal year 1951.

Education and general research

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			New obligational authority for 1951	
	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated	Appropriations	Other
Promotion of education:					
Present programs:					
Office of Education (Federal Security Agency)	$33	$34	$37	$38	----
General Services Administration and Interior	6	8	(1)	(1)	----
Proposed legislation:					
Elementary and secondary education:					
General aid for operating expenses	----	----	290	300	----
Surveys and emergency construction	----	----	22	45	----
Children on Federal property and in emergency areas	----	----	7	7	----
Higher education:					
General assistance to college students	----	----	1	1	----
Educational aid to special groups	3	7	12	[2] 4	$1
Library and museum services	9	11	12	12	----
General purpose research:					
Department of Commerce:					
Seventeenth decennial census	2	45	33	30	----
Other Census Bureau programs	6	7	7	7	----
National Bureau of Standards	10	12	11	10	6
National Science Foundation (proposed legislation)	----	----	(1)	1	----
Other agencies	1	1	(1)	----	----
Total	70	125	434	[2] 455	7

[1] Less than one-half million dollars.
[2] This Budget also includes 2 million dollars of appropriations to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

There is a shortage of school buildings in many parts of the country due to the wartime deferment of construction and the increase in the school-age population. In many localities the need for facilities results from the sudden and substantial impact of Federal activities. I recommend that the Congress enact legislation providing for grants to States for surveys of their need for facilities and their resources, and grants for the construction of buildings in those particular areas where Federal activities have been responsible for increased enrollments.

For a number of years several Federal agencies, under separate authorizations, have been helping to finance the education of children living on Federal property and in communities affected by Federal activities. I recommend that the Congress enact general legislation to establish a single program for all Federal agencies.

Promotion of education—Higher education: Large numbers of young people and adults wish to continue their education beyond high school in order to prepare for entrance to professional schools, to receive additional technical or vocational training or to round out their general education. For many of our people, postsecondary education on a part-time or full-time basis, provided in institutions located within commuting distance of home, would meet their needs at low cost. Several of the States are now developing community institutions for this purpose. I have asked the Federal Security Administrator to make a comprehensive study of this development in order to determine whether the Federal Government might appropriately take any action to encourage the States and localities to establish and expand "community colleges."

Primarily because of low family incomes and of the high costs involved, more than half of our young people who could benefit from a college education are now unable to attend. This failure to develop to the fullest extent the capacities of our young people is a matter of national concern. As a step toward correcting this situation, I shall transmit to the Congress a legislative proposal to authorize a limited Federal program to assist capable youth who could not otherwise do so to pursue their desired fields of study at the institutions of their choice.

This Budget includes 1 million dollars as a tentative estimate of appropriations needed in the fiscal year 1951 to establish the required organization and to initiate the program. Assistance to students would begin in the fiscal year 1952.

National Science Foundation: The Government is investing hundreds of millions of dollars in research—primarily in applied research in the military, atomic energy, and health fields. We must consider, however, not only the ways in which the great reservoir of scientific knowledge already at our disposal can best be utilized, but also the best paths to follow for the discovery of further basic knowledge. To this end, we urgently need a National Science Foundation to stimulate basic research and to assure an effective balance among the Federal research programs. By developing a national research policy and by formulating a truly national research budget it should be possible to relate the activities of public and private institutions in a concerted effort to advance the frontiers of knowledge. The Budget provides 500 thousand dollars for the initial administrative expenses of the proposed National Science Foundation, in the expectation that the Congress will enact legislation, already passed by the Senate, to establish it.

Seventeenth decennial census: The seventeenth decennial census of population, housing, and agriculture, to be taken this year, will provide basic data essential to important decisions by businessmen, governments, and other groups throughout the Nation. Expenditures for the census, estimated at 45 million dollars in 1950, will drop to 33 million dollars in 1951, and continue to decrease in succeeding years as tabulation and publication of the results are completed.

Agriculture and agricultural resources

American agriculture is in a period of transition from the peak production requirements of the war and immediate postwar years to the normal requirements of a peacetime economy. During the war, every effort was made to increase agricultural production to meet the needs of our war economy and of our allies. In some cases desirable long-run goals for conservation of soil resources were deferred in the effort to increase production and to minimize the manpower requirements in agriculture. War dislocations and crop shortages abroad created an abnormal export demand for food grains and a few other farm products, financed largely by United States foreign relief and aid programs. In the next few years, this abnormal demand can be expected to adjust to a more normal level and distribution pattern for world trade.

Although this transition from war to peacetime needs has caused a decline in farm prices and a loss in farm income, the operation of Government price supports has served to cushion the decline and has been a major factor in preventing a serious postwar recession in the economy as a whole. The resulting benefits to workers and employers, as well as to farmers, have been many times the outlay of Federal funds. As the necessary adjustments in agriculture are completed, we should look forward to a reduction in budgetary expenditures for this purpose. The need for food and fiber products will continue to expand as our national income and population increase. Production on existing land, however, must be gradually shifted from the grains and cotton to livestock and dairy production, permitting marginal lands, whose soil is in danger of loss from erosion of wind and water, to be put back into pasture and soil-conserving crops. It is important that Government programs facilitate these adjustments within agriculture as well as between agriculture and the rest of the economy.

Agriculture and agricultural resources

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			New obligational authority for 1951	
	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated	Appropriations	Other
Loan and investment programs:					
Department of Agriculture:					
Commodity Credit Corporation	$1,600	$1,533	$952	----	(1)
Farmers' Home Administration	123	26	26	$35	$110
Rural Electrification Administration	305	362	436	10	450
Other programs	−63	6	−1	10	----
Other agencies	(2)	3	2	2	----
Other financial aids:					
Department of Agriculture:					
Conservation and use (including acreage allotments and marketing quotas)	182	285	314	$319	----
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	75	86	114	110	----
Sugar Act	56	63	69	68	----
International Wheat Agreement	----	82	76	82	----
Other agencies	−2	(2)	(2)	----	----
Agricultural land and water resources	59	64	68	68	----
Other development and improvement of agriculture:					
Present programs	177	161	149	169	20
Commodity Exchange Authority (proposed legislation)	----	----	1	1	----
Total	2,512	2,671	2,206	875	580

[1] Additional borrowing authority of 2 billion dollars is recommended, to become available in the fiscal year 1950.
[2] Less than one-half million dollars.

Federal agricultural programs, in addition to promoting adjustments in agriculture and stimulating conservation of soil resources, are designed to improve the efficiency of farm production, to provide low-income farmers an opportunity to improve their economic status, to assure farmers generally a reasonable stability in farm income, and to improve the level of rural living.

Total Federal expenditures for agriculture and agricultural resources increased from 2.5 billion dollars in 1949 to an estimated 2.7 billion dollars in 1950. Both years reflect the operation of price-support programs as farm prices declined. A decrease of 465 million dollars is expected in 1951, resulting from smaller outlays on price supports as acreage allotments and marketing quotas serve to reduce production of some 1950 crops, particularly cotton and corn.

Price support: Net outlays of the Commodity Credit Corporation amounted to 1.6 billion dollars in 1949. This was the first year since before the war that mandatory price supports have resulted in large cash expenditures and the accumulation of loans and inventories in the hands of the Corporation. Expenditures in 1950, estimated at 1.5 billion dollars, will be largely for corn and cotton, with smaller outlays for peanuts, rice, tobacco, milk and milk products, potatoes, beans, cottonseed, linseed oil, and various other products. Approximately 90 million dollars of the expenditures will be for construction of new grain-storage facilities.

In 1951, estimated Commodity Credit Corporation expenditures decline to 952 million dollars because of the expected effects of acreage allotments and marketing quotas on the 1950 crops. In later years, price-support expenditures should decline further as production is adjusted to normal demand.

Estimates for price-support expenditures are, of course, highly tentative, since the actual expenditures depend upon many factors which cannot be accurately forecast, such as the volume of exports, the rate of domestic consumption, and the influence of insects and weather conditions on yields.

The operation of price supports has resulted in the accumulation of large inventories, particularly of cotton, wheat, and corn. These commodity inventories represent assets which provide insurance against possible crop shortages in future years. It is estimated that the financial requirements of the Commodity Credit Corporation in the fiscal year 1951 may exceed its present borrowing authorization. I recommend that the Corporation be given an additional borrowing authority of 2 billion dollars, to be available beginning in 1950.

Farmers' Home Administration: The Farmers' Home Administration provides management assistance to low-income farmers, and makes loans for farm enlargement and development, production and subsistence, water facilities, homesteads, and farm housing. (Farm housing loans financed under the borrowing authorization provided in the Housing Act of 1949 are classified under housing and community development.) The apparent decline in expenditures for the Farmers' Home Administration in 1950 and 1951 compared with 1949 is due to a shift in financing provisions. In 1949, loans were financed from appropriated funds, and all loans were shown as expenditures, with collections on old loans going directly into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. In 1950 and 1951, most of the loan programs will be financed by a borrowing authorization, and the expenditure figure will reflect loans less collections.

Rural electrification and rural telephones: On June 30, 1949, approximately 78 percent of all farms were electrified. As coverage is gradually extended to the remaining areas, Rural Electrification Administration loans for electrification will decline. Beginning in the fiscal year 1950, the Rural Electrification Administration will also make loans to rural telephone cooperatives and other independent telephone companies under recently enacted legislation. Loans for this purpose are expected to increase in 1951. Net loan expenditures of the Rural Electrification Administration are estimated to be 427 million dollars in 1951, compared with 355 million dollars in 1950 and 299 million dollars in 1949. I recommend that the Rural Electrification Administration be given new loan authority for the fiscal year 1951 amounting to 450 million dollars, of which 50 million dollars will be available for the rural telephone loan program.

Conservation: The Soil Conservation Service provides technical advice and assistance to farmers in establishng a sound program of farm management to insure adequate protection and development of soil resources. Conservation practices are also encouraged through the agricultural conservation payments program carried out by the Production and Marketing Administration. By the end of the fiscal year 1951, about 90 percent of the farms of the country will be in organized soil conservation districts. Progress is being made in the preparation and application of desirable farm management plans for the adequate protection of our soil resources, but still greater emphasis will need to be given in future years to soil and water conservation, including the Department's upstream and on-the-farm flood-control program, to reduce siltation in the downstream areas and to enhance the value of projects constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers.

Expenditures for the Soil Conservation Service and for flood-control work of the Department of Agriculture are expected to increase from 64 million dollars in 1950 to 68 million dollars in 1951. Expenditures for the conservation and use program and for administering acreage allotments and marketing quotas are estimated to be 314 million dollars in 1951 compared with 285 million dollars in 1950 and 182 million dollars in 1949. I am recommending that the advance authorization for the conservation and use program in the 1951 crop year, which will largely determine expenditures in the fiscal year 1952, be maintained at the 1950 crop year level of 285 million dollars.

Other financial aids: Under the terms of the International Wheat Agreement, the United States will export 168 million bushels of wheat each year for 4 years at a price not in excess of $1.80 a bushel. In return, importing countries have agreed to buy the wheat at not less than certain specified minimum prices. In the first year, the effective export price for United States wheat is $1.80. It is estimated that the Commodity Credit Corporation, through which the program is financed, will spend 82 million dollars in the fiscal year 1950 to bridge the gap between the $1.80 export price and the higher domestic market price. In 1951, such costs are estimated at 76 million dollars. The Corporation is to be reimbursed for each year's cost of the Wheat Agreement from appropriated funds. In 1951, an appropriation of 82 million dollars is recommended to reimburse the Corporation for the cost of the Wheat Agreement in the fiscal year 1950.

Additional financial aid is provided for farmers through the Sugar Act of 1948 and through the permanent appropriation for removal of surplus agricultural commodities. Expenditures under the Sugar Act depend on the volume of domestic sugar production for which sugar growers receive payments at the rates determined in the legislation. It is estimated that expenditures under the Sugar Act will be 69 million dollars in 1951. The permanent appropriation for removal of surplus agricultural commodities, established in 1935, provides a fund each year equal to 30 percent of customs duties. In 1951, it is estimated that 110 million dollars will be available in this fund.

Other development and improvement of agriculture: Included in this category are the continuing basic services for agriculture, such as research on crop varieties, livestock and poultry, and the production and marketing of farm products; control and eradication of insects and plant and animal diseases; payments to States for experiment stations and cooperative extension work; and the general overhead expenses of the Department. For 1951, I recommend legislation to strengthen the regulation of commodity exchanges by the Commodity Exchange Authority.

Natural resources

This Nation has learned in recent years what it means to have limited natural resources. Our soil, forests, water, and minerals have been drawn upon prodigiously to support two major wars and the rapid economic growth of our country. If we are to continue to expand production and employment we must use our remaining resources with the greatest possible effectiveness, following sustained-yield principles, developing resources as yet unused, and restoring where possible the resources we have depleted.

Natural resources

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			New obligational authority for 1951	
	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated	Appropriations	Other
Atomic energy:					
Atomic Energy Commission	$621	$673	$817	$266	$334
Other agencies	1	(1)	----	----	----
Land and water resources:					
Corps of Engineers (Army, civil functions)	401	486	563	557	----
Department of the Interior:					
Bureau of Reclamation	240	334	398	355	----
Bonneville Power Administration and Southwestern and Southeastern power systems	29	42	55	37	28
Research in utilization of salt water (proposed legislation)	----	----	1	1	----
Other	32	43	48	47	8
Tennessee Valley Authority (net)	27	52	96	108	----
Department of State and other	4	7	13	9	----
Forest resources:					
Forest Service and other (Agriculture)	63	76	82	84	----
Department of the Interior	3	3	2	1	----
Mineral resources:					
Bureau of Mines and other Interior	29	37	36	35	----
Department of the Navy and other	13	18	20	15	----
General resources surveys (Interior)	13	16	20	20	----
Fish and wildlife resources (Interior and other)	18	28	29	26	(1)
Recreational use of resources:					
Department of Interior	19	29	38	31	----
Baltimore-Washington Parkway (proposed legislation)	----	----	2	3	----
Total	1,512	1,845	2,218	[2] 1,594	370

[1] Less than one-half million dollars.

[2] This budget also includes 500 million dollars of appropriations to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

A large share of the responsibility for such action falls upon the Federal Government, with respect to both resources on public lands and resources in private ownership. Atomic energy development depends upon our pressing ahead with the present Federal program on a broad scale. Continued economic growth in large areas of our country depends upon steady progress in Federal investment for flood control, reclamation, electric power, and related facilities. The wisdom with which we utilize our mineral resources will influence our economic strength and security for generations to come. Continued public investment in these areas is a prerequisite in many fields to the expansion of the private investment which we want to encourage.

The dollars which the Federal Government spends on these programs are largely investment dollars. In many cases, such as irrigation, power projects, and the management and improvement of public lands and forests, the activities are wholly or partially self-liquidating. In all cases, economic benefits will accrue to the Nation for many years.

The 1951 budget provides for total expenditures of 2.2 billion dollars in this area, an increase of 373 million dollars from 1950. Over one-third of the total and of the increase is attributable to expenditures for atomic energy. The balance represents primarily the requirements of projects under way in the fields of flood control and reclamation. This budget provides for no new projects in these areas. Despite the large number of highly meritorious projects which have already been authorized for construction, we should not at this time add to the present high level of commitments. This policy is necessary both because of our over-all fiscal position and in order to provide the greatest possible measure of stability, under present economic conditions, in the rate of Federal public works expenditures.

Atomic energy: The United States is seeking both to develop atomic energy for national defense purposes and to realize the great promise in its use for industrial and other peacetime purposes. Our atomic energy development program is a large venture in diverse fields—scientific research, medicine, engineering, industry—and will continue to require substantial outlays in the next few years.

The 1951 expenditures include increased amounts for the production of fissionable materials and weapons, and for the advancement of the science and technology of atomic energy, including accelerated construction of new facilities and development of new types of nuclear reactors. It is principally through the development of new reactors to produce fissionable materials and radioisotopes, generate power, and propel ships and aircraft, that the Atomic Energy Commission expects to evolve means of utilizing for peaceful purposes the energy released by nuclear fission.

Land and water resources: We have learned a great deal in recent years about the extensive benefits which can be achieved by proper development of our land and water resources—including navigation, flood control, reclamation, power development, soil and forest conservation, preservation of fish and wildlife, and recreation. In the interest of sounder and more efficient programs in later years, emphasis in this budget is placed on more thorough investigation and advance planning, and on assembling more complete basic data. However, the framework of Federal legislation and administrative organization under which we are carrying on development programs is in many respects inadequate and obsolete.

In order to obtain a thorough review of the present basic legislation, I have created by recent Executive order a Water Resources Policy Commission, which will make recommendations later this year with respect to the broad policies which should guide Federal participation in the development, conservation, and use of water resources—both upstream and downstream—and closely related land-use activities. On the basis of these recommendations, I expect that it will be possible to propose up-to-date and effective policies for the Federal, State, local, and private efforts which are needed to make proper use of water resources throughout the country. Some changes in present Federal legislation can and should be made at this session of the Congress, but major changes should be deferred until the Commission's recommendations are available.

We also need to find more effective arrangements for administering Federal laws and programs concerning land and water-resource development. I have already recommended that the Congress authorize the consolidation of a number of Federal activities in the Pacific Northwest into a Columbia Valley Administration, and provide for its proper integration with other Federal agencies and with State and local responsibilities. In other areas also we should be alert to the opportunities for better administrative arrangements, building on successful experience in the Tennessee Valley and elsewhere, and adapting organizational patterns to the particular circumstances of different regions.

The activities of the Bureau of Reclamation and the flood-control program of the Corps of Engineers, involving the construction of dams, power facilities, canals, channels, and levees, will be limited in 1951 to continuation of work on projects started in prior years. Bureau of Reclamation projects now under way will require an expenditure increase of 64 million dollars in 1951. Expenditures required in 1951 to continue going work of the Corps of Engineers will increase by 77 million dollars over the 1950 total.

The expenditures by the Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation will result in materially increased power facilities in the next few years. In addition, continuing progress on the existing programs of the Bonneville and Southwestern power systems will result in a further increase in transmission facilities. An increase of 44 million dollars is recommended for the Tennessee Valley development, notably for expansion of power facilities to meet the growing needs of the atomic energy program.

Experience in recent years has shown that it may not be possible to meet the shortages of water, which are a threat in some areas, through our extensive water-resource programs. I recommend, therefore, that the Congress enact legislation authorizing the initiation of research to find means for transforming salt water into fresh water in large volume at economical costs.

Public lands and national forests: Over many years, our policy with respect to public lands and forests, now comprising over 900,000,000 acres, has gradually been broadened from one of disposal to one of management and conservation. The range, forest, and mineral resources of these lands have considerable commercial value and bring in substantial receipts; in addition they have important watershed, wildlife, and recreational value. In some respects, we have a long way to go before we shall be managing and conserving these resources to achieve their full use and preservation. We should plan to expand our rehabilitation, protection, and management of these resources in the years ahead; the 1951 budget includes increased funds for these purposes.

Mineral resources: The Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey are carrying on important investigations and research in order to ascertain the extent of our mineral resources and the best means of conserving and using them. In view of the limited domestic supplies of many minerals, there is real need for increased exploration and conservation of strategic and critical minerals.

Through laboratory research and developmental work, including operation of demonstration plants, the Government has shown that some of our liquid fuel demands can be met from synthetic fuels produced from oil shale and coal. This budget includes funds for a continuation of efforts to improve synthetic liquid fuels, and to narrow the cost differential between synthetic and natural petroleum products.

Use of recreational resources: During the past travel season there were 32,000,000 visitors to the 181 national park areas. This number of visitors is the highest in the history of the National Park Service; it is double the number before the war. This heavy increase in the use of the park areas has enlarged the requirements for their management and protection. The increase of 9 million dollars in the 1951 budget for the Park Service will provide for additional management and maintenance costs and for some urgently needed construction.

Alaskan resources: Alaska is a land of large natural resources—forests, fish and wildlife, minerals, land, and water—which must be developed in order for the area to make its contribution to the security and economy of the Nation. The 1951 programs discussed above include 23 million dollars for the development of natural resources in Alaska. Developmental expenditures in Alaska under other functions—in particular national defense, transportation, and social welfare—will amount to approximately 162 million dollars.

Indian land resources: Large areas of Indian lands are rich in timber, oil, gas, and other minerals, the conservation and development of which should be related

to programs affecting similar lands. As part of our general program for protecting their rights and for helping the Indians to become self-reliant citizens, funds are included in this budget for initiating the long-range program for the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indians in Arizona and New Mexico. While the greater portion of the amount recommended is for essential construction of educational and health facilities (classified in social welfare, health, and security), provision is made also for expanded conservation and development of the resources of the reservations. Funds are also included for some expansion in conservation activities on Indian lands in other areas, as well as for additional health, education, and other benefits to the Indian population.

Transportation and communication

Efficient transportation and communication services play a major role in promoting the economic growth of our country and in assuring our national security. Throughout our history, the Federal Government has traditionally supplemented private enterprise in this field, wherever necessary to assure adequate services at reasonable cost. To this end, the Government provides basic facilities; it regulates economic and safety aspects of commercial operations; it subsidizes essential services which could not survive without Government aid. In the fiscal year 1951, an estimated 1.7 billion dollars will be spent for these activities, a decline of 212 million dollars from 1950. This assumes a reduction of the postal deficit to a reasonable level, through enactment of postal rate increases.

Most of the Federal transportation expenditures are for the provision and operation of physical facilities. Direct Federal expenditures for aviation facilities, marine navigation aids, waterway improvements, and roads will amount to about 600 million dollars in 1951. In addition, grants to State and local governments for the construction of highways and airports will account for 514 million dollars. Although these programs make important contributions to the development of our economy, over-all budgetary considerations make it impossible to proceed with them as rapidly as we should like. The 1951 budget recommendations have been held as close to the 1950 level as program commitments would allow.

The long-term interests of the general taxpayer, as well as the users of transportation, will best be served by the development of a balanced transportation system, substantially independent of Government support. It is essential that the various promotional and regulatory activities of the Government fit together into a unified transportation program aimed at achieving that goal. At my request, the Secretary of Commerce recently prepared a report outlining the major policy issues which need to be resolved in order to assure such a program. This report is now being reviewed within the executive branch, and I shall later transmit recommendations for any legislation or other action that may prove appropriate.

Merchant marine: Under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the Federal Government provides both construction and operating subsidies to the maritime industry, intended to offset the competitive effects of lower foreign costs. In the fiscal year 1951, operating subsidies alone are estimated to accrue in the amount of 63 million dollars, about five times the average annual level before the war. Shipbuilding subsidies have recently averaged close to 45 percent of the domestic cost of vessel construction, exclusive of national defense features financed entirely by the Government.

I am seriously concerned by the increasing cost of these existing subsidies and by the potential cost of new subsidies now being advocated. Our national security requires an efficient nucleus of merchant shipping and shipbuilding, adequate to permit such expansion as may be required by a future emergency. However, to limit the burden on the taxpayer, this subsidy program should be held to the minimum level that will satisfy national defense needs. In determining this level, full account must be taken of the availability of vessels from friendly nations in the event of an emergency. The existence of the North Atlantic Treaty provides a framework within which joint international planning of shipping mobilization may proceed.

Transportation and communication

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			New obligational authority for 1951	
	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated	Appropriations	Other
Promotion of merchant marine:					
Maritime Commission	$122	$161	$222	$135	$70
Inland Waterways Corporation:					
Present programs	2	1	----	----	----
Proposed legislation	----	----	3	3	----
Provision of navigation aids and facilities:					
Panama Canal	17	20	20	19	----
Corps of Engineers:					
Present programs	160	212	243	242	----
St. Lawrence seaway (proposed legislation)	----	----	4	6	----
Coast Guard	132	158	181	187	----
Interior	(1)	1	3	----	----
Promotion of aviation:					
Civil Aeronautics Administration:					
Present programs	143	187	226	133	70
Alaska airports (proposed legislation)	----	1	4	----	----
Provision of highways:					
Bureau of Public Roads:					
Present programs	414	490	504	----	----
Proposed legislation	----	----	3	3	524
Alaska roads (Interior)	16	23	23	16	9
Forest roads and trails (Agriculture)	23	2	----	----	----
Regulation of transportation	15	15	16	16	----
Other services to transportation:					
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	−3	2	6	----	----
Coast and Geodetic Survey	10	12	12	12	----
Alaska Railroad	33	30	41	28	----
Treasury Department	(1)	(1)	(1)	1	----
Postal service deficit:					
Present programs	530	569	555	555	----
Proposed legislation	----	----	−395	−395	----
Regulation of communication	7	7	7	7	----
Alaska Communication System	2	3	4	6	----
Total	1,622	1,894	1,682	[2] 973	673

[1] Less than one-half million dollars.
[2] This budget also includes 591 million dollars of appropriations to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

The entire subject of Government aid to the merchant marine is now under active study by the executive agencies concerned. Until such studies are completed, we should proceed cautiously with existing subsidy programs, and should avoid commitments for any major new programs. The budget for 1951 has been developed on that basis.

Expenditure increases in 1951 for ship construction and for operating subsidies will be partially offset by reductions in other Maritime Commission activities. The maritime training program is being reduced in size, and consolidated at three locations. Authority for ship chartering, scheduled to expire on June 30, 1950, does not now appear to be required beyond that date. Expenditures will also be lower for the liquidation of wartime obligations.

Navigation aids and facilities: The safety of surface and air operations at sea requires the navigational aids, rescue stations, and other services provided by the Coast Guard. Expenditures for these activities are estimated to increase from 158 million dollars in 1950 to 181 million dollars in 1951. This increase is largely for the replacement of over-age aircraft, and for more adequate maintenance of existing facilities.

The 1951 recommendations do not provide for starting construction on any new river and harbor projects of the Corps of Engineers. Projects already under way will, however, require an increase in expenditures from 212 million dollars in the fiscal year 1950 to 243 million dollars in 1951, and a further increase in 1952.

I repeat most emphatically my previous recommendations for approval of the Saint Lawrence waterway and power project. Authorization of the seaway, with its related power facilities, is a matter of urgency for our peacetime industry and our national security. In particular, each succeeding year reduces further our domestic reserves of iron ore, and increases correspondingly the importance of the seaway as a means of economical access to the proven ore deposits in Quebec and Labrador.

Aviation: The Federal Government provides extensive aid, both direct and indirect, to civil aviation. This assistance, which is consistent with our traditional policy of promoting new forms of transportation, has made possible a spectacular development of air transport services, especially during the past decade. Although continued aid is required for the present, the industry should be expected to become increasingly self-supporting in the near future.

At present, direct financial assistance to the air lines is provided through air-mail payments, which are set generally at levels adequate to cover deficiencies in the carriers' commercial revenues. Subsidy is thus merged with the fair compensation for carrying mail, making it difficult to evaluate the cost of this aid in relation to its benefits. The recent rise in total air-mail payments—to an estimated level of about 125 million dollars in 1950—has made it increasingly important that the subsidy element be separately identified. I recommend, therefore, the immediate enactment of legislation to authorize the separation of subsidy payments from mail compensa-

tion. Such subsidies should be paid from funds appropriated to the Civil Aeronautics Board specifically for that purpose.

The standard by which subsidy rates are determined under existing legislation may itself merit review in the light of the industry's present stage of development. Setting subsidies on the basis of the carriers' revenue needs may weaken the incentives for managerial economy, thereby increasing the difficulty of effective regulation by the Civil Aeronautics Board. While a considerable gain in efficiency has been realized by the air lines since the end of the war, there are undoubtedly important opportunities for further improvement. The 1951 budget will permit the Civil Aeronautics Board to conduct more intensive investigations of air-line efficiency, and to develop operating cost standards. This should assist the Board in shaping its subsidy policies so as to retain, to the maximum extent possible, the normal business incentives for economy.

The continued growth of air transportation depends upon modernization of our airway facilities to permit safe and regular flights under all weather conditions. Expenditures for the development, installation, and operation of such facilities are estimated at 136 million dollars in the fiscal year 1951, 39 million dollars above 1950. Other activities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration—including safety regulation and airport grants—will require expenditures of 93 million dollars in 1951, 3 million dollars higher than in 1950.

Highways: Major development of our highway system is required to overcome obsolescence and to handle safely and efficiently the steadily increasing traffic loads. This is primarily the responsibility of States, counties, and municipalities. The Federal Government must, however, continue providing financial assistance to the extent necessary to assure a basic system of national roads, built to uniformly adequate standards. Under existing legislation, the Bureau of Public Roads is expected to spend 504 million dollars for highway improvement in 1951, mainly in the form of grants to States. Apart from the emergency relief programs during the depression, this will be the highest annual level of Federal highway expenditures to date.

All of the Federal-aid funds thus far authorized have been apportioned to the States, and new authorizing legislation is therefore required during the present session of the Congress. I recommend that such legislation provide an annual Federal-aid authorization for the next 2 years of 500 million dollars, an increase of 50 million dollars above the current level. Within this total, increased emphasis should be placed upon the Interstate Highway System, a limited network of routes which is of greatest national importance to peacetime traffic needs as well as to our national defense. The recommended shift in emphasis, and increase in program level, should permit a satisfactory rate of improvement for this System.

Postal service: Postal rates have not kept pace with increasing costs and, as a result, the postal deficit has reached excessive proportions. Since 1939, the average expense per postal transaction has increased by 67 percent, owing mainly to higher wage and transportation costs; in contrast, average revenue has increased by only 32 percent. On the basis of existing postal rates, the deficit for 1951 is estimated at 555 million dollars. Cases now pending before the regulatory commissions may result in higher payments for transportation, and hence may correspondingly increase the deficit.

The Postmaster General is exploring fully all opportunities for reducing the cost of the postal operation. Modernization of the motor vehicle service, and the mechanization of mail handling, are among the items receiving particular attention. I am confident that the steps now being taken will in the long run help to assure the maximum efficiency of the postal operation. However, the potential savings, if present service standards are maintained, appear small in relation to the prospective deficit; they do not reduce significantly the need for higher revenues at this time.

I have repeatedly urged the Congress to raise postal rates so as to bring them into line with postwar costs. The need for such corrective action becomes steadily more urgent. It is unsound and unnecessary for the postal operation to continue as a growing burden on the general taxpayer. Instead, the users of the postal service should as a group pay the full cost of services received. This requires that the postal deficit be limited to the cost of air-line subsidies, Government mail, franked mail, and other items properly chargeable to the general revenues.

Last year, the Postmaster General recommended to the Congress postal rate revisions designed to yield additional revenue of about 250 million dollars per year. Subsequent increases in employees' pay and in transportation costs have rendered this amount inadequate. I therefore strongly urge again that the Congress pass legislation to bring the postal revenue more in balance with the expenditures of the service. The only alternative to increased rates or a continued large deficit would be an undesirable reduction in the quality of services provided. As a longer range solution to this problem, there should be sufficient flexibility in the postal rate structure to permit at all times a proper relationship between revenues and expenses.

Regulation: Through regulation, the Federal Government seeks to assure the adequacy, economy, and safety of transportation and communication services. Although the expenditures required for this activity are relatively small, this is one of the more important responsibilities exercised by the Government in this field. The 1951 budget includes moderate increases for the regulatory commissions, to permit them to reduce backlogs of pending cases, and to meet new problems more promptly.

Finance, commerce, and industry

As part of its broad program for balanced economic development, the Federal Government provides a variety of general financial and other aids to promote the stability and growth of independent businesses. These are supplemented by regulatory action designed to remove monopolistic barriers to production and commerce. In addition, in two areas—exports and rents—it is necessary to continue, on a limited basis, wartime controls now in effect. Total expenditures in 1951 are estimated at 212 million dollars, of which net expenditures for loans to business will account for about three-fourths.

Finance, commerce, and industry

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			New obligational authority for 1951	
	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated	Appropriations	Other
Business loans and guarantees (Reconstruction Finance Corporation, present programs and proposed legislation)	$65	$153	$155	------	$250
Promotion and regulation of business:					
Department of Commerce:					
Promotion	23	25	23	$20	------
Export control	3	3	2	3	------
Antimonopoly programs (Federal Trade Commission, Justice)	7	7	8	8	------
Rent control (Housing Expediter, present programs and proposed legislation)	22	22	16	16	------
Other	7	7	7	6	------
All other:					
Preferred stock of financial institutions (Reconstruction Finance Corporation)	−14	(1)	−6	------	------
Control of private finance	7	7	7	7	------
Total	120	225	212	60	250

[1] Less than ½ million dollars.

Business loans and guaranties: In the past year, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has contributed substantially to the financial stability of independent businesses, especially small business. The change in economic conditions last spring resulted in many financing needs which private lenders failed to meet, and consequently applications for Reconstruction Finance Corporation business loans increased rapidly. During recent months, the Corporation has been making about 450 new loans per month, or nearly twice the rate of a year ago. With the favorable business outlook now anticipated, a somewhat lower level of new loan authorizations is estimated in 1951, but net expenditures are expected to rise above 1950 because of disbursements on loans authorized this year. In future years, repayments will provide increasing offsets to disbursements on new loans.

To make sure that this program will meet the needs of business for long-term credit, I am renewing the recommendation for a substantial increase in the present 10-year maximum on loan maturities. I also recommend an addition to the funds available for business loans.

Promotion and regulation of business: Since the war we have substantially strengthened our antimonopoly program, but continued improvement is essential. I have asked the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Attorney General, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Council of Economic Advisers, to develop recommendations for increasing the effectiveness of this program. A major aspect of this study will be the development of methods to facilitate establishment of small businesses, to promote their stability and growth, and to remove obstacles to their survival as independent competitive enterprises.

The budget also provides additional funds for strengthening the antimonopoly activities of the Federal Trade Commission. Among other things, this will permit a study of trends in industrial concentration to guide the formulation of Federal policy and to aid in prosecuting specific cases.

As the record levels of housing construction have gradually reduced the housing shortage, rent controls have been removed in many communities. This trend probably will continue. To prevent serious hardship to tenants in areas where shortages remain critical, I am recommending a 1-year extension of rent control authority beyond the present expiration date of June 30, 1950.

Improvement in the supply situation has permitted removal of most commodities from export control. Export licensing of some strategic commodities, however, remains essential because of the uncertain international situation.

Labor

The programs of the Federal Government in the field of labor are designed to encourage increasingly effective use of our major productive resource—the skill of the American workingman—with the ultimate objective of assuring higher production and standards of living. To this end, the Government fosters responsible and peaceful labor relations based on collective bargaining by offering voluntary mediation services and providing a remedy for unfair labor practices. It promotes fair labor standards for wages, hours, and employment conditions to prevent exploitation and unfair competition based on substandard conditions. It finances a free placement service to aid industry, agriculture, and workers and insures workers, mainly through a Federal-State system, against total loss of income during periods of temporary unemployment. Finally, it collects and publishes information on wages, employment, prices, construction, and other subjects in order that business and economic planning and decisions may be on a factual basis.

The importance of these programs is by no means measured by the total expenditures of 243 million dollars in 1951, since many of the activities are regulatory in nature and require only minor expenditures. Of total expenditures, about 70 percent consists of grants to States for administration of the Federal-State employment service and unemployment compensation system.

Placement and unemployment compensation activities: The Federal Government sets standards and pays all administrative costs for State operation of public employment offices and unemployment insurance. Public employment offices placed applicants in more than 12,000,000 jobs during the past fiscal year. Of the total job placements, over 7,000,000 were on farms. Still more placements are expected in 1950 and 1951.

The unemployment compensation work load is closely related to general economic conditions. Last year the Congress recognized this fact by appropriating a contingency fund of 5 percent of the basic grants, to be used if the number of claims increased. It now appears that this contingency fund will not be sufficient to pay for the increase in work load which has occurred. I shall, therefore, request a supplemental appropriation for 1950. For 1951, the budget recommendations for the basic grants assume a somewhat lower average level of unemployment but call for a contingency fund of 10 percent to obviate delays in paying valid claims, should the volume of claims suddenly rise.

Labor

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			New obligational authority for 1951	
	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated	Appropriations	Other
Placement and unemployment compensation activities:					
Department of Labor:					
Present programs	-----	$137	$171	$194	-----
Proposed legislation (mainly reinsurance grants)	-----	-----	12	13	-----
Railroad Retirement Board	$15	10	9	10	-----
Federal Security Agency	148	37	-----	-----	-----
Mediation and regulation of labor relations	12	12	13	13	-----
Labor standards and training:					
Department of Labor:					
Present programs	8	10	15	15	-----
Industrial safety program (proposed legislation)	-----	-----	6	6	-----
Department of the Interior (mine safety)	4	4	4	4	-----
Fair Employment Practice Commission (proposed legislation)	-----	*	1	1	-----
Labor information, statistics, and general administration	6	9	11	12	-----
Total	193	219	243	266	-----

Mediation and regulation of labor relations: In my State of the Union Message I have discussed the imperative need for basic revision of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 to incorporate sound provisions on the rights and responsibilities of labor and management in relation to each other and to the general public, and to remove unworkable administrative provisions in the present law. This budget allows for improving mediation and conciliation activities by providing funds to permit relatively equal service for all parts of the country and for the recently expanded organization for adjustment of employee grievances in the railway industry.

Labor standards and labor training: The 1949 amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act, while inadequate in many respects, made substantial improvements in the law by raising the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour and tightening the provision against the use of child labor in production for interstate commerce. I am recommending increased funds for the additional inspection and legal staff which effective enforcement will require. Such enforcement is essential, not only to protect the purchasing power of workers who need it most, but also to protect law-abiding employers from unfair competition.

Two legislative proposals respecting employment conditions, and one on training, should be enacted promptly. First, a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission should be established. To keep minority groups economically submerged is not only unjust and discriminatory, but also prevents the best use of available manpower. Secondly, I am renewing my recommendation for grants to States to assist them to encourage industrial safety. The Federal Government and the States spend many millions of dollars each year to rehabilitate injured workers. It is only common sense to do what we can to prevent injuries in the first place. Finally, I recommend that a labor extension service be established in the Department of Labor to make available to wage earners educational programs designed to promote sound labor-management relations. Such a program would require about 3 million dollars a year after it gets into operation but would not have substantial effect on the 1951 budget because of the time required to get under way at the local level.

Trust accounts and unemployment compensation legislation: Last year's temporary but sharp rise in unemployment provided the first real test of the Federal-State unemployment insurance system since its establishment 15 years ago. The system was of great help in tiding workers over temporary unemployment and in sustaining markets for the products of employed workers. During the last 12 months, a total of 1.7 billion dollars in benefits was paid from the trust fund. At the same time, major shortcomings of the present system became painfully clear. It does not cover enough workers, and does not replace enough of the wages lost through unemployment. I shall submit proposals for legislation to overcome these and other defects by strengthening the present Federal-State system.

At present, only about two-thirds of the workers employed in nonagricultural industries are insured against the hazards of temporary unemployment. Coverage should be extended to employees of small establishments, of industries processing agricultural products, and of the Federal Government. This would raise coverage to about three-fourths of nonagricultural workers. Furthermore, legislation should include minimum Federal standards for eligibility and disqualifications, in order to remove some of

the present inequalities in administration among the States.

Present weekly benefits now average about one-third of previously earned weekly wages. The insurance was originally intended to replace at least half of previous earnings—the minimum needed to pay for food and rent—but benefits in many States have not kept up with price rises. In order to assure more nearly adequate benefits throughout the Nation, the Federal law should provide minimum standards for benefits paid from the State trust accounts. These standards should require benefits of 50 percent of previous wages up to 30 dollars a week for single workers, with additional amounts for dependents up to 42 dollars a week for a worker with three dependents. The legislation should also require that benefits be available to eligible claimants for at least 26 weeks.

In addition to these changes in coverage and benefit standards, I shall recommend amendments to the financing provisions of present legislation, including establishment of a reinsurance system to provide grants to States whose reserves for benefits become temporarily low, despite reasonable measures to maintain adequate funds. Although most States have sufficient reserves to pay higher benefits without increasing taxes, one or two States may need assistance by next autumn or shortly thereafter.

The proposed legislation will affect chiefly the trust fund rather than the appropriations for administration. For both the trust fund and the appropriations, the effect in the fiscal year 1951 will be slight because time will be required for the State legislatures to revise their laws to conform with new standards established by the Congress. Benefits for Federal workers will represent the principal continuing budgetary cost of my recommendations. (The estimated expenditures for these benefits in the fiscal year 1951 are shown under general government.) Estimates for proposed reinsurance appropriations are also included in the budget. Expenditures from these appropriations will be necessary only if State reserves become inadequate to provide for temporarily high numbers of insured unemployed.

Unemployment trust fund (trust accounts)

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Item	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated
Receipts:			
Deposits by States and railroad unemployment taxes	$994	$1,018	$1,193
Interest	180	162	165
Payments: State and railroad unemployment withdrawals	−1,327	−2,034	−1,570
Net accumulation	−153	−854	−212

General government

The expenditures for general government cover legislative, judicial, and financial management activities, and also many Government-wide administrative services and programs such as property and records management, public buildings construction and maintenance, and the operations of the Civil Service Commission. The total expenditures for these programs for the fiscal year 1951 are estimated at 1.3 billion dollars compared to 1.2 billion for the current fiscal year. The increase is primarily for strengthening further the system of tax collection, for the Government payment to the employees' retirement system, and for public building sites and plans.

Internal revenue operations: Efficient operation of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the Federal Government's primary tax collection agency, is essential to protect the Federal revenue and to assure fair treatment to taxpayers. Studies of the organizational structure and administrative procedures of this agency have been under way for some time and have already resulted in many improvements, including the mechanization of some operations. These have enabled the Bureau to strengthen and extend its audit and enforcement activities, thereby collecting additional taxes, not only directly, but also by stimulating a greater degree of voluntary compliance. Further improvements are in prospect. The 1951 appropriation provides for increased funds for these purposes.

Property management: Under mandate of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, the General Services Administration was established to consolidate a number of Government-wide activities concerned with the procurement, maintenance, and disposal of Federal property. This was in accord with a major recommendation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. The General Services Administration is currently undertaking to establish records storage centers and is emphasizing the expansion of inspection services and traffic management, determination of purchasing requirements, and controls to insure proper utilization of Government property.

General government

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			New obligational authority for 1951	
	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated	Appropriations	Other
Legislative functions	$34	$43	$50	$39	-----
Judicial functions	19	27	31	24	-----
Executive direction and management	7	8	12	7	-----
Federal financial management:					
Bureau of Internal Revenue (Treasury)	208	230	253	253	-----
Customs collection, debt management, and other (mainly Treasury)	135	136	134	133	-----
General Accounting Office	35	36	37	37	-----

General government—Continued

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			New obligational authority for 1951	
	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated	Appropriations	Other
Other central services:					
Property management (mainly General Services Administration)	$169	$139	$110	$99	-----
Civil Service Commission	16	17	17	17	-----
Legal services (Justice)	6	8	9	9	-----
Government Printing Office	5	9	11	19	-----
Special fund for management improvement	-----	1	-----	-----	-----
Government payment toward civilian employees' general retirement system	224	301	333	333	-----
Interest on refunds of receipts	87	93	100	100	-----
Public buildings construction (General Services Administration)	3	22	53	28	-----
Weather Bureau (Commerce)	24	24	26	26	-----
Cemeterial program (Army and American Battle Monuments Commission)	58	30	21	13	$3
Immigration control (Justice)	30	32	32	32	-----
Other:					
Present programs	110	68	24	47	-----
Unemployment compensation payments to Federal workers (proposed legislation)	-----	-----	13	14	-----
Civil rights program (proposed legislation)	-----	-----	1	1	-----
Total	1,170	1,223	1,267	[1] 1,231	3

[1] This budget also includes 41 million dollars of appropriations to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

Civilian employees' retirement system: Federal employees covered by the civil service retirement and disability system are required by law to contribute 6 percent of their salaries toward future benefits; the Government contributes the remaining cost of benefits provided under the system. The expenditures of 333 million dollars estimated for 1951 represent the Government payment necessary to enable the fund to cover its currently accruing obligations.

Construction of public buildings: Of estimated expenditures of 53 million dollars in 1951 for construction of public buildings, more than half is for acquiring sites and drawing plans for future construction in accordance with the Public Buildings Act of 1949. Expenditures for actual construction will be limited to projects already under way.

Operation of the Weather Bureau: Modest increases are requested to meet the increased demand for the services of the Weather Bureau. These include the requirements for general weather service, aviation forecasts, and assisting in the protection of our forests from fire hazards. Increases in Atlantic weather

patrol observations and in forecasting and briefing services to pilots on international flights are to meet commitments under the International Civil Aviation Organization.

Government of Guam, Samoa, and the trust territory of the Pacific islands: It is the announced aim of this Government to accord civil government to the inhabitants of its non-self-governing Pacific territories—Guam and American Samoa—which have been under American rule for half a century, and the trust territory of the Pacific islands which we administer under a United Nations trusteeship agreement. As a partial step in this direction I have transferred administrative responsibility for Guam to the Secretary of the Interior and have directed that arrangements be made for a similar transfer on July 1, 1951, with respect to American Samoa and the trust territory. This budget contains 2 million dollars for Guam as part of a 4-million-dollar appropriation recommended for administration of Territories and possessions for the fiscal year 1951. I urge that the Congress enact the proposed organic acts now before it, providing for the civil government of Guam and American Samoa, and similar legislation for the trust territory of the Pacific islands.

Development of the National Capital: I renew my request that the National Capital Park and Planning Commission be established on a stronger statutory basis. This would enable the Commission to fulfill more effectively its obligations to plan the orderly, coordinated development of the District of Columbia and nearby areas in Maryland and Virginia.

Government Services Corporation: Several organizations not within the normal governmental framework now provide, in Government buildings and on Government property, cafeteria and recreational services for Federal employees. I recommend that the Congress pass legislation now before it to create a self-supporting Government corporation to carry out these essentially governmental responsibilities.

Federal employees' unemployment compensation: The proposed broadening of the coverage of the unemployment compensation program, recommended elsewhere in this message, requires a Government payment to extend coverage to Federal employees. This budget includes 13.5 million dollars for an appropriation to cover benefit payments in the second half of fiscal year 1951, when it is anticipated the program will be in operation.

Civil rights program: This budget includes funds to expand civil rights enforcement activities of the Department of Justice under present laws. In addition to the amount provided for establishing a Fair Employment Practice Commission, there is included 800 thousand dollars as the amount needed under proposed legislation to establish a permanent Commission on Civil Rights, which would continuously review our practices and policies in this field, and to provide for an additional Assistant Attorney General to supervise a needed civil rights division in the Department of Justice.

Interest on the public debt

Interest on the public debt is a fixed obligation of the Government, determined by the amount of Federal securities outstanding and their interest rates. Payments are financed by permanent indefinite appropriations which do not require annual congressional action.

Interest on the public debt

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Agency	Expenditures			Appropriations for 1951 (permanent indefinite)
	1949 actual	1950 estimated	1951 estimated	
Treasury Department	$5,352	$5,725	$5,625	$5,625

Interest payments of 5.6 billion dollars estimated for 1951 are lower than those in 1950, because a shift in reporting methods caused a nonrecurring addition of over 200 million dollars in 1950. Under the new method, effective in the fiscal year 1950, all interest payments are now reported as they become payable rather than when they are actually paid. As a result of the transition, the 1950 total includes interest for prior years that was payable but had not yet been presented for payment at the beginning of the fiscal year 1950. This change does not significantly affect the reporting of interest payments in 1951 and later years.

Apart from this nonrecurring item, total interest payments will continue to rise in the fiscal year 1951. Each year more of the savings bonds sold during the war reach the stage where interest accrues at higher rates. Moreover, continuing accumulations of Government trust funds will cause further increases in special issues to such funds of obligations bearing rates of interest higher than the average on the entire public debt. Finally, the budget deficit this year and next will add to the total volume of interest-bearing debt. Savings in refunding operations, however, will offset some of this increase in interest cost.

Interest payments on the Federal debt are widely distributed, and represent a particularly important source of income to certain institutions and groups. Almost 2 billion dollars of interest in the fiscal year 1951 is expected to go to individuals and unincorporated businesses. About 1 billion dollars will be paid to commercial banks and almost 1.5 billion to insurance companies, mutual savings banks, and other private investors. Another 1 billion dollars will go to Government retirement funds, social security funds, and various other Government trust funds to build up reserves out of which future benefits will be paid. Over 250 million dollars of interest in 1951 will be paid to the Federal Reserve banks; more than half of such payments will be returned to the Treasury and deposited into miscellaneous receipts. The remainder will be used to defray most of the operating expenses of the Federal Reserve System, to pay dividends to member banks, and to add to surplus.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION—A SUMMARY

The following table shows estimated expenditures, appropriations, and other authorizations included in the budget for programs under proposed legislation. The second table shows the effect of proposed legislation upon the Government trust funds.

Many of the programs listed under proposed legislation are actually continuations of programs already in existence but for which new authorizations are required to permit their continuance in 1951. These items are set forth separately in the first part of the table.

The budget also contains a general reserve for contingencies. It is designed as a minimum provision for activities not now definitely foreseen, but on which action may be required before the end of the fiscal year.

Proposed legislation (summary of amounts included in the budget)

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Function and program	Estimated expenditures, 1951	Anticipated supplemental appropriations and other authorizations	
		1950	1951
EXTENSION OF EXISTING LEGISLATION			
International affairs and finance:			
Extension of European recovery program and other foreign aid	$1,700.0	----------	$3,100.0
Extension of mutual defense assistance	200.0	----------	647.5 [500.0]
Inter-American highways	----------	----------	[8.0]
National defense: Selective service program	3.9	----------	4.2
Housing and community development:			
Mortgage purchases	125.0	($500.0)	(250.0)
Loans to prefabricators	17.8	(25.0)	----------
Extension and modification of loan insurance	−12.7	----------	----------
Agriculture and agricultural resources: Commodity Credit Corporation	----------	(2,000.0)	----------
Transportation and communication:			
Federal-aid postwar highway program	----------	----------	[500.0]
Forest highways	----------	----------	[20.0]
Finance, commerce, and industry:			
Business loans and guarantees	10.0	----------	(250.0)
Extension of rent control	15.0	----------	16.0
Expenditures and appropriations (net)	2,059.0	----------	3,767.7
Contract authorizations	----------	----------	[1,028.0]
Public debt authorizations	----------	(2,525.0)	(500.0)

Proposed legislation (summary of amounts included in the budget)—Continued

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Function and program	Estimated expenditures, 1951	Anticipated supplemental appropriations and other authorizations	
		1950	1951
NEW LEGISLATION			
International affairs and finance:			
Technical assistance to economically underdeveloped areas (Point 4)	$25.0	----------	$35.0
Assistance to the Republic of Korea	110.0	$65.0	115.0
Contributions to International Trade Organization and other international organizations	2.5	----------	2.5
Relief of Palestine refugees	20.0	27.0	----------
Expanded displaced-persons program	2.4	----------	2.6
Rama Road, Nicaragua	----------	----------	[8.0]
National defense: Military functions (including public works)	70.0	----------	131.7 [240.0]
Social welfare, health, and security:			
Expansion of public assistance programs	200.3	----------	250.3
Expansion of vocational rehabilitation program	4.3	----------	4.3
Aid to medical education	30.0	----------	45.0
Increased aid to local public health services	4.5	----------	5.0
Increased grants to States for maternal and child welfare	6.9	----------	9.5
Health services for school children	25.0	----------	35.0
Housing and community development:			
Cooperative housing for middle-income families	50.0	----------	35.0 (25.0)
Loans to other cooperatives	30.0	----------	----------
Home Loan Bank Board stand-by borrowing authority	(1)	(1,750.0)	----------
Disaster relief	5.0	----------	5.0
Education and general research:			
General aid for operating expenses, elementary and secondary schools	290.2	----------	300.2
Surveys and emergency construction, elementary and secondary schools	22.2	----------	45.2
Education of children on Federal properties and in emergency areas	7.0	----------	7.0
General assistance to college students	.9	----------	1.0
National Science Foundation	.4	----------	.5
Agriculture and agricultural resources: Administration of Commodity Exchange Act	.7	----------	.8
Natural resources:			
Research in utilization of salt water	.5	----------	.5
Baltimore Washington Parkway	2.0	----------	3.0
Transportation and communication:			
Inland Waterways Corporation	3.0	----------	3.0
St. Lawrence seaway and power project	4.0	----------	6.0
Construction of public airports, Territory of Alaska	3.5	4.5	----------
Forest highways, Alaska	2.9	----------	2.9 [4.4]
Postal rate increase (increased revenue)	−395.0	----------	−395.0
NEW LEGISLATION—continued			
Labor:			
Expanded unemployment insurance: Administration and reinsurance	$12.4	----------	$12.5
Industrial safety program	6.0	----------	6.0
Fair Employment Practice Commission	.6	----------	.7
General government:			
Strengthening Federal civil-rights program	.7	----------	.8
Unemployment compensation payments to Federal workers	13.4	----------	13.5
Expenditures and appropriations (net)	561.3	$96.5	684.5
Contract authorizations	----------	----------	[252.4]
Public debt authorizations	----------	(1,750.0)	(25.0)

[1] Estimated additional receipts of 60 million dollars in 1951.

NOTE.—[ ] indicate contract authorizations. ( ) indicate public debt authorizations.

Proposed legislation affecting trust funds

[In millions]

Function and program	1951 estimated
SOCIAL WELFARE, HEALTH, AND SECURITY	
Extend and improve old-age and survivors insurance:	
Additional receipts	$1,200.0
Additional disbursements	1,433.0
Net accumulation in reserve	−233.0
Medical-care insurance:	
Receipts	250.0
Disbursements for initial expenses	35.0
Net accumulation in reserve	215.0

The budget for the fiscal year 1951 reflects the great strength and the extensive responsibilities of this country. It represents much more than a collection of facts and figures—it represents the program which I am recommending for our Government in the months ahead. It will influence the course of events for years beyond 1951, and the success with which we push ahead toward enduring peace, continuing economic growth, and a steady strengthening of our democratic society.

In preparing this budget, I have earnestly applied the fundamental principles which, in the present circumstances, should guide us in the conduct of our affairs. It is an honest budget, which meets the realities which face us. It provides for essential activities on a minimum basis and no more, despite the great pressures which exist on every side for larger expenditures on specific programs. It meets the obligation of our Government to nourish and support the economic and social health of our Nation. It not only provides for substantial progress in 1951 toward our goal of budgetary balance but also lays the basis for further improvement in subsequent years consistent with the welfare of the country.

We are still a young and growing Nation with a great reserve of human skills and productive resources. We have made and shall make more progress toward a less threatening world. Our strength is not being impaired by our present great responsibilities and the temporary deficits required to meet them. Given wise policies, which meet the broadest tests of national welfare, we can look forward to the future with confidence.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

JANUARY 3, 1950.

Mr. RANKIN (interrupting the reading of the message). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the message be dispensed with and that the entire message be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it seems we ought to know what is going on.

Mr. McCORMACK. I object, Mr. Speaker. I think we ought to continue with the reading of the message. This is a Presidential message, and I think we all ought to hear it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). The Clerk will read.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-five Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 2]

Abbitt	Dingell	Harden
Addonizio	Dollinger	Hart
Albert	Donohue	Heffernan
Bailey	Douglas	Heller
Barden	Eaton	Herter
Barrett, Pa.	Eberharter	Hinshaw
Battle	Elliott	Hoffman, Ill.
Bentsen	Ellsworth	Irving
Bland	Elston	Javits
Blatnik	Feighan	Jenison
Bolton, Ohio	Fernandez	Jennings
Brooks	Fisher	Kelley, Pa.
Buckley, N.Y.	Flood	Kelly, N.Y.
Bulwinkle	Fogarty	Kennedy
Burton	Fugate	Keogh
Celler	Fulton	Klein
Christopher	Furcolo	Kunkel
Chudoff	Gamble	Lane
Clemente	Gilmer	Latham
Cole, Kans.	Gorski	Lichtenwalter
Combs	Green	Lynch
Corbett	Gregory	McConnell
Cotton	Hall, Edwin Arthur	McSweeney
Crosser	Hall, Leonard W.	Marcantonio
Davenport	Halleck	Miller, Md.
Davies, N.Y.	Hand	Miller, Nebr.
Davis, Ga.		Mills
Delaney		Monroney

Morgan	Poulson	Shafer
Morrison	Powell	Smathers
Multer	Quinn	Smith, Kans.
Murphy	Ramsay	Smith, Ohio
Nixon	Rivers	Staggers
Norton	Rodino	Stanley
O'Brien, Mich.	Roosevelt	Stigler
O'Konski	Sadlak	Tauriello
O'Toole	Sadowski	Taylor
Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Saylor	Walsh
	Scott, Hardie	Weichel
Pfeiffer, William L.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	White, Idaho
		Withrow
Philbin		Wood

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 309 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the message of the President of the United States.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard the Clerk read the draft of the Federal fiscal program for the ensuing fiscal year as prepared under the President's direction and approval by him for consideration by the Congress.

It calls for somewhat smaller appropriations and expenditures than those requested for the current fiscal year, a gratifying reduction, but one which contemplates a deficit of upward of $5,000,000,000.

The appropriations proposed, including $4,500,000,000 for liquidating contract authorizations, aggregate $37,600,000,000. That amount omits $7,400,000,000 tentatively estimated for later submission. The over-all total is $45,000,000,000, a reduction of $7,900,000,000 under the current year as now projected.

Expenditures are proposed in the total amount of $42,400,000,000, which would flow from both new and existing obligational availability. That amount contrasts with $43,300,000,000 now projected for the current fiscal year.

The budget message is phrased in sanguine vein. The President expresses confidence "that the fiscal recommendations provide a solid basis for moving toward budgetary balance within the next few years." The realization of that expectation involves many factors, including contingencies, which need to be weighed carefully. Their materialization is not altogether within our own hands. Much depends upon developments beyond our shores, where our political and financial economy is inextricably involved. Under the circumstances there is reason to believe that we should proceed with a measure of caution and keep our budgeting more nearly in line with the principle of pay as we go.

It must be conceded that demands and obligations are such, at present, by reason of international situations and involvements, that we are precluded from operating wholly within income without material disadvantage, but undoubtedly we should consider with care the incurrence of new obligations, however meritorious they may appear, until our Treasury situation has definitely improved. We may exempt, of course, self-liquidating projects and projects which unmistakably contribute to enhancement of the national income, the only character of new obligations involving an overdraft upon our resources which we can afford to approve.

A deficit of $5,100,000,000 in times of peace, and especially during a period in which prosperity so generally prevails, runs counter to the conception of the majority of our people as to what constitutes sound financial housekeeping. It is my considered judgment that it is our clear duty to avoid, or at least reduce drastically, any such overdraft, first, by making lesser amounts available for expenditures than those proposed, and, second, by removing any residue through the medium of raising Treasury income, if only temporarily.

In the short time the budget has been available we have been limited to a rather hurried examination of its contents. But on even a cursory reading it is evident that it is susceptible to judicious pruning. However, unless we resort to indiscriminate cutting, a course both impracticable and indefensible, it is hardly possible to hope to make up the difference between unaugmented projected income and such outgo as it may be necessary to sanction. Should that situation develop, as there is reason to believe it will, then a new tax measure is warranted.

As Speaker RAYBURN sagely remarked a few days ago, "A prudent man pays his debts when he has the money." Like the prudent man, the Nation should not only be paying its way but should be paying something on its debt. No other course is tenable. Until we are again launched upon such a course we must exercise the greatest care in giving approval to new undertakings which would entail further borrowing.

Here in brief is a picture of the 1951 budget:

The estimate of over-all receipts is $37,300,000,000.

The estimate of over-all expenditures is $42,400,000,000.

That amount includes expenditures that would flow from $7,400,000,000 tentatively estimated for later submission in the form of new appropriations and other authorizations. An itemization of such subsequent submission commences on page M84 of the budget. The list is rather long, too long to read from the floor. Similar items may be found in table VII, commencing on page A–18 of the budget. The latter table also indicates the expenditures that would be made during the fiscal year 1951 in consequence of such tentative submissions.

If the budget were approved as presented, including tentative later submissions, the projected deficit would be $5,100,000,000, contrasted with $5,500,000,000 which is estimated as the deficit for the current fiscal year. The projected deficit for the ensuing fiscal year is predicated on lack of any additional revenues which might accrue from the enactment of recommendations later to be presented for the purpose of effecting certain adjustments in our tax laws. Possibly it should be added, that the projected expenditure total and the projected total deficit presuppose action by the Congress augmenting postal receipts to the extent of $395,000,000.

The projected expenditure total comprises amounts—

From appropriations proposed in the budget	$26,725,000,000
From appropriations heretofore made	12,100,000,000
From unpredictable deficiency and supplemental appropriations (this applies to the reserve for contingencies)	175,000,000
From appropriations for objects in the "tentative later submission" category	3,400,000,000

These amounts add up to $42,400,000,000, the total projected expenditure figure previously given.

It is within these expenditure classifications we must find a way to curtail projected Treasury withdrawals. As formerly, the task is made difficult by the allocations for and in consequence of national defense, past and present, and the efforts in which we are engaged for the promotion of world-wide peace. Seventy percent of the spending program is directly traceable to such objects. However, that is not an untouchable field, and it may be that as we examine such allocations in the Appropriations Committee we may find warrant for substituting lesser amounts. You may be certain we shall not hesitate to use the knife when justified by sound business considerations.

In phases of the budget not associated with war and its aftermath, we shall studiously examine any new projects proposed; any increases over current provision for routine Federal operations will be carefully scrutinized; and every effort will be made to determine if such operations may not be satisfactorily financed with lesser amounts than are currently available. In other words, our aim will be to effect reductions wherever possible without impairing efficiency of administration and without contravention of the public interest.

That is not a new committee policy. It merely is a reiteration of the generally conceived duty and practice of the Appropriations Committee to strive to the utmost to conserve tax dollars. Never was that duty of greater importance than at this time, operating as we are in the red and confronted by a continuation of deficit spending in the next succeeding fiscal year.

And make no mistake about it, my friends, deficit spending is not popular with the folks back home. They are insisting in emphatic terms upon a curtailment of Federal spending.

The projected withdrawal figure incident to later submission is not wholly subject to control by the Committee on Appropriations, because a large portion of such submissions must wait authorizing legislation. Legislative authorization must first be secured and in that connection, attention should again be called to the imperative need of considering the financial impact on our fiscal economy of such authorizing legislation when current demands already are consuming all available Treasury in-

come. How, under the sun, can we achieve and maintain a balanced budget if we continue to pyramid new demands upon expenditures already authorized unless we dispense with existing authorizations or provide additional revenue.

Personally, I welcome Minority Leader MARTIN's "price tag" committee suggestion, proposing to put a cost label on every spending bill. In that connection, may I suggest, however, that a more orderly procedure would be a rule requiring all reports on bills to include a statement of cost, and making reports failing to include such statement subject to a point of order.

As a matter of fact, the majority welcomes help from any source which will contribute to economical Federal budgeting. We have been striving since VJ-day to get our financial house in order. Hiroshima was but a few days past before we began recapturing appropriations and the cancellation of upward of $64,000,000,000 which were then open to obligation. Within 6 months after the close of the fiscal year in which fighting ceased President Truman transmitted to the Congress a balanced budget. Up to that time the President had brought about a reduction in the public debt, from its peak of $272,000,000,000 of more than $20,000,000,000.

The situation today is even more imperative.

From every technical and statistical point of view our fiscal situation is the most unfavorable in the peacetime hisory of the Republic. In the last session it was customary to refer to the national debt as a two hundred and fifty-two billion obligation. The final Treasury report, as of December 30, 1949, indicates a total debt of $257,160,110,000, or $4,405,708,000 more than on the final business day of 1948.

In the budget which the President submitted in the last session the amount scheduled for payment of interest on the national debt was $5,350,000,000. In the message just read to the House the requisition for interest on the debt is $5,725,000,000, an increase between the two budget messages of $375,000,000 per annum for interest alone.

During the fiscal year 1949 the full effect of the fiscal policies of the Eightieth Congress were brought to bear—new tax rates went into effect in May 1948, just 60 days before the beginning of fiscal year 1949. As a result it is now estimated the public debt will be $263,800,000,000 by the end of 1951. The interest charge alone in 1951 will aggregate $5,600,000,000.

Attention should again be called, however, to the fact just referred to that the budget as submitted contemplates additional revenue to be derived from increases in postal rates—not yet enacted by Congress—totaling $395,000,000. If this amount is not forthcoming then the public-debt increase will be that much greater.

It is a situation which warrants renewed and detailed scrutiny of the budget and all proposals involving expenditures, and justifies any possible improvement in methods of processing the appropriations.

Ever since the adoption of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, the committee has been seeking some practical method of submitting the annual appropriations in one over-all bill. Notably, under Chairman Swager Shirley of Kentucky and Committee Clerks Mark Sheild and John Pugh, extensive studies were inaugurated with this in view.

Finally, with the opening of the Eighty-first Congress, the first step was taken by the enlargement of the Committee on Appropriations to 45 members, making it possible to create nine subcommittees of five members each, and confining the service of each member to one committee and one bill, with the announcement that if the reorganization was successful, the nine bills would be consolidated into one bill in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress. The reorganization proved successful beyond expectation and the entire budget passed the House and was transmitted to the Senate before April 15, 1949, so well processed that practically no amendments of any importance were adopted in the House.

Plans for collaboration between the House and Senate on the omnibus bill were worked out last week by a joint conference between the deficiency subcommittees of the two Houses under which the hearings by the House subcommittees will be printed in sections, embracing each subdivision of the bill, and released to the press and sent to the Senate as rapidly as completed. Under this system the Senate hearings need be only an average of 10 days or 2 weeks behind the House hearings and will have been practically completed by the time the House bill is passed and messaged over.

The advantages of the one-package bill are obvious. Appropriations will be more carefully processed; duplications, overlapping and conflicts will be reconciled; legislative items will be eliminated; logrolling will be impracticable as all the cards will be on the table at one time and any attempted trades will be too apparent to withstand the light of publicity; the entire expenditures for the year will be submitted in one figure simultaneously with an authoritative estimate of the national income; deficit financing will be discouraged, as a last opportunity will be afforded for reconsideration in the subcommittees of the entire bill with a view of bringing annual expenditures within the annual revenues of the Government; and the bill will have been passed and all annual appropriations enacted before the end of the fiscal year, obviating the need for the usual continuing resolutions and permitting adjournment of Congress much earlier than heretofore. So far as the Presidential veto is concerned, the President will have precisely the same right and opportunity to veto the omnibus bill and return it for further consideration that he now has, and which he has exercised, in passing on the several bills formerly submitted by the Congress.

Adoption of the omnibus appropriation bill has been too long delayed. It has been in use in France, England, Sweden and other countries from the inception of parliamentary government. The need has been long realized in America and the announcement of its adoption here meets with universal approval from the press throughout the Nation, as indicated by the following editorial comment:

[From the Kansas City Times of December 28, 1949]

FOR MORE CARE WITH BILLIONS

Some day we might have a Congress that was honest enough with itself and honest enough with the people it represents to appropriate only the money there actually was to spend—not a dollar more. In peacetime certainly there is no legal, moral, or national security obligation to be used as an argument for any other course.

There could be no better time than the present for an honest start in the one direction. The opportunity is at hand in the proposal that all money bills be tied up into a single package and acted upon at one and the same time—when it is known how much money there will be to spend and when the pattern can be cut to fit the cloth.

That is closely akin to the policy that Congress is morally and legally obligated to follow and by virtue of its own considered action. Under the Congressional Reorganization Act adopted only 3 years ago for its own guidance—Congress is required to frame its own budget in the light of anticipated revenues. It is no excuse to say that it has not been done in the last 3 years, for the requirement is there and is just as strong as ever.

In the past the framing of a budget has been left wholly to the administration or the executive branch of the Government. It does not belong there any more than it belongs to Congress. In fact, it is more the duty of Congress because that body must say finally what shall be spent and for what purposes. That leaves upon Congress the burden of responsibility for what is done. The administration budget is only advisory and in the form of a recommendation—like all the other policies and programs that are laid before the legislative branch for its judgment and decisions.

As it has been and as it shouldn't be, Congress has taken up scores of appropriation bills separately. Each bill has been framed without any particular regard for the total revenue available and usually on the assumption that if any important cutting is to be done then some other committee and the Government agency or other interest behind it can do the trimming. Each is out to get what it can and the devil take the hindmost.

The result often is that near the end of a session there is accumulated a great mass of appropriations that might require billions more than would be at hand. It is loose and irresponsible business that should not be tolerated in running the biggest business in the Nation and the world.

Getting all the appropriations into a single bill would not in itself be a panacea but it would be an immense stride forward. Congress Members still would be human and politically minded. There could still be logrolling, back scratching, and trading back and forth. But these practices would not so easily produce the results that now can be had. With the grand total of appropriations clearly laid out along with the revenue to be at hand there would be more compulsion to line up in accordance with the facts. The public would be able to see clearly the whole set-up and who was responsible for trying to block a sensible and highly justified procedure.

The new idea has the approval of committee leaders who are in position to get it to work. So let's have it and give it a fair trial.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post]

LEGISLATIVE BUDGETS

The chief advantage of the omnibus appropriation bill that is to take the place of multiple appropriation bills is that it will provide Congress with an over-all figure of the cost of proposed spending programs, based on the recommendations of its various Appropriations Committees. A consolidated bill embodying the results of such committee deliberations will not be ready for presentation until late in the session, when Congress will be in a better position to estimate the tax revenues of the next fiscal year. The Reorganization Act of 1946 provided that a joint congressional budget committee should report to Congress each year by February 15 a legislative budget for the coming fiscal year including estimates of total expenditures and receipts. The act also provided that the committee report should be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting this budget and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditures. This legislative budget plan has proved unworkable, because it entailed setting an over-all spending figure at too early a date, in advance of detailed hearings on appropriation requests. Moreover, under the present system of piecemeal appropriations it is virtually impossible to keep total appropriations within a predetermined over-all figure.

The National Committee for Strengthening Congress, therefore, suggests that the Joint Budget Committee should review the items in the consolidated approriations bill and make a report to Congress about the first of May, embodying its own recommendations for increases or decreases in total appropriations or in revenue and/or increases or decreases in the public debt. Although this method of procedure would be an improvement on the present legislative budget plan, which requires the Joint Budget Committee to engage in a guessing contest, the committee would be of little use as an agent for intelligent control of spending unless it had made a continuous, intensive and independent study of the various appropriations measures included in the final appropriation bill. That kind of inquiry calls for a large staff of experts to examine estimates in detail and determine whether expenditures can be reduced without impairing efficiency and where they should be made.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat of December 28, 1949]

ONE-PACKAGE BUDGET

Despite fears of logrolling among the legislative brethren, congressional leaders have decided to wrap up the budget in a single bill. This looks like a good idea. With all its obvious pitfalls, a one-package budget is worth another try.

The procedure of recent past sessions has certainly proved no panacea for budgeting. Appropriation measures have been drawn, considered, and passed separately. The President likes that system, for he can veto individual bills without blocking the entire budget. But the separate bill plan has helped throw the whole appropriation picture out of kilter.

Congress believes it would be better to consider the complete budget structure at once. Thus it can determine the over-all size of its annual appropriations and, like any good tailor, cut the cloth to fit the revenue pattern.

It is impossible to figure out a sound budget piecemeal. Unless the total is taken into all computations, certain features are bound to be overweighted and the possibility of a balance slim indeed. The last session proved this. With grandiose forecast, Congressmen set out to trim Presidential figures. They wound up adding more billions to the President's budget.

The logrolling propensities of solons are ever present whether there is a single bill or not. The mutual back-scratching activities of Congressmen will not be curtailed by a change in procedures, only a change in political nature. The pork-barrelling routine can exist when legislators trade votes for pet projects in an omnibus budget; they can and have done the same thing when allocation bills were separate.

Possibly the Presidential veto gets a slugging in the one-bill plan. The White House can only approve or veto the whole budget, not parts. It might be wise to grant the President the right of vetoing by item, so he could let the main budget pass and disapprove of individual allotments if he wanted. However, it must be remembered the basic power of appropriation under our Constitution lies with Congress.

It will be a tough job to balance the next budget. There would be a better chance of success if Congress tackles the chore in a single, composite bill.

[From Business Action, official organ of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States]

WAY TO APPROPRIATIONS CUTS

New hopes for subsequent years have been inspired by announcement that the House Appropriations Committee will combine all appropriations in a single bill, beginning in the next session for fiscal 1951.

A single appropriation bill, its sponsors believe, should be more conducive to restraints upon the rising cost of government. * * *

Favorable action by Congress on a scheme for Executive cuts in expenditures for the coming fiscal year would be notice that the legislative branch is insistent on a balanced budget without any increase in taxation.

Failure of the administration to bring the budget into balance by reductions below authorized expenditure totals would throw the problem back into the hands of Congress in next winter's session. Lumping of all appropriations in a single bill should make it less difficult to hold expenditures within revenues, although by no means providing complete assurance of avoidance of a tax increase.

Abolition of the system of multiple appropriation bills is in line with efforts by the National Chamber to improve legislative machinery for control of expenditures.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal]

A SINGLE FEDERAL BUDGET BILL

Chairman CANNON of the House Appropriations Committee says he will try next year to get all Federal appropriations into a single omnibus bill. Senator TAFT approves this step. Senator BYRD has long favored it. We hope that enough other influential Members of Congress will join these men to put the idea across.

The present practice of considering appropriations for departments singly, or of combining the appropriations for two or three departments, is bad because it tends to minimize in the congressional mind the staggering totals that are amassed in this piecemeal fashion.

Putting all appropriations in a single measure would keep the attention of Congress and the people on the total. Every change made, up or down, would be seen in its relation to the total, and to the taxes required to meet that total.

We are inclined to agree with Chairman CANNON that if we are able to have economy, we must first have this change in procedure. It is too easy now to slip in a few extra hundreds of millions here and there, without reckoning the ultimate cost and without comparing taxpayer benefits with the accompanying taxpayer burdens.

[From the Mobile (Ala.) Press Register]

CONGRESS SHOULDN'T LET BUDGET TALK CAUSE IT TO PASS UP BUDGET CUTTING

Congress has yet to give a final answer about cutting the Federal budget of almost $42,000,000,000 which the administration asks for the next fiscal year.

But in the meantime it has started talking about using a new approach to the budget for the year after that.

This proposed departure from customary budget practice in Congress contemplates a single-package appropriation bill—that is, all Government money bills would be lumped into a single measure.

The purpose to adopt that procedure for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1950, has just been announced by Representative CLARENCE CANNON (Democrat, Missouri), chairman of the House Appropriations Committee.

Under present practice, Congress deals with a flock of appropriation bills, or, as the United Press expresses it, the Government's annual budget "goes through Congress in a dozen or so separate bills and Federal agencies often come back later with 'deficiency' requests."

The new method which Congressman CANNON says will be offered for the 1951 fiscal year (to begin July 1, next year) is designed to do away with piecemeal handling of the budget.

In its report of Mr. CANNON's comment on the single-package proposal, the United Press related in a Washington dispatch:

"Announcing plans for the far-reaching reform to the House, he said it would enable Congress to see the over-all spending picture in a single frame and balance it against Government income.

"He said it would put squarely up to Congress the issue whether to keep within the Federal income or 'continue to spend more than our income and increase the stupendous national debt.'

"He also said the single-package plan would focus the Nation's attention on Government spending and help Members 'withstand pressure groups more successfully.'"

International News Service quoted Chairman CANNON, of the House Appropriations Committee, as making these remarks:

"When the consolidated [single-package] appropriation bill is presented we will also have an authoritative estimate of the national income.

"We can determine whether the budget is to be balanced with a surplus for debt retirement, or whether there is to be further deficit spending with increases in the national debt.

"There can be no side-stepping or shifting of responsibility on the question of whether we are to live within our income or continue, as during the war years, the spending policies which have boosted the national debt to unprecedented heights."

According to INS, "leaders of both major parties on Capitol Hill" applauded the proposal to lump into one bill all the Government appropriations for the 1951 fiscal year.

"Some obstacles were seen in the new plan," INS reported, "but the consensus was that the possible economies in Government spending make it a worthy undertaking."

Congressional comment aside from Mr. CANNON'S included that of Representative JOHN TABER, Republican, of New York, ranking minority member of the House Appropriations Committee and its chairman in the preceding Congress.

He said he considers the single-package appropriation proposal "worth trying," although he is not as enthusiastic about it as Chairman CANNON.

Most taxpayers, we are convinced, would like for Congress to try something to better safeguard against wasteful spending by the Federal Government.

Furthermore, while talking about budget procedure for the 1951 fiscal year, Congress should crack down against wasteful spending in the 1950 fiscal year soon to begin. But will it?

[From the Wall Street Journal]

A RAY OF HOPE

Chairman CANNON, of the House Appropriations Committee, has promised that next year Congress will get a clear look at what it is doing before it starts spending money.

It is easily done. No legislation or elaborate reorganization plan is required. The Appropriations Committees, while continuing separate hearings on individual spending bills, will simply bring them all to the floor in one bundle. Each Congressman can then see at one look the total amount of the money he is voting to spend.

This is a revolutionary idea. True, it has been long advocated by Senator BYRD and others alarmed at the loose spending practices of Congress, but because it is revolutionary—that is, it would upset old and comfortable customs—it has met heavy opposition. Many Congressmen, it would seem, prefer not to look at what they are doing.

The plan is no panacea for budget pains; it would not prevent Congress from voting as big a spending bill as it chooses to do. It does have the merit of bringing that body face to face with its extravagance. Under the present piece-by-piece method of appropriating extravagance can slip upon the Congress, and the public, unawares.

It won't empty the pork barrel, but it will bring it out in the open where we can see what's inside. And when everybody can look at it some surprising things may happen.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer]

APPROPRIATION PROCEDURE

Representative CANNON, the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, has announced that next year all appropriation measures will be put into one bill so that the Members of Congress will have some idea of the total cost of the Federal Government when they authorize the expenditures.

Under existing procedure, Congress votes separately on a number of supply bills, each containing appropriations for one or more branches of the Government. Nobody can tell what the total cost will be until the last bill has been passed.

With an omnibus bill before it, CANNON pointed out, Congress could compare the total with the estimates of anticipated revenues. Such a comparison would show the need for either budget cuts or additional taxes or, in the case of a surplus, how much money could be applied on the national debt. It would also enable Congress "to more successfully withstand pressure groups and high-powered lobbies," CANNON said.

One flaw has been found in the proposal. The President would be unable to exercise his veto power over appropriations without disapproving the single financing measure for the entire Government.

This objection could be overcome if the Federal Government adopted the appropriation procedure in effect in Ohio and some of the other States. For years it has been the custom of the Ohio Legislature to lump general appropriations into one bill, but the State constitution gives the Governor the right to veto any item or items in any bill making an appropriation of money.

There is no similar provision in the Federal Constitution. An amendment probably would be necessary to give the President the power to veto specific items and this would take some time. But that is no reason why a trial of the omnibus appropriation procedure should be delayed.

[From the Cincinnati (Ohio) Post]

ONE BIG BILL INSTEAD OF ELEVEN

Representative CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, says that in the next session of Congress the whole Federal budget will be lumped into a single appropriation bill.

This is a reform long advocated by Senator BYRD, of Virginia. The Democratic leadership in Congress now apparently has accepted it, and many Republicans are said to be for it.

The Government's spending measures now go through Congress in 11 or more separate bills. Until the last of these is passed, which usually is just before a new fiscal year begins, Congress never knows accurately how much money it will vote for spending in that year.

Under the new plan, Mr. CANNON says, when the single bill is ready for passage, Congress will have an estimate of probable income and can either cut spending to stay within that income or determine to meet a deficit by voting higher taxes or increasing the stupendous public debt. "Thus," he promises, "there will be no sidestepping or shifting. The issue will be clear."

The change will be an improvement. Whatever may be hoped for from it, however, it won't help this year's situation, which finds most of Congress shouting for economy but voting for spending far in excess of probable Federal revenue and, at the same time, sidestepping higher taxes.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post]

ALL IN ONE

Chairman CANNON, of the House Appropriations Committee, plans to put all appropriation items next year into a single omnibus bill that would give Congress an over-all view of the spending program. His proposal has bipartisan support within the committee and is hailed by Senator TAFT as a step in the right direction. Senator BYRD has long advocated the use of a single appropriation bill of this kind, pointing out that the practice of passing separate appropriation bills over a period of several months is a legislative handicap that prevents Congress from considering the budget as a whole and making intelligent reductions in expenditures.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 attempted to put a ceiling on spending in advance of detailed appropriation requests. But the proposed legislative budget has never been put into effect. To estimate total expenditures early in the session before spending plans were fully known proved an impossible task. Moreover, the Budget Committee did not have a staff equipped to do the work entailed in studying and revising budget estimates. The present Congress decided to defer the date for agreement on the legislative budget to May 1 and ended by doing nothing at all about it. The failure of this effort to establish some sort of comprehensive control over fiscal policy adds to the feeling of frustration that overwhelms many Congressmen who believe that Government spending must be curtailed, but lack the information needed to reduce expenditures without impairing essential services. Consequently, there is growing support for the type of omnibus bill that Mr. CANNON is proposing.

Opponents of the plan fear that it might result in undue delay in passing appropriation measures. But if both House and Senate held hearings on spending proposals concurrently the Senate would be ready to act promptly on the final measure approved by the House. Another objection to the plan is that it would bar the President from exercising his right to veto appropriation measures, since the veto of an omnibus bill would leave the Government without any funds for carrying on operations. However, the exercise of the veto power in case of appropriation bills always creates grave disturbances and is seldom resorted to. If the President ventured to veto an unacceptable omnibus bill, the very gravity of the resultant emergency would doubtless insure prompt remedial action.

In our opinion, the need for a control measure of this kind has been convincingly demonstrated. Improved machinery for control of expenditures will not, as the recent CED report on tax and expenditure policy says, assure wise congressional action. But without such machinery Congress cannot be expected to act wisely. An omnibus appropriation bill is, of course, only one means of giving Congress a better insight into fiscal problems. Budget and accounting reforms, such as those recommended by the Hoover Commission, are also imperative if legislators are to know what specific spending projects will actually cost in any given year and in succeeding years.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Daily News]

ONE BIG BILL

Representative CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, says that in the next session of Congress the whole Federal budget will be lumped into a single appropriation bill.

The Government's spending measures now go through Congress in 11 or more separate bills. Until the last of these is passed—which usually is just before a new fiscal year begins—Congress never knows accurately how much money it will vote for spending in that year.

Under the new plan, Mr. CANNON says, when the single bill is ready for passage Congress will have an estimate of probable income and can either cut spending to stay within that income or determine to meet a deficit by voting higher taxes or increasing the stupendous public debt. "Thus," he promises, "there will be no sidestepping or shifting. The issue will be clear."

The change will be an improvement. Whatever may be hoped for from it, however, it won't help this year's situation, which finds Congress talking economy but voting for spending far in excess of probable Federal revenue and, at the same time, sidestepping higher taxes.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star]

LUMPING APPROPRIATIONS

There is a lot of merit in the plan to consolidate all of next year's regular appropriation bills into an omnibus measure. The idea has been advanced at several sessions of Congress by Senator BYRD without success. It is encouraging, therefore, to learn that Chairman CANNON, of the House Appropriations Committee, intends to press for adoption of the single-bill proposal at the next session. He has considerable bipartisan support.

It is now clear that Congress has abandoned hope of bringing appropriation and revenue bills into some sort of balance through a legislative budget scheme. The budget system, authorized by the Congressional Reorganization Act, has proved to be unworkable. It was found that it was infeasible to set a spending limit at the outset of a session because it is impossible to estimate accurately the needs of departments in advance of hearings.

Frustrated in the budgeting approach, Mr. CANNON tried a new tack this year. He instituted simultaneous hearings on the major departmental appropriation bills, with a view of having all of them reported at approximately the same time, so that Congress would have at least a general over-all idea of what it was appropriating. The simultaneous hearings were made possible by reassigning

subcommittee membership so that each member of the Appropriations Committee served on only one subcommittee.

The single-bill plan would carry the simultaneous-hearing arrangement a logical step further. By wrapping up all the departmental appropriations in one package, Congress would have before it the grand total of proposed expenditures. Thus it would know exactly how much money would have to be raised to avoid a deficit. Under the old piecemeal system of voting on appropriations, the legislators had only a hazy conception of what the spending might amount to. Usually when the last appropriation was made and the costs were summed up, it was found that appropriations far exceeded original estimates of revenues that would be available.

There is urgent need for some method of bringing appropriations under over-all scrutiny and control. The loose procedures of the past have imposed upon the taxpayers huge deficits that might have been avoided had Congress operated along sound business lines. The omnibus appropriation plan offers some hope of relief.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun]

ANOTHER PROPOSAL TO TIGHTEN CONGRESS' CONTROL OF THE PURSE

Representative CANNON gives the country good news when he announces that beginning next year the House Appropriations Committee will work out a consolidated general appropriation bill. To sense the scope and significance of this proposal, a little background has to be recalled.

The main trouble has been that the size of the budget problem has forced a division of budget labor by which appropriations are broken up into 12 or more separate bills, each assigned to a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations. Over a period of up to 6 months these 12 subcommittees work in complete independence of each other. The revenue committees also work independently. Finally the practice has grown up of extending expenditures beyond the years for which the appropriating legislation is primarily passed.

The result has been that no Congressman not intimately engaged in the budgeting procedure has had a clear idea of what the Government was spending, for what purposes, in what year. If Members of Congress were completely at sea on these issues, the public was even worse off. In 1946 Congress tried to ease the situation in the legislative budget clauses of the Legislative Reorganization Act.

The idea of the legislative budget was simply that the Appropriation and the Tax Committees of the two Houses would get together and work out an appropriation total which would fit within the proposed ceiling of the prospective tax take. This was an excellent idea and it was embraced with enthusiasm in these columns and elsewhere. But many backers of the legislative budget overlooked the continuing fact that those 12 subcommittees still ground out those 12 separate appropriation bills in complete independence.

This is where the new proposal of Representative CANNON comes into the picture. Mr. CANNON says that the House Appropriations Committee will consolidate the several appropriation bills into one over-all general budget bill which it will present to the Congress at one time.

This over-all appropriation bill will contain rigid limits on the expenditures to be made in the given fiscal year, so that the wide margin between appropriations and actual expenditures which has so obscured budget clarity will be narrowed. And the over-all budget will afford just that total appropriation figure which the framers of the legislative-budget law desired to balance out against prospective tax yields.

Bugs in the new scheme will undoubtedly turn up. But it aims at one of the major obstacles on which the legislative budget of 1946 foundered. It is another step toward a revivification of the ancient doctrine that Congress should control spending and that the people, who elect Congress, should understand the congressional control. And that doctrine was never so vital as in an age of $40,000,000,000 budgets.

In conclusion, by way of summary, we have:

[In billions of dollars]

Pending before Congress for action:	*Appropriations*	*Expenditures*
Pending before Congress for action:		
In budget as submitted	28.8	23.6
To be submitted	5.5	3.2
Total to be acted upon	34.3	26.8
Permanent appropriations (preponderantly interest on public debt)	5.9	5.8
Total, new budget	40.2	32.6
Expenditures from other sources:		
Previous appropriations obligated and carried forward		7.0
Public-debt transaction, etc		2.8
Total expenditures, 1951		42.4
Estimated receipts		37.3
Deficit		5.1

The foregoing table indicates that the Committee on Appropriations will have before it a total of $34,300,000,000 in estimates for consideration and that of these estimates only $26,800,000,000 will be expended in 1951, the remainder of the total expenditure contemplated for 1951—$13,600,000,000—to come from other sources beyond the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations. Therefore it will be necessary to reduce the estimates before the committee by nearly $7,000,000,000 if a balanced budget is to be achieved through reduction of the estimates of direct annual appropriation and the Committee on Appropriations is to be expected to take full responsibility for putting the Treasury in the black.

Of the total amount of $34,300,000,000 to be considered by the Committee on Appropriations the following large items are outstanding:

	In billions of dollars
National defense	13.0
Veterans' benefits	6.0
Foreign aid and international affairs	5.0
Total	24.9

National defense situation is such as to require consideration of major policy matters which must be permitted—to some extent at least—to outweigh cold budgetary requirements. That is, there must be some consideration other than merely the number of dollars on hand at the particular time to determine the amount of national defense we will purchase. On the other hand there is no occasion to so close our eyes to budgetary restrictions as to purchase national defense on a basis which will in a few years result in our having nothing left to defend, by reason of having exhausted our resources so completely in an all out defense effort as to have destroyed our economy.

Veterans benefits cannot be reduced by the Committee on Appropriations materially as such benefits are provided by law and whatever amounts are due must be paid. If any change is to be made in this area it will have to be made by the legislative committee.

In the foreign field we have certain commitments which must be honored in order to maintain our standing among nations. Regardless of how any Member may feel about the policy or about whether we should originally have made commitments, the fact remains that we are committed and whatever the cost, we must pay. Of course the committee will scrutinize such requests carefully to be certain no more is provided than is necessary to meet obligations incurred and to insure continuation of those programs, which have so far proven effective in maintaining the peace of the world and in preventing the spread of ideologies which have for their purpose the destruction of democratic principles.

In view of these facts this is no time to talk about new charges against the general revenues. Before we embark on new programs we must go back and survey the old ones and find what we can do about eliminating those which have outlived their usefulness and reducing the cost of others. Presentation of all proposed expenditures simultaneously in one bill will contribute materially to that end.

It is the plan to include in the report accompanying the omnibus bill not only proposed appropriation figures but expenditure figures as well. Thus we put aside piecemeal consideration of appropriation measures, formulated without knowing what the ultimate aggregate of Treasury demands might be, and determine in the light of up-to-the-minute projected Treasury receipts how far we can go in drafting demands upon such receipts, taking into consideration, of course, requirements without the compass of the omnibus bill.

The new performance-type budget is a long step forward. Recommended by the Hoover Commission, and concurred in by leading budgetary and fiscal experts, both in and out of the Government, it should serve as a further factor in holding Government expenditures to the minimum. As has been well said, "For the first time the budget estimates have been prepared according to a pattern based on logic instead of one based on antiquated custom." However, the performance-budget plan, marking a great step in advance as it does, is not a perfected system in itself. There must be cooperation. It is particularly important that accounting systems of the various agencies be modernized and geared to the new budget concept in order that actual cost data can be supplied as basis for future budgets.

The Citizens Committee for the Hoover report announced on October 16, 1949, that 20 percent of the Hoover Commission recommendations had been enacted into law, resulting in annual savings of $1,250,000,000. The budget will be reviewed to be certain these savings are trans-

lated into actual dollars and reflected in the accounts of the agencies affected.

The omnibus bill of itself will not be a panacea for all of the ills which prompt its inauguration. There is no substitute for laborious and searching inquiries, for analyses and studies, by members of the Appropriation Committees of the two Houses, or for selfless interest and courage exercised by them and other Members of the two bodies when the bill is before them for consideration or when legislative bills are under consideration, whether in committee or on the floor, which would impose new and additional drafts upon the Federal Treasury. These are requisites to the attainment of proper and effective congressional budgeting and their importance cannot be too heavily stressed. We cannot have economy in government under any system without patriotic interest and courage on the part of those charged with the duties of raising and spending revenue in providing for the support of the Government.

It might also be added that economy neither begins nor ends in the halls of Congress. The budget must submit estimates of minimum requirements to accomplish the work proposed on the most economical basis possible and, after the appropriations are made the executive branch of the Government must assume responsibility for operating at the most economical level and returning to the Treasury such savings as it is possible to effect in administration.

Mr. Speaker, it would be futile to attempt to make reduction prophecies. We cannot at this time make even tentative estimates of amounts to be spent or saved. Prophesying ahead of detailed consideration was the fatal defect in the legislative budget contemplated by the Legislative Reorganization Act. It may be said, however, that the 1951 budget is susceptible to reduction. You have never yet seen a budget that could not be cut and which was not cut. You may depend upon the Committee on Appropriations to cut estimates to the lowest amounts consistent with international requirements and the essential needs of the Government generally. It will then be for the House to review and pass judgment upon our determinations.

(Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain newspaper editorials commending the adoption of the omnibus-appropriation-bill idea.)

BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement containing the approved budget estimates for the fiscal year 1951 for rivers and harbors and flood-control projects which will be the subject for hearings before my subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations within the near future.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, the budget message of the President will be presented to this body today. It will contain estimates of amounts required to run the Government for the coming fiscal year and requests that such amounts be appropriated. One of the programs coming within the purview of the requests is that of the civil functions administered by the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army. It has been my privilege to be associated with this program for a number of years and it is with considerable pride that I view the accomplishments of this program. Prior to World War II the program was started and without the completion of numerous of the items under the program the power to produce the necessary munitions of war that made this Nation so outstanding in its contribution to the final outcome of that conflict could not have been accomplished. Since the close of that war the program has again been started and many individual projects have been completed and are now adding to the wealth of this Nation daily. With each annual appropriation many more projects are completed, as is quite noticeable from a comparison of the present list of projects with those placed in the record by me a year ago—many of those included in last year's list having been completed, the program here presented will provide the funds to complete many others:

SUMMARY

Rivers and harbors	
Construction	$457,877,000
Snagging and clearing	1,000,000
Emergency bank protection	1,000,000
Section 205 project	1,000,000
Planning	4,000,000
Maintenance of completed work	4,500,000
Preliminary examination, surveys and contingencies	6,500,000
Emergency repairs	1,000,000
Salaries, OCE	800,000
Transfer to U. S. Geological Survey	670,000
Transfer to U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service	100,000
Total, flood control, general	478,447,000
Emergency fund, flood control, general	3,000,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries	
Construction	57,000,000
Maintenance of completed work	15,000,000
Total, lower Mississippi River and tributaries	72,000,000
Emergency fund for flood control on tributaries of Mississippi River	500,000
Flood control, Sacramento River, Calif	2,805,000
Total, all flood control	556,752,000
Rivers and harbors	
Construction	$150,784,000
Maintenance of completed work	53,000,000
Operation and care	25,000,000
Planning	2,000,000
Preliminary examination and surveys	2,000,000
Contingencies	1,500,000
Removing sunken vessels	500,000
Survey of northern and northwestern lakes	325,000
Prevention of debris in New York Harbor	$360,000
California Debris Commission	5,000
Salaries, OCE	640,000
Printing for Rivers and Harbors Board	40,000
Rivers and Harbors Board expenses	440,000
Beach Erosion Board expenses	600,000
Work under sec. 3, River and Harbor Act, Mar. 2, 1945	300,000
Transfer to U. S. Geological Survey	200,000
Transfer to Fish and Wildlife Service	3,020,000
Total, rivers and harbors	240,714,000
Alteration to bridges	1,000,000
Federal water mains	16,000
Grand total	798,482,000
Construction projects, flood control, general	
Arizona: Tucson	$700,000
Arkansas:	
Blakely Mountain Reservoir	3,500,000
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark. and Mo	18,000,000
Narrows Reservoir	1,750,000
Nimrod Reservoir	150,000
Norfork Reservoir, Ark., and Mo	170,000
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., Tex., and La	700,000
West of Morrilton	600,000
California:	
Cherry Valley Reservoir	500,000
Farmington Reservoir	1,634,000
Folsom Reservoir	6,500,000
Isabella Reservoir	3,500,000
Los Angeles County drainage area (exclusive of Whittier Narrows Reservoir)	9,500,000
Merced County stream group	234,000
Pine Flat Reservoir	13,500,000
Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries	1,000,000
Whittier Narrows Reservoir	7,500,000
Connecticut:	
Mansfield Hollow Reservoir	2,800,000
Winstead	88,500
Florida: Central and southern Florida	7,500,000
Georgia: Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga., and S. C	22,000,000
Idaho: Lucky Peak Reservoir	5,000,000
Illinois:	
Columbia drainage and levee district	250,000
Chouteau, Nameoki and Venice drainage and levee district	60,000
Degognia and Fountain Bluff drainage and levee district	160,000
East Cape Girardeau and Clear Creek drainage district	450,000
East St. Louis and vicinity	500,000
Farm Creek reservoirs	1,000,000
Galena	298,100
Grand Tower drainage and levee district	300,000
Miller Pond drainage and levee district	117,700
Prairie du Rocher and vicinity	200,000
Rosiclare	385,000
Wood River drainage and levee district	500,000
Indiana:	
Cagles Mill Reservoir	2,077,000
Cannelton	149,500
Evansville	600,000
Indianapolis	533,400
Lawrenceburg	260,000
New Albany	2,500,000

Construction projects, flood control, general— Continued

Iowa:	
Coralville Reservoir	$4,500,000
Little Sioux River	500,000
Missouri River agricultural levees, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska. (See Kansas).	
Chariton River, Iowa and Mo. (See Missouri.)	
Kansas:	
Fall River Reservoir	40,000
Hutchinson	750,000
Kansas City, Mo., and Kans.	7,000,000
Missouri River agricultural levees, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, and Nebraska	7,000,000
Wichita and Valley Center	500,000
Hulah Reservoir, Okla. and Kans. (See Oklahoma.)	
Kentucky:	
Ashland	1,733,000
Covington	2,300,000
Dewey Reservoir	1,340,500
Louisville	4,500,000
Maysville	800,000
Newport	733,000
Wolf Creek Reservoir	22,10^,000
Louisiana:	
Bayou Teche and Vermilion River	428,000
Mermentau River	1,000,000
Shreveport	150,000
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., Tex., and La. (See Arkansas.)	
Maryland:	
Cumberland, Md., and Ridgeley, W. Va	1,500,000
Savage River Reservoir	1,029,000
Massachusetts:	
Adams	500,000
Knightville Reservoir	50,000
North Adams	500,000
Michigan: Red Run	565,000
Minnesota:	
Red Lake and Clearwater Rivers	1,482,100
Red River of the North, S. Dak., N. Dak., and Minn	1,800,000
Missouri:	
Chariton River, Iowa and Mo.	1,461,000
Kansas Citys, Mo. and Kans. (See Kansas.)	
Missouri River agricultural levees, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, and Nebraska. (See Kansas.)	
Perry County levee districts Nos. 1, 2, and 3	400,000
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (See Arkansas.)	
Norfork Reservoir, Ark., and Mo. (See Arkansas.)	
Nebraska:	
Harlan County Reservoir	18,000,000
Missouri River agricultural levees, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, and Nebraska. (See Kansas.)	
New Mexico: Jemez Canyon Reservoir	1,000,000
New York:	
Hoosick Falls	500,000
Hornell	500,000
Montour Falls	370,000
Mount Morris Reservoir	8,000,000
Olean	1,300,000
Portville	1,300,000
North Carolina: Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C.	30,000,000
North Dakota:	
Baldhill Reservoir	460,000
Garrison Reservoir	35,000,000
Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See South Dakota.)	
Red River of the North, S. Dak., N. Dak., and Minn. (See Minnesota.)	

Construction projects, flood control, general— Continued

Ohio:	
Dillon Reservoir	$2,500,000
Massillon	624,000
Muckingum River Reservoirs	1,000,000
West Fork of Mill Creek Reservoir	1,800,000
Oklahoma:	
Canton Reservoir	375,000
Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla	1,100,000
Fort Gibson Reservoir	9,000,000
Great Salt Plains Reservoir	43,000
Hulah Reservoir, Okla. and Kans	1,200,000
Kaw	128,400
Oklahoma City Floodway	500,000
Cologah Reservoir	900,000
Polecat Creek	130,000
Tenkiller Ferry Reservoir	8,000,000
Wister Reservoir	431,300
Oregon:	
Detroit Reservoir	20,000,000
Dorena Reservoir	800,000
Fern Ridge Reservoir	56,300
Lookout Point Reservoir	16,000,000
Umpqua River and tributaries	55,400
Willamette River (bank protection)	500,000
Pennsylvania:	
Conemaugh River Reservoir	9,000,000
East Branch Clarion River Reservoir	2,000,000
Sunbury	1,200,000
Williamsport	1,200,000
York	90,100
South Carolina: Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C. (See Georgia.)	
South Dakota:	
Fall River Basin	500,000
Fort Randall Reservoir	37,500,000
Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak	6,000,000
Red River of the North, S. Dak., N. Dak., and Minn. (See Minnesota.)	
Tennessee:	
Center Hill Reservoir	6,300,000
Memphis, Wolf River and Nonconnah Creek	750,000
Texas:	
Belton Reservoir	3,500,000
Benbrook Reservoir	3,000,000
Fort Worth floodway	760,000
Garza-Little Elm Reservoir	4,500,000
Grapevine Reservoir	4,000,000
Hords Creek Reservoir	50,000
Lavon Reservoir	4,500,000
San Angelo Reservoir and floodway	2,800,000
Texarkana Reservoir	4,500,000
Whitney Reservoir	15,000,000
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., Tex., and La. (See Arkansas.)	
Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla. (See Oklahoma.)	
Virginia:	
Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C. (See North Carolina.)	
Philpott Reservoir	5,000,000
Washington: Mud Mountain Reservoir	263,900
West Virginia:	
Sutton Reservoir	2,000,000
Cumberland, Md., and Ridgeley, W. Va. (See Maryland.)	
Total	457,877,000

Construction projects, rivers and harbors

Alabama: Black Warrior, Warrior, and Tombigbee Rivers, Demopolis Lock and Dam	$4,000,000
Alaska:	
Nome Harbor	1,156,000
Wrangell Narrows	750,000

Construction projects, rivers and harbors— Continued

Arkansas: Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma	$850,000
California:	
Crescent City Harbor	1,000,000
Sacramento River	2,500,000
San Diego River and Mission Bay	2,500,000
District of Columbia: Potomac River, north side Washington Channel	100,000
Florida:	
Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers, Ga. and Fla., Jim Woodruff Lock and Dam	5,000,000
Buford Dam. (See Georgia.)	
Jacksonville Harbor	925,000
Tampa Harbor	200,000
Georgia:	
Savannah Harbor	600,000
Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers system, Georgia and Florida, Buford Dam	1,000,000
Jim Woodruff Lock and Dam. (See Florida.)	
Illinois:	
Illinois Waterway	1,000,000
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.:	
Chain of Rocks	9,000,000
Regulating works	850,000
Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn.:	
St. Anthony Falls, Minn	1,500,000
Keokuk Lock, Iowa	1,500,000
Other work	825,000
Ohio River, Ill., Ind., Ky., Ohio, Pa., and W. Va.:	
Locks and dams	500,000
Open channel work	250,250
Indiana: Ohio River. (See Illinois.)	
Iowa:	
Missouri River, Kansas City, Mo., to Sioux City, Iowa (Mo., Kans., Nebr., Iowa)	4,000,000
Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn. (See Illinois.)	
Kansas: Missouri River, Kansas City, Mo., to Sioux City, Iowa. (See Iowa.)	
Kentucky:	
Cumberland River, Ky. and Tennessee, Cheatham Lock and Dam	3,000,000
Ohio River. (See Illinois.)	
Louisiana:	
Calcasieu River and Pass	750,000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway between Apalachee Bay, Fla., and the Mexican border (New Orleans district)	4,000,000
Pearl River, La. and Miss	750,000
Waterway from Empire to the Gulf of Mexico	118,000
Maine: Portland Harbor	94,000
Maryland: Baltimore Harbor and channels	800,000
Massachusetts:	
Boston Harbor	380,000
Fall River Harbor	250,000
Michigan:	
Port Sanilac Harbor	530,750
St. Mary's River	1,300,000
Minnesota: Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn. (See Illinois.)	
Mississippi: Pearl River, La. and Miss. (See Louisiana.)	
Missouri:	
Missouri River, Kansas City to the mouth	2,500,000

Construction projects, rivers and harbors— Continued

Missouri—Continued	
Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn. (See Illinois.)	
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo. (See Illinois.)	
Missouri River, Kansas City, Mo., to Sioux City, Iowa. (See Iowa.)	
Montana: Missouri River at Fort Peck	$1,725,000
Nebraska: Missouri River, Kansas City, Mo., to Sioux City, Iowa. (See Iowa.)	
New Jersey:	
Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers	1,500,000
New York and New Jersey Channels, N. Y. and N. J.	8,000,000
New York:	
Buffalo Harbor	1,000,000
Great Lakes to Hudson River waterway	1,000,000
New York and New Jersey Channels, N. Y. and N. J. (See New Jersey.)	
Hudson River Channel	350,000
New York Harbor: Entrance channels and anchorage areas	400,000
Ohio:	
Cleveland Harbor	3,000,000
Lorain Harbor	58,000
Ohio River. (See Illinois.)	
Oklahoma: Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)	
Oregon:	
Columbia River and tributaries above Celilo Falls, Oreg., to Kennewick, Wash.	259,000
Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg. and Wash.	500,000
Coos Bay	1,000,000
McNary Lock and Dam, Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash.	45,000,000
Pennsylvania:	
Monongahela River, Pa. and W. Va.:	
Locks 2, Pennsylvania	8,780,000
Morgantown lock and dam, West Virginia	2,000,000
Schuylkill River (culm removal)	4,000,000
Ohio River. (See Illinois.)	
South Carolina: Georgetown harbor	480,000
Tennessee: Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn. (See Kentucky.)	
Texas:	
Houston Ship Channel	900,000
Intracoastal waterway between Apalachee Bay, Fla., and the Mexican border (Galveston district)	2,000,000
Sabine-Neches waterway	1,500,000
Trinity River, channel to Liberty	1,000,000
Virginia:	
Norfolk harbor	1,472,000
York Spit Channel	410,000
Virgin Islands: St. Thomas harbor	1,500,000
Washington:	
Chief Joseph Dam, Columbia River	17,500,000
Grays harbor and Chehalis River	971,000
Columbia River and tributaries above Celilo Falls, Oreg., to Kennewick, Wash. (See Oregon.)	

Construction projects, rivers and harbors— Continued

Washington—Continued	
Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg. and Wash. (See Oregon.)	
McNary Lock and Dam, Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash. (See Oregon.)	
West Virginia:	
Monongahela River. (See Pennsylvania.)	
Ohio River. (See Illinois.)	
Wisconsin:	
Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn. (See Illinois.)	
Total	$150,784,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KING (at the request of Mr. O'HARA of Illinois) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report by the Secretary of Commerce to the White House on conditions on the west coast.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Matthew Woll at the Gompers Centennial dinner.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION JOINT RESOLUTION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 437)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the twentieth quarterly report of expenditures and operations under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Joint Resolution, Public Law 267, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 28, 1944. This report covers the period from April 1, 1949, through June 30, 1949.

In view of the fact that the United States appropriations for participation in UNRRA expired for expenditure purposes on June 30, 1949, this is the last report which will be submitted.

The unexpended balance of $2,642,209.08 remaining under the United States appropriations will revert to the surplus fund in the United States Treasury. Any unpaid claims against this balance are subject to presentation to the General Accounting Office for direct settlement in the usual manner.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 9, 1950.*

(Enclosure: Twentieth Quarterly Report.)

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF STATE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 438)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, showing all receipts and disbursements on account of refunds, allowances, and annuities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949, in connection with the Foreign Service retirement and disability system as required by section 862, Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724).

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 9, 1950.*

(Enclosure: Report concerning retirement and disability fund, Foreign Service.)

TWENTY-NINTH REPORT ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 436)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Twenty-ninth Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations, for the quarter ending June 30, 1949.

This report contains in appendix I a report on Lend-Lease Fiscal Operations, prepared by the Treasury Department and submitted to the Secretary of State in accordance with Executive Order 9726. This fiscal report covers the period from March 11, 1941, through June 30, 1949.

In April 1949 the Dominican Republic and Venezuela completed payment of their accounts under their respective lend-lease agreements.

A settlement agreement was signed with Ethiopia on May 20, 1949, and appears in this report as appendix II.

On September 27, 1949, understanding was reached with Soviet representatives as to the dates and procedures for the return of 3 icebreakers and 27 frigates of the United States Navy which had been made available to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics under lend-lease. Negotiations with the Soviet Union on other lend-lease matters have resulted in some progress but as yet there has been no substantial agreement on several of the major issues.

Other lend-lease activities during the period covered by this report included the continuation of final settlement negotiations and other winding-up activites, described more fully in the report itself.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 9, 1950.*

(Enclosure: Twenty-ninth Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations.)

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JANUARY 9, 1950.

The Honorable SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE, SAM RAYBURN.

SIR: I hereby inform you of my resignation from the House Committee on Veterans'

Affairs to take effect upon approval by the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES T. PATTERSON,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made by him last Thursday on the occasion of the visit of the Freedom Train.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SPAIN

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I regret that other demands on my time and energies prevented me from joining my colleagues who studied the problems of United States foreign policy at first hand in the field during the interval between the sessions of the Congress. Had I been able to go, I should certainly have included Spain in my schedule. I should have done so out of regard for the charm of that country and its people and out of regard also for the importance of the Spanish question in United States foreign policy.

The working out of a positive policy with regard to Spain, to succeed the present policy we are pursuing there, will call for the closest working together between the executive and legislative branches of the Government. I speak today at my own instance. The ideas I present are essentially my own. My purpose is to assist the better understanding of problems that are all too often confused in public discussion.

Much confusion results from the fact that many substantial questions regarding relations with Spain are coming up concurrently with the question whether to send an ambassador back to Madrid. The latter question, however, is quite apart from the questions of political, economic, and strategic relations concerning Spain. It will serve to clarify the problems of our Spanish policy if we talk of them separately.

I have seen and heard many references to the desirability of recognizing the Franco government.

The fact is, this Government recognized the Franco regime on April 1, 1939. It did so in keeping with the traditional United States approach to recognition. If a regime has the power to govern, it is a government. If it is willing to assume the burdens of government in dealings with other governments, it qualifies for recognition. Recognition is a neutral thing. It should imply neither approval nor disapproval of the regime receiving it. It should imply only what the term means—recognition of the facts about a government's status and power.

In the past we have sometimes deviated from this principle. We have sometimes acted as if recognition carried a moral value and as if the withholding of recognition applied a moral sanction. When we have done so, we have usually involved ourselves in more problems than we solved. But all that is beside the point here. Our recognition of the Franco government has continued without a break since April 1, 1939. The question now is not one of recognition. It is whether we should continue to leave our affairs in Spain in the hands of a counselor of embassy who is chargé d'affaires or should soon send a person with the title of ambassador to take over as chief of our mission.

This does not reflect on the abilities of the present chargé d'affaires. His name is Paul Culbertson. He has done an excellent job. From my colleagues who visited Spain I have heard nothing but praise of him. But a chargé d'affaires is accredited only to the chief of a foreign office. An Ambassador is accredited to the chief of a state. This distinction sometimes makes a difference. In the months to come it may be distinctly to our advantage to have our chief of mission in Madrid vested with such office as will permit him access to the chief of the Spanish state.

I hasten to add, however, that it is not a proposiiton that can be settled in the abstract. Equally important with the question of whether to send back an Ambassador is the question, Who shall he be? I have no name to recommend. I have certain qualifications in mind. He must have breadth, finesse, and force of character equal to a great task. He must have the balance to avoid the localism of view that often affects Ambassadors. He must be able to deal with Spanish problems in their context as part of our European policy. I do not believe that we can afford a Spanish policy that does not fit in with our western European policy. A solution of issues with Spain is devoutly to be desired—but not at the price of impairing our objectives among Spain's neighbors. Our next envoy must be broad in his comprehension of our objectives and resolute in his devotion to them. The American public must have complete faith in his disposition to represent them 100 percent of the way. I trust that those who shall select him when the proper time comes will let themselves be satisfied with nothing less than the best. With an envoy of such caliber in Madrid, we should find the restoration of an Ambassador there much to our advantage.

Will we find it in any respects to our disadvantage to restore full representation? I do not think so. The purpose behind our action in withholding an Ambassador from Madrid has not been borne out. The purpose was sound. The means have proved inappropriate. We might as well admit this.

Let us review the circumstances behind the withholding of an Ambassador from Madrid.

The Franco government came to power as the result of a civil war beginning in the summer of 1936 and lasting through the spring of 1939. The war had been fought with great ruthlessness and enormous bloodshed. Estimates of its dead varied from 1,000,000 to 2,000,000—roughly from 4 to 8 percent of the total population. Even at this great sacrifice, the Spaniards had not been allowed to settle their own issues. Military assistance on behalf of Franco had been poured in by the Axis Powers and on behalf of the Republic by the Soviet Union. Who would have won if there had been no foreign intervention? It is an academic question. The fact is that the Republic was defeated and the Axis-supported forces, led by Generalissimo Francisco Franco, emerged victorious.

This event was overtaken by the wider tragedy of the World War. During this war Spain followed a course that one might charitably call an ambiguous neutrality. From time to time Franco hailed the cause of his Axis benefactors, particularly in the period before the tide began to turn against the Axis Powers. Nevertheless, Spain's needs were too great, its strength too spent, and the risks of outrightly joining the war too formidable. Hostilities closed with Franco still in power and aloof from direct participation in the struggle.

What should be the orientation as to Spain of the victorious powers? It was agreed at the San Francisco Conference establishing the United Nations that states whose governments had been assisted to power by the Axis should be barred from membership. The Potsdam Conference echoed this action in the following words:

> The three governments feel bound, however, to make it clear that they for their part would not favor any application for membership put forward by the present Spanish Government, which, having been founded with the support of the Axis Powers, does not, in view of its origins, its nature, its record, and its close association with the aggressor states, possess the qualifications necessary to justify such membership.

The first meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations, meeting in London in February 1946, endorsed the earlier action of the San Francisco Conference.

The subject of Spain was discussed at length in the Security Council in April 1946, the issue developing between those nations which were willing to continue to hold Spain at arm's length and those which wished to take definitive action of a character to force a show-down with Franco's government. The issue was continued into the General Assembly meeting in December 1946, with the outcome a resolution, passed on December 12, 1946, recommending—

> That the Franco government of Spain be debarred from membership in international agencies established by or brought into relationship with the United Nations and from participation in conferences or other activities which may be arranged by the United Nations or by these agencies, until a new and acceptable government is formed in Spain.
>
> That all members of the United Nations immediately recall from Madrid their ambassadors and ministers plenipotentiary accredited there.

That resolution stands. A reaffirmation of it offered in the General Assembly in November 1947, failed to elicit the necessary two-thirds vote. On the other hand, a resolution proposing to leave member states free to determine the matter of diplomatic representation for themselves likewise failed to win the necessary two-thirds vote in the General Assembly in May 1949.

I suppose the member nations are free to do so anyway. The General Assembly resolution of December 12, 1946, is a recommendation, not an edict. Several members of the United Nations have restored their envoys to Madrid in the meantime. These are Argentina, Bolivia, the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, Peru, El Salvador, Haiti, Iceland, Lebanon, and Paraguay. Brazil, Colombia, Egypt, and Iraq have announced their intention of doing so. The resolution has failed of its intent to bring about and maintain a united front among United Nations members on the matter of the level of diplomatic relations with Spain. To that degree its value as a moral demonstration has failed.

It has failed also in that it has produced the effect of strengthening rather than weakening the Spanish Government with its own people. I should hesitate to assess the degree in which it has done so. Yet even the most sullen opponents of the regime within Spain have national pride as Spaniards. That pride was pricked by the action of other nations in passing a moral resolution about Spanish affairs. The action resulted in popular demonstration of support for a government that had been singularly denied such manifestations except insofar as it had been able to drum them up among its claque. I do not suggest that the Spanish reaction was such as to give the Government a basis of free consent among those it governs. It remains the one government in western Europe so lacking in self-confidence that it dares not test its mandate in a free election. But for the moment at least, following the General Assembly action, Spaniards freely voiced support of their dictator.

The primary decision about sending an ambassador back to Madrid is, of course, constitutionally one for the Executive to make. My own view is that such action on his part will be in order as soon as the way has been cleared through rescission of the General Assembly's resolution and that it is in the interest of this country to support such a rescission. I believe that we can afford to wait for such clearance. Also, I believe that we should coordinate our action with our allies among those nations which live in proximity with Spain. We have engaged in the closest economic collaboration with Spain's neighbors. With many of them we are engaged in a permanent defensive alliance of the most far-reaching character. We should not act precipitately and alone in dealing with the Spanish issue. We should not act in such a way as to weaken in the slightest degree our unity with the nations with which we have entered into great commitments.

Finally, let us make it very clear to ourselves and to the world, and to Spain in particular, what is involved and not involved in the restoration of an Ambassador.

The question whether or not an Ambassador represents a particular nation at a particular foreign capital should be divorced so far as possible from considerations of value in international affairs. As a means of expressing disapproval, the calling home of an Ambassador is not an effective action. It is a particularly inadequate means of dealing with a fundamental cleavage such as was involved in the issue with Spain. If the end of the regime is the end in view, then such action is of too little moment. But if the end of the regime is not the end sought, then the recall of an Ambassador must always be followed by the question whether and when to send him back. That involves a government in what Elihu Root called the danger of shaking a fist and then a finger. The idea of fastening a moral value to the question of withdrawing an envoy is likely to carry with it as a counterpart the idea of moral approval when one restores the envoy. We must avoid this impression. The differences between the Franco government and us are still fundamental differences. We still have reasons for disapproving many attributes of that government. To recognize the inappropriateness of the steps we took in concert with other nations does not mean that we are changing our minds about the ends. Let us not deceive ourselves that the sending back of an envoy will perceptibly alter the status of the substantial problem between Spain and the United States.

In the weeks to come we may expect much irrelevant argument as to these basic problems.

I expect to hear it said many times that the Spanish dictator is a man of impeccable personal life, that he is devout in his practices, and exudes charm. All of this I do not doubt.

The question will be asked: Since we manage to get along with Great Britain, to deal with France, to cooperate with Italy, to collaborate with Portugal, to do business with the governments of the low countries and the Scandinavian kingdoms, then why cannot we cooperate with Franco, who is a man of such unquestionably high character. That is the form in which the question was recently put to me. It is interesting to note how often people refer to Spain by the name of its dictator.

My only answer is that our recent experience has taught us many times over the difficulty of dealing with countries that go under the name of a man.

Many told us that Mussolini made trains run on time and that in his name the Italian state had been brought to heights of renewed greatness. All this was a delusion. That mercurial and very limited man led his great nation to tragedy and despair. It is only with his passing from the scene in defeat that one may speak confidently again of stable relations with Italy.

We were told that we could do business with Hitler. But the whole world learned through the process of a horrible ordeal that it could not.

During the bitter years since World War II we have been trying in vain to find a basis of collaboration with a government which has taken on the characteristics of a man named Stalin. It has been a disillusioning experience.

I might go on with other examples. No, the experience of recent years is such as to make us wary of dealing closely with nations which are personified in the character of arbitrary rulers. One of the best qualities of responsible constitutional government, as opposed to personal dictatorship, is that it gives ground for stable relations in international affairs. We look in vain for such characteristics in the present regime in Spain.

As to Generalissimo Franco's honesty and devoutness, I wish only to comment that the temptations of office are not so likely to be pecuniary temptations as they are to be temptations of power. Baron Acton observed: "All power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely." I can understand how a soldier seizing power after a military revolt may continue to be tenacious of it for 11 years. At the same time I cannot forego regretting that he continually uses his authority to impede any constructive alternative to his regime.

In discussing the Spanish issue let us not permit the personal qualities of Spain's dictator to obscure the true nature of the regime. It is based upon monopoly of political status by one party—the Falange—which is an authoritarian and monopolistic party in every sense. It maintains exclusive control over the channels of public expression. It has exclusive management of the process of election. No free electoral process and no independent judiciary exist to temper its rule. Free public opinion is not allowed. Labor is permitted to organize only in state-dominated and party-dominated syndicates. Spain is, in brief, a Fascist state. Its Government is made not in precise conformity with the examples of its Axis sponsors, but certainly in their general image.

In the unfolding discussion of the Spanish problem we shall hear much also of the question of religious freedom. This is a delicate and highly charged topic. Discussion of it is all too likely to generate more heat than light. We should avoid saying those things which are likely to aggravate the difficulties of the problem.

Religious equality and the secular state, as we understand them, are, of course, not part of the Spanish tradition. Spain has established one church in a position of official monopoly, has included its prelates in its council of the realm and its regency council, and subsidizes its clergy. The Spanish labor charter makes legally obligatory the keeping of traditional feasts of that church. The Falange, the only party permitted to exist in Spain, has declared the identity of its mission and the mission of the official church. The Spanish Government places the sanction of the

state behind the hierarchy of the official church in preserving uniformity of religion and in restricting nonconforming publications and books.

Spaniards who choose to align themselves with minority religious groups—there are between 25,000 and 30,000 who do so—may not send their children to schools of their own choice. Minority groups may not have their own schools; religious instruction in the state religion is compulsory in the state schools. Minority groups are denied opportunity of public manifestation of their faith. Their worship must be in private. Their chapels may exist only at the sufferance of a government which maintains for itself the power to limit and regulate all exercise of minority faiths.

Worship is now permitted in 163 chapels of minority Christian sects, as compared with 166 such chapels as of 15 years ago, and in 2 Jewish chapels. Issues regarding the opening of chapels have been raised between the British and the Spanish Governments, but I believe there are no such issues now outstanding between our Government and Spain.

In respect to restrictions placed upon minority religious groups, Spain presents an anomaly in western Europe. Law and administration establish a pattern of discriminations that impinges upon freedom of conscience and freedom of worship as we understand these terms. At the same time, Spain can be said to be free of religious persecution in the sense of the employment of force as an instrument of the state in coercing conformity. Furthermore, one should acknowledge that administration has in some degree ameliorated the situation of minorities in recent months.

We shall hear many diagnoses of Spain's economic ills. We shall hear of the benefits to Spain's welfare and to our trade obtainable if we but lubricate the channels of commerce with a loan. I do not doubt that passing benefits to commerce might be achieved by a loan to Spain. I should hesitate to say, however, that such a loan is now a sound proposition. An answer to that question calls for a more thorough appraisal than I can make without long study. In any event, Spain is not foreclosed from a loan through our normal channels, provided Spain can qualify. The fact is that Spain since the close of World War II has not applied for a loan from the regular institutions of our Government set up for that purpose.

The matter of a loan to Spain is of secondary importance in the whole context of Spain's commerce. Spain is impoverished. In this condition Spain has resorted to a rigid system of state controls. This is not unusual in the European picture. What distinguishes the Spanish situation is the extremes and abuses which abound in the system of controls and the failure to take corrective action regarding the tendencies which make controls necessary.

First of all, the maintenance of a prohibitive exchange rate hampers normal trade. This is true in particular as to trade between Spain and the United States. Rather than seek a realistic readjustment, the Spanish Government has resorted to export subsidies on such commodities as cork and almonds. This in turn has precipitated the use of countervailing duties in keeping with our customs regulations. The price factor has inhibited the development of a foreign market in handicrafts, pottery, and many other such items. It has retarded the tourist trade. It has inhibited the repatriation of Spanish-owned dollar capital from other parts of the world.

Spain needs foreign investment, particularly American investment, to obtain dollar capital for machinery and for technical talent. Yet, Spain limits capital participation by foreigners in industrial concerns to 25 percent and prohibits foreign participation in management altogether. Exchange is generally withheld for profit repatriation. This virtually interdicts the reinvestment of frozen profits in plant expansion.

Foreign investors are subjected, moreover, to other harassments of peculiar and far-reaching character.

One example of Spanish practices which discourage the participation of foreign capital is that of permitting the same individual to serve as an entrepreneur in a particular field and as a Government administrator of regulations, particularly allocations, covering the same field. The invariable result is, of course, discrimination against foreign competitors.

A further circumstance is the fixing of price controls on the basis of a cost-of-living index without regard to costs of production—a practice which forces many manufacturers to resort to the black market with a portion of their product in order to stay in business.

As an example of another type of difficulty I cite the recent action of a Spanish court in declaring bankrupt the Barcelona Traction Co., a Canadian corporation, on the ground that the company could not pay its sterling bond interest. The case has been quite fully covered in the American press. This decision was made notwithstanding the fact that the company had at hand the equivalent of some $16,000,000 in pesetas—more than enough to meet its obligations—and was interdicted from meeting the bond interest solely because of the refusal of the Spanish authorities to authorize the conversion. This company, perfectly solvent in Spain and unable to meet its obligations only because of action of the Spanish Government, was declared bankrupt only as a pretext for enabling a Spanish financier to wrest control of it away from its owners.

I could go on with the details regarding the plight of foreign oil companies whose operations, permissible up to 40 percent of Spain's total petroleum trade as against 60 percent allowed to the Spanish monopoly, have been put under increasing pressure through restriction of foreign exchange available to them. It might be well also to explore the particular discriminations laid against the American motion-picture trade and American shipping.

But such illustrations would only add to the general picture of a national commerce suffering from an overdose of restriction administered with a deficiency of common sense. A loan to Spain might palliate, but it would not cure the fundamental ill.

The nature of the regime in Spain and the nature of freedom and the status of property under it are important as they bear upon the larger problem of how to fit Spain into the general picture of our western European policy.

Some take a simple approach to this larger problem. Spain, they argue, is anti-Communist. Our policy is that of containing international communism. Therefore, they conclude, let us embrace Spain within our undertakings for western Europe.

That is deceptively simple.

If our policy were merely anti-Communist, there would have been no reason, no justification for fighting World War II. We should simply have suffered Hitler and Mussolini to organize the world in the Nazi-Fascist pattern.

Our policy is based—and if it is to succeed, it must be based—not simply on the negative premise of anticommunism but on the affirmative premise of freedom.

Look into the declaration of policy of the Economic Cocperation Act of 1948, as amended. It speaks of the restoration and maintenance within Europe "of principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence." It states the policy of this nation "to sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence." Such is made the end objective of our foreign assistance and of the political and economic pattern which it seeks to create.

The North Atlantic Treaty echoes the same thoughts. Its preamble declares the common determination of the members "to safeguard the freedom of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law."

The Mutual Defense Assistance Act speaks in the same vein. It requires assistance in the North Atlantic area to be conducted in conformity with the North Atlantic Treaty. It recognizes the relationship between security and recovery in that the former promotes "the increased confidence of free peoples" so essential to the realization of the latter.

Simply to be anti-Communist is not enough to qualify for participation in these great designs. To combat one negation of freedom with an alternative negation of freedom is simply not enough.

I believe the Spaniards themselves recognize this better than it is recognized by many of the apologists for Spain in this country.

Inherently there is no bar to the participation of Spain in the European recovery program. The legislation does not bar Spain. The charter of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation does not bar Spain. Spain is barred simply by the nature of the regime and by the methods Spain has chosen for the conduct of international relationships. Were Spain to transform its government and mend its ways, bringing itself into harmony with the general patterns of

western Europe, I am sure that the other nations of that region and this Nation as well would welcome Spain as a full partner in the great undertakings.

But Spain's membership under present conditions would be an anomaly. I find in the Spanish press—keep in mind that it is an official and controlled press—and in the pronouncements of Spain's Government an implicit recognition of this. Spain offers itself as a beneficiary of United States aid not as a part of the grand pattern of American policy in Europe but as an alternative to that pattern.

Two years ago, when we first debated the European recovery program, there was an urgency among some in this country to precipitate Spain into the fellowship of western Europe by explicitly stating its eligibility. More recently, however, the proposals for assistance to Spain have taken the form of suggested loans outside the framework of the European recovery program.

The Spanish press and the Spanish Government have shown a quickening interest in this line of procedure. They have looked longingly upon the degree of recovery attained among the participants in the European recovery program. How to share in the benefits without paying the price of democratic collaboration? That has been the question which Spain's Government has sought to solve.

Since Spain could not, without transforming its regime, fit itself into the pattern of western Europe, Spain has sought to impress upon the United States the opportunity to help Spain on different terms.

The approach through the direct channels of public policy was difficult. So Spain's Government sought an avenue to satisfaction of its desires by courting public opinion in the United States. Public relations were substituted for public policy.

It is an old failing of dictatorships to believe their own propaganda about the weaknesses and vanities of democratic peoples. They become bemused by telling themselves so much about our inconstancy and our susceptibility to blandishments.

The Spaniards are fine hosts, capable of great deference and great charm in all personal relationships. Certainly no people ranks higher in American esteem in matters of personal liking. Spain is, in the American mind, a land of color, romance, and great personal courage. If personal responsiveness to foreign charm were to be the measure by which we decide matters of great moment in foreign policy, then certainly assistance to Spain would be with the topmost on the list of American concerns abroad.

We have, however, a well-considered program for western Europe. With all our liking for the Spanish people, we must still face the question: Can assistance to Spain be fitted into the larger pattern?

The idea of military assistance to Spain has followed a parallel route. Under present conditions, the inappositeness of Spain as a participant in the North Atlantic undertakings was manifest. Yet Spain has looked longingly upon the program for strengthening the sinews of Spain's neighbors to the end that they might form a viable unit of defense against potential aggressors.

I have found reflected in the Spanish reaction two approaches to the satisfaction of Spain's desires in this regard.

The first is to press upon the United States the hopelessness of establishing a defense line through central Europe. Coupled with this are warnings as to the fickleness and feebleness of the allies we have chosen. Spain is put forth as a geographically and morally more dependable partner.

I have found reflected in the press and in comments from official sources—we should never forget the identity of the press and the official line in Spain—the idea that defense of the North Atlantic area should be premised upon purely military considerations. There are those in this country who respond to this suggestion to divorce strategy from consideration of its political consequences—always an enticing but dangerous formula.

In this latter connection I have given note to two recent interviews granted by the Spanish dictator.

In one, an interview with Mr. Tom Jacob, an Australian journalist, appearing in the Madrid press on November 24, 1949, Generalissimo Franco recognizes frankly the lack of community between Spain and the democratic nations so far as political considerations go. He speaks of democracy as something the Spaniards found not to their liking and rejected "many decades before democracy was practiced in the world in the form which today is considered to be most perfect." He speaks of democracy as something which enchained, ruined, and degraded the Spanish people, who were right in casting it out.

In the other interview, granted to Mr. Constantine Brown, an American journalist, and printed November 27, 1949, Generalissimo Franco speaks suspiciously of politicians as makers of foreign policy and expresses the view that all might be set aright if America were guided by military men. This was echoed in the Madrid newspaper, Informaciones, in the expressed hope that military men might soon be able to "take control of world affairs over from the politicians."

Could we but divorce Spain from the larger pattern of our European policy, and could we but consider defense of the North Atlantic area in a compartment separate from the politics of the area, then the basic issues between us and Spain might indeed be resolved. I believe, however, that at the cost of disappointment to the aspirations of Spain's present regime, we should continue to work within the limits of our present pattern of policy.

By this I do not mean that we must forever follow a negative course toward Spain. I suggest only that we make it clear to ourselves and to Spain as well the course that future cooperation with Spain must take. For the working out of an affirmative policy does not depend merely on what we may do. It depends primarily upon what Spain does.

Three of my colleagues of the Committee on Foreign Affairs went to Spain in the second week of December 1949. They went as friends and admirers of the Spanish people. When called upon to appraise the future of relations between the two countries they spoke candidly of what they regarded as the unrealistic expectations they found in Spain. The senior member of the group, my colleague, Congressman JOSEPH L. PFEIFER, speaking also for Congressmen THOMAS S. GORDON and CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, spoke at length about the friendly regard of Americans for the Spanish people. Continuing with the outlook for relations, he said:

> I have been asked what is the United States going to do about Spain. I think the order of the question is wrong. I don't mean to be harsh when I say Spain is a secondary problem to the United States. The United States, however, is a primary problem to Spain. The real question is this: What is Spain going to do about the United States? Only the Spaniards themselves can answer that.

There was nothing but candor in this statement—no insult to Spanish pride, no reproach to Spain's regime. Yet the Spanish press answered with a flood of invective, applying such terms as "insolent" and "malice."

I believe there is the key to something important in the reaction of the Spanish press to this inoffensive and well-proportioned statement.

Spain was the first of all the powers to come to national unity and imperial glory. By the start of the sixteenth century Spain had achieved a position within Europe and across the seas unrivaled by any other. Yet this day of power and glory began to fade as suddenly as it had come. By the turn of the next century Spains' imperial decline had set in. That decline continued for 300 years until, a half century ago, Spain yielded up the last of its empire.

Nothing so besets a nation's thinking as the memory of vanished power. This has been true of the Spaniards. Spain achieved its glory alone. For a century Spain enjoyed singular national stature. And then history seemed to pass Spain by.

Spanish thought is still, consciously or unconsciously, dominated by the ideal of national glory singularly achieved and singularly enjoyed. There is always the explicit or implicit belief that the wheel will come full circle again. And Spain has tended to remain aloof from the concert of Europe, to eschew community with other powers, and to withdraw into national pride and ancient memories.

That is the case today with Spain, which prides itself on its separateness and which emphasizes its differences rather than its community with western Europe.

So long as that is the case, so long as Spain insists upon being treated on a separate basis, so long as Spain hangs back from participation in the great joint enterprises, Spain must be a secondary consideration for the United States, which is preoccupied with the considerations of a wider European policy. That

is all the meaning I read into my colleague Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER's statement about Spain.

What is Spain going to do about the United States? That is simply another way of asking, What steps does Spain plan to take in order to fit itself into the larger pattern and thus become a part of the primary area of United States concern? When the gentleman from New York [Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER] asked this question, the Spanish press, as exemplified by Arriba, answered that Spain would do precisely nothing.

That may be the present answer. I doubt that it is the final answer.

The day of singular greatness is gone among the western nations. The pattern is no longer that of national and imperial glory. The pattern of greatness now is that of participation in a larger design of cooperation. I, for one, do not believe that pattern in the west will ever be complete until Spain is a part of it. Spain's becoming a part of it is contingent above all on what course Spain itself chooses to follow. The obstacles of the moment must surely pass; but when and how, I do not know.

Meanwhile, we should seek to develop with Spain whatever pattern of cooperation may be feasible without impairing the larger designs of our policy. As a means to that end, we should, as I have suggested, restore as soon as practicable full diplomatic interchange.

In developing such a pattern, we should be vigilant that we keep first things first.

Our primary concern is with bringing about an integration among the free nations of western Europe. We should not jeopardize that design by attempting to force into their fellowship a nation which resolutely renounces such cooperation, and which prides itself on its lack of community rather than its common destiny with the west.

One of the great political tasks within and among the nations of the Western World is that of fitting labor freely and creatively into full participation in the political functions of society. I emphasize the word "freely" to point up the principle that labor must remain free of the impingements of both the Facist and the Communist systems. In response to this principle of our policy, we have today among the free working men of western Europe some of the strongest supporters of the American objectives. Labor, free labor, is moving more and more into a determining position in the political communities of western Europe. We must not sacrfice that support of free labor—a factor so primarily important to us—for purely secondary considerations in a nation where labor is not free.

Fnally, we should reserve for Spain the same terms of assistance that we apply to others. I believe the Spaniards should be advised against unrealistic expectations that we shall have one policy for the rest of western Europe and another for Spain.

The opportunity for assistance on the basis of self-help, mutual assistance, collaboration among free nations, and the preservation of free institutions has never been denied Spain. It is Spain that in the first instance has chosen to walk alone.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is the gentleman speaking now for the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. KEE. I am speaking solely my own views and upon my own responsibility.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I must confess that I am rather ignorant of the reasons for our not having recognized the Government in Spain. I wonder what the difference is, inasmuch as we have recognized Portugal? What is the difference between that Government as compared with the Government of Spain, which is objectionable?

Mr. KEE. There are a great many differences between the Government of Portugal and the Government of Spain. For one, the Government of Portugal was not placed in power through the operations of other governments or other powers. It is not a government that was forced upon Portugal by outside influences and outside forces. There are various and sundry other differences which it would be time-consuming to enumerate. As a matter of fact, as I have already stated, our Government recognized Spain in 1939.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I listened very closely to the gentleman's remarks with reference to the monopolistic practices in Spain. And I was thinking of the monopolistic practices of Soviet Russia when we recognized that country.

Mr. KEE. We have had that experience with quite a number of governments. There are a few other countries in the world that have monopolistic practices to a more or less extent, but there are divisions and degrees in those practices.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I may say to the gentleman that I have had considerable difficulty following the reasoning of our State Department as to why we should not recognize the Spanish Government. However, I am very grateful for the gentleman's remarks on the subject.

Mr. KEE. I hope I have resolved some of the gentleman's difficulties.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. What does the gentleman think of the way our State Department and our Committee on Foreign Affairs have been handling the situation in China during the past 3 or 4 years?

Mr. KEE. I think, from the knowledge at first hand, that we have had from time to time, the affairs have been handled just as well and just as intelligently as they possibly could have been handled under all the existing circumstances.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman claims that we have handled them intelligently, yet we have gotten licked at every point.

Mr. KEE. Has the gentleman himself ever been licked?

Mr. RICH. Yes, many times, and I have been licked so many times since I have been a Member of Congress that I just feel that I want to keep on fighting all the time, and I want to fight the principles and policies of the State Department and the Committee on Foreign Affairs in this House all I possibly can. And you just look to me to be a regular tiger for doing that in this session of Congress.

Mr. KEE. I hope that the gentleman's recent experience of being licked will not be his last.

Mr. RICH. Well, I hope so, too.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 40 minutes.

RURAL AMERICA

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in asking for this time today I do not want anyone to get the impression that it is the dying gasp of a wounded gladiator. But I would like to review through a few of the problems that confront American agriculture in general, and the oleo industry in particular, and I am glad to talk on a subject that is not controversial in any manner.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Before the gentleman starts, may I ask him one question?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I take it then the gentleman is willing, like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], to be licked in a worthy cause, and that he will be back again if he does get a licking.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not think I will get licked individually, because I still believe in the justice of my cause. There might be a temporary let down here for awhile, but I kind of think today, if we had that oleo bill back here in the House, that we would have a whole lot different vote than we had a year ago.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I take it the gentleman is still an optimist then?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I surely am, because I might say that your party and mine pretty nearly stubbed their toes on this issue. In the other body they gave it a sleeping pill and put it to sleep, and maybe the other body will do this again this year. I am sure they would if they knew the facts involved.

The first time I was on the floor of this House 11 years ago I talked on the economic justice for the rural people. At that particular time, in the days when we had more farm foreclosures in Wisconsin than ever before in the history of the Federal land bank, even if that was the seventh year of the more abundant life, many of the blessings of the New Deal had not extended that far at that time.

We had low farm prices. We had 10,000,000 unemployed in the United States. Of course, since that time we have had a war and the country has gone in debt, as you know, around $250,000,000,000. But, all during the said period the thing that has irritated me all the way through is that although there has been some attempt to give economic justice to the rural people, especially during the war period—and part of it was necessary in order to get the necessary things to win the war—there was no generosity on anybody's part that I know in particular, but during this time we have slipped and we have seen that during all this period we are forgetting social justice to the rural people.

I will enumerate a few instances. First of all, we extended the Social Security Act. But, if you will notice we were very careful to leave the rural people out of the act. We had a minimum-wage law. You notice that the rural people were left out of the minimum-wage law. I realize that unorganized labor was indirectly benefited, but the rural people themselves have been pretty well left out of the minimum-wage legislation. Under the circumstances you can get your help for 20 cents an hour for dragging your logs up to a sawmill, but as soon as they start sawing the logs you have to give them 75 cents an hour. That just does not make sense.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. May I ask the gentleman whether he is in favor of including the farmers under the Social Security Act, and also guaranteeing them and their workers a minimum wage?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I surely am. I would not be standing up here today complaining about it if I were not in favor of it. The gentleman's party had better be in favor of it pretty soon, and you had better quit talking about the slave labor that is going along with the Taft-Hartley Act and check up on the Sugar Act. I do not want to hear anyone tell me about the Taft-Hartley being a slave-labor law, because I know where the slave labor is. It is in the Sugar Act, and anyone can find it there if he takes the time to look it up.

Mr. PERKINS. Did the gentleman offer any amendment to the social-security bill or the minimum-wage bill to take care of the situations of which he now complains?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I have been here long enough to know that most of this legislation comes in all cut and dried.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not a fact that the social-security bill came in here under a gag rule, and you could not amend it if you wanted to?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is right.

I did not expect to get into an argument so quickly. I knew I would before I got through.

I should like to know why the rural people are left out of social security. They are paying other people social security. I should like to know why the farm people are not included under the minimum wage. I should like to know how we can take one group of our people that labor and give them aid and support in the way of social security and the minimum wage, and give them a pension when they get to be 65 years old that is more than the farmers of this country make during the years when they really work. In other words, there is a relationship there that should be put into operation.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. I agree with the gentleman that the farm workers should be under social security, but is it not a matter of record that the Farm Bureau and the Grange recommended that the farmers and farm labor not be under social security?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would not want to criticize the Farm Bureau or the Grange or any other farm organization. I have a high regard for them. I do not want to be in the position the administration is, like a school child, where any time something does not happen they lay it on the Farm Bureau or the Republicans instead of putting the responsibility on themselves where it belongs.

Mr. SUTTON. Is it not a fact that that is the testimony in the record?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The Farm Bureau has the right to make any statement they wish. That has nothing to do with the issue today. I am stating my own position. I am not representing any farm organization. I think that I am right. I may be wrong and I have been in the past, but I think I am right.

This brings up another point about this wage business. Under the Steagall amendment that was put into operation during the war—incidentally Mr. Steagall, whose amendment came from the Committee on Banking and Currency, has done more for American agriculture through that amendment than any piece of legislation this or any other Congress has ever passed. Mr. Henry Steagall at least took into consideration that agriculture included all of agriculture. Under the New Deal they had 25 percent of agriculture covered by special-privilege legislation under the guise of basic commodities, and half of them were not any more basic than horseradish would be. Under Mr. Steagall's set-up all of agriculture had a common consideration.

It grieved me to see President Truman misled into killing the Steagall bill. The minimum wage under the Steagall bill allowed the man who owned the farm to make 50 to 60 cents an hour. That is demonstrated in a 20-year study down here at the BAE. I did not like to see someone mislead President Truman about killing the provisions of the Steagall amendment. When did he do it? On December 31, 1946. How did he do it? With Executive Order No. 2714.

I do not want to put the President in a position of not wanting the farmers of this Nation to have a return for their labor of only 50 or 60 cents an hour, but that is exactly what took place as a result of killing the Steagall bill. It has been made a political football ever since, and the farm people of this country are taking it on the chin as the result of issuing that particular Executive order.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. I am certainly glad to see that my esteemed colleague on the Committee on Agriculture joins with me, as I join with him, in hoping that the farm laborer and the farmer himself will be able some of these days to come under social security, not as a matter of compulsion, but of his own volition if he wants to.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. I hope he gets his party and the leader of his party not to kill the legislation when we have it set up on a nonpolitical and nonpartisan basis so that the rural people of this country can have 50 or 60 cents an hour.

Now, this brings us up to the present. I am not going to talk about the year 2000, because I do not believe any one of us is going to be here.

I would like to talk about what is going to happen in 1950. We are going to be faced with this, and there is no use trying to dodge it.

No. 1 is that we are going to take six or seven million acres of land out of cotton. You will hear a lot about cotton from here on out. Of course, we always do. I have listened to this talk all these years, and sometimes I feel as if I have cotton batting in my ears as a result of listening to it. I have tried to be patient, and tried to understand what their problem is. Now, we are going to take some six or seven million acres of land out of cultivation for cotton. I want to yield to any Member of the House to tell me what he is going to do with the people who lived on those six or seven million acres of land in the last few years. What are you going to have them do next year?

Well, they cannot all be census enumerators. But this is not a sectional problem. It is a problem that faces the whole agricultural economy of the country, as well as the economy generally of the country. What is going to happen? What are you going to do with the 11,000,000 acres that are going to be taken out of corn production? What are you going to do with those people? One of my colleagues from Texas told me the other day that they are being told to go into the dairy business. I said you had better not do that, because you fellows are putting people out of the dairy business much faster than you are putting them in.

I said, "You have driven 3,000,000 dairy cows off the farms in the past 5 years." The oleo interests have ruined 10 percent of the American dairy industry right now. No one will dispute that statement. They are waiting for a chance to ruin more. During the last 5

years you have driven a quarter of a million dairy farmers off the farms by giving aid and comfort to the oleo interests.

I do not want to talk sectionalism at all. But what is the use of telling these people that they can go into the dairy business when out of the other side of your mouth you are putting them out of the dairy business.

It should be one way or the other.

Then he said, "Well, the powers that be are telling us to go into the poultry business." That sounds nice. It is easy to say, "Go into the poultry business"; but I happen to remember that the day Mr. Hoover was defeated for President, eggs were 20 cents a dozen. I called up the BAE the other day to make sure. They said that that is exactly what the price of eggs was at that time.

In the Midwest they were 20 cents a dozen in November 1932. After 17 years of the more abundant life eggs were selling at 18 and 19 cents a dozen in the Midwest. The egg fellows are not like the steel corporations who can go out and raise the price of their product $4 a ton. The egg people are sort of sitting around out there waiting for someone from Washington to tell them what they are going to get for eggs.

So surely they cannot go in the egg business.

I do not know what they are going to do with the people that have been producing on that 7,000,000 acres out of cotton. I cannot answer that question. But I am sure that someone in Washington must have the answer. Are they to go on agricultural relief?

I call your attention to the fact that since 1945 the production of milk has decreased 6,000,000,000 pounds. It would take 3,000,000 cows to produce that in the form of butter. That is more than 10 percent of the cows in the United States. That brings me to just exactly what is taking place in another legislative body in the United States.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. Before the gentleman leaves the question of the price of eggs, does the gentleman mean to say that the price of eggs to the farmer is now 18 cents?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is what they were in Iowa in December—18 to 20 cents a dozen.

Mr. JENKINS. I was wondering how general that is. That is a very astonishing thing if it is true, and I am sure that it must be true or the gentleman would not say so.

It is astonishing that in the Midwest eggs are down to 18 cents, whereas you pay 59 to 79 cents a dozen in the stores, or at least in any store that I have ever been in, in the last 2 or 3 months.

No wonder the gentleman is making a speech, if that is the truth about the price of eggs.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. They dropped to as low as 15 cents a dozen in Nebraska and 18 cents in Iowa.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I told my people last year to look out. Hold on to your hats, because I have been here a long time and I know that there is only so much money to go around, and if you are going to keep King Cotton in the style he is used to being kept, it is going to take a lot of money.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The prevailing market price on large eggs—that is, what the farmer gets—grade A eggs, in our country is 27 cents; and on No. 2 eggs, the straight run of eggs that the farmer brings in, is 20 cents a dozen.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. Going back to the statement you made a few moments ago concerning the Sugar Act, perhaps the gentleman has some information that the Members of this House would like to know about. The gentleman referred to slave labor and so forth. I notice in the Sugar Act of 1948, title III, the conditional payments provision, section C–1, states that—

> All persons employed on the farm in the production, cultivation, or harvesting of sugar beets or sugarcane, with respect to which an application for payment is made, shall have been paid in full for all such work, and shall have been paid wages therefor at rates not less than those that may be determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable after investigation and due notice and opportunity for public hearing.

In view of that statement embodied in the law, if you know anything about slave labor under this Sugar Act, where farmers are not complying, I think we should know about it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If the gentleman had read the RECORD last year, he would have found a letter from the Department of Agriculture which, under the law, gives this power to the Secretary of Agriculture, just as you have read it. He is a member of the President's Cabinet. That is your administration. If he wants to fix the minimum wage at 25 cents an hour in the Virgin Islands, according to that law, or if he wants to fix it at 29 cents an hour in Puerto Rico, according to that law, or if he wants to fix it in Louisiana at 32 to 38 cents an hour, I would think perhaps that is getting pretty close to slave labor. In the sugar-beet areas of Colorado, Nebraska, and California the minimum wage is from 60 to 65 cents an hour, and there are some who pay 75 cents or more an hour. In the Hawaiian Islands they pay from 72 to 78 cents an hour, so sugar does not need to cost the American people any more. All they have to do is to raise the sugar where it should be raised, and pay them 75 cents an hour. It does not make sense to pass a minimum-wage law that is going to apply only to a few. There is no reason in the world why we should not have 75 cents straight across the board.

You ask me why I did not put that through. I have not taken over here yet. I figure that I will later on, and if I do I will put in that 75 cents every day, straight across the board, and if I belonged to the gentleman's party I would not be talking about slave labor until I got it in there, either.

Mr. PERKINS. You gentlemen were in control during the Eightieth Congress, and you did not come forward with any proposals like that.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If your administration would spend more time in executing the laws that the Congress has passed and less time in telling us what legislation to pass, I am sure the American people would be better off, and so would you.

Mr. PERKINS. Does the gentleman know the prevailing wage that is now being paid in areas where sugarcane is being produced?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. All I know is what the Department's letter says—from 25 cents per hour up. I also have a newspaper clipping, where there was a group of DP's who came over here and they thought this was the land of milk and honey, and they dropped them down in Louisiana in one of those sugar plantations and all at once they evaporated. They could not find them, because they found they were getting $2 and some cents a day. In anybody's language, I presume we could say that was getting close to slave labor. So I say you should get that straightened out.

There is nothing personal on my part. I do not raise any cane and I do not want to raise any cain here. I want you to keep your own doorsteps clear and I will keep mine clear. Just to show the little difference it makes, you will remember that all these years the armed services were not supposed to serve oleo; you have been through all that; you Members know about it. It has been a battle. At this last session they passed it. That is one of their greatest contributions. It resulted in the driving of 15,000 more cows down to the stockyards.

Another item I want to see something done about is this filled-milk business. We do not know how much filled milk is being produced in the United States.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman mind telling the House whether or not the Secretary of Agriculture has failed to authorize the prevailing wage in any instance under this Sugar Act of 1948?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I did not say that our present Secretary had or had not; I said that according to a letter from the Department of Agriculture a secretary fixed the minimum wage at 25 cents in the Virgin Islands, 29 cents in Puerto Rico, 32 to 38 cents in Louisiana, 45 cents in Florida, 60 to 65 cents in Colorado, Nebraska, and California. I want to be fair about that; there were prerequisites that went along with that. He did not fix the price in the Hawaiian Islands, for there it was fixed by the people themselves at from 72 to 78 cents an hour.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. If the mandatory support price on eggs expired on December 31 why was it that eggs fell to such a low price as has been mentioned here, 15, 18, and 20 cents a dozen early in December?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The only reason they did is because the law was not followed; that is all.

Mr. CURTIS. By whom?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. By whoever had the executive power of the Government to enforce the law. As I say, we have not had enough enforcement of the law in connection with this whole support program. The law should be followed. If the law is that they should be paid 35 cents they should get 35 cents. But they did not get 35 cents. I do not want to be placed in the uncomfortable situation of telling my people that under the law they will get one price and then have those in charge of administering the law allow a different price to be paid.

Mr. CURTIS. Up until the law expired on the last day of December was any discretionary power vested in the Secretary of Agriculture as to whether or not he could withdraw that support?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. No; the Secretary had the power to do it up until January 1.

Mr. CURTIS. Did he have power to refrain from doing it?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not know what you are going to do to him if he did not do it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. That support price was ordered last August, but if the buyers do not want to buy they do not pay the support price.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The farmers have to sell their eggs whether or not they are paid 35 cents a dozen for them or 20.

Mr. GROSS. The farmer had to sell them either to the drying plant or to someone buying for the drying plant.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That may be; I cannot settle that.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. The gentlemen from the Committee on Agriculture will remember——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the gentleman on the other side of the House has not addressed the Chair.

Mr. SUTTON. The gentleman from Michigan failed to hear me.

The gentleman realizes——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No. A point of order, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman should address the Chair.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. The gentleman realizes that in the bill we passed last year we were trying to take care of the farmer in a number of basic products; we were trying to help him.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; you surely are going to help him, but I do not want to get off on the Anderson or Aiken or the Brannan plan now; today I am speaking for the two and a half million dairy farmers in the country. I want to confine myself to that.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield while we are on the egg subject?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not want to get into the egg business. I am in the oleo business.

Mr. JENSEN. I am in the hog business and our hog people are in the same predicament as the egg people and the poultry people. Why? Because in the last agricultural bill you took eggs, poultry, and hogs from under the support price and down they go. Up to January 1 they did not support the price of hogs, and I say the hog business in the State of Iowa is really a big business. We are suffering.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, now what is the real issue today? The real issue today is whether or not you are going to further destroy the livestock industry of this country. There is no use trying to work both sides of the street. I may be on the wrong side of the street, but I am only on one side anyway. Here is the story, and I wish you would get this. I want to make a statement and I shall yield to anybody to dispute it.

Surely you can sell oleo cheaper than dairy products, but I would like to have someone figure out how many cents a pound oleo is being subsidized? I will yield to anyone to tell you any agricultural product or any food product that is subsidized anywhere near as much as oleomargarine is at this very hour.

It is rather interesting to me to read magazines like Life magazine which has those beautiful pictures in there of oleo. Then you read the editorials. I do not know whether there is any relationship between the editorials and the advertisements or not. But they are always against subsidies. Have you ever noticed that? Here they are, the same ones who are against subsidies, against the farmers having a subsidy, and I could quote a lot of other papers, too, if I wanted to, are opposing these subsidies, yet they are out advocating oleo. Oleo has more of a subsidy per pound than any other food product at this time or any other time. If anyone wishes to correct that statement, I will be glad to have them do so.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell you how much oleo is subsidized. You would have to do a lot of research work to determine it. We do know that we produce, as far as our needs in the United States are concerned, something over a billion, 2 billion or 3 or 4 billion pounds of cottonseed oil. The cottonsed oil is rapidly replacing soybean oil in oleo. There is twice as much cotton-seed oil being used as soybean oil in oleo.

If you figure up all of the subsidies there are to cotton, you will find that cotton has more subsidies than the British have traditions. You would have to get the Brookings Institution to look up the figures. Yet I read every day in the papers how much the farmers are getting. I have here one corporation that on cotton received over a million-dollar subsidy 2 years ago. They sent this to me in confidence and I never betray a confidence, but that corporation received a little more than a million dollars. That is just one corporation. Whether oleo is being subsidized at 10 cents or 50 cents a pound, I cannot say. Of course, you cannot charge it all against the oil. You have to place some of the subsidies on the cotton itself.

I checked up to the past July and I found that we had given away $600,000,000 worth of cotton. I am not saying that the Commodity Credit Corporation lost that much but I do say that the American taxpayer has lost that amount. I do not want to say whether it is a half-billion dollars a year or not. Now we have a cotton bill on which we are going to have a hearing tomorrow. Mr. Ralph S. Trigg, head of the Commodity Credit Corporation, said that if we pass it we will have to provide funds for 3,000,000 more bales of cotton. Yet we cannot use what we already have. We give it away. Of course, it has been cut in two, and I understand that will mean several millions of dollars. It will be kind of an agricultural WPA, because we are going to have them raise a whole lot of cotton that we do not need. In fact, we do not know what we are going to do with what we have now. They will make it into oleo, I guess.

Let us get back once more to the oleo business.

I do not want this debate to go by without realizing what the issue is. Butter is only a part of the issue. The issue is the infiltration of vegetable oils into the whole dairy industry.

In the other body, in discussing this issue, I notice they are saying, well, Wisconsin does not produce so much butter, which is true, and therefore we should not be interested in it. The point is that the dairy people of Wisconsin know what this issue is. A good example has been filled milk, and that controversy has been going on for 25 years. Filled milk is made by taking out the butterfat. They used to put in coconut oil and call it coconut cow milk. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] was here when they passed the bill 25 years ago that prevented them shipping it interstate. But, nobody in the Department knows how much they are making, and if they do not follow the law any more than the oleo they give to the armed forces, well, that is just too bad. Incidentally, all the boys I had in my office since I had Rosy there claim that they get the oleo and the officers get the butter. But, I cannot prove that either. But, this filled milk is just another one of the substitutes. They sell it for about 2 cents a can less than evaporated milk. Why, of all of the faked endorsements and advertisements. They tell you or they even try to make you believe that you can rub it on your head and grow hair and tell you what this doctor and that doctor said. Did you ever hear of a doctor telling you to feed that to your babies? There are millions of babies raised on evaporated

milk, but did you ever hear of them giving cottonseed-oil milk to the children? Oh, no. Yet they say that these imitations are just as good as the real thing. Now, the whole dairy industry today is faced with that situation. If it is going to be good public policy to go ahead and follow that line, all well and good.

I listened with interest the other day to our President, your President and my President, and he was talking about the general welfare. I just wondered when he was talking whether it was the kind of general welfare for some international oil monopoly, such as Mr. Luckman, of Lever Bros., heads. Is he particularly interested in the general welfare of that outfit that is really the prime mover of this whole thing? I did not like to think that he was. I wondered if his interest in the general welfare was in the 24 or 25 oleo manufacturers that reaped such enormous profits by taking away the dairy markets during the war and afterward. They had Mr. Luckman help out on that, as you remember. He was down here. The Agricultural Department could not handle this situation, but Mr. Luckman, as I remember it, was the chief chicken shooter. He was not going to let them feed the chickens or eat the eggs, either. What the President really meant, I think, in the bottom of his heart, is that he was thinking about the general welfare of 2,500,000 dairy farmers in this country, and that his thoughts were not just on those 25 or 26 oleo manufacturers, or the Lever Bros.' international vegetable oil cartel, and that he was thinking about the general welfare of all the people.

Then we have Mr. Ewing and all the rest of them tell us about the health of the Nation. We hear it on all occasions. I saw a picture of some girls the other day showing how they would look in the year 2000. I then thought they would not want to pass the oleo bill, because they will be midgets and dwarfs by that time. We are stupid to appropriate money to our universities and agricultural colleges and to spend money in connection with agricultural chemistry if milk is not the greatest food ever known to man. There is not a doubt about it at all. I imagine Mr. Ewing, interested in health legislation, surely is not going to tell us that we should reduce the consumption of dairy products. Milk and its products are protective foods for the grown-ups as well as for the children. Mr. Ewing surely cannot be for more and more oleo and still insist he is for the health of the Nation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman made reference to Mr. Luckman. I know he is one of the great financiers of this international corporation, Lever Brothers. I understand that Mr. Luckman is also chairman of the Jackson Day dinners down here. They expect 4,000 people to come there and pay $100 a plate for their food. I am reliably informed that Mr. Luckman intends to serve oleomargarine instead of butter at the Jackson Day dinner. That oleomargarine is made by his company, as the gentleman knows. Lever Bros. is one of the large producers of oleomargarine. Has the gentleman any opinion on that, or has he heard that Mr. Luckman may serve Jelke's, or Lever Brothers' oleomargarine at that $100-a-plate Jackson Day dinner, as a special treat to those who contribute the $100?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Luckman has not taken that matter up with me, but if he had, I would have asked him if it is not true that they are just taking these southerners, the cotton boys, along for a little ride.

There is one thing I will say for the Washington News editorials. I hand it to that paper as far as their news articles are concerned. They have always been against the dairy side in their editorials, but their news articles have always been fair on this subject. I noted a reference in that paper about imports of vegetable oils.

They are building a big oleo plant out in California. Coconut oil is nearer butterfat than any other vegetable oil. There is no argument about that. I just wondered what our good cottonseed friends are going to say when we roll in the coconut oil from the Philippines or wherever they get it from. If they start rolling that in they can make oleo cheaper than they can make it out of domestic oils. At the same time, we are not going to be appropriating as much money to the cottonseed people and to the soybean people as we have been. The soybeans are just a war baby, anyway. They have had plenty of subsidy, probably just as much as the cottonseed oil. I did not have time to get at all the figures, and I do not know whether it is 10 cents or 50 cents a pound on the oil that would have to be charged up against that product.

I believe that the Congressmen from the five States of North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Alabama in 5 years from today will be in the camp of the people that really believe in the dairy industry, because they can see the handwriting on the wall.. As they develop industrially they create a local demand for dairy products. They know that a few big western cotton people would gladly put them out of business. If we did not produce any more cotton than we needed in the United States, we would have to cut the acreage in two this year to say nothing about the big cut you hear about on the floor every day and will hear more about as time goes on.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. My colleague from Minnesota spoke about the $100-a-plate Jackson Day dinner they are going to have down here at the Armory. I wonder whether the Republicans, when we have our Lincoln Day dinner at a dollar a plate at Uline's Arena, are going to have butter. I think we are. I think if we can have butter at a dollar a plate, the Democrats ought to have 100 butters for $100.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not want to get into the political angle of this thing. This is a serious business. I want to point out to you another example of the infiltration of these vegetable oils. Take the oleo ice cream that is being made now. That is just one more phase of this. That will eliminate just that many more cows. We will not need 25,000,000 dairy cows in this country if this keeps up. Three million dairy cows have been sent to the slaughterhouse already. That is more than 10 percent of the dairy cows. Remember much of this reduction took place in a very short period of time.

So, just let that Poage-Fulbright bill go through. Then, consider No. 4. Here is another situation. Some of the Members have been on congressional committees that have gone to Tokyo. I have talked with some of the Members who were out there and drank the oleo bottled milk. It was amusing to me when we had the bill up here to hear some people say it is all right to eat oleo as long as you drink plenty of milk. You did not know you were going to get in the same trap. Some of the Members voted that way. I have had a good deal of trouble from my colleagues on my side.

In Washington today there are fellows who are yelling about subsidy, subsidy, subsidy, and yet they support the largest agricultural subsidy that any commodity gets. It is the oleo subsidy. It is a serious business when you stop to think of it. What happened during the last fiscal year? We imported over half a million head of cattle for their beef. Yes, the dairy industry furnishes over 40 percent of the beef and veal of the Nation. We should save the dairy industry while we still can do so. We should cooperate with the FAO and establish a world food organization. We should do our own thinking and not be misled by any highly financed propaganda that complains about farm subsidies and then advocates oleo which is the most highly subsidized article of food on the markets of our country.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE ON COTTON-ACREAGE BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITE of California). The Chair wishes to announce, at the request of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, that on Wednesday, January 11, at 10 a. m., in room 1310, New House Office Building, there will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Cotton of the Committee on Agriculture, for the purpose of considering House Joint Resolution 384, designed to correct alleged inequities in the cotton-acreage bill recently passed. All Members of the House are invited to participate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TALLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter addressed to him, and also a newspaper editorial.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House on Thursday next for 20 minutes, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's

desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] for 15 minutes under special order.

AMERICAN PROSPERITY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a nation's greatness can be measured by the happiness and prosperity of the people who do the work to produce the nation's wealth. Using this standard our Nation today is a truly great one because the people who work on the farm and in the factory are happier and more prosperous than at any other time in our Nation's history. More people own their homes and farms than ever before. More people work for good wages than ever before. More people enjoy modern conveniences, benefits and comforts, both rural and urban, than ever before in our history.

GREATEST NATION ON EARTH

Although our country started out on a shoestring 160 years ago with only 5 percent of the land surface of the earth, and now with only 7 percent of the earth's population, we use more than one-half of the world's telephones; we own one-third of all railroad mileage of the world, and 80 percent of all the world's registered automobiles and trucks. We use one-half of the world's coffee, tin, and rubber, 20 percent of its sugar, and 75 percent of its silk.

HOW 50,000,000 AMERICAN FAMILIES ARE LIVING

We are told by our critics that the Democratic Party has thrown our country into bankruptcy. A recent Federal survey finds that 51 percent of the 50,000,000 American families own at least one automobile; one out of 17 families own two or more, and 77 percent of these 50,000,000 American families own life-insurance policies with premiums costing more than $100 a year. Seventy-one percent of these 50,000,000 American families have bank accounts or Government savings bonds and 45 percent of these 50,000,000 American families own a home or a farm.

It is my belief that depressions are man made and that they can be avoided, and if we were to study the depressions of the past individually, I believe we would find that they could have been avoided if honest, unselfish efforts had been made to avoid them.

In the congressional district in northeast Texas that I have the honor to represent 90 percent of the farm homes have electricity, which is one of the greatest blessings of all mankind. When we came into power in 1933 less than 1 percent of the farms had electricity. The farmers have a floor under their prices, which is in effect a guaranteed minimum price. This is justified because the Nation's prosperity is dependent upon the prosperity of agriculture and, besides, the first general law that was ever passed by an American Congress was a protective tariff act to subsidize industry in the United States, which principle has been in effect ever since.

ACT OF FIRST CONGRESS

I have here a copy of the proceedings of the acts of the First Congress of the United States passed at the first session which was begun and held in the city of New York on Wednesday, March 4, 1789, and continued to September 29, 1789; George Washington, President, John Adams, Vice President of the United States, and President of the Senate; Frederick Augustus Muhlenberg, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The first act was one to regulate the time and manner of administrating certain oaths, which is strictly procedural. The second act, and the first general act passed by that American Congress, was an act for levying a duty on goods, wares, and merchandise imported into the United States, including such things as brown sugar 1 cent per pound, loaf sugars 3 cents per pound, coffee 2½ cents per pound, cheese 4 cents a pound, soap 2 cents a pound, boots 50 cents a pair, snuff 10 cents a pound, salt 6 cents per bushel, wool and cotton cards 50 cents per dozen.

I am just skipping along, covering only a small part of them—and on every coach, chariot, or other four-wheel carriage, 15 percent, like our transportation tax today. There are over a hundred commodities in all covered in this act.

The point I want to make is that the first general law passed by an American Congress was a protective tariff act, a floor under industrial prices that has been in effect ever since for industry and business.

It has been claimed it was necessary to help our country. At the same time I insist that it is necessary that agriculture be protected to help our country. I believe that the laws that we have passed granting support prices for the farmers were absolutely necessary to have a prosperous country. Our country cannot be prosperous without a prosperous agriculture. The protective tariff, which has been in effect all the time, insofar as the farmers were concerned, resulted in discriminating against agriculture, because a farmer was forced to sell in a competitive market and buy in a protected market. Support prices, after over 150 years' delay, partly correct this discrimination against the farmers. Our soil is receiving the attention of the Federal Government, and properly so. It is believed if we do not do something about preventing erosion and improving our soil, one of these days we will wake up to find that we do not have enough soil to produce the food and the fiber necessary to sustain our greatly expanded population.

It would surprise you to know how many of the farmers in the district I have the honor to represent also enjoy hot and cold running water and all modern facilities, nicely painted and papered homes, rural telephones, all-weather roads, school-bus service, and rural free delivery in their farm homes today. Many of them have all the mechanical comforts and conveniences of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City.

I think there is reason for us to believe that although the trend during the first half of the twentieth century was toward the cities, people going from the country to the city, the trend during the next 50 years will be from the cities to the country, because today the people on the farms can enjoy the same benefits, comforts, conveniences, and advantages that the people in the cities enjoy.

I think if we will keep on supporting the farmers' prices just as we have protected industry and business for 161 years we will not only have a prosperous agriculture but we will have a prosperous country. We cannot have a prosperous country without a prosperous agriculture.

The farmers who have the benefit of support prices are enabled thereby to make for themselves, if they work, an honorable living, a good living. With support prices, with soil conservation practices to protect their soil from erosion and to improve it, and then with the benefits of electricity, with all the appliances that go with electricity, like radio and television, and then with the benefit of gas, hot and cold running water, and an all-weather road, with school bus service and rural free delivery, a farm family can live just as well today or a little bit better than any family can live in all the world. That is the reason they are going to be attracted to the farms, I believe, during the last half of the twentieth century.

The object of imposing upon you for these few minutes is to express the hope that nothing will be done that will be injurious to our fine farm program.

BRANNAN PLAN

Personally I happen to believe in the Brannan plan. I favor the Brannan plan. The Brannan plan is exactly the same kind of plan for agriculture as the protective tariff was for industry 160 years ago, and for business. Since we have had a Brannan plan for industry and business for 160 years, come next July Fourth, let us start now and have a Brannan plan for agriculture. Let us all prosper together.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LODGE (at the request of Mr. CURTIS) was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday, January 12, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include parts of several letters and other matter.)

FINANCIAL CONDITION OF THE COUNTRY

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it was in a class in civil government. The teacher was asking what were the duties of the several officers in Congress. "Now, what is the duty of the Chaplain?" she asked of a lad of 12. "The Chaplain," said he, "stands up in front of the Congress, looks them over, and then prays for the country."

The teacher gave him 100 percent on that answer.

Mr. Speaker, we have just heard the budget message of the President of the

United States, which was submitted to the Congress this afternoon in which the President states that he is asking the Congress for $42,400,000,000, and admits that he will receive in receipts, I presume on the basis of an estimate of the Treasury Department, the sum of only $37,300,000,000.

That will leave us $5,100,000,000 in the red. The President of the United States, that is, the present incumbent of that office, ever since he has been in office, has submitted a budget which has placed us in the red, and for 17 years, except for 2 years during the Eightieth Congress, we have been in the red. In other words, in 1933, when this administration came into power we were $20,000,000,000 in the red. Today we are $257,000,000,000 in the red. We have gone in the red $237,000,000,000, notwithstanding that the Eightieth Congress had a credit of about $754,000,000 one year and over $8,000,000,000 the second year.

So you can see that with the Chief Executive of the United States recommending to the Congress budgets that are continuously in the red, a great calamity awaits the American people. To me it is nothing more than downright stealing—stealing money that really belongs to our children and our children's children, because they are going to be compelled to pay the bill that this administration is now running up, expecting somebody in future years to pay it or else repudiate it.

It calls to my mind the time when one of the citizens in my district, shortly after the First World War, asked me to invest in German marks. He said, "Bob, you can buy German marks today at 2½ cents, and if you hold them for 8 or 10 years they will probably go back to 20 or 25 cents and you can make some money."

Well, I was foolish, and I said, "All right, I will buy some of them." Here is one of them. You look through it and you can see old Kaiser Wilhelm's picture, a 100-mark note. I paid $2.50 for it. In about 10 or 15 years after that you could buy two bushel of them for 2½ cents. They were not worth the paper they were written on.

Now, what is happening to this country? We are heading in the same direction that Germany did when they had a mark that they thought was worth 24 cents in our money. It went down to nothing. Today, with the continual draining of the resources of the American people and deficit spending, we are going in the same direction that old Germany did when they repudiated their debt. We should have President Truman's picture on our paper money today. He is leading us the same way.

Let me say that in 1933, when we had another President who told the people of this country to buy American bonds, that they were the most solid investment we could possibly make, and then when he died with an estate of over a million dollars he left the grand sum of less than $1,000 in Government bonds. It seems to me he did not practice what he preached.

The President of the United States says, "Buy bonds. Buy America." I am saying to you we are selling America short. If we continue this process that we are doing now, we are going to reap the greatest whirlwind of dissatisfaction, discord, and bankruptcy that any country every knew. I say to you that by this kind of financing in this country we are simply stealing from our children and our children's children. We are not building up an economy that is sound. We are building an economy on false promises, something that will wreck us as surely as the sun shines. We ought to change our tactics. Do it quick. At least be honest.

I was interested in listening to the address of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. CANNON a few minutes ago. He figures that the amount of money the President asked for for 1951 is not $42,400,000,000, as the President said, but the sum of $45,000,000,000. He increased it almost $2,600,000,000 over what the President suggested. But, he said, "we are going to cut down those expenses." I have heard him say that time and time again during the last 7 or 8 years, but I have not seen it happen. I hope we have enough men in this House with sufficient backbone and stamina to cut down these expenses. It is not a question today of increasing taxes. Today it is a question of cutting down expenses. That is the most important thing and the thing that we should do. Why does not the President of the United States take the lead?

I have been a Member of this House for the last 17 years, and I have heard them talk about needing more taxes to get along in this country. I was here when the national debt was $20,000,000,000. I saw this spending spree going on. I voted for fourteen tax bills that the Democrats foisted upon the American people. I did it because I wanted a sound Government. I did not do it because I wanted to get taxes out of the American people, but I said, "We want economy in the operation of the Government. We want the things back in our home State that we need to do, rather than to be concentrating all our efforts right here in the city of Washington."

It is wrong to do that. In those years of the taxes paid by the people of this country 75 percent went for local government, and 25 percent went for the Federal Government. Today, however, 75 percent goes to the National Government in Washington and 25 percent to the local governments back home. This shows the trend of this enormous spending spree that we are in, which eventually will lead to disaster. The New Deal, the Fair Deal, and, I might say, a raw deal for our children.

Let me read excerpts from two or three letters which came to me this morning. I get them by the hundred, not only from my own district but from every district in the country. These, however, happen to come from my own district.

Here is the first one:

I note that you were able to sit through the joint session and listen to the President's dream. It is hard for me to understand how any man can believe that such plans as he has in mind can be accomplished. It is quite apparent to me that he has but one thing in mind and that is that he will continue to be President the rest of his life. He seems to have no consideration for the future generation.

Here is another:

No doubt you have had the enclosed article called to your attention quite a few times in the last couple of weeks, but I believe it cannot be expressed too strongly that governmental spending is losing all sense of sound economic practices that are taught in high schools and colleges all over the country. It is inconceivable that President Truman's administration could spend $191,000,000,000 in 4 years, while 32 preceding Presidents and 156 years of time could not spend $179,000,000,000. These figures do not include the extraordinary expenditures of the war years from 1941 to 1945.

Before the United States should try to put foreign economy on a going basis it seems quite evident to me that the United States should put its own financial house in order.

I understand that you are in favor of balancing the budget of the Nation, and if so, I wish you many successes in the coming year.

Here is a third one:

As a citizen of the United States, a taxpayer, I am concerned about the terrible amount of money that is being spent by our Government. And I ask that you bring the matter before Congress and do your best to curb the waste, the unwise spending or whatever it is that is putting our country in this alarming condition.

I wish I could say to these people that I felt we would achieve this economy, but I am afraid, unless this administration stops spending, I cannot.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RICH. For a question? Yes; I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact that 76 cents out of every dollar in our budget is to pay for past wars and provide for security?

Mr. RICH. Even if that be so, the President ought to have enough sense when he sends a budget down here that he himself estimates at $42,400,000,000, but which the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House says will be forty-five billion, to cut $5,000,000,000 from it and have the budget in balance. While we are enjoying times of prosperity, while we are passing through times of high earning power in this country, we ought to have enough common sense in our systems and in our souls to try to keep from stealing the money that belongs to future generations.

Furthermore, you will remember that in the President's budget message today he said we were going to collect $2,000,000,000 that was supposed to be for social security. That is a trust fund that should have been set aside for the purpose of paying social security benefits to the aged and the unemployed who pay money in for that purpose. Yet the President calls that income to the Government and deducts that from the amount of his spending. In other words, if we pay for the thing as we should, we would still be $2,000,000,000 farther from the figures the President submitted. You gentleman know the law. If any banker in this country handles a trust fund and spends that money for his own purpose, it would not be 48 hours before the law would take hold of him and he would be tried expeditiously and put behind the bars for spending money that was given him in trust. I say that any man,

whether he be a Member of Congress or not—I do not care—who spends a trust fund ought to be put behind the bars.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman has been criticizing President Truman's budget.

Mr. RICH. Yes. I do have a right to.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact that all of our troubles stem from the fact that the gentleman helped to pass over the President's veto a tax-reduction bill in 1947. If that had not been done we would have a balanced budget.

Mr. RICH. That is bosh. You know, you had a tax of 95 percent on industry which we cut down to 38 percent. Every industry in this country is now paying 38 percent on its income. If you put a tax of 95 percent on you would close every industry. Throw people out of jobs, then what? That is what you are trying to do. You Members on that side of the House are trying to lick industry and put the Government in all kinds of business. You are trying to socialize America. You are not only trying to socialize it, and if you are successful in accomplishing that, then you will have wrecked the country. That is what they did in Great Britain. We do not want that here. You are trying to establish a socialized government here and they are trying to maintain one in Great Britain. You voted to keep socialism alive in Britain by ECA appropriations. I opposed it, and will do it again.

Mr. Speaker, we want a different attitude on the part of the Members of Congress here and I hope that it will result in economy. I hope that you and I and every Member of Congress will work to that end just as hard as we know how.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I include the following news bulletins:

[From Washington (D. C.) News Bulletin of January 4, 1950]

THE DRIFT TOWARD ECONOMIC INTERNATIONALISM

"Anyone who claims he can increase a nation's purchasing power by redistributing wealth, juggling the price, manipulating the currency, or by using any other means than labor intelligently applied in production, is either a faker or a fool."

—John Rustgard.

President Truman's state of the Union message delivered to the Congress today was in substance a stirring appeal for public support of his brave new world policies outlined for the first time last year. In substance the President asks that we as a people embark upon a world-wide share-the-wealth program conceived in all probability by those followers of the cult of idealism, who previously have come forward with grandiose ideas for some form of a world super government under which the sovereignty of the Republic of the United States would be submerged.

The President urges wholehearted support of the United Nations, which means that our taxpayers will continue to foot one-third of the administrative costs besides making substantial contributions to special projects set up under the United Nations, such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization for which an appropriation of $3,703,385 was made in fiscal 1948.

Our adventures into the fields of international sociology and economics have been very costly in the past, and every sincere patriot should at this time consider the warning issued by Senator Warren G. Harding in 1921, that:

"It is better to be the free and disinterested agents of international justice and advancing civilization, with the covenant of conscience, than be shackled by a written compact which surrenders our freedom of action and gives to a military alliance, the right to proclaim America's duty to the world."

The President apparently counts on heavy Republican support for his international policies since he has placed peace as the prime objective of the Nation.

The professional do-gooders, the one-worlders, and the yes "me too" segment of the Republican Party have already reduced it to almost total impotency. If just a few more converts to the administration's program can be made, the GOP is as good as dead. This of course is one man's opinion—but shared by many who are sick and tired of straddling evidenced in the last three presidential campaigns.

JEFFERSON'S VIEWS

In a letter to J. B. Colvin, dated September 20, 1810, Thomas Jefferson wrote:

"A strict observance of the written law is doubtless one of the highest duties of a good citizen, but it is not the highest.

"The laws of necessity, of self-preservation, of saving our country when in danger are of higher obligation. To lose our country by a scrupulous adherence to written law would be to lose the law itself, with life, liberty, and property, and all of those who are enjoying them with us; thus absolutely sacrificing the end to the means."

Despite the assurance given to Congress and the people that our economy is sound, the facts indicate that the net income of the people of the United States, in terms of the current purchasing power of the dollar is still approximately 25 percent below what it was in 1929. Our economy is burdened with a public and private debt that just about approaches our total national assets. The wealth of the United States has been multiplied since 1900, but so has our liabilities as shown by the table following:

	1900	1950
Wealth of the United States	$88,517,307,000.00	$498,500,000,000.00
Public debt	1,263,416,913.00	257,000,000,000.00
Per capita public debt	16.56	[1] 1,696.49

[1] June 30, 1949.

"It is not in the power of any legislative body to make something out of nothing." (Owen Lovejoy, Member of Congress, February 1862.)

[From the Washington (D. C.) News Bulletin of January 2, 1950]

A comparison of the fiscal operations of the Federal Government for the fiscal years 1929 and 1949

	June 30, 1929	June 30, 1949	Percent increase
Population	121,832,000	149,000,000	22
Fiscal year receipts	$4,033,250,000	$37,057,107,857	819
Per capital receipts	$33.19	$248.70	649
Expenditures	$3,848,463,190	$40,180,017,813	944
Per capita expenditures	$31.67	$269.66	751
Surplus or deficit (—)	$184,787,035	—$1,811,440,047	
Public debt	$16,931,197,748	$252,770,359,860	1,393
Per capita debt	$139.40	$1,696.49	1,116

Compiled from official reports of the United States Department of Commerce and other Government agencies.

PAUL O. PETERS.

Mr. Speaker, my slogan: "Be thrifty in 1950."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

TRUMAN'S ROSY PICTURE DOES NOT KEEP US WARM

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in his message to Congress, President Truman painted a beautiful word picture. He told us how great and prosperous was our Nation; how fortunate our people—fortunate not only because we had so much of everything we wanted; lucky not only because we lived while he was President, but because in the not too distant future, as a nation we would be still more prosperous and powerful, and that the average family income would be around $12,000 per year.

Because he did not go so far as to tell us that he would keep us out of world war III or give us any idea of what the $12,000 per year would buy, some reactionary, horse-and-buggy Republicans did not seem over-happy. But then, because they are always looking down their noses, the President was not greatly disturbed.

So, with the President in the saddle and his party in control of the public purse, the Nation still able to borrow money by selling bonds, we may be well on our way toward another boom without the "bust." Although again, selfish interests, according to the President, seem determined to interfere with his program, designed to give all vote-strong groups what they ask, and predict a "bust."

But the facts of life, as encountered by the folks in the "sticks," if what we hear and read is accurate, seem to smear just a little the President's rosy picture of universal plenty for all without effort by anyone.

It might be said that neither Harry S. Truman nor John L. Lewis is politically ambitious, stubborn, desirous of having his own way. It might be said that each and both working together have only the public's good, comfort, and well-being in mind.

True, one cannot say that they are, in the strictest sense of the word, either buddies or pals, or that they are working toward the same end, but their joint acts are producing a common result.

It may be assumed that each is honest, sincere, kindly, charitable, and abhors misery and suffering. Such an assumption might be based upon the well-known fact that John L. Lewis for years has been working for the betterment of the United Mine Workers.

The mine workers are engaged in a hazardous occupation. Their work is dirty and dangerous and, for all too long, their pay inadequate. Beyond question, Lewis has aided in raising their wages, in shortening their hours, lessening their daily tasks.

Some now suggest that the increase in wages has to some degree followed the national pattern and that, for an overall period, the miners may not have gained quite so much in increased wages as the figures seem to indicate.

But let us assume, for there are facts to support the assumption, that Mr. Lewis has really had, not his own financial gain principally in mind, but the good of the working mine workers, this

although Mr. Lewis would be the first to concede that he has personally profited enormously while serving the miners.

Because President Truman says he is a vigorous advocate of equal rights for all; of the expenditure of Federal money for low- and medium-price housing; of the collection of money from all for the payment of social-security benefits to some, for Federal aid to education—in fact, for all plans which include the collection of additional taxes from everyone and the distribution of billions to the vote-producing groups and the sending of other billions to foreign countries, either to fight communism or make secure British trade, it may be assumed that he, too, like Lewis, is desirous of preventing hardship and suffering.

Are their acts consistent with their pronouncements?

Desirous as these two gentlemen, President Truman and John L. Lewis, may be of preventing hardship and suffering, unemployment and the curtailment of business, their joint acts or failure to act are curtailing, if not destroying, many a small business, bringing about unemployment, and are the direct cause of unnecessary suffering.

If the results which their joint acts have caused were deliberately and knowingly brought about by an individual or group of individuals or by a soulless corporation, it might, and it undoubtedly would, be charged that such an individual, group, or corporation was cruel, heartless, lawless, and, for selfish ends, causing unnecessary suffering, sickness, and perhaps death, to many of the people of our country.

Certainly, keeping in mind the announced humanitarian purposes of the President and of Mr. Lewis, one should not charge that they or either, for selfish or political reasons, was knowingly doing this despicable thing.

So let us assume that neither President Truman nor Mr. Lewis is aware of the situation which they have created.

In extenuation of their lack of knowledge, it should be recalled that each has recently spent considerable time, relaxed and enjoyed himself, under the sunny skies, in the soothing waters of the Gulf, on the sightseeing beaches of the South.

There, entranced by the beauty and beauties of the surroundings, one might be able to forget some of the facts of life as they exist north of the Mason and Dixon's line and west of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, where ice and snow cause daily hardships.

Both the President and Mr. Lewis are tops in their chosen field. In any political battle with any United States opponent—we eliminate Churchill and Stalin from the contest—these two gentlemen would be top-heavy favorites.

Unfortunately, however, they are at the moment engaged, and will continue to be engaged, in a contest where the rules they enunciate do not prevail. With Jack Frost and Old Man Winter as their opponents, President Truman and John L. Lewis, astute and experienced as they may be, with a long, long string of wins, without defeats, are up against contestants who know the fundamentals of the game, who play under and use Nature's, not politicians', rules.

Jack Frost, Old Man Winter, may this year have delayed a little in coming on the field, but, in some sections of the country at least, they have arrived. Today, individuals in more than one-half of the area of our country have had a call from Jack Frost, and Old Man Winter is settling down for a long and steady stay.

John L. Lewis and President Harry S. Truman, in the order named, are responsible for the fact that, with the dropping of the thermometer, which both knew was inevitable, there is throughout our land a shortage of coal.

Because of the acts and inactivity of Mr. Truman and Mr. Lewis, in the homes in the North, the housewives, the mothers, lack the fuel to keep themselves or their children warm. They lack the coal to cook the food which the family needs.

Because of the acts and inactivity of Mr. Truman and Mr. Lewis, even in some of the housing provided by a paternalistic government, there is or shortly will be a heat shortage. A freezing temperature is no comforter in a heatless home.

Because of the acts and inactivity of Mr. Truman and Mr. Lewis, school lunches, provided by State and Federal Governments, may be eaten cold or frozen, that is, even though there is sufficient coal to keep the schoolhouses warm. It may be necessary, it undoubtedly will be, unless some action is promptly taken, to close the public schools.

Because of the acts of Mr. Lewis and the inactivity of Mr. Truman, hospitals will find themselves short of fuel.

Because of the acts of Mr. Lewis and the inactivity of Mr. Truman, public utilities may find it necessary to curtail the supply of water, of electricity.

Because of the acts of Mr. Lewis and the inactivity of Mr. Truman, already public transportation on the railways is being curtailed.

In short and to put it all in one paragraph, notwithstanding the so-called humanitarian pronouncements of Mr. Truman and of Mr. Lewis, Mr. Truman's rosy promises as to the future, today individuals in the North are actually suffering because of the policies now pursued by Mr. Truman and by Mr. Lewis.

And, sad as it may be, the people's representatives in Congress assembled lack either the inclination, the ability or the courage to apply a remedy—that is, to either force Mr. Lewis' United Mine Workers to dig coal or to get out of the way so that someone who is willing to work can and will dig it.

TAX REDUCTION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in regard to the tax reduction bill of the Eightieth Congress, may I say that was the second tax reduction bill passed since the end of the war. The first one included an across-the-board tax reduction for individuals as well as a tax reduction for corporations voted by a Democratic Congress, it was passed at a time when we were operating at a deficit.

So far as the tax-reduction bill of the Eightieth Congress is concerned 71 percent of its benefits went to the people making less than $5,000 per year. It cost over $2,000,000,000 in revenue to raise the personal exemptions from $500 to $600. It was a good tax bill. It was passed when we had a surplus and the Eightieth Congress reduced expenditures and lived within the country's income.

The Eighty-first Congress has had the necessary votes to repeal that law if it wanted to. If it is as bad a law as they say it is, I challenge them to repeal in toto the tax reduction bill of the Eightieth Congress.

We have a deficit for the sole reason that too much money has been spent. The deficit would have been bigger if we had given to Mr. Truman everything that he has asked for. If the Congress had taken affirmative action on every request that Mr. Truman has sent down here since he was President, there is not anyone or any group that could write a tax law that would bring in enough money to pay for it.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the Eightieth Congress the first thing that was done was to perpetuate the wartime excise taxes which would have automatically expired on June 30, 1947. After that was done the tax bill was passed which President Truman refers to as the rich man's tax bill, a bill that deprived us of $5,000,000,000 a year in revenue. If that tax bill had not been passed over a veto, we would not have been in the red last year, this year, or next year. We would have plenty of revenue without going into the red and we would not have deficit financing at this time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, January 12, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1101. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report setting forth the number of positions established in the Department of Defense pursuant to Public Law 313, Eightieth Congress, as amended by Public Law 758, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1102. A letter from the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, transmitting a report pursuant to the provisions of section 2 (c) (11) of the Armed Services procurement Act of 1947, Public Law 413, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1103. A letter from the vice president and comptroller, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting

a report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. to the Congress of the United States for the year 1949; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1104. A letter from the president, Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., transmitting the twenty-second annual report of the work and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory including a statement of receipts and expenditures covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 398); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1105. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to extend certain privileges to representatives of member states on the council of the Organization of American States"; to the committee on Foreign Affairs.

1106. A letter from the Director, Office of Airports, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Fourth Annual Report of the Federal Airport Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1107. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a supplemental report of the Securities and Exchange Commission entitled "A Proposal to Safeguard Investors in Unregistered Securities"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 6662. A bill to establish a United States Air Force Academy at Alexandria, La.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 6663. A bill to provide for a technical cooperation program to promote the production of coffee in southeast Asia in accordance with the principles and objectives of the point 4 program for the development of economically underdeveloped areas of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 6664. A bill to indemnify the Indians of Pine Ridge Reservation, S. Dak., for certain rights and lands taken from them by the War Department for an aerial gunnery range in time of war; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 6665. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) with respect to the computation of estimated costs of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction in the case of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6666. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide full annuities at compensation or half salary or wages based on the five highest years of earnings for individuals who have completed 30 years of service or have attained the age of 60; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 6667. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit retirement with full annuity at age 60 after 30 years' service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 6668. A bill to aid in promoting employment opportunities for members of minority groups; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6669. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 6670. A bill to incorporate the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H. R. 6671. A bill relating to cotton acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 6672. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) with respect to the computation of estimated costs of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction in the case of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 6673. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, by providing for treble-damage actions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 6674. A bill to extend pension benefits to persons who served on certain vessels operated by the Army during the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 6675. A bill to provide for raising and strengthening the levees of the Indian Grave drainage district, located in the State of Illinois, in the interest of providing additional flood protection; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TACKETT:

H. R. 6676. A bill granting certain lands to the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 6677. A bill to encourage the prevention of water pollution by allowing amounts paid for industrial waste treatment works to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6678. A bill to relieve postmasters and other paying employees of the postal service from accountability for wrong payment of money orders in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 6679. A bill to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman and Clayton Antitrust Acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITAKER:

H. R. 6680. A bill to provide clerical allowances at certain post offices of the fourth class; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 6681. A bill to repeal provisions of law exempting labor organizations from the antitrust laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 6682. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) with respect to the computation of estimated costs of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction in the case of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 6683. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of the Hill River, Polk County, Minn., for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 6684. A bill to provide for the promotion of employees in the postal field service to meritorious and longevity salary grades; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6685. A bill to permit certain Government employees to receive credit for military service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 6686. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TAURIELLO:

H. R. 6687. A bill to liberalize the loan provisions in the Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. J. Res. 393. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1950, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 394. Joint resolution to provide for printing the Daily Digest of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a separate publication; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. J. Res. 395. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. Con. Res. 152. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings relative to the Federal Fair Employment Practice Act for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. Con. Res. 153. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Committee Print No. 14 for the use of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. Res. 418. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings relative to development of the United Nations into a world federation for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. Res. 419. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 2105, a bill to stimulate exploration for the conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. Res. 420. Resolution relative to Members' incomes and voting records; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 421. Resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives to provide for publishing the voting record of each Member in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 6688. A bill for the relief of Benito Di Pietro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H. R. 6689. A bill for the relief of Mitsuko Uemura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6690. A bill for the relief of Conrad D. Croninger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 6691. A bill for the relief of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6692. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Blaine W. Hughes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6693. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Martha P. Matthews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6694. A bill for the relief of Ervin Haas and Leno Vescovi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6695. A bill for the relief of Edgar F. Russell; Lillian V. Russell, his wife; and Bessie R. Ward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6696. A bill for the relief of Lawrence B. Williams and his wife, Viva Craig Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 6697. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Howard H. Moran; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 6698. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lowell Harris Spotted Elk and Benjamin Spotted Elk; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 6699. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land on the Rosebud Reservation, S. Dak., allotted to Susan Eagle Dog; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 6700. A bill to authorize the sale of certain allotted inherited land on the Rosebud Indian Reservation in South Dakota for the benefit of Solomon White Buffalo Chief; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 6701. A bill to authorize the sale of certain allotted inherited land of Charles Red Horse on the Rosebud Indian Reservation, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 6702. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lizzie Broken Leg Dillon; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 6703. A bill to authorize the sale of certain allotted inherited land on the Rosebud Indian Reservation, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 6704. A bill for the relief of Georgia Marino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6705. A bill for the relief of Salvatore De Marco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 6706. A bill for the relief of Clemente V. Matera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 6707. A bill for the relief of Sirius Proestopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY (by request):

H. R. 6708. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vasilios Georgantas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 6709. A bill for the relief of Ed Howard Russell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. R. 6710. A bill for the relief of Anna Samudovsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 6711. A bill for the relief of Robert Merrill Carter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6712. A bill for the relief of Leon Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 6713. A bill for the relief of George Tongas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 6714. A bill for the relief of Herman Jung Ho and his wife, Yen Wai Har; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 6715. A bill for the relief of Shafeec Abdallah Mansour and his wife, Eleanor Mansour, and their two children, Nabeel Mansour and Erika Randa Mansour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TACKETT:

H. R. 6716. A bill for the relief of John H. Parker; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 6717. A bill for the relief of Hugo Skala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1589. By Mr. GORSKI: Petition of the Buffalo Sewer Authority, favoring an amendment of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to controlling pollution of interstate and boundary waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

1590. By Mr. HAGEN: Petition of Mrs. E. A. Koglin and sundry citizens of Thief River Falls, Minn., favoring House bill 2428 and a companion Senate bill, proposed legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and to prohibit the broadcasting of such advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1591. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of citizens of Plains, Kans., requesting the passage of a bill to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in the press and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1592. Also, petition of citizens of Wellington, Kans., requesting the passage of a bill to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in the press and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1593. Also, petition of Hopewell United Presbyterian Church, Beloit, Kans., opposing House bill 2100 and Senate bill 1029 and other bills to repeal the tax on cabaret admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1594. By Mr. MARSHALL (by request): Petition of Miss Marion Alexander and other citizens of St. Cloud, Minn., requesting the passage of a bill to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through the newspapers and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1595. Also, petition of Mrs. Florence Shutter and other citizens of Burtrum and Swanville, Minn., requesting the passage of a bill to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through the newspapers and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1596. Also, petition of Mrs. Frank Rhode and other citizens of Benton and Stearns Counties, Minn., requesting the passage of a bill to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through the newspapers and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1597. Also, petition of Miss Alice Nicols and sundry citizens of the Sixth District, Minnesota, requesting the passage of a bill to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through the newspapers and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1598. Also, petition of Mrs. F. E. Fairchild and other citizens of Aitkin, Minn., requesting the passage of a bill to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through the newspapers and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1599. Also, petition of Mrs. William Robinson and other citizens of Paynesville and Richmond, Minn., requesting the passage of a bill to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through the newspapers and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1600. By Mr. PETERSON: Petition signed by Mrs. Ellen Waters, Tampa, Fla., and others, regarding the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising on the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1601. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of citizens of Brattleboro, Vt., and vicinity, for reduction in taxes and opposing legislation undermining our constitutional democracy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1602. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Walter Whitaker and others, Waynesville, Ohio, requesting the passage of a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1603. Also, petition of P. V. Draa and others, Daytona Beach, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1604. Also, petition of the president, Orlando Townsend Club, No. 2, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1605. Also, petition of Charles H. Nutting and others, Ormond, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1606. Also, petition of Huey Bailey and others, De Ridder, La., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1607. Also, petition of the secretary, Ninth District Dental Society, New York, requesting Congress not to enact any legislation containing the principles of compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 10, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, we turn to Thee from the perplexities and uncertainties which daily beset us, and bewildered by the confusion of the world we pray for relief from disquieting, cowardly fears. Lead us past all shams and subterfuges to Thyself. Our littleness needs Thy greatness. Our weakness needs Thy strength.

Grant this dear land of liberty in hours that are heavy with crisis the strength of purpose to do justly and to love mercy. Save us from self-interest and self-righteousness, and make us the true servants of Thy will in this troubled time. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

STYLES BRIDGES, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, and MARGARET CHASE SMITH, a Senator from the State of Maine, appeared in their seats today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the

Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 9, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

COMMITTEE SESSION DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. FULBRIGHT, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Magnuson
Anderson	Gurney	Maybank
Benton	Hayden	Morse
Brewster	Hendrickson	Murray
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Neely
Bridges	Hill	O'Conor
Butler	Holland	Robertson
Byrd	Humphrey	Russell
Cain	Hunt	Saltonstall
Capehart	Ives	Schoeppel
Chapman	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Darby	Kefauver	Stennis
Donnell	Kem	Taft
Douglas	Kilgore	Taylor
Downey	Knowland	Thomas, Okla.
Dworshak	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	Leahy	Thye
Ecton	Lehman	Tobey
Ellender	Lodge	Tydings
Ferguson	Long	Vandenberg
Flanders	Lucas	Watkins
Frear	McCarran	Wherry
Fulbright	McCarthy	Wiley
George	McFarland	Williams
Gillette	McKellar	Young
Graham	McMahon	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business as members of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, holding hearings on various flood-control and public-works projects in the State of New Mexico.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, holding hearings on various flood-control and public-works projects in the State of New Mexico.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Public Works.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order of the Senate of yesterday, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is entitled to the floor.

The pending question is the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] to the original bill, but not to the substitute.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] commences his address upon the pending measure, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and submit routine matters for the body of the RECORD and for the Appendix, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the War Claims Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOOVER COMMISSION REPORT ON EDUCATION—LETTER FROM EDGAR FULLER TO JAMES B. CONANT

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, and referred to the appropriate committee, a letter addressed to President James B. Conant, chairman, schools and university committee, Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, from Edgar Fuller, executive secretary of the National Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D. C., relating to the Hoover Commission report on education.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS,
Washington, D. C., December 27, 1949.

President JAMES B. CONANT,
Chairman, Schools and University Committee, Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, Cambridge, Mass.

DEAR PRESIDENT CONANT: The Hoover Commission report on education is startling and disappointing. Without discussion, it dogmatically reverses the principal recommendations of its own excellent task force on education, this council, the National Education Association, the American Association of School Administrators, and most other professional groups and individual educators. It also does violence to the views of the great majority of citizens who believe in the American practice of keeping local, State, and Federal educational agencies politically nonpartisan.

The Commission's recommendation that the Federal agency for education be subjected completely to the executive orders of a political officer, the proposed Secretary of Welfare, violates our national principles and ignores our national experience in education. This would eliminate the already inadequate professional freedom of the United States Commissioner of Education and of the professional educators in the Office of Education. It would open the way for a measure of political domination of education and thought control approaching that by which Hitler and Stalin built their dictatorships. It would inaugurate a new pattern of Federal educational government, similar to politically controlled systems in foreign countries few Americans care to imitate. We believe the educational system developed in the United States is better for a democracy.

Another dogmatism, again without reasons given, resignedly suggests that educational functions must continue to be scattered throughout the noneducational executive branches of the Federal Government, without reference to its educational agency.

It is difficult to believe the Hoover Commission considered these matters thoroughly. Two members of the Commission led the successful effort to defeat Reorganization Plan No. 1 in the Senate last August. Plan 1 would have done for education exactly what the Commission recommended; it would have created a new Department of Welfare with complete absorption of the United States Office of Education. It is true that organization of Federal medical services was the major issue of the debate, but the fundamental issue of educational freedom from partisan political control was also emphasized by these two members of the Commission as well as by numerous other Senators.

There are other reasons to believe that the Commission was too greatly influenced in its recommendations on education by a small minority of its membership. One member has vehemently favored subordination of education to partisan political government at all levels, including appointment of local superintendents of schools by municipal officials rather than by nonpartisan school boards, while others have seemed almost unaware of the educational issues in the report.

Certain divisions of the Citizens Committee on the Hoover Report have attempted to convince Congress and the public that acceptance of the report must be on an all-or-none basis. Any questioning on any detail raises the cry that the omnipotence and infallibility of the Commission must not be doubted and brings the charge that "everyone believes in economy and efficiency in government until he is affected." In the case of education, economy and efficiency are to be found in the direction opposite from that urged by the Commission. We hope this all-or-none approach will not be tolerated by your Committee on Schools and Universities.

The cavalier treatment of education by the Commission will be increasingly resented both by the public and by professional educators as the facts become known. We intend to make them known and hope for your assistance. The terrible mistakes of the Commission in this field must not be uncritically swept into law along with others of its proposals. We hope you will use your great influence, as a friend of our American system of education, to defeat all recommendations of the Commission concerning education except that leading to transfer of the education functions of the Bureau of

Indian Affairs to the United States Office of Education.

With highest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

EDGAR FULLER,
Executive Secretary.

OLEOMARGARINE AND BUTTER—LETTER FROM WILLIAM J. MURPHY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by William J. Murphy, dairy commissioner of the State of North Dakota, dealing with the subject of oleomargarine and butter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Bismarck, N. Dak., January 6, 1950.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
The Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am again asking for your help in behalf of the dairy farmers of North Dakota. The oleomargarine bill is before the Senate for debate, but I would first like to express the appreciation of the dairy farmers of North Dakota for the assistance you have given us during previous sessions of Congress on this controversial issue.

If the oleomargarine bill is passed as is recommended by the Senate committee with all restrictions removed as to licenses and taxes on the colored product without any safeguards set up to protect the consumers against the fraudulent sale of oleomargarine, colored and sold as butter, and to protect our entire national dairy industry; it will certainly mean a necessary curtailment in dairy farming.

North Dakota, as one of the major butter-producing States, is vitally interested in this issue; and when, in trying to promote the expansion of dairying in our State, we are met with the question by our dairy farmers as to what will happen to our butter industry if we are forced to meet competition with the unrestricted sale of oleomargarine colored to resemble butter.

As you probably know, all of the major dairy organizations in the Nation are in favor of a repeal of all licenses and taxes on margarines providing that safeguards are put into the bill making it illegal to color the product to resemble butter.

One of the largest manufacturers of oleomargarine, Lever Bros., as a plaintiff in a court case against one of their competitors, won a decision, which in effect stated that no other soap company could make a bar of soap colored red to resemble their Lifebuoy soap.

In a recent court case brought by the Food and Drug Administration against a soft-drink manufacturer, the court ruled that synthetic orange color and flavor could not be added to a soft drink, as such addition would, in effect, make the soft drink appear to be a more valuable product than it really was.

Through the years that we have had this controversial issue before Congress, we believe that it has been pretty well established that the only reason the oleomargarine people have for using the yellow coloring of butter, is to make it as nearly like butter as possible in order to fool the public.

Some oleo manufacturers are at the present time using dairy terms on their cartons, such as Grade A or Grade AA, which terms are used by the Federal Government in establishing grades on butter.

Speaking for the dairy farmer living in North Dakota, I would like to state that we would appreciate very much, anything you can do to prevent the wrecking of our North Dakota butter industry.

Thanking you again for your past efforts and assuring you that all of our farmers will appreciate anything you can do for them, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WM. J. MURPHY,
Dairy Commissioner.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. 2813. A bill for the relief of certain Mexican aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2814. A bill for the relief of Mir Abzul (Meer Afsar); and

S. 2815. A bill for the relief of Ali Washid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 2816. A bill to provide for the designation of the Heart-Butte dam and reservoir project in Morton County, N. Dak., as the Tschida Reservoir and Dam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

S. 2817. A bill for the relief of Dr. C. A. Schenck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 2818. A bill for the relief of Mariella Ripiesi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2819. A bill to provide for an unemployment reinsurance fund; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 2820. A bill for the relief of Marie Neubert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. FLANDERS introduced Senate bill 2821, relating to the compensation of employees of the Senate and House of Representatives, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MAYBANK introduced Senate bill 2822, to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Law (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 2823. A bill to liberalize the loan provisions in the Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LUCAS (for Mr. MYERS):

S. 2824. A bill for the relief of Tannous Estephan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 2825. A bill to provide for the promotion of employees in the postal field service to meritorious and longevity salary grades; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2826. A bill to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 2827. A bill for the relief of certain Italian aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE (by request):

S. 2828. A bill to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to establish and continue offices in the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Finance.

OPERATION OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act, which deals with the operation of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The bill is the result of long and careful study by members of the staff of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, assisted by representatives of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Secretary of the Treasury. Generally speaking, it provides for certain technical changes in the law which have been shown to be desirable in its administration during the 16 years of the Corporation's activities.

However, there are certain features of the bill upon which there is likely to be some disagreement, but the committee will undertake to iron out these differences and report the bill in a form that all can approve.

Perhaps the provision that will be most discussed is that dealing with assessments against insured banks. The money realized from these assessments is used to pay insurance losses and the operating expenses of the Corporation. Originally the Treasury and the Federal Reserve banks advanced $289,000,000 to provide the Corporation with its initial capital. Since beginning operation in 1934, the amount received from these assessments, which are at the rate of one-twelfth of 1 percent of total deposits, has enabled the Corporation to repay the amount advanced, to pay all losses and expenses for 16 years, and to build up its capital account to nearly one and a quarter billion dollars.

The bill I am introducing would authorize the Corporation to transfer to its capital account annually, beginning with the calendar year 1949, 40 percent of its net assessment income, and to credit the remaining 60 percent, pro rata, to insured banks against their assessments for the ensuing year.

Net assessment income is defined as the total assessment income during the calendar year less:

First. Operating costs and expenses during the year.

Second. Additions to reserves for losses during the calendar year, except that any adjustments to reserves resulting in a reduction of such reserves shall be added.

Third. Insurance losses sustained during the calendar year plus losses from any preceding years in excess of reserves.

Currently the Corporation's annual assessment income is approximately $120,000,000. Its losses and expenses during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949, were $6,700,000, leaving $113,000,000 to be added to surplus. Application of the formula in this bill to these figures would permit addition to surplus of about $69,000,000, leaving $44,000,000, or a little more than one-third of the gross assessment income for the year, to be prorated among insured banks as a credit against assessments for the following year.

Another important change proposed is an increase in the maximum insurable account from $5,000 to $10,000. This would increase the number of insured accounts from 96 percent to 98.4 percent of the total, and would increase the amount of insured deposits from 44.8 percent to 52.4 percent of total deposits.

I am reminded that the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan is the only Member of the Senate who worked directly with that far-seeing group who were responsible for the establishment of the plan for insurance of bank deposits 16 years ago. I take the liberty of assuring him that in my opinion the people of the United States owe him a lasting debt of gratitude for his part in providing the Nation with this agency for restoring, strengthening, and maintaining confidence in our banks. Its successful operation and its present sound financial position fully justify his wise judgment and effective work in that behalf.

The bill (S. 2822) to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Law (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264), introduced by Mr. MAYBANK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES OF SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill relating to the compensation of the employees of the Senate and House of Representatives. I will say that in the closing hours of the last session Congress passed the legislative pay bill which continued the complicated structure of basic salaries and total salaries. The bill I am now introducing is simply intended to do away with the three percentage additions to basic salary and make the basic salary the same as the actual salary.

The bill (S. 2821) relating to the compensation of employees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, introduced by Mr. FLANDERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL FOR OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES, SENATE

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 207), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate, in equal monthly installments from January 1 to June 30, 1950, to the official reporters of Senate debates and proceedings the sum of $6,000 for the employment of additional office personnel.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS ON THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

[Mr. DOUGLAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the budget submitted by the President on January 9, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSALS AFFECTING THE DAIRY INDUSTRY AND AGRICULTURE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD material prepared by him relative to the reactions of the dairy industry of Wisconsin and the Pure Milk Products Cooperative of Fond du Lac, Wis., to proposals affecting dairying and agriculture, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESSES BY HON. LOWELL B. MASON AND HON. JAMES M. MEAD AT SWEARING-IN CEREMONIES

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD addresses by Hon. James M. Mead and Hon. Lowell B. Mason at the swearing-in ceremonies of former Senator James M. Mead as a member of the Federal Trade Commission, November 16, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

BOOZE HAS NO CONSCIENCE—EDITORIAL FROM THE GRAND RAPIDS (MINN.) HERALD-REVIEW

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Booze Has No Conscience," published in the Grand Rapids (Minn.) Herald-Review of January 5, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS OF THE CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM—ARTICLE BY CHARLES WALLACE COLLINS

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Constitutional Aspects of the Truman Civil-Rights Program," written by Charles Wallace Collins, and published in the Illinois Law Review of Northwestern University, which appears in the Appendix.]

LIMITATION OF A BEQUEST TO DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS OF FAMILY—ARTICLE FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the officers and members of the Senate are cordially invited to lend their ears to the reading of an unusual, interesting, and inspiring article that appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on the 7th of last December. A proper caption for this article would be "A prodigal son returns to his political home." An appropriate text for what it says would be: "Joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons, which need no repentance."

It is my hope that the Senate will consider the foregoing opinions fully justified by what I now proceed to read:

SEVEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS BEQUEST TO FAMILY IF ALL ARE DEMOCRATS

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., December 7.—Harvey B. Whitten, northern California peach grower, left most of his $750,000 estate to his two brothers and four sisters—and told them to become Democrats.

Whitten, who died November 17 at the age of 69, said this in his will filed for probate yesterday:

"I have specifically requested my brothers and sisters to renounce the Republican National Party, its policies, and platform, and to vote henceforth a straight Democratic National Party ticket.

"The reason for this is that my estate was accumulated solely under the Democratic administration. It is, therefore, my desire that no Republican Party member receive anything from the distribution of my estate."

Winston A. Langlois, attorney for the executors of the will, said Whitten's statement was probably merely to show his desire that heirs should be Democrats.

"There isn't any clause in the will which specifically disinherits a Republican," Langlois said. "But it's a nice legal question."

Mrs. Anna Whitten Ross, who came here from her home in Charlottesville, Va., for the hearing on her brother's will, said she didn't think there would be any trouble.

"In fact," she said, "I think the family are all Democrats. They may have strayed now and then. I think Harvey just wanted to be sure they stayed Democrats."

Mr. President, if there be any other wanderer from the Democratic pathway of happiness, prosperity, and peace, let him remember, that—

> While the lamp holds out to burn,
> The vilest sinner may return.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for the past several days the pending business before the Senate has been H. R. 2023, and the amendment which has been offered in the nature of a substitute. Every time we reach the consideration of this very vital piece of legislation we find ourselves moving off on a slow boat to China. So, today, I should like to return to home port, to the pending business of the Senate, and continue with the discussion of this proposed legislation. I have observed that oleo seems to be a rather slippery subject, and it continuously melts away under the impact of Senate heat. We will try to keep the discussion and the consideration of the measure today calm, cool, and deliberate, so that there will be no melting away of this vital issue.

Mr. President, it is my intention to vote for the Gillette-Wiley amendment to H. R. 2023, the bill we are now considering; an amendment of which I am a cosponsor; an amendment which is in the nature of a substitute for H. R. 2023. I fully appreciate the inequity of continuing the restrictive taxes on oleomargerine.

I am happy to join with my colleagues, virtually all of whom agree to the desirability of abolishing those taxes. The dairy farmers of America have no intention of being parties to any tax device which is designed to interfere with consumer free choice.

The issue involved in the legislation we now consider, however, is deeper than the proponents of the legislation would have us know. The issue is not one of farmers versus consumers. The dairy farmers of America, who are themselves consumers, fully appreciate the desirability and the necessity of protecting the consumer interest in any piece of legislation to be considered by the Congress of the United States.

I repeat, the issue is not one of farmers versus consumers; the issue is rather one of recognizing the necessity of farmers and consumers joining together in opposition to monopoly and threatened monopoly. It is in this spirit and it is with this emphasis I desire to address myself to this body today.

The 558,609 dairy farmers, Mr. President, are small-business men, who devote at least the majority of their time to the processing or to the production of dairy products. Many hundreds of thousands more have dairying as a small part of their operation. Thirty-eight thousand nine hundred and thirty small-business men dairy farmers, Mr. President, work

and live, bring up their children, and go to their churches, and engage in trade in my State of Minnesota. Many of them have organized cooperatives to assist them in their business activities. There are today more than 40,000 local plants all over the United States processing butter, milk, cheese, ice cream, and other dairy products. There are today 3,500 creameries scattered across our land and in every one of the 48 States, most of them owned by individuals or cooperatives. Butter, Mr. President, is a small man's operation. Butter making does not lend itself to a high-speed, concentrated, big-plant type of production because cream must be procured almost daily from literally millions of farms. Butter always has been and always will be essentially a small-business operation.

Contrast this picture with the industrial picture within the oleomargarine industry. The picture is one of growing monopoly. There are 28 oleomargarine companies, as compared to 3,500 creameries, as compared to 40,000 dairy plants, as compared to more than two and one-half million farmers who were engaged, in some part of their business, in dairying operations. There are 28 oleomargarine companies, but only 5 of these produce approximately two-thirds of the total amount in the United States. Processors and refiners of domestic oils used in the production of oleomargarine are even more limited in number, with merely a handful of companies controlling the industry.

I invite the attention of this body to the list of oleomargarine brands which account for 68.4 percent of the total sales of this product in the United States. They are as follows, "Nucoa," "Parkay," "Allsweet," "Blue Bonnet," and "Del-Rich." Only a few months ago the total production of these five major dominant brands were supplying more than 61 percent of the national output, as compared to a figure of 68.4 percent today—an increase, within a period of less than a year, on the part of these five companies, of 7 percent of the total oleomargarine production. The five largest oleomargarine names, therefore, are growing more and more dominant in the industrial scene.

The issue, therefore, is in a real sense one of small business versus big business. Evidence of this is seen in efforts of big business oleomargarine to advance its self-interest at the expense of the American dairy farmer. It is estimated that half a million dollars a month is being spent in behalf of this legislation by oleomargarine advertisers and publicity representatives. This is, of course, an expenditure which cannot be matched by small dairy plants, however numerous they may be. This explains to a large extent the reason why the case in behalf of the American dairy farmer has not been adequately presented to the American people.

My particular emphasis at this time, however, is not toward the five dominant brands in oleomargarine, dangerous as that threat which I have described may be. It is toward a sixth brand and the potentialities in its growth that I wish to direct the particular attention of my colleagues. The name of that brand is "Good Luck," and it is produced by the John Jelke Co., a property of Lever Bros. Co. operating in this country.

Although today the Good Luck brand of oleomargarine claims only 4.4 percent of the American oleomargarine market, the modesty of that assertion should not deceive us. Potentially, the international fats and oils cartel associated with the John Jelke Co. through its parent company, Unilever, Ltd., of London, England, is the greatest threat to the welfare of the American dairy farmer that has yet been posed by this synthetic age in which we live, and is therefore a threat to our whole economy. Unilever—with its headquarters in London—represents the largest single factor of the world supply of fats and oils, purchasing and processing more than 2,000,000,000 tons of the total 5,800,000,000 tons in world consumption.

A GIGANTIC MONOPOLY

The one company, Unilever, Ltd., alone, manufactures more soap and oleomargarine than any other company in the world, including 75 percent of all the oleomargarine eaten in Europe outside of Russia, and about 40 percent of the world's total consumption of oleomargarine. At the time of the purchase of the John Jelke Co., spokesmen for Lever Bros. Co. in London were quoted as saying that they expected their new American property to grow into the biggest oleomargarine company to be found anywhere. Representatives of the company have stated publicly that the John Jelke Co. would expand its operations to all 48 States, and that management had plans to build new oleomargarine plants on both the east and west coasts.

A company, Mr. President, of the vastness of Unilever, Ltd.—this great cartel—is well able to carry out such plans. It now owns throughout the world some 33 soap and toilet preparation plants; 57 plants for the manufacture of oleomargarine and other edible fats; 68 oil refineries; 24 oil-hardening plants; and more than 40 other plants of an auxiliary type. Those plans are situated in 43 different countries. In addition, Unilever, Ltd., owns vegetable-oil plantations covering 100,000 acres in the United Africa group, served by 15 oceangoing vessels and 2 large river fleets. Before the war Unilever used in its factories over 1,750,000,000 tons of oils and fats annually, and they did not come from the United States of America.

Unilever's announcement of its plans to make the John Jelke Co. the largest oleomargarine manufacturer in America is no idle threat, even in this country. Its subsidiary is already one of the two largest soap-manufacturing concerns in America, with plants in Edgewater and Hoboken, N. J.; Baltimore, St. Louis, Chicago; and Hammond, Ind. Last year it purchased Rayve cream shampoo, America's largest-selling hair preparation. It has entered the field of synthetic washing preparations with a new product called Breeze, and also produces an all-purpose soapless detergent for general household use under the brand name of Surf. It has built a plant exclusively for the manufacture of this product at Edgewater, N. J., adjacent to the Spry plant, which it also owns. Thomas Lipton Tea, another subsidiary of Unilever, Ltd., continues to expand its sales and to set new records in competition with American merchants.

DOMESTIC OIL PRODUCERS MAY LOSE MARKETS

This vast international cartel has every reason to be confident of its strong position on the basis of actual past performance. Over 41,000 tons of palm oil are produced annually on the company's plantations in the Belgian Congo alone. I wish to remind my fellow Senators that palm oil, before the war, was the preferred raw material for the production of oleo.

Only when the war interrupted overseas supplies were our domestic oleo manufacturers induced to turn to cottonseed and soybean oils as sources of vegetable fats. There is nothing to prevent the oleomargarine manufacturers from returning to coconut oil and palm oil, produced by the equivalent of slave labor overseas, as a price lever with which to deprive the American dairy farmer of his market for both butter and vegetable oils.

To those who think that the American cotton farmer and the American soybean farmer are going to find a market for the vegetable fats of those commodities, I would have them look into the record and see where the raw material came from prior to the war for the processing of oleomargarine. At the present time a false hope is being extended because the price of the raw material in the United States is much higher than the price of coconut oil or palm oil produced in the Belgian Congo or in the jungles of Africa.

Unilever's expansion of facilities is continuing on every continent. The Dutch branch of Unilever, Ltd., is already erecting new plants in Indonesia. How much more attractive, then, is the American market? The president of Unilever's Dutch branch, Dr. Paul Rykens, created a sensation in the London office when he declared that economic possibilities in Indonesia were greater than those in Malaya; and in Malaya they have been getting some of the cheapest palm oil and coconut oil obtained any place in the world. What sort of sensation was created, we may wonder, by the statement of the Lever Bros'. spokesman who said that he expected their American property, John Jelke Co., to grow into the biggest margarine company in the world?

Yes; Unilever is probably the world's largest trading company. In many places where it sells goods to natives, it has no competition whatever. It is in complete control of much of its raw-materials resources, since the United Africa Co. supplies fats and oils for approximately one-fourth of all Unilever's products. Company spokesmen have refused to discuss its progress in the development of synthetic proteins, but there is much to suggest that the company is attempting to make its position even more secure through bypassing altogether natural sources of supply.

ARTIFICIAL MILK WILL BE NEXT

Administrative health officials in London have guessed, off the record, that Unilever, the corporation, is working on the production of artificial milk made with vegetable fats and synthetic proteins. If these efforts are successful, the dairy farmers of not only the United States but of the world can look elsewhere for their livelihood.

The picture we have, therefore, is what the economists call monolithic corporate control on an international scale, seeking and planning to expand its activities and its profits. Its London office, Unilever, Ltd., is considered to be the world headquarters of this international organization, but real financial control remains here in the United States with its American corporation.

This international organization now maintains that the manufacturing and the sale of yellow oleomargarine should not be regulated in the interests of fair competition. This corporation presumes to say, instead, that such regulation is unfair to its own products. It further contends that the dairy farmer has no right to the color yellow, despite the fact that for centuries yellow has been the one unique color by which butter could be identified at sight. Yet this same Lever Bros. Co., this same corporation, the dominant unit in a worldwide fats and oils cartel, was prompt to rush into court, back in 1934, with a lawsuit against Jay's Chemical Corp. over an exactly similar question of color.

The defendant company had been in existence for about 2 years. It manufactured a competing article, which it called Life-Guard Health Soap. The record disclosed that the defendant's purpose in so doing was to devise a product substantially like that of Lever Bros. Co.'s in color, odor, shape, and general appearance, and to market it under a name which would be so like that adopted and used by Lever Bros. Co. that it could be fairly termed an imitation.

Oleomargarine manufacturers such as Lever Bros. Co. have been guilty of similar imitations in copying the texture, flavor, odor, and shape of butter. They have imitated the appearance and size of the conventional butter carton, and have even copied the quarter-pound prints in which butter is marketed. They have used brand names which suggest that their oleomargarine is freshly churned—right from the hot jungles of Africa—or otherwise produced by methods similar to those used for butter, and they have not hesitated to use on their packages and in their advertisements not palm trees but farm scenes to suggest the cool country freshness of butter.

But apparently the rules that protect corporations against infringement of established quality and good will fail to protect 2,500,000 small dairy farmers against the same injustices. The color red in soap is claimed to be the exclusive property of Lever Bros. Co. when it is applied to a health soap—we know what it is that eliminates "BO"—Lifebuoy—but the color yellow is in the public domain—it belongs to anyone—when Lever Bros. Co. wants to use it to imitate another manufactured product. This is particularly true when the product to be imitated is made, not by another corporation with tough lawyers of its own, but by a host of small creameries.

The color of the defendant's soap, Lever Bros. Co. claimed in its suit, while of a slightly different shade than that of Lifebuoy, was sufficiently close to it to cause confusion between the two articles. Lever Bros. Co. said such confusion cost it a loss of sales and profits; the company protested. How much closer and more confusing is the imitation of butter by oleomargarine, which now seeks to usurp the exact color of butter? Lever Bros. Co. obtained an injunction against this competitor because, the court said, the defendant had almost completely copied the plaintiff's product in an effort to gain an advantage from the good will of the plaintiff's business. Yet what excuse can there possibly be for coloring oleomargarine yellow other than to gain an advantage from the good will built up by the butter makers of this country? The sole reason for wanting to imitate butter's naturally yellow color is to benefit by butter's reputation as a quality spread.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator mean to say butter is not colored?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course, the junior Senator from Minnesota does not mean to say butter is not colored. He merely says butter in its natural color is yellow, and yellow coloring is sometimes added to give it a sharper and more distinct color. But I am not so sure that the coloring competition arose when oleo started to color just a little bit, and the butter manufacturer said, "Possibly we had better color just a little bit more." So we have had a little competition as to which could get the most color into one of its spreads.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that at certain times of the year butter is very white?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is true that at certain times of the year butter is very light yellow, but it is not true that at certain times of the year butter is white. It is true that in its natural condition, after it has been bleached, oleo is white. Butter is never white. Butter may be slightly on the light side, but it is still, must I say, colored. It is similar to the case of any shade of color. For example, some people are dark, others are reasonably light.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Minnesota say the color of butter varies between a pale gold and a yellow?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota will be more than happy to accept that very fine, artistic description of the coloration of butter.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true at the present time that oleomargarine in a great many instances must be bleached before it can be sold?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I think that is true; because otherwise it would turn out to be green, if a certain kind of product were used; or it might turn out to be brown. We are perfectly willing that oleo shall have all the colors of the spectrum, all the colors of the rainbow, except the one color of which the cow has had a preemption for centuries.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Some years back, a Middle Western State permitted oleo to be sold, under condition, however, that it be colored green. I do not understand the Senator from Minnesota is making any such proposal, but is merely saying the color yellow in the spectrum should be reserved for butter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is my position, and I may say that as my remarks are developed I think my friend from South Carolina will see that the junior Senator from Minnesota is most liberal and most generous in his treatment of oleo as a consumer product. I can make this rather summary statement at this time: There is no intention on the part of the junior Senator from Minnesota to deny the opportunity for oleo to be sold to the American consumers, and I think I shall be able to advance a program this afternoon which will meet with the hearty support of those who today are somewhat in doubt.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Would the Senator from Minnesota object to oleomargarine being sold in whatever color it comes, and would the Senator object to butter being sold in whatever color it might come, at any time, anywhere?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. I think that would be a very good position. As a matter of fact, if we could return to the laws of nature—which at times are a great improvement over the laws of the Congress—I think we should find that about 80 percent of the time we would have butter that would be very sharply and perceptibly yellow, and that 20 percent of the time it would be, as my distinguished friend from Illinois said, of a light golden color. We would then permit oleo to have any of the normal colors which Mother Nature may have provided in its processes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. So the Senator would not object, then, to butter being sold in its natural color, and oleomargarine being sold in its natural color?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think that would be fine.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If that be so, why is it the Senator objects to oleomargarine being colored yellow, and tries to confine the yellow color to butter exclusively?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Because I merely happen to believe that it has apparently been God's will—I do not know who else willed it—that butter be yellow. Butter

was yellow long before the Congress of the United States had its first session. Butter was yellow long before we ever thought about excise taxes. Butter was yellow the first time someone got hold of a very ancient churn and started beating the cream.

We are not going to belabor merely the color, because I know my friend from South Carolina is interested in small business; I know he is interested in the welfare of the family; I know he is interested in the welfare of the consumer, and the welfare of the small-business producer. I do not believe that my friend from South Carolina is interested, for example, in one company which produces 40 percent of the oleomargarine of the world. I do not believe he is interested in the kind of cartel system under which three companies control more than 90 percent of the fats and oils of the world. I do not believe he is interested in the kind of economic system, if you please, which will literally gouge out of business and crush out of business the small independent operator. I believe the facts are disclosed in this address which point out to reasonable men that the greatest threat of the oleomargarine industry is not the threat of color competition; it is nct the fact that someone may want oleo in preference to butter. The threat is to the product of 2,500,000 American citizens who are the backbone of the country, the dairy farmers; to the 40,000 local plants, 3,500 creameries that are involved in the processing of dairy products.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe this is more a consumer's bill than it is a bill for the man engaged in agriculture, in the manufacture of oleomargarine, or in the dairy business.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very happy that my friend has brought that fact to our attention. It is a consumer's bill. Before I have completed my remarks today I hope I shall have shown the Senator, if he will stay with me, that the consumer's interests have never been protected from monopoly, from cartels, and from the growing concentration of economic power.

There is plenty of evidence to show that this is a well-timed piece of legislation. The people of the United States have been told that monopolies were good for consumers. The A. & P. Co. is running a full-page advertisement telling how good monopolies are for the people. It is good for them, so long as there is competition; but when competition is destroyed, monopolies take all the market will bear. The only time the consumer is ever protected is when there is competition. It is not good for the consumer to have a monopoly administer prices and have control over production and distribution.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask another question, if the Senator will yield further. At the present time, according to the way the law is written and the way in which oleomargarine is being sold, what difference would this bill make in the law?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The substitute proposal would repeal the taxes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. At the present time the taxes do not have anything to do with protecting the public, so far as monopoly is concerned.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I point out to my distinguished friend that the manufacture of butter has never been known as a monopoly. Butter may have been high priced; there may have been a shortage of it, but the manufacture of it has never been a monopoly. We can still go to grandma's farm and get a crock of butter.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator does not mean to say that the price of butter at the present time is any protection to the public, does he?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The price of butter is a good protection to the public. As a matter of fact, the Congress of the United States, without a dissenting vote in the Senate, voted for mandatory price supports for butterfat. That is the will of the people. I shall not talk about that. I thought that was settled at the last session of Congress. That is the established policy of the country.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think the Senator from Minnesota has missed the point I made. What I was trying to bring out was that at the present time he speaks of cartels which would come into effect if this tax were removed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, no. The Senator from Minnesota does not speak of that. The cartels have been in effect from the very beginning. There has always been a monopoly of fats and oils. Three major companies have formed themselves into a combination operating all over the world.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. So this bill would have nothing to do with that situation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say to the Members of the Senate and to the people of the United States that if we can protect Lifebuoy soap, which may be a good soap, if we can protect the color of Lifebuoy soap—and this is the first time I ever heard of the Government of the United States wanting to protect the color red; I gathered that we were interested in red only on the negative side—we can protect the American farmer. When it comes to butter, we have to rely upon the ingenuity, the individuality, and the indestructibility of the independent American farmer.

I should like to offer to those who have seen what they consider to be an injustice in our claim that the color yellow should be reserved for butter the following example:

It may be argued that red and yellow are two different colors, and that the commercial rights and privileges pertaining to one are not applicable to the other. If that be the case, let me cite the experience of the Yellow Taxicab Co., which did not hesitate to take its smaller competitors to court in order to establish its sole and exclusive right to the use of the color yellow on its cabs. I say to the Members of the United States Senate that automobiles are not manufactured with a yellow color; they are not created with a yellow coating. They come out as a steel product with sort of an ashen gray color. They are then coated. Nevertheless, the Yellow Taxicab Co. took unto itself the color yellow, and has been protected by our courts.

When it comes to cabs and Lifebuoy soap, red and yellow are sacred, but it is different when it comes to 2,500,000 dairy farmers, who produce a product known as milk, and out of milk we get butterfat, and when we churn butterfat we get a yellow product called butter.

Are we to believe, then, that there is one brand of justice for big business and another for the small, independent farmer? Are 3,500 main-street creameries throughout our 48 States of less importance than the five giant Wall Street corporations that control the oleomargarine business? Are dairy farmers to be penalized because the nature of their business does not permit its concentration in the hands of a few? Is it wrong for the family-sized farm to exist, and for dairy farmers in thousands of villages and hamlets to spend their local creamery checks in the stores of local merchants?

It is difficult to combat powerful groups such as the oleo lobby. The profit from the manufacture and sale of their synthetic product is very large—large enough to afford elaborate publicity campaigns and heavy expenditures of advertising money. Tide magazine has credited the oleo interests with an advertising budget of $6,400,000 in 1947 and $5,900,000 in 1948. Much of this money was spent, as I have already said, to convince housewives that oleo should be colored yellow at the factory in imitation of butter. Where did this money come from? I have seen figures indicating that a complete oleo plant, turning out 40,000 pounds daily, can be installed for around $75,000.

I do not desire to deny the oleo business an opportunity to grow. I merely do not want it to grow all in one or two places. I do not want to see all the oleo business known by the names of one or two people. The oleo business can be decentralized if it wants to be. If a plant can be built for $75,000, there can be three or four plants in every State, and if that is done, and the people in a State want colored oleo, they can have it. The question then is, Are we going to let monopolies produce all the oleo, or are we going to say to the oleo people, "Look. We are not aiding and abetting cartels."

I want to say to some of my friends from the South who are sponsors of this bill that the South and West have been exploited for generations through discriminatory freight rates. They have been exploited for generations through higher interest rates. If we are to have some new business, Minnesota has room for new business, South Carolina has room for new business. There is room for new business all over America. I see the Senator from Vermont rising. Vermont has room for new business.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator feel that if we are to enact legislation which

will result in the concentration of oleo manufacturing in two or three places in the country, he and I might have to reconsider our position on the basing-point legislation? Certainly we are not only unwilling to be penalized in the location of these plants, but we should not be penalized further by making the product cost us a great deal more than it does those who happen to live in the immediately vicinity of where oleo is to be manufactured.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his question, and, believe me, he is right. But when he mentioned basing point, I knew that was the signal for my distinguished friend the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] to enter the debate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to say further that I am not yet changing my position on the basing-point measure, because I feel that the Senate is not going to impose any such unfair conditions on the States of Minnesota and Vermont and other States as some individuals apparently are willing to do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Do I understand it to be the Senator's position that if some of the small dairies are going to be driven out of business we ought to let all the other small businesses be driven out of business?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The position of the junior Senator from Minnesota is that we ought not to drive small business out of business. But I think that if small business is to be driven out of business the people who are to do the driving ought to provide some program for making good the losses small businesses are going to incur.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. First, I should like to say that I regret very much that I was unable to hear the first part of the Senator's statement, because of an important meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee at which I felt obliged to be present.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say that I think the Senator missed the best part of the speech. I am sorry the Senator from Arkansas missed the first part of my speech.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will say that I know of no one who can make a better speech than the Senator from Minnesota, and I regret very much that I could not be present to listen to the first part of his speech.

One or two matters I think should be straightened out in the RECORD. On January 5, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] stated, as appears on page 78 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—and, as I understand the Senator from Minnesota, it holds somewhat the same theory—as follows:

> The Lever Bros. Co., which has taken over the Jelke Co. and handles 75 percent of the sales in Europe and 68 percent of the sales in the United States, is the same concern which went into a United States court and asked for protection against imitation of their product.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota does not agree with that, because Lever Bros. control only 4.4 percent of the production of oleomargarine in the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wanted to make that clear for the RECORD, and to draw the Senator's attention to a letter from Lever Bros.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is that letter in the RECORD?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It appears on page 166 of the House committee hearings. The letter states among other things that they had purchased John L. Jelke Co. on July 1, 1948, and it further states:

> The margarine industry uses very little imported oil, as the statistics show. We ourselves use none, nor do we import any margarine from outside the United States.

It further says:

> Our present share of the total production of margarine is between 4 and 5 percent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is my statement on the floor today.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am very glad the Senator has corrected that.

There is one other statement which I would appreciate the Senator allowing me to read. I shall read just two short paragraphs.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is from an agency which I think the Senator will admit is certainly impartial on this sort of thing. I read from the report of the Federal Trade Commission on the concentration of productive facilities, of 1947, page 64. I do not believe this has been read into the RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be happy to have it placed in the RECORD at this time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to quote it for the Senator's information at this time. It is not very long. I read from page 64 of the report of the Federal Trade Commission on the concentration of productive facilities, 1947. This is the statement of the Federal Trade Commission:

> The pattern of control in the processing and marketing of dairy products is rather similar to that of the meat-packing industry. Before World War I the dairy products industry was made up of small local units, either independently owned or under cooperative control. The contrast between the past and the present state of concentration is perhaps more striking in this field than in any other manufacturing industry.
>
> As the concentration curve for the industry shows, the two leading dairy corporations, National Dairy Products Corp. and the Borden Co., clearly dominate the industry, holding 27.5 and 21.4 percent, respectively, of the industry's net capital assets.

There is nothing comparable to this in the field of margarine manufacture. That is my statement. I continue to read from the report of the Federal Trade Commission:

> Thereafter the slope of the curve becomes much more gradual, with the third firm, the Carnation Co., holding 6.9 percent and five other corporations, with assets ranging from 2 to 4 percent of the industry's total, owning an additional 15.5 percent. Thus the eight largest firms control 71.3 percent of the total net capital assets of all corporations operating primarily in this field.
>
> Even these figures, however, substantially understate the degree of concentration affecting the ultimate consumer. This understatement stems from two factors: (a) Within the broad industry groups, concentration is frequently higher for important individual products; and (b) many of these individual products are highly perishable and can only be shipped within a limited market area, a circumstance which frequently results in a higher degree of concentration in local markets than is true of the country as a whole.

So if the Senator seeks to make a point about concentration in the margarine field, I say to him that it is much greater in the dairy field. We are interested in the maintenance of effective competition within a great industry. That is what we have traditionally relied upon to control prices.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall yield in a moment. I want to make the comment in reply to my friend, the Senator from Arkansas, that, first of all, he is talking about the dairy industry as a total pattern. The dairy industry as a total pattern is one thing, and the butter industry within the dairy industry is another.

I now yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I want to join in the remarks made by my colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] on the question of concentration of dairy products. The junior Senator from Minnesota is entirely right when he says we are dealing with the entire dairy industry. We are not separating the butterfat. The question now before us is butterfat versus oleomargarine. It is not a question of the other dairy products. Butterfat is simply one of the products which are processed in relation to the other dairy products. The reason for the great growth in the condensed milk market was military need, and the processing of a product that was not perishable. That was one reason why an increase resulted in the cheese production during the war years.

But the entire question is: Are we permitting or will we permit, by the legislation proposed by the oleomargarine supporters, the destruction of the butter market? If the butter market is destroyed it means the destruction of the individual creamery, and the entire dairy industry will be put in a position where it must rely on the condensaries to a great extent in processing our whole milk, because there is no free market in the Midwest, in the great diversified area, for milk sales, except through butterfat or through condensed milk, or cheese, and the market today is flooded with cheese. That can be found by referring to the Commodity Credit Corporation's record of the amount of cheese purchased.

The butter market is likewise flooded, as can be found by reference to the record of the Commodity Credit Corporation as to the amount of butter it has purchased in order to maintain and support the price of butter. For that reason there

has never been a time when it was so important to continue and to maintain the butter market as today.

The entire argument is not that of the condensaries. It is a question of whether a synthetic product, camouflaged to look and smell and taste like butter, processed entirely synthetically, shall take over and destroy the small individual farmer-owned, farmer-controlled, farmer-operated creamery throughout the entire diversified area of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank my colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Minnesota and those who uphold the butter position, cannot have it both ways. They either must take the choice they are taking respecting the dairy industry, or uphold the butter position. The other day, when the Senator from Iowa was talking about this matter, and I challenged the importance of butter, he and those supporting him were talking all the time about the great dairy industry which I am as much interested in preserving as they are. When that point is before the Senate for discussion they refuse to delimit or dissociate butter from the over-all milk industry. But now when we talk about concentration, then it is said we must look only at the butter industry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, no.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If we look only at the butter industry, then the point becomes very evident that it is of such slight importance to the over-all dairy industry that here is no real occasion to become excited about it. But I think the Senators from the dairy States must consider either one or the other, in making their points, because they shift their position so rapidly that it is difficult for the public to follow.

One other thought: What I am interested in here is not the margarine industry at all. This is not a fight between the margarine industry and the dairy industry. What I am interested in is the consumer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, yes; we have been talking about that all afternoon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator continually emphasizes the point that 500,000 persons are engaged in the dairy industry. Perhaps there are that many persons engaged in it, but there are 150,000,000 persons interested in the opportunity to obtain a nutritious food at one-half the cost of butter. That is what we are really interested in.

To put up this straw man of monopoly in margarine manufacture is entirely beside the point. I have no interest in margarine manufacturers at all. They are merely incidental to the whole question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We are seeking an opportunity for people to purchase a perfectly good product free from artificial and unnatural restrictions——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Fine.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Which have applied to no other product in all the history of this country's legislation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Marvelous. Now, since my friend, the Senator from Arkansas, is one of the most powerful defenders of States' rights, since he has said he does not believe the Federal Government should be interfering in these things, I say to my brother from Arkansas let us join together and we shall see that there is a little oleomargarine plant in every State of the Union, and we shall provide that those plants in every State of the Union will furnish jobs for small business, so that people of Arkansas can have Arkansas oleo, people of Minnesota can have Minnesota oleo—we are proud, too, you know, of our State—and so that people of California will be able to eat California oleo. Imagine the situation if people in California had to eat Florida oleo. There would be great social unrest in our country, in that case. [Laughter.]

What are we saying, Mr. President? We are saying to the proponents of this measure, "If you want white oleo, like oleo is before you get around to tinkering with it and coloring it——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How about butter? It is white, too, before you get to tinkering with it and coloring it. The Senator from Minnesota also knows that some oleomargarine is yellow, but the law prevents it from being sold with that yellow color; under the law, it cannot be sold until it is bleached white. Let us not confuse the issue, I say to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Some oleo is green, too, and it is necessary to bleach it. All of it must be bleached.

We are saying that those who want oleo can have it. Let us keep the record clear. They can have oleo colored any color they wish to have it. It can even be colored any hue of the rainbow, or even can be colored to look like Neapolitan ice cream. Those who wish to have oleo can have it colored any color they want to have it colored. It can even be put in boxes which look like butter boxes.

The manufacturers can even print on the boxes pictures showing dairy herds in Minnesota. We do not complain about that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Referring to the figures previously given by the Senator as to the monopolistic trend, the correct figure is that six companies control 60 percent of the total production of oleo; and, in the same way, eight dairies control 71 percent of the milk production. So we are about even; there is no great difference in that respect.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Arkansas says we are even, although of course that is a very debatable and disputable point.

All I say is that since the Senator from Arkansas has raised the noble, humanitarian cry about the interests of the consumer, let me ask, Who is opposed to the interests of the consumer? I will tell you, Mr. President. Every monopoly in the United States is opposed to the interests of the consumer. The monopolies are opposed to the consumer; the cartels are opposed to the consumer. Can he show me a single instance where a cartel ever helped a free-enterprise economy or ever did a small-business man any good? Cartels have gone down in infamy in our country. We are supposed to be breaking them up. But here it is said we are trying to hurt the consumer by denying him a chance to get oleomargarine.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would the Senator from Minnesota be agreeable to making the same provision as to color applicable to milk and cheese? Is it satisfactory to the Senator from Minnesota, with regard to the use of artificial color, that exactly the same provisions shall be applicable to butter; and also that exactly the same provisions be applicable to milk, namely, that no milk can be shipped in interstate commerce?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Milk is ordinarily white; is it not? White milk is obtained even from brown cows. [Laughter.]

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oleomargarine is ordinarily yellow. If its sale in its yellow color were not prohibited by law, and if oleomargarine were not required to be bleached white, that would be different. Butter is ordinarily white, during a large part of the year; but by law the butter industry is given a specific exemption from the necessity of complying with the same provisions with which the producers of oleomargarine are required by law to comply. The Senator from Minnesota overlooks the fact that affirmative legislation of the Congress has provided these restrictions; it is not a natural condition at all. This was done by affirmative legislation. That legislation requires the manufacturers of oleomargarine to make oleomargarine white in color. That is not its natural color. It has that white color only as a result of legislation enacted by the Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I suppose the Congress also makes the oleomargarine manufacturers make oleomargarine smell like butter, too; and I suppose the Congress also makes them put sodium benzoate in it, as a preservative, too, and makes them put a picture of a cow on the outside of the oleomargarine carton, too. Congress has absolutely nothing to do with all that.

As I said before in this debate, butter was yellow before the Congress of the United States ever was heard of. So it is about time that the Senator from Arkansas understood that the natural color of butter is yellow.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then, why is butter colored artificially?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sorry that some of my friends in the Senate have digressed from the oleomargarine debate to discuss Formosa. We have had too much trouble in the course of this debate with Formosa, whereas we should have stuck to one issue.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask the Senator to invite a vote on this issue. I am perfectly willing to have it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota is but one of the buck privates

in the ranks. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], whom I now see presiding over the Senate, which is a place entirely fitting and appropriate for him, and my compatriot, the Senator from Vermont, will settle the schedule for the vote.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure the Senator would like to have it pointed out that apparently the Senator from Arkansas does not expect that oleomargarine will be made from soybean and cottonseed oil in the future, because he said that the natural color of oleomargarine will be yellow. I understand that in order to make oleomargarine a natural yellow color, palm oil is the ingredient used. But it is very evident from the Senator's remarks and any suggestion that oleo be permitted to use a natural yellow color, that he contemplates foreign oils will be used in its manufacture in the future, rather than cottonseed and soybean oil, which do not make an attractive coloring for the finished product.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is sort of a greenish color; is it not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to state that the Senator is not correct. We had before the committee examples of cottonseed-oil oleomargarine with a color as yellow as butter. I do not expect everyone to agree with my suggestion, because I know the butter people will not agree to eliminating the artificial color of butter. So I have no expectation of securing such an agreement. I only propose it to show that the butter people are just as much interested, if not more so, as the oleomargarine people are in coloring their product.

All we ask is equal treatment. That is all we ask. We ask no favored treatment such as that which has been given to butter throughout the years. We do not ask to be relieved from the duty of putting on the carton a statement of what is inside the carton. Exemption from that requirement is the sole privilege of the butter people. That is an advantage they have had for many years. We do not seek that kind of advantage.

I know of no one who has any idea of using coconut oil for oleomargarine, in order to obtain a yellow color, because I know the butter people will not agree to the sale of yellow oleo or to the elimination of the use of artificial color in their own product.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Then will the Senator from Minnesota ask the Senator from Arkansas whether the oleomargarine people will agree to include in this bill a provision that oleomargarine shall not at any time be sold or advertised as a dairy product? That seems to be the principal bone of contention now, namely, that the oleomargarine people insist upon selling their product as a dairy product. The only excuse is that it contains a little bit of skim milk.

All of us know that it is widely misrepresented as a dairy product. I hold in my hand an advertisement clipped from a Vermont newspaper of last week. Vermont is one of the States that is said to be so tough on the oleomargarine industry that the consumers in Vermont cannot get oleomargarine, according to the inference which we might draw from the arguments which have been presented here.

Here is the advertisement:

Oleo, Golden Maid.

It is neither golden, nor do I suppose any maid had any part in its preparation. But there is the misleading inference that it is yellow oleomargarine. It is not.

After the words "Golden Maid," we see where the rub comes on the consumer:

One pound package, 19 cents.

I do not know why oleomargarine is being sold so cheaply in certain butter States at this time. Probably there is a reason for it. Nineteen cents is only about 10 cents a pound above the cost of manufacturing oleomargarine, and of course that is a very narrow spread for the oleomargarine interests.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is a very efficient industry; that is the reason for it.

Mr. AIKEN. But if the oleo interests were entirely sincere, I think they would not hesitate to agree that it should not be sold as a dairy product.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to proceed for a while. I informed some of my colleagues that we would try to get through with this portion of the discussion within a reasonable time; but the area of reasonableness was left behind about 20 minutes ago. So I should like to carry on. I shall yield later, because I do not desire to choke off questions. I think we have about exhausted this part of the discussion; but let me say that I have plenty more controversial material to present, and I wish to preserve some of the enthusiasm which still remains in the body politic here.

At this time, let me say that it is worth noting that the price of oleomargarine, as my colleague, the Senator from Vermont, said a moment ago, tends to follow the price of butter, and not the cost of its ingredients. This has been true since the very beginning of the industry, as ample testimony before the Senate Committee on Finance has demonstrated.

Government spokesmen have reported that the spread between grocery prices and farm prices is too wide. We have read a great deal about that. The percentage of the consumer's dollar for oleo returned to the farmer was a mere 31 percent in January 1949, as compared with 73 percent of the consumer's dollar for butter received by the dairy farmer. The price of farm ingredients used in a pound of oleo during January 1949 amounted to only 11.38 cents per pound, while the gross farm value of ingredients in a pound of butter in the same period was 54 cents.

A PRIME EXAMPLE OF ADMINISTERED PRICES

For several years now the Federal Trade Commission has requested that it be given an appropriation to enable an exhaustive investigation into administered prices in American industry. So far, no such investigation has been approved.

I submit that there is indisputable evidence of a classic example of the existence of administered prices in one industry that comes down here asking favors of this Congress year in and year out. There can be no doubt that in the oleomargarine industry there exists a veritable model of a tightly knit monopoly with an example of administered prices that is matched by perhaps no other leading industry.

I should like to list a few of the factors which indicate that existence of this monopoly, and the prevalence of administered prices.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a very short observation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator wish to imply that the manufacturers of oleo are asking a favor?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator was not only leaving the implication; the Senator was making the assertion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator feel that to ask for the removal of a positive application of law designed to restrict the manufacture of oleo is asking a favor?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has attempted all day long to tell his distinguished friend from Arkansas that insofar as the proponents of the Gillette-Wiley bill are concerned, we believe in the removal of taxes—which was the first hue and cry of the oleo industry. There is no argument about that. Secondly, we believe every American ought to be able to buy oleo in interstate commerce.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator feel that there is any indication of administered prices in the fact that oleo is at this time advertised to sell at 19 cents a pound in Vermont, whereas it is selling for 35 cents a pound in the District of Columbia?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall come to that. That is not only administered prices; it is exactly what I meant by one of the facets of the monopoly structure, which enables the price to be handled in that manner for the purpose of destroying competition.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the oleo to which the Senator from Vermont referred yellow or white?

Mr. AIKEN. It is advertised as Golden Maid oleo.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it yellow or white?

Mr. AIKEN. If it is yellow oleo, it is being sold in violation of the State law. I think it is white.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator recognizes there is a difference. A big part of the difference is represented by the tax.

Mr. AIKEN. It is not a tax on the part of the State of Vermont.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I mean a tax on the part of the Federal Government. It is a tax of 10 cents.

Mr. AIKEN. Is there any significance in the fact that yellow oleomargarine, for instance, if it could be sold legally, would be sold for 29 cents a pound in the State of Vermont, while in the District of Columbia the consumer is asked to pay 35 cents a pound?

Mr. HUMPHREY. He pays 45 cents a pound.

Mr. AIKEN. As the Senator from Minnesota says, it is a completely administered price. The price is made what the manufacturers want it to be. They can sell it at a loss in one State, for a particular purpose, and make up the loss by overcharging in another area of the country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota wishes to proceed, because I think what has been pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, and the conflict which comes from the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, will be developed probably in the remarks on the administered price structure.

PRICE BEARS NO RELATIONSHIP TO COSTS

The price of oleomargarine, perhaps more than that of any other product, exemplifies the custom of charging whatever the traffic will bear. Throughout recent years the price of oleomargarine has borne no relationship whatsoever to the cost of producing it. Several different statistical series can be cited to prove this contention.

For example, I should like to refer you to quotations showing the percentage of fats and oils prices to the price of oleomargarine. If one examines this ratio over the years since 1925, he will find that the percentage of fats and oils prices ranged from 45 percent to 76 percent. Let us button down what that range means. Briefly it means that the ratio of the actual price of oleomargarine to the price of its principal ingredients has deviated by almost 100 percent. In other words, the price of oleo, in reference to the cost of the commodities which have gone into the oleo and the labor which has gone into it, has deviated 100 percent.

The failure of oleomargarine prices to reflect costs was particularly apparent last summer. Between May and November 1948, for example, cottonseed oil dropped from 41 to 20 cents a pound, or almost 50 percent. However, during that same period, the price of oleo declined from only 44 to 38 cents a pound, or less than 15 percent.

Here is an unanswerable demonstration of the complete control over prices maintained by the oleomargarine trust.

I now submit for the record a chart showing the relative price movements of butter, oleomargarine, butterfat, and fats and oils used in oleomargarine from 1925–48, taken from the Senate hearings on this bill found as table 25, pages 114 and 115 of the hearings. These data are based on official Department of Agriculture price statistics.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 25.—*Relative price movements of butter, oleomargarine, butterfat, and fats and oils used in oleomargarine, 1925–48*

Year	Butter, 92-score (Chicago)	Oleomargarine vegetable (Chicago)	Price received by farmers for butterfat [1]	Average price of fats and oils used in oleomargarine	Percent of oleomargarine price to butter price	Percent of fats and oils price to price of oleomargarine
	Cents per pound	*Cents per pound*	*Cents per pound*	*Cents per pound*		
1925	44.1	22.5	42.4	12.2	51.0	54.2
1926	42.8	21.3	41.6	13.2	49.8	62.0
1927	45.8	21.2	44.5	9.3	46.3	43.9
1928	46.0	21.0	46.1	11.4	45.7	54.3
1929	43.8	20.5	45.2	10.2	46.8	49.8
1930	35.3	19.0	34.5	9.1	53.8	47.9
1931	27.0	14.0	24.8	6.6	51.9	47.1
1932	20.1	11.2	17.9	5.4	55.7	48.2
1933	20.8	10.5	18.8	5.2	50.5	49.5
1934	24.8	9.8	22.7	6.6	39.5	67.3
1935	28.8	15.1	28.1	10.3	52.4	68.2
1936	32.0	15.1	32.2	10.1	47.2	66.9
1937	33.2	15.8	33.3	10.1	47.6	63.9
1938	27.1	15.5	26.3	8.1	57.2	52.3
1939	25.4	14.7	23.9	7.3	57.9	49.7
1940	28.7	14.8	28.0	6.8	51.6	45.9
1941	33.8	15.8	34.2	10.9	46.7	69.0
1942	39.5	19.0	39.6	14.2	48.1	74.7
1943	[2] 44.0	19.0	49.9	14.3	43.2	75.3
1944	[2] 41.5	19.0	50.3	14.6	45.8	76.8
1945	[2] 42.3	19.0	50.3	14.8	44.9	77.9
1946	61.9	23.0	64.3	18.2	37.2	79.1
1947	70.6	36.9	71.8	28.2	52.3	76.4
1948	75.2	37.1	78.6	27.2	49.3	73.3

[1] Weighted average.

[2] Prices of butter shown reflect actual wholesale trading and include the wholesale mark-up permitted under OPA, MPR as amended.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is another series of data which prove the same point. I refer to the Department of Agriculture's figures showing the farmer's share of the retail price of oleomargarine. This series is available from 1919 to the present. It shows that the farmer's share of the retail price of oleomargarine has ranged from a low of 19 percent to a high of 36 percent. This very wide deviation in relationship of the farmer's share to the retail price proves once again that the price of oleomargarine bears very little relationship to the cost of producing it.

It should be apparent that if oleomargarine prices were set competitively, the relationship of its going price to the price of the principal ingredients used in its production would remain fairly constant. The fluctuation or deviation over the years, if any, would be relatively minor in scope and extent. Certainly no genuinely competitive product could show the very extreme deviation in relationship of price to costs reported for oleomargarine.

In order to prove the point, just consider what comparable data show for butter. The farmer's share of the retail price of butter shows a gradual trend upward over a period of years, rising from 69 percent in 1919 to the current figure of around 80 percent. The fluctuation through the years was never more than a few points. This, of course, is what you would expect, since butter must reflect its cost of production, and the farmer who produces it gets the overwhelming share of the sales price.

OLEO PRICE RATIO TO BUTTER ALWAYS THE SAME

While oleo prices do not reflect the cost of producing the article, they always bear the same relationship to butter prices. Roughly, throughout the years, oleo prices as reported to the Department of Agriculture are just about half the price of butter for the same period. That was the situation in 1923 and in 1933, and was still the situation in 1946 and 1947. The price of the product is carefully controlled as the Senator from Vermont pointed out, to meet the price of butter.

NUMBER OF UNITS IDEAL FOR ADMINISTERED PRICE INDUSTRY

The make-up of this industry readily explains its ability to control prices regardless of the trend in production costs. Five major companies—the Senator from Arkansas says six—turn out more than 65 percent of the total production of oleomargarine, as we have seen. The industry as a whole numbers only 28 concerns.

There is probably no other industry in the country, comparable in sales volume, which is dominated by so few concerns. The steel industry, for example, which we often talk about as being one of the trusts, one of the monopolies, includes more than 100 separately owned companies, and there are several hundred meat-packing concerns.

The tightly knit control exercised by these relatively few large manufacturers is evidenced by the behavior of oleomargarine prices, which we have already cited.

RAW MATERIALS TIGHTLY CONTROLLED

One other characteristic of an administered price industry is also present in the case of oleomargarine. By the way, Mr. President, if I may digress for a moment, we have heard a good deal of complaint about Government-controlled prices. During the days of wartime emergency we had Government-controlled prices. There was a good deal of discussion and a good deal of criticism in connection with Government-controlled prices. But what do we find in a monopolistic condition? We find a privately operated type of control, a monopoly type of price control. That is what we mean by administered prices. I want my position to be quite clear on the floor of the Senate. I do not want Government-controlled prices and I do not believe in monopoly control. I believe in a competitive, free economic system. I think there is no substitute for competition as a regulatory mechanism. Competition is the best regulatory mechanism that has ever been created. But I make the reservation that if prices are to be administered, if prices are to be regulated and are to be controlled, I should rather have them controlled by the Government, in which I as a citizen have one vote, than to have

them controlled by some corporation, run by a handful of people. At least under Government control we have some democratic control. But prices administered by a monopoly are administered prices without reference to cost, without reference to production, without reference to distribution.

I was pointing out that I presumed everyone in the Senate knows that one of the characteristics of an administered-price industry is the matter of control over raw materials. The principal raw materials used in the production of this butter substitute are the vegetable oils. I presume, too, that everyone in this Senate knows that the production of processed vegetable oils is under the control of three large manufacturers of shortening and cooking fats. They dominate the entire market for these crucial raw materials in the oleomargarine industry. I need not tell you that the relationship of these three companies to the large manufacturers of oleomargarine is as close as one would expect to find in an administered-price monopoly.

Last year a subcommittee of the House Agricultural Committee conducted exhaustive hearings into the speculation in vegetable oils. The extent of control over the prices of processed vegetable oils revealed in these hearings proves the existence of the tight control over raw materials essential to the existence of an administered-price industry.

MANIPULATION OF SPREADS BETWEEN WHITE AND COLORED

I should now like to point out some of the manipulation that goes on in this field of the spreads of oleo. Still another evidence of the existence of an administered-price monopoly in the oleomargarine industry is the manipulation of the spread between white oleomargarine and colored oleomargarine.

Recently an advertisement appeared in an El Paso, Tex., newspaper which showed colored oleo to be selling for 30 cents a pound more than was the uncolored product. This in the face of a justifiable spread of silghtly more than 10 cents. In other words, the price went up 27 cents a pound. It is our claim that when all restrictions are taken off, the so-called low price to consumers is not going to be there. The evidence is quite clear that where there are no restrictions, the price of colored oleo starts going up, regardless of how much it costs to make it, and regardless of what the farmer's share may be. There are hundreds of cases of record to show that the price of colored oleo has varied from the normal 10 cents to as high as 27 cents, and even to 30 cents.

A survey of nine cities in January 1949 showed an average difference between uncolored and colored oleo of 21.8 cents a pound. In other words, the minute the manufacturers get the right to color the product, they put the price up. They take all the market will bear, while the five or six major producers put the unprecedented profits in their pockets. This evidence can be found on page 137 of the Senate hearings.

This exorbitant spread between uncolored and colored oleo naturally bears no relationship to production costs or any other economic factor; it represents simply the ability of a monopoly to gouge the public. It is, of course, within their power, too, to reduce the spread to suit their political purposes, and there is evidence that perhaps they may be doing so. It should be emphasized, however, that this is not only an example of the workings of an administered price monopoly, but is also a clear warning to consumers that they cannot expect cheap oleo if the bans on production and sale of yellow oleomargarine are lifted.

Once the bans are lifted to allow yellow oleo to be sold freely, and once there is no competition from uncolored oleo, the price spreads, taken from actual quotations posted by stores, show what is going to happen: yellow oleo will rapidly rise in price, approaching the price of butter. This is what we would expect from the existence of an administered-price monopoly where there is no competition.

Naturally, an administered-price monopoly exists only to make money. The profits which have been earned in oleomargarine constitute one additional evidence of the existence of the type of monopoly we are here discussing. Very few of the oleomargarine makers issue reports on their financial operations. Indeed, the National Association of Margarine Manufacturers last year flatly refused a request from the Senate Finance Committee for data on costs, sales prices, and profits.

There would be a great hue and cry in the Senate if some labor organization refused to submit its books. When the oleomargarine industry is asked by the Finance Committee to produce such data it says, "That is too slippery a subject for us; we cannot afford to bring it up here."

The association maintained that such data simply were not available.

However, from stockholders' reports which have been issued by some of the principal members of the industry, we know that the profit on oleomargarine has ranged from 21 percent to 34 percent on capital investment.

The data compiled by the Department of Agriculture show that the profit margin, as spread between the retail price and the cost of raw materials in the case of oleomargarine, is 1,100 percent greater than the profit on butter.

Let us again compare this picture with the operations of the butter industry, where prices much more accurately reflect costs of production. I remember when I was on a college faculty that college textbooks on economics and monopoly cited butter as one of the relatively few commodities whose prices were set in a competitive market in an open commodity exchange where anyone may bid and sell.

That is free enterprise. There are too many people roaming around the country talking about free enterprise who do not believe in it. The persons who put up the biggest cry about free enterprise are those who have been monopolizing the industries of the country.

The number of producers of butter now exceeds 3,500—a far cry indeed from the number of oleo producers—28 in all. The profit margin on butter is smaller than on almost any other food product reported to the Department of Agriculture. The costs, expenses, and profits of the butter industry are an open book and were freely reported to the Senate Finance Committee last year. There is no mystery about costs and prices in butter, as there is in oleo.

The current butter-oleo controversy, therefore, presents two diametrically opposite types of industry organization. In the oleomargarine industry we have an example of an administered-price monopoly of the most modern vintage, fostered and developed by gigantic advertising outlays, and maintaining its price control by all of the new economic techniques which so concern the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Justice, the Temporary National Economic Committee, and the other groups that have studied the monopoly problem. Oleo is an ideal case study for investigators of administered-price monopolies.

On the other hand, we have the butter industry whose prices are set in one of the few remaining open, competitive, commodity exchanges, and the production of which flows from thousands of small- or medium-sized plants located in every State in the Union.

In conclusion, therefore, Mr. President, I urge that the appropriate committee of the Senate be directed to conduct a comprehensive investigation into the existence of monopoly in the oleomargarine industry. The system of administered prices that exists in this industry exacts its toll from millions of housewives. Southern farm interests have been deluded and preyed upon by this great aggregation of concentrated economic power.

We cannot wait much longer for the Federal Trade Commission to receive authority and funds to go ahead with its investigation. I believe that, instead of acting on the oleo-sponsored legislation now before us, we should attempt to find out what these giant corporations are up to in seeking to escape Federal regulation of their product.

A drop of 25 percent in the price of butter from the present level of 62.5 cents per pound, or a 16.5 cents decline, would mean a loss of $207,000,000 to dairy farmers. For the milk used in manufactured dairy products other than creamery butter, a decline of 19.5 cents per pound of butterfat would result in a loss of $213,000,000. Assuming that a third of the milk used for fluid milk and cream would directly reflect the same decline of 25 percent, a loss of $145,000,000 would occur, at a time when farm income is going down, at a time when farm machinery has gone up an average of 26 percent and farm prices have gone down an average of 52 percent.

This is no time to hurt the farmers. Dairy farmers are the backbone of a diversified farm economy and should be protected. The Members on this side of the aisle should be particularly aware of this fact.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator seems to be surprised that so many on this side of the aisle are supporting the bill. I

believe the Senator participated in the writing of the Democratic platform.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Proudly so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And the platform contains a plank, in the writing of which the Senator participated——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Proudly so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Calling for the repeal——

Mr. HUMPHREY. For the repeal of the oleo tax, and that is exactly what we are doing.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, no; the Senator knows very well that is a subterfuge. The only way to interpret that plank is that oleo be freed from the restrictions imposed on it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Since the Senator seems to be very much interested in having all the planks of the Democratic platform carried out, may I say that there are a few others with which we have had some trouble in the Senate, such as the civil-rights plank. The Democratic platform says, "We stand for the repeal of the oleo tax," and that is exactly what our substitute proposes, repeal of the oleo tax. The Democratic platform did not say that we stand for the repeal of a regulation which prevents fraud. We said we stood for the repeal of the oleo tax, and as a member of the platform committee, and a member of the committee on the drafting of the platform, I knew full well what was in that platform. If the Senator from Arkansas will stand with me on the Democratic platform, we are going to have some real results, because in that platform we have an anti-poll-tax plank, an antilynching plank, and a fair employment practices plank.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have never pretended that I approved those, and I do not think there is any reason to interpret the platform as meaning that we were for a repeal of the tax and at the same time were for destroying the industry. The only reasonable interpretation to be made is that we would free oleo of the restriction put upon it by law 60 years ago. If the Senator's interpretation is correct, of course, that plank is completely meaningless. His interpretation is that we should remove the tax and kill the whole industry by preventing the shipment of the product in interstate commerce.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My interpretation of the platform is only that which would come from the average, normal mind. I read in the platform that we stand for the repeal of the tax on oleomargarine. There are no footnotes, there is no description, it is merely for a repeal of the tax, and that is exactly what we are proposing in our substitute, a repeal of the tax on oleomargarine. But not only do the producers of oleo want the tax repealed, but they are interpreting the platform to mean that there should be abolition of the butter industry. We did not put that in the platform. If we had put it in the Democratic platform, what a great crowd there would have been on the other side of the aisle.

The farmers of this country had some idea what was in this platform. Ask our Republican friends. They will state that the farmers had a great deal to do with this platform and with what happened in the election.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is on the side of two and a half million as against one hundred and forty-seven and one-half million. Does not the Senator know of the opposition of the labor organizations? Is the CIO for the repeal of the tax?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand the CIO is for the repeal of the tax, and so is the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And the Senator interprets the position of the CIO to be for the repeal of the tax and the destruction of the industry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota has learned never to interpret. He reads and tries to understand what he reads. The labor movement speaks for itself and does so very well. The Senator does know that some representative of the American Federation of Labor stand with us on the substitute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How does the Senator explain the result in the Ohio election, the last time the people had an opportunity to pass on this question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota has never tried to interpret the results of any Ohio election, either this one or the one to come in the future. I have enough trouble in Minnesota without trying to interpret results in Ohio.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is leaving the impression that the people of Ohio are somehow peculiar and different from the people of Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; the Senator is leaving the impression that the people of Ohio are masters of their own destiny.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He knows they voted for the abolition of the restriction on oleomargarine. Does the Senator think the same principle should be applicable to the cheese industry, and that there should be many little factories in each State, and no shipments from other States?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not like to be taken into a discussion of the doctrine of eventualities. I prefer that we confine ourselves to the legislative proposal at hand, which is that of preventing fraud of the consumer.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to, also and if we can get an agreement to vote, I should like to make the time any hour the opponents are willing to have a vote taken. I hesitate to say this is a filibuster, but, after all, some of the leaders have been very reluctant to speak on the question before the Senate. A week has passed, and only three speeches have been made by the opponents. We are perfectly willing to vote on the bill today, now.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I told the Senator yesterday that we all stand ready to cooperate with him to arrive at a unanimous-consent agreement to get a vote. I agree that prolonged and extended debate that borders on the nature of a filibuster is beneath the dignity of this body, and I think we should come to a decision.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. I was very much interested in the statement made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] that up to now there had only been three speeches made in opposition to the oleo bill. Up to now there has been only one speech made by the proponents of the Poage bill. While it was a magnificent speech, and worthy of any Senator, yet it is the only real speech which has been made here by the proponents of the Poage bill up to the present time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's comment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Minnesota would like to carry on and complete his speech, Mr. President, so we can some how meet the offer of the Senator from Arkansas to conclude this debate.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I am happy to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GILLETTE. Noting the nervousness of the Senator from Arkansas, I can readily understand his anxiety to conclude the debate when such a speech is being made as we are hearing here today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague from Iowa.

One of the first victims of this monopoly, therefore, will be the American dairy farmer and his family, another small-business victim to monopoly control. The consumer may well be the second victim of this monopoly control.

THE GILLETTE-WILEY SUBSTITUTE

The Gillette-Wiley substitute amendment, of which I am a cosponsor, is one I shall support because it comes close to reconciling the need of removing all taxes and license fees on oleomargarine at the same time as it maintains fair competition between the two commodities. In principle, it is similar to scores of fair-trade laws undertaken to protect small businesses against the encroachments of big business and growing monopoly. Fair-trade laws are a kind of price which the American society must pay to protect itself against the injustices, oligarchical tendencies, and eventual prohibitive cost of monopoly control. Whatever temporary price benefits the consumer may believe that he gains from allowing the potential monopolies to stifle, ensnare, and strangle the small-business man and the small farmer, will soon prove to be completely illusory and, in fact, a serious and grave body blow to American freedom as our economy grows more and more monopoly-controlled and directed.

I have emphasized throughout my whole speech that whatever temporary little relief seems to come to the consumer will represent a dear price to pay for what will ultimately happen in the long run, once the source of our competitive economy has been either severely damaged or destroyed. The price we pay in supporting the American small-business man and the American farmer is indeed a small one when we examine the vital role played by the American middle class, and when we see the advantages to our

democracy of preserving as large an area of competition as we can to withstand the encroachments of big business.

That, Mr. President, is my case before the American people.

In conclusion, Mr. President, what are the arguments of those supporting H. R. 2023? First, oleo taxes will be repealed. That is no argument. This argument, Mr. President, is met and fully answered by the amendment in the nature of a substitute of which I am a cosponsor and am actively supporting. The Gillette-Wiley substitute repeals all oleo taxes.

Secondly, the argument of those supporting H. R. 2023 is that by removing restrictions on colored oleo, specifically yellow-colored oleo, we protect the interests of the consumer. Now let us examine this latter argument. The legislation that I am supporting does not deny the right to produce and sell oleo either in interstate commerce or within a State.

Oleo in its natural form, oleo that has been bleached, that has added preservatives, that has added vitamins, that has added synthetic flavor making it resemble and taste like butter, is given full opportunity to be sold in interstate commerce. The consumer can get oleo if the consumer wants it. The consumer can get oleo, but not oleo that masquerades as butter, that perpetuates a fraud on the people.

In the course of my remarks I pointed out that an oleo-processing plant capable of producing 40,000 pounds of oleo per day can be established at a minimum cost of $75,000, this according to the testimony of the Department of Agriculture. If those who are interested in oleo and not in oleo monopoly want to sell yellow-colored oleo, the solution to their problem lies in the construction of hundreds of small oleo-producing plants producing within the several States, rather than 28 producers throughout the United States, five of which do better than two-thirds of the business. The Gillette-Wiley substitute does not provide for the elimination of oleo from the consumer and producer market. The Gillette-Wiley substitute is an attack upon monopolistic-administered prices and monopolistic production in behalf of the consumer and his welfare.

I wish to elaborate upon this point. The public policy of our Government has been for the establishment of what we call fair-trade standards, and the control, regulation, and elimination of monopolies. I recite as evidence the passage of the Sherman Antitrust Act, the Clayton Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Pure Food and Drug Act, and the Robinson-Patman Act and the Miller-Tydings Fair Trade Law. The established public policy of the Congress of the United States is that of maintaining conditions of fair competition and standards of fair trade. Patent laws and copyrights are further evidence of the will of the Government to protect the channels of trade and the property rights of individuals.

It is a strange coincidence that the oleo bill comes before the United States Senate at the same time that an open attack is being launched upon the Federal Trade Commission, the Sherman Antitrust Act, and the Robinson-Patman Act. These are the bulwarks of free enterprise and the protectors of a competitive economy. Yes, Mr. President, the forces of monopoly in this country are diligently about their business to undermine a competitive business economy. In the process of doing this they appeal to the consumer, which is an old technique, an old game on the part of big business. The arguments we have heard in behalf of oleo are the same as the arguments which are being made throughout the country on the part of the cement industry and on the part of the steel industry, in their fight against the Federal Trade Commission and its rulings on the basing point. It is the same technique that is now being used by the A. & P. stores in their battle against the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department. Monopolistic big business has carried on a propaganda campaign that is attempting to mislead the American people into believing that bigness is to the best interests of the American consumer. To be sure, bigness within itself is not an evil. It even may be a necessity. But bigness that incorporates within itself a control over a market, control over prices, control over distribution, and ultimately control over the producer of the raw material is regimentation, is un-American, and is destructive of the individual property rights and economic liberties of the American citizen. The oleo interests are hand-in-glove with big steel, big cement, big oil and petroleum, and all the other corporate monopolies of this country. The evidence is here to support this conclusion.

Now the question we must ask ourselves on the issue of oleo, as on all issues that pertain to monopoly, is this: Will the short-run advantages of an administered, controlled, and regulated low price that is used to kill off competition be to the long-run interest of the American consumer?

In other words, are we to permit ever-growing concentration of economic power which buys its way into the market by discriminatory prices and all the other techniques of the trade, to destroy our competitive economic structure?

That is the issue. The issue is not the consumer. The consumer is protected by a good product. The consumer can buy butter, the consumer can buy oleo. He can buy colored oleo. The issue here is whether or not we are going to prevent, by the law of the land, a greater infringement of economic power.

Are we to permit 28 oleo companies to undermine the economic well-being of 2,500,000 dairy farmers and 3,500 creameries, and 40,000 local dairy processing plants? Are we to permit this with the approval of the Government of the United States when both political parties, the Republican and the Democratic, have stated again and again to the American people that monopoly is the enemy of a free economic system, and that monopoly is but the first step toward a regimented and controlled economy? Surely the consumers of America should not be misled into believing that there is any advantage, either in price, in quality, in efficiency of production and distribution, in monopolistic enterprise. The testimony before the Congress of the United States, the records in the Department of Justice and in the Trade Commission are filled with evidence that monopoly is not only conducive to inefficiency and high prices, but is a dangerous threat to the political and economic liberty of the American people.

This, Mr. President, is my case before the American people. The issue is clearly drawn. Are we to turn over another segment of the American economy to the cartels, to the monopolies, or are we to fulfill our pledges of democratic faith by preserving, through the law of the land, the conditions of competition and economic opportunity?

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Maybank
Anderson	Hayden	Morse
Brewster	Hendrickson	Murray
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Neely
Bridges	Hill	O'Conor
Butler	Holland	Robertson
Byrd	Humphrey	Russell
Cain	Hunt	Saltonstall
Capehart	Ives	Schoeppel
Chapman	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Darby	Kefauver	Stennis
Donnell	Kem	Taft
Douglas	Kilgore	Taylor
Downey	Knowland	Thomas, Okla.
Dworshak	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	Leahy	Thye
Ecton	Lehman	Tobey
Ellender	Lodge	Tydings
Ferguson	Long	Vandenberg
Flanders	Lucas	Watkins
Frear	McCarran	Wherry
Fulbright	McCarthy	Wiley
George	McFarland	Williams
Gillette	McKellar	Young
Graham	McMahon	
Green	Magnuson	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Mr. YOUNG obtained the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As one of the sponsors of the so-called Wiley-Gillette amendment, I intended to make some remarks outlining my position. But I have just received a letter from Mr. W. J. Knutzen, president of the Skagit County Dairymen's Association in my State, which so aptly and intelligently states the issues involved that I am going to refrain from making the remarks I had intended to make, and ask unanimous consent that Mr. Knutzen's letter be placed in the RECORD at this point, as expressing completely my views on this question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SKAGIT COUNTY DAIRYMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Burlington, Wash., December 31, 1949.
Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: When Congressman HENRY JACKSON was to be in Burlington last week, we left word to call us if you could be with him. We wanted to place our case on the yellow oleomargarine problem before you with all the details possible so that you would know how serious the problem has become. When the House passed H. R. 2023, the dairy industry started on a decline which will be given an added kick if you can't stop or kill it in the Senate. Since we could not meet you, we will do the best we can on paper. Of course, we realize you already know fully what the consequences are if H. R. 2023 passes and yellow oleo has free distribution.

At present, the Navy is selling yellow oleo right in our back yard at Whidbey Island. Why is the Government buying millions of pounds of butter and then selling yellow oleo to our armed forces?

In our own State, where yellow oleomargarine sales are illegal, we have a clean-up job on our hands. Many restaurants are still mixing butter and oleo for sandwich spreads, but we feel we can lick this one if our country does not allow national legal distribution of margarine colored yellow to imitate butter. On the other hand, if H. R. 2023 passes, it won't be long before we lose our law in this State against sale of yellow oleomargarine. There would simply be too much money spent by the vegetable-oil processors to compete with their propaganda.

Our national economy is threatened now. Dairying, combined with beef, is the largest single agricultural crop in this Nation. When 90 percent of veal and 40 percent of our beef comes from dairy herds, we shouldn't allow either imports of dairy products or infringement on dairy products such as yellow margarine. You know that 20,000,000 pounds of cheese is slated for import by the end of 1950. Five million pounds is already here—and at half the price of local cheese. That cheese will replace local cheese to the tune of 8,000,000 pounds of butter, which will have to be made, or we will just simply lose more cows.

Newspapers are carrying predictions (Babson) that milk production will be up in 1950. We heartily disagree with this prediction. Our factory shippers number 1,200 and our grade A shippers number only 315. We can see that some increase could take place in A grade milk in some parts of the Nation where they are short of bottling grade milk but we already have a surplus in almost every major market right in the middle of winter. We also point out that the factory shipper, if not given some protection, will fade from the picture. Secretary Brannan has just announced lower support prices for dairy products. Since these all affect the factory shipper, his immediate 1950 income will drop. That means a drop in national income, which in turn can be multiplied several times over the value of the raw materials. Transferring our butter business to a vegetable product is short-sighted economy even to the grower of those crops from which the vegetable oils and fats are derived. You know that concentrates fed to cows from that source aids in keeping comparatively low vegetable oils and fats selling prices so they can compete with imported fats and oils. By eliminating the dairy herds, this concentrate market will be lost and imported oils will replace local products in our opinion.

From your statements to us, we know that you are as conversant with these problems as we are. However, you may need support in backing up your stand by additional testimony and we want you to know that we are willing to carry out any plan by which you will be supplied with this material. That House bill 2023 is a menace of the first order to us. We do hope you can kill it in the Senate.

Sincerely,

W. J. KNUTZEN,
President.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to speak in opposition to House bill 2023, the bill sponsored by the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. Passage of the Fulbright bill in its present form would do a grave injustice to the 2,500,000 dairy farmers in the United States and also, in my opinion, to the great consuming American public.

The dairy farmers, while they believe they are entitled to the protection they have had for years through the tax which has been applied to oleomargarine, are perfectly willing that these taxes be repealed allowing oleomargarine to be sold subject to the laws in the various States. At the same time, they believe, and justly so, that they must have protection against fraud and imitation of their product which has been recognized as one of the most essential foods of all families for centuries.

After talking with consumers in almost every walk of life, I find that they, too, want at least some protection. They want to know, for example, when they are making purchases in markets of dairy products, whether or not the product they are buying is a real dairy product or an imitation. The millions who eat 65,000,000 meals a day in restaurants and cafes, too, want to know what kind of butter is being served them, whether it be real dairy butter or a substitute.

It is regrettable that manufacturers of margarine have seen fit in recent years so to label their product that the average consumer does not know which product he is buying. For example, many margarine products are being sold on the market with a picture of a dairy farm on the package, or advertised with such phrases as "freshly churned" or "country sweet," or labeled in other ways to indicate that they may be real dairy butter when in fact they are only substitute products.

It is this fraudulent method of selling a substitute product which dairy farmers are violently opposed to and have every right to be. It is my opinion that many hundreds of thousands of consumers have been eating margarine in recent years believing, because of the label on the package which implied it was dairy butter, that it actually was. The dairy industry asks only for such regulations of substitutes as may be necessary to protect the producers and consumers. Butter can be identified at sight only by its naturally yellow color. Whenever vegetable-oil food products are readily identifiable by taste or appearance, consumers will judge by their purchases between the products. This is not possible when a product such as margarine is colored the same as dairy butter and every conceivable method used to even label the package to deceive the public.

Why, in the name of common sense, cannot margarine stand on its own merits, if it is as good a product as its manufacturers would have us believe? Oleo has been allowed to imitate the flavor of butter. It may use preservatives, denied to butter. It is fortified to imitate the nutritional qualities of butter. It imitates butter wrapping and butter packaging. Dairy farmers are fully aware that this has gone a long way to destroy the sales of their own product. It has gone a long way to destroy one of the greatest industries in America. In Canada, in a single year of legalized oleo, Canadian dairy farmers have lost $50,000,000 in butter sales, according to the president of the National Dairy Council.

Mr. President, it appears to be possible that the food requirements of our Nation could be supplied largely by artificial products similar to oleomargarine. Germany, previous to World War II and during the war, of necessity, had to resort to that means. I am told that a large part of both their food and clothing was provided through artificial methods; both food and clothing, for example, being produced in large quantities from coal and wood pulp. I shudder to think what would happen to our economy here in the United States if we applied that philosophy. It would mean a bankrupt agriculture and eventually a bankrupt Nation.

How far and fast we can safely move in the direction of substitute foods, displacing purely agricultural products, is a question that ought to receive serious consideration. At one time approximately one-half the population of the United States was engaged in agriculture. At the present time, approximately 18 percent only of our total population is engaged in farming.

The complete substitution of dairy butter in the market places by oleomargarine would be another step in that direction and would do untold injury to our whole farming economy. Presently, there are approximately 2,500,000 of our farmers engaged in dairying. If our butter markets are to be lost or the price demoralized, a large part of this 2,500,000 people would, of necessity, have to engage in other types of farming or move into the cities, seeking employment in an employment market that is already well supplied.

I wish to point out, too, Mr. President, that in the field of agriculture we have plenty of economic problems. Farm prices have generally declined as much as 50 percent and more in the last 2 years. This decrease in farm income is already being felt in our national economy, and primarily through reduced farm purchasing power and lowered income-tax returns. The future outlook for agriculture is far from bright, and here we have on the Senate floor today the oleomargarine bill which, if passed, would deal another severe blow to agriculture.

If this oleomargarine bill should become a law, as I have pointed out, great numbers of American farmers would have to convert their farms to another type of agriculture. It is obvious that there is little opportunity in this direction. Our farmers are already required to reduce their wheat acreage by 25 percent and more. Cotton, corn, and almost every other type of farming is facing like

curtailed production programs if we are to maintain even a meager minimum price for agricultural products.

Even while the problems of agriculture increase day by day, we are importing great quantities of agricultural products. There are a few astounding examples. While our production of rye in the United States is almost at a record low, we have imported in the past 6 months more than twice as much as we have exported. This at a time when markets were available to us in Austria, Germany, and other countries, if the administration would only see fit to take advantage of them. About a year and a half ago, we gave England, through ECA, $354,000,000 to purchase wheat in Canada. Approximately 6 months ago, through ECA, the United States again furnished $175,000,000 to England for the purchase of wheat in Canada. In effect, this gave the Canadian farmers a better farm price support program than that enjoyed by United States farmers. The Canadians, as a result, face no acreage-reduction program as do our farmers.

We have imported many other farm products that could well be produced in the United States. Some of these importation programs could well be carried to extremes, as is, in my opinion, the margarine question now before us. Imports of sugar supplied 48.7 percent of our United States needs in 1949. If protective tariffs of roughly 10 percent were lowered, or completely abolished, of course the American consumers could buy sugar cheaper, but it is admitted by the majority of this Congress that this would be an unwise policy.

There is a great similarity between the problem of the United States dairy interests and the United States sugar producers. Both need protection. In the case of the dairy interests, the producers are willing to go much further than are the sugar producers in that they are willing to eliminate the protective taxes and ask only that it be substituted by the Wiley-Gillette bill, which would provide a protection against the infringement in their market by substitutes in a fraudulent manner.

Mr. President, many argue that we must not stop progress in any direction; that we must allow cheaper foods to reach our markets, regardless of the consequences to our producers. We have pursued this course much too far already. If we keep moving further in that direction, we shall find ourselves in the same position we were in during that disastrous period for agriculture from 1930 to 1940. During that period, every State in the Midwest, the greatest farm area in the United States, if not in the world, lost large percentages of their population. These farmers, during that period, moved to the cities on the west coast and east coast of the United States, seeking employment when there was little to be had. In North Dakota at that time we lost 18 percent of our population, and even to this day have not regained the total amount of population enjoyed in 1930. Most other agricultural areas are in a similar position.

This population shift was made necessary because there was not a single phase of agriculture which was profitable in that era. Iowa, one of the most fertile agricultural States of all, suffered just as severely, if not more so, than other States during that period.

What I am trying to point out, Mr. President, is the great need at this particular time to protect all segments of our agriculture if we are to prevent another depression far more disastrous than was the past one.

Mr. President, in the bill now before the Senate, the farmers directly affected are the dairy farmers, cotton farmers, and soybean farmers.

The dairy and cotton farmers have long been established in the United States, and both have contributed much to the building of the Nation's commerce and economy. Cotton, however, is grown principally for its fiber. Cottonseed oil is a byproduct. Milk, on the other hand, is the only product of the cow, and its only use of any importance is for food. About 27 percent of all our milk is manufactured into butter, the form in which it may best be stored and shipped.

Cotton farming depletes the fertility of the soil, while dairy farming builds it up. Sections of the country which have pursued cotton farming for long periods have found it desirable to introduce dairying as a method of diversification and to build up the soil. Much time and effort have been expended in many communities, not only in the South but elsewhere, by businessmen, bankers, and civic clubs to foster dairy farming as an important factor in improving agriculture. Dairy farmers furnish a large market for cottonseed cake, which is a byproduct of cotton farming, and which brings the cotton farmer more money than he gets for cottonseed oil used in oleo.

Any policy that results in replacement of butter by oleomargarine will result in a decrease in dairying, a decrease in the cotton farmers' market for cottonseed cake, and an increase in his cost for fertilizer.

Soybean oil does not make as good a quality of oleomargarine as does cottonseed oil. There are so many diversified markets for soybeans and for soybean oil that it is not necessary for them to find a market by invading the dairy field.

Nothing is gained by the Nation if one element in our agriculture is to be built up only by tearing down another.

In my own State of North Dakota sales of dairy products account for 6 percent of our total farm income. Sales of North Dakota farm products used in oleomargarine account for only five one-thousandths of 1 percent of the State's total farm income. More than 92 percent of all the milk sold in North Dakota goes into butter. There is no metropolitan market that could absorb the fluid milk produced in North Dakota and many of its surrounding States, if butter markets are handed over to oleo.

Diversified farming, of which dairy farming is one of the most important single elements, is essential in soybean-growing areas and in cotton areas.

Mr. President, great soil conservation authorities have spoken from time to time on the role that dairy farming plays in conservation of the soil. I wish to quote here briefly from one of the most eminent world authorities on the question of soil conservation, Dr. H. H. Bennett, Chief of the United States Soil Conservation Service:

> Few, if any, other kinds of farms respond more promptly and satisfactorily to soil and water conservation, cropping, and pasture-management measures than does dairy farming.

O. E. Reed, Chief of the Bureau of Dairy Industry, United States Department of Agriculture, says:

> No farmer has a better opportunity to keep his farm land in a high state of fertility and productiveness than the man who markets his crop through good dairy cows.

We would do well here today to heed the warning of Dr. Bennett, Mr. Reed, and others on this all-important subject of soil conservation.

Mr. President, we are wisely spending hundreds of millions of dollars annually on soil-conserving programs. This program not only should be continued but greatly accelerated if we are to avoid the tragedy of other once great nations of the world which failed to recognize this great need. The dairy farmer conserves his soil without Federal subsidies, by returning to the land much of what he takes from it. Destruction of our dairy industry through legislation such as is now pending before the Senate would in a large measure nullify much of our laudible efforts toward better conservation of our greatest asset of all—our soil fertility.

History demonstrates that the leading nations of the world are and have been those which consume the greatest quantities of dairy products.

The progress made in recent years, in which oleomargarine has gained a large part of the butter market, has encouraged the vegetable-oil people to make inroads into the market for other dairy products. Vegetable oils have been substituted for butterfat in ice cream. Vegetable oils have been substituted for butterfat in evaporated milk.

The Fulbright bill, if it became a law, would open the door to more and more substitution in these vitally important food products. While cotton farmers, through greater use of cottonseed in the manufacture of oleomargarine, temporarily benefit, it would, in my opinion, only be a short time until cheaper foreign oils would take the place of cottonseed.

The total per capita consumption of fats in the United States remains about constant, so an increase in consumption of vegetable fats results in decreased consumption of dairy products. The nutritionists agree that our national consumption of dairy products should be greatly increased for the well-being of our people. There is ample market for vegetable oils in the forms of shortenings, cooking compounds, salad oils, and industrial products. That is, if we can prevent the importation of these from other parts of the world, which can produce far more cheaply with low-price labor.

Mr. President, undoubtedly the passage of the Fulbright bill would give a temporary advantage, small though I am sure it would be, to cotton producers.

There will be little, if any, advantage to the consumers of the United States. Most of the production of oleomargarine is in the hands of a very few tremendously large corporations whose records do not indicate that they are willing to pass on much, if any, of their savings to the consumers by way of lower prices for oleomargarine.

In my opinion, if the Fulbright bill should pass, the consumers in the future would be paying even more for this product. It would go a long way toward destroying the economy of two and one-half million small dairy farmers.

I sincerely hope that the Wiley-Gillette substitute will be approved. This substitute, while not all that dairy farmers would like and are entitled to, will in some measure protect the great dairy interests of this Nation.

I add in closing, Mr. President, that I know of no other subject which is closer to the hearts of the dairy farmers than is the bill now pending before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in studying the issue that is before us today I hope we may all realize that the importance of the action we take may run far beyond the direct interests of the butter and oleomargarine producers. We are discussing a proposal that the Federal Government should facilitate an effort by one industry—the oleomargarine industry—to persuade the American public to use a highly refined, processed, and synthetic product as a substitute for natural butter. We are doing more than that. We are encouraging the oleomargarine industry to tailor its product as to color, taste, smell, size, and in every other way exactly like butter, so that the consumer will not be able to tell whether it is butter or not unless he looks at the label, and unless the label is honest.

I recall that a few days ago the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] spoke of artificial leather as a substitute for natural leather, rayon as a substitute for cotton, and referred to other similar imitations. At least none of those products went into the human stomach. I realize that we live in an age of synthetics, but I do not believe that we ought to try to fill the needs of the human stomach with synthetics when the original product of nature is still plentiful. I believe we should at least exempt the human biology from this invasion of additional substitutes. Furthermore, I believe that if we accept the pending measure we may set a precedent which will make it difficult to reject any other product which may be subsequently developed as a substitute for any other natural food.

Mr. President, there is vastly more to this oleomargarine-dairy controversy than meets the eye at first blush. Many aspects of the problem are well known to us, and to a large segment of the general public as well. There are some, of course, who have been swayed in their evaluation of the issue by the high-pressure propaganda tactics employed so ingeniously by the oleomargarine industry's high-salaried, high-powered lobbying, publicity and advertising staffs. There are still others whose selfish personal interests blind them to the real factors involved in this case. But no one with even the sketchiest knowledge of our delicately balanced farm economy denies that a monopoly by the powerful oleomargarine trust of the American table-spread market would bring economic chaos to our 2,500,000 dairy farmers. Anyone with even the most superficial comprehension of this Nation's economic history readily concedes that the butter market is the inexpendable balance wheel of our great dairy industry, and that our vital dairy industry is the inexpendable stabilizer of our entire agricultural economy. For it is a truism among economists that every major depression we have suffered in this country started in agriculture. And currently declining dairy prices indicate that the dairy industry is already on the brink of a real recession.

Mr. President, from the standpoint of the dairyman, the effect of this bill would be to permit oleomargarine to invade the market for butter and destroy that market for the butter producer and the producer of dairy products. That is the sum and substance of it. That apparently is the purpose of some of the sponsors of it. That is the reason why some of us who are familiar with the problems of the farmer are against it.

ENDANGERS SOIL CONSERVATION

No informed person will question the prediction that dairy farmers in every part of this Nation, if confronted with the loss of the butter market, the only equitable outlet they have for 27 percent of their total milk production, would be compelled to slaughter millions of dairy cows virtually overnight. Moreover, Mr. President, in this respect, agronomists and farm experts generally concur that loss of such large numbers of dairy cattle would strike a fatal blow at the very taproots of our national soil-conservation program. This is so because these dairy animals, which perform such a miraculous cycle of efficiency in the course of their existence, contribute to our good earth the very essence of fertility; the fertility for which this Nation is justly famous the world over; fertility that provides us with most of the basic foods to preserve the health and energies of the people of this Nation, and of the people of numerous other nations less fortunate and farseeing than we. In this connection, I urge this body to consider nations such as China, India, and Africa, which have neglected the cultivation of their soil, which have devaluated their dairy industry and failed to practice animal husbandry. Then compare those countries with Denmark, Switzerland, Sweden, Holland, and the other agriculture-conscious nations. In the first group we find people who are undernourished, impoverished, and disconsolate. While in the other group we find well-fed, well-clothed, prosperous healthy, happy people. I say, therefore, that men of vision will not fly in the face of fate by permitting the oleomargarine trust to doom our historically vital dairy industry, which provides our two most nearly perfect foods—meat and milk—foods indispensable to an adequate diet for every man, woman, and child in America.

MEAT AND DAIRY PRICES WOULD SKYROCKET

By the same token, Mr. President, no Member of this body who has perused the records of past hearings on the oleomargarine issue can rationally refute the documented statements of reputable farm experts who contend that the slaughter of millions of dairy cows will eventually result in an unprecedented scarcity of beef, and veal, and milk, and cream, and cheese. They further predict that such an eventuality would skyrocket the prices of these essential foods, and of all other dairy products as well. This condition would be inevitable since, apart from milk, 40 percent of the Nation's supply of beef and veal is derived from our dairy cows. Consequently, a full-scale massacre of dairy cattle would naturally greatly reduce the reproductive source of calves and the cycle of perpetuation would thus be appreciably narrowed.

PERFECT IMITATION OF BUTTER INSURES OLEO MONOPOLY

Some misinformed individuals have questioned the contention that bankruptcy would befall the dairy farmers of this Nation if the 28 oleo corporations were to capture the butter market. Some have been bold enough to express doubt that oleomargarine, colored yellow in exact imitation of butter, could capture the butter market. But how can anyone doubt this, when the synthetic product, oleomargarine, would then not only smell and taste like butter, but would also look exactly like butter?

The fact remains, Mr. President, that we have only to examine the evidence inserted in the records of the hearings to realize how easily such a monopoly could be engineered. One has only to know that 5 of the 28 oleomargarine corporations in this country manufacture 68.4 percent of all of the oleomargarine used in the United States. Furthermore, 40 percent of the world's total consumption of oleomargarine is manufactured by a single company, the giant Unilever empire, which is the parent European company of Lever Bros. This is not rumor, Mr. President. Cables received from the special services division of International News Service, who conducted an objective survey of Unilever, Ltd., of London, were entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These cables reported that Charles Luckman, president of Lever Bros Co., had stated in London that the John Jelke Co. of Chicago, purchased recently by Lever Bros., would ultimately expand its operations to all of the 48 States, and that Lever Bros. planned to build oleomargarine plants on both the east and west coasts. Certainly this leaves little to the imagination concerning Mr. Luckman's and Lever Bros.' and Unilever, Ltd.'s aspirations in the United States of America.

FRAUD INEVITABLE

Those of this body who have examined the official records of the oleomargarine hearings know also that an investigation conducted recently in the State of Arkansas, revealed that 66 out of 100

restaurants in that State were illegally serving oleomargarine colored yellow in exact imitation of real butter. The most pertinent and enlightening facet of this investigation, however, is the startling fact that Arkansas has an oleomargarine law in effect which is virtually identical to the oleomargarine measure now awaiting action by this body. The Arkansas law permits the serving of yellow oleomargarine in restaurants, provided customers are informed of the substitution by posted signs and by mention in menus. Nevertheless, 66 percent of the restaurants investigated were serving yellow oleo illegally, and not 1 of the 100 restaurants displayed a sign of any kind concerning the substitution, or made any mention in their menus of the switch. To fully appreciate the import of this comparatively limited investigation, this body must consider that Americans eat 65,000,000 restaurant meals every day in the year.

ENFORCEMENT INFEASIBLE AND COSTLY

Some may argue that the solution to this fraudulent use of yellow oleo is rigid enforcement. In answer to that, let me say, Mr. President, the Bureau of the Budget and the Pure Food and Drug Administration have estimated that it would cost the taxpayers five to six million dollars annually, and would require employment of a minimum of 950 additional Federal agents, to make only a single check each year of every restaurant in this country. They concede, however, effective enforcement could not be achieved with less than one inspection each month. Simple arithmetic tells us, then, that this would involve an expenditure of $60,000,000 annually and employment of 11,450 additional Federal agents. But even then we would have no assurance that the very lucrative yellow oleo fraud could be controlled.

FRAUD WOULD NOT END IN RESTAURANTS

There is still another fraud possibility to examine. The profit on a pound of oleo is approximately 3 cents and the profit on a pound of butter is a quarter of a cent. It would, therefore, not astonish students of human nature if thousands of unscrupulous tradespeople were to palm off yellow oleomargarine as butter. In fact, testimony before the House and Senate committees showed that unskilled persons are able to switch a pound of oleomargarine from a 1-pound oleo carton to a 1-pound butter carton in a little more than 1 minute.

GLUT OF ERSATZ FOODS MIGHT INJURE PUBLIC HEALTH

Mr. President, while I realize that the points I have made thus far are known to you and to this body, I was impelled to reiterate them as a preface to my major concern in this issue. I am coming now to that imperative matter. I am intensely concerned lest we pass legislation here which would tend to establish a dangerous precedent for the indiscriminate sale of synthetic foods to the people of America. I am deeply fearful lest America's markets be deluged and glutted with ersatz milk and meat and cheese and an unending procession of artificial, substitute, inorganic foods such as those that were developed in Hitler's Reich. I am doing considerable research on this subject, and I shall subsequently submit here scientific data which have convinced me that the wholesomeness of these chemical food substitutes is, to say the least, questionable. And I shall also show that many of these inorganic foods already exist.

GERMANY DEVELOPING SYNTHETIC FOODS

Mr. President, allow me to prove that the fear I express here is not an alarmist's hysteria—not the figment of an unbridled imagination. Only recently the New York Times reported that two food substitutes had been developed in Frankfurt, Germany, where scientists had attested to the fact that the products tasted like and had the same nutritious qualities as milk and meat.

Another reliable report, which was submitted in testimony before the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of this body during the Seventy-eighth Congress, stated that a method had been developed in Germany for the manufacture of fatty acids, soaps, and edible fats from petroleum paraffin and from a byproduct of Germany's synthetic gasoline plants.

Actually, during 1937, a factory was erected in Germany for the manufacture of artificial fatty acids and synthetic fatty acids were produced from coal. At that time the Public Health Bureau of the Reich, under the leadership of a certain professor, Dr. Flossner, claimed to have demonstrated what he termed the "high value of synthetic edible fats" after making several experiments. He then released these fats to the public with the statement: "These are the first synthetic food materials in the world for human nourishment." Also in Germany, the first full-scale plant for the manufacture of edible fats was erected. This edible fat was prepared in a mulsified form as what was called synthetic butter.

FILLED MILK ACT EFFECTIVE

I tell you, Mr. President, that I am deeply disturbed and earnestly fearful that a precedent for the development of such food substitutes might be established in this country. It would seem that Members of the Sixty-seventh Congress in 1923 were assailed by the same fear which now assails me, when they saw fit to pass the Filled Milk Act, to regulate the sale of that synthetic-milk product, which is a combination of vegetable oils and skim milk, to imitate evaporated milk. The Filled Milk Act has proved successful in regulating the sale and manufacture of imitation evaporated milk. But who can say what might have happened to our great dairy industry and perhaps even to the public health had the Congress failed to anticipate the grave potentialities inherent in the uncontrolled sale of an ersatz milk on the American market.

I am unalterably opposed to having every new synthesis compounded by chemists introduced into the food stream of this Nation. I am fearful—and I am not alone in this, for a great many distinguished scientists agree—I am fearful of the deleterious effect which such a synthetic diet might ultimately have upon the systems of every man, woman, and child in this country.

MEDICAL MEN QUESTION MODERN FOOD-PROCESSING METHODS

Mr. President, Members of this body may recall that not too long ago a group of distinguished medical men, among them pediatricians, nutritionists, biochemists, and professors of medicine, signed and submitted to the Food and Drug Administration a resolution in the name of the Council of Foods and Nutrition of the American Medical Association. This resolution pertained to the establishment of standards for bread and related products. The outstanding aggregation of medical men who signed the resolution included such celebrated personages as Dr. Morris Fishbein, editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association; Dr. Philip C. Jeans, professor of pediatrics of the University of Iowa School of Medicine; Dr. James Wilson, secretary of the Council of Foods and Nutrition of the AMA; Dr. George R. Cogwill, professor of nutrition at Yale University School of Medicine; Dr. C. A. Elvehjem, professor of biochemistry of the University of Wisconsin and who is generally regarded as one of the Nation's great biochemists; Dr. Russell M. Wilder, chief of medicine at the Mayo Clinic; Dr. Howard B. Lewis, of the department of biological chemistry, University of Michigan; Dr. John B. Youmans, formerly professor of medicine at Vanderbilt University School of Medicine; these and other distinguished gentlemen of the world of science and of the medical profession, who have investigated the subject of chemical food substitutes in relation to the public health, signed the resolution. I should like at this time to read several excerpts from their resolution:

> An increasing proportion of the Nation's food supply is subjected to industrial processing. Accordingly, alterations in processing techniques may have a direct bearing on the quality of the national diet and health. * * *
>
> At the present * * * there is being introduced a new processing practice which the council views with considerable apprehension—namely, the widespread addition of certain surface-active compounds (shortening extenders) to a variety of foods, especially bread and other bakery products. * * *
>
> They are added to foodstuffs during processing in order to aid emuisification. Their use allows the production of a smooth-textured product, often of superior sales appeal, which contains less fat than one made without the extender. In some instances the addition of the agent also permits the lowering of the proportions of other important food ingredients in the product—for example, the use in bread imparts similar properties of freshness as does the use of nonfat milk solids.

Mr. President, I realize it may appear that some of these data have no specific bearing upon the issue we are debating. However, it is all a part of the trend to substitute chemistry for nature. And I am trying to prove that this body cannot afford to promulgate any law which might ultimately become the means of encouraging our successors or our colleagues, in the years ahead, to predicate other, similar laws upon our ill-advised conclusions—conclusions not formed in the public interest. Toward forestalling

such determinations I must give you all the facts at my disposal.

SYNTHETIC FATS STILL UNFIT FOR HUMANS

I can give authenticated facts, Mr. President, relating to potential, chemically produced oleomargarine which follow the same line as the facts I have submitted concerning new processes in the manufacture of bread. For example, in March of 1949 the Nutrition Division of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations issued a booklet on synthetic fats entitled, "Synthetic Fats, Their Potential Contribution to World Food Requirement." Contained in this booklet is a complete story of the development of synthetic fats to take the place of organic foods. In tracing the possibilities that might arise, the booklet has this to say about synthetic margarines:

No final conclusion on the nutritional value of synthetic fats can be drawn at the present time. The available information emphasized the need for further experimental work.

It would, however, clearly be premature to advocate the large-scale manufacture of synthetic fats for human consumption, pending the collection of more complete and satisfactory experimental and clinical data.

That is a striking example of the point I am debating here. That is a definite indication of what can happen when genii of chemistry set to work to substitute their alchemy for organic fats and oils or any of nature's foodstuffs. Observe their admitted uncertainty as to the final results of this development. Their indecisiveness is patently obvious when they say:

It would, however, clearly be premature to advocate the large-scale manufacture of synthetic fats for human consumption.

Mr. President, I do not wish to make a nuisance of myself through unnecessary repetition, but I must say again that my principal concern in this issue is for the health of the people of America. This body will agree that thus far all the evidence I have presented indicates that science has only a fragmentary knowledge of the effect of these inorganic, synthetic foods upon the human system. Nevertheless, I contend that if we permit oleomargarine to masquerade in the guise of real creamery butter, by passing legislation to legalize the movement of yellow oleomargarine in interstate commerce, we shall be opening the road for an interminable stream of these unproven, laboratory-conceived, chemically concocted inorganic foods.

FRAUD LATENT IN SYNTHETIC-FOOD DISTRIBUTION

Let me go back for a moment to the German report, referred to previously, which appeared in the New York Times. A spokesman, in Germany, in announcing the advent of the chemical food substitutes which had been developed there by a group of Allied and German scientists, stated:

This is potentially the greatest innovation in human feeding since people began to cook. This is a big statement, but it is true. These synthetic foods can be a boon not only to the people of Germany but to hungry areas throughout the world. They are cheap and could be useful in the United States too.

The synthetic foods that this spokesman referred to consist of a combination of protein extracts from such diverse sources as soybeans, peanuts, wood, wheat, corn, and even coal. The synthetic milk produced by this group of scientists is already being distributed in German rations.

The synthetic meat is actually a mixture of 50 percent ordinary meat and 50 percent vegetable proteins. It is prepared in the form of sausages, such as liverwurst and salami. Those two products have also gone on the market in Germany. There was a third synthetic food which they attempted to produce: a 100-percent vegetable protein, but it was rejected because it was not thought to be palatable enough. However, the spokesman stated that experiments were continuing. He said—and there is a fine analogy to be drawn from this:

We can even produce a "roast beef" so that you would not know the difference from the real thing.

SYNTHETIC FOOD "CAPSULES" A POSSIBILITY

That, Mr. President, is precisely what the oleomargarine manufacturers are attempting to do in relation to butter. They are trying to make oleomargarine look and taste so much like butter that you would not know the difference from the real thing. Yes, and that is the paramount evil which this body must nip in the bud now, or else be prepared to see the dairy cow put out of business and our great dairy industry doomed. Then, before too long, we would see synthetic "roast beef," chemical vegetables, ersatz steak, bread and butter, all concocted in chemical laboratories, and piped to the dinner tables of the people of America. Nor is it impossible to conceive that in the course of time these same test-tube geniuses will develop inorganic foods synthesized to a point where perhaps all we shall have to do to be thoroughly nourished, even satiated, will be to gulp a minute capsule, followed by a short sip of water. But I dread to think what would be the effect upon our public health if we had to subsist on this unnatural, man-made chemical diet, from the cradle to the grave.

MEAT INSTITUTE OFFICIAL REPLIES

In this connection, Mr. President, I should like to read to you a short statement made by Wesley Hardenbergh, which some people are apt to regard as biased, since the gentleman is affiliated with the American Meat Institute. Nevertheless, Mr. Hardenbergh made this statement in reply to the report I have just read to you concerning the development of synthetic foods in Germany. Said Mr. Hardenbergh:

This is another of the long series of discoveries as to how people can get the nutrition of meat from a pill, a capsule, the end result of some chemical process, field crops grown for farm animals, minute animal life that swims in the sea, protein derived from sawdust, a combination of powdered vegetables, and so on.

For example, the flavor of meat does not come from monosodiumglutamate. This product is supposed to enhance the flavor of various foods.

For another example, the statement is made that all protein is alike. This emphatically is not true. There are two kinds of protein—complete and incomplete. Meat is a complete protein food.

NO PROOF SYNTHETIC FOODS HARMLESS TO MAN

This statement, regardless of its source, makes sound sense to me. The recurring, blatant fact which unceasingly continues to disturb me is that everywhere I seek information, every avenue and channel of research I pursue, fails to disclose a single scrap of conclusive evidence that these artificially conceived and artificially produced foods if consumed over long periods of time would not be deleterious to human beings. I have discovered innumerable references and statements by chemists, biochemists, nutritionists, doctors, and scientists relating to experiments with synthetized, artificially produced foods on rats, rabbits, and other animals. But not a single word can I find that unconditionally attests to the harmlessness of these synthetic products to man.

LAWMAKERS CANNOT AFFORD TO BE CASUAL

It is true that several toxicologists and nutritionists recently testified before the Food and Drug Administration in support of certain manufacturers' claims that their products were harmless. Bear in mind, however, that these witnesses were brought there by the manufacturers of the products then under scrutiny. You may also recollect that many unexplainable irregularities—involving the deaths of rats, dogs, and other animals who had been fed the substitute foods then under discussion—were revealed at these hearings by the representatives of the Food and Drug Administration. One doctor of medicine on the pay roll of the Atlas Powder Co. testified to the effect that in the course of experiments quantities of the Atlas Co.'s chemicals had been fed to some 60 medical students for the period of a month, and that a large segment of these students reported manifestations of diarrhea, belching, pruritis, itching, and other symptoms. When I read that testimony, Mr. President, the thing that impressed me most forcibly—and I know it must have similarly impressed some of my colleagues in this body—was the casual manner in which the witness, after having made the admissions I have just described, dispensed with the subject by simply stating that all the so-called side effects disappeared after the first 2 weeks of feeding.

FOOD LAWS LACK TEETH

I believe most strongly that we would be criminally negligent in our sworn duty were we to emulate that complacency. Conversely, perhaps we should adopt as our catechism the statement made by Dr. R. M. Wilder, professor of medicine of the Mayo Clinic, in Rochester, Minn. This distinguished medical professor made the following comment during a speech before the National Nutrition Conference in this very city, in May of 1941:

The machinery for Government regulation of foods was devised to prevent the sale of spoiled, adulterated, or misbranded foods. With notable exceptions in certain bureaus of the Department of Agriculture, little attention has been given to the nutritive qualities of human foods. The interest in general has been more in protecting pocketbooks than health. Also unhappily some food leg-

islation has discriminated in favor of special interest groups with large political influence to the detriment of the public at large.

DAIRY FARMERS DO NOT SEEK TO RETARD WHITE OLEO TRADE

Mr. President, it would perhaps be apropos at this time to remind this body that the dairy farmers are not in the least concerned about fair competition with the oleomargarine industry. In fact, the dairy industry has no desire to suppress the sale of oleomargarine in its natural, white, form—the most economical form in which the public can purchase the product. Consequently it can be stated here that the dairy industry—the farmers and those of us who are supporting and cosponsoring the Gillette-Wiley substitute amendment—coincide in our desire to protect the pocketbooks as well as the physical well-being of the people of America, for it must be borne in mind that if we were to legalize the manufacture and sale of yellow oleomargarine, we would be dooming the so-called poor man's spread. This would be a virtual certainty simply because when the oleomargarine manufacturers no longer had to compete against their own white product, the poor man's spread—white oleomargine—would disappear from the market. The Gillette-Wiley substitute amendment also seeks to protect the public health by refusing to sanction a national law which would permit 28 oleomargarine corporations to imitate exactly an admittedly superior product. However, I am not here to debate whether butter is more wholesome or less wholesome than oleomargarine. I repeat, my ultimate concern and contention is that regardless of comparative nutritive values, oleomargarine should not be permitted to camouflage itself so perfectly as butter that in being permitted legally to do so, we throw open the legislative flood gates and allow a deluge of experimental, synthetic, possibly harmful chemical foods to descend upon the market places of this Nation.

FURTHER PROOF OF SCIENTISTS' UNCERTAINTY ABOUT SYNTHETIC FATS

Mr. President, I should like to further substantiate my claim that the scientists are exceedingly dubious as to the effects of synthetic foods upon human beings. I should like to quote a brief excerpt from a letter signed by Dr. F. H. Rein, of Goettingen, Germany. Dr. Rein, who is associated with the Physiological Institute of the University of Goettingen, writes:

> In the method of hydrogenation of coal according to Fischer-Tropsch for the purpose of gasoline synthesis, the so-called paraffin-gatsch is obtained as a byproduct.

"Gatsch," as referred to by Dr. Rein, is a byproduct of the carbon monoxide hydrogenation process originated in Germany under Hitler, which I have already commented upon.

> It is possible to obtain fatty acids through oxidation of the paraffin contained therein. These fatty acids were esterified with glycerine and in this manner a "fat" was produced, which during the war, to a small extent, was given to the German population and to the German Army as an edible fat. Neither severe sicknesses nor death occurred from this; but only because the amounts consumed had been too small and the period of feeding had been too short. Otherwise, this attempt to use synthetic edible fats could have done great harm.

EXPERTS CITE DEFICIENCIES IN OLEO

Some idea of how the scientists, nutritionists, toxicologists, and biologists regard the comparative virtues of butter and present-day oleomargarine may be had from several statements which I have taken from various authoritative sources. T. B. Osborne and L. B. Mendel, in their joint paper "The Influence of Butterfat on Growth," state in part:

> Little has been said in the past of the vitamin E content of butter, but it appears to be present in significant quantities. On a diet in which all vitamin-E-containing substances, except butter, were removed, test animals continued to reproduce and did not otherwise exhibit symptoms of vitamin E deficiency. The removal of butter from the diet, however, saw the cessation of all reproductive powers. The presence of butter in the diet of persons receiving no other supply of vitamin E, when furnished in amounts up to 10 percent, assures not only reasonable success in reproduction, but is followed by notable success in lactation.

E. J. Schantz, C. A. Elvehjem, and E. D. Hart go even farther along this line in their collaboration in Dairy Science. They state:

> [There is a] need for butterfat, if reproduction powers are to remain normal.

On the other hand, let us observe what the same experts have to say on the same subject in relation to oleomargarine. Schantz, Elvehjem, and Hart write:

> The nutritional inferiority of butter substitutes is reflected in their inability to promote growth, or even sustain reproduction in test animals. A series of animal tests placed half the rats on a diet including vegetable oils, and the other half received a diet in which the vegetable oils were replaced with butter. The group on vegetable oils had a lower growth rate. They also tended to have a lower birth rate, and produced unsatisfactory offspring. A third group was placed on a diet which excluded butter, and their weight slumped one-third. The replacement of milk and butter in the diet promptly returned their weight to normal.

EVEN A LEGALIZED SYNTHETIC PRODUCE MAY BE HARMFUL

Mr. President, I said I was not here to debate the comparative nutritive values of butter and oleomargarine. That is true. The comparisons I have just made are not submitted here in an effort to prejudice the minds of Members of this body against oleomargarine as a food, or to imply that oleomargarine is not a wholesome product. I have submitted these comparisons solely in an endeavor to show that some scientists and food experts harbor grave doubts concerning the wholesomeness or harmfulness even of a synthetic produce which already has the official blessing of our Food and Drug Administration, and which is being consumed this very day by millions of men, women, and children here and abroad. Yet, I could produce scores of similar statements which reflect this wavering indetermination in the scientific and near-scientific worlds concerning the wholesomeness of oleomargarine.

ASSEMBLY LINE OF SYNTHETICS WOULD DISPLACE REAL FOODS

I do not want this body to lose track of my determined objection to the coloration of oleomargarine in exact imitation of real butter. That unalterable objection is founded upon a terrible dread that national legalization of yellow oleomargarine would inevitably be the forerunner of an interminable assembly line of only partially proven synthetic foods of every conceivable variety. Nor do I hesitate to predict here that if we lower the legal bars and permit oleomargarine to further disguise itself as butter we shall live to see the tragic usurpation of our great national storehouse of natural foods by ingeniously chemicalized syntheses of every God-given food from fish to fowl. It is with this potentiality in mind that I beseech this body to ponder carefully and soberly the cataclysmic economic repercussions which would unquestionably result from the displacement of millions of pounds of real fish and meat and vegetables and eggs and milk and a legion of other real, basic foods—displacement by artificial, conglomerate mixtures such as those produced in Frankfort, Germany.

CHEMISTS SEEMINGLY AS DUBIOUS AS DOCTORS

Senators have heard me quote several statements by doctors, and even by chemists, whom we can certainly assume would be the least likely to be prejudiced in behalf of my contentions concerning the danger of allowing these man-made food substitutes to masquerade as real foods. Yet these men of chemistry seemingly are curiously conservative and frequently equivocal and obscure whenever they comment upon their own chemical creations or those of their colleagues.

Henry C. Sherman, professor emeritus of chemistry at Columbia University, and a world-wide authority on ersatz foods, speaking of the development of food substitutes in Germany, had this to say:

> There is no doubt that more use can be made of vegetable proteins whenever there is sufficient reason for doing so. Soybeans and peanut proteins have very nearly the same nutritive quality as meat proteins but the mixture would not be allowed to be called a new form of meat here, and should not be.

Those words of a distinguished chemist reflect the reason why extreme caution should be the watchword of this body in approaching the far-reaching issue before us.

I venture to say, Mr. President, the reason why all reputable scientists approach the problem of synthetic foods so cautiously is that they are looking to the future with the same awe and fear as I am—pondering what terrible effect these synthetic, inorganic foods might have on the normal physical and mental growth of our future generations.

Let me call attention to the conclusions which appeared in a paper in the Journal of Nutrition, written by R. K. Boutwell, R. P. Geyer, C. A. Elvehjem, and E. B. Hart, all of whom are attached to the Department of Biochemistry, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

On the subject of filled milk, they write in effect, as follows:

These data are related directly to the question of the desirability of allowing the manufacture of a filled milk which may become the sole source of nutrition for the growing child. The data make it apparent that a great responsibility would be thrown on those who believe that such a product as filled milk as the sole article of nutrition could function adequately in early nutrition.

Unpublished data have shown definitely that filled milks are inferior to whole milk in growth-promoting properties when fed to young rats. By a filled milk we mean a skimmed milk fortified by vegetable oil to the same fat level as a whole milk.

VEGETABLE OILS AS SUBSTITUTE FOR BUTTER CAUSE BONE FRAGILITY

I could submit endless scientific data of similar substance and I assure Senators that reading these scientific comments has given me pause—particularly all the scientific projections relating to the mental and physical well-being of the generations to come, not to mention the many doubts expressed concerning the virtues of elements which are contained in oleomargarine.

Not long ago I read a paper written by C. U. Moore, published in Northwestern Medicine in which he stated:

It has been found that substituting vegetable oils for butter causes a decalcification of bones, resulting in their fragility.

Substantiating this statement, G. H. Zeithraus, M. Neymark, and E. M. Widmark, in a comparative investigation of the influence of butter and margarine on the calcium assimilation of growing and full-grown rats in full vitamin supply, have this to say:

Decalcification of bones, resulting in their fragility, may well be a result of a vitamin-F deficiency since margarine is inferior to butter in calcium resorption even on a full diet of the other vitamins.

These and the previously submitted scientific statements relating to the principal ingredients of an already legalized food product, must certainly impress this body with the imperativeness of extreme caution in reaching a determination on the vital issue before us. This alone should suffice to convince even the most cynical among us of the unseen dangers that lie ahead if our judgment in this case should err. However, I shall submit evidence and still more evidence to justify my fears in this momentous matter and in a solemn endeavor to enlist the unanimous support of this body to prevent an ersatz food monopoly on these shores.

CANADA LAW PROHIBITS SYNTHETIC ADULTERATION OF BREAD

Perhaps one the most specific statements on the subject at hand was contained in an article by Agnes Fay Morgan in Science magazine. She writes:

No food is safe, unless it is free of any kind of synthetic adulteration, representing crude attempts to replace valuable organic constituents lost in processing. Wherever this has been attempted, the result has been found futile, and has proven to be actually dangerous. Tests made on dogs with white flour fortified with synthetic vitamins demonstrated that the fortified flour killed dogs quicker than the old white flour, unfortified. That is why Canadian laws now prohibit the adulteration of bread or flour with synthetic materials of any kind. If the vitamin content is to be raised, it must be done by retaining the original factors, not by adding new ones of unknown effect.

CHINA ALSO DEVELOPS SYNTHETIC FOODS

Singularly enough, Mr. President, despite these grave warnings, the tendency to imitate the world's basic foods is more manifest than ever before, even in distant lands. Christopher Rand, a Yale graduate who served in the OWI in China during the war and afterward as a correspondent in China for the New York Herald Tribune, writing in the May 1949 issue of the Atlantic, says:

It may be, as some experts claim, that milk and meat are necessities in any human diet, and that their absence leaves an intolerable vacuum. Indeed, this claim is borne out by the Chinese themselves for they have taken a seemingly most unlikely object, the soybean, and from it have worked out a series of foods that duplicate, to an amazing extent what cows give us. By grinding soybeans in small, primitive mills they make a white fluid called tou chang, that tastes somewhat like milk, that looks like it except for being on the bluish side, and that is said to have much the same food value, minus the butterfat. This is a popular morning drink. It is sold, warm and usually sweetened. * * *

From this same grinding process the Chinese also make a white bean curd, tou fu, of a consistency somewhat tougher than junket, which is often cured into a brown and more leathery substance called tou fu kan. Either way it is cooked into soups and stews as if it were meat. It has about the same protein content, and of course it is much more in line with the Chinese emphasis on the vegetable kingdom. The poor can eat it relatively often. It has a religious use among Chinese Buddhists, who are vegetarians. Some Buddhist temples operate restaurants where the idea is to imitate all sorts of meat dishes with bean curd. The imitation is very realistic, and things like pork chops and drumsticks are copied exactly. Bean curd is even sometimes pickled until it becomes a cheeselike substance, called tou fu ju. You can't say it tastes like Roquefort or Liederkranz or Camembert, but it is the same general order of thing. Some American cheese fanciers have become very fond of it.

In the same article, Mr. Rand goes on to say:

During the war I was stationed for some time in the south China hinterland, and there I came to realize that dairy cows have almost no place in Chinese life. The peasants around me made their living by intensive hand farming, really gardening, on small rice paddies. They were constantly having children, and their whole idea was to feed as many mouths from each paddy as they could. To this end they lived almost entirely on rice, with a sprinkling of vegetables and with a few bits of meat on feast days.

ORGANIC FOODS ESSENTIAL TO CHILD HEALTH

Mr. President, we have all seen news reels of China in which the pathetic, prematurely old faces of Chinese children, their stomachs bloated from an unvarying diet of rice, peer out at us from the screen, telling us the tragic story of malnutrition better than any words I can use here. We have seen pictures of African children and children from New Guinea, half-starved little gamins, many of them diseased, because they have been subjected to a diet consisting mainly of coconuts. Then, we have seen the children of those countries which have carefully guarded and nurtured their dairy industry—the happy, healthy children of Norway, Denmark, Sweden, and Holland. These youngsters, like the average child in America, are well-fed, bright-eyed, plump-cheeked, intelligent, and alert. Mr. President, this is the major reason why I say that we cannot afford to take the first step toward tendering the chemical corporations of this country unlimited license to tamper with nature's handiwork, and then to sell the resulting concoctions to the people of this Nation.

I fully realized when I adopted the stand that I ran the risk of having this body regard me as a reactionary or perhaps as one who seeks to retard the progress of science. But I promise the Senate it is neither my desire nor intention to place curbs on chemistry or science in their relation to civilization's progress. I merely contend that a nation like ours, which can boast of an unparalleled heritage in natural food resources, which can boast of our rich grazing lands and fertile soil—I say that a country whose earth will produce virtually every edible variety of vegetation would be foolhardy in the extreme to promulgate laws which might permit ersatz food, such as those inspired in time of war in Hitler's food-drained Reich, to supplant foods produced by nature. I predict that many of these synthetic conglomerations would not only prove injurious to our public health, but would wreck the dairy industry and precipitate a national depression.

Mr. President, I do not propose to lend my support to any legislation which would be the means of making people of this Nation human guinea pigs for the unending experiments of every scientist, biochemist, nutritionist, and synthesist who might be inspired to produce a chemical food substitute.

SOYBEAN AND COTTONSEED OIL PRODUCTS DO NOT STAND TO GAIN

Actually, I sincerely believe that many of the deluded pressure groups who favor the yellow oleomargarine legislation now before us will be the first ones to accuse us of short-sightedness if we permit shipment in interstate commerce of oleomargarine colored in exact imitation of butter. Yes, the cottonseed-oil producers and the producers of edible fats and oils, as well as soya- and peanut-butter oils, who now stand firmly against those of us who are sponsoring the Gillette-Wiley substitute amendment, and those of our constituents who favor the oleo legislation, will later turn upon us if we pass this yellow oleomargarine bill. As it is, the Gillette-Wiley substitute amendment is a compromise bill which we are accepting in lieu of stronger legislation. It removes all the taxes from oleomargarine, and I am in favor of removing them, but I can assure you that the soybean-oil producers and the cottonseed-oil producers are going to rue the day when they determined to line up on the oleomargarine side of this issue. A rude awakening awaits these pawns in the oleomargarine strategy because when the taxes are removed, the powerful oleomargarine car-

tel which, as I have pointed out, is fathered by Unilever, Ltd., of London, will import copra oil which they can produce at slave-labor prices on their own African plantations, and the soybean-oil and cottonseed-oil producers will then become the forgotten men of the oleomargarine industry.

PRECEDENT IS POWERFUL IN LAW

No, Mr. President, I shall not help to hoist a signal flag for every experimenter in chemical foods and every lobbyist for the chemical corporations to pounce upon us and upon the Pure Food and Drug Administration with the challenge: "If you permit the oleomargarine producers to manufacture and sell a wholly synthetic product which smells, tastes, and even looks like real butter, why can we not then have equal privilege to produce synthetic meats, cheeses, ice creams, milk and eggs?" ad infinitum, ad nauseam.

CHEMICAL COMPANIES WOULD DUPLICATE OLEO PROPAGANDA IF YELLOW OLEO IS LEGALIZED

Mr. President, those of us who have served on this body for any length of time and those of us who have practiced at the bar are fully cognizant of the power of a precedent. Surely we are not so naive as to think that the great chemical manufacturing companies of this Nation and in many countries abroad are sitting idly by, twiddling their thumbs, while this potentially vast new industrial vista looms in the distance. We can be sure that this is not the case. We would be safe in the assumption that the geniuses of chemistry are, this very instant, busily engaged over their test tubes in their laboratories, developing synthetic chemical foods of every variety against the day when we of this body might make the fatal error of creating the loophole which would open the way for their lobbyists and propagandists to repeat the performance so skillfully inflicted upon us by the Oleomargarine Trust. But I do not wish to see this prognostication proved correct. I believe this body is sufficiently wise and farseeing to detect and correctly analyze the profoundly subtle implications involved in the complex problem which we are here to consider today.

Mr. President, I have unbounded confidence and faith that my colleagues will weigh their decision on this measure without narrow partisanship. But, in conclusion, I make this solemn plea: Think and think and think again, and then think once more before Senators utilize the power vested in them by the people of this Nation to countenance the possible defilement of our country's natural food supply by the unknown quantities of chemistry. Think and think still again before crucifying 2,500,000 dairy farmers and plunging millions of other Americans into the depths of a depression merely to gratify the greed of the Oleomargarine Trust.

Mr. President, yesterday I presented an amendment to the pending measure which provided for a fairly broad reduction of the excise-tax structure, particularly the rates which were set in the Revenue Act of 1943. For the convenience of other Members of the Senate I would like to explain what is provided in this amendment.

The language of my amendment is identical with that which is sometimes called the Johnson amendment, sponsored by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and now pending on the Senate Calendar as a part of House bill 3905. In preparing this amendment I have made no changes whatever from the language of the Johnson amendment, even though I have personally been interested in several other changes in excise rates. I retained the language of House bill 3905 exactly as it was reported by the Senate Finance Committee, because those particular reductions have already been passed on by the Senate Finance Committee and have received its stamp of approval. In voting on my amendment when it comes up, therefore, Members of the Senate will be voting on something which has already been favorably acted on by the committee.

The changes provided by this amendment affect admissions, electric-light bulbs, furs, jewelry, luggage, toilet preparations, communications, transportation of persons, and photographic apparatus. In the case of admissions, furs, most jewelry, and toilet preparations the rate would be reduced from 20 percent to 10 percent. Watches selling at retail for not more than $65, and alarm clocks selling for not more than $5, which are now taxed at 10 percent, would continue to carry the 10 percent rate.

The rate on electric-light bulbs would be reduced from 20 percent to 5 percent. The tax on transportation of persons would be reduced from 15 percent to 10 percent. The rate on local telephone charges would be reduced from 15 to 10 percent, and the rates on other types of communication would be reduced from their present scale of from 8 to 25 percent to a scale running from 5 to 20 percent.

In the case of luggage, the retailers' excise tax of 20 percent is eliminated entirely, and in its place the manufacturers' tax of 10 percent is restored. The manufacturers' tax applies to fewer articles than does the present retailers' excise tax. For example, it does not apply to ladies' handbags but is restricted only to trunks, valises, traveling bags, suitcases, hat boxes for use by travelers, fitted toilet cases, and other travelers' luggage, and leather and imitation-leather brief cases.

The tax rates on photographic equipment have been especially burdensome and have apparently sharply reduced sales and employment in that vital industry. The tax on cameras and camera equipment was particularly high—25 percent—and was imposed early in the war for the primary purpose of discouraging civilians from purchasing such equipment at a time when the national defense needed virtually the entire output of the industry. By the terms of my amendment, the present 25-percent rate on cameras and camera equipment, and the 15-percent rate on films, would both be reduced to 10 percent.

Last year when this proposal was under consideration by the committee, the revenue loss on an annual basis was computed to be about $628,000,000. The category in which the largest single loss of revenue occurs is admissions. The admissions tax is primarily a tax on the average man when he goes to inexpensive places of amusement, such as motion-picture theaters. In my judgment, this tax is particularly objectionable, since it is paid very largely by the poor man and not by the rich man.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not feel that my proposal is merely an attempt to load down the oleomargarine bill with amendments. This question of revising the excise-tax structure has been before us for several years, but the Congress has never had a real chance to vote on the question. If my amendment should be rejected, there is no guaranty at all that we shall have another chance to vote on excise-tax reduction at this session of Congress. The leadership has given us no definite guaranty that excise-tax reduction will be permitted to come up for action this year. If my amendment is defeated, therefore, it is very possible that these burdensome tax rates will continue as a part of the tax structure for at least another year, if not longer.

Inasmuch as both the committee bill and the Gillette-Wiley substitute are before us at this time, I am moved to ask the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who has taken the lead in proposing this substitute, whether at this time he will accept my amendment as a part of his substitute?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a few days ago at a conference of some 15 or 16 Senators who are cosponsors of the bill, the other cosponsors not being able to be present, this matter was debated. I personally offered a similar amendment to the original bill. The substitute measure affects a tax similar to other excise taxes now imposed, with this difference, that when the oleo tax was adopted there never was any promise that it would be repealed, but when the war excise taxes were adopted, they were adopted with the condition and with the promise that they would be repealed as soon as the war was over. The war has been over, and so I feel that in all justice if we are going to have an elimination of one excise tax we might as well have a debate in relation to the elimination of all excise taxes, or a modification thereof. Therefore I accept as part of the substitute measure the amendment suggested. I modify my amendment accordingly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As I understand, the Senator is merely accepting the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska to become a part of his amendment, and to lie on the table.

Mr. WILEY. It becomes a part of my amendment, the substitute amendment. We are not voting on any amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It becomes a part of the substitute amendment?

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). The Senator

from Wisconsin modifies his amendment accordingly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does that require unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Senator has the right to modify his amendment.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute amendment, that was offered by me on behalf of myself and other Senators, now be reprinted, with the several amendments I have accepted as a part of the substitute amendment, so it will be available to the Members of the Senate tomorrow or the following day, as we debate the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF POLITICAL TACTICS IN WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday I sent out to the people of my State a release which I had prepared on the subject of certain outrageous tactics followed by the Democratic Party of Wisconsin in pursuing shake-down tactics against humble civil-service employees. I have urged a Department of Justice investigation of these tactics, and today I received an acknowledgment of my letter from our former colleague and able associate, the Honorable Howard McGrath.

In reviewing my release and the text of my letter to the Attorney General, I trust that it will not be assumed to be political, and lightly dismissed as a purely partisan expression. I assure my colleagues that if my own party were ever guilty of the tactics of which the Democratic Party is guilty, I would condemn the culprits as strongly as I condemn these Democratic opponents. In any event, my party has not been guilty of any such blackjack approach, and I pray and believe it never will be.

I ask unanimous consent now that there be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD my own prepared release and letter on this crucial question of clean politics, clean relations with civil-service employees, and fair play.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the release and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY URGES INVESTIGATION OF WISCONSIN DEMOCRATIC PARTY PRESSURE TACTICS ON CIVIL-SERVICE EMPLOYEES

A request for an investigation of outrageous pressure tactics of the Democratic Party, of Wisconsin, has been made by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin.

The senior Badger Senator has made public a copy of a letter sent to a post-office employee by the Wisconsin Democratic finance office in Milwaukee, which, said WILEY, "arrogantly demanded in effect and by implication financial contributions on the part of the particular postal worker" and "on the part of literally thousands of other civil-service employees to whom a similar letter is apparently being sent."

In a statement supplementing release of the letter and of his message to Attorney General J. Howard McGrath, WILEY stated that, "17 years of holding national office has made the Democratic Party so smug and arrogant in its power that it thinks it can resort to shake-down tactics such as this in Wisconsin. We have always had comparatively clean politics in our State, but this type of vicious pressure against humble civil-service employees is more characteristic of Jersey City under Boss Hague than it is characteristic of the type of affairs which we have known in Wisconsin."

POSTAL WORKER'S COMMENTS

The civil-service employee who sent Senator WILEY this letter stated:

"This is the third high-pressure attempt to solicit support for the Democratic organization. The first occurred last fall at the time of the rally and banquet in Milwaukee when we were more than just invited to purchase a $25 ticket. The second was for a subscription to the party organ. * * * This letter lends support to the whole idea to whip civil-service employees into the machine."

THESE PRESSURE TACTICS MUST BE STOPPED RIGHT NOW

"Anyone who has eyes to see," said WILEY, "can read into this very short Democratic letter the obvious pressure implication, without jumping to any unjustified conclusion. If the Democrats are allowed to get away with dictatorial letters and tactics such as this, the time may come when not only civil-service employees, but ordinary citizens, will be threatened by implication for failing to be listed as a contributor to the Democratic Party. I believe that not only the Department of Justice should investigate this and similar letters and tactics, but that the people of Wisconsin should show at the polls that they are outraged by this vicious technique of the Democratic Party."

The text of Senator WILEY's letter reads as follows:

JANUARY 4, 1950.

Re pressure of Democratic Party of Wisconsin against civil-service officeholders.

Hon. J. HOWARD MCGRATH,
Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: Your Department has already received indications that there is deep apprehension in our Nation over the fact that the Democratic Party in certain States and/or on a national basis seems to be using tactics which violate the spirit and/or the letter of the Hatch Act and related statutes which ban participation in politics by civil-service employees, and which ban pressure against such employees for the soliciting of contributions to political campaigns.

You and I realize, of course, that this is a political and election year, and almost inevitably such a topic as this, will become the subject of partisan discussion and charges. I do, however, feel that the facts in the following case which I am going to cite to you merit the serious consideration by your Department on a nonpartisan basis and that these charges should be considered on their merits.

I have in my hand a letter sent on December 27 from the State of Wisconsin Democratic Finance Office at 753 North Fifth Street, Milwaukee 3, Wis., signed by Mr. Jerome Fox, State chairman, and Mr. Carl Thompson, national committeeman.

This letter was sent to an employee of the Federal Government (whose confidence and privacy will be respected). Apparently this letter is but one of literally hundreds and thousands sent out on a similar basis to a list of civil-service office holders.

TEXT OF DEMOCRATIC PRESSURE LETTER

The letter reads as follows:

"Our records do not show you listed as a contributor to the Democratic Party in 1949. We would appreciate your contribution before the end of the year, so that party activities and the 1950 campaign fund can be assured."

It is obvious to any observer—whether Republican or Democrat—that this type of letter smacks of blackjack tactics against a humble civil-service employee, leading the employee to believe that unless a contribution is forthcoming the individual may suffer drastic consequences, insofar as his job is concerned. This is not jumping at unfair conclusions on my part, but it is based upon a clear recognition of what is obviously implied by the letter.

Such an arrogant letter might better have been written in Moscow rather than in Milwaukee or in Jersey City under Hague control, because it savors of this type of approach: "Come across, Bud, or else!" The letter does not lead the reader to believe that a contribution is purely voluntary or might not even be expected. On the contrary, it leads the reader to believe that a contribution is definitely expected and required to be forthcoming.

By what right does the Democratic Party in Wisconsin or anywhere else approach civil-service employees and crack the whip at them, implying as if such employees were bound to make a contribution?

DEMOCRATS HAVE FLOUTED SPIRIT OF LAW

Legal pedants may say that this letter does not violate the letter of the law, because quite clearly it has been framed very skillfully in order to try to avoid outright violation. Nevertheless, it is clear that, for all intents and purposes, pressure is being used on civil-service employees. I refer you, also, to the charges filed by the Young Republican Federation of Wisconsin against political misuses of the considerable number of census jobs that will be opened this year.

It seems to me that the Department of Justice might well issue a statement clarifying the letter and the spirit of existing laws against political pressure on civil-service employees. I emphasize the spirit aspect because obviously, pressure artists can avoid prosecution by adroit phrasing of their communications, but in so doing, they will be making a hollow mockery of the Nation's statutes.

Some cynics may scoff, saying that pressure tactics are used by both parties whichever is in power. Such a cynical approach, however, hardly justifies violation in spirit of the Nation's laws. Two wrongs have never made a right. Nor, I respectfully submit, has my party ever been guilty of wholesale, premeditated violation of the spirit of the Nation's election laws.

Thanking you, and with every good wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have been informed today that an amendment has been pending in one of the committees to modify the Hatch Act, which would more or less make the tactics of which I complain pardonable, and would render the law of no effect. The tactics simply are these, that a shake-down method is being practiced by saying to civil-service employees, in substance, "You got your job through us, did you not? So come across."

Mr. President, if such conduct is permissible, we might just as well get rid of the Civil Service, we might just as well throw everything open in the future and say, "To the victors belong the spoils."

The tactics are the same as those some of our good labor people are pursuing, levying payments of $2 apiece on the membership of the unions. Just before I left home a young lady came into the office and said, "My husband has been

paying $6 a month dues to the union. Today he got a notice of a special assessment of $2, the purpose of which was to create a political fund to defeat you, Senator."

There it is, Mr. President. There is nothing wrong about that, if they want to do it, but I am frank to say that I have had a number of communications from laboring men throughout my State indicating that they do not like such tactics. But those who are pursuing them are entitled to do so. However, under the civil-service law the party in power is not entitled to go into the program of initiating political "takes" from those who have received employment, and that is what I am complaining about.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, as one of the cosponsors of the Gillette-Wiley amendment, I wish merely to take a few minutes this afternoon to set forth my views on the proposed oleo legislation. My own personal thought on the matter is that this type of legislation has been given time and energy and has been subjected to propaganda clear beyond its importance to the people of the country, and I hope that we may be able to arrive at a time in the near future when this controversial issue as presented before the Senate of the United States may be resolved one way or the other.

I do not believe that any of us who are sponsoring the amendment which is in the nature of a substitute bill can be deemed to be antagonistic either toward the manufacture of oleo or to its consumption in its natural state by the people of this country. We do not wish to deny anyone the privilege of using oleo if he desires to use it. I think all of us have used it and have enjoyed it on many occasions. All we are attempting to do by the substitute amendment is to prohibit falsification in any manner or description. When butter is sold as butter, we want it to be recognized as butter. When oleo is sold as oleo, we want it to be recognized as oleo. We do not want anyone to be fooled.

As the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] has told the Senate, we are perfectly willing to relieve the oleo manufacturers and the consumers of a tax which has been imposed upon them for many decades. We think we should do that in the interest of fairness and fair play, and in the interest of free competition with good edible products flowing in the business economy of our country. I hope we may be able to get this legislation to an early vote and decide the question, so the American housewife will no longer be confused, as she has been confused since the pending bill was first introduced 2 years ago.

The oleo manufacturers and their interests did a high-powered job of propagandizing the housewives of the country. It has caused us a great deal of trouble. Propaganda has gone forth to the effect that if the Congress of the United States would but remove the taxes on oleo the housewives could then buy colored oleo in the market.

Such is not the case in every State of the Union. There are numerous States which have statutes specifically forbidding the sale of colored oleo within their respective borders. My own State of Montana is one of those States. The sale of colored oleo is absolutely prohibited in my home State. We in Congress cannot do anything about that by the legislation now pending. That question must be determined by the people not only of my own State but of all the States which have statutes prohibiting the sale of colored oleo.

Mr. President, it has repeatedly been suggested during the course of this debate that butter is such a relatively unimportant dairy commodity that it might as well be thrown to the wolves. The wolves, in this instance, are the oleomargarine manufacturers who apparently are more than willing to supply the butter markets with their yellow imitation.

Perhaps the best answer to those who would scuttle butter is the rather trite assertion of the dairy farmers that butter is the balance wheel of the dairy industry. By this they mean that whatever affects butter affects every other dairy product. There must be a great deal of truth in their statement. Why else would the Department of Agriculture choose butter as the dairy commodity upon which to base its price-support program?

On December 22 the Department of Agriculture announced its dairy price-support program extending from January 1950 through March 1951. It announced support farm prices on manufacturing milk and on butterfat, and stated that the program will support the price of all milk. As a means of carrying out this support, the Department announced prices at which it will make carlot purchases of cheese, nonfat dry-milk solids, evaporated milk, and butter. It is significant to note that in these price-support operations during 1949, $70,000,000 of a total expenditure of $125,000,000 was for butter.

The passage of House bill 2023 would affect the agricultural economy of most of the States of the Union and very seriously affect the economy of dairy States. Approximately 22 percent of the agricultural income of the Nation comes from dairy products and animals, and from 25 to 30 percent of the butterfat produced goes into the manufacture of butter. Some two and one-half million American farmers are dairymen. The enactment of this bill would upset the rotation system of crops produced, conservation of soil, and the agricultural economy of most of these farms. I believe it would seriously affect the livestock crop rotation of the Nation and would annually cost its taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars in additional price supports for dairy producers. The Commodity Credit Corporation already has, I believe, some 100,000,000 pounds of butter on its hands.

Butter is and always has been what might be called the pivot product of the dairy industry. When fluid milk, ice cream, or cheese sales fall off, the surplus butterfat has always found an outlet through butter. Curtail this outlet and disruption of the whole dairy industry will occur.

The so-called cream check coming into the farm home regularly, especially during times of depression, has been the one thing that has saved thousands upon thousands of small-farm families from total bankruptcy. Mr. President, I am receiving letters from my constituents each and every day stating those facts. The people have not forgotten the depression years. They have not forgotten how dependent they were upon their weekly cream check. That check has bought the shoes and clothes for thousands of children who could otherwise not have gone to school.

Because of the consumption of feed grains and other crops required by the dairy animals, they have been a major stabilizer in preventing disastrous surpluses of such crops, and have thus helped to preserve a reasonable price for them.

Oleomargarine propagandists profess to see no reason why the loss of a part or all of the butter market to oleomargarine should seriously trouble the dairy farmers. They point out, quite correctly, that producers receive less for milk used for the manufacture of butter than for that sold for fluid consumption. Since that is true, they argue, let the farmers sell more of their milk as fluid milk, turn over the table-spread market to oleo, and everybody will be happy.

Unfortunately the oleo propagandists fail to take into account several important facts:

First. Urban consumers are already buying all the milk they desire at current prices, and lower prices in general are not in the picture because of costs of production. It is, therefore, impossible for farmers to divert any large volumes of milk for butter into milk for fluid use.

Second. Fluid-milk consumption is fairly uniform the year around. Herds must supply enough milk for fluid consumption during the fall and winter period of low milk production. These same herds will obviously supply more than enough to meet fluid requirements during their period of flush production. Butter is one of the most practicable forms in which seasonal and other surplus milk can be stored.

Third. Much milk that goes into butter is produced in areas of the country far removed from fluid markets. This segment of the dairy industry is, nevertheless, essential, both as a source of manufactured dairy products and of beef and veal, 40 percent of which is supplied by our dairy herds.

These points add up to the major fact that, oleo or no oleo, butter will always be important in the dairy industry. It cannot be done away with in favor of fluid milk. But it can be depressed in price by the competition of a low-cost substitute colored and flavored in its exact imitation.

To the extent that this happens—to the extent that yellow oleo is permitted to usurp the table-spread market—all dairy products will suffer price reactions. The prices of fluid milk cannot long withstand the effect of drops in the butter market. In recognition of this, the

price structures of fluid milk in scores of primary and secondary markets are tied in part to butter prices.

Yellow oleo can never be other than a drag on butter prices and on dairy product prices in general. This is because it is made from cottonseed and soybean oil; and it can readily be made from coconut oil. With our free trade program in operation that might well occur. Even the oleo manufacturers who have been making oleo out of soybean and cottonseed oil, might find some serious competition. The three oils are interchangeable, and the one that costs least governs the price for all. The low-cost coconut oil produced in the tropics with low-cost labor holds down the price of cottonseed and soybean oil, and the cost of oleo.

Now let us come to the real meat in this oleo bill, namely, what has been held out to the laboring people and the housewives by all this propaganda? Mr. President, they have been told that they are going to be able to get colored oleo at a cheap price. However, such is the farthest thing from the truth; there is no truth in it.

Suppose that House bill 2023 were passed. If it were, it would result in removing one-fourth of a cent a pound tax on oleomargarine; that is all it would do, so far as concerns reducing the cost of oleomargarine to the average housewife in the United States. The result would be to save the average American family the insignificant sum of probably not to exceed from 50 cents to $1 or $1.50 a year. I ask you, Mr. President, who has been fooled in this entire matter? I say most emphatically that if Senators wish to provide a cheap spread, cheap oleo, to the consumers in the United States, it would be much better to leave the present law as it is. Then the housewives of the United States would be able to buy uncolored oleo and either use it in its uncolored form or take it home and color it themselves, and hold down the price. But once this proposed legislation is enacted and once oleo can be manufactured as yellow oleo and placed in competition with butter, we shall see how fast the price will rise, and the housewives and the laboring people of the United States will really find out that they have been badly fooled. I predict that when that occurs it will react against the use of oleomargarine in the United States.

The manufacture and sale of oleomargarine have been making rapid progress in spite of the absolute prohibition by about 21 or 22 States of the sale of yellow oleomargarine. They do not prohibit the sale of uncolored oleomargarine, but they prohibit the sale of colored oleo.

Let us examine the figures to see how yellow oleo sales have increased in the United States under the legislation which has been on the statute books since the early 1900's. For instance, yellow oleo production in 1947 amounted to about 5,000,000 pounds a month; in 1948 it rose to approximately 8,000,000 pounds a month; and in 1949 the production had increased to 15,000,000 pounds a month. Who has been hurt under the oleo legislation which has been on the statute books of the United States for fifty-odd years? The oleo manufacturers have not been hurt; and the people who consume oleo have not been hurt, because they have been getting oleo cheaper than they will ever get it again if they permit yellow oleo to flow freely in interstate commerce. It is altogether probable that if House bill 2023 were passed in its present form, instead of in the form of the substitute we propose, the price of oleomargarine would advance, and United States consumers in the aggregate would have millions of dollars annually added to their food bills.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Montana on making a very fine, factual statement of a situation which is very critical.

I wish to call his attention to the fact that in 1948, out of a sale of 908,000,000 pounds of oleo, only 91,000,000 pounds were colored—in other words, approximately 10 percent. So we see that the argument the Senator from Montana has presented is based on solid ground, namely, there is a desire on the part of the manufacturers of oleomargarine to color all the oleomargarine and then soak the public for the additional cost. In the past they have captured a market which has ranged, in 1930, from 325,000,000 pounds, to 1948, when they had 908,000,000 pounds. Yet in that increase, only 91,000,000 pounds were colored. So the Senator's statement is correct, namely, that if the consumers in the United States want cheap oleomargarine, they should not adopt the suggestion of the Oleo Trust, so to speak.

Mr. ECTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for his observation. I think anyone who has given this proposed legislation his studious and honest and unbiased consideration can come to no other conclusion. Anyone who wishes to help poor people in this country had better take off the taxes on the manufacturers and the wholesalers and the retailers, but prohibit the sale of colored oleomargarine everywhere except in the States which now specifically permit it. I think it would be the fair and the reasonable and the most logical thing to do.

Mr. President, if we would be honest with ourselves and our constituents, we would have to admit that practically no financial benefit would result to anyone save the small group of manufacturers and the retailers of oleomargarine if either the pending bill or the bill as changed by the amendment were passed. Some additional income might be realized from producers of soybeans and other vegetable fat crops; but in only a short time, if the policy of this administration is continued, no doubt foreign products shipped into this country would all but eliminate any benefit to American producers.

Any action taken by the Congress that would harm the dairy industry—and surely this bill if passed would do so—would have serious repercussions upon the entire national economy.

Finally, every product—whether food, fiber, or mechanical—should expect to find sales outlets on its own merits, and not through imitation. Legalizing the sale of yellow oleomargarine would, in my opinion, be most unfair and misleading to the consuming public, unfair to the agricultural economy of great areas of the United States, and would result in fraud and deception and in great costs to the Federal Treasury.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator familiar with the vote on what is now the pending bill in the Senate, when it was in the House of Representatives last year?

Mr. ECTON. I do not recall the vote in the House of Representatives, but I recall there was before the last legislature, in my own State of Montana, a measure the purpose of which was to repeal the law prohibiting the sale of yellow oleo in the State of Montana. How many votes for repeal does the Senator think were cast? Only 12.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have no doubt about it; but the vote in the House of Representatives last spring was in the neighborhood of 287 for repeal; that is, in favor of the committee bill, the bill which is pending in the Senate at this time, to 89 against repeal. Does not the Senator think it is rather odd, if the bill is such a vicious one from the point of view of the farmers, that the vote in the House of Representatives should have been so overwhelming in favor of repeal?

Mr. ECTON. No; I do not.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The year before, at the preceding session, the vote was almost the same. There was but a slight difference.

Mr. ECTON. When we consider the propaganda that was used in favor of the bill throughout the country a year or two ago, I am not very much surprised at the vote. I think if it could have been brought before the Senate at that time there would have been many Senators who would have yielded to the pressure, who would have relaxed their resistance, so to speak, and who perhaps would have gone along. It might be interesting to the Senator from Arkansas to know that in 1 week it was necessary for me to send 3,000 letters replying to letters received from the people of my State, to tell them that, regardless of what was done by the Congress, they still could not buy yellow oleo. That was due to the propaganda that was spread throughout the country. The statement has been repeated many times on the floor of the Senate that the oleo manufacturers of the country spent more than $6,000,000 for publicity in that campaign.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has no proof of that.

Mr. ECTON. No.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is merely the Senator's statement, is it not?

Mr. ECTON. I am merely making the statement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator knows nothing of his personal knowledge of any such thing, does he?

Mr. ECTON. No.

Mr. WILEY. He did not get any of it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No.

Mr. ECTON. No; I am not accusing anyone of giving any Senator anything.

What I am saying is, we know that when letters are sent to the people in the 48 States of the Union, and when full-page advertisements are placed in newspapers and magazines, it costs money.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not the Senator know that the only advertisement which has been published in the newspapers locally is the one which was published by the butter industry day before yesterday? No doubt, the Senator saw it. So far as I know, there has been no advertisement on the part of the oleomargarine industry. The only advertisement that has been published since we returned for the present session was one published by the butter interests, 3 days ago, which, I assume, the Senator saw. The only implication of the Senator's remark is that the House of Representatives is very easily fooled. The Members of the House do not know anything about the matter, and therefore the Senate must save the country. That is what it comes down to, is it not?

Mr. ECTON. No. I would not cast any reflection on our good colleagues in the House of Representatives. They can vote for anything they want, but when it comes to the Senate, we should look at all the facts and make up our own minds. We cannot help what the House does. The Members of the House of Representatives are not responsible to us, and we are not responsible to them. I certainly am not casting any aspersions on any Members of the House.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was very much interested in the brief exchange of ideas between my friend to the left of the aisle and my friend to the right, about what happened in the House of Representatives. The Senator from Arkansas did not ask what happened in the committee, or what kind of bill the House committee reported. It was virtually the same as the amendment I have offered during the debate on the pending bill.

Again I want to compliment my good friend and Republican associate from Montana. He has brought out some very salient facts. He has brought out the fact, which is in no way contradicted, that the oleo interests have spent approximately $6,000,000. Anyone knows that when full-page advertisements appear in the great national magazines, they cost anywhere from $2,000 to $10,000 or even $20,000, depending upon the circulation of the magazines.

I call the attention of my good friends to a significant thing. Last year when this subject was being debated, by reason of the misrepresentation of the facts by the oleo interests, I received in the neighborhood of 25,000 letters from the folks in the cities of Wisconsin, telling me what I should do. Since the present debate opened, I have not received a letter from the city folks. Why? Because they are now aware of the truth. They know that almost maliciously there was undertaken a campaign making an issue of the tax, arguing that the tax made the cost of oleomargarine so much higher for the dear consumer. Of course, the consumers are interested in obtaining free food, if necessary, or cheaper food, but all at once it began to dawn on them, as it has now dawned on Senators, that if the oleo interests are to be permitted to color their oleomargarine yellow, irrespective of State law, irrespective of the right of Congress to regulate interstate commerce, the oleo interests are going to charge what the traffic will bear. It is a significant thing that within the past few years 3,000 dairy cows have disappeared from the farms of America. That is by reason of the increase in the percentage of the spread market taken over by the oleo interests. A few moments ago I enumerated what that was. It has gone from approximately 300,000,000 pounds to over 900,000,000 pounds, leaving only about 1,300,000,000 pounds to the butter producers. If the oleo interests take that, as they intend to do, what will happen? Three thousand cows have disappeared from the farms. Already, within the past 2 or 3 years a quarter of a million people have left the farms. What is to be the result? We must not forget that about 35 percent of the beef produced in this country is produced from cows. Get rid of the dairy cow, and where is the consumer going to get his beef? Then what are we going to do? The consumer will pay the price which the Oleo Trust says he must pay. There will be no restriction upon it. When the competition between oleo and butter is eliminated, and when the oleo interests take over the market, the prices of oleo will go up. That has already been clearly indicated in many places. Recently in the State of California oleo prices have varied as between community and community from as little as 15 cents a pound to as much as 55 cents a pound. There is no restriction.

I suggest therefore to my good friends that we should stop, look, and listen before we do that which will not only destroy the dairy farmer and his dairy herd, but will mean to the consumers of America an increase in the cost of living. The consumers now have their choice. They can buy yellow butter or they can buy oleomargarine uncolored and, in some places, colored. But if it is permitted to be colored, we shall not only have the fraud that now exists, when oleo is advertised, as indicated by my colleague, as a dairy product, but the fraudulent practices will be extended.

At this point in the RECORD I desire to show the ingredients of oleomargarine. It is very interesting to note what they are. Oleo is about as composite a product as any chemist ever conceived of. At this place in the RECORD, I ask that there be printed a table which I shall produce from the record of the hearings. It is table 11, materials used in the manufacture of oleomargarine in the United States by calendar years 1928–48, as set forth at pages 98 and 99 of the hearings of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, in April 1949, on the bill H. R. 2023, known as the oleo tax-repeal bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 11.—*Materials used in the manufacture of oleomargarine, United States, by calendar years 1928–48*

[In thousands of pounds]

Ingredient	1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937
Corn oil	21		159	51	54	341	4	32	1,238	1,796
Cottonseed oil	26,931	30,173	27,448	16,028	15,098	17,997	54,778	99,504	108,106	173,617
Peanut oil	6,329	6,307	5,787	4,598	2,511	2,635	2,744	4,369	4,140	2,880
Soybean oil		11	2,255	622	3	7	24	1,740	14,261	31,791
Other vegetable [1]	28	28	37	37						
Total domestic vegetable	33,309	36,519	35,686	21,336	17,666	20,980	57,551	105,685	127,745	210,084
Babassu oil								1,838	16,114	14,607
Coconut oil	159,852	185,507	177,990	133,118	123,219	150,096	123,678	174,315	150,465	73,806
Palm oil	1,169	1,523	861	2,428	261	544	66	3	1,400	1,063
Other vegetable [2]	91	1	55	253				602	2,915	7,947
Total foreign vegetable	161,112	187,031	178,906	135,799	123,480	150,640	123,744	176,758	170,894	97,423
Lard neutral	25,722	22,628	14,905	9,665	9,415	8,959	7,486	3,005	2,199	1,748
Oleo oil	44,795	48,226	38,916	18,786	12,453	15,095	21,872	18,227	18,330	12,278
Oleo stearin	5,658	6,134	6,024	4,884	3,684	3,120	3,478	2,612	3,550	3,375
Oleo stock	1,440	1,168	1,275	814	470	829	1,454	2,390	1,930	1,318
Other animal [3]	2,627	3,018	1,693	331	39	7	11	1		
Total animal	80,242	81,174	62,813	34,480	26,061	28,010	34,301	26,335	26,009	18,719
Total all fats and oils	274,663	304,724	277,405	191,615	167,207	199,630	215,596	308,678	324,648	326,226
Milk (mostly skim)	93,493	98,840	90,201	61,519	49,044	58,417	61,903	83,307	76,386	72,846
Vitamin concentrate										
Salt and other "conditioning" ingredients [4]	26,604	29,320	27,640	17,549	12,991	14,806	16,619	22,520	21,386	19,073
Total miscellaneous	120,097	128,160	117,841	79,068	62,035	73,223	78,522	105,827	97,772	91,919
Grand total	394,760	432,884	395,246	270,683	229,242	272,853	294,118	414,505	422,420	418,145

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 11.—*Materials used in the manufacture of oleomargarine, United States, by calendar years 1928–48*—Continued

[In thousands of pounds]

Ingredient	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948
Corn oil	566	489	421	627	1,690	5,827	11,480	9,174	6,589	6,651	1,345
Cottonseed oil	142,858	98,656	115,946	149,930	166,444	252,109	215,008	253,997	222,814	322,552	452,691
Peanut oil	3,593	2,445	1,730	2,210	920	4,564	12,295	10,215	13,794	17,500	11,269
Soybean oil	39,885	70,822	87,103	75,634	133,346	198,020	211,105	206,642	200,681	227,594	252,727
Other vegetable [1]	27	12	13	12	259	4,562	1,644	138	67	130	18
Total domestic vegetable	186,929	172,424	205,213	228,413	302,659	465,082	451,532	480,166	443,945	574,427	718,050
Babassu oil	11,547	13,942	6,150	946	332						
Coconut oil	89,520	38,519	21,780	29,786	3,491				14,508	21,214	5,471
Palm oil		1	4	4,991	1,375						
Other vegetable [2]	4,815	473		1,061	816		1	6			
Total foreign vegetable	105,882	52,935	27,934	36,784	6,014		1	6	14,508	21,214	5,471
Lard neutral	1,464	1,355	5,100	8,300	8,133	10,694	9,360	5,786	2,058	3,145	3,498
Oleo oil	13,411	11,866	14,332	18,415	22,495	17,236	11,938	8,841	2,545	3,297	4,305
Oleo stearine	3,282	3,067	3,386	3,058	2,919	3,448	3,079	2,510	2,086	3,701	3,012
Oleo stock	1,532	1,042	1,260	1,919	3,940	2,819	2,092	1,304	335	649	364
Other animal [3]		69	164	296	391	915	220	24	18	826	807
Total animal	19,689	17,399	24,242	31,988	37,878	35,112	26,959	18,465	7,042	11,619	11,986
Total all fats and oils	312,500	242,758	257,389	297,185	346,551	500,194	478,492	498,637	465,495	607,260	735,507
Milk (mostly skim)	73,169	58,655	60,961	67,323	74,875	104,389	101,642	105,002	96,046	116,242	152,502
Vitamin concentrate	17	14	13	45	88	121	109	120	103	120	138
Salt and other "conditioning" ingredients [4]	18,218	13,841	13,773	13,898	15,312	21,758	21,674	21,930	20,496	25,893	31,758
Total miscellaneous	91,404	72,510	74,747	81,266	90,275	126,268	123,425	127,052	116,645	142,255	184,398
Grand total	403,904	315,268	332,136	378,451	436,826	626,462	601,917	625,689	582,140	749,515	919,905

[1] Includes mustard oil, vegetable stearine, soybean stearine, linseed oil, cottonseed stearine, cottonseed flakes, soya flakes, and soya stearine flakes.
[2] Includes rape oil, rice oil, sesame oil, palm kernel oil, sunflower oil, ouricuri, palm stearine, and palm flakes.
[3] Includes beef fat, tallow, whale oil, lard flakes—monostearine.
[4] Including derivative of glycerin, lecithin, benzoate of soda, color, ostearine, and miscellaneous.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Wisconsin for his comments, and assure him that I agree with all he has said. We can look the world over, and it is almost axiomatic that a nation and its people's standard of living are in direct ratio to the number of dairy cattle owned by that nation and its people. As the Senator from Wisconsin has stated, the dairy herds of the country give us many advantages in addition to supplying the spread for our bread—for example, leather for making shoes, milk and cream for making cheese. The economy of any community is stabilized, in any state or nation, by the dairy industry, and we should do nothing by legislation on a national level that would even put a sense of fear in the dairy interests. I do not believe the Senate is going to do that.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to comment briefly on the table which I have placed in the RECORD. Listing the materials used in the manufacture of oleomargarine, we find corn oil, cottonseed oil, peanut oil, soybean oil, babassu oil, coconut oil, palm oil, lard neutral, oleo oil, oleo stearin, oleo stock, other animal products, such as beef fat, tallow, milk—mostly skim—vitamin concentrate, salt and other conditioning ingredients, rape oil, rice oil, sesame oil, palm kernel oil, sunflower oil, ouricuri, palm stearine, palm flakes, whale oil, lard flakes, monostearine, red oil, neat's-foot oil, and miscellaneous soap stock.

Those ingredients are printed on the package in very small type, but no one can take time to read it.

Those are the ingredients, Mr. President, which go into the product with which the oleomargarine manufacturers would take over the butter market.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator stating of his own knowledge that those ingredients are contained in oleomargarine?

Mr. WILEY. I did not understand the Senator's question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator saying of his own knowledge, that those are the ingredients of oleomargarine?

Mr. WILEY. I am taking them from the record. I am not an oleomargarine producer, if that is what the Senator's question implies.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What is the Senator's authority for the statement?

Mr. WILEY. The authority is found in the tables in the RECORD, taken from Government records.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Those are tables submitted by the butter producers. The Senator knows very well that there is no fish oil contained in oleomargarine.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I did not understand the Senator from Wisconsin to say that those ingredients are used in oleomargarine.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what I understood him to say.

Mr. AIKEN. I understood him to say that those ingredients are permitted to be used. I think the Senator goes back to the law which permits the manufacture of oleomargarine, and it will be found that fish oil is permitted to be used.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator says those ingredients are printed on the label of oleomargarine. I say that is not true. It seems to me the least we can do is not to try to mislead persons who read this debate.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it is probable that castor oil and tung oil could be eliminated from the ingredients, but I think the other types of oil mentioned are permissible, although many of them are not commonly used.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask that the RECORD be corrected, because I am sure the Senator realizes that in my haste I failed to refer to the percentage of primary fats and oils used in the manufacture of edible products, other than shortening. I should like to correct the RECORD. This is what goes into oleomargarine:

Cottonseed, prime summer yellow; coconut oil, refined; soybean oil, edible; peanut oil, refined; babassu; linseed oil, raw; oleo oil; neutral lard.

The source of that information is the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not agree that those ingredients go into oleomargarine at all. There are many statements in the RECORD. Most of the ingredients which the Senator has mentioned are not used in oleomargarine. What he has read is what could be used; it is not what is used.

Mr. WILEY. If the Senator is such an expert, would he mind informing us just what goes into oleomargarine?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. Cottonseed oil, primarily, to the extent of practically 60 percent. The next largest ingredient is soybean oil; the next is skim milk or dried skim milk. Skim milk is usually utilized because of the ease in using it. The product contains less than 2 percent of peanut oil and corn oil. The principal flavor is milk. Then there is the same flavor which butter manufacturers use. Every trade magazine advertises this flavor, and I know the manufacturers will not keep on advertising it if it is not used. Under the law it is not supposed to be used.

Artificial flavor is also used, and a preservative is used.

Mr. WILEY. Is any rape oil used?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No.

Mr. WILEY. Sesame oil?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No.

Mr. WILEY. Beef fat?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No.

Mr. WILEY. Tallow and whale oil?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No.

Mr. WILEY. Lard?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. Neither are gasoline, lubricating oil, or dynamite used in the manufacture of oleomargarine.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, if the debate has degenerated into a question of who is telling the truth, I now ask that the table appearing on page 98 of the hearings before the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, Eighty-first Congress, first session, on House bill 2023, be printed in the RECORD. The source is the Bureau of Agriculture Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, and the table shows that oleomargarine contains substantially the same ingredients I read previously. I ask that my previous statement be stricken from the RECORD and that the table appearing on page 98 of the hearings be substituted therefor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WILEY. Then I shall read:

Corn oil.
Cottonseed oil.
Peanut oil.
Soybean oil.
Other vegetable.[1]
Babassu oil.
Coconut oil.
Palm oil.
Other vegetable.[2]
Lard neutral.
Oleo oil.
Oleo stearine.
Oleo stock.
Other animal.[3]
Milk (mostly skim).
Vitamin concentrate.
Salt and other "conditioning" ingredients.[4]

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Wisconsin how long he thinks it will take to finish the debate on the oleomargarine bill? I ask the question because the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] made that request of me.

Mr. WILEY. I think it is a very reasonable request. Approximately 15 Senators met a few days ago, and we felt that by next Friday, perhaps, we might be able to reach a vote on the bill, the substitute, and all amendments. I am frank to say that I have my doubts about it at this time, because, while I have been negotiating with my good friend who is leading the fight for the bill, as I am leading it for the substitute, there seems to be no meeting of minds on the subject. While we might be able to reach a vote on the substitute, with the amendments which I have accepted and which now become a part of the substitute, I have a suspicion that other amendments to the bill will be proposed. If that be the case, I am sure there will be no agreement as to closing the debate. I hope we can have a little talk on that subject tomorrow.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I speak only for myself. May I ask whether the proponents of the bill—and I address the question to the Senator from Arkansas—would be willing to fix a time, whether it be Friday or whatever day may be determined upon, when the bill and all amendments thereto can be voted upon without further debate.

Mr. LUCAS. I should be delighted, as majority leader of the Senate, to enter into that kind of an agreement, and I will say to the Senator from Vermont that I certainly hope that may be done. It seems to me that the remainder of this week should afford sufficient time for the debate.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Arkansas is on the floor. I wonder if he would agree that we might have a vote on the bill, without further debate, at a specified time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should be very glad, and have suggested to the Senator from Wisconsin that we would like to enter into such an agreement, with the usual provision regarding nongermane amendments.

Mr. AIKEN. Oh, Mr. President, I certainly would not care to leave it to the Senator from Arkansas to determine what a nongermane amendment was.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We had many agreements of that kind at the last session. The Senator is quite aware of the significance of that. It is not for me to determine—it is for the Parliamentarian to determine. The very simple question is that we would not agree to the attaching of an FEPC amendment to the pending bill, and then agree to have a vote on the bill.

Mr. WILEY. How about the poll tax?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But all the amendments I know of that have been offered to the pending bill are germane, in my opinion. I do not know of any that are not. There may have been some offered in the last few minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator mean that he would object to a request for a vote on the bill and all amendments at some specified time without further debate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would object to no agreement, with that one provision, which was customary, I think, in every unanimous-consent agreement we had last year. There is nothing new about it. I do not have to tell the Senator from Vermont what it means.

Mr. WILEY. That is the crux of the whole difference between us.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That was true of every unanimous-consent agreement I know of at the last session.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as I understand from the title of the bill, there probably would be no nongermane amendment, because it is to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, "and for other purposes." I do not know why the words "for other purposes" were put in the title, but it seems to me that makes almost any amendment germane.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would not attempt to tell the Senator about it. He has had far longer experience than I have. He knows as much as I do what is meant by an agreement as to germane amendments.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator from Arkansas would delay a final vote on the bill——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is all right to misrepresent margarine, but to misrepresent the attitude of the proponents of the pending bill I would say is not in order. We are perfectly willing to vote on the bill and on the amendments that pertain to the question covered by the bill, at any time, tomorrow or the next day, or the next day, but because there is an incipient filibuster developing here I do not think the Senator should attempt to put the blame for it on the proponents of the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think the Senator from Arkansas should infer that there would be a continuing filibuster if amendments he does not like were proposed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, my attention was distracted. I wish to have it clearly understood, and I think the Senator told me today he understood, that, so far as I am personally concerned, there is no idea of any filibuster, and I am certain no one can accuse us of filibustering so far. The foreign situation has been injected through no exertion on my part. I personally feel it is well to dispose of one thing at a time, but under the rules of the Senate we can debate anything, but I certainly say that no southern Senator should accuse any northern Senator of filibustering unless he talks at least a month.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is no reason at all why we southerners should be accused of participating in a filibuster. We all know that not much progress has been made in debate, and last Friday we had to take a recess shortly after 2 o'clock.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not think that the Senators who are opposed to the margarine bill have attempted up to this point to filibuster the pending question. I am sure the Senators who talked upon the foreign policy were in nowise involved in an attempt to delay a vote upon the bill.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator. That clears the atmosphere. Otherwise I would have replied to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. LUCAS. I was afraid the Senator would say that, but there would probably be more heat than light.

Mr. WILEY. That calls for a reply, because if the Senator thinks he is the source of all light in the Senate he had better go some place.

Mr. LUCAS. I regret I made that statement, if the Senator feels that way.

[1] Includes mustard oil, vegetable stearine, soybean stearine, linseed oil, cottonseed stearine, cottonseed flakes, soya flakes, and soya stearine flakes.

[2] Includes rape oil, rice oil, sesame oil, palm kernel oil, sunflower oil, ouricuri, palm stearine, and palm flakes.

[3] Includes beef fat, tallow, whale oil, lard flakes—monostearine.

[4] Including derivative of glycerin, lecithin, benzoate of soda, color ostearine, and miscellaneous.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WILEY. I am serious about it. I do not like these facetious digs anymore than the Senator does.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not yielding any further to the Senator until I finish, and I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will try to observe the rules of the Senate, because he is one Senator who constantly chips in when another Senator is talking, whether the Senator yields to him or not.

What I am trying to do is to move along with the debate, and seek to reach some sort of a decision upon the pending measure before the week shall expire, if we can do so. I do not think there is reason for any heated words between any Senators on this question. I think the debate has gone along in as orderly a manner as possible, and my only thought was that if we could get a vote before the week expired the country would be very happy about it, and we could move on with other business. After all, this is a pretty important year, as I said the other day, and if we become involved in long discussions upon extraneous matters we may be in session this year longer than some of us would like to be. Nevertheless, we have a program to carry out, and we are going to try to carry it out irrespective of the amount of time it entails.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Speaking only as one Member of the Senate, from a dairy State, who likes to do things differently from some of the Senators from the other States, I should be very glad to agree to a vote on the bill and all amendments thereto at a specified time, preferably not later than Friday.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for his statement, but I believe that if the Senator will examine the unanimous-consent agreements of the past session, he will find they have always been accompanied with the provision referred to by the Senator from Arkansas. That has been done primarily on the suggestion of the Senators from the South, because of their intense interest in the civil-rights program. I think the Senator will find that almost universally, in every unanimous-consent agreement, it was provided that only amendments that were germane could be voted on.

Mr. AIKEN. Personally, I think civil-rights legislation is probably as important as the removal of the oleomargarine tax.

Mr. LUCAS. I think it is more important.

Mr. AIKEN. May I ask the Senator when he expects to call up the civil-rights legislation?

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot say exactly to the Senator when we are going to call it up. We have a program that is scheduled for the next 2 weeks, approximately. It all depends, in great measure, on how far we go in the debate with respect to the measure now pending before the Senate. The Senator understands that on the 20th of this month the basing-point bill will automatically come before the Senate. I hope that will not take too much time, but one cannot tell. Judging the future by the past, the basing-point program will consume a considerable amount of time.

Following the disposition of the pending bill we have other measures which we can take up, including an amendment to the Hatch Act and the measure proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to equal rights for women.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator contemplate taking up the civil-rights legislation following the disposition of the basing-point bill?

Mr. LUCAS. I am not sure, but there is a possibility that we will take up one of the bills at that time.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator expect a civil-rights measure to be taken up by the 1st of March.

Mr. LUCAS. I think so; yes.

Mr. AIKEN. My reason for asking is that many Members of the Senate are fearful that the only way they may get a chance to vote on the civil-rights legislation would be by way of amendment to some other bill.

Mr. LUCAS. I can assure the Senator that he will get a chance to vote on some phase of civil rights legislation before the session closes. The poll tax bill is still sleeping quietly in the Committee on Rules and Administration. I have appealed to my good friend, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is chairman of that committee, to try to bring the bill out of the committee, but so far I have been unsuccessful. The antilynching bill is pending on the Senate calendar, and the FEPC bill is pending on the Senate calendar. Insofar as I am personally concerned, I consider the economic question involved in the FEPC legislation far more important than either the political or the social questions involved in the other two bills. I have discussed the matter with the Policy Committee, and it is my intention as majority leader to take up the FEPC bill at some time in the near future, but the exact date I cannot say.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Illinois, the majority leader. I am sure he is sincere in his assertion that he is going to bring up that bill.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his last statement, and I assure him I would not make this statement on the floor of the Senate if I did not know that that was going to be done. Furthermore, I sincerely hope that in the debate on the margarine bill we will keep all extraneous matters from cluttering up what seems to me a perfectly good issue. We have our agreements and disagreements upon this very important question, but from the time I have been a Member of the Congress, the past 15 years, I have taken a very decided view about attaching immaterial and irrelevant amendments to a measure before the Congress. I have voted against them, even though I favored many of them if they could be debated on their merits in the regular way, that is, if they came to the Senate through the proper committees and were called up as individual propositions and debated.

I am in favor of repeal of certain excise taxes, perhaps of all of them. But I can not vote for an amendment attached to this bill providing for repeal of excise taxes, because such an amendment does not belong on this bill. That is my position. I cannot vote for such an amendment. If such an amendment should be adopted, the first thing we know we would have excise taxes and margarine taxes all mixed up, and the bill, with such an amendment in it, would go back to the House, and to the House Committee on Agriculture which reported the margarine bill. I think those who are truly interested in the repeal of excise taxes should hesitate and pause before they vote to place such an amendment on the margarine bill, unless they are more interested in defeating the excise taxes than they are the margarine taxes, because, before we get through with the legislation, we might not have either kind of taxes repealed.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the position of the majority leader is well taken, and I believe that a rider to a bill is justified only in the event that it appears improbable that any other opportunity will be afforded to vote on the subject of the rider.

Mr. LUCAS. I think there is some justification for that position.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Illinois feel sure that the Senate will have an opportunity to vote on the repeal of excise taxes in the near future?

Mr. LUCAS. I will answer the Senator in this way: The able Senator from Vermont knows that there is a bill on the calendar at the present time which deals with excise taxes. As I recall, the House of Representatives has passed that bill, H. R. 3905. That bill went to the Finance Committee, and the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] attached an amendment to that revenue measure providing for repeal of the excise taxes. As I recall he did not propose to repeal them completely, but I think it was proposed that about 50 percent of the excise taxes should be repealed. That bill is on the calendar, and in the event we do not get an opportunity from the House of Representatives to debate and repeal the excise taxes in what I consider an orderly way, we will then, before we finish, take up the bill which is now on the calendar, dealing with the repeal of the tax on the importation of copper, as well as the repeal of other excise taxes, and through that measure, I will say to the Senator from Vermont, we would then be in a position to discuss with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House the question of the repeal of excise taxes. Otherwise, we would be dealing with the Committee on Agriculture if the excise tax repeal were tied onto the margarine bill. But I again assure the Senator from Vermont that we will also take up that bill before we finish the session, if we do not get the proper kind of an excise-tax repeal bill from the House of Representatives, from which it should come in the beginning, as the Senator well knows.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Illinois, but it seems to me to be a little unusual to take up the matter of repealing a single excise tax, such as the excise tax on oleomargarine, without consideration of all the other excise taxes. I am

sure that is the reason why apprehension is raised in the minds of some, that if the pending measure is passed, they might not have an opportunity to vote on the repeal of the other excise taxes. I will accept the word of the Senator from Illinois on that matter.

Mr. LUCAS. The apprehension of the Senator from Vermont is understandable, but it is not well-founded. I think the Senator will agree with me that it is not, after my explanation as to what we expect to do.

Furthermore, with respect to the margarine tax I will say that was a regulatory tax, rather than a revenue-raising tax. It is in a little different category. It is really not an excise tax from that standpoint. It was passed as a regulatory measure many years ago, and from that angle it stands in a different classification and category from all the excise taxes which were imposed during the war for the purpose of raising revenue only. That is another reason why, in my opinion, a proposal to repeal the excise taxes, should not be attached by way of amendment to this bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course, a tax originally imposed as a regulatory tax, the margarine tax, has recently become a fairly important revenue tax. At the present time it is yielding about $17,000,000 annual income.

Mr. LUCAS. It is yielding sixteen or seventeen million dollars annual income. The Senator is correct about that. It has more or less shifted from a regulatory to a revenue tax. But in the first instance it was passed as a regulatory tax.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Oh, the Senator from Illinois does not know how I love to hear him say that, after having previously said that I "chip in."

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator was chipping in——

Mr. WILEY. Now we see how the Senator from Illinois is chipping in. The Senator is using a poker term, and is not playing cricket now.

Mr. LUCAS. Just a moment. I have the floor.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, who has the floor? The Senator from Illinois yielded to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor, and yielded to the Senator from Wisconsin for a statement.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. I yielded for a question. If the Senator wants to make a speech——

Mr. WILEY. No; I will say just a word, and then we will depart in peace.

Mr. LUCAS. Well——

Mr. WILEY. Does not the Senator want us to depart in peace? Does the Senator want peace or want war?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I love the Senator from Wisconsin, and I do not want any war with him.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I love to hear the Senator say such things. It is very lovely of him, toward the close of the day, to feel that way about me, but words speak louder than actions at times.

Now, talking about excise taxes, the Senator has brought up a very nice question. The facts will demonstrate that from about 10 percent of all the oleo, and that is all that is colored, the Government collects a tax of $17,000,000. If the Government wants a source of revenue—and the Government certainly does want sources of revenue—it could place a 10-cent tax on the whole 1,000,000,000 pounds of oleo made now. That would result in more than $100,000,000 of additional tax. Instead of that, the oleo interests, sensing that there might be, as the Senator from Georgia now suggests, a reevaluation of the whole tax program, have injected this thing on such a basis that the consumer has felt he has been seriously impacted.

I think it might be a pretty good thing, Mr. President, if some method were evolved by which the whole measure could go over until after election, so that the people could really get an understanding of what is involved, and the proper committees could investigate the significant revenue question which is also involved here.

I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Since the junior Senator from Minnesota is a cosponsor of the Wiley substitute, I want my position to be perfectly clear. I understand that on the floor this afternoon the Senator from Wisconsin accepted an amendment to our substitute which provides for the repeal of excise taxes. Am I correctly informed as to that?

Mr. LUCAS. I so understood.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I accepted the amendment which had already been adopted by the appropriate committee; that is, the so-called Johnson amendment to the copper measure, and which was submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and which has become, by my acceptance, a part of the substitute measure.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want my position with reference to this legislation to be perfectly clear. I entered into cosponsorship of the substitute amendment because of my belief in the justice of our position. I have not entered into any understanding that I will be a party to conglomerate amendments attached either to the main bill or to the substitute. It is my considered belief that neither the civil-rights bill nor the excise-tax amendments ought to be a part of this debate or of this legislative proposal. I believe that those of us who are cosponsoring the amendment in the nature of a substitute are doing a disservice to our cause, to the validity of our position, if we attempt to block this legislation by what I call a parliamentary trick.

I have no intention, I will say to the majority leader and to my colleagues, of being a party to what I consider to be beneath-the-table conniving or strategy to kill this oleo bill. As one participant in the debate, I happen to believe that the Senator from Arkansas and those associated with him are going to lose this fight if we can simply vote the bill up or down.

I hope that my friend the Senator from Wisconsin will reconsider his position, or at least I hope he will be kind enough to take us into his confidence. After all, I am one of the cosponsors of the substitute amendment. I believe I should have been consulted. I believe the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] should have been consulted. Possibly he was; I do not know as to that. But if he was not consulted he should be consulted before we make these rather hasty decisions. So long as I have had the assurance from the chairman of the Finance Committee, I wish to state now that in my considered judgment we are going to have a chance to vote on the repeal of excise taxes. I want to vote on the repeal of excise taxes, for which I stand, and for which I shall work as a separate item of legislation. Likewise, I say it is my desire to vote on civil-rights legislation as a separate item of legislation.

I stated my position on this subject pretty frankly in the Democratic caucus. I sort of feel bad that we should have gotten ourselves into this sort of a predicament. I wish to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I do not think we strengthen our case before the American people by being willing to accept a dozen or more amendments, or even one amendment, from the floor that may not be particularly germane to the subject.

We are talking now with reference to a bill which authorizes the shipment in interstate commerce of a commodity which we say is trying to misrepresent itself. Now, I think we are trying to misrepresent ourselves if we are willing to accept amendments which have no place upon this bill. While I intend to vote for the substitute and intend to work for the substitute, I do not intend to let my conscience be stultified by accepting amendments which I do not believe are germane or worthy of being attached to the pending legislation.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I will yield in one moment. I should like to reply to my colleague from Minnesota. The Senator from Minnesota, in a very forcible and clear-cut way, has presented the issue with respect to nongermane amendments, and I wish to commend him for taking the position he has taken. I think he is absolutely correct in his position and in his premise and conclusion in regard to all nongermane amendments to the pending legislation. In view of his vital interest in the dairy industry of his State, and in view of the cause he represents in connection with this measure, I think the position he takes is highly commendable.

Now I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, again I wonder who is indulging in parliamentary tricks. We had a conference in my office. The Senator from Minnesota was invited to be present; he was on the committee. At that conference, in view of the vote taken last year, by which the proponents of oleomargarine on the floor of the Senate enabled oleomargarine to take over the butter market which formerly existed in the Army and the Navy; in view of the fact that, under the bill as introduced, the Government will be deprived of the income from the tax on oleomargarine; in view of the fact that the committee had already reported a bill for the removal of present excise taxes; in view of the fact that the President of the United States was to send a message to Congress in regard to excise taxes; and in view of the fact that everyone seemed to be in favor of removing the excise taxes, it was decided that the Johnson-Butler amendment should be incorporated in my substitute amendment.

Now all at once we find that some persons throw out a smokescreen, saying, "Do not remove the excise taxes." They make that statement in an effort to deprive other Senators of an opportunity to vote definitely on the question of whether millions of farmers should be deprived of their livelihood. Mr. President, we want a show-down on that issue. If it is perfectly all right to deprive millions of farmers of their livelihood, to get rid of 36 percent of the production of beef in this country, and to deprive the Government of the income it has previously obtained from oleomargarine, then I say it is perfectly legitimate—and that was the consensus of opinion of those who attended the meeting—that we should attach this amendment to the substitute, not to the bill.

As I told the distinguished Senator who is sponsoring the bill, this is a way to demonstrate effectively to the people of the United States that they can get what they want, to wit, removal of the oleomargarine tax, in respect to which $6,000,000 has been spent to propagandize the people. It is one way to make it possible for colored oleomargarine to be sold, except in interstate commerce or in the States where the sale of colored oleomargarine is prohibited; and it is one way, more than any other, whereby we can demonstrate to the small merchants, to the fur industry, and to others who have been hit by the wartime excise taxes, that we mean business. If we consolidate our forces and bring together all those who are in favor of removing the wartime excise taxes, then we can win.

I say to my good friend, the Senator from Minnesota, that when he votes against the substitute, with or without attaching to it the amendment respecting excise taxes, he will find that we do not have it in the bag; he will find that the oleo interests will once more have put us in the hole.

A few minutes ago, before the Senator from Minnesota returned to the Chamber, we were requested to enter into a stipulation to the effect that relevant amendments could not be attached.

Mr. LUCAS. No; irrelevant amendments.

Mr. WILEY. Well, some might call them relevant.

But the point is that Senators will not be able to obtain a vote which will satisfy the people of the United States if they follow along the line suggested by the Senator from Minnesota, for Senators then will vote in relation to the oleomargarine proposition; and when that occurs, Senators will find themselves confronted with the other amendments which have been suggested, but which many Senators do not want. Already they are being suggested. They are not attached to my substitute. The only amendments attached to my substitute are the one providing for the repeal of excise taxes and the amendment relating to the advertisement requirement; and everyone seems to agree that they are proper. Those two are the only ones which are attached to my substitute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely wish to clarify the record in respect to what may be an interpretation of the remarks made by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The junior Senator from Minnesota did not participate in a conference in which he ever agreed to the acceptance of excise-tax-repeal amendments.

Mr. WILEY. I agree to that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was invited to the conference, but I did not agree to that.

I merely want it made clear that, insofar as my position is concerned, I feel that by that agreement we are not strengthening the moral or ethical aspects of our case. I entered this debate in the belief that the argument we were putting up and the case we were presenting were sound and strong and morally defensible, and I still believe they are. I still believe that what I stated on the floor of the Senate this afternoon is the issue in this case; namely, the issue of monopoly versus small business or the free-economy issue. I am prepared to defend that issue and to fight out the battle along that line.

Certainly I do not wish to usurp the prerogatives of the majority sponsor or cosponsor of the proposed legislation, who, along with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], has presented it to the Senate; and I do not wish to say that they do not have a right to accept amendments. I merely say it would have been nice if the 25 cosponsors could have been together on this matter, and if it had been possible to see whether all of us were of a like mind.

I know the Senator from Wisconsin would not expect me to be bound by his decision, and I shall reserve the right to form my own judgment when the vote comes.

However, I do accept the statement made by the majority leader and the statement made by the chairman of the Finance Committee that we shall have a chance to vote for the repeal of excise taxes. We ought to repeal them and we shall hold the majority leader and chairman of the Finance Committee to the statements they have made.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to make one other statement, and then I shall conclude.

Under the parliamentary situation, any Senator has a right to move to strike any portion of the substitute amendment, as it has been modified from time to time by the Senator from Wisconsin. I think I am correct in that statement. So when the time comes no doubt a motion will be made to strike from the substitute the amendment dealing with the repeal of excise taxes, and then we can have a straight vote, either up or down, on the question of whether we wish to include such an amendment.

I am sorry the junior Senator from Minnesota has just left the Chamber.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to concur in what the Senator from Minnesota has said. I was in the Chamber this afternoon when the Senator from Wisconsin accepted the so-called excise-tax-repeal amendment.

I also am one of the sponsors of the so-called Wiley-Gillette amendment. We accepted the excise-tax-repeal amendment merely for purposes of printing. It lies on the desk.

But, knowing that a motion would be made—if not made by any other Senator, I myself would make it, as one of the sponsors of the original amendment—to separate the two or to strike the latter one, as the majority leader has suggested, no objection was made to accepting it now. Of course, objection could have been made by one of the sponsors; but then another amendment could have been proposed. So objection then would have served no practical legislative purpose.

Of course, like the Senator from Minnesota, I think this addition seriously weakens the position of those of us who have sincerely believed in the approach of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Iowa. I wish to associate myself with them, having been on the floor of the Senate this afternoon when the acceptance of the excise-tax-repeal amendment occurred. In fact, there were practically no Senators here at that time but the two of us, I believe, and the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator who was presiding over the Senate. That was the situation when the acceptance occurred, as I recall.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I am glad the Senator from Washington has made the statement he just made.

I say again that every Senator who is a cosponsor of the amendment was notified, or his office was notified, and he came to the conference, and we agreed upon this procedure, just as the Democratic conference agreed on their procedure, as is evidenced by the positions taken by two of the Senators who are now present. They agreed on their procedure. They have demonstrated today that they are holding the front; and they will destroy the benefits which should

accrue to the farmers by this bill, if they continue in this way. We have showed them how to win. The Senator from Minnesota says a great moral right and great equities are involved. Certainly they are. However, his farmers do not mean anything to him if he can see the issue in the way he indicates.

On the other hand, I agree with the Senator from Washington that when I accepted the amendment, that did not preclude any Senator from having a right to move to strike what I accepted. Consequently, we have a clear understanding.

But let it also be clear that our good Democratic friends are lining up in accordance with their conference, as reported recently in the newspapers; and it is very clear that the farmers of the United States will now know whom to hold liable, if and when we get a chance to vote on the original bill.

But if certain other amendments, which I have not agreed should be attached to my amendment, are attached to the original bill, some of our Democratic friends will be on the other side of the fence in not agreeing to those amendments.

That is the situation in a nutshell, Mr. President. Perhaps after getting this discussion off our chests, tomorrow we can talk a little more rationally, and ascertain whether there is a basis for compromise, so that we can get some bill which will properly take care of the oleomargarine situation and also the tax situation for the benefit of the country.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is, of course, expounding his views with respect to an analysis of what the practical legislative procedure should be. I am just as wholeheartedly for the substitute amendment as the Senator is. I think if we put forward the amendment just as it is, relating only to the oleomargarine and butter controversy, the Senator will get more votes from both sides of the aisle than he will by resorting to legislative maneuvering in an attempt to attach the excise taxes or the civil-rights amendments, because there are many of us who sincerely favor the original amendment. We are cosponsors. We would not vote for it with those things attached. I think those of us who are sincere in trying to do what the Senator from Wisconson I know wants done had better search ourselves. Senators had better search themselves as to the legislative procedure, because the quicker we vote this bill up or down the quicker will the whole thing be determined. We should not clutter it up with all these other amendments. I grant that the excise taxes are a proper subject of legislation, but they are not germane to the issue now before the Senate. The Senator from Wisconsin knows that to be so. The same thing is true of other amendments. I hope the Senator will be persuaded even to vote with us when we move to separate the excise-tax proposal from his amendment.

Mr. WILEY. I cannot accede to the Senator's argument.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 11, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 10 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mrs. Olive Remington Goldman, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Commission on the Status of Women of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Bernard J. Flynn, of Maryland, to be United States attorney for the district of Maryland. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 4, 1949.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

Surgeon to be senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

Curtis G. Southard

Senior assistant sanitary engineer to be sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of major):

Sheldon L. Lang

Assistant nurse officers to be senior assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain):

Mary E. McGovern	Joan M. Norkunas
Patricia B. Geiser	M. Elizabeth Leeds

The following-named candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective date indicated:

Edward T. Thompson, December 30, 1949.

To be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective dates indicated:

Edward A. Beeman, December 30, 1949.
Leon Levintow, December 30, 1949.
DeArmond Moore, December 30, 1949.
Gerald D. Barton, December 31, 1949.

To be assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective dates indicated:

Norman Tarr, November 16, 1949.
John J. Walsh, December 30, 1949.

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective dates indicated:

Ray Raneri, December 7, 1949.
Keith S. Krause, December 8, 1949.
James H. Crawford, December 9, 1949.
Joseph H. Coffey, December 14, 1949.
Ernest C. Tsivoglou, December 15, 1949.
Charles R. Bowman, December 15, 1949.

To be assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective dates indicated:

Ronald G. Macomber, November 21, 1949.
Donald A. Pecsok, November 21, 1949.

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective dates indicated:

Paul W. Eastman, Jr., November 18, 1949.
David H. Howells, November 21, 1949.
Richard D. Coleman, November 21, 1949.
John T. Chambers, Jr., November 23, 1949.
Robert L. Harris, Jr., November 23, 1949.
Frank A. Bell, Jr., November 30, 1949.
Ralph J. Black, December 2, 1949.
Edward R. Williams, December 2, 1949.
James D. Mickle, December 5, 1949.
Eugene T. Jensen, December 5, 1949.

To be scientist (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date indicated:

William M. Upholt, December 2, 1949.

To be sanitarian (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date indicated:

Daniel E. O'Keefe, December 30, 1949.

To be senior assistant sanitarians (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective dates indicated:

Samuel M. Rogers, November 15, 1949.
Joseph L. Minkin, November 15, 1949.
Richard F. Clapp, November 16, 1949.

Assistant surgeons to be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective November 8, 1949:

Robert Hanan	David H. Solomon
Charles W. Whitmore	Albert L. Patrick
John V. Osborne	Herman H. Gray
Ernest V. deMoss	Sidney Ketyer
John H. Waite	

Nurse officers to be senior nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective December 11, 1949:

Donna Pearce	Lydia M. Zetzsche
Helen Bean	Margaret G. Arnstein

Senior assistant nurse officers to be nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective November 8, 1949:

Marjorie W. Spaulding	Mary A. Rice
Walborg S. Wayne	Gertrude L. Anderson
Esther Kaufman	M. Lois McMinn
Catherine M. Sullivan	Anne M. Leffingwell
Margaret E. Willhoit	M. Dolores Howley
Gladys C. Guydes	Helen N. Buzan
Emijean Snedegar	K. Barbara Dormin
Edith M. Hettema	

Junior assistant nurse officer to be assistant nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date indicated:

Marion E. O'Neil, November 8, 1949.

(The above-named officers were appointed during the last recess of the Senate.)

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, with dates of rank to be as established under the provisions of the afore-mentioned title:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Fred Sidney Borum, 45A (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. John Edwin Upston, 49A (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Laurence Carbee Craigie, 61A (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. David Myron Schlatter, 62A (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Otto Paul Weyland, 63A (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Robert Wells Harper, 53A (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Richard Emmel Nugent, 57A (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Earl Walter Barnes, 67A (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Charles Pearre Cabell, 70A (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Charles Bertoddy Stone III, 66A (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Laurence Sherman Kuter, 89A (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Joseph Hampton Atkinson, 90A (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Gordon Philip Saville, 48A (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Warren Rice Carter, 181A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Herbert Chapman, 189A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Charles Edwin Thomas, Jr., 192A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Francis Leroy Ankenbrandt, Jr., 267A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Morris Robert Nelson, 277A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Kenneth Perry McNaughton, 278A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Elmer Joseph Rogers, Jr., 294A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Clarence Shortridge Irvine, 296A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. George Robert Acheson, 335A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. George Warren Mundy, 358A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Roscoe Charles Wilson, 360A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Walter Edwin Todd, 361A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Bryant Le Maire Boatner, 362A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Samuel Robert Brentnall, 364A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Frank Fort Everest, 366A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. William Henry Tunner, 374A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. August Walter Kissner, 386A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, Jr., 387A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. William Maurice Morgan, 439A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. William Evans Hall, 460A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Frederic Harrison Smith, Jr., 461A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. William Fulton McKee, 467A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Richard Clark Lindsay, 476A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Thomas Sarsfield Power, 481A, (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Donald Leander Putt, 494A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Alfred August Kessler, Jr., 216A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Air Force of the United States under the provisions of section 515, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Hugo Peoples Rush, 75A, United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles Edwin Thomas, Jr., 192A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Frank Alton Armstrong, Jr., 209A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. August Walter Kissner, 386A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Archie Jordan Old, Jr., 605A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Joseph Henry Davidson, 121A, United States Air Force.

Col. Edward Holmes Underhill, 421A, United States Air Force.

Col. Albert Boyd, 424A, United States Air Force.

Col. Kingston Eric Tibbetts, 436A, United States Air Force.

Col. Frederick Rodgers Dent, Jr., 444A, United States Air Force.

Col. Stuart Phillips Wright, 510A, United States Air Force.

Col. Mark Edward Bradley, Jr., 552A, United States Air Force.

Col. Robert Edward Lee Eaton, 594A, United States Air Force.

Col. Sydney Dwight Grubbs, Jr., 660A, United States Air Force.

Col. Phillips Walter Smith, 897A, United States Air Force.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

The officers named herein for appointment in the Air National Guard of the United States of the Air Force of the United States under the provisions of section 38 of the National Defense Act as amended:

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Chester Andrew Charles, AO132773, New Jersey Air National Guard, to date from October 19, 1949.

Brig. Gen. Clyde Henry Mitchell, AO263935, New York Air National Guard, to date from October 19, 1949.

Brig. Gen. Oliver Hart Stout, AO120652, Indiana Air National Guard, to date from October 19, 1949.

Brig. Gen. James Lawton Riley, AO426156, Georgia Air National Guard, to date from December 15, 1949.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Alvin C. Murray, minister, First Methodist Church, Berryville, Ark., offered the following prayer:

Our eternal and ever-present Father, God, we are always conscious of Thy goodness in the interest of our affairs. We thank Thee that Thy hand has been seen using mysterious ways Thy wonders to perform in the history and the life of man. We pray that Thou shalt work through us to accomplish Thy ends, that we might achieve noble purposes in all our endeavors. Give us grace to examine our motives rather than simply to seek selfish ends. Give us the wisdom that comes from contemplation of Thee and from introspective thought and love of Thy Son. Guide us, use us, give us courage. In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

KARL E. MUNDT, a Senator from the State of South Dakota, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 10, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Morse
Anderson	Hendrickson	Mundt
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Myers
Bricker	Hill	Neely
Bridges	Holland	O'Conor
Butler	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Hunt	Robertson
Cain	Ives	Russell
Capehart	Jenner	Saltonstall
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Darby	Kem	Sparkman
Donnell	Kilgore	Stennis
Douglas	Knowland	Taft
Downey	Langer	Taylor
Dworshak	Leahy	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	Lehman	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	Lodge	Thye
Ellender	Long	Tobey
Ferguson	Lucas	Tydings
Flanders	McCarran	Vandenberg
Frear	McCarthy	Watkins
Fulbright	McFarland	Wherry
George	McKellar	Wiley
Gillette	McMahon	Williams
Graham	Magnuson	Young
Green	Martin	
Gurney	Maybank	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business as members of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, holding hearings on various flood-control and public-works projects in the State of New Mexico.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, holding hearings on various flood-control and public-works projects in the State of New Mexico.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. THYE obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and submit routine matters for the RECORD, and that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who now has the floor, will not lose his rights to the floor thereby.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON POSITIONS ESTABLISHED BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the number of positions established by the Department of Defense, for the calendar year 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

A letter from the Acting Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the thirty-fifth annual report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ON RATES OF RETURN

A letter from the Acting Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report entitled "Report of the Federal Trade Commission on Rates of Return for 528 Identical Companies in 25 Selected Manufacturing Industries—1940, 1947, and 1948, Based on a Report to the Commission by Its Bureau of Industrial Economics" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AUDIT REPORT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AUDIT REPORT ON CORPORATIONS OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on corporations of the Farm Credit Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES OF UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of expenditures of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY COAST GUARD

A letter from the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work by the Coast Guard, for the period July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR & RAILWAY CO.

A letter from Steptoe & Johnson, attorneys at law, Washington, D. C., transmitting pursuant to law, a report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., for the calendar year 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Great American Prospectors' Association, favoring the payment of the legal monetary price of silver to American prospectors and miners beginning February 15, 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The petition of Elbert Jefcoat, of Shingle, Calif., relating to old-age and survivors insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by the Fourth Congressional District Townsend Council, and a Sunday rally of citizens held in Lumus Park, Miami, both in the State of Florida, favoring the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan, providing old-age insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

A paper in the nature of a petition, signed by Hans J. Isbrandtsen, president, Isbrandtsen Co., Inc., of New York, N. Y., relating to attacks by the Chinese on American-flag ships; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Mrs. Mary Klepinger, of Union, Ohio, relating to the enactment of legislation prohibiting the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Max Kloen, of Oyster Bay, Long Island, N. Y., relating to the reissue of certain letters patent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Colfax County Education Association, of Clarkson, Nebr., favoring the enactment of legislation providing Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Resolutions adopted by the Mercer Dental Society, of Trenton, N. J., the Ninth District Dental Society, of New York, and the Washington State Dental Association, of Seattle, Wash., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JENNER:

A petition signed by sundry citizens of the State of Indiana, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING—PETITIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from Lucy M. Bon-Durant, member Loyal Women Bible Class, Christian Church, Mount Rainier, Md., transmitting petitions signed by the adult Sunday school classes of the Christian Church, Methodist Church, and Baptist Church, of Mount Rainier, and the Methodist Church of Brentwood, all in the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce. I present the petitions for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petitions will be received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from Mrs. Nora B. Powell, State legislative director, WCTU, New Castle County, Del., transmitting petitions signed by 1,637 citizens of New Castle County, Del., and 353 citizens of Kent County, Del., in support of legislation now pending before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising and the advertising of alcoholic beverages over the radio. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for its consideration.

I am also in receipt of a letter from Mrs. Cora S. Palmer, legislative director, WCTU, Sussex County, Del., transmitting similar petitions signed by 1,073 citizens of Sussex County, Del., urging the enactment of that legislation, and request that they be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petitions presented by the Senator from Delaware will be received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a petition signed by 650 citizens of Stuttgart, Ark., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 1847, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the petition be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, with the notation that it is signed by 650 citizens of Stuttgart, Ark.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

PETITION TO THE SENATORS OF THE STATE OF ARKANSAS RE LANGER BILL (NO. 1847) WHICH WOULD PROHIBIT THE TRANSPORTATION IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING AND STOP ITS BROADCASTING OVER THE AIR

We, the undersigned citizens of Stuttgart, Ark., favor the passage of the Langer bill and urge your support of it.

Increasing numbers of arrests, in our little city, for driving while under the influence of alcohol and for drunkenness, is noted.

Drinking at football games and most all public places is not only on the increase but it is disgusting to the average citizen, and sets a bad example for the children of school age.

This increase in drinking, no doubt, has come along with attractive ads which glamorize drinking as socially correct, seeking to create a false security in moderation.

We feel that "beer belongs" is the most insidious form of advertising, because it enters

the sanctity of the Christian family circle. The ads are misleading because they show only scenes before drinking and not the finished product.

Only you and other good Senators, by your vote, can put the Langer bill across. Won't you, therefore, please attend the committee hearing on January 12.

Signed by 650 citizens of Stuttgart, Ark.

4–H CLUB EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM AND FEDERAL ADMISSIONS TAX—RESOLUTION OF SWIFT COUNTY (MINN.) FAIR ASSOCIATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Swift County Fair Association, Appleton, Minn., relating to the 4–H Club educational program and Federal admissions tax.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the county fairs of our State and Nation serve a useful and educational purpose, promoting and encouraging improved agricultural production, promoting and supporting the 4–H Club movement, and where exhibits are a guide to improvement of farm crops and livestock; and

Whereas the county fair is an altruistic organization not operating for profit and is therefore supported by State and county appropriations; and

Whereas the Federal Government now takes in admissions tax an amount equivalent to the county and State appropriations: Therefore be it

Resolved at this the special meeting of the Swift County Fair Association, That the Federal Government be urged to support this educational institution which is helping to develop the work of over 50,000 boys and girls as members of the 4–H Clubs in the State of Minnesota; and be it further

Resolved, That such Federal support be rendered by the elimination of Federal admissions tax now exacted from county fairs, so that county fair associations will have that additional money to further develop their institutions to better serve the public; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Members of Congress with the request that they introduce and support legislation which would carry out this purpose.

INTERNATIONALISM OF JERUSALEM—RESOLUTION OF PORTLAND (OREG.) ZIONIST COUNCIL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from A. Victor Rosenfeld, chairman, Portland Zionist Council, of Portland, Oreg., transmitting a resolution adopted by that council with reference to the internationalism of Jerusalem. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Israel, having won its war of independence, has now taken its rightful place as a free and independent state among the *nations of* the world and as a member of the community of nations—the United Nations Organization; and

Whereas American Jewry, which has substantially aided in the fulfillment of the Zionist ideal, is eternally grateful to the United States Government for the leading role it played in the effectuation of Palestine's partition and in the subsequent admission of Israel to the United Nations Organization; and

Whereas the security of Israel is now being threatened, this time by the United Nations Conciliation Commission's plan to sever Jerusalem from Israel, a plan which would place all of the Holy City within a 60-square-mile enclave under the "full and permanent authority" of the United Nations; and

Whereas the Jews of Jerusalem, having undergone the most extreme suffering during the war when their city was under siege and in difficult straits, are now being called upon to surrender their city to an alien supervision; and

Whereas the siege of Jerusalem was lifted, not by a United Nations truce, but by the military strength of Israel who, though sorely pressed for its own survival summoned all of its resources to relieve stricken Jerusalem and save it from strangulation; and

Whereas the city of Jerusalem is predominantly Jewish in population (comprising approximately 90 percent of its total inhabitants), in art, culture, educational, and medical institutions; commerce; trade; and industry; and

Whereas for 3,000 years the Jewish people have looked upon Jerusalem with special reverence, regarding it as the spiritual center of the Jewish religion: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, representing the Zionist organizations of Oregon do hereby call upon the United States Government to repudiate the impractical and unjust plan of United Nations Palestine Conciliation Commission which would cut off Jerusalem, the city of Zion, from Israel; and be it further

Resolved, That while we are mindful of the international character of the Christian shrines and holy places in Jerusalem we would recommend that only these sites—and no more—be placed under the supervision of the United Nations; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Harry S. Truman and be brought to the personal attention of Congressman HOMER D. ANGELL and United States Senators WAYNE L. MORSE and GUY CORDON.

SYDNEY E. STERN,
President, Zionist Organization of America.
NATHAN DIRECTOR,
President, Mizrachi Men's Organization.
Miss ROSALIE HORENSTEIN,
President, Junior Hadassah.
Mrs. NORMAN BERENSON,
President, Portland Chapter Hadassah.
Mrs. M. FRAGER,
President, Mizrachi Women's Organization.
A. VICTOR ROSENFELD,
President, Portland Zionist Council.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING—RESOLUTION OF MARYLAND LEAGUE OF BUILDING, SAVINGS, AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, during the interim following adjournment of the Congress I received a resolution from the Maryland League of Building, Savings, and Loan Associations, Baltimore, Md., which deals with a subject of the utmost importance to the future security of our country, Government spending.

I may say that the resolution is typical of the sentiments of a great number of individuals and business groups in Maryland who feel very definitely, as I do, that there must be established a policy in the Government's fiscal operations which will recognize that the sound and proved business practice of living within one's income has its application in government as well as in every other field of national endeavor.

I send the resolution to the desk for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the cost of Government, Federal, State, and local, has continued to increase until today more than 25 percent of the national income is taken in the form of taxes for the operation of Government; and

Whereas the Maryland League of Building, Savings, and Loan Associations, like similar associations throughout the United States, represents thousands of substantial citizens who are either buying their homes on monthly or weekly payments or who by self-denial are endeavoring to accumulate by savings a down payment on a home which they hope some day to own, and yet another group who by small weekly or monthly savings are endeavoring to build a modest competence for their old age; and

Whereas every dollar expended by the Government, whether Federal, State or local, is a dollar taken from these thrifty citizens and handicaps them in their efforts toward personal security—a situation existing not only in Maryland but in every State in the Union: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Maryland League of Building, Savings, and Loan Associations on this, its twenty-ninth annual meeting, calls upon our representatives and Federal, State, and local Government officials to give heed to the excessive cost of Government and bend every effort to reduce expenditures and particularly to eliminate unnecessary services.

The secretary is hereby instructed to forward copies of this resolution to Representatives in the Congress of the United States as well as State and local officials.

EDWARD J. BANEY,
President.
GEORGE J. CLAUTICE,
Secretary.

DISMANTLING OF CERTAIN GERMAN PLANTS—PETITION AND LETTER

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, two items. One is a petition addressed to the President of the United States, signed by 700 workers of the Hochfrequenz-Tiegelstahl G. m. b. H., at Bochum, Germany.

The other is a letter from Dr. John B. Crane in regard to the continued dismantling of German plants. Two different committees were called upon to study phases of the dismantling program in Germany, one headed by Mr. Keenan, the other the Humphrey committee. Both of them unanimously recommended that the steel plant at Bochum, Germany, should not be dismantled. Mr. Keenan declared it was indispensable to the recovery and successful operation of the coal mines. The Humphrey committee declared the plant was essential to the efficient operation of the German steel industry and to the economic recovery of western Europe.

Despite the unanimous opinion on the part of the two committees, this steel plant, upon the insistence of Great Britain, is being destroyed. "Dismantling"

is the wrong word—it is being scrapped. If we can believe our two committees, it is going to affect very seriously the economic recovery of Europe, and, while we are tearing down this steel plant, we have just completed spending $45,000,000 building a huge steel plant in France. I may say I think the British and our State Department and the ECA are going a long way toward making it impossible for many of us to vote further ECA aid to Great Britain.

There being no objection, the petition and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

PETITION OF THE WORKERS OF THE HOCHFREQUENZ-TIEGELSTAHL G. M. B. H.

BOCHUM (WESTPHALIA), *December 20, 1949.*

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is with heavy hearts that we come to you this Christmas season for help in our despair.

We are 710 workers in the German steel plant at Hochfrequenz-Tiegelstahl at Bochum in the Ruhr. During these next 2 weeks, in a season most sacred of the year to our families, as to all Christian workers throughout the world, we are to see the complete destruction of the plant which is our livelihood.

The reason for this we can never understand. Our badly damaged plant was informed on February 21, 1947, by a written statement of the military government that it was withdrawn from the dismantling list. We rejoiced. With our own hands and no more pay each day than the value of a cigarette, despite great hunger, we speeded up rebuilding the walls of our factory and the reconstruction of the machinery. Three of our skilled steelworkers lost their lives in this sacrifice, because they were inexperienced in construction work. At last our factory was once more in useful operation.

Then the blow fell. With no explanation to us we were placed again on the dismantling list.

Mr. President, from that day to this our lives have been filled with uncertainty and anguish. We have learned that all United States investigating committees argued that our plant was necessary and should be saved. All political parties in Germany have spoken out for us. And still we are doomed.

Mr. President, this Christmas season is one of deepest sorrow for us, and we face the new year with despair. In our town of Bochum there are already several thousand metal workers out of jobs. What then can we look forward to? Among us is a larger percentage than in most German factories of partially disabled workers. These live absolutely without hope now.

We trust you will believe our sincerity when we say we long only to produce things which will be useful in a peaceful world. At this Christmas season we say from the depths of our hearts we long only for peace on earth, good will to men. But to show this and to be convinced democrats, we must be permitted to earn our living with our own hands.

Dear Mr. President, if you can't help us and help us quickly, we and our families will be lost. Will you not, as the leader of the greatest and most humane nation in the world, save our plant and make it possible for us to live as decent, useful people?

In love and hopefulness, we ask this.

Sincerely.

LETTER TO SENATOR MCCARTHY

JANUARY 6, 1950.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARTHY: The Hochfrequenz-Tiegelstahl works (a small steel plant in the Ruhr making high alloy heat-resistant steels) at Bochum has been 35 percent dismantled as of December 21, 1949, and the completion of the dismantling is scheduled by the British for January 25.

Any further dismantling of the plant will affect key furnaces and equipment, and will cause the shut-down of the plant, with over 600 workers losing their jobs shortly after January 15.

EFFORTS PREVIOUSLY MADE TO STOP DISMANTLING OF THIS PLANT

The American Government made two investigations of the Hochfrequenz steel plant at Bochum in 1948. One of these was made by Mr. Keenan, and one by a group headed by Mr. Wolf, who worked for the Humphrey committee (Paul Hoffman's committee). In both cases the American experts unanimously recommended that this steel plant be saved. Mr. Keenan declared that it was indispensable to the recovery and successful operation of the German coal mines. Mr. Wolf declared that the plant was essential to the efficient operation of Germany's steel industry and to the economic recovery of western Europe.

Several United States Senators have intervened with the State Department on behalf of this plant. Among those who have tried to save this plant are Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and Senator MCCARRAN, chairman of the ECA "watchdog committee." Moreover, Senators BRIDGES and WHERRY have been active in trying to save this and other steel plants.

PAST AND PRESENT DISMANTLING STATUS OF HOCHFREQUENZ-TIEGELSTAHL PLANT

During the war the Hochfrequenz steel plant was badly damaged by bombings. The British decided the plant was not a war plant and gave the plant a work permit to resume operations, and removed the plant from the reparations list in February 1947.

With the plant removed from the reparations list early in 1947 the management and workers got busy and rebuilt the plant with an expenditure of over 4,000,000 marks. Over 2 years later, on May 5, 1949, the British notified the plant that it would be dismantled beginning July 1, 1949.

As a result of the intervention of Senators GEORGE, MCCARRAN, and others, the British withdrew the dismantling order temporarily, but gave out a new order a month later. They ordered the dismantling to begin August 3, 1949. Dismantling has been in progress since that date and still continues.

In justifying their new order to dismantle the Hochfrequenz steel works the British Government told the State Department that duplicate capacity existed in other German steel plants and that the output of the small Bochum plant could easily be taken over by other steel plants. They said the workers could readily be absorbed in other industries when the plant was dismantled.

I have just returned from Germany where I took occasion to visit the Hochfrequenz plant and to talk with the management. They declare that the bulk of their production cannot be produced in any other steel plant in Germany as it requires special furnaces and highly specialized equipment not available elsewhere. The dismantlement of their plant will make them dependent on imports from the British and French alloy steel industries.

Moreover, I checked with the mayor's office in Bochum and found that the town already has over 2,500 unemployed metal workers as a result of the recent dismantling of the huge Bochumer Verein steel plant which is also located in the town of Bochum.

Hence, if the Hochfrequenz-Tiegelstahl works is dismantled, it will dump an additional 650 workers and their families on the local relief rolls. Since unemployment has been growing in western Germany in recent months, is it desirable deliberately to increase this unemployment by the dismantling of a nonwar steel plant?

The British admit that the Hochfrequenz steel plant is not a primary war plant, and that almost all of its production has always been for major peacetime industries such as the railway industry, the coal-mining industry, the electric utility industry, etc.

ADENAUER INTERVENES TO SAVE HOCHFREQUENZ

Dr. Adenauer, the Reichs Chancelor of the new Federal Republic of Western Germany, has just intervened to try to save the Hochfrequenz plant at Bochum. At the last meeting of the three Allied high commissioners for Germany, held on December 16, 1949, at Petersberg, near Bonn, Dr. Adenauer pleaded for the saving of the Hochfrequenz plant. The commissioners replied that since the plant was not included in the list of plants agreed upon at Paris in November, it was not within their jurisdiction to consider his request.

It should be noted that the decision to dismantle the Hochfrequenz plant was made without any reasons ever being given in defense of such action, and without the Germans ever being told why the plant was to be dismantled, or ever being permitted to refute erroneous statements which have been made about the plant.

It is the consensus of opinion of American experts who have carefully studied the Bochum situation that the major motive behind the British insistence on dismantling the Hochfrequenz plant is the desire to eliminate German competition.

Of great significance in this regard is the fact that the American High Commissioner for Germany, John J. McCloy, told me in a conference in his office at Frankfurt, Germany, on December 19, 1949, that he personally would like to see the Hochfrequenz plant saved.

AN IMMEDIATE MORATORIUM ON DISMANTLING IS NECESSARY

If the Hochfrequenz steel plant at Bochum is to be saved, an immediate moratorium on further dismantling is necessary. Such a moratorium should be for 60 or 90 days, or whatever period is required for the appointment of a special committee to investigate and report on the situation at Bochum. No harm could result from such a moratorium and investigation, while such an inquiry might well prevent a grave injustice being done.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. CRANE,
Washington, D. C.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 180. Resolution to amend rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate with respect to a quorum of committees and subcommittees; without amendment (Rept. No. 1208).

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR REED, OF KANSAS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 201, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 201) submitted by Mr. SCHOEPPEL on January 5, 1950, was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by

the committee appointed to arrange for and attend the funeral of Hon. Clyde M. Reed, late a Senator from the State of Kansas, on vouchers to be approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF PERSONNEL AND FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following report was received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JANUARY 10, 1950.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Elizabeth B. Springer, acting chief clerk	$7,775.31	$3,764.20
Janice M. Everly, stenographer	4,588.89	2,221.56
Sam Oglesby, stenographer	4,588.89	2,221.56
Jesse R. Nichols, document clerk	3,980.55	1,927.10
Hal P. Phillips, professional staff	7,775.31	3,764.20
Serge Benson, professional staff	9,766.16	4,728.04

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended Jan. 1, 1949, to June 30, 1949 (already reported)	3,212.55
Amount expended July 1, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1949	584.16
Balance unexpended	6,203.29

WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 2829. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2830. A bill for the relief of E. C. Browder and Charles Kenyon; and

S. 2831. A bill for the relief of Constantinous Tzortzis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 2832. A bill for the relief of the Hotchkiss Sales Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. CAIN introduced Senate bill 2833, to effectuate the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government with respect to the organization of the Department of the Interior, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2834. A bill for the relief of Gerd. Anni Berger Fedje; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2835. A bill for the relief of Boris Paul von Stuckenberg and wife, Maria Alexander von Stuckenberg (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2836. A bill to extend the terms of patents No. 97,889, 128,610, 130,479, and 2,138,992; and

S. 2837. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Claire Phillips Clavier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to effectuate the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government with respect to the organization of the Department of the Interior, and I ask unanimous consent that a brief explanatory statement of the bill by me be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 2833) to effectuate the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government with respect to the organization of the Department of the Interior, introduced by Mr. CAIN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. CAIN is as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAIN

Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate committee reference proposed legislation dealing with certain aspects of Federal hydroelectric power projects, irrigation-reclamation projects, and flood-control projects throughout our Nation.

This bill, for which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the end of these remarks, has been drafted to follow, as closely as possible, the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government as reflects our Nation's water resources.

Nearly all recommendations of the Commission have been drafted into legislation, and this bill virtually completes the introduction of bills necessary to enable the Congress to study various recommendations in legislative form.

My prime purpose in introducing this legislation is with the same view I had in mind when I introduced other bills dealing with multiple-purpose projects. These bills were: S. 1595, introduced April 14, 1949, dealing with the comprehensive plans agreed to by the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for development of the Columbia River; S. 1631, introduced April 18, 1949, dealing with the administration's plan for establishment of a Columbia Valley Administration; and S. 1632, introduced April 1949, which would establish a Columbia Interstate Commission.

When the bills were introduced in the first session of this Congress, I told the Senate:

"Every suggestion and plan ought to be minutely analyzed and studied by the Congress * * * the problem before the Congress is to make as certain as it can that the very best procedures are employed in securing the maximum beneficial good from the broadest utilization of the resources of the Columbia River Basin and any other river basin."

I introduced these various bills in order that all of the proposed development programs for the Pacific Northwest might be, at the same time, before the committee having jurisdiction, and the Congress. Some of this legislation has been introduced only for the purpose of having all plans up for consideration at one and the same time. The three bills I introduced in the last session are, along with other similar bills, now being considered by the Senate Public Works Committee. Hearings have been held in Washington, D. C., on these proposals. Further extensive hearings must be held in the field.

During the hearings already held, numerous and frequent references have been made by witnesses, and members of the committee, to the recommendations by the Hoover Commission on river-basin projects. While these recommendations are on a national, rather than regional scale, they have a direct and important bearing on the Pacific Northwest and I think the time is now here when the Senate should have these recommendations before it, in bill form, for consideration.

Reading of the bill will readily reveal, in simple terms what it proposes to do. As best it could, the legislation was drawn up to follow the recommendations of the Commission as outlined in the Task Force Report on Water Resources Projects, known as Appendix K of the Commission's over-all report. Regardless of whether one is for or against the Hoover Commission proposals, this bill places the recommendations in legislative form for better study. This bill would consolidate all river-development activities of the Nation within the regular structure of the executive department, specifically through a new water development and use service in the Department of the Interior.

CONSTRUCTION, REPAIR, AND PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAYBANK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservtion of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 2246) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the amendments, prepared by me, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table, and, without objection, the summary presented by the Senator from South Carolina will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The summary is as follows:

JANUARY 11, 1950.

SUMMARY BY SENATOR MAYBANK ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO S. 2246, RELATING TO THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

CHANGES IN TITLE I OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT (EXTENSION OF INSURANCE PROGRAM FOR MODERNIZATION AND REPAIR LOANS)

Amendment 1 would extend on a permanent basis the program for insurance of modernization and repair loans under title I of the National Housing Act. Up to the present time this program has operated on the

basis of a series of extensions by the Congress, and under existing law would expire on March 1, 1950. Under S. 2246 (sec. 101), as reported by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, the program would have been extended until July 1, 1952. Under this amendment 1, each financial institution participating in the program would, as in the past, build up an insurance reserve representing 10 percent of the amount of its title I loans and advances of credit, which would constitute the extent of the Government's maximum insurance liability to the institution. However, after a reserve is built up over a 30-month period under the amendment, one-fifth of the reserve would be cut back at the expiration of each 6-month period, beginning January 1, 1953. For administrative convenience, all these reserve cutbacks would be made on July 1, and January 1 of each year. This amendment would become effective March 1, 1950.

Amendment 2 would provide that the new maximum authorization for the title I modernization and repair loan program provided in S. 2246 would not become effective until March 1, 1950. This would make the effective date of such authorization consistent with the effective date of amendment 1.

Amendment 3 would reduce (from $5,000,000 to $1,000,000) the initial amount provided for the title I housing insurance fund under section 8 of S. 2246. That fund would constitute a revolving fund for carrying out the mortgage insurance program for very low-cost homes under section 8, particularly in suburban and outlying areas.

CHANGES IN TITLE II OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT (INCREASED AUTHORIZATION AND RENTAL-HOUSING AMENDMENTS)

Amendment 4 would increase the mortgage-insurance authorization under title II of the National Housing Act by $1,250,000,000 immediately, and by an additional $1,500,000,000 upon the approval of the President. The present provisions of S. 2246 (in sec. 103 of the bill) have become obsolete by virtue of the enactment of Public Law 387 on October 25, 1949, and the passage of time.

Amendment 5 would make certain changes in section 207 of the National Housing Act in order to provide a better method for the insurance of mortgages on rental-housing projects on the basis of permanent legislative authorization, as distinguished from the emergency temporary rental-housing program under section 608, which is due to expire on March 1, 1950.

At the present time the amount of a rental-housing mortgage insured under section 207 may not exceed 80 percent of the value of the property, and such mortgage may not exceed $8,100 per family unit, except that in the case of certain mortgages on housing of cooperatives this dollar limitation may be $1,800 per room. Amendment 5 would substitute the following schedule of ratios of maximum loan to value: Not to exceed the sum of 90 percent of the first $7,000 value per family unit and 60 percent of the value in excess of $7,000 and not in excess of $10,000 per family unit. The $8,100 per family unit maximum in section 207 would be retained, except that this dollar limitation would be $7,500 per family unit if the number of rooms in the project does not equal or exceed four and one-half per family unit. This exception is designed to encourage the production of rental accommodations of adequate size for families with children. (These maximums in sec. 207 may be compared to the mortgage ceilings of $8,100 per family unit and 90 percent of necessary current cost under sec. 608.) Special mortgage insurance ceilings would be provided for Alaska in view of the higher costs and other conditions peculiar to that Territory.

The amendment would expressly state that the insurance of mortgages under section 207 is intended to facilitate particularly the production of rental accommodations of design and size suitable for family living and at rents within the means of families of moderate income. The Federal Housing Commissioner would be directed to take action which would make the benefits of mortgage insurance under this section available primarily to projects making adequate provision for families with children and in which every effort has been made to achieve moderate rental charges. The amendment would impose penalty provisions (similar to those applicable to sec. 608 housing) for discriminating against families with children in the selection of tenants.

This amendment would also change section 207 (d) of the National Housing Act to increase the maximum FHA charges for appraisal and inspection fees under section 207 from one-half of 1 percent to 1 percent.

Amendment 6 would make certain technical changes in section 207 with respect to foreclosure in the event of mortgage default.

Amendment 7 is technical.

Amendment 11 would make section 608 expire at the time of the enactment of S. 2246 instead of the present expiration date of March 1, 1950.

READJUSTMENT OF POSTAL RATES—RECOMMITTAL OF BILL

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 1103) to readjust postal rates be taken from the calendar and recommitted to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SUGGESTED USE OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY PROVISIONS OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution on behalf of myself, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

The sponsors of the concurrent resolution have concluded that there is persuasive evidence that the growing strike in the coal industry, if permitted to continue, will impair the national health and safety. We cite the existence on the statute books of a law authorizing the President of the United States to act in such circumstances to protect the national health and safety.

The concurrent resolution would be advisory to the President. The Senate of the United States, with the House concurring, should adopt the resolution advising the President that it is the sense of the Congress that in view of existing circumstances the President should invoke the national emergency provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.

On nine previous occasions the President has employed these provisions, which are sections 206 to 210 of the act. Those sections set forth the steps which the President may take when, in his opinion, a threatened or actual strike, if permitted to continue, will imperil the national health or safety:

First. He appoints a board of inquiry to inquire into the issues involved and make a written report to him. He may limit the time for the board's consideration and he has, in the past, required such reports within the matter of a very few days.

Second. Upon receiving a report from the board of inquiry, he may direct the Attorney General to seek an injunction.

In three of the nine occasions upon which the President has in the past invoked these national emergency sections the dispute was settled without the necessity of seeking an injunction.

The nine cases in which the President has invoked the emergency sections are as follows:

First. Atomic energy—injunction issued.

Second. Meat packing — Emergency board created and made its report, but no injunction was sought.

Third. First coal strike—injunction issued.

Fourth. Second coal strike—strike called off before petition for injunction was sought.

Fifth. Long-lines telephone—Emergency board created, but strike was settled without the board considering the case.

Sixth. Maritime, first east-coast strike—injunction issued.

Seventh. Maritime, west coast—injunction issued.

Eighth. Maritime, Great Lakes—injunction issued.

Ninth. Maritime, second east-coast strike—injunction issued.

I send the concurrent resolution to the desk for appropriate reference.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 68), was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Whereas there is persuasive and compelling evidence that the current strike in the coal industry will, if permitted to continue, imperil the national health and safety; and

Whereas there already exists legislation authorizing the President to act under such circumstances to protect the national health and safety: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should invoke the national emergency provisions (secs. 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, in the current strike in the coal industry.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. MAYBANK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 208), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking ing and Currency hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-first Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946, as increased by Senate Resolution 175, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to October 13, 1949.

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON MARGARINE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Should the Senate Remove Restrictions on Margarine Now?" delivered

by him on America's Town Meeting of the Air, on January 10, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUPPORT FOR MARGARINE LEGISLATION—LETTER BY HAROLD A. YOUNG

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Harold A. Young, urging support for margarine legislation, published in the Progress Bulletin of Memphis, Tenn., of January 1, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

HISTORY OF LAYING OF CORNERSTONE OF THE WHITE HOUSE

[Mr. McKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a history of the laying of the cornerstone of the White House on October 13, 1792, including an article from the Charleston (S. C.) City Gazette, which appears in the Appendix.]

MULTIPLE-PURPOSE DAMS FIT IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES—ARTICLE BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on multiple-purpose dams and the development of natural resources, written by him and published in the January issue of the Farm and Ranch magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NATIONAL BUDGET OF SCIENTIFIC WORK FOR 1950—ADDRESS BY DR. JOHN R. STEELMAN

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The National Budget of Scientific Work for 1950," delivered by Dr. John R. Steelman, Assistant to the President, before the Third National Men of Science and Industry dinner, Washington, D. C., December 2, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

WE ARE FOR TAFT'S REELECTION—EDITORIAL FROM COLLIER'S MAGAZINE

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Are for TAFT's Reelection," published in the January 14, 1950, issue of Collier's, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR SCOTT W. LUCAS—ARTICLE BY SIDNEY SHALETT

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding Senator LUCAS, written by Sidney Shalett, and published in Collier's magazine for January 14, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY MARY DONLON BEFORE NEW YORK STATE FEDERATION

[Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered at a meeting of the board of the New York State Federation by Mary Donlon, National Federation's program coordination chairman and chairman of the New York State Workmen's Compensation Board, published in the Independent Woman of November 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

FORMOSA STAND SAID TO PUT ALL PACIFIC IN JEOPARDY—ARTICLES BY GILL ROBB WILSON

[Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Formosa Stand Said To Put All Pacific in Jeopardy," written by Gill Robb Wilson, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of January 10, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHY IS GENERATION A PERENNIAL ISSUE?—ARTICLE FROM THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION MAGAZINE

[Mr. YOUNG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Why Is Generation a Perennial Issue?" written by Malcolm W. Wehrung, and published in the January 1950 issue of the Rural Electrification magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

A POLITICAL PROGRAM FOR DEMOCRACY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Political Program for Democracy," delivered by him before the New York Herald Tribune Forum on October 24, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

AGRICULTURAL PRICE SUPPORTS AND THE BRANNAN FARM PROGRAM—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entiled "United States Price Props for Farm Crops Dip, Survey Reveals," published in the St. Paul (Minn.) Dispatch of December 12, 1949, and an editorial entitled "Brannan's Warning," published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of December 14, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

LAST YEAR'S LYNCHINGS

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Last Year's Lynchings," published in the Washington Star of January 9, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLICY FOR ASIA?—ARTICLE BY JOSEPH AND STEWART ALSOP

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Policy for Asia?" written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, and published in the Washington Post of January 9, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOMPERS CENTENNIAL—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Gompers Centennial," published in the Washington Star of January 9, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROGRAM FOR STRENGTHENING CONGRESS—LETTER TO SENATOR HUMPHREY FROM ROBERT HELLER

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him under date of January 27, 1949, by Robert Heller, chairman of the National Committee for Strengthening Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

TURN OF THE CENTURY—EDITORIAL FROM THE MINNEAPOLIS TRIBUNE

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Turn of the Century," published in the Minneapolis Tribune of January 1, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

BENEFITS PAID MINNESOTA WAR VETS PASS $105,000,000—ARTICLE FROM THE ST. PAUL DISPATCH

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Benefits Paid Minnesota War Vets Pass $105,000,000," published in the St. Paul Dispatch of January 6, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

SAMUEL GOMPERS—HIS STORY

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Samuel Gompers—His Story," published in the Minneapolis Labor Review of January 5, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

FLOOD PERIL AT VINCENNES, IND.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared dealing with flood conditions at Vincennes, Ind., and I also ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "Vincennes Peril Grows," written by Jep Cadou, Jr., published in the Indianapolis Star of January 9, 1950.

There being no objection, the statement and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

Mr. President, at this moment the citizens of that historic city of Vincennes, Ind., are hoping and praying that an unfinished flood-prevention project holds off the raging waters of the Wabash River.

At this moment, Mr. President, the citizens of Vincennes are in deathly fear of the catastrophe they hoped would be prevented by a flood wall for which they have pleaded for years.

I am sure that every Member of the Senate has been reading of the disastrous Indiana floods and the great danger to Vincennes.

The crest of the Wabash flood is expected today or tomorrow.

Whether the short and completely inadequate flood wall around Vincennes will hold is a matter of conjecture.

Vincennes suffered heavy damage from floods in 1943 and in 1945.

I was there and watched Vincennes fight for its life in 1943.

Only because wartime troops stationed near Vincennes were rushed into the city to help bulwark its defenses against the floodwaters was the city saved.

In 1945 more damage came to the city, and in 1946 the Congress heeded our pleas for help and authorized a new and larger and safer flood wall.

While that was pending in the budget another flood hit Vincennes and finally the Congress appropriated $40,000 for planning a new flood wall with authorization to spend $360,000 for building the wall this year.

I appeared before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate last April and pleaded that the appropriation be made so that work could start at once.

I am fully familiar with the Vincennes problem and I greatly feared the very thing that is happening today in Vincennes.

In my testimony before the committee I said:

"This, to my mind, is an emergency because these floods in the Wabash River simply will not wait; and if we have a really bad flood and a lot of high water, we are going to lose literally tens and tens of thousands of dollars' worth of property. We are going to lose a lot of levees."

Mr. President, I gave this warning to the committee:

"I am fearful even now that we will lose the whole thing before it can be finished."

You see, Mr. President, I live along the White River just about 20 miles away, and I am quite familiar with what happens when the Wabash River goes on a rampage.

The fears I expressed for the safety of Vincennes less than a year ago were not unfounded.

If the Congress a year ago could have taken a meager $360,000 out of the billions and billions of dollars that were sent overseas the people of Vincennes would not today be in danger.

We have been penny-wise and pound-foolish in many ways, Mr. President, and this instance is certainly one of them.

For the last several days nearly 1,000 troops from Fort Knox, Ky., have been helping the Vincennes volunteers in the battle to save the city that was the first capital of the great Northwest Territory.

Thousands upon thousands of dollars are being spent to bolster that wholly inadequate flood wall.

Thousands upon thousands of dollars are l. ing lost in property because levees above and below the city have been broken in order to save the city.

And yet today we are not sure that the city of Vincennes will not be wiped out along with many other levees along the river.

I think, Mr. President, that in this session of the Congress we could well give more attention to our own people before we spend weeks and months of our time perfecting ways and means of pouring more billions of dollars into foreign lands.

[From the Indianapolis Star of January 9, 1950]

VINCENNES PERIL GROWS—SANDBAGS RUSHED AS RIVER THREATENS TO OVERFLOW LEVEE

(By Jep Cadou, Jr.)

Troops and volunteers frantically sandbagged the Vincennes sea wall last night in preparation for the highest flood crest in the city's history—expected to reach within inches of the top of the wall.

As the rising Wabash River reached 26.15 feet there yesterday, the Weather Bureau revised upward a previous estimate of a 28-foot crest.

The river probably will go over 28 feet and perhaps almost to 29 late Wednesday or early Thursday, said Paul A. Miller, chief meteorologist at the Indianapolis Weather Bureau.

The wall is 29 feet high. Army engineers said troops from Fort Knox, Ky., may be ordered momentarily to begin construction of mud boxes atop the wall to safeguard the city.

Meantime, 30 miles north, a crumbling dirt levee was expected to wash out momentarily and flood 5,500 acres of farm land. Authorities gave up an attempt to save the levee by sandbagging.

Graysville, a small Sullivan County community 5 miles east of the expected levee break, was evacuated and Indiana 154 was blocked by Indiana State police.

On the Illinois shore of the Wabash River, opposite the weakened levee, Illinois State police closed the Hudsonville bridge.

Indiana State Police Superintendent Arthur M. Thurston expressed fear some sightseers attracted to the area might have remained and could be in danger.

State police said a shift in wind or the flood crest, due within 48 hours near Graysville, could wash out the levee. If the break occurs, a slightly lower crest would occur at Vincennes.

With the level of the Wabash behind the levee higher than the downtown business section, water began pouring up through sewer openings on downtown streets. Evening services at the First Methodist Church were cut short so that the congregation could leave before water, already running-board deep, became too high for driving.

The Niblack levee, nine miles north of Vincennes, broke through at 9:20 p. m., flooding 16,000 acres of bottomland, State police reported. There were no casualties.

U S 50 between Vincennes and Lawrenceville, Ill., was closed by high water yesterday.

Some 970 troops and 200 volunteers were filling and stacking sandbags last night.

REPEAL OF EXCISE TAXES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I prepared this morning entitled "Excise Taxes Should Be Repealed Right Now Simultaneously With Dairy Amendment to Oleomargarine Bill."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

EXCISE TAXES SHOULD BE REPEALED RIGHT NOW SIMULTANEOUSLY WITH DAIRY AMENDMENT TO OLEOMARGARINE BILL

Mr. President, yesterday I attached, on behalf of myself and cosponsor of the Gillette-Wiley amendment to the oleomargarine bill, the Butler-Johnson amendment for reduction of the wartime rates of many nuisance excise taxes. Unfortunately, there has been a certain amount of confusion on this question interjected into the discussion by the oleo lobby, and I should like to set forth below, in a few points, the issue as we see it:

1. We have provided to the American consumer a golden opportunity to repeal excise taxes right now instead of waiting for some mythical tomorrow, when the administration may deign to bring up the excise-tax issue. We notice that the opposition is frantically promising to bring up excise taxes sometime during the session. In the meantime, however, it is simply stating a fact that the administration will be bombarding Congress with requests to spend $42,000,000,000 and more money, and even increase the prospective $5,000,000,000 deficit. In other words, as time goes on, the administration hopes to embarrass the Congress so much, by its requests for appropriations, that the promise of excise-tax repeal will more and more fade into the background.

2. The Senators who have agreed to a one-package excise-tax repeal—dairy substitute amendment—did so in sincere support of excise-tax relief. In other words, we firmly believe, as our able colleague, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] said yesterday, that the time is long overdue to cut the tax on transportation of persons from 15 to 10 percent; on local telephone calls from 15 to 10 percent; on luggage to eliminate completely the retailers' excise tax of 20 percent, replacing it only by the previous manufacturers' tax of 10 percent. We believe that the time is overdue to cut the wartime rate on admissions.

The opposition has attempted to smear our effort and to imply that we are simply trying to kill oleo legislation. That, Mr. President, I respectfully submit is a downright misstatement and misinterpretation of fact. We want some form of oleo legislation to pass, and we want it to pass with excise-tax repeal. We want the dairy substitute amendment to be voted simultaneously with excise-tax relief.

I say to my colleagues who announce that they will try to strike the excise-tax provisions from the dairy amendment:

You are unwittingly fooling yourselves and fooling the people in leading them to believe that—

(a) The people will ever get excise-tax relief unless it is voted immediately, or

(b) A real friend of the 2,250,000 dairy farmers can simultaneously vote for the dairy amendment but vote to strike out the excise-tax amendment.

The dairy farmers of America are not fools. They recognize that a one-package dairy substitute excise-tax bill provides the greatest hope for American agriculture and for the American consumer simultaneously.

I urge every American voter, who wants his excise-tax burden relieved, to urge his Senator to vote to retain the one-package approach, rather than to split it.

PROPOSED RESUMPTION OF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH SPAIN—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared urging that the United States send an Ambassador back to Madrid to resume normal diplomatic relations with the Spanish Government. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this statement be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SHOULD RESUME RELATIONS WITH SPAIN THROUGH AN AMBASSADOR AT MADRID

It has been my firm belief that the best interests of the United States and of world freedom and peace would be served by arranging for the return of an American Ambassador to Madrid to resume normal relations with the Spanish Government.

There is quite a bit of confusion by some folks on this point. In order to be positively sure, in turn, about my own facts, some 3 months ago, I addressed an inquiry to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to secure the background of this problem. On the basis of the answer which I received and further inquiries which I have conducted, I should like to state the following:

WE DO RIGHT NOW HAVE BUSINESS WITH MADRID

1. It would be inaccurate to say that the United States does not recognize General Franco's government. Actually we have an Embassy at Madrid which is under the supervision of a chargé d'affaires, and we continue to do business with the Spanish Government, but not through an Ambassador.

2. We have not had an Ambassador there for several years. This is due largely to the fact that in 1946 the General Assembly of the United Nations passed a resolution recommending to the members of the United Nations that their Ambassadors to Madrid be withdrawn. Even then, our Ambassador was not at his post in Madrid and since then we have not returned him to his duties there.

3. Prior to that, at the San Francisco Conference a resolution was passed to the effect that Spain should not be permitted to participate in the work of the UN as long as General Franco headed the Government.

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT OF RESUMING RELATIONS

4. The fact that leading American legislators believe that the time is long overdue to change America's policy is indicated by the following: Both Senators CONNALLY and VANDENBERG have expressed the view that it is, for example, completely inconsistent for us to have an Ambassador in hostile Moscow and not one in anti-Communist Madrid. We also note that the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Congressman KEE, has now also recommended steps toward a resumption of ambassadorial relations with the Madrid government.

UN RESOLUTION NOT BINDING

5. I should like to point out that in December 1949, at a press conference, Senator CONNALLY stated his belief that the resolution adopted by the UN General Assembly "was not necessarily binding on the United States." He further stated that "it was simply a persuasive resolution recommending to the country that they do this." Senator CONNALLY then went on to emphasize the advantages of having an Ambassador at Madrid, and I will set them forth now.

SPAIN HAS VITAL SIGNIFICANCE TO WESTERN PLANS

6. No one disputes the fact that if an American Ambassador represents our interests there, he can look after the needs of our citizens, serve as a listening post, conduct high-level talks, if necessary with Spanish officials, report to our Government on trends in that area of Europe and elsewhere, etc. This is wholly aside from the question of the present status of our fight against communism throughout the globe.

7. But now, at this point, let us add the crucial fact that we are engaged in a cold war with the anti-Christian and revolutionary conspiracy of the Soviet Union. We have poured untold billions of dollars since the end of the war into Europe to stop communism. We are right now pouring a billion dollars of arms into the western European countries. We are not being choosy about the politics of some of our friends, because we have no alternative but to side with those who sincerely oppose communism.

We sent military missions to Greece although we had doubts about some of our friends there; but we had no doubts about the murderous Greek Communists who were destroying that unhappy little land. We are pouring economic and other aid to Red-turncoat Marshal Tito, although the memory is still fresh in our mind that he was blithely shooting down American airmen but a few years ago.

FEW NATIONS ENJOY AMERICAN-STYLE LIBERTIES

The Portuguese Government is a party to the North Atlantic Treaty, although her people do not enjoy the rights that our own people do. In fact, if we were to withdraw our ambassadors from every country whose people do not enjoy American-style civil liberties, we would have an army of unemployed American envoys, including United States diplomats from every country behind the iron curtain.

We thus see that a realistic view of the situation requires that we utilize every instrument available in our fight against communism or else we will simply be cutting off our nose to spite our face. We will be failing to fully recognize General Franco's government because of some obsolete decisions made by the UN which are by no means binding.

SPAIN'S INTERNAL AFFAIRS ARE SPAIN'S BUSINESS

8. To return our Ambassador to Spain does not mean that we approve of the Madrid government's policies any more than we necessarily approve any other government's policies. Spanish internal affairs are the business of the Spanish people themselves. No one disputes the fact that General Franco is now, always has been, and always will be a powerful opponent of communism. The position of Spain at Gibraltar and at the Pyrenees is of obvious military importance in future operations.

To return our Ambassador to Madrid does not mean, of course, that we are committed to defending western Europe only at the Pyrenees (as against defending it at the Rhine.)

The Madrid government is stable. It possesses all the qualities of a state, and it is ridiculously inconsistent for us to pursue a policy which is now completely outdated, which is not doing us any good, the devout Spanish people any good, or western Europe any good, but which is only helping our common foe—the brutal Communist clique in the Kremlin.

CONCLUSION

I, therefore, urge the President and his Secretary of State to reconsider their policy and to change it in the light of present-day realities. I urge them to make the strongest possible representations accordingly to the United Nations.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], inserting certain language after line 10, on page 4 of the original bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I rise to support the Gillette-Wiley substitute to H. R. 2023. Because I am convinced that removal of restrictions relating to oleomargarine colored yellow in imitation of butter would have a serious adverse effect on the dairy industry, and eventually the entire agricultural economy, I have joined with a group of 25 Senators in sponsoring this amendment in the nature of a substitute to House bill 2023. The amendment would repeal the Federal taxes on oleomargarine, but would make unlawful the manufacture, transportation, or sale of yellow oleomargarine in interstate commerce. This measure is along the lines I believe necessary as a fair safeguard to consumers and producers of both dairy products and substitutes.

Yellow oleomargarine manufactured or colored within the borders of a State or Territory in which it is consumed would not be subject to the provisions of the proposed act, but would be subject to the laws and regulations of the State or Territory. The application of Federal pure-food laws would not be limited by the act, and the enforcement provisions of those laws are specifically cited in connection with the new provisions to be administered by the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency.

In all areas except those adjacent to large metropolitan centers, the dairy producer is dependent on the butter market. The dairy farm lends itself to the most practical type of diversified farming. It is a family-type farm operation, and that is just what we are trying to continue in America, with its individual ownership, individual management, and individual opportunity for the children of a family to assist in the farm work.

We have appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars for soil conservation and soil-building practices. Butterfat comes from dairy farms which, with their acres of pasture lands and legumes, build the soil. A large percentage of oleomargarine is processed from vegetable oils produced from row-crop operations, such as soybean and cotton production, which deplete the soil.

Even in the South, progressive agriculturists have endeavored to establish livestock and diversified farm management in the development of family-type farms. If we now yield to the great pressure of a few large processors of oleomargarine, some of whom are internationally involved—a pressure aided by the Cotton Council—we shall be taking a step backward in respect to the continuance and growth of family farms in this Nation.

I wish to call the attention of Senators to some of the previous statements which have been made not only by my colleague the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] but also by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and other Senators, who have called specific attention to the international cartels and international organizations which are hoping to engage or which are engaged in the processing of oleomargarine.

Mr. President, it was just a few years ago that a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture attended a hearing at Memphis, Tenn.; and from Memphis we went to Muscle Shoals. While we were examining that plant and the TVA development, some of the soil conservationists took us into the countryside and showed us some farms which had been eroded by row-crop operations in years past. Then they showed us another farm, one of several hundred acres. "This farm, as you see it now, is a much better looking farm unit than it was when we first commenced to work on it a few years ago," they said. "This particular farm you now look upon was as badly eroded as some of the fields you see over on yonder hillside. And nothing very much other than weeds and brush were growing on that long general slope that you are now looking at."

We were on the roadside, looking up over more than half a mile of general slope, and it was then beautifully terraced, and grass was growing on it. Herds of dairy cattle could be seen grazing over the general slope of that countryside, and we saw some excellent, well-improved farm buildings. It was a unit which had been developed or created on land which had been so badly eroded that only a short time before it had been laid aside as useless or waste land. Yet by its rebirth, so to speak, the contouring and reestablishment of grass on the land, and the establishment of a dairy herd, the operators of that farm were bringing about a production from land which at one time had been laid aside as useless. The dairy cow fitted into the picture there. Without the aid of the dairy cow, it would have been useless, and an utter waste of time, for the operators of that farm to attempt to reestablish the fertility of the soil by means of the use of commercial fertilizers and the contouring of the land, because unless the land is tied down with a grass crop, it will erode again as soon as the rains come. But with the grass crop and the hay lands or meadowlands which were furnishing dry legumes and feed for the dairy cows, the operators of the farm were establishing a very profitable unit.

I have cited that case to show how the dairy cow fitted into the picture for the reclamation of some badly eroded land in the vicinity of Muscle Shoals or TVA, in the section of the country from which the President pro tempore of the Senate comes. I could cite many other projects—for instance, some in Arkansas, in Mississippi, and elsewhere in the South—where such reclamation projects or operations involving the reclamation of badly eroded lands have been developed, and where the family type of farm and the dairy are now providing prosperity, opportunity, and hope to the individual farmer or individual family man.

I can cite instances of family men coming before the committee at that hearing and telling how well they were progressing now that they had introduced the diversified type of farming, had ceased growing row crops, and were engaged in animal husbandry or in the care of dairy cows. That necessarily meant that there was a creamery adjacent to that particular farm unit or farm operator's location, in order that he would be able to dispose of the butterfat produced on his farm, because unless such a farm operator is located very close to a large, metropolitan milk-consuming area, he is dependent upon the processor of butter to process the commodity or product of his farm into a salable product.

I have cited these instances in order that we may better appreciate what we shall be confronted with if we take such action as will permit a synthetic product to take the market of a genuine product like butter.

By destroying the butter market we may help a few large processors of the substitutes, but we shall put out of business thousands of small creameries all over the land. There are 348 cooperative creameries and 146 independent creameries in Minnesota alone. These creameries serve the thousands of individual farmers residing in our State who have no fluid-milk market.

The eastern markets are closed to these farmers by the milk-marketing control legislation, which protects the producers in areas adjacent to our great metropolitan centers. I myself could not bring a can of milk into the Washington market this morning, in competition with the milk sent into the Washington market by the producers who operate in this area. I could not do so even if I desired, and even though the milk would qualify as grade A milk, because there is a milk board which has control of this market, as well as of the markets in Baltimore, Philadelphia, and the other Atlantic seaboard cities. For that reason the milk produced in the Midwest in the diversified-farming areas must be separated, the butterfat must be churned, and the butter must then have a market. If oleomargarine takes over that market, what are we going to do with the milk we produce in areas where we do not have a large milk-consuming population or a large milk-consuming market to which to sell our milk?

There are more than 3,500 creameries in this country, employing about 40,000 people. There are only 26 oleo manufacturers, and, according to their own admission, their work force at the present amounts to only 4,619 persons. Thus, 10 times as many workers in dairy plants alone would face cuts in salary or possible lay-offs as a result of the serious blow to the dairy industry which the repeal of regulations on oleo, as contemplated by House bill 2023, is certain to cause.

Union leaders are alive to the danger facing the skilled workers in dairy plants all over the country. Many have telegraphed me concerning the matter.

Ray Johnson, business agent of the Milk Drivers and Dairy Employees Local No. 32, at Duluth, Minn., has sent me the following:

> Our union is definitely on record opposed to the coloring of oleo.

Gene Larson, of Minneapolis, chairman of the International Conference of Dairy Employees, affiliated with the AFL, asks for delay in considering the present legislation, so that his union organization could have time "to prepare ourselves to be in the best possible position to defeat legislation sponsored by the oleo interests."

Eugene R. Hubbard, vice chairman of this group of employees, has sent various Senators the following telegram.

> International Conference of Dairy Employees, Division of International Teamsters Union, affiliate of American Federation of Labor, representing more than 100,000 union employees in dairy plants of the Nation respectfully urges your support of Gillette-Wiley amendment to H. R. 2023, now on Senator Calendar. It repeals oleo taxes but protects consumers and dairy industry from imitation of yellow butter, in interstate commerce.

Now, Mr. President, what is the main argument on this question? It has been heard in this legislative Chamber time and again for the past half century. The whole argument involves the restriction on color. Despite all the propaganda that has been circulated, there has been wisdom in the continued restriction of the sale of oleomargarine when camouflaged to resemble butter in every detail. Color restriction does not deny the consumer a food product, nor does it impose a financial burden on anyone. Color adds nothing to the food value of oleomargarine.

The simple fact is that the processors of oleomargarine are attempting to duplicate butter to the last degree. They have, already, successfully incorporated the flavor of butter into the substitute product. They have made oleomargarine resemble butter in texture by adding preservatives. They have packed the oleomargarine in packages made to resemble butter cartons, even to the extent of putting farm scenes and pictures of dairy cattle on them and displaying the word "butter." If they are now allowed to color oleomargarine without restriction, they will have duplicated butter in every detail. There can be only one reason for all this. It is all for the purpose of benefiting from the age-old consumer habit of using butter.

Oleomargarine is not entitled to the yellow color. They claim that oleo has as much right as butter to the yellow color is false. Oleo in this country is largely produced from the oils of cottonseed and soybean. The oleo industry claims it must bleach these oils white because of Federal laws. The real reason is that when cottonseed oils are turned into fat they become grey, and when soybean oils are turned into fat they become green. In order to have a uniform color the oleo manufacturers must bleach out the grey and green colors. It is impossible to produce a natural yellow oleomargarine from domestic oils.

Butter, on the other hand, is always yellow—although at some seasons of the year it is less yellow than at others. That could be explained in this manner: If cattle are on green pasture, the milk itself will have a yellow tint, and the butterfat definitely will come out quite yellow. If the cattle are on dry feed and have been confined to the barnyard or within buildings, as they must be in the winter months, the butterfat then will not be so yellow. In order to have uniformity, there has been a practice of yellowing the butter, so that the season will make no difference in the shade of yellow when the butter is processed. When color is added to butter it is for the sake of uniformity—not for the purpose of making it look like some other product.

Mr. President, in considering the proposals now before the Senate, H. R. 2023, as reported by the committee, and the substitute sponsored by 25 Senators, we are agreed that the present Federal tax of one-fourth cent a pound on uncolored oleomargarine and 10 cents a pound on the colored product, as well as the manufacturers', wholesalers', and retailers' fees and taxes should be removed. We agree on this simply as a matter of Federal tax policy, but we ought not to be misled by false propaganda which a well-financed lobby has circulated that the 9¾ cents added tax on the colored product has worked a hardship or added an expense to the consumer. The 9¾ cents is assessed only against the colored product. When the product is purchased uncolored, the tax is not imposed.

As for the consumer, no one pays the 10-cent tax unless he purchases yellow oleo. The old contention that the home-coloring of oleo is tedious and wasteful no longer holds water. Modern packaging enables a housewife who wants yellow oleomargarine to color it very easily, quickly, and without waste. I may explain why I say that. A small capsule of coloring matter is placed in a 1-pound package of oleomargarine, and all the housewife has to do is to squeeze the pack a few times. The capsule bursts and the coloring matter spreads through the oleomargarine, after which the housewife breaks the pack. In this manner the oleo is as beautifully colored as the processor himself could possibly make it, and the housewife is not required to pay the tax of 9¾ cents.

I may further say that, once the processor is given the unrestricted right to color the product, without an additional tax because of the coloring, the housewife will pay dearly for the product. The makers of oleo, by reason of its imitating butter, will then bring their price up to about the price of butter, and it will remain there so long as they can find a market. Of course, they will find a market, if the product looks like butter, smells like butter, has the texture of butter, and is branded as butter.

Furthermore, oleomargarine already has been given competitive privileges which are denied to butter. It may be flavored with butter flavor and preserved with a preservative. Neither of these—nor any other extraneous substances—may be added to butter.

Yet, the basic purpose of the 10-cent tax on oleomargarine colored yellow in imitation of butter is not to tax one food

to protect the market of another. Its purpose is intended to protect the consumer, just as our pure-food laws are intended to do, against adulteration and substitution. Fundamentally, there is no restrictive tax on oleomargarine except when it masquerades as butter.

Other imitations of good butter are taxed; why should oleo be exempted? Adulterated butter—which, like oleo, is an imitation of good butter—carries the same per pound tax and the same manufacturers', wholesalers', and retailers' occupational taxes as does colored oleo. There is no reason why an exception should be made for oleomargarine. Or do the proponents of removing all Federal restrictions on yellow oleomargarine intend to come forward with a repeal of the taxes on adulterated or reprocessed butter? Senators have never heard it mentioned. Would such action be in the public interest? The answer, of course, is "No."

It is my prediction that repeal of the present laws, as contemplated by H. R. 2023, would prove costly to the consumers.

Already in the city of Washington, for example, colored oleo has sold on the same day at from 14 to 20 cents a pound more than uncolored brands. A recent national survey shows that in cities where yellow oleo may be sold, its price ranges as much as 30 cents more a pound than white oleo. The average mark-up in nine cities was 21.8 cents a pound. The tax is only 10 cents a pound. It is a product that carries only a tax of 9¾ cents, provided it is colored. Yet, when it is marketed after being colored, and is sold where permitted to be sold, in such States as do not have regulations on the subject, it will oftentimes carry a price, when colored, of as much as 30 cents a pound more, when in reality the tax imposed is only 9¾ cents a pound.

Who gets that exorbitant overcharge? It certainly is not the farmer. No, Mr. President, I assure you that farmers never see a penny of that extra money the consumer pays.

And what will happen to the price of oleo if the present laws are repealed? The production of colored oleo could be expected virtually to displace uncolored oleo. There would be nothing to prevent the colored product from being sold at substantially higher prices than the uncolored—with little or none of the uncolored available. How would that help the consumer?

The touching concern of the oleomargarine interests for the consumer, aided by certain metropolitan newspapers, which have been misled by the so-called housewives' revolt, is about as synthetic as the product they would exploit at the expense of our dairy industry.

The American housewife is being fooled in this fight. Another segment of the public, restaurant patrons, are likely to be fooled, too. In the event all Federal taxes are removed and there are no restrictions on how oleomargarine is to be marketed, it will be used in restaurants where some 60,000,000 meals are served daily. The sponsors of H. R. 2023 propose that the pats of oleomargarine served in public eating places be triangular in shape. By "pats" I refer to the familiar servings of individual portions of butter or oleomargarine on a small dish. The oleomargarine used in a sandwich, of course, would lose its identifying triangular shape, and served in half-pounds or quarter-pounds in a dish on a table it would not have its triangular shape. Very few people would examine the walls of a public eating place for a sign to indicate that they were being served oleomargarine. That, of course, is what House bill 2023 proposes to do. It proposes that there shall be a sign in the restaurant saying, "We serve oleomargarine here." The oleomargarine would have to be served in a small triangular pat to indicate that it was not butter.

If House bill 2023 is allowed to pass, oleomargarine will enjoy every marketing advantage of butter, and the age-old taste for butter is in the market that the processor of oleomargarine is striving to capture.

The processor of oleomargarine contends that he has successfully incorporated all of the food and nutritive values of butter in oleomargarine. This question, of course, could be debated at great length. Speaking from my own experience, I know we cannot successfully raise a calf by extracting from the milk all the butterfat and substituting other fats in the same quantity. In nearly all such cases the calf will die. There have been scientific experiments made by some of the leading dairy specialists of the Nation, and their experiments have also proved this to be true.

In a radio broadcast on January 2 of this year, Dr. William E. Petersen, professor of dairy husbandry in the Agricultural College of the University of Minnesota, described experiments conducted at the Minnesota station by Dr. Gullickson.

I know both those gentlemen very well, and I know that Dr. Petersen is one of the greatest dairy specialists and one of the greatest students of the dairy cow in the entire United States.

In this radio broadcast Dr. Petersen described experiments conducted at the Minnesota station by Dr. Gullickson, where various fats have been emulsified into skim milk including butterfat after being taken out of the milk and reemulsified into the skim milk. These various fats put into skim milk—such as butter oil and corn oil, soybean oil, peanut oil, hydrogenated vegetable oil and animal fats such as lard and tallow—have been compared for rates of growth and general well-being of the calves over a period of many years.

What were the results?

Dr. Petersen replied to that question in these words:

> The results have been rather striking. It is proven that there is something in butterfat that is not found in any of the other fats because the calves on butterfat have done so much better than those getting an equivalent of other animal fats, but the most striking results of these experiments has been the observation of the vegetable fats when emulsified into skim milk and to resemble whole milk have been toxic to calves. As a matter of fact, all calves on such diets have died, while those that received the butterfat emulsified back into skim milk did as well as those that received whole milk.

Those are remarks of Dr. Petersen, the great dairy specialist of the University of Minnesota.

The scientist added that the experiments have not yet revealed what it is in butterfat that makes it superior to other fats. "There are certain things we have eliminated," he stated. "For instance, vitamin deficiency is not the factor as the addition of all known vitamins to these calves failed to prevent the onset of the disastrous symptoms."

I have heard the question asked—in fact, the same question has been asked of me—"Why the contention, if you cannot detect the difference in taste between oleomargarine and butter?" That question was asked me in a Senate subcommittee hearing a year ago, and I simply answered in this manner: "You cannot detect strychnine in milk by the taste, but certainly your stomach will know the difference. Likewise, you cannot detect the difference between butter and oleomargarine as it is now processed, but your stomach will soon detect it, as there are certain oils which can be used in the making of oleomargarine which the body cannot assimilate in the same manner as it assimilates butterfat."

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter which I recently received from Mr. Henry J. Hoffman, chief chemist of the Minnesota Department of Agriculture, Dairy and Food, who has had wide experience in the problem of enforcement of food laws. I personally served as deputy commissioner of agriculture in Minnesota and had charge of enforcement of the food laws, so that I can speak from personal experience as well as quote Mr. Hoffman's letter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MINNESOTA, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, DAIRY AND FOOD

Senator E. J. THYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: At the request of the Minnesota Dairy Industries Committee, the writer would like to point out the following facts in the butter versus oleomargarine controversy which is now raging.

1. The State dairy commission was originally created in 1885 for the sole purpose of regulating oleomargarine. At that time, oleomargarine was being freely sold in imitation of butter, and the great bulk of oleomargarine sales were as yellow oleomargarine, palmed off as butter. The legislature saw the need of a law which would enable the public to readily differentiate between butter and oleomargarine. Hence, the law was passed prohibiting the coloring of oleomargarine, and this department (then called the Minnesota Dairy Commission) was created to enforce the law.

2. Butter has always demanded a higher price than oleomargarine, and since the public is willing to pay this higher price, they are entitled to reasonable protection to insure that they get the product that they pay for. The public's protection is the distinguishing color between white oleomargarine and yellow butter. The housewife who complains about the effort used to

color her oleomargarine yellow at home would be the first one to complain if she paid the price for genuine butter and received yellow oleomargarine. Experts—chemists, nutritionists, food officials, doctors, and the like—will have little difficulty detecting oleomargarine from butter even if both were yellow, but laws are not enacted for such experts, they are enacted to protect the everyday layman who, not being endowed with sufficient knowledge, is the one who will be defrauded. And such laymen are the great purchasing public, not the few experts.

3. The magnitude of enforcing the law and insuring people that butter was genuine, if yellow oleomargarine was permitted to be sold, would be so great and so expensive that the cost of administrative effort would be prohibitive.

4. There is no value, either nutritional or otherwise, to the color the oleomargarine manufacturers wish to add to their product. Its only purpose is to cause their product to resemble butter. Why do the oleomargarine manufacturers not direct the effort now expended seeking yellow oleomargarine to some worth-while project such as extolling the merits of their pure white product?

5. Most food manufacturers, including oleomargarine manufacturers, make an advertising point of calling to the public attention that their products are free from artificial color and flavor—yet here is a product which is free from such ingredient, yet the manufacturer wishes legislation so that he can add them. How can such controversial ideas be reconciled?

Let it be further pointed out that butter manufacture is the cornerstone of the dairy industry, and that dairying is one of the most important functions of the American farmer. Our whole economic structure is based upon the products of the soil and the producers of such product—the farmer. To permit the wholesale defrauding of the American public in one of the key items of the diet—butter—will, without question, upset the price differential now existing between butter and oleomargarine, and conceivably upset our present economic picture still further. It is true that today the price of butter is high, but let us not forget that oleomagarine, too, has trebled in price. This is a fact which the oleomargarine manufacturers have spent considerable effort in soft pedaling. We should not be concerned so much with price in this controversy, as we should in price differential.

Lastly, it should be pointed out, American manufacturers are constantly extolling the individuality of their products, and through advertising seek to point out the distinguishing features of their products—yet here come the oleomargarine manufacturers who wish to submerge the identity of their product in the shadow of another. They are disinterested in making their product an individual unit, but, rather, would have it be an imitation. When such efforts are made, we should investigate them thoroughly, because, usually, fraud and deceit are coupled with such efforts.

Sincerely,

HENRY J. HOFFMAN,
Chief Chemist.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, what are the dangers to the agricultural economy of the United States if we lose the butter market to this synthetic product that looks like butter, tastes like butter, and is sold in cartons that have the appearance of butter cartons?

I hope each Senator will ask himself that question.

The dangers are far more serious than appear on the surface in what, in a narrow sense, is the proposed removal of an excise tax. Since butter accounts for 16 percent of all dairy cash income and is the outlet of 27 percent of all milk produced in this country, most of our dairy-farm leaders are convinced that loss of the vital butter market will mean an agricultural depression.

Certainly, the effect on an important segment of American agriculture will be very serious.

First, in the Midwest our diversified farm operation will be jeopardized. Without the butter market there is no outlet for the products of the dairy farm because, as I have stated before, the great metropolitan fluid-milk markets are closed as a result of existing legislation. The two and one-half million dairy-farm families would be injured in every State in the Union. There would be 40,000 milk-processing plants, and their employees that would be adversely affected. The eventual effect on dairying as a whole would be drastic and would lead to changes in our diversified agriculture.

One of the most serious results of this trend would be the effect on our soil resources by discouraging dairy farming, the most important contributor to sound soil conservation.

The dairy-farm movement has been extended into the South to reclaim land that has long ago been depleted of its top soil by constant row-crop operation. I have visited farms in many areas of the South where the dairy cow is now utilizing the legumes and pasture lands which are helping restore the soil. If we destroy the butter market by the pending legislation, we shall handicap the Extension Service and the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture in their endeavors to introduce diversified farming in areas of the South where they have found it is not sound practice to continue to grow the row crops.

If legislation is enacted which does destroy the butter market, we are placing the huge holdings of butter of the Commodity Credit Corporation in a precarious position.

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will pay strict attention to the holdings which the Commodity Credit Corporation now has of butter, cheese, and powdered milk.

In order to support butter prices in 1949, the Commodity Credit Corporation purchased 115,000,000 pounds of butter at an average cost of only 62 cents a pound. This represented a cost of $171,300,000, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, in order to further support dairy prices and to maintain dairy prices somewhere near 90 percent of parity, purchased 26,000,000 pounds of cheese at only 12½ cents per pound, and the total sum so expended was $8,255,000. If we destroy the butter market many of the farmers who are today engaged in growing legume crops and who have many good fertile acres of land in pasture will have to turn to raising another type of crop. That will greatly aggravate our surpluses of corn and wheat, but it will be agreed it will also aggravate the cotton problem in the South. We need only examine the figures to see that we do have a problem.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. THYE. I am most happy to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Would not the Senator like to point out that the dairy industry of this country, first, furnishes one of the largest single items of tonnage which the railroads and other means of transportation carry? They transport fertilizer to the farms, milk to the cities, and dairy products of all kinds. More important than all else is the transportation of grain to the dairy farmer. I do not know how much grain my small State now uses, but 10 years ago we were importing over 500,000 tons of grain annually into that one small State. When we multiply that by the amount of tonnage that moves over all our roads we can easily see what the effect would be of losing a considerable part of that tonnage. It would mean that a bad situation would be made very much worse, if not even desperate.

Mr. THYE. The very able Senator from Vermont is indeed correct when he says products of the dairy industry constitute one of the greatest sources of traffic which the railroads have an opportunity to transport.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to point out also that it takes almost five times as much man-labor to make 1 pound of butter as it does to make 1 pound of oleo. When we consider the two or three million people who today are employed in the production of dairy products, who are employed the year around, 365 days of the year, and compare that labor with the seasonal labor which is required to produce oleomargarine, we can form some idea of what the effect will be on our labor supply and on the standard of living of our workers.

Mr. THYE. I thank the able Senator from Vermont for adding those facts to the discussion.

Mr. President, let us examine some of these surplus problems. In 1948 approximately 55,000,000 bushels of corn alone were placed under loan or purchase agreement. The support price was $1.44, which represents a commitment of approximately $821,400,000. It is impossible to state how much of this corn the Government now actually owns and how much is still under loan or will be resealed under some future loan. As of November 30, 1949, 19,235,372 bushels of the 1949 crop had been placed under loan or purchase agreement, involving a commitment of $26,929,000.

If we take a look at the cotton situation we find of the 1948 crop 5,271,772 bales were placed under loan. Of this, 1,490,772 bales were redeemed by the end of 1949, leaving 3,781,000 bales under Government ownership or commitment. The average support price in 1948 was $158 a bale. Thus there was a total investment of $597,398,000 in the 1948 crop as of December 31, 1949. That is surplus cotton that is held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, because there is no domestic demand or any exportable demand for it at the time.

What we need to do is to find some way of diverting some of these cotton

acres to some other kind of crop, in order that we may not have the surplus problem in cotton as I have described it. If we increase our corn acreage, we are going to have an aggravated surplus problem on our hands, and we already have a problem of surplus corn. So what we need to do is to expand our dairy industry, and induce more families to engage in dairy farming and soil building, rather than to throw them further into the category of adding to the cotton surplus, as well as the corn surplus. In the event we destroy the butter market, we can rest assured that some of those now engaged in diversified types of agriculture in Alabama, Mississippi, and all the other Southern States, including Arkansas, will turn back to some kind of a row crop, whether it is peanuts, or cotton, or soybeans.

I merely call to the attention of my colleagues that we need to think seriously this afternoon and in the remaining hours or days before we cast our votes on the pending question and decide whether we are going to disrupt our whole agricultural economy, or whether we are going to reject the demand on the part of the oleo processor to be allowed to sell his product competitively with butter, in all its synthetic duplication of butter.

The total investment in cotton of the two crops as of the end of 1949 was $947,043,350.

If, by destroying the butter market, we stop the trend toward diversified farming and the introduction of the dairy cow into the Southern States we are going to have a greater clamor for cotton acreage quotas and a greater demand to grow cotton than there is at the present time, as I stated earlier in my remarks.

As an example of the reactions of dairy producers to the controversy in which we are engaged, I wish to read a letter from a Minnesota farmer, Mr. N. O. Evenson, of Litchfield, Minn.:

LITCHFIELD, MINN., *January 3, 1950.*
The Honorable EDWARD J. THYE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: I know that you are doing valiant work in behalf of the American farmer in your stand opposing the oleomargarine interests in pending legislation on this question. I am writing you, thinking you may be interested in receiving some opinions of farmers on this question.

I will make my comments brief; for this reason I will not mention some of the strongest arguments we have regarding the oleomargarine issue, such as the dairyman's rights to the yellow color.

This is a farmer writing to me:

I will confine my letter to some of my thoughts as to how this legislation can effect the consumers, who at present seem to be 100 percent on the oleo side of the question.

First, the coloring of oleo yellow will tend to raise the price of oleo and lower the price of butter. This will reduce the anticipated saving to the consumer.

Second, the dairy farmer is not compelled to keep on producing dairy products.

Give thought to that. He says the butter farmer is not compelled to keep on producing butter products. If he did not continue, I am afraid there would be times in the year when the consumer would be drastically short of fluid milk, because there are peak and low seasons of production.

To go back to the farmer's letter, he says further:

From our Minnesota Department of Agriculture we learn that there are 7,000 farms in Minnesota that had dairy cows on them in 1940 that do not have any dairy cows in 1949. This trend away from dairying is sure to increase if this bill is passed in its present form.

Third, the consumer should be interested in keeping the young men on the farm, where they are needed to produce food. Every obstacle placed on agriculture tends to increase the drift of farm boys to the cities, where they can have such privileges as the 40-hour week, time and one-half for overtime, etc. We see indications every day that can stop us and make us wonder as to what direction we are going. For an example, a good 120-acre farm with a full line of good buildings was sold recently in this neighborhood for $12,000. This would only buy a modest modern home in Litchfield or any other town in the land.

I am still farming the farm where I was born, and have a lot of first-hand experience with the problem of farming. In my opinion, the passage of the oleo bill will not only be a disastrous blow to agriculture but it will react indirectly and unfavorably to the best interest of the consumer.

Yours sincerely,

N. O. EVENSON.

Mr. Evenson was thinking soundly on this question.

Mr. President, dairy farmers do not object to fair and honest competition, but they vigorously resent unfair competition from an imitation product. Yellow oleomargarine lends itself readily to fraudulent substitution. Therefore, a law to bar interstate shipment of yellow oleo is eminently fair, since it leaves to the individual States the right to regulate its manufacture and sale within their own borders.

Oleomargarine should be sold as a separate and distinct product with an identity of its own. Had the oleomargarine industry the courage to market its product on its own merits, and not as an imitation of another product, little regulation would be necessary.

Leading dairy and farm organizations favor the repeal of all Federal taxes and license fees on oleomargarine. They urge, however, a ban on the interstate shipment of oleomargarine colored yellow in imitation of butter.

The Gillette-Wiley substitute, which is sponsored by 25 Senators, is designed to accomplish both of these purposes. I firmly believe that adoption of the substitute amendment would be in the public interest.

I most sincerely hope that the substitute amendment will receive the support of at least a majority of the Members of the Senate.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TAFT ON FORMOSA

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, shortly before the first of the year, I expressed the opinion in an interview in Ohio that we should hang on to Formosa and prevent Communist occupation of Formosa, even though it involved the use of our Navy. I did not suggest the occupation of Formosa, nor the sending of any army, or even the sending of any navy. Our Navy is there already, with bases within a short distance, and its ships are between Formosa and China, as anyone knows who read this morning's newspapers. Formosa is a hundred miles from the mainland and there can be no crossing if our Navy makes it clear that ships carrying troops will not be allowed to cross. In fact, probably there would be no such attempt at all if the State Department made it perfectly clear that we do not intend to permit Communist occupation of Formosa.

The basis of our foreign policy in the last 3 or 4 years, if there has been any consistent foreign policy, is to contain communism where it is and prevent any single step of advance, because success in any such step is certain, considering the character of communism, to lead to another step. We, therefore, sent our military aid and our officers into Greece, although it might easily have involved us in war. We have given military aid to Turkey and to Iran. We have stood firm against Communist advance in Korea and provided the Koreans with large amounts of military aid and American advice. In undertaking the air lift in Germany, we certainly risked war with Russia in order to maintain unimpaired our position in Berlin. We are asked to appropriate billions of dollars to arm western Europe, although there is no evidence that at the present time the Russians contemplate any military attack in that area. We have given notice to Russia, by the adoption of the Atlantic Pact, that if its troops advance across the boundaries of Italy or the American or British zones of Austria or Germany or Denmark or Norway, it will find itself at war with us. In our policy of laying down the law, "this far you shall go and no further" we have not hesitated to risk war. There is not the slightest evidence that Russia will go to war with us because we interfere with a crossing to Formosa. It is hardly possible to see how the Chinese Communists by themselves can begin a war against the United States, or why they should do so.

In China for some reason, the State Department has pursued a different policy from that followed throughout the rest of the world. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that the proper kind of sincere aid to the Nationalist Government a few years ago could have stopped communism in China. But the State Department has been guided by a left-wing group who obviously have wanted to get rid of Chiang, and were willing at least to turn China over to the Communists for that purpose. They have, in effect, defied the general policy in China laid down by Congress. In recent months it has, of course, been very doubtful whether aid to the Nationalist Government could be effective, and no one desires to waste American efforts. But Formosa is a place where a small amount of aid and at very small cost, can prevent the further spread of communism. Such action does not commit us to backing the Nationalist Government in any prolonged war against the Chinese Communists. We can determine later whether we ever wish to recognize the Chinese Communists and

what the ultimate disposition of Formosa shall be.

As I understand, the people of Formosa if permitted to vote would probably vote to set up an independent republic of Formosa. The status of Formosa, therefore, should certainly be kept free for determination until the peace treaty has been written with Japan. Formosa must be legally a part of Japan, for it is difficult to see how the mere declaration of the President at Cairo or Potsdam can change that status without a treaty. One thing is certain, if the Communists take over Formosa, we will have just as much chance of setting up an independent republic of Formosa as we have of returning the western German provinces from Poland to Germany. We know that the Communists will give up nothing which they have occupied. Certainly, we do not desire or intend to undertake an aggressive war to recover land the Communists have occupied. On the other hand if, at the peace conference, it is decided that Formosa should be set up as an independent republic, we certainly have the means to force the Nationalist's surrender of Formosa.

The President's statement on January 5 follows the usual course of setting up a straw man and then proceeding to knock him over. He said:

The United States has no predatory designs on Formosa or on any other Chinese territory.

No one has suggested that it has.

The United States has no desire to obtain special rights or privileges or to establish military bases on Formosa at this time.

No one has suggested that it has such a desire.

The United States Government will not pursue a course which will lead to involvement in the civil conflict in China.

The course suggested will not lead to any such involvement, although, of course, we have involved ourselves in the civil conflict in Greece, in Korea, and elsewhere. When the President, however, says, "Similarly, the United States Government will not provide military aid or advice to Chinese forces on Formosa," he is departing from the policy pursued by us in every other part of the world where the question is whether communism shall be checked. While he states that we will continue the present ECA program of economic assistance, it is quite clear from the past course of the State Department that they have not the slightest intention of giving such assistance in any effective way in such a manner as to assist the occupants of Formosa and defeating a Communist attack.

Those who argue against any action in Formosa are curiously inconsistent. The distinguished Senator from Texas shudders at the possibility of war, although the chance we are taking is 1 in 10 compared to that we are taking in Europe today.

One columnist fears that any action in Formosa different from exactly the action of the State Department would antagonize the leaders of India and Indonesia. His theory seems to be that the way to stop communism in India is to permit it to move into Formosa. That is an exact reproduction of the argument used in support of the policy of Munich. Strange to say, the same columnist is all for extending aid to Burma and Indochina against Communist attack, although it is infinitely less practical and more expensive and difficult than the maintenance of an independent Formosa.

Another columnist argues that if we do not immediately extinguish the Nationalist Government, Red China will not be able to demobilize to carry out economic reconstruction. Therefore, he argues, we should recognize the Communist government. Whatever may be the arguments for such recognition, it is quite certain that it will in no way tend to reduce the armies of the Chinese Communists. Russia has continued to maintain a huge army, although it is faced with no threat of invasion whatever. I think it is safe to predict that it will be many years before the Chinese Communists reduce their armies by one soldier, because only by those armies can they possibly hope to control China.

The question of the containment of communism is largely a practical one. The only reason so much heat has been engendered about the Formosan situation is the bitter resentment of the State Department and its pro-Communist allies against any interference with its policy of liquidating the Nationalist Government.

No two men are more familiar with the Far East than General MacArthur and former President Hoover, and both of them are able to see the obvious military and political facts of the situation. Here is a small area of the world where, with no difficulty or expense, we could prevent the spread of communism to an island which might be of great strategic value and whose people desire to be independent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to know if the able Senator from Ohio is familiar with the press dispatch which came over the teletype a short time ago, and which I now wish to read into the RECORD as follows:

WASHINGTON.—Two Democratic Senate leaders today rejected a Republican demand that the Joint Chiefs of Staff be called to give Senators a report on the strategic value of Formosa to America's far-eastern defenses.

Chairman CONNALLY of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and Chairman TYDINGS of the Senate Armed Services Committee both turned thumbs down on the proposal made by Senator KNOWLAND.

KNOWLAND said he plans to place his request in writing before the armed services group. But TYDINGS said this was a matter for the Foreign Relations Committee to handle.

And CONNALLY told a reporter: "The President already has made his decision on Formosa. I have no intention at present of asking the Joint Chiefs for their views."

CONNALLY said the Joint Chiefs are due to visit the Far East next month. After their return, his committee may ask them to make a report—but not before.

KNOWLAND wants to know if the State Department and the President had the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other military experts before arriving at the hands-off decision on Formosa.

The President announced last week the United States will not give military aid or advice to the defenders of the big island which is the Chinese National Government's last stronghold.

CONNALLY told a news conference yesterday the committee might call on the Joint Chiefs and Secretary Johnson for a report on the far eastern strategic situation.

But he made it clear this morning he plans no action at present in this direction.

"It would serve no good purpose to call them at this time," CONNALLY said. "I am satisfied the President made his decision with the full knowledge of all the facts involved."

I should like to ask the Senator whether he knows of any way the Congress of the United States can come to sound decisions in connection with the performance of its constitutional obligations in meeting the defense needs of the Nation and in helping to formulate foreign policy, if the Congress is to be denied information to which it is entitled and upon which it could base those judgments.

Mr. TAFT. No; I think Congress is entitled to such information, and must have it in order to reach sound judgments. Of course, the strategic importance of Formosa is something upon which I have not undertaken to pass in my statement. I do not know. But obviously its strategic importance is a vital factor in the determination of the Formosan policy; and obviously the Joint Chiefs of Staff should be listened to; and obviously we should have the best possible advice on the question of whether Formosa is a strategic place, from the point of view of war.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wish to say, as one Senator who is not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, that I hope the committee will press for an answer to these questions.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, despite the quotation of the chairman of the committee to which I have referred—and I hope he is not correctly quoted in the article appearing today—I intend to bring that matter before the Armed Services Committee. I think it is one which vitally affects the defenses of the United States. But if we cannot succeed, through either of those committees, we shall make every effort to do so through the Appropriations Committee, when the National Defense Establishment comes before us for funds to support Okinawa and other bases in that area of the world, and when there is good reason to believe that the loss of Formosa into unfriendly hands may jeopardize our strategic position in our other island defenses. In one of those committees we certainly intend to get the answers to these questions.

We certainly did not get the answers to the questions in the Foreign Relations Committee yesterday.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it seems to me that we certainly should have the best advice in regard to what the military facts are. I see no reason why we should not demand that they be given to us, entirely apart from what the foreign policy of the State Department may be.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. As I have said before, Mr. President, I do not wish to enter this debate until all the facts are available. My interest has been in the development of the facts.

I know nothing about the authenticity of the statement read by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]; but, in view of its purport, I must say, with the greatest respect to my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the committee, that so far as I am concerned, I cannot feel that I have obtained adequate information in respect to the facts, without the testimony of the Defense Establishment in general, and of the Secretary and of the Chief of Staff in particular. So far as I am concerned, I would consider that testimony to be not only pertinent, but indispensable.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has expressed himself in regard to the defense of Formosa, and so forth. Perhaps the question I shall ask is a little beside the point; but inasmuch as the Senator is still on his feet and has spoken on this subject, I should like to ask him a question on a subject which was discussed the other day by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. Has the Senator from Ohio given any consideration, as a Senator and as a lawyer and as a citizen, to the title, let us say, to Formosa at the present time? Does the Senator consider Formosa to be a possession of the Nationalist Government, a part of China, or an island whose final disposition awaits further treaties and further discussions of Formosa?

Mr. TAFT. It seems obvious to me that legally Formosa was a part of Japan for 50 years, and was so recognized by the world. I do not know how that status could be changed, except by treaty. I do not think it could be changed by Presidential declaration at Cairo or Presidential declaration at Potsdam. Whatever its status, I think it is something different from the status of the mainland of China. I think that is entirely clear.

So I think we are entirely free, when we participate in the treaty with Japan, and I think the other nations participating in the treaty are entirely free, to set up an independent Formosa. I do not think our hands are necessarily tied by any other action taken by the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then, is it the Senator's opinion, from his knowledge of the law and of the general situation, that Formosa cannot be turned over to the Chinese Nationalists by any surrender agreement or papers signed there?

Mr. TAFT. No; I think they are merely in possession there today, by general consent. But I cannot see how China, whatever China is, has yet acquired any legal title to Formosa.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The first answer which has been given would, it seems to me, indicate the correct view, for otherwise would it not be possible, and even probable in this case, that we would find ourselves, so far as Germany and Japan were concerned, in the position that secret agreements had been made at some of the conferences, and therefore the entire peace had already been determined, and there would not be anything for the peace treaty to take up?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think we can admit—whatever the moral obligations may be—that we are in any way legally bound by declarations of the President, either in secret or made openly, as to the disposition of different parts of the world.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not one of the purposes of the provision of the Constitution which calls for ratification by the Senate of peace treaties and all other treaties, that there must be formal action by both the President and the Senate in passing upon questions which might involve us in war?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I agree with the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I came into the Chamber just at the end of the Senator's remarks. Of course, I was very much interested in them, in light of the position I took here a few days ago.

I shall say to the Senator, if he will permit me to do so, that the proposition I discussed 2 days ago was based upon the assumption—and apparently the Senator from Ohio makes the same assumption—that until the peace treaty is signed, there is a question about the status of this particular part of the world.

Mr. TAFT. That is as far as we have to go.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes; that is as far as we have to go.

Mr. TAFT. Because if there is a question, we at least should keep the field open, so that we can decide that question as it should be decided. But once the Communists are there, we shall no longer be a free agent in respect to deciding that question, unless we are willing to undertake an aggressive war.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Then the Senator from Ohio will agree with me, will he not, that there is a responsibility on the part of the United States, if there is a question as to whether Formosa is or is not a part of Japan, to see that the status quo is preserved, for the protection of everyone concerned—the people of the island, the Chinese Nationalist Government, the Communists—if they have any rights there—and ourselves and our own interest?

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator has suggested a very interesting question which, I take it, referred to the powers of the President of the United States in time of war to make agreements of a military character. I take it that question is to some extent implicit in this problem.

I do not know to what extent hitherto that has been a matter of concern; but is it not obvious that if the principle of the power of the President to make, in time of war, agreements of primarily a military character, in return, let us say, for the entrance into the war, at a certain time, of a particular country, in return for which the President has promised certain territories, can be established, then, despite the provision of the Constitution, as it is stated very plainly in section 2 of article 2, namely—

He—

That is to say, the President—

shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—

And I labor the word "advice" somewhat—

to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur—

The President's power will be unlimited, will it not?

If there is no limit on the Presidential power to make agreements in time of war, then the entire function of the Senate in that respect might easily be eliminated. Is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I think so. The President has rather encroached already on the powers of the Senate; and now a good many things which used to be done by treaty are done by agreement.

But certainly the disposition of the territory of another nation is something which still must be done by treaty, and cannot be done by executive agreement. If we admit any such power to proceed by way of executive agreement, we certainly very much curtail the powers given to the Senate by the Constitution.

Mr. BREWSTER. And is it not highly important that the Senate, if it has any regard for the importance of its constitutional functions, should see to it that there is some determination of this right, before we completely surrender it, particularly since we now have involvements in so many sections of the world? Moreover, are we not now still at war?

Mr. TAFT. I do not know that we are at war. We have not yet disposed of the questions arising from the war. I suppose that technically we are still in a state of war, for the purpose of many statutes and for various other purposes. For some purposes, I would think we are not at war.

Mr. BREWSTER. If in a time of actual hostilities the Presidential power were established to make agreements which would bind us, might not it be possible that then we could easily move into a twilight zone—whether we call it war, or regardless of what we call it—in which the President could continue to assert the right to make agreements which would bind the country under certain eventualities, if we continued to permit this encroachment upon the power of the

Senate and this expansion of Presidential power?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I think that is true.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So as to carry out what the Senator has just said to the Senator from Maine, and to bring the matter to a logical conclusion, let me ask this question: In a case in which our country has been at war with another country, and the other country has surrendered, its title to its possessions cannot be turned over to another country without the consent of the Senate, can it? Is not that a logical conclusion?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I think that is a logical conclusion.

FEDERAL RENT CONTROL—TELEGRAM TO GOVERNOR DEWEY BY SENATOR CAIN

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington felt constrained yesterday afternoon to send a telegram to the Governor of New York State. I wish to read the telegram, which speaks rather plainly for itself, and to draw its substance to the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues. It reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 10, 1950.*

GOV. THOMAS E. DEWEY,
Albany, N. Y.

DEAR GOVERNOR: The New York Times of Monday, January 9, carried a front-page story by its Albany correspondent, Leo Egan, in which it was stated that you and your advisers are considering the advisability of replacing the prevailing Federal rent law in the near future with a State rent-control system. It would not be proper for me to say that rent controls have outlived their usefulness in New York State because I am not familiar with the facts in your area of jurisdiction but I am qualified to venture a prediction that President Truman's request for an extension of the 1949 Rent Act beyond its termination date of June 30, 1950, will be denied by a majority of the Republicans and Democrats in the Congress. Those of us in the Congress who have considered the rent-control question since 1946 to be an economic rather than a political problem are now completely certain that we can defeat the proposed extension of the Federal law by using only the economic facts which have resulted in those scores of American communities of all sizes which have been decontrolled in the last year. Those for whom I speak will use every conceivable legitimate means including whatever time is required to prevent the Federal Government from any longer mismanaging and interfering with the property rights of American citizens throughout the Nation. It is unrealistic to assume that the Congress will authorize Federal rent controls for the beginning of our new half century. If there are isolated communities in America which can establish a proven need for continuing rent controls those communities or their parent States must be charged with a full responsibility for managing their own affairs. New York City may be an exception to the general rule that only good will result from the decontrol of rents. In practically every instance where a city of any size has been decontrolled the following benefits to the community have been in evidence: Restoration of the historic American right of free collective bargaining between tenant and owner, large numbers of locked-up rental units have been returned to the rental market, large numbers of homes previously held for sale only have become available to tenants, rental units have been released by tenants who have purchased homes, residential construction has been accelerated as have the sales of homes, and existing rental accommodations have become rapidly more attractive because the owners have remodeled, repaired, and redecorated their facilities. These are benefits which every State and community must desire. These are but some of the benefits which have come to decontrolled American communities and the case histories of the communities in question will be used by reasonable Members of both parties in the Congress to make certain that there will be no extension of the Federal rent law beyond June. In wiring you of my conviction that an end to Federal rent controls is certain I hope that I am rendering a constructive service to you and to every other State in the Nation. Those in the Congress who feel as I do want no State or community to say in coming months that they hadn't been informed that Federal rent controls would expire on the last day of June. When President Truman requested an extension of Federal rent controls as being necessary for another year he indicated to me at least that he knew distressingly little about the history of the problem, and continues to ignore and disregard the economic facts involved. I take it to be a foregone conclusion that Mr. Truman's own party in the Congress won't support the President's demand. The time is long overdue when New York State and every other State in the Union ought to be completely accountable to their citizens for the fundamental and important issues involved in the management of their private-property-rights question. I am certain that every State will attempt to rid itself of all rent controls everywhere at the earliest possible moment. If the Federal Government is permitted to extend rent controls into our new decade those restrictions against property rights will probably remain forever. Congress is possessed of too much common sense and sense of simple justice to permit this to happen. I would urge you and your legislature to do what it thinks is right for New York State without any further dead-hand control by the Federal Government. With cordial best wishes for your happiness and success in the new year.

HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senator.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to address myself very briefly to the consideration of the bill H. R. 2023, to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

At the Democratic Convention, which I was not privileged to attend, but to whose proceedings I listened over the radio, I remember very distinctly that about 2 o'clock in the morning President Truman, in the course of his address to the convention, stated that the farmers of the United States would be guilty of ingratitude if they did not vote for the Democratic ticket nominated at the convention. He went on to say that labor likewise would be guilty of ingratitude if it did not support the Democratic ticket. Apparently the farmers of the country took the President at his word.

I have before me the official returns of the election, showing that the dairy State of Colorado cast its six electoral votes for Mr. Truman for President of the United States, because the Democrats received a majority of the votes of the State of Colorado. As one reads through the list he finds Idaho, with 4 votes in the Truman column, Iowa with 10, Minnesota with 11, Montana with 4, Ohio with 26, Utah with 4, Washington with 8, Wisconsin with 12, and Wyoming with 3. It is simply a matter of arithmetic to conclude that if we total those electoral votes, deduct them from the 383 votes the President received, and add them to the 189 Governor Dewey received, the Republicans would have won by an electoral vote of 272 to 220.

Mr. President, before I go into the merits of the oleomargarine bill itself, I wish very briefly to address myself to the broken promise made by the Democratic Party, year after year, that they were going to enforce the Sherman Antitrust Act. During the course of the debate yesterday, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], as shown on page 261 of the RECORD, said:

Mr. President, I should like to quote it for the Senator's information at this time. It is not very long. I read from page 64 of the report of the Federal Trade Commission on the concentration of productive facilities, 1947. This is the statement of the Federal Trade Commission.

I am simply quoting what was said yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. He proceeded to quote from the report of the Federal Trade Commission, as follows:

"The pattern of control in the processing and marketing of dairy products is rather similar to that of the meat-packing industry. Before World War I the dairy-products industry was made up of small local units, either independently owned or under cooperative control. The contrast between the past and the present state of concentration is perhaps more striking in this field than in any other manufacturing industry.

"As the concentration curve for the industry shows, the two leading dairy corporations, National Dairy Products Corp. and the Borden Co., clearly dominate the industry, holding 27.5 and 21.4 percent, respectively, of the industry's net capital assets."

There is nothing comparable to this in the field of margarine manufacture. That is my statement. I continue to read from the report of the Federal Trade Commission:

"Thereafter the slope of the curve becomes much more gradual, with the third firm, the Carnation Co., holding 6.9 percent and five other corporations, with assets ranging from 2 to 4 percent of the industry's total, owning an additional 15.5 percent. Thus the eight largest firms control 71.3 percent of the total net capital assets of all corporations operating primarily in this field.

"Even these figures, however, substantially understate the degree of concentration affecting the ultimate consumer. This understatement stems from two factors: (a) Within the broad industry groups, concentration is frequently higher for important individual products; and (b) many of these individual products are highly perishable and can only be shipped within a limited market area, a circumstance which frequently results in a higher degree of concentration in local markets than is true of the country as a whole."

So, Mr. President, what do we have? What have the American people got after all these years of Democratic rule in this country? The great Democratic Party, which says it is for the little fellow, which accuses the Republicans of representing large corporations, has done nothing to prevent monopolies. We find the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] quoting the Federal Trade Commission and showing the few companies which he enumerated having control of 71.3 percent of the dairy industry.

I stood upon this floor only a few months ago protesting the nomination of the leader of certain trusts to be Ambassador to Argentina. The President chose a man for that position who had raised the price of ice cream and milk to little children. The great Democratic Party brags about representing the little fellow, the poor man, but it picked the greatest monopolist of them all, a man who had organized the dairy industry which, in 1 day, in three States, grabbed all the manufacturing plants and formed them into a monopoly, and he has been nominated as Ambassador to Argentina.

I ask this question, Mr. President: Whom have the Democrats named to be general manager of all their Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners? Out of the 150,000,000 people in the United States, Mr. President, whom has the Democratic Party chosen? I shall give his name in a few moments, but before doing so I wish to make it very plain that in behalf of the American people we are dealing today with perhaps the largest trust, the largest monopoly, in the world.

I hold in my hand a copy of Fortune magazine for December 1947. I want to read the first four lines of an article entitled "The World of Unilever":

> Seen from the Old World, the United States is a commercial paradise, where almost every prospect pleases and only Tom Clark annoys. It is the one place in the world where only crackpots want to nationalize industry.

I call the attention of every Senator upon the floor to the first three lines which I have read:

> Seen from the Old World, the United States is a commercial paradise, where almost every prospect pleases and only Tom Clark annoys.

At that time Tom Clark was Attorney General of the United States, Mr. President. He had brought various antitrust suits under the Sherman law. The Sherman Antitrust Act was passed in 1891. The years 1891, 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895, went by, and not a single monopolist was put in jail. 1910, 1920, and 1940 passed, yet, under an antitrust statute over 50 years old, not one monopolist was put in jail. I could forget it if the Republicans did not put anyone in jail, because the opposition has always said the Republican Party was the party of the trusts. If we go out among the people it will be found that the Democrats have given the Republicans that reputation.

But in 1932 the Democrats took over. They said they were going to protect the little fellow, the poor man. I heard, over the radio, their candidate for President say that time and time again.

Did the Democratic Party put in jail any of the monopolists who were robbing the American people? Not one. Were any monopolists put in jail in 1934? Not one. Were any of them put in jail in 1935? Not one.

In 1936 we again heard the Democrats say upon the hustings, "We are the party of the little fellow. We are here to protect the consumer."

According to the speech of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] yesterday, certain corporations have made one combination after another, but, as yet, none of the monopolists have been jailed.

What has the Democratic Party been doing, Mr. President? The people took them at their word in 1936, and monopolies grew and grew and no monopolist was jailed in 1936, in 1937, in 1938, or in 1939.

In 1940 there was a request for more appropriations. Representatives of the Department of Justice said they did not have enough money. So the Senate gave them practically all the money they asked for in order to carry out the antitrust statutes. What happened?

There was another election in 1940, and again and again we heard the candidate for the Presidency tell the people that the Democratic Party was the only salvation of the poor man; that it was against the wicked, terrible trusts which were supporting the Republican Party, and that if the Democratic Party was voted in, what would it not do to those trusts. But 1941 went by, and no monopolist was put in jail. The years 1942 and 1943 went by, and still the antitrust laws were not enforced.

I now come to 1944, when again the Democrats repeated upon platforms all over the Nation that they were going to put monopolists in jail if the people would only once more entrust them with that power.

There is not a Senator on this floor who can name one man who was put in jail for a violation of the antitrust law up to 1946. Not one man was put in jail. The only one who was put in jail was Eugene Debs. He was put in jail, not in the enforcement of the Antitrust Act, but because of the violation of an injunction.

Now we come to the oleomargarine matter. As was stated by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] yesterday, one of the greatest monopolies of all time is the one which is going to benefit in case the pending bill becomes law.

A year ago, Mr. President, when it looked as though we might repeal the tax on oleomargarine, this great monopoly, together with the Best Foods Co., who had sold one of its subsidiaries to it, and who controlled the price of oleomargarine in 3 weeks, raised the price by 23 cents a pound. If that is not true, let someone refute it. Where was this great Democratic administration then? Was anyone arrested?

One of the principal arguments at that time was that butter was too high in price. The argument was that it was so high that a poor man could not buy it. The price of butter was 70 cents, 75 cents, 80 cents, and 85 cents, up to a dollar a pound. The price of butter went up and up. They said, "We want oleomargarine." Yet, I repeat, when it looked as though the measure was going to pass and the tax would be taken off oleomargarine, three companies got control of oleomargarine all over the world. They did it almost in the twinkling of an eye, and the price of oleomargarine jumped 23 cents a pound.

Is that the way the Democratic Party protects the poor people? Is that the way the Democratic Party protects the consumer?

Only a short time ago President Truman said that the farmers would be guilty of ingratitude if they did not vote the Democratic ticket, yet today we find the Democratic Party double-crossing the dairy farmers in the States which I have named, and which voted for them. The Democratic Party is double-crossing them—for whom? Why, Mr. President, for the greatest monopoly that ever existed in the world.

Referring again to the Fortune magazine article for December 1947, let me give Senators some idea as to how large this organization, this monopoly, is. I do not desire merely to gloss over, or not to go into detail. The Senator from Minnesota described it pretty well yesterday in his speech on the Senate floor, but I desire to go into a little greater detail, to point out exactly who will be benefited if the pending measure shall be enacted. This measure is going to hurt agriculture and the farmer. Whom is it going to help? As I have said, the Senator from Minnesota covered that pretty well yesterday when he mentioned this monopoly. Now let us go into some of the details of it.

Referring now to page 88 of Fortune magazine for December 1947, it says:

> This industrial omnium-gatherum—

Referring to Unilever, this corporation, this monopoly—

> is built on as homely and vital a raw material as it is possible to find—on what is known redundantly as fats and oils (an oil is a liquid fat). The fats are extracted from vegetables like peanuts and coconuts, and from animals like cows, pigs, and whales. People encounter them most commonly in butter, margarine, lard, and soap, and without them, as without grain, people obviously would have a tough time getting along. Unilever is the biggest single factor in the world supply of fats and oils, purchasing and processing more than 2,000,000 of the 5,800,000 tons of fats and oils normally finding their way into world commerce.

There we get an idea as to how big this corporation is, Mr. President. It controls 2,000,000 of the 5,800,000 tons of fats and oils in all the world. I continue reading from the article:

> It makes no butter—

"It makes no butter"—

> and renders little lard, but it manufactures more soap and margarine than any other company—about two-thirds of the soap used in the British Empire, and about 12 percent of world consumption; about 75 percent of the margarine eaten in Europe and about 40 percent of world consumption (outside Russia). Even in 1946, with supplies far short of prewar and rationed almost everywhere, Unilever turned out 750,000 tons of soap and 560,000 tons of margarine, for which it received the equiva-

lent of $445,000,000. In crushing palm kernels, copra, peanuts, and other oil-bearing raw materials, it was left with 1,256,000 tons of residues, which it sold as cattle feed for the equivalent of about $67,000,000. It also processed and sold nearly 600,000 tons of oils to other manufacturers and the Government for $144,000,000. Despite its dominant position in the Empire and on the Continent, Unilever feels compelled to promote and advertise its products as no others in the industrial canon are promoted. It was before the war, one of the world's biggest advertisers, spending almost $50,000,000 to sell products like Stork and Blue Band margarine, and Lux, Lifebuoy, Rinso, Persil, and Sunlight soap.

But the basic fat and oil products account for only 60 percent of the company's turn-over. Unilever also does at least a $25,000,000 business in canned goods, of which some $12,000,000 is in canned peas. Before the war it sold more than $7,500,000 worth of Wall's ice cream (in Britain), most of it through white-clad vendors on tricycles bearing the legend "Stop me and buy one." It owns MacFisheries, Ltd., of Britain, the world's largest chain of fish stores (356), which last year sold about $35,000,000 worth of fish and game. Besides dozens of other products, it sells more than $35,000,000 worth of toothpaste (Pepsodent and Solidox) and perfumes and cosmetics. It owned paper and textile mills in Germany, and is half owner of Thames Board Mills, the U. K.'s largest paperboard maker.

Now I shall take this company to Africa, Mr. President, to Africa, where 20 cents a day is paid for labor. We find Senators on this floor saying they are for the pending bill, but we do not find the CIO or the A. F. of L. here fighting for the farmers. They are not lifting a hand. So far as American farmers are concerned, they are abandoned by labor.

Some of us who come from the dairy States find that we have been unable to get any support of any kind from labor in this fight. Perhaps some of the labor leaders are here, within the sound of my voice. The time will come when labor will need the farmer again, and while I will not say it will be refreshing, at least one will have the satisfaction of saying, "When our backs were to the wall, where was labor?"

So I want to take this company over to Africa, where 20 cents a day is paid to a laboring man to compete with the farmers of the United States engaged in the dairy business.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know the Senator from North Dakota, with his demonstrated friendship for the workingmen of this country, would like to know that at least one section of the American Federation of Labor has been in support of the Wiley-Gillette substitute. Men and women working in the creameries, those who drive the milk wagons, trucks, and so on, have, through their labor organizations, supported the substitute. The branch of the American Federation of Labor known as the teamsters' union, and other American Federation of Labor unions have supported us in this fight against the monopoly the Senator is so well describing, and against this kind of what we might very well call attack upon small business enterprises. I simply bring that to the Senator's attention so that the record may be clear.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I am delighted that Dan Tobin of the teamsters' union, and his union, and other A. F. of L. unions are with us in this fight. I am delighted to have the RECORD show that fact.

Let us now go over to Africa, where this monopoly also operates. I quote from Fortune magazine of December 1947:

Unilever's most extraordinary excursion into other fields arises from its quest for raw materials. The United Africa Co., a huge wholly owned subsidiary that accounts for just about a quarter of its consolidated sales, not only grows oil palms and buys raw materials of all kinds from the natives of West Africa and the Congo, it sells everything salable to them. It is, as a matter of fact, the world's largest trading company. An article in a later issue will be devoted to its chromatic activities; suffice to say here that through U. A. C. the Unilever organization finds itself right in the middle of one of the world's most explosive race situations—besides running one of the largest General Motors overseas distributorships, a shirt factory, a full-sized steamship company, and one of the biggest stores in Istanbul.

Mr. President, I have a definition of this company given by the London Economist. This is what the London Economist says about the monopoly which is trying to force the farmers of the United States out of the dairy business:

The Unilever combine and communism—

These are not my words, Mr. President. These are the words of the London Economist, one of the most conservative newspapers in England.

The Unilever combine and communism have not a few points of similarity—in a strictly business sense. That combine is governed by committees innumerable. It controls the working life of the vegetable-oil industries almost as completely as the Soviet monopolizes the working life of the Russian people. It embraces every activity from the production of the raw materials to the retail selling of finished product. And, curiously enough, both Soviet and Unilever catch whales in the Antarctic. For the investor and economist, however, the significant feature is that the more enlightened and efficient Unilever and the Soviet become the more difficult it is to investigate their operations and to analyze their accounts.

Mr. President, is it not strange that even a United States Senator cannot find out what companies are included in this merger? I tried and tried; I went to every source possible in Washington, and I was unable to find anywhere, in any book, a list of the various companies that are amalgamated and affiliated, which are subsidiaries of this giant monopoly. I received some 45 names.

A few months ago I placed in the RECORD the report of the death of the president of this company, who died in Minneapolis, Minn., while there on a visit. In the Minneapolis newspapers appeared an obituary. The obituary contained the statement that he was the president of 613 companies, different corporations, and that they were doing business in 40 different countries.

Mr. President, who have the Democrats chosen to be chairman of the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners? I will tell the Senate in a moment. The Democratic Party, which says it is for the little people, has chosen to handle the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners a man whose name I shall give in a moment. I shall show how the Democratic Party picked him out of 150,000,000 people. The party which says it is against trusts and against monopolies has chosen for this purpose a man who heads a great monopoly.

I read again the quotation from the London Economist:

The Unilever combine and communism have not a few points of similarity—in a strictly business sense. The combine is governed by committees innumerable. It controls the working life of the vegetable-oil industries almost as completely as the Soviet monopolizes the working life of the Russian people. It embraces every activity from the production of the raw materials to the retail selling of finished goods. And, curiously enough, both Soviet and Unilever catch whales in the Antarctic. For the investor and economist, however, the significant feature is that the more enlightened and efficient Unilever and the Soviet become, the more difficult it is to investigate their operations and to analyze their accounts.

Mr. Plummer, in his book, International Combines in Modern Industry, has this to say:

The truth of the last sentence becomes patent when we try to trace the combine's ramifications through to the subsidiaries. In England, for instance, Unilever, Ltd., controls English Margarine Works, Ltd., and the British section of the Van den Bergh undertaking, through which it controls Meadow Dairy Co., Ltd., which in turn controls Pearks Dairies, Sherry's Dairies, Brough's Tea, Ltd., and Neale's Tea Stores. Unilever, Ltd., also holds a substantial interest in Home and Colonial Stores, Ltd., through which it is linked with Allied Stores, Ltd., Liptons, Ltd., and Maypole Dairy Co., Ltd., and, through the latter, with Maypole Margarine Works, Palmine, Ltd., and British Oil Works. This is but a sketch of the combine's English interests, and it is no more than a corner of the whole vast area of its ramifications, for it controls the major part of the margarine industry of Europe, and had interests in oil-crushing and refining factories and allied industries, with their distributing organizations, in Britain, Holland, France, Belgium, Germany, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Italy, and the Dutch Indies.

Here we have a man heading a great monopoly chosen by the Democrats, who love the common people, to manage the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners this year. I will give his name in a moment. I continue to read from Mr. Plummer's book:

The combine's West African interests are in the care of the United Africa Co., Ltd., in which the combine holds 80 percent of the share capital and a dominant proportion of the voting power. Moreover, the United Africa Co. holds, directly or indirectly, controlling interests in no fewer than 66 companies carrying on operations in different parts of the world.

Altogether there are now 616 companies controlled by this combine. At the time its president died the combine controlled 613 companies, and 3 more have been added since. Since I made my last speech on the subject 3 more companies have been included making the total 616.

Alfred Plummer in his book entitled "International Combines in Modern History," published by the Pitman Publishing Co., New York City, 1938, had this further to say:

As an example of a great international trust recently in the public eye we may cite Unilever Ltd., which was registered in November 1927 as Margarine Union, Ltd., and having acquired all the ordinary share capital (£6,500,000) of Lever Bros., Ltd., it changed its name to Unilever, Ltd., in September 1929. This combine includes Van den Berghs, Ltd., the well-known dealers in margarine and similar products, incorporated in 1895, with a capital of over £3,000,000. For many years there was stiff competition between Van den Berghs, Ltd., and Anton Jurgens & Co., a Dutch firm, and in 1908 the competitors thought that it would be to their mutual advantage to enter into an agreement for sharing profits. Accordingly, over a period of years three pooling agreements were entered into. The first agreement, dated February 13, 1908, contained many complicated provisions, but broadly its effect was that each company acquired an interest in the profits of the other. There was a supplemental agreement in 1913 whereby it was agreed that subject to certain modifications the principal agreement of 1908 should continue in force until the end of 1940. After the settlement of a complicated dispute arising out of these agreements, the members of the Van den Bergh and Jurgens families decided to consolidate their interests by forming a Dutch holding company and an English holding company.

Mr. President, it was only a few years ago when, under a Democratic President, the SEC bill was passed, and holding companies apparently were outlawed forever. Yet today whom do we find the Democratic Party taking to its bosom? Who is going to be the general manager, all over the Nation, of the Jackson-Jefferson Day dinners? Wait a little, Mr. President, and I will tell you. Who of the 157,000,000 people in the United States has the Democratic Party picked?

The report further states that—

In association with the Dutch—

They have now formed a Dutch holding company and an English holding company. They were not satisfied with one holding company; they organized two.

In association with the Dutch sister concern, Unilever N. V., Unilever Ltd., now controls not only the Jurgens and Van den Bergh groups of companies, but also the Schlicht and Hartog concerns, both of which manufacture soap and margarine, the former mainly in central and eastern Europe, and the latter in Holland. In 1931, two additional companies were formed under the names of Unilever (Raw Materials), Ltd., and Unilever Grondstoffen Maatschapij N. V., in order to facilitate the buying, holding, and administration of stocks for the English and Dutch groups of companies, respectively. This colossal international combine now includes over 600 companies—

Namely, 616 companies, in 40 different countries.

I read further:

supreme twin holding companies (Unilever Ltd. and Unilever N. V.) are kept separate not only for organizational reasons but also in order to avoid the costs and complications of double taxation. But the real nerve centers are to be found in the interlocking directorates of two private companies, each of which controls 50 percent of the voting power in Unilever Ltd. and Unilever N. V.; so that the British and Dutch interests jointly control both. The whole vast organization is divided into a number of groups of companies. There are separate directors and managers for each group, and a small number of directors whose special function is to keep constantly in touch with the group executives so as to maintain uniformity of policy.

So the entire 616 companies will have the same kind of policy, which, of course, is robbing the common people along the same lines all the time.

Referring again to the article which appeared in Fortune magazine, I wish to say that on page 90 appears the picture of the man selected by the Democratic Party to be the general manager for its Jackson-Jefferson Day dinners. But I do not wish to give his name yet. In a moment I will tell the distinguished gentlemen on the other side of the aisle who he is. But I assure you, Mr. President, that every farmer who tried to make a living when this man was appointed to a responsible position a few years ago by the President, knows, to his sorrow, who he is.

I shall read further from the Fortune article. When this monopoly got to work and started out, it did a great deal of advertising, promoting, and competing. The article states:

Advertising, promoting, and competing, Lever expanded rapidly, and he made soap a mass-produced item by the simple device of selling it as a specialty. In 1888 he started a huge soap factory and model worker's village in a dreary marsh across the Mersey River from Liverpool, and called it Port Sunlight. It is still the world's largest soap factory, and is served by the world's largest privately owned dock. He flooded England with Sunlight, sent it overseas, and was soon manufacturing it all over the world, in Switzerland, Australia, Canada, Belgium, France, the Netherlands, the United States, and Germany. To secure his raw-material supply he picked up 200,000 acres of land in the British Solomons, on which he proposed to plant coconut trees, and got a 1,875,000-acre concession in the Congo for growing oil palm trees, where he built houses, schools, and hospitals for the natives.

But like most born competitors of his time, Lever turned out to be a born monopolist. The older he grew, the less he slept, the more he saw, the more he wanted, and the more he bought. In 1906 he promoted an amalgamation of the leading soap makers, but it was attacked furiously by some of the press, which printed evidence of fraudulent trading and other malpractices.

Mr. President, the article is too long to read in full or even to have printed in full in the RECORD; but I have picked out the most pertinent parts of it. The following appears on page 204:

Besides getting into the British margarine business (margarine had been imported mostly from the Netherlands, so during World War I the Government asked him to make it) he founded the MacFisheries firm, bought a whaling company and built it up, and acquired a half dozen leading British soap, soap flake, chemical, oil cake, and candle companies. Among them was the eminent Joseph Crosfield & Sons, Ltd., makers of soaps and chemicals, which had been the first (in 1906) to hydrogenate hitherto distasteful fats like whale oil and render them first rate for any use. By 1920—

Thirty years ago—

he had gathered unto him more than 75 percent of the British soap business.

So, Mr. President, away back in 1920 he was doing three-quarters of all the soap business in England.

Now I read from page 207:

The story of margarine, man's most successful attempt to compete with the cow, is mostly the story of Margarine Unie's predecessors.

Mr. President, perhaps most of us realize that if we go out on the street and talk to the people we meet there, we find that today the average man does not know where oleomargarine comes from or what it is made of. Of course, those who want to cram it down the throats of the American people leave off the word "oleo," and just call it margarine, because margarine sounds better; it sounds something like "Marjorie" a girl's name. So the producers of oleomargarine like to call it margarine, and leave off the word "oleo."

But I wish to state exactly how it came about that we ever had such a thing as margarine or oleomargarine in the first place. I read further from the article appearing in Fortune magazine.

The story goes back to the middle 1800's and the little town of Osch (later Oss) in the kingdom of the Netherlands, where there flourished two friendly rivals, butter exporters. They made their living buying surplus butter all over the Continent, refreshing it by a simple churning process, and exporting the revived product. One of the firms belonged to Anton Jurgens and his sons, Jan, Arnold, and Henry, devout Catholics; the other to Simon Van den Bergh, a pious, kind, philoprogenitive Jew who, when he got rich, spent great sums in helping refugees from the Russian pogroms flee to America.

Then, in 1870, came the Franco-Prussian War, which caught France short, among other things, of butter. But Napoleon III had anticipated the shortage, and before the war had commissioned a chemist named Mège-Mouriez to experiment on a substitute. Mège-Mouriez wisely studied the cow. He noticed that unfed cows continued for days to deliver milk rich in butterfat but lost their animal fat in the process. He naturally concluded that the butterfat in the milk had been derived from the cow's fat, and verified his conclusion by pressing caul fat (from around the heart) with milk, and so making an artificial butter. For good measure, he invented the name "margarine" to describe this butter.

Jan Jurgens heard about the process while in France and immediately got the rights to manufacture margarine. At this point the narrative can be taken up by an extract from the Van den Berghs touching little family history.

Mr. President, I need not go into all the family history, but the article states what bitter rivals those two men became, after they had been friends almost from childhood.

Later on in the article we find this quotation from a newspaper headline: "Margarine king dead."

The Dutchman had died in 1907. In other words, the heads of those two families had been fighting each other, but in 1907 one of them died.

After that, Simon's sons commanded the fight against the Jurgens. But the Jurgens were led by Henry's son, Anton, the strongest and ablest of the bunch—a sharp-faced, shrewd little man with an overpowering ambition to run the whole margarine industry. Remembering that William Lever had come to the Netherlands and had tried to sell Uncle Jan on the brand idea (Jan had called Lever a fanatic), Anton had taken a leaf from Lever and pioneered branded mar-

garine. He also had been bitten by the monopoly bug—

As was so well described yesterday by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Then we find this:

At first he didn't get very far, but about the time of the depression of 1907 competition got so ferocious and duplication of facilities so flagrant that a profit-pooling arrangement was concluded.

So instead of dividing the stock and the control, they made an agreement to divide the profits 50–50.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks page 213, beginning with the words "mostly because of this decline," and continuing to the end of the paragraph on page 214.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mostly because of this decline, the directors decided to redistribute the assets of the two holding companies so that the British and the Dutch sides of the business would be more nearly equal in volume and profits. This seemingly odd decision goes back to the days of Margarine Union and Margarine Unie, which were tied together by a unique equalization agreement designed to get the benefits of consolidation without incurring the penalties of double taxation. Under the agreement the companies had identical boards and their stockholders had equal rights, and each was bound to help pay the preference dividends of the other, if need arose, and to pay the same dividend on its common. When the Unilever companies replaced the Margarine companies, the agreement remained in force. In 1937, what with falling Dutch profits and no prospect of getting anything out of Germany, it looked as if the English company's dividends would be held down by the imbalance in earning power. So the assets were distributed by giving nearly everything outside the British Empire, including the prosperous American company, to the N. V. side of the business and leaving the rest with the British side. At the same time, Lever Bros. was completely merged with Unilever Ltd., and the names of the two great holding companies were changed to Lever Bros. & Unilever, Ltd., and Lever Bros. & Unilever N. V. If it had not been for the double taxation, to repeat, the two originally would have been consolidated into one, and the question of redistributing the assets would of course never have arisen.

How American profits helped shore up the N. V. side of the combination—remember, Germany's profits were blocked—may be deduced from the following estimate of Unilever's 1937 sales and profits by countries.

Lever Bros. & Unilever Ltd.

[All figures in millions of pounds]

	Sales	Profit
Great Britain	55.0	
Soap	15.0	
Oil cake	15.0	
Margarine	8.0	5.6
MacFisheries	8.0	
Paperboard	3.0	
Foods, glycerin, etc	6.0	
Empire	47.0	
Africa	40.0	1.6
Australia	3.0	
Canada	1.5	1.5
India	1.5	
South Africa	1.0	
Total	102.0	8.7

Lever Bros. & Unilever N. V.

[All figures in millions of pounds]

	Sales	Profit
Germany	35	1.8
United States of America	15	1.3
The Netherlands	15	
France	5	
Belgium	4	
Scandinavia	4	
Eastern Europe	4	.9
Switzerland	2	
Philippines	2	
Others	3	
Total	89	4.0

The war changed these proportions radically, and put N. V. in an even worse position. The Continent faded out of the picture, and Germany, Austria, and the countries east of the Stettin-Trieste line are still excluded from the accounts. The United States now earns practically all N. V.'s profits. Yet total turn-over for 1946, excluding intracompany transactions, was around £270,000,000, or £80,000,000 more than the combined gross shown above, and total profits were £12,000,000, or hardly below the 1937 figure. What happened, as the Continent passed out, was that business in Britain, the United States, and in the domain of United Africa Co. expanded by more than enough to compensate for European declines. United Africa proved to be the star performer, almost doubling its 1937 turn-over and profits. Despite rationing and short supplies, the British and American companies more than held their own, partly because of an acquisition program designed to compensate for the loss of Germany. The United States company bought Pepsodent; and N. V.'s Lipton Tea Co., tea blenders in the United States, went in heavily for dehydrated soups. The British company got the right to manufacture and distribute Birds Eye frosted foods outside the United States, and purchased Batchelor's of Sheffield, world's biggest pea processors and canners. And last year Smethurst Ltd., fish curers of Grimsby, came into the fold.

Mr. LANGER. When Fortune magazine started to write up the monopoly, its editors apparently thought they could do it all in one article. Before they finished, they found it required three editions of Fortune. They treated it serially, as a continuing story. We turn now to Fortune for January 1948. A little while ago I made the statement that all the laborers in Africa were paid was 20 cents a day. I call attention to page 62, where, as a part of the article, there are pictures showing the laborers doing various kinds of work, under which is this note:

West African labor is poorly paid because as a whole it is very unproductive. The 80 men hauling the logs, for example, get so little—20 cents a day—that they are almost as cheap as a tractor, which is still unavailable.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this entire article, dealing with the monopoly, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNILEVER'S AFRICA—LEVER BROS.' UNITED AFRICA CO. IS THE WORLD'S LARGEST TRADING COMPANY—THOUSANDS OF NATIVES PROFIT FROM IT BUT THOUSANDS MORE DISLIKE AND FEAR IT

Promptly at 7 a. m., almost as if he had been set off by the strokes of the ship's bells mounted on the wharves below, Cecil Humphrey, manager of the United Africa Co. trading station at Opobo, Nigeria, puts down his cup of tea, dons his white pith helmet, and strides along the palm-bordered graveled walk leading from his house, down the stone stairs to the Dayspring wharf. It looks as if it would be a busy morning. Up river to the left and out of sight around the bend, the yellow tide is dotted with native dugout canoes, their paddles glittering in a bit of sunshine that has managed to slip through the sodden, lowering clouds. Dozens of traders are already unloading their valuable cargoes of palm oil and palm kernels. Among them is L'Nemchaku, one of the great middlemen of the Ibo Tribe, dressed in gold and white like a prophet, and bringing 14 puncheons containing 9 tons of oil worth in all nearly £250; and Mercy Pepple, one of the oldest female traders on the coast, dancing around and chattering, offering a few hundredweight of palm kernels.

Mr. Humphrey's corps of African helpers are already on the job—sampling and grading the kernels with a terrific swagger and flourish, unloading and rolling the puncheons into the storercoms with a straining and groaning and chanting as if each barrel were heavy as a steam roller. There is, however, none of the old struggling and screaming about prices. These are still fixed by the government, and all Mr. Humphrey does is initial the chits for payment after carefully checking them against the produce—£100 for this trader, £8 for that one, £75 10s 5d for the other.

Within the hour a big part of this payment, which can total as much as 40,000 shillings (natives dislike folding money), will be rolling back into Mr. Humphrey's till. For on each wharf is a store belonging to the United Africa Co., or one of its subsidiaries like Miller Bros. or African & Eastern whose names are preserved because some traders long ago pinned their loyalty to them. But here again is no bargaining palaver, no wrangling among the stores for the traders' custom. Nearly all the stores are owned by UAC, prices are controlled, and the stocks of flamboyant cottons, cigarettes, salt, and so on, are so low that everything not reserved for favored traders is snapped up at once. The West African describes a superior object as "fine pass" this or that, and the finest of all as "fine pass kerosene." "Fine pass kerosene," duly says the clerk, displaying a dubious roll of United States-made shirting. "Everything fine pass kerosene today," comments the trader mournfully. And in terms of price and scarcity, everything is. Last year Mr. Humphrey bought upward of £200,000 worth of palm oil and palm kernels, and one of the major sorrows of his life is that he couldn't sell as many pounds' worth of merchandise because it wasn't there.

TRADING ON THE GRAND SCALE

Compressed into a single instance and oversimplified, this is the current success story of the United Africa Co., Ltd., the biggest enterprise in all Africa, the world's largest trading company—and a wholly owned subsidiary of the Anglo-Dutch Lever Bros. and Unilever combine, whose history was recorded in last month's Fortune. The basic operation at Opobo, one of the last of the old-time river stations, is repeated, on both smaller and larger scale, all over central and west Africa—up at Kano, 700 miles north, the world's greatest groundnut (peanut) market, capital of the Hausa Tribe, the largest and most ancient Mohammedan city west of Istanbul, where the howl of the muezzins wakes you at daybreak every morning; over at Ibadan, the largest and most "modern" city of Nigeria, where nearly half a million people spawn and trade under an ocean of galvanized-iron roofs. Last year UAC bought nearly $115,000,000 worth of African produce from natives and their middlemen, raised $6,000,000 worth of oil on its plantations in West Africa and the Congo; took in some $8,000,000 from its 518 craft on the Niger and the Congo and from its wholly owned

line, which operates a 15-ship, 120,000-ton fleet between the United Kingdom and West Africa. On the other side of the ledger, it sold nearly $145,000,000 worth of merchandise, mostly in West Africa and the Congo. (For an account of the odds and ends of its operations see the note on page 132.)

All this amounts to nearly $300,000,000 worth of business—about 45 percent of the produce buying and 30 percent of the merchandise sales in all West Africa, and nearly as much in the Congo.[1] This great territory stretches more than 3,000 miles from the hump of West Africa in Senegal through the Congo to East Africa. It includes British, Belgian, French, Portuguese, and Spanish colonies, which have different customs and degrees of development but are alike in that they are more than 99 percent native and more than 99 percent illiterate. Its area is roughly equal to that of the United States, and its population is some 50,000,000. UAC's great strength and two-thirds of its business lie in the Gold Coast and Nigeria, the latter now the largest country (23,000,000 approximately) under the British Colonial Office, where it alone does 60 percent of the buying and nearly half the merchandise sales. Eight other relatively small European companies, with which it is on the best of terms, do the bulk of the rest. Wherever you go in this region—the size of Germany, France, and Italy combined—UAC is supreme. Its stores and warehouses seem to take up half the town, its trading posts cover the bush, its managers' houses are the finest, and its managers' "chop" (African for food) the best. "UAC be government," say the natives, logically identifying the most important and powerful organization in the land with the official manifestation of power.

UAC of course is not the government. It is simply in the position of doing a large part of the business there and maintaining commercial relations, free of antitrust legislation, with the rest. UAC is disliked by the people. It is disliked and feared all the more because the people can't do much about it, because their whole economic present and future seem bound to it—and because they are black and largely primitive and prone to distrust and dislike even the most uncommercial Europeans.

FROM COMPETITION TO COMBINATION

It took a long while to achieve this uncomfortable eminence, but in some ways it surely would have pleased the man who started it all. He was the extraordinary William Hesketh Lever, the Viscount Leverhulme, of the Western Isles, founder of Lever Bros., who about the turn of the century was driving toward the domination of the British soap industry. Tropical oils were already being refined and used instead of tallow for both soap and margarine, and the monopoly-minded Lever wanted to be sure of his raw materials. Having bought 200,000 acres and planted 17,000 acres of coconut palms in the Solomons, he turned his attention to Africa, whose principal oils were and are palm oil and palm-kernel oil, squeezed from the fruit of the oil-palm tree. This fruit, growing in huge clusters, somewhat resembles tiny, 3-inch coconuts. The farmers shin up the tall trees, pick the fruit by hand, and extract oil from the pericarp by stewing it and squeezing it in a crude press. And in their spare time their women crack the nuts, whose kernels are nearly always exported and pressed abroad.

This method not only wastes time and oil but produces a low-grade oil with a high free-fatty-acid content; and at the outset Lever, who certainly had what Americans used to call vision, wanted to mechanize the process of decortication and expressing the palm oil, and to grow the palms on plantations, where the yield and quality per tree could be more than doubled. When Lever tried to do business, however, he banged up against British protectorate policy, forbidding Europeans to buy Nigerian land or even lease it for long terms. This idealistic policy was and is based on preserving native land-tenure laws and on the concept of trusteeship, of saving Africa for the Africans and letting their wants determine their development; and although the arguments against it have increased in cogency with time, Parliament and the colonial office, determined to protect the natives against the soap boilers of the world, have clung to it.

Lever stormed and raved, but all he could do was buy a small trading company, put up an experimental kernel-crushing mill, and stamp off to the Belgian Congo. This land, whose moral atmosphere was so magnificently rendered in Joseph Conrad's Heart of Darkness, was just then struggling out from under Leopold II's atrocious exploitation. The Belgian authorities, looking for a new enlightened system, gave Lever a cordial reception. In 1911 he founded the Huileries du Congo Belge, with a concession to develop 1,875,000 acres provided he paid agreed minimum wages, established schools, hospitals, etc. Today Huileries du Congo Belge has nearly all its acreage in oil palms, 80,000 on a plantation basis, employs upwards of 40,000 natives, and produced 37,000 tons of oil and 16,000 tons of kernels last year. Although it technically stems from Huilever, a Belgian subsidiary of Unilever, it is really part of UAC.

In 1920, not long after he had publicly denounced the Nigerian Government for its bureaucratic, highhanded methods, Lever tried again to establish plantations in British West Africa. The Governor of Nigeria, Sir Hugh Clifford, invited him to dinner at Government House in Lagos. The blunt, importunate Lever argued his case violently, while Sir Hugh replied firmly and with some annoyance that the fundamental doctrine of the system of developing agricultural resources through the agency of indigenous inhabitants was the only justification for British rule in tropical countries. The argument got to the point where they would have exchanged blows had they been anything but British. The next day Lever invited Sir Hugh to dine with him on his yacht, the *Albion*. Sir Hugh declined. "My duty compels me to be hospitable to you," he explained, "but it does not compel me to accept your hospitality."

But Lever was already embarked on a move that was eventually to get him what he wanted. At this time two large outfits did the bulk of the trading. One was the Royal Niger Co., which had operated under a royal charter empowering it to maintain the peace. It achieved a virtual commercial monopoly, but the charter was repealed in 1900, when the government decided to do the governing. Nineteen years later a company called the African & Eastern, a new combination of several small firms, emerged as the Niger's chief rival; and in the boom times toward the end of World War I, A. & E. was as big as Niger. The two became fiercely competitive as only tropical traders can become. Lever thought such competition idiotic, and itched to buy and merge them. Since raw materials were at the highest prices in history, he was prepared to pay appropriately for the companies: £8,500,000 or five and a half times the par value of its shares for the Niger Co., and a complex but costly bid for A. & E. The Niger purchase went through, but the A. & E. deal hung up on litigation. Meantime the bottom fell out of the market, and Lever was probably lucky it did. The beating he took on Niger badly bent Lever Bros., and the loss he would have taken on A. & E. might have broken it.

As it was, the two companies almost competed themselves broke in the early 1920's. They had overextended before and during the war, duplicating stores, warehouses, and trading stations, and were now overpaying traders and brokers. The general unprofitableness of the operation was aggravated by the fact that trading could not be tightly controlled by the home office. Gone were the old days of the palm-oil ruffians, when a shipload of assorted junk, mostly empty gin bottles, was enough to make a man's fortune. Not yet gone were the old and romantic characters like A. C. Butler, the palm-oil king of Opobo, with his enormous and picturesque library and gargantuan palm-oil chops. The palm-oil chop, still the Saturday dish of traders, consists of chicken, prawns, and almost any other available meat or fish cooked in fresh red palm oil and served on rice and fu-fu (mashed yams). Butler and his chieftain friends, sluicing down the gory-looking chop with a bottle of gin apiece, would eat and drink themselves asleep, and part of Butler's special fame derived from his ability to rise early next morning and gorge himself on the remains of the feast. Not yet gone, either, were the days when company-employed traders worked their own little game on the side, buying palm kernels when the price was low and not entering the purchase on the books until the price reached its peak. And by no means gone were the competitive days when a trader used every trick and strategy ever heard of to take business away from another trader.

By 1929, A. & E. was in the hands of the bankers, who brought in Sir Robert Waley Cohen, head of Shell Oil, to run it. One of the first things Sir Robert did was to pick up where Lever had left off and make a deal with Niger to combine on a 50–50 basis. The result was UAC. Not even the combined company could stand the depression, however. It lost millions, had to be written down from £15,700,000 to £11,000,000, and passed almost entirely into the hands of the Unilever interests when A. & E. could not meet its bankers' demands for money. But in 1931 UAC began a housecleaning that is still talked about with awe in the jungles of Nigeria and along the reaches of the Congo. Down to Africa sailed two directors, who then proceeded to reduce the number of stores and the staff of both the West African operation and Huilever's SEDEC (Société Anonyme d'Enterprises Commerciales du Congo Belge) by no less than 60 percent. The operation temporarily killed the company's morale, but it revived its financial standing. By 1933, UAC was in the black again.

One of the three managing directors at that time was a shrewd, intense young man named Frank Samuel, who at 21 had gone into the family musical-instrument business in London. He invented the first portable gramophone, which he called the Decca, for no particular reason except that the name sounded good, and shortly set up the Decca Gramophone Co. Convinced that radio had ruined the phonograph, he sold out the company to its present owners for £450,000, made a trip around the world, and looked for something to do. His friend, Sir Robert Waley Cohen, asked him to take a whack at merchandising with UAC. Mr. Samuel took a whack and was at the point of giving up when he decided to go to Africa and have a look for himself.

There he changed his mind so effectively that in 1931 he was appointed a director, and early in the war, when the other two directors went into government service, he took over. Some idea of the importance Unilever attaches to its biggest subsidiary may be derived from the management set-up of UAC. Chairman is the famous Viscount Trenchard, marshal of the Royal Air Force, Chief of Staff of the British Air Staff from

[1] Besides those under UAC's jurisdiction, Unilever's African interests include soap and margarine factories and food-processing companies in South Africa, the Rhodesias, Nyasaland, and West Africa.

1918 to 1929, who fought for 7 years in Nigeria at the beginning of the century and knows the country well. He has been chairman since 1936. The rest of the board consists of 15 members, including, besides Mr. Samuel, 4 other members of the Unilever board: Geoffrey Heyworth and Paul Rykens, chairmen of the parent companies, Sir Herbert Davis, and R. H. Muir. No other Unilever subsidiary has such a team at its head or is so closely integrated with the parent board.

EVERY PRICE HAS ITS COSTS

In the last few years UAC has achieved what no company in Africa has enjoyed since the days of the Royal Niger—stability in both buying and selling, an almost complete hegemony of the field; and the irony in the fact that the wartime controls of the government have helped the company to its unprecedented heights is surely not lost on Mr. Samuel, whose devotion to success is complemented by a sardonic sense of humor. And UAC is successful. Last year profits, after taxes, were somewhat more than $10,000,000, or nearly a quarter of Unilever's consolidated profits, or about 4 percent on UAC's sales and 18 percent on its original capitalization.

What this success means will become clear after we consider the nature of UAC's business, its relation to Unilever, and the normal conditions under which it works. Its activities sound simple. Its primary function is to get tropical produce and sell it in the world market (it never buys directly for Unilever), and it naturally would like to see a comfortable spread between the price it pays and the price it sells for. In the early days a trading company kept native prices low by offering the cheapest possible merchandise for the biggest possible amount of produce. Manhattan Island, remember, was bought for $24. But after the transaction became monetized a strange complication set in. As soon as the native got money to spend, and got it from sources other than the traders, the companies found themselves developing merchandising organizations whose prosperity depended on the native's having money to spend—which he did not have when prices were ruinously low. And experience showed that trading companies almost invariably made more money when prices were high than when they were low, and made more money on merchandising. World prices that were too low to cover transportation costs to Europe would mean no business for anybody.

This logic may seem to place Mr. Samuel in an odd, not to say dichotomous, position. As UAC's managing director, charged with making it profitable, he should prefer high world prices. But as a director of UAC's parent, Lever Bros. and Unilever, which buys colossal amounts of fats and oils and converts them into soap and cooking fats and margarine, he should prefer low world prices. It would be easy to conclude that Mr. Samuel is beaten down by the rest of the Unilever board, which theoretically should sweat to drive produce prices as low as possible. As a matter of fact, prices fluctuate regardless of the wishes of Mr. Samuel or Unilever; and it is more valid to conclude that Unilever is more interested in the prosperity of the trading business as owner and buyer than only as a buyer. This is just another way of saying that the Unilever-UAC vertical combine, like most vertical combines, results almost automatically in a corporate urge to balance prices and costs so that each of the company's components turns a profit; and the key to the balance is stable prices. One can believe Geoffrey Heyworth, chairman of Unilever, when he says: "We run our business positively, keep it healthy and growing, and let the chips fall where they may."

So Mr. Samuel is certainly in no danger of going schizoid. He would like to see produce prices comfortably higher—high enough at any rate to keep the produce coming steadily to market. On the other hand, he naturally aims to drive as hard a bargain as he can for the money the native has to spend. To the native chief who remembers fondly only the feast of the feast-or-famine days of competitive buying and selling, such stability seems like a big squeeze play by the trading companies, by the civilized world on the primitive areas, by the white race on the black race.

One reason trading companies in the Tropics formerly competed so savagely was that they had relatively high overhead costs. There are only some 1,125 UAC European employees in West Africa and the Congo, but Europeans in the Tropics are expensive animals. The company provides them with houses and "boys"—its total investment in houses runs into millions—and grants them a month's leave for every 5 months on tour, with round-trip fare to London or Brussels. A few older men are still on a bonus basis, the bonus varying with profits and amounting to as much as twice the salary, but this has been largely supplanted by a pension scheme enabling a man to retire at 53 on half salary—not too early nor too much for anyone who has steamed out the best years of his life in the Tropics, fighting dysentery, consorting with the same bores day after day, swallowing pounds of quinine or atabrine in a futile attempt to forfend malaria, and giving up his children (if he has any) for a dozen years or more because the Tropics are bad for them and there are no schools there anyway. While salaries are not high by American standards—only a few managers make more than $10,000 a year—they are high by colonial standards, and personnel costs impose a fixed burden that can be absorbed successfully only with great volume. Competition, of course, was worst when times were tough and volume hard to come by, and a native would walk 25 miles to save threepence. And the worst competition was provided not by the European companies but by price-cutting Syrians, Lebanese, and Greeks, who slept behind their shop counters, and did not have to worry about houses, bonuses, retirement pensions, district managers, or area supervisors.

SWARMS OF MIDDLEMEN

UAC's chief purchases, in the order named, are palm oil and palm kernels, cocoa, groundnuts, and hides, and it harvests and saws timber. Most of the cocoa comes from the Gold Coast, and most of the rest from Nigeria and the Congo. The company buys this produce in 1,771 stations, some doing a business of $5,000,000 or more a year, others consisting of a native employee or concessionaire on a commission basis, with a stock of matches, cigarettes, soap, tin pans, and plain and printed cotton goods under a little tin-roofed shack of a store.

All these stations, however, are not anywhere near enough to contact the so-called farmers out in the depths of the bush. Native farming consists mainly of climbing oil-palm trees and picking the fruit, knocking pods off cocoa trees at the right time, and cultivating patches of groundnuts; and even when the farmer has enough wives to do the work, he rarely pursues his calling assiduously. In the main, he sells not for the necessities of life, which he raises or picks from trees, but for luxuries like matches, cigarettes, bicycles, sewing machines, gramophones, and Xavier Cugat records.

Partly because he has to be coaxed, partly because he is so inaccessible, a hierarchy of native middlemen factors or brokers has risen up to fetch his produce to market and to take merchandise to him. Local brokers sell to district middlemen, the district middlemen to lower middlemen, and so on. In 1937 there were some 1,500 brokers or factors and 37,000 subbrokers in the Gold Coast; no attempt was made to estimate the number in Nigeria, but it probably exceeded 100,000. The one big ambition of the smart West African native, male or female, as soon as he or she donned a loin cloth and began to comprehend the weird and intricate ways of the white man, was to forsake the jungle and become a trader or middleman. But, of course, the middleman needed money, and the only way European firms could get produce was to advance the money to the brokers, who advanced it to the middlemen at 40 to 50 percent interest, and so on down the line to the farmer. The native brokers, like the white traders of an earlier day, quickly found out that the capital they had to work with presented tempting opportunities for cleaning up on their own.

A good example of how they worked is provided by the prewar cocoa situation. As the buyer of 40 percent of the cocoa in the Gold Coast and in Nigeria (the source of half the world's supply), UAC advanced hundreds of thousands of pounds to brokers. They in turn would buy cocoa at, say £25, and enter their purchases on the books at £30 or £35 if the price later went up that far, but at the actual buying figure if it fell; with the result that the European companies were left holding the bag no matter which way the market happened to go. UAC claims it lost £1,338,000 in cocoa buying between 1930 and 1937, overpaying brokers by some £350,000.

So practically all the European firms got together and formed a cocoa-buying pool that divided the market and "stabilized" prices. Just about this time, the world price of cocoa, influenced chiefly by the decline in New York prices, fell abruptly. The bewildered natives and their chiefs could not or did not want to understand the reason and blamed the price decline on the buying pool. They organized a strike or "hold-up," and native sales and merchandise purchases fell off to practically nothing. The British Government investigated, and printed a report recommending, among other things, a farmers' cooperative to eliminate usury, misweighing, and other abuses of the middleman system.

But shortly afterward the war began, and the British Government, through traders, did all the buying. It still has a monopoly on West African cocoa, and with the world price around £250 a ton, it is buying cocoa for around £75 a ton, and has already made a profit of some £20,000,000. The Colonial Office says it will set aside these profits to bolster the price in future years at about the level it is paying now, and despite the howls and laments of American chocolate makers apparently intends to continue price controls indefinitely. Through the 1946–47 season it fixed not only prices but buying quotas, the latter on an "as is" or "past-performance" basis. UAC had no kick coming; it made at least a decent profit and any kind of stability was better than the old-time anarchy. Last fall, however, the Government suddenly knocked the props out from under this stability by canceling quotas but still continuing to fix the buying price. The companies must theoretically now bid for tonnage with very little room to bid in, and some kind of buying agreement is obviously in the offing.

Wartime price controls had and still have a salutary effect on other produce. UAC (and its predecessors) had habitually made trade agreements with European competitors—firms like Paterson Zochonis, of Manchester; Compagnie Française de l'Afrique Occidentale, of Marseille; John Holt & Co., of Liverpool. But it had no sooner made agreements than new competitors began to take advantage of the opoprtunity—just as the textbook says they should. In the late 1920's, for example, the European firms at Kano got together, agreed on prices, and made allocations of groundnuts, and it looked as if they would enjoy the blessings of stability. But a Tripolitan named S. Raccah got into the export trade, offered

native middlemen and other sellers a better price than the European firms. He went broke in the middle 1930's, but came back strong by working hard and late, dealing through brokers in Europe, and dickering for lower than conference steamship rates. By 1938 he was exporting a third of the groundnut crop, and of course the European agreement in effect broke down. The war intervened, and the British Ministry of Food controlled and set quotas for West African produce, allocating UCA nearly half of the groundnut crop on a 3-year average.

The only noteworthy UAC activity that perhaps hasn't gained by Government controls is the practically noncompetitive lumber and timber business, which accounts for a rather small part of the company's revenues and an undisclosed but certainly very nice part of its profits. It harvests tropical timber of all kinds on a concession basis in the lowland jungles of Nigeria and the Gold Coast, saws it up in a mill at Sapele, Nigeria, and sells the lumber to the Ministry of Supply. A few years ago Mr. Samuel got interested in plywood, and UAC is now completing a huge factory with an annual output of 40,000,000 square feet of 3/16-inch plywood, worth $3,000,000. The mills are on tidewater—logs float from the forests, and lumber and plywood are loaded onto UAC steamers at the door. UAC is spending money on houses and a hospital for 2,000 native workers; and the plywood mill, the first of its kind in the Tropics, involves considerable risk and experiment, including air conditioning to combat humidity. But UAC has to pay the workers only about 50 or 60 cents a day, and the mill is potentially extremely profitable. Another is planned for the Gold Coast.

The British Government may not control the price of lumber and plywood by the time these mills are running, but it surely will control fats and oils for a long time. It seems determined, indeed, to peg them until the world supply, now a bare 17,500,000 tons, is somewhere near the 22,000,000 tons needed to put per capita consumption on a prewar basis. A question that will inevitably arise when controls are repealed concern Unilever's buying power. One of the arguments for the merger of the Dutch margarine and British soap interests that resulted in the Unilever combine was that together they could buy more than a third of the 5,800,000 tons of fats and oils normally handled in international commerce. Unilever was accordingly charged with having a powerful depressing influence on world prices. As we have noted, however, Unilever does not care to see prices depressed too far. And with a Labor government doing the stabilizing, UAC and Unilever have to worry only about the rather interesting charge, sometimes made, that they are running the Labor government. Even if they were, they wouldn't have to; the government's desire to maintain controls happens to coincide with Unilever's yearning for stability.

LEVER'S DREAM COME TRUE

What the Labor government has found out, ironically, is that Unilever's interests and the British national interests coincide so much of the time lately that it is sometimes difficult to recognize the company as the biggest octopus in the whole Old World. And Mr. Samuel's latest accomplishment is not only another example of such a coincidence; it can be interpreted as a victory in the Lever organization's 40-year-old fight with the Colonial Officer over plantation versus native farmer.

In addition to the 80,000 acres of plantations run by Huileries du Congo Belge, UAC Pamol Ltd. operates palm-oil plantations in Nigeria and the Cameroons. The latter dates back to German control and the other to a temporary excess of leniency on the part of the Nigerian Government, which allowed it to be set up as an experiment. The plantations have proved themselves vastly superior to the native farm methods. The forest is cleared and the young palms are planted, and they begin to bear within a few years. Since other trees do not keep the sun from them, they do not grow long trunks, and thus harvesting becomes easier and safer. The trees are more than twice as productive, and the oil is of consistently high quality, being expressed from the pericarp in plants right on the estate. Total cost has been cheaper than the price paid for native produce in all except the deep depression years. And today the finest palm oil can be produced for about half of the £25 a ton that the inferior native product brings. As a result of such differences in cost, the plantation-farmed Netherlands East Indies passed Nigeria in palm-oil exports in 1936 and the Congo is rapidly catching up.

Whether the plantation is socially superior to native farms is not quite so easy to say. The Colonial Office's contention that it would leave the native high and dry when profits fail has not been borne out, for during the depression plantation workers got along somewhat better than farmers. UAC plantations have provided the native much better housing than he has in the bush, plus free hospitals and clinics, schools, medical treatment; and the difference between the Congo plantation worker and bush native in health and general well-being impresses even the most skeptical visitor. Huileries du Congo is starting to raise a herd of cattle to provide red meat for its native employees, and has just founded L'Ecole Supérieure D'Agriculture-Huilever S. A. to teach bright Congolese to become estate managers. The only way native standards can be raised is by increasing native productivity, and the plantation system has done it faster than the slow educational system of the Colonial Office. The counterargument goes that the native on the plantation is deprived of his old village life and of the chance to process his produce as well as raise it, is fastened to a new kind of existence, and robbed of the illusion of running his own affairs. And it may be somewhat idealistic to expect a native to be more advanced than civilized people who have fought for the illusion of running their own affairs.

Neither groundnuts nor cocoa, however, are yet raised on African plantations. There is some doubt about whether cocoa trees could be; the best ground for them in the Gold Coast seems to be the middle of slopes, and it is of course terribly difficult to get enough middles of slopes together to make a plantation. The company, not missing a bet, has nevertheless planted 6,000 experimental acres of cocoa in the Congo. There is no doubt, however, about plantation culture of groundnuts. In 1946, while on a tour of East Africa, Mr. Samuel got the idea of developing huge groundnut farms in the vast uninhabited expanses of East Africa, where the soil seemed about right. But if Unilever proposed to buy hundreds of thousands of acres of land, the native leaders might have been down on its neck. Accordingly, Mr. Samuel developed the idea on a colossal three-and-one-quarter-million-acre basis, which no private company could very well swing, and turned it over to the Ministry of Food as Unilever's contribution to the solution of the world fats-and-oils shortage.

The ministry sent out a mission to report on the proposal. Soon after the mission returned, Food Minister Strachey, author of The Coming Struggle for Power, got up in Parliament and explained the scheme, adding that His Majesty's Government had asked UAC (one of the favorite targets of his Socialist friends) to manage the undertaking until it was in production. It was almost as if Churchill got up and said he wanted Aneurin Bevan as Prime Minister. There was derisive laughter from the right, and sharp questions from the left, and Strachey could only reply that UAC had the experience and that was that. And only last November 6, Mr. Strachey again gave the company a pat on the back. "I believe that the UAC and all those who have been officially and unofficially responsible for the very rapid launching of Operation Groundnuts deserve well of the people of Great Britain."

UAC not only started the project, it did so without fee. Yet this was not wholly an eleemosynary gesture. Eventually the plantations may produce 600,000 tons of nuts a year, more than Nigeria's exports of palm kernels and groundnuts combined, and the oil will not only enable Unilever to make more soap and margarine but will almost certainly have a stabilizing effect on world prices. As the world's largest buyer of fats and oils, Unilever will benefit immensely. And if the day again comes when there is a glut, Nigerian farmers will doubtless pay for the illusion of running their own affairs—unless the Nigerian Government promotes its own plantation schemes. In that sense the groundnut scheme was a victory for UAC—and for the ideas and ambitions of old Lever himself.

TROUBLE IN PARADISE

Meantime, the native farmers are making a lot of money and UAC is making a lot of money taking their money. Probably no company in the world sells a wider variety of merchandise. More than a third of its $145,000,000 sales comes under the general heading of textiles—180,000,000 yards a year—consisting mostly of cotton baft (heavy gray goods), and gaudy but imaginative cotton prints, carefully designed to satisfy the wierd and changing taste in each section of the country. Next on the list, accounting for about 10 percent of sales, are cigarettes. After that come salt and anything else any department store can conceivably carry, from Sunlight soap made in the local factory to Czech hardware and gas engines and wine and cosmetics and machetes and General Motors refrigerators and cars. More than three-quarters of UAC's sales are wholesale, made in small, dumpy holes in the wall bearing the name of a predecessor or subsidiary like W. B. MacIver, which markets most of the company's textiles. As a matter of general policy, UAC wants to forsake retailing almost entirely and leave it to the African. With that aim in mind it is refurbishing and concentrating its retail activities in a chain of modern, sometimes elegant Kingsway stores, nearly half of whose customers are Europeans, and will maintain them mostly as show places and pilot plants.

The story of merchandising competition is the same as that of produce competition; it used to be devastating. Besides the European companies, there were upstart Greek and Levantine traders who showed a dismaying ability to cut prices, squeeze along, and stay in business. They even decided to import for themselves, a decision that Manchester and German textile manufacturers were only too glad to abet for a while—until one Syrian ordered a lot of textiles from Manchester and refused to accept them when they arrived. When they were auctioned off, his confederate, supplied with the Syrian's cash, got them for about 60 cents on the dollar. Of another shrewd trader his competitors say he hires a claque to stir up a crowd, whereupon he sells a piece of baft, say, at 25 percent below going price in the morning and gradually raises the price as the crowd gathers and the day wears on.

As times picked up, UAC and eight other companies, accounting for the bulk of the merchandise trade, got together and succeeded in stopping the cutthroat competition effectively enough to double mark-ups on some items. This get-together is frequently confused with the Association of West African Merchants, an entirely different body comprising the principal trading firms and found-

ed during World War I. At the outbreak of World War II, the West African and home governments called it into consultation on import controls, price-fixing problems, and schemes for boosting native production. Even the whites, identifying it with high prices, call it the Association of Waylayers and Mercenaries. The get-together is currently unnecessary, for the government still fixes prices and allocates imports, more or less on a past-performance basis, and by and large the situation is beautifully under control for UAC. As a part of a large investment program, UAC has formed a jointly owned construction company with Taylor Woodrow, well-known British contractors, has a one-third interest in a 500,000-gallon brewery being built at Lagos, and is spending $5,000,000 on its river fleet and docks. It is also finishing a banana-flaking plant (to be supplied from its banana plantation in the Cameroons), and planning to produce concentrated orange juice. If anything is to be developed in West Africa UAC will surely have a go at it.

The only notable fly in the ointment is a bold Gold Coast Greek named A. G. Leventis whom UAC sacked in 1936. He had little past performance in most of West Africa, but today he is one of the big retailers in the area. His white, modern, three-story building at Lagos, for example, is always crowded with merchandise and native buyers screaming to be waited on. The question of how Mr. Leventis imported his merchandise was the subject of a government investigation, which mentioned the irregularities of customs officials and United States Army officers. Leventis is unquestionably resourceful. The native is so proficient at the art of drumming that it is sometimes quicker to send messages by drum than by telegraph, and the story goes that Leventis bought up the free time of a whole army of drummers, and that the coastal jungles now vibrate to the Yoruba or Ibo equivalent of "Buy from Leventis—he undersells everybody."

Yet Leventis does not seem to worry UAC too much. Presumably it expects him to sell out as others have sold out when the time is ripe. In any event, UAC has been going its way more or less unconcerned, accumulating its good share of profits and ill will. To be sure, it is blamed for sins it doesn't commit. It is blamed, for example, for the fact that most of the stuff it imports reaches the native consumer at anything from 100 to 500 percent above what it should sell for. Actually, UAC sells to middlemen traders at government-fixed prices, and the traders sell and resell the stuff for whatever traffic will bear. Caustic soda, used by local soap makers and dyers, is very scarce, and last August caustic soda sold by UAC for $9 a ton was fetching $88 a ton in the free market. The natives have accused UAC of taking advantage of the situation by making traders take some of the things they don't want in order to get other things they do want.

The traders themselves are far from blameless. In Ibadan, last August, Yoruba female traders had overstocked themselves with Guinea gold cigarettes and were selling them in the street at less than wholesale price, hoping, in the words of one UAC man, "that their big orders of cigarettes would entitle them to better allocation of scarce stuff, which they could mark way up." This is a variation of an old prescarcity practice known as gold coasting, or buying easily salable items on chit, selling them below cost if necessary, and lending the cash to needy traders or natives at 30 or 40 percent.

Last June the natives of Ibadan, led by a youth movement called the Discrimination Watch Committee and the newly formed Ibadan Wholesalers and Retailers Union, protested tie-in sales, unsuitable merchandise, and what they thought was the European importers' partiality for profiteering Syrian traders. They organized an effective boycott. "Never thought they could do it," admits a UAC man. "Anyway, the reason Africans complain about the inordinate profits of the Syrians is they want to make the profits."

Whatever the facts, UAC settled the boycott by agreeing to create 50 African traders at the expense of the Syrians, and so far it has found 14 natives capable of being made traders. The settlement, reached only after the Africans had demonstrated their strength, obviously did not do UAC any good. It strengthened the native's antagonism to the company and, more important, gave him confidence in his ability to fight it. As every company knows, a strike means bitterness, and losing a strike means losing prestige. In UAC's case the loss was even more severe because the strikers had different-colored skins and a different psychology.

THE WHITE MAN'S BURDEN

Nineteen years after its founding, UAC has arrived at an admirable commercial supremacy. Although its relations with the natives are better than they used to be they have not yet matched its commercial progress. The company is probably still vulnerable commercially—a new American or British company with plenty of Negroes in its management might give it a devastating ride. UAC is also vulnerable to public opinion. Now that India is practically independent. West Africa is one of the most critical frontiers on earth, one of the few remaining chances for liberal western civilization to give a good account of itself. As the dominant enterprise in this area, UAC has to define success as a performance that does credit not only to itself but to the free-enterprise system. It has to bridge the gap between the middle 1800's and middle 1900's.

This is not an easy job, and there is much to be said for UAC. It is not and cannot be expected to be responsible for 50,000,000 Africans. To assure every native connected with the fats-and-oils business a decent living by European standards, soap and margarine would have to sell for $5 a pound. The West African economy cannot be appraised in terms of the European or American social or economic clichés any more than its living standards can be assessed in terms of American standards. The seeming rapacity of the trading companies often sprang from the competitive spirit that is the legal ideal of United States industry. Competitive assailability created the will to monopoly; trading companies have abused their position in one place to recover what they lost by excessive competition in another.

Under ordinary circumstances, a company could partly compensate for all this by wise, deft handling of personnel relationships. Even this is not so easy as it sounds. The bulk of the natives are not only illiterate, they are stupid, listless, and exasperating, as Europeans would be if they and their families were plagued with malnutrition, malaria, dysentery, yaws, sleeping sickness, leprosy, and outsized umbilical hernias. The average native knows the European mostly in the relation of boy or servant to master. This is partly unavoidable, because nearly all Europeans in UAC territory are executives of one kind or another, and would be masters if their employees were white. Anyway, the average native almost compels the European to be the white master. Accustomed to the most despotic kind of rule by his native overlords, he regards the European who tries to be democratic as a weakling and a fool. He responds to being treated fairly—a circumstance overlooked by many white masters—but the fact remains that he seems to perform best when treated firmly. So the average European inevitably regards him as a child, and is disposed to treat him economically as a child.

Complicating all this are the native workers' low wages—as low as 20 cents a day, with "cola" (cost-of-living allowance), housing, and other benefits bringing the grand total up by 50 percent—while merchandise is generally higher in Africa than in Britain. Naturally, a bicycle or a bottle of hair straightener costs a little more in Africa than it does 5,000 miles closer to the place it was made; and the African, until he is more productive, cannot expect to earn as much as European labor. (To pay him high wages now in the last analysis would be to do him out of a job.) Which is not to say that European companies do not take advantage of low prevailing scales, set by governments, the largest employers of native labor, to get productive jobs filled cheaply.

As for the literate African, he would be hard to handle even if he were getting a much better deal economically and were always treated as the adult he is. Neither the British nor French in West Africa nor the Belgians in the Congo tolerate the color line that is a feature of life in South Africa as well as the American deep South. But the mere absence of a formal color lines does not affect things very much. The more enlightened the native, the more he is aware that his brothers and uncles and aunts come closer to monkeys than Europeans seem to; and unless he is a man of immense talent, all the confidence he can muster in himself and all he knows about the stupidity and venality of the white man isn't enough to cover his discomfort.

The situation presents obvious and enormous opportunities for a demagog, and one has appropriately arisen. The most publicized native in West Africa is one Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe, better known as Dr. Zik, a well-educated man with a gift for noble phraseology. He prints several Nigerian papers, and his program is independence for Nigeria, justice for the Africans, "the right to work if a man has to," freedom from UAC, the destruction of AWAM, and so on. Frequently he is unintentionally funny. One of his papers recently created a particularly anguished furor with the news that a UAC manager employed a dog as night watchman at a higher wage than he paid some of his help. Dr. Zik's editors missed the point. This manager, who has since been fired, used the dog to patrol his place and hit upon the whimsical and touching idea of entering the dog's name on his pay roll along with several fictitious names.

Of Dr. Zik and his papers and activities it is fair to observe they are one of the best arguments extant for making Nigeria a crown colony, but his line nevertheless is sometimes just and generally plausible—and packs a big appeal. Dr. Zik cannot be pooh-poohed, as he is, on the ground that only a small literate minority knows him. UAC and the other Europeans almost certainly underestimate him, just as they tend to underestimate the forces that have generated him.

UAC has done something to improve its relations with the natives. It has appointed a personnel manager, and has sent several of its African managers on extended trips through the United Kingdom. It has set up pensions and sick-leave benefits. For economy as well as good will it makes a policy of upgrading native personnel to managerial jobs as soon as they can handle them. In Togoland, all its staff is African. Although Africans are generally paid considerably less for the same work, most students of West African economics agree that equal pay for equal work would be a mistake. It costs the European much more than the native to live in the tropics, and a European scale for the African, besides being too far out of line with the lowest native wages, would tend to keep him out of government and business jobs that he should be trained to hold. But even when the native sees the point of this concept, which he rarely does, he naturally believes that UAC abuses it. During the war, UAC upgraded many Africans, and in the inevitable housecleaning after the war

some lost out. The instinctive native reaction that the company was reviving color discrimination was taken up by the Zik press.

What UAC has on its hands, in other words, is a full-blown public-relations race problem about which it ought to do more than it has done. It could, for example, give thoroughgoing courses in race relations to young trainees and future managers, who now go down to Africa with only their own wisdom and imperfect knowledge to guide them. London seems to have decided it has a responsibility to the native, and Lord Trenchard has stated that it is UAC policy to cooperate more and more with colonial governments, but the company surely has not been able to sell itself or its good intentions to the natives. It might well study the methods of old Lord Leverhulme, who was as hardboiled as they come but knew what he was up against. "A native," he wrote in 1924, "cannot organize. He cannot run even a wooding post on the river satisfactorily." Nevertheless he felt that it was important to generate their good will, and suggested the publication of a magazine for African distribution with a cover showing a white hand clasping a black one and helping the native up a hill. The diagram might make a few sophisticated Africans guffaw, but the motive behind the idea is today more relevant than ever.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, some of the slaves of this great monopoly become educated. At the bottom of page 64 there are pictures of some of the natives, accompanied by the following note:

The fatalistic Mohammedan Hausa and Fulani of northern Nigeria (middle photo) boast a civilization that hasn't changed in a thousand years, yet is centuries ahead of the Congolese. Along the seaboard, the Sierra Leone and Gold Coast natives are considered most adaptable to European ways, with Yorubas and Ibos of southern Nigeria close behind. "And when they advance, that's when they get hard to handle," says a UAC official.

When they get a little education, they become hard to handle. I can understand that a man getting 20 cents a day, when he finds out how much people get in other parts of the country, may become rather hard to handle.

We turn now to page 132. I ask unanimous consent that the article in the box, entitled "The Foundlings on the Doorstep," be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOUNDLINGS ON THE DOORSTEP

"There are lots of funny bits lying about the company," says Geoffrey Heyworth, chairman of Unilever Brothers & Unilever Ltd. "It is like having a foundling on the doorstep; you don't slit its throat, you bring the thing in and take a look at it." Mr. Heyworth was talking about several odd, detached, and very profitable activities of United Africa Co. that function under an odd, detached, and profitable man named John Wigrain Shepherd. Most of them date back to the exploits of a director of African & Eastern (one of UAC's predecessors), Maj. Gen. W. H. Grey, C. B., C. M. G., who during and after World War I picked up a lot of bargains for his company in the Near East. He bought into the business of buying and shipping dates out of Iraq, and UAC now ships 100,000 boxes of the 500,000 going to the United States in the annual date rush. He bought the G. & A. Baker store in Istanbul, which got its start peddling cloth to the members of the Sultan's harem. It lost money for a long time, but now does very well indeed, has gone into the wholesale business, and exports and imports everything from airplanes to tobacco (it sold 200 de Havillands last year). In Iran, Iraq, Mesopotamia, and Syria, UAC buys wool from the tails of desert sheep, much in demand by United States carpetmakers. In the Canary Islands it runs a general import-export business, importing grain and maize from Argentina and water pumps from the United States, and exporting tobacco and highly profitable homemade cigarettes to Spain. In Morocco it specializes in importing Chinese green tea, a staple of Moroccan diet, and exports Moroccan leather, which really comes across the desert from Kano, Nigeria. Finally, it scrapes a few thousand dollars worth of guano off one of the Seychelles, north of Madagascar. All these activities gross it around $8,000,000 and make it a good fat profit. As Mr. Heyworth says, "When profitable loose ends can be tacked on by ad hoc methods, why throw them out?"

Mr. LANGER. I now come to page 134, a continuation of the article previously placed in the RECORD, discussing the monopoly. The little children in America buy Hershey bars, for example, on every one of which England, in control of Africa, makes an outrageous profit. Hershey and other chocolate bars are made from cocoa. Reading from page 134:

A good example of how they worked is provided by the prewar cocoa situation. As the buyer of 40 percent of the cocoa in the Gold Coast and in Nigeria (the source of half the world's supply)—

The article is dealing with the monopoly—

UAC advanced hundreds of thousands of pounds to brokers. They in turn would buy cocoa at, say, 25 pounds, and enter their purchases on the books at 30 pounds or 35 pounds if the price later went up that far, but at the actual buying figure if it fell; with the result that the European companies were left holding the bag no matter which way the market happened to go. UAC claims it lost 1,338,000 pounds in cocoa buying between 1930 and 1937, overpaying brokers by some 350,000 pounds.

What happened?

So practically all the European firms got together—

Here is where our American boys again got gypped—

and formed a cocoa-buying pool that divided the market and stabilized prices. Just about this time, the world price of cocoa, influenced chiefly by the decline in New York prices, fell abruptly. The bewildered natives and their chiefs could not or did not want to understand the reason and blamed the price decline on the buying pool. They organized a strike or holdup, and native sales and merchandise purchases fell off to practically nothing. The British Government investigated, and printed a report recommending, among other things—

What did they recommend? They recommended a farmers' cooperative—a farmers' cooperative, such as the Tax Equality League wanted us to put out of business. When they got all through, that is what they recommended, some 35 years ago.

The British Government investigated, and printed a report recommending, among other things, a farmers' cooperative to eliminate usury, misweighing, and other abuses of the middleman system.

But shortly afterward the war began, and the British Government, through traders, did all the buying. It still has a monopoly on West African cocoa, and with the world price around 250 pounds a ton, it is buying cocoa for around 75 pounds a ton, and has already made a profit of some 20,000,000 pounds.

That is, they buy it for around 75 pounds a ton, and sell it for about 250 pounds a ton.

The Colonial Office says it will set aside these profits to bolster the price in future years at about the level it is paying now, and despite the howls and laments of American chocolate makers apparently intends to continue price controls indefinitely. Through the 1946–47 season it fixed not only prices but buying quotas, the latter on an "as is" or "past performance" basis.

Further on, at page 136, the article says:

The British Government may not control the price of lumber and plywood by the time these mills are running, but it surely will control fats and oils for a long time. It seems determined, indeed, to peg them until the world supply, now a bare 17,500,000 tons, is somewhere near the 22,000,000 tons needed to put per capita consumption on a prewar basis. * * * One of the arguments for the merger of the Dutch margarine and British soap interests that resulted in the Unilever combine was that together they could buy more than a third of the 5,800,000 tons of fats and oils normally handled in international commerce. Unilever was accordingly charged with having a powerful depressing influence on world prices.

There was one fellow over there who objected to the monopoly. His name was Zik. He is a well-educated man, with a gift for noble phraseology. So that everyone who reads the RECORD may know what happened to him when he fought this gang, I ask unanimous consent to have that part of the article, commencing on page 142, with the paragraph starting with the words "the situation presents," through to the end of the article on page 144, inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the portion of the article referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The situation presents obvious and enormous opportunities for a demagog, and one has appropriately arisen. The most publicized native in West Africa is one Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe, better known as Dr. Zik, a well-educated man with a gift for noble phraseology. He prints several Nigerian papers, and his program is independence for Nigeria, justice for the Africans, "the right to work if a man has to," freedom from UAC, the destruction of AWAM, and so on. Frequently he is unintentionally funny. One of his papers recently created a particularly anguished furor with the news that a UAC manager employed a dog, as night watchman at a higher wage than he paid some of his help. Dr. Zik's editors missed the point. This manager, who has since been fired, used the dog to patrol his place and hit upon the whimsical and touching idea of entering the dog's name on his pay roll along with several fictitious names.

Of Dr. Zik and his papers and activities it is fair to observe they are one of the best arguments extant for making Nigeria a crown colony, but his line nevertheless is sometimes just and generally plausible—and packs a big appeal. Dr. Zik cannot be pooh-poohed, as

he is, on the ground that only a small literate minority knows him. UAC and the other Europeans almost certainly underestimate him, just as they tend to underestimate the forces that have generated him.

UAC has done something to improve its relations with the natives. It has appointed a personnel manager, and has sent several of its African managers on extended trips through the United Kingdom. It has set up pensions and sick-leave benefits. For economy as well as good will it makes a policy of upgrading native personnel to managerial jobs as soon as they can handle them. In Togoland, all its staff is African. Although Africans are generally paid considerably less for the same work, most students of West African economics agree that equal pay for equal work would be a mistake. It costs the European much more than the native to live in the Tropics, and a European scale for the African, besides being too far out of line with the lowest native wages, would tend to keep him out of government and business jobs that he should be trained to hold. But even when the native sees the point of this concept, which he rarely does, he naturally believes that UAC abuses it. During the war, UAC upgraded many Africans, and in the inevitable housecleaning after the war some lost out. The instinctive native reaction that the company was reviving color discrimination was taken up by the Zik press.

What UAC has on its hands, in other words, is a full-blown public-relations race problem about which it ought to do more than it has done. It could, for example, give thoroughgoing courses in race relations to young trainees and future managers, who now go down to Africa with only their own wisdom and imperfect knowledge to guide them. London seems to have decided it has a responsibility to the native, and Lord Trenchard has stated that it is UAC policy to cooperate more and more with colonial governments, but the company surely has not been able to sell itself or its good intentions to the natives. It might well study the methods of old Lord Leverhulme, who was as hardboiled as they come but knew what he was up against. "A native," he wrote in 1924, "cannot organize. He cannot run even a wooding post on the river satisfactorily." Nevertheless he felt that it was important to generate their good will, and suggesed the publication of a magazine for African distribution with a cover showing a white hand clasping a black one and helping the native up a hill. The diagram might make a few sophisticated Africans guffaw, but the motive behind the idea is today more relevant than ever.

The VICE PRESIDENT. At this point, if the Senator from North Dakota will permit, the Chair lays before the Senate a telegram from Richard L. Duncan, of the Falls Cities Cooperative Milk Producers' Association, Louisville, Ky., relating to the repeal of oleomargarine taxes. Without objection, the telegram will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the table. The Chair hears no objection.

The telegram was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOUISVILLE, KY., *January 9, 1950.*

Mrs. FLO BRATTON,
Office, Vice President, Senate Office Building:

Will you please convey to Mr. BARKLEY the following message?

The real issue in the oleo controversy is the color, yellow. Our amendment takes tax off all oleo and it is not our desire to prohibit sale of oleo; every day that our 65,000,000 meals served in public eating places you and I and other millions cannot tell difference between butter and high-grade oleo product colored yellow. The three alternates in oleo bill for identification purposes will not be effective and cannot be enforced. Our bill leaves color issue up to individual States. Since dairy farmers' amendment takes tax off oleo and complies with Democratic platform relative to oleo legislation, we sincerely request that you ask administration and leaders to reverse pressure and line up with two and one-half million dairy farmers. The present administration objective merely aids 30 oleo manufacturers who have stirred up consumers on tax issue with $6,000,000 worth of propaganda. Please help us to get a square deal. Thanks.

RICHARD L. DUNCAN,
Falls Cities Cooperative Milk Producers Association.

Mr. LANGER. We now come to volume 3 of Fortune, with its article concerning this great monopoly. It is the issue of February 1948. As I said, the first one was the issue of December 1947, the next, January 1948. I want to quote what one of their directors said. Perhaps some of those who have been voting to give billions of dollars away will not be quite so anxious to continue doing so when they understand the attitude of certain people. The article gives the names. It shows that this outfit has directors. This great trust operates in the United States, the general manager of which is in charge of the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners for the Democratic Party—the one man they chose out of 150,000,000 other persons in the United States.

Let me tell the Senate where this outfit operates and where it has its factories.

It has factories in Belgium, Denmark, France, Finland, Germany, Netherlands, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Belgian Congo, Burma, China, India, Ceylon, Siam, Newfoundland, Canada, British East Africa, and Egypt.

When the Democrats looked around for a good general manager, one who had a wide acquaintance, they certainly chose a good man, because his companies operate in all these countries, and he can sell tickets at $100 apiece to Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners.

I continue: Palestine, North and South Rhodesia, Union of South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippine Republic, Malaya, Netherlands East Indies, and the Solomon Islands.

It may be that the Democrats should give a prize to those who sell the most tickets to the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners.

This monopoly also has factories in Uruguay, Argentina, Chile, Brazil, and the Canary Islands.

I do not know whether there will be any canaries singing at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. To what kind of plants is the Senator referring?

Mr. LANGER. I am referring to the plants of this one giant monopoly, the chairman of which is the general manager of the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners for the Democratic Party.

Mr. THYE. In what are they engaged?

Mr. LANGER. They are engaged in manufacturing margarine.

Mr. THYE. And selling it?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. THYE. If they should be permitted to color oleomargarine without paying a Federal tax, the ability of this great organization to make sales would make it possible to flood this country with oleomargarine to such an extent that butter would no longer be found on the market.

Mr. LANGER. That is exactly the point. They are hiring native labor at 20 cents a day.

Mr. THYE. With such sales ability they could sell oleomargarine to persons who did not even want to use it. Will the Senator give us the name of the corporation, in order that we shall not lose sight of the Senator's argument?

Mr. LANGER. It is known as Lever Bros. in the United States, and outside the United States it is known as Unilever, Ltd.

Mr. THYE. What is the name of the general manager?

Mr. LANGER. Charles Luckman. I want the Senator to see his picture.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Does the Senator think that the butter and milk producers of North Dakota would have any chance to sell their product against such ability as that which the Senator has indicated?

Mr. LANGER. I can quote a letter from the dairy commissioner of North Dakota, William J. Murphy, saying that that kind of competition would be absolutely ruinous to the dairy farmers.

Mr. THYE. The very backbone and strength of the producers in the Senator's State, as well as the Minnesota producers, are the dairy farmer and the livestock man, because they can weather a drought and can carry livestock through even an extremely dry season, which would kill the wheat and barley crops. But if this international organization, with its ability to sell, and its ability to capture man's imagination by pictures and artistic drawings, could take the market, the farmer, who is dependent on his small cream check, would be put out of business. That is what the Senator is trying to show us, is it not?

Mr. LANGER. I may say to the distinguished Senator that when the drought was very severe in the Northwestern States, butterfat dropped to 16 cents, but the farmers were able to exist because even at 16 cents they could manage to make a small amount of profit. I assure the Senator, however, that if this outfit comes into the United States, spending $50,000,000 for advertising, how, in heaven's name, can the farmers of the Northwest compete?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not a fact that this outfit is already in the United States—the John Jelke Co.?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not a fact that the president of that company said that

the oleomargarine plants under the control of this company would be the biggest oleomargarine plants in the world?

Mr. LANGER. That is their boast.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is a company which now produces 75 percent of all the oleomargarine for Europe, outside the Soviet Union, and we are asked to place our dairy farmers and independent operators against that sort of an industrial giant.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct. The people took the Democratic Party at its word, and the dairy farmers helped to elect that party, acting upon the word of the President of the United States in his Philadelphia speech.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator recall that yesterday, when I was delivering my remarks, I made some mention of the fact that the farmers of this country had some idea of what was in the platform, speaking of the Democratic Party platform?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I also went on to say that the farmers had something to do with the result of the election, and I pointed out that no monopoly was going to be able to do for the people of the country what the farmers were able to do for them.

I further pointed out that this was not an issue as to whether oleo was to the best interests of the consumer, but an issue between the independent operator and a giant international cartel which has been masquerading around this country until I think it has even fooled the Democratic Party. I do not suppose there is one Democrat out of a million who realizes the connections and ramifications of this international cartel. Many Democrats will be embarrassed after the pronouncements which have been made here by the Senator from North Dakota. I think the best way for them to save their face is to vote for the Gillette-Wiley substitute and to vote down House bill 2023 and investigate this oleo monopoly and cartel. I think that would save the day, and we could then go home with clean consciences.

Mr. LANGER. I agree with the Senator, but I think we should also investigate how, in heaven's name, the Democratic Party, at a time when the Attorney General of the United States was bringing a case aginst this monopoly, could name the general manager of that outfit as general manager of the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners all over the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think we as Democrats must say we are deeply indebted to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota on an occasion when it is very difficult to find out his politics. He is a good nonpartisan leader——

Mr. LANGER. I am a good nonpartisan all the time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is wonderful. It requires that sort of a clean-cut mind frankly to state the case. We did not receive any information from the policy committee of the Republican Party as to what was happening to us. So we want to thank the North Dakota nonpartisan leader for the great insight he has given to us and for the help he has given to some of us who are just as much against monopoly as he is. I may say to him that both the Democrats and the Republicans are somewhat guilty of lip service in the fight against monopoly.

Much talk has been heard throughout the country about monopoly and about our dislike of it, but neither party has had the courage to do much about it. I think one of the reasons for that is that the Republicans are involved in it so deeply they do not dare talk, and the Democrats have been dirtied up with it a little bit so that they do not dare talk. So, not being a monopolist myself, coming from a Democrat-farmer-labor State, at least from a progressive State, where even the Republicans are progressive, I should like to join with the Senator from North Dakota.

Perhaps it would be a good idea for us to join up and call both parties to task and say, let us come clean on the question of trusts, monopolies, and cartels, let us enforce the law, give the antitrust division the money it needs, and not do as we did a few years ago, take away some of the money. Let us give them some of the attorneys they need, too.

Mr. LANGER. One way by which the Senator can do that is to buy a membership in the Non-Partisan League of North Dakota for $16 a year. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should be delighted to buy such a membership if I only lived in the great State of North Dakota, but since we are being so gracious to each other, possibly we could exchange honorary memberships. I could give the Senator one of ours in the Democrat-Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota, which, by the way, is only a dollar [laughter], and I should be glad to accept the $16 one from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. We will negotiate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Inasmuch as we are talking practical politics, if the Senator feels that what is done will have a great influence on the farmers, it seems to me he might insist that the Democrats are making a great mistake in repealing this law, and then perhaps the Republicans might have a chance to win an election sometime.

Mr. LANGER. The regular Republican Party is not interested in WILLIAM LANGER. I am in a branch of it by myself, the farmer-labor branch of the Republican Party, and I am protecting its interest here today.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I desire to compliment the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, first, because he has brought to the attention of the country a very significant fact, namely, the choice of Mr. Luckman by the Democrats—I must say that when I have listened to my good friend from Minnesota, this corporation would appear to be lily pure, as he made it out.

The Senator is entitled to credit for having brought to the attention of the country that much of the lip service on the Democratic side of the Senate against what are called trusts, corporate interests, is nothing but lip service.

They have put in charge of the Jackson Day dinner one of the great outstanding economic royalists of the country. What is more, they precipitate, at the same time, into the forum of America the very significant fact, which is entitled to a great deal of consideration, that those who are pushing this fight to take color from butter and give it to oleo are likely to succeed unless we have more men of courage and understanding like the Senator from North Dakota.

I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. Does the Senator remember that it was Lever Bros. who went into court to sustain their right to the color of a certain soap?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; I remember that, and I shall read that into the RECORD later.

Mr. WILEY. That is significant, Mr. President, when we consider not only the 2,500,000 farmers whose economic life is involved, but all the others in the chain of economic living who are connected with the farmers and whose subsistence is dependent upon whether or not the oleo monopoly shall take more of the spread market than they already have. Stop and think of it. The spread market in this country consists of about 2,300,000,000 pounds. Already this year, the evidence shows, oleo interests have captured 40 percent of that spread market, or more than 900,000,000 pounds.

Another significant thing is that less than 10 percent of that spread is in the yellow color. Why do they want to use the yellow color? They want to use it merely just to perpetuate their monopolistic activities.

I should like to say to the Senator that the American people owe him a tremendous debt, because he has demonstrated for the first time on the floor of the Senate the fact that the Democratic Party, which has posed all the time as the party of the people, the party of the common man, as serving the interests of the common man, is now really serving the interests of one of the greatest monopolies, not only in the United States, but in the world.

The distinguished Senator from North Dakota has said something about monopoly in this country. Does he know that this same organization is spending $25,000,000 putting up plants in California? The purpose of that, of course, is to take over the west-coast spread, as we call it. In California the same monopoly has been selling oleomargarine for as low as 20 cents and as high as 60 cents. What is more, in order to capture that spread, they have indulged in the practice of giving to anyone who buys 1 pound of yellow oleomargarine a certificate entitling him to a free pound.

Again I say, let us consider the terrific impact upon the economic life of the country if the business of some 3,000,000 farmers and those who are connected with them is paralyzed. That is something we cannot reckon. It may

start a tailspin that cannot be stopped. Personally, I think it would be something really catastrophic.

We have heard on the floor of the Senate debate on danger in the foreign field—in China, in Formosa—and debate about Tito. I think the idea that the green pastures are always farther afield is a wrong philosphy. I think we had better look to our own pastures and see whether or not something should be done here.

I trust that I have given the Senator a sufficient respite so that he can carry on. I thank him for the privilege of interjecting these remarks at this time into his very illuminating address. I say again, I congratulate the Senator. He has brought to the attention of the American people the fact that the Democrats have put at the head of their organization one of the greatest economic royalists in America, and that they now expect they will be able to fool the Senate of the United States into giving back to him a monopoly of the oleomargarine business in America.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator, and I wish to make it plain that not only is Mr. Luckman's company one of the greatest monopolies, but it is the greatest. This organization is bigger than United States Steel, and bigger than General Motors, far, far bigger. Actually, what the Democrats have done is a shameful, disgraceful thing. It is an insult to every real, true, honest Democrat in this country.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not understand the question which the Senator from Wisconsin asked. What was the question he asked?

Mr. LANGER. Whether or not the appointment of this man Luckman was a shame and a disgrace to the Democratic Party, and I said it was. That was the question.

Mr. WILEY. Silence lends consent.

Mr. LANGER. I had not finished giving the names of the countries where this monopoly operates. The list continues:

46. Iraq.
47. Iran.
48. Morocco.
49. Canary Islands.
50. Gambia.
51. Portuguese Guinea.
52. French Guinea.
53. Sierra Leone.
54. Liberia.
55. Ivory Coast.
56. Gold Coast.
57. French Togo.
58. Dahomey.
59. Nigeria.
60. French Equatorial Africa.
61. French Cameroons.
62. Spanish Guinea.
63. Gabon.
64. Belgian Congo.
65. Uganda.
66. Tanganyika.
67. Seychelles.
68. Union of South Africa.

So this outfit is now operating in 68 different countries.

On page 167 is given a list of what this great monopoly sold in 1946. It totals $1,364,147,000. I think the people of the United States are entitled to know what this company is and where it operated, and what it sold and traded in and dealt in. It dealt in household and laundry soaps, in soap powders, in flake soaps, in toilet soaps, in medicated soaps, in scourers, in soapless detergents, and in water softeners.

When it comes to oleomargarine, it has offices in Solo, Belgium; Astra, France and in numerous other countries. The combine sold $216,621,000 worth of oleomargarine, edible oils, and fats in the countries in which it operated. The combine sold canned vegetables, tea, and soups, baby foods, dried fruits, meat and fish pastes.

The combine also sold animal feeding stuffs.

It also sold chemicals, glycerin, bone products, candles, coal, fertilizers, ice, tallow, greases, residues from oil refining, starch derivatives, and received revenue from activities such as printing and packing.

The combine further sold toilet preparations of every conceivable kind, including dental preparations, perfumes, lotions, toilet waters, talcs, shaving cream and sticks, face powders, face creams, shampoos, and hair dressings, and ointments.

Further the combine sold $382,262,000 worth of vegetables and animal oils and fats.

It also sold merchandise in the amount of $143,850,000.

Its produce sales amounted to $114,275,000.

Then it rendered services amounting to $16,269,000 on its steamship line, boats on the Niger and the Congo, and road transport in the United Kingdom.

Mr. President, I shall read a letter from the dairy commissioner of North Dakota, in answer to the question asked by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin respecting this monopoly having brought a lawsuit, to which the dairy commissioner refers in his letter, to prevent the imitation of any one of the products the combine deals in. The letter is dated January 6, 1950, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR: I am again asking for your help in behalf of the dairy farmers of North Dakota. The oleomargarine bill is before the Senate for debate, but I would first like to express the appreciation of the dairy farmers of North Dakota for the assistance you have given us during previous sessions of Congress on this controversial issue.

Mr. President, let me digress to say that when the oleomargarine bill was previously before the Senate I offered an amendment to it which dealt with the subject of civil rights. That was about a year ago. I may say that the pending measure, if passed, will ruin thousands of farmers in the State of North Dakota. They have asked me to present at this time the same amendments to the oleomargarine bill that I presented a year ago. The first amendment I have prepared deals with the poll tax. The amendment is short. I wish to read the important part of it, and I shall offer it as an amendment to the pending measure. I read as follows:

The requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, is not and shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for said officers within the meaning of the Constitution, but is and shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding primaries and other elections for said national officers and attacks upon the right or privilege of voting for said national officers.

I shall not read the other sections. I offer the amendment as an amendment to the pending bill itself, and not to the Wiley-Gillette substitute.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, does the Senator have any objection to the amendment in full being read at the desk?

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection whatever to the amendment being read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). The clerk will read the amendment as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. LANGER to the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 4, line 19, after the word "of", insert "the foregoing provisions of."

On page 5, line 3, strike out the word "This", and insert in lieu thereof "The foregoing provisions of this."

On page 5, after line 6, add the following new sections:

"SEC. . The requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, is not and shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for said officers, within the meaning of the Constitution, but is and shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding primaries and other elections for said national officers and a tax upon the right or privilege of voting for said national officers.

"SEC. . It shall be unlawful for any State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision to prevent any person from voting or registering to vote in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, on the ground that such person has not paid a poll tax, and any such requirement shall be invalid and void insofar as it purports to disqualify any person otherwise qualified to vote in such primary or other election. No State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision shall levy a poll tax or any other tax on the right or privilege of voting in such primary or other election, and any such tax shall be invalid and void insofar as it purports to disqualify any person otherwise qualified from voting at such primary or other election.

"SEC. . It shall be unlawful for any State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision to interfere with the manner of selecting persons for national office by requiring the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, and any such requirement shall be invalid and void.

"SEC. . It shall be unlawful for any person, whether or not acting under the cover

of authority of the laws of any State or subdivision thereof, to require the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask that that amendment be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I now send to the desk and ask to have read, an amendment which is an exact copy of the so-called Ferguson antilynching bill. I offer it as an amendment to the pending bill, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table, and that it be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received and printed, and, without objection, the clerk will read it.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. LANGER to the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 4, line 19, after the word "of", insert "the foregoing provisions of."

On page 5, line 3, strike out the word "This" and insert in lieu thereof the following "The foregoing provisions of this."

On page 5, after line 6, add the following new sections:

"PURPOSE

"SEC. 7. To guarantee, insofar as it lies within the constitutional power of the Congress so to do within the subject matter of sections 7–18 hereof, (a) that each and every citizen of the United States be secured in the equal protection of the laws of the United States, and of the several States, and (b) that no citizen of the United States be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, the Congress, in the exercise of all powers which it possesses, does hereby legislate with respect to the crime of lynching as hereinafter defined.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 8. Any assemblage of two or more persons which shall, without authority of law, exercise or attempt to exercise, by acts of physical force against person or property, any power of correction or punishment over any person, who is (1) in the custody of any peace officer, or (2) charged with or convicted of the commission of any criminal offense, or (3) suspected by such assemblage of the commission of any criminal offense, with the purpose or consequence of preventing the apprehension or trial or punishment by law of such person, or of imposing a punishment, shall constitute a lynch mob within the meaning of sections 7–18 of this act. Any such exercise of power or attempt to exercise power by a lynch mob shall constitute lynching within the meaning of sections 7–18 of this act.

"CONSPIRACY BETWEEN MEMBERS OF LYNCH MOB AND FEDERAL OR STATE OFFICERS

"SEC. 9. Whenever a lynching occurs, any member of the lynch mob who conspires with any officer or employee of the United States or of a State or governmental subdivision thereof who is charged with the duty or possesses the authority as such officer or employee to prevent the lynching or to protect the person lynched, and any such officer or employee who conspires with any member of the lynch mob, to commit, instigate, incite, organize, aid, or abet the lynching shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $10,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 20 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"PUNISHMENT UPON STATE OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES FOR WILLFUL FAILURE TO PREVENT LYNCHING

"SEC. 10. Whenever a lynching shall occur, any officer or employee of a State or any governmental subdivision thereof, who shall have been charged with the duty or shall have possessed the authority as such officer or employee to prevent the lynching, but shall have willfully failed or refused to make all reasonable efforts to do so, and any officer or employee of a State or governmental subdivision thereof who, under authority or duty granted or imposed by law of such State, shall have had custody of the person lynched and shall have willfully failed or refused to make all reasonable efforts to protect such person from lynching, shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"PUNISHMENT UPON FEDERAL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES FOR WILLFUL FAILURE TO PREVENT LYNCHING

"SEC. 11. Whenever a lynching shall occur, any officer or employee of the United States, (1) who shall have been charged with the duty or shall have possessed the authority as such officer or employee to prevent the lynching, but shall have willfully failed or refused to make all reasonable efforts to do so; or (2) who, under authority or duty granted or imposed by the law of the United States, shall have had custody of the person lynched and shall have willfully failed or refused to make all reasonable efforts to protect such person from lynching; or (3) who, in violation of his duty as such officer or employee, shall willfully fail or refuse to make all reasonable efforts to apprehend, keep in custody, or prosecute any person who violates section 9, section 10, or this section, shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"DUTY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

"SEC. 12. Whenever a lynching of any person shall occur, and information on oath is submitted to the Attorney General of the United States that any officer or employee of the United States or of a State or any governmental subdivision thereof who shall have been charged with the duty or shall have possessed the authority as such officer or employee to protect such person from lynching, or who, under authority or duty granted or imposed by the law of the United States or of such State, respectively, shall have had custody of the person lynched, has willfully failed or refused to make all reasonable efforts to protect such person from lynching or that any officer or employee of the United States, in violation of his duty as such officer or employee, has willfully failed or refused to make all reasonable efforts to apprehend, keep in custody, or prosecute any person who has violated section 9, section 10, or section 11 of this act, the Attorney General of the United States shall cause an investigation to be made to determine whether there has been any violation of sections 7–18 of this act. The duty imposed by this section shall be in addition to all other duties of the Attorney General.

"CIVIL ACTIONS BY INDIVIDUALS LYNCHED

"SEC. 13. (a) Any individual who is lynched, as defined in section 8 of this act, and who suffers injury to his person or damage to his property as a result of the lynching, or the next of kin of any such individual if such injury results in death, shall be entitled to maintain a civil action for damages for such injury, damage, or death against any person violating section 9, section 10, or section 11 of this act with respect to such lynching: *Provided*, That the satisfaction of judgment against one person who may be liable shall bar further proceedings under this section, by the individual who has obtained satisfaction of his judgment, against any other person who may also be liable.

"(b) Actions provided by this section shall be brought in the United States district court for the judicial district of which the defendant is a resident. Any such action may be brought and prosecuted by the Attorney General of the United States or his authorized representative in the name of the United States for the use of the real party in interest, or, if the claimant shall so elect, by counsel employed by the claimant, but in any event without prepayment of costs. If the amount of any such judgment shall not be paid upon demand, payment thereof may be enforced by any process, and to the extent, available under the State law for the enforcement of any other money judgment against the defendant. The cause of action accruing hereunder to a person injured by lynching shall not abate with the subsequent death of that person before final judgment but shall survive to his next of kin. For the purpose of this section the next of kin of a deceased victim of lynching shall be determined according to the laws of intestate distribution of the State of domicile of the decedent. Any judgment under this section shall be exempt from all claims of creditors.

"PLACE OF HOLDING TRIALS

"SEC. 14. (a) Any judge of the United States district court for the judicial district wherein any civil action is instituted under the provisions of section 13 of this act may by order direct that such action be tried in any place in such district as he may designate in such order.

"(b) Any judge of the United States district court for the judicial district wherein any criminal action is instituted under the provisions of section 9, section 10, or section 11 of this act may by order direct that such action be tried in any place in such district as he may designate in such order: *Provided*, That where possible no such criminal action shall be tried within the territorial limits of any city or county within which the lynching, which is a basis for such action, occurred.

"APPLICATION OF KIDNAPING LAW TO LYNCHING

"SEC. 15. The crime defined in and punishable under the act of June 22, 1932 (47 Stat. 326), as amended, shall include the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of a person who is unlawfully abducted with intent to lynch or to aid in lynching such person and who is subsequently lynched or held for purposes of lynching.

"APPLICABILITY TO OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS AND OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

"SEC. 16. The term 'officer or employee of the United States' as used in this act includes an officer or employee of any Territory or possession of the United States, or of the District of Columbia.

"SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

"SEC. 17. If any particular provision, sentence, or clause of sections 7–18 of this act, or the application thereof to any particular person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of said sections, and the application of such provision, sentence, or clause to other persons or other circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 18. Sections 7–18 of this act may be cited as the 'Federal Antilynching Act'."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask that the amendments be printed and lie

on the table as amendments to House bill 2023, not as amendments to the Gillette-Wiley amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I now send to the desk, and ask to have printed and lie on the table, an amendment known as the FEPC amendment. I offer it as an amendment to House bill 2023, not as an amendment to the Wiley-Gillette amendment in the nature of a substitute.

I ask that the amendment be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. LANGER to the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 4, line 19, after the word "of" insert "the foregoing provisions of."

On page 5, line 3, strike out the word "This" and insert in lieu thereof "The foregoing provisions of this."

On page 5, after line 6, add the following new sections:

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 7. Sections 7 to 21, inclusive, of this act may be cited as the "National Act Against Discrimination in Employment."

"FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 8. (a) The Congress hereby finds that the practice of discriminating in employment against properly qualified persons because of their race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry is contrary to the American principles of liberty and of equality of opportunity, is incompatible with the Constitution, forces large segments of our population into substandard conditions of living, foments industrial strife and domestic unrest, deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production, endangers the national security and the general welfare, and adversely affects the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States.

"(b) The right to employment without discrimination because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry is hereby recognized as and declared to be a civil right of all the people of the United States.

"(c) This act has also been enacted as a step toward fulfillment of the international treaty obligations imposed by the Charter of the United Nations upon the United States as a signatory thereof to promote 'universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.'

"(d) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to protect the right recognized and declared in subdivision (b) hereof and to eliminate all such discrimination to the fullest extent permitted by the Constitution. This act shall be construed to effectuate such policy.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 9. As used in sections 7 to 21, inclusive, of this act—

"(a) The term 'person' includes one or more individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, receivers, or any organized group of persons and any agency or instrumentality of the United States or of any Territory or possession thereof.

"(b) The term 'employer' means a person engaged in commerce or in operations affecting commerce having in his employ 50 or more individuals; any agency or instrumentality of the United States or of any Territory or possession thereof; and any person acting in the interest of an employer, directly or indirectly.

"(c) The term 'labor organization' means any organization, having 50 or more members employed by any employer or employers, which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of collective bargaining or of dealing with employers concerning grievances, terms, or conditions of employment, or for other mutual aid or protection in connection with employment.

"(d) The term 'commerce' means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States; or between any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia and any place outside thereof; or within the District of Columbia or any Territory; or between points in the same State but through any point outside thereof.

"(e) The term 'affecting commerce' means in commerce, or burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce.

"(f) The term 'Commission' means the National Commission Against Discrimination in Employment, created by section 12 hereof.

"(g) The term 'act' as used in sections 7 to 21, inclusive, means the National Act Against Discrimination in Employment.

"EXEMPTIONS

"SEC. 10. This act shall not apply to any State or municipality or political subdivision thereof, or to any religious, charitable, fraternal, social, educational, or sectarian corporation or association, not organized for private profit, other than labor organizations.

"UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES DEFINED

"SEC. 11. (a) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer—

"(1) to refuse to hire, to discharge, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry;

"(2) to utilize in the hiring or recruitment of individuals for employment any employment agency, placement service, training school or center, labor organization, or any other source which discriminates against such individuals because of their race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry.

"(b) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any labor organization to discriminate against any individual or to limit, segregate, or classify its membership in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive such individual of employment opportunities, or would limit his employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his status as an employee or as an applicant for employment, or would affect adversely his wages, hours, or employment conditions, because of such individual's race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry.

"(c) It shall be unlawful employment practice for any employer or labor organization to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person, because he has opposed any unlawful employment practice or has filed a charge, testified, participated, or assisted in any proceedings under this act.

"THE NATIONAL COMMISSION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

"SEC. 12. (a) There is hereby created a commission to be known as the National Commission Against Discrimination in Employment, which shall be composed of seven members who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. One of the original members shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, one for a term of 2 years, one for a term of 3 years, one for a term of 4 years, one for a term of 5 years, one for a term of 6 years, and one for a term of 7 years, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of seven years each, except that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The President shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Commission. Any member of the Commission my be removed by the President upon notice and hearing for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

"(b) A vacancy in the Commission shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Commission and three members thereof shall constitute a quorum.

"(c) The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

"(d) The Commission shall at the close of each fiscal year report to the Congress and to the President concerning the cases it has heard; the decisions it has rendered; the names, salaries, and duties of all individuals in its employ and the moneys it has disbursed; and shall make such further reports on the cause of and means of eliminating discrimination and such recommendations for further legislation as may appear desirable.

"(e) Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary of $10,000 a year.

"(f) The principal office of the Commission shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet or exercise any or all of its powers at any other place and may establish such regional offices as it deems necessary. The Commission may, by one or more of its members or by such agents as it may designate, conduct any investigation, proceeding, or hearing necessary to its functions in any part of the United States. Any such agent designated to conduct a proceeding or a hearing shall be a resident of the Federal judicial circuit, as defined in sections 116 and 308 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C. Annotated, title 28, secs. 211 and 450), within which the alleged unlawful employment practice occurred.

"(g) The Commission shall have power—

"(1) to appoint such agents and employees as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions;

"(2) to cooperate with regional, State, local, and other agencies;

"(3) to pay to witnesses whose depositions are taken or who are summoned before the Commission or any of its agents the same witness and mileage fees as are paid to witnesses in the courts of the United States;

"(4) to furnish to persons subject to this act such technical assistance as they may request to further their compliance with this act or any order issued thereunder;

"(5) upon the request of any employer, whose employees or some of them refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate in effectuating the provisions of this act, to assist in such effectuation by conciliation or other remedial action;

"(6) to make such technical studies as are appropriate to effectuate the purposes and policies of this act and to make the results of such studies available to interested governmental and nongovernmental agencies: and

"(7) to create such local, State, or regional advisory and conciliation councils as in its judgment will aid in effectuating the purpose of this act, and the Commission may empower them to study the problem or specific instances of discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry and to foster through community effort or otherwise good will, cooperation, and conciliation among the groups and elements of the population, and make recommendations to the Commission for the development of policies and

procedures in general and in specific instances. Such advisory and conciliation councils shall be composed of representative citizens residents of the area for which they are appointed, serving without pay, but with reimbursement for actual and necessary traveling expenses; and the Commission may make provision for technical and clerical assistance to such councils and for the expenses of such assistance.

"PREVENTION OF UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

"SEC. 13. (a) Whenever a sworn written charge has been filed by or on behalf of any person claiming to be aggrieved, or a written charge has been filed by a member of the Commission, that any person subject to the act has engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall investigate such charge and if it shall determine after such preliminary investigation that probable cause exists for crediting such written charge, it shall endeavor to eliminate any unlawful employment practice by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion. Nothing said or done during such endeavors may be used as evidence in any subsequent proceeding.

"(b) If the Commission fails to effect the elimination of such unlawful employment practice and to obtain voluntary compliance with this act, or in advance thereof if circumstances so warrant, it shall cause a copy of such written charge to be served upon such person who has allegedly committed any unlawful employment practice, hereinafter called the respondent, together with a notice of hearing before the Commission, or a member thereof, or before a designated agent, at a place therein fixed, not less than 10 days after the service of such charge.

"(c) The member of the Commission who filed a charge shall not participate in a hearing thereon or in a trial thereof.

"(d) At the conclusion of a hearing before a member or designated agent of the Commission the entire record thereof shall be transferred to the Commission, which shall designate three of its qualified members to sit as the Commission and to hear on such record the parties at a time and place to be specified upon reasonable notice.

"(e) All testimony shall be taken under oath.

"(f) The respondent shall have the right to file a verified answer to such written charge and to appear at such hearing in person or otherwise, with or without counsel, to present evidence and to examine and cross-examine witnesses.

"(g) The Commission or the member or designated agent conducting such hearing shall have the power reasonably and fairly to amend any written charge, and the respondent shall have like power to amend its answer.

"(h) Any written charge filed pursuant to this section must be filed within 1 year after the commission of the alleged unlawful employment practice.

"(i) If upon the record, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find that any person named in the written charge has engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person an order requiring him to cease and desist from such unlawful employment practice and to take such affirmative action, including reinstatement or hiring of employees, with or without back pay, as will effectuate the policies of the act. If upon the record, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find that no person named in the written charge has engaged or is engaging in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue an order dismissing the said complaint.

"(j) Until a transcript of the record in a case shall have been filed in a court, as hereinafter provided, the Commission may at any time, upon reasonable notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify or set aside, in whole or in part, any finding or order made or issued by it.

"(k) The proceedings held pursuant to this section shall be conducted in conformity with the standards and limitations of sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act, Public Law 404, Seventy-ninth Congress, June 11, 1946.

"JUDICIAL REVIEW

"SEC. 14. (a) The Commission shall have power to petition any circuit court of appeals of the United States (including the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia) or, if the circuit court of appeals to which application might be made is in vacation, any district court of the United States (including the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia) within any circuit wherein the unlawful employment practice in question occurred, or wherein the respondent transacts business, for the enforcement of such order and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order, and shall certify and file in the court to which petition is made a transcript of the entire record in the proceedings, including the pleadings and testimony upon which such order was entered and the findings and the order of the Commission. Upon such filing, the court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the standards, procedures, and limitations established by section 10c and 10e of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"(b) Upon such filing, the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon such respondent and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein and shall have power to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper and to make and enter upon the pleadings, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission.

"(c) No objection that has not been urged before the Commission, its member, or agent shall be considered by the court, unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances.

"(d) If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Commission, its member, or agent, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Commission, its member, or agent and to be made a part of the transcript.

"(e) The Commission may modify its findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed, and it shall file such modified or new findings and its recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order.

"(f) The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the appropriate circuit court of appeals, if application was made to the district court as hereinafter provided, and by the Supreme Court of the United States upon writ of certiorari or certification as provided in sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 28, secs. 346 and 347).

"(g) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Commission may obtain a review of such order in any circuit court of appeals of the United States in the circuit wherein the unlawful employment practice in question was alleged to have been engaged in or wherein such person transacts business, by filing in such court a written petition praying that the order of the Commission be modified or set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the Commission and thereupon the aggrieved party shall file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding certified by the Commission, including the pleadings and testimony upon which the order complained of was entered and the findings and order of the Commission. Upon such filing, the court shall proceed in the same manner as in the case of an application by the Commission under subsection (a), and shall have the same exclusive jurisdiction to grant to the petitioner or the Commission such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and in like manner to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission.

"(h) Upon such filing by a person aggrieved the reviewing court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the standards, procedures, and limitations established by sections 10a and 10b of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"(i) The commencement of proceedings under subsection (a) or (g) of this section shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commission's order.

"INVESTIGATORY POWERS

"SEC. 15. (a) For the purpose of all investigations, proceedings, or hearings which the Commission deems necessary or proper for the exercise of the powers vested in it by this act, the Commission, or any member thereof, shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relating to any investigation, proceeding, or hearing before the Commission, its member, or agent conducting such investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

"(b) Any member of the Commission, or any agent designated by the Commission for such purposes, may administer oaths, examine witnesses, and receive evidence.

"(c) Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required, from any place in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing.

"(d) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person under this act, any district court of the United States, or the United States courts of any Territory or possession, or the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the investigation, proceeding, or hearing is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Commission shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring him to appear before the Commission, its member, or agent, there to produce evidence it so ordered, or there to give testimony relating to the investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

"(e) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing documentary or other evidence in obedience to the subpena of the Commission, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying. The immunity herein provided shall extend only to natural persons so compelled to testify.

"ENFORCEMENT OF ORDERS DIRECTED TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

"SEC. 16. The provisions of section 14 shall not apply with respect to an order of the Commission under section 13 directed to any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or of any Territory or possession thereof, or any officer or employee thereof. The Commission may request the President to take such action as he deems appropriate to obtain compliance with such orders. The President shall have power to provide for the establishment of rules and regulations to prevent the committing or continuing of any unlawful employment practice as herein defined by any person who makes a contract with any agency or instrumentality of the United States (excluding any State or political subdivision thereof) or of any Territory or possession of the United States, which contract requires the employment of at least 50 individuals. Such rules and regulations shall be enforced by the Commission according to the procedure hereinbefore provided.

"NOTICES TO BE POSTED

"SEC. 17. (a) Every employer and labor organization shall post and keep posted in conspicuous places upon its premises a notice to be prepared or approved by the Commission setting forth excerpts of the act and such other relevant information which the Commission deems appropriate to effectuate the purposes of the act.

"(b) A willful violation of this section shall be punishable by a fine of not less than $100 or more than $500 for each separate offense.

"VETERANS' PREFERENCE

"SEC. 18. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to repeal or modify any Federal or State law creating special rights or preferences for veterans.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 19. (a) The Commission shall have authority from time to time to issue, amend, or rescind suitable regulations to carry out the provisions of this act. If at any time after the issuance of any such regulation or any amendment or rescission thereof, there is passed a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress stating in substance that the Congress disapproves such regulation, amendment, or recission, such disapproved regulation, amendment, or rescission shall not be effective after the date of the passage of such concurrent resolution nor shall any regulation or amendment having the same effect as that concerning which the concurrent resolution was passed be issued thereafter by the Commission.

"(b) Regulations issued under this section shall be in conformity with the standards and limitations of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"FORCIBLY RESISTING THE COMMISSION OR ITS REPRESENTATIVES

"SEC. 20. Whoever shall forcibly resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with a member, agent, or employee of the Commission while engaged in the performance of duties under this act, or because of such performance, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or by both.

"SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

"SEC. 21. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of this act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to inquire how long the Senator will speak this afternoon. I make the request because I have a short speech to follow his, and I have an engagement at 4:30 this afternoon.

Mr. LANGER. I had intended to speak until 5 o'clock, but I shall be glad to yield to the Senator if I may have unanimous consent that his speech may appear at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can yield only for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Chair has ruled that the Senator can yield only for a question.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to continue with the letter which I received from the dairy commissioner of North Dakota. Because of the fact that I have introduced these bills, I shall reread the first paragraph:

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Bismarck, N. Dak., January 6, 1950.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
The Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am again asking for your help in behalf of the dairy farmers of North Dakota. The oleomargarine bill is before the Senate for debate, but I would first like to express the appreciation of the dairy farmers of North Dakota for the assistance you have given us during previous sessions of Congress on this controversial issue.

If the oleomargarine bill is passed as is recommended by the Senate committee with all restrictions removed as to licenses and taxes on the colored product without any safeguards set up to protect the consumers against the fraudulent sale of oleomargarine, colored and sold as butter, and to protect our entire national dairy industry; it will certainly mean a necessary curtailment in dairy farming.

North Dakota, as one of the major butter-producing States, is vitally interested in this issue; and when, in trying to promote the expansion of dairying in our State, we are met with the question by our dairy farmers as to what will happen to our butter industry if we are forced to meet competition with the unrestricted sale of oleomargarine colored to resemble butter.

As you probably know, all of the major dairy organizations in the Nation are in favor of a repeal of all licenses and taxes on margarines providing that safeguards are put into the bill making it illegal to color the product to resemble butter.

Mr. President, I call the next paragraph particularly to the attention of the Senator from Arkansas. I am sorry he is not on the floor at the moment. I call his attention to this paragraph in the letter from the dairy commissioner of my State:

One of the largest manufacturers of oleomargarine, Lever Bros., as a plaintiff in a court case against one of their competitors, won a decision, which in effect stated that no other soap company could make a bar of soap colored red to resemble their Lifebuoy soap.

In a recent court case brought by the Food and Drug Administration, against a soft-drink manufacturer, the court ruled that synthetic orange color and flavor could not be added to a soft drink, as such addition would, in effect, make the soft drink appear to be a more valuable product than it really was.

I remember very well that only a few years ago the Coca-Cola Co. brought an action against the company making Pepsi Cola, to prevent even what might be called a similarity in name, and got a decision saying that only the Coca-Cola Co. could use the word "coke," because of the fact that it had been used for a considerable period of time by them in advertising.

So here we find the Lever Bros. bringing an action against a competitor to keep them from coloring their soap red, because they have Lifebuoy soap, which they own, and which they distribute, and which is red in color. They get a decision from the court in order to keep a competitor from coloring his soap red.

I repeat, that was Lever Bros., an organization which apparently figures it is far above the law now, because in spite of the fact that an action was brought by the Attorney General under the Democratic administration, we find the Democratic National Committee, which is in charge of the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners, picking the president of Lever Bros., the greatest monopoly in the world, as general manager for the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners all over the United States of America. Of course, it may be that they are also going to have Jackson Day dinners in the 68 countries I named a little while ago, where the Lever Bros. and their subsidiaries are operating.

The letter from the dairy commissioner of North Dakota continues:

Through the years that we have had this controversial issue before Congress, we believe that it has been pretty well established that the only reason the oleomargarine people have for using the yellow coloring of butter, is to make it as nearly like butter as possible in order to fool the public.

In order to fool the public. That is what this bill is here for, in order to fool the public by permitting oleo to be colored yellow.

The letter continues:

Some oleo manufacturers are at the present time using dairy terms on their cartons, such as grade A or grade AA, which terms are used by the Federal Government in establishing grades on butter.

Speaking for the dairy farmer living in North Dakota, I would like to state that we would appreciate very much, anything you can do to prevent the wrecking of our North Dakota butter industry.

Thanking you again for your past efforts and assuring you that all of our farmers will appreciate anything you can do for them, I am,

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM J. MURPHY,
Dairy Commissioner.

So again, Mr. President, I come back to the fact that Lever Bros., headed by its president, Charles Luckman, are really in charge of the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners of the Democratic Party which are to take place in a very few days. Here is this man lending all his influence and giving all his time and all his ingenuity and devoting, I suppose, all the resources of Lever Bros. in the way of advertising—they spent $50,000,000 in advertising, according to Fortune magazine, as I read it—to this new activity. He is the head of this gigantic corporation, this octopus, this greatest monopoly of all, this monopoly which

has directorates not only in the United States, but in Belgium, in the Netherlands, in the Scandinavian countries, in Finland, in the Netherlands East Indies, in Italy, in Switzerland, in Austria, in Germany, in Czechoslovakia, in Poland, in Hungary, in Yugoslavia, in Rumania, in France, in Denmark, in Norway, in the Belgian Congo, in Siam, in China, in the Philippine Republic, in the Argentine, and in Brazil. In the United States, of course, Charles Luckman, the president, is the man chosen by the Democrats to make an outstanding success of these Jackson Day dinners, where I suppose, they are going to charge $100 a ticket. By that I mean that each ticket will cost $100. It will not cover a couple. There were 2,500 persons present at a dinner a few days ago in New York City, and I looked at it on the television. There were more millionaires at that New York dinner, Mr. President—and it was addressed by the Vice President of these great United States—there were more millionaires gathered there than I ever saw before at any dinner anywhere in the entire United States.

Yet, Mr. President, the Democrats tell us they represent the poor people, they represent the underprivileged people—so they say.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I want to congratulate the Senator for admitting that he watched the Democratic dinner on the television. I thought that he would disdain any such performance, would not even look at it, but now that he has confessed to watching that dinner from beginning to end, I want to compliment him. I think it is a compliment to the Democratic Party that my great and good liberal friend from North Dakota would do that.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to thank my distinguished friend for bringing this to my attention, and I assure him that I was getting an education. I do not belong to the regular Republican Party. I am a party within myself, known as the Farmer-Labor-Republican Party. The Farmer-Labor-Republican Party operates chiefly in the State of North Dakota, and I have been wondering how we could finance the Farmer-Labor-Republican Party in North Dakota.

As I watched and saw what was taking place in New York, I went home to North Dakota and there I arranged for similar Lincoln Day dinners. On the 9th day of February we are to have one in New Rockford, N. Dak., and charge $100 for a couple. We could not quite get $100 apiece, so we made it $100 a couple. From there we are going to Bismarck, N. Dak., and have another dinner. From Bismarck we are going to Dickinson, N. Dak. They are all advertised. From Dickinson we are going to Williston, N. Dak., and from Williston we are going to Minot, N. Dak., and from Minot we are going to Grand Forks, N. Dak. From Grand Forks, N. Dak., we go to Fargo, N. Dak., and finish on the evening of the 17th day of February. I sincerely hope that the distinguished majority leader, if he cares to attend a great, liberal gathering like that, will at least buy a ticket so that he may show his good will toward the Farmer-Labor-Republican Party of the State of North Dakota.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to congratulate the Senator again upon what he says he is going to do with respect to Lincoln Day dinners in North Dakota. In other words, the great liberal from North Dakota, having taken a lesson from what happened in New York City, is doing just the opposite of what the Republicans said not long ago they would do in Washington, have the participants take box lunches to their banquet. The Senator is going to charge $50 apiece.

Mr. LANGER. No, $100 a ticket.

Mr. LUCAS. A hundred dollars a ticket.

Mr. LANGER. Yes. We do not sell any halves.

Mr. LUCAS. I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. A hundred dollars for two.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, a hundred dollars for two.

Mr. LANGER. And a man may bring his wife or his sweetheart.

Mr. LUCAS. It costs a hundred dollars to get into any one of these banquets, does it?

Mr. LANGER. Yes. We learned that from the Democrats.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure you have.

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator from North Dakota has learned a good deal from the Democrats since he has been in the Senate, and I congratulate him on the number of votes he has cast with the Democratic Party since he has been in the Senate. He is learning fast, and it will not be long before he will be with the Democratic Party, the way he is going now, because if he follows the trail of those banquets he is surely going to be with them, and the chances are that Mr. Luckman will probably give the Senator a contribution for the Senator's next campaign before he gets through.

Mr. LANGER. I want to say to my distinguished friend that that may happen. I may be invited to join the other party. I gather, from what I have read in the newspapers, that some Republicans propose to drop certain of us who are progressives. The junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] in an interview stated that some members of his party wanted a new party to be formed, to be made up by an amalgamation of certain Republicans and of certain Democrats, but he said he did not want in the new party Republicans who do not vote with the Republicans all the time upon the floor of the Senate. I rather gained the impression that he referred to three or four Republican Senators who have not been consistently voting the Republican—I would not say orders—but who have not voted with the Republican majority on this side of the Chamber.

So far as I am concerned, I want to make it plain that the people of North Dakota do not care whether I am here as Democrat or Republican. It does not make one bit of difference to them. I may say that after I received the Republican nomination for United States Senator the first time, the Republican National Committee donated money to my opponent in the primary.

Mr. President, I owe the Republican Party in North Dakota absolutely nothing. Not only that, but the Republican nominee for President refused to travel on the same train with me. He had my opponent in the primary on the train with him and introduced him to the people of North Dakota.

Eight years ago Mr. Dewey was candidate for President, after I had become the Republican nominee for Senator. In the Republican primary 8 years ago the Republican Governor of North Dakota called all the Republican bankers and "hifalutin" fellows together and they nominated a man against me on the independent ticket, and ran him as an independent Republican. They very proudly announced that so far as they were concerned they would as lief have a Democrat come to Washington as the present Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. In a moment. I want to say that despite all they could do, I carried every single one of the 53 counties of North Dakota. So the people of North Dakota do not care very much about the label of any man.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I sympathize with the Senator, and I can well understand his feelings against the regular Republicans as the result of what they tried to do to him in North Dakota. I do not blame him for taking the position he does, and making the kind of speeches he does on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from Illinois, and I am sure he would feel pretty much as I do if he were in my place.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Now that my good friend the majority leader has had occasion to sort of get the distinguished Senator from North Dakota away from this Luckman tale, I ask him, is there any Republican angle to the Luckman tale, or is it 100 percent Democratic?

Mr. LANGER. So far as I am concerned it is 100 percent Democratic.

Mr. WILEY. We have all heard what the distinguished majority leader has just said. I thought it was a confession, and not avoidance when he said he hoped the distinguished Senator from North Dakota might also receive a contribution from Mr. Luckman.

Mr. LANGER. I do not know Mr. Luckman. I do not know whether he contributes to Republicans or Democrats or to whom he contributes. I said I did not know anything about that.

Mr. WILEY. Has the Senator any thought as to what will be done by Mr. Luckman now that he is the chairman of the Jackson-Jefferson Day dinners, and now that the Democrats are leading the fight to get rid of the oleo tax and want to open up the whole spread field even in those States where it is not permissible by State law for the oleo interests

to take over that field? Has the distinguished Senator any idea as to why Mr. Luckman is in the picture in this way?

Mr. LANGER. As I said in the beginning, Mr. Luckman's company is operating in many different countries. I do not know whether it is proposed to hold Jackson-Jefferson Day dinners in Belgium, the Netherlands, Scandinavia, Finland, the East Indies, India, Switzerland, and other countries. Mr. Luckman, as I said, has a wonderful organization, the finest in the world. I do not know anything about Mr. Luckman. I do not know the man. I do not want any of his contributions. I do not need them. I get along very nicely in North Dakota without them. Whether or not he contributes to the Democratic Party I do not know. I know he was appointed by the President to become the head of a department for a certain time, and he antagonized every farmer in my State when he said they could not eat chickens on certain days of the week. Mr. Luckman is the man who established chickenless days.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I, too, was against the order which was issued with regard to not eating chicken on certain days, I will say to my friend.

Mr. LANGER. I am delighted to know that the Senator was opposed to that order.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not want the RECORD to remain in the shape the Senator from Wisconsin has now made it. What I said a moment ago was that, in view of the fact that the Senator from North Dakota is a great liberal and in view of the fact that Mr. Luckman is a great liberal, Mr. Luckman might at some time make a contribution to the Senator's campaign. When someone wishes to make an honest contribution to the campaign of a person running for office—including the Senator from Wisconsin and other Senators—I have not known any candidate who would not accept such a contribution. Mr. Luckman is making a contribution to the Democratic Party by being chairman of the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners. He is making a tremendous contribution by permitting the use of his name and giving of his talents, and so forth, to make the dinners a success. I consider that to be a real contribution.

Mr. LANGER. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that I question the propriety of choosing as general manager of the Jackson-Jefferson Day dinners a man whose company is being sued at the present time in the Federal courts by the Attorney General on the ground that it is a monopoly.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate the Senator's reaction in that respect and the position he takes, and I shall not argue the question with him at this time. The Senator is entitled to his own views, and he usually has them, and expresses them on the floor very forcefully.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in my opinion, there has never been a more far-reaching bill before the Senate, so far as our domestic economy is concerned, than the oleo bill authored by my distinguished colleague from Arkansas. In fact, Mr. President, I think the bill represents one of the most diabolical schemes that has even been proposed to ruin an industry which is the largest segment of our American farm economy.

During the past few years we have witnessed the near destruction of the sheep industry. We have less sheep in the United States than we had 50 years ago. Imports of wool have been invited by the lowering of duties until we import two-thirds of the wool used in our country. While under the ECA, $600,000,000 worth of cotton has been given away, we have imported 600,000,000 pounds of wool. This does not make economic sense in any language. We subsidize exports of cotton or give it away at a time the sheep industry is being ruined. In fact, we have reduced the sheep numbers by a third the past 5 years. The sheep numbers in North Dakota were reduced by 50 percent between 1940 and 1949.

What has this administration done to the fur-farming industry? It has all but ruined this system of farming. This was done by sending a delegation to Russia asking the Russians to dump their furs on our markets. In fact, over $232,000,000 worth of furs were imported in 1 year and this was followed up by a 20-percent retail tax.

Now it appears that the next livestock industry to be ruined by this same administration is the dairy industry. Why do I make that statement? Just check up a little and see what is happening and has happened. Do Senators know we have two and one-half million less dairy cows than we had 15 years ago in the United States? Do Senators know that we have 3,000,000 less dairy cows and dairy heifers than we had 5 years ago? Before the war we had more dairy cows than beef cattle, but oleo has already replaced 3,000,000 dairy cows. Before the war 200,000,000 to 300,000,000 pounds of oleo were made in the United States. During the war the OPA froze butter at 46 cents per pound (or 30 cents per hour for labor) at a price below the cost of production. The OPA discouraged butter production. While in 1941 and 1942 we had an annual production of over 1,800,000,000 pounds of butter this annual production was reduced to 1,100,000,000 pounds by 1946. Since 1946 the annual butter production has been increasing in spite of the aid and comfort given the 25 oleo manufacturers.

While oleo annual production was 200,000,000 to 300,000,000 pounds prewar, its production was stimulated during and given special consideration and reached an annual production of over 800,000,000 pounds in 1948.

Mr. Charles Luckman, head of the Lever Brothers, the world's largest vegetable oil cartel was brought to Washington to save feed. Senators remember him. The Agricultural Department evidently could not handle the situation so they got the soap and oleo man Luckman to take over. Senators remember he had a program to prevent farmers from feeding their livestock. He must have kept the feed from the dairy cattle because butter production went down, but the joke in the situation is that oleo production went up. The Lever Bros. Co. bought the Jelke Oleo Co. incidentally, though, I suppose oleo and soap are made in much the same manner. There evidently is not much of a change from the soap business to the oleo business.

Is it not a fact that this English vegetable oil cartel is building the largest oleo plant in America in California? Will it not be a joke on our cotton oil friends if the vegetable oil cartel uses coconut oil in its oleo plants instead of cotton seed oil? If this English vegetable oil cartel monopoly can get the Fulbright bill passed what is to stop them from dropping cotton seed oil like other oleo manufacturers have dropped soybean oil from their formula, and use coconut oil, which is recognized as more nearly like butterfat than either soybean or cottonseed oil?

While we are speaking of this English cartel, I wish to say, Mr. President, that I have in my hand a clipping from a newspaper headed "Briton sees need for more United States aid." The article is dated New York, November 1—United Press—and reads as follows:

> A British financial expert said today Britain may need additional loans from the United States to replace special temporary aids now bolstering his country's economy. Sir Sydney Caine, Minister for Financial Affairs and head of the United Kingdom Treasury, hinted that a request for an increase of overseas lending will be made when funds from the Economic Cooperation Administration end in 1952.

Yet this is the same country that, as I stated a few minutes ago, has a monopoly in cocoa and is penalizing every child who buys a Hershey bar.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In view of the observation made about the necessity for increased loans to Great Britain under the ECA program, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator whether, first, he would consider that what we have done for Britain is a loan. Is it not a fact that what we have contributed to Britain through ECA is a grant?

Mr. LANGER. It is a gift.

Mr. WHERRY. Second, what machinery, if any, has been set up by Britain and the United States to carry the ECA countries away from grants, which have been extended to the tune of more than $15,000,000,000, back to a private-enterprise system, whereby they can stand on their own feet if and when ECA aid has been completed and concluded within the next year or, let us say, 2 years, at the most?

My point is this: We have been told that not only would the 4-year program increase the productivity and stabilize the countries which are receiving the ECA grants and aid, but that if the United States would continue that program for 4 years, those countries would be able to take care of themselves. When that time arrives, will there be continued requests for more aid, or will

those countries then be in such a situation that they will be able to proceed under their own steam, without any additional grants in any way, shape, or form; and will those 11 countries then be able to conduct their own business without any further aid from the United States?

Mr. LANGER. My answer simply is that I am not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and I have no particular knowledge of that matter, except as I obtain it from reading the newspapers. Some of the countries say they will be able to carry on. I understand that some of the countries which have been receiving aid from the United States are going to expect it to continue for at least 10 years.

I have just read some newspaper articles about statements given out by the Senator from Texas, saying that so far as he is concerned, as chairman of the committee, he proposes to cut down the amount of the aid, and not to give it unless there is some accounting and some indication that the people of the countries concerned are willing to work.

So far as I am concerned, I am willing to take the word of the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask one other question. The Senator from Nebraska has always been in favor, as has the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, of providing food for people who need it, and I am sure the distinguished Senator from North Dakota feels that way about that matter. Does the Senator now feel, however, that, beyond the requests for food and the other necessities of life, possibly it would be desirable, as a restriction or condition on further loans or grants to Great Britain and other ECA countries, to require that they eliminate their economic and trade barriers and establish convertibility of currencies, so that they can do business among themselves, and sometime can begin to realize that they can do so without further relief from the United States? Would the Senator from North Dakota feel that would be the correct position to take?

Mr. LANGER. Certainly. Not only that, but I feel that dismantling in Germany should be stopped. This morning I received a letter from John B. Crane, of 886 National Press Building, Washington, D. C., relative to the dismantling of the Hochfrequenz-Tiegelstahl Works, a small but highly important steel plant at Bochum. At this moment Britain is dismantling that plant and is putting hundreds and hundreds of Germans out of work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter and reports I have received from Mr. Crane be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and accompanying reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 5, 1950.*

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Knowing of your keen interest and previous constructive efforts in stopping the dismantling of German factories, I thought you would be interested in some of my recent observations on a short vacation trip to western Germany.

I found dismantling still going on, and one small but highly important steel plant at Bochum, known as the Hochfrequenz-Tiegelstahl works, is scheduled to be completely destroyed by January 31.

The facts in the enclosed reports tell the story in detail. It would appear that the British insistence on continuing the dismantling of this plant is based either on ignorance of the facts, or a deliberate desire to get rid of German competition. Most American experts believe the latter is the reason.

Prompt action could still save this plant. The facts presented here are for your information and to be used as you think appropriate. The State Department could probably secure a moratorium on further dismantling, if they so desired.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. CRANE.

DISMANTLING OF HOCHFREQUENZ-TIEGELSTAHL PLANT BASED ON ERRONEOUS DATA—SHOULD BE STOPPED IMMEDIATELY

A grave injustice will be done to the workers and management of the small steel plant at Bochum in the Ruhr, known as the Hochfrequenz-Tiegelstahl Werke, if further dismantling of the plant is continued. The plant is only 35 percent dismantled and can yet be saved if prompt action is taken.

None of the arguments advanced officially and unofficially by the British to justify their continued dismantling of the plant will stand up under close examination. Various American experts, including the Keenan mission, the Humphrey committee, and the staff of Commissioner John J. McCloy, have carefully studied the Hochfrequenz plant at Bochum and all have concluded the plant should not be dismantled. Then why do the British insist on further dismantling?

BRITISH ARGUMENTS TO DEFEND DISMANTLING BASED ON ERRONEOUS DATA

None of the four major arguments advanced by the British to justify destruction of the Hochfrequenz plant can be successfully defended if an investigation is held and an opportunity is permitted in open hearings to refute them. Here are the four arguments:

Argument 1: The Hochfrequenz plant, it is alleged, is already 80 percent dismantled, and it is too late to save it or remove it from the list of plants to be dismantled.

Answer: When this statement was made by the British early in December 1949 an American expert immediately visited the Ruhr and inspected the Hochfrequenz plant. He found it only 35 percent dismantled and the plant was still operating with over 600 workers. The only equipment dismantled had been war-damaged equipment, never used since the plant reopened after the war. At the present time, January 4, 1950, the plant is only about 50 percent dismantled. It can still be saved for effective production.

Argument 2: The plant is a war plant, and it is alleged that it was used during the war to produce turbine blades for jet airplanes. Security demands its destruction.

Answer: The plant is not a category I war plant since it was not built specifically for the manufacture of armament and war material. Before the war, during the war, and since the war it has produced castings and other parts essential to the German steel industry, the coal-mining industry, and the electric-power industry.

The German management categorically deny that they ever produced blades for jet aircraft, and assert this is absolutely false. They welcome a chance to disprove the British charges and will gladly open their books to any investigating committee.

Argument 3: If the Hochfrequenz plant is allowed to continue production it will bring total steel production in Germany above the 11,100,000 tons annually allowed by the Allies.

Answer: The annual steel-production capacity of the Hochfrequenz plant is only 6,000 tons. The parent plant at Krefeld has offered to reduce their steel-producing capacity by 20,000 tons annually, if the British will save the small plant at Bochum from further dismantling. If the British would accept this offer, the total steel capacity of the combined plants would be reduced by 14,000 tons, and the total steel capacity in Germany would be reduced.

The British have replied to the above German proposition for substitution that it is beyond their power to grant such a substitution and that the matter would have to be decided by the three high commissioners. The three high commissioners decided on December 19, 1949, that it was beyond their power and that it would have to be decided by the three foreign ministers in Washington, London, and Paris. An immediate moratorium on further dismantling is necessary to permit the foreign ministers to reexamine the situation of the Hochfrequenz-Tiegelstahl plant.

Argument 4: The Hochfrequenz-Tiegelstahl plant is on the east bank of the Rhine, and hence would be taken over by the Russians when world war III begins.

Answer: This argument scarcely deserves an answer. Many of the steel plants recently saved from dismantling are on the east bank of the Rhine. Present Allied policy calls for the economic reconstruction of all western Germany, not just the part west of the Rhine River.

Conclusion: Since the arguments in support of further dismantling of the Hochfrequenz plant are based on false data and inadequate evidence, an immediate stop to further dismantling of the plant should be granted, and a thorough investigation instituted.

WHY DISMANTLING OF THE HIGH-FREQUENCY STEEL PLANT AT BOCHUM, GERMANY, SHOULD BE STOPPED

The Hochfrequenz-Tiegelstahl works (a small steel plant in the Ruhr making high alloy, heat-resistant steels) at Bochum has been 35 percent dismantled as of December 21, 1949, and the completion of the dismantling is scheduled by the British for some time in January.

Any further dismantling of the plant will affect key furnaces and equipment, and will cause the shut-down of the plant with over 600 workers losing their jobs shortly after the new year begins.

EFFORTS PREVIOUSLY MADE TO STOP DISMANTLING OF THIS PLANT

The American Government made two investigations of the Hochfrequenz steel plant at Bochum in 1948. One of these was made by Mr. Keenan, and one by a group headed by Mr. Wolf who worked for the Humphrey committee (Paul Hoffman's committee). In both cases the American experts unanimously recommended that this steel plant be saved. Mr. Keenan declared that it was indispensable to the recovery and successful operation of the German coal mines. Mr. Wolf declared that the plant was essential to the efficient operation of Germany's steel industry and to the economic recovery of western Europe.

Several United States Senators have intervened with the State Department on behalf of this plant. Among those who have tried to save this plant are Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and Senator MCCARRAN, chairman of the ECA "watchdog committee." Moreover, Senators BRIDGES and WHERRY have been active in trying to save this and other steel plants.

PAST AND PRESENT DISMANTLING STATUS OF HOCHFREQUENZ-TIEGELSTAHL PLANT

During the war the Hochfrequenz steel plant was badly damaged by bombings. The British decided the plant was not a war plant and gave the plant a work permit to resume operations, and removed the plant from the reparations list in February 1947.

With the plant removed from the reparations list early in 1947 the management and workers got busy and rebuilt the plant with an expenditure of over 4,000,000 marks. Over 2 years later, on May 5, 1949, the British notified the plant that it would be dismantled beginning July 1, 1949.

As a result of the intervention of Senators GEORGE, MCCARRAN, and others, the British withdrew the dismantling order temporarily, but gave out a new order a month later. They ordered the dismantling to begin August 3, 1949. Dismantling has been in progress since that date and still continues.

In justifying their new order to dismantle the Hochfrequenz steel works the British Government told the State Department that duplicate capacity existed in other German steel plants and that the output of the small Bochum plant could easily be taken over by other steel plants. They said the workers could readily be absorbed in other industries when the plant was dismantled.

I have just returned from Germany where I took occasion to visit the Hochfrequenz plant and to talk with the management. They declare that the bulk of their production cannot be produced in any other steel plant in Germany as it requires special furnaces and highly specialized equipment not available elsewhere. The dismantlement of their plant will make them dependent on imports from the British and French alloy steel industries.

Moreover, I checked with the mayor's office in Bochum and found that the town already has over 2,500 unemployed metal workers as a result of the recent dismantling of the huge Bochumer Verein steel plant which is also located in the town of Bochum.

Hence, if the Hochfrequenz-Tiegelstahl Werke is dismantled, it will dump an additional 650 workers and their families on the local relief rolls. Since unemployment has been growing in western Germany in recent months, is it desirable deliberately to increase this unemployment by the dismantling of a nonwar steel plant?

The British admit that the Hochfrequenz steel plan is not a primary war plant, and that almost all of its production has always been for major peacetime industries such as the railway industry, the coal-mining industry, the electric utility industry, etc.

ADENAUER INTERVENES TO SAVE HOCHFREQUENZ

Dr. Adenauer, the Reichs Chancelor of the new Federal Republic of Western Germany, has just intervened to try to save the Hochfrequenz plant at Bochum. At the last meeting of the three Allied High Commissioners for Germany, held on December 16, 1949, at Petersberg near Bonn, Dr. Adenauer pleaded for the saving of the Hochfrequenz plant. The commissioners replied that since the plant was not included in the list of plants agreed upon at Paris in November, it was not within their jurisdiction to consider his request.

It should be noted that the decision to dismantle the Hochfrequenz plant was made without any reasons ever being given in defense of such action, and without the Germans ever being told why the plant was to be dismantled, or ever being permitted to refute erroneous statements which have been made about the plant.

It is the consensus of opinion of American experts who have carefully studied the Bochum situation that the major motive behind the British insistence on dismantling the Hochfrequenz plant is the desire to eliminate German competition.

Of great significance in this regard is the fact that the American High Commissioner for Germany, John J. McCloy, told me in a conference in his office at Frankfurt, Germany, on December 19, 1949, that he personally would like to see the Hochfrequenz plant saved.

AN IMMEDIATE MORATORIUM ON DISMANTLING IS NECESSARY

If the Hochfrequenz steel plant at Bochum is to be saved, an immediate moratorium on further dismantling is necessary. Such a moratorium should be for 60 or 90 days, or whatever period is required for the appointment of a special committee to investigate and report on the situation at Bochum. No harm could result from such a moratorium and investigation, while such an inquiry might well prevent a grave injustice being done.

JOHN B. CRANE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 28, 1949.*

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not know the distinguished Senator was even going to mention the subject of dismantling. I have not had a chance to see the letter to which he has referred.

I have already consulted with the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, for whom I have the deepest regard, relative to plant disposal in Germany.

Does the distinguished Senator from North Dakota have any information, other than what is contained in the letter, relative to any orders issued by any Government agencies about the sale of war plants in Germany at this time?

Mr. LANGER. Not about the sale of such plants; but I have information that the military attachés have stopped this matter in the American zone.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator feel there should be an investigation or any further consideration on the part of the Senate, or any committee thereof, to find out what is the status of the dismantling program, other than what has been told us by the Secretary of State?

Mr. LANGER. I think the Senate should make its own investigation, through the appropriate and proper committee, to find out whether dismantling in the American zone by the American military authorities has stopped.

(At this point Mr. LANGER yielded to Mr. MCCARRAN, who discussed the displaced-persons program. On request of Mr. LANGER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MCCARRAN's remarks appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of Mr. LANGER's speech.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the first session of the Eighty-first Congress put oleo into the armed forces diet. Millions of pounds of oleo have been bought by armed forces. I understand the enlisted men get the oleo and the officers the butter. I notice that the House and Senate restaurants do not serve oleo.

Many of my colleagues do not realize what is behind the whole controversy. They seem to think it is just an argument between oleo and butter. That is not the case, by any means. All the dairymen ask is that oleo be sold as oleo and that it not be disguised as butter. We have had other synthetic substitute dairy products, such as filled milk where skimmed milk and vegetable oil are evaporated and sold for 2 cents a can less than evaporated natural milk.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have not been able to hear the entire address of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, but as I entered the Senate Chamber he was speaking about a monopoly in colored soap; was he not?

Mr. LANGER. Yes—Lifebuoy soap.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean there is a suit now pending, by which it is sought to prevent the sale of any other colored soap?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. Luckman, for Lever Bros., brought a suit against some of their competitors who were coloring the soap red, and he won it.

Mr. WHERRY. On that basis, it is the Senator's contention, is it not, that it is a subterfuge to color oleomargarine to imitate butter?

Mr. LANGER. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Therefore, it is the holding of the Supreme Court with respect to the monopoly on soap, held by the firm in question, that leads the Senator to believe the makers of oleo have no right to color it and sell it as a substitute for butter. Is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. My friend from Nebraska is entirely correct.

Mr. President, millions upon millions of American babies are fed a formula based on the use of natural evaporated milk. Do Senators wish to have babies fed filled milk? If oleo equals butter, then filled or synthetic milk is equal to the natural product. I repeat, synthetic filled evaporated milk is the same as oleo in principle. The amounts of vegetable oils and skim milk are different. Oleo has 80 percent slowly undigestible cottonseed or other vegetable oil, and 15 percent skim milk and salt and a preservative. Filled evaporated milk has 7 percent cottonseed oil and 93 percent skim milk. I yield at this time to any Senator who will say that he has been feeding filled milk to any of his children, or that he knows of any doctor who has ever advocated the use of filled evaporated milk instead of the natural evaporated milk. I have no fear of anyone being able to answer the question.

Then we have oleo ice cream, which is an article of commerce in some States. All these substitutes depend on the dairy cow for the base of their product, which is skim milk. Oleo ice cream has already been served here in the Capitol in an effort to demonstrate its qualities. Where does this leave the dairy farmer? Must he develop a skim-milk cow to stay in the dairy business?

Then we have oleo bottled milk entering into the picture. Ask some of the committees that have been in Mexico City and Tokyo how they like oleo bottled milk. My colleagues should go slow before they take this step to ruin a $10,000,000,000 industry. Do they wish to add a few hundreds of thousands to the unemployment rolls? Do they know that 10,000,000 people have jobs in connection with the dairy industry?

When President Truman addressed Congress the other day and talked about the general welfare, I do not think he meant the general welfare of any international English vegetable-oil cartel and monopoly—or did he? I do not think he meant—at least I hope he did not mean—the general welfare of the 25 oleo corporations, who have been reaping such enormous profits from their synthetic product. I should like to think the President meant that he was interested in the general welfare of the 2,500,000 dairy farmers of our Nation. I should like to think President Truman and his party would be interested in the health of the American people, which is being jeopardized by the promotion of the use of cottonseed oil. He speaks often of a health program, and I should like to think his interest in such a program would be based on a greater use of the greatest single food ever known to man—milk—and its products.

My party nearly stubbed its toe on the oleo bill 2 years ago. We were able to give it a sleeping pill in the Senate. We did not let the millions of easy money change our course. I note that Luce's magazines received $12,000,000 for whisky and liquor advertisements last year and that they also had some very extensive oleo advertisements and pro-oleo editorials. I hope the Democrats will not fall for this one, either. They are constantly telling us about cartels and how the Republicans are in with big business. How they will vote on this oleo bill will determine how sincere they really are in trying to hold monopolies in control. In fact, I am really sorry for our distinguished majority leader, who hails from a great agriculture and dairy State. Does he want Illinois dairy prices to be like the Illinois egg prices are at this time? In my State eggs sold in December for as little as 18 or 19 cents a dozen. Every day in my mail I find letters from farmers protesting the price of eggs. Is that what the farmers can continue to expect from this administration? Do we want to follow up what we have done to the sheep business, the fur business, and the poultry business, by taking this step to ruin the dairy business?

I noted in the press that on January 3 our lovable Vice President told a group in Kentucky that "the farm situation is discouraging." I ask today, do we want to discourage another and the largest segment of the farming business by passing this most destructive legislation? We can pass it, perhaps, but we will regret the day. The day it will be found out for sure will be election day, next November, in my judgment. Mark well what I am telling the Senate today, because Senators have the votes and the responsibility. Every Senator who votes for these few big corporations will regret his vote. Democrats may say they are for the people, but for what people? If this bill is passed, I am sure it will be appropriate to get Mr. Luckman, who has already been designated as general manager of the Jackson Day dinners, to serve oleo on that occasion. Nothing could be more appropriate and more proper than to have oleo served instead of butter on this great Democratic holiday, at a time when the Democrats will be celebrating.

Mr. President, I agree with what the distinguished Vice President said about the farm situation being discouraging. During the first 9 months of last year, the farmers of North Dakota received $191,930,000 less than they received for a similar period the year before. That is a reduction of approximately 30 percent. If the farmers had not had that reduction, they would be buying more goods of all kinds, including radios and what not.

I have some figures to show the difference between the prices the farmers received a year ago and what they are now receiving, and what they paid a year ago and what they are now paying for some of the things which they buy.

On April 26, 1948, at Rock Lake, N. Dak., as reported by the administration, oats were selling for 98 cents a bushel. A year later, on April 26, 1949, the price had dropped to 51 cents a bushel.

On April 26, 1948, barley sold for $2.06 a bushel, and in 1949 it sold for 92 cents a bushel.

Flax was reduced in price from $5.66 a bushel to $3.60 a bushel.

Durum, $2.61 a bushel, to $1.94 a bushel.

Wheat from $2.10 a bushel, to $1.91 a bushel.

The protein premium on wheat was reduced from 25 cents a bushel to 4 cents a bushel.

Under this administration, what has happened to what the farmers buy?

On April 26, 1948, a farmer at Rock Lake, N. Dak., could buy a model A tractor for $1,970. Last April the price was $2,400.

A farmer could buy a model D John Deere tractor for $2,370, and last April it cost $2,750. Think of that increase in price, when the prices of most articles are going down.

In April 1948 a self-propelled combine could be bought for $4,740, and in April 1949 it cost $5,045.

In April 1948 a farmer could buy a press drill for $680. Last April it cost $800.

Mr. President, the dairy industry is one of the largest industries in the State of North Dakota, and if this bill should become law that industry will be ruined in that State. That is why I read the letter from the dairy commissioner of North Dakota, Mr. William J. Murphy. That is why the secretary of agriculture of North Dakota came to Washington to protest at the time when the oleomargarine bill was previously being considered. To the people of my State, not only the farmers but also the businessmen, it is a very serious matter when there is the tremendous reduction in farm income which I have already described.

North Dakota is known as the most progressive State in the Union, according to John Gunther. The State bank in North Dakota is owned by the people. It makes a profit of a half-million dollars a year. We have our own mills and elevators, and we manufacture many of our own foods at a profit of $865,000. Last year it was nearly half a million dollars.

We have our own insurance system, our own storm and hail insurance. We saved our farmers $100,000,000 in hail insurance. We insure every public building, every one of our schoolhouses, and our county courthouses, and it cost us, for a little while, a third of what the old-line insurance companies charged. The State writes its own fidelity bonds. Everyone handling public money in North Dakota is bonded. We have nearly $2,000,000 in that fund.

We may do as South Dakota has done—go into the cement business. South Dakota has its own cement plant, which has been a great success. We propose at an election, within a short time, to submit to the people the question of whether North Dakota shall build its own cement plant. Some years ago there was a cement plant owned by private industry, but the Cement Trust put that plant out of business because the trust could furnish the cement more cheaply than it could be produced in North Dakota. So within a short time the question will arise in North Dakota as to whether the State shall establish its own cement plant.

One industry after another has been ruined by this administration. If the pending oleomargarine bill shall become a law, according to the dairy commissioner of North Dakota, the commissioner of agriculture of North Dakota, and according to scores of letters and telegrams which the various creamery cooperative companies have poured in to Washington, the administration will also ruin the dairy industry.

I appeal to Senators not to act hastily, but to make a thorough investigation before they ruin not only the farmers of North Dakota, but the farmers of all the other States I have mentioned this afternoon.

In closing, Mr. President, I again desire to call attention to the speech made by the President of the United States in Philadelphia, when he was a candidate, when he said, "Any farmer who does not vote the Democratic ticket is guilty of ingratitude," and when he said, "Any laboring man who does not vote the Democratic ticket is guilty of ingratitude."

I read on the floor of the Senate the names of the States which took the President at his word, which voted Democratic, which gave him their electoral votes. When we add them together, we find that if those votes had not gone to President Truman, he would have been 70 electoral votes short.

I say, Mr. President, this is no way to double-cross the farmers of those States which took the President at his word, and voted for him believing he was a friend and that the Democratic Party was a friend of the dairy farmers of this great country.

ADMINISTRATION OF DISPLACED-PERSONS PROGRAM IN EUROPE

During the delivery of Mr. LANGER'S speech,

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, has the Senator from North Dakota arrived at a point in his discussion where he can permit me to make a statement for the RECORD?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; and I ask unanimous consent that whatever the distinguished Senator from Nevada wishes to say at this point may appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to have the clerk read a short statement which I send to the desk.

Mr. LANGER. I yield for that purpose, provided it is understood that, by unanimous consent, I shall not lose the floor by so doing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the matter sent to the desk by the Senator from Nevada will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAT M'CARRAN, CHAIRMAN, SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

There is set forth below copy of exhibit No. 8 of the investigation regarding the administration of our displaced-persons program in Europe:

AMERICAN CONSULATE GENERAL,
Munich, Germany, September 9, 1949.

Subject: Possibility of fraud in connection with visas obtained by displaced persons in Amberg, Germany.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington.

SIR: I have the honor to report that it has come to the attention of the Amberg suboffice of the Consulate General that 10 visas were issued between December 29, 1948, and June 16, 1949, to displaced persons who are apparently ineligible under Public Law 774 for admission into the United States. It is understood that these persons are either now en route to or are already in the United States. These persons have all made statements under oath in their visa applications which subsequent documentary evidence had shown to be probably false, and in each case the eligibility of the person concerned was dependent upon the truth of the statements. The specific point in question is the date upon which these applicants arrived in Germany. In order to be eligible under Public Law 774, these applicants must have arrived in Germany before December 22, 1945. The recently discovered documentation indicates that these applicants all arrived subsequent to this date.

The matter was called to the attention of the Consulate General by the military government officer responsible for the town of Schwandorf, Bavaria, who is at present investigating charges of bribery of a member of the city government of Schwandorf by a prospective visa applicant. The accused is said to have paid 50 marks through the wife of the president of the Jewish committee of the town, in an effort to have the city records which show residence in Schwandorf adjusted so as to make him eligible under Public Law 774. This investigation has shown that a number of displaced persons who had already departed for the United States had previously caused their police records in Schwandorf to be changed, and further that upon their presentation for a visa, the statements which they made under oath did not correspond with records in Schwandorf. After examining the Schwandorf police records in these cases, the records of the International Refugee Organization in Amberg (IRO area IV headquarters) were also consulted. It was shown that these records agree with the Schwandorf records and do not support the statements made by the applicants in their application.

The 10 cases in question are as follows:

1. Boltuch, Lea, was issued Polish quota visa 3227/50 on December 29, 1948. Miss Boltuch stated under oath that she had resided in Munich from November 1945 until 1946. The Schwandorf records in this case consisted of two documents, one a questionnaire which Miss Boltuch prepared in order to obtain a German identification card. On the identification card questionnaire, she stated that she arrived directly in Schwandorf from Poland in the summer of 1946. On her police registration card, a notice as to her residence in Munich has been added, obviously subsequent to her original registration. In the files of IRO in Amberg, two documents were consulted in this case, the questionnaire prepared by Miss Boltuch for the Army which states that she arrived in Germany in July 1946 from Poland, and the IRO Card and Maintenance Questionnaire (CM–1 form) which indicates that she resided in Munich during the time stated on her application.

2 and 3. The documents in connection with Miss Boltuch's sister and brother-in-law, Simon and Taube Haber (Polish quota visas 6028/50 and 6029/50, issued February 3, 1949) also follow the same pattern of discrepancy, i. e., the residence in Munich is added later on police registration card, the identification card questionnaire shows no residence in Munich, the Army questionnaire shows arrival in Germany in 1946, and the CM–1 form shows residence in Munich between October 1945 and August 1946. It is noted that in both the Boltuch and Haber cases the CM–1 form was prepared on May 26, 1948, at which time it was generally known that in order to qualify under the President's directive of December 22, 1945, concerning the immigration of displaced persons, the applicant must have been in Germany prior to the date of the directive.

4 and 5. Brafman, Daniel and Anna, were issued Polish quota visas 3593/50 and 3594/50 on February 2, 1949. Brafman stated in his application that he came to Germany in November 1945 and resided in the neighborhood of Schwandorf from that date on. On his Schwandorf identification card questionnaire, he states that he arrived in Schwandorf in July 1946. However, there is an entry in pencil (possibly in Brafman's own handwriting) between his statements as to residence in Piotrkow, Poland, in 1945, and Lodz, Poland, in 1946, stating that he lived in Schwandorf between November and December 1945. Brafman's CM–1 form shows residence in Lodz, Poland, uninterruptedly from June 1945 until June 1946, where he was employed as a tailor.

6, 7, and 8. Henryk, Mela, and Fedor Badrian were issued German quota visa 6945, Polish quota visa 5601/53 and German quota visa 6946, respectively, on April 21, 1949. Badrian based his eligibility on arrival in Schwandorf in September 1945 from Kattowice, Poland. This statement is substantiated by the identification card questionnaire in Schwandorf. However, the IRO CM–1 form shows Badrian to have been residing uninterruptedly in Kattowice from January 1945 until September 1946, and the IRO DP registration card (DP–2 card) shows the same information.

9 and 10. Israel and Irena Dreier were issued Polish quota visas 5415/56 and 5416/56 on June 16, 1949. Dreier claims to have been in Schwandorf between September and December 1945. There is no record in the Schwandorf police records of this trip to Schwandorf from Poland. Furthermore, there is attached to the police records a Polish certificate of residence showing Dreier to be living in Krakow from March 1945 until March 1946. The CM–1 Form does not show residence for Dreier in Schwandorf before September 1946.

The investigation of these cases and other similar cases in which visas have not yet been issued is being continued by the local Displaced Persons Commission team, the International Refugee Organization, and military government, CIC, and this office, and if any other cases are discovered in which it is believed that visas have been issued to persons not eligible under Public Law 774, the Department will be informed immediately.

Information in the records in question indicates that the following persons may have made false statements in their visa applications believing that these statements were necessary in order to establish their eligibility under Public Law 774:

Albert, Solomon (Polish quota visa 5453/56 issued June 30, 1949).

Apfelbaum, Juda and Pérla (Polish quota visas 5626/53 and 5627/53, issued April 22, 1949).

Taffel, Leib and Estéra (Polish quota visas 6202/52 and 6203/52, issued March 29, 1949).

The information in the documents, however, shows that these persons were already eligible from the point of view of entry into Germany prior to December 22, 1945. These persons had been in concentration camps in Germany during the war, then returned to Poland, and apparently falsified the dates of their reentry into Germany.

The Schwandorf documents disclosed above are in the archives of the burgermeister of Schwandorf, and the IRO CM–1 forms and DP–2 cards are in possession of the IRO Area IV Headquarters, Amberg, Germany.

Respectfully yours,

SAM E. WOODS,
American Consul General.

(Copy to Supervisory Consulate General, Frankfurt.)

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, yesterday there was released from my office, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee and as chairman of the subcommittee having in charge the matter of displaced persons, a statement made to me by a person in authority in Germany, an employee of the Displaced Persons Commission, who I believe made the statement freely and voluntarily. It was published, and this morning there appears in the Washington Post a statement purporting to come from Mr. Carusi, Chairman of the Displaced Persons Commission, in which, about as strongly as he dared, he attempts to call the chairman of the Judiciary Committee a liar.

It is not often the chairman of the Judiciary Committee is called a liar by one holding a place such as that occupied by Mr. Carusi. I have had inserted in the RECORD the matter which has just been read by the clerk, and I am wondering whether Mr. Carusi will now proceed to call the consul general at Munich, Mr. Sam Woods, a liar, and whether he will take Mr. Sam Woods to task, as he says he has taken the employee of the Displaced Persons Commission to task for having made statements to me. The statement just read by the clerk is a statement on file with the State Department, made by an official of the State Department, unhesitatingly, and it shows, as did the statements of the witnesses who testified before me in Stuttgart and Munich, that there is continual fraud in the matter of securing visas for displaced persons.

It was stated to me in Europe, not once, but repeatedly, that for a package of cigarettes one could get a birth certificate; for a package of cigarettes one could get affidavits showing his residence to be at a certain place at a certain time, when he was not there at all. All those

statements are at the present time in the possession of the Judiciary Committee, and of a subcommittee thereof and no doubt will be disclosed. But, now that Mr. Carusi has seen fit to call the chairman of the Judiciary Committee a liar for having released the statement of a witness, I am wondering whether he is going to call Sam Woods a liar. If he does, I merely want to tell Mr. Carusi that I shall have more material for him, and by the time he gets through with his Ananias club, it is going to be a real organization.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] in line 10, page 4, of the original bill.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I understand there are to be a number of other speakers, both for and against the pending measure, and in view of the fact that the hour is now 5 o'clock, I presume we should probably take a recess until tomorrow. I should like to ask Senators who are interested in the bill whether they feel that we might be able to get a unanimous-consent agreement for a vote sometime soon on the bill and all amendments.

Mr. LANGER. I do not think we can get a unanimous-consent agreement tonight, but perhaps we may tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator. Under those circumstances, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, January 12, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 11 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Adrian W. Maher, of Connecticut, to be United States attorney for the district of Connecticut. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 18, 1949.

Henry L. Hess, of Oregon, to be United States attorney for the district of Oregon. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired November 29, 1949.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Francis S. Low, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Logistics).

Rear Adm. John H. Cassady, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air).

Vice Adm. William M. Fechteler, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of an admiral while serving as commander in chief, Atlantic and United States Atlantic Fleet.

Rear Adm. Lynde D. McCormick, United States Navy, to be Vice Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy, and to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while so serving under a Presidential designation.

Vice Adm. Robert B. Carney, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Second Task Fleet.

Vice Adm. John J. Ballentine, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Sixth Task Fleet.

Rear Adm. Joseph F. Jelley, Jr., Civil Engineer Corps, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 12, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, this sacred altar at which our spirits bow in the midst of another day's demands is the witness of our weakness and of how fruitless are our quests and how futile are our arguments if we turn not to Thee in the humility of prayer. In these fateful days for whose decisions the future will judge us, by Thine enabling might may we maintain our integrity unsullied by animosities, prejudices, or personal ambitions, regarding always public office as a sacred trust. As our frail hands have a part in the shaping of the world that is to be, give to us the vision, the wisdom, and the courage that will make for both justice and lasting peace. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

EDWIN C. JOHNSON, a Senator from the State of Colorado, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 11, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Cordon	Flanders
Anderson	Darby	Frear
Brewster	Donnell	Fulbright
Bricker	Douglas	George
Bridges	Downey	Gillette
Butler	Dworshak	Graham
Cain	Eastland	Green
Capehart	Ecton	Gurney
Chapman	Ellender	Hayden
Connally	Ferguson	Hendrickson
Hickenlooper	Lucas	Russell
Hill	McCarran	Saltonstall
Hoey	McCarthy	Schoeppel
Holland	McClellan	Smith, Maine
Humphrey	McFarland	Smith, N. J.
Hunt	McKellar	Sparkman
Ives	McMahon	Stennis
Jenner	Magnuson	Taft
Johnson, Colo.	Malone	Taylor
Johnson, Tex.	Martin	Thomas, Okla.
Johnston, S. C.	Maybank	Thomas, Utah
Kefauver	Millikin	Thye
Kem	Morse	Tobey
Kilgore	Mundt	Tydings
Knowland	Myers	Vandenberg
Langer	Neely	Watkins
Leahy	O'Conor	Wherry
Lehman	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Lodge	Pepper	Williams
Long	Robertson	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business as members of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, holding hearings on various flood-control and public-works projects in the State of New Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be allowed to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and resolutions, and submit reports and other routine matters for the RECORD without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the sixth report of the Economic Cooperation Administration created by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress, approved April 3, 1948.

The report covers activities under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 (title I of Public Law 472, as amended) as well as the programs of economic aid to China under section 12 of Public Law 47, Eighty-first Congress, and to the Republic of Korea under the provisions of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act of 1949 (Public Law 793, 80th Cong.) and Public Laws 154 and 196, Eighty-first Congress. There is also included in the appendix a summary of the status of the United States foreign relief program (Public Law 84, 80th Cong.) and the United States foreign aid program (Public Law 389, 80th Cong.).

This report is for the quarter ended September 30, 1949.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 12, 1950.*

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, since there are three new Members of the Senate it is necessary to rearrange committee assignments. It is my understanding that those on the Republican side of the aisle in charge of committee assignments are ready to report their assignments to committees, and we on the Democratic side are ready to make such a report. I now send to the desk an order which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That Mr. ROBERTSON be excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and assigned to service on the Committee on Appropriations;

That Mr. TAYLOR be excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the Committee on Rules and Administration and assigned to service on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs;

That Mr. LEAHY be excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and assigned to service on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service;

That Mr. MYERS be excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration and assigned to service on the Committee on Finance;

That Mr. WITHERS be excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and assigned to service on the Committee on the Judiciary;

That Mr. GRAHAM be excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and assigned to service on the Committee on Rules and Administration;

That Mr. BENTON be assigned to service on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the Committee on Rules and Administration;

That Mr. LEHMAN be assigned to service on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the minority I send to the desk an order for committee assignments which I ask to have read, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That Mr. CAIN be, and he is hereby, excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency and assigned to service on the Committee on Armed Services;

That Mr. DWORSHAK be, and he is hereby, assigned to service on the Committee on the District of Columbia and to service on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service;

That Mr. DARBY be, and he is hereby, assigned to service on the Committee on the District of Columbia and to service on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service;

That Mr. IVES be, and he is hereby, excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and assigned to service on the Committee on Banking and Currency;

That Mr. MUNDT be, and he is hereby, excused from further service as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and assigned to service on the Committee on Rules and Administration;

That Mr. WILLIAMS be, and he is hereby, excused from further service on the Committee on Finance, and assigned to service on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the committee assignments as read, are agreed to.

PETITION

Mr. GREEN presented a resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Resolution memorializing Congress with relation to enactment of legislation to incorporate the principle of reinsurance as a means of enabling the Federal Government to assume its responsibilities in financing the unemployment compensation program and thereby equalizing the tax burden among the States

Whereas Rhode Island has few natural resources and is dependent on light manufacturing industries; and

Whereas the economy of Rhode Island and that of other industrialized States depends largely upon a demand for our manufactured products which is far beyond a State's border to contain and far beyond a State's power to control; and

Whereas these and most causes of unemployment are national in scope; and

Whereas the effects of unemployment fall unevenly upon the highly industrialized States, of which Rhode Island is one; and

Whereas this results in a severe drain on the Rhode Island unemployment compensation fund, placing this State in an unfavorable, competitive position with other States not so severely affected; and

Whereas President Harry S. Truman has proposed that the Federal Government assume its responsibilities with reference thereto: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations hereby memorializes and petitions the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, legislation which would incorporate the principle of reinsurance as a means of enabling the Federal Government to assume its responsibility in financing in part the unemployment compensation program and thereby equalizing the tax burden among the States; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, earnestly requesting the latter to use their efforts to be certain that legislation is enacted which would carry out the purposes of this resolution.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING—PETITIONS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, yesterday I presented to the Senate petitions sent to me by Mrs. Nora B. Powell, State legislative director, WCTU, New Castle, Del., signed by 1,637 citizens of New Castle County, Del., and 353 citizens of Kent County, Del., in support of legislation now pending before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages over the radio. I have today received another letter from Mrs. Powell transmitting similar petitions signed by 71 citizens of New Castle County, Del., and 75 citizens of Kent County, Del. I ask that these petitions also be referred to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for its consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ATTACKS BY CHINESE ON AMERICAN-FLAG SHIPS—PETITION OF ISBRANDTSEN CO., INC., NEW YORK

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, it seems likely that each Member of the Congress has received a copy of the petition which the Isbrandtsen Co., Inc., seeks to have considered by the Congress. I have read and become curious about the copy of the petition which was sent to my office. Knowing absolutely nothing about the stated complaints and alleged facts I ask unanimous consent that the petition be printed in the RECORD in hope that an answer to the petition will be prepared by the executive agencies referred to in the petition, and offered to the junior Senator from Washington for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PETITION BY THE ISBRANDTSEN CO.

To the Congress of the United States.

HONORABLE SIRS: Our company has been engaged for many years in world-wide cargo- and passenger-ship operations and merchandising. At times we have operated over 50 large ships in all parts of the world and employ hundreds of American citizens on our vessels and ashore whose homes and families are in almost every State in the Union.

ATTACKS BY THE CHINESE ON OUR AMERICAN-FLAG SHIPS AND THE AMERICAN CITIZENS ABROAD

You undoubtedly have read, recently, in the press about the experiences through which our American-flag ships have gone, in conducting their regular and long-established course of trade in the Far East and especially on the high seas, off the mouth of the Yangtze River, at the approaches to the port of Shanghai, China.

In September, two of our American-flag ships, the *Flying Independent* and the *Flying Clipper* were, under threats of shelling, stopped by Chinese gunboats, on the high seas, outside the entrance to the Yangtze River and were then seized and taken to a Nationalist Chinese naval base on the Chusan Islands and were held under seizure for 10 days before being released, notwithstanding there were aboard over a hundred passengers, including refugees from Shanghai—whom the American consul at Shanghai beseeched us to take aboard—as well as the American crews.

In November, two more of our American-flag ships, the *Flying Cloud* and the *Sir John Franklin*, were actually fired upon, on the high seas, off the mouth of the Yangtze River, and were severely damaged by a barrage of shells from those Chinese gunboats, seriously endangering the lives of more than a hundred American citizens aboard those ships. Ironically, those same Chinese gunboats, we are informed, are former United States warships, which were among the 132 war vessels presented to the Chinese Government by our Government.

NO LAWFUL OR RECOGNIZED BLOCKADE, OR BELLIGERENT RIGHT TO STOP OR ATTACK AMERICAN SHIPS ON THE HIGH SEAS EXISTS

Before sending our ships, in September and November, on voyages bound for Shanghai, we consulted, at length, with the Department of State, in reference to a reported blockade of that port, announced on June

20, 1949, by the Chinese Nationalists. Secretary of State Acheson informed us, unequivocally, in writing, on September 16, 1949, that the United States Government does not recognize the purported blockade of Chinese ports by the Nationalist Government of China.

THE UNITED STATES PROTESTED AGAINST THE UNLAWFULNESS OF THE BLOCKADE, OR PORT-CLOSURE ORDER

Secretary Acheson also informed us that he had, on June 25, 1949, filed official United States protest against the purported and announced blockade, or port-closure order, on the ground that it was unlawful under international law and invalid, and would not be recognized by the United States.

Mr. Acheson also informed us that the United States does not recognize the existence in China, of any kind of war, civil or otherwise, and that, accordingly, the Nationalist China Navy has no belligerent rights on the high seas or elsewhere, because it is not a recognized belligerent. He has stated that nobody but a belligerent has a right to stop or attack an American ship on the high seas, or to declare a blockade, or to interfere in any way with an American ship on the high seas.

Proceeding on that official advice, when our two American ships, the *Flying Independent* and the *Flying Clipper*, under threat, by radio, of gunfire, were stopped on the high seas, by Chinese gunboats, while en route toward the mouth of the Yangtze River, and were seized and taken to the distant Chusan Islands, we appealed urgently to the Navy Department, and to the State Department, for protection against such clearly unlawful actions. The Navy Department, however, arbitrarily refused to afford protection, notwithstanding the acts of Congress requiring it to do so, and the only satisfaction we obtained from the State Department was the information that it had asked an American consul, in China, for a report on the incident.

On October 5, 1949, however, the Acting Secretary of State publicly announced, through the press, that the Chinese Nationalist Government had been warned that the United States would view seriously any attack on American ships under the purported port-closure or blockade either by Chinese warships or by Chinese airplanes.

THE UNLAWFUL ATTACKS ON, AND SHELLING OF, THE "FLYING CLOUD" AND THE "SIR JOHN FRANKLIN," AND THE ATTEMPTED MURDER OF AMERICAN CREWS AND PASSENGERS

On November 15, 1949, our American-flag ship, the steamship *Flying Cloud*, while upon the high seas, was fired upon by a barrage of direct shelling from 3-inch guns, by these Chinese gunboats, and was barely able to escape and reach another port.

On November 25, 1949, a like attack was made on our American-flag ship, the *Sir John Franklin*, while on the high seas.

It is only a miracle that the many American members of our crews, and the American passengers on board those two ships, were not killed or severely injured. Photos taken of the *Flying Cloud*, after the attack on her, show that one shot went straight through the ship's American flag, and that a hole 13 inches in diameter was blown through the ship's side. On the *Sir John Franklin*, one 3-inch shell exploded close to the bridge and was clearly aimed by the Chinese directly at the American master and American officers on the bridge.

OUR GOVERNMENT PROTESTED AGAINST THE ATTACKS ON THE "FLYING CLOUD" AND ON THE "SIR JOHN FRANKLIN," ON THE GROUND THAT THEY WERE UNLAWFUL

On November 18 the State Department filed with the Chinese Nationalist Government, and published in full in the newspapers, a protest against the Chinese attack on the *Flying Cloud*, on the ground that it was unlawful.

On November 28 the State Department also filed with the Chinese Nationalist Government, and published in full in the newspapers, a like protest against the Chinese attack on the *Sir John Franklin* on the ground that it was unlawful.

Both protests of the United States Government were arbitrarily rejected by the Chinese Nationalist Government, and no denial was made of the attacks or that they were unlawful. And there the matter was allowed to rest.

"ON OUR OWN," SAYS THE SECRETARY OF STATE

To all our protests to the Navy Department and to the State Department, and our requests for protection, from our Navy, for our ships while on the high seas, the Navy Department referred us to the State Department and the Secretary of State merely reiterated that we were "on our own," and that our American ships, although on admittedly lawful voyages, were proceeding at their own risk, even on the high seas, toward the mouth of the Yangtze River—adding, probably intended as our only comfort, that, of course, "the action of the Chinese naval vessel in indiscriminately and wantonly firing on an American-flag ship and thus endangering American lives was unjustifiable and contrary to the law and practice of nations" and "the United States Government holds the Chinese Nationalist Government fully responsible for any losses sustained by American nationals as a result of these reckless acts."

The ultimate measure of that responsibility in American dollars is highly conjectural. We are contending here for principle, not damages.

We contend for the historic and constitutional American policy of protection by our Navy and Congress for law-abiding American citizens on American ships on the high seas—wherever they may be on the high seas—against admittedly lawless attack.

The Secretary of State continued, however, to repeat, on his own responsibility, that the Navy would not furnish any escort, or protection, as the English had provided for their ships, or furnish our American ships, or to the American passengers, or to the American crews, any safeguard, whatsoever, while lawfully on the high seas, and the nearby Navy ships did not in fact respond or come to the aid of the American ships, after their masters had sent distress signals, radioing for Navy assistance, while being actually attacked.

We have lodged with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Navy opinions of one of our counsel that those Departments of our Government had no lawful authority to ignore or set aside the United States Navy regulations, articles 0320, 0313, and 0314, issued pursuant to acts of Congress, and having the force of statute law, imposing the statutory and mandatory duty on the Navy of protecting American ships, crews, and passengers against lawless attack. Those opinions of our counsel have been published in the press and are available, upon request.

We have never been able to comprehend, by what authority the State Department has assumed to speak for the Navy, but the Navy apparently has defaulted to the State Department, as its spokesman—and this despite the published United States Navy Regulations and Articles for the Government of the Navy of the United States (sec. 8, clause 20; sec. 1624 Rev. Stat.) imposing the statutory duty on all senior naval officers to render assistance and protection to American citizens and property whenever in danger (see United States Navy Regulations, 1948, arts. 0320, 0313, and 0314).

AMERICAN WARSHIPS STOOD NEARBY, BUT OFFERED NO AID

There is a large naval force or naval task force, in these waters, on the high seas off the China coast, readily available for those purposes, and, we understand, regularly assigned to the mission, or task, of protecting all American life and property in an area off the China coast, including the very place on the high seas, off the mouth of the Yangtze River, where all of the attacks on our American ships have been made, and where the Chinese Nationalists have within the last week claimed that they have been laying mines indiscriminately, to blow up American ships, crews, and passengers, notwithstanding that our American ships have been at all times carefully observing all the laws of the United States and the rules of international law. That naval force has an admiral in command of the United States naval forces, western Pacific. All of the United States Navy warships in that naval force are, however, apparently following orders from the Secretary of State, to pay no attention to the shelling of American ships and the attempted murder of American crews and passengers by admittedly lawless Chinese warships. Such an attitude constitutes the first occasion in the history of the United States when the Navy has so stood aloof from its sworn and statutory duties, as imposed by acts of Congress (secs. 1547 and 1624, Rev. Stat.), in Navy Regulations and in the Articles for the Government of the Navy (sec. 8, clause 20).

Congress, and not the Secretary of State, has the constitutional power and jurisdiction over American ships, crews, and passengers on the high seas, and over the regulation or restriction of American foreign commerce or shipping, and also over the Navy, during peace, in protecting Americans on the high seas. Those are domestic matters, between Congress and American citizens, and are not subject to arbitrary regulation by the Secretary of State, by directing the setting aside or the evasion of acts of Congress or the Navy Regulations and Articles.

THE LATEST CLAIM OF THE CHINESE NATIONALIST NAVY THAT IT HAS LAWLESSLY LAID MINES INDISCRIMINATELY ON THE HIGH SEAS OFF THE MOUTH OF THE YANGTZE RIVER TO BLOW UP AMERICAN SHIPS HAS NOT CHANGED THE SITUATION

Within the last week the Chinese Nationalist Navy has made a claim that it has laid mines on the high seas at the place where the attacks on our American ships by gunfire have already been made. The State Department has made no statement or finding of its own that the present Chinese Nationalist Navy's claim that it has laid mines there is true or correct in fact. Our own investigation to date has disclosed that no Chinese Nationalist Navy ship or supposed mine layer has approached closer to land or shore than 8 miles from shore, which is well out on the high seas, and outside Chinese territorial waters, so that any possible mines would have to be laid on the high seas. It is just as unlawful to attack American ships by laying mines indiscriminately on the high seas as it is to shoot at them on the high seas, so that the claimed mine laying does not change the situation, excepting to further emphasize the urgent need of American ships for the Navy to furnish the protection guaranteed by Congress and commanded in Navy regulations.

WE BOUGHT OUR SHIPS FROM OUR GOVERNMENT

All these American-flag ships of ours have each a capacity of about 10,000 tons and were purchased by us from the United States Maritime Commission. They were built by our Government during the war, and thus are entirely American ships.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT THREATENS OUR MASTERS

The latest disturbing, unauthorized, and extraordinary conduct of the State Department has been to announce, through its consuls, in Korea and other ports in the Far East, that "violation of the warning (of the Secretary of State) will render masters of United States-flag vessels liable to action under Revised Statute, section 4450," which is the law providing for revocation of a master's license for incompetence and misconduct, etc. Of course, any such action, aimed at taking away the licenses of our American captains, would necessarily have to be initiated and determined by the United States Coast Guard, which is under the jurisdiction of our Treasury Department—not the State Department.

Again, we are puzzled at the confusion of jurisdiction, because we are unable to comprehend by what authority, or voluntary surrender of jurisdiction, the State Department speaks for the Coast Guard, or its superior, the Treasury Department.

So the matter stands at this hour with more of our United States-flag ships en route to the still lawfully open port of Shanghai.

The State Department still refuses assistance; the Secretary of State announced, for the Navy, that our armed services will not obey their oaths or duty under acts of Congress and Navy regulations and articles, to come to the assistance of endangered American lives and property; the State Department threatens our masters with revocation of their licenses—we assume through some action which should be initiated by the separate Treasury Department—through our Coast Guard. And let us emphasize that at no time has the Secretary of State seen fit to forbid our vessels to go to Shanghai, although his determination on such an edict has been expressly requested of the Secretary of State.

LABOR JOINS IN PROTESTING TO THE STATE DEPARTMENT

This conglomeration of Government authority, and its threats, are most disturbing, not only to us but to countless others, including not only shippers, exporters, and importers but all the American officers and crews on our ships.

For instance, the National Maritime Union, representing our unlicensed crews, and the National Master Mates and Pilots Association, representing our officers on board, have vigorously protested to the Secretary of State at the complete confusion and his refusal to afford protection. Especially are these labor organizations incensed at this latest threat of reprisal on the American masters by revocation of their licenses.

ANSWERING SOME SMEARS

Because certain items may have come to your attention, which have usually and persistently been fabricated to confuse the issue involved, we comment on a few here.

NO MUNITIONS CARRIED

The cargoes we have taken into Shanghai have usually originated in the Chinese port of Hong Kong and have consisted principally of foodstuffs, textiles, and medicine, with no munitions among them, whatsoever.

Incidentally, other American steamship lines—with no warning from the Secretary of State—including one line owned and controlled by an agency of the United States Government, have called, and are calling, with like cargo, regularly, at other ports in China—such as Tientsin—all ports held by the Communists. Also other American steamship lines, with no objection from the State Department, are regularly carrying the same kind of cargoes directly to ports of the Soviet Union.

Before our ships leave Hong Kong, bound for Shanghai, they and their cargoes are always officially cleared by the United States consul at Hong Kong, who would not issue such clearance if any war materials, as defined by the Munitions Board's or the Department of Commerce's lists, were on board.

The cargoes we have taken out of Shanghai have been consigned mostly to American citizens, and in the United States—and have consisted generally of strategic or short materials needed in the United States. Again, full clearance has always been granted by the United States consul at Shanghai, still functioning in that Communist-held city—despite the attitude of the Secretary of State toward us calling at that port.

Such goods, transported by us in either direction, have made up a comparatively small portion of the total capacity of these American ships.

PROFITS?

Likewise, do we meet the deliberate smear, that we are interested in profits on these transactions. That is a complete falsehood, if it had any relevancy to the fundamental principle involved, for which we are fighting. The extra cost of such transportation, including increased insurance, wages, bonuses to the crews, etc., make any profit problematical, if real. In any event, if there are any profits—a result which we understand has not yet been outlawed in this country—any residue, after the payment of taxes, remains in this country.

WE ARE AN AMERICAN COMPANY

Another deliberate smear about us dealing with Communists is succinctly answered by our repeated statements, by our 100 percent American company—all of whose officers, directors, and stockholders are American citizens—that of the various political ideologies throughout the world, the ports of which we serve, the only one ideology in which we are in the slightest degree interested, or to which we in any respect subscribe, is the American ideology—the American way.

The fifth amendment to our Constitution guarantees us that our own Government will protect us against being deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

THE OPEN-DOOR POLICY

That American way of free enterprise encompasses the open-door policy of free access, enforced by our Government over all the years, and throughout all the world, that is, until recently.

The book John Hay, by Tyler Dennett (1934), states (p. 198) when "the Department of State was a small and relatively private affair * * * with a staff of about 60 people, among whom perhaps 8 were carrying the load," it is recorded (p. 299) that on June 10, 1900, Secretary Hay telegraphed E. H. Conger, the American Minister in Peking: "We have no policy in China except to protect with energy American interests, and especially American citizens, and the legation."

CONGRESS ALONE HAS JURISDICTION

As American citizens, we address our Congress, particularly because commerce and the free movement of American ships and crews on the high seas, cannot be restricted except by legislative power. The Secretary of State, or the Secretary of the Navy, or the Commandant of the Coast Guard, have no such legislative power, nor even the President. Congress exclusively controls commercial relations and American ships on the high seas, and the Secretary of State and President control only diplomatic relations with recognized foreign governments with respect to Americans, and their property, actually within that foreign country, and this does not include under any circumstances the regulation or restriction of American commerce or shipping.

There exists no act of Congress, or any other valid law or regulation, prohibiting American ships from calling at Shanghai, or from navigating in the area on the high seas, within which our ships were attacked and are now being threatened with further attack. Nor has the Secretary of State issued any order prohibiting ships from proceeding in these waters. Nor is there any act of Congress authorizing him or the Secretary of the Navy to issue any such prohibition.

The right of American ships to call at Shanghai is further secured by the treaty of May 20, 1943, between the United States and China, and by a series of earlier similar treaties.

It has long been a truism of the international relations between our country and other nations, that our weakness is their strength.

Our regular, fixed schedule of sailings, to accommodate the commerce of the United States, calls for the sailing of more of our American-flag ships into Shanghai. Other ships are scheduled to enter that port any day now.

Is this unlawful shelling of our American-flag ships going to be permitted to continue, unchallenged?

What right has any Chinese Government to establish danger zones for our United States ships?

PROMPT ACTION IS VITAL—WHAT CONGRESS CAN DO

Members of Congress: Will you, after reading the foregoing, and otherwise satisfying yourselves of this immediately desperate situation, take action toward affording relief, in the circumstances?

Please: First, place this petition in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Second, communicate your views to the Secretaries of State, the armed services, the Navy and the Treasury, and to the Commandant of the Coast Guard.

Third, introduce in your respective bodies, appropriate resolutions, joint, or otherwise, calling for the immediate investigation of these incidents, by a special committee, or by one of the appropriate standing committees, on Armed Services, or Foreign Relations, or Foreign Affairs, or Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate or the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House.

Fourth. We call your attention to the provisions of article I, section 8, of our United States Constitution:

"The Congress shall have power * * * To * * * grant letters of marque and reprisal."

Only under such a commission, issued by you, would we be authorized to arm our ships, to defend them, and our people, from the admittedly piratical and unlawful attacks, against which the duly constituted officials of our own Government refuse to offer any defense. Must American citizens be compelled to even suggest such drastic relief?

There the matter presently rests—in the hands of you gentlemen, the 531 duly elected Representatives of all our people—the constitutional superiors of each and all of the afore-mentioned public officials.

After having, as a last resort, utilized our sacred and inviolable, constitutional guaranty of the right to petition the Government for a redress of grievances (Bill of Rights amendment 1) we can do no more.

Respectfully yours,

ISBRANDTSEN CO., INC.,
By HANS J. ISBRANDTSEN,
President.

NEW YORK, *January 9, 1950.*

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 203. Resolution to pay compensation for a certain period to employees of former Senator John Foster Dulles; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1209);

S. Res. 205. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to employ assistants and make expenditures in studying relationships of the United States with States and certain international organizations; without amendment (Rept. No. 1210);

S. Res. 206. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to employ temporary assistants and make expenditures in studying the operations of Government activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 1211); and

S. Res. 207. Resolution providing additional personnel for the official reporters of the Senate; without amendment (Rept. No. 1212).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

DECEMBER 31, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
J. Nelson Tribby, chief clerk	$10,846.00	$5,250.98
Justice M. Chambers, staff adviser	10,846.00	5,250.98
Mark H. Galusha, staff adviser	10,846.00	5,250.98
Verne D. Mudge, staff adviser	10,846.00	5,250.98
Herbert S. Atkinson, assistant chief clerk	7,109.06	3,441.68
Georgia P. Earle, clerical assistant	4,154.38	2,011.22
Irene P. Gray, clerical assistant	4,154.38	2,011.22
Roberta Van Beek, clerical assistant	4,154.38	2,011.22

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 81st Cong	$10,000.00
Amount expended, Jan. 1, 1949, to June 30, 1949	8,290.20
Balance unexpended, July 1, 1949	1,709.80
Funds authorized by S. Res. 149	10,000.00
Total	11,709.80
Amount expended, July 1, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1949	5,406.43
Balance unexpended, Dec. 31, 1949	6,303.37

M. E. TYDINGS,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1950.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Virginia Bobo, assistant chief clerk	$4,849.61	$2,347.82
H. W. Brawley, assistant staff director	10,846.00	5,250.98
Costas D. Chrissos, clerical assistant	4,415.10	2,137.44
Andy Faucette,[1] staff member	10,846.00	2,553.71
Colette E. Homan, clerical assistant	4,415.10	2,137.44
Mrs. Linda House, clerical assistant	3,980.59	1,127.10
Mary Irwin,[2] staff member	10,846.00	3,529.32
J. Austin Latimer, staff director	10,846.00	5,250.98
Dorothy Lynott,[3] clerical assistant	3,956.56	824.27
Ethel Morgan, clerical assistant	4,154.38	2,011.22
E. Luise Shawn, clerical assistant	4,154.38	2,011.22
Mrs. Jennie Ulsrud,[4] staff member	10,330.00	1,721.66

[1] Appointed Oct. 5, 1949.
[2] Appointed Sept. 1, 1949.
[3] Terminated Sept. 15, 1949.
[4] Terminated Aug. 31, 1949.

Funds authorized by Reorganization Act and S. Res. 78 and S. Res. 179	$5,454.76
Amount expended	2,961.71
Balance as of Dec. 31, 1949	2,493.05
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure (includes S. Res. 167)	16,433.11
Amount expended	3,714.51
Balance unexpended	12,718.60

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 6, 1950.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
J. G. Sourwine, counsel	$10,846.00	$5,250.98
Joseph A. Davis, chief clerk	9,683.21	4,687.86
Francis C. Rosenberger, assistant chief clerk	7,858.27	3,804.38
J. Carlisle Ruddy, professional staff	9,683.21	4,687.86
Robert B. Young, professional staff	9,517.31	4,607.56
Maurice W. Covert, professional staff	9,517.31	4,607.56
George S. Green, professional staff	8,438.93	4,085.48
John H. Mathews, professional staff	8,438.93	4,085.48
Mary Rogers, clerical assistant	5,805.53	2,810.58
Miriam O. Fox, clerical assistant	5,805.53	2,810.58
Mildred E. Canon, clerical assistant	5,805.53	2,810.58
H. Joan Sheaff, clerical assistant	4,936.51	2,389.86
Barbara E. Duborg, clerical assistant	4,936.51	2,389.86
Patience E. McNamee, clerical assistant	4,936.51	2,389.86
Orrin E. Creesy, clerical assistant	4,675.80	2,263.66

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$20,000.00
Amount expended	11,822.54
Balance unexpended	8,677.46

PAT MCCARRAN, *Chairman.*

DECEMBER 31, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Richard Arens, staff director	$10,015.02	$4,848.52
Drury Harvey Blair, staff member	7,775.31	3,764.20
William F. Cochran, staff member	1,697.85	1,113.06
Dorothy A. Davis, stenographer	4,154.38	2,011.22
Thomas J. Davis, staff member	7,775.31	3,764.20
Otto J. Dekom, investigator	7,277.60	3,524.24
Slobodan M. Draskovitch, investigator[1]	3,956.56	406.64
Owen K. Earl, staff member	2,527.14	1,223.42
Elizabeth Ann Edwards, stenographer[1]	4,415.10	725.84
Katherine S. Florence, stenographer[1]	4,154.38	126.93
Charles A. Grefe, staff member[1]	6,326.94	2,535.76
Ethel L. Johnson, staff member	7,360.55	3,563.42
John A. Loftus, assistant staff director	8,190.07	3,965.00
Stephanie E. Lojewski, stenographer	4,415.10	2,075.37
Guy M. Massey, staff member	7,360.55	3,563.42
Margaret M. Mechling, stenographer	4,154.38	2,011.22
Fred M. Mesmer, staff member	7,775.31	3,764.20
James C. Messersmith, staff member	7,277.60	3,523.24
Marion L. Morgan, stenographer	4,154.38	1,142.98
Mary E. Morrill, stenographer	4,154.38	2,011.22
Anne F. Noyes, staff member[1]	7,277.60	2,552.90
Lois Catherine Odham, stenographer	4,675.80	2,263.66
Margaret J. Polsom, stenographer[1]	3,956.56	1,318.84
Frank P. Randolph, staff member[1]	6,931.05	2,021.53
Frank W. Schroeder, investigator	7,775.31	3,645.80
Wayne H. Smithey, staff member	5,284.12	2,309.88
Mary A. Turner, stenographer	4,154.38	2,011.22
Joseph V. Wilcox, staff member	4,154.38	2,011.22
Francis L. Williamson, staff member	7,277.60	3,523.24
John F. Zimmermann, staff member[1]	6,025.66	1,757.45

[1] Terminated.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$235,000.00
Amount expended	204,828.15
Balance unexpended	30,171.85

PAT MCCARRAN, *Chairman.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Denis J. McMahon, of New York, N. Y., to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of New York, to fill an existing vacancy;

George T. Cromwell, of Ferndale, Md., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 13, with headquarters at Baltimore, Md. (reappointment);

James J. Connors, of Juneau, Alaska, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 31, with headquarters at Juneau, Alaska (reappointment); and

Harry A. Zinn, of Denver, Colo., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo. (reappointment).

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

James E. Webb, of North Carolina, to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Monetary Fund, and United States Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 5 years;

William McChesney Martin, Jr., of New York, to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years; and

John S. Hooker, of Maryland, to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 2 years and until his successor has been appointed, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 2838. A bill for the relief of John Bernard McBride; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2839. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Nicholas George Strangas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 2840. A bill for the relief of Adam Papachristopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 2841. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the death of John James Audubon; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2842. A bill for the relief of Arno Edvin Kolm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE):

S. 2843. A bill for the relief of Sisters Pasqualina Bova, Rosa Pellanda, Emilia Dei Rossi, Speranza Zoia, and Domenica Lapadula; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2844. A bill for the relief of Biagio Poidimani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey) introduced Senate bill 2845, to enable the President to obligate funds heretofore appropriated for assistance in certain areas in China until June 30, 1950, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2846. A bill for the relief of the United Transformer Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. J. Res. 141. Joint resolution to change the name of the reservoir to be formed above Garrison Dam and known as Garrison Reservoir or Garrison Lake, to Lake Thompson; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ECONOMIC AID TO CHINA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and myself, I introduce a bill which proposes to extend title 4 of the ECA Act, insofar as it relates to economic aid for China, from its present termination date of February 15, to the end of the fiscal year June 30, 1950. Inasmuch as the President indicated recently that he was favorably disposed toward economic aid, I hope this will meet with his approval.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2845) to enable the President to obligate funds heretofore appropriated for assistance in certain areas in China until June 30, 1950, introduced by Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONSTRUCTION, REPAIR, AND PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS—AMENDMENT

Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was authorized to hold hearings this afternoon and tomorrow afternoon on the Langer bill.

On request of Mr. MAYBANK and by unanimous consent the housing subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee was authorized to hold a hearing this afternoon.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NEBRASKA STATE BAR ASSOCIATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by him at the fiftieth anniversary meeting of the Nebraska State Bar Association, Omaha, Nebr., October 21, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MYERS BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA SOCIETY OF NEW YORK

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Pennsylvania Society of New York, at the annual dinner of the society, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York on December 10, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

LOCAL PUBLIC-WORKS PLANNING AND HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION—NEWS LETTER BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Washington news letter prepared by him regarding local public-works planning and hospital construction, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOOVER REPORT—NEWS LETTER BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a news letter prepared by him regarding the Hoover report, which appears in the Appendix.]

EARLY SENATE LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR, 1950—NEWS LETTER BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a news letter prepared by him regarding the early Senate legislative calendar for 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

IMPROVEMENT OF GENERAL WELFARE IN 1949—NEWS LETTER BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a news letter prepared by him regarding improvement of general welfare in 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY PAUL G. HOFFMAN BEFORE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Paul G. Hoffman, Economic Cooperation Administrator, before the annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges, Cincinnati, Ohio, January 10, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR GREEN'S ADVOCACY OF FISHERIES CONSERVATION — EDITORIAL FROM THE PAWTUCKET (R. I.) TIMES

[Mr. LEAHY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Green for Conservation," published in the Pawtucket (R. I.) Times of January 9, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR MORSE'S ADVICE TO THE REPUBLICANS—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Maverick's Advice to the GOP," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION—EDITORIAL FROM THE SPRINGFIELD (MASS.) UNION

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Genocide Convention," published in the Springfield (Mass.) Union of December 24, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECOGNITION OF SPAIN—ARTICLE BY CONSTANTINE BROWN

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "United States Boycott of Spain Has Rallied Peoples Behind the Franco Banner" written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Washington Star of November 15, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPORT FROM INDIA

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two articles by Mr. and Mrs. Harris Wofford, one published in the November 1949 issue of the magazine Common Cause, and the other published in the St. Paul (Minn.) Dispatch of November 25, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

NEW YORK TIMES EDUCATIONAL SURVEY

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a regional break-down of a study undertaken by the New York Times through its education editor, Dr. Benjamin Fine, published in the New York Times of January 9, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CRISIS IN EDUCATION—ARTICLE BY DR. BENJAMIN FINE

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "United States Schools Still Impaired Despite Gains in Teachers," written by Dr. Benjamin Fine, and published in the New York Times of January 9, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FORMOSA CRUSADE—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Formosa Crusade," written by

Walter Lippmann, and published in the Washington Post of January 5, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

VALUE OF INSPECTION TRIPS BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY FRED SPARKS

[Mr. FERGUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Sparks Defends Junketeers' Right To Criticize Allies," written by Fred Sparks, and published in the Chicago Daily News of January 6, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

LAYING AWAY THE COLORS—EXCERPT FROM ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an address he delivered at the ceremony of laying away the colors in the Hall of Trophies, Pennsylvania State Museum, Harrisburg, Pa., on October 19, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

WARREN R. AUSTIN

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a fellow Vermonter well known to this body, and whose seat on this floor I now have the privilege of filling.

At the suggestion of the American Legion, the school children of Vermont are today honoring their greatest fellow citizen, Warren R. Austin, United States Ambassador to the United Nations. I wish to put on record at this time my own personal tribute to his character and services, so that they may be recognized here at the same time that the school children of Vermont are drawing inspiration from his useful life and public achievements.

Warren Austin was born in the town of Highgate, in the extreme northwestern corner of Vermont, by the shores of Lake Champlain, and close to the Canadian boundary. After completing his public-school education, he went to the University of Vermont, from which he was graduated in 1899; and then for 3 years he studied law in his father's law office in St. Albans. This was the old-fashioned way in which so many of the outstanding members of the legal profession have gained their education and experience. For 14 years he practiced as a member of his father's firm, and then removed to Burlington, Vermont's largest city, where he established his own law firm, still ably carried on by his son, who thus is third in line of succession in the profession of this notable Vermont family.

His public service commenced with his election as State's attorney of Franklin County in 1904 and United States commissioner in 1907. In 1909 he was elected mayor of St. Albans. He spent a period in 1916 and 1917 as an attorney for the American International Corp. in China, and there got his first practical experience in foreign affairs—the field in which he has become so distinguished. In a special election in March of 1931 he was elected to the United States Senate to fill out the unexpired term of Senator Frank L. Greene. He was reelected in 1934, and again in 1940.

It is not necessary for me to detail his services as a member of the United States Senate. They speak for themselves, and are carried in the memories of many men who have their seats upon this floor. He was a hard-working Senator, constructive in committee work, and wise in counsel. Vermont was proud of him. He was a member of the Atomic Energy Committee, the Committees on Territories and Insular Affairs, on Military Affairs, and on Interstate Commerce. As a member of the Military Affairs Committee he shared the responsibility of introducing the first armed-services-unification bill. He early saw the inevitability of our involvement in world conflict. Both on the floor of the Senate and among his constituents in Vermont he led in the movement which finally provided for the draft and put our Nation in a state of military preparedness. But it was his assignment to the Committee on Foreign Relations which particularly intrigued his interests, and on which he rendered his most valuable service.

It was with the conviction that the President had made a wise choice that the people of our State received the news of his appointment to his present high office. The wisdom of that choice has been increasingly evident during the years that Ambassador Austin has fulfilled the requirements of the difficult and dangerous assignment which was given him. His patience, his intelligence, his wide knowledge of international situations, and his devotion to the cause of peace among the nations of the earth are known to all.

There is a parallel between his personal history and that of our country in the years since his birth in 1877. The country boy grew up, went to school, prepared himself for professional work, and entered doors that were opened to him time after time into fields of greater usefulness and responsibility. As in the case of the man, so also in the case of our country: We have grown; we have learned; we have found unavoidable responsibilities thrust upon us; and inevitably we have become responsible leaders in world affairs, just as Ambassador Austin, through the inevitability of his experience, judgment, and character, has grown to play the leading part in the broadest theater and the most stirring drama that has ever appeared on the stage of human history.

Vermont is proud of its son; and I am glad, as one of his fellow citizens, to add my word of tribute to the work and worth of Warren Robinson Austin.

LOCATION OF STEEL MILL IN NEW ENGLAND—LETTER FROM SENATOR McMAHON TO SENATOR O'MAHONEY

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I wrote to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], chairman of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, under date of January 5, 1950, concerning hearings which his committee will begin on January 24 relative to the steel situation in the United States. In my letter to the Senator from Wyoming I have outlined the situation as it pertains to New England and New England's determination to go forward with the securing of steel production facilities in the New England area.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 5, 1950.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Joint Committee on the Economic Report,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: I wish to commend the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, of which you are chairman, for its decision to explore current steel prices and their effect on the national economy. This inquiry should yield fruitful results.

I am especially pleased that you have asked to appear as a witness, Dr. Alfred C. Neal, vice president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, who is in a position to offer facts and figures which should prove of substantial value to the work of the committee. Dr. Neal is an eminent economist who is thoroughly familiar with the steel situation both nationally and locally.

For some time past, the New England Council has sponsored an effort to locate in New England a steel mill of sufficient size to help meet the growing demands for steel in that area.

New England has an abundance of metal fabricating plants which are vital to its continued prosperity and the undisputed fact is that New England has been handicapped by a lack of sufficient steel for many years past. This has placed a severe hardship upon the economy of the whole New England area.

There are now available around the rim of the Atlantic Ocean ore deposits which are more than sufficient in size and quality to supply a New England steel mill at prices substantially below those now prevailing in the steel industry. New England has the financial resources and the available markets. There is every economic reason why a steel plant should be located in New England to meet the needs of an expanding economy.

Our system of private enterprise cannot be static; it must be dynamic to meet the growing needs of our people. A steel mill in New England would not constitute a threat to present steel facilities; on the contrary it would complement those now in existence.

The New England Council has sought the cooperation of those producing steel companies which possess the experience and technical skills to operate a steel mill of the proposed scope. This policy was adopted in the belief that the project would be mutually advantageous and a wholesome development for the Nation's economy.

It is unpleasant but true that there has developed what seems to be a concerted effort among leading steel producers to oppose the development of a steel mill in New England. This opposition is based, not upon economic grounds, but upon reasons which certainly will bear the most careful scrutiny by your committee. I believe it is beyond dispute that the normal economic growth of the Nation must not be impeded by artificial restraints imposed by a small group of willful men.

In a recent message, President Truman wished the New England Council "every success in working out a satisfactory arrangement with the steel companies." The Chief Executive thus expressed the universal belief that the operation of a steel mill in New England, under private auspices, would be a healthy thing for the economy of the United States.

Steel is the hard core of modern industrial life. In a very real sense, the availability of steel expands or retards our national prosperity. Steel in sufficient quantities at reasonable prices is vital to the growth and development of New England.

I may add that New England will have a steel mill, despite the outspoken or undercover hostility of special interests which may oppose it. But I believe your committee will perform a distinct public service by placing the facts before the public.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

BRIEN MCMAHON,
United States Senator.

LABOR-RELATIONS POLICY—ARTICLE BY THOMAS L. STOKES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most pressing problems facing the Congress of the United States is that of our country's labor-relations policy. The debate during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress on the Thomas bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley law demonstrated to my mind proof of the conclusion that the Taft-Hartley law has created a climate in labor relations which is conducive more toward hostility, bitterness, and interference with the civil rights of vast numbers of American working men and women than toward a firm basis for friendly and constructive collective bargaining. That debate has ended, and for the time being the Taft-Hartley issue is not on the floor of the Senate. It may well be that the American electorate again will have to express itself at the polls before its will to repeal the Taft-Hartley law can be expressed in legislation.

We do have a responsibility, however, to face the facts. In many sections of America the labor movement faces a struggle for its very existence, as employers who choose to interfere with attempts of their employees to organize into unions of their own choosing receive encouragement from the Taft-Hartley law. Here is a most serious problem involving basic civil rights.

A subcommittee on labor-management relations has been appointed by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. I am a member of that subcommittee, and I urged the subcommittee to concern itself with this problem and inform the American people of the facts.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a recent article by Thomas L. Stokes, and I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for consideration by that subcommittee.

There being no objection, the article was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OLD TRICK REAPPEARS

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON.—There is much loose talk about big labor and the labor monopoly.

It refers to giant unions embracing, in some cases, hundreds of thousands of workers in basic industries—coal, steel, automobiles, and the like. They were organized on an industry-wide scale to meet the corporate power of giant industry with which they had to deal.

But there is one part of the country where they haven't seen much labor monopoly. That is the South, where the monopoly power seems still to be on the other side. Tradeunionism is in the pioneer era yet in some respects and encounters old tricks abandoned long ago elsewhere.

There is, for example, the illuminating case history of two textile mills in northern Alabama, at Albertsville and Guntersville in the heart of the TVA area, formerly the Saratoga-Victory Mills which employed 750 persons. The workers there were organized into unions of the Textile Workers Union of America and contracts went into effect July 1, 1946.

Last spring the two plants were closed down with the announcement that they could not be operated profitably. Immediately things began to happen.

The supervisory force left at the plants, under direction of W. H. McGaha, began a campaign to break up the union.

The first tactics were to circulate printed cards to the workers authorizing withdrawal from the union. In July the tactics became more direct. Through an employee of the Albertsville plant the superintendent had the word passed around among former workers that there was a prospective buyer for the mill who operated nine other nonunion plants. The deal would not go through, the workers were informed, if there was a union at the plant.

Since the plant had been closed 3 months by that time, this was persuasive with a number of workers who needed jobs.

At Guntersville, Mr. McGaha told a committee of former employees that it would begin operations if the workers would sign a petition saying they would not join a union.

The plot unfolded neatly in early October when sale of the plants was announced to the J. R. Abney interests of Anderson, S. C. The mills were reopened October 17. In its rehiring, the company avoided workers formerly active in the union and hired some persons who had not worked in cotton mills for years and had never worked at either of the two plants.

The union has filed charges with the NLRB, claiming violation of the National Labor Relations Act, listing 400 workers who have been denied employment. It will take a long time for this to go through the procedures and possibly the courts.

The labor monopoly does not seem to work in the South. It is still not so simple as the propaganda makes out.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] to the original bill, on page 4, after line 10.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on the floor of the Senate we have been discussing all last week, and up until now of this week, the question of whether we shall repeal the oleomargarine tax. There is very little I can add at this time to the discussion which has previously occurred; but I wish to go on record on this issue, so that everyone will understand my position. I shall not at this time undertake to make any extended remarks; neither am I going to discuss the amendments to the bill. I am speaking purely upon the merits of the proposed repeal of the oleomargarine tax.

So far as the amendments known as the Langer amendments are concerned—which insert into this particular discussion the issues of antipoll tax, antilynching, and FEPC—I certainly would want it understood that the brief remarks I am making here and now do not in any way apply to the amendments which have been offered, for in my opinion the Senate will not seriously consider those amendments at this time, because I believe the Senate as a body realizes that if we should enter upon their discussion and if it became necessary to call for cloture in the Senate, then, of course, the antilynch, antipoll tax, and FEPC issues would be stripped from the bill, and we would consider only the oleomargarine tax. Therefore, it is not for the best interests of the Senate, as I see the situation, to discuss at length these other issues at this time. For that reason, I shall discuss only the oleomargarine tax.

Mr. President, for many decades the margarine industry has been a victim of taxation without representation. For many decades the housewives of this Nation have been unduly charged for a food product which contains many vital minerals necessary for our well-being.

In discussing this tax, I want it also understood that in my view it is more of a consumers' tax than a tax to benefit farmers or a tax to benefit the dairymen or a tax to benefit the oleomargarine industry.

We remember that in 1902, when the Federal Government imposed the tax on margarine, it was said that such laws were needed to safeguard the public from fraud and to protect the public health. Even if at that time margarine was not the nutritious food it is now, the situation could have been dealt with more effectively by stricter pure-food laws. The arguments applying then no longer apply. Today, it is a case of the butter boys against justice. That is my way of looking at it.

Cooking experts say margarine is just as palatable as butter; medical men say it is just as nutritious. Anyone buying groceries knows it costs less; but it should be much less costly than it is.

Both margarine and butter contain 3,300 calories per pound; 80-percent fat by volume; and same percentage skimmilk solids. Three percent of margarine is salt and 3 percent of butter is salt. Sixteen percent of margarine is moisture and 16 of butter is moisture. Does it make sense to the housewives of the country that the Federal Government tax one and not tax the other?

As to color, margarine is colored, and so is butter, 8 months of every year. I have heard a great deal of talk on the Senate floor implying that butter has an exclusive right to the yellow color. As I see it, butter has no more right to the yellow color than has oleomargarine. In a great many instances, oleo must be decolored before it can be sold. As to taxation, the housewife must pay a tax of 10 cents on every pound of colored margarine she buys. The report on margarine by the New York Academy of Medicine states:

From a nutritional viewpoint, when it is fortified with vitamin A in the required amount—

By the way, the law requires that amount—

margarine is the equal of butter, containing the same amounts of protein, fat, carbohydrates, and calories per unit of weight. Moreover, since the minimum vitamin A content of enriched margarine is fixed, and the amount of this vitamin in butter may

range from 500 to 20,000 units per pound, enriched margarine is a more dependable source of vitamin A than is butter. Since it is a cheaper product than butter, fortified margarine constitutes a good vehicle for the distribution of vitamin A and fats to low-income groups and should, therefore, be made available to them. Under the standards set by the Food and Drug Administration, margarine is as clean and sanitary a food as butter. The two products are likewise equal in digestibility. Their relative palatability is a matter of individual taste.

Some people like the taste of butter, others like taste of oleomargarine better.

Three distinguished scientists at the University of Illinois College of Medicine conducted a 2-year study of 217 children in two orphanages. The children in one were fed margarine while the children in the other were fed butter. The report reads like this:

Blood studies showed that there were no significant differences between the margarine or butter groups.

The children in the margarine group experienced a high degree of good health during the study and in comparing their health to those in the butter group it appears to have been much better.

When infirmary records are compared, it is readily seen that the margarine group fared much better than the butter group. We are not making claims that the margarine group were healthier simply because their diet contained margarine. Other variables are more likely to account for their better health.

In 1886 it was contended that margarine was an unhealthy food and was being sold fraudulently as butter. In 1902, when the original law—which imposed a 2-cent tax on all margarine—was amended to reduce the tax on uncolored margarine and place an almost prohibitive impost on the artificially colored yellow product the argument was again made that consumers must be protected from fraud. In 1931, when the 10-cent tax was extended to all yellow margarine—whether artificially or naturally colored—the contention was made that margarine was a "foreign" product since a great deal of it was being made from imported palm and coconut oil.

I should like to point out here that the foreign argument is of no importance today. More than 95 percent of all margarine is now made of domestic ingredients. This argument is as archaic today as the contention that margarine is an unhealthy food.

There are, of course, no sound reasons for the imposition of these taxes and license fees on margarine, any more than there would be for the imposition of a tax on 10 cents on every pound of butter.

Both margarine and butter are colored yellow to meet food habits. We are accustomed to yellow table spreads just as we are used to white milk. If anyone should try to sell black milk, no one would want to drink it. The same thing is true of butter and of oleomargarine. We would look with distaste upon green milk—though in every respect except color it might be identical with other milk. Our housewives do not object to white margarine for cooking purposes. They are accustomed to white cooking fats—such as lard. But they do want their margarine for table use to be yellow. There is no valid reason why their preference should be ignored or thwarted.

Margarine looks like butter. It is quite amusing to listen to the speeches of those who say they do not want us even to put margarine in a package that makes it look like butter, although it is printed plainly on the package that it is oleomargarine. God made both to look as they look in their natural state.

Furthermore, margarine imitates and is a substitute for butter, but what is wrong with that? If we are to levy a tax on all products which imitate the original, in color and other characteristics, we are going to stifle competition. The very essence of competition is to develop new products which are like the old but which are better and cheaper.

Of course, the supreme irony of this amazing claim of butter to a monopoly on yellow is that the fats and oils used in the manufacture of margarine contain some naturally yellow color. Under Federal regulations, however, these fats and oils must be bleached, a process which adds to the cost of manufacture in order to make white margarine. If the manufacturers did not bleach it, they would violate the law. It would probably be yellow in some instances, and then it would be a direct violation of the law. Otherwise, the margarine resulting would have to pay the 10 cents a pound Federal tax.

The butter boys tell us that this tax was imposed because the Government needed the revenue and to protect the public from fraud. But the people know it was imposed by butter interests in order to outlaw the sale of margarine. The housewives, however, have great faith in margarine and they have continued to buy it. It is only logic to buy margarine because it is as good as butter in every respect and can be made for much less.

Let me also state that it is my humble opinion that so far as putting the butter interests out of business is concerned, the removal of the tax of 10 cents on margarine will not affect in a material way the amount of butter sold, and will not, in any material way, affect the sale of oleomargarine. But repeal will eliminate a tax which I consider inequitable, a tax which has no proper place in our economy, a tax which is nothing more nor less than an imposition on people who are buying oleomargarine.

Spokesmen for the butter industry have made every sort of claim against the margarine industry. They have even said that soybeans, the principal ingredient of margarine, are detrimental to the soil. Contrary to that statement, the soybean plant is a legume; it restores nitrogen to the soil. Any specialist in soil conservation will tell us that all land must be put to its best use. It is an established fact that one acre of soybeans will produce more butter fat than will two acres used for dairying. One man-hour of labor will produce 13.3 pounds of soybean oil compared with 1.5 pounds of butter fat.

I think the development of margarine has contributed much and will contribute much more to the health of the people in this Nation, because it brings a highly nutritive food to many who could not afford butter. It has been recommended before, and I want to recommend again, that the taxes and license fees be removed from margarine and the sale of margarine be encouraged. We are robbing some while we starve others just to protect the butter industry by taxation, and I want the people to know that the tax money has not amounted to a hill of beans. It no more than pays for enforcing the collection of the tax.

In conclusion, I should like to emphasize this point: I do not believe there is a single Member of the Congress who wants to destroy the butter industry. I do not believe any of the Members who have introduced bills for the repeal of the antimargarine laws want to hurt the dairy industry. It is my sincere belief that the repeal of these laws would be to the advantage of all farmers, including dairy farmers, and of the American people generally.

Much of the argument voiced in defense of the antimargarine laws has been based on an unproved assumption that without this discriminatory legislation, the dairy industry would be disrupted. There has been no proof submitted in Congress or elsewhere, so far as I am aware, to support this assumption. All the evidence I have seen—and I have studied this question carefully—abundantly proves the contrary.

On the other hand, it is clear that restrictions hamper and curtail the production and distribution of margarine and restrict those who produce the ingredients of margarine—more than 2,300,000 American farmers. As I have indicated, they are also restrictions upon the welfare of the great livestock industries of needy people at home and abroad and upon the best interests of the whole American people.

Mr. President, I hope that all Members of the Senate, regardless of party affiliation, will study the facts in this issue carefully and without prejudice. I am confident, if this is done, that there can be but one outcome; the antimargarine laws will be, at long last, removed from the statute books. If that be done, I believe the farmers, as well as the consumers, will be benefited thereby.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have listened to the discussion of oleomargarine by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, who has just yielded the floor. I think he made a very effective argument from the standpoint of one representing his sectional interest and desirous of promoting the production of oleomargarine. I was, however, tremendously impressed by one statement which he made, to the effect that some persons like the taste of butter and some persons like the taste of oleomargarine. Those of us who are representing the dairy farmers and the majority of the farmers of America on this issue should like to keep the distinction clear between oleomargarine and butter, so that those who prefer the taste of butter may have butter, and those, to quote the Senator from South Carolina, who prefer the taste of oleomargarine, may have oleomargarine, and so that each may know what he is getting, so that each may know what is being served in restaurants and hotels,

so that there may be no confusion or deception, so that a customer desiring butter may eat butter, and one who prefers oleomargarine may eat oleomargarine.

We accept that line of reasoning completely. Our legislation is based on that principle.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to withdraw my amendment lettered "D." It was offered both to the original bill and the substitute. I should like to explain my reasons for desiring to withdraw it. It is a very simple amendment which provides that all oleomargarine must be labeled in letters one-half inch high, "This is not a dairy product." I was not aware of the situation at the time I offered the amendment. My purpose was to prevent the fraud and deception now practiced. However, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] has handed me a telegram which is very convincing. It reads as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 9, 1950.*

Hon. IRVIN M. IVES,
Senate Office Building:

Understand Senator McCARTHY proposes to require oleomargarine to be labeled "This is not a dairy product." Such labeling would mislead many Jewish people who observe the religious dietary laws. They would believe that vegetable oleomargarine contains no milk and therefore could be served and eaten with meat products. However, milk content of margarine forbids such use under kosher laws. On behalf of the Synagogue Council of America, representing the reform, conservative, and orthodox rabbis and congregations, I urge you to do all that you can to prevent any such misconception.

RABBI HERBERT S. GOLDSTEIN,
Chairman, Committee on Religious Observance, Synagogue Council of America.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that many brands of oleomargarine contain a very small percentage of dry skim milk, I can see that such labeling would be deceptive insofar as concerns persons who follow the orthodox Jewish faith. For that reason I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to withdraw the amendment. I shall prepare another amendment which will accomplish the desired results and, at the same time, be fair to the Jewish people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEAHY in the chair). The Chair inquires, is that amendment now before the Senate?

Mr. McCARTHY. It is now before the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, is that the second amendment, which says the product is not a dairy product?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was not offered. It was merely presented to be printed and to lie on the table, was it not?

Mr. McCARTHY. It was offered to the Wiley-Gillette substitute, and I desire at this time to withdraw it from the Wiley-Gillette substitute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have no objection. I merely wanted to be clear as to what was done.

Mr. McCARTHY. Insofar as the bill of the Senator from Arkansas is concerned, the amendment merely has been printed and is lying on the table, and I said I was going to offer it to the Senator's bill also, but under the parliamentary rules I could not offer it at the time I presented it. It has been offered as an amendment to the Wiley-Gillette substitute, and my request now is that I be allowed to withdraw it as such.

Mr. MUNDT. It is an amendment offered to the proposed substitute, is it not?

Mr. McCARTHY. It is an amendment offered to the proposed Wiley-Gillette substitute.

Mr. MUNDT. And is not now a part of the proposed substitute?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think it may have been made a part of the substitute by unanimous consent. If so, I wish to withdraw it, and I have talked to as many of the sponsors of the substitute as I could contact, and there is no objection to my withdrawing it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the amendment has never been offered to the Wiley-Gillette substitute.

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe the Chair has made an error. I was here at the time it was offered, and the sponsors of the Wiley-Gillette substitute did accept the amendment at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that it was not accepted.

Mr. McCARTHY. If that is correct, may I have an understanding that it is withdrawn, if it was accepted, and is not now a part of the Gillette-Wiley substitute, so that it is not before the Senate at this time?

Mr. MUNDT. It does not appear in the language of the substitute in which we have all joined and which we offered together as a substitute for H. R. 2023.

Mr. McCARTHY. If that be true, then there was an unfortunate mistake on the part of the clerk, because the sponsors of the Wiley-Gillette substitute did accept it.

Mr. MUNDT. At least the Senator's explanation will certainly clarify the record, so that there will be no misunderstanding.

Mr. McCARTHY. I intend to prepare another amendment, which will call for substantially the same kind of provision, but will make it clear to those who are orthodox Jewish people that there is a small percentage of skim milk in the product, so that they will not be deceived.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield, while the Senator from Wisconsin is on the floor, so that I may call attention to amendment D offered by the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is not the amendment to which I am referring.

Mr. AIKEN. May I call attention to that at this time?

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Mr. AIKEN. The amendment is intended to prevent misrepresentation in the marketing of oleomargarine, and also to prevent misrepresenting it as being a product made from dairy fats.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that his amendment does not provide a penalty, or at least an adequate penalty. The only penalty provided in it will be found in the Clayton Act, a $5,000 fine. If that fine is not paid for a year, it will amount to merely $5,000. I have had prepared an amendment to the Senator's amendment which reads as follows:

On page 2 of the amendment, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following new subsection:

"(c) Subsection (e) of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Each separate violation of such an order shall be a separate offense, except that in the case of a violation through continuing failure or neglect to obey a final order of the Commission each day of continuance of such failure or neglect shall be deemed a separate offense.'"

I wish the Senator from Wisconsin would take this amendment, look it over, and see if he cannot accept it as an amendment to his amendment, because it is apparent there must be provided some effective penalty against misbranding and misrepresentation, or the oleo interests would simply laugh.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator's amendment would simply put teeth in the McCarthy amendment, would it not?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, it would put teeth in the McCarthy amendment, and not only make violators liable to a $5,000 fine, but if they dragged the payment of the fine out over a year or a year and a half, the penalty would be $5,000 for each day they delayed paying the fine.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I think that is an excellent idea. I should have no objection whatsoever to accepting that modification of the amendment. I believe, however, the Senator said it would come between lines 18 and 19. I presume he meant between lines 20 and 21.

Mr. AIKEN. That is why I suggested that the Senator from Wisconsin look it over, to see that it is correct in detail.

Mr. McCARTHY. While I am very happy to accept the modification, in view of the fact that my amendment had already been accepted as a modification of the Wiley-Gillette amendment, I should want to talk to all the sponsors of the Wiley-Gillette amendment and see whether they objected to the modification.

Mr. AIKEN. In the event the Wiley-Gillette amendment is not accepted by the Senate, I understand that the Senator from Wisconsin intends to propose his amendment as an amendment to the bill itself, does he not?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; and I understand that the Senator from Arkansas is at least very seriously considering the acceptance of this amendment to his original bill in case the Wiley-Gillette amendment shall not be accepted.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am sorry I was not attending to the colloquy. What amendment is the Senator discussing?

Mr. McCARTHY. Amendment (E), which has to do with the fraudulent advertising of oleomargarine.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the pending amendment?

Mr. McCARTHY. The pending amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. When the time comes I shall consider discussing it with the Senator. I am inclined to think it is not too objectionable. There are one or two suggestions I desire to make when the proper time comes for voting on it. I may say that, generally speaking, it is not a very objectionable amendment, and it may well be we can agree on it.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to suggest that we delay further debate on this matter until the time comes when the amendment is before the Senate. I yielded for the Senator from Wisconsin to secure unanimous consent and I hope the Senator will be willing to postpone further discussion.

Mr. McCARTHY. In calling this amendment to the attention of the Senator from Arkansas I wish to direct his notice to the fact that the amendment has been modified, so that there will be no objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not understand it had been modified. Has the amendment which is pending been modified?

Mr. McCARTHY. It has been modified by an amendment suggested by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. To provide a penalty, because it is obvious that the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin would not amount to much without a penalty provided.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What I had to say a moment ago referred to the amendment before it was modified. Will it be printed as modified?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall be glad to consider it. I do not know what the nature of the penalty is. There are already penalties provided in the Pure Food and Drugs Act.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, before the colloquy initiated by the Senator from Wisconsin became a part of the RECORD, I was pointing out that people who believe that butter has a right to the protection it now has under the present law need the protection they would get under the substitute which we have joined in offering. I concur completely in that major thesis developed by the Senator from South Carolina when he said that people who like butter better have a right to buy butter, and those who like oleomargarine better have a right to buy oleomargarine. I suggest that from those two facts there must come a third fact; namely, that each has the right to know what he is buying and what he is eating. We have proposed substitute legislation which protects him in that third right, which is just as important as either of the other two.

I also concur in another statement made by the Senator from South Carolina in his appealing discourse from the standpoint of the oleomargarine people, when he said that the housewives have no objection to using white oleomargarine for cooking purposes, but that the housewives insist that they want yellow oleomargarine for table use. Then he said that the American public has been accustomed to preferring a yellow table spread. Then he stopped and got away from what would be a logical sequence—how it happens that of all the colors of the spectrum, the American public has been accustomed to preferring yellow as a table spread. He knows what he did not say, so I say it for him, that the only reason in the world why the American public has become accustomed to preferring yellow as a table spread is because yellow is the color of butter, and people prefer butter. Many people presume that they are getting butter if they get something yellow on their bread. It is against that kind of dishonest delusion that we protest.

There are many other colors the oleomargarine producers could use. People in America do not object to using red as a table spread if the red is actually plum jelly, but they do not like to have foisted on them something colored red and tasting like oleomargarine, and appearing like plum jelly, because the manufacturers, apparently, cannot simulate the taste of plum jelly. Oleomargarine does imitate the taste of butter and the color of butter and the appearance of butter. There is a universal acceptance of butter as a preferred table spread, to such an extent even that, as the Senator from South Carolina said, for some strange reason the American public wants their table spread colored yellow, and that is the reason why those from the oleomargarine area want to enable the people to buy yellow oleomargarine.

Mr. President, for a long time during this debate, as I have heard it and read it, it has been hard for me to find out exactly why the Democratic Party put an oleomargarine plank in its national platform. It has been exceedingly difficult for me to know exactly why the Democrats have joined in these tragic days filled with many major problems in placing the repeal of the protection which the butter makers now enjoy against oleomargarine so high on the agenda and making that proposal an important must piece of legislation rather than considering some problem of real importance to our domestic or foreign situation. I have tried to analyze it objectively. I have tried to understand it because it seems to me important that we should understand it if we are to debate against the point of view and if we are to have a knowledge of the reasons why other people, whose judgments we respect, differ from us.

I think there are probably two major groups who are leading the battle against butter—two major groups who are leading the battle in behalf of the producers of oleomargarine. The first group, I think, is made up of Senators from the areas of America which produce an abundance of vegetable oil which the producers would like to convert into oleomargarine, and consequently those Senators feel that they will increase the prosperity and happiness of their section of the country if they can induce the American public, by hook or by crook, by color or without color, to use an additional amount of oleomargarine.

I think the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] falls into that category of support. I am sure the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] comes within that category. I am sure that many of the other Senators who have spoken for the oleomargarine-tax repealer, and who live in that area of the country, speak with that sort of understandable sincerity. But there are others on the Democratic side who joined in getting the oleo plank in the national platform, which was agreed to in a convention, who had a tremendous amount of difficulty in bringing together the points of view of the North and the South on anything else that was written into the Democratic platform. They agreed on this one point, however.

It seems to me that with respect to the other group or faction of the Democratic Party which does not come from a part of the country which produces oleomargarine, vegetable oil, the group which, in fact, in part, comes from a part of the country where they are trying to develop a dairy industry, we are confronted with just some plain, practical Pendergast politics which believes it can get some votes now by inducing some city people to go along with them, because they are going to give them a little cheaper spread, and they probably are not going to lose many votes among the farmers, because primarily they are dealing with a group of people who have had the good judgment to vote Republican anyway.

I may be wrong, but I am going to analyze this legislation as I go along, and see whether or not that is what has brought about this remarkably happy marriage between the two sections of the Democratic Party which disagreed so repeatedly and so heatedly on so many other issues at the party convention.

I think it can be demonstrated successfully that this proposal is not in the interest of the American farmer. It certainly is a proposal which is not going to increase his income. It is going to decrease it. I think that can be demonstrated from the arithmetic of the situation. The dairy industry is a rather important segment of the whole farm problem with which we have all been wrestling so industriously.

Our dairy herds account for about 22 percent of the agricultural income of the United States. That is nearly one-fourth of the whole farm income we are now concerned about. We are confronted with a direct attack upon 22 percent of the income of the farmers of America. The dairy business produces annually in the United States about $7,000,000,000 of income.

It has now been conclusively shown in statistical table after statistical table that the total income of America in any fiscal year is almost exactly 7 times the income from the farm. So we are tampering with an income not only of $7,000,000,000 which now accrues to the dairy farmers of America, but we are jeopardizing the pyramiding of that income, because when we reduce one factor in the formula of 7 times an important factor, of course we reduce the final answer obtained at the end of the opera-

tion of the formula. So we are dealing with a potential income of $50,000,000,000, because the $7,000,000,000 of it that the farmer gets from the dairying industry pyramids 7 times over, as does all other new real wealth produced in this country. So when we cut down by perhaps a $1,000,000,000 the income of the dairy farmer, we cut down by $7,000,000,000 the national income for a given year. No one has argued on any side of this question, up to now, that denying the dairy farmer this protection he has enjoyed for so long will increase his income. Everyone admits it will decrease his income. We argue, understandably, about the degree to which it will decrease it, but all admit it will decrease our national farm income.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I am very much interested in that argument. As the Senator knows, in the past 10 years 1,500,000 persons have left the farms of America. In the meanwhile the population of the United States has increased some 20-odd million persons. If the process of persons leaving the farms of America continues, for reasons such as we are talking about now, the result will be very evident that instead of getting cheaper prices we will have less and less foodstuffs, and the time may come, if soil of America is depleted by what is now proposed to be done, that we may become an importing nation. That is a very dangerous factor.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the Senator from Wisconsin places his finger on a very important problem, and that is the relationship of employment on the farm to the whole business involving the production of dairy products.

I should like to quote, as a further reply to what the Senator from Wisconsin has said, a portion of the statement I made at the time hearings were held on H. R. 2023 before the Senate Committee on Finance, in April of last year. On page 39 of those hearings, included in a part of my testimony on the subject, I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin, I had this to say:

> I would like to say just one word in emphasis of the very persuasive testimony of Senator THYE about the family-size farm, because in South Dakota the dairy industry is the industry of the family-size farm.

Understandably we have heard much from the Democratic side of the aisle about the family-size farm. But up to now the first legislative proposal dealing with the family-size farm is to deny it a considerable percentage of the income it now receives from the dairy industry.

I continue to read from my testimony:

> We have less than a thousand farms out there on which 50 percent of the effort is devoted to dairying. The dairying industry is part of the operation of the family-size farm. We are concerned, all of us, in maintaining a decent income for the family-size farmer, not only a good income but a steady income from which he has some cash resources and cash income through the year.

South Dakota and North Dakota are the two States of the Union which will be most drastically hurt by the proposed legislation, because they are the two States which derive the largest percentage of their farm income from dairy products insofar as the processing of milk is concerned. In our area the dairy farmer is the average-size farmer, operating the family-size farm. We have very few exclusive dairy farms in South Dakota. Less than 1,000 are exclusively devoted to dairying, but dairying forms a part of the farming operation of every family-size farmer, and it does not set well with the farmers of South Dakota when they listen to this Democratic attack on the family-size farmer for whom the Democrats have shed so many crocodile tears in so many past election years.

One way to do something for the family-size farmer is to protect him in the right he now has to extend his cash income, and project it throughout the year by enjoying a decent profit from his dairy-farm operations and from milking his cows and selling his butterfat.

I continue to read from my testimony:

> It has been figured, and I think accurately, that by permitting oleomargarine to be sold in direct competition, with no restriction, no restraint of trade and no tax, nothing except to let it try to seduce the housewife into buying it by making it appear to look like butter, making it taste like butter, giving it the melting consistency of butter, and everything else except the nutritive value of butter, would reduce the annual income to the American farmer by over $600,000,000 per year. This $600,000,000 is now going to farmers who are at the moment not getting the parity income of which Secretary Brannan talks. So we might find ourselves running into a situation where we would have to increase the Government purchases, the Government subsidy, or the Government support program, call it what you will, by over half a billion dollars if we destroy the revenue now going to the family-size farm from the butter industry.

So I say in response to the Senator from Wisconsin, it is highly important, if we believe in developing a family-size farm income, that we permit the milk operation and the selling of milk, and the selling of butterfats to be a part of the profitable practice of people living on family-size farms.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, while I was absent I understand that my associate, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], accepted an amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] to his amendment, and I understand that that particular amendment is as follows:

> Subsection (e) of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:
>
> "Each separate violation of such order shall be a separate offense, except that in the case of a violation through continuing failure or neglect to obey a final order of the Commission each day of continuance of such failure or neglect shall be deemed a separate offense."

Mr. President, when my associate submitted his amendment the other day I accepted it to the substitute in the nature of an amendment to the pending bill. I wish at this time to accept the modification as proposed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], so that in the amendment in the nature of a substitute we will have in it the original McCarthy amendment in what might be called this Aiken language to the McCarthy amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The substitute amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin will be further modified in accordance with his statement.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Dakota will yield further, I ask that the modification just made in the amendment in the nature of a substitute may be printed, so that it will be available tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the action thus taken means that three acceptances have thus far been secured for the amendment. They await acceptance tomorrow on the part of the Senator from Arkansas.

If I may, I should like now to continue my remarks, rather than to deviate on the amendments.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask that this particular interchange or discussion appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of the Senator's remarks.

Mr. MUNDT. I object. Just let it appear at this point in the RECORD, so that the RECORD will be in orderly fashion; and I shall continue with my remarks now.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Do I correctly understand that the proposed Aiken amendment applies to any injunctive relief, as well as any criminal relief? Is that the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. WILEY. I shall let the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] answer that question. We have had a conference.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, not being a lawyer, I shall simply state that under the Federal Trade Commission law there is a fine of $5,000 for a violation.

Mr. MCCARTHY. The answer is "yes."

Mr. AIKEN. Since the junior Senator from Wisconsin says the answer is "Yes," I shall not continue, but shall let the Senator from South Dakota continue his remarks. He has been very patient.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator; that is quite all right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin desire to have the amendment as modified printed?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, continuing now in our search to try to find the underlying reasons motivating the introduction of this proposed legislation, and the fact that it has received such unanimity of support on the part of our Democratic colleagues, and the fact that it is a part of the Democratic political platform, upon which the Democrats ran successfully for office in the last election, I return to the position I have been attempting to establish, namely, that in the first instance this measure is not designed to help the farmer. Whatever

else its purpose or whomever else it is expected to aid, it is not a piece of legislation which will be beneficial to the farmer. It has been developed thus far that it destroys a considerable segment of the farmers' income.

It goes further than that, Mr. President. We have in South Dakota and elsewhere in the Middle West, and I presume throughout the country generally, a very fine group of organizations known as farmers' cooperative creameries. Most of them are rather small establishments. I helped establish one in my home town. They belong to the farmers of the area, who bring in their butterfat or place it by the roadside and have it called for by the creamery truck. They patronize a particular creamery, and generally send to it all their milk or butterfat, and frequently through that creamery they develop a particular brand of butter. They hold their annual meetings, and distribute earnings at the end of the year. By that means the dairy farmers have been able to improve the grade of dairy cattle, and frequently to bring in calves, for instance, from Wisconsin and other areas to improve the dairy herds. Thus they have been able to establish a considerable development of dairying in areas where dairying is not particularly a major activity.

This measure will make it exceedingly difficult for those dairy farmers to compete with chain cream companies or to engage in the community effort by which they have been able to establish in the small towns and small cities of America a small locally owned and locally operated cooperative to help make dairying profitable to the farmers. So this measure, if enacted, will be of no value to them. It will turn the clock backward, so far as they are concerned.

Furthermore, it seems to me, Mr. President, that this proposal in the 1948 Democratic platform runs in direct conflict with a statement the President made in his address to the joint session of Congress a few days ago. It is merely one of a series of conflicts, incidentally, but it is one of those which is pertinent to this bill, because the President—quite rightfully, in my opinion—emphasized the importance of soil conservation, and referred to it several times in the course of his address to the National Congress. I now quote one or two sentences from what the President said in that connection, namely, that the gains America has made, referring to agriculture "cannot be achieved unless we have a stable and prosperous agriculture. They cannot be achieved unless we conserve and develop our natural resources in the public interest."

A little later he said—and I agree with him:

> If we are to achieve a better life for all, the natural resources of the country must be regarded as a public trust. We must use our precious assets of soil, water, forest, and grassland in such a way that they become constantly more productive and more valuable. Government investment in the conservation and development of our resources is necessary to the future economic expansion of the country.

Mr. President, here I call attention to the fact that the Chief Executive was referring to conservation of the soil and the water on the farms of America. Any student of agriculture must recognize, I believe, the relationship of dairying to soil conservation.

In continuing to quote authorities from the Chief Executive echelon of government, let me give as my authority, in refutation to the President's argument, the statement of Dr. Bennett, Chief of the United States Soil Conservation Service, who says that—

> Few, if any, other kinds of farms respond more promptly and satisfactorily to soil and water conservation, cropping, and pasture management measures than does dairy farming.

So we propose to show that this attempt in the Democratic platform and in the present move to affect injuriously the dairy industry by making it unprofitable, although the Chief of the Soil Conservation Service and others say that dairy farming is highly beneficial to soil conservation, comes at a time when the President calls upon the country to expand its soil-conservation efforts, not to decrease them.

So, Mr. President, aside from being grossly inconsistent with the position which any one party takes, the present move would tend to destroy, to decrease, to make unprofitable soil-conservation measures which are so essential to the future of this country.

O. E. Reed, Chief of the Bureau of Dairy Industry of the Department of Agriculture—still a part of the present administration, with its unique approach to these problems by arguing on each side of every issue—says:

> No farmer has a better opportunity to keep his farm land in a high state of fertility and productiveness than a man who markets his crops through good dairy cows.

So, Mr. President, in searching for the reason for the attempt to repeal the oleomargarine taxes, it certainly is not because it is going to reinforce the President's argument that we should have soil conservation, or the President's argument that we should produce greater prosperity among family-size farms and that we should give farmers an opportunity to work together cooperatively for their common welfare and their common good.

This measure surely is not a piece of proposed legislation which is devised to help the American taxpayer. I thought perhaps the tax feature of the measure was the reason why our good Democratic friends had finally gotten together upon an issue on which they could have almost complete agreement—one to help the taxpayer, because it would decrease, rather than increase, the tax revenue.

I think the Senator from South Carolina was correct when he said the present tax does not bring very much revenue into the Federal Treasury. I agree. However, regardless of whatever this measure will not bring, there is one thing that it will bring, when this change comes, and that will be a decrease, rather than an increase, in the revenue of the Treasury. But that is not the worst feature of this measure.

It comes at a time when we are committed—correctly, in my opinion—to a farm program which insists that there be a certain kind of floor support under major farm products, and when the Government has been purchasing butter in an effort to maintain at least some semblance of a reasonable price floor under butter, as the Government has been doing in the case of eggs, corn, wheat, and many other products. The Government has been doing that now for some considerable period of time, because the people of the United States have been unable to consume or have been unwilling to consume sufficient butter, or the producers have been making too much butter or the butter prices have fallen or something in our foreign policy has shaken them down. At all events, it has become essential for the Government to support butter prices, and the Government has been doing it to a rather considerable degree. About 12,000,000 pounds of butter a month are being purchased under the support price program. Interestingly enough, about 15,000,000 pounds of colored oleomargarine are being produced and sold in this country. So there is the basis for the present arrangement. If by legislative enactment we now further decrease the market for butter, by making it possible for oleomargarine to take over all or virtually all of that market, we shall thus make it necessary for the Government to increase its purchases of butter in order to support butter prices and that segment of our agriculture. I think the Government already has made an investment of approximately $100,000,000 in the butter-production program. But if we are going to drive the price of butter down by this move to change the taxes presently applying to oleomargarine and in respect to its packaging or color or labeling or the small print which says it is oleomargarine, then we are going to have to increase the Government's investment in the butter-purchasing program, and in that way the American taxpayer will find himself purchasing a great deal of extra butter, unless there is a purpose to throw the dairy farmers to the wolves altogether, pull the price floor from under the dairy farmers, or let it sag so low that it will be impossible for dairy farmers to produce butter at any reasonable margin of profit at all.

Let us search further. Why was it the Democratic National Convention made this attack on the dairy farmer? How did it happen? Whom are we going to help by this great program of getting together on the Democratic platform in order to fight a war against butter? How come this attack on the dairy farmer? How come they single out a product which throughout the Middle West means so much to the prosperity of the farmer, and which throughout the country contributes almost 25 percent of the total farm income?

I thought perhaps it was going to be of interest to the consumer; perhaps actually they are going to help the consumer; perhaps they are going to do something worth while for the consumer. So I made an investigation of it, to see how much the consumer would be helped by taking the 10-cent tax off colored oleomargarine. At first blush it looked as if

it would be the quickest way possible to give him a table spread cheaper than he was previously getting. But I then realized, of course, that if the proponents of repeal were actually intending to help the consumer by trying to provide oleomargarine as a table spread to marginal families at a lower price, the place to have started was not with the 10-cent domestic tax but with the 22-cent foreign-import tax. The 22-cent tax could have been repealed if they were really trying to help the poor man, the little fellow, the consumer, the person with a small income, who understandably may want to buy oleomargarine because it is less expensive for his family. The place to do him a really good turn would have been to recommend, not the repeal of the 10-cents-a-pound tax, but the repeal of the 22-cents-per-pound import tax on oleomargarine. That would have given him some real relief, more than twice the relief he would get under this bill, and it would not have thrown the American dairy farmer into direct and unfair competition with the oleomargarine trust.

I may come around a little later to the reason why I think they did not do that. I think it will become clear, when I discuss the reasons for this marriage between the South, which understandably has an economic reason for trying to get the people to use oleomargarine, and the cities of the North, which joined the South in an agreement in the national Democratic convention on a platform plank against the farmer on which there could be unanimity. I think there is reason for it, which I shall come to a little later, which falls under the heading of practical political Pendergastian-type politics, which tries to get votes from one section of the country by doing an injury to people of another section. But anyway, the bill will not reduce the cost of the cheap table spread to the extent it could have been reduced if they had wanted to, because they could have repealed the 22-cent tax instead of the 10-cent tax. Actually the records show that those who buy oleomargarine because it is cheaper, or because, as the Senator from South Carolina says, some people like its taste better, will have to pay more for their oleomargarine, after the Fulbright bill is passed, if it is passed, than they do now. That is demonstrated by the record, because in areas where colored oleomargarine is sold, it sells at almost the price of butter, just enough under it to provide an unfair kind of scab competition against butter, since it sells sometimes as much as 25 and 30 cents a pound higher than uncolored oleomargarine. So the oleo interests will have eliminated the competition which colored oleomargarine now has with uncolored oleomargarine, thus enabling them to raise considerably, the average prices of oleomargarine throughout the country, making the marginal family pay considerably more for its table spread than it pays today, and putting additional lush profits into the coffers of the international oleomargarine cartel. But it is not going to be of any concern to the consumer, so far as helping him is concerned.

How about the little fellow? I have heard from Democratic spokesmen since I have been in Washington for 11 years, so many tear-jerking stories about the little fellow, I thought, "Ha, ha." At last they have found something which is going to help the little fellow, and that is why everyone got together in the happy environment of Philadelphia and agreed, "Here is a Democratic platform on which we can all concur." So I looked around to see who was making the oleomargarine. I thought certainly I should find oleomargarine being fabricated or processed or manufactured or concocted—however oleomargarine is made—by many small producers in small towns operating small oleomargarine plants. Certainly I thought I should find many farmers' co-ops making oleomargarine, because no one has shed more tears for farmers' co-ops than has the Democratic Party, or done less to enable them to enjoy a good economic environment in which to function. But I searched in vain for that, Mr. President. I found that oleomargarine was not being made by little fellows anywhere, that there were no small local, home-town organizations making it; there were no small independents, of whom we heard so much in the President's message: "Give us more small independent-business men." I could not find any of them making oleomargarine. I could not find any farmers' co-ops making oleomargarine. I found that oleomargarine production was about as tight, about as tough, and about as gigantic, an international monopoly and cartel as could be discovered anywhere under the canopy of heaven. So that actually, whom we propose to help fundamentally is a tremendously strong and tight international cartel, owned in large part by foreign capital. And to help those friends of monopoly the farmers of America are expected to lose any right to have a legitimate margin of profit in selling their dairy products.

That sounds like a strong statement. Let us see what the facts are which support it. Let us talk about the dairy farmer first, because he is a little fellow who has for years been trying to develop for himself a family-size farm with a diversity of activity from which he can have a stable and continuing farm income. About 10,000,000 Americans are dependent upon the dairy industry for their livelihood. That is a large number of Americans. There are more than 3,500 creameries, many of them, as I say, small, locally owned creameries, many of them small creameries owned locally by farm cooperatives. They are distributed in all the 48 States, most of them north of the Mason and Dixon's line, but many of them in the South, where they are at long last recognizing the importance of diversified farming and increasing the size and scope of the dairy industry throughout Dixie. I think it is a step of progress from the standpoint of the agricultural pattern of the South. We have found out then who produces the butter, who processes it. It is the little fellow.

Who does the oleomargarine business in this country? There are only 26 plants altogether. As contrasted with 3,500 creameries, most of them locally owned, there are 26 oleomargarine plants, none of them little fellows, all of them in direct competition with the farmer on his farm. But five of them have gotten together and produced 64.8 percent of all the oleo made in this country. One of these is Lever Bros., a subsidiary of Unilever, Ltd., of London. This company produces 40 percent of the oleo in the world. One company, one cartel, one international group of monopolists produces 40 percent of the oleomargarine in the world, and a considerably larger percentage of that used here in the United States. They are now completing in this country a new plant for the purpose of utilizing, if the proposed legislation succeeds, not cottonseed oil, not the fine vegetable oils about which our friends in the South are understandably concerned, but coconut oil, which is imported from abroad, which is now protected by a 6 cents a pound levy; because the South, which does not want the dairy interest to have any protection against oleomargarine, insists that it have protection against vegetable oils shipped in from abroad. In other words, this is not an argument which says, "What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander." It is an argument which says, "Here is our chance to pluck the dairy farmer of the North," because they insist on that protection. But if it disappears, then coconut oil can be used much more inexpensively in the manufacture of oleomargarine, as the Oleomargarine Trust well knows, than can the vegetable oils of the United States and the southern section of the country. So, Mr. President, it will be found that we shall have turned over completely to the international cartel and to the international producers the manufacturing of low-cost table spreads for America.

No; it certainly was not the little fellow they were trying to help. I was tremendously impressed by the recital yesterday by our colleague from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] about who would really get the greatest help in this program. There certainly can be no question that Lever Bros. will be the largest beneficiary, and that organization is one of the big cartels of the world, one of the great monopolies, one of those joining with four other companies in having a virtual monopoly of the oleomargarine business of this country. They are going to be the largest beneficiary.

But they do not lack gratitude, Mr. President. The president of this group for the United States, Mr. Charles Luckman, believes in scratching the backs of people who scratch his. He does not simply accept favors, say, "Thank you," and go home. As we all know, he has accepted the national chairmanship of the "Jefferson-Jackson Day oleomargarine dinners" which are to be held sometime next month, as I understand. It will be the only time in our history when oleomargarine dinners will cost $100 a plate. So this oleomargarine king, Charley Luckman, has been given by the Democratic National Committee the duty of organizing the dinners and shanghaiing the people to pay $100 a

plate so they can hear speeches about the patron saints of democracy and the benefits of oleomargarine as a table spread. Luckman receives the benefit of the oleomargarine angle, and the people who attend the dinners will receive the benefit of political speeches. I hope oleomargarine will be served instead of butter. I think that would be consistent. This law of diminishing returns should be applied to the political product of this country.

Last night, when I heard that Charley Luckman was going to be the recipient of this great favor which is about to be bestowed upon him by the action of the Democratic National Committee, I thought he was going to raise all the money and have all this whoopla to keep everyone happy, since his trust had had dropped into its lap one of the richest financial plums to come to any monopoly in the history of America, because it will enable him to increase the price of oleomargarine of every color, to increase the price of the poor man's table spread, and, at the same time, prevent competition.

I suppose Charley Luckman has some ideas of his own as to what will be served at the dinners, which are $100 propositions. I am only a country boy from South Dakota. I do not know what a $100 dinner tastes like. I let my imagination have full swing, and this is what I think should be the menu:

Of course the donkey emblem of the party will be there. I suppose they will put the donkey emblem on one side and an oleomargarine package on the other side. That would keep the thing in balance, because I think Luckman is entitled to all the advertising he can get from these dinners for the benefit of the Oleomargarine Trust. There will be some liquid refreshments, of course, and since they have set the pattern of specializing in things foreign, I presume they will start out with some Scotch from Scotland and champagne from France. They can import oleomargarine from any 1 of 40 different countries and still pay tribute to Luckman and Lever Bros. The caviar, of course, will come from Russia. I can think of other reasons why they might want to import something from Russia, but I will limit it to the suggestion that they will get their caviar from Russia because it would not be exactly fair to have an oleomargarine dinner publicizing a victory over American-made butter, and then have other American-made products on the table.

The meat course will be Argentine beef. They will hear much at the dinner about F. D. R., for he is one of the patron saints of the party. I hope, among other things, they will remember that he was the man who said that Argentine beef was cheaper and infinitely better than American beef. So, since they will have oleomargarine, which, according to the Democratic position, is infinitely cheaper and better than American butter, they will have Argentine beef which is infinitely cheaper and better, according to F. D. R., than American beef.

For dessert I suppose there will be plum pudding from England. There will be coffee and nuts from Brazil and cigars from Cuba. Then we shall indeed have a Jefferson-Jackson Day oleomargarine dinner at which neither the American producer nor taxpayer can expect to get a fair break.

I do not know what other reason the Democrats could have for picking out Charley Luckman, because, after all, he will have a great debt to pay the Democratic Party if this proposed legislation is enacted into law.

It is not in the interest of the United States, I think, to pass this bill. It would turn over to too many foreign groups, too many foreign cartels, the right to profit from table spreads, and drive domestic butter out of competition for the enjoyment of the housewife, subjecting her to unfair competition by a product colored and packaged in order to deceive the housewife into thinking she is actually buying butter.

I think, Mr. President—and this is my final position—that it is not in an effort to keep in compliance with American tradition and custom of fair play, decency, and honesty, that the oleomargarine plank of the Democratic national platform is foisted upon us. It is not in conformity with American commercial practice. In this country we have recognized for years copyright privileges. When a person writes a story, a song, or a play, he has a right, because he has developed the particular product, to enjoy a reasonable benefit from it. I hope we shall continue that practice. I should hate to see something which is rightfully extended to playwrights, singers, and authors denied to farmers who have spent generations publicizing the color of butter as a table spread to such an extent that a Senator from the oleo region, who preceded me in this debate, said that for some reason or other the housewives of America want to color their table spreads yellow. The obvious reason, of course, is that yellow is the color of butter.

If a mechanic invents a device he is permitted to profit by the invention. A few of the more ardent New Dealers have been trying to remove that right. Thus far a sufficient number of Americans agree that it is pretty good sportsmanship, and pretty wise business to issue patents for inventions. So we still have the patent privilege in this country. If a man schemes out a way to do some particular thing, he can get a patent on his invention.

The farmers have found a way to make a table spread. They have developed a product of a certain shape, size, melting consistency, and color, served in a certain style. The oleomargarine trust, with Charley Luckman riding at its head, wants to destroy that particular product which the American farmer has perfected. That is not in conformity with the American concept of fair play. It may be smart politics. It may attract a few deluded voters in the cities at the cost of the American farmer, but it is not in conformity with the American concept of fair play. It is denying to the farmer that which we rightfully extend to the author, the playwright, and the mechanic. We also extend it to business. We even extend to Charley Luckman's oleomargarine trust the right to protect a certain brand name for a certain type of oleomargarine against the competition of a poor local businessman or a group of farmers who may want to make oleomargarine in competition with the monopoly and the international cartel. We deny the new producer of oleomargarine, and, in my opinion, rightfully so, the right to take Charley Luckman's name, his brand, his label, his motto, his description, or his fictitious formula of nutrition values. We protect the monopoly against the small independent competitor in that connection, because there is a copyright law which applies. That is the American system. But butter has had to rely upon a color and consistency and upon being served in little butter plates in hotels and restaurants, according to a custom which has developed over a long period of time. By the tradition of exclusive usage, butter has that right, and Charley Luckman's international cartel has no right to destroy it.

Mr. President, I shall be disappointed in the Senate if, because of plain political chicanery, it allows this bill to be passed, because, in the final analysis, even the consumer in the city will pay more for his table spread, once we take colored oleomargarine out of competition with white oleomargarine. The difference in the price will hurt the people who are presumed to be helped.

Let me say in conclusion, Mr. President, that I think the Senate should adopt the substitute amendment, in which a number of us join, in an effort to provide some degree of satisfaction to our good friends in the South, who feel that, for some reason or other, oleomargarine is being hampered by the present 10-percent tax. Moreover, we have inserted another protective provision which will meet the principles involved. We continue to give butter an opportunity, within the boundaries of its own State, to enjoy whatever advantage the citizens of the State may suggest.

We provide, in connection with that, repeal of other excise taxes. To me one of the most glaring demonstrations of the purely political conception of this legislation, Mr. President, is that it singles out one excise tax, the tax on oleomargarine, and says, "We are going to eliminate that," and says nothing about all the other excise taxes in which all the other citizens are interested, which pyramid the living cost for all the families using oleomargarine and all the families rejecting oleomargarine.

If we wish to be consistent, we must give the Members of the Senate a chance to vote a very consistent point of view, because we have added as a proposed amendment an excise tax repealer which includes the repeal of the excise tax on oleomargarine, and includes, in addition, repeal or reduction to a prewar level of the excise taxes on the other articles on which the public is now paying excise taxes—not merely oleomargarine, but all the other things, such as furs, toilet preparations, telegraph and telephone, and radio and cable facilities; the tax

on jewelry, electric light bulbs, and tubes; the tax on women's purses, and the tax on admissions; as well as other taxes which certainly take more out of the taxpayer's pocket than the 10-cent-a-pound tax on oleomargarine.

If that is logic, there will be a chance to vote for that kind of legislation, which will provide a still fairer basis of economic cooperation between the butter producer and the oleomargarine producer, and at the same time give genuine relief to the American taxpayer clear across the board.

Mr. President, I hope the substitute will be adopted. If the substitute is not adopted, then I hope that the Senate will reject the Fulbright bill, H. R. 2023, and defeat this unconscionable effort to increase the already rich profits of the oleomargarine trust at the expense of the American farmer. If we can induce enough of our Democratic friends to come along and do that, and if because they have left his ship of state—Charley Luckman refuses to head up the Jefferson-Jackson Day oleomargarine dinners, we shall try to find them a good Republican leader for the patriotic dinner, and provide free tabs of butter so that they may have a good American feast.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I expect to suggest the absence of a quorum, but before I do so I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from South Dakota and I wish to add one little item in relation to what he spoke of as to what might be called the common-law copyright in color.

It is a strange thing that the Yellow Cab Co. can go into the courts, and has done so, restraining competitors from using the color yellow on their cabs; it is a strange thing that Mr. Luckman's company can go into the courts and restrain the use of the red color in soap, and get protection; it is a strange thing that this common-law copyright has been used under the circumstances so dynamically and forcefully outlined by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota and, at the same time, the farmer can be sold down the river, which is what will happen if the Senate refuses to take appropriate action by rejecting the bill.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McCarthy
Anderson	Gurney	McClellan
Brewster	Hayden	McFarland
Bricker	Hendrickson	McKellar
Bridges	Hickenlooper	McMahon
Butler	Hill	Magnuson
Cain	Hoey	Malone
Capehart	Holland	Martin
Chapman	Humphrey	Maybank
Connally	Hunt	Millikin
Cordon	Ives	Morse
Darby	Jenner	Mundt
Donnell	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Downey	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Dworshak	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Kem	Pepper
Ecton	Kilgore	Robertson
Ellender	Knowland	Russell
Ferguson	Langer	Saltonstall
Flanders	Leahy	Schoeppel
Frear	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Fulbright	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
George	Long	Sparkman
Gillette	Lucas	Stennis
Graham	McCarran	Taft
Taylor	Tobey	Wherry
Thomas, Okla.	Tydings	Wiley
Thomas, Utah	Vandenberg	Williams
Thye	Watkins	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the substitute amendment to H. R. 2023, which is known as the Wiley-Gillette amendment and which I have the pleasure of cosponsoring along with 25 other Senators from both sides of the aisle.

In view of all the verbiage which has surrounded this issue, it may be well to restate now what the substitute amendment provides.

It removes all Federal taxes and license fees in the sale of oleomargarine. It prohibits the movement of yellow oleomargarine in interstate commerce. It makes no change in the applicability of the pure food and drug laws. It permits the States to take any further steps they may consider necessary, in accordance with their own interests or desires, to regulate the production and sale of colored oleomargarine.

Mr. President, it does in fact preserve States' rights in this field. All of us know, and it is all too true, that today States' rights are disappearing in many fields; but it appears that this is one field in which we would do well to preserve States' rights.

It is also proposed to revise the Wiley-Gillette amendment so as to incorporate a provision for the repeal of the wartime excise taxes imposed by the Revenue Act of 1943 on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, electric light bulbs and tubes, communications, transportation of persons, theater admissions, and so forth. The revision also contemplates a repeal of the retail tax on luggage, restoring the former manufacturer's tax instead; and it would reduce the tax on photographic supplies, including films, to a uniform 10 percent.

The able senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has also taken as part of his amendment the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], which prohibits certain advertising and certain other things which should be considered fraudulent.

There is, I am sure, a prevailing sentiment throughout the country for the removal or reduction of these excise taxes.

Like the oleomargarine tax, they were imposed for regulatory purposes. They were imposed during the war to discourage the manufacture and sale of certain commodities and services. During the war the Government saw fit to levy the excise taxes in order that the people would not buy, and thus the manufacture of goods of a luxury nature would be discouraged, and in that way industry could devote itself to the principal job of producing the necessities of life, as they were considered in wartime, and also war munitions. As regulatory prohibitions, those excise taxes were purely of an emergency nature. No matter how attractive their revenue features, they have no place in a peace-time economy.

I think it wholly appropriate that this additional provision for the repeal of excise taxes be included in the amendment, in connection with the repeal of another excise tax—that on oleomargarine.

Mr. President, two interests are involved in this controversy. They are essentially the interests which are involved in every economic issue, namely, those of the producer and those of the consumer. In what I shall say at this time, I shall not cover the subject which was so thoroughly covered earlier today by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], when he discussed the question of monopoly and cartel. He analyzed that phase of the question, and I think he demonstrated very clearly that the small manufacturer and the small-business man receive lip service and the crumbs which fall from the table, but the monopoly and the oleo cartel get the dollars and the banquet.

The Senator from South Dakota told us today what he believed to be the proper designation of the menu, when he referred to the oleo dinners which are about to be had at $100 a plate. I am surprised that he did not also say that, at the end of the meal, those who partake of those dinners would find in their finger bowls, not the ordinary rose petals, but soap bubbles, probably from Lifebuoy, which would prevent any odor of what had happened as a result of the activities of this cartel, and also, perhaps, Lux bubbles, so that no one would shrink from the protection being given to the cartel.

Mr. President, it seems to me perfectly certain that the interests of the consumer are involved in the oleomargarine issue. The consumer is entitled to obtain oleomargarine, if it is his preference, without the imposition of arbitrary, discriminatory Federal taxes. I believe that the consumer likewise is entitled to protection by the Federal Government from any fraudulent substitution of oleomargarine for butter, should butter be the consumer's choice. I take it that there is no dispute that in every way possible the manufacturers of olemargarine have sought to imitate the qualities and characteristics of butter. Imitation is flattery, but it may be carried to the point of serious invasion of proprietary rights, in the form of unfair competition, as well as an invasion of the right of personal preference. That proposition has been consistently maintained by our courts and, as a matter of fact, is the basis of the legislative precedent for the pending substitute amendment.

The proposed substitute amendment is patterned after the Federal Filled Milk Act of 1923, which prohibits the shipment of filled milk in interstate commerce. Filled milk is an imitation product resembling evaporated milk. It is a product in which vegetable oils have been substituted for the butterfat found in pure evaporated milk, just as oleomargarine is a product in which vegetable fats and oils are substituted for the butterfat of pure butter.

The Supreme Court has twice upheld the constitutionality of the Filled Milk Act, and in a 1944 case the Court pointed out that filled milk compounds lend themselves readily to substitution for or confusion with milk products and that they are artificial or manufactured foods

which are cheaper to produce than similar whole milk products. The Court said:

> When compounded and canned, whether enriched or not, they are indistinguishable by the ordinary consumer from processed natural milk. * * * The possibility and actuality of confusion, deception, and substitution was appraised by Congress. The prevention of such practices or dangers through control of shipments in interstate commerce is within the power of Congress.

Mr. President, that is exactly what we have before us today, namely, the question of whether Congress should say that in the present case the possibility and probability of fraud should be stopped at the State line. If we consider the Filled Milk case, about which the Supreme Court was talking, and if we then substitute the phrase "possibility and actuality of confusion, deception, and substitution" in the case of the substitution of oleomargarine for butter, we shall have the reasons for the proposed amendment, which is submitted in the exercise of the Federal Government's authority to protect the consumer against possible fraud.

The exercise of governmental authority to prevent the "possibility and actualityof confusion, deception," and substitution at the expense of the consumer does not prevent the consumer from exercising his preference, if he has one, for an adequately identified butter substitute. On the other hand, it is obviously desirable that the producer of butter shall have a fair opportunity to manufacture and market his product; and the amendment in the nature of a substitute is no more than a minimum step in that direction.

Mr. President, it is a well-known fact that the States cannot act in the same fields of law in which the Federal Congress has jurisdiction and in which the Congress acts—such as the field of interstate commerce. This amendment is no more nor less than a declaration of policy, a declaration that Congress is not acting in the field which is reserved to the States in their home territory in relation to colored oleomargarine or insofar as the protection of its citizens from fraud is concerned. Therefore, it is proper to permit States' rights to function in this field, under the police power of the States, to determine how the citizens of the States should be protected from fraud. I am gravely concerned about the consequences, should that element of fair competition not be preserved. I fear greatly for the consequent impact upon the economy of this country.

My own State is vitally affected. Michigan is rightly noted throughout the world for its automobiles and its industrial products. But agriculture is equally the strength of the State's economy. We rank among the first eight States, I believe, in our agricultural product; dairying represents over 40 percent of Michigan farm income.

The inroads upon agriculture of unfair colored oleomargarine competition with butter have been terrific. Farmers receive 75 percent of the consumer's butter dollar. The oleo manufacturer's margins are tremendous and cut down the farmer's share of the oleo dollar to about 30 percent. Farmers receive 50 cents per pound for butter and less than 8 cents per pound for oleo. For each pound of oleo sold to replace butter, the income to dairy farmers is cut 42 cents. That is why we must consider whether we are fostering and helping monopoly, rather than the small farmer, if we enact the bill which is now pending. In this particular field, the farmer's wife who has one cow or a few cows must be considered a manufacturer, when she is producing butter in competition with the trusts which produce oleomargarine. That is true because the oils and fat that go into oleo are produced under certain processing conditions. Butterfat is obtained from the milk of the cow.

I am told that Michigan farmers are losing $26,500,000 a year at the present time due to the substitution of oleo for butter. It is a staggering inroad, which could be justified only if the competition between the two products were absolutely fair. Those inroads are not confined alone to dairy incomes. The economic ramifications are endless.

Mr. President, the farmers of the United States have been able to conserve land, they have been able to obtain a better income, and to enjoy better economic conditions than have the farmers of other lands, because of the dairy cow. As one travels, he finds that the number of cows in America compared to the number in other countries is much greater. We see them all over the landscape, throughout our country. They have been of real economic aid to America's standard of living. I could not help but realize, as I saw the lack of dairy cows in other lands, that the dairy cow is used in America, and was used originally as the only fertilizer so far as farms were concerned; but with the development of chemical fertilizers, naturally many persons think the cow has no place in this field. I should like to relate to the Senate my experiences in visiting a farm in Iran recently. A former Premier took me out one morning to see what he said was the building of a farm. He was taking the top soil from the sides of the hills, digging it up to a depth of 3 feet, removing the larger stones and boulders, and taking the finer gravel for the top surface. It was then necessary for him to go down into the earth to get water. He had to dig holes and finally locate a stream, and then follow the stream until he could bring the water to the surface. It was hard work, as it was to obtain soil. He then said he would like to take me down to a place where he raised chickens, pigeons, ducks, and geese. I asked him about his income from their meat and eggs. He said, "That is not at all the purpose in having these pigeons, chickens, geese, and ducks. I keep them solely to fertilize the land." That showed how important it was to have fertilizer on the farm. It brought back to my mind the days when, here in America, we had only the animals on the farms as a means of fertilizing the land. The same thing was brought forcefully to my attention in Siam, where all the farming is done by hand. There we saw black fertilizer being thrown on the embankment which had been made. When we inquired the nature of the fertilizer, we were told it was the fertilizer from bats which had come from caves in the mountains several hundred miles distant. It again showed me the importance of fertilizer to farm land.

But as I was saying, the economic ramifications are endless. Since 1944 we have lost more than 2,840,000 of our milk-cow population in this country, over 890,000 of them in 1948. This depletion of dairy herds has coincided exactly with the increase in the unrestricted manufacture and distribution of yellow-colored oleomargarine.

The implications of that depletion are felt not just by the 2,500,000 dairy farmers in this country to whom it represents a decline in income. It is felt by all the 10,000,000 people in this country who derive their living from the dairy industry through the processing of dairy products, and by the countless others whose services and products, such as feed and farm equipment, are purchased by the dairy industry.

Just to illustrate that point, I am reminded of one experience in the utilization of agricultural products, which is recognized as so essential to the national economy. Michigan, as you may know, is one of the great sugar-beet producers of the country. It is a foremost agricultural product of the State. For many years the processing of sugar beets entailed a great wastage in pulp, which was dumped into rivers and streams until their pollution became a serious conservation problem. Because of its nature it could not be dumped in the open. Its disposal was a major problem in the sugar-beet industry.

Then Mr. Laroe, a Michigan feed merchant, who had traveled in Europe and observed there a means of processing the pulp as dairy feed, went to the beet-sugar manufacturers with a proposition. "How much will you charge to take this stuff away?" they asked him. "Charge you nothing," he replied, "I'll pay you for it." And so the value of the sugar-beet product in Michigan was increased immensely as its processed pulp found an abundant market among the herdsmen of the country.

The same may be said of brewers' grain, and many other such products. Where will the market go if the dairy herds continue to diminish?

Where will a market be found for vegetable crops, such as soybean, linseed, and cottonseed meal if our milk-cow herds disappear?

Although less capable of immediate observation, an even more important consideration in the stripping of dairying as an agricultural activity is its effect on soil conservation. Food production, and its distribution, is the great problem of the human race. Hanging over the race is the knowledge, in the greater part of the United States, that only 6 inches of topsoil separates it from starvation. The United States Government is spending millions of dollars on soil conservation, and today we find ourselves considering the passage of conflicting legislation, apparently its effect on the mil-

lions of dollars we are disbursing in order to conserve the soil of America.

The conservation of our natural resources and the soil in particular is a major concern for every one of us. Any farm economist can testify that it is impossible to maintain a proper soil conservation while reducing our livestock population.

For once, I have had occasion to agree with Secretary of Agriculture Brannan when he wrote in an article for Country Gentleman:

> Sometimes we have the good fortune to be in a position where the things we want to do are the things we ought to do. That's the way it is now with agriculture. The major change we ought to make in our agricultural pattern is to increase livestock numbers and the acreage of soil-conserving grasses and legumes to support them. That would be good for the land, good for consumers, and good for farmers. In fact, the economic stability of a large part of American agriculture, before another decade ends, may depend upon a big enough increase in livestock numbers to eat what otherwise may be surplus grain, and enough dollars in the pockets of city consumers to buy the resulting increase of meat and dairy products. At the same time, increased emphasis on soil conservation will be necessary in order to make sure that production will be adequate in the more distant future.

Every year a dairy farm becomes more productive, more valuable in promoting the natural wealth to the country. A grass farm is wholly resistant to erosion. On the other hand, the crops which will be substituted for pasture in the production of vegetable oils for oleo are among the worst of the soil depleters.

The effect of the depletion of dairy herds will be felt by the food consumer. Almost 75 percent of the veal which is sold in American butcher shops comes from dairy herds and a full quarter of the medium-grade beef. Where will these popular meat dishes be supplied if the dairy herds are depleted, and what will happen then to the price of meat?

Mr. President, it is the purpose of those who manufacture oleo to put the producers of butter out of business. They would prevent the production of a pound of butter. In this war against the monopolies let us not think that the 35 oleo manufacturers in the United States will not enter this field with a determination to monopolize it entirely. That is the purpose of removing the 10-cent tax on oleo. The purpose will also be to remove the 22-cent importation tax, and then an effort will be made to put butter out of business.

Mr. President, these are major considerations for every one of us in considering the present legislation. They rest on the proposition that dairying, which depends upon butter production for its stability, must inevitably suffer tremendously if butter is not given minimum protection in its competitive position with oleomargarine. That minimum protection is to prevent fraud and deception of the persons who consume it.

There are other considerations which bear noting. For one thing, I am satisfied that the low cost of oleomargarine as a substitute for butter, which is held out as being so attractive to the consumer, is largely illusory. It is cheap today because it must compete with butter for favor. Let it retain that price advantage for a while, and through its unregulated production largely remove butter from the market. Then watch the cartels which are behind oleo production seize their opportunity to skyrocket its price. Combine that result with all the other economic implications of a decline in the dairying industry, and then measure the result. It will be only a loss.

This is not a field in which small businesses will ever become a dominant factor. Small business will never be engaged in the manufacture of oleo. It does not lend itself to small business.

Mr. President, the substitute amendment seeks merely to forestall these consequences and many other implications.

It seeks to do so by placing the weight of the Federal Government behind the consumer's right to protection against fraud in his freedom of choice.

It seeks to acknowledge butter's request for a fair competitive position.

It leaves to the States any exceptions they may wish to make in the exercise of their inherent regulatory powers.

Mr. President, I am informed that the bill, without the substitute amendment, would require $95,000,000 in order properly to carry out its intent, and provide necessary regulations and enforcement. If the amendment be adopted the States alone will be responsible for regulation, so far as fraud is concerned. We are leaving to the people of the States the determination of what they desire to do in their particular States.

I hope that the far-seeing Members of this body, concerned with the interests of both producer and consumer and the national economy as a whole, will support the substitute amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in order to make some progress, I am wondering whether the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, who is in charge of the bill, will consider accepting the so-called McCarthy amendment and taking it to conference. That would remove one amendment out of the way.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will say to the distinguished majority leader that the McCarthy amendment is not objectionable to us. The only question is the phraseology of one portion of it, which seems to me to be too expensive in its application. I am disposed, with the agreement of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is quite familiar with the situation, to take the amendment to conference with the thought that the language which I think is too extensive may be properly limited. I do not think it is a serious defect. It is merely a matter of drafting. I think the remainder of the amendment is acceptable. We have never contended that we wanted oleomargarine to be disguised and presented as butter. The Aiken amendment which was offered this morning is a strengthening amendment, and my understanding is that the Senator from Vermont felt it offered a better safeguard against the objections. So, Mr. President, I am disposed to accept the McCarthy amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Arkansas for accepting the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin as modified by the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. That ends it, of course, Mr. President, but I still wish to make the statement which I started to make. I do not think I was taken off my feet by the distinguished Senator who now occupies the chair when he put the question before I had an opportunity to say anything with reference to it. I merely want to compliment the Senator from Arkansas for accepting the amendment, because I agree with him with respect to the identification of margarine. The amendment is not in opposition to the position of the Senators who favor the bill.

A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. What is the next amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] on behalf of himself and other Senators, subject, of course, to the right of any Senator to offer perfecting amendments either to the substitute amendment or to the original bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LANGER. I have various amendments printed and lying on the table. In the natural course of events would my amendments come up for consideration before the other amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has offered amendments. If amendments are offered to the original bill they would be voted upon before the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin would be voted upon.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. In the event the substitute amendment should be adopted, what would be the position of the amendments with respect to civil rights offered by the Senator from North Dakota?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the substitute is agreed to, no further amendment would be in order.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think no further amendment will be offered to the substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the substitute is rejected, then the original bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, my understanding is that the Senate accepted the McCarthy-Aiken amendment to the original bill. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment was agreed to by action of the Senate.

Mr. WILEY. Did it include the Aiken amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It included the Aiken amendment. It was the McCarthy amendment as modified by the Aiken amendment.

NOMINATIONS REPORTED

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report the following nominations for the Executive Calendar:

Hubert E. Howard, to be Chairman of the Munitions Board; John F. Floberg, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy; Maj. Gen. James H. Burns, United States Army, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense; and Adm. Forrest P. Sherman, United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Operations.

I ask that the civilian nominations go to the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The civilian nominations will be placed on the calendar.

NOMINATION OF CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the nomination of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, to be Chief of Naval Operations, be confirmed and that the President be notified. I make the request for the reason that there has been no confirmed Chief of Naval Operations since last August. The committee has had full and extensive hearings on the nomination, and the report was unanimous, accompanied by the prayer that the nomination might be considered immediately, in view of the national defense. I hope this one nomination, which comes unanimously from the committee, may be confirmed and the President may be notified.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, very reluctantly, I am obliged to object. There are only a dozen Senators on the floor. I shall have no objection when the nomination comes to the floor in its regular course, but I think that when we are considering another measure we should not interrupt the debate to bring up a matter of this kind.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if I may make rejoinder to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, I suggest to him that the committee has gone into this matter fully, and if it did not come from the committee unanimously, with the full committee present, the Senator from Maryland would not make the request. The committee is a very able one, and because this post has been only semiofficial since last August, and because the Senator from Maryland realizes the implications of the national defense, he thought that this one nomination of the Chief of Naval Operations, in view of the unanimous report of the committee, and the long time the appointment has been in abeyance might be confirmed and the President notified at once, solely in the interest of national defense. I hope my good friend from North Dakota will make an exception in this case, because this is not a political appointment; it is routine, and the officer is a very important part of our national-defense machinery. The other nominations I am perfectly satisfied to have go over.

Mr. LANGER. Replying to the distinguished Senator from Maryland, if he wishes to ask for a quorum call, and we have a quorum, I have no objection.

Mr. TYDINGS. I appreciate that, but I doubt if we can do that, in view of the fact that the Senator from Wisconsin has already yielded to me for this purpose, but I venture to say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that if we had a full quorum present the Senator would find that every Member of the Senate would approve the immediate confirmation of this nomination. I hope that the Senator will make an exception to what I know to be a good rule, because this nomination involves our National Defense Establishment. Conditions in the Far East and all over the world are in a state of great confusion, and this will add one more peg of stability in our Defense Establishment.

Mr. LANGER. If the post has been vacant since last August, 2 or 3 days more will do no harm.

Mr. TYDINGS. I certainly do not think that is an accurate statement. I hope the Senator will withdraw his objection because it will be most helpful to have the nomination confirmed, and I can assure him that its confirmation will be received throughout the Navy, which has had somewhat of a hard blow recently, as a reaffirmation that the Navy is back in the picture. It would be a good thing for morale and for the service generally. Will not the Senator reconsider, in view of the fact that all his colleagues on the committee have approved this nomination?

Mr. LANGER. I am almost persuaded by the eloquence of the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not like to make horse trades on the floor of the Senate, although I must say there is a little horse-trading blood in my system, but I will say to my able friend from North Dakota that if he will accord full weight to the words the Senator from Maryland has uttered in good faith, the Senator from Maryland hopes some day to reciprocate on a like auspicious occasion when the Senator from North Dakota may have something which he deems important to his country.

Mr. LANGER. I repeat, I am almost persuaded, but it is a matter of principle with me. There are only a few Senators on the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. If it were anything else but this, I should not even reiterate my request, but this is a routine nomination in one branch of the armed services, and, I can assure the Senator every minute counts. Will not the Senator therefore be willing to waive the rule and let me horse trade with him in private when I get to the point of bringing the mules out on exhibition?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have no serious objection to allowing the Senator to suggest the absence of a quorum so that this matter may be disposed of.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield for the call of a quorum, assuming he will not lose the floor?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be delighted to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. That would satisfy the Senator from North Dakota. I ask unanimous consent that a quorum be called, and that the Senator from Wisconsin may not lose the floor because he yields for this purpose.

Mr. McCARTHY. I might say, before a quorum is called, that it will take infinitely more than this to convince me that it will put the Navy back in the defense picture. I have just looked over the President's budget, and I see that we are now in the unusual position of having a Marine Corps with practically no marines, and we shall very shortly have a Navy without any ships.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to have that straightened out, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Brewster	Hendrickson	Martin
Bricker	Hill	Maybank
Connally	Holland	Morse
Donnell	Jenner	Mundt
Downey	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Dworshak	Knowland	Schoeppel
Ferguson	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	Lehman	Thye
George	Lucas	Tydings
Gillette	McCarran	Wherry
Green	McCarthy	Wiley
Hayden	McMahon	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senators as far as the name of Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. KILGORE, and Mr. McCLELLAN answered to their names when called.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum be vacated.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has already been announced. The order cannot be withdrawn. The clerk will continue to call the names of absent Senators.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Can the order be vacated by unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The absence of a quorum has already been announced. The clerk will continue to call the names of absent Senators.

The legislative clerk resumed calling the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS and Mr. TAYLOR answered to their names when called.

Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. FREAR, Mr. KEM, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MYERS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. TOBEY, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. NEELY, Mr. LODGE, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. TAFT, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. ECTON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr.

McKELLAR, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. CORDON, Mr. HOEY, Mr. DARBY, Mr. IVES, Mr. LONG, Mr. HUNT, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. CAIN and Mr. MALONE also entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the request of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] for unanimous consent for the consideration, as in executive session, of the nomination of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Operations.

Is there objection? The Chair hears none——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I do not know whether the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] heard the Chair ask, "Is there objection?" The Chair was just about to announce there was no objection, I assume.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, reluctantly I shall be forced to object, not because I have anything against Admiral Sherman, nor because I do not think he may be a competent man for the job. I do not happen to be a member of the Armed Services Committee, which I understand held hearings today on the nomination of Admiral Sherman. I think this is a matter so important that all of us should have an opportunity at least to scan those hearings before he is confirmed.

I may say that when the question of confirmation of the nomination of Admiral Sherman comes before us I shall want to discuss at some length a situation which I think is viciously dangerous to the security of the Nation, namely, the current usurpation of congressional prerogatives by the "Brass" in the Pentagon, and the complete iron curtain which has been established around the Pentagon, so that congressional committees can no longer obtain important information. At that time I shall also want to discuss in some detail the unusual circumstances under which Admiral Denfeld's nomination was withdrawn. The Senate confirmed the nomination of Admiral Denfeld. The President and the Senate considered him a competent man. As I recall, not a single voice was raised against the confirmation of his nomination.

Since that time, however, Admiral Denfeld, in answer to a subpena, came before a congressional committee and there performed not only his duty under subpena but also the statutory duty which we established when we passed the Unification Act, namely, the duty to tell the Congress honestly and frankly what he thought was wrong with the unification of the armed services. He did so. Immediately afterward, his nomination was nullified by his removal from the position by the President.

At the time when the question of confirmation of the nomination of Admiral Sherman comes before us, I wish to discuss not only that matter, but also the Crommelin case. Captain Crommelin, with whom I served in the Pacific, I consider to be one of the outstanding heroes of the last war—a brilliant man coming from a family which has an outstanding military record. That man, because he has the intestinal fortitude—the guts, if you please—to try to safeguard the Nation against a bad situation in the Pentagon, has had his career in the Navy practically ended. I wish to discuss that case also in some detail. I think the proper time to discuss it is when the nomination of the successor to Admiral Denfeld is before us for confirmation.

I have not had a chance to go over the Armed Services Committee's hearings. I shall do so tonight; and tomorrow I shall withdraw any objection to the immediate consideration of the nomination of Admiral Sherman.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his courtesy in yielding me the floor, and I wish to thank the Senator from North Dakota for making it possible for us to consider the unanimous-consent request.

However, in view of what the Senator from Wisconsin has said, I withdraw the request for the consideration of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is withdrawn, and the nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the substitute amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield, to permit me to propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, preliminarily, I should like to say that we have been discussing the pending question, namely, the bill to repeal the oleomargarine tax, and for other purposes, since a week ago Wednesday, as I recall. It seems to me we have debated the issues rather thoroughly. There is not really very much of an issue involved. The Members of the Senate on both sides of the question have been afforded an opportunity to present their views, and of course there will be further time to do so under the unanimous-consent agreement which I shall propose, if it is agreed to.

What I hope to do is secure consent to have the Senate reach a vote tomorrow on the substitute offered by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. I am making the unanimous-consent request in the sincere hope that it will be agreed to.

I now ask unanimous consent that on the calendar day of Friday, January 13, at the hour of 4 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon the so-called Wiley-Gillette substitute for House bill 2023 to regulate oleomargarine, repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes, and all amendments thereto which are germane, including the so-called excise-tax provisions; that the time between 12 o'clock and 4 o'clock p. m. on said day be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of said bill, and be controlled respectively by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Would that include any motions? To put the matter concretely, let me say that some suggestion has been made that it might be advisable that a motion be made to strike from the substitute the excise tax repeal provisions. Thus we would get an express vote on that; and after that was over, we would then get a vote on the substitute, as modified.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator please speak a little louder so that all of us can hear?

Mr. WILEY. There has been some talk about specific objection being made to the excise tax repeal provisions of the substitute. So I am asking the majority leader whether his unanimous-consent request would include any motion proposing to strike out those provisions. There would simply be a motion by some Senator to strike out. I wish to protect the rights of a Senator who has suggested that.

Mr. LUCAS. In reply to the Senator from Wisconsin, let me say that the agreement, if entered into, undoubtedly would protect that right. In other words, the Senator from Washington already has served notice on the Senate that at the proper time he will move to strike from the substitute the provisions dealing with the repeal of excise taxes. This unanimous-consent request would cover that motion.

Mr. WILEY. I had that in mind because of the discussion the other day. I thought one or two exchanges indicated possibly a lack of proper consideration of my brethren, and I wanted to make sure their rights in that particular were protected.

Mr. LUCAS. There can be no question about that, I may say to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, may I at this time ask whether there are any other amendments to the substitute pending?

Mr. LUCAS. That is a parliamentary question I cannot answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are no amendments pending to the substitute.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry, if the Senator will yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. Any amendments which have been offered, which are on the table, or which have been called up, could be offered to the substitute, or to the original bill, could they not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be in order for amendments to be offered.

Mr. WHERRY. One or two amendments may be offered. I do not desire to hold up the request; in fact, I should

like to get a vote on the substitute as quickly as possible. Personally I feel that the sooner we have a vote, the better. But I think it should be understood by those who are offering amendments that, unless an amendment is offered to the substitute before the substitute is adopted, they will then be foreclosed from amending the substitute, and the substitute will become the bill itself. Until that is clearly understood, it seems to me that those who have offered amendments should be informed of the procedure. If the majority leader is to press the request, I should like an opportunity to consult further one or two Senators who felt that there would not be a vote today on an amendment they might offer. Later on this afternoon, if no one else objects, if the Senator then presents his unanimous-consent request——

Mr. WILEY. Or tomorrow?

Mr. WHERRY. Or tomorrow would be all right—I would not say then that I would agree, but I should like to be certain that they are informed of the parliamentary situation before unanimous consent is given.

Mr. LUCAS. The unanimous-consent agreement, of course, provides for a vote at 4 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. I know, but if we enter into it now, of course, they will then be foreclosed.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand.

Mr. WHERRY. I myself am not objecting, and I am not sure the Senators I have in mind will object. All I am asking is that the distinguished majority leader present his unanimous-consent request later on in the afternoon, if he is willing to do that. If the amendments are not to be offered, it does not make any difference whether we vote today or tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, that would call for another quorum call.

Mr. WHERRY. I really think we should have another quorum call in connection with the unanimous-consent request, because, if it is agreed to, then, we shall have to vote on the substitute for the original bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I decline to yield any further, unless there is a chance of getting the unanimous-consent agreement. I have been yielding for about half an hour. Under ordinary circumstances I quite enjoy yielding. At the present time, however, the situation is that we have a very important meeting of the District Committee at 4 o'clock. We are reorganizing the committee. I have only about 20 minutes in which to speak, so I frankly must decline to yield further for any lengthy discourse.

Mr. AIKEN. I merely wanted to make a parliamentary inquiry as to whether, if unanimous consent is given to vote on the Gillette-Wiley amendment tomorrow, and the amendment is adopted, it will preclude the offering of any amendment to it at that time, because the Gillette-Wiley amendment would then become the bill itself and be subject to amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not agree with the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. I am asking the Presiding Officer for a ruling.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the precedents, the adoption of the substitute will preclude other amendments.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I must decline to yield further. I shall hold the floor for about 10 minutes only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin declines to yield further.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Was the request for unanimous consent refused?

Mr. McCARTHY. I decline to yield for a parliamentary inquiry, or for any other purpose. I intend to yield the floor in about 10 minutes. I am sure the Senator can wait that long. I decline to yield further only because I have been yielding for about a half an hour, and I have an important meeting at 4 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I may say I sincerely hope the request of the majority leader will be granted. I sincerely hope we can get a vote on the pending bill tomorrow. I think by then it will have been fully and completely discussed.

I wish to thank the able Senator from Arkansas for accepting the McCarthy-Aiken amendments. I think his acceptance of those amendments makes his bill much less obnoxious, insofar as both the dairy farmers and the consumers are concerned.

I am very happy that we finally arrived at a clear-cut issue. The issue no longer is whether oleomargarine taxes are to be repealed. The dairy farmers, and the oleo interests are agreed that we should remove the taxes. The sole question now is, how much protection will be accorded the producer and the consumer. I believe the sole issue for debate now is the issue of fraud—an issue which neither the dairy farmers nor the consumers have created but an issue which the oleo monopoly itself has created by its own inequities of the past. The principal source of fraud is the attempted imitation of butter even down to the minutest detail of packaging. Certainly the housewife cannot gain any advantage by this type of fraud. Certainly the dairy farmer will gain nothing. The oleo monopoly, of course, will gain if they are allowed to continue this type of fraud and deception. If they can accomplish the sly removal of the few restraints which are now in existence our dairy farmers can go into bankruptcy. Whether the oleo manufacturers as a whole plan to perpetrate such frauds, the fact remains that the liberties they demand would make it easy for them to do so.

In my opinion, Mr. President, the oleo monopoly—and I use the phrase "oleo monopoly" advisedly—is to be roundly condemned for its insistence upon freedom from all restraints. Our own good sense tells us that the oleo manufacturers, even if they wanted to, could not control the actions of every retailer and every store clerk in the country, if we pass the type of legislation they request. Why then do they insist on exposing the consumers of the Nation to fraud? The answer is obvious. Even today, under existing regulatory taxes, the basic principles of commercial honesty are flouted by this gigantic monopoly and its large-scale distributors. Why should we believe that the oleo monopoly is to be trusted in the future, when we have never been able to trust it in the past and cannot trust it now?

Mr. President, let me demonstrate the truth of my last statement. I have with me two wax cartons, one of which has long been used by a leading butter producer, a farmer-owned and farmer-controlled cooperative. On each of the two main surfaces of this carton there appears a seal which declares that the contents are "Grade AA Butter." As every housewife knows, grade AA butter is butter of the very top quality—93-score butter, to be exact. Not every butter producer is able to achieve that quality. It brings a top price. It can only be sold with the approval of Government inspectors, who assign it high marks for texture and taste.

Mr. President, in my other hand I hold a carton recently adopted by Durkee—and remember the name, if you will—an oleo manufacturer, for distribution in the same territory where the butter producer does business. What do we find on the two main surfaces of this carton? We see that this oleomargarine is also labeled "Grade AA," despite the fact that there is no Federal grading whatever for oleomargarine. This oleo manufacturer clearly seeks a free ride on the coattails of the butter producer, who has established the grade AA rating as a symbol for the best in table spreads. Just to make the point a little more obvious, this oleo manufacturer has also applied the words "Grade AA" in even larger letters to one end of his box. The carton itself exactly follows the size and shape of the butter producer's carton, although in other parts of the country where dairy concerns use the familiar square box, oleo manufacturers also feel impelled to use square boxes.

Mr. President, why do you suppose the oleo industry follows the butter producers so closely in these matters? Is it because they lack faith in their own product and the courage to let it stand on its own merits? Or is it because it is commercially more profitable to imitate in every respect the packaging of another man's product, a recognized product, a quality product, that already has universal acceptance?

Turning this same oleo carton on its side we discover a travesty of the Government's own certificate of approval printed along one edge, and superimposed on that spurious certificate is a red stamp carrying the letters "AA" and the word "certified." Who has "certified" this oleo to be "grade AA"? None other than Durkee's Famous Foods, a concern that offers "with pride and confidence"—and I am quoting the label now—an oleo which uses "pasteurized fat-free milk."

That is a tricky phrase, Mr. President—"pasteurized fat-free milk." I lived on a farm for some time. We used

to feed the hogs skim milk. We never tried to deceive the hogs and say "This is pasteurized fat-free milk."

Moreover, the manufacturers of Durkee's Famous Foods are not in the dairy industry, as I am advised in very small type by something which looks a great deal like a Good Housekeeping seal of approval. It would seem like Durkee's Famous Foods belong to a family classed roughly as "Glidden quality products." Somewhere in the back of my mind I associate the name Glidden with paints; and, sure enough, it turns out that this oleomargarine is the product of the gigantic Glidden Corp., which makes paints.

Mr. President, I have accustomed myself to the idea that oleomargarine and soap are first cousins, and that, indeed, the difference occurs only in the final stage of conception. If the fats and oils people turn a knob one way, their cottonseed, or soybean, or palm oils come out as laundry soap, or bath soap, or even soap flakes. If, however, they turn the knob the other way at the last moment, they get oleomargarine—"fresh churned," so they say—in the aforementioned "pasteurized fat-free milk." When I use the expression "fresh churned" I am again quoting from the oleo industry's own misleading advertisements.

They are playing upon the lack of knowledge of the consumer when they talk about fresh-churned fat-free milk. As any farmer or any consumer who has taken time to study the subject knows, there is no such thing as fresh-churned fat-free milk.

I ask the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who also was a farmer, whether there is any way to churn "fat-free milk."

Mr. THYE. I will say to the able Senator that we can churn it and tumble it around all we like to, but no butter comes out of skim milk.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

I have here another very interesting advertisement. It is another Durkee advertisement. It uses the words "country fresh." It displays a large picture of what at first glance appears to be a butter carton. There is a drawing of a barn, a silo, and a pasture.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In view of the fact that I have accepted the Senator's amendment, I should like to inquire the Senator's purpose in discussing it further——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I was very happy that the Senator from Arkansas accepted the amendment and promised to take it to conference. I want to show the need for acceptance of the amendment in conference, however. I think, unless it is accepted, extremely bad legislation will result. I am discussing it at this time to show the Senate the necessity of insistence that we retain the McCarthy-Aiken amendment in conference.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The only difficulty is that if by chance the Wiley substitute is adopted, which prohibits the shipment of margarine in interstate commerce, it would seem to me that it would take margarine beyond the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission, and it would be inconsistent to undertake to regulate something and then to declare that it cannot be moved in interstate commerce. I would not be in favor the Wiley amendment. That would seem to take away jurisdiction over the greater part of the business.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the Senator from Arkansas is outstanding in his knowledge of a great number of subjects, except in strictly legal questions.

I think there can be no conceivable question but that the same power to regulate will exist regardless of whether the Wiley amendment is adopted.

The principal difference between the Wiley amendment and the Fulbright bill is that under the Wiley amendment oleomargarine producers are prohibited from shipping in interstate commerce oleomargarine which is colored so as to imitate butter. Such being the case, it cannot, in my opinion, conceivably take from the Federal Trade Commission any of the powers which that body presently possesses.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If we undertake to prohibit oleomargarine from interstate commerce, and, in the same bill, attempt to regulate it, it is an inconsistent position. I thought the Senator would be quite satisfied with the adoption of his own amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am infinitely less dissatisfied with the bill of the Senator from Arkansas if it contains the McCarthy-Aiken amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. One of the considerations in accepting the amendment was that I thought it would reduce the debate on the bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the manufacturers of Durkee's oleomargarine have very obviously embarked on a completely dishonest advertising campaign which has as its basis the misappropriation of the butter-grading system of the United States Department of Agriculture. This grading system has been in existence since 1943. It means a great deal to a producer of butter to merit an AA listing which means 93 score. The benefit of this listing is completely nullified by the dishonest advertising campaign of an outfit such as Durkee.

I had planned to discuss advertising containing the word "fresh" and the words "country fresh", but I notice that some of the other Senators have discussed it in some detail, so I shall spend very little time on it. However, I have here a large advertisement, approximately 2 feet by 4 feet in size, which says "country fresh churned." It also uses the word "milk." It uses the phrases "fresh dairylike flavor" and "no artificial flavoring."

Mr. President, as I have already stated, oleomargarine does not come from the country, but from an oil mill consisting of tanks, pipes, valves, and knobs. That oil mill can be owned by a soap company, or a paint company, or an international cartel employing slaves on the coast of Africa—but none of these things has anything to do with the American countryside as represented by barns and silos. As I have additionally stated, oleomargarine is not fresh, but uses a preservative, as it is so required to state by law. Nothing can be fresh and preserved at one and the same time. That ought to be obvious to anyone. Yet, this advertisement, sponsored by a supposedly reputable corporation, undertakes to tell the housewives of America that oleomargarine containing a preservative is not only fresh, but country fresh. In the face of this evidence, how are we to believed that the oleomargarine interests can be trusted with a color which is the traditional color of butter unless we very closely control their advertising?

Mr. President, there is one other matter before the Senate, namely, the question of removing taxes other than taxes on oleomargarine. Many of us feel very strongly that if we are going to remove the oleomargarine tax it is only common sense, honesty, and fairness also to remove many of the other misnamed luxury taxes. I concede that it is improper for a housewife to be forced to pay a tax on oleomargarine if she wants to buy it and knows what she is buying. I think it is equally improper to force the housewife to pay a luxury tax on the stove upon which to cook or to force her, for example, when she goes to the corner drug store to buy cosmetics or baby powder, to pay a luxury tax on such items.

I do not think that there is anything luxurious, as one mother said to me, in having to take care of the baby and getting the necessary oils and powder.

Another of the taxes which we propose to eliminate is the tax on ranch-raised furs. That is a very important matter to the people of my State and to people of other States, such as Utah, Washingington, Iowa, and so forth. Presently a very contradictory course is being followed, Mr. President. An attempt is being made to tax out of existence one very important branch of agriculture, namely, the fur farmer. We are taxing him out of existence while at the same time we are subsidizing other branches of agriculture. I know there are those who say this is the wrong time to remedy this situation, that at some later date we will be allowed to repeal the excise taxes.

Mr. President, we have before us the Butler-McCarthy amendment. That is no quickly conceived amendment. We have taken the product of the Finance Committee's work. We have taken an amendment which they attached to another bill which has been pending before the Senate for some time, to remove those excise taxes which the Finance Committee, after long study, said should be removed. If it was proper for the Finance Committee to attach that amendment to another bill, which undoubtedly will never come before the Senate, then it would seem to be equally proper that we attach the same amendment to this bill and remove those excise or luxury taxes at the same time that we remove the tax on oleomargarine.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think it is true that in a debate on issues with which Senators have had considerable personal experience they are bound to speak from a certain amount of personal bias. At the outset of my remarks this afternoon, Mr. President, I wish to plead guilty to a certain amount of personal bias on this issue, but I believe that whatever bias may exist in my point of view is compensated for or offset somewhat by the experience I have had in this particular field.

For many years in my youth I was known in Madison, Wis., among a great many consumers, as the "butter boy," in that each Saturday I delivered, on what was known as a dairy route, the butter which was churned during the week from the milk and cream produced by the cows on our farm. I wish today that I had one dollar for every hour I sat in the cellar of that old farmhouse and churned one of the old barrel churns by hand. I could at least approach my coming campaign for reelection without so much concern about where the money is to come from. If I had a dollar for each one of those hours I churned butter when I was a boy I would have plenty of money for my campaign.

I make these statements in fairness to my colleagues, so that they will know at least the bias from which I speak. I hope also that they will give me credit for having had some basis for my conclusions because of my experience from spending a great many years on a dairy farm.

I make these preliminary remarks also because some of my friends in American labor seem to be somewhat perplexed because I have not swallowed with them the oleo lobby's propaganda in regard to the oleomargarine issue. I think the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] very effectively answered those within the American labor movement who have been misled into the conclusion that injuring the American dairy industry by supporting the extreme demands of the oleo lobby is in the best interests of American labor. I point out to the workers of America that they ought to recognize before it is too late that there is a great need for a much greater cooperation between American workers and American farmers in solving the great economic problems which confront the Nation, and I should like to have the workers of America realize that in the last analysis the size of their pay checks is dependent upon a prosperous agriculture. The economy of the United States is, after all, basically an agricultural economy, and whenever the agricultural economy goes into a recession or a depression, it is only a short time before those wearing the overalls in the factories of America begin to feel the effect of an unprosperous agriculture.

Thus, as one who is proud of his record in insisting upon fair play for American workers, I am equally proud, Mr. President, of my record of insisting upon fair play for the American farmers. So I would call the attention of American labor to some of the comments made last Friday by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Let me say, by way of sincere compliment to the distinguished Senator from Vermont, that in my judgment labor does not have a better friend in the Senate of the United States, and I am very happy to join forces on this issue, as I do on so many issues, with the Senator from Vermont, in pointing out to representatives of American labor that they had better do some rethinking in respect to the oleo issue. Some is being done, because in the debate on this issue this year we notice a little different attitude on the part of the legislative representatives of organized labor who pay us visits occasionally in the reception room of the Senate. Apparently they are beginning to question whether or not their position on this issue in times gone by has been as sound as they have been led to believe, and this year some great unions, particularly within the A. F. of L., are openly supporting the position of those of us who are sponsoring the Gillette-Wiley substitute.

Last Friday the Senator from Vermont, in a notable speech, made certain comments which I should like to have reprinted as a part of my remarks this afternoon. I have marked them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Friday, and I ask unanimous consent to have them inserted in my remarks at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTRACTS FROM REMARKS OF SENATOR AIKEN IN THE SENATE FRIDAY, JANUARY 6, 1950

I was informed yesterday by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, that the average hourly farm wage rate in three important cotton-producing States is as follows: Mississippi, 40 cents an hour; Arkansas, 47 cents an hour; Georgia, 37 cents an hour.

In contrast to these very low rates, we find the great dairy State of Washington paying its agricultural labor 93 cents an hour; Iowa pays its labor 71 cents an hour, and Minnesota, 68 cents an hour.

But this hourly wage comparison is not the whole story. The worker on the dairy farm has to work every day of the year, including Sundays. Whether he wants to work or not, he has to work every day.

The worker on the cotton farm has a seasonal proposition to deal with.

Therefore, the yearly earnings of the dairy worker are still further out of proportion to those of the cottonfield worker than a comparison of the hourly earnings would indicate.

If the materials used in manufacturing oleo were produced by as highly paid labor as that employed on dairy farms, there would be little difference between the cost of oleo and the cost of butter.

Even with these low wage rates, the cotton grower of the South is in trouble. He is trying to produce and continue to produce cotton on land which has been producing cotton for 150 years.

He is continuing to grow a soil-depleting crop and doing the best he can to make up for that depletion by adding chemical fertilizer.

* * * * *

But I wish to point out that it is not only agricultural labor which is much cheaper in the South; it is also industrial labor. The average factory worker in Arkansas is paid 90 cents an hour, as compared with $1.16 an hour which is paid to the average factory worker in Michigan.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall not yield during the course of my remarks, because I realize that the hour is late, but I shall be happy to yield when I have finished my formal address. I recognize further that to a great extent my remarks will be by way of reiteration and repetition of a point of view. But I do wish to make the record this afternoon, for future reference, of the position I take in support of the Gillette-Wiley substitute, and why I take it.

RIDICULOUS OLEO CLAIMS

Mr. President, the campaign of the oleo interests for the repeal of most Federal regulations on the manufacture and sale of their product colored yellow in imitation of butter has been characterized by some of the most ridiculous arguments imaginable. These absurd statements would be laughable were it not for the fact that they tend seriously to mislead large numbers of consumers who have no real knowledge or understanding of the importance of the dairy industry in their daily lives. Even so, I am sure that the Members of this body—many of whom were once farm boys themselves—will appreciate a review of the more ludicrous claims advanced by the oleo interests, purely for the entertainment value to be found in them.

OLEO REGULATIONS ARE A RESTRAINT ON FREE ENTERPRISE

A favorite contention of the oleo lobbyists, for instance, is that restrictions on yellow oleomargarine are a handicap to their industry. This is the propaganda line reserved for retail and wholesale grocers in particular, and for other businessmen in general. In addressing the business community, the oleo crowd invariably refers to Federal controls as "discriminatory" or "punitive," and argues that such controls are in restraint of trade and a discouragement of free enterprise.

The fact is that while oleomargarine consumption equaled only 14.9 percent of butter consumption in 1928, it amounted to 59.8 percent of butter volume in 1948. In other words, the oleomargarine manufacturers have improved their position in relation to butter fourfold in a single generation. Is this to be characterized as the result of discrimination? Can any business honestly be said to be handicapped when it shows such remarkable growth in so short a time? Have the Federal oleo laws actually stifled free enterprise in this instance? I think my colleagues will agree that they have not.

Coincident with the increase in oleo sales, butter consumption has dropped from 16.4 pounds per capita in 1938, to only 10.2 pounds per capita in 1948. During the same period, oleo consumption per capita more than doubled, showing an increase of from 2.9 pounds to 6.1 pounds for every consumer. Within the past few months the five leading manufacturers of oleomargarine have increased their production to 68.4 percent of the national total, whereas, a few months ago, they enjoyed slightly over 61 percent of the business. Despite the Federal regulations of which they complain, the five top companies are growing even bigger, and their profits are setting

new records every week. Four new oleo plants were built in the early months of 1948 alone. Surely this is not typical of an industry that is suffering under trade restraints.

According to a market report prepared by McCall's magazine, World War II raised the normal prewar annual production of oleomargarine from 359,000,000 pounds (average 1936–40) to 588,000,000 pounds in 1944. The National Association of Margarine Manufacturers estimated that this 1944 production reflected an extra civilian wartime demand of 154,000,000 pounds with the balance of the gain attributable to orders of the War Food Administration. Comparison of grocery-store sales of oleomargarine, from the same source, indicates an increase from 224,000,000 pounds in 1942 to 497,000,000 pounds for the comparable 1945 period. In other words, grocery-store sales of oleomargarine more than doubled in 3 years. The association estimated that by the end of 1946, 72 percent of grocery-store customers were oleomargarine users.

By contrast, Government diversion of a large portion of the milk supply to the manufacturers of evaporated milk and cheese, products in great demand for lend-lease, caused substantial drops in butter production during the latter war years. The 1944 output supplied less than 12 pounds per capita, including farm butter. The amount actually made available through commercial channels amounted to only 9 pounds per capita. An OPA survey at the time showed that people placed the lack of butter at the very top of their list of annoyances caused by wartime shortages. Since the butter shortage was due chiefly to Government regulation, Mr. President, it is easy to see that the dairy farmers, and not the oleomargarine manufacturers, were the ones who were discriminated against.

Increase in ration-point value of butter to its high of 24 points per pound, late in 1944, further accelerated sales of oleomargarine, which required only 5 points per pound. The result was that butter piled up on retailers' shelves during the early months of 1945. This was due to bungling by the War Food Administration, which had anticipated considerably higher demands on the butter supply later that year, when the end of the war changed the supply picture. Differentials in ceiling prices for butterfat resulted in a considerable scarcity of butter on the market even after the removal of rationing. This was not corrected before the lifting of ceilings on dairy products in the summer of 1946. It is not possible to judge accurately what effect these steps would have had on the ratio of butter to oleomargarine sales under more normal supply conditions, but we can take it for granted that the boom in oleomargarine sales was at least an indirect result of Government discrimination against dairy farmers.

A survey for the National Association of Margarine Manufacturers in 1944–45 purported to show that 61 percent of American families, or twice as many as appeared in a similar survey in 1941, were then using oleomargarine. Acceptance of oleomargarine for cooking and table use among upper-income families had increased six times over the 1941 figure. We may attribute this to the same wartime-induced shortage of butter to which I have already referred, but it is further evidence that the oleomargarine industry has not been and is not now subject to restraint of trade. Use of oleo by city housewives was claimed to have increased three times in the period covered by the oleo manufacturers' own survey. Surely that would be an unusual result of punitive Government regulations, if such regulations were directed against the oleomargarine industry, as its spokesmen claim.

A study by the Home Makers Guild, made in 1946 through a panel of housewives representing all sections of the Nation, showed that 71.6 percent had increased their use of oleomargarine because of Government-created shortages of butter. Oleomargarine was named as the preferred substitute for butter, as a spread for bread, by 61.8 percent of the women questioned. Here again we see evidence of stimulated oleomargarine sales resulting from wartime discriminations against butter outlets for the dairy farmer.

The Wall Street Journal of January 28, 1948, estimated creamery butter output in 1947 at 1,300,000,000 pounds, or 26 percent below the 1939 figure. In the same period, oleomargarine production rose from 301,000,000 pounds to a record of 746,000,000 pounds. While drops in butter prices during the latter half of 1948 brought about some decreases in oleomargarine sales, estimated production of oleo for that year was at an all-time high of 920,000,000 pounds. Estimates by Best Foods Co. in the New York Herald Tribune of September 14, 1947, indicated that by 1946 two families out of every three were oleomargarine users, as against only one family out of every three in 1941. Would those figures indicate to any impartial observer that the oleomargarine industry has been handicapped by restrictions on free enterprise?

According to an analysis of the 1948 outlook for the oleomargarine industry published in March 1948 by Tide magazine, the oleo manufacturers spent about $6,000,000 in advertising during the year ended November 1, 1947, as compared to a prewar annual advertising expenditure of about $1,500,000. A more recent article in the same publication quotes the A. C. Nielsen Co. to the effect that oleomargarine manufacturers spent $5,371,000 in advertising during the first 9 months of 1948 alone. Is this a logical expenditure for a group of companies which really believe that their operations are being handicapped by Federal regulations? Mr. President, the claims of the oleo interests that the development of their industry has in any way been hindered by the regulations which they now seek to have removed are ridiculous on the face of the evidence at hand.

"YELLOW OLEO WON'T HARM THE DAIRY FARMER"

The bankrupting of creamery butter plants is not a mere matter of business failure within the dairy industry; it represents a shrinkage of our national resources for handling and distributing the milk produced by the dairy farmer. Butter has long been the balance wheel of the dairy industry. It is the form in which surplus milk can most readily be stored and shipped to distant markets. So long as cows continue to give more milk during flush seasons than in wintertime, it will be necessary for the dairy farmer to have butter outlets for milk that cannot be sold in bottles.

As dairy prices decline, more and more milk fails to find a market in the more profitable forms, and must be held over for later distribution and consumption. This underlines the historic need for creamery butter plants in our enormously intricate system of marketing milk and other dairy products. Yet the oleomargarine interests are fond of saying that the manufacture and sale of their yellow product will have no adverse effect on dairy-farmer prosperity. The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, however, has developed a forecast of what will happen if unrestricted sale of yellow oleomargarine is permitted in the United States. This prediction is based on, first, what has happened in other countries where the manufacture and sale of yellow oleo has been allowed; and, second, calculations under the widely accepted relationship between production and prices of butter—under which given changes in the supply of butter are traditionally associated with similar but opposite changes in prices. If unrestricted sale of yellow oleo is permitted, it is estimated that—

First. Yellow oleo will replace butter, to a volume of as much as 6,000,000 pounds annually.

Second. This increase in yellow oleo sales will result in a decrease in the price of butter of from 25 to 40 percent.

Third. Contractions in butter sales will cost the American dairy farmers $638,000,000 in income a year.

Fourth. Serious dislocations in the markets and prices of other dairy products, including fluid milk, will affect 40,000 milk-processing plants and 2,500,000 dairy-farm families in every State in the Union.

That is why I say, Mr. President, that labor had better take note of the relationship of this problem to the worker's pay check because when 2,500,000 dairy families are affected, with the great purchasing power their consumer strength represents, labor simply cannot afford to ignore the fact that there is a direct relationship between the prosperity of the people on the farm and the prosperity of the people in the factories.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have already announced I will not yield until I finish my speech. Then I shall be glad to yield.

I would also have labor constantly keep in mind the fact that within the agricultural economy the dairy segment of it is the most basic. It produces the greatest amount of wealth, as I shall show later in this speech; it is, after all, the segment of the agricultural economy which determines in large measure the level of our agricultural economy as a whole at any given time.

Fifth. The resulting slaughter of an estimated 2,000,000 head of dairy cattle by farmers who will be forced out of the milk business will disrupt livestock and meat prices and marketing.

Sixth. Dissipation of our soil resources will result from the subsequent discouragement of dairy farming, now the most important contributor to sound soil-conservation practices, and one that requires no subsidy.

Seventh. A consequent depression in a critically important branch of agriculture will affect retail sales and economic life in cities, towns, and hamlets throughout every section of America.

The dairy farmer, and, indeed, the entire dairy industry, is dependent upon butter outlets as a stabilizer of prices for milk and other manufactured dairy products. No other balance wheel exists in this vast industry, for the simple reason that no other final reservoir for milk surpluses has ever been found that could equal the convenience and simplicity of storage in the form of butter. The importance of butter outlets to the dairy farmer is only partially suggested by the fact that 26.9 percent of all the milk produced in America last year eventually reached the consumer in that form.

We have already seen that an increase in the sale of oleomargarine has been accompanied historically by a decrease in the sale of butter. It is rank nonsense to pretend that a substitute product which threatens to reduce butter outlets for more than one-quarter of the Nation's milk supply will not hurt the dairy farmer.

Would any economist in his right mind suggest that the loss of almost 27 percent of its market would not hurt the Nation's steel industry? Would any Members of this body argue that a 25-percent drop in the demand for automobiles would bring anything but harm to our gigantic automotive industry? Of course not. Yet, the dairy industry is one and one-half times the size of our steel industry, and considerably larger than our automotive industry. It is the largest single source of farm income in America, as I have previously pointed out.

Milk is more important to American agriculture than corn, or hogs, or cotton, or wheat, or any other product of our farms. The production and distribution of milk is inextricably linked to the prices of butter and other manufactured dairy products. Therefore, the current decline in farm income is but a forerunner of things to come if yellow oleomargarine is to be allowed to enter into unregulated and unfair competition with butter, a vital source of income and a historical stabilizer of prices for the American farmer.

Mr. President, I am not opposed to the removal of the tax on oleomargarine. I am an advocate of it. But I think it is fallacious to argue that because we remove the tax on oleomargarine, ipso facto we must then support no regulation whatsoever on the sale of oleomargarine. It was pointed out the other day, on this floor, by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] that, after all, after the removal of the tax, there is then an obligation on the part of the Senate to see to it that there is fair regulation of the industry so as to prevent its misleading and potentially fraudulent practices from being imposed upon the consumer, because there is no question about the fact, as the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] pointed out a few moments ago, that the oleomargarine business is conducted on the basis of an imitation process.

I wish to digress just long enough to pay the Senator from Wisconsin a very much deserved compliment for the great fight he has put up, along with the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], in support of the Wiley-Gillette amendment, throughout this debate. Here are two men, not only from farm States, but two men who understand the problems of the dairy farmer, two men who have been pleading—and, I hope, not in vain—with their colleagues on the floor of the Senate to recognize that we are dealing with a problem which involves a need for fair regulation of the oleomargarine industry in order to protect the consumer from its imitation practices which, in my judgment, at least, as was pointed out by the Senators to whom I have just referred, border on gross misrepresentation and deception.

So, as one who supports the Wiley-Gillette amendment and as one who supports the elimination not only of the excise taxes on oleomargarine but excise taxes generally, I would advise American consumers to keep clearly in mind that those of us who are sponsoring the Wiley-Gillette amendment are agreeable to the elimination of the tax, but we feel it our obligation to protect the consumers of the country from what I consider to be, to put it by way of understatement, the potentialities of fraud and misrepresentation practiced upon American consumers by the oleomargarine industry.

Now, Mr. President, let us listen to some of the arguments which are made by the oleomargarine industry. One of them is, "Let them sell fluid milk"—referring to the dairy farmers, of course. When faced with the facts of life as regards our agricultural economy, the oleo lobby is prone to resort to an unrealistic bit of advice that could appeal, I think, only to the uninformed, to those who have not studied the facts. Our dairy farmers, say the oleo interests, would be better off if they disposed of their entire output of milk in fluid form. When they make that argument, Mr. President, they either show a gross ignorance of farm problems and a great lack of information about the operation of a dairy farm or they plead guilty to seeking to mislead the American people by a fallacious argument. This assertion on the part of the oleomargarine interests has great appeal to city consumers, who—I am afraid—are easily misled into believing that milk is merely another commodity that appears on their doorsteps without being touched by human hands. The fact is, of course, that the processing and distributing of milk and other dairy products constitutes one of the most complex and delicately balanced triumphs of marketing ever developed by our American system of free enterprise.

No longer is the city dweller dependent upon nearby farms for his entire supply of dairy products. Our vast municipal milksheds reach out from metropolitan centers for hundreds of miles in all directions. A shortage of cream in New York City, such as could easily be produced by the recent drought in upper New York State and in New England, is now readily overcome by refrigerator-tank-car shipments originating in States as far distant as North and South Dakota. Many of the dairy needs of Texas—and they are heavy, because Texas is a cotton State that cannot yet supply its own industrial centers from its own dairy herds—are met by shipments from Wisconsin. For practical reasons, however, it is not possible to deliver bottled milk at any such distances. Milk is a highly perishable commodity. It can be sold in bottles only to consumers who are comparatively near at hand. That was pointed out, I think, in a magnificent way the other day by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

This means that a policy of selling fluid milk would automatically signal the extinction of the thriving dairy farms of Iowa, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and more than 17 other States that do not have metropolitan markets for the bottled product. A lack of such metropolitan markets accounts for the fact that more than 73 percent of all the milk produced in North Dakota, for example, goes into butter. Over 70 percent of Iowa's milk is sold for butter. These are but two of the many States that simply do not find it practical or even possible to market their milk in bottles. The mere assertion that they ought to do so does not automatically create the concentrated industrial centers that are required to absorb their heavy milk production.

The average dairy farmer would be the first to agree that it would be nice to sell all his milk in fluid form—if he could. He would like to, if he could. Bottled milk is the most profitable of all dairy products. Every dairy farmer has his eye on that particular market, and naturally he does his level best to sell as much fluid milk as he can. Even so, little more than 40 percent of our entire national production of milk reaches the consumer in bottled form. Significantly enough, the next largest outlet for milk is in the form of butter which—as I have already said—absorbs 27 percent of our milk supply.

Butter, which ranks second only to fluid milk as a volume outlet, is the least profitable source of dairy-farm income. Butter is the final reservoir for surplus milk, and if the dairy farmer did not have that reservoir in which to store his surplus milk, it would be wasted. Between these extremes of operation will be found the other manufactured dairy products, such as cheese, dried milk, evaporated milk, and ice cream. According to variations in demand, you may be sure the dairy farmer will always dispose of his milk production in the form that returns him the highest profit from the facilities at hand. He does not need the oleo lobby to tell him that he will make more money from fluid milk than from anything else. He already knows that. He does not require urging by the oleo interests to develop fluid milk mar-

kets to the utmost limit of their capacity because, through his farmer-owned and farmer-managed cooperatives, he is already creating and serving new customers for fluid milk as rapidly as possible.

What the dairy farmer would prefer to learn from the oleo propagandists is the secret of conjuring up metropolitan markets in such States as Nebraska and the Dakotas. Those mythical markets exist only in the minds of the copy writers now employed by the oleomargarine manufacturers to tell 2,500,000 American dairy farmers how to run their businesses. As soon as the oleomargarine industry locates those nonexistent cities for the benefit of Mr. Rand and Mr. McNally, I can assure the Senators that the dairy farmers of those otherwise remote States will turn their fluid milk-marketing techniques loose on them, to the profit of all concerned.

Meanwhile, however, there remains the purely practical matter of getting rid of millions of gallons of milk, a problem which is not a dream, but an everyday reality facing the dairy farmer. Until the oleo lobby can offer something more than wishful thinking in the way of outlets to replace the butter market, dairy farmers in remote areas will continue to deliver their surplus milk to local creameries. These creameries will continue to turn that milk into butter, a product marketable at any distance and in any season. That is, they will do so unless further inroads on the butter market by yellow oleomargarine eliminate such outlets altogether. In that case dairy farmers will send their cows to slaughter, as they have been forced to do in increasing numbers since 1941.

Mr. President, as one who knows something about the practical day-by-day problems of the dairy farm, I would have my labor friends remember that if there is any substantial reduction in the size of America's dairy herds, then the economic result is bound to be an increase in the price of fluid milk in the bottles placed on the workers' doorsteps each morning. One reason why I am such a stanch advocate of the Gillette-Wiley amendment is my sincere conviction that the ultimate result of the unfair competition of oleomargarine against the dairy farmer, unless we as a Congress impose fair and reasonable restrictions, will be to increase the price of fluid milk. We are able to maintain the price at the level at which it is now maintained, because the surplus milk can be used under present conditions for butter, making it possible for the dairy farmer to keep his fluid milk at a lower price than will be the case once we permit unfair competition to take over in the industry and the size of the dairy herd is reduced to a level where it will have the inevitable economic result of increasing the price of fluid milk itself.

Mr. President, we have lost 3,000,000 dairy cows in that period, and the decline last year was the sharpest in history, according to the United States Department of Agriculture. Does anyone believe that a dairy farmer, deprived of his butter outlets, would rather sell off his cows than sell fluid milk? Of course not. The only possible explanation for the drop in dairy-cow numbers is that fluid milk markets do not exist in the great butter-producing States. That is, they do not exist to the extent necessary to take care of the surplus. This point is further brought out by the fact that by far the largest decline in our cow population has taken place in those States. When I speak of surplus, I am referring to the seasonal surplus. The surplus of fluid milk naturally results in the spring and early summer when the cows are turned out on green grass. In South Dakota in the last 3 years, the number of dairy cows has been reduced 25 percent; in Kansas, 25 percent; in Nebraska, 24 percent; in Oklahoma, 22 percent.

The results are clearly visible for all to see; the States that have let down the bars on yellow oleomargarine have injured themselves not only as butter customers but as recipients of the unending supply of dairy products, including beef and veal, that previously came from those lost dairy herds. "Let 'em sell fluid milk" is more than a misleading slogan for the oleo interests; it is a mockery of all that dairy farming stands for in the States that lie beyond the reach of metropolitan milksheds, and of all that the consumer has learned to expect from the dairy industry. The paid propagandist who tells a women's club that dairy farmers could or should sell their entire output of milk in fluid form has as his aim not only the destruction of a competitor in the table spread market, but the elimination of animal agriculture, and the substitution of vegetable fats and oils in our national diet.

If the average housewife understood that she was being deprived not only of butter but of beef and veal by such propaganda, I am sure that she would be the first to raise her voice for continued protection of the dairy farmer. If she realized that her daily supply of fresh milk was at stake, as well as the ice cream, the cheese, and the evaporated milk that she has learned to rely upon, I think her protests would be louder than all the petitions drummed up by the oleo interests at the rate of 10 cents per signature. If people understood that one-quarter of all the food consumed in this country stems from the dairy industry, I do not believe that they would favor the weakening of that industry by attacks on the vital butter outlets that mean so much to the dairy farmer and to our agricultural economy as a whole.

"THERE IS LITTLE DANGER OF FRAUD FROM YELLOW OLEO SALES"

Another of the oleo lobby's remarkable policy lines is the one to the effect that yellow oleomargarine offers no real possibility of fraud. The treatment of this subject by oleo spokesmen alternates between airy dismissal of the whole matter as being unworthy of mention, and hurt but earnest protestations of commercial integrity. In the latter respect we are assured that oleo is now big business, and that the responsible multi-million-dollar corporations that control it are far above chicanery and double-dealing.

Mr. President, I am willing to accept the latter premise, with certain reservations. I believe that the big organization, with responsibilities to its stockholders, does not dare overreach itself to the point where its operations might invite investigation. I do not believe, however, that those same factors offer any protection whatever to the consumer in other respects. On the contrary, it is the duty of management to charge all that the traffic will bear in order to show the largest possible profit for its stockholders.

No one can say that the oleo interests have been backward in that last respect. Oleomargarine is one of the largest, if not the largest, profit item in the entire food field. Where the profit on a pound of butter is a quarter of a cent or less, the profit on a pound of oleomargarine—costing half as much as butter—is 3 cents or more. In other words, the big oleo manufacturers do not feel constrained to price their product on the basis of the ingredients used, but merely set their selling price at approximately half of the retail price of butter. Apparently that is the price bracket which attracts the maximum number of buyers, because that is the level at which oleo manufacturers have consistently priced their product for a good many years.

When the price of butter goes up, the price of oleomargarine also goes up, regardless of the then existing quotations for cottonseed and soybean oils. It has sometimes happened that the costs of these raw materials have declined meanwhile, which would suggest a cut rather than an increase in the selling price of oleomargarine. Such variations in the cash return to cotton and soybean growers never seem to make much difference to the oleo manufacturers, however. With one hand the oleo interests pay out proportionately less money to our domestic suppliers of vegetable oils, while with the other hand, they jack up the retail selling price of oleo to its traditional level in relation to butter. The extra profit goes to the five giant corporations which control not only 68 percent of the oleomargarine market, but the refineries that supply the smaller oleo manufacturers with hydrogenated vegetable oils.

A comparative newcomer to the American oleo field is Unilever, Ltd., of London, England, which now owns the John Jelke Co. in this country. Unilever, Ltd., has what amounts to a monopoly of the world-wide fats and oils trade outside of this country, and can doubtless supply raw materials from its overseas plantations at even lower prices than our American farmers now receive for cottonseed and soybean oils. I am sure, Mr. President, that no one in this room is so naive as to believe that the result would be lower oleomargarine costs to the consumer. This attitude toward the low-income groups who must eat oleo or go without a table spread may not be fraudulent practice in the legal sense, but it is certainly at variance with our American concept of mass production as applied to the free-enterprise system. It certainly is in conflict with my sense of ethics, or what I think ought to be good business practice.

We believe, do we not, that lowered costs should be passed on to the consumer in order to widen the markets and make more goods available to everyone? The oleo interests have shown by their actions, however, that they do not agree

with this principle. Instead, the oleo manufacturers seek to destroy thousands of small local creameries through unfair competition for the table-spread market. They have millions of dollars to spend on advertising and propaganda, and millions more with which to mislead women's clubs and professional consumer groups as to the true economic interests involved. They have spent, and are spending, those millions for precisely such purposes. Such actions may not be illegal, but they certainly are not good practice, and in my judgment border on business immorality.

It is not necessary, however, to confine ourselves to generalities in the matter of fraudulent sales of yellow oleomargarine. Available evidence indicates that if Congress removes Federal regulations on oleo colored yellow in imitation of butter, the Nation is in for a truly unprecedented increase in consumer deception. As an example of this danger, we need go no further than the restaurant business, which serves 65,000,000 meals a day in this country.

The State of Arkansas has on its statute books certain protective measures, which were designed to prevent the fraudulent serving of yellow oleomargarine as butter in public eating places. These regulations are almost identical with the provisions of H. R. 2023, which are also intended to safeguard restaurant patrons. The law of the State of Arkansas provides that each individual serving of oleomargarine in a public eating place must be clearly identified as such, either by identifying the pat of oleo itself, or by marking the plate on which it is brought to the table. Yellow oleomargarine may be freely sold in Arkansas, which establishes the same conditions that H. R. 2023 proposes to set up for the country as a whole.

An impartial fact-finding agency was retained to visit restaurants in Arkansas this spring, to learn whether, in the face of regulations which are similar to those now proposed by the oleo lobby, oleomargarine is being properly identified as such, and not passed off as butter. The firm's investigators called on 100 Arkansas restaurants scattered throughout the State. In not a single one of the restaurants so visited was there a sign of any kind on the walls, the menus, or the butter plates to indicate that olea was being served.

In every Arkansas restaurant thus visited, the investigator asked for butter, and paid for butter. Yet laboratory tests of samples collected by those investigators disclosed that, in 66 out of 100 of those Arkansas restaurants, the spread served was yellow oleomargarine, and not butter. That is flagrant fraud in complete and total disregard of the law's requirements. If the regulations touted by the oleo interests as being completely adequate to prevent fraud have failed so miserably in Arkansas, why should we assume that they would protect restaurant patrons elsewhere in the Nation?

On the basis of the survey just mentioned, it would appear that restaurant fraud is increasing rather than decreasing, and that oleo propaganda is responsible at least in part for inducing restaurant owners to believe that there is no real dishonesty in serving oleo in place of butter. Last year the dairy industry reported the results of a similar survey, which showed that only one out of three restaurants in a selected list of large cities was defrauding its patrons by serving yellow oleomargarine as butter, at butter prices. The 1949 results in Arkansas indicate that the proportion of fraud has probably doubled in that brief period of time. Those States which have let down the barriers against the sale of yellow oleomargarine have extended an open invitation to "butterleggers" to start gouging the public, and that invitation has been accepted.

The Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture reported the existence of widespread fraud at the time of the hearings before the House Agricultural Committee in March 1949. According to Miles Horst, secretary of agriculture of that State, no less than 153 out of 500 eating places recently checked in Pennsylvania were violating the law. Restaurant owners were either serving oleomargarine without licenses, or were mixing oleo with butter, or coloring the product illegally. Many had failed to post signs stating that oleo was being served, or used in cooking.

In his statement to the House Agricultural Committee, Mr. Horst opposed legalization of colored oleomargarine. If factory coloration were permitted, he said, the problem of protecting the consuming public would, without doubt, reach major proportions and extend beyond the power to control. That is the opinion of an experienced official, who is actually charged with the prevention of fraud, and whose conclusions are based on facts rather than on theories.

The press has also reported the existence of considerable restaurant fraud in Michigan. Naturally, these cases do not come as a surprise to the dairy industry. For more than 60 years the dairy farmers, together with public health officials and agencies such as the Food and Drug Administration, have carried on an unrelenting warfare against "butterleggers" of every size, shape, and description. The files of the Bureau of Internal Revenue are full of case histories resulting from their vigilance, but the oleo interests now maintain that fraud is a thing of the past. That is why I have confined myself in these remarks to only the most up-to-date evidences of consumer deception. I contend that recent violations in Arkansas, and in Pennsylvania, and in Michigan, clearly demonstrate that human nature has not changed. The temptation to easy profits is always hard to resist, and nowhere in the food field are there greater potential rewards for those who would practice fraud and deception than in the manufacture and sale of yellow oleomargarine.

Butter—real butter—can be identified at sight only by its naturally yellow color. Oleo manufacturers already imitate the size and shape of butter cartons, the style of butter packaging, and even the quarter-pound print to which the butter user has become accustomed.

There is no such thing as an imitation egg, for instance, or an imitation potato. No one could get rich by imitating a loaf of bread, or a bag of sugar. But butter is susceptible to this kind of unfair competition, which would be encouraged for their own gain by a handful of manufacturers who have already imitated everything else about butter except its naturally yellow color. The oleo interests have added artificial flavor to their product to make it taste like butter. They have added skim milk to give their product the texture of butter. They have added vitamin A in an attempt to approximate the nutritional qualities of butter, and they have imitated the exact size and shape of butter packages in an attempt to convince the unwary housewife that she is buying something just as good as butter. Now they demand the unrestricted right to imitate butter's exact color.

How can it be said, in the face of these clear evidences of intent to slip something over on the American public, or to encourage others to do so, that fraud will not be a factor if this Congress legalizes the unregulated manufacture and sale of yellow oleomargarine? In more than 60 years the oleomargarine manufacturers have never had the courage to develop a distinctive product of their own, and sell it on its own merits. Other food manufactured have managed to do very well with new products that were not patterned after any existing commodity. Peanut butter, for instance, has been successfully merchandised to the American public during the same years in which the oleomargarine manufacturers devoted all their resources to imitating butter.

No consumer has ever objected to the fact that peanut butter is not yellow like creamery butter. The dairy farmers have never objected even to the use of the word "butter" as applied to this product, because peanut butter is so obviously something so original and different, with a special appeal of its own, that no consumer could be deceived as to its true nature. Its manufacturers have never tried to make it spread like creamery butter, or taste like creamery butter, or smell like creamery butter—and certainly they have never wasted any time trying to imitate the naturally yellow color of creamery butter. Peanut butter deserves the success it has won on its own merits, just as oleomargarine would deserve any success it might win if it were advertised and sold as a unique product with special characteristics of its own. The trouble is that oleomargarine has never been sold on that basis; it has never been marketed as anything but a cheaper imitation of real butter, a phony synthetic substitute that tried to mimic the more obvious attributes of a genuine dairy product.

In a letter addressed to all Members of Congress, under date of July 20, 1948, Mr. F. W. Hoffman, president of the Cudahy Packing Co., had this criticism to make of his fellow oleomargarine manufacturers:

> During the past several decades the industry has encouraged rather than discouraged the consumer to take the time and trouble to color her oleomargarine yellow. All of the industry's advertisements have encouraged this practice. Had the industry, on the other hand, spent its millions of advertising dol-

lars encouraging the consumer to serve oleomargarine white, she would probably have become accustomed to using it that way today.

Other industries in food, drugs, clothing, and shelter have gotten us to change our living habits without resorting to a complete imitation of competing articles, and the oleomargarine industry could and should do the same without imitating the color of butter.

Needless to say, Mr. Hoffman did not find himself in agreement with those of his competitors who were and are backing the propaganda drive to repeal Federal regulation of yellow oleomargarine. At the very opposite pole was the attitude of the John F. Jelke Co., which, as I have already mentioned, is now the property of Unilever, Ltd., of London, England.

In 1938 the Jelke Co. was served by the Federal Trade Commission with a complaint charging unfair competition in the sale of its products in violation of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. Through advertising in newspapers and magazines the John F. Jelke Co. was alleged to have represented that its oleomargarine was made from whole milk from which no part of the cream or butterfat content had been removed. The Government's complaint charged, however, that the company's oleo was in fact made from skim milk from which the cream or butterfat had been removed, and that the company's use of the phrase "fresh pasteurized milk" was wrongfully understood by consumers to mean whole milk, which was definitely not used by the oleo manufacturer.

The Federal Trade Commission further charged that the use of the words "churned" and "churnery" in connection with the phrases "fresh pasteurized milk" and "milk solids" led purchasers to believe that Jelke's oleomargarine was made from whole milk or from cream taken from whole milk. The complaint alleged that the company's product, in fact, did not contain any butterfat extracted from whole milk or cream by churning, as is done in the process of making butter, and that consequently the product was not "churned" in the sense that the term is understood by the public.

A further representation by Jelke in its advertising, to the effect that its product contained 43.8 percent more milk solids than the more expensive spreads—meaning butter—also annoyed the FTC. The Commission said that the oleomargarine manufacturer used the expression to imply that there was a substantial difference between the food value of its product and that of butter because its oleomargarine contained "more milk solids" than butter ordinarily contains. The Federal Trade Commission took the not unnatural stand that, since the quantity of milk solids in butter is about 1 percent, the presence of a mere 1.438 percent of milk solids in oleomargarine was scarcely a nutritional advantage. The presence or absence of milk solids in such a negligible quantity had no relation whatever to the food value of either butter or oleomargarine, the Commission pointed out.

Mr. President, if there is no danger of fraud in connection with the sale of yellow oleomargarine, what is the meaning of these incidents to which I have referred? The question has been raised that these frauds reflect merely a lack of enforcement. It seems to me that any such contention is brushed aside by letters from the Bureau of the Budget, and the Food and Drug Administration, to the effect that a single annual check of every eating place in the country would require the services of 960 Federal agents at a cost of $6,000,000 for the first year, and $5,000,000 a year thereafter, to enforce the restaurant provisions of H. R. 2023 alone.

Naturally, the dairy farmers of this country are not going to be satisfied to have Federal inspectors drop in on restaurant owners only once a year. They will urge, very properly, that such inspections should be carried out at least once a month. That would raise the cost of Federal enforcement to at least $60,000,000 a year, without offering much assurance even then that butterlegging would stop. Moreover, the oleomargarine laws in Pennsylvania restaurants have been and are being enforced, yet fraud persists. The violations found in Pennsylvania restaurants occurred in the face of widely publicized reports that Pennsylvania enforcement agents were cracking down. The number of restaurant owners who knew that the State agents could not possibly cover every eating place in the Commonwealth, and who took the chance of being overlooked, were the ones who were caught. That is human nature, as we discovered during prohibition days. But will the public think it is fun to be fooled when the cost of deception is double or more than double the true monetary value of oleomargarine?

"Butterlegging" can exist at any level of oleo distribution. It will occur on a wholesale scale if the final distinguishing feature between oleo and butter is removed. That distinguishing feature is, of course, the naturally yellow color of butter, which the oleo manufacturers now seek to imitate. Why do they want the unrestricted right to imitate that one particular color? There is only one logical reason—they want their product to look like butter as much as possible, so that it may be passed off for butter in public eating places, and on the home table.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I have already announced, Mr. President, that until I finish my speech, I shall not yield.

"YELLOW OLEO WILL BE CHEAPER IF FEDERAL REGULATIONS ARE REMOVED"

Next, we come to one of the most transparent of all oleo claims—a claim which would be merely amusing had it not already misled so many trusting housewives. In some respects I feel that propaganda to the effect that yellow oleo would be cheaper if only the Government would stop regulating it is less excusable than any other oleo argument, because it appeals to consumers in the low-income groups, who can least afford to be deceived. To hear the oleo interests tell it, they can hardly wait for the removal of present Federal taxes on yellow oleomargarine to cut its price by 10 cents per pound. Yet what are the facts of past performance in those States where yellow oleomargarine may now be freely sold?

Those facts are that the selling price of yellow oleomargarine in such States is more—much more—than the amount of the Federal tax would account for. Receipted sales slips and oleomargarine cartons collected from nine cities in as many States demonstrated before the Senate Finance Committee, only last April, that the difference in price between colored and uncolored oleomargarine was away out of line. The Federal tax on yellow oleomargarine, remember, is only 10 cents a pound. Yet sample purchases in those nine States showed that the mark-up on yellow oleomargarine over white was not 10 cents a pound, but 21.8 cents per pound, on the average.

Who was getting that exorbitant additional mark-up? Who is getting it now? Certainly not the farmer, who is forced to accept for his cottonseed or soybean oil whatever the two or three big refineries in the country choose to pay him. I have already said that it is the nature of big business to charge all the market will bear, and here we have clear-cut evidence of the truth of that statement. Moreover, it is only a forerunner of more extortion to come.

Mr. President, we have seen that the price of oleomargarine even now bears little or no relationship to the cost of its ingredients; that oleo is historically priced at about half the price of butter. A point which is frequently overlooked, however, is that one of the factors operating to keep oleomargarine prices down to even that level is the presence on the market of the uncolored product. In other words, if there were no white oleomargarine for sale, there would be nothing whatever to prevent the oleo interests from pricing the yellow product just far enough under the cost of butter to attract those customers who want to save a few cents regardless of quality.

Instead of costing half as much as butter, yellow oleo would then cost two-thirds as much, or even three-quarters as much. Dairy spokesmen believe that the elimination of white oleomargarine altogether would give the oleomargarine interests an opportunity to increase their profits by perhaps as much as $150,000,000 a year. Low-cost white oleomargarine is the competitor that the oleo interests fear most—not butter. Real creamery butter is a quality product which the oleo manufacturers can never hope to duplicate completely. Their whole objective is to produce a substitute which looks, tastes, and smells as much like butter as possible, but which can be sold on a price basis.

Everyone knows that yellow coloration adds nothing to the nutritional value of oleomargarine. Therefore, oleo manufacturers are forced to claim for white oleomargarine all the advantages possessed by the same product when colored at the factory. But not even the most gullible housewife would pay butter prices for something that looks like lard. So long as the market is flooded with

white oleomargarine, which does not resemble butter, it is hardly feasible for these same oleo manufacturers to charge more than half the price of butter for a substitute made of vegetable fats.

Once white oleomargarine disappears from the market, however, that handicap vanishes. The oleomargarine interests will then be able to concentrate on their product colored yellow in outright imitation of butter, which means that they will be free to follow butter prices much more closely than they can now. In fact, State and Federal laws which encourage the sale of white oleomargarine are the consumers' one sure guaranty of continued low prices for substitute table spreads.

The housewife who believes that she will pay less for oleomargarine if the factory colors it for her is badly mistaken, as a simple calculation will show. The oleo advertisements state that it takes less than 2 minutes for her to color the white product yellow in her own kitchen. However, we have seen that in 9 different States yellow oleomargarine is selling for an average of 21.8 cents a pound more than the uncolored variety, although the Federal tax is only 10 cents a pound. If the housewife can save 22 cents in 2 minutes by coloring the oleomargarine herself, she is being repaid for her trouble at the rate of $6.60 an hour. That is a pretty fair wage scale for any operation.

It must be remembered, too, that many housewives never color their oleomargarine at all, because they use it for cooking or baking purposes and derive no benefit from the yellow color. If these housewives are forced to buy yellow oleomargarine at a premium, it is obvious that they will be paying extra for something they do not need or want. In its greedy grab for the table-spread market, the oleo lobby conveniently overlooks these simple fundamentals, while ruthlessly preparing to sacrifice the same low-income groups that it so loudly professes to serve. The cynical chatter about selling oleomargarine cheaper if only the Government would allow it to be colored yellow at the factory is a screen for exorbitant profits.

The possible scope of this fraud is on a scale worthy of the best legal minds of the giant corporations that have planned it. It justifies the outlay of millions of dollars in publicity, advertising, and propaganda that have produced new highs in cunning verbiage designed to confuse professional clubwomen and the paid representatives of consumer groups. It has warranted all the pressure put on newspapers and magazines, and all the money spent for hired writers and speakers. It has made worth while all the paid-for signatures on petitions, and all the stock letters and post cards sent to Congressmen by employees of the big food companies and their friends. It has produced a classic example of the use of semantics to make local creameries and small-town dairy farmers appear in the guise of a gigantic butter lobby, while the voice of a much more powerful oleo lobby is transformed into the dulcet pleas of seemingly aroused housewives.

The fact remains, however, that the last thing to be expected from all this activity is lowered oleo prices. Our own common sense tells us that the prodigal expenditure of millions of dollars, and the application of thousands of man-hours to publicity and propaganda for yellow oleomargarine, are not motivated by the desire to charge less money for the product, or to make a smaller profit from its manufacture and sale. The oleo interests clearly see an opportunity to monopolize the table-spread market, at their own price, and that price will be higher—not lower—than at present. Any other conclusion from the facts at hand is sheer nonsense. If there remains in the mind of a single Senator any last lingering doubt that this is true, I refer him to the hearings on cottonseed oil speculation conducted last summer by Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, of Minnesota.

"HOUSEWIVES DEMAND YELLOW OLEOMARGARINE"

The oleo interests have long assured the Congress and various State legislatures that American housewives demand yellow oleomargarine. There is strong reason to believe that this assertion, like so many other misleading statements made by the oleo lobby to conceal its real objective, is a creation out of the whole cloth. The only survey of consumer preferences ever presented to congressional committees showed that a mere 23 percent of housewives believed color to be very important to oleo sales. Another 15 percent said they thought color was fairly important, but 62 percent of all consumers polled on this question said that color was not at all important to them. More than half of the women questioned said they would not object if oleo were colored some tint other than yellow or white.

It must further be remembered that only about 20 percent of our people use oleomargarine exclusively, whereas 32 percent—or half again as many—use butter and only butter for both cooking and table uses. It must remembered, also, that of all consumers who use only oleomargarine, the majority do not feel it worth while to color such oleo as they use for cooking or baking. Almost half of all consumers use both oleo and butter, and I need not tell the Senators which product goes on the table, and which is relegated to the kitchen.

It seems to me that these figures put the whole color question in its proper perspective, making it very evident that housewives have no real reason to demand the manufacture and sale of yellow oleomargarine on an unregulated basis. Certainly no housewife would demand anything of the sort if she thought that granting the oleo interests the right to imitate butter's naturally yellow color was going to imperil her supplies of meat, milk, and other dairy products. We have further evidence of the phoniness of this so-called demand in the way in which it has been expressed. State legislators and Members of Congress from all over the country have been bombarded by petitions from new and supposedly spontaneous organizations of women voters, all of which say they want yellow oleo. These organizations do not trouble to conceal the fact that they are hastily put together by professional propagandists skilled in their trade, and that they have large amounts of money available to assist housewives in making their so-called demands known.

In Ohio the chief lobbyist for the oleo interests, in an interview with the Columbus correspondent of a Cincinnati newspaper, openly admitted that he was paying as much as 10 cents a name for signatures to oleo-tax-repeal petitions. In many cases those signatures were obtained by newsboys, who thus increased their earnings while collecting from subscribers along their routes. Mr. President, I am the last to oppose free enterprise on the part of newspaper carriers, but I do not believe that the resulting oleo-repeal petitions were a true expression of popular sentiment.

In Indianapolis a well-known Representative was badgered almost to distraction by form letters demanding that he vote for repeal of oleo taxes, despite the fact that he was already on record as favoring removal of those taxes. When he replied to some of the women who had signed those letters, he received answers stating that they had never written the letters in the first place, and did not know what he was talking about. On further investigation it developed that the letters had been prepared by the local manager of Best Foods, Inc., a leading oleo manufacturer, who supplied the stationery, the typists, and even the stamps for this flood of useless correspondence.

A representative of the Association of Voters for Yellow Margarine in Ohio appeared before the Senate Finance Committee on behalf of 32,000 claimed members, the majority of whom, she said, were women. The hearings were held early in April of last year. Upon being questioned as to when her organization had been formed, however, this professional witness stated that it had been in existence only since January. It developed through further questioning by some of the Senators present that this group of some 32,000 members was what its spokesman called a "loosely formed, voluntary organization." It held no State or district conventions or meetings, passed no resolutions, and existed for no apparent reason other than to prepare oleo repeal petitions addressed to Members of the House of Representatives and Members of the Senate. Are we supposed to believe that so large a group could spring into being, full-grown for such a purpose, without the helping hand of the oleo interests, who thus choose to hide their selfish objectives behind various "front" organizations?

It has been called to my attention that oleo witnesses before the House Agricultural Committee were suspiciously lacking in spokesmen for the oleomargarine manufacturers themselves. The dairy farmers appeared in person, and spoke their respective pieces without hesitation. Four practicing dairy farmers were on hand, including one who is also a novelist and an internationally known authority on soil conservation—Louis Bromfield. One representative of organized dairy cattle breeders was there to tell the Congressmen what he thought the repeal of oleo regulations would do to his branch of the dairy industry. The

dean of the largest agricultural college in Texas expressed the objections of the teachers of animal husbandry to the manufacture and sale of yellow oleomargarine.

The Secretary of Agriculture of the State of Pennsylvania outlined the practical problems of enforcement if "butterleggers" are to have access to unlimited supplies of oleomargarine colored yellow in imitation of butter. Two representatives of the butter manufacturers appeared, along with one representative of the organized dairy cooperatives, and one general representative of other branches of the dairy industry, as well as one operating dairy-industry executive from North Carolina. All of these men had perfectly self-evident reasons for being on hand to defend their industry against what they consider unfair competition. Two officials of the dairy labor union appeared, with forthright reasons for believing that their members faced the loss of jobs and income if oleo were allowed to imitate butter. That kind of self-interest is open and aboveboard, and any legislator understands and expects it.

Some labor-union representatives demand yellow oleomargarine, because the oleo interests have convinced them, wrongly, that repeal of Federal regulations will mean cheaper food bills for their members. Five paid representatives of professional consumer and women's organization demand yellow oleomargarine, because the oleo industry has spent millions of dollars telling them and their followers that yellow oleo is what the housewives ought to have. Soybean and cotton organizations have been persuaded to demand yellow oleomargarine in the hope of increasing the market for their oils, although there is no evidence whatever that domestic oils will continue to be used in oleo production. Retail and wholesale grocers expect to save time and trouble in making out Federal reports, and would be well advised to appear on the side of the dairy farmers, who now support them in this aim. By alining themselves with the oleo interests they have offended millions of farm families that are included among their best customers, and have additionally imperiled the incomes of those same farm families.

All the witnesses cited we can understand and excuse; they appear before committees because it is their business to appear before committees. That is what they are paid to do. But, Mr. President, it is still not clear to me why the oleo industry itself did not appear before the Senate Finance Committee in an open and forthright attempt to win the legislation it seeks. When giant corporations do not choose to work in the open, it well behooves the average American citizen to watch his pocketbook. When big business seeks to operate behind a screen of other groups, some of them formed solely to put over specific legislation and having no other reason for their existence, it is time to watch our votes as well.

"BUTTER IS ARTIFICIALLY COLORED"

Perhaps the most misleading of the oleo claims is that butter is artificially colored yellow, and that oleomargarine, in consequence, should have the same right to artificial coloring. This supposed argument has been particularly difficult to refute because it contains a germ of truth which dairy organizations have never denied. No dairy farmer hesitates to admit that a small proportion of the Nation's butter—about 20 percent at most—has color added. The oleo interests fail to mention, however, either the comparatively small extent of this butter coloration, or the reason for it.

In the wintertime, Mr. President, I have placed quite a few of the little bottles of butter coloring in the butter, after I finished churning it, and proceeded then to salt it. I colored it as I salted it, but I colored it in the winter months when we were feeding the cows on dry feed, which produces a much lighter-colored butter, but still a butter of decidedly yellow tint, than the rich yellow natural color of the butter in April, May, June, and July when the cows are foraging on the luscious green grass.

When color is added to butter it is for the sole purpose of uniformity—not to make the product resemble something which it is not, as in the case of oleomargarine. Butter is always yellow, and always has been yellow. Winter butter in the northern regions is, of course, somewhat less yellow than butter produced in the summertime when cows are feeding on green pastures. By the same token, our largest milk surpluses occur during those very months of the year when the grass is greenest, and consequently a very large proportion of our butter is produced from milk that is high in carotene content and very yellow in color.

Even so, there are certain regional preferences which must be kept in mind by butter producers, and these preferences occasionally call for modifications in the naturally yellow tint of the butter. Consumers in the South, for instance, like a butter that is so deeply yellow as to be almost orange. Housewives in the New England States prefer a very pale yellow butter, and their preference must be taken into account by the dairymen who supply that market.

The important thing to remember, however, is that all butter produced at whatever season of the year is yellower than any oleomargarine, regardless of the type of vegetable oil used in its manufacture. Our domestic vegetable oils cannot be made to produce a naturally yellow oleomargarine at all, according to the Armour Research Foundation of the Illinois Institute of Technology. The reason for this is that the naturally tan or brown cottonseed and soybean oils must be hydrogenated in order to turn them into fat. The hydrogenation process turns cottonseed oil into a pale gray-green substance, whereas soybean oil becomes a sort of tattle-tale gray when thus processed. These hydrogenated fats must then be bleached, not because of Federal laws but in order to remove undesirable odors, tastes, and colors.

Oleomargarine manufacturers have not the slightest basic claim to the color yellow, no matter how carefully we examine their operations. Even the orange coloration of palm-kernel oil, which oil must be imported and presumably does not meet with the approval of southern Senators who are legislating so wholeheartedly for oleomargarine, cannot be counted upon to carry through the hydrogenation process and lend a butter-yellow tint to the finished product. The palest winter butter is deeper in hue than any oleomargarine produced without artificial coloring.

Assuming that oleomargarine manufacturers were forced from the very beginning to bleach their product white in order to make it palatable, why did they then select yellow as the one color in the spectrum that they wanted to add to make it sell? A vast variety of jams, jellies, and other table spreads has been successfully marketed in this country in a multiplicity of colors ranging from the pale green of mint jelly to the deep purple of grape jam, all of them appetizing. The housewife has not discriminated against any of these products simply because they were offered to her in some color other than yellow. On the contrary, she has bought them in tremendous quantities.

Is it not possible that the oleomargarine manufacturers decided on yellow as a desirable color simply because that is the color of pure creamery butter? Is it not possible that the oleo interests have long sought, and still seek, to profit by the quality, reputation, and good will of local creameries through outright imitation of butter's naturally yellow color? Yes, Mr. President, those things are possible; they are, in fact, probable. But it is not possible to argue successfully that all oleomargarine should be colored yellow because a small percentage of creamery butter receives an even smaller proportion of artificial coloring.

"OLEO IS A FRIEND OF THE AMERICAN FARMER"

Now we come to an often-used argument advanced in certain quarters by the oleo lobby, to the effect that oleomargarine is a friend of the American farmer. The sponsors of this propaganda line point out that cottonseed oil comes from cotton; that soybean oil comes from soybeans; and that both cotton and soybeans are raised on farms, and must be classified as farm products. Having established these points firmly in the minds of their listeners, they then proceed to state that oleomargarine manufacturers buy cottonseed and soybean oils and consequently are friends of the American farmer.

The oleo spokesmen carefully omit any mention of the not-too-remote past, when the industry excused its use of cheap, imported palm and coconut oils by maintaining that a satisfactory oleomargarine could not be made from domestic vegetable oils. That dilemma was solved for them by farm representatives in the Congress, who erected tariff barriers against the importation of foreign oils produced by what amounted to slave labor. Immediately the oleomargarine manufacturers discovered that they could, after all, use our own American oils satisfactorily.

Before the war much, if not most, of our oleomargarine came from sources which helped the American farmer not

one iota; but, on the contrary, contributed to the strength of big business corporations and international cartels which controlled the world markets in fats and oils. Now that the war is over, a considerable quantity of palm and coconut oils is once more reaching our shores and is being used in the manufacture of oleomargarine, despite the processing tax imposed for the benefit of our southern farmers.

There has been nothing whatever in all the arguments for repeal legislation advanced by the oleo lobby to indicate that domestic oils will continue to be used in their product. I have heard or read no statement emanating from the oleomargarine industry to the effect that foreign oils will not be substituted for American cottonseed or soybean oil whenever the market warrants, or whenever world prices sink low enough to justify it, or whenever the oleo interests decide that their own selfish aims will be better served by drawing upon the overseas plantations they control.

Meanwhile, it is worth remembering that every pound of butter displaced by a pound of yellow oleomargarine in 1947, fraudulently or otherwise, reduced the income of American agriculture by 46.9 cents. Farmers received only 12.8 cents from each pound of oleomargarine sold that year, but they received 69.6 cents from every pound of butter sold. Is it the work of a friend to take nearly 70 cents from the hands of American farmers every time a pound of oleo displaces a pound of butter, and to give only 13 cents in return?

Oleomargarine manufacturers argue that producers of soybeans and cotton would be greatly benefited by the unregulated sale of yellow oleo. This is not true, because little or no increase is to be expected in the price of cottonseed and soybean oils, and the reductions in dairy herds would deprive these producers of a significant portion of their market for cottonseed and soybean meals. The United States is in a fat-deficit position in normal times. Usually we import far more fats than we export. It was only during the war when the major copra- and coconut-oil-producing countries, the Philippines and the Netherlands East Indies, were under the control of the Japanese, that we exported more than we imported. Since the war we have again become a net importer.

Coconut, palm, and related vegetable oils from foreign sources in normal times establish, or certainly have a vast influence in establishing, the price of domestic vegetable oils. Industrial users of fats and oils shift their raw-material ingredients as price relationships warrant. Coconut oil is very competitive with cottonseed and soybean oil. Therefore, prices for cottonseed and soybean oil in this country will be held in a close relationship to the prices of coconut oil, due to their interchangeability of use. An increase in the prices of cottonseed and soybean oil relative to coconut oil, therefore, will merely cause an increase in imports of coconut oil.

Since cottonseed and soybean oil are sold on a flat-price basis, without regard to use, the oil used in edible products will bring no different price than that of the same grade going into inedible uses. This is quite unlike the dairy industry, where for many years the principle of classification according to use has been recognized. In view of these facts, it is obvious that cottonseed-oil and soybean-oil prices will not increase if restrictions on oleomargarine are removed. Any increase would cause an increase of imports in coconut oil and other foreign fats and oils. The net result, therefore, would be to increase imports of cheap foreign oils—not to increase prices to domestic vegetable-oil producers.

The world oils and fats supply is improving. In the Philippines production was retarded by 1948 by serious typhoon damage, but is again on the upgrade. Exports from the Dutch East Indies are increasing rapidly, although still considerably below prewar levels. United States production of the four major domestic edible oils—soybean, cottonseed, corn, and peanut—is expected to be about 10 to 15 percent above a year ago. The supply has improved to the extent that the Fats and Oils Committee of the International Emergency Food Committee has discontinued the allocation of world oils and fats supplies among importing nations. This amounts to official recognition on the part of the nations involved that the oils and fats shortage is at an end.

Thus, we have the peculiar state of affairs where an industry is asking the Congress, on behalf of the cottonseed and soybean producers, to pass legislation which will not benefit those producers. First, it will not result in any long-run increase in domestic vegetable-oil prices. The price of these oils is determined by the world price levels of competitive oils, the raw materials of which are produced by people with primitive living standards and, therefore, at very low cost.

Second, all of the cottonseed and soybean oil produced in this country is now finding outlets, and has for many years been finding outlets. There is no need to increase outlets which could not be filled by production of these oils. We should note that the production of soybeans and cotton is already heavily subsidized by the Federal Government under price-support programs. Is it wise public policy to encourage a legislative program which will, in the long run, merely increase importation of cheap foreign oils while at the same time subsidizing domestic vegetable oils through price supports?

Soybean oil was not very important until Government programs to encourage soybean production during the war were initiated to offset loss of copra and coconut oil from the Philippines and the Dutch East Indies. Further, we should note that dairy products are subject to price support. Is it wise public policy to drive down the price of butter through removal of oleomargarine regulation, which we would surely do, while in other legislation we order the support of butter prices through price-support programs? We would then have the unusual situation of the Congress forcing the reduction of prices on the one hand, and on the other hand demanding their maintenance through price support.

The only thing that could be done to dispose of such butter, except for small amounts for school lunch and relief programs, would be to dump it abroad or turn it into soap. This would be a most wasteful and uneconomic policy, and dumping would raise another confusing conflict in national foreign trade policy.

The reduction of dairy herds, which will be a longer-run result of the removal of regulation on oleomargarine, will diminish the market for one of the most important byproducts of cottonseed and soybeans. A reduction of 2,000,000 head in the national dairy herd, which I predict will follow removal of all oleomargarine regulations, will sharply reduce the demand for, and the price of, cottonseed and soybean meal.

With respect to the major cotton States, they stand to lose far more by a reduction in dairy production and prices than they could possibly gain from removal of oleomargarine regulations. In the 10 major cotton-producing States, the total farm cash income from dairy products and butter in 1946 was several times the farm value of cottonseed-oil production. The value of cottonseed meal sold to dairymen was actually greater than the value of cottonseed oil used in oleo.

"OLEO IS OPPOSED BY A POWERFUL BUTTER LOBBY"

Mr. President, I have already mentioned the fact that the oleo propaganda machine has managed to transform into a sort of ogre known as the butter lobby, some 2,500,000 individual dairy farmers. If that is what is meant by a butter lobby, we must also add 250,000 employees of dairy plants throughout the Nation, plus all the workers employed in the supply industries that serve the dairy industry. In all, it has been estimated that some 10,000,000 people derive their livelihood from the production and distribution of milk and milk products, and it is certainly true that all these people represent a considerable number of votes.

However, very few of the metropolitan newspapers, which delight in printing pieces about the butter lobby, seem to be aware of the existence of the much more powerful oleomargarine lobby with millions of dollars more to spend than dairymen ever thought of spending. The reports filed under the Federal Lobbying Act prove the existence of this oleo lobby, and demonstrate that it is considerably better heeled than the dairy and farm organizations that oppose it. The oleo lobby at its best, however, lacks one quality that is essential to the successful furtherance of legislation—it is not truly representative of either producers or consumers.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that I am very happy this afternoon to speak on the floor of the Senate as a representative of farm interests in respect to the problem before us. I shall be perfectly willing to defend before the people of my State any editorial attack that attributes to me being a part of a farm bloc. If fighting on the floor of the Senate of the United States for the protection of the best interests of the dairy farmers of

the country, and thereby the best interests of agriculture generally, and thereby the best interests of American workers and consumers generally, is to subject me to the criticism that I am a spokesman for the farm bloc, I am happy to plead guilty, and I intend, so long as I serve in the Senate of the United States, to be one who can be counted upon to rise in defense of the best interests of the American farmer, because protecting the best interests of the American farmer is essential to protecting the best economic interests of American consumers generally.

I am happy also, Mr. President, to plead guilty this afternoon to being opposed to the oleo lobby, and the tactics they have used in the attempt to impose upon American consumers the type of imitation and misrepresentation that constitutes their stock in trade.

The millions of dairy-farm families in this Nation are both producers and consumers, as any small-town merchant or banker, or businessman, can testify. There are 3,500 local creameries in this country, scattered throughout all the 48 States, which turn the dairy farmer's surplus milk into butter, and give him a weekly check in return. Those creamery checks pay store bills in town, and any merchant can tell you how important that cash farm income is to the business life of his community. The dairy farmer is not only a seller but a buyer, and he does his buying in his own home town.

I have no way of knowing how many workers are employed by the five giant oleomargarine companies that do almost 70 percent of the oleo business, but I would venture to say they number only a few thousand. I am equally sure that the oleo plants where these people work are limited to comparatively few communities, perhaps 50 in all.

It is not possible for the small number of oleomargarine plants to influence very greatly the business communities in which they are located, any more than it is possible for the few thousand workers employed by those plants to contribute much to the buying power of the cities in which they live. The manufacture of oleomargarine, like the production of any other synthetic substitute, is highly mechanized and does not require much skill or supervision. A few workers turn a few valves, and a complicated assembly of tanks and pumps and mixers does the rest.

As would be expected, the unimportance of the human factor in this process is reflected in the percentage of return that goes to the farmers who supply the raw materials. That portion of the consumer's dollar that goes back to the cotton planter or the soybean grower is usually around 30 percent, and it is sometimes as low as 22 or even 21 percent. By contrast, almost three-quarters of the consumer's butter dollar goes back to the farmer, who sometimes gets as much as 80 percent of the retail selling price.

Under the circumstances, it is not surprising that millions of dairy farmers support their dairy and farm organization leaders in opposing the unregulated sale of yellow oleomargarine. Millions of small-town businessmen have equally important interests at stake, since they depend upon the farm trade for a large part of their turn-over. The teamsters' unions are active in defending butter outlets because the dairy industry is the largest user of motortrucks in the country. If people like these can be characterized as a butter lobby, then certainly we do have such a lobby and a very influential one.

Opposed to it, however, is the oleomargarine lobby, which certainly exemplifies the type of selfish big business determined to have its own way through the expenditure of unlimited funds. In my opinion, the oleomargarine manufacturers have mistaken power for influence. In a recent article on public relations, Fortune magazine pointed out that it is possible to have power without having influence, just as it is possible to exert influence without having power. It is a mistake for the oleomargarine interests to believe that the mere expenditure of millions of dollars will assure the results they want from Congress, just as it was a mistake for them to believe that our legislators would swallow without protest the absurd assertions which they have made throughout the course of their propaganda campaign.

Mr. President, we have seen that Federal oleo regulation is not restraint on free enterprise, as the oleomargarine manufacturers contend. We have disposed of their claim that oleomargarine will not harm the dairy farmer. We have seen that it is not possible for some of our largest dairy States to sell fluid milk, as the oleo lobbyists so glibly advise them to do. We have established very clearly that oleo spokesmen are wrong in stating that there is little danger of fraud in the manufacture and sale of yellow oleomargarine. We know that yellow oleomargarine will not be cheaper if Federal regulation is removed, because the oleo interests have demonstrated very clearly their continued intention to charge all that the market will bear for their imitation butter, if and when they are allowed to market it without restriction. We have reassured ourselves that housewives do not demand yellow oleomargarine, as its manufacturers claim; that the so-called demand for yellow oleo is a fabrication.

We have examined and discarded oleo arguments to the effect that, because a small percentage of butter is artificially colored, all oleomargarine should also have the right to the use of the color yellow. That contention, needless to say, is no better founded than the equally absurd claim that oleomargarine is a friend of the American farmer.

No one seeks to deprive the American housewife of oleomargarine; she ought to be able to buy all the oleomargarine she wants in its most economical, uncolored form, without the payment of any tax whatsoever. This is the stand taken by dairy and farm leaders, when the leading agricultural organizations voted for repeal of all Federal taxes on oleomargarine, provided some other way of restraining fraud and deception could be found.

The Gillette-Wiley substitute amendment undertakes to provide against fraud and deception on the basis of States' rights. In this it follows the precedent set by the Filled Milk Act of 1923, a measure designed to stop the widespread sale of a mixture of vegetable oils and skim milk as genuine evaporated milk. The Filled Milk Act of 1923 has been reasonably successful in restraining unprincipled manufacturers from imitating a genuine dairy product, and selling it to unwary consumers as such. This it does merely by prohibiting the movement of this questionable product in interstate commerce.

States which believe that it is all right for their low-income groups to purchase and use imitation dairy products are perfectly free to allow its manufacture and sale within their own borders. States which do not believe that unprincipled promoters should be allowed to mislead the public along such lines are at equal liberty to ban its distribution without being overwhelmed by imports from neighboring States. The Fluid Milk Act was passed almost unanimously by the Congress, and has twice been upheld by the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. President, I believe that we might well follow the pattern established by that piece of legislation in supporting the Gillette-Wiley substitute amendment, which undertakes to protect consumers and dairy farmers alike by banning interstate commerce in yellow oleomargarine. No hardship would result to oleomargarine manufacturers. No consumers who now buy and use uncolored oleomargarine would be deprived of the product. No State which now permits the manufacture and sale of yellow oleomargarine would be asked to restrain its distribution in any way. But—and this is a very large but—the great dairy States upon which we depend for so much of our milk and meat and other dairy products, would be protected against unfair competition from yellow oleomargarine with its consequent threat to their vital butter outlets. As a cosponsor of the Gillette-Wiley substitute amendment, I urge the Senate to provide this minimum of protection as the only practical solution to the long butter-oleo controversy.

RECESS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, January 13, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 12 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

James Michael McInerney, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General, to fill an existing vacancy.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS

John A. Marzall, of Illinois, now holding recess appointment, to the position of Commissioner of Patents.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Maj. Gen. William P. T. Hill, United States Marine Corps, to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major general, for a period of 2 years from February 1, 1950.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 12, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. D. H. Daniels, pastor, First Baptist Church, Hendersonville, N. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, the Mighty Ruler of the universe, who dost from the throne behold all the dwellers on earth, we beseech Thee with Thy favors to behold and bless all those who make or interpret or execute our laws and so replenish them with graces of Thy Holy Spirit that they may always incline to Thy will and walk in Thy way; endow them plenteously with heavenly gifts.

As the nations of the world have their eyes focused and fixed on this Congress, give to all the Members of this body a defined and positive sense of their responsibility and wisdom to know the right and strength to do it. We pray that our laws may be so justly and so wisely administered that our Government shall be a living example to all lands, continue to hold these United States of America to a position of honor and trust among the nations.

We pray in the name of Him who said, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 9, 1950, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes, and that, following my address, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to address the House on Wednesday next for 10 minutes following any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOSSETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HÉBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by William H. Fitzpatrick, editor, New Orleans States.

Mr. WIER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a news item appearing in the Minneapolis Star-Journal.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include statements and excerpts.

Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Atlanta Journal.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and in two to include newspaper articles.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph entitled "Why Congressmen Travel."

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a bill he introduced on the extension of the unemployment-compensation program and an explanation of it.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include excerpts from newspaper articles.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include letters.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a set of resolutions of the Wapello County Farm Bureau.

Mr. NICHOLSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter sent to him.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Herbert Hoover before the National Reorganization Conference of the Citizens Committee on the Hoover Report and over the National Broadcasting System on December 12 on the subject of removing obstacles to economy and to competence in government.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to vacate the special order he had for today.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted my colleague the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] for today may be put over until next Wednesday, or, if the House is not in session at that time, the immediately succeeding legislative day; and I further ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COAL SHORTAGE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, although a national emergency exists by reason of the critical shortage of coal in this country, the President of the United States has thus far refused to act, although thoroughly informed as to the critical situation. He has thus far failed to perform his paramount duty to protect the health, the welfare, and the economy of the people, even though in no uncertain terms the Congress of the United States has given him the power so to do. Homes, hospitals, churches, schools, and factories are being closed.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the situation is so serious that the leaders of both political parties of the United States Senate and House of Representatives should call a joint meeting to devise ways and means making so clear to the President his duty as viewed by the Congress that at last he may be moved to act in relief of an emergency of which all the people are cognizant and which all suffer.

DR. TRUMAN'S DIAGNOSIS AND PRESCRIPTION

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Truman says our people are in bad health and need more medical attention, so he prescribes socialized medicine.

Dr. Truman says many of our people live in crowded shacks, so he prescribes public housing as a remedy.

Dr. Truman says our farmers do not know how to operate their farms, so he urges the Brannan plan to socialize and control the American farmer.

Dr. Truman says when our workers are out of work they do not get enough unemployment compensation, so he prescribes larger and more generous unemployment payments.

Dr. Truman says there is widespread ignorance in the country, so he prescribes Federal aid for education.

Dr. Truman says the States are unable and unwilling to secure civil liberties for their people, so he demands Federal laws to provide civil rights for all the people.

Mr. Speaker, what we really need is a new doctor who will prescribe less Government spending and lower taxes so that the people will have more of their money left in their own pockets to make their own welfare expenditures.

COAL SHORTAGE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, last Monday a group of us, possibly 40 or 50 Senators and Members of this House, met with a group of retail coal dealers in the United States. We discussed the existing coal shortage, which is becoming increasingly acute and which is causing great hardship and suffering for thousands of innocent people.

At that meeting, and in the many letters we have been receiving from home, we have had presented to us persuasive and compelling evidence that the current strike in the coal industry imperils the national health and safety. Those present at the meeting agreed that the President should be formally advised of this fact and that he should be formally urged to invoke the national-emergency provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act.

To this end a committee, composed of Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan, the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman WOLCOTT, and myself, were designated to prepare an appropriate resolution. Such a resolution was prepared and was introduced in the Senate yesterday by the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan, joined with several other distinguished Senators.

I have today introduced an identical resolution in the House. Yesterday I sent each of you a mimeographed copy of it, together with an explanatory letter. I did not confine my communication to any particular section of the country or to the members of any one party. I sent it to all of you. While the acute coal shortage more severely affects some congressional districts than others, this grave national crisis is no less the concern of all of us. And, as I stated in my letter to each of you on both sides of the aisle, I hope that many of you will introduce a like resolution as an expression for the people of your district that you believe the President should exercise the powers vested in him by existing law to prevent a continuation of the current strike.

It may be that the President does not like the law we are asking him to invoke. But let me remind you that he has used the national-emergency provisions of it on nine previous occasions. It may be that some of you may not like the law. But let me remind you that on three separate occasions we voted for it with bipartisan support.

The coal-shortage situation confronting us today is as grave and as critical as the other instances in which the President invoked the law. In three of the nine instances in which the President used the power given him by the law, it was not even necessary to obtain a court injunction to settle the dispute. In one of the instances—that of the long-lines-telephone strike—it was not even necessary for the board of inquiry, set up by the President in accordance with the provisions of the law, to file a report. In the interim the strike was settled.

But in the case of the current coal controversy the President has not even so much as set up a board of inquiry, by which at the very least the facts in the dispute, including each party's position, can be ascertained. For reasons of his own, the President has ignored the existing situation, and we who represent the people owe it to the people we represent to indicate to the President the hardship and suffering our people are having to endure and to urge him to act.

That is the purpose of my resolution and the one introduced yesterday in the Senate by several Senators. I hope I may have the full support of all of you, on both sides of the aisle, in securing favorable action on this resolution. You can assist by introducing a like resolution and by urging the Committee on Education and Labor to report it immediately.

DEFENSE FACILITIES IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago the people of the Pacific Northwest were shocked beyond words by the announcement of the military that that area generally, and Puget Sound specifically, were vulnerable to enemy attack. The announcement proposed that thereafter a major portion of the aircraft construction would be transferred from the Boeing Seattle plant to the Wichita, Kans., plant.

The effect of such proposal was tantamount to the military's saying, "The Pacific Northwest is not adequately fortified to defend itself against enemy attack. You do not have sufficient defense installations. In the event of enemy action you would be vulnerable. Your people would be without adequate protection." The droppping of a bomb itself could hardly have startled the people of that region more.

Mr. Speaker, the result of the announcement of the military has been a call to arms to the people of the Pacific Northwest. They are thoroughly aroused. They do not intend to sit idly by and permit their region and themselves to be relegated to the position of expendables. They are perfectly willing to sacrifice themselves and everything they have in the defense of our Nation, but I assure you that they strenuously resent receiving insufficient consideration in the matter of adequate defense installations.

The people recall full well the contribution of their area during both world wars in the building of ships and planes, despite their so-called vulnerability. The record then established has been unsurpassed anywhere.

The announcement of the military is not without its implications. If the area is so vulnerable what will happen to those other industries which produce essential and militarily strategic supplies? Will they too be moved from the region? Not only is the personal security of the people involved, but their economic security and well-being also.

Removal of industries would bring widespread unemployment and distress to thousands of men and women. The effect upon the entire region would be calamitous.

Mr. Speaker, the solution to the problem of possible vulnerability lies not in the removal of industries from an area of such importance and size as the Northwest. It lies rather in the installation of adequate defense facilities. I confess that I am not a military expert, but it strikes me that if people must run from the Northwest in the event of another war, so also must they run from all of our coastal and border areas. In this day of guided missiles and modern long-range bombers, which section of the United States is more secure than any other? Every section is entitled to equal consideration and protection. I trust that the military will reconsider their decision.

SEGREGATION AND DISCRIMINATION IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, on December 22 last I wrote the Secretary of Defense that I would introduce a resolution seeking an investigation into the policies and practices of the Army, Navy, and Air Forces regarding segregation and discrimination and the steps which have been taken to carry out the Executive order of the President of July 1948, as well as the experience under the directive of the Secretary of Defense of April 6, 1949. Army Secretary Gordon Gray today announces yet further plans for dealing with this blight on our constitutional democracy in a most critical area, though the new directive has yet to be issued. His announcement emphasizes that the problem still persists a year and a half after the President's Executive order of July 26, 1948, and 9 months after Secretary Johnson's directive. The Congress should see that this problem is finally liquidated. I am accordingly introducing today the resolution for an investigation referred to in my letter of

December 22, as it seems clear that Congress should at the very least oversee the liquidation of the problem of segregation in the armed forces and see that such segregation is finally brought to an end.

IMPORTS FROM COUNTRIES BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have spoken on the floor of this House against the practice of sending goods of strategic value to countries behind the iron curtain, notably to Soviet Russia, while spending billions of taxpayers' money to stem the march of communism and to arm our country against possible aggression by Communist forces.

It now appears that we are allowing imports from behind this same iron curtain that may cause loss to American farmers and workers.

My district contains some of the greatest onion-growing farms along the eastern seaboard. I hold in my hand a petition signed by 170 of these onion farmers protesting the entry of Hungarian onions into the United States.

These Hungarian onions are produced by slave labor under Communist rule and they can, therefore, be sold in this country for prices that may well ruin the onion farmers here. They have already had a serious effect on the price of onion futures.

I have taken this matter up with the Department of Agriculture and have written the Secretary of State a letter that I am placing in the RECORD.

I intend to fight this thing out to a finish and do all I can to see that the American farmer shall not be ruined and his standard of living be jeopardized by slave labor in the fields behind the iron curtain.

(The petition and letter referred to are as follows:)

We, the undersigned, citizens and farmers of Orange County, N. Y., do hereby protest the receiving in this country, by United States produce concerns, of Hungarian and Czechoslovakian onions, apparently put out by "slave labor" in Communist-controlled territory. We believe in competition, foreign and domestic, on the open market, but in view of the strained cold war relations between the United States and the iron-curtain countries, we feel that American dollars should not go to those nations.

A flood of iron-curtain onions on the market will have the eventual effect of reducing the market price for this type of vegetable—a situation which would be disastrous since this price has recently reached a fair level which enables American farmers to recuperate losses suffered during the low-price year of 1948. Furthermore, we may eventually find it impossible to compete with Hungarian and Czechoslovakian onions because—despite shipping and duty charges—they are selling as low as, or lower than United States onions. As we see it, the only way they could sell at such prices is by employing labor at starvation wages.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 9, 1950.

Hon. DEAN G. ACHESON,
Secretary of State, Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: For some little time I have been receiving protests from farmers and citizens of Orange County, N. Y., complaining about the entry into the United States of onions which were raised in Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

Orange County, N. Y., is one of the large onion-raising counties in the eastern United States and my people are apprehensive for the future of this bussiness in the face of competition from behind the so-called iron curtain. What started out as a mild breeze has developed into a hurricane from newspapers, chambers of commerce, and the people who till the soil.

I have been led to believe that recent arrivals of onions have had an adverse effect on the futures market. I further understand that although we have had a short crop of onions in the United States this past season, supply and demand are in fairly close balance.

I am writing you to ask whether or not the tariff on onions has been reduced since the end of World War II and if so, is this reduction accountable for these imports in competition with our American growers? Further, if this is so, can the situation be corrected administratively or does it require legislation?

Thanking you for your advice, I am,
Very sincerely yours,
KATHARINE ST. GEORGE.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCONNELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. Walter D. Fuller, president of the Curtis Publishing Co., on advertising and its effect on the welfare of the United States.

TAX CREDITS FOR HEALTH-INSURANCE PAYMENTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, no problem transcends in importance the health of our citizens. For that reason, any legislative suggestions on this subject deserve earnest study.

Federal grants for research into the causes and treatment of various diseases and physical ailments are now quite generally approved as proper and necessary expenditures in promoting the public welfare.

Health insurance is unquestionably desirable. It is when the element of compulsion enters that many shy away from the idea. To compel a man to take out such insurance and to say to him that a deduction will be made from his wages to pay for it, whether he wants it or not, is felt by many to be a curb on individual freedom of action, neither in conformity with our traditions nor designed to assure the accomplishment of the underlying objective—better health for a larger number of the American people.

Voluntary health insurance plans have recently made rapid strides of progress in our conutry. They are administered by public-spirited citizens who have given generously of their time and energy to develop them. As is true in most fields of activity, such private institutions are capable of rendering more efficient service than usually characterizes the operation of a Government agency.

If we can provide an incentive for more of our people to avail themselves of the advantages afforded by voluntary health-insurance plans, a real service can be performed without departure from traditional principles and without submission to the abhorrent development of centralization of more and more power and authority in the Federal Government.

Those who advocate compulsory health insurance supervised and directed from Washington are not all thirsters for power. Many of them are, of course. But others argue sincerely and plausibly that only the compulsory feature of health insurance can guarantee the achievement of the ultimate objective of better health for all, with which certainly no one can quarrel.

This thesis I am not prepared to accept. There is no evidence to support such a proposition. The experience with compulsory health plans in other countries convincingly demonstrates their ineffectiveness.

On the other hand, voluntary health-insurance programs have already met with notable success in this country. They should be encouraged in every legitimate manner.

In order to furnish an incentive for more of our people to subscribe for health insurance, I have today introduced a measure providing for a tax credit for premiums or subscription charges paid to obtain protection under voluntary plans already authorized under the Public Health Service Act.

Legislation has already been introduced in the other body to authorize an expense deduction in the income-tax returns for such premiums. While this is perhaps a step in the right direction, it is open to the objection that it grants the greatest relief to those in the highest income brackets who usually least need either the tax advantage or the benefits of health insurance.

The legislative suggestion which I have made proposes a credit against the tax rather than an expense or contribution deduction. In addition, in order further to encourage those who normally stand in greatest need of health insurance to participate in such a system, it is provided that the advantage of the tax credit shall be on a graduated scale, running from a credit of 90 percent of the amount paid for premiums for those with an adjusted gross income under $2,000 a year down to 60 percent of such premiums for those with incomes over $10,000 a year.

Objection will immediately be voiced to such a proposal by those who favor a centralized Federal control over all health systems that it would involve a great loss in tax revenue if large numbers

subscribed for the plan. There is no doubt that tax revenues would be reduced. That is the very essence of the incentive involved in the program.

On the other hand, such a plan would relieve the Federal Government of the stupendous burden involved in setting up a huge medical bureaucracy and subsidizing all our citizens for medical expenses. In every country where compulsory governmental systems have been placed in operation the cost has vastly exceeded the estimates made when the plan was adopted. There is no reason to suppose that we are any exception. It may confidently be expected that those who seek to fasten socialized medicine on our people have yielded to conservatism when it comes to forecasting how much such a plan is going to cost.

In the long run the choice lies between an increase in the cost of government, an increase in taxes, less money in the pay envelope, and compulsion on the one hand, and a decrease in income taxes, more money in pay envelopes, and volition on the other hand. If substantially as good results could be achieved in bringing about better health for our citizens through voluntary means, certainly that is to be preferred.

The question is whether the real interest of the socialized medicine advocates is in building up another formidable Government agency and keeping taxes high or in expanding health insurance to protect more people.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

FORMOSA

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, during the war I was somewhat instrumental in securing your acquiescence in calling the heads of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps to appear before the Congress to tell us of the state of preparedness of the country and the state of the war.

I should like to request, Mr. Speaker, that at the present time you call the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, and the Secretary of National Defense, Mr. Johnson, before the Members of the House—perhaps not in the Chamber, because that probably cannot be done—but, in any event, to appear before the Members of the House to tell us what they consider to be the importance of having our forces in Formosa and what they consider the value to our national defense is in Formosa. It is a vital matter today to every Member of Congress and to every person in the United States.

It is vital to democracy to those who paid the price in blood, sweat, and tears because of unpreparedness and unwise foreign policy. The American people should know before it is too late whether our interests are being fully protected.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of New York (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

YANKEE BOY MAKES GOOD IN DEEP SOUTH

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California Mr. Speaker, things are tough all over. Strange things are going on in this country. The solid South is beginning to crack. In fact, that bastion of the southern democracy which lies south of Mason and Dixon's line is falling apart at the seams—a Republican has gotten a job in Alabama.

As proof of what I say, Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a letter addressed to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. It is as follows:

SHERIFF'S OFFICE,
MOBILE COUNTY,
Mobile, Ala., January 1, 1950.

DEAR FRIEND: It is a real pleasure to hand you herewith your 1950 deputy sheriff's commission card.

In order to complete our file we ask that you return the enclosed information slip. This will also insure the prompt issuance of your 1951 card.

May the New Year bring happiness and peace to you and yours.

Sincerely,

W. H. HOLCOMBE,
Sheriff.

Now, can you beat that?

Mr. BOYKIN. Will my friend from California yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. BOYKIN. If we must have a Republican in Mobile, Ala., I would rather have JOE MARTIN than any man in this world. He is one of the greatest Americans I have ever known.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I realize we must all make an humble start. Great oaks from little acorns grow. I want the people of Alabama to know that I appreciate their generosity and assure them that I will not, in my zeal, attempt to work in two different positions at the same time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Massachusetts. Suppose any of us happened to be going through that part of Alabama where my friend has been made honorary deputy sheriff, will the gentleman from Massachusetts guarantee us that if we are exceeding the speed laws he will take care of it?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Massachusetts realizes that no Member of the House would violate any law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RIBICOFF (at the request of Mr. SADLAK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

MILK PRICES IN NEW YORK

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have always had the greatest desire to see the people of New York City and all of the other great metropolitan areas supplied by the New York milk shed, fed well and fed properly. The Federal Government, however, through the Federal milk marketing law, which covers our particular section of the Northeast, gave us all a death blow when, for the first 3 months of this year 1950, they gave an order that the milk price to producers of fluid milk should be knocked down 44 cents per hundredweight. I say it jeopardizes the very nutrition of the people of our great cities, and I for one want to protest against it loudly.

I do not like to see the dairymen of the Northeast go into bankruptcy. I am introducing a resolution at this time which will raise the milk price to these producers to $6 for every 100 pounds of milk they sell. This action will save a hundred thousand family-size dairy farms from the sheriff and will guarantee proper food for the people in the city.

The Hall resolution reads as follows:

Whereas dairy farmers of the New York milk shed are unable to meet their costs of production with prices of fluid milk at their present levels; and

Whereas the current shortage of hay and fodder due to the recent drought constitutes an additional burden upon them; and

Whereas the producers of dairy products within the New York milk shed are faced with growing hardships due to low income; and

Whereas the people of large metropolitan areas are dependent upon these family-size dairy farms of the New York milk shed for proper nutrition: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Congress hereby directs the Federal Milk Marketing Authority to raise the price paid to producers of fluid milk to at least $6 per hundredweight.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Altoona Tribune, of Altoona, Pa.; and also to extend his remarks and include a speech delivered by him before the Poultry Men's Association at Harrisburg.

Mr. LATHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Dr. Edwin A. Cottrill, notwithstanding the fact that the matter exceeds the usual amount allowed in the sum of $287.

SELFISH INTERESTS

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I note in the recent state of the Union message that the President has omitted his usual reference to selfish interests. I always thought the President did not know a selfish interest when he met one, but I have come to the conclusion that perhaps he has given some thought to the matter. Perhaps he has been giving thought to the fact that one man can say who shall work and for how long in the coal mines in this country; that one man can say how many railroad trains shall run from one point to another; and perhaps that one man really ought to be called a selfish interest.

Perhaps he has in mind another man who can throw a blockade around the Hawaiian Islands off the mainland. Perhaps he realizes that that, too, constitutes a selfish interest. Perhaps there is hope for Mr. Truman. If there is, then indeed there is hope for the country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Miss Grace Humphrey.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a committee report.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement and excerpts with regard to three different matters.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the Henderson County, Tenn., Farm Bureau and a letter from Mr. John H. Phipps.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address he made recently in Fredericksburg, Va.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the Department of Agriculture and also a newspaper article from the Washington Times-Herald.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter voicing my love and respect for you, as I did not get to attend your birthday party.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to extend my remarks, and to include therein a joint resolution I am today introducing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, like other Members of Congress, I am receiving many complaints from the constituents whom I have the honor to represent setting forth the distressing condition in their communities because of the impossibility to secure sufficient coal to heat their homes, their schools, and public institutions, their hospitals, and their churches. In addition, I am receiving telegrams and letters from manufacturers and operators of industries, some reporting that their coal supply is entirely exhausted, others that they only have enough coal to continue for a few days, and all appealing to the Congress to do something about it.

Here is a sample of a telegram just received:

We are in dire distress for coal in our community. The supply in Adrian is exhausted. Congress should get busy today and have miners back at work at once. Investigate afterward. This is not only an emergency but disaster is approaching. Please do something about it.

People do not seem to realize the Congress makes the laws and the executive departments execute and enforce them. There are already on the statute books adequate laws to permit the President to take action to the end that the prayers of the people be answered, and that coal be provided in the public interest. This question is not merely a commercial one. Human rights and even human suffering are involved. In the section of the country from which I come, it is cold in the winter. The average home is equipped for coal heat. Gas, oil, and wood are impossibilities in these homes at this time. The weather is turning rapidly colder, and a few days of zero weather will cause terrible suffering, much sickness, and probable death in many cases.

This is no time to toy with words, to play politics, or to try to escape responsibility because of technicalities. Affirmative and decisive action is essential on the part of the President. Joe Stalin may control Russia, but John L. Lewis must not be permitted to control the United States. The Taft-Hartley law may have its defects, but certainly it contains language giving ample authority to the President and the executive agencies to intervene in behalf of our people and put an end to this emergency which is not only already a calamity but, in many instances, disastrous.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] has just announced the introduction by a number of Senators and Representatives of a concurrent resolution indicating that a national emergency does exist. I have read that resolution carefully and do not believe it goes far enough. I am, therefore, introducing today a concurrent resolution amplifying and strengthening the Church resolution.

In my opinion, the emergency is presently upon us and, while the Congress cannot enforce the laws now available to the President, it should in clear, definite, and concise language express its views and at least request the President to do something about it.

My resolution will be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor—pursuant to the rules of the House—and I hope that committee will give immediate consideration not only to this resolution, but to all similar resolutions, and report favorably to the House in keeping with the necessities of the occasion and the demands of the hour.

My resolution reads as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Whereas the current strike in the coal industry is imperiling the national health and safety; and

Whereas there is not sufficient coal above the ground and available for fuel purposes

to meet the minimum requirements of the people of the country for heating purposes; and

Whereas factories are being compelled to close; people thrown out of employment; wage earners deprived of the right to provide support for their families and heat for their homes; and

Whereas the threat to national health and safety is increasing hourly, as evidenced by calls of distress from many parts of the country; and

Whereas there already exists legislation authorizing the President to act under such circumstances to protect the national health and safety: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should, and he hereby is requested to, invoke the national emergency provisions (secs. 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in the current strike in the coal industry.

COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein some letters and clippings with reference to the cotton quota allotments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, irrespective of the percentages which people tell you about, insofar as the cotton-acreage allotment is concerned, the important thing with reference to every cotton county in this Nation is how many acres of cotton allotment it, the individual county, has. If it has enough acres this is fine, if it does not have enough, how many does it need? I certainly wish that every interested Member of Congress would find out from his own State PMA committee just how many additional acres, if any, his counties will receive under the proposed Cooley amendment, the one the gentleman from North Carolina, Representative COOLEY, introduced January 3, House Joint Resolution 384. It will be enlightening and it will be interesting.

I have a letter dated January 10 about the resolution, House Joint Resolution 384, to remedy this cotton-acreage situation. Here is what the writer states: He is the secretary of the Rusk County, Tex., PMA county committee.

If Resolution 384 goes through as now written, it will be very damaging to the farmers of Rusk County.

That is Rusk County, Tex.

A 20-percent sample of 2,550 farms affected by the allotment was tabulated with the following result: 1,347 acres would be the increase, of which 160 farms would receive less than 1 acre; 295 farms would receive the balance. This would leave 2,090 farms receiving less than their original 1950 allotment.

Find out about your counties, those of you who are interested.

Please note specifically what is said about House Joint Resolution 384, the resolution introduced by Mr. COOLEY to amend the cotton quota law:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Henderson, Tex., January 10, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
United States Congressman, Third District, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will acknowledge your letter of January 6, 1950, relative to the cotton allotments in Rusk County. We also received a copy of House Joint Resolution 384.

The copy of Judge Selman's telegram attached to your letter states the situation in Rusk County the same as it applies to Houston County. If resolution 384 goes through as now written, it will be very damaging to the farmers of Rusk County.

A 20 percent sample of the 2,550 farms receiving an allotment was tabulated with the following results:

One thousand three hundred and forty-seven and one-half acres would be the increase, of which 160 farms would receive less than 1 acre and 295 farms would receive the balance. This would leave 2,095 farms receiving less than their original 1950 allotment.

This penalty to the bulk of the cotton farms would be a direct result of an arbitrary adjustment of the planted history by the county committee in order to meet the figures of the BAE.

We have 2,105 other farms which do not have a planted history for 1946, 1947, or 1948 but many of them did grow cotton in 1949. There is a reserve of 1349.7 acres set up for new growers. We have over 100 applications for "new grower" allotments and more coming in every day. It is estimated there may be as many as 900 in all.

Respectfully yours,

B. A. DINWIDDIE,
Secretary, Rusk County PMA.

MOUNT PLEASANT, TEX., *January 10, 1950.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This acknowledges your letter of January 3 and January 6, and also House Joint Resolution 384.

Please be advised that for new grower allotments here in Titus County, we have approximately 171 acres available, and it looks like that it will be close to 100 such farms requesting new grower allotments. Such being the case, it would take at least 500 acres to give these farms 5 acres each, many of which though, must have 10 to 15 acres in order to carry on the type farming program that will be necessary for them to support their families and meet commitments that have already been made.

As to my opinion of the House Joint Resolution 384, I don't believe that it will help but very little here in Titus County. You will remember that we were required to come within BAE figures before we could start figuring cotton allotments, and here in Titus County, this meant that practically every farm, and especially the cotton farms, had to have the acreage reduced in order for the county to come within the BAE figures. In some instances, in order to get within this BAE estimate, it was necessary to reduce the reported acreage to zero. My sincere opinion of legislation that would benefit most would be the permission to take released acreage and reapportion it out to those farms that need additional acreage, and to give the county credit for war crops in the same proportion as each farm has already received credit for war crops. To illustrate how giving the county credit for war crops would benefit such a county as Titus County, I would like to advise you that of the 1,160 Group I cotton farms 816 of these farms received all credit or partial credit for war crops, yet the county did not receive credit for any war crops. This then reduced the factor, which in turn meant that the real cotton farmers in the past were the ones that received the largest cut. In fact, the factor for this county is .1339, which means that if a farm had as much as 13.4 acres planted in cotton in any one of the years 1946, 1947, and 1948, and the farm had 100 acres of cropland, the farm would not be allowed but 13.4 acres, even though on such a farm the records show that the farm had been consistently planting 40 acres or more of cotton. To be sure, such farms as shown above were given all of the assistance by the committee that was permitted under the small acreage available for adjustments, and bear in mind, that the acreage available for committee adjustments was slightly over 1,000 acres, and there were 1,160 farms eligible for cotton allotments.

I hope this gives you the desired information.

Yours very truly,

HARRIS A. GREEN.

Note why no higher percentage was reserved by the State committee:

COLLEGE STATION, TEX., *January 11, 1950.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Less than 10 percent of State cotton allotment was reserved by committee for the reason that it was felt that the amount reserved was enough to take away from the stable cotton-producing area of Texas. Details relative to studies made by committee too voluminous to wire.

B. F. VANCE.

CROCKETT, TEX., *January 3, 1950.*

Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Houston County 1942 cotton acreage 72,000; 1950 acreage 26,000. Met with B. F. Vance, chairman, State PMA committee today. Cy Heaton was present and we decided an amendment setting up 70 percent of the farmers actual acreage in 1946–47–48 would alleviate our troubles but if the BAE figures are used we would be hurt still worse than we are as it is now.

ROY SELMAN, *County Judge.*

I desire to include a number of communications:

STEPHENVILLE EMPIRE-TRIBUNE,
Stephenville, Tex., January 7, 1950.

DEAR LINDLEY: I have read with considerable interest your discussion of the farm allotment program on the floor of the House the past week.

The farmers of this section of Texas are badly demoralized. Moreover, they are not at all pleased with the way this plan is working nor in the way it is being applied.

I wish to commend you for the constructive manner in which you are seeking to correct this very impractical plan.

All good wishes for the New Year.

Sincerely,

RUFUS HIGGS.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Palestine, Tex., January 10, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congress, Third District, Texas, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This acknowledges receipt of your letter of January 3, 1950, and it is indeed a pleasure to give you the information that you ask for concerning the portion of allotment reserved to take care of the old cotton farms and the new-grower farms.

An old farm, according to the interpretation in CMQ program, means any farm that had cotton planted on it in either of the years 1946, 1947, 1948, or was regarded as

having cotton planted on it by having war crops planted in 1946 or 1947, provided such farm had cotton planted on it in 1941 and decreased the cotton acreage in these 2 years and increased the war crop acreage. In this group we have 200 acres in the reserve to take care of corrections, lates, and reconstitutions.

A new-grower farm, according to the interpretations in the CMQ program, is a farm that did not have cotton in either one of the years 1946 through 1948 or was not regarded as having cotton in the year 1946 or 1947. We have 800 acres in the reserve to take care of such farms and we will likely have as many as 300 applications for this acreage.

We farmers call an old cotton farm one that grew cotton regular prior to the war, but, for various reasons, such as shortage of farm labor, lack of equipment, and the urge to go to defense jobs, etc., caused the farm to loose its cotton history, and 90 percent of the farms that are asking for new-grower allotments are just such farms.

Our regular cotton farms only got 9.55 percent of the total cropland in this county, which is a thing we cannot figure out how to live with.

If we can furnish you with further information we will be too glad to do so.

Yours very truly,

HOMER D. KILLION,
Acting Secretary, Anderson County PMA.

YANTIS DRUG CO.,
Yantis, Tex., January 5, 1950.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I read your card and papers in regard to the cotton acreage reduction this morning. I read all of them and I imagine it is like some of them stated. This is the counties that were the poorest for agriculture. More people left and went to the Army and to defense work, thereby cutting down the cotton acreage in those counties during those years like Wood County and some other East Texas counties but now since the people have come back to the farm and want to farm, I think this all should be considered and each farmer given a reasonable number of acres for cotton.

I guess you know what they mean when they say a county has, or is allowed, a certain factor. I believe they claim this county's factor is 12. I think that means 12 percent of the acreage in farm. While some other counties' factor is much higher.

It looks like they have just about figured the farmers in this county out of a cotton crop which will almost put some of them out of business. I don't see much use in the Government supporting the price on cotton and then cut the little farmer out of cotton acreage to produce the cotton; this is supporting the price and then not allow them to produce it. To support the price, I know there should be a reduction made but I think this reduction should be fair to all and I feel that you will do all in your power to get it adjusted this way. I imagine the counties in your district are hit harder than any.

Thanks for your reply and will appreciate hearing from you again.

Your friend,

J. O. MCCREIGHT.

TYLER, TEX., *January 4, 1950.*

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have been raising 20 to 25 acres of cotton. The farm was sold and we moved to the edge of town paying $45 per month on house there cash rent and my cotton and corn land rent done paid. Yet they won't let me plant any cotton at all because the land are weed land not in cultivation for 7 years. Yet my old farm was bought for a stock farm; there be no crop of any kind on it. Can I live at that. I wanted 15 acres cotton. My average cotton crop about 22½ acres.

A friend of yours. Thanks to you.

Very truly,

C. C. GARRETT.

HENDERSON, TEX., *January 5, 1950.*

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I am writing you in regards to the cotton quota on my farm 132 acres, and they only allowed me 8 acres of cotton. How can a widow woman with two grandchildren live on what one-fourth an 8 acre of cotton makes? I am not physically able to work or to help as I have high blood pressure and gall bladder trouble, and I will be 62 in June. The grandchildren are very small and can't get any job to help. At present they are both in school. Their mother is dead and their father helps what he can, but he is out of work lots. You have told me if you could ever be of any help to me you gladly would do so and I have all the confidence in the world in you. I feel like you will help if you can. Several told me to write you. As you know I am very dumb in this as my husband always saw after this business. I helped him all I could but he saw after the farm. I was in hopes I could get enough cotton to help me get the tax straight on our home. I have had so much on me this past year. I could not straighten them out as my husband and I had planned before his death in May. If you can help any way on getting this cotton acreage raised I will surely appreciate it as I feel so blank about it all. I just know I need all the acreage I can possibly get.

I hope you and yours had the merriest Christmas and a very prosperous New Year.

Your with best wishes.

Mrs. MARVIN GRAY.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 10, 1950.

DEAR MR. BRANNAN: I quote the pertinent part of a letter I have received from Mr. A. M. Mainer, route 3, Carthage, Tex.:

"If this acreage allotment is forced on, thousands of farmers will go to the relief rolls. I have a neighbor that hadn't planted any cotton since 1944. He has one son—a war veteran come back from overseas—has a wife and little baby girl and now has another little girl. This young man bought a tractor last spring and farmed his father's farm and made around 30 bales of cotton. They gave him an allotment of 5 acres. Do you think he can survive as a farmer? As ever your friend."

Any help you can give concerning this matter will be appreciated by Mr. Mainer and his neighbor. Your suggestions I'll welcome.

Sincerely,

LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have requested the Library of Congress to assist me in preparing a list of counties that have more cotton acreage in 1950 than they had in 1942. I include the part of the work which has been completed:

Cotton Belt counties with more cotton acreage allocated in 1950 than in 1942

County	Acreage allocated in 1950	Acreage allocated in 1942
ALABAMA		
Colbert	31,875	31,871
Cullman	58,142	48,344
De Kalb	51,999	43,149
Lawrence	59,173	48,325
Limestone	67,516	61,093
Madison	80,151	77,438
Marshall	50,909	48,917
Morgan	45,009	41,734
Jackson	59,033	36,010

Cotton Belt counties with more cotton acreage allocated in 1950 than in 1942—Con.

County	Acreage allocated in 1950	Acreage allocated in 1942
ARIZONA		
Cochise	5,011	12
Graham	15,684	12,858
Greenlee	1,448	971
Pima	11,189	6,551
Pinal	110,687	44,594
Santa Cruz	528	564
ARKANSAS		
Clay	44,996	39,667
Craighead	84,052	64,830
Crittenden	110,500	99,316
Cross	43,031	40,104
Desha	57,028	45,825
Greene	43,406	34,249
Jackson	64,989	55,669
Jefferson	90,836	81,005
Lawrence	34,069	33,358
Lee	66,972	56,450
Mississippi	228,607	179,566
Phillips	83,181	68,832
Poinsett	96,376	51,300
St. Francis	86,345	66,979
Woodruff	47,888	43,424
CALIFORNIA		
Fresno	169,318	85,274
Kern	165,487	75,839
Kings	88,164	40,750
Tulare	128,712	89,470
FLORIDA		
Lake	1	
Madison	3,236	
Polk	1	
GEORGIA		
Morgan	21,501	20,585
ILLINOIS		
Pulaski	1,960	1,555
Johnson	15	
Union	1	
KANSAS		
Cowley	11	3
Sumner	5	
LOUISIANA		
East Carroll	32,635	31,709
St. Martin	10,149	9,933
MISSISSIPPI		
Coahoma	109,161	107,620
Humphreys	63,614	58,463
Leflore	97,470	95,828
Pontotoc	28,472	28,341
Prentiss	23,649	22,768
Quitman	72,441	59,858
Sharkey	38,629	37,616
Tallahatchie	69,775	69,394
Tunica	66,903	61,943
Washington	114,395	108,881
MISSOURI		
Butler	19,214	11,793
Cape Girardeau	220	124
Dunklin	93,309	83,342
Mississippi	30,452	29,366
New Madrid	122,546	88,412
Pemiscot	127,158	109,441
Scott	18,325	17,494
Stoddard	41,965	32,042
NEW MEXICO		
Chaves	36,674	24,799
Dona Ana	52,780	35,561
Eddy	27,798	24,544
Hidalgo	2,383	340
Lea	15,333	1,196
Luno	10,197	1,737
Otero	659	457
Quay	4,752	3,142
Sierra	2,047	696
Socorro	178	66
NORTH CAROLINA		
Cleveland	50,171	49,768
Rockingham	20	12
OKLAHOMA		
Osage	11,412	8,316
Pawnee	11,200	7,895
Wagoner	29,403	29,019
SOUTH CAROLINA		
Clarendon	37,091	30,668
Horry	4,863	2,965
Marion	11,952	11,291
Sumter	44,921	44,525

Cotton Belt counties with more cotton acreage allocated in 1950 than in 1942—Con.

County	Acreage allocated in 1950	Acreage allocated in 1942
TENNESSEE		
Crockett	28,152	27,863
Davidson	30	26
Franklin	6,577	6,535
Grundy	229	202
Haywood	47,214	47,096
Lauderdale	35,494	33,920
Marion	789	773
Van Buren	34	12

I desire to include clippings from the Tyler Telegraph of January 5 and 9, 1950:

BECKWORTH ASKS AID FOR STATE'S COTTON FARMERS

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 4.—Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH, Gladewater, spent 30 minutes Wednesday with Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan, outlining for him in detail the desperate plight of Third District cotton farmers.

BECKWORTH said afterward that the Secretary listened with sympathetic interest and while he could not commit himself to any course, the Congressman feels that it was worth while to give the Cabinet officer a first-hand account.

BECKWORTH told of the plight of war defense workers and veterans who have been classed as new farmers and thus have no cotton history to get greater allotments.

He said in some sections of the district, each farmer had but 3 acres to plant. Because of poor soil, this might produce less than a bale. In Panola County, there are 1,000 acres to be divided among 1,300 farmers if all elect to grow cotton.

There seems no chance for change in the Agriculture Department's present interpretation of existing law.

"Something must be done," said BECKWORTH, looking hopefully to amending the law.

Much evil will come from this piece of legislation. If the Government won't let folks work and earn a living, then it can just expect to feed them.

BECKWORTH put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Tuesday for all House Members to read a comparison county-by-county of 1942 allotments with the present and these show in some instances an 80 percent cut in east Texas, whereas counties like Lubbock in west Texas have double their 1942 allotment.

COTTON ACREAGE FIGHT LOOMS IN WASHINGTON—CONGRESSMEN FROM BOTH EAST AND WEST TEXAS DECLARE LAW UNJUST

WASHINGTON, January 8.—Texans cannot "let dog eat dog" on the question of county cotton acreage allotments Representative KEN REGAN, Midland, Sixteenth District Congressman, has declared in calling for all-out coordination of effort among Congressmen and cotton leaders.

REGAN'S statement was believed more significant in view of the fact he comes from one of the three districts in the State which stand to benefit from the new county acreage allotment law.

"We cannot let the little farmers of Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH'S district in east Texas suffer and lose their land," said REGAN. "We have to take some from the counties that got the big allotments and give some to the counties with lesser allotments."

REGAN said he does not see why it could not be possible to scrap all the confusing formulae and gadgets and county factors used in figuring county and individual allotment and give everyone a straight across-the-board 30 percent cut on 1949 production.

Representative W. R. POAGE, Waco, member of the House Agriculture Committee, said this is not possible because the House had voted last year that 1949 production would not apply to 1950 allotments.

REGAN answered, "Well, what's that old eraser put on the end of a pencil for if we all don't make mistakes? Let's wipe out that act of 1949, which was a mistake, and write a new one."

Other than REGAN'S proposal, the Texas delegation in Congress seems to be without any definite plan.

Following Representative BECKWORTH'S conversation with Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan, in which BECKWORTH set forth the desperate situation of small farmers in east Texas, BECKWORTH said the Department denied it had been asked to express its views, formally, by the House Agriculture Committee before the bill was reported out.

Department officials denied that they were to blame for the legislation and said in the form in which it was passed their solicitors could do nothing else but interpret the law the way they have.

Congressman POAGE said emphatically that promises of Agriculture Department officials as to how the law would apply had been broken. Deputy Administrator Frank Woolley, of the Production and Marketing Administration, had promised POAGE that Texas might get credit for her war crops but now she does not.

BECKWORTH said: "One thing is certain. If the Government is not going to let these farmers in east Texas earn a living, it is certainly going to have to feed them."

BECKWORTH warned that many tenant farmers in east Texas would have to get off the farms where they are now living. He mentioned Panola and Smith Counties in particular but put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a comparison of allotments of all counties in the State for 1950 and 1942.

This shows some east Texas counties being cut to 3 acres to a farm while some cotton farmers of west Texas are getting double their previous acreage.

Farmers are remaining on farms now in the desperate hope that the law will be changed, he said, but come spring, there will be no alternative but for families to move on, and where will they go, he asked.

"This cotton law was written for the big interests," said REGAN. "Now they selfishly want to perpetuate these benefits which they have received."

Also I desire to include some items from the Dallas News:

UNFAIR COTTON QUOTA

To the NEWS:

This cotton-acreage bill has ruined me with my farming. I have a wife and 10 children to support, and cotton is my only cash crop. I have a 100-acre farm. I have been planting between 35 and 45 acres of cotton for the last 6 or 7 years, except during the war years when I planted war crops such as beans, potatoes, peanuts, and anything that we eat.

I think this cotton bill is the worst thing that has ever happened to a cotton farmer in east Texas. It is very unfair. I have one girl taking a business course and my next to the oldest child is finishing high school this year. I have five more in school, which makes a total of seven. It is impossible for me to make a living for them and educate them on 7.2 acres of cotton, which is all I'm allowed.

I know of farmers all around me who haven't been raising cotton, and they have got more acres in cotton to plant than I have. They do not have more than a wife and two children. I need at least 25 acres of cotton to support my family and educate my children. I think we should have a cotton quota, but I think it should be cut equal.

ZAN R. MAY.

JOAQUIN, TEX.

PMA SECRETARY STUDIES COTTON ACREAGE BILL

LUFKIN, TEX., January 7.—The 70–50 cotton-acreage allotment bill introduced into Congress Tuesday may do Angelina County farmers more harm than good, Leon Pledger, secretary of the Angelina County Production and Marketing Administration, said.

A survey of 80 farms in the county, made on a basis of probable effect of the 70–50 bill, showed that only 10 of the farms would get an increased allotment in cotton acreage, Pledger said. The other 70 farms would get cut back more than they are under the present plan, he declared.

Under the proposed bill, no cotton-acreage allotment would be less than the larger of (1) 70 percent of the average acreage actually planted to cotton in 1946, 1947, and 1948, or (2) 50 percent of the highest acreage planted in cotton or regarded as planted in cotton in any of the 3 years.

TEXAS FARMER'S PLIGHT SHOWS JOB FOR CONGRESS

Every Texan should read Zan R. May's complaint in the Letters From Readers column on this page. Injustices reported by Mr. May are typical of those inflicted on thousands of Texas farmers by the cotton-marketing quotas. Mr. May's cotton acreage has been cut by law from 45 to 7⅞10 acres for 1950. He has received no credit for cotton acreage he diverted to war crops. Neighboring farmers who have not been growing cotton, nevertheless, have received cotton acreages for 1950. Yet Mr. May cannot take over any of his neighbor's allotments if they decide to continue to farm without planting cotton.

Mr. May's hurt has come from the manner in which the present law is applied. His county's acreage was not prorated justly among cotton farmers. On the contrary, it was prorated among all farmers—on the basis of tillable acres. Under the law, this procedure will result in loss to cotton of thousands of acres, because these acres will go to farmers who do not intend to use them. And these acres, be it noted, will be lost from the State and National allotments. They are not excess acres whose cultivation would contribute to cotton surpluses.

This is the sorry mess that Congress must clean up this month. No time can be lost. Farmers want some kind of centralized agency to regulate cotton production on this Nation's hundreds of thousands of farms. They want to keep total production of bales of cotton somewhere within a reasonable range of demand. The present law won't do it. It will set farm diversification in Texas back at least one generation. Enforcement will wreck much of the good done by the Extension Service and Soil Conservation Service. Farmers will plow up any and every class of land in order to increase the number of their tillable acres. The present law is evil, a twisted nightmare of all those asinine dreams that float eternally through the twilight mentalities of the glib visionaries who infest the National Capital.

HAMILTON COUNTY FARMERS PROTEST COTTON ALLOTMENTS

HAMILTON, TEX., January 8.—The Government's cotton acreage allotment program drew fire from Hamilton County farmers at a meeting attended by more than a hundred cotton growers.

A petition, protesting the allotments, which on 90 percent of the farms is less than 10 acres and on many of them just 5

acres, was sent to Congressman OMAR BURLESON, asking his aid in obtaining relief.

It was pointed out that many farmers who have not planted cotton in several years and who do not plan to plant any this year, have been granted allotments. BURLESON has pledged his aid in an effort to secure the reallotment of this unused acreage to farmers who wish to grow cotton.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

PROMOTING EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR MINORITY GROUPS

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, as a service to the House I would like to extend in my remarks a copy of a proposed substitute for the FEPC. This is in an effort to be helpful, because many Members have asked me just what the Arkansas plan is. Since I have not taken much time of the House in the last year to describe it I do want the Members to be informed on it. I have approached this problem with a compromising spirit, because I think the issue is divisive, and I think we should try to find a middle-of-the-road course. I realize that some principles should not be compromised, and I must say in all candor that I see no basis for compromise on the question of force and compulsion in private employment. I hope I have entertained at the same time a feeling of tolerance for the minority position. I realize that discrimination is an evil and in an effort to be helpful I have drawn what I think is a thoroughly American plan that I hope the Members will consider. I will extend it in my remarks.

The bill referred to is as follows:

H. R. 6668

A bill to aid in promoting employment opportunities for members of minority groups.

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Minorities Employment Act."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States—

(1) to eliminate discrimination because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry in regard to (A) opportunity for employment, (B) tenure, terms, or conditions of employment, or (C) membership in labor organizations; and

(2) to encourage to the fullest possible extent a policy of nondiscrimination throughout industry.

FUNCTIONS OF THE SECRETARY OF LABOR

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of Labor (referred to in this act as the "Secretary") shall—

(1) receive and investigate complaints charging any discrimination of the nature described in clause (1) of section 2 (referred to in this act as "discrimination"), and investigate other cases where he has reason to believe discrimination is practiced;

(2) endeavor, by methods of mediation and conciliation, to eliminate any discrimination disclosed by any such investigation;

(3) investigate and study the character, causes, and extent of discrimination in general;

(4) formulate plans for eliminating discrimination, after studying the best methods to accomplish that end;

(5) publish and disseminate (without regard to section 306 of the Penalty Mail Act of 1948) reports of the results of such studies and investigations in such form as may be most useful in accomplishing the policy declared in section 2; and

(6) cooperate with employers and labor organizations, and other private and public agencies, in formulating programs, educational and otherwise, to eliminate discrimination.

(b) In the performance of his functions under this act the Secretary may utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel.

(c) The United States Employment Service shall cooperate fully with the Secretary in effectuating the policy declared in section 2.

MINORITIES EMPLOYMENT BUREAU

SEC. 4. There is hereby created in the Department of Labor a Minorities Employment Bureau, to be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall be paid a salary of $ a year. The Director shall perform, under the direction and supervision of the Secretary, such of the Secretary's functions under this act as the Secretary may delegate to him.

LOCAL ADVISORY COUNCILS

SEC. 5. The Secretary may create such local, regional, and State advisory councils as in his judgment will aid in carrying out the policy declared in section 2. Any council so created shall, at the request of the Secretary, (1) study the general problem, and investigate specific instances, of discrimination in the area for which it is created; (2) foster, through community effort or otherwise, good will, cooperation, and conciliation among the various groups and elements of the population of such area; and (3) make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to his functions under this act. Each member of a local advisory council shall be appointed by the Secretary from among resident citizens of the area for which the council is created, and shall serve without pay, but shall be reimbursed under Government travel regulations for expenses incurred while performing duties under this section away from his place of residence. The Secretary may, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, employ and fix the compensation of such technical and clerical employees as may be necessary to assist advisory councils under this section.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 6. The Secretary may create a National Advisory Council on Minority Problems to consult with him and make recommendations to him in regard to his functions under this act. The Council shall be composed of not more than seven members to be appointed by the Secretary, representing employers, employees, and the public. The number of members representing employers shall equal the number representing employees. Each member of the Council shall be paid compensation at the rate of $25 per day while engaged in the performance of duties under this section and shall be reimbursed under Government travel regulations for expenses incurred while so engaged away from his place of residence. The Council shall have access to all files and records of the Minorities Employment Bureau.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 7. As soon as practicable after the close of each fiscal year the Secretary shall submit to Congress and to the President a report covering his activities under this act for such year, together with such further information and recommendations for further legislation with respect to the policy declared in section 2 as he deems advisable.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. MULTER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

THE LATE MARTIN GORSKI

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, many fine tributes have been paid by his colleagues to the memory of our late friend Martin Gorski, but I am sure we all agree that words alone cannot express fully our feeling of his loss.

Our late dear friend from Illinois, in his service through four Congresses, made his influence for good felt in an unpretentious but effective fashion. His sincerity, his love for humanity, his industry on behalf of his constituents, his patriotism, and his unselfish desire to be helpful to all with whom he came in contact, were a shining example to his fellows.

Martin Gorski personified the spirit that has made America great. Rising from humble but God-loving parents of Polish origin, he repaid with service to the Nation and its people for the opportunities this land had given him. Individually he was representative of a practical ideal that has helped to bring America to its present position of eminence in the world; and that is, that men of varied nationality backgrounds, of different religious faiths, and of all races, can learn to live together in amity, each contributing to the richness and the growth of our country.

Our democracy is stronger today because Martin Gorski lived in its yesterday.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader what the program for next week will be.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be very glad to answer the gentleman.

Monday is Consent Calendar day.

While Tuesday is Private Calendar day, I am informed that there are no bills on the Private Calendar. There is no legislation scheduled on Tuesday or Wednesday unless the Committee on Rules, meeting tomorrow, should report out some rule, and then there might be an assignment for those days. But I have no knowledge of any now.

On Thursday the Korean aid bill will come up. That is the only piece of legislation that is specifically assigned for next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is there a rule out on that bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman inform us how much general debate there will be on that bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. There will be 1 hour of general debate. We made an interim appropriation in the final appropriation bill last year, as you remember, of something like $60,000,000. That will terminate on February 15, as I remember, so that action has to be taken very soon. Consequently, we have assigned it for next Thursday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And the gentleman will advise us if he makes any additions to next week's program?

Mr. McCORMACK. Absolutely. I will know tomorrow. I will follow it very closely, and I will advise the leadership on the other side as far in advance as I can. I will know tomorrow and I will advise my friend from Massachusetts and the Republican whip so that the Members can be advised if anything is going to come up on Tuesday or Wednesday. There is nothing for Monday, so we can just rule that out.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I say to the gentleman that the inquiry was not made with any expectation that he would do other than he always has done in the past. The gentleman has always been very generous in giving us such information.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SCUDDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by himself.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts from current publications and also from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

SIXTH REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the sixth report of the Economic Cooperation Administration created by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress, approved April 3, 1948.

The report covers activities under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 (title I of Public Law 472, as amended) as well as the programs of economic aid to China under section 12 of Public Law 47, Eighty-first Congress, and to the Republic of Korea under the provisions of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act of 1949 (Public Law 793, 80th Cong.) and Public Laws 154 and 196, Eighty-first Congress. There is also included in the appendix a summary of the status of the United States Foreign Relief Program (Public Law 84, 80th Cong.) and the United States Foreign Aid Program (Public Law 389, 80th Cong.).

This report is for the quarter ended September 30, 1949.

HARRY S TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 12, 1950.*

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 16, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1108. A letter from the adjutant general, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting the proceedings of the Fifty-first National Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, held in Tampa, Fla., October 9 to 13, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 440); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1109. A letter from the adjutant general, Veterans of Foreign Wars, transmitting the proceedings of the Fiftieth National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Miami, Fla., August 21 to 26, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 441); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1110. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 442); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1111. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the financial statements, records, and procedures of the banks and corporations supervised by the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 443); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1112. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and title IV of the National Housing Act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1113. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1114. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Thirty-fifth Annual Report of the Federal Trade Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1115. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Report of the Federal Trade Commission on Rates of Return for 528 Identical Companies in 25 Selected Manufacturing Industries, 1940, 1947, and 1948, Based on a Report to the Commission by Its Bureau of Industrial Economics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1116. A letter from the Chairman, War Claims Commission, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1117. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a copy of the detailed statement of expenditures of appropriations for the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. Report on the investigation of the B–36 bomber program pursuant to House Resolution 234, Eighty-first Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1470). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 33. A bill to authorize Joe Graham Post, No. 119, American Legion, upon certain conditions, to lease the lands conveyed to it by the act of June 15, 1933; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5101. A bill to provide for the transfer to Pierce County, Wash., of certain surplus land in the Fort Lewis Military Reservation; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1472). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5503. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to release and quitclaim a portion of a right-of-way easement to Langley Air Force Base, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1473). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 6718. A bill to extend and improve the unemployment-compensation program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 6719. A bill to encourage the development and expansion of privately owned tramp shipping and operations under the United States flag, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 6720. A bill to provide for the coinage of a "bit" which shall be worth 12½ cents and of a "half-bit" which shall be worth 6¼ cents; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 6721. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide certain retirement benefits for civilian marine inspectors, officers in

charge, and marine inspection officers of the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6722. A bill to provide additional benefits with respect to optional retirement of persons serving in the Coast Guard who served in the former Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 6723. A bill to eliminate the manufacturers' excise tax on certain tires used on children's toys and wheel goods and to eliminate the application to children's sleds and playthings of the manufacturers' excise tax on sporting goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 6724. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6725. A bill to give effect to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, signed at Washington under date of February 8, 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H. R. 6726. A bill to amend section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 for the purpose of preventing further increases in the public debt; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 6727. A bill to provide for the deduction and credit of contributions or subscription charges to certain prepayment health service plans for the purposes of the Federal income tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6728. A bill to amend the provisions of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LINEHAN:

H. R. 6729. A bill to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for families of moderate income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6730. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in or near Fall River, Mass.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 6731. A bill to redefine the powers and duties of the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, to establish a Department of Public Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 6732. A bill to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for families of modern income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 6733. A bill to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for families of moderate income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 6734. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the death of John James Audubon; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6735. A bill to amend section 3360 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 6736. A bill to prohibit the transportation or receipt of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 6737. A bill to provide for an increase in monthly rates of compensation and pension payable to veterans of World War I and World War II and dependents of such veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6738. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1948 (Public Law 877, 80th Cong.), as amended, to include persons whose service-connected disability is rated not less than 10 percent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 6739. A bill to appropriate funds for the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 6740. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to furnish memorial markers commemorating certain deceased members of the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 6741. A bill to amend the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 6742. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 6743. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, and title IV of the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 6744. A bill to provide a system for the treatment and rehabilitation of youth offenders, to improve the administration of criminal justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 6745. A bill to clarify the longevity status of supervisors in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 154. Concurrent resolution relative to invoking the national emergency provisions (secs. 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in the current strike in the coal industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H. Con. Res. 155. Concurrent resolution relative to invoking the national emergency provisions (secs. 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in the current strike in the coal industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 156. Concurrent resolution relative to invoking the national emergency provisions (secs. 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in the current strike in the coal industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. Con. Res. 157. Concurrent resolution favoring the invoking by the President of the United States of the national emergency provisions of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in the pending coal strike; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. Con. Res. 158. Concurrent resolution relative to invoking the national emergency provisions (secs. 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in the current strike in the coal industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. Con. Res. 159. Concurrent resolution relative to invoking the national emergency provisions (secs. 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in the current strike in the coal industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 160. Concurrent resolution relative to invoking the national emergency provisions (secs. 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in the current strike in the coal industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MASON:

H. Con. Res. 161. Concurrent resolution relative to invoking the national emergency provisions (secs. 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in the current strike in the coal industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MEYER:

H. Con. Res. 162. Concurrent resolution relative to invoking the national emergency provisions (secs. 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in the current strike in the coal industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. Con. Res. 163. Concurrent resolution relative to invoking the national emergency provisions (secs. 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in the current strike in the coal industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 164. Concurrent resolution relative to invoking the national emergency provisions (secs. 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in the current strike in the coal industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. Con. Res. 165. Concurrent resolution relative to invoking the national emergency provisions (secs. 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in the current strike in the coal industry; to the committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 166. Concurrent resolution calling upon the President of the United States to invoke the national emergency provisions of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in the current strike in the coal industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. Con. Res. 167. Concurrent resolution relative to invoking the national emergency provisions (secs. 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in the current strike in the coal industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. Res. 422. Resolution to amend Public Law 428 of the Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 423. Resolution to authorize an investigation into segregation and discrimination in the armed services; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 424. Resolution requesting information from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs regarding certain hospitalized veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. Res. 425. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct an investigation and study of American military government in Germany and the civilian administration which succeeded it; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 6746. A bill for the relief of Helena Jange Chinn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 6747. A bill for the relief of Helga Holleb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVENPORT:
H. R. 6748. A bill for the relief of Francesca Romeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. GARY:
H. R. 6749. A bill for the relief of William O. Stevens; to the Committee on Armed Services.
By Mr. HARDY:
H. R. 6750. A bill for the relief of Achileus Maroulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. KEOGH:
H. R. 6751. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Pipola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. LANHAM:
H. R. 6752. A bill for the relief of William Smits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. LINEHAN:
H. R. 6753. A bill for the relief of Ann Tobak and John Tobak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. McGRATH:
H. R. 6754. A bill for the relief of Peter Francis O'Riley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 6755. A bill for the relief of Stefan Zdzislaw Zaremba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MORTON:
H. R. 6756. A bill for the relief of Arthur Chen Shu Jee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MURDOCK:
H. R. 6757. A bill authorizing the naturalization of George Aeton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mrs. NORTON:
H. R. 6758. A bill for the relief of Ruby Thaw and Hla Sein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER:
H. R. 6759. A bill for the relief of Artur Duarte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. REES:
H. R. 6760. A bill for the relief of Dr. In Sung Kwak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. YATES:
H. R. 6761. A bill for the relief of Mary Beck, also known as Mary Plairee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 6762. A bill for the relief of Rica, Lucy, and Salomon Breger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. ZABLOCKI:
H. R. 6763. A bill for the relief of Antonio Tralonga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1608. By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: Petition of residents of Wyoming, favoring H. R. 2428, a bill prohibiting the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1609. Also, a petition of residents of Cheyenne, Wyo., in re passage of H. R. 2428, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1610. Also, a petition of Wyoming residents, in re passage of H. R. 2428, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1611. Also, petition of Wyoming residents, favoring H. R. 2428 and S. 1847, being legislation prohibiting the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1612. By Mr. DOYLE: Petition of Mrs. Vesteen Knox and 56 citizens of Long Beach, Calif., favoring the passage of a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1613. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of citizens of Meade, Kans., requesting passage of a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio and in the press; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1614. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution memorializing Congress with relation to enactment of legislation to incorporate the principle of reinsurance as a means of enabling the Federal Government to assume its responsibilities in financing the unemployment-compensation program and thereby equalizing the tax burden among the States, passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations at the January session, 1950, and approved by the Governor on January 3, 1950; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1615. Also, resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to pass legislation repealing excise taxes, or luxury taxes, so-called, passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations at the January session, 1950, and approved by the Governor on January 3, 1950; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1616. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition of several residents of Schenevus, Milford, and Cooperstown, N. Y., advocating passage of legislation which would prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1617. Also, petition of several residents of Broadalbin, N. Y., advocating passage of legislation prohibiting alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1618. Also, petition of Mrs. Mary L. Beams and other residents of Oneonta, N. Y., advocating passage of legislation prohibiting alcoholic-beverage advertising in periodicals and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1619. Also, petition of Mrs. Althea M. Handley and other residents of Schenectady, N. Y., advocating passage of legislation which would prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1620. By Mr. MARSHALL (by request): Petition of Mrs. A. E. Eske and other citizens of Litchfield, Minn., requesting the passage of a bill to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through the newspapers and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1621. By Mr. MASON: Petition of Mrs. Alfred Barnes and 31 other citizens of Will County, Ill., favoring legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and to prohibit the broadcasting of such advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1622. By Mr. PETERSON: Petition of Mrs. Chalmer Barley, of Sebring, Fla., and others, to prohibit transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1623. By Mr. RIEHLMAN: Petition signed by Mrs. Rossman Rockefeller and other residents of Onondaga County, N. Y., favoring the enactment of H. R. 2428; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1624. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Fortnightly Club, of Milton Junction, Wis., protesting against any form of compulsory health insurance or any political control of health services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1625. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Walworth, Wis., urging passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2428, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1626. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Janesville, Wis., urging passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2428, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1627. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of the Quincy Committee for the Advancement of the United States Merchant Marine, Quincy, Mass., urging the adoption by the Congress of a long-range shipbuilding program; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1628. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Edwin G. Winters and others, Great Barrington, Mass., requesting passage of the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1629. Also, petition of Rev. James A. Logan and others, Geneva, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1630. Also, petition of the president, South Miami Townsend Club, No. 1, South Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1631. Also, petition of Peter Turner, treasurer, Townsend Club, No. 22, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1632. Also, petition of the president, St. Petersburg Townsend Club, No. 1, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1633. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Bert Sears and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1634. Also, petition of Dr. Joseph J. Tronolone, city clerk, Buffalo, N. Y., relative to the excise tax on admission tickets to amusements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1635. Also, petition of Isbrandtsen Co., Inc., New York, N. Y., relative to receiving a telegram from Forrest Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations, saying: "Two United States destroyers now in vicinity have been directed to join *Flying Arrow* if she is still outside Chinese territorial waters"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1636. Also, petition of Sisterhood of Temple B'nai Israel, Milburn, N. J., relative to urging passage of the FEPC bill; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1637. Also, petition of the president, Classroom Teachers' Association of Dade County, Miami, Fla., urging immediate passage of Senate bill 246, Educational Finance Act of 1949; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1638. Also, petition of the president, Mercer Dental Society of New Jersey, Trenton, N. J., requesting Congress not to enact any legislation containing the principle of compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1639. Also, petition of the Kiwanis Club of Marshall, Tex., requesting the preservation of free enterprise, free speech, and freedom of

religion, endorsing the Hoover Commission objectives, and urging the reduction in Federal Government expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1640. Also, petition of Miami Townsend Club, No. 1, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1641. Also, petition of Mrs. Clara M. Hodges and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1642. Also, petition of West Palm Beach Townsend Club, No. 1, West Palm Beach, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1643. Also, petition of Robert I. Bishop and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1644. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles H. Nutting and others, Ormond, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 13, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Francis E. Corkery, S. J., president, Gonzaga University, Spokane, Wash., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Eternal God, source of all wisdom, courage, and truth, we humbly implore Thy blessing upon this great legislative body of our Nation, whose deliberations will so deeply affect the lives of our people, and the peace and freedom of our world.

We are profoundly grateful for the privilege and blessing of citizenship in this great land—a land utterly unique in its beauty, its wealth, its fertility, its boundless opportunity—a land above all where men are still accorded the right of men to live in the freedom of the children of God.

Help us by Thy grace to preserve intact the noble philosophy upon which our Nation was founded and under which it has grown to greatness so that we may be Thy instrument in preserving for our Nation, and for the world, the dignity of man, human freedom, and basic human rights.

We ask these blessings in the name of Christ Jesus, our Lord. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

GARRETT L. WITHERS, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 12, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Anderson	Hill	Millikin
Brewster	Hoey	Morse
Bricker	Holland	Mundt
Bridges	Humphrey	Myers
Butler	Hunt	Neely
Cain	Ives	O'Conor
Capehart	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Darby	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kem	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Downey	Knowland	Sparkman
Dworshak	Langer	Stennis
Ecton	Leahy	Taylor
Ellender	Lehman	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	Long	Thye
Frear	Lucas	Tobey
Fulbright	McCarran	Tydings
George	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Gillette	McClellan	Watkins
Graham	McFarland	Wherry
Green	McKellar	Wiley
Gurney	McMahon	Williams
Hayden	Magnuson	Withers
Hendrickson	Malone	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business as members of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, holding hearings on various flood-control and public-works projects in the State of New Mexico.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CAIN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate Monday and Tuesday of next week.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. FULBRIGHT, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senate for a moment in order that I may submit to the Senate a unanimous-consent agreement with respect to the business pending before the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the following order be entered:

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That on the calendar day of Tuesday, January 17, 1950, at the hour of 1 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment that may be pending or that may be proposed to the so-called Wiley-Gillette substitute, as modified, for the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; upon any amendment to an amendment to such substitute; and upon the substitute itself: *Provided,* That no amendment that is not germane to the subject matter of said substitute shall be in order.

Ordered further, That the time between 12 o'clock and 1 o'clock on said day be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the said substitute and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I do not desire to object to the request if I can be given the understanding that certain amendments which have been proposed, which, of course, are not yet pending, but which it has been announced would be offered, are not germane to the pending bill. I speak with reference to what we all know as the civil-rights amendments. If they are not germane to the bill, then, of course, I have no objection to the request.

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senator from Arkansas that what we are now proposing is to vote on what is identified as the Wiley-Gillette substitute. I am certain that the Presiding Officer and the Parliamentarian would say that the civil-rights amendments are certainly not germane to the Wiley-Gillette substitute.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would be my interpretation also that they are not germane. I certainly could not consent to the request if I thought they were to be held germane and that a vote would be forced on them without opportunity to discuss them.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate what the Senator says. Let me add a further statement to the colloquy. Entering into the agreement would not preclude, however, the proponents of the civil-rights measures from offering them ultimately to the bill itself, in the event the substitute should be defeated.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But if the civil-rights amendments are then offered, debate would not be precluded on them?

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, no.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am sure the able majority leader appreciates what I am undertaking to do; that is, to make certain that we shall not be precluded from proper and full discussion of civil-rights

amendments if and when they are offered.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator will not be precluded from debating at length all the civil-rights amendments, of course, when the time comes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that unfortunately the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the junior Senator from Virginia were anxious to attend the inauguration of the new Governor of the State of Virginia, in whose success we had some interest, and we were scheduled, with the consent of the Senate, to be away from Washington on Tuesday of next week. I was under the impression a request would be made to vote on the Wiley-Gillette substitute on Monday.

I understand that in order to accommodate one or two Senators it is proposed that the vote be postponed until Tuesday. I realize, of course, that we cannot have any fixed date for voting in the future which will suit all 96 Members of this distinguished body. But it is my understanding that under parliamentary rules the bill must first be perfected, before action is taken on a substitute for the whole bill. If it would not unduly delay action on this important measure it would certainly be most accommodating to the senior Senator from Virginia and the junior Senator from Virginia if the time from now until Thursday could be consumed in perfecting the bill and disposing of that, and then on Thursday next the vote be taken on the substitute. I ask our distinguished majority leader if he would not be willing that that be done.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate the position in which the able Senator from Virginia finds himself with respect to a long-standing engagement which I, of course, know is tremendously important to both Senators from Virginia.

Mr. President, we find ourselves in the same situation we always do with respect to requests for a unanimous-consent agreement. Personally, I should like to vote this afternoon. Yesterday I offered a request for a unanimous-consent agreement providing for a vote this afternoon. We have debated and discussed the pending amendment at great length. In my opinion there is no reason why we could not vote on it this afternoon, and then permit the bill to go over until Monday, and vote on the bill some time Monday. In my opinion, the pending amendment is the most important amendment which will be presented by any Senator with respect to the merits of the bill. We have debated it some 11 or 12 days. It seems to me we should be able to vote on it this afternoon. I am perfectly willing to do that, rather than vote on the amendment on Monday or Tuesday, or wait until the following Thursday to vote on the bill. If we are going to wait another week we might just as well have no unanimous-consent agreement at all, and simply let the debate take its natural course, finally making a determination one way or the other.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. By way of inquiry, I should like to ask the able majority leader if he has explored the possibility, and if there is a likelihood of achievement, of having the unanimous-consent request which he has just propounded amended so as to provide for a vote on Monday instead of Tuesday, and whether we could not accommodate ourselves to that situation without injury to any particular Senator?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in reply to the distinguished Senator from Maryland, I should like to say to him that it was more or less on the advice of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] that we agreed to vote on Tuesday. I am sure the Senator from Arkansas did not appreciate the situation in which the two Senators find themselves at this time, although I am sure he was attempting to accommodate two other Senators who cannot be here on Monday.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that is exactly the case. I was in hope that we could reach a vote today and that we could obtain agreement in that respect from the proponents of the substitute.

Then the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], in discussing this matter, said the one day they could not be here was Monday. I agreed I would not ask for the vote on Monday. I am perfectly willing to have the vote taken either today or on Tuesday.

But I hope Senators will realize that there will not be any day when some Senator will not be absent. In view of the preliminary discussion we had with the Senator from Nebraska yesterday, I understood that Tuesday was acceptable.

If we attempt to wait until every Senator can be present, it will only mean that we may not be able to get a vote at all, or else not for a very long time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield first to the Senator from Virginia, who has been on his feet, requesting recognition, for some time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to say that it has never been my inclination at any time since I have been a Member of this body or of the body across the hall, to ask for special consideration for myself.

I presented my peculiar problem. I realize what the majority leader is up against.

I am committed to vote for the repeal of the tax on yellow oleomargarine, and I wish to go on record on that vote. The bill is an important one, and it already has consumed much time in a very vital session which I believe and hope will end by July 31.

I shall not object to the request for a vote at 1 o'clock on Tuesday, and I shall cancel my engagement in Richmond up to that point, and then light out, and hope I will not get arrested going down there. [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair might advise the Senate, for its information, that so far as the Chair knows, only three Senators have indicated a purpose to speak today—if that will shed any light upon the possibility of an early vote.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to state to the distinguished majority leader, now that he has yielded, that it is perfectly agreeable to try to have the agreement provide for the vote on Monday. I think that can be done. I am sure I told the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that a vote on Monday would be agreeable. But in order to work out the unanimous-consent agreement in compliance with the request of the Senator from Arkansas, we made it Tuesday.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Now the Senator from Virginia has agreed to a vote on Tuesday, so that hurdle has been crossed.

I am quite satisfied now that it will be agreeable to vote on Tuesday, so far as concerns Senators on this side of the aisle to whom I have spoken. I did not canvass every Senator, but I did take up the matter with those who are in charge of the pending legislation. We talked to as many as we could.

But in order that each and every Senator might be here to present his views and ideas as to whether the vote should be taken on Monday or on Tuesday, the matter is now being discussed, after a quorum call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would state that, under the rule, a quorum call is not required before entering into a unanimous-consent agreement, in regard to a vote on an amendment; but only in regard to a final vote on a bill or joint resolution is a quorum call required.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is my understanding, however—and I agree with what the distinguished President of the Senate has just said—that the proposed unanimous-consent agreement also includes an agreement to vote on the substitute; and the substitute, if adopted, will preclude any further amendments to the bill. For that reason, I suggested to the distinguished majority leader that I personally would like to have a quorum call, because in reality, if the substitute is adopted, that vote will preclude the offering of amendments to the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in reply to the distinguished minority leader, let me say that we had a quorum call yesterday on that theory. After we went through with the quorum call, I understood that two Senators were to be absent today, so that the Senator from Nebraska had to make objection for them, so far as having a vote taken this afternoon. So, after all, there was no use in having a quorum call under those circumstances; it was rather absurd to do so, because the distinguished minority leader had to protect the two Senators who would not be

here today, and who would have objected if they had been here on yesterday.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that if the RECORD is examined closely it will be found that I stated I wanted to object until later in the afternoon, because I had been told by two Senators that they desired to offer an amendment to the bill. I was not sure that they would offer it; and I said that I would endeavor to work out a unanimous-consent agreement at that time.

I appreciate the fact that the majority leader has endeavored to comply with my request in regard to quorum calls. There is no dispute here, unless there will be objection on the part of some Senator whom we have not yet contacted to agreeing to vote on Tuesday.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in view of the last statement made by the minority leader, I wonder whether we can agree to vote at 4 or 5 o'clock this afternoon on this amendment.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say I have no intention of objecting to the unanimous-consent proposal which has been made to vote on Tuesday. I shall object if there is an attempt to change the proposal to provide for a vote on an earlier date.

Under the reservation of objection I have just made, I should like to ask one question of the majority leader, relative to the purpose and effect of the unanimous-consent request. As I understand, the effect will be to give the substitute and amendments pending to the substitute precedence over the amendments offered to the original bill, which are pending, and will dispose of the substitute and amendments to it, as of the date fixed, but will leave the bill and other amendments to be considered later.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is absolutely correct in his understanding of the unanimous-consent proposal.

Mr. GILLETTE. I should not object to the original proposal; but in view of the statement made by the junior Senator from Virginia, I shall object to any attempt to reach an agreement for a vote prior to that time.

Mr. LUCAS. I thoroughly understand the position of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. I now yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the senior Senator from New Jersey and the junior Senator from New Jersey find themselves in exactly the same position as that of the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. On Tuesday New Jersey is inaugurating a governor who has won the admiration of the people of the State, and who is very close to the New Jersey Senators. We would like, if we can, to be in attendance at that inauguration. So we would prefer, if possible, to reach a unanimous-consent agreement for a vote before Tuesday.

However, if the unanimous-consent agreement is to provide for a vote on Tuesday, we, like the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia, will stand by and will participate in the agreement which is reached by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement which has been proposed?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me inquire who has the floor. I yielded to the Senator from New Jersey.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey concluded his remarks, and the Senator from Oregon rose under what the Chair thought was a reservation of objection.

Mr. CORDON. The Chair is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I still have the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois does.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator from Oregon wait for a moment, please?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. Did the Senator from New Jersey make objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I did not make objection. I said that I thought it would be very inconvenient for the senior Senator from New Jersey and the junior Senator from New Jersey to be here on Tuesday; yet if the Senate enters into the unanimous-consent agreement to vote on Tuesday, we will be here to vote on Tuesday.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire whether the request for unanimous consent, if granted, would preclude the offering of any additional amendments to the pending substitute.

Mr. LUCAS. The unanimous-consent agreement as proposed permits any amendments to be offered to the pending substitute up to the time when the voting begins, which would be at 1 o'clock on Tuesday.

Mr. CORDON. In other words, we would vote at 1 o'clock on Tuesday on the substitute, and at that time the amendments which may be offered to the substitute prior to that time will be voted on before the substitute itself is voted on. Is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct, assuming that the amendments are germane.

Mr. CORDON. I have no objection.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Reserving the right to object, let me say that I myself had planned to be away on Tuesday. But if all other Senators are going to yield in respect to Tuesday, I shall withdraw any objection which otherwise I would make, and will cancel my engagement.

However, in view of the fact that it seems that there are now five of us who would like very much to be away on Tuesday, if we can do so, I would prefer to have the vote taken on Thursday, because I understand that some Senators who have to be away on Tuesday also have to be away on Wednesday.

So I wonder whether the majority leader would amend his proposal so as to provide for the taking of the vote on Thursday.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in reply, I reluctantly say that I cannot agree to make that change. If we can reach agreement to vote on Tuesday, I feel that we must do so.

I thoroughly understand the position of the Senator from New York and of other Senators; but, after all, there is important business which must be disposed of by the Senate, and we are now on the second week of the debate on this measure, and have not yet voted on a single amendment. Yesterday the distinguished Senator from Arkansas was willing to accept an amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], but that is the only business which has been transacted in connection with the pending measure. I feel that we must get along with the business of the Senate, and I simply cannot agree to a further postponement.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that the senior Senator from New York will not object to having the vote taken on Tuesday; and, as other Senators have indicated, he will cancel his engagement for Tuesday, under those circumstances.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish to be technical, but I should like to respond to the inquiry made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon. If I correctly understand the unanimous-consent agreement, it provides that the Senate shall proceed, without further debate, to vote upon any amendment which may be pending at that time or any amendment which may be proposed, so that all rights are protected. Of course, there could be no debate on an amendment after the hour fixed in the proposed agreement, but an amendment could be offered until the vote is taken on the substitute. Am I correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will answer the question. Under the unanimous-consent proposal, any and all germane amendments can be offered up to the hour of 1 o'clock; but, after 1 o'clock, they cannot be debated. They can be voted upon before the final vote on the substitute. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I feel that we should try to accommodate Senators who may be inconvenienced by the agreement. The agreement was attempted to be entered into, without consultation with certain Senators who are really concerned. At various times, the majority leader has spoken about the debate having extended a long time. Fortunately, I have had the RECORD examined, and I find that, during a period of about 2 weeks, and until yesterday, the total time consumed was 29 hours and 15 minutes. From January 4 to January 11, inclusive, there were 14 hours and 15 minutes consumed in discussion of the oleo bill. The remainder of the time was consumed on other matters. If we estimate that a period of 5 hours was consumed on the bill yesterday, the total time spent on the oleo bill is 19 hours and 15 minutes. The proponents of the bill consumed in

the neighborhood of 4 hours of that time. So I do not think there can be any suggestion of undue delay. We had a discussion of world affairs and of other issues which were injected. Debate on extraneous matters yesterday consumed more than 1 hour.

I, for one, should like to have an agreement which would accommodate as many Senators as possible, such as an agreement fixing the time for voting on Thursday next. I feel that it is very important that Senators be here, if possible. I must say that the opposition is pretty well informed as to who, on their side, will be absent at certain times, but we do not have the machinery and the facilities for doing that. I feel that I should suggest to the majority leader that the request which has been made by the five Senators be given consideration, and that we see whether it is possible to arrange for a vote sometime Thursday afternoon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a tabulation showing the time spent in debating the oleo bill from Wednesday, January 4, to Wednesday, January 11, inclusive, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEBATE ON H. R. 2023, THE OLEOMARGARINE BILL

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 4, 1950

Duration of session: 3 hours and 52 minutes.

Discussion: 2 hours.

The bill was taken up about 1:55 p. m. and discussed by Senators GEORGE and FULBRIGHT.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 5

Duration of session: 5 hours and 55 minutes.

Discussion: 1 hour and 20 minutes.

Senator GILLETTE spoke approximately 1 hour and 20 minutes.

Foreign policy debate consumed rest of session.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 6

Duration of session: 2 hours and 53 minutes.

Discussion: 2 hours and 10 minutes.

Senator AIKEN, approximately 1 hour and 15 minutes.

Senators MCCARTHY, LANGER, and WILEY about 55 minutes.

MONDAY, JANUARY 9

Duration of session: 5 hours and 58 minutes.

Discussion: None.

No discussion of oleo bill. Foreign policy debated entire day.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 10

Duration of session: 5 hours and 38 minutes.

Discussion: 5 hours.

Senator HUMPHREY spoke about 2 hours. Senators YOUNG, BUTLER, and ECTON took about 2½ hours. Quorum calls and discussion of time to vote took about 30 minutes.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11

Duration of session: 5 hours and 2 minutes.

Discussion: 3 hours and 45 minutes.

Senators THYE and LANGER consumed approximately 3 hours and 45 minutes.

Approximate time consumed in debate on oleo bill from January 4 to January 11, inclusive: 14 hours and 15 minutes.

Total time Senate in session: 29 hours and 18 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does that mean that we are to vote at 1 o'clock Tuesday?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The vote is to be taken at 1 o'clock Tuesday.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. HICKENLOOPER obtained the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, and if the Senator from Iowa will yield for that purpose, the Chair will recognize Senators who wish to put in the RECORD petitions or memorials, and introduce bills or present other routine matters. It is better to do it now than to have it done throughout the afternoon.

REPORT OF PHILIPPINE ALIEN PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the second annual report for the Philippine Alien Property Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1950.*

EXHIBITION OF WORKS OF ART FROM VIENNA MUSEUMS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a letter from the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D. C., which may be of interest to Senators. The clerk will read the letter.

The legislative clerk read the letter, as follows:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART,
Washington, D. C., January 12, 1950.

The Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
The Vice President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The exhibition of works of art from the Vienna museums, which are on loan from the Austrian Government to the National Gallery, will close on Sunday, January 22. The attendance has been very large and will probably increase during the closing days of the exhibition.

I would like for the Members of the Senate and their families to have an opportunity of seeing the collection as comfortably as possible and would be delighted to arrange a private view for them on Friday afternoon, January 20, after the gallery closes at 5 o'clock. We should be glad to have them come to the gallery from 5:15 to 7 o'clock and to use the entrance on Constitution Avenue at Sixth Street. I should be grateful if you would be kind enough to extend the invitation to them and also to the Senators' secretaries, clerks of the committees, and members of the Senate Press Gallery, with their wives.

I hope that we shall have the pleasure of welcoming you and Mrs. Barkley on that occasion, and with kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

DAVID E. FINLEY, *Director.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON SPECIAL ASSISTANTS EMPLOYED BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the Special Assistants employed by that Department for the period July 1 to December 31, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Mary Elizabeth Coughlin from a report relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted by him to the Senate on October 17, 1949; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SCHEDULES OF PUBLIC WORKS AND IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS UNAPPROPRIATED FOR BY DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 136, Eighty-first Congress, a copy of schedules of public works and improvement projects and related work of the Department of the Interior for which no construction funds have been made available to date (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixty-third annual report of that Commission for the period November 1, 1948, to October 31, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for the fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ARCHIVES TRUST FUND BOARD

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the National Archives Trust Fund Board for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS ON DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT RECORDS

A letter from the Administrator of General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, three reports of the Archivist of the United States, on the disposal of certain Government records, for the calendar year 1949 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

A letter from the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed amendments to the bill (S. 2246) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK AND NATIONAL HOUSING ACTS

A letter from the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and title IV of the National Housing Act, and

for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ON FERTILIZER INDUSTRY

A letter from the Acting Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of its report entitled "Report on the Fertilizer Industry" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of Hugh P. Andrews, of Portland, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation which would give special recognition to veterans who served in both world wars (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Resolutions adopted by the Miami Townsend Club, No. 1, and the West Palm Beach Townsend Club, No. 1, both in the State of Florida, favoring the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan, providing old-age insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Gate City Lodge of B'nai B'rith, Atlanta, Ga., favoring the prompt ratification of the genocide convention of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the Northwestern Ohio Dental Society, of Lima, and the Akron Dental Society, both of the State of Ohio, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The memorial of Mrs. George H. Coon and sundry other members of the Harbor Delphians of Bay Ridge, of Brooklyn, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance, etc.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Concurrent Resolution 6

"Concurrent resolution respectfully asking the Congress of the United States by and through the Oklahoma delegation to appropriately rename the Red River Dam

"Whereas the Great White Father in His infinite wisdom has seen fit to vest this land with the great river on our south boundary called by the Spanish, Indians, and Americans, the Red River; and

"Whereas by treaty between the Spanish and United States Governments in the year 1819, and later upheld by the United States Supreme Court in the case of *United States* v. *Texas* (162 U. S. 1), it has been declared that the boundary between the States of Oklahoma and Texas is the south bank of the Red River which decision has later been declared to be the high-water mark of the south bank of the Red River; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has constructed the Red River Dam at an approximate cost of $55,000,000, for the purpose of creating a vast amount of power from the said river; and

"Whereas the Red River Dam, although a far greater portion is in Oklahoma, has been erroneously named the "Denison Dam": Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Extraordinary Session of the Twenty-second Oklahoma Legislature (the Senate concurring therein):

"1. That the Congress of the United States be, and is, hereby earnestly requested to rename the Red River Dam.

"2. *Be it further resolved,* That the land comprising the said dam and lake having been originally the 'Indian Territory' that the name 'Okachito Dam,' 'Okachito' being the Choctaw word for 'Big Water,' be adopted to replace the name it now bears. This would appropriately rename the Red River Dam as well as pay tribute to the pioneer citizens of this great State and Nation.

"3. And providing that a copy of this resolution be sent to each member of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress, both the House of Representatives and the United States Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 14th day of December 1949."

By Mr. MORSE:

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING—PETITION

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on January 11, I presented to the Senate petitions sent to me by Mrs. Cora S. Palmer, legislative director, WCTU, Sussex County, Del., signed by 1,073 citizens of Sussex County in support of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, now pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I have today received a similar petition from Mrs. Palmer signed by 45 citizens of Sussex County. I ask that this petition also be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for its consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition presented by the Senator from Delaware will be received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

TRANSFER OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT, THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Department of North Dakota, the American Legion, at its midwinter conference at Fargo, N. Dak., December 12 and 13, 1949, relating to the recommendation of the Hoover Commission which advocates the transfer of the Veterans' Administration hospital program to social-welfare agencies.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas certain uninformed individuals and organizations have recently seen fit to again flood this country, as they did following World War I, with erroneous propaganda concerning the cost of the veterans' rehabilitation program established by the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas such activity is designed to bluff the American people into believing that this Nation's veterans, particularly the wounded and disabled who are still fighting their war from hospital and sick beds, are receiving benefits to which they are not justly entitled; and

Whereas the cost of rehabilitating this Nation's veterans, who served their country in time of need, must be considered as part of the actual expense of war as was the cost of bombs, planes, and ships during armed hostilities; and

Whereas the Hoover Commission Report, which suggests the elimination of the Veterans' Administration as the agency responsible for the administration of veterans' laws, was written without seeking the advice and counsel of those who have made the care of disabled veterans their life's work; and

Whereas the adoption of the Hoover Commission Report would place the care of disabled veterans under several Government agencies wholly incapable of and absolutely unwilling to appreciate the many problems of the veterans of all our wars and their dependents; and

Whereas the Hoover-suggested procedure was tested after World War I and was found wanting because of the red tape and confusion it caused and the unnecessary expense it placed upon the taxpayers of our country due to the many Government agencies which attempted the handling of veterans' affairs; and

Whereas Congress eliminated such confusion by establishing the Veterans' Bureau, now known as the Veterans' Administration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the annual midwinter conference of the American Legion, Department of North Dakota, meeting at Fargo, N. Dak., December 12 and 13, 1949, That the American Legion vigorously oppose that portion of the Hoover Commission Report pertaining to veterans which advocates the elimination of the Veterans' Administration hospital program and the turning over of that program to social-welfare agencies, and that the American Legion take immediate steps necessary to present the true picture of veterans' activities in correction of the insidious misinformation now being circulated by antiveteran individuals and organizations.

REPEAL OF EXCISE TAXES ON CERTAIN COSMETICS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have previously pointed out some of the problems raised by the heavy wartime excise taxes on various industries in America. One such burden has received comparatively less attention than it so eminently deserves, and I am referring to the excises on the cosmetics and other preparations used in connection with services rendered in barber and beauty shops. I feel that these excise taxes should long ago have been repealed and I am hoping that under the Butler-Johnson amendment to the pending bill, H. R. 2023, now before the Senate, we can wipe out these and many other nuisances.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of two important letters which I have received from the national organization and from the Associated Master Barbers in Milwaukee, Wis., be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The letters arrived prior to the offering on the floor of the excise-tax-repeal amendment to the pending bill.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSOCIATED MASTER BARBERS OF MILWAUKEE,
Milwaukee, Wis., January 7, 1950.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILEY: Once again we urgently and respectfully request that you support

legislation which will remove unjust excise taxes from the cosmetics used in connection with the services performed by barbers and beauticians.

In the giving of shampoos, facials, scalp treatments, permanent waves, and many other services the use of cosmetic preparations in conjunction therewith is essential as the using of shears, combs, brushes, tweezers, and other instruments, and therefore these cosmetics must be deemed to be tools of our trades as much as the very furniture with which our shops are equipped or the instruments referred to.

We plead that we are entitled to be relieved from unjust taxation which adds to our burdens in operating our businesses on a profitable basis with the coincident opportunity of our employees to earn a living. Please help us.

Respectfully yours,
NORBERT C. KOFFARNUS,
Secretary.

ASSOCIATED MASTER BARBERS AND BEAUTICIANS OF AMERICA,
Chicago, Ill., December 29, 1949.

DEAR SENATOR: We again take this means of registering a protest against what we deem to be an unfair excise tax on the cosmetic preparations used in conjunction with services rendered in barber and beauty shops. Since 1942 barber and beauty shop owners have suffered the imposition of these taxes which have added to their burdens in trying to operate their places of business profitably while at the same time trying to pay good wages to their employees. This legislation, enacted as a means for securing revenue to help prosecute the war, should have been repealed coincident with cessation of hostilities in the interest of encouraging a large group of small-business people.

We point out to you that cosmetics used in giving services in barber and beauty shops are in fact tools of the trade, inasmuch as a barber or beautician cannot apply a shampoo or facial, as well as many other services, without using cosmetics incident thereto. The requirement of using cosmetics in barber and beauty shops is as necessary as is the requirement of using shears, razors, clippers, tweezers, permanent waving machines, curlers, and so forth, all of which are recognized as tools of the trade. Tools of the trade should not be burdened with excise taxes, and we believe that conviction is unanimous.

We refer you to House Report No. 1970, which contains considerable information and facts relative to this matter. We also call to your attention the bill known as H. R. 3825, which passed the House in the Eightieth Congress, a bill which sought repeal of these unfair excise taxes on cosmetics used in barber and beauty shops.

The thousands of barber and beauty-shop owners in your own State and throughout the Nation ask you through this association to support and vote for any legislation which seeks to remove the unfair excise taxes now levied on cosmetics used in connection with barber or beauty shop services. We need the relief which you can give us.

Sincerely yours,
T. C. MACDUFFEE,
General President.
LOUIS E. MCILVAIN,
General Secretary-Treasurer.

THE COAL SHORTAGE IN INDIANA

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD 12 telegrams which I have received today from 12 greenhouses in and near the city of Indianapolis. In all the telegrams complaint is made that they will be forced to close within anywhere from 3 days to a week because of the shortage of coal.

Not being in the coal business, I have no way of knowing whether a national emergency exists in respect to coal. But if one can take at face value the statements made in the telegrams which I am receiving from people in Indiana, certainly a grave emergency exists in the city of Indianapolis and nearby. Therefore, I have requested unanimous consent to have the telegrams printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *January 13, 1950.*
HOMER E. CAPEHART:
In bad need of coal to operate greenhouses for vegetables.
LAWRENCE WIEGMAN.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *January 13, 1950.*
Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building:
Desperate need of coal for greenhouses growing lettuce and tomatoes.
FRED H. ROSEBROCK.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *January 13, 1950.*
HOMER E. CAPEHART:
Survey indicates that one-half million dollars damage will be done to Marion County greenhouse crop if we don't get coal to supply them within 1 week. It is urgent that you use all influence possible to get us coal.
SCHUSTER COAL CO.,
J. F. HARRIS.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *January 13, 1950.*
HOMER E. CAPEHART:
Coal supply very critical. The greenhouse vegetable industry will have to close down unless immediate action is taken.
BREHOB BROS.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *January 13, 1950.*
Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building:
Please give immediate attention to coal shortage. One week's supply left.
MARION COUNTY GREENHOUSE GROWERS,
FRED HOELTKE,
FREDERICK HOELTKE,
FORREST MEYERS.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *January 13, 1950.*
Senator HOMER CAPEHART:
Coal situation critical in Marion County.
ERVIN BUESCHER,
Member, Marion County Greenhouse Growers Asscciation.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *January 13, 1950.*
Senator HOMER CAPEHART:
Do something about coal situation.
AL BUNTE,
Member, Indianapolis Greenhouse Growers Association.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *January 13, 1950.*
Senator HOMER CAPEHART:
Unless we receive aid of coal within 1 week the Marion County Greenhouse Growers Association will suffer loss of half million dollars.
HENRY HELDMAN,
President.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *January 13, 1950.*
Senator HOMER CAPEHART:
Indianapolis Greenhouse Truck Growers urgently needs coal. Situation serious.
THANE BROS.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *January 13, 1950.*
Senator HOMER CAPEHART:
Coal situation serious. Unable to plant more vegetables in greenhouse. Help.
FRANK RIEDEL.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *January 13, 1950.*
Senator HOMER CAPEHART:
If unable to get coal within 5 days will lose entire crop.
FRED OLLE,
Greenhouse Vegetable Grower.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *January 13, 1950.*
Senator HOMER CAPEHART:
As president of 65 greenhouse vegetable growers, need aid on this critical coal shortage. Due to mild weather we have been able to stretch coal to the limit; now it is critical. If cold front moved in, we would be out of coal within week. Sad state of affairs when two men can manipulate Congress as well as public like puppets on a string. Wake up Congressmen, do something about this coal shortage. One hour of zero weather without heat can wipe out 6 months' work.
ROBERT BOLLINGER,
President, Growers Clearing House.

STUDY OF PROBLEMS RELATING TO LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE (S. REPT. NO. 1213)

Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare submitted, pursuant to Senate Resolution 140, Eighty-first Congress, first session, authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to investigate and study problems relating to labor-management relations, a report, which was ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JANUARY 6, 1950.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Paul E. Hadlick, consultant	$7,941.22	$3,844.52
Joycette K. Jones, clerk	7,775.31	3,764.20
James M. Kendall, clerk	6,674.55	3,231.30

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	3,655.91
Amount expended as of June 30, 1949	873.09
Balance unexpended	5,471.00

ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman.

JANUARY 6, 1950.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY—SUBCOMMITTEE ON UTILIZATION OF FARM CROPS, PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 36, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, together with the

funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Albert J. Wolken, investigator [1]	$7,858.27	$1,850.21
Eva Charlton, stenographer [2]	3,893.68	1,560.55

[1] Service began Oct. 5, 1949.
[2] Service terminated Nov. 30, 1949.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$12,000.00
Amount expended	4,384.86
Amount expended as of June 30, 1949	824.47
Balance unexpended	6,790.67

ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1, 1950.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Everard H. Smith, chief clerk:		
July 1 to Oct. 31	$10,330.00	$3,443.32
Nov. 1 to Dec. 31	10,846.00	1,807.66
Cecil H. Tolbert, assistant chief clerk:		
July 1 to Oct. 31	10,012.13	3,337.36
Nov. 1 to Dec. 31	10,512.73	1,752.12
Thomas J. Graves, professional staff member:		
July 1 to Oct. 31	10,330.00	3,443.32
Nov. 1 to Nov. 15	10,846.00	451.91
Earl W. Cooper, professional staff member:		
July 1 to Oct. 31	9,459.12	3,153.04
Nov. 1 to Dec. 31	9,932.07	1,655.34
Thomas J. Scott, assistant clerk:		
July 1 to Oct. 31	8,827.10	2,942.36
Nov. 1 to Dec. 31	9,268.45	1,544.74
Harold E. Merrick, professional staff member:		
July 1 to Oct. 31	8,827.10	2,942.36
Nov. 1 to Dec. 31	9,268.45	1,544.74
Herman E. Downey, professional staff member:		
July 1 to Oct. 31	8,827.10	2,942.36
Nov. 1 to Dec. 31	9,268.45	1,544.74
Francis S. Hewitt, professional staff member:		
July 1 to Oct. 31	8,353.09	2,784.36
Nov. 1 to Dec. 31	8,770.74	1,461.78
Robert H. Montgomery, professional staff member:		
July 1 to Oct. 31	8,353.09	2,784.36
Nov. 1 to Dec. 31	8,770.74	1,461.78
Kimball Sanborn, professional staff member:		
July 1 to Oct. 31	8,353.09	2,784.36
Nov. 1 to Dec. 31	8,770.74	1,461.78
Edmund T. King, professional staff member:		
July 1 to Oct. 31	8,353.09	2,784.36
Nov. 1 to Dec. 31	8,770.74	1,461.78
Adelbert F. Teague, assistant clerk:		
July 1 to Oct. 31	8,116.08	2,705.36
Nov. 1 to Dec. 31	8,521.88	1,420.30
Lawrence H. Wendrich, assistant clerk:		
July 1 to Oct. 31	6,852.05	2,284.00
Nov. 1 to Dec. 31	7,194.65	1,199.10
Mamie L. Mizen, assistant clerk:		
July 1 to Oct. 31	6,025.66	2,008.52
Nov. 1 to Dec. 31	6,326.94	1,054.48
Richard C. Venne, clerical assistant:		
July 1 to Oct. 31	4,204.86	1,401.60
Nov. 1 to Dec. 31	4,415.10	735.84
Bernadine Wassam, clerical assistant:		
July 1 to Oct. 31	3,542.74	1,180.88
Nov. 1 to Dec. 31	3,719.87	619.96
Mary K. Yanick, clerical assistant:		
July 1 to Oct. 31	3,542.74	1,180.88
Nov. 1 to Dec. 31	3,719.87	619.96
Lois C. Joy, clerical assistant:		
July 1 to Oct. 31	3,542.74	1,180.88
Nov. 1 to Dec. 31	3,719.87	619.96

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1, 1950.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report in addition to the statement showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

Unexpended balance of amount authorized by S. Res. 129, June 26, 1947, as of July 1, 1949	$36,987.73
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1949	12,836.24
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1949	24,151.49
Unexpended balance of funds authorized by Reorganization Act and S. Res. 126, 81st Cong., as of July 1, 1949	13,265.97
Funds authorized by S. Res. 185, 81st Cong.	10,000.00
Total	23,265.97
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1949	9,865.16
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1949	13,400.81
Funds authorized by Legislative Appropriation Act, 1950 (Public Law 118)	50,000.00
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1949	
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1949	50,000.00

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1950.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Walter L. Reynolds, chief clerk	$10,846.00	$5,250.98
Ann M. Grickis, assistant chief clerk	5,979.34	2,843.01
Mrs. Mollie Jo McCarthy, clerical assistant	4,154.38	1,993.96
Mrs. Emily I. Tennyson, clerical assistant	4,154.38	1,976.74
Marie C. Tylor, clerical assistant [1]	3,956.56	780.31
Velda Blanche Holder, clerical assistant	4,067.49	1,900.16
Ray Barnett, clerical assistant, from Oct. 16, 1949	3,719.87	749.64
Glenn K. Shriver, professional staff member	9,102.55	4,406.76
Miles Scull, Jr., professional staff member	9,517.31	4,525.26
Herman C. Loeffler, professional staff member	10,846.00	5,250.98
Brewster H. Marshall, professional staff member, from Oct. 20, 1949	8,024.17	1,570.86

[1] Terminated Sept. 11, 1949.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended to date	2,310.70
Balance unexpended	7,689.30

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1950.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS—SUBCOMMITTEE ON RELATIONS WITH INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS (S. RES. 51)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Eli E. Nobleman, Counsel	$8,521.88	$4,125.66
Helen P. Dailey, clerk-typist [1]	3,791.04	1,236.09
Katharine M. Ellis, secretary, from Oct. 10, 1949	3,980.59	884.56

[1] Terminated Oct. 31, 1949

Total funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditure under S. Res. 51	$18,000.00
Amount expended to date	11,484.01
Balance unexpended	6,515.99

HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1950.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS—SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS (S. RES. 51)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Paul H. Menk, Jr., staff member	$9,019.59	$4,202.02

Total funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditure under S. Res. 51	$15,000.00
Amount expended to date	7,671.61
Balance unexpended	7,328.39

GLEN H. TAYLOR,
Chairman.

JANUARY 7, 1950.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Paul R. Eaton, chief clerk, to Oct. 18	$10,330.00	$3,098.98
Darrell St. Claire, chief clerk, from Oct. 19	10,846.00	2,151.99
Russell C. King, assistant clerk	7,775.31	3,625.96
James L. Harrison, professional staff	10,846.00	5,250.98
B. Eloye Gavin, clerk (research)	5,457.92	2,642.28
Eileen B. McGenty, clerk (research), to Oct. 15	5,198.02	1,516.06
Catherine L. Guyon, clerk (research), from Oct. 16	5,457.92	1,273.83
Myrtle Paynter, clerk (stenographic)	3,459.17	1,674.64
Ruth P. Noon, clerk (secretary)	3,806.78	1,842.94

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1949	188.13
Balance unexpended	9,811.87

CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Francis A. O'Neill, Jr., of New York, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1953 (reappointment);

Edward T. Thompson and sundry other candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service; and

Curtis G. Southard and sundry other candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

TREATY WITH ORIENTAL REPUBLIC OF URUGUAY—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive D, Eighty-first Congress, second session, a treaty of friendship, commerce, and economic development between the United States of America and the Oriental Republic of Uruguay, signed at Montevideo on November 23, 1949. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the treaty, and the treaty, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a treaty of friendship, commerce, and economic development between the United States of America and the Oriental Republic of Uruguay, together with a protocol, an additional protocol, and an exchange of notes, relating thereto, signed at Montevideo on November 23, 1949. The enclosed treaty is a comprehensive instrument which takes into account the developments in international relationships during the past century and is intended to meet effectively the needs of the present day.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, a report on the treaty made to me by the Secretary of State.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1950.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) treaty of friendship, commerce, and economic development, with protocol, additional protocol, and exchange of notes, signed at Montevideo, November 23, 1949.)

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 2847. A bill to aid in the use, conservation, and development of the natural resources of the river basins in the New England States and to establish the New England River Basin Survey Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2848. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Bernhard Horowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 2849. A bill for the relief of Claire C. Trigledas; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 2850. A bill for the relief of the Town of Southington, Conn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 2851. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to William Burning Breast a patent in fee to certain land; and

S. 2852. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Florence Smith Leader Charge to certain lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS (by request):

S. 2853. A bill to authorize the acceptance of foreign decorations for participation in the Berlin airlift;

S. 2854. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records;

S. 2855. A bill to extend the time limits for the award of certain decorations, and for other purposes;

S. 2856. A bill to authorize certain land and other property transactions by the military departments, and for other purposes;

S. 2857. A bill to amend section 12 of the Missing Persons Act, as amended, relating to travel by dependents and transportation of household and personal effects;

S. 2858. A bill to authorize the President to convey the United States Army Provisional Philippine Scout Hospital at Fort McKinley, Philippines, to the Republic of the Philippines and to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for Philippine Scouts hospitalized therein;

S. 2859. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments to provide for the promotion and maintenance of civilian recreation programs;

S. 2860. A bill to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel;

S. 2861. A bill to extend the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604) for a period of 3 years, and for other purposes; and

S. 2862. A bill to amend the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503), as amended (known as the Vinson-Trammell Act), so as to remove certain construction limitations therefrom, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2863. A bill to provide for the expansion and disposition of certain national cemeteries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2864. A bill to authorize certain administrative expenses for the Department of Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2865. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Takino Kajikawa; and

S. 2866. A bill for the relief of Egbert G. Gesell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, at the request of the Secretary of Defense, I introduce for appropriate reference 11 bills, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of Defense in relation to the bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bills introduced by Mr. TYDINGS (by request) were read twice by their titles and referred, as follows:

S. 2853. A bill to authorize the acceptance of foreign decorations for participation in the Berlin airlift;

S. 2854. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records;

S. 2855. A bill to extend the time limits for the award of certain decorations, and for other purposes;

S. 2856. A bill to authorize certain land and other property transactions by the military departments, and for other purposes;

S. 2857. A bill to amend section 12 of the Missing Persons Act, as amended, relating to travel by dependents and transportation of household and personal effects;

S. 2858. A bill to authorize the President to convey the United States Army Provisional Philippine Scout Hospital at Fort McKinley, Philippines, to the Republic of the Philippines and to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for Philippine Scouts hospitalized therein;

S. 2859. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments to provide for the promotion and maintenance of civilian recreation programs;

S. 2860. A bill to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel;

S. 2861. A bill to extend the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604) for a period of 3 years, and for other purposes; and

S. 2862. A bill to amend the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503), as amended (known as the Vinson-Trammell Act), so as to remove certain construction limitations therefrom, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services; and

S. 2863. A bill to provide for the expansion and disposition of certain national cemeteries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter presented by Mr. TYDINGS is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, January 13, 1950.

Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee, United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There are forwarded herewith on behalf of the Department of Defense drafts of 11 legislative proposals together with appropriate justifications for each legislative proposal. As Secretary of Defense I respectfully recommend that these proposals be enacted into law.

These proposals are forwarded with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and represent, by number of items, approximately half of this Department's 1950 legislative program. As you know, our over-all legislative program, as submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, has already been made available on an informal basis to the staffs of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees.

The balance of our program, in addition to the items submitted herewith, excepting only four items which are undergoing certain drafting changes in this office, are now under active consideration by the Bureau of the Budget for comment as to the relationship of

our proposals to the program of the President. It is anticipated that the Bureau of the Budget will be able to advise me within the next few weeks as to the relationship to the program of the President of these remaining items. As these advices are received such items as are approved will be forwarded to you by the Assistant Secretary of Defense.

This is the first attempt by the Department to formulate in one package for submission to Congress and the Bureau of the Budget a complete program of legislation for an ensuing session of the Congress. It is not yet as complete as I would like it to be, but in its present form it represents a substantial step forward from previous years' practices. As you know, under prior practice, the separate items of each military departmental program were forwarded at irregular intervals during the full two sessions. It is my hope that next year the Department can offer to the Congress on the day it convenes, and in a single package, the entire legislative needs of the Department, and to that end plans are already under way.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS JOHNSON.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF IMMIGRATION HEARINGS BEFORE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 69), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 3,000 additional copies of the hearings conducted before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on S. 1832, Eighty-first Congress, first session, to amend the Immigration Act of October 16, 1918, as amended. Such additional copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CORDON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted by Mr. WILEY (for himself and other Senators) to the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. McCARRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted by Mr. WILEY (for himself and other Senators) to the bill (H. R. 2023) supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SHOULD SENATE REMOVE RESTRICTIONS ON OLEOMARGARINE?—REMARKS BY SENATOR WILEY IN TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD his remarks on the subject "Should the Senate Remove Restrictions on Oleomargarine?" delivered in the course of a debate with Senator FULBRIGHT in America's Town Meeting of the Air, January 10, 1950, which appear in the Appendix.]

UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP IN THE AMERICAS—ADDRESS BY HON. EDWARD G. MILLER, JR.

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "United States Leadership in the Americas," delivered by the Honorable Edward G. Miller, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State of Inter-American Affairs, before the Rotary Club of Charleston, W. Va., January 13, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CHINESE SITUATION AS I SAW IT—MEMORANDUM BY ROGER D. LAPHAM

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum written by Roger D. Lapham, explaining an address delivered by him before the Commonwealth Club of northern California, at San Francisco on the subject The Chinese Situation as I Saw It, which appears in the Appendix.]

RFC'S NEW PLACE IN THE MID-CENTURY—EDITORIAL FROM THE LOUISVILLE COURIER-JOURNAL

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "RFC's New Place in the Mid-Century," published in the Louisville Courier-Journal, January 13, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMUNITY CHATTER—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEBRASKA CITY NEWS-PRESS

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Community Chatter," published in the January 10, 1950, issue of the Nebraska City News-Press, which appears in the Appendix.]

MONEY, INFLATION, AND SOCIALISM—EDITORIAL FROM THE SEATTLE POST-INTELLIGENCER

[Mr. DWORSHAK ask and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Money, Inflation, and Socialism," published in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, January 10, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR DANGEROUS FOREIGN POLICY—EDITORIAL FROM INDIANAPOLIS STAR

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial "Wish-Washing United States to War," published in the Indianapolis Star of January 8, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

BLAME FOR VINCENNES FLOOD CONDITIONS—ARTICLE FROM THE INDIANAPOLIS TIMES

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Blame for Vincennes Flood Conditions," published in the Indianapolis Times of January 11, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RADIO PROGRAM—ASSAULT AND FLATTERY

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a broadcast under the title of "Assault and Flattery," on the program conducted by B. S. Bercovici, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXEMPTION FROM TAX OF COSMETICS SOLD TO BARBER SHOPS AND BEAUTY PARLORS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared with regard to my amendment proposing to exempt from the tax cosmetics sold by barber shops and beauty parlors for use in the operation thereof.

I also ask to have attached to the statement a copy of my amendment and a copy of House Report No. 1970 of the Eightieth Congress dealing with this matter.

There being no objection, Mr. BUTLER's statement, the amendment, and the report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, at this time I would like to make a brief statement explaining one of the amendments I have prepared to the bill, H. R. 2023, relating to oleomargarine, so that when it comes time to vote Senators may be familiar with the amendment and the reasons for it. I refer to my amendment to exempt from tax any toilet preparations sold to barber-shop and beauty-shop operators when intended for use in the operation thereof and not for resale.

When we discuss excise taxes, we sometimes refer to them as nuisance taxes. That designation is not always correct. They may be a nuisance, but some of them do bring in substantial revenue. The amendment I am discussing now, however, relates to a tax which is practically all nuisance and no revenue. My amendment proposes to repeal the cosmetics tax only on those items which are actually used on the customers in barber shops and beauty parlors.

The revenue derived from the tax on toilet preparations as a whole is fairly substantial—$95,000,000—but the tax on that portion of the cosmetic business which is sold for use in barber shops and beauty parlors is very small—about $3,300,000. Evidently repealing this particular tax would not affect the Federal revenue materially.

The tax on hair tonic, fingernail polish, and items of that sort used by barbers and beauticians in their actual operations is probably not too heavy a burden on them, although as a matter of principle I personally do not think we should levy taxes that simply go into business costs. However, that is not the real reason for removing this tax.

The principal reason for my amendment is that under present procedure as long as there is a tax on such items when used in the operations of the beauty parlor or barber shops, the Treasury must collect it and enforce it through methods which frighten the beauty or barber shop out of handling toilet preparations and cosmetics for retail sale at all. Under the present procedure, each barber or beauty-shop operator handling cosmetics must sign a "certificate of purchase for resale," and that certificate, among other things, provides for a fine of up to $10,000 or imprisonment of up to 5 years for fraudulent use. It also places upon the barber or beautician the burden of establishing competent evidence that the articles were actually purchased for the purpose stated in the certificate.

The simple effect of this whole business is to scare the average barber and beautician out of handling cosmetics for retail at all. The average barber is not a lawyer or even a skilled bookkeeper. He does not want to be involved in anything that involves a potential danger of fines running up to $10,000 and prison terms that might run 5 years. It is all right to talk about "fraudulent use," but there is always a chance of an honest mistake that might be misinterpreted. It is much simpler just to avoid the whole business by not handling toilet preparations for resale at all.

My amendment would likewise repeal the requirement for this "certificate of purchase for resale." It would leave the tax on the basis of a simple retail sales tax, similar to the many other retail sales taxes that we have in the excise tax structure.

Two years ago this identical proposal was considered and favorably acted on by the House Ways and Means Committee and the House in the form of H. R. 3825 of the Eightieth Congress. At that time the bill was not acted on by the Senate because it was anticipated that there would be a review

of the entire tax structure the following year, which was last year, 1949. However, no such review took place, and we have no real guaranty that it can be had during the current session. I, therefore, hope very much that the Senate will adopt this amendment.

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BUTLER to the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes, viz: At the appropriate place, add the following new section:

"SEC. . Effective on and after the first day of the first month which begins more than 10 days after the date of enactment of this act, section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'except when sold to any person operating a barber shop, beauty parlor, or similar establishment for use in the operation thereof.'

"Effective the same date, section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is repealed."

EXCISE TAX EXEMPTION OF TOILET PREPARATIONS SOLD FOR USE IN THE OPERATION OF BARBER AND BEAUTY SHOPS

The Committee on Ways and Means, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3825) to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

EFFECT OF THE BILL

The bill would exempt from the retailers' excise tax toilet preparations sold to the operator of a barber shop, beauty parlor, or similar establishment for use in the operation thereof. By specific provision of existing law, such a sale is considered a sale at retail and is taxed accordingly. Resales by such an establishment would continue to be taxed as under existing law.

The bill would also repeal the provision of existing law which taxes toilet preparations sold to such an operator for resale but used in the operation of his establishment.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

Existing law, as indicated above, treats a sale of toilet preparations to the operator of a barber shop, beauty parlor, or similar establishment, for use in its operation, as a sale at retail, for purposes of the excise tax. It also accords to the business use of such preparations the status of a retail sale, where the operator bought for resale but in fact used the preparations in the operation of his business. To have made the tax base the portion of the service charge attributable in the preparations used in rendering the service would have created extreme difficulties of administration by the Bureau of Internal Revenue and of compliance by the taxpayer. Accordingly, the tax base in such a case was made the price paid for the article by the proprietor. The result is a hybrid scheme of taxation, having features both of a manufacturers' excise tax and a retailers' excise tax. The tax base, therefore, is subject to all the variations dependent upon whether the operator buys his supplies of the manufacturer or of a wholesaler or other distributor. It is apparent that such a shifting tax base results in fluctuating operating costs and competitive inequalities, and, at the same time, achieves no adequate solution of the difficulties of administration or compliance.

In the enforcement of the present law governing the application of the tax to preparations used in the service of patrons of a barber shop, beauty parlor, or similar establishment, recourse is had to a requirement that the operator must certify that all purchases made by him for resale will be resold and not used in the operation of the establishment. The "certificate of purchase for resale" recites the understanding of the proprietor, among other things, that the fraudulent use of the certificate to secure "exemption" will subject him and all guilty parties to a fine of "not more than $10,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both, together with the costs of prosecution."[1] Operators are reluctant to make purchases for resale under such penalties and the retail market for toilet preparations is curtailed as a result. And the deterrent exists, regardless of the fact that articles purchased for resale may, nevertheless, be used in the operation of the business if the tax thereon is paid when they are first set aside for such use.

Under the present statute, resales of toilet preparations bought for operational use appear subject to the severe penalties mentioned in the certificate of purchase for resale; under the statute as proposed to be changed by the bill, such resales would be taxable in the same manner as other sales at retail.

For these reasons, your committee believes that the enactment of the bill would serve the best interests of the industry and facilitate the tax collecting functions of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

REVENUE EFFECT

Collections of the tax on toilet preparations during the fiscal year 1947 amounted to about $95,500,000. It is estimated that not more than $3,300,000 of that amount is attributable to sales of the kind proposed to be exempted by the bill. Moreover, in the opinion of your committee, the apparent loss in revenue from the exemption of such sales would be more than offset by the increased yield from sales in a broadened retail market.

An increased income tax yield would also follow reduced business costs and an enlarged volume of sales at retail. There are said to be some 240,000 barber shops and beauty parlors in the country.

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

The exemption proposed by the bill would be accomplished by amending subsection (a) of section 2402 of the Internal Revenue Code and repealing subsection (b) of that section.

The amendment consists in the addition of a clause excepting from the application of the tax imposed by the subsection on toilet preparations sold at retail such articles "sold to any person operating a barber shop, beauty parlor, or similar establishment for use in the operation thereof." Sales to such establishments for resale would continue to be taxed, as under existing law, when resale is made. Under the bill, likewise, preparations so sold would be taxed upon resale, if in fact they were resold instead of being used in operation.

Subsection (b), proposed to be repealed by the bill, prescribes the occasion of the tax and what the tax base shall be, in the case of toilet preparations sold to the operator of an establishment of the kind above mentioned for use in its operation, or sold to him for resale but in fact used in operation. In both cases, the tax base is the price paid for the articles by the operator. The tax is imposed at the time of the sale, where the sale is for use in operation; in the case of a sale for resale, where the article is not resold but is used in operation, the tax is imposed when the article is first set aside for such use. The repeal of the subsection supplements the amendment to subsection (a), to make complete the exemption of toilet preparations sold for use or used in the operation of a barber shop, beauty parlor, or similar establishment.

EFFECTIVE DATE

The changes made in existing law by the bill would become effective on the first day of the first month which begins more than 10 days after the date of enactment.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 2a of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as introduced, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

"INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

"SEC. 2402. TAX ON TOILET PREPARATIONS

"(a) Tax.—There is hereby imposed upon the following articles sold at retail a tax equivalent to 20 percent of the price for which so sold: Perfumes, essences, extracts, toilet waters, cosmetics, petroleum jellies, hair oils, pomades, hair dressings, hair restoratives, hair dyes, aromatic cachous, toilet powders, and any similar substance, article, or preparation, by whatsoever name known or distinguished; any of the above which are used or applied or intended to be used or applied for toilet purposes, *except when sold to any person operating a barber shop, beauty parlor, or similar establishment for use in the operation thereof.*

"[(b) Beauty parlors, etc.: For the purposes of subsection (a), the sale of any article described in such subsection to any person operating a barber shop, beauty parlor, or similar establishment for use in the operation thereof and not for resale, shall be considered a sale at retail. The use in such operation of any article described in subsection (a) purchased by such person on or after the effective date of section 622 of the Revenue Act of 1942 for resale, shall be considered a sale at retail by such person at the time the article is first set apart for such use and at a price equivalent to the amount paid by him for the article.]"

---

[1] Regulations 51, sec. 320.52 contain the following paragraph:

"Following is the form of 'certificate of purchase for resale' which shall be adhered to in substance:

"'CERTIFICATE OF PURCHASE FOR RESALE

"'(For use by operators of barber shops, beauty parlors, or similar establishments in purchasing for resale purposes articles described in section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code.)

----------19--
"(Date)

"'The undersigned purchaser hereby certifies that he is an operator of----------
"(State business in which engaged)
and that the----------in the order
"(State articles purchased)
covered by this certificate or on the reverse side hereof will be resold by him and not used in the operation of his business.

"'The undersigned understands that if the articles are used by him in the operation of his barber shop, beauty parlor, or similar establishment, or resold by him at retail, he will be liable for tax on such use or resale. It is understood that the fraudulent use of this certificate to secure exemption will subject the undersigned and all guilty parties to a fine of not more than $10,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 5 years or both, together with costs of prosecution. The undersigned also understands that he must be prepared to establish by competent evidence that the article was actually purchased for the purpose for which stated in this certificate.

"(Name)

"(Address)'"

RENT CONTROL—EDITORIAL FROM THE OMAHA WORLD-HERALD

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "And on and on," having to do with rent control, from the Omaha World-Herald of January 5, this year.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AND ON AND ON

The time has not come to end rent controls, President Truman believes. He has asked for another 1-year extension, from June 30, 1950, to June 30, 1951.

In support of his demand, Mr. Truman makes two points: (1) That in areas where controls have been removed rents have gone up; (2) that there is still an acute shortage of housing for the lower- and middle-income groups.

If Mr. Truman's points are valid, there will never be an end to national rent control. It will go on and on.

Discussing point No. 1, Mr. Truman says that a survey of six typical cities showed rent increases of 13.8 to 41.3 percent after controls were lifted.

Rents were frozen in 1942, at a time when the rental index stood at 108. In cities where controls have been lifted the rental index now stands at 135 to 166.

The general cost-of-living index stood at 116 in 1942, now stands at 169.

Even in decontrolled cities, then, the rise in rents has been smaller than the general rise in the cost of living.

The way to get rental housing at reasonable prices is to remove controls, and we think Omaha is giving a remarkable demonstration of this truth. Decontrolled, Omaha is entering the biggest rental housing boom in its history. Responsible builders are planning a 432-unit apartment at Thirty-eighth and Jackson, a 700-apartment development near Twenty-fourth and St. Marys, and numerous others.

To be sure, these apartments are not specifically designed for the lower- and middle-income groups, but the people who move into them will vacate apartments and houses that will be available at reasonable rentals. This is the classic method by which low-cost housing has been provided in this country. Only in recent years has the theory that low-cost housing should always be brand new housing been advanced, and this can be accomplished only by Government subsidy. It is, we submit, as silly as it would be to insist that the man who wants low-cost transportation should not buy a serviceable 1948 Chevrolet, but a new car paid for in part by the Government.

Omaha was one of the first metropolitan cities to escape from rent control. Now, a couple of months later, it is on the threshold of its biggest housing boom. We submit those two interesting facts to the attention of the die-hard few who are still clamoring for rent control.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the argument as to oleomargarine and butter has gone on for decades in this country, and is perhaps now going on all over the world. There is nothing new about it, and yet there is something tremendously ominous and dangerous about any final conclusion which may possibly be reached on this floor today or tomorrow, or whenever the vote is taken on this question, for it may fix the fate eventually of the dairy cow of the United States and perhaps of the world. The various merits and demerits of butter and oleomargarine have been pretty well canvassed by speakers who have given the Senate much very valuable information in the past few days. Many moral arguments have been advanced by speakers who canvassed the situation pretty well. I think we could, as a result of this debate, up to this point at least, come to some fairly clear-cut propositions that have developed. It seems to me the meat of this great controversy is the question of economic competition. That seems to be the major stimulus to the oleo people who are attempting to substitute in the diets of the American people an oil emulsion which violates all the pure-food provisions applying to other foods in the United States, and will have its net result in the lowering of the standards of the dairy industry and the possible eventual elimination, after a period of time, of much of the butter business which has brought prosperity to our diversified farm areas and to some of our specialized farm areas.

My State of Iowa has become a great butter-producing State. I do not know whether I want to dispute with my good friend, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] as to whether his State produces more butter than does the State of Iowa, or whether Iowa produces more than Minnesota, but I am reliably informed that today those two States produce more butter than any other States in the Union, and whether we are first or second does not make too much difference. It does mean that butter production is one of the major industries in the greatest diversified agricultural State of the Union.

I have lived all my life in Iowa, and I have seen prosperity go up and down. In the early days it was mostly down. I have seen many farmers of Iowa begin to lift their mortgages and to accumulate a little personal independence, after they began to milk cows and found a market in which they could sell their butter. In the State of Iowa we have always called the pig the mortgage raiser. It has produced a greater volume of money in the past for the relief of obligations and debts than has any other one branch of our agricultural economy.

There are reasons for that, into which I shall not go at this time, but in the days when the hog was considered to be the sole mortgage lifter of the Iowa farmer, the means of distribution of milk and the distribution and sale of butter had not been brought to the point of efficiency to which the farmers themselves have raised it at this time. Changes and developments in the standards of cleanliness and of preservation, and new means of shipment, have indeed brought butter in my State up to the point where it is one of the most stabilizing of the economic products of our farms. Iowa, unfortunately, is a State which is not close to the great fluid-milk-consuming areas which handle great quantities of fluid milk, and we had to find means and methods of disposing of our milk other than through an attempt to concentrate in the fluid-milk market. We cannot sell our Iowa milk in Washington, D. C. We would have great difficulty, with few exceptions, in the eastern part of our State, in selling large quantities of fluid milk in the city of Chicago, which is several hundred miles from the heart of our State, and our fluid milk is not subject to ready markets such as is the fluid milk in locations nearer great concentrations of population and in great cities. In my State we have had to find some way to take advantage of the natural qualities of milk in order to make its production a paying proposition and economically sound. We have found such means in the greatly increased production of butter and cheese. We also raise soybeans in Iowa. I think it is probably the second State in the Nation in the production of soybeans, which mean soybean oil. But the marketing of soybeans and its products, such as oil and mash, present far different problems and lend themselves to far easier solution and more versatile handling than do milk and milk products.

So, Mr. President, we are very much concerned about butter. In Ames, Iowa, at our State college, there has been developed one of the greatest butter-research departments in the world. Years ago the problem was realized, and we have devoted a great portion of the work of the agricultural school to the study of butter and the products which can come from raw milk. That has in large measure been occasioned by our remoteness from great centers of population. So it is very vital to us that butter, which is the outlet for the milk produced by the dairy cattle on an overwhelming number of our small family size diversified farms, shall not be given a death blow because a few concentrated corporations want to get into a highly profitable and deceptive business and substitute a synthetic product for an age-old food which has nourished civilization since man was able to domesticate the cow.

It will mean a great deal to our individual economy, of course, whatever shall be the result. But we are concerned because Iowa is a State of family-size farms and of family-size dairy producers. Almost without exception, it can be said that the average farm in Iowa, which consists of approximately 164 acres, keeps a substantial number of dairy cattle, depending entirely upon the farmer's inclination toward dairy cattle. I should say from 8 to 15 or 20 dairy cattle would be maintained. Such a farmer will not call himself a dairy specialist, nor will he claim he is in the dairy business exclusively. He is in the dairy business for two reasons: One is that he has learned throughout the years that one of the most important soil-conservation practices he can adopt is to maintain animals, and especially dairy cows, on his farm, and, secondly, he has found that the production of milk and cream, which can be turned into butter, and, more recently, the production of cheese, has brought in a check each week which pays much of his grocery bill and incidental expenses which he and his family must meet, and it levels out some of the hazards of the highs and the lows which the normal cropping of land in

row crops and otherwise forces upon the farmer.

The farmer has been able to build up a stable market for his butter on the basis of cleanliness and the improvement of quality and taste of his butter, and he has been able to build up a fairly reliable and consistent price.

The two and a half million dairy farmers, most of whom are small farmers on family-size farms, are facing what may well amount to a major catastrophe, under diversified farming operations, and which may affect the diet of the public in future years beyond what we now know.

This problem has resolved itself, I think, so far as the issues immediately before us are concerned, into two things. One is the color of a synthetic product, and the other is the question of the interstate shipment of that product. The question of taxes on oleomargarine, under the pending legislation, is completely out of the picture, because under the bill before us, H. R. 2023, and under the Wiley substitute, the elimination of all taxes on oleomargarine is proposed, so that both measures before the Senate propose to eliminate all taxes on oleomargarine.

That issue, therefore, is out of this debate, because either way we go, the tax question is eliminated.

So, Mr. President, I am supporting and have supported the theory of the elimination of the tax on oleomargarine. I think we should lay the ghost of the tax at this point, because even now there is no appreciable tax on oleomargarine across the counter at the store. That is the greatest misrepresentation and distortion that has been foisted on the American people through what I regard as fraudulent advertising and ill-advised and uninformed statements. The only tax on uncolored oleomargarine, as such, to the housewives or other consumers today is a quarter of a cent a pound, plus a small license fee which the dealer or manufacturer has to pay. However, when oleomargarine is changed from its natural state, and there is an attempt by coloring it, to sell it in imitation of butter, then there is a tax of 10 cents a pound on it. But anyone in Washington may buy oleomargarine today, and, if he desires, color it at home, without any tax except the quarter-of-a-cent-a-pound tax, plus the dealer's license fee that inheres in the product itself.

But the question of taxes, Mr. President, has been eliminated from the bill and we may disregard it and consider the question of color. It has been amply developed in this debate by the various Senators who have spoken that oleomargarine is a synthetic product put together after a fashion and represented as being the equal of butter in all its uses as a spread. I cannot say that necessarily that is true or untrue. Ample chemical opinion can be obtained to the effect that oleomargarine does not have the long-range, sustained nutritional value of butter. Other opinion can be obtained to the effect that its nutritional value is comparatively equal to that of butter. So I am not sure just what the truth of the matter is. But I know that the entire foundation upon which the producers of oleomargarine attempt to operate today is a foundation of deception and an attempt to steal an age-old industry's development of a color and a method and a system of acceptance which butter has built up over the years.

No one in the butter industry objects, so far as I know, to the sale of oleomargarine on its own merits—in its natural state—but the attempt is made to stick the nose of the oleomargarine camel under the tent of the butter business, which can result in only one thing. If they are permitted to sell and ship in interstate commerce oleomargarine colored to the exact color of butter, and advertised deceptively, as the junior Senator from Wisconsin pointed out yesterday, as the "breath of the farm," or as "farm fresh," or something of that kind—if they are permitted to do that under the cover of the color of butter, the result will be disastrous to the butter industry. The advertising appropriations of the oleomargarine industry, which consists, I am told, of only about 23 companies in the United States, of which about 10 or 12 control about 65 percent of all the business, reach as high as $6,000,000 a year. If this bill, with the restrictions it removes on oleo, is passed, undoubtedly, the advertising budget will go many times higher; and with the artful methods of modern presentation, used without restraint, the oleo interests will come pretty close to driving the butter of the United States off the market entirely in the not too distant future, or will make butter, because of the competition of the low-cost oils, eventually such a luxury product that very few people, indeed, will be able to afford it.

Manifestly, at the present time, on the basis of price, butterfat at 75 cents a pound simply cannot compete with soybean oil or cottonseed oil or coconut oil at 12 or 13 cents a pound. I am told that oleomargarine is now selling for around 26 and 28 cents a pound. If we merely take the proper differential, we find that butter is selling at nowhere near the mark-up margin, percentagewise or even pennywise, at which oleomargarine is selling today to the American public, based on the cost of the basic oils which go into oleomargarine. In other words, the manufacturers of oleomargarine, made from the oils which are employed in its production, and sold tax-free to the public, should be selling oleomargarine to the public at about 17 or 18 cents a pound, rather than the 26 to 28 cents a pound they are now charging. I have no doubt that once the permission is given to the small concentration of great corporations to make oleomargarine as only a side line, before long they will have such a hold on the market that they will be able to increase the price of oleomargarine, and instead of giving the people a cheaper product, the people will be eventually paying a greater price. The profits will go into the pockets of such great world oil-controlling trusts, if you please, as Lever Bros., as was so well demonstrated by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] the other day.

Mr. President, I do not care to take a great deal of the time of the Senate in the discussion of the question of color, and I shall not do so, as other Senators have discussed it. It has been pointed out heretofore, but I think we should accentuate the fact, that the courts of the land themselves have protected color. People are heard to say that there is no exclusive right to a color, that the butter producers cannot contend that they should be protected in the color of butter, which has been standardized by usage and by the expenditure of a great deal of money and a great deal of training over the past many years, and that they have no exclusive right to the use of that color in their product. The courts of the country have decided differently. The famous Yellow Cab case has been called to the attention of the Senate repeatedly. I shall not requote the decision, but I again wish to emphasize the case. The color of soap, I believe in the Lifebuoy case, was clearly set forth as being a factor in the special development and the special attention given to that soap by the company which has been mentioned. So color has been protected.

The Federal Trade Commission undertakes today to protect one industry against apparently intended aping its product by another industry, that is, it protects a corporation, or a producer, or manufacturer against labeling or advertising by another designed to deceive the purchaser into thinking that he is buying some other brand or design or type of goods or merchandise. Such protection is being afforded every day.

In my own office this moment I have a case from my State in which the Federal Trade Commission is looking into statements and declarations on the outside of a package which I think would lead reasonable people to believe that the package was intended to deceive the purchasing public into thinking it was getting another manufacturer's product under a name under which the original manufacturer has built up a business over a period of a good many years. Such action is taken in the case of individuals in business and as to manufactured products, and it is done without patent or copyright protection.

Here we have the case of butter, which involves the economic stability of 2,500,000 small farmers. Countless farm children have been educated on the butter and egg checks, or the cream and egg checks, which have come in weekly to the farms of the United States, when other sources of revenue have been missing. Two and a half million farmers in the United States who have gone into the business of producing butter, which, as I said a while ago, is age-old, and who continue it after spending many years building up acceptable, reliable, and productive dairy herds, are facing the competition of oleomargarine, if this bill becomes law, and if interstate shipments of colored oleo are to be permitted, and promoted by national advertising in great programs which the dairy industry cannot begin to approach. We see this great segment of 2,500,000 ordinary, hard-working, family-raising people, threatened with either the necessity of losing their investments or having to

change their entire method of operating their diversified farms.

Mr. President, in the discussion of the pending legislation it has been taken for granted by many of us that the yellow oleomargarine threat is one that concerns butter, and butter alone. This, however, is a misconception. The passage of H. R. 2023 would hit not only at butter, but at every other important segment of the dairy industry. I can use by way of illustration a row of dominoes. If the first domino is tipped they will all fall over. So in the case of the dairy industry. If H. R. 2023 is passed, it will touch not only butter, it will touch fluid milk, it will touch the evaporated milk industry, it will touch the dry milk industry, it will touch the ice cream and cheese industries. Those are great outlets of the dairy and cattle industry of the United States.

I have here with me, compiled for brevity, excerpts from the statements of six individuals, each of whom has a primary interest in one of the major products just named. These spokesmen were asked to appraise and evaluate what the effect would be in their particular end of the dairy industry if the bars were to be let down on yellow oleo. Their conclusions were presented last week at a joint meeting of dairy farmer groups and dairy industry representatives.

Speaking for evaporated milk was Walter Page of New York, treasurer and general manager of the Midland Cooperative Dairy Association. He pointed out that evaporated milk—like butter—is threatened by an imitation which, to the average consumer, is indistinguishable from the real product. This imitation is filled milk, in which vegetable oils are substituted for the natural butterfat. Filled milk made its first appearance about 1915 and its production grew by leaps and bounds for the simple reason that it could be produced at a cost of about 3 cents less per can than evaporated milk. It can be sold for less than evaporated milk and it nets a larger profit. Mr. Page said:

> The fraud and deception which was involved in filled milk finally resulted in the enactment of the Federal Filled Milk Act which prohibits its shipment in interstate commerce. If it were not for the Filled Milk Act the imitation would be a very serious problem—just as yellow oleo will become a serious problem if its unrestricted shipment is allowed in interstate commerce.

Mr. President, I call the attention of this body to the fact that the purpose and effect of the Filled Milk Act is identical with that of the Gillette-Wiley substitute amendment to H. R. 2023—to prevent the movement in interstate commerce of a substitute dairy product. The Filled Milk Act permits the individual States to determine whether that product can be manufactured within its borders, and there are several States which do in fact permit it. The Gillette-Wiley amendment would give to the States the same right of decision with respect to yellow oleomargarine. The Filled Milk Act has been upheld by the United States Supreme Court. I submit that in this act we have the legal, economic, and moral precedent for the enactment of the Gillette-Wiley amendment.

Mr. Page, speaking in behalf of the evaporated milk industry, concludes:

> In the evaporated milk industry we don't want to see the farmers injured by letting down the bars to imitation dairy products. One of the greatest markets for American-made industrial goods is the dairy farmers. Industrial workers would be better off to pay the oleo taxes—if they are necessary to protect against yellow oleo—and thereby keep the dairy farmer market prosperous for the purchase of industrial products.

DRY MILK CLOSELY LINKED WITH BUTTER

As for dry milk, we are all familiar with the fact that nonfat dry milk solids and butter are complementary dairy products. In the manufacture of butter from whole milk, the butterfat goes into the butter. The residue is available for drying, and the resultant product is an abundant source of the important elements which make milk the ideal food. It is obvious that any condition which would eventually reduce the volume of butter production would also affect the production of dry milk.

Gar Wagner, assistant manager of the McDonald Cooperative Dairy Co., of Flint, Mich., summarized the results as follows:

> Butter and dry milk solids are complementary dairy products—the only important milk products with this characteristic. If butter prices drop, the skim portion of the milk must carry a larger share of the load, pricewise. Yellow oleo would cut the volume of factory separated milk used for butter, and likewise nonfat solids.
>
> The only result would be higher prices for nonfat solids. The amount used in foods would be cut. Price has been the main reason why bakers and others have not used the recommended quantities of nonfat solids. Higher prices would defeat increased consumption; would cause reduction in use.

FILLED CHEESE IS ANOTHER THREAT

Cheese is another dairy product which will suffer if the oleomargarine interests are successful in having all restraints removed in the coloring of their product in imitation of butter. The position of the dairy farmers whose milk goes into cheese production was outlined by Milo K. Swanton, secretary of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture, Madison. The chief threat to cheese producers, of course, is that once we undermine our food standards by permitting imitation products to masquerade without restrictions as genuine products, there will be open invitation for the manufacture of filled cheese—just as there will be for the manufacture of filled milk, filled ice cream, and yellow oleo. That is the vitally important point which was stressed by Mr. Swanton when he said:

> The yellow oleo issue is a battle of substitutes that involves every one of us in the dairy industry. What happens to one branch of the dairy industry faces every other branch.
>
> Cheese is directly concerned with what affects butter because in cheese manufacture there is a recovery of fat from whey, which goes into butter.
>
> Indirectly we also are concerned because we think in terms of defending the inalienable right of consumers to depend—in their choice of foods—on the senses of sight, feel, taste, smell, and hearing. Each one of these senses is violated by yellow oleo.

Mr. President, I believe this last statement deserves emphasis. In the manufacture and merchandising of yellow oleomargarine its processors are seeking to hoodwink each one of the five senses by which we mortals are able to tell the true from the false, the genuine from the imitation. They are permitted to hydrogenate their oily substances to the consistency and the "feel" of butter. They are allowed to add butter flavor to simulate butter's taste and smell. They have infringed upon our hearing with beguiling phrases that suggest green pastures and the gentle fragrance of the dairy—a far cry from the heavy stench of the oil-pressing plant. Finally, they are seeking to deceive our sense of sight by coloring their product yellow. And all to what purpose? Simply for the selfish purpose of usurping the table-spread market of America.

FLUID-MILK PRODUCERS WOULD FEEL REPERCUSSIONS

Raymond Skinner, of Memphis, Tenn., representing the Milk Industry Foundation and speaking for the fluid-milk industry, summed it up this way:

> We have less fault to find with a truly substitute product than with a camouflaged product, such as oleomargarine. Oleo relies upon dairy products for camouflage. Oleo made without the addition of milk products and butter flavor would be ordinary cooking fat. It couldn't be produced without the camouflage of dairy products.
>
> Why is the fluid-milk group interested in the yellow oleo issue?
>
> 1. Because fluid milk is one member of the dairy-products family, and anything which injures one member of the family injures all.
>
> 2. Because we believe in preserving some semblance of competitive decency.
>
> 3. Because we believe in the rights of individual communities to determine what shou'd be manufactured and sold in these communities.
>
> 4. Because as producers would be driven o t of the dairy industry because of unfair oleo competition, fluid-milk prices would one day go so high that substitutes for other dairy products would have to take over.

Mr. President, in connection with substitutes for other dairy products, I will say that I have brought with me a little example of what is going to happen to us and what is happening to us. If the pending bill is passed and unlimited advertising and uncontrolled interstate shipments of oleo products become entrenched in this country, it will be found that every other field of dairy production will be subject to the ersatz treatment, and dairy products will suffer, either because of prohibitively high prices or because of the industry going out of business entirely.

I have here an imitation whipping cream synthetic put on the market as "whipped topping." It has to be kept under refrigeration. It is made by a corporation in Buffalo, N. Y. It is advertised as:

> A delicious topping for desserts, salads, gelatins, and pastries.

The following statement appears on the carton:

> The pure, frozen soy cream for whipping.

Mr. President, we see that there is deception right at the outset, namely, a "cream for whipping."

Of course, Mr. President, in the past cream for whipping has always been the product of the dairy cow.

This further statement appears on the carton:

Has all these advantages:
Whips to three times its bulk.
Whips simply and quickly.
Can be rewhipped and rewhipped.
Keeps indefinitely frozen—keeps for a week at normal refrigerator temperature.
Economical in cost.
Can be whipped to any desired stiffness.
Retains its flavor and appearance.

Here is the statement, printed on the carton, of what is in it, according to the label:

Water, hydrogenated soya oil, with added propylene glycol monosterate, soy protein, corn syrup, salt, artificial flavor, artificial color.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WITHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is there anything on the package to indicate that "soy" is a bean? The Senator has not yet read anything from the label to indicate that the consumer is told that "soy" is a bean. The consumer might well think that soy is a breed of cow.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that I am unable to find anything of that sort on the package. I am quite certain that there is no statement on the package that "soy" is a bean. The label says "soya oil" and "soy protein," but there is nothing on the label to show that it comes from soy beans, other than the word "soya" and the word "soy."

Mr. AIKEN. There is nothing on the label to indicate that "soy" is not a breed of cow, is there?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No.

But, Mr. President, one of the significant distortions about the advertising is the statement appearing on the bottom of the container:

Pure frozen soy cream.

At one place the words "soya oil" appear, and at another place the words "soy protein" appear.

Mr. AIKEN. That is why I asked the question, because there are millions of consumers who would not know that "soy cream" was not simply a variation from Jersey cream or Guernsey cream.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That could be.

Mr. AIKEN. It is, I think, a fact.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But I think perhaps one of the glaring deceptions contained in the statements appearing on the carton is:

The pure frozen soy cream for whipping.

In other words, whipping cream. Those who market this article are trying to make the public believe they are putting out a whipping cream. But it is a synthetic product completely, starting with a water base, and then filled with various oils and chemical products and proteins.

Mr. President, the reason for this illustration I think is manifest, namely, that here is another product which now is actually being produced and put on the market, in an attempt to take away another great field for the sale of dairy products. It is not inconceivable that with great advertising programs and the attractive appeal which can be made to the eye and the attractive representations which can be made by the wording of the labels, the producers of such products, who make these very ingenious presentations can, with substitutes such as this "whipping cream," invade the market with great rapidity. Then, as in the case of the first of a row of dominoes, where the first domino which falls over will, in turn, cause the falling over of all the other dominoes in the row, so it will be not alone a question of butter whose market will be destroyed, and the reliability of whose market will be destroyed, but of the destruction of the markets of the succeeding dominoes, so to speak, representing the milk, the butter, and the cheese business.

I do not know when the production of synthetic cheese will begin. Perhaps it has begun. If so, I do not know it. But I did not know until a few days ago that synthetic whipping cream is now being produced to invade this market. Senators will find that the profit motive of a few concentrated corporations to invade and obtain this market for their various and diversified products will know no bounds and will be without conscience. They will steal the market of two and one-half million dairy product producers in the United States, and with little thought or care as to the economic well-being or prosperity of the great, evenly spread dairy segment of our farm economy in the United States, just so a few corporations in the United States may make a little more profit return in their business.

Mr. President, these statements are no idle threats. If we sabotage the butter industry, we undermine the entire dairy industry. The effect will not be felt tomorrow. It will be at least a matter of months; perhaps years. But so surely as we cripple one important segment of dairying, the paralysis will creep through the entire industry. More and more dairymen will go out of business or reduce their herds. They will have no alternative. And in the end, American consumers will have lost their present abundant source of dairy products and meat products—the products upon which we have built a dietary standard that is largely responsible for our present strength.

THE ISSUES INVOLVED, FROM THE BUTTER VIEWPOINT

Speaking in behalf of butter, N. R. Baker, vice president of the Fairmont Foods Co., Columbus, Ohio, stated:

In the butter-oleo controversy at least five important issues are involved: The moral issue; the economic issue; the political issue; the human element; and the issue of fraud and deception.

The moral issue is one of common right or wrong. It is certainly not in keeping with the American spirit of fair play to allow an imitation product to supplant a genuine by means of dubious practice. Yellow oleo in imitation of butter is simply the first of a long line of ersatz products that might similarly seek to supplant their natural counterparts.

In keeping with that statement by Mr. Baker, I again point out the ersatz product of "whip topping" I have just shown to the Senate.

I continue to quote from the statement by Mr. Baker:

Under the economic issue there is the contrast between the soil-improving effect of dairy husbandry and the soil depletion connected with the growing of oil-bearing crops. There is the cost involved in the resulting surpluses of dairy products, and the cost in displacing a large segment of agriculture that would be displaced by a reduction in dairy production.

The political issue is one of States' rights, and the privilege that the States alone should have in deciding such questions as whether yellow oleo should be permitted within State borders. The human element—a very important factor—is involved in the interests of several million farm families as contrasted with the interests of a few hundred families concerned with the manufacture of oleo.

The fraud and deception issue is of course fundamental. It is simply a proposition of the devious ways and means in which yellow oleo will be palmed off as butter, if its unrestricted manufacture and sale is allowed.

ICE CREAM LIKEWISE THREATENED

Aside from butter, evaporated milk, and cheese, ice cream is another dairy product that is in line for wholesale substitution, once the pattern is set and approved for yellow oleo. Ice cream is particularly susceptible of imitation, and filled ice cream will be the rule rather than the exception if the parade of imitation dairy products is allowed to get started. Robert Hibben, executive secretary of the International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, makes this brief and pointed comment:

Dairy products may be likened to a row of dominoes, standing on end. If one of them is tipped over, the whole row will fall down. If butter is hurt by letting down the bars on yellow oleo, every other dairy product will feel a direct injurious effect.

Mr. President, I have presented very briefly the statements of representatives of each of the important segments of dairying—evaporated milk, dry milk, cheese, fluid milk, butter, and ice cream. These statements verify what we all should know and heed—that the oleomargarine issue is not merely a controversy on butter and yellow oleo. It is an issue which involves every dairy product and every dairy farmer, and, in the end, every consumer of dairy products and meat products in America.

As I said at the outset, Mr. President, the question of taxes on oleomargarine is eliminated in this debate because, under both approaches—under House bill 2023 as it now confronts us and under the Gillette-Wiley substitute—the taxes on oleomargarine are completely eliminated. The question then resolves itself down to the point not of eliminating yellow oleomargarine necessarily from the American market but reserving to each State itself the right to say whether the manufacture and sale of colored oleomargarine shall be permitted within its borders. If a State says it may be, then, under its sovereignty and under its sovereign right, it can permit the manufacture and sale of yellow oleo. Under the Gillette-Wiley amendment,

the interstate shipment of yellow oleo is forbidden, but under the amendment the question of whether they want to permit yellow oleo is left to the States. Under the Wiley amendment, however, great oleo concentration plants cannot be set up in one part of the United States and their product be shipped in interstate commerce as colored oleomargarine. It could still be shipped under its natural color, in any event, and under either bill.

So there is no proposal here to deny to the States of the Union the right to have colored oleomargarine sold, but it is proposed to preserve to the States the right to say whether it shall be manufactured and sold within their borders. In each bill the taxes are eliminated and are out of the question. But the philosophy underlying the whole program on the part of the oleo interests is that of imitation, amounting to business banditry, if you please, Mr. President, of the color of one of the greatest dietary products the human race has ever developed, namely, butter, natural butter from the dairy cows of America. If this bill passes, the movement will spread abroad, and pretty soon we shall find the American cow supplanted by the oil press and, yes, coconut oil will be coming here, and will push the cottonseed oil boys back on their haunches just as quickly as production in the coconut oil field in other parts of the world can be more highly developed. We need have no fear, Mr. President, but that Lever Bros.—so friendly now—and the other great oil-producing interests and cartels of the world will have no hesitancy in flooding the United States with coconut oil and palm oil, when their production is up to a competitive basis. In their business ruthlessness, they will disregard the interests of the cottonseed producers in this country, they will disregard the interests of the soybean producers in this country when and as coconut oil and palm oil produced in other parts of the world become sufficiently plentiful to push our locally produced oils off their synthetic markets. Although they are great pals today in this common interest, they will have no sympathy then, with those who are attempting to force an unlimited and uncontrolled sale of yellow oleo on the American public. They are great friends today. They are great buddies, but the minute the coconut oil in drums begins to roll in from the South Pacific and other places, the minute palm oil production reaches the point where its volume will warrant their doing it, they will just as ruthlessly drive the cottonseed and soybean oil producers into outer darkness, as today, with their world-wide set-up and their concentration of manufacturing plants they are trying to drive the butter industry and, therefore, the dairy industry of this country to the wall.

It is impossible to stop a dairy cow by turning off the spigot, Mr. President. It takes years to develop a dairy herd; it takes great expense to develop a dairy herd, and it takes a high degree of training and knowledge to operate successfully a dairy business, great or small. Dairy cows cannot be turned into something else if business gets a little bad—unless they are turned into the slaughterhouse. Dairymen do not have the versatility the great manufacturers have of stopping production in one line if it is uneconomic and turning their resources into another field. The dairymen cannot do that. Dairying, like farming itself, is a long-range, skilled, and financially hazardous occupation. We are today threatening the very existence of a business and an industry that furnishes a food product to the American people at a reasonable cost; we are today facing the undermining of that entire business. If we permit substitution to go on uncontrolled, we shall be doing a disservice to the American economy not only in a dietary way but in a financial way that may plague us for many, many years to come.

DEATH OF WILLIE SIX

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, though I expect to speak briefly on the pending question, I should like first to address myself to a personal matter. It was my good fortune some years ago to have been a student at the University of the South, which is situated on a high plateau in the Cumberland Mountains between Chattanooga and Nashville. The university had commonly been known as Sewanee through the decades since the War Between the States because it is located adjacent to the tiny village of Sewanee, Tenn.

Sewanee, Mr. President, is a small liberal arts university for men; it remains as one of the few such institutions in the Nation. The university's prime hope is to help her sons secure and earn for themselves an ability to think, to master any subject with reasonable facility, and to live broadly and happily in the years beyond graduation. The sons of Sewanee remain grateful for the encouragement and stimulus to curiosity provided by their university.

Not all the sons of Sewanee have been undergraduates, and some of them have never qualified for a degree. But among these, Mr. President, are to be found those whom the university and all her graduates hold in the highest possible regard, respect, and affection. One such son of Sewanee passed away yesterday, after a life of Christian usefulness, and the junior Senator from Washington has risen to express his personal feeling of loss and to extend his sympathy to the family of a man by the name of Willie Six.

From the New York Times of this morning I wish to read an obituary about a good and God-fearing Christian:

NEGRO FOOTBALL AIDE MOURNED AT SEWANEE

SEWANEE, TENN., January 12.—A Sewanee tradition passed today with the death of Willie Six, a bent and kindly old Negro who eased the aching muscles of Sewanee football players for 36 years.

Six was football trainer and confidant of his "white folks" on University of the South teams from 1909 until his retirement in 1947. The 63-year-old trainer, whose real name was Sims, died at his home after an illness of several months.

His love for the university and for his "boys" endeared him to thousands who attended Sewanee. At his retirement the tradition-steeped university observed "Willie Six Day" during homecoming festivities. More than 3,000 of his boys of years ago attended.

Among those present were six Protestant Episcopal bishops, five Army generals, a United States Senator, two members of the Tennessee Supreme Court, two college presidents, an air line president, and a National Broadcasting network president.

They presented to him a purse of more than $2,500. A plaque also was presented, along with a leather-bound scrapbook with all his newspaper clippings and more than 100 congratulatory messages.

Willie often boasted that in all his years as trainer he had never seen his team scored upon. "I always turned my head," he explained.

When Willie was asked at his retirement to pick the greatest Sewanee team of all, he replied with an answer he had used for 36 years: "It's the one a'comin' up."

Mr. President, when I heard of the passing of this good friend I expressed my own feelings in a telegram to one of the authorities at Sewanee, and, for the benefit of Willie Six's family, and because of my respect for him and because, in my official capacity as a Senator from one of the 48 States of the Union, I wish to acknowledge the passing of this real American, I should like to read the telegram into the RECORD:

JANUARY 12, 1950.

Mr. ARTHUR CHITTY,
University of the South,
Sewanee, Tenn.:

My distress over the passing of Willie Six is keen and deeply sincere. Because of what I knew him to be I have always considered him to be among the foremost Americans I have ever known. His virtues of humility, integrity, decency, and reliability were unexcelled by anyone else. I consider his comment "The best team Sewanee ever had was the team that is a coming up" to be among the priceless gems of wisdom ever uttered. Generations of Sewanee men are better men because Willie Six was their tutor in the ways of life. I am privileged to have counted myself as being a friend of his.

HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senator.

Good people, Mr. President, never die. I think both of us are in agreement on that fact. Willie Six has gone to join friends up above, where he will obviously live forever.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like rather briefly to address myself to the pending question.

For several days the butter-oleo question has been ably debated on the floor of the Senate. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] presented the arguments of the oleomargarine manufacturers. Answering him have been some of the most distinguished Members of this body. The RECORD of the past several days is replete with arguments, statistics, facts, figures, and phantasies—all bearing on butter and oleo.

But as I read the speeches and debates, I note a striking omission from the record. Seldom, if ever, during the debate has any Senator spoken on behalf of the consumer or attempted to present his wishes and opinions in this matter. One might almost say that the battle lines are drawn between a few great manufacturing corporations on the

one side and a large group of farmers on the other. Both are fighting for the same thing—the market represented by the 38,000,000 families in the United States who daily use in their kitchen and put on their table some sort of nutritious spread. Yet up to this point there has been little reference to what these consumers themselves say about the problem now under discussion.

For the last 14 months polls and surveys of public opinion have not occupied the high place they once held in our country. No one of us, I am sure, any longer considers opinion polls to be a precise measure of public thinking. Few of us would take issue, however, with the broad results of an opinion poll, properly made by experienced, objective specialists in that field.

Within the last few days I have had an opportunity to study just such a survey. It was made by the firm of Benson & Benson, Inc., of Princeton, N. J. That firm is recognized as one of the leaders in the complicated art of determining public thinking. I am interested and surprised by some of the opinions which this survey has revealed to exist in the public mind. If the results of this survey correctly indicate the temper of the public—and I have no reason to doubt that they do so—many of us have been tilting at a windmill during these debates. Recent discussion here has been along one line. The public's thinking is along another line. It is timely that we take into account in our deliberations where the public stands on this question.

Let us take up, first of all, the basic question of how important yellow oleomargarine is to consumers. Bear in mind that I am not discussing how important yellow oleomargarine is to the producers of that commodity. I am talking about how the consumers feel. There is a great deal of difference.

A broad cross section of consumers in all parts of the country were asked this question and I quote directly from the survey:

> How much difference (aside from price) does it make to you whether or not you can buy oleomargarine colored yellow—a great deal, a fair amount, only a little, or no difference?

Here are the answers to that question: 58 percent of the people, almost 3 people out of every 5, said it made no difference to them whatsoever. Another 11 percent said it made only a little difference. That means that to almost 7 out of 10 consumers it makes little or no difference whether oleomargarine is colored yellow. There are some, to be sure, who think that the availability of yellow oleo is a matter of major importance. Twenty percent of the people replied that it made a great deal of difference to them, while another 11 percent said it made a fair amount of difference.

We could give or take a few percentage points either way. The fact remains that by a majority of more than 2 to 1 the consumers of this country are on record as saying it makes little or no difference to them whether they can buy oleomargarine colored yellow. It is very interesting to note in this connection that the housewives see almost eye to eye with the men of the family. Broken down between men and women the survey shows little difference in opinion.

I should like to pose this question to my colleagues: Do these facts testify to a mandate from the people for yellow oleo?

We are all trying to obtain an adequate answer to that question.

I say they do not, that the call for yellow oleo comes almost entirely from the manufacturers of that product. The Senator from Arkansas has stated that the sole purpose of the margarine interests was to sell more margarine. To bring that about they have intelligently and relentlessly propagandized the assumption that consumers clamor for yellow oleo. The facts of the matter now arise to confound them and to expose the propaganda as a myth.

Before I leave this one phase of the opinion survey, I want to point out another very significant finding. A similar survey was taken in May 1948 by the same organization. The results were incorporated into the testimony before the House committee considering the oleo question. At that time the survey reported that to 62 percent of the people it made little or no difference whether they could buy yellow oleo. During the year and a half that has elapsed since that first survey was taken, the oleomargarine mimeograph and countercharge machines have been grinding away furiously at a great clip. However, the current survey, which was taken in November and December of last year, showed a marked increase in the percentage of people to whom yellow oleomargarine made little or no difference. Eighteen months ago the figure was 62 percent. Sixty-two out of every 100 did not care one way or another. Today, after all the to-be-expected oleomargarine interests' denials, the figure of those who do not care one way or another whether oleomargarine is colored yellow has risen to 69 percent. If there is a mandate to be read from these figures it is, from my own point of view, along these lines: We the people are not much interested in yellow oleomargarine.

However, it is legislation we are debating, not consumer opinion. The survey from which I have quoted went to the heart of the matter, and asked the people this question, which I think is a fair one:

> At present there is a Federal tax of one-fourth cent a pound on white oleomargarine and 10 cents a pound on yellow oleomargarine, as well as certain retailers' license fees. A law has been suggested which would do these two things:
>
> 1. Remove the present taxes and license fees on oleomargarine, and permit the sale of white oleomargarine which could be colored at home or anywhere else.
>
> 2. Forbid the shipment of yellow oleomargarine from one State to another and let each State decide whether or not yellow oleomargarine should be made and sold within the State.
>
> Would you approve or disapprove of a law which would do both of those things?

It will immediately be apparent that this question describes the Gillette-Wiley substitute amendment to the oleo bill. The question is not couched in legal language, and it does not go into all the details, but it is, I believe, a fair and unbiased statement of the basic elements of the Gillette-Wiley substitute amendment. Now, let us see the public reaction. Perhaps it will be a guide to us in our continuing consideration of this question.

First of all, the survey results show that 26 percent of the people have no opinion on the proposed legislation as stated, or no opinion of any kind on any subject having to do with butter and oleomargarine. These people are in a different category from those who on preelection polls say they have not yet made up their minds. These are people who simply have no opinion. They are just not interested in the question.

But what of the other people? Fifty-two percent of all consumers would approve such a law, while only 22 percent would disapprove, or a margin of 30 percent. These figures mean that of the people who have an opinion on the pending legislation and who think of it and are interested in it, 7 out of 10 favor the enactment of the Wiley-Gillette amendment. It is pertinent again to take a look at how the housewives voted on this issue as compared with the men. After all, housewives are the Nation's buyers, especially of food products. Let us look at the record and see what the ladies have to say.

Curiously enough, more women than men approve the legislation described, which is, as I have said, virtually the Gillette-Wiley substitute amendment. Fifty-three percent of the women approve the proposed legislation as against only 50 percent of the men. Eighteen percent of the women disapprove, as against 26 percent of the men. Twenty-nine percent of all women have no opinion. That is a curious situation, whether the question is oleomargarine or anything else. Twenty-nine percent of all women have no opinion, while 24 percent of the men have no opinion and no interest. The ladies, it seems, are even less impressed by oleo propaganda than are the men. Perhaps they have seen and heard so much of it up to this time that its lack of justifiable substance has become all too clear.

The oleomargarine interests are obviously, and I think properly, afraid of the Gillette-Wiley substitute amendment. The Senator from Arkansas in his eloquent speech before the Senate on January 4 tried to discredit the amendment by ridicule, I think, by laughing at it a little bit. Adroitly the basic problem of States' rights was avoided by the Senator from Arkansas, or obscured in a smoke screen of time-worn propaganda arguments.

It would be a very rash man who would undertake to say why it is that American men and women so obviously approve the basic provisions of the Gillette-Wiley amendment. Yet it seems to me that in our deliberations we need to know, and, in fact, ought to know, the underlying reasons for the public's opinion of this proposed amendment.

Fortunately, in taking the poll, Benson & Benson asked the people why it was that they felt as they did.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington would like to suggest that he has

perhaps 5 or 6 minutes more of his address, and would prefer to answer all questions at the conclusion; but if it is important to the Senator from Arkansas, the answer is yes, I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is putting so much faith in polls, and, because he has just now been discussing polls, I wondered if he had heard about a poll recently taken in Ohio, which was a real poll, in which the people voted on the issue of oleomargarine, and in which they eliminated the prohibition on yellow margarine by half a million votes. Had he heard of that poll?

Mr. CAIN. As the Senator from Arkansas knows, the junior Senator from Washington has but recently returned to the Senate, and quite naturally all his time has been occupied with a study of the poll to which he is referring. I shall at the first opportunity look up and analyze the vote to which the Senator from Arkansas has just alluded.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I referred to an election. It was not a poll by Benson & Benson, or by the dairy people, at all. It was a legal, bona fide election in the State of Ohio, just last November. I thought that if the Senator was interested in polls, the result of that election gave a good indication of what the people really thought.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I should merely like to respond to the Senator from Arkansas that people think differently in different States. I am not quite certain or satisfied as to what the people in the State of Ohio are thinking about this question, but regardless of how they may think, people in other areas of the country hold the views I am expressing.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator knows that Ohio is a great dairy and agricultural State.

Mr. CAIN. I do, indeed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is significant that under such conditions as exist in Ohio, the majority in favor of the repeal of the oleo legislation was so great as it was. In that poll about 2,500,000 people participated. It was not a little sample ballot, in which the poll taker picks out the people he knows are favorable to what he is advocating. The poll was of everybody in Ohio.

Mr. CAIN. Is the Senator from Arkansas suggesting that all the clients of Benson & Benson, and other such fact-finding bodies, should immediately dispense with such activities because the producers of facts seek information only from their friends?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I might remind the Senator of the divergence in the result of the Gallup poll and other polls about the national election in 1948. There was a similar situation. The actual poll, which was the election, showed quite a different result from that of the hired polls, similar to those taken by Benson & Benson. I assume that Benson & Benson, whoever they are—I do not know who is meant—were employed by Mr. Holman and his group to take the poll, and I expect they were given to understand that they were to get right results.

Mr. CAIN. As a Member of the Senate on this side of the aisle, I can with greater force than can the Senator from Arkansas agree that in the election to which he refers there was quite a difference between the results of preelection polls and the results of the election itself. But I think that developing from that experience there has been a far greater degree of accuracy on the part of such fact-finding bodies as Benson & Benson. It is interesting to note that a very great number of the more stable, successful, and progressive business companies lean heavily on such results as are developed by Benson & Benson, and others in their field.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator will admit that the poll which really cannot be contested for its accuracy is the kind of poll taken in Ohio in the election. That is much more reliable, it seems to me.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I should be pleased to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. My only reason for interrupting the Senator at the moment is that I desire to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that only about 20 to 25 percent of the population of this Nation engages in agriculture. For that reason, unfortunately, we who speak in behalf of the Gillette-Wiley substitute measure are strictly a minority, insofar as the people of the entire country are concerned, but we are speaking for those who are engaged in diversified agriculture, which basically is the foundation of good soil-conservation practices. While, unfortunately, we are in the minority, we must voice our opposition to legislation which would permit a synthetic, camouflaged product to come onto the market, thereby destroying entirely the outlet for butter, a commodity the producers of which unfortunately happen to be in the minority.

I would say that the danger of destroying our agricultural economy by permitting this camouflage or substitute, so to speak, for butter to come onto the market and thereby destroy the agricultural economy of this Nation is not lessened by the fact that the voters in a State-wide election voted to permit colored oleomargarine to be sold without any restriction. If we lose the butter market the Midwest, where diversified agriculture is practiced, will have to change from dairying to some other type of agriculture. As I stated before, we certainly are going to aggravate the problems we now have with respect to surpluses with excess cotton acreages as well as excess corn acreages if we destroy an outlet, and a profitable outlet, for dairy products.

Mr. CAIN. The debate will obviously be benefited by reason of the observation just made by the able Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin for a comment on what the Senator from Minnesota has just said, if that is his wish.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to comment on the election in Ohio. Of the 48 counties 24 voted for the free use of color. Twenty-four counties voted against it. It is true that the proposal was carried in the State by 500,000 votes. It is also true that the Oleo Trust proceeded on the same basis of misrepresentation it has always used, and threw in everything it had in the bag, on the theory that if oleo could be colored the people would obtain cheaper oleo. The Oleo Trust persuaded what it calls the consumer class in the cities that that would be the fact.

The Senator well knows that it has been demonstrated, and it is demonstrated daily, that if the Oleo Trust takes over the so-called spread market, instead of getting a cheaper spread the consumers will pay much more for it. What is more, I have statistics showing that where yellow margarine can be bought and there should be a differential of only 9¾ cents a pound, the differential ranges from 10 to 30 cents a pound. That shows what will happen to the "dear consumer," who voted in Ohio 500,000 strong for oleo, due to the persuasive methods of the Oleo Trust, if similar action is taken elsewhere.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to say that the Senator's observation simply comes to this—that the people of Ohio have been fooled, and apparently the implication of the Senator's remarks is that the only ones who know the facts about this subject, as to the effect of margarine on agriculture, and as to the question of whether or not the price of oleomargarine will be higher or not, if the pending bill is passed, are himself and his colleagues in the Senate. Apparently only they know the truth about that. It is a challenge to the judgment of the people of Ohio. That is what it comes down to.

The people of that State have had an opportunity to study this matter for many years—just as the Members of the Senate have and just as the Members of the House of Representatives have. On two occasions within the past 3 years the House of Representatives has voted on this very issue with a margin of 3 to 1 against the position of the Senator from Wisconsin. So apparently the only places where any persons understand anything about this are Wisconsin and, perhaps, the States of Washington and Minnesota. No one else seems to know the true situation. The implication is that the statistics which have been quoted are entirely false. There is no trust. There is nothing to support the idea that there will be an increase in the price of oleomargarine if the pending bill is passed. Knowledge of the subject, however, seems to be confined to persons living in two or three States. Everyone else seems to be ignorant on the whole question.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Arkansas must readily agree that Washington, Wisconsin, and Minnesota are extremely important areas to the maintenance of a stable and healthy economy in the United States. What the junior Senator from Washington seeks to do in a few minutes this afternoon is to present a point of view which is subscribed to very generously within the confines of the

State of Washington, and subscribed to likewise, I think, by a good many ordinary American citizens, including housewives, throughout the country.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree entirely with that. If the subject is presented on the basis that what is involved is important to the economy of Washington, of Minnesota, or Iowa, I do not question that. I think it is important. That is a sound ground on which to base the argument the Senator is making.

Mr. CAIN. That is the foundation on which we have advanced this particular case.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree that that is the Senator's base. The only question is: Is the interest of four or five States to outweigh the interests of all the remainder of the States and 145,000,000 people?

Mr. CAIN. From the point of view of the States to which I have made reference it is certainly our opinion that it is good for a majority interest of the country to support the Wiley-Gillette amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not a fact that if any State decides and chooses, by vote or by any other constitutional process of the State, that it wants oleomargarine to be manufactured in that State, it can do so under the provisions of the substitute?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator brings up a very interesting but delicate question. I know how the Senator from Arkansas thinks on the subject of States' rights. There appears to be a contradiction between his present stand and the sentiment of the area from which he comes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Whether Benson & Benson took the poll, or whether the voters of Ohio took the poll, or however a poll was taken, it seems to me the result of the poll is the most convincing evidence in favor of the amendment that can be offered. The people of Ohio took a stand on the question. Under the provisions of the substitute amendment the people of every State in the Nation can do what the people of the State of Ohio did, if they choose to do so.

Mr. CAIN. I think the Senator from Nebraska will agree that we should not press an obvious point. However, it does still seem to me a little strange that the Senator from Arkansas and his colleagues have gotten some distance removed from the basis of States' rights, which is to let a State have an opportunity to vote on various subjects as it pleases.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. I know the Senator from Washington is intensely interested in housing and in the subject of rent control. One of the important pieces of legislation which was passed recently was the return of the power of imposition of rent control to the States. I am strongly in favor of permitting the local governments to handle such matters. I think one of the finest things that ever happened was the return of the centralized authority over rents to the States. I believe such action should be taken wherever possible.

Mr. CAIN. Is the Senator from Nebraska aware of the magnificent fact that since the amendment offered to the Rent and Housing Act of 1949 by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas was approved and became the law of the land seven sovereign States have said, "We know better how to regulate and control or discontinue rent control than does the Federal Government," and they have in consequence seen fit to decontrol.

Mr. WHERRY. That amendment to the law was the so-called Fulbright amendment; was it not?

Mr. CAIN. As indeed it should have been called, because the substance and the idea came from his fertile brain.

Mr. WHERRY. I happened to be one who supported that amendment. I thought the amendment was very constructive. I was glad it was adopted.

Mr. CAIN. The Senate approved it overwhelmingly.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. I think Congress by taking that action rendered a great service to the people of the United States of America. I certainly want to compliment the Senator from Arkansas for submitting the amendment, and debating it, and supporting it upon the floor of the United States Senate.

I submit that the same principle is involved in the present discussion. In view of the fact that the great State of Ohio took a vote on the subject of margarine, it seems to me that every other State could take similar action, under the provisions of the substitute, and that could be the final solution. Such action would seem to be absolutely parallel to the action advocated by the Senator from Arkansas when handling the bill relating to rent control during the last session of the Congress.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. If the Senator wishes to respond to the Senator from Nebraska rather briefly, I certainly shall yield to him.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I desire to respond briefly to the Senator from Nebraska. First, I want to thank the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Wisconsin for the undeserved compliment they have paid me, because I had very little to do with the matter. Both Senators did as much as I did.

I merely wish to say that the eminent Senator from Nebraska, busy as he is with his duties as minority leader, has, in my opinion, not had time to analyze the effect of the Wiley amendment, because that amendment by Federal law would provide that a State which is perfectly willing to have, by its own laws, yellow margarine, but does not have a plant, may not import yellow margarine. In other words, the amendment would provide, by Federal law, "No, you cannot buy yellow margarine, you cannot ship it in, even though your State laws say it is perfectly proper to do so." Thirty-two States, two-thirds of the States, have no prohibition, no restriction on yellow margarine, yet by the Wiley amendment it is proposed to deny half of those States the right to import this perfectly good product into those States. The Senator's amendment would say, "No, you cannot do that. If you want yellow margarine you have got to build your own plant," which is the antithesis of States' rights.

As to the foolish argument that the bill reported by the committee in any way restricts the State's product, it is absolutely not so. The Wiley amendment would prevent interstate commerce into those States which want the product. In no way does the bill try to direct or supersede the State laws on the subject.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more observation?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the States so vote, they can manufacture oleomargarine within their own borders. That is the point I am making. If they want it that badly, they certainly can do it.

Mr. CAIN. I think the Senator from Nebraska has made his point most ably.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I was very much interested in the comment made by my good friend on the other side of the aisle. He ignores one great fact, namely, that in two cases the Supreme Court of the United States has said that it was not only proper but legal and constitutional to stop the importation of filled milk. The only difference between filled milk and oleomargarine is there is more foreign matter in the milk, which makes it more solid.

The reason for that—the Senator has not argued, and will refuse to argue, this point—is that in his own State, where the law prohibits the serving of oleomargarine in restaurants unless there is a sign showing that oleomargarine is served there, the poll shows—and the Senator ignores this fact—that 69 out of 100 restaurants were violating the law, in his own State—meaning that the poor consumer, thinking he was getting butter, was being fed greasy oleomargarine.

Of course, Mr. President, the whole thing is based on the right of the public to have the Fair Deal.

When the Senator says that only Wisconsin and Minnesota, and perhaps a few other States, are interested in this problem——

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin permit me to interrupt at this point, to observe that in my opinion the Senator from Arkansas referred to only three States, namely, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Washington, because it happened that only the Senators representing those States were at the moment engaged in this discussion—which is not to say that perhaps 25 more Senators, had they been on the floor, might have caused the Senator from Arkansas to refer in the same terms to all the other States. I think he will take

most of us in, as the vote will disclose on Tuesday.

Mr. WILEY. The point I wanted to make was that in his very fine and gentle manner of approaching a problem the Senator puts words into the mouths of other Senators and leads to the conclusion, if one is not careful, that those words may properly be attributed to those Senators.

Mr. President, our arguments have been very well put. We know there is a very large oleomargarine industry; we know that in Europe the same group controls approximately from 50 to 60 percent of all the oleomargarine manufactured outside the United States of America. We know that that group has come into America. We know that five or six of the plants control about 60 percent of the oleomargarine manufactured and sold in this country. We know that at the present moment, in States where they have the right—under State law, mind you; it is a State-law proposition—to sell white or yellow oleomargarine they are using cartel methods. In California they are following the cartel method of selling, at one point in the State, 1 pound of oleo for 15 cents and giving the right to get another pound free, whereas at another point in the same State they are selling oleomargarine at 60 cents a pound.

I wish to say that we are representing directly 2,500,000 dairy farmers, not in 1 State but in 48 States. Opposed to us is the Oleomargarine Trust. Let us call a spade a spade. We know the methods of the Oleomargarine Trust. We know how they take over territory and fix prices and "take the poor consumer for a ride."

When it is said that we are selfishly engaged in protecting the rights of the dairy farmer, we plead guilty to the charge that not only are we here protecting the rights of the dairy farmer but we are protecting the rights of all the people of the 48 States. It is a question of looking after the public welfare.

If and when the law as they want it to be changed becomes the law of the United States, Senators or Representatives who vote for it will rue the day they did so. But that change will not come about in a month or 6 months or a year. However, when Senators see a creeping paralysis spread over the great heart of the Nation, the Middle West; when Senators see what occurs there, not only on the farms but in the villages—and, after all, the farmer is the best market for the laboring man's products—when Senators see that the laboring man cannot buy, and various other things occur, then, I suppose, some other excuse will be given. Perhaps some persons will say it is the fault of the Eightieth Congress. But we will say it is the Eighty-first Congress that has stuck the dagger in the back, not only of the farmer but of all the people of the United States.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin is a very sturdy proponent of the substitute to which I have addressed myself favorably this afternoon. I can fully appreciate why the Senator from Wisconsin thinks it proper to answer so spontaneously some of the arguments which have been presented by the Senator from Arkansas because the Senator from Arkansas is a very able man. I consider him to be one of the very best informed Members of this body. So I was surprised, during the course of the present debate, to have the Senator from Arkansas say, if I understood him correctly, that he was not familiar with the firm of Benson & Benson, Inc., from whose poll or survey I have been quoting.

I should like to say to the Senator from Arkansas that Benson & Benson, Inc., was organized in 1938 by Lawrence and Edward Benson. Both those men were formerly associated with the Gallup poll organization, beginning in 1933, and they still do a great deal of the Gallup work. Some of their current clients happen to be W. R. Grace & Co., the Parker Pen Co., the Columbia Broadcasting System, the Buffalo Evening News, the Aircraft Industries Association, the Association of Reserve City Bankers, the National Tuberculosis Association, and the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.

As the Senator from Arkansas so very well knows, in the somewhat recent past four polls were taken by Gallup on the oleomargarine question; at least, the results of those polls, which said rather conclusively that a great many American people wanted to rid themselves of the tax on oleomargarine, were referred to by the proponents of the Senator's present-day position. Those polls were taken on March 14, 1948, June 9, 1948, March 5, 1949, and May 14, 1949. I mention them only for the reason that, although the Senator from Arkansas presumably has not previously heard of Benson & Benson, Inc., he has—and very favorably—heard of Gallup. The work which went into the four polls to which I have referred was done by Benson & Benson for the benefit of Mr. Gallup, for whom the Senator from Arkansas has such a very high degree of admiration.

The only difference between the Benson & Benson, Inc., poll which I am using now and the four Gallup polls to which I have referred is that the Benson & Benson poll was designed to clarify the earlier polls with the tax issue left out.

Mr. President, a few minutes ago I raised the question of why people generally, as a result of this survey by Benson & Benson, appear to be in support of the Gillette-Wiley substitute amendment. I should like to give what appear to be their reasons.

Removal of the tax on oleo was one important reason. Next in importance was the public sentiment that the question is a matter of States' rights which each State should decide for itself. A substantial group said the law would eliminate the danger of fraud and misrepresentation. The Senator from Wisconsin has just referred to fraud or misrepresentation as they have seemingly been practiced within the State of Arkansas in connection with the oleomargarine question.

Let us take up these reasons one by one; to do so will not take long.

First, the matter of taxes on oleo: Both butter people and oleo people agree that the taxes and fees on oleo should be removed. Oleo propaganda would have us believe that the only reason the butter people feel this way is that they have no recourse—that it is a last-ditch attempt on their part to win public support for their basic position.

The record shows that is not an accurate charge. Competent legal testimony, which has never been contradicted, was presented by dairy representatives to committees of both the House and Senate. This testimony indicated that the use of the Government's taxing power was invoked by the Congress in the first place only because that was the only way to secure Federal control and enforcement.

Recent court decisions have opened up new ways to activate and fortify Government policies on oleo. Within a short time after these decisions were handed down, dairy policy voluntarily advocated the elimination of taxes and license fees on oleo and the substitution of other forms of Government control.

Personally, I see great significance in the fact that a substantial segment of the public volunteered as the reason why they approved the substance of the Gillette-Wiley amendment, their feeling that each State should decide for itself. We have seen evidence in many quarters that the people are growing resentful of the encroachment by the Federal Government into the privileges and prerogatives of the individual States. We now see that sentiment again here in connection with a question which, as the survey itself shows, is not of burning importance to a large part of the public. We are treading on the toes, not only of the respective State governments, but of the people, when we arrogate to the Federal Government powers and actions which logically rest with the States.

Mr. President, I am surprised and more than a little concerned over the public's voluntary expression, through the medium of this poll, of their fears in this regard. Many of the questions and problems which confront us in our sessions cannot and should not be delegated to the States. But the question of oleo restrictions and legislation is one which can and should be solved at the State level where sectional preferences and sectional opinions can be individually expressed and not submerged with those of other sections.

The third strong reason why the public expresses its approval of a ban on interstate shipments of yellow oleo is vital and compelling. It is the fear of fraud. The Senator from Arkansas has pooh-poohed again and again the idea that any consumer could be defrauded in view of the regulations which the bill under consideration places upon restaurant service of yellow oleo. He failed to point out—perhaps he did not know—that in his own State, where very similar restrictions now exist, 66 out of 100 restaurants surveyed by a fact-finding agency less than a year ago, passed off oleo in place of butter upon their patrons unsuspecting or otherwise.

But oleo naturally lends itself to fraud when it is colored yellow. It looks, it tastes, and it resembles closely in other respects butter, a more expensive product. Shady operators could make easy money by rewrapping yellow oleo in but-

ter cartons. The ease with which this can be done was pointed out graphically to the House Committee on Agriculture a year ago. That committee, you will recall, reported out favorably a bill very similar to the Gillette-Wiley substitute amendment.

Consumers see the inherent possibility of fraud in oleo. They recognize the need for rigid controls of those who would defraud them of their money. It is apparent that they see a satisfactory measure of protection in a Federal ban on interstate shipments of yellow oleo and enforcement at the State level of whatever restrictions each State chooses to impose.

We are debating here a measure which affects virtually every family in these United States. Involved in the question are such basic factors as agricultural economics, corporation sales problems, and the rights of consumers to buy what they please and get what they pay for. We have heard arguments on both sides of the question, but in the last analysis, it seems to me, we should harken to the voice of the people. After all, they are the ones who consume the butter and the oleo. In the survey to which I have referred, and in a number of others, the people have spoken clearly. The survey was broad in scope, objective in purpose, and as scientifically conducted as it is possible to conduct surveys in this enlightened twentieth century. Whatever margin of error may exist in the findings—and I think we ought to say there must obviously be some margin of error—it is bound to be a matter of only a few percentage points one way or the other.

But the weight of evidence is predominate, not marginal. Seven out of ten people say it makes little or no difference to them whether or not they can buy yellow oleo. And more than 2½ times as many would approve a law which would remove present taxes and license fees on oleo and forbid the interstate shipment of yellow oleo as would disapprove such a measure.

No one yet has advanced any reasons why the Senate should disregard public opinion on this issue.

CONSULTATION AND COLLABORATION IN THE FORMATION OF INTERNATIONAL POLICY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for allowing me to speak for a few moments on a matter not related to the subject before the Senate.

There are two matters that are giving serious concern to the people of this country. One is, will the leadership of this Nation and of the world prove itself adequate so that the world will not have to experience a third world war? The second concern of our people is whether or not we will be wise enough and adequate enough to avoid another economic depression. Recently on the floor of the Senate, in the course of debate regarding Formosa, I catechised my good friend the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and in the debate I stated that after we had heard the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, in an executive session of the Foreign Relations Committee, I would have a few words to say in regard to the first of these problems, the problem which concerns our people and the people of the world. In the center of that problem there seems to be the controversy relating to Formosa.

The Foreign Relations Committee was in session today. I could not attend, but I have heard something that came out of that meeting of the committee, which more or less fits into what I had dictated before I came to the Senate Chamber. We say we are "a government of laws." That is, the United States of America is controlled by a government of laws. In the realm of foreign relations, our Supreme Court, in the case of the *United States* v. *Curtiss Wright Export Corp.* (299 U. S. 304), has said the President possesses a delicate, plenary, and exclusive power, as a sole organ of the Federal Government, in the field of Foreign Relations, a power which does not require as the basis of its exercise an act of Congress. The Court stated that the President, rather than the Congress, has the better opportunity of knowing the conditions which prevail in foreign countries; which of course is generally true. Through the State Department and the branches of the Foreign Service, information is furnished to the Executive. While this states pretty clearly where the plenary and primary responsibility in relation to foreign affairs resides, in a world which is pretty touchy and sensitive in spots, and which has been contracted through the ingenuity of man in the last two decades, and particularly in a world in which the races of men are on different intellectual and spiritual levels, I personally believe that on all international problems, at least those which are of the highest importance, the Executive can well afford to give consideration to the views and suggestions of national leaders of thought, particularly those in the legislative branch.

While I have been in Congress it has never been my policy to criticize the President in the exercise of his functions, so long as he remained in his own bailiwick and performed his own functions, but when he got over into the legislative bailiwick, so to speak, or when he has attempted to interfere with the functions of the judicial branch of government, I have not hesitated to criticize such action. Personally, I do not believe in indulging in personalities, nor do I set myself up as one who possesses any superior judgment or vision. Parenthetically, I may say there are too many visionaries in all fields. What we need is what Mr. Dooley called common sense, which he says is the scarcest commodity on the market.

I repeat that I have not hesitated to criticise action, if and when the Executive in my opinion has jumped over the fence and attempted to dominate the legislative branch, or to impose legislation on Congress, and when and if through his departments downtown we find a failure to recognize that they are but creatures of the legislative branch, who have become, through custom and through practice, the creatures of the Executive, and they become visionaries after a sort, not only in matters of legislation but in impressing the will of the Executive on the Congress. In those cases I have not hesitated to criticise, and I want to say why. It is not because I like to indulge in criticism, because in my humble opinion one of the serious infiltrations that might impair the stability of our whole society is this thing that has gone on in the last three decades, throughout the world, in which there has been a lack of checks and balances in government. Thank God we still have a government of checks and balances. We still have an independent legislative branch, but we have seen in other nations that the executive has taken over, not only the courts but the legislatures, with the result that there is a revival of ancient autocratic forms of government, under the names of fascism, communism, and statism. It is a disease which is abroad in the world. That is why I felt that I should defer any comment on Formoso and the Formosan controversy until after I had heard from the Secretary.

The Secretary made a full and complete explanation, which many Senators have read. He talked to the Press Club.

So, Mr. President, I have reached the conclusion, because I feel that the world is touchy and sensitive, that there may be a powder keg here or there which may explode, resulting in a train of consequences with we know not what result. In the interest of the general welfare and of the peace of the world I feel that it is well that the Executive should consult not only with the leaders of thought in the legislative branch, but with great leaders of thought outside the legislative branch.

So, in evaluating the Formosa problem, without any thought of giving any direction, I have made these few remarks. Elbert Hubbard, that great American philosopher, said that the person who gets the most out of a talk is the one who makes it, because he hears himself talk. So I am perhaps the one who is getting the most out of this speech. I do feel, Mr. President, that we should proceed very carefully on the Formosa question, not only as it affects Asia, but as it affects the rest of the globe, now that America has been precipitated to the top as the leading nation of the earth. Care and caution do not include weakness or indecision. In the case of Formosa it might well include, when Chiang asked for assistance, sending "brains"—military brains. Especially is this true when we consider that we are informed that some of our best military men feel that Formosa is of vital significance and have expressed a desire to do this very thing.

I am informed, although I did not have an opportunity to attend the meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee today, that it is agreed that the top echelon of the military will be called before the Foreign Relations Committee to get their reaction. I like that procedure. I should like to refer to an incident which occurred on the floor of the Senate in February 1941. That was a long time ago. At that time I introduced a resolution asking the President to submit in executive session of the Senate the Secretary of State to be examined in relation to our defenses in Hawaii and in

the Philippines. Twice that month I made a speech on that resolution and I asked the significant question, "Will our fleet be caught in some harbor as was the Russian fleet in the Russo-Japanese War?" I was no prophet, and yet the question I asked was answered rather dramatically a few months later, at Pearl Harbor.

The Executive refused to produce the Secretary to be examined in executive session to give us the facts desired. If he had permitted the Secretary to make such a statement, the course of history might have been different. At least, Pearl Harbor might have been alert. If it had been alert, the course of the history of Asia would have been different and the war would have been shortened by at least 18 months.

Mr. President, I believe in such consultations. I do not believe any human brain is big enough to encompass the problems of this earth. I do not believe any group of human brains is adequate enough to tell us what is around the corner tomorrow. I think we need the direction and guidance of the Almighty. If we would compose our little differences and would sit down and consult we would make progress.

So I am happy to know, Mr. President, that we shall receive, a little belatedly, the benefit of some of the brains which I think should have been sent to Chiang.

I am also glad to note, Mr. President, that war matériel is going to Formosa for defense purposes. From what I have heard, what is needed more than anything else is what I have characterized as brains—men who can evaluate the facts, who can understand what they see, and who understand their environment.

I cannot lightly dismiss, Mr. President—and this is the third consideration—the idea of former President Hoover, which I understand is also the idea of General MacArthur. I have heard that General MacArthur thinks the Navy might perform a great containing function if it should hold maneuvers in the Pacific area. It would not be the first time America has used its Navy to do the right thing.

I have reached no conclusion on the subject. I should like to know from the brains, the men who are trained, who know the East and who know the thinking of the people of the East.

We have heard a great deal about losing face or retaining face. I sometimes wonder whether we should seek, in the national interest, to regain some of the face we have lost in the East. It would seem, from the little I have heard of the process of losing face, that it is a very significant thing to the millions of people in the East. General MacArthur understands the East, and he understands the significance of face in the East.

These suggestions are not made, Mr. President, with any sense of superior wisdom on my part, but rather in seeking to look around the corner of tomorrow to see what may take place, figuratively speaking, whether it be a week, a month, a year, or 10 years. I am seeking to look around the corner in the interest of finding the way to keep this world from going into another tail-spin of war.

Mr. President, there is another concern of our people, and that is that we shall be so on the alert and so adequate that we shall not precipitate ourselves into another depression. That question involves the subject of taxes and the subject of utilizing the Taft-Hartley law to see that our people in the Middle West and elsewhere do not freeze. It involves looking after the public interest. It also involves the question of whether one man should have the power to order out 500,000 men to create a crisis.

There is another matter which I shall discuss when I discuss the oleo segment of the question which is involved, and that is to see to it that we do not precipitate ourselves into another depression or recession.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that suggestion? It is getting pretty late.

Mr. WILEY. Does the Senator from New Hampshire desire a quorum call?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; I should like to have a quorum call.

Mr. WILEY. That is the reason I made the suggestion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Anderson	Hill	Millikin
Brewster	Hoey	Morse
Bricker	Holland	Mundt
Bridges	Humphrey	Myers
Butler	Hunt	Neely
Cain	Ives	O'Conor
Capehart	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Darby	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kem	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Downey	Knowland	Sparkman
Dworshak	Langer	Stennis
Ecton	Leahy	Taylor
Ellender	Lehman	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	Long	Thye
Frear	Lucas	Tobey
Fulbright	McCarran	Tydings
George	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Gillette	McClellan	Watkins
Graham	McFarland	Wherry
Green	McKellar	Wiley
Gurney	McMahon	Williams
Hayden	Magnuson	Withers
Hendrickson	Malone	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM in the chair). A quorum is present.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL TUESDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it take a recess until Tuesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICAN POLICY IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the time has come when all of us who are Members of the United States Senate must ask ourselves the same question Abraham Lincoln asked himself in the Civil War: "Has the manhood of this race run out?"

I am sure that all those who heard the President of the United States on January 4 applauded his acceptance of the challenge of communism. I am sure that most Americans recognize communism for what it is—an international conspiracy to obtain political control of the entire world.

I am sure that most Americans recognize and are willing to meet the challenge of this violent, anti-Christian, antireligious, antihuman drive for power. The challenge has been thrust into our teeth ever since the day after a victory was won in Europe, on the President's own birthday of May 8, 1945—in fact, ever since the moment that Joseph Stalin and his gang were freed of the direct threat to their personal security which World War II represented.

But we should ask ourselves here and now: Is the threat of communism to be half acknowledged and half evaded? Is it a ruthless struggle for power in Europe, where we are giving extensive aid to other governments, and a benevolent development in Asia, where it is knocking on our back door for recognition? Or are we going to accept it everywhere for what the President says it is, and for what we all know it is? Is it one thing in Europe and another in Asia? Is it one thing in Greece and another in Formosa?

Are we to be strong and resolute in Europe and weak-kneed and dissolute in the Pacific—the very area in which we were last so disastrously attacked? Are we preparing another Pearl Harbor and are we going to stand in paralyzing indecision while we feel it come upon us? Have we manhood in Europe and none anywhere else in the world? Are we men in Europe and mice in Asia?

The miserable failure of the Munich appeasement of Hitler and the postwar appeasement of Joseph Stalin should begin to come into perspective and have some meaning to us.

Mr. President, we should have learned by this time in our history that the policy of appeasement has a natural consequence. That consequence is war. We can now see that if we had stopped Hitler in the Rhineland by firm action we would have avoided World War II, or perhaps postponed it indefinitely.

We have also learned that Joseph Stalin understands us when we speak firmly and indicate we are prepared to act with resolution. Stalin also understands appeasement and he will be appeaseable so long as we vacillate and tremble before him.

We are confronted in Formosa with another Munich and I foresee that another appeasement will eventuate in another war.

This country has had a long and honorable association with China. Contacts began in 1784 and our first mission was sent to that ancient country in 1811. Our first treaty was made in 1884. In 1899 John Hay proclaimed the doctrine of the open door, and in 1900 this Government took the lead in urging all nations to respect China's territorial and administrative integrity. This policy was strengthened further in 1922 at the Washington conference, and in 1932 a

great Republican Secretary of State, Henry L. Stimson, proclaimed the famous doctrine of nonrecognition of conquest.

A Democratic Secretary of State, William Jennings Bryan, had suggested such measures in 1915. During the last war our country abandoned extraterritorial rights in China and received the plaudits of the world for doing so. In the halls of Congress the wife of Chiang Kai-shek pledged unremitting devotion to democratic principles and a democratic victory in the Far East.

What has happened since? If ever a nation—half starved and half decimated by 20 years of struggle against organized Communist and Japanese aggression—was laid low by assassination and innuendo, by charges and lies and half-truths, by a campaign of clever defamation, some from this very Hall, it was the Chinese nation and its government.

The Constitution of the United States imposes upon the Senate the responsibility of advising, consenting, and finally ratifying our foreign policy. Is it not time for this Senate to exercise its constitutional prerogative and call a halt to the shameful pursuit of a bankrupt policy in the Far East? Is it not time that, if we do nothing more, we pass a resolution of censure on this policy?

Is there a deadly blight in the Department of State that translates itself into our far-eastern policy? Are there men in that Department who work more to paralyze our policy than to devise one that will work? Do these men have a vested interest in their own errors?

I ask that all Senators consider the history of the manner in which the Chinese Government has been attacked indirectly, its confidence undermined, its faith before the world impugned, its character slandered, and its arm paralyzed in its effort to defend itself; not only to defend itself, Mr. President, but to defend all of Asia against the march of a Communist power bent on world conquest and international mental, moral, and economic slavery.

It is time that we ask ourselves who in the State Department is responsible for the divided counsels and the paralyzing indecision which has led this policy from one disaster to another, from one bankruptcy to another, from one retreat to almost ignominious rout? Thank God, it is not quite that, for there is yet time for resolute action. Perhaps the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who has done so much and labored so valiantly to construct a nonpartisan foreign policy, could best answer that question.

I recall that at the time our first bill for aid to China was reported, a certain Mr. W. Walton Butterworth, Jr., was serving as Director of Far Eastern Affairs in the Department of State. That bill was passed, and we presumed that we had furnished the funds to stiffen our policy in China. We were wrong. The attacks on the Chinese Government continued, and we continued to lose the Chinese war right here in Washington.

So what happened. Failure was rewarded. The ineffable Mr. Acheson's Mr. Butterworth was promoted for his failure, which resulted in having China turned over to the Communists. He was promoted to be Assistant Secretary of State—no less—in charge of far-eastern affairs.

How was this done? In the first session of the Eighty-first Congress his nomination to that position was reported from the Foreign Relations Committee without extensive hearings or any inquiry into his failures. His nomination was not called up for confirmation for weeks, because it was a well-known fact that a large number of Senators, including the senior Senator from Michigan, intended to oppose him.

To the detriment and almost fatal disadvantage of American foreign policy, it befell that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] had to leave for a serious operation. What happened? The State Department, lying in ambush, on the very next day called up the nomination of Mr. Acheson's Mr. Butterworth, and his confirmation was engineered.

Is that the statesmanship of a John Hay or a Charles Evans Hughes or a Cordell Hull? How far can a department of Government fall—to what low in governmental integrity and rectitude of high principles—before it shall be called into question? Are we, as Senators, to ignore a situation that as individuals we know fairly reeks of failure, while turning our backs on all principle?

The question now arises, are these errors, this confusion and lack of decision going to be compounded? Should not President Truman, as President of the United States, clean house and start all over again? Shall the Senate be required to force action through appropriations or by a resolution of censure?

Must we continue supinely to underwrite the bankruptcy of the past engineered by Mr. Acheson's Mr. Butterworth and his associates in the State Department, or shall we insist that the line be drawn somewhere with resolution?

No nation, no man, can retreat forever; but that is what the State Department advisers would have us do. First, they write off Manchuria. They then write off south China. Now, in a document, whose "top secret" classification still conceals its authorship, they send word abroad to write off Formosa. Are they ashamed to show Senators that document?

Mr. Acheson reportedly has assured the Foreign Relations Committee, in secret session, that Formosa in the hands of the Communists would have no effect on plans for the military defense of our country. I should like to hear the testimony of the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff on this question. They are charged with the defense of the United States. I am of the impression they would differ with the reckless statements reportedly made by Mr. Acheson in secret session in an attempt to justify his ridiculous stand.

I would remind the Senate that one of the architects of far-eastern policy, Mr. Acheson's Mr. Butterworth, was studying at Oxford University in England in 1927. I would also remind the Senate that in that same year a resolute Chiang Kai-shek, of the Chinese Nationalist Government, started driving organized communism out of China into the northwest hinterlands. He knew what communism was before Mr. Acheson's Mr. Butterworth would have been able to distinguish Joseph Stalin from Ferdinand the Bull.

For 23 years this man of Asia has stood with iron will, fighting almost with his bare hands against communism, then for years against Japanese aggression, and then against communism again. This soldier has smelled burnt powder in the field, has been wounded, has risked his life for over a quarter of a century fighting the cause of democracy. He knows communism because he has seen its unutterable brutalities and its degradation of the human spirit.

His armies pinned down more than a million Japanese soldiers in China after the attack on Pearl Harbor. Certainly we can thank God for that, if we cannot do anything more.

Are the Truman administration and the United States Senate going to continue to harbor these apostles of a bankrupt policy? Is it not time that we turned to other counsels? Have we no decisions of our own to make? Are we of the Senate impotent? Is there anyone who will rise now and insist that all is well with far-eastern policy, after we have gone from one reversal to another, from one failure to another?

Some doubtless will say that the Chinese people and armies have shown they will not support Chiang Kai-shek. My answer to this perversion is that there has not been a single, solitary example of an uprising against Chiang behind his lines through the last 3 years of defeat. If there is a man in China who is a more forthright opponent of communism, it is only necessary to name him, and many persons will support him. But I ask this question: If the President of the United States, when engaged in prosecuting a foreign-inspired civil war in a country reduced to the most desperate extremities, had been the target of such a campaign of insinuations, blackguardism, and propagandistic undercutting by the State Department of the one nation supposed to help him, could he—any President—hope to retain the confidence of his people?

I should also like to ask whether we have ever extended any real aid to China in its desperate struggle against communism? The answer is "No." Literally China asked for a sword, and we gave her a dull paring knife. And why? Because the State Department did everything within its power to paralyze and negate the Chinese program. We were hopeful a few weeks ago, when President Truman ordered a resolute policy, that the Joint Chiefs of Staff would devise one. Now we learn that the State Department has succeeded in blocking this effort.

There is a soldier-statesman in the Far East, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who has been crying for a policy, for resolution and decision, in regard to Formosa as the last outpost against a Communist sweep into the islands of the Pacific, and into Japan, thence to our western shores.

The question should be asked here and now, Are there any guts left in this country? Any in the State Department?

Any in the administration? Any in the United States Senate?

Even now the architects of our far-eastern policy, led by our Secretary of State—who, through his assurances to Great Britain, pushed that nation into the role of pacemaker in recognizing the Communist government in China—are agitating for the recognition by the United States of this same Communist China. They propose that we come to heel with communism in the Far East and belie every principle we have preached in western Europe. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the distinguished former chairman and present chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, said we should not now take this disastrous step. How can we convince western Europe of our resolution and determination to oppose communism if we come to its heel in Asia? Yet, that is what Mr. Acheson would have us do.

How long is this blight to be endured? To the final ruin? To the inevitable conclusion of bankruptcy? The time for brave words and fine acceptances of the challenge is past. It is time for resolute decision, Mr. Acheson's Mr. Butterworth and his paralyzing politics notwithstanding.

Mr. President, I can hear those who have attempted to defend the State Department's bankruptcy in the Far East saying that I have joined with others of my colleagues in denouncing the Department without offering counterpolicies.

I am sure you will pardon me, Mr. President, if I point out to you that in 1937—some 13 years ago, when this country went blindly on, shipping scrap iron and steel to Japan—I stood on the floor of the Senate and submitted a resolution, which I supported in one of the Senate's committees, to stop the shipment of scrap iron and steel to Japan. From that day on, I have made various suggestions, as a humble Member of the United States Senate, in regard to our dealings with China and other parts of Asia.

I do not wish to appear before the Senate as a prophet, but I say that we must draw the line today, as it exists at the present time. We must save Formosa from the Communists. If bold methods are necessary, we must be prepared to use such methods.

I hear many persons say that isolationists are springing up throughout the country. The people who are turning their backs on Formosa and China are the isolationists of today. They are the appeasers of today. We have in this country a new kind of appeaser, a new kind of isolationist. Let us not try to put the tag on some of those who have been so labeled in the past, because we have new kinds of isolationists sitting in the front row. They are headed by the officials who are conducting our far-eastern policy in the State Department of the United States. That is where they are, and some day, just so surely as there is a God in heaven, those in responsible positions in this Government will have to answer to their God and to their conscience for their conduct. The man in the United States Senate who today sits still and tolerates what is now going on will also be called upon to answer.

I went through the period here prior to World War II. I know the records of some of the officials prominent in Washington at the time. I have been reviewing some of the votes in the Senate. They are interesting—so are some of the records, some of the utterances of those outside of the Senate. Let us recognize that we have a new crop of appeasers and isolationists appearing in this country. They are headed by the men who conduct the affairs of the State Department of the United States, and many others in high posts as well as those in the newspaper and radio business. I want to say I think we are doing a relatively good job in Europe, but the administration has turned its back and closed its eyes to the threat of communism in Asia, particularly in China.

Mr. President, I propose this policy for the United States. I propose that our Government give the Nationalist Government of China its unqualified assurance that whatever assistance is needed to insure its continued existence will be furnished.

We have one very vital interest in maintaining the legal government of China. There are many other reasons why we should maintain this government, but the reason which I will outline to you is in itself sufficient to justify the policy, which I propose.

We must maintain the legal government in opposition to the Communist regime in order that that government, exiled to Formosa, an island half the size of the State of Maine, may maintain contact with, encourage, strengthen, and provide assistance to, the anti-Communist forces which remain in China.

Mr. President, the weakness of our position in dealing with Russia is more and more apparent to me each day. We do not have contact or liaison with anti-Communist forces inside Russia.

While the Russian Government avails itself not only of its legal authorized diplomatic representatives in this country and all of the countries of the world as a means of gathering information and disseminating propaganda, that government likewise avails itself of a fifth column in the guise of a political party. Surely the Members of the Senate will agree with me that the Communist Party, U. S. A., is nothing more or less than an instrumentality of Joseph Stalin.

We must continue to recognize the Nationalist Government in order that the Communist Government may not establish in the United States diplomats who will provide the Soviet regime with additional eyes, ears, and sounding boards.

Only this week we have seen the eagerness of the Stalinist regime with regard to securing a seat for the Chinese Communists in the Security Council of the United Nations. By continuing to recognize the legal government of China and by furnishing that government with such support as it may need to maintain itself, we shall unmistakably indicate to the democratic people of the whole world that the United States stands firmly against the spread of communism in Asia, as well as in Europe.

There was a man by the name of Franklin D. Roosevelt who was President of the United States. He had as a Secretary of State a man by the name of Cordell Hull. Sometimes I did not agree with Mr. Roosevelt, as President, or with Mr. Cordell Hull, as Secretary. But Mr. Roosevelt, as President, and Mr. Hull, as Secretary of State, felt it was so important to the security of the country that China be kept out of the hands of a hostile power, namely, Japan, that they took certain definite, considered steps. They wrote the notes which eventually brought about the clash with Japan, when they could have maintained peace by simply allowing Japan to have a free hand in China. If Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hull were right, those who are at present running the administration are wrong. I happen to think Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hull in that instance were right. But certainly the present handling of the China-Russian situation is not consistent with the position taken by them. If the Democratic Party or the American people who supported Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hull in World War II, believed they were right, they cannot believe that those who are now shaping our foreign policy are right, because in their policies and their attitude they are proceeding in exactly the opposite direction.

It will be remembered that the time was when we were told that the Communists in China were not really Communists but were merely agrarian reformers; that actually they had no connection with Moscow. When the head of the Communist forces in China last April stood up and said, "In case of a war between Russia and the United States, we shall fight on the side of Russia against the United States," even the most stupid, even the most naive individual in this country should have been able to understand that language, and I am sure the American people did understand it.

Mr. President, Senators sitting in the Senate Chamber today, when we go from one appeasement to another, and when we turn over the greatest territory and most populous area in the world, with the greatest area of unexploited natural resources, to the Communist forces, are allowing a tragedy to occur. Some day we shall realize the truth of the old saying, "Chickens come home to roost." Let us bear in mind they are coming home.

I have made a very interesting compilation of the statements of certain of our supposedly great statesmen in the past few years about the China-far eastern policy. I hope it will not be necessary someday to rise in the Senate and read it, because it shows a record that should make the blood of every American boil to hear it read.

I hope finally that we are going to regain our self-respect, that this Nation again can answer Abraham Lincoln's question with a ringing "No, the manhood of this race has not and will not run out."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Calling the Senator's attention to the address made yesterday by Mr. Secretary Acheson before

the National Press Club, the full text of which apparently appears in this evening's edition of the Washington Star, I call his attention to two paragraphs, in one of which Mr. Acheson is quoted as follows:

> Communism is the most subtle instrument of Soviet foreign policy that has ever been devised, and it is really the spearhead of Russian imperialism which would, if it could, take from these people what they have won—what we want them to keep and develop—which is their own national independence, their own individual independence, their own development of their own resources for their own good and not as mere tributary states to this great Soviet Union.

I should like to ask the able Senator from New Hampshire whether these are not the same Communists who a few years ago the State Department, as a matter of American policy, was urging China to take into its Government in a coalition?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from California is absolutely correct; they are the same Communists whom the representative of the United States who went to China attempted to force Chiang Kai-shek to take into his Cabinet as equal partners. At least Chiang Kai-shek had the wisdom to know that wherever in the world a coalition had been formed with Communists, the Communists had taken over. He could foresee disaster. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire whether he is familiar with another paragraph from the Secretary's speech or address of yesterday, reading as follows:

> Armed with these new powers, what is happening in China is that the Soviet Union is detaching the northern provinces of China from China and is attaching them to the Soviet Union. This process is complete in outer Mongolia. It is nearly complete in Manchuria, and I am sure that in inner Mongolia and in Sinkiang, there are very happy reports coming from Soviet agents to Moscow. This is what is going on. It is the detachment of these whole areas, vast areas—populated by Chinese—the detachment of these areas from China and their attachment to the Soviet Union.
>
> I wish to state this and perhaps sin against my doctrine of nondogmatism, but I should like to suggest, at any rate, that this fact that the Soviet Union is taking the four northern provinces of China is the single, most significant, most important fact, in the relation of any foreign power with Asia.

I should like to ask the able Senator from New Hampshire whether he thinks it would be possible for such a statement to be made by an American Secretary of State, if, at Yalta, we had not consented to giving to the Soviet Union something which was not within our power to give, to give it without the permission or knowledge of the Government of the Republic of China, to do it behind her back, to sign a blank check in her name, of which China had no knowledge, to put the Soviet Union in strategic positions in Manchuria and north China, which not only permitted them to arm, out of the captured Japanese stocks, the Communist forces in China, but also permitted them to carry on by devious means this final taking away from the Republic of China of these provinces to which the Secretary of State now belatedly objects? Is it not the Senator's opinion that these statements from the secret agreement which was made at Yalta were made without the knowledge of the Republic of China?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is absolutely correct in everything he has said.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator one other question. During the course of the remarks of Mr. Acheson yesterday he repeated the statements which have been made on the floor as to the vast amount of assistance received by the Republic of China. Is the Senator familiar with the American white paper, dated December 18, 1946, which is, I think, the highest authority I can quote at this time?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The President says that of this vast VJ-day aid approximately $600,000,000 was mostly in transportation costs. In other words, that was a charge levied against the Government of China to transport troops by plane and ship from south China up into north China and Manchuria in an attempt to occupy the country. So, obviously, none of that $600,000,000 could have been in arms and munitions. Let me read this, because the memories of the people are very short, and there has been a large amount of misrepresentation as to the assistance which China has received.

The President is speaking now of the postwar lend-lease agreement. He says:

> China agreed to buy all surplus property owned by the United States in China and on 17 Pacific islands and bases, with certain exceptions.

I am reading from page 692 of the white paper statement of the President of the United States:

> Six months of negotiations preceded the agreement finally signed in August. It was imperative that this matter be concluded in the Pacific as had already been done in Europe, especially in view of the rapid deterioration of the material in open storage under tropical conditions and the urgent need for the partial alleviation of the acute economic distress of the Chinese people which it was hoped this transaction would permit.

Please listen to this:

> Aircraft, all nondemilitarized combat material, and fixed installations outside of China were excluded.

I am still quoting the President of the United States—

> Thus no weapons which could be used in fighting a civil war were made available through this agreement.

The fact of the matter is that until the Eightieth Congress passed the $125,000,000 arms implementation bill there was very little sent to the Republic of China of the type of equipment which was urgently needed in order to combat the Communists who had been fully armed by the Soviet Union out of captured Japanese stocks.

Is the Senator familiar with that matter?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am. What we shall see is a situation similar to that which resulted through the action of Chamberlain, with his umbrella, back in the days of Munich; and the time is not very far away when those who turned the great country of China over to the Communists will hand over the whole continent of Asia. There will be a sad day of reckoning.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is opposed to the Communist form of government which is seeking to seize China, is he not?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is the Senator in favor of sending an armed force over there?

Mr. BRIDGES. I would have started a definite program of military assistance a long time ago.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am talking about now. Is the Senator now in favor of sending an American army to China to oust the Communists?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am in favor of doing this——

Mr. CONNALLY. I am asking the Senator a question. Is the Senator in favor of sending an American army to China to oust the Communists? The Senator should not go off on a side issue. If he does not want to answer the question, he can say so; but he should not try to bypass my question. Please let me have an answer to it.

Mr. BRIDGES. As of today, at this minute, I am not in favor of sending an American army to China. I want to hear from our American Chiefs of Staff, General MacArthur and others—which we have been prevented from doing to date.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is the Senator opposed to the occupation by the Soviets of north China?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is the Senator in favor of declaring war on Russia and sending an army over there because of that incident? Will the Senator please answer my question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall answer it, and then I shall ask the Senator from Texas some questions, which may be very embarrassing. I am not in favor of declaring war against Russia, but I am in favor of the United States of America standing up and taking a firm position. We did not hesitate to stand up in connection with the Berlin airlift. We did not hesitate to stand up in Greece. We did not hesitate in Europe at all. Our policy in Europe did not mean war. The Communists respect firmness; but what we have given them has been appeasement, all along the line.

Mr. CONNALLY. I repeat my question. Does the Senator today favor declaring war against Russia because of communism? Not next year, but now?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; I am not in favor of declaring war on Russia today; but I am in favor of taking a definite stand and drawing a line against further Communist expansion, come what may.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is the Senator in favor of sending an army to Formosa?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am in favor of sending equipment and supplies to the Chinese Nationalists in Formosa to enable them to hold that island, and I am in favor of sending an American military mission to advise them.

Mr. CONNALLY. What about the Army or Navy?

Mr. BRIDGES. If it is necessary to use them, yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator think it is necessary to send an army to Formosa?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; the Senator from New Hampshire does not think it is necessary to send an army to Formosa, but I think it is necessary for us to send supplies and equipment to the army already there.

Mr. CONNALLY. They are getting supplies.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very few.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did not the Senator see in the newspapers the statement that there are two shiploads of tanks leaving Philadelphia, paid for by money of American taxpayers?

Mr. BRIDGES. I have heard about supplies going to China which never arrived there. I have been hearing about it for years.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I beg the Senator's pardon. The Senator from California has taken up most of the time.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it not true that it would be difficult for any Member of the Congress of the United States or for any of the people of the United States to come to a clear-cut decision as to what should be done in the way of a mission or the use of the Navy or the Army unless they are advised as to what is the strategic judgment of the supreme commander in the Far East, of the commander in chief of the Navy in the Pacific, and of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and that up to this hour that information has not been available either to the Members of the Congress or to the American people, and until that information is received the questions asked by the Senator from Texas cannot be intelligently answered?

Mr. BRIDGES. So far as I know, up to this moment, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the majority of the Foreign Relations Committee itself have declined to call on the Joint Chiefs of Staff to advise us as to the situation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator from New Hampshire want to know about bringing in the Chiefs of Staff?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. We decided today that we would have them before the committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad the Senator has come to that conclusion.

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment. Do not answer the question and then run off and leave it. The Senator from California asked the Senator from New Hampshire a question regarding information, stating that we could not do anything unless we had more information. The matter of information does not seem to bother Senators. The Senator from California has been speaking for 2 or 3 weeks, and before we took a recess he had spoken on the subject. He knows exactly what to do and all about China and all about Formosa. I do not see why, with all that information running around loose, anyone should quarrel about a lack of information. The Senator from New Hampshire has told us all about everything, from Europe right down to the line, and yet he will not answer my question. The Senator says that he cannot intelligently answer the question. I agree with that, but not for the same reason.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire can answer the question just as intelligently as the Senator from Texas any day in the week, with or without the information.

Mr. CONNALLY. More so, if he would only answer the question, but he will not answer it. He dodges. When I asked him if he wanted to send an army or a navy, he said, "Well," "but," "also," "if," "maybe," "or," "not yet," "don't know yet." When I asked him if he wanted to send a navy to Formosa, he did not answer that question. How much information does it take to enable the Senator from New Hampshire to come to a conclusion?

Mr. BRIDGES. There is no one in authority in our military forces who has come before the Senator's committee or before the Armed Forces Committee to testify. Yes, Mr. Acheson has testified, in secret session, but what does he know about the defense of Formosa?

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator will compose himself, and come to the Foreign Relations Committee meeting on the 26th of January, when we will have there the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, we will try to give the Senator from New Hampshire an intellectual hypodermic so he will know exactly what he wants to know about that question.

Let me ask the Senator another question. As I understand, the Senator from New Hampshire is not in favor of sending an army to north China at this time to fight the Communists. Is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. He is not in favor of sending an army to Formosa?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. There is an army there already.

Mr. CONNALLY. He is not in favor of sending a navy to Formosa.

Mr. BRIDGES. I would keep our Navy over there, and I would have them ready for action.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would the Senator have the Navy act?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly, I would not——

Mr. CONNALLY. Would the Senator have the Navy take any action?

Mr. BRIDGES. I certainly would not do what the American Government did, when the Communists started to fire a few shells, have our naval ships high-tail it out of the way so they would not be in the line of fire of the Communists. I would have American prestige stand for something.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am trying to find out what the Senator means by standing for something. The Senator would send the Navy over there. I see the Senator's point. He would send the Navy over there, but he would not order the Navy to do anything. He would put all the responsibility on the Navy. I should like to have him say what directions he would give the Navy. Would he tell them to fight? Would he tell them to go in there and clean out the Commies? Would he tell them to go there and resist any approach to Formosa? Would he go there and embrace Chiang Kai-shek to his bosom and take care of him and protect him and defend him and shed the blood of our boys, if need be? Is that what the Senator favors?

Mr. BRIDGES. So far as Formosa is concerned, the Senator from New Hampshire believes that Formosa is still a part of Japanese territory, because, although we agreed tentatively that it should go to China, there is no formal peace treaty. Therefore, Formosa is in the same position as are the islands of Japan. We have American troops in Japan today. The Chinese Nationalists were allies of curs in the Pacific, and there is no reason why they should not occupy Formosa and there is no reason why we should not supply them with the equipment and the material and the ammunition to enable them to hold Formosa against the Chinese Communists, so that at least the anti-Communists will have one place in that area from which to work toward continental China.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire a question. It seems that asking the question, "What would you do," after the horse is out of the barn, and after the decisions have been made, is leading us nowhere. I am not a member of the Committee on Armed Services and I am not a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Perhaps if I were I would have the information I am seeking. But all those whom I have contacted cannot give it to me, so I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, who has had long service in the Senate, of which we are all proud, whether he can tell me what the policy of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was prior to the time when the President abandoned Formosa. It seems to me that is a proper question to ask. Did we have any policy? What was the intention of the administration?

I have been told that with the aid of the $75,000,000 appropriation, if the money had been placed in the hands of the Formosan Government, they could have defended themselves. I have been told some things which indicate that they have defended themselves. So I should like to know, if the Senator can inform me, what has been the policy, if there has been any? Have the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, if they have made any, been carried out by the State Department? Have we had

any advice relative to what we should do with Formosa, before the time the Secretary simply said we are going to abandon Formosa, and thereby permit a dent in our line of defense between Okinawa and the Philippines?

Mr. BRIDGES. If that information is available, it certainly is not available to the Members of the United States Senate.

Let me say that there has been ample opportunity and plenty of time when we could have done something about the Chinese situation, but the new crop of appeasers which we now have in this country, these new isolationists who have now come forth, are turning their backs upon the most populous and the largest territorial area of the world, and little by little we are seeing what is happening. Now it is the question of Formosa, next it is going to be Indochina, next it is going to be Burma, next it is going to be India, and so all down the line.

When are we going to draw the line? The Senator asks whether we favor fighting Russia. No United States Senator is going to stand on the floor of the Senate and say that we ought to declare war on Russia. But I do say we have to take a stand for definite principles, we have to draw the line, we have to say what we mean and mean what we say, and we have done neither.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is talking about our not doing anything for China. When the war came to an end Chiang Kai-shek had control and command of the entire land area of China. He had command of armies of millions of men. He had the resources of all that territory, whatever they were. He had the largest armies any soldier in China had ever had. In addition to that, he had the aid of the United States. Since the war came to an end the United States has given aid to China, through Chiang Kai-shek, in the amount of $2,500,000,000. The United States sent them arms, it sent them munitions, it sent them supplies.

I heard General Barr, who was an observer in China representing our Army, testify before our committee that the Chinese in Manchuria never lost a battle because of the lack of ammunition or arms furnished by the United States, but that the only reason they lost battles was their unwillingness to fight. If the Chinese had all been as militant as the Senator from New Hampshire, if they had all burned up with passion as the Senator from New Hampshire burns up every time he takes the floor, we would not have had this situation. They would have demolished, they would have absolutely liquidated, all the people opposing them. But they did not have it. They did not have the clarion voice of the Senator from New Hampshire ringing out along their lines. They simply did not fight. They quit.

What happened to these arms and ammunition? Soldiers in that area said the arms and ammunition, or a large part of them, were found in the hands of the Communists, that Communist soldiers had United States muskets in their hands, which we furnished the Chinese. Does the Senator know all that we did for them?

Mr. BRIDGES. I know a great deal of what we did.

Mr. CONNALLY. What is the Senator complaining about, then? Did we not do more for China than any other nation on earth?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire permit me to reply to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was seeking the information from the Senator from New Hampshire. Of course, I realize the Senator from Maine can answer almost any question, but I thought I was going to twist an answer out of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BREWSTER. If the Senator does not object, I appreciate his statement about my encyclopedic knowledge. The Senator from Texas is not exactly a moron himself.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. That is a very high estimate the Senator from Maine places upon the Senator from Texas. In other words, the Senator from Texas is only about 4° lower than the Senator from Maine in intelligence. But I should prefer to have the answer made by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is the very reason why perhaps it would be better for someone else to answer, because the Senator from Texas, while he does direct his own artillery, is not yet in charge of whatever goes on on this side, so I think it is quite fair for someone else——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

Mr. BREWSTER. I think I have a right to the floor. I have not mixed up in this controversy, I certainly have not attacked the Senator from Texas, and I think it is quite proper that someone else on this side may be permitted to say a word.

The Senator from Texas started out with the proposition——

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas wishes to announce that he may have a word to say when his time comes and he is recognized.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] controls the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. He is not doing much with it.

Mr. BREWSTER. He has listened quite a while to the Senator from Texas, which I admit is somewhat questionable, but perhaps someone else can contribute something.

The Senator from Texas said that at the close of the war Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek controlled all the land area of China. I am quite sure the Senator from Texas knows that is not true. If it were true, why was it that we sent General Marshall over there to undertake to negotiate some sort of an understanding between the Communist armies and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek? That is No. 1 in the early inaccurate statements which I am sure the Senator from Texas inadvertently made.

Secondly, the Senator from Texas said that we supplied the armies——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not care to engage in some sort of interlocutory discussion.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure the Senator from Texas will be recognized in his own right later, and I refuse to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). The Senator from New Hampshire yielded to the Senator from Maine, and the Senator from Maine has the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. I make the point that the Senator from New Hampshire can yield for only a question; not for a speech.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I now have the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Take the floor.

Mr. BREWSTER. So much for the initial premise of the Senator from Texas.

His second proposition was that we gave the Chinese arms. I do not think it is necessary to labor the point. The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has repeatedly on this floor given the figures as to how those $2,000,000,000 were expended and what they provided.

I would rather call attention to the simple and indisputable fact that, for 10 months following the close of the war, under the advice, apparently, of General Marshall, we imposed an embargo on the shipment of any arms to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, and for the 10 months following that, according to the testimony of General Marshall before the Committee on Foreign Relations, it proved impracticable to resume the shipments. For 20 months following the end of the World War, when the Communists were being organized in Manchuria, we cut off all aid to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek.

Now, what was happening on the other side of the fence? In Manchuria sufficient Japanese arms to supply the Chinese Communist armies for 10 years of warfare were being turned over by our Russian friends to the Chinese Communists. But, of course, the mere turning over of those arms might not be sufficient. It was going to take some time to organize the Chinese Communists and familiarize them with the weapons which they were receiving, and 20 months were, prudently or otherwise, provided by the action of the United States administration in order to achieve that purpose. Meanwhile we were trying, in accordance with our then settled policy, to persuade the Chinese Government, which we recognized, to take the Communists into bed with them. That was the policy sponsored by the present administration, I presume supported by the Senator from Texas, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to try and persuade Generalissimo Chiang to take the Communists into his government.

Apparently we have gotten our eyes opened somewhat on that score, and realize that it is not quite practical to do

such a thing. We finally discovered that. Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek had discovered it a long time before. He had been fighting the Communists for some 20 years, with or without our aid. He had been fighting the Japanese as well for 7 years, while we supplied the Japanese with the scrap iron and the ore with which to carry on their war.

Now let us come down to the question of fighting; as to whether the Chinese Nationalists did any fighting, and whether the outbreak in China was an agrarian revolt, as we were told. It was said the Chinese agrarians were in a great upheaval. What happened? While we were being told this story, we heard another story from the other side of the iron curtain, and, I think, from a far more competent authority than any of us had heard thus far, and that was from the leader of the Chinese Communist army, General Mao. He said that without the Russian aid he never would have been able to accomplish the conquest of China. That is his statement.

I read the words of our Secretary of State yesterday that the Chinese had simply abandoned Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, and had run away from him. That was the picture he painted. I wonder whether he knows more about that than General Mao, who paid tribute to what the Russians had done to assist him in developing the conquest of China? I thought that now almost everybody was prepared to recognize that it was chiefly, if not solely, as the result of the Russian aid that present conditions in China were brought about.

Now to the final matter of whether or not any opposition was offered and whether any fighting went on. We have heard ring through this hall, with all the eloquence the Senator from Texas can contribute to any cause which he champions, his version of that aspect of the case. Very well. Was there any fighting? Again I shall summon General Mao, who I think ought to know something about whether there was any fighting. It is his official report that there were 1,300,000 casualties on the Communist side in the course of this conquest of China. Am I to presume that these Communists committed suicide, that they had apoplexy from chasing the Chiang forces down from Manchuria? Or is it possible that 1,300,000 casualties represented the fact that some fighting was done so long as it was possible for the Chinese Nationalists to carry on, but when they faced the 20 months embargo we had imposed upon extending them assistance, they finally found themselves in the condition which I am sure the Senator from Texas regrets as much as every other American who recognizes the tragedy of Russia taking over the influence in China which we had exercised. General Mao is now in Moscow negotiating the military alliance which will organize, as he has publicly announced, all the forces that China represents with Russia against all liberty-loving peoples of the earth.

These are some of the reasons why there are many Americans who certainly are profoundly disturbed at a continuance of this same policy. I like to think of the destroyer deal. I should like to see us make available 10 destroyers to the Chinese forces on Formosa. I think that would end for a considerable time any necessity of any further action. However, I do not pose as either a military or a naval strategist, and I welcome the day when the Senator from Texas, having reconsidered his decision, will take off the lid and permit the members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations at least, and perhaps other Senators, to have the benefit of the military opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which is indispensable to any just conclusion regarding the future course of America in this most distressing situation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder if the able Senator from Maine is familiar with the Wedemeyer report, which was withheld from the Congress of the United States for several years, and was not made available, though it had been requested by many Members of Congress, including, I am sure, the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Maine asked the Senator from Texas repeatedly to secure it, and I think the Senator from Texas indicated an interest in securing it. I desire to be perfectly just to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That report, as the Senator knows, was dated the 19th of September 1947, and it was not made available, even to the Members of the Congress of the United States, until the American white paper on China was published in August of last year.

Mr. BREWSTER. And was it then a complete document?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That, of course, we do not know. I am assuming for the moment that it was, except for that part which related to Korea and other sections of the Far East. But I have been told that so far as China is concerned it is a complete document.

Is the Senator familiar with the paragraph I am about to read from General Wedemeyer's report? General Wedemeyer probably was, more than any other American, familiar with both the assets and the liabilities of the Chinese; he had served his Government well in that country; he had been an Assistant Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States and is now the commander of the Army on the Pacific coast. This is what General Wedemeyer has to say:

> Indirectly the United States facilitated the Soviet program in the Far East by agreeing at the Yalta Conference to Russian reentry into Manchuria, and later by withholding aid from the National Government.

Is the Senator familiar with that, which confirms the statements he has made?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the Senator familiar with this statement from General Wedemeyer's suppressed report which finally came out several years late:

> Although the Japanese offered increasingly favorable surrender terms during the course of the war—

I am now reading from page 768 of the official white paper—

> China elected to remain steadfast with her allies. If China—

I interpose to say, under the leadership of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek—

> If China had accepted surrender terms, approximately a million Japanese would have been released for employment against American forces in the Pacific.

Mr. BREWSTER. I assume that that statement was made because the Generalissimo was relying to some extent upon the pledged word of the American Government at Cairo.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator's assumption is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. Not knowing that Manchuria had been turned over as a Russian sphere of influence.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Without Chiang Kai-shek's knowledge or consent.

Mr. BREWSTER. And with catastrophic consequences.

Mr. KNOWLAND. So that all Americans, not only every American soldier and sailor and airman who fought in the Pacific, but those who were in Europe and would otherwise have been displaced and sent to the Pacific, should have a vital interest in the fact that had this man then heading the Republic of China accepted the blandishments of the Japanese to surrender, it would have brought about the release of 1,000,000 Japanese soldiers, who would have greatly increased the problem of this country, might have endangered the entire Pacific coast, and perhaps would have led to the fall of Australia. This is the man upon whom they have turned their backs, whom they have written off. They have practically invited, by the statements that were made the other day, the Communists to come across the channel to Formosa. We have practically said: "Come and get them. We no longer have any interest in them."

This great country of ours, which has drawn a line in Europe, which has said that it is of interest to the American people to maintain a free world of free men, has apparently said that that means nothing to us in the Pacific; that so far as the Pacific is concerned we are not interested in maintaining a free world of free men. Perhaps through some legerdemain freedom is of some importance in Europe, but it is of no importance to the people of China who are also being taken behind the iron curtain.

I think if this debate goes on, both in the Congress and throughout the country, we will be able to demonstrate with facts which have not heretofore been available, by the words of responsible Government officials, that this great betrayal has taken place, it has willfully been brought about by a small group of men in the State Department who have been willing to abandon and to sacrifice all of Asia, and present the world with a most critical situation in the future, and perhaps threaten the further

security of the people of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from California has made statements here several times to the effect that the United States has turned its back on Chiang Kai-shek—that we are traitors to Chiang Kai-shek. He used the word "treachery" a while ago.

I wish to know upon what authority Chiang Kai-shek has more claims on us than any other government has, for that matter. We have done more for him than we have done for all other governments combined, with the exception of ECA aid in Europe.

The Senator from California is burning with his passion for Chiang Kai-shek, yet he said the other day that he is unwilling to send a single soldier to Formosa, he is unwilling to send a single ship to Formosa. If these tremendous issues are at stake, why does the Senator hesitate? Why does he pause and stammer and not reply to questions of that kind?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes, whenever the Senator from Texas finishes his remarks.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, many charges and assertions are made with respect to who is running the State Department and who is responsible for the action taken by the State Department. The Senator says a little group of officials in the State Department—not the Secretary of State, not the President of the United States, who is over the Secretary of State, but a little group of men in the State Department—have been running the foreign affairs of the United States and have wiped out Chiang Kai-shek. I suppose the Senator means that two or three little fellows in the State Department get together, after adjournment every evening, and map out the policies of the State Department.

Mr. President, that is a preposterous statement. Whatever is done by the State Department is done by direction of the Secretary of State, and whatever is done by direction of the Secretary of State is done at the actual direction of the President of the United States.

I have heard statements of this kind made here from day to day by the Senator from California and by other Senators. If they have the courage of their convictions, Mr. President, why in the name of common sense do not they express them? Why do they not say, "We want to send the armies of the United States on the march into Formosa"? Why do they not say, "I want the Navy to go there to protect the vital liberties, not alone of the people of Formosa, but of the people of the United States"?

No, Mr. President, they do not have the nerve and the courage to vote their real convictions, if those are their convictions.

All of them want to go back to a discussion of Yalta. Oh, Mr. President, if we could only have had the Senator from New Hampshire at Yalta.

Mr. BRIDGES. If the Senator from New Hampshire had been there, it would not have happened—not under that authority.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine has the floor, and has yielded to the Senator from Texas. No other Senator has a right to speak.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I cannot resist an impulse to reply to the statement the Senator from New Hampshire just made. The Senator from New Hampshire has just said that if he had been at Yalta, it would not have happened. I agree—that nothing would have happened. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, it is a pity that we did not have the Senator from California at Yalta and at Cairo and at Tehran and at all the other conferences. But those things are history; they are behind us. We cannot help what has happened.

But we are here today to decide the questions which we now have before us; and the particular question before us now is Formosa. Yet the Senator from New Hampshire dares not say that he favors sending a single soldier to Formosa, notwithstanding that the fortunes of the world are involved in Formosa, notwithstanding that the destiny of the United States is wrapped up in Formosa, so we are told by some Senators. Notwithstanding all that, he will not send a single soldier or a single vessel there, to protect it from its enemies.

Mr. President, I do not want to take up any more of the time of the Senator from Maine. I know how he values the time—when someone else is using it. [Laughter.]

I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his generosity in yielding to me.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am the Senator who yielded.

Mr. CONNALLY. It was earlier today that the Senator from New Hampshire yielded to me.

Mr. BREWSTER. But is not the Senator from Texas going to thank me for yielding to him now? [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; if the Senator from Maine will wait, he will get his turn. [Laughter.]

The Senator from New Hampshire earlier today had the floor, and yielded to me several times, and I wish to express my appreciation to him.

Now the Senator from Maine has the floor, and has yielded to me, and I thank him also. Mr. President, I think Maine produces a good many very valuable things. Senators, lobsters, and other products of Maine are invaluable, and I am very fond of all of them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. With the permission of the Senator from Texas, I shall yield to the Senator from California, to permit him to reply to the question asked by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, very briefly to reply to the statement made by the Senator from Texas that nothing gets out of the State Department except with the permission of the Secretary of State, let me say that of course that statement is not quite accurate, because the trial of Mr. Alger Hiss is now going on in New York, and apparently in the past some documents have gotten out of the State Department without the knowledge of the Secretary of State.

But I wish to say to the Senator from Maine and to the other Members of the Senate who are present at this time, that, of course, it is true that the National Government of China has lost some of its equipment during the course of the civil war, but China is not the only country that has lost equipment. In 5 days the Dutch Army, in World War II, surrendered, with all its equipment. In 7 days the King of the Belgians surrendered the entire Belgian Army, with all its equipment. In a matter of a few weeks the mighty French Army, which was the mightiest in Europe, surrendered, with all its equipment. The British lost all their equipment at Dunkerque. We did not turn our backs on Britain at that time, but we sent to Britain rifles and ammunition and French 75's which we had in stock or storage, and we sent other equipment to help them in the Battle of Britain.

The fact of the matter is that while some of this captured American equipment has turned up with the Chinese Communist forces, it is also true that during the war period, when we were supplying Great Britain with approximately $31,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease, we were supplying the Soviet Government with approximately $11,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease. I make no criticism of that; I think the Soviet Union was a wartime ally, and, of course, was entitled to receive assistance from us. But some of that equipment was composed of American arms, munitions, jeeps, and so forth.

The Soviets and the Communists may be accused of many things, but they have not been accused of not being good propagandists. When I was in China, I heard reports to the effect that some of the equipment which we often see shown in photographs with captions stating that the equipment had been captured at Peiping and Nanking and at other places in China by the Communists, is actually American lend-lease equipment which had first been sent by us to Russia, and subsequently was transshipped by Russia to the Chinese Communists, and has been very effectively used as propaganda in order to undermine the Government of China and give the impression that it has lost all its equipment—which is not so, because I personally have observed, on the island of Formosa and on the island of Kinmen, where the Government forces turned back an invasion of over 10,000 Communist troops, American equipment which still is in Government hands and still is being effectively used.

But they do lack a modest amount of equipment which is needed to defend the island of Formosa.

It is my judgment that the requests of the Government of China were still within the existing appropriation bills which have been passed by the Congress of the United States; and if the amount of aid requested by the Government of China had been granted, perhaps it would not even have amounted to 50 percent of the $75,000,000 appropriated for that purpose by the last Congress.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I add only one thing: The stories about the turning over of equipment to the Chinese Communists began in 1943, at the time when the matériel was being shipped over the "hump." While here in America we were reading those stories of the diversion of this equipment from the purpose for which it was designed—namely, to fight the Japs—yet the facts at that time were, as I learned from personal knowledge in flying the "hump," that the agreement with the Chinese Government provided that they were to have all the matériel and equipment above 6,000 tons a month which was flown over the "hump"; but during the entire year the amount which went to General Chennault at Kunming never exceeded 3,000 tons. That was the first thing that disturbed me when I returned to this country—to find stories, as early as that, designed to discredit Chiang Kai-shek and what was going on, when as a matter of fact they were getting nothing at all, except for what the Chinese National Airways could fly from Calcutta.

I should like to ask the Senator from Texas, if I may, one question which deals with the issue now before us. The Joint Chiefs of Staff are, I understand, to come before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to testify, I assume perhaps in executive session or in open session. It has been stated that if military, naval, or air officers deviate from the line of authority, from the principles laid down by the Commander in Chief, then those men are apt to be disciplined by being "sent to Siberia." They are not going to be punished, we were told by Secretary Matthews, but they are going to be removed from the chain of command and sent to some other station. Are we to understand that if the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in any of their evidence, should happen to deviate from the line laid down by the President of the United States, those men are going to be subject to possible displacement or discipline as a result? I think it is an extremely important question, to which perhaps the Senator from Texas has given some consideration.

Mr. CONNALLY. What is the Senator's question? I do not know what the Senator understands.

Mr. BREWSTER. I shall try to put the question in words of one syllable for the benefit of the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. I merely want to know what the question is.

Mr. BREWSTER. I want to know whether, if the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in testifying before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, should deviate in their opinions from the policy laid down by the President regarding Formosa, they would be liable to discipline or to displacement under the principle enunciated by Secretary Matthews of the Navy?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not the Chief Executive. I cannot anticipate all that sort of thing. I may say that the Committee on Foreign Relations has invited General Bradley and the Secretary of Defense to come before the committee on the 26th of January. They will be there on the 26th; and if the Senator will just wait out in the ante room until after they testify, I shall be glad to tell him what they testify, if necessary.

Mr. BREWSTER. Was the Senator from Texas in any way disturbed by this principle laid down by Secretary Matthews, if he noted it?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I was not disturbed. But if I were the President of the United States, or if I were Secretary of State, and one of my subordinates took violent issue with my policies, he would not remain a subordinate very long.

Mr. BREWSTER. Suppose he did not take violent issue; suppose he merely took issue; suppose, in some measure, he should deviate from some accepted line; what then?

Mr. CONNALLY. That happens all the time. Deviation does not amount to anything, if the individual is acting in good faith and is a man of integrity and a loyal individual, not someone sniping around.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator distinguish the case of Admiral Denfeld, then, as not being a sniper?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not going into any particular case. I have no desire to mention names, and to engage in that sort of thing.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator from Texas not believe that perhaps the Joint Chiefs of Staff contemplate Admiral Denfeld's retirement?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not propose to answer questions of that kind. The Senator is trying to maneuver me into a position where he can quote me.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator from Texas not answer the question? It is a simple question. The Senator was rather insistent that some of us answer.

Mr. CONNALLY. What is it the Senator desires me to answer?

Mr. BREWSTER. I wish the Senator to answer the question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have answered it as best I can, and the only way that I intend to answer it.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator does not think, then, does he, that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have any occasion to have concern about their testimony before the committee?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know what the Joint Chiefs of Staff have in mind. They are intelligent men. If it is in the mind of the Senator from Maine, it may also be in the mind of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They do not seem to agree on anything else, but they might agree on that.

Mr. KEM and Mr. BRIDGES addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has the Senator from Maine concluded his remarks?

Mr. BREWSTER. I wish later to be recognized, but I yield the floor for the present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri has been waiting for recognition, and the Chair indicated at the conclusion of the address by the Senator from New Hampshire that, if he was on his feet, the Chair would recognize him. The Chair now recognizes the Senator from Missouri.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the pending measure, House bill 2023, has been debated at considerable length. The issues have been discussed with learning and with a wealth of argument and illustration. I should like to discuss it very briefly and to state my position on the bill.

Mr. President, I shall support the Wiley-Gillette amendment providing, with certain safeguards, for removal of the present taxes and license fees on oleomargarine.

It is my opinion that the Federal Government should not continue to impose discriminatory taxes against this commodity, which has become an important part of the household budget of many families, particularly those in the low-income brackets where pennies count. The tax has been passed on to the consumer, and will continue to be paid by the consumer if the present law remains on the statute books.

Therefore, I am convinced that it should be repealed.

On the other hand, the millions of farmers throughout the country who are engaged in the dairying business, and the thousands of creameries, large and small, which make butter, are entitled to protection against unfair competition from this substitute product. No one should buy oleomargarine thinking it is butter. In righting one wrong, I feel very keenly that we should not commit another.

The Wiley-Gillette amendment should result in adequate safeguards for the public and the great dairy industry that means so much to the prosperity of my own State of Missouri. I shall therefore support the Wiley-Gillette amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have a few things to say regarding the pending legislation. I should like to correct the record, if the matter before us now is not the Formosan question but the pending oleomargarine bill.

Mr. President, I have in my hand an editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of January 6. As everyone knows, the editor, Mr. Virginius Dabney, is one of the leading editorial writers of the country. I wish to read one paragraph from it referring to the pending so-called Wiley-Gillette amendment:

> This bit of skulduggery has been dubbed "the Wiley amendment" by punsters on Capitol Hill. If passed by the Senate, it will go down in history as one of the most disgraceful chicaneries of all time. * * * The vote on the Wiley amendment should provide us with an excellent criterion of the kind of statesmanship we have in the Senate.

It goes on to point out that the Wiley amendment is not a solution to the difficulty of which the butter producers themselves complain. I ask unanimous consent to insert the entire editorial in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SCANDALOUS AMENDMENT

Far more than the price of yellow oleomargarine is at stake in the outcome of the Senate's vote on the House-passed oleo tax repealer—as amended by a 25-man butter bloc in the upper House. The Senate is expected to vote on their emasculated repeal bill today.

The amended version of the bill, proposed by Senators GILLETTE, Democrat, of Iowa, and WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, would repeal the 10-cents-per-pound tax on colored margarine, and the quarter-of-a-cent tax on uncolored—but would prohibit all interstate traffic in colored margarine. In other words the housewife could buy tax-free oleo only if it were manufactured in the State in which she resides.

This bit of skulduggery has been dubbed "the Wiley amendment" by punsters on Capitol Hill. If passed by the Senate, it will go down in history as one of the most disgraceful chicaneries of all time.

Senator WILEY and his butter men are perfect examples of the type of politician referred to in the oft-quoted epigram of John Morley's: "Those who would treat politics and morality apart will never understand the one or the other."

Tools of the butter bloc, these men are determined to prolong the controversy indefinitely and at any cost to the millions of housewives who now pay 10 cents more than they should for each pound of oleo they buy.

The vote on the Wiley amendment should provide us with an excellent criterion of the kind of statesmanship we have in the Senate.

There is no more excuse for prohibiting the interstate shipment of colored margarine than there is for a law compelling a housewife to buy no butter except that produced within her own State.

The oleo people have science, the consumer, and justice on their side. The consumers demand the repealer; the scientists have proved that the fats in oleo are palatable, nutritious, and wholesome; justice demands an end to this intolerable discrimination. If the butter bloc can defeat all three, the only conclusion to draw is that those Senators who vote for the Wiley amendment are impervious to the appeal of justice, blind to scientific evidence, and deaf to the plea of housewives—something to be recalled when these gentlemen offer for reelection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to point out that the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], as amended by the Aiken amendment, is the proper approach to the problem, if the dairy interests are really concerned about misrepresentation and fraud. It undertakes to set down a proper criterion for advertisements and labeling, the labeling being covered in the Pure Food and Drug Act, and to provide very severe penalties for violation of the act. If there is any proper approach, that is it. The approach of the Wiley amendment, which simply prohibits the shipment of yellow margarine in interstate commerce, does not accomplish that purpose in any way. It is an infringement upon existing rights of the States which permit without restriction yellow margarine to be sold within their borders. There are 32 States which permit it, and only 15 of those States have plants within their borders; one of those being Missouri, the State of the Senator who has just spoken. Of course, that State is large enough to support a plant, but in such States as Nevada, Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico, which have relatively small populations, I do not think it would be economically possible to support a plant. The Wiley amendment in effect denies the people of those and other States the right to buy yellow margarine, whereas today they can buy it freely—of course, paying the tax. In my judgment it would be much more sensible to leave the existing legislation in effect than to adopt the Wiley amendment, which would put up a complete barrier against interstate commerce in yellow margarine.

Mr. President, I have before me an article which appeared in a trade journal that is no way related either to the margarine industry or the butter industry. It was in the Refrigeration and Air Conditioning News, of Detroit. It was a guest editorial by E. N. Guild. I desire to read it, as I think it high-lights one of the interesting phases of this situation:

IT COULDN'T HAPPEN HERE—OR COULD IT?

(A guest editorial by E. N. Guild)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Author of this grand satire is both an electric refrigeration executive and a farmer. He's also fed up with socialistic government. All people in the gas-appliance industry, we trust, will understand that he's lampooning political gas bags, not the gas industry.)

The national controversy over the butter and margarine situation has given me a great inspiration. This is such a wonderful idea that it should have been thought of long ago, and the fact that nothing previously has been done reveals that American industry has failed to exercise the privileges and opportunities open to it under our enlightened form of government.

I am identified with the electrical industry, and have a strong preference for this form of energy; so strong that over the years I have convinced myself that all other forms should be abolished, in the public interest. Naturally, I use an electric range in our kitchen at home, and being completely satisfied that it possesses greater merit than competitive gas ranges, I propose, with the help of others, to launch a program that would protect consumers against this dangerous and inferior rival. The plan is justified on grounds that we—the electric interests—are larger; we represent more employees (voters) and cut a bigger figure in the national economy than the gas group. Therefore, we need special advantages to help us maintain our position of leadership. Otherwise we might not prosper, and that would be a bad thing for the country. Adversity might also cause us to transfer our political allegiance to another party.

The silly legal point concerning combinations in restraint of trade need not bother us. The dairy industry blazed the trail a couple of generations ago when our democracy was far less liberal and advanced than it is today. In fact every one of the items in this proposal is copied from the laws of our fair land with respect to butter and margarine competition. Hence, its absurdity cannot be said to exceed that of the sources from which it was derived.

I propose that Congress enact the following legislation:

1. A measure to require that all gas ranges be produced with black finish, for purposes of identification. Since the natural color of ranges is white, the white finish should be set aside for our exclusive use, in perpetuity.

The objectives of our group, although quite pure and altruistic, may be misunderstood. So we will form an association, and invest money in well-placed gratuities, coupled with an educational campaign to show that unless gas ranges are painted black, millions of unsuspecting people are likely to purchase them in the mistaken belief that they are genuine electric models. However, we may not get away with this because of stupid opposition, and are prepared to agree on a generous compromise. Our competitors may have the right to supply a can of white paint with each black range, provided that the repainting shall be done in the customer's kitchen. Heavy fines should be imposed for noncompliance.

2. Stiff taxes should be imposed on the gas-range industry to curb the growth of this public menace. Since the Government is looking for additional sources of revenue, such a proposal would likely meet with great favor. Moreover, the tax structure can be devised cleverly, with a low rate on gas ranges in black and a high rate on gas ranges which may employ in defiance our natural white finish. Therefore, if proposal No. 1 is considered discriminatory or impractical, we can accomplish our purpose with equal effectiveness by the tax route. First, slap on a Federal processing tax. This should be about 30 percent of the retail price for white gas ranges. Second, soak the manufacturer an additional $600 per year for a special license to engage in such an unlovely business. Third, State taxes should be imposed, and although these will vary tremendously in different parts of the country, the variation in itself adds to the nuisance value. Fourth, let us arrange a wholesaler's tax of $200 per year for handling black gas ranges and $480 per year for white gas ranges. Fifth, stick the retailer $6 for handling the black stuff and $48 for white.

It should be obvious to any sensible person that these special taxes are reasonable and fair. They act as a deterrent to the manufacture and sale of spurious goods.

3. For the purpose of discouraging gas-range sales still further, we should require each dealer to placard his establishment with warnings in letters not less than 3 inches high stating that the proprietor is trafficking in gas ranges. The phrase "caveat emptor" need not be added, the implication being sufficient. Likewise each restaurant where a gas range is used must have the dining room well-posted in a similar manner for the guidance of patrons who may wish to be forewarned.

4. Compel the manufacturer to identify each gas range with "caution" labels on all exposed surfaces, ostensibly as a protective measure, but also to transmit to the buyer a distinct impression that the product is a substitute for something better.

5. None of the foregoing restrictions or special taxes should apply to our electric-range industry. Furthermore, we require and are entitled to the following privileges:

(a) The right to finish our product in black, or any other color, at the factory, should we find that our natural white color is losing ground in consumer preference.

(b) A subsidy from the public, paid through the Federal Government, so that we cannot lose money in producing our merchandise. This financial support is not to be repaid during periods of prosperity or scarcity when profits may be excessive. The gas-range manufacturers shall not qualify for such benefits.

The advantages of my proposal should instantly be apparent to all persons skilled in modern political science. The economy of this country has become so complex that our industry should no longer be expected to struggle along, virtually alone, on the basis of free enterprise. By applying a special kind of analysis, not out of accord with the philosophy of our present administration, one may easily be persuaded to believe that our purposes are completely unselfish.

Combinations, it seems, refer to a sinister plot between two or more individuals or groups to restrict or injure the trade of others. But it has been demonstrated that when one of the conspirators happens to be a branch of the Government, nothing in the

Constitution can stop them, for each discriminating action is taken through the creation of new laws and regulations. With reference to our margarine problem, Jefferson, or any of our early American patriots, would have stormed these barricades with flags waving, for they were sworn to defend our democracy with their "lives, fortunes, and sacred honor."

Ah—but I shrug—Thomas Jefferson is dead.

Mr. President, the opponents of the bill have made much of the argument that the giant Unilever Co. is going to monopolize the margarine business, if the bill is passed. Their remedy for this is to pass the Wiley substitute, which would require a separate margarine plant in each State. Testimony before the committee indicated that this would require a great deal of expense on the part of margarine manufacturers. It seems reasonable to assume, in the scramble for the construction of these margarine plants, that Unilever might well lead the way, since, according to some Senators, they have unlimited resources and are determined to take over the margarine business in the United States.

Of course that argument is wholly without foundation. The facts are that the Jelke Co., which was bought by the Unilever Co., produced less than 5 percent of the total production. There is very keen competition within the industry. The part which is completely inexplicable otherwise is the question of the price, under the existing conditions. If there were a monopoly, certainly there would not be such an enormous spread—more than 50 percent—between margarine and butter. It is not characteristic of monopolies to take so much less than the market will bear. There is no explanation of the fact that today white margarine is selling at less than one-half the cost of butter and that yellow margarine sells at approximately half the cost of butter.

As I have stated before, they cannot have it both ways. If there were a monopoly, the price would be much higher than it is today in the normal course of events. The reason why margarine is so cheap is that the ingredients are cheap, which is admitted, and the competition within the industry is so strong that the price is kept within a very reasonable margin of profit.

It was recently stated on the floor of the Senate that the cost of a pound of margarine is 9 cents. That is ridiculous. Refined cottonseed oil is selling in the neighborhood of ten and a half cents a pound. That is the raw product. The cost of soybean oil is slightly more than that amount a pound, so that the actual cost of production must be in the neighborhood of 18 or 20 cents a pound. The price from the manufacturer to the wholesaler is approximately 1 or 2 cents above that, and by the time it gets into the hands of the retailer it is sold at a price in the neighborhood of from 31 to 33 cents a pound, depending upon the distance of the manufacturer from the market, the freight rates, and so forth.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator has just been speaking of the cost of oleomargarine, apparently on the basis of the cost of certain domestic oils, principally cottonseed oil, soybean oil, and such items. But would it not be possible for the manufacturer of oleomargarine to considerably lower the cost of his finished product by using some of the 400,000,000 pounds of coconut oil coming in annually from the Philippines, in addition to similar items from other countries where the cost of labor is very low?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It might be possible. The evidence is very clear in the hearings held last year and the year before that the manufacturers of margarine, in the total production in this country, utilize no oils other than the ones mentioned a few days ago, namely, cottonseed oil and soybean oil, which are the two principal oils accounting for approximately 95 percent. Corn oil and peanut oil are also used. Some margarine is made for special uses, a small amount for export, in which some of the other oils are utilized. But I think that is simply a straw man which is set up.

It has been stated for a number of years that practically 95 percent of the production of margarine is made from domestically produced cottonseed oil and soybean oil. I suppose much the same statements can be made of milk as have been made regarding oleomargarine. A great many persons have been convicted of putting water in milk and selling the product for pure milk. That would necessarily lower the price. I suppose it might be argued that we should abolish milk because someone might put water into it. We read in the newspapers now and then that someone has been convicted of adding water to milk.

Mr. BUTLER. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to say that there can be no question about the importation of 400,000,000 pounds of coconut oil from the Philippines, and there cannot be very much question about what it can be used for. I am perfectly willing to admit that it is used principally in the manufacture of soap, but it can be used in oleomargarine when competition reaches the point where the manufacturer of oleomargarine needs to lower his cost a little further in order to accomplish certain purposes. There is no doubt that an increased percentage of the 400,000,000 pounds of coconut oil, supposedly imported for the manufacture of soap, could be used in the manufacture of oleomargarine.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As I said a moment ago, I suppose that would be possible, but I think it would be unwise. The oleomargarine manufacturers are relying upon the quality of their product, and if one observes the curve of sales during the past 6 or 8 years, I think he will agree they are entirely justified in doing so.

The principal reason why the sales have increased so substantially is that oleomargarine is an excellent product. Everyone knows what he is buying, and is quite content to buy it, and all the evidence which has been submitted indicates that it is a nutritious food. We are familiar with the experiments which have been conducted by several leading scientists, in institutions such as the University of Illinois, the University of Southern California, and others, to which I wish to make reference a little later.

A good deal has been said by the proponents of the Gillette-Wiley amendment with regard to the spread between yellow and white margarine. In order to get first-hand information on that point, I made inquiry of manufacturers with respect to their policies, and I have the replies here. I shall not read all of them, but I should like to read several into the RECORD at this time, as samples. I have replies from most of the principal manufacturers, and I should like simply to read some of them as illustrative of what they all contain.

I have here a telegram dated January 3, from New York, addressed to me, which reads as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 3, 1950.*

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT:

In response to your request please be advised that we manufacture one brand of uncolored margarine and the same brand of yellow margarine. The price differential between the two charged by us is 10 cents per pound for solid brick, yellow margarine and 11 cents per pound for yellow packed in 4 quarter-pound prints. These are and have been our differentials. Should the Federal taxes on margarine be repealed our selling prices will be reduced by the saving in taxes.

THE BEST FOODS, INC.,
S. CYPRESS,
Director of Sales Coordination.

Here is one from a well-known firm, Armour & Co. I do not know why that one company was not particularly mentioned. Indeed, Armour & Co. makes more margarine than do Lever Bros., but for some reason or other it was presumed by some Senators that Lever Bros. had a little more dramatic appeal. This is dated Chicago, Ill., addressed to me, and reads:

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 3, 1950.*

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building:

In response to your request we have two brands, Mayflower and Sweet Sixteen, white and colored. Our cost price to dealers on colored 1-pound packages is 10 cents per pound over regular white, 11 cents over regular white on colored quarters. This has been our pricing policy over the years. In event of 10-cent color law repeal our price on colored will be reduced 10 cents per pound.

ARMOUR & CO.,
E. C. LEWIS.

Here is one from my own State, Osceola, Ark., which reads:

OSCEOLA, ARK., *January 3, 1950.*

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building:

In response to your request for information regarding brands and prices, we manufacture 10 brands of margarine in white solids and colored quarters. Differential between regular white and colored quarters is 10 cents per pound, and it is our definite intention to pass this differential on to the trade in the event taxes are repealed.

OSCEOLA FOODS,
L. C. B. YOUNG, *President.*

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In the early part of the afternoon I obtained a unanimous-consent agreement that at the conclusion of business today the Senate would take a recess until 12 o'clock on Tuesday. In talking with some Senators they have indicated that they thought the hour of meeting should be 11 o'clock. I ask unanimous consent to modify my request and make it 11 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. That does not involve changing the order as to the hour of voting, does it?

Mr. LUCAS. No.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is also understood that the time from 11 until 1 o'clock will be equally divided between the Senator from Wisconsin and myself, is it?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Arkansas is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate too long, and I shall not read all the telegrams I have. There are two others, from well-known companies, which I am sure are highly responsible companies. I know the Senator from Nebraska, for example, is well acquainted with one of them, and I am quite sure he has confidence in them. I speak of Swift & Co., of Chicago. They say:

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 3, 1950.*

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building:

In response to your request for information as to how many brands yellow and white margarines we quote also the price differential at wholesale level. We quote one brand Allsweet in 1-pound solid white or 1 pound solid or quarter-pound yellow. Price differential between solid white and solid yellow 10 cents to cover tax. Between solid white and yellow quarters 11 cents to cover tax and increased packaging costs. This differential has been constant since we first began sale of artificially colored margarine.

SWIFT & CO.,
W. L. PRENTISS.

One other, and then I shall desist. This is from a different part of the country, from Sherman, Tex. It reads:

SHERMAN, TEX.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building:

In reponse to your request we wish to advise that we manufacture only two brands of margarine. Namely Meadolake and Hollandale margarine in both colored and uncolored. The uncolored is packed in 1-pound solid prints, the colored is packed in 1-pound solid prints and four one-quarter-pound prints. We do not pack margarine in the squeeze bag. Our differential in price between the colored and the uncolored has been uniform since we first started making colored margarine. The differential in price on the colored in 1-pound solid prints is 10 cents per pound above the price for the uncolored. The differential in price on the colored and four one-quarter-pound prints is 11 cents per pound above uncolored. When the present Federal taxes are removed on margarine we expect to reduce our price on colored margarine 10 cents per pound.

MRS. TUCKERS FOODS, INC.

Mr. President, there is no reason whatever to believe that all these companies are simply standing by expecting to raise the price of all their margarine 10 cents. It is assumed, and I believe, and I think it is undisputed, that these companies are making a reasonable profit on their product today. They would, indeed, be very foolish to raise the price if they had the power to do so, as has been alleged by the supporters of the Wiley amendment. They would be simply creating a situation which would invite into the field additional competitors. That always happens if an industry is left free, if it is not Government controlled. It would be a very stupid move on their part, because there is no evidence that there is a monopoly. If, as the allegation is, there were a monopoly in this field, then of course that would be attacked. It should already have been attacked, and those who believed it should have preferred charges that it was a monopoly in violation of the Sherman Act. Of course there is no evidence whatever in support of such an allegation, or some representation would have been made long before now.

There is no more active group in the whole United States than the butter organization, and I must say, in spite of the fact that I differ with them, that I have never encountered a group better organized or more efficiently represented in Washington than that represented by Mr. Charles Holman. I pay him that compliment, because he is the most resourceful man who has ever represented any important industry in this Capital. After all, this is the first time in 60 years in the history of this legislation that the Senate has ever agreed even to vote on the subject. Ever since I have been a Member of the Senate, certainly for at least 3 years, we have been attempting in every possible way to get a vote, and I can hardly believe that even today we have finally agreed to vote on one part of it, a substitute, in this instance.

The fact that there has been no prosecution of the margarine industry as a monopoly cannot be ascribed to the fact that they do not have efficient and alert representation in Washington. That in itself is quite sufficient proof that there is absolutely nothing to the allegation that there is a monopoly or a trust in this business. It would long since have been broken up if anything of that sort had existed.

Of course, the additional fact, and the one that is unanswerable, is the existing price of the product. It is cheap. In fact, that is its only real crime. The only real offense it is guilty of is that it is so cheap that it embarrasses its competitors, that is, the butter makers.

Mr. President, as I have said, I have telegrams from some 15 or 20 other companies, but they are exactly the same in substance as those I have read. They support the view, or they all agree, that with the elimination of the tax the price of yellow margarine will be the equivalent of the existing price of the white margarine, at least within approximately a cent. There is the cost of the coloring, which is very slight, but it would justify a differential at least half a cent or a cent.

Mr. President, I have several editorials pertaining to this subject which I think are of great interest. I have a great many more in my office than I have here, but I have selected a few of them from the States in which it is alleged great harm will result from the repeal of these taxes.

The foremost State, or certainly among the first few States in the productio of butter, is Iowa. I have in my hand an editorial from the Reinbeck (Iowa) Courier. I wish particularly to call it to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who is a cosponsor of the amendment. The editorial was published on April 21, 1949, when it was expected that a vote would be had on this subject. I shall read only a few sentences from it to illustrate that even in Iowa, a great butter-producing State, its people do not all see the matter in the same way. I read as follows:

COLORED OLEO AND COLORED BUTTER

Now comes Senator GUY M. GILLETTE, who states that he is sponsoring a bill to repeal the tax on oleo. GILLETTE'S bill will be very much the same as other bills that have been introduced, and almost identical with the Grainger bill, with exception that GILLETTE'S bill will not permit shipment of colored oleo in interstate commerce.

How silly this is. Just as well include butter in the bill also. There is no such thing as natural golden yellow butter, with the exception of about one month in the year. All butter is colored with the same ingredients that oleo is colored with.

I remind Senators that this editorial is not from an Arkansas or Alabama newspaper. It comes from an Iowa newspaper. Reinbeck is a rather small town in Iowa, too. It is not one of the great metropolitan centers. I continue to read:

The writer—

That is of this editorial—

had a vital interest in a creamery in Reinbeck some 14 years ago, in fact we had money invested in it, and we know whereof we speak. Our creamery purchased a lot of butter coloring, and it was used aplenty.

It just strikes us a little out of line to legislate one group against another. In fact this legislating business has grown to an extent where it has become dangerous. Nothing can bring about one of the so-called isms as quickly as too much legislation.

Southern Senators can be expected to fight to a finish this oleo bill restricting their farmers and industries of the Southern States making oleo. It seems to be O. K. to ship colored butter down South, but wrong to send colored oleo up North. Such a law.

I think that editorial is especially appropriate to appear in this debate, because I believe many persons who are so very eager in their support of the Wiley-Gillette amendment are also on other occasions very much inclined to complain of the great amount of Federal regulation in other fields. So I think that the views of this writer are especially appropriate.

I have another editorial published in the Denver (Colo.) Post of June 2, 1949. Denver is in another State which has been quite prominent in its support of the Wiley-Gillette amendment and, I may say, of all the restrictions in the past upon oleomargarine. The editorial is as follows:

A FAST-FADING HOPE

Two months ago the House of Representatives passed a bill removing the special Federal taxes on oleomargarine—taxes which penalize one product for the benefit of a competing product—butter.

The House action raised high the hopes of consumers. At last, they thought, people who could not afford the luxury of eating tax-free butter would no longer have to pay discriminatory taxes for the privilege of eating margarine.

They figured the most un-American of all taxes—a tax based on inability to pay instead of ability to pay—was about to be repealed.

In the last 2 months, however, butter manufacturers, backed by many misguided dairy farmers, have been bringing great pressure on the Senate to keep the bill passed by the House from becoming law.

Their campaign has been so successful that congressional observers now list the margarine-tax repeal as having but slight chance for Senate action, particularly if Congress sticks by its intention of closing up shop on July 31.

Popular demand for repeal of the margarine tax has been unmistakable. There is no reason why this discriminatory tax should not be repealed at this time. It is poppycock for anyone to pretend that the dairy industry rests on such a shaky foundation that only a 10-cents-a-pound tax on colored margarine stands between it and economic collapse.

That is exactly the point I think I have proved by the statistics as to the use of milk in this country, especially by the statistics coming from Wisconsin, the State of the proposer of the amendment. I maintain, just as the editor of the Colorado Post maintains, that it is poppycock to say that the whole stability and prosperity of the dairy industry depends upon this 10-cents-a-pound tax on margarine and the restrictions which have existed upon margarine through the years. The editorial continues:

It is time the Senate quit playing farm-vote politics on a matter which affects the food budgets of millions of families from coast to coast.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial published in a Wilmington, Del., newspaper under date of April 29, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMANCIPATE OLEO

Back in February the State senate passed the bill to permit the sale of yellow oleomargarine in Delaware. In the house the proposal has been reported favorably out of committee, but somehow has been held back from a vote. It now looks as if the house will act on the bill this week. Because we think yellow oleo should be emancipated in Delaware, as elsewhere, we urge that the local restrictions be removed without further delay.

The same bill which removes the restriction on color also sets up adequate safeguards for the buying public. Colored oleo would be clearly labeled as such in packages. Before serving it, a restaurant must identify it on the bill-of-fare or must announce its use on a placard in full view of all customers.

The present Federal 10-cent tax on yellow oleo, along with other Federal taxes on manufacture and sale of oleo, is pretty sure to be repealed in the United States Senate. Such a repealer has already passed the House of Representatives. There is no doubt that President Truman and Governor Carvel will give final approval.

We would not be happy in urging the emancipation of margarine if we thought the dairy industry would suffer in any serious degree. We think it will not, especially in Delaware and the Eastern Shore.

But we could not, in any event, support legal discrimination in favor of one good product and against another. It then becomes discrimination against the consuming public. Housewives have the right to buy yellow margarine, if they wish, without penalty.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I see the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] present in the Chamber. For his benefit, and because he has given such close attention to the subject, I wish to read into the RECORD an editorial published in the Muncie (Ind.) Star of May 25, 1949, as follows:

PUT MARGARINE BILL TO VOTE

The bill to repeal discriminatory Federal margarine laws passed the House by a 279 to 89 vote and was approved by the Senate Finance Committee. But it has got no further than that. It now is in danger of becoming the victim of a legislative log jam. That was its fate last year.

The margarine measure is the target of threats of filibusters and crippling amendments. This hurts its chances for consideration on the floor of the Senate, which has a lot of work to do before the July 31 adjournment date. This situation, however, will not excuse the Senate from putting the bill up for vote. Both the House action and public opinion, which has been shown to be heavily in favor of the measure, obligate the senior legislative body to go on record.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two editorials from the Wichita (Kans.) Beacon, an editorial from the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, an editorial from the Louisville (Ky.) Times, another from the Bath (Maine) Times, one from the Pontiac (Mich.) Press, one from the Marquette (Mich.) Journal, and one from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Beacon of June 16, 1949]

FOUR HUNDRED THOUSAND RETAIL GROCERS JOIN THE DEMAND FOR THE REPEAL OF THE OBNOXIOUS TAX ON MARGARINE

Four hundred thousand retail grocers have joined the public demand that Congress remove the discriminatory and obnoxious tax on margarine. They reflect the desire of the 40,000,000 Americans with whom they are in constant contact.

These 40,000,000 people include farmers, laboring men, the white-collar group, and others who purchase and consume margarine as one of their nutritious foods. As margarine buyers they do not want to continue to be penalized by paying a premium on margarine.

These merchants meet day in and day out their margarine customers. They know public sentiment. They are reflecting the sentiment of their patrons—the American public—when they declare that the margarine tax should be removed immediately.

Retail grocers do business with the rich and the poor alike. Their patrons represent people in all categories.

These merchants want the tax penalty taken off margarine in the general interest. They see it as an unfair discrimination which the people should not be compelled to endure.

Senators, the people want action by you that will result in the repeal of the margarine tax. Ten thousand retail merchants, in the convention of the National Retail Grocers Association, have passed a resolution for the tax repeal. The House of Representatives already has passed a similar measure.

Why does the Senate stand in the way of the tax repeal? The grocers represent no group or clique. They speak for the public—their customers—and they know what they are talking about.

After all, Senators are elected to serve the people. The tax repeal is a service the people want and demand of their legislators. Surely, no Senator wants to continue to keep this hardship on the people he represents.

The margarine tax is a hardship and injustice on people who can afford to buy margarine but cannot afford to buy butter. They plead with you, their Senators, to remove this uncalled-for, obnoxious, and penalizing tax.

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Beacon of May 19, 1949]

REPEAL OF THE ANTIMARGARINE TAX LAWS IS DUTY THE UNITED STATES SENATE OWES ITS CONSTITUENTS

The hour of the show-down on whether the unjust and discriminatory taxes on margarine are to be repealed or remain in effect is at hand. This is the most critical period the groups that favor the elimination of this penalty on a popular and necessary food have faced.

The bill that would remove the taxes on margarine has passed the House of Representatives. It is soon to be called up for debate and action in the Senate. Many Senators have not made up their minds on this greatly important matter to the consumers of margarine—and they are legion.

The laborers, white-collar groups, farmers, tenants, and others should have the opportunity to buy margarine without having to pay obnoxious taxes on it. They want the Senate to relieve them of this burden.

Foods, and especially margarine, are taxed to death by Federal taxes and State taxes, including a sales tax. Taxes are responsible for the high prices now being charged for foods.

Why should the Federal Government pick out margarine for special taxation when there are so many other kinds of taxes? It simply is not understandable. The American people should have the right to buy their foods, including margarine, without having to pay obnoxious taxes on them.

Passage of the margarine antitax bill by the Senate should come without any crippling amendments that may be offered.

Many consumers cannot afford to buy butter. Their health demands the fats margarine provides. This nutritious and economical food should not be denied them because of a prohibitive tax.

Justice and plain common sense demand that the people should not be deprived of a food they want, need, and are able to buy.

The Senate should be quick to follow the example set by the House of Representatives and by passing the measure for the removal of margarine taxes do its constituents an invaluable service. The Senators owe such action to the people they were sent to Washington to serve.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of May 22, 1949]

MARGARINE TAX REPEAL IS UP TO THE SENATE

It is true that the Senate faces decision on unprecedented international affairs at this session. It is true that more legislation is awaiting enactment or in the process than can possibly be completed before adjournment.

But this is no reason why an act repealing the Federal tax on margaraine should be allowed to die. The bill has been passed by the House of Representatives. It has been reported favorably by the Senate Finance Committee. The tax on margarine is every-

where recognized as a discrimination foisted on the housewife by the dairy lobby. There is no serious pretense that it is a revenue measure. It has weighed unfairly on those housekeepers who must watch pennies—and there are millions—for 60 years.

At the last session of Congress the repeal bill passed the House, was approved by the Senate Finance Committee, and died with the Eightieth Congress. If Members of the Senate know the wishes of those who elected them, it will not happen again this year.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Times of May 21, 1949]

ANOTHER RUN-AROUND SIMPLY WOULDN'T DO

Unquestionably the Senate's docket is heavy. But this can be no excuse for putting aside a bill which has passed the House by as many votes as 279 to 89. A tally like that shows that a large majority of the people really want a bill enacted into law. The bill in this case is that repealing discriminatory Federal taxes on oleomargarine. It has not only been approved overwhelmingly by the House but also by the Senate Finance Committee, so that the way is clear for final action.

Yet word comes from Washington that there is serious danger final action will not be taken before Congress recesses, probably in midsummer. This danger exists because some of the dairy-State Senators, led by ALEXANDER WILEY, a Wisconsin Republican, threaten to filibuster in case the margarine bill is taken up. With so much important business before the Senate and time now so precious, such a threat is, of course, potent.

However, those Members who would vote for the bill if given a chance, and they are a majority, ought to meet it squarely. If an arbitrary and unfair competitive advantage for butter over margarine is more important to the dairy-State Senators than the Atlantic pact and other vital matters on the Senate's agenda, then let these men be compelled to proclaim that fact to the Nation and endure public obloquy for a while.

Last year a margarine tax bill was passed by the House by 260 votes to 106, approved by the Senate Finance Committee and killed by threat of filibuster in the Senate in the last-minute rush. We don't think most of the housewives of the land and the farmers who produce vegetable oils will take meekly another such run-around as that.

[From the Bath (Maine) Times of April 22, 1949]

MARGARINE VERSUS BUTTER

For 63 years the Congress of the United States has fought margarine. The recent procedure in Congress withdrew taxes on margarine, and provided for its sale as foodstuff with occupational licenses of $600 on manufacturers, and less amounts for the wholesale and retail trade. On top of that the lower branch of Congress voted that all margarine served in all public eating places must be served in triangles, which one legislator remarked, "would be like a baby's diaper."

Another lawmaker called it a new pyramid club. The House also included in the bill a provision that eating houses serving margarine must display large signs advertising that fact.

Butter is a popular element of our best food, but the power of its political strength is another matter. There is now more margarine used daily than at any previous time. The butter people have claimed a monopoly on yellow coloring. The color of margarine does not seem to affect the spread.

Numerous articles of all kinds of foods carry colors that distinguish them from other fruits, meats, greens—and even bread sails under different colors. All of which goes to show that the color of different foodstuffs exists in the open market. The coloring of margarine is a very queer issue for the dairy interests and politicians to stand on. In the open markets and homes hundreds and thousands of people tell you: "I can't tell the difference in the taste of margarine and butter."

[From the Pontiac (Mich.) Press of June 8, 1949]

NO MRS. MILQUETOAST

A bill to repeal the deliberately discriminatory Federal taxation of oleomargarine has passed the House and won approval by the Senate Finance Committee. It has taken years to get that near to justice for the consuming public in this matter. Yet dairy State Senators now threaten to filibuster the bill to death, counting on their threats to discourage a Senate move to bring it up for action. Maybe these Senators know on which side their bread is buttered. It is certainly not the same side for the majorities in Congress and the political party responsible for Congress' record. If these others know what is good for them they will see that the bill comes to a vote, filibuster or no filibuster. If they want to hear a real talkfest, let them ask any intelligent housewife her opinion of penalty taxation of the substitute she turns to when she thinks butter is too high.

[From the Marquette (Mich.) Journal of May 20, 1949]

MARGARINE TAX

There has been widespread editorial support for repeal of the Federal tax on margarine. Last year a repeal bill passed the House but died in the Senate. A similar major measure presented at this session may succumb to the same fate. This no doubt is the reason the National Association of Margarine Manufacturers is urging the press to call attention to the present status of the bill.

The House has passed the repeal measure by an overwhelming vote. The Senate Finance Committee also has reported it out of committee. But the association reports, "We are informed that measure may be shunted aside."

There is no valid reason why the Senate should not vote on this bill at this session, and vote favorably. The margarine tax is discriminatory. It never should have been imposed under pressure from the dairy lobby some years ago. It has stood as a horrible example of misuse of the powers of taxation.

Congress has done little to correct the inequities of Federal taxation. The least it can do at this session is to knock out the margarine tax.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of May 24, 1949]

OLEO REPEAL IN DANGER

The American people want the discriminatory taxes on oleomargarine repealed. A small block of dairy States in the Senate want them retained. There is a good chance that the tactics of this minority group and the Senators who represent them will be able to thwart the will of the majority.

The oleomargarine tax repeal bill was passed by the House in April by a thumping majority. It has been reported favorably by the Senate Finance Committee. All that remains to end this 63-year-old excise levy is approval by the Senate. The measure, however, is now caught in the legislative log jam, and unless the leaders of the upper House act to extricate it, history will repeat itself and the bill will die, as it did at the last session.

Prospects for its consideration by the Senate are marred by the threat of Senators JOHNSON of Colorado and WILEY of Wisconsin to filibuster and amend the bill to death if it is called up for a vote.

There are two sound reasons why such tactics should not be permitted to prevail. The oleo tax is an unjust discrimination against the margarine industry. It is an arbitrary and unnecessary charge which increases living costs. The oleo taxes include a levy of 10 cents per pound on colored margarine at retail, a manufacturers' tax of $600 a year, a wholesalers' tax of $480, and a retailers' tax of $48. Repeal of these levies would reduce the cost of margarine by more than 10 cents a pound—a substantial saving for the average family.

The situation should be a challenge to America's housewives. They can, if they will, make it clear to the Members of the Senate that they want the oleo-tax-repeal bill put on the calendar for prompt consideration and approval.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have also an editorial from the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune. That is an interesting editorial. The Montana Senators have been very active in their opposition to the pending legislation. I ask unanimous consent to have that editorial printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARGARINE CONTROVERSY PERSISTS

Montana has a producing interest in the controversy over regulation and special taxes on oleomargarine. That producing interest is on the side of butter. But, as is the case in other States, Montanans have a consumer interest in margarine because of the price differential. A good share of the butter-oleo controversy has approached the ridiculous, and the average observer is inclined to disregard most of it and put the whole thing down as a trade fight, pure and simple.

Ever since Congress failed last year to complete action on a repealer of taxes on margarine the butter people have been devising new strategy. Now they are recommending an outright prohibition on the making of yellow margarine. Most consumers are likely to agree with this sentiment, expressed in a recent New York Times editorial:

"The heavy discriminatory tax on colored margarine has not succeeded in preventing the greater use of uncolored margarine, and neither will an unfair prohibition against coloring margarine at the plant, which the butter lobby now proposes in a 'compromise' last-ditch fight in which they have at last conceded failure on the unfair tax.

"The public wants its margarine colored yellow. The butter producers themselves use artificial coloring, at least at certain seasons, to make the appearance of their product more attractive. The housewife is entitled to emancipation from the chore of coloring her own margarine in the kitchen. Enact whatever law is necessary to protect the consumer, in store or restaurant, from being deceived as to what he is buying. If the decline of butter consumption affects the public welfare through unduly depressing the dairy farmer's income, then let us attack that problem directly through general legislation."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have another editorial in which I believe the Senators from Nebraska might be interested. It is published in the Omaha World-Herald under date of April 4, 1949. I am sure the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] know well the importance and good judgment of what I believe is the

only, and surely the leading, newspaper of Omaha and, I presume, the leading newspaper of the State of Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. Omaha manufactures more butter than does any other city in the world.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is a singular coincidence, because here we have an editorial on the margarine bill from the leading newspaper of the State, located in Omaha, and I understand it is a leading Republican newspaper, so it is not tainted with any southern or foreign isms. It has this to say about the margarine bill:

The bill passed by the House to repeal taxes that discriminate against oleomargarine was a good one.

The House turned away from the latest slick trick of the dairy bloc—to prohibit the shipment of colored margarine in interstate commerce—and voted a straight-out repealer. It provided that restaurants that serve margarine announce this fact and serve it in triangular pats—a reasonable enough provision.

The Senate should now pass the bill and end, after 70 years, an unjustified "domestic tariff" that has favored one wholesome food product at the expense of another.

Mr. President, I commend the Omaha World-Herald very highly for its ability to be objective in a matter of this kind, even though Omaha is the largest butter-producing city in the world.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD various other editorials. Most of them are short. They are, I believe, representative of every State whose Senators are opposing the removal of the restrictions on margarine. Some may say that is a rather strange coincidence, but the fact is that the newspapers throughout the country, feeling that it is their duty, and I think properly so, to represent the public opinion, are almost uniformly in favor of repeal of the restrictions on margarine. They are not unanimous in the sense that all of them are for removal of the restrictions, but they represent about the same proportion there was in the recent election in Ohio, the election in which a majority of almost half a million people—I think it was a better than 3-to-2 majority—voted to repeal the restrictions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorials may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Leader of May 26, 1949]

COLORED OLEO

Oleo for the table has been treated more kindly in the New Hampshire Legislature than in Congress. Here the colored oleo bill has been approved in both branches, and will presumably become law despite the amendment, tacked on by the senate, requiring that it be identified when served in public eating places.

In Washington, a pro-oleo bill was passed by the House, but now is apparently lost, perhaps by design, in the Senate. That is a poor way of doing the business. The oleo bill was vigorously fought in the national House, but won out. It should be given its fair chance of final enactment—at long, long last.

[From the New York World-Telegram of July 11, 1949]

MARGARINE REPEAL

In all the legislative schedules and "must" lists put out from Washington on the assumption Congress is going to adjourn July 31, we see nothing about the margarine-tax repeal bill.

Remember the bill that was going to permit the Nation's 31,000,000 housewives to buy yellow margarine without having to pay a heavy, unjust, and discriminatory Federal tax? It was passed by the House of Representatives by a 287-to-89 vote. It was favorably reported by the Senate Finance Committee. President Truman has advocated repeal of the margarine taxes and license fees. But where is the repealer?

Senate Majority Leader SCOTT LUCAS said 6 weeks ago he hoped to bring it up for Senate vote—there is good prospect it would be passed if it could get to the floor—but nothing has been done. Now the bill is competing for place with a host of other important measures in the preadjournment bottleneck.

But there is still time to get Senate action on the margarine bill if housewives will make themselves heard. Let your Senator know in no uncertain terms that the repealer must not die on the eve of success.

[From the Oregon City (Oreg.) Enterprise of June 30, 1949]

SENATE SHOULD ACT ON MARGARINE

The House in Congress has recently, again, passed a bill to repeal the law placing a Federal tax on margarine and prohibiting sale except with a penalty when colored, but there is no assurance the Senate will even take up the bill. Thus, the effort to place margarine where it should be in the economy is stymied.

The public, in these times of extraordinary, high prices and endless price supports for the agricultural economy, we believe is heartily intersted in having margarine, colored, at its lower cost, available without a penalty tax—a tax strictly to protect the butter industry. If butter could be kept down in price there might be some reason to let things stand, but butter was out of reach of millions and still is in generous quantities. It is economically cheaper to produce margarine and the public should not be denied it. Now, the public may have it of course by paying a penalty tax, that is strictly protective, but in most places the public has to color the product by a laborious and troublesome process. It should not be necessary.

Thus far the butter industry has not produced a convincing argument why the public should be penalized. Margarine is now made with vitamin values; it figures in the entire national economy through the work it provides, the shipping it brings and in many other ways. It is not a parasite on the economy.

The pressure is powerful and influential on the Senate. But the House withstood it not only now but in past years. Passage of the measure is in the public interest. The farmers are not as opposed to the measure as the butter manufacturers. Some way should be found to force the issue to the floor of the Senate, or the public clearly told why it is stymied.

[From the Salt Lake City Tribune of May 12, 1949]

CONSUMER TAKES HAND IN MARGARINE FIGHT

The Senate Finance Committee voted last week to approve the Poage bill (H. R. 2033), previously adopted by the House of Representatives, to free oleomargarine from the Federal restrictions it has been under for more than 60 years. The measure is expected to be brought out on the floor for debate within the next 2 weeks.

This is where we came in, for a similar bill was advanced this far last year, but never came out on the floor. The dairy interests received such a scare, however, that they retreated from their traditional demand that the tax be retained on margarine. Then they concentrated on a program of banning from interstate commerce all yellow margarine. The House Agriculture Committee, dominated by the dairy industry for 50 years, recommended the ban this year.

When the bill reached the House floor, however, it was passed with amendments repealing all taxes and requiring public eating places serving colored margarine to do so in triangular pats and to post notice to that effect on menus. It is very likely that what they hear from their constituents will have much to do with what the Senate does with the problem.

For more than 60 years the butter-margarine tussle was considered by most citizens as a struggle to keep a substitute from posing as a genuine product. That argument has largely been disproved. Scientific reports showing one product as good as the other and the boost that oleo received during the wartime scarcity of butter caused the public to realize it, too, had an interest in the fight.

Housewives discovered that they not only were paying high prices for butter, but were being taxed to supply subsidies to maintain high prices of butter. In addition, many States, including Utah, levy taxes on oleomargarine. And the housewife is still required to go through the messy job of coloring the spread. From statistics at hand, it appears that the margarine industry is not suffering. It is the housewife who is the victim, the abused one, in this three-way ruckus.

Most consumers who can afford it very likely will go on preferring butter and there are other paying markets for the dairy industry, notably fresh cream. But the housewife and the consumer are entitled to relief from unnecessary restrictions.

[From the Rutland (Vt.) Herald of July 16, 1949]

OLEO FORGOTTEN?

Tremendous pressure was placed on the Eighty-first Congress to bring about repeal of Federal tax restrictions on margarine. Consumer groups and others did all they could to bring about favorable action. Oleo tax repeal was one of the objectives of the Truman program, but it also had the support of many Republicans.

As of July 1, this year, Congress as a whole had taken no final action on the measure. It was passed by the House by a 287 to 89 vote. It was favorably reported by the Senate Finance Committee. But the Senate has yet to act—and the time is short.

Congress is rushing to adjournment; some say by the end of this month. This means a flood of last minute business—and a chance that oleo tax repeal may be sidetracked or forgotten.

Will history repeat itself? Through the years there have been repeated efforts to get Congress to remove restrictive controls on margarine. Until the Eightieth Congress these efforts were blocked by the powerful House Agriculture Committee which would not permit the bills to reach the floor.

The Eightieth Congress was an exception. The bill was forced out of committee and overwhelmingly approved by the House. It was stifled in the Senate.

While the Senate Finance Committee of the present Congress has reported the bill favorably, it must be approved by the Senate. But there's no word that the Senate will act on this measure in the pressure of last-minute business before adjournment.

Housewives have a special interest in seeing that the bill is acted upon. It was their protests against discriminatory Federal oleo taxes that did so much to bring the relief measure to its present position. But unless the bill becomes law, relief will not be forthcoming.

The bill would permit the Nation's 31,000,000 housewives to buy yellow margarine without having to pay a heavy, unjust, and discriminatory Federal tax. It would relieve them of the chore of coloring margarine themselves, so far as Federal regulations are concerned.

While similar restriction-removing laws in various States would also have to be enacted, Congress must start the move. And Congress has not done so.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Argus of May 14, 1949]

UNABASHED DISCRIMINATION

Few more transparently discriminatory and patently senseless pieces of legislation persist as the law of the land today than the 63-year-old Federal laws covering the manufacture and sale of a legitimate food product which happens to be in competition with butter—oleomargarine. The restrictions on oleomargarine have been so obviously designed to serve the selfish interest of the relatively small group of producers in certain limited areas who contribute to the production of butter that one might almost expect the butter lobbyists to give up the fight against oleo simply from self-consciousness. After all, they've had things their own way for a good long time, considering that the rival product is the absolute equal of butter, in cleanliness and nutritional value, at least, if not in taste. The fear of the dairymen's organizations lest their product lose cut in free and open competition with the cheaper substitute bespeaks an uncertainty in the dairymen's own minds as to whether the merits of butter are really recognizable by the public.

Washington State is, of course, among those in which the dairy industry is most important; and thus it is explainable, if not entirely excusable, that among the many failures of the State's recent legislative session was the failure to abolish, or at least modify, our outmoded antimargarine restrictions. It no longer accords with our idea of serving the national welfare that the Federal Government and 18 States, including Washington, should perpetuate sectional and special interest protective devices at the expense of the myriad consumers of the country as a whole, especially when the devices set farmer against farmer, as these do.

For the second time in as many sessions, Congress seems close to acting decisively to end the antimargarine restrictions. The Poage bill (H. R. 2023) has passed the House by an overwhelming vote and is at this writing still to be acted on by the Senate. If the upper House does not let the legislation die in committee as it did in the preceding session, it will probably pass there also. The Poage measure would, if passed, abolish all the restrictive Federal taxes and license fees obstructing the free supplying of the market with margarine and would permit interstate shipment and sale of the product in precolored form. The bill does require that margarine is to be labeled for what it is and that it is to be distinguished from butter, if served in restaurants, by presentation in triangular shapes. The bill specifies that it shall not supersede existing State legislation covering the sale of colored oleo.

Merritt M. Nash, dairy farmer from Fall City, recently created something of a Nation-wide sensation by appearing before the Senate Finance Committee in behalf of a view that was explicitly disavowed, subsequently, by the lobbying organizations which presume to speak for dairy farmers. Said Farmer Nash: "I don't want to have to rely upon this crutch, this restrictive legislation, these unwarranted taxes, these color restrictions that we are imposing against a competitor, a legitimate competitor who is producing and distributing an American farm product.

"I don't need that crutch. * * * As a matter of fact, our present policy of restricting the other fellow has not increased our sales of butter, but our sales of butter have actually been going down." With a little more such disinterested encouragement, the Senate ought to be enabled to see its way clear to taking Government this little way out of a field of regulation where the results have been anything but favorable to either consumers or the competitive system. Personally, we think well enough of butter to believe it will maintain its popularity in competition with the lower-priced product.

[From the Oshkosh (Wis.) Daily Northwestern of May 19, 1949]

SHOULD REPEAL OLEO LAW

Although efforts were made to induce the Wisconsin Legislature to take off the punitive taxes levied by the State on the sale of oleomargarine and which adversely affect manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers, to date there continues to be a sufficient opposition among the lawmakers to prevent repealing the prohibitions that prevent ready-colored oleo being made available to consumers.

While many States allow yellow margarine to be sold, there is still a group of States that will not allow oleo colored yellow at the source of manufacture to enter State trade. Wisconsin is one of these latter and the pressure exerted by the dairy interests and dairy lobbyists apparently is too powerful to be overcome.

But eventually, we are convinced, yellow oleomargarine will win the day and Wisconsin will relax its discriminatory restrictions in the matter of taxes, license fees, and color, so that the vegetable product will be on its own as to proving its merit in free competition with butter.

The fight to throw aside the Wisconsin law against colored margarine will go on and should be pushed by those interested in giving oleo a chance to compete with butter on equal terms.

In Illinois a situation somewhat similar to that existing for a long term of years in Wisconsin has prevailed. But the oleo interests are battling on to get a law that will be fair to oleo and fair to butter. On this matter, the Chicago Daily News says:

"A bill to repeal existing State laws against colored margarine is before the house agricultural committee at Springfield. It offers adequate protection to the public against sale of margarine as butter, but it is being opposed on the phony old argument that butter has a vested interest in yellow coloration as applied to spreads.

"In the interest of the people of Illinois the legislature should pass this bill, removing the punitive restrictions on oleomargarine.

"Fortified with vitamins, as most commercial oleomargarine is, it is a healthful food, little different from butter and much cheaper. Many persons who cannot afford butter can get the food values necessary to a balanced diet from margarine. They should not be forced to pay an excessive tax. They should not be forced to color the margarine themselves."

In a statement presented some time ago by Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, of the Senate Finance Committee, the Senator, in discussing bills placed before the committee that deals with oleomargarine, said among other things:

"One measure is H. R. 2023, by Congressman POAGE, of Texas, which passed the House on April 1. This bill, similar to my own, S. 117, repeals all Federal taxes and excises on margarine. In addition it contains provisions intended to prevent fraud in the sale of margarine in public eating places.

"Another measure, in the nature of a substitute for H. R. 2023, sponsored by 26 Senators, proposes to confine the manufacture and sale of yellow margarine to intrastate commerce. For purposes of identification only, I shall refer to this measure as the Wiley bill.

"The Wiley bill, by contrast, contains no provisions whatever with regard to the identification of margarine in public eating places.

"Both the Poage bill and the Wiley bill would permit the sale of yellow margarine in exactly the same areas—the States which do not prohibit the sale of yellow margarine. The Poage bill would protect the consumer against deception; the Wiley bill gives him no protection and takes away protection he now has. If I were a dairyman and were concerned about competition from margarine, I would support the Poage bill in preference to the Wiley bill.

"Margarine, either yellow or white, is a perfectly good and wholesome product. It is made from domestic farm products and is manufactured in the United States. Housewives want to buy it already colored. They should have that privilege.

"It is time, and past time, to repeal these un-American Federal antimargarine laws and to pass on to other things."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a great deal has been said in the debate by various speakers opposing the removal of restrictions, about polls, this poll or that poll, conducted by some private poll organization, at the request, I am sure, of the butter organizations. But, after all, there is only one poll with which we in the Senate are thoroughly familiar, and on which we rely, and that is the elections in the States. That is how we get here. That is the only poll we can count on as being accurate and reflecting the real views of the people. In every one of such polls with which I am acquainted, and especially the latest one in Ohio, a not insignificant State, a very important dairy State—and there is no question about anyone conducting it for a special purpose or being influenced by any employer—we have the answer as to what the American people want, and I think those election polls can be accepted as fair examples of how the American people generally would vote on the question. The Ohio poll was not a sample poll. Nearly two and a half million people voted in that election on the issue of whether or not the restrictions upon colored margarine should be removed.

Mr. President, for the RECORD I desire to point out one or two other effects of the Wiley amendment if it shall be adopted. It is contended that it would be a very simple matter to establish margarine plants in the various States. I think those who make that contention are, in a way, trying to hold out the idea that a Senator who votes for the amendment is thereby bringing a plant into his State. Of course, that is a complete non sequitur. There are many other kinds of industries which it would be more profitable to bring into the various

States. The same thing, for example, could be done in connection with the automobile industry. Certainly if each State should have a margarine plant there ought to be an automobile plant in every State. It is a larger industry than the oleomargarine industry. In dollars and cents value it is a greater industry than the oleomargarine industry. If the principle is sound, it ought not to be confined to margarine.

But here is what has happened in some of the States. It has been estimated—fairly accurately, I think—that a plant should have a potential market of approximately 5,000,000 people. Of course not all of them would buy oleomargarine. But that is about the number which I am informed normally would be required in order to supply a market for an average-sized plant.

I shall mention the States which at the present time do not have any plant in which yellow oleomargarine could be manufactured under existing law—and certainly the bill proposed by the committee does not specifically say that the States shall not have the right to determine whether yellow margarine—or any margarine, for that matter—shall be sold or made within their borders. Idaho has no plant. It is a State, if I recall correctly, with a population of approximately half a million. I think it is perfectly absurd to say that a margarine plant could economically be started there. Such a plant simply would not be economical. But if one were started, the margarine would have to be sold at a very high price. Of course, I assume it is one of the objectives of the proponents of the Wiley amendment that if oleomargarine were made at such a plant in Idaho, it would have to be sold at a price of $1 a pound, if it could be made and sold at all. But certainly it could not be sold from a plant there, with the market existing in the State, at anything like the present price.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator think it would be difficult for a plant in Idaho to mix a little yellow pigment with the white oleomargarine already going into that State? That is all the amendment would require.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I made inquiry about that, and there are very grave doubts as to whether that would be a compliance with the proposed statute.

The next point—and it is a very important one—is that one of the things oleomargarine especially prides itself on is the purity of the product. We are told that it is not shipped in containers of this kind or that kind; we are told that in a modern oleomargarine plant, after the oil is pumped from the tank cars, from then on the process is a completely mechanical one which is not exposed to the air or to handling by persons who might contaminate the product with any kind of filth or dirt or anything of the sort.

But, Mr. President, if oleomargarine were shipped in tubs or other containers, it would run a very serious risk of being removed from the possibility of controlled quality; and I think that would be a very uneconomic process. But even if that problem were solved, such a process certainly would add substantially to the cost of oleomargarine.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I would say, first, that as between the shipment of yellow oleomargarine in interstate commerce, on the one hand, and permitting it to be shipped uncolored, and subsequently colored in the several States, on the other hand, there is to my mind very little difference.

However, it would appear to me also that if the housewife can color white oleomargarine yellow by a little squeezing of yellow coloring into it, certainly Lever Bros. and others might be able to do so with equal facility and at least in reasonably sanitary fashion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not doubt that it could be accomplished.

The main point I was making about Idaho is that certainly the establishment of an independent plant for that purpose in Idaho would add considerably to the cost of the product in that area, and the market available would not support a complete plant there. If there were an answer to that situation, it would have to be along the line suggested by the Senator from Oregon.

But when we contemplate that kind of situation, what earthly good would the restriction proposed by this bill do the dairy people or to anyone, by forcing a plant in California—let us assume there is a plant in California—to make oleomargarine in white form in California, then ship it to another State, and then have the white oleomargarine colored yellow there? What would be the sense of doing that?

Knowing how very experienced the sponsors of the amendment are and how very successful they have been over the years in throttling oleomargarine, the suspicion developed in our minds that after the adoption of their amendment, they would insist that it prohibited the very thing the Senator from Oregon has suggested. I do not know. That point will have to be left for decision by the courts and by much better lawyers than I am.

But if it would be easy, as the Senator from Oregon suggests—and that may be possible—to have the plant in the State simply color the oleomargarine yellow, then there is no sense at all in putting this restriction into the law. It would be perfect nonsense. The only excuse which could be had for putting such a provision in the law is that it would prevent any easy coloring of white oleomargarine and any easy evasion of what the proponents of the amendment want.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield, but I wish to finish my remarks in a few minutes.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Arkansas is not so naive as all that. He knows that the purpose is to prevent the unfair practices which have been engaged in by the oleomargarine interests—practices deceiving people by the coloring of oleomargarine to look like butter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yielded for questions, not for a speech.

Mr. WILEY. I asked whether the Senator was so naive as he claimed to be.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was not claiming to be naive.

Mr. WILEY. Then the Senator's words belie his own arguments.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All I say is that the dairy organization has been the most efficient of any I know of anywhere in the world in its activities in preventing or delaying a decision in the Senate on this matter. Certainly it has been most efficient in delaying the decision. I was paying a compliment to the Senator from Wisconsin and to Mr. Holman and to their associates, because I know of no one else who has been able to protect a relatively small and specialized interest, and to make all the rest of the country pay for it. I do not know of a similar case.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only, not for a speech.

Mr. WILEY. Does the Senator know that in 1948 the organization which is alleged to have spent $6,000,000 to get the people in the mood the Senator thinks they should be in had no organization at all?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I know that that is not the truth. I have heard the Senator make that statement on this floor time and time again.

Mr. WILEY. Then the Senator from Arkansas did not listen yesterday to the proof.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I know that the inspiration for most of the editorials, for example, that I just put into the RECORD did not come from any organization, but came from the debates in the House and in the Senate. I always maintain that one of the greatest mistakes, and the only one I can think of, of the butter organization was to precipitate this legislation and to oppose it as long as they did, and thereby give the oleomargarine producers what I would consider conservatively to be $10,000,000 worth of free advertising for which they did not have to pay. The editorials which I put into the RECORD were not paid for; I think the Senator from Wisconsin will agree with that statement. Some of them come from newspapers published in his own State. They were printed because of the public interest in these matters; and that was a very great mistake on the part of the butter interests. If anyone had had to purchase that kind of advertising it really would have run into money.

Mr. President, I wish to mention a few other States as illustrations. The State of Nevada had a population, at the last census, I believe, of approximately 150,000. It would be in the same situation. New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, Oklahoma, Mississippi, Florida, Kentucky, Virginia, West Virginia, New Hampshire, Maine, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island are other States which, under the Wiley amendment, although they now permit the sale of yellow oleomargarine, would then be prohibited from importing it. That is the best comment I know how to make on the other phony theory

that the substitute amendment is a States' rights amendment. Under that amendment, by affirmative Federal legislation, States which now are enjoying the privilege of using yellow oleomargarine would be prevented from using it or having it, unless someone—and we are not told who that would be—would build in those States plants for the production of oleomargarine.

I do not know whether the proponents of the amendment are proposing—they may be, of course—to have the Federal Government finance the building of such plants. I suppose that would be the next step, namely, to have the Government say, "We will build it with RFC money."

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to know if the same logic applies for filled milk.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What logic?

Mr. WILEY. I refer to the Senator's statement that there should not be this prohibition against interstate shipments of colored oleo.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Filled Milk Act was a complete violation of fundamental principles. I think it was erroneous. But that is water over the dam, by now.

Mr. WILEY. Then, the Senator disagrees with the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The distinction between that case and this one is that in the filled milk case the advocates of that measure were able to get the Congress to make a positive finding that filled milk was deleterious to health and dangerous to public health and safety, and so forth. But the proponents of the amendment in the nature of a substitute have really backed up on that argument in this case, for no serious effort is now being made to say that oleomargarine is bad for health.

I think that law was absolutely wrong and that finding was wrong. But that is not an issue here.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question. I should like to finish my remarks, if I may.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Arkansas said that 15 minutes ago.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not realize that the Senator from Wisconsin would interrupt me every 5 minutes. If he will calm down and permit me to conclude, I shall be through in 5 minutes' time.

Mr. WILEY. I did not interrupt the Senator from Arkansas until some time after he said he would be through in 15 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not say I would be through in 15 minutes or at any other time if I was interrupted constantly.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question only.

Mr. WILEY. Does the Senator say that the Supreme Court decision in the filled milk case was based on the proposition he has stated?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I said I thought the Filled Milk Act was a bad act, an act violating the fundamental principles of our free economy.

Mr. WILEY. Very well. The Senator avoids the answer.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator understands what I mean, does he not? I think it is a bad act, just as I think the Oleomargarine Act is a bad act, violating the fundamental principles of our free economy. That brings up a point, since the Senator referred to it. I have but a very short statement from the original case in the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. I do not want to discuss it at length. It is also water over the dam, and we know how the court held, but I wish to quote briefly from the opinion of Mr. Justice Gordon. I want to make it clear that it was a dissent, but he states very well what I think is an appropriate comment on that act, and upon the Filled Milk Act, for that matter, although this was long before there was a Filled Milk Act. I wish to quote but one paragraph. He is referring to the original Oleomargarine Act, and to its application within the State of Pennsylvania. It is the first case, I believe, which tested the act in Pennsylvania, which prohibited this perfectly good food. Mr. Justice Gordon said:

> A glance at this act shows its purpose was to protect the dairyman at the expense of the consumer. Cannot a pure, wholesome butter be made from some other oil than that extracted from milk? Certainly it can. The chemist has discovered that it may as well be manufactured from the fat of the cow as from the fat of her milk.

Originally oleomargarine, I may say, was made from beef fat.

> This wonderful act of 1885 will allow us to eat it (oleomargarine) as a substitute for pork, or beef, or bread, or a substitute for anything but butter * * * it looks much more like a regulation passed for the welfare of the dairyman without regard to the welfare of the balance of the people. Class legislation, that political curse which the framers of the Constitution endeavored to prevent. * * * We * * * are establishing a precedent of the most dangerous character. * * * A doctrine which must necessarily be found on the ruins of the Bill of Rights. A chemist has discovered a process by which an important article of food can be manufactured more cheaply than by the old method. * * * Naturally we might suppose that this inventor would be hailed as the benefactor of his race since he has thereby added much to the happiness of the laboring class of people. But no, say our lawmakers; he is a malefactor, and shall not make or sell his product.

I turn now to a dissenting opinion written by Mr. Justice Field in the Supreme Court of the United States. I think it is useful for the RECORD, because there is much misapprehension about the character of the act. It has been on the books so long that everyone has assumed that, because it is old, it must have validity. But in this case that does not apply. Mr. Justice Field, in the United States Supreme Court, One Hundred and Twenty-seventh United States Reports, page 678, said:

> The right to pursue one's happiness is placed by the Declaration of Independence among the inalienable rights of man, with which all men are endowed, not by the grace of emperors or kings, or by the force of legislative or constitutional enactments, but by their Creator, and to secure them, not to grant them, governments are instituted among men. The right to procure healthy and nutritious food, by which life may be preserved and enjoyed, and to manufacture it, is among those inalienable rights, which in my judgment, no State can give and no State can take away except in punishment for crime. * * * A law does not necessarily fall under the class of police regulations because it is passed under the pretense of such regulation, as in this case by a false title.

I think that is exactly the correct situation with regard to the margarine legislation, which has been on the statute books so long.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to insert as a part of my remarks certain material found in a document compiled by Anton J. Carlson, Ph. D., M. D., of the University of Chicago. First, there is the foreword to the revised edition, reading as follows:

FOREWORD TO THE REVISED EDITION

Requests for this compilation have been so numerous that in less than 2 years the relatively large number of copies printed has been exhausted. In the meantime, competent investigators in three university laboratories—University of Wisconsin, University of Illinois, University of Southern California—have verified the past record of all mammals as well as the prediction in my 1943 prefatory remarks: Normal growth, health, and life after weaning can be sustained without butterfat in the diet. In fact, the accelerated growth induced by an excess of the growth hormone can be sustained by diets containing fats other than butter. These significant findings are included—in abstracts—in this revised edition.

The facts at hand today eliminate all questions as to the nutritive value of vitamin A fortified margarine as compared to butter, except as to the question of flavor. But the restrictive laws—Federal and State—touching the production, distribution, and consumption of margarine are still on our statute books, and still render it more difficult for many people to secure adequate nutrition.

ANTON J. CARLSON.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, *August 1945.*

From the prefatory remarks on page 3, I desire to insert in the RECORD the following:

1. While milk is not an essential food, it ranks among the best foods for man. The common view that the main food value in milk is in the butterfat is an error. The other components—proteins, salts, vitamins—found in the skim milk are at least as important for human nutrition as is the milk fat—cream and butter.

Turning to page 5, there is an article entitled "Report on Butter Substitutes" from which I desire to quote the following:

From a nutritional viewpoint, when it is fortified with vitamin A in the required amount, oleomargarine is the equal of butter, containing the same amounts of protein, fat, carbohydrates, and calories per unit of weight. Moreover, since the minimum vitamin A content of enriched oleomargarine is fixed and the amount of this vitamin in butter may range from 500 to 20,000 units per pound, enriched oleomargarine is a more dependable source of vitamin A than is butter. Since it is a cheaper product than butter, fortified oleomargarine constitutes a good vehicle for the distribution of vitamin A and fats to low-income

groups and should therefore be made available to them.

Under the standards set by the Food and Drug Administration, oleomargarine is as clean and sanitary a food as butter. The two products are likewise equal in digestibility. Their relative palatability is a matter of individual taste.

On page 7 there is an extract from a report on margarine by the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

V. SUMMARY

1. Margarine fortified with vitamin A in accordance with Food and Drug regulations supplies an important amount of this nutrient as well as of much-needed fat. A previous recommendation of the Food and Nutrition Board that all margarine be fortified is reaffirmed. Because of the high proportion of margarine now fortified, mandatory requirement of fortification for all margarine for table use seems unnecessary at present, though it may become desirable if the situation changes in such a manner as to reduce importantly the proportion now fortified.

2. The present available scientific evidence indicates that when fortified margarine is used in place of butter as a source of fat in a mixed diet, no nutritional differences can be observed. Although important differences can be demonstrated between different fats in special experimental diets, these differences are unimportant when a customary mixed diet is used. The above statement can only be made in respect to fortified margarine and it should be emphasized that all margarine should be fortified.

3. It is obvious that the present excise and license taxes imposed by both Federal and State Governments on margarine interfere with the distribution and utilization of certain of our fat resources, but the implications of these taxes are so extensive and complex that no recommendation with respect to them can be made in this report.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. From the same publication, page 11, I offer for the RECORD the following:

EXTRACT FROM VI. GROWTH AND REPRODUCTION OVER 10 GENERATIONS ON SHERMAN DIET B WHERE BUTTERFAT WAS REPLACED BY A MARGARINE FAT

(By Harry J. Deuel, Jr., Lois F. Hallman, and Eli Movitt, Department of Biochemistry and Nutrition, University of Southern California School of Medicine)

SUMMARY

Experiments are reported on reproduction and growth of 10 generations in which the lineage is through the first litter and of 8 generations in which the lineage is through the second litter where the diets have been a modification of the Sherman B diet in which butterfat has been replaced by vitamin A-fortified margarine fat. The growth rate considerably exceeded that obtained with animals on our stock diet and progressively improved with the later generations. Somewhat faster growth was obtained with the first litter rats than with those in the second litter group. It is concluded that a vegetable fat such as that contained in a margarine can serve adequately in place of butterfat for growth and reproduction on a diet otherwise nutritionally satisfactory.

From the same document, page 12, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the matter appearing on the lower half of the page.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTRACT FROM FURTHER STUDIES ON THE COMPARATIVE VALUE OF BUTTERFAT, VEGETABLE OILS, AND OLEOMARGARINES

(By R. K. Boutwell, R. P. Geyer, C. A. Elvehjem, and E. B. Hart, Department of Biochemistry, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin)

"On the mixed carbohydrate diet, such as man ordinarily consumes, there was no conclusive evidence that oleomargarines were inferior to butterfat. In fact, some oleomargarines showed slight superiority and there was quite as much variation among oleomargarines as between the butterfat and the oleomargarines. If 6 weeks of growth of the rat at a rapid stage of its development can be used as the criterion of adequate nutrition, then certainly these oleomargarines compare favorably with butterfat. Whether this deduction is entirely sound can be answered only when growth to maturity and reproduction are studied experimentally."

SUMMARY

1. With lactose as the sole carbohydrate in the diet, rats showed superior growth when fed butterfat or lard as compared to corn oil, coconut oil, cottonseed oil, soybean oil, peanut oil, olive oil, and hydrogenated cottonseed oil.

2. With a mixture of carbohydrates composed of sucrose, starch, dextrose, dextrin, and lactose in the diet, the average growth response of the animals fed vegetable oils was equal to that of the animals fed butterfat and lard. The growth rate on this ration was more rapid than when all of the carbohydrate was present as lactose.

3. Properly fortified oleomargarine fats gave growth equal to butterfat over a period of 6 weeks when the above mixture of carbohydrates was incorporated in the rations.

4. Properly fortified oleomargarines did not give growth equal to butterfat when lactose was the sole carbohydrate in the diet. On such a regimen rats fed butterfat grew slightly better than rats fed oleomargarines of animal origin, but decidedly better than rats fed oleomargarines of vegetable origin.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In the same document, at page 14, there is an article entitled "Oleomargarine," an editorial from the Journal of the American Medical Association. I ask unanimous consent to have two excerpts from the article printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Deuel and his associates found that growing rats could use either butterfat, various vegetable fats, or margarine with equal ease. The animals grew equally well, as shown by increase in weight and increase in bone length, whether their dietary fat consisted of butterfat or of margarine. In addition, Deuel made careful analyses of the rats maintained on diets containing the various fats and found that there was no difference in the protein, lipid, ash, or water content of the tissues of the animals. Then Elvehjem and his associates showed that margarines permitted satisfactory growth in rats when the carbohyrate of the diet was glucose, sucrose, starch, dextrine, or a mixture of them, whereas, when lactose was the sole carbohydrate of the diet, the rats grew better when butter or lard rather than oleomargarine was the fat used.

* * * * *

Vegetable fats such as those used in margarine, the evidence proved, can serve adequately in place of butterfat in regard to growth, reproduction, and lactation on a diet which would be otherwise nutritionally satisfactory.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe those are the only articles I wish to insert at this time. I merely want to add one further thought. I think much of the argument and debate on the pending subject has gone off on a sort of incidental matter. The real question of interest to the Senate, as it was to the House, is not the relative importance of the prosperity of a relatively few butter producers, even accepting the exaggerated claims of those who have stated how very important the industry is. The facts in the record will show that it is of minor importance compared to the over-all importance to the dairy industry itself. Even the proponents of the amendment I think stated recently that approximately 25 percent of the milk is used in butter.

Mr. WILEY. Twenty-nine percent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In many States, it is very small. The real matter of argument is the interest of the consumers of the country, and as I stated before, in every election where the question has been submitted to the people, they have voted overwhelmingly to get rid of the restrictions on a perfectly legitimate and healthful food product. The restrictions constitute a nuisance and are costly to them. It is costly to the poor man not to have this item of food available to him.

Much attention has been given to the tax of 10 cents a pound. In my opinion the tax on the retailers is much more effective to throttle the industry than the tax of 10 cents a pound, since less than 10 or 12 percent of the retailers will even handle yellow oleomargarine, because of the restrictions with regard to reporting, which are very onerous. It brings complaints similar to those we heard in the days of the OPA. They simply are not going to put up with the nuisance of keeping track of every pound of margarine and reporting it. That is one of the principal reasons why it has not been available. So when the proponents of the Wiley amendment so graciously give up their position with regard to taxes, and then in the next breath seek to restrict the shipment of oleomargarine, they do nothing at all to promote freedom in the handling of this food, or to make it available to the people who want it. I hope the Senate will not support the so-called Wiley amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have on the desk an amendment which is proposed to be offered to the amendment in the nature of a substitute which is to be voted upon on next Tuesday. I would not take the time of the Chair and of my three or four colleagues now present on the floor were it not for the fact that I understand there will be no session of the Senate on Monday and this is my last opportunity to have the RECORD indicate even an elementary outline of what I take to be the cogent reasons why my amendment should be adopted.

My friend from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has been dwelling upon the tax on oleomargarine as being a nuisance tax, a troublesome tax, an expensive tax to the manufacturer of oleomargarine. I wish to call attention to a real nuisance

tax, to a tax which is really troublesome, a tax which is really expensive to collect, a tax which is really founded in injustice.

The purpose of the bill is to repeal the excise tax on oleomargarine. Germane to that purpose is the repeal of any excise tax. The sponsor of the proposed substitute has accepted and made a part of the substitute an amendment to repeal certain so-called wartime excise or nuisance taxes. For some reason which I do not know, the most onerous, the most unjust, of those several nuisance taxes has not been included in the list. I refer to the transportation tax on property. While that tax was enacted into law in 1942 and the balance of the nuisance or wartime taxes were enacted in the following year, 1943, the transportation tax on property is nonetheless a wartime tax, and more than any of the other taxes it fails in having any logical basis and it fails in answering any of the logical tests for equitable taxation. It is not, in fact, a tax on transportation. It is not a tax on persons. It is a tax on distance and nothing else.

This tax, Mr. President, will, for instance, result in discrimination which increases with the distance the taxpayer is located from the point of his market. I live on the Pacific coast and represent a State on the Pacific coast. Because the people in that State are 2,000 miles from manufacturing centers of the United States they must pay a tax on manufactured articles far in excess of that paid by those persons who are nearer the source of manufacture. There is no way for them to avoid it. It is not a tax based upon the value of the article there or eleswhere; it is a tax on distance. Not only are they compelled to pay the additional tax on the property which comes to them, but, by virtue of the competitive factors involved, they are compelled to absorb a like transportation tax on what they send to the market. When their products, chiefly agricultural products, including, of course, lumber, come into highly competitive markets, the competitive factor alone requires an absorption by the seller of the additional transportation cost in order that there may be a competitive price. That fact is set out most graphically in a letter which I have recently received from one of the lumber operators in the Pacific Northwest. I shall presently ask for the inclusion of the entire letter in the RECORD, but at the moment I desire to read only some brief excerpts in the interest of saving time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the entire letter may be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CORDON. This lumber operator says:

The west coast lumber industry has the following problem before it pertaining to the Atlantic coast lumber market, which can become most serious to the entire industry at any time.

For the first 10 months of 1949 there has been shipped to the Atlantic coast from the west coast approximately 993,000,000 feet of lumber or about 10 percent of our west coast fir production. Of this amount approximately 816,000,000 feet came from Oregon and Washington and approximately 177,000,000 feet from British Columbia. However, during the last few months the British Columbia mills have greatly increased their shipments to the Atlantic coast to the extent that—we are informed—they have chartered approximately 18 ships that will move from British Columbia to the east coast during December, January, and February.

The reason for this increase is on account of the decline in their export lumber markets due, no doubt, to dollar scarcity over the world, but principally, in our opinion, due to the tremendous advantage they have in our domestic Atlantic coast market compared with American mills. This comes about in this way. American lumber must move on American ships, the present rate being $26.50 plus 3-percent tax. British Columbia lumber can and does move on foreign ships, which at present prevailing charter rates reflect approximately $7 to $9.50 per thousand lower freight than American freight. This, together with the 10-percent Canadian dollar devaluation, enables them to deliver lumber to the east coast ports at $9 to $11 per thousand cheaper than we.

Mr. President, the letter goes on to picture graphically the discrimination against the western mills. It suggests certain types of relief. I have referred the letter to the Tariff Commission for its comment. I think I know what the comment will be. I call attention to it only because here is exemplified the inequity of the transportation tax on property. We ourselves by that tax are increasing the subsidy of the Canadian mills. We are ourselves increasing the discrimination against our own people in the Pacific Northwest. It is not a question of a few large owners of vast amounts of timber and great sawmill properties. There are thousands of small operators, and many of them have been compelled to close their business because of this competitive situation. I do not know that the removal of the 3-percent tax would answer all their problems, but it would be at least a partial answer and would be in the interest of common equity and honesty.

Mr. President, I ask that the entire letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

C. D. JOHNSON LUMBER CORP.,
Portland, Oreg., December 15, 1949.

The Honorable Senator GUY CORDON,
Imperial Hotel, Portland, Oreg.

DEAR SENATOR: The west coast lumber industry has the following problem before it pertaining to the Atlantic coast lumber market, which can become most serious to the entire industry at any time. For the first 10 months of 1949 there has been shipped to the Atlantic coast from the west coast approximately 993,000,000 feet of lumber, or about 10 percent of our west coast fir production. Of this amount approximately 816,000,000 feet came from Oregon and Washington and approximately 177,000,000 feet from British Columbia. However, during the last few months the British Columbia mills have greatly increased their shipments to the Atlantic coast to the extent that (we are informed) they have chartered approximately 18 ships that will move from British Columbia to the east coast during December, January, and February.

The reasen for this increase is on account of their decline in their export lumber markets due, no doubt, to dollar scarcity over the world, but principally, in our opinion, due to the tremendous advantage they have in our domestic Atlantic coast market compared with American mills. This comes about this way. American lumber must move on American ships, the present rate being $26.50 plus 3 percent tax. British Columbia lumber can and does move on foreign ships which at present prevailing charter rates reflect approximately $7 to $9.50 per thousand lower freight than American freight. This together with the 10-percent Canadian dollar devaluation enables them to deliver lumber to the east coast ports at $9 to $11 per thousand cheaper than we. This is aside from any lower wage rates and stumpage costs they have in manufacturing lumber compared with us which is substantial and estimated to be at least $5 per thousand feet. The net result of the transportation and devaluation factors alone mean that they can sell lumber at say $52 American f. a. s. mill and realize approximately $62, or conversely they can lower their price to say $42 and still realize approximately $52 American. In other words they have approximately $10 per thousand leeway to put us out of the Atlantic-coast market and still be on a profitable basis to them and probably an unprofitable basis to west-coast lumber.

It has occurred to us that probably under the present set-up in Washington nothing can be done about the devaluation advantage, probably nothing can be done about their wage and stumpage advantage, nor could any import duty be imposed to equalize the difference in cost. However, it has occurred to us that it might be possible to equalize some of these large differences by imposing an excise tax on the difference between their transportation to the east coast compared with ours. In other words, if their rates were $6 to $8 less than ours, then a $6 to $8 excise tax would be imposed on this shipment as the ship arrives at east-coast ports. This would be a flexible tax, moving up or down with the prevailing charter rates, and if at such times there was no difference in their transportation rates compared with ours, no tax would be imposed.

If such a suggestion as this were possible and practical, it would appear to be a reasonable solution under our present politics and foreign policy. First, it would not involve a duty on Canadian lumber and involve in any way our reciprocal trade agreements with all their ramifications. Secondly, it would not impose any penalty or discrimination on Canadian lumber as they would still be able to compete on the Atlantic coast under the same transportation costs that American lumber would have. Thirdly, it eliminates discussion of a controversial issue of possibly subsidizing American shipping to compete with foreign shipping to our own domestic markets. Fourth, it would bring revenue to the Federal Government without discriminating against the Canadian mills by merely pocketing the difference between foreign shipping and American shipping to our own market and putting the American mills on the same basis, insofar as transportation is concerned, as Canadian mills to our own domestic market. Fifth, this should not be an unpopular request as it would have the full support of the lumber industry and its labor, and the full support of the American shipping interest and its maritime labor, and should not involve our foreign policy and reciprocal trade agreements as presently set up.

This approximate $10 advantage the British Columbia mills have can at any time put the west coast lumber industry almost totally out of this important Atlantic coast market, and along with it American intercoastal shipping and maritime labor.

We shall be glad to get your ideas on this subject and suggestions of what you think might be done or might not be done to meet this problem.

With best regards, we are,
Sincerely yours,

E. E. JOHNSON,
Vice President.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the transportation tax on property affects everyone. It is particularly iniquitous with reference to all agriculture and especially to the wheat farmer, the corn farmer, the cotton farmer, and those who raise crops in bulk which must have a market off the farm. I hope that when consideration is given to the amendment which has been accepted by the sponsor of the substitute he may feel that he can, under the parliamentary situation, accept this additional amendment. If that cannot be done, I desire to say now for the RECORD that I shall present the amendment at the appropriate time for action by the Senate on Tuesday. Equity in this country pleads for its adoption.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S FOREIGN TRADE PROGRAM

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate long, as the hour is late. I am sure we all wish to return to domestic bliss, and home will look more attractive as my speech goes on. I had planned to speak briefly on this subject, which is utterly unrelated to any of the matters which have been discussed here today, but in view of the situation I feel that I should get my statement in the RECORD.

There were approximately 1,000,000 more men out of work in December than in November. That is a matter of grave concern. It brings our total unemployed in the United States now close to 4,000,000. What the Senator from Oregon has said is an indication of one factor. In my home town in Maine, a woolen mill which has operated for 100 years is this month in process of liquidation as a result of the textile problem which we are facing in New England.

I have followed with keen interest the effect upon our imports and exports of the devaluation of the British currency in September, and of the acceptance of the Annecy agreements shortly thereafter, which were negotiated at Annecy, France, and were promulgated by our State Department under the reciprocal trade agreements shortly after the devaluation. I have always been puzzled as to how the Annecy agreements could be justified after devaluation if they were just before. That, however, is only an aggravation of the problem.

Following the report of the imports and exports for October and November, the 2 months following devaluation, the trend was extremely interesting.

The jobs of more than 1,000,000 American workers will be sacrificed to the administration's foreign trade program this year if current trends of export and import trade continue. Well over 3,500,000 men, women, and children will lose their meal tickets and 1,150,000 workers will find their jobs eliminated if exports continue to decline at the October and November 1949 rate while cheap labor imports of competitive products continue to increase at the October-November rate.

Imports increased $33,400,000 in October over September, and they increased another $33,600,000 in November over October, a total increase of $67,000,000 in 2 months and a continuation of this geometrical stepping up appears to be in the offing. If it should continue for even 1 year our imports would increase by about $100,000,000 in 3 months, $200,000,000 in 6 months, and the increase in the twelfth month would be $400,000,000 over that of September 1949.

The accumulation of each month's increase would mean that in the 12-month period following September 1949 we will bring into this country additional imports amounting to $2,600,000,000.

Now, on the other hand, exports decreased $53,100,000 in October from the September level, and they decreased another $13,600,000 in November, a total decline of $66,700,000 in the 2 months. The gradual strangulation of American exports in many foreign markets indicates that this trend will also continue—and, projecting them for 1 year, we find just the reverse of the imports—a loss valued at over $2,500,000,000, every cent of which can be definitely identified as a loss of business for the domestic producer and a loss of jobs to the workers.

It was apparently contemplated if we could increase our imports we would also increase our exports. That has not proved to be the case to date.

The estimated national product for 1949 — Department of Commerce — is $259,000,000,000, and the average employment, including the armed forces, has been officially estimated at around 59,500,000. Dividing the number of employees into the value of the product we find that the average workman in 1949 produced goods valued at $4,353. On that official basis is would take, for the production of $5,000,000,000 worth of goods, 1,150,000 men working for one full year.

I wish to offer for insertion in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article from the Wall Street Journal of January 11, 1950, entitled "Import Impact—Cheaper Foreign Goods Begin To Cut a Swath in Domestic Markets—They Hit United States Chinaware, Gloves, Sewing Machines, and Simulated Pearls—Protests Reach Washington."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I shall read very briefly from the article, showing that it details the effect of imports on small American manufacturers who are being forced to curtail profits because of an inflow of cheap-labor products manufactured abroad. I quote briefly from the article:

> Makers of a significant scattering of items—from simulated pearls to sewing machines to chinaware—are getting those import jitters once again.
>
> Reason for the latest reoccurrence of a well-known prewar ailment: Goods from Japan and Europe—

It should be clear in the RECORD that Japan and Germany are still in the most-favored-nation class, so that imports from those countries take the benefit of whatever reduction of duties may be put into effect at any time—

> are entering the United States market in increasing volume and at prices domestic producers find hard to meet.
>
> Take the Gelmart Knitting Mills, Inc., of Yonkers, N. Y. This firm has cut back its production of wool and cotton gloves 80 percent from a year ago. Gelmart still considers itself lucky, however, because it was able to get a supply of nylon for glove making. President Arthur Goldsmith explains the switch to the synthetic fabric: "Japan sells cotton string gloves to American jobbers at $5 for a dozen pairs. We have to get $9.75 a dozen, since our labor costs alone amount to $5."
>
> Other glove makers in the same Hudson River town are not so lucky. Reports the Hega Knitting Mills, "We're operating at 25 percent of capacity and our break-even point is 60 percent. And the outlook is worse. We may be forced to close down next year." * * * The York Glove Mills, also in Yonkers, looks for a 50-percent drop in its 1950 volume.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Wool-fabric makers are alarmed at the influx—at lower than domestic prices—of English and Italian merchandise. Better quality imported goods, according to trade reports, are landing duty-paid at $1.50 to $2 a yard below current New York quotations.
>
> Dinnerware manufacturers are more than alarmed: They cite Japanese and German imports as the main factor behind an estimated 25-percent dip in their sales last year below 1948. The Jackson Vitrified China Co., which claims to produce the least expensive chinaware set in the United States, says it is "unable to meet Japanese prices."
>
> * * * * *
>
> Several protesting groups are seeking import curbs and higher duties. These include northwestern nut growers, who ask a 50-percent hike in duties, and the Association of Knitted Glove and Mitten Manufacturers, which is pressing for a quota on shipments to this country.
>
> One United States maker of knitted berets, for instance, declares his labor costs are five to eight times those prevailing in France and Czechoslovakia. A manufacturer of wool fabrics puts his labor bill at triple the English level and five times the Italian rate.

The administration is sacrificing small American handicraft industries to foreign imports on the grounds that dollar earnings by foreign competitors will encourage American exports of automobiles and other mass-production items.

The fact is that while imports have risen to threaten small industries in America, exports have fallen off.

The increase in imports of competitive goods and the decrease in exports of all kinds of goods inevitably increases unemployment in the United States.

I have pointed out these possibilities as a firm reminder to those who clamor for increased use of foreign goods that the result of artificial stimulation of imports can very well mean extensive unemployment in this country. Some of our diplomats are either unaware of this, or they are ignoring it for what seems to them more important reasons.

One wonders how long unemployed Americans or their more fortunate but sympathetic fellows will desire to support the propaganda broadsides of the State Department to "buy foreign" and put American workmen out of jobs. In the eyes of this administration to "buy American" is almost treason.

I hold in my hands two recent Government publications designed to show foreign industries how to move into the American market.

One brochure of 130 pages is issued under the joint auspices of the ECA and

the Department of Commerce. The other is issued by the State Department. Both fail to disclose the sacrifice of some American industries that is involved and of thousands of American workers for the sake of what is alleged to be the larger whole.

There are other ways of balancing our international exchange budget that need not involve the loss of nearly so many jobs.

I trust that as time goes on the impact of these imports upon our domestic situation and the growing loss of exports that seems to be its concomitant will bring about such a situation that the administration will seriously reconsider its current trade policies, and will not in the case of our tariff rates carry the reductions which are now authorized under existing law some 20 to 30 percent further. Our tariff rates are now at the all-time low in the history of our country, averaging 6 percent on all our imports, and practically 12 percent on all our dutiable imports. I hope the administration will not undertake to bring about further reductions, as announced by the State Department as now being contemplated, but that they will reconsider, as they may under the escape clause, the existing cuts which are having such a devastating effect upon current employment in many sections of the country, and particularly in New England.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Wall Street Journal of January 11, 1950]

IMPORT IMPACT—CHEAPER FOREIGN GOODS BEGIN TO CUT A SWATH IN DOMESTIC MARKETS—THEY HIT UNITED STATES CHINAWARE, GLOVES, SEWING MACHINES, AND SIMULATED PEARLS—PROTESTS REACH WASHINGTON

(By Edward Bejan)

Makers of a significant scattering of items—from simulated pearls to sewing machines to chinaware—are getting those "import jitters" once again.

Reason for the latest reoccurrence of a well-known prewar ailment: Goods from Japan and Europe are entering the United States market in increasing volume and at prices domestic producers find hard to meet. These foreign wares constitute only a trickle, of course, compared with the enormous cutpouring of American factories, but they are already beginning to have an impact on certain industries.

Take the Gelmart Knitting Mills, Inc., of Yonkers, N. Y. This firm has cut back its production of wool and cotton gloves 80 percent from a year ago. Gelmart still considers itself lucky, however, because it was able to get a supply of nylon for glove making. President Arthur Goldsmith explains the switch to the synthetic fabric: "Japan sells cotton string gloves to American jobbers at $5 for a dozen pairs. We have to get $9.75 a dozen, since our labor costs alone amount to $5."

Other glove makers in the same Hudson River town are not so lucky. Reports the Hega Knitting Mills: "We're operating at 25 percent of capacity and our break-even point is 60 percent, and the outlook is worse. We may be forced to close down next year." The Sternwild Knitting Mills, Inc., which usually halted regular output for 30 days around this time of the year for sample making, says it will be slower resuming operations this year; the company's output before the current shut-down was running 25 to 30 percent below a year ago. The York Glove Mills, also in Yonkers, looks for a 50-percent drop in its 1950 volume.

THEY WERE DIFFERENT

American producers in the postwar era have tended to regard most imported products as different from home-made goods rather than as a competitive threat. They have in mind such things as Scotch whisky, Irish linen, and Belgian lace. Now, however, many a manufacturer sees foreign wares directly threatening his markets.

Up and down New York's Worth Street, textile hub of the country, merchants are keeping a nervous eye on Japanese cotton goods quotations. Dealers report some Nipponese-made "gray" textiles have already entered the United States at prices below those for corresponding American wares. One result: Anglo-American textile men are planning to send an exploratory group to Japan to size up the situation.

Wool-fabric makers are alarmed at the influx—at lower than domestic prices—of English and Italian merchandise. Better quality imported goods, according to trade reports, are landing duty-paid at $1.50 to $2 a yard below current New York quotations.

Dinnerware manufacturers are more than alarmed: They cite Japanese and German imports as the main factor behind an estimated 25-percent dip in their sales last year below 1948. The Jackson Vitrified China Co., which claims to produce the least expensive chinaware set in the United States, says it is unable to meet Japanese prices.

Reports Philip Distillator, Jackson's president: "A few months ago, Japanese producers trimmed the wholesale price of a typical 12-piece set from about $42 to $30. Our set was $50 then. We were forced to come down to $40, but we can't go any lower."

SEWING-MACHINE HEADS FROM JAPAN

Bulking large in the sewing-machine field are imports of Japanese heads—machines not yet installed in cabinets or equipped with electric motors. A spokesman for big Singer Manufacturing Co. estimates these are coming in by the thousands. One importer reports his sales of heads rose from about $10,000 in 1948 to well over $100,000 last year.

Several American manufacturers and distributors specialize in putting the Nipponese machines in cabinets and outfitting them with motors. Some do their own importing under exclusive contracts with Japanese plants. One of these, Bega Bros. Products Corp., says its sales of the imported machines have increased 200 percent over 1948. Morse Sewing Machine, which imports a unit to retail at $139, claims its current volume is running 25 percent over 1948 and "we sell everything we bring over."

A bargain hunter can pick up an inexpensive console-type Japanese-make machine today for around $95. In contrast, the cheapest Singer console model retails for $164.50.

Another major Japanese import—simulated glass-base pearls—is gaining a foothold in American markets. To meet the wholesale price of the imported beads—$1.50 a dozen necklaces in New York—United States makers have been forced to use plastic-base pearls. The catch is that domestic consumers prefer the glass-base pearls which are heavier and fit more snugly.

Some simulated pearl manufacturers, finding it difficult to meet this Japanese competition, are solving the problem by becoming importers. Ditchik Bros., for example, has trimmed its output some 50 percent and is importing merchandise to offset that cutback. Spencer Novelty Manufacturing Co. is now importing 25 percent of the wares it is selling.

BULB COMPETITION

"Killing" is the term used by flower bulb growers to describe competition from Holland. Says Arend Schravendeel of Schravendeel & Segers Sons, Inc.: "We should get $20 a thousand for gladiola bulbs but we have to sell at $9 to $10 to meet the Dutch price. Back in 1947, gladiola bulbs were bringing $45 to $50 a thousand." Mr. Schravendeel has watched his production at Palmyra, N. Y., shrink from 52 acres in 1948 to 15 acres today "and I don't know whether I'm going to be able to keep that much going."

Charges of foreign "dumping" are beginning to reach the Federal Tariff Commission in Washington. Among them: The Northwest Bulb Growers Association says the Dutch sometimes sell narcissus bulbs at a loss in this country to get badly needed dollars. The S. S. White Dental Manufacturing Co., Ransom & Randolph Co., and Lee S. Smith & Son Manufacturing Co. have lodged complaints that German dental burs offered to American buyers at $2.88 a gross are being sold to Brazilians for $3.60. American-made dental burs range from $5.82 to $7.73 a gross.

United States customs regulations prescribe a special duty for goods that are dumped, the penalty consists of the difference between the purchase price and the foreign market value on the date of purchase or the difference between the purchase price and the cost of production.

Several protesting groups are seeking import curbs and higher duties. These include northwestern nut growers, who ask a 50-percent hike in duties, and the Association of Knitted Glove and Mitten Manufacturers, which is pressing for a quota on shipments to this country.

Their chances of getting such restrictions, manufacturers agree, are slim. ECA and other Government officials have long been urging increased imports to close the trade gap; United States overseas purchases still lag far behind shipments abroad.

Lower labor costs are a big factor in foreign manufacturers' successful invasion of American markets. One United States maker of knitted berets, for instance, declares his labor costs are five to eight times those prevailing in France and Czechoslovakia. A manufacturer of wool fabrics puts his labor bill at triple the English level and five times the Italian rate.

Ability of overseas producers to make speedier delivery than before is also aiding the sale of foreign goods. And finally, say importers, merchandise produced abroad has improved considerably in quality during the past year. Harold Wilson, president of the British Board of Trade, mentions that he didn't hear a single complaint about the quality of English wares during a recent trip to United States cities.

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 11 o'clock a. m. on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, took a recess until Tuesday, January 17, 1950, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 13 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

The following-named persons to be members of the United States Advisory Commission on Information for terms of 3 years expiring January 27, 1953, and until their successors have been appointed and qualified (reappointments):

Mark A. May, of Connecticut.
Justin Miller, of California.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Charles S. Reed 2d, of Ohio, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Edmund A. Gullion, of Kentucky, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 5 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Weldon Litsey, of Wyoming.
Leslie Albion Squires, of California.
Richard A. Poole, of New Jersey.
Randolph Roberts, of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Antonio Certosimo, of New York.
Harold E. Hall, of Utah.
Robert W. Harding, of New York.
Harris R. Hungerford, of Maryland.
Richard E. Kleinhans, of New Jersey.
Thomas C. M. Robinson, of Maryland.
Joseph E. Wiedenmayer, of New Jersey.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

R. Clyde Larkin, of Maryland.
Thomas G. Murdock, of North Carolina.
Wilson E. Sweeney, of Virginia.
Robert E. Ward, Jr., of South Carolina.
Miss Nancy H. MacLennan, of New York, a Foreign Service reserve officer, to be a vice consul of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Richard H. Sanger, of Maryland.
C. Edward Wells, of New York.
Woodbury Willoughby, of Virginia.
Murray M. Wise, of Indiana.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

John A. Carver, of Idaho, to be United States attorney for the district of Idaho. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired September 28, 1949.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Everett M. Evans, of Idaho, to be United States marshal for the district of Idaho. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired October 11, 1949.

Chester M. Foresman, of North Dakota, to be United States marshal for the district of North Dakota. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired November 19, 1949.

Edward Lawrence Burke, of Vermont, to be United States marshal for the district of Vermont. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 18, 1949.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the United States Navy to the grades and corps indicated:

CAPTAIN, LINE

Bon, Francis J.
Eagleton, William L.
Walker, Philip A.
Ward, Chester, C.

COMMANDER, LINE

Abercrombie, Theodore J.
Albrink, Frederick S.
Bodziak, Edmund J.
Boyle, John J.
Brooks, Tilden L.
Burke, Edmund, Jr.
Cole, Charles T.
Davis, Jack C.
De Vico, Anthony J.
Di Pirro, Charles
Fisher, Guin M.
Greenberg, Mack K.
Harrison, Cecil R.
Hogan, Richard J., Jr.
Humphreys, Thomas H., Jr.
Hunsicker, Charles, Jr.
Kenny, Edward T.
Lowe, Frank W., Jr.
Miller, Hugh B., Jr.
Moloney, Ralph T.
Nichols, Edwin H.
O'Bannon, Albert L.
Page, James C.
Robinson, Martin W.
Ryan, Richard E.
Smith, Emory C.
Whiteman, Armand D.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, LINE

Bradbury Malcolm J.
Carlisle, Geoffrey E.
Forshee, Francis L.
Gibbons, John P.
Groom, Ralph A.
Hughes, James L., Jr.
Hutchinson, Harold
Katz, Saul
Kiracofe, Warren C.
Krouse, Gale E.
Larkin, Murl A.
Miller, Ashton C., Jr.
Mazalewski, Raymond A.
Smith, Thomas P., Jr.
Warnes, James T.

LIEUTENANT, LINE

Kelley, Fonville

LIEUTENANT, DENTAL CORPS

Steinauer, Jerome J.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Shifflette, Charles H.

LIEUTENANT, NURSE CORPS

Davis, Bertha M.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment in the United States Navy to the grades and corps indicated:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE), LINE

Adams, Alfred E.
Grantham, Delbert D.
Kosnik, Joseph T.
Marshall, Frank D.
Matthews, Pierce Y., Jr.
Wood, William B., Jr.
Woods, Kenneth

ENSIGN, LINE

Remsen, Henry

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS

Hoffman, Lloyd K.
Richardson, William C.

LIEUTENANT, SUPPLY CORPS

Sanders, Roy N.

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE), SUPPLY CORPS

Johnson, John T.
Thompson, Robert W.

ENSIGN, SUPPLY CORPS

Ward, Gretchen N.

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE), CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Dietrich, Neff T., Jr.
Rumble, James D.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, NURSE CORPS

Pennington, Clyde B.

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE), NURSE CORPS

Brennan, Muriel L.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment in the line of the Naval Reserve to the grade indicated:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Boeckh, Victor H., Jr.
McDaris, Charles H.
Pevear, Roger
Skelly, William J.
Stanford, Robert F.

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950:

Alfred R. Ackley
Emmett R. Aillaud, Jr.
Robert A. Beavers
Daniel Bergman
Joel T. Biles
David A. Blalock
Fred H. Bonekamp
Leo Boston
Richard S. Bradley
Elwood E. Brey
James Brogan
Andrew G. Brtis
Robert B. Cavanagh, Jr.
Thomas J. Cawley
David Cheney
Edwin H. Cherry, Jr.
John J. Cotchen
William D. Cracraft
Otho W. Crowl
Warren J. Cusack
Ralph F. Daly
Allen A. Denton, Jr.
Ralph G. Dermott
William R. Dinsmore
Fred S. Etherton
Albert D. Fox
Charles L. Gibson
Kevin Giffen
Burton H. Gilpin
Niles R. Gooding, Jr.
Richard E. Gregory
James A. Guggenbiller
Lealand P. Hage
Paul R. Harlin
Donald E. Herbert
Alexander A. Holeczy
Daren W. Johnson
Everett E. Kelley
Russell M. Killingsworth
Robert L. McCombie
Dewey W. McCrary
Emiddio Massa
Orman V. Mehner
Donald S. Munger
William I. Parrish
Robert L. Pelton
Charles T. Phillips
Robert W. Pollard
William J. Powell
James W. Roebuck
Wayne E. Severson
Gilbert L. Summers
Alex L. Sundstrom
Thomas H. Thornburg
Elmer M. Tollgard
Donald S. Ward
Carlton L. Wilgus
Neal R. Wooden

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 3d day of June 1949, in lieu of ensigns in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed to correct name:

Albert G. Kuehnapfel
Wencil M. Stanek

The following-named (naval R. O. T. C.) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950:

Thomas S. Bryan
Walter D. Chaney
Melvin "S" Cook
Ronald F. Dick
Herbert C. Oakes
John E. O'Drain
John McN. Pulliam
Winston W. Salter
Edward L. St. Ville
Edward J. Walsh

James Thrash (naval R. O. T. C.) to be an ensign in the Navy, from the 3d day of June 1949.

The following-named (naval R. O. T. C.) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950:

Samuel D. Dawkins, Jr.
George P. Kramer
Edward G. Smith

The following-named (naval R. O. T. C.) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950:

Donald C. Harder, Jr.
Thomas E. McHale
John F. Mitchell

The following-named (naval R. O. T. C.) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, from the 2d day of June 1950:

Robert G. Acheson
Peter F. C. Armstrong
Edwin H. Arnaudin, Jr.
Harold Arutunian
Joe M. Barnes
Robert H. Berkshire
James L. Black
Malcolm R. Blakeslee, Jr.
James M. Brannaman
Paul W. Brosman, Jr.
Frederick F. Brower, Jr.
Francis A. Brewster
Robert H. Brunker
Richard H. Burnett
Franklin K. Burns
James B. Callahan
Donald A. Campbell
Richard E. Campbell
Gary J. Carle
Ralph W. Carver
Bruce Chandler
Will J. Clardy, Jr.
William F. Clarkson, Jr.
John T. Cooper
Lawrence G. Copeland
Eugene T. Corcoran
John E. Courtney
James P. Cowley
Randle C. Cox
James J. Creamer
James P. Cruise
David I. Curtis
John S. Daggett
Albion C. Deane III
Claude E. Deering, Jr.
Lawrence E. Donegan, Jr.
Tommie G. Dudley
Maurice G. Duncan
William D. Duryea II
Robert A. Eccles, Jr.
Robert LaM. Egbert
Vernon G. Eisenbraun
Adolf F. Ems
Robert B. Farrell
Don P. Ferguson
James J. Ferro
William B. Fleming
Ernest C. Friesen, Jr.
Winfield P. Fuller, Jr.
Robert B. Gawne
Walter Gibbs, Jr.
Hobart C. Gottlieb
Edward F. Green
Herman H. Hamilton
Orville W. Hampton
Eugene F. Hertling
William L. Heuser, Jr.
John H. Hews
Charles J. Hoffman
Kenneth D. Hornbacher
Albert B. Jeffers, Jr.
Homer E. Johnson
Warren R. Johnson
Gale A. Katz
Paul X. Kelley
Kenneth J. Killgore
Raymond H. Koch
Jered Krohn
Ronald H. Laack
Richard E. Lafreniere
Richard M. Larsen
Robert L. Larson
James S. LeVoy
Richard D. Lindow
Robert A. Louis
Louis P. Louro
Nolan Lushington
Paul F. McBain
Bain McClintock
Darrell L. McCormick
Robert F. McCulloch
Keith E. McKee
Paul S. Maeder
Robert B. March
Jerry F. Mathis
Eric T. Miller
Roddey B. Moss
Stewart A. Munroe, Jr.

Walter F. Murphy, Jr.
Harvey A. P. Myers III
James W. Myers
Hal S. Needham
Murray L. Nelson
Aloysius E. O'Flaherty III
Howard B. Olson
Glenn E. Omholt
Peter G. Paraskos
Davis R. Parker
David A. Patriquin
Robert C. Phelps
Jack N. Phillips
Reagan L. Freis
Robert E. Presson
Kenneth F. Provost
David J. Pudas
Joseph D. Reed
James L. Rice
Nicholas E. Ries, Jr.
Elmer P. Rieser
Harvey F. Robbins
Ray C. Roberts, Jr.
Donald E. Ross
Philip F. Ruppel
Richard W. Scott
William E. Shackelford
Donald DeL. Shrier
Charles A. Sloan, Jr.
Erin D. Smith
Richard J. Smith
James E. Spangler
David M. Staples
John S. Steel
Richard B. Steinmetz, Jr.
Richard L. Stemshoel
Alexander M. Stewart
Samuel T. Stumbo
Joel D. Sugg
Oral R. Swigart, Jr.
Aubrey W. Talbert, Jr.
Arvin C. Teschner
Richard L. Thompson
William S. Torrance
Dallas B. Trammel
Richard E. Tremblay
Thomas G. Troxel, Jr.
George F. Tubley
Edward F. Tucker
Thomas A. Tweedy
Wendell N. Vest
Paul G. White
Robert M. Wilkins
David W. Wilkinson
Walter G. Wilson
William B. Wilson, Jr.
Edwin W. Wislar
Frederick M. Woeller
Roger Wolin
James L. Wood
Kenneth W. Yonkman
Thomas S. Young III
Marvin H. Zelibor
Joe F. Zuccarello

The following-named women (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Rosemarie S. Armstrong
Emily C. Bittner
Betty J. Bloxsom
Dorothy A. Borbidge
Bonnie M. Brunner
Beverly J. Cytron
Dorothy J. Darr
Barbara J. Dobson
Ludean S. Earnest
Eleanor M. Edwardson
Gloria J. Folger
Jimmie R. Fralic
Dorothy M. Funk
Maryvonne L. Herron
Dolores T. Heutte
Peggie R. Holliday
Margaret A. Hubbell
Kathrine V. Iams
Betty M. Krett
Donna J. Mueller
Audrey R. Murray
Rhea N. Parker
Elizabeth A. Read
Ada L. Reed
Susan K. Reed
Marjorie L. Richardson
Jeanne M. Schrumpf
Mary A. Wilkinson
Joan E. Zook

Bennett F. Avery (civilian college graduate) to be a commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

John D. Bealer
Deck E. Chandler
Konstantin H. Geocaris
Robert C. Hastedt
Dale A. Hudson
James J. Humes
Maurice N. Johnson
Billy D. McKneely
Donald J. MacPherson
Pierce P. Newman, Jr.
Joseph A. Witt

The following-named women (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Elizabeth Baker
Patricia E. Blakely
Elizabeth Campion
Ruth A. Dinsmore
Alys I. George
Barbara J. Peterson
Elizabeth C. Schwartz

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, from the 3d day of June 1949:

Frederick B. Bunke
Stephen R. Edson, Jr.
Alfred S. Kulczycki
Robert T. Mayo
Elvin L. Van Zee

Chester T. Radecki (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, from the 3d day of June 1949.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Milton C. Kohler
Philip E. McLaughlin
Ray A. Rigterink

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Travis W. Drummond
Ray F. Paige

Vera L. Ortynsky (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Helen M. Balashek
Ella Barber
Myrtis R. Beaudrot
Dorothy E. Blackmore
Lola C. Bull
Mattie L. Chandler
Irene M. Chulack
Audrey M. Devaney
Mary T. Duhamel
Bernice E. Fenn
Pearl Y. Gasper
Helen M. Gustas
Eva V. Haring
Olive J. Haskew
Betty J. Hogan
Mary N. Hood
Dolores G. Irion
Kathryn D. Kutina
Betty J. Lewis
Gloria L. McIntyre
Mildred J. Pastrana
Ruth A. Petchesky
Onis Spinks
Vivian I. Tedder
Loraine H. Tourville
Joan Warmack
Fern R. Warnes
Charlene T. Yasiunas
Joycelaine M. Zimmerman
Adela DeL. Zubke

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

COMMANDER

LeRoy F. Friend

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

George M. Bell

LIEUTENANTS

David J. Greiner
Harold V. Palmer

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Richard H. Lee
Markham J. Anderson
Willard P. Arentzen
Donald T. Kelley

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

Thomas J. Hanson

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

James E. Naser

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

Clarence W. Bowman

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

Emma H. Lichtenwald

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Kathyrn C. Duprea
Mae I. Schumm

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 16, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty! Heaven and earth are full of Thy goodness; glory be to Thy holy name. We praise Thee that Thy love and mercy are over all, and blessed for evermore.

In the spirit of gratitude we come to Thee, with faith and confidence in those great virtues that make for righteousness in man and stability in government. O make us strong with Thy strength, make us wise with Thy wisdom, and make us better with the sense of Thy goodness. As instruments in Thy hands, help us to be diligent in all good works, and thus bring honor to our country and our God. We pray in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 12, 1950, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY at a testimonial dinner for William L. Boyle at Kansas City, Mo., on September 29, 1949.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include therein some appropriate printed matter.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

COTTON-ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is important that we give careful consideration to remedying the cotton-acreage allotments.

At the time the bill was being considered, prior to its passage, I appeared before the House Agricultural Committee and offered several amendments which would have relieved the inequities which we now face.

Our State and county PMA officials and committeemen are not to blame for our present predicament.

Later, I offered several amendments on the floor of the House during the debate on the measure, and warned the membership that the acceptance of my amendments was imperative. However, the amendments were not accepted.

Last week I appeared before the House Agricultural Committee and urged the adoption of certain other amendments

which I submitted. The adoption of the Cooley amendment will not be sufficient to remedy the inequities. We must make a provision that an individual farmer be allowed to plant at least 70 percent of the average acreage planted to cotton or war crops, combined, in the years 1941 to 1948, inclusive, or at least 50 percent of any of those years, including 1949, whichever is the greater acreage. It will also be necessary that we provide for reallocation of acreage within the county and State in order that those who do not desire to plant may release the unused or frozen acreage to those who need it. This would be done through the county committees. One-half of the acreage should be reallocated by the county committee, and the remainder by the State PMA.

Many farmers, including thousands of veterans, have purchased farms in 1948 and 1949 with the expressed intention of raising cotton, and should be considered, and the minimum should be adopted which would provide a specified separate allotment for irrigated areas like the Lugert-Altus, Okla., area, which would not take away any of the acreage from dry-land farmers.

There should be a provision adopted which would grant an appeal from BAE acreage figures.

We should also adopt an amendment which would allow any cotton farmer to vote, not just those who raised cotton in 1948.

We should likewise adopt my amendment which would provide for the swapping of wheat and cotton acreage allotments at the county and State levels, just so the acreage did not exceed our county and State allotments.

The act should have been based on the historical basis instead of tillable-acreage basis.

An amendment should be adopted that would insure that each family has sufficient cotton acreage to provide a living. In other words, each family should have enough acreage to provide an economic family operating unit.

Twenty years ago Oklahoma was at one time the largest cotton-producing State, and was second in acreage in the Nation. We had four times as much cotton acreage as is now allotted. Oklahoma farmers have been taught the advantages of diversifying, and as a result have diverted considerable cotton acreage to wheat and other commodities in the last few years, due to labor conditions, diversification, price, and climatic conditions, and because farmers were urged to diversify to war crops in 1945, 1946, and 1947, and because of the fact that we farm our land in 1-, 2-, and 3-year cycles, alternating between wheat, cotton, grain sorghums, and other crops.

I desire to read a letter from the PMA executive officer, together with tabulations relating to the various amendments:

STILLWATER, OKLA., *January 9, 1950.*

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WICKERSHAM: As you requested in our telephone conversation today, we are sending a tabulation by counties showing the estimated acreage which would be required "to provide each farm with (1) 70 percent of the 1946–48 average actual cotton acreage, (2) 50 percent of the highest planted cotton acreage, including war crop credit for 1946, 1947, or 1948, (3) higher of 70 percent or 50 percent as outlined above." These estimates were made by the county committees on the basis of a 10-percent sample of farms.

Because of the time allowed and the lack of any sound basis, we are unable to give you any estimate by counties of the additional acreage which would be required had the 70-percent provision included the war crop credit. However, we doubt whether the inclusion of this acreage would make any substantial difference in the total acreage required, probably 8,000 or 10,000 acres for the State.

We have also enclosed a tabulation showing the comparison between the 1942 and 1950 cotton allotment. You will notice that Osage and Pawnee Counties are the only counties in which the 1950 allotment is equal to the 1942 allotment.

In connection with the release and reapportionment provision which we discussed in our conversation, the county committee estimated that approximately 70,000 acres would be released for reapportionment if a provision similar to that contained in past programs was provided by law. The State committee is of the opinion that this is probably too conservative.

The State committee is very anxious that a release and reapportionment provision be made immediately for use in connection with the 1950 program. This would provide the county committees with a means of alleviating many of the hardship cases and adjusting some of the inequities.

I hope that this information will be helpful to you and that you will call on us for any additional information that you require.

Very truly yours,

H. P. MOFFITT,
Executive Officer.

Additional acreage required to provide each farm

District and county	70 percent of 1946–48 average adjusted cotton acreage	50 percent of highest planted cotton+war crop for 1946, 1947, and 1948	Higher of column 1 (70 percent) or column 2 (50 percent)	Estimated acres that would be released for reapportionment
District 1: Ellis	14	199	199	50
District 2:				
Garfield	0	0	0	0
Kay	----	----	----	100
Major	----	130	130	175
Noble	175	905	905	450
Woodward	17	45	48	43
Total	192	1,080	1,083	768
District 3:				
Craig	12	9	14	10
Mayes	100	307	352	224
Nowata	27	69	77	0
Osage	1,535	1,614	2,021	200
Pawnee	315	1,192	1,347	500
Rogers	208	237	324	250
Tulsa	220	443	506	204
Wagoner	530	945	1,129	3,000
Washington	18	22	25	37
Total	2,965	4,838	5,795	4,425
District 4:				
Beckham	3,173	2,678	4,718	700
Blaine	466	344	675	2,500
Custer	1,011	1,264	1,630	2,000
Dewey	1,119	1,538	1,782	350
Roger Mills	1,564	1,689	2,303	200
Washita	180	1,459	1,591	500
Total	7,513	8,972	12,699	6,250

Additional acreage required to provide each farm—Continued

District and county	70 percent of 1946–48 average adjusted cotton acreage	50 percent of highest planted cotton+war crop for 1946, 1947, and 1948	Higher of column 1 (70 percent) or column 2 (50 percent)	Estimated acres that would be released for reapportionment
District 5:				
Canadian	589	2,294	2,500	700
Cleveland	106	270	330	500
Creek	387	387	690	900
Grady	2,507	4,150	4,858	5,000
Kingfisher	411	356	475	275
Lincoln	85	263	314	2,000
Logan	268	751	807	750
McClain	861	1,617	2,065	1,500
Okfuskee	555	1,211	1,470	1,000
Oklahoma	143	501	586	700
Payne	145	707	752	700
Pottawatomie	350	782	782	1,500
Seminole	152	284	348	498
Total	6,559	13,573	15,977	16,023
District 6:				
Adair	4	2	4	25
Cherokee	4	----	4	250
Haskell	687	1,139	1,139	1,000
Hughes	586	1,580	1,666	2,000
McIntosh	1,306	1,005	1,560	2,000
Muskogee	1,437	922	1,828	1,000
Okmulgee	931	687	1,341	7,000
Pittsburg	867	263	883	500
Sequoyah	723	975	1,025	500
Total	6,545	6,573	9,450	14,275
District 7:				
Caddo	2,573	5,170	6,436	1,200
Comanche	741	3,213	3,400	800
Cotton	652	1,770	2,277	1,000
Greer	3,904	597	4,171	1,000
Harmon	----	153	153	3,000
Jackson	3,923	2,147	4,848	250
Kiowa	1,575	2,995	3,839	300
Tillman	1,095	2,628	2,835	1,750
Total	14,463	18,673	27,959	9,300
District 8:				
Atoka	492	1,037	1,168	325
Bryan	615	2,631	2,772	4,000
Carter	292	566	599	500
Coal	87	118	128	400
Garvin	157	477	585	1,500
Jefferson	6,838	3,945	6,579	800
Johnston	155	153	212	200
Love	568	643	903	1,500
Marshall	215	315	429	580
Murray	51	167	167	600
Pontotoc	34	224	224	550
Stephens	1,271	2,209	2,675	3,000
Total	10,775	12,485	16,441	13,955
District 9:				
Choctaw	680	1,142	1,342	1,653
Latimer	31	189	193	400
LeFlore	773	842	1,266	1,500
McCurtain	506	722	855	1,800
Pushmataha	80	200	220	500
Total	2,070	3,095	3,876	5,853
State total	51,096	69,488	93,479	70,899

Oklahoma cotton allotments

District and county	1942	1950
District 1: Ellis	4,353	452
District 2:		
Garfield	329	78
Grant	22	----
Kay	642	500
Major	2,438	700
Noble	5,018	2,400
Woodward	1,293	143
Total	9,742	3,821
District 3:		
Craig	1,006	140
Delaware	118	4
Mayes	7,263	2,946
Nowata	2,108	777
Osage	9,784	11,412
Ottawa	45	2
Pawnee	11,035	11,200
Rogers	7,717	3,320
Tulsa	10,390	7,877

Oklahoma cotton allotments—Continued

District and county	1942	1950
District 3—Continued		
Wagoner	34,196	29,403
Washington	588	236
Total	84,250	67,317
District 4:		
Beckham	92,363	65,500
Blaine	29,517	12,156
Custer	36,688	18,226
Dewey	21,446	6,994
Roger Mills	49,038	19,309
Washita	108,806	85,000
	337,858	207,176
District 5:		
Canadian	23,486	12,600
Cleveland	16,992	5,334
Creek	34,134	16,804
Grady	78,219	33,575
Kingfisher	9,483	1,572
Lincoln	37,025	11,802
Logan	21,893	8,142
McClain	49,966	20,737
Okfuskee	44,123	28,136
Oklahoma	13,842	2,758
Payne	18,498	7,038
Pottawatomie	30,655	7,284
Seminole	25,315	7,546
	403,631	163,328
District 6:		
Adair	336	53
Cherokee	7,291	1,103
Haskell	23,274	10,000
Hughes	33,953	16,379
McIntosh	48,822	33,500
Muskogee	57,649	49,232
Okmulgee	36,965	32,500
Pittsburg	33,708	18,500
Sequoyah	22,775	6,247
Total	264,773	167,514
District 7:		
Caddo	112,750	61,340
Comanche	42,042	16,883
Cotton	46,291	18,960
Greer	75,240	52,000
Harmon	59,230	55,822
Jackson	104,565	67,123
Kiowa	92,478	52,238
Tillman	110,272	60,601
Total	642,868	384,967
District 8:		
Atoka	15,742	4,819
Bryan	49,310	26,700
Carter	20,237	4,139
Coal	16,128	8,000
Garvin	48,770	15,495
Jefferson	48,653	27,000
Johnston	18,424	5,335
Love	24,905	15,700
Marshall	16,502	7,988
Murray	10,689	2,288
Pontotoc	22,000	4,993
Stephens	44,270	18,613
Total	335,630	141,071
District 9:		
Choctaw	28,868	13,400
Latimer	4,964	1,400
Le Flore	37,492	15,800
McCurtain	39,251	21,767
Pushmataha	8,393	2,057
Total	118,968	54,424
State total	2,202,073	1,190,070

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. EVINS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. TACKETT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GREEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. RAMSAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD covering a survey and report of the Port Control Division of the Bureau of Customs.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three letters.

Mr. KEE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and in each to include a brief newspaper article.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and attach extraneous matter.

COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I recall, if I am not mistaken, when the cotton acreage allotment legislation was before us in August we had only 1 hour of general debate. I furthermore recall that it was difficult to get time to speak on the amendment to it offered in October 1949. I sincerely trust that the Committee on Agriculture, when the resolution is brought to this floor, will see that ample time for discussion of these important cotton acreage allotment proposals is available.

I have a letter from a veteran in Van Zandt County in which he says:

I have a wife and four children. I was raised on a farm. After spending 2 years overseas in the Navy during the war I came home to start farming for myself. I've done very well up until now. I bought a place this last November through the Farmers Home Administration. But I am going to lose it unless you help me. The farm consists of 161 acres and sold for $9,900. The land has been laying out for several years, and therefore I cannot get either a cotton or peanut allotment. It is very good cotton land and I am a cotton farmer. I worked part of the land last year and made about one-half bale of cotton to the acre. Could you tell me what to do? If I lose it, the Government will never buy me another farm. I am sure to lose it unless you can help.

It is obvious the Government in one instance undertakes to put this veteran in a secure position to farm and then through the inadequacy of the acreage given him to farm takes from him the opportunity to pay for the very farm it helped him to buy.

I enclose his full letter:

CANTON, TEX., *January 12, 1950.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I have a wife and four children. I was raised on a farm. After spending 2 years overseas in the Navy during the war I came home to start farming for myself. I've done very well up until now. I bought a place this last November through the Farmers Home Administration, but I am going to lose it unless you help me. The farm consists of 161 acres and sold for $9,900. The land has been laying out for several years and therefore I cannot get either a cotton or peanut allotment. It is very good cotton land and I am a cotton farmer. I worked part of the land last year and made about one-half bale of cotton to the acre. Could you tell me what to do? If I lose it, the Government will never buy me another farm. I am sure to lose it unless you can help.

Yours truly,

JOHN T. ATHERTON.

It is shown that one county, for example, has 500 families that will not be able to farm because of the present cotton-acreage legislation that has been written. Unless the so-called Cooley resolution is much different from what I have heard it is, I think the facts will show that this country will get only about an additional 1,500 acres. It is obvious that 1,500 acres will not take care of 500 families. I certainly hope the bill can be amended, as the people down there are hoping it will be amended, in order that genuine, family-sized, cotton farmers can remain on the farm, because getting a job today is not the easiest undertaking in the world.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. COX. Maladministration of this law has put hundreds of farmers on the road looking for jobs in my State.

Mr. BECKWORTH. There is more to it than maladministration.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include some letters I have received:

TYLER, TEX., *January 10, 1950.*

Hon. Mr. BECKWORTH:

I am wondering tonight as I read through your documents from the first session of the Congress and wondering what will become of the little farmer. I have a 135-acre farm and children farming that land and five of them have families on the farm. And the allotment on the farm to plant in cotton is 5 1/10 acres for the five crops. If there can be any remedy in our favor I do favor more acres. I will appreciate your efforts for the same. Please let me hear from you at an early date. Thanking you for past favors.

Respectfully,

CHARLES MAYFIELD.

P. S.—The war had my boys and now they are back on the farms to try and make a living. Please tell me what can be done about this matter.

CARTHAGE, TEX., *January 11, 1950.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you about this cotton allotment. I don't know how you all think the people are going to live down here. We have just been planting enough to get by, and now with this cut we can't get by. It has ruined the people in this part of the country. There are just lots of us can't make enough to pay back what it would take to make a crop, and there will be lots of people that can't borrow any money.

There are just lots of places that are just allowed 5 or 6 acres. Take me, I have farmed all of my life. Take back during the war, I stayed on the farm renting the other fellow's land and now I have bought 100 acres 3 years ago and I have a little over 40 acres in cropland. And I have not found out how

much cotton I can plant yet, but they told me it would be about 5 or 6 acres, and a man can't live on that amount of cotton much less pay for a place. There isn't anything right about it and I think it is high time to do something about it and I would be glad to hear from you and I want you to do something about it.

Well, I will close hoping to hear from you soon.

S. F. MAINES.

HENDERSON, TEX., *January 14, 1950.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LINDLEY: I have 270 acres in my farm, 138 in cultivation. I only get 8 acres. Can't rent my farm. Can't you help? Happy New Year.

MARTHA HAMLETT.

GRAND SALINE, TEX., *January 10, 1950.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I have two 100-acre farms near Edgewood in Van Zandt County. Each of these farms has about 90 acres tillable land, one of them being your grandfather's old home place south of Edgewood and the other north of Edgewood.

It has been some 5 years since either of these farms had any cotton on it and I find it almost impossible to rent either this year unless I am allowed to have cotton planted. Will you do what you can to assist me in getting cotton acreage allotment on each farm for the current year? If I am not allowed an allotment, and have cotton planted regardless, please advise me what penalty if any for such action and would I be allowed to market the cotton.

Wishing you the best of success, I am,

Yours very truly,

W. L. PETTIGREW.

CARTHAGE, TEX., *January 5, 1950.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Third District, Texas,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will answer your letter of December 23, 1949, regarding proposed legislation to relieve the deplorable situation that cotton growers in Panola County, Tex., find themselves. No doubt the same conditions exist in most of east Texas, parts of Arkansas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Alabama, Georgia, and the northern part of Mississippi. In referring to these areas, I have in mind sections of the country where poorer land and smaller farms are located. They were populated with people, both colored and white, with limited education, small incomes, large families, and low credit ratings. Then the war came and age groups affected by selective service could not be deferred because of insufficient units on these small farms. For economical and patriotic reasons those rejected for military service went to nearby shipyards, defense plants, and other employment necessary to the war effort and even to large farms in other sections of the country where farming is carried out on a mass-production scale. Rising prices made it necessary that they earn more money than could be expected from a small farm.

After the war was over these farmers did not readily return to the farm for economical reasons. This resulted in little or no cotton history on many farms in Panola County during the base period—1946–48. In fact 1,300 of the 2,860 farms in this county have no cotton history. Many of these farm people that we refer to have returned to their farms now, because industries are catching up with orders and this labor is no longer needed. Since industry is not obligated to pay men they don't need, these people must be allowed the privilege of earning a living and farming is all they know. This county has only 1,000 acres of cotton allotment to give these nonhistory farms and if one-half of this 1,300 apply for an allotment, there will be less than 2 acres of cotton allowed for each farm. On these 1,560 history farms in Panola County, most of them will be allowed less than 14 percent of their cropland for a cotton allotment—the county factor is .1393. This situation makes many farmers unreasonable to talk to and you can hardly blame them. Their normal farm life was interrupted by the war and they became displaced persons for such period and it will take time, even a longer period of time, for their readjustment than most any other industry. By comparison, farmers were allowed over 31 percent of their cropland for a cotton allotment before the war.

You asked about the proposed 70–50 amendment for the sections of the country that we mention, but I doubt if very much relief can come from this amendment. In this country it was necessary to make severe downward adjustments in cotton acreages reported by the farmer, to come within BAE estimates. These adjustments had to be made on an individual farm basis and when the farmer complained he was told that such adjustment would not affect his cotton allotment because at least 1 of the 3 years 1946, 1947, or 1948 had been left reasonably high. We told him wrong if the 70–50 amendment is passed and many appeal cases will result.

You asked what provisions would be needed to give some relief. I will say an amendment as follows would give us much relief and not take too much additional cotton acreage: (1) Irrespective of the county factor, the cotton allotment on any history farm shall not be less than 75 percent of the highest acreage reported by the farmer to be planted to cotton in 1946, 1947, or 1948 but not to exceed 30 percent of the cropland on the farm. (2) Grant additional cotton acreage to the county committee for distribution to extreme hardship cases including nonhistory farms. (3) Allow unused cotton acreage to be returned to the county committee for redistribution to other farms.

This is what I think about the situation in general. We are dealing with the same farmer who grew cotton for 5 and 6 cents per pound in the early thirties. That is why they voted for marketing quotas on December 15, 1949, and not because they were satisfied with their newly established allotment. They do have hopes, however, that some relief will be offered when Congress meets in January. Mr. BECKWORTH, I believe you will agree, it's no time for anyone to be trying to place the blame on the other fellow for criticizing or grabbing glory. The welfare of many people are affected and cannot be helped by "passing the buck." I have confidence in Congress and the Department of Agriculture working out a program fair to the areas of the country that I mention.

Be assured of my sincere appreciation for your personal interest in this subject. With kindest regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

T. L. VINCENT,
Secretary, Panola County PMA.

HENDERSON, TEX., *January 10, 1950.*

Mr. BECKWORTH.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you in regard to my farms. I have 278.02 acres of cultivated land and five tenant houses and they did not give me any land to work in cotton. It looks like I ought to have got some acres. Everybody around me got some acres but me. I would like for you to tell me how to get some land so the tenants can grow some cotton, if they don't get some it is going to be the worse depression that has been in this part of section in many years.

If there is any way you see to help me, will appreciate it.

Your friend,

H. E. PRICE.

JANUARY 11, 1950.

Mr. B. F. VANCE,
Production and Marketing Administration, Department of Agriculture, College Station, Tex.:

Please wire me immediately why you reserved only 3.7 percent for State reserve cotton acreage rather than 10 percent for reserve.

LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress.

Note why no higher percentage was reserved by the State committee:

COLLEGE STATION, TEX., *January 11, 1950.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Less than 10 percent of State cotton allotment was reserved by committee for the reason that it was felt that the amount reserved was enough to take away from the stable cotton-producing area of Texas. Details relative to studies made by committee too voluminous to wire.

B. F. VANCE.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Tyler, Tex., January 10, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: About 300 to 400 additional acres would be given to Smith County if the 70-percent amendment were added. This is taking into consideration that we were required to adjust downward the reported acreage to get within the BAE figures. If the actual farmers' reported acreage were used as a basis it would greatly help this county.

The number of acres that we have to distribute to old cotton farms which grew cotton first since the war in 1949 is 600 acres, new farms will have to draw their allotment from this same 600 acres. There are 5,600 farms in this county. Only 2,190 of these were eligible to draw a regular cotton allotment. This leaves about 3,400 to draw their allotment from the 600 acres.

Up to the present time we have about 300 requests for this acreage, each day adds a good many more, and it is estimated that we will have at least 500 requests for this acreage by the time we are required to quit taking applications.

Trusting this to be the desired information, I am,

Sincerely,

DAN G. OWEN,
Secretary, Smith County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Tyler, Tex., January 12, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The proposed amendment to the present cotton-allotment law would help some farms in the county, but this would be a minority of the farms, and it would possibly cause an uproar and protest from those that were not helped.

Under the present law as it now exists the counties were required to reduce the cotton acreage as reported by the farmers so that the total for the county would come within the acreage limits set by BAE. In this (Smith) county the farmers reported planted in 1946, 16,875 acres; BAE said we had 6,340 acres, we were required to reduce it to the BAE figure; in 1947 the farmers reported 16,731 acres, BAE figures were 9,450 acres; in 1948 the farmers reported 20,676 acres, BAE figures were 14,300 acres; in every year we were required to get within BAE figures on cotton.

Local committeemen were used to reduce the reported farm acreages in their respective communities; written notice was given the farmers of the downward adjustments; many protested this downward adjustment on the grounds that it would ruin their average. In many instances a farmer's reported cotton acreage was reduced in 2 of the 3 years to a zero, leaving him 1-year's history, so that county totals could be gotten within BAE limitations. It was explained to the protesting farmers that the average would not be used, and that the 1 year left as reported would prevent his allotment from being limited by his highest planted. Under the proposed amendment the average would be used in the 70 percent of the average planted acres for the 3 years of 1948, 1947, and 1946. Naturally such farms would not benefit from this amendment; under the 50 percent of the highest year few would benefit.

The proposed amendment would help a few farmers and would only serve to make even a greater number mad, if the BAE limitations have to be used.

Trusting this to be the desired information, I am,

Sincerely,

DAN G. OWEN,
Secretary, Smith County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Hemphill, Tex., January 13, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I am sorry to be late with a reply to your letters of January 3 and January 7, 1950, but I have been busy on peanut-marketing quotas.

The committee of this county has reserved 115.3 acres for new farms. The term "new farm" includes all farms not having cotton history for 1946–48. This acreage has been asked for by approximately 200 farmers. You can see that this would average about one-half acre per new farm.

I sincerely hope this information will aid you in arriving at a solution to the hardships imposed upon east Texas by the present allotment formula.

Sincerely,

HARRIS H. MINTON,
Secretary, Sabine County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Canton, Tex., January 10, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: We believe that the 50–70 amendment would increase Van Zandt County acreage by approximately 4,000 acres.

We have only 427.7 acres of cotton to distribute to all farms which grew cotton first since the war in 1949 and new farms. We feel that around 1,000 farmers will make application for this new grower allotment.

We feel that unless the whole allotment procedure can be revised that House Joint Resolution 384 should be passed with an amendment added to the effect that no allotments will be increased to more than 40 percent of the farm cropland by this resolution.

Very truly yours,

JAMES C. HODGE,
Secretary, Van Zandt County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Jefferson, Tex., January 11, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In reply to your request on House Joint Resolution 384, I submit the following comments:

1. The bill states that no farm cotton-acreage allotment established for the 1950 crop shall be less than the larger of 70 percent of the average acreage actually planted to cotton on the farm in 1946, 1947, and 1948, or 50 percent of the highest cotton acreage.

This would be excellent if we took the average acreage before the State office forced the county committee in each county office to adjust the cotton acreages reported as planted on a farm so as to lower the county acreage enough to come under the BAE figures sent out from the State office.

Since the BAE figures on cotton for Marion County was several thousand acres lower than the reported acreage from the farmers, the only way the county and community committee could cut within the BAE figures was to take the entire reported acreage away from a farm for 1 or 2 of the 3 years so as not to cut a little off each year and ruin his highest planted. Now, if we go back and take an average of the 3 years, his farm adjusted acreage might show the planted acreage for only 1 year, whereas he actually planted cotton all 3 years.

Unless Congress allows the State and county offices to adjust the BAE figures, which we firmly believe in this county to be completely in error, the adjustment average will not help too much.

If Congress will allow farmers who are not going to plant cotton in 1950 and who have a cotton allotment to release such cotton allotment, we will be able to distribute this extra acreage to farms that need it.

Yours very respectfully,

WALTER C. RALPH,
Secretary, Marion County ACA.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Let me acknowledge your communication of January 9.

We are aware that the reinstitution of acreage allotments for cotton under the provisions of Public Law 272 of the present Congress has been attended with difficulties in certain areas. We are glad to have the further information regarding the extent of these difficulties in east Texas conveyed in your communication.

Problems of this sort may appear small in relation to the national economy as a whole, yet they can give rise to serious economic dislocations in the areas affected, as well as in the lives of many individuals, and this makes them a proper matter of national concern.

Such difficulties are perhaps inevitable in connection with the reinstatement of a program as complex as that for the apportionment of cotton acreage, and one that directly affects so large a number of individuals. The need is to be alert to the emergence of these problems, and expeditious in remedying them as they arise.

The Council of Economic Advisers, obviously, is not in a position to judge the local administration of this program in your area. Quite regardless of local administration, however, it is our impression that the primary basis of the problem to be resolved arises out of provisions of the present law regarding which the Department of Agriculture has no discretion of action. We are informed that amendment of these provisions is currently under consideration by the Congress, and that representatives of the Department have made suggestions regarding such amendment.

Although we do not have the detailed familiarity with the complexions of operation of this program that would qualify us to render competent opinion regarding specific aspects of it, we believe that it should be possible to devise amendments of the present law that will remedy difficulties of the types you describe, and that will do within the spirit and intent of the allotment program as a whole.

Certainly we shall watch with interest any action that the Congress may take in this matter.

Very sincerely yours,

LEON H. KEYSERLING,
Acting Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of November 8 relative to the effect of synthetic fibers upon the future consumption of American cotton.

As you know, the consumption of synthetic fibers in the United States has risen rapidly since staple rayon fiber came into general use during the early 1930's. The increase in the use of rayon fiber has been especially rapid during the past 5 or 6 years. Recently, it has amounted to approximately 17 percent of the amount of cotton that has been consumed in this country. While there are other synthetic fibers such as Nylon that compete to some extent with cotton, its important competitors are rayon and paper. Not only has the use of rayon increased rapidly in the United States during recent years, but it has also increased rapidly in important foreign cotton-consuming countries. During 1948, for example, the use of artificial fibers as a group amounted to 24 percent of that for cotton. In some countries such as Germany, Austria, Sweden, and Switzerland, it amounted to much more, from 20 percent to as high as 50 percent.

It is impossible to foretell what the future holds with respect to increased rayon consumption at the expense of cotton. No one knew 15 years ago when the staple fiber rayon industry was in its infancy that it would be as large as it is today. Perhaps the real answer to the future is what research in the rayon industry may be able to do to impart to rayon those superior characteristics that cotton now possesses. Research, plus an aggressive advertising campaign has largely been responsible for the prominent position rayon occupies today.

I should like to point out, however, that there are some favorable aspects toward maintaining cotton consumption at a reasonably high level, particularly in the United States. The most important factor is a continuing high level of employment and national income. Another important factor is the increase in our population. These two factors, coupled with the fact that cotton fiber still possesses many characteristics superior to rayon and other synthetic fibers, will probably mean a continuing relatively large consumption of cotton fiber in the United States.

As regards foreign markets, which are important for cotton, the situation may be greatly different. While the increase in population abroad will create a continually increased demand for fiber, that demand may not be met with United States cotton due

to the lack of dollars abroad with which to pay for it. The outlook for continued exports of cotton in large amounts does not appear favorable at this time for that reason.

I should like to have replied more specifically to the question you raised, but it is of such nature that it can be dealt with only in general terms.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. LOVELAND,
Under Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, November 22, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of November 14 enclosing a newspaper clipping commenting on the report of Senator SPARKMAN'S committee regarding families earning less than $1,000 per year.

The estimates of the number of farm and nonfarm families receiving incomes of less than $1,000 and $2,000, respectively, reported in the newspaper clipping were prepared by Mr. SPARKMAN'S staff from data supplied by the Bureau of the Census in its current population survey. "Income" as the term is used in this report, refers to an estimate by the person interviewed of the total money income of all family members. This includes the net income from the operation of a farm, ranch, business, or profession; money wages and salary; net income from rents; royalties; and cash receipts from various other sources. It should be noted that farm laborer families are included in these estimates of the distribution of farm families by total money income level.

One cannot say categorically that most of the farm families earning less than $1,000 per year are working either on poor or on rich land. First, there are important regional differences in the productivity of land in its present use and in the concentration of low-income farms. Generally speaking, the per-acre value of crops in the Great Plains is lower than in the Southeastern States and the land has a lower market value per acre. Low-income farm families, however, are far more numerous in the Southeast, and represent a much greater proportion of the total number of farms in the latter region than in the Great Plains. The farms are smaller in the Southeast and more of the work is hand labor.

Generally speaking, within the same geographic region the average value of land and buildings per acre increases as the economic size of farm, measured in terms of total value of products sold and used, increases. Yields per acre of the major crops in each respective region likewise were higher in 1944 on commercial-family farms than on small-scale farms. These comparisons suggest a tendency for low-income farming units in a particular geographical area to be concentrated most heavily on the less-productive land. These apparent differences in land quality are not large enough, however, to warrant a conclusion that most of the farm operator families who earn less than $1,000 per year are located on poor land. One cannot draw the conclusion that any given number of farm operator families earn less than $1,000 because they are located on poor land. The annual earnings of a farm operator's family depend primarily upon the total amount of labor, land, and other capital owned and used effectively in farm production, prices received for farm products, and prices paid for items used in farm production. Experience indicates that within a farming area the number of acres operated is a much more important factor determining the net earnings of a farm operator than is the productivity of those acres—assuming, of course, that he has sufficient machinery and managerial skill to operate the larger acreage.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. LOVELAND,
Under Secretary.

Counties with more cotton acreage allocated in 1950 than in 1942

TEXAS

County	Acreage allocated in 1950	Acreage allocated in 1942
Bailey	85,910	73,111
Borden	19,512	14,934
Cameron	161,395	65,405
Cochran	81,434	50,180
Crockett	106	5
Crosby	99,995	90,699
Culberson	191	
Dawson	228,755	126,188
Deaf Smith	1,563	696
Delta	54,762	45,931
El Paso	44,103	31,383
Fannin	116,025	112,705
Gaines	33,061	23,181
Garza	48,771	38,131
Glasscock	4,911	4,399
Hall	103,327	89,812
Haskell	123,445	108,197
Hidalgo	141,259	95,242
Hill	158,392	157,888
Hockley	203,939	123,388
Howard	87,927	64,560
Hudspeth	14,935	8,031
Hunt	149,162	136,439
Kinney	290	30
Knox	72,618	67,698
Lamar	99,213	93,970
Lamb	188,709	136,532
Loving	460	170
Lubbock	248,699	175,123
Lynn	203,782	145,899
Martin	99,435	58,278
Maverick	7,287	2,662
Pecos	17,145	7,766
Reagan	511	
Reeves	20,268	6,432
Rockwall	33,222	29,381
Scurry	85,005	75,337
Starr	24,934	23,472
Terry	118,937	99,224
Tom Green	56,978	50,997
Ward	11,712	11,012
Willacy	109,444	50,338
Zavala	6,019	1,104

At this point I desire to insert a paragraph from the monthly Business Review, of the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, which is dated January 1, 1950. It was written by C. H. Moore. Note what is said about the "nearly one-half billion dollars":

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN TO TEXAS AGRICULTURE?

Application of the control program on a substantial scale in Texas during 1950, for the first time in nearly a decade, follows a year in which near-record acreages, together with good to excellent yields, resulted in the largest physical volume of production in the history of the State. Of special significance were the highest per acre yield of cotton in more than 50 years and the record total cotton production. The value of production also was a record, despite some price recession. In contrast with this high production, the 1950 control program calls for a reduction in acreage of the four major crops—cotton, wheat, peanuts, and rice—which would reduce total acreage of Texas crops more than 4,000,000 acres, or 13 percent below the 30,000,000 acres harvested in 1949. Furthermore, if history repeats itself, yields of most crops in 1950 are not likely to equal the very good yields of 1949. Two successive years of favorable weather and high yields for major crops in Texas are unusual. Thus, total volume of production in 1950 appears likely to be substantially below that of 1949; this, together with the probability of some further price decline, would materially reduce the value of production and the income to Texas farmers. For example, the probable production of cotton, based on the allotted acreage of 7,637,000 acres and the 10-year (1940–49) average yield of 181 pounds, would amount to only 2,765,000 bales, or 53 percent less than the 1949 production. On the basis of 1949 prices, the reduction in income as a result of this smaller production would be nearly one-half billion dollars.

At this point I desire to include some data I have received from Mr. B. F. Vance, College Station, Tex.:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., January 13, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: As requested in your wire of January 12, I am attaching a listing sheet showing a distribution of the 1950 State cotton acreage allotment and the State committee reserve of 290,207 acres. The State committee reserve represents 3.8 percent of the total State allotment.

The State committee reserve was required to be used for (1) adjusting computed county allotments and upward trend in cotton planting, (2) abnormal conditions affecting cotton plantings, (3) for assisting county committees with the establishment of fair and equitable allotments for farms whose indicated allotments were between 5 and 15 acres, (4) for assisting county committees with the making of 1950 new farm allotments, and (5) to assist county committees with the making of minimum farm allotments of not less than the smaller of 5 acres or the highest cotton history of the farm during the years 1946–48.

The adjustment in county allotment for abnormal conditions affecting cotton plantings was the most difficult one since it required that consideration be given to (a) all types of weather conditions affecting cotton plantings in 1947 and 1948, (b) soil crusting in irrigated areas, (c) production of designated war crops instead of cotton in 1947, (d) disproportionate movement of farm operators and farm labor to off-farm employment as between counties, and (e) other minor abnormal conditions affecting one or more counties.

The State committee formula for use in distributing the State reserve is as follows:

1. Trend: For counties and administrative areas where the 1948 actual planted cotton acreage exceeds the 1947–48 average planted acreage by more than 10 percent, an allotment adjustment for such trend was computed as the product of (a) the increase in 1948 acreage over 1947 acreage and (b) .0904686.

2. Abnormal conditions: For counties and administrative areas where the 1947–48 average planted acreage is less than the 1941 planted acreage an allotment adjustment for abnormal conditions of production affecting cotton plantings was computed as the product of (a) the decrease in planted acreage from 1941 to the 1947–48 average and (b) 0.0904686.

3. Five- to fifteen-acre allotment farms: For assisting county committees with the adjustment of allotments for 5- to 15-acre allotment farms, 50 percent of the amount of acreage used for this purpose under the 1942 allotment program (but not less than the smaller of 5 acres or the amount actually used under the 1942 program), except that an additional 1,204 acres was allocated to McLennan County, 859 acres to Hill County, and 214 acres to Coryell County above the amounts specified for use in determining fair and equitable allotments for such farms that will be comparable with allotments established for other similar farms in the communities in these three counties.

4. Group II: For assisting county committees with the establishment of Group II (new grower) allotments in 1950, these amounts were allocated:

(a) For counties with official 1950 allotments of less than 1,000 acres: 25 acres, but not more than 25 percent of such official allotment.

(b) For counties with official allotments of 1,000 acres or more but less than 3,000 acres: 50 acres.

(c) For counties with official allotments of 3,000 acres or more but no more than 5,000 acres: 75 acres.

(d) 19,613 acres to certain counties in which substantial acreages of land in farms were devoted to cotton and other crops for the first time in 1949, on the basis of the amount of such cropland of record in the State office.

5. Small-farm increases: The remaining amount of such 3.8 percent State reserve to be added to the State reserve of 5,287 acres, which amounts of allotment are to be used for providing minimum acreage allotments for small farms in all counties.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

TABLE 3 (Revised Dec. 1, 1949).—*U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics—Agricultural estimates*

TEXAS—1-3

District and county	Cotton acreage base, 95 percent of 1947-48 average	Computed county allotment (2)×0.89721957	State committee adjustments		Official county allotment	Apportionment for small farm adjustments 5-15 acres	County commission reserve Item 4, MQ-26	Apportionment for group II farms (new)
			For trends	For abnormal conditions				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
District 1-N:								
Armstrong	950	852		62	914	15	47	25
Briscoe	19,902	17,856	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]
Castro	6,816	6,115	240	181	6,536	95	897	
Deaf Smith	1,591	1,427	77	1	1,505	7	60	50
Floyd	51,063	45,815		11	45,826	215	6,559	
Gray	3,007	2,698		254	2,952	54	226	50
Hale	85,975	77,138		20	77,158	188	6,378	
Hemphill	1,026	921		541	1,462	32	48	50
Parmer	4,560	4,091		675	4,766	129	556	75
Swisher	7,410	6,648	505		7,153	98	1,024	
Total	182,300	163,561	822	1,745	148,272	833	15,795	250
District 1-S:								
Andrews	1,662	1,491		86	1,577	14	22	50
Bailey	94,525	84,810		21	84,831	220	3,816	828
Cochran	90,250	80,974		158	81,132	93	1,200	207
Crosby	111,150	99,726		26	99,752	129	9,246	
Dawson	254,600	228,433		57	228,490	106	5,657	155
Gaines	35,625	31,963		8	31,971	216	706	724
Glasscock	5,320	4,773		1	4,774	12	201	75
Hockley	226,100	202,862		52	202,914	329	4,500	621
Howard	97,850	87,793		23	87,816	108	3,292	
Lamb	209,950	188,372		47	188,419	214	7,977	
Lubbock	276,450	248,037		62	248,099	505	14,999	
Lynn	227,050	203,715		51	203,766	8	7,627	
Martin	110,675	99,300		25	99,325	106	3,499	
Midland	25,888	23,227		7	23,234	63	513	
Terry	132,050	118,478		30	118,508	305	8,836	103
Yoakum	9,737	8,736		250	8,986	70	633	517
Total	1,908,882	1,712,690		904	1,713,594	2,498	72,724	3,280
District 2-N:								
Borden	20,900	18,752	723		19,475	37	843	
Childress	56,857	51,013		13	51,026	165	1,481	
Collingsworth	81,415	73,047		19	73,066	296	4,067	
Cottle	63,698	57,151		15	57,166	82	4,806	
Dickens	59,375	53,272		14	53,286	209	5,570	
Donley	30,685	27,531		599	28,130	166	573	
Foard	18,762	16,834		278	17,112	69	1,129	
Garza	54,150	48,584		13	48,597	124	723	
Hall	114,950	103,135		27	103,162	125	3,162	
Hardeman	39,425	35,373		654	36,027	149	4,209	
Kent	24,914	22,353	629	43	23,025	142	974	
King	12,801	11,485		61	11,546		45	
Motley	43,130	38,697		10	38,707	84	1,988	
Wheeler	31,825	28,554		1,345	29,899	126	3,759	
Wichita	9,405	8,438		873	9,311	259	1,293	310
Wilbarger	73,625	66,058		16	66,074	181	6,467	
Total	735,917	660,277	1,352	3,980	665,609	2,214	41,089	310
District 2-S:								
Baylor	13,300	11,933		1,223	13,156	168	894	
Coleman	16,910	15,172		3,279	18,451	197	2,455	
Fisher	93,575	83,957		22	83,979	199	2,323	
Haskell	137,275	123,166		31	123,197	233	1,506	
Jones	105,450	94,612		1,621	96,233	575	4,224	
Knox	80,750	72,450		20	72,470	73	4,891	
Mitchell	74,480	66,825		17	66,842	145	1,431	
Nolan	42,893	38,484		11	38,495	127	1,630	
Runnels	94,810	85,065		22	85,087	172	1,814	
Scurry	94,430	84,724		23	84,747	158	2,317	
Stonewall	22,515	20,201		1,262	21,463	99	1,727	
Taylor	28,072	25,187		2,496	27,683	362	3,963	
Total	804,460	721,776		10,027	731,803	2,508	29,175	
District 3:								
Archer	1,026	921	22	423	1,366	70	189	50
Brown	3,895	3,495	163	852	4,510	284	546	75
Callahan	4,745	4,257		1,034	5,291	113	457	
Clay	15,770	14,149		1,458	15,607	508	2,067	
Comanche	2,641	2,370	156	646	3,172	272	414	75
Eastland	1,339	1,201	81	295	1,577	120	219	50
Erath	7,315	6,563	416	888	7,867	377	937	
Hood	2,251	2,020	190	91	2,301	92	299	50
Jack	2,636	2,365	68	119	2,552	82	186	50
Mills	1,947	1,747	109	238	2,094	162	300	50
Montague	4,646	4,168	197	799	5,164	132	608	
Palo Pinto	2,304	2,067	100	6	2,173	58	267	50
Parker	1,867	1,675	175	272	2,122	109	248	50
Shackelford	1,791	1,607		434	2,041	38	35	50
Somervell	1,216	1,091	78	100	1,269	28	150	50
Stephens	627	563	54	62	679	45	100	25
Throckmorton	4,722	4,237		399	4,636	78	631	75
Wise	1,235	1,108	72	654	1,834	150	253	50
Young	8,408	7,544		1,317	8,861	119	822	
Total	70,381	63,148	1,881	10,087	75,116	2,837	8,728	750

[1] See administrative area tabulation.

TABLE 3 (Revised Dec. 1, 1949).—*U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics—Agricultural estimates*—Con.

District and county	Cotton acreage base, 95 percent of 1947–48 average	Computed county allotment (2)×0.89721957	State committee adjustments		Official county allotment	Apportionment for small farm adjustments 5–15 acres	County commission reserve Item 4, MQ–26	Apportionment for group II farms (new)
			For trends	For abnormal conditions				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
District 4:								
Bell	91,152	81,783		21	81,804	1,191	2,340	
Bosque	16,672	14,958		628	15,586	368	2,031	
Collin	143,593	128,834		34	128,868	695	9,322	
Cooke	11,970	10,740	434	1,784	12,958	321	856	
Coryell	23,228	20,841		1,284	22,125	818	2,322	
Dallas	57,998	52,037		413	52,450	478	2,777	
Delta	60,800	54,551		14	54,565	120	1,760	
Denton	35,578	31,921		1,045	32,966	312	4,372	
Ellis	185,250	166,211		41	166,252	525	5,403	
Falls	106,875	95,890		25	95,915	590	3,811	
Fannin	127,775	114,642		29	114,671	962	3,075	
Grayson	68,922	61,838		774	62,612	511	3,495	
Hamilton	10,592	9,503	244	436	10,183	282	869	
Hill	174,800	156,835		39	156,874	1,318	3,235	
Hunt	165,443	148,440		37	148,477	487	12,803	
Johnson	47,785	42,874						
Kaufman	101,650	91,202		23	91,225	1,201	6,264	1,387
Lamar	109,915	98,618		25	98,643	430	5,667	
Limestone	110,818	99,428		25	99,453	392	1,698	
McLennan	121,885	109,358		28	109,386	2,094	5,118	
Milam	70,110	62,904		753	63,657	582	5,587	
Navarro	153,900	138,082		35	138,117	1,091	2,886	
Rockwall	36,812	33,028		9	33,037	85	2,734	
Tarrant	16,150	14,490		103	14,593	144	1,082	
Williamson	154,850	138,934		737	139,671	486	580	
Total	2,204,523	1,977,942	678	8,342	1,944,088	15,483	90,087	1,387
District 5–N:								
Anderson	11,020	9,887	923	1,719	12,529	280	1,461	
Bowie	30,780	27,616		1,174	28,790	350	1,138	
Camp	5,918	5,310	320	579	6,209	83	701	
Cass	21,660	19,434	434	2,890	22,758	237	2,216	
Cherokee	10,878	9,760	425	2,561	12,746	391	1,482	
Franklin	8,336	7,479	222	658	8,359	133	859	
Gregg	2,223	1,995	71	714	2,780	85	298	50
Harrison	22,420	20,116		3,388	23,504	270	3,117	
Henderson	8,312	7,458	172	2,554	10,184	431	1,287	
Hopkins	48,308	43,343		1,192	44,535	604	3,232	
Houston	24,368	21,863	896	2,202	24,961	503	3,099	
Marion	3,420	3,068	92	826	3,986	80	388	75
Morris	6,246	5,604		811	6,415	151	659	
Nacogdoches	9,975	8,950	271	2,396	11,617	265	1,406	
Panola	15,152	13,595		2,341	15,936	424	2,001	
Rains	12,492	11,208	443	461	12,112	117	1,302	
Red River	55,338	49,650		13	49,663	327	2,599	
Rusk	19,238	17,261	950	3,160	21,371	561	2,725	
Shelby	12,920	11,592	326	2,190	14,108	289	1,792	
Smith	11,281	10,122	439	3,833	14,394	276	1,684	
Titus	9,215	8,268	181	1,060	9,509	203	1,073	
Upshur	7,125	6,393	244	2,135	8,772	156	1,211	
Van Zandt	35,530	31,878	887	2,917	35,682	348	2,412	
Wood	7,448	6,682	463	1,987	9,132	100	801	
Total	399,603	358,532	7,759	43,761	410,052	6,664	38,943	125
District 5–S:								
Angelina	4,113	3,690		851	4,541	75	329	75
Brazos	28,072	25,187	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Freestone	27,265	24,463	597	925	25,985	317	1,625	
Grimes	19,095	17,132		1,548	18,680	233	349	
Hardin	8	7		19	26	6	4	6
Jasper	352	316	16	227	559	12	61	25
Leon	12,825	11,507	326	1,194	13,027	338	1,395	
Madison	8,788	7,885	208	1,243	9,336	267	925	
Montgomery	807	724		306	1,030	70	117	50
Newton	390	350	33	120	503		75	25
Polk	4,418	3,964	100	381	4,445	97	418	75
Robertson	41,752	37,461						
Sabine	2,546	2,284		613	2,897	62	415	50
San Augustine	7,196	6,456	222	792	7,470	121	940	
San Jacinto	2,760	2,476	111	457	3,044	22	239	75
Trinity	3,743	3,358		608	3,966	69	369	75
Tyler	290	260		181	441	8	35	25
Walker	6,911	6,201	140	631	6,972	64	648	
Waller	6,246	5,604		578	6,182	122	825	
Total	177,577	159,325	1,753	10,674	109,104	1,883	8,769	481
District 6:								
Culberson								191
Ector	309	277		8	285	5	42	25
El Paso	48,260	43,300		11	43,311	289	1,251	
Hudspeth	15,898	14,264		76	14,340	26	57	569
Loving	475	426		4	430	5	30	25
Pecos	16,862	15,129						
Presidio	2,190	1,965						
Reeves	18,682	16,762	1,859		18,621	58	1,850	1,552
Terrell	84	75	2	1	78	5	0	19
Ward	12,920	11,592		2	11,594	18	479	
Total	115,680	103,790	1,861	102	88,659	406	3,709	2,381
District 7:								
Blanco	142	127	9	78	214	35	6	25
Burnet	7,742	6,946	154	607	7,707	172	1,038	
Coke	3,501	3,141		1,106	4,247	52	177	75
Concho	25,175	22,587	1,538	336	24,461	38	1,282	
Crockett	81	73	12		85		0	21
Gillespie	95	85	9	236	330	70	39	25
Irion	760	682	54	6	742	13	50	52
Kendall	5	4		3	7	5	1	2

[1] See administrative area tabulation.

TABLE 3 (Revised Dec. 1, 1949).—*U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics—Agricultural estimates*—Con.

District and county	Cotton acreage base, 95 percent of 1947–48 average	Computed county allotment (2)×0.89721957	State committee adjustments		Official county allotment	Apportionment for small farm adjustments 5–15 acres	County commission reserve Item 4, MQ–26	Apportionment for group II farms (new)
			For trends	For abnormal conditions				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
District 7—Continued								
Kimble	19	17	4	80	101	20	12	25
Kinney								290
Lampasas	1,910	1,714	56	511	2,281	135	282	50
Llano	62	56	6	85	147	22	15	25
McCulloch	8,716	7,820		2,136	9,956	93	120	
Mason	306	275		199	474	67	67	25
Menard	214	192	14	126	332	20	10	25
Reagan	427	383	63	3	449		67	52
San Saba	4,798	4,305		778	5,083	113	609	
Schleicher	5,462	4,901		68	4,969	27	260	
Sterling				25	25	11	0	5
Tom Green	63,412	56,894		15	56,909	68	3,641	
Uvalde	38	34	7	75	116	26	0	103
Total	122,865	110,236	1,926	6,473	118,635	987	7,676	800
District 8–N:								
Austin	24,795	22,247		158	22,405	275	1,769	
Bastrop	16,340	14,661	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Bee	7,838	7,032		1,353	8,385	158	777	155
Bexar	4,593	4,121		1,120	5,241	66	728	
Burleson	39,758	35,672	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Caldwell	30,162	27,062		810	27,872	198	2,275	
Colorado	13,442	12,060		502	12,562	246	1,224	
Comal	223	200	15	252	467	39	70	25
De Witt	21,802	19,561		1,266	20,827	427	2,981	
Fayette	39,473	35,416		175	35,591	300	4,141	
Goliad	4,650	4,172		1,070	5,242	81	436	
Gonzales	22,848	20,500		1,274	21,774	150	3,016	
Guadalupe	27,122	24,334		2,389	26,723	271	2,784	
Hays	11,495	10,314	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Karnes	38,653	34,649		2,966	37,615	232	5,185	
Lavaca	46,265	41,510		10	41,520	296	5,443	
Lee	10,972	9,844		429	10,273	196	1,367	
Medina	147	132	26	186	344	52	47	25
Travis	51,443	46,156		35	46,191	367	1,041	
Washington	36,670	32,901		556	33,457	375	4,230	
Wilson	4,940	4,432	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Total	453,596	406,976	41	14,551	356,489	3,729	37,514	205
District 8–S:								
Aransas	1,021	916		83	999	5	0	25
Kleberg	8,598	7,714		40	7,754	126	74	
Nueces	97,375	87,367		3,011	90,378	410	1,526	1,035
Refugio	10,498	9,419		464	9,883	68	1,120	
San Patricio	71,725	64,353		2,046	66,399	105	1,750	1,035
Total	189,217	169,769		5,644	175,413	714	4,470	2,095
District 9:								
Brazoria	11,281	10,122		390	10,512	164	1,333	
Calhoun	19,998	17,943		4	17,947	65	2,550	
Chambers	142	127		79	206	13	21	25
Fort Bend	79,800	71,598		18	71,616	582	6,441	
Galveston	14	13		4	17	5	0	4
Harris	4,318	3,874		849	4,723	136	609	75
Jackson	18,952	17,004		179	17,183	136	1,628	
Jefferson	195	175		82	257	14	35	25
Liberty	3,325	2,983		252	3,235	63	300	75
Matagorda	18,288	16,408		5	16,413	103	2,299	
Orange								
Victoria	28,358	25,443		7	25,450	249	3,295	
Wharton	89,300	80,122		20	80,142	498	7,354	
Total	273,971	245,812		1,889	247,701	2,028	25,865	204
District 10–N:								
Atascosa	4,456	3,998		1,303	5,301	113	759	
Brooks	3,061	2,746	322	77	3,145	51	292	75
Dimmit	665	597		5	602	6	60	25
Duval	19,238	17,261		278	17,539	173	1,097	
Frio	793	711	30	13	754	36	113	25
Jim Hogg	1,463	1,313	62	400	1,775	44	165	50
Jim Wells	19,285	17,303		2,120	19,423	179	450	517
Kenedy	3	3	1	1	5	5	0	1
La Salle	1,349	1,210	33	125	1,368	16	155	50
Live Oak	15,912	14,277		842	15,119	265	1,078	310
McMullen	1,259	1,130		105	1,235	8	173	50
Maverick	6,935	6,222		2	6,224	5	120	1,035
Starr	26,362	23,652	769		24,421	185	2,265	
Webb	1,197	1,074	125	106	1,305	26	149	50
Zapata	1,360	1,220	114	104	1,438	7	185	103
Zavala	4,038	3,623	315		3,938	11	118	2,070
Total	107,376	96,430	1,771	5,481	103,592	1,130	7,179	4,361
District 10–S:								
Cameron	175,275	157,261		39	157,300	206	19,345	1,552
Hidalgo	143,925	129,132	6,854		135,986	168	9,368	2,070
Willacy	116,992	104,968	3,230		108,198	116	6,535	1,035
Total	436,192	391,361	10,084	39	401,484	490	35,248	4,657
State	8,182,540	7,341,535	29,928	123,699	7,289,611	44,404	426,971	21,286
Totals for areas			1,380	6,332	213,263	1,701	15,696	1,085
State totals			31,308	130,031	7,502,874	46,105	442,667	22,371

[1] See administrative area tabulation.

TABLE 3 (Revised Dec. 1, 1949).—*U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics—Agricultural estimates*—Con.

ADMINISTRATIVE AREA TABULATION

County	Administrative area	Acreage allotment base	Percent base is of county total	1950 computed cotton allotment	State committee adjustments		Official administrative area allotment	Adjusted for small farms (15 acres or less)	County commission reserve, item 4	Group II farm (new) apportionment
					Trends	Abnormal conditions				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Pecos	I	8,593	48.41	7,324	923	0	8,247	50	1,180	1,035
Do	II	9,157	51.59	7,805	0	2	7,807	0	330	0
Total		17,750	100.00	15,129	923	2	16,054	50	1,510	1,035
Burleson	I	19,395	46.35	16,534	0	379	16,913	293	1,764	
Do	II	22,454	53.65	19,138	0	7	19,145	0	1,046	
Total		41,849	100.00	35,672	0	386	36,058	293	2,810	
Hays	I	437	3.61	372	17	14	403	20	60	
Do	II	11,662	96.39	9,942	0	413	10,355	107	967	
Total		12,099	100.00	10,314	17	427	10,758	127	1,027	
Robertson	I	13,619	30.99	11,609	0	1,249	12,858	350	416	
Do	II	30,330	69.01	25,852	0	7	25,859	10	1,516	
Total		43,949	100.00	37,461	0	1,256	38,717	360	1,932	
Wilson	I	5,080	97.71	4,330	0	1,449	5,779	90	753	
Do	II	119	2.29	102	8	79	189	17	28	
Total		5,199	100.00	4,432	8	1,528	5,968	107	781	
Bastrop	I	4,133	24.03	3,523	0	10	3,533	32	172	
Do	II	13,067	75.97	11,138	301	700	12,139	130	1,702	
Total		17,200	100.00	14,661	301	710	15,672	162	1,874	
Presidio	I	475	20.62	405	0	61	466	0	0	0
Do	II	1,829	79.38	1,560	37	0	1,597	12	72	50
Total		2,304	100.00	1,965	37	61	2,063	12	72	50
Johnson	I	33,695	66.99	28,721	0	6	28,727	0	866	
Do	II	14,274	28.38	12,168	0	547	12,715	0	816	
Do	III	2,330	4.63	1,985	0	418	2,403	331	342	
Total		50,299	100.00	42,874	0	971	43,845	331	2,024	
Briscoe	I	3,830	18.28	3,264	94	184	3,542	27	507	
Do	II	17,119	81.72	14,592	0	3	14,595	82	2,088	
Total		20,949	100.00	17,856	94	187	18,137	109	2,595	
Brazos	I	22,095	74.77	18,832	0	5	18,837	0	155	
Do	II	7,455	25.23	6,355	0	799	7,154	150	916	
Total		29,550	100.00	25,187	0	804	25,991	150	1,071	
Grand total		241,148		205,551	1,380	6,332	213,263	1,701	15,696	1,085

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GWINN (at the request of Mr. WOODRUFF) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend in the RECORD an article on excise taxes printed in the American magazine.

WHO IS "J. SMITH"?

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, what is your reaction when you read the account of an air-line crash and see the incomplete names and addresses of those presumed to be aboard the wrecked plane?

You think of the needless worry, the uncertainty, the confusion.

And you wonder why the air lines are so negligent in this matter.

Perhaps you see the name "J. Smith" listed among the victims, when there might have been many "J. Smith's" in air transit at the time of the tragedy.

And the thought comes to you that it would not be difficult for the air lines to have a complete roster—first name, middle initial, last name, and address, of all passengers and crew members on every flight.

Apparently they do not have such a list available to the press, which is a cause of grave anxiety to many people.

The recent decline in air-passenger traffic in the United States cannot be blamed on the season or the weather alone.

The public has confidence in the planes and the pilots.

More people would like to travel by air, but they have misgivings concerning the controls, the management, and the policies in operation at our airports.

In an effort to overcome these objections in part, I have introduced a bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to require the preparation of passenger lists for all flights of commercial air lines. It provides:

That subsection (A) of section 610 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out "And" at the end of paragraph (4), by renumbering paragraph (5) as "(6)", and by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

"(5) For any person to transport any passenger in air commerce unless such passenger has registered, in such manner as the Board shall by regulation prescribe, his full name and address and the name and address of an individual to be notified in case of an accident involving the aircraft in which he is to be transported; and."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect 15 days after the date of its enactment.

THE LATE GEN. HENRY H. "HAP" ARNOLD

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today I mourn the passing of a great American citizen, a great American warrior, Gen. Henry H. "Hap" Arnold.

I recall meeting the Air Force general with President Roosevelt at the White House during the middle of the late war. The going was rather rough but General Arnold was not terribly concerned. He said: "We are going to win; we are not going to lose. Those kids of mine, most of them in their teens, are knocking

the enemy's best out of the air right and left. We are not going to lose." It was in that spirit that General "Hap" Arnold and his boys wrote history in freedom's cause.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I think I express the views of every Member of this House when I say that General Arnold will go down in history as one of the greatest military leaders of all time and one of the greatest servants the American people ever had in time of war.

THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to read to the House a letter that came to my desk this morning from one of my good friends and a constituent. He writes as follows:

JANUARY 14, 1950.

Hon. L. C. ARENDS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LES: The coal situation: We have been out of coal for the part 3 days and many of our good customers are out. The only thing that saved them was the mild weather. I wonder just who is running the country. I know from first-hand that most miners want to work, but they have no voice in the affairs of the UMWA. How about applying the antitrust laws to the UMWA? It might be well to look into the legality of John L.'s position. The strip mines are hardest hit of all. Three days in a strip mine means 3 days stripping and 1 to 1½ days' mining. How about having some Senator start impeachment proceedings against the President for not doing his duty in this case.

We have just counted up the customers who have orders in and will be out of coal completely within 3 to 5 days and they total 148 as of now. The Department of the Interior was quoted in this morning's Pantagraph that there was no emergency. The people who are out of coal are in a real state of emergency.

Sincerely.

The writer did not say so, but the people he refers to are neither Democrats nor Republicans. They are American citizens who are either out or will be out of coal in a few days. Maybe it is warm down at the Blair House, where the President lives, but it is getting cold in the homes of many of the people of my district.

Mr. Speaker, Congress accepted the responsibility toward avoiding such emergencies as we now face by writing the Taft-Hartley Act. So I ask, Whose responsibility is it? Certainly the Members of Congress are not to blame but rather the responsibility rests on the shoulders of one man, President Truman, and he should use what machinery he has available to forestall suffering on the part of many of our citizens whose coal bins are empty. After all, the welfare of the people does come ahead of politics.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each an editorial.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last I asked and obtained permission to insert an editorial by Mr. David Lawrence and also copy of a report by the Committee on Economic Development on the subject of civilian control and militarism. The Public Printer advises me this extension will cost $389.50. In view of the subject matter covered by the article and the caliber of the committee making the recommendation, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article and an editorial.

THE LATE HENRY H. ARNOLD

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, nearly 4 years ago one of America's great wartime leaders retired from his role as commanding general of the Army Air Forces. Gen. Henry H. Arnold—he was "Hap" to all, whether a civilian or a military man—sought a quiet life as a gentleman farmer in the lush Sonoma Valley of California, Jack London's famous Valley of the Moon. There he said he wanted to sit under an oak tree and look at white-faced cows.

General Arnold's ranch was only a few miles from my home in Sebastopol. The week before I left Sebastopol to come on to Washington as a Member of Congress, Mr. and Mrs. Walter Murphy, publishers of the Sonoma Index-Tribune, had Mrs. Scudder and myself as house guests. They invited "Hap" Arnold, Mrs. Arnold, and their daughter to the house for dinner. During the evening I had occasion to discuss with the general many things of moment concerning our Government, and especially did we discuss the Chinese problem, over which he was greatly concerned. It is pathetic to lose students of world affairs in such times as these.

Even after his retirement General Arnold remained active in Air Force affairs and could be seen on occasion in his office at Hamilton Air Force Base in Marin County, Calif. There less than a year ago he was presented with a model of the plane in which the Wright brothers taught him to fly in 1911. This model he added to his collection at Sonoma, a collection which characteristically the general made available for public display.

When one looks at this kitelike plane he is impressed with its flimsiness. And he is impressed further that from this very small beginning was built the mighty aerial armada which made such telling blows on the Axis Nations in World War II. This force of 2,300,000 men and 80,000 planes of all types—the wartime United States Army Air Forces and the Air Force of today—are great monuments to his lifetime of labor and statesmanship in its behalf.

Flags throughout the United States fly at half-mast today. It is entirely fitting that a peaceful and nonmilitaristic Nation should pay this respect to one of its greatest soldiers. For General Arnold was not only a military man, but a plain citizen as well—a man who believed sincerely in the orderly processes of a democracy, who abhorred war and worked throughout his lifetime for a real and just peace. He contended that such a peace can be maintained through strength. He labored in behalf of his beliefs. Today a policy of strong defense, with the Air Force as its keystone, stands as the avowed aim of this Government.

Gen. Henry H. Arnold—"Hap" Arnold—has passed from the scene. In his departure he is mourned by all in these United States. To me he was a counselor and friend. The memory of "Hap" Arnold will remain indelibly with me, as it will with all the people who knew him.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes following disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

I AM NOT A DEMOCRAT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a news article which appeared in a paper caused a letter to be written to me which I want to read because someone is really taking advantage of me through the newspapers and I do not like it. The news article is as follows:

"Be nifty and thrifty in '50," says economy advocate Representative RICH (D., Pa.). This lawmaker used to shout, almost every time a spending proposal came up: "Where are we going to get the money?"

You see they listed me as a (D) meaning Democrat. Now I insert the letter I received from one I knew 45 years ago:

JANUARY 10, 1950.

Hon. ROBERT F. RICH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RICH: I see by the enclosed clipping you have turned Democrat. How horrible. Don't you realize that the conscience—the Democratic conscience—has lost its eyes and ears and that two more years of deficits will find us going into a tailspin and paternalism or communism (identities) or any other ism will not be able to avert the crash in which all that is worth while will be destroyed. The first indication of this fatal disaster will be a mass realization that Government securities are unsound,

which they will be, and then the tailspin of a run on the (Treasury) bank for redemption. And what will the cash they will get be worth? This is no joke. It is a probability more than a possibility. I understand the incapacity of the crosscut of our people to think in time before the catastrophe is recognized, and they alone can save their land of plenty—but we, the people, are damn fools because we cannot think in time to realize that those in control, without vision or consistency or much conscience, dominate their even more selfish or weaker brethren. But you, a Democrat!

Respectfully,

FRYSINGER EVANS.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deny this accusation that I am a Democrat with all the vehemence at my command. I am and always will be a Republican. I will do all I can in aiding the Republican Party to do those things that will make our country the best country in all the world, for all of our people, at all times.

THE LATE HENRY H. ARNOLD

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I read in this morning's newspapers, with great sadness of the death of General Arnold. It was not generally known by Members of the Congress that General Arnold became an aviator by chance or perhaps one might say by accident.

In 1907 he was graduated from the Military Academy and was commissioned in the Infantry. He went to his Congressman and requested that he be placed in the Cavalry. His request was not granted and he was sent to the Philippines as a second lieutenant in the Infantry. Later he returned to America, and in 1911 he was transferred to the Signal Corps and became one of the pioneer aviators in the armed services of the United States. "Hap" Arnold as he was known won many honors as a young aviator. He really did not come into his own until after the First World War. When the Chief of the Air Corps, General Westover, was killed in 1939 Arnold was made the Chief of the Air Corps and was elevated to the rank of major general.

Like others, he saw trouble coming and he and his associates made the plans on which our tremendous Air Force was made possible when the war came to us. Under his leadership we had formulated a plan that sprouted until we produced over 50,000 planes a year and also we had the machinery and facilities to train the thousands of pilots, bombardiers, and navigators to man and operate these planes. This great air armada, which operated in every theater in the war was made possible through the leadership and vision of General Arnold and those who worked closely with him. He really was the spark plug that made all of this possible.

He became a young officer in the United States Army in 1907. At that time there was no fear of war and we all felt America would be secure for generations. Yet he lived through two great wars. He saw the destructive power of weapons greatly enhanced through the use of airplanes. He lived to see air power develop into the most deadly and destructive thing in the whole world. The planes built under the guidance of the Air Force carried the atom bomb. The destruction wrought by the planes sent out under his direction laid waste two great nations in the world. He worked so hard that his heart was overstrained and he finally had to take it easy.

But after he retired to beautiful Sonoma he still kept in touch with our security problems. In 1949 he appeared before a committee of which I was a member, which investigated the problems surrounding the procurement of the B–36. At that time he looked thin and tired but the old spark was there.

When he wrote a series of articles for the Washington Post I think he showed that he was more than just a great general. He was a statesman and a humanitarian. He had seen enough to know that under modern conditions war should be made impossible, or the human race might destroy itself. In one of these articles he dwelt on this and pointed out that the nations must find some way, besides war, to settle their differences. He advocated a large military establishment as a peace weapon. He knew and said that if two great industrial nations came to grips in a war they would both lose, even though one of them was declared the winner.

We sympathize with his family over their great loss. But they should find great comfort from the fact that their loved one contributed much toward the victory which we all hope will bring peace to the world. His men and the other services working as a team destroyed two vicious and inhuman dictators. We all hope that his hopes for peace and good will on this old world will come to pass. He will be missed by thousands who knew him personally and by millions who admired him.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in Newsweek, republished in the Des Moines Sunday Register, December 18.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD to pay tribute to the accomplishments of the late Gen. Hap Arnold.

THE COAL SHORTAGE

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the coal shortage in my district is now serious. I wish to serve notice on this House that if it continues and if we get the same kind of weather in Nebraska as we had last year there will be loss of life. Mr. Clarence Isaacson, one of the prominent coal dealers, called me by telephone this morning. He was speaking for the coal dealers of my home town, Norfolk, Nebr. He stated that the town is entirely out of stoker coal and that other grades are being depleted. He and these coal dealers want something done at once to relieve this situation. Members of this House will recall that last winter the "snow lift" operations in Nebraska resulted in saving life because operators of airplanes hauled fuel and medicines to the isolated farmers. If the weather changes and "snow lift" conditions come again there will be no coal for the airmen to fly. There will be much suffering. I am merely calling your attention to this serious situation and am putting those responsible for this condition on notice. Something must be done about it at once. By passing this information on to the members of the House of Representatives I hope it will come to the attention of those who can and should do something about it now. It has been very cold in Nebraska. A short time ago, I am informed, it was 32° below zero at some places in the State.

COTTON-ACREAGE ALLOTMENT

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it would be amusing if it was not tragic to hear the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], who speaks from his head as well as from his heart, and the comment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox]. Now, over the years, who wrote this legislation affecting cotton, anyway, the legislation of which you now complain? You fellows on the Democratic side, the New Dealers, the Fair Dealers. Day after day you have been coming in here and squawking and bellyaching about it. Why do you not change it? Will not the big boss permit it, if he is ruining your cotton farmers, as you claim this legislation is? He and John L. Lewis, between them, are fixing it so our people in the North are cold, eat cold meals, go to bed to keep warm. You lack either the inclination or the courage to do the job. You will not let us do it.

VETERANS' INSURANCE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Friday I went to the Veterans' Administration office where they are getting out insurance overpayments checks to the veterans. The Veterans' Administration call them dividends, but they are not dividends. It is money the veterans paid into the insurance funds themselves as overpayments. Our Committee on Veterans' Affairs made an investigation in the last session of Congress and report that I think are responsible for the getting out of these checks, even though belatedly. They are coming out today.

There is a misunderstanding even among the press. Some of the press are writing editorials saying that this is a sort of bonus given to the veterans. It is in no sense a bonus. It is a business proposition. It is an overpayment that the veterans made for their insurance. This money belongs to them. It is a debt owed to the veterans that is being paid to them at last.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio (at the request of Mr. VORYS) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report of the Altoona Chamber of Commerce for the calendar year 1949.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and include in one an exchange of telegrams with the American Legion of South Dakota and in the other an editorial.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two releases.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

THE LATE GEN. H. H. ARNOLD

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, to the extent that victory went to air power during World War II, it should be a matter of national mourning that the chief architect of our air power in the war passed away yesterday.

It was my privilege to see Gen. "Hap" Arnold at close range during the war years and the years immediately prior thereto as a member of the committee making appropriations for the Air Force. I have seen him when he was stern, I have seen him when he was gentle, I have seen him when he was harassed and harried by all the problems of production during the war, I have seen him when he sensed victory. We instinctively admired him, who could be cheerful in the face of trial, who was sad when the price of victory was the life of young American boys, and yet who kept his eye unswervingly on the goal. The fact that we achieved it is the real tribute to him.

In South Dakota we shall remember him as the pilot who flew the mail in for President Coolidge when the summer White House was the State Game Lodge in the Black Hills. He was on that mail run, we have understood, because he was in disgrace for having supported Gen. Billy Mitchell's point of view on the importance of air power in national defense.

That point of view prevailed, however, and eventually Major Arnold became Gen. H. H. Arnold, Chief of the United States Air Force that knocked the famed Luftwaffe out of the skies, smashed the transportation system of the enemy in Europe and then destroyed the initiative of the enemy in the Pacific and carried the atomic bomb to Hiroshima. I would not detract one iota from the credit due anyone in the great record written by every unit and branch of the armed forces in World War II, but to the extent that air power contributed to final victory it is only proper to say that the Nation suffered a great loss when the chief architect of our air power in World War II died yesterday.

General Arnold's life was unquestionably shortened by the tension of his service in the war. He was a great American and one of the greatest of all times.

FOREIGN TRADE POLICY

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, many industries in the United States are in a bad way because of the foreign-trade policy of the present administration. The situation has become so serious that many employees and employers are joining together to combat this growing menace to their employment and business.

The New Deal doctrine that some industries should be sacrificed for the benefit of others does not go well with those that are being sacrificed.

Tomorrow there will be a big meeting here in Washington, participated in by management and labor working together and both fighting together for their economic lives. The so-called New Deal trade agreements have seriously affected pottery and glassware output and also the production of matches, cedar shingles, fish and sea food, scientific instruments, gloves—both leather and wool—hats and millinery, hothouse vegetables, aluminum products, kaolin and book products.

The constant efforts of Secretary Acheson and of Mr. Hoffman and others to persuade the public to buy foreign goods rather than those made in this country threaten the continued existence of these very important industries.

Top-ranking representatives of both labor and management in these industries, over 50 of them, will join tomorrow in this meeting to fight to preserve these industries and the jobs that they provide.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the many requests I have received from people outside my own district asking for copies of the speech I made on January 12, which you will find in the RECORD on pages A212, entitled "Defenseless America," suggests it might be worth while for a Congressman or two to read it.

I would like to continue by suggesting that sea power will be vital to the Atlantic Alliance.

With great stretches of ocean between the participating members of the Atlantic alliance the sea lanes must be avenues for both military and economic supplies.

Only sea-air power can keep them open.

In my opinion, we need not only one big carrier—we need a half dozen.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HALE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LET US KEEP THE PENNY POSTAL RATE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I was very much upset when, a few minutes ago, I heard the report that the old bugbear of doubling the penny postal card rate is to be brought up before long. I thought we fought that battle out last year. But I fear once again that this way of putting the tax on the poor man is coming up before the Congress. I hope there will be enough Members to defeat such a bill, because it is definitely against the interests of the people. It is the only way left for the rank and file to send messages in any profusion through the mails. I believe the penny postcard should be retained, and I hope the House will not take action to the contrary.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, since the end of the war one of our major outlets for wheat has been Germany and Japan. This wheat has been purchased by the United States Army and paid for by the taxpayers of this country. This will be necessary as long as the occupation lasts, because these countries cannot produce enough food to supply their people. The amount so consumed has been more than 150,000,000 bushels per year.

Today representatives of the member nations of the International Wheat Agreement are meeting in London to consider the admission of western Germany and Japan as members of the International Wheat Agreement. It is my understanding that our delegate to this meeting has been instructed to vote for the admission of Germany and Japan. If they are admitted, it means that they will hereafter secure most, if not all, of their wheat imports under the International Wheat Agreement. But that is not all. As soon as these countries are admitted, Canada and Australia will demand that 30,000,000 bushels of the wheat so imported into Germany and Japan under the agreement be allotted to them as exporters. If this demand is granted, 30,000,000 bushels of the wheat which in the past has been supplied by United States producers and paid for by the taxpayers of the United States and which will continue to be paid for by the taxpayers of the United States, will be supplied by the wheat growers of Canada and Australia, who have not been asked to reduce their acreage and who will never have to reduce their acreage if we continue to turn over to them export markets which rightfully belong to us.

In the meantime, our wheat exports are shrinking, surpluses are accumulating, and the farmers of the United States, pursuant to the acreage allotment program announced by the Secretary of Agriculture, are cutting their wheat acreage by 10,000,000 acres.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances; in two to include editorials, and in the third, an article from the Kiwanis magazine.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include two editorials and one newspaper article.

JACKSON DAY DINNER

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note the first Jackson Day dinner, on January 8, 1835, was held to celebrate the fact that the new little Republic was free from debt. The United States had no national debt. The Jackson Day dinners throughout the country this year are presumably being held to celebrate the fact that, under Harry S. Truman, the United States has a national debt of over $257,000,000,000, the largest peacetime debt in our history, and perhaps to celebrate the fact that in time of peace and employment, this debt is being increased at the rate of from five to ten billions a year. I rise to remind my Democratic friends that the purpose of the Jackson Day dinner seems to have changed in 115 years.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. How did the gentleman vote on the tax cut in the Eightieth Congress?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I voted for all tax cuts.

Mr. DINGELL. I thought so.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILLIPS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, following the business of the day and any other special orders, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENTSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

QUEEN OF AMERICA

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to express my appreciation to the thousands of women's clubs and clubwomen throughout America who participated in the recent Queen of America contest on the Mutual Broadcasting System's Queen for a Day program.

This queen was not selected for her beauty qualifications alone, instead, she was chosen by women's club representatives for her voluntary contributions in the field of public service, particularly among distressed and underprivileged people.

It is with great personal pride that I mention Mrs. Sally Baker, a resident of Pikeville, Ky. She has given over a quarter century of her life aiding the people in the villages and mountains of eastern Kentucky. She was highly praised by hospitals, churches, and citizens and charity groups. She is truly the "queen of America." Shortly she will depart for a European tour to talk with individuals and groups participating in club work and humanitarian endeavors there. I am sure that the Mutual Broadcasting System, its Queen for a Day program, and clubwomen of America have made a wise selection. Mrs. Sally Baker, of my own State of Kentucky, and from my own congressional district, is a worthy ambassador of good will. She represents the type of womanhood that makes up eastern Kentucky.

THE PENNY POSTAL CARD

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] about the proposed increase in rates on the penny postal card. I would like to call his attention to the fact that we subsidize business in a big way through the present penny postal card. It costs about 2.6 cents to deliver each penny postal card, and 90 percent of them are used by business firms in the solicitation of business or in the conduct of their business. This is a hidden subsidy that the Government is paying them. It is to wipe out a part of this subsidy that the bill I have mentioned was introduced.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This is just another attempt to wipe out a part of that deficit that the gentleman and his party have been talking about so much?

Mr. MILLER of California. That is right.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Why do you not bring a bill in here to raise the penny post card, and why do you not raise the price of parcel post, and a lot of things, and let them try to pay their own way? You will get a vote over here on that.

Mr. MILLER of California. I will tell the gentleman there is a bill, H. R. 2945, that is presently before the Rules Committee, that has been reported, and we hope to get it before the House shortly,

which raises the penny postal card. It also serves notice on the people who receive these postal subsidies that we are going to end them. At the present time many businesses predicate that business on the subsidies they receive from the Government in the form of special treatment. We hope in time to end this practice and eliminate the so-called postal deficit.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman's bill pay its way?

Mr. MILLER of California. Yes; part of it, not all of it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio broadcast, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit established by the Joint Committee on Printing and will cost $328.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. CLEMENTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the story of the development of the typographical union.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to insert in the RECORD a speech by the Honorable M. W. Szymczak, a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit prescribed by the Joint Committee on Printing and will cost $191.34.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on pensions and general welfare, written by E. B. Clark, of his district.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes on Wednesday next, or if there be no session of the House that day, then on the following day, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered, on the subject Those Are Your Tax Laws.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

EDITORIAL ABILITY

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, on last Wednesday my local paper, the Akron Beacon-Journal, which is one of a chain having papers in Detroit, Miami, and Chicago, sponsored a high-school day and allowed high-school students to edit the paper. Two of the students, Shirley Schley, of St. Vincent High School, and Joe Cooper, of West High School, wrote editorials on the so-called welfare state.

While we may or may not agree with their thinking, I am sure we will all agree that their freshness of thought is most inspiring. In view of the soggy drivel which most of our country's newspapers inflict upon the reading public, I would suggest that many of them should recruit high-school students to write all of their editorials.

No doubt some editorial writers may reply that we should elect high-school students to Congress, and to that I would have no objection.

Reporters by and large get out and learn the facts, but too many editorial writers grind out the same old tunes, with never a new thought or idea. So I commend the editorials of these young people to the attention of the Members:

TWO VIEWS ON THE WELFARE STATE

As the 1950 campaign opens, both Democrat and Republican leaders are vigorously engaged in shaping party platforms. Already the welfare state, that much-used and much-abused term, has entered the controversy.

Philip Willkie, Republican representative to the Indiana State Legislature, substituted for this term one which better describes the goal of many Republicans. Mr. Willkie appeals for the opportunity state. In essence, his plan might be summed up as public welfare through private funds.

Liberal Republicans are quite willing to agree that during the past 20 years the American concept of a democratic form of government has changed. Members of Congress are now charged not only with the responsibility of guarding the present welfare of the public, but with obtaining better conditions for more people. Besides the basic freedoms, many workers of today are asking for security.

There has been an increasing tendency to obtain this security at the price of destroying individuality. A person is not regarded as capable of thought and action, but rather as a statistic, an automaton that pays income tax and receives social security.

Incentive was the spark that kindled early American democracy. Why not put this powerful force to work again?

A few experiments along this line have been made in the past and proved successful. The New York Port Authority, with the cooperation of both New York and New Jersey, has succeeded in building and maintaining airports, bridges, and tunnels. These, while used by the public, have been financed exclusively with private funds. Similar action by New York City has made possible the building of modern low-cost housing by private concerns.

When the Roosevelt administration took office, there was little private capital available for this type of development. Now that the situation has almost reversed itself, it is time to take advantage of it.

It remains for America to take advantage of the ingenuity and incentive that has made her great.

SHIRLEY SCHLEY,
St. Vincent High School.

We have been progressing toward a welfare state from time immemorial. Each century has seen a more intelligent man, a more progressive man, and a man willing to do more for himself and for humanity. The trend through the ages has been toward a more liberal form of government.

The Government of the United States has followed the trend. We have had a type of welfare state ever since the first tariff was levied, ever since the Government started subsidizing groups in the country, and ever since there has been a United States Post Office Department.

The fact that we've had a type of welfare state ever since we've been a nation is what the opponents of a welfare state have overlooked in their zeal to discredit it. When they continue to contend that they are against all the principles of a welfare state completely they fail to realize that this places them in opposition to fire and police departments, waterworks, tariffs, Federal grants, even the postal system. Clearly the issue is not whether to have a welfare state, but rather to what extent to have a welfare state.

The welfare state should go to this extent:

1. It should protect and safeguard the individual from matters over which the individual has no control, but which can harm him, such as sickness, accident, old age, depression, and inflation, to mention a few.

2. It should guarantee our citizens equal social, moral, and economic opportunities and equalize these opportunities. This includes civil rights and aid to education.

3. It should provide for the general welfore of the people by stepping in whenever the people need and want something they are not receiving adequately through private funds. A good example on this point is the Government's housing program.

Truly a welfare state is just a state designed more and more to help the people help themselves. Actually a welfare state is a Fair Deal state.

Many liberal Republicans will concede the need for certain welfare legislation but they will argue, "Let's do it through private funds." This is a utopian attitude. Private business on the whole is neither willing nor able to provide for the public welfare. The Government is the people's instrument and because it is both able and willing, it looks out for the public welfare.

Others condemn the welfare state because it can be mismanaged or because it can be carried too far and become socialism. That is true. Anything can be mismanaged or carried too far.

The people need and want a welfare state. They proved it in the last election. We should not look at the welfare state seeing only its cost and not its value.

JOE COOPER,
West High School.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—SECOND ANNUAL REPORT FOR THE PHILIPPINE ALIEN PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION (H. DOC. NO. 449)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the second annual report for the Philippine Alien Property Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1950.*

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—THE RUBBER POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 448)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on the Armed Services and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

The tremendous increase in the use of rubber is one of the outstanding features of our industrial development in the last 50 years. Rubber has become indipensable to the United States, in both peace and war. Yet, 10 years ago this country was dependent for practically all of its supply of this essential material on areas halfway around the world. Early in World War II these areas were lost, and it became necessary to develop a domestic source of rubber. The creation, in the midst of war, of a new industry capable of supplying a million tons of synthetic rubber a year was one of the great achievements of our war effort.

Since the war, the sources of natural rubber have again become available to us, and production has increased as the destruction and dislocations of war have been overcome. At the same time, the world demand for rubber has risen so far above the prewar levels that the supply of natural rubber is still less than demand. Thus, continued production of synthetic rubber in this country has prevented a serious world rubber shortage.

Facilities for producing general-purpose synthetic rubber, commonly called GR–S, are owned by the Government, as are the plants for producing butyl, the type of synthetic rubber used primarily in inner tubes. Facilities for producing other types of synthetic rubber are now all privately owned. In 1949 about 289,000 long tons of GR–S and 52,000 long tons of butyl were produced by the Government. In addition, about 53,000 long tons of other synthetic rubbers were produced in privately owned plants.

It is essential to our national security that facilities to produce enough high-quality synthetic rubber to meet our needs in an emergency be continuously available. We must build up a stock pile of natural rubber, and we have been doing so, but the accumulation of a stock pile large enough to meet all emergency needs for rubber is impractical. We must be equipped to meet the bulk of our needs from domestically produced rubber.

The Government's synthetic rubber activities are now conducted under the Rubber Act of 1948, which expires on June 30, 1950. This legislation provides that capacity for production of synthetic rubber shall be maintained in the United States at all times, and requires that minimum quantities shall be produced and consumed each year. It provides authority for continued Government production of synthetic rubber, for regulations requiring its consumption in certain products, for stand-by maintenance of plants not in operation, and for continued Government research in synthetic rubber. Although the act prohibits the disposal of the facilities in the synthetic rubber program, it declares it to be the policy of the Congress that Government ownership shall terminate whenever consistent with national security. The act provides that on or before January 15, 1950, the President shall recommend to the Congress "legislation with respect to disposal of Government-owned rubber-producing facilities * * * together with such other recommendations as he deems desirable and appropriate."

As a basis for making recommendations to the Congress, I have had made a thorough investigation of all aspects of the rubber problem. A report summarizing the results of this investigation is transmitted to the Congress with this message. The detailed recommendations in that report have my approval.

The rubber policy of the United States should be based upon the fundamental national objectives of protection of the national security, promotion of a free competitive economy, and achievement of a peaceful and prosperous world. I recommend that legislation succeeding the Rubber Act of 1948 be enacted, setting forth this rubber policy, and providing for continuation of the synthetic rubber industry in a manner consistent with these objectives.

In order to maintain the productive capacity needed in the event of emergency, the President should have the authority to designate the plants which must be kept available at all times for synthetic rubber production. On the basis of present technology and estimated requirements, it appears that our present plant capacity of nearly a million tons a year should be maintained to be prepared to meet emergency needs for synthetic rubber. It is not necessary, however, that all this capacity be in operation. Maintenance in a stand-by condition of those plants which are not being used should, therefore, be authorized.

In order to encourage technological development in the production and use of synthetic rubber and to provide a basis for rapid expansion of production if this proves necessary, at least a minimum quantity of each type of synthetic rubber must be produced and consumed. Certain types of synthetic rubber, which are privately manufactured, have established a sufficiently strong position in the competitive market to assure a continuing demand for them. Recent improvements in butyl rubber, which is produced only in Government-owned plants, make it superior to natural rubber for use in inner tubes, its major use. It is probable, therefore, that as soon as private production of butyl begins, this type of synthetic rubber will be produced and consumed in adequate volume in a competitive market. Until butyl is privately produced, however, the President should have the authority to determine the minimum quantities of butyl which must be produced and consumed, and to the extent necessary to require its use in specified products.

The situation with respect to general-purpose synthetic rubber (GR–S) is not quite so favorable. Since it is not yet a satisfactory substitute for natural rubber in all of the products for which it would be used in an emergency, it is desirable that the Government's authority to conduct research in this field continue. The physical properties of GR–S have been steadily improved in recent years, and at present the quality differences between GR–S and natural rubber for peacetime general-purpose uses (chiefly passenger-car tires) are not significant. Price differentials are likely to be the determining factor in the choice between the two rubbers for most uses. It is very possible that for some time to come a considerable volume of GR–S production will be required, since the supply of natural rubber is not likely to be sufficient to meet world market demand. This possibility, however, is not an adequately dependable base for national security planning.

I believe that, at the present time, at least one-quarter of total consumption of GR–S and natural rubber, and not less than 200,000 long tons annually, should be GR–S. However, the needed level of production and consumption may change over the next few years with changes in world conditions. Therefore, the President should be given the authority to establish from time to time the minimum level of production and consumption necessary to the national security.

The present technological position of general-purpose synthetic rubber is such that it probably could not compete for bulk uses with natural rubber offered at significantly lower prices. There is thus no adequate assurance that the demand for GR–S either because of the possible shortage of natural rubber or because of its technological qualities, will be sufficient to insure production and consumption at levels necessary for national security. The President should, therefore, have authority to require the use of GR–S in certain products to the extent necessary to assure such production and consumption.

The minimum level of production and consumption should not be higher than the national security requires, for if it were, it would unduly prevent consumers in this country from realizing the benefits of market competition, and interfere with our objectives of expanding world trade and world prosperity.

It is my earnest hope that controls on consumption of GR–S may be reduced or suspended over the next few years, as technological improvements result in increasing quantities of general-purpose synthetic rubber being consumed without Government support. This development should be stimulated by the disposal of the Government's plants to private owners.

The President should be authorized to dispose of the synthetic rubber facilities to private owners, under conditions which will protect the national security and promote effective competition.

The disposal of these plants while promoting effective competition will present many difficult problems. The plants are large and involve large-scale operations. Furthermore, only a few plants are required to meet the probable demand for both required and anticipated voluntary consumption of synthetic rubber. The legislation authorizing disposal should

take account of these facts, and provide specific standards designed to assure that the disposal program will actively promote effective competition and avoid monopolistic concentration.

A special problem will arise when general-purpose synthetic rubber plants are privately owned, if the Government continues to require the use of synthetic rubber in certain products. In this situation, the Government must see that synthetic rubber is made available on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to those required to use it. Such Government intervention in the normal buyer-seller relationship will present difficult practical problems for both industry and Government. Development of a vigorous private synthetic rubber industry, however, may soon result in adequate consumption of synthetic rubber to permit removal of Government regulation.

I believe that the policies outlined in this message and the detailed recommendations contained in the accompanying report provide a sound program for action. For this reason, the legislation establishing these policies can be of relatively long duration. Furthermore, a firmly established legislative framework is highly desirable if disposal of the Government's synthetic rubber plants is to be successful. I recommend the adoption of legislation of 10 years' duration in order to provide adequate protection of the national security and to contribute to the development of a vigorous, competitive, and privately owned synthetic-rubber industry in the United States.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1950.*

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 2988, to provide for a Resident Commissioner from the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

BENEFITS FOR ANNUITANTS WHO RETIRED PRIOR TO APRIL 1, 1948

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4295) to provide benefits for annuitants who retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, prior to April 1, 1948.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

ERECTION AND OPERATION OF A MUSEUM AT KLUKWAN, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2012) to authorize the erection and operation of a museum at Klukwan, Alaska.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

PRACTITIONERS BEFORE ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4446) to protect the public with respect to practitioners before administrative agencies.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL CEMETERY AT FORT LOGAN, COLO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4548) to provide for the utilization as a national cemetery of surplus Army Department owned military real property at Fort Logan, Colo.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PUBLIC AIRPORTS SERVING NATIONAL PARKS, NATIONAL MONUMENTS, AND NATIONAL RECREATION AREAS.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1283) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire, construct, operate, and maintain public airports in, or in close proximity to, national parks, monuments, and recreation areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL LABOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5557) to provide for coordination of arrangements for the employment of agricultural workers, admitted for temporary agricultural employment from foreign countries in the Western Hemisphere, to assure that the migration of such workers will be limited to the minimum numbers required to meet domestic labor shortages, and for other purposes.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

FOREST RECREATIONAL RESOURCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2419) relating to the disposition of moneys received from the national forests.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5965) to provide for the construction of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals, and for other purposes.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN PARTS OF ALASKA BY WAR VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4424) to provide for the settlement of certain parts of Alaska by war veterans.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1282) to authorize grants under the Federal Airport Act for minor projects at major airports, and for other purposes.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

ALASKA AIRPORTS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2436) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2596) relating to education or training of veterans under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (Public Law 346, 78th Cong., June 22, 1944).

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. That completes the list of the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THREE HUNDRED MILLION ADDITIONAL REVENUE FROM IMPORTED OIL

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which should raise approximately $300,000,000 a year from a relatively untaxed source, to wit,

foreign crude oil imports and derivatives thereof. Furthermore, such a measure would furnish some sorely needed protection to American labor and American industry. Why should we permit comparatively untaxed, unregulated foreign industry and labor to destroy heavily taxed, heavily regulated domestic labor and industry? Not only is the American petroleum industry being crowded out of world markets but we are permitting world markets to move into this country and displace a domestic production of which this country produces and can continue to produce a great surplus. This is not good business or good economics and is not in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I have today introduced is as follows:

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code by increasing the excise tax on imported crude petroleum and crude petroleum derivatives

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress, in view of the essentiality of petroleum and derivatives thereof to the welfare and security of the Nation, to encourage the development and maintenance of sources of petroleum within the United States in order to prevent a dangerous and unnecessary dependence by the United States upon foreign sources for supplies of petroleum. It is further declared to be the policy of Congress that imported petroleum and derivatives thereof should not be permitted to destroy domestic industry or displace domestic labor, and further should be required to make a fair and equitable contribution to Federal revenues.

SEC. 2. To carry out the policy of this act section 3422 (53 Stat. 414) of the Internal Revenue Code hereby is amended to provide import taxes on petroleum and derivatives as follows:

"Crude petroleum and all liquid derivatives of crude petroleum, except lubricating oil, 2½ cents per gallon; lubricating oil, 4 cents per gallon; paraffin and other petroleum wax products, 1 cent per pound."

SEC. 3. For the purposes of administering section 3420 and section 3422 of the Internal Revenue Code imports of petroleum and derivatives thereof shall include imported petroleum and derivatives thereof for supplies for vessels at United States ports, but shall exclude petroleum and derivatives thereof imported for manufacture and reexport.

SEC. 4. The import taxes established by this act shall apply notwithstanding any action heretofore taken pursuant to the authority of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and shall not be subject to increase or decrease or modification in any matter whatever under the authority of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, or any other law.

Imports of foreign oil into the United States are now averaging approximately 750,000 barrels daily. Practically all of this is either, first, crude oil; or, second, residual fuel oil. About two-thirds of the total is crude oil and about one-third is residual fuel oil. Imports of other petroleum products such as gasoline, kerosene, and home heating oils are insignificant and do not today present a problem. The bill I have introduced, therefore, is directed mainly at crude oil and residual fuel oil which are causing the present injury being suffered by the domestic industry.

In 1932 Congress established a tax on crude oil and residual fuel oil of 21 cents a barrel. Under the trade agreements with Venezuela in 1939 and Mexico in 1943 this tax was reduced to one-half of its original amount or 10½ cents per barrel. It is generally recognized that a tax of 10½ cents a barrel on crude oil and residual fuel oil is ineffective in placing imports on a competitive basis with the domestic industry and it is insufficient to prevent foreign oil from taking over the home markets as has been occurring during the past few years. To place foreign oil on a basis that will prevent it from further displacement of American labor, from further absorption of the home markets and from further destruction of the domestic industry, will require a substantial increase in the existing taxes. I am, therefore, proposing that a tax of 2½ cents per gallon or $1.05 per barrel be established on both crude oil and residual fuel oil.

The tax established by Congress in 1932 on gasoline and other motor fuels was 2½ cents per gallon, on lubricating oil, 4 cents per gallon; and on paraffin and wax products, 1 cent per pound. Under the trade-agreements program all of these taxes have been reduced by 50 percent. I am proposing that these taxes, which were intended by Congress to be outside the purview of the trade-agreements program, be restored to their original amounts.

The legislative history of the Trade Agreements Act shows it was the understanding and the intent of Congress when it provided Executive authority in 1934 to negotiate trade agreements that the excise taxes on oil, coal, copper, and lumber were not to be the subject of negotiations with foreign countries. These excise taxes differ from a tariff or customs duty and were given special treatment because the excise taxes, as a part of the revenue law, are reviewed periodically by Congress. The record clearly shows that Congress intended to retain full control over these excise taxes. The Ways and Means Committee of the Seventy-third Congress in its report on the pending trade agreements bill said:

In order that the necessary reciprocity may be accorded, the President is empowered to promise that existing duties which affect imported goods will not be increased during the term of any particular agreement. It should be carefully noted, however, that the President is given no right to reduce or increase any excise duty. His power of reduction of duties is limited to those which are in fact customs duties.

The Senate Committee on Finance adopted the Ways and Means Committee report, including the above language.

In addition, Senator Harrison, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, on May 17, 1934, in presenting the bill to the Senate called specific attention to excise taxes and their position with respect to the trade agreements authority, saying:

It was the intent of those who framed the legislation, and of the House in passing the bill, that they would be frozen; in other words they might not be modified. * * * They cannot be increased and they cannot be lowered.

This intent and understanding on the part of Congress was further evidenced a few years later when in 1939 it was proposed that the excise tax on copper would be the subject of negotiation in an agreement with Chile. At that time Senators HAYDEN and Ashurst, of Arizona, filed a brief with the State Department in protest of the proposed consideration to reduce the excise tax on copper. They said, in referring to the excise taxes:

For the executive branch of the Government to reduce them, by negotiation with a foreign government, would constitute a serious and substantial breach of faith with the Congress.

In the bill I have introduced I propose that the import tax shall apply on imported oil that is used as supplies for vessels at United States ports. Under the Internal Revenue Code imports for vessel supplies are exempted from the import tax. Such imports during the past year have averaged from 60,000 to 75,000 barrels per day. The supplies for vessels at United States ports are a part of the domestic market. It is in our national interest that the domestic industry be able to supply these requirements at all times. It is important that this portion of our needs does not become dependent upon an uncertain source of supply. A tax on these imports will also provide a substantial source of revenue. In line with past practice, my bill further provides that imports for manufacture and reexport are not subject to the tax.

Mr. Speaker, the world now produces a surplus of crude petroleum and its derivatives. Much of the foreign production which we now find so competitive with our domestic production has been financed by American money. Imports which have now risen to the staggering amount of 750,000 barrels per day are still rising and will doubtless soon reach the amount of a million barrels per day. This tremendous flow of relatively untaxed, unregulated foreign oil should contribute not less than $300,000,000 a year to our needy Treasury. Not only this, but our American labor and our American industries are entitled to the small degree of protection which this bill would afford.

Notwithstanding some statements to the contrary, we in this country now produce and will continue to produce a surplus of crude petroleum and the derivatives of crude petroleum. We are a surplus producer of these commodities. Not only that, but vast new fields have been discovered throughout the world, and the world is now a surplus producer of crude petroleum and the derivatives thereof.

In the Middle East, largely by American companies, fabulous new oil reserves have been discovered, and vast production is now occurring in that area. American companies, too, have developed great fields in Venezuela and vast new supplies have been discovered in Canada. In 1936 we were a net exporter of crude petroleum and crude-petroleum products in the net amount of approximately 200,000 barrels per day. Now, get this picture. From a net exporter of this surplus commodity, one that we produce in surplus here in our domestic economy, we have now become a net importer of this same commodity in the amount of around 300,000 barrels per day.

Now, what has been the effect of these tremendous imports of foreign crude oil and the derivatives thereof? In my own State of Texas which, as you gentlemen know, is an oil-producing State, our allowables, that is the amount of crude oil we are permitted to produce, have been reduced by the railroad commission, the conservation agency of our State, by approximately the same amount as our imports. Within the last year the State of Texas has suffered in tax-revenue loss alone more than $30,000,000 because of this reduced production of crude oil and the derivatives of crude oil.

The Texas Legislature is convening this month to levy new taxes in our State to take up the slack as the result of the loss of revenue because of curtailed oil production, production which we have been compelled to reduce largely because of imported foreign crude oil. Through ECA, through loans, and through other methods, we have subsidized to a large extent the exploration and development, in these foreign areas of the world, of these vast supplies of crude oil, therefore it seems to me that a sense of fairness and of equity to the American taxpayer alone ought to cause us to give serious consideration to increasing the excise tax on crude petroleum and the derivatives of crude petroleum.

Now we are faced with a situation where domestic labor is being forced into idleness. Refineries are being closed. Independents in the industry are going broke. Businesses allied with them are suffering. The situation grows worse instead of better. Importation of foreign oil will probably soon rise to a million barrels per day or more.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not understand just what the gentleman is telling us here. Does he mean that if we had a higher excise tax on petroleum and crude products that would increase the supply of oil?

Mr. GOSSETT. No; I say we have a surplus of oil, and our domestic oil is being supplanted by foreign oil which comes in relatively tax-free. I say that domestic labor and domestic industry is entitled to some protection against utter destruction from foreign competition.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What the gentleman proposes is to increase the tax on the oil that comes in or on the domestic oil?

Mr. GOSSETT. No; I propose to increase the tax on imported crude oil and the derivatives thereof. I want to bring the tax up to around a dollar a barrel. It will have no effect on the supplies, except that it will mean that our domestic producers can supply the domestic demand rather than having this foreign oil brought in for the domestic market.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then it is not a tax on domestic oil?

Mr. GOSSETT. No.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I am glad to see the gentleman come in here and talk for tariffs on products coming into this country. It is a real joy to me to see that coming from that side of the House, because of the fact that you have given the President and the State Department now under the reciprocal-trade-agreements program the right and the power to cut down these tariffs.

This removal of all duties on imports is wrong because eventually you will be putting our working people out of their jobs and you will have our industry closed down. It is high time that somebody on that side began to see that. I take my hat off to you, sir, and I hope you will get many more Members on that side to do something because if you do not you will find that labor in this country will be out of luck. They will not have a job and the industries will be closed down and out of business.

Mr. GOSSETT. I thank the gentleman. I might say to the gentleman that thousands of workers are already out of jobs because of this foreign oil coming into this country in an ever-increasing flood.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. Would the gentleman care to discuss the ECA situation whereby we are making loans or grants to foreign refineries which will be in competition with our own export business?

Mr. GOSSETT. I do not have all of the data before me, but I do know that ECA money is being used in some degree, at least, to build refineries abroad and to develop production by foreign countries. The British have recently declared their intention to quit using dollars in the purchase of oil and they are closing the British market, or at least threatening to close it in substantial degree to American oil.

In other words here is a world market which we have had some part in heretofore and now we are not only losing our world markets in crude petroleum, but foreign oil is coming in from all over the world and supplanting our domestic supply to a dangerous degree.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Then, in other words, along with the importation of crude oil, which is working a hardship on the petroleum industry and the independent producers, we are asking these independent producers in the petroleum industry to furnish the money, through taxes, which go to the Government and then the ECA is developing these refinery programs abroad which will bring about competition for our independent producers here? In other words they are furnishing the money to sharpen the razor that is cutting their economic throat; is that not right?

Mr. GOSSETT. To a certain degree. The small independent producer in this country in effect is helping to finance their own destruction so far as foreign competition goes. This tax that I am proposing would be to some degree an equalization tax.

Mr. GAVIN. That is right. I quite agree. The gentleman has made a very fine statement. Could the gentleman tell us approximately how many barrels of oil are being imported into this country monthly, or daily?

Mr. GOSSETT. Roughly 750,000 barrels per day. We are told by the major importers, who are quite frank and honest about it that that figure is going up. The State Department has estimated that importations will increase and I make the prediction that within the next few months we will be getting into this country 1,000,000 barrels per day of crude oil from foreign fields.

Mr. GAVIN. What was it last year at this time?

Mr. GOSSETT. The gentleman means in 1948?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes.

Mr. GOSSETT. I believe it was around 500,000 barrels a day, or even less.

Mr. GAVIN. And it is rapidly increasing?

Mr. GOSSETT. The import curve is going up rapidly.

Mr. GAVIN. And the market for the independent producers is going down because they cannot find a market for their oil and refineries are being closed down; is that not correct?

Mr. GOSSETT. Refineries are being closed by the dozen. Research is being slowed and exploration is being curtailed. Nobody with any information on this subject at all in this country has any idea that we are running out of oil. We have tremendous known reserves which are not being drilled. The independents, your wildcatters in the industry, have quit looking for oil to a large extent because it is not profitable any longer.

Another thing we should remember is if we get into a war, my dear sir, we are going to have to depend on our domestic supplies for our own domestic economy.

We are being shortsighted in the interests of our own national defense when we destroy or seriously impair so vital a domestic industry.

Mr. GAVIN. Unless we permit these independents to live, we cannot build up our reserves so that in the event we are catapulted into a cataclysm of war we are going to find ourselves in difficulties unless we have these reserves of oil; is that not correct?

Mr. GOSSETT. The gentleman is exactly right. I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. From the gentleman's statement I understand that what he is complaining about is the importation of foreign oil with little or no tax on it and the fact that this oil, which is cheaply produced is being dumped on our American market to the detriment of the independent oil producers in our own country. Is that right?

Mr. GOSSETT. That is quite right, sir.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Permit the Chair to state there are other special orders. However, the Chair will put the request.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has made his plea, as I understand it, in behalf of the independent producers of oil?

Mr. GOSSETT. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. The large oil companies are in the foreign field, are they not?

Mr. GOSSETT. There are about 11 of them that constitute the majors of the industry in this country. They are the chief importers. They also have most of these reserves in foreign fields.

Mr. KEEFE. They are either actual American corporations or subsidiaries of American corporations that have developed oil in foreign countries which they are bringing into this country in competition with the independent producers in America? Is that right?

Mr. GOSSETT. That is 95 percent correct; yes, sir.

Mr. KEEFE. What the gentleman proposes to do, as I understand it, is to levy a tax upon that oil that comes into this country from foreign countries? Is that right?

Mr. GOSSETT. That is exactly right.

Mr. KEEFE. That is a tariff, is it not? Call it what you want to.

Mr. GOSSETT. It might be called a tariff, but in the revenue code it is called an excise tax. There is a distinction.

Mr. KEEFE. It does not make any difference what you call it, the result is the same. You are seeking protection for the independent oil producer against the importation of cheaply produced oil, produced in foreign countries? Is that not what you are asking?

Mr. GOSSETT. That is part of it. There are many reasons. First, is protection. Second, is revenue. Third, is to keep the domestic industry on its feet against the day when we probably would need it. Another is the over-all benefit to our entire domestic economy.

Mr. KEEFE. Let me ask the gentleman: What you are asking, therefore, is the old theory of tariff for revenue, as distinguished against a purely protective tariff?

Mr. GOSSETT. Well, is the gentleman for it or against it?

Mr. KEEFE. I am not being interrogated.

Mr. GOSSETT. I am not a tariff expert. I do not want to make a speech on the tariff just here.

Mr. KEEFE. I will say this to the gentleman, that what I am interested in, and I think the problem is becoming very, very acute right now, and you do not need to limit it to oil. You can apply it to a half dozen industries. For instance, in my own district, one of them, notably the domestic fur industry, which has been put out of business by cheaper products coming in under the reciprocal trade-agreements program, free, or practically free of any tax or tariff protection. So I am interested, in answer to the gentleman's question to me, in seeing to it if we can develop a system in this country that will protect your industry and protect my industry, so that labor will have a chance to work in this country and these people who were so optimistic in the past, talking about the wonders and the glories of free trade, are just now beginning to awaken and become alive to the fact that apparently it is a one-way street, as far as it affects America.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the gentleman is to be commended for his statement with reference to the protection for the domestic producers of oil. I think the gentleman might well describe to the House the effect that has resulted from the high importation of oil, on our small producers and on our independent producers, in that they are not continuing their exploration of the oil fields, and they are fast going into the hands of the large producers, creating a greater and greater monopoly in the oil production.

Mr. GOSSETT. That is a very fine point, and I thank my colleague.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I want to commend the gentleman for the statement he has made, and to say that the last meeting I attended in my district before returning here was with the free and independent producers from the east Texas oil fields in Texas. I sincerely think that the State Department is not considering the plight of this industry as carefully as it should. I thought that so strongly that when I returned here, the first contact I made with any department was to get in touch with the Secretary of State and describe to him as best I could that which had been told me by these independent producers.

Mr. GOSSETT. I know the gentleman has been working hard on this problem.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. TEAGUE. The remark was just made that the best way to conserve oil is to keep it in the ground. Is that entirely true?

Mr. GOSSETT. That is not true. There are 8,000,000,000 barrels of known reserves that are produced in stripper wells. When you let a cow go dry, you do not start milking her again the next day. When you let these wells go dry, you have lost that oil forever. These are the first wells to be retired, to go out of production when this competition comes in, and they are now being abandoned by the thousands.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended five additional minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I wish to ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Texas be extended five additional minutes; is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. GOSSETT. I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. I merely wish to commend the gentleman for his effort in dealing with this problem. I hope that he may be able to secure a majority of this House to support his proposal. The gentleman well knows that I have done some work on this question myself, and I could very well join with him in extending my remarks and telling him about the work I have done.

Mr. GOSSETT. I know the gentleman from Kansas has introduced a bill to place a quota on imported crude oil and that he has done a great deal of studying on this problem. His State is being injured by excessive importation of crude oil.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I hope the gentleman will go further than oil in the work he is trying to do. I had a letter from a concern in Pittsburgh that manufactures tool steel, the writer stating that because of imports of tool steel into this country he is unable to keep his plant going, and he asked: "Can you not do something about getting an excise tax or a tariff on imported tool steel?"

I said "No," that I could not help him at all, because I had no influence whatever with the administration, that he would have to call in his labor leaders and tell them that they would be out of jobs, and get them to go down to see Mr. Truman if he wanted to get any results. I think that is the only way in the world that these manufacturers are going to get any relief, to make labor realize that their men will be out of jobs if this importation is not stopped.

Mr. GAVIN. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, I might state that the concern the gentleman from Pennsylvania is talking about is a Pittsburgh steel industry. The basic wage rate for steelworkers in the United States is $1.65; in Canada it is 97 cents; in Sweden it is 37 cents. Under the reciprocal trade treaties Canada reduced the price to 13½ cents. The price in this country is 15 cents. Canada gets this preference, a country that has balanced its budget, and that last year, I understand, had a surplus of $90,000,000. We still have an unbalanced budget and are still following this policy of breaking down the industrial and economic life of our country. As the gentleman said, labor should investigate these conditions. They certainly have something to think about in the steel industry.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, these gentlemen are going to have a chance to declare themselves on excise taxes. They are either for them or against them. I have always been opposed to excise taxes; I am going to be opposed to this excise tax. They can say what they want despite the fact there is a lot of backslapping between representatives of the coal States and representatives of the oil States. Where do you come in now in defense of your tourists who were short of gasoline and were rationed and denied gasoline in and around Chicago, Detroit, and the great tourist State of Pennsylvania? What are you going to do for your tourists, for your automobile gasoline user? Do you want to up the price of gasoline? It is too high now.

Mr. GOSSETT. There is no shortage of gasoline; there has been no shortage of gasoline; there will be no shortage of gasoline.

Mr. DINGELL. There was last summer.

Mr. GOSSETT. If there was, then it was due to some transportation difficulty, not to any inadequacy of supplies, because storage is full of gasoline. Many gasoline refineries are being closed.

I now yield to my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], who has done a lot of work on this problem as a member of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. KEOGH. It has been suggested in some quarters that the reduction of the allowable production in such producing States as Texas, and the effort to impose restrictions on the imports of petroleum and petroleum products have for their objective the maintenance of an abnormally high price structure in centers like the metropolitan area of New York.

Mr. GOSSETT. This question does not involve price structure at all, because the price has not been reduced and will not be reduced on account of imports. I am not an expert on price, I may say to the gentleman from New York, but let me say that the prices of crude oil and crude-oil products are considerably below parity when measured by the commodity index of the Department of Labor. If the independents of the oil industry are destroyed, prices will rise, not fall.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BREHM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE PETROLEUM INDUSTRY

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to represent an oil field that produces a finer grade of crude oil than any other district in the United States.

The quality of this crude oil produced in Allegany County, N. Y., has no superior.

The excellence of its lubricating quality was so recognized by the experts in the aviation field.

I want to protect the operators, the employees, and our consumers from the devastating consequences of the present policy of opening our domestic markets to foreign oil.

The petroleum industry of the United States is today beginning to reap a weedy crop of sale cancellations, order losses, and unemployment slips. The seeds were thoughtlessly sown many months ago by internationalists who, in the name of rehabilitation and aid to foreign countries, laid the plans for closing foreign markets to our own oil and opening our own markets to foreign oil.

In this connection I quote from the New York Times of Friday, January 13, 1950:

TOKYO, January 12.—American oil interests are rapidly being squeezed out of the Japanese market. Businessmen say the experience here parallels that elsewhere and that markets everywhere are being closed to them as the British effectively enlarge the sterling bloc by bilateral agreements.

The article goes on as follows:

Businessmen say there already are signs that the British who have acquired complete cartel control through American acquiescence, are beginning to raise prices far above normal competitive levels and to supply inferior products such as sulfur and heavy crude oil.

I want you to note carefully the next paragraph:

Occupation officials decline to accept any responsibility for this policy, asserting that it comes direct from Washington.

Now the representatives of oil-producing areas know who is taking such good care of your businessmen and workers.

The oil industry today could be producing efficiently and according to strictest conservation practices about 1,000,000 more barrels of oil every day than are now allowed. Although new wells are continually being discovered, production is already over 600,000 barrels per day less than it was a year ago. In the fourth quarter of 1948 output was 5,660,000 barrels per day. In the fourth quarter of 1949, estimating the last 3 or 4 weeks to be similar to that of the first 2 months of the quarter, production was about 5,000,000 per day. The unlucky workers who formerly produced that amount are now without jobs.

What has caused this? Simply the horse trading and finagling of our Government officials who, in the name of balancing our trade, justify any extreme.

Imports of petroleum in 1948 averaged 513,000 barrels per day. Imports in the first 10 months of 1949 averaged 634,000 barrels per day, an increase of over 23 percent. Imports in January 1949 amounted to 654,000 barrels per day, and in October they had risen to 785,000 per day. In the fourth quarter of 1948 imports were about 586,000 barrels per day—in the same period of 1949 they were about 750,000 per day.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the worst. Recent testimony before the Small Business Committee by oil importers indicate definite plans for imports during the first half of 1950 of at least 800,000 barrels per day, and if that does not spell additional unemployment in our own industry my education has been faulty.

Are our exports of oil to take up the slack? Hardly a week passes that we do not read of some foreign market for our oil products being closed to us or taken over by some foreign power through judicious use of the ECA money we have granted them.

In 1947 our exports of oil averaged 451,000 barrels per day. This had declined to 369,000 barrels by 1948, the average for that year. As sale after sale and market after market was lost through the bilateral and State-trading deals negotiated by Government heads and sanctioned or condoned by our own Government leaders the export business became poorer and poorer. In January of 1949 we exported only an average of 311,000 barrels per day, and the steady decline continued, for in September of last year exports were only 251,000 barrels per day.

I do not need to remind the unemployed oil worker of this, but perhaps some of my listeners do not know, we, by State or Government action, force the producers in this country to curtail output. Will someone kindly inform me by what law of justice we place no curb on imports, but on the contrary continue to increase them?

The independent oil producers, the principal ones to suffer when exports are shut off and imports greatly increased, will be interested to know of the devious and back-handed methods used to undermine them. I call their attention to a very curious procedure that is in the process of development.

The impotency of Congress under its present leadership is openly recognized by prominent Government administrators and other public servants. The elected representatives of the people are charged with the solemn obligation to formulate the policies of this Government, both foreign and domestic. We have had no foreign policy for many years—the White House has vacillated, experimented, and ignored the need for a sound program. Attempts of Congress, as feeble as they have been, have constantly been thwarted by the President.

Now plans are being pushed to name a committee of private citizens to formulate United States policy toward current world economic problems—see New York Times, December 13, 1949. ECA officials especially are urging that such a group be formed to take over what Senate and House leaders of the majority have not done or allowed to be done. It appears that Paul G. Hoffman, ECA Administrator, has discussed the formation of this committee with Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, and that, while most of the effort is being made by ECA, the State Department agrees with the idea.

This so-called Citizens' Committee would take over Congress' job on major problems arising from the economic imbalance among various sections of the world. The closing of the dollar gap between United States exports and imports

would likely receive first attention. This would be a real undertaking, as witness the fact that all the King's men—Presidential advisers—and all the King's horses—American taxpayers—have not been able to put it together. Imports in the first 9 months of 1948 were 55 percent as large as exports—in 1949, during the same period of the year, they were only 52 percent of exports. All the haphazard pushing and pulling seems to have done Mr. Humpty Dumpty more harm than good—as was to be expected when so much of the effort was aimed at artificially stimulating exports for the benefit of big business.

The Citizens' Committee or Little Congress or Policy Makers, Inc., or this group by whatever name, just may turn out to be hand-picked and packed with pro "export at any cost" citizens. The ECA is taking the initiative and may be expected to do a conscientious job, but the Departments of State and Treasury will be playing equal hands in the game. The proclivity of the State Department for "picking and packing"—picking the right kind of people and packing of the right committees—is well known. Inasmuch as the future of the petroleum and a good many other domestic industries will be at stake in this chessboard juggling to keep double imports, someone should examine very carefully the citizens who are to be handed this most important policy-making job.

The role of Congress in this molding of the future of our country will be minor at best. It is possible that some enabling legislation will be steam-rollered through to give the President power to put into effect the desires and recommendations of the substitute legislators on the committee. After all, the Constitution is quite specific about the powers and duties of Congress, and if the executive wants to continue to usurp the functions of Senators and Representatives it will have to be by even greater delegations of power.

Regardless of the sincerity or nonpartisan attitude of the committee members, and their education, experience, and ability notwithstanding, the formulation of our foreign policies was delegated to duly elected representatives of the people by the founding fathers, and no biased administration leaders should undermine or attempt to destroy that function. If Congress refuses to act, or if waste and inefficiency and negligence has left us with only a smelly remnant of a foreign policy, then the voters of this country should and will rise up to do something about it. It is and will always be the duty of Congress to pass on our trade policies, and no administration appointees should be empowered to manipulate foreign trade or domestic production or to shift manpower from free-enterprise industries to huge exporting combines.

The crux of it all is that the passage of a few highly controversial bills by very narrow margins during the last session have been literally interpreted by certain individuals as a mandate to revise the labor, management, and production structure of the entire country; to shift manpower, to close some industries and expand others, and to dictate whether we should consume goods made in America or pamper the foreign "leaders" exploiting state-controlled, low-paid labor.

The buying of American goods, produced from domestic raw materials by American labor, is actually being attacked as unpatriotic and is constantly being discouraged by speeches, publications, and various sorts of propaganda put out by hand-picked bureaucrats and financed by the taxpayers. Trade with iron-curtain countries, through deals with political leaders who control output, sale, price, and markets, is being pushed vigorously by our own leaders. Export controls have limited shipments of some types of goods to Russia, but we apparently welcome with open arms the goods they want to ship to us, including enormous amounts of furs which have literally devastated our own industry. In 1948—now mark this—in 1948 we imported from Russia almost three times as much as we exported to that country. Common sense tells us that we are building up a war potential in that country and her satellites just as much through importing from them as we do by exporting to them.

In 1948 we exported to iron-curtain countries goods valued at about $165,000,000 and imported goods from them in the sum of almost $150,000,000. Let the man walking the street hunting for work understand that—and ask him if he favors such a huge volume of trade with the Communists. Our enormous budget and high taxes are, according to the President, the result of preparations for defense against communism—and so we pamper it and foster it by importing huge quantities of highly competitive goods produced in Communist slave-labor camps.

State trading, in Russia and many other countries, is rapidly setting a pattern for future world exchange of goods and our own diplomats are fostering the idea by urging the adoption of an International Trade Organization, which, while it shakes a finger at such practices in its preamble, proceeds to legalize and recognize such deals in its later chapters.

It takes no expert forecaster to prognosticate that this new citizens committee will follow instructions from someone. There is a citizens committee for the promotion of this International Trade Organization. This proposed new one will also likely do much less analyzing and studying than it will do by way of promotion. This idea that we must buy foreign goods instead of our own is not meeting with too good a reception, and apparently the public must be bamboozled more than the bureaucrats have been able to do by themselves.

I cannot but wonder how the farmer will be represented on such a committee. The administration, and the State Department have openly and frequently broken the promises of President Roosevelt that duties on agricultural products would not be reduced.

Very much the opposite has taken place. Here is some really astounding information. The full impact of the last trade agreements, those negotiated at Annecy, France, a year ago, fell right on the farmer. The administration has been careful not to advertise the fact, but look at these figures—and they are easily proved—almost 84 percent of the reductions in duties at the Annecy horse-trading session were on agricultural products. Only about 16 percent of the value of imported articles affected would not be classed as farm-income products. Butter was one of those items—and who is there to say that our own Department of Agriculture was not right in overruling the State Department by refusing to issue import licenses when we have a huge surplus in our own country. Who is to say that peace and good will have been promoted with Denmark and New Zealand and Norway, and several other countries by making promises that even our most ignorant negotiators knew we might not be able to keep.

The farmer begins to see the handwriting on the wall. He knows that the pap of temporary price supports and Government purchases of his products is not solid nor nourishing. He is rapidly becoming aware that he is losing his export markets, and he is also learning fast that agriculture is taking the brunt of the tariff cuts that drive his products out of his own home market. The farmers' reaction of disgust to the Brannan plan of socializing the industry which brings life and plenty from the soil is a good indication. Our farmers, our developers of new products such as tung oil and rice and other items that formerly could be obtained only in far-away places, will not be misled by any committee set up to extol the virtues of abandoning their farms and their projects so the public will be forced to buy food from abroad.

I, and most of the agriculturists, and most businessmen want to see and promote the largest possible volume of profitable foreign trade. The efforts of any one-world group promoting excessive imports, however, will meet some strong opposition.

About three-fourths of the oil-producing wells in the United States are in the stripper class. Natural decline ultimately makes strippers of all wells. In recent years, with the betterment of conservation practices, the stripper-well stage is delayed, but there still are in excess of 300,000 such wells.

A stripper well has two principal characteristics. First, it is capable of only small natural production (most of them are pumped); and, second, it is always in the lowest profit zone. It is, therefore, the one most vulnerable to the raids of low-cost foreign oil.

Stripper wells normally account for 13 to 15 percent of the annual production of crude oil in the United States. Important as that is—the importance was especially noticed during the war—it is of equal or even greater importance that stripper well reserves operated under secondary recovery methods are very large.

On many properties where water has been systemically injected into the producing sand there has been a recovery of oil greater than the total recovered over a long period of primary methods.

Estimates are that billions of barrels of oil are recoverable by restoring pressure in the sands with water, natural gas, or compressed air.

The probability that secondary recovery work will be done is greatly lessened when stripper-well properties are abandoned or forced to discontinue daily operation. Yet, under the weight of huge imports of oil, the stripper reserves would be junked first. Purchasers of domestic crude oil, in the effort to reduce costs, would seek their supplies in the fields of greater volume where gathering costs in the field were lowest. They are highest in the stripper-well fields.

Repeatedly, certain elements in the executive department of government have given all possible support to foreign oil development and importation into the United States. Two recommendations illustrate this attitude:

First. On July 27, 1943, the Special Committee on Petroleum, an interdepartmental group set up by the State Department, held a meeting. Attending were Herbert Feis, Alger Hiss, and J. C. Sappington, of the State Department; Commodore A. F. Carter, Navy Department; Brig. Gen. Boykin C. Wright, War Department; C. S. Snodgrass and E. L. DeGolyer, Petroleum Administration for War. It was the declared purpose to "facilitate entry into the United States of foreign oil by reducing import restrictions." It was also stated in the minutes of the meeting—see Senate Report No. 440, part 5, Eightieth Congress, page 49—that Government policy should be to "encourage through financial and other appropriate governmental assistance the development of foreign oil supplies." This committee's existence, it had earlier been declared, was not related to the war effort, but was to assure postwar supplies of oil. What makes our domestic market so attractive to oil importers? The answer is plain.

Approximately four-fifths of the automobiles, busses, and trucks in the world are owned and operated in the United States.

Latest figures on world registration of motor vehicles indicated the following population ratios per vehicles: Europe, 1 to 61 persons; Asia, 1 to 1,804; all North and South America, including the United States, 1 to 75; United States 1 to 4.

More homes are heated with oil in the United States than in all the rest of the world; more industries consume fuel oil.

Distribution facilities are the best and the most numerous. There are about 400,000 retail outlets for the sale of gasoline.

Importers are in a hurry to find big markets for their foreign production. The largest, most accessible and most readily served market in the world is in the United States. Further development of foreign markets is slow and costly.

Second. In August 1948 the National Security Resources Board circulated privately a report recommending a reduction of 20 percent in domestic production to create a reserve producing capacity for emergency use. Any deficit in supply, resulting from such reduction, it was stated, should be made up by imports. The recommended reduction would, as of the producing rate at that time, equal about 1,100,000 barrels daily. Through cut-backs in State allowable production and increases in new production created by drilling, the goal set in the report has been approximated.

These recommendations of policy by agencies of the executive branch of government are in opposition to the expansion of the domestic industry sufficient to meet both peacetime and emergency requirements.

I wish at this point to present the history of oil-import tax and application of trade-agreements program.

In 1932 Congress recognized the problems confronting the domestic oil industry resulting from a rising flood of imports, and at that time established excise taxes on the importation of crude petroleum and all petroleum products. The problem facing the industry today closely parallels the situation existing in 1932.

The excise taxes established in 1932 on the principal petroleum products were as follows:

		Cents
Crude	barrel	21
Fuel oil	do	21
Gasoline	do	2½
Kerosene	do	½
Lubricating oil	do	4

The action of Congress in 1932 was in effect an announced policy of encouragement to the domestic industry by preventing injury that might result from imports of foreign oil. The amount of the tax was not so important as the assurance that the congressional policy gave to the domestic industry, which was encouraged to proceed in its normal way in developing the petroleum resources of the Nation. The result was that the industry had built up a reserve producing capacity of approximately 1,000,000 barrels daily above requirements by the beginning of World War II. This supply was readily available in case of emergency, and not subject to interruption by enemy submarines.

The petroleum excise taxes have been the subject of treatment under the trade-agreements program on three occasions. First, in 1939, in the agreement with Venezuela. Second, in 1943 in the agreement with Mexico. Third, in 1947 in the multilateral agreement consummated in Geneva.

In the Venezuela agreement the excise tax was reduced from 21 cents to 10½ cents per barrel on the following: First, crude petroleum; second, topped crude petroleum; third, gas oil; and, fourth, fuel oil. These reduced taxes, however, applied only to a quota based on 5 percent of the total quantity processed in United States refineries. All imports in excess of the quota were subject to the full tax.

In the Mexico agreement the quota restriction of the Venezuela agreement was removed, the reduced rates of the Venezuela agreement were reaffirmed, and, in addition, the tax was reduced 50 percent on the following: First, kerosene; second, liquid asphalt; and, third, road oil.

In the general agreement on tariffs and trade of 1947, concluded at Geneva, the tax on gasoline was reduced from 2½ cents to 1¼ cents and on lubricating oils from 4 cents to 2 cents. All other products not treated in previous agreements also were reduced by 50 percent.

Thus the status of the petroleum-import taxes which Congress provided in 1932 is that all petroleum excises have been reduced by 50 percent. Through this action the executive branch of the Federal Government has reversed the congressional policy of encouragement of the domestic industry to one of favoring oil development in foreign countries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, be nifty and thrifty in fifty.

I want to impress that on the minds of all Members of Congress, if this country is to survive. We have reached the high-water mark of squandering and spending and taxing. From now on we are either going to have a hard time to work ourselves out of the condition in which we find ourselves or else we are going to sink. Too much expensive, overburdened government, and taxes. It is going to take the best minds we have, and use of the best common sense that we have to do the things that are for the best interests of the Nation. We have to forget a lot of things that we are doing, cut out a lot of burdensome government, if we are going to survive.

When the time comes that we follow a party blindly because the head of the party says we ought to follow that road to bankruptcy, you are only heading for bankruptcy, unless you get the head of the party to change his course. Get common sense and have a common-sense program.

I take the Federal budget, in brief, that was handed to me, and which was read before the Members of Congress during the past 2 weeks, and I find that the President has asked you to spend this year $42,400,000,000 when he says, by the best experts that he has in Government, that he is going to receive only $37,300,000,000. He is advocating spending $5,100,000,000 more than he expects to take in. Ever since he has been President he has been doing that very thing. He has been advocating spending money without trying to keep the country solvent. It is not going to work. It is a wreck ahead. That is what he did in the haberdashery business.

If you will take the years back, for the last 15 years, just see what has happened to this country. We have increased our national debt from $20,000,000,000 since 1932 until today we have a debt of $269,000,000,000. It was not all war by any sense; it has been foolish, ridiculous, unsound administration and laws by an irresponsible people and Congress and a President who led you into this terrible mess and is still at it.

Here are the great items of expenditure: National defense, $13,500,000,000; veterans, $6,100,000,000; interest on the public debt, $5,600,000,000, and the ECA or the international fund that we are

spending, or providing, is $4,700,000,000. In 1949 on this ECA we spent $5,876,000,000; in 1950, the current fiscal year, the amount is $5,364,000,000; and the President has requested for next year $4,700,000,000. This is the principal thing about which I wish to talk today. When we know the condition of our country and we know just what the results are going to be if we go into bankruptcy, it ought to be our duty to look after America first, last, and all the time. It is not that I do not want to try to help some foreign country or someone else get on their feet, but when it goes to the extent of breaking down this country, America, then I am against it. I would like to see the Members of this Congress, the men here who were responsible for spending all this money in the last few years go back to their people and let them vote on the proposition whether they want you to give away without their consent to some foreign country $45 for every man, woman, and child in your district in 1 year to foreign countries. I just do not believe they want you to do it; I know they do not in my district. I find a few of them who say that we ought to help these foreign countries, but when I ask them for their $45 they do not shell out. They do not have anything to shell out; they want somebody else to do it, for they are not willing to. They are taxed too much now. And that is a point I wish to make, that it is easy to talk and nice to say all these things about these foreign countries, but it is quite a different matter when it comes to placing more taxes on the back of the people of your district, because they are the ones that have got to pay the bill and that is the only way in which you can get the money to pay the bill; tax, tax, and tax, they just do not do it voluntarily.

I was very much interested in reading an editorial in this morning's Times-Herald in which Britain asks us to pay her debts. I think it would be a good thing if each Member here read it, and I shall insert it in the RECORD at this point:

BRITAIN ASKS US TO PAY HER DEBTS

Another move for aid to Britain at the expense of the American taxpayer is being promoted. With encouragement from some of the more extreme Anglophiles here, Stafford Cripps in London last Monday called for an early meeting with Secretary of the Treasury Snyder on Britain's dollar-shortage problem.

What Cripps wants help on this time is the sterling balances, Britain's war debt to India, Egypt, Pakistan, Eire, Ceylon, and other countries in the sterling bloc.

At the end of the war Britain owed these countries £3,700,000,000 sterling. The debt was not in the form of bonds, but consisted of balances at London banks in the accounts of the creditors. At the rate of $4.03 per pound, the sterling debt amounted to nearly $15,000,000,000.

While Britain owed the sterling countries $15,000,000,000, she owed the United States $30,000,000,000 under lend-lease. Forty-five billions was quite a burden for the British. The United States came to Britain's aid at this juncture by canceling the $30,000,000,000 debt.

In the expectation that Britain would make a deal with her sterling creditors extending most of the debt for payment over a long period of time and making a small amount available for current drawings, the United States made a cash loan of $3,750,000,000 to Britain at a nominal rate of interest, with no payments for 5 years, and payments excused in years of financial strain.

At the same time, Britain was given title to lend-lease goods which were in the pipe lines but not delivered. These goods, worth $650,000,000, were to be paid for on the same terms as the $3,750,000,000 debt.

STERLING CREDITORS REFUSE TO CONCEDE

But the sterling creditors, who would have been compelled to go along on a composition settlement had we not canceled lend-lease and granted the $3,750,000,000 credit, have since refused to make any material concessions. Cripps and his predecessor have made annual deals with these countries, limiting the amount that could be withdrawn and fixing an annual interest rate of one-half of 1 percent.

But the countries have been using the amounts released under these annual agreements to pay for a substantial portion of the goods Britain was prepared to export. Actually, the Labor government has been unable to hold the withdrawals down to the amounts agreed upon. Much of the goods made in Britain has gone out of the country without offsetting imports coming back.

The goods Britain has shipped to pay off the war debt to these preferred creditors reduced the amount that could be shipped to the United States and sold for dollars. And as a result, there is a dollar shortage.

* * * * *

To correct this situation, Britain now asks that the United States assume the British debt to the sterling countries. It is said this is in our own interest and it will "establish a wide market for American exports." We shall be shipping the "unrequited exports" instead of Britain. By assuming a debt that is busting Britain, we are to get rich.

The London Times asserted a short time ago that "the American taxpayer is bound to finance eventually a large portion of the export surplus anyhow," and "free exports to India may be regarded as good a way of giving away money as any of the ways practiced in recent years."

UNITED STATES URGED TO AID STERLING SETTLEMENT

The advocates of shifting of the sterling debt to the shoulders of the American taxpayers are not all British. A committee of the United States council of the International Chamber of Commerce only last month brought out the idea of the United States contributing 15 percent toward the settlement of the sterling balances.

That isn't the only way to wipe out the sterling debt. By payments in unrequited exports Britain got the debt down from £3,700,000,000 at the end of 1946 to £3,200,000,000 by September. That is from $15,000,000,000 down to $12,800,000,000. It stood there on Saturday night, September 17. The next day the debt was down to $8,960,000,000. It was reduced $4,000,000,000 by devaluing the pound from $4.03 down to $2.80.

The sterling-debt countries have seen how their money can get away fast. The threat of wiping out more of it the same way should bring them to time. But that is Britain's problem, not ours. Congress should make it clear that it isn't going to unload the sterling debt on the United States. Now is the time to tell Cripps that that is all there is, there isn't any more.

I wish to comment on this editorial a little. I have no objection to Great Britain; my ancestors came from Great Britain before the Revolution, and my people have been here all these years. I am proud of my English blood, but I am not proud of the fact that I am asked to sink America to save England. I do not think we ought to do it. Sir Stafford Cripps is coming over here now to talk again to Mr. Snyder—and just remember that Mr. Snyder and Mr. Acheson and Mr. Truman are the fellows who are recommending all this money to save these foreign countries.

Last year the President asked for $5,364,000,000—that is five thousand three hundred and sixty-four millions of dollars—think of it, five thousand three hundred and sixty-four millions—that is a lot of money. Where are you going to get the money? Are we now going to try to pay the debts that England owes to her own Commonwealth countries? For instance, to India, to Egypt, to Pakistan, to Ireland, to Ceylon, and to other countries in the sterling bloc? What obligation have we to pay the debts of Great Britain? I say none at all. Why do we not pay our own debts? We owe $269,000,000,000. To pay that debt is your business and my business, and we have got to go back to our people and ask them to pay increased taxes to do it, or else economize in our spending. The only alternative is to go into bankruptcy, and when we go into bankruptcy we change our form of government and lose the government that gave us liberty, that gave us independence, that gave us the right to do the things we have done here in this country, the most free country on the face of the whole earth. We are just about to have a yoke placed upon our necks if we follow the advice and counsel of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, if we follow the advice and counsel of the State Department of the United States of America, and of the President of the United States.

Why should the American taxpayers pay the salaries of the officials of a Socialist government, including a king who gets $2,500,000? And you ask me to go back and tax my people to pay those enormous salaries. Why, one of the princesses over there receives $200,000 a year, which is more than the salary of the President of the United States.

I do not think we have any right to contribute money to pay such emoluments as that. Yet, when the British Government goes in the red and provides for itself a Socialist government by purchasing their coal mines, railroads, electric and telegraph lines, their steel mills, and everything else, they want us to pay the deficit. Socialism does not pay and never did. Why, I would not contribute a quarter of a dollar to go Socialist in this country and I do not propose to ask the taxpayers to contribute that amount of money to take over industries whether it is in Great Britain or any other foreign country. Socialism is like a sore, it gets bigger and bigger, and hurts more and more and more.

Mr. Speaker, we should wake up to the facts now. We should not permit the State Department to obligate us anymore. I want to warn Mr. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, and Mr. Acheson, Secretary of State, that if they are going to come down here and recommend that we spend $16,000,000,000 which you will find reported in this editorial I have included as a part of my remarks, we as Members will turn down the request. If we do not we are not fit to be here as

Members of Congress. That is my judgment in this matter.

Refer this whole matter back to the people of this country and let the people vote whether they want to spend this money abroad or not. If they vote to do so, then let them dig down in their pockets to pay the bill and let us stop quibbling about it. It is not right, it is not just, it is not fair for you gentlemen to do the voting and expect your people to pay the bill. They will not vote for you if you do. Every time you vote for the ECA and these other foreign indebtednesses you are taking the American people for a big joy ride. Why, we have given away already over $100,000,000,000 without any accounting whatsoever. Of course, it may be contended that it is doing a lot for this country, but I cannot see it like some of the rest of you do and I think you are getting enough.

Now, what is a billion dollars? Here is an article by Norman P. Rood, of Philadelphia, I want to read to you:

A BILLION DOLLARS

When you read that the Democratic Congress has appropriated thirteen billions for this, ten billions for that; when you learn that the Federal budget is $42,000,000,000 per year; and that Marshall-plan aid to Europe costs us per year $5,500,000,000, and that United States loans and grants to foreign nations have amounted to $103,103,078,135 from World War I to July 1, 1949, and that potato subsidies cost us $225,000,000 in 1948; and that eggs purchased by the Government in order to keep the consumer price high, and dried at considerable expense to preserve them, amounted to 63,000,000 pounds dry weight in September 1949. And that eggs purchased January–September 1949 cost taxpayers $84,251,000. That the loss on them is estimated as $40,000,000. And that total loss on the egg program since 1936 has been $100,045,000. And that salary raises recently granted by Congress increase the Federal pay roll by $10,200,000,000 for year ending June 30, 1950. And that Federal deficit amounted to $2,651,000,000 in July and August 1949 alone, and is expected to reach $5,500,000,000 by the end of the year; and that the national debt amounted to $259,775,958,318. Servicing the debt amounts to $5,500,000,000 per year; and that Federal, State, and local taxes we paid in year ending June 30, 1949, amounted to $54,500,000,000.

Does it make you shudder, Mr. Taxpayer? Do you realize we are pretty well along the road to national bankruptcy with the Communists standing on the side lines hoping we reach that destination? Or don't you realize how much even one billion amounts to?

Well, if Methuselah, the long-lived man of Bible times, had been born on January 1 of the year 1 and had expected to live 2,000 years, he might have decided that he would like to have a billion dollars along about September 1, 1949, to provide for his old age without applying for a pension.

To amass this sum, without accrual of interest, during the period of 1,948⅔ years, including 487 extra days for as many leap years, he must have laid aside $1,404.99 per day for 711,750 days, $42,764.28 per month for 23,384 months, $513,171.57 per year for the 1,948⅔ years. Or if the old fellow decided to live well and spend all his money for a while, say 1,448⅔ years, and save for only 500 years, his budget would have been increased to $3.80 per minute for 262,980,000 minutes; $5,475.70 per day for 182,625 days; $166,666.67 per month for 6,000 months, and $2,000,000 per year for the 500 years.

Of course, to amass this money old Methuselah would have been required to work his printing press quite diligently, just as we are doing today.

If your heart is sound and your nerves shock proof just multiply the figures at the beginning of this article by the Methuselah factors just given. Or apply these factors to the figures you read in the daily papers. Never mind the odd millions and hundreds of thousands, small change, just use the billions which will produce as great a shock as an ordinary person can endure.

For example, it will require $100,000,000 per year for 2,567 years, 9 months, and 4 days to pay off the present national debt, without including interest upon it.

Do the figures startle you, Mr. Taxpayer? Think it over. It's your money. You are the one who pays and pays and pays.

My slogan: Be thrifty in 1950.

To realize what it means to give away a billion dollars, it takes $7 for every man, woman, and child in America. I do not know how many more billions of dollars you can give away without it meaning ruination for us in this country.

Another thing. Getting in debt is one thing and one thing that is bad, but I think notwithstanding that, the greatest thing that is bringing discontent, discomfort, and turmoil to this country is the hatred, the bitterness, and the strife that you are fomenting now in the minds of the people of this country, especially between employer and employee. I think nothing is going to break us down more than that. When the time comes in this country when we have got to pass laws to get people to do the right thing, you are on the wrong track. You have got to educate the people to see the wrong and do the right. You have got to let the people know that the difference between right and an injustice is wrong, and you are not going to get any place with the American people, who are the most intelligent class of people on the face of the earth, if you do not follow that principle. If you show the American people that they are doing the thing in the wrong way, you will not have much difficulty in convincing them of the right road to follow, and they will follow that road.

Take, for instance, the Taft-Hartley Act, an act which I believe the great majority of the Members of this Congress believe is the right thing in trying to regulate the differences between capital and labor. I think the great majority of the people believe that that law was passed for the purpose of trying to do the most good for the greatest number of people and do it in a way which will do right and justice. It is a good law. But that is not the course that the Chief Executive of this country is trying to follow. He is trying to break it down. He is not trying to educate the people in the right way to go, and if he would do that we would be able to get together and we would have a better country because the Chief Executive was doing the right thing.

It is only the wild labor leaders who want more and more power over labor who have Mr. Truman's ear in that respect. They want everything their way or they do not play. All or none is their motto. Do you think Mr. Lewis wants it enforced? No. Do the miners want to work 5 days a week? Yes. Mr. Truman, why not invoke the Taft-Hartley law and give the miners work and the people coal at a reasonable price? Soon all will use oil and we will not need miners or coal. Then where are their jobs? Right is right and wrong is nobody.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

REPAYMENT OF VETERANS' INSURANCE PREMIUMS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I spoke earlier of the fact that the Veterans' Administration is sending out checks for the overpayment of premiums by the veterans into their insurance funds. A mistaken idea has been given out, and I would like to say very emphatically, by the Veterans' Administration. They call them dividends, and do not speak of it as the veterans' own premium money. I should also like to bring to the attention of the House the fact that I understand before many months go by another so-called lot of dividend checks will go out to the veterans, which is also nothing but an overpayment by the veterans of their insurance premiums.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will make a complete investigation of the actuarial forces and the operation of the insurance office, because, obviously, a great injustice has been done to the veterans. All of these months they have been paying more than the proper amount in premiums for their insurance.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And all we are doing is returning the money to the veterans that they have previously overpaid into the Treasury?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Exactly. They paid more than they should have paid, and we are only returning it, and it would have been dishonest to keep it from them.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. It seems to me the gentlewoman might want to add that a number of Members of our party introduced a resolution to force the payment of these so-called dividends, the veterans' own money, last October, and I know that the gentlewoman supported that measure. But we were not able to get anywhere in getting that done. Instead of that they waited until an election year with the hope that these payments might be looked upon as some gratuity from the Government, when they were simply paying them back their own money.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is true. And, I should also like to say that an investigation made by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the Eightieth Congress brought out these matters

to the Veterans' Administration, focusing it on the Veterans' Administration, and that is why these so-called dividend checks are being given to the veterans. It is really their own money going back to them. They never should have been asked for it in the first place.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

SIGNING OF DISCHARGE PETITION

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, my predecessor, the Honorable Richard J. Welch, signed Discharge Petition No. 15. I desire to have my name entered on this petition. I ask unanimous consent that his name be taken off the petition so that I may sign it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CELLER (at the request of Mr. WALTER), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. ALLEN of California, for 1 week beginning today, on account of official business in California.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 17, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1118. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Home Owners' Loan Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 446); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1119. A letter from the director, national legislative commission, American Legion, transmitting the proceedings of the Thirty-first Annual National Convention of the American Legion, held at Philadelphia, Pa., August 29 through September 1, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 447); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1120. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting drafts of 11 legislative proposals, as follows: (1) Berlin Airlift Medal; (2) cemeteries omnibus bill; (3) claims, correction of records; (4) decorations and awards, time limitation; (5) lands and property bill; (6) Missing Persons Act; (7) Philippine Scouts; (8) recreational programs, civilian; (9) selective-service extension; (10) transportation, household goods and personal effects; (11) Vinson-Trammell Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1121. A letter from Steptoe & Johnson, attorneys at law, Washington, D. C., transmitting the annual report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1122. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from July 1 to December 31, 1949, with compensation payable from the allotment contained in the appropriation for salaries and expenses, miscellaneous legal activities; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1123. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the Sixty-third Annual Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1124. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Communications Commission for the fiscal year 1949; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1125. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the report of the Federal Trade Commission entitled "Report on the Fertilizer Industry"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1126. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to relieve Floyd E. Dotson from financial liability for certain overpayments"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1127. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the case of Silvestra Flores or Angel Silvestre Flores or Crescencio Reza or Soltero Deflin or Crescencio Reva or Jose Marquez, file No. A-5455041 CR 24161, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1128. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the case of Raymundo Gonzalez or Raymond Gonzalez or Filiberto Huerta, A-7112706 CR 24205, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1129. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the case of Valeria Juliano or Valeria Margherita Nerina Iuliano, A-7140422 CR 25212, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1130. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the case of Mary Elizabeth Coughlin, A-6791099 CR 25434, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1131. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the case of Leslie Alexander Panton, A-3599556 CR 23082, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1132. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the case of Nickolas Georgios Ganotis, A-4660119 CR 24788, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1133. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the quarterly report of the United States Maritime Commission on the activities and transactions of the Commission under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 from October 1 through December 31, 1949; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1134. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 6, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of report on the Arkansas River and tributaries, with a view to improvement for flood control on Big Mulberry Creek in Crawford County, Ark., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on May 2, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

1135. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 29, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports from Punta Rasa to Fort Pierce and Stuart, Fla., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on October 13, 1943, and by resolution of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted on June 17, 1942; to the Committee on Public Works.

1136. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 6, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Arkansas River and tributaries with a view to improvements for flood control on Galla Creek, a tributary of Arkansas River in Pope County, Ark., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on June 21, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

1137. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 23, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Tenkiller Ferry Reservoir on Illinois River, Okla., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Public Works.

1138. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the Annual Report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, covering operations for the fiscal year 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1139. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report for the disposal of certain records for the year 1949; to the Committee on House Administration.

1140. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the Annual Report of the National Archives Trust Fund Board for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. S. 2734. An act to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE of California: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6406. A bill providing procedure for claimants of mining claims in the United States obtaining credit for assessment work performed during the year ending July 1, 1949, under the provisions of Public Law 107, Eighty-first Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1476. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 6764. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 6765. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide certain retirement benefits for civilian marine inspectors, officers in charge, and marine inspection officers of the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. BOSONE:

H. R. 6766. A bill to establish a national health insurance program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 6767. A bill to exempt from any excise tax admissions to activities of elementary and secondary schools and amateur athletic contests; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 6768. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the typographical union; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CROCK:

H. R. 6769. A bill to amend the farm ownership loan provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to increase the amount which may be loaned with respect to certain farms; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 6770. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 6771. A bill to increase from $600 to $750 the income-tax exemptions of an individual taxpayer for himself and for his spouse or other first dependent, and to increase the amount of credit for a dependent from $600 to $750; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 6772. A bill to strengthen the Republic of the Philippines and make permanent the friendly ties between our respective countries by permitting certain persons from the Philippines to receive instruction at United States service academies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 6773. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code by increasing the excise tax on imported crude petroleum and crude-petroleum derivatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 6774. A bill to provide for uniforms for employees of the United States Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 6775. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to require the preparation of passenger lists for all flights of commercial air lines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 6776. A bill to establish a United States Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. R. 6777. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 6778. A bill to amend section 114 (2) of Public Law No. 76, Eighty-First Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 6779. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to provide for the voluntary control of the alcoholic-beverage industry in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 6780. A bill to provide for the determination of peril points with respect to foreign trade agreements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 6781. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TACKETT:

H. R. 6782. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 6783. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 6784. A bill to amend the income limitation governing the granting of pension to veterans and death-pension benefits to widows and children of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VELDE:

H. R. 6785. A bill to establish a Fair Employment Practice Commission and to aid in eliminating discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 6786. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to make it a Federal offense to make certain loans at rates in excess of 3 percent per month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. J. Res. 396. Joint resolution establishing a Walter Reed Commemoration Commission; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TACKETT:

H. J. Res. 397. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of Camp Chaffee, in the State of Arkansas, as Fort Franklin D. Roosevelt, and to establish it as a permanent military installation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. Con. Res. 168. Concurrent resolution relative to invoking the national emergency provisions (secs. 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in the current strike in the coal industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. Con. Res. 169. Concurrent resolution favoring the invoking by the President of the United States of the national emergency provisions of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in the pending coal strike; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. Con. Res. 170. Concurrent resolution relative to invoking the national emergency provisions (secs. 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in the current strike in the coal industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WOODRUFF:

H. Con. Res. 171. Concurrent resolution favoring the invoking by the President of the United States of the national emergency provisions of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in the pending coal strike; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to Concurrent Resolution No. 6, requesting the appropriate renaming of the Red River Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio:

H. R. 6787. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kyoko Nakamura Kornhauser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 6788. A bill for the relief of the alien Ilona Lindelof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6789. A bill for the relief of the alien Hajna H. Sepsi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6790. A bill for the relief of the alien Eva Ruttkay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 6791. A bill for the relief of Louis Grant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6792. A bill for the relief of Innocenzo Mornese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 6793. A bill for the relief of Fujiko Fukuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 6794. A bill for the lawful admission of August Soo and Hilda Vaikjarv Soo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 6795. A bill to provide for the extension of patents Nos. 2,208,300 and 2,247,832, relating to the use of nylon-covered elastic yarn in the manufacture of nylon hose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6796. A bill for the relief of Antos Zajdel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 6797. A bill for the relief of certain Yugoslavs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6798. A bill for the relief of Alexander George John McKerrow and George Edgar McKerrow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 6799. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Catherine V. Mycue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 6800. A bill for the relief of Martinez Community Hospital; to the Committe on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 6801. A bill for the relief of Irene B. McMullen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 6802. A bill for the relief of Edward L. Jenkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 6803. A bill for the relief of Albert Van De Velde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 6804. A bill for the relief of certain Italian aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1645. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution entitled "Senate resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States of America to use every effort in order that old Fort Adams, at Newport, R. I., may be made a national shrine and recreation center for the United States Army," passed by the Senate January 11, 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1646. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition of several residents of Amsterdam, N. Y., and vicinity, advocating passage of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1647. Also, petition requesting the removal of discrimination from our national life and passing a permanent FEPC law; to the Committee on Rules.

1648. Also, resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Otsego County, Cooperstown, N. Y., on November 28, 1949, opposing construction of the St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Public Works.

1649. By Mr. PETERSON: Petition of Mrs. L. L. Hobart, of Sebring, Fla., and others, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1650. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of a large number of citizens from Groton, Peacham, Rygate, and vicinity, urging the passage of House bill 2428; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1651. Also, petition of a large number of citizens of Rutland, Vt., urging the passage of House bill 2428; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1652. Also, petition of about 25 citizens of Wilmington and surrounding area in Vermont, urging the passage of House bill 2428; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1653. Also, petition of about 25 citizens of Thetford Center, Vt., urging support of the Langer and Bryson bills prohibiting liquor advertising in publications and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1654. By Mr. RICH: Petition of Rev. Bertil Lovain, pastor, Mission Covenant Church, Bradford, Pa., and other residents of Bradford, urging the passage of a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1655. By Mr. SHELLEY: Petition received from Mrs. Eva Vice, of San Francisco, containing 262 signatures, urging the passage of House bill 2428; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1656. Also, petition of members of the Bethel Full Gospel Church, of San Francisco, containing 65 signatures, urging the passage of House bill 2428; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1657. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of sundry citizens of Janesville, Wis., requesting the passage of Bryson bill, H. R. 2428, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1658. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Mrs. Tom Mackey and other citizens of Aurora and Monett, Mo., urging the passage of a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1659. Also, petition of H. Ellis Ogden and other citizens of Jasper County, urging the enactment of the Langer bill, S. 1847, and the Bryson bill, H. R. 2428; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1660. Also, petition of Lydia Stockton and other citizens of Lawrence County, Mo., urging the passage of a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1661. Also, petition of Mrs. H. L. Briggs and other citizens of Aurora, Mo., urging the passage of Senate bill 1847 and House bill 2428; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1662. Also, petition of Mrs. O. B. Hughes and other citizens of Aurora, Mo., protesting the sale and distribution of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1663. Also, petition of Mrs. R. M. Hall and other citizens of Aurora, Mo., urging the passage of a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1664. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Kearny Education Association, Kearny, N. J., requesting the enactment of Senate bill 246, providing Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1665. Also, petition of the chairman, La Junta Teachers Club, La Junta, Colo., favoring Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1666. Also, petition of the chairman, Cobleskill Central School, Cobleskill, N. Y., favoring Federal aid to education provided that these funds are under the complete jurisdiction of the State departments of education and are apportioned on the basis of need; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1667. Also, petition of Isbrandtsen Co., Inc., New York, N. Y., relative to attacks by the Chinese on American-flag ships and American citizens abroad; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1668. Also, petition of Hawaii County Dental Society, Hawaii, T. H., requesting Congress not to enact any legislation containing the principle of compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1669. Also, petition of the secretary, Akron Dental Society, Akron, Ohio, requesting Congress not to enact any legislation containing the principle of compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and being as follows:

I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the Eighty-first Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the Eightieth Congress, entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948:

JOHN F. SHELLEY, Fifth District, California.

EDNA F. KELLY, Tenth District, New York.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 17, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, at this daily altar dedicated to the far look, together we bow in the hush and joy of Thy presence pausing in the morning tasks to listen for Thy call sounding in our ears. Lift us, we pray Thee, above the foggy valley of narrow loyalties and partisan interests to vaster vistas where small things are seen as small and great things as great. In all our attitudes and decisions give us perspective and horizon. Save us from substituting cheap shibboleths and slogans for costly thought and impartial investigation. Help us to recognize truth and to welcome revelation from whatever quarter they arrive.

Give us peace in our time, O God, peace with honor, with human dignity vindicated and social justice the canopy of all the nations. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. FULBRIGHT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 13, 1950, was dispensed with.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I withhold the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order, the time is divided equally between the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] until 1 o'clock, at which time the vote is to be taken. Of course, the time consumed in any roll call or quorum call will be taken out of the time

between now and 1 o'clock and the Chair feels that the division of time applies to the time that is left.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand the time taken by the quorum call is to be charged equally to both sides.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is satisfactory.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Maybank
Anderson	Hoey	Millikin
Benton	Holland	Mundt
Brewster	Humphrey	Murray
Bricker	Hunt	Myers
Bridges	Ives	Neely
Butler	Jenner	O'Conor
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Darby	Kefauver	Russell
Donnell	Kem	Saltonstall
Douglas	Kerr	Schoeppel
Downey	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Knowland	Sparkman
Eastland	Langer	Taft
Ecton	Leahy	Taylor
Ellender	Lehman	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	Long	Thye
Frear	Lucas	Tobey
Fulbright	McCarran	Tydings
George	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Gillette	McClellan	Watkins
Graham	McFarland	Wherry
Green	McKellar	Wiley
Gurney	McMahon	Williams
Hayden	Magnuson	Withers
Hendrickson	Malone	Young
Hickenlooper	Martin	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business as members of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, holding hearings on various flood-control and public-works projects in the State of New Mexico.

I announce further that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on important public business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Public Works.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY AND STATEMENT BY HIM OF REASON FOR HIS ABSENCE

Mr. WILEY obtained the floor.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No Senator can be recognized for any purpose unless he is yielded to by one of the two Senators who have charge of the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to yield a minute to the Senator from New Jersey.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas yields 1 minute to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, at the session on Friday last, in the course of the colloquies in respect to the unanimous-consent agreement, I made the statement that "If the Senate enters into the unanimous-consent agreement to vote on Tuesday, we"—meaning my distinguished colleague [Mr. SMITH of New Jersey] and myself—"will be here to vote on Tuesday."

I did not know at the time that the senior Senator from New Jersey had commitments in New Jersey other than the inaugural ceremony at the State capitol.

Accordingly, I now ask unanimous consent, first, that my colleague be excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today and, secondly, that a formal statement prepared by my colleague pertaining to his absence from the session today be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request for leave of absence of the senior Senator from New Jersey is granted, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey is as follows:

Mr. President, at my request my colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], is inserting this statement for me in the RECORD because of my necessary absence today.

I note in the RECORD of Friday last the colloquy with regard to the unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the pending Wiley-Gillette substitute for the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, and so forth. When this colloquy took place, while I had answered to the roll call, I was attending a prolonged meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee and did not return to the floor until after the unanimous-consent agreement had been made. In the RECORD it appears that my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] stated that: "If the Senate enters into the unanimous-consent agreement to vote on Tuesday, we will be here to vote on Tuesday." My colleague was thoroughly justified in making this statement for both of us under ordinary circumstances, but I find myself in a situation which makes it unavoidably necessary for me to be absent today. Not only are we inaugurating our Governor, but in addition to that I have had a long-standing commitment to make an address later in the day in an important anniversary celebration in the State and it will not be possible for me to be in Washington for the 1 o'clock vote and keep these two important commitments.

I am, therefore, requesting my colleague to ask unanimous consent that I be excused from attendance today. I have endeavored to arrange for pairs on the contemplated vote or votes. I understand distinctly from the colloquy that took place as recorded in the RECORD that the so-called civil rights amendments will not be considered in connection with the votes taken today.

I would have made this statement myself at the Monday session, but the recess over Monday has prevented my doing so.

H. ALEXANDER SMITH.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senate has now been engaged for some time in consideration of the very important subject now before it. As I think of what is involved there comes to my mind an incident which occurred after Columbus returned to Spain, following his discovery of America. He thought he had discovered the Indies. When he returned to Spain much was made of him. A banquet was held in his honor, during which one individual asked Columbus "Do you think, sir, that I could have discovered the Indies?" Columbus paid no attention. Finally, after a persistent pressing of the question Columbus picked up an egg and said, "Can any of you make this egg stand on end?" The answer was in the negative. Columbus tapped the end of the egg on the table and it stood upright, on end. The guest who had directed the question to Columbus said, "Well, if I had thought of it I could have done the same." "Yes," said Columbus, "and if you had thought of it you also could have discovered the Indies."

What we must do in connection with the issue now pending before the Senate is to think straight and not be confused by our emotions, our prejudices, or what not.

A FINAL SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS FOR GILLETTE-WILEY DAIRY AMENDMENT

Mr. President, last Friday, I spoke briefly on one of the two major problems which concern the American people today. Those two problems are:

First. How can we prevent and keep out of a terrible third world war? and

Second. How can we prevent a depression?

OLEO LEGISLATION CAN PRECIPITATE DEPRESSION

With reference to the second problem, I firmly feel that the legislation which we are now considering can have a crucial effect. I say a crucial effect. Enactment of the right kind of legislation can be of help to prevent us from sliding into a depression.

Time will not permit me to present a complete summary of our position on this issue, but those parts I am unable to cover orally will be placed in the RECORD, with the kind consent of the Senate.

Yes, Mr. President, as I have indicated, the passage of the bill H. R. 2023, the oleo legislation, if it be not amended, can plunge us into an economic tailspin; it can start a series of circumstances which can inevitably lead the heart of the Nation into what might be called an economic paralysis.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the table which appears on page 153 of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Finance, showing the percentage of the milk produced in 10 States which goes into butter. It ranges from 72.6 percent to 15.1 percent.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Butter-producing States with more than 400,000 cow population

	Percent of milk into butter	Percent decline in cow population since 1945
North Dakota	72.6	28.4
South Dakota	68.2	25.3
Iowa	65.3	16.9
Nebraska	58.5	24.7
Kansas	41.7	22.9
Minnesota	39.5	14.3
Colorado	33.1	14.3
Oklahoma	32.3	22.8
Missouri	18.8	12.6
Arkansas	15.1	17.0

WHERE WILL HUGE MILK OUTPUT GO?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask my associates to ponder what will happen to the 30 percent of the fluid milk of this Nation which at present finds its way into butter. What will happen to that great flood of billions of pounds of milk unless new markets can be found for it? Yes, Mr. President, the great hope those of us who favor the dairy amendment have is that, if perchance, our amendment should unfortunately be defeated, the inventive genius of the American people will find new dairy outlets for that flood of milk so as to prevent catastrophe in American agriculture.

Mr. President, we have the hope that the inventive genius of the American people will, through chemistry, do for the dairy industry what it has done for the oleo industry. We, in the Middle West, are never licked. I hope outlets will be found for the flood of milk. But, Mr. President, I want to say that in the East, even here in the Washington market, the doors have been closed against our milk. If our butter market is taken from us, we will show the Congress a volume of pressure of milk that will blow these doors wide open. It is not possible to take the livelihood away from 30,000,000 people without feeling an economic and moral and political pressure which will have widespread results. Mr. President, we can deliver all the milk that can be used by the people in the Washington area; we can deliver it at 10 cents a quart and still get our 8 cents, whereas in our area now we are getting only 5 cents a quart, and dairy farmers are reducing their production.

Unless new outlets are found, we may well find ourselves returning to the bleak days of the 1930's, when American agriculture was in the depths of economic chaos.

Fortunately there is a great resilience in the people of the Midwest. Just as they created the economic bread basket of America, just as they developed their region into the richest heart of America, so it is our prayer that the Midwest will find the answer through modern chemistry to the problem of adequate disposition of this flood of milk.

It is inconceivable that the representatives of the rest of the people of the country would let us down. We have helped build this Nation, but now some would stick a dagger in our backs. However, we will pull the dagger out, if that happens; and those in this area, those in Maryland and Virginia and West Virginia, who control this milkshed area, whose farmers get 20 and 22 cents a quart for milk, will find that they cannot keep us shut out all the time. We ask the Senators from all the States to cooperate with us in this fight, to help us get the break so that at least we can get 8 cents a quart for our milk.

STATES MUST TIGHTEN OLEO REGULATIONS

Fortunately, too, there is another possibility, and that is for the respective States to tighten regulations in order to prevent fraud and deception on their consumers. We ask all Members of the Senate to help us do that. I have already shown in the debate on this floor that in the State of Arkansas, where there is a requirement that all restaurants and other public places serving oleomargarine must post a notice to that effect, 69 out of 100 serving places violated that State law. But we ask the Representatives in Congress of the other States to be fair. If they are going to do this thing to us, then let them be fair to their consumers and to the eating public, so that fraud will not be perpetrated on them. If the dairy amendment is voted down, the gates of interstate commerce will be opened, at least insofar as the Federal Government is concerned, to an inundation by imitation butter. But the respective commonwealths will still be able to protect their citizens within their own borders, unless the Oleomargarine Trust controls the politics of those States. I believe the various State legislatures should give their earnest attention to this problem. The farmers have not been organized, and now the result is that we have this pressure in the shape of the legislation which is pending here today.

But, Mr. President, in spite of these two partial remedies, let us not underestimate the gravity of the present crisis. I am not picking a crisis out of the air. I am saying that when the livelihood is taken from more than 2,500,000 farmers and when 29 percent of the milk production is taken away from its legitimate channel, then a severe crisis is created; and it is a major one, not a minor one. In my State, although the Democrats in 1948 promised the farmers that prices would be kept up, already there has been a tumbling of prices in an average amount of 25 percent. That will immediately affect the national revenue. It also will affect the purchasing power of the farmers. Now the situation has been muddled all the more, and the present developments are worse. So there will be chaos, as I have said, unless—and I have hope for this—the chemists of America, the ingenuity of America, find an answer to the crisis which thus has been created.

RAPE OF BUTTER INDUSTRY IS BUT FIRST ACT IN THIS TRAGEDY

If the Gillette-Wiley substitute amendment is defeated, then, as I have stated, I fear that we shall have started a chain reaction whose final effects no man on either side can accurately predict. The rape of the butter industry—and, Mr. President, I use that description advisedly—is but the first act which the monopolists will perform in order to obliterate all other segments of the American dairying industry—cheese, fluid milk, evaporated milk, and so forth.

EVIL CONSEQUENCES OF BODY BLOW TO DAIRYING

"So, what?" a cynic might ask. "So, what?" Mr. President, one might as well ask, "So, what?" if America's far-flung automobile industry were destroyed, for remember that the $7,000,000,000 of dairy value in 1949 was about equal to the value of the American automobile industry. And dairying, involving as it does our health, our soil, the life of 2,500,000 farmers, involves the very heart of our way of life.

The evil consequences are so staggering to contemplate that one shudders at the prospect, if the oleo bill should pass, of tens of thousands of deserted farms, of villages becoming ghost towns because they were dependent upon farmers who had to auction off their stock and other assets. One shudders to think of the consequences to State and Federal tax revenues because of the loss of the dairying segment which accounts for 22 percent of all American farm income.

In 1940, America's farm population was 30,500,000. This year it is 28,000,000. We are forcing more and more people from the farms into the overcrowded cities. We are taking steps that can only lead to the waste and the ravaging of the soil. We are endangering the very fundamentals of the American economy. Yet all that some of our local newspapers can see in the situation is the tax issue which is involved.

THIS IS NOT SCARE PROPAGANDA

Again the cynic might scoff at what he might feel to be scare propaganda, exaggerated fearist talk. But, Mr. President, the record of decline in dairy herds, the record of the 25-percent loss in dairy income in 1 year, the record of the insidious creeping larceny by the Oleo Trust—stealing 40 percent, then more and more of the table-spread market by deception—all this record attests to the accuracy of these predictions.

DAIRY PARALYSIS WILL NOT OCCUR OVERNIGHT

I do not say the decline in the dairy industry and the blight of the dairying Midwest will occur overnight. Rather, it will creep like a fog, slowly involving more and more geographic areas, paralyzing our economic life. It may take years, but the consequences will be lasting. This generation will feel them to a tremendous degree, while succeeding generations will experience even worse consequences that will have accumulated over the years.

We who support the Gillette-Wiley substitute amendment have sought to protect the legitimate interests of our States. But we would not have fought either as hard or as long if we had not been firmly convinced that the issues at stake were of far greater consequence to all 48 States than the opposition has indicated.

ONE-PACKAGE DAIRY EXCISE-TAX AMENDMENT NECESSARY

I appeal to my colleagues to support not only the original Gillette-Wiley amendment as perfected by the McCarthy-Aiken provisions, but to stand by the excise-tax-repeal amendment in a

one-package approach to these interrelated matters.

The fate of the country depends upon this vote, Mr. President. American dairying may be defeated, but the defeat will weigh heavily on the hearts of those responsible for it and on the American people in the generations that are to follow.

When oleo sells for two or three times as much as it does now, and when the dairy herds no longer fertilize the soil, but are depleted so greatly that America's beef and the veal supply will be largely gone, and when we have to import what we now have in abundance, then the words and the deeds of those of us who have fought for the substitute amendment will be remembered.

SUMMARY OF SPEECHES MADE BY SENATORS ON BEHALF OF THE DAIRY AMENDMENT

Mr. President, a look at the RECORD will reveal the distinguished group of Senators who have spoken on behalf of the dairy amendment. I should like now to pay a brief but sincere tribute to them for their valued contributions. Each one of them carried the ball. No one of them wanted to be the hero, the "Grange." No one of them wanted to be the big shot. Each one of them was a member of the team. No one of them tried to steal the ball from another. I feel proud to be associated with such a group.

JANUARY 5 DEBATE

On Thursday, January 5, my distinguished colleague from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], cosponsor of the dairy substitute amendment, very carefully analyzed the oleomargarine bill. He very decisively proved the sheer inability of Federal authorities to enforce the so-called labeling provisions of the Senate Finance Committee's version of the oleo bill. He demonstrated conclusively that these provisions to label and identify oleo under that version are a farce and unworkable.

JANUARY 6 DEBATE

The following day, on January 6, we received a comprehensive analysis of the issues involved in this dispute from the able senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. Our colleague proved that butter is the balance wheel of dairying and that the destruction of the butter market will inevitably lead to the sticking of a dagger into the heart of dairying as a whole.

That same day my able associate from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], offered a well justified amendment which would prevent the use by the oleo interests of dairy references in their advertising. I was glad to accept this amendment to the substitute amendment.

JANUARY 10 DEBATE

The next legislative day, Monday, January 9, was devoted to a discussion of United States foreign policy and the United States budget. Debate did not therefore resume on this issue until Tuesday, January 10. At that time it was led off by my colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who did a splendid job in analyzing the world-wide monopoly of Unilever, Ltd., which controls table fats and oils throughout the globe, and which is among the largest producers of oleo in our country. The Senator from Minnesota demonstrated that the total production of the five principal oleo corporations accounts for 68.4 percent of the domestic output today, which in turn is an increase of 7 percent over their total output a few months ago.

Then followed the remarks of the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. Among the many telling points made by our colleague was the drastic effect of soybean and cotton farming in impairing the health of the soil. This point was reinforced by our experienced associate, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who followed with an impressive description of those unhappy lands which have "devaluated their dairy industry and have failed to practice animal husbandry." "Then," said the Senator from Nebraska, "compare those countries with Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland, Holland, and other agriculture-conscious nations." The Senator from Nebraska went on to evaluate very closely the great menace created by synthetic products of natural agricultural commodities and all the implications of that menace.

That same day, January 10, we were treated to a splendid discussion by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], who pointed out the complete inconsistency of the Federal Government's supporting dairy prices on the one hand and stabbing the dairy industry in the back on the other. Following the remarks of the Senator from Montana I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page 279, a table setting forth all the materials used in the manufacture of oleomargarine during the past 20 years.

JANUARY 11 DEBATE

January 11, 1950, provided another harvest of discussion and fact presentation on this issue, beginning with the splendid commentary of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. Our colleague from his long experience in dairying affairs, pointed out many striking facts, including the wide price spread which exists today between different brands of oleo, indicating the ability of the Oleo Trust to juggle prices as it pleases. The senior Senator from Minnesota also pointed out the very clear fact that in 1948, 3,750,000 surplus cotton bales were under cotton bale loan. Thus there was a total United States investment of almost $600,000,000, an average of about $160 a bale. The senior Senator from Minnesota pointed out that we need to find some way to divert some of those acres devoted to cotton to some other kind of crop—and the same holds true for surplus corn—rather than cause further cotton or corn overproduction.

None of my colleagues who were present in the Senate on January 11 will forget the address which followed, delivered by the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who gave one of the most impressive descriptions which we have had of the world-wide monopoly of oleo. We are indebted to the senior Senator from North Dakota for pointing out what we fear is not merely a coincidence in the relationship between (a) Mr. Charles Luckman, as head of the Democratic Jackson-Jefferson Day dinners, raising funds for the Democratic Party and (b) the zeal of the Democratic Party to pass this oleo legislation.

JANUARY 12 DEBATE

On Thursday, January 12, we were treated to a brilliant analysis of the question by the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], who analyzed the contradictory record of the Democratic Party in pretending to be a friend of the dairy farmer at the very same time it was destroying the market of the farmer. I may mention at this point the unfortunate stand of our Democratic colleagues who are seeking to strip the excise-tax repeal amendment from the dairy substitute amendment, thus threatening the fate of both.

On that day, we benefited too by a discussion by one of the ablest legal minds in the Senate, our colleague, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. He brought to our attention the decision of the United States Supreme Court, which twice upheld the constitutionality of the Filled Milk Act. Following the address of the junior Senator from Michigan, we heard of the dishonest advertising campaign conducted by the oleo manufacturers in attempting to utilize dairy terms and grade descriptions. This discussion was handled by my associate, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], whose worthy advertising amendment I have previously referred to.

Still another comprehensive treatment of this subject came from our associate, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who pointed out the crucial effects of the loss of the butter market on the American dairy industry.

JANUARY 13 DEBATE

That brings us to Friday, January 13, when the position of the great State of Iowa was again clearly expressed by our colleague, the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who warned us that imitation butter is but a first step in wholesale fraud against the dairy industry, to be followed by filled cheese and other synthetic products. Our colleague the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] then presented the results of a public-opinion poll on the butter problem. Among the striking facts in that poll was that 53 percent of the women approved of legislation which involved practically the very provisions of the Gillette-Wiley substitute amendment, while only 18 percent of them disapproved, and 29 percent had no opinion.

I COULD NOT ATTEMPT A COMPLETE SUMMARY

Mr. President, in addition to the above principal addresses, there were many splendid interrogations and brief comments delivered by other Members of the Senate. As I indicated at the start, I could not attempt to try to present a complete summary of either their arguments or their telling questions, but I did not want to let this opportunity pass without expressing my sincere thanks to my colleagues.

CONDENSATION OF OUR MAJOR ARGUMENTS

Let me summarize now our principal points in this argument under these major headings:

First. The moral right to protect butter's yellow color.

Second. The free-enterprise factor—protecting the little fellow against monopoly.

Third. The consumer factor—protecting our people from fraud and deception and from impairment of health.

Fourth. The factor of the over-all economic consequences to the Nation.

FIRST MAJOR ARGUMENT, THE MORAL RIGHT TO PROTECT BUTTER'S YELLOW COLOR

First. There is a moral right of the dairy industry to protect what amounts to its common-law trade-mark. Let the Washington press say something about that. Let someone use their names, and see how quickly they will react to it. Shame on the ignorance of men who write as they have written within the past few days.

(a) Many products protect their color from imitation by other corporations, for example, yellow color of Yellow Cab Co.; red color of Lifebuoy soap, of which Luckman is now the boss.

WE DO NOT OBJECT TO LEGITIMATE COMPETITION

(b) The butter industry does not object to legitimate-type imitation; for example, oleo imitation of butter's flavoring, butter's packaging, butter's melting point, butter's specific gravity, and so forth, but the butter industry draws the line when it comes to the last crucial feature—color—because such imitation gives an opportunity to perpetrate a fraud not only on the dairy industry, but on the consumer.

(c) The Supreme Court has twice sustained as constitutional the Federal Filled Milk Act. This act provided a perfect precedent in confirming right of Congress to prevent subterfuge and deception on consumer when artificial, filled milk was attempted to be shipped in interstate commerce, even though that product was as allegedly nutritious as the natural product.

(d) The pending dairy amendment does not interfere in intrastate affairs in contrast to the oleo bill itself, which would put Federal snoopers in all the Nation's restaurants—that is, in intrastate business—if an attempt were made to secure enforcement.

SECOND MAJOR ARGUMENT, FURTHERANCE OF UNITED STATES FREE ENTERPRISE

Second. Furtherance of our free enterprise system requires protection of dairy industry.

(a) In any contest between five or six huge billion-dollar corporations, as against two and one-half million little fellows, it is only fair and right that the United States Government should protect the small man, the family-type farmer. To do otherwise is to accelerate a trend toward monopoly and bigness which everyone admits is harmful to free enterprise.

(b) In addition to two and one-half million dairy farmers, there are 40,000 processing plants, 3,500 creameries, and literally hundreds of thousands—yes, millions of jobs involved in hauling milk from the farmer to the ultimate consumer and in all of the intermediate steps. All of these jobs will be threatened by the pending legislation.

OLEO INDUSTRY IS FAR FROM BEING DISCRIMINATED AGAINST

(c) The oleo industry is completely unjustified in pleading that it is being discriminated against in a manner contrary to the principle of free enterprise. A look at the statute books shows that oleo, far from being placed at a disadvantage, is actually pampered in relation to butter. The oleo makers have a tariff of 22 cents per pound against foreign competition. Butter has a 7-cents-per-pound tariff. When we tried to cut out the 15-cent margin and equalize the tariff, the supposed protectors of the consumer in the House of Representatives screamed and squawked and killed the motion. Yes, these boys have a lot of power.

The oleo makers can use preservatives in their product; butter cannot.

Oleo can be reheated and processed without being labeled as such; butter cannot. Oleo can be made from any number of fats; butter cannot. If a foreign substance is added to butter, such butter must pay the present 10-cents-per-pound Federal tax the same as oleo. In other words, the butter industry has no advantage over any other industry, and allows to be imposed upon itself even higher standards than statutes impose upon oleo. The butter industry has always had the housewife's and the consumer's legitimate interests uppermost in its consideration.

BUTTER ONLY OCCASIONALLY ADDS COLOR

(d) To be sure, a slight coloring is occasionally added to butter. But when a butter maker deepens the color of butter he desires to achieve the opposite effect from that intended by the oleo manufacturers. The one intends to bring out the natural color of his product—and this is only done in a few northern States in the winter period when comparatively very little butter is produced—while the other, the oleo manufacturer, intends to imitate the color of another product and to change the basic color of cottonseed oil and soybean oil.

It is not true that their product is naturally yellow, as oleo spokesmen have frequently contended. The most careful scientific tests have demonstrated, once and for all, that oleomargarine made of domestic oils is gray-green or off-white, with no natural resemblance to the color of butter. It is impossible to make naturally yellow oleomargarine out of domestic vegetable oils, according to the Armour Research Foundation.

THIRD MAJOR ARGUMENT, PROTECTING THE WELFARE OF AMERICA'S CONSUMERS

Third. One hundred and fifty million American consumers will be helped, not hurt, by the dairy substitute amendment.

(a) Butter is sold with minimum parity support by Government. Its actual price is set in the 48 States, according to the law of supply and demand, when the 2,500,000 dairy farmers send their product to market. On the other hand, the oleo price is set, not according to the law of supply and demand, but according to whatever the Oleo Trust feels the traffic will bear. If oleo is sold at a low price now, it is purely in line with the strategy of the Oleo Trust to emphasize a wide difference between butter's price and oleo's price. However, once butter is driven from the market it can be predicted with certainty that the Oleo Trust will raise the price of colored oleo.

DAIRYING IS VITAL TO NUTRITION

(b) The consumer depends upon American dairying for his health and nutrition. Anything which serves to reduce the flow of milk into dairy products hurts America's diet. Since butter serves as the outlet for 30 percent of all fluid milk, it is inevitable that, once the butter market is destroyed, dairy herds will be drastically reduced, according to some predictions by as much as 2,000,000 animals. This inevitably means less milk available for cheese, bottled milk, and so forth. Moreover, dairy herds provide 75 percent of United States veal and 30 percent of United States beef. The effect on veal and beef supplies and prices will, therefore, be drastic once dairy herds are liquidated.

UNCOLORED OLEO CAN BE COLORED IN KITCHEN

(c) Consumers can easily color uncolored oleo according to their preference in their own kitchen in 120 seconds. Coloring oleo by a capsule or any other handy device is no more difficult than peeling vegetables or performing 100 other household chores. The difference in requiring those few seconds of coloring may spell the difference between continuation or destruction of the United States dairy industry.

(d) The "butterlegging"—that is, butter bootlegging—that existed when the original oleo regulations were set up will be as child's play compared to the new rackets which will spring up if House bill 2023, unamended, is enacted.

If Federal regulations of yellow oleo are to be repealed, the oleomargarine manufacturers will once more have "butterleggers" for customers. If an immense "butterlegging" business sprang up, as it did when the spread between butterine and real butter was only 10 cents a pound, what else can be expected at today's difference in prices? And if the "butterlegging" racket prospered despite all kinds of early restrictions and penalties, what may we anticipate when all restraints are off?

None of us is so naive as to believe that the situation can be handled by the Pure Food and Drug Administration, or by similarly undermanned agencies. We shall find that our available manpower is wholly unable to cope with thousands of individual racketeers.

(e) "Butterlegging" would be easy. Testimony on oleomargarine legislation in hearings before both Senate and House committees revealed that it would be relatively simple to switch packaged yellow oleo into standard butter cartons. Such an operation would require only 2 or 3 minutes per package and could be performed by nonskilled workers. A profit of up to 40 cents a pound could be realized by such fraud.

A yellow oleo, legalized in interstate commerce, would make it simple, convenient, inexpensive, and even almost acceptable, to perpetrate such frauds.

(f) Fraud is actually already increasing. Last year the dairy industry re-

ported a survey, which has never been refuted in any respect, and which showed that one out of three restaurants in a selected list of large cities was deceptively serving oleo for butter. The 1949 Arkansas data, which I cite below, indicate a far higher proportion—double as much fraud.

Arkansas State law already embodies regulations similar to those contained in House bill 2023, but a survey in February, 1949, disclosed that 66 out of 100 Arkansas restaurants were violating oleo regulations. The current Senate Finance Committee report omits all reference to this survey.

(g) Labeling provisions of House bill are inadequate. The oleo bloc in Congress has frequently said that labeling provisions are ample protection against fraud. That this is not true is clearly shown by the following excerpts from a noted Supreme Court decision—*Carolene Products Co.* v. *United States* (65 S. Ct. 1, 323 U. S. 18):

> In dealing with the evils of filled milk, Congress reached the conclusion that labeling was not an adequate remedy for deception.
>
> Here a milk product, skimmed milk, from which a valuable element—butterfat—has been removed is artificially enriched with cheaper fats and vitamins so that it is indistinguishable in the eyes of the average purchaser from whole milk products. The result is that the compound is confused with and passed off as the whole milk product in spite of proper labeling.

FOURTH MAJOR ARGUMENT—THE OVER-ALL EVIL CONSEQUENCES OF OLEO LEGISLATION

Fourth. The economic consequences to all 48 States are staggering to contemplate.

(a) The heart of this Nation, speaking from a geographical standpoint and from many other standpoints — the dairying Midwest—will inevitably suffer an economic blight if this legislation is enacted. Dairying has always constituted the most prosperous, the most advanced, enlightened segment of American agriculture. It pays the highest wages for farm labor. It is the greatest consumer of industrial products of any type of farming.

All types of farming are, in turn, a better customer for industry's products than is any other segment of our population. To strike at dairying, therefore, means harm to all American farming, and to strike at farming, in turn, means to push our entire Nation into an economic tailspin. It has been conclusively proven that practically all American depressions have begun by a nose dive in farm prices.

(b) In 1949 dairying suffered a loss in cash income by 25 percent. Indirectly, in States which depend upon dairying, that loss was far greater. If this loss continues, whole communities whole counties, whole regions of the Midwest will feel an increasing creeping paralysis. From the step where the farmer mortgages his farm, sells his animals, it is only a short step to the businessman in the village closing down his enterprise and the bank closing its doors. When the farmer stops buying, the factories of the Nation will have inevitably to reduce production and in many instances close down completely. If any of my listeners feel this is an exaggeration of the consequences of this legislation, let him remember that these are not my predictions. These are the conservative estimates of men who have devoted a lifetime to studying the dairy industry.

(c) Dairying operates according to basic laws. Unless a butter market is available in the flush season, it is inevitable that the farmer will have to cut down his year-around output of milk, and this will start the chain reaction I have referred to above. It follows necessarily that with the dairy income cut and the Nation's income and the manufacturer's income cut and labor's income cut, there will not be much left for the Government to get its taxes from.

SOUTHERN FARMER WILL NOT BE HELPED

(d) Some may argue that dairying's loss will be the South's gain. Nothing could be further from the case because dairying is a far better customer for the southern farmer than the oleo industry is. If dairy herds are liquidated, a tremendous amount of soybean meal and cottonseed meal will find that it has lost its market.

I personally feel that, perhaps, we could have been engaged more profitably here in the Senate in these last 2 weeks if, instead of the cotton representatives seeking to take over the butter market and we seeking to preserve the same for the 2,500,000 dairy farmers, if instead of that we all had put our brains to work so as to get a better way of distribution for the surpluses in both cotton and butterfat.

(e) Dairying gives to the farmer a better return than does oleo ingredients. The farmer gets around 70 percent of the retail dollar paid by the consumer for butter. By contrast, the farmer gets only 30 percent of the retail dollars paid by the consumer for oleo.

WHY FOLLOW CONTRADICTORY POLICIES ON DAIRYING?

(f) It is completely inconsistent for the Government to be supporting declining dairy prices on the one hand and to take an action which will mean further declining in dairy prices and expenditures by the Government in order to fulfill legal requirements for parity support.

Through last November 16 the Department of Agriculture had purchased, in supporting prices of producers of milk and butterfat, 284,000,000 pounds of nonfat dry milk, 101,000,000 pounds of butter, and 22,000,000 pounds of cheddar cheese. This was at an expenditure of $110,000,000. Lest, however, my colleagues think such dairy support was excessive, let me point out that the Commodity Credit Corporation has made loans on cotton each year since 1933 with the exception of 1936. The total of such loans amounted to a little less than $3,000,000,000 through mid-1949.

UNITED STATES SOIL CONSERVATION INVOLVED

(g) Still another economic consequence is an uncountable loss to the top soil of America. Every agricultural expert who has ever testified before Congress has set forth the superiority of dairying to any type of field-crop farming. The dairy cow enriches the soil in a more efficient economic continuous way than is available through any other type of agriculture. Field crops have led to soil erosion, dust bowls, and economic blight, in whole States, as attested by such outstanding soil conservationists as the noted author, Louis Bromfield, and other farm leaders, and the United States Department of Agriculture.

So, if the Congress should unwisely act to cut the throat of the dairy cow—literally and figuratively, speaking, cut the throat of the mother of the race—it will at the same time be destroying the factor which assures the health of that precious 6 inches of United States top soil.

EXCERPTS OF LETTERS FROM WISCONSIN

Mr. President, I have in my office literally hundreds of letters sent to me by dairy farmers and other folks in Wisconsin pleading that the natural color of butter be protected in interstate commerce.

These letters were not dictated by $150,000 a year executives sitting in plush offices, surveying a billion dollar oleo enterprise. These were signed by plain, humble folks owning 80, 100 or 120 acres, working sunup to sundown, breaking their backs day and night 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year trying to produce an ever finer natural product and asking only that they receive reasonable protection of the law.

DAIRY FARMERS ARE TRYING TO PROTECT MORE THAN OWN INTEREST

Cynics will scoff at these letters. They may say: "Huh. These farmers are only looking after their own interests." To be sure, Mr. President, they are, of course, looking after their own interests and they have a right to do so, because it is certain that if they do not, the oleo trust certainly will not.

But these farmers are thinking, too, of more than their own farms. These farmers are prducing milk and butter and cheese for the Nation's youngsters and adults. They have known the deep satisfaction of contributing to the health of American bodies and, too, they have contributed to the health of America's soil. These are not robbers of the soil; they give to the soil whatever they take from it and even more. They are trying to preserve America's land heritage at the same time as trying to make a decent income for their wives and children.

These dairy farmers are not seeking to inflict any harm on the soybean farmers or the cotton farmers. On the contrary, as I have proved, they constitute the best customers of those southern farmers. All that they are seeking to do is to prevent themselves from being swindled, yes, to prevent the swindling of the American consumer.

WISCONSIN IS NOT THE LEADING BUTTER STATE

I am sure my colleagues in other States have received similar letters. I call attention to the fact that Wisconsin alone is not interested in this issue. In fact in 1948 only a small percentage of Wisconsin milk went into butter. Only

8.8 percent of the Nation's butter was produced in Wisconsin. But dairy farmers in the Badger State and elsewhere understand the critical tie-up in all 48 States between butter and other dairy products, and between butter and the Nation's soil.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD some comments from Wisconsin dairy farmers.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

COMMENTS FROM WISCONSIN DAIRY FARMERS

From Gleason, Wis.:

"DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I am a veteran of World War II with about $12,000 mortgage on my dairy farm from which I am making a fair living. What would I do if the oleo people slip that repeal over on us dairy farmers—why, we just wouldn't be able to make a living."

From Neillsville, Wis.:

"I wish to express my appreciation for your fight against the oleo bill. * * * I am a veteran, I have been on the farm training program for 2 years now and we have discussed this problem a great deal and I feel that we, the dairy farmer, will suffer more than a great many farmers realize if this bill is passed. I am a dairy farmer on an 80-acre farm and I have a family with four children."

From Dresser, Wis.:

"I am writing you in the interest of the dairy farmer. With the wish that you earnestly and forcefully oppose this yellow-oleo bill. I am writing this as an individual farmer but I also represent about 327 patron farmers of Rock Ridge Dairy Co-op."

From Clam Falls, Wis.:

"I am writing to you regarding the efforts of the oleo people to be allowed to imitate butter by coloring it yellow so that it would pass as the real thing in place of what it is. I know that you will fight for us to prevent the legalizing of fraud for us farmers cannot leave our farms and stock to come to Washington to fill the balconies of the Capitol protesting."

From Antigo, Wis.:

"In regard to the bill favoring oleomargarine, it don't seem right after we worked so hard for years to build up good herds that this bill should go through and substitutes be favored. There would be too many farmers who would have to discontinue dairy farming."

From Neillsville, Wis.:

"I am a dairy farmer and am quite concerned over the oleo question. To me the sale of untaxed colored oleo in competition with butter is only the beginning of other synthetic products in competition with dairy products.

"On my farm I practice soil conservation, which I can do in dairying, grasses, and long rotation of crops. Now, if I must raise cash crops because of no dairy-product market, it will not be in the best interest of soil conservation."

From Wausau, Wis.:

"We do not believe the average American consumer wants a substitute for the genuine. Whenever we visit in town, 990 prefer butter to oleo. We believe this bill is being pushed by the makers of oleo so they can make a few more dollars. How would they like it if the farmer would come up with an inferior product. They sure would squawk."

From Phlox, Wis.:

"I live in a community that is strictly dairy. My greatest ambition was to build up a good dairy herd, which I have accomplished. A World War I veteran, I have put everything I got into this herd. I am speaking for a lot of other veterans around here that has done a good job in building their herds but if we have to compete with oleomargarine we face a slim future; we can't just drop everything and move to the city as there is no industry around here."

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, since I first came to the United States Senate in 1941, I have constantly interested myself in the repeal of the unjust taxes and license fees which have been applied to colored oleomargarine.

In 1943 I urged the repeal of these fees by offering an amendment to the Revenue Act. I have appeared before the Senate Finance Committee at every opportunity since I have been here in an effort to urge the committee to report a revenue bill to the Senate with my amendment. My amendment has also been introduced as a bill in its own right.

We have been successful in bringing this legislation to open debate on the Senate floor on two separate occasions. My repeal measure was last offered as an amendment to the Revenue Act of 1948. Again, last year, I went before the Finance Committee in support of House bill 2023.

I am delighted that this measure is now before the Senate in its own right, and I congratulate the Senator from Arkansas and other Senators on their efforts.

The public demand for the removal of these taxes and license fees has reached the point that favorable congressional action can no longer be denied.

I am deeply concerned over the efforts being made to defeat this bill with crippling amendments. I beg the Senate not to defeat the bill in this manner. Even though I shall vote for repeal of some of the excise taxes at the proper time, I shall be forced to vote against these repealers as amendments to this bill. I hope other Senators will join me so that we may have an opportunity to vote this single important issue up or down. Let us then treat the amendments in a like manner in their turn.

I have long been an advocate of repealing most of the wartime excise taxes. However, such repeal amendments are not germane to this bill because the margarine tax is neither a wartime nor an excise tax. Let me remind my colleagues that this method will further retard the efforts for ultimate repeal of the excise taxes when they come to the floor in their own right. Furthermore, oleomargarine for the past 48 years has been handled in the Agriculture Committee, while excise-tax repeals must clearly originate in the House Ways and Means Committee.

The taxes and license fees on margarine need to be removed primarily in the interest of the consumer. The dairy interest charges of special Southern agricultural interest in margarine are both unwarranted and untrue. There is not a sufficient amount of cottonseed used in the manufacture of margarine to warrant any particular concern on behalf of the farmers. The great need for this tax repeal lies in the relief it will afford the consumers.

Under the present laws uncolored margarine is taxed at the rate of one-fourth of a cent a pound, while a 10-cents-a-pound tax is levied on colored margarine. The license fees are equally discriminatory. For example:

	Pay
Retailers—	
Handling yellow margarine	$48
Handling uncolored margarine	6
Wholesalers—	
Handling yellow margarine	480
Handling uncolored margarine	200

Add to these figures a $600 annual fee for coloring the product, and we can begin to see the unjustness of this discrimination both to the manufacturer and the housewife.

These complex and burdensome regulations make anyone coloring margarine yellow, and serving it to customers or paying guests, liable to a manufacturers' license fee of $600 a year and 10 cents a pound tax on each pound so colored.

These regulations are understandable when we remember the quality of this product when it was first placed on the market and its one claim to consideration was its economy. The present tax and license fees were set by the Congress of 1902, 48 years ago. These were imposed after the crippling taxes and fees of the Oleomargarine Act of 1886. So it is that, after 64 years, the Federal Government still imposes the very same taxes on margarine, which is the only pure food in the land so restricted by national laws.

Mr. President, it is unthinkable, in the light of page after page of testimony such as has been given on behalf of this product, that these ancient and outmoded laws should still rest among our ladened statutes. These laws still stand despite the fact that a small army of witnesses has, in recent years, appeared before committee meeting after committee meeting. They have represented science; manufacturers; wholesalers; retailers; cotton, soybean, livestock, and peanut producers; labor consumers; and hospitals; and they have unequivocally urged the repeal of the discriminatory margarine taxes and license fees.

American margarine is made today from domestic vegetable oils—oils derived from soybeans, cottonseed, peanuts, and corn. Margarine has become the second largest user of soybean oil and also uses about one-fourth of all the cottonseed oil refined in this country. Farmers of 44 States produce the products from which margarine oils are taken. Because of the substantially increased demand for margarine, manufacturers are encouraging production of more of these farm products which produce these fine domestic food oils.

The issue at hand has been boiled down to two basic points: Color and definition of the word "manufacturer." The only basic difference between margarine and butter is that margarine is vegetable fat, butter an animal-fat product. There is actually no perceptible nutritive difference. Each offers about 3,300 calories per pound. The amount of vitamin A in butter varies according to seasonal and other factors; while in margarine it

is maximum and uniform the year-round. Both products are equally digestible.

Report after report by medical associations and nutritional scientists declare margarine to be a nutritious, high-quality food.

An official definition and standard of identity was adopted by the United States Food and Drug Administration in 1941 under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938. Under it, margarine has a minimum fat content of 80 percent; the actual average figure is slightly more. The standard requires fortified margarine to contain a minimum of 9,000 U. S. P. units of vitamin A per pound. But 99 percent of all margarine is now fortified with 15,000 units of vitamin, the content always being shown on the label. This margarine fortification is endorsed by the American Medical Association and leading nutritionists.

The nutritional value of the product dispensed with on the word of competent authorities, we come to color.

Artificial color adds nothing to the direct nutritional value of foods. It is not nutritive in itself. But, by satisfying natural color perceptions in relation to the palate, it promotes digestion and thus indirectly aids the process of nutritive assimilation.

A product's "right" to any color is established by consumer preference. There is no patent or natural or common law trade-mark to yellow for butter, for example.

The argument that all that is being done, in the coloring of butter, is restoring a uniform yellow to the product, falls to the ground. For one thing, butter is not colored uniformly, but to meet market demands. Thus, butter coloring is done to suit regional taste preferences—the New York market, I am told, generally prefers butter whiter than Wichita or Kansas City markets.

Butter is only one of the hundreds of food products using artificial coloring. Butter itself uses artificial coloring during most of the months of the year, because butter produced from cows on winter forage is pale yellow in color; frequently white.

Furthermore, the ingredient of butter, cream, has no more, or even less, claim to yellow than the ingredients of margarine, vegetable oils. Cottonseed, soybean, peanut, and corn oil are yellow in color, varying, of course, in degree. Nevertheless, in their natural state, they frequently could convey to the finished product a yellow tint. Because of this, the oil ingredients of margarine must be bleached to avoid the Federal tax of 10 cents a pound and the other penalties imposed on yellow margarine.

Artificial coloring is permitted by the United States Pure Food and Drug Administration when the colors used are certified United States Pure Food and Drug Administration colors. There are scores of those colors, each of which has been approved by the Administration. Under the Pure Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act of 1938, all food products using artificial coloring must label that fact. Margarine is made under a Pure Food and Drug Administration standard of identity and the yellow coloring, used in or packed with margarine, is so labeled. Butter, cheese, and ice cream, however, enjoy special and unique exemption from labeling artificial coloring under the act of 1923.

The effect of the Federal tax and other restrictions on yellow margarine has been to limit that food in production and distribution. In 1946, only 58,000,000 pounds of yellow margarine were produced compared with 514,000,000 pounds of uncolored margarine. A large share of the colored margarine produced was for Government purchase; the Government not paying the tax to itself.

Margarine is denied the use of yellow simply because the butter industry has misused its political power to drive a competitive product off the counter. This is discrimination and a violation of the American principle of fair, openly competitive business.

One of the most unjust points of the Federal law, at least from a monetary value, is the definition of the word "manufacturer." Under the regulations, restaurants, hotels, clubs, charitable institutions, schools, hospitals, churches, and other institutions are all liable to the manufacturers' license fee of $600 per annum and 10-cents-a-pound tax for each pound colored. There is an exception, where an institution under the complete control of the United States, or a State or political subdivision thereof, in the exercise of an essential governmental function, colors margarine for use of inmates or employees of the institution.

It is my sincere belief that these regulations are pointedly designed to restrain the free marketing privileges of one group of manufacturers.

Such an archaic statute in our modern Federal code is almost as incongruous with free trade as the sight of an archer shooting arrows at a modern jet plane.

Mr. President, in the name of free enterprise, in order that this long-ignored discrimination may be corrected, I sincerely hope the Senate will finally take advantage of this opportunity to act favorably on a bill removing these taxes and license fees.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the amendment in the nature of a substitute of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], for himself and other Senators, to the pending bill, H. R. 2023, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement by me of the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Washington will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

AN AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE (JANUARY 12, 1949, VERSION) TO H. R. 2023

The amendment strikes from the so-called Wiley substitute of the oleomargarine bill all provisions dealing with excise taxes other than those related directly to oleomargarine itself.

Previously I made my position clear on this subject. I am for repeal or reduction of excise taxes on telephone, telegraph, transportation, etc., but I do not believe the oleomargarine bill a proper place to effectuate this objective.

A vote for my amendment should in no way imply that the Senator so acting is against repeal of the excise taxes listed in section 4. My purpose is very simple. I merely wish to keep the oleo-butter controversy entirely separate from the excise-tax question.

I intend to vote for the Wiley substitute, which repeals oleo taxes. At the proper time I intend to vote for repeal of excise taxes. As a matter of fact, H. R. 3905 is now on the Senate Calendar. It can be called up at any time. It deals with many of the same excise taxes as are contained in section 4 of the Wiley substitute. I myself have an amendment lying on the table to H. R. 3905, which proposes to repeal the 3-percent excise tax on transportation of freight.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion during this debate as to the vote recently taken in my State in regard to the manufacture and sale of colored oleomargarine. Many years ago, in fact in 1912, we authorized in the State constitution of Ohio the initiative and referendum. From year to year, more or less regularly, there have been presented to our legislature various bills to make legal the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine in Ohio. None of them had passed until year before last, when an initiated petition was filed in the legislature to bring the subject, as a matter of constitutional right, before the general assembly. The assembly did not approve the bill as initiated by petition. The referendum provisions were taken advantage of by the proponents of the bill, and a referendum to a vote of the people was made possible through a referendum petition. A vote was had at the election in November 1949. There has been a great deal of discussion on the floor of the Senate as to what that vote proved and did not prove.

In the rural counties, of course, the vote against the manufacture and sale of colored oleo was not as strong as it would have been a few years ago, because of the increased planting and marketing of soybeans in my State, a by-product of which is used in the manufacture of oleomargarine.

I have calculated the vote, however, in the various counties, 43 of which voted for the amendment and 45 against it. The 43 counties, with the exception of 5, were what we might term the larger counties of the State, and 44 were what we might class, with the exception of a few, as the smaller counties of the State. I have calculated the vote in those counties which supported the amendment rather strongly, and I find that in the rural sections of those counties the vote against yellow oleomargarine was 399,000 and the vote for it was 308,000.

To clear up any thought that might be entertained that our farmers would

vote either very strongly for or against the amendment, a majority were against it in the rural territories of Ohio, particularly in the smaller counties, and yet it was not such an opposition as could in any way influence the outcome of the total vote.

I have analyzed the vote in the cities, the cities including municipalities with a population of over 5,000 people, and villages, those municipalities having under 5,000 people. In 110 cities "yes" votes were in the majority in all but 7. In those 7 the "no" votes prevailed. In 563 villages the "yes" votes were in the majority, and in 203 villages the "no" votes were in the majority, and in 3 villages there was a tie vote.

In compiling the total vote, however, which was in favor of making legal the manufacture and sale of colored oleomargarine in Ohio, the vote for it was 1,282,606 and the vote against was 799,473, a majority of practically half a million votes.

Therefore, in Ohio, which for many years, practically half a century, prohibited the manufacture of colored oleomargarine, by a vote of the people, with almost half a million majority, the manufacture and sale of the product has been made legal.

As a result of that vote I think it would likewise be the expression of the people of Ohio that the tax should be removed from oleomargarine. The product is perfectly legal. It is a wholesome food, and there is no reason for the tax being maintained any longer, according to the judgment of the people of my State, and my own judgment also. Therefore I shall vote against the amendment and shall vote for the repeal of the tax.

Further than that, as Governor of Ohio, in cooperation with many Senators who have served in like position, we have been attempting to break down trade barriers among the States of the Union. The subject has been on the agendas of the governers' conferences, and our action has been in the interest of the preservation of the whole system of government by breaking down the tariff barriers between the States and breaking down all trade restrictions. Such action has had a constructive public-interest purpose.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think it would be contrary to the intended purpose and all the activities of that organization of governors, which has been so constructive in its purposes and unanimous in its agreements on all resolutions it has considered, if we should fail to remove the tax and all possible barriers on the transportation in interstate commerce of any product which otherwise is legitimate.

Mr. WILEY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, although I am one of the Senators whose names appear on the amendment heretofore offered by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] to H. R. 2023, I have, before arriving at a conclusion as to whether to cast my vote for or against the amendment, nevertheless, reexamined the subject matter of H. R. 2023 and of the amendment.

I have concluded to vote for the amendment so offered by the senior Senator from Wisconsin. The amendment, as does the bill itself, strikes out the taxation provisions, applicable to oleomargarine, of existing Federal law. Those provisions constitute a tax levied on or with respect to one single food product. I think the elimination of them is sound.

House bill 2023 would, in my judgment, injure the dairying industry. The extent to which that industry would be injured by the bill is a subject on which opinions may differ. Eminent Members of the Senate who are in position to be informed on the subject matter have, however, in the argument which has ensued, clearly indicated their view that extremely serious injury to that industry would result from the passage of the bill.

The importance of preserving the prosperity of the dairying industry cannot be seriously questioned. Not only is that industry of substantial importance to dairy farmers from the standpoint of their own income, to the public as consumers, and to the Nation as a whole, but, in addition, that industry is specifically of great importance to the conservation of the soil.

The provision of the amendment declaring unlawful the manufacture, transportation, handling, possession, sale, use, or serving of yellow oleomargarine in commerce, or after shipment in commerce as yellow oleomargarine, or in connection with the production of yellow oleomargarine for shipment in commerce, prevents the competition, in interstate commerce, of yellow oleomargarine with butter.

I am of the opinion that the provisions contained in the amendment are advisable. I shall therefore, vote for it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have already discussed the bill at length, and I do not propose to go back over the substance of the argument. However, much has been said about the public interest in this matter, and it seems to me some of the recent editorials, from some of the leading neswpapers, are pertinent at this moment.

I speak particularly of a newspaper such as the New York Times, which is not merely a local newspaper in New York City or New York State, but is commonly known as the editors' paper, and practically everyone in this country has respect for the judgment of the New York Times. There has been comment in this newspaper on this matter heretofore, but I think at least a part of this morning's editorial is worth quoting, with particular reference to the Wiley amendment.

Mr. President, this amendment was very cleverly drawn. It purports to repeal the taxes, and in a sense leaves the impression that it is in accord with the objective of those supporting the bill itself and that there is only a slight difference between the two proposals.

One of our colleagues the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] last week said that the Wiley amendment was in accord with the platform of the Democratic Party. I merely wish to say that I disagree with that view. I think it is less than frank. I think it is a disingenuous argument. I note that practically every newspaper which has commented on it agrees with this view.

The New York Times of today, January 17, says:

AT LAST, A MARGARINE VOTE

Senate opposition to margarine has at times skated to the brink of filibuster. Nongermane subjects such as luxury taxes and civil-rights amendments have been intruded, to befog the issue. But, when all is summed up on the eve of the first votes, Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina has accurately simplified the situation in saying: "Today it is a case of the butter boys against justice."

Today we shall see whether the majority of our Senators represent 150,000,000 consumers or whether the butter lobby, representing a fraction of our population, still has the Senate in its pocket. If the Senate wishe to reflect the people's wishes, we remind that body of the vote April 1, 1949, in the House, which we believe spoke the consumer's mind. It was 287 to 89 for the bill that would repeal all restrictive taxes and permit interstate shipment of colored margarine. A preliminary vote, to strike out a proposed ban on interstate shipment, favored free trade by 242 to 137. Our Senators will be on trial today, with the American people watching to see whether they are legislating for the few or for the many.

Strangely enough, in this instance the other leading newspaper of the city of New York, which is also a national paper, and is generally considered a Republican paper, the New York Herald Tribune, contained a very excellent editorial today, January 17, with regard to the Wiley amendment. I wish to cite merely one or two paragraphs. The point is that the tax which has existed on oleomargarine has never been a tax in the sense of a revenue tax, such as an income tax or a true excise tax. The sponsors of the legislation made it clear that they did not expect it to produce revenue, but that it was for the purpose of regulation.

The Wiley amendment itself merely changes the character of the regulation. The fact that it is a tax is merely incidental. It abolishes one regulatory method and then applies one that is even more serious, and I should prefer that the legislation on this whole subject remain as it is, rather than accept the Wiley amendment.

I quote now from the New York Herald Tribune of this morning with reference to the Wiley-Gillette amendment:

Shabby as this dodge is, it appears to have the support of some statesmen from whom we have had reason in the past to expect better things. When the vote is taken we shall be able to identify those Senators, and we hope there are few, who preach free competition as the pride and sheet anchor of the United States and urge an integrated, open market as the salvation of Europe, but who are prepared in practice to fragmentize the United States economically. Passage of the transparently unfair amendment would set up interstate barriers against the sale of a commodity that consumers should be free to buy or not to buy as they choose.

* * * * *

The debate over the antimargarine laws has been much too effective in fulfilling the

real function of debate—to clarify issues. It has exposed the unattractive truth of discrimination underlying the double-talk and specious reasoning employed by the defenders of barriers to commerce and consumption.

Senators who vote to repeal margarine taxes are acknowledging that the production and sale of colored and uncolored margarine are in the public interest. Senators who vote to ban margarine from interstate commerce are simply labeling themselves as servants of a pressure group, not public servants.

Mr. President, the editorials which I have cited are typical of many others. I do not expect to read the others. I merely refer the Senate to the editorial in this morning's Washington Post, and I ask that it be inserted at this point in my remarks. It is entitled, "Margarine Vote."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARGARINE VOTE

The Wiley-Gillette amendment offered as a substitute for the House bill repealing Federal excise taxes on margarine, on which the Senate votes today, is also a repeal measure; but, unlike the House bill, it proposes to ban interstate commerce in yellow margarine. If the Senate approves this bill, it will be a triumph for the dairy interests that are behind it. We agree with Senator FULBRIGHT, who has led the fight for repeal of the discriminatory excise taxes that it would be preferable to leave the existing legislation in effect rather than outlaw shipments of colored margarine. For the substitute amendment, instead of removing obstacles to free competition between butter and margarine, would impose new competitive handicaps on the margarine industry by further restricting the area within which yellow margarine could be sold.

Spokesmen for the dairy interests actually have the effrontery to argue that this wrecking substitute amendment would protect the rights of the States by allowing them to decide whether or not yellow margarine shall be sold within their borders. As a matter of fact, it would deprive 15 of the 32 States permitting sales of the colored product of access to sources of supply, since they have no margarine plants of their own. Of course, plants might be constructed in these 15 States. However, as Senator FULBRIGHT points out, quite a number of them do not have sufficiently large populations to provide adequate market outlets justifying investments in new plants.

Another phony argument in favor of the proposed interstate ban on shipments of yellow margarine is that it would give added protection against fraudulent substitution of colored margarine for butter (a danger, by the way, greatly exaggerated by the dairy interests). On the contrary, if interstate trade in yellow margarine were prohibited safeguards against deceit and fraud would be less effective, because yellow margarine would no longer be subject to the protective provisions of the Federal Pure Food Act. Under the House bill, on the other hand, which the dairy interests insist would encourage fraudulent practices, yellow margarine would still be subject to the stringent protective provisions of Federal regulatory law. Evidently Senators who claim that the Wiley-Gillette amendment would give added and necessary protection against so-called butter-legging are either ignorant or disingenuous—willing to play on fears and emotions, and base their case on arguments that they themselves do not believe in.

If the substitute amendment should pass, we hope that the House will refuse to accept Senate modifications that would defeat the basic purpose of its own bill: namely, to free the margarine industry from legislative restrictions that protect the dairy industry from the competition of a cheaper and equally nutritious product. It would be a shabby legislative trick to repeal taxes that obstruct fair competition only to replace them with discriminatory prohibitions of an equally or even more oppressive nature.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I also hold in my hand an editorial from last night's Washington Evening Star, of January 16. I wish to quote one sentence from it:

Masquerading under the favorable appearance of a tax-repeal measure, this carefully thought-up amendment nevertheless would hamstring the margarine industry almost as effectively and unfairly as the present punitive taxes on the butter substitute. It would make it a Federal offense to transport yellow margarine in interstate commerce.

* * * * *

Whatever the effect on the butter industry, there is no justification for setting up an interstate commerce ban designed to protect manufacturers of one good food product from fair market competition by producers of an equally good food product. The Wiley-Gillette amendment should be roundly defeated, preliminary to repeal of all Federal taxes restricting the manufacture and sale of margarine, whether transported in interstate commerce or not.

Mr. President, I ask that the entire editorial be included in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT SHOULD BE DEFEATED

Coming up for a vote in the Senate tomorrow is a proposed substitute for the margarine tax-repeal bill that is so lacking in merit as to deserve complete and unequivocal rejection by the lawmakers. This last-ditch compromise by the bitter-end opponents of a fair deal for oleo is known as the Wiley-Gillette amendment.

Masquerading under the favorable appearance of a tax-repeal measure, this carefully thought-up amendment nevertheless would hamstring the margarine industry almost as effectively and unfairly as the present punitive taxes on the butter substitute. It would make it a Federal offense to transport yellow margarine in interstate commerce. Such a prohibition could be justified, morally at least, only on the ground that yellow margarine is a dangerous product which should be barred from crossing State boundary lines in the interest of public safety. It is on such a thesis that the Federal Government has outlawed the movement in interstate commerce of harmful drugs, diseased livestock, fraudulent mail, and so on.

But even the most extravagant charges against margarine have not included any serious allegation that the nutritious vegetable compound is dangerous to health or is a menace to public safety. On the contrary, a mass of convincing evidence has been produced to show that it is fully as nourishing and tasty as the finest dairy butter. The only interest that would be hurt by the free competition of margarine for public favor is that of the butter industry—and there is reason to doubt that the effect of this free competition would be as adverse to butter as has been represented by the anti-margarine forces.

Whatever the effect on the butter industry, there is no justification for setting up an interstate commerce ban designed to protect manufacturers of one good food product from fair market competition by producers of an equally good food product. The Wiley-Gillette amendment should be roundly defeated, preliminary to repeal of all Federal taxes restricting the manufacture and sale of margarine, whether transported in interstate commerce or not.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, one interesting editorial, which I think is worth noting, appeared in the Des Moines Tribune, which is one of the leading newspapers of the great State of Iowa, which State has had the great good sense to send to us a very fine Senator, the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who is one of the cosponsors of the pending amendment. I wish to quote a word or two from the Des Moines Tribune. The editorial is quite a long one, and I do not wish to take the time to read it all, but I do ask that the entire editorial be inserted in my remarks at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUTTER PROTECTION DOESN'T REALLY HELP

The oleomargarine tax issue is the first item of business scheduled for the Senate as the new session opens. The House passed an oleo tax repeal bill last session.

Undoubtedly many midwestern Senators will try to delay passage of the margarine tax-repeal bill again. Being in favor of the dairy farmer and opposed to the coconut cow is as traditional in the North Central States as being for race segregation in the South. A few midwestern Representatives from large cities have swung to the oleo side in recent years, but the average Congressman from this part of the country dares not give oleomargarine equality in the market with butter.

It is an emotional, unreasoning position—this insistence on protection for butter in the competitive race. It no longer fits the economic facts.

In the first place, oleomargarine consumption is growing steadily at the expense of butter. Restrictive legislation in many States and by the Federal Government has not prevented this. So, at best, the 10-cent tax on colored margarine appears to be a futile effort to hold the butter market.

Secondly, consumers are demanding more and more whole milk and whole milk products. This tends to reduce the production of butter. Attempts by the butter manufacturing industry to keep the dairymen tied to a butter market are not in the best interests of the producer. Dairymen stand to gain most by switching to a whole-milk market, improving sanitation (not so essential when cream alone is sold for making butter), and commercializing or specializing to a greater degree. Butterfat production in the Midwest has been a sort of side-line enterprise on many farms and has not been as efficient as it should be.

Third, midwestern farmers have a big stake in expanding the margarine market nowadays, since they are heavy producers of soybeans. Protecting the market for butter at the expense of margarine is not a net gain to midwestern farmers, by any means.

The changed economic situation indicates that dairy-State Congressmen would be more help to their dairy farmer constituents if they supported legislation to stimulate conversion of the dairy industry to a whole-milk system.

Instead, they have consistently pushed two lines of protective legislation which tend to freeze dairy farming into its present pattern. One is the maintenance of State and

Federal oleo tax laws and color restrictions. The other is high price support for butter.

Butter is pegged at 90 percent of parity, and the Government has piled up 130,000,000 pounds of it in storage. In the last Congress, dairy-State Representatives got dairy products added to the mandatory list of price support commodities. Secretary Brannan has announced that butter will be supported at 60 cents a pound next year.

This is too high a price for butter under present conditions. It probably will add to the surplus. It will be helpful to the margarine industry, also.

Yet, in the next few days midwestern Senators will be talking about defending the dairy farmer's competitive position—while actually hindering healthy change in the dairy industry.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I quote from the editorial. Referring to the pending legislation, it says:

It is an emotional, unreasoning position—this insistence on "protection" for butter in the competitive race. It no longer fits the economic facts.

* * * * *

Secondly, consumers are demanding more and more whole milk and whole-milk products. This tends to reduce the production of butter. Attempts by the butter-manufacturing industry to keep the dairymen tied to a butter market are not in the best interests of the producer. Dairymen stand to gain most by switching to a whole-milk market, improving sanitation (not so essential when cream alone is sold for making butter), and commercializing or specializing to a greater degree. Butterfat production in the Midwest has been a sort of side-line enterprise on many farms and has not been as efficient as it should be.

Third, midwestern farmers have a big stake in expanding the margarine market nowadays, since they are heavy producers of soybeans. Protecting the market for butter at the expense of margarine is not a net gain to midwestern farmers by any means.

This is exactly the point I made the other day. It is here confirmed by one of the leading newspapers of Iowa, which is the largest butter-producing State in the United States.

The next point upon which I insisted in my initial statement, and which was very vigorously denied by the leading sponsors of the substitute, is one I especially call to the attention of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and others who are interested, I am sure, in the dairy industry. I continue to read from the editorial in the Des Moines Tribune:

The changed economic situation indicates that dairy-State Congressmen would be more help to their dairy-farmer constituents if they supported legislation to stimulate conversion of the dairy industry to a whole-milk system.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself three more minutes.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD at this point a very interesting editorial which I do not have time to read. It was published in the Kingman, Kans., Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YELLOW SENATORS FIGHT YELLOW OLEO

One of the first acts to be considered in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress is the bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine. This bill passed the House of Representatives in the first session although it had to be forced out of the Agricultural Committee. It is now before the Senate for final action.

This discriminatory tax has been in effect 63 years, in spite of the protests of the housewives who have been forced to perform the useless and unpleasant chore of mixing the yellow coloring matter into the oleo with a paddle, food mixer, or some other manual way, which could have been done by the manufacturers practically without cost. Incidentally, this harmless vegetable coloring matter is exactly the same as that used by every manufacturer in the country to make the butter yellow. Yellow is no more the natural color of butter than it is of oleo, except when cows are on wheat or grass pasture, and even then the coloring is added.

Oleo manufacturers must pay a tax of $600 a year and wholesalers $480 a year if they distribute colored oleo and $200 a year if they sell only the uncolored product. Retailers must pay a license of $48 for the colored and $6 for the uncolored oleo. In addition to this, there are 16 States, of which Kansas is one, which levy a State tax on oleo. All of which is, of course, added on to the price the consumer has to pay.

No longer can the dairy interests put up the specious argument about the lack of nutritious values and wholesomeness of oleo, and that the customer should be protected. There may have been a little merit—but not much—to this argument when oleo was an animal-fat product, but that has long since disappeared by the use of vegetable oils, such as cottonseed oil, and other elements which scientists claim make it the equal of butter in food value. This stand by the dairy interests has been abandoned and their only hope now is to fight a rear-guard action and try to ban shipment of yellow oleo in interstate commerce.

Before the war the consumption of butter was about 17 pounds per capita annually; now it is 10 pounds. The heavy tax on oleo has not prevented its increased sale. Americans are using about 6 pounds of oleo a year per capita as compared with 2½ pounds before the war. This latter increase has been due largely to the high price of butter. Millions of dairymen sell their cream and then buy oleo for their own use.

It would make little difference to the dairy interests if they never sold a pound of butter on the market. The Government is buying the surplus in order to keep up the price and the first of last month had $60,000,000 invested in butter and still buying more. The Government also has a price support for cotton and at the same time levies a tax on oleo which cuts down the sale of cottonseed oil. It is not fair to the consumers to have to pay their share of the taxes for these price supports and then have to pay another tax on oleo because the price of butter is high. If the tax is not repealed now it will be because parliamentary trickery and political skullduggery is used to keep it from coming to vote. It will be worth watching to see how the two Kansas Senators act in the matter.

F. J. C.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I merely use those editorials as examples of recent expressions of newspapers published in dairying States which have furnished some of the leading advocates of the Wiley amendment.

Mr. President, the vote on the so-called Wiley amendment is obviously the test vote on the legislation. If that amendment should be adopted it would mean, for practical purposes, that the Senate has defeated the effort to repeal the restrictive legislation on margarine which has existed for some 64 years. If the Senators have any regard for the demands and wishes of the vast majority of the people of the country I cannot believe that they will insist upon the retention of this legislation on the statute books. Such genuine polls as the recent election in Ohio have shown that at least a great majority—I would estimate it to be in the neighborhood of 2 to 1—are in favor of the pending legislation, that is the legislation repealing the restrictions.

On two occasions the House of Representatives, the Members of which are as close to the people of the country as any group could be, since they are elected every 2 years, has voted by a majority of approximately 3 to 1 to repeal the existing law. The House of Representatives turned down, by the same majority, the precise legislation as represented by the Wiley-Gillette amendment.

I may say that I do not think the House of Representatives would accept the Wiley-Gillette amendment at all, and, of course, if the Senate should insist upon approving the Wiley-Gillette amendment it would result in our being in a position of stalemate with the House. I cannot believe the House will accept such an amendment, and I sincerely hope Senators will search their consciences before casting their votes on the question, and will reject the Wiley-Gillette amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert as part of my remarks previously made, a telegram received yesterday from an eminent doctor in my State, Dr. D. E. White, relating to the question of the quality and healthfulness of oleomargarine as compared to butter.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EL DORADO, ARK., *January 15, 1950.*

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As an aid to you in your fight to eliminate the unfair taxes on oleomargarine actual statistical data as confirmed by medical science reveals oleomargarine to have a greater food value to the human body than does butter. Oleomargarine has been highly fortified with vitamins and other important health giving substances and is not only as good, but is better for human consumption than is butter. Furthermore it is much more clean and sanitary than butter from the time it is prepared until it ultimately reaches the consumer. Am sure you can readily obtain actual statistics for the sake of comparison but if not, I will be glad to assist you and refer you to proper source for factual data.

Your friend,

D. E. WHITE, M. D.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I yield to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The junior Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, during the past 10 days I have spent much time in studying the pending legislation to repeal the excise and licensing taxes on the production and marketing of oleomargarine. I have also studied, with deep interest, the substitute measure sponsored

by 26 Members of the Senate proposing to prohibit the shipment in interstate commerce of oleomargarine colored a particular shade of yellow.

This legislation is of special and particular interest to me because it involves one of the large sectors of the economy of New York State—the dairy industry. It is also of interest to me because it involves the consumers of New York, although to a lesser extent than those of other States. Finally, this legislation involves legal and economic questions of wide and ramifying importance to the entire Nation.

In the campaign preceding the special election in New York State last November, I told the voters of New York that I would vote against the excise tax on oleo. I believed then—and I still believe—that a discriminatory influence exercised in favor of one domestic industry and against another by the use of the Federal taxing power is wrong in itself. I believed—and I still believe—that an excise tax on a product such as oleomargarine is a tax on the consumer and not on the industry. When that tax is borne by the group in the population least able to support it, it is immoral.

But today the question is not one affecting the tax. We are all agreed that this special tax—the excise tax on oleomargarine—must and will go. Today the question is whether the Federal Government shall substitute for that tax a prohibition on the shipment in interstate commerce of all oleomargarine or margarine which is colored yellow in imitation of butter. After much deliberation, I have decided to vote in favor of that prohibition. I shall state, as briefly as I can, why I have so decided.

My reasons are simple and direct. I believe that oleomargarine or margarine colored yellow is, without doubt, an imitation of butter, so designed and so colored as to invite the housewife and the restaurant keeper to use it as butter. Although it may be labeled in letters four inches high on the carton, it is not so labeled when it reaches the dinner table, either in the home or in the restaurant. No one says, "Please pass the oleo."

First. I believe that the dairy industry should be protected against the obvious imitation of its product, just as soap manufacturers and others are.

Second. I believe that the consumers—the men, women and children at the dinner or restaurant table—should be protected against this imitation, as far as the Federal power can logically go without invading the prerogatives of the States.

Third. I believe that the manufacture of oleo is controlled in a monopolistic manner, and that the price of the oleo manufacturers' product is based as much on what the traffic will bear as on the cost of production.

Fourth. I believe that the entire dairy industry—including that of New York—which is one of the leading dairy States of the Nation—would suffer great damage, with consequent ramifications throughout the structure of American agriculture, unless the proposed substitute amendment is adopted.

Fifth. I believe that there is a point at which a decrease in the returns of dairy farmers will be harmful to the entire national economy, including industrial workers. Such a point might be reached without the protection of the Wiley-Gillette substitute.

Sixth. I believe that the profits of the oleo industry, and the fact that the cost of production of oleo is lower than that of butter, are based in some measure on the lower costs of farm and factory labor in the southern States where oleo is produced and manufactured.

Seventh. I believe that foreign producers of vegetable oils will benefit as much, if not more, than domestic oils producers from a vast expansion of oleo production in this country, and that this foreign production is based on the most exploited and underpaid labor in the world.

Eighth. I believe that the consumers who need and should get a butter substitute at a price cheaper than butter should be able to get a substitute, not an imitation, at its minimum price, and not be required to pay premium prices for a coloring in order to deceive themselves and their families into thinking that they are getting butter. Oleo can and should develop its own market.

Mr. President, it may very well be that in the long run it would be desirable that fortified and enriched oleomargarine should replace butter in everyday use, and that eventually butter should be a luxury item. This eventuality presupposes, of course, that the cost of production of such oleomargarine shall continue to be considerably lower than that of butter.

To permit such an eventuality, however, it is essential that we proceed along two definite and difficult lines. The first is to launch an integrated and far-reaching program to help the dairy industry adjust the transfer of production from butter to other dairy products. Few people realize, and yet it is a hard fact, that the dairy industry has delicate interrelations reaching into the whole field of animal agriculture, the live-stock industry and soil conservation. It is one of the most complex industries in the American economy. To tamper with one aspect of it without considering the impact upon the others is to play games with an economic atom bomb.

Mr. President, I have no ready solution. Yet, one must be worked out. It will take deep consideration and study, but until such a solution is found, I do not think that we dare strike a body blow at the butter industry which has already suffered a critical shrinkage of its market because of oleo.

On the second front, we must strike and strike hard at the monopolistic nature of the oleomargarine industry. If we are to depend upon that industry for a substantial and major part of a food which is so essential to our daily life, we must insure that the freest and fairest competition exists in that field. There are 3,500 creameries in the United States and only 28 oleomargarine plants. I cannot in good conscience favor an industry in which one or two major combines control the entire output at the expense of an industry so widespread, involving so many of our farm producers.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I shall vote in favor of the Gillette-Wiley substitute. If it is defeated, I shall, in any event, vote for the repeal of the oleo excise taxes which represent, to my mind, an unfair and improper use of the Federal taxing power, oppressing the consumer without bringing a commensurate benefit.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield to the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] what time he desires.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, a motion has been made to strike from the amendment in the nature of a substitute all those parts and parcels repealing or reducing excise taxes, except, of course, the tax on oleomargarine. Since there will be no discussion, obviously, of this particular point, I wanted to make some remarks concerning it.

Mr. President, my position on the wartime excise taxes is very well known. For many months I have said that those taxes should be either reduced substantially or should be repealed. But I strongly oppose the attempt to repeal or to reduce any of the wartime excise taxes in this bill.

In the first place, Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate originated in the House Committee on Agriculture. For nearly half a century the Committee on Agriculture has had jurisdiction of oleomargarine and of legislation dealing with it. Therefore, if this bill should pass with the excise taxes reduced or repealed thereby, the conference between the Senate and the House would be composed of members representing the Senate Finance Committee and representatives of the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives. That would obviously be most unfortunate, and would create a conflict between committees in the House and in the Senate on a jurisdictional question.

It would be most unfortunate for another reason which I think should appeal to all Members of the Senate: If we are to repeal the excise taxes or to reduce them, then certainly the taxing committee in the Senate should have the advantage of the judgment and experience of the members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives who have given long years of study to our tax program. If it were a mere matter of removing the excise taxes, it might be said with some show of reason that the House Agriculture Committee could as well do that as anyone else could. But if we remove the excise taxes, we must eventually and inevitably be called upon, whatever we may decide about them, to consider at least a recommendation for some compensatory increases in tax rates so as to make up for the loss of revenue incident to the drastic reduction or repeal of the excise taxes. In the consideration of that important matter, is not the Senate Finance Committee entitled to have the advice and cooperation of those Members of the

House of Representatives who serve on the Ways and Means Committee and who have given long study not merely to excise taxes but to the question of raising additional revenue or raising revenue generally? To attempt to repeal all excise taxes on this bill is obviously unfair; it is obviously unwise; and it will defeat the purpose of those who have offered, and I assume in good faith, to eliminate in whole or in part the wartime excise taxes.

Frankly I think they should be eliminated, or drastically reduced if they cannot be eliminated entirely. But this bill deals not with wartime excise taxes but with the oleomargarine tax, which has been imposed, at one rate or another, for 60-odd years. It is not a wartime tax in any event.

In the second place, the most burdensome part of this tax lies in the fact that it is not so much an excise tax, but is an occupation tax; it is a license on the manufacturer, the wholesaler, the retailer of oleomargarine. Therefore, Mr. President, the amendment seeking to modify or repeal the wartime excise taxes should not be placed on this bill.

Mr. President, I express the hope that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] will prevail, and that the provisions dealing with the wartime excise taxes will be stricken from the bill. I warn the Senate and the country that if that is not done, probably there will be no legislation upon excise taxes at this session of the Congress. Not only do I think the wartime excise taxes should be repealed or modified, but I think action should be taken quickly in order to prevent what now is taking place, namely, some stagnation in the sale and merchandising of the articles on which the excise taxes are imposed.

But if we follow this course, it may result in defeating the effort to repeal the oleomargarine tax; and it undoubtedly will, I think, result in defeating any effort to deal with excise taxes at this session of the Congress, because the House committee would certainly raise an issue, and we would be confronted with a condition which we could not overcome.

Mr. President, I wish to say one word about the Wiley substitute. It has been blandly accepted here that it is entirely constitutional. I seriously doubt it. Undoubtedly it is true that the interstate and foreign commerce clause of the Constitution must be construed in connection with other related and pertinent provisions of the Constitution. In other words, the interstate and foreign commerce clause cannot ignore the fifth amendment, the due process guaranteed in the fifth amendment to the Constitution; and therefore it has always been held, in all the rightly and well-considered cases, that there must be some reasonable relationship between the prohibition or regulation imposed and the legitimate control or regulation of commerce.

Mr. President, what is the Wiley substitute? It does not outlaw oleomargarine. On the contrary, it merely outlaws a particular tint or color of oleomargarine. On the contrary, it recognizes the right to manufacture, ship, sell, and use oleomargarine in any form except when it has a particular tint of yellow. Not only that, Mr. President, but not a word is said here with respect to the particular tint of yellow which is described in the substitute amendment as being deceptive. It is said that oleo so colored is in competition with butter and that the competition is unfair because someone is deceived. Who is deceived, Mr. President? The most illiterate purchaser in my State and, I dare say, the most illiterate buyer of oleomargarine in any State, knows he is buying oleomargarine. The idea of the public's being deceived is so transparently baseless that I do not think it warrants discussion. Deceive, indeed. When shipped in interstate commerce, the color is not even disclosed. When shipped in interstate commerce, it bears the labeling required under both Federal and, in many instances, State regulations of food, and drugs, and cosmetics. When shipped in interstate commerce, no one knows the color or sees the color. What reasonable relationship is there between an outright prohibition or denial of the right of a particular tint of yellow oleomargarine—none other—to move in interstate commerce and the prevention of deception in interstate commerce, when the color is not even disclosed in that movement or is not even visible while the article is moving in interstate commerce?

We know that oleomargarine is transported in packages; we know that the packages carry labels and an analysis. It is not in any sense a matter that is related—not even remotely related, in my judgment—to the regulation of commerce.

There must be borne in mind—and I wish to state this as the premise upon which I am making this statement—the origin and history of the commerce clause of the Constitution, and the primary purpose it was intended to serve, to wit, to make freer and easier commerce between the States, to permit things to move in interstate commerce, if you please, notwithstanding that one State, because of special interests in the State, might desire to prevent it. Not only because of its historic background and not only because of the consistent application of the commerce clause for a full century after the approval of the Constitution, but because of the fact that the prohibition of a particular tint of yellow oleomargarine bears no reasonable relationship to any legitimate regulation of commerce in margarine, beyond all doubt we cannot ignore the fifth amendment, which guarantees due process, in the application of the interstate and foreign-commerce clause of the Constitution.

Indeed, Mr. President, the Supreme Court itself has specifically said that the interstate and foreign commerce clause of the Constitution must be construed in the light of the fifth amendment, which guarantees due process.

But it is said that the filled milk case fits this case like a glove. Mr. President, the filled milk case is not a closely reasoned case, as I analyze it. But what did the filled milk bill do? Let us glance at it for a moment.

That bill passed the Senate a little while after I came here. I was ashamed of it; I was ashamed that United States Senators would, after so long a time, merely to protect one particular food product, outlaw another legitimate food product. However, the Congress did so. But it said this in the act—and I read now from section 2 of the Filled Milk Act:

> It is hereby declared that filled milk, as herein defined, is an adulterated article of food, injurious to the public health, and its sale constitutes a fraud upon the public. It shall be unlawful for any person to manufacture, within any Territory or possession, or within the District of Columbia, or to ship or deliver for shipment in interstate or foreign commerce, any filled milk.

It is true, Mr. President, that at the trial of that particular case evidence was offered for the purpose of showing that filled milk, as then prepared or made, was not an adulterated food and was not injurious to the public health. But that evidence was rejected. The court then proceeded to say that because the public might be confused because of the second leg upon which the filled-milk bill originally stood, they would hold the act constitutional. That is true. I can see how the decision was made, although I think the reasoning is not too clear. It was an act which in the first place outlawed something. In the second place, it was an act which said filled milk was an adulterated food; and in the third place, it said it was a fraud.

What does the Wiley amendment say? Does it say oleomargarine is a fraud? Not at all. Does it say it is an adulterated food? Does it say it is injurious to the public health? Not at all. It says that a particular tint of yellow oleomargarine is outlawed; that is to say, it cannot be shipped at all in interstate commerce. In order to prevent the shipment of a particular tint of oleomargarine, the Senate is asked to do the most drastic thing the Congress has ever been called upon to do—namely, to prohibit entirely the shipment in interstate commerce of this particular tint of yellow oleomargarine. White oleomargarine can be shipped. Oleomargarine of any color except this particular tint of yellow can be shipped. Is Congress to say that? Is Congress to turn completely around and begin to put up the bars against the product of one State as against another? I beg Senators not to do it. Coming from a State which has felt several times the effect of certain class legislation, similar to that here proposed, I beg Senators not to do it. It would reverse the current of history if it were undertaken to be done. I think it most doubtful that the Supreme Court, under this amendment, would say the act was constitutional, even if it were passed. Why do Senators want it passed? In the bill which the Finance Committee sent to the Senate floor we were most careful to preserve and protect all the States. Rewriting the House language upon that point, we said:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the possession, sale, or serving of colored oleomargarine or colored margarine in any State or Territory in contravention of the laws of such State or Territory.

That constitutes protection to the States. There are 32 States which now legalize the sale of oleomargarine. There are manufacturing plants in only 17 of them. Under the Wiley substitute, the 15 of the 32 States having no manufacturing plants within their borders would be denied the right to have a pure-food product shipped into their borders. I wonder what the sponsors of the amendment are thinking about. I wonder why the newspapers have not been more severe. I wonder upon what basis we can justify legislation of this kind, except upon the frank declaration that we want to protect a particular food product, desirable as that product is, necessary as that product is, against another food product which is nutritious, palatable, and not assailed here as being impure, and upon the pretense, as I have said, that only a particular tint of a particular food product is to be denied the right to enter interstate commerce. If the Supreme Court looks at the case, in the event the amendment is adopted and becomes a part of the law, the court may say it is not even remotely related to the underlying reason upon which the Filled Milk case was decided, and upon which many other cases, for that matter, were decided, sustaining both Federal and State statutes.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope, in the first place, that the provision to repeal all excise taxes will be stricken from the bill. I express that hope in the interest of obtaining some legislation at this session upon excise taxes. I also hope the substitute amendment will be defeated when the vote comes upon it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have on the desk an amendment to the so-called Gillette-Wiley amendment. Is it in order now to call up the amendment, which in effect strikes out a portion of the Wiley amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has not offered the amendment actually. He has had it printed, and it is lying on the table.

Mr. MAGNUSON. At this time I offer the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If no further amendment is in order to the substitute, the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to amend the amendment in the nature of a substitute by striking out section 4, beginning on page 5, line 3, through line 20, page 6.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, all the amendment seeks to do is to strike from the Wiley-Gillette amendment the portion of the amendment which would repeal or modify the excise taxes, and that action is sought for the very able and cogent reasons stated by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I hope Senators interested in the repeal of the tax on oleomargarine—to which I am opposed—will not support the portion of the amendment which would modify the excise taxes.

We have heard an able discussion of this question by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia. The Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate are giving consideration to the repeal or modification of the excise taxes. The subject does not belong in the pending bill, and, although I favor the modification of the excise taxes and also favor the Wiley amendment, I still think we should not have the tax repeal amendment made a part of the bill. I hope the Senate will so vote.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the junior Senator from Minnesota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the latter part of last week, it was my privilege to speak in support of the Gillette-Wiley substitute. At that time I emphasized that the bill which comes from the committee is not a bill in the interest of the American consumer. I recognize that one of the principal arguments propounded by sponsors of the oleo legislation is, that by the removal of excise and other taxes on oleo, along with restrictions on color, the American consumer will be provided with a palatable, nutritious spread at much reduced cost. So, Mr. President, I wish to offer for the RECORD, and have included as a portion of my remarks, a survey which has been released by the American Butter Institute of Chicago. This survey was made by the merchandising division of the Reuben H. Donnelley Corp., nationally known and independent market research analysts. The survey brings to our attention some facts which need to be well studied before we take a vote on this important issue.

The substance of the survey is simply that, where we have uncolored oleo, the price per pound in the major cities of the United States ranges from 18 to 22 or 23 cents a pound; but where we have the colored oleo, which colored oleo should by the nature of the tax, increase the price about 10 cents a pound, thereby having an average price range of from 28 to 30 cents, we find that the price ranges from a high of 55 cents a pound to a low of 40 cents a pound. There is, in other words, by the mere fact of the addition of a small amount of color a price differential, which averages 23½ cents.

I bring this to the attention of the Senate, because the argument which has been placed before the American housewife and the American consumer is that the removal of all restrictions on the oleo product will mean a great reduction in the cost of living. The facts of price differential between uncolored and colored oleo reveal, however, that the price increase bears no relationship to the amount of the tax. In fact, colored oleo seems to provide a means of jacking up the prices to as high a point as the market will bear. The fact is, that profiteering takes place when we have colored oleomargarine as compared with uncolored oleomargarine.

Mr. President, I ask that the table which I send to the desk, and the remarks pertaining thereto, be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table, with the accompanying remarks, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRICE SPREADS—WHITE AND COLORED OLEO
(DECEMBER 27–30, 1949)

The following figures show the price spreads between yellow oleomargarine and white oleomargarine in 25 supermarkets in each of six cities, December 27–30, 1949. The figures represent posted prices in the several stores as reported and certified to the American Butter Institute, Chicago, by the merchandising division of the Reuben H. Donnelley Corp., nationally known and independent market research analysts. The figures do not include small independent stores where merchandising costs are presumably not as low as in supermarkets. Prices in some independent stores are reported to be higher than those submitted herewith:

	Yellow oleo	Uncolored oleo	Difference between colored and uncolored
	Cents per pound	*Cents per pound*	*Cents per pound*
Fort Worth	49	19.0	30.0
Indianapolis	49	13.0	36.0
Louisville	45	18.0	27.0
Kansas City	45	17.0	28.0
Little Rock	45	17.5	27.5
San Francisco	43	21.0	22.0
Average	46	17.6	28.4

Average difference in price of colored and uncolored oleo, 28.4 cents per pound—almost 3 times the Federal taxes and license fees on yellow oleomargarine.

MEMORANDUM ON SURVEY

1. The difference of price in each city and the average difference for the six cities reflects the lowest and highest retail price for the two types of oleomargarine—colored and uncolored. It will be contended that the average comparison as stated above is not fair because similar brands of colored and uncolored oleomargarine were not taken to make such a comparison. However, it must be remembered that oleo is the same product throughout the country, with its ingredients being controlled by the standards of identity or definition promulgated by the Food and Drug Administration of the Federal Security Agency. Oleomargarine must contain 80 percent fat with other ingredients being water, emulsifier, artificial flavoring, salt, and chemical preservatives, etc.

2. A study of the prices of oleomargarine in the six cities showed an extreme variation among the colored spreads and the uncolored varieties, respectively, with prices varying up to 100 percent. However, prices of creamery butter, checked in the same 150 supermarkets, show only a 10 to 15 percent spread in any city and are relatively the same price in the various cities.

3. The average price of cottonseed and soybean crude oils for January delivery reported in the New York Journal of Commerce January 10, was 11 cents per pound. Each pound of oleomargarine contains only 0.8 of a pound of fat and, thus, the cost of the fat ingredient for each pound of oleo is only 8.8 cents. The other ingredients in a pound of oleo would not exceed 1 to 1½ cents. Add to this the labor involved and processing costs, and the six-city survey reliably proves that the retail price per pound of oleo results in a most liberal spread between the price of the raw ingredients, or farmers' share, and the price paid by the consumer.

4. Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, on January 4, introduced a survey which was the result of a questionnaire he had sent to several thousand grocers. Based on the replies they gave to the Senator's question, the average spread between white and yellow

oleomargarine was only 10.8 cents per pound. It can be left to your own imagination as to whether the findings reported by trained, professional shoppers and investigators are more reliable than those uncovered by a mail questionnaire survey. It is an old saying in opinion research that the mail survey process shows only the "yes" vote. Those people who have time to fill in questionnaires, and like to do so, are particularly interested in the subject. Clearly a grocer responding to the Senator's question and knowing that the Senator from Arkansas was the leading advocate of yellow oleo, would not return a questionnaire unless his own spreads contributed to the general objectives of the Senator. On the other hand, the investigation by shoppers determines conditions as they actually exist with a sale being made and recorded at the prices reported in the survey.

5. One other observation should be made about the price spreads. The oleo manufacturers—the distributors of this butter imitation—and the retailers of the country have become greatly concerned over the publicity about price spreads distributed by the dairy interests. All the branches of the industry are policing these spreads, therefore, to try and make a good showing and avoid supplying any ammunition to dairymen.

Nevertheless, despite the fact that manufacturers, distributors, and retailers are all on notice about the necessity for holding down spreads, the wide margins reported in the Donnelley survey prevailed in December of 1949.

6. There is one other factor that distorts the survey reported by Senator FULBRIGHT that should be mentioned. It has been found that in every State where yellow oleo was legalized, manufacturers and distributors introduced the new product at an abnormally low price during the first weeks or months it was on sale. In many cases, and this is shown in the Senator's own survey, the yellow product was sold below cost with the manufacturer or distributor actually absorbing some part of the Federal tax.

The purpose of this, of course, is obvious. The idea of the price cutting was to try and capture a large proportion of the market right at the very time yellow oleo was first being introduced to consumers. Subsequently, of course, the price can be boosted. These abnormally low prices, however, distort Senator FULBRIGHT's survey. Taken in conjunction with the fact that the survey itself was conducted by mail, one can conclude the results are meaningless.

OLEOMARGARINE PRICE SURVEY, PRICE SPREAD BETWEEN COLORED AND UNCOLORED OLEOMARGARINE IN VARIOUS CITIES, DECEMBER 1949

A survey made during December 1949 in various cities where both yellow and uncolored oleo are sold, indicates the range in prices at the retail grocery stores. Receipted sales slips and cartons are available to verify the purchases.

Price spreads—white and colored oleomargarine, December 1949

City and State	Yellow oleo	Uncolored oleo	Difference in price
	Cents per pound	*Cents per pound*	*Cents per pound*
Terre Haute, Ind.	55.0	19.0	36.0
Denver, Colo.	44.0	18.0	26.0
San Francisco, Calif.	41.0	19.0	22.0
Los Angeles, Calif.	40.0	23.0	17.0
Cincinnati, Ohio	45.0	19.0	26.0
Cleveland, Ohio	43.0	28.0	15.0
Lima, Ohio	40.0	19.0	21.0
Nashville, Tenn.	40.0	19.0	21.0
Enid, Okla.	43.0	19.0	24.0
Average	44.6	20.3	23.1

The average difference in price of colored and uncolored oleo was 23.1 cents per pound—more than double the Federal tax and license fees.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to make the further observation that colored oleo has been given a particular exemption which no other food product has ever been given, with the exception of one product, namely, mint jelly. I ask Senators who are experts on the Pure Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to tell us what product that agency has permitted to have artificially colored.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILEY. I yield one more minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mint jelly is permitted to be colored green. The only other food which is artificially colored has been oleomargarine. Within the past month or two the Food and Drug Administration prohibited the manufacturers of noodles to include yellow tomatoes, which are a natural food product. The manufacturers wanted to have yellow tomatoes used in order to impart a yellow color to the noodles. The administration said that if that should happen, it would appear to the consumer that the noodles were egg noodles. Therefore, artificial coloring was prohibited.

I shall, at a later time, speak in more detail on the subject of artificial coloring in food products and the limitations on such practices.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, in the past week or so so much has been said in the Senate about the Federal taxes on oleomargarine that there are not, to the best of my knowledge, any facts on the subject which have not been brought out repeatedly in the debate thus far, and I have not the slightest intention of delaying the vote on this bill by adding to the talk.

On the other hand, in my broadcast last week, one of the regular biweekly series in which I report to the people of Pennsylvania the legislative goings-on in Washington, I attempted a brief summary of the legislative history of oleo, and I should like at this point to have my entire radio address printed in the body of the RECORD, because I believe it will make it clear where I stand on this issue and because I believe it will make it clear why I take the position which I take in support of oleo-tax repeal.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Soon after President Truman delivered his state of the Union address before a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives Wednesday, the Senate went to work on the job of repealing the Federal taxes on yellow oleomargarine.

Those of us who favor the repeal of the oleo tax—and we're in the majority—expected a filibuster to be delivered by a handful of dairy-State Senators, and from the looks of things, a mild form of filibuster is what we're getting.

A noisy and lengthy battle in the Senate over oleo was, I suppose, more or less inevitable when we stop to recall that for about three-quarters of a century, oleo has had a pretty bad time at the hands of the Congress, and in the State legislatures all over the country.

By the 1880's margarine had appeared on the market as a widely hailed and cheaper substitute for butter. But all too frequently, in those days, it was unscientifically made, impure, and in too many instances, constituted a real threat to health.

So the earliest laws passed by Congress and the State legislatures were, more or less, in the nature of pure-food regulations designed to protect the public from misrepresentation, and to prevent the sale of an unsanitary and injurious product.

In a short time those laws had the desired effect of raising the production standards for oleo, and with the assistance of science and by more careful methods of manufacture, oleo became a safe and adequate foodstuff. When oleo became safe, it began to present a real competitive threat to butter, especially when colored to look like it.

So the emphasis on the oleo laws underwent a change of purpose from health protection to protection of the butter producer against competition from a less expensive substitute.

Many techniques for eliminating competition were developed—some of them almost fantastic. For example, there were repeated efforts made to require oleo to be colored blue or pink or green before it could be put up for sale. Others suggested that it be shaped like a bar of soap or a piece of pie.

These efforts were more or less unsuccessful, though at one time—I believe it was in New Hampshire many years ago—there was a State law that required all oleo to be pink. The Supreme Court, however, held the law to be unconstitutional.

Two other techniques proved more successful. One of them simply prohibits the sale of yellow oleo within a State. Pennsylvania and 15 other States at present forbid the sale of yellow oleo—and housewives will have to continue adding color by hand until the State legislature at Harrisburg repeals the existing prohibition.

The second successful technique for protecting butter is illustrated by the Federal taxes we're seeking to repeal in the Senate. These Federal taxes have been on the books pretty much in their present form since 1902—and they hit oleo, not once, but over and over again. There's a Federal tax of $600 a year on the oleo producer—another Federal tax of $480 a year on the wholesaler of yellow oleo—and another of $48 a year on the retailer. In addition to these taxes, every pound of yellow oleo is taxed 10 cents, as compared to one-quarter of a cent a pound on uncolored oleo. So, as you can see, the direct tax on the yellow product is 40 times greater—a big discrimination.

The bill now before the Senate seeks to repeal all these Federal taxes.

I want to make it clear, however, that our repeal bill does not do away with the requirements that oleo be pure and nutritious. In fact, the bill on this point goes quite far in that it seeks to regulate the sale of all oleo served in public places, whether it is made in one State, and shipped through the channels of interstate commerce to another State, or whether it is made and sold in the same State. In both instances, our new bill, when passed will require that all oleo be marked clearly as such.

We plan to prevent any possibility that oleo will be misrepresented to the consumer as butter. The customer in a restaurant will know whether he's getting butter or oleo—and so will the shopper in the stores.

I want to make it clear, also, that we recognize the vital importance of the dairy industry. We know that, in order to obtain the necessary supplies of fresh milk required for our people that we must overproduce milk most of the time to avoid any possibility of a

shortage at any time. Both State and Federal laws have had as their basic purpose for years the maintenance of a thriving and healthy dairy industry, and in repealing the oleo taxes we have no intention of harming our supply of fresh and healthful dairy products—and no intention of harming those who produce them.

Now, frankly, I believe there are some big differences between butter and oleo. For one thing, as every shopper knows, oleo is cheaper to buy. For another, though I'll admit this is a matter of choice, I believe there's a big difference in taste between the two, and I personally prefer butter.

But what I do think is most important is that we should have the kind of law which makes it possible for the consumer to select what he wants—so long as he knows what he's getting—and I don't believe the consumer should be penalized by a group of taxes on yellow oleo which are primarily aimed at taxing oleo out of the market.

I think you can understand why it is that I intend to vote for repeal of the Federal oleo taxes—and I think you can understand, too, why I share with most of you the regret that this Federal tax relief won't mean much to us in Pennsylvania until the legislature at Harrisburg makes it possible for us to buy yellow oleo.

At the start of this broadcast, I mentioned that a majority of the Senate favored repeal of the oleo taxes—and I mentioned, too, that a handful of dairy-State Senators was trying to kill our efforts by a filibuster.

Now just what is a filibuster?

A filibuster is a tactic to avoid bringing an issue to a vote. Suppose that a small group of Senators is opposed to a particular measure and knows it lacks the votes to defeat the issue numerically. Now the only way to block passage of the bill is to prevent the Senate from voting on it. The technique of the filibustering Senator, determined to prevent a vote, is to talk—to talk on and on—endlessly, on whatever he wants to talk about, for as long as he is physically able to stay on his feet and continue talking.

One Senator alone, obviously, can't tie up the wishes of the rest of the Senate for any prolonged period of time simply because one Senator just doesn't have the stamina to talk long enough to stave off a vote.

But when there is a well-disciplined, well-led, and determined group of 15 or more Senators banded together, a group of this size generally has been successful in the past at talking so long that the majority of the Senate is forced to give up its fight. The fight to break the filibuster has to be abandoned because there is usually some other very urgent business that must be finished before a deadline—perhaps a law about to expire that must be renewed, or an appropriation about to run out, or something of that sort, which must be done—and thus the filibuster fight is ended to undertake the pressing business.

It is particularly significant, I think, that the oleo filibuster—if we can call it that—is not a southern affair, though I know we've tended to think of the southerners as the great filibusterers of the Senate. The filibusterers on oleo are from the Middle West. The southerners are in favor of oleo-tax repeal, both to aid consumers, and because so much oleo is made from cottonseed oil.

Now why does the Senate permit a small bloc to dominate it on some issues that have overwhelming popular support?

The answer to this, I think, is found in the firmly rooted belief that free speech in the Senate should be absolutely free and unfettered. It's true, of course, that completely unrestrained speech can be the subject of abuse, and that is what happens when free and unlimited debate degenerates into a filibuster that has for its real purpose the blocking of legislation rather than the purpose of informing the Senate and the public on some new facts not previously brought to light.

The Senate, like any other parliamentary body, has adopted a set of rules that apply to the conduct of our business—and in those rules are to be found a number of limitations on unrestrained talk.

For example, a Senator will be forced to sit down if he attacks the morals or the propriety of another Senator's conduct. A Senator will lose the floor, too, if he attacks the motives or conduct of the House of Representatives.

Another means we frequently adopt for limiting the time we will debate an issue is to get the unanimous agreement of all the Senators to vote on a particular day and at a given hour. Once we reach a unanimous-consent agreement to vote at a definite hour, the remaining time is divided evenly between supporters and opponents of the measure—and when the appointed hour rolls around, the talk ends, and the issue is decided by vote.

Perhaps the most famous and controversial Senate rule has been our so-called cloture rule—Senate rule No. 22, adopted in 1917. Cloture is a means of curbing debate when efforts to obtain unanimous agreement have failed—in other words, by invoking cloture as we call it, debate may be halted if a certain percentage of the Senate is willing to see the talk stopped.

Cloture rule 22 provided, until it was changed last winter, that debate could be limited by the agreement of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting. Filibustering Senators, however, discovered some loopholes in rule 22, and it never proved to be effective when really needed.

The filibuster we had in the Senate last session came about as a result of an attempt to plug the loopholes, and provide an effective means of controlling useless talk. The debate in the early days of the filibuster last winter centered around what changes should be made in rule 22, and after several weeks, a cloture petition was filed. A crucial vote followed shortly on whether the Senate agreed with an interpretation given the old rule by Vice President BARKLEY.

The vote on the Barkley ruling split both the Democratic and Republican parties right down the middle. We on the Democratic side of the aisle realized, of course, that the Southern Senators would vote against the control of filibusters, and that it would be necessary to get strong Republican support if we were to emerge successfully. In a close vote, the Vice President's interpretation was voted down, with 23 Republicans and 23 Democrats voting against, and with 26 Democrats and 15 Republicans voting to support Mr. BARKLEY.

We knew then that the Senate's efforts to discipline itself in debate had taken a big set-back. Shortly after the vote on the Barkley ruling, Senator WHERRY, the Republican floor leader in the Senate, presented a compromise change in rule 22 that was satisfactory to the southern Senators and to the Republicans who had voted with them. The compromise plugs most of the gaps in the old rule 22, but it makes cloture much more difficult to obtain by the new requirement that 64 of the 96 Senators must agree to limit debate. Under the old rule, instead of 64 votes, it was only necessary to obtain agreement from two-thirds of the Senators present and voting. And this is a big and exceedingly important difference when you consider that on only two occasion in the past have 64 or more Senators been willing to invoke cloture.

The net effect of the new rule, I feel, is that certain classes of emotionally explosive legislation will remain for the present in a special category such that a determined group of opponents can block the will of Senate majority by the technique of filibustering.

I don't feel we will find it necessary to attempt a cloture vote on the oleo bill, because there aren't enough Senators seriously intent on talking it to death. We can usually break a filibuster where no more than eight or nine Senators are actively engaged. If there are 15 or 20 Senators willing to filibuster, this is a question which remains to be answered by testing the new rule 22. Since the southern Senators voted for the rule change adopted last year, they must feel safe in believing cloture can't be applied to some, at least, of the measures they are opposed to.

The filibuster question is essentially one of deciding whether, in the operation of our kind of democracy, a determined minority may block the will of the majority. It is a serious question, and in view of the set-back we took last year in attempting to get a rule that would curb filibusters, it may be a long time before we are able to work out an effective answer which in the first place provides an adequate opportunity for the exercise of free speech and which will at the same time allow the majority to act without jeopardizing the rights of minorities.

If you're interested in further, more technical details about filibustering in the Senate, I invite you to write me, Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

I hope you will join me on this broadcast at the same time in 2 weeks.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to add a brief statement to the remarks which I have already made.

I remember that when I first came to the Senate the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] would rise and, not only with the force of his logic, but with the force of his voice, would almost blow me out of the Senate, but I would be convinced. Since then I have seen him sometimes go off the deep end in his logic. This has happened when he and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has disputed the validity of a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, and the Senator from Arkansas has even stated that the Supreme Court was wrong. That is the argument of the Communists. It reminds me of the boy marching down the street with his regiment, and his mother saw him out of step and said that every man in the regiment was out of step except her boy.

The Supreme Court of the United States has decided this identical question as late as 1944, when the issue involved was the question of filled milk, when the Court said that the control of shipments in interstate commerce so as to prevent confusion or deception and substitution was within the power of Congress under the commerce clause.

In the original case Justice Stone stated that the question for decision was whether the Filled Milk Act of Congress prohibited the shipment in interstate commerce of skim milk containing any fat or oil other than milk fat so as to resemble milk or cream transcended the power of Congress to regulate interstate shipments or infringed on the fifth amendment. The Court decided the issue clearly and decisively.

Mr. President, I have to laugh when I think of my dear friends of the East who talk about restricting commerce. I have brought out the fact that we cannot ship our milk to New York. The people of the East have built barriers

against it. If they had not built them, we could give the people in the cities in the East cheaper milk and better milk than that which is produced in the eastern area. But there are barriers.

The Supreme Court has decided distinctly, definitely, and clearly that it is within the power of Congress to do the identical thing which we are endeavoring to do.

Let me remind the Senate that the oleo industry has never sought to develop a new product. It has at all times worked solely to produce an imitation butter in every respect. The Congress has a right, under the Fair Standards Act, to protect the interest of the great dairy segment against imitation products.

I say, again, that the oleo industry has at all times worked to produce an exact imitation of butter. It has not developed a product having a distinctive flavor. It has developed the exact flavor of butter. The oleo manufacturers have not sought to produce a new and more appetizing color for their product. They have insisted on using the color of butter.

The oleo industry has not tried to develop new methods of packaging or serving, nor a new body or consistency for their product. No; at all times their goal has been to produce not a new product but solely an exact imitation in every respect and characteristic that can most easily be palmed off as butter.

Dr. E. V. McCollum, world-renowned nutritionist of Johns Hopkins University, has said:

> Who are the peoples of the earth who have used the dairy cow as the foster mother of the race? They are the people of northern Europe and North America. They are the tallest of stature, the longest-lived, have the lowest infant mortality, the greatest resistance to disease, and they are the only people on earth who have ever made any material progress in literature, science, and politics.

A strong, efficient, and healthy dairy industry means a strong and virile America, economically and physically.

Mr. President, when the Senator from Georgia says that the Congress of the United States has not the inherent power, under the commerce clause, to do what this bill seeks to do, he is off the beam. I am sorry to say it, but he cannot very effectively contradict the Supreme Court, which has the last say on the subject.

The Senator from Georgia admits that a measure providing for the repeal of the excise taxes, which is appended to the substitute which some 25 Senators signed, came out of his committee, was approved, and is on the calendar, but he says that if we attach it to this bill it will not pass. That does not sound very logical to the people of the hinterland, when the committee reports and approves the repeal of excise taxes. We have seen that there is a lot of talk but very little action in connection with every tax repeal. If we are to take the tax off oleo we might as well take it from furs, from tickets, and from other articles which have had such taxes imposed upon them.

Are we so imbecile in our activities that we think the thing we want to do has to be done according to the old pattern? Can we not put vitality into our actions and accomplish what we wish to accomplish?

Mr. President, the life of the dairy industry of this Nation is at stake. I repeat, that a strong, efficient, and healthy dairy industry means a strong and virile America, economically and physically. If this synthetic product is substituted for butter, and if the necessary vitamins are taken away, we shall be like the calves which have been referred to, which simply passed out of the picture.

So, Mr. President, I ask the Senate to face up to the situation with heads erect. We owe it to the people of the Nation. I could say a great deal about newspapers and magazines which have received millions of dollars from advertising, without doing anything more than to scratch the very surface of what is involved. We do not want creeping paralysis to attack the Middle West section of this country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired. All time for debate has expired, and the Senate will proceed to vote upon the Wiley substitute and amendments thereto, without further debate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Maybank
Anderson	Hoey	Millikin
Benton	Holland	Mundt
Brewster	Humphrey	Murray
Bricker	Hunt	Myers
Bridges	Ives	Neely
Butler	Jenner	O'Conor
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Darby	Kefauver	Russell
Donnell	Kem	Saltonstall
Douglas	Kerr	Schoeppel
Downey	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Knowland	Sparkman
Eastland	Langer	Taft
Ecton	Leahy	Taylor
Ellender	Lehman	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	Long	Thye
Frear	Lucas	Tobey
Fulbright	McCarran	Tydings
George	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Gillette	McClellan	Watkins
Graham	McFarland	Wherry
Green	McKellar	Wiley
Gurney	McMahon	Williams
Hayden	Magnuson	Withers
Hendrickson	Malone	Young
Hickenlooper	Martin	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. WILEY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILEY. What is the first amendment before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Wisconsin and other Senators.

Mr. WILEY. May it be stated?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out section 4, beginning on page 5, line 3, running through line 20 on page 6.

Mr. CORDON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CORDON. Notice has been given of the intention to offer two amendments in the nature of perfecting amendments to the substitute. One of those was offered by the Senator from Oregon, and I wish to get a vote on the amendment I have offered. The question is which would be in order, perfection of the substitute, or a motion to strike from the substitute, which raises the point whether the amendment of the Senator from Oregon should be acted upon before the motion to strike.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator from Oregon or any other Senator desires to offer a perfecting amendment involving the section which the Senator from Washington seeks to strike out, it would be in order, and a vote would be taken on that first.

Mr. CORDON. In that situation, the Senator from Oregon calls up his amendment marked "1-13-50—A," and asks that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 6, between lines 13 and 14, to insert a new subsection, as follows:

> (e) Effective on and after the first day of the first month which begins more than 20 days after the date of enactment of this act, section 3475 of the Internal Revenue Code (tax on transportation of property) is hereby repealed.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is not debatable.

Mr. CORDON. I understand that, but in the amendment as stated there is an error due to a later printing of the substitute, and I ask that it be corrected. It should come on page 6, between lines 20 and 21, instead of between lines 13 and 14.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator modifies his amendment accordingly. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN answered in the affirmative when his name was called.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, between lines 20 and 21, it is proposed to insert a new subsection as follows:

> (e) Effective on and after the first day of the first month which begins more than 20 days after the date of enactment of this act, section 3475 of the Internal Revenue Code (tax on transportation of property) is hereby repealed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the amendment of the Senator from Oregon should not prevail, would the next order of business be the amendment of the Senator from Washington?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unless some other Senator desired to amend the Senator's amendment. It is in order to offer perfecting amendments to it before it is voted on. The Secretary will resume the roll call.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that on this vote the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], who is absent on official business as a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, holding hearings in the State of New Mexico, would vote "nay" on this amendment, if present.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent on official business as a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, holding hearings in the State of New Mexico.

On this vote the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who is absent on important public business, is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Washington would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who is absent on official business as a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, holding hearings in the State of New Mexico, is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Public Works, is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is absent on official business, is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 56, as follows:

YEAS—33

Aiken	Gurney	Millikin
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bricker	Ives	Saltonstall
Butler	Jenner	Schoeppel
Capehart	Kem	Thye
Cordon	Langer	Vandenberg
Darby	Lodge	Watkins
Donnell	McCarran	Wherry
Dworshak	McCarthy	Wiley
Ecton	Malone	Withers
Ferguson	Martin	Young

NAYS—56

Anderson	Fulbright	Humphrey
Benton	George	Hunt
Bridges	Gillette	Johnson, Colo.
Byrd	Graham	Johnson, Tex.
Douglas	Green	Johnston, S. C.
Downey	Hayden	Kefauver
Eastland	Hendrickson	Kerr
Ellender	Hill	Kilgore
Flanders	Hoey	Knowland
Frear	Holland	Leahy
Lehman	Murray	Sparkman
Long	Myers	Taft
Lucas	Neely	Taylor
McClellan	O'Conor	Thomas, Okla.
McFarland	O'Mahoney	Thomas, Utah
McKellar	Pepper	Tobey
McMahon	Robertson	Tydings
Magnuson	Russell	Williams
Maybank	Smith, Maine	

NOT VOTING—7

Cain	Connally	Stennis
Chapman	Morse	
Chavez	Smith, N. J.	

So Mr. CORDON's amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by Mr. WILEY for himself and other Senators, was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] for himself and other Senators, to strike out section 4, beginning on page 5, line 3, through line 20, on page 6. [Putting the question.] The "noes" seem to have it. The "noes" have it.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. RUSSELL rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request comes too late. The Chair has already announced the result.

The question now is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] for himself and other Senators, as modified.

Mr. WILEY and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On what is the Senate to vote now?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The vote is on the so-called Wiley substitute, as modified. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KERR (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who is absent on important public business. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. TOBEY (when Mr. MORSE's name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is absent on official business. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. WITHERS (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], who is absent on official business as a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, holding hearings in the State of New Mexico. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HUNT. On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who is necessarily absent on official business as a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, holding hearings in the State of New Mexico. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent on official business as a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, holding hearings in the State of New Mexico, and if present would vote "nay" on this amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Public Works, is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent on official business, and his pair has previously been announced by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—37

Aiken	Humphrey	Murray
Brewster	Ives	Schoeppel
Butler	Jenner	Taylor
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	Kem	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	Langer	Thye
Dworshak	Lehman	Vandenberg
Ecton	McCarran	Watkins
Ferguson	McCarthy	Wherry
Flanders	Magnuson	Wiley
Gillette	Malone	Young
Gurney	Millikin	
Hickenlooper	Mundt	

NAYS—48

Anderson	Hendrickson	McMahon
Benton	Hill	Martin
Bricker	Hoey	Maybank
Bridges	Holland	Myers
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Darby	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Douglas	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Downey	Kilgore	Pepper
Eastland	Knowland	Robertson
Ellender	Leahy	Russell
Frear	Lodge	Saltonstall
Fulbright	Long	Smith, Maine
George	Lucas	Sparkman
Graham	McClellan	Taft
Green	McFarland	Tydings
Hayden	McKellar	Williams

NOT VOTING—11

Cain	Hunt	Stennis
Chapman	Kerr	Tobey
Chavez	Morse	Withers
Connally	Smith, N. J.	

So the modified amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by Mr. WILEY for himself and other Senators, was rejected, as follows:

DEFINITIONS

SECTION 1. (a) The term "oleomargarine" as used in this act includes—

(1) all substances, mixtures, and compounds, known as oleomargarine, margarine, oleo, or butterine;

(2) all substances, mixtures, and compounds which have a consistency similar to that of butter and which contain any edible oils or fats other than milk fat if (A) made

in imitation or semblance of butter, or purporting to be butter or a butter substitute, or (B) commonly used, or intended for common use, in place of or as a substitute for butter, or (C) churned, emulsified, or mixed in cream, milk, skim milk, buttermilk, water, or other liquid and containing moisture in excess of 1 percent and commonly used, or suitable for common use, as a substitute for butter.

(b) For the purposes of this act, "yellow oleomargarine" is oleomargarine, as defined in subsection (a) of this section, having a tint or shade containing more than 1.6° of yellow, or of yellow and red collectively, measured in terms of the Lovibond tintometer scale read under conditions substantially similar to those established by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, or the equivalent of such measurement.

(c) The term "commerce" as used in this act means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States, or between the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States and any State or other Territory or between any foreign country and any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or within the District of Columbia or any Territory, or between points in the same State but through any other State or any Territory or the District of Columbia or any foreign country.

PROHIBITED ACTS

SEC. 2. The manufacture, transportation, handling, possession, sale, use, or serving of yellow oleomargarine in commerce, or after shipment in commerce as yellow oleomargarine, or in connection with the production of yellow oleomargarine for shipment in commerce, is hereby declared unlawful: *Provided, however,* That yellow oleomargarine manufactured or colored within the borders of a State or Territory in which it is to be consumed shall not be subject to the provisions of this act but shall be subject to the laws and regulations of such State or Territory. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to limit in any way the applicability of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

SEC. 3. (a) Section 15 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, is amended by inserting "(1)" after the letter "(a)" in subsection (a) thereof, and by adding at the end of such subsection the following new paragraph:

"(2) In the case of oleomargarine or margarine an advertisement shall be deemed misleading in a material respect if in such advertisement representations are made or suggested by statement, word, grade designation, design, device, symbol, sound, or any combination thereof, that such oleomargarine or margarine is a dairy product."

(b) Such section 15 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The term 'oleomargarine or margarine' includes—

"(1) all substances, mixtures, and compounds known as oleomargarine, margarine, oleo, or butterine;

"(2) all substances, mixtures, and compounds which have a consistence similar to that of butter and which contain any edible oils or fats other than milk fat if (A) made in imitation or semblance of butter, or purporting to be butter or a butter substitute, or (B) commonly used, or intended for common use, in place of or as a substitute for butter, or (C) churned, emulsified, or mixed in cream, milk, skim milk, buttermilk, water, or other liquid and containing moisture in excess of 1 percent and commonly used or suitable for common use, as a substitute for butter."

(c) Subsection (1) of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Each separate violation of such an order shall be a separate offense, except that in the case of a violation through continuing failure or neglect to obey a final order of the Commission each day of continuance of such failure or neglect shall be deemed a separate offense."

SEC. 4. (a) Effective on and after the first day of the first month which begins more than 20 days after the date of enactment of this act—

(1) the tax imposed by section 1700 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (tax on admissions);

(2) the tax imposed by section 3406 (a) (10) of such code (tax on electric light bulbs and tubes);

(3) the tax imposed by section 2400 of such code (tax on jewelry);

(4) the tax imposed by section 2401 of such code (tax on furs);

(5) the tax imposed by section 2402 of such code (tax on toilet preparations);

(6) the tax imposed by section 3465 (a) of such code (taxes on telegraph, telephone, radio, and cable facilities); and

(7) the taxes imposed by section 3469 of such code (taxes on transportation of persons, and on seating or sleeping accommodations in connection with such transportation);

shall be determined without regard to the war tax rates specified in section 1650 of such code.

(b) Effective on and after the first day of the first month which begins more than 20 days after the date of enactment of this act, section 1651 of the Internal Revenue Code (retailers' excise tax on luggage, purses, handbags, toilet cases, etc.) is hereby repealed.

(c) Effective on and after the first day of the first month which begins more than 20 days after the date of enactment of this act, section 3406 (a) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code (manufacturers' excise tax on photographic apparatus) is hereby amended by striking out "25 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "10 percent," and by striking out "15 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "10 percent."

(d) For the purposes of section 1657 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to floor stocks refunds on electric light bulbs) and of section 1658 of such code (relating to the application of the effective date of rate reduction in the case of telephone, telegraph, etc., services) the term "rate reduction date" means the first day of the first month which begins more than 20 days after the date of enactment of this act.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 5. The Administrator of the Federal Security Agency is authorized and directed to administer and enforce this act and to prescribe and enforce rules and regulations to carry out its purposes and policies. The enforcement provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, including the provisions relating to injunctions and seizure, shall be available for the enforcement of this act.

PENALTIES

SEC. 6. Any person, firm, or corporation violating any of the provisions of this act, or of the rules and regulations issued in connection therewith, and any officer, agent, or employee thereof who directs or knowingly permits such violations, or who aids or assists therein, shall upon conviction thereof be subject to punishment in the same manner and to the same extent as persons who violate the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the adequate enforcement of this act.

REPEAL

SEC. 8. The following sections of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to taxes on colored and uncolored oleomargarine, to special occupational taxes on manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers of oleomargarine, and to packaging, reporting, and other regulations of oleomargarine) are hereby repealed: Sections 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2313, 3200, 3201, (26 U. S. C., secs. 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2313, 3200, 3201).

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still before the Senate and open to amendment.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

SYNTHETIC RUBBER—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 448)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, transmitting his recommendations relating to the development of domestic rubber, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For text of President's message see pp. 426 and 427, House proceedings of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 16, 1950.)

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1915, as amended, establishing the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, I transmit herewith the thirty-fifth annual report of the Committee covering the fiscal year 1949.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 16, 1950.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letter, which was referred as indicated:

REPORT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual

report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, for the fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Memorials of Mrs. Chester Green, of Newton, N. C., and Mr. and Mrs. L. G. Miller, of Blackey, Va., remonstrating against the passage of Senate bill 1103 and House bill 2945, to readjust postal rates; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. GREEN:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States of America to use every effort in order that old Fort Adams, at Newport, R. I., may be made a national shrine and recreation center for the United States Army

"Whereas the old historical fort at Brenton's Point in Newport, known as Fort Adams, located in the city of Newport on the island of Aquidneck, surrounded by water on three sides in Narragansett Bay, has had a far-reaching history, even from the latter part of the sixteenth century, including:

"1. In 1740, order of the general assembly for a military barracks and storehouse on Brenton's Point;

"2. On December 20, 1775, General Washington considered Brenton's Point as a strategic point in the Nation's defense at that time;

"3. On April 6, 1776, hastily erected battery there drove the British back to sea, followed by capture by the British, the point under its command until July 10, 1780;

"4. July 4, 1779, Brenton's Point named John Adams in honor of our second President of the United States;

"5. May 2, 1799, the date of the first deed of record to the Government as a location for a fortification; and

"6. In 1842, Fort Adams became a permanent garrison and the building of the present fort was completed; and

"Whereas the harbor of Narragansett Bay is an ideal place for refuge for ships in time of storm, since it can take care of the entire Atlantic Fleet at one time; is a naval base for the United States Navy with the War College on Coasters Island, a part of Newport adjacent to Fort Adams; and

"Whereas the proposal under consideration of making Fort Adams, due to its ancient history, construction, and location, a national shrine would be an asset to our Government and to the city of Newport, whose ideal beauty for vacationists and summer residents is displayed in all its splendor along the ocean drive and rock-bound coast of the sea, the perfect set-up for a national museum and recreation center for the United States Army: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States of America be and they are urged to use every effort in order that old Fort Adams, at Newport, R. I., may be made a national shrine and recreation center for the United States Army and that they approach the authorities of the United States Department of the Interior with such an idea in mind, first, for the erection of a national museum at such site of old Fort Adams and, secondly, for the assigning of two companies of hand-picked soldiers to be stationed there for ceremonial duties; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State is hereby authorized and directed to transmit to the Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States and to the Secretary of the Interior duly certified copies of this resolution."

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING—PETITION

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am in receipt of another letter from Mrs. Nora B. Powell, State legislative director, WCTU, New Castle County, Del., transmitting a third petition signed by 55 citizens of New Castle and Kent Counties, Del., in support of legislation now pending before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages over the radio. This brings the total number of signers of the petitions sent in by Mrs. Powell to 2,191. I ask that this petition also be referred to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for its consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition will be received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTION OF OTSEGO COUNTY (N. Y.) BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Otsego County (N. Y.) Board of Supervisors, protesting against the construction of a St. Lawrence seaway.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Board of Supervisors of St. Lawrence County has appropriated $5,000 for use in promoting and publicizing the proposed billion dollar St. Lawrence seaway project; and

Whereas this board of supervisors of Otsego County, N. Y., believe that the construction of the Federal St. Lawrence seaway is against the best interests of all the people of the State of New York and especially the interests of labor and business: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this board of supervisors for and in behalf of the people of the County of Otsego, N. Y., strongly oppose the construction of such St. Lawrence seaway project; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk be and hereby is authorized and directed to send certified copies of this resolution to Hon. HERBERT LEHMAN and Hon. IRVING IVES, Senators representing New York State and Hon. BERNARD W. KEARNEY, Representative of the Thirty-first District of New York State.

DELIVERED-PRICE SYSTEMS AND FREIGHT-ABSORPTION PRACTICES—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RETAIL DRUGGISTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate a resolution adopted at the fifty-first annual convention of the National Association of Retail Druggists held in New York City during the week of September 18. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas S. 1008, which is now in conference, would, in the opinion of this association, destroy the effective use of the Robinson-Patman Act, a measure that has become the Rock of Gibraltar to the small-business men of this country; and

Whereas tremendous gains have been made by business in general under the Robinson-Patman Act by establishing fair competition, and requiring all sellers to treat all buyers alike without discrimination; and

Whereas the proponents of S. 1008 assert that its purpose is to legalize delivered prices and freight absorption; and

Whereas there is nothing in the antitrust laws forbidding delivered pricing or forbidding freight absorption, provided buyers are treated equally and are not subjected to the basic price or discount discrimination; and

Whereas the association asserts that S. 1008 was passed without due regard for proper hearings on the measure justified by its far-reaching importance: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Association of Retail Druggists in convention assembled go on record strongly opposing the measure now in conference, and, because it was denied the privilege of doing so before hearings on the bill, that it communicate its reasons for opposition to the conference committee.

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY—RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF PULASKI, TENN.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Pulaski, Tenn., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass and the President of the United States to approve if passed the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic

death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Pulaski, and State of Tennessee:

SECTION 1. That we hereby memoralize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Tennessee.

STRENGTHENING OF UNITED NATIONS—PETITION

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a petition signed by a large number of leading citizens from North Carolina, addressed to the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, in support of House Concurrent Resolution 64 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, relating to strengthening of the United Nations. The petition was signed by a large number of the outstanding men and women in North Carolina who have given sincere and earnest thought to world conditions and to the necessity for establishing and maintaining world peace.

Several resolutions have been submitted in the Senate looking toward amending the United Nations and to implementing that organization with sufficient power and authority to make it effective in the field of foreign relations.

I have joined as a sponsor for some of these resolutions. I think that all are good; however, after careful consideration of the resolutions submitted, I believe that this particular resolution would be most effective and I should like to see our Foreign Relations Committee take favorable action on it.

Although I was not one of the original sponsors of the resolution I take pleasure in giving it my support.

I ask unanimous consent that this petition be printed in the RECORD with all the signatures attached, and referred to the Foreign Relations Committee.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD with the signatures attached, as follows:

To the Members of the United States Congress from the State of North Carolina, Senator CLYDE R. HOEY, Senator FRANK P. GRAHAM, Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER, Hon. JOHN H. KERR, Hon. GRAHAM A. BARDEN, Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY, Hon. THURMOND CHATHAM, Hon. CARL T. DURHAM, Hon. F. ERTEL CARLYLE, Hon. C. B. DEANE, Hon. R. L. DOUGHTON, Hon. HAMILTON C. JONES, Hon. A. L. BULWINKLE, Hon. MONROE M. REDDEN:

PETITION ENDORSING HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 64 AND SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 56

We, the undersigned citizens of North Carolina, believe that a just and lasting peace is the goal which our civilization must achieve; and that if we fail to achieve it, there is grave danger that our civilization will be destroyed. We believe that the only practicable way in which to achieve a just and lasting peace is through the establishment of a world federal government with limited but adequate powers. We believe that this may best be done by amending the Charter of the United Nations to develop it into such a limited world federal government; and that the United States should assume world leadership in advocating such amendments. Therefore, we endorse House Concurrent Resolution 64, sponsored by 105 Representatives, including North Carolina's THURMOND CHATHAM, and Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, sponsored by 21 Senators, including North Carolina's FRANK P. GRAHAM. These resolutions read substantially as follows:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations, and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law."

We strongly urge that North Carolina's congressional delegation unanimously support these resolutions; that each member of the delegation publicly announce his support; and that each actively voice his support before the appropriate committees and on the floor of Congress.

LIST OF THOSE WHO HAVE SIGNED PETITION ENDORSING HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 64 AND SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 56 (THE WORLD FEDERATION RESOLUTION)

R. Mayne Albright, former director, State employment service; candidate for Governor, 1948 Democratic primary.

Arch T. Allen, chairman, committee on judiciary I, and vice chairman, committee on finance, North Carolina House of Representatives.

Mrs. Ed M. Anderson, president, North Carolina Federation of Women's Clubs.

Dr. Charles W. Armstrong, past president, Kiwanis International.

J. L. Atkins, Jr., chairman, Durham County Democratic Executive Committee.

L. Y. Ballentine, State commissioner of agriculture; former Lieutenant Governor of North Carolina.

Hyman L. Battle, treasurer and manager, Rocky Mount Mills.

Kemp D. Battle, past president, North Carolina Bar Association.

Mrs. Karl Bishopric, past president, North Carolina Federation of Women's Clubs.

M. K. Blount, attorney; former State senator and former mayor, Greenville.

W. Bryan Bolich, professor of law, Duke University Law School.

Dr. Harold A. Bosley, dean, Duke University, Divinity School.

W. T. Bost, Raleigh correspondent, Greensboro Daily News.

Leon S. Bradshaw, L. S. Bradshaw & Sons, contractors, Salisbury.

Henry Brandis, Jr., dean, University of North Carolina Law School.

Henry L. Bridges, State auditor.

B. F. Brown, chairman, Raleigh Housing Authority; former dean, Basic Division, North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering, University of North Carolina.

Harry B. Caldwell, master, North Carolina State Grange.

Irving Carlyle, attorney, Winston-Salem.

D. D. Carroll, dean, University of North Carolina School of Commerce.

Dr. Roma S. Cheek, chairman, welfare department, North Carolina Federation of Women's Clubs; former executive secretary, State commission for the blind.

Waldo C. Cheek, State commissioner of insurance.

James H. Clark, merchant, Elizabethtown.

W. A. Coble, farmer and dairyman, Guilford College.

William J. Cocke, attorney, Asheville.

Ben Cone, mayor, Greensboro; director, Cone Mills.

Lewis M. Conn, State director, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO.

J. C. Cowan, Jr., president, Burlington Mills, Inc.

Mrs. Burton Craige, Winston-Salem.

Christopher Crittenden, director, State department of archives and history.

Dr. John R. Cunningham, president, Davidson College.

Ruth Current, State home demonstration agent.

Mrs. J. H. Cutchin, president, Woman's Society of Christian Service, North Carolina Conference, Methodist Church.

Jonathan Daniels, editor, Raleigh News and Observer; Democratic National Committeeman for North Carolina.

Dr. W. C. Davison, dean, Duke University School of Medicine.

Emery B. Denny, associate justice, North Carolina Supreme Court.

William A. Devin, associate justice, North Carolina Supreme Court.

Mrs. Louise P. East, president, North Carolina Nurses Association.

Dr. Alphonso Elder, president, North Carolina College at Durham.

S. J. Ervin, Jr., associate justice, North Carolina Supreme Court.

Clyde A. Erwin, State superintendent of public instruction.

Thad Eure, Secretary of State of North Carolina.

C. A. Fink, president, North Carolina Federation of Labor.

J. H. Fogler, former Representative in Congress, Fifth North Carolina District.

J. P. Frank, president, North Carolina Granite Corp.

Mrs. F. G. Fuller, international relations chairman, Catholic Women's Group.

O. Max Gardner, Jr., law student, Chapel Hill.

Ralph W. Gardner, attorney, Shelby and Washington, D. C.

Don Gilliam, United States district judge, eastern district of North Carolina.

R. C. Godwin, State commander, American Legion.

Carl Goerch, editor, the State; radio commentator.

Dr. G. W. Greene, director, World Government Institute, Catawba College.

Joe Grier, Jr., past State commander, American Legion.

Allen H. Gwyn, judge of the superior court.

Frank W. Hanft, former associate State utilities commissioner; professor of law, University of North Carolina Law School.

Dr. John W. Harrelson, chancellor, North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering, University of North Carolina.

Johnson J. Hayes, United States district judge, middle district of North Carolina.

Mrs. J. Henry Highsmith, past president, North Carolina Federation of Women's Clubs.

Brandon P. Hodges, State treasurer.

Robert B. House, chancelor, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Mrs. Lucie B. Humber, president, North Carolina Division, American Association of University Women.

Robert Lee Humber, author of Humber Resolution for World Federation.

Dr. Guion Griffis Johnson, chairman, department of international relations, North Carolina Federation of Women's Clubs.

Mrs. Alice A. Jones, Greenville.

Millard F. Jones, president, Planters National Bank & Trust Co., Rocky Mount; director, Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, Wachovia Bank & Trust Co., etc.

Frank Jordan, Methodist minister, Shelby.

Dr. A. R. Keppel, president, Catawba College.
William D. Kizziah, United States marshal, middle district of North Carolina.
E. R. Latty, professor of law, Duke University Law School.
Thomas H. Leath, president, North Carolina Bar Association.
Robert E. Lee, dean, Wake Forest College Law School.
O. C. Lee, State director, Communications Workers of America, CIO.
Charles L. B. Lowndes, acting dean, Duke University Law School.
R. S. McClelland, mayor, Wilmington.
Mrs. D. A. McCormick, State vice chairman, Democratic Party.
L. P. McLendon, former chairman, State board of elections; attorney, Greensboro.
Harry McMullan, attorney general of North Carolina.
Holt McPherson, managing editor, Shelby Daily Star.
Douglas B. Maggs, former solicitor, United States Department of Labor; professor of law, Duke University Law School.
Mrs. Gordon Maddrey, secretary of missionary education, Baptist Missionary Union.
William Medford, former State senator; attorney, Waynesville.
Oscar K. Merritt, industrialist, Mount Airy.
Dr. Clyde Milner, president, Guilford College.
John Mitchell, former State commissioner of banks; cashier, State Bank & Trust Co., Greenville.
F. Orion Mixon, Baptist minister, Raleigh.
Clifton L. Moore, solicitor, eighth judicial district.
Dan K. Moore, judge of the superior court.
Wallace C. Murchison, attorney, Wilmington.
Spencer Murphy, editor, Salisbury Evening Post.
Mrs. Marie B. Noell, executive secretary, North Carolina Nurses Association.
Dr. L. W. Nordheim, atomic physicist, Duke University.
John J. Parker, chief judge, United States court of appeals, fourth circuit.
Edwin Pate, chairman, appropriations committee, North Carolina senate.
Thomas J. Pearsall, former speaker, North Carolina House of Representatives.
Helen E. Peeler, associate executive secretary, North Carolina Nurses Association.
John DeJ. Pemberton, Jr., professor of law, Duke University law school.
Dr. J. Kenneth Pfohl, bishop of Moravian Church.
J. W. Pless, Jr., judge of the superior court.
Dr. Clarence Poe, editor, the Progressive Farmer.
William T. Polk, associate editor, Greensboro Daily News.
Ed Post, Jr., editor and publisher, Cleveland Times.
Edwin McNeill Poteat, Baptist minister, Raleigh.
Max Radin, visiting professor of law, Duke University Law School; Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton.
Kerr Craige Ramsay, speaker, North Carolina House of Representatives.
D. Hiden Ramsey, publisher, Asheville Citizen-Times.
Claude W. Rankin, Jr., general insurance, Fayetteville.
Charles E. Ray, chairman, North Carolina National Park, Parkway, and Forests Development Commission.
Dr. John A. Redhead, Presbyterian minister, Greensboro.
Dr. J. B. Rhine, director, parapsychology laboratory, Duke University.
E. Earl Rives, judge, municipal court, Greensboro.
Dr. Howard E. Rondthaler, president emeritus, Salem College.
Charles G. Rose, Jr., former mayor, Fayetteville.
Terry Sanford, president, North Carolina Young Democrats.
Thomas B. Sawyer, State commander, AMVETS.
Mrs. P. C. Scott, Greenville.
J. W. Seabrook, president, Fayetteville State Teachers College.
A. A. F. Seawell, associate justice, North Carolina Supreme Court.
Susie Sharp, judge of the superior court.
R. Flake Shaw, executive vice president, North Carolina Farm Bureau Federation.
Don C. Shoemaker, editor, Asheville Citizen-Times.
Forrest H. Shuford, State commissioner of labor.
Dr. T. D. Slagle, surgeon, Sylva.
J. R. Smith, president, National Furniture Co., Mount Airy.
William J. Smith, State director, CIO.
C. C. Spaulding, president, North Carolina Mutual Insurance Co. and Mechanics and Farmers Bank.
Dale F. Stansbury, executive officer, Duke University Law School; former dean, Wake Forest College Law School.
Verna Stanton, adviser to the North Carolina Federation of Home Demonstration Clubs.
Richard G. Stockton, acting president, Wachovia Bank & Trust Co.
B. B. Sugg, president, State Bank and Trust Co., Greenville; past president, North Carolina Tobacco Warehousemen's Association.
E. H. Taft, Jr., past president, North Carolina Young Democrats.
J. O. Tally, Jr., mayor, Fayetteville.
H. P. Taylor, Lieutenant Governor of North Carolina.
P. N. Taylor, vice president, North Carolina Farm Bureau Federation.
Albert L. Turner, dean, school of law, North Carolina College at Durham.
M. T. Van Hecke, former chairman, regional war labor board; former dean, University of North Carolina Law School.
L. R. Varser, chairman, North Carolina Board of Law Examiners; former associate justice, North Carolina Supreme Court.
Mrs. Dan E. Vornholt, Greenville.
J. H. Waldrop, president, North Carolina Bankers Association.
Wilson Warlick, United States district judge, western district of North Carolina.
Dr. R. D. Wellons, president, Pembroke State College.
Robert H. Wettach, former assistant attorney general of North Carolina; former dean, University of North Carolina Law School.
Mrs. R. R. Willman, president, Woman's Club, Greenville.
Francis E. Winslow, past president, North Carolina Bar Association.
Dr. David D. Jones, president, Bennett College.
J. Spencer Love, chairman, board of directors, Burlington Mills.
W. Y. Preyer, president, Vick Chemical Co.
Dr. W. C. Jackson, chancellor, Woman's College of University of North Carolina.
Mrs. Mabel S. Lucas, president, Woman's Auxiliary of Episcopal Church, diocese of North Carolina.
Dr. Luther L. Gobbel, president, Greensboro College.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1059. A bill for the relief of John W. Wagner; without amendment (Rept. No. 1214);

S. 1146. A bill for the relief of Francis W. Dodge; without amendment (Rept. No. 1215);

S. 1423. A bill for the relief of Alex Morningstar; with amendments (Rept. No. 1216);

S. 1529. A bill for the relief of Amy L. Hefington; without amendment (Rept. No. 1217);

S. 1677. A bill for the relief of Erik H. Lindman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1218);

S. 1769. A bill to reimburse the Stebbins Construction Co.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1219);

S. 1863. A bill for the relief of Fremont Rider; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1220);

S. 1933. A bill for the relief of C. L. Leffingwell; with amendments (Rept. No. 1221);

S. 2070. A bill for the relief of the Clark Funeral Home; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1222);

S. 2314. A bill to provide for holding a term of the United States District Court for the District of Oregon at Eugene; without amendment (Rept. No. 1223);

S. 2385. A bill for the relief of Edward C. Ritche; without amendment (Rept. No. 1224);

H. R. 322. A bill to transfer funds to the town of Craig, Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 1225);

H. R. 587. A bill for the relief of the estate of Dick Walook, Alfred L. Woods, and Edward Kimoktoak; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1226);

H. R. 746. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of August Michela, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 1227); and

H. R. 3532. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sirvart Arsenian; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1228).

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim February 6, 1950, as National Children's Dental Health Day; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1229).

By Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 947. A bill for the relief of the Baggett Transportation Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1230); and

S. 2339. A bill for the relief of the Davis Grocery Co., of Oneida, Tenn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1231).

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. Res. 208. Resolution further increasing the limit of expenditures for hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency; without amendment; and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JANUARY 13, 1950.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress,

first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
A. Lee Parsons, chief clerk	$10,846.00	$5,250.98
Joseph P. McMurray, staff director	10,846.00	5,250.98
William F. McKenna, counsel	10,846.00	5,250.98
Robert D. L'Heureux, counsel	10,846.00	5,250.98
Thomas H. Daniel, counsel	10,846.00	5,250.98
Raimond Bowles, assistant clerk	10,846.00	5,250.98
Eunice V. Avery, clerical assistant	5,892.43	2,852.66
Henrietta S. Chase, clerical assistant	4,328.19	2,095.36
Pauline C. Beam, clerical assistant	4,067.49	1,969.14
Caro M. Pugh, clerical assistant	4,067.49	1,969.14

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$20,000.00
Amount expended Jan. 1 to June 30, 1949 (already reported)	4,401.85
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1949	11,084.96
Balance unexpended	4,513.19

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman.

JANUARY 13, 1950.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY—SUBCOMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS OPERATING UNDER AUTHORITY OF SENATE RESOLUTION 101

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Charles E. Shaver, counsel	$7,858.27	$3,804.38
William C. Stewart, Jr., investigator [1]	7,858.27	3,035.18
John L. Douglas, investigator [1]	7,858.27	3,035.18
Carter E. Talman, financial adviser	7,858.27	3,804.38
Sarah I. Harley, clerical assistant [2]	4,067.49	1,710.89
Richmond Harris, consultant	[3] 30.13	2,840.67

[1] Appointed Aug. 8, 1949.
[2] Appointed July 25, 1949.
[3] Per diem.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$60,000.00
Amount expended Jan. 1 to June 30 (already reported)	623.66
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1949	17,849.93
Balance unexpended	41,526.41

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1950.

SENATE INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Jerome S. Adlerman, assistant counsel	$7,941.22	$3,844.52
Mary G. Cousins, assistant clerk	4,067.49	1,969.14
Francis D. Flanagan, assistant chief counsel	10,844.54	5,250.10
Howell J. Hatcher, assistant counsel	8,936.64	4,326.44
Lydia Lee, record clerk	5,631.72	2,726.46
Myles C. McCahill, investigator	6,326.94	3,063.00
Robert J. McElroy, investigator	4,762.70	2,305.74
Ruth Meacham, assistant clerk [1]	4,204.86	1,226.40
Gladys E. Montier, assistant clerk	4,328.19	2,095.36
Constance L. Morris, assistant clerk	3,806.78	1,842.94
Betty F. Oliver, assistant clerk [2]	3,211.69	669.10
William P. Rogers, chief counsel	10,846.00	5,250.98
James F. Sherican, investigator	6,326.94	3,063.00
James H. Thomas, assistant counsel	5,718.63	2,768.54
Ruth M. Young, clerk	4,415.10	2,137.44
Carmine S. Bellino, accounting consultant	[3] 25.00	4,338.53

[1] Through Oct. 15.
[2] Through Sept. 15.
[3] Per diem.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$62,438.14
Amount expended	52,614.95
Balance unexpended	9,823.19

CLYDE R. HOEY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 14, 1950.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Francis O. Wilcox, Chief of Staff	$10,846.00	$5,250.98
Richard H. Heindel, staff associate [1]	10,846.00	4,045.87
Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, staff associate	10,846.00	5,250.98
C. C. O'Day, clerk	9,351.40	4,527.24
Emmett M. O'Grady, assistant clerk	5,110.31	2,474.02
Isabel M. Smith, assistant clerk	4,588.89	2,221.56
Morella Hansen, assistant clerk	4,241.29	2,053.32

[1] Resigned Nov. 20, 1949.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$20,000.00
Amount expended:	
January to June 1949	6,985.82
July to December 1949	3,292.03
	10,277.85
Balance unexpended	9,722.15

TOM CONNALLY,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Margaret Adair, clerical staff	$5,197.21	$2,516.08
E. W. Bassett, professional staff	10,846.00	5,250.98
Arthur E. Burgess, clerical staff	5,892.43	2,852.66
Frank Burnett, chief clerk	10,846.00	5,250.98
Joanne C. Jefferys, clerical staff	3,791.04	315.92
Margaret Miller, clerical staff	4,415.10	2,137.44
Frances Ortiz, professional staff	7,941.22	2,584.02
Eloise Porter, clerical staff	6,326.94	3,063.00
T. W. Sneed, professional staff	10,346.83	5,009.10
Frances A. Stovall, clerical staff	5,197.21	2,516.08
Tom Wilson, professional staff	10,846.00	1,175.27

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	4,655.04
Balance unexpended	5,344.96
Additional funds authorized under S. Res. 123	50,000.00
Balance unexpended	50,000.00

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman.

JANUARY 17, 1950.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION—SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Joan Burch, clerk typist [1]	$3,542.74	$442.83
Francis D. Carrigan, investigator [1]	6,025.66	753.19
Janet M. Hartzell, stenographer [2]	3,625.51	155.06
Grace E. Johnson, clerk [3]	4,500.00	2,586.85
Henry P. Kiley, investigator [4]	7,010.05	739.94
James E. Lynch, investigator [5]	5,100.00	935.50
Drew J. T. O'Keefe, assistant counsel [5]	6,000.00	2,528.47
Lena G. Orme, stenographer	4,112.09 4,328.19	2,095.36
Sue Patterson, stenographer [6]	3,542.74	1,180.88

[1] To Aug. 15.
[2] To July 15.
[3] Off Oct. 24 to Dec. 5.
[4] To Aug. 8.
[5] To Oct. 15.
[6] To Oct. 30.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure (balance June 30, 1949)		$27,693.50
Amount expended:		
Salaries	$11,418.08	
Expenses	1,963.97	
		13,382.05
Balance unexpended		14,311.45

G. M. GILLETTE,
Chairman.

GRACE E. JOHNSON,
Clerk.

O. K.: CARL HAYDEN.

JANUARY 15, 1950.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its

subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Edward Cooper, professional staff member	$10,846.00	$5,250.98
Halford Davis, professional staff member	10,846.00	5,250.98
Harriet Gray, clerical assistant	4,154.38	2,011.20
Edward Jarrett, chief clerk	10,846.00	5,250.98
Edward R. Jelsma, professional staff member	10,846.00	5,250.98
Dorothy Prout, clerical assistant	4,154.38	2,011.20
Evelyn Rosenkranz, clerical assistant	4,154.38	2,011.20
Vera Rudolph, clerical assistant	5,197.21	2,516.08
Martha Shaffer, clerical assistant	4,154.38	2,011.20
Edward C. Sweeney, professional staff member	10,846.00	5,250.98

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	3,902.50
Balance unexpended	4,290.80

EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1950.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE (PURSUANT TO S. RES. 50, AGREED TO APRIL 11, 1949)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
John R. Butz, clerical assistant [1]	$4,154.38	$1,879.33
George W. Chane, consultant [2]	10,846.00	1,807.66
Paul R. Conway, attorney [3]	7,400.00	3,823.06
Cecelia M. Cook, clerical assistant	4,154.38	2,011.20
Louise H. Dagney, clerical assistant	4,154.38	2,011.20
Catherine L. Harrington, research assistant	5,197.21	2,516.08
Douglas W. Hartman, consultant	6,326.94	3,063.00
Albert H. Hinkle, consultant [3]	10,761.59	1,793.58
Beatrice Hoover, clerical assistant [4]	3,708.27	927.06
William J. Jacquette, consultant [2]	8,936.64	1,489.44
Hugh C. McCarthy, attorney	8,438.93	4,085.48
Edgar R. McShane, consultant	6,326.94	3,063.00
Elizabeth G. Moore, clerical assistant	3,719.87	1,800.84
George R. Paschal, economist [3]	8,438.93	1,406.48
Frank Pellegrini, chief counsel [1]	10,846.00	4,836.65
Mildred L. Shaver, clerical assistant [6]	3,542.74	1,052.95
Mary Belva Shrader, clerical assistant [7]	3,719.87	1,751.64
Edward A. Stern, special assistant	8,438.93	4,085.48
Willard B. Van Horne, Jr., attorney	8,438.93	4,085.48
Ernestine Vigil, clerical assistant [3]	3,806.78	634.46
Charlene D. Wolfarth, research assistant	3,719.87	1,718.08
Nicholas Zapple, attorney	8,438.93	4,085.48

[1] July 13, 1949.
[2] Nov. 1, 1949.
[3] Detailed from Civil Aeronautics Administration May 16, 1949.
[4] Resigned Sept. 30, 1949.
[5] July 11, 1949.
[6] July 14 to Oct. 31, 1949.
[7] July 6, 1949.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$165,000.00
Amount expended	65,627.64
Balance unexpended	87,488.29

EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Chairman.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 2867. A bill for the relief of Yukie Nishimura Okubo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma):

S. 2868. A bill to incorporate the Future Farmers of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN (by request):

S. 2869. A bill for the relief of Edgar F. Russell; Lillian V. Russell, his wife; and Bessie R. Ward;

S. 2870. A bill for the relief of Lawrence B. Williams and his wife, Viva Craig Williams;

S. 2871. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Martha P. Matthews; and

S. 2872. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2873. A bill for the relief of Constantions Angelides; to the Committee of the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN (by request):

S. 2874. A bill to amend titles 18 and 28, United States Code, with respect to the time of reporting to Congress rules of procedure adopted by the Supreme Court for criminal, civil and admiralty cases and the time of their taking effect; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2875. A bill to extend for a period of 5 years the time for appropriating and expending funds to carry out the Federal Airport Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2876. A bill for the relief of Robert J. McGarry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2877. A bill to clarify the status of apple cider under the laws relating to taxes on alcoholic beverages and under the Federal Alcohol Administration Act; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2878. A bill to authorize the development of Rhododendron Gardens, in Pisgah and Cherokee National Forests, as a recreational area; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2879. A bill for the relief of Erika Tschernich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 2880. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the birth of President James Buchanan; to the Committtee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2881. A bill for the relief of Andrew J. Xanthopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2882. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2883. A bill for the relief of Devir M. Wood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 2884. A bill for the relief of Julia N. Emmanuel;

S. 2885. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jack B. Meyer; and

S. 2886. A bill for the relief of Erna Elena Zale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 2887. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment in favor of all persons for damages or losses arising or resulting from the construction, further development, and improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway, from Jacksonville, Fla., to Miami, Fla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNER:

S. J. Res. 142. Joint resolution establishing a Walter Reed Commemoration Commission; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. STENNIS):

S. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution relating to rice acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate Joint Resolution 144, designating the week of February 14, 1950, as National Heart Week, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and appears under a separate heading.)

NATIONAL HEART WEEK

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the week of February 14, 1950, as National Heart Week, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the joint resolution, prepared by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement presented by the Senator from Wisconsin will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 144) designating the week of February 14, 1950, as National Heart Week, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

NATIONAL HEART WEEK

Ordinarily, Mr. President, I would hesitate to offer a resolution of this sort, because I well recognize the tremendous number of commemorative resolutions which are introduced for a wide variety of other purposes. When, however, we are confronted by a certain killer, namely, diseases of the heart and circulation, which will claim the lives of 6,000,000 Americans now alive—when we are confronted with a killer responsible for 1 out of every 3 deaths in this country, it is quite clear that extraordinary action is necessary.

HEARINGS ON HEART INSTITUTE

We could cite page after page of dreaded statistics on the ravages of heart disease. We could show the tremendous economic cost, let alone the cost in human lives and suffering, because of heart ailments. However, undoubtedly most of my colleagues are more than well acquainted with many of these statistics, because they will recall that this problem has been presented to them before. For example, hearings on the subject of a proposed National Heart Institute were conducted on April 8 and 9, 1948, by a subcommittee of the Senate Labor Committee. At

the start of those hearings, my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] said: "During the period we were engaged in World War II, nearly 2,000,000 people in America died of heart and artery ailments. This is approximately seven times the number killed in action in our armed forces in this war."

Other able testimony was offered by the senior Senators from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Let us note, Mr. President, as brought out in those hearings and elsewhere, that heart disease kills 3 times as many as cancer, 6 times as many as accidents, 7 times as many as kidney disease, 9 times as many as pneumonia, and 10 times as many as tuberculosis.

TERRIBLE TOLL OF HEART DISEASE AMONG CHILDREN

And so the story of the terrible blight of this disease could be elaborated. One need only contemplate the terrible toll taken among the Nation's youngsters by rheumatic fever to ponder how critical this disease is. As a matter of fact, rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease are responsible for almost five times as many youth's deaths as infantile paralysis, whooping cough, diphtheria, scarlet fever, measles, and cerebrospinal meningitis combined.

WISCONSIN HEART ASSOCIATION

As usual, when a great challenge is presented, the American people respond magnificently to it through the American Heart Association and all the affiliated groups in the 48 States. It is my pleasure to serve as a sponsor of the Wisconsin Heart Association, acting in conjunction with organized medicine in my State and civic-minded laymen and public officers in trying to reduce the toll of these dreaded diseases. The able chairman for the 1950 campaign in the Badger State is Mr. G. V. Rork, president of the Northern States Power Co., of Eau Claire. President of the executive committee is Dr. Einar Daniels, of Milwaukee, executive secretary is Grant Laired. Some of the leading physicians of Wisconsin are enrolled in the Wisconsin Heart Association drive. Included in the prominent board of directors is our Governor, the Honorable Oscar Rennebohm and his excellency, Bishop John P. Treacy, of La Crosse.

RECOGNIZING PROBLEM'S GRAVITY

These illustrious gentlemen clearly recognize the magnitude of this problem. Today, more than 3,700,000 people are victims of heart disease. Hardening of the arteries and high blood pressure claim another 3,700,000 victims.

Of course, in all our comments on this problem, there is no intention to scare our people unduly. We certainly don't want to cause psychological problems about ailments which might not even exist in certain individuals. We do believe, however, that we can ask Americans to exercise reasonable precautions about their heart and to give generously in order to bring about greater research into the causes, treatment, and provention of heart ailments.

CONSTITUTION HALL PROGRAM

We are indeed proud that Washington, D. C., will be the scene of a gigantic "kick-off" for observance this year of the heart-fund drive.

At Constitution Hall on February 2, there will be a distinguished amateur show conducted for the District of Columbia Heart Association and for the entire heart drive throughout the country. The number of prominent amateurs who will participate in this program is so enormous and includes the names of so many Senators and Representatives in addition to the Vice President and Mrs. Barkley, leading officials of our armed forces, that I would not attempt to spell out all of the names because I could not do justice to all of the worthy folks who are lending their talents to this project.

I believe that particular thanks is due to the folks who have voluntarily set up this program, namely, to Ted Mack and the Original Amateur Hour Production. Some time ago, I understand that one of the Members of Congress who was preparing to work on this show said, "I think that all of the American people should know the fine group that is handling and paying all expenses of such an important public-service program." Ordinarily, neither that Member of Congress nor I believe in mentioning the name of a private business. But this organization certainly seems entitled to credit, so let me say a word of salute to Ted Mack and the Original Amateur Hour produced by the Major Bowes staff and presented by the makers of Old Gold cigarettes.

This Original Amateur Hour has given a number of truly splendid performances on behalf of a tremendous list of grand organizations, ranging from the Boys' Clubs of America to the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Archbishop Cushing's Children's Fund in Boston, the Crippled Children's Association, the National Jewish Hospital, and many other great outfits. The cost of every one of those shows was borne solely by the Original Amateur Hour organization.

In these days, Mr. President, when some folks get accustomed to thinking that only the Federal Government by itself can meet a given humanitarian need, it is heartwarming indeed to note the fact that private enterprise can mobilize talent and give that talent unstintingly without fanfare and without concern as to cost for a worthy public service. Moreover, it is encouraging to note that 150,000,000 Americans are willing to pitch in with their contributions.

CONCLUSION

I am sure that all of my colleagues intend, if it is at all possible, to be on hand in Constitution Hall on February 2, along with a packed audience of District citizens. I know that their presence and the participation by many of our associates will give a tremendous thrill to all of the folks who are working voluntarily to raise funds for the American Heart Association and its affiliates throughout the Nation.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. McCARTHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

IMPROVEMENT OF FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE SYSTEM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. FERGUSON submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6000) to extend and improve the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System, to amend the public assistance and child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED ANTILYNCHING LEGISLATION—NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, January 20, 1950, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 1404, to declare certain rights of citizens of the United States, and for the better assurance of the protection of such citizens and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes, and S. 1726, to provide protection for persons from lynching, and for other purposes. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee by Thursday, January 19, so that a schedule can be prepared for those who wish to appear and testify. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON H. R. 3111, TO AMEND AN ACT TO ESTABLISH A UNIFORM SYSTEM OF BANKRUPTCY THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 31, 1950, at 10 a. m., to be continued Wednesday, February 1, 1950, if not completed, in room 424, Senate Office Building, on H. R. 3111, to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and to repeal subdivision b of section 64, subdivision h of section 70, and section 118 thereof and all acts and parts of acts inconsistent therewith. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in this legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], chairman, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. IVES was granted leave to be absent from attendance on the Senate tomorrow.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SALTONSTALL was granted leave, because of official business, to be absent from the session of the Senate from 3:30 o'clock this afternoon to Thursday morning.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO BEFORE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS BAR ASSOCIATION

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the annual meeting of the Federal Communications Bar Association, at Washington, D. C., on January 12, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MODERN CHALLENGE TO BUSINESS LEADERSHIP—ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Modern Challenge to Business Leadership," delivered by him before the Boston Board of Fire Underwriters at their annual meeting luncheon on January 10, 1950, in Boston, Mass., which appears in the Appendix.]

GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER: PIONEER IN HUMAN RIGHTS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR GILLETTE

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "George Washington Carver: Pioneer in Human Rights," delivered by Senator GILLETTE at Trinity Cathedral, Pittsburgh, Pa., on January 8, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CITY OF HOPE AWARD DINNER HONORING ELLIS A. GIMBEL—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MYERS.

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the City of Hope award dinner, Bellevue Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, December 7, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

PEARL HARBOR ANNIVERSARY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Pearl Harbor anniversary memorial meeting, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars Women's Council, City of Hope, at Convention Hall, Philadelphia, December 7, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAM FOR WEST TEXAS—ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM E. WARNE

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. William E. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, on the subject of the west Texas water problem, before the annual directors' assembly, west Texas Chamber of Commerce, at Fort Worth, Tex., on November 22, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

HISTORY AND ITS MEANING TO A COMMUNITY—EDITORIAL BY DR. LEWIS E. THEISS

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "History and Its Meaning to a Community," written by Dr. Lewis E. Theiss, for many years head of the department of journalism at Bucknell University, and published in the Lewisburg Journal, of Lewisburg, Pa., of January 5, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

OPPOSITION OF PRINCE HALL MASONRY TO COMMUNISM

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by the Grand Masters Conference of Prince Hall Masons relative to the opposition of that organization to communism, which appears in the Appendix.]

O LIBERALS—ARTICLE BY BRUCE BARTON

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "O Liberals," written by Bruce Barton, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTES TO FLORIDA BY THE VICE PRESIDENT AND J. MYER SCHINE

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD statements by Vice President BARKLEY and J. Myer Schine, paying tribute to Florida, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE CRISIS IN EDUCATION—STATISTICS SUPPORTING A STUDY BY THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtain leave to have printed in the RECORD statistics in support of an educational study undertaken by the New York Times, heretofore placed in the RECORD, which appear in the Appendix.]

STATISTICS OF STATES ON SCHOOL TEACHING AND OPERATING—REPORT BY DR. BENJAMIN FINE

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the report of a study by Dr. Benjamin Fine, published in the New York Times of January 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEPC—EDITORIALS FROM THE ST. PAUL PIONEER PRESS AND THE ST. PAUL DISPATCH

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials, one entitled "Unparalleled Stalling," from the St. Paul Pioneer Press of January 3, 1950, the other, an editorial entitled "Gains for Tolerance," published in the St. Paul Dispatch of January 5, 1950, which appear in the Appendix.]

CIVIL-RIGHTS RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY ELEVENTH CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION OF THE CIO

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD resolutions on civil rights adopted at the eleventh constitutional convention of the CIO, October 31 to November 4, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

EDUCATION—RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT ELEVENTH CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION OF THE CIO

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD resolutions on education adopted at the eleventh constitutional convention of the CIO, October 31 to November 4, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

WE MUST NOT BE AFRAID OF CHANGE—ARTICLE BY RAYMOND B. FOSDICK

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "We Must Not Be Afraid of Change," by Raymond B. Fosdick, former president of the Rockefeller Foundation, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT PRICE FREEDOM?—ADDRESS BY ROBERT M. HUTCHINS

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "What Price Freedom?" delivered by Robert M. Hutchins, chancelor, University of Chicago, before the Chicago University convocation, in June 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

99.6 PERCENT LOYALTY—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "99.6 Percent Loyalty," published in the Washington Post of January 12, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I offer to House bill 2023 the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 15, it is proposed to strike out all down through line 16 and insert the following:

(m) The sale or offering for sale of colored oleomargarine or colored margarine, or the possession or serving of colored oleomargarine or colored margarine in violation of section 407 (b), or 407 (c).

On page 3, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following new subsection:

(b) On and after July 1, 1950, no person shall sell, or offer for sale, colored oleomargarine or colored margarine unless it is manufactured, prepared, molded, shaped, and packaged so that (1) the net weight of the contents of the retail package shall not exceed 1 pound, (2) each part or parts of the contents of such package is manufactured, prepared, and molded so as to be triangular in shape.

On page 3, lines 3 and 23, redesignate subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

On page 4, line 5, redesignate subsection (d) as subsection (e).

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, this amendment is offered as an added attraction to House bill 2023. It gives better identification to the molding of packaged oleomargarine. It simply states that it must be molded in triangular shape.

I hope the proponents of House bill 2023 in the Senate will be permitted to accept this amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me ask the Senator whether he has made any investigation as to whether the amendment would necessitate the installation of particularly adapted molding machinery, as differentiated from that now in the plants.

Mr. FREAR. In answer, I should like to say that it is anticipated that some necessary adjustments in the machinery already available will be necessary, but it is my understanding that the cost of such adjustments will not be excessive.

Mr. TYDINGS. I take it from what the Senator has said, then, that the same machines could be used, but the particular molding part of the machines would have to be altered or changed so as to conform with the Senator's amendment.

Mr. FREAR. The molding and the wrapping parts; yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me ask the Senator whether he has any idea what would be the cost to make the change required by his amendment.

Mr. FREAR. I have been informed by a reliable engineer that the over-all cost of changing the machines already in operation would be approximately less than one-fourth of a cent a pound on the number of pounds of oleomargarine now being marketed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have discussed this amendment with the Senator from Delaware. It has always been the position of those of us who seek to repeal the existing legislation on oleomargarine that we do not wish to have oleomargarine disguised as butter. It will be noted that one of the provisions of the bill coming from the committee provides an alternative method for the serving in restaurants of margarine in a triangular form. I think there is some question

about the Frear amendment, that it might result in added cost to the consumer, but nevertheless, on the ground that it is consistent with the over-all objectives of the proponents of the pending legislation, I am prepared to accept the amendment, take it to conference, and if possible, perfect it—I hope, in a way that will be consistent with the original legislation—and not increase substantially the cost of margarine.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I should like to submit a question to the distinguished Senator from Delaware. As I heard the reading of the amendment, I heard the word "triangle" used. To be more definite, will the Senator kindly advise the Senate, is this an isosceles triangle, an equilateral triangle, or is it a part of the eternal triangle?

Mr. FREAR. In answer to the Senator from New Hampshire, I may say I am not so well versed on triangles as is the Senator from New Hampshire, but I should assume that any object having three sides is a triangle.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. With no reflection on the author of the amendment, I think it is a bit of obtuse triangle.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the Senator from Delaware why these particular provisions with regard to yellow or colored oleomargarine are proposed? Is there any difference in the margarine content? Would it not apply to uncolored oleomargarine as well as to colored? I notice colored margarine is specifically singled out in the amendment.

Mr. FREAR. If it is uncolored, it would not be for sale, would it?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, that goes to the meat of the argument, that uncolored oleomargarine is not readily salable to the American public. But I merely wondered whether the question of color was specifically brought out in the amendment in order to make oleo competitive, and to have it receptive, so far as being a substitute for butter is concerned.

Mr. FREAR. No, it was not, I may say in answer to the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the pending bill, and ask that it be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be received and printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to call up my amendment B to the bill, and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 19, after the word "of", it is proposed to insert "the foregoing provisions of."

On page 5, line 3, to strike out the word "This" and insert in lieu thereof the following "The foregoing provisions of this."

On page 5, after line 6, to add the following new sections:

PURPOSE

SEC. 7. To guarantee, insofar as it lies within the constitutional power of the Congress so to do within the subject matter of sections 7–18 hereof, (a) that each and every citizen of the United States be secured in the equal protection of the laws of the United States, and of the several States, and (b) that no citizen of the United States be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, the Congress, in the exercise of all powers which it possesses, does hereby legislate with respect to the crime of lynching as hereinafter defined.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 8. Any assemblage of two or more persons which shall, without authority of law, exercise or attempt to exercise, by acts of physical force against person or property, any power of correction or punishment over any person, who is (1) in the custody of any peace officer, or (2) charged with or convicted of the commission of any criminal offense, or (3) suspected by such assemblage of the commission of any criminal offense, with the purpose or consequence of preventing the apprehension or trial or punishment by law of such person, or of imposing a punishment, shall constitute a lynch mob within the meaning of sections 7–18 of this act. Any such exercise of power or attempt to exercise power by a lynch mob shall constitute lynching within the meaning of sections 7–18 of this act.

Mr. LANGER. I have offered this amendment, in order to find out whether the Senate, at long last, is going to give the poor people, both the whites and the Negroes, a square deal in America. Ever since 1932 with the exception of 2 years, during which time a Democratic President was in the White House, the great Democratic Party, which says it is for the poor people, which says it is for the depressed, has been in control of the Government. The Democrats said in 1933 they were going to pass the antipoll-tax bill and the antilynching bill. At that time they had a Democratic President, and they held two-thirds of the seats in the House of Representatives. I repeat, the Democratic Party, which says it is the friend of the poor people, both the poor whites and the poor Negroes, had a President in the White House for 16 long years. During that time the Democratic Party had a majority of 2 to 1 in the House of Representatives. Believe it or not, Mr. President, at one time there were only 16 Republican Senators and 80 Democratic Senators—80 to 16 in the Senate, 2 to 1 in the House of Representatives, and a Democratic President. 1933 went by and no anti-poll-tax bill was passed, no antilynching bill, no FEPC. 1934 went by with the Democrats in control—no anti-poll-tax bill, no antilynching law, no FEPC. In 1934, 1935, and 1936 there was the same result. Yet the men running for President and for the Senate and House of Representatives stood up on rostrums all over the country, appealing for votes, and said they were going to pass these various measures. I repeat, although the Democrats were in overwhelming control, they did not pass the legislation. We had a repetition of the same situation in 1940, and again in 1944. The New Deal was going to take care of the poor people, it was going to pass an antilynching bill, an anti-poll-tax bill, and an FEPC law. No action of any kind was taken by the so-called friends of the oppressed and the underprivileged.

The Republican Party obtained control of the Eightieth Congress. Before they held their convention, they were definite and specific as to what they were going to do. They held themselves out as the friends of these people. What happened all over the country? The Democratic Party kept upon its pay roll the leaders of all the societies and organizations that ostensibly were arranging meetings in order to promote the passage of an anti-poll-tax law and an antilynching bill and the FEPC. It is for that reason, Mr. President, in order to show up this hypocrisy on the part of the Democratic Party, that I have prepared and offer the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of ascertaining the names of all officers of associations, societies, committees, or other organizations, a principal purpose of which is to secure the enactment of antilynching, antipoll tax, fair employment practices, or related legislation, who have been on the pay roll of a political party at any time within the last 10 years.

The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

The resolution (S. Res. 209), submitted by Mr. LANGER, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send the resolution to the desk. If it is adopted, what are we going to discover? We are going to discover that the head of the greatest organization of them all, the man who sends letters and telegrams to all Senators, was all this time on the pay roll of the Democratic Party. I am prepared further to show that one of the leading ladies ostensibly working to secure enactment of antipoll tax, antilynching, and FEPC legislation, also was on the pay roll of the Democratic Party. Whenever they got the word from the Democratic bosses, they called another congress. They got together people from all corners of the United States, and adopted resolutions in behalf of the Democratic Party.

It continued year after year. In fact, if any Senator has any doubt about it, I suggest he vote for my resolution when it comes up, so that the proof can be produced. Not only that, Mr. President, but I am prepared to show that the Demo-

cratic Party has sent certain persons all over the United States who are on the pay roll of the Government at what I consider to be very exorbitant salaries.

This resolution, as I have said, is submitted with the purpose of giving the facts to the poor whites and the Negroes of the United States so that they may determine who are their friends.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that during the Eightieth Congress it was the Republican Party which finally had enacted into law, by a majority of 3 votes, the right for Negroes in the Army to vote.

With reference to the Democratic Party having put these politicians on the pay roll, there is now in the city of Washington, called together from 40 States of the Union, between 4,000 and 5,000 delegates, or representatives, as they were called by the Washington Evening Star on Saturday. This conference of politicians again is busy going around buttonholing Senators and is again busy passing resolutions.

Mr. President, certainly the senior Senator from North Dakota cannot be charged with playing politics in this matter, because I think the last census showed that there were 210 Negroes of all ages in the State of North Dakota. There are considerably less than 100 Negro votes in the entire State. As a matter of fact, I doubt whether there are that many. There are perhaps 50 Negro votes in my State. I repeat, certainly the Senator from North Dakota cannot be charged with playing politics in this matter. I feel, however, Mr. President, that I am in a peculiar position, not only to bring to the attention of the Senate but to the attention of the entire Nation how the Democratic Party has played politics with the so-called Negro vote. I welcome the opportunity to do it.

I hold in my hand the Democratic platform which was adopted at Philadelphia a little over a year ago, in which the party pledged, time and time again, what it was going to do for the poor, the oppressed, and particularly for the Negro. The platform mentions antilynching bills, anti-poll-tax bills, and FEPC bills. Yet, Mr. President, the Democratic Party has been in control of the Government, with a majority of approximately 100 in the House of Representatives and a majority of from 10 to 12 in the Senate, with a Democratic President sitting in the White House, and during the Eighty-first Congress, first session, they did not even bring up such a bill upon which we might vote on this question. All we have had has been promises and no action. It is my considered judgment that we shall not get any action in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress at any time, in spite of the fact that for a long time two such bills have been upon the calendar.

I should like to reach a vote on the subject. I assume a motion will be made to table the resolution. I hope I may be accorded the courtesy of a yea-and-nay vote, so that the people may know who are their friends and who are their enemies.

I might say, Mr. President, that perhaps the best example—I shall give two examples—of how the Democratic Party has played with this segment of the American population, would be to cite the following occurrence:

Four years ago the education bill was being considered. It was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I offered an amendment which provided that if any State did not apportion the State money fairly between Negroes and whites it would be barred from receiving any Federal aid. Who defeated that amendment? Every Senator on the floor received a telegram from a man by the name of Walter White who said he was the head of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. He asked us to vote against that amendment.

Mr. President, can you imagine a man, really, truly, honestly, and genuinely interested in getting a bill passed, being opposed to the amendment which I offered at that time?

I think it will be found, if the resolution be adopted, that Walter White was one of the men who at that very time was upon the pay roll of the Democratic Party, because he had a Federal job.

Let me give another illustration. At the time when the matter of seating the late Senator Bilbo was under consideration a colored lawyer in this city by the name of Perry Howard, wrote a letter in which he said:

> The bill you are now considering is valueless. Even if it is passed, it will mean nothing.

In that letter he offered certain amendments dealing with legislation in the States in which poll-tax laws are still in existence.

Did my distinguished brethren on the other side of the aisle adopt the recommendation made by Perry Howard, the colored lawyer to whom I have referred, a man who was a friend of the late Senator Bilbo? They did not. Mr. Howard said that even if the bill were passed it would be valueless, so far as actually permitting colored persons to vote.

So, Mr. President, at this time, because I believe it will very likely be the only opportunity in this entire session, and at the request of Edgar G. Brown, president of the National Negro Council, with a membership of 2,000,000 Negroes, I offer this amendment, and I shall offer two other amendments.

I should like to tell the Senate that again, just as I expected, I received a telegram from one of the Negro associations, an outfit headed, apparently, by a man by the name of Henderson, asking me not to bring up these amendments at this time. But I say that an honest man does not mind when an amendment comes up. An honest man, who has a sincere interest in trying to get a bill passed which, in my opinion, is a thousand times more important than is any oleomargarine bill, would not be sending a telegram of that kind unless he had some sinister interest. That is why I want my resolution to be referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee, and I want an investigation made to find out how many of these so-called Negro leaders have been betraying the Negro race and lying morning, noon, and night. They were lying in 1932, 1933, 1934, 1935, and 1936, down to the last election. They were lying to those poor people who were depending upon them, because they held high offices in some of the Negro organizations and in some of the poor-white organizations. I want those persons to appear under oath, to admit whether they were or were not upon the pay roll of the Government during the time the Democrats have been in control within the past 10 years.

In other words, Mr. President, at the request of Edgar G. Brown, president of the National Negro Council, with 2,000,000 members, I am asking for a square deal for the Negro people of the United States, the whole 13,000,000 of them, because they have not been getting a square deal. From 1933 up to the present time all they have been getting is promises, promises, and more promises. At election time candidates go out among these folk and say to them, "If only you will put us back in office, we will see that the anti-poll-tax bill and the antilynching bill and the FEPC bill are enacted."

Mr. President, we are at last asking for a show-down, to find out how many of the Democrats on the other side of the aisle, who since 1932 have been yelling that they are for all these measures, will stand up and be counted now when they have a chance to get this legislation enacted.

SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not rise at this time to reply to the address just made by the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota, although I must say that I completely agree with one position which he took—namely, that the handling of the subject of anti-poll-tax legislation by the leadership of the Democratic Party over a long period of years has been a distinctly political handling. To be entirely fair and impartial, however, it must be admitted that the handling of that same subject by the Republican Party during the same period of time has been equally and just as distinctly political. I remind my good friend, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, of the fact that, in spite of the declaration in his party platform in 1944 to the effect that the anti-poll-tax question should be handled through a Federal constitutional amendment, instead of following that course the party in which he claims membership, when it got into control of the Senate and of the House after the elections of 1946, declined and refused to follow that perfectly correct and perfectly constitutional course of action, which that party itself had endorsed in its platform and to which it was solemnly committed and, instead, chose to approach the subject through a Federal anti-poll-tax statute of highly doubtful constitutionality, and refused to adopt the suggestion or follow the course which was urged by numerous southern Democratic Senators, who themselves advanced a constitutional amendment dealing with this subject, and who in this

Congress, the Eighty-first Congress, in the first and opening days of this Congress, introduced such a proposed constitutional amendment, 10 of the southern Democratic Senators joining as joint authors and cosponsors of that measure.

So I think that while the distinguished Senator from North Dakota is applying the term "politics" to the handling of this very interesting and vital subject by the leadership of the Democratic Party all through recent years, he should, with equal fairness and impartiality, admit, with his customary candor, that exactly the same political handling of that subject has prevailed on his side of the aisle and in the party in which he claims membership. The leadership of both parties has made the issue a political football.

Mr. President, I regret, in a way, that the amendment just offered by the senior Senator from North Dakota has been proposed, because the subject matter to which I wish to address myself is one which has sometimes been confused with the civil-rights issue, but one which, in my humble judgment, at least, should never be confused with it. I feel so keenly on the subject that I would not have continued with my intention to present the remarks which I now propose to make on the subject of southern regional education but for the fact that my release has already been given to the press.

With that point made, Mr. President, I wish to discuss briefly the subject of southern regional education, and I hope that those Senators who are interested in the subject—and I think that embraces all of us—will take the time either to listen to what is said here this afternoon on the floor of the Senate or at least to examine the RECORD tomorrow upon this subject, because such tremendous progress has been made since this subject was mentioned on the floor of the Senate nearly 2 years ago that I think every Senator will want to be advised as to the scope of the progress made.

Mr. President, the Senators now present who were here in February 1948 may recall that at that time 28 southern Senators, of whom I was one, introduced and sponsored Senate Joint Resolution 191, which was a joint resolution designed to give the consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the 15 southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948. Representative SAM HOBBS, of Alabama, introduced in the House a companion measure, House Joint Resolution 334, which, after debate, passed the House on May 4, 1948, by the impressive vote of 235 to 45. I remind Senators that a subcommittee composed of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who at that time was chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and the then junior Senator from Rhode Island, Hon. J. Howard McGrath, now Attorney General of the United States, held hearings, and that the Committee on the Judiciary itself reported favorably to the Senate Senate Joint Resolution 191. Unfortunately, at the time this joint resolution was debated in the Senate, it became involved in the civil-rights discussion which was proceeding in the Senate during that session, and after protracted debate the Senate by the vote of 38 to 37 saw fit to recommit Senate Joint Resolution 191 to the Judiciary Committee for further consideration.

Undiscouraged by the fact that the consent of Congress was not given to the compact, the leaders of the southern regional education program deemed it so vital to the cause of higher education in the South that they went ahead with the program in those fields where the need was most imperative.

Mr. President and Senators, I now believe that it is timely, and I consider it a privilege, to report to the Congress and the Nation the swift and substantial progress that already has been made in southern regional education, and it is for that reason that I address the Senate at this time.

The most comprehensive and authoritative statement I have found on this subject is an article entitled "Regional Education: It Is Working in the South," by Dr. John E. Ivey, Jr., director, board of control for southern regional education, appearing at pages 278 to 280 of the December 1949 issue of State Government the official magazine of State affairs, published monthly by the Council of State Governments.

The distinguished author of this article, Dr. John E. Ivey, Jr., was formerly professor of sociology at the University of North Carolina, and was for several years chairman of the committee on southern regional studies for the American Council on Education, prior to his appointment as director, board of control, southern regional education, on August 1, 1948.

The statement by Dr. Ivey is as follows, and I quote it in full:

REGIONAL EDUCATION: IT IS WORKING IN THE SOUTH

(By John E. Ivey, Jr., director, board of control for southern regional education)

The South's regional education program, which was a dream of many years, a hope of recent years, and a formal resolution 2 years ago, today is a functioning reality.

It is in operation with the official sanction of 12 States and the participation of 14 institutions of higher education. This fall, nearly 400 students are enrolled under the program, in courses often not available to them just a year ago. Interest in similar programs has developed in other regions, with the Rocky Mountain and New England areas considering action.

The regional program already has expanded the educational facilities of the Southern States in the fields of medicine, veterinary medicine, and dentistry. It has widened the horizons of the States immeasurably, holding out the promise of an educational system equal to that of any area in the Nation or world.

The results attained in these 2 years of organizing and launching the program permit the hope of a sound contribution to the theory that States can work together on a regional basis to solve problems that are overwhelming in scope if tackled individually.

The South's regional program took shape in October, 1947, when the Southern Governors Conference agreed that a joint effort should be made to solve the educational problems they faced in common. Rising costs, limited facilities, growing enrollments, expanding demands—these were elements of the over-all problem in Georgia as they were in Tennessee, in Florida as they were in Virginia.

It made sense to the governors that cooperative effort was a logical approach to the solution. It made sense that instead of each State tackling the imposing problem in what would be a hopelessly unequal match, the States should pool their strength, and marshal their facilities in a program of self-help.

From this philosophy emerged a compact. It was a simple document, setting forth the aims of the participating States and outlining a plan of action. The governors signed the compact early in 1948, and agreed to submit it to their respective legislatures for approval.

The executive authority of the governors, however, was enough to create a regional council for education immediately. It was incorporated to get the program under way, and established offices in Atlanta in September 1948. The council membership included the governor and two members from each of the States.

These States were Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Maryland, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.

The number of the council members later was increased to four from each State in order to make possible the appointment of a Negro representative from each State.

The council went into immediate action and determined that the greatest needs for regional action, so far as the South was concerned, were in the fields of medicine, veterinary medicine, and dentistry. The council staff at once began working out arrangements with institutions within the area whereby they would contract to provide services for students in other States within the compact where such services were not available.

The contracts stipulated that the States should pay $1,500 per year per student for medical and dental training, and $1,000 per year per student for veterinary training. The student enrolled under the program was assured of a place at the institution, provided he qualified scholastically, and was not charged the usual out-of-State fees. He had the other normal expenses, just as he would have if he attended school in his own State.

This arrangement permitted a State to obtain facilities of a two- or three-million-dollar school for a few thousand dollars annually; it provided the student education he would not get otherwise; it gave the institutions additional revenue, with the contracts stipulating that the money must be spent within the school providing the service.

As the application of the program developed on one hand, the firmness of the regional structure grew on the other. In December of 1948, the governors and other council members approved a biennium program involving, in round numbers, one and one-half million dollars.

As legislatures of the various States met, the program was presented and approved. Within a few months, 11 States had enacted bills, making them partners in this, the Nation's first regional venture in the field of education.

With the formal approval of these States, the Regional Council for Education gave way to a board of control, established on a permanent basis at a meeting in Daytona Beach in June, 1949. Like the council, the board membership includes the governor and three members from each participating State.

By September, 1949, the voluminous detail involved in the working out of some 40 contracts had been cleared, the States had adopted procedures for certifying students, and 388 of these students were enrolled. Those students are scattered among institutions all over the South.

Four institutions are providing services in veterinary medicine—Alabama Polytechnic

Institute, Tuskegee Institute, the University of Georgia, and Oklahoma Agriculture and Mechanical College. Seven universities are providing medical training under the program—Vanderbilt, Tennessee, Tulane, Louisiana State, Meharry Medical College, Duke, and Emory. Six institutions are providing dental training—Maryland, Loyola of Louisiana, Meharry, Tennessee, Emory, and the Medical College of Virginia.

Thus, the students from Mississippi who aspired to veterinary training with little hope heretofore, this year were eligible for such a school elsewhere in their region. Florida students who want to help fill the South's great and growing need for doctors could get medical training, although there is no medical school in their State. Meharry's fine medical college for Negroes at Nashville has been literally saved by the program, which creates a means of continuous financing through the regional agreements.

The program operates to benefit all students. Of the total enrolled in the first semester of operation of the program, 181 are Negro and 207 are white. Facilities in all three of the fields offered are available to both; admission policies are controlled, of course, by the institutions themselves.

The immediate response to the facilities offered by the regional program underscored the need for such services. But the opportunities are just as great from other methods of joint action: the exchange of faculty members, for example; the joint use of research facilities and joint research projects; the voluntary specialization in offerings; and the movement of students from one institution to another in completing specialized study and getting the best instruction available from several universities.

The Oak Ridge Institute for Nuclear Studies, where 24 universities are making use of the incomparable facilities of the Oak Ridge laboratories, probably is the most dramatic illustration of the possibilities from such agreements.

The South's regional program of education has an unlimited future as it develops these methods of cooperation and moves toward an efficient, intelligent use of its resources.

The contract-for-services phase of the program has been involved by the State of Maryland in a suit brought against that State by a Negro student seeking admission to the university school of nursing. The State of Maryland said that, by providing facilities through the regional program at Meharry Medical College, it was meeting the requirements of equal facilities. The board of control for the regional education program filed an intervention, clarifying its position. The intervention stated:

"The Board of Control for Southern Regional Education was established for the purpose of assisting States and institutions and agencies concerned with higher education in their efforts to advance knowledge and improve the social and economic level of the southern region.

"The board's position is that it shall make regional arrangements to supplement educational facilities within States. It is not the purpose of the board that the regional compact and the contracts for educational services thereunder shall serve any State as a legal defense for avoiding responsibilities established or defined under the existing State and Federal laws and court decisions."

The Baltimore City court ruled in favor of Maryland; the student's attorney has given notice of appeal. It is expected that the case will go eventually to the United States Supreme Court.

The board's policy since its formation has been that the issue of facilities for Negroes and whites was one that must be settled within each State. It has held that the board should not and could not become involved in political and racial questions and accomplish its goal of building within the South an educational system second to none. The program was not conceived as a means of modifying responsibilities placed on States by law. Its conception was on the sound vision that the people and institutions of the South, just as those in any region anywhere in the Nation, can solve common problems by using the resources available to them all; by recognizing needs on a regional basis and meeting them at that level; by rising above State allegiance to broader citizenship that means deeper accomplishment for the good of all.

As the South pools its resources in the educational field, it pools its needs as a natural sequence. It must assay those areas where there are similar deficiencies, else the union of resources would be like an army unable to find the foe. What are the needs? What types of education do we require? How much of what types of education do we, as a region, need? This part of the program, too, falls to the board of control as created by the Southern Governors' Conference.

In aiding States, institution, and agencies, the board "explores fully, recommends, where desirable, and develops, where needed, interstate collaboration in the support, expansion, or establishment of regional services or schools for graduate, professional, and technical education."

The southern regional program has plans well under way to extend the project into additional fields. A commission on social work, one on forestry, and another on graduate work already have been named, and have held preliminary meetings. The commissions are made up of educators and professional people drawn from institutions and industry in all sections of the region. The board enlists the commission members, assembles data, compiles records, and in other ways aids the commissions.

In October, more than 100 educators from 43 institutions in 12 Southern States met in Savannah under auspices of the board and for a week joined in intensive discussion of the regional needs and opportunities in the field of graduate study. Months of research were conducted by the board's staff prior to this meeting, so that a picture of graduate work and demands for such study, more comprehensive than any ever before compiled in the South, was available to guide the group in reaching conclusions and drafting recommendations on extension of the regional program into this field.

There are some who feel that this field of graduate study is perhaps the richest for the South, or any other region, to cultivate. Clearly, the smaller number of students in these higher strata makes the cost of meeting the needs higher, and just as clearly, the value to society of developing the leadership from this field makes it an imperative investment. If any region fails to make the investment it is going to lose its most promising youth to another region that is not failing to do so. And even more serious, its most competent people may be unable to reach any graduate school whatever.

As Governor Gordon Browning, of Tennessee, said in an address at the work conference on graduate studies in Savannah: "We can look, I hope, to the public schools and the colleges for creating an educated populace, clear-headed and straight-thinking, unswayed by appeals to prejudices and unfounded fears either from within or without the country, and at the same time firmly grounded in the great spiritual ideals on which America rests for security. But we must look to the graduate schools and the professional schools, public and private, for new insights and knowledge obtained through painstaking, objective research and for the education and training of a leadership which can help us move more rapidly toward our material and spiritual goals."

The philosophy of a regional education program is that the goals can be attained not only much more quickly but more thoroughly than on a State-by-State basis, where duplication, so often spurred by competition, is the rule rather than the exception.

Too often one State has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to build a great school in one field because a neighboring State has forged ahead in that field. Thus, the immediate area finds itself with two schools in this field, and no adequate school in another field. Properly developed, regional guidance can channel the wealth and manpower of the region away from such expensive duplication and into an integrated program profitable to all States within the region.

The possibilities of such programs are being surveyed not only in the field of education, but elsewhere. In this regard, it is interesting to note the exploration under way by Western States into the feasibility of a regional approach to the problems of social welfare. The Western Interstate Committee on Institutional Care, created in 1946, has conducted broad studies on the value of regional institutions for the deaf, the blind, and the cerebral palsied. The problem of institutions for juvenile delinquents, women criminals, and mental patients also has been surveyed for attack on a regional basis.

This story, like that of the South's regional education program, is a story of States engaging actively and boldly to meet their problems without turning to the Federal Government for a solution.

Such programs, devised by the States, financed by the States, controlled by the States, and operated by the States, are a positive demonstration of States meeting their responsibilities as well as executing their rights. Above all, they are the means to a greater development of our regional resources and thus to the building of a greater America.

Mr. President, that concludes the statement written by Dr. Ivey. Among its highlights are the following: That southern regional education already is functioning in three fields of professional higher education, namely: medicine, dentistry, and veterinary science; that under this program a total of 388 students in these three fields, of whom 207 are white and 181 are Negro, are this year attending institutions of higher learning in southern States other than their own; that the funds which make this program possible are entirely State funds; that plans are already under way to extend this program into the fields of social work, forestry, and graduate work; and that the southern States through this program, devised by the States, financed by the States, controlled by the States, and operated by the States, are giving a positive demonstration that while they insist upon States' rights, they also propose to recognize and meet State responsibilities.

Mr. President, one indication of the large amount of public interest in the possibilities of this program is found in the number of articles written about it in recent months. As long ago as last July, Benjamin Fine, the eminent education editor of the New York Times, wrote in his column "Education in Review":

It is clear that the project is exceedingly significant. It can help the South build and develop a sound system of graduate and professional schools that will be the equal of any in the country. The implications not only for the South but for the rest of the country are far-reaching. A new pattern has appeared in higher education that will have a profound influence on colleges and universities everywhere.

Mr. President, so excellent is the article written by Dr. Benjamin Fine, as published in full in the New York Times of July 24, 1949, that at this time I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in full at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION IN REVIEW—REGIONAL SYSTEM IS SEEN AS A GREAT ADVANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE SOUTH

(By Benjamin Fine)

In a move expected to have vast educational implications, 11 Southern States have entered upon a mutual plan to aid one another in developing a sound program of higher education. For the first time in the history of this country, a regional system of education has been established. It will go into effect this fall.

For the time being the plan will cover only the fields of medicine, dentistry, and veterinary medicine. Under this project, the colleges and universities that now maintain such graduate schools will admit students from other States. They will be accepted on the same basis as residents of the States where these regional centers are situated. In this way, it is hoped, the South will be able to develop strong professional schools on a regional basis. Because of the tremendous expense involved in setting up a medical school, for example, it will be cheaper for a State to send its students to a medical school that already exists in a nearby State.

Last month a Board of Control for Southern Regional Education was created by action of 10 State legislatures—Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Tennessee. Virginia has been admitted pending removal of certain legal objections. Alabama, Texas, and West Virginia are expected to join soon.

Various reasons prompted the creation of this board. For some time southern educators have recognized the fact that they could not hope to set up all the educational facilities needed on a State-wide basis. They knew that if they were to offer their students an adequate program of higher education they would have to cooperate and pool their resources.

COMPOSITION OF BOARD

The operation of the plan is simple. The board of control membership will include the Governor and three members—one a Negro—for each participating State.

Four institutions will provide services in veterinary medicine—Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Tuskegee Institute, the University of Georgia, and Oklahoma A. & M. College. They will accept 119 first-year students under the regional arrangements, and will receive $1,000 per student from the States. Seven universities—Duke, Emory, Louisiana State, Meharry Medical College, Tennessee, Tulane, and Vanderbilt—will admit 187 medical students, at $1,500 per student. Six institutions will provide services in dentistry—Emory, Loyola of Louisiana, Maryland, Medical College of Virginia, Meharry, and Tennessee. They will accept 210 students, and the States will pay them $1,500 per student.

Under the pooling arrangement, the universities will select the students according to their own admission policies and standards. However, the States will certify students as eligible, based on criteria that they establish. Under present plans, 233 white students and 231 Negro students will receive training in 1949–50 at a cost of $1,500,000 to the States. The plan will have no effect on present segregation policies; white and Negro students will continue to attend their own respective schools.

FURTHER DEVELOPMENT EXPECTED

Other fields are now under consideration. Regional arrangements may ultimately be adopted in graduate studies, social work, architecture, forestry, engineering, agricultural, and professional education. Moreover, according to the sponsors of the regional plan, other methods through which the institutions of higher learning can jointly serve the needs of the South might include joint use of research facilities, exchange of faculty members, and voluntary specialization.

According to Dr. John E. Ivey, Jr., director of the regional board, the widespread support that has been received from the South indicates that the new project will expand. He points out that by planning as a region the South can provide itself with the leadership, the imagination, and the skills which it needs.

Southern educators point out that the South has been dependent upon institutions in other regions for the training of leaders in many fields. In many Southern States no institution offers courses at the doctor of philosophy level in any field.

Regionalism in education, the university officials hold, is a way to improve both the quality and the quantity of advanced college training at a minimum cost. For example, there are five veterinary medical schools within the region. To provide plant facilities and develop a first-class veterinary college would cost close to $3,000,000. Thus the savings to a State under the regional plan will be considerable. Besides, it will help existing institutions strengthen their programs, rather than add other possibly second-rate ones to compete with the universities that now serve the South.

Enthusiastic support for the regional plan was expressed last week by Millard F. Caldwell, former Governor of Florida, chairman of the board of control. Mr. Caldwell said that the Southern States, working together, could build the finest system of higher education in the United States or the world. He said the alternative, on a State-wide rather than regional basis would mean that southern education would continue to limp along, unable to meet the total needs of the region.

DUPLICATION OF EFFORT

It is obvious, Mr. Caldwell went on, that many States are duplicating what others are doing and in many fields none is doing a first-rate job. Various fields are wholly ignored. No State, he pointed out, can supply the best in every phase of education, because of lack of money or because of insufficient students to create an adequate school. Regional planning and cooperation appear to be the answer.

Other sections of the country have manifested an interest in similar programs for their own needs. Dr. John Dale Russell, Director of the Division of Higher Education, United States Office of Education, believes that the pattern of cooperative support now being developed on a regional basis in the South can be extended ultimately to all the States and Territories. In fact, the American Council on Education is planning to call together representatives from various groups some time this fall to see if the regional plan can be put into practice elsewhere.

According to President Colgate W. Darden of the University of Virginia, the southern regional program will measurably stimulate and improve college and university facilities for both white and colored students. This plan, he stressed, is not in any way a racial one, as it will improve educational facilities for both whites and Negroes.

Tulane University, participating in the regional program in medicine, is confident that the plan will strengthen higher education as it will eliminate duplication of facilities. Similarly, the president of Louisiana State University sees two strengthening effects on educational facilities in the South: (1) It will provide immediately some expansion of professional education, and (2) the agitation and planning in connection with regional education will add to the general concern about education in the South.

LOW-COST SPECIALIZED TRAINING

The University of Tennessee, an ardent supporter of the regional plan since its inception, considers regional education a sensible method of giving southern youth the highest quality of specialized training at a minimum cost. The plan enables each participating institution to build exceptionally strong staffs in selected specialized fields instead of spreading its financial resources too thinly over a greater area of advanced studies.

From the standpoint of a privately endowed institution, the immediate effect of the regional plan, Emory University notes, will be to provide financial support in extremely expensive fields of professional education.

Meharry Medical College, where Negro students are trained, has signed a contract with the regional council to enroll competent students of the States in this region. President M. Don Clawson observes that it costs about $2,000 a year to educate a medical student. The tuition is $500, and now with the $1,500 that will be received from the State sending a student, the college will be in a sounder financial condition.

It is clear that the project is exceedingly significant. It can help the South build and develop a sound system of graduate and professional schools that will be the equal of any in the country. The implications not only for the South but for the rest of the country are far-reaching. A new pattern has appeared in higher education that will have a profound influence on colleges and universities everywhere.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, another article on the subject is found in Phylon, the Atlanta University Review of Race and Culture, just off the press. The article is entitled "Regional Education: An Experiment in Democracy," by Dr. John E. Ivey, Jr., the director of the regional board. This article closes with the statement:

This is an experiment in regional action. It is an effort to make democracy work within States and localities. Success in this venture has implications far beyond education and far beyond the borders of the South. Always, visions of a stronger Nation must form the pattern into which regions of the United States find their place.

Mr. President, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Senators a group of interesting articles on this subject in the January issue of Higher Education, published by the United States Office of Education, which issue is entirely devoted to the discussion of regional action in higher education. In this issue a distinguished group of educators pay tribute to the possibilities of interstate action in education and also to southern leadership in creating the first of such programs in the Nation's history. For example, Dr. Arthur J. Klein, dean emeritus of the College of Education at Ohio State University, says:

It is significant to note that the largest degree of leadership in the practical development of the ideas and the techniques of regionalism in higher education has been provided by the South.

He also notes that—

The degree of success thus far attained has been won by overcoming institutional, State

governmental, and social localisms in a region where these characteristics have been supposed to be especially stubborn.

Some of the other outstanding contributors to this issue of Higher Education are Hon. Millard F. Caldwell, former Governor of Florida, and now chairman of the Board of Control for Southern Regional Education: Dr. William T. Sanger, president of the Medical College of Virginia; Dr. R. S. Sugg, dean of the Alabama Polytechnic Institute School of Veterinary Medicine; Dr. G. D. Humphrey, president of the University of Wyoming; and Dr. Ralph T. Esterquest, who is director of the Midwest's Interlibrary Center.

Mr. President, because of the widespread interest in these articles, I have had placed on the desk of each Senator a copy of the January issue of Higher Education. Let me again call the attention of the Senators now present to the fact that the editors of the January issue of the magazine, Higher Education, which is printed on the subject of higher education, by the United States Office of Education, have thought so highly of this experiment in the field of regional education in the South, that they have literally devoted the entire issue of the magazine, from cover to cover, to the consideration of that subject matter. Senators will find it well treated by prominent educators from all parts of the United States. I particularly ask and express the hope that Senators will not lose sight of the fact that upon the desk of each Senator is placed a copy of the January issue of the magazine, Higher Education.

And so, Mr. President and Senators, I hope that it is both timely and appropriate to invite your attention to the South with its pioneer program of regional education, the first in the Nation. It is with pleasure and pride that I note that the former Governor of my State, Hon. Millard F. Caldwell, who was one of the leaders in initiating this program, is still actively devoting a large portion of his time to this important work as chairman of the Board of Control for Southern Regional Education. I do not intend to imply that leadership for such developments exists only in the South. In 1946 the Western States formed their Interstate Committee on Institutional Care. That group has conducted studies of, first, the value of regional training institutions for the deaf, the blind, and the cerebral palsied; and, second, the handling on a regional basis of juvenile delinquents, women criminals, and mental patients. These same States now are concerned with setting up machinery to broaden their regional interests to include the field of higher education. At the Western Governors' Conference last November, Governor Caldwell reviewed the southern program. As I understand it, the Western Governors passed a resolution adopting the basic ideas of the southern plan. They have much leadership in such men as Gov. William Lee Knous, of Colorado, and President G. D. Humphrey, of the University of Wyoming.

(At this point, Mr. HOLLAND yielded to Mr. MARTIN and Mr. SALTONSTALL, for remarks upon the two hundred and forty-fourth anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, which remarks appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of Mr. HOLLAND'S speech.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it was a pleasure to yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, because I am sure that every citizen of the United States, whether he lives in the good State of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, the State of Massachusetts, or in the State where he rose to such glory and honor, the State of Pennsylvania, feels that he, individually, has a personal interest and concern in Benjamin Franklin and in the giving of proper honor and recognition to this day. Certainly the citizens of Florida, I am sure, would want me to say, though at the time of the birth of Benjamin Franklin Florida was and had been for a long time, an area over which the armies of Spain held jurisdiction and in which Spanish functions and Spanish customs and even the Spanish language prevailed, we claim a common heritage in the fine things which were done by Benjamin Franklin for all Americans everywhere.

Now, to continue the trend of my statement, I am happy to call attention to the interest of the New England States. It so happens that this part of my remarks comes down to the New England States, so I shall hope that the distintinguished Senator from Massachusetts, with whom I have just been exchanging compliments, will pay heed to this portion of my remarks.

I am happy to call attention to the interest of the New England States.

Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut have joined together in forming a New England Educational Council. The present task of the council is, first, to prepare an inventory of educational services needed in New England, and second, to prepare an inventory of educational services now available. The results of these studies will be used, I believe, to recommend specific opportunities for coordination among the States in their educational planning and in the effective use of their present facilities.

Last June the Board of Control for Southern Regional Education was formally organized at Daytona Beach, Florida. At that time, Dr. John Dale Russell, director, division of higher education of the United States, spoke of the movement as "an historic step in education that is certain to have an important effect upon the whole country." This remark was a forerunner to the question: "What does regional action in higher education hold for the planning of national movements in higher education?" And a number of representatives from the regions I have mentioned have been working on this problem as well as thinking how they might best share with the Nation the experiences of the several regions now in action. Dr. George F. Zook, president of the American Council on Education, I am told, has taken the lead here by sponsoring planning meetings of those interested in and concerned with these questions. It is premature to predict, but I suspect that some significant developments for interregional collaboration will shortly result.

In summary, the States have opportunity to solve a great many of their problems by interstate planning and action. Thus far, the Southern States are giving a successful demonstration of how, through joining hands across State borders, they can produce a system of higher education which will raise the social and economic level of the region.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, and for the information of the Congress, a partial bibliography of materials relating to activities of the Board of Control for Southern Regional Education, and its predecessor, the Regional Council for Education.

There being no objection, the bibliography was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF MATERIALS RELATING TO ACTIVITIES OF BOARD OF CONTROL FOR SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION AND ITS PREDECESSOR, THE REGIONAL COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION

Millard F. Caldwell, Legal Aspects of the Regional Plan for Higher Education. Higher Education, volume VI, No. 9, January 1, 1950. (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education.)

John E. Ivey, Jr., and William J. McGlothlin, The South's Evolving Pattern of Regional Planning in Higher Education. Higher Education, volume VI, No. 9, January 1, 1950. (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education).

Arthur J. Klein, Regionalism in Higher Education. Higher Education, volume VI, No. 9, January 1, 1950. (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education.)

William T. Sanger, Regional Planning for Medical and Related Education. Higher Education, volume VI, No. 9, January 1, 1950. (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education.)

R. S. Sugg, Regional Planning in Veterinary Medical Training. Higher Education, volume VI, No. 9, January 1, 1950. (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education.)

Henry Lesesne, Regionalism in Education. New York Herald Tribune, December 3, 1949.

John E. Ivey, Jr., Regional Education: It Is Working in the South. State Government, volume XXII, No. 12, December 1949. (Chicago, Ill.: The Council of State Governments.)

John E. Ivey, Jr., Building a Better Region Through Higher Education, an address before the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Houston, Tex., November 30, 1949. (Mimeographed, to be published in The Southern Association Quarterly.)

William J. McGlothlin, The First Year of Regional Education, an address before the Section on Medical Education and Hospital Training, Southern Medical Association, Cincinnati, Ohio, November 16, 1949. (Mimeographed.)

School Compacts in the South, Express News Letter, volume XI, No. 8 (October 17, 1949). (Washington, D. C.: Educational Press Association.)

Gordon Browning, Leadership Needs of the South: A Challenge to Graduate Education. (Atlanta, Ga.: Commission on Development of Graduate Studies, Board of Control for Southern Regional Education.) October 1949.

The Nation's First Regional Educational Program, Educator's Washington Dispatch. (Washington, D. C.: Educator's Washington Dispatch.) October 13, 1949.

J. D. Williams, Regional Pacts as an Answer to Educational Inequalities, College and University Business, October 1949.

John E. Ivey, Jr., Regional Education: An Experiment in Democracy. Phylon: The Atlanta University Review of Race and Culture, volume X, No. 4, fourth quarter, 1949. (Atlanta, Ga., Atlanta University.)

Ten Reasons Why the Regional School Plan Is Opposed. New Orleans: The Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc. Undated.

Benjamin Fine, Regional System Is Seen as a Great Advance in Higher Education in the South. Education in Review. New York Times, July 24, 1949.

Regional Cooperation in Higher Education: A Progress Report. Atlanta, Ga.: Board of Control for Southern Regional Education, July 1949.

Regional Action in Higher Education. A quarterly news letter published by the Board of Control for Southern Regional Education, volume I, Nos. 1, 2, and 3; volume II, No. 1.

Edgar W. Knight, A Unique Plan for Educational Administration. School Management, March 18, 1949.

William J. McGlothlin, The Regional Council for Education: A Beginning Is Made. The Journal of Southeastern Research, January 1949.

William J. McGlothlin, Regional Bootstraps for Higher Education. Higher Education, V, January 1, 1949.

Clyde L. Ball, Constitutionality of the Proposed Plan for Professional Education of the Southern Negro. Vanderbilt Law Review, I, April 1948.

Charles H. Thompson, Extension of Segregation Through Regional Schools, editorial comment in the Journal of Negro Education, volume XVII, No. 2, Spring, 1948. (Washington, D. C.: Howard University.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President and Senators, great progress has been made in the field of regional education, and further progress will be made not only in the South, but elsewhere in the United States. The Congress, as you know, because of the failure of the Senate to take favorable action, has not given its consent to the southern regional education compact, and the opponents strongly assert that consent is not necessary. The question of approval or disapproval, of course, is not now before the Senate, but I call to the attention of the Senators, Mr. President, that the States have, up to now, hesitated, and properly so, to expend large sums of money as capital outlays across State lines for the expansion of old or the creation of new educational facilities, because of the lack of congressional approval. Under the present situation the program is to all practical intents and purposes confined to the complete utilization of existing facilities and a wider distribution and availability of existing opportunities to the youth of the cooperating States. I hope and believe that congressional approval will come at a later date, and I urge all Senators to study carefully the splendid work being accomplished for both Negro and white citizens under the southern regional education program.

TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

During the delivery of Mr. HOLLAND'S speech,

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, this being the two hundred and forty-fourth anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, I intended to speak for a few minutes, but, owing to the pressures of time in the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, Mr. MARTIN'S statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, today is the two hundred and forty-fourth anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, benefactor of all mankind, foremost champion of human liberty and one of the illustrious authors of American independence.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania proudly proclaims Benjamin Franklin as its first citizen. I am happy, on this anniversary, to pay tribute to his greatness and to recall, in praise and gratitude, his vast contribution to world progress and to the glory of the American Republic.

I am glad to recall also that this year marks the two hundredth anniversary of Franklin's first election to the General Assembly of Pennsylvania, of which he later became president, and thereby Governor of the State.

Mr. President, every activity in Dr. Franklin's many-sided career was touched with genius. He won world-wide fame as an author, scientist, philosopher, statesman, and diplomat. But he took great pride in his skill as a craftsman and his success as a businessman.

More than any other man of his time he looked into the future with prophetic vision and gave of his wisdom for the benefit of every generation of Americans.

Benjamin Franklin had a clear understanding of the nature of individual freedom. He recognized its priceless value in the affairs of men and nations. He had unlimited faith in the capacity of man for self-government.

He recognized honesty, industry, thrift, tolerance, and liberty as the prime essentials of national progress and individual welfare.

Liberty was the goal toward which he directed his countrymen at a time when much of the world suffered under the misrule of despots and tyrants.

His philosophy of individual freedom was expressed in his words which I now quote:

"They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."

Franklin's words have come down to us through the years as an axiom of true Americanism. His warning should be remembered wherever the temptation is held out to sacrifice liberty in exchange for so-called security.

Today, as in Franklin's time, liberty cannot be taken for granted. It cannot survive when people place reliance upon government for security rather than upon their own efforts.

Well known in the writings of Dr. Franklin is a philosophical dissertation, told in simple language, and warning against the folly of paying too high a price for that which seems so attractive and so desirable.

The theme of this essay was based on a youthful experience when he bought a whistle paying four times its real worth. From that unprofitable transaction came the advice he gave in later years.

"Don't pay too much for your whistle."

"I conceive," wrote Dr. Franklin, "that a great part of the miseries of mankind are brought upon them by false estimates they have made of the value of things and by their giving too much for their whistles."

Dr. Franklin's reasoning is just as trustworthy and his conclusions just as valid today as they were in his day.

Liberty is too precious to be traded away for the attractive but deceptive promise of happiness and security to be provided by a paternalistic government.

Let us follow the teachings of Benjamin Franklin rather than the present-day exponents of an easy way of life.

Let us not make false estimates of the value of nonessentials in our pursuit of happiness.

Let us so shape our lives and the destinies of our Republic so that future generations shall not say of us that we paid dear, very dear, of our precious liberties in exchange for security that had no more real value than the whistle of Franklin's boyhood.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, coming as I do from the birthplace of Benjamin Franklin, I desire to join in the statement of the Senator from Pennsylvania, as I did last year, on this anniversary of Franklin's birth.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for his remark.

CHINA, FORMOSA, AND THE FAR EASTERN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. FERGUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield for the purpose of permitting me to suggest the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that it will not prejudice his right to the floor?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for that purpose under those circumstances.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Maybank
Anderson	Hoey	Millikin
Benton	Holland	Mundt
Brewster	Humphrey	Murray
Bricker	Hunt	Myers
Bridges	Ives	Neely
Butler	Jenner	O'Conor
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Darby	Kefauver	Russell
Donnell	Kem	Saltonstall
Douglas	Kerr	Schoeppel
Downey	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Knowland	Sparkman
Eastland	Langer	Taft
Ecton	Leahy	Taylor
Ellender	Lehman	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	Long	Thye
Frear	Lucas	Tobey
Fulbright	McCarran	Tydings
George	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Gillette	McClellan	Watkins
Graham	McFarland	Wherry
Green	McKellar	Wiley
Gurney	McMahon	Williams
Hayden	Magnuson	Withers
Hendrickson	Malone	Young
Hickenlooper	Martin	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, one of the critical problems before the Congress during the past 2 or 3 years has been the quest to discover the key to the great Chinese puzzle presented by our far eastern policy. I think the key lies within the very snarl which makes the picture so puzzling, and I shall proceed to state what I believe it to be.

In self-imposed blindness we have entered, beginning at Yalta, into a whole series of agreements with the Communists which now come back to haunt us in the form of our conflicting and confusing policies. Each one of those agreements, if adhered to, would have held some promise for a world of peace and

friendship. But each has proved to be merely one of the traps set by persons who do not know the meaning of good faith or principle. Those persons are the Communists.

Each agreement has carried with it a moral commitment, which we have sought to preserve. Our insistence on observing our moral obligations has left us far out on the limb time after time in the hard and cruel realities of world politics.

A gentleman is no match for a scoundrel, or a Communist.

It follows that now is the time to take off the gloves and adopt a policy as realistic as that of the Communists.

The many agreements I have mentioned have had these tragic effects:

First. They have violated the essential principle of open covenants, openly arrived at, and have nourished secret diplomacy.

Second. They have confused Congress, the people of the United States, and the nations of the world, as to where we stand from day to day.

Third. They have contained provisions which themselves violate international law. The cover-up practices and policies that result have further jeopardized our world position and our reputation for integrity.

Fourth. They have clouded the high purpose of bipartisanship in foreign policy, because they have shown how little the administration really cared for bipartisanship. It has been said the bipartisan policy was never called into use for the take-off, but only for the crash landing. Our Formosan policy, for instance, was formulated in a secret note at least as early as last October, and reaffirmed in another secret memorandum dated December 23. Such secrecy does nothing but kick bipartisanship out the window. And it has gone further, because not only have Republicans been shut off from discussing matters of fundamental policy, but even Democrats in Congress have been notified only after the fact.

Fifth. They cause our representatives in the United Nations to do one thing while the State Department has secretly decided on another policy.

Sixth. They have misled the Defense Department, the Chiefs of Staff, and the Security Council, who are concerned with the defense questions which follow from our foreign policy. For instance, it is clear that the State Department allowed the Chiefs of Staff to indulge in shadow boxing with the Security Council prior to the meeting of December 29, 1949, which presumably was a meeting to decide the Formosan question. The State Department had already decided that issue.

These are not the criticisms of a Republican. They are statements of fact. They are based on the record. They are important because they are the basis of questions which are being asked today by keen-minded Americans whose only interest is peace.

These are mistakes of the past which must be avoided in the future. These mistakes must not be repeated in the recognition of Communist China.

In the conflict between our ideology and communism, we need China and the Chinese on our side. For, first, one-half of the population of the world is located in Asia; and, second, one-half of Asia's population is in China. Her size, location, and resources make her the political and economic center of gravity in the east.

We recognized this when we made the Republic of China, which was a friend of the United States, a permanent member of the Security Council of the United Nations.

The avowed purpose of communism, whether it be in Russia, China, Yugoslavia, or Czechoslovakia, is to destroy capitalism. The conflict is global. It is for the minds of men. We must not forget we are on the defensive.

There can be no security in Europe, in the North Atlantic, or even in America, no real security anywhere, so long as communism is in a position to impose itself anywhere by force or infiltration, for all Communists are committed to the destruction of persons and peoples who oppose totalitarianism; all Communists imitate the Soviet regime, use its methods, and follow the Moscow party lines.

Recognition of Red China by any country which has been engaged in the fight to contain world communism is surrender on another front of the cold war.

If we recognize Red China, we completely abandon the hopes of all the people of the world, particularly those in southeastern Asia, who look to us for leadership in any effort to resist the inroads of communism. Economic assistance, or whatever else of that nature is planned, cannot buy faith in us if we place our stamp of approval on Communist aggression by recognizing the Chinese Reds.

A recent editorial in the New York Times aptly sums up the far-eastern situation. It was written after the President's press announcement of January 5 on Formosa. It has even more biting application today than it had at the time it was written. The editorial said:

> We have been bamboozled, outsmarted, and trapped into political and moral paralysis which was precisely what the Kremlin intended. There is only one thing left for us to do. We must retrench, regroup, and reform. We have admitted that the moral battlefield is lost. We dare not then lose the next one by the same processes of hesitation, divided counsel, and evasion.

The China question and the Formosa matter are not closed issues. Their nature does not permit them to be locked away like skeletons in a closet. Too many questions remain to be answered, and events may provide responses which no locked door can muffle.

We have yet to have an authoritative opinion, freely expressed, on the strategic importance of Formosa.

It now looks as if the Senate of the United States will be stymied on the question of Formosa's strategic importance until January 26, the date set for the appearance of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of National Defense before the Foreign Relations Committee.

A quick glance, however, at its history and geography should emphasize the strategic importance of Formosa. It contains 13,429 square miles of territory. It lies about 100 miles off the east coast of China. At one place it is only 90 miles offshore. Okinawa is to its north, and the Philippines are only 457 air miles away to the south and east. Japan is 780 air miles to the north and east.

The population is 6,500,000, of whom the main group is Chinese, mostly from the Chinese mainland provinces of Fukien and Kwangtung. The former natives number about 150,000, of whom 30,000 are still classed as savages. This makes Formosa predominantly Chinese and these Chinese have maintained close contact with their kinfolk on the mainland.

Japan has treated Formosa as of great strategic value since 1895 when it was ceded by the Chinese to Japan under the terms of the treaty following the Sino-Japanese War. Japan built it up as an island fortress for its future aggression. After Pearl Harbor Japan used Formosa to launch her attack upon the Philippines and Hongkong and to move southward to conquer the British Empire in southeast Asia.

General Douglas MacArthur, in a warning placed before the National Security Council and reported in the New York Herald Tribune of December 30, 1949, stated that—

> 1. Communist possession of Formosa would endanger the Philippines, American-held Okinawa and perhaps even Japan, and that
> 2. Communist drives made possible by a Formosa base might eventually push America's defenses back to the Marianas, the Hawaiian Islands, and the Pacific coast.

Strategic considerations must cover the possibilities should Formosa ever be occupied by an unfriendly power. This would be the case if the Communist Government of China occupied it, for it would be the same as though it were occupied by the Soviet Union.

On January 5, 1950, a New York Times dispatch from Moscow said:

> Soviet press comment made plain today that the new Chinese Government of Mao Tse-tung could be certain of the full support of the Soviet Union in efforts to establish sovereignty over Formosa.

With absolute certainty, the Chinese Communists are planning an invasion of Formosa as soon as the winter monsoon season in the Formosa Straits is over, which would be by early spring.

I am not satisfied at all that the legal status of Formosa, and our responsibility for it can be easily dismissed either. That is a subject which has not been fully explored in the debate of the past 10 days. I believe it is a subject which demands penetrating analysis, for it involves our national integrity.

I should like to examine that subject briefly at this time before proceeding to my further remarks on our future policy in the Far East and in our world-wide struggle with the forces of communism.

The President, in his January 5 statement, cited the provisions of the Cairo and Potsdam declarations as governing the status of Formosa.

The Cairo declaration was issued December 1, 1943, by President Roosevelt, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, and Prime Minister Churchill. After a statement of general purposes for pressing the war in the Pacific, they stated:

It is their (the Allies) purpose that Japan shall be stripped of all the islands in the Pacific which she has seized or occupied since the beginning of the First World War in 1914, and that all the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China.

Note that the term, "Republic of China," is used.

This 1943 declaration was seriously compromised by the secret Yalta agreement of early 1945, which promised Russia certain rights in Manchuria. However that may be, the Potsdam declaration of July 26, 1945, reiterated the Cairo terms in a proclamation defining terms for Japanese surrender, as follows:

The terms of the Cairo declaration shall be carried out and Japanese sovereignty shall be limited to the islands of Honshu, Hokkaido, Kyushu, and such minor islands as we determine.

The Potsdam declaration was signed by President Truman and Prime Minister Churchill and was concurred in by the President of the National Government of China. Russia announced its adherence to this declaration when it declared war on Japan August 5, 1945.

In accordance with these surrender terms Chinese Nationalist troops were designated to occupy Formosa when the Japanese surrendered.

What has happened subsequently raises the question of that island's legal status.

It has always been my understanding and belief that international law requires that territorial changes pursuant to a surrender be accomplished only by a treaty. That feature of international law has particular importance under our constitutional system, because treaties are made by the President of the United States "by and with the consent of the Senate."

It appears, however, that something else has happened with respect to Formosa.

Note that the statements issued at Cairo and Potsdam were purely declaratory in form. But pursuant to them, as the President said in his January 5 statement, "Formosa was surrendered to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and for the past 4 years the United States and other allied powers have accepted the exercise of authority over the island."

What he said in effect was that by our conduct we are estopped to apply international law.

All the other countries of the world, including those in the Pacific, have a right to expect that we will not conduct ourselves in a way to wreck the principles of international law. Yet we have done just that. Take the application of the Atlantic Charter to Formosa.

The people of Formosa had a right to expect that the Atlantic Charter would be applied in their case. The Atlantic Charter says:

They (the signatories)—

And the United States of America was one of the signatories to the Atlantic Charter—

They (the signatories) desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

And—

They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That part of the Atlantic Charter, of course, has been violated, and most flagrantly and atrociously in most all our peace arrangements; has it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree with the Senator. But I think we should apply the principles of the Atlantic Charter if we are going to implement, let us say, a press declaration which attempts to give away Formosa.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am delighted that the Senator from Michigan is entering into this field of inquiry, because I think there should be a foundation in the debate resting on the legal situation so far as Formosa is concerned. I think that involves the question of whether our military leaders during wartime can make permanent disposition of conquered territory. If they can do that, then there is no limit to the power of our military leaders. It seems to me they are entitled to make military dispositions and military arrangements which can last throughout the war, but it seems to me for them to assert that they can make permanent dispositions and permanent future peacetime arrangements because of their positions as military leaders, which necessarily are temporary ones, is to make a very swollen contention which runs contrary to the ultimate peace-treaty powers of the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that contribution by the able Senator from Colorado, and I thank him for his remarks, because they fit into the subject I am discussing. I think it is a subject which should be discussed here. I agree with the Senator and I am satisfied that in this case both the facts and the law agree with that analysis.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The question of the legal rights of the parties, so far as Formosa is concerned, of course, makes the greatest difference insofar as action by the United States is concerned, independent of communism or independent of that whole question. If the military leaders are charged in fact with holding the acquisitions from the enemy as trustees for the future disposition by the victorious powers there is a firm legal basis for occupation of Formosa regardless of the Communist question.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator for his statement and I agree with it. Later in my remarks I wish to discuss the question of trusteeship. I believe the trusteeship of Gen. Chiang Kai-shek on the island of Formosa is the same as the trusteeship of General MacArthur in Japan, as the trusteeship of our General McCloy in Germany, and the trusteeship of our forces in Berlin. We are trustees until the peace treaty can be settled, and we, I am sure, would defend our trusteeship in Berlin, we would defend it in Germany, we would defend it in Japan.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If we are unwilling to defend our trusteeship—if that is the correct term for it—we are then abandoning the consequences of the war, and we are abandoning our victory. Is not that clear?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is clear.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I congratulate the Senator on going into that phase of the question, and I hope he goes into it thoroughly, because I think if that is soundly premised, we have a good foundation for the occupation of Formosa independent of the Communist question, and that gets by all this business of whether we are interfering in civil wars, and what our duties are under those circumstances, and whether we are making other people angry by sticking our nose into their business. It comes down to the simple proposition, since the territory involved is conquered territory, of protecting that conquered territory until there is a formal disposition by treaty, in which this body has a direct and constitutional interest.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree with that statement. It is more important because the Constitution of the United States provides that this body shall have the right to advise and consent to the treaty. Other nations may say it makes little difference to them, because their executive branch might be able to dispose of conquered territory differently than we can. But our Constitution is drawn up on the basis of a different philosophy. The philosophy is that the Senate of the United States shall say what the treaty will be at the conclusion of a war. Is that not correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It seems so to me.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. When we get into these strategic considerations, we have no right to occupy a country simply because it has strategic advantages.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree with the Senator as to that.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If that were so, we could have our forces all over the world, because there are many countries that have strategic advantages, countries which we might invade, as against certain future contingencies. But that gives us no excuse to move in.

I should like to see laid under this debate the kind of foundation the Senator from Michigan is approaching.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Cairo and Potsdam declarations would clearly seem to violate the terms of the Atlantic Charter, to which I have referred.

The nature of the de facto authority of the Republic of China over Formosa is another point in question.

The Chinese Nationalists clearly believe their authority to be complete, for they have set up in Formosa a government on the order of a provincial government. It is apparent that the United States has not always treated the possession of Formosa as absolute, however. In October 1949 we demanded that the Nationalist Government of China do certain things in relation to its government on Formosa. We even demanded that it change the governor of the island, which was done.

Mr. President, if the President of the United States is correct in saying that we gave Formosa to the Chinese Nationalist Government at the time of the Cairo Conference, why is it that the United States Government demanded certain reforms in the government of Formosa and demanded that a new governor be appointed? I think those facts show the absolute incorrectness of the statement that we did entirely give Formosa to the Chinese Nationalists. To the contrary, it seems to me that at that time, in October, we had in mind that the status of Formosa was to be settled finally by a treaty. As I have just pointed out, we even demanded that the governor of Formosa be changed.

Of course, we have not gone that far in our relationship with Spain; in the case of Spain, all we did was to recall our Ambassador.

Following our demand, the governor of Formosa was changed; and K. C. Wu is now the Governor. He is the Princeton-educated former mayor of Shanghai. I had the opportunity to see him in Formosa, just last December, and he impressed be with having a capacity to administer the affairs of the island. He has taken into office an overwhelming proportion of the local leaders of Formosa, three of his five committee members being Formosans. The Assembly, elected by the people of Formosa, is all Formosan. I had an opportunity to talk to some of the members of their parliamentary body at the time when I was there.

The State Department may say that the island of Formosa is ripe for revolution; but I found no evidence of that when I landed at the airport at Taipei, on Formosa. I shall give the facts upon which I base the statement that I found no such evidence. I was met there by Governor Chen, and we drove from the airport to the city—which has a population of more than half a million—and through the streets without an escort of any kind. Only the chauffeur accompanied us. When I returned to the airport from the city, again I drove with the Governor, leaving the city at 6:45 in the morning; and again we were driven to the airport without guard or without escort, other than the chauffeur.

Mr. President, those facts are absolute proof, to me, that the Communists on the island of Formosa did not have the upper hand. Governor Chen is the man whom the Government of the United States of America asked to have removed as governor. I made inquiry from soldiers there on the island. I made inquiry from other persons. I found that the condition regarding Communists was good. It is true that Communist activities existed, just as they exist here in the United States of America. But they were being reported by the natives—which clearly indicated that there was no foundation to the so-called revolution. The people of Formosa believe that the conduct of the United States and the reports which were being circulated were instigating allegations and rumors and charges of a revolution by the Communists on the island of Formosa, in order that it could be taken away from the Chinese Nationalists.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I ask the Senator whether he believes that the Chiang administration of the island has been a good one.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall answer that question in this way: For about a year, now, I have talked to our people in the embassy there, and I have talked to others; I have talked to Chinese; I have talked to members of the Formosa Assembly. They said a great reform was coming about. They said, for instance, that the ground rents had been reduced from about 60 percent, so that now not more than approximately 37½ percent could be charged; that certain rehabilitation, insofar as water was concerned, was going on; that money had been stabilized; and that conditions were much better than they had been.

However, when we compare the Government there with a government such as the one we have here in the United States, it was not good; but the people of Formosa, including members of the legislature who were Formosans, believed those reforms were taking place, that more of their own people were being taken into the Government, and that conditions were much better.

Mr. McMAHON. How long was the Senator from Michigan there?

Mr. FERGUSON. I was there 2 days.

Mr. McMAHON. How large is the island?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is about 800 miles long by 200 miles wide.

Mr. McMAHON. Was the Senator from Michigan in the capital of the island?

Mr. FERGUSON. I was.

Mr. McMAHON. Did the Senator from Michigan confer with the officials who now are administering the island—that is to say, Chiang officials?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. Did the Senator from Michigan go to any other city or any town in the interior?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. I went out into the country.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator did so within the period of the 2 days in which he was on the island. Is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. McMAHON. Did the Senator from Michigan talk with representatives of the other groups on the island, persons who were against Chiang?

Mr. FERGUSON. I talked to members of the Formosa Legislature, who were Formosans, and who were not in the Chiang regime at all.

Mr. McMAHON. It is upon the basis of the 2-day visit and the fact that the Senator from Michigan was in the capital of the island and for most of his time was with the Chiang adherents that he now wishes to tell us that, on the whole, the island has been fairly well administered and the Formosans as a whole are satisfied with the Chiang overlordship. Is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. Plus the fact that I had a long, personal conversation with General Sun, who is in charge of the training of the army. He was vitally interested in this question, and he discussed it, and said conditions were much better and, in fact, that at that time the condition was good.

Mr. McMAHON. The situation there had been rather brutal, had it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that at first it was not good.

Mr. McMAHON. The Nationalists killed hundreds of thousands of Formosans, did they not?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not know the number.

Mr. McMAHON. When they went to Formosa, after the Japanese left, they rode with a rather high hand, did they not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; they took over the island.

Mr. McMAHON. "Taking it over" is a euphemistic term for having brutalized the population and having destroyed their economy, according to my information.

Mr. FERGUSON. If I had that information I would give it here on the floor. I shall quote some statements which were made by John MacDonald, who was the American consul general.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I was very much interested in the statement just made by the Senator from Connecticut. I do not know how long he spent on the island of Formosa, but I am interested to know where he got his information that hundreds of thousands of Formosans had been killed.

There was a period, immediately following the Japanese occupation, in which there was insurrection. However, the highest number I have ever heard estimated, even by the anti-Chiang group on the island, was that perhaps five or ten thousand people might have been killed—which would be altogether too

many if it were done without reason, of course.

But I wondered where the Senator from Connecticut got his figure of hundreds of thousands.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I think the Senator's correction is a good one. What I should have said was that hundreds of thousands of them were brutalized, dispossessed of their property, starved, and beaten. That is my information. I think the Senator is correct in stating that hundreds of thousands were not killed.

In answer to the Senator's question about how long I stayed on the island, I wish to assure him that I have never been on the island. Perhaps, though, I am almost as competent to talk about it as if I had been there for 48 hours, because I think one of the great errors which can be committed is by persons who spend a few hours or a few days in a country, and then feel that they are entitled to set themselves up as experts on that subject. I should much prefer to form my own impression, in the alternative, upon the basis of careful estimates and careful testimony of men who have dealt for all their lives with these problems.

That is not to say to the Senator that I would not have welcomed adding to that my own personal observations; but I would hesitate, upon the basis of a 48-hour visit, to expatiate as to the economics, the political economy, or the military strategy which might be involved in a particular country.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not know whether the able Senator from Connecticut is or is not familiar with it, or whether the Senator from Michigan may be, but since the Senator from Connecticut says he would rely on people who had spent the greater part of their lifetime in studying Formosa, I should like to call his attention to a Department of State bulletin, volume 12, for the period January through June 1945; this particular one being the bulletin for June 3, 1945, volume 12, No. 310, the official document of the Department of State, and on page 1019, here is what the Department of State bulletin has to say relative to Formosa:

> Strategic factors greatly influence the problem of Formosa. With the exception of Singapore, no location in the Far East occupies such a controlling position. Formosa is separated from the continent of Asia by 100 miles; from the main island of the Philippines by 200 miles; and from Kyushu, the nearest home island of Japan, by 700 miles. Flying distance from military airports in Formosa is 559 miles to Manila, 410 miles to Canton, 428 miles to Shanghai, 1,290 miles to Tokyo. Formosa, larger than the State of Maryland, stands in a strategic relation to the China coast comparable for the United States to an imaginary island of such size 100 miles off the coast of North Carolina, 400 miles from New York City. Every point on the entire coast of China falls within a radius of 1,100 miles. A radius of 2,000 miles includes Burma, Singapore, Borneo, Guam, and Japan, including Hokkaido.
>
> Formosa has two important ports: Takao and Keelung. The main naval base is located in the Pescadores at Bako, which, in the hands of the Japanese, has been the most important base for Japanese aggression in the southwest Pacific and for preparation of the present war.

I call the Senator's attention to the very able statement in the Department of State bulletin, which runs entirely counter to the bulletin issued on December 23, in which it was said that the island had no strategic interest to this country.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from California to the fact that at the time the bulletin was written it was written with respect to an island that lay off the coast of China, and which was held by Chiang Kai-shek and his adherents. Today the island lies off land that is totally controlled by the Communists. I may say to the Senator, if the Senator from Michigan will indulge me further for a moment, that I do not welcome for one moment the possession of this island, or any other part of the globe, by those who have their policy dictated from the Kremlin. But I also say to the Senator I think it is high time it was pointed out that the future of the relationships between the Kremlin and the United States of America do not rest in any solution of the Formosan problem, nor do they rest, in my opinion, in any solution of the entire far-eastern situation. I am one of those who believe, and I think the Senate will understand why—at least, the Senator from California will understand why—that the heart of the question does not lie in Formosa or off the coast of China, but it rests in the fact that we are faced with the possession by the Soviet Union of power hitherto undreamed of, to be used, not in Formosa or off the China coast, but to be used, if the event ever occurs, here in the United States of America. It is time we began to reorient this situation and to put first things first. When that standard is applied it will be found that Formosa is near the bottom of a very long list.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I realize that the Senator from Connecticut is very critical of one who has come back from Formosa, and who spent a very short time there—too short a time to become an expert or to advise the Senator, who is on the Foreign Relations Committee, and whose party, as I understand, this morning in caucus decided to stand by the President upon this important issue. I realize also that the State Department was not anxious that any Senator visit the island of Formosa. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] advised the Senate how difficult it was for him to get to Formosa. I may state that I had very great difficulty in getting to Formosa. The State Department did not even make clearance for the plane in which I rode to Formosa.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should merely like to clear up the statement the Senator made with respect to what happened at the Democratic conference this morning. There was no party vote taken at the conference.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should be glad to have the Senator clear it up.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well; I can clear it up. But I do not want the Senate to misunderstand it. In the party conference there was a consensus that the Foreign Relations Committee, headed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], so far as his position is concerned, was correct, and that the State Department and the President of the United States also were correct.

It is not the little thing we did in conference that is threatening to destroy the bipartisan foreign policy. Ever since they returned from the Old World a number of Senators, including the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], along with former President Hoover, have been talking about Formosa and about what ought to be done with Formosa. It seems to me that if anyone is attempting to destroy the bipartisan foreign policy, it is the junior Senator from Michigan, along with other Senators who are constantly, here, day after day, denouncing the State Department and the President with respect to what is going on in Formosa and China.

I could not let pass the statements which have been made without making this explanation, and I shall have more to say about the bipartisan foreign policy. What we did this morning does not in anywise destroy the bipartisan foreign policy of the United States. So far as I am concerned, and speaking for myself, I am stronger for the bipartisan foreign policy today than ever before. But it was the Senator from Ohio who recently said—and I heard his voice on the air—that there was no bipartisan foreign policy. He has been attempting to destroy the bipartisan foreign policy for years, and ever since he has been in the Senate. He has, I am afraid, just about convinced certain Senators they should go along with him with respect to it.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator has given his version as to what happened in the caucus. I merely want to read the press release, which I was paraphrasing. It reads as follows:

> The Senate's 54 Democrats were practically unanimous today in voicing their support at a party conference for President Truman's hands-off Formosa policy.
>
> Democratic Leader Lucas told reporters that majority Members had been asked to rally behind Mr. Truman and Secretary Acheson to offset Republican criticism of United States far-eastern policy.
>
> "The Democrats are practically united in support of the President and the State Department" and are "fearful that any intervention in Formosa would ultimately mean a shooting war," LUCAS said.

Mr. President, it is apparent we are now going to have some bipartisanship. Both the Republicans and the Democrats are going to have something to say about the Far East. We shall then have bipartisanship; but not if the decisions are to be made by the White House prior to the debate, and even prior to knowledge on the part of Congress of what is going on. I now ask any Democratic Senator upon

the floor of the Senate to rise and tell us that, prior to the 5th day of January, he was consulted by the State Department or the President on what was to be said in the January 5 release.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield. I take it for granted the Senator is going to tell us.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to make this comment to the Senator: I was not consulted by the President of the United States as to the action he took on that date. I may say to the Senator from Michigan, however, that, unlike him, I sat on the Foreign Relations Committee during the past spring and summer. As I stated recently, we listened to the admirals who visited the area in question, we listened to the generals, we listened to the Secretary of State and his assistants. We listened to the representatives of every single branch of the Government that had an interest in it. Before I had the honor to become a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, the committee even took time to listen to the Honorable Patrick J. Hurley. As a result of all that listening, I may say to the Senator that so far as I am concerned, in my estimate of the facts which were adduced before the committee, the President of the United States took a very sensible and judicious position in what he said on January 5. I cannot, therefore, quarrel with it for one moment. The Senator asked Democratic Senators to rise and state whether they were consulted. My answer is that the facts were placed before the Foreign Relations Committee—facts from which the logical position taken by the President of the United States eventuated.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I reply to the Senator's statement by saying that the junior Senator from Michigan consulted and conferred with generals and admirals who are now in the Far East on the question of Formosa, on the question of whether the situation should be handled by treaty, or by allowing Formosa to be taken. He received no such report as that which the generals and the admirals are said to have given to the committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a slight interruption?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It goes on the very issue raised by the Senator from Connecticut. It so happens that on Saturday morning, January 14, 1950, the State Department released a statement dealing with the seizure by the Chinese Communists of our Peiping consulate property. This seizure took place at 9:50 a. m., January 14, Peiping time, which is 8:50 p. m., January 13, Washington time.

According to the official State Department release, the Chinese Communist military authorities, on January 6, issued a proclamation for the seizure of former foreign military barracks in Peiping. On January 7 the Communist authorities addressed an order to the Consul General for requisition of the United States Government-occupied property. On January 7 the United States Government informed the British Embassy of the Peiping developments, and on January 10 requested the good offices of the British Foreign Office to the end that the British officer in charge at Peiping be instructed personally to convey to the Communist regime the serious view we would take of such seizure of our property.

On January 10 the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, met with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the morning and in the afternoon. He met again with the Foreign Relations Committee on the morning of Friday, January 13. The Secretary of State also met with the House Foreign Affairs Committee on January 11. The developing Peiping situation was not disclosed to either committee of Congress. This despite the fact that on January 10, 11, and 13 the Secretary was meeting with the committees of Congress which deal with foreign relations. They were both in executive session primarily to discuss China and the Far East. I have no present knowledge as to whether or not the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee had any information regarding the Peiping situation prior to 8:50 p. m., January 13, Washington time, or 9:50 a. m., January 14, Peiping time, at which time the property was seized.

Yet here was very important information on a subject of vital importance to Senate and House committees and both committees were conveniently in executive session during the period of time the incident was approaching its climax. It is another example of the State Department lowering an iron curtain between itself and the responsible committees of the Congress. I hope that at the next meeting with Secretary Acheson the following questions will be asked and that the State Department will furnish definite answers and I call them to the attention of the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Connecticut:

First. On what day and hour did the cable relative to the January 6 proclamation by the Chinese military authorities reach the State Department?

Second. On what day and hour did the January 7 order of the Communist authorities addressed to the Consul General for requisition of United States Government-occupied property at 22 Legation Street under the prior order of January 6 reach the State Department?

Third. Was there any prior indication of any type or character written or verbal given to the American authorities at Peiping prior to the issuance of the January 6 proclamation that such action was being contemplated? If so, was such information conveyed to the State Department and on what date and at what hour was such information first received?

Mr. President, the exact time the first information concerning the issuance of the January 6th Communist military proclamation in Peiping reached the State Department becomes significant when it is recalled that on January 5 at approximately 10:30 a. m. the President of the United States was issuing his press statement relative to cutting off any further military supplies to the non-Communist Republic of China, on the island of Formosa, and the British Government, on January 6, was announcing its recognition of the Chinese Communist regime.

Was this merely one of the coincidences of history, or is there any particular significance in the timing of—

First. The President's announcement of January 5 relative to no more military supplies being available to the Nationalist Government of China;

Second. The Communist proclamation of January 6 announcing the taking over of United States property in Peiping; and

Third. The January 6 recognition of the Communist regime by the British Government.

These and other matters deserve more attention than they have had to date. We can only expect to develop a sound foreign policy in the United States if both Congress and the American people have adequate information. The State Department, in my opinion, has been negligent in not keeping the proper committees of Congress informed.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator for putting that statement into the RECORD at this place, because I believe it is a matter which should be debated by Senators on the floor. For that reason I have not requested that I be not interrupted, because I believe that in the give and take of debate on the floor we shall be able to solve, at least in our own minds, some of the problems and can advise the public as to exactly what is going on. At a later time I wish to make some remarks upon what happened on the 6th and 7th of January in Peiping, because I think it is very important in connection with a question which I shall discuss, which is the question of recognition of Red China.

When the debate took its present form I was discussing the question of what I found personally in the city of Taipei as to whether there was a revolution about to take place and whether the Nationalist Government was about to be overthrown. I merely cited my personal experiences, because I believe they demonstrate, at least to me, beyond any doubt, that there was not a revolution about to take place, because no governor will ride without escort if he knows or has any reason to believe there is going to be a revolution which is adverse or contrary to his ideas and his thinking. It demonstrated to me that the Communists did not have the upper hand in Formosa, or communism would have been raising its head in the chief capital city of that island.

The Communists naturally have tried to infiltrate into Formosa. Stringent measures were taken to prevent such infiltration by the Formosan administration, with considerable success. John J. MacDonald, American consul general in Formosa, stated that "there was no evidence that the Communists had begun infiltrating into Formosan affairs." That statement is from the New York Times, January 4, 1950. In case of a Communist invasion, therefore, the invaders cannot count on a Communist revolt on the island itself.

The Chinese Reds seem to hold no doubts or fears as to their rights or prospects in Formosa, for it is no secret that they are planning to project their conquest of Nationalist China to the food and industrial center on the island. That matter of right presents a question itself, however, as the Cairo and Potsdam Declarations state Formosa shall go to "The Republic of China" and it is my understanding that the Reds do not claim the character of the former republic as sucessors to the Nationalists.

There is conclusive proof, in fact, that the Chinese Communist authorities do not recognize and will not recognize the treaties of the Republic of China. It has been revealed that on January 13, at 8:50 p. m., Washington time, they proceeded to invade the American consular compound at Pekin. This was all in violation of the protocol signed at Pekin on September 7, 1901, by China and 11 other powers and that right was reaffirmed in the Sino-United States Treaty of 1943 under which the United States relinquished its territorial rights in China.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Did I correctly understand the distinguished Senator to say that the Communist regime in China does not claim to be the successor of the prior government?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. It claims that it is a new and independent government, a people's government, and it is not to take over any treaty or any other obligation. It will start with new sovereign rights.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If that be true, it would have a most profound effect on the status of that government in the United Nations.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, that is one of the nubs in this situation. There will be a new government asking to come into the United Nations with no obligations, so far as old Nationalist China is concerned, as to treaties or anything else. It will come in as a new so-called people's government. It is a totalitarian, communistic government.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Assuming the question of the admission of that government as a member of the Security Council, if it claims it is not the successor of the Republic of China, it has no right to sit as a permanent member of the Security Council, has it?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, that will be the great issue in the Security Council. But I think it indicates clearly what has been occurring. We have recognized no obligation whatever.

I shall come back a little later to the Ward case. I conferred with Mr. Ward this morning on this subject, because I think it has direct significance.

When the Chinese Communists come to the United Nations seeking, with the aid of Russia, admission to the Security Council, they will probably take a different attitude, but today all their conduct and all their statements indicate that they are not going to assume any obligations of what they call the capitalistic government, because they are not its successor. That is why I argue that they should not, under any circumstances, be recognized.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Even if they came for admittance to the Security Council under that theory, that itself would raise a serious question. We denounced our first military alliance treaty with the Monarchy of France on the ground that we were no longer dealing with the same government with which we dealt when we entered into the treaty. In other words, we did not have a treaty with the successor revolutionary government of France, and therefore we kept out of the war which France at that time wanted us to get into against Britain.

Mr. FERGUSON. By now, however, the President of the United States and the Secretary of State appear clearly to have accepted a transfer of the sovereignty over Formosa, as evidenced by their statement of January 5. Such a position flies in the face of established international law. No matter what transfer may be predetermined by agreement among the conquering nations, there can be no finality in the transfer until a peace treaty is made.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am very glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I correct in understanding that the able Senator contends that Japan in reality has legal possession of Formosa until a treaty is signed?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. I take the position that now Formosa is under a trusteeship.

Mr. LUCAS. Under what trusteeship?

Mr. FERGUSON. The same one under which General MacArthur is operating in Japan. He is there for all of the Allied Powers until a peace treaty is made.

Mr. LUCAS. Who is in charge of Formosa at the present time?

Mr. FERGUSON. Chiang Kai-shek's National Republic.

Mr. LUCAS. What right has Chiang Kai-shek there if in reality there is a trusteeship?

Mr. FERGUSON. I will state what right I think he has. He has been sent there by General MacArthur's order to take over the surrendered arms of the Japanese there, just as General MacArthur went into Japan to accept the surrender there. Chiang Kai-shek was sent there under an order of General MacArthur known as General Order No. 1, and it is the contention of the Senator from Michigan that he is there, in effect, as a trustee for all the Allied Powers until a peace treaty is made. I shall cite Mr. Martin, who was in the State Department, and I shall cite former Secretary of State Byrnes on the very question, to the effect that it was his opinion that a peace treaty was necessary before a final closing of sovereignty over these conquered nations.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator, but who has closed the final sovereignty? The mere statement which the President of the United States made the other day certainly does not close final sovereignty with respect to the island of Formosa. Certainly it will depend ultimately on a treaty between this country and other countries.

Mr. FERGUSON. But the President says in his statement that we have delivered Formosa to the Nationalist Government of China, and therefore we have no rights there at all, that we are estopped from saying that the Nationalist Government is not the supreme and the sovereign power, and it is my contention that Chiang Kai-shek is no more nor less than a trustee of the island of Formosa for all the Allied Powers, and I believe I can prove that.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Has the Senator from Michigan a copy of the order General MacArthur issued?

Mr. FERGUSON. I can get the Senator a copy of Order No. 1.

Mr. LUCAS. I think it is important that it go into the RECORD. I should like to see the order.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall get it. I believe we are not very far apart in the way we think.

Mr. LUCAS. We are quite a way apart, just about as far apart as from here to Formosa. That is how far we are apart.

Mr. FERGUSON. Not if the Senator believes that a treaty should be made.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand the Senator's position perfectly, and I think the Senator understands my position. I am backing up the position of the President and the Secretary of State.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then we are far apart.

Mr. LUCAS. I know we are.

Mr. FERGUSON. We are just as far apart as from here to Formosa.

Mr. LUCAS. And we will remain that far apart, apparently, because I do not think there is any point at which the Senator from Michigan and I could agree between here and Formosa so long as he takes the position he does take.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, let me tell the Senator what Mr. Byrnes said and what Mr. Martin, of the State Department, said.

Mr. LUCAS. I have heard of many things Mr. Byrnes has said recently, and I should like to hear what he said a few years ago, too.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will tell the Senator what he said.

Mr. LUCAS. Let it be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. FERGUSON. Certainly.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In my opinion, the temporary occupancy of Formosa, no matter who may occupy it, is not the final decisive question, any more than is the fact that under war arrangements Russia is occupying eastern Germany.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Theoretically, at least, we have not abandoned our rights,

as one of the victorious powers, to have a further say about the disposition of eastern Germany. We may be confronted with a fait accompli, and I am somewhat afraid we are, through the stupidity of the arrangements which were made Nevertheless, we still have a right to participate some day in treaty making with Germany which will determine, or should determine, what will happen to eastern Germany.

By the same token the mere fact that our Nation occupies a part of western Germany does not give us any claim to that territory. We are merely occupying it, just as I assume the Chinese Nationalists are occupying Formosa, to the extent such occupancy can be justified, as trustees, against the day of final settlement.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is the contention of the Senator from Michigan that that is the situation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe it is a very sound contention. I should like, if I may, to make one further suggestion.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Even if the Chinese Nationalists were not in Formosa at all, even if the Communists were in there, that would not preclude our assumption of responsibility for the final disposition of Formosa. We are obligated, in order to exploit our victory and to secure the results of it, and to meet our responsibilities, to see that Formosa is disposed of according to the final peace arrangements, and as a matter of right we are entitled to take these steps necessary to protect that trusteeship.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is the proper thing for us to do, under international law.

As I said, however, if we admit that the whole thing is ended, that legality has nothing to do with the situation, such a position flies in the face of established international law. No matter what transfers may be predetermined by agreement among the conquering nations, there can be no finality in the transfer until the peace treaty is made.

This principle of international law and its application in the case of Formosa is fully substantiated in the authoritative book, The Allied Occupation of Japan, by Edwin M. Martin. Interestingly enough, Mr. Martin is described in the foreword of that book as writing "with the great advantage of knowing, by virtue of his official position in the United States Department of State, the complex but seldom publicized interactions of political, economic, and strategic factors which shape the formulation and execution of occupation policy in Japan."

On page 35 of his book, referring to the Cairo and Potsdam declarations and their support by the United States, Great Britain, China, and Russia, Mr. Martin states:

> With this support, although legal confirmation of the transfer of the territories involved cannot take place until the signing of a peace treaty with Japan, de facto transfers have already been made.

To illustrate the underlying thesis, Mr. Martin notes in his discussion of the Micronesian Islands that—

> Since Japan did not possess full sovereignty over these islands, it is not considered by the United States to be a case of territorial cession requiring legal confirmation in the peace treaty with Japan.

That is from page 37.

Even more authoritative are the views of James F. Byrnes, as Secretary of State. The Department of State Bulletin for February 10, 1946, at page 189, reports a press and radio interview given by the Secretary on January 29, 1946, as follows:

> Asked whether it would be necessary to have a treaty of peace to formalize their transfer (the discussion concerned the Kueriles), the Secretary replied in the affirmative, adding that was his understanding of all these matters. Pointing out that someone might raise the question that where territory had preciously been in possession of a government, that would not be necessary, the Secretary said that it was his understanding that any cession of territory must be legalized in a treaty, either a treaty bebetween two countries or where a treaty has been forced upon a country that has surrendered, the government is required to sign.

Mr. President, if that is not international law, then the powers which were allied in the last war may sit down together, no matter whether they be the heads of states or subordinates, and may agree what is to take place, and the Constitution of the United States will never have its sway, will never be used, because the Senate of the United States will never hear about a treaty. No treaty will ever be required. Nations may be split up, nations may be divided. All-powerful will be the man who has the sword. That, however, is not the idea of international law. International law has in mind that after a war is over and men sit down around the table they will in sober moments settle the peace of the world, and that the various bodies required to approve the peace will have something to say.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question on that point?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. What is going to happen, then, to all the secret commitments which were made at Yalta and ratified at Potsdam? The carving up of the nations of the world has already been accomplished. Does the Senator from Michigan mean to say that when the time comes to sit down and write the peace the parties to the making of the peace will repudiate the selling down the river of countries that now have lost their freedom and have become a part of the Soviet regime, or are at least under her domination?

Mr. FERGUSON. I will answer that by saying that if the State Department's present position is correct, if former Secretary of State Byrnes was not correct, then Joe Stalin at the time the peace treaties are considered can say, "This matter or that matter was settled at Yalta; this matter or that matter was settled at Tehran; this matter or that matter was settled here or there." The result will be we shall have no real peace treaty.

I know the State Department will have to recede from its position. International law will not back up the State Department in its position. There is no logic, there is no justice in the present stand of the State Department.

The President of the United States, by issuing a press release, attempted to write a peace treaty so far as Formosa is concerned. I say to the President today that matters of such deep significance should not be settled by issuing a press release. Even though he believed the Republicans were getting into the act, even though he believed the Republicans were going to have something to say respecting foreign affairs, I say to him that the time was not ripe for him to rush in and, in effect, make a peace treaty by a press release. The matter is too serious to take snap judgment on and issue press releases about. Conquered territory should not be disposed of in violation of the Atlantic Charter. The press release represented a violation of the sacred principles of international law.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, it is the Senator's position that, regardless of any commitment which might have been made by any representative of our Government, the constitutional processes should be adhered to and that anything that is the subject matter for a treaty should be brought before the Senate of the United States for its ratification.

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe that to be true. Any nation which deals with the President of the United States or deals with a general of the United States Army should be made aware of the limitations which the Constitution of the United States places upon them. The President, under the Constitution, has certain powers. During war he makes the war policy. But under international law, and as a matter of justice, he does not have all power. In other words, the President of the United States cannot say, as Louis XIV said, "I am the state," because, after all, the Constitution and the people are the state.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I endorse and corroborate what the junior Senator from Michigan has said. The evidence which has been adduced is convincing that agreements and commitments have been made in the past few years which, if they had been brought before the Senate of the United States for ratification, would never, in my humble judgment, have been entered into or ratified.

While the case of Formosa is in a state of flux, while we are trustees for Formosa, I feel, as the Senator from Michigan does, that in the final analysis the people of the United States of America, through their chosen representatives, under their constitutional processes, have the right to pass upon the terms of the peace treaties and to say what shall be thus and what shall be so among the nations of the world.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. President, I have raised this question today because I believe it is fundamental to the future integrity of the United States of America, and it is important to our constitutional governmnet that we should think about it. We should make it the subject of bipartisan debate. We should debate the issue.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am sorry to interrupt the Senator again. Will he yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The debate should be had before any bipartisan commitment is made. The debate should be had upon the Senate floor before representatives of any party pledge themselves respecting the present policy of the United States. If any proposed policy is hammered out here on the anvil of debate and of discussion, and agreement is reached concerning the policy, I shall be perfectly satisfied with such policy. But if we are to have the kind of bipartisan policy which enlarges and sustains commitments of men, when the issue was not brought before the Senate of the United States and here hammered out on the anvil of debate, then I ask the Senator, do we really have a bipartisan foreign policy?

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe such matters must be debated here. I know there are certain matters that can be taken up in Council. But the subject of the Far East was one respecting which the Republican Party was not consulted. As I said before, the President, being fearful that this question would be debated before he had issued an order, issued a press release, and in it he attempted to estop the United States of America forever from saying that international law should say something else. So I say that if the authority over Formosa has passed completely to the Chinese, it serves to justify the President's thinking, and his hands-off policy, but if that be true, this country has been guilty of a serious offense against international law, which requires territorial transfers to be confirmed by treaty; and the executive department has been guilty of an unpardonable offense against our constitutional processes, which require the Senate to ratify treaties.

On the other hand, if legal confirmation of the transfer can be made only by the peace treaty, Formosa has a status resembling a trusteeship until a treaty is made. In that case we, as one of the allies creating the trusteeship, are legally obliged to defend the status quo pending the signing of a treaty of peace. I ask the people of the United States, Why did we defend our sector of Berlin? Because we, as trustees, felt we had a right to hold that sector until the peace treaty should be signed. No one will contend that America wants forever to hold that sector of Berlin. We considered ourselves as trustees, we considered ourselves as being bound by international law, and even though it meant war, we said, "We will carry out the terms of that trusteeship." I see no difference between the case of the Island of Formosa and the case of our sector of Berlin.

In either case our international integrity is at issue. For that reason it is a matter which demands the fullest possible exploration.

The dilemma it represents illustrates the snarled position into which we have worked ourselves in our world position. It emphasizes that immediately we must retrench, regroup, and reform unless we are to entangle ourselves further in a manner which even the expenditure of our wealth cannot relieve.

The immediate test will be our attitude toward the recognition of Red China. Anticipating England's recognition, Pakistan, Burma, India have recognized the Communist regime in China. They did not want to be placed in the position of following Great Britain. England has extended recognition, in the hope of preserving its trade position in Asia. Other countries, such as Norway, have given recognition. The question is whether or not this country shall follow suit.

I wonder why our Government did not call to England's attention before she recognized Red China what President Coolidge said about recognition of Russia. This is what Mr. Coolidge said:

> I do not propose to barter away for the privilege of trade, any of the cherished rights of humanity. I do not propose to make merchandise of the American principle.

Had it been called to the attention of His Majesty's Government, in Great Britain that in effect the action of Britain was bartering away, for the privilege of trade in Hong Kong, the cherished rights of humanity, that it was making of the cherished rights of humanity and the principles of the British Empire merchandise for the highest bidder, the split between England and America respecting recognition, could have been avoided. England not only sold her birthright in this case for a mess of pottage, but she will be lucky if she gets a mouthful of pottage.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest they will get a mouthful of ashes.

Let me suggest to the Senator that when we recognized Russia, in the hope, entertained by many, that we would better our trade relations with Russia, the direct contrary resulted. I will ask the Senator whether he knows of any increase in our trade rights in Russia since we recognized that nation?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I do not. About all we got was a nest of espionage agents.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator is exactly right. And all we have is the trade that Russia gives to us, entirely by sufferance. We have no right to trade in Russia at all, and have not had since the recognition.

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, we get the crumbs from the table.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes. So I wonder whether we are simply preparing ourselves for the same sort of deadfall in the Orient.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall discuss that question.

Mr. President, the United States has been known to follow suit on other occasions. That is why I wish to debate this question today. In this connection, we can recall the occasion when we followed the influence of the British Labor Government by withdrawing our Ambassador from Spain. Thereafter, when the representatives of that nation came before the United Nations, seeking recognition, we even refrained from voting. Imagine that, Mr. President. The representatives of the United States of America, which is supposed to stand upon principle, walked out and took the same position that we find Communist Russia taking time after time, namely, refraining from voting because they do not want to be counted.

We have as yet failed to draw any line of resistance to communism in the Orient, outside of Japan. We backed away from it in Formosa. We can still draw a line, if we will, with a firm policy of nonrecognition.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the Senator from Michigan familiar with the letter sent out by the Communist Party of New York State, under date of March 1, 1949? I hold a photostat copy of it in my hand.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish the Senator would place it in the RECORD.

Mr. KNOWLAND. And is the Senator familiar with the fact that with the letter was sent an enclosure which included the following statement of program objectives:

> 2. Demand a new China policy.
>
> A. An end to all forms of American intervention in China and of plans to aid any elements and remnants of the Kuomintang.

Is not that the policy which, apparently, the Democratic caucus has gone on record in favor of today, namely, ending all aid to the Kuomintang in China?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think the press release so indicates.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I read further from the enclosure which was sent with the letter of March 1, 1949, by the Communist Party of New York State:

> B. Preparation by our Government to recognize the government which the people of China are now es'ablishing.

Is it not the Senator's impression that up until this most recent incident and the Angus Ward incident, the Government of the United States itself was prepared to recognize the Communist Government of China?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am very much satisfied that that is true.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I read further from the statement of program objectives accompanying the letter from the Communist Party of New York State:

> C. Planning now by our authorities for genuine and self-respecting cooperation with the people's government in China, including normal and friendly trade relations free of any political conditions.

Is it not the impression of the Senator from Michigan that up until this latest affront, we had deliberately left our consular officials behind the iron curtain in the hope of doing that very thing?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am satisfied that is true, and I think the debates on the

floor of the Senate have indicated it, namely, that we took the attitude "Let's wait until the dust settles."

Mr. President, this debate will disclose what actually occurred, and I wish to discuss the Angus Ward case and the case of the loss of our consulate at Peking.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from Michigan recall the colloquy which occured in the Senate last week between the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], during which I rose and asked the Senator from Texas what he meant when he said that all the nations of the world were about to recognize Communist China? Does the Senator from Michigan remember that statement?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do.

Mr. WHERRY. In view of the statement just made by the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan, let me ask him whether he now feels that it was the intention of our State Department to recognize the Communists at that time.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not know whether that was the intention at that particular time, and I would not wish to say at this moment what was then in the minds of the officials of the State Department, because it is difficult for the Senator from Michigan to analyze some of the things which have been occurring.

I think such a move was going on, beginning last September. What we saw in the various places we visited as we went around the world indicated that a movement was under way for all the nations to recognize Red China, and that we were negotiating with the other nations concerning the recognition of Red China.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator agree that finally the defense was made, "Well, we will not recognize them at this time, but we may do so when the government becomes stabilized"?

Does the Senator remember that?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. So, when we consider the entire sequence of events, does it not indicate that in the minds of those who have been directing the policy there has been a purpose in line with the statement made by the Senator from Texas, namely, that the major nations of the earth would recognize the Chinese Communists?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. But once a nation says it will recognize a Communist government, that makes the Communist government more powerful than ever, and it becomes that much more difficult to do business with them. Under such circumstances, we find such a government taking on certain aspects of the old tribal governments.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is not recognition of the Chinese Communist Government the perfectly logical outcome of the attitude of the Government of the United States toward Manchuria and the attitude of our Government in sending General Marshall to China in an attempt to persuade Chiang Kai-shek to take communism into his government? Is not recognition the last logical step in the process?

Mr. FERGUSON. That was Mr. Wallace's policy. Mr. Wallace returned with a report indicating—saying, in fact, in 1944—that Chiang Kai-shek could not govern any longer, that he would be "taken over" in about 60 days, that we should favor the Communists, and that the Communists would be better friends to us than the Chinese Nationalists were.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest to the Senator that that policy was adopted as the official policy of the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. So is not the recognition of that which was in effect requested, merely the logical outcome of the request?

Mr. FERGUSON. I should think so. That is why I raised my voice today on this subject, because I had, and I have, grave fear that we would not even know about it and would not have a right to say anything about it until after recognition occurred. Therefore, I think the time to debate the question of recognition or nonrecognition is now, today, so that our people may know what is going on, so that we can prevent recognition. I hope we can have a bipartisan foreign policy upon the question of recognition.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Did I correctly understand one of the Senators to say there was a Democratic caucus this morning with reference to this subject?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I read into the RECORD the press release from that caucus, and the able and distinguished majority leader gave his version of it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. So the opposition party has made the issue a completely partisan one, through the operation of its caucus?

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course, that is what is called the bipartisan foreign policy.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I see.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is called bipartisan foreign policy; but it is a policy after the fact.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Could it be claimed that those of us who at times have followed a bipartisan foreign policy are obligated now to abide by the action taken by the Democratic caucus of this morning?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I really think the President of the United States released the Senate Members on this side of the aisle from following the idea of a bipartisan foreign policy when it was decided by the President to abandon the bipartisan foreign policy, as we learn that that was agreed to, judging by his hurried press release of January 5. I think that is the time when the President said to the Nation, "Here she goes out the window; this is the end of the bipartisan foreign policy. We are going to run the show from now on. We do not even want you to think we have a bipartisan foreign policy."

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thought I heard the President of the United States say, in his message to the Congress at the recent joint session, that he hoped the bipartisan foreign policy would continue.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; but if the Senator will recall in the press release he issued at that time he did not thank the Republicans, although as he read the address to the Congress at the joint session, he had written in it and read to the Congress a statement to the effect that he thanked the Republicans for the bipartisan foreign policy.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Then, should we thank the opposition party for its caucus of this morning?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. President, let me say that I want debate, consultation, and agreement, as much as possible, on questions of foreign policy. I regret the fact that I saw our understanding of bipartisan go out the window. I am not regretful if the idea of the opposite party's bipartisanship, under which they did it all and we did nothing, went out the window, but I am hoping we can be taken in and given the facts, and that we can debate the issues. I do not think we have the evidence yet that that is going to happen. I think the fact that, as read into the record by the Senator from California, nothing was said about our consular property being taken over in China until after it was done, is not bipartisanship. I hope we can have genuine bipartisanship. For instance, we need it not only in matters of foreign policy, but let us say we need a bipartisan policy in connection with reducing expenditures of the Government, and lifting burdens from the shoulders of the American people. We need it there. We also need it on the foreign question. We need it in many places. In other words, we need it wherever there is right and justice. We ought to be together on the principle, but we ought to have the facts, first, in order to know whether the principle is right and just.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point, in view of the question of the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The second addition to the press bulletin which came out on the Senate's teletype is one in which I think both Senators will be interested. I cannot vouch for it, except to say it comes from a responsible press association.

It reads as follows:

It was made clear by other Senators present that the State Department has assured Senate Democrats that full information regarding far eastern policy will be available to the majority party in Congress. The conference action, which was not subject to a formal vote, appeared to mean concentrated majority party counterfire to GOP charges of bankruptcy in China policy and Republican demands for Acheson's ouster.

The matter was raised at a party caucus by Senators A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Democrat,

Virginia, and RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, Georgia.

ROBERTSON, who recently lunched with Acheson at the Capitol, urged all Democrats to stand back of Mr. Truman, the Secretary, and Chairman CONNALLY of the Foreign Relations Committee.

LUCAS reported practically unanimous acceptance of ROBERTSON'S plea, except from Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Democrat, Louisiana, who declared he had some doubts about Formosa's future.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate the Senator's reading the press bulletin. It would seem to indicate that the Democrats not only kicked bipartisan consideration out the window, but today the majority party put it in the ashcan.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator from Michigan and also the distinguished junior Senator from California for the illumination they have given this subject. I have voted for certain of the so-called bipartisan measures, and I have opposed others. I am now wondering what my duty is under the present circumstances. As chairman of the Republican conference, I wonder, for example, whether I should call a Republican conference, so that we may rubber-stamp what was done by the Democratic conference this morning. That would be truly bipartisan, but I am a little bit uncertain as to whether I ought to do it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am not only uncertain that the Senator ought to do it, but I should feel the Senator would find it a very difficult position to sustain before the minority conference. I am afraid the Senator would find that Senators would want a different kind of bipartisan foreign policy than one involving our being merely a rubber stamp. But of course, the Senator is in charge of the Republican conference, and I should be very glad to attend and to debate the issue.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The distinguished Senator anticipates that there might not be complete agreement among Republican Senators, if such a caucus were called, does he?

Mr. FERGUSON. Not only that there might not be complete agreement, but that there might be difficulty in obtaining any agreement.

Mr. MILLIKIN. As I recall, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan has made it very clear in his talks to the Senate that in the China field there has been no bipartisan foreign policy. Is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Bipartisan foreign policy has been rebuffed by the opposition in that field, has it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. It has.

Mr. MILLIKIN. And it was rebuffed again this morning. Is not that true?

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe it was.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wonder how many times we have to get kicked out of that house before we conclude we are not wanted, at least so far as the Chinese situation is concerned.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that any bipartisan policies were announced at Yalta before any issue was raised? Was there any bipartisan policy there?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator know anything about the agreement at Yalta?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator have any chance to vote on what was done at Yalta? Was it ever brought before the Senate? The Formosa situation is merely an incident in long years of secret agreements being made by men, not through the constitutional processes, under the theory that it was bipartisan foreign policy. I say to the Senator, a bipartisan policy in the settlement of the Formosa question is not enough. If we want to have a truly bipartisan foreign policy, we must go back to Yalta, start with what happened at Yalta, bring it right out into the open, and let the people of the United States of America know not only what was done there, but what has been done under other secret agreements. I ask the Senator, Will there ever be any peace in the world until the sins of Yalta are completely washed away?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am hoping we can establish a system by which both parties, on a global basis, not in Europe alone, but in Asia also, can act on a bipartisan basis. It has been established beyond any doubt that this side of the aisle has never been consulted in regard to Asia.

If we fail to draw the line, we simply launch ourselves into another series of entanglements and self-contradictions. It is a game we can only lose because we do not play ball the way the Communists do.

We will not be sacrificing our moral position in drawing a line against communism at the point of nonrecognition. The greatest morality of the moment is a strong position from which the rights of free institutions may be defended, and to which free people everywhere can look.

It has not generally been recognized, but the course of affairs in China is identical with the course of affairs in eastern Europe.

Both start from a basic understanding between the United States and Russia secretly adopted at Yalta, that the latter should have friendly governments on its borders. That friendly governments mean governments dominated by Moscow was understood by few of the people from the west. That a dilution of Communist control by democratic representation was impossible appears never to have been understood at all.

Our attitude was expressed by Sumner Welles in his book, Time for Decision. He was a high official of the State Department, and he was speaking on the subject of policy. He said:

> The Soviet Government is as legitimately entitled to promote a regional system of eastern Europe composed of cooperative and well-disposed governments in the countries adjacent to Russia as the United States has been justified in promoting an inter-American system of the 21 sovereign American Republics of the Western Hemisphere.

At Yalta, the President of the United States confirmed this line of thought when he wrote a letter to Premier Stalin on the subject of Poland. It has been little publicized. Let us see what the President said:

> I hope I do not have to assure you that the United States will never lend its support in any way to any provisional government in Poland that would be inimical to your interests.

I say now that if we are going to see that a government in Poland is not inimical to the interests of the Communist totalitarian state, then it is going to be a Communist totalitarian government.

Mr. James F. Byrnes, former Secretary of State, saw it more clearly. In his book he says the Soviet "idea of a friendly government was a government completely dominated by them." He failed to convince Molotov at Yalta that "Soviet security would be better assured by having in Poland a people who were friendly, rather than a government that was friendly only because it was dictated to by the Soviet Union."

Our way of filling out the formula for friendly governments was to insist upon free and unfettered elections, and democratic representation in the governments of eastern Europe. Quite naturally the accommodating Russians agreed to that formula. But it took Stalin, in a burst of candor at Potsdam, to puncture the whole bag of wind by remarking: "Freely elective governments in those countries will be anti-Soviet, and we can't allow that." And Stalin did not allow it. Nor did he do anything more than make a plaything of our stand for democratic representation in the eastern European governments. Ultimately we were reduced to a tiresome series of protests, which were entirely fruitless and which inspired replies which were not short of insulting to our intelligence and our dignity.

Take one typical example. The peace treaty with Rumania provided protection to all persons under Rumanian jurisdiction for the enjoyment of human rights and of the fundamental freedoms, including freedom of expression, of press and publication, of religious worship, of political opinion and public meeting.

Four months after the signing of the peace treaty the Rumanian Government dissolved the National Peasant Party and arrested its leader. The National Peasant Party and its leaders stood for the things that were in the treaty. Our Government protested this obvious violation of the treaty terms, and here is the answer we got:

> In principle the Rumanian Government cannot take into consideration observations and recommendations which would constitute acts of interference in its internal policy and which would thus be incompatible with the attributes of a free and sovereign state.

In other words, Rumania said to us that the signer of a treaty cannot protest that treaty's nonfulfillment because to do so would be an invasion of the violator's sovereignty.

What did we do? We rested the matter, for, if the United States were to press it further, it would be guilty of that imperialism for which the Communists have lampooned us in their propaganda and which we have shrunk from countering

in order that we might defend a moral principle. Appeasement is our reply.

In eastern Europe we were completely bamboozled, outsmarted, and trapped until we finally attempted a policy of Communist containment which was to be the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan.

In Asia there has been a deadly parallel, except that we have not yet drawn the line.

Mr. President, I feel that the thing which has happened to us is that Russia all the time had in mind taking over all Asia, and that in order to lull us into a sense of security she drew a red herring across the European nations so she could have full sway in Asia. We are just about to awaken from our slumber and see the false security Russia has held out.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator has mentioned communism taking over, country by country. A great many persons in the United States have the impression that Formosa is relatively a small and unimportant island off the coast of China. I think, by putting into the RECORD the State Department's own document today, we have at least demonstrated that competent persons in the State Department felt that it was a strategically located island.

I should like also to call the Senator's attention to the fact, so that the record may be clear, that, according to the World Almanac, Australia, in 1946, had a population of only 7,448,601 persons, and my latest information is that the island of Formosa, which has between six and one-half and seven million people who are natives of the island, plus the influx from the mainland, has probably as many people as are on the continent of Australia.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is a correct analysis, and I believe the Senator has made a very worthy contribution to the subject which we are discussing. I think the people must not lose sight of the fact that Formosa is important, as well as the fact that it represents a policy; it represents what is being done in violation of international law. If we make no issue of it we shall end up by saying nothing can be done because this question was settled at Yalta, or at Tehran, or at some other place.

Except that its premises were adopted at Yalta and were so identical with agreements for eastern Europe that they constituted a world plan, our China policy might be called the Henry Wallace plan for Asia."

Henry Wallace, it may be remembered, visited China in 1944 as Vice President of the United States. The State Department's "whitewash-paper" on China says there is no record of a report on that visit. I have reason to believe such a report exists and might be found in the archives of the Army's historical section.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall yield, and then I shall ask not to be interrupted until I can finish, for it is getting late.

Mr. KNOWLAND. A moment ago I put into the RECORD the total population of Australia. I wish also to put into the RECORD the figures for the population of Greece, appearing in the World Almanac and estimated for 1947. The figures are 7,450,000. Therefore, the island of Formosa has as many persons as have Greece and Australia. To Greece, as the Senator knows, we have already sent a mission, when Greece was disturbed by a domestic revolution, and at the proper time and place, on the floor of the Senate, I shall be prepared to quote from the speeches of the able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. CONNALLY] the importance of avoiding civil war and revolution in Greece, to show that the island of Formosa, with a population of more than seven and one-half million, is of vital importance, and that its people, as the able senior Senator from Michigan has pointed out, are entitled to some consideration before they are surrendered to the wolves of communism.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree with the Senator. Representatives of the Formosan people have a right to sit down around a conference table with representatives of all other nations, as well as other nations have the right to sit down with us on this question.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I wanted to get, if possible, the Senator's view upon this question: Does the able Senator from Michigan consider the territory of Formosa as being properly a part of China's territory?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I do not. I think that under the Sino-Japanese Peace Treaty of 1895 it became part of the Japanese nation, a part of the Empire of Japan. At the close of World War II it was surrendered to the Chinese under an order from General MacArthur, and it is now held, as are other islands, until the settlement of the peace treaty.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator recognizes as a binding and definitive document the instrument entered into between the Chinese and the Japanese after the Sino-Japanese War, and not the document entered into among the heads of Allied Powers.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is correct. One was a peace treaty and the other was a declaration.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the able Senator tell us, if he knows, what the attitude of Chiang Kai-shek is as to whether Formosa is a part of Chinese territory or is a part of Japanese territory?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have no idea. International law should control the matter with him as well as with us.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator tell us, from his study of the subject, whether the actions of Chiang Kai-shek have indicated whether he regards Formosa as a part of Chinese territory or as a part of Japanese territory?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would think, from the evidence I found, that he had treated it as Chinese territory.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. But I do not think that makes it right.

Mr. President, I have spoken of the Wallace report being in the archives of the Army's Historical Section. I think the nature of that report can be deduced on the basis of other evidence over Henry Wallace's signature. Its nature would be to discredit the Nationalists and Chiang Kai-shek, and to urge a flexible policy which would permit our doing business with the Communists, whom Wallace hopefully saw emerging as the postwar power in China.

The Marshall mission was the culmination of what I would call the Wallace plan in operation.

General Marshall was not sent there by Henry Wallace. He was sent there under the orders of the President of the United States.

The Marshall mission to China and the Hodges mission to Korea were for the purpose of introducing Communists in those Governments. Governments so established were to be Russia's "friendly neighbors" in the Orient. This was the basic Yalta agreement.

When the Chinese Nationalists refused to mix water and gasoline, an experiment we naively endorsed, they were written off our lists and left to shift for themselves against the tide of communism which rose from that point forward, with direct aid from Moscow.

The vicious part of the Wallace plan was that it appeared based on a desire of American officials and others to coerce or destroy Chiang Kai-shek which began to take shape in China in 1943.

The favoring of the Communists by the United States official action began in 1945 in Washington. The result was the President's statement on China policy of December 15, 1945.

The United States active intervention in China's internal affairs took place in a big way in China in 1946. The Marshall mission, under the direction of the President, tipped the scales against the Nationalists and for the Communists. From the time of the Marshall mission, when their success against the Reds was at its peak, the Nationalists began to sink sensationally.

There was a reason for that. We might consider the old seesaw, when the Nationalists were high with a big army, and the Communists were low without one, and ask why did the plans shift and why did the seesaw go where it is at this time? Our State Department says that is the reason we should do nothing.

General Marshall's embargo on exports of arms to China in August of 1946, at the very moment when the Soviet Union was effectively trying to set the Communists up in business with Japanese arms in Manchuria, upset the physical balance and the moral balance in favor of the Communists.

What did we do? We destroyed enormous amounts of Japanese military equipment in Japan which could have been sent to China for the Nationalists. The Soviet Union gave the Japanese arms to the Communists in China. We asked the Nationalists to wait, and the Communists would be able to get the arms, and bring them back and fight with the Nationalists; and the Nationalists did what was requested in order

to please General Marshall and the United States.

Throughout 1946 General Marshall induced the Nationalists not to fight the Communists. This delayed the Nationalist action, which probably would have been successful at that time. He gave the Communists face, and we know what face counts for in China. He gave them opportunity, and this was carried on into 1947.

He decided against giving them Marshall plan aid. When, in 1948, the Eightieth Congress voted aid to China, both military as well as economic, the administration dragged its feet on deliveries of arms and ammunitions. I made speeches against the Nationalists. Why do I say it dragged its feet? Only last week, I think unknown even to the State Department, because I am convinced that the right hand did not know what the left hand was doing, the right hand was sending some aid under the 1948 program from New Jersey, in the United States, from our own shores, while we were saying, "Hands off" in a press release, and the administration was making speeches against the Nationalists. Finally, in 1949, in issuing the white paper when it did, it struck a terrific blow under the belt which greatly impaired the waning morale of the Nationalists and greatly strengthened the Communists.

In order to get some idea of the value of the white paper, look at the way in which Russia used it in the United Nations. One would have thought it was written expressly for them, to be used against the Nationalist Government.

How we could weigh the commitment for a friendly government involved in the Marshall mission against the certain knowledge of Russian designs, and find them canceling each other out, is the real mystery of our foreign policy. But that equation is the explanation of the Chinese puzzle.

The hands-off policy we adopted in China was reasserted in the United Nations, when we found ourselves, on December 6, 1949, voting with the Russians against a proposal to investigate Chinese charges of Russian aggression, and sponsoring a resolution which in turn would be our justification for extending the hands-off policy in Formosa.

Why did we write the white paper? It does strengthen the hands-off policy we now find being used. It was used by Russia in the United Nations.

As the President quoted it, the resolution "calls on all states to refrain from (a) seeking to acquire spheres of influence or to create foreign-controlled regimes within the territory of China; and (b) seeking to obtain special rights or privileges within the territory of China."

That was on December 9, when, according to the State Department, they knew that Russia was already exercising these very influences. By this message and by this resolution we forever cut ourselves off and say, "We will have nothing to say," even though we then knew Russia was penetrating the country, and using it as a satellite, nothing more nor less. But we are paving the road to get out. As I said before, a special note was sent to the Chinese people then indicating that we would not intervene, and we in effect said that policy had been made in October. But it was made known finally to the American people and to the world by a press release.

It is apparent from the remarks of the Secretary of State at the Press Club on January 12 that our Government knew when the resolution was offered that the Soviet Union had even then acquired this very right in Mongolia, Manchuria, and northern China. As a matter of fact, it develops that we were relying on this circumstance to cause another civil war in China so that the Soviet Union's influence might be overthrown and China might again be free from the Kremlin.

I understand from what Mr. Acheson said to the Press Club that China will one day overthrow Communist rule. Can he point to one place where this has happened without outside aid? There are those who have waited since 1919 for the Russian people to overthrow communism. Does any Senator know of one place where this has happened? I know of no such place.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It might be argued that it was overthrown in Spain.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, it could be argued that it was overthrown in Spain by a war, but there are those who would contend that communism was not there. I think the Senator is correct, that it was there, and it was overthrown. I stand corrected. I think there was one place.

Yugoslavia comes closest to being such a place, outside of Spain, where some would say the people came close to overthrowing communism. But that is merely a case of national communism holding an upper hand over international communism.

If Russia has not acquired a sphere of influence, a foreign-controlled regime, or special rights or privileges in the territory of China, it is beyond the understanding of any person who has read history in recent years, or the daily papers.

Yet I foresee little prospect of our pressing our resolution in the United Nations.

From its inception, before San Francisco, we have been bamboozled, outsmarted, and trapped there by the Russians. The veto principle was agreed upon at our insistence, for instance, because we foresaw a gentleman's use of that instrument. It has been used to whiplash us, and we have avoided a show-down with the whip's user because we gave it to him, and we do not want him to walk out on the game.

The time to draw a line is now. The place, as I have said earlier, is in connection with recognition.

Our Chinese policy should be considered in relation to our foreign policy as a whole. The question of recognition should be considered in relation to world problems and questions.

A decision to recognize the Communists in China would add to rather than reduce the embarrassments and perplexities regarding the great problem of peace.

If we have any hope of recapturing our moral position before it disintegrates alongside our economic and strategic position, we must assert it by a policy of nonrecognition. We will have ample legal grounds for adopting such a policy.

Recognition is purely a matter of policy. A consideration of national interest may justify one country's recognizing another, and, likewise, a consideration of national interest may justify a policy of nonrecognition.

In international law recognition is "the assurance given to a new state that it will be permitted to hold its place or rank, in the character of an independent political organism, in the society of nations." It definitely implies a diplomatic exchange.

So far as international law goes, it involves no necessary endorsement of a nation's quality or form of government. As a matter of practice, however, this technicality of the law is overlooked by lay opinion throughout the world, and recognition carries with it in the eyes of the world public generally an endorsement of the country's form. Why, otherwise, have we withdrawn our Ambassador from Franco's Spain?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Why?

Mr. FERGUSON. We did it to satisfy a few governments in Europe. We did it because we wanted to impress the world that we wanted some reform in Spain. But in this case we could say recognition does not mean that.

I have heard it stated in the cloakrooms that recognition does not technically indicate that we approve of a government, but I say public opinion does, and we certainly save the face of the nation that is recognized.

Once extended, recognition cannot be withdrawn. Diplomatic representatives may be withdrawn and diplomatic relations broken, but recognition continues.

Except for its relations in Latin America during the revolutionary years there, and certain oddities that have resulted from the aftermath of the war such as the recognition of regimes in nonexistent countries, this Nation has well-defined and well-established tests for recognition.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the maintenance of an ambassador by us in Moscow imply approval of the regime in the Kremlin?

Mr. FERGUSON. It does in the eyes of the public. It does in the eyes of the Russian people.

Mr. McMAHON. Does it in the eyes of the American people?

Mr. FERGUSON. To many of them, yes. I think we have had an eye opener. I think we have found that Russia did not live up to her promises that she would not place espionage agents in this country, that she would not try to endeavor to establish her form of international government here.

Mr. McMAHON. I might say to the Senator from Michigan that he is now going somewhat far afield.

Mr. FERGUSON. No, the Senator from Michigan is not going far ahead.

Mr. McMAHON. The question is a simple one. Does the Senator believe the maintenance of an Embassy in Moscow is interpreted by our people as approval of the regime of the Kremlin?

Mr. FERGUSON. To a great extent yes, and in Russia fully.

Mr. McMAHON. I was not asking about Russia. I was asking about the people of this country. I may say to the Senator from Michigan that I think he would be with the minority. I have not taken any poll on the subject, and I presume the Senator has not either, but I certainly believe that the maintenance of diplomatic relations with Russia or with any of the countries which she dominates, is not interpreted by the majority of our people as being an act of approval of the way they have been acting in world affairs.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish the Senator would take a poll on that question.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield so that I may propound a question to the able Senator from Connecticut who just asked the question whether the fact that we had an ambassador in Russia would be interpreted by our people as meaning that we held a friendly attitude toward that country. I wish to propound this question to the Senator from Connecticut. Why could we not send a man holding full ambassadorial rank to Spain, just as we have sent a man of full ambassadorial rank to Russia? In what respect is there a difference?

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to answer that question by saying that the reason for withdrawing our ambassador to Spain was to impress the American people and the Spanish people with the fact that we did not agree with Franco, and therefore we did not approve of his government. So if the sending of an ambassador to Spain would mean recognition of the form of government in Spain, I think the same would apply in the case of Russia.

Mr. THYE. But I should like to have the able Senator from Connecticut answer the question whether he would recognize any specific difference between a full ambassador to Russia and a full ambassador to Spain?

Mr. McMAHON. I might say to the Senator that I do not intend to become involved in a discussion of the Spanish situation at this time. What I want to point out is simply that it has been, according to my information, the time-honored tradition of this country to have diplomatic relations with any government in the world which maintained de facto control over a sufficient period of time; in other words, which was sovereign in its own area. I think a departure from that principle is something which is not justified by our history and our precedents. To me it looks now as though a majority of the nations which acted in the General Assembly some 3 years ago in withdrawing their ambassadors from Spain, made a strategic mistake, because that is not the way, I might say to my friends, in which countries should express their approval or disapproval of a regime in another country. The ambassador is not there for the convenience of the people of the country to which we send an ambassador. He is there for our convenience. He is there as our ambassador, as our listening post. We must look at this matter, it seems to me, realistically and objectively, and add up the advantages and disadvantages to us.

I think the Senator realizes how I feel about the 14 men who are ruling Russia today, and ruling so many other hundreds of millions of people. The Senator is in no doubt as to my sentiments respecting those 14 gentlemen. At the same time I believe we are better off by having an ambassador in Moscow who can inform us to the best of his ability as to the situation there, than we would be if we did not have that listening post there.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut another question. I interpret his statement to mean that the State Department is really inconsistent in first recognizing Russia and sending a full-fledged ambassador to Russia, but denying the United States the right to receive the same kind of intelligent report, so to speak, from Spain by having a full-fledged ambassador in Spain. The State Department, according to the Senator's own statement, is inconsistent. I personally have somewhat the same conviction the Senator from Connecticut has expressed. It is for that reason I asked the Senator from Connecticut the question whether the State Department is not inconsistent in denying Spain a full-fledged ambassador, and at the same time assigning a full-fledged ambassador to Russia.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I might point out to the Senator from Minnesota that we do have a chargé d'affaires, we do have a fully operating mechanism inside Spain. The Senator was present as a guest of the Foreign Relations Committee the other day and he heard the Secretary of State discuss our relations, not only in the Far East, but in western Europe as well. The session was an executive one, and I do not intend to pursue that subject any further. I simply wish to say that I do not think the present is a proper time to go into a discussion of the Spanish situation, which has many, many ramifications which cannot be understood unless many circumstances and facts are examined. I do not intend to do that extemporaneously in the process of this debate. I still say that the conception that the purpose of having an ambassador in a foreign country is to please the people of that country, is totally at variance with our history and with what I regard to be common sense. He is there in order to serve us.

The Senator can say, "If that be true, then we ought to have a full-fledged ambassador in Spain to serve us in our relations with Spain." That is a subject which I do not see at this time to be apropos. I merely again assert the fact that our Ambassador in Moscow is there for our convenience and not for the convenience of the gentlemen of the Kremlin.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether the Senator from Connecticut would answer the question as to whether he believes that Red China should be recognized.

Mr. McMAHON. I would say to the Senator that I am not prepared to come to a conclusion on that matter today. The action taken in Peiping last week certainly did not predispose me to grant recognition. After all, if it was the idea of the men who are now in control of China that we could be forced into taking action because of what they did, I think they misjudged the situation. As to what I would say 6 months or a year from now the Senator from Connecticut cannot answer the Senator from Michigan, because I do not know what the facts then may be. However, I again would like to say, if the Senator will indulge me, that we apparently have started on a long-distance talkathon upon the subject of Formosa.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator has not cut it down today.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator for his implied compliment. I have not attempted to speak at length on this subject, and perhaps, in view of the Senator's remark, I should immediately desist. I do not wish to trespass on his time. I realize the Senator has a 5-hour speech, and perhaps he should have been permitted to go through it without interruption. But I will say to the Senator again that he cannot change the fundamental facts that the future of our relations with the Soviet Government will not be affected materially by whatever happens to Formosa. That will be determined upon a different basis, upon different events, with which many of us here in the Chamber are only too familiar.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I cannot follow the logic of the Senator with respect to our having an ambassador to one country for our convenience, and then withdrawing him to impress the people of America with the fact that we do not agree with the government of the country to which he was sent, while to another country we send an ambassador, and do so solely because it is for our convenience that he should be there, and then we find that government seizing the property occupied by the ambassador, and yet we do not withdraw him. I simply cannot follow that type of logic. But I understand that within the next few months, as the dust settles, it will become the policy to recognize Red China. There will probably be no sadder words uttered than those words of recognition.

Mr. President, I hope that America will be prepared for the news when and if the time comes that we recognize Red China. I hope we shall have debated the subject, even though it may take a number of hours. I said when I began my remarks, that I wanted, that I welcomed a debate on this important subject.

Secretary Hull in 1936 quoted an instruction dated in 1900 and which itself

cited practice for over a century, as follows:

> The rule of the United States is to defer recognition of another executive * * * until it shall appear that it is in possession of the machinery of state, administering the government with the assent of the people thereof and without substantial resistance to the obligations and responsibilities incumbent upon a sovereign state under treaties and international law.

We have to look at what happened in Russia and what happened in China on the 6th of this month, and what happened in the Angus Ward case. But, Mr. President, our sad plight is that we learn from history the fact that we do not learn from history; that is the correct application of the old axiom.

The history of our recognition policy toward Soviet Russia illustrates the application of these tests. One might add that the history of our relations with Russia since recognition in 1933 proves also how unreliable can be the terms of a recognition of any Communist regime.

Secretary Hughes, in 1923, stated that the United States did not intend to recognize Soviet Russia until Russia acknowledged its liability for the debts contracted by previous governments of Russia, agreed to make restitution to American citizens whose property was confiscated, and ceased its revolutionary activity in the United States.

Mr. President, it was only a few months ago that, in New York City, there was a trial of 11 men who had been carrying on revolutionary activities in the United States of America, instigated from the Kremlin, the same Kremlin which, back in 1933, was recognized by our country under the solemn pledge that they would cease their revolutionary activities in the United States. Yet now, when our country is even considering the recognition of another Communist regime, Members of the Senate are saying on the floor of the Senate that they do not know what developments 6 months' time will bring forth. Mr. President, what have the years between 1933 and 1950 brought forth? They have brought forth nothing but absolute proof that we cannot recognize a Communist regime and be able to depend upon the terms of the recognition.

Also in 1923, President Coolidge put the case in a manner which, as I have said, should have been brought to the attention of Britain before her recognition of Red China. Britain consulted the United States of America in regard to what to do in this case. Why did not our State Department officials tell Britain what President Coolidge said in 1923? Let me refer to a conversation I had with the British Foreign Minister when I was in Britain. I was there for 1 day only; and in that connection let me point out that we find that Mr. Jessup spent only 2 days on Formosa getting "all the facts." When we were in Britain we know that Britain was going to recognize China. When we were in Hong Kong we knew that Britain was going to recognize China. But, as I have said, it is too bad that we do not have evangelists for the American way, rather than apologists for what we are doing. Oh, for someone to have called to Bevin's attention what President Coolidge said about the recognition of a Communist government. Let me read it to the Senate:

> Our Government offers no objection to the carrying on of commerce by our citizens with the people of Russia. Our Government does not propose, however, to enter into relations with another regime which refuses to recognize the sanctity of international obligations.
>
> I do not propose to barter away for the privilege of trade any of the cherished rights of humanity. I do not propose to make merchandise of any American principles.

Mr. President, that was good advice; that was sound logic; that was sound reasoning. That was the reason why the United States of America did not recognize Red Russia.

In 1933 President Roosevelt and Ambassador Litvinov exchanged notes in which the latter gave assurance that if the United States would recognize Russia that country would do certain things in accordance with its obligations at international law. The prime emphasis was on an assurance that Russia would not promote any subversive activity in this country. On the basis of those assurances, recognition was granted. However, at the trial of the case in April of 1949, in New York City, we had absolute proof that the Russian Government did not cease promoting subversive activities in our country, and had no intention of doing so.

Mr. President, I ask the Senate of the United States and the people of the United States, how long must we see these incidents, but pay no attention to them? How long must we know what communism stands for, but pay no attention to it?

Let us go back in history a little, to the time when Hitler wrote Mein Kampf. In that book he told the world exactly what he wanted to do. Did we pay any attention to it? No, Mr. President—not until it was too late, not until we had gotten into the Second World War.

Joe Stalin has written his intentions and his policy in a manner that all the world can see, in a way that everyone can read. Yet some of the Members of the Senate are blind to what he has written, and do not understand what communism is. Mr. President, until we understand these things, we shall become involved in inconsistencies, in trouble, and in wars.

On the basis of the legal tests which we have established, and on the basis of our experience with Communist governments for the past 17 years, I am of the firm opinion that from this time forward we should grant no recognition to any Communist regime.

Our experience with Communist regimes proves conclusively, beyond reasonable doubt, that we cannot expect anything but substantial resistance to obligations and responsibilities under treaties and international law.

The files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation on the activities of diplomats and others coming from Communist nations who have diplomatic immunity should show—and I say will show—our State Department what we can expect a Chinese Communist embassy, so far as espionage and subversive activities are concerned. I take it that those files are open to the Secretary of State and to others in the State Department, so that they may read what is contained in them. I say they will prove conclusively what will happen if we recognize another Communist regime. Certainly we can expect no reciprocity whatsoever in the exchange of diplomatic representatives. There is no quid pro quo with Communists.

To have diplomatic intercourse with a Communist regime is merely to lift the iron curtain long enough for it to be dropped a few yards from the Embassy door. Senators should read General Bedell Smith's statement about how he was treated while he was our Ambassador to Russia. I once spent some time with a British Ambassador, discussing how the British were treated in Moscow. Anyone who has discussed that matter with one who has spent any time in Moscow as a diplomat, knows that the iron curtain is pulled down right beside the door of the Embassy; and anyone who leaves the Embassy to go outdoors there, can do so only when under Russian guard.

Since our municipal laws do not allow the restrictions upon movement and activity to which our diplomats behind the iron curtain are accustomed, recognizing a Communist regime means, in our case, setting loose within this country a new horde of espionage agents cloaked with diplomatic immunities and privileges. Their activities are flagrant violations of international law, against which we are almost wholly powerless to guard.

Following such recognition, we can only expect further outrages of mistreatment against persons and property, in violation of international law, as represented by the treatment of Angus Ward; of the two downed American fliers in China, Meschter and Willis; of the two ship's officers who were kidnaped and taken to Korea; and the treatment of our businessmen in Hungary.

From Red China we can expect no regard for the treaties made with China, for the new regime denies that it is the successor of the Republic of China.

Here is what our State Department said in regard to the seizure of American consular property in Peking on January 13, 1950:

> This violation of consular property has arisen in almost immediate sequence to the harsh and unjustified treatment of the United States Consular General, Angus Ward, and his staff at Mukden. It also is one in a long series of mistreatment of Americans which includes the beating of Vice Consul Olive in Shanghai and the continued detention of Messrs. Smith and Bender, United States naval personnel.

Mr. President, let all of us consider those incidents. Let us realize that all the facts about the Angus Ward case are known by our officials, for he has returned to the United States. I had the privilege of talking to him today. I was trying to understand why China would do such a thing, why China would seize our property the day following our saying we would not defend Formosa. Mr. President, do you know why the Chinese Communists acted that way? They did so because they wanted to demonstrate,

for political, propaganda purposes, "We have a strong government in China. We, the Communists, can stand up to the big United States, and we can say to it, 'You cannot appease us. We won't recognize the fact that you say you will not help Communist China. We are going to tell you, big America, where your place is. We are going to take over your consular property'." And they did take it over.

What shall we do about it? What we did when Mr. Ward, in Mukden, was asked whether he had the title to certain property there in his possession? He replied, "No, I am only an administrative officer, the titles would be in Washington," to which the Communists replied, "If you do not have the titles, we will take them over." Let us consider the Ward case. Is it something new? It has gone on for 14 months. Mr. Ward was put behind the iron curtain. He was detained for 13 months, while at the same time the United States of America was carrying on, sending ships into Shanghai. How are we to expect a consular agent to feel when he is imprisoned, and when his Government is not doing anything about it, but when, in fact, his Government is trading with the enemy of its own people? Why did the Communists do it? They did it to defy big America. They did it for propaganda purposes. All over China, wherever it was possible to circulate the story, the Chinese people were told "America is the imperialist, who has agents in this country." How did they do this? They put Ward in prison, and then, let us imagine, they put in the Chinese newspapers that he was the head of the espionage agents in China for capitalist America. Did they ever try him on that charge? No, except after he was leaving.

Let me cite the facts. They did not have a case against Ward as being an espionage agent. They could not put him on trial on that charge. But the stooges of the Kremlin trumped up a case against him. Oh, yes; they hoped Ward would break down, after 28 days in prison, when the frost was on the windows and when he had on only a suit of clothes. For 28 long days he remained in prison. Thank God, he was a character who would not sign a confession in order to obtain his release. It was offered to him the easy way, many times. Mr. Ward comes from Michigan. Men of Michigan are made of firmer stuff than to give the Communists a confession, which in this case would have been absolutely false, to back up their propaganda. Mr. Ward had spent 14 years in Soviet Russia. He knew what to expect. He knew when he was put in prison what they would try to do in order to obtain a confession. But he and his chief man stood up and said, "No." If death came, death would have to come, but he was not going to sell America short for Communist propaganda purposes. Does he believe that Mao is a Tito? No. No; these people are trained in Russia. They know nothing but the Russian method. Everything that was done in relation to his trial was identical with what would happen in Russia and with what has happened in Russia. The attempt to obtain confessions proceeded. The confession of the Italian who was in our embassy, absolutely false as it was, bolstered up their propaganda. They even got a Japanese to confess, though the confession was later repudiated by him. Then what did they do? They could not press the espionage charge against Ward. They put him in prison and tried him for assault and battery alleged to have been committed upon a Chinese servant. The case had been trumped up from beginning to end. All the men were tried. I wish I could relate graphically how it all happened, how efforts were made to wring confessions from them. The prisoners had no counsel at the trial, no right to ask questions, no right to contradict anyone. The man who had conducted the efforts to obtain a confession from Ward sat as one of the three judges during the trial. He sat at a desk, holding a paper on which questions were written. He held them in a newspaper, so they could not be seen. He asked slanting questions; for example, "What did you do?" Or "Did you not do this, after you beat this man?" They have learned that technique from us. We can remember the question, "When did you quit beating your wife?" It is the same technique.

What did they do? They found everyone in the embassy guilty of assault and battery and ordered them deported. There were three Russians working for our embassy. They were found guilty. Were they deported? No. Immediately after the conviction, when it was learned that three Russians had been convicted and ordered deported, their consular agent called and had the sentence stayed or rescinded, so far as the three Russians were concerned. That is the way they do business. What a great lift it gave those few Russians there. Let me say, what a great lift it gave to the trained Communists. Their men were out. The sentence was set aside so far as they were concerned. It was told to all the Chinese people, "Russia is our aid, our assistant." The Communists are in China for the sole purpose of delivering to the Communists the goods, chattels, and wealth of China.

Mr. Acheson feels that eventually the Chinese will overthrow the Communist regime. I do not want to wait that long. I think we ought to give the moral support we can. Then what did they do with Ward? After he was convicted in the assault case, which was trumped up, he was tried in absentia on the espionage charge, and they found him guilty. They found him guilty of being the top espionage agent for all the capitalistic nations. He was tried without being present or being allowed to call any witnesses in his behalf. He was deported together with all the other defendants in the case. The charge against him was made for propaganda effect on the minds of the people.

Our State Department could not see what went on in the Ward case. It could not see exactly what was going on in the consular case, on the 13th of December.

Mr. President, if the facts stated do not prove that this Communist nation should never be recognized by the United States of America, what proof does the United States of America need? Angus Ward is a witness to the fact, and our State Department knows his testimony to be true. I say we cannot expect Red China to recognize any international law.

For all these reasons we must not abandon our historic tests and recognize any Communist regime in the future. But there is another and more impelling reason for withholding recognition from Red China.

Nonrecognition of Red China would be the first step in putting an end to the appeasement policies we have entered so blindly, time after time, in recent years. These policies have led us out on one limb after another as we have sought to hold up our end of a bad bargain, while the Communists have scooted off into the night.

It would be a reassertion of that determination to place right above might which had a parallel application in the Stimson doctrine of not recognizing the fruits of territorial aggression, and which did so much to bring America of age and elevate it in the eyes of men the world over.

It would be a beacon of light for all the people of southeast Asia who are hopefully looking to us for some signal that we expect them to hold the line against communism. It would be the first step in regaining our dignity and strength before a world which is alarmed to see us jump when the Communists pull the string. It would reverse years of bamboozlement, trapping, and outsmarting. It would be late, but, I hope, not too late.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the able Senator from Michigan whether he is familiar with the article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune this morning, entitled "Must General Bradley Testify?" and written by Mr. Walter Lippmann? Mr. Lippmann is normally a very competent and very observant reporter, but he apparently received some misinformation. He indicates that there has been a suggestion on the part of Senators that, when Secretary Johnson and General Bradley appear before the Foreign Relations Committee, they appear in a public session. I certainly know of no Senator who has made any suggestion, in connection with the taking of testimony dealing with the strategic defense of the country, that either Mr. Johnson or General Bradley testify in public. But there has been a demand that the Senate of the United States, through its Foreign Relations Committee, and the House, through its Committee on Foreign Affairs, ascertain whether the State Department was given advice to the effect that Formosa had no strategic value. That is an entirely different suggestion from the one outlined by Lippmann this morning.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan has never heard anyone even suggest that those witnesses be heard in public.

OUR BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, every day that passes confronts us with mounting evidence to prove that our bipartisan

foreign policy has been, and continues to be, a gigantic hoax.

For the past several days, this evidence has derived from the discussions on the Senate floor of the debacle which our pro-Communist State Department policy has brought about in China.

Even the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan now has admitted that the Republicans on the Foreign Relations Committee have never been consulted.

The senior Senator from New Jersey, also a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, has gone so far as to admit that he felt himself, "An unwelcome meddler in a policy that had already been determined."

Certainly, the recent antics of the Secretary of State, during his secret testimony before the Foreign Relations Committees of both Houses of Congress, and his refusal to discuss the role which our national defense officials have played in determining our disastrous policy in the Far East, are added proof of how vicious a hoax our so-called bipartisan policy really is.

Even the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has admitted that such evidence is "indispensable."

I am informed that at long last the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been overruled and that the committee has voted to ask the Joint Chiefs of Staff to testify on these matters on January 26.

Yet, confronted as these men are by the "gag rule" that has been imposed on members of the armed services, our chances of getting a realistic picture that deviates from the official line are slim indeed, particularly since the Democratic Members have caucused and have determined that that will be the official line.

This afternoon, however, I want to bring to the attention of the American people additional proof of how the bipartisan foreign policy continues to betray their vital interests, not only in the Pacific, but in Europe as well.

Mr. President, I refer to the fact that at this very moment our policies toward the defeated peoples in central Europe are making a mockery of every single one of the European programs into which we have entered since the end of the war, and which we are continuing to finance.

To be more specific, I refer to the continued dismantling of the peacetime industrial potential of the German people.

I want to ask my colleagues in the Senate, more particularly my colleagues of either party who are members of the Foreign Relations Committee, when they have ever been formally consulted on or when they have ever formally endorsed this dismantling program either before or since its inception?

I am convinced the record will show that at no time has the Senate of the United States either been consulted, or given any opportunity whatever to participate in the formulation, the endorsement, and the carrying out of this policy, which today, 5 years after the war is over, at the continued expense of the American taxpayer, continues to gnaw at the economic vitals of German and European recovery.

Think of it, Mr. President. The same Department of State officials, who have been responsible for the calamity we confront in the Far East, are also responsible for the origin and the continued suicidal destruction of this dismantling program which is being forced on the German people.

What more convincing evidence could be found to discredit our bipartisan policy as a gigantic hoax, than the following?

In the first place, Mr. President, this senseless destruction of the economic potential, which is so desperately needed for the maintenance of even a minimum standard of living, is costing the American taxpayers $1,000,000,000 a year.

In the face of our so-called all-out anti-Communist cold war this policy of vengeance now constitutes a dagger of treason that is being twisted in the back of the Marshall plan, ECA's integration of the European economy, the Truman doctrine, and the North Atlantic Pact.

What is even more outrageous, Mr. President, is the disposition of these plants which are being destroyed.

The industrial potential which they represent continues to be allocated behind the iron curtain, bolstering the Russian designs against the west, because Britain is continuing to ship material through the British zone to the east and because Czechoslovakia and Albania, who are nothing but Stalin's stooges, continue to sit as members of the inter-Allied reparations agencies in Brussels, and continue to function as the regular recipients of Germany's industrial potential, with the American taxpayer continuing to foot the bill.

Think of it, Mr. President. Today, 5 years after the end of the war, this senseless policy of destruction is continuing to go on without its ever having been presented to the United States Senate for consideration.

This senseless destruction continues in spite of the fact that, first, it is in plain violation of the directives for the treatment of captured enemy property which are contained in the training manual for military officers in the Charlottesville (Va.) Officer's Training School of the United States Army.

Second, this senseless destruction is in direct violation of the plain mandate of the Constitution that captured enemy property is the property of the United States Government and the President has not the authority to give away even a toothpick.

Third, Mr. President, this senseless destruction and confiscation of Germany's industrial potential is in violation of the provisions of the international law which were written at The Hague Conference of 1908 for the specific protection of the private property of defeated people against confiscation by the victors.

I would remind my colleagues and the American people that these provisions of The Hague Conference are the basis of international law that protects the concept of private property upon which our own social and economic system is based.

Fourth, this senseless destruction continues in spite of the fact that, suicidal as they were, the provisions of the infamous Yalta agreement at least put a 2-year time limit on savage policies of destruction.

Fifth, Mr. President, this senseless destruction continues in violation of the revised provisions of the Potsdam agreement which put a February 2, 1948, dead line on dismantling.

Sixth, even though the Congress of the United States has never been consulted in the formulation of this policy, and has sought indirectly to exercise some control over its continuation, by the appointment of special committees to study the matter, the records show, Mr. President, that the basic recommendations of the Colmer committee, of the Hoover committee, of the Kennan committee, of the Wolfe committee, and of the Humphrey committee itself have been flouted or ignored.

Seventh, Mr. President, the continuation of this senseless destruction has been carried on in violation of the specific promises and pledges of the administration representatives that the whole question of German dismantlement, if left in their hands, would be determined by the sole consideration of the greatest contribution the dismantling program could make to the reconstruction of the European economy.

Mr. President, I want to emphasize the following charges to prove that the administration has had no intention whatever of accounting for the actions it has taken or the policy it has pursued in this field since it began.

I have been informed that there is not in existence today any formal list of end uses to which dismantled German industrial potential has been put on the other side of the iron curtain, although we know that Russia has collected nearly $14,000,000,000 in reparations.

There is not in existence a single formal list of the end uses to which this dismantling equipment has been put on this side of the iron curtain.

This means that today there is no way by which a United States Senator can hold this administration to account for the economic insanity, the terrifying waste and destruction that has followed in the wake of this dismantling insanity.

There is not in existence today, Mr. President, a single list even of those plants that have been partially destroyed, to implement the so-called prohibited industrial agreement of last April.

There is not in existence, to my knowledge, Mr. President, not only a single reliable list of plants that have been dismantled for reparations, but there is no list of those which have been turned over to other nations under a so-called policy of "restitution."

Eighth, Mr. President, this senseless process of destruction continues to go on and is excused on the basis of the plea, that "it is in the clean-up stage," which is merely another way of giving the same men who have been responsible in the past blanket power to drag this destruction on indefinitely into the future.

For instance, I am informed that licenses to operate have been denied many of those plants that have been removed from the reparations list.

Mr. President, on October 17, 1949, Senate Resolution 187 was submitted on the Senate floor following a bipartisan petition of 44 Senators to the President

stating that it was the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of State be requested to ask President Truman to review this whole dismantling problem.

There were two resolutions, as a matter of fact. Senate Resolution 187 was submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. That Senate resolution is still pending. It was promised an early hearing by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I wish to ask now, has anything been done with regard to this resolution?

It was at the insistence of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that this resolution was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, and, as I have said, it was sidetracked, and remains undisposed of.

On November 24, following the adjournment of Congress, a sop was thrown to the Senate by the Department of State, in the form of concessions embodied in the Bonn agreement, by which twenty-odd plants were removed from the reparation list in exchange for the new German Government's agreement to hasten the destruction of all the other 100-odd plants that remained to be dismantled.

In other words, Mr. President, the Department of State used the threat of continuing dismantlement to force the new German Government to agree to a policy that would destroy jobs for German workers, impoverish German families, undermine the already shaky economic foundations of the German people, and play directly into the hands of Communist propaganda.

As a result, Mr. President, on December 6, 1949, the European branch of the Office of International Trade, in the Department of Commerce, issued a pamphlet titled "Reparation News," a copy of which I hold in my hand.

This document states:

The Interallied Reparations Agency has announced that 138 German war and industrial plants containing general-purpose equipment adaptable for peacetime production will be allocated as reparation among the western allied nations, including the United States, in the near future, according to the information received by the Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce.

Think of it, Mr. President, 138 plants containing "general-purpose equipment adaptable for peacetime production" still had not been allocated to other nations.

As of this very moment, Mr. President, the German section of the Department of State has not the slightest notion of the stages of dismantlement to which this policy of destruction has been pushed, or of the present status of this list of 138 plants which are "adaptable to peacetime production."

And this outrageous policy continues to go on in Germany, Mr. President, in spite of the fact that on May 12, 1949, Gen. Frank R. McCoy issued a unilateral statement in which the United States repudiated its Japanese reparation program, and put an end to an identical policy of senseless destruction in Japan.

This action was taken, Mr. President, in spite of the violent opposition of other members of the Far Eastern Commission who were scheduled to be recipients of additional Japanese industrial potential.

I call attention to this matter because I believe the conduct of our foreign relations, as revealed by the handling by the Department of State of our foreign relations both in the Far East and in Europe, conclusively demonstrates how this administration has used the fraudulent slogan of bipartisan cooperation to usurp the basic policy-determining and treaty-making power of the United States Senate to silence all criticism, to strangle all opposition, and to make and break foreign commitments, in the name of the United States Government and of the American people, without having to be responsible to anyone.

What more proof do my colleagues need than that I have just presented to them, to enlist them in support of a move to put an end to this senseless policy of destruction in Germany, and restore some semblance of sanity to our dealings not only with a defeated people, but with the European peoples as a whole before it is too late?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the documents from which I have quoted be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPARATION NEWS

I. FINAL DUE DATE FOR ALLOCATION OF GERMAN REPARATION PLANTS

The Inter-Allied Reparations Agency has announced that 138 German war and industrial plants containing general-purpose equipment adaptable for peacetime production will be allocated as reparation among the western allied nations, including the United States, in the near future, according to information received by the Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce. These plants are as follows:

GROUP I. DUE DATE: DEC. 15, 1949

Serial No.	Plant	Location	Description
1065, B/S/474	Pressmetall G. m. b. H	Hamburg-Bahrenfeld	Plant for production of aircraft parts.
1076, B/S/367	Teuto-Metallwerke G. m. b. H	Osnabruck	Plant for production of ammunition.
1179, B/S/301	Bernhard Bruns	Bad Zwischenahn	Part plant comprising equipment for the production of torpedoes, aircraft parts, and parts for naval craft.
1181, B/S/378	Weser Flugzeugbau	Nordenham, Oldenburg	Plant for the repair of aircraft.
1182, B/S/377	do	Einswarden, Weser Marsch, Oldenburg.	Do.
1184, B/S/376	do	Lemwaerden, Oldenburg	Plant for production of aircraft.
1193/1, B/S/485	Kampnagel, A. G	Hamburg	Part plant comprising part of the equipment for the production of conveyors.
1262, B/S/335	Kurt Heber Maschinen und Apparate Fabrik.	Osterode/Harz	Plant for the production of electrical equipment for aircraft.
1301, B/S/11	Bochumer Verein Gusstahlfabrikation A. G. Edwin Dranz Works.	Bunde	Part plant for the production of tools and equipment for shell manufacture.
1303, B/S/12	Bochumer Verein Gusstahlfabrikation A. G. (Jollenbeck Works).	Jollenbeck	Part plant for the machining of shell cases.
1333, B/S/62	Bohler Gebr. & Co., A. G. Edelstahlwerk Duesseldorf.	Duesseldorf-Oberkassel	Part plant comprising 1 electric arc furnace.
1337, B/S/94	Dortmund Hoerde Huettenverein Dortmund Works.	Dortmund	Part plant comprising forging section.
1376, B/S/373	Vereinigte Wollwarenfabriken, G. m. b. H.	Hameln-Weser	Part plant for the production of special nuts for aircraft.
1385, B/S/41	Veltrup Werke A. G	Aachen	Plant for the production of parts for aircraft and armaments.
1429, B/S/395	Osnabruecker Kupfer-u. Drahtwerk	Osnabrueck	Part plant comprising steel wire drawing plant.
1472/2, B/S/366	Stahlwerke G. m. b. H	Wateustedt Braunschueig	Part plant for the production of shell and gun parts.
1478, B/S/383	Wilhelm Schmidding	Linden	Part plant for the production of aircraft and mine cases.
1483, B/S/17	Dynamit A. G	Foerde, near Grevenbrueck	Plant for the production of explosives and ignitors.
1486, B/S/67	Kloeckner Werke A. G. Haspe Works	Hagen-Haspe	Part plant comprising 1 electric arc furnace.
1495 B/S/24	Heindrichs und Auffermann A. G., Works No. 1.	Wuppertal-Oberbarmen	Part plant for production of bomb cases and armor plates for aircraft.
1496 B/S/35	Ruhrmetallwarenfabrik G. m. b. H	Neheim Huesten, Kreis Arnsberg.	Plant for the production of fuses and shell parts.
1498 B/S/27	Kieserling und Albrecht Works No. 2	Solingen-Ohligs	Plant for the production of shells.
1530 B/S/125	A. G. fuer Stickstoffdunger	Knapsack	Part plant comprising (a) the section for the production of activated carbon; (b) part of the section for the production of acetone from acetic acid.
1566, B/S/129	Henkel & Cie. G. m. b. H	Dusseldorf	Part plant comprising (a) part of the section for the production of soap powder; (b) part of the section for distillation of glycerin.
1568, B/S/127	Dynamit A. G	Schlebusch	Part plant comprising (a) the section for the distillation of glycerin; (b) part of the section for the production of trinitrotoluene.
1574, B/S/137	Kabelwerk Duisburg Abteilung Zuenderfabrik.	Mulheim	Plant for the production of fuses and detonators.
1575, B/S/142	Vereinigte Zuender und Kabelwerke	Lage/Lippe	Plant for the production of fuses.
1606 B/S/500	August-Thyssen-Huette A. G. Vulkan works.	Duisburg-Hochfeld	Part plant comprising 2 blast furnaces and ancillary equipment.
1618, B/S/74	Eisenwerk Milspe Dr. Ing. Karl Welken.	Milspe	Part plant comprising steel-making equipment and steel foundry.
1620, B/S/71	Ed. Breitenbach G. m. b. H	Weidenau (Sieg)	Part plant comprising 1 electric arc furnace.
1623, B/S/80	Gusstahlwerk Wittmann A. G	Hagen Haspe	Part plant comprising 3 converters with ancillary equipment.

GROUP I. DUE DATE: DEC. 15, 1949—continued

Serial No.	Plant	Location	Description
1627, B/S/75	Eisenwerk Wanheim G. m. b. H.	Duisburg-Wanheim	Part plant comprising steel-making equipment and part of the section for the production of drop forgings.
1628, B/S/73	Deutsche Eisenwerke A. G. Hilden Works.	Hilden	Part plant comprising part of steel-making equipment.
1629, B/S/70	Joachim Baumgart Stahl u. Tempergiesserei.	Tonisheide	Part plant comprising 1 electric arc furnace.
1630, B/S/450	Ahlmann-Carlshuette K. G.	Rendsburg	Part plant comprising steel-making equipment.
1635, B/S/390	Bockhoff & Co., Eisengiesserei, Ofen, u. Herdfabrik.	Leer (Ostfriesland)	Part plant comprising steel-making equipment and steel foundry.
1637, B/S/348	Maschinenfabrik Niedersachen Hannover (MNH) G. m. b. H.	Linden	Plant for the production of tanks and tank parts.
1648, B/S/36	Ruhrstahl A. G.	Witten	Part plant for the production of aircraft parts. (Previously installed at Bochum Querenberg).
1656, B/S/89	Bochumer Verein fuer Gusstahlfabrikation A. G., Stahlindustrie Works.	Bochum	Part plant comprising part of the section for the production of drop forgings.
1667, B/S/104	"Kronprinz" A. G. fuer Metallindustrie, Hilden Works.	Hilden	Plant for the production of seamless precision tubes.
1677, B/S/118	Wickede Eisen u. Stahlwerk G. m. b. H.	Wickede (Ruhr)	Part plant for the production of cold-rolled strip.
1680, B/S/497	Mannesmannroehrenwerke	Finnentrop (Sauerland)	Part plant comprising 1 sheet bar mill and ancillary equipment.
1681, B/S/143	Ferd. Wecke, Nachf.	Wuppertal	Plant for the production of pyrotechnics.
1684, B/S/146	W. Arendt Maschinenfabrik	Koeln-Niehl	Plant for the production of pneumatic locomotives, pumps, and compressors.
1686, B/S/148	Autogenwerk Sirius	Duesseldorf	Plant for the production of gas-welding and cutting equipment.
1687, B/S/149	Victor Bauer Maschinenfabrik	Troisdorf b. Koeln	Plant for the production of metallurgical equipment.
1690, B/S/153	E. Benninghoren	Hilden	Plant for the production of lifts and elevators, and equipment for building and road construction.
1694, B/S/157	August Bilstein	Altenvoerde	Part plant comprising the equipment for the production of equipment for building and road construction.
1695, B/S/158	Bischoff Werke KG	Recklinghausen	Part plant comprising the equipment for the production of conveyors and cableways.
1699, B/S/162	A. Budich	Gladbeck	Plant for the production of equipment for building and road construction.
1700, B/S/163	Arnold Buerstinghaus	Engelskirchen	Plant for the production of small tools.
1701, B/S/164	J. Christgen	Dortmund-Hoerde	Plant for the production of conveyors.
1703, B/S/166	Demag A. G.	Wetter/Ruhr	Part plant comprising part of the equipment for the production of hoists, winches, and cranes.
1705, B/S/168	Demag, G. m. b. H.	Duesseldorf-Benrath	Part plant comprising part of the equipment for the production of metallurgical equipment, machinery for the gas and water industry.
1711, B/S/174	F. Duerholdt	Wuppertal-Barmen	Plant for the production of boilers, tank work, and pipe lines.
1713, B/S/176	Eichelberg & Co. G. m. b. H.	Iserlohn	Plant for the production of accessories and fittings.
1714, B/S/177	Eisenwerk Hugo Brauns	Dortmund	Plant for the production of conveyors.
1716, B/S/180	Erboe Maschinenbau (Erley & Boeninger).	Hasslinghausen	Do
1717, B/S/181	Fuchs Gebr.	Kann	Plant for the production of accessories and fittings.
1719, B/S/183	F. Geldbach	Gelsenkirchen	Do.
1720, B/S/184	Gertges & Co.	Homberg	Part plant comprising the equipment for the production of cranes.
1725, B/S/190	H. & G. Grossman	Dortmund	Plant for the production of hoists and winches.
1728, B/S/194	Gutehoffnungshuette Oberhausen A. G.	Oberhausen, Sterkrade	Part plant comprising part of the equipment for the production of foundry machinery and equipment, and the equipment for the production of boilers, tankwork and pipe lines, hoists and winches.
1731, B/S/197	Hamelrath & Schwenzer	Duesseldorf	Plant for the production of pumps.
1732, B/S/198	Hugo Hammelsbeck	Rodenkirchen	Plant for the production of lifts and elevators.
1735, B/S/201	Heinrichsglueck (K. & M. Beth)	Salchendorf, Nuenkirchen	Plant for the production of forgings, accessories and fittings.
1737, B/S/203	H. Herring & Sohn, Hesonwerk	Milspe	Plant for the production of foundry machinery and equipment.
1743, B/S/209	Indapp J. Volpert	Warstein	Plant for the production of metallurgical smelting equipment, and industrial furnaces.
1744, B/S/210	E. Isphording	Attendorn	Plant for the production of accessories and fittings.
1746, B/S/212	Kesselschmiede Amort	Kaan-Marienborn	Do.
1747, B/S/213	H. Klaesener	Gladbach	Do.
1749, B/S/215	Kloeckner Humboldt Deutz	Isselburg	Part plant comprising the equipment for the production of internal combustion engines, hoists and winches.
1750, B/S/216	....do	Koeln-Deutz	Part plant comprising part of the equipment for the production of internal combustion engines, and quarry and processing equipment.
1751, B/S/217	....do	Koeln-Kalk	Do.
1753, B/S/219	W. Knapp	Wanne Eickel	Plant for the production of boilers, tank work and pipe lines.
1758, B/S/224	Koester	Hagen	Plant for the production of accessories and fittings.
1761, B/S/227	W. Langbein	Bochum	Plant for the production of fans, blowers, air circulating systems.
1766, B/S/232	Losenhausenwerk Duesseldorfer	Duesseldorf-Grafenburg	Part plant comprising the equipment for the production of conveyors and cableways, equipment for building and road construction, weighing machines.
1773, B/S/239	Pellentz & Co., Walter Hebezeug	Koeln Ehrenfeld	Plant for the production of cranes, weighing machines.
1777, B/S/243	Reckling & Hoffmann	Eiserfeld	Plant for the production of penumatic locomotives, pumps, and compressors.
1778, B/S/244	Reinery	Hagen, Kabel	Plant for the production of small tools and machine tools.
1779, B/S/245	Rheinische Walzmaschinenfabrik	Koeln-Ehrenfeld	Plant for the production of metallurgical equipment.
1790, B/S/260	P. Schmidt	Medebach	Plant for the production of accessories and fittings.
1794, B/S/264	H. Seelbach Co.	Dahlbruch, Siegen	Plant for the production of fans, blowers, air-circulating systems.
1795, B/S/265	F. Seiffert & Co.	Bochum	Plant for the production of boilers, tank work, and pipe lines.
1802, B/S/272	Steinmann & Co.	Hagen	Plant for the production of accessories and fittings.
1804, B/S/274	Wilhelm Stolle, KG	Bad Godesberg	Plant for the production of small tools.
1805, B/S/275	Joseph Strack Armaturenfabrik	Oberlar near Troisdorf	Plant for the production of accessories and fittings.
1806, B/S/276	Stratenwerth G. m. b. H. Machinenfabrik.	Duisburg	Plant for the production of cranes, derricks, and loading bridges.
1808, B/S/278	Th. Tilemann	Gevelsberg	Plant for the production of conveyors, gears and power transmission equipment.
1811, B/S/281	Vetter Gebr.	Duesseldorf-Benrath	Plant for the production of accessories and fittings.
1817, B/S/289	Rudolf Wilhelm	Essen-Altenessen	Plant for the production of foundry machinery and equipment. Machinery for gas and water industry.
1819, B/S/291	R. Dampfkessel & Apparatebau	Dortmund	Plant for the production of boilers, tank work, and pipe lines.
1824, B/S/403	Havermeier & Sander	Hannover	Plant for the production of lifts and elevators, ceramic and porcelain machinery.
1825, B/S/404	Herfurth & Engelke	Braunschweig	Plant for the production of conveyors.
1826, B/S/405	Koch & Reitz	Hannover	Plant for the production of boiler, tank work and pipe lines.
1827, B/S/406	Julius Meyer Osnabruecker Dampfkesselfabrik.	Osnabrueck	Do.
1828, B/S/478	L. Artmann	Hamburg	Plant for the production of equipment for building and road construction.
1829, B/S/479	Barthels & Lueders	....do	Plant for the production of chemical equipment, boilers, tank work and pipe lines.
1833, B/S/484	Junkers G. m. b. H.	Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg	Plant for the production of internal combustion engines.
1836, B/S/489	Rudolf Otto Meyer	Hamburg-Wandsbek	Part plant comprising the equipment for the production of fans, blowers, air-circulating systems, boilers, tank work, and pipe lines.
1839, B/S/492	Stanau K. H.	Hamburg-Harburg	Plant for the production of hoists and winches.
1845, B/S/407	H. Schlueter	Neustadt	Plant for the production of cement machinery and metal-working tools.
29, A/S/126	I. G. Farben Sauerstaffwerke Griesheim.	Griesheim	Plant for the production of industrial gases.
197, A/S/66	Wieland Werke A. G.	Ulm-Voehringen	Part plant for production of aluminum, copper and zinc fabrications.
200, A/S/123	I. G. Farben Hoechst	Hoechst	(a) Part plant comprising part of the sections for the production of Uresin; (b) Part plant comprising part of the section for the production of polyvinyl acetate; (c) part plant comprising the section for the production of carboresin; (d) part plant comprising the section for the production of sulfur black; (e) part plant comprising part of the section for the production of solvents; (f) part plant comprising part of the section for the production of chlorinated solvents; (g) part plant comprising part of the section for the production of dinitrobenzene.
201, A/S/69	I. G. Farben	Gersthofen	Part plant comprising part of the section for the production of wax.
278, A/S/137	Dr. Ing Heymans	Auerbach nr. Darmstadt	Plant for the production of fine mechanics.

GROUP I. DUE DATE: DEC. 15, 1949—continued

Serial No.	Plant	Location	Description
304, A/S/130	Lavis H. Soehne	Offenbach	Plant for the production of boiler and accessories.
318, A/S/77	M. A. N.	Augsburg	Part plant for the production of prime movers.
367, A/S/133	Rheinhuette	Wiesbaden	Plant for the production of prime movers, general engineering.
444, A/S/121	Chem. Werke, Kurt Albert	do	(a) Part plant comprising part of the section for the production of phenoplasts (molding powder); (b) part plant comprising part of the section for the production of artificid copals.
467, A/S/122	M. Kappus	Offenbach	Part plant for production of soap products.
471, A/S/125	Roehm & Haas	Darmstadt	Part plant comprising the section for the production of soap powder.
493, A/S/127	I. G. Farben Sauerstoffwerke	Kassel-Mittelfeld	Plant for the production of industrial gases.
503, A/S/115	Haas & Sohn	Sinn	Part plant comprising one 2-ton converter for the production of steel. (Foundry in which steel-making equipment was installed during the war. Converter available for reparations.)
508, A/S/72	Vereinigte Flusspatwerke	Stulln	Part plant comprising (a) section for production of hydrofluoric acid; (b) section for production of sodium fluoride; (c) section for production of synthetic cryolite; (d) section for production of potassium bifluoride; (e) section for production of sodium fluoro silicate.
509, A/S/82	Suedwerke	Bamberg	Plant for the production of trucks.
2024	Aluminum Werke, Rheinfelden G. m. b. H.	Rheinfelden	3 shops for the fabrication of aluminum (entire plant, except shop for electrolytic refining of waste products).
2054	Durener Metalwerk, Giulini	Ludwigshafen	Fabrications of aluminum, 2 groups converters; 12 furnaces (entire experimental shop).
2084	I. G. Farben	do	Zinc oxide and sodium hydrosulfite (less than complete unit).
2122	Gewerkstatt Siegtal	Enteneuen	Oxygen (whole plant).
2147	Kurt Kopperschmidt	Blumberg	Paints (whole plant).
2167	I. G. Farben	Ludwigshafen	Adiponitrile (complete shop).
2223	Hermann Dorflinger	Metzingen	Shaping machines.
2244	August Gobel	Bad Ems	Milling machines, screw cutters.
2287	Johann Landolt	Gosheim	Clock and watchmaking.
2304	Muller und Christner	Metzingen	Machines for manufacture of machine tools.
2316	Ravensburg Maschinenfabrik	Ravensburg	Lathes, slotting machines.
2359	Weingarten	Weingarten	Various presses.
2360	Johann Weiss und Sohne	Grosheim	Clock and watchmaking.
2372	Keller Messwerkzeugfabrik	Aldingen	Machines for the manufacture of machine tools.
2379	J. Hengstler	do	Clock and watchmaking.

GROUP II. DUE DATE: JAN. 10, 1950

1422, revised B/S/25	Honsel Werke A. G.	Meschede	Plant for the production of light alloy castings. Previously installed in underground workings at Antfeld.
2375	Werkzeug und Maschinenbau	Hassloch	Machine for the manufacture of machine tools.
2380	Klenzle Uhrenfabrik	Schwenningen	Clock and watch making (50 percent of plant).
2381	Mauthe	do	Do.
2391	Raschig	Ludwigshafen	Tar distillation (part of shop).

Inventories may be examined: The official inventories, listing and describing the equipment available for allocation in these plants, may be examined in the European branch, Office of International Trade.

Expressions of interest invited: This announcement does not constitute an offer of sale. Pursuant to the German reparations program, the Inter-Allied Reparations Agency will allocate these plants among its 18 member western allied nations, including the United States. These allocations are made on the basis of requests for allocation submitted by the governments of the respective nations. As a guide to this Government in determining whether any requests should be submitted on behalf of the United States, American business firms and citizens are invited to express any interest which they may have in the possible purchase of any of these plants. These plants have been announced in previous reparations news circulars as available for reparation. The due date below represents the final opportunity for the United States to submit requests for allocation on behalf of American firms and citizens.

Expressions of interest, accompanied by justifying data, should be forwarded to the European branch, Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce, Washington 25, D. C., and must be received by December 15, 1949, for group I and January 10, 1950, for group II.

Addition: The following five plants are to be included with the above plants under the respective due dates as shown. The new total thus becomes 143.

DUE DATE: DEC. 21, 1949

Serial No.	Plant	Location	Description
1214	Vereinigte Aluminum Werke	Grevenbroich	Part plant comprising the primary electrolytic aluminum plant.

DUE DATE: JAN. 3, 1950

1013/2, B/S/409	Kriegsmarinewerft	Wilhelmshaven	Plant for naval construction.
1287	Deutsche Werft	Reihersteig, Hamburg	Whole plant for shipbuilding.
1462	Luigi-Thermi, G. m. b. H.	Horrem	Whole plant on the production of silumin (high silicon alloy).

DUE DATE: JAN. 17, 1950

1063, B/S/355	Motorenwerke Varel	Varel	Plant for aeroplane engine repairs.

STATEMENT BY GEN. FRANK R. MCCOY, UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE ON THE FAR EASTERN COMMISSION, CONCERNING JAPANESE REPARATIONS AND LEVEL OF INDUSTRY

The Japanese reparations problem has been one of the most important and pressing questions with which the Far Eastern Commission and its member countries have had to deal. The United States, on its part, has taken a long and continuing interest in this problem and has been keenly aware of the interest of the other FEC countries in finding a reasonable solution to it. It is to be regretted that this controversial issue which for such a long time has proved incapable of solution by this Commission continues to retard the achievement of economic self-support by Japan, which is so greatly in the interest of our common objectives with respect to that country.

In our discussions of the matter here in the Commission we have proceeded from the agreement contained in the Potsdam Declaration that reparations would be exacted from Japan and that they should be in a form which would not impair the ability of the Japanese people to support themselves. From the earliest days of the Far Eastern Commission the United States has been guided by a desire that the victims of Japan's aggression receive as reparations such of Japan's resources as was possible without jeopardizing Japan's ability to meet its own peaceful needs. The United States has felt, further, that in order that the nations devastated by Japan might receive reparation while their need was greatest, in order that there might be removed from the mind of the Japanese Government and people uncertainty regarding the reparations question, and in order that as many as possible of Japans' postwar obligations might be disposed of during the period of the occupation, a reparations program should be worked out and put into effect at the earliest practical moment.

These factors led the United States Government to take the initiative in making a

number of policy proposals to the Far Eastern Commission. In April 1946, the United States submitted to the Far Eastern Commission a pattern of proposals providing that there should be made immediately available for reparations designated quantities of industrial facilities which were at that time considered to be clearly surplus to Japan's peaceful needs. Between May and December of that year the Commission adopted a series of interim reparations policy decisions based upon these United States proposals, but the subsequent inability of the Commission to agree on a schedule of shares for division of the facilities among the claimant countries prevented implementation of the decisions. In April 1947, the United States Government offered further proposals, which would have had the effect of making known to Japan precisely, and on a final basis, what industrial capacity should be considered by that country to be immune from removal as reparations and what should be eligible for removal. In the same month, the United States because of its desire to work toward a settlement of this matter issued an advance transfers intrim directive, under authority granted in paragraph III, 3, of the terms of reference of the Far Eastern Commission, instructing the supreme commander to effect delivery to four of the FEC countries of 30 percent of the facilities which the Far Eastern Commission itself had previously determined in the interim removals decisions to be available for reparations removal. Issuance of this directive was motivated in part by a desire to assist those countries which had in the course of fighting against Japan's aggression on their own territory suffered most grievously, but it was also motivated by a desire to prompt FEC countries to agree upon a reparations program from which all 11 countries might benefit.

In November 1947 the United States Government took the initiative once more in an effort to end the stalemate within the Commission on the question of reparations shares, a stalemate which continued to make it impossible for any of the Commission's decisions on the reparations problem to take practical effect. This United States proposal contained the provision that if the Far Eastern Commission countries would accept the schedule of percentages which had been worked out by the United States Government—on the basis of prolonged exchanges of views among Commission members as to the equities involved—the United States Government, on its part, would make available an important part of its own share for distribution among the countries which could accept the United States proposal as a whole. Sixteen months have passed, and this proposal has not been accepted by the Commission.

I should like to emphasize at this point that the action of my Government, and, it is assumed, of the other member governments, in participating in the policy decisions which have been taken by the Commission on the question of reparations was predicated upon two basic assumptions, namely, that the resources to be removed from Japan as reparations were clearly excess to the peaceful needs of a self-supporting Japanese economy and that there would be a shares schedule acceptable to and agreed upon by the Far Eastern Commission countries which would determine in what proportions available reparations should be divided.

As I have already stated, and as the Commission well knows, the second of these assumptions has not been realized and there seems little prospect of its being realized. As regards the first assumption, that reparations removals should be limited to facilities clearly excess to the needs of a self-supporting Japanese economy, successive studies during the past 18 months of Japan's future industrial requirements have necessitated progressive upward adjustments of earlier estimates of these requirements. The first of these studies was that of Overseas Consultants, Inc., whose report was made available to the Commission on March 2, 1948, and the second was that of the so-called Johnston committee, whose report was made available to the Commission on May 19, 1948. Both of these reports came to the sober conclusion that the quantity of capital equipment in Japan which could be properly considered in excess of Japan's peaceful needs had been greatly overestimated. Both reports indicated that for a variety of reasons the Japanese economy was continuing to operate at a heavy deficit even though living standards remained at a minimum level, and that the end to these deficits is not in sight. The evidence contained in these reports and the common knowledge of all Far Eastern Commission countries leads to the inescapable conclusion that the Japanese economy can be made to bear additional economic burdens, beyond those directly related to meeting its own requirements, only by prolonging or increasing the staggering costs borne by the American taxpayer.

The United States has, since the time of the Japanese surrender, carried the burden of preventing such disease and unrest in Japan as might jeopardize the purposes of the occupation. The critical economic conditions with which, it is now apparent, Japan is faced, and the prospect of continuing deficits in Japan's international payments for some years to come, render measures of Japanese economic recovery of utmost importance. It is inescapable that if the basic purposes of the occupation are to be achieved, the Japanese people must be enabled to support themselves at a tolerable standard of living. No one could reasonably suggest that Japan should be abandoned to economic despair. So to abandon Japan would be to undo the costly victory in the Pacific.

I am sure that other Commission countries agree with my Government that the Japanese people themselves must exert maximum efforts for the attainment of recovery. For some months the United States Government has explored means whereby this objective could best be achieved. In issuing its directive of December 10 regarding Japan's economic stabilization, the United States Government took a major step toward requiring the Japanese people to exert their utmost energies in stabilizing their economy and reducing their dependence for subsistence on foreign subsidy. Under present circumstances in Japan the cost of dismantling, packing, and transporting reparations facilities would conflict with the program of Japan's economic stabilization and would constitute an additional financial burden upon the United States Government. I do not wish to emphasize this point unduly, but the United States Government would be lacking in candor if it did not point out that the resources at its disposal to meet demands from all parts of the world are limited.

It is now apparent to the United States Government that the first as well as the second of the two basic assumptions mentioned earlier, assumptions which underlay the policy decisions of the FEC having to do with reparations and are a precondition for an FEC reparations program, has not been realized. This fact has led my government to several conclusions. Before stating them, however, I wish to emphasize that the United States Government maintains fully and categorically its support of the principle adopted by the Far Eastern Commission that Japan's war-making capacity should be eliminated. As you know, all of Japan's specialized war-making facilities have been destroyed. The United States Government believes that all other equipment used for war purposes in the past should, if retained in Japan, be fully converted to the purposes of and utilized in Japan's peaceful economy. Where this cannot be done, the United States Government believes that such equipment should be scrapped. The United States will not permit difficulties in reaching a solution of the reparations problem to be a means whereby Japan's war capacity might reemerge.

It may not be amiss at this point to recall that Japan has already been deprived not only of all of its overseas territorial possessions, but also of substantial quantities of real property of Japanese ownership and origin in the former possessions and elsewhere abroad. This property constitutes a large payment which the Japanese have already made toward satisfaction of their reparations obligations. Unfortunately, from the standpoint of equity, some countries have benefited more than others in the reparations that they have obtained in this form. However, from the standpoint of Japan, the loss of these properties, whatever the proportions in which they happen to have been distributed, drastically reduces Japan's ability to support even at a minimum level the needs of its people.

In view of the above considerations, the United States is forced to the following conclusions:

(a) The deficit Japanese economy shows little prospect of being balanced in the near future, and to achieve eventual balance, will require all resources at its disposal.

(b) The burden of removing further reparations from Japan could detract seriously from the occupation objective of stabilizing the Japanese economy and permitting it to move toward self-support.

(c) There is little or no prospect of Far Eastern Commission agreement on a reparations shares schedule despite the repeated initiatives by the United States over the past 3 years to assist the Commission in reaching such an agreement. Without agreement on a shares schedule the existing Far Eastern Commission policy decisions regarding reparations are incapable of implementation.

(d) Japan has already paid substantial reparations through expropriation of its former overseas assets, and in smaller degree, under the advance transfer program.

In light of these conclusions the United States Government is impelled to rescind its interim directive of April 4, 1947, bringing to an end the advance transfer program called for by that directive. It is impelled also to withdraw its proposal of November 6, 1947, on Japanese reparations shares, and I am so informing the Secretary General. Finally, the United States Government takes this occasion to announce that it has no intention of taking further unilateral action under its interim directive powers to make possible additional reparations removals from Japan.

I earlier stated my Government's belief that maximum efforts should be exerted by the Japanese themselves for their economic recovery. It is the view of the United States that all facilities, including so-called primary war facilities, present designated as available for reparations which can contribute to Japanese recovery should be utilized as necessary in Japan's peaceful economy for recovery purposes.

With regard to primary war facilities, all of which as I earlier stated were some time ago stripped of their special-purpose equipment and thus of their war facilities characteristics, it is the view of the United States that SCAP, under the authority granted in paragraph 10 of the FEC decision on reduction of Japanese industrial war potential, should as rapidly as practicable require the dismantlement, dispersion, or other action for the utilization in Japan's peaceful economy of such of these facilities as are required to meet the needs of the occupation, which needs prominently include economic recovery. Remaining primary war facilities should continue to be protected, in the sense of preventing loss or scrapping of individual items, pursuant to the above-mentioned FEC decision requiring their impounding.

Impounding does not, however, include requirement that the facilities be kept in their present locations or that the Japanese devote resources to preserve their value or maintain them in working order.

The United States, it will be recalled, has repeatedly clarified its understanding that the "level of industry" proposals before the Commission, excepting those levels which will lapse by FEC decision on October 1, 1949, had application only to the question of the quantities of industrial facilities which could be spared for reparations, and had no bearing on the matter of future levels of industrial capacity in Japan. Turning now to this latter question, I have already emphasized my Government's support of the principle that Japan's capacity to make war should not be permitted to re-emerge. It is the considered view of the United States Government that this objective does not require that Japan's production for peaceful purposes be limited or that limitations be imposed on levels of Japanese productive capacity in industries devoted to peaceful purposes. This belief, coupled with the evidence of Japan's present economic plight and the difficult problems Japan will face in future in attaining levels of industrial production and foreign trade sufficient to support its people even at minimum levels, render it clearly advisable in my Government's view that Japan be permitted to develop its peaceful industries without limitation. The problem facing us is not one of limitation of Japan's peaceful industries but of reviving these industries to provide the people's barest wants.

The United States Government plans shortly to submit to the FEC for its consideration proposals for the rescission or amendment of existing and pending FEC reparations and level of industry policy papers so as to bring FEC policies on these matters, should the proposals be approved by the Commission, into conformity with the position which I have set forth. My Government earnestly hopes that the other member governments will appreciate the considerations underlying this position and will be able to concur in the new United States proposals.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HICKENLOOPER was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of this week.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HENRY H. ARNOLD, GENERAL OF THE AIR FORCES

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am sure that I express the feelings of the Members of this body in voicing deep regret over the death on Sunday in California of the General of the Air Forces, Henry H. Arnold.

"Hap" Arnold entered the Army Air Service in its very infancy, when it possessed two airplanes. He literally grew up with the Service and with aviation. He was one of the pioneers who first saw the tremendous possibilities of air power, and he worked tirelessly through the years for its recognition and its development.

When World War II came "Hap" Arnold was ready. His dynamic leadership and his guiding genius developed and led the mighty Army Air Force that took such a terrific toll of our enemies, and did so much to make possible and to hasten our victory. The Air Force he built stands guard over our shores today.

Henry Arnold devoted his life to the cause of America. He will stand in history alongside the great captains of our Nation. He has gone to join them and the choice and master spirits of the ages.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD an address which I delivered at the testimonial dinner of the Army Air Forces to General Arnold, at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., February 9, 1946, on the occasion of General Arnold's retirement from the Army Air Forces.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We gather tonight to do honor to an old comrade, a great soldier, a great air man, a great military leader, a great servant of our country, Gen. Hap Arnold.

His is the story of the achievements of an American boy who was to rise step by step until he was to stand within the small and select company of the leaders who were to save our country and the liberties of all peoples. His is the story of the man who did the impossibles.

We see Hap Arnold a lanky young second lieutenant graduating at West Point in 1907, winning Aviator's Certificate No. 29 in 1911, winning the first of all United States military aviation badges in 1912, and in that same year being the first Army officer to have his name inscribed on the Mackay Trophy.

World War I comes and he does well his part. In 1935 he wins for the second time the Mackay Trophy, and in 1938 brings the Collier Trophy to the Army Air Corps.

And then World War II, the greatest war in all the world's history. Hap Arnold is full grown now with his splendid personal leadership, driving spirit and professional genius. His unerring vision grasped the picture and his sound judgment correctly estimated the situation. In his brain the eagles of battle built their eyries, and beginning almost from scratch without a precedent, without a pattern, he created the mightiest military machine of the air the world has ever known. He smashed precedent, he cut the lines of static thought, he did the needful and built anew. He demanded from his subordinates, from science, from industry and labor, from all America, twice as much as it appeared humanly possible to deliver. He got at least 50 percent more than anyone, except Hap Arnold, expected to get. His driving spirit, the driving spirit of the Army Air Forces found translation in their motto, "It Can Be Done."

In 1940, we had to get aircraft to England—not a few but a veritable flood of them. There was not sufficient shipping space to make even a start. Hap Arnold mused, "Airplanes are made to fly. We will fly them to England."

Oh, it could not be done; everybody except Hap Arnold knew that. It was a long way to England. The route lay across the icy wastes of the North Atlantic. There were no intermediate landing fields, no communications, no weather services. The percentage of losses would be terrible to contemplate. Maybe a few long-range bombers could make it in a few of the better days during the summer. But it was just impossible.

A few months afterwards, Hap Arnold was to report to a committee of Congress, "We did fly the planes, pursuits as well as bombers, to England, and during the winter with the same success as we did in the summer, with no greater losses."

American and allied experts assured Hap Arnold that daylight, high-altitude precision bombing was impractical and impossible. Our allies had tried and had given up. Theoretically and demonstratedly it could not be done. We could not possibly break through German defenses without prohibitive losses. Even the Germans were convinced. But Hap Arnold knew that to win the war we had to go through, and we know how well and how often we went through in broad open daylight straight to the targets.

The general had to have fighters to accompany the heavy bombers over Germany. A young staff officer remembers vividly walking to his desk one morning and finding there a directive for a fighter aircraft that would escort heavy bombers from England to Berlin and return. The general wanted it in less than 6 months, and from the assembly lines came pouring the Thunderbolts and the Mustangs. When the first fighters accompanied the heavy bombers over Germany and Nazi pilots reported them, the Nazi high command laughed and said that the pilots were seeing things. They said it was impossible for a fighter to fly that far, until one day the commanding general of the Nazi fighters went out to take a look at the air war and met four American Mustangs which chased him all the way back to Berlin. Then he knew how far the American long-range fighters could fly.

The European winter came with its wretched weather and our air operations were coming almost to a standstill. The general's answer was to find out how to bomb through the overcast. He rallied the world's scientists and forced the solution. Soon our thousand-plane attacks were as regular in bad weather as in good. With our fancy radar and radio gadgets our planes were able to drop their bombs on the enemy almost as precisely as if they were seeing the targets.

There was often a scarcity of many of the critical materials needed for the building of our planes and their equipment. These materials were in demand by other leaders no less conscientious or patriotic who were carrying grave responsibilities. It was the driving spirit of Hap Arnold that made all appreciate the vast importance of his great bombing offensives, won the approval of the President and secured from the Joint Chiefs of Staff the overriding priority to meet his needs.

Great as were the planes that Hap Arnold built, he recognized that their effectiveness against the enemy depended upon who serviced and navigated and piloted and fought them. He realized that 65 percent of the Air Forces enlisted personnel and practically all of its officers had to be technical specialists. He demanded that the Air Forces have only the best in officers and personnel. He got them. From the flower of American youth came his mechanics, his pilots, and his fighting airmen. They paid tremendous dividends.

When the war broke with such swiftness there was an insistent demand that Hap Arnold send all available trained personnel to stem the engulfing tide of enemy air power. He was too wise for this. He refused to hazard the future to serve the hour. He sent only a portion. With the remainder as a teaching nucleus he welded together the mighty Army Air Forces that whipped its weight in Messerschmitts, Folke-Wulffs, and Mitsubishis. It was a tough decision. It was the right decision.

With his planes and his fighting airmen Hap Arnold carried the war to the very heart of Germany long before it was possible to land on the beaches of Normandy. Where Hitler and Goering with all their planes and stratagems and all their vaunted Luftwaffe failed, Hap Arnold succeeded. While Hitler and Goering could not understand and appreciate the tremendous significance and import of strategic bombing, Hap Arnold smashed Nazi plants and production lines, paralyzed their transportation, blasted their reserves and made possible the landings on the Normandy beachheads, the terrific and heroic drive of our Ground Forces across France, through the Siegfried line, over the Rhine, and on to the complete disaster of the German armies.

Few of us will ever know the difficulties encountered in keeping the European bombing offensive coordinated under the command of airmen so as to utilize maximum efficiency of air power. General Arnold well remembered those difficulties when he set up the great B-29 offensive in the Pacific. To insure that its mighty strategic strength would not be weakened by the divided command in the Pacific, he set up the headquarters of this great force here in Washington with himself directly in command. Here he was the commanding general of the Army Air Forces, a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a member of the Combined Chiefs of Staff, and, in addition, brilliantly commanding the largest combat air force of all the world 5,000 miles from its theater of operations. What a general!

There is nothing in recorded history like it.

In early 1944, Hap Arnold took a trip to Europe. On the basis of what he saw there he decided in his own mind that the war in Europe would soon be finished. He forthwith cabled his staff in Washington to stop the enormous flow to Europe of aircraft, crews, bombs, ammunition, fuel, and all that goes with aerial war, and to channel the full weight of our air-power potential toward Japan. What a momentous decision! Only courage and military genius could make a decision of such import.

With that decision and all it meant in the bombing and burning and blasting of Japan, within 90 days from VE-day, without a single American ground soldier having to put his foot on the Japanese mainland, Japan surrendered and we celebrated VJ-day.

How sweet must be the thought tonight to Hap Arnold that his courage, his daring, his vision, and his genius contributed so much to the saving of the lives of thousands of American youth and of millions of American casualties.

It was a fateful quirk of chance that made Hap Arnold a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. But once he sat with the President and other service chiefs there was no question about the need for him in that body. At long last the Chief of the Air Force was in his rightful place. At long last air power had won recognition as an equal partner in waging the war. At long last the Army Air Forces had an authoritative voice in the decisions as to how and where they would be employed. Military aviation made its greatest forward step and Billy Mitchell stood vindicated.

Under Hap Arnold so brilliant were the achievements of the Army Air Forces, so magnificent their record, and so superior their contribution to the winning of the war that they cannot today be denied equal status and equal autonomy with land and sea forces. I tell you tonight that it shall be so written into the law of the land. Air power takes its place as America's first line of defense.

In this atomic age we know that our best hope for peace lies in an organized world under law and justice. We also know that until the world can be so organized—and the processes are slow, painfully slow—we must keep America strong if we would play our part in the leadership of the world and in the building of its peace. Men and nations do not follow weak leaders. And we must keep America strong that we may keep America free.

Hap Arnold, ever looking to the future, has already called in the scientists, the experts and the best brains of our country and started them on mountainous research to find the answers, to look 20 years into the future that we may best plan and shape our defenses. In his historic document, the Third Report of the Commanding General of the Army Air Forces to the Secretary of War, he has left a rare testament of wisdom and of experience for our guidance.

As we pay tribute tonight to Hap Arnold, we cannot forget her who has been his best lieutenant, his kindest critic, his wisest counselor and who has done so much to keep the home fires burning, Mrs. Hap Arnold.

Brooking no fear, quick to decide, going through with his purposes whatever obstacles opposed, Hap Arnold leaves an inspiring example of achievement, of devotion, of brilliant leadership, that will quicken and strengthen the spirit of the Army Air Forces down the years.

As Hap Arnold departs from us he carries with him our affection for him as a comrade, our appreciation of all that he has done for the Army Air Forces and our pride in his exalted services to our country and its free institutions. A searching survey of his record shows that there is no great act of his which our country would annul, no great decision by him which military judgment would reverse. His fame as a soldier is eternally fixed. He has won his place in the high fellowship of our country's great military leaders headed by George Washington. And we may know that if Washington were with us tonight he would join with us in saying to Hap Arnold, "Well done. Well done."

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the hour is late, and I do not wish to take much time, but I do desire to join with the distinguished Senator from Alabama in his tribute to Gen. Henry H. Arnold.

Mr. President, the Arnold family is one of the most distinguished from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. "Hap" Arnold, as we knew him as a young man, was reared in the same county in Pennsylvania where there resided several other distinguished generals, including General Hancock, General Hartranft, and General Stewart. It is a family which has been an inspiring one. The father was an outstanding soldier. The sister was an outstanding teacher and the dispenser of good will and humanitarian spirit all over the world.

Pennsylvania most reluctantly lost General Arnold to the great State of California, but he went to California for his health. He really was a casualty, a front-line casualty, of great World War II.

I wish to thank the Senator from Alabama for the fine tribute he has paid to a great Pennsylvanian.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR HENRY J. ALLEN

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I rise to announce the death of Henry J. Allen, a distinguished Kansan, former United States Senator from the State of Kansas.

Henry Allen had a brilliant career as Governor of our State, and served with distinction the State and the Nation in the United States Senate. The high regard and esteem he commanded from the people of his native State is symbolized by the fact that he was elected Governor of Kansas while absent from the State, serving overseas with the American Red Cross during World War I.

He was well known as a journalist and newspaper publisher, and served as a war correspondent in Cuba during the Spanish-American War.

Henry Allen was in constant demand as a public speaker. His statesmanship was recognized when he was called upon to serve as a Special Commissioner of the Near East Relief to Armenia, Turkey, Greece, and southern Russia in 1923.

He was a fine and devout Christian gentleman. The Nation has lost an outstanding statesman, Kansas has lost a great citizen, and I have lost a faithful and understanding friend.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FULBRIGHT in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Oscar L. Chapman, of Colorado, to be Secretary of the Interior, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

NOMINATION OF OSCAR L. CHAPMAN TO BE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement with respect to Oscar L. Chapman, of Colorado, whose nomination to be Secretary of the Interior was favorably reported from committee today.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, in view of the fact that I will necessarily be absent from the session of the Senate tomorrow, Wednesday, January 18, 1950, on public business, and feeling that the confirmation of the Honorable Oscar L. Chapman for Secretary of the Interior will be before the Senate, I wish at this time to call attention to some of his outstanding qualifications for the position he is being called upon to fill.

Secretary Chapman is truly a great American. Born, reared, and educated in Virginia, he served with distinction in the armed forces of his country in World War I. Upon his return to civilian life he moved to the State of Colorado and became a part of the civic, social, and political life of that great State.

For many years he has occupied a position of real responsibility in the Department of the Interior. He also filled many important positions in the civilian activities of our country in World War II. He has, therefore, had the background of being a military soldier for his country in World War I, and a civilian soldier for his country in World War II.

He had demonstrated broad vision in the development of a mighty Nation. He has worked to inspire and improve the human resources of our country, and with equal zeal to conserve and build its natural resources.

In the positions which he has occupied he has evidenced constant courtesy and consideration both for those in his organizations and those who had business with him. He also has been efficient and tireless in meeting the responsibilities of the many positions which he has held.

Mr. President, truly he has been faithful over those things for which he has been

given responsibility and thus has demonstrated that it is wise, proper, and fitting that he be given responsibility in larger and broader fields.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James E. Webb, of North Carolina, to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Monetary Fund, and United States Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 5 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William McChesney Martin, Jr., of New York, to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years and until his successor shall have been appointed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John S. Hooker, of Maryland, to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 2 years and until his successor shall have been appointed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. James H. Burns, United States Army, retired, to be assistant to the Secretary of Defense, Mutual Defense Assistance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it was understood that the nominations in the Department of the Navy would be carried over. In compliance with that understanding I now ask that the nominations in the Department of the Navy be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Navy nominations will be passed over.

MUNITIONS BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Hubert E. Howard, of Illinois, to be Chairman of the Munitions Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Denis J. McMahon, of New York, N. Y., to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of New York, to fill an existing vacancy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of collectors of customs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations for collectors of customs are confirmed en bloc.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Francis A. O'Neill, Jr., of New York, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1953.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Public Health Service, which are all routine nominations, may be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 18, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 17 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Matthew B. Welsh, of Indiana, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Indiana, vice B. Howard Caughran, term expired.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Robert H. Mollohan, of West Virginia, to be United States marshal for the northern district of West Virginia, vice Russell Nichols, term expired.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named person to be a commander in the United States Coast Guard:

Claude H. Broach

The following-named persons to be lieutenant commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

Axel B. Axelsen	Thomas N. Kelley
Ashton H. Barnes	Arthur M. Davison
Martin D. Berg	William R. Sayer
Frederick B. Thatcher	William B. Durham

The following-named person to be assistant professor with the grade of lieutenant commander:

Robert E. Reed-Hill

The following-named person to be commissioned instructor with the grade of lieutenant:

Raymond J. Perry

The following-named persons to be lieutenants in the United States Coast Guard:

Nathan L. Fendig	Clyde J. Miller
Edwin S. Radford	Alfred J. Unger
Andrew J. Grogard	John M. Nagy

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the United States Coast Guard:

Frederick C. Thomas	Edward F. Oliver
Vincent J. Wernig	William L. Russon, Jr.
Franklin J. Miller	Robert H. Wertham
Edward P. Boyle	Leonard M. Unterein
William M. Barney	Edgar W. Dorr
William C. Behan	

The following-named persons to be chief boatswains in the United States Coast Guard:

Kenneth Templeton	Nulland E. Mahar
George R. Rollinson	Ralph A. Palmer
Wayne E. McElroy	Thurman Salter
Edward L. Openshaw	James E. Bill
Ward R. Turner	Harold G. Weber
John M. Lydon	Hubert R. Lindsey
Harvey E. Willis	August Lays

The following-named persons to be chief gunners in the United States Coast Guard:

Lewis A. Johnson
Hiram B. Rodman

The following-named person to be a chief radio electrician in the United States Coast Guard:

John L. Price

The following-named persons to be chief machinists in the United States Coast Guard:

Carl A. Stanton	Alvie McCool
Lonnie Bridges	Herman Schenauer
Clifford J. Hudder	Pernell Kelly
Carl A. Fenske	George W. Thomas
Frederick E. Sanderson	

The following-named persons to be chief ship's clerks in the United States Coast Guard:

Earl Elder
Samuel Brown
Michael Herko

The following-named person to be a chief carpenter in the United States Coast Guard:

Herman J. Boudreau.

The following-named persons to be chief pay clerks in the United States Coast Guard:

Henry J. Burness
Louis C. Spaniol
Thomas P. Festo

IN THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the position indicated:

To be commanders

Ernest B. Lewey, effective January 5, 1950.
John C. Mathisson, effective January 5, 1950.
George E. Morris, effective January 5, 1950.
Roswell C. Bolstad, effective January 5, 1950.
A. Newton Stewart, effective January 5, 1950.
Max G. Ricketts, effective January 5, 1950.
Clarence A. George, effective January 5, 1950.
Robert A. Earle, effective January 5, 1950.
Harry F. Garber, effective January 5, 1950.
Karl B. Jeffers, effective January 5, 1950.

To be lieutenants

Gerald L. Short, effective January 18, 1950.
John O. Phillips, effective January 18, 1950.

To be ensigns

Robert L. Kneedler, Jr., effective December 23, 1949.
Omar H. Quade, Jr., effective December 27, 1949.

William R. Kachel, effective January 1, 1950.

Thomas M. Krall, effective January 5, 1950.

Pentti A. Stark, effective January 18, 1950.

IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. Edgar Erskine Hume, O4033, Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), for appointment as major general, Medical Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Brig. Gen. George Jacob Nold, O8338, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army), for appointment as assistant to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and for appointment as brigadier general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 11, National Defense Act, as amended, and title V, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

(NOTE.—The above-named officers were appointed during the recess of the Senate.)

Brig. Gen. Ernest Marion Brannon, O12292, Judge Advocate General's Corps, United States Army, for appointment as The Judge Advocate General, United States Army, and for apointment as major general, Judge Advocate General's Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 8, National Defense Act, as amended, and section 249, Selective Service Act of 1948.

Brig. Gen. Franklin Prague Shaw, O8168, Army of the United States (colonel, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U. S. Army), for appointment as Assistant Judge Advocate General, United States Army, and for appointment as major general, Judge Advocate General's Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 8, National Defense Act, as amended, and section 249, Selective Service Act of 1948.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be brigadier generals

Col. Robert Washington Brown, O4834, Judge Advocate General's Corps, United States Army.

Col. Claude Bayles Mickelwait, O10287, Judge Advocate General's Corps, United States Army.

IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

The officers named herein for appointment in the National Guard of the United States of the Army of the United States under the provisions of section 38 of the National Defense Act as amended:

To be major generals of the line

Maj. Gen. H. Miller Ainsworth, Texas National Guard, to date from October 17, 1949.

Maj. Gen. Albert Sidney Johnson, Texas National Guard, to date from October 17, 1949.

Maj. Gen. Donald Wilson McGowan, New Jersey National Guard, to date from October 17, 1949.

Maj. Gen. Jesse Eschol McIntosh, Indiana National Guard, to date from October 17, 1949.

Maj. Gen. Otto Edward Sandman, California National Guard, to date from October 17, 1949.

To be brigadier generals of the line

Brig. Gen. William Henry Abendroth, District of Columbia National Guard, to date from July 25, 1949.

Brig. Gen. Hampton Anderson, New York National Guard, to date from July 25, 1949.

Brig. Gen. William Michael Flanigan, New York National Guard, to date from July 25, 1949.

Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, Illinois National Guard, to date from November 10, 1949.

To be brigadier generals, Adjutant General's Department

Brig. Gen. Rhodolph Leslie Esmay, Wyoming National Guard, to date from July 25, 1949.

Brig. Gen. James Alvin May, Nevada National Guard, to date from July 25, 1949.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 17 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

James E. Webb to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Monetary Fund, and United States Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 5 years.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

William McChesney Martin, Jr., to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years and until his successor has been appointed.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

John S. Hooker to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 2 years and until his successor has been appointed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Maj. Gen. James H. Burns, United States Army, retired, to be Assistant to the Secretary of Defense, Mutual Defense Assistance.

MUNITIONS BOARD

Hubert E. Howard to be Chairman of the Munitions Board.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Denis J. McMahon to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of New York, to fill an existing vacancy.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

George T. Cromwell to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 13, with headquarters at Baltimore, Md.

James J. Connors to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 31, with headquarters at Juneau, Alaska.

Harry A. Zinn to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Francis A. O'Neill, Jr., to be a member of the National Mediation Board, for the term expiring February 1, 1953.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel)

Curtis G. Southard

To be sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of major)

Sheldon L. Lang

To be senior assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain)

Mary E. McGovern
Joan M. Norkunas
Patricia B. Geiser
M. Elizabeth Leeds

APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective date indicated

Edward T. Thompson, December 30, 1949.

To be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective dates indicated

Edward A. Beeman, December 30, 1949.
Leon Levintow, December 30, 1949.
DeArmond Moore, December 30, 1949.
Gerald D. Barton, December 31, 1949.

To be assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective dates indicated

Norman Tarr, November 16, 1949.
John J. Walsh, December 30, 1949.

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective dates indicated

Ray Raneri, December 7, 1949.
Keith S. Krause, December 8, 1949.
James H. Crawford, December 9, 1949.
Joseph H. Coffey, December 14, 1949.
Ernest C. Tsivoglou, December 15, 1949.
Charles R. Bowman, December 15, 1949.

To be assistant sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date indicated

Ronald G. Macomber, November 21, 1949.
Donald A. Pecsok, November 21, 1949.

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date indicated

Paul W. Eastman, Jr., November 18, 1949.
David H. Howells, November 21, 1949.
Richard D. Coleman, November 21, 1949.
John T. Chambers, Jr., November 23, 1949.
Robert L. Harris, Jr., November 23, 1949.
Frank A. Bell, Jr., November 30, 1949.
Ralph J. Black, December 2, 1949.
Edward R. Williams, December 2, 1949.
James D. Mickle, December 5, 1949.
Eugene T. Jensen, December 5, 1949.

To be scientist (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date indicated

William M. Upholt, December 2, 1949.

To be sanitarian (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date indicated

Daniel E. O'Keefe, December 30, 1949.

To be senior assistant sanitarians (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date indicated

Samuel M. Rogers, November 15, 1949.
Joseph L. Minkin, November 15, 1949.
Richard F. Clapp, November 16, 1949.

Assistant surgeons to be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective November 8, 1949

Robert Hanan
David H. Solomon
Charles W. Whitmore
Albert L. Patrick
John V. Osborne
Herman H. Gray
Ernest V. deMoss
Sidney Ketyer
John H. Waite

To be senior nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective December 11, 1949

Donna Pearce
Lydia M. Zetzsche
Helen Bean
Margaret G. Arnstein

To be nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective November 8, 1949

Marjorie W. Spaulding
Mary A. Rice
Walborg S. Wayne
Gertrude L. Anderson
Esther Kaufman
M. Lois McMinn
Catherine M. Sullivan
Anne M. Leffingwell
Margaret E. Willhoit
M. Dolores Howley
Gladys C. Guydes
Helen N. Buzan
Emijean Snedegar
K. Barbara Dormin
Edith M. Hettema

Junior assistant nurse officer to be assistant nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date indicated

Marion E. O'Neil, November 8, 1949.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 17, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. C. R. Hooton, Methodist Board of Temperance, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, creator of all mankind, in whose gentle affection are the hearts of Thy creatures, look with compassion upon the plight of Thy children. By the might of Thy Holy Spirit quench the pride, the passions, and the greediness of men who divide and agitate people against people.

Help us by Thy word marvelously to work out the reconciliation of mankind. Give us faith to so follow Thee in higher loyalty that we may be united to each other in holy love. "Drop Thy still dews of quietness 'til all our strivings cease. Take from our souls the strain and stress, and let our ordered lives confess, the beauty of Thy peace."

In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include newspaper articles.

TAX REDUCTION AND VETERANS' BENEFITS

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill providing for a reduction in taxes. It is one of the few bills I have introduced in the 9 years I have been in Congress, because, like some great statesman once said, those who are governed least are governed best. Most of the good things we are offering to our people demand large outlays of tax money. Mr. Speaker, I have a consistent record of voting for reductions in expenditures ever since I have been in Congress. I feel I can be entirely consistent in also demanding a reduction in taxes. Leave the money in the pockets of those who are producing the wealth of this country and we will not need to worry about its economy. My bill also provides for payment of benefits to veterans in lieu of what will sometime come up in the way of a bonus. My bill also provides for special tax exemptions for veterans, the amount depending upon the tenure of service.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

HOLLOW DRILL STEEL

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from the Pittsburgh Crucible Steel Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is about time the American people awaken to what is happening to the industrial and economic life of the Nation.

The Crucible Steel Co. at its Park works in the city of Pittsburgh produces hollow drill steel for use in mines, quarries, and general contracting work. Ninety-five percent of the hollow drill steel consumed in this country during and since World War II has been produced in the State of Pennsylvania. However, it would now appear there is a possibility that such plants, employing hundreds of people, will have tougher competition sometime in the near future due to the State Department and the reciprocal trade treaties arrived at in the international conference at Annecy, France.

The average price on drill steel in the United States is 15 cents a pound, but due to the agreements entered into—and which were entered into before the devaluation of foreign currency—will permit the Canadians to offer to reduce the price to 12.17 cents per pound. The going price for Canadian consumption is 13½ cents per pound. The basic steel labor rate in Canada, in United States dollars, is approximately 93½ cents per hour. Contrast this with our current base rate in the United States of $1.65 per hour, which cost, I understand, will be increased by the pension and insurance agreements recently entered into. In addition, low-priced Swedish competition will certainly affect the American market because in that country the current labor rate based upon the devalued krona is approximately 37 cents per hour.

I understand it is expected that Canada will operate in the black in the current fiscal year and it is estimated will have a surplus of about $90,000,000. Canada is to be congratulated; this is an excellent recovery and a fine showing. If Canada can do it, we certainly should be able to balance our budget, reduce our expenditures, and get down to a sound, businesslike basis.

However, even in face of our unbalanced budget, the reciprocal trade treaties entered into will knock out American industry, dry up our source of revenue, and throw thousands of our people out of employment. It is about time the American people realize and awaken to what is happening in American industry and to the economy of the Nation.

CRUCIBLE STEEL CO. OF AMERICA,
Pittsburgh, Pa., December 13, 1949.

The Honorable LEON H. GAVIN,
Representative in Congress,
Oil City, Pa.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Knowing of your interest in the necessity for maximum employment of labor in the State of Pennsylvania, we take this opportunity of placing before you the following facts:

At our Park works in the city of Pittsburgh, we produce hollow drill steel for use in mines, quarries, and general contracting work. We believe we are perfectly safe in saying that at least 95 percent of the hollow drill steel consumed in this country during and since World War II has been produced in the State of Pennsylvania.

This specialty requires approximately 50 man-hours per ton in contrast with approximately 18 man-hours per ton for ordinary hot rolled steel. At the present moment our average price is approximately 15 cents a pound. We are now confronted with offerings from Canada at a base price of 10.045 cents per pound, United States dollars, plus duty or a total of 13.92 cents United States funds. Effective as of January 1, 1950, the Canadians offer to reduce that price to 12.17 cents per pound because of a reduction in duty January 1, arrived at in the international conference at Annecy, France, of from 3.875 cents to 2.125 cents. Their going price for Canadian consumption is 13½ cents per pound.

The changes in import duties into the United States were negotiated during April through August 1949. We assume that during that time no consideration was given to the possible devaluation of foreign exchange which eventually took place on September 22, 1949. As a result we are now subject to a double-barreled attack. The various trade treaties, we believe, contain escape clauses which can be used to at least dampen the powder in one barrel.

The basic steel labor rate on that commodity in Canada as of this date is $1.04 an hour or in United States dollars approximately 93½ cents in contrast with our current base rate of $1.65 per hour which cost will be materially increased by the pension and insurance agreements just concluded with the CIO.

A conservative estimate indicates a monthly production of 1,000 tons which means at least 50,000 man-hours or $82,500 per month but actually nearer $90,000. This, in turn, could easily be translated into at least 600,000 man-hours per year or a million-dollar pay roll covering at least 300 employees.

That is the situation that confronts us at the moment; in addition to which, plans are now being laid for a further international conference in September 1950, at which time we are led to believe that consideration will be given to further reductions in certain import duties.

There is another important factor in connection with this type of production, and that is consideration of what could happen in case of a national emergency. This item is unusually important in all types of mining, and during the last war mines and construction work were entirely dependent upon domestic production for their requirements.

We realize that special steels of this type represent but a small segment of the total steel volume, but there are many other special steel items under attack, all of which represent a tremendous number of man-hours; some items even as high as 200 man-hours per ton.

In addition to the Canadian, we already see definite indications of low-priced Swedish competition in special steels. In that country the current labor rate based upon the devalued krona is approximately 37 cents an hour. In your opinion, how can industry pay our going rates and cope with that type of competition?

Are we correct in assuming that this is a matter of interest to you and what action will you take to prevent the contemplated

reduction in import duties as of January 1 and a further revision next September?

Respectfully yours,

R. E. CHRISTIE,
Executive Vice President.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a news release.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me for today may be put over until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COAL SHORTAGE EMERGENCY

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the President states, in a news conference that he is watching the weather to make up his mind if he will enforce laws passed by Congress to secure a resumption of coal production in this country. Watching the weather and permitting the coal strike to continue, affords no relief or comfort to American families in the Central and Northwestern States who are suffering from want of coal. Official weather reports from these sections show temperatures from 10 to 25 degrees below zero.

The failure of the President to act in accordance with the law, in the present coal-shortage emergency, will cause widespread suffering and hardship for thousands of families whose coal bins are empty. Mr. President, the emergency is here and you should act at once.

My survey in southern Minnesota, where temperatures are as low as 10 degrees below zero, shows that scores of communities will be without coal by the end of this week. Dealers' bins are empty and immediate action must be taken to provide the people with necessary fuel.

Mr. Speaker, in the event that the President of the United States does not take action to secure a resumption in coal production by Friday of this week, I call upon you to convene an extraordinary session of the House of Representatives for the purpose of taking emergency action in the present coal-shortage crisis.

Mr. Speaker, a critical emergency exists in coal supplies. Shut-down of many school systems is reported imminent. Hospitals and other institutions face alarming shortages in many places. Rail transportation is greatly curtailed, and a state of emergency has been proclaimed in some areas. Again I demand, Mr. Speaker, that the House convene to take appropriate action if the President fails to carry out existing law.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

LEWIS AND THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, from personal observation and comments of parties who are conversant with the subject matter, I learned something of the present danger of the John L. Lewis coal strike and the repercussions that are bound to follow.

In the Chicago area 73 passenger trains have been put out of commission, all to the detriment and discomfort of our citizens. Dim-outs were ordered to take effect in 28 State institutions. Stock piles of coal have dwindled to almost nothing because of the lack of coal shipments. People on relief cannot get coal for their stoves because there is none of the proper size to supply them.

People are asking why the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law are not invoked to obtain the relief called for under that law.

The question is this: Is it right to play cheap provincial politics with the miseries and hardships now being perpetrated upon the people of our Nation?

The answer to that question is obvious: Playing politics with a national crisis surely is not the decent thing to do—but some statesmen regard it as being highly propitious.

Suffering and hardships untold are in the immediate offing due to the lack of coal, and the responsibility, actual and potential, should be placed squarely where it belongs—and there is only one place where it does belong—and that is on the shoulders of Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, who refuses to live up to his oath of office and enforce the laws of the Nation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, people are getting cold north of Mason and Dixon's line. When the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS] begins to complain, he lines up with the senior Democratic Senator from that State, who gave the President like information a few days ago.

When we find our good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]—I think he is a Norwegian—saying it is cold; when a Norwegian says it is cold why it is cold—freezing to the rest of us—and there is no question about it.

The civil-rights folks are here. Because they are or were here, I saw 12 extra policemen on duty in front of our office building this morning when I came to work. To those advocates of the President's civil-rights program I say that if you gentlemen will just fix it up so that citizens can exercise their right to buy a little coal and keep warm and cook we would appreciate it and perhaps be in favor of a civil-rights program. And if you are honest and sincere, and of course you are, in your talk about discrimination because of race, creed, or color, you will fix up the proposed legislation so the people can exercise the right to work, the right to go out and buy something to eat, the right to buy a little coal to keep warm. If the President and Lewis permit that it will be helpful to some of our folks who are snowed and frozen in. We cannot all go to Florida when Mr. Truman and Mr. Lewis go there.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

FOREIGN COMPETITION

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want you all to be nifty, and thrifty, in fifty. Somebody just put a badge on my shoulder and said "You belong to the TTP," and I asked what that was. "Tired Tax Payer," they told me. They are putting everything on me nowadays and are forcing me to do a lot of things I do not like.

I wish at this time to comment on a statement made by my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN], just a minute ago when he talked about the effect of the reciprocal trade agreements on steel. The same steel industry in which he is interested I am likewise interested in from the standpoint of helping them. They asked me what could be done to change the tariff to protect the industry and what I could do with the President to get him to change his reciprocal trade treaty program. I said "Nothing; I have no influence with the President of the United States. But I will tell you what to do. Your plant is going to be closed if you do not get your people, your labor leaders in and tell them they will be out of jobs if they do not come down to see President Truman and tell him what his policies are doing to them." I think that is the only answer.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILLIPS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RIEHLMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD and include an article from the Washington Evening Star.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the Woman's Home Companion.

ANENT TODAY'S POLITICAL HUBBUB

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, for several days now I have sat in the House of Representatives in patriotic horror while all of us here have been stormed with ultrareactionary sentiments and, before I express myself, I want to extend due apologies to a very worthy author for messing up his splendid verse, so that I might in rhyme say that today we have heard—

Bits of ancient, puzzling observation
From old G. Gabrielson wild-garnered each
As pebbles worn and polished slick,
In the current of right-wing-ed speech!

The average normal person ofttimes, to give vent to his pent feelings, throws his hat up into the air, whereas the present-day boisterously blundering political reactionary, for a like purpose, discloses his abnormality by everlastingly throwing the air up into his hat, or where his hat ought to be.

The modern-day political reactionary has discarded the Golden Rule of the ages followed by the average normal person and again to show his abnormality has substituted therefor the reactionary rule of gold.

Today ignoble political reactionaries make abnormal uproar for the blood and the political crucifixion of our truly great and realistic friend of the people, President Harry S. Truman, in much the same deicide fashion as the sadistic old high priests of eld cried out for the blood and the crucifixion of the God-proffered Saviour of mankind.

My, how thoroughly antisocial, cruel, and cunning old Joe Stalin must just simply love these unwittingly, un-American efforts in his behalf.

Political reactionaries today may advertise haughtily their venal verdure, personally and through equally venal media, and spread themselves like the Biblical green bay tree—Laurus nobilis—and claim that the power of gold is supreme but what doth it avail them—it, too, shall pass away like a drunkard's disturbing dream and be lost forever in fathomless nothingness long before their life's bad book shall have found its last resting place in oblivion's uncataloged library.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article from the Boston Globe.

Mr. DOLLINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and a resolution of the New York State liquor authority.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

MEMBERS INVITED TO VISIT NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members, I desire to read a letter which is addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART,
Washington, D. C., January 12, 1950.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The exhibition of works of art from the Vienna museums, which are on loan from the Austrian Government to the National Gallery, will close on Sunday, January 22. The attendance has been very large and will probably increase during the closing days of the exhibition.

I would like for the Members of the House of Representatives and their families to have an opportunity of seeing the collection as comfortably as possible and would be delighted to arrange a private view for them on Friday afternoon, January 20, after the Gallery closes at 5 p. m. We should be glad to have them come to the Gallery from 5:15 to 7 p. m. and to use the entrance on Constitution Avenue at Sixth Street. I should be grateful if you would be kind enough to extend the invitation to them and also to the Representative's secretaries, clerks of the committees, and members of the House press gallery, with their wives.

I hope that we shall have the pleasure of welcoming you on that occasion, and with kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,
DAVID E. FINLEY,
Director.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered into, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes; and in the event that the House is not in session on tomorrow, I ask that I may have this special order on the first day after that in which the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Armed Services and to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1915, as amended, establishing the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, I transmit herewith the thirty-fifth annual report of the committee covering the fiscal year 1949.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 16, 1950.*

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

ATOMIC DEFENSE OF AMERICAN CITIES

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I shall always remember my visit to Corregidor in January 1946, 4½ months after Hiroshima and Nagasaki. I had always been under the impression that Corregidor was America's fortress of the seas, an impregnable rock. How chagrined and how disillusioned I was to see that on Corregidor the most modern guns that we had in World War II were of the vintage of 1898 and 1900. There were no modern antiaircraft guns, in fact no modern guns of any kind, on Corregidor.

When I spoke to those in charge of our tour that day about this situation, it was explained to me that our country had adhered religiously to the Disarmament Pact while Japan was fortifying Truk and other islands of the Pacific. "No," they said, "we did not even dare sneak in anything of a modern nature."

Mr. Speaker, last summer I was equally chagrined, I was equally disillusioned, when I learned for the first time that our country had no real federally coordinated plans for the atomic defense of our cities. That is how this information came about.

I received a letter from Vincent Duffy, cochairman of civilian defense in my home city of Paterson, N. J., which, incidentally, is labeled as a prime target in the case of an atomic-bomb attack, and he asked me for information from the Federal Government that would be helpful to him and his organization. I sent the request downtown and I was advised that there was no information at that time of a Federal nature, and that Mr. Duffy should send his inquiry to the State authorities at Trenton, N. J. Whereupon, I wrote the President of the United States asking the question "Wherefore," and the answer came back from Dr. John R. Steelman, now Acting Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. He told me that the whole problem under date of October 5 last had been turned over to the various States, with the Federal Government acting only in an advisory and counseling capacity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have come to five conclusions after studying this problem, and they are these:

First. There is no coordinated Federal plan for civilian defense of American cities against atom bomb or poison-gas attack.

Second. All of the States are not cooperating in the effort begun by Mr. Steelman, although my own State of New Jersey is. I talked about this problem to one of my colleagues the other day. He comes from a large industrial State. He told me this: "I went to my Governor just a week or so ago and asked him if he had received a letter from Dr. Steelman on civilian defense, and his answer was, 'Yes, I received such a letter, but in all frankness, I have misplaced it.' "

Third. There is some question as to whether civilian defense of American cities should be under the Federal Security Resources Board and not under our Defense Establishment.

Fourth. Dr. John R. Steelman is too busy to be the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. Dr. John R. Steelman is the President's alter ego, his trouble-shooter. He has a hundred and one tasks assigned to him. Ofttimes he has to leave Washington to meet problems of labor and management. He is too busy for this most important undertaking. The administration has been remiss in not making a permanent Chairman of the National Security Resources Board charged with this undertaking, a chairman who knows something about the problem and can give it time, study, and effort.

Fifth. The Congress of the United States cannot longer delay a proper review of the problem. As I have said, New Jersey is going ahead under Governor Driscoll's on-his-toes leadership.

I have recently received and I am going to read a very informative and very challenging letter from Leonard Dreyfuss, civilian defense director from my State of New Jersey. He says, among other things:

My basic philosophy on civilian defense is this: Our national war machine—Army, Navy, and Air Force—costs the United States some $15,000,000,000 a year; more than one-third of every citizen's tax payment. If that colossal war machine is necessary, then certainly civil defense is vitally important, otherwise the war expenditure must be a sheer extravagant waste.

Certainly, our State Department and armed forces are concerned with the possibility of war. If the unbelievable happens and we have a third war, it will strike fast and there will be no time for preparation or training. The States on the eastern and western seaboards are particularly vulnerable. We, in New Jersey, feel that we are a critically vulnerable area. We are an industrial State. We are important, too, because we have the longest coastline on the Atlantic Ocean. we feel it would be sheer neglect not to prepare our citizens for any eventuality. Therefore, we are organizing our civil defense without any waving of flags or blowing of bugles, but on a thoroughly practical basis.

I am going to put the New Jersey plan in the RECORD.

When I first became concerned about this problem last summer I was attracted to a byline story in the Washington newspapers saying what? Saying this: A reporter had gone downtown and visited the three Commissioners who under law are charged with carrying out the administration of District of Columbia affairs, and not one Commissioner could tell him anything about civilian defense for our Nation's Capital. The Superintendent of Police, Major Barrett, said to this reporter, "I tried to get some information from Federal authorities but I could not get anything." Now, I have something. I have in a small envelope in my office all the material that the Federal Government, the National Security Resources Board, through its Acting Chairman, John R. Steelman, has been able to get together on this subject. I am terribly concerned about our national approach to this problem.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from California, who, like myself, comes from a very important industrial seaboard State.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I congratulate the gentleman on bringing this matter to the attention of the House. It is a very vital question. I wonder if the gentleman is familiar with my House Joint Resolution 369? I introduced it previous to the recess. If passed, it would have authorized the Secretary of Defense to hold public hearings in all the important centers throughout the United States in order to formulate a civilian defense program against an atomic-bomb attack.

Mr. CANFIELD. I know about that and I commend my colleague.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In addition, there is as a matter of record the Hopley report, which outlines a method of civilian defense.

Mr. CANFIELD. I know about that, too, may I say to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. However, no action has been taken on any of these.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true. I know the gentleman is concerned. I know about his approach to the matter. It is time for those hearings to begin.

May I say also that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has given much serious thought to this problem, and he, too, is terribly concerned.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman's talk is very instructive. May I add that it is very timely, in view of the fact that the State Department and the present administration have this country entangled in every quarrel everywhere in the world today. It is about time, instead of mixing into every fight, that we get ready for those we ask for.

Mr. CANFIELD. I will agree with the gentleman that it is very timely, in view of the atomic explosions that have taken place in Russia.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HUBER. The gentleman speaks of his first-hand knowledge of this by being there. Is that right?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is right.

Mr. HUBER. That is one reason why more Members of Congress should make inspection trips, notwithstanding the criticism. How else will they know, when otherwise they would have to depend on somebody to come back here from 10,000 miles away and tell them about the situation?

Mr. CANFIELD. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks today the correspondence I have had with the President of the United States and a letter from the Civil Defense Director of New Jersey, Mr. Leonard Dreyfuss, outlining how my State is proceeding to protect its citizenry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 30, 1949.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am concerned about a newspaper story published this week in Washington stating no national program has been developed for civilian defense in American cities in the event of an atomic or poison-gas attack. Washington city officials are quoted they have been given no advice, and the cities of Chicago and Detroit are said to be appraising their local situations.

My district is in a so-called target area, possibly the No. 1. The civilian defense heads in Paterson are currently seeking information and they have been unable to get such from Washington other than a reference to State authorities.

I am certain you will agree neglect, especially in the light of your recent announcement, would be unconscionable and I am equally certain you will insist on Federal authorities educating and assisting our citizenry as to the potentials of atomic warfare and methods to meet any attack in our cities and towns.

As a member of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations handling stock-piling funds, I have been glad to note your statement urging the Congress to delete the Senate rider rescinding $275,000,000 in stock-piling funds already appropriated. On August 5 last I warned the House any such cut-back would be tampering with our national security. I repeated this last Wednesday and I shall follow through.

With assurances of esteem, believe me,

Very sincerely,

GORDON CANFIELD,
Member of Congress.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD,
Washington, October 17, 1949.

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CANFIELD: The President has asked me to acknowledge your letter of September 30, 1949, and to indicate his appreciation of your interest in and deep concern for the civil defense and stock-piling aspects of our preparedness program.

Six months ago, the President asked the National Security Resources Board to take over the leadership in civil defense planning. After considerable study of the work then in process, the NSRB made assignments of planning responsibility to several departments and agencies. These assignments are explained in some detail in an announcement made to the press on June 26, 1949. A copy of that announcement is attached for your convenience.

Very recently, we were asked by the International Association of Police Chiefs and the International Association of Fire Chiefs to give them an accounting of the current status of civil defense planning in the Federal Government. I believe it would be of interest to you to review the address made to the fire chiefs by our Coordinator of Civil

Defense Planning on September 28, 1949, copy attached. A similar address was made to the police chiefs.

On October 5, 1949, after appropriate consideration by its members, the Board sent to the governors of all the States and Territories a 10-point statement of policies with respect to civil defense planning. A copy of this statement and of the covering letter are attached as NSRB Document 121.

Our concern with another aspect of protection against attack is reflected in the publication by the NSRB of the booklet entitled, "The National Security Factors in Industrial Locations."

I trust that the above information and the attachments will serve to indicate to you that the newspaper story which prompted your letter apparently was not based upon authentic information. While it is true that the Federal Government is not in a position to furnish all the information needed by State and local governments from Federal sources to develop their own civil defense plans, it should be evident that we are progressing toward that objective.

Your reference to your actions with respect to the stock-piling appropriation has been noted by the President and he is most appreciative of your support.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. STEELMAN.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
Trenton, N. J., December 28, 1949.

The Honorable GORDON CANFIELD,
Paterson, N. J.

DEAR GORDON: I am gratified that you and your colleagues are concerned with the matter of civil defense and are going to give it thorough consideration.

As you know, during World War II I was civil defense director for the State of New Jersey and also chairman of the East Coast Conference of Civil Defense Directors, comprising all States from Maine to Florida on the eastern seaboard. I served as a volunteer without pay. Governor Driscoll, early this year, reappointed me civil defense director, and we in New Jersey have given the matter very careful study.

My basic philosophy on civil defense is this: Our national war machine—Army, Navy, and Air Force—costs the United States some $15,000,000,000 a year; more than one-third of every citizen's tax payment. If that colossal war machine is necessary, then certainly civil defense is vitally important. Otherwise, the war expenditure must be a sheer extravagant waste.

Certainly, our State Department and armed forces are concerned with the possibility of war. If the unbelievable happens and we have a third war, it will strike fast, and there will be no time for preparation or training. The States on the eastern and western seaboards are particularly vulnerable. We, in New Jersey, feel that we are a critically vulnerable area. We are an industrial State. We are important, too, because we have the longest coast line on the Atlantic Ocean. We feel it would be sheer neglect not to prepare our citizens for any eventuality. Therefore, we are organizing our civil defense without any waving of flags or blowing of bugles, but on a thoroughly practical basis. We urge that your legislative body give thought to and investigate our plan. Boiled down, it is this:

We have asked each mayor in the State to appoint a civil-defense chairman and as many subcommittees as he deems necessary, according to the size of the municipality. This gives us, roughly some 3,000 citizens who will, in effect, be the executive staff of civil defense for the State. These people are going to be thoroughly trained in what to expect and how to act in the event of either a wartime or peacetime catastrophe. Then, should there be a war, there would be no difficulty in recruiting manpower under them, but at least 3,000 people throughout the State will know what to do and can go into immediate action. This is the plan we want to put before your committee.

Civil defense at the Federal level has been taken out of the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Defense and is now based under the National Security Resources Board, of which Dr. John R. Steelman is president.

It is my considered opinion that this is a grave mistake. I say this because of a very important reason. It is not easy to recruit civilians without pay in peacetime unless they are assured that what they are asked to do has important military significance. Regardless of the importance of the National Security Resources Board, it sounds like just another Government bureau to the average civilian and he does not feel that he wants to work without pay for a civilian bureau of the Government. This may seem trivial at the first reading, but it is of vital importance if we are to recruit an army of civilian volunteers and keep them interested in their task.

Governor Driscoll feels very strongly that the auxiliary police and firemen, who did such fine work during the war, have tremendous peacetime value for all of our municipalities. The communities that kept their auxiliary police and firemen when the war ended will all tell you that they would not do without them. They have been of tremendous help in emergencies such as bad fires or even local football games where additional police are needed.

In New Jersey, when World War II broke, we had some 250 professional forest-fire fighters. These men were young and able-bodied citizens who immediately went to war. We then recruited some 6,000 citizens and trained them in the art of fire fighting. We have never disbanded this force and they are of tremendous influence today in the conservation of our wooded areas. These are just a few of the peacetime dividends that the State of New Jersey got out of its wartime civil defense.

Civil defense in New Jersey is now a division of the Department of Defense which is so ably headed by Maj. Gen. Edward A. Rose. General Rose agrees with me that civil defense should be kept a civilian activity because in the event of war, the State Guard would be immediately recruited into the National Army and therefore of no avail for home defense.

This past year, at the Governor's suggestion, a civil defense bill was introduced, giving the Governor the right to declare a state of emergency when a catastrophe hits New Jersey. At that time, the civil-defense forces go into action when the Governor so directs. In other words, Governor Driscoll, today, has all of the wartime powers of civil defense which he can utilize in peacetime when a serious situation arises.

I earnestly recommend that other States follow this example. I believe that 10 or 11 have already done so. New York State has drawn a similar legislative act to be presented when their State assembly reconvenes in January. The one thing that is lacking in the picture is strong and definite direction from Washington. I think an active and well-trained civil defense organization on the eastern and western seaboards would be of tremendous military importance and would provide one more reason why hostile nations would hesitate to attack us.

To sum up, as I said in the foregoing paragraphs, I believe civil defense at the Federal level should provide strong leadership to the States. Should be based under the Secretary of Defense—not as at present—with some of the duties under the National Securities Resources Board, some under the old Public Works Administration, some under the Health Service, etc. It will work best, in my judgment, under the Secretary of Defense, with other services being called upon for advice but for no specific direction.

Sincerely,

LEONARD DREYFUSS,
State Director of Civil Defense.

AMENDMENT OF PARAGRAPH (2) (C) OF RULE XI OF THE RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 133, Rept. No. 1477), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That paragraph (2) (c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Committee on Rules shall present to the House reports concerning rules, joint rules, and order of business, within three legislative days of the time when ordered reported by the committee. If such rule or order is not considered immediately, it shall be referred to the calendar and, if not called up by the Member making the report within seven legislative days thereafter, any member of the Rules Committee may call it up as a question of privilege and the Speaker shall recognize any member of the Rules Committee seeking recognition for that purpose. If the Committee on Rules shall make an adverse report on any resolution pending before the committee, providing for an order of business for the consideration by the House of any public bill or joint resolution, on days when it shall be in order to call up motions to discharge committees it shall be in order for any Member of the House to call up for consideration by the House any such adverse report, and it shall be in order to move the adoption by the House of said resolution adversely reported notwithstanding the adverse report of the Committee on Rules, and the Speaker shall recognize the Member seeking recognition for that purpose as a question of the highest privilege."

AMENDING RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution concerning which instructions were given by the Rules Committee this morning to the effect that I should file it. I am stepping aside with the understanding that the chairman file it and that he will ask the Speaker to recognize him on Thursday to call it up, and in the event he the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is not present that I may call it up or some member of the committee favorable to the resolution shall call it up. Is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SABATH. To be candid, I did not hear the statement. I did not hear the gentleman's statement.

Mr. COX. I said that the understanding between the chairman and the committee is that I am stepping aside as the member designated to file the report, leaving it to the chairman to file it and he files it with the understanding that he will ask the Speaker to recognize him on Thursday to call it up; and in the event the chairman is not present, the understanding is that I shall call it up or some other member of the committee favorable to the resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. On what Thursday are you going to call this up?

Mr. COX. The coming Thursday, the day after tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I had understood that that could not come up this week and that it would not come up before next week, and I so advised many Members to that effect.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the gentleman from Massachusetts will remember that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] made the statement that the Korean-aid bill would be the only thing to come up this week, unless the Committee on Rules reported out a rule providing for the consideration of other matters.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. He also made the statement that the Korean bill would come up on Thursday.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. COLMER. Of course, the gentleman from Massachusetts understands that this is a matter which the Committee on Rules itself decided upon and which could not be anticipated under the circumstances.

RULE ON FEPC BILL

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has considered the rule on the fair employment practices bill today. The committee ordered reported the resolution, House Resolution 133, introduced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], on Friday, January 13, which would eliminate the procedure under the rule which we adopted on the first day of this Congress giving the committees the right, when the Committee on Rules fails to act within 21 days, to file a resolution to discharge the Committee on Rules.

Today we were considering a rule for the FEPC bill, this being the third day of its deliberations on this measure. The rule on the Cox resolution was granted, over my protest, of course, last Friday. Under the rules of the House, the chairman of the Committee on Rules has 3 days within which to file a report on a rule. I intended to file the report within this time because I have never violated the rules of the House in my 44 years of service and 20 years as a member of the Committee on Rules.

But today some members of the Committee on Rules thought the report on the Cox resolution should be filed immediately and that the right to file should be taken away from the chairman, and that the rule should be called up by the gentleman who introduced it, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox]. I felt that that was a violation of the rules of the House, because the Rules of the House plainly state as follows:

It shall be the duty of the chairman of each such committee to report or cause to be reported promptly to the Senate or House of Representatives, as the case may be, any measure approved by such committee—

The word "promptly" means within the rules—within 3 days—which I did intend to do. I thought originally that the motion of the gentleman from Georgia was out of order and so ruled, but it being 12 o'clock we adjourned, but nevertheless some of the members remained and wanted to act upon it.

In order to avoid any controversy that might develop I agreed to file it today instead of tomorrow, and I am filing the report today on the resolution.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] approached me on the floor and wanted to know if I was not present Thursday, whether the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] could call up the resolution. I said if I were not here Thursday, I would have no objection to Mr. Cox calling it up.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. COX. I have no desire to air publicly what took place in the Rules Committee this morning. It is the understanding that the gentleman will file the rule today and will ask the Speaker to recognize him on Thursday to call it up, and, in the event he is not here, it is agreeable that some other member of the committee do so.

Mr. SABATH. That was an afterthought. I do not know. I know that the committee agreed and the House agreed to take up another bill in which I and the House are very much interested. I have filed my report. As to the other procedure, I do not know whether it would be in order for me to agree to call it up Thursday, because I do not know whether that will give time enough for Members to be here on this important question.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, that is not in accord with the agreement.

Mr. SABATH. I am not inclined to create any unnecessary controversy in the House. I am trying to bring about orderly procedure.

Mr. COX. Without intending to offend, Mr. Speaker, that is an evasion, and it is not in keeping with the understanding we had on the floor a few minutes ago. The understanding was that if I would step aside, having been designated by the committee to act, and let the chairman make the report, that he would ask the Speaker to recognize him to call it up on Thursday, and in the event he is not present, that I would call it up, or some other member of the committee.

Mr. SABATH. Well, I do not say that I will not call it up Thursday. I do not want to say that, but I do not want to be bound by that.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I will have to withdraw the statement I made, based upon the agreement and understanding I had with the chairman, and ask the Speaker to recognize me to file the report.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Of course, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, I am sure, wants to be perfectly fair and carry out all commitments. I am going to ask my distinguished chairman if he did not tell me a few minutes ago, standing in the well of this House, that it would be agreeable to him, and that he would not raise any question if he could not be here on Thursday and could not call it up, that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], or some other member of the Rules Committee could call it up.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from Mississippi did come to me after I had stated that I was going to file the rule today. He did ask, if I am not in town, whether I would agree that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] should call up the resolution. I said, "If I am not in town, and Mr. Cox is recognized by the Speaker, I would have no objection to it."

Mr. COX. May I ask the gentleman a question? Did not the gentleman tell me that he would call it up Thursday?

Mr. SABATH. Well, I do not remember saying that I would call it up Thursday.

Mr. COX. Does not the gentleman know that I would never have agreed to step aside——

Mr. SABATH. Oh, stepping aside, nothing. I have a right to file it, and what you have tried to do in the committee does not matter. Under the rules of the House I have the right and privilege to file the resolution, and no one else.

Mr. COX. Is it the intention of the gentleman to call it up Thursday; and if he does not, then will it be agreeable for some other member of the committee to do so?

Mr. SABATH. I said if I am not in town and it is agreeable that the Speaker will recognize you and you want to call it up, it is all right with me.

Mr. COX. But if the gentleman is here, does he intend to ask the Speaker to recognize him to call it up?

Mr. SABATH. Well, I do not know. I want to consult with the Speaker and others.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. DELANEY. On Friday last, the committee reported out this resolution by a vote of 9 to 2. Is that correct?

Mr. SABATH. Correct.

Mr. DELANEY. And in accordance with that action of the committee today the gentleman filed the report; is that right?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. DELANEY. And it is not necessary that the gentleman make any commitment to anyone other than to file it according to the direction of the committee; is that right?

Mr. SABATH. That is my opinion.

Mr. DELANEY. That is exactly what the gentleman ought to do.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman from Illinois state to the House whether or not, so far as he knows, he will be in town on Thursday?

Mr. SABATH. To be candid, I ought to be home because of the illness of Mrs. Sabath. I will know this afternoon or tonight how she is. I may be obliged to leave tomorrow if she is not in good health; if the doctors say she is not improving I will have to leave tomorrow or the day after. At the moment I do not know, but I will know later in the day.

As the gentleman realizes, I was not here the first few days of the session; I was not able to come when the House met on the 3d of the month because of her illness; I came only last Monday.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under the circumstances I appreciate the answer of the gentleman from Illinois, but to resolve the question presently before us it would be pertinent to know whether or not the gentleman is to be in town, because apparently he has stated that his being agreeable to the rule's being called up by some other member of the Rules Committee depended on whether or not he was to be in town.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, by direction of the Committee on Rules I file a privileged resolution; and permit me to make this statement; these differences may be ironed out later.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Georgia if it is the same resolution that has already been reported to the House.

Mr. COX. I presume it is the same resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chair doubts very seriously whether two reports on the same resolution can be filed at the same time.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the filing of this rule at this time.

The SPEAKER. Permit the Chair to handle this matter.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. But I am making a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was clarifying the situation. The Chair is of opinion that two reports cannot be filed on the same resolution at the same time.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I addressed my remarks to the gentleman from Illinois. I will ask the gentleman: Is it the gentleman's intention in keeping with the agreement that he had with me in the event that he is here Thursday to ask the Speaker to recognize him?

Mr. SABATH. I will state this to you, sir——

Mr. COX. No, no; that is what you said to me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SABATH. Oh, because you say so, I do not so understand. I did say this, that if I am not in the city that I have no objection to your calling up the resolution.

Mr. COX. But if the gentleman is here, did he not say he would ask——

Mr. SABATH. Is not that what I said?

Mr. COX. Did you not tell me twice that you would ask the Speaker to recognize you?

Mr. SABATH. I do not say that I will not call it up; I am going to consult with the Speaker and the majority leader.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has consumed at least a minute.

Mr. SABATH. I think I have.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is a disagreeable situation to have arise here, and I would hope the Speaker would permit the Committee on Rules to file the resolution which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] was directed to file and let this matter simmer over the day. I think the gentlemen can get together in a friendly arrangement about it, and arrange for some time that will be agreeable to all parties to bring this measure up. If we could have this opportunity of having the two resolutions lying on the table just to be reported so that we could try and iron out this thing in a friendly, orderly sort of way instead of having a rather unbecoming discussion concerning it here all the morning, I think the difficulty could be solved. I am wondering if in the interest of harmony and getting this matter straightened out the Speaker would not permit the Committee on Rules to file the resolution which the gentleman from Georgia has attempted to file.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is trying to carry out orderly procedure. If two identical resolutions on the same subject matter can be reported, then a number can be reported and the RECORD would be cluttered up. The Chair hopes the gentleman from Virginia will not say that he hopes the Chair will allow something to be done if he thinks it is unnecessary because the report has already been filed.

As to the agreement, the Chair knows nothing about that, and the Chair thinks that any agreement that may be worked out between now and tomorrow can as well be worked out without the reporting of an unnecessary resolution as with it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I hope the Speaker understands I am not finding fault with his ruling; as a matter of fact, I have no right to. I am speaking in a conciliatory way hoping that we may iron something out.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hopes this whole matter can be ironed out also.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. KEEFE asked and was given permission to address the House tomorrow for 30 minutes following disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the Members are fully informed as to the rule governing the calling up of resolutions reported by the Rules Committee. Am I correct in my understanding that the gentleman from the Rules Committee who files a rule is the only one permitted to call up the resolution for a period of seven legislative days?

The SPEAKER. That is true unless the committee directs otherwise.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, do not the rules of the House provide that the gentleman who files a resolution with the Speaker is the only one permitted to call up the resolution and does the Speaker mean that the Committee on Rules can by a majority vote override what is provided in the rules of the House?

The SPEAKER. Of course, the chairman could request another member of the committee to call up a resolution in his absence. That certainly could be done. Otherwise, if the chairman of the Rules Committee were out of town continuously the Committee on Rules could not offer a resolution and, as a matter of fact, the House could not function either.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I beg the Chair's pardon?

The SPEAKER. If it were otherwise, and if the chairman of the committee were out of town the whole session, the Committee on Rules could not operate, neither could the House.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, my point is that the gentleman who files a petition has the privilege for seven legislative days to call up the resolution and failing to call it up within that time, after the 7 days any member of the Rules Committee can call it up; is that correct?

The SPEAKER. That is what the rule says but that is not what we have been talking about for the last half hour. The Chair trusts no more parliamentary inquiries will be addressed to the Chair for the simple reason that he would like to see these misunderstandings composed.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I think every Member of the House realizes the importance of the resolution which has just been discussed and about which I have directed a parliamentary inquiry. I think also that the Members of the House are beginning to realize that the whole country is aroused over this resolution and this very important proposal to go back to the rules as they existed before the commencement of the Eighty-first Congress.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it would be the wise thing for the House to wait for a few days before considering a major proposition like this. It is further my considered judgment that those who are trying to rush through this resolution are doing so because of the fear in their hearts that they will hear from the country at large, and that they are trying to

put something over on the American people before they can find out what is going on in Washington. They are trying, in my opinion, to put over a fast one involving a matter that will affect legislation for many, many years to come. Mr. Speaker, this should not be rushed through when many Members are away from Washington.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

AMENDMENT OF RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to restate for the understanding of everyone that when I stepped aside and yielded to the chairman the right to report the resolution reported in the Committee on Rules this morning, I stated the conditions under which I was doing so. The agreement or understanding had with the chairman was to the effect that if I would step aside the chairman would file the report today, and he would ask the Speaker to recognize him on Thursday to call it up, and in the event he was not here that I would have that privilege.

AMENDING RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I think it is obvious to the whole country what this maneuvering that has been going on in and out of the Rules Committee is all about. The purpose of this maneuver is to bypass what ordinarily would take place next Monday, and that is the calling up of the FEPC bill if the Speaker recognizes the chairman of the Committee on Labor, and if the chairman of the Committee on Labor asks for recognition.

I do not believe, I will say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], that if a private agreement was made between the two, that that agreement is binding on the House or on the country. The interests of FEPC and civil rights are paramount to any private agreement that may have been entered into between the two gentlemen, if such an agreement was entered into. Any private agreement operating against civil-rights legislation is contrary to the public interest and can have no validity.

The rules of the House give the chairman of the Rules Committee seven legislative days in which to call up the resolution that is intended to deprive the House of the right to vote on FEPC next Monday. He is honor bound not to call it up until after next Monday. He is one of the leaders of the Democratic administration which promised FEPC to the Nation in its platform. President Truman has repeated that promise. The chairman of the Rules Committee, the other Democratic leaders of this House, as well as President Truman, can have FEPC passed next Monday if they really want it. Therefore, they all have the responsibility of seeing to it that this latest maneuver of the Rules Committee be not brought up in this House before FEPC is taken up next Monday. Further, in keeping with the demands of the people of this country for civil rights, I call upon the chairman of the Rules Committee to stand by his rights and not call up this resolution for seven legislative days, so that on Monday the chips will be down and we will know in this House whether Truman and his Democratic Party meant what was in the platform or whether the platform and Truman's speeches are some more demagogy. We know what the Republican Party has done, however, in the Committee on Rules. It knifed FEPC.

THE COAL SHORTAGE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, my home city of Royal Oak, Mich., contains about 43,000 inhabitants. It is a residential city in the metropolitan area of Detroit, made up mostly of homes of people who work in Detroit, or have their business in Detroit.

I received a telegram from the mayor of that city which I feel should be placed in the RECORD and the President given notice of existing conditions. This telegram is dated the 13th of this month, last Friday. This is what the mayor, Vernald E. Horn, has to say:

ROYAL OAK, MICH., *January 13, 1950.*
Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Coal dealers in Royal Oak average only 3 or 4 days' supply of coal; a very serious situation for this residential city. Unless additional supplies of coal become available immediately, the health and safety of the community will be seriously jeopardized. We urge action to relieve coal shortage.

CITY OF ROYAL OAK, MICH.,
VERNALD E. HORN, *Mayor.*

In a State like Michigan, where winter in January is not like the winter in southern California and Florida, people must have fuel to keep warm or they suffer. The community is in danger, and I hope something will be done, and done immediately to relieve the situation. What I say about Royal Oak can be said generally about the people of the State who use coal.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 18, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 133. Resolution to amend paragraph (2) (c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House (relating to the Committee on Rules) to read as it read during the Eightieth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1477). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3205. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the time for making application for terminal-leave pay; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1487). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5921. A bill to terminate lump-sum benefits provided by law to certain Reserve officers of the Navy and Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 1488). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1446. An act for the relief of James Hung Loo; without amendment (Rept. No. 1478). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1702. An act for the relief of Riyoko Sato; without amendment (Rept. No. 1479). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1915. An act for the relief of Viktor A. Kravchenko; without amendment (Rept. No. 1480). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2100. An act for the relief of Penelope Corolyn Cox; without amendment (Rept. No. 1481). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2114. An act for the relief of Mitsue Shigeno; without amendment (Rept. No. 1482). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1862. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Walter K. Miyamoto (formerly Miyoko Takahashi); with an amendment (Rept. No. 1483). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6093. A bill for the relief of Masami Hiroya and Aiko Hiroya; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1484). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6283. A bill for the relief of Johny Nielsen; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1485). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4502. A bill to authorize the

Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain easement near Fort Belvoir, Va., in exchange for another easement elsewhere on the same property; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1486). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 6805. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Military Departments to provide for the promotion and maintenance of civilian recreation programs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BAILEY (by request):

H. R. 6806. A bill to promote the progress and welfare directly of the wage earners and indirectly of all the people of the United States by establishing an information and service agency in the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 6807. A bill to provide for the expansion and disposition of certain national cemeteries; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 6808. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to extend the time for filing the report of the War Claims Commission pursuant to section 8 of such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 6809. A bill to provide for the termination of rent control under the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 in municipalities which enact adequate local rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 6810. A bill to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for families of moderate income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 6811. A bill to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for families of moderate income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 6812. A bill to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 6813. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 6814. A bill to amend section 12 of the Missing Persons Act, as amended, relating to travel by dependents and transportation of household and personal effects; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 6815. A bill to amend sections 112 and 113 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 6816. A bill to authorize the President to convey the United States Army Provisional Philippine Scout Hospital at Fort McKinley, Philippines, to the Republic of the Philippines and to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for Philippine Scouts hospitalized therein; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 6817. A bill to prohibit the payment of awards of annuity under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, in the case of Government officers and employees convicted of a felony; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6818. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 6819. A bill to provide for the credit of subscription charges or insurance premiums with respect to health or medical service plans or programs or health or medical insurance for the purposes of the Federal income tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 6820. A bill to authorize the acceptance of foreign decorations for participation in the Berlin airlift; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 6821. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the city of Lynn, Mass.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 6822. A bill to amend Public Law 810, Eightieth Congress, chapter 708, second session; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 6823. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) with respect to the computation of estimated costs of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction in the case of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 6824. A bill to authorize certain land and other property transactions by the military departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 6825. A bill to extend the time limits for the award of certain decorations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 6826. A bill to extend the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604) for a period of 3 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6827. A bill to amend the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503), as amended (known as the Vinson-Trammell Act), so as to remove certain construction limitations therefrom, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 6828. A bill to provide for incentives, increased production, and employment through reduction in taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. J. Res. 398. Joint resolution relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITTINGTON:

H. J. Res. 399. Joint resolution relating to rice acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. Con. Res. 172. Concurrent resolution favoring the invoking by the President of the United States of the national-emergency provisions of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in the pending coal strike; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. Con. Res. 173. Concurrent resolution favoring the invoking by the President of the United States of the national-emergency provisions of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in the pending coal strike; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. Con. Res. 174. Concurrent resolution favoring the invoking by the President of the United States of the national-emergency provisions of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in the pending coal strike; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. Con. Res. 175. Concurrent resolution favoring the invoking by the President of the United States of the national-emergency provisions of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in the pending coal strike; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. Res. 426. Resolution directing the Federal Milk Marketing Authority to raise the price paid to producers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. WHITTINGTON: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, urging Congress to take immediate steps to correct inequities in present Cotton Allotment Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, urging Congress to take such action as it may deem necessary to make a more careful selection of displaced persons before admission to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, urging Congress to make an appropriation of $250,000,000 for the construction or reconstruction of United States Highway No. 90; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHESNEY:

H. R. 6829. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Ernest Isler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORSKI:

H. R. 6830. A bill for the relief of Martha Ejbeh and Nayes Ejbeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 6831. A bill for the relief of C & S Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 6832. A bill for the relief of Choko Nishida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE of California:

H. R. 6833. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Bruna Pardini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1670. By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New Castle County, Del., containing 62 signatures, opposing the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1671. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New Castle County, Del., containing 150 signatures, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1672. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Kent County, Del.,

containing 187 signatures, opposing the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1673. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 21 members of the New Castle (Pa.) Ministerial Association, urging the passage of the civil-rights program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1674. Also, petition of members of the City Council of New Castle, Pa., and certain individual residents of New Castle, urging the passage of the civil-rights program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1675. By Mr. HOLMES: Petitions of citizens in the vicinity of College Place and Walla Walla, Wash., bearing 1,274 signatures, favoring legislation to outlaw alcoholic-beverage advertising over the air and through the channels of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1676. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Petition of 27 residents of Easton, Md., to support and strengthen the United Nations as set forth in House Concurrent Resolution 64 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 56; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1677. Also, petition of 50 members of the WCTU of Hurlock, Md., in support of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1678. By Mr. RICH: Petition of the Bradford (Pa.) Board of Commerce, against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1679. By Mr. RIEHLMAN: Petition of Mrs. Josiah Tallmadge and other residents of Onondaga County advocating passage of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1680. Also, petition of Mrs. Harold C. Bainbridge and other residents of Onondaga County, advocating passage of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1681. Also, petition of Mrs. Herman Carpenter and other residents of Onondaga County, advocating passage of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1682. Also, petition of Miss Leah J. Keeler and other residents of Onondaga County, advocating passage of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1683. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Fine Arts Club of Beloit, Beloit, Wis., protesting against any form of compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1684. Also, resolutions of the Delavan Olio Club, Delavan, Wis., opposing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1685. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Miami Townsend Club, No. 22, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1686. Also, petition of Mrs. Jeanette Kellogg and others, of St. Cloud, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1687. Also, petition of Mrs. Maggie Goldsmith and others, of Orlovista, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1688. Also, petition of Buddy Hays and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1689. Also, petition of A. F. Horton and others, Ormond, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1690. Also, petition of Josie B. Gardner and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1691. Also, petition of H. C. Curtis and others, West Palm Beach, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all wisdom, away from the confusion of tongues we seek this quiet pavilion of prayer. We confess that we but grope in the darkness and that our sight is dim, our knowledge partial, and our judgments fallible.

Lift us out of our doubt and cynicism by a great faith to live by, great causes to live for. Teach us to value beauty of heart or of brain, in any strand of our common humanity, that we may become workers together with Thee in binding the races of man into that perfect unity that shall yet belt the earth with good will when Thy radiant kingdom comes. In the dear Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 17, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Martin
Anderson	Hill	Maybank
Benton	Hoey	Millikin
Brewster	Holland	Mundt
Bridges	Humphrey	Murray
Butler	Jenner	Myers
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Darby	Kefauver	Pepper
Donnell	Kem	Russell
Douglas	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Downey	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Leahy	Sparkman
Ecton	Lehman	Taft
Ellender	Lodge	Taylor
Ferguson	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McCarran	Thye
Fulbright	McCarthy	Tobey
George	McClellan	Tydings
Gillette	McFarland	Vandenberg
Graham	McKellar	Watkins
Green	McMahon	Williams
Gurney	Magnuson	Withers
Hayden	Malone	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON] are attending the inauguration of Hon. John S. Battle as Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, and are therefore unavoidably absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business as members of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, holding hearings on various flood-control and public-works projects in the State of New Mexico.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on important public business.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. DARBY, because of official business in his State, was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during the week beginning January 22.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MYERS obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate may be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and submit other

routine matters for the RECORD and the Appendix of the RECORD, without debate, and without the Senator from Pennsylvania losing the floor thereby.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Six letters from the Attorney General, withdrawing the names of Leslie Alexander Panton, Silvestra Flores or Angel Silvestre Flores or Crescencio Reza or Soltero Delfin or Crescencio Reva or Jose Marquez, Raymundo Gonzales or Raymond Gonzales or Filiberto Huerta, Ishmael Theophilus Beckles, Nickolas Georgios Ganotis, and Valeria Juliano or Valeria Margherita Nerina Iuliano from reports relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted to the Senate on April 1, 1949, July 15, 1949, August 1, 1949, October 1, 1949, and October 17, 1949, respectively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT OF HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities and transactions of the Commission under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 for the period October 1, 1949, through December 31, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Rochester (Wash.) Townsend Club, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 2181, providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by the Florida State Townsend Council, Tampa, and a State Townsend mass meeting, held in Tampa, both in the State of Florida, favoring the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan, providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the United States, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan, providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Frederick W. Galbraith Post, No. 999, the American Legion, of New York, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation providing statehood for Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Resolutions adopted by the Southwestern Idaho District Dental Society, Nampa, Idaho, the Cascade County Dental Association, Great Falls, Mont., the Bradford Board of Commerce, Bradford, Pa., the Greater Carbondale Chamber of Commerce, Carbondale, Pa., the Toledo Dental Society of Toledo, Ohio, and the Hawaii County Dental Society, of Hawaii, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The memorial of Mrs. A. E. Page, of West Fairlee, Vt., remonstrating against the enactment of House bill 2945 and Senate bill 1103, to adjust postal rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter in the nature of a memorial, signed by John W. Dargavel, executive secretary, the National Association of Retail Druggists, of Chicago, Illinois, enclosing a copy of a resolution adopted by that association at its annual convention held in New York City, September 18, 1949, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 1008, to provide a 2-year moratorium with respect to the application of certain antitrust laws to individuals, good faith delivered price systems, and freight-absorption practices (with an accompanying paper); ordered to lie on the table.

RELEASE OF CERTAIN MARINES HELD BY COMMUNISTS—RESOLUTION OF MARINE PARENTS' CLUB, INC., CINCINNATI, OHIO

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Marine Parents' Club, Inc., of Cincinnati, Ohio, relating to the release of certain members of the Marine Corps held by the Communists.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Marine Parents' Club, Inc., of Cincinnati, Ohio, was formed and incorporated for the specific purpose of aiding and assisting members of the United States Marine Corps and their families; and

Whereas our attention has been directed by newspapers and radio to the fact that on October 19, 1948, Master Sgt. Elmer C. Bender, United States Marine Corps, and Chief Electrician's Mate William C. Smith, United States Navy, while on duty and in the service of the United States were taken prisoner after being forced to make an emergency landing behind the Communist lines; and

Whereas the State Department and other governmental agencies who could assist in having these men released have been very negligent in the matter, causing undue hardship on these men as well as untold mental agony to their families: Therefore be it

Resolved, That an appeal be made to the President of the United States, to the members of his Cabinet, and to all Senators and Representatives in Congress to the end that immediate steps be taken by the proper authorities through the International Red Cross, the United Nations, or by some foreign government who may have representatives in Communist China, to demand that these men be released at once and sent home to their families, as was recently done concerning members of our Diplomatic Corps; and be it further

Resolved, That our Government be requested to treat all Americans alike and equal, whether they be civilians, in the Diplomatic Corps, or in military service; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all United States Senators and Congressional Representatives.

ROBERT G. GLENN,
President, the Marine Parents' Club, Inc.

INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES STEEL CORP.—RESOLUTION OF UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA, CIO, ROCHESTER, N. Y.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the United Steelworkers of America, CIO, of Rochester, N. Y., requesting an investigation of the United States Steel Corp. relating to the price of steel.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA, CIO, LOCAL 1498, DISTRICT 4, ROCHESTER, N. Y.

We, as a part of the national organization of the United Steelworkers of America, CIO, abandoned our wage demand in our negotiations for a new contract, in accordance with the findings of the Presidential fact-finding board.

In our negotiating conferences both union and management based their agreement on this report, and thus we were able to conclude our conferences and write a new contract with no strike involved.

We feel that the price increase, recently announced by United States Steel Corp., is a direct threat to the economy of the country and indicates a flagrant disregard of the welfare and economic stability of all the fabricators in the steel industry who are being caught in a remorseless squeeze by this monopolistic and greedy corporation.

The earnings of United States Steel, according to all accepted standards, are more than enough to absorb the cost of pensions and insurance plans embodied in their new contract with the union.

During the immediate prewar period, the war period, and the postwar period up to and including the present time, United States Steel has piled up unheard-of and undreamed-of profits. Despite this, every wage increase or other benefits, to the employee has been passed on to the fabricators or other consumers and eventually to the public and generally the price raise has been more than was actually needed to cover the so-called added expense.

We further feel that this practice is driving us inevitably toward Government control of the basic-steel industry which is something that, I am sure, no one, least of all we of the union, want.

Bearing all these facts in mind, it can only be assumed that the United States Steel Corp. is sticking to its policy of "the public be damned."

We are, therefore, on behalf of this organization, asking you in your official capacity to ask for a complete congressional investigation of the United States Steel Corp., and its subsidiaries, with a view of doing everything possible to force them to rescind their latest price increase. In that way stabilizing our economy and avoiding a ruinous strike in the steel industry at the expiration of the present contracts, which is a practical certainty if this price increase is allowed to stand.

ROBERT F. BURNETT,
President.

WILLIE MAY DORSEY

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 210), which

was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Willie May Dorsey, widow of Mitchell J. Dorsey, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ENTITLED "PROGRESS ON HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS"

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 211), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, United States Senate, 3,500 additional copies of Senate Report No. 1158, Eighty-first Congress, first session, entitled "Progress on the Hoover Commission Recommendations."

FIVE PERCENTER INVESTIGATION—INTERIM REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (S. REPT. NO. 1232)

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I submit herewith an interim report of the Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments made to the full committee, dealing with the 5-percenter investigation conducted by the committee last summer and fall.

The subcommittee sought to elicit such information during the investigation as would serve to present a clear picture of the customs and practices engaged in by certain persons who were holding themselves out as possessing unusual facilities for having things done in Government and who were charging business men and others for the supposed influence which they possessed and for the services which they represented that they could render to those who employed them.

The report speaks for itself. The committee did not go on any punitive expedition. It sought only to find the facts and to disclose them without regard to whom they affected. There was no purpose to injure any individual or to interfere with any legitimate service rendered by either attorneys or business agents. The purpose also was to aid Government officials in the proper discharge of their duty and to safeguard them from imposition by people who might have ulterior purposes to serve. Wherever criticisms are made, they are in the public interest. The committee had no desire to either smear or clear anyone but rather to develop the facts in the hope that the public service would be improved and irregular or improper practices discontinued.

The committee sought to do constructive work. This report will be later followed by the presentation of a measure calculated to make permanent the changes and improvements which have been effected in different Government agencies and to aid the general public and especially small business men in having access to Government agencies and bureaus without the necessity of having to expend vast sums of money to obtain the information necessary to properly conduct their business with their government. It is in this spirit and for this purpose that the committee held the hearings and that this report is submitted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

REPORT OF PERSONNEL AND FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following report was received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JANUARY 15, 1950.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Mills Astin, chief clerk	$8,438.93	$4,085.48
Nellie D. McSherry, assistant chief clerk	7,775.31	3,764.20
Albert A. Grorud, professional staff member	8,438.93	4,085.48
Elmer K. Nelson, professional staff member	8,438.93	4,085.48
Stewart French, professional staff member	7,775.31	3,764.20
Arthur A. Sandusky, professional staff member	7,775.31	3,764.20
Charlotte Mickle, clerical assistant	3,980.59	1,927.10
Saides Blair, clerical assistant	3,719.87	1,800.84
Mary C. Moran, clerical assistant	3,719.87	1,436.74

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$45,000.00
Amount expended, Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1949	9,489.93
Balance unexpended	35,510.07

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Abraham J. Harris, of Illinois, to be Assistant Solicitor General, vice George T. Washington, resigned, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONVENTION WITH IRELAND RELATING TO TAXES ON ESTATES—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive E, Eighty-first Congress, second session, a convention between the United States of America and Ireland, signed at Dublin on September 13, 1949, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on the estates of deceased persons. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the convention, and the President's message, together with the convention, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the convention between the United States of America and Ireland, signed at Dublin on September 13, 1949, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on the estates of deceased persons.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the convention.

The convention has the approval of the Department of State and the Treasury Department.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1950.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) Estate-Tax Convention between the United States and Ireland, signed September 13, 1949.)

CONVENTION WITH IRELAND RELATING TO TAXES ON INCOME—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive F, Eighty-first Congress, second session, a convention between the United States of America and Ireland, signed at Dublin on September 13, 1949, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the convention, and the President's message, together with the convention, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the convention between the United States of America and Ireland, signed at Dublin on September 13, 1949, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report of the Secretary of State with respect to the convention.

The convention has the approval of the Department of State and the Treasury Department.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1950.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) Income-tax convention between the United States and Ireland, signed September 13, 1949.)

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unani-

mous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2888. A bill for the relief of Frances Ethel Beddington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2889. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 2890. A bill for the relief of Kikuko Mori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 2891. A bill designating the first Monday of October in each year as National Farm Day and declaring such day a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 2892. A bill for the relief of Isabel Toldi; and

S. 2893. A bill for the relief of Hermanegild Sanz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. HOEY):

S. 2894. A bill to provide for the continued construction of the Blue Ridge Parkway motor road between the Shenandoah National Park, Va., and Asheville, N. C.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 2895. A bill for the relief of the adopted child of Lt. and Mrs. Edward Cuccia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Res. 145. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to enable the Congress, in aid of the common defense, to function effectively in time of emergency or disaster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. J. Res. 146. Joint resolution relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PLIGHT OF CHILDREN REMOVED FROM GREECE TO EASTERN EUROPE DURING GUERRILLA WARFARE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on the 6th day of January, the archbishop of the Greek Orthodox Church, a very great and noble person, Archbishop Michael, honored Florida by visiting the Atlantic City of that State, Tarpon Springs. He called attention to the shocking tragedy of 28,000 Greek children being taken out of that country and distributed among other nations by the guerrillas. Following his conversation, I sent a telegram to the President urging action by our Government in the interest of the restoration of those children to their homes. I received, in response to that telegram, a letter from Hon. Matthew J. Connelly, secretary to the President, together with a communication passing between the President and the archbishop on January 6. Before offering those instruments, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a resolution which reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate profoundly condemns the action of the Communist guerrilla forces in Greece in abducting thousands of Greek children and carrying them off into servitude in countries of eastern Europe during the course of the recent Communist guerrilla warfare in Greece, and requests the President to exert all of his powers, acting through the United Nations and other international organizations and directly with the governments of the countries where these children are confined, to the end that these thousands of children shall be speedily returned to their homes and homeland.

The resolution (S. Res. 212) submitted by Mr. PEPPER was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask unanimous consent that the documents which I have identified appear in the body of the RECORD in full at this point.

There being no objection, the documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALLAHASSEE, FLA.,
January 7, 1950.

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

Yesterday while attending Epiphany day ceremonies at our beautiful Tarpon Springs, the most Hellenic city in the United States, you know, Archbishop Michael, the new Greek Orthodox bishop for North and South America, paid the highest tribute to you and to our Government for what we have done to save and to help the Greek people. While the archbishop reported that our program had achieved most satisfying progress in protecting the security and promoting the economic recovery of Greece, the archbishop told of how the heart of the Greek people bled for 28,000 of their children who had been kidnaped and carried off into Communist servitude by guerrillas and expressed the fervent hope that the President and our country would take the determined initiative through the United Nations and with the governments of the countries where these kidnaped children are confined, to restore them to their homes and to their homeland. While the archbishop hopes to have the opportunity when he visits Washington to discuss this matter with the President personally, I assured him of the very deep interest of the people of Florida and myself in this great humanitarian project and that I would immediately address this message to the President. I know how deeply you have been personally moved by this shocking outrage to humanity and that you have been doing and will continue to do everything in your power and in the power of our Government to bring these children back to their parents. I have assured the archbishop that I am confident Congress will cooperate in every possible way and that I proposed to bring up the matter in the Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate upon my return to Washington next week. I shall look forward to discussing this matter with you personally at first opportunity I have for personal conference.

Most sincerely,

CLAUDE PEPPER,
United States Senator.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 9, 1950.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PEPPER: The President has asked me to acknowledge the receipt of the telegram which you sent him from Tallahassee and to assure you of his appreciation of your interest in wiring as you did.

Last Friday the President sent a message to His Grace Michael, Orthodox archbishop of North and South America, in response to an appeal which he had received from Archbishop Michael regarding the plight of the children removed from Greece to eastern Europe during the course of the recent guerrilla warfare. A copy of the exchange of messages between the President and Archbishop Michael is attached for your information and convenient reference.

With kind regards,

Very sincerely yours,

MATTHEW J. CONNELLY,
Secretary to the President.

JANUARY 6, 1950.

The President today sent the following message to His Grace Michael, Orthodox archbishop of North and South America:

"In response to your appeal, I am glad to assure you that the United States will continue to give the utmost support to the efforts of the United Nations and the international Red Cross organizations to bring about the return to Greece of the thousands of children removed from that country to eastern Europe during the course of the recent guerrilla warfare. The people of the United States, and particularly the mothers of the United States, are deeply sensitive to the plight of these children and their bereaved families. We pray that the governments of the countries harboring these children will be moved by a spirit of broad humanitarianism to cooperate in fulfilling the unanimous desire of the United Nations General Assembly that these children be promptly restored to their homes.

"HARRY S. TRUMAN."

Following is the text of the message sent to the President by Archbishop Michael:

"Just from Greece as the new spiritual leader of the Greek-American Orthodox people in your and our prosperous and beloved country. I make today an appeal to the civilized humanity and generous American people for the return to their parents of the abducted Greek children. Our Orthodox people here and in Greece who are so grateful to you and to the American people for all given assistance will count very much on your personality. Will you please exercise all your high influence upon the members of the United Nations so that these Greek children are returned to their homes?

"MICHAEL,
"Archbishop of North and South America."

IMPROVEMENT OF FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE SYSTEM—AMENDMENT

Mr. HENDRICKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6000) to extend and improve the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System, to amend the public assistance and child-welfare provisions of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

FORTY YEARS OF ACHIEVEMENT BY NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FINE ARTS (S. DOC. NO. 128)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the document I hold in my hand, entitled "Forty Years of Achievement," commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the establishment of the National Commission on Fine Arts, be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON—BROADCASTS BY SENATOR MARTIN

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD four broadcasts

by him under the headline "Happenings in Washington," on October 24, November 7, November 21, and December 5, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT ON ATLANTIC UNION BY FORMER SUPREME COURT JUSTICE OWEN J. ROBERTS

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts on the subject of Atlantic union, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRACTICAL INTERNATIONALISM—ADDRESS BY WALTER CENERAZZO

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Practical Internationalism," delivered by Walter Cenerazzo, national president, American Watchworkers Union, before the International Student's Center, Cambridge, Mass., on January 8, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT TO THE AID OF FARMERS—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Taft-Hartley Act to the Aid of Farmers," published in the Washington Times-Herald of January 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

LIQUOR AND FREE SPEECH—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Liquor and Free Speech," published in the Christian Science Monitor of January 14, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CLOSE OF A CHAPTER—ARTICLE BY FELIX MORLEY

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Close of a Chapter," written by Felix Morley and published in Human Events of January 11, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

FAILURE OF PEACE ON EARTH—LETTER FROM EMIL FREDRICH

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to the editor of the Garrison (N. Dak.) Independent, by Emil Fredrich, of Garrison, N. Dak., which appears in the Appendix.]

MR. TRUMAN'S BUDGET — EDITORIAL FROM THE NEVADA (MO.) DAILY MAIL

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Truman's Budget," published in the Nevada (Mo.) Daily Mail of January 10, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PINE TREE—ESSAY BY JACKIE DOUBERLY

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an essay by Jackie Douberly, entitled "The Pine Tree, Its Importance and Possibilities to Baker County," together with her accompanying letter, which appear in the Appendix.]

GET THE REAL FACTS BEFORE JUDGING EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS — STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him broadcast at the week end October 14–16, on the subject Get the Real Facts Before Judging Eighty-first Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

LOW-RENT HOUSING PROGRAM OF THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a broadcast by him on the subject Low-Rent Housing Program of the Eighty-first Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

FARM BILL OF THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a broadcast by him on the subject Farm Bill of the Eighty-first Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAGE-HOUR BILL OF THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a broadcast by him on the subject Wage-Hour Bill of the Eighty-first Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACHIEVEMENTS BY ECA—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a broadcast by him on the subject Achievements of ECA, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHRISTMAS 1949—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a broadcast by him on the subject Christmas 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY—PRIZE-WINNING ESSAY BY MISS GLORIA CHOMIAK

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a winning essay entitled "I Speak for Democracy," by Miss Gloria Chomiak, of 510 South Heald Street, Wilmington, Del., in the recent contest sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters, the Radio Manufacturers Association, and the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, which appears in the Appendix.]

NLRB SCHISM—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. DOUGLAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "NLRB Schism," published in the Washington Post of January 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, there is now pending to the oleo bill an amendment proposing to add as a rider the antilynching bill. I believe similar amendments proposing to add the FEPC bill and the anti-poll-tax bill as riders to the oleo bill will also be offered Therefore I should like to address my remarks to all those riders, although but one is pending at the moment.

Mr. President, I am going to vote to table further discussion of the civil-rights amendments which have or will be proposed as riders on the bill to repeal the Federal taxes on oleomargarine. However, I want the RECORD to be absolutely clear as to why I am supporting the motion to lay these amendments on the table.

In the first place, I think it is imperative that we identify these riders for what they are. The so-called civil-rights riders are designed to kill oleo tax repeal. They have that purpose, and no other purpose. The riders are not intended to give us, in a single package, both repeal of oleo taxes and civil rights. It is simply a cut-rate device to kill two birds with one stone.

We are told that a vote in favor of tabling the amendments is a vote against civil rights. This is categorically untrue—and I believe this may be proved with what approaches mathematical exactness. I am happy, incidentally, to report that such responsible organizations as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People recognize that the amendments are being attempted here for the wrong purpose.

Mr. President, I understand that the majority leader will address himself in detail to a telegram which has been received from the acting secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in which he has made very clear the position of his organization in regard to these amendments. Therefore, I shall not burden the Senate with a discussion of the opinions of that organization, inasmuch as the distinguished majority leader will, I understand, address himself to that subject. But I ask unanimous consent that the telegram be printed in full at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People we urge the defeat of the so-called civil-rights amendments offered by Senator WILLIAM LANGER to H. R. 2023, the bill to repeal oleomargarine tax. As you know, this association since its inception 40 years ago has worked unceasingly to win for all persons, regardless of race, religion, or nationality, security of person and freedom of political and economic opportunity. Senator LANGER does not intend for his amendments to further the cause of civil rights. He desires only to defeat the oleomargarine-tax repeal. Senator LANGER made this clear in his speech on the Senate floor January 11 when he charged that the passage of H. R. 2023 "Will ruin thousands of farmers in the State of North Dakota." Last year, this association actively supported amendments to prohibit racial segregation in housing and education when respective bills were before the Senate. Racial discrimination in both of these fields is widely practiced and should be banned in all Federal aid to such programs. Lynching, poll taxes, and other such civil-rights questions are not, however, germane to, or involved in, the repeal of the oleomargarine taxes. We, therefore, urge the defeat of the so-called Langer civil-rights amendments.

ROY WILKINS,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I feel that this telegram alone should serve to make it clear that a vote to lay the civil-rights amendments on the table is not a vote against the merits of those issues, but I feel that I should make some further explanation as to why I shall support the motion to table the amendments.

I shall begin, however, by reaffirming my position regarding these two completely unrelated issues which have been brought together before us.

First, I want to see the discriminatory Federal taxes on oleomargarine done away with—and I want to see that done now.

Secondly—and I am sure there is no Member of this body who does not already know this—I have consistently fought for civil rights at every opportunity which has presented itself during the years I have been in the Congress. I have fought for them outside the Congress as well. I have fought for them because of the sincere conviction that the American spirit of fair play and justice, by its very definition, insists that no person be discriminated against in his work, in his beliefs, or in his living, because of his race or because of the color of his skin. That has been my position. It is still my position.

Yet, Mr. President, I intend to vote to stop, here and now, any further discussion of civil rights, and get on with the business of repealing the oleo taxes.

Why do I make that statement? The reasons are to be found, fundamentally, in several technical requirements of the rules under which the Senate conducts its business as a legislative body. Once those rules are clearly understood, the reasons for voting to table the motion are obvious.

To begin with, the pending business of the Senate at this instant is the bill to repeal Federal taxes on oleo. Amendments which have been called up for debate would add to that bill sections providing for a number of civil-rights laws. These amendments are not germane to the oleo bill. They have nothing to do with that bill. Furthermore—and this is also an important consideration—separate legislative committees of the Congress have jurisdiction over these unrelated issues.

During the course of our debate on these amendments, a motion will be made to lay the amendments on the table; in other words, that we abandon further discussion of them.

Let us consider, then, just what it is we shall be doing in voting on the motion to lay the amendments on the table. A vote in favor of tabling merely means that we are abandoning at this time further debate on the merits of the amendments. A vote against tabling means we wish to continue discussing civil rights.

Thus, a vote against the motion does not do anything more than keep the discussion alive. It does not tie the amendments to the oleo bill. If, by refusing to table, we continue discussing the amendments, I think it is clear to all of us that a filibuster will result, because those who oppose civil-rights legislation do not wish to see the Senate reach a vote on the riders.

Assuming, then, that a filibuster develops, in the event we do not table the rider proposals, what happens when we seek to apply cloture and cut off debate? This is the critical point to an understanding of the entire question before us. A cloture petition, by the requirements of rule XXII, can be applied only to the business then pending in the Senate, which now is the oleo bill. Rule XXII also specifically rules out the consideration of any matter not germane to the pending business—and thus the civil-rights amendments would be automatically stripped away on a point of order, because clearly they are not germane to the oleo bill.

So, if cloture is invoked, we have merely limited debate on the oleo bill—minus any pending amendments that are not germane—and there is nothing whatsoever in the Senate rules which will permit us to limit debate on an amendment to the oleo bill if the amendment is not germane. In other words, a vote which would follow a cloture ruling would be a vote on the merits of the oleo bill alone.

I invite any Member of the Senate to suggest to me now any conceivable technique under the Senate rules which will permit us to invoke cloture in such a fashion that we may come to a vote squarely on the issue of appending the civil-rights amendments to the oleo bill. This simply is not possible—period.

Debate on these amendments can be endless, or, at least, they can be filibustered as long as those opposed to them wish to filibuster them. So I conclude that we all agree there is little hope of ending such a filibuster if we cannot invoke cloture to assist us.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MYERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Aside from the technical grounds which the Senator has so ably urged—and I take it that he is completely sound in his position—is it not true that the practical effect of attaching civil-rights amendments to the pending oleomargarine tax repeal bill would be to join together as opponents of the measure, as it would then exist, those who oppose the repeal of the oleomargarine tax and those who oppose the civil-rights program, with the result that under those circumstances it would become impossible to obtain the votes of a majority of the Members of the Senate in favor of such a joinder of issues in this one bill?

Mr. MYERS. I say to the distinguished junior Senator from Florida there can be no question about that. As I said earlier in my remarks, that is the purpose of such amendments. Their purpose is to kill the oleomargarine tax repeal bill. In fact, I think it has been stated here on the floor that some of the opponents of the oleomargarine tax repeal bill will use any tactics to gain their objective, namely, to defeat that bill.

So, what is the answer to all this, Mr. President? The answer is that there is no possible way in which we may get a clearly defined vote on the civil-rights amendments to the oleo bill unless we wear out a filibuster; and that, I submit, is the hard way to achieve civil rights.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator has referred to wearing out a filibuster. If the filibuster were worn out, the amendments would be germane; would they not?

Mr. MYERS. Yes; but if cloture were invoked, the amendments would not be germane.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, there is an easier way—a direct way—in which we may come to a clear-cut vote on the merits of such civil-rights legislation as FEPC, and that way is to bring up the FEPC bill pending now on the Senate Calendar. When the FEPC bill, standing on its own legislative feet, is before us, we can file a cloture petition to limit the debate on it. Thereupon if, under the new rule XXII, which was adopted last winter over my protest, for I felt it would make cloture harder to obtain, we are successful in getting 64 Senators to vote to apply cloture on the FEPC debate, we then can go on to vote on the bill a short time later.

I want to say something further at this time to some of my colleagues in the Senate who, like myself, have strong convictions in favor of FEPC. Some of these Senators are troubled by the assertion that if they vote to table discussion of the civil-rights amendments, they are, in effect, voting against FEPC, antilynch, anti-poll tax, and others. Some of the same Senators are troubled, too, that they may not have another opportunity during this session of the Congress to bring the FEPC issue squarely into focus and vote on it. To them I say that in his message to the Congress, on January 4 of this year, President Truman called upon us to enact the FEPC law and the other civil-rights measures. The distinguished majority leader of the Senate, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] has repeatedly stated for himself, and for the majority policy committee of the Senate, of which both he and I are members, that we fully intend to schedule debate on the pending FEPC bill early in this session of the Congress. He has reiterated that pledge just recently. I, as a member of the majority policy committee, also give my solemn pledge that I shall work unrelentingly to bring up the FEPC bill. Furthermore, I am prepared to state as my unqualified belief that we will debate FEPC on its own merits in a very short time.

The reasons I have already stated are sufficient in themselves to show conclusively that we could not possibly be successful in amending the oleo bill to include the civil rights riders, and, what is more, that we cannot bring the Senate to a vote on the merits of the riders short of breaking a filibuster without benefit of cloture.

There are, however, other very good reasons for voting to lay the amendments on the table. I am convinced that the riders are devices to launch an unrestrained filibuster. It is perfectly evident that the amendment has no other purpose than to kill the oleo bill.

As all of us are aware, we have in the Senate no rule of germaneness, apart from the restriction which applies to general appropriations bills—no rule, in other words, that, at least theoretically, prevents us from trying to wed together completely unrelated issues.

We know, too, that nongermane riders have been used repeatedly in the past to kill legislation, which otherwise could be passed, because we have numerical majorities great enough to do so. It is obvious that the technique of attempting nongermane amendments is, as the Senator from Florida just said, a technique merely to divide our strength and to defeat our efforts to pass measures which we are otherwise in a position to pass.

I therefore wish to submit the thought, Mr. President, that we have ahead of us in this session a great deal of vital legislation, on which, taken individually, bill after bill will be passed, if we confine our discussion to one issue at a time. If we fail to discipline ourselves, if we fail to stick to a self-imposed rule of germaneness, we shall stand helplessly by, watching measure after measure go down in defeat through the mechanism of nongermane riders, which will tie us up in knots, or cut away the voting strength of the majorities who support the individual bills.

So, Mr. President, I repeat the thought I suggested in the opening of my remarks: Let us recognize the civil rights riders for what they are. Let us vote to lay them on the table, and let us get down to the business of repealing the oleo taxes. And then, when FEPC comes before the Senate, as I am confident it will come, shortly, let us confine ourselves to the merits of FEPC and not be side-tracked at that time by the efforts which will be made to kill it through the technique of some other nongermane rider designed to produce a stalemate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I notice the Senator is asking that no vote be taken on the antilynching bill which the Senator from North Dakota has sponsored and which is now on the calendar, but the Senator wants to vote on it later. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania, as the whip on the Democratic side, consent to taking it up and making it the next regular order of business in the Senate? If it is not germane to the pending bill, will the Senator see that it is brought before the Senate as the next order of business?

Mr. MYERS. That is something, as the Senator from Michigan knows, which I cannot decide. I think the Senator should be well satisfied with the assurance and promise of the able majority leader, a man of integrity, that the Senate will have an opportunity to vote on some of the civil-rights bills at an early date. The majority leader and the majority policy committee have a program. They have other things to consider, too. The basing-point bill, by order of the Senate, is to be taken up Friday. I know how greatly interested the Senator from Michigan is in the displaced-persons bill, which, by order of the Senate, will be back on the calendar on the 25th. We have much important business, but I think, when the majority leader gives the Senate his word that civil-rights legislation, in which I am just as much interested as is the Senator from Michigan, will be brought up at a very early date, the Senator should be well satisfied with the promise and assurance of the majority leader.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield further to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan merely wants to say that in the number of years he has been in the Senate, he has always seen that the bill in question has not been on the program, insofar as coming to a vote is concerned. We find civil-rights bills introduced from year to year, during which time, with the exception of 2 years, the present majority has been in power. The majority party does not bring them up at a time when the Senate could really get a vote on them, which is early in the session. That is why the Senator from Michigan feels that he will vote not to table the amendment, because the time is ripe. If it is desired to pass a bill on this subject, let us pass it now.

Mr. MYERS. I may say to the Senator, I have been endeavoring to be very factual in the matter, and I have not injected politics into it. It was not my intention to inject politics into the subject, because I am interested in getting a repeal of the tax on oleo.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania consider it to be the injection of politics because a Republican rises——

Mr. MYERS. Let me finish.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is that the Senator from Pennsylvania may yield for a question only.

Mr. MYERS. Let me finish. I said I had endeavored to approach the question through the rules, and to discuss it dispassionately. The Senator has mentioned that the Democratic Party has been the majority party for a good many years, and that we have not brought up certain of these bills. I may say to the Senator that the first order of business in the Eighty-first Congress was a motion to change the rules. We were not successful. We got a bad cloture rule. We made an effort to support the decision of the Vice President. The first order of business was the motion to change the rules, which was the most important thing in the consideration of civil-rights legislation. But I may say to the Senator that the bill in question was on the calendar for 15 months during the Eightieth Congress, during which time no attempt was made to bring it up.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MYERS. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania know where the junior Senator from Michigan stood on the question of the cloture rule?

Mr. MYERS. I know definitely.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan stood alongside the Senator from Pennsylvania, did he not?

Mr. MYERS. Definitely; and he did everything in his power to see to it that a real change in the rules was finally accomplished. We were unsuccessful. But, as I have already said, there is no possible way in which we can get civil-rights legislation during a discussion of the oleo bill, without a prolonged filibuster, and without breaking a filibuster without benefit of cloture. So I say let us confine ourselves to the merits of FEPC and civil-rights legislation, and not be sidetracked by the efforts which will be made to kill it through the technique of some other nongermane rider designed to produce a stalemate.

A rule of germaneness is a good rule—and even though our official rules of the Senate do not impose that limitation upon us other than in the instance of general appropriation bills, we can impose one upon ourselves, and thus make it possible by the end of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress to come up with a record of achievement which all of us may view with pride. The alternative of being bogged down with death-dealing riders, by a refusal to lay them on the table each time they are brought up, is an alternative I do not like to contemplate.

I trust and hope, therefore, that when a motion is made to table the riders the motion will prevail.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Some time ago, in a conference of the Democratic Members of the Senate, we went on record as being opposed to all amendments during the present session of Congress which were not germane to an issue pending before the Senate. It is my studied opinion that we took a remarkable step in the direction of more orderly procedure in the Senate, so far as expediting the business of the Senate is concerned. The amendment pending before the Senate at the present time, as everyone knows, is utterly irrelevant to the issue we are now debating. It is a classical example of what can be done in the Senate under the rules as they now exist. I prophesy that, sooner or later, as a result of the tremendous amount of work the Senate has before it in these days of domestic and world problems, the Senate ultimately will bring in a rule under which no amendment to an issue pending before the Senate, unless germane, shall be considered. That is the rule in the House of Representatives. There is absolutely no reason, so far as I can see, why the Senate, if it desires to expedite its business, should not have a similar rule.

We have the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, seeking to attach the antilynching bill to a bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine—two bills which are just as far apart as the two poles, Mr. President. Yet, under the rules of the Senate, the Senator from North Dakota is permitted to do that. We are compelled to take the time of individual Senators to debate, vote, and raise parliamentary

situations, to reach a final conclusion upon it.

Mr. President, no one is being deceived as a result of what my distinguished friend from North Dakota is doing in connection with the offering of his amendment. My friend waited until the Wiley-Gillette substitute was defeated before he offered the amendment to the original bill. I am sure he would now admit that had the Wiley-Gillette substitute been adopted, he would not have delayed the Senate by offering this kind of an amendment to the oleomargarine bill. In other words, the Senator from North Dakota was more interested, and rightly so from his viewpoint, in killing the repeal of the margarine tax than in any other one thing. He made his position clear on the floor of the Senate. He debated the issue at great length, which it was his right, of course, to do. But the Senator from North Dakota knows that as a result of offering his amendment he may cause a filibuster to start which will ultimately defeat the repeal of the oleomargarine tax. That is what he hopes to do. That is the real reason for the offering of the amendment. Every Senator knows that to be so, and the country knows it. The Senator from North Dakota is not deceiving the people who are truly interested in passing a civil-rights program.

Mr. President, I want to read into the RECORD at this time two telegrams from organizations which are vitally concerned with civil rights. They are more interested in civil rights than they are in the repeal of the margarine tax, so far as that goes, but at the same time they do not want to see civil rights riders placed on the bill, because they know the reason why such a maneuver is being attempted.

The first telegram which I wish to read is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 17, 1950.*

Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our organizations stand stanchly in support of the President's civil-rights program. The national emergency civil-rights mobilization has demonstrated the fullness of our support for this program. However, we do not favor the proposed civil-rights riders to the oleo tax-repeal measure. We believe that these riders, if adopted, would insure the defeat of oleo tax repeal. We strongly urge that you not allow the great issue of civil rights to be misused so as to defeat programs designed to benefit the economic welfare of the great majority of Americans.

Roy Wilkins, Acting Executive Secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Violet M. Gunther, Legislative Representative, Americans for Democratic Action; Lewis Hines, Special Representative, American Federation of Labor; George L. P. Weaver, National CIO; Elmer Henderson, Director, American Council of Human Rights; Michael Straight, Chairman, American Veterans Committee; Herman Edelsberg, Washington Representative, Antidefamation League, B'nai B'rith.

The telegram refers to the issue of civil rights being misused. That is exactly what is attempted to be done by this sort of an amendment.

The next telegram which I wish to read comes from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 16, 1950.*

Senator SCOTT LUCAS,
The Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People we urge the defeat of the so-called civil-rights amendments offered by Senator WILLIAM LANGER to H. R. 2023, the bill to repeal oleomargarine tax. As you know, this association since its inception 40 years ago has worked unceasingly to win for all persons, regardless of race, religion, or nationality, security of person and freedom of political and economic opportunity. Senator LANGER does not intend for his amendments to further the cause of civil rights, he desires only to defeat the oleomargarine tax repeal. Senator LANGER made this clear in his speech on the Senate floor January 11 when he charged that the passage of H. R. 2023 "will ruin thousands of farmers in the State of North Dakota." Last year this association actively supported amendments to prohibit racial segregation in housing and education when respective bills were before the Senate. Racial discrimination in both of these fields is widely practiced and should be banned in all Federal aid to such programs. Lynching, poll taxes, and other such civil-rights questions are not, however, germane to, or involved in, the repeal of the oleomargarine taxes; we therefore urge the defeat of the so-called Langer civil-rights amendments.

ROY WILKINS,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. President, I have read these telegrams into the RECORD to advise the Members of the Senate that those who are deeply interested in the passage of civil-rights legislation are unalterably opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

Some statements have been made with reference to those who support amendments of this kind or who may be instrumental in the sponsoring of such amendments. It has been said that they are doing it for one purpose, and for one purpose only, and that is to defeat the repeal of the margarine tax. I should like to absolve any Member of the Senate on the Democratic side of the aisle, who has been opposed to the repeal of the oleomargarine tax and has represented his constituency in the dairy sections of the country ably and well, of being in any way responsible for the offering of this amendment. I should like to state, Mr. President, that in due course of this session the Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, having discussed the subject with the policy committee, and a majority of that committee having agreed with him, we shall be constrained to take up certain phases of the civil-rights program. I can assure my friends on both sides of the aisle that that will be done, and the first issue which will come before the Senate is the FEPC bill which is now on the calendar ready for action. There will be no question about that, Mr. President.

I sincerely hope that those Senators who supported the present cloture rule, which provides that 64 Members of the Senate must vote for cloture before we can get a vote on a bill, will remember, when the civil-rights bills come before the Senate, the vote they took to fasten that rule upon the Senate, and will vote to give us an opportunity to pass upon such legislation when the time comes.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to discuss that issue, because it is not germane at this particular time.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate of the United States, Democrats and Republicans alike, will vote to table the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota because of what seems to me the unanswerable arguments which have been made against it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Martin
Anderson	Hill	Maybank
Benton	Hoey	Millikin
Brewster	Holland	Mundt
Bridges	Humphrey	Murray
Butler	Jenner	Myers
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Darby	Kefauver	Pepper
Donnell	Kem	Russell
Douglas	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Downey	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Leahy	Sparkman
Ecton	Lehman	Taft
Ellender	Lodge	Taylor
Ferguson	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McCarran	Thye
Fulbright	McCarthy	Tobey
George	McClellan	Tydings
Gillette	McFarland	Vandenberg
Graham	McKellar	Watkins
Green	McMahon	Williams
Gurney	Magnuson	Withers
Hayden	Malone	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator fram Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to lay on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have been requested to announce that the senior Senator from the State of Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is unavoidably detained today. He is in Richmond attending the inauguration of the Governor of that Commonwealth. If present, the senior Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

Mr. WITHERS. My colleague the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] is absent on official business as a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, holding hearings in the State of New Mexico. If he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. EASTLAND. My colleague the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is absent on official business as a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, holding hearings in the State of New Mexico. If he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. McCARTHY (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. MYERS. The junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], are absent on important public business. If these Senators were present and voting they would vote "yea."

I announce further that the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is attending the inauguration today of the Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia and is unavoidably absent. His pair on this vote with the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] has previously been announced.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent on official business as a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, holding hearings in the State of New Mexico.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is absent on official business, is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—60

Anderson	Humphrey	Millikin
Benton	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Bridges	Johnson, Tex.	Myers
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Darby	Kefauver	O'Conor
Douglas	Kem	O'Mahoney
Downey	Kilgore	Pepper
Eastland	Knowland	Russell
Ellender	Leahy	Schoeppel
Flanders	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Frear	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Fulbright	Long	Sparkman
George	Lucas	Taft
Gillette	McClellan	Taylor
Graham	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Green	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	McMahon	Tobey
Hill	Magnuson	Tydings
Hoey	Malone	Williams
Holland	Maybank	Withers

NAYS—20

Aiken	Ecton	Martin
Brewster	Ferguson	Mundt
Butler	Gurney	Thye
Cain	Hendrickson	Vandenberg
Capehart	Jenner	Watkins
Donnell	Langer	Young
Dworshak	McCarran	

NOT VOTING—16

Bricker	Hunt	Saltonstall
Byrd	Ives	Stennis
Chapman	Kerr	Wherry
Chavez	McCarthy	Wiley
Connally	Morse	
Hickenlooper	Robertson	

So Mr. FULBRIGHT's motion to lay Mr. LANGER's amendment on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate, but I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the body of the RECORD, at this point, a brief statement setting out the fact that I favor the passage of the pending bill. I voted against the substitute, and I am opposed to all irrelevant amendments which may be offered thereto.

I send my statement to the desk for incorporation in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, Mr. PEPPER'S statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, under the present law housewives of America are compelled to pay a tax of 10 cents a pound for colored oleomargarine and ¼ cent a pound for uncolored margarine. In addition, the manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers must pay license fees to the Federal Government. The total revenue from these taxes and fees has risen from $1,347,190 to an estimated $16,000,000 in 1950.

This tax on oleomargarine is unfair and discriminatory. What we are doing by keeping this tax is to raise the cost of living of the American families with lower incomes, who are the prime purchasers of oleomargarine, colored or uncolored. It is a burden on the housewives in these families who have the problem of providing a decent fare for their husbands and children.

The amount of the tax may be small to some people, but it is, I am sure, large to the nearly 16,000,000 families and individuals in the United States who have incomes under $2,000, and probably to the 23,000,000 who have incomes between $2,000 and $5,000.

Oleomargarine is a good food. It has been established that it is as nutritious and digestible as butter. Nowadays manufacturers add the necessary vitamins to oleomargarine which puts it on a par with butter.

Mr. President, I am going to vote for the bill which has been reported by the Senate Committee on Finance. This bill would remove the Federal taxes and license fees on oleomargarine. It would continue to require reporting by manufacturers and wholesalers. It would permit yellow oleomargarine to move freely across State lines.

It would prevent adulterated and misbranded colored margarine from being served or sold in public places. Colored oleomargarine must be clearly identified as such. Misrepresentation of oleomargarine as butter is prohibited by section 5 (a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, and we know that the Commission has promptly acted against labeling and advertising practices which were deceptive in confusing oleomargarine with butter. Under the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act the Federal Security Administrator has established a standard of identity for oleomargarine and he has the power to prevent the shipment of any adulterated or misbranded oleomargarine in interstate commerce.

Mr. President, when the Congress repeals the oleomargarine tax it will be helping the housewives of America. This bill would add to and raise our national levels of nutrition and health. Increased production of oleomargarine would expand the market for our southern products, such as cottonseed oil, and soybean oil, which are used by manufacturers of nutritious oleomargarine. Therefore I hope in the interest of fairness and the general welfare of the people this bill, too long delayed, will speedily become law.

NOMINATION OF ADMIRAL FORREST SHERMAN TO BE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the other day the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] asked unanimous consent for the consideration by the Senate of the nomination of Admiral Forrest Sherman to be Chief of Naval Operations. At that time I objected, but not because I did not think Admiral Sherman would make a great Chief of Naval Operations. I know him by reputation to be the finest type of service officer; a man of outstanding ability and experience.

But I have here today a photostat of an official document which I intend to read to the Senate, which raises questions of a vastly more important nature than the mere confirmation of the nomination of any man to any post.

It brings up the very important question of whether the office of Chief of Naval Operations is now actually vacant. It brings up also the more important question of whether the Secretary of the Navy is a man who is completely incompetent or whether the other day before the Armed Services Committee he was just plain untruthful.

This document and the facts which I am about to discuss should bring to my colleagues the question of whether they actually have the power to appoint a Chief of Naval Operations to his statutory term of two full years. It raises the question of whether confirmation means that the Chief of Naval Operations may hold office for 1 day, 1 week, or 1 month—depending upon the extent to which he is willing to be a yes-man.

I specifically call the attention of the chairman and the members of the Armed Services Committee to the question whether there actually is a vacancy in the post of Chief of Naval Operations to which Admiral Sherman can be appointed, or whether the job is already filled by Admiral Denfeld, who as we all know is not physically occupying his post, but who as most of us do not know was commissioned to it for a 2-year term on September 14, 1949.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. My advices are that there is a vacancy in the office of the Chief of Naval Operations at this time.

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] in arriving at that conclusion, depends upon the testimony given by Secretary Matthews. Is that correct?

Mr. TYDINGS. Largely. As I understand the situation, Admiral Denfeld was nominated by the President; his nomination came to the Senate; the Committee on Armed Services held hearings and recommended the confirmation of Admiral Denfeld. After the Senate had acted and the matter went to the President, the President did not issue the

commission. Therefore, there was no confirmed appointee in the job.

In the celebrated case of Marbury against Madison a similar question came before the Supreme Court of the United States, in which case the Supreme Court held that the President had the right not to issue a commission to an appointee, although he had been confirmed by the Senate; that the appointing power, notwithstanding confirmation, held good all the way up to the time of the issuing of the commission.

Mr. McCARTHY. May I interrupt the Senator? If the commission had been issued, then the Senator would say that there now is no vacancy?

Mr. TYDINGS. If the commission had been issued, in the judgment of the Senator from Maryland, without study into the matter, I would assume that there would be no vacancy until the term for which the admiral had been appointed had expired. Whether or not in that contingency the President would have the right of removal is not before the Senate, and the Senator from Maryland would not want to pass on it without more study as to the precedents, the law, and the circumstances that might enter into it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. How many more situations have existed exactly the same as the one which has just been described, namely that the Senate has confirmed someone and the President has refused to issue a commission?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. No, Mr. President, not for a minute. Before yielding I want to read this document, which I think will make unnecessary many of the questions which would otherwise be asked. I very much wish the Senator from Maryland would remain in the Senate Chamber.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that the Senator from Maryland has an important engagement at 1 o'clock and he must leave shortly. So if there are any questions which the Senator from Wisconsin desires to address to the Senator from Maryland, the Senator from Maryland would be grateful if he would do so in the immediate future, because I cannot remain much longer without breaking my engagement entirely. I did not know the Senator from Wisconsin was going to speak now or I would have postponed the engagement if that had been possible.

Mr. McCARTHY. There are some things to which I will call the Senator's attention in the next 2 or 3 minutes before he leaves, which I think he will consider of vast importance.

Mr. President, we must decide whether or not Admiral Denfeld has been legally removed before we can put another man in his place.

The law provides for not more than a total of 4 years' term of office as Chief of Naval Operations upon appointment by the President and confirmation by the Senate. The act did not provide that the Chief of Naval Operations could be removed at the pleasure of the President or the whim of the Secretary of the Navy.

The Supreme Court of the United States, in a unanimous decision handed down on May 27, 1935, held in the celebrated Humphreys case that the President of the United States could not remove a Government official in disregard of a fixed term prescribed by the Congress.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to continue for a short while. Let me speak for about three minutes more and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. But the Senator wants to keep his facts straight as he goes along.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will not yield for about 3 minutes, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin refuses to yield now.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will yield in about 3 minutes. There are some facts I want to bring to the Senator's mind before he asks any more questions, because the Senator might be embarrassed by reason of the questions he may ask before first getting these facts.

Mr. TYDINGS. No, I will not be embarrassed by reason of any questions I may ask. I should like to have the Senator yield to me now.

Mr. McCARTHY. In the Humphreys case the Court held that there was insufficient cause to remove a public servant in disregard of a fixed term prescribed by Congress simply because his thoughts did not coincide with those of the Chief Executive. The Supreme Court wisely said:

> It is quite evident that one who holds his office only during the pleasure of another cannot be depended upon to maintain an attitude of independence against the latter's will.

You, Mr. President, were a Member of the Senate at the time we passed the unification bill. You will recall that after careful study and thought, the Senate and the House, without a dissenting vote to that provision, decided that the term of office should be for a fixed term. On that point there can be no question. If we intended that he could be removed at the whim or caprice of the Secretary of the Navy, we would have so provided.

Mr. President, on the afternoon of last October 27, President Truman announced to a news conference that Admiral Denfeld was being replaced as Chief of Naval Operations.

Last week, Secretary of Navy Francis P. Matthews appeared before the Senate Armed Services Committee to support the nomination of Admiral Sherman as Chief of Naval Operations.

He testified, in effect, that a vacancy existed in the post of Chief of Naval Operations because this document did not exist. Therefore, Mr. Matthews reasoned, he was entitled to appoint a new man to this vacant post. His testimony was to the effect that if the document which I now hold in my hand were in existence, then there would not be a vacancy in the post of Chief of Naval Operations.

I gather from what the Senator from Maryland has just said that he also agrees with that. Before reading this document, I should like to refer to Mr. Matthews' testimony.

Incidentally, can the Senator tell me whether Mr. Matthews was under oath when he was before the committee?

Mr. TYDINGS. No.

Mr. McCARTHY. He was not?

Mr. TYDINGS. No.

Will the Senator yield to me, Mr. President?

Mr. McCARTHY. In a moment.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to answer the question, but I wish to do so in a parliamentary way.

Mr. McCARTHY. Very well; I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. So far as I recall, Mr. Matthews was not under oath; and no member of the committee, either Democratic or Republican, requested that he testify under oath. Otherwise, the oath would have been administered.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who was on the Armed Services Committee, asked some questions which are very pertinent. I read now from portions of the Secretary of Navy's testimony as it appears on pages 94 and 95 of the hearings before the Armed Services Committee last week:

> Senator KNOWLAND. My recollection is that on or about the 15th of August, the former Chief of Naval Operations was confirmed by the Senate, and his name was sent up; is that approximately correct?
>
> Secretary MATTHEWS. I would say about that time.
>
> Senator KNOWLAND. You were Secretary of the Navy at the time?
>
> Secretary MATTHEWS. I was Secretary; yes.
>
> Senator KNOWLAND. How long is the term of Chief of Naval Operations?
>
> Secretary MATTHEWS. The term for which Admiral Denfeld was appointed the first time was 2 years.
>
> Senator KNOWLAND. Was the appointment on August 15, 1949, presumably for a 2-year term?
>
> Secretary MATTHEWS. A second term of 2 years; yes, sir.
>
> Senator KNOWLAND. Could you inform the committee as to how it happened that there is a vacancy in the office?
>
> Secretary MATTHEWS. Well, at the present time the vacancy occurs by the fact that Admiral Denfeld's first term has expired and he never has been appointed for a second term. His name was suggested, he was confirmed, but his commission was never issued to him.

With that information before the Armed Services Committee, I think the committee was perfectly justified in assuming that there was a vacancy.

I read further:

> Senator BRIDGES. Mr. Secretary, I do not want to break in, but Admiral Denfeld never,

then, was the Chief of Operations for the second term?

Secretary MATTHEWS. No, sir.

Senator BRIDGES. The Senate confirmed him.

Secretary MATTHEWS. But that was, as I understand it, the confirmation was if the President wishes to appoint him, but he never appointed him for the second term. He never issued the commission.

Mr. President, in that connection I should like to read from this document. The one I hold in my hand is a photostatic copy of the commission, which was issued to Admiral Denfeld. The original is in his possession.

This is the commission which Secretary Matthews told the Armed Services Committee did not exist. It is Admiral Denfeld's commission as Chief of Naval Operations. It runs from December 15, 1949, to December 15, 1951. It is dated September 14, 1949. It is signed, Mr. President, by Francis P. Matthews and Harry S. Truman. It says that Harry S. Truman and Francis P. Matthews repose "special trust and confidence in the patriotism, fidelity, and abilities of Admiral Louis E. Denfeld." This is the commission which Secretary Matthews told the committee did not exist. I assure the Senate that it does exist.

Now I should like to ask the very able Senator who is chairman of the Armed Services Committee whether he thinks it might be well, before bringing Admiral Sherman's nomination before the Senate on the question of confirmation, for the committee to go into the question, to determine whether we would be considering the confirmation of a nomination for a position which already is filled.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, of course what the Senator from Wisconsin has read as the testimony of Secretary Matthews is accurate, as I recall it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. My recollection is that the Secretary testified before the committee that although Admiral Denfeld had been confirmed yet, so he said, according to my recollection the commission had not been issued.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. And as I recall the testimony, I think it is exactly as the Senator from Wisconsin has read it.

The existence of the commission would, of course, create a situation different from that which existed in the committee at the time when the committee acted upon the nomination of Admiral Sherman. The Senator from Maryland has had no occasion to make an examination of the facts regarding whether the President of the United States can, after the issuance of a commission of the kind the Senator from Wisconsin has produced, remove the man who holds the place, and put another man in that place. Offhand, and without any examination of the precedents, the Senator from Maryland is inclined to believe that if the President desires to remove the Chief of Naval Operations or the Chief of Staff of the Army or the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, during the term for which he is commissioned, perhaps the President, as Commander in Chief, has that right.

However, in order to be fair with the Senator, let me say that I have never had occasion to look up the precedents. I may be wrong, and I am not asserting this today as any profound opinion. I am only trying to answer the Senator from such information as I have available, and therefore I cannot give him an opinion based upon precedents; and so forth, which would be the only fair answer to the Senator's question.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. First let me say that I wish to thank the Senator from Maryland. In my opinion, knowing the high type of man that Admiral Denfeld is, I think if the President were to say to him, "Admiral, we want you to resign," then, regardless of whether the President had the power to remove him or not, I am sure Admiral Denfeld would resign.

However, when the President and Secretary Matthews, without even consulting Admiral Denfeld, without even informing him of the action they were going to take, announced at a press conference that he was being booted out, and finally, a day or several days later, called in Admiral Denfeld, and told him, "You have been fired," I think it is definitely incumbent upon us, before we take any action on a subsequent nomination to the same position, to determine whether or not, as of today, there is a Chief of Naval Operations.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WITHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, whether it was brought to the attention of the Armed Services Committee that any order of the kind to which he has referred—in other words, an order of removal—had been issued by the President?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not have the papers before me, and of course I may be wrong. But my recollection is that we were notified that the position was vacant.

Mr. KEM. That is an entirely different matter, of course, from an order removing the occupant of the office. A notice that the post is vacant is one thing; an order of removal is another. I think the Senator will agree with me as to that.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say to the Senator from Wisconsin that, speaking for both myself and all other members of the Armed Services Committee, of both political persuasions—I am sure I can include all of them in what I am about to say—we have no desire or wish or intention to take advantage of the Senate in any matter which is in dispute.

My suggestion is that, so long as this matter has been raised, the nomination of Admiral Sherman remain on the calendar, where it now is; and we shall try to get some precedents either for or against or on both sides; and upon the ascertainment of what the precedents and the law seem to portray, the Senator from Maryland in complete frankness will try to be governed accordingly, in fairness to his own committee, as well as to the Senate.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to address a question to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall yield in a moment.

I may say that I am not in any way attempting to cast any reflection upon the members of the Armed Services Committee. When the Secretary of the Navy comes before the committee and in unqualified terms says the commission never was signed, and says that neither the President nor he ever signed it, I do not believe that under normal circumstances it was incumbent upon the members of the committee to assume that either the Secretary of the Navy was lying or that he did not recall signing the commission. I think the members of the committee were justified in relying upon what the Secretary of the Navy told them. So I wish to make clear that this is no criticism whatsoever of the members of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield at this point, I shall be grateful to him.

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am grateful to the Senator for yielding, because I do not want to leave the floor, if I do leave it, with any room for misinterpretation or misunderstanding.

I have the very highest regard for Admiral Denfeld. I consider him a very fine and outstanding naval officer.

The dispute which led up to this controversy occurred in another body, to wit, the House of Representatives. The Armed Services Committee of the Senate and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee have, in the main—not in all cases—looked upon this controversy as one which was more or less, in the nature of things, under the jurisdiction of the House of Representatives; and we have tried to give the House of Representatives precedence in determining whether or not they thought what happened was fair or unfair, because they were the tribunal, one might say, before which the controversy took place and before which the promises of no reprisal were made.

Therefore, having very able and eminent men on that committee, we did not want to arrogate or delegate to ourselves the jurisdiction of a matter in which the House of Representatives was already engaged. Therefore, what we have done has not been in condonation of what has taken place or in condemnation of what has taken place. That dispute so far has been on the other side.

I wish the Senator to know that in making answers to his questions, I am not taking an adverse position to whatever side Admiral Denfeld may have, nor am I necessarily approving what Admiral Denfeld has done or said. The matter has been in the House of Representatives, and we have acted in a more constrained area, to wit, on the question whether or not there was a proper nomination before us, whether or not the man who was nominated was fitted, and

whether or not we thought his nomination should be confirmed by the Senate.

I do not want the RECORD to show in any manner, shape, or form that the Senator from Maryland or the other members of the Armed Services Committee are hostile or have sat in judgment on what Admiral Denfeld may or may not have done in any manner, shape, or form.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator from Wisconsin has raised today a very serious question on the floor of the United States Senate. When the matter was pending before the Committee on Armed Services, as shown by what the Senator has read from the official transcript of the hearings, I raised certain issues with Secretary Matthews, so that the Armed Services Committee of the Senate of the United States might be adequately and properly informed. I do not quite agree with the able chairman of the committee that the Senate had no concern in this matter, because I think it relates to the appointment which has been made, and particularly because of the reference to the question as to whether there was a vacancy. In proceeding along the line of questions, I am frank to say I was stumped by the statement the Secretary made, because it was the first knowledge the junior Senator from California had that the point was being made that there was no person occupying the position. I had assumed, since the President had appointed Admiral Denfeld and his nomination had been sent to the Senate and had been regularly confirmed, that Admiral Denfeld was occupying the office for the first time.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, before the Senator from Maryland leaves, I should like to interrupt the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. McCARTHY. While the distinguished Senator is here, I may say I think it is a great mistake to call a witness before any committee without his first being sworn. Only last week the grand jury indicted a man for testifying falsely before our committee on a much less important matter, a matter which certainly did not affect the security of the United States. That man will be tried, and, if convicted, will, of course, serve time.

Incidentally, I cannot understand the testimony given by Secretary Matthews. I tried to check his background. I found that in his home town of Omaha he is apparently considered a very honorable man, a very truthful individual. It is hard to understand how he could so unequivocally say to the Senator from California and to the entire committee that the document was never signed, even though he himself had signed it. It may be that the man is so incompetent that he did not know what he was signing, but I think, while the chairman of the committee is present, one of the things the Senate should have in mind is that, no matter how important or how unimportant a matter may be, and no matter how much confidence we may have in the truthfulness and integrity of a witness, under all circumstances I think the witness should first be sworn.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. If I may complete the statement I started to make——

Mr. McCARTHY. Let the Senator from California complete his statement. After that, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As a result, when I asked this question as to how it came about that Admiral Denfeld had been removed, we were confronted, at least for the first time to my knowledge, with the fact that a commission had not been issued to him, despite the fact that the Senate had confirmed his nomination. A very plausible case was made, particularly in view of the legal background raised by the Senator from Maryland that the President had the right to withhold the commission prior to the time it was actually delivered to the person who was to receive the appointment. The documentary evidence which the Senator from Wisconsin has presented today is an entirely contrary bit of evidence to that testified by the Secretary of the Navy, and I certainly believe, as one member of the Armed Services Committee, that our committee is entitled to a full explanation from the Secretary as to how it has happened that he testified one way before the committee, in the face of this facsimile or photostat which has been presented today.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I merely want to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that my views are somewhat similar to those of the Senator from California. But I want to say to him that the reason I did not ask, and I think the reason why many of my colleagues did not ask for the swearing of the witness, was that we thought there was no question that the Secretary of the Navy was such a responsible official that he would tell the truth. I am shocked, absolutely shocked, to think the Senator is able today to produce a photostat of a commission issued to Admiral Denfeld, which I, with my own ears, heard Secretary Matthews testify before the Armed Services Committee had never been issued. It certainly is something the Armed Services Committee should look into and look into immediately. Secretary Matthews should be summoned at once to appear before the committee to explain the differences between his testimony before the committee and the facts which the Senator from Wisconsin has presented on the floor of the Senate today.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the photostatic copy has not yet been offered in its entirety in the RECORD. Does the Senator care to do that at this time?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to read the entire photostat into the RECORD. It is as follows:

To All Who Shall See These Presents, Greeting:

Know ye that, reposing special trust and confidence in the patriotism, fidelity, and abilities of Admiral Louis E. Denfeld, I do, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint him Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of admiral, from the 15th day of December 1947, for a term of 2 years from the 15th day of December 1949.

Given under my hand, in the District of Columbia, this 14th day of September A. D. 1949, and in the one hundred seventy-fourth year of the independence of the United States.

HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States.
FRANCIS P. MATTHEWS,
Secretary of the Navy.

The Senate will note that the rank of Admiral is to date from the 15th day of December 1947, while the commission as Chief of Naval Operations, for a term of 2 years, is to date from the 15th day of December 1949. I mention that, for otherwise the two dates might be confusing.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Do I correctly understand the commission as rank of Admiral was retroactive?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is not unusual, I may say.

Mr. AIKEN. It is not?

Mr. McCARTHY. No, it is not unusual to have a rank made retroactive.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator. May I ask the purpose of making it retroactive?

Mr. McCARTHY. I should know, but frankly I do not.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it because it would give the appointee a little better rating on retirement? If not, what is the reason?

Mr. McCARTHY. I frankly do not know. I may say I recently obtained my commission as a major in the Marine Corps. It was retroactive.

Mr. AIKEN. It was retroactive, and made as of a time away back somewhere, was it?

Mr. McCARTHY. No. It was retroactive for a period of about 1 month.

Mr. AIKEN. I should say that was different.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. For the benefit of Senators who came in late, I should like to reread this testimony. I am utterly shocked by what took place before the committee, in view of what the Senator from Wisconsin has produced here today. I read from page 94 of volume 2 of the hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, relative to the nomination of Admiral F. E. Sherman to be Chief of Naval Operations. Secretary Matthews was before the committee. I may say it took a little maneuvering in order to get the Secretary before the committee,

but I shall not go into that at the present time. The question was:

Senator KNOWLAND. How long is the term of chief of naval operations?

Secretary MATTHEWS. The term for which Admiral Denfeld was appointed the first time was 2 years.

Senator KNOWLAND. Was the appointment on August 15, 1949, presumably for a 2-year term?

Secretary MATTHEWS. A second term of 2 years; yes, sir.

Senator KNOWLAND. A second term of 2 years. Could you inform the committee as to how it happened that there is a vacancy in the office?

Parenthetically I may say at that point, I raised the question as to how there happened to be a vacancy in the office, because the matter of confirmation is, under the Constitution, peculiarly a Senate function. The House has no function to perform in the confirmation of appointees. I felt it was a very pertinent question. I continue:

Secretary MATTHEWS. Well, at the present time the vacancy occurs by the fact that Admiral Denfeld's first term has expired and he never has been appointed for a second term. His name was suggested, he was confirmed, but the commission was never issued to him.

That is a categorical statement. It is one on which I, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I believe, have a right to rely, as I believe the other members of the committee have a right to rely, when a responsible official of the Government of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, is appearing before a committee of the Senate. I think it is a matter of such importance that the chairman of the committee should summon the committee into session again immediately, so we may have an opportunity of again having Secretary Matthews before us to explain the discrepancy which now appears.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator very much. The Senator referred to "a responsible official." I think until the matter is cleared up, we cannot very well assume that the man is a responsible official. I think we may say, "a supposedly responsible official."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CAIN. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Wisconsin to say that he personally had obtained this photostat from Admiral Denfeld?

Mr. McCARTHY. The original is in Admiral Denfeld's possession. The photostat was made from the original, which has been delivered, and which is now in the possession of Admiral Denfeld.

Mr. CAIN. If I may inquire further, has the Senator from Wisconsin seen the original of which this is a photostat, or has the Senator been told personally by Admiral Denfeld that the original is in his possession?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have not seen the original, nor have I asked Admiral Denfeld the specific question as to whether he has it in his possession.

I was informed that he had it in his possession. I asked him to supply photostatic copies of it, and I received four photostatic copies of the document. I never specifically said, "Admiral do you have that in your possession?"

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator. May I ask the Senator to read to the Senate again from the case which seems to establish the fact that the President does not have the authority to remove an executive officer who has been appointed for a stated period to a position as the result of his nomination having been confirmed by the Senate of the United States?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to. First, however, let me say that I am convinced that even if the President does not have the power to remove Admiral Denfeld, he could nevertheless have accomplished his removal. For if the President had said, "I no longer want you in my official family; you cannot get along with Matthews; you do not subscribe to the policies and the thinking of this great naval expert, Matthews," I am sure Denfeld would have had no alternative but to resign.

The case to which I had reference is the Humphreys case involving a Mr. Humphreys who had been removed by President Roosevelt from the Federal Trade Commission. After his death the executor of the estate sued the Government for pay from the time Humphreys was removed up to the expiration date of his term of office. The Supreme Court held that the estate was entitled to the money, stating that there was a definite, fixed term of office, and that a man could not be removed from office merely because he held different views and different policies from those held by the President. In other words, it was held that such a term of office is not at the whim or caprice of even the appointing power.

Mr. CAIN. The reason the junior Senator from Washington raised that question is that during the hearing at which Admiral Sherman was recommended for confirmation by the Armed Services Committee, the Secretary of the Navy established what he claimed to be a fact, that the President of the United States did have a perfect right to nominate Admiral Sherman for the office of Chief of Naval Operations because there was a vacancy in that office. If I have understood clearly, as I think I have, the position taken by the junior Senator from Wisconsin, it is that there has been no vacancy in the office of the Chief of Naval Operations, for the reason that the signed certificate to which the Senator from Wisconsin has referred was given officially by either the President or the Secretary of the Navy to Admiral Denfeld.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator understands, of course, that I do not know what action the President or the Secretary may have taken. I have not talked to either of them. In view of the fact that Matthews either did not know or else misrepresented the facts regarding the existence of this document, it is entirely possible that the President did take some steps which might have effectively removed Admiral Denfeld about which Matthews did not know. That I do not know.

Mr. CAIN. Permit me to associate myself with the views expressed by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and to join in the hope that the Armed Services Committee will find it convenient at an early date to call Secretary Matthews before the committee in an attempt to secure an understanding on this important national problem.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. When this matter came before the Armed Services Committee, prior to the opening of this session, some members of the Armed Services Committee were very greatly disturbed about this problem, because they had high respect for Admiral Denfeld's ability and his Americanism, and they had confidence in him as Chief of Naval Operations.

When the President submitted Denfeld's name last fall for the second 2-year term, the nomination came before the Armed Services Committee and, in turn, before the Senate. The President appointed him, the Armed Services Committee recommended the confirmation of his nomination, it was confirmed by the Senate, and we thought it was a closed chapter. Certainly I, for one, was shocked when I read and heard that the first thing Admiral Denfeld knew about his removal was when an aide came into his office and stated that he had read on a news ticker outside the statement that the admiral had been removed. We all felt that he had been properly appointed and commissioned. That raised a question of reasonable doubt as to whether a vacancy occurred in the office of the Chief of Naval Operations. I had some rather concerted legal opinion as to whether a vacancy did exist. I raised the question in the Armed Services Committee. It was then pointed out to us that the commission had never been issued. Then the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] brought forth a Supreme Court ruling which he interpreted to hold that the President was within his rights in not issuing a commission. The action of the committee came about, at least in part, as a result of the statements by Secretary Matthews, and the Supreme Court ruling interpreted and read by the chairman of the committee. I think all the members of the committee had a very high opinion of Admiral Sherman as a man.

But when the Senator from Wisconsin produced on the floor of the Senate a photostatic copy of a commission which was issued to Admiral Denfeld, when the Secretary of the Navy, testifying before the Armed Services Committee, stated that no such commission had ever been issued, it presents a very serious matter. I think the Senator could well ask the chairman of the committee, "Was the witness sworn?"

Frankly, as a member of the committee, I never thought we had to resort to swearing members of the Cabinet or sub-Cabinet officers. I did not think we had reached that point. But from now on I think my attitude certainly will change. I think it is a shocking thing, and I agree with the sentiments expressed by the

Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] that the committee should immediately call Secretary Matthews before it for an explanation of why he testified one way on one day when he had previously testified to the contrary.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

I may say that I heartily disagree with one of the statements made by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] involving his assumption that the task of trying to penetrate the Pentagon "brass curtain" in order to find out what has been going on there is not the task of the Senate, but for some reason is the task of the House of Representatives. I do not follow that reasoning at all. The Pentagon has been guilty of very shameful and shoddy treatment of Admiral Denfeld. I do not mean his removal, but I refer to the method of his removal. What was the reason for this? Here was a man with an outstanding record, whose nomination had been confirmed unanimously by the Senate, a man in whose integrity and ability the President and Matthews just a few months ago said they reposed special trust and confidence. Yet that man learned from an aide that he had been fired. The aide came into his office and said, "I have just heard over the news tape that you have lost your job."

That, in my opinion, was deliberately done to inform every other officer in the military, whether the Army, the Navy, the Air Corps, or Marine Corps, that they were no longer free to tell the Congress honestly and truthfully what they think may be right or wrong with our Defense Establishment. If the Pentagon is allowed to get away with that type of high-handedness—which apparently is condoned by the Secretary of Defense and obviously is condoned by the President, or it would not go on—if they are allowed to get away with it, then never again can we intelligently legislate insofar as our Defense Establishment is concerned, for we shall be legislating blindfolded.

For that reason I very heartily disagree with the Senator from Maryland when he says that the Senate should not go into the matter, but that for some reason the House should go into it. I think it is a task which the Senate also should perform.

Mr. President, who is this man Matthews who says that anyone who disagrees with him on how to run the Navy will be transferred to the Siberia of an inferior post?

Certainly he must be loyal to the Navy. Certainly he must be an authority on Navy affairs. So at least I thought when I heard his statement that anyone who disagreed with him as to how the Navy should be run, anyone who was disloyal to his concept of naval strategy, would be relegated to the limbo of obscurity.

However, Mr. President, upon checking we find that this man Matthews is a fine family man and apparently a likeable lawyer from Omaha. Aside from practicing law and having a short tour of duty in the USO, he has no background which could even remotely entitle him to the claim of being a great naval strategist. In fact, Mr. President, when he was first appointed by President Truman, he told newsmen in Omaha that he had never sailed in anything larger than a rowboat.

This, Mr. President, is the same Mr. Matthews who says that Admiral Denfeld's head must fall and that the heads of two other great naval heroes—Admiral Bogan and Captain Crommelin—must fall because they had the audacity to differ with him on the question of what was good for the defense of the Nation.

Mr. President, I should again like to refer to the hearings which were held before the Senate Armed Services Committee last week. The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], one of our most objective, sincere, and intelligent Senators, was apparently disturbed about Matthews' concept of loyalty. Under questioning by the Senator from California, this is what Matthews said—and I am again quoting from the record of the hearings at page 111, and I call the attention of the Senate to this:

Secretary MATTHEWS. Senator, I am just as convinced as you are that the congressional committees should have that right.

He was referring to the right to get the true facts. I ask Senators to listen to the next two sentences, and see if they can reconcile them.

The individual—

Meaning the military or naval officer who testified—

The individual should have not only the right but the duty to testify, to be absolutely sure that he will not suffer any reprisal by doing so.

So far, that sounds fairly good. But this is what he next said:

But I also think that when a member of the Military Establishment does that—

That is, testify truthfully and honestly—

that he must be prepared to, in a sense, take the consequences.

Mr. President, that was the Secretary of the Navy speaking, assuring the Congress that any military man should be prepared to tell the truth, but that if he does so, he must be ready to take the consequences.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] then asked this question, which appears on page 113:

Well, then, they are all on notice here that if they do disagree, even if I or any other member of the committee asks a question, they are apt to be removed and sent, perhaps, to a less desirable or more distant post?

Secretary MATTHEWS. Whether you ask the question or not, that would be the case.

Later, as appears on page 113, Matthews said this:

It is not a matter, in my judgment, as to where he expresses that opinion.

Again referring to an officer in the service—

The important thing is that he entertains that conviction in opposition to his superior officer.

In other words, even if nothing is said, if any man in the Navy, the Air Force, the Army, or the Marine Corps, entertains—using Matthews' own language—a conviction in opposition to that of this great naval strategist, Matthews, then he should go. How Matthews hopes to enforce this thought-control I frankly do not know.

Mr. President, this is the most dangerous, the most illogical, the most hairbrain concept of the duties of an officer sworn to defend his Nation that I have ever heard.

I wonder why the President of the United States, the commander in chief of our armed forces, appoints such a man to such a critically important job in our defense set-up. Certainly not because of his ability. I realize, of course, that Matthews was a good and loyal supporter of Truman when his campaign looked hopeless. But why must he pay him off at the expense of our national security?

Mr. President, there are many criticisms which a great number of us make about the late President Roosevelt. Fortunately, however, he did not play politics with national security. He did a tremendous job of building up a strong, well-balanced Military Establishment. Instead of having the military operate behind a brass curtain of secrecy, he encouraged free discussion and criticism between the branches of the service, with the aim of improving our defense machinery.

History, Mr. President, will remember Franklin Roosevelt as a great builder of a strong, well-balanced defense, while Truman will go down in history as the man who destroyed, and at an unpredictable cost, the defense of the Nation.

The Secretary of the Navy defines as disloyalty any disagreement with him as to what is best for the defense of this Nation. Luckily, some of our oustanding naval officers have refused to subscribe to that theory. Luckily, they have refused to be cowed by his threat of reprisals if they honestly advocate what they think is best for this Nation.

Those men are being used as an example, apparently with a hope that men with less backbone will be discouraged from doing likewise. For example, Navy Capt. John Crommelin—with a war record which most of us who served with him in the Pacific envy—felt that his duty to the Nation was infinitely more important than his own future.

If Matthews himself had known even 1 hour of war, he perhaps would have understood that threats of demotion could no more deter Captain Crommelin than could the Japs, who burned off his uniform, stopped him from rescuing his wounded men lying below deck in sick bay.

But Matthews says Crommelin's head must fall because Crommelin puts loyalty to his Government above loyalty to Matthews—who, Mr. President, as far as I know, certainly has done nothing to earn loyalty from any member of the Navy.

Nor, Mr. President, is this the only example of the antagonism toward Navy officers by the man who should be their champion?

Not long ago the name of Capt. Arleigh Burke was recommended by the Navy Selection Board for promotion to rear

admiral. Recognizing the remarkable qualities of this brave officer the Navy Selection Board voted unanimously to include him among the 22 who were to be promoted to rear admiral. The law states—and incidentally, Matthews is a lawyer, and I understand one with rather a good reputation—the law states that only the President may remove a name from or add one to that list. In other words, the President only has the power to do that. Yet the Secretary of the Navy asked the Navy Selection Board to remove the name of Capt. Arleigh Burke, because he disliked his views.

We were told by the press that when the President was asked at Key West whether any name had been removed from the list, he stated that he had seen only one list, and that that list did not contain the name of Arleigh Burke. He stated definitely to the press that Captain Burke's name had not been removed from the list by him. Yet the Secretary of the Navy had undertaken to do what the law does not empower him to do, what the law in effect forbids his doing. Subsequently, exercising good sense, the President, listening to the plea of Admiral Sherman, restored the name of Capt. Arleigh Burke to the list for promotion to rear admiral, and I cannot commend too heartily both the President and Admiral Sherman for this sensible step. Otherwise, every man in the armed services would have felt that promotions no longer were to be achieved by merit, but only by conformity to the views of others, and by goose-stepping mentalities.

If, as we now find, the commission for Admiral Denfeld, which the Secretary of the Navy says was not signed, actually has been issued, does it not cast doubt upon the legality of the new nomination which we are asked to consider today? Has Admiral Denfeld been lawfully removed from office? On what basis has he been removed, and is there a vacancy for which Admiral Sherman is eligible?

This is a serious question, Mr. President. It is a question that touches the whole future of our Military Establishment. Even if we are to concede that the President of the United States has the power of removal—though I seriously doubt it, because of the limitations placed upon him by the unification law passed last August—would it not have been the better part of wisdom to have asked for the resignation of the Chief of Naval Operations without subjecting him to public humiliation and an accusation of disloyalty? Is this the reward which a naval officer may expect for the free expression of his views?

I do not doubt for a moment, knowing Admiral Denfeld's fine personality, that if the President of the United States had told him that he desired to appoint another Chief of Naval Operations, he gladly would have submitted his resignation, and there would have been no doubt today of the legality of the step which we are asked to take.

But there must have been some other purpose, Mr. President, in making a public accusation and making a public announcement of the removal of Admiral Denfeld. It must have been—and this is what I think should disturb not only the Members of the Senate, but every other American—it must have been in order to impress members of our armed services with the fact that they must conform to the views of their civilian superiors in everything, and that they must not expect to talk frankly and honestly to those civilian superiors.

It must have been, Mr. President, intended to convey explicitly the impression that the Secretary of the Navy is master, and that everybody in the Navy is his servant. Such autocracy is deplorable. Such autocracy is not in keeping with the traditions of the American system of government.

We talk about democracy inside the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. We ask that segregation be abolished, and we ask also that the members of our armed services shall be indoctrinated with the great aims and purposes of our country in its world policies. But, in so doing, are we making a convincing impression when we proclaim and profess to be interested in the freedom of the individual, and then use the iron hand of suppression to build a wall between the members of our armed services and their true civilian superiors, the Congress and the people of the United States?

This wall—this Johnson-inspired and Truman-condoned brass curtain of secrecy—can lead to serious consequences for our Military Establishment.

It can mean that the Congress of the United States will never again have the necessary information upon which to legislate independently on the needs of the armed services.

It can lead to interservice rivalries. It can increase rather than diminish the friction which we all have hoped to avoid through the passage of the unification law. It can lead to a widespread demoralization, not only inside but outside the armed services, so that the people will begin to question whether the military policies we are adopting are, after all, the most effective. There can be no harmony where there is injustice.

But the remedy does not lie in opposing the nomination of Admiral Forrest Sherman. As I stated before, I think he is an outstanding officer. However, I doubt very much that he will measure up—or measure down, rather—to the qualifications which Matthews demands in a Chief of Naval Operations. I am firmly convinced that Sherman, after his outstanding record, will not develop the type of goose-stepping mentality and be the type of yes-man that apparently Matthews expects. The remedy lies rather in the writing of specfic safeguards into the law so that the power of removal will be limited to those proper and desirable causes which may require a change in personnel. At no time should it be possible for a man to be punished for his views. This is not the way to serve Congress or the country.

Congress at all times must have access to the views of persons in the executive branch of the Government. The Constitution says that the Congress and the executive establishment are coordinate.

The Constitution, moreover, specifies that Congress, and Congress alone, shall make the "rules for the governing of the land and naval forces."

It is an essential part of this rule-making that Congress shall keep open the avenues of communication between the executive and legislative establishments. It is important that we shall be able to get accurate information, unbiased information, truthful information, and information given us without fear of any reprisals.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I want to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that, as one member of the Armed Services Committee, I draw a distinction between testimony given to the properly constituted committees of the Congress of the United States, and such activities as naval or Army or Air Force officers might wish to carry on on the outside. If a person writes a magazine article or a press statement, or makes a speech at a public meeting, I think he must be prepared to accept the responsibility for what he says, because there exists in the armed services, of course, the matter of discipline, which does not exist in the civilian services, certainly not to the same extent. But I think the question of whether a witness would have the right, and in fact I think the duty, to respond to questions from a congressional committee, is a very basic one, and unless there is that right, I know of no way that the properly constituted committees of the Congress can discharge their constitutional obligation in carrying on their responsibilities.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from California. I want to call his attention to the fact—I am sure he is aware of it, but I am not sure it is in the RECORD now—I call his attention to the fact that Secretary Matthews has a directly opposite view from that of the Senator from California. As the Senator said, any member of the military should be able to come to the Capitol and freely discuss matters with the properly constituted committees of the Senate and the House. The Senator says there may be a difference between doing that and writing newspaper articles and making speeches. But this is what Secretary Matthews said before the committee:

> It is not a matter, in my judgment, as to where he expresses the opinion. The important thing is that he entertains that conviction in opposition to his superior officer.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not have all the facts which the Senator from Wisconsin has presented, and which have led him to his conclusion in this particular case. But I wonder if I understood the Senator correctly to say that Congress probably should pass a law which would limit the right of the Commander in Chief or the civilian secretaries of any of the Armed Forces, not to remove a man from the military, but to change a man from one tour of duty to another. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. It may not be necessary to pass any additional laws. We

already have on the books a law which provides a definite term for the Chief of Naval Operations.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What is that term?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me read from the law:

> There shall be a Chief of Naval Operations who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of not more than 4 years.

That has apparently been established for 2 years. I believe the reason for that provision is obvious. It is to make sure that the Chief of Naval Operations can feel some security, that he can come before congressional committees and discuss freely and without threat of removal, the problems of the military organization. That, in my opinion, is the reason why we have set a specific term of office.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I can understand the reason.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish. That is the reasoning of the Supreme Court in the Humphreys case, in which the Court said that where the appointment is for a specific term there cannot be removal merely because the appointee disagrees in some respects with the man who appointed him.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I can understand the desirability of having as long a term as possible for any military policy maker. But I cannot understand the complete desirability of freezing men in military posts. Let us leave Secretary Matthews out of the discussion for the moment. It seems to me undesirable that an individual should be frozen in his post of command, either military or naval.

Mr. McCARTHY. We are not talking about that, I will say to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It seems to me that would be undesirable. The only reason the founding fathers decided we should have civilian heads of the military is to have that flexibility. There may be the legal exception in the case of the Chief of Naval Operations, but I still believe it is undesirable.

I am somewhat familiar with the Humphreys case. Mr. Humphreys happened to come from my town. He had been a distinguished Member of Congress. His appointment was for a stated term to an independent agency, an agency which was independent of the Executive, except only so far as the appointing power was concerned.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me say this, so the Senator can have no misconception as to my position. Obviously we cannot freeze every man in the military in a particular command. I have no desire to defeat the appointment of Admiral Sherman. I think he will make an outstanding man for the position. I am not attempting to discuss the question of whether Sherman or Denfeld would make the better Chief of Naval Operations. I think there is no doubt whatsoever that if the President says to Denfeld, "I wish you would resign," that Denfeld will give the President his resignation. The thing which disturbs me a great deal, I will say to the Senator, is the very, very unusual procedure used in the removal of Denfeld. He was appointed and came before the Senate committee. He was sworn, sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth—at least, I assume he was sworn.

In addition to that, we gave him a statutory duty when we set up this job. We gave him a statutory duty to discuss his problems freely with the Congress. He did that, and because of that he was not only removed, but removed in an extremely shoddy manner. The first he heard about his removal was when some aide walked into his office and said, "Admiral, you have been fired."

The question today is not whether he should be Chief of Naval Operations, but whether we now have in the Pentagon a situation in which no officer will dare to come before Committees of Congress and testify to facts, because he knows that his head will fall the next day.

I might say I have many friends in the Pentagon, Army officers, Navy officers, Air Corps and Marine officers, men with whom I have served. I have discussed these problems with them. When they have given me information that I think should be given to the Senate I have invariably asked, "Well, will you come before the committee and testify?" The answers have been couched in different words, but it all sums up to the same thing, and that is "I would only risk testifying if I were ready to resign my commission tomorrow." That I believe is the important issue, not only before the Congress, but before the entire Nation. The Denfeld dismissal happens to be the culmination, I believe, of a long series of events which I intend to discuss briefly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree with the Senator concerning the necessity of allowing military men to give such military information as they can before the Congress, or even political information. I was for a long time a member of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House. While such a member I helped to establish a policy under which such officers could have more leeway in giving their political views.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not speaking of political views.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is all right if they wish to discuss political views. I am not discussing the Denfeld or the Sherman incidents. I think the question goes much deeper than that. I hope the Congress will not in any way freeze the hands of the Commander in Chief or the civilian heads of our Military Establishment, as they are provided to be under the Constitution, not necessarily in their right to remove a man, but in their right to change the tours of duty.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator think their hands are frozen?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It may be that Secretary Matthews in the present case, or someone else in another case used bad judgment, or did not act in the right manner. But in my opinion it would be most undesirable to freeze any man in the post of Chief of Naval Operations for 4 years. Suppose we were at war and the Chief of Naval Operations was frozen in his post for 4 years. Suppose the Commander in Chief decided that Chief of Naval Operations was not operating the war as he, the Commander in Chief, thought he should, whether the Commander in Chief was right or wrong in his judgment. If the Senate were to enter into the situation the war might be over before it could conclude its debate on the subject.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Senator will now come back to the question before us——

Mr. MAGNUSON. The real reason for providing civilian heads of our military departments was to give them the right to change the tours of duty of officers. A vast body of law has evolved in the past years establishing the rights of those who are in the military with respect to promotions, and so forth.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will say to the Senator that we are discussing different things. To get back to the subject I am discussing, I will say I am not concerned about mistakes Secretary Matthews may have made. We know that when Mr. Sullivan was Secretary of the Navy he said, "I am going to fight for a balanced defense. To have a well-balanced defense we must have a strong Navy." When he refused to be a "yes" man he was forced out. Now, if we must have "yes" men, under one man at the top who is a dictator, that means we are going to have only second and third and fourth team men, because small men can always be found, men who will "yes" their superior just to maintain the position of power which they have. If Secretary Matthews is removed, I am sure the President can find another "yes" man.

It appears that Mr. Matthews is not a man who has any conceivable knowledge of the Navy or any conceivable interest in it. I wonder whether the Senator knows the background of Mr. Matthews. I tried to check into it. I cannot understand what he is doing in that position.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, the Senator is——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I refuse to yield until I have finished this statement.

Mr. Matthews is apparently a well-thought-of lawyer from Omaha, Nebr. He has never been near the water. He himself said—to quote his own statement—that the greatest naval experience he ever had was in a rowboat. He came to the post of Secretary of the Navy, but apparently he has no loyalty either to the Navy or to the President. Apparently he did not know what he was doing. I do not think he was actually lying when he told the committee that Admiral Denfeld's commission did not exist, when he said that Admiral Denfeld never got the commission, even though Mr. Matthews himself had signed it a short time before. The reason I say that I do not think he was lying is that the use of the word "lie" presupposes that the person concerned knew what he was talking about. However, I do not think Mr. Matthews even knew that he had signed the document appointing Admiral Denfeld to the most important position in our Naval Establishment. I think Mr. Matthews did not know that a

plan was being put into execution behind a brass curtain of secrecy.

Of course, any man who tries to penetrate that brass curtain of secrecy immediately finds himself in great difficulties and his head falls. Not only do I think such a situation is most unfair to the officers of our Military Establishment but I think that situation is very dangerous to the Nation.

In this connection, let us consider the secrecy situation at the Pentagon. Presently General Bradley is Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I think General Bradley is one of our most outstanding men, and would do a good job in any position. I would not be so disturbed by this brass curtain of secrecy if we could know that we would always have a man such as General Bradley in his post. But we cannot begin such a practice of secrecy and rely upon always having an outstanding man in that job.

Furthermore, General Bradley, of course, may differ some day with some politician whom the President may appoint as head of the Defense Establishment and Bradley's head may then also fall. Then the brass curtain which is now being created would be infinitely more dangerous.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. When the Senator refers to penetrating the brass curtain, I assume he means penetrating it from the outside, in; does he not? I say that because, according to the information which has come to us from time to time, it occurs to me that there has been considerable difficulty in penetrating it from the inside, out.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think both. The five naval officers who testified before the committee, decided they would break through the brass curtain of secrecy and would tell the truth. But their heads are falling; and every other man who has been working behind that brass curtain is being informed today that, "If you do the same as Denfeld did"—in other words, if you honestly tell the Congress the truth—"and if you do not abide by the secrecy rules we have adopted, you will no longer be in this Establishment."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to ask a question of my colleague?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for that purpose, without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAIN. I am simply seeking information. The problem before us is admittedly very confusing.

I wonder whether my colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], representing, as he does, the administration, judging from the seat he now occupies, knows whether Admiral Denfeld ever received a commission from the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Navy for a second term as Chief of Naval Operations, to begin some time in December of 1949?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; I answer my colleague by saying that I know nothing of the facts in this case, and I know nothing as to whether the conclusions of the Senator from Wisconsin in respect to what has happened are correct. I am merely talking about what in my opinion is the undesirability of freezing any man in a military post. Of course, there might be a time when there would be a bad Chief of Naval Operations or a bad Chief of Staff. I do not say Admiral Denfeld is good or is bad; I merely refer to the undesirability of freezing any man in a military post. Our forefathers recognized that it would be unwise. I think it would be very unwise for the security of our Nation.

The Senator from Wisconsin is complaining about the method used in Admiral Denfeld's case. I do not have any idea about that; I know none of the facts.

Mr. CAIN. Permit me to say that before my colleague came on the floor, the Senator from Wisconsin maintained, through offering for the RECORD a photostat of the commission and showing it to the Senate that Admiral Denfeld had received a signed commission as Chief of Naval Operations.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; I understand that.

Mr. CAIN. The fundamental question in the minds of all of us is that if Admiral Denfeld received that commission, how is it humanly possible to understand the action of the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Matthews, when seeking the confirmation by the Senate of the nomination of Admiral Sherman, denying the existence of such a commission? Certainly my colleague and I are in agreement that out of fairness to the administration and to the admirals involved, and to the Secretary of the Navy, we should waste no time at all in bringing the Secretary of the Navy back before the Armed Services Committee and giving him an opportunity to reconcile these outstanding differences, and to determine wherein lies the truth. Are we in agreement on that?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have no disagreement on that.

Leaving all personalities aside, and forgetting about the incident, this matter brings up the very serious question, What is the power of the Commander in Chief or of a civilian secretary of a military establishment, working either separately or jointly, under the orders of the Commander in Chief, to remove anyone at any time from a military post.

Mr. CAIN. But I think there is one question which has priority over that, namely, whether a member of the President's Cabinet has spoken the truth before a standing committee of the United States Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree that the members of the President's Cabinet should always speak the truth.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that the unification law calls for the Chief of Naval Operations to be appointed for a term of not exceeding 4 years?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct; he has a specific term.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, if there is any weakness, as the Senator would like to make us believe there is, it lies at the feet of Congress, because the law provides that the Chief of Naval Operations shall be appointed for a specific period of time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But what is the power of removal?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall answer that question. I do not think there can be any question about it. Under the well-established law, a man who is appointed for a specified term can be removed for cause—in other words, if he is incompetent or is not doing a good job.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. The senior Senator from Washington and I know that, as a practical matter, a Secretary of the Navy appointed by the President is appointed at the President's pleasure. If the Chief of Naval Operations cannot get along with the Secretary of the Navy, then it is incumbent for the President to ask for the resignation of his Secretary of the Navy; or if the President thinks the Chief of Naval Operations is incompetent, it is incumbent upon the President to take steps to remove him. Those steps are not difficult. The Senator and I know that all the President has to do is call up or write Admiral Denfeld and say to him, "I wish you would resign." So we do not run into a serious problem there.

But in considering the appointment of a Chief of Naval Operations for a specified term, let us now consider the possibility that he may be asked to resign or may be told that he may be removed, not because of incompetence, but because, as Matthews said, because he maintains convictions in opposition to his superior officer. The Senator and I know that normally the Secretary of the Navy does not consider himself to be a great naval strategist. Normally the Secretary of the Navy is a liaison man between the Navy and the White House. Normally he is a man who has a deep interest in the Navy and will go to bat and fight for the rights and interests of the Navy.

But now for the first time in the history of the Navy, so far as I know, we have a Secretary of the Navy, who says, "I am the final word in naval strategy." He is a lawyer who, according to my knowledge, has had nothing to do with the Navy, except for a tour of duty in the USO, and his only experience with naval matters or maritime matters has been to go on the water in a rowboat. That constitutes his entire experience on the water, so he himself states. Now we learn that he says that if the officers of the Navy entertain convictions which are in opposition to his own, then those men must go.

Of course, it is obvious that officers of the Navy entertain convictions opposite to those of Secretary Matthews. When a man is appointed to such a post as the one Mr. Matthews holds, not because of his ability, but because he supported the right man politically, and then insists upon maintaining his idea of goose-step loyalty, then it is indeed a sad day for our country.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Again, I say I do not know whether Secretary Matthews made an error in his statement, or whether his interpretation of what he said is the same as that presented here

by the Senator from Wisconsin. The Senator from Wisconsin and I have our own views of the military.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If we had expressed all our views, we might have been in the brig once or twice on certain occasions. But I am not talking about that. I am trying to emphasize the seriousness of the conduct of the Military Establishment. I do not know anything about Mr. Matthews. I do not know whether it was a purely political appointment or not. He was confirmed by the Senate. His record was gone into by the Committee on Armed Services. I believe his confirmation was unanimous. I do not know whether the President selected the wrong man. Perhaps it is time we had a Democrat as Secretary of the Navy; we have had Republicans in that office for so long. It might be helpful to have such a switch. But I say it is a serious matter as to what are the rights not only of the Commander in Chief but of the civilian Secretary, in terms of their relationships with their officers. I think the matter should be explored by the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think there should be some clarification of the question about the issuance of the commission to Admiral Denfeld. The Senator will note on page 100 of the transcript of the testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee that Secretary Matthews apparently thought the commission had never been issued to Admiral Denfeld, and he also said that Admiral Denfeld had never held up his hand or been sworn in, that the commission had never been executed or accepted by Admiral Denfeld, and that he had not taken the oath of office. Secretary Matthews apparently was incorrect about the commission's not having been issued. But I understand the facts to be that Admiral Denfeld was never actually sworn in, that he never took the oath of office. In the colloquy appearing at page 100 of the transcript, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] said:

Well, the President changed his mind, is what it amounted to.

Secretary MATTHEWS. That is right, and on my recommendation.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Admiral Denfeld never held up his hand?

Secretary MATTHEWS. Never held up his hand; the commission was never issued to him; he was never sworn in.

Senator SALTONSTALL. And he changed his mind on your recommendation?

Secretary MATTHEWS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. So, the first term had expired, and he was not reappointed—

Colloquy follows at that point. So I take it it is true that, regardless of the merits and the abilities of these men—and I think everybody agrees that Admiral Denfeld is a very capable officer—he had never actually taken the oath of office, and I believe that is necessary in order to begin a term. I think the Senator will agree with me.

Mr. McCARTHY. I frankly do not know what if any papers Admiral Denfeld had signed but, so there will be no question about this, will the Senator turn to page 125, where the following appears:

Senator SALTONSTALL. May I ask Mr. Matthews one question, which I hope is for the purpose of clearing the record with respect to what he has said.

You have stated, Mr. Secretary, that you took full responsibility for not recommending to the President to sign Admiral Denfeld's commission. * * *

Is that correct?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; that is correct.

I may say to the Senator that I have made no thorough investigation of this. It is possible the President may have taken steps which have actually removed Admiral Denfeld; I do not know. All I know is that Secretary Matthews, who is a lawyer, appeared before the committee and said, "The reason there is a vacancy is because the commission was never signed, it was never issued." We now find the commission was signed; it was issued. Therefore, it is entirely possible that Matthews is also wrong as to what, if any, action the President took.

I frankly cannot conceive of Secretary of Defense Johnson and the President proceeding to take steps to have a second Chief of Naval Operations while one man was still in office. I am inclined to think the Armed Services Committee may find that the President took some action, about which Matthews does not know, which may have removed him; I do not know. That is one of the things I think the Senator from Maryland, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, intends to investigate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to say a word further.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish to compliment the Senator from Maryland on the very frank, honest attitude he takes toward this matter, when he says that if the commission was issued, and there is a doubt in his mind as to whether we have a Chief of Naval Operations, the Armed Services Committee will go into the matter.

Mr. KEFAUVER and Mr. TYDINGS addressed the Chair.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me yield first to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The fact is that Admiral Denfeld's commission expired, I believe, on December 15, 1949, and that practically all of this had taken place, including the argument in the House Armed Services Committee, prior to that time. I do not think the oath of office would have been given to Admiral Denfeld prior to December 15, and, of course, at that time it was known that he was out, and that Admiral Sherman or someone else was going to be selected.

Mr. McCARTHY. Wait a minute, Senator—Admiral Denfeld had taken the oath of office 2 years before; this commission extended his term for an additional 2 years.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; but his first term expired December 15.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say to the Senator, I am not going to argue with him as to whether the office was vacant or not. I do not know. All I know is that Matthews either deliberately lied or he is so incompetent that he did not realize he signed the commission appointing a Chief of Naval Operations. I am not going to argue with the Senator as to whether the office was vacant or not; I do not know, at the present. I do not know what action the President took. He may have signed any number of orders. I do not know what action Johnson took. All I say is that Matthews gave the Armed Services Committee the wrong picture, either deliberately or because he was incompetent; I do not know which. Beyond that, I do not intend to argue whether the office was vacant or not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is going to enforce the rule that the Senator can yield for a question only.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I ask the Senator whether Secretary Matthews made two statements, one, that the commission had not been issued——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I am going to insist that this be a question. If I do not, I may lose the floor.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Second, that he had not taken the oath of office; and he was incorrect as to his first statement, but there is no evidence that he was incorrect as to his second statement; is that not true?

Mr. McCARTHY. All I know is that he either lied or was mistaken in one major fact. How often he made mistakes, how much of the remainder of his testimony is true or false, I do not know.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot evaluate the testimony and say, "Here, the man was lying; here, he was incompetent; here, his statements are contradictory," without more information.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the Senator will yield for a question, I wonder whether the Senator does not think that in order to give the Senate the benefit of the explanations that Secretary Matthews made, the Senator should read the colloquy beginning on page 116, and ending in the middle of page 117, in which Secretary Matthews explained what he meant by his answers to the previous questions?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that the entire transcript of the hearing before the Committee on Armed Services, January 10 and 12, 1950, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOMINATION OF ADMIRAL F. E. SHERMAN TO BE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

TUESDAY, JANUARY 10, 1950

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:05 a. m., in room 212, Senate Office Building, Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators TYDINGS (chairman), RUSSELL, BYRD, CHAPMAN, JOHNSON of Texas,

KEFAUVER, HUNT, BRIDGES, GURNEY, SALTONSTALL, MORSE, and KNOWLAND.

Also present: Admiral F. E. Sherman.

The CHAIRMAN. We have got a quorum now, I believe. The admiral is here. We will go into executive session to vote, but I thought perhaps some of the members of the committee might——

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, might I make a brief statement? I have a very high regard for Admiral Sherman. My remarks are not directed towards the admiral, but I do think that there is a question involved on witnesses being able to testify before a committee of Congress without fear of recrimination.

Calling your attention to the testimony on unification and strategy before the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, Mr. VINSON in opening the hearings had this to say, among other things:

"I would like to say on behalf of the committee, although I believe this comment is probably unnecessary, that it is the intent of the committee that all testimony given shall be frankly and freely given and be given without reprisals in the Department of Defense against any individual presenting testimony during the course of these hearings.

"This committee will not permit nor tolerate any reprisal against any witness in these hearings, nor will we permit nor tolerate any shepherding of the testimony being presented. We want these witnesses to speak what is in their minds, to put their cards on the table, and to do so without hesitation or personal concern. We are going to the bottom of this unrest and concern in the Navy. And the committee expects full cooperation in this effort from the Department of Defense. When the testimony is all in, the committee will try to reach a decision as to what action is indicated in the interests of national defense.

"I have asked the Secretary of the Navy, Admiral Denfeld, Admiral Radford, and Admiral Bogan to be present this morning to offer such testimony to the committee as they wish to present, and the committee will afford other officers an opportunity to appear."

Now since that time Admiral Denfeld has been removed and Admiral Bogan is apparently on the way out of the service.

Now on page 4 of the same hearings the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Matthews, made a statement, and I will ask that his entire remarks be put into the record. I will not take the time of the committee to read them, but it was indicated that witnesses could testify without fear of recrimination, and I believe there is also a letter from Mr. Matthews in that regard.

(The statement referred to follows:)

"STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF THE NAVY FRANCIS P. MATTHEWS

"Secretary MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in response to your committee's invitation, which I received yesterday, I appear here today as a witness from the Navy.

"You have invited several other officials of the Navy to testify in this proceeding at this time, and it may be that you plan to call other Navy witnesses later. All of us in the Navy desire to cooperate with your committee in every possible way. To that end, let me assure the committee that any naval officer or enlisted man or any Navy civilian whom your committee wants to hear, or who desires to be heard by your committee, is completely free to testify. There has been no censorship. There will be none.

"In addressing ourselves to the agenda which your committee adopted some time ago, we in the Department of the Navy had considered the advisability of having four top naval officers take the lead in presenting the official views of our Department. That plan represented a desire to offer you an orderly statement of the views and conclusions of the Department of the Navy. It was distinctly understood by all, however, that your committee would call such additional witnesses from the Navy as you might desire, and that any other member of the naval personnel who might not be called by you or by us who wished to be heard would be at liberty to speak so far as the Navy is concerned.

"In that connection, my position is the same as that which former Secretary Forrestal outlined in his annual report to the President and the Congress when he said:

"'I have stated to the Congress my position on the expression of personal views by the Secretaries and chiefs of the departments in the National Military Establishment. I have told those officials that I want them to feel perfectly free to express their personal views when called upon to do so by the Congress. The public and the Congress are entitled to know the personal views of the Secretaries and the chiefs, but the public and the Congress are also entitled to know whenever there is a material distinction between such personal views and the official conclusion which the Military Establishment has arrived at after mature consideration.'"

Senator KNOWLAND. Now I do not know what the facts are in the case, but it seems to me that before finally acting on this nomination of a new Chief of Naval Operations, I would like an opportunity to question the Secretary of the Navy and perhaps others to see whether or not witnesses who appeared—though it was not before this committee, it was before a committee of the House of Representatives—had recriminations against them because of the testimony they gave at the legislative branch of the Congress.

I say it with the highest regard for the admiral, because I know he has a splendid record, but I think this is the time and the place, if witnesses are to have protection before congressional committees, the matter should be gone into.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair for a moment get the situation straightened out. Without taking issue about anything that Senator KNOWLAND has presented, the facts are that Admiral Denfeld has resigned. The facts are that the place is vacant. The facts are that Admiral Sherman has been nominated by the President, so the question before this committee is, Is Admiral Sherman fit to be the Chief of Staff of the Navy?

Now there is very properly the concern of the committee in the question which Senator KNOWLAND has raised, but it seems to me that that ought to be a separate transaction and that Admiral Sherman is not here as a part of that because the question here is—he has been nominated, the place is vacant—is he fit to be the Chief of Staff of the Navy?

Senator BRIDGES. Mr. Chairman, may I say just a word here? You said Admiral Denfeld resigned. Did he resign?

The CHAIRMAN. I understand so.

Senator BRIDGES. I understand that the first Admiral Denfeld knew of his removal from that office was when an aide came into the office and reported it on a ticker from somewhere outside. If so, I think that is a contemptible manner of removing a man who 2 months before was considered a party Chief of Naval Operations and who was considered competent.

Now I believe, just as Senator KNOWLAND said, that Admiral Sherman is an able, competent, alert man. I have high admiration for him, but I do not like the method that has been used here.

The CHAIRMAN. Nobody is taking issue with that, but what is before us here is if we are going into the manner in which Admiral Denfeld severed his connection with the Navy, that is a very proper subject for us to take up, if we care to, but what we are here concerned with is the place is vacant, and whether or not Admiral Sherman should fill it. That would not bar an inquiry into the matter along the lines suggested by Senator KNOWLAND, if the committee desired it.

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would not frankly be prepared, as one member of the committee, insofar as I have influence on the committee, to act on this nomination today.

It may be that after I have had additional time to study additional testimony before the House, after I get some other information which I have requested from the Navy Department but have not yet received, I would feel differently about it, but I do think that as one member—and perhaps other members on this committee feel—this is a pertinent inquiry, and at the time the particular job is open, particularly since Admiral Denfeld had just been renominated for a 4-year term and had been before this committee for confirmation not too long ago, it is pertinent to perhaps some of us to address questions to the Secretary of the Navy in this regard, and I would frankly object to any action today on the nomination.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have something you want to say, Senator GURNEY?

Senator GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I know that this committee should go into the matter of testimony before committees of the House and Senate. When the chairman of the House committee made the opening statement just read by Senator KNOWLAND, that there would be no reprisals, frank and open discussion, I believe the committees of Congress have got to maintain the right to question witnesses. Otherwise we are impotent.

If the members of the armed services know that they cannot talk to committees without being kicked out of the service, why then we might as well abandon the functions of this committee. Certainly we cannot function properly.

Now I do not know how we are going to reach that question unless we exercise the right we have of confirming nominations. If there is a way to reach it other than by bringing the matter up when nominations are presented, I would like to know about it. I do not know about it at present.

I do not know how you are going to reach it other than to object to nominations of successors to officers who have come up and given the committee the requested information. I would like to have that question answered as to how we are going to reach it, if we do not reach it in this way.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I do not know whether I can answer it or not, but let us assume that investigation went on for a year. In the meantime you would have no confirmed acting member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff representing the Navy or Chief of Staff of the Navy.

Senator KNOWLAND. He is acting——

The CHAIRMAN. Just let me finish. Suppose that at the end of the investigation it was found that Admiral Denfeld had a raw deal. That would not alter the question that there is a vacancy and we have to do something about it.

My thought is this: That an inquiry into the proposition would be perfectly proper if the committee desires to make it, but, regardless of the outcome of the inquiry, we will be confronted with the fact sooner or later that we must have a Chief of Naval Operations, which position is vacant, so that you would be gaining nothing by postponing what you have got to do eventually.

If I could see where the one could not be conducted without the other, that would be one thing. We can still have our investigation into the Denfeld matter, if we desire it. That has nothing to do with the fitness of Admiral Sherman to fill a vacancy which now exists.

I would like to ask Admiral Sherman, Did Admiral Denfeld finally resign?

Admiral SHERMAN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. He has not?

Admiral SHERMAN. No, sir. He is on leave, and he has not given an indication whether he will request retirement at the end of leave

or not. His leave will expire on the 19th of January.

The CHAIRMAN. Did I read in the paper a rumor or a statement to the effect that he refused, I think it was, the Mediterranean command?

Admiral SHERMAN. He was offered the assignment as commander in chief of the Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean, and he has declined that.

Senator KEFAUVER. Admiral Sherman has misunderstood. The chairman referred to this: Did he resign as Chief of Naval Operations?

Admiral SHERMAN. It is my understanding that he did not, sir; that he was removed by order of the President.

The CHAIRMAN. I see. Well, I was wrong about that. I had been under the impression that he had resigned as Chief of Naval Operations. That is not correct. He was removed by the President.

Now, is anyone here in a position to say whether the President has that authority or whether it is in dispute?

Senator BRIDGES. Mr. Chairman, I think it ought to be very clear to Admiral Sherman here that in any of these remarks that we are not questioning, at least I am not, his fitness for the job or his ability or his patriotism or anything else. I am just looking back on this thing. Now I have got a 4-page opinion that there is not any vacancy, from very eminent counsel.

The CHAIRMAN. May we ask who it is?

Senator BRIDGES. I could not get an opinion out of the Attorney General, of course, because they will not render it to an individual thing, but this is a personal opinion of Louis Wyman to me in which he cites the possibility of a question as to whether a vacancy exists.

Now, I do not know whether that is accurate or not, but there is a difference of opinion whether or not a vacancy exists, and whether a man who was nominated for Chief of Naval Operations by the President and commended as outstanding and competent, 2 months later should suddenly become incompetent and you have to remove him. It just does not make sense to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I suppose we could get opinions on both sides in great profusion. It seems to me that what the committee is confronted with is this fact: that the President has removed Admiral Denfeld as Chief of Naval Operations.

If the President has that right, as far as I can see I would not question it because he is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and can select his own staff pretty much at will, subject to the confirmation of the Senate. That is something I have made no study about and do not attempt to be profound, but if there is that situation the question here is whether or not the nominee who has been nominated to fill the vacancy is suitable to occupy the office.

The chairman would be very glad to have an expression from the committee on what the committee would like to do about this so we can get something concrete before us in the form of a motion.

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the question right now before the committee is if one or more members of the Armed Services Committee have requested some additional time to go into this matter, feeling that the whole basic issue as to whether the committees of the Congress can have witnesses before them from the services who can testify to the truth as they see it, and are going to be disciplined because they have given testimony before a committee of Congress—I think that is a very basic issue.

The first time we have had to go into this matter is on the nomination of Admiral Sherman for Chief of Naval Operations to take the place of a man who at least some people in the country believe was removed and disciplined because he had given testimony before a committee of the Congress of the United States, when both the chairman of that committee and the Secretary of the Navy himself had publicly stated that no disciplinary action would be taken.

A second witness who appeared before the committee, Admiral Bogan, has apparently been reduced in grade and has himself asked for retirement because of a letter which was sent or a statement which was made by the Secretary of the Navy to the committee. Now I think that that is a basic issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman does not want to interrupt the Senator from California, but I think the record also ought to show that this whole thing started upon very grave and serious charges made in the Navy Department that the Air Force was corrupt, which has been entirely lost sight of in a great deal of this hearing.

There were very serious charges made of corruption and giving of contracts to favorites, incompetency, and so on, which was the foundation of this whole inquiry to start with, and most people seem to have forgotten that that was the genesis of it, and are talking about some of the later ramifications of it.

Senator KNOWLAND. If I might just complete my statement, Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, Admiral Sherman is acting under a recess appointment by the President as Chief of Naval Operations. He is functioning today. It is not a question of his not being able to function in that capacity.

Therefore, I do not see that any great harm can take place if this committee and the members thereof at least have sufficient time to satisfy themselves by an examination of the facts which they are seeking to get, as to whether the legislative power of the Government to get testimony has been infringed upon.

Senator BYRD. May I ask the Senator how much time he would like?

Senator KNOWLAND. Why, I would think that 2 weeks would not be an unreasonable period of time.

Senator BYRD. I am prepared today, Mr. Chairman, to vote for the confirmation of Admiral Sherman, but I think, if Senator KNOWLAND wants 2 weeks, with the distinct understanding that at the end of 2 weeks we will vote on the nomination regardless of the period of inquiry, which I approve of, I am in favor of it, but I think it would be very unfortunate to hold this nomination up for a long time.

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman is inclined to feel that a request of any member of the committee for some time is always a reasonable request and should be granted. The Chair did feel that 2 weeks is a pretty long time to go into something with which most of us are generally familiar already, and, in view of the fact that the admiral here has been acting for several months, the Chair was hopeful that the Senator from California could get his facts together by this time next week and arrive at a decision.

The Chair does not want to push him, but I am just making that as a request, whether the 2 weeks could not be shortened somewhat.

Senator KNOWLAND. I would like to feel that we had 2 weeks on it. If that time can be shortened, why, I certainly am just as anxious as the chairman to shorten it, but we all have many other problems in which we are interested, and sometimes it is a little difficult to get information out of Government departments. The shortness of the time may somewhat depend on the cooperation——

The CHAIRMAN. Well, how about this, Senator KNOWLAND: This is Tuesday. Our regular meeting time is Thursday, anyway. Why not make it Thursday of next week, which would be an intermediate period between 2 weeks and a week, which would give you about 10 days.

Senator GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word there. I do not like to talk about time. I like to talk more about the merits of the question. Before any information comes in, before we hear from the Secretary of the Navy, if we decide in advance that we are going to handle the matter in 10 days or 2 weeks——

The CHAIRMAN. What matter do you mean, the confirmation of Admiral Sherman, or the investigation into the Denfeld matter? I am talking about the confirmation of Admiral Sherman.

Senator GURNEY. I am talking about that too, but I am talking about the more important problem as to how this committee is going to continue to get information from the armed forces without——

Senator BYRD. Is that not a separate inquiry though, Senator?

Senator GURNEY. I do not know.

Senator BYRD. I think it would be very unfortunate to hold this confirmation up indefinitely. I am perfectly willing to vote, as a courtesy to Senator KNOWLAND or any other Member, that they have reasonable time to present any facts that they do not have, but concerning becoming involved in something else which is more or less foreign, to my mind, to the question of confirming Admiral Sherman, I would have to vote for immediate action today if it is going to go into a question of months and months, which this other inquiry may take, and I am in favor of the inquiry, I might say.

The CHAIRMAN. That is my position exactly. We ought to separate the two things.

Senator BYRD. If Senator KNOWLAND wants 2 weeks, I am perfectly willing to submit the motion with the understanding that not later than 2 weeks from today——

Senator GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not even want to vote on 2 weeks. Maybe I will be ready to vote tomorrow. I would like to rather have this committee ask the Secretary of the Navy to come up here and meet with us this afternoon, tomorrow, or any time.

The CHAIRMAN. On Admiral Sherman's fitness?

Senator GURNEY. No; on the other problem.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we are using Admiral Sherman as a battering ram about something that is not before the committee.

Senator GURNEY. Let us bring it before the committee, then.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it is very proper, but why should we penalize a man who comes here with clean hands, who had no part in the thing?

Senator GURNEY. I am one of those who believes that Admiral Sherman is completely fitted for the office. I like him and have known him for a long time.

The CHAIRMAN. Even if we find that Admiral Denfeld has been mistreated, or anything you want to call it, that will have no effect upon this situation, as I see it.

Senator GURNEY. I still would like to ask the Secretary of the Navy some questions, and 2 weeks does not mean anything to me. I want the questions answered.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the Chair will entertain a motion.

Senator BYRD. Let me ask a question: Would it not be just as well to have an inquiry? We have the power, this committee does, to summon anybody before us to ascertain these facts.

Senator GURNEY. Let us have them.

Senator BYRD. Nobody charges that Admiral Sherman had anything to do with it. He was not even here. He was thousands of miles away.

Senator GURNEY. I agree completely with all those statements.

Senator BYRD. Why does not the inquiry go along? It probably would take a very

long time. If it started it would not be 2 weeks or 2 months.

I just cannot see why we should indefinitely postpone a consideration and action on Admiral Sherman when every member of this committee, I take it, agrees that he is eminently qualified and fitted for this position.

Senator GURNEY. Well, we decided exactly that way when we confirmed Admiral Denfeld for a 4-year term as Chief of Naval Operations.

Senator BYRD. Something was done by somebody else and Admiral Sherman had nothing to do with it. I do not see why he should be punished for it. He certainly had nothing to do with any of this.

Senator GURNEY. We want to know if the man we did confirm for office, Admiral Denfeld, created some error that justified his being removed.

Senator BYRD. That is another question.

Senator BRIDGES. We would like to know if he is legally removed.

Senator BYRD. With all deference to the opinion, I am not a lawyer but I cannot imagine that the Commander in Chief of the United States Navy cannot remove a subordinate.

Senator BRIDGES. I think probably he can, but I mean there is a question.

Senator BYRD. All right, make an investigation of that, but that is no reason to say there is no vacancy here when every reasonable person has got to realize that the Commander in Chief can remove a subordinate if he chooses to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me say this: I think Senator BYRD stated the matter. Nobody is opposing an inquiry into Admiral Denfeld's situation.

Senator BYRD. I will vote for the inquiry right now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not trying to throttle that inquiry, but even if you make it, regardless of what you find, the post of Chief of Naval Operations, in the Chair's opinion, will be vacant, so what is the use of having it vacant if you are going to vote finally, no matter what the inquiry shows, that the place is vacant and has got to be filled.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Chairman, may I just say this: I think one viewpoint that has been lost sight of, or at least has not been mentioned, is the prestige of Admiral Sherman's position and his authority over the United States Navy, which is very vital at the present time.

Now we all agree that Admiral Sherman is a good man. I say with a smile that both Admiral Denfeld and Admiral Sherman are residents of Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that is the only bad thing I have heard against both of them.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I say this: That it seems to me that we have got to think of the prestige of the United States Navy at a time when it is in great difficulty, and Admiral Sherman, if his confirmation is held up, if we believe he is a proper man, infringes upon his authority, infringes upon the respect which other nations hold toward him and toward his office. It makes it more difficult for him to issue authority.

Now I voted for Admiral Denfeld. I have the greatest respect for him. I agree with what Senator KNOWLAND has said. I hope if we conduct such an inquiry, it will be conducted on a very high level, and in the first instance anyway in executive session, trying to find out what is the background of some of these things, but I think the sooner we confirm Admiral Sherman, the sooner we regain the prestige of the United States Navy, and that is the point, rather than Admiral Sherman as an individual.

Now the President has authority unquestionably in my opinion to kick out any Chief of Staff that he wants to at any time. I cannot believe that that is not true. It is done in wartime, it is done in peacetime if it is necessary to do it, or if in the opinion of the Commander in Chief it is necessary.

Now we have got a man whom we think is qualified. He is well chosen for the position, and I want to look at the United States Navy as a very important adjunct of our defense and our security at this time, and I would like to see Admiral Sherman confirmed as quickly as possible, and I will vote, Senator KNOWLAND and Senator BRIDGES, for an inquiry into this other thing on a high level, to try to get the facts.

Senator GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I feel as Senator SALTONSTALL feels and has so stated. I do not think there is any chance of having Admiral Denfeld back in as Chief of Naval Operations. I do not think they would want to do it under the conditions as they exist and have existed for the last few months.

I am perfectly willing to vote for Admiral Sherman, but I do want to insist that we go ahead and get to the bottom of this so that committees of Congress can continue to get information.

The CHAIRMAN. You gentlemen can have any kind of an inquiry that a majority of the committee desires at any time about the Navy. Now so far as the Chair is concerned, he will cooperate wholeheartedly with any movement in the committee, supported by the committee, for an inquiry into this matter, if the committee desires it.

The only thing that the Chair asks is do not let us penalize Admiral Sherman. We can go right ahead with our inquiry anyway, but in the meantime, as Senator SALTONSTALL said, let us confirm Admiral Sherman, get it out of the way and then pick up the inquiry if you want it, and go to the bottom of it and get a finding.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Chairman, may I ask Senator KNOWLAND a question which would also perhaps involve Senator BRIDGES: If we voted an inquiry before we confirmed Admiral Sherman this morning on a motion by Senator KNOWLAND or Senator BRIDGES, and voted that unanimously, the method of the inquiry to be determined later by agreement and after thoughtful consideration by the committee in executive session, then would you be willing to vote for the confirmation of Admiral Sherman?

Senator KNOWLAND. No, I would not be ready to vote for the confirmation of Admiral Sherman today. I think that I am entitled to some additional time.

Senator BYRD. What is the shortest time, Senator?

Senator KNOWLAND. I would not think on a nomination of this kind—and I am just as interested as the Senator from Massachusetts is in upholding the Navy and strengthening the Navy, particularly in the Pacific and other areas, as anybody in this committee room, but I am also interested in upholding the constitutional responsibilities of the Congress of the United States, and I think that that is also important to this Republic.

Senator BYRD. Would a week from Thursday, the regular meeting day, be agreeable?

Senator KNOWLAND. That would be agreeable.

Senator BYRD. I make a motion that we vote on this nomination a week from Thursday.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me state the motion first. The motion is that the matter of the confirmation of Admiral Sherman for Chief of Staff of Naval Operations be temporarily laid aside but that on Thursday, January 19, at 10:30 a. m., the committee convene and proceed to vote upon the confirmation of Admiral Sherman without further debate.

Is that correct, sir?

Senator BYRD. Yes. I want to say further, Mr. Chairman, that I am prepared to vote for a resolution making a full investigation of these other matters that have been discussed here, at any time.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I am perfectly willing to vote for that today.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you ought to word it pretty carefully rather than just generalize on it.

Whoever is going to sponsor it, I would suggest that they take a little time in the wording of it so that the purview of the thing clearly gets to the things you want to reach, rather than go off on just a generalization.

Go ahead, Senator MORSE.

Senator MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I have a few brief remarks. I want to say at the outset that I join in thinking that Senator KNOWLAND should have sufficient time to make inquiry into the relationship as he may see it between this nomination of Admiral Sherman and the whole naval discussion that arose incident to the House investigation, but I want to second the point of view expressed by the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Virginia that we have a great responsibility, it seems to me, of protecting the good name of the Navy, and bringing to an end what I think must be recognized to be some internal conflicts within that Department.

Now I do not know whether Admiral Denfeld was disciplined or not. The Secretary of the Navy says he was not. That is a question of fact which I think we can get answered, but I do know this, Mr. Chairman, and that is what we have a problem as a Senate committee, the House has a problem as a House committee, of not permitting ourselves to be used as a shield for improper conduct within the military branches of this Government on the ground that they are going to be protected if their misconduct happens to be disclosed at a hearing on the Hill.

Now I express my own judgment when I say that if he was not disciplined, I think he should have been, and I am not satisfied that it should have been limited to him, because after all I do not know how you can conduct the Navy under civilian heads or an army or an air force, either, under a civilian head and give to them the type of protection that they can make representations at one time that they are for unification and then subsequently in a hearing on the Hill have disclosed that they were not after all acting in good faith in regard to unification.

I think that this committee was misled in regard to the attitude of some Navy officials toward unification too, and I am perfectly willing to go into that inquiry if you want it, but I do not see why this great naval officer should be held up for very long in his confirmation, because I do not think any question can be raised as to his qualifications.

I think the sooner we get the Navy back as a part of the team, the better, and I will vote for the inquiry. I will vote as a matter of courtesy because I think BILL KNOWLAND is entitled to it, to any time he needs within reason to conduct his own investigation into Admiral Sherman's qualifications, but as far as my personal view is concerned, I want to say I did not like the whole fiasco over on the House side, and Hollywood, I think, never became quite so slapstick as the Navy did passing secret documents in the darkened doorway of an office building in Washington.

I say if discipline was not meted out, it ought to be meted out for that sort of conduct. Let us go ahead with the inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to say, gentlemen, I promised some of the members of the committee we would only meet a half hour this morning. We are going to meet again Thursday at our regular time. The Chair has made commitments based on the fact that we would only meet a half hour.

The Chair would be very grateful if we could proceed to a vote on the Byrd motion,

and we will meet again on Thursday and take up the other matter.

Senator BRIDGES. Mr. Chairman, may I ask is Admiral Sherman going to be here on Thursday?

The CHAIRMAN. He will be here any time we want him. Would you like to have him here on Thursday?

Senator BRIDGES. I would like to ask him some questions whenever it is convenient to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the first thing to do is to adopt the motion that probably Senator KNOWLAND will offer Thursday about whatever type of inquiry he has in mind, before we get any other witnesses up on it, do you not think so, Senator Bridges?

Senator BRIDGES. I think so.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Chairman, you have got an important thing here, and out of this meeting is going to go the fact that Admiral Sherman's appointment is held up because we want to vote an inquiry. I think we ought to vote that inquiry before we leave this room.

The CHAIRMAN. There would be an awful lot of discussion about it, and frankly I would not want to vote on it without hearing from the Secretary of the Navy as to whether or not we ought to vote on it, and I think you are going into something about which, before we can make a decision, you have got to have some pretty cogent testimony on before you decide whether the inquiry ought to be made.

Now I happen to be in possession of one or two facts that I do not believe many people know about, and I would certainly want those facts brought out here, and it might change the whole appearance of some of the thinking here. I think the question now is on the Byrd motion as to whether or not we want to give those who want this inquiry time enough to frame a motion to bring it about.

All those in favor will signify by saying aye.

(A chorus of "ayes.")

The CHAIRMAN. Opposed.

Senator HUNT. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The "ayes" have it. The motion is carried.

NOMINATION OF ADMIRAL F. E. SHERMAN TO BE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

THURSDAY, JANUARY 12, 1950

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met, pursuant to adjournment and subsequent notice, at 11 a. m., in room 212, Senate Office Building, Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators TYDINGS (chairman), RUSSELL, CHAPMAN, JOHNSON of Texas, KEFAUVER, HUNT, BRIDGES, GURNEY, SALTONSTALL, MORSE, KNOWLAND, and CAIN.

The CHAIRMAN. Before we proceed further here I have a letter from Senator KNOWLAND which came in yesterday during my absence, and I have a letter from Senator KNOWLAND that came in, I think, just before I left yesterday, so I have two letters asking for—I think one of them asks—the Joint Chiefs of Staff to be called before the committee to give their opinion on whether or not Formosa is essential to our national defense; and the second letter, I think—correct me if I am wrong, Senator—came in during my absence yesterday afternoon, and it asked that Mr. Matthews be called before the committee in connection with the confirmation of Admiral Sherman. Is that correct?

Senator KNOWLAND. That is right; and that is the letter to which I wish to address myself and to direct your attention.

The CHAIRMAN. So far, of course, I could not have acted, if I wanted to, on the Matthews' thing for the very simple reason that there would not have been any opportunity to get word to him.

I did not get the letter until I came to my office this morning.

The thing that concerns me, however, even if I had been here, if it has to do with the Denfeld matter, so far as I know the committee has never voted for an inquiry into that field, and the chairman would be reluctant to call Secretary Matthews or anybody else for an investigation into a matter that the committee had not authorized.

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, if I might state so that I think the record can be clear, the letter that I addressed to the chairman yesterday, as he said—I tried to reach him by telephone, but he had the necessity to be out of the city, and I understood that—the letter reads as follows:

"DEAR SENATOR: I tried to reach you a few minutes ago, 2:30 o'clock p. m., by telephone at your office, but was informed that you had gone to Maryland and would not return until late tonight.

"It would be very much appreciated if you would invite Secretary of the Navy Matthews to attend the sessions tomorrow of the Armed Services Committee and extend this similar invitation to Admiral Louis Denfeld.

"In conformity with the desires of the committee to expedite matters relative to the nomination by the President of the new Chief of Naval Operations, I believe that this action would contribute toward that end."

I merely wish to say, Mr. Chairman, as I said to the committee the other day, I have no desire to delay beyond the date agreed to the nomination of Admiral Sherman; so far as I know, he is a very competent, able naval officer, and I have no reason to believe but that he will make an excellent Chief of Naval Operations.

I do believe, however, that this committee is entitled to make some inquiries of the Secretary of the Navy.

I am not convinced in my own mind that a full-dress inquiry would be necessary. I think, perhaps, the factual information that might be developed from a discussion with Secretary Matthews, in executive session or otherwise, might furnish some members of the committee with sufficient information so that they would not desire to pursue a full-dress inquiry.

However, I do wish to call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that not only does the Constitution of the United States itself place upon the Congress a primary r ponsibility for the raising and the supporting of armies and navies, but there appeared in Collier's magazine, which was out yesterday, January 21, 1950, an article entitled "If This Be Treason," by Rear Adm. Daniel V. Gallery, United States Navy.

Now, Admiral Gallery is a responsible, able officer of the United States Navy. In the Collier's insert, it says that Admiral Gallery has had a distinguished record of service to his country. "The 48-year-old native of Chicago saw service in both World Wars, and has been an outstanding Navy flyer since 1927. His current assignment is in Washington, where he is Assistant Chief of Naval Operations for the Guided Missiles Branch."

He is apparently a responsible, able naval officer, with a distinguished career of service, and would not be holding that position if his superiors did not think he was.

Quoting from page 16 in this article in Collier's, this is what Admiral Gallery has to say:

"Last October, on the date which was formerly Navy Day, Admiral Louis Denfeld, after 40 years of distinguished service to his country, in peace and in war, was kicked out of his job as Chief of Naval Operations. The admiral learr ed of his firing from an aide, who read about it in the newspapers. In the reshuffle, which followed, all the other top admirals who supported Denfeld were swept into the 'deep freeze.'"

Now, that is a statement which is made by a responsible naval officer. Then he goes on to say:

"But I think that the implications of the purge are even more ominous to the country than they are to the Navy, the handwriting on the wall can nov be plainly seen by military officers in the Army, Air Forces, and Marine Corps, as well as the Navy. It says, 'Conform or be liquidated.'"

I read on a little further, where he says:

"Under our form of government, the basic decisions of military policy should be made by Congress. How can these decisions be made wisely if Congress is to be denied the honest advice of the men whom the taxpayers have trained to be their experts?"

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to read the whole article, but I am going to ask that it be placed as a part of our record for Senators who might not see it in Collier's.

Now, I think they are serious statements which have been made by, presumably, a responsible officer of the United States Navy.

I do not know whether they are true or not, but I do want to most respectfully say that if we are to discharge our constitutional obligation, and that if people representing the Army and the Navy and the Air Force feel that if they come to the Armed Services Committee of the Senate or the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, and answer inquiries, inquiries that we propound to them so that we may properly have information to discharge our constitutional obligation, and they feel under any duress, direct or implied, that if they answer truthfully and to the best of their ability, they may be punished, I say to you that we have a situation which the Congress of the United States should not tolerate.

I do not know whether it is true or not. I hope it is not, but I do feel as a Senator of the United States, having some responsibility, both as a member of this committee and in my capacity as a Senator, that I am entitled to direct some questions to the Secretary of the Navy to see whether those statements have any basis of fact, and that is my case, Mr. Chairman, and I respectfully ask that the chairman invite Secretary Matthews before this committee this week and, certainly I want to do nothing that will delay action on Admiral Sherman. I think I am entitled to that request.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, Senator KNOWLAND, certainly you are entitled to your point of view.

I would like to submit, however, to you and the other members of the committee, certain facts with respect to this case that I think ought to receive some attention.

In the first place, no promise was made to the Senate Committee on Armed Services regarding this whole incident. It was made to a committee of the armed services of the House of Representatives.

The Senate was not a party to the investigation, was not a party to the inquiry. It did not elicit the promise from those in authority about purges, and so forth, and the incidents all took place before our sister committee or fellow committee, if you please, in another branch of this Government.

If there has been any affront, if there has been any violation of an understanding, if there has been anything unconstitutional, if there has been anything unconstitutional or untoward or unwarranted, it seems to me that the House of Representatives, where the whole thing occurred, the court in which the litigation is pending, so to speak, is the proper committee to investigate it, and I have understood from things I have read in the press, one of them being a statement from my own colleague, Congressman SASSCER, who serves on the Armed Services Committee, that the matter is to be looked into by the House of Representatives.

Now, it would be most unbecoming, in my opinion, for us to inject ourselves into a

matter that is pending before the House of Representatives, and which has not been formally concluded. That is No. 1.

The second thing is that in order to expedite this whole matter and to give you access to any information that you want, I took the liberty yesterday of calling the Secretary of the Navy, and telling him what transpired here in the morning, and I told him that I thought it would be very helpful if you and he could sit down together, and you could ask him any questions you wanted, and he could give you what he knew about it, and put you in a position of being in possession of all the facts with respect to it upon which you could make a fuller determination as to whether or not you felt the facts in this article, and other articles, were complete and worthy of further action on the part of the House committee or ourselves.

The Secretary told me he would be very glad to meet with you, to go over this whole matter fully, to answer any questions that you wanted to ask him, and to put you in possession of everything that was possible.

Now, would it not be wiser for you to do that and to find out whether or not the thing in a prima facie way is worthy of further investigation than it would be to have a full-dress hearing about something that is pending in another body all the time?

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, if I might answer most respectfully——

The CHAIRMAN. Let me just say, and then, coupled with that, I also got your letter that we called the three Joint Chiefs of Staff up here to investigate whether or not Formosa was this, that, or the other thing.

Now, that hearing is going on at the present time before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate, and you attended one of the hearings there yesterday. Our province here as the Committee on Armed Services is to defend where our Army is, and where our commitments are. So far as I know, we have no commitment in Formosa.

Senator BRIDGES. But, Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Just let me finish. My point is this, that if that inquiry is to be made as to whether or not Formosa should or should not be defended, it seems to me it ought to be made by the Foreign Relations Committee.

They make international policy. This committee is a defense committee.

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, if I might just briefly say one thing.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me continue—we will not do anything but investigate the whole time that we are here if we get into all these things.

Senator KNOWLAND. Just let me say this: In the first place, the letter that the Secretary wrote to Mr. VINSON, and which——

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. VINSON, chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House?

Senator KNOWLAND. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Why does not Mr. VINSON call him to task?

Senator KNOWLAND. My point is that the policy as laid down, as I understood it to be laid down, by the Navy and the Defense Department, is that witnesses come before the committees of the Congress, both committees, and we have a responsibility that we cannot delegate to the House, or the House cannot delegate to us, and I do not believe that we can be unconcerned about injustices taking place, and wait on the House with respect to the matter.

They are within their province in going ahead with such inquiries as they want.

I have not demanded a full-scale investigation. I have sought through the proper medium of a Senate committee to carry on in such a way so that we might get some information.

Now, I am not the only member of this committee who believes that we are entitled to this information.

The CHAIRMAN. Why do you not go down and see Secretary Matthews?

Senator KNOWLAND. Because I do not feel that as a member of the Armed Services Committee on this particular issue that is a proper way to handle it.

The CHAIRMAN. We can still vote for the investigation, but we certainly ought to find out, before we go to all this trouble, whether or not the facts are as stated.

Senator KNOWLAND. Is there any reason that you can think of why——

The CHAIRMAN. What does Admiral Gallery know what took place?

Senator KNOWLAND (continuing). He should not come down to discuss matters with the members of the Armed Services Committee?

The CHAIRMAN. I have already invited him. He says he will come; you can have any talk you want to. You have it public or private.

I am talking about a committee hearing, and to say that you do not want a full-dress hearing, when nobody knows where these hearings will go—we might be here for a month. As a matter of fact, we might be summoning the same witnesses on the same case in both Houses at the same time on the same investigation.

Senator KNOWLAND. Now, Mr. Chairman, all I have asked for is that this committee, and the other members who, I believe, also have and should have an interest in this situation, all I have asked is that this committee might invite the Secretary of the Navy to come before us and answer some questions which we would like to propound, and carry on a discussion with him, as members of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. You certainly can do that without any workings on the part of the Chair.

Senator KNOWLAND. Can we have him here tomorrow?

The CHAIRMAN. No; you can have him all you wish. All that you have to do is to call him and you may meet, if you wish, in this room.

Senator KNOWLAND. I do not want to have him individually, but I want to have him as a member of the Armed Services Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, let us find out what the committee wants.

Senator KNOWLAND. All right, Mr. Chairman, then I move you that the Secretary of the Navy be invited to appear before the Senate Armed Services Committee to answer certain questions as the committee might care to direct to him.

The CHAIRMAN. About what subject?

Senator KNOWLAND. About the subject of whether officers of the Navy are being punished or have been punished for giving testimony before a committee of Congress of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. You have heard the motion, gentlemen. What is the decision?

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Chairman, a fellow who tries to get in the middle always gets his head knocked off by both sides. I hope we do not have to vote on any such motion as that. If I have to vote on it, I would vote formally.

The CHAIRMAN. Vote how?

Senator SALTONSTALL. I did not say how I would vote. I said formally.

The CHAIRMAN. Formally; yes.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I would amend, if I had to, Senator KNOWLAND'S motion, to ask Mr. Matthews to come down here in connection with the confirmation of Admiral Sherman.

Now, there are perfectly good grounds for that: On the ground that we confirmed Admiral Denfeld a few months ago, and there was great publicity concerning his resignation or his retirement as Chief of Staff.

Therefore, there is certainly a proper inquiry, if any member of the committee wants to make it, in connection with why there was a retirement and, therefore, why, if this man is capable of doing so, of succeeding him. Now, that is putting it in technical language.

I say, most respectfully, that I do not see that that involves us in the full inquiry that is now before the House. It seems to me that Secretary Matthews, being the civilian head of the Navy, if any Member requests it, we should permit him to ask questions in connection with the confirmation of a man in uniform.

Now, I would hope that we would not be forced to vote formally on whether or not to bring Mr. Matthews before us, because it seems to me to divide the committee, or it may divide the committee, most unfortunately, on a subject where that is not necessary.

Senator KNOWLAND. I will amend my motion, and I am perfectly willing to withdraw the motion, as I stated it, and to ask that the Secretary of the Navy be invited to appear before the Armed Services Committee relative to the nomination of the Chief of Naval Operations and for such inquiries as the committee might desire to make.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the same thing, is it not, only it is made a little more palliative by sugar-coating, but the purpose is to inquire—let us be frank and honest about it—into the circumstances surrounding Admiral Denfeld's tenure of office.

Senator KNOWLAND. No; that is not the only thing.

The CHAIRMAN. I did not say only; I said that is the primary purpose of it.

Senator KNOWLAND. No; my primary purpose is to find out whether there is any attempt being made to prevent members of the armed services from giving their honest opinions to the Congress of the United States in response to inquiries directed by a regularly constituted committee of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be. I think that is a basic issue.

The CHAIRMAN. Without reference to the Denfeld case or with particular reference to it?

Senator KNOWLAND. No, I think that is only one facet of the situation.

Senator JOHNSON. Has the Senator any indication that such attempts have been made, so far as our committee is concerned?

Senator KNOWLAND. I do not know. I read the statement to the Senator this morning, which just came to my attention yesterday, and I think there are rather serious implications in that statement made by a responsible naval officer.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Chairman, may I say something?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator MORSE has attempted to speak several times. All right, Senator SALTONSTALL.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I just, to complete my statement, would like to say that I would hope that Senator KNOWLAND'S request, as an individual member of this committee, would be either granted or that I would like to see Mr. Matthews volunteer to come before this committee at the earliest possible moment, this afternoon preferably.

The CHAIRMAN. There have been no charges filed before this committee.

Senator SALTONSTALL. No, but there has been some publicity given out with respect to the building up of Sherman, and so on.

I say, sir, that I would hope that that could be done without putting a formal vote on, and in connection with the confirmation of Admiral Sherman.

It would seem to me that any member were entitled to ask the civilian head of the Navy any questions that he might want, concerning his Chief of Naval Operations.

For instance, just to put an extreme case, Mr. Matthews might not agree at all with the policies of Admiral Sherman. Therefore, we are entitled, as a confirming body, to know that he does approve of Admiral Sher-

man's appointment. Presumably he does; of course, he does, but assume a set of facts, then it seems to me that any individual member of the committee, without a formal vote, is entitled to do that, and I think, as I said the other day, the prestige of the Navy, the authority of Admiral Sherman in Russia, in England, in France, and everywhere else, is involved in this thing, and I would hope that we could eliminate it as soon as we could, and in a simpler way which, it seems to me, is to either ask Mr. Matthews to come before the committee or have Mr. Matthews volunteer to come before the committee.

I am through, sir, and, as I say, I do not want to get into the middle between two people, two friends or colleagues, or the chairman and an individual member.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose the House wanted to investigate it, would it make any difference?

Senator SALTONSTALL. Not the slightest difference. It seems to me Senator KNOWLAND has made a personal request with respect to the confirmation to a very important post, and we should do it as promptly as possible; we should not get into a disagreement in the committee concerning it, where a motion is forced.

Senator BRIDGES. If Senator MORSE will speak, I will withhold what I want to say until he is through.

Senator MORSE. You will not have to hold it very long, because I have three very brief points to make.

Mr. Chairman, my first one goes to the matter of committee procedure. We have before us the nomination of Admiral Sherman. I think it is perfectly reasonable and proper for an individual member of this committee, or in this instance I think it happens to be more than one, to ask the committee to bring before the committee the Secretary of the Navy for the purpose of discussing that nomination.

Now, there is no sense in our trying to run away from the fact that in the discussion of that nomination it is going to get into this whole question of the Secretary's views with respect to the Denfeld matter, but I think, as a matter of committee policy, it would be unwise to establish any precedent here in regard to the Knowland request of denying it.

Therefore, my second point is that I think that we ought to proceed in executive session—at least to the point of getting the Secretary's point of view and deciding for ourselves in executive session after we have it—as to whether or not there is any reason for our extending the hearing to any open session. I think that is something that we would decide at a later date after we talked to the Secretary.

The third point I would make is that this committee has had a remarkable record under this chairman and preceding chairmen of working cooperatively in the interests of promoting the best security policy of this Nation through our Military Establishment, and I do not think in this session of Congress we should permit this incident to develop into an area for misunderstanding among us as Senators.

I think we can sit down here in executive session with the Secretary of the Navy and reach some very definite understandings to get the atmosphere, at least, cleared within the committee.

Now, I happen to be one who does not believe that the Armed Services Committee of either the House or the Senate should ever be used by the military as a sanctuary in which to hide their insubordination, and I happen to be one who is of the opinion that this incident is one in which the House committee was used as a sanctuary for the purpose of hiding what I think was some pretty reprehensible conduct on the part of some Navy officials, but I am perfectly willing to sit here and listen to points of view that may prove me wrong, with respect to that, but we have got to watch out that we do not permit ourselves to be a territory in which these officers can run, and, once having testified before us, then be protected for all time in the future for conduct unbecoming officers.

I think that is part of this problem, so I would support the Knowland motion, if it would include a provision or understanding that we proceed, at least in the first instance, in executive session, in regard to the Sherman nomination, and ask the Secretary of the Navy to come before us in connection with that nomination.

Senator KNOWLAND. That is perfectly agreeable, and I think I mentioned the executive session.

Senator BRIDGES. Mr. Chairman, on the question of the Knowland request or the Knowland motion, I have been a member of this Armed Services Committee since it was created, and prior to that a member of the old Military Affairs Committee, on both of them for some 14 years, and I have never known of the request of a single member of the committee on a subject that was pertinent, where they have asked a witness to appear, that that request has been denied, and I certainly do not want to see that precedent established so far as Senator KNOWLAND is concerned. If it is, certainly I do not care to be a member of the committee, and I do not think anybody else would if it were that.

I certainly do not think that the interests and the good of the country or the proper conduct of the Senate would call for or allow that to happen.

My other point was just a personal point on a remark that you made, Mr. Chairman, which is possibly something where there is, perhaps, a matter of opinion, but where you said that we had no interest in——

The CHAIRMAN. I did not say we had no interest in——

Senator BRIDGES (continuing). In Formosa.

The CHAIRMAN. I said we had no jurisdiction.

Senator BRIDGES. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Which is an entirely different situation.

Senator BRIDGES. All right. Then, I want to show you how I think we have——

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, all the Senators have an interest in it, but as far as making policy about Formosa, I do not think the Armed Services Committee is the committee to do it, regardless of what the facts are.

Senator BRIDGES. All right. Let me tell you what I think about that.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you agree with that?

Senator BRIDGES. No.

The CHAIRMAN. That we ought to make the policy?

Senator BRIDGES. Let me say this, Mr. Chairman: Formosa today is part of Japan.

The CHAIRMAN. Agreeing that we ought to hold it, we ought to put everything we have got there, and all that, this is not the committee to decide that, is my point.

Senator BRIDGES. Well, it certainly is a committee that could properly consult with the Chiefs of the Armed Forces.

The CHAIRMAN. So could every committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and other committees, because they all have an interest.

Senator BRIDGES. You are being facetious about that.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not facetious at all. What is the use of having a Foreign Relations Committee if you are going to have your other committees do this which you suggest here? Would you think that the House Armed Services Committee would be the proper committee to take up the policy on Formosa?

Senator BRIDGES. I certainly think it is within their province, certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought foreign relations were primarily the thing that the Senate concerned itself about.

Senator BRIDGES. If you will just let me finish here, I understood you to say——

The CHAIRMAN. Even if the Senate Foreign Relations Committee wants to occupy Formosa, I, as an individual, both as a member of that committee and this one, would be violently opposed to it, and will have plenty to say about it on the floor of the United States Senate, if I have anything to say on it.

I am not going to start another war inadvertently.

Senator BRIDGES. I will tell you that if some people had spoken up back in the time when we were——

The CHAIRMAN. You fellows who want war out there can go ahead and fight it. I do not want any war.

Senator BRIDGES. Do you think we would be any more subject to war than we were at the Berlin air lift or——

The CHAIRMAN. We were already in Berlin, but we are not in Formosa; it is a different situation. When you find yourself on the football field and on a team you have to play, but if you are sitting up in the gallery watching somebody else play you do not have to come down and carry the ball.

Senator BRIDGES. Now, let me ask you this: Who do you think owns Formosa today?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, according to the preliminary Japanese peace treaty, we said that Formosa belonged to the Chinese, was stolen from them by the Japanese, and, therefore, should be returned to the Chinese.

Senator BRIDGES. But there has been no Japanese peace treaty yet.

The CHAIRMAN. I am talking about the surrender terms which we signed with the Japanese people on the battleship *Missouri*, which contains a provision that Formosa is to be ceded to the Chinese.

Senator BRIDGES. But it has not been formally ceded yet.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, certainly, it has not been ceded to us. We never won it by conquest; we have not anything more to do with it than Siam has, which is not too far from it.

Senator BRIDGES. Well, how about some of the other islands?

The CHAIRMAN. Let us talk about what our responsibility is.

Senator BRIDGES. Well, I say that up until the time that——

The CHAIRMAN. Why should we not land on Hainan and hold it?

Senator BRIDGES. Maybe we should.

The CHAIRMAN. Why should we not take all the Pescadores and hold them? Why not go and fortify the British in Hong Kong?

Senator BRIDGES. I think that we certainly should. We have gone through a period here back some days when we saw World War II coming on, and if we had taken some positive action in some of the other things, we might not have gone through World War II, and we are going through the same thing today.

The CHAIRMAN. You go back to the votes on the building up of the Air Force, and you will find where the lack of positive action happened. I put them all in the record here 4 or 5 years ago.

Senator BRIDGES. It was not anything on my part.

The CHAIRMAN. There was not on your vote, but you will find where the votes were that prevented preparedness and the extension of the draft, and all those things, so that when you are talking about affirmative action, you are not talking about me.

Senator BRIDGES. I am not accusing you of it.

The CHAIRMAN. And I am not accusing you of it.

Senator BRIDGES. But there are certain people on the other side, a good many of them today, who have changed their tune today, and they are certainly on the other side.

The CHAIRMAN. I certainly hope that we will not do anything about Formosa, as long as the situation is like it is. It may change or it might be advisable, but not today.

Senator BRIDGES. I certainly hope we do, so there is a difference of opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. In the meantime, Senator GURNEY wants the floor to make one of his eloquent speeches, which I always like to listen to.

Senator GURNEY. As usual, the Chairman is again flattering me, because he knows I am not eloquent. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. I am not; that is an understatement.

Senator GURNEY. I want to join with the gist of the statement that was enunciated by Senator BRIDGES. So long as I have been in the Senate, I have been a member of the Military Affairs, and Armed Services Committee, and never has there been, I do not remember an instance, where a witness was called for by any member of the committee, especially in executive session—I will confine it to that—where there has been any effort by the chairman or any member of the committee to stop that witness from coming up and talking to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Understand me, Senator——

Senator GURNEY. I think it is a very bad precedent to establish.

The CHAIRMAN (continuing). I think that will be perfectly proper, if you will allow me to interrupt you—that is not the point at all. If we were considering only the witness, as a matter of testifying on the fitness of Admiral Sherman, that would be one thing; but what we are really doing by the back door is ordering an investigation into the removal of Admiral Denfeld, and that is the thing that the committee ought to pass on.

Senator GURNEY. I do not want to argue with the Chairman. I just want to leave it as my belief that when a member of a committee asks for a witness in executive session—I will confine it to executive session—there never has been an instance in my memory where it has been refused, and I do not think that this committee wants to get into that position, and I certainly hope that the committee will sustain the request of Senator KNOWLAND.

That is the end of my eloquent statement.

The CHAIRMAN. You have made a good statement, and if you will allow me just so I will not be misunderstood, I have no objection in the world to calling Secretary Matthews, or the President or the Vice President or anybody else, about any matter that the committee wants to take up.

What we have pending before us is the nomination of Admiral Sherman, and I do not want to start an investigation into something else informally under the pretext that we are holding it to confirm Admiral Sherman or reject that motion.

Senator GURNEY. Well, the committee has not yet decided whether they want to make an inquiry or not, and certainly any member of this committee, in order to decide whether or not he should hold an inquiry, is entitled to have as a witness, especially, the Secretary of the Navy, in order to find out and make up his mind as to whether we should have an inquiry or not.

The CHAIRMAN. My point is that we are going about having an inquiry without really formally asking for the inquiry to be made.

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest that is not the case in this situation. As a member of this committee——

The CHAIRMAN. It is my view, Senator.

Senator KNOWLAND. I have requested that Secretary Matthews appear in executive session. We have the question of the new Chief of Naval Operations to take the place of one whom we confirmed just a few months ago.

Now, I certainly do not think that even the chairman of this committee wants to establish a precedent that a member of this committee is going to be gagged and not permitted to ask pertinent questions when a witness comes before the committee, and I think it is a very basic issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman is not going to have words put in his mouth. He is not attempting to gag anybody. He has just finished saying that he will be very glad to have Secretary Matthews appear before the committee in connection with the fitness of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman to hold this office.

What the committee chairman is saying is that he does not want that situation used as a pretext to launch a full-scale investigation into something that the committee has not so far agreed to investigate; just get the nose of the camel in under the tent, and have a whole investigation about something which was never ordered by the full committee, that is my point, and that is exactly what will happen.

Nobody is going to ask Secretary Matthews if he thinks Admiral Sherman is fit to be the Chief of Naval Operations. What they are going to ask him is to ask him about the circumstances that have to bear on the removal, if you want to call it that, of Admiral Denfeld, and so far as I know, an investigation of that kind ought to be ordered specially and not be taken up left-handed and indirectly.

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest that the only way the members of this committee can make up their minds as to whether a further inquiry is either necessary or desirable is to be able to direct some pertinent questions to the Secretary of the Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. You can do that.

Senator KNOWLAND. I hope that no such further inquiry will be necessary, but I certainly do not intend to be throttled or gagged in this committee in asking what I believe are pertinent questions in order to discharge my obligation as a Senator of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I have got an obligation, too, and the obligation is to conduct this committee in a businesslike and parliamentary fashion.

If you want an investigation of the removal of Admiral Denfeld, then let us make a motion to that effect, and have it. Let us not go in and have it under the guise that we are investigating Admiral Sherman, that is my point.

I like things frank and open and aboveboard and on the table, and what we are trying to do here is to have an investigation of the removal of Admiral Denfeld under the guise of an investigation of Admiral Sherman for this fitness. I do not think that is the way to proceed.

If the committee wants to do it, it is all right with me, but I want my position thoroughly understood, and there are no efforts being made to gag anybody. You could sit down this afternoon with Secretary Matthews and get an answer to any question you wanted to propound, and on that information you could then come before the committee and submit a case that would justify or not justify an investigation.

What we are doing here is fishing in the open for a whole lot of information that we could get in 10 minutes' conversation with the Secretary.

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I renew my request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any comment from you gentlemen on the right here who have been silent?

Senator KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I came in a little late, and I do not know whether this has been discussed or not, but after all, is not this a matter that is being investigated and in particular pertains to the House of Representatives? That is where the whole matter took place.

Senator BRIDGES. That is not Senator KNOWLAND's motion. Why do you not state your motion again?

Senator KEFAUVER. I am sorry, but I would appreciate if he stated it again.

Senator KNOWLAND. My motion was that the Secretary of the Navy be invited to appear before the Senate Armed Services Committee in executive session relative to the pending nomination of the Chief of Naval Operations.

Senator KEFAUVER. May I ask, Senator KNOWLAND, if you say that it was relative to Admiral Sherman or whether we are going to try to go into this matter that the House is going to go into?

I served in the House of Representatives, and we never did think very highly of the Senate's taking up something that particularly affected the House, and I know those gentlemen over there on the Armed Services Committee are fully capable of taking care of it themselves.

Senator KNOWLAND. I do not intend to press for an investigation of the unification fight that went on in the House. I do not intend to press for the investigation they are conducting, as I understand it from the newspapers, on the state of our defenses.

The Senate has a peculiar responsibility in confirmations which the House does not have.

Just a few months ago, the name of Admiral Denfeld was sent before the committee for a 4-year term, and within a few months of that time, having been recommended to us, and we having confirmed him, he was summarily removed.

A new nomination has been sent to us. The questions that I want to ask, I believe, are pertinent to the subject under discussion, and I make the request as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, having a peculiar responsibility not only in the matter of confirmation under the Constitution, which the House does not have, but also in our coequal responsibilities under the Constitution of the United States for providing for the national defense and the support of the armed forces.

Senator KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I have one further observation. I have never known—of course, we have very frequent examples or occasions where some member of the Cabinet, a high Government official whom we may like or not like—he is dismissed from the Government service, and then his successor is nominated.

I have never known of Congress or the Senate to go into the question of what happened leading up to the letting out or to the resignation of the previous official in connection with whether the new man is fit or not fit to hold the particular position.

It seems to me that we are going pretty far afield, unless this is to be directed at the matter of fitness of Admiral Sherman, and I have not heard anybody raise any question about his ability or his training or his character.

The CHAIRMAN. I will have no objection to calling the Secretary, calling Secretary Matthews, up here, if it is confined entirely to the fitness of Admiral Sherman.

My point is that we ought not to have the fitness of Admiral Sherman used as a pretext to launch an investigation without our formally agreeing to an investigation in this committee.

There is no use talking, Senator KNOWLAND, from the very articles that he has read, shows that the purpose of calling Secretary Matthews is to launch an investigation into the alleged breach of trust on the part of the Navy to the effect that if Navy officers testified certain ways, contrary, perhaps, to the thought of the Navy, there would be reprisals, and that is the sole purpose of Senator KNOWLAND's wanting Secretary Matthews up here.

I think Senator KNOWLAND will admit that.

Senator KNOWLAND. No, that is not the sole reason, I respectfully suggest, Mr. Chairman; I have stated my position that I think that all of us, as members of this committee, have a responsibility to discharge to the Armed Services Committee, and to the defense of this country, and I do not take a second place to anyone on this committee in being interested in the maintenance of the armed services of the United States.

I have tried to the best of my ability to do so, and in the discharge of that responsibility I believe I am entitled to direct some pertinent questions to the Secretary, and I want to know if, as a member of this committee, I am to be denied this opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to reiterate my own point that if the committee wants to vote for an investigation into the circumstances surrounding the removal of Admiral Denfeld from the post of Chief of Naval Operations, that is one thing.

If they want to inquire into the fitness of Admiral Sherman, that is another thing, but let us have a frank statement of what the committee is to do, and not use the qualifications of Admiral Sherman to indirectly launch an investigation into something that the committee has not directly authorized.

Senator CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator CHAPMAN.

Senator CHAPMAN. Did I correctly understand that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire intends to raise the question as to whether a vacancy exists in this office?

Senator BRIDGES. Well, very frankly, let me tell the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that I have an opinion which raised that question. I do not think—certainly, I am not going to press it at this point, so I will not raise that question.

The CHAIRMAN. That is settled.

Senator BRIDGES. But I believe in the minds of some people there may be a small question, but there is some question about it.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is sound. I think some people do question it, but you do not intend to raise that question?

Senator BRIDGES. No.

Senator CHAPMAN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other remarks? Senator JOHNSON, what is your thought on this matter?

Senator JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I think every member of the committee ought to have the right to ask any questions of any proper people concerning the fitness and qualifications of Admiral Sherman.

I feel very much as the chairman does that if Senator KNOWLAND and some other members want to go into the Denfeld case, I have no objection to their doing that.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Senator JOHNSON. I do not want them to use me, put me at a table and bring their photographers and their newspaper reporters, and let me participate and provide a forum for going off on a tangent on an entirely different matter.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Senator JOHNSON. If they want information, Senator KNOWLAND could call the Secretary of the Navy and invite Senator BRIDGES around to his office, and I am sure the Secretary of the Navy will answer any questions they may want to ask him. If he does not answer them, then he may want to come before the committee and ask the committee to summon the Secretary up here. But so far as I am concerned, I am satisfied with the qualifications of Admiral Sherman, his fitness.

I am ready to vote now. If some other Senator is not, I have no objection to his pursuing any inquiries he wants to, but I served as a member of the House long enough to know that the chairman, the very able chairman, of that committee is not going to have to rely on a single member of the Senate Armed Services Committee to protect himself from any injustices that may have been done to him, and so far as I am concerned, I do not know what kind of commitments were made to the House committee, I do not know what statements the chairman of that committee made to the naval officers testifying, but whatever they were, I am sure that before this session is over with, Chairman VINSON will be perfectly able to take care of any commitments he made, and any commitments anybody else made.

So far as I am concerned, if you want to have the Secretary up here to testify on the qualifications and the fitness of Admiral Sherman, I am ready to send for him now. If you want to have him up here to use us as a sounding board and publicity forum to perhaps attack some branch of the service or to go into this unification field, I am against it.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator HUNT?

Senator HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I am rather discouraged that this matter has opened up again. To my way of thinking, the Navy, especially, has been ridiculous in a situation, and I had hoped that they would let up; and apparently they have not.

Secondly, the Army also has, of course, taken some criticism, as well as the Air Corps; in fact, the whole United States Armed Services have been in a bad light, as has Congress, too, from this situation.

Now, I cannot see that any good purpose would be served by having the Secretary come up, providing questions are absolutely limited to the fitness of Admiral Sherman, for there has been no evidence to the contrary.

If we, in our own minds, had some doubt as to the fitness of Admiral Sherman, then I would, perhaps, be the first to suggest that we have the Secretary come up and appear before us, but I am very reluctant, Mr. Chairman, to see this whole question of unification opened up and battled against, because in the last analysis, the question is, Who is going to run the Army and the Navy, the Congress or the Navy?

The CHAIRMAN. The civilian or military.

Senator HUNT. My position on this would necessarily have to be, Mr. Chairman, that I would now oppose the request of the distinguished Senator from California, but it is discouraging to see it come up.

Secondly, though, I would need to have some qualifications with reference to the invitation, namely, that they be limited to the qualifications of Admiral Sherman.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you would have no objection to the Secretary's testifying exclusively to the fitness of Admiral Sherman?

Senator HUNT. Absolutely not.

The CHAIRMAN. But you do not want to have it come up and start an investigation into a matter that the committee has not ordered, an investigation to be had which was not ordered.

Now, I would suggest to Senator KNOWLAND—he is perfectly within his rights in wanting, if he wants an investigation into the removal of Admiral Denfeld—to say so, and submit it to the committee, in which event, call all the witnesses who are pertinent to that inquiry.

I want it distinctly understood that my whole opposition to the procedure that has been embodied in this motion is because I think that what will happen is that we will do very little about finding out anything about the fitness of Admiral Sherman, but will devote ourselves almost exclusively to an investigation into the circumstances concerning the removal of Admiral Denfeld, and if that is to be the purpose of it, that is to be the result of it, then we ought to have this clearly put before the committee, and vote on that as a separate matter.

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to say for the last time, I do not believe the Chairman has any right to question the motives of the Senator from California for the reasons that he wants the Secretary of the Navy here in order to properly, Mr. Chairman, inform himself on the discharge of his duties as a member of the committee.

I shall not serve any longer as a member of the committee if I am to be gagged in the questions that I can ask the Secretary of the Navy or any other witness before this committee.

I shall not under any circumstances bind myself to limit myself to any particular questions when the Secretary is here. I shall ask him questions which I believe to be pertinent to the issue; I shall only ask him questions that I believe to be pertinent to the issue.

The CHAIRMAN. What issue?

Senator KNOWLAND. To the issue of a vacancy in the office of Chief of Naval Operations, and to the defense of this Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what I thought.

Senator KNOWLAND. And when the answers are given, I shall then make up my mind, as other Senators are entitled to do, as to whether the answers are satisfactory or whether at that time to press for a further inquiry.

I have no present intention of pressing for a full-dress inquiry, but I am not going to agree to be bound and gagged as a member of this committee, and if an effort is made to do so, I shall tender my resignation as a member of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, if there is anybody who has ever been bound and gagged on this committee during either the term of my predecessor or myself, so far as I can recall, I do not know of such incident.

Let me say, so long as you have raised this question, that this is the only major committee of the Senate that stands seven to six.

The chairman of this committee has been asked several times if he wanted an eight-to-five committee. It is very nice to have a majority sitting on your own side that you can usually get on matters of this or similar types to agree on with you. Every chairman likes to have a good, big bunch of support that under normal conditions he can call on.

As late as 2 weeks ago this chairman said, no, he would stand on his seven-six proposition, and the eight-to-five proposition went to the Committee on Finance, so I just want to let you know that the chairman of this committee has leaned over backwards to give the minority party the fullest representation possible on this committee, and sometimes he has been criticized by some of his colleagues for that attitude.

Certainly, in view of that fact, you cannot say there has been any partisanship or gagging or anything else, because the record shows that the chairman has tried to keep this on a thoroughly bipartisan and fair basis.

Further than that, Senator CAIN came to the chairman and said he would like to serve on this committee, and I told him if he was a military man, we would be delighted to have him, but I have no say on it, but I would not do anything in the caucus to prevent him from getting a place on this committee, although I would like very much to have had in some cases a little more membership of my own party on it, so that when you make the charge that there has been some attempt to gag anybody here, the facts refute it completely.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Chairman, in the instance——

The CHAIRMAN. Let me finish. Furthermore, all the personnel that were appointed by my predecessor, to the last stenographer, have been kept right on the pay roll here. How many other committees have kept them? They have wiped them out in practically

every other committee in the Congress. I have appointed not one single expert.

Senator GURNEY. That is because the——

The CHAIRMAN. Because what? It is because the chairman of the Armed Services Committee has had more consideration for his colleagues in the other party than any other chairmen have had who have come into power since the Eighty-first Congress, and I expect to get kicked overboard for it if the circumstances ever change, and to get no consideration at all.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Chairman, may I say, with a smile, and with the utmost sincerity, that with one exception in the 5 years that I have served on this committee, and the Committee on Naval Affairs before it, where you and I were members, that I have never heard a partisan vote. There was only one place where there might be said to be partisanship.

Now, I have just one more suggestion to make. In the interests of the committee as a whole, and since this is a public session, I want to make this further observation: a Member of the Senate, a member of the committee, has made a request. I hope that that request will be granted. He has stated that he would be agreeable, and we all expect that when the Secretary of the Navy appears, that it will be in executive session here. When the Secretary of the Navy comes, and I hope he is asked to come at 2 o'clock this afternoon or earlier, the committee can, if any member asks a question that is deemed unwise, improper, or anything else, have the vote in executive session on the question of the member. The member can then determine what he wants to do about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator SALTONSTALL, may I interrupt you just long enough to say——

Senator SALTONSTALL. I am through.

The CHAIRMAN (continuing). That is an impractical procedure.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Let us have the Secretary of the Navy come here without a formal vote, divided as to whether he should or should not come, and then argue out these questions in executive session privately when he comes.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think we have made our point clear, Senator SALTONSTALL. I have no objection to the Secretary of the Navy's coming. I have no objection to the committee's going fully into the removal of Admiral Denfeld, if that is what the committee wants to do.

What I object to is calling the Secretary ostensibly on the question of the fitness of Admiral Sherman, and then having an investigation into the removal of Admiral Denfeld.

If Senator KNOWLAND will amend his motion so as to say that an investigation should be had into the removal of Admiral Denfeld, and that the Secretary of the Navy be called as the first witness, why, then, that will be one thing. But, for heaven's sake, let us not be so childish as to suppose that if we call the Secretary of the Navy up here in reference to the fitness of Admiral Sherman that it is going to stop there and we are not going to have that investigation, because that is silly.

We might as well be frank about it, and tell the American people what we are going to investigate, and with no disrespect to anyone, because it is probably unintentional, but, in my opinion, this is a procedure that takes on the character of a subterfuge rather than a frank, open attack on the removal of Denfeld, if that is what is to be examined into.

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I renew my motion, in view of the chairman's statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you state it again?

Senator KNOWLAND. My motion is that the Secretary of the Navy be invited to attend a session of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate of the United States on the pending question of the nomination of a new Chief of Naval Operations.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that all?

Senator KNOWLAND. In executive session.

The CHAIRMAN. You want it confined to that?

Senator KNOWLAND. No; and I do not intend to be gagged or confined in the questions that I shall ask the Secretary at that time. I will not ask any questions which I do not believe are pertinent.

The CHAIRMAN. For the reasons that I have already stated, I cannot go along with you on that. If you had made it to investigate Denfeld or to pass on the fitness of Admiral Sherman, I would probably ride along with you.

Now, there are 10 of us present here, and we cannot vote any proxies on this thing, because I do not think it would be fair to have those who have not heard the discussion cast a vote one way or the other. Is that agreeable to the committee?

Senator BRIDGES. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. The clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Mr. RUSSELL?

The CHAIRMAN. Absent.

The CLERK. Senator BYRD?

The CHAIRMAN. Absent.

The CLERK. Mr. CHAPMAN?

Senator CHAPMAN. No.

The CLERK. Senator JOHNSON?

Senator JOHNSON. No.

The CLERK. Mr. KEFAUVER?

Senator KEFAUVER. No.

The CLERK. Mr. HUNT?

Senator HUNT. No.

The CLERK. Mr. BRIDGES?

Senator BRIDGES. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. GURNEY?

Senator GURNEY. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. SALTONSTALL?

Senator SALTONSTALL. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. MORSE?

Senator MORSE. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. KNOWLAND?

Senator KNOWLAND. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. CAIN?

The CHAIRMAN. Absent.

The CLERK. The chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Senator KNOWLAND. I might say Mr. Chairman, with reference to Senator CAIN, while he has been assigned to the committee by the Republican conference, he has not yet been formally elected by the Senate which, I assume, will be done today.

The CHAIRMAN. If he is not elected today, Senator KNOWLAND, please tell him that we would be delighted to have him sit with the committee, pending his confirmation, and so far as I am concerned, he could actually vote, although it would——

The CLERK. Voting in the affirmative are Mr. BRIDGES——

The CHAIRMAN. What is the total?

The CLERK. Five and five.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion having failed for want of a majority, there is nothing before the committee in reference thereto.

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to state that at the earliest opportunity when we have a full meeting of the committee, I shall renew my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator KNOWLAND, you are perfectly at liberty to do that.

In the meantime, the chairman, with the greatest affection and respect, and with no desire to short-circuit your intentions and desires, would like very much if you would explore this matter somewhat in a preliminary way with Secretary Matthews, and then, as a result of your exploration, you have some facts to present before us, you might pick up some support that in the present situation is not available.

In other words, if a prima facie case can be made out justifying some investigation as a result of your talk with Secretary Matthews, that would be one thing; but so far as I know we have not got anything to go on at all at the moment, excepting something that appeared in the paper.

Senator GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say this: I do want to get more information myself on the Navy and other departments of the Defense Establishment, not necessarily affecting the way I would vote on the nomination of Admiral Sherman.

I regret the decision of the committee this morning, for it has turned down the request of a member of the committee to have a witness come before the committee.

Senator BRIDGES. Mr. Chairman, I regret the action of the committee. I think it is the first time—certainly in 14 years—that it has happened, and it is a very regrettable thing.

I believe the chairman said that when Admiral Sherman was here before that we would have an opportunity to question Admiral Sherman before we voted. I would like to ask him some questions. May I ask when he will come?

The CHAIRMAN. Admiral Sherman? We have had him here. Do you want him back again?

Senator BRIDGES. When I asked the other day, you said we would have an opportunity to question him before we voted.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want him back?

Senator BRIDGES. Yes.

Senator KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I think no one wants to prevent Senator KNOWLAND or anyone else from going into any matters affecting Admiral Sherman, and I wonder if we would have the chairman plan to have Mr. Matthews come up at the same time that Admiral Sherman does, to ask him any questions.

The CHAIRMAN. I have no objection into inquiries into Admiral Sherman's fitness. I have no objection to an inquiry into Admiral Denfeld. All I want to do is not to get one done under the pretext that we are doing something else, that is all.

If the motion and intent, and my opinion, is to inquire into the removal of Admiral Denfeld, then we ought to be frank enough to say so and vote on it.

We ought not to do the inquiring under the pretext of inquiring into the fitness of Admiral Sherman.

Now, gentlemen, to end this on a pleasanter note, I have a communication from the Secretary of Defense.

(Discussion off the record.)

Senator BRIDGES. What date will we have Admiral Sherman up here?

The CHAIRMAN. Today is what, Thursday?

Senator BRIDGES. Any day except Monday would be all right.

Senator CHAPMAN. You said Thursday, the 19th, to vote on confirmation.

Senator KNOWLAND. I might say when we agreed to the 19th, you recall that Senator BYRD said he was perfectly willing for any other inquiry to go ahead, and it seems to me that they have changed the rules a little in the middle of the game.

The CHAIRMAN. He said to give you time to look into it, Senator.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I would like to make a motion while we have the full group here.

The CHAIRMAN. I am going to try to do it for Monday next.

Senator BRIDGES. Monday is the one day I cannot be here.

The CHAIRMAN. How about Tuesday?

Senator CHAPMAN. I will not be here. If you will vote by proxy, I am ready to vote on Admiral Sherman.

Senator BRIDGES. We will just ask him a few questions.

Senator CHAPMAN. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. Is Tuesday all right for everybody? Well, Tuesday at 10:30—let me change that to say that we will make it Tuesday sometime either in the morning or the afternoon.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I would like to make a motion to invite the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Matthews, to come before this committee in executive session to give the committee what information he desires concerning the Navy, its physical condition, its morale, and any other matters he may care to discuss with the committee.

I make that motion that he come at the earliest possible moment at a convenient time, mutually convenient to him and to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you allow me to interrupt you?

Senator SALTONSTALL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman was going to, as soon as these nominations were out of the way, and after some preliminary contact with the Defense Department, ask the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to come before us on three separate days, tell us what they had, what they did not have, and what they needed primarily, and give us the picture of all three services.

If you will allow me, Senator SALTONSTALL, I think your inquiry is right along that line, and I would like to arrange it all first tentatively, and then ask the committee when they wanted these gentlemen to appear, and to have the fullest attendance possible when we have these recitals, hear these recitals.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Now, I say, I make that motion, very frankly out here because I was very much disturbed by the vote on the other question.

The CHAIRMAN. So was I.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Regarding personalities and everything, and I hate to see this committee get into partisanship and personalities.

I cannot see—I say this in an open session, I know, but I asked for it in executive session—I cannot see why any member of this committee from my past experience of 5 years, can be refused to ask the Secretary of the Navy or any other secretary any questions that he thinks may be pertinent.

Now that necessarily may involve some of the questions that we have been previously discussing. Naturally it does in connection with the morale of the Navy.

That does not lead to any——

The CHAIRMAN. Senator SALTONSTALL, you are absolutely right on that. Nobody on this committee wants to stop any man from asking any questions. What we are doing here is asking whether the committee wants to investigate the Denfeld matter or whether it does not want to investigate it. That is all.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I say to you very frankly I do not want to investigate the Denfeld matter, so far as I know, on any information I have at the present time.

Now, you know and I know, Mr. Chairman, that there is no pertinency to questions or discussions, either on the floor or in committee—sometimes some of the questions seem so far from the point that it becomes very discouraging. There is no man who gets more discouraged than your good self, because I have seen you shift from one place to another and smoke unlighted cigarettes, and so on, as you are doing now. [Laughter.]

All I say is that it seems to me that we get off on a bit of a sidetrack and get involved in personalities and partisanship and everything else on what seems to me to be a perfectly reasonable request that, as we tie it up with a confirmation of a very high-type gentleman whom we expect to confirm for a very high-type office——

The CHAIRMAN. That is just what I want to prevent.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Now, Senator KNOWLAND is entitled to ask any questions that he wants in this room, rather than in his own office. I am interested in the answers, and you are interested in the answers, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, and it seems to me that if we brush aside these sidetracks down which we have gone on a 5-to-5 vote, and say to ourselves, Mr. Matthews is coming before this committee sooner or later; he is coming in executive session; we are all entitled at that time to ask him questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Why should he come in an executive session? Why not in the open? What is there to hide?

Senator SALTONSTALL. There is nothing to hide, but I should suppose that the matters of the boilers of the Navy and the guns of the Navy, and the condition of its aircraft——

The CHAIRMAN. We are not going into that in this hearing, as I understand it.

Senator SALTONSTALL. When Mr. Matthews comes up here to discuss the physical conditions of the Navy, we are going to go into those questions.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean Friday?

Senator SALTONSTALL. I do not know when you will bring Mr. Matthews before us.

The CHAIRMAN. What did we just vote on here, Tuesday? If I understand it, Mr. Matthews is going to have to answer questions of that kind, and he will have to bring the big staff up here, because he will not be in a position to answer those questions.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Well, maybe I do not make myself clear. All I am trying to say is that any member of this committee, when Mr. Matthews comes, sooner or later, and he is bound to come before the session is over, and I hope in executive session, we can feel free to ask him any involved or detailed questions, questions that he can give the answers to in executive session, which answers he cannot give in open session.

All I am trying to do at this time is trying to face the realities, as I see them, and to eliminate this difficulty into which we may have gotten ourselves which, I feel, is most unfortunate.

The CHAIRMAN. It is unfortunate, I agree with you, and nobody regrets it more than the chairman. I think it probably will be blown up out of all proportions to what is involved.

The real question here is this: If the committee desires to go into the fitness of Admiral Sherman, all right. If the committee desires to go into the removal of Admiral Denfeld, all right.

But let us have a clear-cut understanding of what it is that the committee wants to do, that is all.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Is there not one more question?

Senator KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, just to get the thing behind us, why does not the chairman ask Mr. Matthews to come up with Admiral Sherman, to be on hand, if anybody wants to ask him any questions about Admiral Sherman's fitness or qualifications? He will then be here.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; we will do that.

Senator KEFAUVER. At the same time Admiral Sherman comes.

Senator CHAPMAN. At the time you invite the Secretary to come on those other days, we can go into all these things about Senator SALTONSTALL'S remarks about which he has spoken, the boilers and the physical condition of the Navy and everything else.

You do not mean to do that on Friday?

Senator SALTONSTALL. I would assume when Mr. Matthews was here and opened himself to questions on any questions, such as whether Admiral Sherman received a high-school education or not, that we would be entitled to ask him any questions we wanted to when that came up?

The CHAIRMAN. Sure.

Senator MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear you say that you intend to bring the Secretaries up here. I understand that includes the Secretary of Defense.

I want to say, and I am sure that the Senators from California, and I know the Senators from Washington, and my own colleague, agree that there is great concern all along the Pacific seaboard concerning our defenses, and a great fear has developed among our people in the West that we are not in a defensible position. At least, they want some assurance that we are, if we are, and they want some steps taken to correct the situation if we are not, Mr. Chairman.

We have had this very unfortunate rumor that has spread all over the West, which apparently came from some person within the Air Force, that the Air Force believed that Seattle, for example, was not defensible, even to the point of scaring the people into the thought that our defense plants, including the Boeing plants, would have to be moved inland.

Now, that is a shocking thing, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I have seen some mail about it myself.

Senator MORSE. I want to announce now that when we have the Secretaries before us, including the Secretary of Defense, that I am going to pursue that matter in minute detail because I do not want to see the people of the west coast confronted with a terrific fear that has been stirred up out there just because somebody spoke out of turn down in the air branch of the services.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator MORSE, I am glad you brought that up. I wonder if the committee—I know the committee will—but I would like to put it this way—allow the chairman to take up this whole question of defense with the Military Establishment from top to bottom, and try to arrange a series of hearings or briefings or whatever they may be called, that will give us an overall picture of the whole show, some of which obviously will have to be done at the Pentagon, where they have the maps and data.

I have already done some work on it, but I hope that the committee will not find fault with the chairman in trying to arrange it as the facts that come to his attention seem best calculated to give the committee the information that it desires on the whole picture.

Senator MORSE. I appreciate what you will do in regard to that.

Senator KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, this meeting on next Tuesday with Admiral Sherman and Mr. Matthews on hand to answer any questions relative to his qualifications and what not, would that be an open meeting?

The CHAIRMAN. What will be the wishes of the committee?

Senator KEFAUVER. I think it ought to be.

Senator JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I think we are going to do and are doing the Navy a great injustice. I think we are doing Admiral Sherman a great injustice. I think we are doing the House committee a great injustice by coming in here and using Admiral Sherman's nomination to provide a forum each day on something that has no relationship to his fitness and his qualifications; and the thing I would like to do—I do not want to deprive any colleague of mine of asking any questions that he wants to ask on the subject pending before us; I do not know that I want to deprive him of a full-scale or full-dress investigation on this Denfeld matter. I think we ought to take one at a time.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Senator JOHNSON. I wish the Chairman would find it possible at 2 o'clock this afternoon to bring the Secretary of the Navy and Admiral Sherman into this room and say, "We do not want this man," or "We do want this man."

We can confirm the head of the Munitions Board and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy and everything else without any debate, but here is a man who has had a long and faithful record and each morning we come up here and debate it and make the headlines for another day, and I think we

could get it all over with by bringing the Secretary up here and bringing the Admiral up here, and any member of the committee who wants to ask any questions concerning his qualifications or his fitness or anything else he wants to ask, do so, and if we think that using the nomination for some other purpose is being done, why, we can make our wishes known, and let the public judge at that time. Why do we not meet at 2 o'clock this afternoon and bring both of them in here?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Johnson, I am reluctant to add anything to what you have said or prolong this discussion, but if I can be completely nonpartisan and objective solely for the interests of our country, I think unwittingly, and I know it is completely unwittingly and unintentionally, we are doing quite a disservice to Admiral Sherman and to the Navy in particular by pursuing the matter in the fashion that we are going about it.

Now, I have not the slightest objection to an inquiry into whether these officers are gagged or are not, or whether Denfeld should or should not have been removed, or whether he was treated fairly.

I have my own opinion about it, but I have no objection to having the facts brought out. But I do feel that in the pursuit of that we ought to keep that separate from whether or no Admiral Forrest Sherman, who has been nominated and has served for several months under very difficult circumstances, because he is in there under very great difficulties—we might as well face it—with some dissension down below him, I think the longer we postpone his confirmation the longer we do the cause of national defense immense and irreparable harm.

I would rather confirm him and have Senator KNOWLAND say he wants to go into the removal of Admiral Denfeld and the gagging of these officers, and put that proposition on the table, and I believe it would command a lot of support; but as for myself, in order to state it once again, I hate to see Admiral Sherman caught in-between these opposing forces, and the Navy and everybody and everything else suffer.

I am willing to go along with any investigation that the committee wants, but I would like to see Admiral Sherman exculpated.

Will 2 o'clock this afternoon suit you if I can arrange it? Shall it be open or executive? All right, it will be open and we will meet at 2 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12:05 p. m., the committee adjourned to reconvene at 2 o'clock p. m. of the same day.)

(Afternoon session, 2:05 p. m.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, I wonder if you and Admiral Sherman would take seats side by side over there.

Gentlemen, in order to be perfectly fair, I do not know how long this hearing will last, but the chairman will be compelled to terminate it at 4 o'clock due to the fact that before he was obliged to call this meeting, he had made a previous engagement to be in Baltimore, and will have to recess it at that time.

Senator KNOWLAND, I would like you to know that in advance.

Senator KNOWLAND. If we have not finished, we can always take it up again.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what I wanted to say, that the meeting will have to be terminated at 4 o'clock.

While we are waiting, I would like to say that Senator CAIN, of Washington, has been nominated as a member of the Armed Services Committee; the Senate has acted upon that nomination, and we are very glad to have you, Senator.

Senator CAIN. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. We know you have had quite extensive experience in the last World War, which is a fine qualification.

We are happy to have you here. We are all interested in promoting the defense of our country, and we are glad to have you helping us.

Senator CAIN. I am glad to be here.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is anything we can do to help you make your service on the committee pleasant, as well as to get you any information you would like to have, why, we will be very glad to try to get it for you.

Senator CAIN. I appreciate that very much.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we might proceed.

I would like to make a short statement, that we had quite a discussion this morning over a variety of subjects having to do with top personnel in the Navy Department.

Shortly before we recessed, it was proposed that we ask the Secretary and Admiral Sherman if they found it convenient to come before the committee at 2 o'clock this afternoon. I communicated immediately with the Secretary and Admiral Sherman, and am happy to have them here, and they were very willing and anxious to come if the committee wanted them.

The pending matter before us is the confirmation of Admiral Forrest Sherman to be the Chief of Naval Operations.

I would like to have you make any statement you care to make, Mr. Secretary, in regard to that matter.

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANCIS P. MATTHEWS, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, ACCOMPANIED BY ADMIRAL FORREST P. SHERMAN, NOMINEE TO BE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Secretary MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is a little bit difficult, under the circumstances, to know just where to start on that subject. I do not know just what is the question at issue.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the question at issue, immediately at issue, is, at least, the qualifications of Admiral Sherman, in your judgment, to be Chief of Naval Operations.

We would like to have your opinion as to his qualifications to occupy one of the very most important posts in this whole Government, either civilian or military.

Secretary MATTHEWS. Well, I suppose that I probably could throw the best light on the question by reciting to the committee how it happened that I recommended him to the President for this post.

As the committee knows, I was before the committee in May on a question of my own nomination for the position of Secretary of the Navy, and I assumed the duties of that office on May 25 of this year.

When I took the office of the Secretary of the Navy, I came into it inexperienced in any technical knowledge of the affairs of the Navy, and at the time and under the circumstances that I assumed office, there were two live questions being discussed: One was the cancellation of the construction of the so-called supercarrier, that was a very live question; and another question which was a very live question was the question of unification.

I personally had no thorough knowledge of the unification or what it was, other than the average citizen would have who reads the newspapers and a lawyer might have because of his special interest in legislation.

I had never read the bill. I recognized that in assuming the office of Secretary of the Navy under the circumstances, that the question of unification was a very important one, and that it would be my duty to myself and to my office, to my country, to inform myself accurately on unification as best I could.

So I immediately started to study the question, and to that end I secured copies of the reports of the hearings on the Unification Act of 1947 from the committee in the House and the committee in the Senate and proceeded to start to read them and study them.

The first thing that challenged my attention was that Secretary Forrestal had appointed a man named Sherman to work with a man appointed by Secretary Patterson by the name of Norstad to draft the bill, the unification bill, and I pursued that subject and discovered that the bill which was finally introduced into Congress was substantially the bill which these two men had drafted.

Then by reason of the fact that Admiral Sherman was a naval officer I wanted to see what he thought about unification, and so the first thing I did was to read what he said in the record, the statements that he made and the testimony he offered and his answers to the various questions that were put to him, and I was impressed by the fact that he understood what unification was all about, he understood the implications from the standpoint of national defense, and he understood its application to the Navy, and it was evident that he was an accomplished naval officer.

So I thought to myself that this would be an opportunity for me to get a man who could help me very much in familiarizing myself with unification, and so I made inquiry about where Admiral Sherman was, and I found that he was in command of a task force in the Mediterranean, and then I made inquiry about him and discovered that some people did not like him, many people did like him, but I found that without exception everybody felt that he was an able officer, able naval officer, and that he was a man of obvious intellectuality, and so at that time I realized that by reason of his absence in the Mediterranean I would not have the privilege of conferring with him, and I continued in the performance of my duties.

Then in the course of time, as I inquired about Admiral Sherman, I found, as I say, that those who ought to know were of the opinion that he was a very able naval officer.

In the course of time—I do not know how much you want me to tell about this.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we want just a summary of what your opinion of him is based upon, your own observation, and such other researches as you made as to his fitness for the post; at least, that is all I want.

Secretary MATTHEWS. From that inquiry and from what I learned at that time, I came to the conclusion that he was an able naval officer and ranked among the very top men.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, let me ask you, if during the time that he has been acting as Chief, have you had any occasion to alter your high opinion of him?

Secretary MATTHEWS. Not the slightest; in fact, my opinion of him has grown, has become better every day I have known him, and every day I have had an opportunity to observe him, especially since that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you consider him to be fully fitted in all particulars to discharge the very difficult duties of this post as well as to be a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Secretary MATTHEWS. I so think, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. You recommend his confirmation by the Senate?

Secretary MATTHEWS. I recommend his confirmation, and I recommended him to the President for appointment, and I certainly recommended him to the committee and to the Senate for confirmation.

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman has finished asking questions, but he would like to accord full opportunity to the members of the committee, and if any member desires to ask a question he will simply indicate and I will be glad to recognize him.

Senator KNOWLAND?

Senator KNOWLAND. I have a few questions.

Mr. Secretary, what was the date upon which you became Secretary of the Navy?

Secretary MATTHEWS. May 25.

Senator KNOWLAND. May 25? My recollection is that on or about the 15th of August the former Chief of Naval Operations was confirmed by the Senate, and his name was sent up; is that approximately correct?

Secretary MATTHEWS. I would say about that time.

Senator KNOWLAND. You were Secretary of the Navy at the time?

Secretary MATTHEWS. I was Secretary; yes.

Senator KNOWLAND. How long is the term of Chief of Naval Operations?

Secretary MATTHEWS. The term for which Admiral Denfeld was appointed the first time was 2 years.

Senator KNOWLAND. Was the appointment on August 15, 1949, presumably for a 2-year term?

Secretary MATTHEWS. A second term of 2 years; yes, sir.

Senator KNOWLAND. A second term of 2 years.

Could you inform the committee as to how it happened that there is a vacancy in the office?

Secretary MATTHEWS. Well, at the present time the vacancy occurs by the fact that Admiral Denfeld's first term has expired and he never has been appointed for a second term. His name was suggested, he was confirmed, but the commission was never issued to him.

Senator BRIDGES. Mr. Secretary, I do not want to break in, but Admiral Denfeld never then was the Chief of Naval Operations——

Secretary MATTHEWS. For the second term.

Senator BRIDGES (continuing). For the second term?

Secretary MATTHEWS. No, sir.

Senator BRIDGES. The Senate confirmed him.

Secretary MATTHEWS. But that was, as I understand it—the confirmation was if the President wished to appoint him, but he never appointed him for the second term. He never issued the commission.

Senator BRIDGES. Well, is that not unusual? Is that not a situation, when his name was up here, Mr. Secretary, just to get the record straight—when we confirm an appointment, is that not over then?

Secretary MATTHEWS. No; not according to my understanding of it, Senator.

Senator BRIDGES. Well, it certainly is different from anything that I have ever heard before.

Secretary MATTHEWS. Do not ask me as a lawyer now; I am talking as Secretary of the Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. You are just reciting or relating the facts that happened?

Secretary MATTHEWS. As they happened. You have to get a legal opinion on that yourself, but as a curbstone opinion, there is no appointment until the commission is issued. That is, the indication of the appointment—the way has to be cleared before the commission can be issued by a confirmation by the Senate, where nominations have to go through the Senate. In other words, the President could not, as I understand it, appoint a man to the office where his appointment has to be confirmed by the Senate unless that confirmation were given, but even if it is given, he still does not have to appoint him.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Well, the President changed his mind is what it amounted to.

Secretary MATTHEWS. That is right, and on my recommendation.

Senator SALTONSTALL. And Admiral Denfeld never held up his hand?

Secretary MATTHEWS. Never held up his hand; the commission was never issued to him, he never was sworn in.

Senator SALTONSTALL. And he changed his mind on your recommendation?

Secretary MATTHEWS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. So, the first term had expired, and he was not reappointed——

Secretary MATTHEWS. December 15.

The CHAIRMAN (continuing). For his second term?

Secretary MATTHEWS. This is a new term for which nobody has ever been appointed, except the interim appointment.

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Secretary, might I ask this question: His name was sent here on August 15 or thereabouts——

Secretary MATTHEWS. Yes, sir.

Senator KNOWLAND (continuing). August 11, and I think the Senate acted August 15, the same day the Senate confirmed.

On the date on which his name was sent to the Senate, did he have your approval for reappointment at that time?

Secretary MATTHEWS. Yes, sir.

Senator KNOWLAND. When, on what date, did you recommend that he not be sworn in?

Secretary MATTHEWS. Senator, I would have to refer to my record on that. I have not refreshed my recollection with those dates.

Senator KNOWLAND. Was that before or subsequent to the hearings before the committee of the House?

Secretary MATTHEWS. I would have to make two statements in that respect: The actual written recommendation was subsequent to the hearings.

Senator BRIDGES. Mr. Secretary, did you ever hear of another case or can you cite another case where the President of the United States has sent a name to the Senate of the United States for confirmation, the Senate of the United States has voted confirmation, and then you failed to issue his certificate of appointment or his commission?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator BRIDGES, if you will allow me, Mr. Secretary, because this throws some additional light on it, one of our staff has just called to my attention the fact that the term of Admiral Denfeld, his second term, would have begun on, I think, the 7th of December 1949, so that he would have had to start, his commission would have been issued, is what I am trying to say, dated as of December 7, 1949, because he would have been up to that time under his old appointment.

Secretary MATTHEWS. If that is the date of the expiration of the term.

Senator, I can answer your question by saying that, "No, I have never heard of such a thing," but that would not be significant or signify much because I dare say there has been such a case, but still I would have no occasion to know about it.

Senator BRIDGES. Senator KNOWLAND, go ahead. I want to ask a few questions after you are through.

Senator KNOWLAND. I wanted to complete this line of questioning.

Mr. Secretary, apparently your change in recommendation, then, of the Chief of Naval Operations, who had been recommended to the Senate and confirmed by the Senate, changed sometime between the 15th of August 1949, and the date on which normally he would have taken office which, you say, was brought about in your change of viewpoint, brought about as a result of the hearings before the House committee; is that correct?

Secretary MATTHEWS. Did you say that my opinion was brought about because of the hearings, the change of my opinion?

Senator KNOWLAND. I understood the change had taken place subsequent to that.

Secretary MATTHEWS. I did not say that the change of my opinion was due to the hearings; no, sir.

Now, I want to say this to the committee, if I may, that if you want to go into the question of my reasons for my changed opinion in regard to Admiral Denfeld, there are two requests I have to make.

I would want some time to go back and look over my records and refresh my recollection on dates that you mentioned, and then I would ask that out of deference to Admiral Denfeld it be a closed hearing.

Senator KNOWLAND. I am perfectly willing to drop my line of questioning at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that may be done.

Secretary MATTHEWS. I am perfectly willing to give you my innermost motives and everything that impelled me to do what I did, but I do want to do it properly.

Senator KNOWLAND. I think it is a perfectly reasonable request, and I am willing at this stage of the proceedings, providing the Secretary says he would be glad to come before us another time—that satisfies me on that particular point, and I will be glad to pursue that at some other time.

Secretary MATTHEWS. I will be glad to talk to you further.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we all agree that we all like Admiral Denfeld; he has a very distinguished career in the Navy, and regardless of this particular thing, none of us want to cast any aspersions on the fine record he has made, and whether he stays in the Navy or goes out, good luck to him.

Secretary MATTHEWS. And I least of all would wish to cast any aspersions on Admiral Denfeld.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Would you yield, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator SALTONSTALL. You take full responsibility for that change?

Secretary MATTHEWS. Absolutely, and I am totally responsible for it, yes, sir.

Senator KNOWLAND. Now, one other line of questioning, Mr. Secretary: Yesterday there was brought to my attention an article which is appearing in Collier's magazine of January 21, 1950, by Rear Adm. Daniel V. Gallery, United States Navy. Are you familiar with Admiral Gallery?

Secretary MATTHEWS. I have seen the article, yes.

Senator KNOWLAND. As I understand it, he is now Assistant Chief of Naval Operations for Guided Missiles?

Secretary MATTHEWS. Yes, that is correct.

Admiral SHERMAN. Yes, that is correct. There has been a change.

Senator KNOWLAND. Changed since when?

Admiral SHERMAN. He went to sea about the time that I came to Washington. He was deputy commander of the operational development force, Atlantic Fleet.

More recently, I assigned an admiral to investigate our status with respect to antisubmarine warfare, and he asked to have Admiral Gallery report there temporarily as assistant in the development of antisubmarine warfare. Admiral Gallery has had extensive experience in that respect, so that he now has a permanent station as deputy commander of the operational development force of the Atlantic Fleet, and is on temporary duty in my office.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like at this point to have the record show—and I think I was remiss in my duty in not calling this to the committee's attention before, but it slipped my mind—that during the recess I called up Congressman VINSON, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House, and in a few sentences sort of briefed the discussion that we had had in this committee this morning, and told him that Secretary Matthews and Admiral Sherman were coming before us this afternoon, and that it might be pertinent to what we did here to know whether or not they intended to pursue the promises allegedly made to them against reprisals in further hearings, or to investigate further in reference to Admiral Denfeld, etc., covering the whole situation.

Mr. VINSON said that he—and he felt his committee—had all of the facts that entered into the matter in their possession now. They would shortly write their report and deal fully with that phase of the matter, and I then asked him pointedly, "Are you sure that the Denfeld matter will be fully dealt with in your report?" And he said, "It will."

So I think that puts a little different light on the situation as we contemplated it this morning, and I think I ought to have that

in the record so that we all may know that the House intends to deal with this matter.

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Secretary, so far as you know, Admiral Gallery is a competent qualified naval officer?

Secretary MATTHEWS. So far as I know; yes, sir.

Senator KNOWLAND. In the article it states, and I read from page 16:

"Last October, on the date which was formerly Navy Day, Admiral Louis Denfeld, after 40 years of distinguished service to his country, in peace and war, was kicked out of his job as Chief of Naval Operations. The admiral learned of his firing from an aide who read about it in the newspapers. In the reshuffle which followed all the other top admirals who supported Denfeld were swept into the 'deep freeze'."

I will not pursue that article any further, but it goes on to say that—

"But I think that the implications of the purge are even more ominous to the country than they are to the Navy; the handwriting on the wall can now be plainly seen by military officers in the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps, as well as the Navy. It says, 'Conform or be liquidated'."

Then it goes on and says—I have skipped some of it; I am not changing the context of the article, I believe:

"Under our form of government the basic decisions of military policy should be made by Congress. How can these decisions be made wisely if Congress is to be denied the honest advice of the men whom the taxpayers have trained to be their experts?"

Then, calling your attention to the Constitution of the United States, in article I, dealing with the powers of the Congress, that among the powers are those to raise and support armies but no appropriation of money for that use should be for a longer term than 2 years; to provide and maintain a navy, to make rules for the government and regulations of the land and naval forces, which clearly puts a considerable responsibility upon the Congress.

Would you give this committee your views, and I would like to ask Admiral Sherman later to give his views, as to the right of a congressional committee to interrogate witnesses to get their full, frank, and complete answers in executive session, if we are dealing with security matters or other matters which should be for the security of the country, whether you believe that there should be or has been any attempt to censor the views of officers, and in this particular case of the Navy, in giving those views before the Congress?

Secretary MATTHEWS. Senator, I am happy to have the opportunity to deal with that subject and to reveal to the members of the committee my thinking on the question.

Your question is a little bit involved. As I understand it, you are asking me what my opinion is about the right of a committee of Congress to question a member of the Military Establishment and require that individual to testify before a committee of the Congress.

Senator KNOWLAND. That is one question, yes.

Senator KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, may I interpose a thought here?

It would seem that the inquiry here would be about Mr. Matthews and I think we are going pretty far afield in getting into Mr. Matthews' views.

Secretary MATTHEWS. Senator, there have been a lot of things which have been said about me and my opinion, and I would like to have the opportunity myself so that I can be clearly understood.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you allow the Chair to interrupt a moment?

I am going to suggest to my able colleague, Senator KEFAUVER, that in this particular question we allow Mr. Matthews to answer it. I have not discussed this matter with him; I do not know what his answer is going to be, but I think we ought to have that question answered. I would like to ask everybody here, in a spirit of fair play, with which I try to meet the wishes that were in conflict this morning, to go into the qualifications of Admiral Sherman, that we do not get too far afield.

I am not going to object to this question or any similar questions, but I would like some cooperation, as the chairman is trying to accommodate both sides to this controversy.

Senator KNOWLAND. So that the issue may be clear, I believe that this is a pertinent question for this reason: There is now a vacancy in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations; an appointment has come before the Senate of the United States; statements have been made by responsible naval officers that because of their views people have been punished for coming before a congressional committee.

I want not only the views of the Secretary of the Navy—and I think he may be able to clarify the statements which have appeared, but I also want the views of the new Chief of Naval Operations, because I think it is pertinent.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a different matter.

Senator KNOWLAND. But the new appointee is the personal recommendation, apparently, of the Secretary of the Navy. I think it is pertinent to the inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. We have not got the Secretary of the Navy on trial. We have got, in the best sense of that word, in the American tradition, Admiral Sherman here to give us his views on, and to justify his ability to hold, his job. Now, the question might be pertinent. I am not going to object to it. It might be pertinent if you would ask Admiral Sherman what his views are on that, but it seems to me to be a little far-fetched to ask the Secretary what his views are, because we not going to vote on the confirmation of the Secretary.

Secretary MATTHEWS. It might be a little bit late on that. If I were up for confirmation, that might be true.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead and ask it. Let us have a little latitude here, but I will ask all concerned if they will not cooperate so that we can end this nightmare.

Secretary MATTHEWS. Senator, I am just as convinced as you are that the congressional committees should have that right. The individual should have not only the right but the duty to testify, to be absolutely sure that he will not suffer any reprisal by doing so.

But I also think that when a member of the Military Establishment does that, that he must be prepared to, in a sense, take the consequences. By that, I do not mean that he should be punished, but I believe that in the Military Establishment you must have authority, there must be top authority and whoever is in authority is entitled to be supported by subordinates who are in accordance, in sympathy and belief in the policies of whoever is in authority.

If he is not in sympathy and not only is not in sympathy but if he denounces the policy of the highest authority in the Establishment, then he has not any business being in the chain of command where the one in command has to depend upon him to carry out his policies and his administration of the Department.

Now, that does not mean that he should be punished for saying that, but it would seem to me to be an utterly illogical position to require me, as Secretary of the Navy, to attempt to administer the Navy, particularly as a military establishment, and attempt to carry out my orders, my direction of the Navy through a man who is not only, as I say, not in sympathy with my policies and who openly denounces my policies, whether he does that before a congressional committee, on a public platform, or in a publication, and he must be ready to stand by his convictions.

Now, he should not be demoted. He should not be punished. But he should be transferred to a place where he can serve properly.

Senator KNOWLAND. Just let me understand that: As I get your answer—I do not want to do you an injustice on that situation, because I have not the facts—you say that you recognize the constitutional right of the Congress to have witnesses, from the Navy in your case, Navy personnel, and also personnel of the other armed services, to appear before the Armed Services Committee of the Senate or of the House, and that they are free, and you, in fact, encourage them to give their frank opinions in answer to inquiries, and so forth; but if in elucidating information they happen to disagree or to throw a different light upon it, then the policy laid down by yourself, as the Secretary of the Navy: They should be prepared to surrender their position in the chain of command and be moved to some other position.

Now, am I accurately stating your point of view?

Secretary MATTHEWS. If, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy, that was necessary for the proper administration of the Navy; yes, sir.

Senator KNOWLAND. Well, then, they are all on notice here that if they do disagree, even if I or any other member of the committee asks a question, they are apt to be removed and sent, perhaps, to a less desirable or more distant post?

Secretary MATTHEWS. Whether you ask the question or not, that would be the case.

Senator KNOWLAND. Now, you apparently do not differentiate in your statement—and, again, I want to be perfectly fair about this—differentiate between a disagreement that might take place in a public magazine article of this kind or in a speech before some club, or in testimony before a committee of the Congress of the United States. You apparently group the three things together, and if a person in executive session responds to questions from a member of the committee and happens in doing that to state his honest opinion, which may differ with your opinion, that, therefore, he is on notice that he may be transferred?

Secretary MATTHEWS. It is not a matter, in my judgment, as to where he expresses that opinion. The important thing is that he entertains that conviction in opposition to his superior officer.

Senator KNOWLAND. Those are all the questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Before pursuing this investigation any further, Senator KNOWLAND, would you allow me to read this?

The question has been raised as to whether or not, when a person has been nominated and confirmed by the Senate, the President then has the right to withhold his commission, which is the instant case before us insofar as Admiral Denfeld is concerned.

In the very celebrated case of *Marbury* v. *Madison*, where this issue was raised and went all the way through the Supreme Court and is one of the key cases in American jurisprudence, the Supreme Court met the issue firmly, and it has been the law of the land from that good day to this.

In that matter the Court said:

"This is the last power conferred on the President by this clause"—referring to the clause in the Constitution—"the act of appointing to office and commissioning the person appointed cannot be considered as one and the same thing. The last act necessary to complete the commission is the signature of the President, and the signature which gives force and effect to the commission is conclusive evidence that the appointment is made. The President may withhold a commission from the appointee even after the appointment has been confirmed by the Senate."

That case arose, as many of you know, from a situation in my own State of Maryland. It is one of the key cases in American jurisprudence, and there is no law that I know of to the contrary, and even after the Senate confirmed Admiral Denfeld, before he was commissioned, the President has the right to withhold his commission if he so desires, and the Supreme Court says that is good constitutional law; so, I think we need to go no further into that any more.

Senator BRIDGES. Now, Mr. Secretary, I do not know as you realize your answer to Senator KNOWLAND's question, just exactly what the implications are that you throw out here.

What you are saying is, as I understand it, that if an officer of the United States Navy, an official of the United States Navy, comes before this—take away this committee—comes before the Appropriations Committee, and we press him on questions, and he gives us his honest answer, which happens to be different from the general policy laid down—he does not offer it of his own free will and accord, and he is asked by a Member of Congress, whose Members have the duty and the job under the Constitution of the United States, as far as the armed services are concerned—that he is subject to, in effect, reprisals of some kind? I do not think you want to say that; do you?

Secretary MATTHEWS. Not at all.

Senator BRIDGES. Is not that what you said to Senator Knowland?

Secretary MATTHEWS. No; that is not what I said at all. I said that when a subordinate in a military establishment differs from his superior that that superior is not compelled to retain him in that position even though he expresses that opinion before a congressional committee.

In other words, he cannot get, as I view it, and I do not see how you can maintain military command otherwise, as I understand it—just because a man has an opinion in opposition to his superior, because he expresses it before a congressional committee, that does not immunize him from what action the superior might take if he told the thing to the superior himself.

I think that he should not be subject to reprisal, and so far as I know I do not know of any instance where anybody has, and I would be the last one to favor reprisal, and I can assure you that this situation in the Navy is a situation where nobody has been subject to reprisal.

Senator BRIDGES. Now, just leaving the past entirely, and looking into the future, so that you are not in a position of defending or justifying any position which you or anybody else has taken, let us look to the future.

If I, as a Senator of the United States, and a member of this committee, or a member of the Appropriations Committee, in which capacity so and so or Admiral So-and-So is testifying before that committee, and he presents the case of the department, or his division of the department, in line with the policy, and then I say to him, "Now, let us look into this a little," and we press him, and I know of several cases, particularly in the Appropriations Committee, where things have come out in that manner, which certainly have been very helpful for the national defense, suppose we press it, how can I, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, or the Appropriations Committee, legislate intelligently if I cannot go to the bottom and get the honest conviction of the man or the men we train as our experts, and they cannot feel that they can talk freely without the thought that they are going to be censured or removed from their posts and shifted elsewhere?

Now, I say, that is wholly different from writing an article for a magazine or making a speech, or something like that. I mean, where he is testifying before a committee. Leave the past, let the past be the past, but just think of future cases.

Secretary MATTHEWS. Well, as I understand it, Senator, the problem that you had in mind is whether or not because the man testifies before the committee, then he will be subject to reprisal or punishment for doing that. Of course, he should not be, and he would not be.

Senator BRIDGES. Well, then, for instance, here is a man, here is a captain——

Secretary MATTHEWS. I would stand for that policy just as zealously as any member of this committee or any Member of the Congress. You could not do your work otherwise until you are free to ask the people who know. You have to depend upon them to get the information, that is obvious.

Senator BRIDGES. I may have got all wrong the way you answered Senator KNOWLAND, but I thought that if this man differed from his superior in the answers he gave, then you would say that it would be for the best interests of the service that he be transferred to some other post.

Secretary MATTHEWS. No; I did not say that. That would depend upon the situation; and the fact that he testified before the committee would have nothing to do with it at all. It would be the convictions that he held, and he might never testify. He might have those same convictions.

Senator BRIDGES. Mr. Secretary, you might never know those convictions unless he did testify.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator BRIDGES, you certainly are not advocating that a man who has strong convictions should keep them to himself because he was afraid that he would be transferred to some other post if he thinks his country's welfare is at stake?

Any man in the service who would not come up and have his say, no matter what the consequences were, if he thought that his country was being sold down the river, would not be worth his salt. He may be wrong.

The question here is not that, as I understand the question. The question is if you have a settled policy in a department, if you are not entitled to have men under you who are in harmony with trying to make that policy work. That is all there is to this.

Senator BRIDGES. I agree with that.

The CHAIRMAN. Which is an entirely different thing from what we have before us here.

Senator BRIDGES. I agree with what you have said there, but I also say that if the day comes when a committee of the Congress of the United States cannot call a member of the armed services up here and question him and have him state his convictions, whether they are contrary to the policy of the Department or anything else, it is a sad day for America.

The CHAIRMAN. Even Members of Congress sometimes do not give their convictions, because they are afraid they will be recalled from their posts by those who have the right of recall latent in the ballot box. I have seen some of those during my lifetime. That is just a human equation. Can't we dispense with this? Senator KNOWLAND has got the answers that he wants at this stage of the proceeding, at least, and the Chair does not want to go into this morning's controversy.

Here we have got Admiral Sherman before us. It looks to me as if good sportsmanship ought to prevail here. We are all good Americans, we all love the Navy. We all want to see it getting ahead under a full head of steam, and would it not be a fine thing, if there is no objection, to Admiral Sherman, if we could confirm him and let him go back to work instead of running him up here every day or every 2 days to testify before the committee?

Senator BRIDGES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Admiral Sherman a question or two.

Secretary MATTHEWS. May I say that I think we, who have these executive positions, are entitled to be credited with good faith and good intentions, just as Members of Congress are. We are all serving the Government as best we can, and I hope that I am actuated by the same good motives which actuate the members of this committee, and in the performance of such duties as are entrusted to me, I have done that, and I have meticulously striven to avoid anything in this proceeding that would in any way reflect upon Admiral Denfeld, for whom no member of this committee has any higher regard than I have, and I think I have his friendship, as well as his having mine.

Senator BRIDGES. Mr. Secretary, you understand that the questions I was addressing to you have not particularly to do with that.

Secretary MATTHEWS. I know that.

Senator BRIDGES. I am dealing with the whole broad question, whether it is the Secretary of the Air Force or the Secretary of the Army or anybody else or you; it is the whole broad question.

Secretary MATTHEWS. I understand that. I think it is a fundamental question.

The CHAIRMAN. I think Admiral Sherman ought to be allowed to participate in this tête-à-tête. He is the culprit or the hero. I do not know which he is, and we have got him before us, and I would like to ask whether there are any members of the committee who want to ask Admiral Sherman any questions.

Senator BRIDGES. I would like to ask Admiral Sherman one.

When you were offered the post of Chief of Naval Operations, with the offer did there go any request of you or any commitment from you as to the policies that you would pursue or what you would do or were you given a free hand?

Admiral SHERMAN. I was given a completely free hand. There were no commitments or promises whatsoever.

Senator BRIDGES. To anyone?

Admiral SHERMAN. To anyone. I was not asked for any; and I would like to correct the phrase "offered me the post."

I was quite happy where I was. When I first came back I was asked if I would come back here and serve; I said that I would serve as second under Admiral Nimitz or any other chief, and I did not seek the position, and I was not asked to make any commitments or promises when it was given to me.

Senator BRIDGES. And such talk as you may have had with the Secretary of the Navy or with the President of the United States, or such general conversation, those conversations were not to define for you what your duties were to be or what your policies should be, with the concurrence from you; they were general talks, and you were entirely free to, you assume yourself, that you were entirely free and that you were to be entirely free——

Admiral SHERMAN. As a matter of fact, the assignment was made to me that I would not be asked any questions, because my views on the unification and the policy of the national defense organization were known.

Senator BRIDGES. Admiral Sherman, I would like to ask you another question: You have taken over the job of Acting Chief of Naval Operations, and if you are confirmed by the Senate you will be Chief of Naval Operations.

What would be your personal attitude as Chief of Naval Operations relative to one of your subordinate officers testifying before a congressional committee in the future—we will disregard the past, and look entirely into the future—now before this committee or any other committee, if as a result of questioning by a congressional Member, that man gave his convictions, honest convictions, which differed from yours, or from the policy of the department head, perhaps, under which you worked?

Admiral SHERMAN. I would expect any officer who testifies before a congressional

committee to present the views of the department and identify them as such, as then when asked for his own views in questioning he should give his own views, with one exception, that when he gives his own views, which are not those of the department he represents, he should make that distinction known. In other words, he comes up here to ask for an appropriation of a certain amount, and if he is asked if he can use more money, he should certainly give the answer correctly, but he should not leave the impression that his own views are those of the department, if they happen not to be.

Senator BRIDGES. And as Chief of Naval Operations, if he did that, would you in any way with respect to the word "reprisal" or "discipline"—would you take any act to discipline him or take reprisals against him?

Admiral SHERMAN. No, indeed.

Senator BRIDGES. Would you also go so far as to say that not only would you not discipline him but you would protect a man in those rights?

Admiral SHERMAN. I certainly would.

I was always protected when I appeared as a witness before congressional committees in the past, and I certainly would expect to do everything in my power to protect any officer who testified honestly and fearlessly before a committee of the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, gentlemen, I would like to get the attention for a moment of Senator KNOWLAND—without cutting off the probability of any collateral inquiry; Senator KNOWLAND, do you feel that the thing has gone far enough, that you would be satisfied for us to vote on Admiral Sherman now or would you still like to hold it up a while longer?

Senator KNOWLAND. I would say that based upon the answers that Admiral Sherman has given to this committee, and upon his standing as a naval officer and his excellent record, I am personally prepared to vote for his confirmation.

The CHAIRMAN. That is very nice. I hope somebody will make a motion.

Senator CHAPMAN. I move that he be confirmed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there a second to it?

Senator KEFAUVER. I will second it.

Senator GURNEY. I will second it.

Senator SALTONSTALL. May I ask Mr. Matthews one question, which I hope is for the purpose of clearing the record with respect to what he has said?

You have stated, Mr. Secretary, that you took full responsibility for not recommending to the President that he sign Admiral Denfeld's commission. You have stated also your policy with relation to officers, and their testimony, and so on.

You have also testified by inference, as I listened to you, that your recommendation to the President with relation to Admiral Denfeld was not in any way connected with the congressional hearings.

Now, Admiral Denfeld is a Massachusetts citizen. You have stated that you have a great deal of friendship for him; so have I. I assume from what you have said that your failure to recommend that the President sign his commission was in no derogation to Admiral Denfeld in any shape, way, form, or manner, except that he may have differed in policy from your conception of the policy of conducting the Department; is that correct?

Secretary MATTHEWS. That is it; yes, sir.

Senator SALTONSTALL. For that reason you did not make the recommendation to the President?

Secretary MATTHEWS. That is right; yes, sir.

Senator SALTONSTALL. And there is no evidence of any kind of derogation with respect to Admiral Denfeld in any way, shape, form, or manner?

Secretary MATTHEWS. I felt I could not administer the Navy with Admiral Denfeld as Chief of Naval Operations. I did not in any way discount his qualities or qualifications.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you both for coming up, and I would now like to propose that the question be voted on.

It has been regularly moved and seconded that the nomination of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman to be Chief of Naval Operations be reported favorably to the Senate, with a prayer that it be speedily confirmed.

All those in favor signify by saying "aye."

(There was a chorus of "ayes.")

The CHAIRMAN. Those opposed, "no."

(There was no response.)

The CHAIRMAN. It is unanimous. Thank you, Admiral; thank you, Mr. Secretary.

(Whereupon, at 2:55 o'clock p. m., the committee adjourned.)

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. In order to comply with the ruling of the President of the Senate, I should like to ask the Senator, if the chairman of the Armed Services Committee obtains a chronological account of what really happened, from the documents and other data, necessary to sustain the chronological account, and if that is accompanied by any order, or otherwise, that might throw light on it, the Senator does not think we should get that and call it to the attention of the Senate before either the Armed Services Committee of the Senate considers this matter further, because then we shall be in a position to have a chronological and factual account as well of all the steps leading up to the matter which is now before the Senate.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator's question is, Do I think we should withhold the confirmation of Sherman until we have all the facts? Absolutely yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I asked the Senator if the chairman of the Armed Services Committee produced a chronological record of all the steps leading up to what is now before the Senate and open to discussion and it is put in the RECORD and the Senate advised of it, does the Senator not think that should be done first and we should ascertain the facts before we proceed further with the consideration of this matter so that we shall have the facts before us rather than suppositions upon which to argue?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me first answer the question of the Senator from Maryland. I say absolutely yes; the Senate should not take any action upon Admiral Sherman's appointment today. There should be no vote upon it until the Armed Services Committee has obtained all the facts. There is no question about that. I frankly would not be in a position to vote on his confirmation today. If the Senate were to call up Sherman's nomination, I could not vote against the man. I think he is extremely competent. I could not vote for him because it now appears from Matthews' own testimony that we already have one Chief of Naval Operations. All I could do when called upon to vote would be to answer "present." I assume many other Senators are in the same position, so I heartily agree that we are not in a position today to pass on the confirmation of Admiral Sherman.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator from Wisconsin think that the proper place to develop the chronological order is in the standing committee of the Senate which is charged under the law with responsibility for the armed services, and if Secretary Matthews comes before the committee and presents that, he will then be subject to such examination as the committee members might care to put him through, so that we can develop all the facts. The committee of the Senate is the proper place for these facts to be developed, particularly in view of the apparent discrepancy in the testimony which was given at our last meeting.

Mr. McCARTHY. I agree with the Senator 100 percent. I assume that was what the Senator from Maryland had in mind. I assumed he was referring to an investigation by the Armed Services Committee, and not to a review by some individual. I may say also that I hope the committee will see fit to invite the Senator from Wisconsin to sit in at the time the committee conducts the investigation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should be happy to make such a request on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin, but unhappily I have to be away from the Senate for the remainder of the week.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I do not like unnecessarily to take up the time of the Senate. I have a number of remarks which I was prepared to make, but most of them have been made in answers to questions. For that reason I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my remarks be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the remainder fo Mr. McCARTHY's remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There can be no other interpretation of this, because surely we are not expected to believe that the day-to-day transactions of Government agencies are of such a character as to throw our national existence into jeopardy.

The only meaning that this order can possibly have—the real truth about it—is that the bureaucrats wanted to be free forever from the prying eyes of the press and the people, and free from congressional suspicion.

Somehow, Mr. Truman managed—even before his censorship code went into effect—to draw the curtain of secrecy around the very creation of this censorship code. To this day the order might be a secret had not an alert reporter in October 1947 accidentally overheard a conversation about the order. The story then exploded in the press. And what was President Truman's explanation? There was none. The President merely said, in writing, that he had never heard of the program.

An investigation of the matter was commenced in March 1948 by the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. This investigation showed clearly what was going on. The important question, of course, is, Did this congressional investigation put a stop to the President's over-all censorship order? No one knows.

We do know that the Secretary of the Security Board told the House committee that action on the regulations would be suspended until the investigation was completed. The investigation was completed long ago, but dead silence has fallen ever since on the subject of the secrecy code. Whether or not the secrecy code is in effect today, I do not know, but I strongly suspect that it is. In fact, there is every reason to believe that it is in effect today.

Let me cite an example of how this all-encompassing censorship code works—an incident which occurred after the congressional investigation was completed.

Six months ago, in July of 1949, reporters of the Washington Times-Herald tried to attend a conference being held in one of the Cabinet departments The press has always attended such conferences. The subject of the conference was of vital concern to the public. The reporters, however, were refused admittance.

At the close of the conference the department's director of information told the reporters no details would be released, and he added—which I think is the crux of this whole story—this comment: "Like all Government business, this is being handled in private, and the decision will be announced later."

The American people, in other words, were not to know about their own business.

This, of course, is only one example of how the secrecy system has been applied to civilian agencies. The most thorough, the tightest, the most efficient job, however, has been done by the Department of Defense.

What does all this mean? It means that the administration clearly feels that it has a perfect right to operate on a stage that has been fixed so that none but the privileged can look on. On the other side of this curtain of secrecy are the American people, the American press, and the Congress.

I submit, Mr. President, that the high-handed methods being used in the Defense Establishment are completely contradictory of our alleged high aims and purposes. I submit that this entire picture involves not only the Secretary of the Navy, but his own responsible superior, the Secretary of Defense, who is charged by the unification law with specific responsibility for the administration of the affairs of the three armed services.

It's Secretary Matthews' blunder if he does not know whether there is or there is not a vacancy in the office of Chief of Naval Operations. Why, in God's name, doesn't the Secretary of Defense know what he is doing? Why does he allow such incompetence in one of his important divisions? Is it possible that he concurred in this reprisal? Is it possible that he, too, was a party to the ignominious manner in which the Chief of Naval Operations was removed? Is it possible that he believes and concurs in this autocracy? The country is entitled to know just who is responsible for the debacle in which we find ourselves.

I submit also that the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief, has become involved. For while he cannot watch every detail of operation, he must know by now that there are blunderers in the defense establishment who are weakening confidence in that establishment throughout the country and demoralizing our armed services. His is a responsibility that should rise above political party and personal favor.

Mr. President, the questions which I have outlined involve no partisanship. Men who served in the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force knew no party. And when they go to war they know only one loyalty. But precisely because they are asked to give their lives for their country in time of war, they must not be required to sacrifice their consciences in time of peace.

Mr. WITHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. WITHERS. I should like to ask the Senator whether the question of delivery would be involved in the issue of a commission.

Mr. McCARTHY. Perhaps.

Mr. WITHERS. That being true, the Senator has not made out any case on issue at all. Delivery must be proved. The Senator has charged a witness with falsifying, but he has not shown that there was ever proper delivery of the commission.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not interested in making out a case for or against anyone. I am merely presenting facts to the Senate. The original commission is in the possession of Admiral Denfeld. While in his possession these photostatic copies were made and sent to me.

Mr. WITHERS. Is that even prima facie evidence of delivery?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not concerned with that question.

Mr. WITHERS. I may want to ask the Senator this question——

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me complete my answer to the Senator's question. I am not concerned with making out a case. I come before the Senate and state the facts which I have discovered. Apparently, both the Republican and Democratic members of the Armed Services Committee are agreed that in view of these facts they will not bring up the question of confirmation of the nomination at this time. We want to find out why Matthews lied before the committee. I am not making out a case; I am only giving the Senate the facts, which seem to be that we now have a Chief of Naval Operations, and that before we attempt to confirm the nomination of a second man to that position, let us ascertain whether the office is vacant.

Mr. WITHERS. The Senator did say that the Secretary had made a false or an incorrect statement before the committee. If there had been no delivery of the commission there was no issue of it. It takes delivery, if I properly understand the Senator, to complete the issue of the commission. Am I correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. No; the Senator is completely incorrect.

I refer to page 125 of the hearings. Nothing was said about delivery.

Mr. WITHERS. Let me ask the Senator if he did not say that delivery was part of the issue.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me call the Senator's attention to page 125 of the transcript, a question by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]:

> You have stated, Mr. Secretary, that you took full responsibility for not recommending to the President that he sign Admiral Denfeld's commission.

There is more of that question, but Mr. Matthews said:

> That is it; yes, sir.

Matthews said the commission was never signed. I again refer to page 95 of the transcript of the hearing:

> Secretary MATTHEWS. But that was, as I understand it—the confirmation was if the President wished to appoint him, but he never appointed him for the second term. He never issued the commission.

Admiral Denfeld has the commission in his possession. If there is some other definition of "delivery," I frankly do not know what it is. Admiral Denfeld has the commission which was issued and signed by President Truman and Mr. Matthews. I cannot tell the Senator any more.

Mr. WITHERS. Would it not have been easy to ascertain whether there had been an actual delivery?

Mr. McCARTHY. I just said to the Senator that if he had some other definition of delivery, then, in heaven's name, give it. I have stated that the commission of which I have a photostatic copy was given to Admiral Denfeld—or delivered, if the Senator prefers. It was signed by the President and by Matthews. That is my definition of "delivery." I have practiced law for a long time, and I have been on the bench. So far as I know, that would constitute a complete legal delivery.

Mr. WITHERS. Did the Senator say that he did not know how he obtained possession of it, or whether he had possession of it? Did not the Senator say that before the Senate?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know how he obtained possession of it; that is true. I have not asked him that question.

Mr. WITHERS. Then, has the Senator established a prima facie case of issue?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have established a prima facie case of either incompetence or deliberate lying.

Mr. WITHERS. I ask the Senator——

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not want to take up the time of the Senate unnecessarily. I have given the facts as I have them. I say I do not know how Admiral Denfeld got the commission. I do not know who delivered it to him. I do know that it is in his possession. I have here a certified photostatic copy of it. Whether it was delivered in such a way that the Senator would say it was a legal delivery, I frankly do not know. I have neither the facilities nor the time to conduct an investigation, which I am sure the Armed Services Committee will conduct. If it should develop that there was no legal delivery, then, perhaps, Denfeld is not the Chief of Naval Operations today. I do not know. I do know that Matthews says the commission was never signed. He was either lying or he did not know what he was doing when he signed it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to precede the question I am going to ask by a short observation, without the Senator from Wisconsin losing the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the case of Myers against United States, decided by the Supreme Court in 1926 and reported in two hundred and seventy-second United States Reports. The facts of the case were that in Portland, Oreg., a postmaster had been appointed for a term of 4 years, and prior to the expiration of his term he was removed from office by

order of the President and the Postmaster General. He petitioned Congress and the courts for reinstatement, and also sued for the balance of his salary of his unexpired term.

The Court, speaking through Mr. Chief Justice Taft, in a very lengthy opinion, in which all the authorities were cited, held that the vesting of the power in the President, as the chief executive officer, gave him the right to remove an officer, even though he might be appointed for a term, before the expiration of that term. I quote two sentences from the opinion of the Court, on page 161:

> The power to remove inferior executive officers, like that to remove superior executive officers, is an incident of the power to appoint them, and is in its nature an executive power. The authority of Congress given by the excepting clause to vest the appointment of such inferior officers in the heads of departments carries with it authority incidentally to invest the heads of departments with power to remove.

The whole matter is discussed in a great many cases along that line.

So, even assuming that Admiral Denfeld had held up his hand and had taken the oath of office, under this Myers case I cannot see how there can be much question about the power of the President to remove him, even if he had been serving, during his term.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. Just a moment, until I reply to the Senator from Tennessee.

I am afraid the Senator has misunderstood the issue I have been discussing. I do not believe there would be any question about the removal of Admiral Denfeld. If the President said, "Admiral, we want you to resign," I am sure, knowing the type of man Denfeld is, that he would sign his resignation tomorrow. The point is that as of today we do not know the facts. There is no way for this body to know whether or not there is presently a Chief of Naval Operations. In other words, we do not know whether or not there is a vacancy. We know that the Armed Services Committee assumed there was a vacancy, an assumption which they were justified in taking, basing it on the erroneous information given to them by Matthews. When the Senator from California asked Matthews, "How does it happen that there is a vacancy?" he said, "There is a vacancy because a commission was never signed." We can assume that his thought was that, had the commission been issued, there would not have been a vacancy. It is the task of the Armed Services Committee to investigate that matter both from the factual standpoint and from the legal standpoint. The Senator from Maryland has told us that that will be done. The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] says that he believes very strongly that that should be done. I think all the members of the Armed Services Committee who are present have agreed that the task of the Armed Services Committee is to take the information which they now have and then come back to the Senate and say, "These are the facts."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Maryland just went to the telephone and tried to reach Secretary Matthews, but he was advised that the Secretary was in Omaha. The Senator from Maryland, in order to expedite the business that is before the Senate, then went to other sources in the Defense Establishment, and in a brief manner recounted what had taken place on the floor of the Senate this afternoon in regard to the confirmation of Admiral Sherman, and the points that are incident and related to a consideration of that matter.

The Senator from Maryland has asked for a chronological account of the steps leading up to the appointment of Admiral Sherman insofar as they deal with Admiral Denfeld. The Senator from Maryland has likewise asked for copies, or the originals—whichever is more convenient—of any written orders having to do with the subject.

The Senator from Maryland has also pointed out that a commission has been exhibited here on the floor of the Senate, which puts the testimony of Secretary Matthews somewhat in question. We do not know what the real facts are. It may be, perhaps, that the commission was issued and the admiral was never sworn, as required by law. Whether or not, in the absence of that compliance with the requirement, the position would be vacant, according to the decisions, or whether it could still be filled, we do not know. In any event, I have asked that all the circumstances surrounding the appointment of Admiral Sherman, based on whether there is a vacancy, be put in the hands of the Armed Services Committee, so that the Senate may have all the facts when they determine to proceed with this matter again. All that information will be forthcoming.

I believe, however, that if we find that there has been an order by the President, regardless of whether it was right or wrong, or what the merits or demerits might have been, removing Admiral Denfeld, whether he had been commissioned and sworn, or whether he had been commissioned without being sworn, or whether he had not been commissioned, there is a vacancy.

If that assumption is correct, there are two possible avenues of inquiry. If we establish, first, that there is a vacancy and that Admiral Sherman is qualified for the position, and that the vacancy was legally created, then our duty is to vote for or against Admiral Sherman. The other horn of the dilemma is whether or not the Committee on Armed Services wishes to go into the manner in which Admiral Denfeld was removed. That has nothing to do, primarily, with the Sherman nomination, assuming there is a vacancy in the office.

If the committee wishes to go into the Denfeld matter, the proper way to bring that up is to offer a resolution in the Senate and have it go to the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, and have that committee vote either for or against an investigation of that character. The point the chairman of the Armed Services Committee makes is that he does not think that in a matter of this importance we should proceed informally, but should proceed in the regular way.

Inasmuch as the committee itself and the arguments of the able Senator from Wisconsin are bottomed on the point that the removal or the holding of office ought to be accomplished in an orthodox and legal way, it is incumbent upon the Senate to proceed in an equally orthodox and legal way. All the information requested by the Senator from Wisconsin will be gotten as soon as possible, and the Senator from Maryland will charge himself with spreading it on the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. After we have the facts, the Senate can determine in what field it may wish to investigate and what further it may wish to do in this matter.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Wisconsin to yield at that point, because the discussion deals with the Armed Services Committee, and I ask that the Senator may not lose his right to the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, may I have unanimous consent that I will not lose the floor by yielding to the Senator from California to answer the Senator from Maryland?

The PRESIDING OFFICE (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The Senator asks unanimous consent. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the consent is granted. The Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say to the able Senator from Maryland that I do not quite agree with him on the procedure he has suggested, as to whether a formal inquiry is necessary or desirable in the Denfeld matter. In view of the understanding in the Armed Services Committee, when the Senator from California agreed not to press the questions, in view of the prior answer by the Secretary of the Navy to questions regarding the Denfeld matter in open meeting, the Secretary agreed that he would be glad to come before the committee in executive session, where the full facts might be developed.

Under those circumstances, and in view of the new evidence which has been produced today—and there may be some logical explanation as to how the Secretary was misunderstood—it seems to me that the correct procedure would be to have a meeting of the Armed Services Committee in executive session, as the Secretary indicated there were some matters he wished to present in executive session, so that the members of the committee could satisfy themselves as to whether or not this testimony which the Secretary gave was the result of a misunderstanding, or whether there were other facts with which he had not familiarized himself.

I regretfully suggest that if the Senator will follow that suggestion, we may be able to expedite this whole matter of the Sherman nomination, which I personally do not want to see held up, because I think Admiral Sherman is a very able officer.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not believe the Senator from California and I are very far apart in this matter. The position of the Senator from Maryland is, briefly, that if it is established to the satisfaction of the Senator from California and other members of the Armed Services Committee, and the Members of the Senate, that a vacancy actually existed, and that Admiral Sherman was nominated to fill the vacancy, we should act upon the fitness of Admiral Sherman to fill the vacancy. If facts and information in connection with this whole incident, as to the way in which Admiral Denfeld was removed, or any other factors relating to the creation of the vacancy for which Admiral Sherman has been nominated, develop, that would be a very proper subject of inquiry for the committee. If there is established the fact that a vacancy was created in a purely orthodox manner and existed at the time Admiral Sherman was nominated to fill this position, it seems to me the President is within his rights in filling the vacancy, and the sole question before us, insofar as that phase is concerned, is whether or not we should confirm or not confirm Admiral Sherman's nomination.

That would not preclude the committee or the Senate or the Congress from conducting any investigation it cared to make into the Denfeld matter, and all the steps that led up to his removal. But I respectfully submit that if the vacancy exists in the office of the Chief of Naval Operations, and if that vacancy is a purely legal one in all its ramifications and manifestations, then the question before the Senate is, Is the nominee who has been named to fill a legally existing vacancy an able and efficient and fit man to occupy that post?

In conclusion, let me say to the Senator from California that in making these two distinctions I do so with no idea of shutting off any investigation the committee may desire to make in reference to the Denfeld matter. But I do not think Admiral Sherman should be penalized nor the Department left without a head while we conduct an investigation into other circumstances than the vacancy itself, which might conceivably last over a period of months, and serve no good purpose at all, and in the meantime leave the Navy Department without a confirmed head, and the prestige and morale which goes with confirmation, to conduct the Department during this critical period of its affairs.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I want to say most respectfully to the Senator from Maryland, the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, that, as the Senator will remember, the committee originally agreed that the nomination of Admiral Sherman would not be voted upon until Thursday, January 19. However, based on the testimony which was given to the committee, whatever the date of the hearing was, the testimony of the Secretary that no commission had been issued, and in fact that there was a vacancy, immediately an entirely changed aspect was given to the hearings, and as the Senator quite remembers——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me finish my statement.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator has made a misstatement, and I know he does not want to make it. The Senator from California asked that 10 days or a couple of weeks, or some part of that time, be given to him to make an inquiry into this matter, and the committee acceded to the wishes of the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. It was not agreed that there would not be a vote until the 19th, but when the Secretary testified, the Senator from California then said that he was satisfied to proceed immediately.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Based on the——

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not want the Senator to be under the impression that we broke an agreement. We simply were released from a tentative agreement by the Senator who made the request.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is absolutely correct. The Senator from California released that agreement based on the testimony before the committee of Secretary Matthews and Admiral Sherman.

I raise no question of the testimony given before the committee by Admiral Sherman. But I believe, in view of the fact that I had released the committee from the agreement to vote on the 19th, that we are entitled now to have Secretary Matthews clear up this point which he may be able to do in an hour's meeting one morning either tomorrow or the next day, whenever he might be available to us. I think, as a member of the committee—and I am sure from listening to other members who were here and have now left the Chamber—that it would be the desire of all of us, in fairness to Secretary Matthews and in fairness to the committee, that he should promptly come before the committee and clarify the point which has been raised.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am going to release my part of the time after making this final statement. The Senator from Maryland is as anxious as is the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from California to bring all phases of the matter before the Senate before he requests any further action upon the confirmation of Admiral Sherman. He has asked for information. He has tried to ask for it as comprehensively as the debate would indicate the Senate desires it to be, and he will make no move of any kind whatsoever until that information is at hand, until it is spread upon the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and Members have had time enough to say what they think is best to do from that point on. He has asked for all phases of it so far as he is able to imagine what would be requested, so that nobody will be in the dark when the time comes either to investigate further or confirm, or do whatever is essential.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I may say that I, for one, think Admiral Sherman will be an excellent Chief of Naval Operations, when he becomes Chief. How long Admiral Sherman will last we do not know. Unless Matthews changes his attitude, probably Sherman will not last any longer than Denfeld did.

Mr. President, in fairness to the Senator from Maryland, I believe I should repeat a statement I made when the Senator was not present. Before the Senator left the floor earlier in the afternoon, I understood him to say that he felt it was not the function of the Senate Armed Services Committee to investigate a matter which I think is infinitely more important than the question of whether there is a vacancy today. The question which I think is of vast importance is whether or not deliberate steps are being taken in the Pentagon to make it impossible for the officers of the military forces freely and honestly to tell the proper congressional committees what they think should be done and what they think should not be done. Whether that is correct or not, many of us do not know. We do know that outstanding naval officers, such as Admiral Gallery, who wrote an article published in Collier's magazine, have made statements along that line. Admiral Gallery claimed in unqualified language that there was an attempt to build a "brass curtain" of secrecy. I think we will all agree that that would be a dangerous thing for the country.

I understood the Senator from Maryland to say earlier in the afternoon that he felt that investigation should not be conducted by his committee, but by the House committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is an error.

Mr. McCARTHY. Wait a moment, please. I stated, while the Senator was absent, that I feel that such a position is very erroneous. I feel that the important function of the Senator's committee is to make sure that a condition does not exist which makes it impossible for him freely to obtain information from the military branch of the Government. I stated that I sincerely hope his committee will proceed now to make an investigation and determine whether or not the claim which is now being made by many outstanding officers regarding this "brass curtain" of secrecy is true or false. I hope the Senator from Maryland will take steps in that direction.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator misunderstood me, and I can understand how he did misunderstand me. What the Senator from Maryland attempted to say was that there is a Committee of the Armed Services in the House and one in the Senate. It has always been a matter

of courtesy when one committee has taken jurisdiction of a matter, particularly an investigation, that the opposite committee in the other branch of the Congress keeps its hands off until the first committee has concluded its work, thus avoiding a multiplicity of work and the interrogating of the same witnesses, and so forth.

The matter has not been finally determined in the House committee yet. The promises about who would be removed and would not be removed, and the latitude with which witnesses would be permitted to testify, were all made over in the House committee. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate called up the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House and asked him, Representative VINSON, who occupies that position, whether or not he was going to deal with this matter further, whether the Armed Services Committee of the House was going to deal with it further, and Representative VINSON told the Senator who is now speaking, the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, that that matter would be covered fully in his report, which would be made in a few days.

In view of that fact, and also in view of the courtesy connected with the whole discussion, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate did not feel that he could advocate an investigation into a matter in which the House committee was already acting, without creating bad feeling. Therefore he preferred to wait until after the House committee had made its report before bringing this matter to the attention of his own committee in a further way.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say to the Senator from Maryland that I think a statement made by Secretary Matthews, which appears on page 111 of the committee hearings held on January 12, should be sufficient in and of itself to inspire a very searching investigation by the Senator's committee. On page 111 Secretary Matthews is quoted as saying:

> I think that every officer should be entitled to tell the truth.

But he says if he tells the truth then he should be prepared to take the consequences. I think the Senator's committee, just from that statement alone, should find out what the consequences of telling the truth would be.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I do not want to prolong the discussion on this point. The matter is already being investigated by the House committee. I just finished telling the Senator that the promise respecting whether there would be reprisals or not was not made to the Senate committee. It was made to the House committee. I do not feel that while the House committee is investigating that very matter we should go into it. If the Senate committee were investigating the matter I would resent very much the House committee going into the matter over which we had taken jurisdiction and respecting which an investigation was already under way.

Secretary Matthews did go on further in that very testimony to support his contention that the reasoning was logical. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who represents in part those who sit on the other side of the aisle on the Senate Committee on Armed Services, as the Senator will find from the testimony in his hand, backed up the Secretary of the Navy and said some very caustic things, which I shall not repeat.

Mr. McCARTHY. Am I correct in saying that the House committee is no longer conducting any investigations; that there are no plans to have any hearings on the part of the House committee? Does not the Senator know that to be a fact?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am sorry, I did not clearly hear the question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does not the Senator know it to be a fact that the House committee is not now conducting an investigation and that there are no plans for any hearings?

Mr. TYDINGS. No. I know that the House committee is being polled on this matter, and I think I know what the report is going to state. I think the report is going to be very much in favor of Admiral Denfeld. But, inasmuch as the Senator from Maryland has been told all of that, he does not feel that he should duplicate what the House is almost completing, and which is going to be somewhat along the line the Senator from Wisconsin has been arguing here on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the junior Senator from Wisconsin agree with me and others who served in the Marine Corps during the recent war that Admiral Sherman is an outstanding naval leader of great combat experience?

Mr. McCARTHY. I most certainly do.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the junior Senator from Wisconsin further agree that there can be no valid objection to the appointment of Admiral Sherman to the post of Chief of Naval Operations?

Mr. McCARTHY. Not if there is a vacancy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder if the junior Senator from Wisconsin will agree with me that the points of view of the Navy and Marine Corps will be intelligently and ably presented in the councils of the Joint Chiefs of Staff by Admiral Sherman, inasmuch as the Navy, for the first time, is being represented by a naval aviator who is thoroughly familiar with problems of naval aviation and who has taken such an active part in the amphibious operations which the Marine Corps carried out in the Pacific.

Mr. McCARTHY. I heartily agree.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to ask the Senator, if he is not asked any more questions, how long he will continue?

Mr. McCARTHY. Oh, I would say about 3 or 4 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is recognized for 3 or 4 minutes. [Laughter.]

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not hear the Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I said: The Senator is recognized for 3 or 4 minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Thank you, Mr. President. I have already obtained unanimous consent to have the remainder of my prepared remarks printed in the RECORD, as though they had been given by me, for the reason that most of the material has been covered in question-and-answer form. I feel that reading the remainder of my remarks would mean unnecessary repetition.

Mr. President, I want to call attention to one matter very briefly. The matter of secrecy exists far beyond the Military Establishment. Almost 3 years ago—on March 21, 1947—President Truman made it very clear, in a written order, that the gag rule which now exists in the Pentagon should operate throughout the executive branch of our Government. At that time he issued what is known as the loyalty order. Far down in the order, and very well concealed, was a section identified as Miscellaneous. In that section, President Truman clearly stated—it is a matter of record—that a censorship board should be created in every Government department.

Let me read that section:

> The Security Advisory Board of the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee shall draft rules applicable to the handling and transmission of confidential documents and other documents which should not be publicly disclosed, and upon approval by the President, such rules shall constitute minimum standards for the handling and transmission of such documents and information, and shall be applicable to all departments and agencies of the executive branch.

The Security Advisory Board followed through on that order, and drew up an elaborate secrecy code which was distributed to the heads of the more than 50 executive departments and agencies. The code was drafted in conformity with the President's order, and more than 50 executive departments and agencies got a copy of the secrecy code. I shall not read all of it, but sections of it are being placed in the RECORD. Here is the interesting part of the censorship code:

> The term "confidential" as used herein applies to information the unauthorized disclosure of which, although not endangering the national security, would be prejudicial to the interests or prestige of the Nation or any governmental activity thereof or would cause unwarranted injury to an individual or would cause serious administrative embarrassment or difficulty.

Please note, Mr. President, and I ask all Members of the Senate to note, that the Security Advisory Board was giving the 50 governmental agencies and departments a code drafted in accordance with the President's order; and in the code the statement is made that the Security Advisory Board is concerned not only with anything which would endanger the national security, but also with anything which would "cause serious administrative embarrassment."

In other words, Mr. President, the Department heads, at the President's direction, were to gag any person in the Government's employ or any written document coming from their Department if what was said might embarrass the administration or part of it or any person

in it. This censorship was not restricted to information that might endanger our national security. It was designed to withhold from the public information that might endanger the political security of the administration which happened to be in power. It has been applied to withhold information from the press and the Congress, which, in the final analysis, means it is being applied against the American people.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, Francis P. Matthews has been the subject of considerable discussion in the Senate this afternoon. I wish to state for the RECORD that Francis P. Matthews is a very distinguished resident of the State from which I come. He is a member of a political party opposite to my own party. I am sure that anyone who has known Francis P. Matthews, whether belonging to his party or to any other party, will not question the loyalty or the integrity of Mr. Matthews.

It may be that he has made some mistakes. After all, he is but human, as all of us are. I simply wish to make this statement about Francis P. Matthews, because I do not wish any of the remarks made in the Senate today to prejudice anyone in advance.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to be recognized at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to state that all day he has been attempting to recognize the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who advised the Chair that he wished to offer another amendment to the oleomargarine tax-repeal bill. However, the Chair cannot recognize the Senator from North Dakota unless he is on his feet.

The Senator from Maryland has addressed the Chair, and the Chair recognizes him.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if what I am about to say provokes additional discussion, I shall be very sorry.

But in order that the RECORD may be complete, for the purpose of carrying the news to the country, let me state that I have just been advised that Admiral Denfeld never was sworn in, and therefore did not hold a full commission, in the absence of the oath of allegiance.

The second thing I have been advised about is that the President removed Admiral Denfeld on a written order, based largely on the Myers case, which has been quoted here today, whereby the Supreme Court clothed the President with the authority to do so; and the President attached to the written order a memorandum. All that matter will be presented to the Senate.

However, I felt that the fact that Admiral Denfeld had not taken the oath, and therefore was not fully qualified, and therefore was not clothed with the office itself, and the fact that the action was taken by written order of the President, should be stated for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, lest there be misunderstanding about the matter in the country.

GOVERNOR DRISCOLL, OF NEW JERSEY, AND THE CIVIL-RIGHTS ISSUE

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, in these difficult days when we are all seeking enlightenment on the ways and means to make America sufficiently strong internally to meet its obligations to its own people and to the world, it might be well for every Member of the Congress to examine carefully the very eloquent and forceful second inaugural address of New Jersey's Governor, Alfred E. Driscoll.

Mr. President, it is a message of a man of destiny. Though it treats largely with the problems of a single State, it sounds a note which every legislative body in the Nation, including the Federal Congress, can well afford to heed.

Because of the wisdom and vision which it expounds, I recommend its careful study by every Member of this body. To this end, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, members of the legislature, we have been given a unique opportunity to complete the tasks we have undertaken together during the past three momentous years. I propose that we proceed to do so at once.

As we review even a small portion of the record of the immediate past—a new constitution; a strong, capable, independent judiciary—the keystone of our republican form of government; the effective division of powers among the three branches of State government; executive reorganization; greater legislative responsibility; one first-class citizenship, based upon a constitutional guaranty that recognizes the God-given dignity of mankind; our faith in and respect for our fellow citizens should strengthen and renew our determination to serve them faithfully and constructively.

For any part, as I resume my duties, neither time nor familiarity with the great office of Governor of New Jersey has lessened my abiding sense of the responsibility that is ours.

It is appropriate that the establishment of a new precedent, the continuation of a governor beyond a single term, should occur in a year that marks the half-way point in the twentieth century. In the first half of our productive, turbulent, and frequently terrifying century, we have achieved greater technological, industrial, and personal gains than were achieved in all previously recorded history. And yet, in this same period of time, we have come closer to losing our very souls than at any time since the Dark Ages.

Within the half-century, mass production became an American achievement—even a fetish. Early in 1901 a startled American populace received word that a billion-dollar corporation had been formed in New Jersey. The race to be the biggest and the richest was on in earnest. Big corporations were to be followed by big unions and big government. In fact, bigness was to become a center of controversy, frequently more violent than thoughtful.

The events of the first 50 years stimulated the organization of the group interest mentioned in my message to the legislature 3 years ago. These same events promoted centralized authority upon the theory expressed by Woodrow Wilson in his inaugural address as Governor, that we cannot "pit power against weakness." As our society became more complex, the individual became more dependent upon the activities of his fellows, and new methods were sought to overcome his growing feeling of insecurity. By the same token, the task of government became more complex, yet there was no planning to meet complexity. We moved into a period of government by crisis. The National Government assumed to undertake new services of great social and economic significance, but was unwilling to recognize the consequences of its assumption of vast centralized power.

Our whole world has changed in the last 50 years. The big Government that has grown from year to year to meet the challenge of big wars, big depressions, and to provide greater security, contains the elements of insecurity.

In our search for freedom, and in our defense of it, we have come close to losing freedom. Despite our efforts to achieve security, we are not yet secure.

Our mastery of the art of government and our ability to govern ourselves and our world have lagged far behind the technological and materialistic advances that have come to us during the first half of the twentieth century.

We are gradually learning that while objectives are important, methods are equally important. The methods employed in some countries to achieve security actually prevented the people of those countries from attaining their objectives. Furthermore, freedom was lost. The methods to which I refer resulted first in a centralization of the government and finally in its ultimate destruction.

In its report to the Congress of the United States, the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government asked two pertinent questions:

"1. How can the American type of democracy—a democracy based on individual liberty and extensive citizen participation in and control of government—be maintained and strengthened?

"2. At the same time, how shall government provide the services which people increasingly demand and which are necessary for the general welfare?"

The Hoover Commission recommended that the functions and activities of government be appraised to determine which can be most advantageously operated by the various levels of government and which require joint policy making, financing, and administration. The Commission proposed that our tax systems—"National, State, and local—be generally revised and that, in this revision, every possible effort be made to leave to the localities and the States adequate resources from which to raise revenue to meet the duties and responsibilities of local and State governments."

The Commission urged "that the grant-in-aid plan and program be clarified and systematized." The Commission states in its report that to accomplish these recommendations in an orderly and adequate manner a continuing agency on Federal-State relations should be created.

In our efforts to secure an orderly, responsive, economical government, these recommendations are vitally important to all of us. It is my hope that the recommendations of the Hoover Commission will be adopted. I recommend that appropriate steps be taken by you to memorialize Congress to adopt the recommendations of the Hoover Commission as quickly as possible.

The urgency of these proposals is to be found in the fact that the President, in his budget message for the fiscal year 1950–51, has recommended an increase in Federal grants-in-aid of approximately a billion dollars over those found in the grants allocated in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

There is a far more simple and effective method of accomplishing our social and economic objectives than the methods presently being employed. Current methods merely result in the speed-up of a vicious circle in which expensive grants-in-aid with unnecessary administrative costs compel the Federal Government to levy abnormally high taxes. Many of the services contemplated by these grants could be provided by the States with greater economy to meet local needs if the resources which formerly belonged to them were returned.

We must end our flight from yesterday's crises and, by a prudent appraisal of our needs, careful planning and the application of common sense, avoid tomorrow's catastrophies. During this stock-taking period we shall seek to consolidate our gains and complete our unfinished business.

Our State government during the past 3 years has been engaged in the hard task of putting its house in order, so that it might more efficiently serve its citizens. In three previous messages, as well as in legislative and executive action, we have stressed the importance of keeping government as close to the people as possible. We have emphasized again and again that the continued nationalization of our Government threatens to completely destroy our Federal system and home rule. One sure way to destroy our Federal system and home rule is for the States to fail to provide for the general welfare of their citizens.

This then represents the heart of our philosophy: an orderly Federal system with government close to the people, prudently managed. Government free to test old values, to seek new values. Government strong enough and courageous enough to pioneer with the times, promoting the general welfare in the service of all of its people. New programs in government carried on at the State or local level do not place in jeopardy the economy of the entire Nation and need not be adopted by all until they have proved their general worth. A system in which the citizens control the destiny of government rather than government controlling the destiny of its people.

It is our responsibility to clarify the relationship between State government, our counties, municipalities, and school districts. The recommendations of the commission on municipal government, as modified by another year of careful study, should be adopted. We should strengthen the capacity of our municipalities to govern themselves and to mold their form of government to fit the needs of their citizens.

The commission should be continued. In cooperation with representatives of our local government and the members of the tax policy commission, it should be authorized to appraise the services now being rendered by government within the State in a serious effort to reduce overlapping and conflicting services and dual responsibility.

During this study period, I advise that we hold the line against any and all additional expenditures not absolutely required to meet emergency needs. New Jersey enjoys the lowest per capita State tax collection in the Nation. We shall strive to maintain that favorable position. On the other hand, there is growing awareness of the need to modernize an antiquated tax system with many inequities. At your request the tax policy commission is engaged in this study. In my judgment, the study should be broadened. In cooperation with representatives of our local government every phase of the problem should be analyzed.

Since our primary concern this year is to finish tasks to which we have set our hands during the past 3 years, it is not necessary for me to review all of the recommendations of the last 3 years. Nonetheless, I should like to make it abundantly clear that I have not changed my position on any of the recommendations heretofore made.

Our concern for an orderly and economical government has not prevented us from adopting programs designed to protect and promote the health, safety, and welfare of our citizens. New Jersey has pioneered in the development of these programs within the framework of a private-enterprise economy.

We must face the fact that the National Government continues to be committed to deficit financing. This is inflationary. It means less purchasing power both for the State's tax dollars and for the individual's pension-and-insurance benefits. If our insurance programs, including particularly sickness benefits and unemployment compensation, are to have real meaning and accomplishment their purpose, the present maximum benefit payments should be increased to levels that will permit them to accomplish their objectives. Further, we should eliminate the present discrimination between employees of firms employing four or more persons and those employing less than four. Every effort should be made to limit benefits to those entitled to them, but those who are entitled to benefits should be protected by recognition of the new wage structure of industry.

It is sound policy to place our emphasis upon these insurance programs, rather than upon direct relief. The New Jersey unemployment compensation trust fund in Washington contains credits of over $400,000,000. We are fortunate in having the largest reserve ratio of any industrial State in the Union.

Last year we achieved full coverage of occupational diseases under our workmen's compensation law. A number of inequities still remain to be corrected this year. Provision should be made for the prompt settlement of all compensation cases, including a board of review within the department of labor and industry and a direct appeal to the appellate division of the superior court, eliminating the present appeal to the county courts.

The right to organize and bargain collectively, guaranteed in our new Constitution, should be augmented by a State labor-relations law applicable to intrastate employees. Our present minimum wage law should be made more comprehensive.

Within the State government we should consolidate and systematize all agencies engaged in the various categories of welfare services. The Department of Institutions and Agencies is presently engaged in the consolidation of its activities. Nonetheless, two State departments, several Federal agencies, the counties and municipalities are all engaged in welfare services. This arrangement is neither economically sound nor administratively desirable. State welfare activities should be confined to a single State department. The number of levels of government engaged in welfare services should be reduced. A report on this subject will be submitted to you shortly for your consideration.

There will be no security, either in private or public pension programs, nor in our national old-age and survivors insurance program—in which New Jersey has a vital stake—until we have reasonable prospects that future prices will remain within reasonable limits of today's promises of future benefit payments. Deficit financing, poor planning, and extravagance in government promote insecurity rather than security. We have taken the position that the National Government should not expand its direct relief activities at a time when the emphasis should rather be placed upon the strengthening of old-age and survivors insurance, expanding its coverage, thus reducing the need for Federal old-age assistance, in which the State is a participant. As part of our tradition that the State should seek to do more and more for itself, while asking less and less of the National Government, I recommend that the entire subject of pensions and our insurance programs be studied in the light of our postwar experience and to the end that State policies may be established at the State level.

On numerous occasions, I have stressed the fact that our problems are largely social and economic, not political. In common with all other States, New Jersey is facing serious fiscal problems. The demand for services by our citizens far exceeds available revenues. A most striking illustration of this fact is to be found in the field of education. Since our capacity to increase State aid for education is limited to available revenues, I shall discuss that subject in my budget message.

Our teacher salary schedules and pension programs should be further strengthened. I recommend that the members of the State board of education should be chosen from the State at large, with no limitation in regard to the number to be chosen from any one county, and that the terms of two members of the board shall expire each year. I recommend that legislation be adopted authorizing the board of education to appoint a commissioner, subject to the approval of the Governor.

The 1949 report of the President's Highway Safety Conference states "the outstanding achievement during this year was made in New Jersey. Legislation was enacted for a State-wide system of county district courts and municipal courts to replace police courts, recorders' courts, family courts, magistrate courts, justice of peace courts, city district courts, and small cause courts. The new courts are an integral part of the State judicial system, under supervision of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court." The new system appears to be working well. It does, however, require further strengthening.

Everyone, I believe, recognizes the need for greater uniformity in traffic regulations throughout the country. I recommend that we adopt a uniform vehicle code. Effective action should be taken to prevent destruction of our highways by trucks of excessive weight and size. These trucks constitute a definite menace to other users of our highways. New Jersey should seek uniform regulations with its neighboring States on this and on subjects relating to the use of our highways.

Good traffic laws and effective enforcement can do much to reduce the toll of traffic accidents; but our major need must remain improved and modernized highways throughout the State. During the past 3 years, we have allocated almost $180,000,000 for the construction, maintenance, and safety of highways at the State, county, and municipal levels. These new highways include freeways and parkways that are now under construction, to relieve traffic bottlenecks in our major cities.

The New Jersey turnpike is a major piece of our unfinished business. The innovation of the turnpike in New Jersey which fundamentally becomes the backbone of the new State highway system has required a restudy of all of our highway planning to take full advantage of the turnpike's great potentialities. For the first time, we are in a position to anticipate meeting fully the requirements of the world's heaviest traffic load. The continued development of freeways in the metropolitan areas of north and south Jersey, such as the Trenton and Camden freeways soon to be completed, will continue a major policy of our administration.

We have yet to overtake the needs of the automotive age, but we are pledged to continue the effort. With a view toward a full solution of our State's transportation problems, I renew to you the program and recommendations which are already before you for a coordinated highway, rail, air, and water transportation system, which will not only relieve our roads but secure high-speed transit facilities in north and south Jersey.

Water shortage is not a new problem in New Jersey. The current shortage is in part due to a deficiency in rainfall and in part to a steady increase in demands—in face of an inherently deficient water-supply system. No large additional supplies of water have been made available since the Wanaque system was put into operation in 1930.

I recommend the creation of a water authority within the department of conservation and economic development em-

powered to immediately complete the Delaware and Raritan Canal water supply project as authorized by the legislature in 1943. The completion of this project will make available an additional 75,000,000 gallons a day for the lower Raritan Valley between Bound Brook and New Brunswick and can be made available north into Union County as far as Elizabeth.

This authority would be further empowered, subject to the approval of the legislature, to develop other sources of water. It should be understood that the purpose of the authority is to cooperate with municipalities of the State; the New Jersey District Water Supply Commission and other State and interstate agencies.

In addition, the State should sponsor a Tri-State Water Authority, including Pennsylvania and New York, to develop the water resources of the Delaware River watershed and to make those resources available to the citizens of the three States. My studies indicate that these projects may be completed on a pay-as-you-go basis. The modern industries of New Jersey, and the employment they provide, are very largely dependent upon a sure source of water.

As I have previously stated, one substitute for big government in Washington is responsive, serviceable, State governments and interstate cooperation.

Our institutions are performing modern miracles in the treatment of persons suffering from mental illness. Seventy-four percent of the admissions to our mental hospitals are now being returned to society in less than 6 months, and an additional 13 percent are cured within 6 to 11 months. There are, of course, incurable cases. When the construction program that will be undert ken this year is completed, we may confidently expect an improved rate of cure or correction. This has many advantages—humanitarian, as well as economic.

Our mental hospitals have, over a period of years, served not only as places for active treatment, but also as social and scientific laboratories for the testing of procedures and practices that have won the praise and support of the medical profession. The $25,000,000 rehabilitation and construction program approved last November will permit us to overcome the fire hazards that presently exist within our institutions and take initial steps to eliminate serious overcrowded conditions.

The need for the development of regional health services, and the strengthening of intermunicipal cooperation, is apparent. The department of health has been authorized to create regional health districts. We believe that through the medium of State and local cooperation, in close association with the medical profession and the encouragement of private medical and surgical plans, we can make adequate medical care available to all of our citizens. It is apparent, however, that there is a very real need for medical training facilities within our State. We are exploring every phase of this knotty problem.

Last year I urged the adoption of a broad program providing for a concerted attack upon our slum areas and for the stimulation of low-rent housing within the reach of families of limited incomes. The program was adopted. As a result of the November election, we will not be able to use the State's credit in furtherance of this program.

A large amount of rental housing and home construction has been undertaken in the past year. Despite this, and after an extensive study of the problem, the Temporary Committee on Housing (J. R. 4, 1948) clearly shows, in its report which has recently been filed with you, that there still exists a need for housing which can be made available at a cost of from $50 to $60 per month and less. Moreover, the social cost of slums and the need for slum clearance is just as great as ever. We shall not abandon our housing responsibilities to the Federal Government. But the initiation of the Federal program, under which many of our municipalities plan to act, makes it prudent to reexamine our previous plans.

We can take encouragement from the recent and gradually increasing development of serious interest among builders in our new limited dividend housing law. We shall stimulate and foster this interest to the fullest. Legislation further to strengthen this law and to provide additional encouragement to private enterprise to engage in large-scale middle-income housing construction will be submitted to you shortly.

The department of law and public safety and the department of health are now jointly engaged in the formulation of plans to provide, with the cooperation of our local governments, a unified and vigorous enforcement of all laws and ordinances applicable to substandard housing.

The continued shortage of housing, particularly in our urban areas, requires that we devote our attention to the need for the continuation of rent controls until such time as there is a reasonable balance between housing supply and demand. I urge you to adopt legislation establishing a State stand-by residental rent control law—one that will serve fully to protect our citizens should the Federal Government decide to withdraw from this activity.

An extensive study of the building code situation in our State was undertaken by the temporary committee on housing. Its report shows that we have today 179 different building codes in municipalities of 2,500 population or over. In addition, 60 percent of these codes range in age from 11 to 30 years and present a condition which seriously stifles the realization of low-cost homes.

The need for uniformity, simplification and standardization in this field is crystal clear. Accordingly, I urge the immediate adoption of legislation creating a State building code commission with authority to formulate modern, performance-type building codes. Much of the spade work along these lines has already been gotten under way through the division of planning and development. The legislation should include authorization for the formulation of up-to-date plumbing and electrical installation requirements, adequate local option provisions in the adoption of the code, and enforcement and supervision at the local level.

On the agenda of unfinished business, I urge you to provide for a much-needed continuing revision of our general statutes; continue support of our notable civilian defense program; strengthen our veterans' services in which New Jersey has pioneered; and make provision for the protection of our resort areas and the development of new parks, including particularly the Sandy Hook project.

There will be plenty of hard work for all of us. The legislature will want to participate in the studies and hearings that must be completed prior to final consideration of a modern and equitable fiscal system. The legislature will also have an opportunity to perfect its own techniques, including the consideration of a legislative council which, from the point of view of the executive branch of the State government, will promote a good working relationship with the legislature during the period when the latter is not in session.

I have enjoyed our work together during the past 3 years. We have been engaged in large undertakings. We have been an intimate part of the forces that for ages past have been seeking a better way of life for mankind. I am looking forward to a continuation of our pleasant and constructive relationship. Despite the pessimism of some, we live in a good world. It is a world of opportunity, particularly in the field of government.

As we move ahead in the service of our fellow citizens, let us dedicate ourselves to giving a new warmth, a new dignity to the basic strength of our sacred heritage as citizens of a republic of free people. Under divine guidance, our aims, our hopes, and our prayers for lasting peace, a world in which spiritual values are paramount and in which each person is free to play his part, will be achieved.

Respectfully submitted.

ALFRED E. DRISCOLL,
Governor.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. In a moment.

But, Mr. President, I do not stop there. I would remind this distinguished assembly that Governor Driscoll was reelected primarily because of his complete integrity on an issue which the Congress has evaded far too long. I refer to the civil-rights issue. This issue is before us today. It will be with us for some days. Let us solve it courageously and squarely, as New Jersey solved it in its consitutional convention. Let us, too, recognize that ours is a Government for all of the people without regard to race, creed, color, or religious affiliation.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an editorial entitled "Governor Driscoll's Address," which appears in today's issue of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNOR DRISCOLL'S ADDRESS

The statement of principles with which Governor Driscoll begins his second term will be read with interest outside New Jersey for its strong affirmation of the desirability of self-reliance at the lower levels of government. This is in the nature of reiteration; the Governor made the same point last December in an address here, when he said, "We want to do more and more for ourselves and ask less and less from others." It is a theme that echoes with frequency of late. It was dominant in Governor Dewey's recent message opening the New York legislative session. It was emphasized, we are especially pleased to note, in the letter published yesterday of the State Conference of Mayors to Governor Dewey and the legislature.

Our cities and States might well take to heart one warning uttered by Governor Driscoll in his inaugural speech: "One sure way," he remarked, "to destroy our Federal system and home rule is for the States to fail to provide for the general welfare of their citizens." The same lesson applies to the relations between the State and its localities—a fact recognized when Mr. Driscoll urges strengthening of the capacity of cities to govern themselves and to mold their form of government to fit the needs of their citizens.

Most of the problems of New Jersey are not unique except in emphasis. Some of these and the general philosophy for dealing with them bear a marked similarity with the pattern of Governor Dewey's message. The fiscal situation is troublesome. The demands for services by our citizens far exceed available revenues. After reviewing the several fields in which he hopes to extend progress already made and others in which new ground needs to be broken, Governor Driscoll reminds us that "despite the pessimism of some, we live in a good world." He sees this as a world of opportunity for government, but his fundamental interest is in keeping government close to the people.

We wish the Governor well in his second term as he seeks to continue in New Jersey the progress acknowledged by the voters in returning him to office.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment numbered A.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 19, after the word "of" it is proposed to insert "the foregoing provisions of."

On page 5, line 3, it is proposed to strike out the word "This" and insert in lieu thereof "The foregoing provisions of this."

On page 5, after line 6, it is proposed to add the following new sections:

SEC. . The requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, is not and shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for said officers, within the meaning of the Constitution, but is and shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding primaries and other elections for said national officers and a tax upon the right or privilege of voting for said national officers.

SEC. . It shall be unlawful for any State, municipality, or other Government or governmental subdivision to prevent any person from voting or registering to vote in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, on the ground that such person has not paid a poll tax and any such requirement shall be invalid and void insofar as it purports to disqualify any person otherwise qualified to vote in such primary or other election. No State, municipality, or other Government or governmental subdivision shall levy a poll tax or any other tax on the right or privilege of voting in such primary or other election, and any such tax shall be invalid and void insofar as it purports to disqualify any person otherwise qualified from voting at such primary or other election.

SEC. . It shall be unlawful for any State, municipality, or other Government or governmental subdivision to interfere with the manner of selecting persons for national office by requiring the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, and any such requirement shall be invalid and void.

SEC. . It shall be unlawful for any person, whether or not acting under the cover of authority of the laws of any State or subdivision thereof, to require the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in connection with this amendment, I also want to read a resolution which I am going to send to the desk, on which I am going to ask the Senate to take action after it is referred to the proper committee. The resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a thorough investigation to determine (1) what connection, if any, Lever Bros., or any subsidiary or affiliate thereof, had with raising the price of oleomargarine any time within the last 10 years, particularly at any time when legislation to remove the tax on oleomargarine was under consideration by the Congress of the United States—

I may say, Mr. President, that about a year ago when the oleomargarine question was up before the Senate, when it looked as though the bill removing the tax from oleomargarine might pass, at a time when the argument in favor of removing the tax from oleo was that the poor people would be able to buy oleo at a low price, rather than buy butter, at that very time Lever Bros. investment company and another corporation got together to corner oleomargarine not only in the United States but all over the world, and within a space of 3 weeks the price of oleomargarine was raised 23 cents a pound. I believe that should be investigated. When we remove the tax from oleo, are we doing it for the benefit of the common people of the country, or are we doing it for the benefit of a great big trust?—

(2) whether an attempt to corner the market on oleomargarine was made by or on behalf of Lever Bros. or any such subsidiary or affiliate; (3) what part, if any, Charles Luckman, as president of Lever Bros., had in any such attempt to corner the market and increase the price of oleomargarine—

I may say this is the same Charles Luckman who recently was appointed—I do not know by whom—to be general manager for the Democratic Party in the holding of its Jackson-Jefferson Day dinners all over the United States. I am curious to know why this man, whose company only a short time ago was sued by the United States Government for being part of a trust, and who came before the court pleading nolo contendere, saying, "Yes; it is all true," and who was a member of an outfit that paid a $50,000 fine—this man was one of the defendants, who, with others, paid a fine of $50,000—I am curious to know why that man should have been chosen by the Democratic Party, which says it is fighting the trusts, which says it is for the poor people, and that all the trusts belong to the Republican Party. I am curious to know why that man should have been chosen out of 157,000,000 people in this country by the Democratic Party to be at the head and to act as general manager of all the Jackson-Jefferson Day dinners to be held all over the country—

and (4) whether there is or has been a conspiracy on the part of the Lever Bros., its subsidiaries, or affiliates, and any other concerns, to violate the antitrust laws in causing an increase in the price of oleomargarine at any time during the last 10 years, and particularly to ascertain the part played therein by Charles Luckman, either individually or as president of Lever Bros., and whether in furtherance of such conspiracy legislation was proposed which would permit importation either without tax or with a very low tax of products in competition with the dairy farmers of the United States. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is directed in connection with such investigation to cause a subpena to be served upon the said Charles Luckman for the purpose of obtaining his testimony with respect to any matters which it considers relevant thereto.

The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, not later than April 1, 1950, the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

The resolution (S. Res. 213) submitted by Mr. LANGER was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a thorough investigation to determine (1) what connection, if any, Lever Bros., or any subsidiary or affiliate thereof, had with raising the price of oleomargarine any time within the last 10 years, particularly at any time when legislation to remove the tax on oleomargarine was under consideration by the Congress of the United States; (2) whether an attempt to corner the market on oleomargarine was made by or on behalf of Lever Bros. or any such subsidiary or affiliate; (3) what part, if any, Charles Luckman, as president of Lever Bros., had in any such attempt to corner the market and increase the price of oleomargarine; and (4) whether there is or has been a conspiracy on the part of the Lever Bros., its subsidiaries or affiliates, and any other concerns, to violate the antitrust laws in causing an increase in the price of oleomargarine at any time during the last 10 years, and particularly to ascertain the part played therein by Charles Luckman, either individually or as president of Lever Bros., and whether in furtherance of such conspiracy, legislation was proposed which would permit importation either without tax or with a very low tax of products in competition with the dairy farmers of the United States. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is directed in connection with such investigation to cause a subpena to be served upon the said Charles Luckman for the purpose of obtaining his testimony with respect to any matters which it considers relevant thereto.

The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, not later than April 1, 1950, the results of its investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in connection with the question which we are now discussing, I desire to offer another resolution. The resolution reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a thorough investigation for the purpose of ascertaining the amount of campaign contributions made at any time during the last 10 years by or on behalf of Charles Luckman personally or by or on behalf of Lever Bros., or any of its subsidiaries or affiliates, to the Democratic or Republican National Committees, or to any State committee of the Democratic or Republican Parties, or to any individual representing the Democratic or Republican Parties. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is directed in connection with such investigation to cause a subpoena to be served upon the said Charles Luckman for the purpose of obtaining his testimony with respect to any matters which it considers relevant thereto.

The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, not later than April 1, 1950, the results of its investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will examine the resolution. Unless it involves an investigation as to the violation of the antitrust law, it would not automatically go to the Judiciary Committee. The Chair will take a look at it and reserve his ruling as to that.

(Subsequently, the resolution (S. Res. 214) submitted by Mr. LANGER, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.)

Mr. LANGER. I may say, Mr. President, that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania some 3 or 4 hours ago, when he talked upon the first amendment I offered, the one dealing with antilynching, said, among other things, "I have fought consistently for civil rights." That is what was said by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. Well, Mr. President, it is passing strange to me that the Democratic Party, which has been in power since January 1933, a matter of 16 years, during the overwhelming majority of which time they had a majority of 2 to 1 in the House and a majority once of 4 to 1 in the Senate, at a time when they could pass any kind of legislation they wished, never once enforced the criminal provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act. We then had a President, elected upon the platform that he was going to enforce laws; that he was going to fight for the little man. In his speeches he said that all the big corporations were supporting the Republican Party, and so he was elected by an overwhelming vote. Sixteen years later what do we find? We find appointed as head of the Jackson-Jefferson Day dinners the head of the Oleomargarine Trust—not only a trust here in the United States but a trust so large that when the president of Lever Bros. died a short time ago in Minneapolis the Minneapolis Tribune said he represented 530 corporations scattered all over the world.

How large is this Lever Bros. corporation and its affiliates? They have a branch away over in Belgium. They have a branch in the Netherlands. They have a branch in Scandinavia. They have a branch in Finland. They have a branch in the Netherlands East Indies. They have a branch in Italy. They have a branch in Switzerland. They have a branch in Austria. They have a branch in Germany. This octopus has a branch in Czechoslovakia. It has a branch in Poland. It has a branch in Hungary. Yes, this great octopus has a branch in Yugoslavia. It has a branch in Rumania. The outfit of Charles Luckman, who is at the head of the Jackson-Jefferson Day dinners of the Democratic Party, has a branch in France. It has another branch in Denmark. It has a branch in Norway. It has a branch in the Belgian Congo. It is doing business and has a branch in Siam. It has a branch in China. It has a branch in the Republic of the Philippines. It has a branch in the Argentine. It has a branch in Brazil. It has a branch in the United States, its headquarters being in Boston. It has a branch in Canada. It has a branch in the West Indies. It has a branch in Newfoundland. It has a branch in Ireland.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. LANGER. I refuse to yield at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. This octopus has a branch in Palestine. It has a branch in Egypt. It has a branch in British West Africa. It has a branch in the Union of South Africa. It has a branch in Pakistan. It has a branch in India. I do not know whether the general manager of this great, big octopus, who is also general manager of the Jackson-Jefferson Day dinners of the Democratic Party, the party which says it represents the poor people, is going to have these Jackson-Jefferson Day dinners in all these countries or not. I do not know whether he is going to serve oleo or butter at those banquets. But he also has a branch in Burma, a branch in Australia, a branch in the Solomon Islands, a branch in New Zealand. Another arm of this great octopus is in Chile. Another arm is in Uruguay, and another arm of the octopus is in Tunisia. Another arm is in Asia. This great corporation, the largest in the world, far larger than General Motors Corp., far larger than the United States Steel Corp., has a branch in Syria, a branch in Iraq, another branch in Iran, another branch in Morocco, another branch in the Canary Islands.

I do not know whether the Democrats will have canaries singing at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners, but, in any event, this great corporation has a branch in the Canary Islands. It has other branches in Gambia, Portuguese Guinea, French Guinea, Sierra Leone, and Liberia.

Mr. President, the Democratic Party is holding some Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners, and I understand they are $100 a plate. If a man takes his wife or his sweetheart it would cost him $200. The man in charge of all these dinners is the President of Lever Bros., the greatest oleomargarine manufacturer in the world. It produces 75 percent of all the oleomargarine sold in Great Britain, and it has branches, as I have said, all over the world. I stopped with the fifty-fourth branch. It has other branches. Wherever there are people, Mr. President, it has a branch. It has 68 branches in all, including a branch on the Gold Coast of Africa, in Nigeria, and in the Belgian Congo.

As I said when I submitted a resolution a while ago, Mr. President, we are curious to know how it happened that this outfit raised the price of oleomargarine 23 cents a pound, at the very time, a year ago, when it was thought we would take the tax from oleomargarine. I have letters from all over the country telling me to vote to take the tax off oleomargarine and saying, "We are going to get it 10 cents a pound cheaper." But instead of that, the price went up until it was raised 23 cents a pound in 3 weeks. If the bill had been passed, that is what the people of the city of Washington and the people of every State in the United States would have had to pay for oleomargarine.

Mr. President, this morning the distinguished majority leader read a telegram. As a matter of fact, he read two telegrams. He said there were two great organizations which did not want the civil-rights amendment offered in connection with the oleomargarine bill. The distinguished Presiding Officer will remember that the Senator read those telegrams. I received one of those telegrams myself. Mine is signed by Roy Wilkins, acting secretary. He does not say of what he is acting secretary, so I have to read the telegram. He says:

We have just sent the following telegram to various Members of the Senate:

"On behalf of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People we urge you to defeat the so-called civil-rights amendments offered by Senator WILLIAM LANGER to H. R. 2023, the bill to repeal oleomargarine taxes. As you know, this association, since its inception 40 years ago, has worked unceasingly to win for all persons, regardless of race, religion, or color, security of person and freedom of political and economic opportunity. Senator LANGER does not intend these amendments to further the cause of civil rights. He desires only to defeat the oleomargarine tax repeal."

It is very strange how this man knows what is going on in my mind. As a matter of fact, he knows nothing about it, and I make this statement, without fear of contradiction, that WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, has done more for civil rights than this man Wilkins has done during all his lifetime. I ascertained that these organizations never voted to send these telegrams at all, Mr. President. This man represents no one but himself. There are several thousand delegates in their congress, and that congress never adopted a resolution with regard to this subject, and yet Mr. Wilkins sends me a telegram.

I say, shame on Mr. Wilkins for presuming to send a telegram which he says represents the views of his organization, when, as a matter of fact, no executive committee and no membership ever authorized him to send this telegram.

Mr. President, a man came to me who represents the National Negro Council, with 2,000,000 members—Negroes from every State in the Union. He filed this statement with me:

Edgar G. Brown, director, National Negro Council, calls on Senator LUCAS, majority leader of the Senate, to demand vote on Langer civil-rights amendments and not move to table and cut off debate on these measures.

A 200-man civil-rights delegation from Illinois, and Edgar G. Brown, director of the National Negro Council, representing more than a million signers to a petition supporting the President's civil-rights program—

A million persons signed this petition, Mr. President—

supporting the President's civil-rights program, called upon Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS (Democrat, Illinois), majority leader of the

Senate, to get a vote now on the Langer civil-rights amendments to the oleo bill, pending on the floor of the Senate.

To get a vote now, Mr. President—not a year or 5 years or 10 years from now. The distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] yesterday admitted that the Democratic Party had been playing politics with all the civil-rights measures, and, for good measure, he accused the Republicans of doing likewise. I do not know what he knows about the Republican Party, but here is a leading Democrat, a man who has been governor of his State and is now Senator, admitting that the Democratic Party has been playing politics with the civil-rights issue.

So the director of the National Negro Council says they want to get a vote now. A million Negroes who signed this petition want a vote now. They want to get a vote now on the Langer civil-rights amendments to the oleo bill pending on the floor of the Senate.

The civil-rights delegation pointed out to Senator LUCAS that any motion made by him to lay the Langer civil-rights amendments on the table and any subsequent votes by any Senators to kill off any further consideration of civil rights at the very first opportunity in the second session of this Congress to vote in the Senate on civil rights would be construed and recorded as an unfriendly and destructive action, calculated only to indefinitely hold off the sincere supporters of civil rights and play into the hands of the Dixiecrat enemies of civil-rights legislation and defeat the patriotic demand of 15,000,000 Negroes, who sent 1,000,000 of their sons and daughters to fight in World War II for first-class citizenship in our American democracy.

The statement of the director of the National Negro Council continues:

The civil-rights delegation further pointed out to Senator LUCAS that in 20 years of Republican rule and 18 years of Democratic control of Congress no single antilynching bill had ever reached the voting stage in the Senate under the old two-thirds majority cloture rule or the new 64 two-thirds rule to stop filibuster by limitation of debate, in order to bring such legislation to a final vote in the Senate.

In 38 years, Mr. President, 20 years under the Republicans and 18 years under the Democrats, the antilynching bill has never been brought to a vote. No wonder a million Negroes signed the petition.

Edgar G. Brown, the spokesman, stated to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]:

There is the best chance in 40 years to get a vote now in the Senate by meeting this Senate parliamentary situation and the Dixiecrat filibuster tactics head on and calling for a vote on the Langer civil-rights amendments now which are the pending motion before the Senate. If the Senate leadership is seriously determined to carry out the President's demand to stay in Washington all summer if need be to pass the President's civil rights, there is no logic in the Senate leadership making a motion to lay the Langer civil-rights amendments on the table at this time. The President's civil-rights program as sponsored by Senator LANGER (Republican, North Dakota) is now the pending amendments before the Senate, and the final effort to force a vote, as the President promised the civil-rights delegation at the White House yesterday, can be fought out now by the majority leader, Senator LUCAS, demanding a Senate vote on civil rights. It takes the same 64 two-thirds vote of the Senate membership at this time, just as it would take 64 two-thirds vote at some future date set by the Senate majority leader, Senator LUCAS, to vote on civil rights. The true friends of civil rights—

Say these million Negroes through their leader, Edgar G. Brown—

and those Senators of both parties who ever intended to actually vote for the civil-rights legislation that so often has been promised and much lip service and ballyhoo broadcast have the best opportunity to make good to the Negro people by standing up now and being counted by voting for the Langer civil-rights amendments to the oleo bill now the only business officially before the Senate of the United States. Any promise of later consideration for civil-rights action by the Senate is patently and simply another filibuster tactic, this time the resort of the vote-dodging and those secretly opposed to the civil-rights program who have been fooling the Negro people by some ramification of these tactics for the past 25 years to my personal knowledge. The record is going to be made and recorded for the Eighty-first Congress and the Senate majority leadership on the Langer civil-rights amendments. A move by Senator LUCAS to table means defeat of civil rights and all Senators voting for it know it and the voters will know it from now on.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a telegram sent to me by Roy Wilkins, acting secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, be printed in full in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 16, 1950.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We have just sent the following telegram to various Members of Senate: "On behalf of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People we urge the defeat of the so-called civil-rights amendments offered by Senator WILLIAM LANGER to H. R. 2023, the bill to repeal oleomargarine tax. As you know this association since its inception 40 years ago has worked unceasingly to win for all persons, regardless of race, religion, or nationality security of person and freedom of political and economic opportunity. Senator LANGER does not intend for his amendments to further the cause of civil rights, he desires only to defeat the oleomargarine tax repeal. Senator LANGER made this clear in his speech on the Senate floor January 11 when he charged that the passage of H. R. 2023, 'will ruin thousands of farmers in the State of North Dakota.' Last year this association actively supported amendments to prohibit racial segregation in housing and education when respective bills were before the Senate. Racial discrimination in both of these fields is widely practiced and should be banned in all Federal aid to such programs. Lynching, poll taxes, and other civil-rights questions are not, however, germane to or involved in the repeal of the oleomargarine taxes. We therefore urge the defeat of the so-called Langer civil-rights amendments."

ROY WILKINS,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I now wish to make it very clear to the distinguished Members of the Senate why I offer these amendments at this particular time. As a friend of the Negro and a friend of the poor whites, I can only say that for 9 years, during all the time I have been a Member of the Senate, we have tried repeatedly to get a vote in the Senate on an antilynching bill, an anti-poll-tax bill, or on an FEPC measure, and it has not been done. Edgar G. Brown, whom I have just quoted, the director of the National Negro Council, says that to his own personal knowledge 25 years have passed and they have been unable to get a vote.

What did we find in 1932? We found President Roosevelt, as a candidate, talking about what? He wanted votes, so he talked about the underprivileged one-third. He talked and talked and talked. Nearly everyone believed that if the people were to make him President, and put the Democratic Party in power, one of the very first things they would do would be to pass civil-rights legislation. They were very powerful. They brought back whisky, Mr. President. They brought back the old saloon, where a young boy or girl could go and get drunk, standing up or sitting down. They brought back the saloon. They had a must program in Washington, and all they had to do was to call the tune. In the House they had a majority of 3 to 1, and in the Senate at one time the Republicans had only 16 Members. There were 80 Democratic Senators to 16 Republicans. Did they pass a civil-rights bill? Not one, Mr. President, not one. Talk about hypocrisy!

Four years went by, and again we heard about the underprivileged one-third, and again the Democrats were put into power. In 1940, in 1944, and in 1948 there was the same old cry, "We are for the poor people, we are for the Negro, we are for the poor whites."

Yesterday I received a pamphlet, Mr. President, sent to me from 312 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C., by Dewey Anderson, executive director of the Public Affairs Institute. Again they are out fooling the Negro, or attempting to.

I said yesterday that whenever a Negro got into some organization or society and became prominent, within a short time his name was on the Democratic pay roll somewhere in the Government.

Now let us see what this new outfit is, the Public Affairs Institute. After 18 years of confessed failure, when today the Negroes are worse off than they were when Mr. Roosevelt was first elected, something new appears—the Public Affairs Institute. Who are its sponsors? John M. Carmody is one of the sponsors. For years he was on the public pay roll, drawing one of the large salaries in the Government. Here he shows up again. This time he is a sponsor or director of the Public Affairs Institute.

Another sponsor is Hugh B. Mitchell, a former Member of this body, and now a Member of the House of Representatives. But during the time he was out of office, between the time he was a Senator and the time he was a Representative, he had a Federal job. Now we find him as a sponsor of the Public Affairs Institute.

Another sponsor is Charles A. Murray. He is on the Federal pay roll, or was a short time ago.

Another sponsor is Wendell Berge, formerly Assistant Attorney General. He was on the Federal pay roll for a long time. Do Senators know what job he had? Let me tell my distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] that Mr. Berge was at the head of the Antitrust Division for 11½ long years, and finally when the Republicans came in and I became chairman of the Civil Service Committee I asked him to appear before our committee one day. I said, "Mr. Berge, how long have you been at the head of the Antitrust Division?" He said, "Eleven and a half years." I said, "Name to this committee one man you sent to jail, or one corporation that was punished for violating the antitrust laws." He could not name one. For 11½ years he had been at the head of the Antitrust Division, drawing an enormous salary. He felt so ashamed when we got through with him that he went over to the Attorney General's Office and resigned. He should have resigned 11½ years before. Now we find him as one of the sponsors of the Public Affairs Institute, trying to fool the Negroes.

Another sponsor is John M. Coffee. He has a Federal job in the State of Washington.

Clifford J. Durr is another sponsor. As I remember, he had a job on the Federal Trade Commission for a long time and drew down a large Federal salary. He has been off the Federal pay roll for a little while, and now he is a sponsor of the Public Affairs Institute trying to fool the Negro, too.

Leon Henderson is another sponsor. We all remember Leon. Here he is again. Now he is one of the sponsors of the Public Affairs Institute. Yes, they are going to save the Negro for sure this time. They did not save him in 1933, 1934, 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948, or 1949. But in 1950, on January 9, 1950, they are going to start all over again, and this time they are going to save the Negroes for sure.

Then here is our old friend Maury Maverick, of Texas. I do not need to say anything about him.

Another sponsor is Culbert Olson, elected on the Democratic ticket to be Governor of California, and he made such a poor job of it that he was not reelected, and thereupon was given a Federal job. Here he is, as a sponsor of the Public Affairs Institute.

And here we find as a sponsor one of the Roosevelt boys, Jimmy Roosevelt. It always looks nice on a piece of stationery to have the name of one of the Roosevelt boys appear on it. There are three or four of them. Any one of them can be used as a sponsor whenever a sponsor is needed. Jimmy appears as a sponsor in this case. He is going to save the Negroes, just as his father was going to save them in 1933.

Then, of course, there appears the name of our old friend Aubrey Williams, who comes from Alabama. Aubrey Williams is the one who said that the farmers of North Dakota could till their farms with a unit consisting of a horse and an ox. He said a horse and an ox could pull a plow anywhere in North Dakota. He said a team would be enough for that purpose. This farm expert is now a sponsor for the Public Affairs Institute. Everyone in the State of North Dakota knows that the least number of horses needed to pull a plow is five. But Aubrey Williams under the NRA fixed the unit to pull a plow as an ox and a horse. He also limited the number of cows and chickens on the farm. While I was Governor of North Dakota I came to Washington in an endeavor to have the allotment increased, so the farmer could grow a larger crop.

Mr. President, I shall not read all the names of the sponsors. The list is a long one. I shall now read what they said in their letter to me, which represents the greatest confession of failure of the Democratic Party from 1933 up to the present time. This is what they say in their letter:

My Dear Senator—

The letter is written to me—

The startling revelation of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on the point of the low-income families shocked us.

Mr. President, just think of it. The Democrats have been in office 18 years, and under the Democratic administration there are more than 2,000,000 employees in the Government. Some of those who are sponsors of the Public Affairs Institute were heads of departments, some of which employed more than 100,000 persons. They now for the first time find out all about these low-income families and they say they are shocked. Mr. President, I think they should be shocked. I want to show what the Democratic Party did after 18 years of rule, according to their own report. Mind you, I did not write the matter from which I am about to read. It was written by Democrats. I will read what these men who have been drawing down huge salaries say. I repeat that one of the men who is a sponsor was formerly Governor of California, Culbert Olson. He is one of those who 18 or 19 years ago told the Negroes how he was going to help them.

Mr. President, I want to make it plain again that the senior Senator from North Dakota has voted for measures which would be of help to the Negroes every time such measures have been brought before the Senate. I was one of the few Senators who would not vote for the resolution which provided that 64 Senators had to sign a petition for cloture, before action could be taken. I defy any Senator upon this floor to find one time when the senior Senator from North Dakota did not vote for measures which would be of help to the underprivileged, whether Negroes or whites.

I am sick and tired of all the hypocrisy, of all the sham which has been exhibited. There was in office as President of the United States one man for a period of 16 years. Then his successor, also a Democrat, has been in office 3 or 4 years. Yet nothing has been done for the poorer people, or less than nothing.

When Mr. Roosevelt became President, within two blocks of the Capitol there were slums which were a disgrace to humanity. Now 17 or 18 years later they are still there. The Democratic Party was going to wipe out the slums. We heard all the beautiful speeches which were made to that effect. We heard speeches which told how the poor people were suffering, how in these slums the water supply was so close to the toilets that the poor people living in the slum dwellings were drinking polluted water and becoming sick with typhoid fever. It was said that if the Democrats were put in power such water pipes would be moved away from the toilets a certain number of feet so there would not be the danger of typhoid fever any more. Yet, after 18 years, those pipes are still there. The slums still exist within two blocks of our Capitol. Oh, the Democrats are going into every country in the world, saving the people everywhere, all over, at the four corners of the earth, and yet within two blocks of our own Capitol the slums are worse than ever. That, in spite of this great Democratic Party.

This is what is said by the men I have named, Leon Henderson, Hugh B. Mitchell, John M. Carmody, Culbert Olson, James Roosevelt, and all the others of them:

The Lower Third Described and Characterized.

In other words, we still have them all. It was at one time the lower third. Now it has increased. When the Republicans were voted out of power one-third of the population was underprivileged. Now, after 18 years of Democratic rule the number has increased to 40 percent. The number has gone up instead of down. I am reading from page 13 of the pamphlet entitled "The Lower Third":

The committee's own data reveals that one-half of all families headed by persons over 64 years of age received less than $2,000 income in 1949. More than a fourth of such families received less than $1,000 income. Even more significant, these old-age families account for nearly one-quarter of all low-income families.

That is their own record, Mr. President. One would figure that the Democrats would be so ashamed of the situation that now exists that they would be glad to vote for a civil-rights bill submitted by the senior Senator from North Dakota. One would figure the Democrats would not have the gall to stand up on the Senate floor and move to table the civil-rights measure.

Moreover, nearly a half of all families headed by women of working age had incomes of less than $2,000 a year.

They have the women working, Mr. President, in this great Democratic family. I continue to read:

Moreover, nearly a half of all families headed by women of working age had incomes of less than $2,000 a year. * * * More than 700,000 of these family heads were not even in the labor force at the time of the survey.

They do not even have a job.

Now, Mr. President, let us come to the Negroes, for whom the Democratic Party cries and cries, shedding crocodile tears. What is stated in this pamphlet

about my friend the Negro, Mr. President? I read further from the pamphlet:

The Negro's position is very clear from the committee's data. Among the low-income nonfarm families headed by persons of working age in 1948, one of every five was nonwhite, predominantly Negro.

Mr. President, mind you, I am quoting the Democrats themselves. No Republican wrote this book. If we examine the list of sponsors, we find no Republican among them. So far as I know, there is not a Republican among them.

I read further from the committee's statement:

There are about 1,000,000 Negro families living in our cities—

Listen to this, Mr. President, and then let the Democrats hang their heads in shame—

on incomes that do not permit of anything above bare subsistence.

Mr. President, because I see the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], here now, I wish to state again that the pamphlet from which I am reading is a report made by Democrats, including Leon Henderson, Jimmy Roosevelt, and all the others of a new organization, just set up, called the Public Affairs Institute. This report came off the press in January 1950. They say:

There are about 1,000,000 Negro families living in our cities on incomes that do not permit of anything above bare subsistence.

Imagine that, Mr. President. The Democrats themselves say the Negroes are in that position after 18 years of Democratic rule.

But then the Democrats in the Senate say that when a Senator tries on the floor of the Senate to secure the enactment of some legislation for the benefit of Negroes, the amendments he offers for that purpose should be tabled, when, as a matter of fact, the Democrats know that the only way to secure the enactment of such legislation is to have it enacted now, or else it never will be enacted at this session.

Mr. President, let me point out that one of the Democratic-controlled committees had one of these bills all last session, all during the first half of the present Congress. Yet that bill has not been reported as of today. How can anyone tell me that the committees will report an anti-poll-tax bill, when that bill has been tied up in committee for over a year.

Mr. President, the report from which I have been reading says that a million Negro families are on the verge of starvation. Think of that, Mr. President, after 18 years of Democratic rule.

A little while ago I saw a picture—in Life magazine, I believe—showing that in Harlem a Negro woman had to use a club to keep the rats off little children so the rats would not bite the children while they were sleeping.

This Democratic report then says:

Consider this comparison between white and colored families: In families headed by white males of working age only one out of nine had incomes of less than $2,000; but in similar families headed by nonwhites nearly two-fifths had incomes of less than $2,000.

Listen to this statement; and I point out that to this Democratic committee the statement was not even sufficiently important to be printed in large black type:

The causes of differences between whites and Negroes in income, occupation, health, living standards, cultural attainment, etc., are well known and have been so adequately described in the scientific literature as to require no elaborate comment here. It is sufficient to remark that the unique factor which is added to the other causes of poverty common to all groups is denial of equal occupational opportunity to colored people.

After 18 years of Democratic rule, Mr. President, mind you, after the time when the Democrats had a majority of over 3 to 1 in the House of Representatives, and after they had, here in the Senate, 80 Senators, as compared to 16 Republican Senators, after 18 years when the Democrats could write any kind of law they wanted to write, that is the result—after 18 years of Democratic rule.

Mr. President, now, when I have offered some amendments to help the colored people, some amendments which at last give the Senate an opportunity to be heard on the subject of civil rights, we find the distinguished Democratic Senator from Arkansas moving to lay this amendment on the table. Every Democrat on the other side of the aisle but one—the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]—voted to do that.

O Mr. President, they say the amendment is not germane to the bill which is before the Senate. They say, "We are considering oleomargarine." Since when, Mr. President, did oleomargarine become more important than human lives? Since when did oleomargarine become more important than little children who are dying? Let Senators look at the mortality rates in some of the slums. But the Democratic Party's members here in the Senate say, with only one member of their ranks voting against them: "We have had this matter up for 25 years. We have never gotten a vote on it, and it will not be voted on today. We will take it up some time later." That may be 1 month or 2 months or 3 months. But they simply say, "later." Of course, Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] said this morning that later, when it is brought up, a filibuster will result. If we are going to have a filibuster, let us have it at the beginning of the session. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to stay here every day and every night until we come to a conclusion on this matter which Mr. Edgar G. Brown, of Chicago, says has been pending for 25 years without ever having been voted on by the Congress.

Mr. President, the second session of the Eighty-first Congress met almost a month ago; but the anti-poll-tax bill still sleeps in committee.

I hold in my hand a copy of the Democratic platform for 1948. When the Democratic Party was looking for votes, it sang another tune. When the Democrats wanted votes from the Negroes, this is what they said in their platform. Mr. President, to save time, I now ask unanimous consent to have the civil-rights plank of the 1948 Democratic platform printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator also place in the RECORD, at the same time, the Republican platform?

Mr. LANGER. No; I will let the Senator from Illinois, my friend, place it in the RECORD. I am nonpartisan. Why should I not let the Senator from Illinois place it in the RECORD?

Mr. LUCAS. I thought the Senator from North Dakota was elected on the Republican ticket.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I decline to yield further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOWNEY in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. LUCAS. I have no objection. The Senator from North Dakota really pays a compliment to the Democratic Party by putting that part of the Democratic platform in the RECORD.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois knows that no one was more critical than I of what the Republican Party did not do in the last Congress. They pledged themselves to do this, that, and the other thing for the Negroes, but they did not do it. I stood upon this floor time after time and said so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

There being no objection, the plank referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Democratic national platform for 1948]

The Democratic Party is responsible for the great civil-rights gains made in recent years in eliminating unfair and illegal discrimination based on race, creed, or color.

The Democratic Party commits itself to continuing its efforts to eradicate all racial, religious, and economic discrimination.

We again state our belief that racial and religious minorities must have the right to live, the right to work, the right to vote, the full and equal protection of the laws, on a basis of equality with all citizens as guaranteed by the Constitution.

We highly commend President Harry S. Truman for his courageous stand on the issue of civil rights. We call upon the Congress to support our President in guaranteeing these basic and fundamental rights—

(1) The right of full and equal political participation;

(2) The right to equal opportunity of employment;

(3) The right of security of person;

(4) The right of equal treatment in the service and defense of our Nation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, to satisfy my friend, the Senator from Illinois, I shall read the Republican platform of 2 years ago. I have a copy of it before me, too. The Republican Party said at that time:

Lynching or any other form of mob violence anywhere is a disgrace to any civilized state, and we favor the prompt enactment of legislation to end this infamy.

One of the basic principles of this Republic is the equality of all individuals in

their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This principle is enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Constitution of the United States; it was vindicated on the field of battle and became the cornerstone of this Republic. This right of equal opportunity to work and to advance in life—

The FEPC—

should never be limited in any individual because of race, religion, color, or country of origin. We favor the enactment and just enforcement of such Federal legislation as may be necessary to maintain this right at all times in every part of this Republic.

We favor the abolition of the poll tax as a requisite to voting.

We are opposed to the idea of racial segregation in the armed services of the United States.

Mr. President, I want to be sure that it is understood that that is the statement of the Republican Party, and that it is not confused with the statements or platforms of the Democratic Party, because they are so much alike. However, neither one of the two parties kept their promises in their platforms. But I have just read from the Republican platform of 1948.

Then, of course, the Democrats offered to help the Indians, too. But the Indians were poorer, when the Democrats got through than when they started; and today they are far, far worse off than they were 18 years ago.

But, Mr. President, I wish to say that during the Eightieth Congress the Republican Party did not have the Presidency. As everyone knows, the Republicans have not had a President since 1933. So in the last analysis, the final responsibility is upon the Democratic Party, because, as I have said, there has been a Democrat as President during all this time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LANGER. No. I decline to yield, because I have only a short time left. I did not request the distinguished Senator to yield this morning, when he was talking, and I have so much to say about what the Democratic Party did not do, which they promised to do, that I simply do not have time to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. We come next to schools. I repeat this. The distinguished Senator was not present when I read the names of some of the sponsors of the Public Affairs Institute: John M. Carmody, who is a pay-roller; Hugh B. Mitchell, who was a pay-roller; Charles A. Murray who is a pay-roller; Wendell Berge, who was a pay-roller; John M. Coffee, who was a Democratic pay-roller. They are all Democrats. Clifford J. Durr, who was a Democratic pay-roller; Leon Henderson, who was a Democratic pay-roller; Maury Maverick, of Texas; Culbert Olson, of California; Jimmy Roosevelt—he is merely on it for good measure—and of course, Aubrey Williams—all sponsors of the Institute of Public Affairs. Now, after 18 years, they are going to save the Negro, and, I imagine, the poor whites. Here is what they have to say about education:

While schooling may not correlate perfectly with the occupational achievement and income, there can be no serious doubt of the so-called money value of schools. Few, again, see the necessity of possessing more than the rudiments of knowledge in making any appreciable headway in the workaday world. For the variety of incomes that are above the average incomes and stations, special preparation in educational institutions is the essential way of broadening skills and credentials that enable the recipient to perform.

I merely want to say, Mr. President, that the Democratic Party did such a poor job in helping out nationally on the matter of education that, when World War II broke out, roughly 800,000 young boys could not even pass the educational test required to get into the Army. The Democrats made the examination very simple. They said, "Is this a ball?" and they held up a ball. They then held up a square, and they would say, "Is this a square?" Eight hundred thousand of the boys could not pass the examination to get into the Army. They could not tell a square from a ball. That may seem farfetched. Many people may think it untrue, yet that is the record as disclosed upon the floor of the Senate.

This morning I heard some Senators say I was not sincere in offering these amendments. We shall find out who is sincere. Right now, I move that the Senate consider on the first Monday in February the bill (S. 1728) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin, the so-called FEPC bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the motion is out of order. There is something else pending before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the motion is out of order at this time.

Mr. LANGER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LANGER. When will the motion be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks the objection goes rather to the form than to the time.

Mr. LANGER. Then I move that the Senate proceed to consider the bill (S. 1728), known as the FEPC bill, immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That motion is in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move to lay the motion on the table, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LANGER. I did not yield for a quorum, but I yield on condition that, by unanimous consent, I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not understand the Senator. What was the last remark?

Mr. LANGER. I did not yield for the calling of a quorum, but I have no objection to the calling of a quorum, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator has already lost the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Then I ask unanimous consent that I may have it when we reconvene.

Mr. LUCAS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Millikin
Anderson	Hoey	Mundt
Benton	Holland	Murray
Bridges	Humphrey	Myers
Butler	Jenner	Neely
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Donnell	Kefauver	Russell
Douglas	Kem	Schoeppel
Downey	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Leahy	Sparkman
Ecton	Lehman	Taft
Ellender	Lodge	Taylor
Ferguson	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McCarran	Thye
Fulbright	McCarthy	Tobey
George	McClellan	Tydings
Gillette	McFarland	Vandenberg
Graham	McKellar	Watkins
Green	Magnuson	Williams
Gurney	Malone	Withers
Hayden	Martin	Young
Hendrickson	Maybank	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOWNEY in the chair). A quorum is present. The question is on the motion of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to take up the FEPC bill, which is Calendar No. 1211.

The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1728) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Chair kindly restate the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to take up the FEPC bill, which has just been stated by title.

On this question the Senator from North Dakota asks for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and several Senators voted when their names were called.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, is a parliamentary inquiry in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is voting on the motion of the Senator from Illinois to lay upon the table the motion of the Senator from North Dakota that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the FEPC bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Independently of what had been the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, if the motion of the Senator from North

Dakota should prevail, it would displace the oleo bill and return it to the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the motion made by the Senator from North Dakota should not be laid upon the table, what the Senator has stated would be the result.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. If the motion to lay on the table shall be defeated, then the Senate will have an opportunity to debate the motion to make the FEPC bill the pending business, and displace the oleo bill temporarily; will it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion would be debatable at that time.

Mr. AIKEN. But if the motion to lay on the table shall prevail, then any discussion as to bringing up the FEPC bill would be out the window; would it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would not be in order.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, if this motion should prevail, what would happen to the oleo bill? Would the Senate resume consideration of the oleo bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator restate his question?

Mr. MILLIKIN. If the motion of the Senator from Illinois should prevail, namely, to table the motion to proceed to the consideration of the FEPC bill, would the Senate then automatically go back to the oleo bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If the motion shall not prevail, then we will go ahead with the FEPC bill, independent of the oleo bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to consider it would then be debatable.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Under the latter alternative, what would be the status of the oleo bill? Would that go back on the calendar, to come up on separate motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate would have before it the consideration of the motion of the Senator from North Dakota to make the FEPC bill the order of business. If that were agreed to, then the oleo bill would go back to the calendar.

The clerk will resume the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. MCCARTHY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who is necessarily absent. If he were present and permitted to vote, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON] are attending the inauguration of Hon. John S. Battle as Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia and are therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business as members of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, holding hearings on various flood-control and public-works projects in the State of New Mexico.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] are absent on important public business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] would vote "yea."

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] would vote "nay" and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY], and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY] would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 17, as follows:

YEAS—59

Anderson	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Benton	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Bridges	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Kem	Pepper
Downey	Kilgore	Russell
Eastland	Leahy	Schoeppel
Ellender	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Frear	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Fulbright	Long	Sparkman
George	Lucas	Taft
Gillette	McClellan	Taylor
Graham	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Green	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Gurney	Magnuson	Tobey
Hayden	Malone	Tydings
Hill	Maybank	Vandenberg
Hoey	Millikin	Watkins
Holland	Mundt	Williams
Humphrey	Murray	Withers
Johnson, Colo.	Myers	

NAYS—17

Aiken	Dworshak	Langer
Butler	Ecton	McCarran
Cain	Ferguson	Martin
Capehart	Flanders	Thye
Cordon	Hendrickson	Young
Donnell	Jenner	

NOT VOTING—20

Brewster	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bricker	Hunt	Robertson
Byrd	Ives	Saltonstall
Chapman	Kerr	Stennis
Chavez	Knowland	Wherry
Connally	McCarthy	Wiley
Darby	McMahon	

So the motion of Mr. LUCAS to lay on the table Mr. LANGER'S motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] relating to the poll tax.

The amendment offered by Mr. LANGER is as follows:

On page 5, line 3, to strike out the word "This" and insert in lieu thereof "The foregoing provisions of this."

On page 5, after line 6, to add the following new sections:

"SEC. . The requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for President, Vice President, electors for President, or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, is not and shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for said officers, within the meaning of the Constitution, but is and shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding primaries and other elections for said national officers and a tax upon the right or privilege of voting for said national officers.

"SEC. . It shall be unlawful for any State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision to prevent any person from voting or registering to vote in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, on the ground that such person has not paid a poll tax, and any such requirement shall be invalid and void insofar as it purports to disqualify any person otherwise qualified to vote in such primary or other election. No State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision shall levy a poll tax or any other tax on the right or privilege of voting in such primary or other election, and any such tax shall be invalid and void insofar as it purports to disqualify any person otherwise qualified from voting at such primary or other election.

"SEC. . It shall be unlawful for any State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision to interfere with the manner of selecting persons for national office by requiring the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, and any such requirement shall be invalid and void.

"SEC. . It shall be unlawful for any person, whether or not acting under the cover of authority of the laws of any State or subdivision thereof, to require the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is the poll-tax amendment, a rather lengthy amendment, which has heretofore been read. Does the Senator desire to have it repeated?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think the statement of the Vice President is sufficient.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who is necessarily absent. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON] are attending the inauguration of Hon. John S. Battle as Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia and are therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business as members of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, holding hearings on various flood-control and public-works projects in the State of New Mexico.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent on official business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] would vote "yea."

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] who is absent by leave of the Senate is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] who is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 17, as follows:

YEAS—59

Anderson	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Benton	Johnson, Tex.	Myers
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Cordon	Kefauver	O'Conor
Douglas	Kem	O'Mahoney
Downey	Kilgore	Pepper
Eastland	Knowland	Russell
Ellender	Leahy	Schoeppel
Flanders	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Frear	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Fulbright	Long	Sparkman
George	Lucas	Taft
Graham	McCarran	Taylor
Green	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Gurney	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	McKellar	Tobey
Hill	Magnuson	Tydings
Hoey	Malone	Williams
Holland	Maybank	Withers
Humphrey	Millikin	

NAYS—17

Aiken	Ecton	Mundt
Butler	Ferguson	Thye
Cain	Hendrickson	Vandenberg
Capehart	Jenner	Watkins
Donnell	Langer	Young
Dworshak	Martin	

NOT VOTING—20

Brewster	Gillette	Morse
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Byrd	Hunt	Saltonstall
Chapman	Ives	Stennis
Chavez	Kerr	Wherry
Connally	McCarthy	Wiley
Darby	McMahon	

So Mr. FULBRIGHT's motion to lay on the table Mr. LANGER's amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, there is an amendment on the table which I ask to have read. The amendment was offered by me for myself and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. Since I offered the amendment I have added an additional paragraph.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. . (a) Effective on and after the first day of the first month which begins more than 20 days after the date of enactment of this act—

(1) the tax imposed by section 1700 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (tax on admissions);

(2) the tax imposed by section 3406 (a) (10) of such code (tax on electric light bulbs and tubes);

(3) the tax imposed by section 2400 of such code (tax on jewelry);

(4) the tax imposed by section 2401 of such code (tax on furs);

(5) the tax imposed by section 2402 of such code (tax on toilet preparations);

(6) the tax imposed by section 3465 (a) of such code (taxes on telegraph, telephone, radio, and cable facilities); and

(7) the taxes imposed by section 3469 of such code (taxes on transportation of persons, and on seating or sleeping accommodations in connection with such transportation);

shall be determined without regard to the war tax rates specified in section 1650 of such code.

(b) Effective on and after the first day of the first month which begins more than 20 days after the date of enactment of this act, section 1651 of the Internal Revenue Code (retailers' excise tax on luggage, purses, handbags, toilet cases, etc.) is hereby repealed.

(c) Effective on and after the first day of the first month which begins more than 20 days after the date of enactment of this act, section 3406 (a) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code (manufacturers' excise tax on photographic apparatus) is hereby amended by striking out "25 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "10 percent," and by striking out "15 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "10 percent."

(d) For the purposes of section 1657 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to floor stocks refunds on electric light bulbs) and of section 1658 of such code (relating to the application of the effective date of rate reduction in the case of telephone, telegraph, etc., services) the term "rate reduction date" means the first day of the first month which begins more than 20 days after the date of enactment of this act.

(e) Effective on and after the first day of the first month which begins more than 20 days after the date of enactment of this act, section 3475 of the Internal Revenue Code (tax on transportation of property) is hereby repealed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield so I may make a short statement?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield if I do not lose the floor thereby.

Mr. LUCAS. I assure the Senator he will not lose the floor. I simply wanted to make a statement to advise Senators that we are going to try to make disposition of this amendment before we recess. I hope Senators will not leave the floor.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the language of the amendment which has just been read is identical with that which is sometimes referred to as the Johnson of Colorado amendment, with the exception of the addition of the amendment previously offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] with reference to the tax on transportation. In preparing the amendment I have made no change in the Johnson amendment with the exception of the addition of the Cordon amendment.

The changes provided by this amendment affect admissions, electric-light bulbs, furs, jewelry, luggage, toilet preparations, communications, transportation of persons, and photographic apparatus. In the case of admissions, furs, most jewelry, and toilet preparations the rate would be reduced from 20 percent to 10 percent. Watches selling at retail for not more than $65, and alarm clocks selling for not more than $5, which are now taxed at 10 percent, would continue to carry the 10-percent rate.

The rate on electric-light bulbs would be reduced from 20 percent down to 5 percent. The tax on transportation of persons would be reduced from 15 percent to 10 percent.

I might say in that connection that the tax on transportation is very unfair, as I found recently in making a trip to a place in United States Territory, the Virgin Islands, to visit which one must pay a tax on transportation, whereas if one buys transportation to the Bahamas, to Trinidad, or some other islands not in American possession, but in the same area, one pays no tax.

In the case of luggage, the retailers' excise tax of 20 percent is eliminated entirely, and in its place, the manufacturers' tax of 10 percent is restored. This manufacturers' tax applies to fewer articles than does the present retailers' excise tax. For example, it does not apply to ladies' handbags but is restricted only to trunks, valises, traveling bags, suitcases, hat boxes for use by travelers, fitted toilet cases, and other travelers' luggage, and leather and imitation leather brief cases.

The tax rates on photographic equipment have been especially burdensome and have apparently sharply reduced sales and employment in that vital industry. The tax on cameras and camera equipment was particularly high—25 percent—and was imposed early in the war for the primary purpose of discouraging civilians from purchasing such equipment at a time when the national defense needed virtually the entire output of the industry. By the terms of my amendment, the present 25-percent rate on cameras and camera equipment, and the 15-percent rate on films, would both be reduced to 10 percent.

Last year when this proposal was under consideration by the committee, the revenue loss on an annual basis was computed to be about $628,000,000. The category in which the largest single loss of revenue occurs is admissions. The admissions tax is primarily a tax on the average man when he goes to inexpensive places of amusement, such as motion picture theaters. In my judgment, this tax is particularly objectionable, since it is paid very largely by the poor man, not by the rich man.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not feel that my proposal is merely an attempt to load down the oleomargarine bill with amendments. This question of revising the excise-tax structure has been before us for several years now, but the Congress has never had a real chance to vote on the question. If my amendment is rejected, there is no guaranty at all, other than the statement which has just been made to us by the majority leader, that we shall have another chance to vote on excise-tax reduction at this session of Congress.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to associate myself with the Senator from Nebraska on this amendment, in view of the fact that on April 27 of last year, I submitted an amendment very much the same as this one. I should like to solicit from the Senator from Nebraska his opinion as to whether he shares with me the fear that if we fail to enact this excise-tax relief at this time, it may be the only opportunity we shall have at this session of Congress to have a clear-cut decision on whether or not to decrease the excise taxes.

Mr. BUTLER. I very definitely share that fear.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield further?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. We have heard reports emanating from the other side of the aisle that there will be an opportunity at this session of Congress to vote on excise taxes, which is an altogether different prophecy, of course, from the statement that we shall be given an opportunity to vote on these precise taxes at this session, without having attached thereto proposed new taxes or taxes in other areas.

So it seems to me that those of us in the Senate who are desirous of reducing excise taxes at this session of Congress, without increasing taxes in some other area, have this one opportunity, and this one only, that they can be assured of, to so register their views.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the Senator, I share with him the fear that if the amendment is not adopted at this time, we shall not have an opportunity to vote on this matter again for another year, which is quite a long time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this amendment is almost identical to one incorporated in the Wiley amendment, except it includes the Cordon amendment, which was rejected by a vote of 33 to 58, as I recall, the day before yesterday.

It was discussed at considerable length, as the Senator well knows. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the Finance Committee, assured the Senate that this approach is the best one by which not to secure a reduction in the excise taxes.

I can assure the Senate, particularly those who seem to be so desirous of reducing taxes, that this amendment is not the best way of doing so.

There are many other Senators who have expressed themselves on the floor of the Senate as desiring to secure a reduction in taxes. The chairman of the Finance Committee assured us that we can later reach a vote on a bill, now on the calendar, which does involve a direct, out-and-out reduction of excise taxes. Since we have had so much discussion of it, it would seem to me to be quite proper——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the motion which I assume he is about to make? I should like, if I may, to have the privilege of saying a few words on this subject.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall withhold it, if I may have the understanding that I shall have the floor later to make the motion. I do not wish to lose an opportunity to make the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will have to yield the floor in order for the Senator from Ohio to take it. The Chair will give consideration to the Senator from Arkansas, if he is on his feet seeking recognition.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Very well; I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have consistently voted against amendments to the oleomargarine-tax-repeal bill which I thought would in any way block the passage of the bill. However, in my opinion, there is no reason to believe that this amendment will do so, particularly in view of the fact that the bill which is the basis of this amendment was actually reported favorably to the Senate by the Finance Committee as long ago as July 11. It has been on the calendar for 6 months. Yet the majority leadership has not seen fit to call up the bill.

If the pending bill goes to the House of Representatives with this amendment attached to it, inasmuch as the House leaders have stated that they are in favor of a reduction of excise taxes, then if they are prepared to add such a provision to another bill, that will be quite all right with me. In such case, I think the Senate can recede in the conference from this excise-tax-reduction amendment.

But it seems to me our hands are tied unless we act now. This question has been before us, and it has been before the House of Representatives. So far, the House of Representatives has refused to take action on it. Apparently the House intends to act on it only in common with a number of other provisions regarding taxation.

Mr. President, it seems to me that if we wish to request the House of Representatives to take immediate action on it, this is the best way to do so. I am not sure the House of Representatives will not accept this excise-tax-reduction amendment as a part of the oleomargarine tax-repeal bill. I am not sure that the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives will not give a rule for the consideration and adoption of the amendments as we in the Senate may adopt them to this bill, including the excise-tax-reduction amendment.

But if that is not done in the House of Representatives, at least the House will have the choice of passing a separate excise-tax-reduction bill and sending it to the Senate.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the industries which are affected by excise taxes will find that their sales of merchandise will practically cease from the time when it is agreed in Congress that excise taxes shall be reduced. That will be true in regard to the sale of jewelry and other articles affected by the excise taxes, because the people will wait for the cuts in excise taxes to come.

So, Mr. President, if we do not take this action today, I do not think we shall get any such excise-tax-reduction bill from the House of Representatives until July or until such time as the various industries are seriously affected.

Mr. President, I am not in favor of in any way hampering the oleo-tax-repeal bill, except as it may be delayed for perhaps a week or two in the House of Representatives while the subject matter of this amendment is fought out.

Therefore I propose to vote for the amendment to repeal the excise taxes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not care to argue this question. This amendment is the one way not to secure any legislation on the reduction of excise taxes at this session of Congress.

The other day I stated to the Senate—clearly, I hope—that it is very unfair to send a bill, including an amendment of this character, to the Agricultural Committee of the House of Representatives, from which conferees would be appointed. It is very unfair to the Senate Finance Committee. It is very unfair to all of us who have any responsibility for the fiscal affairs of the Nation.

If this amendment is adopted as a part of this bill, the conferees will consist of a number from the Senate Finance Committee and a number from the House of

Representatives Committee on Agriculture, if the bill ever gets to that point. It makes no difference whether the committee wishes to strike out these excise taxes without considering other taxes. Certainly when a responsible conference committee is called on to give consideration to the possibility of raising additional taxes, we ought to have the advice and counsel of the able men on the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives who, through long years of experience, have studied tax problems.

This amendment will cost the Government more than a billion dollars. We already have a deficit of $5,500,000,000 for this fiscal year. The President in his message estimated the deficit for the next fiscal year at $5,133,000,000.

The amendment is not the way to obtain tax reduction, Mr. President. This amendment certainly is not the way to encourage hope of securing the enactment of any legislation dealing with the repeal of the oleomargarine tax.

Therefore I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

The items considered by the Senate Finance Committee, and which now are included in a bill on the calendar, would cost the Treasury $670,000,000. The repeal of the tax on freight alone would cost the Treasury $330,000,000. So the total loss under this amendment, if it should be adopted, would be at least $1,000,000,000.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me inquire how different is the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska from the bill reported last fall by the Senator's committee?

Mr. GEORGE. In part it is the same bill, but it includes additional features, particularly as regards the freight tax. The repeal of that tax alone will cause the Treasury to lose more than $330,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The President did recommend last year, as I remember, that the freight tax be removed.

Mr. GEORGE. He did, but he also recommended that there be some compensatory taxes. I do not commit myself to compensatory taxes. But as a responsible Member of the Senate, viewing the fiscal status of the Government, I do commit myself to have an open mind and a fair chance to try to balance the budget and to try to begin payments on the national debt. I know this amendment is the way to defeat every intelligent effort to secure excise-tax reduction at this time. Of course, it is obvious, I think, that if it should have that effect, it would also jeopardize any action upon the oleomargarine bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. The oleo tax bill, without this amendment attached, would go to conference, with members selected from the Agricultural Committee of the House and from the Finance Committee of the Senate, in any case, would it not?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, that is where it would go, and the Agricultural Committee certainly would claim jurisdiction in the House. We would not have the advantage of a committee of 25 men who for a long, long period of years have given study to tax problems.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not suppose the Senator can answer the question, but I wonder how the pending bill happened to miss the Ways and Means Committee in the first place?

Mr. GEORGE. For more than 45 years, legislation affecting oleomargarine has been handled by the Agricultural Committee of the House. That is why it missed it. It never has been considered a tax matter. The Senator's amendment is not really germane under any strict construction because the oleomargarine tax was imposed confessedly as a regulatory matter, and the principal burden of the oleomargarine tax lies in a license tax or occupation tax, rather than in an excise tax.

Mr. BUTLER. I should also like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, whether his attitude would be a little more favorable to the proposal, if the tax on transportation, which is now included in the amendment, were eliminated? That would reduce the loss to the Treasury by $330,000,000, the Senator says.

Mr. GEORGE. It would be better on the Treasury, but the committee has already voted on the question of the tax on freight, which, as a matter of fact, presents one of the most meritorious cases for the lifting of the tax. I am not against the lifting of the excise taxes. Many months ago I said they should be lifted. There is a bill on the calendar, very high up on the calendar, known as House bill 3905, which deals with these specific taxes, and that calendar number can be taken up on motion at any time. If it is not taken up with the agreement of the leaders on this side, I myself propose, as I have already stated, to move to take it up at some reasonably early date.

I wish first of all to have a further conference with the Ways and Means Committee of the House in the interest of greater harmony, because if there is not some cooperation between the two houses, we shall be unable to do what a great many of us desire to do, and that is to eliminate or substantially reduce many of the wartime excise taxes.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator another question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Nebraska for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. The proposal would reduce the tax to 10 percent. It would cut it generally from 20 percent to 10 percent, which is perhaps as much as the Senator contemplated in the reduction of excise taxes at this period, anyway. So I do not see that it is at all out of reason. The question, when it finally comes, is going to be whether we shall have a complete repeal, or merely a reduction in the excise tax. In this case we are only asking for about a 50 percent reduction.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, I understand. If we want to repeal all the wartime excise taxes, it would mean a loss to the Treasury of about two billion, three hundred, or four hundred million dollars. This amendment would deplete the Treasury—that is, upon the present basis—to the extent of about one billion dollars in round figures. My position is taken not because I am opposing the removal of the taxes; but because I know, that if we take this course, we foredoom any reasonable hope of a tax-reduction program at this session of the Congress.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator think that if this question comes up independently, before we get through with the specific excise tax bill, we will have reduced these taxes by $1,500,000,000, instead of only $1,000,000,000, as proposed in this amendment, or $900,000,000, or whatever the figure may be?

Mr. GEORGE. I think so.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator think that, on the whole, it might be better to take this lump-sum reduction as proposed by the amendment, rather than to have it come later?

Mr. GEORGE. No. This is not a way by which any relief whatever can be had against excise taxes, and it is not the way by which the effort to obtain relief should be undertaken. We certainly ought not to preclude the taxing committee of the other House from some real consideration and participation in the matter, because there is a second step, namely, whether we are to raise additional taxes, and there also remains the question whether this is a sufficient reduction. All these matters are so intimately related that I think we ought not to proceed in this way. I do not propose to make a motion to table, but I earnestly request that the Senate proceed to vote upon the amendment as quickly as possible. I hope it will be rejected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT obtained the floor.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a minute so that I may ask the Senator from Georgia a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I appreciate the graciousness of both Senators in allowing me to ask a question of the Senator from Georgia. It is not germane to the present discussion, but it bears on the matter of taxes and the President's request for new taxes, and the income of the Federal Government. As the Senator knows, I have been deeply interested in the subject of bringing the tax laws into line so that the motto inscribed in imperishable granite over the Supreme Court, "Equal justice under the law," might be even more than a statement in cold stone, and instead might become a living force in our country's financial affairs. I am referring to a bill which is in the Finance Committee of the Senate, a bill which I caused to be introduced more than a year ago, whereby a remedy may be

found for a very pressing problem. Throughout the country, there are so-called charitable trusts, which are milking the honest taxpayers of hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars, by those who are escaping taxation by finesse. The legislation which I have introduced seeks to correct that evil. I have talked to the Senator from Georgia and also to my colleague from Colorado, and every time the question is asked, I get the answer, "It must originate in the Ways and Means Committee of the House." That sounds good to me, but in another way, when I go to the House Committee on Ways and Means, I find it difficult to get action. The question I now propound to the Senator from Georgia is this: Here is a crying need. It relates to a phony situation in the tax mechanics, whereby clever and dishonest men are evading their just share of honest taxes. How am I, a Senator from New Hampshire, who bears this matter in his heart as a real problem, going to get justice for the taxpayers of America, through either of the great committees of the House and Senate, who have these matters in charge? Will the Senator advise me in friendly intercourse and relationship, about it? Must I leave it with these committees, or should I adopt the suggestion made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and wait for the time when his bill (H. R. 8935) comes on the floor, which he is going to call up, and then seek to amend it with my proposed legislation here on the floor? I should rather do it through hearings, and have this matter expounded and shown up to the country at large, and acquire some good will and momentum behind it. But I am a disappointed soul, traveling around in this great vast area on Capitol Hill under a sense of frustration and getting nowhere fast. Therefore, I ask the Senator to help me out of my slough of despondency, to lift me out of the miry legislative and parliamentary clay, and put my feet on a rock foundation, in order that justice may triumph over injustice.

Mr. GEORGE. I shall undertake to do so, as fast and as speedily as possible. I can assure the Senator that he would be at liberty to offer an amendment, but the problem to which he has referred is complicated. A very technical amendment would have to be drawn to do what the Senator wants to do, and not do too much. It is a highly technical and complicated problem, action on which should be based on testimony taken in hearings. However, any tax program which may come before the Senate from the House this year dealing with any technical or administrative provisions of the act would certainly be an appropriate place for the amendment which the Senator from New Hampshire desires to offer.

I may say to the Senator that at some interval in the hearing on social security—I would not want to suspend social security in midair indefinitely, because I know he will agree with me that that is an important bill, too—but at some interval in the social-security hearing, the Finance Committee will be pleased to give the opportunity for a hearing on the bill which the Senator has introduced, because it is a bill of the technical character I have indicated, upon which a hearing should be held.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator in all sincerity, but I wonder whether the Senator is aware of one provision in my proposed legislation, which I think ought to meet with universal approval, regardless of party. It is the provision which requires all these trusts, good, bad, and indifferent, to be registered with the Department of Commerce or with the Department of the Treasury, with a statement of their assets and liabilities, a copy of the indenture under which they operate, the beneficiary, how much has been paid, and so forth. Therefore, the Department of Commerce or of the Treasury, as the case might be, could then look over the facts and figures, separate the sheep from the goats, the chaff from the wheat, and determine which are honest-to-God charitable trusts and which are not. Does the Senator feel it is advisable to have a registry of these trusts?

Mr. GEORGE. I repeat what I have said, the Senator is in a very technical and entirely complex field.

Mr. TOBEY. If I may ask this question, Does the Senator from Georgia mean by that, that the Senator from New Hampshire, by this proposed legislation, is treading upon the toes of some very sacred cows in America?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no; I do not at all mean that. I am saying the Senator's proposal, as he has offered it—I am now speaking very frankly—would undo so many charitable and religious trusts that I think, before the Senator was through with it, he would be asking the Finance Committee to reenact a part of the law which he might have repealed. It is therefore a subject matter which is not like an excise tax on jewelry or furs or freight bills. It is one that needs some study.

I do not speak now with official permission or information, but I may say that I think I have some ground upon which to base the statement that in the special tax message which the President himself proposes to send to the Congress, perhaps this week or perhaps next week, certain things are going to be referred to as loopholes, and both the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate will be asked to close those loopholes. I am quite sure that what the Senator really has in mind, which is covered by the bill which he introduced, will be one of the indicated loopholes. I have said my information is not official, but if it is at all trustworthy, it is one of the loopholes that both committees and both Houses of Congress will be asked to close. So I think the Senator is going to have full opportunity. So far as excise taxes are concerned, as I have said, the bill is very high on the calendar, and, by motion, it could be taken up tomorrow or any other day when there is not some special order. If it is not taken up at a reasonably early date, I myself pledge the Senator that I shall make the motion, and if I get a majority vote, the Senate will consider it.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I merely conclude with this statement, if I may: I appreciate the words of the Senator from Georgia, the distinguished leader of the great Committee on Finance, and I welcome his cooperation and help and aid and criticisms, constructive and otherwise, as I approach this matter. He has a great degree of intelligence and understanding of this complex subject. He can be a tremendous ally.

There are in the hinterlands of America 140,000,000 persons suffering great injustice. Clever lawyers are relieved of the yoke of taxation which other citizens have to bear. Every dollar which clever lawyers arrange to escape paying the rest of us have to pay, and every industry which avoids its fair share of taxation by establishing and operating charitable trusts has done its fellows throughout the country a great injustice. Common justice cries out to right this wrong.

So, Mr. President, I again refer to the United States Supreme Court Building, which cost $9,000,000. I have looked at the motto which is engraved on it; I love it and cherish it; but let us make it a living force—"Equal justice under law." Make it true in America, so that common men can say that on Capitol Hill we mean what we say.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement in corroboration of what the distinguished Senator from Georgia has said with respect to consideration of excise taxes at some time during this session. In the colloquy which I had a few days ago with the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the record will show that I advised him that at some time in the near future during the second session of the present Congress, we will consider the repeal of excise taxes. I agree with the Senator from Georgia that the machinery for the repeal of those taxes should be set in action in the House of Representatives, through the Ways and Means Committee of that body. That committee has been handling such questions for many years. If that committee reports this proposed legislation and the Finance Committee of the Senate has an opportunity to consider it, we shall then have a tax bill coming to us in an orderly way in line with the Democratic processes as we understand them.

Just so surely, Mr. President, as we attach amendments to the oleomargarine bill relating to excise taxes, we are likely to get neither the repeal of the tax on oleomargarine or the repeal of any other excise taxes.

I appeal to those Senators who are vitally concerned with repealing excise taxes to vote down this amendment. I appeal to my friends on this side of the aisle, as well as those on the other side of the aisle, to remember that in the near future we shall consider in the Senate of the United States the repeal of the war-time excise taxes.

Another reason this amendment should not be adopted at this hour is that the Congress of the United States should wait for the message of the President of the United States upon the question of taxation. That message will be placed before the Congress in the immediate future. After it has been received we shall have an opportunity to

determine from it what the Congress should do.

I appeal to my friends on both sides of the aisle to reject this amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As to the suggestion that we pass the bill which has been referred to, which has been pending for 6 months, does not the Senator feel that it is such an unimportant bill that the House would simply ignore it, whereas, if we attach an amendment to the margarine bill the House cannot ignore it? The House must either act on the tax-repeal amendment attached to the margarine bill, or must originate a separate bill in order that we may be able to remove the excise-tax from oleomargarine.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, my reply is simply this: I do not know what the President will recommend with respect to the repeal of excise taxes. Assuming he may recommend the repeal of all the wartime excise taxes, that may also be the position taken by the House of Representatives. But, so far as I am concerned, I do not want to see the job half done. If we are going to undertake the repeal of excise taxes, we should do it in a thorough and orderly manner rather than to take a bite here and a bite there and keep the housewife and the individual purchaser from buying, because the purchaser will say to himself, "Well, I shall wait, because they have taken a little off this excise tax, and I am sure they are going to take some more off, and finally they will repeal it all."

I do not think we shall stimulate the buying power of the country by repealing excise taxes in a piecemeal fashion. In other words, if we want to give to the country an orderly piece of legislation, so far as the repeal of excise taxes is concerned, we had better follow normal processes rather than to do what some Members are trying to do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the affirmative when his name was called.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum was recently declared to be present. Moreover, the roll call has begun, and one Senator has voted.

The roll call will be proceeded with.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON] are attending the inauguration of Hon. John S. Battle as Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia and are therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business as members of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, holding hearings on various flood-control and public works projects in the State of New Mexico.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] on this vote. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] would vote "nay."

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is absent on official business, is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who is absent on official business, is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who is absent on official business, is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—32

Aiken	Hendrickson	Millikin
Butler	Jenner	Mundt
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Capehart	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Knowland	Taft
Donnell	Langer	Thye
Dworshak	Lodge	Tobey
Ecton	McCarran	Vandenberg
Ferguson	McCarthy	Watkins
Flanders	Malone	Young
Gurney	Martin	

NAYS—43

Anderson	Humphrey	Myers
Benton	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Douglas	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Downey	Kilgore	Russell
Eastland	Leahy	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Lehman	Sparkman
Fulbright	Long	Taylor
George	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Graham	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Green	McFarland	Tydings
Hayden	McKellar	Williams
Hill	Magnuson	Withers
Hoey	Maybank	
Holland	Murray	

NOT VOTING—21

Brewster	Frear	Morse
Bricker	Gillette	Pepper
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Chapman	Hunt	Saltonstall
Chavez	Ives	Stennis
Connally	Kerr	Wherry
Darby	McMahon	Wiley

So Mr. BUTLER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, after line 10, it is proposed to add a new subsection, as follows:

(f) Section 402 of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (21 U. S. C., sec. 342) is amended by adding a new subsection (e) as follows:

"(e) If it is oleomargarine or margarine and any of the seeds, beans, nuts, copra, fats, oils, or other raw material used therein consisted in whole or in part of any filthy, putrid, or decomposed substitutes, or was otherwise unfit for food."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, just a brief word of explanation. The amendment merely applies the pure food and drug sanitation and health code to the materials used in processing oleomargarine. It merely equalizes the sanitation and health standards between oleomargarine and butter.

The only implication of the amendment is that where at present oleo health standards are checked in the refined oil, the amendment would necessitate the checking of the sanitation standards of the raw materials, and check oleo back at the pressing mill or at the plant level, as is done in the case of butter.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. May I ask if this is precisely and exactly the same sanitary test that is applied now to butter, or does it go further, or not so far?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe it is identical with the test applied in the case of butter. Its jurisdiction is limited. In the case of butter it goes back to the creamery, and the amendment providcs that in the case of oleo the test shall go back to the processing plant, or the plant where the seed or other raw material is processed.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not know, from the Senator's answer, whether it is precisely the same. He says he thinks it is precisely the same. I should like to have a yes or no answer, so I could judge the amendment in its relationship to what is required in the case of butter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I said to the best of my knowledge. I do not claim to be an expert in pure food and drug administration, but the amendment applies the same standard to oleo and the raw materials entering into oleo in processing as is applied to butter as it comes on the creamery level.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it not a fact that both butter and oleomargarine are today subject to the Pure Food and Drug Act in the same way? The implication of the amendment is that there is something peculiarly wrong about oleomargarine. The language that is used is designed to try to induce one to think it is normally a filthy, putrid, or decomposed substance, exactly along the line of the argument of a few days ago. I have accepted two amendments which were really designed to prevent any kind of deception.

This amendment was not submitted to the committee. I saw it only a moment ago myself. I am confident it adds nothing to the legitimate protection of the consumer. Actually, the pure food and drug law does not pursue butter back to the source from which it comes, the cow, except in those areas where there is regulation of fluid milk.

I see no reason for singling out oleomargarine at this late day to imply that there is some peculiarity about the raw material. There is no such peculiarity. I do not like to accept the amendment. We are not trying to palm off any decomposed or putrid materials. Those administering the Pure Food Act, during the past 20 years of supervision, have found 100 times as many contaminated materials in butter as in oleomargarine, and I cannot see that this is a legitimate amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me reply to the Senator from Arkansas by saying that there is no intention of trying to say that oleo is either putrid, decomposed, or filthy, nor is there any attempt to say that of butter. This is merely an attempt, since we ask for the application of health standards to the dairy farmer, to have more rigid inspection as to oleo.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It does not apply to butter at all, and at the present time we have the same coverage in the pure food law.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. THYE. The junior Senator from Minnesota is justified in offering this amendment, and I ask the sponsors of the oleomargarine legislation to accept the amendment, for the reason that when the oil comes from the processing plants, the gins where the cottonseed is ginned from the cotton itself, and where the oil is squeezed from the cottonseed are not under the same rigid inspection and sanitary and health requirements which a creamery making butter is required to meet.

This is an effort to give protection to the consumer of oleomargarine, knowing very well that there will be a great increase in the consumption of oleomargarine when the tax is removed. We must safeguard the public, and know that the processing plants which are engaged in processing the raw materials which eventually go into the product come under the same sanitary standards which apply to creameries.

Mr. President, for this reason the amendment of the junior Senator from Minnesota is entirely justified, and the sponsors of the bill should accept the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair warns the junior Senator from Minnesota that he may yield for a question only, and not for speeches.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I appreciate the application of the rule by the Chair, but I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that it has not been done heretofore during the debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The fact that a rule is not applied when the Senate is running along in a normal situation is no reason why it should not apply late in the day when every Senator is trying to get a vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I assure the Chair that there is no desire for delay on my part, whether Senators are for health or sanitation or not.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was not completely satisfied with the Senator's answer to the Senator from Maryland because I am quite sure there is nothing in the pure-food law to justify the statement that the same standard would apply to butter. But if so, would the Senator be willing to add the word "butter"? If the Senator would add the word "butter" to his amendment, so as to have the same implication apply to butter, I think it would improve it. There would be no discrimination if the word "butter" were added.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am against discrimination in employment, as well as in spread.

Mr. ANDERSON. Would the Senator be willing to add the word "butter" to his amendment? I should like to see him do so, because I would not like to have the farmers think that butter is made from putrid or decomposed substances.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am willing to accept the amendment if the Senator will add the word "butter." Then we might add "cheese," if the Senator would like to do that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have before me the Federal Security Agency's notices of judgments under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in pursuance of section 705 of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. The pamphlet is filled with certain cases pertaining to the dairy industry. There does not seem to be any notation in reference to the matter of the oleo industry, simply because oleo has its sanitary standards at the stage of the refined oil, when the refined oil has been fully processed, but the dairy farmer is required to meet the standards at the stage where the product comes from the farmer, at the creamery level. All we are asking for is that the processors of oleo have exactly the same requirements, placed upon them, because there is in the Pure Food and Drug Act ample law, I will say to all those who have sought the answer with reference to the butter industry, and all those familiar with the act know that to be true.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator will agree to insert, after the words "oleomargarine or margarine," the words "or butter," we will take it to conference, and if what the Senator has stated to be the fact with regard to the law is so, I shall have no objection. I do not think the statement is quite accurate, however. If it is accurate, I have no objection if both oleomargarine and butter are included. I understand that to be the position of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota has submitted an amendment pertaining to the health standards and inspection relating to oleo and raw

materials going into oleo. I will leave it to the Members of the Senate to decide whether they want to vote for such standards for the protection of the consumers and for the health of the American people. The record is replete with cases of the use of the courts and the laws of the country with respect to the dairy industry, as was testified to by the Senator from Arkansas and others. The Senator said on the Senate floor that the cases of adulteration of dairy products are some 100 times more than the cases of adulteration of oleo. The reason for the cases respecting dairy products is the rigid supervision that exists, even down to the local level, even down as far as the local dairy barns, insofar as local and State laws are concerned.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is, I think, entirely in error in that statement. The application of the pure-food laws does not go back to the farm.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota did not say that the application of the pure-food laws went back to the farm.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The reason that there have not been so many cases in connection with margarine is simply that it is easier to protect margarine from contamination. There is no secret about that. That comes about by reason of the way margarine is made. It is mechanically made in a factory, and it is much easier to protect it from the ordinary kind of bacteria that gets into milk. I do not want to become involved in another argument about the relative merits of the two. The fact is that margarine is pure and easier to keep clean.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not want to get into an argument respecting the relative merits of the two.

I understand the Senator from Minnesota refuses to apply the language to butter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; I did not refuse.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then I shall accept the amendment, if the Senator will add the word "butter."

Mr. HUMPHREY. If my friend, the Senator from Arkansas, wishes to offer another amendment with respect to butter we will consider it on its merits, and since he is so vitally concerned about the health standards and purity standards of butter, and I am concerned about the health and purity standards of oleo, I shall offer my amendment on oleo, and be more than happy to vote, and vote intelligently, on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas affecting butter.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I wish to ask the junior Senator from Arkansas a question. Is it not true that the oils, whether they be the cottonseed oil or the soybean oil or any other bean oil, or the coconut oil that is shipped from the South Sea islands are not subject to inspection under the Pure Food and Drug Act? Does the Senator think those oils are processed in a more sanitary manner or in a cleaner manner than the average dairy product which is handled in the creameries throughout the land? I should like to have the Senator ponder that question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We have talked about that for 2 weeks, and we can go on for two or more weeks discussing it.

Mr. THYE. I have seen a ginning plant. I have seen the open vats and the open spouts which convey the oil. I have seen all around such an operation flies which have followed the oil down through the open spouts to the oil vats. The oleomargarine is made from that. It may be pasteurized, it may be cooked, it may be purified by straining, but nevertheless that is a contamination the oil is subjected to when it is being processed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the Senate vote on my amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota, in paragraph (e), after the words "or margarine" to insert the words "or butter."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. [Putting the question.]

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] as amended. [Putting the question.]

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I note that we may have a vote on the bill before very long. I should like to make a short statement before the vote is taken. I am very sorry that a considerable part of the press and the radio has seen fit to play up this controversy as a struggle over the tax on oleomargarine.

I am for the removal of that tax, as well as for the removal of any direct tax on food commodities, and I am sure that practically the entire dairy industry has no objection to the removal of the tax. We did, however, feel that every effort should be made so to shape this bill that there would be no possibility of imposition on the consumer, or unfair competition with the dairy interests through misrepresentation or misbranding of the product itself.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] was intended for that purpose. However, that amendment did not prevail.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], which was accepted by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and which I certainly hope will be kept in the bill in the conference committee, will, if effectively enforced, prevent the sale or representation of oleomargarine as a dairy product, and provide effective penalties for the enforcement thereof. I personally think that that amendment, offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, as amended by the penalty provision which I proposed, probably gives the dairy industry as much or more protection than the Wiley-Gillette amendment would have given. I feel we have done all that law can do to prevent misrepresentation in this respect. So far as that goes, I see no reason why one cannot now vote for the bill with that amendment attached to it, as well as one could have voted for it had the Wiley-Gillette amendment been accepted. Because, after all, most of us, even those of us from the dairy States, are willing to remove the tax on oleomargarine.

I should like to say, however, that the enactment of this legislation will hurt the dairy interests somewhat. It will make competition much easier. People who do not know the difference are bound to buy oleomargarine and use it, thinking they are using butter. We may expect a decline in the price of dairy products probably within 2 or 3 months after the bill becomes law. We may expect an increase in the cost of oleomargarine to the poor people of our cities, because when yellow oleomargarine becomes the product which is generally carried in the stores, the price will be raised as near as the manufacturers and the dealers can raise it to the butter price. So far as the consumer is concerned, as was pointed out by the able junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] the other day, the consumer in all probability is going to pay more for oleomargarine.

Yes, the dairy industry is going to be hurt somewhat. Our entire economy will be hurt somewhat. But so long as each product is sold under its true name, if not under its true colors, then we can hardly complain. If people prefer oleomargarine then they will buy it. If they prefer butter they will buy that, if they know they are getting butter.

I have referred to the argument made by the junior Senator from New York the other day that it will cost the consumers more in the future to buy oleomargarine. It has already been brought out on the floor that although the tax on colored oleo was only 10 cents a pound, when oleo was colored the average selling price was 21 cents a pound above that of the uncolored oleo.

There is a tremendous profit in the manufacture and sale of this product. This tremendous profit will enable the manufacturers of this commodity to engage in political campaigns and conduct propaganda campaigns through magazines and newspapers. While I do not think the oleo interests are concerned solely in the support of Democratic candidates, yet it is not without significance that one of the leading manufacturers in the oleo industry has recently been selected to head the Democratic campaign-fund dinners.

I should like to say a word about the riders which have been proposed to the bill. Ordinarily I am very much opposed to riders to a bill, and I will not vote for a rider to a bill if I think there is going to be an opportunity to accomplish a worthy purpose by a direct attack through a bill which is brought to the floor of the Senate for that purpose.

So far as the repeal of the excise tax goes, I think the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is entirely sincere when he says he intends to get a vote on that before the end of the session. However, getting a vote on that in the Senate is one thing, and getting the repeal of the excise taxes enacted into law is something else. I seriously doubt if that will be done. The American people have lived on promises of excise-tax repeal for about 3 years now. There was an opportunity to repeal these taxes this afternoon. It was most unfortunate that the majority side of the Senate saw fit to vote almost unanimously against repeal which they profess to favor.

As to the civil-rights riders; it is now safe to say that there will be no civil-rights legislation at this session. No doubt the FEPC bill or the anti-lynching bill will be brought up, but there is no possible chance of either being enacted into law. The only chance for civil-rights legislation to be enacted at this session of Congress was lost when civil-rights amendments were defeated today.

We have to be practical about these things. Civil-rights legislation cannot be enacted by this Congress, when brought up on the floor of the Senate, where filibusters can be engaged in and where there are not 64 votes to stop such filibusters. The only chance for the enactment of civil-rights legislation at this session of the Senate is as a rider on a bill which the opponents of civil rights feel must be passed. Mr. President, the only way that civil-rights legislation will ever be enacted in this Congress, at least for many years, is simply by attaching it as a rider to legislation which the opponents of civil rights feel they must have. Therefore, any vote to attach the civil-rights bill to the oleo bill was completely justified if one believes in civil-rights legislation at all. It is most significant that the administration forces are strong for civil rights when there is no possible chance of enacting the legislation into law, but vote solidly against it when a real opportunity to enact such legislation presents itself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, rather than to take the time of the Senate at this hour, I wish to state that I have prepared a statement relative to the bill and some of the legal complications involved in the proposed legislation upon which we are about to vote. I simply ask consent that my statement be incorporated at this point in the RECORD, in order that the legislative history of the measure we are now considering may be more clear, so that at least the point of view of those who have supported the Wiley-Gillette amendment in the nature of a substitute will be available, to afford opportunity to the Food and Drug Administration to reconsider the regulations it has made in regard to the coloring of oleomargarine.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is perfectly amazing to me that serious consideration should be given by Senators to the fierce opposition of the oleo industry to the yellow color ban.

The truth of the matter is that in 1896, the Congress of the United States in the exercise of the only power it believed it possessed to stamp out fraudulent yellow oleo, imposed what was intended to be a prohibitory tax. Congress at that time believed yellow oleo to be fraudulent. It was and still is.

The Food and Drug Administration with respect to other foods has had an opportunity to consider whether or not the addition of an artificial color to a food is or is not deceptive.

The Food and Drug Administration has never had an opportunity to consider this question in relation to oleomargarine.

An official of the Food and Drug Administration appearing before the Finance Committee on an oleo bill in the Eightieth Congress, when asked whether Food and Drug had opposed the addition of artificial color to oleo when that agency was considering a standard of identity for oleo, stated that because Congress has preempted the field, Food and Drug had no authority to consider the question.

But, Senators, how had Congress preempted the field? It had preempted the field by defining yellow oleo in order to impose what was intended to be a suppressive tax. That is the kind of recognition which Congress gave to yellow oleo. The irony of the oleo situation is that because of that backhanded recognition, Food and Drug was powerless to consider the question of whether or not artificial color in oleo is deceptive.

What would the Food and Drug Administration have done if it had had an opportunity? I don't know, but I'm sure their determination would have been based on a most exhaustive examination of the question, as their decisions always are.

But there are many striking parallels in the food field, all pointing to a sound doctrine of food law to which every Senator must subscribe. That doctrine is:

"The purchaser of foods is guided many times in the identity of a product, by its flavor, its appearance, and its physical properties, regardless of what statements are made on the label, with respect to artificial color or flavor as the case may be; and it is one of the fundamentals of law enforcement procedure that such effects, resulting from appearances and flavors, when they are deceptive are not correctible by label declaration."

Let me review briefly for you some of the cases in which this sound principle has been applied. Some of them are court decisions, others administrative actions of Food and Drug.

The first case to which I will refer is *U. S.* v. *Two Bags of Poppy Seeds* (147 Fed. (2d) 123):

"This case involves the familiar poppy seeds which are widely used to decorate and flavor bread rolls and other bakery goods. The Circuit Court of Appeals for the sixth circuit had before it some British Indian poppy seeds which are naturally white but which had been artificially colored to resemble the more valuable Dutch blue and Turkish grey seeds. The Government sought to have the food condemned because the artificially colored seeds, which were indistinguishable to the ordinary consumer from the more valuable seeds, were made to appear of greater value than they actually were. In this case the only difference between the imitation poppy seeds and the genuine was the market value. In flavor and food value they were the same. As in the case of yellow oleomargarine, the owner of the seeds claimed that the purpose of coloring the white poppy seeds was to impart 'eye appeal.' However the Court saw behind this explanation and found that artificial coloring concealed the price inferiority and made the seeds appear better or of greater value. The artificial coloring had enhanced the value of the seeds from 10 cents, the price of uncolored, to 20 cents per pound for the colored. The bags had been labeled to indicate the presence of the artificial coloring but this was no defense. A decree of condemnation was ordered to be entered."

Next, let us turn to mayonnaise. Not only is artificial color prohibited, but spices which impart a yellow color are prohibited. Listen to the finding of fact made by the Federal Security Administrator in support of his prohibition:

"In these dressings the use of turmeric or saffron is apt to deceive consumers, because the yellow color imparted by these spices causes the dressing to appear to contain more egg yolk than it actually contains. For this reason no turmeric, saffron, or any spice oil or spice extract or other seasoning or flavoring ingredient which imparts to the dressing a color simulating the color imparted by egg yolk should be included in the optional ingredients for mayonnaise or salad dressing."

In a very recent case tried before a jury in a Federal court in Camden, N. J. (*U. S.* v. *88 Cases of Bireley's Orange Beverage*), Food and Drug proceeded against an orange drink which contained a small amount of orange oil and orange-juice concentrate, but which was artificially colored so as to resemble orange juice. The jury found for the Government, which had contended that the production was adulterated.

Let's look now at the definitions and standards for macaroni and noodle products. There the use of artificial color is not permitted. To support this prohibition the Administrator published this finding of fact (Finding H 27, Dec. 17, 1942; F. R. 10728):

"The use in macaroni products or egg-noodle products of artificial coloring or other colored ingredients which impart a color simulating that of an egg product is a deceptive and unfair practice that has been followed to some extent."

So sensitive to the possibility of deception was the Administrator on this subject that in fixing a standard for "vegetable macaroni products," yellow tomatoes may not be used because they would impart a color resembling eggs (Finding No. 34).

In this same group of products we find that carotene may not be added to alimentary paste for the reason that it is calculated to deceive consumers because it imparts to the finished product a color resembling that of egg.

Turning to bakery products, the Food and Drug Administration has ruled—"In our opinion, bakery products or any other food containing pumpkin which gives the appearance of having an egg content when no eggs are present, or a greater egg content than is the case, would be an adulterated article under any form of labeling."

There are many other instances which may be cited, but the policy is clear and the reason for it equally so—that the concealment by the use of artificial color of any type of damage or inferiority whether it be loss of strength, quality or commercial value constitutes adulteration.

For years internal-revenue regulation had been effective because it suppressed the sale of yellow oleo. At the time of the food and drug hearings to establish a standard for oleomargarine no yellow product was being manufactured for sale in regular commercial channels.

In recent months it has been observed that yellow oleo is being manufactured in large

volume, with the very result that caused enforcement officials to prohibit the additional artificial color to the poppy seeds. The relatively valueless artificial color has enhanced the price from 6 to 30 cents a pound above the price of uncolored plus tax.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of a statement I have released to the press explaining my reasons for supporting the oleomargarine bill, but opposing the excise tax and civil-rights riders sought to be attached thereto.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAM BENTON, OF CONNECTICUT

I intend to vote for repeal of Federal restrictions on the sale of oleomargarine. I intend to oppose all amendments which would restrict the legitimate sale of oleo through the exercise of the Federal power over interstate commerce.

I have taken this position because I am opposed to trade barriers which raise living costs or curtail production and employment in this country. I am also opposed to prohibiting the shipment of yellow oleo in interstate commerce because this opens the door to local monopolies which can jack up prices if they are not subject to competitive pressures.

In all frankness to the people of Connecticut, I should point out that repeal of present Federal taxes on oleomargarine will not guarantee Connecticut consumers cheap, colored oleo. Under the terms of this bill, restrictions imposed by State legislatures still apply. Connecticut law will continue to prohibit the sale of colored oleo in our State even if this present bill passes the Congress.

Reading my mail, I have obtained the impression that many Connecticut families are not aware of this important fact. Many of them, apparently, have been led to believe that this bill removes all oleo restrictions, both Federal and State. This is not the case. This should be completely understood. After the Federal Government acts, Connecticut must still act in line with the recommendations made by Governor Bowles.

I also intend to vote against any riders which may be brought up as a parliamentary device to kill the repeal of Federal oleo restrictions.

I favor the elimination of many wartime excise taxes which are hurting our economy and Connecticut industry in particular. I favor prompt passage of President Truman's civil-rights program and I will vote to limit debate wherever needed to accomplish that result. The freedom and unity of all people is the ultimate foundation of America's strength at home and her influence abroad. My experience in the Department of State particularly focused my interest and activities on this great area of human rights, of which the civil-rights program is an integral part. Enactment of this program will bring our practices of democracy into line with the Bill of Rights in our Constitution and with the declaration of human rights adopted by the United Nations.

Because of my strong and lifelong views on the merits of civil-rights legislation, I want to see that legislation considered promptly on its merits and pressed to enactment. I must, however, vote against any attempt to misuse that issue by attaching civil-rights riders to the margarine bill. Such riders are not designed to expedite enactment of civil-rights legislation but rather represent a misuse of that proposed legislation for the purpose of killing the margarine bill. Such riders will delay and impede the real consideration of civil-rights legislation on its merits.

These riders should be opposed for another reason. I have always advocated and worked for efficiency in Government and efficiency in Congress. The use of riders not germane to pending legislation stultifies the legislative procedure and runs counter to every concept of efficient governmental activity. If we do not strike down such riders, the Senate would always be at the mercy of every and any parliamentary maneuver calculated to prevent forthright decisions on important questions of national policy.

I hope and believe that the fair-minded and devoted advocates of civil-rights legislation in Connecticut and throughout the Nation will understand the real issues here.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WITHERS (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], who is necessarily absent on official business. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON] are attending the inauguration of Hon. John S. Battle as Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia and are therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Missisippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business as members of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, holding hearings on various flood-control and public-works projects in the State of New Mexico.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] would vote "yea."

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], who is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is absent on official business, is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—56

Aiken	Hill	Malone
Anderson	Hoey	Martin
Benton	Holland	Maybank
Bridges	Jenner	Millikin
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Darby	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Kem	Russell
Downey	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Leahy	Sparkman
Ellender	Lehman	Taft
Flanders	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	Long	Tobey
George	Lucas	Tydings
Graham	McCarran	Vandenberg
Green	McClellan	Watkins
Hayden	McFarland	Williams
Hendrickson	McKellar	

NAYS—16

Butler	Humphrey	Taylor
Cordon	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McCarthy	Thye
Ecton	Magnuson	Young
Ferguson	Mundt	
Gurney	Schoeppel	

NOT VOTING—24

Brewster	Hickenlooper	Neely
Bricker	Hunt	Pepper
Byrd	Ives	Robertson
Chapman	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kerr	Stennis
Connally	McMahon	Wherry
Frear	Morse	Wiley
Gillette	Murray	Withers

So the bill H. R. 2023 was passed.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. BYRD, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. TAFT conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed with the amendments adopted by the Senate numbered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE HATCH ACT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 1243, Calendar No. 428, a bill to amend the Hatch Act.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1243) to amend the Hatch Act, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments.

REDUCTION AND REPEAL OF EXCISE TAXES

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3905, Calendar No. 644, to amend section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate cannot adopt that motion without displacing the bill which already has been made the unfinished business.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I simply wish to suggest to the Senate that it should lay aside what has become the unfinished business in favor of House bill 3905, which was reported favorably by the House of Representatives last June, and was reported to the Senate calendar on July 11 by the Finance Committee. The bill is on the subject of repealing and reducing excise taxes.

I have moved that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. CAIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Washington will not press the motion. We have had two or three votes upon the question of excise taxes. The distinguished Senator from Georgia has assured the Senate he will call up this bill at the proper time. I have attempted to reassure the Senate, as majority leader, that we shall consider excise taxes, and, after all, what the Senator is now attempting to do is to take over the leadership of the Senate. Mr. President, if the Senate were to permit the Senator from Washington to displace the bill which is now the unfinished business, we would do violence to the orderly procedure of business. It would simply mean that the Republican Senators are taking over the leadership of the Senate. I do not think the Senator wants to do that.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington has no possible desire to quarrel or to argue with his distinguished friend, the majority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], but the reasons why the Senate in recent hours has turned down a consideration of the excise-tax question do not apply to the consideration the Senate itself has said it would give to the question if and when House bill 3905 was called up for consideration and action.

I argue, as I think every thoughtful Senator on the floor does, that because the House of Representatives has already taken affirmative action on H. R. 3905, and because a great standing committee of the Senate has recommended favorable action on an excise-tax reduction amendment, and because every Senator almost without exception has said, "Give us an adequate and legitimate opportunity to vote on the question and we will get rid of the excise taxes"——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. The junior Senator from Washington, and I trust others will support him, is merely attempting to provide an opportunity for the Senate to do what it has so often said it wants to do, and in my considered opinion we could take up H. R. 3905 and pass it before the afternoon is over.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, he said the House of Representatives had passed this bill, and that it had been referred to the Finance Committee.

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. I believe that is not quite a correct statement of fact. I do not believe the House of Representatives has ever passed upon any excise taxes. What happened was, the Finance Committee, on the motion of the Senator from Colorado, attached an excise-tax amendment to a revenue bill which came to the Finance Committee from the House of Representatives. We reported the bill as amended. It has been on the calendar since the date the Senator suggested.

Mr. CAIN. I am very pleased the distinguished Senator from Illinois has mentioned what is obviously a fact. I said the bill, by number, had been reported favorably to the Senate by the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; but I think the Senator left the impression the House of Representatives had acted on excise taxes. It has not.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Illinois has established what the American people want to know, namely, that the Senate of the United States was so anxious 6 months ago, through its standing Committee on Finance, to repeal and reduce excise taxes that they added an amendment to a bill which the House sent to the Senate. In view of all the discussion about excise taxes this afternoon and in view of the repeated assertions by both Democrats and Republicans, assertions known to the average citizen of this country, that the excise taxes will be repealed or reduced at the earliest possible moment, why should we not take the advice, counsel, and leadership which has come from the Finance Committee, call the roll, and reduce the excise taxes this afternoon.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not have the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington is pleased to yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the floor in my own right, for a brief statement. It seems to me the Senator——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot make a statement in the time of the Senator from Washington, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to conclude a brief statement, and then I shall yield the floor, which will certainly permit the Senator from Florida and other Senators to make any observations they may care to offer.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a question, I should like to address a question to him at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Florida for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I am very happy to yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does not the Senator recall that this afternoon in his argument the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the Finance Committee, made quite clear that he felt the Senate should await the message of the President of the United States upon the subject of taxation before taking action on the subject of excise taxes, and that that was one of the reasons upon which the Senate predicated its action?

Mr. CAIN. I am keenly conscious of what the distinguished Senator from Georgia said. I should like to say, because I mean it, that I have a very great respect for his thoughtfulness, for his intellect, and for his considered judgments given to the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield further to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. CAIN. I will yield in a few moments if the Senator will permit me to conclude the answer as I think proper. I find it proper in this instance to differ with the Senator from Georgia, because I feel the body which represents the people of the United States, the Congress, ought to make up its mind concerning what it wants to do for a change, and do it. Six short months ago Democrats and Republicans on the Finance Committee said, "We want to repeal and reduce excise taxes." The American people want that done. We all know that the President is said to have stated that he would have had a tax measure and message before the Congress some days ago. It is not here. No one knows when it is coming. But, for one, merely as an individual Senator representing in part one sovereign State, and feeling as I do about the need of benefiting America, for a change, by getting rid of some of the war-created excise taxes, I think we as a part of the Congress ought to decide what action should be taken, rather than wait and wait and wait for a Presidential measure, the nature of which we do not know anything about, and concerning the authorship of which most of us are going to be seriously in doubt. I want to call to the attention of the Senator from Florida and of other Senators who care to listen what the distinguished Senator from Georgia, in his role as chairman of the Finance Committee, said, and what other members of that committee agreed to in the concluding paragraph of the report which urged the passage of H. R. 3905:

> The war excise-tax rates were imposed along with the excess-profits tax and heavy corporation income taxes and individual income taxes. The excess-profits tax has been

repealed, and individual and corporate income taxes reduced. It is believed only fair that some reduction should be made in the war excise-tax rates, which are interfering with consumer purchasing power and are increasing the cost of doing business.

I emphasize the words, "It is believed only fair." Who wrote those words? Thirteen Senators of the United States Senate, both Democrats and Republicans. It is believed only fair that some reductions should be made in the war excise-tax rates, which are interfering—with what?

Interfering with consumer purchasing power and are increasing the cost of doing business.

Six months ago a standing committee said, "These bad things are facts today; let us get rid of them." The Senator from Washington hopes that a good many Senators, both Democrats and Republicans, will support the motion just offered by him to settle down and get rid of these taxes, now that we have been given advice by the committee to whom we look for counsel and direction, and because every Senator in the Chamber, and our gallery guests too, are as keenly conscious as are we of the desire of the American people to reduce and eliminate these taxes which have completely outworn their moral justification. The only reason we continue to have war excise taxes is that they produce dollars which we find it necessary to spend, with the greatest extravagance the world has ever known. I press my motion.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. LODGE rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in a few moments I shall move an executive session to consider the nomination of the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Oscar L. Chapman of Colorado. Before I do that, I want to say merely a word or two in reply to the distinguished Senator from Washington, who has become vocal so suddenly and so greatly interested in the repeal of the wartime excise taxes.

I do not recall that the Senator from Washington made any such motion last year, after the bill was reported from the Finance Committee by a vote of 7 to 6. It was on the calendar a long time. We had a debate upon different questions, running several days. Many bills were considered. The Senator from Washington was there, and I am sure, had he been as much interested in the repeal of the excise taxes then as he is now, he would have been trying to take the leadership away from the Democratic Party during the last session.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. One moment.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington is trying to take the leadership away from the Democratic Party and set up the kind of program he thinks ought to be considered by the Senate. Mr. President, that is not done very often. It has not been done since I have been a Member of the Senate. No one that I ever recall, when the Republicans were in power 2 years ago, attempted to take over and tell the Republican majority what they should do with respect to a program.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I only asked that the Senator yield, in view of what he has just said. I should like to say that my degree of interest was no more keen in the latter stages of the last session of the Eighty-first Congress, than it is this afternoon. But I, along with a number of other Senators, have placed reliance on the assurances many times given that action would be taken on this question. I think it fair to state——

Mr. LUCAS. I shall not yield to the Senator for a speech.

Mr. CAIN. I am not trying to take over the leadership——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield further.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, we have had the question of excise taxes up on at least two different occasions during consideration of the margarine bill. It was rejected both times for the reason which was stated over and over again by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Finance Committee. He has left the Senate for the day and is not present to argue that point. He will be here tomorrow, and, of course, wants to make an argument against this motion.

I want to say, Mr. President, that so long as I am majority leader of the Senate, the Policy Committee representing the Democratic Party in the Senate will meet and lay down certain policies which we believe are for the best interests of the country. I do not believe that any Senator on the other side of the aisle is going to make a motion such as has been made by the distinguished Senator from Washington and meet with success. I am satisfied that when all the Democratic Members realize what is attempted to be done, they will stand unanimously back of the Senator from Illinois in what he is attempting to do.

I have told Senators on the other side of the aisle, as well as my Democratic friends, that the repeal of excise taxes will be given consideration in due course. But some Senators cannot wait. There are some politics involved in the repeal of the excise taxes. It is a great political issue, and some Senators want to get on the band wagon before it has started.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question regarding something which is not a political issue.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to have my comrade do that.

Mr. LODGE. I realize the responsibility of the majority leader, and I try never to ask him a question without giving him notice. I am not trying to surprise him at all. But I have written him one or two letters and have received no reply to them, so I should like to ask him whether it will be possible, within the next week or so, to proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 2, providing for a constitutional amendment to abolish the electoral college and to count the electoral vote in proportion to the popular vote. I understand that the majority's policy committee has decided to call up the equal-rights amendment, which is a constitutional amendment. The resolution to which I have referred is another constitutional amendment which is also on the calendar. It has been very carefully considered. The Senate is ready to vote on it, and I should like to express the hope that we can get it up at the same time the Senate takes up the equal-rights amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. In reply to my friend from Massachusetts, I want to apologize to him for not answering his letters with respect to the consideration of the measure which he has in mind and which is now pending upon the Senate Calendar. However, we have already considered in the policy committee the resolution now being discussed with the Senator from Massachusetts. I shall not give the Senator from Massachusetts definite assurance, but I believe that in due course we shall be able to take up that resolution. We have discussed it, but no decision has been reached.

I may say to the Senator that what we try to do in the majority policy committee is to arrange a schedule of bills for the Senate to consider for the next week or 10 days. As the policy committee meets practically every week, it is in a position to consider a number of measures and keep the schedule arranged in orderly fashion in advance of Senate action. I do not hold any particular brief for the Senator's resolution; neither am I opposed to it. I should like to give it more study. I think the policy committee, before we finish the session, will give that resolution the consideration which it deserves.

Mr. LODGE. I hope the measure will be taken up fairly soon, because my experience, which goes back quite a few years, has been that if we do not take up a matter of that kind during the early part of the session, it will be too late.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator that it takes a long time to consider a measure which should be passed in 3 or 4 days. We have been debating the repeal of the oleomargarine tax for more than 2 weeks, but there is nothing we can do in the Senate, so far as concerns expediting measures of that kind. It was debated thoroughly, and most of the arguments were germane to the issue, but we took a long time, in my opinion, to act upon the oleomargarine bill. If business is not facilitated, it may require a long time to dispose of other measures which must be acted upon.

Mr. President, I do not want to charge any Senator with delay and obstruction, but I believe that last year, in the first half of the session, there was an unusual amount of delay, and obstruction. While I should like to complete the work of this session as quickly as would any other

Senator, a certain amount of work must and will be done, and we might just as well understand that.

I am not attempting to lecture any Member of the Senate, but it will be recalled that last year I thought it necessary to announce to remain here until Thanksgiving in order to complete the program. Certain things have to be done, and we are going to do them, regardless of the time it takes. I want to expedite the business of the Senate as much as does any other Member of the Senate. That is one reason I started consideration of the margarine bill the day the President's message was delivered.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader whether it is quite fair to make the statement that 2 weeks' time has been consumed on the oleomargarine bill. As a matter of fact, many other important matters have been discussed. Is not that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is quite correct. I may have been in error in making that statement, but many irrelevant matters, not at all germane to the subject, were discussed during that time.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to understand clearly the position of the Senator from Illinois. In response to the Senator from Washington, he referred to efforts being made "on the other side of the aisle" to displace the program of the majority party.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator from Illinois consider that Members of the minority are estopped from making motions on the floor or from endeavoring to persuade Members upon the other side of the aisle to join——

Mr. LUCAS. No; they may go as far as they like.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator consider that it is proper democratic process—I use that term in the broad sense—because one political party in the Senate has decided upon a program that no member of the other political party shall have a right at least to test the vote of the Senate as to whether that program is wise?

Mr. LUCAS. No. The Senator can go as far as he wants to go. He can test out any motion to take up any measure he desires. But that has not been done very often in the Senate of the United States. If we go back into the history of the Eightieth Congress, when the Republican Party was in power, we cannot find one Democrat attempting to displace the program which was laid down by the Republican Party during the 2 years it was in power. If a Senator can do that, he takes away the leadership of the party in power. I do not think the Senator is going to do it. It is within his power to make the attempt. I understand some of these moves a little better than perhaps some Members would like. I understand what some people would like to do to the Democratic Party this year, which is an election year, in this second half of the Eighty-first Congress. Some persons would like to black out the program and confuse issues as much as they possibly can. But we are not going to be misguided by anyone attempting to displace a piece of legislation which has been brought up in good faith by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. We shall test it out by a vote when the time comes.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator mean to imply that the Senator from Washington, in making this motion, has been motivated by improper motives of any kind?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator can use his own judgment as to what I mean.

Mr. DONNELL. I have asked the Senator a direct question. The Senator has stated upon the floor of the Senate that he is not so lacking in knowledge as some of us might think he is. I am sure that the Senate agrees. I have the highest respect for both his ability and his good qualities, but I want to have it perfectly clear on the floor of the Senate this afternoon that because I am a member of the opposite party from the majority party, neither the Senator from Washington, the Senator from Missouri, nor any other Senator is estopped from bringing up a motion in good faith to set aside the program which has been presented.

Will the Senator permit a further statement?

Mr. LUCAS. Go right ahead.

Mr. DONNELL. I have failed to see upon the floor of the Senate this afternoon any such urgency in regard to changing the provisions of the Hatch Act as would justify such a tremendous effort to overcome an attempt to bring up a matter of tax legislation.

I appreciate that the Democrats are in control of the Senate, and I have no desire in the world to doubt the fact that they are in the majority, but, Mr. President, I say most respectfully that I would be one who would dissent from the idea that, because the Democratic Party was in control of the Senate, we upon the Republican side were estopped from bringing up motions with respect to the program, in the hope, even though the hope might turn out not to have been well founded, of persuading some of the Senators on the other side of the aisle of the merits of our proposals.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure it will take more than the Senator from Illinois to estop the Senator from Missouri from attempting to bring up anything which he desires to bring up, and to debate it thoroughly, because the Senator from Missouri is a very methodical and a very meticulous gentleman. We are all well acquainted with his ability and the great amount of time which he consumes on every question which comes before the Senate, and we all learn from listening to his erudite discussions of almost every question which comes before the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois if he thinks that, in the absence of the chairman of the Finance Committee, it would be possible to get a vote this afternoon on the motion of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. LUCAS. No; it will not be possible.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Illinois if it is his plan, since there is no possibility of acting on this motion, to move an executive session so that we may consider the nomination of Oscar L. Chapman to be Secretary of the Interior, a nomination which, I may say, was unanimously reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. LUCAS. I intend to do that. I do not know whether the Senator was on the floor when I made the explanation a moment ago, but I hope the Senator from Wyoming is not trying to rush an executive session, in view of the parliamentary maneuvering which is being carried on here. I always hope to get help from the Senator from Wyoming; apparently on this occasion he wants to leave the subject and take up the Executive Calendar.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to ask the able majority leader, inasmuch as he has accused some Senators on this side of the aisle of playing politics, whether it would be possible that his haste to take up the amendment of the Hatch Act might not likewise be political, in view of elections coming up this year?

Mr. LUCAS. I am not surprised that the Senator would make such a charge. He is usually lying in wait to find something like that. When the Senator from Arizona presents the bill tomorrow, the Senator from Indiana can debate with the Senator from Arizona whether or not it is a political move. I am, of course, satisfied that the Senator from Indiana never engages in political activities. He is one of those who are elected without getting into politics, and never plays politics. He is one of those nonpolitical fellows who does the nonpolitical thing every time; everybody understands that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAIN. What is the prevailing status of the motion made by the Senator from Washington?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The prevailing status is that if the Senate takes a recess today the motion of the Senator from Washington will carry over until tomorrow.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY—NOMINATIONS PASSED OVER

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John F. Floberg to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask that that nomination, as well as that of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman to be Chief of Naval Operations, be passed over again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be passed over.

NOMINATION OF OSCAR L. CHAPMAN TO BE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Oscar L. Chapman to be Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, if there were a record vote on the nomination of Mr. Chapman, I should vote in favor of it. I shall vote for confirmation if there is a viva voce vote.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I wish to take a brief moment to express my pleasure, and the happiness of the people of Idaho, and I believe of the entire West, at the nomination of Oscar L. Chapman to be Secretary of the Interior. He is eminently qualified. He has served in the Department of the Interior since 1933. He understands the problems of the West, and we are very happy to have a westerner as Secretary of the Interior.

The only regret I have, and I am sure the people of Idaho would feel the same way, is that Oscar L. Chapman is not from Idaho, not that we begrudge Colorado, but we would be very glad to have him as a citizen of Idaho.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, like my colleague, the Senator from Idaho, I do not think the nomination of Oscar L. Chapman should be confirmed without my adding a word of congratulations to him on his appointment to his new post. As the Senator from Idaho has said, we of the West are very conscious of Mr. Chapman's great sympathy and great understanding and wise handling not only of our great power, reclamation, and irrigation projects, but of all the great western developments the Government has undertaken to finance and develop in our area.

As I have said, Oscar Chapman has had a great understanding of the problems of the West. His wisdom in aiding, in the Department of the Interior and otherwise, in the beginnings, when the projects of power, reclamation, and irrigation were receiving a great deal of criticism from the disbelievers who thought not only they could not adequately pay back, but that the projects were not in fact self-liquidating, received no help from Oscar Chapman, who believed in the West, and in its great potentialities.

So, Mr. President, we of the western area are happy to see Oscar Chapman now assume the great office of Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have prepared some remarks in support of the confirmation of Oscar L. Chapman, but in view of the lateness of the hour, I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, Mr. LEHMAN'S statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Yesterday the junior Senator from New York made his maiden speech. It was on the subject of oleomargarine. I had not planned to make that speech. I had hoped to reserve my first words for a happier occasion. This today is such an occasion.

I am indeed pleased to be able to add my voice to those who today urge the confirmation of the nomination of Oscar Chapman as Secretary of the Interior.

I have known of Oscar Chapman even longer than I have known the man personally and my personal friendship goes back many years. His reputation preceded him in New York State, although he is a westerner by preference and adoption. He was known to us not so much as an advocate of conservation and reclamation, of the welfare of the Indians and of the peoples of the Territories—although he was known to us in that respect, too—but rather as a friend of the weak and the oppressed, of the underprivileged and the undefended. He became a champion, a spokesman, and a friend. He was a man who spoke out against both intolerance and tyranny, who offered his energies and his support to that large majority of our people who, in their individual groups, are unhappily called the minorities. In the early thirties he organized the Washington branch of the committee to save the Jewish people when the people of my faith were in the early throes of their agonies under the Nazis. He has labored hard to assist, in all parts of our country, underprivileged children, delinquent boys, and young persons in trouble.

I think the fact that Oscar Chapman has been honored by such various groups as the B'nai B'rith, Howard University, and the Sons of the American Revolution is testimony to the depth of his concern for the welfare of all.

In the city of New York there live some hundreds of thousands of natives of the island of Puerto Rico, American citizens from one of the most underprivileged sectors of the national population. Oscar Chapman is known to them as a tireless worker in their interest and in the interest of all their fellow Puerto Ricans. For 16 years he has had a special concern for their welfare and their advancement and their progress. In all these enthusiasms and efforts Oscar Chapman has not been parochial.

He is known also as a friend of the Negro, the Hungarian, the Czech, the Pole, the Italian, the Irish; in short, he is a friend of those many elements which go to make up the life of America.

This modest man—for that has always been his principal characteristic—sought always to serve and seldom to be served. In the ranks of the Democratic Party, he was always the worker. In his long and distinguished service in the Department of the Interior, he was a source of comfort and assistance to those of us who looked, from time to time, for comfort and assistance from the Interior Department and the Federal Government in Washington.

Oscar Chapman has not sought the spotlight or clothed himself in borrowed glamor. Only yesterday he told the Committee on Interior Affairs, of which I have the honor of being a member, that he did not pretend to know all the answers. I think he knows more of the answers than his share. But we can expect that the new Secretary of the Interior will be the same Oscar Chapman who was Under Secretary and Assistant Secretary for the past 16 years * * * a man of courage, vision, and boldness, but still unassuming and unpretentious.

Oscar Chapman was a seagoing sailor during the First World War. I have heard, and the story comes from Secretary Chapman himself, that he made 33 crossings of the Atlantic, and was seasick on every crossing. That showed him to be a man of constant and persistent habits. Now as Secretary of the Interior, the country looks to him to be persistent in his liberalism and constant in his vision and devotion to those same good causes and high purposes which have marked his public career thus far.

I understand that with the confirmation of Secretary Chapman there will be two distinguished citizens of the great State of Colorado in the President's Cabinet. I understand that this is unprecedented. There was even the rumor that this circumstance might have prevented Secretary Chapman's nomination. This rumor was happily false. But had it had even the faintest basis in fact, I am sure that the Empire State of New York would have been proud to put in a claim for Secretary Chapman and present him as its own.

The country expects that Oscar Chapman will make a great Secretary of the Interior. That is a sound expectation. I shall be happy to cast my vote for the confirmation of a fine American and a great liberal, Oscar Chapman.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, although I am not from the West, but am from the Northeast, I consider it a privilege to add my word of commendation of the appointment of Oscar L. Chapman to be Secretary of the Interior. Throughout his career in the State of Colorado and in the Federal Government he has exemplified the highest type of public servant, dedicated to the welfare of the Nation and the American people.

In the years I have known him, I have been continually impressed with his profound knowledge of the problems which have faced this Nation. In his appearances before committees of the Senate his understanding and clear presentation of these issues, and his close consultation with the Members of this body, have made possible a fine type of cooperation in our efforts to resolve these problems.

As an administrator, Oscar Chapman has gained a high type of recognition. Keenly conscious of the problems of government through long experience, his career as an Assistant Secretary and later as Under Secretary of the Interior, where he had over-all responsibility for administrative management, was marked by a continuing and successful effort to render always more effective service to the American people.

Finally, it is as a man that I wish to commend Oscar Chapman. Throughout his long years in office, he has constantly evidenced his warm interest in the problems of others, not only as a type, or as a class, but also as individual human beings. The many who have the privilege of knowing him are convinced that he is eminently well qualified for the high honor and responsibilities of this new office.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am sure that it will give the Secretary of the Interior great pleasure to note the commendation which has been expressed here this afternoon, particularly the words of approval which come

from Senators upon the Atlantic seaboard. Speaking as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I undertake for Secretary Chapman to express his appreciation.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs unanimously, on a roll-call vote of every member of the committee, recommended confirmation of the nomination. It is a deserved tribute to a most excellent administrator.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I wish to join these commendations, but coming from an Eastern State I join with the Senator from Idaho in regretting Mr. Chapman does not come from my State.

I wish to add another commendation, which I think would fit many Eastern States. From my dealings with Mr. Chapman I have come to find that he has a proper appreciation of conservation of natural resources. Among the many great resources of my State is coal, and I have found he understands the problems of coal, as well as the problems of conservation generally. For that reason I wish also to add my voice in commendation of the nomination, which I think is an excellent one.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the country and the President of the United States on the appointment of Mr. Chapman to the great office of Secretary of the Interior. Particularly I desire to congratulate the Indians, 400,000 of them, who at last, in my opinion, have one of their very best friends in a position of power.

I remember very well the investigation Mr. Chapman made only 2 years ago of the Navajo and the Hopi Indians. I know he is thoroughly familiar with the Indians in Alaska, in North and South Dakota, in Minnesota, and in some other States. I think we shall find that at last we will have someone in that office who is going to give active support to the Indians.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with what has been said respecting Mr. Chapman. The hour is late and I do not wish to detain the Senate, but I will say that I also believe the appointment to be an excellent one, and I thoroughly approve of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination of Oscar L. Chapman, of Colorado, to be Secretary of the Interior, is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified.

SHORTAGE OF COAL IN THE WEST—NEED FOR ACTION IN THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, there is bitter disappointment in the Rocky Mountain section of the United States because of the failure and unwillingness of the Chief Executive to invoke the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act which would authorize him to declare a national emergency and proceed to take action that would result in maximum production of coal. We read in the press that it is questionable whether there is any national emergency, and while I shall not qualify myself to speak for other sections of the country, without hesitation I can say that because of unusually severe winter weather and blizzards which are raging in the Rocky Mountain areas there is extreme suffering and distress, and conditions which point to a national emergency unless there is a greater production of coal.

The people in the State of Idaho and in the surrounding States are heartened by the fact that the chief counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, Robert Denham, is proposing to ask for a court injunction which will ban the short workweek in the soft-coal mining industry.

Mr. President, I have received hundreds of letters and telegrams from my State during the past 2 weeks appealing for some action by Congress. In reply I merely pointed out that it is not within the province or jurisdiction of the legislative branch to compel the Chief Executive to enforce the provisions of an act with which he may not be in sympathy. I should like to quote one or two telegrams showing that there is an acute situation in my State. I quote one sent me by trustees of a school district in Idaho as follows:

> Coal shortage critical. Local supply exhausted. The closing of schools and severe weather are creating a national emergency. Request you and other Idaho Representatives to use all influence in persuading the President to declare an emergency under the Taft-Hartley law.

I read one other telegram sent me by the Idaho Coal Dealers' Association, representing most of the dealers in that State and in eastern Oregon:

> Representing the coal dealers a survey has been completed today—
>
> On January 16—
>
> showing average of 3 days' supply on ration basis. Expected weather will wipe out stock even with expected 3 days' supply from mines this week. Week to 10 days required for deliveries to reach this territory from mines. Urge all possible action to bring about return of miners on full-week basis.

Mr. President, I have accurate statistics received only today from the Coal Producers' Association of the State of Utah, which annually furnishes about one and one-half million tons of coal for the State of Idaho. So as to show that there is not the necessary and essential production, I point out that in December 1948, the soft-coal miners in Utah worked 26 days, and in the corresponding month of December 1949 they worked only 11 days, resulting in a reduction of 52 percent below the production in the same month in the previous year.

Taking the first 14 days of January 1950, there was only 5 days' production of coal, whereas in the same 2 weeks' period the year previously the miners worked 11 days. The result is that there is a 57-percent reduction in the coal production this year compared with the same period in 1949.

Mr. President, without taking any more time of the Senate at this late hour I merely want to emphasize the fact that during the past 17 years this country has been in an almost perpetual state of emergency; and it seems peculiar at this time, when these tragic and desperate conditions are confronting many States in the West, which are experiencing blizzards and extremely cold winter weather, that the Chief Executive, for some reason that he may justify only for himself, refuses to invoke the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. I deem it my responsibility, Mr. President, to register an emphatic protest against this failure on the part of the Chief Executive, because I am sure that in the days ahead, unless some remedial action is taken, there will be unnecessary and widespread suffering on the part of the people of my State and in the surrounding area in the Rocky Mountain section.

THE COAL SITUATION IN KANSAS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, in view of the remarks that have just been made, and because of the lateness of the hour, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared and which I desired to make with reference to the coal situation as it affects my State.

There being no objection, Mr. SCHOEPPEL's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Mr. President, within the last 2 weeks I have been receiving numerous inquiries and requests for assistance in obtaining supplies of coal in many sections of my State. Only yesterday I received an urgent request from rural high-school authorities, one of which had only a week's supply on hand and apparently unable to obtain additional supplies.
>
> In any number of instances schools, and business establishments, to say nothing of dealers, have informed me that they have had coal on order for as long as 4 or 5 months, with no prospect of deliveries because of the lack of supply. Some railroads operating in my State have informed me of the critical situation as it pertains to our transportation system.
>
> I mention these instances because I am sure that it is apparent to any fair-minded person that since we are in the midst of the winter season we must expect weather conditions to become progressively worse. Certainly an emergency exists as the result of the inaction of those in authority in alleviating the present coal dispute. It is sheer folly to refuse to recognize that this Nation is feeling the pinch of the coal strike. When an agency of the Government, namely, the Interstate Commerce Commission, has publicly declared an emergency, giving railroads top priority on the country's dwindling supply, such an emergency that it is necessary to instruct the railroads to curtail passenger-train service, then it certainly goes beyond mere speculation that all is not well.
>
> A short time ago seven of the Nation's major railroads were affected by this strike to the extent that one railroad took matters into its own hands even before the Interstate Commerce Commission issued its order, and it arbitrarily confiscated some of the coal passing over its rails. Responsible railway officials have notified the Interstate Commerce Commission members that they had only a few days' stock of locomotive fuel coal and lacked a dependable source of supply.
>
> Can anyone have an honest opinion that the present coal strike does not affect the substantial part of an entire industry?
>
> Could anyone having the interests of the common welfare of all our people at heart and not special groups, say that the national health and safety of our people was not in peril?
>
> It is just that simple, Mr. President. If an entire industry is involved—and it is—if

the national health or safety is in peril—and it is—then the Chief Executive is flaunting the laws of the land and denying the people protection provided them by their elected representatives. We must see that those rights are protected.

RECESS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, January 19, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate January 18 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

ASSISTANT SOLICITOR GENERAL

Abraham J. Harris, of Illinois, to be Assistant Solicitor General, vice Hon. George T. Washington, resigned.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 18 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Oscar L. Chapman to be Secretary of the Interior.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we believe that Thou art God, yet our faith is still unproved by works, our natures still undeveloped by service, and our hearts still fail to overflow with charity.

We believe that we are part of a great plan and are servants of a great purpose that shall carry with it moral victory and spiritual progress. O enable us to bear the yoke of service without complaint and to perform our duty in the spirit of a high privilege.

On this day, so short and so soon to pass, give us courage fearlessly to say the words which witness to righteousness; patiently to do the deeds that strengthen virtue; generously to extend the hand to sustain the weak and give support to all things good. And when the day is ended, bless us all with the quieting consciousness that we have been in the presence of our God. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 3]

Abbitt	Gilmer	Philbin
Allen, Calif.	Green	Phillips, Tenn.
Barrett, Pa.	Hand	Powell
Battle	Hardy	Regan
Beckworth	Harrison	Ribicoff
Bentsen	Hart	Roosevelt
Bland	Heffernan	Sasscer
Blatnik	Hobbs	Scott, Hardie
Brooks	Howell	Shafer
Buckley, N. Y.	Irving	Short
Bulwinkle	Judd	Simpson, Pa.
Burdick	Kelly, N. Y.	Smathers
Burton	Kilburn	Smith, Ohio
Cavalcante	King	Smith, Va.
Celler	Kunkel	Stanley
Christopher	LeCompte	Taber
Chudoff	LeFevre	Taylor
Davies, N. Y.	Lynch	Towe
Dawson	McGrath	Underwood
Dingell	Macy	Vursell
Donohue	Mansfield	Wadsworth
Douglas	Mason	White, Idaho
Fellows	Morgan	Wier
Frazier	Murphy	Wilson, Okla.
Fugate	Pace	Withrow
Fulton	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Wolverton
Gamble	Pfeiffer, William L.	Woodhouse
Garmatz		
Gary		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 348 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, I have received a subpena duces tecum, directed to me as Clerk of the House of Representatives, to appear before said court on the 19th day of January 1950 at 10 o'clock a. m. as a witness in the case of the *United States* v. *Harold Roland Christoffel* (No. 791–47 Criminal Docket), and to bring with me certain and sundry papers therein described in the files of the House of Representatives.

Your attention and that of the House is respectfully invited to a resolution of the House adopted in the Forty-sixth Congress, first session (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 680), upon the recommendation of the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

"*Resolved*, That no officer or employee of the House of Representatives has the right, either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpena duces tecum, to produce any document, paper, or book belonging to the files of the House before any court or officer, nor to furnish any copy of any testimony given or paper filed in any investigation before the House or any of its committees, or of any paper belonging to the files of the House, except such as may be authorized by statute to be copied and such as the House itself may have made public, to be taken without the consent of the House first obtained."

And to a resolution adopted by the House in the Forty-ninth Congress, first session (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1295), from which the following is quoted:

"*Resolved*, That by the privilege of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate or process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission.

"That when it appears by the order of a court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereor as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House."

These resolutions result from the issuance of subpena duces tecum upon the Clerk of the House to produce certain original papers in the files of the House.

Permission to remove from their place or from the custody of the Clerk, any papers, was denied by the House but the court afforded facilities to make certain copies of the papers to be secured from the House. This seems to be the uniform procedure in the case of a subpena duces tecum served upon the Clerk of the House of Representatives to produce original papers from the files of the House.

The subpena in question is herewith attached, and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Very respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES V. HAROLD ROLAND CHRISTOFFEL, NO. 791–47, CRIMINAL DOCKET

The President of the United States to Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk, House of Representatives, Eighty-first Congress, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Thursday, the 19th day of January 1950, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you—

(a) All records of attendance at sessions of the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress for the following Representatives: Fred A. Hartley, Jr., Edward C. McCowen, Max Schwabe, Charles J. Kirsten, Wint Smith, O. C. Fisher, John F. Kennedy, Clare E. Hoffman, Walter E. Brehm, Thomas L. Owens, Carroll D. Kearns, Ralph W. Gwinn, Richard Nixon, John Lesinski, on February 27 and 28 and March 1, 1947.

(b) All records of the votes of said Representatives on said dates.

(c) All records of disbursements made for or on behalf of said Congressmen for salary, travel charges, telephone-toll charges, telegrams, during the months of February and March 1947.

(d) All correspondence or interoffice communications with said Congressmen during said months.

(e) All records of the House Committee on Education and Labor of the Eightieth Congress relating to Harold Roland Christoffel.

(f) All records of the House Committee on Education and Labor of March 1, 1947.

(g) All tally sheets, attendance records, journals, and other documents showing attendance of members of the House Committee on Education and Labor during the months of February and March 1947.

(h) All records of attendance and statements before the House Committee on Education and Labor of one Louis F. Budenz.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 427).

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas in the case of the *United States* v. *Harold Roland Christoffel* (No. 791–47, criminal docket), pending in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, subpena duces tecum was issued by the chief justice of said court and addressed to Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the

House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court on the 19th day of January 1950, at 10 o'clock antemeridian, and to bring with him certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpena duces tecum before mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as Clerk of the House; be it further

Resolved, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpena duces tecum then the said court through any of its officers or agents have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any documents or papers in possession or control of said clerk that the court has found to be material and relevant, except minutes and transcripts of executive sessions, and any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said clerk shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their file or custody under said clerk; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena afore-mentioned.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER CONTINUED

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted for this afternoon to my colleague from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] be continued until next Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 428), which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That House Resolution 44, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, providing that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, making a study and analysis of the financial operation of the Panama Canal, shall report its findings not later than January 31, 1950, is hereby amended to extend the time of such report until December 31, 1950.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain to the House the reason for the resolution regarding the subpena which was presented today. I refused to deliver any minutes of the Committee on Education and Labor to the attorneys for the reason that I did not think I had authority, because the happenings occurred in the Eightieth Congress. I suggested to the attorneys that if they brought one of their own congressional members from their State they could look at the minutes of the committee, but that I would not release the minutes to the attorneys.

THE POWER OF THE RULES COMMITTEE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, at a caucus of the Democratic membership of the House held on the 1st of January last year, a resolution was adopted that was binding on the Democratic Members with respect to rule 11 of the rules of the House.

The action taken at that caucus is binding on the Democratic Members for the entire period of the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it is within the province of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania or any other Member of this House to make a flat statement that the Democratic Members of this House are bound by any action that was taken at a former caucus meeting. Many of us have our own conceptions; many of us have our own pledges that we made to our constituents on former occasions. Let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania and to anyone else concerned that I do not consider myself, and I know there are many other Members of this body on this side who do not consider themselves, bound by any action that was taken on a former occasion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the colloquy between the majority leader and the minority leader is going to confuse the country. The country knows that on Monday those of us who for years have been striving to obtain a vote on FEPC in this House would have had that opportunity should the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] ask recognition and the Speaker recognize him. By bringing up this resolution on Friday that chance is being wiped out if that resolution passes. No matter the amount of demagoguery used here, you cannot explain this situation to the American people to whom you promised civil rights.

Why is it being brought up on Friday? The gentleman from Illinois has control of that resolution for seven legislative days under the rules; he does not have to call it up until after Monday. Any rumor to the effect that control can be taken away from him is pure sham. A reading of yesterday's RECORD, pages 499 and 500, together with the rule makes it clear that only an arbitrary tearing up of the House rules would take control of the resolution away from him. If you believe in FEPC as you say you do in your platform, if Mr. Truman's speeches are not demagogic, then the responsibility rests with the majority leadership not to call up this resolution and not endanger the only chance to vote on FEPC next Monday.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to answer in part the short argument made by the gentleman from New York. First, his premise that the gentleman from Illinois may call this resolution up under the 7-day rule is not entirely correct. I believe he will find if he examines the rules and the RECORD of January 17 that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] would be precluded from bringing it up at a later date should the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] insist upon action Thursday or Friday.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. In view of the 1-minute rule, I cannot yield at this time.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I will say to the gentleman that his statement is not correct.

Mr. CARROLL. There are many other Democrats present who are sincerely interested in passing FEPC and who are also interested in passing other important legislation. A year ago, at the beginning of the first session of the Eighty-

first Congress, the Democrats, by caucus action, bound themselves to effect a change in the rules. As a result of that caucus action and with the help of approximately 50 Republicans, we were successful in preventing the Rules Committee from further acting in an arbitrary and an undemocratic manner with reference to reporting out legislation important to the Nation. The real issue before this body is to defeat the pending resolution which is designed to restore the old dictatorial system.

When the time for consideration of FEPC arises, I am confident the Democrats of the North and West will stand together, and we are hopeful that we also shall have support from those forward-looking Republican Members who believe in the teachings and the philosophy of Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That time is Monday, but you are killing that chance. That is what you are doing.

Mr. CARROLL. I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Why not call it up then?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLEMENTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and a resolution from the National Committee for Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a proclamation.

Mr. DAVENPORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles from Business Week.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he delivered before the Eagles Luncheon Club of Milwaukee, Wis.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include extraneous material.

REA CO-OPS IN ARKANSAS

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I regret to find myself in disagreement with my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT], whose statement to the House on Monday concerning the contract of the Arkansas REA co-ops appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date.

The fight to bring rural electrification to the farm people of my section has been a long, hard one, and it is just now coming into full fruition. Up until 15 years ago the farmers in our section were denied the benefits of electricity which their neighbors in the towns were able to receive. They were denied it because the utility companies in the area believed that it was unprofitable to serve them. We had no quarrel with that and went about urging the passage of the rural electrification law and enabling legislation in Arkansas; and the REA co-op movement was born.

In the intervening years much progress has been made. It was my happy privilege on December 21 last, to snap the switch that turned electricity into the one-hundred-thousandth home served by the 18 REA co-ops in our State.

If my memory serves me correctly, 67 percent of our rural people in Arkansas now have the benefits of electricity. It is our problem and our challenge to get electricity to the 33 percent who are still unserved, and to secure for all of them all the electricity which they need at prices which they can afford. To do that, our co-ops must secure the cheapest rate possible, whether from the utility companies who serve the area or from any Government agency which has power for sale. These REA co-ops are competitive enterprises with their roots firmly planted in the rugged soil of individualism in our State. They deserve the same respect and consideration in their efforts to serve their people as the utility companies should have in serving their customers. To require them to come to Congress to get approval for their contracts would certainly be an invasion of their rights to serve their people.

In our efforts to secure a cheaper rate for the farm people of Arkansas, we have urged and supported the construction of all feasible hydroelectric projects to supplement electric energy generated by the steam plants of the local power companies.

Recently, REA co-ops in Arkansas, acting within their moral and legal rights, have made application for a loan to build a steam plant which will be located near the district which I represent. The Congress believing, and I think rightfully so, that all the power generated at all of the hydroelectric dams now in production or to be constructed in the future belongs to all the people, has instructed the Department of the Interior to tie all these dams together and to enter into contracts with public bodies, cooperatives, and private power companies for disposal of the power generated at the dams. The local power companies oppose this and want to buy the power at each dam separately, which for all practical purposes shuts off competition.

At the present time, negotiations are under way not only between the co-ops and the power companies in Arkansas with the Southwestern Power Administration but negotiations are also under way between the local power companies and the REA co-ops looking toward a contract for the purchase of power generated by the hydroelectric plants built by the Government in its flood-control program, and the integration of the hydro power with the generating systems of the REA co-ops and power companies in the local area or both.

I am not familiar with the terms of the contract discussed by my colleague, but I understand that, if consummated as tentatively agreed upon, it will give to the REA co-op users of Arkansas the cheapest rate in the Southwest or perhaps in the United States, and that the steam-generating plant involved will not become the property of the Southwestern Power Administration under the contract.

At any rate, it is my conviction that the REA co-ops are entitled to negotiate with and to contract with the Southwestern Power Administration or the private power companies in the area as they can without having to be forced to come to Congress for approval, and that it is their moral obligation to secure for their consumers the cheapest rate possible in order that they may extend the coverage to all those who are not now receiving service and to give all users all the service which they need. I fear that if the contention of my colleague is upheld by the Congress, or if by reason of it, the Rural Electrification Administration withholds loans for generating plants to the REA co-ops, the long fight for the rural people of Arkansas will receive a blow from which it will not recover and will put them at a great disadvantage in the years ahead.

No one that I know objects to free, competitive enterprise, and I hope the REA co-ops of Arkansas will keep their chins up and fight for a contract that will bring to their users all the power that they need at prices they can afford, whether that contract be with the private utility companies in the area or with the Southwestern Power Administration.

PROPOSED FEPC LEGISLATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], I do not think we are in any way endangering the passage of the bill in which the country and the President are so vitally interested, namely, the Federal Fair Employment Practice Act legislation.

It must be remembered that President Roosevelt and President Truman, as well as both the Democratic and Republican Parties have gone on record and have promised to support this legislation.

This morning I read in the press that the Republicans are in favor of FEPC legislation, and in view of that fact, I am calling a meeting this afternoon of the Rules Committee so that they can go on record and vote accordingly. I am confident that we will have four Democrats

in favor of the rule on FEPC and this, together with the four Republicans, will make the vote 8 to 4 in favor of a rule; therefore, we are not endangering the passage of FEPC legislation. I am hopeful that the rule will be granted today and that the legislation will come to the floor and be voted on without delay.

As to the question raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], to the effect that FEPC should be called up on Monday, let me state with deference that originally I understood that it would be brought up on Monday under the new 21-day rule. However, the Cox resolution, House Resolution 133, was reported and filed, and if unfortunately passed, would foreclose not only consideration of the FEPC bill on Monday, but also action on the 10 other bills which will be considered under the 21-day rule. On Friday we will have a full membership present and on Monday many are absent. Therefore, by bringing the Cox resolution up on Friday and by defeating same, the FEPC bill will be called up on Monday under the 21-day rule by Chairman LESINSKI, unless something unforeseen occurs in the legislative situation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

AMENDING RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the meeting of the Committee on Rules this afternoon, I call the attention of the chairman of that committee to the fact that when the committee adjourned on yesterday it adjourned with the understanding that it would meet at 10 o'clock on next Tuesday.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the West Virginia State Medical Journal.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two radio speeches he recently delivered.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Mr. King, of the Guaranty Loan Department of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. GRAHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include five telegrams relating to the coal situation.

THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to advise, and thus I hope alert, my fellow Congressmen to a realization of the fact that the superlatively selfish reactionary political and financial alliance in our Republic has been quite busy for some time, like a rogue in the night, laying illegitimate propaganda babies upon the doorsteps of some of the unsuspecting, sleeping Americans, and among said babies is the following:

By blaming John L. Lewis and his United Mine Workers and not the coal barons, mine owners, and operators of the Nation for causing or threatening to cause the banking or putting out of the fires in the factories and homes of America by failing, neglecting, and refusing to bargain collectively, honestly, and in good faith with Mr. Lewis and his miners, and jamming the listening posts of America with calamity howling that the wheels of industry will stop for want of coal and the home fires of America will sputter out, until today the conjured-up cold causes the substitute teeth of some people to chatter and their aging knees to knock in unison until you cannot distinguish any more the old clippity clop in the mule-train song from the noises these calamity howlers are making, all to the great detriment of hill mountain and plain billy music. I am today placing this and other instances of illegitimate propaganda baby placing in the Appendix of the RECORD and invite all of you Congressmen and others to read same.

COAL SHORTAGE IN NEW ENGLAND

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include certain letters and information regarding the coal situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the coal shortage in New England is a serious situation and is getting worse each day. Mr. J. Leonard Johnson, president of the New England Fuel Dealers Association, has written to me and to the President for help and I shall put his letters in the RECORD. I shall also put in the RECORD quotations from Saward's Journal of January 14 which states:

> BOSTON, January 12.—More instances have come to light this week of the strangle hold that John Lewis has on the coal industry, and it is now pretty well manifest that if the curtailment in production continues some consumers are going to be in serious condition before the month is out.

The New England Fuel Dealers Association states that an emergency exists and that steps should be taken at once to prevent suffering from lack of heat and unemployment from lack of coal. The Lowell Sun says a cold wave might bring widespread suffering, and rationing of coal has begun in some areas. The president of the Hood Rubber Co., at Watertown, Mass., asks for our best efforts to bring an end to the coal strike to prevent the closing down of Hood and other rubber companies.

NEW ENGLAND FUEL DEALERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Boston, Mass., December 30, 1949.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
United States Congresswoman, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MADAM: It is apparent to everyone in the coal business that 3 days per week operation at the mines does not furnish enough coal to take care of normal winter demands.

In the last few weeks, inventories in the hands of dealers have been shrinking very rapidly. With the advent of cold weather, many dealers will be entirely without coal. Unless action is taken immediately to assure adequate supplies from the mines, widespread suffering is apt to result.

I enclose copy of a letter sent to the President of the United States, which bears on this subject.

I hope that you will use your influence to secure action.

Very truly yours,

J. L. JOHNSON,
President.

NEW ENGLAND FUEL DEALERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Boston, Mass., December 29, 1949.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of United States of America, the White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In the newspapers and on the radio last week, you were quoted as saying, in effect, that you would take the necessary action if the coal situation reached the emergency stage. I heartily approve of your determination to act, but I am afraid that we may differ as to what constitutes the emergency stage.

I am reminded of the story which we used to read when we were children about the little Dutch boy who discovered a hole in the dike through which the water was seeping from the ocean on the outside of the dike. He put his thumb in the hole and kept it there effectively stopping the flow of water until others could come and repair the damaged dike. The little Dutch boy, while probably knowing that the amount of water flowing through the little hole of itself would do no great damage, realized that without immediate action on his part the hole would gradually grow until the water came through in torrents and the countryside would be flooded. The emergency existed although the immediate consequences were not great. If immediate action had not been taken, it is probable that the dike would have been demolished and irremedial damage caused.

The present emergency stage of the coal situation, of course, is much more advanced than that discovered by the little Dutch boy. Irremediable damage will soon be with us unless effective steps are taken immediately to prevent it.

An emergency exists, in my opinion, when current economic forces will bring widespread hardship and suffering unless curbed. It is not dependent upon the actual present existence of hardship and suffering.

Unless the present forces at play in the coal business are checked, it is inevitable that people will suffer from lack of heat, that factories will close from lack of fuel, and their employees thrown out of employment.

On behalf of the fuel dealers of New England, and the people who are dependent, directly or indirectly, upon coal for their livelihood and comfort, I urge you to recognize immediately the existence of an emer-

gency and to take such steps as will assure the people of an adequate supply of their vitally necessary fuel.

Respectfully yours,

J. L. JOHNSON,
President.

NEW ENGLAND AND BOSTON NEWS

BOSTON MARKET: COAL RECEIPTS REFLECT SHORT WEEK—DOMESTIC ANTHRACITE GROWING SCARCE

BOSTON, January 12.—More instances have come to light this week of the strangle hold that John Lewis has on the coal industry, and it is now pretty well manifest that if the curtailment in production continues some consumers are going to be in serious condition before the month is out.

Receipts of bituminous coal during the week ended December 31 reflected the output of the 2-day work week, having totaled but 264,998 net tons, a drop of 66,064 tons from the preceding week and, 78,819 tons less than the corresponding week last year. It brought receipts for the calendar year up to 11,534,493 tons, compared with 20,380,125 tons for the year 1948, a drop of 8,845,627 tons. The receipts for the coal year to December 31 amounted to 7,641,240 tons, compared with 15,761,926 tons received in the corresponding period of the preceding coal year, a drop of 8,120,666 tons.

Receipts of anthracite during the final week of 1949 amounted to only 66,100 tons and that brought the receipts since April 1 up to 3,165,803 tons, compared with 4,024,420 tons received in the corresponding period of the previous coal year, a drop of 858,617 tons.

Although no householder has yet been forced to live in a cold house because domestic fuel is not available, it is a fact that many users are getting down to the bottom of the bins and many dealers throughout New England have little or none of the sizes of anthracite mostly wanted. Stove is very scarce and nut and egg, which most dealers have had, are now disappearing in some places.

The big shippers of soft coal to this market, who have managed up to this time to offer a satisfactory substitute to their customers when their regular coals were not available, now fear that, because of the so-called unauthorized strikes that have occurred this week, even these substitutes will be scarce in another week or two.

Consumers have substantial tonnage

It is true that there is still a fairly substantial tonnage of bituminous coal in the hands of New England consumers but it is not at all evenly divided, and a sizable tonnage of reserve coal in Maine does not help the consumer in southern New England who is running out of coal. Based on inquiries that have come to shippers this week, there is a greater shortage of bituminous coal in southern New England than in the more northerly area.

Whether it was due to a smaller supply of coal, or to a lessened need by consumers, is not clear, but the shipments from the New England tidewater terminals declined during the week ended December 24. The six railroads serving these terminals loaded 508 cars, compared with 605 cars the preceding week, and 814 cars in the corresponding week last year. This brought the car shipments for 1949 to December 24 up to 24,367 cars, compared with 41,273 last year.

Prices on bituminous coal at the docks here have been advanced this week. The shippers found it necessary to pay higher prices at the mines to get coal and passed this on to consumers. For standard grade mine-run at Boston the prices now range $11.70 to $11.90 net ton on cars or trucks, with most dock operators holding for or near the higher price. Little domestic mine-run is offered now under $12.15. Low volatile inch-and-a-quarter nut and slack ranges $11.50 to $11.65 and medium volatile nut and slack is firm at $11. Low volatile pea is $13 to $13.25, and high volatile pea is generally quoted at $13, although one or two houses are still open to orders at 25 cents less. Medium volatile stoker is offered at $13.25.

Following the advance in wholesale price, retail distributors throughout Greater Boston have upped their prices on bituminous coal 50 cents a ton—$14.95 for mine-run, $14.50 for nut and slack, $16.25 for low volatile pea, and $16 for high volatile pea.

No changes have been made in retail anthracite prices here, the prevailing price in the Boston area for white ash egg, stove and nut being $23.50 per net ton delivered, plus $1 for carry where necessary.

Price of kerosene has been advanced to 9.8 cents per gallon tank cars and 13.9 cents tank wagon in the greater Boston area.

INFORMATION RECEIVED FROM THE BUREAU OF MINES, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Pennsylvania anthracite	September to December		Percent change
	1948	1949	
Total production (net tons)	20,163,000	[1] 14,635,000	−27.4
Shipments to New England	1,673,000	[1] 1,255,000	−25.0

[1] Estimated.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of January 13, 1950]

NEW ENGLAND FACES GROWING COAL SHORTAGE—WIDESPREAD SUFFERING LIKELY IF COLD WAVE HITS THIS AREA—RATIONING ALREADY STARTED BY DEALERS IN SOME SECTIONS AS SUPPLY DROPS

BOSTON, January 13.—New England faced a growing coal shortage today. Dealers said a cold wave might bring widespread suffering. Rationing already has begun by dealers in some areas.

A direct appeal has been made to President Truman by Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL (Republican, Massachusetts) after receipt of pleas from the president of the New England Fuel Dealers Association and from a leading coal transporter whose Boston docks now have scarcely a day's supply ahead.

ASKS ACTION

J. L. Johnson, of Boston, the fuel dealers' organization head, asked the President to take steps to assure the people an adequate supply of coal.

Three-days-a-week mine operation does not meet normal winter demands for coal, he said.

In his communication, sent by Senator SALTONSTALL to the President, Johnson wrote:

"In the last few weeks inventories in the hands of dealers have been shrinking very rapidly. With the advent of cold weather many dealers will be entirely without coal.

"Unless action is taken immediately to assure adequate supplies from the mines, widespread suffering is apt to result."

In Boston, Johnson said, "a few days of cold weather and many dealers will be out of anthracite."

BAD REPORTS

From northern and central New England, particularly, came reports of growing shortage.

The president of C. H. Sprague & Son Co., Richard Bowditch, operating a line of colliers into Boston, said:

"If it had not been for the heavy oil conversion and the unseasonable weather we would have been in great trouble in this area at this time."

Both Waltham and Quincy dealers forecast serious coal shortages should the cold weather continue many days.

Three of the four major coal dealers in Claremont, N. H., reported anthracite stocks so low they have resorted to rationing.

Two suppliers deliver only a ton at a time and a third is cutting deliveries to a ton or less. Another reported only enough on hand for a 2 weeks' supply.

SOFT COAL

Soft-coal supplies, however, were reported fair to good. But both hard and soft coal was in short supply in Portsmouth, N. H. Three big dealers said it was a very definite scarcity and a wholesaler termed the situation "even dangerous."

Maine, too, was suffering from lack of both hard and soft coal. A spokesman for Randall & McAllister Co., Portland, one of the State's biggest wholesalers and retailers, said anthracite was particularly low.

The company serves dealers in northern New Hampshire as well as Maine.

Some of the dealers were reported either entirely out of anthracite or with less than a week's supply.

The company's sales manager said only the recent unseasonably warm weather kept the situation from being more critical.

Many Augusta dealers are low on both hard and soft coal. None has put in rationing so far. But one dealer said supplies of soft coal for those requiring large quantities were being halved.

General Maine Power said there appeared to be no serious shortage at its steam-generation plants as they are equipped to use oil, too, and are doing so to save on coal.

WATERTOWN, MASS., *January 18, 1950.*

EDITH N. ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Duquesne Light & Power Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., must suspend operations Friday, January 20, due to lack of coal. This company furnishes power to St. Joseph Lead Co., second largest producer of zinc oxide, an important and necessary compound in the manufacture of rubber goods. The shutting down of St. Joseph Lead Co. will cause serious repercussions in the rubber industry and if continu d will necessitate the closing down of Hood and other rubber-manufacturing companies in a short time. This specific situation is indicative of many others which will result if the coal strike continues. Believe you should use your best efforts to bring an end to the coal strike as soon as possible and promote legislation which will prevent a recurrence.

C. L. MUNCH,
President, Hood Rubber Co.

THE COAL SHORTAGE

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, this morning telegrams began pouring into my office from both heads of manufacturing plants in our district and also representatives of coal merchant associations. These all have reference to the critical coal shortage in our district. Under leave to file some of these telegrams, this need will be made apparent in the RECORD. The Twenty-fifth Pennsylvania District is one of the largest industrial districts in the world. If my memory serves me right, it is the fourth

industrial district in Pennsylvania and the eighth in the United States.

Yesterday the Duquesne Light Co., of Pittsburgh, Pa., which supplies electric power throughout the area, notified over 300 major industrial plants that they must shut down voluntarily starting Friday night. This action was caused by an electric power shortage resulting from the coal walk-outs in the mines, and that if the situation does not improve quickly that other steps would be necessary; the first, that this appeal would go out to all of its 3,000 industrial consumers, and then due to the fact that there is only a 12-day supply of coal on hand, that a request would be made of private consumers that they ration their electric power on a voluntary basis. This will not only throw thousands of men out of work but will also affect hundreds of homes wherein stokers are used and oil-burning furnaces that depend upon electricity for their operation.

Mr. Speaker, the President is quoted as saying that in his opinion, no coal crisis exists which would justify his taking action under the national emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. Surely, the President is not cognizant of the situation such as I have just stated.

I join with the other Members of the House of Representatives who are seeking to bring to the President accurate information to show that he is mistaken in his belief that a national emergency does not exist.

In my judgment, if he does not act quickly great hardship will result.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, in all this discussion that has been taking place in regard to the rules, one very important standing rule of this House is being completely forgotten. Under the rules that were adopted at the beginning of this session, every Wednesday is a Calendar Wednesday, on which the Speaker of the House can call the names of the committees in order, and the chairman of any committee called, under instructions from the committee, can bring up any bill that has been favorably acted upon in that committee.

Over and over again the leadership in this House has asked unanimous consent to pass over Calendar Wednesday. Under that standing rule, if the administration in power here and the majority party wishes to bring onto the floor of the House a bill that has been favorably reported by a committee, regardless of any action taken by the Committee on Rules, it can do so.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an article from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of January 16, 1950, entitled "Australians See a Bigger Future Minus Socialism," and in the other to include an article by David Lawrence entitled "What Is Right in the Left."

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances with reference to the Panama Canal and include extraneous matter.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a lot about bonuses for veterans. Yesterday I introduced a bill which I think should have thorough consideration along with any other proposed bonus bills. Mr. Speaker, my bill allows each veteran income exemption for Federal tax purposes in the amount of $25 for each 6 months of honorable service or a major fraction thereof for himself and the same for each dependent.

Now, let us see what that would amount to for a veteran who served 3 years 9 months and 5 days. This would amount to eight exemption periods, since he served eight periods of 6 months or major fraction thereof. Therefore he would have for himself an exemption for income-tax purposes of $200 per year as long as he lives. Now, let us suppose that he has a wife and two children, which is considered the average American family. Under those conditions, he would have 4 times 8 exemptions, or 32, which would allow him $800 exemption on his income for tax purposes. Just how much money this would amount to would depend upon how much income the veteran had.

Major arguments in favor of my bill are:

First. No revenue would be taken from the Government.

Second. No large staff of Federal employees would be necessary to handle the disposal of such revenue, since the revenue would never leave the veteran's pockets. He would be allowed to keep it. He could not speculate or lose all of his bonus money overnight for it would be an annual convenience for him as long as he lives, perhaps in the amount of some $200 per year.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that an annual benefit of this nature would be less expensive to the Federal Government and would be of maximum benefit to the veteran. I am sure the veterans and their families would receive more satisfaction from this sort of a bonus over their lifetime than any other form of bonus possible. Since this bill, of necessity, is being referred to the Ways and Means Committee, I am asking the members of that committee to give it their most serious consideration.

THE DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP IS STALLING ON FEPC

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, today is Calendar Wednesday. In line with what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] has just said, I now suggest to the majority leadership of this House that, rather than attempt to prevent and thwart a vote on FEPC, today, here and now, on this Calendar Wednesday they call up the FEPC bill from the Committee on Education and Labor—the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Michiman, is on the floor—and that action be taken on it forthwith to stop this stalling and this hypocrisy.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for the last 18 years except two, the Democratic Party has been in control of all three branches of the Government, legislative, judicial, and executive. Now, it came as something of a shock to me—I have always admired the Democratic Party and the members of that party—to learn from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the party either is—I will not say incompetent, but that it just cannot operate without help from the Republicans. You are in an awful state, are you not? It is just too bad. But I am sure some Republicans will be able to assist the cause of good government.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, if I may have as long a minute, as some gentlemen had yesterday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman take the position that the Republican Party does not have its own responsibilities?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Sure we have.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then the gentleman's statement falls to the ground.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As far as I am concerned, the gentleman knows my attitude on FEPC and on the rule.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, I know.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Cannot the gentleman get Democrats enough to go along with him?

Mr. McCORMACK. What about the promise of the gentleman's party? There are four Republican members on the Committee on Rules, who have a responsibility.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman still have to come squawking to us for help?

Under permission granted to extend my remarks, I include a radio talk as follows:

THE HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE PROMOTES ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY

Friends and fellow Americans, this is your Congressman, CLARE E. HOFFMAN, calling all members of the junior chambers of commerce, who are asking for the adoption of legislation recommended by the Hoover Commission.

Our people, aware of the extravagance and inefficiency of the present administration at Washington, realize that national bankruptcy is knocking at the door.

The members of the junior chambers of commerce know that national bankruptcy means a disastrous depression, suffering and want, the loss of the individual's freedom.

Being young men, they know that the major part of the burden of paying for the administration's extravagance and inefficiency will fall upon them, their children—even unto the third and fourth generations.

Because of this knowledge, the members of the junior chambers of commerce have been holding meetings throughout the district, and no doubt elsewhere, urging the people to write their Senators and Congressmen, to make effective by legislation, the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Although your drive is all to the good, may I suggest there is no need to write me on that subject. I have always voted for economy and efficiency in the Federal Government, and intend to continue so to do.

Now, to aid the junior chambers of commerce in their drive for economy and efficiency, let me call attention to an additional and far more effective method of achieving that end. That is, to support the pending effort to restore to the House Rules Committee the power to screen legislation which it is proposed to bring before the House. Restore to that committee the power to apply the legislative brakes to the proposals of the spenders.

It is the primary duty of the Rules Committee to program the legislation which is to come before the House, to keep from the floor of the House proposed legislation which would be unworkable, wasteful, and detrimental to the public welfare.

If anyone of the 435 Members of the House, or if any committee of the House could force a vote in the House on his or the committee's pet measure or hobby, many a bill unworkable, calling for unnecessary appropriations, would be enacted into law.

You ask why that apparent absurdity exists—it exists because Members of Congress are subjected to terrific pressure by groups representing special interests wanting Federal funds for some desirable, but unnecessary or excessively costly measure.

Let me cite an example: Secretary Tobin recommends a pension of $100 for everyone. However desirable, a moment's thought shows that the Federal Government does not have and cannot obtain, without ruinous taxation, sufficient funds to pay that kind of a pension to everyone.

Because of pressure which would be put upon Congressmen not only by needy and deserving individuals, but also by people who do not think, such a bill could, under the present rules, be, by a committee chairman, brought before the House, and the House, its individual Members, under direct pressure, might pass the bill. But that kind of bill would never get through the Rules Committee. Nor would a petition for its consideration get the signatures of a majority of the Members.

Do I hear you ask: "But why should we permit a Rules Committee to gag the House?" Now, listen my good friends, and no longer be deceived, if you have been deceived, by the false propaganda of the lobbyists who favor an unlimited spending program. The Rules Committee never has and it cannot gag the House. The House is the boss. Always under the rule, when 218 Members of the House, that is, a majority, show they want to vote upon a particular bill by signing a petition, that bill must come before the House for a vote.

All the Rules Committee does, all it can do, is to safeguard the interests of the people, as a whole, by screening legislation, throwing out the unworkable, impracticable bills, introduced by some Congressman to promote his hobby—the program of some special group.

One other thing, the Rules Committee does—it protects a Member of Congress from being required to vote for measures which he knows are detrimental to the national welfare, but which, because of peculiar circumstances or special interests in his own legislative district, he might otherwise, because of political expediency, support.

Now the surest and the quickest remedy for the present excessive wasteful spending of the taxpayers' money is to restore the power of the Rules Committee.

So, in all sincerity, and with the utmost earnestness, I say to you, members of the junior chambers of commerce, and to all others who want to prevent a disastrous depression, support this effort to restore to the Rules Committee, authority to separate the wheat from the chaff, aid Congressmen in getting worth-while, constructive legislation as recommended by the Hoover Commission. But keep the Congressmen off the political spot upon which politically minded, Treasury-raiding groups would put them.

EXCISE TAXES

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I take the time of the House again to call to the attention of the Members, the demand of the people for relief from the burdensome wartime excise taxes. I have received from the people of my congressional district some 3,200 letters, telegrams, cards, and so forth, urging Congress to repeal these taxes. It is to be presumed that other Members have received as many or more like requests for tax relief and it is not my purpose to claim any kind of a record. But if other Members have been as deluged as I have with this kind of mail, then most certainly we have ample evidence of public demand for action by Congress to grant some measure of relief from these so-called luxury taxes.

During the war years the people did not mind paying these taxes because they knew that the revenue was needed to meet the war emergency. They realized also that another primary objective of such taxes was to discourage civilian consumption and civilian production of items in competition with the defense program for materials and men. They were perfectly willing to pay increased taxes and to forego the consumption of luxury items if it was in the best interests of the war effort.

But the war has been over for about 5 years and the same justification for these taxes no longer remains. Most certainly that is true with respect to those articles which by no stretch of the imagination could ever have been considered luxuries, such as: Baby oils, powders and lotions, electric light bulbs, numerous gas and electric appliances, leather goods, lubricating oils, transportation, and many other items. There is no good reason for continuing the fiction that these things are luxuries when they are actually necessities.

These excise taxes in many instances are actually a deterrent to business activity and employment. With the cost of living still high many people refrain or are prohibited from buying products which they want and need. The purchase price, together with the tax, is prohibitive. Representatives of industry have informed me that decreases in the volume of their sales can be directly attributed to this factor. Verification of that fact comes from members of organized labor who tell me that the tax has caused some unemployment.

Retention of all these excise taxes does not represent sound fiscal management. High rates of taxes do not necessarily of themselves mean increased revenue to the Government. On the contrary, history points to instances when a high rate may tend to reduce revenues. If there are fewer sales of highly taxed items simply because people do not want to pay the taxes it should be obvious that revenues will decrease. Likewise, some relief from payment of burdensome taxes may result in increased revenues.

We might benefit from Canada's experience in this regard. The Canadian Government accorded similar tax relief despite the belief on the part of some that the beneficial results thereof would be doubtful. Time has proven the wisdom of the course taken. Canada's tax revenues are now exceeding its expenditures.

Several measures have been introduced providing for tax relief. They are presently pending before the Ways and Means Committee. I urge all Members who are interested in excise-tax relief to exert every effort to secure early and favorable action by that committee, so that the membership of the House may have an opportunity to vote on this much-requested, and I might say demanded, legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks a resolution of the National Committee for the Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes with offices in New York:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the undersigned have associated themselves together as a committee of principals under the name National Committee for Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes for the purpose of undertaking to secure the repeal of the discriminatory wartime excise taxes so as to leave in effect only the pre-1941 excises, and have included in their objective all such excises except those on alcohol, tobacco, and gasoline, and

Whereas this committee of principals believes that these unfair and discriminatory taxes should be repealed for the following reasons, among others:

1. The strongest reason for their enactment was that they were admittedly repressive and would put a brake on the businesses affected. They were intentionally diversionary and punitive in order to meet wartime necessities. Since they continue to repress and to divert in peacetime, they are discriminatory and unfair.

2. They are rationing by taxation—the last of the wartime controls.

3. They dictate to the consumer how he shall spend his dollar; a severe limitation on his freedom of choice.

4. Since they strike deeply into whole communities and particular businesses, their unfairness causes bitterness when unemployment results to the individual worker.

5. The Congress has a moral commitment to the American people to end the high wartime excise taxes. This pledge is woven through the laws, their legislative history, and the very logic of their original enactment.

6. Since they increase prices to the consumer, they produce a maximum of mass irritation at a minimum of return, with their greatest impact on the low-income group, least able to pay.

7. Because they are arbitrarily selective by peacetime standards, they have injured particular industries.

8. More people and more businesses are subjected to the repeated bite of these taxes than any other, without exception.

9. Consumer spending (which we must increase in order to sustain high-level employment) is decreased by these taxes.

10. The term "luxury taxes" is misleading, confusing, and in fact false, since the wartime excise taxes were not imposed on luxuries. They were imposed on goods and services that interfered with wartime necessities.

11. Only complete repeal (restoration of the pre-1941 status) can be effective; mere reduction in rates would be a serious mistake—the irritant would remain; the moral commitment would be unfulfilled; the discrimination and unfairness would continue.

12. These are bad taxes; they are placed on gross revenues not on net profits.

13. If it is wrong to keep the discriminatory wartime rates, and right to repeal them, America cannot afford not to do the right.

14. Tax-repeal action rather than public works is the only way to reach the skills unemployed by consumer resistance to wartime excise taxes.

15. If these taxes are now repealed, the Government will have exerted itself positively in the direction of continued high-level employment and increasing national income throughout 1950.

16. When taxes enacted for an emergency purpose are permitted to remain after the emergency has passed, the faith of the people in their Government is shaken.

17. Because of the general belief that these taxes will be repealed, quick action to this end is necessary, as the public is curtailing its purchases of many products and services in the affected industries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Committee for the Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes, That the aforesaid unfair and discriminatory excises should be repealed, and the pre-1941 status restored at the earliest possible date.

This 12th day of January 1950.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR REPEAL OF WARTIME EXCISE TAXES.

THE KOREAN AID BILL

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, in company with three other Members of Congress, I had an opportunity to visit Korea this last December. I do want to bring to my colleagues my reaction upon this bill which proposes to make $150,000,000 available to Korea.

Korea, as you must know, was split at the thirty-eighth parallel in a secret agreement made with the Russians either at Potsdam or Yalta. The northern part of Korea, with about 9,500,000 population, is under the complete control of Communist Russia. The southern part of Korea, with about 28,000,000 people, is called the Republic of Korea. This country has been supporting southern Korea, having had a considerable army there until a few months ago. At the present time, we have about 500 officers and men who are training a Korean Army of about a hundred thousand men. We had an opportunity to review these troops. They look like tough, hard-fighting individuals. I understand that most of them are "trigger happy" and they are equipped with light rifles, a few cannons, and a dozen old observation planes which we left with them. I do believe that I am not violating any military secrets when I say that General Roberts, who represents our Government, stated before a rather large group that it was not any longer "if" the Communists move in, but "when" they move on southern Korea. It is understood the northern Communist army is being equipped with heavy tanks and fighting material. When they do move in, south Korea could last about 8 or 10 days.

Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the last ECA report of the December 30 issue, No. 71, page 5, that the ECA has authorized $10,900,000 for power plants, fertilizer plants, and money to build dams which will permit the irrigation of an additional 27,000 acres of land in Korea. It is my understanding that the bill under consideration today will make money available for fertilizer plants and other permanent improvements which, when the Communists take over, would be of great benefit to the Russians.

I call your attention to the fact that the won, while it is officially 450 to the dollar, it can be had on the street at the rate of 900 to the dollar.

Mr. Speaker, I refer you to a press release by Doctor Jessup, dated January 13, from Seoul, Korea, in which Doctor Jessup refused a direct reply when a Korean reporter asked what the United States would do if the Korean Republic faced imminent Communist aggression as does Formosa. I would also refer you to a statement in the New York Times of Sunday, January 14, in which the price of rice has doubled in the past 6 months, and during the last few days has been rising about 6 percent daily. It would seem from this article that there is a run-away inflation.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the State Department has no intention of interfering when the Communists move in to take over southern Korea. If that conclusion is correct, then I ask the question, "Is it wise for this country to invest $150,000,000 in Korea?" It is my understanding that the State Department and the policies of this Government is to keep hands off and let the Communists take Korea and most of Asia. I have every sympathy for southern Korea. President Rhee and his Cabinet are doing their best to establish a republic. I was greatly impressed with the statement made by the American chairman of the National Assembly when he spoke to us on our visit to their legislative body. His remarks were as follows:

ADDRESS OF P. H. SHINICKY, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL ASSEMBLY, REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Ladies and gentlemen, I consider it a great honor for me to say a few words of welcome in honor of the Congressmen and the officials of the United States.

Although the United States and Korea are separated by the Pacific Ocean, they have been as close in relationship as brothers. Especially after the liberation, the United States has been the main supporter of the independence of Korea, and she has also favored Korea as the first recipient of the Marshall-plan aid. We cannot be too grateful for these things.

While other material supplies are highly important for the rehabilitation of Korea, the American military aid can be considered most important and urgent for her. We, the Korean people, are fighting every day against the Communist aggression, and our zeal to defend our fatherland against the impact of the communism is indeed invincible, but we have no munitions and arms with which to fight the aggressors. We do not expect other people to defend our country; we want to defend it with our own lives. But in doing so we must have arms. God helps those who help themselves. We will sacrifice our lives for our country. Therefore, we are earnestly appealing to the United States for aid in ammunition.

It is my conviction that the moral and material support from the United States and the United Nations comes to Korea, not as aiming to revive Korea alone from its struggle, but as being motivated by the sense of the fundamental principle of mutual help among mankind. The world is one—nations of the world are now linked together—they are inseparable in their affairs. If, by the help of the United States and the United Nations, Korea should become the bulwark in the Orient against communism, it would not only be a fortunate thing for the Koreans, but also a great contribution to the United States and, further, to the United Nations. Korea, well defended, will contribute its part to the peace of the world.

May God's blessings be on you Members of the Congress and the officials of the United States in your trip through the Orient. I thank you.

Mr. Speaker, you will note that its principal plea is for military aid. He says we must have arms. It does not seem to be the purpose of this appropriation to supply arms and fighting equipment to Korea. It does not seem that the permanent capital improvements is the proper direction we should travel if we are really to give Korea the help they need.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain extraneous matter.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at the lack of familiarity with the rules of the House just exhibited by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.], former national chairman of the Republican Party. In the first place, he knows that Calendar Wednesday, as of today, has already been dispensed with by unanimous consent; and in the second place, he knows that Calendar Wednesday can only be dispensed with by unanimous consent. If the gentleman were diligent in his duties and was on the floor of the House and wanted to see business in order on Calendar Wednesday go ahead under the rules of the House, he can do so at any time by objecting to dispensing with Calendar Wednesday. Any one Member can achieve that end.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. The gentleman has made an incorrect statement. The majority leader has submitted that unanimous-consent request to the House and all he has to do at this time is to resubmit the question and ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday business be in order today. But I have not heard him do so.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, that is a further illustration of one of the weirdest and strangest states of mind that I have ever heard of in my years in this body, and that is to resubmit a unanimous-consent request now under the conditions that exist.

The statement that the gentleman made is absolutely correct. He knows that Calendar Wednesday business can only be dispensed with by unanimous consent, and he knows, or ought to have known, that it had been dispensed with as far as this Wednesday is concerned.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I am only suggesting a way by which the FEPC matter can be brought up today.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] has expired.

REA STEAM-GENERATING PROGRAM

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT], made an unwarranted attack on the Southwestern Power Administration and the policy of the Rural Electrification Administration in making loans for the building of generating plants and transmission lines. He introduced H. R. 6782, which has for its purpose the prohibiting of loans by the Rural Electrification Administration for building plants or lines to be owned, leased, used, or operated by other than the rural electric cooperatives, unless the consent of Congress is obtained. By this means he seeks to hamstring the rural electrification program; and his bill is contrary to the interests of the 160,000 members of our rural electric cooperatives in Missouri, as well as inimical to the 90,000 in my State who are awaiting electric service. In fact, it is a blow to the rural people all over this Nation.

When I was home after adjournment of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, I was besieged almost daily by delegations of farmers who have been trying for years to obtain electricity but who have not yet received this most necessary service. The gentleman from Arkansas has seen fit to take up the cudgel of the private utilities who have tried to destroy the REA program by every means at their command. I do not believe that the membership of this House will be misled by the attack that has been made upon this program, because the whole economy and welfare of our farm population is at stake.

The gentleman from Arkansas says that he is a great friend of the farmer and a firm believer in REA, and then he introduces a bill which would practically nullify this program. He blows both hot and cold in the same breath.

Aesop mentioned in one of his fables about two travelers who were going down a highway on a cold, wintry day. They came finally to an old tavern and decided to have a cup of coffee. As they were seated at the table waiting to be served, one of the travelers raised his hands to his mouth and blew upon them. Whereupon, his companion said to him: "Why do you blow upon your hands?" "To warm them," said the other. After the coffee had been served, the same traveler who had blown upon his hands to warm them, raised the cup of coffee to his mouth and blew upon it. Again his companion spoke and said: "Why do you blow upon the coffee?" Whereupon the other answered: "To cool it." "Farewell," said the other, "I must bid you adieu. I have no faith in any man who blows both hot and cold in the same breath."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the International Teamster on labor unions in Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia by Edward Walsh.

Mr. BISHOP asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made before the Appropriations Committee today.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article written by him.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

DISCRIMINATION IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I hope that on Monday of next week this House will call up for final action, the FEPC bill that has been receiving so much attention throughout the country.

At this time I want to direct your attention to the fact that one more step in the right direction to eliminate discrimination in this Nation has been taken by the Army, pursuant to an order issued by Gen. Gordon Gray. He has issued an order which requires that Negro troops be integrated into every branch of the service, taking into consideration only their qualifications, their ability, and their competence to do the particular job required of the rating or rank to which they may be assigned or commissioned.

Last year I introduced a bill in this House which would attempt to accomplish the same purpose in the National Guard. It has not even had a hearing. I hope it will get a hearing at this session and be reported to this House so that the National Guard, which in time of war, is an integral part of our Army, may be brought up to the same level as the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force in accordance with the direction of the President, and those subordinate to him.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I introduced a resolution which seeks a complete inquiry into the extent to which the armed services, particularly the Army, have met the tests laid down by the President and the Secretary of Defense, in respect to this question of equality of opportunity and treatment in the armed forces. Does the gentleman see anything inconsistent in his position and in the proposition suggesting that Congress, in the exercise of its legislative oversight, should ascertain and be sure that these great policies have been, are being, and will be fully carried out in all three branches of the armed services, including the Army?

Mr. MULTER. If the assurances that I have received are correct, and I have no reason to believe that they are not, I do not see any need for the gentleman's investigation. If integration by occupation and talent has been functioning in the Navy and the Air Force, as I have been assured it has been, there is no need to investigate in those branches of the armed services. If, pursuant to General Gray's direction, the same thing

happens in the Army, again there is no need for an investigation. If the gentleman has any information that indicates that those assurances I have received are not in accordance with the fact, then, of course, his investigation should be conducted.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. It is a fact, is it not, that there still are segregated Negro units in the Army even under the present order of Secretary Gray? I do agree, however, that the Department of the Army has been at long last making some real efforts to deal with the problem. It is a fact, though, that segregated units remain. In view therefore of the long time it has taken even to get to even this stage, have we in the Congress not a right to ask that the whole process which is now said to be continuing in a more opportune way, that the whole process should be subject to legislative oversight?

Mr. MULTER. Separate units necessarily will continue until this order can be implemented and carried into effect. But you cannot expect that these Negro units are going to be disbanded at once; these men must be integrated into their proper places where they can be used in other units. I believe that the purpose and aim of General Gray's order is to accomplish just that, but it certainly cannot be done overnight. If there should be delay in its being accomplished, or if this order should be eyewash—and we have been assured that it is not eyewash—then, of course, the gentleman's investigation must go forward.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield still further? And I promise not to interrupt him further.

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The Air Force and the Navy have actually eliminated segregated units, whereas the Army has not.

Mr. MULTER. And the Coast Guard did likewise.

Mr. JAVITS. Those three services have eliminated them.

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. The Army has not done so.

Mr. MULTER. Not yet.

Mr. JAVITS. Certainly we have the right to know why.

Mr. MULTER. We do know that fact; I am expressing the hope that this order will very quickly accomplish the same result in the Army that has been accomplished in the other services.

It is appropriate at this time to call to your attention while we are talking and thinking about FEPC, that 10 States have enacted antidiscrimination statutes.

Eight additional States have legislation on their books now which forbid discrimination in the National Guard. Last year the State of New York became one of the eight which enacted such legislation. The bill to which I referred a moment ago, which I introduced, would accomplish that purpose on a Nationwide scale.

Eighteen States today forbid discrimination in transportation and in recreation.

I do not pretend that this matter of discrimination is wholly a southern problem; it is not. In the last year there were four lynchings and eight race riots throughout the country. They were not all in the South; we had them in Chicago, in St. Louis, right here in the city of Washington, and in New York State; we had them in Baltimore, in Birmingham, and in Florida. So it is not a southern problem; it is a Nation-wide problem. The enactment of the FEPC law on a national scale will go a long way toward eliminating those very situations which bring about such riots and lynchings, it will be one further step in the accomplishment of true freedom, freedom in the democratic way.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THOSE TAXES COME FROM YOUR POCKET

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, Lenin is reported as having said, just before his death: "We shall force the United States to spend itself into destruction." If his spirit is keeping check, it must be gleefully gloating as it looks down on us and reads our daily Treasury balance. If Lenin did not say that, the cumulative effect of the Communist program very closely approaches its accomplishment.

Seemingly the only remedy our present leaders have for communism is the old "greenback poultice."

Each day we grow financially weaker as our national debt mounts, even in these days of prosperity. What will happen if we have a little depression, just a teeny one, no one can predict.

Just how bad is it?

Let us take the Treasury's own figures as shown by the daily statement of the United States Treasury for December 30, 1949. This statement reflects our financial condition for that day and compares it with that day in the previous year.

On December 30, 1949, the Treasury report shows that Uncle Sam had spent $3,299,798,921.52 more than had been received since July 1, 1949.

Our national debt as of January 1, 1950, was $257,160,110,000.09, an increase of $4,305,708,539.54 over January 1, 1949. Since the calendar year takes in parts of two fiscal years, a part of this deficit, $1,005,909,618.02 applies to the fiscal year 1949, for which the initial appropriations were made by the Eightieth Congress. But the Eighty-first Congress made deficiency and special appropriations of $2,152,868,802 to apply against fiscal 1949 without which there would have been a surplus for fiscal 1949 of $1,146,959,183.98.

From these figures it can be clearly seen that the first calendar year under the Eighty-first Congress put Uncle Sam in the red $5,500,000,000 to $6,000,000,000 more.

Incidentally, the more we owe the greater becomes our burden of interest which is now nearly $500,000,000 per month.

It should be remembered, too, that the much-maligned Eightieth Congress not only cut spending $3,500,000,000 under that proposed by the President but also reduced taxes $4,000,000,000 and still left a $7,000,000,000 surplus, most of which was paid on the Federal debt. This was the first balanced budget in 17 years and probably the last tax cut, of any substance, the country will get for a long time in the future.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee you would naturally expect me to talk about where we spend our money. However, since the subject of taxes is uppermost in everyone's mind—is close to your heart, at least to your pocketbook—let us take a look at where Uncle Sam gets his money.

Whether you realize it or not, the United States, through its taxes, lives with you every second of every minute of every day of your life. Studying these figures which I will point out to you—you will soon see, if you have not done so before—that there is nothing free from Uncle Sam. Uncle Sam has to pay for it all, and the only source of revenue that the Government of the United States has is taxes. If Uncle Sam spends more than he takes from us in taxes, the only thing left to do is issue more bonds. The more bonds that are issued against Uncle Sam as security, the less all those bonds are worth. That is just plain economics. Eventually the widows, the school children, the veterans, businessmen, banks, and insurance companies who hold these bonds, whether the investment is $25 or $25,000,000, must some day be repaid—repaid from current taxes.

Everything Uncle Sam buys on credit costs 25 percent more than if bought with cash. The bonds we issued in 1940 are due in 1950. Each $3 invested calls for $4 in repayment.

The Federal debt is a burden all of us must help carry and pay with accrued interest. At present, with 60,000,000 persons working, the pro rata debt burden is over $4,000 for each worker. If that were a hunk of silver, it would weigh 403 pounds. That weight of debt hanging around each worker's neck is enough to slow him down considerably.

With those remarks as background, let us look at a report made by the Treasury Department covering revenue from July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949. The figures are big. They may become boring but they are important. They show what comes out of your pocket.

It is your money.

Everyone who earns, and this includes school children on vacation, has learned about income tax and has found that before he gets his hands on his pay check Uncle Sam's tax collector has been there ahead of him, taking out social security and income taxes. Personally, I would favor repeal of the withholding tax system, for it has made taxpaying too painless. The worker today hardly realizes how much tax he does pay. The worker would be conscious of his tax burden if he had to dig up the dough each 3 months, as many of you do. He would be brought face to face with the fact that he, the worker himself, not the boss, pays the tax.

Well, at any rate individual earners in the fiscal year of 1949—July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949—kicked in a trifle over $18,000,000,000, nearly three billion less than in 1947, mostly withheld and paid in by the employers. The corporations paid in a little more than eleven and one-half billion on income—up one and one-fourth billion over 1947. These two items total $29,605,000,000. That was not enough to meet the $43,250,000,000 spending spree, so Uncle Sam had to dig deeper for tax dollars.

Corporations paid in another $2,500,000,000 for retirement insurance, including railroad and unemployment tax. These are special trust funds and, just as labor and material, they are part of the cost of production and as such are passed on to and indirectly paid by the worker who buys the bread, the shoes, the radio, and the car.

Now that it is legal in Kansas, we can discuss liquor, even mention highballs. One fact should not be lost sight of: Uncle Sam's tax collector is right there at your elbow when you are bending it.

From taxes on imported and domestic wine and whisky the tax collector comes in for $2,000,000,000. This is less than the amount collected in 1947.

One of the radio programs advertising cigarettes asks, "Does your cigarette taste different lately?" The wonder is, Mr. Speaker, no matter how good the meal may have been, that the after-dinner cigarette even tastes, because the greater portion, around 75 percent, of the cost of that cigarette is taxes. Puffing on taxes certainly cannot be anything but distasteful, especially when the cost is $1,232,734,672.22 annually.

Tobacco taxes on cigars, chewing tobacco, and other forms bring in $89,140,097.73. Though many people think chewing went out with handle-bar mustaches, tobacco chewers and smokers contribute $25,000,000 in taxes for spitting at and probably missing the spittoon.

An amazing disclosure in this report is that snuff chewers pinch off $7,272,000 in taxes. Most people did not realize there was that much snuff sold, let alone that much tax paid on the stuff.

Stamp taxes were a hot issue in 1776. They are still with us—stuck on bonds, mortgages, and playing cards, all told in the sum of $73,000,000. The bridge, canasta, and poker players, if any, pay a $7,500,000 levy on the cards they use.

However, businessmen are especially concerned about the tax burden on business; taxes which, if they could be reduced, would lower the cost of living, and by so doing make the workers' dollars buy more. After all, these taxes, too, are in the price, though concealed, of every item they affect, and all are affected in one way or another. Some necessities of life carry uncountable tax items; for instance, a loaf of bread has at least 150 items of tax in it.

Greases and lubricating oils, so essential to keeping the wheels of production and the wheels and motors of our cars turning smoothly, feel the grip—firm despite the elusive quality of oil—of the tax collector. Taxes on lubricating oils bring Uncle Sam $82,000,000.

Without gasoline a lot of us could not work, let alone take a vacation. We could not call on as many customers, we could not serve our clients, and we could not deliver our merchandise. There, too, we find the tax cash flowing into Uncle Sam's coffers. This time it is a real item, a big load on business, $503,000,000—a half billion dollars.

Our farm wagons and oxcarts rolled on steel rims, but fast-moving cars, busses, trucks, tractors, and trailers need rubber tires and tubes. Here again Uncle Sam gets his hand into our pocketbooks for taxes, $150,000,000 worth. That is not all; before we even get the cars and trucks on the highways the bite is on for more taxes on them, $498,000,000. Experts declare that nearly one-fourth of the price of a Ford—or any other car—is taxes. That is before you are hit with State sales and license taxes. You would think that after you begin to use these vehicles and they start wearing out Uncle Sam's tax men would get out and let you alone, but they do not. They snag you again for taxes on repair parts and accessories in the amount of $120,000,000.

Most of us take electricity for granted and as tax-free, but even the light I need at home to read this mass of figures to the taxpayers is taxed. Electrical energy produced in our plants brings more dollars into the tax bill, $79,000,000.

Our doctors tell us to use better light to save our eyes. We do and we pay more taxes on the very light bulbs that shed their gleam on the pages of our daily paper. As we depend more on electricity, gas, and oil, the appliances we use contribute more taxes, $80,000,000.

Radio has become a part of our life—whether it is Bing Crosby or Ezio Pinza or the Metropolitan Opera. Some families have two or three radios, not to mention the one in pop's car. In more recent days television has come into our taverns and our homes. Surely, you say, here is amusement that is free. You are wrong. The tax collector sits with us at our fireside to the tune of $49,000,000 more on these radio and television sets—$20,000,000 less than 1947.

Even Mule Train records are lugged. Records—musical, discordant, classical, or hillbilly—pay $6,500,000 to Uncle Sam.

Parents purchase pianos, drums, saxophones, clarinets, and trumpets for aspiring and embryo Sousas, Dorseys, Iturbis, and Krupas. The clatter, squeaks, squawks, and booms was sweet music to the Treasury, with $9,250,000 dropping in the coffers.

When the ice man went out the back door the tax man came in the front with the electric refrigerators. The demand for air conditioning in factories, offices, and homes grew by leaps and bounds, but whether it is hot or cold, cooling or freezing, the tax collector comes in for $77,000,000 more—$22,000,000 increase over 1947.

Zippo or Ronson and other lighters are found in many of our pockets and purses yet matches are not a thing of the past. Uncle Sam gets in on burnt fingers for $8,750,000—$2,000,000 less than 1947—on matches.

With sales taxes, social-security taxes, unemployment taxes—all sorts of deductions—the bookkeepers and the billing clerks in plants and offices have become machine operators. The more business machinery you have to have the happier the Collector of Internal Revenue becomes. On business and store machines he issues tax receipts for $43,000,000.

Most men like to see pictures—especially of beautiful women and children. Movies and still cameras record pleasurable moments on vacations or at conventions. News stories are more readable with photos. Professional and amateur photographers add to the pile of tax dollars by another $43,000,000 each year.

Fishermen, golfers, hunters, baseball, softball, and football players cannot escape Uncle Sam and his horde of tax hounds. All of these pay over $30,000,000 for their fun and exercise.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that somewhere we should escape these Treasury sleuths.

Possibly we can do it in our own home, in our bathroom—that is private, is it not? Well, each morning, except Thursday or Friday in New York, the tax-earner gets up and shaves, but he has company: The tax collector is leering into the mirror, thinking about the taxes on soap, face lotion, and powder. A man's wife cannot powder her nose, rouge her cheeks, perfect the cupid bow on her lips or polish her nails without that tax man invading her boudoir. The take here is $93,000,000. Uncle Sam gets in on our romances too. The young GI, heart pounding, can do no less than get "her" an engagement ring even if it has only a little teeny-weeny diamond. When he slips it on her finger, puts his arm around her, and kisses her, is he alone in his bliss? No, the tax man is there, too. And when he gets the plain gold band and says "I do" the tax man is right behind—if not ahead of—the preacher.

Jewelry glitters and glistens, and its purchasers pay over $200,000,000 to Uncle Sam. But how a $5 alarm clock ever got into the luxury class I will never know but Uncle Sam thinks it is. When it clatters at 5:30 in the morning that young husband will not think it is even a necessity.

A year or so later, about three in the morning the young husband, a father now, has to get up—well, all you fathers know what for. When he changes that "didy" and rubs some oil or pats some powder on the baby's—uh—bottom, the tax taker is right there participating in those pats. Toilet preparations for dad, mother, sister, and baby carry a tax load of nearly a hundred million dollars.

We are still way short of the billions the administration is spending at home and abroad. No matter how sweet home is, lots of us travel—to school, to Washington, to factories, on honeymoons. Of course, we could just tie our stuff in a bundle like our hobo friends do, but we do not; we get suitcases and all sorts of luggage. Uncle Sam just chuckles and taps us for another chunk in the amount of $80,632,323.81.

Then there is another little item: After mother has lived with us 30 years or so, she suggests that several of the girls have fur coats and she would like to have one, too. After putting up with us that long, she deserves one. Maybe

you did not kick too much on 20 percent being added to your twenty-fifth-wedding-anniversary silver, but 20 percent on a fur coat burns you up and only 80 percent of the cost goes to keeping her warm. So whether it is muskrat, mink, or rabbit, husbands throughout the Nation drop $62,000,000 more into that yawning tax cavern. Even our sweet tooth is taxed. Sugar carries enough taxes to turn it sour—$76,000,000.

Talk about free speech all you please, but the use of long-distance telephone and telegraph adds $311,000,000 to the cost of doing business. When you are not home you call your wife or she calls you, your conversations are taxed to the last click of the receiver—224 more millions. So chatter, business or pleasure, is costly—over one-half billion.

Whether it is a trip to Niagara Falls, a sales convention, or an emergency due to illness or death in the family, Uncle Sam rides along and this tax adds another one-fourth billion to the expense of the trips.

We have a vast network of railroad lines and highways. Freight cars and transports carry everything from food to furniture, candy, fruit, vegetables, flour, coal and iron, all the products of mines, farms, forests, and factories from coast to coast, border to border. The more we buy, the more freight we move, the more that tax man adds to the bill. We pay taxes on transportation of property—$337,000,000 more or another one-third billion dollars. This torrent of taxes pyramids because transportation taxes are levied every time the commodity moves from the very first time the raw ore, food, or fiber leaves the mine or field.

Occasionally you try to forget your worries; forget how you will pay the bills, including taxes. You try to lose yourself and your problems in the world of make-believe. You and your wife decide to leave the children with a sitter and go to the movie. Who walks in and sits down in your seat with you? The tax collector, of course. Theatergoers help the harvest of taxes—paying tribute of more than one-third billion dollars—to be exact $385,843,793.10.

Cabarets and night clubs help a little—$3,000,000. Club members add $28,000,000 more. Bowling alleys and pool halls help things along but not much. Their share is only $3,800,000.

Outlawed though they may be in most places, there are enough slot machines of all kinds in operation that Uncle Sam, while he may not hit the jackpot, gets his much more surely. The whirling disks, the blinking lights, and the clanging bells run up twenty-one million in nickels, dimes, and quarters in Uncle Sam's coin-collecting machines.

The much-discussed oleo, pale or yellow, often called the poor man's butter, carries its load of taxes, too, $17,500,000 worth. Coconut oil adds another $17,500,000, and a few miscellaneous items add a little more.

Mr. Speaker, two things are certain: death and taxes. These figures show how Uncle Sam plagues and taxes us at every turn. You would think surely he would let us alone in death. But not so; there are a lot of tax items tied up in the funeral, so the tax collector goes with you to your grave. Estate taxes bring in $735,000,000—nearly $100,000,000 less than 1947 and constantly shrinking. Gift taxes, also shrinking, give Uncle Sam $60,757,000 more.

Taken altogether Uncle Sam has scraped our pocketbook for more than we spend for food. He took $40,463,125,018.61 in fiscal 1949. That is still $5,500,000,000 to $6,000,000,000 less than your servants, the Democrat administration and the Democrat-controlled Eighty-first Congress, are spending. Furthermore, the President's message calls for still increased spending.

This alarming state of affairs recalls the words of two former Democrat Presidents. One said:

> Any government, like any family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse.

How far we are from the poorhouse no one can say but we are altogether too close for comfort. How near we are to fulfilling Lenin's prediction, no one knows.

Mr. Speaker, the other Democrat President, Thomas Jefferson, spoke words which should be in every American taxpayer's home, they should be in the office of the President and every Member of Congress in letters a foot high:

> I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude.
>
> If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and our comforts, in our labors and in our amusements. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy.

Mr. Speaker, how truly he spoke. Every worker is taxed on his necessities and comforts, his meat and drink, his labors and his amusements. His labors are wasted by the Government and the Government does pretend to care for them.

Mr. Speaker, every worker, every housewife, every employer, especially every young person, should realize that those are his dollars that Uncle Sam is spending.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to address the House on Tuesday next for 10 minutes, following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ENGLE of California). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

ONE-YEAR RENEWAL OF FEDERAL RENT CONTROL URGED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the people of the country are entitled to know now while many State legislatures are in session the intentions of Congress with respect to the extension of Federal rent control. It will be a serious mistake and not in the best interests of the country if this decision is permitted to wait until close to June 30, 1950, and is then not made at all, or made at the eleventh hour. Such action will play directly into the hands of those misguided people who believe that a runaway rental structure is beneficial to property owners—for should this happen the retribution would be far more severe than rent control today.

As it is today, though Federal rent control has, due to the fair net operating income adjustment provisions, resulted in some enormous rent increases of between 30 and 50 percent, it has on the whole thus far—and I emphasize thus far—tolerably held the rent control line, and the fair net operating income provision can and should be eliminated in a renewal of the act. Certainly removal of Federal rent control is no answer to the problem. For example, in New York City with 1,800,000 family housing units under control, rent increases under the 1949 act averaged 11.4 percent and applied to 7 percent of the controlled units. Most of the cases in which increases were granted—100,740 out of 123,491 units, the total affected by increases—were stated by OHE to be due to major capital improvements, increased services, and increased occupancy. In the rent clinic which I conduct in my own district where the cases of about 6,000 tenants have been serviced, our experience has been that about 5 percent of the tenants whom we have represented have received rent increases and the amount of increase has not exceeded 11 percent. The amendment to the Federal rent control which I had the privilege of proposing, and which requires the landlord who wishes to qualify for a rent increase to certify to maintenance of tenants' services equal to those existing on the rent-freeze date, has been a vital factor in holding the balance of equal justice between landlord and tenant. In New York City OHE reports that tenants in 30 percent of the cases successfully opposed efforts to get rent increases where the required services were not being rendered by the landlord, and in that city OHE reports that 85,271 reduction-of-services cases were handled in 1949 with restoration of service or compensating rent reductions in 83.8 percent or 71,452 of the cases.

We must not overlook that fact that some extremist elements, sometimes unwittingly aided and abetted by some short-sighted politicians, have been using the rent-control issue to stir up public confusion and what is even worse, discord and lack of confidence by thousands of tenants in government. It is difficult for Members who are not from

big cities to understand the amount of mischief which can be done in this way and the real subversion of public confidence which can be practiced through some ostensibly claiming to be protecting tenants' rights. The abandonment of Federal rent control at this time would strengthen the hands of such harmful elements in the community, for rent is of the most critical importance to the normal big-city family, costing as it does 15 to 25 percent of their total income, and a runaway rent structure is, therefore, a fertile breeding ground for demagoguery and the creation of bitter class antagonisms.

The evidence bearing on the question of continued Federal rent control demands its extension. The reason for applying Federal rent control in the first instance was that the housing shortage was countrywide and that rent gouging on a national scale could ensue as rent controls were loosened. Certainly the brief experience with runaway rents during the short time when controls were off just after the war demonstrated the incipient national danger in this condition.

The criteria which should determine whether Federal rent control should be reenacted or should terminate on June 30 next are, first, has the housing shortage been materially overcome; second, what has been the experience with decontrol where it has been tried; and, third, is the Federal rent-control law adequate for the public interest?

Country-wide surveys indicate that the housing shortage continues. Since 1945 the annual rate of housing construction has not exceeded roughly a million units per year. We have fallen far short of this mark. It should be noted that our population increased in 1949 alone about 3,000,000 and that in that year there entered into the market for housing about 700,000 families. It is significant that the Joint Committee on Housing in their final report, March 1948 (pp. 8–11) estimated that 1,287,000 to 1,441,000 housing units must be started each year to satisfy housing requirements by 1960. When the housing shortage was first recognized as a housing emergency, estimates of the emergency housing need ranged between 3 and 5 million new units, with a great proportion needed as rental units. The rate of construction since 1945 up to December 31, 1949, has resulted in 3,471,000 housing starts, an average of 868,000 per year, and of these only about 20 percent were for rental—the high being 23 percent in 1949—against a normal 40 percent constructed for rental before World War II. The recorded housing starts include, too, considerable replacement housing and higher income bracket housing; also the addition of over 2,000,000 new families since 1945 has greatly increased the demand. Altogether I estimate that housing construction to date has resulted in an actual contribution to reducing the housing emergency by no more than one-third.

In New York City, for example, 250,000 housing units were urgently needed early in 1946 to look after families doubled up or tripled up, most all of them veterans, or compelled to live in substandard accommodations. Yet under the whole construction program in New York City since 1945 about 80,000 of these units have been supplied. Evidence of the great need is also shown in New York City by the fact that applications for public housing units are often 10 times the number of units available.

One of the primary contributions to the emergency need is the inability to supply housing under existing costs and even with existing Federal aids, at rentals of less than $80 per month for the normal unit. This is between $20 to $30 per month beyond the reach of the normal family. Even the public housing program authorized by the last Congress expected to contribute 810,000 public housing units is designed for construction over a 6-year period and such units have not been supplied or will not be for about another year.

Of the approximately 14,500,000 units under control, April 1, 1949, OHE reports that 2,621,900 had been decontrolled by December 16, 1949.

OHE reports that between April 1 and December 16, 1949, a total of 642 decontrol actions were taken which removed controls from an estimated 2,621,900 rental units; the Housing Expediter took 438 of these actions on his own initiative, thus decontrolling 1,035,600 rental units in about 200 towns and cities; local option accounted for 193 actions affecting 674,800 rental units, and 6 actions affecting 837,500 rental units were taken by State option; and 5 actions affecting 74,000 units were taken on the recommendation of local rent advisory boards.

Experience with decontrol indicates sharp rent rises in most areas in which decontrol has taken place—averaging between $6.76 to $14.09 per month in apartments in the $30–$50 monthly rental brackets and covering 50 percent of all apartments in such rental brackets in key cities. Even assuming that areas decontrolled had a right to expect material rent increases in connection with the decision to decontrol it is yet extremely significant that increases were heavy and widespread.

Though the decontrol machinery under the Federal law permits decontrol on a State-wide and even on a local basis, decontrol has been relatively limited both in the number of units and the areas affected. Only six States—Nebraska, Texas, Arizona, Utah, Alabama, and Wisconsin—have decontrolled and there are not included the most populous States of New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and California. For example, no big city in the Northeast has decontrolled, and even in the South where the decontrol movement has gained headway there is strong opposition to decontrol in a central point like Atlanta, Ga. OHE reports that 75 cities with over 100,000 population remain under Federal rent control.

The theory of congressional reenactment of the Federal rent-control law is being sustained. The housing emergency continues to exist on a broad scale throughout the country and therefore a national law is essential. The machinery for decontrol is beginning to function by States and localities so that the problem may at the proper time safely be liquidated into local controls or decontrols as the original rent-control program was designed to operate. But at this time an extension of Federal rent control to June 30, 1951, is essential. Certain changes in the law are, however, required in connection with its reenactment for a year, to eliminate the fair net operating income provision of the law and reestablish the hardship test for landlords to qualify for rent increases contained in the 1946 Federal rent-control law which worked with much greater fairness.

I am appending to these remarks a country-wide survey published by the New York Times on Sunday, January 1, showing how limited has been the decontrol movement and the drastic upswing in rents where decontrol has taken place:

UPSWING IN RENTS IS FOUND WHERE CONTROLS ARE ENDED

(By Lee E. Cooper)

A general upswing in the level of residential rents in decontrolled areas throughout the country was indicated yesterday in a survey made by the New York Times. With Federal controls lifted from more than 2,600,000 family rental units during the past 9 months, it was apparent from reports received from all regions that the prices being paid for shelter had broken out of the narrow range in which they had been held by law for about 6 years.

Although about 12,000,000 families, including those in New York City, and nearly all other major population centers, still are under rent-ceiling protection, many of these families have been affected recently by the growing number of approvals by rent authorities of landlord petitions for increases.

From April 1, 1949, the date the present Federal legislation became effective to December 9 the Office of the Housing Expediter in Washington reported that 631 decontrol actions had been completed, taking 2,587,000 family rental units from its control. In the past 3 weeks several communities have been added to the list.

STATES WITHOUT CONTROLS

Four States, Nebraska, Texas, Arizona, and Utah, are now without controls and Alabama has voted to end controls in May. Wisconsin is under a State law which replaced the Federal statute and has permitted substantial rises in rents.

Details on the present situation in the housing market as reported by New York Times correspondents in key cities and obtained from other sources were in most instances at variance with the assertions of realty interests that the lifting of the ceilings had caused no appreciable changes in rental conditions. Unprecedented building activity in some centers, however, has helped to ease the problem of transition.

The general level of rents in Houston was found to have risen 11 percent in 3 months and nearly as much in Milwaukee. Substantial increases were reported in Omaha and Lincoln in Nebraska. Rises put into effect in Spokane, Wash., were said to average 14.3 percent.

There was evidence of isolated increases of 100 percent or more in some cities now operating under a free market. In communities such as Tampa and Miami families occupying the cheaper apartments were found to have been hit hardest, while tenants of some of the more expensive apartments had slightly lower monthly charges.

THE NORTHEAST

In New York State and the New England region all major population centers still are

under the Federal ceilings extending to June 30, 1950, and fairly stable conditions are noted despite occasional protests against approval of rent rises based on the hardship clause or other sections of the law. No large city has been decontrolled. Actions seeking decontrol have thus far affected only a few sparsely populated communities.

Thus far the Metropolitan Fair Rent Committee, representing property owners here, has failed in its efforts to get a blanket increase of 15 percent. Last week it suggested an increase of 25 percent under the revived rule requiring repainting of apartments every 2 years.

In Boston, although exact figures were not available, a large percentage of rent-increase petitions was being granted under the fair net operating income provision of the law, according to Edgar Driscoll, area rent-control director for New England. This was in line with a general policy reflecting increased costs of operation, Mr. Driscoll said.

In the five-county Philadelphia area containing 420,000 registered units under the jurisdiction of the Housing Expediter, the borough of Swarthmore voted for local option in October, but otherwise there has been no movement for the removal of rent controls.

A spokesman for the Philadelphia real estate board reported that his organization always would be moving in the direction of decontrol and also would like to see some provision allowing for the increasing cost of operation and maintenance.

The Philadelphia area rent office processed 749 petitions from landlords in November and approved 490. The approvals grant rent increases on 1,725 units with an average rise of $10.45 monthly. In the first 11 months of 1949 increases approved on 7,389 rental units increased aggregate monthly payments by the tenants from $348,445 to $421,593.

THE SOUTH

In the South attention has been centered on Florida, where Miami, Tampa, and Jacksonville were freed of ceilings recently after Gov. Fuller Warren had vetoed a bill which would have removed controls on a State-wide basis except for areas around military installations.

In Miami a typical small apartment or house which brought $50 monthly now is renting for about $65, but those which had been leased at $200 can be had for about $150.

With more than 100,000 new family units built in Miami in the past 3 years and many seasonal units offered on an all-year basis following decontrol, the supply now exceeds the demand in some types of housing and there are quite a few vacancies. The net effect is to force down the rent for higher-priced living space.

Higher-priced all-year apartments in Tampa which had been bringing $90 to $120 a month have been reduced by about 10 percent. In the medium-price bracket, from $50 to $90, there have been rent increases of about the same percentage. In the cheaper housing, notably housing for Negroes, there have been instances of rent increases of more than 100 percent, with rents formerly at $4 a week going to as much as $10. Owners of this type of housing assert that they went for years without any return on their investment while rents were frozen.

A high level of house building in Tampa has helped to keep rentals down. Motor court building on the outskirts also has been very active recently, with the result that a price war has developed in some areas. This has forced down the daily cost of a "kitchenette" unit in some courts to about $1.25 per person from $3.50 to $7.

"Not much change" in Tampa

Officials of the Tampa Board of Realtors, on the basis of a recent survey, reported "not much change" in the general level of rents.

By action of the Alabama Legislature, rent ceilings will end in the State May 25. Rent-control officials in Montgomery predicted that the result probably would be a number of upward rent adjustments ranging to 50 percent.

An increase in the number of rental units was reported in Knoxville, Chattanooga and some smaller communities in Tennessee, but spot surveys indicated an over-all rise of 6 to 8 percent in monthly rentals. One leading realtor in Chattanooga estimated the rent rise in that city at 12 to 15 percent. There has been a marked increase in the amount of repair work on rental properties recently. High-priced units have been offered at lower prices.

Landlords and tenants in Atlanta are bracing for a fight over decontrol this month when a new city council takes office. The prospects seem to favor the tenants. Mayor William B. Hartsfield has been opposing all attempts to lift ceilings in the city.

Atlanta has had a continued shortage of low-rent units. There has been no let-up in the demand for housing at $60 a month or less, but the situation has eased for houses and apartments at $80 or more, with slight declines noted last month in the rents on new higher-priced suites. The level of rents in the city rose about 4 percent in the year ended November 15.

Columbus, Ga., moved into the rent decontrol bracket last week when Gov. Herman Talmadge approved action of that city's rent commission. Savannah has taken similar action to go into effect early this year. Decontrol also has been voted in Charlotte and Asheville, N. C., and Columbia, S. C.

Local action to lift ceilings in Savannah and Charlotte, however, received at least a temporary set-back by an adverse ruling just made by Ed Dupree, Acting Housing Expediter, because deferred dates were fixed for decontrol in those cities. The resolution adopted by the governing body of Savannah had set February 1 as the decontrol date, and Charlotte had specified May 1.

Mr. Dupree said the Housing and Rent Act of 1949 failed to make any provision for decontrol by local option at a specified future date, but contemplated only immediate actions.

It is expected that amended resolutions omitting the dates will be approved in the two cities.

THE MIDDLE WEST

A considerable number of decontrol actions taken on the initiative of the Office of Housing Expediter and increasing numbers of rent rises granted on petitions of landlords characterized the past year in the nine-State area administered as region VI.

Region VI comprises Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming, and covers about 2,500,000 rental dwelling units. Nebraska and Wisconsin were in region VI, but Nebraska dropped controls by legislative action over the veto of Gov. Val Peterson, and Wisconsin substituted a State law last September.

The decontrol actions in region VI indicated an improvement in the rental situation in smaller communities, but conditions still are tight in the metropolitan districts, particularly with respect to medium rentals available to families with incomes of $50 a week or slightly higher, where the bulk of the demand is concentrated.

Rents were officially increased in the region for various reasons on 25,000 apartments during October, the rises ranging from $6.94 to $8.83 a month. The final figures are expected to show 35,000 or more December increases. The Chicago Fair Rent Committee has an action pending in the emergency court of appeals for a blanket increase.

Farm areas not affected

Conditions were found to be fairly quiet in the agricultural areas of the Midwest, which never felt the full force of the housing shortage. Few instances of use of the local option clause in the Federal statute have come up. In Ohio, ceilings still are in effect in Cleveland, Cincinnati, and Dayton.

In Des Moines, the city council recently rejected a decontrol resolution. In St. Louis a movement has been started to put a decontrol resolution before the city council. In Laramie, Wyo., such a petition recently was withdrawn.

Wichita, Kans., and Blytheville, Ark., were freed of ceilings last week, but the full effect has not yet been apparent in either place.

Continued "unprecedented" apartment building has eased the housing situation in most Indiana communities and there have been no general complaints of rent increases. Some Federal officials, however, insist that the situation demands more Government-sponsored projects.

Bloomington, Ind., took local decontrol action but formal ratification in Washington was held up because the Bloomington petition had set a deferred date, April 1.

Wisconsin law debated

Controversy has arisen over the merits of the Wisconsin law which replaced Federal ceilings. The State statute authorized rent increases of 15 percent for all tenants who had agreed to a 15-percent voluntary rise previously under the Federal regulations and permitted increases of 30 percent for families which had not signed such agreements.

Most landlords requested and received the authorized increases. Some held the line voluntarily, however, and others decided to charge less than the maximum permitted under the law. The State CIO challenged the constitutionality of the State law, but lost the case in the Federal district court.

Conflicting reports were heard in Topeka, Kans., following decontrol. Officials of a property owners' group which sponsored the decontrol movement insisted that increases had been slight, but a labor-union representative declared that in some instances rents had doubled. One instance was cited of a monthly rate increased to $75 from $40.

A disturbed situation was noted in Nebraska, where decontrol was completed on November 2 with the lifting of ceilings in Omaha and Lincoln. Mayor Glenn Cunningham, of Omaha said tenants' complaints recently had declined to a trickle and court records there showed a slight drop in evictions.

The fair-rent committee set up by the Omaha real estate board asserted that these factors indicated a surprisingly easy adjustment to decontrol, but Mayor Cunningham and spokesmen for labor countered that they merely indicated that there is nothing the people can do about it.

"I think that maybe in the spring the situation will begin to adjust itself, but certainly November was too early for decontrol," Mayor Cunningham commented.

He guessed that rent increases had averaged 45 percent.

Al Witzling, president of the Omaha Central Labor Union, said that the increases would average 50 percent. He declared that one reason for the dearth of complaints is the fear of eviction.

Dr. Wesley Jones, who represents the Urban League on the Omaha fair-rent committee, stated that the rent situation as a whole was fair, with increases averaging 30 percent. Peter Marchetti, lawyer representing the small property owners association, reported many large houses made available for rent after having been held off the market while controls existed. Jack Evahn, representing the Omaha building owners and managers association, estimated the average rent increases at 20 percent.

In Lincoln Joseph T. Wishart, lawyer and chairman of the Nebraska small property owners committee, estimated the average rise at 18 percent.

THE WEST COAST

On the west coast conditions generally were reported stabilized, with controls continuing virtually intact.

A considerable number of higher rents was noted in Spokane, Wash., after 5 months of decontrol. James P. Dillard, chairman of the Spokane rent advisory board, which recommended the decontrol, noted in a report last month to Housing Expediter Tighe Woods that the average increase was 14.3 percent, or about $5.25 monthly. He added that a few rental housing operators had taken advantage of the situation to put unreasonable increases into effect.

He stated that there had been a large increase in the number of properties offered for rent recently, and estimated the number of Spokane vacant units at 1,200 to 1,500. One reason is the heavy postwar construction of fairly low-priced houses.

On the other side of the picture, Fred Simmons, who managed the Spokane area rent office before decontrol closed it, announced that he had received complaints from 100 tenants that their rent had been increased 38 to 53 percent.

In the Los Angeles district rents were reported still "extremely tight." Decontrol was authorized on December 7 in Beverly Hills and Ben C. Koepke, area rent director, said that complaints by Beverly Hills tenants of rent increases of as much as 275 percent and averaging nearly 80 percent had reached his office. Bitter controversy preceded decontrol in Beverly Hills, west-end neighborhood of Los Angeles.

Complaints also were received from Pasadena, Alhambra, Elmonte and Pomona. The average increase cited in the complaints, according to Mr. Koepke, was slightly more than $52, indicating that some owners were attempting "rent gouges" and that others were taking this method of trying to get rid of unwanted tenants.

General Los Angeles picture

Many modern apartments are available in the Los Angeles district at $75 or more a month, unfurnished, but hundreds of families are looking in vain for places at $35 to $70 and new arrivals are complicating the situation.

A growing sentiment for decontrol was noted in Long Beach and some other populous communities near Los Angeles, where the housing situation has improved lately.

Controlled rental units in the San Francisco area show an average rate of $44.42 a month, compared with an average of $82.50 for suites in new houses not under control, according to the Federal rent office there. Rent adjustments were granted in the years to landlords of more than 7,000 units, with an average increase of $8.25 a month. The total annual income of landlords was increased by about $695,000. All of the populous centers near San Francisco still are under the rent regulations.

THE SOUTHWEST

In the Southwest interest has been centered on the results of decontrol in the large cities of Texas. The Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that the index of rents in Houston rose 11 percent in the 3 months which ended November 15. There was said to be a comparable situation in Dallas, Fort Worth, and San Antonio, all of which have been free of ceiling since September 1.

Rents for some houses in the four cities have been increased 10 to 15 percent, with isolated increases of perhaps as much as 100 percent, according to the Houston Property Owners Association. The association asserted, however, that these increases had been largely offset by lower rents for many apartments.

There have been recurrent warnings lately that Houston may be overbuilding so far as multifamily housing is concerned. A renter's market appears to be returning. There also has been a broad expansion in construction of houses. A further competitive factor has been the return of many houses to the rental market following decontrol.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If I understand the gentleman correctly, under the legislation that he is proposing the landlord would have to give the figures justifying his request for an increase?

Mr. JAVITS. He does now—he gives the figures now, sir. What I was referring to just now was a provision in the law which says that in order to qualify for an increase the landlord must certify, and there are penalties for false certification, that he is giving and will continue to give the same services to the tenant which the tenant enjoyed on the rent-freeze date, whatever that is in the particular rent-control area.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If we are to have rent control, I can see the justice of that, but does the gentleman advocate any provision being inserted in the law whereby the tenant would be required to show whether his income has increased, so that he might be able to pay more rent?

Mr. JAVITS. I think the very fundamentals of a private economy, which the gentleman from Michigan speaks of so often on this floor, would be exactly contrary to an effort to require that rents other than for public housing should be established on requiring the tenant to show how much he could pay.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. This is what I am getting at: Assuming, just for the sake of the argument, that the rents are excessive, do you see any reason why the landlords, being selected out as a class, should be required to furnish the tenant a part of his rent charge? Why should it not be furnished by the public generally by giving the tenant a subsidy? Why in effect make the landlord pay a part of the rent?

Mr. JAVITS. We certainly made enough provisions in the law. I think we have much too liberal provisions in this law to see that landlords get a fair rental for their property. That is, if they endure a hardship, we have even gone to the extent, which I think is too far, of saying if they operate at a loss within a certain figure of net operating income their rents will be increased. Certainly, I think much more than a reasonable balance in favor of the landlord is being struck between the national housing emergency and private ownership of rental housing. The Government has taken a hand in the situation due to the emergency. But it has not taken a hand, and I do not think anyone would be able to sustain that position, to the point where it has compelled the landlord to subsidize the tenant in order to meet this particular situation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, that is just the trouble. I have cases in my district where landlords are not getting enough rent, and the rent boards will not give them enough to pay for repairs, insurance, and running expenses.

Mr. JAVITS. What we are dealing with is the fundamental statute. We cannot in Congress try every case in order to determine whether the courts, boards, and machinery which we have set up are fairly applying the statute. I think our experience shows that, taking the country over, the statute is being fairly applied to landlords. Tenants complain bitterly that it is being much too fairly applied. If in the gentleman's district there is some administrative difficulty, I am sure the gentleman will seek ways and means, either through his own influence and prestige in this House, or otherwise, to show how that particular problem can be met. I am talking about the entire law as it stands.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understand that, but I have been trying to get a little justice for a landlord here and there. But the law, speaking generally, seeks to regulate the rental income of the landlord, does it not?

Mr. JAVITS. No. I would not say that. The law limits, to the standard which is established by the statute, the extent to which the landlord may increase his rent.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, why do you not look at the financial income of the tenant and see what he can afford to pay, while you are looking at the landlord's income?

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman shows a strange inconsistency. I am sure if we brought any such proposition to the floor of the House, that incomes shall be shown to determine what the rental shall be, the gentleman would see the end of our society in it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The Congress has determined, in determining what the landlord's income from his property shall be; that is why I think your rent control measures are going to be the end of our free-enterprise society.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. I do not quite gather the point the gentleman is trying to make; possibly I have not listened to the gentleman long enough. President Truman in his state of the Union message recommended that the Congress extend rent control. The Banking and Currency Committees of the Senate and the House have announced that they are going to conduct hearings with a view to extending rent control. This, of course, does not mean that the entire House will go along with it if it is finally recommended. I believe that the House Committee on Banking and Currency will recommend the extension of rent control because it is necessary. I do not quite gather the point the gentleman is trying to make. I think every man, no matter what his politics may be, who comes from any metropolitan community, any large municipality, must

stand for an extension of rent control at this time.

Mr. JAVITS. If the gentleman will permit me—the point I am making is that Congress should act on this question not on June 15, 1950, but should act on this question now, within the next 30 days while State legislatures are in session. If Congress does not renew rent control promptly we could easily have a repetition of the situation which occurred just after the war when there was complete chaos, very damaging to the country's economy. If Congress does not renew rent control, and I am stating why I believe that failure to extend Federal rent control would be a great mistake, the State legislatures, many of which are in session the first few months of the year, would have an opportunity to correct the situation in their own States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not doubt the need for controls in certain areas of the country, but as I see it the question in regard to the question of Federal rent control is whether or not the control of rents should be left to the local authorities.

Mr. JAVITS. If the gentleman will bear with me for 1 minute I will cover that point.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Here is the question I wish to ask the gentleman: In the case of New York City which, of course, I assume needs rent control, is there not State machinery and municipal machinery already set up for the control of rents? And, if so, why the need for Federal rent control?

Mr. JAVITS. We have State machinery which is stand-by; that is, if the Federal Government control goes off, the State steps in. Our city machinery right now is in complete turmoil because of the constitutional questions involved.

My point is that the country needs rent control, and the two most salient elements of proof are first, that all the dwelling units we have built so far have not reduced the urgent need for housing. What causes doubling and tripling of occupancy? The fact that the houses we have built in the 3 years of operation have not reduced the emergency need. Secondly, despite the provision for decontrol that is in the law now in effect, relatively few States and municipalities have taken advantage of it. The problem is still an urgent country-wide problem. Finally, an unbiased survey, like the one made by the New York Times on January 1, 1950—which I am putting in the RECORD—demonstrates that in those cases where decontrol has taken place, rents for the people of moderate income, have shot inordinately upward.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended for five additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not like to, but I wish to know if we are going to continue this year the practice of last, of extending time and extending time on these special orders? It interferes with others who have subsequent special orders. It happened the other day, and time went on for almost half an hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state to the gentleman that there are other special orders pending.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will not press the objection, but I merely call the matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. JAVITS. One minute will suffice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that he may proceed for one additional minute?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. YATES. I may state to my friend from Michigan that the reason I asked that the gentleman's time be extended was because of his graciousness in yielding to so many who wished to interrogate him.

I may state to the gentleman from New York that in Illinois the legislature is not in session at this time and will not convene again until next year in the absence of a special session; and there will be no need for a special session unless an emergency arises. I should like to point out to the gentleman that the city of Chicago set up its own rent-control act, but that act was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois. So that for the State of Illinois on the basis of decisions as they presently exist, we cannot get a State-wide rent-control act. Therefore, for the State of Illinois, and particularly for the city of Chicago, a need exists for Federal rent control.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, may I make this one final point and then conclude. Under the pattern by which rent-control legislation has been brought up in the House before it has always been at the eleventh hour. This has created a very grave difficulty and constitutes, in my opinion, the nub of the problem. My point today is that we take it up immediately, early in this session.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter he received regarding the coal strike and his answer thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

INDUSTRY'S SOUTHWARD MIGRATION

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, for generations the South has been considered a region whose economy depends largely upon her agricultural products. Agriculture is an ancient and honorable occupation, but its opportunities for expansion are minor as compared with those of business and manufacturing industries. Consequently, many regions throughout the entire world are attempting to increase their manufacturing facilities in an effort to improve business conditions and enhance prosperity.

During the past decade, no section within the United States has made greater strides than the South in expanding manufacturing industries. In tobacco products, the lumber industry, the manufacture of chemicals and the production of paper and pulp the South has made great progress. It is the textile industry, however, which has done more than any other manufacturing industry to change the South into an industrial region. This is especially true in the Southeastern States. In South Carolina, the value added by manufacturing rose 369.3 percent from 1930 to 1947. This increase exceeds that of all but one other State in the Nation.

In South Carolina since January of 1945, 803 industrial plants costing more than $270,000,000 have been completed. In addition, 1,066 existing plants have expanded or have planned expansion costing in excess of $200,000,000. This industrial activity has created 58,000 new jobs and has been reflected in business and financial figures. Bank deposits are up 322 percent; the business population has increased 40 percent; per capita income has increased 208 percent; private and commercial automobile registrations have increased in number from 268,000 to 408,000; and salaries and wages paid employees engaged in manufacturing activities have increased from $103,000,000 to $377,000,000. These comparisons are with the year 1939. Sales of insurance, the number of telephones in use, and the increases in retail sales also reflect the general prosperity of our State. All of this business activity cannot be attributed to the expansion of the manufacturing industries, but manufacturing has played a more important role than any other single factor.

In view of this fact, it is necessary to examine the factors which have changed the South, for many years purely by agricultural section, into an important manufacturing and industrial region.

From an industrial aspect the South is blessed with certain natural advantages. These may be classified as geographic, political, and social.

The South's geographic advantages are so many and varied. Its proximity to natural resources is one such advantage. Industrial water sources are unequalled. Long summers and mild winters keep fuel costs at a minimum.

Perhaps the South's greatest geograhic advantage is its ability to grow cotton, the world's greatest textile fiber. More cotton is used than all other textile fibers combined, and textile manufacturers have begun to take advantage of the cheaper transportation costs, which production near the source of the raw material allows. The textile industry has reached such great proportions in the South that 63.1 percent of the Nation's spinning activity is located within a 200-mile radius of my home. The Southeastern

States have become the most important area in the United States for textile manufacturing. The influence of King Cotton in the South's industrial expansion cannot be overestimated.

The political advantage of the South is intangible, but it cannot be disregarded. Realizing that new industry must be attracted if the economy is to be expanded, the South's legislative policies have consistently been favorable toward industry. Governmental restrictions are kept at a minimum, and taxes are comparatively low. This policy of fair treatment and a minimum of interference has become a southern characteristic, and industry has responded by greatly expanding its activities.

The social factor is even more intangible than the political, but it is perhaps more important as a basic reason for attracting industry. The social factor is concerned with the people and their attitudes, habits, and mode of living. These people are native born Americans who equal any people in the world in skill, intelligence, and general ability. Many have come from farms and small cities where a 10- or 12-hour day is not unusual. An 8-hour day in a factory seems quite reasonable to them, and their willingness to follow the schedule of work is reflected in the low record of turn-over and absenteeism. Furthermore, they realize that they are well off and are naturally suspicious of agitators and trouble makers. An official of the Textron Manufacturing Co. has said that workers in plants located in the Carolinas outdo New England workers by 10 percent. The notion, long cherished in the North, that southern workers are lazy and shiftless is a myth, pure and simple. Industry has learned that the labor force in the South is cooperative, able, and intelligent. This abundant labor supply has become an important incentive to manufacturers who are seeking satisfactory locations. The charge that the southern labor force is paid starvation wages will not bear scrutiny. Figures belie this accusation, and manufacturers agree that it is efficiency, not cheapness, which is attracting industry South.

All of these factors have combined to give the South low-cost production and to attract industry. The South has also learned during the past decade that it pays to advertise. With all of the advantages which any section possesses, it can expect no results unless those advantages are known. South Carolina offers an example of a State which has learned to make known its attractions.

In 1945 an act was passed by the South Carolina General Assembly providing for the establishment of a research, planning, and development board. Nine objectives were listed which may be summed up in the last listed objective, which is to advance the general welfare of the State and the people. One specific objective as listed in the law is "to promote and encourage industrial development, private business and commercial enterprise, agricultural production, transportation, the utilization and investment of capital within the State."

The research, planning, and development board, operating under authority of this act, has been an essential factor in South Carolina's recent industrial expansion. The board inaugurated an advertising program and carried it out in national magazines and newspapers. This advertising and publicity was for the purpose of attracting new industry. Thousands of inquiries were received, and numerous manufacturing concerns opened plants after learning of the facilities and advantages. When an inquiry was received the board furnished data on the labor supply, power, transportation, sites, buildings, and the other necessary information to meet the requirements of a prospective manufacturer. The board has been careful to consult industries already established and to take no action which would be harmful to them. In some cases prospective industries which appeared undesirable have been discouraged from locating in the State. Industrial expansion is desired, but not at the expense of those industries already established.

Besides the advertisements, the board has issued a series of valuable bulletins giving the physical characteristics and various statistics for South Carolina. Those publications have proved invaluable to prospective manufacturers who are considering locating in the State. The board has pointed out that in South Carolina taxes are 10 percent cheaper than in any other section of the country; that power is 30 percent cheaper; fuel and heating 15 percent cheaper; and plant sites cheap and sometimes free. Together with the reasonable cost of labor, cheap construction costs, and cheap water, these factors offer a strong inducement for industry to locate within our State.

Proximity to good markets is important if an industry is to prosper, and South Carolina has not hesitated to point out that markets in the South, and especially the Southeast, have grown rapidly in recent years and are at present growing more rapidly than in any other section of the country.

It is no accident, then, that industry has commenced a steady migration southward. All businessmen admit that they seek a location where costs are lowest and profits are highest. The cotton textile industry was the first to demonstrate that conditions in the South are suitable for profitable manufacturing activities. Now other textile industries are beginning to follow suit, and within the next decade, we may see the synthetic fiber and woolen industries locating in hospitable southern climates. Since the close of the war, several woolen and worsted plants have opened in the South, and the August 18, 1949, edition of the American Wool and Cotton Reporter suggested that the woolen industry is likely to follow the cotton textile industry South. Granted that transportation costs will increase for a time, the high caliber of labor and the favorable geographical conditions will offset this and eventually lead to lower production costs than is possible in other locations.

In spite of the South's favorable location and her wealth of natural resources, it is her people who are responsible for bringing about the great industrial migration and expansion now in progress. Local capital has cooperated with industry in every respect, bringing about increased expansion and prosperity.

Labor has done even more to gain the respect of industry and to attract still more manufacturers. Whenever a new plant has been erected, applications for jobs have flooded the owner. The qualifications of the applicants are high, and their expectations of wages reasonable. Once on the job, they have demonstrated a willingness to work, to cooperate, and to follow instructions. Although cooperative with their employers, they are independent in spirit and are exceedingly wary of being organized or regimented in any way by professional organizers. In the State of South Carolina, 99.7 percent of the population is native-born, many of whom can trace their ancestry back to people who were in this country more than a century ago and in numerous cases to people who were here before the Revolutionary period. This background has instilled in the present generation a loyalty and a devotion to duty which is seldom found anywhere in the world. We are indeed a homogeneous people.

New industries in the South have led that region to a postwar growth and to a prosperity which would have been considered impossible two decades ago. Industry realizes that it has found a friend in the South. State governments have gone to considerable pains to keep industry prosperous and happy, and in turn industry has brought with it prosperity and higher living standards for all. This mutual cooperation between the people of the South and new manufacturing industries is serving both groups. The people understand that their greatest opportunity for prosperity and happiness lies in expanding industry, and they have made industry welcome. With a favorable climate, natural resources, an abundant supply of skilled labor, and generous treatment by legislative bodies, industries have found that great opportunities lie below the Mason and Dixon's line. Chemical plants, garment manufacturers, and ceramic industries are following the textile companies' lead and are discovering the advantages which the South offers.

It is to be expected that since these advantages are now known, industry will continue its expansion in the Southern States at an accelerated rate. Undoubtedly this expansion will continue for many years, and it is not at all unlikely that the South will someday be as noted for her manufacturing as she has been noted in the past for her agriculture. The prophecy of a great southern orator shall then become a reality. He said:

Far to the south lies the fairest and richest domain of this earth. It is the home of a brave and hospitable people. There is centered all that can please or prosper humankind. A perfect climate, above a fertile soil, yields to the husbandman every product of the Temperate Zone. There by night the cotton whitens beneath the stars, and by day the wheat locks the sunshine in its bearded sheaf. In the same field the clover steals the fragrance of the wind, and the tobacco catches the quick aroma of the rains. There are mountains stored with exhaustless treasures; forests, vast and primeval, and

rivers that, tumbling or loitering, run wanton to the sea. Of the three essential items of all industries—cotton, iron, and wood—that region has easy control. In cotton, a fixed monopoly; in iron, proven supremacy; in timber, the reserve supply of the Republic. From this assured and permanent advantage, against which artificial conditions cannot much longer prevail, has grown an amazing system of industries. Not maintained by human contrivance of tariff or capital, afar off from the fullest and cheapest source of supply, but resting in divine assurance, within touch of field and mine and forest; not set amid costly farms from which competition has driven the farmer in despair, but amid cheap and sunny lands, rich with agriculture, to which neither season nor soil has set a limit; this system of industries is mounting to a splendor that shall dazzle and illumine the world.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that I had an important engagement at a Government department downtown, I was unable to be present for the quorum call today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ENGLE of California). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, during my entire service in the Congress, now approaching 12 years, I have maintained a consuming interest in all matters affecting the public health and welfare. The record has been made and it will establish that great progress has been made in the control and prevention of disease.

This progress has resulted from the combined efforts of patient, painstaking men and women engaged in the field of research and the continuous development and application of proven scientific and medical discoveries by the medical profession and those engaged in the field of sanitary engineering and preventive medicine. Recent mass advertising in the public press and over the radio causes me to wonder whether the American people are being taken for a ride. Articles have recently appeared in the Reader's Digest relating to various antihistamine cold preparations and with reference to certain laxatives. Through the advertising columns of the newspapers and radio air waves, alert manufacturers of these products are, in my opinion, making claims regarding the efficacy of these products which ought to receive immediate attention of the Federal Trade Commission.

It can be stated authoritatively, and what I shall state is stated with authority, that the Food and Drug Administration has most emphatically not endorsed any antihistamine cold preparations. The general public, I am afraid, is being led to believe that the effectiveness of these remedies has been vouched for by the Food and Drug Administration.

To understand just what that Administration has done about these products, we must understand the requirements of the Food and Drug and Cosmetic Act. The position of the Food and Drug Administration in administering the act must be clearly defined. All antihistamine cold preparations are new products under the terminology used in the drug section of the pure-food and drug law.

Under the drug section of the law, new products may not be shipped in interstate commerce until the proposed distributor has convincing evidence, and filed it with the Food and Drug Administration, acting for the Federal Security Agency, that the new product is safe for use under the conditions described, recommended, or suggested in the labeling on the container containing the remedy.

Antihistamic cold preparations now on the market have met this simple test. They are safe for use when taken as directed on the label. The Food and Drug Administration, therefore, have no alternative but to allow the new product applications filed with them to become effective. Before the Administration made the applications effective, it had before it evidence of very extensive use of the drug under the supervision of physicians. It had expressions of opinion of many of those physicians to the effect that, while they did not approve of self-medication, they conceded that in the dosage or frequency of use recommended these preparations were safe, and they would not harm the consuming public. The Administration had opinions, obtained on its own responsibility, from many experts who, again, while objecting to self-medication, discounted the likelihood of injury from the drugs in the doses recommended.

Finally, in view of the millions of doses dispensed on prescriptions by physicians during the past 4 years, it has received only a trifling number of consumer complaints.

In this connection it might be pointed out that the ordinary antihistamic cold preparations that are now being offered for sale to the public generally contain 50 percent or less of the dosage ordinarily prescribed by physicians heretofore. Thus, it is clear that under existing law the Pure Food and Drug Administration—which I may say is now under attack from many sources; letters are pouring in to them from all over the country, many of which have come to me individually attacking the Pure Food and Drug Administration because of its failure to stop what these writers claim are fraudulent claims in the advertising being made as to the effectiveness of these remedies. Under the law it is clear that the Food and Drug Administration is not called upon to determine the effectiveness of the drug, but is only required to make sure that if the drug is taken by the public in accordance with the dosage prescribed on the label it will not be harmful. This has been done by the Pure Food and Drug Administration. Immediately, when these new proprietary remedies have received registration with the Food and Drug Administration, the country is flooded with a tremendous variety and many types of so-called antihistamic cold preparations, all of which no doubt use one of the three basic drugs.

I call your attention to some clippings which I casually took out of the press in Washington yesterday, advertising four of these preparations; quarter-page and full-page ads. All over the Nation, and on national radio programs, all four of them are advertising, claiming that their specific preparation is the one that has been recommended by someone. I think the public is entitled to know the best authoritative information on this particular subject.

I am amazed, in discussing it with Members of Congress, how many are not aware of the limitations on the authority of the Pure Food and Drug Administration to deal with this very problem.

I want it made crystal clear that antihistamic drugs have been in use for 4 years or more as treatments for allergy conditions, especially hay fever. They have been used on doctors' prescriptions quite satisfactorily for that period of time.

What does the term "antihistamine" mean? The term "antihistamine" means literally "against histamine." The recent medical view is that when a patient has hay fever, for example, the condition is caused by a sensitivity to certain outside factors such as pollen of various growing plants, feathers, house dust, animal dander, and so forth. The conditions caused by sensitization are called allergies. Among the various allergic conditions are asthma, hives, food sensitivity such as reactions to strawberries and lobster and even to milk. Such substances are called allergenic. When the patient is exposed to the allergenic substance to which he is sensitive, the medical theory is that these allergenic substances release in the body a substance known as histamine.

Antihistamines are so called because they appear to have the property of neutralizing the effect of histamines. They have been extensively and successfully used by doctors in relieving the acute symptoms of hay fever. They have not been so effective in relieving symptoms of asthma, which is usually due to an allergic condition.

I want the RECORD to show clearly that there are three basic antihistamine drugs. There are at least 40 or 50 of these preparations which are being advertised in the press all over the country, but there are only three basic drugs. I shall not attempt to name them; the drug names are very technical and quite long, but the normal vocabulary can be used to describe these three drugs. One of them is described under its trade name by the pharmaceutical manufacturer as Trimeton; another is Neohetrymine; and another is called Neoantergan. There are three of them, and every one of these cold preparations that are on the market contain at least one of these basic drugs; many of them contain the same basic drug. It should be definitely known to a person when he picks up one of these ads and reads that it is a new drug—here is one, Anahist, described as "a new miracle drug, just discovered"; and there are many more just like it. The fact of the matter is that the word "Anahist" does not describe that drug at all; it describes the manufacturer's name given his proprietary preparation, but the drug used in that preparation is the drug neohetrymine, which is a basic drug. So I could go on

down 10 or 15 others and show the type and character of the basic drug that has been used.

It should be definitely known to the American people that in making these applications to the Food and Drug Administration, the Administration in nowise has endorsed the sweeping claims now being made for the prevention or cure of colds; it expressed skepticism and expresses that skepticism as to the ability of these products to do what is claimed for them, particularly in the advertising that is going over the radio and the advertising that appears in the public press. Here is the danger, Mr. Speaker: While these preparations have shown that they are effective in the treatment of allergic conditions, allergies causing a sniffling, I am fearful that the person who has a cold caused by a virus infection, for example, relying upon this advertising may resort to self-medication in the hope that he can cure himself in 20 minutes, as some of the advertising states, when there is no clinically established factual basis for any such statement. So that a person who may be suffering from a virus infection that is serious could find other complications developing because of his placing himself under self-medication and failing to get the best medical advice he can to take care of a virus infection sometimes erroneously called a cold.

The Food and Drug Administration concedes that in the case of some colds the allergic type of symptoms will be relieved. It should be noted and understood by the American people that the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act restricts the Administration's authority over misrepresentation to false and misleading statements appearing either on the labels or on the container or in the literature that accompanies the container. It has absolutely no control over the claims that are made by radio or in the public press. It has no authority whatsoever to question these claims that are constantly being made to the American people. Yet, Members of Congress with whom I have talked, and I have spoken to many, have asked me the question: Why does not the Food and Drug Administration do something about this? People are writing to me and many are writing to the Pure Food and Drug Administration asking: Why does not the Food and Drug Administration do something about it? The fact is that Dr. Dunbar, and the other faithful and splendid men in charge of that Administration, having the public interest always in mind, have done everything that existing law will permit to be done in order to protect the interests of the American consumer.

My interest in this matter, may I say to my colleagues, is prompted by the fact that for a number of years I have tried to secure necessary and needed amendments to the pure food and drug law which would enable the Food and Drug Administration to give proper protection to the American people. I have a resolution pending before the Rules Committee now—it has been there for over a year—asking for action that would set up a committee of investigation on this and other related public-health questions which will enable us to get the facts and thus on the basis of real facts and information pass, if necessary, needed remedial legislation.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I should like to commend the gentleman for his excellent exposition of the authority of the Food and Drug Administration. It has jurisdiction, as he has so well stated, only with respect to labeling, whereas the Federal Trade Commission has jurisdiction over advertising, over the radio and in the public press. The question which the gentleman complains about of false advertising may well be referred to the Federal Trade Commission for the correction of that advertising, but as far as correction of what is placed on the brand label, or on the label, that is a matter of jurisdiction, as the gentleman stated, for the Pure Food and Drug Administration.

Mr. KEEFE. The danger in the situation, as the gentleman knows is this: The American people have been taught to believe they have a great protective agency down here known as the Food and Drug Administration and they have depended upon that agency to protect the American consumer. They do not know that the word "efficacy" is not found in the drug section of the pure food and drug law. That word is not there. They have no right to pass upon the conflicting claims as to the efficacy of these drugs. They can only pass upon the question as to whether the consumer who takes the remedy in the dosage recommended on the label will be injured.

Mr. EVINS. Would the gentleman not state that there should be a clear definition of the jurisdiction as between the Federal Trade Commission and the Food and Drug Administration?

Mr. KEEFE. I think that is very definitely necessary.

Mr. Speaker, the Food and Drug Administration concedes that in the case of some colds the allergic type of symptoms might be relieved. It should be known and understood by the American people that the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act restricts the Administration's authority over misrepresentation to false or misleading statements appearing on labels or in literature accompanying the package. It has no authority over separate advertising claims. It should also be borne in mind that the new drug section of the law does not contain the word "efficacy." In passing on a new drug application therefore the Food and Drug Administration must make the application effective if it concludes that the drug is safe for use provided it is taken in accordance with the directions stated on the label. If it has doubts as to the effectiveness of the drug to do the things claimed, it can only advise the proposed distributor of its doubts and inform him that any such claims are made on the manufacturer's own responsibility and will be subject to legal action for misbranding if they are found to be false or misleading. The Food and Drug Administration cannot institute an action alleging misbranding in the courts solely because it has a suspicion that curative claims are untrue. It must have evidence that will convince courts and juries that such claims are false or misleading. Such evidence is not available with respect to antihistamine cold preparations at the present time. The reason for this is that colds are due to many causes. There is medical evidence that some are due to allergies. It is entirely probable that such colds will be helped by the antihistamine cold preparations. It may take several years of very comprehensive medical research and study to determine whether or not the claims now being made for these drugs are true or false. Unless or until convincing scientific evidence is obtained, the Food and Drug Administration cannot undertake legal action.

I am making this statement merely to answer the complaints that are being registered with the Food and Drug Administration, some of which have come to my personal attention. For several years I have advocated an amendment to the food and drug sections of existing law that would require the proponent of a new drug, or the proponent of a new chemical to be introduced into the food supplies of the Nation, to submit convincing evidence of the effectiveness of the drug or the lack of toxicity occasioned by the introduction of new chemicals into the food supply, and to establish by convincing clinical findings before it is placed on the market for over-counter sale that the new drug or the new chemical is not only effective but that it will not injure the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, I have had pending before the Rules Committee for a considerable period of time Resolution 207 calling for an investigation by a committee of Congress of certain phases of this very important question. I trust that the Rules Committee will review the hearings already had upon the resolution and submit it to the Congress for immediate action. The existing food and drug law administered by the Federal Security Agency is ineffective in its present form. It should be amended and strengthened in the interests of protecting the consuming public. In my opinion the administration should be granted the right to subpena in order to ascertain facts. It has no such power under existing law. The resolution which I have referred to is a step in the direction of securing facts upon which to base remedial legislation to deal with this ever-growing threat to public welfare and health.

It must be definitely understood that in no sense do I oppose the march of scientific progress or the ulilization of the products of medical and scientific research and development, but I do feel that if the facts disclosed in such a fair and open hearing demonstrate the necessity, as I believe those facts will demonstrate, then the Government through the Food and Drug Administration should be vested with the power and the right to insist that those who seek to put new drugs on the market or new chemicals into the food or pharmaceutical supplies of the Nation shall first be required to prove that they are

not only safe but effective in accordance with the claims made for them.

I sincerely trust that this great and important public-health problem may be dealt with effectively at this session of the Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLMER (at the request of Mr. BECKWORTH) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Messrs. ABBITT, BURTON, FUGATE, GARY, HARDY, HARRISON, SMITH of Virginia, and STANLEY (at the request of Mr. KERR), on account of official business, being in attendance at the inauguration of the Governor of Virginia.

To Mr. SASSCER (at the request of Mr. BOLTON of Maryland), for 1 week, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 19, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1141. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report providing specified information on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work or for the manufacture or furnishing of supplies for experimentation, development, research, or test for the period July through December 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1142. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1143. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the case of Ishmael Theophilus Beckles, A-6752702 CR 24802, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1275. A bill for the relief of Anna Helman; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1489). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4857. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katsuko Nakahara Huntley; without amendment (Rept. No. 1490). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5580. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tsuneko Shimokawa Guenther; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1491). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5704. A bill for the relief of Janis Shimada; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1492). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6282. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eivor Anne-Britt Jedlund; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1493). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 299. Joint resolution to provide unrestricted entry privileges for Sister Elizabeth Kenny; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1494). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 6834. A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States and to authorize participation in a cooperative endeavor for assisting in the development of economically underdeveloped areas of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 6835. A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States and to authorize participation in a cooperative endeavor for assisting in the development of economically underdeveloped areas of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 6836. A bill to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge for the district of Delaware; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 6837. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R. 6838. A bill to change the name of the Cherry Creek Dam in Arapahoe County, Colo., to the Lawrence Lewis Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 6839. A bill to appropriate funds for the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 6840. A bill to provide for the coinage of a 7½-cent piece; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 6841. A bill to establish a Fair Employment Practice Commission and to aid in eliminating discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 6842. A bill to repeal the taxes on telephone, telegraph, radio, and cable facilities and on transportation of persons and property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H. R. 6843. A bill declaring Little River, La Salle and Catahoula Parishes, La., to be a nonnavigable waterway; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REDDEN:

H. R. 6844. A bill to provide for the continued construction of the Blue Ridge Parkway motor road between the Shenandoah National Park, Va., and Asheville, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 6845. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 6846. A bill to provide for a preliminary survey of the mouth of the Sparkill Creek and the immediate area of the Hudson River thereto; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WALSH:

H. R. 6847. A bill to improve the Government service; to facilitate the transfer, reinstatement, and promotion of career employees; and to effect economies in the Federal pay roll; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. R. 6848. A bill to authorize the courts to impose either a fine or imprisonment, or both, for certain offenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. Con. Res. 176. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings relative to the national health plan for the use of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. Res. 429. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill S. 938; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. Res. 430. Resolution providing additional compensation for the bookkeeper-cashier of the House stationery room; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 431. Resolution providing for the employment of a laborer for the joint recording facility; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COX:

H. R. 6849. A bill for the relief of Harmon L. Adams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 6850. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. F. A. Ferguson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 6851. A bill for the relief of Maria Rosa Bardales Arias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 6852. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Labibe Salibi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 6853. A bill for the relief of Leon D. Cotomatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 6854. A bill for the relief of Joseph J. O'Loughlin; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 6855. A bill for the relief of Julian Kania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 6856. A bill for the relief of Elisabeth Marguerite Post; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1692. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Fort Worth Bar Association, Fort Worth, Tex., re-

questing support and enactment of House bill 4446, the Administrative Practitioners Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1693. Also, petition of Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., containing the signatures of 1,650 students, issued by the Cornell coalition committee for the NAACP civil-rights crusade requesting enactment of the President's civil-rights program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 19, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, as in reverence we hallow Thy name, so may we hallow our own, keeping our honor bright, our hearts pure, our ideals untarnished, and our devotion to the Nation's weal high and true. Amid the tensions of these terrific days we seek in Thy presence a saving experience of inner quiet and certainty. Unworthy though we are, Thou hast made us keepers of the holy flame of freedom the fathers kindled with their lives.

We would be Thy ministers of abiding peace. Make us true servants of the common good and forerunners of Thy kingdom's coming. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 18, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McCarthy
Anderson	Gurney	McClellan
Benton	Hayden	McFarland
Brewster	Hendrickson	McKellar
Bricker	Hill	McMahon
Bridges	Hoey	Magnuson
Butler	Holland	Malone
Byrd	Humphrey	Martin
Cain	Hunt	Maybank
Capehart	Ives	Millikin
Cordon	Jenner	Murray
Darby	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Donnell	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Downey	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Dworshak	Kem	Robertson
Eastland	Kilgore	Russell
Ecton	Knowland	Saltonstall
Ellender	Langer	Schoeppel
Flanders	Leahy	Smith, Maine
Frear	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Fulbright	Lodge	Sparkman
George	Long	Taft
Gillette	Lucas	Taylor
Graham	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Thomas, Utah	Tydings	Williams
Thye	Vandenberg	Withers
Tobey	Watkins	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business as members of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, holding hearings on various flood-control and public-works projects in the State of New Mexico.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on important public business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I desire to obtain the floor to discuss the bill which is the unfinished business, and the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] to displace it. I have no desire, however, to interfere with Senators who desire to place routine matters in the RECORD.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an insertion in the RECORD?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair feels that if one Senator is going to place a routine matter in the RECORD, all Senators who wish to do so should be given the opportunity to do so at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and submit routine matters for the RECORD, without debate, and without taking the Senator from Arizona from the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PETITION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina presented a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

House resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact certain legislation now pending in order to effect an increase in the retirement pay of all railroad employees

Whereas the retirement pay for railroad employees in this country has been so meager in the past that it has been necessary for many railroad engineers, conductors, and other employees of this country's vast railroad system to work beyond the age at which they are eligible to retire; and

Whereas many of these employees are engineers and conductors engaged in operating high-powered Diesel trains; and

Whereas the operation of such high-powered trains by employees of over 70 years of age has and will greatly increase the safety hazards of modern railroad trains; and

Whereas there is now pending by the Congress of the United States of America a bill authored by the Honorable JOHN L. MCMILLAN, Member of Congress from the Sixth District of the State of South Carolina, providing for a 20-percent increase in retirement pay for all railroad employees; and

Whereas the necessary cost of such pay increase will be borne by the employee and employer without cost to the taxpayers of this country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to enact the McMillan bill or such other legislation as will result in an increase in retirement pay for the railroad employees of this country; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Members of the House of Representatives and to the Members of the United States Senate from South Carolina.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING—PETITION

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter in the nature of a petition signed by Mrs. Grace Outcelt and Graham Outcelt of Viroqua, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the advertising of liquor over the radio.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIROQUA, WIS., *January 11, 1950.*

Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARTHY: Would you kindly consider us as sincere supporters of the Langer-Bryson bill to prohibit liquor advertising on the radio?

We would be grateful indeed if this bill passes so radios could be used for the betterment of American homes, instead of another means of helping the liquor traffic.

Please insert this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Yours for a Christian America.

GRACE OUTCELT.
GRAHAM OUTCELT.

EXTENSION OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS BENEFITS TO FARMERS

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions adopted by the National Grange, at Sacramento, Calif., and the American Farm Bureau Federation, at Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation to extend old-age and survivors benefits to farmers.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF NATIONAL GRANGE RESOLUTION ON EXTENSION OF OASI COVERAGE TO AGRICULTURE ADOPTED AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION, SACRAMENTO, CALIF., NOVEMBER 16–26, 1949

We have considered the report of the Interim Committee on Social Security appointed pursuant to resolution adopted at the

Eighty-second session and endorse that section of the national master's address, Social Security for Farmers, and recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Whereas (1) the old-age assistance program is a heavy financial burden in many States and will become increasingly so, and (2) the old-age and survivors insurance program is a plan whereby each worker during his working years must help to pay for the survivorship and retirement benefits; and

"Whereas (1) the old-age and survivors insurance program has not been extended to farm people, and (2) many difficult problems will be encountered in its extension to farm people: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, (1) That we favor extension of coverage to farm people on a trial basis working toward the perfection of a practical plan, (2) that coverage be extended to farm people in those States adopting appropriate legislation, (3) that the executive committee be authorized to advocate the Grange stand favoring general coverage of farm people if it is satisfied that the plan proposed is workable."

TEXT OF AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION RESOLUTION ON EXTENSION OF OASI COVERAGE TO AGRICULTURE ADOPTED AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION, CHICAGO, ILL., DECEMBER 15, 1949

The Federal old-age and survivors insurance program under the Social Security Act provides a type of assistance which has become accepted as an integral part of our economic system. However, the total of direct payments by Federal and State governments to needy aged persons is constantly increasing. This trend must be changed by extending old-age insurance coverage and by establishing insurance benefits on at least a minimum subsistence level. Employees of general agricultural organizations should be covered. Farm labor should also be covered. If the extension is provided by law to include self-employed other than farmers, and is proved feasible and administratively practical, then careful consideration should be given by State and county farm bureaus to the question of the coverage of farm operators under the old-age and survivors insurance program.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. GILLETTE, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. Res. 198. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in its investigation of matters relating to crop production; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1233); and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF PERSONNEL AND FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, the following report was received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JANUARY 13, 1950.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Earl B. Wixcey, clerk	$10,846.00	$5,250.98
Philip R. Rodgers, assistant clerk	10,846.00	5,250.98
Vivien Harman, clerical assistant	5,718.63	2,768.54
Crawford C. Heerlein, clerical assistant	5,284.12	2,461.60
Paul Sample, clerical assistant	5,284.12	2,558.16
Marguerite Yost, clerical assistant	3,719.87	1,800.84
Herman Lazarus, professional staff member	10,846.00	5,250.98
William G. Reidy, professional staff member	10,846.00	5,250.98
Thomas E. Shroyer, professional staff member	10,846.00	5,250.98
Melvin W. Sneed, professional staff member	10,846.00	5,250.98

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure: Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1949.		$20,000.00
Amount expended:		
Jan. 1 to June 30, 1949	$7,406.84	
July 1 to Dec. 31, 1949	3,879.57	
		11,286.41
Balance unexpended		8,713.59

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH

Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditure: Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1949		10,000.00
Amount expended:		
Jan. 1 to June 30, 1949	None	
July 1 to Dec. 31, 1949	$150.00	
		150.00
Balance unexpended		9,850.00

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
Chairman.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 2696. A bill for the relief of Vito Martell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 2697. A bill for the relief of Hyman D. Langer, his wife and daughter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. McCLELLAN introduced Senate bill 2898, to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CORDON (for Mr. MORSE):

S. 2899. A bill for the relief of Joseph Veich, also known as Guiseppe Veic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. FREAR introduced Senate bill 2900, to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the settlement of New Castle, Del., which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEM:

S. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution giving the consent of Congress to an agreement between the State of Missouri and the State of Kansas establishing a boundary between said States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMMEMORATION OF THREE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF SETTLEMENT OF NEW CASTLE, DEL.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the settlement of New Castle, Del., and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill, prepared by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2900) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the settlement of New Castle, Del., introduced by Mr. FREAR, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. FREAR is as follows:

The General Assembly of Delaware, at its 1949 regular session, authorized the appointment by the Governor of a State commission to prepare a fitting commemoration, in 1951, of the tercentenary of the first permanent settlement by the Dutch on the Delaware River.

This settlement, made in the summer of 1651 at the site of New Castle and called Fort Casimir, later New Amstel (and finally, under the English, New Castle), served as the Dutch capital on the river.

Here (between 1651 and 1664) citizens of the Dutch Republic of that day claimed the rights and freedoms that were theirs in the homeland, and here were first established the free institutions that gave opportunity for the spirit and practice of self-government. The first town meetings on the Delaware were called together here to form ordinances for their own government; the people were given a voice in the election of their own local officers, and here the first courts of justice were established from which, in unbroken sequence, Delaware's present system of justice is derived.

From these Dutch people and these institutions—by infusion and growth among the people of other nations who followed as settlers on the Delaware—stemmed directly the generations who envisaged and fought for American independence that gave leaders to the formation of the Union and made Delaware the first State to ratify the Federal Constitution.

In the mellow old town of New Castle, heritage from the days of its founding by the Dutch is still manifest. The plan of the town with its strand by the river, its central green and surrounding streets, is unchanged, and direct descendants of the Dutch founders still live on the streets near the green, as well as throughout the State and the United States.

Because the town, that in the Dutch period was the cradle of self-government on the Delaware, became the capital of the colony and of the early State of Delaware—one of the 13 to form the Union—it is the authentic symbol as well as one of the few surviving unspoiled monuments of American beginnings.

It is with this high justification that the Dutch Tercentenary Commission of Delaware calls the attention of this Nation and of other nations to the celebration of the founding of New Castle to be held June 16, 1951.

I feel, Mr. President, that the approval by Congress for the authorization of a commemorative coin is amply justified in order to more fittingly observe this memorable occasion.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 215), which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized, until otherwise provided by law, to employ one analyst and one additional clerical assistant to

be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (3) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947.

MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD AND MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMIES

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I wish to announce that I have appointed the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy.

I have also appointed to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON—BROADCASTS BY SENATOR MARTIN

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two broadcasts by him under the headline "Happenings in Washington," on December 19, 1949, and January 2, 1950, respectively, which appear in the Appendix.]

A SUGGESTION FOR REDUCING FEDERAL SPENDING—EDITORIAL FROM SAN DIEGO JOURNAL

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial suggesting a method of cutting Federal spending, published in the San Diego Journal of January 7, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL SPENDING FACTS

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a review of the President's budget for fiscal year 1951, prepared by Alvin A. Burger, director of research of the council of State chambers of commerce, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRUMAN'S BUDGET—EDITORIAL FROM THE UNIONTOWN (PA.) EVENING STANDARD

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Truman's Budget," published in the Uniontown (Pa.) Evening Standard of January 10, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHOULD FARMERS GET FEDERAL PENSIONS?—EDITORIAL FROM THE DES MOINES SUNDAY REGISTER

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Should Farmers Get Federal Pensions?", published in the Des Moines Sunday Register of January 8, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

NONAGRICULTURAL EMPLOYMENT IN NORTH DAKOTA

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from William R. Waind, cooperating representative, North Dakota State Employment Service and North Dakota Unemployment Compensation Division, together with an analysis and table dealing with the nonagricultural employment situation in North Dakota, which appear in the Appendix.]

FARM RENTERS—LETTER FROM MRS. FRANK BOHN

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Mrs. Frank Bohn, of Hannah, N. Dak., dated January 2, 1950, dealing with the subject of farm renters, which appears in the Appendix.]

BILLS ENDANGER FARM RADIOS—EDITORIAL FROM THE NATIONAL LIVE STOCK PRODUCER

[Mr. ANDERSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bills Endanger Farm Radios," published in the National Live Stock Producer, which appears in the Appendix.]

SAVINGS EFFECTED IN THE GOVERNMENT — STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCLELLAN

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have issued today, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, pointing out that more than $1,500,000 in direct savings have been effected by reason of the activities of the committee and its staff in pointing out and eliminating many useless forms that were in use in the various agencies of executive branches of the Government, and also by reason of the elimination of many useless reports which it had been the practice to make heretofore.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHN L. M'CLELLAN, CHAIRMAN, SENATE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Expenditurer in the Executive Departments, stated today that as a result of studies initiated by the committee staff more than 2 years ago, savings running into several millions of dollars have been effectuated in the Government in eliminating unnecessary forms and reports.

The Comptroller General, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the Secretary of the Treasury, in response to a request from this committee entered into a joint agreement about 2 years ago for the development of a cooperative program designed to integrate budgeting, accounting, and financial reporting throughout the Federal Government on a simplified and consolidated basis. As a direct result of this action, an Accounting Systems Division was created in the General Accounting Office and a program initiated under which reports and existing financial procedures were reviewed by the affected agencies with the objective of eliminating useless reports and nonproductive operating procedures.

Joint survey and review committees were established under the direction of the Accounting Systems Division, each specializing in designated fields of endeavor. Following recommendations made by these special committees, specific improvements in public administration were effectuated, and simplified voucher payment and collection procedures have eliminated duplicate handling of documents to Washington.

The staff of the Senate Committee on Expenditures has worked in close cooperation with representatives of the General Accounting Office, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Department of the Treasury in effectuating new accounting systems and adopting new processes of installation in many agencies employing the accrual system of account keeping, the application of comprehensive and site audit procedures, and the development of property accounting under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

A summation of accomplishments under this program reveals that from a detailed analysis of 47 outstanding forms and procedure cases a total of 362 forms were abolished, and 86 improved forms substituted therefor, with a number of special cases further reducing the documentation to an even greater degree. Savings as a direct result of this activity on the part of the staff of the Senate Committee on Expenditures will, when fully activated, probably total between two and three millions of dollars, and additional economies will develop as the program progresses.

Savings already effectuated, directly attributable to this program, include (1) the abolition of 11 positions in the Department of Justice which carried an annual pay roll of $33,000, and net savings in printing attributable to the abolition of such positions of about $5,000; (2) initial equipment orders canceled in the Veterans' Administration totaling $888,000, through improvements in present systems and the proposed installation of more efficient methods; and, (3) the elimination of 450 additional employees who were scheduled to have been added to the Federal pay roll to process systems and forms now eliminated, aggregating a total pay roll estimated at $701,500. Therefore, a direct annual saving of $1,636,500 can be attributed to these efforts to date.

In addition to the forms abolished appropriate administrative reporting forms are being substituted for standard Forms 1116, 1117, and 1118 which will when fully effectuated bring about additional savings, which cannot be accurately estimated at this time. Nor can an accurate estimate be made of savings effectuated through time spent by innumerable employees formerly assigned to the compilation of these and many other similar useless and duplicating reports.

NEW ENGLAND BITUMINOUS COAL RECEIPTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD a table showing the bituminous coal receipts in New England for the calendar years 1939 to 1949, inclusive. The table shows that the receipts in 1949 were about half what they had been in previous years. I am also informed that receipts of anthracite are away down, and that if the weather turns cold the supply will become dangerously low in 3 or 4 days.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

New England bituminous coal receipts for calendar years 1939 to 1949, inclusive, all net tons

Year	Hampton Roads, Philadelphia, and Baltimore	Northern ports	Total tidewater	Percent	All rail	Percent	Grand total
1939	11,611,595	----------	11,611,595	71.5	4,626,388	28.5	16,237,983
1940	12,412,576	----------	12,412,576	71.7	4,891,765	28.3	17,304,341
1941	12,960,450	468,144	12,428,594	64.7	7,322,590	35.3	20,751,184
1942	8,158,979	3,567,590	11,726,569	50	11,678,205	50	23,404,774
1943	6,999,577	5,625,000	12,624,577	54.6	10,521,065	45.4	23,145,642
1944	10,009,578	4,002,906	14,012,384	58.7	9,857,815	41.3	23,870,299
1945	9,381,301	3,736,171	13,117,472	62.5	7,878,035	37.5	20,995,507
1946	8,804,120	3,245,344	12,049,464	63.5	6,667,385	36.5	18,726,849
1947	11,983,934	1,402,279	13,386,213	66.5	6,714,895	33.5	20,101,108
1948	12,523,069	1,101,321	13,624,390	66.6	6,731,560	33.4	20,355,950
1949	6,013,467	465,802	6,867,977	65	4,382,565	35	11,250,542

GOVERNOR DRISCOLL'S INAUGURATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I had the privilege on Tuesday last of attending the inaugural ceremonies of Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll, of New Jersey, who for the first time in the history of New Jersey and under our new State constitution was reelected governor for a second consecutive term.

My distinguished colleague [Mr. HENDRICKSON], yesterday inserted in the RECORD, Governor Driscoll's outstanding inaugural address. I am glad to join with my colleague in urging the Members of the Senate to study the important suggestions the Governor makes.

There appeared in the New York Herald Tribune this morning, an editorial entitled "Governor Driscoll's Inauguration," and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial may be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNOR DRISCOLL'S INAUGURATION

For the first time in New Jersey's history a governor has succeeded himself; and it seems a good omen that the new constitutional provision should permit the continuance of a regime as enlightened and promising as Governor Driscoll's. In his address at Trenton on Tuesday, Mr. Driscoll summed up the philosophy which has guided him through many reforms and improvements in State administration and on the basis of which he hopes for further improvements in the term ahead. He spoke of an orderly Federal system, with government close to the people, prudently managed; of government strong enough and courageous enough to pioneer with the times, promoting the general welfare in the service of all its people. Mr. Driscoll made it plain that the fight against excessive centralization and power in the Central Government can be successfully waged only if the States are alert and vigorous in meeting the people's needs. Such a measure as a tri-State water authority, which he called for in his program, is a clear example of what States can accomplish by their own exertions and by cooperation among them.

Governor Driscoll won reelection in a year that was marked by many defeats and disappointments for Republicans. His victory was a proof that an administration which gets close to the people, showing itself concerned with their problems and vigilant in advancing their interests, does not have to be extravagant or demagogic in order to win the voters' approval. In wishing the Governor good luck for his second term, we hope that his success will be a harbinger of many similar Republican victories.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Mr. Driscoll's Aims," published in the Newark Evening News of January 18, 1950, and an editorial entitled "States Must Lead Fight Against Centralized Power," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 18, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Newark Evening News of January 18, 1950]

MR. DRISCOLL'S AIMS

In beginning his second term at Trenton, Governor Driscoll realistically outlines as the first order of business the completion of tasks begun during his first.

Aside from water-supply development on a moderate scale and highway expansion under the new turnpike authority, Mr. Driscoll launches no large new State projects. His is a message designed to fit the public mood and, equally important, the public purse. Essentially the admonition he addressed to the legislature is: Hold that spending line.

This does not mean, as special pleaders would have us believe, the end of progress at Trenton. Far from it.

"The social cost of slums and the need for slum clearance is just as great as ever," says Mr. Driscoll. A stand-by residential rent law, in event the Federal act expires, is high on the Governor's list. The need for such protection is demonstrated by the analysis of National Housing Expediter Woods. He has shown that decontrol in six large cities was followed by rent increases ranging from a moderate 16.2 percent to as much as 41.3 percent.

Still in the field of housing, Mr. Driscoll calls for creation of a State building codes commission. Its duty would be to dispel existing confusion caused by 179 different municipal codes, most of them over age, and nearly all helping to stifle low-cost housing.

Mr. Driscoll reveals plans for better correlation of welfare services under State control, the elimination of inequities in the workmen's compensation act, a more comprehensive minimum-wage law, and increased sickness and unemployment benefits "if our insurance programs are to accomplish their purpose." All these suggest that, under a hold-the-line policy, government does not stand still.

A State water authority to complete the modest Delaware and Raritan supply project is suggested by the Governor. If the legislature assents, he believes it should be authorized to develop new sources of supply. There is no recommendation that this new creation should replace any of the numerous water agencies now at large. Indeed, Mr. Driscoll proposes, in addition, a tri-State water authority to negotiate with New York and Pennsylvania on allocation of Delaware River water among the three States. In view of the trend toward consolidation at Trenton, the question arises as to whether or not one water authority, in good working order, couldn't prevent diffusion of effort which these projected and present agencies seem to imply.

Mr. Driscoll reminds us that the State's tax and revenue problem will be under continuing study. Recommended reading for the students, we suggest, are the income-tax returns in New York State which have hit, in 9 months at the new rates, an astronomical $202,764,000 on personal incomes. It is satisfying to note that Mr. Driscoll also recommends an extension of the tax-revenue inquiry to municipal governments.

The question of regulation of giant trucks is discussed and Mr. Driscoll, as have other highway users, sees a need for uniform regulations in this field. The hard question of higher fees for giant interstate carriers is not mentioned, possibly on the score that this phase of the matter should await proper integration with the general revenue problem.

There is another phase of the Governor's message, national in tone, which obviously is for more than local consumption. Here Mr. Driscoll cites the Hoover report to support his own apprehension of big government, and he restates his demand for reallocation of taxing powers to obviate the necessity for gigantic Federal grants-in-aid. Attendant evils of this system, as the Governor sees them, are unnecessarily high administrative costs and abnormally high Federal taxes. Worse, he thinks, it is a system which breeds a centralization of government he deplores. In a word, the Governor would substitute for big government responsive, serviceable State governments and interstate cooperation in problems mutually affecting neighbor States.

If the Republican Party, in a continuing search for a new set of principles to guide it, wants the Driscoll idea of national policy, this, in part, is it.

[From the Philadelphia Enquirer of January 18, 1950]

STATES MUST LEAD FIGHT AGAINST CENTRALIZED POWER

Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll's views on the need for States to recover—and exercise—their traditional powers, reaffirmed at his inaugural ceremonies in Trenton, have an importance extending far beyond the borders of his own State of New Jersey.

For the trend toward centralization of power in the Federal Government which Driscoll criticizes is more than a transfer of power from one governmental unit to another. It signifies the gradual separation of the Government from the people it is supposed to serve.

There's no doubt this separation has been taking place, with bad results for the people and their local governmental units. Matters concerning the individual are not decided on the basis of knowledge of needs and local conditions. They are decided by officials far away, who, as Driscoll observed, move from crisis to crisis to justify their grabs for power.

All over the Nation we've seen the effects. Instead of handling their own problems locally, people are encouraged to look to Washington. The Federal Government gladly takes over, and further builds up an administrative hodgepodge which is costly and inefficient.

As the first New Jersey Governor to succeed himself in over a century, Driscoll has tried to reverse this trend by asserting the State's own powers with a forward-looking program. In his inaugural address, he pledged himself to continue his efforts to improve housing, workmen's compensation, labor relations, and many other programs on the basis of local initiative and action.

That approach is needed by all States if they are to retain their rightful places in the Federal system. But they cannot do the whole job alone. The Federal Government has to move out of fields where the States have a prior right to act, and particularly must be made to stop its present policies of drying up tax sources which now make it difficult for States to finance their own programs.

The Driscoll program of aggressive, forward-looking action by the States to battle Federal centralization merits the attention of Republican Party policymakers. More important, it demands the support of citizens in every State who want to see our traditional system of government maintained.

WHAT WOULD YOU CUT?—EDITORIAL FROM THE PITTSBURGH PRESS

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I have a very interesting letter from a lady in Pennsylvania enclosing an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of January 9, 1950, entitled "What Would You Cut?" She asked me to read the editorial into the RECORD, but I shall not take the time of the Senate to do so. Instead I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be

printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT WOULD YOU CUT?

That is the question the taxers and spenders usually ask, with a triumphant smirk, when anyone suggests that the Government ought to stop spending more money than it's got.

Their smug assumption is that, if you specify where to spend less, you will immediately arouse the angry protest of some pressure group.

Well, what of that? All of us are taxpayers. If we really get stirred up about the way our money is being wasted and our future mortgaged, we can be the most formidable pressure group of all.

The answer to the taxers' and spenders' question is simple:

Cut everything.

Cut the farm subsidies. Reduce all subsidies. Cut the rivers and harbors and highway and housing appropriations. Curb the lending powers of Government corporations. Reduce the amounts the Army and Navy and Air Force can spend. Pare down European aid. Cut the pay rolls. Put an economy and efficiency team to work in the Veterans' Administration to cut out the obvious wastes and abuses in administering the GI bill of rights, and empty the hospital beds of nonservice-connected cases.

We could fill this page listing places and activities where money can be saved without diminishing any really essential Government service, and without weakening the national defense.

There is excess fat in the Federal budget from the Agriculture Department and Atomic Energy Commission all the way through the alphabet. The Government habitually hires at least three people to do what could be done better and at less cost by two.

The toughest place to cut will be in the $5,000,000,000 annual interest bill on the public debt. But we can cut that, too. We can do it by taking the money saved by stopping waste elsewhere, and using that money to start reducing the quarter-of-a-trillion debt. As we shrink the principal, we shrink the interest bill.

We cannot do all this by saying, "We're for economy, but * * *." What we must say is, "We're for economy, period." And that must mean cutting all the way down the line. We must stop spending money we haven't got for things we cannot afford.

THE COAL SITUATION IN SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD several telegrams I have received from South Dakota dealing with the desperate coal situation existing there. As everyone who has looked at the weather map knows, we have had in South Dakota subzero temperatures, 29 below, 20 below, 15 below, and generally very cold weather. An emergent condition exists in South Dakota, as proved by these sample telegrams, only half a dozen of which I offer for the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABERDEEN, S. DAK.,
January 15, 1950.

CHAN GURNEY,
Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Coal shortages due to strike have reached an emergency stage in our city and surrounding territory and conditions most serious. Survey by our mayor shows coal supply so low that he has called for rationing of fuel. School board advise that they have a 3-day supply on hand, and if not replenished schools will have to close. Hospital which serves entire northeast quarter of State advise they have enough coal on hand or in transit to carry them through; but if railroads have to further curtail service, will the coal arrive? We urge you to do everything in your power to see that President Truman makes use of the Taft-Hartley Act in this serious emergency. As you know, we have had extremely cold weather. It was 15 below this morning and has been below zero for days.

P. A. BRADBURY,
President,
Aberdeen Chamber of Commerce.

MOBRIDGE, S. DAK.,
January 16, 1950.

CHAN GURNEY:

What can be done about coal situation? None on hand; 25° below; blizzard conditions. Need help; desperate. Wire answer today.

MAYOR HIMRICH AND CITY COUNCIL.

YANKTON, S. DAK., *January 13, 1950.*
Hon. CHAN GURNEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The morning papers announced that President Truman continues his refusal to consider a national emergency existing in the coal situation. The drastic curtailment of trains into this area because of coal shortage is resulting in inefficiency in our wholesale and retail operations and a 25-percent increase in plant labor. To us and thousands of other small manufacturers and processors such a condition is most emphatically an emergency. May we respectfully request your assistance in obtaining immediate action to correct this intolerable situation.

KEATING CREAMERY CO.

YANKTON, S. DAK., *January 14, 1950.*
Hon. CHAN GURNEY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building:

Truman's refusal to consider the coal situation an emergency resulting in delays, inefficiency, needless costs in our business. Rail curtailment extremely disadvantageous to us. Respectfully urge that you lend your weight to immediate efforts to prevent coal miners from jeopardizing the national interest.

THE MEANS CO.,
M. L. MEANS.

VERMILLION, S. DAK., *January 7, 1950.*
Hon. CHAN GURNEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

For the second time in recent months we are now obliged to endure restricted railroad service on account of coal shortages. This is inconveniencing our people, interfering with our mail service, and hampering our business. Vermillion people are sick and tired of being at the mercy of the whims of John L. Lewis. We call on our Government to carry out their obligations to put a prompt end to this preposterous situation.

VERMILLION CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
H. G. MOELLER, *President.*

SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK., *January 17, 1950.*
Hon. CHAN GURNEY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building:

Prolonged coal strike creating hardship here with supplies for schools and hospitals nearing exhaustion. Impairment of train schedules causing some inconvenience. We hope steps can be taken to resume production.

SIOUX FALLS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
A. G. PATTON, *Executive Vice President.*

YANKTON, S. DAK., *January 13, 1950.*
Hon. CHAN GURNEY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Just wired Truman urging invoking of Taft-Hartley in coal situation. Rail curtailment costing our businessmen money. Delay and inconvenience daily. Hope you will push it too.

YANKTON CHAMBER,
SMITH.

SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK., *January 19, 1950.*
Senator CHAN GURNEY:

Sioux Falls College only 1 day ahead of empty coal bins. Health and program of 350 students jeopardized.

A. E. GODFREY,
Chairman of the Board of Trustees.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a copy of a letter which I wrote to the President on the subject of the coal shortage in South Dakota, a few days ago.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 16, 1950.

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The shortage of coal in South Dakota has created an emergency condition, and unless remedial action is taken immediately, actual human suffering will result. Business has been generally disrupted, and the threat of cold schools and hospitals within the new few days is very real.

From Aberdeen, S. Dak., a city of approximately 20,000, comes the following information:

"Survey by our mayor shows coal supply so low that he has called for rationing of fuel. School board advises that they have a 3-day supply on hand and if not replenished, schools will have to close. Hospital which serves entire northeast quarter of South Dakota advises they have enough coal on hand or in transit to carry them through, but if railroads have to further curtail service, will the coal arrive? It was 15 below this morning and has been below zero for days."

From the Mayor of Mobridge, S. Dak., a city of 5,000 wholly dependent on coal for all heating purposes, comes the following:

"What can be done about coal situation? None on hand. Twenty-five degrees below. Blizzard conditions. Need help desperately. Wire answer today."

The president of the chamber of commerce in Vermillion, S. Dak., a city of 5,000 in the southeastern corner of the State, wires:

"For the second time in recent months we are now obliged to endure restricted railroad service on account of coal shortages. This is inconveniencing our people. Interfering with our mail service and hampering our business. Vermillion people are sick and tired of being at the mercy of the whims of John L. Lewis. We call on our Government to carry out their obligations to put a prompt end to this preposterous situation."

The foregoing are typical of many telegrams that I have received over this weekend. I urge you to take whatever action is necessary to correct a situation that is

approaching disaster proportions in South Dakota and other northwest States.

Sincerely yours,

CHAN GURNEY.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, something must be done quickly and adequately in order to relieve the emergency in my State. The coal emergency is worse in other States, because, believe it or not, it is colder in other States than it is in South Dakota. It is 42 degrees in North Dakota. Trains are being cut off. There is not adequate mail service there. The desperate coal-shortage situation makes it mandatory that prompt action be taken to alleviate conditions.

AMENDMENT OF THE HATCH ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1243) to amend the Hatch Act.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate adopted the motion to make the bill (H. R. 1243) to amend the Hatch Act, the unfinished business of the Senate. Subsequently the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] moved to take up another bill on the calendar relating to excise taxes. In order that the Senate may be advised as to what is being proposed to be set aside, I should like briefly to discuss the bill.

As it passed the House the bill provided for an amendment to section 9 (b) of the Hatch Act. Section 9 (a) of that act provides that—

It shall be unlawful for any person employed in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, to use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the result thereof. No officer or employee in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express their opinions on all political subjects—

And candidates.

The bill does not change that part of section 9. It merely modifies the penalty provision, which reads:

(b) Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be immediately removed from the position or office held by him, and thereafter no part of the funds appropriated by any act of Congress for such position or office shall be used to pay the compensation of such person.

The result of that drastic penalty is that throughout the United States there have arisen a number of instances of persons guilty of merely a technical violation of the law being summarily removed from office, and there is no law which will permit them to be reinstated under any circumstances.

So the House of Representatives passed this bill amending the penalty clause by providing that—

(b) If in the case of any person violating the provisions of this section it is found by the United States Civil Service Commission that such violation warrants removal he shall be immediately removed from the position or office held by him, and thereafter no part of the funds appropriated by any act of Congress for such position or office shall be used to pay the compensation of such person. If the Commission—

The Senate committee has amended the House bill at that point by inserting the words "by unanimous vote"; and then the bill as passed by the House continues, as follows—

finds that the violation does not warrant removal, a lesser penalty shall be imposed by direction of the Commission: *Provided*, That in—

And this is a further committee amendment—

no case shall the penalty be less than a 15-day suspension from duty without pay: *And provided further*, That in—

Then the bill as unanimously passed by the House continues, as follows—

the case of any person who has heretofore been removed from the service under the provisions of this section, the Commission shall upon request reopen and reconsider the record in such case. If it shall find—

As a further amendment by the Senate committee, we insert at this point the words "by a unanimous vote." Then the House version of the bill continues, as follows—

that the acts committed were such as to warrant a penalty of less than removal it shall issue an order revoking the restriction against reemployment in the position from which removed, or in any other position for which he may be qualified.

This bill passed the House unanimously, Mr. President. It came to the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. A hearing was held on the bill by the full committee on April 13, at which time the president of the Civil Service Commission, Harry B. Mitchell, appeared and urged that the bill be enacted, citing numerous instances which appear in the committee report and records, in which for very minor offenses the Commission was compelled to remove persons from the service.

In support of his statement, he read a letter addressed to him by the author of the Hatch Act, which is included in the record. This is what Senator HATCH said:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS,
September 12, 1945.

Hon. HARRY B. MITCHELL,
President, United States Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MITCHELL: I have a carbon copy of your letter of September 7 addressed to Senator MCCARRAN concerning the case of the post-office clerk in the Philadelphia Post Office who is about to be dismissed for a violation of the so-called Hatch Act.

As I have told you on previous occasions, I favor the granting of discretionary power as contained in the Magnuson bill, and I agree with you that this bill should be reported favorably and hope it will be done promptly.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Senator MCCARRAN.

As you suggest in your letter, the passage of this law would not benefit the employee whose case you mention unless the bill were made retroactive. I wish you would have your legal department draft and prepare, if possible, an amendment to the Magnuson bill granting authority to the Commission to authorize the employment or reinstatement of all employees who have been dismissed under the Hatch Act where that dismissal constituted a penalty out of proportion to the offense committed.

Very truly yours,

CARL A. HATCH.

That letter was written in 1945, when the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] had pending a bill to accomplish the same purpose.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand this bill is an attempt to remove or reduce the penalty for violation of the main feature of the Hatch Act. In other words, the Hatch Act says—and this is a statement of what the offense is:

SEC. 9. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person employed in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, to use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the result thereof. No officer or employee in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express their opinions on all political subjects.

I suggest to the Senator that a 15-day suspension from duty without pay is merely a slap on the wrist, and that the effect of such a change would be absolutely to nullify the Hatch Act. If we are to pass this measure, we might just as well agree that there will not be any Hatch Act left, so far as the main provision which I have just read is concerned.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator from Ohio will listen to a reading of some of the cases which have arisen, I am quite sure he will feel that the act should be modified in some degree.

In the form in which the bill passed the House of Representatives, there would be no penalty at all; that is to say, if the Commission determined that the offense did not warrant complete removal from the service, the employee could be reinstated. That provision has been amended by the Senate committee to require a unanimous vote of the Commission, so that a political majority of the Commission could not restore such an employee. That is one improvement the committee has made in the bill as passed by the House. The other improvement the committee has made is to provide that there shall be a penalty of at least 15 days of suspension or removal.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator from Arizona know of any other case in which the Civil Service Commission is given the power to act as a court and to conduct an extensive hearing on the question of whether a Federal Government employee has been engaged in political activity? If it is desired to substitute some other penalty for the rather drastic penalty now imposed by the act, should not it be a criminal penalty, with the matter to be taken before a court, rather than to be left to the Civil Service Commission, which it seems to me is the wrong body to decide such cases.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me read a résumé of some of the cases which have been decided by the Commission. For instance:

1. Post-office clerk, 58 years of age, with over 14 years of service in the Philadelphia post office. Complaint was received alleging that this clerk had circulated a nominating petition to qualify a candidate on the Democratic ticket for the office of magistrate.

Investigation established that the complaint was true. However, it was also established that the candidate in question was himself a retired post-office clerk and a life-long friend of the accused employee, and that petition was circulated because of this long-standing friendship and not as a political party service. Supervisors, neighbors, friends, and local political leaders stated that the accused was an efficient Federal employee, an extremely good citizen, and established that he was not a politician in any sense of the word and was not prominently identified with any political party or political faction. Employee admitted activity, and in view of the mandate of section 9 (b) of the Hatch Act was removed even though he was less than 2 years from retirement age.

2. Clerical employee in Army hospital in New Jersey was the widowed mother of three minor children and had been in the service as a war-service appointee for only a short period of time. Inquiry was received by the Commission reporting that this employee was a candidate for election as member of county Republican committee. Investigation established that employee had long been active in civic affairs and was interested in better local roads, improved tax assessment methods, and other normal civic association activities. Investigation established that the accused had been informed by friends that she could do more toward improving the local situation if she were to become a member of the Republican committee in this normally Republican county. At the solicitation of these same friends, the employee became a candidate and was elected to the county committee. However, upon hearing that there was some question of the propriety of this action by a Federal employee, she immediately resigned without attending any committee meetings other than the one at which she submitted her resignation. Employee admitted the candidacy for the partisan office and her removal under section 9 (b) of the Hatch Act was mandatory.

3. Veteran of World War I: Former Virginia State policeman, father of four children (three minors) was released from the State police because of his poor health and accepted a war-service appointment in a low-paying civilian position at the United States Marine Corps air station at Quantico, Va. This man had been interested in becoming local sheriff for some time, and shortly after receiving his Federal war-service appointment filed in the Democratic primary for sheriff. Investigation established that this employee had no knowledge of the restrictions of the Hatch Act, that he did not conduct an extensive campaign, and that he was defeated in the primary election. Employee readily admitted all details of his political activity and his removal was required, even though he had been in the service for less than 1 year at the time of filing his declaration of candidacy in the primary.

4. War Department contract negotiator, employed in Massachusetts, with 3 years of Federal service. Complaint received that employee was Republican candidate for the office of town water commissioner. Investigation established that in this particular town the water commissioner's office was filled on a partisan ballot. However, the same investigation also established that in the neighboring towns throughout the area water commissioners were designated at nonpartisan town meetings and that under the circumstances Federal employees could seek election as water commissioners in these neighboring towns. Employee readily admitted that he was a candidate for water commissioner and stated that he thought this was permissible as no active campaign was necessary. This employee was removed from the service even though he had no Democratic opposition in the election and, of course, was not required to conduct an extensive campaign.

5. Civilian patrolman employed by an Army air base in Montana: This man was a veteran of World War II and after less than 9 months of Federal employment filed as Democratic candidate for sheriff. Investigation established that this man had not been fully instructed on the political activity restrictions of the Hatch Act and was under the impression that he could be a partisan candidate if he took leave from his Federal job during the campaign period. This employee readily admitted his candidacy and voluntarily resigned as soon as he heard that his activity during his period of leave was questionable. Under section 9 (b) of the Hatch Act this veteran had to be removed even though he acted on an erroneous interpretation of the law and had been employed in the Federal service for less than 1 year.

Mr. TAFT. When the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Hatch, wrote this law, he knew of that situation. It was absolutely known when the Senate passed the bill. The Congress chose to impose that drastic penalty because the Members of Congress felt it was the only way by which political activity on the part of Federal employees could be stopped.

It certainly seems to me that to leave the entire matter to the discretion of the Civil Service Commission, which is practically what the bill proposes, would be to go from one extreme to the other, from the extreme of too drastic a penalty to something which will be no penalty at all and will not operate as a restriction upon political activities by Federal employees.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have read the letter from Senator Hatch, the author of the bill, in which he stated that the provision was too drastic, and that he favored not only giving discretion to the Civil Service Commission in cases of this kind, but making the change retroactive in the cases of employees heretofore dismissed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to call the attention of the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio to the fact that the pending bill is a stronger bill than was the bill in the form in which it was unanimously passed by the House of Representatives.

The bill as recommended to be amended by the Senate committee provides that the Civil Service Commission in taking such action must be unanimous in holding that the violation does not warrant removal from office.

There are two types of violations under the Hatch Act. One is where a Federal employee uses his official position to influence an election. If he does that, I would say that undoubtedly the Commission would not be unanimous in deciding that he did not deserve removal. To the contrary, I would say the Commission would be unanimous in deciding that he should be removed. But even if the Commission were not unanimous in that ruling, the employee would have to be removed, under such circumstances.

The other type of violation, and the one sought to be relieved by this bill, is where a Federal employee engages in some minor type of political activity, primarily in a municipal or local or county election, where Federal officials are not involved. We have such a situation in Maryland and also in Virginia. The Civil Service Commission has ruled that if a civil-service employee operates by calling himself an independent, he can do what he pleases; he can agitate; he can electioneer; he can run for office. But the Commission has held that if a civil-service employee calls himself a Republican or calls himself a Democrat, he is beyond the pale.

I say to my distinguished friend that the Democrats as well as the Republicans in Virginia do not like that kind of discrimination. We have it in Arlington County. We have it in Montgomery County, Md. The independents have formed there to exclude both the Democrats and the Republicans from control of local affairs.

The distinguished Senator wanted to know whether the Civil Service Commission had ever gone into the question of political activity. I can tell him of an instance in Virginia, in Madison County, with respect to a fourth-class postmaster, who was a Democrat. An aspirant for that office learned that a Republican post office inspector was coming to inspect the post office, so the man who aspired to hold that office slipped into the post office and tacked under the delivery window a picture of the distinguished colored Member of the House of Representatives from Chicago, Mr. de Priest. Then the post office inspector looked in, and said, "Why do you put this up in the post office?"

The postmaster replied, "I did not put it up; I don't know anything about it."

The inspector said, "Oh, yes, you do; and you have been engaging in pernicious political activity."

The postmaster appealed to the Civil Service Commission. The Commission investigated his activity, and held that he was engaged in pernicious political activity, removed him from office, and put in that office a good Republican who would not violate the civil-service law.

Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. LANGER addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will yield to me for a minute, I should like to suggest to the distinguished Senator from Ohio, who I know is always fair and wants to take a broad-gage view of the situation, that we have here a stronger bill than the one passed by the House. We have a bill which only seeks to do justice in cases involving minor infractions, such as when a civil-service employee, unwittingly perhaps, steps over the line a little bit, and engages in a local election. Certainly in Virginia and Maryland, if more than 10 percent of the locality is comprised of civil-service employees, are we to disfranchise them completely with respect to their local elections? That is all the amendment seeks to accomplish. The amendment comes from a bipartisan committee, with a unanimous recommendation that it be adopted.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield the floor back to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield first to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I understand the distinguished Senator from Maryland wishes to catch a train, and I therefore yield to him first.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator. I simply want to make the observation that Montgomery County, Md., in which county Silver Spring, Bethesda, and Chevy Chase are located, does not elect Democrats all the time. The present State senator from Montgomery County is a Republican. Many of the offices have been held by Republicans. The county went about eight or ten thousand for Mr. Dewey in the last Presidential election. There is absolutely no desire on my part or on the part of the Senator from Virginia to make this a partisan matter.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield at that point, I may say the Republican leaders of both Montgomery County and Arlington County endorsed the pending bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to point out that the present government of Montgomery County is nonpartisan. The Democratic organization of the county, and some elements of the Republican organization, fought the present charter form of government there, and the independent citizens voted it in. Therefore, I think the Senator from Maryland is fully within the facts when he says that there cannot be in the great area around Washington any partisan advantage to either party. The amendment is simply designed to give American citizens the right to participate in local elections where the 10-percent factor is present. At present many of our best citizens are precluded from taking part in political campaigns and the cause of good local government suffers by it. In the case of Montgomery County, which contains the second largest city in Maryland, the elections are frequently Republican, and in national elections they are almost always Republican. Therefore, when we ask for this bit of justice for the people who live in that area, I hope no one will consider it is for purely partisan purposes. It is in the interest of good citizenship, nothing more and nothing less; and it is only for the local offices, with respect to which civil-service employees ought to have the right to assert their voice and influence, in the interest of good government.

Mr. HAYDEN. I now yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Arizona is aware of the fact that after Senator Hatch wrote the letter in 1945 to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who was then chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Senator from Nevada had the staff study the question, and a bill was prepared; and that when it came before the committee, Senator Hatch himself voted against the bill. The bill was very similar to the one now before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Washington, who is the author of the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know what Senator Hatch did in the Committee on the Judiciary. I can only corroborate the letter that has been written to the distinguished chairman, the Senator from Arizona. The bill was introduced in 1945, and subsequently became a committee bill. It did not involve any particular case in the State of Washington. A distinguished Member of the House of Representatives called my attention to two cases in the State of Massachusetts involving technical violations and injustice, because the employees involved had to be removed. He asked me whether I did not think this law ought to be amended so as to allow some flexibility in the matter of punishment, and whether I would not speak to the Senator from New Mexico about the matter.

I spoke to the Senator from New Mexico, calling his attention to this particular case. He made some investigation. He came to me on many occasions afterward, saying informally, "I think the original provisions of the law are too drastic, and therefore I should be glad to endorse such a bill." I introduced a bill, and the Senator from New Mexico, on many occasions, publicly and privately endorsed it, as he does now in his letter addressed to the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield further to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that in 1945 and 1946 Senator Hatch was a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and, of course, attended the meetings, and that when the bill which was drawn up was before the committee, the Senator from New Mexico himself voted against it?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not have access to the records of the committee. I should be very curious to find a yea-and-nay vote in the committee to that effect.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Did I correctly understand the Senator to indicate that he thinks the bill is improved by the provision inserted by the Senate committee, namely, that in order that a lesser penalty may be imposed, the United States Civil Service Commission must by unanimous vote find that the violation does not warrant removal?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator regard the provision which has been inserted by the Senate committee, requiring a unanimous vote on the part of the Civil Service Commission in order to make the lesser penalty become effective, quite an important addition made by the Senate committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think so. I think it is important, and that the provision should be worded in exactly that way.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like further to ask the Senator whether he thinks its importance is somewhat diminished by the fact that, under the Federal law, while the President is authorized to appoint three persons, not more than two of whom shall be adherents of the same party, the President may remove any commissioner? I amplify the question by asking the Senator whether, in view of the fact that each of the commissioners receives a salary of $10,000 per annum, and that the President has absolute power without any requirement, so far as I can find, that the removal must be for cause, he does not think that the zeal of the minority member of the Civil Service Commission to insist that the offense should involve the maximum penalty, would be somewhat diminished by the fact that if he so votes, that is, if he votes for the maximum penalty being retained, he is subject to instant dismissal by the President without cause?

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me ask the Senator, has he ever known of a President who has removed a member of the Civil Service Commission? It has never been done so far as I know.

Mr. DONNELL. I may say to the Senator, I do not know the history of that, but it appears to me that this particular insertion by the Senate committee, that is to say that the Commission can act only by unanimous vote, is not by any manner of means a guaranty that the Civil Service Commission will exercise a wise discretion in the matter, when the President, if one member should not concur, has the authority to remove that member of the Commission.

Mr. HAYDEN. That recommendation was made by a subcommittee which I, as chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, appointed. The subcommittee consisted of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. They conducted hearings on the bill, and the President of the Civil Service Commission and the Special Assistant to the Commissioner appeared, along with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. The subcommittee then held a second hearing, at which time there was considered the second section of the bill, which relates to political activities of residents of communities in the vicinity of Washington, where 10 percent or more of the voters are Federal employees. The bill was favorably reported to the main committee. My recollection is there was some further amendment made in the committee, and that it was then reported to the Senate without opposition.

The bill has been on the calendar for a long time. I am satisfied that some of those who have looked at it believe, simply because the Hatch Act is mentioned, that there must be something of political significance in connection with the bill, and therefore that it should not pass. However, if Senators will examine its terms, as it stands, it seems to me they will agree with me it is a perfectly reasonable regulation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an observation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. First, I want to call attention to the harshness of the penalty. Let us assume a man is 55 years of age, and that he is making $5,000 a year; he commits a minor infraction of the rule; he is dismissed. At the age of 55 he cannot get employment in industry anywhere. He has been in the Government all his life. It is equivalent to imposing upon him a penalty of $50,000 because of a minor infraction of an election restriction.

Now, so far as giving Democrats favors, I may say to my distinguished friend from Missouri that I have had 17 years' experience with the Civil Service Commission. I do not know the membership; but never, in 17 years, have I been able to get a single favor of any kind from them. I shall refer to one incident. The Commission insisted on disqualifying a postmaster whose appointment I had recommended. He was a past postmaster, and he had been approved. He automatically moved up to a third-class postmastership. The Commission went back and dug up evidence of things they claimed happened when he was a fourth-class postmaster, and said, "We will not approve him to be a third-class postmaster." I tried for over a year to get them to do what I thought was merely simple justice to the man, but they would not do it. What happened? The Congress passed a law to take care of his situation by providing that when a man has been a fourth-class postmaster and has been approved by the Civil Service Commission, and the receipts of his office increase, so that he would automatically be confirmed as a third-class postmaster, the Civil Service Commission cannot kick him out in the second round. In that particular case the Civil Service Commission absolutely would not confirm that man, although, on the same evidence, they had previously confirmed him.

Any Senator who thinks the Civil Service Commission will not enforce the law should wait until his party comes into power and see how many favors he will receive from the Commission. I have never received a favor, from a strictly party standpoint, from the Civil Service Commission in 17 years.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not true that practically every postmaster in the country today, under the civil service, is a Democrat. Is it not inevitable, under the law, that whichever party is in control tends to acquire all the positions?

Mr. HAYDEN. There are at this time Republican postmasters in many States. The difficulty from the political angle is that where there is a choice under the civil-service laws, going back to the time of the late President Harding, any applicant among the top three on the list could be considered and appointed. The late President Wilson placed all postmasters under the civil service, and the high man had to be selected. President Harding changed that, and since that time there has been a rule that anyone among the top three could be selected. If the Democrats were in power, the man selected would be a Democrat, and if the Republicans were in power, the man selected would be a Republican.

Mr. TAFT. Have there not been cases of applicants failing to qualify and Civil Service Commission ordering and holding another examination?

Mr. HAYDEN. There have been instances of that kind; but what has that to do with a minor infraction of the law, such as that of an employee who without adequate knowledge of the drastic penalty that might be imposed upon him, circulates a nominating petition, or is guilty of some other minor act of that kind? If he does that, out he goes, and the Civil Service Commission has no discretion whatever.

Mr. TAFT. My question has this bearing. I do not think the Civil Service Commission is the proper body to determine the question. The bill provides that the United States Civil Service Commission has to find that such violation warrants removal. The law provided originally that a violator should be removed. I think that what will happen will be that the Civil Service Commission will say, "There is no offense warranting removal," and it will assume in every case to determine the exact penalty to impose. I think that would entirely kill the remedy of removal.

So far as a 30- or 60-day suspension is concerned, the violator will be paid by the political party for which he is working. He has nothing to lose. Once the Commission has taken the position that it does not think the violation warrants removal, it will take that position as to all offenses.

Mr. HAYDEN. This bill does not change the law in that respect. It merely changes the penalty to be imposed under the law.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest that if we want to substitute another penalty it should be a penalty to be imposed by a court, such as a fine or imprisonment. It should not be left to the discretion of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the Senator mean to say that a violator should be put in jail for a minor violation?

Mr. TAFT. Not for a minor violation; but if there are other unlawful acts I think there should be the usual form of penalty, so the offenders can be prosecuted in court and so that the court can impose whatever penalty it may think is fair. I am willing to leave such judgment to a court, but not to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Here is another example which is in the unanimous report of the committee:

An outstanding example noted was that of a young girl, a minor, employed in a Midwest post office. Her father, a friend of a candidate for political office, asked her to distribute some 20 cards for this candidate. She asked the postmaster, her superior, whether it was proper for her to do so. He informed her that there would be no objection so long as she did not distribute them in the post office. Relying on this statement, and with no intention to violate the Hatch Act, a law of which she had no detailed knowledge, she distributed the cards. A complaint was made to the Civil Service Commission that by this action she had violated the Hatch Act. After investigation, the penalty imposed, as required by section 9 (b), she had to be removed from her position.

It seems to me that when cases such as that occur, there should be some flexibility. A young girl such as that could not go to court. It would cost a great amount of money. She would have to employ lawyers. She would be subject, as the Senator from Ohio suggests, to a fine, or possibly she would be sent to jail. I do not know whether the girl was a Republican or a Democrat, but, under the Civil Service Commission, which has jurisdiction over civil-service employees, she could, by merely writing a letter, have her case reviewed. I think that is only fair to employees who, in many cases, are in technical violation because they do not understand the act, and in some cases they feel that the law is a violation of their constitutional rights.

In my State there is a town called Richland, with approximately 25,000 inhabitants. Of the 25,000 persons in that town, 20,000 are Federal employees. They would like to be incorporated as a township, because they want to reside there permanently. They want to pay taxes and to be a part of the State of Washington. If this bill should be enacted into law any of them could run for office. Under the present conditions it would be a violation of the Hatch Act and any violator could be sent to jail or fined.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to bring up for discussion and opinion the second section of the bill, which has not yet been discussed. As I understand, it would permit a Federal employee not only to take part in a political campaign in a locality, but to become a candidate for office. That is going much further than the present Hatch Act. Section 1 of the Hatch Act allows a Federal employee to take part in political campaigns wherever the United States Civil Service Commission permits it. It substantially provides that it is not lawful for Federal employees, with a few specific exceptions, to take part in a campaign. By this bill we would allow a person to become a candidate for a local office. If such a person is permitted to become a candidate for a local office, what about towns in the western part of the country, where atomic energy is now being manufactured and where almost everyone in the town is a Federal employee?

Mr. HAYDEN. Would the Senator say that in a town where practically all the inhabitants are Federal employees none

of them should participate in the city government?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not object to their taking part in politics, but if they are to become candidates themselves, would it not completely change the whole principle of the law?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to reply to the Senator from Massachusetts.

As I understand the situation, under the present law, as shown on page 4 of the committee report, the Commission has discretion to permit Federal employees, if they are not candidates on a Republican or Democratic ticket, to become active in local affairs. These questions were raised in a letter from a lady in Arlington, Va.:

"1. May Federal employees subject to the Hatch Act become members of political groups, irrespective of the name used, which nominate or endorse candidates and actively participate therein to any greater extent than a Government employee may participate in the affairs of the recognized political parties or the clubs of such political parties?"

No such Federal employees are permitted to participate in the affairs of State or National political parties or in the management of clubs of such parties beyond mere membership. Under the privileges of section 16 of the Hatch Act such employees may become members of a local group not affiliated with a State or National political party even though such group may sponsor or endorse independent candidates for local office. Further, any Federal employee subject to the Hatch Act may become a candidate for local Arlington County office provided that he runs as an independent candidate and does not seek endorsement by one of the State or National political parties.

As I understand the situation, in the counties adjoining Washington, if a person runs for office as an independent candidate, it is perfectly proper, but if he is a candidate on either the Democratic or Republican ticket, it is illegal. It seems to me that either such a person should not be permitted to be an employee at all or should not be permitted to hold any political office whatsoever, and the discretion Congress has given the Commission heretofore should be revoked, or it should be expanded as provided in the pending bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator agree with me that as a result of what the Civil Service Commission holds with respect to permitting civil-service employees to run on an independent ticket, they are destroying to some extent the two-party system, which we on this side of the aisle and those on the other side of the aisle are constantly saying should be maintained? I have heard that said by both Democrats and Republicans. But as a result of the Civil Service Commission's ruling civil-service employees are encouraged to go into different kinds of independent parties. In other words, "splinter" parties are encouraged as a result of the Civil Service Commission's ruling, and the proposed amendment of the law would take care of that.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct in that respect.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will yield, I believe I can give some information requested by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to call to the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts the fact that the 10-percent provision is restricted to Virginia and Maryland. I framed an amendment with the 10-percent provision, but after the subcommittee considered places like Oak Ridge, where the workers are all Government employees, and where the activity is run by an employee commission, subject to some little participation, nonpartisan, they thought that the provision should be restricted to where two known situations existed.

I do not know what percentage of the citizens in Arlington County are Government employees, but it may be 20 or 30 percent. If one of the Government employees runs for a full-time position, of course he is out of his Government position. When I say, full-time position, I refer to such offices as county treasurer or county clerk. The counties like to get the benefit of first-class people for the school boards and for county boards, and they are the positions for which the Government employees run.

Strange to say, the Civil Service Commission has ruled, as the Senator from Arizona has said, that if such a person does not call himself a Republican or does not call himself a Democrat, but says, "I am an independent," it is all right, that is pro bono publico. The Commission says, "Go ahead and do what you please." So in Arlington County enough of them got together and called themselves independents to take charge and fill the places on the county board. Now they want to take charge and fill all the places in the county, not by Republicans, not by Democrats, but by hybrids who call themselves independents. They have the blessing of the Civil Service Commission.

I, myself, believe in the two-party system. Of course, I would not prohibit the existence of other parties, but I find that the responsibility imposed on a party in charge has been a great blessing to our Nation, especially when I have had the privilege of going to Europe and finding that so many countries there cannot have a stable government because they do not have the two-party system. I think that in France there are more than 30 parties. I do not know how many parties there are in Italy. But many of the small countries of Europe have as many as 5 or 10 or 15 parties, and the government, if it is to be at all stable—and none of them are very stable—has to be a coalition government. In some of those countries Communists have to be taken into the government. There are in the Parliament of France, mind you, 182 Communists who, when they once get in, worm themselves into key positions, and learn all the Government secrets. It has been a bad thing for those countries, and I hope we can avoid that here. I should like to see in charge of running our Government, and responsible for it, either Democrats or Republicans, one or the other. I think it has been a great thing through the years that we have adhered to the two-party system.

This bill is designed to turn back an entering wedge that has been thrust forward by an illogical ruling of the Civil Service Commission, so that if a civil-service employee calling himself a member of one of the established parties takes part in politics, he is to be held as engaging in pernicious political activity, but if he says, "I have no affiliation, I am an independent," he can do what he pleases.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Along the line of the questions I asked the Senator a few minutes ago, as I understand, when this bill came from the House it provided that if the United States Civil Service Commission finds that a violation does not warrant removal, a lesser penalty may be imposed by direction of the Commission. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. That would have left the determination of that question to the majority vote of the Commission.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Am I correct in understanding that the Committee on Rules and Administration felt that it would be a mistake to leave it to a majority vote of the Commission, because a majority might be motivated by partisan considerations, and so act. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is my understanding, that the committee desired to make sure that no case would be acted upon unless all the members of the Commission were agreeable. They think that would be a greater safeguard against any undue or precipitate action.

Mr. DONNELL. Am I correct in understanding that therefore, in order to insure against decisions that violations shall not warrant removal being made on a partisan basis, it was provided by the Senate committee that unanimous action of the Commission would be essential to find that such a violation did not warrant removal?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; and the same provision is made with respect to the restoration to office of those who had been removed on trivial charges.

Mr. DONNELL. If I may ask the Senator another question, I assume he agrees with the sentiments expressed on page 2 of the report, which reads, "The provision for a unanimous vote of the members of the Commission will in the opinion of the committee preclude possibility of political considerations entering into the penalties determined upon by the Commission." Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. HAYDEN. That was the opinion of the committee.

Mr. DONNELL. To take a concrete case, suppose a series of facts was presented to the Commission, and the majority of the Commission should say, "This does not warrant removal. It is a minor matter, and we think it does not warrant removal." Does not the Sen-

ator think, first, that the minority member of the Commission would be very apt to be largely influenced by his constant association with the majority of the Commission, and thereby might very readily be induced to vote with the majority? Does not the Senator further think that the minority member of the Commission would be apt to be somewhat alarmed, if he should disagree in a series of cases, at any rate, with the majority, by reason of the fact that under the statute the President has absolute authority to remove any member of the Commission, as I understand, with or without cause, from the $10,000 position which the member holds? Therefore, would not the minority member be very reluctant, first, because of his association with the majority members over a period of time, and, second, because of the possibility of risking his very important and lucrative position, to put his own judgment against that of the majority, if there were any basis for debate in the matter at all?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I cannot concede that that would be the case, for the reason that the Senator's assumption is that the Commissioner holding the minority position is so anxious to hang on to his job that he will not exercise the judgment and discretion imposed upon him by law.

As for the Commission, I have never favored it. I have always favored a single executive authority, because, as I am sure the Senator found when he was Governor of Missouri, whenever a commission of three is established, there is always one who does not get along with the other two and who stands up for what he thinks is right. There is more confusion and discussion and disagreement in a commission than there can possibly be where there is one executive, when one man can render a decision. I do not think men in offices of that kind would yield their honest judgment in a case. I do not believe it.

Mr. DONNELL. Does not the Senator think that this sentence I quoted from the report, namely: "The provision for a unanimous vote of the members of the Commission will, in the opinion of the committee, preclude the possibility of political considerations entering into the penalties determined upon by the Commission" is something strong, and perhaps exaggerates the absolute insurance the provision inserted by the Senate committee would bring about?

Mr. HAYDEN. It certainly does convey the impression, however, that where there is a Commission consisting of two members of one political party and a third of another political party, sitting as members of the Commission representing their parties, they might act in a partisan manner if the two of them who were in the majority could control; whereas if three were required, the liability of partisan action would certainly be reduced.

Mr. DONNELL. But the Senator does not think, does he, that, to quote the language of the report, "the provision for a unanimous vote" will preclude possibility of political considerations entering into the penalty?

Mr. HAYDEN. "Possibility" is a very large word, of course.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand the amendment, it deals only with minor offenses of Federal employees, and not with major offenses.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is mistaken. It is entirely possible for a Senator to imagine that the Commission would not apply the law to minor cases, but he might imagine that in certain instances they might use it in a minor case, and if he lets his imagination run wild enough, he could conceive any sort of circumstances.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator on that point. If he fires his imagination to the extent the Senator has indicated, he could make a major case out of a minor case. The real purpose of the amendment, as I understand, is to take care of the minor infractions.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to make one observation because of what the distinguished Senator has been saying. To me it is most fantastic to think that the great and distinguished Senator from Missouri would lean upon such a weak reed, as is indicated when he says that he is afraid that a member of the Civil Service Commission, appointed by the President of the United States, will not do his duty for fear the President of the United States might remove him because of the action taken by him in the case of one of these minor infractions.

It is simply absurd and ridiculous to think that anyone could believe such a thing. If a Senator does not have more confidence in that part of the executive branch of the Government than the Senator from Missouri has, then, Mr. President, in the opinion of the Senator from Illinois, we are moving far down the stream. I am surprised at what the Senator from Missouri says.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Unfortunately, I have an important engagement to lunch with an official of the Government with whom I am going to discuss some official business. I hope the Senator from Arizona, who is in charge of the bill, will suggest the absence of a quorum, so Senators can get to the Chamber and register their opinions on the bill. Before I leave, to be absent for about 40 minutes, I should like to suggest that I have been sitting here trying to figure out how I could further purify the political situation in this country. I am sorry the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is not present because I know he stands for pure government, as we all do, and certainly as the Senator from Missouri does. I am thinking about offering the following amendment:

Add to section 16 of the Hatch Act the following:

"No corporation, any officer of which contributes to the political campaign fund of a candidate for Federal office or to a political party campaign fund, shall for a period of 5 years thereafter be eligible to bid for, negotiate for, or receive any contract with the Federal Government."

I think an amendment such as that might do a great deal more good than inflicting what the Constitution itself prohibits, which is cruel and inhuman punishment upon an ordinary citizen who is working for $2,000 or $2,500 for the Federal Government, and who, by reason of the fact that he distributes 20 cards advocating a friend's election, shall be forever barred from service to the Federal Government. I say it is time to look at this matter realistically.

We do not say to our judges, "You must put everyone in jail for 5 years who, while working in the post office, takes a $5 post-office money order. Yes; it is true a person guilty of such an offense can be put in jail for 5 years. Some persons who have done such things have been put in jail for considerable terms. On the other hand, I point out that we also trust our Federal judges. We trust them to say, "Well, John took $5 worth of money orders out of the till, but he had a wife who was sick with cancer, and he had two kids who needed shoes. He should not have done what he did, but I am not going to send him to jail."

Yet we say to the Civil Service Commission that a Federal employee cannot hand to his friends cards advocating support of a friend for office. We heard cited the case of a post-office employee who had been working in the post office for some 25 years, who was within 2 years of his retirement. What was his great offense? A friend of his, a close friend, had been working alongside of him and had retired about 6 months before. The retired man became interested in politics. The man who retired stood for office, and his friend had some nominating petitions signed in behalf of the candidate. In spite of the fact that the testimony showed he had been a loyal Government worker, that he had rendered excellent service to the Federal Government, and although he was within 2 years of retirement, he was discharged. The Commission said they regretted it, but that under the law they could do nothing else.

It seems to me we would be using good judgment to pass the bill which has been reported by the committee, with the amendments suggested to it, a bill which was passed unanimously by the House without a yea-and-nay vote and without a single objection having been made to it.

I should like to know from the Senator from Missouri, and perhaps the request may also come to the attention of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], whether he will join me in sponsoring the suggested amendment I just read.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a further question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator doubtless heard the expression of surprise uttered by the Senator from Illinois at the position taken by the Senator from Missouri. The Senator from Illinois in substance said that because of some trifling, minor infractions, and some rulings that

will be called forth by reason of them, there is no danger that the minority member of the Commission will be fearful of losing his job. I ask the Senator from Arizona whether it is not a fact, as I understood the Senator from Arizona to say to the Senator from Illinois, that the amendment proposed by the committee is not limited to minor matters but, as the Senator from Arizona has said, it is conceivable that it could apply to any matters, and that it is merely left to the determination of the Commission as to whether the specific violation is or is not one which warrants removal.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think the discretion is in the Commission, just as it is in a judge on the bench, to pass on the case upon its merits. If there is a deliberate violation of the law, certainly the full penalty should be imposed. If a Federal employee, knowing the law and knowing the regulations, deliberately engages in political activity, he should be removed from office, and a Civil Service Commission of any account at all would remove him.

Upon the other hand, in a minor case of the kind referred to in the committee report—and cases vary in degree—the Commission is given discretion, either as a minimum penalty to say that the girl in question, who was guilty of a minor infraction, shall lose 15 days' pay as a warning, which would have been entirely proper in the case of the little girl who distributed a few cards, or in the case of other minor infractions to lay off an individual for 6 months or a year, or whatever the time considered to be justified, according to the nature of the offense.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. However, the section proposed by the Senate committee, the one to which we are now addressing ourselves, is not confined by its terms to minor infractions, is it? It provides that—

> If the Commission by unanimous vote finds that the violation does not warrant removal, a lesser penalty shall be imposed by direction of the Commission.

This provision does not say that it is limited in its operations to minor infractions, but leaves it to the Commission to determine whether or not the infraction is minor.

Mr. HAYDEN. Exactly as a judge on the bench determines whether or not the person before him for sentence is a real villain, who deliberately committed a heinous crime and should be severely punished, or one who has merely gone astray for a little while, and should have a suspended sentence.

Mr. DONNELL. Did not the committee itself, by inserting the language "by unanimous vote," requiring that the Commission must make such a finding in the case of minor infraction by unanimous vote, recognize that there was at least some basis for fear that if it were left to a majority vote the matter would be determined on the basis of political considerations? Is it not true, therefore, that the committee took the view, as I quoted from the report:

> The provision for a unanimous vote of the members of the Commission will in the opinion of the committee preclude possibility of political considerations entering into the penalties determined upon by the Commission.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator will agree with me, I am sure, that it does reduce the possibilities of political considerations.

Mr. DONNELL. I think it reduces them, but, if I may say so, it still leaves it subject to possibilities. One is that when a closely associated Commission is working along year after year, two members of one party and one of the other, it is easily possible that those men may become very much in the same groove, and regard things very much along the same line, and that when the majority members decide one way the minority member may, particularly if he is not a very strong personality, yield to the other two. I think it is probable that in a series of cases which might come before the Commission, not necessarily matters the minority member believes to be minor infractions, but in a series of cases that come before the Commission, the minority member is very apt to think twice, and with great reluctance, before he votes against the majority members, when he is subject not only to their displeasure and to the discomfort of working with them, but is subject under the law to immediate dismissal by the President from a $10,000-a-year position.

Mr. HAYDEN. My experience in dealing with commissions is that there is no hesitancy on the part of a minority member to disagree with the majority. There are more rows and troubles on commissions than can possibly occur under any other system.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I now yield to the Senator from California, who was on the subcommittee which reported the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to make this contribution to the discussion today: I am no longer a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, but was at the time this measure was before that committee during the last session of Congress, and I served as a member of the subcommittee which heard the testimony in regard to this matter. If my recollection serves me correctly, it was the junior Senator from California who suggested the amendment requiring unanimous vote of the Civil Service Commission so that there would not be, at least, much danger of a purely partisan decision. I think the point raised by the Senator from Missouri that it does not eliminate the possibility of a purely partisan decision, is well taken, although I think it greatly lessens the possibility of such a decision.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator, then, thinks that this statement in the report is a little bit strong, does he not?—

> The provision for a unanimous vote of the members of the Commission will in the opinion of the committee preclude possibility of political considerations entering into the penalties determined upon by the Commission.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, I think the Senator's point is well taken on that. I do not believe it precludes it, but I think it lessens the likelihood of it.

Mr. DONNELL. I agree with that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In hearing the testimony, it seemed to the Senator from California, who was a member of the subcommittee, that there are a number of these cases which are of a minor nature, and that removal and barring from office was rather an extreme penalty in view of the character of the offense. I did not eliminate from consideration, of course, the danger of opening the barn door and letting all the horses out.

Nevertheless, I felt that with the Commission charged by the Congress and the country with the enforcement of the law, the Commission would not abuse the discretionary power which would be vested in it by the bill as proposed to be amended.

It was also my feeling that even in the case of minor infractions, there should be some penalty. That is why the amendment provides for a 15-day suspension.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator a question which I was going to ask the Senator from Arizona. All of us know that in criminal law some penalties, because of the nature of the case, are made very severe, with no discretion vested in the court to lessen them. Such a situation applies in cases of murder, for instance.

But in this case, the amendment proposed by the committee would have us go from one extreme to the other; it would leave in the law the severe penalty, but would provide a minimum requirement. All of us know that in court cases, if a good case is made, the minimum penalty generally is imposed.

I wonder whether in this case, if there is to be any minimum—and we feel that a minimum of 15 days' suspension is a very low one—would it not be better to increase the minimum to, let us say, 30 days or 45 days?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, I cannot speak for the committee, because the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is handling the bill on the floor. But personally I feel that the point the Senator from Massachusetts has made is well taken. If the minimum were increased from 15 days to 30 days, I think it would put all Federal employees on notice that they should not violate the law, because the penalty would be a little stiffer; but at the same time we would remove what seems to me to be an inequitable situation, namely, forever barring such employees from holding Federal office.

Were I in charge of the bill, I would accept such a suggestion, namely, to increase the minimum from a 15-day suspension to a 30-day suspension.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Massachusetts will offer such a modification of the amendment, I will accept it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, is such an amendment now in order to be offered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the motion of the Senator from Washington is the pending question; amendments are not now in order to the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. When it is proper to offer such an amendment, I shall do so. The purpose is to increase the minimum penalty from suspension of 15 days to suspension for 30 days.

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall accept that as a modification of the amendment, Mr. President, on behalf of the committee.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts has raised a point with regard to the participation of Federal employees in local elections. I should like to attempt to clear his mind, if possible, as well as that of the Senate as a whole.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The point I raised was presented in the form of a question.

Mr. BYRD. I understand.

Mr. President, when the Hatch Act was first passed, the Senator from Virginia offered an amendment to give to the Civil Service Commission the right to promulgate rules and regulations so that in counties having a large proportion of Federal employees, such Federal employees, under conditions established by the Civil Service Commission, could participate in local elections. I think that is a matter which is of supreme importance, because, for example, in Arlington and Fairfax Counties, Va., and in Montgomery County, Md., there are communities in which perhaps a majority of the residents are employees of the Federal Government. They are not Virginians or Marylanders primarily, in many cases; many of them come from various other sections of the United States, and are located in those counties because of their proximity to Washington. There is not sufficient room in the city of Washington for those Federal employees; there is not sufficient housing in Washington for them.

When the Senator from Virginia offered that amendment, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 86, part 3, page 2976, the Senator from Virginia said:

> Mr. President, in certain areas of the country, and especially adjacent to Washington, a majority of the residents of certain towns and counties are employees of the Federal Government. My amendment is for the purpose of giving the Civil Service Commission the authority to permit a Federal employee to take part in purely local elections when it is considered in the interest of the public welfare to do so.

I was referring, of course, to the election of school trustees and other elections purely of local interest.

I further said at that time:

> If that is not done, Mr. President, those Federal employees will be denied the right even to hold a nonprofit office, such as member of the school board or member of the town council; and, in my judgment, serious injury to the cause of good government will be done unless those Federal employees are permitted, under regulations adopted by the Civil Service Commission, to take part in purely local affairs.

Senator Hatch accepted that amendment. He said:

> Inasmuch as the amendment which the Senator now offers merely restores to the Civil Service Commission the power it had, and which it exercised before the passage of the act last year, I thought perhaps it was wise to give general authority to meet local or domestic situations—

And so forth. For the information of the Senator from Massachusetts, let me say that the Civil Service Commission made the ruling under discussion. I think that ruling was entirely out of line and did not deal properly with the situation at all. It permitted Federal employees to become candidates on nonpartisan nominations and in nonpartisan elections. In Arlington County, for example, what are called town meetings are held, and at those meetings certain nominees are selected; and they are opposed by the regular Democratic nominees and the regular Republican nominees. I hold in my hand a clipping from the Washington Star of June 5, 1949, which refers to a Miss Martin, who is employed by the Bureau of the Budget as an economist. The article states that she became a candidate for the Arlington County Board, at a town meeting. However, she could not become a candidate for that position as a Democrat or as a Republican. But under the Civil Service Commission's regulations she could become a candidate of some nonpartisan organization.

I think that situation is destructive of the method by which we conduct our Government, which is carried on largely through the regular parties. However, under its present ruling, the Civil Service Commission does not permit any Government employee to become a candidate of any of the regular political parties; but if such Federal employees run for office as independents, they can participate in elections, can run for office, can speak in election campaigns, can serve in office, and so forth.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I simply wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the same kind of condition exists in some of the towns where Government plants, some of them wartime plants, recently have been established. For instance, let me refer to Oak Ridge, Tenn. I am informed that approximately 75 or 80 percent of the people living there are nonresidents of Tennessee who came there to work, coming there from various other parts of the United States. Quite a little city has grown up at Oak Ridge. However, instead of the residents of that city having anything to do with their local government, through local elections, the situation is that under the leadership of that great statesman and purist, Mr. Mr. Lilienthal, a New York corporation has been given the duty of governing the city. The Federal Government employees who live there have nothing to do with running that city, though most of the residents of the city are employees of the Federal Government. A New York corporation conducts all the city's public affairs. That is something very unusual, Mr. President. It should not exist in this free country.

So I hope very much this bill will pass. It should pass. The Hatch Act should be amended so as to allow local self-government, even if the persons engaging in the local government are Federal employees. Service as a Federal employee does not make a miscreant of a man. After all, several of us are Federal employees. We should not adopt a rule of that sort, it seems to me.

So, Mr. President, I say that this bill, which has been carefully studied by the committee and has been reported by it to the Senate, should be passed, and should be passed at once.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I did not realize from reading the act that, under it, Federal employees are permitted to be independent candidates. If that is so, the act should be amended so as to permit all Federal employees to be candidates for local office.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, many of the Federal Government employees in the counties I have mentioned are splendid citizens and have lived in those sections for years and years. However, at the present time they cannot even take part in an election of a school trustee, unless they are nonpartisan. Why the Civil Service Commission should make such a ruling, I am unable to understand, because the purpose of the amendment which I offered to the bill in the Seventy-sixth Congress was to permit Federal Government employees to participate in elections for purely local offices, such as school trustees and other offices having to do with the education or welfare of the children of the communities, and so forth. However, the Civil Service Commission has said that Federal employees cannot become candidates for such offices if they run on the regular party tickets—either Democratic or Republican—but can do so if they run on an independent ticket. That is the situation now existing in the counties surrounding Washington. In those counties, under the Commission's ruling, if Federal Government employees are to be candidates for local office, they must do so as nonpartisan candidates, but must not follow the usual procedure of alining themselves with some established party.

So, Mr. President, I hope this amendment will be adopted. There is nothing political about it. In a political sense, from my standpoint, I feel I would not gain anything by the adoption of the amendment. But I believe the citizens in the localities to which I have referred, who are connected with the Federal Government, have a right to take part in purely local affairs, and to do so without having their jobs taken away from them or without being penalized by fines, and so forth.

So I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the parliamentary situation is, as I understand,

that the bill has been made the unfinished business of the Senate, but that a motion is pending to displace it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question before the Senate is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3905) to amend section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code, Calendar No. 644.

Mr. HAYDEN. Must that motion be disposed of, before this bill can be proceeded with?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have certain documents I should like to place in the RECORD. Apropos of the reports released yesterday on the summary of the Wallace report on China, I wish to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter which I addressed to the Secretary of State under date of April 19, 1948, as follows:

APRIL 19, 1948.

Hon. ROBERT A. LOVETT,
Acting Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, which will soon be taking up the European and China relief bill, I would like to have a copy of the Wallace report on China made by Mr. Henry Wallace to President Roosevelt in 1944.

With best personal regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senator.

I also wish to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter which I wrote on the same date to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who was then chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, telling him that I had written to the Secretary of State; a copy of the Senator's reply to me; and a copy of the letter I received under date of April 24 from Mr. Robert A. Lovett, Acting Secretary of State.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 19, 1948.

Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed is a copy of a letter that I have today written to Mr. Robert Lovett, Acting Secretary of State, requesting a copy of the Wallace Report on China issued in 1944.

It seems to me that the time has come when constructive action by the Congress of the United States depends upon members of the Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate having access to information which is the basis of certain policies we are following in Europe and the Far East. In a short while the appropriation bill for European and China aid will be before the Appropriations Committee.

I hope you may be able to use your good offices to get the report in question released for the information of the Members of the Senate.

With best personal regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senator.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
April 20, 1948.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Thanks for your note of April 19.

I shall be glad to urge Secretary Lovett to release the China report you request. I think I understand the significance of your suggestion.

With warm personal regards and best wishes,
Cordially and faithfully,
A. H. VANDENBERG.

APRIL 24, 1948.

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of April 19, 1948, in which you request a copy of the Wallace Report on China made by Mr. Henry Wallace to President Roosevelt in 1944.

A thorough search of the records of this Department has failed to reveal the existence of a Wallace Report on China. As you will recall, in the early summer of 1944 Mr. Wallace, who was then Vice President, visited China at the behest and as the personal representative of the President. It seems that Mr. Wallace reported directly to President Roosevelt. In any event, the Department of State is not aware of any report prepared by Mr. Wallace.

Very sincerely yours,
ROBERT A. LOVETT,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also wish to call the attention of the Senate to the footnote on page 549 of the so-called white paper entitled "United States Relations with China," which footnote reads as follows:

The files of the Department do not contain any indication of the existence of a report in written form made by Mr. Wallace to President Roosevelt or of the nature of any oral report made.

I also wish to have printed as a part of my remarks, and following the statements I have just made, the text of the summary of the Wallace Report as released yesterday by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], who had received it from Mr. Wallace, and merely to observe that it is a very strange thing that in dealing with our foreign policy, an important matter in the Far East, the right hand of the Government apparently did not know what the left hand was doing.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our first stop in China was at Tihua (Urumchi), capital of Sinkiang Province. The Governor, Gen. Sheng Shih-tsai, is a typical war lord. The government is personal and carried out by thorough police surveillance. Ninety percent of the population is non-Chinese, mostly Uighur (Turki). Tension between Chinese and non-Chinese is growing with little or no evidence of ability to deal effectively with the problem. General Sheng, 2 years ago pro-Soviet, is now anti-Soviet, making life extremely difficult for the Soviet consul general and Soviet citizens in Sinkiang.

There seems little reason to doubt that the difficulties in the early spring on the Sinkiang-Outer Mongolia border were caused by Chinese attempts to resettle Kazak nomads who fled into Outer Mongolia, were followed by Chinese troops who were driven back by Mongols. The Soviet Minister in Outer Mongolia stated that Mongolian planes bombed points in Sinkiang in retaliation for Chinese bombings in Outer Mongolia. He did not appear concerned regarding the situation now.

AREAS WILL BEAR WATCHING

Soviet officials placed primary responsibility on General Sheng for their difficulties in Sinkiang, but our consul at Tihua and our Embassy officials felt that Sheng as acting as a front for Chungking, willingly or unwittingly. Singkiang is an area which will bear watching.

Due to bad weather at Chungking, we stopped for 2 hours at the large Twentieth Bomber Command (B-29) airfield near Chengtu. The first bombing of Japan had taken place only a few days before. We found morale good but complaint was freely made of inability to obtain intelligence regarding weather and Japanese positions in North China and leak of intelligence to the Japanese.

Summary of conversations with President Chiang Kai-shek is contained in a separate memorandum. Principal topics discussed were: (1) Adverse military situation, which Chiang attributed to low morale due to economic difficulties and to failure to start an all-out Burma offensive in the spring as promised at Cairo; (2) relations with the Soviet Union and need for their betterment in order to avoid possibility of conflict (Chiang, obviously motivated by necessity rather than conviction, admitted the desirability of understanding with U. S. S. R., and requested our good offices in arranging for conference); (3) Chinese Government-Communist relations, in regard to which Chiang showed himself so prejudiced against the Communists that there seemed little prospect of satisfactory or enduring settlement as a result of the negotiations now under way in Chungking; (4) dispatch of the United States Army Intelligence Group to North China, including Communist areas, to which Chiang was initially opposed but on last day agreed reluctantly but with apparent sincerity; (5) need for reform in China, particularly agrarian reform, to which Chiang agreed without much indication of personal interest.

SOONG CONCERNED

It was significant that T. V. Soong took no part in the discussions except as an interpreter. However, in subsequent conversations during visits outside of Chungking he was quite outspoken, saying that it was essential that something "dramatic" be done to save the situation in China, that it was 5 minutes to midnight for the Chungking Government. Without being specific he spoke of need for greatly increased United States Army air activity in China and for reformation of Chungking Government. He said that Chiang was bewildered and that there were already signs of disintegration of his authority. (Soong is greatly embittered by the treatment received from Chiang during the past half year.)

Conversations with Ambassador [Clarence E.] Gauss and other Americans indicated discouragement regarding the situation and need for positive American leadership in China.

Mr. Wallace and Mr. Vincent [John Carter Vincent, director of Far Eastern Office of the State Department] called on Dr. Sun Fo and Madame Sun Yat-sen. Dr. Sun had little to contribute. He was obviously on guard. Mme. Sun was outspoken. (Mme. Sun Yat-sen is now an official of the Communist regime.) She described undemocratic conditions to which she ascribed lack of popular support for government; said that Dr. Sun Fo should be spokesman for liberals who could unite under his leadership; advised Mr. Wallace to speak frankly to President Chiang who was not informed of conditions in China. Mme. Sun's depth and sincerity of feeling is more

impressive than her political acumen but she is significant as an inspiration to Chinese liberals. Dr. Sun Fo does not impress one as having strength of character required for leadership but the fact that he is the son of Sun Yat-sen makes him a potential front for liberals.

Mr. Vincent talked with Dr. Quo Tai-chi, former Foreign Minister and for many years Ambassador in London, and to K. P. Chen, leading banker. They see little hope in Chiang's leadership. Dr. Quo spoke in support of Sun Fo under whom he thought a liberal coalition was possible. Quo is an intelligent but not a strong character. K. P. Chen said that economic situation had resolved itself into a race against time; that new hope and help before the end of the year might be effective in holding things together.

LITTLE OF NEW INTEREST

Conversations with other Chinese officials in Chungking developed little of new interest. The Minister of Agriculture (Shen Hung-Lieh, who incidentally knows little about agriculture) showed himself an outspoken anti-Communist. General Ho Ying-chin, chief of staff and minister of war, also an anti-Communist, is influential as a political rather than a military general. Dr. Chen Li-fu, minister of education, a leading reactionary party politician, also had little to say. Ironically, he took Mr. Wallace to visit the Chinese industrial cooperatives, which he is endeavoring to bring under his control to prevent their becoming a liberalizing social influence.

Conversations with provincial government officials were also without much significance. As an indication of political trends, there were unconfirmed reports that the provincial officials in Yunnan, Kwangsi, and Kwangtung Provinces were planning a coalition to meet the situation in the event of disintegration of central government control. In Szechwan Province the governor, Chang Chun, is a strong and loyal friend of President Chiang. The loyalty of military factions, however, is uncertain. In Kansu Province the governor, Ku Cheng-lun, is a mild appearing reactionary who, during his days as police commissioner in Nanking, earned the title of "bloody Ku."

Developments subsequent to conversations with General [Claire L.] Chennault and Vincent in Kunming and Kweilin have confirmed their pessimism with regard to the military situation in East China. There was almost uniform agreement among our military officers that unification of the American military effort in China, and better coordination of our effort with that of the Chinese, was absolutely essential. It was also the general belief that, the Japanese having during recent months made China an active theater of war, it was highly advisable to take more aggressive air action against such Japanese bases as Hankow, Canton, Nanking, and Shanghai. However, the factor of loss of Chinese life at those places was recognized as an important consideration. It was the consensus that Chinese troops, when well fed, well equipped, and well led, can be effectively used. A number of Chinese generals were mentioned as potentially good leaders. Among them were Gens. Chen Cheng, Chian Fa-kwei, and Pai Chung-hai.

MONGOLS IN CONTROL

In Outer Mongolia there is considerable evidence of healthy progress, military preparedness, and nationalistic spirit. Soviet influence is without doubt strong but political and administrative control appear to be in the hands of capable Mongols. Any thought of resumption of effective Chinese sovereignty would be unrealistic. On the contrary, it is well to anticipate considerable agitation in Inner Mongolia for union with Outer Mongolia after the war.

Specific conclusions and recommendations regarding the situation in China were incorporated in telegrams dispatched from New Delhi on June 28.

We should bear constantly in mind that the Chinese, a nonfighting people, have resisted the Japanese for 7 years. Economic hardship and uninspiring leadership have induced something akin to physical and spiritual anemia. There is widespread dislike for the Kuomintang government. But there is also strong popular dislike for the Japanese and confidence in victory.

Chiang, a man with an oriental military mind, sees his authority threatened by economic deterioration, which he does not understand, and by social unrest symbolized in communism, which he thoroughly distrusts; and neither of which he can control by military commands. He hoped that aid from foreign allies would pull him out of the hole into which an unenlightened administration (supported by landlords, warlords, and bankers) has sunk him and China.

Chiang is thoroughly eastern in thought and outlook. He is surrounded by a group of party stalwarts who are similar in character. He has also, reluctantly, placed confidence in westernized Chinese advisers (his wife and T. V. Soong are outstanding examples) with regard to foreign relations. Now he feels that foreign allies have failed him and seeks in that and the Communist menace a scapegoat for his government's failure. His hatred of Chinese Communists and distrust of the U. S. S. R. cause him to shy away from liberals. The failure of foreign aid has caused him to turn away from his uncongenial western advisers and draw closer to the group of eastern advisers for whom he has a natural affinity and for whom he has been for years more a focal point and activating agent of policy than an actual leader.

At this time, there seems to be no alternative to support of Chiang. There is no Chinese leader or group now apparent of sufficient strength to take over the Government. We can, however, while supporting Chiang, influence him in every possible way to adopt policies with the guidance of progressive Chinese, which will inspire popular support and instill new vitality into China's war effort. At the same time, our attitude should be flexible enough to permit utilization of any other leader or group that might come forward offering greater promise.

Chiang, at best, is a short-term investment. It is not believed that he has the intelligence or political strength to run postwar China. The leaders of postwar China will be brought forward by evolution or revolution, and it now seems more likely the latter.

POSSIBLE POLICY LINE RELATIVE TO LIBERAL ELEMENTS IN CHINA

Our policy at the present time should not be limited to support of Chiang. It is essential to remember that we have in fact not simply been supporting Chiang, but a coalition, headed by Chiang and supported by the landlords, the warlord group most closely associated with the landlords, and the Kung group of bankers.

We can, as an alternative, support those elements which are capable of forming a new coalition, better able to carry the war to a conclusion and better qualified for the postwar needs of China. Such a coalition could include progressive banking and commercial leaders, of the K. P. Chem type, with a competent understanding both of their own country and of the contemporary Western World; the large group of western-trained men whose outlook is not limited to perpetuation of the old, landlord-dominated rural society of China; and the considerable group of generals and other officers who are neither subservient to the landlords nor afraid of the peasantry.

The emergence of such a coalition could be aided by the manner of allotting both American military aid and economic aid, and by the formulation and statement of American political aims and sympathies, both in China and in regions adjacent to China.

The future of Chiang would then be determined by Chiang himself. If he retains the political sensitivity and the ability to call the turn which originally brought him to power, he will swing over to the new coalition and head it. If not, the new coalition will in the natural course of events produce its own leader.

AMENDMENT OF THE HATCH ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1243) to amend the Hatch Act.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, it is my belief that the bill, H. R. 1243, before the Senate today strikes directly at weakening and detracting from a law which has had force in holding in check—to some degree at least—corrupt political practices in our country.

It has become accepted fact that a person who is employed by the Federal Government, or who receives all or part of his salary from the Federal Government, may not actively engage in a political campaign or influence votes for a political candidate.

I was not a member of the Senate Rules and Administration Committee when the bill, H. R. 1243, was considered by it. But I have had the opportunity since to read the testimony taken on it, and the deliberations preceding its report to the Senate. I think the amendments made by the Senate Rules Committee, with respect to section 9 (b) of the Hatch Act, are an improvement to the measure which came to us from the House.

But I cannot agree that we should consider, in any broad way, weakening the mandatory provisions of the original act. Nor should we further confuse the issue by providing a new amendment to grant an exception to a certain group of Federal employees who happen to reside in counties adjoining the National Capital. I am not unaware that there are some inequities developing which should receive some attention in that respect.

But it seems to me that there is more reason today even than in the past 10 years since the passage of the Hatch Act, for adhering to its concept and intents, rather than to seek loopholes through its structure, or weaken the purposes for which it was created.

There are today in the direct employ of the administrative services of the Federal Government some 2,000,000 employees. Many millions more are engaged in contracting for Government work, or are working on State or local projects where their salaries are partially or wholly paid by the Federal Government.

Though all may not be subject to the provisions of the Hatch Act, it is a matter for consideration to realize that 14,416,000 American citizens today are receiving direct, regular payments from the Federal Government. Another 5,000,000 are on State and local pay rolls, partially supported by Federal funds.

Twenty years ago there was 1 Government employee to about 40 of the population. Today there is 1 Government employee to about every 22 of the population. And if we use only the

working population in the comparison, there is one Government employee for every eight employed in other fields.

Twenty years ago, persons directly or indirectly receiving regular moneys from the Government—that is, officials, soldiers, sailors, pensioners, subsidized persons, and employees of contractors—represented about 1 person in every 40 of the population. Today—and our population has vastly increased—about 1 person out of every 7 in the population is a regular recipient of Government moneys. If those of age are all married, they comprise about one-half of the voters in the last presidential election.

Let us think that over. To bring the comparison in direct relation with one of the amendments in the bill we are considering, I am told that in Arlington County, immediately adjacent to the National Capital, out of 140,000 population in the area, 40,000 are Federal employees.

The Hatch Act, after setting forth what it means by political activities, requires, in section 9 (b), as it now stands, that a Federal employee shall be dismissed, and not rehired, if he is found to have engaged in political activities.

There is no shilly-shallying in the present law. It leaves no leeway for interpretation. It should perhaps provide specifically for hearing cases of violation instead of leaving that function to the Civil Service Commission. But if a case is proved, involving political activity, no matter whether committed in innocence or through lack of knowledge of the law, the employee must be dismissed.

This seems to me to have had a salutary effect, even though it may have resulted in injustice in a few isolated cases. I would be interested in knowing just how much injustice has been done. I have seen no presentation of such facts. Only a few isolated instances were presented to the Rules Committee by the Civil Service Commission.

I should be more interested to know with what vigor the Civil Service Commission is able to pursue a program of surveillance of Hatch Act violations—which must be numerous—than I am in hearing of a few instances of punishment for trivial offenses, on the basis of which the Civil Service Commission is seeking to be relieved of its responsibility for dealing out mandatory expulsion.

I think the Congress is not above blame. The present Congress is undoubtedly at fault for not providing adequate funds for compliance action under the Hatch Act. The Civil Service Commission admits that it can do little more than investigate the cases which are brought to its attention voluntarily.

It seems to me that fact presents a more serious consideration to the Senate than the pending bill, which proposes to weaken the mandatory provisions of the law.

Here we have the instance of a law already weakened by lack of funds for its enforcement, and it is proposed further to detract from its effectiveness by setting up a number of exceptions or processes to relieve offenders under the act from the weight of its hand.

The amendment to section 9 (b) of the Hatch Act contained in the bill, H. R. 1243, proposes to recognize offenses under the Hatch Act which may warrant a lesser penalty than mandatory expulsion. It proposes to bring back for consideration those expulsions which may have warranted a lesser penalty in the past and to reopen their cases, leading to possible reinstatement and reemployment in the Federal service.

Mr. President, this seems to me to place a tremendous responsibility upon the Civil Service Commission, which already admits that it cannot carry out a compliance program under the existing requirements of the law. The proposed amendment would create a diversity of new responsibilities, adding to present decisions upon dismissals, the job of setting up penalties less than dismissal, and of acting upon the reinstatement of persons heretofore dismissed.

In my opinion, Mr. President, it is opening the gates for wide discretionary action by an executive agency, and I am opposed to relaxing, to this or any other degree, the provisions of the existing law, as proposed by the amendment.

I think, seriously, as I view it, that it is opening the opportunity for token resistance only. If we must consider having the dignity of the Hatch Act lived up to, then the mandatory provisions for the lesser penalties certainly should not be as low as 15 days' suspension. I realize that injustices and inequities develop. I understand that almost any person seeking a Federal job at the present time must make application and must meet the requirements of the civil-service system. I am not willing to admit that in this great body politic and all over this great country there are people seeking Federal employment who are not able to know the rules and regulations of the act. The Hatch Act, harsh as it may be, has been an important part of our governmental processes for a good many years and should be respected and lived up to.

Mr. President, I do not take with too great a degree of sympathy the argument that persons seeking employment in any Government service and meeting the requirements of the Civil Service Commission examination, do not know of the hazards they are facing. I feel that to chip from the act here and there would weaken its entire structure and cause disrespect for the general purposes intended to be accomplished.

AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT RELATING TO EVALUATION OF FISCAL REQUIREMENTS OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, out of order, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference, a bill and I request that the bill may be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, because I should like to take a few minutes of the Senate to discuss it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Without objection, the bill will be received, printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, and without objection, the Senator from Arkansas may proceed. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 2898) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

"SEC. 138. (a) There is hereby created a joint service committee to be known as the Joint Committee on the Budget (hereinafter in this section called the "joint committee") to be composed of 10 members as follows:

"(1) Five Members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, three from the majority party and two from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee; and

"(2) Five Members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, three from the majority party and two from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee.

"(b) No person shall continue to serve as a member of the joint committee after he has ceased to be a member of the committee from which he was chosen, except that the members chosen by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives who have been reelected may continue to serve as members of the joint committee notwithstanding the expiration of the Congress. A vacancy in the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection, except that (1) in case of a vacancy during an adjournment or recess of Congress for a period of more than 2 weeks, the members of the joint committee who are members of the committee entitled to fill such vacancy may designate a member of such committee to serve until his successor is chosen by such committee, and (2) in the case of a vacancy after the expiration of a Congress which would be filled from the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the members of such committee who are continuing to serve as members of the joint committee, may designate a person who, immediately prior to such expiration, was a member of such committee and who is reelected to the House of Representatives, to serve until his successor is chosen by such committee.

"(c) The joint committee shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its members at the first regular meeting of each session: *Provided, however*, That during even years the chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the House of Representatives and the vice chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the Senate, and during odd years the chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the Senate and the vice chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the House of Representatives.

"(d) A majority of the Members of each House who are members of the joint committee shall together constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, but a lesser number, as determined by the joint committee, may constitute a subcommittee and be authorized to conduct hearings and make investigations. Any member of a subcom-

mittee so designated shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of any hearing or investigation, but the concurrence of a majority of the members of such subcommittee shall be necessary before any report or findings may be submitted to the joint committee.

"(e) It shall be the duty of the joint committee—

"(1) (A) to inform itself on all matters relating to the annual budget of the agencies of the United States Government, during and after the preparation thereof; (B) to provide the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate with such information on items contained in such budget, and the justifications submitted in support thereof, as may be necessary to enable said committees to give adequate consideration thereto; and (C) to consider all available information relating to estimated revenues, essential programs, and changing economic conditions, and, on the basis thereof, report to said committees findings relating to necessary adjustments or revisions in appropriations as may be required to balance the budget;

"(2) to recommend to the appropriate standing committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate such changes in existing laws as may effect greater efficiency and economy in government;

"(3) to make such reports and recommendations to any standing committee of either House of Congress or any subcommittee thereof on matters within the jurisdiction of such standing committee relating to deviations from basic legislative authorization, or in relation to appropriations approved by Congress which are not consistent with such basic legislative authorization, as may be deemed necessary or advisable by the joint committee, or as may be requested by any standing committee of either House of Congress or by any subcommittee thereof.

"(f) The joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act anywhere within or without the District of Columbia whether the Congress is in session or has adjourned or is in recess; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

"(g) Employees of the joint committee, upon the written authority of the chairman or vice chairman, shall have the right to examine the books, documents, papers, reports, preliminary and other estimates of budget requirements, or other records of any agency of the United States Government within or without the District of Columbia: *Provided, however,* That such employees shall not be permitted access to books, documents, papers, reports, estimates, records, or any other thing containing information classified for security purposes unless specifically authorized by the joint committee to receive such types of classified information.

"(h) At the request of any member of the Committee on Appropriations of either House or of any member of a subcommittee thereof, or at the request of any member of the staffs of such committees or subcommittees, professional employees of the joint committee may be detailed to advise and assist such committees or subcommittees or the staffs thereof during consideration of any appropriation bill or part thereof.

"(i) The joint committee shall, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, employ and fix the compensation of a staff director and such other professional, technical, clerical, and other employees, temporary or permanent, as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the joint committee, and all such employees shall be appointed without regard to political affiliation and solely on the ground of fitness to perform the duties to which they may be assigned: *Provided, however,* That such appointment may be terminated by the concurrence of a majority of the members of the joint committee. No person shall be employed by the joint committee until a thorough investigation as to loyalty and security shall have been made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a favorable report on said investigation submitted to the chairman or vice chairman.

"(j) It shall be the duty of each agency of the Government to supply to the joint committee duplicate copies of any budgetary request submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, either for regular or supplemental appropriations required for each fiscal year, with the detailed justifications in support thereof.

"(k) When used in this section, the term 'agency' means any executive department, commission, council, independent establishment, Government corporation, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government. Such term includes the Comptroller General of the United States and the General Accounting Office, and includes any and all parts of the municipal government of the District of Columbia except the courts thereof.

"(l) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section. Appropriations for the expenses of the joint committee shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the bill which I have just introduced bears the title, "A Bill To Amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 To Provide for More Effective Evaluation of the Fiscal Requirements of the Executive Branch of the Government of the United States."

This bill, if enacted, will repeal the provisions of section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 which established the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget. That provision of the Legislative Reorganization Act, as we all know, has proved unworkable. The joint committee established by that provision of law under the Eightieth Congress, with the Republican Party in the majority and in control of the Congress, was unable to function in accordance with the provisions of that statute. Likewise, Mr. President, in the Eighty-first Congress under the leadership of the Democratic Party, that joint committee has not been able to function, and I think it may now be assumed that this provision of the statute is a dead letter and should be repealed or so revised as to give it some practical operating effect. I propose, Mr. President, to repeal that provision of the law and to substitute in lieu of that section of the Legislative Reorganization Act the provisions of the bill which I have today introduced.

Under the Constitution the Congress has the responsibility and duty of appropriating public funds for the support of all branches of the Federal Government. The Chief Executive, as the head of the executive branch, submits to the Congress a budget of estimated revenues, anticipated expenditures, and recommendations for appropriations to meet the operating cost of the Government. The President's budget is not mandatory upon the Congress, but it is most persuasive and is largely accepted by the Congress as a yardstick to guide it in making annual appropriations, and particularly so with respect to appropriations for all agencies of the executive branch of the Government. Under our system, the President recommends, but the final responsibility and duty with respect to appropriations are vested in the Congress.

To aid and counsel the President in his budgetary recommendations to the Congress, there has been created an agency known as the Bureau of the Budget established within the Executive Office of the President. The Bureau of the Budget has a staff and personnel of some 531 employees. Its work and duties continue the year around, and I regard it as an indispensable adjunct to the Office of the President and to the executive branch of the Government. Among other duties it is charged with the duty of screening requests for appropriations that are submitted by the different departments, bureaus, and agencies of the executive branch of the Government. Its services are of great value to the President in preparing his annual budget and in paring requests for funds by administrative agencies, and holding down the operating costs of the executive branch of the Government. Therefore, Mr. President, I do not have in mind, and I want to stress that it is not the purpose of the legislation which I propose to in any way hinder, obstruct, impair, or detract from the functions of the Bureau of the Budget. But, Mr. President, the Congress has the final responsibility for appropriating the funds requested by the several agencies of the Government and by the President in the budget he submits to us, and to enable the Congress to more intelligently and adequately meet this responsibility is the purpose of the bill I have introduced.

The President's initial estimate of expenditures for the present fiscal year was $41,900,000,000. Supplemental requests increased estimated and requested expenditures to $43,300,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950. Meanwhile, anticipated receipts had declined from an originally estimated $41,000,000,000 to a revised estimate of $37,800,000,000. This resulted in an anticipated deficit of some $5,500,000,000 for this fiscal year. On January 9, 1950, the President submitted his budget to Congress for 1951, the next fiscal year, in which he recommends total expenditures of $42,400,000,000 as against anticipated revenues of $37,300,000,000.

Thus the President's budgetary recommendations for fiscal 1951 at present envisions another deficit for 1951

in excess of $5,000,000,000. When the 1950 budget was submitted, the President envisioned a deficit of some $900,000,000, but it develops that the deficit for this fiscal year will be 6 times greater than the President anticipated or estimated when he submitted the 1950 budget 1 year ago. I trust that ratio of error will not hold true for 1951. But I think we can assume that, unless the Congress meets its responsibility to reduce the expenditures recommended by the President in the present budget, the deficit for 1951 will very likely greatly exceed the amount of $5,000,000,000, plus, which the President acknowledges will accrue if the Congress conforms to his wishes with respect to expenditures.

So, Mr. President, notwithstanding the excellent services rendered by the Bureau of the Budget in an administrative and advisory capacity to the President, we are confronted, it seems, with perpetual and increased deficit spending unless the Congress puts a stop to it and materially reduces the present tremendously swollen and rapidly growing annual cost of the Federal Government.

To establish and maintain sound fiscal policies, to prevent waste and unnecessary and excessive expenditures of the public funds, to keep the Government solvent and generally operating on a balanced-budget basis is the final duty and inescapable responsibility of the Congress itself. This is no easy task, Mr. President. It is a job that will require not only courage of individual Members of Congress, but one where the greatest of wisdom and skill should be employed—a job that Congress cannot adequately perform without securing the ablest technical assistance and counsel that can possibly be made available to it. That, Mr. President, is what I propose to do in this legislation.

This measure, Mr. President, would establish within the Congress a Joint Committee on the Budget, composed of five members of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives and five members of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, with an adequate technical staff, to serve as an agency of the Congress. It is to be a service committee to the Appropriations Committee of both Houses of Congress, with authority to study and further screen budgetary requests that come to us from the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. President, it might be asked, why not simply increase the staffs of the two Appropriations Committees of Congress? If that course were followed—and I think possibly the same results could be achieved by it—there would be absolutely a duplication of effort. To adequately staff one committee would cost as much as the expense of a joint staff.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the plan would enable the members of the Budgetary Committee to work together as a joint committee of the two Appropriations Committees, with a staff under its direction making an all-year-round study of budget requests.

As I proceed, I shall point out how the proposed legislation would make it possible for that to be done.

This committee will be adequately staffed with technical and professional personnel, and will have the job—an all-year-around job, Mr. President—of studying budget requests and expenditures in the various departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government, with a view of eliminating unnecessary expenditures and in aiding—not supplanting—the Appropriations Committees and the Congress to make cuts and reduce appropriations in every instance where it can possibly be done without impairing essential and necessary services of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the Senator will wait for a moment until I make one further statement, I shall be very happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

So that proper studies can be made by this committee and its staff, it would also require that all agencies of the executive branch of the Government submit to the committee a duplicate of all budget requests for expenditures that they submit to the Bureau of the Budget. This would enable the committee and staff, Mr. President, to make studies along with the Bureau of the Budget; and, so, where the Bureau of the Budget or the executive branch of the Government fails to make reductions that can or should be made, on the basis of factual information that the studies and work of this committee may provide, the Congress certainly will be in a better position to make such reductions.

I am now very happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very much interested in the Senator's proposal. It must be evident to everyone that we should take steps to balance the budget. The question I wish to ask the Senator is whether he has had any estimate made as to the cost of the proposal he makes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have had no estimate made, I will say to the able Senator, because the Congress can itself control it. We have had no estimate made, anymore than we have had estimates made of what it would cost to staff any other committee. But I may say to my distinguished friend that I cannot conceive that it would be necessary for us to provide a staff for this committee comparable to the staff which is provided for the Budget Bureau. They have 531 employees working the year round to prepare the budget which the President submits. With the limited staff with which we undertake to operate in the Appropriations Committee, as the Senator knows, it is an absolute physical impossibility for the present staff to begin to make the checks and the analyses of the budget and of all the requests which I believe to be essential if we are to reduce expenditures in a sound, businesslike way, and do it discreetly and with judgment, so as not to impair actual services of the Government which are needed, which are indispensable, and which are essential to a proper functioning of the executive branch of the Government.

As I pointed out a moment ago, I think the staff could well be limited, but if we provide, as our proposal would require, that the executive agencies of the Government, when they submit their budget requests to the Bureau of the Budget, be required at the same time to submit them to an agency of the Congress which would be prepared to work the year round, we would have information in advance of the hearings before the Appropriations Committee as to whether the requests had been properly screened, whether they had been reduced, what the requests were originally, and what action was taken on them. The budget comes to us now at the beginning of a session of Congress, when appropriation bills are being introduced. With the limited facilities we now have, it is a physical impossibility for the Congress to be certain it is doing the work which could and should be done.

I do not maintain, Mr. President, that what is proposed is the only approach or the only solution. It may not be. But I believe this bill will serve as a basis for the appropriate committees of the Congress and for the Members of the Senate to study this problem, to hold hearings, and to try to find some means, some vehicle, which we can employ to fortify and equip the Congress to do the job of reducing Federal expenditures. That ought to be done, and ultimately, Mr. President, in my judgment, it must be done.

The joint committee proposed by this bill will be specifically a service committee, having no authority granted to standing committees, nor would it be authorized to report directly to Congress. It will report to the Appropriations Committees of both Houses, and to their subcommittees, or, in certain instances, to other standing committees. It will have a staff director and be staffed by an adequate number of professional budget and technical experts who will be assigned to work with the agencies of the Government during the preparation of their annual budget in the same manner as the Bureau of the Budget now works with those agencies on behalf of the President. It will have access to the same information. There will then be available to the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of the Congress, at the time the President's budget message is received, detailed factual information on all items contained in the budget.

Again, Mr. President, I emphasize that I am not trying to set this up for the Senate alone, because if this service is worth while and needed, I feel that a joint committee and one staff could serve both Appropriations Committees, rather than to have a separate staff for each committee.

In this way the Congress can better, more fully and intelligently discharge its duty to the American people by reducing the cost of Government without at the same time crippling essential activities.

Mr. President, if after a thorough study of the bill it is determined, in the wisdom of the Congress, that it would cost more to service and to operate this staff and this committee than the anticipated savings would amount to, such a committee should not be established. But if

by establishing such a committee we can reasonably expect to reduce the costs of Government, and have a proper and adequate check upon the executive agencies of the Government with reference to their expenditures, then, Mr. President, for each dollar of the cost of operating and servicing this committee we should get returns of many, many dollars in Federal savings.

It is further believed that this procedure will expedite and in some instances eliminate the necessity for formal hearings on certain titles of the appropriation bills which now require a great deal of the time of the Members of Congress and the officials of the executive departments. Through utilization of factual, detailed data compiled by its service committee, the Committees on Appropriations would be in immediate possession of information that must now be developed through long and tedious hearings. This new procedure cannot help but speed up the legislative process in the appropriation field.

Any investigation of the budget items will necessarily require a knowledge of the manner in which past and current appropriations have been and are being expended. The bill, therefore, proposes to grant to the new joint committee the additional responsibility of reporting to the appropriate standing committees of the Houses of Congress any matters which relate to the improper expenditure of funds, and areas in which economies might be effected through cutback of programs by legislative action.

Finally, as this proposed committee will have useful, detailed information in the formulation of the legislative budget, it is charged with the duty of submitting to the Appropriations Committees suggestions for adjustments or revisions in appropriations which may be made to balance the budget, or hold deficits to the minimum.

It is also contemplated that the joint committee, through its staff of experts, will obtain information as to estimated revenues and the general economic condition of the country from all available sources and submit such information to the Appropriations Committees.

Mr. President, one reason why section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act has not been found practical, is that the committee was not staffed, it was not equipped to do the job. So far as I know, no attempt to operate under it has ever actually been consummated. It has been found impossible for the Ways and Means Committee and the Appropriations Committee and the Finance Committee simply to say, "The revenues are going to be so much and the expenditures should not be more than so much," because the information has not been made available to them, and because the joint committee was not equipped and staffed with the talent necessary to acquire the information and make it available to the Budget Committee.

This function is a modified form of the duties imposed on the Legislative Budget Committee established in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and, therefore, section 138 of that act is repealed and the enlarged powers of the new joint committee substituted therefor. Senators are well aware of the fact that the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget was unable to accomplish its duties primarily because it had no adequate information upon which to base a major policy decision on the maximum amount which should be spent for the operation of our Government. Its estimates, based on information supplied by the executive branch, failed to accomplish the purpose for which it was created.

This new budget committee and procedure to be established by this proposed legislation, in my judgment, will greatly improve our legislative appropriation processes. The establishment of this committee and this service will enable both the House and the Senate Committees on Appropriations to be provided with continuous, factual and detailed information relative to the various appropriation items and programs contained in the budget. By having its own facilities, a committee created by and responsible to it, the Congress will no longer be compelled to rely upon wholly ex parte evidence of need for expenditures by the administrative agencies of the Government that want to spend the money.

In my brief period of service on the Appropriations Committee, Mr. President—and I think this statement can be verified by all other members of the Appropriations Committee—we have had the situation that the President has had the Bureau of the Budget within the Executive office. The Bureau serves him. Members of the Bureau come before committees of Congress, together with the heads of the agencies of the executive branch of the Government and present their side of the matter. They support the budget. They come to committees of Congress prepared with statistics and other persuasive material and arguments to induce the Appropriations Committees and the Congress to grant them the money they say they want and need to spend. Under our present system we are simply having to take what is presented to us, or, in most instances, arbitrarily act to the contrary. The proposed system and procedure, however, would enable us not to be compelled, as we are now, even to act arbitrarily if we are to cut expenses, but would enable us to act intelligently on the basis of reliable information.

With about 1,800 items of recommended appropriations in the President's budget I think I can say without challenge from any source that no Member of the Senate or of the Congress, even though he may be a member of the Appropriations Committee, can possibly have the detailed knowledge or the time personally to examine each item separately and be satisfied in each instance that the item of expenditure itself is necessary or that the amount requested is the minimum required to do the job. In fact no single individual without any other responsibilities could perform that stupendous task, and certainly Members of Congress, already burdened with other tremendous legislative and official duties, can give the President's budget and the appropriation bills the time required for necessary screening of budgetary requests so as to be fully informed and thoroughly satisfied that the particular item and amount requested are fully justified. Every Member of the Senate knows that to be so. I dare say not a Member of the Senate would stand upon this floor and say he is familiar with every item in the budget and is satisfied that this or the other expenditure is essential and necessary to be made. It is physically impossible for each Member of this body, in the course of the performance of the heavy duties laid upon him today, so to inform himself through his own efforts.

This year, Mr. President, we are undertaking to process a single, omnibus appropriation bill. That means, Mr. President, that this measure will likely be retained in the House for quite a long time before it reaches the Senate. Certainly, it will take much longer to get an omnibus appropriation bill over from the House than it has in the past for the House to get over to the Senate separate appropriation bills for the different departments. Thus the Senate Appropriations Committee will experience this delay and cannot and will not know what the House bill contains until it has passed the House and reaches the Senate. We can well anticipate, therefore, that the time after receipt of the bill from the House until the end of this fiscal year will be comparatively short, and likely not sufficient for the Appropriations Committee of the Senate to give thorough and adequate consideration to the measure before the beginning of the next fiscal year.

I favor the single appropriation bill. I hope the experiment will prove advantageous and that it will be an improvement over the system of considering separate appropriation bills, which has been the practice in the past. But even if we continued the past procedure of having some 12 or 13 separate appropriation measures, the need for this service of a budgetary committee would exist, but with this change to a single, omnibus appropriation bill, the need is further accentuated.

I know that the present occupant of the Chair, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] realizes the difficulties under which we are compelled to labor with a single appropriation bill, and that if we wait until after the House acts and sends its bill to the Senate before we undertake to make a study, or make any preparation toward passing an appropriation bill, we will find it impossible to give adequate consideration to the bill and study it and make the checks which ought to be made, in time to pass the bill before the end of the fiscal year.

For that reason I believe the chairman of our Appropriations Committee has, very wisely—I do not know that a decision has been made yet—proposed to begin hearings immediately on the basis of the budget, without knowing what action the House will or will not take. I believe that if we had in effect a system whereby we required the executive agencies of the Government to submit to the joint committee of the Congress the same request it submits to the

budget, we also could make a year-around study, just as the President's advisers do, so we could be prepared to act when the time came, and act without the necessary delay which occurs under our present system.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. What the Senator from Arkansas is now discussing is a matter of vital importance to the Senate. In the judgment of the Senator from Nevada the Senate should take its place in the appropriation facilities of the Government. It was never intended by the Constitution, so far as I can determine, that appropriations must of necessity arise in the House. Be that as it may, this body must sustain its position in the matter of appropriating for the Government. With that in mind we have held several meetings of the Appropriations Committee. I am not at all certain, and I express only my own views, that the omnibus bill will be a success. But it is certainly worthy of trial. To that extent, we are entirely content to go forward and try to work it out successfully.

In keeping with that, let me say that as chairman of a subcommittee having charge of the appropriation bill for the State Department, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Judiciary, I have called a meeting of the subcommittee on the 31st of this month, and have requested the representatives of those agencies to appear before the committee at that time, with a view to going forward independently, hoping that we may have the printed copies of the House hearings, if they are then available, and may avail ourselves of such information as the House committees have been able to obtain, but also going forward independently ourselves, looking to our independent position in making appropriations for those agencies.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from Nevada. I may say that I believe that if this proposal were now in effect and if the committee were now functioning, the Senate Appropriations Committee could go forward with facts and information which would enable it to act intelligently and to expedite the work the committee will be compelled to do.

Through the utilization of fully developed information made available to them at the time when the budget is submitted, the Appropriations Committees of both the House and Senate would be better prepared to pass on appropriation items when the bill is under consideration, since much information and detail would have already been ascertained by the Joint Committee on the Budget and its staff, and made available to the Appropriations Committees.

Mr. President, this pyramiding cost of the Federal Government, which entails continuing and increasing deficit spending, causes many of us grave concern. I have felt that, as one Member of the Senate, I have a personal duty and obligation, as does every other Member of this body, to do something about this problem—not just talk about it and say I favor economy in government, but to do everything within my power to correct this situation. At least, Mr. President, I intend to make the effort. In fact, Mr. President, I started or attempted to secure action of that sort during the last session of Congress. Other Members of this body, having the same deep concern that I have about the policy of deficit spending, likewise undertook to take action at the last session of Congress to materially reduce Federal expenditures and balance the budget, or at least hold the deficit to a very practical minimum.

It will be recalled that during the last session of Congress various joint resolutions were introduced, by Senators from both sides of the aisle, calling for cuts of different dimensions in the appropriations, cuts that were definitely under the budget estimates and recommendations. Those resolutions were referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which I am chairman. The committee conducted extensive hearings, in an effort to report a resolution designed to bring about a sizable reduction in Federal expenditures.

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments finally reported Senate Joint Resolution 108, which would have required the President to make reductions of from 5 to 10 percent in the total appropriations made during that session. One reason for that method of approach to this problem—and, Mr. President, it was an unorthodox method; I admit that was because some of the appropriations measures at that time had already passed both Houses of Congress. Others had been passed by the House and were then pending in the Senate. We could not recall the bills that had already been passed and enacted into law. In fact, the Congress was not prepared, it had not equipped itself with adequate facilities, Mr. President, to make the cuts wisely and discretely on the individual items in each appropriation bill that would have been required to bring about a reduction sufficiently large to balance the budget. The situation too, Mr. President, was considerably aggravated because the President's budget estimate of revenues was so inaccurate and because additional and supplementary budget requests so increased the amount of proposed expenditures that it had become apparent that the $900,000,000 deficit which the President's original budget for 1950 estimated was a great understatement of the reality. In those circumstances, it appeared to many of us that Congress had no other alternative except to pass a resolution on the order of Senate Joint Resolution 108, and to delegate to the President the power to reduce appropriations and cut expenditures between 5 and 10 percent, in the hope that the budget might be balanced, or at least that the deficit would be held to the lowest practicable minimum.

We know, Mr. President, the parliamentary obstacles and the administration opposition which that joint resolution encountered. Some 63 Senators, representing both political parties and more than 40 States in this Union, signed a petition urging the leader of the majority party to bring up the joint resolution in the Senate for a vote. That request was denied by the policy committee and the leadership of the majority. Therefore, Mr. President, the Senate was never given an opportunity to consider that resolution in its own right and upon its individual merits. Those of us who sponsored and favored it had to resort to the tactic of offering it as an amendment to an appropriation bill. Because it was offered as legislation on an appropriation bill, the rules of the Senate required, as all of us know, a two-thirds majority vote for suspension of the rule, so that the amendment might be offered for adoption. It was not adopted, Mr. President, I regret to say, although on that vote 49 Senators, a constitutional majority of this body, voted in favor of suspending the rule, so as to permit the resolution to be offered as an amendment, and only 28 Senators voted against doing so. Obviously, Mr. President, a majority of the Senate during the last session of Congress favored a reduction in Federal expenditures, but that parliamentary obstacle was resorted to and was interposed to defeat the will of the majority of this body.

Having met defeat, under the above circumstances, in an effort to pass Senate Joint Resolution 108, which could have resulted in a balanced budget, I tried to do something a little more modest. I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 131, which would have left untouched and unimpaired the present requirements of existing budget law, but would have added an additional requirement, namely, that the 1951 budget to be submitted include revised expenditure figures so reduced as to be in balance with estimated revenues. That would have given Congress the full picture of what the President wanted to spend and what he was willing to say he would spend if the Congress was unwilling to continue the policy of deficit spending, and insisted upon a balanced budget.

Mr. President, we are here confronted with a budget of expenditures, which the President wishes to make next year, in excess of $5,000,000,000 more than the anticipated revenues will be. Had that joint resolution become law, we would have had this budget with just another column of figures added to it. It would have shown what the President would have eliminated from the budget if the Congress insisted upon balancing the budget. That would have been helpful to us. It would not have been any more binding than the President's other budget recommendations, but it would have been helpful to a Congress that is economy-minded in response to the publicly expressed sentiment of the American people, who want government costs reduced and want to get the Government back on a sound fiscal basis.

Senate Joint Resolution 131 met with no opposition when I offered it as an amendment to the executive pay bill, relating to salary increases for officials of the executive branch of the Government. In fact, I thought the administration accepted it. No opposition was expressed to it in the Senate. As I re-

call, it was adopted without a dissenting vote. Being a Senate amendment, of course it went to conference. Although I do not know what occurred in conference or before the conferees met, I do find in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 13, 1949 (p. 14442), the following statement by Representative EDWARD H. REES, a member of the conference committee:

> The bill, as passed by the other body—

He was referring to the bill providing for salary increases for personnel of the executive branch of the Government—

> included a provision that would require the President to submit a balanced budget in addition to his regular budget. * * * I thought the provision had merit and sound reasoning. The President objected to this provision of the legislation. He opposed it so strenuously that he followed the unusual procedure of calling the conferees of both Houses to the White House, before they had opportunity to consider the measure, so he could tell the conferees he wanted that particular provision removed from the legislation.

So, Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 131, passed by the Senate, did not become law. It was stricken from the bill in conference.

Let me pause to remind my colleagues that I think it is now perfectly obvious that we are not going to get any help from the present Bureau of the Budget in respect to balancing the budget, because it is under the direction of the President; and I am quite certain that the President will contend this year, as he did last year, that the budget he has submitted is one he has pared down to the very minimum. We must either accept it or we must meet what many conceive to be our responsibilities as Senators and as representatives of the people by undertaking to find a way to reduce it, where and if it can be reduced, without destroying or unduly impairing essential services of the Government.

I have said that the final responsibility for fiscal policies rests with the Congress of the United States, but, Mr. President, the initial responsibility is and shall remain with the President of the United States. It is his duty to give consideration to and be concerned about the solvency of the Government and the pursuit of sound fiscal policies of the Government. He has the duty and responsibility of requesting appropriations of the Congress. The Congress has provided him with a staff of experts in the Bureau of the Budget to enable him to study the financial conditions of the Government, to screen requests for expenditures that come to him and, through him, to the Congress, from the different agencies of the executive branch of the Government. Thus, the Congress, in great measure, relies upon the President of counsel and guidance in the matter of Federal expenditures and, while the Congress has the final responsibility to say yes or no to budgetary requests of the President, this does not relieve the President from the duty to cooperate with the Congress in establishing and pursuing sound fiscal policies, in attaining and keeping a balanced budget, and in keeping the Government solvent. The President of the United States has just as solemn a duty as has the Congress to formulate sound fiscal policies, to the end that the Government may keep on a safe and sane course and not go down the road to insolvency, notwithstanding the fact that the final power is reposed in the Congress itself to prevent such a course.

I do not care to rehash all the arguments I made in support of Senate Joint Resolution 108 and Senate Joint Resolution 131 when those resolutions were offered as amendments to other bills at the last session of Congress, but I should like to point out the divergent views entertained and expressed by myself and by the majority leadership with respect to Senate Joint Resolution 108, as reflected by the debate when that measure was under consideration.

The majority leader, speaking in opposition to the resolution, as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 21, 1949, at pages 8043–8045, stated:

> I maintain with all the sincerity I possess that the Congress of the United States has the responsibility for cutting appropriations. The President of the United States submits his budget to the Congress, and under the Constitution and laws of the country it is the duty of the Congress to say whether or not it will approve funds requested in that budget, whether it will cut the budget, or whether it will increase the budget. It is our responsibility; and in my judgment we should not shift the responsibility to the President of the United States and tell him to cut the budget 5 or 10 percent after we ourselves refused to do so in the Senate. For that reason, in view of what has happened in connection with appropriation bills which have come before us, certainly the majority leader is not going along with that kind of a resolution. We should have the courage to reduce appropriations if we desire to do so. If we do not have the courage to do it, we should not shift our responsibility to the Executive.

I pause to say I have confidence in the Congress. I believe the Congress has the courage to do it. I question that the Congress has equipped itself with the proper facilities and technical help to enable it to reduce it at all times intelligently. That is what I think is needed. That is what the bill I have introduced seeks to do.

A little later in the same speech, the able majority leader further stated:

> But, Mr. President, the Senate cannot do what is attempted to be done by the joint resolution, simply pass the buck to the President of the United States, and hope to convince the American people that we are doing our duty and accepting our responsibility as Senators. I say it is ridiculous to place that responsibility on the President, after he himself has said that he has had his experts work on the budget, that he has cut it to the bone; and then has sent it to us either to reduce or to increase. Now some Senators propose that we send the problem right back to him, that we delegate to him the power to appropriate for the Congress of the United States.

Like others, constituting a majority of the membership of this body, I did not accept what I conceived to be an unsound argument on the part of the majority leadership of this body. After listening to the able, but what I conceived to be the unsound, argument of our distinguished majority leader, I stated, as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 29, 1949, at page 12391, as follows:

> I do not care who shouts that the passing of this resolution is an act of political cowardice. The President of the United States cannot escape his share of either the blame or the legal and moral responsibility for any deficit that occurs either great or small so long as the Congress does not appropriate in excess of his budget recommendations.
>
> No, Mr. President, this is not an act of political cowardice. On the contrary, it is sound legislation necessary in the public welfare, and failure to balance the budget or to hold the deficit to the minimum this legislation makes possible may well prove to be a stupid and dangerous blunder. The risk is too great. This living beyond our means in government must be stopped. It often takes courage to do our duty, and the duty to maintain sound fiscal policies now is so impelling—the safety and security of the Nation is involved.

I reiterate, with even stronger emphasis than then, that the necessity for maintaining sound fiscal policies is now so impelling as to involve the safety and security of the Nation.

When this resolution was defeated by a vote of 49 yeas to 28 nays, to which I have already alluded, certain newspapers—I believe one of them was the New York Times—on September 2, 1949, quoted the President of the United States as saying:

> The Senate has done the right thing. It was the duty of Congress to analyze all appropriation bills, and to pass them or not. It was not a function that they could transfer to the President.

I do not agree with all the President said, but let us accept this much of his statement:

> It was the duty of the Congress to analyze all appropriation bills.

I can agree with this, Mr. President. It is our duty to analyze them, and it is our responsibility to make the final decision. That is what the bill I have introduced today seeks to do—to better equip the Congress with necessary and adequate facilities to do just what the President says it is the duty of the Congress to do—to "analyze all appropriation bills." After having equipped ourselves to do a thorough job of analyzing appropriation bills and the President's budget, then the Congress can better meet its responsibility of voting the appropriations which the President requests of it, eliminating some items entirely and making reductions in others where reductions can and should be made.

Pursuing the argument that was made against Senate Joint Resolution 108, that it is the full responsibility of Congress to cut appropriations, and the President's statement that it is the duty of Congress to analyze all appropriation bills, it is obvious that unless the Congress adequately equips itself to do this, it definitely cannot adequately or fully meet that responsibility. If the Congress simply accepts the ex parte evidence submitted at hearings of the Appropriations Committees by the executive

branch of the Government, including its Bureau of the Budget, and votes appropriations accordingly, for all practical purposes and effect it will simply be abdicating the power of appropriation to the Chief Executive of the Nation.

If we are going to follow the Budget plan, if we are going to take the evidence adduced before the Appropriations Committees from the heads of the executive agencies of the Government, if we are going to take that evidence without any question or check against it, then we are, in effect, absolutely delegating to the executive branch of the Government the writing of the "ticket" for appropriations.

Too long already the Congress has labored under the handicap of an outmoded system of checking against the executive branch of the Government with respect to budget requests for appropriations. This course cannot be continued in the face of the challenge that now confronts us. Deficit spending has already reached a down-hill momentum. The deficit for 1951, if the President's program is followed, will be greater than the deficit of $5,000,000,000 in 1950, and there is every indication that each succeeding year deficits will increase unless the Congress itself puts on the brakes. The American people want the brakes applied. The Congress is the instrumentality of the people that has the power to apply the brakes.

The urgency of action by Congress in this area has been stressed by many outstanding authorities who have joined in the large chorus of protests against unbalanced budgets in these times of high national income, high taxes, and a high level of prosperity. Speaker of the House RAYBURN is reported to have stated recently that "A prudent man pays his debts when he has the money."

Similarly, Dr. Edwin G. Nourse in a recent speech, which was followed shortly by his resignation as Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, stated:

> I am not happy either when I see Government slipping back into deficits as a way of life when production and employment are high, instead of putting its fiscal house in order and husbanding reserves to support the economy if less prosperous times overtake us.

Dr. Nourse reiterated his position in a speech at Richmond on January 13, in which he asserted that every effort should be bent toward getting the spending policies out of the red if the Nation is to avoid cracks in its economic structure, and stated that he told the President that—

> The administration has resorted again to inflationary short-cuts, and I think that the deliberate launching of a program for false prosperity is a grave mistake. * * * And I don't think the program is either sound or progressive.

I have not seen the article, Mr. President, and cannot vouch for the accuracy of it, but I am in receipt of a letter from one of my constituents, Mr. M. F. Sloan, a farmer of Pocahontas, Ark., from which I quote as follows:

> I have just read Senator Capper's The Reddest Menace to America is Government Red Ink.

Then he says, "I believe there is a lot of truth in it," and he quotes again from the article as follows:

> The flood of red ink can overwhelm and destroy us as individuals, as family units, and as a nation. It can be as devastating as an atomic bomb explosion. We had better stop it and the inevitable inflation that follows it, before it is too late.

Mr. President, I subscribe to those sentiments, and I resolve to do everything in my power to stop it. I intend to vote accordingly in this session of Congress.

In closing I remind my colleagues of what President Franklin D. Roosevelt said, before he became President, in a speech he delivered at Pittsburgh on October 18, 1932:

> If a nation is living within its income its credit is good. If in some crisis it lives beyond its income for a year or two, it can usually borrow money temporarily on reasonable terms. But if, like the spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds, is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending, extends its taxing up to the limit of the people's power to pay and continues to pile up deficits, it is on the road to bankruptcy.

Mr. President, I do not propose by my vote and by my services here to help America travel down that road.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to invite my colleagues to study this proposed legislation, and I urge them to give to me and to the committee to which the bill will be referred the benefit of their study, their counsel, and their suggestions, to the end that we may all work together to do something about this problem which I think may well prove to be a challenge, a definite threat, and a danger to our future security and liberty.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to join in the expressions of the able Senator from Arkansas. I entered the Chamber during the course of his presentation. I take this opportunity to join in the expressions he has made, to which I have listened. From observations made in a study throughout Europe a little while ago, I found, as have others, that today the American dollar is the only sound currency in the world. If anything should occur which would impair the integrity and strength of the American dollar, I do not know where civilization might go, nor where, indeed, the American way of life might go. So I join with the able Senator from Arkansas in expressing the hope that the Congress of the United States may take unto itself that which belongs to the Congress, and see to it that deficit spending shall be ended.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

THE WORK OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I sought recognition so that I might speak for a moment of the committee of which I have had the privilege for some time of being the chairman, namely, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. That committee has as many members on its staff as has any other committee of the Senate, if not more than has any other committee of the Senate.

Hence, I think it entirely appropriate that I speak of the work of that committee. The Judiciary Committee, as the record will show, has presented to the Senate for consideration and has itself considered more legislation, more bills, more resolutions, and more matters of vital importance than has any other committee.

I do not say that with the idea of speaking disparagingly of other committees, but rather to show to the Senate of the United States the load which, through the Reorganization Act, was placed on the shoulders of the Judiciary Committee.

With that in mind I have had prepared a complete statement and summary of the work done and accomplished by the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate during the first half of the Eighty-first Congress, and I ask unanimous consent now that the clerk may read and that there may be inserted as a part of my remarks a statement prepared from the records of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE WORK AND WORK LOAD, FIRST SESSION, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

The work load of the Senate Judiciary Committee during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress consisted of 39.2 percent of all Senate bills and resolutions introduced; 45 percent of all House bills and resolutions presented in the Senate; 40.5 percent of all bills and resolutions, irrespective of origin.

Not only did the Judiciary Committee get a far larger share of the work load than any other standing committee of the Senate; it also performed a larger share of all committee work than any other committee. Of 1,203 written reports filed in the Senate by all committees, the Judiciary Committee filed 524, which presented 43.5 percent.

The total of reports filed to the Senate does not give the whole picture of committee activity, because committee consideration of many bills resulted in adverse action and indefinite postponement. Furthermore, the committee handled and disposed of more than 3,000 individual immigration cases, involving suspension of deportation. Each immigration case is equivalent to a bill.

During the first session the Judiciary Committee received 1,244 Senate bills and resolutions and 402 House bills and resolutions, making a total of 1,446 bills and resolutions.

By the end of the session the committee has disposed of 498 Senate bills and resolutions and 352 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 850 bills and resolutions.

Of the bills thus disposed of, 122 were general bills other than claims or immigration; 498 were private relief bills; 210 were private immigration bills; 9 were general claims bills; and 11 were general immigration bills.

Committee approval was granted to 241 Senate bills and resolutions and 290 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 531 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

(It will be noted that written reports were filed by the Committee with respect to all but 7 of the 531 bills and resolutions approved.)

Of the bills and resolutions acted upon favorably, 75 were general bills other than claims or immigration; 302 were private relief bills; 138 were private immigration bills; 9 were general claims bills; and 7 were general immigration bills.

Bills indefinitely postponed by the committee included 257 Senate bills and resolutions, 62 House bills and resolutions, or a

total of 319 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

Of the bills thus acted upon unfavorably, 47 were general bills other than claims or immigration; 196 were private relief bills, 72 were private immigration bills; and 4 were general immigration bills.

Measures pending before the committee at the end of the session included 746 Senate bills and resolutions and 50 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 796 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

Of these bills, 119 are general bills other than immigration and claims; 164 are private relief bills; 449 are private immigration bills; 24 are general claims bills; and 40 are general immigration bills.

It will be noted the committee disposed of 352 House bills and resolutions out of 402 such measures referred to it, leaving only 50 House bills and resolutions pending at the end of the session.

In comparison, out of 1,244 Senate bills and resolutions referred to it, the committee acted upon 498, leaving 746 Senate bills and resolutions pending.

(In this connection it should be noted the committee received 294 Senate bills and 117 House bills subsequent to June 30.)

Suspensions of deportation by the Attorney General, under authority delegated by the Congress, are submitted in groups; but in the committee, each such individual case requires separate investigation, appraisal, and action. At the beginning of the first session, there were pending in the committee 1,501 cases of suspension of deportation, to which were added 2,926 additional cases submitted during the session, making a total of 4,427 cases; of which 2,966 were approved, 38 were rejected, 85 were "screened out" and held for further consideration, and 4 were withdrawn by the Attorney General; leaving 1,334 cases "in process" at the end of the session.

(The Chief of the Adjudication Division of the Immigration and Naturalization Service estimates that during the second session of this Congress, approximately 5,000 additional cases of suspension of deportation will be transmitted to the Congress for approval. These 5,000 cases will include cases for the adjustment of the status of displaced persons, pursuant to the displaced persons law. No such cases of adjustment were included in the suspensions reported during the first session.)

During the first session, the committee received 138 executive nominations, of which 63 were Federal judges, 30 were United States district attorneys, 33 were United States marshals, 1 was Attorney General of the United States, 2 were assistant attorneys general, 3 were members of the Displaced Persons Commission, 3 were members of the War Claims Commission, and 3 were members of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission.

At the end of the session, nominations not yet acted upon totalled 29, of which 23 were nominations submitted within less than a week of the end of the session.

During the session, the committee and its subcommittees conducted 91 hearings, which involved 198 separate hearing sessions. The record of these hearings total 20,220 folios.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I file this report with the Senate as a compliment to the members of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, 13 members in all. Twelve of the thirteen, regardless of party lines, have devoted their time, their energy, and their best efforts to a collossal load which has been given to the committee. With our best efforts we have accomplished the result that is set out in this report.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. In a moment. I desire at this time to pay my personal respects and to offer my sincere gratitude and my compliments to the members of the committee, who, regardless of political lines, served with me on the committee.

I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the Senator referred to 12 out of the 13 members of the committee. I assume he was, in modesty, eliminating himself.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. If I may have the privilege of saying just a word with respect to the activities and work of our distinguished chairman, to my mind, as the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, he has made himself a place for many, many years in this great body, whether he be here in person or in memory, by reason of the great and outstanding service which he is rendering and has rendered as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate. I take pleasure in saying this very brief word of tribute to him, and giving this expression of my admiration for his fine qualities, integrity, and ability.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am, indeed, grateful for the kind remarks of the Senator from Missouri.

At this time, Mr. President, I wish to draw the attention of the Senate to a highly important phase of the work of the Committee on the Judiciary. Having taken occasion to make an intimate study of the matter of immigration, and especially an intimate study of the matter of displaced persons as that phase of immigration comes to the committee of which I have the honor of being chairman, I draw the attention of the Senate to the colossal load of immigration matters which are referred to the committee. It is estimated that 5,000 cases will be referred to the committee during the second session of the Eighty-first Congress. The record shows the disposal of thousands of cases during the first session.

Mr. President, there are being brought into this country unlimited thousands of immigrants about whom there is a question as to whether or not they fit into our ideology. Indeed, no more vital question can come before the Senate and before the Congress than whether or not there are being brought into this country those who are enemies of our form of government. If that is the case, then the load that is placed on the shoulders of the Committee on the Judiciary and on the Congress of the United States becomes all the more burdensome, all the more important, all the more colossal.

I draw the attention of the Senate to the fact that it is estimated that 5,000 cases will come before the Judiciary Committee during the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, including the question of displaced persons. If that shall follow, then it is for the Senate and for the Congress to be alert every minute to every one of the immigration cases that comes before this body.

The staff of the Committee on the Judiciary, the membership of the Committee on the Judiciary, yea, indeed, the staff of the whole Senate, must be called into play in order that we may to the best of our ability determine whether or not any and every individual who comes here seeking admission to our land, or citizenship, is worthy of citizenship. If the screening that is taking place abroad is ineffective, unworthy, and incompetent, then it is time for us to devise another method of screening, another method of determination as to whether or not there are being brought into our country enemies to our form of government, and if that is so, then we must stop it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. I appreciate the great burden that is placed upon the Senate Committee on the Judiciary by a requirement in the law—why it was ever enacted I am not quite clear—that the Committee on the Judiciary shall pass upon deportation cases. Obviously that is purely an executive function. Why should a committee of the Senate be required to pass upon the question of whether or not a person is lawfully in the United States? It would be just as reasonable to expect a congressional committee to go to Europe and screen every person who is proposed to be brought to the United States under any immigration law. That is clearly an executive function. Has the Senator ever considered the advisability of repealing that provision of the statute which burdens his committee with 5,000 cases?

Mr. McCARRAN. In answer to the inquiry of the Senator from Arizona, I will say that that has been a matter of consideration. So far as I am concerned, I would not advocate repeal, because it might appear that the committee is trying to shirk its duty. I am not one who will shirk his duty. I shall try to perform the duty as best I can.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am quite sure that whoever initiated that statute had no idea that a Senate committee would be required in one session of Congress to pass upon 5,000 deportation cases. It is perfectly obvious that Senators, along with their other duties, cannot individually look into cases of this kind. The function is purely an executive one. Congress enacts statutes providing who can and who cannot come into the United States. It enacts statutes providing for deportation of persons who are in the United States in violation of our laws. Why a committee of Congress should be required to perform an executive function I cannot understand. It is utterly illogical to me.

Mr. McCARRAN. I voted against the Reorganization Act; but it is the law. So long as it is the law, the Committee on the Judiciary will attempt to carry out its duties under the law. Let me say to the Senator from Arizona and to the Senate that it is almost impossible to carry it out as it should be carried out. It is almost impossible to carry it out with the staff we have. If that staff were augmented many times, it would still be highly questionable whether we could properly carry it out. However, I am not ready to shirk the duty, and I never shall. So long as the provision remains in the law we will carry it out to the best of our ability. We have not

been able to meet all the obligations, but we are going to meet them as best we can. I wish to say to those who are critical, if there be those who are critical of the acts of the Committee on the Judiciary in passing upon deportation cases, that I want Senators to be more critical, because they cannot be too critical of those who are permitted to remain in this country and obtain citizenship, for that will make those persons more alive to their duties as citizens, and more willing to take part in carrying on the Government of the United States.

Mr. President, today of all times in the world, when our country is the pivot country of the world, we must maintain integrity in our citizenship, and that is true also with respect to those who have come here to make this their haven, their safe harbor, their hope for the future.

DELIVERED - PRICE SYSTEMS AND FREIGHT-ABSORPTION PRACTICES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it is my understanding that under a previous order of the Senate the conference report on Senate bill 1008 is to come up for consideration tomorrow. Inasmuch as the conference report differs substantially from the original bill, and as it was amended in the House and in the Senate, and also since there has been a change of members of the Federal Trade Commission, I made a written request of the Federal Trade Commission for their opinion on the proposed legislation. In response to that request I received a letter dated January 18, 1950, which represents the majority opinion of the Federal Trade Commission, and under date of January 19, 1950, I received a separate view by the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, Mr. Lowell B. Mason. I ask unanimous consent that the two opinions be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, January 18, 1950.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: This is in further response to your letter of January 11, 1950, and the request therein for an analysis of S. 1008 as reported by the conference committee, and a statement of the Commission's position with respect to the bill in its present form.

The Federal Trade Commission believes that S. 1008 in the form in which it was reported from conference will greatly weaken, if not destroy, the effectiveness of section 2, of the Clayton Act as amended, as well as jeopardize and probably similarly affect other sections of that act. Two features of the bill are of paramount importance in this conclusion: (1) the definition of "the effect may be" contained in section 4–D of the bill and (2) the conflict between sections 2–B and 3 of the bill upon the issue of whether or not meeting the equally low price of a competitor in good faith shall constitute a complete defense to charges of price discrimination.

As introduced by Senator O'MAHONEY, Section 4–D of the bill defined "the effect may be" as meaning a showing of reasonable probability of the specified effect. For more than 20 years the courts consistently interpreted "may be," as used in the Clayton Act, as meaning reasonable probability. This interpretation expressed a declared intent of the Congress to use the Clayton Act to curb monopolistic practices in their incipiency. This definition was changed during debate in the Senate, but the original version was restored by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House. It is believed that this definition was intended to make sure that the meaning of "reasonable probability" should continue and to settle any doubts raised by the use of the term "reasonable possibility" in the decision of the Supreme Court in *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Morton Salt Company*.

The bill as reported by the conference committee provides, however, that the term "the effect may be" shall mean that there is reliable, probative, and substantial evidence of the specified effect. This definition requires evidence of an effect which cannot be obtained until after the effect has appeared. It therefore amounts to a provision that the words "may be" shall be read as "is." The definition would therefore no longer rest upon the standard of reasonable probability, and the Commission would not be able to proceed against a price discrimination because of its probable effects, or even its certain future effects, but could only proceed after the effects had actually occurred.

It has been said that the conference committee definition of "may be" was intended to affirm the standards of proof set forth in the Administrative Procedure Act. This purpose could have been accomplished by defining the term as a reasonable probability determined from reliable, probative, and substantial evidence, though this would have been repetitious of the standard presently applicable.

The conference committee's definition of "the effect may be" applies directly to the language of section 2 of the Clayton Act. The defined term also appears, however, in section 3 of the Clayton Act, prohibiting exclusive-dealing and tying contracts, and also in section 7, prohibiting corporations from acquiring the stock of other corporations when the effect may be substantially to lessen competition. Similarly, the defined term appears in the bill to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act which has been passed by the House, and which the President has just recommended that the Congress enact. Since it is unlikely that the courts would give one meaning to the term in one section of the statute and a quite different meaning in other sections of the same statute, the enactment of section 4–D of the bill would destroy the test of reasonable probability in section 2 of the Clayton Act and would seriously jeopardize, if not destroy, it in other sections of that act.

The principal question raised by the bill in its original form was whether or not meeting an equally low price of a competitor in good faith shall be a substantive defense to charges of illegal price discrimination. As introduced, the bill answered this question in the affirmative; as passed by the Senate this question was answered in the negative; as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House it was answered in the affirmative; as passed by the House it was answered in the negative; as reported by the conference committee the bill does not meet, but only confuses, the issue.

Section 2–B of the bill provides that it shall not be an unlawful price discrimination "to absorb freight to meet the equally low price of a competitor in good faith (except where such absorption of freight would be such that its effect upon competition will be to substantially lessen competition), * * *" Section 3 of the bill, which relates to any form of discrimination in price, provides:

"That a seller may justify a discrimination by showing that his lower price or the furnishing of services or facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor."

Thus, section 2–B of the bill invites the institution of proceedings when injury to competition results from freight absorption, while section 3 provides that the establishment of "good faith" in meeting an equally low price of a competitor shall be a complete defense to the charge of illegal price discrimination. The two sections point in opposite directions and, taken together, can only create confusion as to the legality of freight absorption.

Turning to the sections of the bill other than those just discussed, they do not accomplish any presently important public purpose. Section 1 of the bill is apparently intended to be declaratory of existing law and to write into statutory form what the Commission has repeatedly said is the meaning of the present statute. Section 2–A of the bill declares that postage-stamp pricing is not to be regarded as unlawful price discrimination. There has never been a case in which this Commission or the courts have found the use of this type of pricing to constitute illegal discrimination in price. Section 4–A defines the word "price"; section 4–B defines the term "delivered price"; and section 4–C defines the term "absorb freight." None of these definitions is seriously controversial or represents any departure from existing law.

It seems clear that any new statutory language, however innocent, or intended to be simply declaratory of existing law, will nevertheless entail long delays and much litigation, with all the attendant uncertainties, before it is interpreted by the courts with finality. These inevitable costs appear warranted only when they are outweighed by countervailing public advantages. Whether or not there was need for clarification of these matters at the time the bill was introduced, the Commission believes that the passage of time and the march of events has greatly reduced any public uncertainty as to the meaning of the law thus sought to be defined. A substantial contribution was made by the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit on August 22, 1949, in *Bon Crown & Cork Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission*. To the results of new legislation must be added the destructive effects of section 4–D upon the effectiveness of the Clayton Act as amended. There must also be added the fact that the only important substantive issue raised by the bill in its original form had to do with the status to be given a defense based upon good faith in meeting an equally low price of a competitor in a proceeding charging unlawful discrimination in price, and the fact that the bill as reported from conference confuses without solving this question. It is therefore believed that the over-all effect of the bill will be seriously destructive.

For the reasons stated, the Commission is of the opinion that S. 1008 as reported by the conference committee will seriously weaken the Clayton Act.

The above does not reflect the views of Mr. Mason.

By direction of the Commission, and with personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LOWELL B. MASON,
Acting Chairman.

JANUARY 18, 1950.

N. B.—The Commission has not yet had an opportunity of ascertaining from the Bureau of the Budget whether its position in this matter is in accord with the legislative program of the President.

LOWELL B. MASON,
Acting Chairman.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, January 19, 1950.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As I noted in the letter to you transmitting the Commission's report that my own views were not in accord with the majority, I beg leave to present herewith my own evaluation of the conference report version of S. 1008.

Assuming as I do, that it is the legislative intent to make clear that the law shall not be construed so as to prohibit a concern from selling its products at delivered prices, nor for such a company to absorb freight to meet equally low prices of a competitor in good faith, and that it is desired to preserve the right of an individual seller to meet at the buyer's place of business competitive prices in good faith, it is my judgment that S. 1008, read in the light of its legislative history, will accomplish those purposes, and I am prepared to endorse the bill's objectives and to recommend its passage with an amendment of section 4 (D) as hereinafter suggested.

Those who would avoid the strong guiding hand of Congress upon our shoulders claim that there is no need for Congress to concern itself with our actions because the Court in the Bond Crown & Cork Co. case upheld the right of an individual seller to absorb freight, and that, therefore, such a practice was not now unlawful; hence no present legislation was required.

As far as the Crown & Cork case is concerned, a close examination of the Court's opinion will disclose that the Court said that the practice of freight equalization individually followed was not in issue, and the decision of the Court was limited to passing upon the question as to whether or not there had been conspiracy among the respondents to use the basing-point system. In considering the practice of freight equalization, the Court said:

"It should be noted in this connection, however, that the question in this case is, not whether such practice may be enjoined as constituting of itself an unfair trade practice, but whether it may be considered along with the other facts and circumstances to which we have adverted as tending to establish the conspiracy and combination in restraint of trade, which is the only charge in the complaint."

The Court further held:

"We need not decide, however, whether the freight equalization practice here involved constitutes of itself an unfair trade practice or whether it may be condemned as systematic price discrimination in violation of section 2 of the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, * * * as was held of the multiple-basing-point system in the Cement Institute case, as those questions are not before us. The practice unquestionably constitutes evidence to be considered, along with other facts and circumstances, as tending to establish the conspiracy charge; and that was the only purpose for which it was considered by the Commission."

It is apparent from the above that the Court in the Bond Crown & Cork Co. case did not pass upon the question of individual freight absorption or delivered prices independently arrived at, which are the subject matter of S. 1008. For this reason, in my judgment this case does not clarify the existing confusion. The Court left open the question as to what its holding would have been had the Commission attempted to prohibit the individual use of a freight equalization system by each particular respondent.

It is to be noted that there are cases pending in the Commission in which the independent use of freight absorption is challenged as being unlawful. It would be impossible, as well as improper, for me to forecast what our decision will be in these pending cases. However, you should be advised that the Commission some time ago authorized the filing and is presently prosecuting before it the following complaints which, if sustained, will condemn the independent, nonconspiratorial use of freight absorption: D. No. 4878, Chain Institute, Inc., et al.; D. No. 5253, National Lead Co., et al.; D. No. 5483, Clay Products Association, Inc., et al.; D. No. 5484, Clay Sewer Pipe Association, Inc., et al.; D. No. 5502, Corn Products Refining Co., et al.

The complaints in the above cases each contain a second count charging the individual respondents with unlawful price discrimination because of differences in net prices received after deductions of actual freight costs. These differences in net prices accruing to each individual seller, thus attacked as being unlawful, are inherent in any independent system of freight absorption, freight equalization, uniform delivered prices, or basing-point quotations. You will recall that count II of the Conduit case (affirmed by an equally divided Supreme Court) held nonconspiratorial freight absorption to be an illegal unfair method of competition.

Last June we advised the House Committee on the Judiciary that all of the Commissioners believe that on balance it is preferable to make the good faith meeting of a competitor's equally low price a full defense. No action has been taken by the Commission to change this view. The letter sent you yesterday over my signature indicates that the majority of the Commission take exception to the results of the amendments offered to sections 2 and 3. (These are the Kefauver amendments in the Senate, the Carroll amendments in the House, and the conference committee's compromise thereof.) While I agree it would have been preferable if these amendments had not been offered, I do not believe that they move in opposite directions.

The amendment to section 2 refers to good faith competition which will not substantially lessen competition. The amendment in section 3 refers to good faith competition that is not monopolistic or oppressive. These are relatively similar terms. In any event, however, it is not necessary that these restrictions be identical because section 2 refers to what is required for the Commission to prove its case, while section 3 relates to what is required for a respondent to affirmatively prove his defense if the Commission has made out a case. These amendments in sections 2 and 3 of the act appear to be adequate safeguards.

In section 4 (D) I would prefer the House version which defines the words the "effect may be" as meaning reasonable probability.

In my judgment, it can hardly be denied that there is at the present time widespread confusion as to the legality of the use of delivered prices by one seller, independent of conspiracy, the absorption of part or all of the transportation costs and the meeting of lower competitive prices, and that this confusion should be dispelled by legislative action. With the above amendment S. 1008 seems to be adequate to accomplish this purpose.

Sincerely yours,

LOWELL B. MASON.
JANUARY 19, 1950.

N. B.—I have not yet had an opportunity of ascertaining from the Bureau of the Budget whether my position in this matter is in accord with the legislative program of the President.

LOWELL B. MASON,
Acting Chairman.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I also wish to present for the consideration of the Senate a rather detailed anaylsis of the bill. But, first, I should like to acknowledge my indebtedness to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for an anaylsis he presented in the Senate on October 18, covering sections 2, 3, and 4 of the bill. This was an analysis with which I wholly agree. Using the distinguished Senator's analysis as a base, I have expanded it to include an analysis of section 1 of the bill and to include a somewhat more extensive analysis of section 4B of the bill. Likewise in other sections, I have expanded the analysis to develop several related ideas. On the other hand, I have condensed, revised, or omitted materials on other points which seem now to be better understood than they were last October. The distinguished Senator from Oregon is to be held in no way responsible for the faults of the final product, especially since he is not in the Chamber to defend himself. I simply express my indebtedness to him for an analysis which has been very helpful to several of us who have been giving particular study to this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the analysis may be printed in the body of the RECORD for the benefit of Senators when they are considering the report tomorrow.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF THE BASING-POINT BILL, S. 1008 (AS REPORTED BY THE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE)

SUMMARY

Section 1 of S. 1008 would amend section 5 (a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act. Sections 2 and 3 would amend sections 2 (a) and 2 (b) of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act. Section 4 provides definitions of certain key phrases which appear in section 5 (a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act and in sections 2 (a), 2 (b), 3, and 7 or the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act. The detailed analysis below may be summarized as follows:

Section 1

The language of section 5 (a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act is brief and general, but has a clear statutory purpose. Its purpose is to make unlawful "unfair methods of competition in commerce, and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce." The proposed amendment to this law is also in brief and general language, so much so that the courts would necessarily have to refer to the record of this legislation in order to find the congressional intent of the language. The legislative history of this proposed amendment provides no clear record of congressional intent.

Consequently, passage of this section would at best merely add confusion to the law. It is expected that at least 10 years of new litigation would be required to clear up the confusion and yield new guide posts. In the meantime, monopolistic pricing systems now in practice would go unchecked, and those recently broken up would be reestablished.

What the courts would ultimately take this amendment to mean is a matter of speculation. If the courts take as their guide the simultaneous action of the Congress in passing sections 2 through 4 of the bill, they will conclude that Congress intended to legalize any and all pricing practices, except those systems maintained by open agreement among competitors.

Section 2A

This section would exempt, without qualification, the postage-stamp price system and

the limited-zone price system from possible illegality under the law governing price discriminations. If steel or any other heavy industry, should adopt one of these pricing methods, extensive dislocations of industry could be expected to result.

Section 2B

This section confers exemptions upon freight absorption to meet the equally low price of a competitor. It thus exempts from possible illegality the Pittsburgh-plus system, the multiple-basing-point system, and the freight-equalization system.

The exemptions of this section are qualified to the effect that freight absorption is not to be exempted if it will be to substantially lessen competition. This qualification fails to adopt the standards of the present law in two respects: First, only one of the effects upon competition is named—"injury to competition," as under the present law, is omitted. Second, the present law is stated in terms of "effect may be"—the judicial criterion of which is "reasonable probability." Adoption of the word "will" renders the qualifying clause a nullity, since the future effect of a current act or practice cannot be proved in advance.

Section 3

This section would reestablish the good-faith defense as a complete and final defense against a charge of illegal price discrimination and would thus nullify the Robinson-Patman Act amendment to section 2 of the old Clayton Act.

The good-faith defense may be established in either of two ways. First, by a showing that two or more sellers are meeting, or offering to meet, one another's price. Second, that a seller can show evidence which would lead a reasonable person to believe that a competitor was offering the same price, although no competitor was in fact doing so. Sellers discriminating in price among their various buyers are in good faith so long as two or more sellers meet one another's price to the favored buyers, and the Federal Trade Commission could not issue an order terminating the discrimination, no matter what the effect of the discrimination upon competition.

The good-faith mechanism will work to destroy small business in two ways. First, there is a widespread tendency among sellers to make, in favor of large buyers, discriminations which are not justified by differences between the costs of serving the large buyers and the costs of serving the smaller buyers. (Differences in prices which are justified by differences in the costs of serving the various buyers would be legal—as they are under the present law.) Such favorable prices afforded large buyers enable them to put smaller competing buyers out of business without respect to the question of efficiency in the economic system. Moreover, when one seller offers a large buyer a special price, another seller usually will do so, with the result that both sellers would be in good faith under this bill. Even though the Federal Trade Commission could determine which seller made the discrimination first, it could not issue an order stopping the discrimination.

The second way in which the "good faith" mechanism would work to destroy small business is that whereby large sellers would destroy small competing sellers. A large seller with sales outlets over several areas or territories can usually destroy his small competitors whose outlets are confined to single territory, simply by cutting the price to cost—or below cost—in one territory at a time. This technique always enables the large seller to win out, and it thus destroys smaller business firms to the advantage of the larger firms without respect to the question of which is the more efficient. When one seller makes a special price cut in a particular territory, one other seller will usually follow suit—thus both sellers would be in "good faith" under this bill.

Section 4

This section provides definitions for certain key phrases appearing in the other sections. It does not, however, provide a definition of certain key terms—which happen to be new terms to the law—appearing in section 1. These terms are: "monopolistic" and "oppressive" practices. The definitions provided in subsections 4A through 4C make no substantive change in law, other than those changes indicated where the terms appear in sections 1 through 3. Section 4D would, however, make a substantial change in law. It provides that the term "'effect may be' shall mean that there is reliable, probative and substantial evidence of the effect."

The decision of the Commission or the courts that a given act or practice may have, will have, or has had, a specified effect is necessarily an interpretation, conclusion, or judgment drawn from fact.

Thus this definition, which ordinarily applies to the procedure for admitting facts to the record, would also require that the Commission and the courts prove the accuracy of their conclusions by reliable, probative, and substantial evidence.

ANALYSIS OF SECTION 1

Section 1 of S. 1008 would amend section 5 (a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act. Any proposal to amend this act raises peculiar problems with the judicial branch of the Government and, in brief, any amendment which would successfully clarify this act must go to some pains to instruct the courts in their duties under the act. This may be explained as follows:

First of all, it should be noted that section 5 (a) is the very heart of the Federal Trade Commission Act. Other sections of this act relate to the organization and internal procedures of the Commission, the salaries of the Commission, procedures in taking evidence, investigatory powers, and such matters. Later sections of the statute forbid false and misleading advertising in "food", "drugs", "devices", and "cosmetics", and provide for the Commission's enforcement. But the legal prohibitions covering the broad field of unfair methods of competition—that is, business methods and practices which are sometimes described as "monopolistic"—are all contained in section 5 (a). Yet, this language is quite brief and in quite general terms. It prohibits what are called unfair methods of competition, but nowhere in the law are the acts and practices to be regarded as unfair methods defined. It may be quoted as follows:

"Unfair methods of competition in commerce, and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce, are hereby declared unlawful."

The legislators who drafted this law in 1914 first considered the question of writing into the law precise definitions of the acts and practices that were to be condemned as unfair, but decided to assign this task to the Commission and the courts. The act was passed, therefore, with a clear record of legislative intent by which it was understood that the term "unfair methods of competition" was to include not only the acts and practices condemned by the then existing common law, but that as a better understanding of other practices was gained, or new practices were invented, those that contravened the general purpose of the act were to be defined as coming within its prohibitions.

The Supreme Court, speaking through Mr. Chief Justice Stone, made a complete review of the legislative history of this act in *Federal Trade Commission* v. *R. F. Keppel Bro., Inc.*, and concluded in part as follows (291 U. S. 304, 310-312):

"Neither the language nor the history of the act suggest that Congress intended to confine the forbidden methods to fixed and unyielding categories. The common law afforded a definition of unfair competition and, before the enactment of the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Sherman Anti-trust Act had laid its inhibition upon combinations to restrain or monopolize interstate commerce which the courts had construed to include restraints upon competition in interstate commerce. It would not have been a difficult feat of draftsmanship to have restricted the operation of the Trade Commision Act to those methods of competition in interstate commerce which are forbidden at common law or which are likely to grow into violations of the Sherman Act, if that had been the purpose of the legislation.

"The act undoubtedly was aimed at all the familiar methods of law violation which prosecutions under the Sherman Act had disclosed. See *Federal Trade Comm'n* v. *Raladan Co.*, supra (283 U. S. 643 (649, 650).) But as this Court has pointed out it also had a broader purpose, *Federal Trade Comm'n* v. *Winsted Hosiery Co.* (258 U. S. 483, 493); *Federal Trade Comm'n* v. *Raladam Co., supra* (648). As proposed by the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and as introduced in the Senate, the bill which ultimately became the Federal Trade Commission Act declared unfair competition to be unlawful.[1] But it was because the meaning

[1] The Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, in recommending the bill in its original form, seems to have adopted the phrase "unfair competition" with the deliberate purpose of giving to the Commission some latitude for dealing with new and varied forms of unfair trade practices. The committee said in its report of June 13, 1914, S. Rept. No. 597, 63d Cong., 2d sess, p. 13:

"The committee gave careful consideration to the question as to whether it would attempt to define the many and variable unfair practices which prevail in commerce and to forbid their continuance or whether it would, by a general declaration condemning unfair practices, leave it to the Commission to determine what practices were unfair. It concluded that the latter course would be the better, for the reason, as stated by one of the representatives of the Illinois Manufacturers' Association, that there were too many unfair practices to define, and after writing 20 of them into the law it would be quite possible to invent others.

* * * * *

"It is believed that the term 'unfair competition' has a legal significance which can be enforced by the Commission and the courts, and that it is no more difficult to determine what is unfair competition than it is to determine what is a reasonable rate or what is an unjust discrimination. The committee was of the opinion that it would be better to put in a general provision condemning unfair competition than to attempt to define the numerous unfair practices, such as local price cutting, interlocking directorates, and holding companies intended to restrain substantial competition."

Senator NEWLANDS, in introducing the bill for the committee, emphasized this feature. In answering the criticism that the phrase "unfair competition" lacked definition he said, 51 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 11084:

"Our answer to this is that it would be utterly impossible for Congress to define the numerous practices which constitute unfair competition and which are against good morals in trade, for we are beginning to realize that there is a standard of morals in trade or that there ought to be. Germany does not hesitate by law to condemn practices in business that are contra bonos mores. It leaves their tribunals to determine what practices are against good morals.

* * * * *

"It is the illusive character of the trade practice that makes it, though condemned today, appear in some other form tomorrow. If we should attempt to define all the trade practices that can be devised, that would create dishonest advantage in competition, we would undertake a hopeless task."

which the common law had given to those words was deemed too narrow that the broader and more flexible phrase 'unfair methods of competition' was substituted.[2] Congress, in defining the powers of the Commission, thus advisedly adopted a phrase which, as this Court has said, does not admit of precise definition but the meaning and application of which must be arrived at by what this Court elsewhere has called the gradual process of judicial inclusion and exclusion. *Federal Trade Comm'n* v. *Raladam Co., supra,* compare *Davidson* v. *New Orleans* (96 U. S. 97, 104).[3]"

As a result of the outcome of some of the recent cases decided by the courts under this act, the cry has been heard that the courts are usurping the legislative functions in deciding what are "unfair methods of competition." Yet, the record is clear that this is precisely the job Congress assigned to the courts. This was not an unusual assignment nor an impractical solution to a problem which the House managers of the conferees on the Federal Trade Commission bill described as "practically impossible to define unfair practices so that the definitions will fit business in every part of the country," and as "what is harmful under certain circumstances may be beneficial under different circumstances."

It was also not an impractical method of keeping the definitions sufficiently flexible to embrace newly invented unfair methods, where, as the same report said, "There is no limit to human inventiveness in this field." Business conduct which is newly condemned under this law appears in the record of judicial decisions, so that other businessmen may see what specific acts and practices are condemned and under what specific circumstances, and so judge their own conduct accordingly. It was undoubtedly because this procedure of defining "unfair methods of competition" was adopted in lieu of specific definitions written into the statute that no fines or penalties for violation of section 5 of the act were provided.

Section 1 of S. 1008 now proposes to amend section 5 (a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act by inserting certain broad language which purports to describe certain business practices that would henceforth be exempted from the law. Passage of this bill will make it pointedly clear that Congress disapproves of the way the courts have recently exercised their assigned duties in defining "unfair methods of competition." Yet, at the same time, the enactment of the highly generalized language of this amendment would not indicate any disposition on the part of Congress to supply the precise definitions itself. Moreover, unlike the legislative record of the original act, the record of this bill provides no clear guide of congressional intent by which the courts could determine how and in what ways they are deemed to have gone wrong. The history of this legislation to date does not show which of the recent court decisions are disapproved by Congress, nor does it indicate in which specific features of these decisions Congress considers that the courts have gone too far.

Clearly, there are only two cases under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act which can have been at issue in this legislation. These are the Cement Institute case and the Rigid Steel Conduit case—this much the courts could determine. But where would they turn for further light?

When the courts came to test the theory that by section 1 of this bill Congress meant merely to clarify the law, and not to make any substantive change in law, they would have to conclude, tentatively, that Congress did not object to these two decisions, as such, but rather that Congress was condemning as confusing the opinions in which these decisions were announced. In testing this theory, the courts would find in the one existing committee report which offers amplification, that the Supreme Court's opinion in the Cement Institute case is severely criticized for what the report calls confusing obiter dictum. At page 3 of the report submitted by Mr. Walter on the part of the House Committee on the Judiciary (H. Rept. No. 869), the following statement may be found:

"Language in the opinion in the Cement Institute case indicating that individual absorption of freight and individual selling at delivered prices may be illegal is considered to be obiter dictum, but its effect has been very persuasive in promoting the confusion."

But no hint is given in this report which would guide one to the specific passages of the opinion which Mr. Walter considers to indicate that "individual absorption of freight and individual selling at delivered prices may be illegal." Indeed, many who have studied this opinion say they are unable to find language of such import.

It is manifest that the stated objective of this bill to clarify will not be accomplished by enacting a rebuke to the Supreme Court, without also enacting some clear guides as to how Congress wishes the statute to be interpreted.

On the other hand, when the courts began to explore the legislative history of this bill in search of the congressional intent behind section 1, they would find an indication that some Senators, at least, sought to cancel the law of the Rigid Steel Conduit case while, at the same time, to retain the law of the Cement Institute case. No doubt there is in the minds of some a distinction which can be drawn between the two. But if this is so, then the distinction clearly ought to be drawn. Many lawyers who have studied these cases are unable to see any distinction between the law of the two, and it is quite possible that the courts will be unable to do so. At least the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was unable to see a distinction. It said that the legal issues before the court in the Rigid Steel Conduit case were identical with those before the Supreme Court in the Cement Institute case. (*Triangle Conduit & Cable Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission,* 168 F. 2d 175, 181 (C. C. A. 7, 1948).)

If, however, Congress has found that such a distinction does exist, section 4 of this bill fails to provide a clue whereby the courts can share in this discovery.

Finally, when the courts came to test the theory that Congress intended by section 1 of the bill to make a substantial change in the Federal Trade Commission Act, they would find a great deal of evidence to support this theory.

Section 1 of S. 1008 would amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to add the following:

"It shall not be an unfair method of competition or an unfair or deceptive act or practice for a seller, acting independently, to quote or sell at delivered prices or to absorb freight: *Provided,* That this shall not make lawful any combination, conspiracy, or collusive agreement; or any monopolistic, oppressive, deceptive, or fraudulent practice, carried out by or involving the use of delivered prices or freight absorption."

If it were not for the qualifying language following the word "provided," the preceding language would clearly legalize the Pittsburgh-plus system, the multiple-basing-point system, and any other delivered-price system, irrespective of the question of its "dangerous tendency unduly to hinder competition or create a monopoly." In view of the qualifying language, however, it is not certain what meaning the courts would ultimately construe this amendment to have. It is clear that pricing systems which are proved to be maintained by overt agreement and conspiracy among competitors would be illegal—as they are under the Sherman Act. What effective powers would be provided by this law for terminating such illegal systems are, however, not clear.

The terms "monopolistic, oppressive * * * practices" are new terms to the law. They are also highly general terms, and, consequently, it would be necessary in future litigation for the courts to explore the legislative record underlying their adoption in order to decide what the Congress meant by them. Here again the one committee report which provides amplifying language—the report of Mr. Walter—may be noted. In this report the entire qualifying clause, "monopolistic, oppressive, deceptive, or fraudulent practices" is defined as "practices designed illegally to drive a competitor out of business." If the courts should come to adopt Mr. Walter's definition of this qualifying clause, the result would be twofold. First, the phrase "deceptive and fraudulent practices" would be divested of its ordinary meaning, and in lieu thereof it would come to mean "practices designed illegally to drive a competitor out of business." Second, section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act—insofar as it applies to pricing practices—would be limited in meaning to "practices which are designed illegally to drive a competitor out of business." The act would then no longer apply to the broad field of practices which are designed to protect competitors from competition or to confront the general public with monopoly prices.

This definition of Mr. Walter's is far different from the meaning of the term "unfair methods of competition" which Mr. Justice Brandeis referred to in *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Gratz* (253 U. S. 421, 427), as practices "against public policy because of their dangerous tendency unduly to hinder competition."

It is also far different from the meaning of the Federal Trade Commission Act Mr. Justice Black had in mind when he referred to the basing-point system in cement as "an effective instrument which, if left free for use of the respondents, would result in complete destruction of competition and the establishment of monopoly in the cement industry" (*Federal Trade Commission* v. *The Cement Institute, et al.* (333 U. S. 683, 720–721)).

It is not the purpose of this analysis to weigh the various purposes and understandings which the sponsors of this bill seem to have in mind, and thereby attempt to draw a net balance of the underlying congressional

[2] The phrase "unfair methods of competition" was substituted for "unfair competition" in the conference committee. This change seems first to have been suggested by Senator Hollis in debate on the floor of the Senate in response to the suggestion that the words "unfair competition" might be construed as restricted to those forms of unfair competition condemned by the common law (51 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 12145), The House managers of the conference committee, in reporting this change, said, House Report No. 1142, Sixty-third Congress, second session, September 4, 1914, at page 19:

"It is impossible to frame definitions which embrace all unfair practices. There is no limit to human inventiveness in this field. Even if all known unfair practices were specifically defined and prohibited, it would be at once necessary to begin over again. If Congress were to adopt the method of definition, it would undertake an endless task. It is also practically impossible to define unfair practices so that the definition will fit business of every sort in every part of this country. Whether competition is unfair or not generally depends upon the surrounding circumstances of the particular case. What is harmful under certain circumstances may be beneficial under different circumstances."

[3] References showing the details of the legislative history of the act may be found in Handler. The Jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission Over False Advertising, 31 Col. L. Rev. 527; Montague, Unfair Methods of Competition, 25 Yale L. J. 20; Henderson. The Federal Trade Commission, ch. I.

intent. It is reasonable to assume, however, that the guide which the courts would be most likely to adopt for interpreting what Congress meant by section 1 of the bill, would be that provided by its simultaneous action in enacting sections 2 through 4 of the bill. If this should be the case, then the courts must conclude that Congress intended to legalize everything, except open and overt agreements in restraint of trade.

A law which would exempt all monopolistic practices except those maintained by overt agreement would be tantamount to legalizing monopolistic agreement and conspiracy. In this modern, sophisticated industrial age, it is well nigh impossible for the antitrust agencies to find evidence of overt conspiracy. Business policies do not change from day to day; once adopted, they tend to remain stable over long periods. In short, the conspiracy of the old-fashioned variety, whereby exuberant entrepreneurs needed to get together from week to week or month to month in order to patch up their agreements, is an antique in the current-day business community.

Whatever interpretation the courts ultimately came to put on section 1 of this bill, the effect of its passage would create a prolonged moratorium on the law which it would amend. The past record of litigation under this law indicates that at least 10 years of new litigation would be required to clear up the uncertainties and provide business and the Commission with new guideposts. In the meantime, the monopolistic pricing system now practiced, as well as those recently suspended, would continue unchecked. Among the latter, it may be noted, are multiple-basing-point systems in milk and ice-cream cans, cement, steel, rigid steel conduit, and bottle caps; and, in addition, the Chicago-plus system in glucose (corn sirup), and the Tulsa-plus system in gasoline—the last-mentioned having been voluntarily abandoned in the summer of 1949.

Moreover, it is to be expected that under the extensive moratorium which this bill would provide, other industries which have not previously employed monopolistic pricing systems would take them up. In its final report, the temporary national economic committee included the following:

"Extensive hearings on basing-point systems showed that they are used in many industries as an effective device for eliminating price competition.

"During the last 20 years basing-point systems and variations of such systems, known technically as zone-pricing systems and freight-equalization systems, have spread widely in American industry."

It seems quite reasonable to assume that, since these monopolistic systems "spread widely in American industry" during the 20 years prior to World War II, they would continue to spread during the next 10 years. An effective moratorium upon these systems for such a period would, moreover, not only constitute a hardship upon the public interest, but would bring about a degree of hardship upon the industries themselves which came to adopt such systems—assuming that by the end of this period Congress could and would restore the law.

The Temporary National Economic Committee gave a persuasive answer to the argument that those who have been practicing monopoly should not suffer disturbances, in the following statement:

"The committee is not impressed with the argument that a legislative outlawing of basing-point systems will cause disturbances in the rearrangement of business through a restoration of competitive conditions in industries now employing basing-point systems. Such disturbances may be costly to those who have been practicing monopoly. But the long-run gain to the public interest by a restoration of competition in many important industries is clearly more advantageous."

Nevertheless, the truth still remains that monopolistic positions gained by default of Government action to preserve the public interest acquire forceful practical arguments for their continuance. Those who question Congress' practical power to restore the public interest now must conclude that such power would be sadly diminished by the time it came to consider legislation to correct this bill several years hence.

INTRODUCTION TO SECTIONS 2, 3, AND 4

Sections 2, 3, and 4 of S. 1008 would make far-reaching changes in sections 2 (a) and 2 (b) of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act. Each of these sections of the bill deals with questions of price discrimination, and each section is closely interrelated with all the others. For instance, although an individual section seems to modify existing law with respect to particular forms of price discrimination, actually each successive section makes still further modifications with respect to the forms dealt with in the previous section.

Because of the interrelationships between each of the sections, it may be well to take up first a change which would be brought about by section 4 (d) in the definition of certain key words which appear in the other sections. The key words are "the effect may be." The significance of a law which would define these words in a manner contrary to their usual meaning may be explained as follows:

Under the present law all price discriminations are not illegal. On the contrary, only those discriminations are illegal which have the specified effects set out in section 2 (a) of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act. A discrimination is illegal, in the language of the law, where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, or to injure, destroy, or prevent competition. The legislative history of the Clayton Act is unmistakably clear that the central purpose which the Congress of 1914 had in mind in framing this act was that of providing a law to stop certain practices before the adverse consequences which could reasonably be expected to follow such practices were in fact brought about. The term "effect may be" was used throughout several sections of the act, and as early as 1920 the Supreme Court recognized the intent of the term in deciding a question under section 3. In *Standard Fashion Co.* v. *Magrane-Houston Co.* (258 U. S. 346, 356), the Supreme Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Day, spoke of this term as follows:

"Section 3 condemns sales or agreements where the effect of such sale or contract of sale 'may' be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create monopoly. It thus deals with consequences to follow the making of the restrictive covenant limiting the right of the purchaser to deal in the goods of the seller only. But we do not think that the purpose in using the word 'may' was to prohibit the mere possibility of the consequences described. It was intended to prevent such agreements as would under the circumstances disclosed probably lessen competition, or create an actual tendency to monopoly."

The effect of section 4 would be to substitute a law which would prohibit price discriminations which had already resulted in a substantial lessening of competition. Such a law might be compared to a traffic law which made it illegal for motorists to run through stop signs only if, after having run through a stop sign, the motorist had caused a substantial accident. Only after the accident had occurred could the effect of the violation be established by reliable, probative, and substantial evidence.

Analysis of section 2 (a)

The present law, in prohibiting discriminations of certain specified effects, makes no distinction between discriminations appearing directly in the quoted prices of goods, and those made indirectly by the seller's paying varying amounts of the freight charges for the different buyers. Changes in the present law which would be brought about by section 2 (a) may be summarized as follows:

1. Delivered prices which are identical at all delivery points would be legal under any circumstance, no matter what their effect upon competition. Delivered prices coming under this heading are of two types. The first is the so-called postage-stamp price, whereby a commodity is sold at one delivered price all over the country. The second type is a limited form of the zone price system. Such zone prices are those which come about when the sellers located in various parts of the country establish a single delivered price throughout the particular zone in which each seller markets his products. This form of zone price is distinguished from other zone prices only in that no individual seller, or no individual mill of a seller, sells in more than one zone.

Thus, if the bill should be passed into law, any commodity at all could be sold on either the postage stamps or limited-zone system; and such selling would not be subject to legal challenge, no matter how great the freight costs and no matter how much the adoption of such a practice might disrupt industrial location. For instance, if the steel companies should decide to designate the whole country as a single zone and quote one delivered price throughout the country, this practice would not be open to legal challenge—except, of course, upon the possible grounds that the various sellers had conspired to adopt this practice. But even as to the latter possibility, it might be observed that if one of the largest corporations in this industry, having mills in various parts of the country, should adopt such a method of selling, the other producers could hardly avoid following suit. If it should happen that the postage-stamp method of pricing became the practice in this industry, or the practice in any of several other basic industries, the disruptive effects upon the location of industry in the country could hardly be foretold.

2. Delivered prices which are different at different delivery points would be subject to legal challenge if they are discriminatory and if the effect may be that specified by the present law. But in such situations the restrictive definition of the term "the effect may be," as contained in section 4D, has a particular bearing. Such discriminations would be subject to a cease-and-desist order, provided the specified effects could be proved by reliable, probative, and substantial evidence. Thus, unlimited-zone prices, basing-point prices, and other variations of these systems would not be subject to a charge of illegal price discrimination until after a sufficient number of businesses had been destroyed to provide the reliable, probative, and substantial evidence which would be necessary before a cease-and-desist order could be issued.

ANALYSIS OF SECTION 2B

After conferring, in section 2A, exemptions upon freight absorption as practiced in a variety of zone price systems, the bill would confer in section 2D, exemptions upon freight absorption in general. This section would legalize, insofar as the law on price discrimination is concerned, "Pittsburgh plus" systems, multiple basing-point systems, and freight equalization systems.

The language of section 2B may be cited as follows:

"B. to absorb freight to meet the equally low price of a competitor in good faith (except where such absorption of freight would be such that its effect upon competition will be to substantially lessen competition), and this may include the maintenance, above or below the price of such competitor of a dif-

ferential in price which such seller customarily maintains."

This language would make two drastic changes in existing law. First, it would limit possible illegality to only one of the effects specified in section 2 (a) of the present law—namely, "to substantially lessen competition." Thus, the decision in the *Corn Products Refining Co.* case (324 U. S. 726), decided by the Supreme Court in 1945, would be set aside. In this case, the Corn Products Refining Co.'s "Chicago plus" system used in the sale of glucose was found to be illegal on the ground that it resulted in a substantial injury to competition. This company has a plant manufacturing glucose at Chicago and another at Kansas City. Under its "Chicago plus" system, it charged buyers located in Chicago the Chicago base price, and it charged all other buyers the Chicago base price plus freight from Chicago to point of destination, even though shipments were made from its Kansas City plant. The Federal Trade Commission found that competition was injured among candy manufacturers—a business in which glucose is an important raw material. Several Kansas City candy manufacturers, for example, had been forced to move their plants to Chicago in order to take advantage of the lower price of glucose offered to their competitors in that city.

The language of section 2B would further exempt basing point and other pricing systems from illegality by the introduction of the new term "will be." Thus, if this language should become law, the Federal Trade Commission could issue no cease-and-desist order against discriminations carried out through freight absorptions, unless it could prove as a positive certainty that the discriminations will have the future effect of substantially lessening competition. Since it is not within the province of mankind to prove that any prospective event will certainly take place in the future, the effect of this language would be to legalize any and all discriminations carried out by means of freight absorption, irrespective of either the past or the reasonably probable future effects of such discriminations.

By this time it should be well understood that a law which confers upon freight absorption an exemption from the law on price discrimination must necessarily confer a corresponding exemption upon phantom freight. Should it not be clear, however, the matter may be illustrated as follows:

In the Corn Products Refining Co. case, the Commission found that the company in question received phantom freight on some shipments from its Kansas City plant and absorbed freight on others. The Supreme Court, speaking through Mr. Chief Justice Stone, declared that:

"In the case of all shipments from Kansas City to purchasers in cities having a lower freight rate from Kansas City than from Chicago, the delivered price includes unearned or phantom freight, to the extent of the difference in freight rates. Conversely, if the freight from Kansas City to the point of delivery is more than that from Chicago, petitioners must absorb freight upon shipments from Kansas City, to the extent of the difference in freight."

Since there is no ruling on how high a seller may set his price, the Kansas City plant could, under the language of section 2B, avoid the definition that it was taking phantom freight by the simple expedient of announcing a convenient plant price. The convenient plant price would be the Chicago base price plus the freight from Chicago to Kansas City. Thereafter, sales made f. o. b. plant at this price would not include phantom freight, and all sales yielding a mill net return less than the announced plant price would be accounted for by freight absorption. Yet, as it may be seen, delivered prices from the Kansas City plant would be the same as under the company's Chicago plus system.

Still a third change from existing law appears quite probable under the language of section 2B. A literal interpretation of this language would mean that a seller would be free to absorb part or all of the freight charges for some customers, while refusing to absorb any freight charges for other customers in the same locality. For example, a steel mill in Chicago could absorb all of the freight charges on shipments to a favored customer in Denver, while refusing to absorb any freight charges to other customers located in Denver. Since freight charges constitute a major item in the delivered cost of steel, one may well imagine that such a discrimination as between competing buyers would soon put the unfavored buyers out of business.

REVISION OF NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION POLICY

Two of the incidental effects of section 2 of S. 1008, upon the National Transportation Policy are worthy of note.

Under this bill, the Federal Government would continue the exercise of regulation over common-carrier rates paid by sellers of goods. It would, on the other hand, relinquish regulation over the rates which buyers of goods would pay for common-carrier services, wherever sellers chose to exercise the privilege here extended them of reallocating the freight charges among the various communities to suit their fancy.

Similarly, the Federal, State, and local Governments presumably will continue to allocate the expenditures of public funds for transportation facilities. But, here again, instead of a consequent division of the benefits of such public expenditures accruing to both the buying and selling communities, the seller may arrogate all of the benefits of the public expenditure to himself, reallocate the benefits among other communities, or determine whether individual public facilities shall be used at all. It is a matter of record that under the basing-point systems recently practiced in the steel and cement industries, the producers would generally not allow these materials to be shipped by other than rail carrier. Moreover, in those instances where shipment by water or highway carrier was practiced, it was usually the custom of these producers to charge buyers the rail rates. These privileges would be legalized by section 2.

ANALYSIS OF SECTION 3

Section 3 of S. 1008 nullifies the Robinson-Patman Act amendment to section 2 of the Clayton Act. Thus it would restore the so-called good-faith defense to the status of a complete and final defense against a charge of illegal price discrimination, such as was its status under the old Clayton Act prior to 1936. The distinction between the exemption from the general rule against harmful price discrimination which would be provided by this section and the exemption which would be provided by section 2 of S. 1008, may be stated as follows:

Section 2 of S. 1008 would exempt illegally those price discriminations which are accomplished through the seller's manipulations of freight charges. Thus, these exemptions relate, for the most part, to discriminations between buyers at different geographic locations, and the amount of the individual discriminations so exempted is limited to the amount of the freight charges involved.

Section 3, on the other hand, would provide a more general exemption, relating to discriminations as between buyers in the same community as well as to buyers located in different communities. Where sellers could make the so-called good faith defense, their discriminations among buyers in the same community would be legal without reference to any question of their effect upon competition. Neither the question of how much the discriminations might injure or lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly, nor the question of how far these effects had already been advanced could raise any legal challenge to the discriminations. Similarly, discriminations as between buyers in different communities would likewise be legal, irrespective of whether the amount of the discrimination exceeded the amount of the freight charges involved in shipping the goods discriminated in.

Here it may be noted that section 3 of the bill drafted by the conferees differs from the corresponding section of S. 1008 as it was first passed by the House in that the conferees have removed the so-called Carroll amendment. Similarly, the bill drafted by the conferees differs from the bill previously passed by the Senate in that the conferees have eliminated the so-called Kefauver amendment. In lieu of the language of the Carroll amendment, on the one hand, or the Kefauver amendment on the other, the conferees have substituted a general qualifying clause which reads as follows:

"except that this shall not make lawful any combination, conspiracy, or collusive agreement, or any monopolistic, oppressive, deceptive, or fraudulent practice."

This is in part the same language which section 1 of the bill would put into the Federal Trade Commission Act. While the meaning of this language would not be clear, should it be put into the Federal Trade Commission Act, it cannot be said to be wholly irrelevant to that act. Similarly, it might be relevant if included in an amendment to the Sherman Act. But it is wholly irrelevant in extraneous language insofar as the Clayton Act is concerned. Moreover, it is in no sense a substitute for either the Carroll or Kefauver amendments, both of which proposed to retain some restraint upon price discrimination.

WHAT IS THE GOOD-FAITH DEFENSE?

Section 3 of S. 1008 provides that a seller may justify his discriminatory price by showing that it is made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor. The burden of showing good faith would be upon the person charged with an illegal price discrimination, just as is the burden of showing justification under the present law. But what is this burden of showing good faith? What would a seller have to do in order to show that his price discrimination is in good faith to meet the price of a competitor and is, therefore, legal?

Under current judicial interpretations, the seller charged with an illegal price discrimination may show good faith in either of two ways: First, he may show that his discriminatory price did in fact meet the price of a competitor. Second, he may establish good faith by showing that he acted upon the belief that his discriminatory price would be meeting the lower price of a competitor, although the lower price of the competitor did not in fact exist. That is to say, if the seller charged with an illegal discrimination can show the existence of facts which would lead a reasonable person to believe that a competitor's lower price did exist, he can establish good faith.

These requirements for establishing good faith were made clear in the Supreme Court's decision in the Staley case. Referring to the good-faith defense, Mr. Chief Justice Stone said:

"Section 2b does not require the seller to justify price discriminations by showing that in fact they met a competitive price. But it does place on the seller the burden of showing that the price was made in good faith to meet a competitor's."

In order to establish good faith, according to this decision, the seller is merely required "to show the existence of facts which would lead a reasonable and prudent person to believe that the granting of a lower price would in fact meet the equally low price of

a competitor." (*Federal Trade Comm'n* v. *A. E. Staley Manufacturing Company and Staley Sales Corporation* (324 U. S. 746, 759, 760).) This is the whole length and breadth of the seller's burden of establishing good faith. Neither the past nor future consequences of the discrimination, nor the seller's belief concerning these consequences enters into the question of good faith. The seller establishes that his discriminatory prices are made in good faith merely by showing that they meet the price of a competitor, or that he has evidence for believing that they do so.

Of course, if the Federal Trade Commission can show that discriminations in prices are made as a result of an illegal agreement or conspiracy among competitors, then the good-faith defense is overruled. Such, for example, was the outcome in the Cement Institute case. In this case, the Supreme Court held that, since the discriminations in cement prices were inherent in a pricing system maintained by illegal agreement and collusion among the cement manufacturers, the discriminations could not be said to have been made in good faith. But the seller's burden of showing good faith does not include the task of proving that his discriminatory price is free from conspiracy or collusive agreement. On the contrary, the burden of proving conspiracy—and therefore the absence of good faith—must necessarily be borne by the Commission. It is for this reason that the language concerning "combination, conspiracy, or collusive agreement, or any monopolistic, oppressive, deceptive, or fraudulent practice" which the conferees wrote into section 3 of the bill, in lieu of the Carroll or Kefauver amendments, neither adds nor detracts anything from the other language contained in this section of the bill. The most that this extraneous language could mean is that price discriminations which substantially lessen competition, could be found to be illegal under the Clayton Act, provided sellers practicing such discrimination are also proved to be in illegal agreement in violation of the Sherman Act or the Federal Trade Commission Act. Conversely, it would also mean that where two or more sellers are meeting one another's discriminatory price, or have good faith reason to believe that they are so doing, such sellers could never be in violation of the Clayton Act, unless they are first shown to be in violation of either the Sherman Act or the Federal Trade Commission Act. This raises the question, of course, why the conferees proposed to retain on the books a semblance of the law against monopolistic price discrimination when the presumption of their bill is that the Sherman Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act are adequate to prevent all practices which "substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly, or to injure, destroy, or prevent competition."

The death warrant for small business

By establishing the good-faith defense as a complete and final defense, S. 1008 would exempt sellers from section 2 (a) of the Clayton Act—no matter how great their discrimination and how destructive of small business—so long as two or more sellers met, or offered to meet, one another's price. Thus, if two or more sellers quote a low price to a large buyer, while demanding a high price from a small competitor of the big buyer, their discrimination would be legal and exempt from a cease-and-desist order, irrespective of all other questions (except the question whether the sellers were engaged in an illegal agreement).

Where a single seller made a discrimination having the monopolistic effects specified in section 2 (a) of the Clayton Act, and did not meet the price of another seller in so doing, the Federal Trade Commission could issue a complaint with some possibility that a cease and desist order might eventuate—provided the Commission could find out about the discrimination and issue its order before another seller met, or offered to meet, the discriminatory price. But once a second seller met, or offered to meet, the discriminatory price, the discrimination of neither seller could be stopped, even if it were possible for the Commission to discover which of the several sellers had initiated the discrimination. The fact that a second seller is currently meeting, or currently offering to meet, the discriminatory price would make the discrimination of both sellers currently legal.

It is apparent that the Congress which passed the Robinson-Patman Act was primarily concerned with correcting the nullity which the "good faith of defense" had made of the prohibitory language of Section 2 of the old Clayton Act. In reviewing the legislative history of this act in the Standard Oil (Indiana) case, the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit pointed out the position of the "good faith defense" under the old Clayton Act, and observed: "But since large buyers could always get such price meeting by suppliers to justify a discrimination in price in their favor, the purpose of the act to avoid such discrimination was easily evaded." *Standard Oil Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (173 F. 8d 210, 215.) This court also pointed out that the chairman of the house conferees on the Robinson-Patman bill had explained the purpose of modifying the old "good faith defense," and quoted his explanation on the floor of the House as follows:

"It is to be noted, however, that this does not set up the meeting of competition as an absolute bar to a charge of discrimination under the bill. It merely permits it to be shown in evidence. This provision is entirely procedural.

* * * * *

"If this proviso were construed to permit the showing of a competing offer as an absolute bar to liability for discrimination, then it would nullify the act entirely at the very inception of its enforcement, for in nearly every case mass buyers receive similar discriminations from competing sellers of the same product." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 15, 1936, p. 9418.) (*Standard Oil Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission*, supra (215).)

What was then said of the ability of large buyers to obtain from two or more suppliers discriminatory price quotations in their favor is no less true today. The tendency of sellers to grant special price concessions to large buyers is one of the most widely observed characteristics of business behavior.

This tendency, moreover, goes far beyond sellers' prospects of effecting cost savings in dealing with large buyers. The present law is not intended to discourage price discriminations which are justified by differences in the costs of supplying different buyers; on the contrary, the cost defense is always a complete and final defense against a charge of price discrimination.

The price discrimination which is philosophically indefensible on any grounds is that which goes beyond cost savings and permits large buyers to drive small buyers out of business. The individual seller may well reason that the prospect of an increase in volume of business which would result from his sales to a large buyer—or to any buyer whose business he does not already have—will result in cost savings by a further spreading of his overhead costs. But it is the total volume of business—the orders of all sellers, both large and small—which justifies overhead costs and permits the economies of mass production. It is not just the orders of the large buyers which do these things.

Just as the good-faith defense would legalize price discriminations by which large buyers put small buyers out of business, it would also legalize discriminations by which large sellers put small sellers out of business. A large seller with national sales outlets usually can, by making a special low price in one particular territory, destroy the small sellers whose established outlets are confined to that particular territory. This is true even though the unit costs and operating efficiencies of the smaller sellers may be the same or even more advantageous than those of the larger seller. When a large national seller makes a special territorial price cut, moreover, at least one other seller will usually follow suit. In such cases the good-faith defense would exempt the discriminations from a cease and desist order, irrespective of the destructive effects upon small business.

In commenting on the conference report on S. 1008, the Wall Street Journal of October 13 expressed the opinion that the real relief for industry contained in this bill lies in the good-faith defense which would be established by section 3. It is of pointed significance that this journal, which is conceded to be in touch with certain segments of business thinking, should look upon such a modification of the law as this as relief for industry. Since a modification of the law on price discrimination that would bring relief for some members of industry must necessarily place strictures on other members, the first question raised by this proposal is, Which members are to gain the relief and which to suffer the stricture?

ANALYSIS OF SECTION 4

Section 4 provides definitions of certain key phrases introduced elsewhere in the bill. Unfortunately, some of the new phrases introduced in section 1—namely, monopolistic, oppressive, practice—are not so defined. The definitions provided in sections 4A, 4B, and 4C appear to make no substantive change in law, other than those indicated in sections 1, 2, and 3, where the key phrases appear.

Section 4D would, however, effect quite a sweeping change in existing law. Here it is provided that:

"The term 'the effect may be' shall mean there is reliable, probative, and substantial evidence of the specified effect."

This definition would take away the normal legal meaning of the term "effect may be" and substitute a new meaning. It would, therefore, radically alter the meaning of the prohibitory language of section 2 (a) of the Clayton Act, as it probably would alter sections 3 and 7 of the Clayton Act.

The cited definition doubtless reflects an off-hand notion to conform the language of section 4D with that of the Administrative Procedure Act and may be counted—as may the other sections of the bill—an error of hasty and ill-considered legislation.

The Federal Trade Commission is governed by the Administrative Procedure Act. The relevant portions of section 7 (c) of this act may be cited as follows:

"Except as statutes otherwise provide, the proponent of a rule or order shall have the burden of proof. * * * no sanction shall be imposed or rule or order be issued except upon consideration of the whole record or such portions thereof as may be cited by any party and as supported by and in accordance with the reliable, probative, and substantial evidence."

This language describes established legal procedure and must be taken to mean, in ordinary language, two things: (1) The party instigating the suit has the burden of proof; obviously, a law-enforcement agency cannot allege a violation of law and call upon the defendant to prove himself innocent. (2) Facts alleged by either party, if they are to be admitted to the record and given consideration, must be supported by reliable, probative, and substantial evidence.

It is recognized, however, that decisions of the administrative agencies and the review-

ing courts must of necessity be based upon interpretations, conclusions, and expert judgments drawn from the facts, and that such interpretations, conclusions, and expert judgments cannot themselves be proved by reliable, probative, and substantial evidence to be correct. Herein lies the distinction between the Administrative Procedure Act and the proposed amendment to the Clayton Act as contained in section 4D of S. 1008. The question raised under section 2 (a) of the Clayton Act is whether the effect of a given discriminatory practice will, if the practice is continued, be "substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, or to injure, destroy, or prevent competition." "It thus deals with consequences to follow," as the Supreme Court said of the term "effect may be," speaking through Mr. Justice Day in *Standard Fashion Company* v. *Magrane-Houston Co.* (258 U. S. 346, 356). The courts may use their intelligence and past experience to conclude that, under the circumstances shown, certain consequences may be expected to follow a given act or practice, but there is no "reliable, probative, and substantial" evidence that these consequences will follow.

The term "substantially" will serve to emphasize the distinction between fact and conclusion drawn from fact. The courts have had before them many times a question whether there had been a substantial lessening of competition, and have always been able to decide the question one way or the other. Yet, given all the facts and quantities which could conceivably be relevant to the question, the decision that a given quantity is substantial is ultimately a conclusion or judgment drawn from the facts, and is not itself a fact which can be proved by reliable, probative, and substantial evidence.

ANALYSIS OF PARTY PLEDGES

The elementary injustice to small business which S. 1008 proposes should be obvious to all Members of Congress, whether or not the portent to our political system is so. Any such drastic curtailment of the antitrust laws as this bill offers should, however, be considered in the light of the most recent pledges of the two major political parties.

The Republican convention, in the summer of 1948, wrote into its party platform the following:

"Small business, the bulwark of American enterprise, must be encouraged through aggressive antimonopoly action, elimination of unnecessary controls, protection against discrimination, correction of tax abuses, and limitation of competition by governmental organizations."

The Democratic Convention adopted in its platform, in July 1948, the following:

"We recognize the importance of small business and a sound American economy. It must be protected against unfair discrimination and monopolies, and be given equal opportunites with competing enterprises to expand its capital structure.

"We favor nondiscriminatory transportation charges and declare for the early correction of any inequalities in such charges.

* * * * *

"We pledge an intensive enforcement of the antitrust laws, with adequate appropriations.

"We advocate the strengthening of existing antitrust laws by closing the gaps which experience has shown have been used to promote the concentration of economic power. We pledge a positive program to promote competitive business and to foster the development of independent trade and commerce."

REDUCTION AND REPEAL OF EXCISE TAXES

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Malone
Anderson	Hoey	Martin
Benton	Holland	Maybank
Brewster	Humphrey	Millikin
Bricker	Hunt	Murray
Bridges	Ives	Myers
Butler	Jenner	Neely
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Cordon	Kefauver	Russell
Darby	Kem	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kerr	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Downey	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Langer	Sparkman
Eastland	Leahy	Taft
Ecton	Lehman	Taylor
Ellender	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	Long	Thomas, Utah
Frear	Lucas	Thye
Fulbright	McCarran	Tobey
George	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Gillette	McClellan	Watkins
Graham	McFarland	Williams
Gurney	McKellar	Withers
Hayden	McMahon	Young
Hendrickson	Magnuson	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3905) to amend section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the argument to be presented by the junior Senator from Washington in support of the motion he offered yesterday to call up House bill 3905, a bill which includes an amendment to reduce some of the wartime-created excise taxes, is to be so simple and clear that it can be understood by every Member of the Congress and by every citizen throughout the United States. Because the argument will consist only of what is obvious and factual, it will not take long to present.

As everyone knows, war excise taxes were imposed for three basic reasons, and at a time when our Nation was fighting for its life. The American people willingly accepted the burden of war excise taxes and acknowledged a justification of the need for imposing them.

The prime results of war excise taxes were that the American people traveled less, communicated less with each other, and purchased fewer consumer goods. Our Nation's economy was being devoted to energizing and feeding a war machine, for the protection of our Nation and that of our allies throughout the world. Our citizens everywhere gladly and knowingly accepted the sacrifices required through war-created excise taxes.

When the Congress and the President imposed war excise burdens on the American people, they were careful to explain to the people why the taxes were necessary. They made it clear to everyone that the taxes would be reduced and repealed when the war was over.

Mr. President, this is the 19th day of January 1950. The fighting war came to an end in 1945. Five long years have passed since World War II was concluded. This fact constitutes the most obvious and the simplest reason why I press a motion for the Senate to take action on a measure designed to reduce war-created excise-tax rates.

On July 11, 1949, the Senate Committee on Finance reported House bill 3905 to the Senate Calendar. That date was more than 6 months ago. The Senate Committee on Finance recommended to the Senate that war excise taxes be reduced for two pressing reasons. The committee maintained, and I assume every Senator agrees, that prevailing war excise taxes add unreasonably to the cost of doing business and materially reduce consumer purchasing power. If those reasons were valid 6 months ago, as I am convinced they were, they are more valid and pressing today.

The President of the United States has spoken glowingly about a trillion-dollar national income to be achieved in the second half of our twentieth century. The goal is both worth while and highly desirable, but it can only be approached and fought for if our people are encouraged and helped to buy more, communicate more, and travel more. The prevailing war-created excise taxes are a concrete restriction against each of these demanding needs. Why then, Mr. President, do we not agree to take action on H. R. 3905, which would be a constructive step in the direction of a trillion-dollar annual income, and do it now?

The majority leader [Mr. LUCAS] is vehemently resisting the motion offered by the junior Senator from Washington. What, may I ask, is the basis for his resistance? Yesterday he said—and it will be found on page 560 of the RECORD:

> The distinguished Senator from Georgia has assured the Senate he will call up this bill at the proper time. I have attempted to reassure the Senate, as majority leader, that we shall consider excise taxes.

What the senior Senator from Illinois said yesterday amounted to absolutely nothing, for his assurance was but a meaningless generality. On page 553 of the RECORD, the Chairman of the Finance Committee, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], speaks for himself. He said:

> I am not against the lifting of the excise taxes. Many months ago I said they should be lifted. There is a bill on the calendar, very high up on the calendar, known as House bill 3905, which deals with these specific taxes, and that calender number can be taken up on motion at any time. If it is not taken up with the agreement of the leaders on this side, I myself propose, as I have already stated, to move to take it up at some reasonably early date.

In the face of these two comments by the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Georgia, can any Senator forecast a date on which the subject of excise taxes will be debated by the Senate of the United States? If we do not want to debate the question, that is one thing, but if we are anxious to dispose of the matter we must agree on a beginning date for the debate. Should my motion carry, we shall immediately have the question before us. If the majority leader is serious, and if he does not want H. R. 3905 to remain dangling on the Senate Calendar as a juicy but unfulfilled political promise, I think he ought to agree to a specific date, which

will bring the excise-tax question before the Senate. If the majority leader thinks it is not the proper time to take action on the excise-tax question, let him offer a definite date, in order that we and the country may know what he actually has in mind.

The majority leader took the junior Senator from Washington to task late yesterday afternoon on the charge that the latter was attempting to play politics. If one plays politics through an attempt to provide tax relief for the American people, then I happily plead guilty. If one plays politics by trying to secure action, which most people agree is needed, then I again plead guilty. If trying to proceed with a responsibility which the majority leader seemingly avoids for reasons of his own constitutes an attempt to take over the majority leader's leadership then, for the third time, I plead guilty.

All the majority leader has to say is to say something which is positive and which can be understood by everyone. If we are going to debate this question in this session, the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, let us promptly agree on a target date. The majority leader has only said up to this moment that he has attempted to reassure the Senate that we shall consider excise taxes. He knows and every Senator knows that the majority leader's attempt to reassure the Senate has failed utterly. An assurance without a do-date is no assurance at all.

There is no reason to believe that we will remain in session as long as we did in 1949. Both sides of the aisle will be anxious to take part in the coming elections. I think the majority leader will be foremost among those who desire to explain their assurances in person to their constituencies. On this assumption that the majority leader will help to see that the Senate recesses in early summer we must move much more rapidly and aggressively from now on than we did a year ago.

Should H. R. 3905 be brought up for consideration at this time and if it quickly passes it must then be returned to conference. All of this will take time. The sooner we approve the measure the sooner the House can be given an opportunity to support our action and the American people will the sooner be given that relief which they have been patiently waiting for throughout the past several years.

The American people, Mr. President, have been told by the President of the United States, by the majority leader of the Senate, and by most Senators, that they could expect some war-excise-tax relief. The people are now doing a perfectly natural thing. They are holding back from buying what they need and want until the Congress and the President has given them the promised relief. This situation is confusing and bad for both the consumer and for business. Is not it the best kind of good politics to take action on and satisfy the promises we have made to the American people about war excise taxes? I think it is and that is the reason I offered a motion yesterday to take up H. R. 3905.

Mr. President, I think that H. R. 1243, the pending business and a bill to amend the Hatch Act, is a deserving measure, but I hope that the majority leader will not tell us or the country that it can be favorably compared with the importance of the war-excise-tax question at this time. The Hatch Act does concern itself with politics. The excise-tax question concerns itself with the health and the strength of the American economy. Where relatively few persons either understand or are interested in the Hatch Act, almost every American has an impelling interest in our Nation's struggle to maintain the integrity and health of our economic structure. Why must we quibble and quarrel and waste time talking about what we automatically ought to undertake without argument.

Yesterday afternoon the chairman of the Finance Committee said that the war-excise-tax provisions in H. R. 3905 represented a saving or tax reduction for the American people in the sum of $670,000,000. Six months ago the committee recommended that these savings, and this amount of additional purchasing power, be granted to the American people at the earliest possible moment. Six months have passed since the Finance Committee urged the Senate to take action. After 6 months all the majority leader can do is to say that he has attempted to reassure the Senate that we shall consider excise taxes. The American people, Mr. President, are getting restless about these continuing but meaningless assurances. The American people want some action. The American people expect their Congress to get rid of those types of taxes which have completely outlived their justification.

The very least we ought to do, Mr. President, is to vote House bill 3905 up or down. We must not let it remain longer to mildew on the Senate Calendar.

Yesterday the majority leader, the senior Senator from Illinois, offered a series of reasons why the excise-tax amendment to the oleomargarine bill should not pass. He will shortly offer reasons why the motion offered by the junior Senator from Washington should not prevail. Listen carefully to the reasons he offers. His reasons today will be different from the reasons he offered yesterday. The substance of all his reasons will merely consist of a further delaying action against taking action to reduce war-created excise taxes. If the majority leader wishes to reassure the country that what I have said about his position is not true, let him, let all other Senators agree today on a given date for taking action on repealing excise taxes.

I trust, Mr. President, that the motion which has been offered, without pride of authorship, by the junior Senator from Washington, will prevail.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the parliamentary system of free government is to function with a modicum of expedition and dispatch, some member of the political party in power must be chosen to carry on the duties and obligations imposed upon the Senate by law and by rule. Every Senator knows that the party in power organizes for the majority of the Senate. I have the honor to represent the majority party in the Senate as majority leader. That great honor was bestowed upon me by my colleagues in a Democratic conference, by a unanimous vote. As a result of the power placed in my hands, I have a tremendous responsibility, not only to the Senate but to the country as a whole.

Mr. President, there is on this side of the aisle what is known as the Democratic Policy Committee, composed of some of the most distinguished Senators in this body. Once a week the policy committee meets, and at such times we make a careful examination of the bills on the calendar and arrange a schedule for their consideration in the Senate accordingly. As every Senator knows, the first bill the policy committee brought up for the consideration of the Senate was the bill to repeal the tax on margarine. The policy committee agreed to follow that with House bill 1243, to amend the Hatch Act. That was the considered judgment of every member of the policy committee, and that bill is the one which is before the Senate, in charge of the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. President, the question of excise taxes is not involved in the motion of the Senator from Washington at all. The sole question before the Senate is simply whether the majority party, duly constituted and organized, shall be permitted to carry out the obligations and duties of the Senate of the United States in a way which the majority believes is best for the Senate and for the country. The question in this debate is not excise taxes; the question is whether a Senator on the opposite side of the aisle can take the leadership away from the majority party and advise the Senate and the country that from now on, any time the Senator from Washington desires to make a motion for the consideration of some measure in which he is interested, the majority of the Senators must go along with him.

It is a most unusual and unique motion which the Senator from Washington has made. The Senator is not a member of the Finance Committee. I do not know whether he is a member of any of the policy-making committees on the other side of the aisle. But the Senator who is responsible for offering the amendment to the Revenue Act which came over from the House of Representatives, the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has not seen fit to attempt to do what the Senator from Washington now wants to do. No other member of the Finance Committee, whether a Democrat or a Republican, has seen fit to rise on the floor of the Senate and make the kind of motion which the Senator from Washington has made, to lay aside the unfinished business of the Senate, brought forward for consideration not only by the majority leader but also by the policy committee of the Democratic Party, take it out of our hands, and from now on permit any Senator who so desires to rise and offer a motion to displace the pending business and secure consideration of some measure, im-

portant or otherwise, in which he is interested.

Mr. President, I have the greatest respect for every Member on the Republican side of the aisle. I believe ordinary fairness and the custom which exists in the Senate will convince all my good Republican friends that the Senator from Washington is not in order in making this kind of motion. After all, Mr. President, it is the responsibility of the majority to make the determination as to when excise-tax matters shall be presented to the Senate. As I stated yesterday, the distinguished and eminent chairman of the Finance Committee [Mr. GEORGE] has definitely given his assurance to the Senate that in due course, after a fair and full determination of the facts in connection with this important question, he will see to it that the Senate has an opportunity to consider the subject of excise taxes.

I reassure the Senate, as majority leader, that that will happen. There will be no question about it. But I repeat, Mr. President, that at this hour the question of excise taxes has absolutely nothing to do with the point I am making.

I think the Senators on this side of the aisle who unanimously selected me as majority leader will support the position taken by the majority leader and the policy committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Can the majority leader give us any more definite assurances than he has given as to when the matter of excise taxes, which is of interest to a great many persons throughout the country, will be presented for debate?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator makes a very fair inquiry, and I wish I could tell him definitely the date when excise taxes will be taken up. But I think the able Senator from Massachusetts, who is always fair in all his dealings with his fellow Members of the Senate, will agree with me that, at least, we should have an opportunity to see what the President of the United States has to say in his tax message, if we want orderly government so far as dealing with taxes is concerned. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts knows full well that the Senate, as a general rule, never considers a revenue measure until it comes from the House of Representatives. In fairness to the Ways and Means Committee, where revenue bills are initiated, it seems to me that we should wait a little while longer to ascertain whether the distinguished Members of the House who serve on the Ways and Means Committee will act with sufficient speed to satisfy the Senator from Massachusetts and the country as a whole.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I point out to the Senator from Illinois—and I am confident he agrees with me—that while it is advisable to wait to hear what the President may have to say, and while it is customary to have revenue measures come from the House of Representatives, since we have pending in the Senate a bill on which the tax question can be debated and on which it can be voted, it would be helpful to have it voted sufficiently early so that it will not die in conference or die through inaction in either branch of the Congress. Does the Senator agree with that?

Mr. LUCAS. I wholly agree with the Senator from Massachusetts, and I can assure him, as the Senator from Georgia has assured the Senate, that House bill 3905, which is pending on the calendar, and which the Senator from Washington seeks to call up now and thus displace the unfinished business, will be taken up. To have attached the amendment affecting excise taxes to the margarine bill would have been a clumsy way to proceed because, as the Senator from Georgia well explained, when that bill goes to conference the conference will be with members of the Agricultural Committee of the House, the committee which reported the margarine bill. When we take up excise taxes the Senator from Georgia and other members of the Finance Committee would like to discuss them with the members of the Ways and Means Committee who handle revenue measures.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. May I point out to the Senator from Illinois that the bill to which I addressed myself, H. R. 3905, does not come under the Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representatives. It originated in the Ways and Means Committee of the House. It is a revenue measure. The Finance Committee of the Senate saw fit to add——

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Washington is absolutely correct.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I accept the statement of the Senator from Washington. I was still thinking of the margarine bill, which passed the Senate yesterday. The Senator from Washington is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, may I ask the majority leader one more question?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I listened with a great deal of interest and sympathy and accord to what the Senator said in regard to his duty and in regard to the duty of the majority party.

I should like to suggest to the Senator, and I think he will agree with me, that any Member of the Senate, whether he is of the majority party or the minority party, has the responsibility and the right to bring a matter to the attention of the Senate, as forcefully as he can, in any way in which he thinks it best, and at any time, as part of his duty, whether or not he is successful. Does the Senator agree with that?

Mr. LUCAS. Precisely. Any Senator has the right to do exactly what the Senator from Washington is doing. I am not questioning the right. I am only questioning the propriety of the Senator from Washington attempting to pursue such a course against the overwhelming opinion of the Democrats on this side of the aisle.

I mean to say, Mr. President, that we have a program. Some Senators may not like it. Some of the Senators on this side of the aisle will not like the program when we bring up FEPC. But it is going to be the program. Some Senators did not like it when we brought up minor amendments to the Hatch Act this afternoon, but it is a part of the program.

We formulate a program, and we try to carry it through. That is the way the Senators on the other side of the aisle proceeded when they were in power. We never attempted to take that power away from them at any time. I challenge any Republican to show that at any time any Democrat attempted, during the 2 years the Republicans were in power, to make a motion comparable to the motion made by my distinguished friend from Washington.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Maine. He is smiling, and I always fear him when he starts to smile.

Mr. BREWSTER. The only such episode I recall—and I think this was under Democratic control and when the distinguished Vice President was majority leader—was when the Senator from Montana moved adjournment one night without the presence or the approval of the distinguished majority leader at that time. It aroused considerable commotion, even to the point of expressions such as one the Senator from Illinois indulged in, that if such motion were approved it would amount to practically a vote of no confidence. That came from the Democratic side, and I should like to cite that as an illustration.

I did not hear all that the Senator from Illinois said, but I gather from his remarks that he assumes full responsibility for the program which we are to consider, and that if any particular measure in which many Senators may be interested is not brought up, it is not the fault of an individual Senator, so far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. The failure last year for 6 or 7 months to bring up any civil-rights measure was a responsibility fully assumed by the Senator from Illinois. Is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Maine will form his own judgment as to what happened last year concerning civil rights, and no doubt he will try to place the responsibility for it on my shoulders. My shoulders are broad, and I have taken responsibility for a long, long time, and I will take much more responsibility. Whatever the Senator from Maine desires to say, either on the floor of the Senate or on the hustings, he is perfectly free to say.

Mr. BREWSTER. I merely wanted to have the record clear.

Mr. LUCAS. The record is always clear after the Senator speaks. I might remind my friend from Maine that perhaps there should be a little rejoinder to that, because the Republicans in the Eightieth Congress lingered a long, long time, and did little or nothing about

civil rights, even though they had some bills on the calendar.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not a fact that bills were brought up, and that the discussion which ensued on the Senator's side of the aisle made it seem impracticable to continue the discussion?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I recall when the Republicans moved the consideration of a civil-rights measure at the special session of Congress which the President of the United States called, and my friends on the other side of the aisle discussed the civil-rights measure instead of the various measures which the President wished to have considered and acted upon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not believe anyone in this Chamber is any more interested in the early repeal of the excise taxes than is the Senator from Colorado. I have been very active in trying to have something done along that line for many months. But I realize the situation which is facing us. The Senate is not in a strong position in the present parliamentary situation. H. R. 3905 came over from the House of Representatives. It is not an important measure. The excise-tax repeal amendment which was placed on the bill in the Senate Finance Committee, by a divided vote of 7 to 6, is a far more important matter than the original bill. That puts us in a very weak position when we stop to think that the Senate alone cannot enact legislation. It takes the two Houses to enact legislation.

The Senator from Illinois has stated several times that we are anticipating a message from the President on the subject of taxes. I do not think the message, whatever it may say, will influence my desire for repeal of the wartime excise taxes. I think that no matter what the message may say, I shall still feel as I do about repealing those excise taxes. But I am only one Member of the Senate. There are 435 Members of the House, and some of the Members of the House may be extremely interested in what the President may say.

The senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has stated several times that he desires to talk with the chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, and the chairman of that committee is certainly entitled to that courtesy and that consideration. What I want is to see the excise taxes repealed. I am not interested in what record we may make in the Senate. So, in the interest of reaching results, it occurs to me that we had better move cautiously, though as rapidly as we can, work the matter out in a courteous way with the Members of the House Committee on Ways and Means, and try to enact an effective piece of legislation.

Mr. President, when the motion is voted on, even though the bill contains an amendment which I sponsored in the Committee on Finance, I shall have to vote to go along in an orderly way, in a sensible way, in a practicable way, in order to get some results. In my opinion that is the course the majority leader is following in this instance. So he may depend fully upon whatever support I can give him.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to my distinguished colleague and friend from Colorado for the valuable contribution he has made to the debate. After all, as I said in my previous remarks, he is the author of the amendment dealing with excise taxes. He realizes the delicate position in which we find ourselves, and I dare say he is much more interested in the repeal of the excise taxes than is the distinguished Senator from Washington, yet he is going to vote to lay the motion on the table, or to defeat it, whichever way the issue shall be presented.

Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] desires to make a few remarks, and I now yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, at the time the bill H. R. 3905 was reported by the Senate Finance Committee on July 11, 1949, I voted in committee against the measure. At that time I made the statement that I did not think it was consistent with sound economics to vote a tax reduction in view of the fact that we were then confronted with a deficit of approximately $5,000,000,000. However, I recognize the fact, since there has been so much said by Members on both sides of the aisle in favor of repeal of the excise taxes, that some action should be taken at the earliest date possible either to repeal these taxes or else reject the proposal in order that customers will cease withholding their purchases. At the time the bill was reported to the Senate I called attention to the fact that I did not think that at that late date, in July of last year, there would be any effort made to bring the bill before the Senate for action; and the results during the months that followed have proved the correctness of the position I took.

Yesterday when the amendment to repeal the excise taxes was offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] to the oleo bill, I again voted against it, because I agreed with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] that that was not the proper bill on which to put an excise tax repeal provision. I thought that it should be handled only on a bill which would go to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

I am not at all sure now, when a vote is taken on the question of excise-tax repeal how I shall vote, because I strongly feel that a balanced budget should come first. However, I am going to vote for the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] this afternoon, because I think that it is important that we take some action at the earliest date possible, and either repeal the excise taxes or notify the customers and the merchants that they are not going to be repealed.

I also call attention to the fact that the bill as reported to the Senate calls for repeal of about $600,000,000 in taxes, yet there is not a Senator on this floor who does not recognize the fact that when we get through amending the bill it is going to call for a reduction of at least a billion dollars or more. There are now thirty-some-odd amendments which are scheduled to be offered.

Many Senators feel that if we are going to repeal excise taxes in certain fields, excise taxes on other items should likewise be repealed. I may offer some amendments of my own if the bill is brought before the Senate, although on the question of final passage I may vote against the bill, depending upon its scope and effect upon the budget.

Mr. President, I am seriously concerned with the program we have been following for the past 20 years of deficit financing. If Senators will read the Democratic platform of 1932, they will find that the Democratic Party pledged economy to the country and a balanced budget. In 1948, in Philadelphia, the Democratic Party in their platform were still pledging economy and a balanced budget. Yet it is a matter of record that during the past 36 years the Democratic Party has had control of the Government for 24 years, and during those 24 years they have never balanced the budget but once, unless they want to take credit for the balanced budget in 1947 and 1948; but the President of the United States said that that was not the result of any effort on the part of the Democratic Party, but that the Republican Party, which controlled the Eightieth Congress, were responsible for everything that happened during those 2 years. So surely we of the Republican Party are going to get the credit for the balanced budget during those 2 years, 1947 and 1948.

The only period the Democratic Party has ever balanced the budget, since the year 1912, was in 1916, when they did show a small surplus.

The truth of the matter is that the present Democratic administration have no intention of ever balancing the budget. They have deliberately launched on a program of deficit spending. I do not believe the members of the Democratic Party nor the President of the United States have the courage to tell the people of the United States the cost of the welfare program they are launching nor the courage to levy a tax bill of sufficient size to pay for that program.

It is time the American people realize that they are not going to receive any net reduction in taxes until first we reduce the cost of government.

Everyone is expressing concern at the $5,000,000,000 deficit last year. There is nothing surprising about that. During the calendar year 1949 we spent $5,340,000,000 more than was spent by the last session of the Eightieth Congress in 1948. So there is nothing at all surprising about the fact that today we are confronted with a deficit.

When we stop to consider that on June 30, 1949, we had a deficit of $1,800,000,000 and then that the Congress last year authorized expenditures of five billion more than the year previous there was nothing else to expect except a huge deficit.

That was the time, when huge appropriations were being authorized, to take pity on the taxpayer. Yet the truth is

that only a small minority of us voted for the cuts. Unless we cut the proposed budget this year by at least from five to seven billion dollars we are again going to have a deficit.

Furthermore unless the cost of government is reduced, for every dollar of excise taxes taken off certain articles which the housewife is watching, they are planning to stick two or three dollars of taxes in some other place less conspicuous. This administration has no intention to reduce taxes, and I think the fact should be told to the American people in plain language.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article published in the Wall Street Journal of January 18, 1950, defining the President's program on taxes.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX REPORT—A SPECIAL SUMMARY AND FORECAST OF FEDERAL AND STATE TAX DEVELOPMENTS

Truman's message on taxes, due on Capitol Hill late this week or early next, will please few taxpayers or lawmakers.

White House advisers are now going over the final wording of the message, and the Treasury is busy writing legislation to follow up the President's proposals. Businessmen who hope Mr. Truman will propose lots of tax changes which would stimulate business will feel let down.

According to the latest list, the President will ask cuts in these seven excises only: The four 20-percent retail levies on furs, jewelry, luggage, and toilet preparations, to be 10 percent; the 15-percent tax on passenger tickets, to be 10 percent; the 25-percent rates on telegrams and long-distance phone communications, to be 15 percent; and the 3-percent tax on freight, to be repealed. The Treasury would stand to lose about $755,000,000 a year, unless the cuts stimulate sales and make up some of the loss due to lower rates.

Another crumb of tax relief will also be held out to businessmen.

Congress will be asked to spread tax credits for business losses over a 7-year period, instead of the present 5-year span. Under existing law, a company that suffers a net loss in 1950, can apply this against its taxable income previously reported for 1948 and 1949 and obtain refunds of taxes paid in those years. Then it can use any unrecovered balance of the loss to reduce taxable income in 1951 and 1952. After 1952, the company gets no further credit for the loss.

The Treasury wants the loss carry-back limited to 1 year, but it proposes to stretch the carry-forward out to 5 years. This would mean, for a company suffering a loss in 1950, a refund of part or all of 1949 taxes, and any balance of the loss still unused could be credited against tax liabilities in 1951–55, inclusive. Businessmen generally approve this change. Initially it might deprive them of some refunds but it would give them more time to offset their losses against profits.

Some investors with money in businesses overseas would benefit from the President's program. He will suggest that Congress allow corporations with branches abroad to treat them as separate subsidiaries, even if they are not set up in this fashion. The home office could then defer counting foreign income except when it is received here in dollars. Under present law, the branches' earnings are supposed to be counted, even if they're in blocked foreign currency.

Mr. Truman is not expected to propose any costly tax changes that would stimulate business, however. There has been talk of bigger depreciation allowances, special tax-free reserves for investment, and relief of double taxation of corporate profits which are hit once as corporate income and again as individual income when they're distributed as dividends to stockholders. But all these would involve substantial revenue losses.

The other points in the President's tax program will be complicated.

Much of the message will be devoted to tax changes designed to bring a moderate amount of additional revenue in the 1950–51 fiscal year which begins July 1, and to pave the way for bigger gains later on. This part of the message is a closely guarded secret, but officials say there is no way to offset $755,000,000 in excise cuts and still increase receipts in 1950–51 without tapping personal income taxes.

The President has repeatedly attacked the COP's 1948 income-tax cut for giving too big a break to upper bracket individuals.

Other revenue-raising proposals under discussion would increase the tax on corporate profits; tax corporations which are now operated tax-free by nonprofit institutions; tax interest on State and local bonds; increase levies on capital gains and on estates and gifts. There has also been talk of (1) decreasing the special deductions which are allowed mining and oil-drilling concerns to make sure they recover their investments before mineral reserves give out and (2) changing the tax formula for mutual life-insurance companies which have escaped taxes on investment income the past 3 years.

Does Truman want any tax bill?

It's hard to see how the administration could concoct a set of proposals less likely to fire congressional enthusiasm and be enacted. And even if the President's program isn't accepted, he can always say he wanted to cut excises and reduce the budget deficit.

Suspicion that this is all the President wants is fairly widespread. Experts at the Council of Economic Advisers say frankly they would rather see nothing done about taxes for another 6 months. By then, these men argue, business activity may be easing down again and a tax cut, rather than an increase, might be better economics. Treasury officials are certainly not enthusiastic about their program. They think excise-tax cuts at a time when business conditions are good aren't worth all the trouble this bill is likely to cause in Congress.

Congress wants to cut far more than the seven excises on the President's list.

On Capitol Hill, most guesses on the extent of excise trimming are about double $755,000,000. "Why discriminate in favor of these seven levies?" Congressmen will want to know. The Treasury is collecting over 50 excises and about 20 of these were started during the war, theoretically for the duration of the emergency.

But the more excises Congress cuts, the more increases Mr. Truman will want in other taxes. Congress will not swallow many of the revenue-raisers he's about to propose. In the end it will probably have just two choices: Either just cut excises and run the risk of a veto, or cut excises and boost the rates on corporate profits. This is an election year and corporations don't vote. A higher corporate tax would be simpler to draft, it would appeal to prolabor Congressmen and wouldn't hike the lawmakers' personal tax bills.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator said he thought there might be a loss of $1,000,000,000 resulting from repeal of the excise taxes. Has the Senator any estimate of how much of that $1,000,000,000 would be recovered through increased income-tax receipts? Certainly when an excise tax is paid three or four times over by three or four different people, as it is in the case of the transportation tax, that must materially affect the amount of income tax which those people pay.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true.

Mr. AIKEN. There is bound to be considerable recovery from the loss of the excise taxes by way of increased income taxes which many people would pay.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think that is true. I have heard it estimated that about one-third of any reduction would be recovered in additional income taxes. I do not know how accurate that estimate is. But unquestionably some of it would be recovered.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Is it not true that repeal or reduction of excise taxes will also greatly stimulate business, and in that way increase the profits of business enterprise? The Senator from Delaware has already pointed out that the fact that a reduction or elimination of the excise taxes as expected by the people is causing goods to pile up on the shelves of merchants and manufacturers. If these taxes are eliminated or reduced, will not the increased prosperity go all the way down the line throughout our business system?

Mr. WILLIAMS. To a certain extent it will. Yet there is a limit beyond which we cannot go in reducing taxes just as there is a limit beyond which we cannot go in increasing taxes, without reaching the point of diminishing returns. That was my reason for voting in 1948 for a tax reduction plus the fact that even after the reduction we had a balanced budget. It resulted in a stimulation to business. The over-all net loss to the Government in 1948 by the tax reduction was not so large as the amount by which taxes were reduced. Some of it came back to the Treasury in the way of increased income taxes resulting from increased business.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder if, in the course of his study of the tax situation, the Senator from Delaware has discovered how many persons are employed in handling and collecting the excise taxes, and what saving could be made in that field if we did not have to employ, let us say, several thousand persons and pay their expenses as employees of the Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Vermont has raised a very interesting point and it should work that way. But my experience is that the less work we give any of these agencies the more men they hire. In 1948 we took 7,000,000 taxpayers off the rolls. Yet the Treasury Department now has more employees on the pay roll than it ever had before in the history of the country; and at the same time it claims they do not have half enough employees. So instead of working out as it should, and as the Senator from Vermont pointed out, it works in directly the opposite manner.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Is the Senator from Delaware aware of the fact that some of the taxes embodied in the amendment under discussion were definitely placed, not for the purpose of raising revenue, but for the purpose of discouraging the purchase of certain articles?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Nebraska is correct and I have stated there should be a study made of these taxes and some reductions made, although I do not think the floor of the United States Senate is the place to write a tax bill. That is the reason I voted as I did last July. I think the revision should have originated in the House after hearings had been held.

However, I wish to call attention to the fact that the reason Senate bill 3905 is on the calendar is because the deciding vote on reporting the bill was cast by the then Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. McGrath, who, at that time, was chairman of the Democratic National Committee. That is the reason it is here on the calendar. If it is a political question, it is a Democratic political question, because the chairman of the Democratic National Committee voted against the Democratic chairman [Mr. GEORGE] to report the bill to the floor.

I quite agree with the Senator from Illinois that we should follow orderly procedure on the floor, although I am not so concerned today as he is, because I remember it was only last year, when he himself signed a petition trying to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of a bill, in order to bring that bill to the floor of the Senate. The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary was at that time absent in Europe. What was then attempted is something which I understand has never before been done upon the floor of the United States Senate, yet the senior Senator from Illinois was the spearhead of that action. So, apparently, the question of following parliamentary procedure depends entirely upon how we feel concerning measures before the Senate.

Mr. President, as I stated before, I shall support the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], although I am not sure at this moment how I shall vote on the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to make a short statement. I have been chairman of the Finance Committee for quite a long time. I have never been disposed to hold back any measure of merit, or one upon which any considerable number of Senators wished to vote. That is my record. I give the Senate my assurance that as soon as the complications involved in this particular matter can be ironed out with the opposite committee in the House, I shall then myself call up a bill to which a suitable amendment dealing with the excise taxes can be attached.

The question here involved is whether the majority party is to be allowed to function. If my friends on the other side of the aisle think they are playing good politics, please let me assume, for a moment, the role of a prophet, and say to them that they never were so sadly mistaken. The American people expect us to function in the normal way. There is a way by which legislation can be enacted. There are other ways which will impede and ultimately defeat the enactment of legislation. But for this motion, Mr. President, today I would already have been in conference with the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and with representatives of the Treasury in an effort to work out this problem in such a way that there would be some assurance that we could obtain effective action upon the excise taxes.

That is all I have to say, Mr. President. There has never been any disposition on my part to prevent a vote by the Senate on this issue. When this bill was reported from the Finance Committee, although I thought it inadvisable to report it, I said I would bring it up in the Senate, if possible. There is not a Senator here who does not know what we had to contend with last July and in August and September and October, up to the date of adjournment of that session of the Senate. We had before us such measures as the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Extension Act, the European aid program, and the North Atlantic Pact, followed by an appropriation to implement that pact. It was utterly impossible to bring this bill to the floor of the Senate then. The bill was called on about three or four successive calendar calls, but each time objection was made. I could not move to have the Senate take it up then; with the parliamentary situation what it was at that time, it was impossible to do so.

If we have any respect for a parliamentary system of government, under which responsibility must rest upon those who have the direction of the parliamentary body, I do not believe those of us on this side of the aisle, at least, can afford to do anything but sustain the position taken in this case by the majority leader.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I have heard a great deal of discussion today about orderly procedure. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia whether the motion of the Senator from Washington violates any rule of order of either the Senate or the House of Representatives?

Mr. GEORGE. No; I do not think it violates any rule of order. But I have never seen any responsible movement made to restrict the authority of the chairman of a committee and to disregard the order of business as fixed by a majority leader, unless there was a disposition on the part of those in charge not to permit the Senate to act upon such matters.

Mr. President, the program does not suit me altogether. However, I am not on the policy committee. I do not fix the order in which the measures are presented to the Senate. Undoubtedly some measures which will be presented will be ones on which I do not wish to vote affirmatively, and on which I shall not vote affirmatively. But there is no possible occasion for any Senator to say that the chairman of the Finance Committee has acted in bad faith or is now acting in bad faith. Unless that situation were to arise, as a responsible Member of this body, I would never move to have the Senate proceed to the consideration of a bill which came from a committee of which I was not a member.

I am not critical of any Senator as having violated a rule of the Senate. Nevertheless, there is such a thing as propriety and there is such a thing as orderly procedure. If Senators wish to obtain results, they must observe those rules, as they should be observed everywhere. We cannot force results by any such tactics.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to make only a brief comment for, I think, primarily, the information of the majority leader, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and, in part, for the information of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

A few minutes ago the majority leader expressed some surprise that a Senator would offer a motion which would test the feeling of the Senate of the United States on a pressing public question. He suggested that certainly during the Eightieth Congress, when the Republicans were in the majority, no such motion on any subject had ever been offered by any member of his party. I should only like to point out—and to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois to tell me the difference—that on June 15, 1948, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] made a motion, in opposition to what was then the program as laid down by the majority party, that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the oleomargarine tax-repeal bill. Some 57 Senators, both Republicans and Democrats, thought it proper to vote "yea," so as to bring that question before the Senate for consideration, over and against the so-called orderly procedure, to which the Senator from Illinois has so quaintly addressed himself this afternoon. I notice, merely from the record, that among those then voting "yea"—meaning to say, "Yes, let us tell the majority leader that we want to take action on the measure," which was one which the majority leader and those on his policy committee thought should be delayed a little while—was the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] was absent on that occasion; but it was announced, in his name, that had he been present, he, too, would have voted in favor of the immediate consideration of the oleomargarine tax-repeal question, an important question. Fifty-seven of the 96 Senators said, in effect, "Let us consider it"; and their action did, as should have been the case, upset the program that certain other Senators thought should be undertaken at the moment.

I suggest to the Senator from Illinois that we seek only to test this question. It is time to tell America who is and who is not in favor of doing away with war excise taxes. We have spent a great deal of time talking about it. Let us

now proceed to call the roll. If there are Senators on both sides of the aisle who wish to do something about the wartime excise taxes, that is precisely what we are Senators for. If a majority of us wish to vote "yea" on any measure which we think is good for the United States of America, let me say, with all respect for the senior Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, that is what we should promptly do. I am anxious to determine the wishes of individual Senators, in order that the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Finance Committee, may discover the degree of interest within the Senate on the question of beginning to get rid of taxes which have outworn both their usefulness and their moral justification.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3905.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, since I have been in the Senate I have never been more embarrassed than I am at the present time. When the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee states to us now, as a matter of good faith, that he will do everything he can to bring this matter before us under other vehicles or in different ways, that is 100 percent with me, and I think it should be with everyone else.

I find myself in this position: I have told my constituents repeatedly that I would take hold of any and every horn which presented itself to get many of the excise taxes reduced or eliminated. So I find myself embarrassed, as between my pledge to my constituents and the great respect and desire which I have to cooperate closely with the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee.

Under all these circumstances, Mr. President, I think I must vote for the motion to bring up this measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3905.

Mr. CAIN, Mr. HENDRICKSON, and other Senators requested the yeas and nays, and the yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised that no business has been transacted since the last quorum call was had, and therefore a quorum call is not now in order.

The yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered on the question of agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll; and Mr. AIKEN voted in the affirmative when his name was called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to state that, under the advice of the parliamentary clerk, the mere ordering of the yeas and nays is the transaction of business which would justify a quorum call. The Chair was under the impression that nothing had been done since the last quorum call, except the making of speeches, which, under the parliamentary rules of the Senate, is not the transaction of business in that sense.

Under the circumstances, the Chair feels that, in view of the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, the quorum call should be proceeded with.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, let me ask what happens to my vote in that event. Do I get two votes?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will get another one, but it will not be added to this one.

The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	McMahon
Anderson	Hill	Magnuson
Benton	Hoey	Martin
Brewster	Holland	Maybank
Bricker	Humphrey	Millikin
Bridges	Hunt	Murray
Butler	Ives	Myers
Byrd	Jenner	Neely
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Darby	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kem	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Downey	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Knowland	Sparkman
Eastland	Langer	Taft
Ecton	Leahy	Taylor
Ellender	Lehman	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Frear	Long	Thye
Fulbright	Lucas	Tobey
George	McCarran	Watkins
Gillette	McCarthy	Williams
Graham	McClellan	Withers
Gurney	McFarland	Young
Hayden	McKellar	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business as members of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, holding hearings on various flood-control and public-works projects in the State of New Mexico.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay," and the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "nay," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], who is unavoidably detained on official business, would vote "nay" if present.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is absent on official business, is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who is absent on official business, is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—35

Aiken	Butler	Darby
Brewster	Cain	Donnell
Bricker	Capehart	Dworshak
Bridges	Cordon	Ecton

Flanders	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Gurney	McCarran	Taft
Hendrickson	McCarthy	Thye
Ives	Martin	Tobey
Jenner	Millikin	Watkins
Kem	Saltonstall	Williams
Knowland	Schoeppel	Young
Langer	Smith, Maine	

NAYS—45

Anderson	Holland	McKellar
Benton	Humphrey	McMahon
Byrd	Hunt	Magnuson
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Maybank
Downey	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Myers
Ellender	Kefauver	Neely
Frear	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Fulbright	Kilgore	Robertson
George	Leahy	Russell
Gillette	Lehman	Sparkman
Graham	Long	Taylor
Hayden	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Hoey	McFarland	Withers

NOT VOTING—16

Chapman	Malone	Tydings
Chavez	Morse	Vandenberg
Connally	Mundt	Wherry
Ferguson	O'Conor	Wiley
Green	Pepper	
Hickenlooper	Stennis	

So Mr. CAIN's motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3905) to amend section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code was rejected.

AMENDMENT OF THE HATCH ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1243) to amend the Hatch Act.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendments have not yet been disposed of, and, therefore, the Senator's amendment is not in order at this time.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to talk approximately 2 minutes, in order to explain my amendment. I hope the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] will accept it. I ask that it may be read for the information of the Senate. I think it is an amendment which the Senator will accept.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not in order to offer it at this time.

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask only that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 3. Section 612 of title XVIII, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Whoever places or causes to be placed in any post office or authorized depository for mail matter, any such publication, card, pamphlet, circular, poster, dodger, advertisement, writing, or other statements which violates any provision of the foregoing paragraph, to be sent or delivered by the Post Office Department, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the amendment simply makes it a criminal offense to mail, in a political campaign, any material which does not contain the name of the individual who authorizes or pays for the particular material. I shall not dwell on it at any great length. I know that all Members of the Senate have at some time been the subject of attack, and I think, in fairness to the voters and to the candidates, we should do everything possible to make sure that when anyone issues any campaign material it shall be made very clear who is doing the issuing and who is paying for it. My amendment merely provides that if anyone places in the mail any such unsigned material it is a violation of postal laws and regulations, and he will be liable to a $5,000 maximum fine or 2 years in the penitentiary, or both.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it so happens that the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration is not a lawyer. I do not know what the effect of this amendment would be. I thought, on the face of it, it would be entirely proper, but it seems to me that if we impose a $5,000 fine on someone, the Judiciary Committee should first pass upon it, rather than for the Senator to ask me to accept the amendment on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not object to having a vote on it. I have talked to a number of Senators, and up to this time every Senator with whom I have talked is in favor of it. I have no objection to putting it to a vote, although I thought the Senator might care to take the amendment to conference. If he thinks that a $5,000 fine is too great, it may be cut down, and if a 2-year term in a penitentiary is too long, it might be cut down. If the Senator does not want to take the responsibility of accepting the amendment, I shall ask for a vote on it at the proper time.

Mr. HAYDEN. The amendment is not really germane to the bill.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I am curious to know whether the amendment refers to matter in newspapers.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; it would not refer to matter in a newspaper. There is a provision in practically all State laws, at least there is in my State, and I think there is such a provision in the law of the Senator's State, covering newspapers. There is also a provision in the Federal law covering newspapers. My amendment merely provides that if certain matter is placed in the post office it is a violation of postal laws and regulations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not really a question for each State to determine in connection with its Corrupt Practices Act and its Election Code? I know there is such a law in Massachusetts. It would seem to me that this is a question for the States, and if we begin to place such a provision in a Federal statute we shall bring about a dispute between the States and the Federal Government as to what is legal and what is not legal.

Mr. McCARTHY. Section 612 of title XVIII of the United States Code already covers this subject. It provides for a fine of $1,000 and for a jail sentence for anyone putting out advertising or any material which does not contain the name of the sponsor, but there is no provision in the Federal law which makes it a criminal offense to send such material through the mail.

As to whether it is a matter the States should cover, I frankly do not know. There is a question of how much power a State has in dealing with the election of the President and Members of the House and Senate. We are not establishing any new precedent when we have the Federal Government deal with a particular problem. We are merely tightening up the law to make it more difficult for persons to send through the mail unsigned and anonymous material.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Wisconsin understand that the States have any jurisdiction over the type of material which goes through the mail? The States would not have any authority to determine the type of material which may go through the United States mail.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the Senator from Vermont makes an excellent point, which is an answer to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. For the benefit of Senators who did not hear the Senator from Vermont, let me say he has pointed out that the States have no power whatsoever to pass any laws regulating the type of material which can go through the post office. Only the Federal Government can do that.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The question of the use of the United States mails is worrying a great many people. In a recent campaign in which I participated I tried very hard to find the source of certain material which was sent through the mail and which was extremely damaging to me. It was not subject to the States laws applying to the publication of advertisements. If the Senator from Wisconsin has anything making it unlawful for persons to send that sort of material through the mails, sometimes containing a fake campaign address, which is made to appear to come from the candidate himself, which it does not, he has my blessing.

Mr. McCARTHY. I know of many other States which have the same problem. Sometimes it is not entirely a case of being protected from the opposition. Sometimes we must be protected from our overzealous friends who take it upon themselves to send out campaign material.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the first committee amendment to House bill 1243.

The first amendment was, on page 2, line 2, after "mission", to insert by unanimous vote."

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CORDON. I have in preparation an amendment which I desire to offer which would be in lieu of section 1 of the bill as it is before the Senate, which contains several committee amendments.

If the committee amendments should be agreed to, would it then be in order to strike the entire section 1, and insert a substitute in lieu thereof?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would be in order, after all perfecting amendments to the section had been disposed of.

Mr. CORDON. Before considering the committee amendments, and because I believe that as soon as the amendments are taken up, there may be a possibility of getting a substitution without too long delay, I should like to present the substance of an amendment which I intend to offer.

I may say, in preface to my explanation, that I am in sympathy with the purpose of the proposed legislation, and I believe, Mr. President, that the present penalty for a minor violation of section 9 of the Hatch Act may in many instances be too severe. I think that somewhere there should be lodged discretion to impose some type of penalty less than absolute discharge from employment. On the other hand, I agree with the Senators who feel that the bill, as reported, provides no standard whatever to guide or circumscribe the actions of the Civil Service Commission. I think some standards should be provided. I am in agreement with the feeling that every possible safeguard should be thrown around authority granted to an administrative body as distinguished from a judicial tribunal.

The amendment which I shall propose will be, substantially, that section 9 of the present act be amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (b) and adding certain provisos and paragraphs, the substance of which will be that persons who are found guilty of violating the section shall be dismissed from the service of the United States, and so on, as now provided, but adding a proviso that if the Civil Service Commission, after hearing, shall find by unanimous vote that such violation was not willful, a lesser penalty may be imposed; then a provision that in no case shall the penalty be less than 90 days suspension from duty without pay. That would mean, if that portion of the amendment were adopted, that there would be established a standard to guide the Commission, namely, an affirmative finding by a unanimous vote that the violation was not willful.

If my understanding of the criminal law is correct, the term "willful" comprehends, first, a knowledge of the wrongfulness of the act, and, second, an intent to perform the act despite the knowledge that it is wrong.

Mr. President, there will follow in the amendment which I intend to propose, with respect to consideration of cases where dismissal has already occurred, a provision that reconsideration may be had upon request to the Commission, and that in that event there must also be a finding that the original violation was not willful, in which case the remedy provided in the pending bill may be applied, namely, that the individual involved may be subject to reemployment by the Government.

There would follow then, Mr. President, in a separate paragraph, a provision requiring the Commission at the end of each month to report to the Senate and to the House of Representatives the names, addresses, and nature of employment of all persons with respect to whom action had been taken by the Commission under this section, together with a statement of the facts upon which action had been taken, and the penalty imposed.

Another paragraph, which I believe should be in any law of this character, would provide that the proceedings of all hearings should be transcribed and the transcript should be held available to any committee of either House upon request.

In substance, the amendment, which I hope will be on the floor within a very few minutes, will, first, carry the present penalty of expulsion from service, but, second, will also carry provision that where the violation was not willful, consideration may be given by the Civil Service Commission to the imposition of a lesser penalty, with a minimum penalty, which in any event must be imposed.

Then, in order that the Congress and the country may be apprised of what takes place in connection with this particular provision of section 9 of the Hatch Act, a provision is added that the Congress shall be kept currently informed of all the facts, and shall have access to the testimony itself upon which the Commission acted. That will have two results. It will serve to keep the Commission always conscious of the fact that its actions are subject to careful consideration and appraisal at all times by the Congress, and it will give to the Congress an opportunity, by studying the reports, to effect any correction which it may find necessary in the act as it will then be on the books.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am very much interested in the passage of the bill, and I have no objection at all to getting reports on the cases arising, but I wish to raise with my distinguished colleague from Oregon, the question of the construction of the word "willful" he is proposing to insert.

The Senator from Oregon is a very fine lawyer.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator thanks the Senator from Virginia for his generosity.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator, of course, knows that the courts have uniformly held that a man intends the necessary and probable consequences of his voluntary acts. So, if we wrote the word "willful" into the law, a man would have to prove that he was too drunk to know what he was doing, or had no will, in order to escape the very heavy penalty sought to be written into the bill. If the Senate agreed to the Senator's amendment and the word "willful" were written into the law, we might as well leave the law as it stands. I can not see that we would be getting anywhere at all in taking care of the clear hardship cases, when the equivalent of a fine of $50,000 could be imposed for a very minor infraction of the election laws.

Take the case cited in the report, of a postal employee who lacked only 6 months of reaching the retirement age, who wanted to help a friend with whom he had served for some 29 years, who had retired and was a candidate for office. He took a petition and got 2 or 3 signatures, and he was dismissed and lost his retirement pay and all his benefits, and was forever excluded from Government employment. But that penalty would still be possible under the proposed amendment because he could not say, "I did not know how to circulate the petition. I did not know my friend was running for office. I did not know what I was doing."

If the Senator really desires to perfect the bill, in my opinion he should eliminate the provision of his amendment to which I have just referred, and leave the provision which calls for the reports, so that Congress may know what cases had been handled, and just what had been done.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Virginia, but I utterly disagree with his position with reference to the definition of the term "willful" as it is used in the criminal law. The term "willful" as used in the criminal law—and I am sure I could bring to the Senate floor a handful of decisions on the subject, with the weight of opinion throughout the United States in criminal case decisions—first, imports a knowledge on the part of the individual that the thing he does is unlawful, and it also imports a guilty intent to commit the unlawful act. Both are included in the term "willful."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In the Senator's course on torts he, of course, remembers the firecracker case, in which a man threw a firecracker about to explode at the feet of another man, who picked it up and in trying to get rid of it threw it toward a second man, and it blew up in his face. The last man who threw it was not intending to blow up the man toward whom he threw it. He was acting under an emergency.

Let us consider a traffic violation. One may be temporarily looking one way and drive through a red light. The law is violated, but it is not willfully done, because the driver did not notice the red light.

But a difference exists between "willful," as applied to a violation of the election laws, and as applied to negligence cases, because in an election case a man cannot say or plead that he did not know what he was doing. If he did not know what he was doing his act would still be willful. If I circulated a petition accidentally, did not intend to do it, and did not willfully do it, but I simply circulated it, the defense that the act was not willful would not stand up for a minute. We are dealing with a case in which someone solicits the vote of another. He hands out election cards. He circulates petitions. He goes to a meeting and stands up in that meeting and perhaps he says, "The candidate is my candidate. I hope everybody will

vote for him." It cannot be pleaded that such action was not willful.

I say, with all due deference to my friend from Oregon, that when dealing with election laws there is no such thing as not intending or not being willful in what one does. But there is a difference in degree in what is done.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I think it would serve no particular purpose to continue the discussion between my friend and myself, inasmuch as we do not agree. I am sure I cannot convince him, and I am equally certain that in this instance he cannot convince me. I regret that I must leave it in the end to the Senate to determine.

I call the Senate's attention to the fact, however, that the term "willful" is used in many instances in the criminal law. It is used in many instances in cases where technically there is no crime in the sense that crime must exist only when there is a statutory provision and penalty attached. But it is used in cases of this character where, while the penalty is not imprisonment or assessment of a fine, it nevertheless is a statutory penalty for affirmative action, with the light of knowledge of the action an indispensable part of the offense, and in this instance I feel that the protection of the employees will be had if the language be used as indicated.

Mr. President, I do not care to impose further on the Senate's time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the first committee amendment on page 2, line 2, after the word "Commission," to insert "by unanimous vote."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In line 4, after the word "in", it is proposed to insert "no case shall the penalty be less than a fifteen-day suspension from duty without pay: *And provided further*, That in."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, earlier in the debate I asked that the words "fifteen-day" be changed to "thirty-day." I understood the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] agreed to accept that amendment. I believe a 15-day suspension is too small. I think a 30-day provision would be more fair. I offer that amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 4, it is proposed to strike out the words "fifteen-day" and insert "thirty-day."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish to amend that by striking out the word "thirty" and inserting the word "ninety." I offer that as an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That amendment is not in order. The amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts is an amendment to the committee amendment, and the Senator's proposed amendment would be in the third degree.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona if there would be a willingness to get together on the figure, say at 60?

Mr. HAYDEN. If the two Senators on the other side can agree on 60, I will accept it.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts modifies his amendment so as to make it read "60" instead of "30." The question is on the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was on page 2, line 10, after the word "find" to insert "by a unanimous vote."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on the same page, after line 14, to insert a new section 2, as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 16 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 16. Whenever, in any municipality, county, or political subdivision of a county in the immediate vicinity of the National Capital in the State of Maryland or the State of Virginia, 10 percent or more of the qualified voters are persons employed by the Government of the United States or by the municipal government of the District of Columbia or, in any municipality, county, or political subdivision of a county of any State, the majority of the qualified voters are persons employed by the Government of the United States, it shall be lawful for any person to whom the provisions of this act are applicable, and who is a resident of such municipality, county, or political subdivision of a county, to participate actively as an individual, candidate, or manager in elections for offices which are filled only by the voters of such municipality, county, or political subdivision of a county, including participation in primaries, conventions, caucuses, or mass meetings sponsored by political parties and including participation as a candidate seeking office as the nominee of any such party."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is still open to amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. As I understand, the Senator from Oregan [Mr. CORDON] desires to offer a substitute for section 1, but that should not prevent us from considering section 2 of the bill which is in the nature of an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator from Arizona that that has already been agreed to. All committee amendments have been agreed to.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute for section 1 of the committee bill, as amended, and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Beginning with line 3, on page 1, it is proposed to strike out down to and including all of line 14, on page 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That section 9 of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, is hereby amended by changing the period at the end of subsection b to a colon and adding the following: "*Provided*, That if the Civil Service Commission after hearing shall find, by unanimous vote, that such violation was not willful, a lesser penalty shall be imposed by the Commission: *Provided further*, That in no case shall the penalty be less than 60 days' suspension without pay: *Provided further*, That in the case of any person who has heretofore been removed from the service under the provisions of this section, the Commission shall upon request reopen and reconsider the record in such case. If it shall find by a unanimous vote that the violation committed was not willful it shall issue an order revoking the restriction against reemployment in the position from which removed, or in any other position for which he may be qualified.

"(c) At the end of each calendar month the Commission shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives the names, addresses, and nature of employment of all persons with respect to whom action has been taken by the Commission under the terms of this section, with a statement of the facts upon which action was taken, and the penalty imposed.

"(d) Testimony in all hearings had pursuant to the terms of this section shall be transcribed and made available to either the Senate or the House of Representatives upon the request of any committee thereof."

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I desire to modify the amendment in one respect. I modify my amendment in the third line of the proviso, after the word "penalty", by striking out "shall" and inserting "may."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may modify his amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Would not the word "willful," as the Senator uses it in his amendment, be clarified if he were to add the words "with malice aforethought"?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, let me suggest to the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Virginia, who are able lawyers, that the subcommittee which reported the bill to the full committee consisted of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. The Senator from California is no longer a member of the committee, but the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is. They will be the conferees on the bill. They are three very able lawyers. I should like to ask the two Senators who have been discussing the matter if they agree that when the bill goes to conference we can trust those lawyers to straighten out the difficulty about "willful." If we can come to an accord in that regard, the matter can be taken care of in conference.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I shall not seriously object. I want to see the bill passed today. But I do not want it passed without registering my belief that if the word "willful" is retained, it will not apply to every offense that is committed, although a strict construction of it might make it difficult to find an exception. Perhaps in conference the conferees can change the wording to make that clear. Otherwise I hope the

Senator from Oregon will agree with me that it is not his intention to make it apply to every offense.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have endeavored to make that clear. I have no pride of authorship. I had hoped that we could provide a sound procedure, one which would give protection to the orderly processes of government, on the one hand, and, on the other, would give a break to the man in Government employ who has made an unintentional mistake. I think the language accomplishes that objective. Yet, if better language can be found, I would be the first to adopt it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I like the idea, Mr. President, of reports to the Congress with respect to these cases. That appeals to me. I am inclined, therefore, to accept the substitute offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] as a substitute for section 1 of the bill, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, and ask to have it stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 3. Section 612 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Whoever places or causes to be placed in any post office or authorized depository for mail matter, any such publication, card, pamphlet, circular, poster, dodger, advertisement, writing, or other statement which violates any provision of the foregoing paragraph, to be sent or delivered by the Post Office Department, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President——

Mr. GILLETTE rose.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GILLETTE. I want the floor in my own right before the amendment is voted on.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have not yielded the floor.

Mr. President, in case there are any Senators present who were not present at the time when I previously discussed my amendment, I will say that the amendment simply makes it a criminal offense—and the penalty is set forth—to put in the mails during a campaign, campaign material which does not show the source thereof, who is paying for it, and who authorized it. Practically all the States have laws making it a criminal offense to circulate such matter. However, the States have no authority to pass laws providing that it shall be an offense to pass such matter through the United States mails. In that respect, I think there is a gap in our Federal laws, and I believe we should fill the gap.

There may be some question as to whether the penalty provided by the amendment is too severe, whether $5,000 is too large a fine or whether imprisonment for 2 years is too great a penalty. I suggest that the amendment be adopted and taken to conference; and if the conferees feel that the fine is too large or the penalty is too great, they can be reduced.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to say that I have no objection to the purpose the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has in mind; in fact, in the past I have sponsored proposed legislation of this kind before the Senate, but unsuccessfully, I may say. But I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and to the other Members of the Senate that the pending measure is not the place to which to attach amendatory matter of this kind. The pending measure has for its purpose the lessening of a drastic penalty which would be imposed by the Civil Service Commission under regulatory authority conferred upon it by the Hatch Act. The proposal the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has presented in his amendment is amendatory of the Criminal Code, and has no reference to the Hatch Act or to the regulatory matter or authority of the Civil Service Commission, as sought to be covered by the pending measure. The portion of the Criminal Code which the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin would amend is a definite fixing of what constitutes a crime and of the penalties for committing it.

Section 612 of the Criminal Code, which the Senator from Wisconsin seeks to amend by having his amendment added to the pending measure, provides that—

Whoever willfully publishes or distributes any card, pamphlet, circular, poster, dodger, advertisement, writing, or other statement relating to or concerning any person who has publicly declared his intention to seek the office of President, or Vice President of the United States, or Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress, in a primary, general, or special election, or convention of a political party, or has caused or permitted his intention to do so to be publicly declared, which does not contain the names of the persons, associations, committees, and corporations responsible for the publication or distribution of the same, and the names of the officers of each such association, committe, or corporation shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

That provision of the Criminal Code establishes as a crime the distribution, under those circumstances, of campaign documents which do not carry the name of the sponsor, and imposes a penalty of $1,000. On the other hand, the Senator by his amendment, if I correctly understood the amendment as it has been presented, seeks to change the penalty to one of $5,000—in other words, a greatly increased penalty—for merely depositing such material in a post-office box or in a mail box.

Mr. President, it is altogether too vital, too intricate, and too judicial a matter—to attempt to amend the Criminal Code by adding an amendment of this kind to a regulatory measure which merely goes to authority delegated to a commission of the United States Government.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I submit to the Senator that there is nothing intricate about the amendment. It simply provides that if a person sends such material through the mails, he will be in violation of the postal regulations.

We are now proposing to enact, as an amendment to the Hatch Act, a measure lightening the severity of the provisions of the Hatch Act, which has to do with elections. By the pending measure we propose to make it easier for people to violate the Hatch Act. I think all of us agree that it is improper for anyone to issue material in a campaign without showing the source of the material. In other words, anyone who has something of a derogatory nature to say about a Senator or candidate for Senator in a campaign should be required to sign his name to such material. We know that in the last campaign Senators had some very unpleasant experiences; we know that in various parts of the Nation there are some unscrupulous persons who do not hesitate to write libelous articles about candidates, but do not have the courage to sign their names to such articles.

This amendment simply provides that such persons, if they pass such material through the mails, will be guilty of a crime.

The $5,000 fine provided by the amendment is to be the maximum fine, not the minimum. The judge trying the case will, of course, have discretion in that matter. The provision of imprisonment for 2 years is to be the maximum penalty, not the minimum.

If the amendment is adopted and taken to conference, and if the conferees believe the penalties provided by the amendment are too severe and that it should not be added to the measure we are now considering, of course, they can agree to a conference report providing for the elimination of this amendment. But certainly there is no rule to prevent us from passing such a very sensible measure.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, let me repeat what I have already said, namely, I have no particular issue at all with the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin in regard to the goal he seeks to attain, because there have been scores and scores of instances of the abuses to which he has referred, not only within my own personal experience, but in the experience of many other persons. I may say that I happened to be chairman of the Campaign Expenditures Committee in 1940, and we had literally hundreds of complaints about abuses such as those the Senator from Wisconsin seeks to reach by his amendment, abuses which should be stopped.

So I would join with the Senator from Wisconsin in favor of an amendatory provision. If the present section 612 of the Criminal Code is not sufficient, I shall join the Senator from Wisconsin in seeking to secure its amendment.

Again I say the question of germaneness arises here. The question now before us is that of seeking to minimize a

drastic penalty imposed by the Civil Service Commission, under delegated authority. However, the Senator's amendment would amend the Criminal Code.

So, Mr. President, I hope the amendment will not be adopted as an amendment to the pending measure, because certainly the amendment is not in accordance with the legislation we are seeking to enact at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. [Putting the question.]

The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have just been informed that there is to be a reception this evening for one of the Members of the Senate, and of course Senators wish to attend it. Some Senators, I am informed, already have left the Chamber for that purpose, on the assumption that no record vote would be taken or no quorum call had tonight.

So I ask unanimous consent that my suggestion of the absence of a quorum may be withdrawn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator's suggestion of the absence of a quorum will be withdrawn.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask for a division on the question of the adoption of the amendment.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the endorsement of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 1243) was passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. STENNIS, Mr. GILLETTE, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona wish to have the bill printed with the Senate amendments to the bill numbered?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, of course the amendments the Senate has adopted simply provide for striking out certain House language and inserting certain new language. Nevertheless, I ask that the bill be printed with the Senate amendments numbered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN—PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 119, Senate Joint Resolution 25.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the joint resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 25) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Iowa.

The motion was agreed to.

FEDERAL JUDGESHIPS—LETTER FROM PEYTON FORD, ASSISTANT TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, TO SENATOR KNOWLAND

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. Peyton Ford, the Assistant to the Attorney General, giving certain statistical information on Federal judgeships.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 12, 1950.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: With further reference to your letter of August 24, addressed to the Attorney General, making certain inquiries concerning Federal judges, the information you have requested is set forth below:

1. Total number of Federal judges having life appointments, including 35 who are retired: 308.

2. Total number of present incumbent judges who have been appointed since the close of 1932, to include—

(a) United States	213
(b) Territories	24
(c) Lower courts of the District of Columbia	14
Total	251

3. Total number of Republicans appointed to judgeships since the close of 1932, to include—

(a) United States	21
(b) Territories	7
(c) Lower courts of the District of Columbia	2
Total	30

4. The number and names of the Republican judges appointed since 1933 to the Federal appeals courts: 7.

James M. Proctor, United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

D. Lawrence Groner, Chief Justice, United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

Harris Brigham Chase, second circuit.
Robert P. Patterson, second circuit.
William Clark, third circuit.
Wayne G. Borah, fifth circuit.
Walter G. Lindley, seventh circuit.

5. Total number of Federal judicial vacancies created by act of Congress since March 1933: 91.

Relative to the foregoing statistics, the following is also noted:

1. Total number of Federal judges having life appointments as of March 4, 1921: 167.
(a) Number who were Republicans, 83.
(b) Number who were Democrats, 79.
(c) Unknown affiliation, 5.

2. Total number of Federal judges receiving life appointments between 1921 and 1933: 214.
(a) Number who were Republicans, 191.
(b) Number who were Democrats, 20.
(c) Unkown affiliation, 3.

3. Total number of Federal judges having life appointments as of March 4, 1933: 231.
(a) Number who were Republicans, 172.
(b) Number who were Democrats, 57.
(c) Unkown affiliation, 2.

4. Total number of Federal judges receiving life appointments between 1933 and 1950: 289.
(a) Number who were Republicans, 17.
(b) Number who were Democrats, 272.

5. Total number of Federal judges having life appointments as of January 10, 1950: 308.
(a) Number who were Republicans, 84.
(b) Number who were Democrats, 224.

Hence, it is observed that there were apparently more Republicans than Democrats holding life appointments at the end of the last Democratic administration, and that there is approximately the same proportion of Republicans holding life appointments today as there were Democrats holding life appointments at the end of the last Republican administration, that is, approximately one-third of the total number of Federal judges holding life appointments at the respective times.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
The Assistant to the Attorney General.

PREFERENCE ACCORDED FOREIGN MERCHANDISE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the Government has started this week the purchase of a number of pork products, under the terms of our farm legislation, in order to maintain a reasonable price to producers. The program is strictly according to law, and is one which I support heartily. Without such a support program the prices of hogs might go down to disastrously low levels.

Not all the surplus hogs come from American farms, however. A substantial proportion of our market surplus is the result of the importation of Polish hams, which started a few months ago, and which has now reached a rate of hundreds of thousands of pounds a month. Our price-support policy, of course, encourages imports of Polish hams. The Government may not actually purchase at import any Polish hams, but it clears the way for the Polish ham to be imported by holding the domestic price up, and by taking part of the domestic hams off the market. Tariff rates are negligible as a result of substantial tariff reductions and foreign devaluation. This development must be pleasing to our State Department, since administration leaders have been pleading for increases in imports for some time. Recently they have even attacked our traditional policy of the Government's buying for our representatives abroad diplomatic products from our own producers. It is getting so that a citizen who prefers to buy products made in America is shamed by those who prefer to buy abroad, even from countries dominated by the Communists.

A glaring example of this has come to my attention. I call it to the attention of Senators, not because of any sub-

stantial injury that is occurring in the State of Nebraska but because it indicates the present policy of the State Department.

The United States produces as fine a chinaware as any country. It can produce sufficient quantities for our consumption at a very fair and reasonable price. It cannot produce average chinaware as cheaply as some countries, where wage rates and living standards are one-third, one-fifth, or one-eighth those of this country. Import duties have been reduced, and devaluation has aided the foreign producer. Unemployment, the cancellation of orders, and a slowing down of domestic production is occurring.

In the face of this situation it might be expected that the domestic chinaware industry could hope for some relief from the State Department. No such relief has been granted, however. On the contrary, the State Department has added insult to injury by decreeing that even our own embassies abroad shall use German chinaware rather than American chinaware.

I have in my hand articles from reputable publications that reveal this situation. They indicate that the purchases of German chinaware were made without even giving American producers an opportunity to bid for the business. They were negotiated secretly with the favored representative of a German manufacturing firm. The deals that have already been made were quite substantial. Over $280,000 was the cost of just the first batch.

At this point I desire to read two very short articles which appeared in the Retailing Daily. The first is entitled "United States Embassies to Dine from German China—State Department Contracts for Dinnerware Through New York Firm." It was written by John T. Norman, and reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, September 26.—Bypassing domestic chinaware manufacturers, the State Department has completed two contracts—and soon will negotiate a third—for the purchase in Germany of gold-trimmed dinnerware for use in American embassies and consulates throughout the world, Fairchild News Service learned today.

One contract, dated May 16, 1949, was made by the State Department with William Graham, identified as president of the Royal York China Co., New York City, for the purchase of 100 sets of dinnerware—service for 12—for 259,820 German marks. Another contract, completed August 23 this year, covered the following:

Fifty sets of service for 12, priced at 129,-910 German marks.

Fifteen sets of service for 24, priced at 68,648.25 German marks.

Fifteen sets of service for 36, priced at 124,459 5 Germans marks.

Reserve stocks, priced at 17,636.3 German marks.

THIRD CONTRACT

Officials of the State Department's division handling foreign building operations said that the third contract with Mr. Graham would be about the same size as the August 23 order. At the current official rate of exchange, the German west mark still is worth 30 cents, although Government fiscal experts expect that the west mark will be devalued shortly to bring its value into line with other European currencies.

In each case, it was explained, the contracts with Mr. Graham specify that payment shall be made in west German marks, rather than dollars, for the chinaware manufactured for this Government by the Hutchenreuther China Co. in Germany.

The second article is headed, "State Department turns to foreign supplies for dinnerware," is dated Washington, September 29, and reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, September 29.—The State Department has turned to foreign suppliers to get fancy, gold-trimmed dinnerware for United States embassies and consulates throughout the world, because blocked currencies owned by this Government abroad can be used for purchase of everything from tableware to real estate, Government officials explained today.

Allen Donaldson, of the State Department's Foreign Building Operations Division, refused to explain, however, how contracts were made with one New York businessman for large purchases of official State Department dinnerware, manufactured by the Hutchenreuther China Co. in Germany.

"The reason why we didn't advertise this thing," he said, "was because we didn't want commission men to come down here from New York."

Mr. Donaldson said that further details on business arrangements between his office and William Graham, of the Royal York China Co., New York—under which Mr. Graham already has received two contracts to supply dinnerware to the State Department and soon may get a third contract—will have to come from Mr. Graham.

At first the excuse offered was that these 200 sets of chinaware could be purchased more cheaply abroad. After being criticized severely for these purchases, however, the State Department made some further explanations. "The orders were not actually placed because of lower prices," the Department said, "but because certain laws permitted them to utilize foreign credits." The letter from the Department to a representative of the domestic chinaware industry went on to say very frankly that the program "is being vigorously pursued in the public interest." Further on, the State Department letter states that no dollars have been expended for this purpose, and promises that "when the buildings and furnishings program is again on a dollar basis the Department will make domestic purchases of American materials and furnishings."

The letter goes on to claim there was nothing secret about the foreign deals. It seems they just did not tell anyone about them. It has been proved to my satisfaction that no bids were called for. There were no advertisements, and no domestic supplier was approached. The whole arrangement reached the light only as the result of the initiative of an alert reporter.

Mr. President, I wonder what high officials of a foreign government think when, at an embassy function, they discover that our Government thinks so little of our own chinaware that they purchase and use chinaware from other countries. I wonder what foreign governments would think if we suggested to them that their embassies use chinaware made in this country. It happens that I have here an exchange of letters which I should like to read, which show very clearly what the British thought when such a suggestion was made to them. They laughed. I am reading from a letter addressed to the British Embassy by the executive secretary of the Vitrified China Association, Inc., Washington, D. C., and the reply thereto. The letters reads as follows:

VITRIFIED CHINA ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Washington, D. C., October 31, 1949.
COMMERCIAL COUNSELOR,
British Embassy,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Because of the prestige involved, it may be possible, in spite of devaluation and payment in sterling, to supply fine American china for your and possibly other British Embassy services at an attractive price. I would, therefore, appreciate it if you would inform me as to the proper steps to be taken to have this proposal considered.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT F. MARTIN,
Executive Secretary.

BRITISH EMBASSY,
Washington, November 8, 1949.
Mr. ROBERT F. MARTIN,
Vitrified China Association, Inc.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 31st of October, and would point out that, as the United Kingdom is itself the manufacturer of some of the finest chinaware in the world, we are not in the market for china manufactured elsewhere; nor do I think that any of the other embassies in the British Commonwealth would be interested in your proposal.

Yours very truly,

F. A. DE MOLEYNS.

This country—our country—has a surplus of pork products, just as we have a surplus of china. The Government is buying up the surplus pork in order to maintain the price of hogs. Nevertheless, it will not surprise me greatly if the State Department follows through and we see the day when Polish hams embellish the German chinaware in our embassies all over the world.

DRAFTS IN THE SENATE CHAMBER

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to call the attention of the Architect of the Capitol, the engineers, and others involved, to the fact that for the last day or two a very disagreeable draft has been blowing across this rostrum, which has given everyone at the desk a cold. The Chair hopes that some steps will be taken to remedy the situation.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of John M. Cabot, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Finland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John F. Floberg to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. LUCAS. The nomination of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman will go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, January 20, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate January 19 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John M. Cabot, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Finland.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 19 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

John F. Floberg to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 19, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Father John J. Keahane, St. John the Evangelist Roman Catholic Church, Cambridge, Mass., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

O Almighty and Eternal God from whom all blessings flow, we ask Thee to bless this country of ours—at present the hope of freedom-loving people throughout the world—that it may be faithful to its trust.

We ask Thee to bless the President of these United States in his unparalleled task of guiding the destinies of our beloved country in these difficult times.

We ask Thee to endow the Congress with wisdom and understanding so they can frame and enact laws for the prosperity and peace of our people.

We ask Thee to assist the Speaker and Members of this House and direct their deliberations according to Thy holy will through Christ our Lord.

For these ends we will say the Lord's Prayer:

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us, and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil.

Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2023. An act to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. BYRD, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 50–13.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House on Tuesday next for 30 minutes, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made by Hon. George N. Craig, national commander of the American Legion, before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

WHEN WILL THERE BE PEACE?

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, since the last bullet was fired in Europe and since the last prisoner of war was released in the Pacific the imponderable hanging over all of us has been, "When will there be peace?"

Believe me, nothing is going to matter much until the minds of men are quieted on the fear of combat. We may speak of building the greatest projects on earth, of creating the greatest mass production, educating the greatest number of people, protecting the health of the millions, procuring financial security, but nothing is going to matter unless there is peace on this earth. The next war, if it comes, will prove not who is right, but who is left.

Underlying all that we do in Congress is the thought of "When will we have peace?"

The United Nations, I believe, has done a magnificent job, and its work has not been in vain. Hundreds of groups have been stimulated to further their work in organizing for world good will. But time moves on rapidly, and fear becomes so huge and powerful that its grotesqueness chokes our prospects for a joyous, prosperous, and happy world.

Any move in the direction of peace is worth trying. When I read in the Washington Evening Star on January 9 the article by Mr. Thomas L. Stokes—and I always read Thomas L. Stokes, for I think he is one of the finest and most humane columnists in America—I was particularly impressed with his reference to Mr. Irving Pflaum, foreign editor of the Chicago Sun-Times, who has made the suggestion that the people of the United States present to the people of Russia a statue of peace and brotherhood to be paid for by popular subscription by our people. His thought is much the same as that which inspired the people of France to give to the United States that glorious Goddess of Liberty which stands in New York Harbor.

The little people of Russia—the little people of the world, I am convinced, are not interested in war. They have suffered too much; they are tired. I feel sure that the little people of Russia would appreciate a gift from the little people of America. At least Mr. Pflaum's idea is well worth trying.

I should like to expand upon Mr. Pflaum's idea. I have long since believed that the women of the world should declare a strike on war. It is about time they did something about it. Women everywhere feel the same about war—regardless of the type of government under which they live or the language they speak. Any woman who has ever borne a child will fight in every way she can to keep war from coming to her country and perhaps taking her child from her. No woman, anywhere, wants

to see her son, or her husband, or her father, or her daughter sent into battle.

I am wondering, therefore, if the women who live in America—this great country where women are free to express their opinions in their own way—should not pick up Mr. Pflaum's idea and give a statue of peace and brotherhood to the women of Russia. I feel sure that our women's organizations in America would spearhead the movement and stimulate women of this country to offer such a statue of peace to the Russian women. Surely the Government of the Soviet Union would not refuse to allow the entry and acceptance of such a gift.

I believe this gesture of good will and desire for peace would be very tangible evidence, not only to the women of Russia, but to women all over the world, of the sincerity and earnest desire of the American people to seek peace among nations.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. CLEMENTE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

PEANUTS AND THE ACREAGE ALLOTMENT PLAN

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, there has been reported from the Agricultural Committee of the House an amendment to the existing law dealing with the 1950 cotton acreage. I shall not discuss this, but the difficulty that is being experienced by those who have been allocated acreage is due to the fact that the State committee and the county committee in the majority of cases failed to carry out the law, the directives, or regulations issued by the Department of Agriculture as to the allocation of acreage, that is, to reserve 10 percent for State adjustments and 15 percent for county or farm adjustments, or vice versa. The additional acreage that is proposed in the amendment will only be that much more additional cotton for the Government to purchase. The subject I desire to bring before the House is the amendment dealing with peanuts. It is a fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation purchased in 1948, 85 percent of runner-type peanuts grown, and yet, in this additional amendment it provides for the growing of additional runner-type peanuts which will mean that the Commodity Credit Corporation will have to purchase more of this type peanut. In addition to this, I am informed that in the Spanish-type area farmers are diverting from Spanish to runner-type which will further confuse this situation, whereas in the Virginia-type area there is today not a sufficient amount of this type peanut produced to meet the great market demand, and the cost to the Commodity Credit Corporation in handling this type peanut program has been negligible. Therefore, instead of reporting out this amendment, the entire peanut program should be revised so as to divide the peanut-producing areas into types similar to the tobacco program; that is, there should be the Virginia-type area, the runner-type area, and the Spanish-type area. In the light of the facts above, it is my present intention to oppose the resolution presented to the House from the Committee on Agriculture for further increasing the production of cotton and peanuts in the face of a great surplus in the market today in both crops. I am interested in saving the entire farm program—not destroying it through patchwork.

UNITED STATES CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, I introduced a bill (H. R. 6848) to authorize the judges of the Federal courts to use their discretion in imposing either a fine or imprisonment, or both, for certain offenses.

For 10 years or more, at nearly every conference of United States attorneys, composed of men who represent the great law-enforcement branch of the Federal Government, a resolution was adopted urging the repeal of the mandatory provisions of the internal revenue statutes pertaining to the manufacturing of illicit liquor and empowering the judges of the Federal courts to use their discretion in imposing fines or imprisonment in such cases. The amendments proposed in nowise change the maximum penalties heretofore provided in such cases.

The exercise of such discretion by the courts is a recognized judicial function and existing statutes which assume to curtail it by requiring the court to impose both a fine and imprisonment should be amended.

During my years of service as United States attorney for the eastern district of Tennessee, I prosecuted many cases for illicit distilling and similar offenses. In each case, where the defendant was found guilty, the court was obliged by the terms of the law to impose both a fine and imprisonment. Almost without exception, the defendant was financially unable to pay the fine imposed with the result that millions of dollars of fines were uncollected and uncollectible. If the court in those cases had been authorized to exercise its proper discretion it would not have imposed such fines.

In 1946 when Congress enacted the revision of the Criminal Code, it abolished the requirement for mandatory fines and imprisonment in scores of cases and substituted the generally accepted language permitting the court to impose either a fine or imprisonment, or both. The few provisions relating to liquor offenses which still require both fine and imprisonment were not incorporated in the Criminal Code and consequently were not amended by the act revising that code.

The Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives in its report on the revision—House Report 304, Eightieth Congress—in commenting upon the change in punishment provisions, stated that "legislative attempts to control the discretion of the sentencing judge are contrary to the opinions of experienced criminologists and criminal-law experts. They are calculated to work manifest injustice in many cases."

In the light of that statement, my bill also eliminated minimum punishments in these cases. The court could, by exercising the power it has to suspend sentence, avoid the imposition of any fine or imprisonment at all, and should have the authority to impose fines or imprisonments to a limited extent. As a matter of fact, the elimination of the minimum will enable the court to impose a just penalty where otherwise it would have suspended the imposition of any penalty.

Mr. Speaker, I urge prompt action upon my bill, H. R. 6848, so that the intention of the Congress in this matter will be extended to those few instances where the courts are still hampered by being required to impose both a fine and imprisonment.

GEN. ROBERT E. LEE

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, this being the birthday of Gen. Robert E. Lee and in view of the increasingly high esteem for this outstanding Christian military and educational leader, it is fitting that we should call attention to the occasion.

It was my privilege last night to speak before the Sidney Lanier Chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy at Confederate Memorial Hall here in the city of Washington, on the lives and characters of Gen. Robert E. Lee, Gen. Thomas J. Jackson, and Commodore Matthew Fontaine Maury, all of whose birthdays fall within the week.

I ask leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a copy of my address.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, is is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE BUDGET OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I arise to make a suggestion concerning the budget of the United States. I believe if this

suggestion were carried out, it would please a great many people back home.

Our present tax structure will bring in a little more than $37,000,000,000 this year, it is estimated.

Why not, then, give Harry Truman twice the spending money that was given Franklin Roosevelt in any peacetime year? This would require $22,000,000,000.

The remaining fifteen billions could be divided—seven and one-half billions applied on the national debt and seven and one-half billions to reduce taxes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include an article, and in the other a newspaper article.

Mr. JAMES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper item.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LICHTENWALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and to include newspaper articles.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to address the House on Monday next, after the disposition of the regular business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered, for 5 minutes, on the subject John L. Lewis versus Samuel Gompers.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to address the house today for 15 minutes at the conclusion of the legislative business and any other special orders heretofore entered.

STATE SEALS

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we have had a great deal of discussion about the beautiful old traditional glass seals that many of us understood were to be put where these almost invisible and rather indistinguishable seals have been placed by the Architect of the Capitol.

It happens that in London there is being built a chapel, a memorial to the American men who died in England for the freedom of the world. This chapel is to be reached from St. Paul's Cathedral through beautiful wrought-iron gates overshadowed by several stained-glass windows. The reports that come to me advised that the suggestion has been made to make these windows out of the seals of the States.

The British are a people who have a deep regard for tradition; they know its value. It has occurred to me that we might well find out whether the beautiful old seals under which the laws of this great country have been drafted for some 90 years, which have been rejected by those responsible for the changes in this Chamber, might be acceptable to those who are building this memorial chapel. Should this be the case—and no other suggestion for a suitable use of these traditional bits of American glass be forthcoming—I feel sure that we can feel certain of the respect and care that will be given these rejected seals on into the dim future.

REPEAL OF EXCISE TAXES

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, cameras and films are not luxury items in my home city of Binghamton, N. Y., the home of 8,000 Ansco workers who make film and cameras. The Ansco plant is one of the largest of its kind in the world. From time to time they have called upon me to urge the Congress to remove excise taxes once and for all. I am carrying out their demand here today and express the hope that this House will be given the opportunity to vote down excise taxes so that the workers in the Ansco plant in Binghamton will have the chance to make a livelihood and continue with their jobs. Their jobs are being threatened because production is down.

Personally, I do not look upon cameras and photographic equipment as luxuries. They are simply a part of the advanced American standard of living. They should be within the reach of the pocketbook of every American. The 25-percent addition to these prices, which is the excise tax, is exorbitant and unnecessary. The public has the right to enjoy these films and cameras at a reasonable cost, and I think the tremendous excise tax upon them is outrageous and should be taken off.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

THE POWER OF THE RULES COMMITTEE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from one of my colleagues.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a letter from a colleague reads as follows:

JANUARY 17, 1950.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: There is pending before the House at this time an issue of transcendent importance to the American people: Shall a majority of the House of Representatives retain control of the legislative processes or shall this control be returned to a small group of willful men in the Committee on Rules?

The move by the Committee on Rules to seize anew its former arbitrary power to block legislation favorably reported by other standing committees of the House is a grave threat to representative government.

The issue is far more important than any measure against which the rules change is purportedly directed. Regardless of party, can any Member who really believes in democracy deny to a majority of the House the right even to decide whether a given bill shall be taken up for debate?

To abolish the 21-day discharge rule can only result in deterioration of legislative processes that, as a matter of fact, need strengthening. This is not a partisan issue. The rules of the House affect all parties. When the 21-day rule was adopted, earnest cooperation by Members of both parties resulted in the final action that was hailed throughout the press of this land as a major achievement in good government.

A vote on this important issue is probable before the week end. I appeal to you to come forth and confirm the faith of the people in the Congress.

Sincerely,

HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
Chairman, Informal Rules Reform Committee.

I wish to call attention to one paragraph. Let me read:

Regardless of party, can any Member who really believes in democracy deny to a majority of the House the right even to decide whether a given bill shall be taken up for debate?

It is my hope that if and when the distinguished gentleman ascends the bench, becomes a Federal judge, that he go a little deeper in his research to ascertain the facts and then be a little more accurate in the conclusions which he expresses from the bench than he is in this letter. Anyone who ever paid any attention to the House rules and procedure knows that the House has never been gagged as to legislation which it wished to consider.

Whenever 218, a majority of the Members, want to vote on a bill, they have the power to bring it to the floor.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THE POWER OF THE RULES COMMITTEE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to reply to the statement just made by my friend the gentleman from Michigan.

On January 3, 1949, this Congress, by an overwhelming vote of 275 to 143, voted for a rule which would permit legislation to come from any committee whose

chairman desired to stand on the floor after a certain period of time and ask that the legislation be considered by 435 Members of the House. In the last analysis, each Member of Congress owes his responsibility to the people in his district and the Nation to show where he stands on controversial legislation. So far as I am concerned, I am not willing to go back to the Dark Ages when six men on the Rules Committee could decide arbitrarily on the merits of legislation. I believe that it is an individual responsibility for every Member of Congress to decide whether a piece of legislation has merit or does not have merit, and I, as one Member, do not need six men to sit as a superjury and exercise judicial opinion as to whether I shall be allowed to vote upon any piece of legislation. I say that any man who does not have the guts to decide for himself on controversial measures needs a wet nurse in place of six men on the Rules Committee to help him out.

I understand that a motion to adjourn will be made just before consideration of the Cox resolution, House Resolution 133, which is to be considered Friday. In my opinion, any attempt to postpone consideration of this measure is dilatory and without justification.

The Member who votes to adjourn on Friday puts himself on record as being unwilling to vote on probably the most important matter which will face the Eighty-first Congress.

Unless the Cox resolution is defeated, every piece of legislation passed by the House, which is now pending in the Senate or in conference, is jeopardized by the possibility of possible adverse action of the Rules Committee through blocking the report of conference reports to the House. Please note that I said "possible adverse action."

Future legislation such as the National Science Foundation bill, legislation for middle-income housing, hospital and medical scholarship aid, as well as other progressive legislation, may be denied legislative consideration.

The failure to defeat the Cox resolution will be regarded as a key vote to kill every progressive measure to which the Democratic Party is pledged.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he made before the Junior Bar Association of Milwaukee, Wis.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include certain telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, there are strange rumors afloat that our Republican colleagues have succumbed to the wiles of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], and, following his leadership, are going to attempt to adjourn the House when it convenes tomorrow.

I think these gentlemen might be interested to know that I have just received a telegram from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People urging that the House meet tomorrow, stay in session and vote down the proposed change in the rules tomorrow and not do any monkeying around with further parliamentary procedure.

The telegram reads:

Hon. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
House Office Building:

We urge that the House remain in session on Friday, January 20 and vote down the Rules Committee's proposal to change the 21-day rule.

ROY WILKINS,
Acting Secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

The duration of this strange affair between the Republicans and Mr. MARCANTONIO is unpredictable, but its existence cannot be doubted.

How else account for his strange insistence that we adjourn Friday without whipping the attempt to rescind the 21-day rule? The Republicans are in favor of this device, but are squirming on the hook as the result of a wire each of the minority Members received from the NAACP this morning which read in part—and I quote:

The entire civil-rights program is endangered by the proposal of the Rules Committee to abandon the present 21-day rule. We urge you to be present at all sessions to vote against this dangerous backward step.

Remember the same group has specifically stated it wants the vote on this motion to come tomorrow on the single and clearcut issue of the rule.

If the gentleman from New York thinks he can get the whole Republican Party off the hook, he will find himself sadly mistaken.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, this week will go down in the history of the Congress as the week of rank hypocrisy. If the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] who has been protesting so vociferously his love for FEPC wanted the FEPC bill enacted, his first obligation would be to see to it that the resolution which makes it impossible to bring up FEPC on Monday would not come up tomorrow, so that on Monday next we could vote on FEPC.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] has been here long enough to know that if the resolution comes up tomorrow and if it is adopted we will not have a chance to vote on FEPC on Monday next. Why take the risk? He loves FEPC when he does not have a chance to vote on it; when he has a chance to vote on it that love fades far, far away.

He may as well face it. Despite his glib talk, the people will know that his vote against adjournment tomorrow will be a vote against FEPC.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is proceeding on an altogether wrong premise. This resolution to amend the rules of the House, in my opinion, will not prevail. I have always been a supporter of FEPC. I am also, and have been, a supporter of President Truman's program. I want Mr. Truman's program, including the FEPC, to win. That is the reason I want this resolution to amend the rules defeated on Friday. I want it out of the way. The gentleman is also proceeding in his interpretation of the rules on a wrong premise. I can tell him I have that on competent authority.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is interesting to note the relationship on adjournment Friday between the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] and the Republican leadership.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I understand the suggestion was first made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] to offer a motion to adjourn tomorrow, and I understand also the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] has accepted that suggestion from him. So they are working together.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. If the gentleman really wants FEPC, why take a chance on bringing up this resolution tomorrow, which may kill FEPC? He cannot get away from that. He can cover it with all the baloney about the Republicans he wants to, but he cannot escape the fact that bringing up this resolution tomorrow endangers FEPC.

Mr. EBERHARTER. If the gentleman wants to sacrifice votes so that the Truman Fair Deal program will be defeated, that is up to him.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is what the Democratic leadership is doing when it calls up the resolution tomorrow. It is just double talking.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he will deliver today to the Daughters of the Confederacy in Constitution Hall.

KOREAN AID ACT OF 1949

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 368 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5330) to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to the Republic of Korea. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the Korean aid bill, known as H. R. 5330, reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It has the approval of the President and the Secretary of State.

The Committee on Rules has heard the considered evidence of gentlemen who have spent 2 and 3 years in that new Republic. They are of the opinion, and firmly believe, that this legislation is absolutely necessary to aid Korea, and that without this aid it would be impossible to bring about the conditions and improvements they are seeking in the interests of the people of that country. Of course, it calls for an authorization of $150,000,000, but, Mr. Speaker, we already have expended in aid to Korea about $360,000,000. Unless this bill is passed, I fear that the $360,000,000 that has been heretofore expended will be lost. Of course, there are some who believe that the appropriation of $150,000,000 provided for in this bill may also be lost because of the danger that Russia may step in and take over. But, I have it on very good authority from people who know, who are informed, and who have made a thorough investigation, that there is no such danger. So, therefore, the argument that this might be lost, is not well founded and not supported by real facts.

Personally, I am for economy and I am willing to reduce appropriations everywhere possible or feasible. Our friends on the other side advocate economy, but unfortunately every time they have a chance to vote for increased appropriations, they do so. Therefore in this instance the charge that the authorization of $150,000,000 should not prevail or should not be granted, on the theory that we should reduce the deficit, is not well founded. We have appropriated billions and billions of dollars for countries nowhere near as deserving as Korea, and I do not know of any better investment we have ever made than by granting this rule. Therefore, after hearing the evidence of those who know, the Committee on Rules reported this rule, and I am going to ask for its adoption making in order the bill providing that much-needed relief.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has filed a very comprehensive report on this measure, tracing the genesis of the present situation from its early beginnings, through the period of liberation of the Korean people from Japanese control and domination, and the development of the impasse with Soviet Russia regarding the political future of Korea. It has developed, in this report, the various stages by which the United States now finds itself with an obligation to the Korean people and the Republic of Korea—the direct obligation upon which this bill is passed.

In the very short period of time since the Republic of Korea was established, democratic elections have been held and a government of, by, and for the people has been established.

Bolstered by the love of freedom and independence that has kept it a liberty-seeking nation under 40 years of Japanese rule—retaining this same spirit of determination for self-rule during 3 years of division and occupation following the end of hostilities in the Far East, the people of Korea have not faltered during the difficult first year or more of the republic. They have met the challenge of establishing a new government of their own. They have woven together the traditions of their 4,000 years of history with modern democratic theory into a solid pattern of successful government. This has all been accomplished in the face of a threat as great as that faced by any nation on the face of the globe—the Communist threat and operation in the northern section of that land.

Through American military cooperation in the defense program and the economic support granted through ECA, Korea has been enabled to establish itself as a free nation and to make the fullest possible contribution in the global struggle to safeguard democratic freedom against the aggressive drive of totalitarian communism. Korea has constantly reiterated its intention to stand shoulder to shoulder with the friends of freedom against every totalitarian threat.

The present bill presents the first full effort by Congress to place in the form of legislation a definite policy toward Korea. All other assistance to Korea has been in the form of appropriations requested by the President. The policy established by this legislation carries out the principles of the Charter of the United Nations as part of United States foreign policy.

There is also an indirect relation to the security of the United States in this Korean program. If Korea falls, the Communists are just that much closer to Japan. For us to withdraw from Korea today, as far as this assistance is concerned, without giving these people who have placed their entire trust in us for survival, is just not an honorable American action to expect. We owe it as much to the indomitable Korean people, as we do to our friends across the Atlantic, to give them all the financial, moral, and military support we can, if not more so.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, I submit herewith a detailed estimate by projects of the proposed program of assistance under this bill for fiscal year 1950 as follows:

	Total cost estimate
Food:	
Vegetable oil	$160,000
Salt	630,000
Total	790,000
Fertilizer and agricultural supplies:	
Nitrogenous	24,640,000
Gross tonnage	
Superphosphates	5,090,000
Insecticides and fungicides	600,000
Total	30,330,000
Petroleum products	9,870,000
Coking coal	300,000
Medical supplies	550,000
Raw and semifinished materials:	
Raw cotton	9,389,000
Manila fiber	412,000
Chemicals	3,587,600
Hides and skins	499,000
Textiles (marine)	770,000
Lumber	7,380,000
Wood pulp	590,000
Special petroleum products	476,000
Construction materials	409,000
Iron and steel	1,780,000
Tin plate	83,000
Nonferrous metals	270,000
Crude rubber	1,371,000
Total	27,016,000
Equipment and supplies:	
Iron and steel products	2,128,000
Electrical apparatus	526,000
Mining equipment	989,000
Marine equipment	896,000
Total	4,539,000
Items in specific recovery projects:	
Roads and bridges	2,228,000
Irrigation and reclamation	1,950,000
Salt production	210,000
Electric power	5,733,000
Signals and communications	1,400,000
Coal and other mining	2,804,000
Silk manufacture	400,000
Railroad building	3,010,000
Pig-iron plant	300,000
Coal cargo vessels	3,000,000
Fishing vessels	6,080,000
Processing of coal	775,000
Cement plant	3,950,000
Total	31,840,840
Surveys and contracts:	
Operation of 2 power barges	700,000
Marine repair base	150,000
Coastwise shipping	715,000
Surveys	650,000
Total	2,215,000
Technical assistance:	
Training Koreans in United States	272,000
Technical training in Korea	400,000
Supplies and equipment	1,100,000
Mission advisory staff	2,174,000
Total	3,946,000

	Total cost estimate
Ocean freight:	
Food products	$1,265,000
Fertilizer and supplies	15,938,000
Petroleum products	4,444,000
Coking coal	455,000
Medical supplies	11,000
Raw and semifinished materials	6,450,000
Equipment and supplies	385,000
Recovery projects	1,640,000
Technical assistance	80,000
Relief packages	125,000
Army 1949 procurement	5,800,000
Total	36,593,000
Kimpo Airport	730,000
Administration	1,280,400
Grand total	150,000,000

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago a Member of the House made the statement that one of the colored organizations is opposed to the adjournment of the House tomorrow before taking up the resolution to amend the rules. Since that time I have had a message conveyed to me to the effect that the National Negro Council supports adjournment and urges its friends to vote for adjournment tomorrow.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the rule on this bill, but I have very serious doubts with regard to the bill itself. It is a bill that brings up some extremely important considerations dealing with the foreign policy of the United States.

Testimony will be given here at a later date to the effect that Korea is militarily untenable, that under none of our defense plans as such could we consider trying to hold Korea in the event of aggressive action north of the thirty-eighth parallel by either Communist-trained Korean troops or by Russian troops.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, Korea is an independent republic. It became an independent republic as a result of our military action and as a result of the United Nations recognition of it as a newly created independent republic, an independence which it had not had for a long period of time since it had been under Japanese domination.

That republic is today struggling in the southern half of what constituted the old territory of Korea to maintain itself from an economic point of view in the face of a very serious and difficult economic situation. We have spent nearly half a billion dollars in military occupation costs in that country. We have already spent some $60,000,000 since the independent republic was established in trying to give it economic aid so that it can stand on its own feet.

The main objection that I have to the bill that will be before us is to its statement of purpose at the outset, which commits us to what in effect is a long-range aid-to-Korea program. In the uncertain Far East today, I think it would be a great mistake for us to make a commitment of that kind. On the other hand, we are faced by this situation.

If we withdraw aid from Korea, no witness can possibly testify that there will not be economic chaos in a comparatively short time and that then the standard technique which Russian communism has used everywhere is sure to step in, namely to develop in that chaos a strong Communist cell which would begin a revolution which would get its support from the Communist Koreans north of the 38th parallel and eventually from the Soviet Government.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. RANKIN. As a matter of fact, is it not true that the United States now owes more money than all the rest of the countries of the world put together? Is that your understanding?

Mr. HERTER. I would assume so.

Mr. RANKIN. You talk about chaos in Korea. If we keep pouring the money of the American taxpayers down the rat-holes of Europe, Asia, Israel, Africa, and Japan, how long will it be before we will be in economic chaos?

Mr. HERTER. I do not agree with the gentleman's statement with regard to rate-holes. I think we have a security interest of the first order in trying to maintain the free peoples of this world. We are not strong enough militarily or financially or in any other way to live in a world which is completely dominated by the Communists on every side of us.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Korea is a small country among the vast population of China, is it not?

Mr. HERTER. It is. The area that we are talking about, I think, embraces about 21,000,000 people.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. If Korea were armed according to our standards, as we are today, could it maintain its independence against an onslaught from the rest of China and Russia?

Mr. HERTER. I would think probably not.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Did I understand the gentleman to say that since the establishment of the Republic of Korea we have spent $60,000,000 there?

Mr. HERTER. We have done that through appropriations in one form or another, but without any formal authorization. The Congress, as I understand it, has never made any commitment of any kind by legislation for continuing Korean aid.

Mr. KEATING. Unless I am in error, the total expenditures set forth on page 26 of the report, which have been made in Korea to date, are $385,000,000.

Mr. HERTER. Those figures include the military occupation costs before the Independent Republic of Korea was set up, while we were the occupation authority.

Mr. KEATING. I see. The $60,000,000 you speak of is only a portion of that $385,000,000?

Mr. HERTER. The $60,000,000 is what has been spent since the independence of the Republic was proclaimed and recognized by the world.

Mr. KEATING. Is that in addition to the $385,000,000 to which I have referred?

Mr. HERTER. That is in addition.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Is it not a fact that the United States Government now owes more than the total assessed valuation of all the property west of the Mississippi River?

Mr. HERTER. I am not sure of the figure. The gentleman is undoubtedly correct.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. It is very close to it, if not exactly that. Is it not a fact that during the past 2 years the Federal Government collected more in taxes than at any time in the history of the Government, and we still went into the red?

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Is it not a fact that if we give these $130,000,000 to Korea we will have to borrow the money, or else raise the national debt?

Mr. HERTER. It will certainly increase the deficit. There is no question about that. I think that is a very important consideration. I had hoped that this Korean matter could be cared for on a different basis from that which is provided for in this bill. Actually, you will hear testimony to the effect that this bill makes an authorization, or will, after an amendment offered by the committee, for only $60,000,000 additional. However, the statement of intent, at the beginning of the bill, will make for a moral commitment which would certainly carry over a very much longer period of time.

However, Mr. Speaker, as this is a matter of real major policy in connection with our over-all world policy, I feel the rule should be adopted and that both sides ought to have a full opportunity to be heard.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that we are trying to get funds to build some veterans' hospitals which are very necessary. We are told that the opposition is opposing it on the ground of economy. Yet here they come along and propose to give out of the taxpayers' money, out of the pockets of many of these disabled veterans themselves, not only $150,000,000 provided in this bill, but probably it will run to half a billion before it is through. I cannot see the consistency.

Mr. HERTER. I think the gentleman is correct in his statement. On the

other hand, I think we have a major problem that comes ahead of any other problem, and that is the problem of our own security.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Has it come to the gentleman's attention that many, many Members on both sides of the aisle went back to their districts this last summer and got up and told how they were for economy; that we were spending too much, and that we could not continue to do what we were doing. Is that not true?

Mr. HERTER. I am very sure of that.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Today some of those people who have been talking economy will have a chance to vote, and we will see whether they will back up the promises they made to the people back home.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire to use any additional time?

Mr. HERTER. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this bill and I oppose this rule. Considered in the light of our policy in the Far East, this program, which is not a one-hundred-and-twenty-million-dollar program but a permanent policy which involves a present program of $385,000,000, is, to use General Marshall's words, a "piecemeal palliative" that I think we just cannot afford.

We are not going to get enough light on our far-eastern policy, with reference to China and the rest of Asia, from the published hearings or in 1 hour of general debate to make an intelligent decision. Remember, this is not a 1-year proposition. True, the authorization is for 1 year, but if you will look at the bill, section 2 provides:

> It is hereby declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to continue to assist the people of Korea—

And there is no termination date put on it.

Since this is such a long-range policy, your committee last June decided to obtain testimony on our whole far-eastern situation from Secretary Acheson, Under Secretary Webb, George Kennon, and Assistant Secretary Butterworth for the Far East. You will find hardly any of that testimony, however, in the hearings. I tried to find out from the Department of State the reason for this suppression of testimony, and I received a letter from the Secretary of State last night, in which he said:

> We followed the principle of including in the testimony cleared for release, only information which pertained to the subject of aid to Korea, the issue involved in this legislation.

However, on page 115 of the hearings, you will find a statement by Mr. Webb, Under Secretary of State, of the Administration's story on the whole situation in China. If you will look, however, on pages 149 and 150 you will find no indication that Mr. Butterworth, when it came to his testimony, deleted not only what he said but what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and I said, and you will find no indication that there has been a deletion or suppression.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 4]

Abbitt	Green	Phillips, Tenn.
Allen, Calif.	Heffernan	Powell
Barrett, Pa.	Hobbs	Sasscer
Bennett, Fla.	Hoffman, Ill.	Scudder
Bland	Irving	Simpson, Pa.
Blatnik	Jensen	Smathers
Buckley, N. Y.	Judd	Smith, Ohio
Bulwinkle	Keogh	Stanley
Burdick	Kilburn	Stigler
Cavalcante	King	Taylor
Celler	McGrath	Vursell
Davenport	McSweeney	Wadsworth
Davies, N. Y.	Macy	White, Idaho
Dingell	Moulder	Wier
Dondero	Murphy	Withrow
Durham	Noland	Wolcott
Fugate	Pace	Wolverton
Fulton	Pfeiffer, William L.	Woodhouse
Gilmer		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 376 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

KOREAN AID ACT OF 1949

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I did not ask for a quorum. But there were those who thought some of you who were absent might like to hear something about this Korean aid bill. I am opposed to the bill and opposed to the rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate. I think in the light of our total far eastern policy—or lack of policy—this permanent policy of assisting Korea with a program, not of $120,000,000, that is only the first installment, but of $385,000,000, and leaving Korea in the red $35,000,000 after 3 years, is—to use General Marshall's words—a "piecemeal palliative." To use a more common expression, this is strictly rat-hole money which we cannot afford.

You cannot consider this intelligently without considering our whole far-eastern policy, but you will not get our far-eastern policy out of the hearings printed in this bill.

When this bill came up in committee on June 8, last summer, with orders that it must be through the Congress by June 30, the committee wanted to know about our whole far-eastern policy, of which Korea and its policy is a small part, and called for administration witnesses and held hearings for 9 days. But you will not find all that in this book. The State Department has suppressed almost all of the hearings that would give the background of this matter. However, not quite all.

I have been attempting for 6 months to find out what military or diplomatic secrecy justified the suppression, not only of the testimony of departmental witnesses, but statements of mine and Mr. JUDD's before the committee. I received a letter from Secretary Acheson on that, last evening, and this is what he said:

> I have given careful consideration to your request that certain testimony given in executive session in June 1949 be released for publication and I regret that I cannot agree with your proposal.
>
> It will be recalled that at the inception of the hearing in question, it was agreed that no departmental testimony would be made public without the consent of the Department. In making our recommendations to the committee last year as to which testimony should be made public, we followed the principle of including in the testimony cleared for release only the information which pertained to the subject of aid to Korea, the issue involved in this legislation—except for a small portion thereof which, for security reasons, we felt should not be made public.
>
> Officials of the Department discussed very frankly with members of the committee in executive session many other matters. To publish a discussion of this nature, extraneous to the main issue involved, or to publish excerpts from it out of context, would, in my opinion, not be consistent with the kind of continuing confidential relationship which, of necessity, must exist between officials of the Department and members of the committee on matters handled in executive session.

However, you will find a statement read by Under Secretary of State Webb on the whole Chinese situation on page 115 of the hearings. That was apparently not considered extraneous. That was information which pertains to the subject of aid to Korea. But you will not find any cross-examination of Mr. Webb, Mr. Kennan, or Mr. Butterworth on the background of the Chinese policy. Anything the committee asked was apparently "extraneous."

These hearings were such as are conducted on appropriations and by other committees. They were in executive session, in this case to prevent any inadvertent leak of military or diplomatic secrets. But there was to be prepared a record to come to the floor so that the rest of the Congress would know something about what went on. The Department officials were permitted to edit the statements of their own witnesses and to take out anything of military or diplomatic secrecy. I will not disclose what any administration witness said in the hearing. I do feel justified, however, in telling you not what some witness said, not what I asked but what I said there, so as to ask you whether or not you can conceive that what I referred to was a diplomatic or military secret. I said:

> Mr. VORYS. The gentleman is so highly erroneous and distorts the history of the legislation so shockingly that I feel I should correct him.
>
> I want to read from the conference report. The Senate does not have a conference report, but by tradition and usage, uses the House conference report to explain the thing on the floor of the Senate:

"Of the total authorization it was agreed that $125,000,000 should be provided under the language of the Senate bill, allowing for aid of military character, with $338,000,000 remaining for the economic reconstruction type of aid. In making this adjustment the allotment for military aid is slightly larger in proportion to purely economic aid than in the original House bill. These changes are embodied in section 404 of the agreed bill."

It was at the insistence of the Department of State, their entreaties and insistence during that conference, that the words "military aid" were not inserted into the bill, and the same thing happened on the Senate bill. But the House report shows quite clearly that the net result of the conference was to raise the military aid as it said here:

"The allotment for military aid is slightly larger in proportion than in the original House bill."

So any deletion of the word "military," and insistence that it should be put in solely as an appropriation to the President, was solely at the insistence of the State Department, in opposition to the views of both Houses and the conferees of both Houses, and therefore to take that as a statement of the intention of Congress, in view of the contemporary statements outside the statute, that this was to be military aid, is shockingly inaccurate history.

Here is what Mr. JUDD said that was deleted from the published hearings:

Mr. JUDD. It is worse than subterfuge to come down and ask Congress to agree to language that would be less provocative and then take our agreement as indicating we did not want you to carry out the purpose that was in the original language.

Mr. JUDD later furnished for insertion in the Korean aid hearings the following from the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, June 10, 1948, page 527:

Mr. THORP. May I make sure that my answer to the question of our attitude on this legislation is clear, that we in the State Department question the desirability of the proviso which was placed by the House Appropriations Committee in connection with this expenditure which would tie it into the objectives and limitations in the act for assistance to Greece and Turkey. At that point we feel that there should be a change in the legislation.

* * * * *

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. May I make one statement, sir? The Secretary of State, who I believe is appearing before the committee shortly, did authorize me to state that he is opposed to the provision regarding the inclusion of China in Greek-Turkish legislation.

This quotation from a public hearing, furnished for the record by a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. JUDD, was deleted from the purported hearings on Korean aid by the State Department.

The statement of Mr. W. W. Butterworth on June 20, contained on pages 149 and 150 of the printed hearings does not indicate that there was any omission or deletion of any kind in his own testimony, nor does it show the suppression of these statements by two committee members.

As I say, the full story of our Far Eastern policy is suppressed in the hearings, and this story cannot be presented adequately under a rule that permits only 1 hour of debate.

However, using such light as we have, viewed in the perspective of our Far Eastern policy, let us look at this Korean-aid proposition. I want to take my text from General Marshall in his famous Harvard speech of June 5, 1947. We had gone through a lot of piecemeal, stop-gap foreign-aid legislation, and Congress and the country were getting tired of it; so at Harvard General Marshall said, as to future aid policy:

Such assistance, I am convinced, must not be on a piecemeal basis as various crises develop; any assistance that this Government may render in the future should provide a cure rather than a mere palliative.

I believed that, and that is the policy I have been attempting to follow ever since. It is the policy that is not followed here. In this legislation there is no direct benefit to our military security; our troops are out; the Soviets can come into southern Korea whenever they wish. I call your attention to page 170 of the hearings.

This is no economic cure, but a palliative. The program was ably and honestly presented by ECA. Mr. Hoffman himself testified, and you will find his testimony at page 15 of the hearings and in the report at pages 27 and 28, that 25 percent of this money is to go for freight. The first part of the program is to last 3 years and to cost not $120,000,000, but $385,000,000. At the end of that period Korea will be out of balance $35,000,000. So it cannot be justified as an economic cure for the ills of Korea.

There is no commitment, no agreement, no obligation. If you will turn to page 182 of the hearings you will find that Mr. Claxton from the Department of State, said:

This is not a commitment in the sense of an international treaty, an international agreement; it is not as much as a promise.

Why, therefore, do we go forward with this program which does not involve our military security, which does not help solve our own economic problems and will not solve Korea's economic problems, with half of Korea under Communist control, and for which we have no obligation, no commitment? Why? Because we helped Korea secure independence. How about Indonesia? We helped Indonesia secure independence in the United Nations and outside. How about Israel? We helped Israel secure independence in the United Nations and outside. How about India, Finland, Burma, Austria, and other countries whose independence and membership in the family of nations we aided and welcomed? Are we to continue to assist them, or is Korea to be a special case?

The Koreans are fine people, a gallant people who are making a magnificent struggle. We have helped them to the tune of $445,000,000 already. They may, however, have to do as we did after we achieved our independence—get along without outside help.

On June 23, Secretary Acheson stated before our committee in summing up his argument for Korean aid—hearings, page 192:

There is no assurance that the thing is going to be successful; there is complete assurance that Korea will go in 2 or 3 months if you do not do this.

Last June the Secretary said:

There is complete assurance that Korea will go in 2 or 3 months if you do not do this.

Six months later, Korea is still holding her head up as an independent nation and we have not done this; we have not passed this bill. When it comes to the Far East, our Secretary of State shows as much ability in predicting the future as he does in explaining the past.

We cannot justify this as conscience money. There are those who would vote for it because their consciences hurt them for what they have done, or not done, about China and Formosa. My conscience does not hurt me as to what I have advocated for Asia, China, Formosa.

There are those who want to vote for this on an "iffy" basis; on the basis that if we had done what we should have in China, Manchuria, Formosa, at Yalta, and so forth, Korea would now be a sound economic and military part of our policy. I cannot justify a vote based on something that did not happen, merely because I wish it had happened. We must face the situation as it is, regardless of how it got that way.

There are those who will vote for this as a vote of confidence in the policy or lack of policy of their administration and the Secretary of State. I have no such confidence.

There are those who are voting for this on a sympathy basis. Congress voted money for Finland back in 1940 out of sympathy. I voted against it. I felt then about them as I do about this. I feel a great sympathy for the Republic of Korea and will show it in my own voluntary way; but I do not think Congressmen have any right to be sympathetic or charitable with other people's money.

I have given a good bit of thought, as we get closer to the deadline in our own financial status, as we go deeper into the red, to this whole matter. This is a goodwill, humanitarian, charity measure. Of all human virtues, the greatest is charity, but it is an individual virtue, and it must be voluntary. You cannot be charitable with somebody else's money. I have come to the conclusion that Congress has no right to appropriate money, to take it from American taxpayers by involuntary means, to give to foreign countries for solely charitable purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, not only has Congress no right under our Constitution to give away taxpayers' money solely for charitable purposes, but foreign countries do not believe us when we say we are giving them something just because we love them. They look for the "gimmick."

Mr. Speaker, I hope our people continue to be big-hearted, charitable, and humanitarian. I hope that our great voluntary agencies, our churches, continue the fine work they have carried on

so magnificently during the 160 years of our existence. But whatever our Government does should serve our own purpose and policies and we should say so.

Under present circumstances and in view of our present policies in Asia, we are not justified in adding to our deficit any further by voting money for this permanent policy of economic aid to Korea. It may be that in the future as we develop a new policy, as we develop legislation which is now before our committee, Korea will receive aid under some mutual aid plan, some far eastern plan that makes sense and conforms to some sensible policy. I hope that day will come. But in the present state of our policy or lack of policy, we should not vote money down the Korean rat hole that will not save them militarily, that will not add to our military security, that will not help us economically, but will be, on the contrary, an economic drain, that will not solve their economic problem, a program for which we have made no promise, no commitment, no obligation.

Mr. Speaker, this rule should be voted down. If it is not voted down, I shall offer a motion to recommit this bill for further study and hearings so that it may be brought in here later in order that we may know what we are doing.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I do not know what rules the gentleman has in his committee in the taking of testimony in hearings, but I have never yet heard in our committee that departments are given permission to edit or delete any of the questions propounded by a Member of Congress on the committee. However, in case of security we have an understanding that the testimony is always available to all of the committee, and there is no deletion.

Mr. VORYS. Up to this Korean aid bill that was, so far as I remember, the practice in our committee. In this instance not my questions, but my statement as well as that of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], to the committee—not on any military or diplomatic question but on what the China Aid Act of 1948 meant—was deleted, and I have been unable to get it back in, and I have been trying for 6 months.

Mr. STEFAN. Under the rule of our committee when that happens in a department, the original transcript is returned to the committee with the original statement and the questions, and no deletion is allowed. But, it is not made public. However, if it is of a secret nature it is left in the committee for the information of the members of the committee, of course. But, that statement had something to do with security, did it?

Mr. VORYS. No. It had nothing to do with security. My statement and the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], had to do with the construction of the China Aid Act of 1948.

Mr. STEFAN. That ought to be corrected in the gentleman's committee by a rule set up in that committee.

Mr. VORYS. It certainly should.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman quoted the Secretary of State. If the gentleman will read further in the statement of the Secretary of State he said that if nothing is done, Korea will be lost within 2 or 3 months. What would the gentleman say to that?

Mr. VORYS. On June 23 the Secretary of State said—and it is in the hearings—"There is no assurance that the thing is going to be successful. There is complete assurance that Korea will go in 2 or 3 months if you do not do this." That was 6 months ago. I submit that his ability as a prophet is equal to his ability as an apologist for our policy in the Far East.

The SPEAKER. The time for the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I followed closely the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], and with a great deal of interest. I appreciate the fact that he has spent considerable time in China and that he has an active interest in Chinese affairs.

Of course, we have two or three other gentlemen, who, like the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], seem to be, for reasons unknown to me, continually assailing the administration policy and urging the support of the corrupt and vicious Chiang Kai-shek government. This latter government has been misruled for many years by a most tainted clique, whom the United States has aided, in the last few years, with three to four billion dollars and with millions upon millions of dollars worth of supplies and war materials. Yes, with air power, naval power, vehicles, and ammunition, notwithstanding the reports of such men as Gen. George Marshall and General Wedemeyer, who reported to the people of the United States that Chiang and his dishonest group refused to bring about any agreement for peace between the Chinese Nationalists and the revolutionary forces. Not only these two great generals, but many others have made clear the fact that our aid to China could not and has not saved the crooked Chiang government from defeat. Witness the Chinese white paper that was published last year by our State Department.

In the last three or four months we have come to generally recognize and realize that the days of the Chiang regime are gone forever and are far beyond any hope of being retained. Witness the moving of Chiang Kai-shek and his capital city from one place to another until now, they have abandoned the Chinese mainland and have retreated to Formosa.

Now comes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] and objects to the authorization of this small amount to Korea and to aid the new Korean Republic. Korea is pleading and urging us to aid them so as to enable them to maintain themselves and retain their hard-won freedom and independence which they gained about a year ago. The gentleman from Ohio concedes that the Koreans are a splendid people, and I concur. Although I am interested in economy, I feel that by our aiding the Koreans and helping them maintain their freedom, it is well worth the amount called for in this bill as opposed to the spending of billions of dollars to aid the old Chinese clique in Formosa and their lust for returned power, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] and others urged. It is comparable to sinking money into a rat hole, for certainly that is what has happened to the billions of dollars that we have spent and that the gentleman from Ohio would like us to spend on China and Formosa.

Of course, there are several other gentlemen on his Republican side who preach economy and yet advocate the spending of billions of dollars on the lost cause of China. All this because they were in China for a short time and sympathize with China, but not with the poor, unfortunate, oppressed common people of China who have been fighting valiantly for many years to overthrow the corrupt Chiang government so that they can obtain better social and economic conditions for themselves and their families.

However, other well-informed men, in addition to our State Department, which seems to be possessed of all the facts, know what is for the best interests of the United States—certainly more so than the gentlemen who are appealing for aid to the Chinese and Formosa.

I personally believe that the appropriation provided for herein will be of tremendous help in strengthening the Koreans in their desire to retain their independence, and the Koreans do not fear any Russian threats. I have been at all times in favor of aiding all peoples and countries who are seeking their freedom and independence. Consequently, after talking with many people who know the true facts, as I said before, although I was first opposed to this bill, I came to the conclusion that it will be of tremendous aid and benefit to the Koreans and to the United States as well.

Since I have not observed any real opposition to the rule, and as the House is well-informed on the subject, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5330) to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to the Republic of Korea.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5330, with Mr. BONNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it should be understood in the beginning that this bill (H. R. 5330) has, in the form of S. 2319, already passed the Senate. As passed in the other body it authorized an appropriation of $150,000,000 for Korean aid. That happened the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. The bill before you today, H. R. 5330, failed of consideration in the House at the last session of this Congress and is now called up at this session for the consideration of the Members of the House.

I am glad to say, however, that when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule I will offer an amendment reducing the amount called for in the authorization clause of the bill from $150,000,000 to $60,000,000. This reduction is authorized and justified by the fact that because of the failure of the last Congress to provide sufficient funds to carry the work in Korea on through the fiscal year 1950, the director of this aid in Korea was unable to do many things which could have been done had the money been available.

In other words, when the bill was first introduced in this House, the director of ECA operations in Korea was about out of money. He had very little available from former appropriations. He asked for $150,000,000 to carry him through the fiscal year 1950. This means from July 1, 1949, on through June 30, 1950. He failed to receive, and the Congress failed to authorize, the appropriation; but from time to time, in order to carry on operations in Korea that it was necessary to carry on, there was appropriated in piecemeal sections to this project the sum of $60,000,000 throughout the course of a few months.

The first appropriation amounted to $17,500,000. There was a second appropriation which I believe amounted to something like three to four millions. There was another appropriation which amounted to $30,000,000, and to the latter appropriation was credited or charged the former appropriations which had been given piecemeal. Altogether during the course of the last year, up until February 15th of this year, they had available for aid to Korea $60,000,000, which was insufficient to carry on the program to its full and complete extent.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. That brings me to the very question I was going to ask the gentleman at the beginning of this discourse. As I am informed the $60,000,000 that you propose to authorize by this bill was spent without an authorization, is that right?

Mr. KEE. This $60,000,000 is in addition to what has been authorized and appropriated heretofore.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. In other words they spent $60,000,000 which was unauthorized and when you use the word appropriation, it would be more appropriate to use the word allocation. They have allocated from time to time money which was unauthorized and have spent it.

Mr. KEE. No, the gentleman is mistaken. It was appropriated.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I wish the gentleman would explain what he means. Was the $60,000,000 which has been spent appropriated or authorized?

Mr. KEE. It was appropriated. It was not authorized through any operation or act of a legislative committee. But it was authorized on the appropriation bill which was passed by the Congress. Every cent which has been expended in Korea was appropriated before it was expended.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I beg the gentleman's pardon. This is an authorization and not an appropriation, is that not correct?

Mr. KEE. This is an authorization we are asking for today—an authorization of $60,000,000 in addition to what has been expended.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. If the gentleman proposes to cut this authorization from $120,000,000 to $60,000,000, why would that be necessary if they have already been authorized $60,000,000? Why bring in an authorization bill at this time?

Mr. KEE. We have no authorization for $60,000,000, none whatever. That is what we are asking for now.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the original $60,000,000 was actually authorized by the Congress——

Mr. KEE. It was appropriated.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is the $60,000,000 which has been spent?

Mr. KEE. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then why is it necessary to bring this bill in asking for a total appropriation of $120,000,000, which would include the $60,000,000 which the gentleman just said had been authorized. The facts are that the $60,000,000 has already been spent.

Mr. KEE. Will the gentleman permit me to answer the question? I know what the facts are.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, let us have the facts.

Mr. KEE. The fact of the matter is that we are not asking for an authorization of $120,000,000. We are asking for an authorization of $60,000,000 to carry this work forward during the balance of the fiscal year 1950—from February 15, 1950, to July 31, 1950.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Do you not propose to offer an amendment—that is what we were given to understand in the committee—that you would offer an amendment to make this a total of $120,000,000?

Mr. KEE. I am offering an amendment to make this a total of $60,000,000.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Not $120,000,000?

Mr. KEE. Not $120,000,000.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am certainly glad to hear that. So it will be a total of $60,000,000 and not $120,000,000?

Mr. KEE. I join with my good friend in being happy about that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So that there will be no misunderstanding, the total will be $120,000,000, $60,000,000 of which has already been spent and obligated until February 15.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then my understanding is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is $60,000,000 to come under this authorization, making a total of $120,000,000 for this fiscal year to be spent in aid to Korea.

Mr. KEE. But the gentleman from Ohio was asking about authorizations. It will only be $60,000,000 to be authorized. The other $60,000,000 has already been appropriated and has been used. There is no authorization except for $60,000,000, and the amendment will be offered to that effect when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman says the total is $120,000,000. Which gentleman is correct?

Mr. KEE. That is it; what was appropriated last year.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But not authorized?

Mr. KEE. It was never authorized by any legislative committee, as I have explained, was authorized by an appropriation in an appropriation bill passed by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The thing that disturbs me is that foreign commissions can spend money that is not authorized, but if you want to spend any money in the United States by any department, it must be authorized.

Mr. KEE. The appropriation authorizes its expenditure, and this Congress certainly appropriated $60,000,000 that has been spent. There has been nothing spent that was not authorized.

Now, it is unnecessary, I should think, for me to go into the advisability or the wisdom or the justice there is in our rendering aid to the Republic of Korea. It must be understood that the Republic of South Korea is a child of the United States and the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE] has expired.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

It was born through our efforts. It has been raised by our efforts. We established the Government of Korea as a free and democratic government, and it is the only free and democratic government existing in that area of the Far East.

Toward the close of World War II, the Japanese were driven to surrender, but it took no military operation to bring about their surrender in Korea. That is, it was not necessary for the United States to conquer the occupying Japanese Army.

Written into the terms of surrender is a provision that the surrender of the Japanese Army in Korea would be taken by the Russian Army from the border of North Korea and Manchuria down to the thirty-eighth parallel of latitude, and that the surrender of the Japanese troops south of the thirty-eighth parallel would be accepted by the United States troops. At that time the Russian Army was poised on the border of Manchuria. United States forces were located in the far-off Philippines. It

took the United States forces 1 month to get into Korea. The Russians were there on the border and immediately marched southward, and 1 month later, when United States troops reached Korea, the Russian troops had taken the surrender of the Japanese to a point even south of the thirty-eighth parallel, and had to be induced to retreat to the thirty-eighth parallel of latitude. That is the boundary line between the Russian-occupied part of Korea and that portion south of the thirty-eighth parallel of latitude that is now incorporated in the Republic of South Korea.

Together, the United Nations Commission and the United States Government, at the invitation of the people of South Korea, went in and organized the South Korean Government and have taken care of it ever since. May I, however, go back across the years and give you a brief story about Korea, beginning with the turn of the present century.

Prior to World War II, Korea, a peninsula jutting out from the east coast of China, had been governed for many years by Japan. The latter country established a protectorate over the peninsula in a treaty on February 23, 1904. At the close of the Russo-Japanese War, Russia conceded Japan's political, military, and economic interest in Korea and pledged that it would not oppose Japanese measures for its protection and control. Korea's emperor was forced out by Japan and replaced by a puppet in 1907 and Japan assumed entire control of the country. On August 22, 1910, Japan formally annexed the country and ruled it from that time down to the close of World War II.

After four decades of subjugation and occupation, Korea was taken from Japan by the terms of surrender at the close of World War II. It was not taken over by direct military operations. An order, issued by the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers to the Japanese Government for effectuating the surrender, specified that Japanese forces in Korea north of the thirty-eighth parallel should yield to Soviet forces and those south of the line should yield to United States forces. Thus was first established the dividing line now separating the Russian controlled North Korea and the territory controlled by the free, democratic Republic of South Korea. At the time of Japan's surrender, Russian troops were poised on the northern border between Manchuria and Korea. The nearest body of United States troops was located in the Philippine Islands. Immediately after the surrender, the Russian army at once marched down from the north and took the surrender of Japanese troops throughout the northern portion of the country, and in fact penetrated to a point some distance south of the thirty-eighth parallel. While the Russians entered Korea on August 12, 1945, the United States forces had to be brought from the Philippines and did not succeed in reaching and entering Korea until September 8, 1945. The Russian forces in northern Korea, having occupied certain sections south of the thirty-eighth parallel, were finally induced to withdraw back to that dividing line.

The thirty-eighth parallel was first established as purely a military measure and for the sole purpose of administering the terms of the surrender. It had no permanent nor wider significance. It was not long, however, until the iron curtain had enveloped Korea north of the thirty-eighth parallel. When this phase of the matter appeared, the commanding general of the United States forces initiated a series of interchanges with Soviet commander attempting to lower or erase the barrier thrown by the Red Army across the Korean peninsula. No argument, however, prevailed with the Russian authorities.

As I have said many attempts have been made by the American Government to remove the barrier line established by the Russians. None have been successful. A joint commission was established by Russia and the United States, and this joint commission engaged in a time-consuming effort to remove all barriers between North and South Korea, but without success.

Following the complete failure of diplomacy and of all conferences, the entire matter was taken to the United Nations and the issues respecting the future of Korea were placed before the General Assembly. On September 23, 1947, the Assembly voted to include the problem of Korea in its agenda.

The United Nations appointed a temporary commission on Korea and this commission made an immediate visit to that country. Arriving in South Korea in January 1948, it held its first meeting on January 12. North Korea, still occupied by Russian armies, was barred to the commission. The Soviet commander even refused to receive a communication suggesting an appointment for a courtesy call. A satellite, the Ukrainian Soviet Republic, which had a representative on the commission, failed to send one. All efforts to enlist cooperation from the Soviet authorities in Korea met only with rebuffs and denials.

The temporary commission officially recognized its complete failure to attain its objectives and referred the matter back to a committee of the United Nations General Assembly. This committee thereupon instructed the temporary commission to proceed to carry out the United Nations program "in such parts of Korea as are accessible to the commission." Thereupon the commission announced that it would observe elections in such parts of Korea as were accessible to it and that elections would be held on the basis of adult suffrage and by secret ballot and with perfect freedom of speech, press, and assembly.

Because of the fact that not only United States officials but also the Commission were barred even from entering North Korea, the elections were held only in that section of the country south of the thirty-eighth parallel. For the first democratic election approximately 75 percent of the eligible voters in South Korea had registered. On election day, May 10, 1948, an estimated 95.2 percent of these qualified voters cast their ballots. This free election was held notwithstanding the obstructive efforts of the Communists, which included large-scale terrorism, violence, and threats.

In December 1946 a legislative body for South Korea had been established. The members of this body were selected by an indirect voting process customary in Korea, and to this body were added an equal number of delegates appointed by the United States military governor to represent various cultural activities.

After the legislative assembly was set up further steps were taken by the United States authorities to transfer all authority from Americans to Koreans. The development of self-government in South Korea became a concern not only of the United States but also of the United Nations. In August 1948 a new government set-up under United Nations auspices was established and ready to receive full authority by transfer from United States military government of all civil authority.

A new constitution was adopted in 1947 and with the election of Dr. Rhee as president on July 20, 1948, the new government was in full operation.

The temporary commission which had observed the elections held in South Korea reported to the United Nations General Assembly at Paris in the fall of 1948, and the United Nations recognized the new government as the only free government in Korea. The United States accorded full recognition to the government in 1949 and recognition has been accorded by China, France, the United Kingdom, the Philippine Republic, and other governments throughout the world.

As briefly as possible I have set out the facts in connection with the organization of the South Korean Republic and the reasons why the jurisdiction of that republic extends only northward to the thirty-eighth parallel. The action of the Soviets in North Korea was, of course, following the pattern of the conduct of the Soviet Government in respect to each and everyone of its satellites and countries coming under Soviet domination. Having once established its forces in northern Korea, having once taken over the country upon the surrender of the Japanese Army, having once been given an opportunity of domination, the Soviets firmly entrenched themselves north of the thirty-eighth parallel, and there they stand today defying every attempt to either move them or to agree with them.

On the other hand, in all that section of the country lying south of the thirty-eighth parallel, the influence of the United States is dominant. After accepting the surrender of the Japanese forces in that area, the United States military authorities at once initiated a movement to establish, not a protectorate under United States domination, but a free, democratic government participated in and controlled only by the Koreans themselves. We gave to this government every encouragement. We taught them the principles of democratic government and the know-how to enable them to conduct it in the democratic way. We maintained in that country sufficient military forces to insure the government against invasion or aggression from its neighbors until the government itself was able to resist any force likely to be sent against it. We

have since that time withdrawn our military combat forces but still maintain in the country a military commission to which the officers of the South Korean army can apply for counsel and advice. Under ECA and other legislation of this Congress, we have been rendering economic aid to the government of South Korea. We have been of aid to them in building up their industrial plants and in increasing their agricultural activities and production. Today so far as food is concerned the Republic of South Korea is self-sufficient and is able to export food to other nations.

Unfortunately, however, the great bulk of the country's factories and industrial plants are located above the thirty-eighth parallel in North Korea now under control of the Communists. The electric plants formerly supplying light and power not only for the northern area but for South Korea, including a number of hydroelectric plants are all located in the Russian section of Korea, to wit north of the thirty-eighth parallel. In other words, the southern section of Korea is the great agricultural section of the country while the northern section has been and is the industrial section. In order that the South Korean Republic may grow and prosper and in every respect become self-sufficient, it is necessary that the government be aided, assisted, and encouraged to construct industrial plants as well as power plants to operate them. These are the things in which the American Government has been engaged and which we want to continue to do, to assist the only free and independent democratic nation now in the China area. To cut off not only our economic aid but also our military counsel and assistance and to turn this country and its people over to the Communist controlled northern government of Korea would indeed be tragic. Not only all of the Far East, but also the Middle East and the Near East—in fact all the world—has known for a long, long time that the South Korean Republic was born and established through the agency of the United States acting jointly with and within the framework of the United Nations. The world has known that we were the sponsors of this government, that we were responsible for its formation, that it was builded upon our principles and with our help, and should we abandon these people to their own devices at this time, our action would be looked upon not only with horror but with despair by the peoples throughout the world. We would be held up to the scorn of all nations as a nation that has broken its word, its promise and its commitments. We would be branded as undependable and unreliable, as a weak counselor and a weaker ally.

STATEMENT REGARDING ESTABLISHMENT OF THIRTY-EIGHTH PARALLEL LINE

The Foreign Affairs Committee looked thoroughly into the background of the establishment of the line along the thirty-eighth parallel which has divided Korea into two parts. Questions were raised as to whether the line had been established as part of the agreements at Yalta and as to whether it might not have been possible to have excluded Soviet forces from Korea entirely. The testimony of representatives of the Department of State and the Department of the Army shows the following facts:

First, the drawing of the line was as I have stated essentially a military decision. The sole purpose of the line was to define the areas in which United States forces and Soviet forces would accept the surrender of Japanese troops in Korea at the end of the war against Japan. When the Japanese offer of surrender came on August 10, it was necessary to decide immediately what forces of the various allies should take the surrender of the Japanese troops in the various areas of the Far East where they were. Our military authorities, in making their decision, had to consider the relative availability of Allied military forces in those territories. Soviet forces already were well into Manchuria and other Soviet forces were on the border between Korea and the Soviet Maritime Provinces. The great Soviet base of Vladivostok is only some 80 miles from the northeast border of Korea. On the other hand, the nearest American forces were on Okinawa, some 600 miles south of Korea, with some of the forces needed for movement into Korea as far distant as the Philippines, some 1,500 to 2,000 miles away.

In this situation the Secretary of War submitted to the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee on August 11 a draft of General Order No. 1, which it was intended that General MacArthur as Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers should have the Japanese Government issue to all of the Japanese armed forces. This draft of General Order No. 1 directed that the Japanese forces north of the thirty-eighth parallel should surrender to the Soviet commander in Asia, while those south of that line should surrender to the American commander. Following further consideration by the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Order No. 1 was submitted to the President on August 14 and following his approval was telegraphed to General MacArthur on August 15.

The second main fact is that, far from permitting the Soviet Union to take over part of Korea from which it could have been excluded, the establishment of the thirty-eighth parallel line actually held for the free people of Korea the southern half of the country, which otherwise might have been overrun by the Red Army. As I have said, Red army forces were already on the move in Manchuria at the time of the Japanese offer of surrender on August 10. They had already entered the northern part of Korea on August 12, while General Order No. 1 was still under discussion. It was only by virtue of this order prepared by the United States Government that the United States forces were able to enter any part of Korea to take the surrender of Japanese troops, and it was only by virtue of a brilliant and rapid operation covering up to 2,000 miles that General Hodge and his soldiers were able to land in South Korea on September 8, 1945 and accept the surrender of Japanese troops in that area on the following day. Some idea of the size of this operation may be gained from the fact that it would be comparable to starting troops from Cuba or Haiti, staging them in Florida, and landing them in Nova Scotia.

In the third place, there is no evidence whatever of any agreement or arrangement arising out of the Yalta Conference, or any wartime conference, relating to the division or joint occupation of Korea.

Finally, it should of course be thoroughly understood that the division of Korea and the movement of United States forces into Korea was never intened to be for a long-term occupation. This was a development which resulted from the persistent refusal of the U. S. S. R. to agree to the establishment of a united and independent Korea upon terms which would do justice to the aspirations of the Korean people for freedom and national independence.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, we have before us today the question whether we should authorize $120,000,000 to assist Southern Korea.

It is my understanding this amount is but a part of a 3-year program involving approximately $400,000,000.

Before considering whether this bill should be passed, I feel we should not only look at the over-all aid we have already given foreign countries but also the aid we have given Korea to date.

In a statement prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, the total postwar aid given from July 1, 1945 to January 1, 1950 to all foreign entities amounts to $33,070,200,643. And according to this same tabulation, Korea received $238,652,893 between July 1, 1945 and June 30, 1949. This does not include military agency disbursements such as military pay and allowances in foreign areas, supplies and materials, dependency payments, transportation services, overseas cemeterial expenses, and so forth.

Since that time Korea has received an additional $60,000,000 and also $24,927,596 from the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner. Furthermore there has been earmarked for Korea $3,000,000 under the military assistance program.

When this bill was under consideration last July I joined with four others of my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee in a minority report in which we pointed out the folly of rendering this assistance under existing circumstances. At that time we said:

> To expect Korea to withstand the aggressive political tactics of the Soviet in a surrounding climate of rampant communism, would be to expect an isolated and powerless Luxemburg to repel the ideology and the tactics of a Hitlerized Europe. * * *
>
> The proposed program is a double-bitted ax, and one which may well be turned against us in the future. Already, along the thirty-eighth parallel aggression is speaking with the too-familiar voices of howitzers and cannon. Our position is untenable and indefensible.

Since that time the march of events in the Orient have only strengthened my belief that this proposed action would be putting money down a rat hole. If the island of Formosa, located over 100

miles from the mainland of China, cannot be defended against aggression as contended by Secretary of State Dean Acheson, how much less could South Korea be defended being the tail end of the peninsula, with guerrilla activities in North Korea and Communist control in Manchuria?

As we pointed out in our minority report:

> Korea is hopelessly outflanked by the adjacent land mass of China, and the peninsula has no connecting link with any friendly continental power. Every ton of supplies contemplated to be furnished under the terms of this legislation must be transported vast distances, only to be put down in the midst of a complex and daily shifting Pacific picture, in which the rapid and undeterred spread of communism is the salient feature.

The testimony before our committee disclosed that Korea was not considered as vital to our security program. This testimony disclosed that even with the economic aid proposed during the next 3 years Korea would not be self-sustaining. Therefore, this help would not aid this country militarily or insure the economic security of Korea. The evidence also disclosed that there was no commitment to give this aid.

In my judgment, to furnish this aid under these circumstances would be like treating a hangnail on one's finger when the arm was swollen with poison from the wrist to the shoulder.

While an amendment will be offered from the floor to cut the original amount of $150,000,000, in reality it will not be a substantial reduction but merely takes into account the $60,000,00 that was appropriated last year.

When we take into consideration that we have spent over $33,000,000,000 in foreign aid since July 1, 1945, and largely because of that fact we have had to continue deficit spending, it might be well to seriously consider just how much further and how much longer we can continue spending these vast sums. In the case of Korea I think the time to stop is now. This bill should not pass.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I am interested only in national defense, as far as Korea is concerned. I was a member of the subcommittee on public lands that visited about 22 islands, in addition to Hong Kong, and also the Republic of Korea. At Tokyo we were informed by General MacArthur's staff of the danger of world war III. There is no use camouflaging the danger. We were informed how we got into this danger. We put ourselves there.

But that is water under the bridge. We were put in that position when our Presidents were advised and counseled by Dean Acheson and Hiss and others to go to bed with Stalin and betray not only our own country but the world. I have no confidence whatever in anything that Dean Acheson says. But I still feel that we owe some obligation to the Korean people that we put in the position they are in, and also to realize that our war is in Asia, not in Europe.

I have noted with some surprise that members of the Foreign Affairs Commitee who have so lavishly thrown the American dollar all over Europe where there was no war, who have voted to finance inefficient and, in some cases, dishonest governments, now say that if we give a little money for national defense where the war is really going on it is unconstitutional.

When I was in Tokyo we were shown in MacArthur's headquarters that the division of Korea was very unfortunate and dangerous to us. We gave North Korea to Stalin. It had the hydroelectric power and the coal mines, and the Russians immediately shut them down and would not let South Korea have any electric current, so South Korea needs money to reestablish their hydroelectric power and reopen their coal mines and get access to these coal mines.

We were informed in no uncertain terms that Russia was supplying arms and training North Korea, and we were also informed that we were doing the same for South Korea. That is the situation that exists there today. We are in Korea; we have General Roberts there training the Korean soldiers. The guns and things they have for defense are American. We are going to continue to stay there.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I am sorry; I have but 5 minutes; I cannot yield.

Mr. Chairman, that is the situation. We are there now. Are we going to withdraw? Are we going to throw another nation to communistic Russia? That is the whole question. Or are we going to call a halt and take a stand for the people who still believe in peace and not in aggression?

What did we find when we went to Korea? We found an intelligent, a patriotic people there, a people who believed in us, a people who were friends of ours—far more so than any that we can find in Europe. In addition, we are responsible for the position they are in. We agreed to turn part of their country over to Russia. We were told by the highest officials in Korea that if we would let them alone they could reunite their country that we so cruelly divided and that belonged to them.

Of course there is civil war between these two factions. The Communists go over in nightly raids of the South Koreans; but the South Koreans have 22,000,000 people and the North have only 9,000,000. The South Koreans can take care of themselves unless Russia steps in.

When Russia steps in, if ever she does—and I hope she will have brains enough not to—then world war III is on, and we need not camouflage it. We will then have at least some responsibility somewhere in behalf of the American people and of the people of the world as far as communism is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, we did not give North Korea to the Russians. The Russian troops took that area and they had extended much farther in South Korea, but we have them back over to the thirty-eighth parallel now.

I just recently returned from Korea. The Hoover Commission recommended that five make this trip to the Far East in order to examine the expenses, the way in which we were spending our money in that part of the world. Five of us made that trip and I think the group was unanimous in its opinion that the money was being well spent in Korea. I do not know of any exception to that report.

We had a most wonderful reception from the people of Korea. More than 750,000 Koreans greeted us at the airport, along the way, and in the city. That is a very large group. One thing we were constantly impressed with was the sincerity of the Korean people. They were very, very sincere in their desire to maintain the independence of Korea.

Mr. Chairman, Korea is the only Christian country in Asia. All the Christians here certainly should think about endeavoring to the best of their ability to maintain the only Christian country in Asia.

We saw a large number of people who had come down from North Korea to South Korea because there was a democratic government in South Korea and we also saw troops that had deserted from the North Korean forces, who came down to the south. We reviewed some of these troops. They wanted to fight for democracy. They were held in tow by the Communist forces in North Korea, but they broke away from those forces and came south, and joined the South Koreans.

The Republic of Korea must not be ignored in a consideration of our present status and future policy in the Orient. The United States has a moral commitment to see that the Republic is able to stave off any full-scale North Korean Communist invasion, and they are perfectly able to do that.

We saw many of the 60,000 troops which are exceptionally well equipped in small arms. They had their arms very well cleaned, their equipment was in excellent shape, which is the sign of a good, well-trained trooper. These men paraded excellently. They do need more ammunition to practice with. They are doing a good job. Our fellow West Virginian has done an excellent job in training these troops. General Roberts has done an extremely good job in training them.

As I stated, the United States has a moral commitment to see that the Republic is able to stave off any full-scale North Korean Communist invasion. We have done that in equipping these 60,000. There are also another 60,000 men who are trained much like our National Guard and they are ready to go into the breach if necessary. In addition to that, they have 10,000 men in the cities who are trained and there are more than 2,000,000 Koreans in the Youth Corps who are able to take up any type of equipment they can get in order to defend their native land.

I have never seen a more sincere people, a people who are more anxious to fight for their independence than are these Koreans.

Under the terms of an agreement we made with the Russians, the United States occupied South Korea after the war while Russia occupied the northern half. The Russians have withdrawn their troops and left behind a strong North Korean army and a Communist government. We withdrew our forces last summer. This was a year after a democratic election was conducted by a United Nations Commission in the southern zone as the result of a resolution introduced into the General Assembly by the United States. Russia would not allow the conducting of such an election in the northern zone. I may say also that in the north there are now 9,000,000 Koreans while in the south there are 21,000,000 Koreans. Last year there were more than 2,000,000 who came from the north to the south to join the south in its fight for independence for Korea, really true independence, not one under the domination of the Communist forces.

Because the thirty-eighth parallel iron curtain divides Korea into two zones which are normally dependent upon each other economically and industrially, the Republic continues to need United States aid in the form of ECA grants. The fact that the Republic has used wisely the aid given to it so far has been attested by both officials of the ECA and our congressional mission which visited Korea recently.

The people of south Korea are eating more and better food than ever before in their lives. They are even going to be able to export a little in 1950. This is absolutely essential to their economy.

Passionately patriotic, they have their own national government, now a year old, and there is every indication that the overwhelming majority would like to be loyal to it. They wish to be left at reasonable peace on their farms, where 80 percent of the people live and work by standards that have advanced little in several centuries. Here is where our technical assistance can be of tremendous aid to these people. I might say that it has already been of tremendous assistance to these people.

Under American leadership, followed reluctantly by the recent National Government a land-reform program in South Korea has well nigh wiped out farm tenancy. By doing this we have tremendously strengthened their desire to fight with all their might for these new landed peasants to keep their farms. The Korean peasants stand today as landed proprietors, with rents and taxes lower than ever before. They have a keen desire to fight to maintain democratic institutions. More children are in South Korean schools than in all previous history. Illiteracy which was a lot of almost 90 percent of the Koreans up to 1945 is vanishing fast.

If ever there was a subject lesson in the grandeur of national political independence as a stimulus to the human spirit, it is in South Korea today. As the situation now stands South and North Korea comprise a significant area in the Far East in which democratic and Communist principles and ideals are being tested side by side in two parts of what is normally a single country. This test is being watched by all Asia.

Last June the Economic Cooperation Administration appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee to explain:

(a) The total aid requirements of Korea.

(b) The purposes to be served by this aid.

(c) A forecast of the effect which these aid supplies would have on the Korean economy.

I need not remind the Members of Congress that we did not authorize the $150,000,000 which the Foreign Affairs Committee, after careful investigation, recommended to the Congress.

By reason of legislative accidents Korea has received a total of $60,000,000 for 7½ months, rather than $75,000,000 for 6 months. In short, we have granted 64 cents on each requested dollar.

With these seriously restricted funds, nonetheless, ECA has been able to cling to its basic purpose—which is to assist in the economic recovery of Korea. It has taken great prudence to cut back every dollar by 36 percent and yet avoid an abortive retreat into a purposeless relief program.

For the most part ECA has met this fiscal stringency by a program of preparatory deferment.

(a) It has gone ahead with recovery projects that it could afford.

(b) It has accomplished the preengineering planning of those projects which it was most reluctantly compelled to defer.

The plain facts of the matter are that the Korean program has been delayed in time. Moreover, the incidence of this delay has fallen on the critical recovery portions of the projected program.

The Members of Congress will be the first to recognize that one cannot embark on a capital-installation program with uncertain funds, made available in small increments. The House will recall that the Korea program received a total of $60,000,000 for 7½ months; and that it never had the assurance that it would receive that much. Actually it received:

Seventeen million five hundred thousand for 6 weeks.

Then nothing for 6 weeks.

Then $12,500,000 for the barren 6 weeks.

Then nothing for 10 weeks.

Then $30,000,000 for the 10 fallow weeks and for the next 9 weeks.

Under these circumstances, it is quite clear why only modest progress could be made on engineering and reconstruction projects.

Yet, these recovery projects are the key to the Korean problem. For they are the only means whereby Korean imports can be reduced, Korean exports increased, and the Korean balance-of-payments problem resolved.

Yet, what amazes me is the record of how much has been accomplished in the course of ECA's first year of operations. Thanks to their great efforts, the Koreans have more than met their targets in industrial production.

ECA has been able to fulfill the promises it made to the Bureau of the Budget and to the congressional committees with regard to Korean exports.

Korea has gone twice as fast in her railway building program than we had any right to prophesy by reason of the industry, the enthusiasm, and the imagination of the Koreans.

ECA could not have dared forecast the operation of Yongwol power plant at 44.5 kilowatts.

Here is an example of Korean energy, perseverance, and will to succeed. Korea has more than met the projections for coal production, a most difficult task. All these things have been accomplished because there has been—

(a) A tremendous effort on the part of the Koreans.

(b) Judicious use of available supplies.

(c) An energetic effort at improvising.

(d) Wonderful cooperation between Americans and Koreans.

(e) A firm attitude on the part of the Americans that the Koreans must use their best efforts.

Take, for example, the export of rice. This was not an easy task for the Koreans. It was loaded with political dynamite. It took perseverance on the part of the Americans, courage on the part of the Koreans. And yet, sooner or later this step had to be taken. The American view was that it should be taken this year.

ECA has not done all it had hoped to do. On the other hand, in terms of funds, it has done more than we had any right to believe it could do.

In preparing the supplemental 1950 program, ECA asked the Koreans to supply an accurate inventory of the supplies they have on hand. Acting on that request a national inventory was made in the summer of 1949. It was on the basis of this inventory that ECA presented the request for a supplemental appropriation of $65,000,000 to the Bureau of the Budget (dated December 12, 1949).

When the director of the Korea Division of ECA was in Korea in late November 1949, he importuned the Prime Minister to ascertain beyond question the amount of aid supplies in Korea. This he agreed to do. Since the preparation of the budget request (dated December 12, 1949), ECA has received the findings of this second inventory. It reveals the following information:

(a) That fertilizer supplies (to which ECA had given procurement priority) are larger than had been expected.

(b) That raw cotton inventories are much smaller than ECA had believed.

(c) That certain savings can be made in lumber which had not been anticipated.

(d) That a portion of the essential materials for railway construction are available in Korean inventories.

Against savings, however, must be placed certain deficiencies now very clearly revealed:

First. Manila fiber stocks are all exhausted, and some 6 months will be required to restore basic inventories.

Second. Sulfite pulp is in short supply.

Third. Cement stocks have been exhausted, both for general use and for recovery projects. Here procurement time is 3 months.

Fourth. Creosote stocks are exhausted at the very moment when the building of railway extensions calls for supplies to treat the new ties that are being laid.

Since the submission of the supplemental request on December 12, 1949, the Korea Division of ECA has examined and reexamined the minimal requirements that are necessary to sustain the Korean economy.

The outcome of this reexamination of Korean requirements—in view of existing, definitely determined inventories—is that we now believe that a genuinely effective program for the remainder of fiscal year 1950 can be provided by $60,000,000 rather than $90,000,000. This means cutting every item to its very minimum.

The 1950 program has been reduced from the original request of $150,000,000 to $120,000,000 for the following reasons:

First. An unprecedented drought increased the production of salt so that all salt imports for fiscal year 1950 could be eliminated.

Second. Nitrogen requirements, originally calculated at 110,000 were reduced to 106,000. This reduction in requirements is a result of a careful screening of Korean requests based on careful experiments in the capacity of dense paddy land to hold nitrogen longer than is normally the case.

Third. Curtailed consumption resulting from more stringent controls allowed a programed cut-back of petroleum.

Fourth. Delay in reopening the Sam Wha iron works—from lack of funds for rehabilitation—made possible the elimination in fiscal year 1950 of coking coal.

Fifth. Certain industrial chemicals, programed in finished form, are now scheduled in crude form because of the improved situation in the Korean chemical industry, thus saving dollars.

Sixth. The circumstantial availability of safe-haven cotton from China has made possible the elimination of certain marine textiles.

Seventh. Unavailability of funds for fishing boats has resulted in a cut-back in total lumber requirements.

Eighth. Ropes and nets programed originally in finished form are now programed as materials with a material saving.

Ninth. The largest cut-back occasioned by unavailability of funds came in recovery projects.

With only 4½ months of fiscal year 1950 remaining—after February 15—it is obviously impossible to launch as comprehensive a type of recovery program as was originally planned.

Progress in the use of Korean anthracite has similarly been greater than we had anticipated. The increased use of briquets, for railroad and industrial purposes, has augmented the need for coal-tar pitch, but saved Korean balances in Japan.

I think it will be evident from what I have said that the (a) Korean Government, (b) ECA mission, and (c) Korea division have studied and restudied the Korean program, adjusting it to changing circumstances not merely from week to week as performance was revealed, but from industry to industry in terms of a reappraisal of visible possibilities. There has been not only a willingness to economize, but a constant search for savings. ECA has cut back its personnel from 275 to 225, and will continue to cut. Above all, there has been a performance by the Koreans which has been far better than we had any right to expect.

At the same time, ECA has been able to get more certain estimates of the engineering costs of recovery projects. Detailed and precise engineering data is available now that was not available last June:

(a) Day & Zimmerman.
(b) International Engineering.
(c) Allis-Chalmers.
(d) Roberts & Schaefer.
(e) Gilbert Associates.

Experts in the field have checked all estimates—see below:

(a) Jones: Combustion.
(b) Giroux: Power.
(c) Crentz: Coal beneficiation.
(d) Naef: Marine base.
(e) Selheimer: Technical training.
(f) Andrews: Geological survey.
(g) Pierce Management: Coal.

I think the House will appreciate that, in the face of what happened in China, one cannot afford to be extravagant in any statements.

But in all sincerity, the Korea program is really accomplishing its purpose. In those areas where funds have been made available, it is ahead of schedule.

Mr. Eric Biddle, who is not given to careless statements, told Mr. Hoffman and his staff—after he had visited the ERP countries—that, in his opinion, the United States Government was "getting more for its money in Korea" than anywhere else.

What are the reasons:

(a) There are no generalities in the Korea program. Specific things for specific purposes are purchased.

(b) Technical supervision by Americans insures that the specific commodities are put to their best use.

(c) ECA does not hesitate to modify requirements. And that works both ways—it has cut back more often than it has increased.

(d) We have an ECA mission that knows its job, whose morale is amazingly high, one that knows when to give the Koreans leeway when they are doing a job, and to needle them when they are not.

(e) Finally, we have a Korean Government that knows that it must succeed or fall victim to Communist expansion. Do not underestimate this will to succeed. It is the key, not only to the future of Korea, but it may be the key to the future of the Far East.

One would not be honest, however, if one painted the entire picture in roseate colors. Whereas the agricultural, the industrial, the mining, the transportation, and the foreign-trade outlook is most promising, the fiscal situation is disturbing to the State Department, to ECA, to Washington, and to the American mission in Korea.

Money in circulation has risen at an accelerated rate since the elected Korean Government took over the government.

The overdraft at the Bank of Chosen has expanded dangerously.

Prices are still rising despite the inflow of ECA supplies and the dramatic increase of domestic production.

Revenues are lagging behind expenditures more than ever before.

There are one or two things that should not be overlooked, however:

First. That certain financial risks must be taken in order to cultivate industry and stimulate a greater volume of business activity.

Second. That the increase in money in circulation is almost exactly proportionate to the increase in industrial production.

Third. That the new nation had to assume responsibility for its own military force when the American Army forces withdrew.

Fourth. That only when Korea is politically secure will it have the capacity to borrow abroad or induce capital investment by foreigners.

Fifth. That the state-owned factories, mines, and other vested property have not yet been sold or alienated but many presently will be.

We should not, by any neglect on our part, let this situation get out of hand.

(a) ECA has laid an 8-point program before the Korean Government.

(b) State Department has sent instructions to Ambassador Mucci to make it abundantly clear to President Rhee that the Korean Government must put its financial house in order if it expects further American aid.

(c) ECA is presently recruiting two outstanding authorities on public finance to, first, work out with the Koreans a precise plan of expenditure control; and, second, show them precisely how the tax system can be made more efficient and productive.

Nor is financial reform entirely a matter of future action. Reforms are already being made:

(a) Prices of ECA goods are being steadily advanced to more realistic levels.

(b) Counterpart deposits are being increased in rate.

(c) Transportation rates have been markedly increased.

(d) Electric rates were doubled as of January 1.

(e) Ten billion won of short-term bonds are being sold to Korean purchasers.

(f) More rigid controls are being imposed on bank loans.

(g) Plans are being finalized for the reorganization of the Bank of Chosen.

(h) The legislature has passed, and the President has signed, a law which will make possible the sale of vested property.

Much more remains to be done, but important steps are already being taken.

A recovery program in a context such as the Korean one must be a race between expanding expenditures and expanding production. Without the first, the second cannot occur.

The immediate task, therefore, is to insure that economies will be made in the unproductive areas so that local currency

can be made available for the recovery program without adding a net inflationary element.

If you wish to help the Christian people of Korea to remain as a nation among the nations of the world, here is your opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, the tragic state of the Korean people today cannot but move to pity those who seek freedom, happiness, and peace for men and women everywhere who have suffered under and continue to suffer under the bondage of totalitarianism. Quite rightly, we are concerned with the plight of those who are our spiritual allies in this world-wide global fight which today keeps all nations and all peoples in a state of constant turmoil and uncertainty.

However, it is not alone the people of Korea or the Korean Republic whom we must think of in these trying times. We must likewise think in terms of the substantial welfare of the 150,000,000 American people. Our ability to help and assist nations and peoples in distress is not measured alone in terms of our financial and physical resources. If the defeat of the forces of world chaos were simply a matter of logistics, of transportation, of communications, then, indeed, the price asked in this legislation would be a small price to pay for the confusion and the defeat of our common enemy.

However, Mr. Chairman, the problem with respect to Korea is much more complex than this. There are physical factors and geographical considerations which render the proposed program not only one of the most hazardous we have ever undertaken, but one which is less likely to succeed in the final analysis, than any other program of which I have any personal knowledge.

First of all, let us place Korea in its proper geographic perspective. As the map will indicate, Korea is no Greece, flanked by an allied Italy and a friendly Turkey. Korea is already half behind the iron curtain, severed in two at the thirty-eighth parallel. Dominant in the northern half of this tragically divided country are the Communist forces in North Korea. The other portion of the country, representing the Republic of South Korea, is the portion of the map which is colored blue. Here is the Ongjin Peninsula where sporadic fighting has been in progress for many, many months, and will doubtless continue on an increased scale in the future. It will be noted that South Korea is hopelessly outflanked on the west by the adjacent land mass of China, and that the entire line along the thirty-eighth parallel is open to full-scale and unrestricted warfare at any time.

In addition to that, large bands of guerrillas at the present time are harassing the southern portion of the Republic. Korea is by no means in a serene and placid state. South Korea has experienced a series of severe constitutional crises which continue to this very date. Inflation is rampant. The country is truly in the last stages of an economic disease which it is questionable can be cured by any amount of money.

The arrows on the map indicate some very interesting points which should be taken into consideration by this committee in its contemplation of this legislation. What is our practical position relative to the supply of capital goods and commodities to South Korea? As the arrow indicates, South Korea lies 7,000 miles west of San Francisco; 7,000 long and tortuous miles, over each mile of which must be carried at a tremendous expense every ton of supplies contemplated in the proposed program. The amount allocated for freight charges alone in this bill represents 25 percent of the total appropriation. Twenty-five percent of the money appropriated by this Congress will go up in exhaust fumes before the last of the cargoes is landed.

Another reference point for the information of the committee is Vladivostok 500 miles to the north. It is quite obvious that in any economic or political challenge to supply contesting forces in the north and the south, that we would be at a decided disadvantage as represented by the difference between 500 and 7,000 miles.

The third of the arrows, and perhaps the one most important from the Soviet standpoint, is the one which indicates the direction of and the distance to the Russian industrial area east of the Urals. It is inconceivable to many of us that the Communists would countenance the maintenance of such a threat to their productive capacity. Two years ago—even a year ago—the Republic of South Korea might have managed a precarious and uncertain tenure, but if anything is likely or certain in this world today it would appear to be the eventual engulfment of South Korea by the rampant forces of communism, which in their drive through Manchuria and north China have left Korea unsupported and tragically isolated.

It is not my desire, Mr. Chairman, to debate the China problem at this time, but it is impossible to consider Korea except as it relates to the physical and political conditions surrounding it. There is no counterpart in recent legislation for what is here proposed to be done in the instance of Korea. Here is no wide and defensible belt of interlocking states, no community of common ideas and cultures such as have rendered possible the success of the European recovery program in western Europe. All of the factors which made possible the putting down of guerrilla activities in Greece are missing in the case of Korea. Greece found a Tito willing to close his common frontier in return for the favors which could be obtained from the west, but no such quid pro quo can be expected along the thirty-eighth parallel.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, one can admire and respect the South Koreans in their period of dire tribulation, but to fatten the prize for an ultimate conqueror who at this moment holds all of the trumps is neither kindness to Korea nor justice to the American taxpayer who must foot the bill.

Much will be said during the course of the debate on this measure of our obligations and our commitments with respect to the establishment of the Republic of South Korea. Too little will probably be said of the failure of the Soviets to carry out their implied obligations. But circumstances alter cases and we have only to refer to our repudiation of our traditional open-door policy in China to see that fact clearly. Too, we were a party to a declaration and a commitment which guaranteed the maintenance of a free, friendly, and democratic China. Certainly China has never been less free, less friendly toward us, and less democratic than is the case at the present time.

But assuming that we have made commitments to Korea and that a moral obligation did exist when those commitments were made, we must still consider that the color and the shape of political things have since been radically altered. What was once a friendly coast to the West now serves the same enemy as faces the Republic on the north. To expect South Korea to resist the political and military infiltration which is the constant dread of every nation in western Europe is, quite frankly, to expect the impossible.

Our resources are not unlimited. The necessity of conducting a world-wide operation for the containment of aggressive and godless communism requires the careful husbanding of our financial and physical means. Within a very few days or weeks this body will be called upon to consider the so-called point-4 legislation for the development of backward areas throughout the world. We must put our resources and our help not only where our hearts dictate but where our heads tell us the national security and the national welfare are at stake.

South Korea is no Japan, no Okinawa, no Philippines. Not one word of military testimony is on the record indicating the essential nature of the peninsula in the plans for the national defense. To the contrary, it has been stated time and again that from the military standpoint South Korea is indefensible and tactically isolated.

The pending legislation might stand the test of urgent necessity if it were proposed as a part of an over-all policy for the United States in the Far East, but such is certainly not the case. The development of such a policy is admittedly one of the most pressing requirements of the moment, but it will never be initiated with South Korea as a reference point. South Korea is exactly what the map shows it to be—a small peninsula separated by 7,000 miles of ocean from the mainland of the United States and completely surrounded by the raging tides of international communism.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is valid to say that the case for Korea cannot by any measurement other than that put forth as a commitment stand upon its merits. This commitment is brought to the Congress not as a subject for discussion and debate, but as a fait accompli which we are told we must ratify, although we have taken no direct action or legislative step which constituted a pledge or a promise on the part of

the Congress of the United States. This is the last in a long series of diplomatic commitments, arrived at on the basis of discussions far removed from the legislative branch, commitments which we are told we must honor with never-ending appropriations from the Federal Treasury.

South Korea is a Bataan without a Corregidor, a Dunkerque without a flotilla, a dead-end street without an escape. If the Congress wills it we shall invest in a gambit of pawns against an opponent whose major pieces are skillfully jockeyed against both South Korea and the United States on terrain chosen by our opponent and on terms which he alone will dictate. Let us be humanitarian, but let us not close our eyes to reality in a day when the fate of a world depends upon clear judgment and straight thinking.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER].

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I recently had the very great honor of being chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures that visited Korea several months ago. I did not find conditions there exactly as they have been described by some of the Members who have occupied the well and have not had the opportunity to see conditions first hand in Korea.

If you ever want an excuse to vote against a bill, this would be an easy bill to vote against. If you want to go back home and demagogue about it and say, "I voted to save the taxpayers money," it is an easy thing to do on this bill. But I think it might be penny-wise and pound-foolish. I think you ought to give it just a little bit more thought.

We have made definite commitments in Korea, commitments that we must keep. Our committee worked very diligently while we were there. We did not depend on the so-called cocktail circuit to get our information. We talked to and interviewed people right down to the smallest person we could find, and we also talked to Ambassadors and State Department officials. Everything we could find out about Korea was good.

Not long ago I attended a press conference. Somebody said, "How about all the political prisoners that are in prison there?" I said, "I have it on very good authority that is not true." This newspaperman said, "What is your authority?" I gave the name of one of the outstanding news reporters in the world, who was the authority for that statement. So some of these things that we have heard are just not true.

We have a great many people who would propose that we send men and money to certain places in the Far East. In supporting this measure you are not asked to send men there, you are not asked for armed intervention, you are asked only to give financial support, financial support that is desperately needed.

I know when we returned last fall, joined by the other members of the committee, I went to the leadership and spoke to the leadership of the House. At that time we realized there was some doubt as to whether even the $30,000,000 appropriation would be passed. I said at that time to the Speaker, "If we are not going to follow through, let us send a cable to President Syngman Rhee, and send it immediately, and tell him that no help is coming, that he might as well make the best deal he can with the northern Communist forces and not sacrifice those gallant young men who are wearing the uniform of that new Republic over there, trying to hold that beachhead of democracy."

I think this is very important legislation and should be passed. I hope that Members will not use this as an opportunity to demagogue but will realize the commitments we have, and will not break faith with the Korean people. In effect we are their sponsors. We have helped them to set up their Government. That Government is a going concern. It is a good Government, and it is destined to be a great democracy. If you want to help them, then I know you will help to pass this bill.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUBER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman from North Dakota said a moment ago that he heard in MacArthur's headquarters that we were going to defend South Korea, and if the Russians attacked it world war III would start there. Did the gentleman from Ohio receive any such information?

Mr. HUBER. I think if all the rumors we hear that are attributed to General MacArthur's headquarters were laid end to end, it would be a good thing. I do not know.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen who argue here against this aid to Korea, I think, are the very same gentlemen who have been most eloquent and most vocal in arguing for a positive foreign policy in the Far East on the ground that is where the whole civilized world is likely to go down the drain. They have argued that the loss we are in a way suffering in the Far East would be a loss even greater than the loss we run the risk of suffering if we lose Europe. Yet these same gentlemen have voted $5,000,000,000 and $3,500,000,000 and will probably vote again about $3,000,000,000 this year for ERP to Europe. The demand for a positive policy for the Far East, in the face of the opposition to the $60,000,000 in this bill for Korea, sounds hollow. If the committee will look at the Mutual Defense Assistance Act—Public Law 329 of the Eighty-first Congress—which the Congress passed and which the Committee on Foreign Affairs reported out, and fully backed, it will find that the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House has provided a positive far eastern foreign policy. That policy is expressed as follows:

> Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation among the free countries and the free peoples of the Far East of a joint organization consistent with the Charter of the United Nations to establish a program of self-help and mutual cooperation designed to develop their economic and social well-being to safeguard basic rights and liberties and to protect their security and independence.

In other words, this is a call for a far-eastern recovery program. Of such a program. South Korea is an integral and absolutely essential part.

That is a positive far-eastern policy; and now as a means by which to hold these 21,000,000 people in South Korea for 6 months, until there can be a positive far-eastern policy—to spend $60,000,000 to hold 21,000,000 people in the Far East in reserve for the great positive policy—these gentlemen say "Oh, no."

Let us examine the arguments made against this bill. The first argument is that Korea is a very long way from the United States. The second is that it is indefensible militarily. I ask these same gentlemen whether Korea is any more indefensible militarily than is Berlin. Berlin is an isolated island in the very heart of the occupied zone of Germany where we have few troops.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry I cannot yield now.

Mr. JACKSON of California. The gentleman is asking for an answer to a question.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish the gentleman would permit me to go on at the moment and I will yield later, as I permitted the gentleman to do.

Mr. Chairman, Berlin is an island in the Soviet Zone, surrounded on all sides by Soviet troops. Every military man and every commentator has said that the Soviet could push us out of Berlin by military action at will. But the Soviet has not pushed us out of Berlin, nor will it, any more than the Soviet will seek to push us out of the areas we occupy in the Far East at will, because she knows that means war.

It is not what military forces we have there. It is not General Roberts, with his 500 officers, that are going to hold the Soviet, but it is the unwillingness of the Soviet Union to attack us.

Then consider the outposts of United States security. Have the gentlemen forgotten that we are basing our security in that area today on Japan and Okinawa, which are directly flanked by South Korea? I say to the gentleman if we are driven out of there in 6 months, or if we should be driven out of there in 6 months, with the incalculable stakes which the advocates of a positive China policy say we have in the Far East, it is still worth $60,000,000 to take this opportunity to save these people.

A great deal has been made here of the economic situation of Korea. Certainly the economic situation of Korea is bad. Why? Because we have not followed through on the recovery program needed to help their economy. That is why she has been working her printing presses. They have no other way to sustain their economy except as they get this very support from this very bill from the United States. The circulation of Korean money has doubled in the period from March 1949 until today. Why? Because we have not aided them. It is not because they are fundamentally wrong in Korea.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of California. The gentleman has mentioned the Korean situation in relation to Berlin. I should like to ask the gentleman in what respects he considers the situations to be at all analogous.

Mr. JAVITS. I think I made that very clear. I said that in Berlin today we do not have any military force which is able to resist the Russians if they wanted to roll over the western sectors. Yet we know very well that the Russians will not roll over our forces in Berlin, for the same reason that they will not in the Far East, because they are not willing as yet to accept the gage of battle.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman said, "If we are driven out of Korea." The fact is we are out now.

Mr. JAVITS. That is not so, so long as the lawfully elected Korean Government is there.

Mr. VORYS. I thought the gentleman meant our military force.

Mr. JAVITS. We have a military mission still in Korea.

Mr. VORYS. Our military force has been withdrawn and we were told it was withdrawn so we would not become involved. Is that not correct?

Mr. JAVITS. We withdrew our military force in response to a request from the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, there are two movements in the world today. One, the forward march of the non-self-governed peoples toward independence. Second, the struggle between Communist and democratic ideologies in the world. We will strengthen democracy to the extent that we give leadership to the non-self-governing peoples of the world so that their people may be truly free and their nations may be independent. I think that the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee are agreed on this.

Korea was under the domination and government of Japan for 40 years. The country is today divided. I do not have time to go into that. But because we moved fast, at the end of the war, we are in half of Korea today. If we had not moved fast we would not have been in Korea at all.

We have a 3-year program to help the southern half of Korea to be independent and self-supporting. We hope it will work out that way. Korea has 21,000,000 people who have the stamina to stand on their own feet and to fight and work for freedom. If we abandon them today, as the Secretary of State said, we can be sure that in 2 or 3 months they will collapse, economically, which will mean that the Communist forces in that southern part will take over, and all of Korea will then come under a Communist government—and Russian influence.

We cannot guarantee that this economic program will insure a democratic Korea, but we can be sure of what will happen if we do not help them.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield for a question?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The Chinese were marching toward democracy under Sun Yat-sen, but something happened to reverse their direction in recent years.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. That is right. They were marching toward democracy, but then there was a terrible war, a devastating war, and unfortunately the leadership of China was not able to retain the confidence of the Chinese people.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Does not the gentlewoman think the same thing can happen in Korea?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Anything can happen. We are trying to prevent the economic collapse of southern Korea.

Here are 21,000,000 people who want freedom and are looking to us to help keep them a free and independent people. This sixty millions economic aid that we are about to vote on we believe will give them the chance they ask.

The Korean situation, remember, is under the direct supervision of the United Nations at this time. So bear in mind that it is not quite the same kind of situation that you could have in some other places of the world.

It was just stated that there was testimony before our committee by representatives of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the present armed forces in southern Korea, trained by American military men, are quite capable of putting down any internal revolt, any Communist revolt in southern Korea, and are capable of withstanding any pressure from North Korean forces, unless a major power starts an open war. They did not say that they could withstand a war started by a great power, but should war start, that would be an international issue which would come before the United Nations. As my colleague from New York has just said, it would be hard to imagine that Russia would intentionally provoke any such war at this time with Korea under the glaring light of United Nations attention, and, in fact, with a United Nations commission in Korea at this time.

I wish to read to you what the President said in his message when he sent the Korean bill to us last year:

> Korea has become a testing ground in which the validity and practical value of the ideals and principles of democracy which the Republic is putting into practice are being matched against the practices of communism which have been imposed upon the people of North Korea. The survival and progress of the Republic toward a self-supporting, stable economy will have an immense and far-reaching influence on the people of Asia. Such progress by the young Republic will encourage the people of southern and southeastern Asia and the islands of the Pacific to resist and reject the Communist propaganda with which they are besieged. Moreover, the Korean Republic, by demonstrating the success and tenacity of democracy in resisting communism, will stand as a beacon to the people of northern Asia in resisting the control of the Communist forces which have overrun them.

This is what the President has said about the positive effect of carrying out this program. Now let me read you what the Secretary of State testified about the negative effect of failing to carry out this program:

> If you do not take this step, it seems to me that it is a public declaration that we are not going to do anything in the Far East, and I think you will get a shiver of fear all through the Philippines, all through southeast Asia, India, and all the other parts of the Far East, which would be quite unjustified, because we are not taking that attitude toward those areas. If we do not do what we can do, and just say it is all hopeless, * * * we are bound to have accentuation of a disintegration which has taken place instead of a pulling together in many areas, where I think we are getting very definite signs that there is a pulling together and a stiffening.

I want to add to that only that eyes of hundreds of millions of people in southern and southeastern Asia are on the United States, constantly questioning whether they can safely continue to give us their confidence or whether they should turn elsewhere. The action of this House today, our decision to help the people of Korea in their fight for independence, or to abandon them to slavery, will be our answer to their question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman from California one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for one additional minute.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Here are a people wanting to resist communism. We feel that they are able to if we give them this economic aid. We know they will go down if we do not. This is the only foothold we have in northeastern Asia. Is it worth the gamble or is it not? It seems to me very emphatically that it is. Our military men feel so, the ECA feels so, the State Department feels so, and the President of the United States feels so; and that is enough for me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, we of the Committee on Foreign Affairs have given a great deal of study to the vast problem presented by the Far East. There are a number of us who have been very deeply saddened by the complete failure of the administration's policy over a period of years as far as China is concerned. This failure has not been caused only by what has happened in the last 4 or 5 years, it dates back at least to the early thirties. From that tragic moment in 1932 when we failed to protest the taking over of Manchuria by the Japanese; every move that we as a nation made has been unfortunate, whether we acted from ignorance, from a partial knowledge, or from a refusal to face facts.

There are very few people in America today who do not feel that China always has been and still is the very center of and the key to the peace of the world. My very able colleague from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] spoke a moment ago of the understanding that is necessary if we are to have a peaceful world. That leadership must be given. The peoples of the world who are struggling up from difficulty and ignorance, who are freeing themselves from foreign domination do need leadership. This is so throughout the world, and unless we find a way to give them leadership they will fall into hands that will make the world a very unsafe place for us and for all the freedom-loving people of the world. It is quite impossible for us to separate our future well-being and our future security from that of the peoples of all continents all over the globe. I am not saying it is my opinion that we should give and give and give without any question, without any attempt to curtail extravagance, or to limit the misuse of funds. My record in this House will make that very clear to everyone. But I do feel very strongly that there is a force far greater than the military force, a force that comes from the hearts of a people.

Mr. Chairman, I ask you if there is any country in the world that has so illustrated the strength of that inner courage of that inner power than the little country of Finland? Finland has been the only country to pay her war debts to us. Finland has been the only country that has stood firmly for democratic forces regardless of anything that was done on her borders.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield? I want to ask if Finland received ECA help?

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Finland, I believe, paid her debts to us. I have had the pleasure of lunching today with one of the Representatives in the Finland Parliament, Miss Pohjali, who has been in this country at various times during the last few years. To our great joy she told us that the situation in Finland is steadily progressing, that life has returned almost to what it was before the war, that the people are beginning to breathe more freely again. Why? Because of the inner courage they have displayed.

Being a mother—and may I say this in reply to a question of a colleague of mine a few moments ago—I know that no child is ever helped by too much assistance, too much ease, too few demands upon his own strength. I am in complete agreement that no nation is helped by similar methods.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman from Ohio two additional minutes.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, wisdom must be used, judgment must be used and, above all things, mothers know that one must never break a promise to a child.

We set up this little Republic over there, surely our responsibility is not over.

My colleague from California suggested that if we had not been as fast as we were, we would not have had half of Korea. I would remind her that we have had testimony showing that if we had been able to get there a little faster, we would have had more of it. But, our troops were too far south for us to get them there before the Russians could reach the thirty-eighth parallel.

Here is this little Republic fighting its way. We know well that the best soil for communistic control is starvation and discouragement. Above the thirty-eighth parallel they have the power plants and they have all the ease. If we give help to the South Korean Republic to put up power plants near the coal mines, they can then mine their coal, they can also build and run railroads, there is every possibility that that little seed will grow into a very thriving country.

I would urge strongly that this House vote for this $60,000,000. I agree that $60,000,000 might do more somewhere else, or that we may be preparing something for the Kremlin to take over. But, Mr. Chairman, we heard that same argument over Greece and Turkey. We heard the same argument about Europe generally: that we would just be getting everything ready for the Kremlin to walk in and take over. Well, the Kremlin has not walked in at any of those points.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Does the gentlewoman think that it would have been possible to achieve victory in Greece on the basis of economic aid alone, without some considerable element of military aid which was given to them?

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. We did it piecemeal, if the gentleman remembers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to these very able and learned discussions from the financial point of view, much of which is beyond any comprehension that I possess. But, I approach this problem from a point of view of my own which I have followed for a long number of years.

I have been a student of the great forces that make human history, and I feel confident that we are here assembled today in the most tragic, difficult, and challenging hour of human history and that these tremendous issues are complicated beyond words by the emergence into the influence of public policy throughout the world by about a billion and half of brown people in the Orient.

Mr. Chairman, the situation is tragic from our American point of view, because, if under the leadership and world program of the Russian Communists they are able to mass against a handful of free, white folks here, such as we are, with our traditions of democracy and self-government behind us, if they are able to amass a force of from a billion and a half to two billion of people against us militarily or economically or any other way, how are we going to maintain the civilization and the wonderful blessings inherited by us from our fathers? So, for this reason I feel that our policy in the Orient has been a most disastrous one in recent years, and I look upon this little group in the peninsula of Korea as the last toe hold we have on the Asiatic Continent at the present moment. These people are worthy; they have a great history. Two thousand years before Christ they had a great civilization, a great religion, a great literature. They are a fine people. There are 21,000,000 of them. They inherit a fruitful and fine section of the world. They have the shadow of Russia over them all the time. Russia, taking the north half of this peninsula, has seen to it that it runs up contiguous to Siberia, so that it is a continuous portion of Russian-dominated territory and will continue to be.

For the reason that we are now face to face with a world challenge which sooner or later will have to be decided by a terrific sacrifice, perhaps, of men and treasure, I do not want to see this country at this moment withdraw from the one spot in all of dark Asia where people are struggling to be free and where they have a right to expect our help and our assistance.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. EATON. For a question.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Does the gentleman think our Navy should have intervened when the Chinese Communists turned their artillery on that English ship and drove it out of China?

Mr. EATON. I will be glad to take a day or two off sometime and discuss that question with the gentleman, but it has nothing to do with this subject.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I am afraid it will take a good deal longer than a day or two to settle that.

Mr. EATON. I know the gentleman enjoys chasing intellectual rabbit tracks but I will not join him at this time in that practice.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I endorse every word the distinguished gentleman has said. If there was ever a bill that ought to be passed by this Congress for the assistance of a nation that is really trying to help itself, this bill is it, with the amendments the committee will recommend.

Mr. EATON. I have always had the highest regard for the gentleman's ability and intelligence, but it goes even a little higher at this moment. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I understand this money is to be dispensed through ECA; is that right?

Mr. EATON. Yes. The ECA is there carrying on, and I suppose will continue to carry on. That is one of the most successful and practical administrations of funds we have ever had.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that. The ECA in its fifth report to the Congress on September 15 said in connection with counterpart funds that the Korean Government had collected from importers only half of its bill for ECA-financed goods. Are importers collecting from the Korean people and then not paying the Korean Government? Does the gentleman know about that?

Mr. EATON. In regard to the specific question about the lag between the making of counterpart deposits and collections from end users of the assistance—I believe that 59 percent is the current figure for the portion collected of the value of goods furnished.

In part the government of the Republic of Korea has to subsidize the sale of goods to the end users. This practice is diminishing as stability increases and the threat of inflation abates. However, the government of South Korea puts the equivalent of one whole cost—both the sale price and the subsidized portion—into the counterpart deposit. This accounts for part of the discrepancy. The rest of the discrepancy is accounted for by normal lag between billing and collection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for this bill. Our United States Government has made definite commitments to the Republic of Korea, and I feel in all fairness we must keep faith with these people who are making such a magnificent struggle to take their rightful place among the nations of the world. Korea is fighting its battles under tremendous odds and now is the hour of destiny for them and their fight for freedom—and they need a friendly helping hand.

Korea is standing almost alone in the world today as a nation which is actively fighting communism. It is in a virtual state of war. Attacks occur almost daily along the thirty-eighth parallel and the depredations of the guerrillas who have infiltrated even to its southern provinces are a severe drain on Korea's economy. They are particularly costly because Korea is holding a defensive position which is more expensive than maintaining an offensive. It is essential that Korea not only maintain a minimum subsistence level, but it must have a margin of safety and enough food and industrial supplies to tide it over an emergency and enough economic rehabilitation at least to give hope and encouragement to the people of Korea.

Industrial and social development has progressed tremendously since the government of occupation has gone out of Korea. They have plenty of labor—all Korea needs is more equipment and material with which to work.

We do not want Korea to go along the road the rest of the Asiatic countries have. I feel—and it is the opinion of men who should know—that if Korea is given this aid now, she will be able to withstand the onslaught of the Communists and will be able to stand as a first line of defense in the far-eastern waters.

Korea is industrious. She has proved her loyalty, and Korea is most appreciative for the help which has been given. There is no sign in her weakening.

With adequate aid Korea could be considered a strong and secure outpost of freedom and decency in a chaotic world.

I urge each and every Member of this House who believes in the inherent rights of mankind to enjoy the rights of liberty and freedom on this earth to vote for this bill.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, there is not much I can add to the debate which has already gone on. But I am pleased that the debate has been on such a high plane that we have stuck, generally speaking, to the question of aid to Korea. As my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Ohio said, this is an easy bill to vote against. This is an easy bill to demagogue about. This is an easy bill to vote against because you can say you are doing it in the name of economy. But before you do so you had better think of your responsibilities as American citizens and you had better think of the welfare and security of your own country.

This country was responsible for the setting up of the Republic of South Korea. You and I know that if this aid is not forthcoming the American-sponsored Korean Republic will not be able to stand on its own feet very long. You must know that just as we took a calculated risk in entering into the European recovery program so you will be taking a calculated risk in this program for Korea.

The choice is pretty definite—the decision is up to us. In my opinion, a vote for this measure is a vote to strengthen our hand in Japan—northeast Asia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Korean Aid Act of 1949."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to bring some observations before my colleagues about Korea, because in company with three Members of the majority side I had an opportunity to visit Korea this last November. Our committee has issued a report and while I am not free to tell you what is in the report it is in the hands of the Committee on Appropriations and some of you may be able to read it there.

I do want to comment briefly on some things that have been said here on the floor of the House. The gentlewoman from Ohio spoke very highly of Finland. I agree with her 100 percent on Finland. Finland made a great recovery. But I would point out to my colleagues who are voting for ECA funds that Finland did not get any help from the ECA funds. The countries that have made the greatest recoveries are those that did not get help. England is a country that has the lion's share of help and she is coming back for more billions.

If that is the history of what happens to countries that have gotten ECA help, then I would like to have more countries like Finland.

Now, as to Korea, I would like to read a letter, or part of a speech that the chairman of the National Assembly gave to our committee when we were in Korea. This is what he says, in part:

> While other material supplies are highly important for the rehabilitation of Korea, the American military aid can be considered most important and urgent to her. We have no munitions and arms with which to fight the aggressors. We do not expect other people to defend our country. We want to defend it with our own lives; but to do so we must have arms. God helps those who help themselves. We will sacrifice our lives for our country. Therefore, we are earnestly appealing to the United States for aid and munitions.

I think that is very definitely the thing that they want.

I would point out to you also it is not the food situation in Korea that is urgent, because I read from page 33 of the Report on Aid to Korea:

> It is estimated that the 1950 crop will enable Korea to provide for its domestic needs and to export some 200,000 metric tons of rice. This contrasts with exports of 100,000 metric tons from the 1949 crop.

So it is not food. What we are doing in this bill, as I understand it, is to put in some heavy equipment. We are supplying electric-power plants, dams, irrigation districts to irrigate, according to the report, 235,000 acres of land. We are supplying fertilizer plants. I am not revealing any secret when I tell you that our military commission in Korea, the officers and men under General Roberts who are helping to train the Korean Army, made the statement that it is not a question of if the Communists were going to move, but when they would move in.

In such an attack South Korea can only last 8 or 10 days. Well, are we going to put a lot of heavy, permanent improvements in Korea and let the Communists then take it over?

I note in the December 30 report of the ECA that we have appropriated or made available to Korea $10,450,000 for an electric-light plant in Korea.

Korea has other troubles besides machinery, and it is mostly military, because they are going to get along without all of this economic aid. They might need some fertilizer, and I think probably they do. I would be willing to see that they had some fertilizer. They do not need the rice, because they are exporting rice.

But with reference to the money situation in Korea, I happened to be there in 1935 and 1936. The yuan was worth about four to the dollar. We were there last November, and I believe it was 450 to the dollar officially, but on the street you could get 950 or 1,000 yuans to the dollar.

Another reason I hesitate to vote for this bill is that the defense dollars in our own country are definitely limited. We are spreading it pretty thin. If we are going to have real defense of our country, perhaps we had better take this $60,000,000 and defend Okinawa or the Philippines or Japan. The State Department and the War Department have written off Korea as a lost cause. Look at the map that Dean Acheson presented

in his address to the Press Club the other day. It did not include Korea. Korea is written off.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as I have listened to the debate, I have been trying to learn just what our responsibility is in Korea. It seems to me that there has been only one point made, and that is that we have a moral commitment—a moral commitment. I am wondering if we had a moral commitment to the boys who are today buried in the South Pacific. We have heard no word from the Democratic side of the aisle as to what occurred in China, and yet we went to war in defense of China. We talk about this cold war——

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I do not yield. I have only 5 minutes. You had 5 minutes and I did not interrupt you.

I call to your attention that, try as we may, and as fine as our ideals and our concepts may be as to our responsibility to the Koreans, we cannot lose sight of the fact that under the bankrupt policy of our State Department and this administration we are losing the cold war.

In 1945 there were 190,000,000 under Communist domination. In July of 1948 there were 480,000,000. In January 1950 there were 800,000,000. And why? Because we have been following the identical policy that has occurred in China, and now, after the horse is gone we are going to lock the door in Korea. The horse is gone. Everyone who testified, among the military men especially, there was not one bit of testimony to justify our continued interest, militarily, in Korea.

What is asked for in this bill? The statement is made that we are asking for $60,000,000. Mr. Chairman, understand, this legislation calls for $385,000,000.

Just a short time ago, just a week ago we had before our committee a distinguished member of the State Department. In fixing the limitations of our responsibility he indicated that what we should do was to confine our interests within the limitations of a certain arrow running from the Philippines to Japan, and then to the Aleutians. There was not one word as to the value of Korea, not one.

I say to you that as far as a moral commitment to Korea is concerned we should encourage the Koreans, but we are going so to encourage them that we pour in $385,000,000 and build up civil establishments only to have the Communists from North Korea walk in and take them over? That is what we are preparing for; that is what this money will do.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The gentleman mentioned the figure of $385,000,000 Korean aid. Will the gentleman explain his statement?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will refer to pages 27 and 28 of the report he will there find the figures set out: In the year 1950, $150,000,000; in 1951, $115,000,000; in 1952, $85,000,000; and in 1953, $35,000,000. That is the report from our own committee. That is what we are talking about—$385,000,000; not $60,000,000, as has been said. It seems to me it is about time that we talk and act for our own people. Our taxpayers are entitled to some consideration. This is absolutely "operation rat hole." It will be said, of course, that that is demagoguery, but if that be demagoguery, make the most of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who support this legislation providing aid to Korea believe that it is in the interests of the American people to do so. Although Korea would not be strategic in case of another war—nevertheless, Korea is important to the security of the people of the United States. We hope that in Korea we can help build a sound democratic nation that will be an example to the people of Asia. Show them that it is possible to have not only security but freedom as well.

We are playing for very high stakes; we are playing for a world in which freedom and a decent standard of living will be enjoyed by all people. We want a democratic world, not a totalitarian one.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I cannot yield at this time. I want to say to the gentleman, whom I respect very greatly, that those of us who support this bill do so in the broadest sense, and that is for the good of the American people. We believe that it is not in the interest of the American people to turn our back on Korea now that China has come under a Communist government. We do not believe it wise to turn our backs on this new Republic, which has given every indication that it has the resistance needed to withstand communism. Shall we give up the one foothold we have in that part of the world, where our voice can be heard, where the way we behave can be observed and judged in relationship to the way the Russians behave by the other peoples of Asia? Shall we do that?

The gentleman talks about the amount of money involved. This program may be cut as we make progress. It is a lot of money, but what happens if we do not spend it? There is the question, What may that cost in the end?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Did we not walk out on China?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. No; I do not agree with the gentleman that we walked out on China. I do not agree at all that we walked out on China. We gave aid to China and did everything we could to support the Nationalist Government of China, but that Government lost the confidence of the Chinese people; that is a hard fact.

I do not think we should walk out on China now. I think we ought to be very careful not to turn China over lock, stock, and barrel to Russian influence. How do we prevent this? Certainly not by going to war.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The gentlewoman would not say that the Communists do not control China today, would she?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I would say that the leadership in China today is Communist, yes, certainly; but if the gentleman means by that that Russia controls China today, I do not think that he can make a case for that. We do not know.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Has not Mao Tse-tung been over to a conference at the Kremlin in Moscow?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. He is taking his orders from the Kremlin, from Russia?

Mrs DOUGLAS. That does not prove that China is lost behind the Russian iron curtain for all time. This is not the first time that Russia has had her finger in China and has given advice to China. Sun Yat-sen turned to Russia for advice in the twenties when the Western World would not come to the aid of his non-Communist Revolutionary Party.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Even the white paper says that he had to take over.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. White paper or no white paper.

We can save Korea if we act now; we can help it economically, perhaps politically. I think we should.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, to continue the line of argument which I was following at the time of my previous remarks, I should like the Committee to consider further the matter of Korea with relation to the national defense of the United States. In my opinion, we are not justified in doing anything in this world today unless it furthers the enlightened self-interest and the national defense of America. Again, if that be demagoguery, make the most of it.

It is unfortunate that from time to time when one takes an honest, sincere position out of a very deep conviction, it is deemed necessary by some who hold other views to refer to his stand as demagoguery.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. On the map the gentleman showed in his previous discussion, I notice he made a comparison between Korea and what it was surrounded by, and Greece and what it was surrounded by, but the gentleman did not have a map of Japan to the east of Korea showing that the difference, as far as separation is concerned, is nothing but the Chosen Strait between Korea and Japan. Is Japan in its present shape, occupied by us, necessary to our security; and if it is, then what is the

position of South Korea pointing right at the heart of Japan?

Mr. JACKSON of California. The position of South Korea, if one may take the words of the military experts who testified, has absolutely no strategic position with reference to our national defense; nor is it contemplated that South Korea would be defended by the United States in the event of armed aggression. It is untenable; it is outflanked; it is not within the consideration of our national defense to defend it in case of attack, and that testimony is in the record.

What kind of a policy in the Far East could be predicated upon Korea and the geographical location which it occupies? What kind of a policy for the Far East would put economic aid into Korea, which bears no relationship to our national defense, and at the same time refuse a request to put aid into Formosa? Formosa is essentially a point in the line of defenses which include Japan, the Philippines, and Okinawa, all essential and vital to the national defense of the United States. Formosa is a tenable position; it is a position which might well be held; it is a position, certainly, which should be strengthened if we are going to have any kind of policy at any time in the Pacific area.

Now, to commitments. The gentleman from Ohio has pointed out that there is no commitment with respect to Korea. It was stated very clearly in the testimony before the committee that no commitment, no promise, was ever made with respect to the Republic of South Korea. It is very strange that a commitment was not made, because we have been confronted on many occasions since I have been in the Congress with a never-ending series of commitments, diplomatic commitments, in which the legislative branch, that body having responsibility for expending public funds, has had no part. It seems to many of us that the time has come when the Congress should be consulted more frequently with respect to foreign commitments which entail expenditures from the Public Treasury. We do have paramount commitments to the American people and, again, that is not the statement of a demagogue. We have a continuing responsibility to see that the public funds in the United States Treasury are expended wisely, and only in those places where we may expect to receive the greatest possible return for them.

So, the case for Korea, aside from the emotional approach to the Korean problem, cannot stand on its merits as essential to the national defense, or as in any manner as being related to the national security of this country. Our resources, financial and physical, are by no means unlimited. It is true that I have supported the expenditure of many billions of dollars in those areas of the world where there appears to be a hope of success; but only on those occasions where there appeared to be a reasonable hope of success. Calculated risks are one thing, incalculable risks are quite another matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last several words.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with one of my preceding colleagues who said that the debate on this bill has been conducted on a very high level, and I hope that it will continue to be discussed on that level, and that the debate will confine itself mainly to the issue involved in the bill, which is whether or not we will provide economic assistance to the people of South Korea, thereby strengthening their political institutions against Communist aggression.

Korea is one of the newest free nations of the world. Forty years under foreign domination, now 18 months as a Republic and a sovereign nation, it has done a remarkable job in government.

As an illustration of the ability of the present Government to function and maintain internal order against the forces of aggression from within, it has put down two armed Communist uprisings during the past 18 months. The Government is stronger and more stable now than at any time during the past 18 months.

Some Members of the Congress have expressed doubts, and properly so, I think, as to whether or not the new Republic can resist external aggression against border attacks of Communists.

The important fact is that such forces have not made gains, and the internal military forces, the militia and the police, of the new Republic have been able to resist the border attacks that have been made by the Communists of northern Korea. Southern Korea can resist any attack by northern Korea. That has been testified to by the highest military authority of our country, and I think it was testified to before the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Suppose the Soviet Union attacked southern Korea, what then? Of course, that would be different. If the Soviet Union did attack, it would do so at a calculated risk. However, as I see it, it would not be different than if the Soviet Union were to attack other countries in Europe that we are now assisting, the probabilities are that if such an attack were made, which would probably mean war, it could take over those countries. So it is not a matter of southern Korea alone. That would be taken over in the event the Soviet Union itself moved, but the same situation would apply to other countries we are assisting.

The question is, With the power of America as it is, and I hope the power of America will be stronger, would the Soviet Union take the calculated risk of a fighting war rather than the cold war in which we are now engaged?

While I am talking about power, there is only one respect the Communists have or that any Communist nation has, as I see it, and that is respect through fear, where there is a greater power than themselves. That is unfortunately so, but as it is a fact, I believe that we and the countries associated with us in the North Atlantic Pact or under any other relationship should be more powerful than the forces of communism throughout the world.

Should we fail to act in the case of southern Korea, the last foothold of democracy in northeast Asia will be lost. The retention of southern Korea as a free people and an independent nation is of vital importance to us for a number of reasons. A Communist southern Korea will be a direct threat to Japan. One of my colleagues referred to that in a question he asked. It will also be a direct threat to our interests in the Philippines and in Okinawa, and in the Aleutian Islands.

To those of us who stand for affirmative policies in the Far East and elsewhere, failure to pass this bill, in my opinion, would be a matter of vital importance. Therefore, it seems to me that those who favor intervention in Formosa in one way or another should be the strongest supporters of this measure.

For one thing, it is quite probable that if the southern Korean Government receives no assistance from the United States, the chances of that Government's retaining its sovereignty and of its people retaining their freedom and resisting communism are slim. I do not say that they cannot resist. I would not say that about any people or any other nation. It would be too presumptuous on my part. But I make the statement and express my opinion that their chances, without our assistance in this economic rehabilitation and political strengthening, would be very slim.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the passage of this bill is in the national interest of the United States, in view of our world-wide considerations. I hope the House will pass this bill.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was interested a moment ago in a comparison. I do not wish to make comparisons between distinguished Members of the House, but I recall that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] took an opposing view to this bill, whereas the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] urges the passage of this bill. These gentlemen were in Korea some months ago. For the benefit of those who may not have heard his statement earlier in the debate, the gentleman from Arkansas, a conservative member of the Appropriations Committee, stated: "If there is any reason to vote for a measure for relief, this is the one bill that should pass."

I realize that in view of the gradual increase in our present recovery programs we need to recast our thinking on economic aid to foreign nations. This new approach which, in my opinion, promises so much is through the President's point-4 program of technical assistance and the encouragement of private capital to enter these countries.

As a member of the congressional committee mentioned by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER], I desire to point out that of the several countries we visited in September and October, which included Indochina, Indonesia, Thailand, Burma, and Korea, I can in all frankness state that we did not see in any of those countries the military power comparable to what we saw in Korea. Let me make this observation: All too often we forget and fail to appreciate the splendid services of our personnel

who are administering this program in Korea. I recall our able Ambassador, John Muccio, as well as Dr. Arthur C. Bunce, director of our ECA program in Korea. These men and their faithful staffs are performing an excellent job. I recall Dr. Oscar Underwood, as well as Dr. Ned Adams, outstanding missionaries who have served in Korea for many years, who spoke so affectionately of members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. They mentioned in particular Dr. EATON, as well as Dr. JUDD, and several other distinguished members of this committee.

These faithful servants asked that we come back and urge the Congress to pass the assistance contained in this bill and thus keep faith with the Government and people of Korea.

We have already committed ourselves to great projects in that country in the way of hydroelectric developments and other programs. To cut off the funds at this particular time would cause us to lose the value of what we have already put into the country.

It has been said that this particular country is not prepared, militarily speaking. I remember talking personally to President Rhyee. I asked him this question: "Mr. President, is there any chance your army may move out before it is ready?"

He spoke immediately and said: "We are prepared now to resist the aggression of the northern Communists."

Furthermore, if we fail in this particular effort there will be repercussions not only in southeast Asia, but throughout the world.

Furthermore, I am convinced that we will be breaking faith with the Korean people, with that nation which today stands out so far ahead of any other country in southeast Asia.

I am confident, if the United Nations will take a firm stand, so far as aggression from north of the thirty-eighth parallel, together with our continued assistance economically speaking, Korea will withstand the assaults from the north.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, the defense of our people continually raises in my mind the location of two triangles which I shall illustrate by the map that is now being placed before you.

In times past, and prior to World War II, we substantially thought in terms of a triangle which runs from Alaska down to Honolulu and back to the Panama Canal. When we got into World War II we expanded our liabilities considerably by reason of the success of our gallant youth under the leadership of General MacArthur, and we moved from American Samoa, below the equator, down in this general area which I point out on the map back through the so-called trusteed area into the Philippines, Formosa, and Okinawa, and on to Tokyo. Since the end of World War II we have been thinking in terms of a new triangle which runs from the tip of the Aleutians down through Japan, embracing southern Korea, on past Okinawa in the general vicinity of Formosa, down through the Philippines, down through the trusteed area to the Panama Canal.

The whole question in my mind with respect to national defense in the far Pacific is whether or not we want to maintain that second triangle. If we do not want to maintain that second triangle, unbroken—and by that I mean running from the Aleutians, through Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, the Philippines, the trusteed area, with as much support from New Zealand and New Guinea and Australia as we can get, and on into the Panama Canal—if we do not want to maintain that second triangle, I think the head of every Member of this House ought to be examined and exposed to the people of this country.

I have as little patience with Secretary of State Dean Acheson and his position on Formosa as a person could have with anything on earth. To me it is the most ridiculous performance that has ever occurred in the history of our State Department.

It has been my privilege to visit through this area a number of times. I am not a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I am not a member of the Military Affairs Committee, and the information I have got I have to pick up as best I can from dead reckoning and from the contacts that I make. As far as I am personally concerned, I am ready to dedicate everything that I have in human blood or otherwise, to hold that second defense line against all forces that might oppose this country, directly or indirectly. By that I mean to say I have little patience with any person who advocates the breaking of that line. To say to our people from time to time that we ought to contribute to western Europe in opposition to the spread of communism, as we have contributed since July 1945, and at the same time perform in the Far East, as we have performed, in my opinion, is an insult to the intelligence of the people of the United States.

Three years ago, while in Tokyo, I raised with our top officials this basic question: I said, "It is only a matter of months until the Congress of the United States will have to substantially decide whether or not it pulls out of western Europe or the Far East. When the pressure of events forces us to make that decision what in your opinion—I was talking to our forces in Tokyo—what in your opinion should we do? I am not going to quote what was said to me. Quoting these statements that are made directly to us by top-level military men does not amount to a hill of beans on this floor; yet the principal members of this committee will come to this floor and quote all that is said to them and expect us to swallow it without any consideration whatsoever. You can draw your own conclusions.

Here throughout the trust area we have assumed the responsibility for an area which covers approximately 3,000,000 miles of ocean area. Right there today we cover the trusteed areas, the Marshalls, the Marianas, the Carolines, and the Gilbert Islands. The load on the American people will aggregate billions of dollars in decades to come. Those are not going to be revenue-producing islands; they are part of your defense line, and that is why we took them on. Unfortunately, we tied it up with the proposition under the trust agreement with the United Nations Organization, and we must conform to that agreement instead of the judgment of the American people. The Russian agents can meet in the trustee council annually and puncture holes in everything that we authorize or do for the trustee area by reason of our sins of omission as well as our sins of commission. That whole area has got to be tied together through the acts of this Congress. Proposals will, no doubt, come before you between now and June 30 next; that situation is facing you.

We have practically ditched Honolulu and Pearl Harbor as bases by reason of what we are doing in Guam, Okinawa, and other points farther away. How can you defend the Nation unless you have your outposts? How can you hold this extended line if you give up Formosa? I wish some practical person would answer that question for me sometime. It is like playing a game of checkers: I have two men with a space between and my opponent comes between them. What is going to happen? I will lose one of those men just as sure as you know anything about the game of checkers. We are placing the agents of the Communist Government in between two of our men through our giving up Formosa. This breaks the line of defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to continue, on terms consonant with the independence of the Republic of Korea and the security of the United States, to assist the people of Korea in their endeavors to establish a sound economy, to support the growth of individual liberty, free institutions, genuine independence, and representative government in Korea, to strengthen the ties of friendship between the American and Korean peoples, and to help to achieve the basic objectives of the Charter of the United Nations.

SEC. 3. The Administrator for Economic Cooperation is hereby authorized to furnish assistance to the Republic of Korea in conformity with—

(a) the provisions of this act;

(b) the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, wherever such provisions are applicable and not inconsistent with the intent and purposes of this act; and

(c) the agreement on aid between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea signed December 10, 1948, or any supplementary or succeeding agreement which shall not substantially alter the basic obligations of either party.

The Clerk read the committee amendments as follows:

Page 2, line 7, strike out "(a)" and insert "(1)."

Page 2, line 8, strike out "(b)" and insert "(2)."

Page 2, line 12, strike out "(c)" and insert "(3)."

Page 2, after line 16, insert a new section as follows:

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Administrator shall immediately terminate aid under this act in the event of the formation in the Republic of Korea of a coalition government which includes one or more members of the Communist Party or of the party now in control of the government of northern Korea."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for this bill, despite some grave misgivings and full realization that there are several strong arguments against it which have real validity and cogency. In the first place, Korea is not essential to our security. No military man says that it is; every military man before our committee said that it is not. Also the Secretary of State last week, in a speech he made before the press club, is reported to have said that Formosa is not essential to our security because it is beyond a line he drew from the Aleutians through Japan and Okinawa to the Philippines. Korea is also beyond that line. If Acheson's argument regarding Formosa's dispensability is sound, then he himself ought to be opposing aid for Korea, too.

In the second place, South Korea is not tenable whenever there is any effort by Russia or her satellites to take it. I would like to quote the expert opinion of General Marshall on this point from the hearings 2 years ago when he appeared before our committee:

Representative JUDD. If North China and Manchuria should be taken over and organized by the Communists, do you think our position in Korea would long be tenable?

Secretary MARSHALL. I think it would not be tenable.

So you can properly argue, if you wish, that it is a waste of money to pour millions into an area which cannot be defended because of the situation we have helped produce in Manchuria and China, and an area which we have no intention of making the slightest effort to help defend. Furthermore, it may well be against the interests of Korean security to built it up industrially, making it so much more desirable a prize for Russia's agents to seize and use for Russia's interests and against our own.

A third argument you can give for voting against it is that there is reason to believe some in the State Department who sponsor the bill do not do so in good faith. Owen Lattimore, whose ideas unfortunately have probably had more to do with our whole Far Eastern policy in the last decade than any other one person's in America, and also with public thinking regarding Asian matters, wrote an article on this subject which was published last July 17 in the Sunday Compass, which is the successor to the newspaper PM and the New York Star. I should like to quote from it. He said, speaking about China:

The problem was how to allow them to fall without making it look as if the United States had pushed them.

As you know, that policy has been faithfully followed since 1946, although I do not think the State Department and the promoters of the Chinese Communists have been fully successful in convincing our people that our Government did not give free China a push.

He states further:

Korea is another chapter in the same unhappy story. I have yet to meet an American who knows all the facts and believes that Syngman Rhee is either a popular or a competent President of South Korea. In spite of high-pressure elections, his legislature is more badly split against him than China's was against Chiang Kai-shek.

The thing to do, therefore, is to let South Korea fall—but not to let it look as though we pushed it. Hence, the recommendation of a parting grant of $150,000,000.

There is no question but that there are people in the State Department who think South Korea is doomed as a result in no small degree of our own Government's blunders in this whole area which they want to cover up. They ask us to put up this money now so that if and when the day comes that Korea goes, they will have their alibi already prepared. They can then issue a white paper on Korea and say: "Well, we did everything we could, and Congress appropriated plenty of money. But the Government of Korea was just so incompetent and inefficient and undemocratic and corrupt that it failed to hold the support of the people and so collapsed before the Communists."

To those people this bill never was a bona fide effort to save Korea. It is a phony—an attempt to shift blame from themselves for the Communist conquest of Korea which they expect. If we make the money available, they can blame the Koreans; if we were not to pass the bill they could blame the Congress. In any case the primary aim to them is to get themselves off the hook in Asia, to get an excuse for their failure to save Korea all fixed up in advance.

There is a fourth argument against the bill. I myself feel our greatest need is for a positive, over-all consistent and defensible far eastern policy. China was important to such a policy, in fact essential to it; Formosa is vital to it. The Philippines, Japan, southeast Asia are all vital to it. South Korea is not.

Those are all valid reasons why you can oppose this bill. But despite those reasons—and I respect completely the integrity and sincerity of the Members who hold them—and despite my fear that as a result of our actions at Yalta and our inaction in China, the odds are against this young Republic and the difficulties we have helped pile up for it may prove beyond its strength, still I am in favor of passing this bill because the reasons for it outweigh those against it. First, it provides the only hope Korea has. I may think it cannot be saved, but I am not God, and Dean Acheson is not God, George Marshall is not God. Who can say for sure that Korea is doomed? We are responsible for the formation of this young republic, and we are duty bound to give it the best possible chance we can. My complaint about our Korea policy is that it does not provide enough. But if we cannot get our Government to adopt a really effective and comprehensive policy, at least I am not willing to tear away the only hope it has.

Second, I agree completely with the words of Dean Acheson appearing on page 47 of the committee report:

For us just to quit and walk out without giving these fellows who have trusted in us any possible chance to survive is just not a decent American thing to do.

I am sorry he does not agree with his own principles when it comes to China and Formosa. I wish he had reread his own statement before he and the President did to the Chinese on Formosa only 2 weeks ago what they ask us not to do, and I am not willing to do, to the Koreans. I refer particularly to those thousands of Chinese on Formosa, still unwilling to yield no matter what the odds. The weakest elements in the Chinese Government are gone, they have been sloughed off or defeated or defected. The best elements are in Formosa—many of them trained in the United States, almost the only men on the continent of east Asia who understand western democracy, our type of civilization, our free-economic system, and who are committed to them. Their crime was that they tried to orient China toward the west instead of toward the Kremlin. Now they are backed up against the wall in Formosa and we pulled the rug out from under them. For us to walk out on those fellows who have trusted us and not give them any possible chance to survive is just not a decent American thing to do. Besides, if they are liquidated, who will there be in China to try to turn her millions toward the West and freedom again?

If on top of the blow the administration has just dealt to the last hope of the Chinese, we here today walk out on the Koreans, what do you think it will do to the hearts and hopes and confidence in us of the other 800,000,000 human beings in Asia? On their decision depends more of our own future than we realize.

Just because Mr. Acheson has, in one case, China, done what by his own definition is just not a decent American thing to do, is no reason or justification for you or me to go and do likewise in the case of Korea.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Just because the Secretary of State, in other parts of Asia, follows a policy which I feel is unworthy, indefensible, and disastrous beyond calculation to our country, is no reason why I should follow that bad example and unwise precedent. It seems to me that we have got to give Korea the benefit of the doubt no matter how big it be. We ought to give every possible assistance we can, because again and again and again it has been demonstrated in Asia that if, when things look utterly

impossible or hopeless from any western standards, you give them moral support and sympathetic encouragement and just a modicum of balanced military and economic advice and assistance—not American combat soldiers—more can be done for less than anywhere else in the world.

I am willing to bet this much on Korea: I am willing to bet the amount of money involved in this in order to give those people a chance. It is, in part, a sense of moral obligation, in part a concern not to destroy what faith in us still remains in Asia, and in part to get a load off my conscience, or rather to try to atone for what I believe are the sins of our Government in Asia, for which sins we will eternally stand in judgment before God and before history. The burden of error and guilt which we carry is already heavy indeed. Let us not today make it heavier.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota has really posed the real issue to the House today. His statement should be considered together with the remarks of the gentleman from California. The gentleman from California said today that we are only interested in one proposition, and that is the security of the United States of America. There is a further consideration, and that is the good name of the United States of America. If this House throws South Korea to the wolves, we are jeopardizing the good name of the United States of America. Our Nation is responsible for the creation of the South Korean Republic. Our Nation gave encouragement to those people. Our Nation has allowed 21,000,000 people, who do not want communism, who want decency and democracy, and a nation who is willing to fight for its survival, to expect our assistance. They need our help. Now, are we going to let them down on the basis that their position is militarily indefensible? I agree with the gentleman from Minnesota that the good name of the United States is too important in the world today, because if we let Korea go down, what faith will anyone else in south Asia have in the word of the United States. If you expect India to have faith in us, if you expect Indonesia to have faith in us, or any other nation in southeast Asia to have faith in us, it is important that our commitments and our implied promises to Korea be kept.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. How far would the gentleman have us go in protecting Korea from the wolves of communism? To war?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I do not think that is the question at all that is involved today. We are concerned here with economic aid only. No one has asked for military intervention.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this legislation. This is a good opportunity for us to save about $300,000,000. There is no use for us to literally give this to Russia. Every competent military man says that South Korea will inevitably pass to North Korea and to Soviet Communist control.

We had better keep these millions here and apply them to our national debt which is increasing at the rate of $17,000,000 per day.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Administrator is authorized to make available to the Republic of Korea merchant vessels of tonnage not in excess of 2,500 gross tons each, in a number not to exceed 10 at any one time, with a stipulation that such vessels shall be operated only in east Asian waters and must be returned forthwith upon demand of the Administrator and in any event not later than June 30, 1951.

(b) Any agency of the United States Government owning or operating any such vessel is authorized to make such vessel available to the Administrator for the purposes of this section upon his application, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law and without reimbursement by the Administrator, and title to any such vessel so supplied shall remain in the United States Government.

SEC. 5. (a) In order to carry out the provisions of this act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, not to exceed $150,000,000.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate $50,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this act, in such manner, at such times, and in such amounts as the Administrator shall request, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest for advances made by it hereunder, from funds made available for the purposes of this act.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEE: On page 3, line 14, strike out all of lines 14 through 25 and through line 4 on page 4, and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 5. In order to carry out the provisions of this act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, in addition to sums already appropriated, not to exceed $60,000,000 for the period February 15, 1950 to June 30, 1950."

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I stated would be offered, when I made my opening statement. I have no desire to speak further on the amendment.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to support this amendment, but do not kid yourself that this cuts the Korean aid program from $150,000,000 to $60,000,000. It cuts it to $120,000,000 for the first year, but the explanations that have been made to our committee do not reduce the total amount of the program, which you will find on pages 28 and 29 of the committee report.

This amendment also does not change section 2 of the bill, which has already been passed without amendment, which provides a permanent policy of continuing to assist the Republic of Korea.

When you vote for this bill, if you do, you will be voting a permanent policy which is estimated to cost $385,000 in the next 3 years and leave Korea, as long as the far eastern situation is the way it is now, still in the red to the tune of about $35,000,000 a year.

There is one other point I want to make. The words promise and commitment have crept into the debate now and then. I urge you to look at page 182 of the hearings, where Mr. Claxton, on behalf of the Secretary of State, said there was no promise, no commitment, no international treaty, no obligation involved. He said, "It is not as much as a promise."

In view of the fact that our present hearings have been so fragmentary, for reasons I have mentioned earlier, and in view of the fact that they are 6 months stale, and that a lot of water has gone over the dam in the Far East with reference to the movements of Russia and to the backward movements of the United States with respect to that half a billion people in northern Asia whom we have abandoned, all except this 21,000,000, I am going to offer a motion to recommit this bill to the Committee on Foreign Affairs for further study and hearing. I suggest that those of you who feel that maybe we had better take another look at this in view of what has happened, much of which we do not know about now, can carry out that idea by voting to recommit this bill to our committee for further study and hearings.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. If the bill is recommitted and further study is given to the matter, will that not give the Secretary of State an opportunity to revise his testimony which appears at page 47 of the record, where he said, "There is no assurance that the thing is going to be successful. There is complete assurance that Korea will go in 2 or 3 months, if you do not do this." Those statements were made in June of last year.

Mr. VORYS. That was his statement on June 23. There is no complete assurance that Korea will go in 2 or 3 months if this bill is not passed.

Now the Secretary of State can have an opportunity, if we have further hearings, to bring his prophecy up to date on this matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to what the gentleman from New York just said about the possible collapse of South Korea if aid is not forthcoming, let me call his attention to the fact that Korea has been kept going because of appropriations which have been made since the end of the last fiscal year.

Furthermore, in response to the question raised by the gentleman from Ohio, I am sure the gentleman did not mean that there was any misapprehension on this side insofar as the amount needed this year is concerned to carry South Korea through. We have stated that

$60,000,000 was already appropriated and obligated, and this additional $60,000,000, which will be put into the bill if this amendment is carried, means the total for this fiscal year will be $120,000,000.

Mr. VORYS. That is correct; under a program which was set before us very ably and intelligently by the ECA officials which will require $385,000,000 to bring Korea within $35,000,000 of balancing their dollar budget.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Unless Congress decrees otherwise.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that on page 1, line 3, the figure "1949" be changed to "1950."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REDDEN: Page 4, after line 4, add the following new subsection:

"(c) At least one-half of the funds made available to carry out the provisions of this act (including funds advanced by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation but excluding appropriated funds used to repay such advances) shall be used to purchase from the Commodity Credit Corporation wheat, corn, tobacco, and cotton heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Corporation in the administration of its price-support programs, and such other surplus agricultural commodities so acquired as the Administrator determines can reasonably be used by the people of Korea, and to furnish the commodities so purchased to the Republic of Korea."

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to require at least one-half of the money appropriated under this bill to be spent in the purchase of surplus agricultural commodities.

According to a report just issued by the Department of Agriculture, price-support operations in four commodities accounted for the bulk of the loan total. These commodities, the quantities of collateral pledged, and the loans outstanding, as of November 30, 1949, were as follows:

	Quantity	Amount
Wheat.....bushels..	299,369,674	$593,635,564
Corn.....do....	360,788,638	497,482,734
Cotton.....bales..	1,482,498	222,370,127
Tobacco.....pounds..	363,385,733	149,755,155
Other.....	.....	194,850,926
Total.....	.....	1,658,094,506

The warehouses available to the Production and Marketing Administration are overflowing with surplus farm commodities. In many instances, large surpluses against which loans have been granted, are still in storage on the farms. In some cases loans have been granted against grain piled high in the fields because the warehouses available and the storage places of the farmers were all insufficient to care for these surpluses.

The figures I have given you with respect to these four basic commodities represent the products now on hand, and which must be disposed of along with many other farm products if there is to be storage space for surplus commodities on the farms, or in the warehouses. And so the question arises, What are we to do with this great surplus which is fast accumulating and will soon be completely out of control?

One day the Congress will have to order it given away or dumped into the ocean. It is depreciating now to the extent that for the current fiscal year between June and October 1949, the Government sustained a loss of $43,958,000 in carrying out this program. The loss for one year prior to June 30, 1949, was $254,000,000.

In all surplus commodities as of November 30, 1949, the Department of Agriculture had invested $3,370,190,000 under the price-support program administered by the Production and Marketing Administration.

This is a staggering figure of surplus farm commodities in America. It will bring catastrophe to the farmer if allowed to continue. It will upset our entire economy, and something should be done about it before it is too late.

If this amendment is adopted and is carried through our entire foreign aid programs, it will remove approximately $3,000,000,000 worth of surplus agricultural commodities from the warehouses of the Production and Marketing Administration. The effect of such an operation would be twofold. First, it would remove a vast part of the surplus agricultural commodities from the warehouses, and prohibit them from being sold again on the open market in competition with the farm products of 1950. Second, it would reduce by approximately $3,000,000,000 a budget recently submitted by the President, because we would be authorizing the expenditure of surplus commodities rather than dollars.

Certain Members of the Senate have recently suggested that around $3,000,000,000 could be cut from the budget in various ways. If their program is added to the suggestion which would be possible by this amendment, we will have no trouble in balancing the budget, and I urge that this amendment be adopted forthwith.

Other commodities which are in surplus supply, against which loans have been made, aggregate $194,850,926.

The warehouses of this country, I understand, according to the Department of Agriculture, are completely bulging and overflowing with surplus farm commodities. We have invested in those commodities approximately $3,250,000,000, all of which are on hand, or were as of November 30, 1949.

Mr. MILES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REDDEN. I yield.

Mr. MILES. I feel this is a very worthy amendment. Should the amendment be adopted, I will vote for the bill. Otherwise, I would seriously consider voting against it.

Mr. REDDEN. I appreciate that from the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REDDEN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Our farmers in Iowa are getting 18 cents a dozen for their eggs.

Mr. REDDEN. I so understand.

Mr. GROSS. Is there anything in this amendment that would preclude shipping some of the 73,000,000 pounds of dried eggs to Korea?

Mr. REDDEN. Not at all. This includes any products of the farm that the Department of Agriculture or the Administrator of ECA say can reasonably be used by the people of Korea. So I contend that if this amendment is adopted it will have two effects: First, it will help to relieve the surplus agricultural commodities that are available in tremendous abundance everywhere in this country. Second, if this policy is followed in this bill and in all other foreign-aid programs that this Congress may adopt, it will possibly relieve appropriations by this Congress in a minimum of $3,000,000,000, because if we follow out the recommendations of the administration with respect to the ECA program for this year, we will appropriate around three and one-half billion or perhaps four billion. If half or two-thirds of that amount is spent for surplus commodities, then, instead of appropriating dollars, we will be appropriating surplus farm commodities.

So I hope this House may adopt the amendment, not only in order to help the people of Korea but to help the farmers of America who have filled all the warehouses, including their own, with surplus agricultural commodities.

I understand loans have been advanced by the Commodity Credit Corporation on grains that are lying out upon the soil now; that we have corn and wheat and rye and other farm products in such tremendous quantities that they cannot even find shelter for them. At least we might offer them to the people of Korea, since this appropriation is a gift.

I would like to say further that if cotton, tobacco, wheat, and corn in this country are removed from storage and across the waters to the people to whom we are going to give this money, it will save us someday from being called upon to send it out into the ocean and there dump it without any compensation. It reminds me of the story of a man that I talked to down home. I asked the fellow if he raised any rye that year. He said, "Raise rye? I raised so much rye on my farm this year until I had to rent my neighbor's farm to store it on." We are just about that way with surplus farm commodities in this country. We are going to have to find some other country to pile it upon or else send it to foreign countries under legislative enactment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment on its face seems to be a pretty good thing. I come from a tobacco, cotton, and corn country too. We are going to have a real problem of getting rid of our farm surpluses some day, but when we do have to give them away, we want them to do somebody some good.

As far as the Koreans are concerned, they do not need this stuff. It may be better to follow one of the alternative suggestions of the gentleman from North Carolina, the suggestion that if we do not

send some of our surplus farm products to Korea it might be necessary to dump them in the Pacific Ocean. So far as benefit to all concerned, it might be better to dump them into the Pacific Ocean. Certainly they would not be of material benefit to the Koreans because they do not need them. If we dump this produce into the Pacific Ocean, then probably the fish would eat it and we could catch the fish and eat the fish at home and it would help a great many American taxpayers. Agricultural food products are not in short supply in Korea. The estimate of Korea's immediate needs does not include food, except $160,000 of vegetable oils and $630,000 for salt. I do not know whether we have any surplus salt in this country; maybe we have a little surplus vegetable oil.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. KEE. We have reports from Korea that they are now in a situation where they can produce all the salt they want and more too.

Mr. RICHARDS. In Korea we have a country that can produce all of its own food; and, given some additional help, it can grow into a self-sustaining economic unit. A country that is self-sustaining usually has the will to defend itself. It is not easy to find peoples these days who are willing to sacrifice and fight for the democratic ideal. We do not find the will to sacrifice and fight in the hearts of everybody we are helping these days, but the evidence is uncontradicted that the will to fight is in the hearts of the Koreans. They have 100,000 soldiers ready to fight. They have turned back the Communists on their borders twice by force of arms. Korea is one of the few spots in Asia, Mr. Chairman, right now where we can depend on the people to fight to the limit. You have got something here, you have a people who believe in democracy, you have a people who have indicated a will to fight for democracy. The whole Pacific and Asiatic area is looking to the Congress of the United States today. We have promised the people of the world that we would help those who believe in democracy and who would fight for it. Now, having put our hand to the plow, are we going to turn back?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman is not laboring under the impression that there are no hungry people in Korea, is he?

Mr. RICHARDS. No; there are some hungry people everywhere.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Should we not then do something for them by sending them surplus farm products?

Mr. RICHARDS. We are dealing here with the needs of Korea.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. If the gentleman will read the amendment he will find that it reads as follows:

> At least one-half shall be used for the purpose contained in the amendment.

That means that this is an amendment to cut this bill by 50 percent, period.

Mr. RICHARDS. By 50 percent?

Mr. JAVITS. That is exactly what the amendment states.

Mr. RICHARDS. It means that the Koreans will get but $30,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the spirit of this amendment is good; I do not believe that it would work. The Chinese now have sufficient rice; in fact, last year they exported 100,000 metric tons and expect to export 200,000 metric tons this year. They use but little corn and wheat. I think they do want their cotton and tobacco. I doubt very much whether the amendment would be practicable, although I think the spirit of it is commendable.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that a motion to recommit this bill is going to be offered by the gentleman from Ohio. Inasmuch as the chairman of the committee has said there has been a change in the situation, that they do not need salt now—I note the hearings were held in June of last year—that is another reason for recommitting this bill to see if we can get a little more information. Perhaps they do not need all of this vegetable oil. We were told that they are doing pretty well on coal and that the electric-light situation has improved a great deal since this report was written.

My object in coming again to the well of the House is this: the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE], made the statement that there apparently is some difference of opinion between the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], and myself with reference to our visit in Korea. There is no difference of opinion in our committee, as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE] has stated on the floor of the House. I think the Members of Congress ought to have this report, which is now in the hands of the Appropriations Committee. I hope it will be made a public document shortly. I quote from it as follows:

> For example, South Korea needs fertilizer plants and other facilities, but the wisdom of our aiding them to build industrial facilities, unless the United States is entrenched in the Far East sufficiently to buttress South Korea, is open to question. We certainly do not want to be party to developing ready-made industrial capacity and other capital improvements to fall into the hands of the Communists if they should take the country. At least we ought to go slow in this respect until the situation is clarified.

This report was signed by the four members of the committee who visited that area.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that we endorse the request of the Korean Government, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations appointed to visit Korea in order to obtain certain information for our committee. We have made our report to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of our House Appropriations Committee. We did say in our report that we doubted the wisdom of constructing permanent projects until the matter of our foreign policy could be ironed out and settled in the Far East. This, however, is a matter that the Appropriations Committee can handle. I am sure that serious consideration shall be given to this matter. The bill, after the amendments that we have adopted, should be passed.

Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, we were placed in Korea at the surrender conference of Japan. The American flag was placed there, and I am not willing to retreat. We have always enjoyed the friendship of the Korean people. They are a fine and noble people. We have assisted them in establishing their Government. The Government is young although their nation is old in years of existence. The seeds of democracy have been planted and I hope in the years to come the Republic of Korea shall be a strong democratic nation. This bill should be passed. The request of Korea has been reduced. This was done by the Republic of Korea. They reduced their request $30,000,000. We have already given them $60,000,000, and this constitutes the reason for reducing the amount of the pending bill to $60,000,000. I hope this bill as amended will pass.

Mr. KRUSE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I was a member of the committee that went to Korea, along with the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], and I endorse what he just said about the particular legislation now before us. I agree that in our consideration of Korea we certainly have to consider it in its relation to the whole picture in the Far East. We do feel that possibly our whole policy, insofar as the Far East situation is concerned, needs to be clarified in some respects.

I would like to say this so far as my personal observation of the Korean people is concerned. I have never been more impressed with a group of people and their determination and their willingness to sacrifice their lives, if necessary, in behalf of what they believe is right and for the kind of government they wish to have. Korea has had a turbulent history of some 4,000 years. During the 40-year domination by the Japanese, which has just recently ended, I would like to point out the fact that the Korean people had a government in exile, and they never lost their determination to establish a free, independent, democratic government. I think the circumstances warrant our supporting this legislation at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REDDEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REDDEN) there were—ayes 55, noes 95.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 3 after section number 5 insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 6. The authorization for appropriations in this act is limited to the period ending June 30, 1950, in order that any subsequent authorizations may be separately passed on, and is not to be construed as an express or implied commitment to provide further authorizations or appropriations."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the page reference contained in the amendment be made to read page 4 instead of page 3.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to answer the statements which have been made here and which are not grounded upon the record, that this is a commitment by the Congress to engage in a $380,000,000 recovery program for Korea. The idea with which the committee reported this bill to the floor was that it meant exactly what the bill said; that it was an appropriation limited by the date which is contained in the bill itself, June 30, 1950. It was confined to this particular amount, $60,000,000, and that thereafter the committes of Congress and the Congress itself could determine whether the situation warranted going on further. That is borne out by the record to which my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] referred, when he read the statement of Mr. Claxton, but he did not read it all. Mr. Claxton said as follows: "It is not as much as a promise." That is what the gentleman from Ohio read.

Then he goes on:

We have made numerous declarations as to our intention with the Government of Korea. It was a question simply of whether the United States was going to carry through on its declarations as distinguished from carrying through on a commitment or obligation.

In other words, this has been declared to be the policy with respect to the United States, subject—and I underline the word "subject"—to what the Congress may do about furnishing money.

The Congress by the amendment which I have just proposed makes it crystal clear that it is going along with the policy only to the extent authorized by this act, to wit, to June 30, 1950, for the amount of money which is specified in the act, $60,000,000. With that, no one can say we are writing a blank check or a check for more than the exact amount stated, $60,000,000.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Therefore, do I understand the gentleman correctly that this statement by Mr. Claxton of the State Department as to a declaration by the State Department is the one thing in the nature of a commitment to which the gentleman referred in his remarks in the general debate?

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman would recognize, would he not, that the use of the word "commitment" is a rather strong phrase to use under these circumstances?

Mr. JAVITS. I grant it is inappropriate.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I believe the gentleman has an excellent amendment, inasmuch as it will serve to clear up any consideration of commitment and will make it, as the gentleman said, crystal clear that future decisions with respect to Korean aid will largely rest within this body.

Mr. JAVITS. May I say in all fairness, Mr. Chairman, that I have consulted the chairman of the committee, and I think most of the members of the committee favor this bill and may favor this amendment.

I should like to make one other point before completing my remarks about this amendment, and that is to answer briefly the question which has been asked about this bill. I quote this question:

What kind of a policy for the Far East could be based on Korea, and is our national security involved in Korea?

I think we all must understand and we all must believe that our national security is involved in the people of Asia, that the policy for the Far East which we must build must be built upon the people of Asia, and that this bill designs to preserve for our cause, the cause of democracy and freedom, the 21,000,000 people of Asia who reside in Korea.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is not necessary, but in view of the fact that it is absolutely impossible for one Congress to bind a succeeding Congress, and that this amendment merely states what is true, anyway. that a succeeding Congress can always review what has taken place in a preceding Congress, I am willing to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BONNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5330) to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to the Republic of Korea, pursuant to House Resolution 368, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. VORYS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. VORYS moves to recommit H. R. 5330 to the Committee on Foreign Affairs for further study and hearings.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VORYS) there were—ayes 89, noes 112.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 190, nays 194, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—190

Abernethy	Goodwin	Mason
Allen, Ill.	Gossett	Meyer
Allen, La.	Graham	Michener
Andersen, H. Carl	Grant	Miller, Md.
Anderson, Calif.	Gross	Miller, Nebr.
Andresen, August H	Gwinn	Morris
Andrews	Hagen	Morton
Angell	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Moulder
Arends	Halleck	Murray, Tenn.
Auchincloss	Hand	Murray, Wis.
Barden	Harden	Nelson
Barrett, Wyo.	Hare	Nicholson
Bennett, Mich.	Harrison	Nixon
Bishop	Harvey	Norblad
Blackney	Hébert	O'Hara, Minn.
Boggs, Del.	Herlong	O'Konski
Bramblett	Hill	Passman
Breen	Hinshaw	Patterson
Brehm	Hoeven	Phillips, Calif.
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman, Ill.	Pickett
Bryson	Hoffman, Mich.	Plumley
Byrnes, Wis.	Hope	Poage
Camp	Hull	Potter
Carlyle	Jackson, Calif.	Poulson
Case, S. Dak.	James	Powell
Chiperfield	Jenison	Preston
Church	Jenkins	Rains
Clevenger	Jennings	Rankin
Cole, Kans.	Johnson	Reed, Ill.
Colmer	Jonas	Reed, N. Y.
Corbett	Jones, Mo.	Rees
Cotton	Kean	Regan
Crawford	Kearney	Rich
Cunningham	Kearns	Rivers
Curtis	Keating	Sadlack
Dague	Keefe	Sadowski
Davies, N. Y.	Kilday	St. George
Davis, Ga.	Kunkel	Sanborn
Davis, Tenn.	Larcade	Saylor
Davis, Wis.	Latham	Scott, Hardie
D'Ewart	LeCompte	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Dolliver	LeFevre	Scrivner
Doughton	Lichtenwalter	Scudder
Ellsworth	Lovre	Secrest
Elston	Lucas	Shafer
Fellows	McConnell	Short
Fenton	McCulloch	Sikes
Fisher	McDonough	Simpson, Ill.
Ford	McGregor	Smith, Kans.
Frazier	McMillen, Ill.	Smith, Va.
Gamble	Mack, Wash.	Smith, Wis.
Gathings	Magee	Stefan
Gavin	Marcantonio	Stockman
Golden	Martin, Iowa	Sutton
	Martin, Mass.	Taber

Tackett	Velde	Williams
Talle	Vorys	Willis
Taurielio	Weichel	Wilson, Ind.
Taylor	Welch	Wilson, Tex.
Teague	Werdel	Winstead
Thomas	Wheeler	Wolcott
Tollefson	White, Calif.	Wood
Towe	White, Idaho	Woodruff
Van Zandt	Whitten	

NAYS—194

Addonizio	Gordon	Mills
Albert	Gore	Mitchell
Aspinall	Gorski	Monroney
Bailey	Granahan	Morgan
Baring	Granger	Morrison
Bates	Green	Multer
Battle	Gregory	Murdock
Beckworth	Hale	Noland
Bentsen	Hall,	Norrell
Boggs, La.	Leonard W.	Norton
Bolling	Hardy	O'Brien, Ill.
Bolton, Md.	Harris	O'Brien, Mich.
Bolton, Ohio	Hart	O'Hara, Ill.
Bonner	Havenner	O'Neill
Bosone	Hays, Ark.	O'Sullivan
Brooks	Hays, Ohio	O'Toole
Brown, Ga.	Hedrick	Pace
Buchanan	Heller	Patman
Buckley, Ill.	Herter	Patten
Burke	Heselton	Perkins
Burleson	Holifield	Peterson
Burnside	Holmes	Pfeifer,
Burton	Horan	Joseph L.
Byrne, N. Y.	Howell	Philbin
Canfield	Huber	Polk
Cannon	Jackson, Wash.	Price
Carnahan	Jacobs	Priest
Carroll	Javits	Quinn
Case, N. J.	Jones, Ala.	Rabaut
Chatham	Jones, N. C.	Ramsay
Chelf	Judd	Redden
Chesney	Karst	Rhodes
Christopher	Karsten	Ribicoff
Chudoff	Kee	Richards
Clemente	Kelley, Pa.	Riehlman
Cole, N. Y.	Kelly, N. Y.	Rodino
Combs	Kennedy	Rogers, Fla.
Cooley	Kerr	Rogers, Mass.
Cooper	King	Rooney
Cox	Kirwan	Roosevelt
Crook	Klein	Sabath
Crosser	Kruse	Shelley
Davenport	Lane	Sims
Dawson	Lanham	Spence
Deane	Lemke	Staggers
DeGraffenried	Lesinski	Steed
Delaney	Lind	Stigler
Denton	Linehan	Sullivan
Dingell	Lodge	Thompson
Dollinger	Lyle	Thornberry
Donohue	Lynch	Trimble
Douglas	McCarthy	Underwood
Eaton	McCormack	Wagner
Eberharter	McGuire	Walsh
Elliott	McKinnon	Walter
Engle, Calif.	McMillan, S. C.	Whittington
Evins	McSweeney	Wickersham
Fallon	Mack, Ill.	Wigglesworth
Feighan	Madden	Wilson, Okla.
Fernandez	Mahon	Withrow
Fogarty	Mansfield	Worley
Forand	Marsalis	Yates
Fulton	Marshall	Young
Furcolo	Merrow	Zablocki
Garmatz	Miles	
Gary	Miller, Calif.	

NOT VOTING—47

Abbitt	Doyle	Pfeiffer,
Allen, Calif.	Durham	William L.
Barrett, Pa.	Engel, Mich.	Phillips, Tenn.
Beall	Flood	Sasscer
Bennett, Fla.	Fugate	Sheppard
Biemiller	Gillette	Simpson, Pa.
Bland	Gilmer	Smathers
Blatnik	Heffernan	Smith, Ohio
Boykin	Hobbs	Stanley
Buckley, N. Y.	Irving	Vinson
Bulwinkle	Jensen	Vursell
Burdick	Keogh	Wadsworth
Cavalcante	Kilburn	Whitaker
Celler	McGrath	Wier
Coudert	Macy	Wolverton
Dondero	Murphy	Woodhouse

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Vursell for, with Mr. Wolverton against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Allen of California against.

Mr. Bennett of Florida for, with Mr. Gilmer against.

Mr. Smith of Ohio for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Dondero for, with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mrs. Woodhouse with Mr. Beall.

Mr. Murphy with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Biemiller with Mr. Macy.

Mr. McGrath with Mr. Phillips of Tennessee.

Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Engel of Michigan.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Gillette.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. REDDEN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BROOKS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MCMILLAN of South Carolina changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 191, nays 192, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—191

Addonizio	Fogarty	Mack, Ill.
Albert	Forand	Madden
Aspinall	Fulton	Mahon
Bailey	Furcolo	Mansfield
Baring	Garmatz	Marsalis
Bates	Gary	Marshall
Battle	Gathings	Merrow
Beckworth	Gordon	Miller, Calif.
Biemiller	Gore	Mills
Boggs, La.	Gorski	Mitchell
Bolling	Granahan	Monroney
Bolton, Md.	Granger	Morgan
Bolton, Ohio	Green	Morrison
Bonner	Gregory	Multer
Bosone	Hale	Murdock
Brooks	Hall,	Noland
Brown, Ga.	Leonard W.	Norrell
Buchanan	Hardy	Norton
Buckley, Ill.	Harris	O'Brien, Ill.
Burke	Hart	O'Brien, Mich.
Burleson	Havenner	O'Hara, Ill.
Burnside	Hays, Ark.	O'Neill
Burton	Hays, Ohio	O'Sullivan
Byrne, N. Y.	Hedrick	O'Toole
Canfield	Heller	Pace
Cannon	Herter	Patman
Carnahan	Heselton	Patten
Carroll	Holifield	Perkins
Case, N. J.	Holmes	Peterson
Chatham	Horan	Pfeifer,
Chelf	Howell	Joseph L.
Chesney	Huber	Philbin
Christopher	Jackson, Wash.	Polk
Chudoff	Javits	Price
Clemente	Johnson	Priest
Cole, N. Y.	Jones, Ala.	Quinn
Combs	Jones, N. C.	Rabaut
Cooley	Judd	Ramsay
Cooper	Karst	Redden
Cox	Karsten	Rhodes
Crook	Kee	Ribicoff
Crosser	Kelley, Pa.	Richards
Davenport	Kelly, N. Y.	Riehlman
Dawson	Kennedy	Rodino
Deane	King	Rogers, Mass.
DeGraffenried	Kirwan	Rooney
Delaney	Klein	Roosevelt
Denton	Kruse	Sabath
Dingell	Lane	Shelley
Dollinger	Lanham	Sims
Donohue	Lesinski	Spence
Douglas	Lind	Staggers
Doyle	Linehan	Steed
Eaton	Lodge	Stigler
Eberharter	Lyle	Sullivan
Elliott	Lynch	Thompson
Engle, Calif.	McCarthy	Thornberry
Evins	McCormack	Trimble
Fallon	McGuire	Underwood
Feighan	McKinnon	Wagner
Fernandez	McSweeney	Walsh
Walter	Wilson, Okla.	Young
Whittington	Withrow	Zablocki
Wickersham	Worley	
Wigglesworth	Yates	

NAYS—192

Abernethy	Hand	Pickett
Allen, Ill.	Harden	Plumley
Allen, La.	Hare	Poage
Andersen,	Harrison	Potter
H. Carl	Harvey	Poulson
Anderson, Calif.	Hébert	Powell
Andresen,	Herlong	Preston
August H.	Hill	Rains
Andrews	Hinshaw	Rankin
Angell	Hoeven	Reed, Ill.
Arends	Hoffman, Ill.	Reed, N. Y.
Auchincloss	Hoffman, Mich.	Rees
Barden	Hope	Regan
Barrett, Wyo.	Hull	Rich
Bennett, Mich.	Jackson, Calif.	Rivers
Bentsen	Jacobs	Rogers, Fla.
Bishop	James	Sadlak
Blackney	Jenison	Sadowski
Boggs, Del.	Jenkins	St. George
Bramblett	Jennings	Sanborn
Breen	Jonas	Saylor
Brehm	Jones, Mo.	Scott, Hardie
Brown, Ohio	Kean	Scott,
Bryson	Kearney	Hugh D., Jr.
Byrnes, Wis.	Kearns	Scrivner
Camp	Keating	Scudder
Carlyle	Keefe	Secrest
Case, S. Dak.	Kilday	Shafter
Chiperfield	Kunkel	Short
Church	Larcade	Sikes
Clevenger	Latham	Simpson, Ill.
Cole, Kans.	LeCompte	Smith, Kans.
Colmer	LeFevre	Smith, Va.
Corbett	Lichtenwalter	Smith, Wis.
Cotton	Lovre	Stefan
Crawford	Lucas	Stockman
Cunningham	McConnell	Sutton
Curtis	McCulloch	Taber
Dague	McDonough	Tackett
Davies, N. Y.	McGregor	Talle
Davis, Ga.	McMillen, Ill.	Taurielio
Davis, Tenn.	Mack, Wash.	Taylor
Davis, Wis.	Magee	Teague
D'Ewart	Marcantonio	Thomas
Dolliver	Martin, Iowa	Tollefson
Doughton	Martin, Mass.	Towe
Ellsworth	Mason	Van Zandt
Elston	Meyer	Velde
Fellows	Michener	Vorys
Fenton	Miles	Weichel
Fisher	Miller, Md.	Welch
Ford	Miller, Nebr.	Werdel
Frazier	Morris	Wheeler
Gamble	Morton	White, Calif.
Gavin	Moulder	White, Idaho
Golden	Murray, Tenn.	Whitten
Goodwin	Murray, Wis.	Williams
Gossett	Nelson	Willis
Graham	Nicholson	Wilson, Ind.
Grant	Nixon	Wilson, Tex.
Gross	Norblad	Winstead
Gwinn	O'Hara, Minn.	Wolcott
Hagen	O'Konski	Wood
Hall,	Passman	Woodruff
Edwin Arthur	Patterson	
Halleck	Phillips, Calif.	

NOT VOTING—48

Abbitt	Fugate	Sasscer
Allen, Calif.	Gillette	Sheppard
Barrett, Pa.	Gilmer	Simpson, Pa.
Beall	Heffernan	Smathers
Bennett, Fla.	Hobbs	Smith, Ohio
Bland	Irving	Stanley
Blatnik	Jensen	Vinson
Boykin	Keogh	Vursell
Buckley, N. Y.	Kerr	Wadsworth
Bulwinkle	Kilburn	Whitaker
Burdick	Lemke	Wier
Cavalcante	McGrath	Wolverton
Celler	McMillan, S. C.	Woodhouse
Coudert	Macy	
Dondero	Murphy	
Durham	Pfeiffer	
Engel, Mich.	William L.	
Flood	Phillips, Tenn.	

So the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Wolverton for, with Mr. Vursell against.

Mr. Allen of California for, with Mr. Coudert against.

Mr. Gilmer for, with Mr. Bennett of Florida against.

Mr. Lemke for, with Mr. Smith of Ohio against.

Mr. William L. Pfeiffer for, with Mr. Dondero against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Macy against.

Additional general pairs:

Mrs. Woodhouse with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. McGrath with Mr. Beall.
Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Phillips of Tennessee.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. LYLE, Mr. GRANGER, and Mr. HAYS of Ohio changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote just taken and lay that motion on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have been granted a special order to address the House for 15 minutes today. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

TAPS SOUND FOR BATTLESHIP "OREGON"

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, heretofore on several occasions I have called attention in the House to the sad plight of the U. S. S. *Oregon*, the old battleship which performed such heroic service in the Spanish-American War. The final chapter in the history of this famous battleship seems now to have been written.

After the ship was decommissioned by reason of age and obsolescence it was turned over to the State of Oregon and from June 1925 to October 1942 the State of Oregon had possession and custody of the ship, which was maintained as a shrine and historical monument to instill in the hearts and minds of our people, and particularly the boys and girls, patriotism and love of country. However, December 7, 1942, the old battlewagon was repossessed by the United States Navy and in February 1943 was sold to be junked, against the wishes of thousands of Oregon residents whose affection for the battleship led them to believe that it would be of far greater value to the Nation to maintain the ship as a shrine than to junk it for the small amount of salvage it contained.

It may be of interest to future generations to recite here some of the history of this famous battleship. The battleship *Oregon* was constructed pursuant to an act of Congress June 30, 1890, at a cost of $6,280,000, and was launched October 26, 1893. Capt. Charles Edgar Clark was in command when the historic ship made its famous run around South America, through the Straits of Magellan, on to Key West, and then to Santiago, to take part in the destruction of the Spanish fleet on July 3, 1898.

As detailed in the Oregon Journal of Sunday, December 7, 1947, on March 18, 1898, the *Oregon* sailed from what had been her home port and where she had been christened to steam away on a renowned cruise.

The *Oregon* covered a distance of 14,500 miles from Bremerton, Wash., to Jupiter Inlet, Fla., using 4,000 tons of coal and maintaining an average speed off 11.6 knots per hour.

She reached Santiago on the morning of June 1.

On the Sunday morning of July 3, the ships lay at anchor in waters as calm as an inland lake. Officers and men alike, clad in spotless white, were ready for the general muster to listen to the reading of the Articles of War, a customary rule in the Navy on the first Sunday of every month.

Suddenly there was a clanging of gongs and men and officers alike rushed for their stations.

Shouts and cheers rang out. "There they are. There they are." Caps were waved and shouts rose higher as the *Maria Theresa*, one of the most powerful battleships in the world at that time, led the Spanish fleet through the narrow channel and swept majestically from the harbor of Santiago.

Cervera's fleet was making for the open sea when Commodore Schley, on the *Brooklyn*, ordered the Atlantic squadron to close in. The first ship had scarcely cleared the harbor when a shot was made from one of the *Oregon's* 6-pounders, fired by Private O'Shay, of the gun crew.

The *Oregon* had been ready and waiting for this time to come. Chief Engineer Milligan had sufficient steam up to give the vessel a speed of 10 knots, while the other ships started from 5 or 6.

Full speed ahead went the old *Oregon*. She ranged up near the *Maria Theresa* which was already afire from bursting shells of the *Indiana* and *Iowa*, and raked the Spanish ship until she ran ashore on the rocks, 6 miles from Santiago.

Then the *Oregon* charged after the *Almirante Oquindo*, which beached in a mass of flames 10 minutes after the Spanish flagship had run on the rocks.

By now the *Oregon* had worked her speed up to 16 knots, and when about 3,000 yards from the *Viscaya*, which had swung offshore and headed across the *Oregon's* bow, launched a furious broadside. On fire, she, too, headed for shore 10 miles from Morro Castle.

Commodore Schley, of the *Brooklyn*, signaled, "*Oregon*, well done." The only one of the Spanish fleet that had escaped from the harbor was the *Colon*. The *Brooklyn* and *Oregon* shortened the 6-mile lead in short order. From the *Oregon's* 13-pounder, shells struck under the *Colon's* stern, and the last shot of July 3 had been fired.

The commander of the *Colon* dropped her colors at the foot of the flagstaff. A boat from the *Brooklyn* was sent, under cover of the guns of the *Oregon*, to receive the surrender of the *Colon*. Bugles sounded "Cease firing."

The thunder of the heavy guns stopped. The band on the deck played the Star-Spangled Banner and followed it by There's a Hot Time.

The crew of the *Oregon*, 500 strong, bare to the waist, begrimed with powder and coal dust, danced and cheered with joy. They cheered their captain rousingly. The *Brooklyn* signaled, "Congratulations upon a glorious victory."

On the following morning the *Oregon* sailed back over the route of the victory to see what was left of the pride and glory of Spain piled in burning wreckage for miles along the Cuban coast.

The reception given on the Fourth of July to the *Oregon* will never be forgotten. Commodore Schley's greeting signal of "Welcome back, brave *Oregon*," will be remembered as long as there is a history to record the events of those days.

The citizens of our Nation and particularly the State of Oregon are proud of this heroic achievement of the battleship *Oregon*. When the time arrived for retiring the *Oregon* from active service in the Navy, possession was turned over to the State of Oregon, and from June 1925 to October 1942 the State had possession and custody under the memorandum receipt executed to the Secretary of the Navy by the Battleship Oregon Commission, an agency of the State. Title, however, remained in the United States. The *Oregon* was moored in a historic park on the banks of the Willamette River, within the corporate limits of the city of Portland, where it was maintained by the people of Oregon as a historic shrine in commemoration of heroic achievement in defense of our country.

The biennial reports of the secretary of state for Oregon show that from 1927 to June 1941 the State appropriated $154,961.14 for the care and maintenance of the ship, under the supervision of the Battleship Oregon Commission, the members of which served without compensation or other allowance. During this period these appropriations by the State, together with appropriations by the port of Portland, the city of Portland, public subscriptions, and contribution from the United States made possible providing a permanent anchorage for the *Oregon* in the historic park to which I have referred, which was dedicated and improved with the assistance of the Work Projects Administration and was known as the Battleship Oregon Marine Park.

The *Oregon* as maintained by the commission was not only a relic of great historic and patriotic interest but was maintained as a museum for the preservation and display of historic objects having reference to the old battleship. The gun deck also served as a meeting place for Boy Scouts, Sea Scouts, Boy Rangers, Girl Scouts, Campfire Girls, Girl Mariners, and various other civic, patriotic, and character-building organizations, particularly having to do with the youth of our Nation. There was an average monthly attendance of 6,000 visitors to the ship, composed largely of school children and other organizations. The old ship, by reason of its heroic achievements in the Spanish-American War and its glorious history as a fighting battle wagon in the American Navy and its maintenance through the years by

the State of Oregon as a symbol of patriotism to our country had enshrined itself in the hearts of the people of Oregon to such an extent that it had become an invaluable factor in all patriotic endeavors engaged in my our State particularly in time of war. In passing I may say there can be little question that the value of the ship for war purposes as a historic shrine in building morale and patriotism in our people far exceeded the nominal value of the material involved for purely salvage purposes.

On October 12, 1942, the Navy Department, with the approval of the President, as contended in order to meet the exigencies of the war occasioned by the shortage of scrap metals, ordered the vessel scrapped, and these operations began on about December 8, 1942. I was in Portland in my district at the time, and I sent a telegram to the officials in charge of the dismantling of ship reading as follows:

Oregon cooperating 100 percent in war effort. Willing to sacrifice old *Oregon* battleship so near to our hearts that the old ship may again in a new form perform gallantly as she did in her memorable fight. We hope you will see that the ship be not sold to dealers but may go through to war needs without profit to anyone. Please advise if this can be done.

In reply to this telegram, on October 24, 1942, I received a letter from R. W. Berry, commander, United States Navy, deputy Director in the Office of Public Relations, Navy Department, reading as follows:

As our official news release indicated, the U. S. S. *Oregon* is to be dismantled under the strict supervision of the War Production Board and the Navy Department.

I am advised, however, by the Salvage Construction Section of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, that it cannot be guaranteed to have the ship wrecked without profit to anyone.

The only way she can be dismantled is by a qualified wrecker. The project is an enormous one. It is regarded as being next to impossible to obtain the services of a wrecker who will do this job without profit and for sentiment only. Unless you, or perhaps someone else, knows of a person or a company on the west coast who will warrant to wreck the *Oregon* without profit, there is no alternative to proceeding as contemplated.

Please be assured that your feelings about the *Oregon* are fully appreciated. Every effort will be exerted by all concerned to wreck her in accordance with the spirit of your wishes.

Mr. Speaker, after the dismantling of the battleship *Oregon* was presumed to have been completed I asked for the report on the salvage operations and the disposition of the salvage material and the payment received by the Federal Government therefor, and the contribution to the war effort of the scrapping of the battleship.

On April 19, 1944, I urged the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs in the House to make an investigation and report on the salvaging operations, without avail. However, I continued my investigations and inquiries and at last have received from the Secretary of the Navy and the Maritime Commission reports purporting to show the results of the salvaging operations and all of the funds received by the Federal Government therefor and the disposition of the salvage material.

As shown by this report the ship was turned over to Edward M. Ricker & Co., on a purchase price of $35,000. The total amount received from sales of the salvage material by the Edward M. Ricker & Co. as shown by the reports to me amount to $189,629.35 against which the allowable costs and expenses of the contractor to that time, including the purchase price of the ship of $35,000 was $161,811.03. After the hull of the ship was requisitioned by the Navy, the Maritime Commission determined on April 13, 1948, that $10,250 was just compensation for title to the hull that had been requisitioned by the United States and that $1,020.80 was just compensation for delay in payment. These amounts were unsatisfactory to Edward M. Ricker & Co., whereupon the Maritime Commission paid to the Company 75 percent of these amounts, namely $7,687.50 plus $765.60, in June of 1949, reserving to the owner the right to sue the United States to collect an additional amount. The Maritime Commission advised me on January 16, 1950, that they had received no notice of the filing of any action for this collection.

These reports, to me, disclose that the War Shipping Administration repossessed from Edward M. Ricker & Co., salvage material for which they paid the company $93,278.63 which, together with the amounts paid by the Maritime Commission on account of payment for the hull of the battleship, namely $8,453.10, makes a total aggregate of $101,731.73 paid to Edward M. Ricker & Co. by Government agencies for salvage material from the battleship. In other words, the United States Government disposed of the ship for $35,000 but paid back to the purchaser $101,731.73 for purchases of a portion of the salvage material from the ship and is still subject to a suit for additional amounts claimed by the company as payment for the hull taken over by the Government.

I include as a part of these remarks correspondence received by me which will show in detail the entire transaction:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, August 17, 1949.

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANGELL: In my letter of July 15, 1949, I advised you that I would take steps to assemble certain information concerning the *Oregon*, desired by you, and would forward it when it had been compiled.

As you are aware, the Department of the Navy was most reluctant to scrap this ship. On numerous occasions it expressed the belief that the ship could best serve the interests of the country by remaining a relic. For example, Mr. Forrestal, in his letter to Mr. Paul C. Cabot, Deputy Director of the Conservation Division of the War Production Board, stated on August 6, 1942:

"The great need of all available metal for use in the war effort is realized. However, it is considered that memorials such as the battleship *Oregon* constitute a distinct morale factor and should be preserved until all other sources of material have been exhausted."

On September 7, 1942, Mr. Bard stated to the commander of Marin-Sonoma County Council, VFW of San Rafael, Calif.:

"It is, therefore, the present intention of the Navy Department to retain the *Oregon* on the Navy list to remain in the possession of the State of Oregon under a loan status."

On July 22, 1942, Mr. Forrestal wrote the Governor of Oregon as follows:

"Your letter of July 16, 1942, enclosing correspondence with Mr. C. W. Wendle, of the War Production Board, in regard to the use of the battleship *Oregon* as salvage material, is greatly appreciated.

"Your answer to Mr. Wendle regarding the status of the *Oregon* was correct. The vessel can be disposed of only by the Navy Department and by that agency only in accordance with the existing laws concerning the disposition of naval vessels.

"The action of the Seattle office of the War Production Board was taken without the knowledge of the Navy Department.

"The great need of all available metal for use in the war effort is realized. However, it is considered that memorials, such as the battleship *Oregon*, representing in their being the spirit and traditions of the Navy and of the country it represents, constitute a distinct morale factor and should be preserved until all other sources of material have been exhausted."

Other examples could be cited.

The scrapping of the *Oregon* was directed by the President on October 26, 1942. The ship was sold to the Edw. M. Ricker & Co., of Portland, Oreg., for scrapping, and the contract provided that the removal of material would be under the direction or approval of the War Production Board and/or the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Navy Department.

In the spring of 1944 an operational use developed for the hull of the ship, which had not been scrapped, and on April 11, 1944, the War Shipping Administration directed that the hull be requisitioned for the Navy, pursuant to section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended. The ship was delivered to the Navy by the War Shipping Administration on April 19, 1944, and was subsequently fitted for use in the Pacific campaigns, and was so used.

As requested by you, there is forwarded herewith a list of materials removed from the ship up to the time it was requisitioned by the War Shipping Administration, together with its value and disposition.

At the time the ship was requisitioned a cost inspection was made covering the execution of the contract by the scrapping company. This inspection indicated that the contractor, to that time, had received from sales of material the amount of $189,629.35, and the allowable costs and expenses of the contractor to that time (including the purchase price of the ship of $35,000) was $161,811.03.

Section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act of June 29, 1936 (46 U. S. C. 1242), under which the *Oregon* was requisitioned from the scrapping contractor for use in the Pacific, places the determination of compensation for the seizure in the hands of the Maritime Commission. It is understood that this determination has not been finally made, and, accordingly, any fiscal data subsequent to the cost inspection made at the time the ship was requisitioned is not available. I suggest that inquiries in regard to this settlement with the wrecker be addressed to the Maritime Commission.

I trust the above information adequately answers the request for information contained in your letter of July 7.

Sincerely yours,

DAN A. KIMBALL,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

[Enclosure: (1) Copy of list of material disposed of as a result of the dismantling of the battleship *Oregon*.]

Material disposed of as a result of the dismantling of the battleship "Oregon"

Delivery date	Material	Weight	Dollar value	Purchaser	Invoice No.
1943		*Pounds*			
	1 2½ hp. 110-v. d. c. shunt-wound motor	1,000E	$140.15	Marine Electric Co	101
	1 13¾ hp. 110-v. d. c. shunt-wound motor	900E	108.90	do	
	1 200 AMP ammeter	20E	28.00	do	
	1 150-volt voltmeter	20E	28.00	do	
	3 electric controllers	300E	90.00	do	
Apr. 21	1 100-kw. steam generator, complete with ammeter, voltmeter, rheostat, and circuit breaker.	22,000E	10,000.00	War Shipping Administration	102
	2 600 cu. ft. per min. blowers with motors attached, 7" outlet, 7½" inlet motor #165620 #14484.	3,000E	190.70	do	
	6 4,000 cu. ft. per min. blowers with motors #163543, #163558, #163572, #163564, #163569, #163570.	12,000E	1,899.78	do	
	4 2,500 cu. ft. per min. blowers with motors #163489, #163500, #163474, #163737.	6,000E	956.80	do	
June 9	1 16" dia. bronze hand wheel	25E	6.15	Columbia River Deperming Sta	104
	16 37" brass deck stanchions	448E	91.20	do	
	4 37" brass deck stanchions with end rings	120E	24.40	do	
June 16	35 valves from ½" to 1¾"	90E	36.25	V. E. Stevens	105
	30 used valves	85E	33.75	Yelton Plumbing & Heating	106
	4 brass wheels (used)	40E	3.75	do	
	1 used iron stairway 9'	200	7.75	do	
	1 used chain ladder	82			
June 9	2 rolls linoleum		120.00	Oregon Electric Steel Rolling Mills	107
	1 5" Leslie reducing valve	50	220.00	War Shipping Administration	108
	1 2" Leslie reducing valve	40	78.50	do	
	3 ash hoists, shafts and drums	4,500	750.00	do	
	1 Westinghouse compressor	850	250.00	do	
	1 Combination air and circulating pump with steam and exhaust valves and condenser.	3,000	1,620.25	do	
	2 electric centrifugal pumps for vegetable oil 2½" suction 2" discharge.	1,000	197.00	do	
June 24	2 fire and bilge pumps	5,000	1,392.00	do	109
	3 boiler feed pumps	7,500	3,126.75	do	
	3 discharge valves for feed pumps	100		do	
	1 steam end valve for feed pumps	40		do	
	1 suction valve for feed pumps	50		do	
July 13	1 steel tank	150E	15.00	Dolan Wrecking Co	113
July 16	15 tanks	3,000	67.50	Hall Machinery & Supply Co	114
	⅜" chain (short lengths)	1,735	52.05	do	
July 26	1 broken vise	40	5.00	Fred Rupley	117
	Toilet with valve	75	5.00	do	
	Chain hoist	50	25.00	do	
July 15	4 used worm gear assemblies	600E	100.00	Mixermobile Manufacturers	118
July 22	1 C/L scrap brass and bronze	73,040	7,669.20	Portland Bag & Metal Co	119
July 13	1 C/L scrap steel	51,140	216.89	Zidell Machinery & Supply Co	120
	do	61,020	258.79	do	121
July 20	do	77,820	486.38	do	122
July 28	do	111,640	1,105.51	Luria Bros. & Co., Inc	123
July 16 and July 27	2 evaporating units with 2 4 x 8 x 3½ pumps and 1 12 x 10 x 12 pump; 1 steam valve for pumps: 9 extra tubes; 1 piece 5" pipe; 2 steam valves 3"; 1 angle valve 5"; 2 globe valves 5".	24,000E	8,000.00	War Shipping Administration	124
July 9	4 fire, bilge, and ballast pumps	8,000	2,785.20	do	125
	2 auxiliary air pumps 11 x 16 x 11, with 16 valves, 5 discharge valves, 1 governing valve, 1 manifold, 6 air chambers.	6,000	1,392.60	do	
	2 Westinghouse air compressors	1,800	500.00	do	
July 16	1 spare armature for 100-kw. generator	3,000E	1,500.00	do	126
	1 electric winch	1,300	2,000.00	do	
	1 2" Mason reducing valve	40	87.50	do	
	1 1½" Leslie reducing valve	25	45.00	do	
	2 hot-water heaters	1,500	200.00	do	
July 15	2 100-kw. generators with 2 bundles pipe fittings, 2 flywheel guards, 2 rheostats for generators, 6 extra wrist pins for generators, and 1 bundle piping.	42,000E	20,000.00	do	127
July 28	1 lot copper pipe	25,560	6,390.00	do	128
Aug. 2	1 C/L scrap steel	126,200	1,315.58	Luria Bros. & Co., Inc	129
July 16	Rope	919	34.46	Zidell Machinery & Supply Co	130
	6 pieces smokestack	19,075E	170.31	do	
July 15	3 pieces smokestack	17,260E	153.57	do	131
Aug. 4	1 tin locker	10	1.50	R. D. Mason	132
	1 60-gallon tank	100	10.00	do	
	2 brackets	80E	1.94	Wm. Ball	133
	2 lights	21	5.25	H. Crawford	134
	4 tin drawers	80E	1.94	do	
Aug. 2	1 C/L scrap steel	118,080	1,238.79	Luria Bros. & Co., Inc	135
July 19	do	55,300	234.53	Zidell Machinery & Supply Co	136
Aug. 5	2 reduction gear assemblies	250E	50.00	Sundfelt Equipment Co	137
July 16–24, 27.	5 feed pumps	12,500E	5,211.25	War Shipping Administration	138
July 19	1 1½" Leslie reducing valve	25E	45.00	do	
Aug. 6	6 shaft alley lube oil tanks	3,240E	324.00	do	
	1 electric warping winch	13,000E	2,000.00	do	139
	1 steam warping winch	8,000E	750.00	do	
	1 1,500-gallon stove oil tank	2,500E	250.00	do	
Aug. 5	1 rotary compensator, 15 kw		Consigned	Sundfelt Equipment Co	*140
	3 15 hp. GE motors		Consigned	do	
Aug. 9	3 hauser reels with cranks	2,400E	1,050.00	War Shipping Administration	141
	2 shaft alloy oil tanks, 8 x 37 x 17	1,080E	108.00	do	142
Aug. 12	2 3-hp. GE motors		Consigned	Sundfelt Equipment Co	*144
	4 motor generators		Consigned	do	
	1 15-hp. GE motor		Consigned	do	
	3 15-kw. convertor		Consigned	do	
	1 GE controller		Consigned	do	*145
	1 GE back geared motor		Consigned	do	
	4 GE motors		Consigned	do	
	1 GE motor shell and armature		Consigned	do	
	1 2½-hp. motor generator		Consigned	do	
	2 3½-hp. GE motors (split cases)		Consigned	do	
	4 back geared motors		Consigned	do	
	2 motor generators		Consigned	do	
	2 GE motors, 3 hp		Consigned	do	*146
	1 standard dynamo 1½-kw		Consigned	do	
	1 split case motor		Consigned	do	
	2 motor generator sets		Consigned	do	
	2 motors		Consigned	do	
	1 small motor with paper pinion		Consigned	do	
Aug. 11	1 C/L scrap steel	132,380	620.53	Luria Bros. & Co., Inc	148
	1 2½" release valve	20E	8.00	J. C. Barnard	149

*Refer to invoice No. 248.

Material disposed of as a result of the dismantling of the battleship "Oregon"—Continued

Delivery date	Material	Weight	Dollar value	Purchaser	Invoice No.
1943		*Pounds*			
Aug. 18	1 toilet with pump	75E	$10.00	R. Krimbel	150
	¾6 galvanized chain	32	1.92	do	
Aug. 19	4 pieces shafting	985	29.35	Janisch Bros	151
	4 pieces plate	85			
	Bolts	210	10.50	do	
Aug. 20	2 lamps	14	3.50	B. E. Goodrich	156
Aug. 24	1 C/L scrap steel	124,560	583.87	Luria Bros. & Co., Inc	158
Aug. 26	250' 1¼" pipe	750E	31.25	Pacific Paperboard Co	159
	40' catwalk	810	22.28	do	
	2 stairways	454	12.48	do	
	1 lub. part	5E	1.00	R. D. Mason	160
	1 mail box	60E	1.20	do	
	1 wall shelf	15E	2.00	do	
	1 toilet	75E	7.50	C. J. Nagel	161
	1 washbowl	50E	5.00	do	
	20' 1¼" pipe	60E	2.05	do	
	40' 1½" pipe	160E	6.60	do	
Aug. 27	2 auxiliary condensers with comb. air and circulating pump, 7½ x 9¼ x 11".	6,000E	2,921.00	War Shipping Administration	162
	1 1½" Leslie reducing valve	25E	45.00	do	
	1 Westinghouse Simplex air compressor, 11 x 11 x 12	850E	250.00	do	
Aug. 25	4 small chain blocks	200E	100.00	Brown Bros. Welding Co	163
	1 small chain block incomplete	50E	15.00	do	163
	2 reduction gear assemblies	200E	30.00	do	
	1 gong bell	5E	1.50	do	
	2 hand-operated hydraulic pumps	100E	40.00	do	
Aug. 24	1 truckload armor-plate studs	32,370	645.40	Portland Bag & Metal Co	164
Aug. 27	1 C/L scrap steel	116,660	729.12	Salco Iron & Metal Co	165
Aug. 28	1 piece angle iron	110E	2.91	A. O. Kaiuu	166
Aug. 27	Copper pipe	11,666	2,916.50	War Shipping Administration	167
Sept. 1	9 wooden drawers and frames	200E	18.00	H. B. Crawford	168
	8 wooden wall shelves	120E	16.00	R. D. Mason	169
	2 5' ladders	194	9.70	Frank Key	170
	Brass pipe and fittings	15	3.75	Perry Nagle	171
	Turnbuckles	42	2.10	do	
	Brass pipe and small valve	13	3.25	F. W. Melville	172
	do	14	3.50	R. Krimbel	173
	Small chain	24	1.20	do	
	2 small wooden skylights	200E	20.00	do	
Aug. 16	2 turret-turning assemblies consisting of 1 roller race holder, and ring and housing for same.	22,330	334.95	Steel Tank & Pipe Co	174
Sept. 3	Steel plate	390	10.73	Fielding & Shepley	175
Sept. 1	Old bolts	200	10.00	Pacific Paperboard Co	176
Sept. 7	Angle irons	103	2.06	Fielding & Shepley	177
Sept. 3	4 ½-ton used chain blocks	200	100.00	Fred A. Rupley	178
	2 toilets with flushing valves	150	20.00	do	
	2 hand bowls	100	10.00	do	
Sept. 7	Brass fittings	14	3.50	F. W. Melville	179
Sept. 8	6 bed springs	240	12.00	R. Krimbel	180
	2 knuckle joints	6	2.00	do	
	Brass fittings	15	3.75	do	
Sept. 9	10 pieces old lumber		3.00	Pacific Paperboard Co	181
Aug. 28	1 C/L scrap steel	121,700	1,220.16	Luria Bros. & Co., Inc	183
Sept. 10	1 door (wooden)	60E	5.00	H. V. Arveson	184
Sept. 14	Used pipe	640	32.80	Geo. Koehmstedt	185
	Old bolts and nuts	503	25.15	Pacific Paperboard Co	186
	2 hardwood planks	100	4.00	do	
Sept. 15	1 C/L scrap steel gun	137,540	644.72	Steel Tank & Pipe Co	187
Sept. 11	do	74,060	347.16	do	188
Sept. 4	1 wardroom wall shelf	15E	1.99	Clair Reeves	189
Sept. 17	2 marine toilets	100E	9.70	W. W. Grenfell	190
Sept. 20	Used ½-inch conduit pipes	25	.96	Jack Griffith	191
Sept. 10	1 C/L scrap steel	154,130	963.31	Salco Iron & Metal Co	192
Sept. 16	Prepared scrap steel	5,770	30.91	Zidell Machinery & Supply Co	193
Sept. 15	1 C/L scrap steel	116,700	1,272.21	Luria Bros. & Co., Inc	194
	do	85,000	871.08	do	195
Sept. 21	1 desk	100E	10.00	Wm. Ball	197
	1 wall rack	50E	2.00	do	
	1 hardwood drawer	100E	5.00	R. D. Mason	198
Sept. 15	1 C/L scrap steel	107,460	1,065.68	Luria Bros. & Co., Inc	200
Sept. 21	8 shower bath heaters of mixers with 4 bundles of valves	200E	160.00	War Shipping Administration	201
	2 feed water heaters	1,480	200.00	do	202
Sept. 20	Grate bars assorted	7,291	72.91	Pacific Paperboard Co	204
	do	7,925	79.25	do	
	Brass fittings	13	3.25	do	
	Grate bars assorted	7,925	79.25	do	
Sept. 24	4 30 x 24 steam jacketed copper kettles	1,335	140.18	Portland Bag & Metal Co	206
	1 35 x 28 steam jacketed coffee cooker				
	1 C/L scrap steel	70,560	684.35	Luria Bros. & Co., Inc	207
Sept. 27	1 bathtub	150E	10.00	J. A. Schlarb	217
Sept. 28	1 small brass gong	2	.50	C. B. Korten	218
	1 boat toilet	75	5.00		
Sept. 29	1 C/L steel scrap	118,760	556.69	Dulien Steel Products Co	219
Sept. 25	do	97,460	700.62	Salco Iron & Metal Co	220
Sept. 27	1 C/L nonferrous scrap	72,200	7,581.00	Portland Bag & Metal Co	221
Sept. 25	1 C/L lead scrap	95,140	5,042.42	do	222
Sept. 30	Brass fittings	12	3.00	R. D. Mason	223
Sept. 20	Heating coils	1,689	261.80	Portland Bag & Metal Co	224
Sept. 30	260' 4" I beams	2,600	71.50	Fred A. Rupley	225
July 10	Brass valves	65	16.25	Clark & Wilson Lumber Co	226
	Brass washers	26	6.50	do	
	Brass shaft	29	7.25	do	
	Brass flexible hose	8	8.00	do	
Oct. 5	1 C/L scrap lead	69,100	3,662.30	Portland Bag & Metal Co	227
Oct. 11	20 board feet teakwood		10.00	R. Campbell	228
	1 porthole window	30	7.50	C. V. Eversole	229
Oct. 13	1 lot tin drawers and galvanized cabinet	500	10.00	R. D. Mason	230
	10 drawers	200	5.00	do	
Oct. 4	1 galvanized iron tank	340	34.00	Pacific Paperboard Co	231
	Brass fittings	11	2.75	do	
	Brass steam coil	120	24.00	do	
Oct. 8	1 piece ship plate	817	8.72	do	
	1 steam trap	187	1.87	do	
	1 Belgo strainer	151	1.51	do	
Oct. 13	Brass fittings	40	10.00	do	

Material disposed of as a result of the dismantling of the battleship "Oregon"—Continued

Delivery date	Material	Weight	Dollar value	Purchaser	Invoice No.
1943		*Pounds*			
Oct. 5	10 H. P. boiler	4,500	$100.00	Frank C. McCrum	232
Oct. 14	1 bathtub	150	10.00	Rafael Pumula	233
Oct. 13	16 1 1/16" x 9' 2" steel rods and nuts	1,264	34.76	San Francisco Bridge Co	234
	12 sets 1 1/2" and 1" double coil steel springs 16" long	1,176	70.56	do	
	24 bronze spacers	192	48.00	do	
Oct. 14	1 lot tin drawers and galvanized iron cabinet	500	10.00	R. D. Mason	235
	10 drawers	200	5.00	do	
	12 pounds of brass fittings	12	3.00	do	
	Adjustment invoice No. 119		308.21	Portland Bag & Metal Co	236
Oct. 11	1 C/L scrap steel stack and pipe	47,560	399.82	Zidell Machinery & Supply Co	237
Oct. 20	2 sheave load blocks	400	40.00	Sundfelt Equipment Co	238
Oct. 19	1 piece shafting 10' 6" long	450	12.38	Janisch Bros	239
	Small shafts	830	22.82	do	
	2 1 1/4" x 9" bars	280	7.70	do	
	1 piece 3" shaft	211	5.80	do	
	Channel iron	233	6.40	do	
Oct. 20	Brass	5	1.25	Ken Krivanek	240
	Brass fittings	26	6.50	Pacific Paperboard	241
	Iron fittings	130	13.00	do	
Oct. 19	1 C/L steel scrap	88,420	690.78	Commercial Iron Works	242
Oct. 18	do	121,780	761.12	Salco Iron & Metal Co	243
	Prepared steel scrap	22,040	118.07	Zidell Machinery & Supply Co	244
Oct. 25	1 piece 1/2 steel ring from 13" gun turret 3 1/2" x 5" x 8' 6"	463	4.13	Acme Tool Works, Inc	245
Oct. 20	Copper pipe	22,800	5,700.00	War Shipping Administration	247
	For merchandise consigned to you on our invoices No. 140, 144, 145, and 146.		1,600.00	Sundfelt Equipment Co	248
Oct. 26	Davits	9,570	478.50	War Shipping Administration	249
	1 1 1/2" Leslie reducing valve	25	45.00	do	
	1 engine oil tank, capacity 72 gallons		21.50	do	250
	2 engine oil tanks, capacity 197 gallons		184.40	do	
	1 engine oil tank, capacity 66 gallons		20.00	do	
	2 storm oil tanks, capacity 129 gallons		69.00	do	
	3 linseed oil tanks, capacity 63 gallons		51.60	do	
	2 feed and filter tanks capacity 319 gls		230.00	do	250
	2 air receivers 30" x 6'		210.60	do	
	1 Westinghouse cross compound steam compressor		425.00	do	
Oct. 28	2 small towel rings	8	2.00	Francis Majors	251
Oct. 29	2 back geared GE motors	1,225E	150.00	Sundfelt Equipment Co	254
	1 squirrel cage d. c. motor	600E	750.00	do	
	Equipment for motors	975E		do	
Nov. 1	8 pieces shafting	1,732	47.63	Portland Fabricating Co	257
	1 flagstaff	400	20.00	Charles W. Ackerman	258
Nov. 3	Adjustment weight on invoice # 15 8	760	786.81	Luria Bros. & Co., Inc	261
Nov. 2	10' extra heavy 2 1/2" pipe	125	2.50	E. Erion	270
Oct. 30	6 deck ladders	1,212	599.40	War Shipping Administration	271
	1 lot flat grating	10,776			
Nov. 8	1 lot wood grating		4.00	R. D. Mason	280
	Brass fittings	11	2.75	do	
	1 copper sink	42	10.50	H. B. Crawford	281
	1 bathtub	150E	10.00	Ross LaRoy	282
	do	150E	10.00	R. E. Lindsay	283
	1 toilet (broken base)	75E	5.00	do	
Nov. 5	1 spring	60	1.94	A. Doe	284
Nov. 9	Forging stock as selected	14,003	125.03	Portland Fabricating Co	285
Nov. 11	Forging stock	5,900	52.68	Acme Tool Works	287
	Adjustment on nickel content on invoice #148		768.28	Luria Bros. & Co., Inc	297
Nov. 1	1 lot scrap lead	4,700	249.10	Portland Bag & Metal Co	300
Nov. 9	do	80,860	4,285.58	do	301
Nov. 17	Brass fittings	38	9.50	R. D. Mason	302
	10' 1/2" pipe	15	.50	do	
	2 tin drawers	40	2.00	do	
Nov. 22	1 piece steel ring	628	5.61	Acme Tool Works	313
Nov. 12	66' iron bands	112	12.32	Pacific Paperboard Co	314
	132' iron bands	336			
	2 strainers	700	19.25	do	
	1 enameled-lined trough	150	5.00	do	
	2 plates	160	7.15	do	
	80' 8" pipe	800	40.00	do	
	3 tin drawers	60	1.50	do	
	356 grate bars	11,214	112.14	do	315
Nov. 22	1 load piping	3,510	70.20	do	316
	52' 2 1/2" galvanized pipe	390	10.92	do	
	1 steel stairway	190	5.22	do	317
	do	170	4.68	do	
	1 lot various sizes piping	2,885	57.50	do	
Nov. 26	Wooden grating		5.00	R. D. Mason	318
Nov. 23	4 pieces long irons	2,000	55.00	W. E. Burdett Co	319
Nov. 27	2 bolt racks	1,840	20.00	Pacific Paperboard Co	337
	1 tin box	20	1.50	do	
	1 wood cupboard	60	5.00	do	
Nov. 23	Brass fittings	496	124.00	do	338
	Bolts and nuts	138	6.90	do	
	2 cast iron traps	200	10.00	do	
Nov. 27	28' 6" galvanized pipe	280	14.00	do	339
	Steel plate	5,405	148.64	do	
Nov. 24	10 pieces 91 board feet used teakwood blocks		63.70	Seattle Police Department	340
Nov. 27	1 used 250# steam gauge	25E	10.00	Port of Kalama	341
Nov. 16	1 piece steel plate	3,275	90.06	Longview Fibre Co	353
Dec. 2	1 4" globe valve	121	75.00	Albina Engine & Machine Works	354
Nov. 26	Brass fittings	10	2.50	Kelso Junk Co	357
	1 hammer	25	3.00	do	
	2 iron traps	200	4.00	do	
Dec. 5	1 brass hand wheel	8	2.00	Portland Fabricating Co	370
	1 1 1/2" valve (brass)	4	1.00	do	
	1 1 1/2" pipe (brass)	36	3.00	do	
Nov. 27	Galvanized iron ventilating flues, plates and pipes	6,215	124.30	Pacific Paperboard Co	372
	Galvanized iron vent, flues, plates, and pipes	4,303	86.06	do	373
	Brass fittings	16	4.00	do	374
	Steel plate	11,926	327.96	do	
	Cast iron fittings	252	6.93	do	
Dec. 10	300' 1 1/4" pipe short lengths		37.50	do	375
	Galvanized flues, screens, etc	600	12.00	do	
	3 wall shelves (wooden)		6.00	R. D. Mason	376
Dec. 13	1 plate	30	2.00	Thomas Hakala	377
	1 piece pipe	10	1.00	do	

Material disposed of as a result of the dismantling of the battleship "Oregon"—Continued

Delivery date	Material	Weight	Dollar value	Purchaser	Invoice No.
1943		*Pounds*			
Dec. 6	1 C/L nonferrous metals	104,200	$10,941.00	Portland Bag & Metal Co	380
Dec. 14	100' 2" black pipe	600	21.00	Frank C. McCrum	382
	200' 1½" black pipe	900	33.00	do	
	40' 1" black pipe	80	4.10	do	
	250' ¾" black pipe	375	20.00	do	
Oct. 16	85' 2" pipe	510	17.85	do	383
	96' 1½" pipe	425	15.84	do	
Oct. 6	Brass fittings	154	38.50	Pacific Paperboard Co	384
	Steel plates	136	3.74	do	384
	do	45	1.23	do	
Oct. 8	Copper pipe	3,003	900.75	War Shipping Administration	387
Dec. 7	1 stove oil tank 9' x 6' x 30"		186.60	do	387
	20 iron ladders	3,449	172.45	do	
	1 small Dow pump 4" x 5" x 5"		150.00	do	
Dec. 23	Usable fittings	85	21.25	M & M Plywood Co	389
	1 load usable plates and beams	1,465	40.29	W. E. Burdett Co	390
Dec. 27	1 lamp	5	1.25	W. G. Peters	392
Dec. 9	1 only stock anchor complete with mooring shackle	4,340	260.40	Nieder & Marcus	393
Dec. 27	Bolts and nuts	90	4.50	Perry Burcham	399
	Universal coupling	11	2.75	do	
	Flexible hose and coupling	6	1.50	do	
Dec. 28	20 blocks teakwood, 270 board feet		189.00	Seattle Police Department	396
1944					
Jan. 3	Flat iron	150	4.13	H. G. Burkhamer	397
Jan. 14	1 radiator		20.00	Columbia Shipbuilding & Drydock Co	428
	2" valve, brass	10	2.50	do	
	1½" valve brass	5	1.25	do	
	1" union		.45	do	
	2 ½" tees		.40	do	
	10' 1½" brass pipe	30	7.50	do	
Jan. 20	2 large anchor davits	25,140	1,257.00	War Shipping Administration	457
Jan. 21	do	25,280	1,264.00	do	
Jan. 24	20' ½" used pipe		1.00	M. W. Houhtonen	458
Feb. 2	Copper pipe	75	18.75	Pacific Paperboard Co	460
Feb. 23	Steel plate	15,840	435.60	do	479
Mar. 1	Steel plate and ladders	4,205	115.64	do	486
Mar. 2	do	10,305	283.38	do	487
	Bolts and nuts	1,060	53.00	do	
	Steel plate	6,645	182.74	do	489
	Bolts and nuts	792	39.60	do	
Dec. 7	2 duplex auxiliary hydraulic pumps		1,500.00	War Shipping Administration	499

On Mar. 3, Edw. M. Ricker & Co. sold to the William Shenker Co. a co-partnership, 427 Pacific Building, Portland, Oreg., the remaining armor plate, teakwood, nonferrous metals, lead, boilers, pumps, miscellaneous scrap and machinery as then located on the Battleship *Oregon* including anchors, chain, and windlass, but exclusive of hull itself together with all materials from ship then existing on the dock for the sum of $27,500. Contract.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, January 16, 1950.

The Honorable HOMER D. ANGELL,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANGELL: This is in reply to your inquiry of January 10, 1950, about payment for title to the vessel (former battleship) *Oregon*, which was requisitioned on April 19, 1944.

On April 13, 1948, the Maritime Commission determined that $10,250 was just compensation for title to the vessel and that $1,020.80 was compensation for delay in payment. Those amounts were unsatisfactory to Edward M. Ricker & Co., the owner, so 75 percent of those amounts ($7,687.50 plus $765.60) was paid to the owner late in June 1949, reserving to the owner the right to sue to collect an additional amount.

We have not received notice of the filing of any action for this collection.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES D. MARSHALL,
General Manager.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KUNKEL and Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KEE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and an article from the Richmond Times-Dispatch.

Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, last week I was given permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by the head of the Curtis Publishing Co. on the value of advertising to the future of this country. I am informed by the Public Printer that it will take up two and two-thirds pages of the RECORD and will cost $218.68, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram from a firm in her district in Watertown, Mass., regarding the coal shortage.

Mr. HELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter in two instances.

Mr. MORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. CHURCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes tomorrow and for 20 minutes on Tuesday following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 20, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6616. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1506).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 570. An act for the relief of Donald Francis Wierda; without amendment (Rept. No. 1495). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1003. An act for the relief of Emory T. Wales; without amendment (Rept. No. 1496). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1054. An act for the relief of Northwest Missouri Fair Association, of Bethany, Harrison County, Mo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1497). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1604. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of F. DuWayne Blankley; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1498). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1801. An act for the relief of Mrs. Effie S. Campbell; without amendment (Rept. No. 1499). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2031. An act for the relief of the Willow River Power Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1500). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1293. A bill for the relief of the Franco-Italian Packing Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1501). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3351. A bill for the relief of John J. Franklin, James H. Bradford, William M. Orr Co., and Alex Maier; without amendment (Rept. No. 1502). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4100. A bill for the relief of Calvin E. Cranford; without amendment (Rept. No. 1503). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3924. A bill for the relief of Dr. T. F. Harrison; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1504). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6003. A bill for the relief of John E. White; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1505). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 6857. A bill to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for families of moderate income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 6858. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 6859. A bill to extend the educational benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to the designated children of veterans of World War II where the veterans have received no educational benefits under such act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 6860. A bill to provide for the construction of a Federal building at Snyder, Tex., to accommodate the postal service and other Federal agencies entitled to office space in such a building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 6861. A bill to repeal certain laws relating to timber and stone on the public domain; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 6862. A bill to provide for the disposition of tribal funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 6863. A bill to return to the public domain a tract of land known as the Battle Mountain Sanitarium Reserve, South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 6864. A bill to provide three additional longevity increases for hourly employees of the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 6865. A bill to incorporate the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 6866. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6867. A bill to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for families of moderate income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TAURIELLO:

H. R. 6868. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 6869. A bill to repeal the prohibition against the filling of the vacancy in the office of district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITAKER:

H. R. 6870. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) with respect to the computation of estimated costs of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction in the case of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. R. 6871. A bill relating to the employment of married persons by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 6872. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Bunker Hill, Massachusetts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 6873. A bill to create a Government corporation to operate cafeterias and conduct certain other activities in Government buildings and on Government property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. Con. Res. 177. Concurrent resolution requesting that the Secretary of the Air Force select an appropriate airfield and name it in honor of the late Gen. Henry H. Arnold; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. Con. Res. 178. Concurrent resolution favoring the invoking by the President of the United States of the national-emergency provisions of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in the pending coal strike; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FORD:

H. Con. Res. 179. Concurrent resolution relative to invoking the national emergency provisions (secs. 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in the current strike in the coal industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois:

H. R. 6874. A bill for the relief of George Panagoti Glikis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 6875. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Alice Bear Shield Knock; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 6876. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marianne Speelman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6877. A bill for the relief of Michel Speelman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6878. A bill for the relief of Uttal Bros.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 6879. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Szyfra Szefner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 6880. A bill for the relief of the wife, the son aged 2, and the stepdaughter aged 10 of George S. Murakami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6881. A bill for the relief of Carl Schmuser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 6882. A bill for the relief of Oldrich (Olda) Evse Spytihenev Karlik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6883. A bill to relinquish the mineral rights of the United States under certain lands in the county of Santa Barbara, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 6884. A bill for the relief of Erkki Mainio Sakari Salo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 6885. A bill for the relief of E. Elmer Mynatt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 6886. A bill for the relief of Fortunato Giulio Torre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY (by request):

H. R. 6887. A bill for the relief of Dr. Panagiotis Darviris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 6888. A bill for the relief of Edward C. Brunett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 6889. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Northern

District of Illinois to hear and determine the claims of the Aetna Insurance Co. and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 6890. A bill for the relief of Tadeusz Danielewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6891. A bill for the relief of Sylvia Lakomska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 6892. A bill for the relief of the Del Rio Grille, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6893. A bill for the relief of Christian Dorn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 6894. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nobuko Eto Heard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1694. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Minnie L. McVey and 15 others, of Bison, S. Dak., requesting enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation and broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1695. Also, petition of Bernard B. Ridings, Rapid City, S. Dak., and 74 other citizens, requesting enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation and broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1696. Also, petition of Otto Stensland and 93 other citizens of Faith, S. Dak., expressing opposition to the enactment of legislation that would limit the size and weight of parcel-post packages; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1697. By Mr. COLE of New York: Petition of residents of Ithaca, Newfield, Freeville, Dryden, Waverly, Montour Falls, Chemung, Elmira, Wallace, Cohocton, Avoca, Savona, Bath, Corning, Painted Post, Hornell, Addison, and Trumansburg, in the Thirty-ninth Congressional District of New York, for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1698. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of sundry citizens of Chariton, Iowa, urging the passage of a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1699. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Florida State Townsend Council, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1700. Also, petition of Mrs. N. B. Day and others, Cassadaga, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1701. Also, petition of Mrs. May B. Whitehead and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1702. Also, petition of Ray F. Smith and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1703. Also, petition of Josie B. Gardner and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

JANUARY 10, 1950.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Joseph O. Parker	Attorney	$5,250.98
John J. Heimburger	Commodity and research specialist.	5,250.98
Altavene Clark	Executive officer	5,250.98
Mabel C. Downey	Clerk	5,250.98
Lydia Vacin	Staff assistant	2,347.82
Lorraine Adamson	do	1,856.96
Betty Prezioso	do	1,716.72
Alice M. Baker	do	437.92
Ruth B. Phillips	do	834.14

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount expended from July 1, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1949	9,030.65
Total amount expended from July 1, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1949	9,030.65
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1950	40,969.35

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JANUARY 16, 1950.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George Y. Harvey	The clerk	$5,250.98
Kenneth Sprankle	The assistant clerk	5,250.98
William A. Duvall	Second assistant clerk.	5,076.10
Corbal D. Orescan	Assistant clerk	5,076.10
Robert E. Lambert	do	5,076.10
Arthur Orr	do	4,741.42
Robert P. Williams	do	4,406.76
Paul M. Wilson	do	4,631.70
Claude E. Hobbs, Jr.	do	4,072.12
Jay B. Howe	do	4,072.12
Frank Sanders	do	3,737.46
Lawrence C. Miller	Junior assistant clerk.	2,558.16
G. Homer Skarin	do	2,347.82
Earl C. Silsby	do	2,137.44
Melvin E. Lefever	Clerk-stenographer	1,927.10
Robert W. Thompson	do	1,927.10
Ralph A. O'Malley	do	1,927.10
James A. Eastop	do	821.38
Ross Pope	Assistant clerk	3,096.88
Robert M. Lewis	Messenger	1,632.60
Frank B. Avery, Jr.	Page	1,506.38
E. L. Eckloff	Clerk to majority	4,072.12
Robert E. Lee	Clerk to minority	5,250.98
Lawrence A. DiCenzo	Clerk-stenographer to ranking minority member.	1,927.10
Josephine E. Frick	Clerk-stenographer to subcommittee chairman.	$1,927.10
Eula D. Rigsby	do	1,927.10
Helen G. Boyle	do	1,694.90
Annette L. Kelley	do	947.76
Ruth T. Ringstrom	do	1,927.10
Marion B. Lacey	do	1,927.10
Marion Jebe	do	631.84
Alice C. Keeffe	do	979.34
William J. Neary	do	979.34
N. C. Barrett	do	979.34
Joann Womack	do	232.19

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$212,000.00
Amount expended from July 1, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1949	96,677.11
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1949	115,322.89

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 16, 1950.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (INVESTIGATIVE STAFF)

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Edward E. Hargett	Chief investigator	$4,229.02
Orrin H. Bartlett	Investigator	2,101.44
Lorene Hudgens	Clerk-stenographer	1,758.80
Rena F. Sylvestre	do	1,590.52
James J. Maloney	Investigator	2,103.45
Tennessee Valley Authority: Reimbursement for services of Van Court Hare.	do	212.17
Federal Security Agency: Reimbursement for services of David W. Bishop.	do	735.63
Federal Bureau of Investigation: Reimbursement for services of James J. Maloney.	do	1,886.61
Civil Service Commission: Reimbursement for services of Edward J. Hickey.	do	2,292.80
Civil Service Commission: Reimbursement for services of Alfred F. Fraser.	do	1,940.12
Federal Bureau of Investigation: Reimbursement for services of Warren A. Hughes.	do	1,887.09
Federal Bureau of Investigation: Reimbursement for services of Arthur J. Norstrom.	do	1,887.09
Federal Bureau of Investigation: Reimbursement for services of Harold H. Hair.	do	1,910.61

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Department of the Air Force: Reimbursement for services of Thompson J. Simpson.	Investigator	$1,616.19
Department of the Army: Corps of Engineers: Reimbursement for services of Allen W. Burkholder.	do	1,572.66
Department of the Army: Corps of Engineers: Reimbursement for services of Charles E. Zedaker.	do	644.53
Department of the Air Force: Reimbursement for services of John P. Huebsch.	do	812.00
Treasury Department: Bureau of Internal Revenue: Reimbursement for services of Edgar E. Hoppe.	do	2,341.27

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$150,000.00
Amount expended from July 1, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1949	35,713.11
Balance unexpended	114,286.89

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1950.

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert H. Harper	Chief clerk	$5,250.98
James Deakins	Assistant clerk	2,074.32
John R. Blandford	Professional staff member.	5,250.98
Clinton B. D. Brown	do	5,250.98
Bryce N. Harlow	do	5,250.98
Robert W. Smart	do	5,250.98
Agnes H. Johnston	Secretary	2,600.24
Rosemary Curry	Stenographer	2,403.90
Gladys Flanagan	do	2,403.90
Berniece Kalinowski	do	2,403.90

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31	16,318.82
Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31	16,318.82
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1949	8,681.18

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1950.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Orman S. Fink	Professional staff	$4,607.56
John E. Barriere	do	3,563.42
William J. Hallahan	Clerk	5,250.98
Elsie L. Gould	Assistant clerk	3,663.58
Margaret P. Battle	Stenographer	2,347.82
Helen E. Long	Assistant clerk	2,312.74

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
Amount expended from Oct. 19, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1949	6,038.40
Total amount expended from Oct. 19, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1949	6,038.40
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1949	18,961.60

BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1950.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
William N. McLeod, Jr.	Clerk	$5,250.10
Ruth Butterworth	Assistant clerk	2,347.82
Charles D. Farmer	Minority clerk	2,558.16
Mabel Haller	Professional staff	4,406.76
Charles Howe	Messenger	1,276.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$12,000.00
Amount expended from July 1, 1949, to Jan. 1, 1950	[1] 1,653.38

[1] For Davis special crime committee. 1 voucher for this special committee pending.

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1950.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE DISTRICT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(This subcommittee created by H. Res. 340)

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the period from November 4, 1949, to December 31, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during the period
Hyman Fischback	Counsel (no voucher submitted for services to present time).	
John F. Woog	Investigator	$654.37
P. Gabrielle Tarter	Secretary	523.56
Mary Ellen McFerron	Stenographer	475.45

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$10,000.00
Amount expended from Nov. 4 to Dec. 31	1,653.38
Balance unexpended	8,346.62

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1950.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Joseph Koski	Chief clerk and executive assistant.	$5,250.98
John S. Forsythe	General counsel (professional staff).	5,250.98
Joseph S. Jarosz	Research specialist (professional staff).	5,250.98
Frank E. Boyer	Investigator (professional staff).	5,250.98
John O. Graham	Minority clerk (professional staff).	5,250.98
Frances A. Los	Assistant clerk	2,642.28
Eleanor Barc	Assistant clerk (resigned Aug. 31).	1,299.48
Mary Pauline Smith	Assistant clerk	2,642.28
Mary E. Gilbert Sanders.	do	2,642.28
Barbara A. White	Assistant clerk (from Oct. 1).	1,342.80
Myrtle S. Locher	Assistant clerk	2,642.28

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$30,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	863.20
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31	12,621.11
Total amount expended from Jan. 2 to Dec. 31	13,484.31
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1950	16,515.69

JOHN LESINSKI,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1950.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949,

inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Full committee	$10,610.97
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Congressman Herbert C. Bonner, chairman	1,464.37
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Congressman Chet Holifield, chairman	16,857.01
Federal Relations with International Organizations Subcommittee, Congressman Henderson Lanham, chairman	2,884.41
Government Operations Subcommittee, Congressman Porter Hardy, Jr., chairman	39,501.03
Total spent	71,317.79
Balance unexpended June 30, 1949	80,120.77
Additional appropriation July 14, 1949	50,000.00
	130,120.77
Amount spent from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1949	71,317.79
Balance unexpended Jan. 1, 1950	58,802.98

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Christine Ray Davis	Chief clerk	$5,250.98
Martha C. Roland	Assistant chief clerk.	4,072.12
William A. Young	Staff director	5,250.98
Thomas A. Kennedy	General counsel	5,250.98
J. Robert Brown	Research analyst	3,737.46
Dolores Fel'Dotto	Clerk-stenographer	2,838.64
Adrienne C. Masterson.	do	2,621.47
Teresa Barrett	Clerk-typist	1,506.38
Annabell Zue	Minority clerk	3,189.26
Francis T. O'Donnell	Minority counsel	4,406.76

EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE

Stationery supplies	$194.66
Telephone	135.25
Air travel	737.35
Expenses, taxi fare, postage, etc	28.75
Foreign travel:	
Expenses incurred by 5 members of the committee and 1 staff member on trip to the Far East	2,694.75
Expenses incurred by 8 Members of the Congress, 2 staff members, 2 liaison representatives on trip to Europe and the Near East	6,820.21
Total expenses full committee, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1949	10,610.97
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Congressman Herbert C. Bonner, chairman; Lindsay C. Warren, Jr., clerk, July 1 to Sept. 21, 1949	1,464.37
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Congressman Chet Holifield, chairman:	
W. Brooke Graves, staff director	5,250.98
Julian Fahy, research analyst	4,406.76
Herbert Roback, administrative analyst	4,206.34
Dorothy D. Morrison, clerk	2,838.64
Stationery supplies	64.29
Total expenses	16,857.01
Federal relations with International Organizations Subcommittee, Congressman Henderson Lanham, chairman:	
Franklin D. Rogers, Jr., clerk	2,768.54
Stationery supplies	13.10
Telephone	3.65
Expenses for trip to New York, N. Y., for Congressman John A. Blatnik	56.62
Expenses for trip to New York, N. Y., for Franklin D. Rogers	42.50
Total expenses	2,884.41
Government Operations Subcommittee, Congressman Porter Hardy, Jr., chairman:	
Carl H. Monsees, staff director	5,142.96
Frank F. Reynolds, legal analyst	1,563.30
George H. Bowers, legal analyst	899.36
Joseph V. Machugh, legal analyst	230.73
Charles Futterer, administrative analyst	3,804.38
Edwin S. Ketchum, administrative analyst	2,084.40
George M. Rose, administrative analyst	3,011.47
James T. Gobbel, administrative analyst	3,804.38
Ann F. Cavanagh, administrative analyst	2,373.29
Stephen D. Carnes, Jr., administrative analyst	1,873.11
Herbert E. Wickenheiser, administrative analyst	1,578.04
Hester H. Harper, administrative analyst	61.53
John C. Vick, administrative analyst	1,673.46
Gordon Peyton, legal services in connection with hearings	$2,400.00
Mildred H. Lang, stenographer	1,274.72
Olive Willeroy, stenographer	1,951.62
Eloise G. Menefee, stenographer	1,311.74
Elizabeth A. Kultchar, stenographer	314.92
Doris Brassell, stenographer	111.98

EXPENSES

For conducting official business—taxi fares, hotel, per diem, postage—miscellaneous expenses for following:	
Congressman Porter Hardy, Jr	531.06
Congressman Richard Bolling	232.72
Congressman M. G. Burnside	78.03
Congressman Clare E. Hoffman	119.90
Congressman R. Walter Riehlman	67.62
Carl H. Monsees	71.35
James T. Gobbel	210.36
Charles Futterer	3.60
Ann F. Cavanagh	514.45
Herbert E. Wickenheiser	272.10
Stephen D. Carnes, Jr	24.62
George M. Rose	19.05
Olive Willeroy	5.80
John C. Vick	3.60
Air travel	907.78
Railroad travel	579.92
Telephone	79.25
Truman Ward	69.50
Stationery supplies	244.93
Total expense	39,501.03

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 14, 1950.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford	Clerk and administrative officer.	$5,250.98
Charles Burton Marshall.	Staff consultant	5,250.98
Ira E. Bennett	do	5,250.98
Sheldon Z. Kaplan	Staff consultant (from Aug. 1 to Dec. 31).	4,390.15
George L. Millikan	Staff consultant (from Aug. 20 to Dec. 31).	3,844.93
June Nigh	Staff assistant	2,768.54
Winifred Osborne	do	2,875.44
Doris Leone	do	2,768.54
Mabel Wofford	do	2,558.16
Mary G. Chace	do	3,469.74

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31	6,442.94
Total amount expended from Jan. 2 to Dec. 31	6,442.94
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1949	43,558.06

JOHN KEE,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 30, 1949.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Jeanne McDonagh	Clerk	$3,737.46
Marjorie Savage	Assistant Clerk, clerk to Subcommittee on Accounts.	3,603.58
Jack Watson	Assistant Clerk, clerk to Subcommittee on Enrolled Bills, Library, Disposition of Executive Papers and Memorials.	3,469.74
Maureen Sandiford	Assistant clerk, clerk to Subcommittee on Elections.	2,347.82
Lura Cannon	Assistant clerk, clerk to Subcommittee on Printing.	2,347.82
Merle Harris	Assistant clerk and stenographer.	2,347.82

MARY T. NORTON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1, 1950.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
CLERICAL STAFF		
Elton J. Layton	Clerk	$5,250.98
Glenn R. Ward	Assistant clerk	2,558.16
Royice Reno	do	2,347.82
Georgia G. Glasmann	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	2,221.56
Helen A. Grickis	do	2,137.44
Frances W. Galvin	Assistant clerk-stenographer (authorized under H. Res 157).	2,039.28
Roy P. Wilkinson	Assistant clerk	1,822.48
PROFESSIONAL STAFF		
Arlin E. Stockburger	Aviation and engineering consultant.	5,250.98
Andrew Stevenson	Expert	5,250.98
Kurt Borchardt	Professional assistant.	5,250.98
Sam G. Spal	Research specialist	4,072.12

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (funds authorized under H. Res. 157)	$60,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	323.64
Amount expended from July 1 to December 31, 1949	11,000.58
Total amount expended from January 1 to December 31, 1949	11,324.22
Balance unexpended as of December 31, 1949	48,675.78

ROBERT CROSSER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 14, 1950.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Dick, Bess Effrat	Chief Clerk	$5,250.98
Bernhardt, C. Murray.	Committee counsel	5,250.98
Besterman, Walter M.	Legislative assistant	5,250.98
Foley, William R.	Committee counsel	5,250.98
Lee, Walter R.	Legislative assistant	5,250.98
Smedley, Velma	Assistant Chief Clerk.	5,250.98
Berger, Anne J.	Clerk-stenographer	2,417.92
Christy, Frances	do	2,417.92
Collier, Mabel L.	do	2,207.58
Kaslow, Berta	do	3,399.60
Lamon, Lucile P.	do	2,069.62

1. Funds for preparation of United States Code and revision of the laws:

A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year):

Unexpended balance July 1, 1949	$13,036.89
Expended	0
Balance Dec. 31, 1949	13,036.89

B. Preparation of United States Code:

Authorized by Legislative Appropriation Act, 1950	150,000.00
Expended	4,751.88
Balance Dec. 31, 1949	145,248.12

C. Revision of the Laws 1950:

Authorized by Legislative Appropriation Act, 1950	12,000.00
Expended	5,250.98
Balance Dec. 31, 1949	6,749.02

2. Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure by H. Res. 156 (pursuant to H. Res. 137)

	30,000.00
Amount expended	15,138.31
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1949	14,861.69

3. Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure by H. Res. 246 (pursuant to H. Res. 238)

	45,000.00
Amount expended	26,360.00
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1949	18,640.00

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1950.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Hugh A. Meade	General counsel	$229.53
John M. Drewry	Assistant general counsel.	240.80
Do	General counsel	4,963.99
Lynn E. Mote	Assistant counsel	2,456.22
Reginald S. Losee	Chief investigator	4,339.80
Gus S. Caras	Investigator to minority.	4,339.80
Elizabeth B. Bedell	Chief clerk	3,094.13
Frances Still	Secretary	3,286.02
Frances B. Hoover	Assistant clerk	2,908.78
Marie Wilson	do	2,957.06
Leonard P. Pliska	Clerk to minority	2,908.78

S. O. BLAND,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1950.

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PANAMA CANAL TOLLS

(Pursuant to H. Res. 44, 81st Cong., 1st sess.)

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Madonna Haworth	Stenographer	$2,816.82

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$15,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	2,731.27
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1949	4,829.55
Total amount expended from Feb. 28, to Dec. 31, 1949	7,560.82
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1949	7,439.18

S. O. BLAND,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1950.

SPECIAL INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE

(Pursuant to H. Res. 215, 81st Cong.)

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from June 30, 1949, to December 31, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Leroy C. Bedell, Jr.	Investigator	$1,033.15
Lynn E. Mote	do	361.21
Charles A. Miller	do	1,869.17

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount expended from June 30 to Dec. 31	8,718.74
Total amount expended from June 30 to Dec. 31	8,718.74
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1949	41,281.26

S. O. BLAND,
Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1950.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George M. Moore	Chief counsel	$5,250.98
Frederick C. Belen	Counsel	5,250.98
John B. Price	Staff assistant	2,468.52
Lucy K. Daley	Assistant clerk	2,698.40
Elayne Morelle	Secretary	2,347.82
Lillian Hopkins	do	2,347.82
Ann Hayden	Stenographer	2,173.09
Elizabeth Feltman	Clerk-stenographer	689.31

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	5.00
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1949	590.60
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1949	595.60
Balance unexpended	24,404.40

TOM MURRAY,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1949.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period

from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George H. Soule	Technical consultant.	$5,250.98
Saul C. Corwin	Counsel	5,250.98
Preston E. Peden	Attorney	5,076.10
Mary L. Steele	Clerk	5,250.98
Claude E. Ragan	do	5,250.98
Nancy J. Arnold	do	3,603.58
Virginia McMichael	do	2,908.78
Geraldine Eaker	do	2,347.82
Betty Lee Angus	do	1,997.20

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$30,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	1,407.61
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1949	[1] 3,156.02
Total amount expended from Apr. 1, to Dec. 31, 1949	[1] 4,563.63
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1949	25,436.37

[1] There are some bills still outstanding for expenses incurred but not yet paid and not included herein.

J. HARDIN PETERSON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 7, 1950.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Thomas E. Massie	Counsel	$4,205.96
Joseph H. McGann, Sr.	Clerk	4,205.96
Robert F. McConnell	Assistant clerk	3,189.26
Joseph H. McGann, Jr.	do	2,698.40
Mrs. Alice B. Norton	Clerk-stenographer	1,327.08
Mrs. Margaret R. Beiter	do	2,698.40
Miss Mary E. McBee	do	2,698.40

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$15,000
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1949	15,000

WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 5, 1950.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Humphrey S. Shaw	Clerk	$5,209.94
Merritt R. Kotin	Assistant clerk	4,406.76
Jane W. Snader	Minority clerk	2,922.76
Elliodor M. Libonati	Stenographer-clerk	2,922.76
T. Howard Dolan	Assistant to the clerk.	2,102.96

A. J. SABATH,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1950.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from June 30, 1949, to December 31, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
EMPLOYEES PAID BY VOUCHER		
William A. Wheeler	Investigator	$4,139.08
Courtney E. Owens	do	3,871.30
Charles E. McKillips	do	3,871.30
William J. Jones	do	3,737.48
Alvin Stokes	do	3,737.48
Helen Mattson	Research clerk	2,838.14
Lillian E. Howard	do	2,698.40
Mary Ann Moffett	do	2,347.82
Asselia Poore	do	2,908.78
Margaret Pinet	Research clerk (July 1 through Aug. 6, 1949).	406.69
Blanche McCall	Research clerk (Oct. 10 through Dec. 31, 1949).	948.95
Pearle Gay	Clerk-stenographer	2,207.58
Jane Gordon	do	2,067.36
Helen McCarthy	do	2,207.58
Lorraine M. Nichols	do	2,347.82
Rose M. Sanko	do	2,347.82
Katherine Zimmerman	do	2,314.46
Ruth Tansill	do	2,347.82
Jo B. Benisch	Clerk-typist	2,347.82
Virginia McCraw	do	2,067.36
Catherine Crews	File clerk	2,347.82
Lucille Fitzgerald	do	2,347.82
Alyce Gartrell	do	2,207.58
Eileen Sonnett	do	2,207.58
Alice Walker	do	2,347.82
EMPLOYEES CARRIED ON PERMANENT HOUSE PAY ROLL		
Frank S. Tavenner, Jr.	Committee counsel	5,250.98
Louis J. Russell	Senior investigator	5,115.53
John W. Carrington	Clerk of committee	4,406.71
Benjamin Mandel	Director of research	4,741.40
Donald T. Appell	Investigator	4,373.79
Anne D. Turner	File chief	3,993.06
Carolyn Roberts	Assistant file chief	2,628.30
Rosella A. Purdy	Clerk-stenographer	3,049.02
Juliette Joray	do	2,347.82
Thelma Scearce	do	2,698.40
Margaret S. Kerwan	Clerk - stenographer (June 30, 1948, through Aug. 31, 1949).	884.72

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	[1] $200,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported, Dec. 31, 1948, through June 30, 1949	65,910.85
Amount expended from June 30 to Dec. 31, 1949	$65,356.26
Total amount expended from Dec. 31, 1948, to Dec. 31, 1949	131,267.11
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1949	68,732.89

[1] H. Res. 78, 81st Cong.

JOHN S. WOOD,
Chairman.

JANUARY 11, 1950.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from June 30, 1949, to December 31, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Ida Rowan	Chief clerk	$5,250.98
Edwin B. Patterson	Professional aide	5,250.98
Casey M. Jones	do	5,250.98
Karl Standish	do	5,250.98
Paul K. Jones	Assistant clerk	4,406.76
Edward C. Wrede	do	4,406.76
Frances Montanye	Clerk-stenographer	2,347.82
Mary Schmidt Ponow	Stenographer	2,347.82
George J. Turner	Assistant clerk	2,417.92
Total		36,931.00

J. E. RANKIN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1950.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles W. Davis	Clerk (C)	$5,250.98
Leo H. Irwin	Professional assistant (P).	3,084.04
Stella O. Miller	Assistant clerk (C)	2,978.88
Gladys L. Kullberg	Staff assistant (C)	2,558.16
Ralph O. Simmerson	do	2,032.28
Harriet B. Lamb	Clerk-stenographer (C).	2,137.44
Gordon Grand, Jr.	Minority adviser (P).	5,076.10
Susan Alice Taylor	Minority stenographer (C).	2,289.58
Fedele F. Fauri	Social security adviser (P).	2,581.09
Harry Parker	Messenger	1,338.08
Sam Hardy	do	1,298.24
Hughlon Greene	do	1,005.00
Esmer Durham	do	447.60

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	[1] $25,000
Balance unexpended as of December 31, 1949	25,000

[1] H. Res. 333, authorizing the committee as a whole or by subcommittee, to conduct studies or investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of the committee.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1950.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of

the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 2-month period from November 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 2-month period
Lucien Hilmer	Staff director	$1,724.46
Thomas F. Flynn, Jr.	Legal-investigative staff.	1,047.33
Jerome H. Spingarn	Research assistant to the chairman.	1,597.72
Irene Salmans	Clerk-stenographer.	640.50
William Earl Griffin	Clerk	1,001.38
Benedict F. Fitzgerald, Jr.	Legal-investigative staff.	747.02
Louis Little	do	798.86
Joseph M. Mannix	do	541.72
Charles B. Holstein	Research director	373.45
Total		8,472.44

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$40,000.00
Amount expended from Nov. 1 to Dec. 31, 1949	53.26
Total amount expended from Nov. 1 to Dec. 31, 1949	8,825.70
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1949	31,474.30

FRANK BUCHANAN,
Chairman.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO ATTEND THE WORLD ASSEMBLY FOR MORAL REARMAMENT

JANUARY 10, 1950.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

None. The entire amount appropriated for the purpose of attending the World Assembly for Moral Rearmament has been spent and no additional funds remain unspent.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$5,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	964.51
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1949	[1] 4,035.49
Total amount expended from June 2 to Dec. 31, 1949	5,000.00

[1] Paid Air Force for use of plane in connection with trip.

PRINCE H. PRESTON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 4, 1950.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Victor P. Dalmas	Chief, special services (July 1 to Aug. 31, inclusive); executive director (Sept. 1 to Dec. 31, inclusive).	$5,132.16
Mildred Deen	Stenographer	1,828.90
Otis H. Ellis	Executive director (July 1 to Aug. 31, inclusive); special counsel for Petroleum (Sept. 1 to Dec. 31, inclusive).	3,487.92
Janus Morgan Glover	Messenger (from Nov. 4).	492.65
Richard R. Haas	Research assistant	1,632.60
Rowan F. Howard	Special investigator (Sept. 16 to 30, inclusive).	190.14
Joseph W. Kaufman	Chief counsel	5,250.98
Eugene Kelly	Research assistant (from Sept. 26).	1,965.62
Suzanne D. Manfull	Administrative assistant (from July 1 to Aug. 15 and Nov. 16 to 30, inclusive).	779.39
LaVerne Maynard	Stenographer	2,039.28
Bertha A. Padgett	Secretary	2,347.82
Arlone Read	Stenographer (Oct. 12, 13, and 14).	29.98
Suzanne Shepherd	Research assistant (Sept. 1 to Oct. 30, inclusive).	501.94
Kathryn E. Smith	Chief clerk	2,347.82

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$100,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	26,915.67
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1949	29,986.93
Total amount expended from Feb. 2, to Dec. 31, 1949	56,902.60
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1949	43,097.40

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 20, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God eternal, immortal, invisible, we would hush our busy thoughts to silence as we wait for Thy word. If we listen only to the clamor of the world without, we lose our way, our purpose, our peace, and our poise.

Override the errors of our faulty judgments. Through the sincere expression of differing appraisals may the final wisdom that charts the Nation's course in these perilous days be higher than our own. Make our America more and more the hope of all who suffer and the dread of all who plot iniquity. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 19, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MYERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Maybank
Anderson	Hoey	Millikin
Benton	Humphrey	Mundt
Brewster	Hunt	Murray
Bricker	Ives	Myers
Bridges	Jenner	Neely
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chapman	Kefauver	Russell
Cordon	Kem	Saltonstall
Darby	Kerr	Schoeppel
Donnell	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Downey	Langer	Sparkman
Dworshak	Leahy	Taft
Eastland	Lehman	Taylor
Ecton	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	Long	Thye
Flanders	Lucas	Tobey
Frear	McCarran	Tydings
Fulbright	McCarthy	Watkins
George	McClellan	Wherry
Gillette	McFarland	Wiley
Graham	McKellar	Williams
Gurney	McMahon	Withers
Hayden	Magnuson	Young
Hendrickson	Martin	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. PEPPER] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business as members of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, holding hearings on various flood-control and public-works projects in the State of New Mexico.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

DELIVERED-PRICE SYSTEMS AND FREIGHT-ABSORPTION PRACTICES

The VICE PRESIDENT. On October 18, 1949, an order was entered for consideration today, January 20, 1950, of the conference report on Senate bill 1008. The Chair now lays before the Senate the conference report, which will be read.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1008) to define the application of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to certain pricing practices, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "(except where such absorption of freight would be such that its effect upon competition will be to substantially lessen competition)"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: ", and this may include the maintenance, above or below the price of such competitor, of a differential in price which such seller customarily maintains, except that this shall not make lawful any combination, conspiracy, or collusive agreement; or any monopolistic, oppressive, deceptive, or fraudulent practice"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "reliable, probative, and substantial evidence"; and the House agree to the same.

PAT MCCARRAN,
Per H. R. O'C.,
HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

FRANCIS WALTER,
By EARL C. MICHENER,
EARL C. MICHENER,
CLIFFORD CASE,
By EARL C. MICHENER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. O'CONOR obtained the floor.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York wishes to inquire if it is in order at this time to insert routine matters into the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not in order unless it is agreed to by unanimous consent.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and submit routine matters for the RECORD, without debate, and without taking the Senator from Maryland off the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 450)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

Attached hereto is a Report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems covering its operation from April 1, 1949–September 30, 1949, and describing in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

Previous reports of the National Advisory Council were transmitted to the Congress on March 1, 1946, March 8, 1946, January 13, 1947, June 26, 1947, January 19, 1948, May 17, 1948, August 3, 1948, March 14, 1949, and July 5, 1949, respectively. In addition to the First Special Report on the Operations and Policies of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, submitted on May 17, 1948, previous reports on the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank were included in the reports of January 13, 1947, June 26, 1947, January 19, 1948, August 3, 1948, March 14, 1949, and July 5, 1949, respectively.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 20, 1950.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CLAIMS PAID FROM APPROPRIATION "SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE"

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, that no claims were paid from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary of Defense," during the year ended December 31, 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A petition signed by Miriam Chamberlain, and sundry other employees of the High School of Commerce cafeteria, of New York, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to liberalize the social-security law; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Miami Townsend Club, No. 22, of Miami, Fla., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 2181, providing a national insurance program; to the Committee on Finance.

The memorials of Mrs. Ben Thoma, of East Butler, Pa., and Mrs. Bertha Andrew, of Belfry, Mont., remonstrating against the passage of Senate bill 1103 and House bill 2945, to adjust postal rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a list of 408 communities in the State of New York which have submitted petitions containing 12,288 signatures favoring the enactment of the so-called Langer-Bryson bill, Senate bill S. 1847, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the list was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROHIBITION AGAINST LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Twelve thousand two hundred and eighty-eight signers from 408 communities of the State of New York which have submitted petitions in support of the Langer-Bryson bill (S. 1847):

Adams, Addison, Afton, Alabama, Albany, Albion, Alexander, Alfred, Allegany, Altamount, Altmar, Ames, Amityville, Amsterdam, Angelica, Angola, Arcade, Arkport, Ashokan, Ashville, Athens, Attica, Auburn, Ausable Chasm, Avon, Babylon, Baldwinsville, Basom, Batavia, Bath, Bay Shore, Beaver Falls, Belleville, Bergen, Berkshire, Binghamton, Bloomingburg, Bloomville, Bovina Center, Branch, Breesport, Brewster, Brightwaters, Broadalbin, Brockport, Brookfield, Brooklyn, Brownville, Brushton, Buffalo, Burt, Buskirk, Caledonia, Callicoon Center, Cambridge, Camillus, Canajoharie, Candor, Canisteo, Cannonsville, Carthage, Castile, Cato, Cattaraugus, Cayuta, Cazenovia, Chaumont, Chautauqua, Chazy, Chemung, Cherry Valley, Chili, Chittenango, Cicero, Circleville, Clayton, Clifton Springs, Clinton, Cobleskill, Cochecton, Cold Brook, Comstock, Cooperstown, Corfu, Corinth, Corning, Cortland, Craryville, Dansville, Darien Center, De Lancey, Delevan, Delhi, Delmar, Depauville, Deposit, Derby, Dexter, Dickinson Center, Dryden, Dundee, Eagle Bridge, East Aurora, East Bloomfield, East Islip, East Kingston, East Meredith, East Moriches, Eastport, East Randolph, East Rochester, East Syracuse, East Windsor, Eaton, Edmeston, Eggertsville, Ellenburg Center, Elma, Elmira, Elnora, Endicott, Esperance, Etna, Fair Haven, Fairport, Falconer, Ferndale, Flushing, Forestville, Fort Edward, Fort Montgomery, Fort Plain, Frankfort, Franklin, Franklinville, Fredonia, Freeport, Freeville, Friendship, Fulton, Galway, Gasport, Gerry, Gilbertsville, Glens Falls, Glenwood, Gloversville, Gouverneur, Gowanda, Grahamsville, Grand Island, Granville, Greenville, Groton, Guilderland Center, Hagaman, Hague, Hamburg, Hamilton, Hannibal, Harrison, Harrisville, Hauppauge, Hempstead, Hensonville, Herkimer, Hermon, Highland, Hobart, Holcomb, Holley, Homer, Honeoye Falls, Hornell, Horseheads, Houghton, Howes Cave, Hudson Falls, Hurleyville, Ilon, Islip, Ithaca, Jamesport, Jamestown, Johnsonburg, Johnson City, Johnsonville, Johnstown, Keeseville, Kendall, Keuka Park, Kill Buck, Kingston, Kirkville, Lacona,

La Fargeville, Lakewood, Larchmont, Lenanon, Leonardsville, LeRoy, Liberty, Lima, Lindenhurst, Little Falls, Little Genesee, Little Valley, Livingston, Livonia, Long Island City, Loudonville, Lounsberry, Lowville, Lynbrook, Lyndonville, Machias, Manchester, Mannsville, Marcellus, Marcy, Marion, Martindale Depot, Maryland, Massena, Mattituck, Mayfield, Mechanicville, Medina, Mexico, Middle Granville, Middleport, Middlesex, Middletown, Milford, Millport, Mineola, Minoa, Modena, Mohawk, Moira, Montgomery, Monticello, Montour Falls, Mooers, Moravia, Mount Vernon, Nedrow, Neversink, Newark, Newark Valley, New Berlin, Newburgh, Newfane, Newfield, New Hartford, New Paltz, New Rochelle, New Woodstock, New York, Niagara Falls, Nineveh, Norfolk, North Bangor, North Granville, Northport, North Tonawanda, Norwich, Norwood, Nunda, Nyack, Oakfield, Oceanside, Ogdensburg, Olean, Oneida, Oneida Castle, Oneonta, Ontario, Ontario Center, Oriskany, Oriskany Falls, Orwell, Otego, Owego, Oxford, Painted Post, Palatine Bridge, Panama, Patchcgue, Pattersonville, Pearl River, Penn Yan, Perry, Philmont, Phoenix, Pierrepont Manor, Pike, Pilot Knob, Plattekill, Plattsburg, Point Pleasant, Poland, Portageville, Port Dickinson, Port Ewen, Port Washington, Potsdam, Poughkeepsie, Pulaski, Pultneyville, Randolph, Ransomville, Ravena, Red Creek, Rensselaer Falls, Richburg, Richfield Springs, Richford, Richland, Riverhead, Rochester, Rock Stream, Rockville Centre, Rome, Roscoe, Rose, Rossburg, Rotterdam Junction, Roxbury, Rushford, Rushville, Russell, Sacandaga, Sackets Harbor, Salamanca, Salem, Sandy Creek, Saratoga Springs, Sayville, Schenectady, Schenevus, Scio, Scotia, Seneca Falls, Sherburne, Shortsville, Sidney, Silver Springs, Sinclairville, Skaneateles, Smiths Basin, Smithtown Branch, Sodus, Sodus Point, South Byron, South Dayton, South Kortright, South Otselic, Springfield Center, Stafford, Stamford, Stanley, Staten Island, Stony Brook, Stratford, Sundown, Swan Lake, Syracuse, Troy, Trumansburg, Ulster Park, Unadilla, Union Center, Ushers, Utica, Valley Stream, Varysburg, Verona, Vestal, Walden, Wallace, Walton, Warsaw, Washingtonville, Waterport, Watertown, Watervliet, Watkins Glen, Watts Flats, Waverly, Webster, Weedsport, Wellsburg, Wellsville, West Albany, West Chazy, Westdale, Westfield, Westford, West Granville Corners, West Oneonta, West Sayville, West Winfield, Whitehall, White Plains, Whitesboro, Williamson, Williamsville, Wilson, Windsor, Worcester, Wyandanch, Wyoming, Yaphank, Yonkers.

DELIVERED-PRICE SYSTEMS AND FREIGHT-ABSORPTION PRACTICES

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received from James G. Patton, president of the Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union.

Mr. Patton, in this letter, very ably points out the adverse way in which the farmer and small business would be affected by S. 1008, to provide a 2-year moratorium with respect to the application of certain antitrust laws to individual, good-faith, delivered-price systems, and freight-absorption practices. Many small-business men in North Dakota take almost exactly the same position with respect to S. 1008 as does Mr. Patton.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS EDUCATIONAL AND COOPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., January 17, 1950.

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: I am writing you in regard to S. 1008 which, I understand, the Senate is taking up late this week. This legislation as it now stands is the result of action taken by the House, by the Senate, and by the conferees.

As approved by the Senate, S. 1008 contained the Kefauver amendments which provided that price discriminations should not be practiced if there were a reasonable probability that competition might be injured. As approved by the House, S. 1008 contained the Carroll amendments which also safeguarded competition. The conferees in considering S. 1008 saw fit to violate the wishes of both Houses. Clauses safeguarding competition were deleted from section 3 and in 4 d the definition of "may be," which has been defined by the courts as "reasonable probability" was changed to "substantial and probative evidence."

Taken together, these two changes made by the conferees in the Clayton Act mean that as long as two sellers are competing all price discriminations are legalized if there is no element of conspiracy even though such discriminations put out of business every small business and cooperative in the land. To give a concrete example: If the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. and the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., which account for about half the capital assets of the tire industry, chose they could give discounts to various selected buyers on the ground that they were meeting each other's competition. They could, for example, give discounts to all tire distributors except the Farmers Union Central Exchange. They could, by this method, pick off our cooperatives one by one until the members of the Farmers Union were denied the right to buy cooperatively.

Not only would the enactment of S. 1008, as amended by the conference report, make it possible for the big duopolies and oligopolies to put out of business all cooperatives but all small businesses as well. As long as one big business could find a dancing partner to go through the motions of competition every discrimination under the sun would be legal. Thus, in the name of free competition free competition would be murdered. Thus would our system of free enterprise come to an end.

I am, therefore, urging you to vote against S. 1008 and to use your great efforts to influence other Senators to do likewise. I know, Senator, that you have the interests of our country at heart and therefore feel confident that you will not vote to approve the conference report. My only fear is that Members of the Senate may be preoccupied with other legislation, with hearings being carried on by various committees, with foreign policy decisions and other affairs of state when S. 1008 reaches the floor. I sincerely hope this does not happen. As pointed out above, approval of S. 1008 would be a disaster of the first magnitude.

With best personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES G. PATTON,
President.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. Res. 215. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to employ additional personnel; without amendment; and under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following report was received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JANUARY 13, 1950.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE—SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from September 15, 1949, to December 31, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Jack Barbash, consultant	$10,015.02	$918.03
Edna Raye Bowman, secretary	4,154.38	1,022.09
Alexander K. Christie, economist	6,848.36	1,956.66
Thomas M. Cooley II, general counsel	10,846.00	2,496.32
William N. Dunstan, staff member	3,632.97	302.74
John F. Egan, clerk	4,415.10	1,261.44
Evelyn M. Gustin, secretary	4,154.38	1,022.09
Curtis E. Johnson, investigator	8,936.64	1,743.08
Vesta V. Nelson, secretary	4,154.38	1,186.94
Russell E. Stone, economist	6,848.36	1,576.19

Funds appropriated for Subcommittee on Labor Management Relations		$25,000.00
Funds expended for salaries	$13,485.58	
Funds expended for purposes other than salaries	538.10	
Total expenditures		14,023.68
Balance unexpended		10,976.32

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
Chairman.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FREAR:

S. 2901. A bill to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge for the district of Delaware; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 2902. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2903. A bill to provide for the promotion of certain retired officers of the Regular Navy recalled to active duty during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2904. A bill for the relief of Peter T. Revesz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. THYE introduced Senate bill 2905, to extend until July 1, 1951, import control powers with respect to fats and oils and rice and rice products, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2906. A bill to authorize and direct the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Mississippi to Louis Emfinger; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2907. A bill to provide for the coinage of a 3-cent piece; and

S. 2908. A bill to provide for the coinage of a 7-cent piece; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. TOBEY (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. TAFT, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. CORDON,

Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL) introduced Senate bill 2909, to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) with respect to the computation of estimated costs of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction in the case of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts and other nonprofit educational institutions, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 2910. A bill for the relief of Werner Plack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN IMPORT CONTROL POWERS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend until July 1, 1951, the authority of the President to control imports of fats and oils—including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, butter, soap, and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products—and rice and rice products, under the provisions of the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, as amended.

Under Public Law 155, first session, Eighty-first Congress, this authority will expire on July 1 of this year. In view of our surpluses, world shortages, and the importance of orderly liquidation of stocks of these products owned or controlled by the Federal Government, it is essential that this authority should be continued as provided in the bill which I now introduce.

The bill (S. 2905) to extend until July 1, 1951, import control powers with respect to fats and oils and rice and rice products, introduced by Mr. THYE, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRINTING OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "MONETARY, CREDIT, AND FISCAL POLICIES"

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 216), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the committee print, entitled "Monetary, Credit, and Fiscal Policies," prepared for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, be printed as a Senate document.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES FOR INVESTIGATION OF FIELD OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. NEELY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. DONNELL), submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 217), which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare through its subcommittee appointed pursuant to Senate Resolution 140 (Rept. No. 827) (Rept. No. 894) Eighty-first Congress, agreed to August 15, 1949, is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $108,000 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for the same purposes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committe on Labor and Public Welfare, to which was referred the foregoing resolution (S. Res. 217), reported it without amendment, and, under the rule, referred it to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES—ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on January 12 the Honorable Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, delivered an address before the National Press Club. He was also interrogated. This is a brilliant and illuminating document. It really challenges comparison. I ask unanimous consent that the address, along with the questions and answers, be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the address and questions and answers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, members and guests of the National Press Club, I stand before you in the tattered remains of my reputation as a lawyer. (The president of the National Press Club, Mr. John O'Brien, in his introduction referred to a biographical sketch of Mr. Acheson at the time of his appointment as Assistant Secretary of State, which stated, "He came to this position with the reputation of a first-rate lawyer, a reputation he still has.") I think anybody who permits me to speak with them on the subject of foreign affairs has their courage in their hands.

The president (again referring to Mr. O'Brien's introduction) has perhaps given a wrong impression of the proceedings in the last few days. I think it is unfair to my friends and colleagues on the Hill to believe that they kept me. The question as to who kept whom is one which is still open.

In talking with you today, I shall try to avoid the sin of dogmatism, and if I do not avoid it I shall leave myself fairly open to your chastisement. I have been in this business of foreign relations too long to believe that anyone can be sure about results. I have been dealing with the subject matter that I am going to talk with you about today too short a time to believe that my judgments are infallible. In fact, I don't believe that anybody's judgments are infallible. And so when I read, as I read in the press this morning, the words of the distinguished statesman who said that there was no doubt that if there had been sincere aid given to the Government of China some years ago, there would have been no difficulty, I was interested to observe the introduction of the word "sincere" which, of course, raises all possibilities of argument: Was the aid given with tongue in cheek? Was it insincere? But the interesting point was that there was no doubt if some kind of aid had been given an inevitable result would have happened.

He then moved from the area of no doubt to the area of possible doubt and he said as time went on to be sure there was doubt whether aid could be successful. But with that slight concession to fallibility, he then moved back to the area of no doubt and he said, but now there is no doubt whatever that aid, and very small aid, can solve the problem in Formosa. I was interested at the courage of a person who can allocate to the area of doubt and no doubt with such assurance, and my mind went back to a man whom you all know, one of the most beloved characters who has ever lived in Washington, Mr. Justice Hitz, who practiced law here for many years and was on our district court and on our court of appeals. I remember Justice Hitz from the bench one day replying to a lawyer who was arguing some dogmatism before him and the old justice said: "My friend, this court is often in error but never in doubt."

This afternoon I should like to discuss with you the relations between the peoples of the United States and the peoples of Asia, and I used the words "relations of the peoples of the United States and the peoples of Asia" advisedly. I am not talking about governments or nations because it seems to me what I want to discuss with you is this feeling of mind that the relations depend upon the attitudes of the peoples; that there are fundamental attitudes, fundamental interests, fundamental purposes of the people of the United States, 150 million of them, and of the peoples of Asia, unnumbered millions, which determine and out of which grow the relations of our countries and the policies of our governments. Out of these attitudes and interests and purposes grow what we do from day to day.

Now, let's dispose of one idea right at the start and not bother with it any more. That is that the policies of the United States are determined out of abstract in the Department of State or in the White House or in the Congress. That is not the case. If these policies are going to be good, they must grow out of the fundamental attitudes of our people on both sides. If they are to be effective they must become articulate through all the institutions of our national life, of which this is one of the greatest—through the press, through the radio, through the churches, through the labor unions, through the business organizations, through all the groupings of our national life, there must become articulate the attitudes of our people and the policies which we propose to follow. It seems to me that understanding is the beginning of wisdom and, therefore, we shall begin by trying to understand before we announce what we are going to do, and that is a proposition so heretical in this town that I advance it with some hesitation.

Now, let's consider some of the basic factors which go into the making of the attitudes of the peoples on both sides. I am frequently asked: Has the State Department got an Asian policy? And it seems to me that that discloses such a depth of ignorance that it is very hard to begin to deal with it. The people of Asia are so incredibly diverse and their problems are so incredibly diverse that how could anyone, even the most utter charlatan, believe that he had a uniform policy which would deal with all of them. On the other hand, there are very important similarities in ideas and in problems among the peoples of Asia, and so what we come to, after we understand these diversities and these common attitudes of mind, is the fact that there must be certain similarities of approach and there must be very great dissimilarities in action.

To illustrate this only a moment: If you will consider as an example of the differences in Asia the subcontinent of India and Pakistan you will find there an area which is roughly comparable in size and population to Europe. You will find that the different states and provinces of that subcontinent are roughly comparable in size to the nations of Europe, and yet you will find such differences in race, in ideas, in languages and religion and culture that, compared to that subcontinent, Europe is almost one homogeneous people.

Or take the difference, for instance, between the people and problems of Japan and Indonesia, both in the same Asian area. In Japan, you have a people far advanced in the complexities of industrial civilization, a people whose problems grow out of overpopulation on small islands and the necessity of finding raw materials to bring in and finding markets for the finished goods which they produce. In Indonesia, you find something wholly different—a people on the very threshold of their experience with these

complexities and a people who live in an area which possesses vast resources which are awaiting development. Now, those are illustrations of complexities.

Let's come now to the matters which Asia has in common. There is in this vast area what we might call a developing Asian consciousness, and a developing pattern, and this, I think, is based upon two factors which are pretty nearly common to the entire experience of all these Asian people.

One of these factors is a revulsion against the acceptance of misery and poverty as the normal condition of life. Throughout all of this vast area, you have that fundamental revolutionary aspect in mind and belief. The other common aspect that they have is the revulsion against foreign domination. Whether that foreign domination takes the form of colonialism or whether it takes the form of imperialism, they are through with it. They have had enough of it and they want no more.

These two basic ideas which are held so broadly and commonly in Asia tend to fuse in the minds of many Asian peoples, and many of them tend to believe that if you could get rid of foreign domination, if you could gain independence, then the relief from poverty and misery would follow almost in course. It is easy to point out that that is not true, and, of course, they are discovering that it is not true. But underneath that belief there was a very profound understanding of a basic truth, and it is the basic truth which underlies all our democratic belief and all our democratic concept. That truth is that just as no man and no government is wise enough or disinterested enough to direct the thinking and the action of another individual, so no nation and no people are wise enough and disinterested enough very long to assume the responsibility for another people or to control another people's opportunities.

That great truth they have sensed, and on that great truth they are acting. They say and they believe that from now on they are on their own. They will make their own decisions. They will attempt to better their own lot, and on occasion they will make their own mistakes. But it will be their mistakes, and they are not going to have their mistakes dictated to them by anybody else.

The symbol of these concepts has become nationalism. National independence has become the symbol both of freedom from foreign domination and freedom from the tyranny of poverty and misery.

Since the end of the war in Asia, we have seen over 500,000,000 people gain their independence and over seven new nations come into existence in this area.

We have the Philippines with 20,000,000 citizens. We have Pakistan, India, Ceylon, and Burma with 400,000,000 citizens, southern Korea with 20,000,000, and within the last few weeks, the United States of Indonesia with 75,000,000.

This is the outward and visible sign of the internal ferment of Asia. But this ferment and change is not restricted to these countries which are just gaining their independence. It is the common idea and the common pattern of Asia, and as I tried to suggest a moment ago, it is not based on purely political conceptions. It is not based purely on ideological conceptions. It is based on a fundamental and an earthy and a deeply individual realization of the problems of their own daily lives. This new sense of nationalism means that they are going to deal with those daily problems—the problems of the relation of man to the soil, the problem of how much can be exacted from them by the tax collectors of the state. It is rooted in those ideas. With those ideas they are going forward. Resignation is no longer the typical emotion of Asia. It has given way to hope, to a sense of effort, and, in many cases, to a real sense of anger.

Now, may I suggest to you that much of the bewilderment which has seized the minds of many of us about recent developments in China comes from a failure to understand this basic revolutionary force which is loose in Asia. The reasons for the fall of the Nationalist Government in China are preoccupying many people. All sorts of reasons have been attributed to it. Most commonly it is said in various speeches and publications that it is the result of American bungling, that we are incompetent, that we did not understand, that American aid was too little, that we did the wrong things at the wrong time. Other people go on and say: "No, it is not quite that, but that an American general did not like Chiang Kai-shek and out of all that relationship grows the real trouble." And they say: "Well, you have to add to that there are a lot of women fooling around in politics in China."

Nobody, I think, says that the Nationalist Government fell because it was confronted by overwhelming military force which it could not resist. Certainly no one in his right mind suggests that. Now, what I ask you to do is to stop looking for a moment under the bed and under the chair and under the rug to find out these reasons, but rather to look at the broad picture and see whether something doesn't suggest itself.

The broad picture is that after the war, Chiang Kai-shek emerged as the undisputed leader of the Chinese people. Only one faction, the Communists, up in the hills, ill-equipped, ragged, a very small military force, was determinedly opposed to his position. He had overwhelming military power, greater military power than any ruler had ever had in the entire history of China. He had tremendous economic and military support and backing from the United States. He had the acceptance of all other foreign countries, whether sincerely or insincerely in the case of the Soviet Union is not really material to this matter. Here he was in this position and 4 years later what do we find? We find that his armies have melted away. His support in the country has melted away. His support largely outside the country has melted away and he is a refugee on a small island off the coast of China with the remnants of his forces.

As I said, no one says that vast armies moved out of the hills and defeated him. To attribute this to the inadequacy of American aid is only to point out the depth and power of the forces which were miscalculated or ignored. What has happened, in my judgment, is that the almost inexhaustible patience of the Chinese people in their misery ended. They did not bother to overthrow this government. There was really nothing to overthrow. They simply ignored it throughout the country. They took the solution of their immediate village problems into their own hands. If there was any trouble or interference with the representatives of the government, they simply brushed them aside. They completely withdrew their support from this government and when that support was withdrawn, the whole military establishment disintegrated. Added to the grossest incompetence ever experienced by any military command was this total lack of support both in the armies and in the country, and so the whole matter just simply disintegrated.

The Communists did not create this. The Communists did not create this condition. They did not create this revolutionary spirit. They did not create a great force which moved out from under Chiang Kai-shek. But they were shrewd and cunning to mount it, to ride this thing into victory and into power.

That, I suggest to you, is an explanation which has certain roots and realism and which does not require all this examination of intricate and perhaps irrelevant details. So much for the attitudes of the peoples of Asia.

Let's consider for a moment another important factor in this relationship. That is the attitude of our own people to Asia. What is that fundamental attitude out of which our policy has grown? What is the history of it? Because history is very important and history furnishes the belief on the one side in the reality and truth of the attitude.

What has our attitude been toward the people of Asia? It has been, I submit to you, that we are interested—that Americans as individuals are interested in the peoples of Asia. We are not interested in them as pawns or as subjects for exploitation but just as people.

For 100 years some Americans have gone to Asia to bring in what they thought was the most valuable thing they had—their faith. They wanted to tell them what they thought about the nature and relationship of man to God. Others went to them to bring to them what they knew of learning. Others went to them to bring them healing for their bodies. Others and perhaps fewer went to them to learn the depth and beauty of their own cultures and some went to them to trade and they traded with them. But this trade was a very small part of American interest in the Far East and it was a very small part of American interest in trade. It was a valid interest, it was a good interest. There was nothing wrong about it, but out of the total sum of the interests of the American people in Asia, it was a comparatively small part.

Through all this period of time, also, we had, and still have, great interests in Asia. But let me point out to you one very important factor about our interests in Asia. That is that our interests have been parallel to the interests of the people of Asia. For 50 years it has been the fundamental belief of the American people—and I am not talking about announcements of government, but I mean a belief of people in little towns and villages and churches and missionary forces and labor unions throughout the United States—it has been their profound belief that the control of China by a foreign power was contrary to American interests. The interesting part about that is it was not contrary to the interests of the people of China. There was not conflict but parallelism in that interest. And so from the time of the announcement of the open-door policy through the nine-power treaty to the very latest resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations, we have stated that principle and we believe it. And similarly in all the rest of Asia—in the Philippines, in India, in Pakistan, and Indonesia, and in Korea—for years and years and years the interests of Americans throughout this country have been in favor of their independence. This is where their independence societies and their patriotic groups have come for funds and sympathy. The whole policy of our Government insofar as we have responsibility in the Philippines was to bring about the accomplishment of this independence and our sympathy and help. The very real help which we have given other nations in Asia has been in that direction and it is still in that direction.

Now, I stress this, which you may think is a platitude, because of a very important fact: I hear almost everyday someone say that the real interest of the United States is to stop the spread of communism. Nothing seems to me to put the cart before the horse more completely than that. Of course we are interested in stopping the spread of communism. But we are interested for a far deeper reason than any conflict between the Soviet Union and the United States. We are interested in stopping the spread of communism because communism is a doctrine that we don't happen to like. Communism is the most subtle instrument of Soviet

foreign policy that has ever been devised and it is really the spearhead of Russian imperialism which would, if it could, take from these people what they have won, what we want them to keep and develop which is their own national independence, their own individual independence, their own development of their own resources for their own good and not as mere tributary states to this great Soviet Union.

Now, it is fortunate that this point that I made does not represent any real conflict. It is an important point because people will do more damage and create more misrepresentation in the Far East by saying our interest is merely to stop the spread of communism than any other way. Our real interest is in those people as people. It is because communism is hostile to that interest that we want to stop it. But it happens that the best way of doing both things is to do just exactly what the peoples of Asia want to do and what we want to help them to do, which is to develop a soundness and administration of these new governments and to develop their resources and their technical skills so that they are not subject to penetration either through ignorance or because they believe these false promises, or because there is real distress in their areas. If we can help that development, if we can go forward with it, then we have brought about the best way that anyone knows of stopping this spread of communism.

It is important to take this attitude not as a mere negative reaction to communism but as the most positive affirmation of the most affirmative truth that we hold, which is in the dignity and right of every nation, of every people, and of every individual to develop in their own way, making their own mistakes, reaching their own triumphs, but acting under their own responsibility. That is what we are pressing for in the Far East and that is what we must affirm and not get mixed up with purely negative and inconsequential statements.

Now, let me come to another underlying and important factor which determines our relations and, in turn, our policy with the peoples of Asia. That is the attitude of the Soviet Union toward Asia and particularly toward those parts of Asia which are contiguous to the Soviet Union, and with great particularity this afternoon, to north China.

The attitude and interest of the Russians in north China, and in these other areas as well, long antedates communism. This is not something that has come out of communism at all. It long antedates it. But the Communist regime has added new methods, new skills, and new concepts to the thrust of Russian imperialism. These communistic concepts and techniques have armed Russian imperialism with a new and most insidious weapon of penetration. Armed with these new powers, what is happening in China is that the Soviet Union is detaching the northern provinces [areas] of China from China and is attaching them to the Soviet Union. This process is complete in Outer Mongolia. It is nearly complete in Manchuria and I am sure that in Inner Mongolia and in Sinkiang, there are very happy reports coming from Soviet agents to Moscow. This is what is going on. It is the detachment of these whole areas, vast areas—populated by Chinese—the detachment of these areas from China and their attachment to the Soviet Union.

I wish to state this and perhaps sin against my doctrine of nondogmatism, but I should like to suggest at any rate that this fact that the Soviet Union is taking the four northern provinces of China is the single most significant, most important fact, in the relation of any foreign power with Asia.

What does that mean for us? It means something very, very significant. It means that nothing that we do and nothing that we say must be allowed to obscure the reality of this fact. All the efforts of propaganda will not be able to obscure it. The only thing that can obscure it is the folly of ill-conceived adventures on our part which easily could do so and I urge all who are thinking about these foolish adventures to remember that we must not seize the unenviable position which the Russians have carved out for themselves. We must not undertake to deflect from the Russians to ourselves the righteous anger and the wrath and the hatred of the Chinese people which must develop. It would be folly to deflect it to curselves. We must take the position we have always taken that anyone who violates the integrity of China is the enemy of China and is acting contrary to our own interest. That, I suggest to you this afternoon, is the first and the greatest rule in regard to the formulation of American policy toward Asia.

I suggest that the second rule is very like the first. That is to keep our own purposes perfectly straight, perfectly pure and perfectly aboveboard and do not get them mixed up with legal quibbles or the attempt to do one thing and really achieve another.

The consequences of this Russian attitude and this Russian action in China are perfectly enormous. They are saddling all those in China who are proclaiming their loyalty to Moscow, and who are allowing themselves to be used as puppets of Moscow, with the most awful responsibility which they must pay for. Furthermore, these actions of the Russians are making plainer than any speech or any utterance or any legislation can make throughout all of Asia what the true purposes of the Soviet Union are and what the true function of communism as an agent of Russian imperialism is. These I suggest to you are the fundamental factors, fundamental realities of attitude out of which our relations and policies must grow.

Now, let's, in the light of that, consider some of these policies. First of all, let's deal with the question of military security. I deal with it first because it is important and because, having stated our policy in that regard, we must clearly understand that the military menace is not the most immediate.

What is the situation in regard to the military security of the Pacific area and what is our policy in regard to it?

In the first place, the defeat and the disarmament of Japan has placed upon the United States the necessity of assuming the military defense of Japan so long as that is required, both in the interest of our security and in the interests of the security of the entire Pacific area and in all honor in the interest of Japanese security. We have American and there are Australian troops in Japan. I am not in a position to speak for the Australians, but I can assure you that there is no intention of any sort of abandoning or weakening the defenses of Japan and that whatever arrangements are to be made, either through permanent settlement or otherwise, that defense must, and shall be, maintained.

This defensive perimeter runs along the Aleutians to Japan and then goes to the Ryukyus. We hold important defense positions in the Ryukyu Islands and those we will continue to hold. In the interest of the population of the Ryukyu Islands, we will at an appropriate time offer to hold these islands under trusteeship of the United Nations. But they are essential parts of the defensive perimeter of the Pacific and they must, and will be, held.

The defensive perimeter runs from the Ryukyus to the Philippine Islands. Our relations, our defensive relations with the Philippines, are contained in agreements between us. Those agreements are being loyally carried out and will be loyally carried out. Both peoples have learned by bitter experience the vital connections between our mutual defense requirements. We are in no doubt about that and it is hardly necessary for me to say an attack on the Philippines could not and would not be tolerated by the United States. But I hasten to add that no one perceives the imminence of any such attack.

So far as the military security of other areas in the Pacific is concerned, it must be clear that no person can guarantee these areas against military attack. But it must also be clear that such a guarantee is hardly sensible or necessary within the realm of practical relationship. Should such an attack occur—one hesitates to say where such an armed attack could come from—the initial reliance must be on the people attacked to resist it and then upon the commitments of the entire civilized world under the Charter of the United Nations which so far has not proved a weak reed to lean on by any people who are determined to protect their independence against outside aggression. But it is a mistake, I think, in considering Pacific and far-eastern problems to become obsessed with military considerations. Important as they are, there are other problems that press and these other problems are not capable of solution through military means. These other problems arise out of the susceptibility of many areas and many countries in the Pacific area to subversion and penetration. That cannot be stopped by military means.

The susceptibility to penetration arises because in many areas there are new governments which have little experience in governmental administration and have not become firmly established or perhaps firmly accepted in their countries. They grow in part from very serious economic problems, some of them growing out directly from the last war, others growing indirectly out of the last war because of the disruptions of trade with other parts of the world, with the disruption of arrangements which furnished credit and management to these areas for many years. That has resulted in dislocation of economic effort and in a good deal of suffering among the peoples concerned. In part this susceptibility to penetration comes from the great social upheaval about which I have been speaking, an upheaval which was carried on and confused a great deal by the Japanese occupation and by the propaganda which has gone on from Soviet sources since the war.

Here then are the problems in these other areas which require some policy on our part, and I should like to point out two facts to you and then discuss in more detail some of these areas.

The first fact is the great difference between our responsibility and our opportunities in the northern part of the Pacific area and in the southern part of the Pacific area. In the north, we have direct responsibility in Japan and we have direct opportunity to act. The same thing to a lesser degree is true in Korea. There we had direct responsibility and there we did act and there we have a greater opportunity to be effective than we have in the more southerly part.

In the southerly part of the area, we are one of many nations who can do no more than help. The direct responsibility lies with the peoples concerned. They are proud of their new national responsibility. You cannot sit around in Washington or London or Paris or The Hague and determine what the policies are going to be in those areas. You can be willing to help and you can help only when the conditions are right for help to be effective.

That leads me to the other thing that I wanted to point out and that is the limitation of effective American assistance. American assistance can be effective when it is the missing component in a situation which might otherwise be solved. The United States cannot furnish all these components to solve the question. It cannot furnish determination, it cannot furnish the will and it cannot furnish the loyalty of a people to its Government. But if the will and if the determination exists and if the peo-

ple are behind their Government, then, and not always then, is there a very good chance. In that situation American help can be effective and it can lead to an accomplishment which could not otherwise be achieved.

Now, with that statement, let's deal very briefly—because the time is going on and I am almost equaling my performance in the Senate and House—let's deal very briefly with some of the problems. Let's take the situation in Japan for a moment. There there are three great factors to be faced. The security matter I have dealt with. Aside from that, there are the economic questions and the political questions. In the political field, General MacArthur has been very successful and the Japanese are hammering out with some effort and with some backsliding and regaining and backsliding again of progress a political system which is based on nonmilitaristic institutions.

In the economic field, we have not been so successful. That is in very large part due to the inherent difficulty of the problem. The problem arises with the necessity of Japan being able to buy raw materials and sell goods. The former connections of Japan with the mainland and with some of the islands have been disrupted. That has produced difficulties. The willingness of other countries to receive Japanese goods has very much contracted since the war.

Difficulties of currency have added to those problems. But those matters have got to be faced and have got to be solved. Whether they are solved under a treaty or if the procedural difficulties of that are too great under some other mechanism, they must be solved along lines which permit the Japanese greater freedom—complete freedom if possible—to buy what they need in the world and to sell what they have to offer on the mainland of Asia, in southeast Asia, and in other parts of the world. That is the nature of the problem and it is a very tough one. It is one on which the occupation authorities, the Japanese Government, ourselves, and others are working. There can be no magic solution to it.

In Korea, we have taken great steps which have ended our military occupation and in cooperation with the United Nations have established an independent and sovereign country recognized by nearly all the rest of the world. We have given that nation great help in getting itself established. We are asking the Congress to continue that help until it is firmly established, and that legislation is now pending before the Congress. The idea that we should scrap all of that, that we should stop halfway through the achievement of the establishment of this country, seems to me to be the most utter defeatism and utter madness in our interests in Asia. But there our responsibilities are more direct and our opportunities more clear. When you move to the south, you find that our opportunity is much slighter and that our responsibilities, except in the Philippines and there indirectly, are very small. Those problems are very confusing.

In the Philippines, we acted with vigor and speed to set up an independent sovereign nation which we have done. We have given the Philippines a billion dollars of direct economic aid since the war. We have spent another billion dollars in such matters as veterans' benefits and other payments in the Philippines. Much of that money has not been used as wisely as we wish it had been used, but here again, we come up against the matter of responsibility. It is the Philippine Government which is responsible. It is the Philippine Government which must make its own mistakes. What we can do is advise and urge and if help continues to be misused to stop giving the help. We cannot direct, we should not direct, we have not the slightest desire to direct. I believe that there are indications that the Philippines may be facing serious economic difficulties. With energtic, determined action, they can perhaps be avoided or certainly minimized. Whether that will be true or not, I can not say, but it does not rest within the power of the American Government to determine that. We are always ready to help and to advise. That is all we can and all we should do.

Elsewhere in southeast Asia, the limits of what we can do are to help where we are wanted. We are organizing the machinery through which we can make effective help possible. The western powers are all interested. We all know the techniques. We have all had experiences which can be useful to those governments which are newly starting out if they want it. It cannot be useful if they don't want it. We know techniques of administration. We know techniques of organizing school districts and road districts and taxation districts. We know agricultural and industrial techniques, all of which can be helpful, and those we are preparing to make available if they are wanted, where they are wanted and under circumstances where they have a fighting chance to be successful. We will not do these things for the mere purpose of being active. They will not be done for the mere purpose of running around and doing good, but for the purpose of moving in where we are wanted to a situation where we have the missing component which, if put into the rest of the picture, will spell success.

The situation in the different countries of southeast Asia is difficult. It is highly confused in Burma where five different factions have utterly disrupted the immediate government of the country. Progress is being made in Indo-china where the French, although moving slowly, are moving. There are noticeable signs of progress in transferring responsibility to a local administration and getting the adherence of the population to this local administration. We hope that the situation will be such that the French can make further progress and make it quickly but I know full well the difficulties which are faced by the Foreign Minister of France and my admiration and respect for him are so great that I would not want one word I say to add a feather to the burden that he carries.

In Malaya, the British have and are discharging their responsibility harmoniously with the people of Malaya and are making progress.

In Indonesia, a great success has been achieved within the last few weeks and over a period of months. The round-table conferences at The Hague in which great statesmanship and restraint were displayed, both on the Dutch and the Indonesian side, have resulted in this new government being formed. Relations of this government with the Dutch will be very good and the Dutch can furnish them great help and advice and we will be willing to stand by to give whatever help we can rightly and profitably give. That situation is one which is full of encouragement although it is full of difficulty also.

As one goes to the end of this semicircle and comes to India and Pakistan, we find really grave troubles facing the world and facing these two countries there, both with respect to Kashmir, and to the utter difficulties—economic difficulties growing out of the differences in devaluation, settlement of monetary plans back and forth, et cetera. We know that they have assured one another and they have assured the world that as stubborn as these difficulties may be and difficult as they may be of solution, they are not going to resort to war to solve them. We are glad to hear those assurances and the whole world is glad to hear it but we know also that the problems are in such a situation and in such an area that they are most inflammable, and we believe that in addition to these most desirable assurances there should be some accommodation of wills to bring about a result as soon as possible.

In India and in Pakistan we are willing to be of such help as we can be. Again, the responsibility is not ours. Again we can only be helpful friends. Again the responsibility lies with people who have won their freedom and who are very proud of it.

So after this survey, what we conclude, I believe, is that there is a new day which has dawned in Asia. It is a day in which the Asian peoples are on their own and know it and intend to continue on their own. It is a day in which the old relationships between east and west are gone, relationships which at their worst were exploitation and which at their best were paternalism. That relationship is over and the relationship of east and west must now be in the Far East one of mutual respect and mutual helpfulness. We are their friends. Others are their friends. We and those others are willing to help but we can help only where we are wanted and only where the conditions of help are really sensible and possible. So what we can see is that this new day in Asia, this new day which is dawning, may go on to a glorious noon or it may darken and it may drizzle out. But that decision lies within the countries of Asia and within the power of the Asian people. It is not a decision which a friend or even an enemy from the outside can decide for them.

Thank you very much.

Mr. O'Brien then read the following questions which were submitted in writing by the members of the Press Club:

1. Can you explain why the Republican leaders are so intent in intervening in the hopeless Chinese situation when they opposed the Truman plan for Europe?

2. Up to now, we have been emphasizing our problems in Europe. Does this mean that from now on our problems lie mainly in Asia?

3. You touched on the Korean situation. There are two rather definite queries here. One is whether it is militarily tenable to hold South Korea in the face of aggression from the North, and secondly, whether it is a suitable base for possible operations?

4. You stated that the present trend in Asia is to throw off foreign domination. Is not the present debacle in China the very reverse of this; that is, the allowance of a foreign power to overthrow an existing self-government?

5. The President has said that there will be no military aid for Formosa. Yet we see stories and pictures of shiploads of tanks and planes and aircraft being shipped from United States ports to Formosa. Who is providing these weapons to Formosa?

Secretary ACHESON. Mr. President, let me separate these questions into those I can deal with and those which I cannot deal with. One of the sound rules of ancient justice was that the wise thing for a court to do was to observe the limits of its jurisdiction. Having studied the Constitution and statutes of the United States applicable to the duties of the Secretary of State, particularly a Democratic Secretary of State, I find nothing in them which gives me either responsibility or power for the action of Republican leaders.

Similarly these questions which are directed toward military conceptions in regard to Korea seem to me to fall properly within the area of responsibility of the Department of Defense and I am sure that they will deal appropriately with those questions. Now, that leaves me some here which I should like to take up.

One is a question of fact which says: Who is paying for the materials which you see being shipped to Formosa? The materials which are being shipped to Formosa are being paid for by the Nationalist Government of China, and those payments have been paid either out of their own funds or out of the remaining part of the $125,000,000 which was appropriated by the Congress. Those goods

are being shipped at the present time. They are being shipped under export licenses and there is no intention or desire to interfere with their shipment. I think this question was asked at my own press conference and was answered by me.

Now, here are two other questions which state that in the past we have been emphasizing problems in Europe. Does what I have said this afternoon mean that we are now emphasizing problems of Asia? And a question which says that what I have said indicates that the great desire in the Far East is to throw off foreign domination and is not the present debacle in China going to result in foreign domination?

Let's deal with this which I think I have dealt with. Let's clear it up in a few words.

One of our difficulties in the United States is that we tend to put on blinders and we can only look at one thing at a time. Therefore, since a speaker cannot cover all parts of the world in one afternoon in one speech, if he does cover one aspect, the conclusion appears to be drawn that he has abandoned all interest in other aspects of foreign policy. Of course, it is not our intention in any way to diminish the interest or the intensity of our interest in Europe. What I have been talking about are the problems of Asia today. I have tried to talk about what we have done in the past and what we intend to do so far as we can in the future. What I have said, I think indicates a continuity of effort and a continuity of principle.

We are hoping to get from the Congress broader and wider powers and more support to do what we have been doing more vigorously. The President has a fund of $75,000,000 which is available. We are asking the Congress under the point 4 program for authority and further funds and we are going ahead along the lines that we have gone ahead in the past but we hope with greater power and greater resources and greater funds.

Now, in regard to this conflict in China, of course, what has been asked is true and of course the fundamental interest in China is to get rid of foreign domination. Of course, one of the results of recent events is the reintroduction of a new and even more powerful foreign domination. That conflict, it seems to me, is one of the underlying facts upon which American policy must be based. I have been urging this afternoon that we do not put ourselves in a position of deflecting the attention of the Chinese people from this basic and real fact. We do not want to deflect their attention from what the Russians are doing to some silly adventure which some people in this country are urging.

May I say one other thing which is not in answer to a question but is something that I have long wanted to get off my chest and since you are helpless victims, you must listen to it. It seems to me that a great deal of the discussion of our foreign affairs loses in helpfulness because it is misdirected in aim. There seems to be a great interest in many quarters in trying to point out a logical inconsistency. They say if you do so and so in Greece, why don't you do so and so in China? The idea is that we must always act exactly the same way in every country in the world, and if you don't somebody rings up score one on the cash register. That, I think, is not a helpful way of discussing foreign policy and it is a very false trend.

The United States in my judgment acts in regard to a foreign nation strictly in regard to American interests or those wider interests which affect American interest. And if it is to American interests or those wider interests which affect it, to do one thing in one country and another thing in another country, then that is the consistency upon which I propose to advise the President, and I am not in the slightest bit worried at all because somebody can say, "Well, you said so and so about Greece, why isn't all of this true about China?" I will be polite. I will be patient and I will try to explain why Greece is not China, but my heart will not be in that battle.

Therefore, what I think we should all do is to look at the problem before us. Don't bounce it off another problem somewhere else, but hit it directly and say, "What is the common-sense thing from the point of view of American interest to do here?"

Once we can solve that, we can have little side humorous debates about how different it is from something else but we are on the main track there and we will pursue American interests which it is my duty to pursue and which it is the wish of all of us to pursue.

INTERNATIONALIZATION OF JERUSALEM—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared on the subject of America's sound position in opposition to the United Nation's resolution dealing with the internationalization of the state of Jerusalem. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, along with a resolution which I have received from my State, and certain other material.

There being no objection, the statement, resolution, and other material were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENDORSEMENT OF UNITED STATES POSITION

I have in my hands the text of a press release reporting on the unanimous action by representatives of many leading organizations of our country, endorsing the vote which the United States cast in the General Assembly in opposition to the proposed internationalization of Jerusalem.

These organizations include Americans of many faiths, many backgrounds, many walks of life. I believe that they were sound in their commendation of our Government's action, because I definitely believe, as pointed out in the release and in the following resolution, that it is impractical, undesirable, and absurdly costly to even attempt to apply the United Nation's decision in the face of justified opposition by both the Arab and Jewish nations.

MILWAUKEE RESOLUTION OPPOSED UN STAND

Last November a mass meeting was held in the city of Milwaukee by the Milwaukee Zionist Emergency Council on this subject and I should like to have the text of the fine resolution which this meeting adopted also printed at this point in the RECORD.

The main interest of world public opinion is naturally that justice and equity be served in the holiest of cities—Jerusalem—sacred to the Christian, Moslem, and Jewish faiths. Ninety percent of the sacred shrines and holy places lie within the walls of the old city of Jerusalem, which is under the control of the Arabs. The Israeli Government has indicated its desire for complete UN observance over these holy shrines and has in turn readily granted freedom of access to all holy places within its jurisdiction.

This, however, is a far different matter from the undesirable proposal for internationalization of the entire city of Jerusalem, plus setting up a 60-square-mile enclave around the city. Obviously, the UN has no police force powerful enough to make such a scheme effective, and it is quite clear that such a conclave would involve far more new problems than it would actually solve.

NEW CITY MUST REMAIN IN ISRAEL

I should like to point out further, Mr. President, that the new city of Jerusalem, comprising the major portion of the whole city, is 95 percent Jewish in population and to attempt to separate the new city from the new state of Israel would be to violate the principles of historic justice, as well as to be in direct contradiction with America's recognition of that heroic new state.

UN DECISION MUST BE RESCINDED

I am hopeful, therefore, that in the interest of world Christianity, that in respect for the religious principles of Moslem civilization, that in respect to both the Arab and Jewish neighbor states, the United Nations will promptly recognize that its decision must be rescinded.

Such a change will help assure stability and peace in the troubled Near East and will help push back the clouds of conflict which hover over that embattled area.

PRESS RELEASE OF JANUARY 10, 1950

National representatives of church, labor, veterans, education, and other public-interest groups today presented to Under Secretary of State James E. Webb a memorandum addressed to the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, approving the vote cast by the United States Government against the United Nations resolution dealing with the internationalization of Jerusalem.

The memorandum emphasized that the resolution was impractical and unenforceable. It pointed to the unduly heavy costs which the United Nations would be requested to absorb and toward which the United States Government would have to contribute the major portion of the necessary funds. The delegation also pointed out that the structure of the United Nations would be strained and weakened in the attempt to enforce internationalization.

The delegation urged the State Department to support a proposal for an international arrangement to secure the holy places and free access to them under a United Nations guaranty.

Among the representatives of national organizations who presented the memorandum to the State Department were the following: Rev. Donald B. Cloward, executive secretary, Council on Christian Social Progress, Northern Baptist Convention; Lilian K. Watford, Washington representative, United Council of Church Women; Dr. Joseph B. Dawson, executive director, Commission on Public Affairs, Baptists of the United States; Michael Ross, director, Department for International Affairs, Congress of Industrial Organizations; Victor E. Devereaux, national commander, Regular Veterans Association; Leslie Perry, national representative, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; James Loeb, Jr., national executive secretary, Americans for Democratic Action; L. C. Pakiser, executive director, American Veterans Committee; Elizebeth Christman, Washington representative, National Women's Trade-Union League; Russell Smith, legislative secretary, National Farmers Union; Jacob Blaustein, president, American Jewish Committee; Elmer W. Henderson, director, American Council on Human Rights; Bernard Weitzer, legislative representative, Jewish War Veterans of the United States; Dr. Richard B. Kennan, executive secretary, Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education, National Education Association; Philip Schiff, Washington representative, National Jewish Welfare Board.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 10, 1950.*

The Honorable DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The undersigned, who have supported the aims and principles of the United Nations since its inception and have made every effort to strengthen it, have noted and approved the vote cast by our

Government against the resolution dealing with the internationalization of Jerusalem passed by the General Assembly of the United Nations in the session just concluded.

We therefore deplore the action taken by the General Assembly of the United Nations for the following reasons:

1. The action of the United Nations imperils the peace negotiations now proceeding between Hashemite Jordan and Israel as a logical sequence of their armistice, and which would probably conclude in an equitable settlement of the Jerusalem problem and the protection of the holy places.

2. The United Nations, as the result of its resolution, has put itself in a position of vitiating the great efforts it has made since its inception to assure peace among nations by attempting to superimpose upon the two sovereign nations whose territorial interests are most closely related to Jerusalem a resolution which it is impractical if not impossible to enforce.

3. By adoption of the resolution the United Nations has embarked upon a course which calls for an initial expenditure of $8,500,000, nearly one-fourth of its total budget. This puts an almost unsupportable burden upon the fiscal operations of the United Nations. But even worse, the full cost of attempted enforcement is unpredictable.

4. We, therefore, call upon our Government to use every means within its power to correct the action taken by the General Assembly of the United Nations and thereby restore the full capacity of the United Nations to assure peace among nations, in favor of the solution which we believe can be reached by Hashemite Jordan and Israel through their continued negotiations for a treaty of peace between them which will insure complete protection of the holy places under United Nations jurisdiction.

Sincerely yours,

Rev. Donald B. Cloward, Executive Secretary, Council on Christian Social Progress, Northern Baptist Convention; Lilian K. Watford, Washington Representative, United Council of Church Women; Dr. Joseph B. Dawson, Executive Director, Commission on Public Affairs, Baptists of the United States; Michael Ross, Director, Department for International Affairs, Congress of Industrial Organizations; Victor E. Devereaux, National Commander, Regular Veterans Association; Leslie Perry, National Representative, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Jacob Blaustein, President, American Jewish Committee; Philip Schiff, Washington Representative, National Jewish Welfare Board; James Loeb, Jr., National Executive Secretary, Americans for Democratic Action; L. C. Pakiser, Executive Director, American Veterans Committee; Elizabeth Christman, Washington Representative, National Women's Trade Union League; Russell Smith, Legislative Secretary, National Farmers Union; Elmer W. Henderson, Director, American Council on Human Rights; Bernard Weitzer, Legislative Representative, Jewish War Veterans of the United States; Dr. Richard B. Kennan, Executive Secretary, Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education, National Education Association.

RESOLUTION OF MILWAUKEE ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL

Whereas, as American Jews, we are grateful to the President and the Government of the United States for the leading role they have played in the effectuation of Palestine's partition and in the subsequent admission of Israel to the United Nations Organization; and

Whereas the United Nations Conciliation Commission's proposal to sever Jerusalem from Israel, a plan which would place all of the Holy City within a 60-square-mile enclave under the permanent authority of an international regime, would threaten the security of Israel; and

Whereas the siege of Jerusalem was lifted, not by a United Nations truce but by the military strength of the Jewish residents of Israel who, though sorely pressed for its own survival, summoned all its resources to relieve stricken Jerusalem and saved it from strangulation; and

Whereas the city of Jerusalem is predominantly Jewish in population, comprising over 90 percent of its total inhabitants, in art, culture, educational and medical institutions, commerce, trade, and industry; and

Whereas for 3,000 years the Jewish people have looked upon Jerusalem with special reverence, regarding it as the spiritual center of the Jewish religion: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, American Jews of the city of Milwaukee, meeting in joint assembly this 2d day of November 1949, do hereby call upon the Government of the United States to repudiate the impractical and unjust plan of the United Nations Palestine Conciliation Commission which would cut off Jerusalem from Israel; and be it further

Resolved, That while we are mindful of the international character of the Christian shrines and holy places in Jerusalem, we respectfully submit that only these sites—and no more—be placed under the supervision of the United Nations; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Harry S. Truman and be brought to the personal attention of Congressmen ANDREW BIEMILLER and CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, and United States Senators ALEXANDER WILEY and JOSEPH MCCARTHY.

Rabbi LOUIS SWICHKOW,
Chairman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request and by unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate on Monday next, so that he may keep an important engagement in New Jersey.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN AT CAMPAIGN DINNER OF REPUBLICAN CITY COMMITTEE OF PHILADELPHIA

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the 1949 campaign dinner of the Republican City Committee of Philadelphia at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa., October 28, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN AT DEDICATION OF THE MELLON DORMITORY, WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON COLLEGE

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the dedication of the Mellon Dormitory at Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa., October 29, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOVERNOR DRISCOLL OF NEW JERSEY—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEWARK (N. J.) STAR LEDGER

[Mr. HENDRICKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Substance Is There," relating to Governor Driscoll, of New Jersey, published in the Newark (N. J.) Star Ledger, which appears in the Appendix.]

OSCAR CHAPMAN, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR—ARTICLE FROM THE DENVER POST

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Chapman Caps Notable Career," published in the Denver Post of January 8, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM FOR AMERICA—EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an address on the subject, Civil Rights Program for America, delivered by him at the National Emergency Civil Rights Mobilization on January 15, 1950, in Washington, D. C., which excerpts appear in the Appendix.]

THE LAW OF REVERENCE AND THE LAW OF FEAR—SERMON BY THE RIGHT REVEREND JOHN K. CARTWRIGHT

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a sermon entitled "The Law of Reverence and the Law of Fear," delivered by the Right Reverend John K. Cartwright at the Red Mass, January 15, 1950, in the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

HEYWOOD BROUN'S GIFTED PEN—ARTICLE FROM THE GUILD REPORTER

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Some Jottings From Broun's Gifted Pen," published in the Guild Reporter, a newspaper published by the American Newspaper Guild, which article appears in the Appendix.]

ARMY OPEN DOOR—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Army Open Door," from the Washington Post of January 20, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOR EQUALITY IN THE ARMY—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "For Equality in the Army," published in the New York Times of January 17, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further routine matters to be presented, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], who is entitled to the floor, may proceed.

DELIVERED PRICE SYSTEMS AND FREIGHT-ABSORPTION PRACTICES—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1008) to define the application of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to certain pricing practices.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the conferees appointed to represent the Senate on the committee of conference on the disagreeing amendments of the two Houses on S. 1008 entered the motion to agree to the conference report, believing that its provisions represented sound legislation for the benefit of the general public.

Following the extended debate just prior to adjournment of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, the Senate postponed consideration of the report until this date. Since the adjournment continued consideration has been given

by those of us who have advocated passage of this measure.

The proposed legislation is intended to clear up widespread confusion which has been prevalent as to whether or not it is legal to absorb freight and to quote delivered prices when an individual acts independently and in good faith and where there is no conspiracy or collusive effort.

Since the conference report on S. 1008 was filed in the Senate there has been a concerted attack on the bill, a great deal of the barrage being aimed at section 4D. As pointed out in the statements of the managers on the part of the Senate, the Senate amendment to this section defined the term "the effect may be" to mean that there is "substantial and probative evidence" of the specified effect. The amendment to this section adopted by the House would define the term to mean that there is "reasonable probability" of the specified effect. The compromise language adopted by the conferees to this section sought to define the term to mean that there is "reliable, probative, and substantial evidence" of the specified effect. This was simply adopting the exact language of the Administrative Procedure Act.

In view of the vigorous and highly vocal opposition to this compromise language, and in an effort to avoid any suggestion of a desire to weaken either the Robinson-Patman Act or the Clayton Act, the Senate managers, at the suggestion of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], sought the advice of the Department of Justice on the matter. It might be added that no one has been more determined to avoid any injurious change to the antitrust laws than has the senior Senator from Wyoming, who has also been outstanding in the effort to assist the legitimate aims of business and industry in regard to freight absorption and delivered prices.

At a meeting with the Attorney General of the United States, the head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, and the Assistant to the Attorney General, there were present various Members of the Senate who have been in support of this proposed legislation. This group included the able senior Senator from Nevada, chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. MCCARRAN], the able senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which previously had handled this legislation, and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS]. It was the senior Senator from Pennsylvania who had originally introduced this proposal, which was then in the form of a moratorium for the suspension of action against the business interests involved during a period of study of this complicated subject matter.

As the outcome of the conference, the Attorney General was asked to submit a formal opinion analyzing each section of the conference report and giving his views as to whether any different language should be adopted in order to avoid conflict with the protective features of the antitrust statutes. The further request was made that the Attorney General suggest the precise language which should be used. Complying with the suggestion, the Justice Department subsequently delivered the opinion on the disputed points.

In the opinion on the meaning and interpretation of section 4D, contained in a letter over the signature of Mr. Peyton Ford, the Assistant to the Attorney General, dated January 13, the Justice Department, after stating categorically that it had no objection to the enactment of sections 1, 2, and 3 in their present form, did question the definition of the term "the effect may be." He suggested the possibility that the language of this definition, as approved by the conference committee, might be so construed that, to quote from Mr. Ford's letter, it "would impose an evidentiary burden that may go beyond the present requirements of the Clayton and Robinson-Patman Acts and create an almost impossible burden of proof by requiring positive evidence of facts not yet in existence."

The definition might also, Mr. Ford wrote, be interpreted as applying to other provisions of the Clayton Act in addition to those in the bill under discussion.

Speaking for the Justice Department, Mr. Ford recommended that, to avoid any possibility of such a construction, section 4D of the bill be amended to read as follows:

> D. The term "the effect may be" shall mean that there is reasonable probability of the specified effect.

It will be noted this was the language of the bill as passed by the House.

The conference committee was never at any time interested in any attempt to emasculate or in any way weaken the Robinson-Patman Act, or otherwise to withdraw from small business any of the protection now afforded by the present antitrust laws.

As viewed by the conference, there was no foundation for the fears that had been expressed that any of the definitions contained in section 4 might be construed as carrying over into the Clayton Act, as amended, and as applying to, or affecting, the construction of the defined terms as used elsewhere in that act.

In their statement, the conference committee pointed out that such fears were ungrounded, since the definitions in section 4 were, by the terms of the section, applicable to the defined terms only "as used in this act." Therefore, the Senate managers were firmly of the opinion that the same or similar terms, as they may appear in any portion of the Clayton Act not specifically rewritten by Senate bill 1008, necessarily would remain unaffected.

At this time I should like to place in the RECORD a statement, with which all the managers on the part of the Senate concur, respecting the meaning and interest of section 4D. I ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEANING AND INTERPRETATION OF SECTION 4D OF S. 1008

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1008) to define the application of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to certain pricing practices, desires to submit a supplement to the conference report which supplement it feels is necessary in order to make clear to the Members of the respective Houses the scope, effect, and meaning of section 4D of the bill as reported out by the conference.

When the report of the conference was before each of the Houses last October great concern was expressed as to the effect of this section upon the Clayton Act in two respects: (1) That it may have the effect of changing existing law by imposing upon the Federal Trade Commission a greater burden of proof, in establishing a violation of the act, than is required under present law, and (2) that, to the extent that this is so, it will have that effect, not only upon the specific provisions embraced within this bill, but upon other provisions of the Clayton Act as well.

This situation, the committee feels, results wholly from a misunderstanding of the meaning of the words now in section 4D of the bill and a misconception of their application to the existing law. The committee therefore takes this opportunity to record the congressional intent with respect to what was intended by this section of the bill and in so doing to explain to the Congress the meaning to be given the section The committee is satisfied that a reference to the legislative history of this bill, for reasons hereinafter stated, can lead only to the conclusion that section 4D does not, and is not intended to, change existing law in any respect and that even if it were to change it, such changes would extend only to the specific provisions of this bill wherein the defined term is used, and would not extend to other provisions of the Clayton Act.

It has been contended by some, however, that the clear language of section 4D will foreclose the courts from looking to the legislative history. Our answer to that contention is twofold. First, the plain language of the provision, even without resort to legislative history, is susceptible to no other interpretation than that which we have hereinbefore given it. Secondly, it is clear under the controlling Supreme Court decisions, that the courts would not be foreclosed from looking to the legislative history in interpreting this provision.

The prevailing attitude of the Supreme Court, as expressed in two recent cases, *United States* v. *American Trucking Associations* (310 U. S. 534 (1940)) and *Northern Trust Co.* v. *Harrison* (317 U. S. 476 (1943)) is that in interpretation of statutes, courts should construe the language so as to give effect to the intent of Congress and in ascertaining that intent they may properly look to the legislative history of the statute.

In the former case, speaking through Mr. Justice Reed, the Court said (pp. 542–544):

"In the interpretation of statutes, the function of the courts is easily stated. It is to construe the language so as to give effect to the intent of Congress. There is no invariable rule for the discovery of that intention. To take a few words from their context and with them thus isolated to attempt to determine their meaning, certainly would not contribute greatly to the discovery of the purpose of the draftsman of a statute, particularly in a law drawn to meet many needs of a major occupation.

"There is, of course, no more persuasive evidence of the purpose of a statute than the words by which the legislature undertook to give expression to its wishes. Often these words are sufficient in and of themselves to determine the purpose of the legislation. In such cases we have followed their plain meaning. When that meaning has led to absurd or futile results, however, this court has looked beyond the words to the purpose of the act. Frequently, however,

even when the plain meaning did not produce absurd results but merely an unreasonable one 'plainly at variance with the policy of the legislation as a whole' this court has followed the purpose, rather than the literal words. When aid to the construction of the meaning of words, as used in the statute, is available, there certainly can be no rule of law which forbids its use, however clear the words may appear on superficial examination."

The Northern Trust case is even more emphatic in its language. In that case the use of legislative history in the construction of a statute clear on its face, was the only issue in the case. The Circuit Court of Appeals had refused to examine the legislative history of an act of Congress on the ground that the language of the statute was clear and unambiguous. In its reversal in a unanimous opinion the court said:

"Words are inexact tools at best and for that reason there is wisely no rule of law forbidding resort to explanatory legislative history no matter how clear the words may appear on superficial examination."

In *Mitchell* v. *Cohen* (333 U. S. 411 (1948)), despite an allegation of clear and obvious meaning (p. 417), the Court resorted to legislative history to determine congressional intent.

During the past 10 years the Supreme Court has decided more than 130 cases in which legislative history was decisive of construction of a particular statutory provision. For a listing of such cases see 335 U. S. 687–689.

For the benefit of the courts, if the need for construction of this section should arise, the committee desires to state unequivocally its intentions with respect to the language it recommends in section 4D, so that there can be no lingering doubt as to the meaning of that section.

The definition of "effect may be" does not change the Clayton Act as it is presently construed. This term appears in Section 2A and section 3 of S. 1008.

Section 2A amends section 2 (a) of the Clayton Act. As used in section 2A of S. 1008 the term "the effect may be" reads as follows:

"If differences between such prices are not such that their effect upon competition may be that prohibited by this section."

The "specified effect" referred to in section 4D is that effect which is prohibited by this section. But the "effect prohibited by this section" is that which is prohibited by section 2 (a) of the Clayton Act, namely, a price discrimination where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition. The term as used in section 2A of the bill means, therefore, that there must be a showing through reliable, probative, and substantial evidence that the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition.

Section 3 of S. 1008 amends section 2 (b) of the Clayton Act. As used in section 3 of S. 1008, the term "the effect may be" reads thusly:

"Upon proof being made, at any hearing on a complaint under this section, that there has been discrimination in price the effect of which upon competition may be that prohibited by the preceding subsection."

Here again, the specified effect is that effect which is prohibited by section 2 (a) of the Clayton Act. The meaning of the term "the effect may be" as used in section 3 of S. 1008 is, therefore, identical to its meaning in section 2A of the bill, namely, that there must be reliable, probative, and substantial evidence that the effect of such discrimination may be to substantially lessen competition. That of which there must be reliable, probative, and substantial evidence is not that competition has actually lessened, but only that it may be lessened.

Reliable, probative, and substantial evidence that the effect of a price difference may be to lessen competition is, however, required under existing law. Thus, the effect of section 4D is to leave the present status of the law unchanged, except as it restores the rule that existed prior to the 1948 decision in *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Morton Salt Co.* (334 U. S. 37), namely, that there must be a reasonable probability of lessened competition and not mere reasonable possibility as was held in that case.

Prior to the adoption of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1945 the courts, following the rule laid down in *Standard Fashion Co.* v. *Magrane-Houston* (258 U. S. 346 (1922)), consistently held that the evidentiary requirement respecting the effect on competition under section 2 (a) of the Clayton Act necessitated a showing of reasonable probability of the specified effect. The Morton Salt case has been the only departure from that rule. That case, although decided after the Administrative Procedure Act was passed, was not governed by the latter and appears to us inconsistent with its purpose and objective. Consequently, it has been the purpose in S. 1008 to restore the previous test.

The Administrative Procedure Act was passed in 1946 and is applicable to cases coming before the Federal Trade Commission. Section 7C of that act provides for every agency that—

"No sanction shall be imposed or rule or order be issued except upon consideration of the whole record or such portions thereof as may be cited by any party and as supported by and in accordance with reliable, probative, and substantial evidence."

The congressional debates disclose, and the Court has so held, that the purpose of the above provision is to improve the quality of evidence presented before agency proceedings. Although evidentiary requirements before administrative agencies are not and cannot be as strict as in civil or criminal proceedings, the intention of the Administrative Procedure Act was to do away with the scintilla rule. *Securities & Exchange Commission* v. *Chenery Corp.* (332 U. S. 194 (1947)); *Willapoint Oysters* v. *Ewing* (174 F. 2d 676, 1949), *United States ex rel Lindenau* v. *Watkins* (73 F. Supp. 216 (D. C. N. Y. 1947), reversed on other grounds, 164 F. 2d 457).

The consistent intention expressed in both the House of Representatives and the Senate, in formulating the provisions of S. 1008, has been to retain the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act and not to provide an exemption from them. The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. O'MAHONEY) recognized this fact when, in answer to an objection raised by the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. KEFAUVER) to a proposed amendment which would reword section 4D, he said:

"The language of the Administrative Procedure Act, which, of course, is now the law, is, as I understand, 'substantial and probative evidence.' So I think the objection of the Senator from Tennessee would be met by altering the amendment on page 4, line 6, to read as follows:

" 'Is substantial and probative evidence of the specified effect.'

"That would be a declaration of existing law" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Volume 95, Part VI, p. 7070).

The Senator from Tennessee accepted this suggestion (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Volume 95, Part VI, p. 7071) and the Senate passed S. 1008 with the understanding that section 4D did no more than restate existing law.

To summarize, the committee adopted this identical language, adding only the word "reliable" to conform to the exact wording of the Administrative Procedure Act. Section 4D, therefore, as applied to section 2 (a) of the Clayton Act, results in no change in existing law, since the present law requires reliable, probative, and substantial evidence that the effect of a price discrimination may be to lessen competition. This is the construction intended by the committee of conference when it filed its report. It is the construction intended by the sponsor of the bill. It is the construction intended by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] when he accepted the Senator from Wyoming's [Mr. O'MAHONEY] alternative. It is the construction intended by the Senate when it passed the bill. It is the present law applicable to all Clayton Act proceedings before the Federal Trade Commission.

Turning to the effect of section 4D upon other provisions of the Clayton Act, it is, of course, immaterial in view of the interpretation we put upon it, whether or not the section is applicable to sections other than those in S. 1008 which use the phrase "the effect may be." In order to dispel any doubts on this score, however, we wish to reiterate that section 4D applies only to the latter.

Section 4 defines the word "price" (4A), the terms "delivered price" (4B), "absorb freight" (4C), and "the effect may be" (4D) "as used in this act." Quite aside from its obvious limited meaning, the term "this act," being in the singular, clearly must refer to S. 1008 and not to the Clayton or Federal Trade Commission Acts generally, both of which S. 1008 would amend.

Section 4D defines the term "the effect may be" to mean "that there is reliable, probative, and substantial evidence of the specified effect." Since the term "the effect may be" is found only in section 2A and section 3 of "this act" (S. 1008), it is only to those sections of this act (S. 1008) to which it applies. Hence, it can have no application to the unamended portions of section 2 (a) of the Clayton Act or any other sections thereof.

In the light of this supplemental statement on the intended construction of section 4D, members of the committee of conference are satisfied that no possible construction, other than that heretofore expressed, can be given to section 4D by any court before which the question may be raised, and the Senate may vote upon S. 1008 with full confidence that statements herein represent the intended meaning of this section and that it will be so interpreted in the event that the bill becomes law.

PAT MCCARRAN.
HERBERT R. O'CONOR.
ALEXANDER WILEY.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, while still firmly of the belief that the compromise definition, in section 4D, of the clause "the effect may be," did not in any way weaken the safeguards already established in law to protect all business, and particularly small business, nevertheless, in view of the position taken by the Justice Department, we are perfectly satisfied to see this point reopened.

We would be willing, therefore, Mr. President, to see the conference report rejected, and to seek a new conference with a view to amending section 4D along the lines of the Justice Department's recommendation.

Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. LONG, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield; and, if so to whom?

Mr. O'CONOR. I am glad to yield. I yield first to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, as the Senator from Maryland very well knows, I supported the bill the Senate passed. I have had some private conversations with the Senator from Maryland, and he knows my interest in having enacted necessary and constructive

legislation on this point. Personally, I agree with the viewpoint taken by the conferees that the conference report did not do violence to the Robinson-Patman Act, and that no one was going to be permitted to do anything in violence of that restraint on unfair competition, as had been done until the Supreme Court decision was rendered.

The only purpose of this measure was to restore what had been accepted as a normal and necessary means of doing business, without any intention at all of weakening the antitrust laws or of vitiating any part of the Robinson-Patman Act.

Personally, I would have no objection to voting today for the adoption of the conference report. But what disturbs me is this: If we agree to the suggestion—and I hesitate to oppose it, since I understand that all the conferees are going to unite on this matter—to let this measure go back to conference, will we have the Senator's assurance that in due season this measure will be brought before the Senate again?

Mr. O'CONOR. I can assure the Senator from Virginia that it is our hope and expectation that immediate consideration will be given the matter. We are just as anxious to move expeditiously to clear up the confused condition which we believe exists, as is anyone else, but at the same time we do not wish to do anything which by any possible construction might weaken or might be considered as possibly weakening the antitrust laws.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The distinguished Senator from Maryland knows that all of us have been flooded with letters, and he well knows that the patron of the Patman-Robinson Act has taken a very determined stand, as I understand, against any legislation on this subject at all, or else he wants the provisions which are written into the bill to be such as will fail to achieve the objective the Senator from Maryland and the junior Senator from Virginia have in mind.

Has the Senator from Maryland looked into the parliamentary procedures, practices, and regulations to the extent of being able to tell the Senate whether it would be possible for the House conferees to tie up this matter in conference, so that the Senate could not get the measure back before it again?

Mr. O'CONOR. Of course, there is no assurance which can be given by anyone in regard to what the conferees will or will not do. But I feel safe in saying to my friend, the junior Senator from Virginia, that we feel the managers on the part of the House are ready and willing to give immediate attention to the matter, and I would hope it can be brought to a successful conclusion.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I understand that the Senate conferees now are in agreement that the change suggested by the Department of Justice in the language merely does what we considered we already were doing in the language previously used.

Mr. O'CONOR. I may say, in answer to the Senator, that I hold in my hand a statement which I have asked to have incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. The statement is signed by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman of the committee, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the junior Senator from Maryland, who are the Senate conferees, unanimously agreeing to this language.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And I understand that we have the assurance of the chairman of the managers on the part of the Senate that it will be their very definite purpose, as soon as a satisfactory report can be agreed upon, to bring it back to us, and that we are not in effect permitting this important measure to be put to sleep indefinitely.

Mr. O'CONOR. I agree entirely with all that has been said by the Senator from Virginia, and hope to proceed to bring that situation about.

Mr. LONG, Mr. TOBEY, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield now to the Senator from Louisiana, who previously has sought recognition.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland is well aware, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee having charge of this bill, that much of the controversy which has been raised over the bill came over the differences between amendments offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] on the floor of the Senate and by Representative CARROLL on the floor of the House. Those amendments were, in effect, designed to protect small business.

In view of the fact that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is now a member of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, I wonder whether the Senator from Maryland would be willing, in the event that further conferences are had, to let the Senator from Tennessee be a member of the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. O'CONOR. In answer to the Senator from Louisiana, I would say that, of course, I have no control over the appointment of the conferees. But, knowing that the junior Senator from Tennessee has made a very sincere contribution to this entire matter, as have also the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I can say that, if the present conferees happen to be members of the conference committee appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Senate, we shall welcome from the Senators mentioned, and from any other Members of the Senate, any suggestions they may care to submit at the time the conference committee meets, and will give every consideration to any point of view they express. There will be nothing binding on the conference in any respect; the conferees will give full consideration to all questions, and will welcome and give attention to any suggestions the junior Senator from Tennessee and from the other Senators whom I have mentioned, including the junior Senator from Louisiana, may have to offer.

Mr. LONG. I wonder, in view of the differences between the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee and the amendment offered in the House, which was intended to accomplish the same effect, if the Senator would have any objection to the Senator from Tennessee being a member of the conference itself, to work out the differences between the two bills.

Mr. O'CONOR. I should have no objection whatever, although, of course, I should assume the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the senior Senator from Nevada, would, of course, be the first to be consulted on the question. But I should interpose no objection whatever.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. THYE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield; and, if so to whom?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland whether, after having conferred with the other conferees on the part of the House, it is his opinion that they are in accord on referring the bill back to the committee?

Mr. O'CONOR. I may say to the Senator from South Carolina I believe that would render impossible, certainly most difficult, the consideration of the matter at this session, as the junior Senator from Virginia has indicated there is very good reason to do. The measure has received very extensive consideration by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, was reported by the committee, was debated on the floor of the Senate last June, was acted upon favorably, was sent to the House, was acted upon by the House, came back to the Senate, was discussed very much at length on the floor of the Senate, and then went to conference. When the conference committee report was submitted, it was then debated extensively. Personally, I see no valid reason for having the bill referred back to the Judiciary Committee at this time, but think the better purpose would be served by sending it to a conference between representatives of the Senate and House.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Has the Senator conferred with the conferees on the part of the House?

Mr. O'CONOR. I have not, I may say to the Senator from South Carolina, because at the present time there are no conferees on the part of the House; that is to say, the conference committee has reported to the House, the House has adopted the report, and the conferees have been discharged.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to make an inquiry of the junior Senator from Maryland. I am keenly interested in the basing-point legislation, as I believe all other Members of the Senate are. Nothing has brought so much confusion to businessmen as has the basing-point question. Since the convening of the present session, I have received a large number of telegrams and letters, both from druggists within my State and from

the National Druggists Association, as well as from those engaged in the grocery business, setting forth their fears that the bill as drawn would destroy them eventually because of the unfair business practices. I do not share that feeling, however, and I do not believe the fears are justified or reasonably founded. In my opinion, there are ample safeguards in the bill, as was so ably set forth by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and other Senators in the debate which took place last fall. If the bill must be returned to the conference committee, I sincerely hope we may have the assurance of all who are serving on the conference committee as conferees on the part of the Senate, that they will speedily submit another report in order that the confusion which exists may be eliminated.

Those in my State who are engaged in the business of canning vegetables and corn are in a depressed state of affairs. Their businesses are suffering seriously. The same is true of the lumber industry, the cement business, the operators of lumber yards and coal yards, and all other businesses involving heavy freight shipments. They are in a state of confusion. I am positive that, unless we correct the situation, and correct it speedily, a great injury will be done to the entire free-enterprise system of the United States.

In closing, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Maryland whether he sees any danger in this type of legislation, so far as the druggists throughout the country are concerned?

Mr. O'CONOR. My answer is that I do not see any such danger, and have never seen danger in the bill as it is now drawn. To the contrary, I think it will promote the legitimate aims of business and will be for the best interests of all business, both large and small. However, I think there has resulted some misunderstanding on the part of the public, to which the junior Senator from Minnesota has adverted. We, too, have heard a great deal of that. It was in order to clear it up, to remove any possible doubt, that we sought the advice of the Attorney General. The best answer I can give the Senator, in saying we do not think the bill will be violative of the antitrust laws, is that the Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division himself suggests the language which we are ready to adopt.

Mr. THYE. The suggested language, while in no sense changing the basing-point question, will attempt to make certain there will be no misinterpretation of what has been sought in the bill as it is now written; is that correct?

Mr. O'CONOR. That is exactly so.

Mr. THYE. It is primarily designed to guard against misinterpretation of the language of the proposed act; is it not?

Mr. O'CONOR. That is exactly correct.

Mr. THYE. And at the same time it is designed primarily to carry out the purposes of the bill as now drawn; is it not?

Mr. O'CONOR. The Senator states the situation accurately.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I desire to congratulate the Senator from Maryland on his splendid explanation of the bill. I share his views. We should reject the conference report in order that we may then ask for the appointment of conferees to reconsider the matter and to correct the language in section 4D, as pointed out by the Senator. I wish to join with him in the statement he has made. I share his views, and I certainly hope the Senate will follow the suggestions offered by the Senator from Maryland and that the conference report will be rejected, in order that we may have a further conference. In that way I think we may obtain legislation. If any other course is pursued, it is very doubtful whether any such legislation will ever be enacted by the Congress.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland a question. I know it is a most difficult question to answer, and I should like to preface it with a brief statement. Many of the small industries in Pennsylvania, which are now in great confusion by reason of the uncertainty of the decision in the basing-point case, are vitally interested, so far as the economy of the country is concerned. That is not equally true in the case of large corporations. The United States Steel Corp. has already taken the precaution of buying 3,000 acres of land in the eastern part of Pennsylvania for its seaboard use.

The large corporations can do that, the small ones cannot. Does the Senator feel that within a reasonable length of time a report can be brought back to the Senate, receive consideration, and be acted upon, so existing uncertainty may be cleared up?

Mr. O'CONOR. I am quite confident, I may say to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, that that may be done. I think it will expedite the final consideration of the measure, and I think it will clarify the situation generally and will go far to give protection to the very interests for which the Senator is concerned. I know the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has stressed the very points to which the Senator from Pennsylvania now refers. It is in order to rectify that situation, to remove any doubt, and to clear up the situation that the present suggestion is being made.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate the Senator's statement. Things have already gone so far that there is unemployment in many of the smaller industries. I know of an industry in the neighboring State of West Virginia which has fallen off 60 percent by reason of the uncertainty. I appreciate very much the Senator's assurance.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I desire at this time to congratulate the junior Senator from Maryland upon the splendid statement he has made, and for his attitude. From the beginning the Senator from Maryland has acted in good faith and with intelligence and good judgment, in trying to clarify a very serious situation in our economy. I think he is now showing excellent judgment in asking to have the bill returned to the House, in order that it may be perfected, so far as it is possible to perfect it, after seeking advice from the Attorney General and receiving his recommendation. I think the Senator is not only showing good judgment, but is acting in good faith, instead of trying to ram the conference report through the Senate, though I believe we have the votes in the Senate today to adopt the report without any change. Instead of that, the Senator is interested in having the best bill possible, and with that in his mind, and I believe that is what he has in his mind, he proposes to return it to the House, in an effort to have it perfected. I congratulate him for his attitude and for the constructive manner in which he has proceeded all through the tedious hearings and the lengthy legislative processes through which we have gone in trying to enact legislation.

Mr. O'CONOR. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I will not object to this bill's being returned to conference. However, I should like to point out one or two objectionable features which I fear are presently in the bill and which may be in the bill when it comes from conference. I think they should be considered by the conferees.

In the first place, when this bill was first considered by the Senate, many of us felt that it would not protect the small-business people of the Nation from being run out of business by unfair price discrimination. We felt, since the bill provided for absorbing prices to meet the prices of a competitor, in good faith, that it might permit discrimination of the kind which resulted in a case presently before the United States Supreme Court, a case in which Mr. Justice Minton wrote the opinion. The Senate thought enough of him to confirm his nomination as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Standard Oil Co. of Indiana was selling to certain customers at prices substantially lower than those at which it was selling to other filling-station operators. A few persons were receiving favoritism. The discrimination in price was so great that certain favored jobbers owning their own stations could sell gasoline at 1, 2, or 3 cents below the price which other filling-station operators could charge and remain in competition. That is the sort of situation against which the Robinson-Patman Act was designed to guard.

In the city of Detroit it so happened that jobbers could have bought an off-brand of gasoline at approximately the

same price at which they could buy Standard Oil Co. gasoline if Standard Oil would discriminate.

Mr. President, I am not in favor of high prices. I am in favor of low prices at any time. But it is not fair to permit any large concern to sell at low prices to certain customers, usually to chain-store customers, and sell at high prices to small independent retailers.

The question is, If the discrimination in favor of a large concern is made in good faith, should that be a defense, under the Robinson-Patman Act, against the charge of unfair price discrimination? My argument is that it makes no difference whether someone is acting in good faith, if he is following a practice which will drive hundreds or thousands of persons out of business.

That is the reason, Mr. President, why every independent business organization, so far as I know, and every association of retail merchants, are against the bill as it is presently written. In my opinion, they would have been reasonably protected if the language offered by Representative CARROLL, of the House, had been agreed to by the Senate. I made an effort on the Senate floor, when the bill came back the first time, to get the Senate to agree to the House amendment, because I felt that we would not improve on the bill with the House amendment. I felt that we would protect retail merchants if we should insert the language which the House inserted in sections 2 and 3.

In my opinion, if that language is eliminated, independent merchants will be at the mercy of manufacturers and large chain stores.

The hearings on the Robinson-Patman bill led the committee to report that it had found in some instances that independent merchants were having to pay 30 percent more than the chain stores were paying. What difference would good faith make if there were discriminations in favor of large concerns, if the effect should be to run out of business hundreds and thousands of independent business people? We feel that the language inserted in section 2 and section 3 on the House side should be saved.

The Senate agreed to an amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. We inserted the words "except where the effect of such absorption of freight will be to substantially lessen competition."

That language was intended to protect independent merchants, but, unfortunately, the word "will" was a defect in the language of the amendment, because it would be necessary to prove that discrimination against small-business people actually would drive them out of business. That might be a very difficult thing to prove.

On the other hand, with the Carroll amendment, in which the word "may" was used, if it could be proved that discrimination might drive independent people out of business, that would be sufficient to protect them from unfair price discrimination.

We know that in many cases manufacturers might be in good faith in discriminating in favor of a large concern and against a small concern. The intention which Representative CARROLL had when he offered the amendment to which the House agreed was to protect small merchants from being driven out of business by unfair price discrimination.

I have always felt and always shall feel that section 1, which was passed by both Houses without amendment, is not good for the industry and commerce of the Nation. I feel that it will make possible again the same basing-point pricing system which the Supreme Court outlawed in the Cement case. The Supreme Court actually found that the cement companies of the United States were in conspiracy and had been in conspiracy for many years to deny the public the benefit of price competition. They had been using the element of freight absorption to arrive at identical prices. It is my fear, and I believe that if this bill should pass I would be proved to be correct, that the cement companies will go back to the identical pricing system they were using when the case was decided by the Supreme Court.

The Federal Trade Commission proved that the Cement Institute, including every large cement manufacturer in the country, was actually in conspiracy. That fact was proved by 50,000 pages of testimony and 49,000 pages of exhibits. It took 14 years to get a decision in that case by the Supreme Court, and all that time the Cement Institute was following a pricing practice which was monopolistic, which involved conspiracy, and involved robbing the public. After 14 years, when the case was finally won by the Federal Trade Commission, the Supreme Court simply said, "Stop this practice." No one went to jail, although the public had been robbed for 14 years since the case was brought, and for 30 years before the case ever reached the court. The cement companies, and everyone acquainted with this bill, know that once this bill is passed, even if the amendments intended to save small business are retained, the cement companies will go back to the same pricing system they had before this time.

What will be the effect if we enact section 1 of the bill? The effect will be that it will be necessary to prove conspiracy, because it will be completely legal to absorb freight in any manner so long as it cannot be proved that there is a conspiracy. We have included the words "acting independently" and "in good faith." We shall not be able to prove lack of good faith. We shall not be able to prove bad faith. The person who is accused will simply say he was meeting competition. He will say he simply found out what his competitor was charging, and he charged the same price.

In the event we do prove conspiracy, there will be no way, under this bill, if it is finally passed and becomes law, to break up the practice, even if we are able to prove the conspiracy. We can order the cement companies or the steel companies or the paper companies who may be charging identical prices throughout the entire Nation to quit conspiring; we may find them guilty and fine them, but we shall not be able to make them handle their pricing in such a way as to make them compete among themselves.

The law now says they cannot discriminate in their prices—and that includes freight absorption—in such way as to lessen, reduce, prevent, or destroy competition. Therefore, Mr. President, I feel that this is a bad bill, but I believe that the amendment proposed to be made in conference might be an improvement. In fact, I think it would be a substantial improvement, and therefore I shall not object to returning the bill to conference.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. LONG. I yield for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator agree with me, granted everything the Senator has just stated to be true—I do not agree that it is, nor do I deny that it is—that the only possible way we can cure what is now complained about is by passing a bill compelling all sellers to sell f. o. b. their places of business?

Mr. LONG. I do not agree with that at all. It is true there are certain nondiscriminatory ways of pricing products. If the same price is charged at the mill on all occasions, that would be nondiscriminatory. Everyone would have the advantage of the manufacturer's price if he would treat them all alike. On the other hand, I feel that it would not be a discrimination if the manufacturer absorbed all freight, in other words, if he simply said, "I am going to sell my product for $3.50 a barrel," if he were selling cement, or for $100 a ton, if he were selling steel—"No matter where I ship it in the United States, I will charge that particular price, and I will absorb freight for everybody." I am inclined to think that that system would not be discriminatory. It would treat all customers alike. But when they start in saying, "I will absorb a third of the freight bill for another, and two-thirds for somebody else, and absorb all the freight for another customer," they are discriminating in price. That discrimination is not illegal unless it eliminates, prevents, or destroys competition. That is the basis on which the Supreme Court outlawed it.

It is true that it may be difficult to find just exactly what the effect on competition is when one starts discriminating in his price. But the whole idea of the Clayton Act and the Robinson-Patman Act was that where we found discrimination in prices and the effect was injurious to competition, we should be able to eliminate and prevent that type of discrimination.

I feel that an effort has been made by the steel, cement, and other interests to try to make those engaged in honest business, who have never been in a conspiracy in their lives, feel that they were in danger of being held in violation of the antitrust laws.

The cement companies were found by the Supreme Court to be in conspiracy in violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act, to be in violation of the Clayton Act, and actually, I believe that

if they had been prosecuted on the proper basis they would have been found to be in violation of the Sherman antitrust law.

Here are these violators going around to the entire Nation and trying to tell small merchants that they cannot discriminate. The only time they run into trouble is when they are discriminating in prices in interstate commerce, and when the effect of the discrimination may be to substantially injure competition or prevent competition.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator agree that a seller acting independently now under the law has a right to pay all the freight, absorb the freight, or equalize freight?

Mr. LONG. He has the right, except where it can be found that the effect of discrimination in his so doing would be to substantially injure, prevent, or destroy competition. That was the basis of count 2 of the Rigid Steel Conduit Co. case. If it is going to eliminate competition, the producer cannot discriminate in prices, even though he desires to do so.

If a man is selling to A. & P., or Safeway, or Kroger's and the only way he can get the business of those stores, we will say, is to give them a reduction, and if he does that, he may be in complete good faith, but if he does it without giving the other competitors the same prices, he is making a discrimination which would ultimately run the others out of business, and, therefore, he could be restrained.

Mr. CAPEHART. If he has a right to do that acting independently, then I again ask the Senator, will he not agree with me that the only possible way to avoid sellers getting together, as the Senator stated it a moment ago, would be to pass a law forcing all sellers to sell f. o. b. their places of business? How else could it be done?

Mr. LONG. Certainly, as the law stands today, the law prevents a man acting independently from making discrimination which, in the terms of the statute, may substantially injure, prevent, destroy, or eliminate competition. Today one cannot do it acting independently, and I do not feel he should be able to, if he is going to destroy competition.

Let us take a very good example. General Foods is one of the greatest distributors of canned goods and processed groceries in the entire United States. If General Foods, acting completely independently, should decide it was going to give every chain store in the Nation a 30-percent discount, even though it may be acting independently, and in good faith, it would not be permitted to make discriminations in prices, where that would have the effect of running many independent merchants out of business. I feel that a seller should not be able to make discriminations if the whole effect is to eliminate competition.

On the other hand, the discriminations which were practiced in the case of the cement industry were not made to keep any contractor from building a bridge, or keep anybody from acquiring cement to build houses. Those discriminations were made for the purpose of eliminating competition.

So they discriminated in their prices in terms of freight absorption. Sellers absorbed whatever amount of freight was necessary in order that they could say that they would not be competing in prices with the nearest mill. That is the practice of the cement companies, and they would like to go back and eliminate any competition, as would the paper industry, and as would the steel industry. But that is not in the best interests of the people of the United States, or we would not have passed the Sherman Antitrust Act, or any other act to keep people from eliminating competition among themselves.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Does the Senator understand that if the bill goes back to conference the Carroll amendment can still be considered as a part of the matters in conference?

Mr. LONG. It is my understanding, and I am sure the Chair would so rule, that the Carroll amendment can be considered by the conferees. I certainly hope it will be considered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I would like to clarify the parliamentary situation on S. 1008.

May I refer the Members of the Senate to the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act, effective the 2d of January 1947, governing the authority of conference committees? This is embodied in rule 27 of the Rules of the Senate. The authority of a conference committee under this rule is limited to matters which are in disagreement between the two Houses. But the conference committee has no power to change any wording or any matter upon which there is agreement between the two Houses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the original rule of the Senate. It was not changed by the Reorganization Act.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that until the passage of the Reorganization Act conference committees had much broader powers than they now have? I remember that in the autobiography of George W. Norris, he said that there were three Houses here on Capitol Hill—the House, the Senate, and the conference committee. As I understand it, the powers of conference committees have been somewhat restricted by the amendment of the Legislative Reorganization Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The remark of the Senator from Nebraska was, the Chair believes, based upon the fact that conferees occasionally brought in a complete substitute. He was eminently right in that respect, and the power of the conferees to bring in such a substitute was recognized by both Houses. But with respect to individual amendments, the rule which the Senator has just quoted is and has been a standing rule of the Senate for as long as the present occupant of the chair can remember.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Whatever the historical origin of the rule may be, it is certainly true that a conference committee is able to make only such changes as are justified by differences in the original wording between the House and the Senate versions of the measure. In the matter now before the Senate, S. 1008, the conference would be confined to certain passages of section 2, certain passages of section 3, and to section 4 (d).

Mr. President, I do not intend today to debate this whole subject, but I do believe the matter is so serious that a statement should be made about it.

Section 1 and section 2B of the bill which the conference committee will have no power whatsoever to change since the matter has already been agreed upon by both Houses, makes legal the basing-point system, by legalizing the three essential features of the basing-point system. The first of these features is a delivered price. In the basing-point industries buyers are not able to buy f. o. b. or at the mill of the seller. The seller insists that he must sell to the buyer not only the commodity, but also the freight, whether the freight be real or phantom. The buyer must take delivery at his own factory. He cannot take delivery at the point of sale. This is legalized under section 1, which says that—

> It shall not be an unfair method of competition * * * to quote or sell at delivered prices.

The second feature in the basing-point system is identity of price at any given location. Once the price leader fixes a base price and then fixes a price at every other point in the country equal to the base price plus the freight, the other alleged competitors then fix identical prices with those of the price leader. For example, if the price in Pittsburgh is $80 per ton, and the freight from Pittsburgh to Omaha is $40 a ton, and the price leader, which in the steel industry is United States Steel, therefore delivers steel in Omaha at $120 a ton, then a rival steel manufacturer in Kansas City or in Pueblo, Colo., also sells in Omaha at $120 a ton, the same price as United States Steel, irrespective of what their costs of production may have been, and irrespective of what the actual freight may be. Thus, under the basing-point system, any given buyer is always faced with exactly the same price quotations by all sellers. This feature is made legal by section 2B which says in part that it shall not be an unlawful discrimination in price for a seller "to absorb freight to meet the equally low price of a competitor in good faith."

The third feature in the basing-point system is the absorption of freight. This would be legalized by section 1, which says:

> It shall not be an unfair method of competition or an unfair or deceptive act or practice for a seller * * * to absorb freight.

Now the Federal Trade Commission has never moved to stop freight absorption unless it might tend to hurt competition. But under this bill it could be used as a part of the basing-point system which can tend to hurt competition. This

comes about not merely when steel is sold at points farther west from the base points. There, of course, when the seller sells the steel at a delivered price he pays the freight charges to the railway company himself. But it is also true when a mill ships back toward the basing point. For instance, under Pittsburgh-plus with Pittsburgh as the basing point, a steel mill, let us say in St. Louis, is selling steel to St. Louis customers at $110 a ton—$80 base price plus $30 freight rates from Pittsburgh. If it sells to Cleveland where, let us say, the price is $80 plus $20 freight, or $100 a ton delivered, the steel mill in St. Louis will sell in Cleveland at $100 a ton and pay, let us say, $20 freight itself, and net only $80 at the mill. In many cases the western mill will ship eastward by absorbing freight and selling at lower prices eastward than in its home community, and on top of that deduct the freight. That means that the price they realize at the mill is still lower. In order, therefore, to sell eastward and quote the same price as eastern mills, they discriminate against their local customers. So we see that the three features of the basing-point system, the delivered price, identity of price, and freight absorption, are made legal by section 1 and by section 2B, which cannot be changed by the conference committee.

I think the Senate and the House should know what they are doing. The basing-point system is the method by which monopolies in the heavy industries fix prices and suppress competition. With variations it has been practiced in a large number of industries, such as lumber, lime, floor tile, gypsum, roofing, window glass, heating boilers, linseed oil, heavy chemicals, copper, zinc, lead, iron ore, paper and paper products, petroleum products, a large range of light chemicals, steel and cement, and many others as well. It was declared to be illegal by the United States Supreme Court in a series of cases—the Corn Products case, the Staley case, and finally the Cement case. It was declared by the Supreme Court to be a method of preventing competition and of violating the Sherman and the Clayton Acts. All that is needed is for the price leader to establish a base price and to sell at delivered prices consisting of the base price plus freight, and then all the other firms in the industry, without getting together, fix identical prices because they have in their possession freight books which show the freight from the base points to every place in the country. Once the price leader establishes the base price which fixes the prices over the country under the basing-point system, all the other firms need to do is to take that base price, look up the freight from the base place to every destination in the country, and then they quote identical prices. They do this regardless of where their mills are located or what freight they have to pay, or what their costs are.

It is very hard to prove that this is collusion or conspiracy. All that is necessary is for them to move together, and they do move together, and the effect is to destroy the competitive system of pricing in the United States. That is the effect.

I think we should legislate against effects. But section 1 and section 2 prevent us from doing that. I want to say that if the bill finally passes Congress and is approved by the President, the proper title for it should be "An act to nullify the Sherman Antitrust Act and an act to repeal the Clayton Act."

My very able colleague from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], whose services in this matter have been of the greatest service to the public, has, I think, correctly pointed out that the bill in its present form also repeals the Robinson-Patman Act. He points out that section 2B declares that it is not illegal to absorb freight to meet the equally low price of a competitor in good faith.

New price discrimination between buyers can be disguised in the form of freight absorption. The basing-point system will give identical prices in a given locality no matter where the goods are produced, no matter what the cost, and no matter what freight rates are paid. The Robinson-Patman Act, however, was designed to strike at discrimination between buyers in a given locality, so as to prevent the A. & P., for instance, or the large chain stores from buying at unjustifiably lower prices than their small competitors across the city square.

The bill before the Senate, however, says it is all right to absorb freight to meet the equally low price of a competitor in good faith. The discrimination can be given not in the form of an open-price discount, but in the form of a delivered price to one and not to the other. It can be a delivered price to the chain store with the freight absorbed, but the small man can be asked to pick up his goods at the factory and to pay his own freight or if the goods are delivered to him he can be charged the freight.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does not section 2 go beyond that and provide further this language?—

> And this may include the maintenance, above or below the price of such competitor, of a differential in price which such seller customarily maintains.

I know that was not the purpose of that particular provision. Nevertheless, could not that provision also be used by someone who was discriminating in favor of certain of his customers by virtue of the fact that other people were doing it, and permit him to make further discriminations in view of the fact that he would customarily make a price below what someone else would make?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Louisiana has mentioned that point, because in the case he mentions we have specifically written into the bill the provision that goods can be sold at lower differentials to one customer than are given to another. That is a direct authorization. I was merely trying to show that the first part of 2B permits discrimination under the guise of an absorption of freight.

The wording to which the Senator from Louisiana has called attention, and the first part of the sentence which I previously quoted were both agreed to by both the House and the Senate, and therefore it will be impossible for the conference committee to effect any change in those provisions.

Similarly, section 3 was largely agreed to, except insofar as differences existed between the Kefauver and Carroll amendments. Very little change can be made in section 3. The bill will therefore come back to the Senate in about the same condition as it is now in. The principal change which can be made is in section 4D. I take it from the statement of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], that while the conference committee is not estopped from considering certain sentences in sections 2 and 3, at present the main change which is contemplated is merely a change in section 4D.

Mr. President, as I said, I think if we pass the bill we are repealing the antitrust laws of the Nation. I think we ought to know what we are doing. We Senators believe in free competition, but if we pass this bill we are pulling the teeth of the Federal Trade Commission Act, pulling the teeth of the Clayton Act and pulling the teeth of the Robinson-Patman Act.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and Representative CARROLL in a desperate attempt, when they saw all this happening, tried to insert some false teeth in the jaws of the antitrust laws. But false teeth are simply not as good as real teeth which we should never pull out in the first place by passing S. 1008.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I asked the Senator to yield in order to make an interpolation which may not have much legal sense, but the thought comes to me that, in order to obviate the difficulty which the Senator from Illinois enunciates it perhaps might be well to insert an amendment to the effect that any or all laws or parts of any law which contravene the principles and tenets and ideals of the Sherman antitrust law and the Clayton Act are hereby repealed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator mean that it should be stated openly that all the antitrust laws are being repealed?

Mr. TOBEY. Yes. Hang a sign up in the sky which he who runs may read, so that when anyone votes for that amendment or against it we can know whether he is in favor of or in opposition to the antitrust laws of the country.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the legislation were ever to pass the Senate I think I would move to change the title in conformity with the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. I wonder whether the Senator will agree with me that insofar as the Sherman Act is concerned, that act will not be repealed by this measure, at least to the extent that so long as a conspiracy can be proved, those who are conspiring can be ordered to stop conspiring.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But generally it is not possible to prove a conspiracy.

Mr. LONG. But, actually, so far as the Sherman Act is concerned, if it can be proved that a conspiracy exists, those who are conspiring can be ordered to stop conspiring. However, the difficulty in the present instance is that even if they are ordered to stop conspiring, they cannot be made to stop doing what they were doing when they were conspiring, namely, eliminating competition between themselves.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the point exactly.

Mr. LONG. The Robinson-Patman Act would stop such elimination of competition. However, that could not be done if this measure, as now proposed, is enacted into law.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think this is a bad bill. I am sorry to say the Senate has not been given time to put its mind on this matter. As originally introduced, the bill introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] was a measure calling for a 2-year moratorium. Then, on the second day of debate on this matter in the spring—on the first of June, I believe—this bill was hastily substituted, without hearings and without full discussion. There was some discussion of the bill on the floor of the Senate, but even then it was not as full as it should have been.

Now the bill returns from conference, and is to be sent back to conference again. When it returns to us from the further conference, we shall be asked to vote in favor of sections 1, 2, and 3, unless our good friends on the Judiciary Committee see the light and "hit the sawdust trail." We shall be asked to vote without proper hearings, and the result will inevitably be bad, because it is not possible to write good legislation on such a complicated subject on the floor of the Senate, without proper hearings. I think the present situation is a clear demonstration of the correctness of that statement.

So, Mr. President, if we pass such a bill, we might as well say good-by to the antitrust laws in the United States.

I am very sorry that the Department of Justice has given the opinion it has. I understood the Senator from Maryland to state that the Department of Justice did not disagree over sections 1, 2, and 3, but merely disagreed as to section 4D. Did I correctly understand the Senator?

Mr. O'CONOR. The Senator from Illinois is correct in that statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well. Well, Mr. President, I am very sorry about that. I think it is a great mistake on the part of the Department of Justice. It pains me very deeply.

But merely because the Department of Justice has made an error, that does not mean that the Senate of the United States should compound that error. We should certainly exercise our right of independent judgment. This measure would repeal the decisions of the United States Supreme Court. I am struck by the fact that whenever decisions upholding competition are handed down by the Supreme Court, or there is a possibility of such a decision, then someone introduces a measure in the Congress to comfort those restraining competition.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield for a question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does not the Senator think the Department of Justice is in a very inconsistent position in having at least joined in the prosecution in the Standard Oil case, which has just been argued in the Supreme Court, when it is admitted that if this measure is enacted into law it will make that question academic? In other words, the Department of Justice apparently wants to have Congress pass a bill which will take away the effectiveness of the decisions it asks from the Supreme Court.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; the Senator is entirely correct on that point. Mr. President, I think the fort has been surrendered by the Department of Justice.

There is too much of a tendency, however, on the part of legislators to protect monopoly when the courts are trying to protect competition. That movement began a few years ago when the Supreme Court in the Southeastern Underwriters case declared fire-insurance companies to be engaged in interstate commerce. What happened then, Mr. President? Congress then passed a law taking the fire-insurance companies out of interstate commerce, and putting them back under State regulation, which, because of the 48 conflicting jurisdictions, would largely be ineffective.

Then Governor Arnall started suit against the railways for their combinations fixing freight rates which had the effect of imposing excessive freight rates on the South and on the West. I am sorry to say that Governor Arnall was not properly supported by the South and the West in regard to the decisions which he succeeded in having made.

Then what happened? The Reed-Bulwinkle bill was passed which permitted the railroads to get together and make combinations and to fix freight rates. Thank heavens, the President vetoed that bill; but Congress passed it over his veto.

These are two instances in which the Supreme Court defended or might have defended the right of competition, namely, in the case of fire insurance and the fixing of railroad rates, but the Congress then stepped in and restored the power of the monopolies.

That is what is happening in the present case. The Supreme Court ruled out the basing-point system in three cases, concluding with the Cement case in 1948, because, it said, it permitted monopolies to fix prices all over the country; and that the example of the price leader was being followed by all the other concerns in the industry. Then the move started to seek to have the Congress repeal these decisions, and then to have the Congress postpone their effects for several years.

Now we have this measure which would repeal these decisions which were based on our present antitrust laws.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Has not the situation fairly well reached the point where, although many of us had the idea that the United States Supreme Court was the court of last resort, yet it seems that, so far as the major industries of the country are concerned, the Congress of the United States is the court of last resort? In other words, every time the courts find that the major industries are using practices which would create a monopoly and would eliminate competition in the Nation, the companies involved appeal to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I undertake to say that whenever the Federal Trade Commission Act or the Clayton Act or the Robinson-Patman Act are interpreted by the courts in a way to preserve competition, Congress then rushes in to protect the monopolists.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the platforms of the Democratic Party and the Republican Party on the question of monopoly. Those planks are very brief.

I read now from the Democratic platform:

> We advocate the strengthening of existing antitrust laws by closing the gaps which experience has shown have been used to promote the concentration of economic power.
>
> We pledge a positive program to promote competitive business and to foster the development of independent trade and commerce.

I ask the Senator if he can imagine anything that would be more opposed to the policy of the Democratic platform therein stated than the passage of this basing-point legislation which wrecks the Clayton Act and certainly weakens the Sherman Act and fosters, instead of reduces, monopolies.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The bill proposed is a plain violation of the principles of the Democratic platform.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; I yield for a further question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Quoting from the Republican Party's platform:

> Small business, the bulwark of American enterprise, must be encouraged through aggressive antimonopoly action, elimination of unnecessary controls, protection against discrimination, correction of tax abuses, and limitation of competition by governmental organizations.

Can the distinguished Senator think of anything that would damage small business more than this basing-point legislation, whereas the Republican Party's platform says the Republicans wish to encourage and protect small business?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I say to the Senator from Tennessee that perhaps I view that statement in the platform with prejudiced eyes, but, frankly, I never took it seriously; I never thought they meant it. But if the Republicans, as represented in this Chamber by the Senators

on the other side of the aisle, do mean that plank, and did mean it when it was adopted by the Republican Party, the way for them to prove that they meant it then, and mean it now, is to vote down this measure.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I call attention to the fact that also in the platform of the Democratic Party it is stated that—

> Small business * * * must be protected against unfair discrimination and monopoly.

But, Mr. President, this measure certainly is not antimonopoly action. It is action to relieve monopolies from the force and effect of antimonopoly action, entirely in the teeth of both the Democratic and the Republican platforms. Does the Senator agree as to that?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Tennessee is entirely correct.

This measure is a promonopoly measure. It will increase the prices which the fabricators of goods will have to pay for the raw materials coming from the South and the West. Therefore, it will discourage new concerns from engaging in mass-production industries, as long as the system prevails, because they will not be able to obtain the stock they need at the lower local prices which the advantages of competition would otherwise permit them to do. This measure will restrict competition in industry, will jack up prices, and will restrict investment. It will have all those bad consequences and many others as well.

However, Mr. President, I wish to reserve until a later time a full analysis of the bad features of the bill.

At this time I merely wish to point out that whatever the conference committee does, it will have to come back, under the rules of the Senate, with a bad bill. I had hoped that we could fight this thing out today and on Monday and on the other days in the first part of next week, that we could reach a decision now and kill the bill because that is the only proper answer—death to this bill. But the very able Senator from Maryland has asked that it be recommitted to the conference committee. I am willing to postpone the fight, but I am not going to give up the fight. And I am not indulging in mock heroics when I say that, either. It is a bad bill now. By changing 4D it may be a little less bad when it comes back, but it will still be a bad bill.

I am only one Member of the United States Senate, but, so far as I am concerned, I am going to fight it when it comes back, because the conference committee cannot make it a decent measure. I think there will be other Senators who will stand with me. While I am sorry that the Department of Justice has, in effect, given up its antitrust attitude in these matters, I am not going to let that deter me. I am going to hold to the Democratic platform, and I hope that, if the bill should pass the Senate and should pass the House, it will then be sent back to us from the White House with a ringing veto from our President.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. In line with the Senator's statement, I wondered whether he recalls that, some time ago, an assistant attorney general referred to the Department of Justice having for many years given only lip service to the antitrust laws. I wonder whether he will agree with me that while the Department of Justice is talking about the suit filed against the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., at the same time it is permitting the one law which has done more to enable small concerns to compete than any other one thing, to be emasculated so that the small concerns will have no real protection under the law. I wonder whether the Senator agrees with me that certainly we know that if the Department of Justice stands idly by and watches existing legislation being repealed, it will have done irreparably greater harm to small business than could be offset by a hundred A. & P. suits?

Mr. DOUGLAS. This decision by the Department of Justice gives away the entire case against monopoly.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, when the bill came before the Judiciary Committee, it was very carefully considered. As I now remember, we spent several months on it. When the subcommittee made its report, the bill was discussed further by the main committee. After all the discussion had been had, I felt that I could not support the bill. I therefore prepared minority views. I desire to read a portion of the minority views, because I think it emphasizes what is basically wrong with the pending bill. From the minority views, I read as follows:

> The proposed amendment to the antitrust laws, as contained in S. 1008, should not be passed for the following reasons:
>
> 1. S. 1008 introduces new terms and phrases into the antitrust laws, without providing any definitions or standards for their interpretation, and thus confuses the law instead of clarifying it. The antitrust statutes of this country represent an established body of law which the Congress framed with infinite pains in choosing exact words to convey congressional intent. Through many years of judicial interpretation, these words have come to have definite meanings which are understood by both business and the legal profession. It is like throwing sand into a gear box to force new words and phrases into this carefully developed body of law without giving a clue to their intended meaning. Specifically, the proposed bill contains four new undefined phrases:
>
> (a) "Engaging in competition."
> (b) "Absorb freight."
> (c) "In any and all markets."
> (d) "Delivered prices."

As the distinguished Senator from Louisiana said a little while ago, it took 14 years in court, in a single case, to get a phrase defined. As the distinguished Presiding Officer [Mr. O'MAHONEY] knows, these phrases have come to mean certain things both to business interests and to lawyers. Yet we find here four undefined phrases. "Engaging in competition" has never been defined by the courts. "Absorb freight"—what does it mean? It has never been defined by the courts. "In any and all markets"—what does that mean? "Delivered prices."

> None of these phrases has even been tested in the courts. It is uncertain whether "engaging in competition" will be held to include (a) only the behavior characteristic of businessmen in a competitive industry, (b) also the tactics of enterprises that seek more business by discriminations that destroy their small competitors, or (c) also the limited rivalry for orders that exists under price formulas which produce identical delivered prices. That the latter constitutes "engaging in competition" has been the fundamental and persistent defense of many of the respondents in the Federal Trade Commission's price-fixing cases.
>
> It is uncertain whether "absorbing freight" will be interpreted as reducing a delivered price by an amount not greater than the freight cost actually incurred upon the particular shipment, or by an amount not greater than the applicable rail freight charge even when goods are shipped more cheaply by water or truck, or by an amount not greater than the freight cost from the seller's plant nearest the point of delivery even if shipment is made from a more remote point, or by an amount not greater than the freight cost from the seller's most remote plant even if shipment is made from a nearer plant.

Mr. President, those of us who live in the Northwest are sick and tired of the old formula "Pittsburgh plus," with which every Senator is thoroughly familiar. I regret to say no other member of the Judiciary Committee would join me in the minority views, though I am entirely satisfied the minority views were absolutely right. I further said:

> It is uncertain whether the term "market" will be interpreted as a local area subject to a single freight rate, so that within any one such area a single seller would obtain no immunity for variations in his delivered prices or whether smaller areas might be regarded as markets so that, by different degrees of freight absorption, a seller might establish more than one delivered price even within an area covered by a single freight rate.
>
> It is uncertain whether delivered prices will be interpreted to mean only prices in transactions in which, under the general law of sales, ownership passes to the buyer at the delivery point, or whether they will be interpreted to include prices like those of the cement industry, in which the seller quoted a price at the buyer's place of business but passed legal title to the buyer at the seller's mill.
>
> In view of these uncertainties the meaning of the bill depends almost wholly upon judicial interpretation of the broad and inherently ambiguous term "good faith."

I may say, Mr. President, I do not quite agree that the Supreme Court is the court of last resort. I say the Congress ought to define terms so clearly that there would be no ambiguity at all.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I should like to say to the Senator that I for one read his minority views, and I feel they were probably the first warning we had of what was to be included in the bill (S. 1008) when it was reported and that its effect would be greatly to weaken the antitrust laws. I feel that the Senator from North Dakota is to be highly complimented upon the fact that, although, as I recall, the Senator was not a member of the subcommittee, yet, as a member of the Judiciary Committee he pointed out what would be the effect of the bill when it was reported by the committee.

Mr. LANGER. I am very grateful to the Senator from Louisiana. I thank him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to associate myself with the Senator from Louisiana in the comments which he has made about the Senator from North Dakota. His dissent was the fire bell clanging in the night to summon the lovers of competition to arms.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Quoting further from my minority views:

The ambiguity of these phrases is reinforced by lack of clarity in the use of them. It is uncertain whether the phrase "for the purpose of engaging in competition in good faith in any and all markets" is intended to be applicable only to freight absorption or also to quotation and sale at delivered prices.

It is submitted that a proposed bill which inserts into an established body of law new words and phrases which are undefined and may be subject to widely varying interpretations not only represents poor draftsmanship but, of more importance, will necessarily muddle the law instead of clarifying it, and should not become the law of the land.

(2) S. 1008 will, in practical reality, permit monopolistic practices to develop which the supporters of the legislation undoubtedly do not intend should be permitted. Congress must consider not only a bill's theoretical effects but also its practical results.

In practice, business enterprises will be free to disregard the limitations which the supporters of the bill intend to retain. This is so because the bill's ambiguous language will need to be interpreted by the Supreme Court and proceedings for this purpose cannot be decided until several years after the moratorium expires. Aware of this obvious fact, business enterprises will be able to interpret the bill as they choose and thus to justify a variety of monopolistic practices that are now illegal. When the Supreme Court decides against them the moratorium will have expired, and the Court's affirmation of a cease-and-desist order will provide no punishment nor relief.

It is submitted that a bill which throws the gate open to monopolistic practices not contemplated by its supporters should not become the law of the land.

(3) S. 1008 sets the clock back many years in the enforcement of the antitrust laws against discrimination by replacing the test of effect with the test of purpose or intent. The antitrust laws can be effectively enforced when they forbid activities which have monopolistic effects. Effects can be observed and proved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the minority views may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the remainder of the minority views was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

But when the legality or illegality of a practice depends, not on its effect, but on its purpose, the law cannot be effectively enforced unless the enforcement agencies become mind readers. To avoid the obstacles which such a legal standard created was one of the principal reasons for the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act. It would be tragic if this test of intent, which for many years constituted the principal means by which monopolistic firms were able to evade the purpose of the antitrust laws and which was specifically taken out of those laws by congressional enactment, should now be placed back into the law as the test of violation.

To be specific, price discriminations which injure competition are now forbidden by the Clayton Act unless the price differences can be justified by differences in cost. But under S. 1008 a price discrimination through absorbing freight would be lawful no matter how seriously it might injure competition, provided its purpose was to engage in competition in good faith. Thus no violation of law could be proved unless the Government could prove that the hearts of the discriminators are not pure. Even the orders of the Federal Trade Commission terminating violations of law by the conduit producers and by the United States Steel Corp. would be suspended insofar as they limit the right of these concerns to absorb freight, unless the Government could show that those who disregarded these orders acted with a bad purpose.

It is submitted that a bill which reintroduces the mystical and psychic concept of intent as the test of violation would put antitrust enforcement back into the Dark Ages and therefore should not become the law of the land.

4. S. 1008 will legalize, through the use which can be made of freight absorption, certain monopolistic acts and practices which have been specifically held to be illegal by the courts.

(a) The basing-point system: Since each firm in an industry will be able to absorb freight from its own mill, all mills will be able to quote identical delivered prices at any delivery point by suitably varying the amounts of their respective freight absorptions. This can be done automatically if every mill establishes a mill price and regards the mill prices of all other mills as base prices governing the delivered prices in territory contiguous to those mills. The amount of any mill's freight absorption to any destination will then become whatever is required to equal the sum of the mill price at the governing mill plus the freight from that governing mill to the destination. The result will be a complete basing-point system, with every mill a base and all delivered prices identical, by formula, at every delivery point. The participating mills can then defy the antitrust agencies to prove that this result is due to conspiracy, since the means by which it is achieved have been specifically sanctioned by law.

(b) Phantom freight: Neither the bill nor the present law imposes any limit upon the height of a seller's factory price, nor is it practicable or desirable to impose any such limit. Under the basing-point system phantom freight was charged when a mill distant from a base included freight from the basing point in the delivered price to a nearby customer. Under the bill the name of the practice must be changed, but the practice will continue. Now the mill may quote a factory price as high as the former delivered price at the factory door; and when it sells to a nearby customer at the same delivered price as before, it will say it is absorbing freight instead of charging phantom freight. Phantom freight meant price discrimination between customers and a handicap to industrial development in the areas where prices were high. Consequently the practice has been almost universally condemned, both in Congress and elsewhere. Changing the name of the practice will not change its results. Phantom freight by any other name would smell the same.

It is submitted that a proposed bill that legalizes monopolistic acts and practices, particularly such practices as the basing-point system and phantom freight, which have specifically been held to be illegal by the courts, should not become the law of the land.

5. S. 1008 constitutes an unwarranted encroachment on the normal functions of the judiciary. Notwithstanding the memorandum on the constitutionality of the bill which forms appendix A to the committee's report, the bill does impose an arbitrary rule of determination upon the courts. It tells the courts how the statutes in question are to be construed and also tells them that they would not be construed as the courts have construed them in the recent past. As the Supreme Court said in *United States* v. *Klein*, quoted in the committee's report. "the Court is forbidden to give the effect to evidence which in its own judgment such evidence should have and is directed to give it an effect precisely contrary."

For 35 years the construction and application of the statutes forbidding unfair methods of competition and price discrimination which promote monopoly or injure competition have been undergoing a gradual process of judicial inclusion and exclusion. That process has been continuing since amendment of the Clayton Act by the Robinson-Patman Act in 1936 and since amendment of the Federal Trade Commission Act by the Wheeler-Lea amendment of 1938.

The theory of the Federal Trade Commission Act from its beginning in 1914 has been to prevent restraints of trade in their incipiency.

The Supreme Court expounded the theory of incipient restraint in the Cement Institute case decided a year ago. It said that "a major purpose" of the Federal Trade Commission Act "as we have frequently said, was to enable the Commission to restrain practices as 'unfair' which, although not yet having grown into Sherman Act dimensions would most likely do so if left unrestrained. The Commission and the courts were to determine what conduct, even though it might then be short of a Sherman Act violation, was an 'unfair method of competition.' This general language was deliberately left to the 'Commission and the courts' for definition because it was thought that 'There is no limit to human inventiveness in this field'; that consequently, a definition that fitted practices known to lead toward an unlawful restraint of trade today would not fit tomorrow's new inventions in the field; and that for Congress to try to keep its precise definitions abreast of this course of conduct would be an 'endless task.'" (See *Federal Trade Commission* v. *R. F. Keppel & Bro.* (291 U. S. 304, 310–312), and congressional committee reports there quoted (333 U. S. 683, 708–709).)

It is submitted that a bill which represents an invasion into the proper sphere of the judiciary and thus tends to weaken the traditional separation of the powers provided for by the Constitution should not become the law of the land.

To summarize, S. 1008 should not be passed because (1) it represents poor and slipshod draftsmanship, introducing new and undefined phrases into the antitrust laws; (2) it will have the practical effect of immunizing numerous monopolistic acts and practices which the supporters of the bill undoubtedly do not believe should be permitted; (3) it will make the antitrust laws against discrimination almost impossible of effective enforcement by substituting intent and purpose for effect of the test of violations; (4) it will legalize, through the use that can be made of freight absorption, certain monopolistic acts and practices, namely, the basing-point system and phantom freight, which have been specifically held to be illegal by the courts; and (5) it represents an unwarranted intrusion by the legislative branch of Government into the proper sphere of the judiciary.

The fundamental effect of S. 1008 is to make it impossible for the antitrust laws to keep abreast of the changing forms and disguises of monopoly. As the Yale Law Review stated in its issue of February 1949:

"The cases culminating in the new Cement decision have caught up with delivered-price

systems and recognized them for what they are. The courts have thus informed business once more that the antitrust laws are concerned with illegal results, and not with the techniques employed to achieve them. The cases may make businessmen uncomfortable, but the peace of mind of monopoly is not yet a recognized reward for economic endeavors."

Finally, it must be remembered at all times that the world today is undergoing a battle of ideas between Communist collectivism on the one hand and individual free enterprise on the other. It is a known fact that the Communist propagandists regard the existence of monopolies in this country as the Achilles heel in our defense of free enterprise. Any action which we take which surrenders the power of the people to the power of monopoly will immediately be seized upon by the Communist propagandists and spread throughout the world as proof of the fact that America is not a land of individual free enterprise but is actually under the control of monopolistic big business. We can ill afford at this critical stage in world affairs to provide our Communist foes with concrete proof of the correctness of their propaganda.

For these reasons it is recommended that S. 1008 not be passed.

If, however, the Congress feels that some form of legislation on this issue must be passed, it should undertake to confirm the legality of innocent practices without providing immunity for monopolistic practices by adding an amendment at the end of section 1 of the bill. Such an amendment should read as follows:

"*Provided*, That this shall not legalize any violations of said acts which may appear in such delivered prices or freight absorptions.

"*Provided, however*, That nothing herein shall legalize any act or practice now unlawful because of bad faith, discrimination, coercion, oppression, or a tendency to injure, suppress, or eliminate competition.

"*Provided*, That this shall not legalize monopolistic practices or discriminations which injure competition and are not shown to be in good faith."

WILLIAM LANGER.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, someone may ask, What is the solution? Certainly the conference report is not the solution. In my opinion, it is worse than was the original bill itself.

I want to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] in saying that when the bill comes back I shall most certainly join them in their fight to defeat it.

In conclusion, let me say that I endeavored to give a solution in the last paragraph of my minority views. I said that if the bill were amended, the amendment should read as follows:

Provided, That this shall not legalize any violations of said acts which may appear in such delivered prices or freight absorptions: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein shall legalize any act or practice now unlawful because of bad faith, discrimination, coercion, oppression, or a tendency to injure, suppress, or eliminate competition: *Provided*, That this shall not legalize monopolistic practices or discriminations which injure competition and are not shown to be in good faith.

Mr. President, from one end of my State to the other protests have been received from small businesses located in Fargo, Jamestown, Bismarck, Minot, Grand Forks, and many other places. Small-business men have been practically unanimous, because not one telegram in favor of the enactment of this measure has come to my attention.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, and the distinguished Senator from Illinois for the fine fight they have made in behalf of small business, and, I believe, for all the common people of this country.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I have in mind, for the reason which I shall hereafter state, moving that the conferees be instructed not to report back to the Senate until after June 30. We know that after the decision of the Supreme Court in the Cement case, and also after the question was last discussed on the floor of the Senate, there was a great cry about the calamity which would befall the Nation, but we have not yet seen that calamity occur. There have been no ghost-towns created, no closing of plants, no moving of fabricators to production centers such as Detroit, Pittsburgh, and Cleveland. Instead, the record indicates that new production plants have been opened up by the cement industry and there is evidence indicating the development of new steel and fabricating plants. There is also new evidence that industry can and does absorb freight, and no one considers the right to absorb freight or to sell at delivered prices illegal per se. It is only illegal when there is a conspiracy to fix prices and defeat the antitrust laws.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I wonder if the Senator agrees with me that it should not be necessary actually to prove a conspiracy where, by joint collateral action, several competitors are charging identical prices, even though it may be impossible to prove that there is actually a conspiracy afoot. Where the effect is the same as it would be by reason of conspiracy, and injury to competition is present although it is impossible to prove that conspiracy is actually present. I have in mind the type of situation in which there is a conspiracy, but it is impossible to prove the conspiracy although we can prove that by joint action the competitors have eliminated price competition.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Where there is an arrangement whereby all have the same price, by use of the basing-point system, it is usually difficult to prove that there is an illegal conspiracy. We know these things are sometimes not worked out on paper and it is very hard to prove a conspiracy by overt acts, such as letters, memoranda, and so forth. So I agree with the distinguished Senator fully.

Mr. President, since there has been no calamity to business since the decision in the Cement case, and since this bill was originally introduced, there is no need for hurry. Congress should have the opportunity to determine exactly what Senate bill 1008 does and what its effect could be, not only on the economy as represented by the great corporations but on small retailers, manufacturers, distributors, and processors.

Both the Senate and the House were told by the sponsors of the bill that there was no intention to scuttle the Robinson-Patman Act, and yet when the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana case was argued in the Supreme Court, counsel for the Standard Oil Co., in answer to a question by Justice Black, said that in his opinion section 3 of the pending conference report would render a decision of the Supreme Court unnecessary. The case would be made moot as a result of congressional action.

Mr. President, I have here the Daily Report for Executives, which is a highly reliable report to the executives of the Nation, from Washington, which contains a colloquy between Justice Black and Mr. Herbert Ellis when the case was being argued before the Supreme Court. Who is Mr. Herbert Ellis? He is counsel for the Standard Oil Co. of Louisiana.

Justice Black was interested in the effect of the O'Mahoney bill. He wanted to know what effect it would have on the present proceeding before the Supreme Court. Mr. Ellis said that if the House version is accepted, the doctrine of the circuit court would be reversed. Here, according to the report, is what the counsel for Standard Oil said would be done by this bill:

Justice BLACK. What does it do with the defense?

Mr. ELLIS. It says it will be a complete defense.

So, Mr. President, we are asked today to send back to conference this bill with the expectation that something will be brought back for approval by the Senate. The bill would reverse the action of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals and take away the protection which small business and the people of the Nation have had from section 2 of the Robinson-Patman Act. It would declare, as a matter of policy, that if anyone is meeting competition, regardless of what kind of discrimination may be engaged in, what effect it might have upon business, whether it is a justified discrimination or not, the mere showing of meeting competition in good faith would be a complete defense. The passage of this bill would be the worst catastrophe that ever happened to the small businesses of this Nation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wonder if the Senator would be willing to withhold his motion to postpone consideration in order that we might expedite the matter and save the time of the Senate. Some of us feel that the conference may be able to arrive at some agreement whereby the amendment offered by the Senator or the amendment offered by Representative CARROLL, of Colorado, might be preserved. I am certainly hopeful of that. I wonder if the Senator would be willing to withhold his motion and wait to see what the effect of the conference report actually will be.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have not been in on any agreements about what is going to happen in conference. If some agree-

ment has been made by Members of the Senate who see things as I do with other Members of the Senate who are sponsoring the bill we are discussing, of course, I desire to go along, but I do wish to point out that nowhere along the line have the sponsors of the legislation, either in the Senate or in the House of Representatives, even been willing to agree to any amendments which would protect the Robinson-Patman Act. They have made the bill worse every time they had a chance of doing so. The conference report we have before us today is worse than the original bill which was presented by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]; it is worse than the bill that was passed by the Senate, it is worse than the bill that came out of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House. Instead of securing some relief from the conference committee, we seem to be getting a worse and worse bill, more destructive, more damaging to small business all along.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator was not present on the floor at the time, but I did discuss with the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and also with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] the possibility that the Senator from Tennessee would be a member of the conference, and I hope that may be possible in order that we might have a better chance of working out some amendments which would give effective protection to the small-business interests.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator, and perhaps later during the discussion I shall have an opportunity of speaking with the Senator from Louisiana and others relative to the matter.

This whole consideration should be deferred until at least June 30, and the conference committee should not report until that time, since there is a case involving the question we are discussing in the Supreme Court, the Standard Oil Co. case, from the Seventh Circuit, which was argued just about 10 days ago. It will probably be April or May before the Supreme Court hands down a decision in the case. It seems to me that we should wait until that decision is handed down, and then we will be better able to draft legislation.

Mr. President, this case was argued in the Supreme Court on the 9th and 10th of January. One of the questions which the Senate must decide at this time is whether it wants to legislate a Supreme Court decision out of existence without giving the Court an opportunity to rule on the question at issue.

Mr. Herbert Ellis, the counsel for the Standard Oil Co., says that if this bill is enacted in the form in which it is here today, we will be deciding the Supreme Court case in favor of the Standard Oil Co., that is, that the oil company can make any price discriminations it cares to make when it comes up with the evidence that it is meeting competition of just one as seller, and then the small man who has been discriminated against has no redress whatsoever.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Did I understand the Senator correctly to say that was the actual statement of the attorney for the Standard Oil Co. before the United States Supreme Court, that the passage of this bill as reported by the conference would decide that case in favor of the Standard Oil Co.?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That was his statement not only once, but according to the report of the colloquy, which I am certain is correct, it was his statement twice. He said that if this bill shall be passed by Congress, the Standard Oil Co. will have won the Standard Oil case, it will have become a moot question. In other words, the large companies could then discriminate against any little fellows they desired to discriminate against, as they were trying to do in the Detroit case, and make the defense that they were meeting competition, which would be a complete defense. It completely nullifies section 2 of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, which I certainly do not think we want to repeal. I have the exact colloquy, the questions and answers, and Mr. Ellis' statement.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, does the Senator recall how long the discrimination against which these independent gasoline operators are complaining has been in effect, and about what time that litigation started?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have here somewhere the opinion of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, which was written by the present Supreme Court Justice Minton. The discrimination began at least by January 1, 1938, and has been pending all this time.

Mr. LONG. Then, that would be a good indication that these independent merchants are trying to protect themselves and trying to have the antitrust laws enforced. For 12 years they have been trying to get the law enforced, and just about the time they get their case into the Supreme Court, Congress would change the law in favor of the Standard Oil Co.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That would be the effect of it. This opinion by Circuit Judge Minton, now Supreme Court Justice Minton, which was concurred in by the other members of the seventh circuit court of appeals, is an excellent opinion. I do not believe any Member of the Senate could read the opinion of the court in that case without agreeing that these small independent oil dealers were entitled to the protection they sought, and which they secured under the Robinson-Patman Act. Now, when they are about to win their case in the Supreme Court, for the Senate of the United States to make their case moot and take away their protection under the decision of the seventh circuit court, is an unreasonable action, in my opinion.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I agree completely with the Senator in his feeling in this matter, although I certainly hope the Senator will withhold his motion at this time in order that this measure may go to conference, and so that we may see what the conference will report. When the conference report comes in, possibly we will be informed as to when this decision may be handed down by the Supreme Court.

Mr. KEFAUVER. What killed the protection, and makes the Standard Oil case moot, is not section 4, which I think is what the conference wants to change, but it is section 3 of the bill, which makes the meeting of competition a full defense.

Of course, if the sponsors of the bill would be willing to say they were going to rework the bill so as not to legislate against a possible decision in the Standard Oil case, I might have a different opinion about it. But I have not heard any such statement from any of the sponsors of the bill. It seems to me that what the bill is intended to do is what the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has said. Standard Oil has lost a lawsuit, and just before the case is to be decided by the Supreme Court of the United States, is legislation to be enacted by Congress against the interests of the small-business men and in the interest of the Standard Oil Co.? That would be the effect. These little merchants have been fighting for this protection 11 long years, and finally got into court, and are about to get a favorable decision. Then a law is passed which takes away the benefit of that decision.

Let me say, Mr. President, that we have before us now a new bill, in effect, written by the conference committee, with which even they are not satisfied, which they want to write again. They made it so bad that even the conference committee does not want their last product. We have no chance of hearing, no opportunity of considering, what the Supreme Court is going to do.

We were told that the bill dealt with freight absorption and delivered prices, and not with the Robinson-Patman Act. That was when the bill was originally before the Senate. Yet we are now told that the bill would, if enacted into law, render the whole question raised by the Standard Oil Co. case a dead issue. I think we should wait to see what the Supreme Court does before we act on the conference report.

Mr. President, I therefore think we could legislate and consider this matter more intelligently, that we could arrive at a better conclusion, if either the considerations here today were postponed, or if a conference committee were appointed to study the matter and wait until the Supreme Court decision is handed down in the case, which has recently been argued.

So as matters now stand it is my intention to offer a motion to have the conferees—unless they are willing to agree to delay their report—report at some time which will be after the decision of the Supreme Court.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish to speak for only a minute or two. I have spent days and days studying this subject. I deny that the passage of the legislation before us will injure small

business. In fact, in my opinion, it will help small business. If I thought it would not I would be opposed to it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President——

Mr. CAPEHART. I deny, Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. May I ask the Senator if he does not think that emasculation of the Robinson-Patman Act would injure small business?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I deny that the bill would emasculate the Robinson-Patman Act.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does the Senator from Indiana deny that the counsel for the Standard Oil Co. of Louisiana, Mr. Herbert Ellis, in a colloquy with Mr. Justice Black in the argument of the Standard Oil case, said that if this bill were passed it would make that case moot; that it would be, in effect, a decision in favor of the Standard Oil Co. and a reversal of the decision of the circuit court of appeals?

Mr. CAPEHART. I have not seen that statement. I heard the Senator say that they were about to lose their case in the Supreme Court, meaning that the Supreme Court was going to rule against them. Anyone——

Mr. KEFAUVER. Let me make the matter clear.

Mr. CAPEHART. I refuse to yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana refuses to yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I further want to say that if the bill is so injurious to business as those opposed to it say it is, and if the bill, if passed, would injure small business as those who are opposed to it say it will, I promise them that I will join with them at any later date to repeal the legislation, because I am just as much opposed to weakening the antitrust laws, I am just as much opposed to weakening the Robinson-Patman Act as they are. I am just as much interested in protecting small business as they are.

I have studied the problem very carefully, and I am just as sincere in saying that, in my opinion, the pending legislation will not injure small business as others are in saying that it will. I want to say publicly—and I am now saying publicly—that if it is proved that I am wrong—and I do not believe I am—I shall join with them in proposing a measure to repeal this particular legislation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wonder if the Senator would agree with me to this extent, that it really would not make much difference whether a seller were in good faith or not, especially if he was a large manufacturer, if he was making large discriminations in favor of large purchasers as against his small purchasers? I wonder if the Senator would agree with me that in situations similar to that existing in Detroit, in the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana case, in which small purchasers were discriminated against, even though the person doing the discriminating may be acting in good faith, it would not be possible for the many small-business people to survive in business for a long period of time.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the case, but I want to say again, as I did earlier in the day, that if the things the able Senator fears cannot be handled at the moment under our antitrust laws, if they cannot be handled under the pending legislation, then there is only one way they can be handled, and that is for Congress to pass a law which would force everyone to sell f. o. b. It seems to me that if the opponents of the pending legislation were in earnest about the matter they would introduce legislation which would force everyone to sell f. o. b. That is the only way we can ever be certain that from time to time there will not be conspiracies arising in this Nation. I believe we have sufficient laws to deal with conspiracies at the moment. I believe the bill we are now considering likewise deals with monopolistic conspiracies as effectively as does existing law. The reason I favor the pending legislation is that it clarifies certain situations.

THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, the special order of business which has been under discussion is of importance, but there is a matter of deeper concern to the people of our country, and which should really be a special order of business in the public interest. To that matter I wish to call the attention of the Senate at this time. I have received two telegrams this afternoon from my home State. I shall read them into the RECORD so the people of Ohio may know that the danger which threatens them is appreciated. The first telegram I shall read comes to me from T. W. Smith, Jr., general manager, Sun Rubber Co., Barberton, Ohio. It is as follows:

> Announcement by Duquesne Power & Light Co., Pittsburgh, that supplies to industrial consumers will be halted January 20 threatens us with shut-down due to lack of basic materials originating in Pittsburgh area. We urge immediate action making available adequate supplies of coal to permit continued industrial operations.

Mr. President, yesterday the press carried the story that the President of the United States had again said—and he has said it repeatedly in recent weeks and days—that there is no national emergency or crisis in the coal industry. A suit has been filed by Mr. Denham, and there is to be a hearing on the petition filed by him, as I understand, on the 26th of the month.

A resolution has been offered in the Senate declaring it to be the opinion of the Congress that the Taft-Hartley law should be used by the President of the United States and the strike or semistrike, or whatever it may be called, ended through that authority. It does not seem that otherwise there is any adequate relief for the public, for manufacturers throughout the country who are dependent upon an adequate and continuing supply of coal, or for the labor employed in those plants.

Another telegram I have received comes from Mr. C. B. Smythe, president of the Thew Shovel Co., at Lorain, Ohio. His telegram reads as follows:

> LORAIN, OHIO, *January 19, 1950.*
> The Honorable J. W. BRICKER,
> *The United States Senate:*
> Believe you should be informed that we are continuing plant operations at tremendous risk; our coal supply is less than 3 weeks whereas we should shut down with less than a 30-day supply. Any worsening of the situation will idle over 1,000 people.
> C. B. SMYTHE,
> *President, Thew Shovel Co.*

That telegram describes the situation at the small county city of Lorain, Ohio.

I have another telegram, coming from the city of Cleveland, Ohio, from the Ferry Enamel Corp. The telegram reads as follows:

> CLEVELAND, OHIO, *January 18, 1950.*
> Hon. J. W. BRICKER,
> *Senate Office Building,*
> *Washington, D. C.:*
> Operation of our plant, producing enamel, depends on the availability of zinc oxide. Due to lack of coal Duquesne Light & Power Co. of Pennsylvania are unable to furnish electric power to our zinc supplier, St. Joseph Lead Co. of Monaca, Pa. Lack of this electric power prohibits St. Joseph Lead Co. from furnishing zinc oxide. This will result in shut-down of our plant operations as well as shut-down of all our customers' plants who produce stoves, refrigerators, housing, washing machines, etc. May we ask for your intervention in this situation caused by lack of coal?
> FERRY ENAMEL CORP.

I have another telegram, from Cleveland, Ohio, from the Copperweld Steel Co., reading as follows:

> WARREN, OHIO, *January 17, 1950.*
> Senator JOHN W. BRICKER,
> *Senate Office Building:*
> Request action as provided in Taft-Hartley Act to relieve serious coal shortage occasioned by labor dispute in coal-mining industry. Industries at Pittsburgh must shut down Friday to conserve rapidly dwindling coal stocks for essential uses. Domestic consumers supply is also at low ebb and situation is extremely serious.
> COPPERWELD STEEL CO.,
> C. W. HOLMQUIST.

Another telegram comes from the city of Wadsworth, Ohio, from the Ohio Match Co. It reads as follows:

> WADSWORTH, OHIO, *January 17, 1950.*
> JOHN W. BRICKER,
> *United States Senate,*
> *Washington, D. C.:*
> We will be short of raw materials due to shut-off of power by the Duquesne Power & Light Co. to the St. Joseph Lead Co. due to coal shortage which will be effective January 20. Isn't there some way to give us relief from the coal shortage?
> THE OHIO MATCH CO.,
> DON WILLIAMS.

Another telegram comes from Bedford, Ohio, also in the eastern part of the State. It reads as follows:

> BEDFORD, OHIO, *January 17, 1950.*
> Senator JOHN BRICKER,
> *Senate Building,*
> *Washington, D. C.:*
> The Duquesne Power & Light Co. will cease operations January 20 due to coal shortage. This will affect the manufacture of zinc oxide at Josephtown, Pa., vital to our industry.
> THE STALWART RUBBER CO.,
> R. H. TYRRELL.

Another telegram comes from Dover, Ohio, from the Reeves Steel & Manufacturing Co.:

DOVER, OHIO, *January 17, 1950.*
Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

St. Joseph Lead Co., on whom we depend for 25 tons of slab zinc per week to keep our galvanizing department in operation, has just wired us that Duquesne Power Co., which provides power for their electro thermic smelter, will cut off power this Friday on account of coal shortage, forcing them to close their Josephtown zinc plant and suspend shipments to us. Anything you can do to relieve the situation and keep our galvanizing department in operation will be much appreciated.

REEVES STEEL & MANUFACTURING CO.
A. J. KRANTZ,

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wish to ask the Senator from Ohio whether he has received reports such as the one I hold in my hand, which I should like to read to him, from other sections of the country, as well.

I may say that this morning I have received both a letter and a telegram from the Governor of Maine expressing very serious concern; and there has just been handed me a telegram from the Commissioner of Agriculture of Maine, Mr. A. K. Gardner, saying that the coal situation affects not only the people but something more. I read the telegram:

Currently 2,000,000 chicks for broilers are being brooded in the central Maine area, mostly in Waldo County. Require 250 tons nut-size anthracite coal per week. Now receiving about 50 tons per week from regular suppliers. Reserve practically exhausted. Can you help the boys out? Prompt action necessary.

A. K. GARDNER,
Commissioner, Department of Agriculture.

That seems to support the position the Senator from Ohio is taking; and I understood the Senator referred to Mr. Denham's action.

Mr. BRICKER. I referred to that action earlier. In other words, a hearing is set on the question whether there shall be a restraining order or a temporary injunction. The hearing is set for the 26th day of this month.

Mr. BREWSTER. In the hearing before the Committee on Education and Labor, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], with his rather extensive knowledge of the Taft-Hartley Act, stated that it was very questionable whether any adequate relief could be secured by that procedure. It was very interesting—I do not know whether the junior Senator from Ohio is informed as to this—that the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], stated, at the conclusion of the hearing, that the committee were in agreement with the position taken by the Senator from Ohio as to the adequacy or inadequacy of relief which could be secured under the Denham proposal.

I think that should be taken into account by everyone concerned with possible action in this case.

Mr. BRICKER. In other words, we cannot rely upon having any adequate action taken by the court at the instance of Mr. Denham. There is not even confidence on the part of counsel himself as to the relief to be obtained even though the court grants the petition.

Mr. BREWSTER. I understood that to be the sentiment of the committee, as expressed by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. BRICKER. That seems to be the sentiment of the public articles I have read. No doubt the telegram the Senator from Maine has just read is characteristic of those which have been received by other Senators. I have received letters and telegrams, likewise, from many parts of the country. I have limited the ones I have read to those which have come from my home State.

I have another one, from Coldwater, Ohio, reading as follows:

COLDWATER, OHIO, *January 18, 1950.*
Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We are advised by our principal steel supplier that if coal stoppages in short workweek are not eliminated promptly they will be forced to start cutting operations next week. Within 2 weeks thereafter shipments may be cut as much as 50 percent. Other companies are in same condition. Since this division has been operating hand-to-mouth on steel for manufacture of farm equipment since the steel strike last fall any curtailment of shipments would have immediate drastic effect on employment at this plant employing 1,600 in Coldwater, Ohio, and 300 in Sandwich, Ill. Any loss in production now will seriously affect farmers this spring. Request vigorous action be taken to relieve this situation.

NEW IDEA DIVISION, AVCO MANUFACTURING CORP.,
E. C. CARMAN, *Director of Purchases.*

Other companies are in the same condition.

I have another telegram, from Akron, Ohio, from the Harwick Standard Chemical Co., Mr. R. L. Lasser, vice president. The telegram reads as follows:

AKRON, OHIO, *January 17, 1950.*
Senator JOHN W. BRICKER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Our business as distributors for many manufacturers of materials used in the rubber manufacturing industry put us in a position to evaluate the serious consequences which are developing from curtailed or discontinued production of basic items. We have been notified today of the necessity of discontinuing production of zinc oxide and synthetic resins in the Pittsburgh area because the Duquesne Power Co. does not have sufficient coal to operate industry after Friday of this week. These developments will necessitate shutting down rubber manufacturing plants, hundreds of them throughout the country, in a very short time. We believe a serious emergency is upon the rubber industry and urge that immediate steps be taken without further delay to get the coal mines in immediate production.

HARWICK STANDARD CHEMICAL CO.,
R. L. LASSER, *Vice President.*

I have another telegram, from Akron, Ohio, from Mr. E. A. Stevens, director of purchases of the B. F. Goodrich Co. Of course, the B. F. Goodrich Co. is one of the four great rubber companies of the United States, and employs thousands upon thousands of laborers, not only in our State, but throughout the country. Mr. Stevens says in his telegram:

AKRON, OHIO, *January 17, 1950.*
Senator JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senate Office Building:

Operations of B. F. Goodrich, Akron, Ohio, and Cadillac, Mich., plants and many other plants in rubber industry seriously threatened by shortage American-process, lead-free, zinc oxide arising from strikes in coal and zinc oxide industries. New Jersey zinc plant in Palmerton, Pa., has been on strike since September. Only other large source is St. Joseph Lead Co. plant at Josephtown, Pa. Duquesne Power & Light Co., Pittsburgh, has notified St. Joseph Lead that power will be completely cut off Friday, January 20, leaving practically no American-process zinc oxide for rubber and other industries. No substitute known. Coal and power shortages must be corrected quickly to avoid curtailment, unemployment, distress.

B. F. GOODRICH CO.,
E. A. STEVENS, *Director of Purchases.*

I have another telegram, from the General Tire & Rubber Co., also a company of extensive operations throughout the country. Their telegram reads as follows:

AKRON, OHIO, *January 17, 1950.*
Senator JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Zinc oxide and zinc metal indispensable materials for rubber compounding in our industry. New Jersey Zinc Corp., largest suppliers, closed for 4 months account strike, therefore burden thrown on other suppliers, among which is St. Joseph Lead Refining Co., which is being closed by inability of Duquesne Light & Power Co. to furnish power, caused by coal shortage. If this condition continues tire production will be curtailed and men laid off. Ultimately this would affect truck transportation in shortage of truck tires. Urge you consider growing emergency.

THE GENERAL TIRE & RUBBER CO.

I have another telegram, from Akron, Ohio, reading as follows:

AKRON, OHIO, *January 18, 1950.*
Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senate Office Building:

Our company and other companies of the rubber industry obtain very vital basic materials for the manufacture of tires and other rubber products from the Pittsburgh district, which obtains its power from the Duquesne Power & Light Co. This company is curtailing power to all industrial users on January 20 because of the critical coal shortage. We hope that every possible action will be taken to restore normal coal production thus avoiding seriously crippling American industry with a resulting break-down of our national economy.

FIRESTONE TIRE & RUBBER CO.,
JOSEPH THOMAS, *Secretary.*

That telegram comes from Mr. Joseph Thomas, secretary of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.

I have another telegram, from Toledo, Ohio, reading as follows:

We have just been informed that Duquesne Power, Pittsburgh, will shut off power for industries in that region Friday night.

That is tonight, Mr. President.

I read further:

This affects us on high-grade zinc used at Cincinnati, Ohio, and Woodstock, Ill., and steel used in all of our plants. This will be exceedingly serious for us, and the repercussions on the automobile industry, our customer, will be great. It will throw several thousand men out of work.

That telegram is signed by D. H. Kelly, executive vice president of the Electric Autolite Co.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I have heard from a great many communities in South Dakota, where there is now subzero weather, about the shortage of coal; and several of them have telegraphed me that they have only a 3-day supply of coal left.

Earlier in the Senator's remarks, he suggested that a court decision would be made in Washington on the 26th of January.

Mr. BRICKER. That is to be only an argument on the motion or demurrer.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. I do not think we can be assured of a decision even at that time.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree completely. But even that is substantially more than 3 days away. I wonder whether the Senator could suggest a more immediate approach which might be made to alleviate this very serious Nation-wide condition.

Mr. BRICKER. The only approach that can be made at the present time—and the sole responsibility is his—is for the President of the United States to avail himself of the power and authority given him under the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator. I have so advised the citizens of South Dakota, and I am happy to have that opinion corroborated by so esteemed a source.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter from the A. F. Champney Coal Co., of Oberlin, Ohio, reading in part as follows:

> We wish to call your attention to the fact that the emergency is here. Our coal supply is practically exhausted and we are unable to get shipments because of the very short workweek at the mines. Without exaggerating, we feel that the situation is critical.

I have another letter which I received from the Merrill-Ranfft Co., of Toledo, Ohio, a merchandise brokerage company, one paragraph of which reads as follows:

> It seems very unusual to me that our miners should be forced to remain idle and our American consumers of coal be forced to import it from England.

Mr. Merrill encloses an article from the press, headlining the fact that the first British coal, since before the war, is on the way to Boston. I hope New England gets some relief through the medium of coal imported from England, but that is not going to relieve the great Central West, including my State. It is not going to relieve the miners who are thrown out of work. It is not going to relieve industry, which is utterly dependent upon American coal.

I have another letter, which comes from the Fahrland Fuel Co., Cleveland, Ohio, and which, in part, reads as follows:

> It is of the utmost importance that one of the first items on the agenda of the new session of Congress and the Senate is to end the ridiculous badger game being played by the mine owners, Washington officials, and the United Mine Workers of America.
>
> * * * * *
>
> At present we have antitrust laws on our statutes to regulate large corporations—don't you think the same laws could apply to the large labor unions, they are also big business.
>
> In closing, please let me repeat, let us put aside any and all prejudices or any political beliefs we may have had in the past and use our best efforts to protect the health and welfare of the people. The coal industry is too large for any one individual to dictate as to when and how coal shall be mined.

I have another letter along the same line which comes from the Leonard Coal & Supply Co., of Dayton, Ohio. The company says it is almost out of coal, and definitely emphasizes that there is an emergency in Dayton, Ohio.

I have another letter from the Reid Coal Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, likewise emphasizing the emergency which is today prevalent throughout that great industrial center, and which is not only distressing industry and business, but actually threatening the peace and health and safety and welfare of the people of that great industrial city.

I have another letter which comes from the Majestic Coal Co., of Columbus, Ohio, my home city. Last week I was called at home by several coal operators who said they were practically out of coal, and that they were having to ration, among people who actually needed it for the heating of their homes, the small amount of coal they had in their bins, and which they could supply. The letter reads as follows:

> The coal supply problem is not a local or State issue. It is a Nation-wide issue that can be settled only on a national basis. Therefore, we ask that you enforce the Taft-Hartley law, so the mines will be running on a 5-day-a-week schedule.

There is nothing that an individual Senator can do except bring to the attention of his colleagues and the American public the critical situation which prevails everywhere because of the shortage of fuel not only for industrial needs but for home heating as well.

But there is something that can be done by the President of the United States.

I hope the Senate and the Congress will immediately proceed to consider the resolution now pending before this body, sensing the importance and the danger of the situation throughout the country, and that we shall at least express our feeling to the President of the United States, whose sole responsibility it is under the law today.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator, is it not true that a great number of the domestic consumers of coal buy in very small quantities and depend entirely on the stock piles of coal dealers?

Mr. BRICKER. That is entirely true. I know those who even buy in bushel baskets, as well as in half-ton lots and in ton lots. Very few of the homes in my city are supplied with much more than 1 or 2 tons of coal at a time. They, as well as the dealers in coal, are at this time caught in short supply. I know many of our friends are in a very critical situation by reason of the shortage in the supply of coal, and if they did not have oil or gas as an auxiliary heat, their homes would actually be cold today.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the the Senator yield further?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it not also true that of the new homes now being erected, at least nine-tenths of them are being provided with fuel-oil or gas-heating appliances and are eliminating coal, because of the difficulty and uncertainty of securing a coal supply?

Mr. BRICKER. There can be no question that the Senator from Pennsylvania is correct. I had the figures a short time ago from the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio. As I remember, they have this year authorized approximately 100,000 installations of gas-heating equipment in our State alone. The figure is entirely from memory, but I know I was startled at the size of it. Not only are 100,000 new houses using gas for heating, but today, tomorrow, and for all time to come, the great bituminous coal industry, in which the Senator's State is vitally interested, is being deprived of a permanent market.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Referring to the coal mines which in Pennsylvania we call "wagon mines," are they still operating in Ohio, or have they been closed down by reason of the pickets?

Mr. BRICKER. Some of them have been closed down. A few of them are operating. I think we had one or two perhaps that entered into a contract. I am not sure about that, but most of them are shut down. There is no adequate supply from the open-surface mines or from the strip mines.

Mr. MARTIN. If the Senator will permit, I should merely like to make an observation, because I feel that this is one of the most serious crises that has ever confronted our section of the United States. Last Friday, Saturday, and Sunday morning, I started out to look over the situation so as to obtain personal knowledge. During the week end, ordinarily one will see trainloads of coal ready to move the first of the following week. I did not observe a single car of coal on the siding. I then went to the stock piles of the great steel corporations and utilities, which ordinarily keep a 90-day supply of coal on hand. There is practically no coal there. There is no coal for the man, mentioned by the Senator, who buys a bushel at a time, or possibly a half a ton at a time. The situation is serious. Within the past 2 weeks, one of the great veterans' hospitals had to go to a coal broker to ask on two occasions, as an emergency, that it be furnished 1,000 tons of coal in order to keep the veterans who are in the hospital from becoming cold. It is most fortunate that we have had but little cold weather during this winter. If it starts to get cold, I am afraid there will be terrible suffer-

ing and probably disease as a result. I repeat, the situation is serious, and I thank the Senator for bringing the matter to our attention.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. There not only will be suffering, there actually has been suffering in the United States as a result of the coal shortage.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Under a provision of the law of the land, the Taft-Hartley Act, whenever the President finds that a national emergency exists, as I think the Senator has already brought out, he has the power to act and to correct the situation. Is that not correct?

Mr. BRICKER. He is given authority under the law to resort to the courts and obtain an injunction for an 80-day period, during which the strike is enjoined.

Mr. MUNDT. He is authorized to look around and to determine whether there is a national emergency. Then, too, other governmental agencies having findings on the same subject should have some influence on the White House. The Interstate Commerce Commission has issued a public statement that we are now in a national emergency. Because we are in a national emergency, it is exercising its authority to curtail the movement of trains drawn by coal-burning locomotives. It would seem consequently that the President has access to a rather clear-cut definition of a national emergency by one of our governmental agencies which has charge of the transportation network. I wonder whether the Senator from Ohio shares with me the feeling that in the debate now taking place among the executive agencies as to whether there is a national emergency or not, the Interstate Commerce Commission has clearly the better of it, in view of the facts which have been spread in the RECORD of what is taking place in all the States of the Union.

Mr. BRICKER. The Interstate Commerce Commission is the body best qualified I think both to observe, through its constant contact with railroads and schedules, the need of coal and the distribution of coal throughout the country. At first there was an allocation or a priority right given to the rails for the purpose of their utilization of coal. Later on, the Interstate Commerce Commission I think, as a temporary measure, permitted the railroads to take off a portion of their trains—I think it reached about 25 percent of their passenger transportation trains—in order to lessen the demand for coal.

I may say to the Senator from South Dakota, referring to what the Senator from Pennsylvania said as to the future market being taken away from the coal industry, which is important in his State and in mine, the railroads are as rapidly as possible changing to Diesel locomotive or to fuel oil of some kind, in order to get away from the constant harassment they have suffered in recent years, due to the intermittent strikes, and finally, the strike which is on at the present time, of a 3-day-workweek character, which has further imperiled their ability to carry on their transportation service in an adequate fashion.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I can well appreciate why railroads are switching from coal-burning locomotives to Diesel locomotives. In South Dakota a predominant number of trains are drawn by coal-burning locomotives, and we find ourselves in this hopelessly vicious cycle, because the Interstate Commerce Commission has declared that a national emergency exists and has asked the railroads to reduce the amount of transportation they provide by coal-burning locomotives. We find it increasingly difficult to have coal delivered to the areas in South Dakota in which the weather is the coldest. So, because the Interstate Commerce Commission says a national emergency exists, at a time when the President says there is no cause for alarm and that no emergency exists, we find the situation is made more hopeless because of confusion existing among executive departments.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, no one could receive the letters I have received without realizing that there is a critical situation which is dangerous to the public health and safety of the Nation.

Mr. President, I have in my hand another letter from the town of Versailles, Ohio, from the George H. Worch Lumber Co., Inc., saying, among other things:

> Normally at this time of the year, we have in the neighborhood of 1,000 tons of coal on hand to meet our winter demand. At the present time we have 120 tons of fuel and would not be able to meet any severe demands for fuel on the basis of our receipts at present.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the able junior Senator from Ohio is discussing a question which is vital to the Northwestern section of the United States. I have received many telegrams and telephone communications advising me of the situation existing among the manufacturers of our cities, who are constantly confronted with canceled orders because the merchandise could not be shipped to them by reason of the shortage of coal which has compelled them to close their plants from which manufacturers had been getting some of their raw materials. After having received telephone calls, telegrams, and letters on the subject, night before last, in the evening hours of my office day, I felt the urgency of the situation was so great that I should telegraph the President and state to him frankly what the situation was in my State. I sent a telegram to the President, calling to his attention the emergency with which we are confronted. The temperature at the time in my State was below 40 degrees. Plants were laying off anywhere from 100 to several thousand employees a day because they could not get the raw materials to continue in operation.

So I say that the junior Senator from Ohio is discussing a subject which needs to be discussed. The situation is certainly working a hardship on many of our manufacturers and the people of the State of Minnesota.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I might say that his State is in even greater peril than is the State of Ohio. In Ohio we have some wagon mines and strip mines from which coal is available, but it would be very difficult, with lake cargo traffic closed, to get coal into the great Northwest.

Mr. President, I have a letter from the Carl A. Abe Coal Co., of Waupakoneta, Ohio, in the western part of the State, from which letter I shall read one paragraph:

> All we hear is "No emergency," but if zero weather would hit overnight, within 48 hours I doubt if 10 percent of the dealers in Ohio would have any coal of any kind or size in their yards.

I think, Mr. President, that condition prevails in other sections of the country to an even greater extent than in my State.

I have a letter from Homer C. Gill Coals, Inc. The letter says:

> Since our last meeting, conditions have changed in our area to an alarming state—not only with us but with all coal merchants.
>
> We note that Senator SCOTT LUCAS is endeavoring to get President Truman to do something to relieve the coal situation. We trust you will throw all the weight that is humanly possible on this matter because we are absolutely going to be too destitute to take care of a part of our regular demand for domestic coal. This relates to stoker coal.
>
> We hate to write you and burden you with our troubles, but we are needing help now.

Mr. President, I have a telegram from Hamilton, Ohio, signed by approximately a dozen persons, saying:

> Shortage of domestic coal for our homes is very acute here. A calamity can be avoided only by promptly restoring full production at the mines.

I have another telegram from Hamilton, Ohio, containing approximately two and a half pages of signatures of home owners in the State of Ohio, and saying:

> Would appreciate any effort on your part to ease the critical coal shortage in our community.

Those letters and telegrams, Mr. President, come from every section of my State. They could be multiplied to cover every section of the United States. A critical and dire situation prevails. I doubt very much the efficacy of the action brought by Mr. Denham. Even if he is successful, there will be intolerable delay to the people of the country in getting adequate court action to bring about the relief so sorely needed at the present time and which has been needed for many weeks.

I do not know the considerations in the mind of the President when he says there is no emergency. I do not know the information upon which he arrives at that conclusion. He certainly has not

talked to the people of the country. Certainly he is insulated from the actual truth of the situation, or he could not possibly come to that conclusion. I hope no political consideration has led him in making his decision. I hope he is not controlled by those who are so opposed to the Taft-Hartley law that they do not want him to avail himself of it so that the American people may see the benefit of that law which he has criticized so viciously throughout the country.

Mr. President, a crisis is present. There is only one person in the United States who can relieve it. He sits in the highest seat of authority in the land—the President of the United States.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] for his courageous statement this afternoon. I just arrived in Washington this morning from Wisconsin, and while we in Wisconsin are also geographically pretty well situated, we find that not only are plants being interfered with, so far as jobs no longer being in existence is concerned, but we find also that the cold weather has struck. In my section the thermometer went down to about 20 below zero. I was in Milwaukee when it was 5 below.

Mr. President, the present condition not only means that there will be suffering, but there will be a drop in national income. If our Government is to continue spending, there must be an income base in the Nation to tax.

I had to smile a little when the distinguished Senator from Ohio was telling about the income from coal in Ohio and Pennsylvania being destroyed because of the inactivity of the President. There are many ways by which income can be reduced. A few days ago the Senate hit my State when it got mixed up in the oleo-butter controversy. What the impact on the income of my State will be the Lord only knows, unless, as I said, American ingenuity comes into play, chemistry comes into play, and outlets are found for the billions of pounds of milk which will be seeking a market.

By legislation which might be characterized by some as the foolish act of the legislative branch, and by the inaction of the Executive, wealth can be dissipated, unemployment increased, and taxes diminished. As I stated a few days ago, the time for thinkers has come.

I desired to say, in relation to the matter of the failure of the President to act, that I was speaking yesterday with a number of businessmen in Milwaukee, who took the position that Congress itself was in a position to handle the situation. That indicates what seems to me to be an utter lack of knowledge of the way our Government is constituted. There are functions which are legislative which we in the Congress can perform. There are functions which are executive, such as those the President now refuses to perform, and which he should perform as the executive or administrative branch of the Government. It is his function to administer the law. The law is on the statute books. As I said to some of those with whom I was talking, "I am merely a legislator. We have legislated the law. We have created the necessary machinery." Yet they looked blankly at me as if I had failed in my function.

Mr. President, I say that in this great Nation, with its 150,000,000 people, it is time we went back to the Constitution and understood that this was created a Government of divided functions. I say again that in my humble opinion the President of the United States is poorly advised, because if the present cold snap in the Middle West should continue, there would be untold suffering.

I got off the train in Chicago expecting to catch another train for Milwaukee, and found that the train had been taken off. Of course, the inconvenience was one of only 2 or 3 hours, but when I got on the train and started to talk to the trainmen, I found that the President is not making votes by what he is doing. A good many of the trainmen have been pretty good Democrats, but they are becoming fed up. Thousands of them are being thrown out of work. Perhaps as a Republican I should rather say, "Carry on with your foolishness," but that is not the way I feel. I feel that there is a tremendous threat to our economic health, moral health, and sane thinking.

As I left Chicago I particularly noticed the coal yards, scraped clean. In my own city and State the supply of coal is being depleted. When the temperature reaches 15 or 20 degrees below zero, then cold weather is upon us.

Mr. President, for the good of the Nation, for its economic health, for the good of the jobless, more and more of whom at this time are asking assistance, and for the sake of better understanding between man and man, I hope the President will perform now the function which we have asked him to carry out in a resolution which has been entered. What if he did make a mistake of a week or two, and there were not an emergency until 2 weeks from now? Is he not supposed to be a man looking after the welfare of the whole people?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Is the Senator from Wisconsin advised as to the situation in the Rocky Mountain region of the West with respect to the coal supply?

Mr. WILEY. Not in detail, but I heard a comment about that on the train as I came to Washington. A gentleman from Colorado on the train told me that the situation there was very serious. Today I attended a meeting where the matter was discussed. I understand the situation is serious.

Mr. WATKINS. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that in a recent report from Utah, which is a large coal-producing State, it was stated that the production is less than 50 percent of what it was a year ago, when we had a severe winter, and now we are having another severe winter there. Possibly there is a 3 days' supply on hand in most of the distributing centers.

The State of Utah supplies coal for seven of the Intermountain or Western States. Most of the supply comes from Utah, and the miners are working only 3 days a week. In ordinary years it takes full production of 6 days a week to take care of the needs of the intermountain area so far as coal supply is concerned.

Under present conditions, as I have been advised within the last 24 hours, there is on hand only a 3 days' supply. It takes 10 days to get coal from the mines to the distributors. By that time, I think the Senator will realize, we will be facing an emergency in the Intermountain States.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator. I wish to conclude this thought by saying that I trust that when the newspapermen comment on this matter it will be made clear to the public that the legislative branch is not failing the country. I suppose some think that we as legislators can legislate coal into being. One of the cock-eyed notions which has been in evidence for the past 15 or 20 years is that economic, moral, and political ills can be cured by legislation. It takes something else. It takes action, and that action, when it relates to political matters, requires wisdom, when it relates to economic matters it requires wisdom, and when it relates to moral matters it also requires the wisdom of an individual. Mere legislative enactments will not accomplish the purpose. They cannot make John Jones, a crook, into a clean man. So I trust that the country will understand that the failure to get jobs back, to get the railroads running, to get the mines in operation, is due entirely to the inaction of the Executive.

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS FROM LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I am joining today with several other Senators in introducing a bill which seeks to relieve the land-grant colleges and universities from onerous restrictions which have been placed on them by the Veterans' Administration.

The Senators who are joining me in the introduction of this bill are the following:

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senators from Oregon [Mr. CORDON and Mr. MORSE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL].

I hope that the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] will also join, because he signified his great interest in this bill. He is away today, and I cannot reach him by telephone.

The bill (S. 2909) to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) with respect to the computation of estimated costs of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction in the case of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts and other nonprofit educational institutions, introduced by Mr. TOBEY (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. TAFT, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. CORDON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL), was received, read twice by its title, and re-

ferred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, it is my sincere belief that unless Congress acts upon this bill or a similar bill, a fundamental educational principle will have been seriously threatened by arbitrary administrative action.

In October of 1949 the president of the University of New Hampshire, Dr. Arthur S. Adams, was elected president of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities. Working with his executive committee, he has placed the problem which faces his association before me. For well over a year the land-grant colleges have been seeking an administrative remedy from the Veterans' Administration, so this is no Johnny-come-lately proposition.

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, sets up certain standards by which the Veterans' Administrator shall carry out the intent of Congress in administering veterans' educational benefits. In particular reference to the problem at hand, section 5 (d), as amended, reads, in part, as follows:

> That any institution may apply to the Administrator for adjustment of tuition, and the Administrator, if he finds that the customary tuition charges are insufficient to permit the institution to furnish education or training to eligible veterans, or inadequate compensation therefor, may provide for the payment of such fair and reasonable compensation as will not exceed the estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction.

As I explain in full in the statement which I am going to insert as a part of my remarks, Congress specifically rejected, in 1945, the authority for the Administrator to deduct certain funds which are customarily received by the colleges from the "fair and reasonable" compensation which he must supply to such colleges when they meet certain standards.

When Dr. Adams laid his problem before me late in December, I was very shocked to find that the Administrator, buttressed by his Solicitor's opinion, had taken into his own hands the authority which Congress had previously specifically rejected. By administrative regulation, he now requires the deduction of certain Morrill Act funds from the grants for tuition which he gives to each college for a veteran's education.

I submit, Mr. President, without any fear of successful contradiction, that this is directly contrary to the intent of Congress when it passed and amended the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. This is not all. Even beyond the specific deduction of Morrill Act funds which he now requires, contrary to the intent of the law, he has specifically reserved the right to act further by administrative regulation in requiring deduction of other funds, even beyond Federal funds.

Let me read to you from Administrator's decision, No. 812, dated April 22, 1949:

> It is at once apparent from the foregoing that what might be a fair and reasonable rate for one institution for such purposes might not be for another. For instance, if an institution has large endowments or other adequate funds, whether provided by public or private sources or from earnings of the institution itself, it may not be said to need any material additional amount of compensation over and above the customary charges in order to permit it to furnish education or training to veterans, and while the institution might well argue that the other alternative should be applied to it, that is, that it should be adequately paid for such education or training courses, the argument loses much of its weight when measured against the element of actual need.

Conscientious and sincere educators the country over are vastly perturbed lest this decision throws the door wide open to much greater Federal interference in their educational policies.

Speaking for myself and the cosponsors of this legislation, I cannot conceive that any such capricious and arbitrary wording as that found in the Administrator's decision can be allowed to stand. My examination of the legislative history of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act leaves absolutely no doubt in my mind that there is no power, implied or otherwise, for the Veterans' Administrator to require the deduction of normal educational funds, whether Federal or otherwise, and if the present administrative regulation in relation to Morrill Act funds is not bad enough, the assumption of the power to deduct other funds from public or private sources is intolerable.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to submit certain other material as exhibits as a part of my remarks at this time. I particularly call the attention of all Senators to the whole of the Administrator's decision No. 812, which, in my opinion, is as skillful a job of legal rationalization to get around the intent of Congress as I have ever seen.

I now offer for the RECORD at this point these exhibits.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT I

STATEMENT CONCERNING FISCAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES AND THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION IN CONNECTION WITH THE VETERANS' EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

1. BACKGROUND

The integrity and proper use of certain funds granted to land-grant colleges and universities by the Congress under acts long antedating World War II have been gravely endangered by actions of the Veterans' Administration in connection with the veterans education program. The 53 member institutions of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, which, as a group, enroll more than a quarter of all the college students in the Nation, are greatly aroused by this state of affairs.

I believe that the action of the Veterans' Administration has grave implications for the relationships of the Federal Government with all of education. We feel that a fundamental principle is involved. In my conviction that the Veterans' Administration is wrong in principle I am supported by the American Council on Education (which represents all types of institutions, public and private), by the National Association of State Universities, by the Department of Higher Education, National Education Association, and by the Advisory Committee to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The history of this controversy is complex. The issue is simple. The issue is whether the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, exercising powers expressly rejected by the Congress when requested by VA, shall nevertheless so interpret them as to permit the conversion of funds coming to educational institutions for other purposes than the veterans program. The Solicitor of the Veterans' Administration has ruled this is within the legal powers of the Administrator.

Since wide discretion is given the Administrator under the law to administer a complex program, and there is no provision for recourse to the courts, it is difficult to establish the legality of an action of the Administrator. The case of the land-grant colleges and universities is, however, not based on this point. It is my contention that the position of the Administrator is unsound, arbitrary, in violation of the intent of Congress, and a grave threat to confidence of educational institutions in the integrity of the Federal Government as represented by VA, in its dealings with them.

The history of the controversy is this:

In the passage of Public Law 268, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, the Congress provided that for public institutions whose customary tuition charges were insufficient or inadequate compensation to carry on the veterans' educational program, the Administrator might contract to pay on a fair and reasonable basis for such education, but not to exceed the estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies.

The Veterans' Administration had asked the Congress for authority to include in its estimation of the amount of compensation which should be paid, the amount of private or public funds available to educational institutions (from other sources than VA).

The Seventy-ninth Congress expressly rejected this proposal when it upheld its conference committee on H. R. 3749 and turned down authority for the Administrator to readjust payments in consideration of increased or decreased enrollment and available contributions to meet such costs whether from public or private funds.

This action, therefore, empowered the Administrator to pay public institutions, for the education of veterans, an amount not to exceed the estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies. In testimony on this bill before the Senate, Mr. E. E. Odom, solicitor of the Veterans' Administration, said "What we propose to do is pay the cost of teaching personnel and supplies. That is determinable * * *."

Subsequently, the Veterans' Administration issued regulations as to how institutions should proceed in determining their cost of teaching personnel and supplies. These regulations provided, essentially, that institutions should determine their teaching costs by adding up salaries paid teachers. These were to be divided by the number of credit-hours taught by these teachers, and a rate per credit-hour arrived at. This rate would then be paid for all the credit-hours taken by veteran students. Since the formula above does not cover any of the cost of teaching assistants, classroom supplies, and the like, a flat percentage to cover these items is added to the figure arrived at. The Veterans' Administration also pays certain nontuition fees regularly required of all students (as it does with institutions on a customary tuition basis).

Although the formula given above has obvious inadequacies in that it excludes many of the real costs of teaching, it had the merit within its limitations of being simple and fairly easy to arrive at. There was no thought at the time that the Veterans' Administration would take the position of requiring that certain teaching expenditures be eliminated in estimating the cost of teaching.

Subsequently the Veterans' Administration issued regulations which said in essence that where Federal funds (from other than VA sources) were available to institutions, due consideration would be given these funds in

determining teaching costs. The only funds specifically mentioned were Smith-Hughes funds for vocational agriculture teacher-training and teaching.

Some land-grant institutions interpreted this regulation to mean that funds received by land-grant institutions for further endowment under the Morrill, Morrill-Nelson, and Bankhead-Jones Acts (passed in 1890, 1907, and 1935) were to be deducted from teaching costs on the cost side of the ledger while credit-hours taught for these funds should be included on the other side of the ledger. This interpretation, which was that given to the regulation by the contract office of the Veterans' Administration, involved introduction of the principles rejected by the Congress in 1945 that funds from other than VA sources might be taken into account in determining the amount of compensation. Many institutions did not make this interpretation of VA regulations, and did not deduct these funds. Many institutions protested individually, to VA regional and other offices. There was no organized protest at the time because college presidents generally found their time and energies taxed to the limit in getting facilities expanded to take care of veterans.

Late in 1948, audits by the General Accounting Office were used as the basis for claims by the Veterans' Administration against institutions which had not deducted Federal land-grant teaching funds in estimating their teaching costs.

On February 13, 1949, a joint committee of the National Association of State Universities and the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities met with the Advisory Committee to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and formally protested, among other things, the Veterans' Administration's interpretation of its regulations to require deduction of Federal endowment funds of land-grant institutions from their teaching costs. While there was no formal notification of the action of the Advisory Committee, it is understood that at that time the Advisory Committee recommended to the Administrator that he not require such a deduction.

On April 22, 1949, 3¼ years after the passage of Public Law 268, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for the first time issued a decision that this deduction requirement was legal. The Solicitor's opinion (812) accompanying this decision based the legality of this requirement on the power (which he also pointed out was expressly rejected by the Congress) of the Administrator to require that the availability of any funds from any source to an institution (private endowment, State funds or Federal funds) be taken into consideration by the Administrator in determining payments on behalf of the veterans program. The theory of this decision is, apparently, that it is not necessarily the responsibility of the Administrator to pay an institution for the cost, or any portion of the cost of the veterans program beyond customary fees if the institution can keep its doors open otherwise. This contrasts with the views of Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs at the time of passage of Public Law 268, who said "It was assumed originally that the States would meet their normal program and that the Federal Government should meet any additional cost by reason of the educational provisions of the Readjustment Act."

On June 8, 1949, representatives of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities and the National Association of State Universities met with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and his Advisory Committee, and again objected to the VA requirement on deduction of Federal funds. At this time it is known that the Advisory Committee did specifically recommend to the Administrator that he change his decision on Federal funds effective July 1, 1949.

On July 15, 1949, General Gray told the chairman of his advisory committee that he would not change his decision.

On October 13, 1949, a committee again met with General Gray, this time without the presence of his advisory committee.

General Gray promised to reconsider his decision, and to give an answer before October 27, the date of the annual meeting of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities. No answer was given. Telegraphic communication with General Gray brought the response that he had again referred the matter to his advisory committee.

On November 13, 1949, a joint committee met for the fourth time in a year to discuss this matter, this time with the advisory committee. The advisory committee again (presumably for the third time) recommended to General Gray (1) that he change his decision and also (2) that he find means of reimbursing those institutions which had deducted Federal funds in figuring their teaching costs.

On December 12, 1949, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs notified the president of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, and the heads of each institution, that he had reached a final decision not to alter the regulation in question administratively, though he expressed willingness to submit the question to the Congress.

2. WHAT ARE THE FEDERAL FUNDS AT ISSUE?

The Federal funds at issue between the land-grant institutions and the Veterans' Administration come from a series of Federal acts.

1. The first, or original Morrill Land-Grant Act of 1862, is not presently in controversy, but its nature is part of the essential background. The original Land-Grant Act offered grants of land to each State and Territory to be sold and the money used as a perpetual endowment for institutions which would stress agriculture and the mechanic arts and provide education for the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life. Veterans' Administration has not asked that the income from these endowments be deducted, although decision 812 certainly states the view that the Administrator has power to require their deduction.

2. In 1890, the Congress passed the Second Morrill Act, which was for the more complete endowment and maintenance of land-grant institutions, through annual appropriations, to be used for instruction or facilities for instruction.

3. In 1907, the 1890 act was amended by the Nelson amendment, also for the more complete endowment and maintenance of land-grant institutions and for the same purposes as the 1890 act.

4. In 1935, section 2 of the Bankhead-Jones Act of that year provided additional funds for the more complete endowment and support of land-grant institutions, through annual appropriation.

Some of these grants are on the basis of so much per State, some on the basis of population, adjusted, as relative populations rise or fall.

All of these annual appropriations are for the further endowment of the institutions established under the 1862 act. All the acts were passed long before World War II and the passage in 1944 of Public Law 346. None of the appropriations under these acts have been increased since World War II. All were part of the normal instructional or other budget of the institutions prior to World War II, just as were State appropriations and private endowment funds.

3. SUPPORTING POINTS

The following points are cited in support of the contention that the deduction of these funds should not be required:

1. The Morrill-Nelson and Bankhead-Jones funds were all appropriated for the further endowment of land-grant institutions, and therefore have an endowment character, even though appropriated annually for instruction and instructional facilities.

2. These funds were part of the normal instructional budget of the institutions prior to the passage of Public Law 346. They have not been increased since that time. They were therefore part of the normal program of all the institutions involved, and should not be deducted under the theory of Federal payment for costs beyond a normal program, which is the minimum theory that can be found in the pertinent history of the acts.

3. While the Administrator has asserted the power to require deduction of any type of funds available to the institution, he has in practice not yet attempted to require deduction of State funds, private endowments, or private gifts. The endowment character of the funds in question places them in the same essential status as private endowments. It is also believed that just as private endowments may become State funds when used by public institutions in accordance with the wishes of the donee, so also do Federal endowment funds.

4. The Comptroller General has held (2 CG 684, and in other citations not immediately available) that the responsibility of the State with respect to Federal-grant funds is to see that these funds are expended in accordance with the purposes for which appropriated by the Federal Government, and that as long as this responsibility is discharged the Federal Government may not control the handling of the funds. They become State funds, not in an unlimited sense, but in every sense except the requirement of accounting to the Federal Government for their expenditures for the intended purpose.

The land-grant funds in question have been expended for the purpose covered in the Morrill-Nelson and Bankhead-Jones Acts. The institutions were performing before the war and are still performing the services required. The funds have not been increased by virtue of Public Law 346 or any act of Congress since 1945. Question: Is there then, any basis for requiring deduction of these funds as Federal when they are in effect State funds? Further question: Public Law 346 originally and as amended contains a specific provision against any department, agency, or officer of the United States, in carrying out the provisions of this part, exercising any supervision or control whatsoever over any State educational agency, or any educational or training institutions. Is the requirement of deduction of certain funds in estimating teaching costs an exercise of control over a State educational agency or educational institution, particularly under the theory that these are State funds?

NOTE.—VA holds that income from the original Morrill Act is a State and not a Federal fund. All subsequent acts in question are amendments to the original act.

5. The statute provides that the Administrator may provide for payment of such fair and reasonable compensation as will not exceed the estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies of instruction. The wording and the history of the act indicate clearly that the word "cost" means cost without regard to the source of funds from which these costs are paid. It is impossible to estimate cost without estimating all elements of cost.

6. The above (par. 5) also covers the VA contention that if Federal endowment funds were not deducted in estimating costs, duplicate payment would result. No duplicate payment whatever is involved. These contracts are not reimbursement contracts. They are agreements to pay a credit-hour rate for veterans' instruction on the basis

of estimated credit-hour costs of all instruction. This is the only payment made for this purpose. The cost formula should be a method of arriving at costs, not a method of excluding a portion of the costs. Duplication does not enter.

7. As stated above, the formula of Public Law 268 threw on public institutions with low fees most of the essential costs of instruction except those of teaching personnel and supplies. VA proposes to throw still additional costs on them by eliminating a portion of their costs from their cost calculations. There is no indication that this was contemplated by the Congress, which rejected the above suggestion of VA.

8. Nowhere in the VA manuals or regulations are Federal grants to land-grant institutions specifically mentioned by name. The only funds mentioned are Smith-Hughes, George-Dean, and other matching State-Federal funds. These are not Smith-Hughes, George-Dean, or matching State-Federal funds, indicating a distinction in the minds of VA personnel. It is not strange that institutions made the same distinction.

9. The fact that many land-grant institutions have prepared their teaching cost data and budgets on their own bona fide construction of the statute and regulations creates in and of itself, a situation which merits serious consideration.

10. The broad powers claimed as legal justification for the requirement of deduction of Federal funds afford a precedent for a similar claim by other Federal agencies that their respective commitments to pay reasonable compensation for various services to be received, could be reduced by the conversion or partial conversion of funds appropriated or donated for other purposes than those covered by the contract. The setting of such a precedent, and the exercise of such power, would mark a development in the relationship of the Federal Government to the States and to educational institutions generally which can be viewed only with the gravest apprehension.

11. The endowment character of these funds, as plainly indicated in all the acts of Congress, is again stressed as a basis for their protection from encroachment, when used by the institution for the purposes indicated by the Congress.

4. OTHER POINTS

Many other points have been raised between the Veterans' Administration and educational institutions, both public and private.

The public institutions have been particularly harassed in the operation of the veterans' program, because they are the only nonprofit institutions which have, because of their normal low fees, been under the necessity of operating under contracts with the Veterans' Administration, which contracts are subject to subsequent interpretation on a one-sided basis by the Veterans' Administration, and whose accounts are subject to audit by the General Accounting Office. Veterans' Administration is in a position to, and has repeatedly, canceled signed contracts on the basis that provisions of them were illegal, although holding that the institutions do not have a similar right to pass on legality or recover underpayments due to misinterpretation of regulations by representatives of the VA. The combination of General Accounting Office accountants who are not informed about educational procedures and VA decisions has caused interference with educational institutions to a degree certainly not anticipated by the Congress under its explicit directive against such interference in Public Law 346, or by the educational institutions themselves.

None of these matters is quite as alarming, however, as the position taken by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and his legal staff that they may, at their discretion, so construe the law and the intent of Congress as to require the conversion of endowment funds long part of the normal instructional budget of public educational institutions.

Mr. TOBEY. And so, Mr. President, I respectfully ask the aid of the Senate in taking such steps as will, first, forbid the Administrator from requiring the elimination of Federal further endowment funds from acts prior to World War II in estimating cost of teaching personnel and supplies by land-grant institutions; second, prohibit the Administrator from reserving the power as he did in Administrator's decision No. 812, to require reduction of payments to such institutions by reason of payments from State, municipal, or other non-Federal public funds, or from private endowments or gifts; and third, make it possible for the Veterans' Administration to refund to those institutions which did make this deduction the full amount of the deduction retroactively.

EXHIBIT II

DECEMBER 12, 1949.

Mr. ARTHUR ADAMS,
President, Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ADAMS: As promised in the several conferences with representatives of the land-grant colleges and other educational institutions, which conferences were held several times since last June, I have given the most careful, even prayerful, consideration to the question whether there should be eliminated from the Veterans' Administration regulations the requirement that certain Federal funds be taken into consideration in establishing a fair and reasonable rate of tuition for the education of veterans by such institutions. After such consideration of all representations which have been made, and in the light of the legal and other aspects of the matter, I have reached the conclusion that the regulation does result in fair and reasonable rates within the intent of the statute and that it will not be modified in this respect. The association representatives were informed at the June conference that it could not be legally changed retroactively.

It may be appropriate to state briefly the grounds upon which my decision is founded, inasmuch as your organization requested that the entire matter be presented to the Congress, and I agreed to forward to the Congress any material you send me with a request that it be submitted to the Congress.

The basic question, of course, is whether the regulation is valid. It was issued in January 1946 by the then Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The statutory basis for the regulation is paragraph 5, part VIII, Veterans Regulation 1 (a); title II, Servicemen's Readjustment Act, Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended by Public Law 268, Seventy-ninth Congress, act of December 28, 1945; as construed by Administrator's Decisions 580, August 24, 1944; No. 720, September 20, 1946; No. 812, April 22, 1949; and No. 820, August 8, 1949. (Incidentally, the decisions of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on any question of law or fact are final and not reviewable by any other governmental official or court (38 U. S. C. 705), and the regulations issued by him are not reviewable.) (See Opinion of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in *Metropolitan Training Center, Inc.*, v. *Gray;* Opinion of the United States District Court for the District of Maryland in *New York Technical Institute* v. *Limburg, et al.*, November 30, 1949; and Decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in *Slocumb* v. *Gray*, decided December 5, 1949, citation not yet available.)

The said paragraph 5 authorized the Administrator to pay the customary cost of tuition and fees but it provides an alternative authority whereby the Administrator is authorized, upon application by any institution, to establish a fair and reasonable rate of tuition in lieu of the customary tuition if he find that the customary tuition charges are insufficient or inadequate compensation for the education or training of veterans. It restricts such fair and reasonable rate, however, to an amount not in excess of the estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction. As pointed out in the several decisions cited, it was realized by the Congress and all concerned that such rate would not pay the entire cost of instruction of veterans, but that it was never the intent of the Congress that the Federal Government should pay the entire cost thereof, it being assumed that the States would continue to meet their normal obligations in this request. It was not the intent of the Congress either that the Administration must pay the actual cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction or even the entire amount of the estimated cost thereof; in fact, the langauge of the statute leaves it to the discretion of the Administrator first, whether he will establish any adjusted rate of compensation whatsoever, and if so, what rate within, of course, the limitations stated. This being a discretionary matter, it can be changed only by the Administrator and then only for the most cogent reasons or by amendatory legislation.

The regulation established by my predecessor and continued in effect by me is based upon this fundamental principle plus the consideration that funds paid the institutions affected by the Federal Government under other laws, which funds are used for paying the cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction, should be taken into consideration in establishing the adjusted rate of compensation so as not to pay such cost twice out of the Federal Treasury, and, of course, the regulation contemplated that this would be done on a pro rata basis calculated upon the ratio of the veteran student population to the entire student population of the institution.

Aside from this principle of considering other Federal funds, to which it is understood your organization violently disagrees, it seems that no question is raised as to funds under statutes such as the Smith-Hughes and George-Dean Acts, but that the exception is taken to the consideration of appropriations under the so-called Morrill-Nelson and Bankhead-Jones Acts. It is argued that these acts, as did the original Morrill Act, provide endowment funds and that they should be excluded from the formula in establishing fair and reasonable tuition rates under the statutory authority cited hereinbefore. But this overlooks the fact that these latter acts specifically authorize the use of such funds for maintenance and support, and that the regulation, properly applied, takes into consideration only such portions of said funds as are actually used for teaching costs and supplies for instruction, either one or both. It is also argued that these funds would be available for such purposes, notwithstanding the veterans education and training program, and therefore, should not be considered in connection with such program, but this argument ignores the fact that a large number of veterans enrolled in these institutions since the close of hostilities would have been the responsibility of the institutions, and therefore the States, during the war years under the normal program if it had not been for the fact that instead of enrolling in colleges the youth of those years

were engaged in fighting a war. It was not the intent of the Congress, as expressed in the governing statutes, that this normal obligation of the States should be taken over by the Federal Government, but that the Federal Government should assume the additional expense or a large part thereof due to the additional enrollment occasioned by the Readjustment Act educational program.

While complete data are not immediately available, it appears from known facts that of the 70 institutions involved, a number, perhaps a majority, entered into agreements properly applying the regulations with respect to consideration of Federal funds. Probably some of these institutions were not affected because they did not use Morrill-Nelson funds for paying costs of teaching personnel or supplies for instruction. A relatively small number, consisting of several very large institutions entered into contracts which were approved by the Administration's field personnel, which contracts did not comply with the regulations in that the rates established did not take into consideration these Federal funds. This resulted in such institutions being paid over the past several years more tuition than they were entitled to under the regulations, and the Comptroller General has properly required that the Veterans' Administration recover such overpayments. This he is required to do under the statutes prescribing the duties of his office, and he is also authorized and empowered by said statutes to make final settlement in any case where there is a disagreement between the parties concerned, but in making such settlement, he is, of course, bound by the governing law and regulations.

It is urged strenuously by representatives of certain of these institutions in legal briefs submitted to the Veterans' Administration that the Government is bound by these contracts notwithstanding the fact that they were in violation of the governing regulations, and that under the law relating to reformation of contracts the Administration or the Government may not reopen such contracts without affording the institution an opportunity to show other costs which might offset these overpayments, but this argument ignores the law relative to Government contracts as it has been upon many occasions expounded by the Supreme Court of the United States. Without going into legal or other technicalities, the governing principle may be stated briefly that the Government is not bound by a contract or an act made by one of its agents if he acted beyond the scope of his authority. One of the most recent and fully considered decisions to this effect is that of *Federal Insurance Corporation* v. *Merrill* (92 Law Ed. 10; 332 U. S. 380).

In exercising the authority placed upon the Administrator, and the tremendous responsibility thereby engendered, I am convinced that there has been taken into consideration every reasonable need of the institutions of higher learning maintained out of public funds and that the adjusted rates of compensation authorized by the Administrator in lieu of the customary rates have been and are fair and reasonable compensation for the education and training of veterans within the purposes and intent of the Readjustment Act, as amended. Thereunder such institutions have been afforded a much-needed means of readjustment during the readjustment period following the cessation of hostilities amounting to millions of dollars, as contrasted with which the amounts of Federal funds here involved, while not in any sense immaterial, are relatively small. It is, of course, within the power and jurisdiction of the Congress to prescribe a specific rate of compensation for such purposes, but it is my reasoned conclusion that the Veterans' Administration should not go further than it has in establishing fair and reasonable rates of compensation within the formula and limitations provided by existing law.

Sincerely yours,

CARL R. GRAY, Jr.
Administrator.

EXHIBIT III

UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
Durham, N. H., December 17, 1949.

Hon. CARL R. GRAY, Jr.,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL GRAY: Thank you for your letter of December 12, in which you set forth the considerations you feel support your decision not to modify Veterans' Administration regulations requiring the deduction of Morrill-Nelson and Bankhead-Jones funds in determining the rate of tuition for veterans education in land-grant colleges.

I deeply regret that the persuasive reasons presented repeatedly by representatives of this association and others supporting the justice, equity, and propriety of modifying the regulations in question have not seemed compelling to you. As you have already been informed, the membership of the association is greatly concerned about this matter. We hold the firm conviction that this regulation strikes at the very integrity of the philosophy and policy on which the land-grant-college system was established by the Congress and by which the land-grant colleges have been able to make their dramatic and impressive contribution to the welfare of the people of the United States.

Our association and its member institutions are mindful of the many important objectives we hold in common with the Veterans' Administration. We are likewise sensitive to the complex problems with which the Veterans' Administration must deal in administering the veterans educational program. Because of these considerations, we had entertained the hope that an answer to the question of nondeductibility of Morrill-Nelson and Bankhead-Jones funds might be obtained by administrative action. We deplore the fact that apparently this possibility must now be rejected.

As indicated in Mr. Thackrey's letter to you of November 4, 1949, the senate of the association voted unanimously at its convention in Kansas City on October 23 to 27 to approve the following resolution:

"Whereas the entire history of Federal acts for assistance to the States in the establishment and maintenance of a national system of land-grant institutions shows clearly the endowment character of these grants; and

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration has followed the policy of requiring the deduction of these grants in determining costs of instruction as a basis of compensation for veterans education under the GI bill of rights; and

"Whereas the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, assembled at its sixty-third annual convention, believes that this ruling of the Veterans' Administration is contrary to sound practice and the intent of Congress in granting these endowment funds: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the association direct its executive committee respectfully to request the Eighty-first Congress to take legislative action to correct this situation if appropriate administrative action by the Veterans' Administration to correct it is not taken prior to the beginning of the second session of said Eighty-first Congress."

Under the circumstances stated in your letter, it appears that it is not possible to carry on further negotiations looking toward an administrative solution of this problem. Therefore, the association now has no recourse other than to seek legislative action.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. ADAMS.

EXHIBIT IV

PERTINENT SECTION OF PUBLIC LAW 346, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS, AS AMENDED BY SECTION 5 (d), PUBLIC LAW 268, SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS, DECEMBER 28, 1945; AND SECTION 2, PUBLIC LAW 377, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, AUGUST 6, 1947

5. The Administrator shall pay to the educational or training institution (including the institution offering institutional on-farm training), for each person enrolled in full-time or part-time course of education or training, the customary cost of tuition, and such laboratory, library, health, infirmary, and other similar fees as are customarily charged, and may pay for books, supplies, equipment, and other necessary expenses, exclusive of board, lodging, other living expenses, and travel, as are generally required for the successful pursuit and completion of the course by other students in the institution: *Provided*, That in no event shall such payments, with respect to any person, exceed $500 for an ordinary school year unless the veteran elects to have such customary charges paid in excess of such limitation, in which event there shall be charged against his period of eligibility the proportion of an ordinary school year which such excess bears to $500: *Provided further*, That no payments shall be made to institutions, business or other establishments furnishing apprentice training on the job: *And provided further*, That any institution may apply to the Administrator for an adjustment of tuition and the Administrator, if he finds that the customary tuition charges are insufficient to permit the institution to furnish education or training to eligible veterans, or inadequate compensation therefor, may provide for the payment of such fair and reasonable compensation as will not exceed the estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction; and may in like manner readjust such payments from time to time.

EXHIBIT V

VALIDITY OF REGULATIONS PROMULGATED IN CONNECTION WITH ADMINISTRATION OF PARTS VII AND VIII, VETERANS REGULATION NO. 1 (a), AS AMENDED, FOR COMPUTATION OF CHARGES BY INSTITUTIONS RECEIVING FEDERAL FUNDS

Question presented: Are provisions of paragraphs 49c and 75c (3), Veterans' Administration Manual M7-5, relating to the method of computing charges to the Veterans' Administration where an institution receives funds from the Federal Government, illegal and contrary to provisions of Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, and Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, respectively?

Facts: The restriction regarding payments where Federal funds were involved was set forth in paragraph 3 (G), Veterans' Administration Instruction No. 6, title II, Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, viz., "When the total cost of instruction is paid from Federal funds, as in programs designed to train war workers, the Veterans' Administration will not approve any payments." These restrictions were more clearly set forth with the promulgation of Veterans' Administration Manual M7-5 on April 15, 1947. Paragraph 49c of the manual provides that "When the total cost of instruction is paid from Federal funds, or where a portion of the cost is covered by grants from the Federal Government (i. e., Smith-Hughes or other laws), due consideration to such subsidy will be given in determining the charge to the VA." Also, paragraph 75c (3) provides that "When the total cost of instruction is paid from Federal funds, the VA will not approve any payments for tuition. When a portion of the cost is covered by grants from the Federal Government (i. e., Smith-Hughes or other laws), due considera-

tion to such subsidy will be given in determining the proper charge to the VA." This restriction was also set forth in paragraph 5d, Veterans' Administration Instruction No. 9, title II, Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, dated August 28, 1947, with regard to the payment for instruction for institutional on-farm training.

Some institutions have heretofore failed to comply with Veterans' Administration regulations requiring that due allowance be made for Federal contributions in the calculation of the rate per credit hour to be paid by the Veterans' Administration.

Comment: Objection has been raised to existing instructions requiring that, in the determination of costs to institutions furnishing education or training under Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, and Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, due allowance be made for Federal aid grants or contributions received by such institutions under other Federal laws. Insofar as concerns Public Law 16, supra, no question arises as the matter is left wholly to the discretion of the Administrator (cf. par. 2, p. VII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as added by sec. 2, Public Law 16). As to Public Law 346, the question inheres in the amendment of December 28, 1945, Public Law 268, Seventy-ninth Congress.

On May 3, 1945, a bill to amend parts VII and VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to liberalize and clarify vocational rehabilitation and education and training laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes, was presented by this administration to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and this proposed measure was introduced on the same day in the House as H. R. 3119 by Mr. RANKIN, chairman of the committee.

Such bill provided for authority in the Administrator to readjust payments to institutions furnishing education or training "in consideration of increased or decreased enrollment and available contributions to meet such costs, whether from public or private funds." When this proposed legislation, following consideration in committee, was passed by the House on July 18, 1945 (H. R. 3749), the original provision, as referred to in the foregoing, to the effect that contributions to institutions of public or private funds be considered in the determination of charges to the Veterans' Administration for the education or training involved, had been eliminated, and the bill, H. R. 3749, Seventy-ninth Congress, as the same passed the House, did not include, as had been proposed by this administration, any direction for or reference to consideration of contributions from other sources, public or private, in relation to costs from which proper charges were to be calculated against the Veterans' Administration for education or training. Such elimination of the provision directing that Federal contributions from other laws be taken into account in the determination of costs cannot be considered in any sense as an oversight but, to the contrary, as a rejection by the House when it passed H. R. 3749 of the suggestion that Federal contributions were to be considered in the manner as originally proposed. However, H. R. 3749, Seventy-ninth Congress, as passed by the Senate on November 8, 1945, did include authority, as proposed, on the part of the Administrator to readjust payments to educational and training institutions from time to time "in consideration of increased or decreased enrollment and available contributions to meet such costs whether from public or private funds." With these differences, in the particular in which we are presently concerned, following the passage of H. R. 3749, Seventy-ninth Congress, by the Senate and the House, respectively, the bill went to conference with the result that the legislation as finally enacted into law (Public Law 346, 78th Cong., as amended) did not include the requirements as had been originally proposed and as had been accepted by the Senate and rejected by the House, that contributions from Federal or private sources be included as a factor in the determination of costs on which charges for the education or training were to be calculated.

From the legislative history, as outlined in the foregoing, it is manifest that, in the consideration of the legislation here involved, the Congress did have before it the question of contributions of Federal or private funds to institutions being taken into account in the determination of costs upon which charges for the education or training were to be based, and in the final enactment of the law the original proposal to that effect was eliminated. The Conference Report No. 1449, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, as reported to accompany H. R. 3749, does not include any reference which discloses any intention or purpose contrary to the action shown in the final enactment of the law with respect to the elimination of the original proposal to consider public and private grants to institutions in relation to costs. A statement of the managers on the part of the House, accompanying the conference report, referred to the bill as finally agreed upon retaining an amendment permitting the estimated cost of education and training to be fixed by regulation if desirable instead of the actual cost only by agreement, but such statement contains no reference indicating any purpose or intention in the bill, as agreed to, leaving to administrative regulation the question of public or private contributions to institutions being a consideration in the determination of costs contrary to the final action of the Congress in the nonacceptance of the original proposal to that effect.

It is believed there is an apparent reason for the action of the Congress in excluding the public or private funds from the formula of paragraph 5, part VIII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended. Theretofore, the authority of the Administrator was to establish fair and reasonable rates of compensation without limitation other than $500. The formula established by Public Law 268, amending Public Law 346, was much more restrictive, permitting consideration only of cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction. Obviously this did not permit inclusion of other costs—such as general administrative overhead, new buildings or equipment, or obsolescence of old utilities, and many other items of cost of running an institution. The Congress must be assumed to have known the Veterans' Administration measured available Government funds against these costs prior to Public Law 268; and it seems clear that the Congress did not intend that such funds should necessarily be deducted from the amount authorized under restrictive formula of the amendment.

Turning to the regulation or instruction in question, it is noted that paragraph 49 (c) has to do with adjustment of tuition payments to nonprofit educational institutions in connection with training under Public Law 16, whereas a similar provision in paragraph 75 (c) has to do with education or training under Public Law 346, as amended. The language is as follows:

"When the total cost of instruction is paid from Federal funds, the Veterans' Administration will not approve any payments for tuition. When a portion of the cost is covered by grants from the Federal Government (i. e., Smith-Hughes or other laws) due consideration to such subsidy will be given in determining the proper charge to the Veterans' Administration."

The proper charge as used therein means the adjusted rate which the Veterans' Administration agrees to pay or the institution elects to receive under the pertinent regulations issued by the Veterans' Administration. Prior to Public Law 268, supra, the Veterans' Administration acting pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 5, part VIII, Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as added by section 400 (b), title II, of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, provided several alternative methods of determining fair and reasonable compensation to nonprofit institutions for the training under said act. Among these were a fixed amount, monthly, quarterly, or per semester, an amount equivalent to the nonresident fee of the institution, or, if none of these were deemed adequate, an agreed rate based upon specified cost data including teaching personnel and supplies for instruction. This was in accord with the principles enunciated in Administrator's Decisions Nos. 580 (August 24, 1944), and 638 (March 19, 1945). However, after the enactment of Public Law 268 it was held in Administrator's Decision No. 711 (June 22, 1946) that these several alternatives were legal, under the amended act, only in the event the amounts therein provided did not exceed the cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction as prescribed in the amended paragraph 5. These principles were incorporated in instructions issued April 3, 1947, and can now be found in the Federal Register, part II, volume 13, No. 131, in sections 21.433 to 21.448, inclusive. (See also section 21.531.) While it was administratively determined after the date of Administrator's Decision No. 711 that the nonresident rates charged by various institutions were within the limits prescribed by the amended statute, it was later found that in numerous instances this was not so, and that the formula for determining a reasonable rate based upon the cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction, section 21.531, supra, must be applied. Still further studies now indicate that the whole subject matter of fair and reasonable rates of compensation for nonprofit institutions should be placed upon a somewhat more refined basis—particularly in view of probable decreased enrollment of veterans and consequent change in proration of costs. It is therefore necessary to study the question herein submitted not only from the standpoint of those institutions which have or have not heretofore complied with the applicable regulations referenced herein, but also from the standpoint of what the Administrator should use as the basis for determining fair and reasonable rates for application to such institutions in future academic years.

Certain fundamental facts must be kept in mind. Under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, the least that the Administration may pay for tuition and other expenses of veterans enrolled in courses of education or training thereunder is the customary cost of tuition and the usual laboratory, library, health, infirmary, and other similar fees as are customarily charged. These customary costs are those which the individual veteran himself would have to pay if he were paying for his own education or training. As pointed out in the Administrator's decisions above, Congress, by the proviso in paragraph 5 as originally enacted and as later amended, evidenced an intent that the Veterans' Administration should in certain instances pay more than such customary costs in order that the full burden of the education and training of veterans should not fall upon the States, but should be shared by the Federal Government, although not entirely assumed by the latter. (See particularly Administrator's Decision No. 580, which was contemporaneous with the original enactment.) As pointed out hereinbefore, the original act placed no limitation upon the Administrator's discretion in fixing fair and reasonable rates other than the $500 maximum for an ordinary school year. The preliminary factors which the Administrator had to find were either that the institution had no established tuition fee or that its established tuition fee was found

by the Administrator to be inadequate compensation. In the amended paragraph, the preliminary requirements are likewise two in number and in the alternative; one, if the Administrator finds that the customary tuition charges are insufficient to permit the institution to furnish education or training to veterans or two, inadequate compensation therefor. Having so found, the maximum placed on fair and reasonable compensation to be determined by the Administrator is the cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction. This, therefore, becomes the maximum which the Administrator may legally pay. But note that while he is restricted as to the minimum and maximum, he may within such extremes establish any rate which he finds fair and reasonable to permit an institution to furnish education or training to veterans or adequate compensation for furnishing such training.

It is at once apparent from the foregoing that what might be a fair and reasonable rate for one institution for such purposes might not be for another. For instance, if an institution has large endowments or other adequate funds, whether provided by public or private sources or from earnings of the institution itself, it may not be said to need any material additional amount of compensation over and above the customary charges in order to permit it to furnish education or training to veterans, and while the institution might well argue that the other alternative should be applied to it, that is, that it should be adequately paid for such education or training courses, the argument loses much of its weight when measured against the element of actual need. For example, some nonprofit institutions do not, either because prohibited or otherwise, have any charges which are denominated tuition; but such institutions generally have a number of different fees, some of a very generalized nature, which take the place of what another institution frankly terms tuition. If an institution of the former type is allowed the same rate of adjusted compensation as one of the latter, it can hardly be said that this is fair and reasonable, for either the one has been overpaid or the other underpaid.

The same observation would be true if one institution is made a grant of Federal funds and another institution has no such grant. This decision is not here concerned, of course, with courses such as existed during the war for which the Government paid the institution the entire or an agreed cost, but rather about generalized grants made to institutions based upon enrollment and other factors and for the purpose of encouraging the carrying on of certain types of courses or instruction. And while the Congress did not see fit to specify as recommended by the Veterans' Administration that all such amounts be taken into consideration in fixing the fair and reasonable rates, and while, therefore, such amounts need not be deducted in toto from the amount which would otherwise be payable under the formula prescribed by the regulation, such amounts do necessarily enter into the question of what is necessary in addition to enable the institution to furnish education to veterans or what is adequate compensation for education or training so furnished. Viewed from this aspect, the regulations, if properly applied, are certainly within the terms of the governing statute and are therefore valid. A proper method of applying this would be to prorate such grants or other sums rather than to charge all of it against the formula; which as a matter of law would be within the intent of the act as amended. This also would be the "due consideration" specified by the regulations.

Held: The provisions of the regulations in question properly applied are not contrary to the provisions of either Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, or Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended. Those institutions which have not complied with such regulations, and as a consequence have received more compensation than they were entitled to under the law, should be required to comply therewith through an adjustment to be made in the amount to which they would otherwise be currently or in the future entitled. As to any institution which received less, due to any improper application of the regulations, it would seem—unless protest was made at the time—there would be no basis for adjustment, as presumably they were able to furnish the education or training with the amount of compensation received, and hence the rate was fair and reasonable. (Opinion of the Solicitor dated March 15, 1949, approved March 30, 1949.)

This decision is hereby promulgated for observance by all officers and employees of the Veterans' Administration.

CARL R. GRAY, Jr.,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

POLITICAL PRESSURE TACTICS IN WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Tuesday, January 10, 1950, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, beginning on page 276, the text of a release which I had prepared regarding certain outrageous political tactics being followed in Wisconsin by the Democratic Party finance headquarters in Milwaukee. I pointed out that letters were going out from the Democratic central organization pressuring humble civil-service employees into making political contributions into the party's treasury.

Such pressure letters were, I indicated, contrary to the spirit, if not to the letter, of present statutes. It seems to me that a violation of the spirit of statutes is equally, if not more, reprehensible than a breaking of the actual letter of the law, because a violation of the spirit of the statutes strikes at the very fundamentals of civil service.

Since releasing that statement, newspaper editorials and comments all over Wisconsin have confirmed the judgment which I expressed, namely, that civil-service employees—postal workers and others—were being bombarded by these pressure letters.

Of course, Democratic headquarters in Milwaukee denied my charge, using some lame excuses, moans, and groans. A spokesman for the Democratic Party attempted to prove that the letter which had come into my possession and which had been received by a postal worker was purely an isolated letter and that the communication had gone to the postal worker perhaps by accident or coincidence.

Well, Mr. President, it has since been confirmed that this was not an isolated pressure letter, but a part of a mass campaign.

Attorney General McGrath, whom I asked to investigate these "blackjack" tactics, has acknowledged my communication and I am awaiting a further report from him.

In the meanwhile, however, it is most unfortunate that the Senate on Thursday, January 19, decided to enact substantial changes in the Hatch clean-politics law. I have previously commented on the floor of the Senate on my grave concern over the wisdom of any such changes. I felt that to place removal of civil-service employees for political activities at the discretion of the Civil Service Commission would obviously be opening the door to dirty politics, and I mean "dirty."

This, of course, is an election year, and each of us tends to approach the election problem from our own individual and sometimes partisan standpoint.

I do, however, feel, Mr. President, that this should be an issue above partisanship. I do not believe that civil-service employees should participate in Republican activities, any more than I believe they should participate in Democratic activities, nor do I believe they should be pressured into making contributions to the GOP any more than into making contributions to the Democratic Party.

Suffice it to say, however, at this point, that I feel that the administration in pushing the amendment to the Hatch law has committed a grave mistake in terms of the welfare of the American people and that someday that mistake may boomerang against the Democratic Party itself.

We have made much progress in this country in taking politics out of civil service, but now I am afraid the Senate has taken a backward step and that much progress has been canceled out.

At any rate, I, for one, expect to continue my battle to keep politics clean in my own State. My own State, Mr. President, has had a wonderful record, and, I may say parenthetically, it does not make any difference whether under a Democratic, a Republican, or a Progressive regime, there has been nothing but clean politics in the State of Wisconsin throughout the years—and to keep the civil service untainted by political intimidation. That, Mr. President, will be one of my objectives.

DELIVERED PRICE SYSTEMS AND FREIGHT-ABSORPTION PRACTICES—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1008) to define the application of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to certain pricing practices.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before action is taken on that question, I wish to make a statement. First, I wish to pay my respects to the conferees for the industry and energy they have displayed in attempting to get the legislation ironed out and to have freight absorption legalized, in the interest of all industry, and especially of the small-business men of the country.

As I understand, the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland asks that the Senate disagree to the conference report and that a new conference be asked so further consideration can be given to the proposed legislation. I am perfectly content that that be done. That is a proper thing to have done under the procedures of the Congress. I want to make it indelibly clear, however, Mr. President, that when I agree to reject

the conference report, I do not want the RECORD to show that I am in disagreement with the legislation which has been brought back by the conferees for adoption by the Senate. I believe in it. I believe it will be a wholesome thing to legalize existing practice so that those who want to absorb freight can do so without violating any of the antitrust laws. I feel very strongly the need for legislation of this kind.

I shall go along with the request of the distinguished Senator from Maryland to defer action, but it is my hope that the conferees will meet without undue delay and that the legislation will be ironed out and brought back to the Senate for adoption. I think such legislation is reasonable. I think it is constructive. I hope that when the conferees bring it back there will be no doubt that the legislation which will then be presented to the Senate of the United States will clarify the situation which now exists.

I wish to make one more statement. During the last session of Congress Senators who oppose this legislation rose on the floor of the Senate over and over again and stated they felt it was in violation of the antimonopoly laws; that it would violate the pricing laws, and so on and so forth. They contended that the Department of Justice would never approve the legislation, and that, if enacted, it would probably be vetoed at the White House. It is my understanding that the Department of Justice has approved the legislation, with the possible exception of the amendment to section 4. I ask the Senator from Maryland if that statement is correct.

Mr. O'CONOR. In answer to the question of the Senator from Nebraska I will say the statement is correct. We sought and obtained from the Attorney General of the United States and from the head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice a written statement to the effect that with the change as proposed the legislation would meet with the approval of the Department of Justice and would not be destructive of the antitrust laws.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Maryland for his answer.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does not the Senator from Nebraska know, however, that the Federal Trade Commission, which has the primary responsibility in this matter, is opposed to the legislation in its present form; not ony to section 4D but to the other sections?

Mr. WHERRY. I am not wholly aware of what the Federal Trade Commission does stand for. I think there are conflicting opinions in the Commission, if I am correctly informed. Will the Senator agree with me in that statement?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may call the attention of the distinguished Senator to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, at page 609, where there is published a statement presented by the Federal Trade Commission; that four members of the Commission submitted an opinion opposing all the sections of the bill; that the Acting Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, Mr. Mason, opposed section 4D of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there might be some authority for stating that the members of the Federal Trade Commission are opposed to section 4 as it is amended. But my understanding is, and I am sure the statement is correct, that there is a conflict of opinion among the members of the Federal Trade Commission.

I have in my hand an article entitled "O'Mahoney Bill Changes Sought," written by Joseph R. Slevin, of the Washington Bureau of the Journal of Commerce, and printed in that publication under date of January 19, 1950. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

O'MAHONEY BILL CHANGES SOUGHT—SENATE BACKERS WANT TO AVERT POSSIBLE VETO

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON, January 18.—Senate supporters of the controversial O'Mahoney bill to legalize absorption of freight by sellers acting in good faith are expected to oppose passage of the measure in its present form.

OBJECT OF MOVE

A final decision has not yet been reached but Senator HERBERT R. O'CONOR (Democrat, Maryland) is believed ready to ask the Senate to send the bill back to a joint Senate-House conference committee. O'CONOR was chairman of the conference committee that approved the measure last fall.

O'CONOR's move would be designed to forestall a Presidential veto.

Peyton Ford, the Assistant to the Attorney General, has written O'CONOR informing him that the Justice Department will have no objections to the measure if section 4D is amended to change language the Department believes would shift the burden of proof from the defendant in certain antitrust cases to the prosecuting agency.

COMPROMISE BLOCKED

The Senate voted in the closing days of the last session to postpone consideration of the bill until January 20 (Friday). O'CONOR is expected to call the bill up then and to read the Ford letter to the Senate.

The letter was drafted by Herbert A. Bergson, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division. It has the approval of Attorney General J. Howard McGrath.

Differing versions of the freight-absorption measure were passed by the House and Senate. The report of the conference group that was appointed to iron out the differences between the two bodies was adopted by the House, but Senate approval was blocked by the threat of a filibuster shortly before the Senate adjourned in October.

Senators RUSSELL LONG (Democrat, Louisiana), PAUL DOUGLAS (Democrat, Illinois), and ESTES KEFAUVER (Democrat, Tennessee), are the leaders of the opposition.

They are expected to counter O'CONOR's move to send the bill back to conference with a motion to table the conference report, which would, in effect, kill the bill.

A victory for O'CONOR, however, would still leave the proponents with the job of pushing a new conference report through the House and Senate. Representatives WRIGHT PATMAN (Democrat, Texas), and HALE BOGGS (Democrat, Louisiana), will try to muster enough votes to defeat the proposal in the lower House.

SENATE PROBLEM

House approval still will leave the bill's supporters with the job of overcoming the opposition of the Long-Douglas-Kefauver bloc later in the session.

"I'm a simple guy," DOUGLAS said today. "I don't want to play around with wording. I'm opposed to it. It would gut the antitrust laws."

LONG declared that after the fight is over "small business will know where their friends are." If the measure is approved, he added, "it would take years to get the antitrust laws back where they were."

The Justice Department, in endorsing the measure, has made it clear that it disagrees completely with the measure's opponents. KEFAUVER and LONG have met several times with Chief Trustbuster Bergson, but emerged each time with their views unchanged.

The Department, it is understood, does not agree that the bill would drastically modify the antitrust laws. Instead, it believes that the bill merely restates the existing law.

It believes that the members of the Long group want to write a new legal doctrine into the statutes.

SPLIT OVER GOOD FAITH

The split has come on the question of whether good faith is an absolute defense when advanced by a defendant in an antitrust case. The Department believes that it is and should be.

The Federal Trade Commission, however, convinced the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit that good faith should not be a complete defense where there has been injury to competition. It advanced this theory in the recently decided Standard Oil of Indiana case.

Standard appealed to the Supreme Court and when the case was heard earlier this month the FTC had to send its own attorneys to the Supreme Court to argue its side. The Justice Department, which normally represents other agencies before the high court, refused to defend the FTC's good-faith theory.

The Department believes that the Long-Kefauver-Douglas group is opposing the freight-absorption bill now because it wants to write the FTC's good-faith theory into law.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to read several paragraphs of the article which I think are very important:

The Justice Department, in endorsing the measure—

The measure that was brought back by the conferees—

has made it clear that it disagrees completely with the measure's opponents. KEFAUVER and LONG have met several times with Chief Trustbuster Bergson, but emerged each time with their views unchanged.

The Department, it is understood, does not agree that the bill would drastically modify the antitrust laws. Instead, it believes that the bill merely restates the existing law.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana in a moment. Permit me to continue to read from the article:

It believes that the members of the Long group want to write a new legal doctrine into the statutes.

The split has come on the question of whether good faith is an absolute defense when advanced by a defendant in an antitrust case. The Department believes that it is and should be.

The Federal Trade Commission, however, convinced the Circuit Court of Appeals for

the Seventh Circuit that good faith should not be a complete defense where there has been injury to competition. It advanced this theory in the recently decided Standard Oil of Indiana case.

Standard appealed to the Supreme Court—

This is significant, Mr. President—

and when the case was heard earlier this month the FTC had to send its own attorneys to the Supreme Court to argue its side. The Justice Department, which normally represents other agencies before the high court, refused to defend the FTC's good-faith theory.

The Department believes that the Long-Kefauver-Douglas group is opposing the freight-absorption bill now because it wants to write the FTC's good-faith theory into law.

Of course, they have a perfect right to do that, and I am not going to argue that question. If the very able junior Senator from Louisiana feels as he does, sincerely—and I am sure he does—of course, he has that right. The only point I wanted to make is that the Supreme Court of the United States when this case was heard did not have before it the Justice Department, because apparently the Department refused to go there and plead the case, which indicates to me that they are in total sympathy with what we are attempting to do here respecting the pending legislation.

Mr. President, I want to be fair about the matter. If there can be worked out by the conferees any adjustment that will be satisfactory to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], that is perfectly agreeable to me. That is why we have conference committees. That is why we have the mechanics which we make use of. But I want to leave this thought with the Members of the Senate: This remedial legislation is long overdue. Let us send the conference report back for a further conference, if that is believed to be the proper way to proceed at this time. Then let a subsequent report come from that further conference, so that all Members will be given a chance to vote it up or down. In that way, let us see whether we can enact some legislation which will clarify existing conditions which are playing havoc with a great many small-business men throughout the country.

Now I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I understood the Senator to state that the Senator from Louisiana had conferences with the Department of Justice.

Mr. WHERRY. No; I merely quoted the newspaper article. The article states that—

The Justice Department, in endorsing the measure, has made it clear that it disagrees completely with the measure's opponents. KEFAUVER and LONG have met several times with Chief Trustbuster Bergson, but emerged each time with their views unchanged.

That is what I read.

Mr. LONG. I should like to say that statement in the article is not correct. Whoever made that statement was misinformed. Although it might serve some purpose for us to confer with Mr. Bergson, at this time we have not. In the past I have discussed this matter once with Mr. Bergson, but not officially and not with the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. WHERRY. I may say to the able Senator from Louisiana that his word is good enough for me; I have found him to be entirely honest and truthful. But I may say that the fact that the attorneys for the Department of Justice did not plead its case in opposition to this measure is convincing. I say that because the attorneys in the Department of Justice are in total sympathy with the proposed legislation already reported by the conferees.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. LONG. I should like to have the Senator state his position on a proposition I shall state now, one which, of course, makes a great deal of difference to the Senator from Louisiana: I wonder how the Senator feels about a situation in which a large corporation, such as the Standard Oil Co., will sell to certain customers in a given city at a price substantially lower than it will sell to everyone else in that city who wishes to purchase the same product.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, all I am interested in is freight absorption; that is all. I want a farmer to have the right to sell a mule 50 miles away from his home and be able to meet, if he has to do so, his competitor's price. That is all I want. That has been possible for 50 years in this country. However, if we do not act in this matter, that right will not be continued.

This measure will not hurt competition. It will stimulate competition. The fact that the Department of Justice does not uphold the position of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is convincing evidence to me that this measure will not in any way create monopoly, so far as prices are concerned. That is my feeling about it. Instead of reducing business, instead of restricting it to small, local areas, I want all the competition we can get for business, every bit of it. Competition is the way to get low prices. That is the way to get things sold to consumers at the lowest possible prices.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Nebraska is a small-business man, I believe.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; very small.

Mr. LONG. He knows other small-business men. I feel that he understands the evils of a situation in which large-scale purchasers, such as chain stores, are able to buy the goods they need at prices substantially lower than the prices at which small-business men can buy the goods they need. I think he will agree with me that the effect of such a procedure is to put small-business men out of business.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana is contending that good faith should not be a complete defense. The Senator says that is one thing that cannot be done. Very well, Mr. President, I shall not argue the legal point. We shall leave that to the Supreme Court, when it makes the final decision, at the time of the final test.

All in the world that those of us who believe in this proposed legislation want to do is permit one who has merchandise to sell, no matter whether it is candy bars or chewing gum, or this, that, or the other thing—to sell it anywhere in the United States, and to sell it at a price which will enable him to compete with other similar merchandise—for instance, in the case of a candy bar, possibly at a price of 5 cents—and be able to absorb the freight, if he wishes to do so, in order to sell the candy bar at that price to everyone who will buy it in any of the 48 States. That is what we want to be able to do with our cattle and with everything else produced in our State. We want competition. There will be competition if the Congress permits it to continue to exist as it has existed.

This proposed legislation will not change the procedure one iota. If there is any monopoly, a suit against it will still be able to be filed under the Clayton Act; the existing procedures still will be able to be used to accomplish everything the Senator has been discussing.

But at the same time, if we finally enact into law the sections of the conference report, other than section 4, as we would like to have them, freight absorption will then be possible, so that if a sugar-beet producer at Scottsbluff, Nebr., wishes to sell his sugar beets at New York at the same price at which he sells them at Scottsbluff, and to absorb the freight from Scottsbluff to New York, he will be able to do so without violating the law, provided he does so in good faith. That is the whole point.

I do not intend to get into an argument now on the merits of this matter. We shall do that again. I do not wish to hold up the Senator from Maryland on the work he has done.

I say to the Senate, let us go ahead with the procedure now proposed. However, I wish to make it indelibly clear that I am not backing down on the stand I have previosuly taken. I hope that when the report comes back from the further conference, we shall join in permitting fright absorption in a legal way, within the confines of this great country.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. If the conference report is not finally enacted into law, the confusion which presently exists among processors and manufacturers will continue; will it not?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. THYE. The big manufacturer who can afford to purchase a fleet of trucks will acquire them, and will ship his merchandise in them, and thus, we might say, will be able to get around any restrictive measures which might be imposed against him under any existing legislation or under the basing-point court decision.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. So unless we enact legislation of the type now proposed, instead of aiding and benefiting small business, we shall simply continue to add to the difficulties of small business. The result will be to destroy one small business after

another, because they will be unable to meet the competition with which they are confronted, in view of the fact that the large operators will be able to acquire their own fleets of trucks and, using those trucks will be able to move freight in any manner in which they wish, whereas the small operators will not be able to afford to operate in that way. Therefore the small operators will have to go out of business, and the large operators will take their business.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. I thank the Senator for his observation.

Mr. President, as I have said, I do not wish to get into a discussion of the merits of this matter. However, it is obvious that unless we enact legislation of this sort, the only thing for the small-business men who are fabricators to do will be to move from their present locations to the places where the raw products they use in their operations are produced. For instance, let us consider the manufacturers of washing machines or refrigerators who need steel. If they cannot continue to operate on a freight-absorption basis, they will have to move to Pittsburgh or Chicago, to the area where the steel they need is produced. Then there will be another difficulty with freight rates; they will have unfair competition there.

I have just talked to a steel operator who, because of unfair charges by the railroads, has to pay for steel a different price to three producers in his own city, the prices varying about a dollar a ton. On the old basis, the manufacturer producing steel for a dollar a ton less will be able to take over all that business, unless the other producers sell theirs for a dollar a ton less, and thereby meet the price. The producer who is nearest the point of consumption will be able to get all the business, unless producers who are farther removed from the point of consumption reduce their delivered prices sufficiently to meet the lowest price.

Mr. THYE. In our State we have canners of beans and various other kinds of vegetables. There are similar plants in Nebraska, of course. States like Minnesota and Nebraska are in the Midwest, where there is not the great consuming population that is found in the East. Since those States do not have the great consuming population, the canneries in those States are compelled to ship their goods to the areas where the large body of consumers live. Some of the goods go to Chicago; some go to Philadelphia; some go to New York—or to other eastern or seaboard cities, wherever there is a demand for those goods.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. THYE. If the restriction continues, those particular processors will be absolutely out of the picture, because of the court decision, and they will either have to go out of business or will have to send their raw materials to a point near the point of consumption, and process them there. In such case, the farmer would have to absorb the freight for the expenses of shipment, and then, from there on, meet the competition.

Certainly the situation must be clarified.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THYE. I am familiar with the drug business and the position it takes in this case. I think the druggists have been unduly and unreasonably excited. Nevertheless, I have been besieged with telegrams and telephone calls from druggists who ask that I block this proposed legislation. I have talked to those gentlemen. They are not quite clear how they would be harmed, but they think they will be harmed. I am willing to do all I can to help them, just as I am willing to do all I can to help the small grocers or any other businessmen on Main Street, any of the businessmen in the towns in the Midwest. But I think they are unduly alarmed over the action proposed here.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was rejected.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate further insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the House of Representatives, request a further conference with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. O'CONOR, and Mr. WILEY conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I say to my very distinguished friend, the Senator from Maryland, that we will meet again at Philippi. [Laughter.]

PROTECTION AGAINST LYNCHING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this morning the Judiciary Committee afforded me the opportunity to testify in behalf of Senate bill 1404, the antilynching bill, introduced last session by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], Senator Wagner, and myself. I welcomed the opportunity to testify, as in my opinion antilynching legislation is one of the most vital pieces of domestic legislation which the Congress of the United States has within its power to pass on. Freedom from fear and freedom from mob violence are basic tenets for any program of civil rights and for any enjoyment of free citizenship in a democracy.

It was particularly significant that the Judiciary Committee held hearings on S. 1404 and also on S. 1726 introduced by former Senator McGrath, in the light of the fact that the Judiciary Committee had already, during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, approved the antilynching bill S. 91 introduced by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. This move was significant to me because it implied a recognition on the part of the Judiciary Committee that S. 91 is totally unacceptable, not only to the minority groups in America who would be affected by the legislation, but also totally unacceptable to the President of the United States, to his administration, and to all who are genuinely concerned with civil liberties in America.

Out of order, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the testimony I presented this morning before the Judiciary Committee, which includes within it detailed arguments in support of S. 1404 and the basis for the widespread opposition to S. 91.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATEMENT OF SENATOR HUMPHREY BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, ON S. 1404, THE FEDERAL ANTI-LYNCHING ACT

Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation to the committee for giving me the opportunity to testify on behalf of S. 1404, a bill introduced by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the former Senator from New York, Mr. Wagner, and myself last year. I know that Mr. MORSE would have been eager to testify in person in behalf of this legislation, but he is unfortunately away on official business. I will, however, ask your permission to place in the record of the hearings the statement by Senator MORSE 2 years ago when a bill similar to the one we are now discussing, was under consideration.

There can be very little debate, Mr. Chairman, about the advisability of safeguarding Americans against the fear of lynchings. Legislation to solve this problem has been introduced in every Congress since the Sixtieth Congress. Several antilynching bills passed the House of Representatives; the Senate, however, has never passed a bill on this subject.

Mr. Chairman, I can think of no measure which will do more to raise the moral stature of Americans in the eyes of the world than the passage of the bill which we have introduced. Mr. Chairman, I can think of no measure which will do more to guarantee freedom of the individual from the threat of illegal bodily injury and death, freedom from violence, and irresponsible mob action, than the bill which we have introduced and which we ask you to support. Freedom is the most basic of human rights. Without it, all other civil rights become academic.

I do not believe that it is relevant for us to analyze this bill statistically. Full hearings were held on this legislation during the Eightieth Congress. Adequate testimony was presented statistically demonstrating either that more than 5,000 persons were lynched during the past 50 years, which would be an argument for the legislation, or that lynchings are decidedly on the decline since there have been only two or three annually in the most recent period, which would be an argument that the legislation is unnecessary. In the testimony of Mr. MORSE, which I have submitted for the RECORD, you will find statistical tables of lynchings which have taken place in the United States between 1882 and 1946.

Mr. Chairman, one lynching is one lynching too many. Mob violence has no place in America. Lynching has no place in a society based on the eternal religious and democratic principles of human dignity. Antilynching legislation represents the heart and core of a civil-rights program in America.

Just as important, however, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that the nature, character, and techniques of lynchings have changed in recent years. Today public lynchings by large crowds with great publicity is the exception rather than the rule. Today terrorists frequently operate in small bands secretly. I am informed that every year many Negroes in the South simply disappear. Statistics as regards lynchings are inconclusive in that Negroes, knowing that they are without Federal protection, refrain from exercising basic civil rights which would incur the anger of anti-Negro forces.

In 1946, the President of the United States issued Executive Order 9808, establishing the

President's Committee on Civil Rights. It is significant that this Executive order came about as a direct result of a series of lynchings which took place that very year—the murder of two men and their wives in Monroe, Ga. The President, issuing the order, declared:

"The preservation of civil rights guaranteed by the Constitution is essential to domestic tranquillity, national security, the general welfare, and the continued existence of our free institutions."

He further stated:

"The action of individuals who take the law into their own hands and inflict summary punishment and wreak personal vengeance is subversive of our democratic system of law enforcement and public criminal justice, and gravely threatens our form of government."

Fifteen distinguished citizens representing the religious, labor, business, and national racial minority groups, coming from every geographical section of the United States, were commissioned with the responsibility of determining how the Federal, State, and local governments could better safeguard civil rights and to recommend to the President necessary legislation toward this end.

After nearly a year of painstaking study of all questions relating to the violation of civil rights, the Committee unanimously recommended, as one of the measures to make secure the rights of Americans, enactment by Congress of an antilynching act. The Committee was also careful to point out what such a law must contain to be effective.

It is in considering the specific recommendations of the Committee as to the content of antilynching legislation that our opposition to S. 91, the Ferguson antilynching bill, which has already been reported out by your committee, can best be understood.

Let us look specifically at section 4 of the Humphrey-Morse-Wagner bill. Our bill defines a lynch mob as "any assemblage of two or more persons, which shall, without authority of law, (a) commit or attempt to commit violence upon any person or persons or on his or their property because of his or their race, creed, color, national, racial ancestry, language, or religion." The same applies where the participants in the lynching desire to take the law into their own hands and punish the victim. This definition would clearly exclude all the usual cases of murder.

S. 91, however, does not effectively punish those who engage in lynching. It punishes members of a lynch mob only when a conspiracy can be proved between the members of the lynch mob and any State or Federal officer with the responsibility to protect public safety. The necessity to prove conspiracy is the Achilles heel of the Ferguson bill. It is the great weakness of the legislation which makes it inacceptable to all who are truly concerned with civil rights, and all who are genuinely interested in solving this vital national problem.

This approach to the problem of lynching may have served some purpose 10 or more years ago when almost all lynchings that took place involved the open participation of local police officers, county sheriff, or constable. In the past 10 years, however, in the majority of lynchings, evidence of active, open participation by police officers has been difficult to obtain. Even if the State police machinery is negligent, the open, active participants usually do not include the police officers. The most recent lynchings which have taken place would, under the terms of the Ferguson bill, not be violations of the antilynching law and would not be subject to Federal jurisdiction.

The President's Committee on Civil Rights, in delineating what an "effective" antilynching law "must contain" to be "effective," said:

"First, it should define lynching broadly," the committee declared. Section 4 of the Humphrey-Morse bill contains a broad definition of lynching.

"Second, the Federal offense ought to cover participation of public officers in a lynching, or failure by them to protect a person accused of a crime against mob violence. The failure or refusal of public officers to make proper efforts to arrest members of lynch mobs and to bring them to justice should also be specified as an offense." Sections 5 and 6 of our bill so provide.

The Committee continued: "Action by private persons taking the law into their own hands to mete out summary punishment and private vengeance upon an accused person; action by either public officers or private persons meting out summary punishment and private vengeance upon a person because of his race, color, creed, or religion—these too must be made crimes." Section 5 of our bill makes it a felony for any person whether a public officer or not to commit violence under these conditions and section 6 punishes State officers who neglect or willfully refuse to prevent a lynching or apprehend members of a lynch mob.

"Third, the statute should authorize immediate Federal investigation in lynching cases to discover whether a Federal offense has been committed." Section 7 of the bill directs the Attorney General of the United States to make such an investigation.

"Fourth, adequate and flexible penalties ranging up to $10,000 and 20-year prison term should be provided." Section 5 of our bill provides that any person found guilty of participation in a lynching shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $10,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 20 years or both.

In its report to the President, the Committee on Civil Rights stated:

"The devastating consequences of lynchings go far beyond what is shown by counting the victims. When a person is lynched, and the lynchers go unpunished, thousands wonder where the evil will appear again and what mischance may produce another victim. And every time lynchers go unpunished, Negroes have learned to expect other forms of violence at the hands of private citizens or public officials. In describing the thwarted efforts of the Department of Justice to identify those responsible for one lynching, J. Edgar Hoover stated to the Committee:

"The arrogance of most of the white population of that county was unbelievable, and the fear of the Negroes was almost unbelievable.

"The almost complete immunity from punishment enjoyed by lynchers is merely a striking form of the broad and general immunity from punishment enjoyed by whites in many communities for less extreme offenses against Negroes. Moreover, lynching is the ultimate threat by which his inferior status is driven home to the Negro. As a terrorist device, it reinforces all the other disabilities placed upon him. The threat of lynching always hangs over the head of the southern Negro; the knowledge that a misinterpreted word or action can lead to his death is a dreadful burden."

I assume, Mr. Chairman, that since the committee did report out an antilynching bill, it is unnecessary for us to make further argument as to the necessity for Federal intervention with regard to this basic policy question. The basic question our opponents tell us is a constitutional one. First, as to whether a county can be held civilly liable as our bill would provide; secondly, whether we can make lynching that much of a Federal crime that we can hold citizens who participate in the lynching criminally responsible in the Federal courts. I am not a lawyer, Mr. Chairman, but I have had an opportunity to read the scholarly testimony of the Senator from Oregon on this subject 2 years ago which I have had included in the RECORD. He said:

"It is my firm conviction that my proposed legislation is entirely constitutional in every respect. I believe that every provision in the bill is fully authorized by the due-process and equal-protection clauses of the fourteenth amendment. I believe that every provision of my bill is independently authorized and supported by the privileges and immunities clauses of the fourteenth amendment. However, since the United States has recently entered into treaty obligations with other nations which require us as a Nation to protect the lives and property of all persons within our jurisdiction against any infringement based on race, color, creed, or national origin, I also desire that Congress explicitly recognize that this bill is in fulfillment of those treaty undertakings."

The Senator from Oregon is the former dean of a law school, one of the outstanding legal scholars of America and is, in my opinion, competent authority for the proposition that the legislation which he and I introduced is constitutional. I have already placed Mr. MORSE's testimony in the RECORD for your examination.

America has given the world economic and political leadership, but she cannot and will not supply true moral leadership until every person regardless of his race or color may exercise every right as a citizen and be safe against the lynch mob.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN—PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 25) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I rose for recognition for the purpose of speaking to the pending joint resolution, but I have had some discussion with the leadership, and I hope they are receptive to the thought of having the Senate recess until Monday, and take up the measure at that time.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until Monday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, January 23, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 20, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our Lord, Thou whom we love to call Father, speak to us as in the days of old, as in humility and yet in eagerness we await Thy presence. Continue to work through us Thy great purposes, and bestow upon us the treasures of Thy truth. Teach us that our love and faith are tested by what we are willing to suffer and sacrifice. In our failures, chasten and forgive us; if impulsive, restrain us with Thy blessed calm.

Do Thou help the Congress in its questions, in the solution of its problems, and even in its fears, and teach us that

righteousness earns its own reward, and that its highest object is man, and its greatest service love.

Hear us in the name of Him who prayed for His enemies, wept with his friends, and would not scorn even a little child. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1243. An act to amend the Hatch Act.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STENNIS, Mr. GILLETTE, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 7]

Allen, Calif.	Gilmer	Sasscer
Blatnik	Hobbs	Simpson, Pa.
Bulwinkle	Lemke	Smathers
Burdick	Lyle	Smith, Ohio
Crosser	Macy	Stigler
Durham	Murphy	Vursell
Fallon	Poulson	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 411 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 450)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Attached hereto is a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems covering its operations from April 1, 1949, to September 30, 1949, and describing in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

Previous reports of the National Advisory Council were transmitted to the Congress of March 1, 1946, March 8, 1946, January 13, 1947, June 26, 1947, January 19, 1948, May 17, 1948, August 3, 1948, March 14, 1949, and July 5, 1949, respectively. In addition to the First Special Report on the Operations and Policies of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, submitted on May 17, 1948, previous reports on the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank were included in the reports of January 13, 1947, June 26, 1947, January 19, 1948, August 3, 1948, March 14, 1949, and July 5, 1949, respectively.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 20, 1950.*

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn, and on that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 161, nays 255, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

YEAS—161

Allen, Ill.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Murray, Wis.
Andersen, H. Carl	Hall, Leonard W.	Nelson
Anderson, Calif.	Halleck	Nicholson
Andresen, August H.	Hand	Nixon
Angell	Harden	Norblad
Arends	Harvey	O'Hara, Minn.
Auchincloss	Herter	O'Konski
Barrett, Wyo.	Heselton	Patterson
Beall	Hill	Pfeiffer, William L.
Bennett, Mich.	Hinshaw	Phillips, Calif.
Bishop	Hoeven	Phillips, Tenn.
Blackney	Hoffman, Ill.	Plumley
Boggs, Del.	Hoffman, Mich.	Potter
Bolton, Ohio	Holmes	Poulson
Boykin	Hope	Powell
Bramblett	Horan	Reed, Ill.
Brehm	Jackson, Calif.	Reed, N. Y.
Brown, Ohio	James	Rich
Byrnes, Wis.	Javits	Riehlman
Canfield	Jenison	Rogers, Mass.
Case, N. J.	Jenkins	Rooney
Case, S. Dak.	Jennings	Sadlak
Chiperfield	Jensen	St. George
Church	Johnson	Sanborn
Clevenger	Jonas	Saylor
Cole, Kans.	Judd	Scott, Hardie
Cole, N. Y.	Kean	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Corbett	Kearney	Scrivner
Cotton	Kearns	Scudder
Coudert	Keating	Shafer
Cunningham	Keefe	Short
Curtis	Kilburn	Simpson, Ill.
Dague	Kunkel	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Wis.	Latham	Smith, Va.
D'Ewart	LeCompte	Smith, Wis.
Dolliver	LeFevre	Stefan
Dondero	Lichtenwalter	Stockman
Eaton	Lodge	Taber
Ellsworth	Lovre	Talle
Elston	McConnell	Taylor
Engel, Mich.	McCulloch	Tollefson
Fellows	McDonough	Towe
Fenton	McGregor	Van Zandt
Ford	McMillen, Ill.	Velde
Fulton	Mack, Wash.	Vorys
Gamble	Marcantonio	Wadsworth
Gavin	Martin, Iowa	Weichel
Gillette	Martin, Mass.	Werdel
Golden	Merrow	Wigglesworth
Goodwin	Meyer	Wilson, Ind.
Graham	Michener	Wolcott
Gwinn	Miller, Md.	Wolverton
Hagen	Miller, Nebr.	Woodruff
Hale	Morton	

NAYS—255

Abbitt	Garmatz	Norton
Abernethy	Gary	O'Brien, Ill.
Addonizio	Gathings	O'Brien, Mich.
Albert	Gordon	O'Hara, Ill.
Allen, La.	Gore	O'Neill
Andrews	Gorski	O'Sullivan
Aspinall	Gossett	O'Toole
Bailey	Granahan	Pace
Barden	Granger	Passman
Baring	Grant	Patman
Barrett, Pa.	Green	Patten
Bates,	Gregory	Perkins
Battle	Gross	Peterson
Beckworth	Hardy	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Bennett, Fla.	Hare	Philbin
Bentsen	Harris	Pickett
Biemiller	Harrison	Poage
Bland	Hart	Polk
Blatnik	Havenner	Preston
Boggs, La.	Hays, Ark.	Price
Bolling	Hays, Ohio	Priest
Bolton, Md.	Hébert	Quinn
Bonner	Hedrick	Rabaut
Bosone	Heffernan	Rains
Breen	Heller	Ramsay
Brooks	Herlong	Rankin
Brown, Ga.	Holifield	Redden
Bryson	Howell	Regan
Buchanan	Huber	Rhodes
Buckley, Ill.	Hull	Ribicoff
Buckley, N. Y.	Irving	Richards
Burke	Jackson, Wash.	Rivers
Burleson	Jones, Ala.	Rodino
Burnside	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Fla.
Burton	Jones, N. C.	Roosevelt
Byrne, N. Y.	Karst	Sabath
Camp	Karsten	Sadowski
Cannon	Kee	Secrest
Carlyle	Kelley, Pa.	Shelley
Carnahan	Kelly, N. Y.	Sheppard
Carroll	Kennedy	Sikes
Cavalcante	Keogh	Sims
Celler	Kerr	Smathers
Chatham	Kilday	Spence
Chelf	King	Staggers
Chesney	Kirwan	Stanley
Christopher	Klein	Steed
Chudoff	Kruse	Stigler
Clemente	Lane	Sullivan
Colmer	Lanham	Sutton
Combs	Larcade	Tackett
Cooley	Lesinski	Tauriello
Cooper	Lind	Teague
Cox	Linehan	Thomas
Crawford	Lucas	Thompson
Crook	Lyle	Thornberry
Crosser	Lynch	Trimble
Davenport	McCarthy	Underwood
Davies, N. Y.	McCormack	Vinson
Davis, Ga.	McGrath	Wagner
Davis, Tenn.	McGuire	Walsh
Dawson	McKinnon	Walter
Deane	McMillan, S. C.	Welch
DeGraffenried	McSweeney	Wheeler
Delaney	Mack, Ill.	Whitaker
Denton	Madden	White, Calif.
Dingell	Magee	White, Idaho
Dollinger	Mahon	Whitten
Donohue	Mansfield	Whittington
Doughton	Marsalis	Wickersham
Douglas	Marshall	Wier
Doyle	Mason	Williams
Eberharter	Miles	Willis
Elliott	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Okla.
Engle, Calif.	Mills	Wilson, Tex.
Evins	Mitchell	Winstead
Fallon	Monroney	Withrow
Feighan	Morgan	Wood
Fernandez	Morris	Woodhouse
Fisher	Morrison	Worley
Flood	Moulder	Yates
Fogarty	Multer	Young
Forand	Murdock	Zablocki
Frazier	Murray, Tenn.	
Fugate	Noland	
Furcolo	Norrell	

NOT VOTING—15

Allen, Calif.	Hobbs	Rees
Bulwinkle	Jacobs	Sasscer
Burdick	Lemke	Simpson, Pa.
Durham	Macy	Smith, Ohio
Gilmer	Murphy	Vursell

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Lemke against.

Mr. Macy for, with Mr. Burdick against.

Mr. Smith of Ohio for, with Mr. Murphy against.

Mr. Allen of California for, with Mr. Gilmer against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Durham with Mr. Rees.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDING THE RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 133 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That paragraph (2) (c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Committee on Rules shall present to the House reports concerning rules, joint rules, and order of business, within three legislative days of the time when ordered reported by the committee. If such rule or order is not considered immediately, it shall be referred to the calendar and, if not called up by the Member making the report within seven legislative days thereafter, any member of the Rules Committee may call it up as a question of privilege and the Speaker shall recognize any member of the Rules Committee seeking recognition for that purpose. If the Committee on Rules shall make an adverse report on any resolution pending before the committee, providing for an order of business for the consideration by the House of any public bill or joint resolution, on days when it shall be in order to call up motions to discharge committees it shall be in order for any Member of the House to call up for consideration by the House any such adverse report, and it shall be in order to move the adoption by the House of said resolution adversely reported notwithstanding the adverse report of the Committee on Rules, and the Speaker shall recognize the Member seeking recognition for that purpose as a question of the highest privilege."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, though I am calling up this resolution, it is not my resolution. It is rather a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], to whom I will yield later on, to speak in favor of his resolution. I myself have been and am opposed to it.

Mr. Speaker, when I came to Congress 44 years ago Republican Speaker Cannon was the czar of the House and had the House at his mercy. The country resented Cannon's power. This abuse of power on his part brought about the defeat of the Republican Party. The Democrats, with the aid of the progressive Republicans, took away from the Speaker his great power by liberalizing the rules of procedure under the Norris resolution.

The present unholy alliance formed by the reactionary Democrats and reactionary Republicans on the Committee on Rules is an attempt to emulate and restore that power to the Committee on Rules and again hope to have the House at their mercy.

Because the Committee on Rules is a policy committee, yes a procedural committee, designed to carry out the recommendations of the party in power that is supposed to carry out the mandate of the people, it is composed of eight Members representing the majority and four of the minority. All other legislative committees are composed of a bare majority.

There is an unfortunate condition that exists in the Rules Committee because, as I have stated, three members of the Committee on Rules elected as Democrats on the Democratic ticket in name only, unfortunately vote and gang up with the Republicans, leaving me, the chairman, and the other real Democrats on the committee in a minority. Consequently, the Committee on Rules has been unable to report rules on bills approved by legislative committees and recommended by the President. The majority has been unable to work its will.

In view of this unfortunate situation, the House adopted House Resolution 5 in the first days of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. This was in the interest of orderly procedure and in order to expedite legislation so as to preclude the Committee on Rules from bottling up legislation.

That resolution permits chairmen of various legislative committees to file their own 21-day discharge petition and call their bill up on the floor if the Committee on Rules fails to act.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] and his two other colleagues, in conjunction with the four Republicans, as I pointed out previously, reported out this resolution—House Resolution 133—which will kill and sabotage the rights of committees under the new rule.

Up to now, 33 resolutions have been filed under the new liberalized rule by chairman of legislative committees desirous of availing themselves of their rights. All will be dead if this unfortunate resolution should pass.

The charge that the Committee on Rules is now deprived of all power is erroneous, because in the last session it reported 88 rules and 27 resolutions.

If the committees wish to be deprived of their rights they will vote for the Cox resolution.

If they expect their bills to be acted upon and considered by the House, they must vote against it.

I personally believe that if the existent coalition between the Republicans and the three reactionary Democratic members of the Committee on Rules did not exist, the new 21-day rule would not have been necessary. If these three so-called Democrats would vote as Democrats—owing their allegiance and duty to their party, and not call themselves Democrats in name only, as I said before, the new rule would not have been necessary. The result is that legislation recommended by the President and promised by the Democratic Party could be brought to the floor for consideration by the membership.

I have heard it said that at all times chairmen of committees try to gain more and more power. That is not true in my case, and will never be true. I believe that the membership should not be deprived of voting on any and all legislation approved and reported by committees after full and complete hearings and consideration. I have been a member of the Committee on Rules for 20 years, and chairman for 10 years. During all those years I have at all times endeavored to safeguard the interests of the membership and of the country.

I have been greatly encouraged in my position against the Cox resolution by reason of the whole-hearted support from the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the railway labor unions, other labor organizations, and many civic and veterans' organizations, all of whom strongly protested any change in the rules of the House.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I feel that our present rule should remain in force, unchanged, in order to provide orderly procedure and expedite the business of the House. The Cox resolution should be defeated.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for the purpose of offering an amendment at this time?

Mr. SABATH. I am sorry I cannot yield to my colleague, a member of the Rules Committee, for that purpose.

Mr. DELANEY. Will the gentleman yield for the purpose of permitting me to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, it was my intention, had I been recognized, to offer an amendment to this resolution to correct the abuses that have existed and will exist regardless of whether or not the Cox resolution is adopted or defeated. Prior to the enactment of the 21-day rule abuses existed in the Committee on Rules, in that six men were able to prevent the Congress of the United States from deciding important issues necessary to the welfare and well-being of the people of the United States. This abuse was widely recognized. Therefore, on the opening day of the Eighty-first Congress, January 3, 1949, a resolution was offered in the House calling for the adoption of a 21-day rule, the rule which this resolution seeks to repeal. Prior to this first session of the Eighty-first Congress the members of the Democratic Party in caucus pledged themselves to support this change. Since then new and unforeseen abuses were born, namely, the action of chairmen of committees to circumvent the Committee on Rules by taking advantage of the newly created 21-day rule.

I supported the motion at the time because I considered it a proper corrective measure. What actually happens is this: Upon a bill being reported out of committee, a discharge petition is filed simultaneously with the application for a rule. If for any reason the Committee on Rules fails to act or report, the bill is called up by the chairman and brought before the House, thus circumventing the Committee on Rules, whose duty it is to regulate legislative traffic.

Every bill reported out of a legislative committee has some merit. The committee members reporting a bill, being enthused about their own duties and

cognizant of the need of such legislation, feel they are justified in pressing for a vote on the floor of the House. It is obviously popular to vote for these bills. All committees report out bills far in excess of the greatest amount that could possibly be allocated under our budgetary system of government; therefore, Congress can lose balance and spending goes unbridled.

It is necessary to make corrections and the beginning of the session is the best time to do this. Some check must be made upon the power of chairmen of committees reporting bills to call up any number of bills involving untold amounts. For example, in the Eightieth Congress bills calling for expenditures of $20,000,000,000 were held up by the Committee on Rules. At the close of the first session of this Congress, before many of the chairmen realized their ability to call up bills by getting them out of committee early, there remained in the Committee on Rules bills calling for expenditures of about $9,000,000,000. Under the 21-day rule, these bills can be called up merely by application for discharge petition. While I do not deem it possible to balance the budget exactly, I cannot approve unbridled spending, particularly when it is conceded that the amount of the deficit will be $5,000,000,000 as it now stands.

Various motives have been ascribed to members of the Committee on Rules for the way they voted on amending the 21-day rule. I want it to be known that my sole purpose was to correct a bad situation. One of the charges made is that this change would block a civil-rights program. I am unequivocally for civil rights.

I intend to follow the line I have always pursued in fighting and voting for civil rights and other liberal measures. All this week I worked and fought to bring the civil-rights program before Congress.

When FEPC reaches the floor I will vote for it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I ask unanimous consent that I may have the right to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my colleague the gentleman from Illinois, former chairman of the Rules Committee, for a short time, fortunately, 30 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the issue before us is a most important one. It is much bigger than the FEPC, which is of so much concern to my liberal friends. The issue is whether or not the entire Truman socialistic program will succeed or be defeated. I refer especially to the socialization of medicine and the socialistic Brannan farm plan. Of course there are about 10 others.

Please understand me. I know well—and the social schemers also know—that the American people, that the Congress of the United States would not knowingly accept socialism all in one dose. They know it must come piecemeal and sugar-coated. That is why those people who want to make America over are opposed to this resolution. But remember that you cannot go halfway over Niagara Falls in a rowboat. Neither can you believe in being half-socialistic. It is eventually all socialism or all self-individualism, self-reliance, and free private enterprise.

I have been on the Rules Committee for many years. It is not the easiest job in the world. We have all been attacked by these so-called liberals, liberal writers, liberal commentators, and liberal organizations. That makes no difference to me, nor to the majority of the membership on the Rules Committee. We have our job to do—and with your help, we will do it.

I do not intend to infer that more than a few of you want a total socialistic nation. But I do say this—that there are but few of you who know the overall picture regarding the multitude of bills reported by the various standing committees—each one harmless in itself, but in aggregate detrimental and ruinous to our country. I know that you would not accept all of the proposed socialistic bills all in one dose—but the plan is to bring them in one at a time. Therein lies the danger.

Some will say this country is headed for socialism. I will go further and say—we are not headed for it—we are in it right now. You ask why. To you I would say that if I believed in socialism, the first two things I, as a Socialist, would want the Government to control would be the credit and the power of the Nation. Today the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks are completely dominated by the Government. Add the RFC and 30-odd other governmental agencies, and you must admit the Government controls the credit of this Nation. Next to credit, electrical power is of great importance. Today, through the TVA and other power units, the Government controls over 15 percent of our electrical power. You say we are but headed for socialism?

During the Eightieth Congress I was chairman of the Rules Committee. During that Congress the various standing committees of the House, in good faith, reported bills totaling over $67,000,000,000. All of these bills had some merit—sufficient merit in my opinion that if they should have been immediately reported piecemeal by the Rules Committee most of them would have passed the House of Representatives. We continually discussed this phase in the Rules Committee and agreed that we just could not let out all of these bills, even though we knew we would be severely criticized. The result—we were criticized, but during the first session of the Eightieth Congress we were in the black approximately $2,000,000,000, and in the second session of the same Congress we had a surplus of $8,000,000,000.

We changed the rule at the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress, and what has happened? Even though we had the second highest income in history, we went in the red, and next year all predict that we will go in the red by at least $5,000,000,000. I will go further than that—if we do not adopt this rule, you will go into the red over $10,000,000,000 this year, even though we will again have one of the highest incomes in history. Think of it—an income of $40,000,000,000, at peace, and still running in the red. What will we do should our income drop? Think of it—not being able to make ends meet with a $40,000,000,000 income. Do you realize that all the farm lands, all the farm equipment, all the farm stock in the United States totals less than $40,000,000,000—that you can purchase every home in the United States for less than $40,000,000,000? Still it costs more than $40,000,000,000 to operate our Government.

I want to speak briefly to my Republican colleagues.

Like yourselves, I went home last fall and promised my people I was against "me-tooism," the proposed socialistic program, and for economy. Is there any Republican who will deny that they did not do just that? This resolution gives you the opportunity. Your people will be watching. Make no mistake about that.

My district of northwestern Illinois is similar to most of your districts—outside of large cities—west of the Alleghenies. Years ago our ancestors went West by boat, by covered wagon, to a wilderness. They knew they had to work or starve. They worked, both men and women. As a result of their hard work, perseverance, individuality, Americanism, and frugality, we now have beautiful homes, fertile farms, and productive factories. Yes, these are the splendid monuments to their memory. Today we are attempting to dissipate these inheritances by scattering billions of dollars to the four winds, by fostering cradle-to-the-grave security for everybody whether or not they be able to take care of themselves. We are forgetting their American ideals which made America great and which is the only thing that can keep it great. We, instead, have saddled our children with a debt which will never be paid, if we continue much longer to spend more than we receive. We have already saddled them with a degree of socialism, which will take generations to eliminate.

So I say to you that we have a responsibility. I emphasize that if we adopt this resolution, we will put the brakes on those who love socialism and gigantic spending. It is crystal clear. Otherwise, those who desire that sort of thing, would not be so anxious to have this resolution defeated. Is not that the answer?

You remember that story of over a century and a half ago. They were writing the Constitution of the United States at Philadelphia. As Benjamin Franklin was leaving the meeting, the mob in the street called: "Franklin, what are you trying to give us?" He turned and scornfully replied: "A republic—if you can keep it."

My colleagues, that is the challenge. Do you for a moment believe that the left-wingers would be opposed to this resolution if they thought they could get their socialistic program easier with its adoption? Of course not.

I ask you to vote for this resolution.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] has laid down the issue; and I could think that I saw my friend, my dear friend from Georgia [Mr. COX] wince when he laid it down: Whether or not the program of the successful party in the last campaign is going to be sabotaged. That is what he said in so many words. Who won the election in 1948, anyhow?

What party came again in control of the Senate of the United States and of the House of Representatives? I thought that after the campaign of 1948 no Republican would have the temerity to compare the Eightieth Congress with any other Congress that ever sat in the history of America.

We have the issue here. The gentleman from Illinois made it very clear as to why the Republicans are going to support this rule. The reason is: They can take four Republican members of the Committee on Rules and if they can get two Democratic members of the Committee on Rules to vote with them, no rule making in order any program of this administration can come before the House for consideration. That is the issue.

There is a lot of talk here about civil rights being involved in this matter. As far as I am concerned, there is no element of the civil-rights program involved in the rules as they exist today and, as, in my opinion, they should exist. The rules of a legislative body should be such at all times as to allow the majority of a legislative body to work its will. Under our present set-up, I am sorry to say, that is not the case in many instances.

When a legislative committee of the House of Representatives has labored long and honestly, and by overwhelming majority brings in a bill and reports it to the House, and it asks for the privilege of being granted the right to try their case before the elected representatives of the people of the United States, there should be something in the rules of the House, regardless of one other committee which is not a legislative committee, allowing the House to work its will on that bill.

That is the issue here and I do trust that the membership of the House in their wisdom will leave the rules of the House as they are so that a majority of the House of Representatives on any and all occasions may have the opportunity to register its will.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much misrepresentation of the issue before us that I think it is time we attempt to clarify the situation. Left-wing columnists, news reporters, and radio commentators have been telling the country that a vote for a change in the rules will be a vote against all civil-rights legislation. The radical elements and organizations of the United States have been screaming the same propaganda. That is not true. Here is the truth:

The Truman administration and the Democratic leadership of this House could have had a vote on FEPC and other civil-rights legislation on at least a dozen different occasions during the past 6 or 7 months. Last summer Chairman LESINSKI of the Labor Committee filed a request with the Rules Committee for a rule on the FEPC bill. He also filed a resolution under the 21-day rule. Many times last session I personally asked Chairman SABATH of the Rules Committee when he was going to hold a hearing on FEPC. Finally, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] did appear before the Rules Committee and stated he did not want a hearing at that time, giving as his excuse that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], the chairman of the subcommittee having FEPC in charge, was not available, and promising he would notify the committee when he was ready for a hearing.

Later we learned an arrangement had been made whereby if a gag rule on the social-security legislation were voted by the Rules Committee, no civil-rights legislation would be considered by the House during the remainder of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. Within an hour or so after the gag rule was voted, the President, at a White House conference, announced that no civil-rights legislation would be considered during the remainder of last year's session.

No attempt was ever made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] or the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] to call up FEPC legislation under the 21-day rule last year. Before the Rules Committee last week the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], in his usual honest and frank way, admitted publicly that such a deal had been made. So the only reason why FEPC is even being discussed here today is because the Truman administration which has been giving lip service to civil-rights legislation, made a deal to shunt aside its consideration during last year's session of this Congress.

Let me call attention to the fact that in the Seventy-ninth Congress the four Republican members of the Rules Committee voted many times to send an FEPC bill to the floor for consideration, although some of us did reserve the right to vote for amendments to it. Only two Democratic members of the Rules Committee voted in favor of such a rule, although there were eight Democrats on the committee.

Let me also remind you that during the many years I have served on the Rules Committee of the House, there has never been a single time when the Speaker of the House, whether he be Democrat or Republican, has requested the Rules Committee to grant a rule on any legislation that such a rule was not granted. To my knowledge the great Speaker now occupying the chair has never requested the Rules Committee for a rule on the pending FEPC bill. If he had done so, I presume the rule would have been granted. Let me also remind you that the majority in this House can always work its will, and that no committee, including the Rules Committee, can hold up any legislation which the majority of this House wants to vote upon.

The real issue before us is not FEPC but rather whether we are going to open the way for enactment of all sorts of wasteful, socialistic legislation.

So let me say to my colleagues: If this resolution fails, the floodgates will be opened to pour in onto the floor of this House all sorts of wild, wasteful, socialistic legislation, which most of us know is bad legislation, yet which the Truman administration may be able to force through by means of political promises and with the aid of the pressure groups in this country.

Let no Member of this House make any mistake. If he follows the "me too" policy and votes with the left-wing element in this House, and with the Truman administration, as against the leadership of his own party, in opposition to the adoption of this resolution, he will be voting for waste and extravagance, for deficit spending, and for higher taxes. And I fear it will be charged he is just as responsible for the financial ruin and socialization of this country as any radical exponent of the New Deal philosophy. There may be those who will forever brand him as a "me too" follower of President Truman and the New Deal, the servant of the special interests and the pressure groups. I hope such a situation will never come to pass.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, it indeed will be a tragic retrogression of our democratic legislative processes if this so-called Cox resolution is adopted. I hope that the House will reject this unnecessary and unpopular backward movement to restore unlimited power to the Rules Committee. That power existed before the convening of the Eighty-first Congress.

During the last half century this Congress has adopted two great progressive improvements in its legislative procedure. The first was the uprising led by former Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, against the autocratic domination of former Speaker Joseph Cannon in 1909. Up to that time the Speaker of the House was an absolute czar and dictated all legislation which could be considered by the membership. Up until the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress, a year ago this month, a majority of the 12-member Rules Committee held almost dictatorial power as to what legislation could be considered by the 435 Members of this House. The change in the rules, adopted on the 3d day of January 1949, placed the legislative processes of the Congress closer to the American people than ever before. Had it not been for this important change, several important bills which were passed by the last Congress would

not have been considered on the floor of this House.

Since the beginning, our Government, and particularly our Congress, has operated under the two-party system. Every 4 years, at our national conventions, our two major parties adopt platforms which they ask the people to accept or reject at the polls. The party which wins the Presidency and the majority of Members in the Congress is duty-bound to carry out the platform which the people ratified.

The 435 Members of Congress are also duty-bound to respond to the will of the people on matters of legislation. It is undemocratic that a committee of 12 Members of Congress, known as the Rules Committee, should be given the power to pigeonhole or hold up legislation that has been ratified by the people and favorably reported out of one of the other standing committees of the House. By holding up legislation, a majority of the 12 members of the Rules Committee can thus deny the remaining 423 Members of the House an opportunity to debate, amend, and vote on legislation which the House committee has already passed upon favorably.

For years we have had the undemocratic spectacle of a coalition between Republican members and certain Democratic members of the Rules Committee divert progressive administration measures into the legislative graveyard.

The amendment to the rules adopted last year has worked in the interest of all progressive-thinking Members and has received the editorial endorsement of the vast majority of American newspapers of both parties.

The New York Times had this to say in their editorial of January 14:

> It is odd that seven members of the House Rules Committee should be able to veto measures possibly desired by a majority of the House of Representatives and a majority of the 48,489,000 voters who went to the polls in November of 1948. Such, however, may sometimes be the case. This is a point at which our democracy is still imperfect and needs attention.

The adoption of this rule change today will be a body blow at not only the President's civil-rights program, but it will curtail the great progressive program which the American voters demanded in November of 1948 when they rejected the reactionary record of the Eightieth Congress and ratified the platform of the Democratic Party. My friends on the Republican side of the House should realize that there must be some reason why the American people have rejected the Republican Party in five successive Presidential elections. My Republican friends should realize that if they vote for the adoption of the Cox amendment today that they are again serving notice on the American voters that their party is under the domination of special privilege and believes that a small minority of Congress should dictate legislation. In other words, repeated failures at the polls during the last 15 years has not taught the leaders of the once-great GOP that the American people are demanding that the voters have something to say about their Government.

Public opinion very emphatically, in November of 1948, placed its stamp of disapproval on the unholy political alliance of the reactionaries in both parties. That unnatural political alliance was the No. 1 reason for the failure of the Republican Eightieth Congress to secure the endorsement of the people. The Republican Members who support the Cox resolution today will reveal that they have not profited by past election defeats, but will continue on to further election failures by reason of their disregard of American public opinion and the will of the majority.

I hope the Cox resolution is defeated overwhelmingly.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be justifiable at this time for me to give to my colleagues of the House a description of the origin of this movement in the Committee on Rules which finally resulted in its making, by a vote of 9 to 2, this recommendation that the rules should be changed.

On or about June 12, 1949, in an executive session of the Committee on Rules, some one member, and I am quite sure that my recollection is correct that it was a Democratic member, called our attention to the fact that the trend of legislation as we could see it, sitting on either side of our table, was most significant and in a way most alarming.

At that time a tip had come to us that on June 30, 2 weeks later, we might expect a deficit in the Federal Treasury of about $1,200,000,000. On June 30 the information was given to the press and to the country that the deficit was $1,800,000,000. It was then thoroughly understood and since then confirmed that the deficit in the Treasury for the next succeeding year, that is, the year we are now living in, would be at least $5,000,000,000.

We were deeply concerned about this matter. We had no one particular bill in mind. This was long before the FEPC had been brought up to the committee. We were so deeply concerned that by unanimous agreement we asked the Legislative Information Service, headed by Mr. Dixon, to keep the committee informed from time to time, say once in 2 weeks, as to the trend of legislation which, if enacted, would increase the future financial commitments of the Government of the United States. We asked that Information Service to tell us, for example, the amount of money in the way of additional commitments which had been authorized by bills that had already passed both Houses containing additional authorizations and commitments, including the appropriations bills; by bills that had passed one House and not the other House; bills passed by the House but still in the Senate, and bills passed in the Senate but still in the House; bills which had been reported by a standing committee of the House or a standing committee of the Senate; and bills for which standing committees had advertised important public hearings. Those were bills which, if enacted, would increase the future financial commitments of the Government.

We reached the conclusion that something should be done because obviously the condition was becoming chaotic. We finally learned that if all the bills for Federal aid for this and subsidies for that and additional commitments and contract authorizations then on the legislative conveyor belt should pass, not counting the Marshall-aid program, and not counting the military-aid program in western Europe, if all those other bills should pass, the annual obligation financially of the Federal Government would be increased by $9,000,000,000.

And the bills came pouring in on us—pouring over from the Senate, pouring out of our own standing committees—bill after bill. The trouble is, of course, that under the present rule it is utterly impossible for the standing committees of the House to get together and estimate what the aggregate of their proposals may be—what effect they will have upon the finances and economic condition of the country.

For 40 or 50 years that job was left to the Committee on Rules because only to that committee came all the bills. That committee could sit there and watch the trend and make its recommendations in one form or another—to the effect that we would better go slow in this direction, because we are going too far and going too fast.

That is the origin of this request from the Committee on Rules. There is no other element involved. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] introduced his resolution in March of 1949. As it is today, I can say to you in all candor that the legislative condition in the House is chaotic—absolutely chaotic. Outside of the membership of the Committee on Rules I dare say there is not a Member on the floor, including the chairmen of the several standing committees, who can tell us just how fast and how far we are going in the matter of Government expenditures.

All the old rule did was to permit the Committee on Rules to screen, as it were, this great multitude of requests for future commitments—that is all.

Two hundred and eighteen Members could take a bill away from us by signing a petition; and if we would only use Calendar Wednesday, the standing committees would have Wednesdays to call up bills which they have reported and which are upon the calendar.

This is a very serious matter. As a member of the Rules Committee, the Lord knows I am not hungering for the exercise of power, and I do not know of any of the other 11 members who hungers for it. To be candid with you, service on the Committee on Rules is an utterly thankless job. You get no thanks. You are pulled and pushed, hauled and mauled, day after day, mostly by organized minority groups, who flood our mails with demands that their particular pet project be given preferential consideration by the House, and without the slightest regard for the future of our country. But, in a body as large as this, some group must strive to keep our house in order or else—chaos.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise from the Republican side to speak against Resolution 133. The reason I speak is that I think each Member represents his own district and has the right to vote on every major issue that comes before this Congress.

I believe that the Rules Committee should not be a legislative committee, which dams the flow, as the gentleman from New York has said, not only of the House bills but also the flood of bills from the Senate, which this group of 12 men do not want to reach a public vote.

The Rules Committee of the House was changed from the position of a legislative committee to its proper function of a procedural or scheduling committee in this Congress, and 49 Republicans voted for that change.

As one of the Republicans in the Teddy Roosevelt tradition, I am very proud of it, I voted that way. As one of the Republicans maintaining that tradition, I hope that any other Republicans who feel that way will be free to interrupt me and say the same thing.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I support the gentleman's position. This is a question of fundamental constitutional freedom to act in the legislative branch of the Government and is not a question of action on any particular bill. I do not believe that any Member of the Congress needs to be told whether he may or may not vote on an issue which has gone through the screening of the appropriate standing legislative committee. There is an ingrained attachment among the American people for making one's position clearly known especially when there is a difficult decision to be made, and this belief is one of the fundamental bases for our freedom. This proposition should certainly apply to us as legislators. I feel that in voting against this resolution I am acting in that typically American tradition.

Mr. FULTON. I am sorry there is not time for the ones I see standing. May I close by saying that this is not a partisan matter, but is one of basic democracy in each Congressman representing the people in each of the districts of this country. Each Representative should meet the issues squarely, be recorded publicly for all to see, and each should be willing to take his full responsibility, instead of having major decisions made by arrangements between minorities of the members on the Rules Committee, excellent though their service might be.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I believe this is one of the most important issues that I have ever voted on in the 12 years I have been in Congress.

In opposing this retrogressive change back to the old, absolute power of the Rules Committee, I am more sure that I am right than on any other issue I have voted on in 12 years.

I am amazed at the argument made in favor of the change back to the gagging of the sovereign representatives of the people of this country. Do we not trust ourselves? Must we have a group of 12 men on the Rules Committee to protect myself against myself, or you from yourself?

Must we say to the people of this country who have elected you Congressmen to represent them here that you men whom they send here cannot be trusted with the safety and security of their country?

Who are these irresponsible people that these 12 committee men are trying to protect the country from? Here we are, the Democratic Party; and you, the Republican Party, because you have quite a membership in this Congress too.

This is not an issue of FEPC and must not be confused with it. This issue so far transcends anything of that nature that it is of no use even to discuss that issue compared with this basic question of preserving our system of representative government.

The men who wrote the Constitution in Philadelphia intended that the people should have the power in this Government, and they made us, the Congress, the people's branch. Yet now they are trying to take that power from the people's branch, the branch to which the Constitution gave more power than any other. This resolution would remove the powers from the 435 Members of Congress and give it to 12 men, who in star-chamber session would decide on the issues upon which Congress can vote.

All of our committees in this Congress are coequal, and no one created a supercommittee to veto the action of a coequal standing committee. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that I have almost seen red as the great chairman of my own committee has gone before the Committee on Rules—and you members of other committees have seen this, too—and has been treated far worse than any lobbyist would be treated in the standing committees.

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue that the people understand; every college student, yes, every high school student understands what the gag rule of the Rules Committee means in the House of Representatives just as they understand what a filibuster means in the Senate.

The other body is to be credited at least with having to work hard on the floor of that body to prevent legislation from coming up to a vote over there. This resolution would do it the easy way, we would have a committee to protect this Membership, the sovereign representatives of the people of this country, from going on record.

Maybe Congress is irresponsible sometimes; if we are—this is not the way to correct it. The way to correct the evil of which my distinguished and honorable colleague from New York spoke is for the individual Members of this Congress to accept the grave responsibilities their constituents place on the people's branch.

There are no Reds in favor of this resolution; the Reds are not interested in defeating this rule. Top-level organizations that have supported the strengthening of the people's branch of Government, the reorganization of Congress, were emphatic and determined in the stand that you could not have a good, effective Congress unless you repealed the obsolete, antiquated system of control by the Committee on Rules.

Do not vote yourselves back into being bound and gagged and delivered to the control of the Rules Committee of this House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] the proponent of this resolution.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, in bringing this resolution here for consideration I do so without fear of punishment or hope of reward. For me there is nothing selfish about it. Any glamour that may have once attached to being a Member of this great body has for me long since passed. It is to the public welfare, and to the public welfare alone, that I subordinate every other consideration. I do not deem it to be particularly important that any Member of this body retain his seat; but I do know it to be of tremendous importance, Mr. Speaker, that while here he maintain the courage to do right and that he labor unceasingly for the public good.

Mr. Speaker, as redecorated, this is a beautiful Chamber in which we assemble. But I would make one addition. I would nail over every entrance to it the sign "Stop, look, and listen."

From my recent visit home I came back here wishing to take some cognizance of the worry which the people of the country are undergoing. I wish to take some recognition of the state of public opinion. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that public opinion is demanding of this body that it plant its feet upon solid ground and that Members keep their eyes upon the Flag.

When this House adopted the 21-day rule, it took the governor off the legislative engine, which has since been running wild. This resolution, Mr. Speaker, is merely an attempt to put them back on in the interest of orderly and responsible legislative procedure.

Mr. Speaker, it is not true, as has been asserted, that the adoption of this resolution would stymie the President's program; it is not true, Mr. Speaker, that the adoption of this resolution would check the progress of bills reported by the legislative committees of this House. Going back to the old rule under which the Rules Committee operated up until January a year ago is not retrogression. This rule to which we propose to return is a rule that was adopted by a Democratic House in 1931 after the Democrats came into power. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that that rule was made more

stringent than the rule previously existing. It was provided in that rule that it would take a majority of the membership of this House to discharge the Rules Committee, whereas previously a lesser number was sufficient.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make this statement, which may or may not be astounding to many: There has never been a time when the present Speaker of this body, or his predecessor, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], made request of the Rules Committee for a rule on any bill but what the request was honored, and I now call upon both to witness the accuracy of this statement.

This resolution should be adopted or else the Committee on Rules abolished.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of talk here about gagging, and not allowing Members of the House to work their will. Last year before the session opened the Democrats in caucus agreed to change the rules, and bound the members of the caucus to support the new rules as adopted in that caucus. Then what happened? The Republicans learned about it by reading the press. The Republicans had no caucus scheduled, but the policy committee of the Republicans on this side of the aisle met to discuss what they should do and the position they should take with regard to the change of the rules. That committee authorized me, as a member, to bring before the full membership of this House an amendment to the rule governing Calendar Wednesday so as to stop any filibustering on that day, and to make it possible on that day, in accordance with our standing rules, for any committee chairman, as his turn was called, to bring up any matter that had been approved by his committee without regard to any action of the Committee on Rules. What happened? When we got on the floor of this House the chairman of the Committee on Rules moved that the House adopt the rules of the previous session with certain amendments. The amendments were read. Then the chairman of the Committee on Rules moved the previous question. We were debarred by that motion from even discussing the implication of this rule. We were debarred from offering any amendment. Here is the amendment in my hand as it came to me from the Speaker's desk, as it was returned to me, because I was not allowed to offer it.

If you talk about a gag rule, if you talk about shutting a minority off so that they have no voice whatever in how this House is run, then go back to the procedure that was offered here. In my opinion it was an outrageous method of pretending, in the guise of liberalism, to use the most drastic gag method that was ever adopted on the floor of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the resolution offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]. I think all of the members of the Committee on Rules, regardless of what you may think about its membership, do not enjoy their service on that committee. It is a very difficult, arduous, and unpopular job. The Democratic Party has twice as many members on that committee as the Republicans have. I think we should go back to our orderly procedure, and then on Calendar Wednesday allow the committee chairmen to bring up bills that they may not have gotten a rule on from the Committee on Rules. That would be orderly procedure.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RULES COMMITTEE GRAB FOR POWER THREATENS REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the Eighty-first Congress it was decided that a majority of the 435 Members of this body have the intelligence and the fortitude to decide whether or not they want to take up for debate a bill reported by a standing committee of the House.

The principle then agreed upon is about as revolutionary as our Constitution and just as basic as that historic document to American principles of representative government.

I wonder how many Members really believe that they were authorized by the people of their districts to abdicate their legislative responsibilities to a little group of six or seven members in the Committee on Rules.

Of course, without effective organization and procedures the Congress cannot do its job. But never should the rules be used as an obstruction to the legislative process.

During the first session, under the 21-day rule, the Committee on Rules exercised its proper function of scheduling the priority of bills reported by the other committees. In those few instances in which the Rules Committee did not act within 21 days, the chairman of the committee reporting a bill could obtain recognition from the Speaker to call up the measure.

Much has been said about the desirability of protecting the Members of the House from the embarrassment of voting on controversial legislation. It has been suggested that the Committee on Rules, consisting of Members who do not embarrass easily, can more appropriately serve as the watchdog of the Treasury than can the 43 members of the great Committee on Appropriations.

It was a famous Republican Speaker who observed "The committee is the eye, the ear, the hand, and very often the brain, of the assembly." If this was so in 1895, how much greater must be the responsibility of the legislative committees in passing upon the heavy volume of legislation that we have today.

The House necessarily must rely heavily upon the committees which, after full hearings, discussions, and deliberations favorably report a piece of legislation. The 21-day rule recognizes the important role of the committee by providing a detour, in the discretion of the committee chairman, whenever confronted by the undemocratic and autocratic usurpation of power by the Committee on Rules.

The Rules Committee has often considered and discussed the substantive merits of legislation at its hearings on applications for special orders. It has the right to do this only in the case of resolutions proposing changes in the rules of the House, over which it has primary jurisdiction. But there is nothing in the rules of this House which authorizes this committee, in considering the order of business, to review or pass judgment upon the content of bills coming from the legislative committees of the House.

This view of the authority of the Rules Committee was succinctly stated to the House by a former chairman of that committee, Bertrand H. Snell, Republican, New York. Mr. Snell, then chairman of Rules, told the House on January 31, 1931:

> Never by one single paragraph in the House Manual, not by a single sentence or a single word, as far as I know, has this House ever given the Rules Committee any substantive power to control legislation. It has not given the Rules Committee any substantive power to defeat legislation. * * * The Rules Committee is not a legislative committee. It is very largely a procedure committee. * * * The function of the Rules Committee * * * is to act in harmony with the majority sentiment of the majority of the House. * * * If the Rules Committee should start absorbing authority over legislative committees of this House, there would be real reason for the House rebelling against the authority of the Rules Committee. * * * We have never tried to dictate to legislative committees, and if we did try it, there would be real reason for criticizing the members of the Rules Committee.

At about the same time, Representative Charles R. Crisp, of Georgia, attacked the House Committee on Rules in a notable address on January 26, 1931.

If the Rules Committee is to hold hearings and review the merits of all bills reported by the other committees, then we might just as well abolish the other committees.

Mr. Speaker, I have always been a champion of FEPC and recognize its great importance. But far beyond the importance of the pending measures against which this grab for power is ostensibly directed is the question whether a few Members shall be able to block the will of the majority. I repeat, regardless of party or of the stand of a Member on any particular bill, how can any sincere believer in the democratic process vote to abdicate his responsibility to the people he represents?

Mr. Speaker, if a majority of the 435 Members of the House cannot be entrusted with the decision whether a given piece of legislation shall be taken up for debate, then I am afraid that government of the people, by the people, and for the people cannot long endure.

FURTHER ARGUMENTS AGAINST REPEAL OF 21-DAY RULE

First. It would restore to the Rules Committee the power to block bills, favorably reported by other committees, from consideration by the House.

Second. It would enable the Rules Committee to issue "gag" rules, drastically curtailing debate, prohibiting amendments on the floor, and waiving points of order.

Third. It would substitute minority rule by six or seven Rules Committee men for rule by a majority of the House.

Fourth. In recent years the Rules Committee has denied rules for the floor consideration of a score of important bills, including the following:

Pace parity bill: Seventy-eighth Congress.

Bulwinkle railroad bill: Seventy-eighth Congress.

FEPC bill: Seventy-ninth to Eighty-first Congresses.

Minimum-wage bill: Seventy-ninth Congress.

Housing and slum clearance: Eightieth Congress.

Universal military training: Eightieth Congress.

Spanish-American and Civil-War pensions: Eightieth Congress.

VA payments on cars for disabled veterans: Eightieth Congress.

Kefauver bill to amend Clayton Act: Eightieth Congress.

National Science Foundation bill: Eighty-first Congress.

Participation in international organizations: Eighty-first Congress.

Fifth. Like filibustering in the Senate, dictation by the Rules Committee of the House nullifies democratic processes and the principle of majority rule. There were many cases before 1949 in which a bill, which was bottled up in the Rules Committee, would have passed the House if it could have been brought to a vote.

Sixth. Outnumbered and outargued, some southern Members of this body appear to be unwilling to yield to the force of logic and to majority rule. Instead, they seek refuge in political chicanery and parliamentary tricks. They make much of keeping gentlemen's agreements, but they are unwilling to abide by the decisions of our party caucus.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress the Democratic caucus approved and the House adopted the rules of the Eightieth Congress, with an amendment, which amendment it is now proposed to repeal. It has been asserted that Democrats are bound by the caucus to oppose the pending amendment. I believe that position to be untenable.

The caucus did bind the Democrats to support the rules. The rules with the amendment were adopted. They may be amended. After the lapse of a year the appropriate committee of the House has submitted an amendment, respecting which there has been no Democratic caucus. If those who contend that the Democrats are bound by the caucus are correct, it would mean that the rules of the House, once adopted, could never be amended during the entire session. I maintain that such a position is unsound.

Aside from the merits of the pending amendment, the advocates of the so-called civil-rights program, and especially of the FEPC bill that has been reported, have maneuvered the Members of the House into the position where we are confronted, so to speak, with a condition and not a theory. The advocates of FEPC oppose the amendment and they have repeatedly stated that the opponents of FEPC are in favor of the amendment. The country will thus construe the vote on the pending amendment. I oppose the FEPC and similar legislation. I, therefore, will vote for the pending amendment to the Rules of the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, at the very beginning of the first session in the present Congress, this House made one of the most fundamental and far-reaching reforms in its history. The power of the Rules Committee to sidetrack or bury legislation which did not happen to meet with the approval of the committee members was drastically modified by changing the rules in order to permit the chairman of any legislative committee to call up bills after a lapse of a 21-day period.

The benefits of that change in rules were very soon apparent. It became possible for the House to pass an anti-poll-tax bill and the minimum-wage bill, as well as several other pieces of important social legislation.

In addition, the Rules Committee was persuaded by this possible curb to act favorably on housing and other vital measures.

The proposal now pending to restore the Rules Committee to its former position where it can block important legislation has been appropriately titled in a recent newspaper editorial, "Back to the Graveyard." If this body abrogates its decision taken 1 year ago and permits the former rule to be reinstated, this will be a graveyard for the rest of the Fair Deal program; it will be a graveyard for the hopes and aspirations of the American people who have entrusted us with the great responsibility of writing the Fair Deal program into law.

Civil-rights legislation is at issue here but it is not the only issue. This is an issue which our Republican friends and others who are constrained to follow them have attempted to confuse. Let us be very clear and definite about what we are doing here.

The facts are in. The issue is crystal clear. If we are to continue our fight for progress this proposal must be defeated.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress, in January 1949, I voted for a change in the rules to permit House consideration of any bill which had been pending before the Rules Committee for 21 days without action being taken. At the time I felt it to be in accordance with democratic principles to permit a vote on major issues. However, a year's experience has proven that it is of minor value in securing such consideration. On the other hand, it has resulted in an intolerable condition in the House. The Speaker and the leadership have been deprived of all control of the program and procedure of the House. Pressure groups have assumed control. Any pressure group which can secure favorable consideration by any committee can now secure final favorable action in the House by applying pressure to the chairman of the committee reporting the bill, and such chairman's motion must be entertained by the Speaker.

If this rule is not changed it will bankrupt a Nation already heavily in debt and resorting to deficit financing. Proposals costing no less than $15,000,000,000 are pending or being advocated. If they come to the floor under present rules practically all will pass. I cannot, in good conscience, vote to maintain the present rule.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my emphatic opposition to House Resolution 133. This move on the part of a Rules Committee coalition is a devious attempt to scuttle the whole Fair Deal legislative program. If the resolution is adopted the Rules Committee will become a graveyard where the policies of both political parties and the hopes of the American people will be buried.

This resolution presents the House, I believe, with a fundamental issue. That issue is, Should legislative action be controlled by a majority of the House or by a little group of willful men who sit on the Committee on Rules. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, there can be only one answer to this fundamental question. The Constitution vests the legislative power in this House and in the Senate, not in the committees thereof. To repeal the 21-day rule would be to deny the House its constitutional power to legislate on many of the crucial issues of our time.

Adoption of the 21-day rule in 1949 was a major step forward in eliminating control over the House by a small group of men. To repeal the 21-day rule now would be to restore to the Rules Committee undemocratic and autocratic power to block legislation. It would be a step backward toward oligarchy and away from true representative government. Popular government can only be a reality under a system where the majority of the whole House can make its will prevail.

The sponsors of this resolution seek to justify it with the claim that it will stop many spending measures from reaching the floor of the House. The members of the Rules Committee seem to have delusions of grandeur. They apparently think of themselves as watchdogs of the Treasury. Surely, if any committee of the House is a watchdog of the Treasury, it is the Committee on Appropriations. I imagine that the chairman and the members of the Appropriations Committee must resent this attempt upon the part of the Rules Committee to usurp their watchdog function.

Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come for this House to admonish its Committee on Rules to attend to its own business and not to interfere in the business of the other standing committees of this

body. The Rules Committee should understand that it is an order-of-business committee and that there is nothing in the standing rules of this House which authorizes it to review the substantive merits of measures reported by our legislative committees. When the Rules Committee in its arrogance undertakes to review the substantive content of bills favorably reported by the legislative committees of this Chamber, it is trespassing upon their assigned jurisdiction. Upon what meat do these would-be dictators feed that they have grown so great.

If it be objected, Mr. Speaker, that the Rules Committee affords us a refuge from voting on special-interest legislation or bills backed by powerful minority groups in the country, then my answer is that the House should have the courage to vote down such measures here on the floor, if they are not in the public interest, instead of using the Rules Committee as a shield.

In short, Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to defeat this retrogressive resolution on the ground, first, that it is a denial of the principle of majority rule; and, second, that it is designed to blockade a Fair Deal legislative program which the Democratic Party was chosen by the people to enact.

The central issue of our time is whether government by the few or by the many shall prevail. The controversy over the powers of the Rules Committee is a current manifestation of this world-wide contest of ideas. Last year the dictatorship of a minority in the other body was established by a regressive amendment of its cloture rule. Now the Rules Committee is fighting for the dictatorship of a minority in the House. The effect of these maneuvers is to nullify majority rule and to undermine popular faith in representative government. If this coup d'état is successful, it will mark another milestone in the trend in this country away from democracy and toward totalitarianism.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to raise my voice to protest as strongly as I know how, the present attempt to bring about a dictatorship in this great democratic body.

I was very proud last year, to be able to cast my vote to change the rules so as to permit true democracy to function. It seems strange that in the past, legislation should have been permitted to be bottled up in the Rules Committee, so that the will of a few could control the destinies of this Nation.

It has always been my philosophy of government that the will of the majority should control; that every Representative of the people should be permitted to legislate for the best interests of all—not in committee, but on the floor of Congress.

It also seems strange, indeed, that this attempt to again change the rules should take place right before a vote was expected on FEPC legislation. Do the opponents of FEPC believe that they can thwart the will of the people by this attempt? Do not they realize that all parties have in convention favored FEPC and the passage of other civil-rights bills? Do they think that their dictatorial efforts will prevail? Do they believe also that they will likewise defeat the rest of the Truman Fair Deal program? The answer is a definite "No" because the people spoke in the last election—and they will speak again in no uncertain terms.

These puny efforts are merely temporary. Let us be men enough to face the facts. Legislation should be passed or defeated on its merits, not in committee, but on the floor of the House where all Representatives will have an opportunity to vote as true representatives of the people. We should be ashamed of ourselves to admit our weaknesses and to be afraid to face facts, by resorting to such tactics. These tactics in turn, prevent action on important legislation which is for the best interests of our country. We should be honest enough to come out into the open and put ourselves on record in voting on legislation now before us. We should not resort to underhanded methods to kill off such bills by maneuvers such as we are attempting today.

I trust that we will not go backward, but will act to defeat this attempt to change the House rules, and further that we will make the present House rules even more democratic and workable.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a brief statement. First of all, I must confess that I have a feeling of sadness that the issue of the so-called civil rights has been injected into this question of the proposed change in the rules of the House which would put us back where we were prior to the beginning of this Congress insofar as the method of bringing legislation to the floor of the House is concerned. The injection of that issue has had the effect of completely beclouding the fundamental issue involved. Actually, as I view it, neither the question of civil-rights legislation nor any other specific piece of legislation is involved. I think it reasonably evident that no matter what action the House may take with respect to this proposed rule change, the so-called FEPC bill, in the very nature of things, will in all probability be brought to the floor of the House for consideration before the present session ends. In the first place, like any other piece of legislation reported out by a committee, it can be called up on any Calendar Wednesday without any action on the part of the Rules Committee. In the second place, it can, of course, be petitioned out by a bare majority of 218 signatures on a discharge petition. Consequently any Member who supports the proposal to restore the former power of the Rules Committee to hold up legislation with the expectation that the adoption of this proposal will accomplish his aim is indulging a vain hope and taking a wholly unrealistic view of the true situation.

The fundamental issue involved here, and the only one as I see it, is whether or not the Rules Committee shall be again empowered to deny House consideration of legislation worked out by appropriate legislatives committees and recommended for consideration. It must not be overlooked that before a bill reaches the Rules Committee it has already been considered by the appropriate legislative committee, and already has been recommended for House consideration. The Rules Committee still has an important function in channeling legislation under existing rules, both as to the order in which bills shall be considered and in recommending the type of rule under which consideration is to be had in the House.

As I view it, the present rule does not unduly limit the Rules Committee. A good deal has been said about the damage to the prestige of that committee. And in that connection I ask, What about the prestige of all the legislative committees of the House, whose primary duty it is to conduct hearings and patiently consider over a period of weeks and months various phases of proposed legislation? Must their recommendation that the House consider a bill be subject to absolute veto by the Rules Committee, which has conducted no hearings and which, in the very nature of its work and the great number of requests for rules it must consider, cannot give to the many bills which come to it the thorough study that legislative committees are supposed to give?

As I view it, to so empower the Rules Committee to hold up consideration of bills is to lodge in it an arbitrary power to deny to the membership the right to debate and consider legislation of any and all kinds. We here in this House are the chosen representatives of our people. We are supposed to be able to think and to have the courage to vote according to our best judgment upon all issues that may come up in Congress affecting the interests of our people. I rebel at the thought that we of the House of Representatives have not the courage and forthrightness to perform the fundamental duties that devolve upon us as lawmakers for our people.

Issues are never settled by ignoring their existence nor by refusing to meet them. I believe in democracy and in the democratic process. The very bedrock upon which representative democracy rests is that the people's Representatives in Congress shall meet and insofar as in their power lies resolve the issues that confront the Nation. Only in that way can we retain the faith and the confidence of our people in the Congress of the United States.

We can and will deal with specific legislation when it comes to the floor. Today there is but one thing for us to consider and that is the democratic legislative process. So far as I am concerned, I feel no need for any committee or other device to shield me from the necessity of facing any issue, whether it be FEPC or any other. As a Representative I shall face each piece of legislation as it arises and do my simple duty as I see it. I am opposed to the backward step that the adoption of this resolution would take. A year ago we adopted what I think is a more democratic rule of procedure and until we have had more experience with it it should be retained in the interest of enabling the House to work its will as to what legislation shall be taken up for consideration. I shall not support the

resolution to return us to the old rule and thereby say to the people I represent that I have not the courage to come into the open and take my stand on any bill that may be reported out by a committee of this House.

And as for the suggestion made by several speakers during this debate to the effect that only a powerful Rules Committee can save this Nation from bankruptcy by excessive appropriations, I share no such view. That argument assumes that the majority of us here are so wanting either in intelligence and courage or concern for the welfare of our country that for purpose of expediency or political gain we would vote the Nation into financial ruin. I entertain a higher opinion of the integrity and patriotism of the Members of this House than to subscribe to such a view. If I so believed, I could hardly indulge much hope for the future of this Nation. For, if that is true, then the democratic institutions created by the founding fathers can no longer be trusted to the people who, after all, determine who shall represent them here in the halls of Congress.

In short, if those who entertain such a view are correct, then this democracy as we know it is in grave peril. For surely merely technical rules procedure could not protect the country from a supine, cowardly, and faithless Congress. I have no doubt that I shall find it necessary to oppose as strenuously as I know how some bills that will reach the floor. But I prefer to discharge my responsibility by facing the issue rather than to avail myself of the device that will deny to all Members, as well as myself, the right to consider and support or oppose legislation. I think there has been altogether too much excitement created over the pending measure. Personally, I have an abiding faith in the soundness of our democracy. I believe devoutly not only in the right of the people to rule, but also in their capacity to rule. And it is my honest conviction we can best serve at this moment by retaining our present rule and opposing the proposed change.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, a year ago the Eighty-first Congress, under Democratic Party control, took one of the most forward, progressive steps in over 50 years in Congress when it amended the rules of the House to curb the arbitrary authority assumed by the Rules Committee to gag the membership and prevent consideration of legislation vital to the welfare of the Nation.

Today a coalition of Republicans and others in the House ask us, through this resolution, House Resolution 133, to go backward—a habit, not uncommon to the GOP, and reerect the Rules Committee as an all-powerful group which can completely throttle the will of the majority in this House.

Unwilling to accept the verdict of the people in the November 1948 elections, and in defiance of the wishes of the American people, this group, with the Republican leadership in the vanguard, again seeks power to bottle up important legislation included in the program submitted to Congress by the President of the United States. President Truman sought approval of his program before the electorate. He carried the issues direct to the people. They endorsed the Democratic platform and President Truman's leadership. The President talked plain English in his campaign—there could be no mistaking his position—neither can there be any mistaking the position of the people of the United States as expressed by their votes in 1948.

It is the opponents of the administration's program who have initiated this move to reclaim the old power of dictation for the Rules Committee. They want to be able to throttle bills they do not like—they want to sabotage President Truman's program.

I am confident the majority of the membership in the House will vote against this resolution and will not return the Rules Committee to its former tyrannical position.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the coalition of conservative Republicans and Dixiecrats is determined to reverse the basic principles of representative government. They seek the repeal of the 21-day rule on the grounds that the people should be protected from the representatives they have elected, a doctrine directly opposed to the democratic principles written into the Constitution by our founding fathers.

This unholy coalition would set up its Members on the Rules Committee as a superjury to decide what legislation the people's representatives shall have an opportunity to vote on.

The action is a slap in the face of every Member of Congress who responsibly represents the people of his district, and a slap at the people who have conscientiously cast their votes to elect a Representative to legislate in their behalf.

Hirohito chose the legislation which might be considered by the Japanese Diet.

Hitler ordered the Reichstag to vote on the legislation he favored.

And now the conservative coalition seeks to install that system in our country.

Each Member of Congress is elected by the people of his District as their full-fledged representative in Congress. He is expected to have the intelligence, the courage, and the ethical standards which will enable him to act wisely on any controversial legislative matter which may be presented. If any Representative lacks these qualifications, the people who elected him should know about it. He must not be allowed to crawl behind the private cloak of any group of men because he lacks the moral courage to meet the vital issues of our day.

This move on the part of the coalition supporting the Cox resolution is a step backward to the day when six men, by a secret vote in executive session of the Rules Committee, could and did block legislation of which they personally disapproved. It is a complete denial of the principles of representative government. It is a negation of the theory of representative government because it provides a method whereby men who are public servants can make secret decisions and private deals without the knowledge of their constituents. If there is a time when the Representatives of the people should stand up frankly and fearlessly and declare themselves for the record, it is today. This is absolutely imperative if the people are to retain their faith in democratic processes.

I predict that this unholy coalition will be defeated. The House of Representatives will prove by its vote today that it is still the greatest legislative body on the face of the earth.

Those Representatives who vote to kill this restrictive resolution will justify the faith of the people who elected them. Those who vote to return again to the secrecy procedures heretofore followed by the Rules Committee will have to make an accounting to their people in the next election.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for the defeat of the Cox resolution to preserve our American democracy.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I shall cast my vote in opposition to the proposed change in the rules. If this change were adopted, we would go back to the former system where a small group of 12 men constituting the Rules Committee could effectively block consideration of any legislation which they did not like.

Certainly, under the present rules, there are measures before us to which I am opposed, but in the operation of a democracy it is only right that major bills agreed to by our legislative committees should be given full consideration no matter what our individual feelings on these measures.

Giving the Rules Committee power to pigeon-hole certain controversial legislation would avoid our having to be recorded thereon, but that is not consistent with our duties as legislators.

We owe it to ourselves and the country to allow free and open consideration of legislation by the entire House, not by a small committee of twelve.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to any change of the rules of the House that would give the Rules Committee unlimited jurisdiction to say whether any piece of legislation should come before the House for consideration. Too often in the past when the Rules Committee did have such authority it resulted in legislation which had been reported favorably by a regular committee of the House from coming before the House for a vote. In other words, the Rules Committee substituted its judgment for the regular committee having jurisdiction of the subject legislation.

The unsatisfactory experience that often resulted in this respect led the House last January to adopt a new rule to correct the situation. It provided that in the event the Rules Committee did not within 21 days after receipt of a bill favorably reported by a committee of the House grant a rule to bring the legislation before the House for its consideration, then the chairman of the regular committee reporting the legislation could by motion bring the bill before the House for consideration.

The resolution now before us would take away this right of the chairman to make a motion to discharge the Rules Committee and would thereby leave the Rules Committee with the full jurisdiction to determine what legislation the House should consider and when and

under what circumstances. The action that was taken by this Congress a year ago was a step forward. The action that the House is now asked to take would be a step backward.

If the change now suggested is adopted, it will in effect be a gag rule, as it would enable the Rules Committee to deny members the right of expressing their views on legislation regularly reported fo. the consideration of the Congress. In my opinion this would not be true representative government.

I am strongly of the opinion that when a committee of Congress has studied a subject and reported legislation, then the Members of the House should have the right to vote either for or against the proposed legislation. I do not believe that a small number of members on the Rules Committee should have the right to preclude this.

It has always been my opinion, and I have expressed it many times in the past during my service in the House, that public questions in which our people are interested should be considered and Members of the House given the opportunity to vote their convictions as representatives of the people. I do not believe in gag rule of any kind or character that prevents the membership of the House from expressing by their speeches and their votes what they believe to be right.

Therefore, I will vote against the resolution, now before the House, that would take from the chairmen of the regular committees of the House the right to move the consideration of legislation in the event that the Rules Committee refuses to grant a rule to bring the matter before the House for action.

LET US MOVE FORWARD, NOT BACKWARD

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this resolution for the same reasons that I favored and voted for the change of the rules at the opening of the Eighty-first Congress. The arguments urged in support of this resolution will not withstand analysis. Those who urge that without this rule a flood of socialistic and communistic legislation will be enacted should welcome the opportunity to stand up and be counted against such legislation. Those who urge that enactment of this resolution will give some control over the expenditure of moneys by this Congress know that that cannot be accomplished in this way.

In the first place, it is the duty of every Member and not the Rules Committee to determine what money should be spent, and, in the second place, appropriation bills do not go to the Rules Committee. The very idea that the Rules Committee will sit back and wait until all bills calling for expenditures are submitted to it, and then it can determine which of those bills should be enacted, and then present them to the Congress as a single package, is absurd.

Neither the Rules Committee nor the Congress could ever function if the bills were allowed to pile up in the Rules Committee until it found the time to decide what the House should pass upon and what it should not pass upon. The complete answer, however, to that argument is that it is not the function of the Rules Committee to decide what the House shall pass upon, but merely when it shall be passed upon by the House and how much time should be devoted to the particular matter.

One of the most progressive steps taken by the Congress was the enactment of the amended rule at the beginning of the first session which curbed the power of the Rules Committee.

Let us move forward, not backward.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the argument on the proposed change of the rules. As I understand it, if the proposal of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] is adopted, we will then be operating under the rules that prevailed in the Eightieth and many previous Congresses.

Under the change we made at the commencement of the Eighty-first Congress it is true that much power is granted to the Speaker. I favored the change, and consequently I am going to cast my vote against the resolution.

I recognize that it is a question of balance. We should try to find some way so that the majority may work its will and at the same time not trample too strongly upon the rights of the minority. Also, I think one of the factors involved is just how much power the Rules Committee shall have.

It appears to me that the underlying fallacy in the argument of those who wish to change the present rule is that they feel that the Rules Committee must chaperone and censor what the House of Representatives may wish to consider. In other words, they wish the power to determine what shall be considered by the House because, as they say, "it might be bad legislation and might ruin the country." They want the power to sidetrack legislation that in the opinion of the majority of that committee comes in the category of bad legislation. The Members of the House are presumed to have as much restraint and statesmanship as the Rules Committee members and should not arbitrarily be denied the right to consider legislation which has been approved by the appropriate legislative committee. We realize that by a petition signed by 218 Members the Rules Committee can be discharged of its duty and a measure be brought to the floor. But that is a very clumsy way to bring legislation to the floor. It should, if considered by the House, be in charge of those who drafted the legislation, after hearings on the proposal, and who would be presumed to have a balanced judgment on the merits of the legislation.

Of course, should a Speaker show by his conduct that he was too arbitrarily exercising the power granted him under the present rules, then we should change them. Perhaps then it might be wise to consider a relaxation of the rule requiring 218 signatures to circumvent the Rules Committee and bring legislation to the floor for consideration.

It has been repeatedly emphasized during the debate many times that the Rules Committee is really a traffic committee of the House. That is true, but in the application of this function it does not mean that the Rules Committee should be able to stop legislation because it does not agree with the policy of the legislation. It should be permitted to regulate how and what legislation comes to the floor, but the committee should not have so much power that instead of regulating and expediting legislative traffic it may absolutely stop it and only permit the legislative traffic which the majority of the committee considers good and constructive.

These are some of the reasons that impel me to vote to retain the amendment to our rules which we adopted in January 1949.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, again I repeat that to place the control of what bills should come to the floor of this great legislative body, after they have been duly voted for by legally constituted legislative committees of this Congress, in the hands of a nonlegislative committee of 12 Members of this Congress is diametrically opposed to the strengthening of the democratic processes whereby and whereupon this democracy depends for its vigor and vitality.

The very first word of this statement is the word "again." I used it because, when I was a Member of the Seventy-ninth session of this Congress, I did, amongst other things, say on June 8, 1945, as follows:

> Mr. Chairman, I am not going to speak on the merits or lack of merits of the FEPC bill at this time. But I feel impelled to say that as a baby Member of this great legislative body during these last 6 months, it is a shocking experience for me to learn that there is in this House a method or system whereby a few members of our Rules Committee can prevent debate and discussion on the floor of this great legislative body, even after another duly constituted and empowered committee, in full performance of its duties and its responsibilities, has reported a bill favorably out of committee by a unanimous or almost unanimous endorsement, as was the case in point with the Labor Committee on this FEPC bill.
>
> I repeat, I am not here discussing the merits of this bill. I am not criticizing any person or persons. I criticize as dangerous to democratic processes any system whereby a minority controls the will of a majority to the extent obtaining in this House in a situation such as this.

And, then, again on February 6, 1946, on the floor of this Congress, I stated, as follows:

> Mr. Chairman, on the 8th of last June, on the floor of this House, I stated that I was speaking against a system which permitted the Rules Committee to stifle and choke and actually prevent a democratic opportunity to this great House for debate on a measure after a duly constituted committee reports favorably it be considered by the Members of the House. I also stated then, as I do again now, that I am not criticizing any person, but I am again protesting the same procedures by which the bill H. R. 4908, was, to all intents and purposes, made secondary and of virtually no importance for legislative purposes, by the procedure followed by the Rules Committee.

Again I speak out with all the vigor I have within me to the end that this resolution shall be defeated and that the rules of this House shall stand as they are so that the will of the majority of the Members of this House can be worked to all legislation instead of a majority of 12

men being able to choke and stifle and delay legislation, preventing it from coming to the floor unless 218 Members first go to the Clerk's desk and sign a petition to take it out of the hands of the nonlegislative committee which we call the Rules Committee. To revert to the old rule, as proposed in this resolution by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] would be to revert to the very condition against which I spoke on the two afore-mentioned occasions. My experience since February 6, 1946, and June 8, 1945, has been such that I feel even more compelled to speak out against the purpose of this resolution than I did when I was a "baby" Congressman in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

By the very text of our Federal Constitution this House of Representatives is challenged to be representative of the wishes of the people. And our technical name, as Members of this branch of the national legislative body, is House of Representatives. The American people expect us and each of us to vote according to our own individual consciences and the dictates of justice and to our individual integrity and independence. I feel we have no legal or moral right to allocate unto any 12 men a decision as to whether or not we shall have the right to vote on legislation which has first been diligently considered and voted to be submitted to the floor of this House by any of our legislative committees. I consider that I have no right, as a Representative from the great Eighteenth Congressional District of California, to allocate unto anybody a decision as to how I shall vote or what I shall vote for. Therefore, it is inconsistent with my philosophy of representative government to have our Rules Committee, in effect, turned into a legislative body. We need more opportunities, and more adequate opportunities, for individual Representatives in Congress to adequately consider legislative matters and, after due consideration, to make the final decisions by a majority vote. Only by majority processes can democracy permanently endure.

As it is imperative that more and more of the American citizens become informed and act in their citizenship duties as intelligent voters and participants in shaping their destiny, so it is even more important that we, as their elected Representatives, do not let any 12 men determine for us the destiny of the constituents of our respective congressional districts in matters of what should be talked about and decided upon the floor of the House of Representatives.

When the gentleman from Illinois, Representative ALLEN, on the Republican side, who, for many years has been a member of the Rules Committee, a few minutes ago declared that the issue was whether or not President Truman's program should become law, he thereupon made clear that he, as a member of the Rules Committee, would vote against the Members of Congress having opportunity to debate and to determine for themselves whether or not any of President Truman's program should become law. You also heard him say that, when he was chairman of the Rules Committee in the Eightieth Republican Congress, he called the members of the Rules Committee together and they, in substance, agreed upon what bills should pass the House. Therefore, he made it clear as to what his intention is by voting for turning the clock back to the status of the Rules Committee as it was in the Eightieth Congress. And, certainly, no one can disagree with the fundamentals of the declaration by our distinguished Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, a few minutes ago when he stated that the rules of legislation should be such as to allow the majority of the Members of that legislative body to work its will.

Why do some Members of this House want to make it as hard as possible for the majority of the Members to work their will? Yes; I grant that 218 Members of this House can work their will by going forward and signing a petition to take any bill out of the House Rules Committee; but can you give me a single reason why it should be necessary to have 218 Members collaborate thus to take a bill out of the hands of the Rules Committee? What right has the Rules Committee to strangle a bill which has been sent to it merely for calendaring and orderly processes in being timed as to when it should come to the floor? Should not the approval of any of the legislative committees of this great House be sufficient to bring a bill which they have duly studied and considered to the floor of this House on their recommendation that it be debated and decided upon?

And the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], who is also a very able member of the Rules Committee, a few minutes ago, indicating that the Rules Committee, in his judgment, should sit upon bills already voted for by legislative committees of this House and determine whether or not they should come to the floor for debate and decision, is the first time I was ever informed that the Rules Committee had the authority to act upon appropriation matters. I think the distinguished gentleman from New York is mistaken when he indicates that the Rules Committee would have any jurisdiction whatsoever over appropriation bills. Yet, he argued at length that in the Eightieth Congress they had learned that if all the bills then on the legislative calendar were passed, it would increase by $9,000,000,000 the Government's obligations. Inferentially, at least, it was indicated by him to me that the Rules Committee could negative an appropriation bill already approved by the Appropriations Committee. I do not believe that is the rule of this House. I am sure it is not.

It is not my purpose nor intent to here question the motive of any Member or of any group of Members who support this resolution. It is significant to me, however, that all the Members on the Republican side of the aisle to whom I have spoken about it and all Members on the Democratic side of the aisle substantially give the same reason for their support of the change back to the old rule, to wit: They either tell me that they oppose the FEPC bill or other phases of President Truman's legislative program, or that the Truman administration is leading us into socialism.

Mr. Speaker, I think I recognize some of the distinguished Members of this House who come from districts south of Mason and Dixon's line. I respect their problems. But this issue of minority versus majority rule and control and decision transcends the issue of whether any one or two or three bills shall be considered by the Members of this House. And, of course, it would be almost beyond comprehension that the majority of the Members of this House on the Republican side would be expected to do anything to help the Truman Democratic administration enact its program into law. This leads me to say I greatly respect the Members of the minority party who, more or less, regularly vote to support progressive, sound legislation which is so often opposed by the majority of the minority party on this floor.

A few minutes ago we heard two of the distinguished leaders of the minority party talk directly to certain members of the minority party in plain language and tell them that, in substance and effect, they would be expected to vote for the resolution. Yet, from my visits with a few of them, I am sure a surprising number will vote for the resolution.

It is not democracy which will destroy democracy. Only the lack of democracy can catapult us into socialism or worse. It is more democracy and not less of it which we need. It is considered, informed opinion by more people at the grass roots instead of less that we need. It is a larger proportion of the voting public which is needed to vote only after being fully informed instead of a lessor proportion of people. The perpetuation of our democratic processes depends upon majority knowledge and majority participation based upon an informed electorate which will strengthen our American way of life. I am not afraid of the decisions by an informed, intelligently voting majority. I am increasingly fearful of minority decisions.

The issue today is not the fate or success of any one bill. It is the issue of whether or not a minority, constituted of 12 members shall dictate to the full membership of this House what they shall and shall not have a chance to debate and decide for or against. I shall vote against the resolution.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, those who seek the passage of this resolution are attempting to block the democratic process and to thwart the will of the American people.

It has been said by proponents of this reactionary resolution that public opinion favors such action to stop what they call the trend to statism and socialism. One wonders what kind of a yardstick they use to measure public opinion if it is not the vote of the American people.

During this debate the Republican leadership has expressed fear because the Nation's credit is controlled by our Government. Is it because they favor Wall Street control of credit and fear control by the people through their Government?

What impresses me is the fact that many Republican Members of this Con-

gress are not in accord with the reactionary position of their leadership. I am quite sure that many Republican Members, when they decide on this question, will give serious consideration to the voting trend of last November, especially those from Pennsylvania.

They must know that the people are fed up with this kind of hokum that is being spread by Republican brass about welfare state, statism, and national bankruptcy.

It should be clear even to the dullest of persons that the people want progressive legislation regardless what kind of a tag the agents of reaction care to pin on measures which are designed to promote the common welfare of our people and of the Nation.

Today we may see some success by a reactionary alliance to ignore the will of the people and to block legislation for which the people have given a mandate.

But time and history are against it and any success it now wins will only hasten the day when it will receive a final and well-deserved rebuke from the people back home.

The Nation will watch with interest to see how their representatives stand on this crucial issue. It will also watch to see how many Republican Members will rebuke their own leadership and expose its hypocrisy of pinning unpopular labels on legislation it opposes.

Every great issue should be decided on its merits and not by what someone chooses to call it. To resort to name-calling and placing unpopular tags on legislation is the lowest type of demagoguery.

The people have a right to know how their representatives stand on every major question regardless how members of the Rules Committee view such legislation.

Every great step forward in our country had to face the same kind of reactionary opposition as we see today in this Congress.

But those who would turn the clock backward toward a dead past are fighting a lost cause and will be relegated by time and history with their fellow Tories of bygone days.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, one of the most constructive changes made by the first session of the Eighty-first Congress was the adoption of the resolution improving the procedures of the Rules Committee in an effort to avoid constructive legislation from being bottled up in the Rules Committee. I am very disappointed to find that the Rules Committee has now passed a resolution to revert back to the antiquated procedures that were employed prior to the rules change of last year. As a member of the Veterans' Committee I strongly oppose this resolution for I know the veterans of this country vividly remember how the housing bill was bottled up in the Rules Committee during the Eightieth Congress. Blocked by a few willful men in the Rules Committee when our heroic veterans were so direly in need and deserving of adequate housing for themselves and their loved ones.

Surely, we Representatives do not need to depend on a handful of our colleagues to protect us from the embarrassment of having to vote on certain legislation on the floor of the House. I believe that we people who have been entrusted with the confidence of the voters are willing to stand up and vote conscientiously on any legislation which is introduced in the House of Representatives. We owe this to the people who elected us, to show them that we are capable of expressing our opinions sincerely and conscientiously regardless of the consequences. If we are not willing to do this, in my humble opinion, we are not worthy of being returned to represent the people of our districts.

To again give the Rules Committee the authority to blockade legislation would be a trend away from our democratic principles and would be very undesirable in one of the highest legislative bodies in the most democratic country in the world.

FREE DEBATE AND MAJORITY RULE IS THE ESSENCE OF DEMOCRATIC ACTION

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my opposition to the pending resolution, aimed at restoring the bottleneck veto power of the Committee on Rules, with all the vigor at my command.

My fundamental objection to this resolution, and to the procedure which it would restore, goes to the very heart of free, democratic government.

Free and open debate, followed by the open vote of the majority and adherence to that decision, is the very essence of the democratic processes of government.

Ever since the Committee on Rules was created by the House, and in spite of successive reforms, it has arrogated to itself powers which the House never intended to bestow.

Regardless of the party in power, the committee has exercised a power of veto over duly constituted legislative committees which has frequently defeated the fundamental principles on which not only our Government, but our two-party political system have been firmly and successfully founded.

POLITICAL MORALITY AT STAKE

My second most basic objection is based on a purely moral argument.

The Democratic Party is a party of minorities united on basic principles, which can be most aptly summed up as the greatest good for the greatest number consistent with good government and sound administration.

The one-word definition of those policies is "security"—freedom from fear, from hunger, from want, from oppression.

The people of the United States have trusted us with their security for 18 unbroken years of economic, social, and political progress.

If we now break faith with them, the people will repudiate us, and rightly so. One year and 20 days ago we gathered in this Hall as the Democratic caucus and we bound ourselves to the change in the rules of this venerable and honorable House which the resolution before us would repeal.

A DEGRADINGLY IMMORAL ACT

I am shocked—and the Nation is shocked—by the suggestion that now, by the whim of a few Members, we can lightly renounce our pledged word. For my part, I consider myself as firmly bound today by the decision of the caucus as I was on January 1, 1949, and I can only regard the wanton disregard of that decision as a degradingly immoral act.

By the same token, the Democratic Party went to the people in the presidential campaign of 1948 with a sound and specific platform of legislative and executive accomplishment. In my vocabulary, as in the vocabulary of our party leader, President Harry S. Truman, the planks of that platform were solemn pledges to the American people.

The obvious object of the resolution under debate is to defeat President Truman's legislative program, not by the democratic processes of open debate and public decision by a reasoning majority, but by the secret veto of a handful of willful men to whom their private passions are more important than the public benefit.

Mr. Speaker, the forces of liberty and progress have already won one resounding victory here today, and I am confident—absolutely confident—that when the roll is called on this resolution there will be the same great triumph for the people.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it has been stated that this is an important vote, and that is true. I have a deep conviction about this matter that I assure you is disassociated from any particular measure or the consideration of any particular measure. I had that deep conviction when I spoke against the rule change on January 3 a year ago. I still have that deep conviction.

May I say to my colleagues, particularly on my side, who voted against the rule change at that time, that I cannot for the life of me see any reason why their vote on this occasion should be any different from what it was on the previous occasion. I understand the adroit tactics here trying to involve this question, which is fundamental and deep, with the problem of civil rights. Certainly those of us here who said originally that this matter should be postponed until after Monday, else the administration must take the responsibility, had a valid argument.

I say also that those of us who voted to adjourn, to put this matter over past Monday, have proven again that it is completely disassociated from the consideration of any civil-rights matter. The best evidence of that is that the author of the FEPC voted to adjourn.

There is talk here about a lot of things, and talk about deficits. I have seen the time when the Rules Committee was sitting on bills running into billions of dollars, that would have bankrupted the country.

Some reference has been made to the Eightieth Congress. One day when history is written it will yet be established that that Congress performed in the real interest of the country. But let me remind you of this, that it was the first Congress in 14 years that balanced the

budget and had money to apply on the debt. A big part of the credit for that goes to the Rules Committee, and I ought to know something about it.

Of course we are confronted with this demand that comes from Mr. Truman. Mr. Truman at the moment is stubbornly, for political reasons, refusing to invoke the provisions of the law enacted by the Congress to settle the coal strike. And then he has the effrontery to come here and demand of us, my colleagues, that we yield to his demand in respect to the rules of the House of Representatives. The matter of the rules of the House of Representatives is one for this body to determine. I resent his failure to do what we said in the law should be done as I resent his determination, apparently, to usurp what I believe is the legislative function.

Reference was made by Mr. Truman again to the fact that this is designed to scuttle his program. Let me say to my colleagues on my side, no one can tell which of those measures may yet be voted on in this session of Congress. As far as I am concerned, I am ready to vote on any of them. But let me say here and now that there are a lot of them that should be defeated because they are unwise, ill-timed, beyond our ability to pay, reckless, extravagant, and socialistic. As far as I am concerned, if what he says is true, that there is in the adoption of this resolution a possibility of defeating some of those measures, then I want to support this resolution.

There has been a lot of bunk written about this awful bad Rules Committee. Why, the fact of the matter is that the Rules Committee was designed to be the creature of responsible leadership. It is no indictment of legislative committees to say that they attract to their individual membership members generally interested in the particular field in which that committee operates. Frequently they become special pleaders for a particular section, for a particular group, or a particular activity, or a particular segment of our population or our economy. For this reason it often happens that bills are reported which are clearly not favored by the majority of the membership of the House of Representatives. In such circumstances the Rules Committee is as necessary as is a traffic light on the busiest intersection in the whole country. Many times they get to be special pleaders. Many times bills are reported by legislative committees where the leadership knows they will be overwhelmingly defeated if they come to the floor of the House for a vote. Is it the function of the leadership to flood the floor of the House with all of these bills and waste the time of the House of Representatives so that we never can get to the matters which are really on the agenda? Why, all that sort of talk is pure nonsense. The fact of the business is that the House of Representatives can work its will if it wants to and we should have a Committee on Rules to see to it that the work of the Congress is properly expedited and carried on. Responsible leadership must have some implement of control. I am worried about a flood of bills that are not desired by the administration or by majority party leadership which may bankrupt the country. For myself, in this or in any Congress, I am convinced that the Rules Committee should have a very considerable measure of responsibility and control.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the House would agree to a postponement of action on the rule until next week. This would have made it possible to have the issue more clearly defined. The Democratic leadership has refused that adjournment. That makes it necessary for us to make the decision today.

Believing as I do firmly that the adoption of this rule is in the interest of orderly consideration of legislation and may well mean the preservation of the solvency of the country, I shall vote for it.

The adoption of this rule will not prevent legislation from coming to the floor. Through the vehicle of Calendar Wednesday, any committee can instruct its chairman to call up legislation. There is also the discharge rule, by which a majority of the House can always function through the simple expedient of signing a petition. The will of the majority of the House cannot be refused.

In my experience, legislation cannot be kept off the floor when a majority of the Congress really wishes it to be considered. Under the rules of 16 years under President Roosevelt, there was no difficulty in getting legislation to the floor.

The greatest issue before the country today is whether we are headed toward bankruptcy and eventually a socialist state. We are being spent and taxed into socialism. I shall do my best to resist that destructive trend. This rule, in my judgment, will materially aid in preventing that trend.

Therefore, I shall vote for it and I sincerely hope that Members will put their country ahead of self and vote for its adoption.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the consideration of this resolution is not partisan and should not be partisan. The issue involved is one that affects each and every one of us as a Member of the House of Representatives. I am elected by the people of my district and you are elected by the people of your district. As a Member of the House and as majority leader, I thoroughly respect each and every one of my colleagues, but, above all, I respect the fact that each and every one of my colleagues has been elected by a majority of the people of their own congressional district.

Yet the argument of my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], is "Yes, you have been elected, but give me the power to control you—give the power to six of us without regard to party, whether Democrat or Republican, to control the legislation which will come before the House of Representatives."

What my friend advocates is that a small minority of the Committee on Rules should control the House of Representatives.

The gentleman says the issue is socialism. Of course, that was raised in 1935 against the social-security legislation, which I helped to draft and which men like the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], who was and is now chairman of the committee, and others voted for. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] mentioned the Tennessee Valley Authority. I wonder how the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] feels now, when he knows that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] considers that socialistic. I wonder how the Representatives from the Tennessee Valley districts feel when they know that he would like to have control of the situation on any legislation relating to the Tennessee Valley, and if he did he would throttle it in the Rules Committee. In other words, you and I have no right to determine in our own minds whether legislation is socialistic or not. It all depends upon how my friend from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and a few others feel. If they feel it is socialism, then it is, even if it may be the most reactionary type of legislation imaginable.

Boulder Dam would have been considered socialistic under his theory. I spoke for the first Bankhead Cotton Quota Act. My friends from the South asked me to do it. It was a close fight. It passed the House by only a few votes. I know why they wanted me to speak, coming from a city district. I did it. I did not consider that socialistic. But many of my friends on both sides did consider it socialistic, and there are some people today who consider any farm program to be socialistic.

The issue transcends FEPC. That is not involved. That is only a minor incident, because that can come up one way or another. But there are many other bills that cannot come up. There is a cotton bill from the Committee on Agriculture now. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], chairman of that committee, is present. Suppose that bill is tied up. Suppose there are four members of one party and three of our party—they may not be from the South, but coalitions can work in two or more ways. Suppose that happens, and suppose you did not have this 21-day rule, how are you going to get it up outside of a 218 discharge petition?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I yield to my friend.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman does not have to convince me. I am sure he knows that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, I am referring to the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. The same argument of socialism might very well be made today against the Rural Electrification Administration, and the rural telephone program, and the soil-conservation districts, and many acts of Congress that have contributed to the welfare of agriculture.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. And the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and many others.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] talks about authorization legislation. Our Congress has been passing authorization legislation since time immemorial. There is an omnibus river-and-harbor bill that goes through. It involves authorized appropriations of hundreds of millions of dollars, but it is a long-range proposition. We are appropriating this year on authority given 20 years ago, perhaps, in some cases.

Furthermore, the gentleman's argument falls to the ground when he talks about the Rules Committee screening and protecting us against expenditures, because expenditures are made by the Appropriations Committee. No appropriation bill from the Appropriations Committee comes before the Rules Committee. The Appropriations Committee reported out a forty-billion-odd-dollar appropriation bill. Not one of those items comes out of the Rules Committee or comes before the Rules Committee. So the argument of the gentleman from New York, it seems to me, falls to the ground.

On January 31, 1931, a former member of the Rules Committee, and former majority leader of this House, whom I admired as a colleague of mine, and who is still living and whom I admire very, very much, Bert Snell, in a speech in the House said this, in relation to the Rules Committee:

> Never by one single paragraph in the House Manual, not by a single sentence or a single word, as far as I know, has this House ever given the Rules Committee any substantive power to control legislation.
>
> It has not given the Rules Committee any substantive power to defeat legislation. * * * The Rules Committee is not a legislative committee. It is a very largely a procedure committee.

Yet, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] assure us that it is a legislative committee and not a procedure committee. But this former great Member of the House, Bert Snell, said:

> It is very largely a procedure committee. *

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Will not the gentleman wait until I complete the reading of this quotation?

Mr. COX. The gentleman attributes to me a belief I do not entertain, a statement I did not make. I understood, of course, that the Rules Committee was not a legislative committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will accept that correction; I will let it stand that way in the RECORD.

Continuing, Bert Snell said:

> The function of the Rules Committee * * * is to act in harmony with the majority sentiment of the majority of the House. * * * If the Rules Committee should start absorbing authority over legislative committees of this House, there would be real reason for the House rebelling against the authority of the Rules Committee. We have never tried to dictate to legislative committees, and if we did try it, there would be real reason for criticizing the members of the Rules Committee.

That is what happened; that is what will happen if this authority is given to the Rules Committee. In the Eightieth Congress many of my Republican friends tried to get a housing bill up. I spoke for it; you spoke for it, and you know it; you could not get it up. You did everything possible, you as individual Republican Members, to get the low-cost housing bill up, to get a rule from the Committee on Rules, but the committee never permitted the legislation to come up. All they did was to permit a vote under a suspension of the rules on something that did not include public housing or low-cost housing.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will yield; yes.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman will recall that in this House the matter of public housing was carried by only five votes. In view of that, even had the Rules Committee reported it, it would not have carried in the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has not contradicted a thing that I said.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. McCORMACK. My friend from Indiana says properly, and I agree with him, that the Rules Committee functions as a traffic light for the leadership; but it is not now a traffic light for the leadership. When the gentleman's party was in power I agree that it was.

The Rules Committee is not a legislative committee; it is not a policy committee; it is a procedure committee to cooperate with the leadership. I agree with my friend from Indiana. But my friend from Indiana disagrees with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] because he says it should have all power to stop socialism—his type, what he thinks is socialistic, not what you or I may think is socialistic or not socialistic.

My friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] insists that the Committee on Rules should have the power to prevent authorizing legislation that carries appropriations when the Committee on Appropriations is the committee that makes the actual appropriations; and furthermore, the Committee on Appropriations never even goes to the Committee on Rules.

So, without going into it any further, and to bring the debate to a close, the evidence is overwhelmingly against any change.

I hope the resolution will be defeated.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

All time has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is a vote on the adoption of the resolution?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The vote is on the resolution?

The SPEAKER. The vote is on the adoption of the resolution.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 183, nays 236, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

YEAS—183

Abbitt	Gamble	Nicholson
Abernethy	Gary	Nixon
Allen, Ill.	Gathings	Norrell
Allen, La.	Gillette	Pace
Anderson, Calif.	Goodwin	Passman
Andresen, August H	Gossett	Peterson
Andrews	Graham	Pfeiffer, William L.
Arends	Grant	Phillips, Calif.
Barden	Gregory	Pickett
Barrett, Wyo	Gwinn	Plumley
Bates	Hagen	Poage
Battle	Hale	Preston
Beall	Hall, Leonard W	Rains
Bennett, Fla	Halleck	Rankin
Blackney	Harden	Redden
Boggs, Del.	Hardy	Reed, Ill.
Boggs, La.	Hare	Reed, N. Y.
Bolton, Md.	Harris	Rees
Bolton, Ohio	Harrison	Regan
Bonner	Hébert	Rich
Boykin	Herlong	Richards
Bramblett	Herter	Rivers
Brehm	Hinshaw	Rogers, Fla.
Brooks	Hobbs	St. George
Brown, Ga.	Hoeven	Sanborn
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman, Ill.	Scrivner
Bryson	Hoffman, Mich.	Scudder
Burleson	Hope	Shafer
Burton	Horan	Short
Byrnes, Wis	Jackson, Calif.	Sikes
Camp	Jenison	Simpson, Ill.
Carlyle	Jenkins	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Jennings	Smith, Kans.
Chatham	Jensen	Smith, Va.
Chiperfield	Jones, Ala.	Smith, Wis.
Church	Jones, N. C.	Stanley
Clevenger	Kerr	Stefan
Cole, Kans	Kilburn	Stockman
Cole, N. Y	Kilday	Taber
Colmer	Kunkel	Tackett
Cooper	Lanham	Talle
Coudert	Larcade	Teague
Cox	Latham	Thomas
Crawford	LeCompte	Towe
Cunningham	LeFevre	Vinson
Curtis	Lucas	Vorys
Davis, Ga.	Lyle	Wadsworth
Davis, Tenn.	McCulloch	Weichel
DeGraffenried	McMillan, S. C.	Werdel
D'Ewart	McMillen, Ill.	Wheeler
Dolliver	Mahon	Whitten
Dondero	Martin, Iowa	Whittington
Doughton	Martin, Mass	Wigglesworth
Eaton	Mason	Williams
Elliott	Meyer	Willis
Ellsworth	Michener	Wilson, Ind.
Elston	Miller, Md	Wilson, Tex.
Fallon	Miller, Nebr	Winstead
Fellows	Mills	Wolcott
Fenton	Morrison	Wood
Fisher	Murray, Tenn	Woodruff

NAYS—236

Addonizio	Buckley, Ill.	Crook
Albert	Buckley, N. Y	Crosser
Andersen, H. Carl	Burke	Dague
Angell	Burnside	Davenport
Aspinall	Byrne, N. Y	Davies, N. Y.
Auchincloss	Canfield	Davis, Wis.
Bailey	Cannon	Dawson
Baring	Carnahan	Deane
Barrett, Pa.	Carroll	Delaney
Beckworth	Case, N. J.	Denton
Bennett, Mich.	Cavalcante	Dingell
Bentsen	Celler	Dollinger
Biemiller	Chelf	Donohue
Bishop	Chesney	Douglas
Bland	Christopher	Doyle
Blatnik	Chudoff	Eberharter
Bolling	Clemente	Engel, Mich.
Bosone	Combs	Engle, Calif.
Breen	Cooley	Evins
Buchanan	Corbett	Feighan
	Cotton	Fernandez

Flood	Klein	Polk
Fogarty	Kruse	Potter
Forand	Lane	Poulson
Ford	Lesinski	Powell
Frazier	Lichtenwalter	Price
Fugate	Lind	Priest
Fulton	Linehan	Quinn
Furcolo	Lodge	Rabaut
Garmatz	Lovre	Ramsay
Gavin	Lynch	Rhodes
Golden	McCarthy	Ribicoff
Gordon	McConnell	Riehlman
Gore	McCormack	Rodino
Gorski	McDonough	Rogers, Mass.
Granahan	McGrath	Rooney
Granger	McGregor	Roosevelt
Green	McGuire	Sabath
Gross	McKinnon	Sadlak
Hall,	McSweeney	Sadowski
Edwin Arthur	Mack, Ill.	Saylor
Hand	Mack, Wash.	Scott, Hardie
Hart	Madden	Scott,
Harvey	Magee	Hugh D., Jr.
Havenner	Mansfield	Secrest
Hays, Ark.	Marcantonio	Shelley
Hays, Ohio	Marsalis	Sheppard
Hedrick	Marshall	Sims
Heffernan	Merrow	Spence
Heller	Miles	Staggers
Heselton	Miller, Calif.	Steed
Hill	Mitchell	Stigler
Holifield	Monroney	Sullivan
Holmes	Morgan	Sutton
Howell	Morris	Tauriello
Huber	Morton	Taylor
Hull	Moulder	Thompson
Irving	Multer	Thornberry
Jackson, Wash.	Murdock	Tollefson
Jacobs	Murray, Wis.	Trimble
James	Nelson	Underwood
Javits	Noland	Van Zandt
Johnson	Norblad	Velde
Jonas	Norton	Wagner
Jones, Mo.	O'Brien, Ill.	Walsh
Judd	O'Brien, Mich.	Walter
Karst	O'Hara, Ill.	Welch
Karsten	O'Hara, Minn.	Whitaker
Kean	O'Konski	White, Calif.
Kearney	O'Neill	White, Idaho
Kearns	O'Sullivan	Wickersham
Keating	O'Toole	Wier
Kee	Patman	Wilson, Okla.
Keefe	Patten	Withrow
Kelley, Pa.	Patterson	Wolverton
Kelly, N. Y.	Perkins	Woodhouse
Kennedy	Pfeifer,	Worley
Keogh	Joseph L.	Yates
King	Philbin	Young
Kirwan	Phillips, Tenn.	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—12

Allen, Calif.	Gilmer	Sasscer
Bulwinkle	Lemke	Simpson, Pa.
Burdick	Macy	Smith, Ohio
Durham	Murphy	Vursell

So the resolution was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Lemke against.

Mr. Macy for, with Mr. Burdick against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Gilmer with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Allen of California with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. SCRIVNER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion by Mr. MCCORMACK, a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include statements by the commander in chief and other officials of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

ADJOURNMENT OVER AND PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to object, I would like to ask the majority leader what he can tell us about the program for next week.

Mr. MCCORMACK. On Monday, of course, is the discharge rule under the 21-day rule. I have nothing else scheduled for next week, except that we have been advised there is a probability that House Joint Resolution 371 may be reported from the Committee on Ways and Means. That relates to income taxes of life-insurance companies for 1948 and 1949. If it is reported, I shall program that. Everything else depends upon what the Rules Committee may report out.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I have a motion pending to bring up the bill to restore 16,000 hospital beds. I expect to call that up.

Mr. MCCORMACK. That is a matter of discretion with the Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, but that is a part of the program, and I just wanted the House to know that I will call it up.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tomorrow to file a report on House Joint Resolution 398, the cotton-acreage bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include printed matter.

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. PATTEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four separate instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WAGNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from yesterday's Cincinnati Enquirer on the death of Lee Evans.

Mrs. WOODHOUSE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article written by Dr. Alice Hamilton, of Hadlyme Ferry, Conn.

Mr. BARING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JACOBS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DAVENPORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning that appeared in the New York Times.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution from the Marinette County Pomona Grange.

Mr. SCUDDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article by Morley Cassidy.

Mr. JACKSON of California (at the request of Mr. LODGE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech of the president of the American Chamber of Commerce, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit established by the Joint Committee on Printing and will cost $205.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next

following the legislative business and any special orders heretofore entered for the day.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 2 minutes today following other special orders.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include resolutions of the Farm Bureau.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution of the City Commission of Jacksonville, Fla.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HOOVER COMMISSION

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inquire when, if ever, the Truman administration intends to put into effect the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

The record to date indicates that the administration is conducting a stalling game. On a basis of what has been accomplished and what could have been accomplished, there appears to be no real intention whatever on the part of the Truman administration to carry out this much needed reorganization program, that we may have a more efficient government with substantial dollar savings for the taxpayers. It is time the American people became aware of this fact.

This administration is more interested in spending money than saving it. It is more interested in enlarging bureaucratic powers than in restricting them. It is more interested in increasing Federal jobs to reward the political faithful than in reducing the exorbitant number of persons now on the Federal pay roll.

The administration praises the Hoover Commission reorganization recommendations, but it has made no real effort to put them into effect. It has not translated this high praise into executive and legislative action. To avoid having to do what the American people want to have done to save tax dollars, the administration has adopted this deceptive stalling game.

Let us look at this record. It was over a year ago that the Commission submitted its reports to this Congress. The Bureau of the Budget estimated that the program involved 114 recommendations that could be effectuated by administrative action itself, that 124 required legislative action, and that 80 recommendations could be effectuated by reorganization plans.

This program was submitted over a year ago, but to date the President has sent to Congress only 8 of the possible 80 reorganization plans. And of the eight submitted, two of them constituted items the Congress had previously disapproved, such as creating a Department of Public Welfare and transferring certain functions of the Federal Security Administration with respect to unemployment compensation to the Department of Labor.

Not a single reorganization plan has been submitted to this session, and we have been here almost a month. In the President's message to Congress at the opening of the session he did not so much as even mention the Hoover Commission reorganization program. He made only some reference to certain phases of it in his budget message. Nor has the administration leadership brought before us thus far in this session a single bill to carry out recommendations that require legislative action.

Actions speak louder than words. Mr. Speaker, I question whether there is any real intention on the part of this administration to effectuate the Hoover Commission recommendations. In the meantime, while the administration carries on this stalling game, giving only lipservice to the program, our people are losing potential savings of several billions of dollars.

It strikes me as somewhat significant that it took the administration 6 months in the last session of Congress to secure enactment of the basic reorganization legislation, giving the President authority to propose reorganization plans subject to disapproval by Congress in 60 days. But the administration was only 16 days in the last session in having a law enacted to raise the salaries of the President, Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and the various heads of the departments and independent agencies.

In 16 days the administration secured passage of legislation to spend additional money, but it took around 180 days to secure passage of legislation to provide the means by which money might be saved.

Apparently those phases of the Hoover Commission recommendations which might involve certain additional expenditures for certain purposes, or certain additional bureaucratic powers are popular with this administration. But those phases of the recommendations which would result in economies or a limiting of certain bureaucratic activities are unpopular and are being ignored.

Mr. Speaker, let us have an end to this stalling game. I ask the President: Where are the reorganization plans to carry out the Hoover Commission program? It must be borne in mind that it takes 60 days after a plan is submitted to Congress before it becomes effective. I ask the leadership of the Congress: Where are the necessary legislative bills to carry out this important program?

While we are marking time, waiting for the President to send us reorganization plans and waiting for the legislative committees, particularly the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, to bring reorganization bills before the Congress, billions of dollars are lost to the American taxpayers and the national debt continues to grow.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 2 minutes.

REPUBLICANS, WE MISSED THE BOAT

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from the press and the information which comes to our desks, it is apparent that our constituents are at last aware of the danger which confronts our country if the taxing and spending program of Mr. Truman is carried out. They also fear the adoption of socialized medicine, Federal aid to education, the extension of bureaucratic control, and left-wing proposals which pressure groups are attempting to force through Congress. The people fear socialism, which England adopted and which had it not been for United States dollars, would long ago have wrecked that country.

There are 435 Members of Congress—at least 300 of them active.

Each session thousands of bills are introduced. It is evident that if each Member introducing a bill could force even slight consideration of it the House would never be able to vote upon each bill introduced.

Hence it is that the House, like every other organization, is forced to adopt rules for the transaction of its business. What would happen if a corporation dispensed with its board of directors—permitted the stockholders to run the business? From the beginning, Congress has had what is known as standing committees, such as the Committees on Agriculture, on Commerce, on Labor, and so on down through the list—19 in all. When a bill is introduced, it is by the Speaker and the House Parliamentarian sent to the appropriate standing committee for consideration.

Members seek appointment to a particular committee because they have a special interest in legislation considered by that committee. For example, Members interested primarily in labor ask for a place on the Labor Committee. Those interested in agriculture seek to be placed on the Agriculture Committee. Veterans and those interested in legislation affecting veterans go to the Veterans Committee, and so on down through the list.

So it is. The regular standing committees of the House might be said to be, while not necessarily biased, at least primarily interested in the type of legislation handled by the appropriate committee.

If a committee considers legislation referred to it to have merit, its chairman then goes before the Rules Committee, whose function it has always been to screen legislation for House consideration.

Just as bills introduced by individual Members are referred to the appropriate House committee for screening, bills favorably approved by a standing committee go to the Rules Committee for a final screening.

The Rules Committee acts as a sort of check for the House. If it deems the legislation detrimental to the public welfare, it refuses to report it out for consideration. Some committee chairmen, and others especially interested in proposed legislation, say such action by the Rules Committee gags the House, results in thwarting the will of the House. That charge is not true, for the reason that there is a rule of the House which provides that if a majority of the membership—218 Members—sign a petition, the Rules Committee is discharged and the bill automatically comes to the House for a vote.

Last year, President Truman and his supporters, determined to put over his program, forced an amendment to the rules which provided that if the Rules Committee refused to report out a bill, the chairman of the House committee before which the bill was pending might bring it to the House for a vote. The purpose of that amendment was to bypass the Rules Committee, bypass a majority of the House, and put it within the power of any one of the 19 chairmen of the standing committees of the House to bring a bill to the floor.

The reason the President, his supporters, and those in favor of certain socialistic legislation, like socialized medicine, Federal aid to education, and similar measures, wanted to change the rule was because they knew that if a chairman could and would call before the House a bill which had behind it a powerful lobby and widespread propaganda, some Members who would not otherwise support it, might be induced to vote for it and so the legislation would slip through many times.

The Rules Committee of the Eighty-first Congress has before it bills calling for the expenditure of around $9,000,000,000. With a debt approaching $260,000,000,000 and a current annual deficit of more than five and a half billion, the Rules Committee has been sitting on proposed legislation calling for additional expenditures.

Some Members of Congress desire economy and efficiency and wish to put into effect the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. Some of us, realizing that the Rules Committee could be bypassed by the chairmen of the committees wishing to put over legislation which is socialistic in its nature, and calling for billions, proposed an amendment to the rules, taking that privilege of calling up a bill from the chairmen of the respective committees, but leaving it possible for the majority of the House Membership to bring to the floor any desired bill.

When the question came before the House today, the Speaker of the House and the majority leader, who, of necessity, must support President Truman's program, took the floor and vigorously opposed the change. They supported the President's spending program.

Strange as it may seem, many a Republican, who has loudly and frequently condemned Mr. Truman's tax-and-spend program, his plan for socialized medicine, for additional billions to Europe, when the show-down came, voted against changing the rule and by that action made the "come and get it," or more accurately the "wait and I will take it to you legislation," more easy of adoption.

The result is that the Speaker of the House, the majority leader, and a committee chairman can force the House to consider and vote upon any measure recommended by Mr. Truman, no matter how ruinous to our economy, how destructive of our individual freedom and liberty it may be.

Some of those who opposed the change argued "well, what is the harm—the House can still vote the bill down." Sure, the House can vote against an unsound bill but sometimes it will not. The record for the last few years shows that the House just will not resist spending. Santa Claus proposals, when loud and active pressure groups descend on Washington, either in person or by letter, go through.

It is all very well to tell constituents that we are in favor of the Hoover Commission recommendations. That we favor economy. The test comes when the chips are down and they were down today.

Truman, his supporters, and those who favor a left-wing program won. They won because at least 50 Republicans—perhaps 60 or 70—voted as requested by the Speaker and the majority leader. They won because while approximately 80 Democrats—I have not had time to check the record—deserted Mr. Truman—Republicans made up the loss.

Today we had an opportunity, not necessarily to stop Mr. Truman's program, but certainly an opportunity to stop a part of it—to slow up the whole of it—we missed the boat.

I voted for the change in the rules because I believe it to be the wish of my constituents to take advantage of every opportunity to cut down deficit spending, to slow up every proposed piece of legislation which drives us nearer to socialism, which to my mind is close kin to communism.

Perhaps telegrams we received yesterday and today had something to do with the vote. Here is a sample:

BENTON HARBOR, MICH., *January 20, 1950.*
Congressman CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please be present Friday, January 20, and vote against repeal of the 21-day rule. Vote for repeal will be interpreted as vote against civil-rights legislation. When attempt is defeated we urge you be present Monday, January 23, and vote to bring H. R. 4453 to floor. We are depending on your cooperation in all crucial test votes involving civil rights.

RUSSELL BRUCE,
President, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Because the issue which was before us today is so clearly stated in an article by George Rothwell Brown in this morning's Times-Herald, I ask unanimous consent to include it as part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The article referred to is as follows:

POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

President Truman, with a cynical effrontery without precedent in American history, has now openly and brazenly asserted the mastery of the Executive power over the legislative branch of the Government.

This is the sinister significance of this week's show-down battle in the House of Representatives over a resolution to restore the power of the Rules Committee.

"I am doing everything possible," said the President in a direct quotation, "to have that motion beaten when it comes up for consideration on the floor of the House."

Those shocking words, hitherto unfamiliar to American ears, represent the most flagrant and unconstitutional attempt at Executive usurpation of power since the adoption of the organic law of the Republic.

They mean that the President of the United States has viciously undertaken to dictate to the House of Representatives the making of its own rules.

No President in this country ever before thus publicly claimed a royal prerogative which went out of fashion in the English-speaking world with the overthrow of the Stuart kings and the Declaration of Independence.

The Constitution of the United States provides that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings."

The form of government it provides is strictly one of separate and independent branches, legislative, executive, and judicial.

A President of the United States has no more authority to tell the House of Representatives or the Senate what rules it may or may not adopt, than he has to tell the United States Supreme Court what decision to hand down in a pending case in which, as President, he might be interested.

As a matter of fact the rules of House and Senate are carefully designed to preserve the constitutional functions and independence of those bodies and to prevent any attempt at Executive encroachment.

The President's impudent interference in the vital question now agitating and dividing the Membership of the House is a deliberate and premeditated infringement upon congressional liberty of action under the Constitution.

It is a challenge to the high estate of the House and its freedom from all Executive penetration, and is enough in itself alone to inspire the House to repudiate this attempted invasion of one of its most sacred rights, by ignoring the President's pressure—and it is plenty—and restoring its powers to the Rules Committee.

The President's intemperate attack upon the constitutional integrity of the House of Representatives was made before a so-called civil-rights group that has been meeting in Washington.

This outfit made a great show of excluding all Communists who clamored for admission, but with transparent insincerity it has swallowed nearly the whole of what the Communists stand for.

But there is more than FEPC or civil rights involved in the revolt of conservative members of both parties in the House against Executive domination.

Notwithstanding, it was deprived of its traffic control of pending legislation on January 3, 1949, the Rules Committee, controlled by a bipartisan conservative majority, has been bottling up since the adjournment of the last session of Congress a prospective welfare state treasury raid involving eventually upwards of $15,000,000,000. Some estimates are much higher.

The continued solvency of the United States is hanging in the balance in the Rules Committee at this very moment.

If the floodgates of squandermania are opened this country is sunk.

Thus far the Rules Committee has been keeping back the threatening tide of unconscionable spending that could only end in national bankruptcy.

But in its present condition of limited power it cannot hold back this impending flood of red ink indefinitely.

Mr. Truman knows that if the conservative coalition in the House can rehabilitate the Rules Committee the scheme to socialize America cannot be carried any further this year.

From his point of view his design to browbeat the House into submission to his will is perfectly understandable.

Aided by the powerful labor dictators who are deluging members with their demands and orders, the President is pouring it on.

Will the Republican minority play Truman's game?

It is up to them.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. LEMKE (at the request of Mr. D'EWART) for an indefinite period while attending the funeral of his brother.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2319. An act to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to the Republic of Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, January 23, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

1144. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1145. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report relative to reserving from all appropriations lands within Indian reservations valuable for power or reservoir sites necessary for use in connection with irrigation projects, pursuant to section 13 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 858); to the Committee on Public Lands.

1146. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of E. G. Morris"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1147. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 27, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of report on the Arkansas River and tributaries, with a view to improvements for flood control on the Big Piney Creek, a tributary of the Arkansas River in Johnson County, Ark., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on June 21, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Report on study of immigration and nationality problems pursuant to House Resolution 238, Eighty-first Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1507). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDERSON of California: Committee on Armed Services. House Concurrent Resolution 97. Concurrent resolution to provide for a single supply catalog system; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1508). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 6895. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 6896. A bill to stimulate the investment of venture capital in the production of strategic and critical metals or minerals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 6897. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the 1950 Annual Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans to be held in Atlantic City, N. J., September 24 through September 28, 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. R. 6898. A bill to reduce the wartime excise taxes on rubber tires and tubes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 6899. A bill to provide for the coinage of a 7½-cent piece; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 6900. A bill to provide an accelerated program for surveying and mapping of the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 6901. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the town of Clinton, Mass.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 6902. A bill to provide for the determination of peril points with respect to foreign trade agreements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 6903. A bill for the establishment of a Fair Employment Practices Commission; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. R. 6904. A bill to provide for the purchase, construction, rehabilitation, expansion, conversion, and joint utilization of buildings, including armories, structures, utilities, and other facilities, including the acquisition of land, for the training of the National Guard and the Reserve components of the National Military Establishment of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 6905. A bill to require the establishment of a classification of freight and a scale of class rates, for application to transportation of property by railroad, so adjusted as not to discriminate among regions or territories in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 6906. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. WOODHOUSE:

H. R. 6907. A bill to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for families of moderate income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. Res. 432. Resolution to amend paragraph (2) (c) of rule XI of the House (relating to the Committee on Rules); to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. Res. 433. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the District of Columbia to investigate and study on-street and off-street parking in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. Res. 434. Resolution providing for additional compensation per annum to the disbursing clerk of the House; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. Res. 435. Resolution creating a special committee to investigate the election of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio:

H. R. 6908. A bill for the relief of Emma Antonius; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 6909. A bill for the relief of Floyd E. Dotson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 6910. A bill granting the consent of Congress to Henry L. de Give to accept appointment as honorary Belgian consul at Atlanta, Ga.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 6911. A bill for the relief of Sisters Maria Rita Rossi, Maria Domenica Paone, Rachele Orlando, Assunta Roselli, Rosa Innocenti, and Maria Mancinelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 6912. A bill for the relief of Antonis Paliouras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 6913. A bill to provide for payment by the Maritime Commission for the use and reconditioning of the vessel *Retreat;* to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 6914. A bill for the relief of Werner Plack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 6915. A bill for the relief of Master Stanley (Zachne) Hiller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 6916. A bill for the relief of the estate of Carlos M. Cochran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6917. A bill for the relief of Archie Kass; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1704. By Mr. RICH: Petition of the Business Men's Association of Mansfield, Pa., against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1705. Also, petition of T. C. Crossley, superintendent, Methodist Sunday School, Nisbet, Pa., and other residents of Lycoming County, Pa., protesting extravagant, false, misleading advertising propaganda on the radios, newspapers, magazines, etc., and urging passage of Senate bill 1847; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1706. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. O. O. Day and others, of Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1707. Also, petition of John H. Johnson and others, of St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1708. By Mr. BYRNE of New York (by request): Petition of Miss Susan C. Teetsell and 24 other residents of Albany County, N. Y., advocating passage of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1709. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of sundry citizens of Mount Ayr, Iowa, urging the passage of legislation to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1710. By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petitions of Mrs. Cora Talbot and other residents of Genesee and Wyoming Counties, N. Y., advocating passage of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1711. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Allegany-Garrett County Dental Society, Cumberland, Md., requesting that Congress do not enact any legislation containing the principle of compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1712. Also, petition of Edmond C. Fletcher, lawyer, Washington, D. C., requesting the impeachment of Hon. John J. Parker, circuit judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit for gross misdemeanors in his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, at this altar of prayer we would be sure of Thy presence ere pressing duty leads us back to a noisy, crowded way. Speak to our waiting hearts words of forgiveness, of empowering, and of cleansing, that as servants of Thine and of the people we may the more worthily serve this great day as the hearts of men are stirring with the throb of deep desire. May the great causes that concern Thy human family, the selfless ministries that heal the world and rebuild it, the attitudes that create good will and make abiding peace possible at last, command the utter allegiance of our labor and our love. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. GILLETTE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 20, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. GILLETTE. On behalf of the majority leader, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Martin
Anderson	Hoey	Maybank
Benton	Holland	Millikin
Brewster	Humphrey	Mundt
Bridges	Hunt	Myers
Butler	Ives	Neely
Byrd	Jenner	O'Conor
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Connally	Kefauver	Russell
Cordon	Kem	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kerr	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Downey	Knowland	Sparkman
Dworshak	Langer	Stennis
Eastland	Leahy	Taft
Ecton	Lehman	Taylor
Flanders	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Frear	Long	Thye
Fulbright	Lucas	Tobey
George	McCarran	Tydings
Gillette	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Graham	McClellan	Watkins
Green	McFarland	Wherry
Gurney	McKellar	Wiley
Hayden	McMahon	Williams
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Withers
Hickenlooper	Malone	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is unavoidably detained.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S TAX POLICY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 451)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk and referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on pp. 769–772.)

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MCCARRAN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet this afternoon and tomorrow during the sessions of the Senate.

On request of Mr. MAYBANK, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. THOMAS of Utah was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate on Tuesday next.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without losing the right to the floor, I may yield to Senators for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, the presentation of petitions and memorials, and the submission of routine matters for the body of the RECORD, and for the Appendix, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Chair will recognize Senators for the purposes stated, without taking the Senator from Iowa off the floor.

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of the Veterans' Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN—PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it in order at this time to move an amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 25, the so-called equal-rights amendment, to establish the so-called equal-rights status of men and women?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not in order at this time, because we are engaged in the transaction of routine business, under unanimous consent.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I had understood, Mr. President, that the consideration of the equal-rights amendment had already been made the order of the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is the unfinished business, but, under unanimous consent, Senators are now being recog-

nized for insertion in the RECORD of routine matters which are ordinarily encompassed in what we call the morning hour. It will be in order, if the Senator gets the floor at any time following the Senator from Iowa, to make his motion.

Mr. KEFAUVER subsequently said: Mr. President, I send to the desk, to lie on the table and to be printed for the information of the Senate, certain amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 25, and I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be changed in form to a bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request to change the form of the joint resolution to a bill should properly be made if and when the amendments are agreed to.

In the meantime, the amendments will lie on the table and be printed.

PROTEST AGAINST WHEAT-ACREAGE REDUCTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received a resolution which was adopted at a mass meeting of farmers held in the Memorial Building, New England, N. Dak., on January 7, 1950, which reads as follows:

"Wherefore spring wheat is the surest grain crop which can be grown in this area and is the backbone of the local farming industry; and

"Wherefore farming is practically the only industry in this State; and

"Wherefore many farmers will not be able to even seed this 1949 summer-fallowed acres to wheat if they comply with the Government program: Therefore be it

"Resolved by this meeting, That we strenuously protest the wheat acre cut as handed down by the Department of Agriculture; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of North Dakota Senators and Representatives in Congress and to the Secretary of Agriculture."

The above resolution was passed at a mass meeting of farmers held in the Memorial Building, New England, N. Dak., January 7, 1950. There were 300 present at the meeting and the resolution passed unanimously.

C. M. CHRISTENSEN,
Chairman.
EARL CRUNDLE,
Secretary.

I might say, Mr. President, that I have been requested to bring this resolution to the attention of the Senate, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

MERIT PROMOTIONS IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution dealing with merit promotions in the postal service which was adopted unanimously by Local 483, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, in December 1949, at the People's Center, Jersey City, N. J.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution requesting support of H. R. 5260, merit promotions in the postal service

Whereas the Post Office Department has no fair, uniform, equitable procedure for the advancement of employees of the field service to supervisory positions; and

Whereas the lack of such a procedure prevents eligible employees from competing openly and fairly for such positions; and

Whereas the present method of selection of supervisors gives insufficient recognition to the long years of competent service of capable employees; and

Whereas throughout the years there have been numerous cases in the postal field service where capable, senior employees have been denied the opportunity to compete, and as a direct result of such practices senior competent employees have been passed over; in some cases their qualifications not even considered, and the appointments awarded junior employees; and

Whereas such morale-destroying practices cause resentment among employees with resultant impairment of discipline and efficiency; and

Whereas local 483 has always maintained that the adoption of such a method, mandatory upon the Post Office Department to enforce, would promote a harmonious relationship among all concerned and contribute to high employee morale and thereby benefit the postal service: Therefore be it

Resolved, That local 483, NFPOC, go on record as being wholeheartedly in favor of the enactment of H. R. 5260 into law; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the national, New Jersey State federation, members of the House and Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committees, AFL affiliates, and other locals requesting their support in the passage of this much-needed legislation.

ZYGFRED OSIEWICZ,
President.
ROLAND H. CUNNINGHAM,
Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS OF BLUE STAR MOTHERS OF AMERICA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc., convened in national convention in the Hotel New Yorker, from October 31, 1949, through November 3, 1949.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas an order has been issued by the Department of the Navy closing the Long Beach Navy Shipyard and retaining personnel sufficient only to guard and maintain the premises; and

Whereas the Long Beach Navy Shipyard was the only shipyard singled out for complete inactivities, thereby losing highly skilled personnel that it has taken years to assemble; and

Whereas this Long Beach Shipyard has contributed and is contributing to the national defense and is ranked as the most efficient of the shipyards; and

Whereas present world conditions are such that it would indicate that all agencies of national defense be maintained at the highest levels; and

Whereas the people of the community are acting in good faith to relieve land subsidence as recommended by the Navy; and

Whereas families of 5,700 men will suffer, including more than 3,500 veterans and with aircraft and other defense industries being moved inland, the welfare agencies of the Long Beach community will not be able to handle problems: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc., by the adoption of this resolution signify that we desire to be on record as being emphatically opposed to the closure of the Long Beach Navy Shipyard; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable CLYDE DOYLE, Member of Congress, and to the Subsidence Remedial Council.

Whereas Blue Star Mothers of America, have been embarrassed by another group with a similar name, which was listed as subversive by Attorney General Tom Clark; and

Whereas taking the oath of loyalty to our country is a privilege which would be welcomed by any loyal American: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That each member of our organization be asked to sign a loyalty oath and any person making application for membership in Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc. be requested to sign this loyalty oath.

Whereas among those that served overseas in the armed forces of the United States in World War II, a large number have officially been declared missing in action; and

Whereas it is strongly believed that many of such former servicemen are in fact now being held as prisoners of war behind the iron curtain countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in regular meeting assembled, do hereby request the Department of State of the United States of America to use its entire resources to search out, locate, and return to their native land these former servicemen, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to both Senators from the State of California and our Representative in Congress.

Whereas many instances have come to the attention of Blue Star Mothers in their work with veterans, that a great amount of red tape and technicalities are involved when attempting to secure medical attention or hospitalization for veterans, and valuable time is lost trying to procure the information that seems to be required before a veteran may be admitted to a hospital or receive medical attention: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc., here assembled, go on record as protesting this attitude and procedure and ask Congress to take steps to eliminate this abuse.

Whereas many orphans of veterans are unable to procure advanced education, as they no doubt would have been able to had their fathers not made the supreme sacrifice: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc., go on record as favoring that educational benefits that the veteran might have been eligible for may be granted to the children of said deceased veteran, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to all Congressmen of the United States.

Resolved by the Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc., assembled in convention in New York, N. Y., November 1949:

Whereas a knowledge of government—local, State, and national—is highly important to good citizenship and performing the duties and opportunities of citizenship in many ways, particularly—

How our Government operates.

What the provisions of government are.

The value of our form of government by comparison.

How a citizen of our country may take his part in the different levels of our Government activities.

The duties and privileges of a good citizen.

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is hereby petitioned and urged, and this organization will follow up on securing, the placing of the teaching of civics in the regular course of study in the schools of the Nation for not less than four full and complete years in the first eight grades of all school and/or high schools of such nature, and recognized as acceptable for credits, and the building of a better-informed and more active and responsible citizenship of the coming generation.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING—PETITIONS

Mr. DONNELL. I present for reference to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, certain petitions, all of which have been received by me and refer to S. 1847. On said petitions are the names of approximately 9,703 petitioners. The petitioners in some of said petitions request that their Senators and Representatives in Congress use their influence and vote for the passage of a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio. The petitioners in others of said petitions urge their Senators and Representatives in Congress to secure the prompt enactment of laws which will withdraw the protection of interstate commerce from liquor advertising crossing State lines. The petitioners in others of said petitions petition for passage of S. 1847. The petitioners in others of said petitions petition me to work and vote for the passage of S. 1847. The petitioners in another of said petitions ask me to vote for S. 1847. The petitioners in another of said petitions petition my support of S. 1847. The petitioners in others of said petitions request that the junior Senator from Missouri and I use our influence and vote for S. 1847.

I also present to the Senate for reference to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce four letters which have been received by me. One of said letters, which is dated January 9, 1950, indicates the writer to be in favor of the bill referred to by the writer as now pending in Congress forbidding the advertising of intoxicating liquors of any kind over the radio, or in any other way. The second of said letters indicates the writer thereof to favor S. 1847. The 14 signers of the third of said letters request that I vote for—to quote the signers—"the bill to prohibit the advertising of intoxicating drinks." The fourth of said letters states that the 11 persons, the name and address of each of whom appear thereon, are very heartily in favor of the passage of S. 1847.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions and letters will be received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ALLOCATION PLAN AS APPLIED FOR CONTROL OF FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the allocation plan as applied for the control of farm products, prepared by H. S. Casey Abbott, in 1931.

There being no objection, the plan was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ALLOCATION PLAN AS APPLIED FOR THE CONTROL OF FARM PRODUCTS

(By H. S. Casey Abbott)

This article is a compilation of notes made during the past 3 years by the writer covering various phases of the farm problem.

The machinery for the carrying out of this plan is already set up in the form of the Federal Farm Board. No further appropriations are necessary for its operation.

PERTINENT FACTS

There are in the United States 6,000,000 farms which today can be considered as food manufacturing plants, operating at a loss. This is a condition which must be rectified.

This plan attempts to consolidate their efforts and enable them to function as a unit of industry—making a profit which in the aggregate is sufficient to pull us out of the bread line and put us back on the road to prosperity.

They ask Government direction but not Government operation.

Remember we could do without every man in industry except the American farmer. The price of farm products is directly reflected in the purchasing power of the majority of the American people.

Our problem must be solved within our largest basic industry and we must begin at the bottom and build rather than attempt to relieve this depression from the top down.

No industry has been so grossly neglected or abused by the business world as has the American farm, yet, this industry can be brought back to prosperity quicker than any other because of the simple fact that earth, sun, air, and water and not purchased materials are the main factors in producing farm factory products.

The American farmer is the basic and biggest consumer in our country today. The prosperity of 90 percent of our industries depend upon the prosperity of the farm and the farmer's dollar. His is the greatest number and once he is prosperous our country is prosperous.

We are still basically an agricultural Nation and we will continue to be this for many years to come. The American farmer asks only for a plan, at the expense of no one, which will enable him to gage his production according to prospective demand. Overproduction has meant poverty for him. He only asks that he be reasonably prosperous along with his fellow Americans. His prosperity means the prosperity of the entire Nation.

There are today approximately 26,000,000 Americans living on farms. There are directly dependent, in a business way, on each family on the farm, a family and a half in our rural communities, thereby making 70,000,000 of our people absolutely dependent upon the price of farm products.

PLAN FOR STABILIZING THE FARMING INDUSTRY

This is the general plan which should be used in making the allocation system effective.

Allocation shall be on an acreage basis strictly.

The Federal Reserve bank, the Federal intermediate credit bank, and the Federal land bank to agree on a common policy regarding finances for the farmer and attitude toward those financing the farmer, either directly or indirectly, with the idea of enforcing indirectly or if necessary directly the allocation system outlined below. Their policy to be transmitted through all channels down to the local or country banks and the local merchants and through those banks to the businessmen doing business with the farmers.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States to line up with the above program and to transmit through their various channels of putting out information, the same program.

The merchants and manufacturers associations and buyers associations to do the same.

The Agricultural Department of the United States to make available to the Farm Board all statistical information necessary to establish the needs of the country, both for domestic consumption and export trade, of products of the farm for a period of 2 years with the view of working out a definite allocation system. This to be revamped from period to period.

The Federal Farm Board to ask each State to create an allocation commission and the State governors to create an allocation commission in each county and the supervisors of each county to designate districts and create in each district an allocation commission. If possible the latter commission to be selected by the farmers themselves.

A system of warehouse control, through bonding, to be set up by the Federal Farm Board. Unnecessary long hauls of farm products to be eliminated wherever possible.

Lands shall be classified as active and inactive. The inactive shall be classed as reserve and as 5-, 10-, and 20-year inactive. The reserve lands shall be the marginal lands which shall be cropped or not cropped each year in accordance with the allocation plan. The plan for the balance shall be directed by the Agricultural Department in conjunction with the Forestry Department to establish and carry out the general policy of reforestation, regrassing or rebrushing of all developed lands which have been in crop the previous year under the above classification but which are not to be cropped under the allocation system, employing in this plan as much local labor as is possible. The above plan to be financed entirely by the Federal Government.

The State governors to declare an emergency to exist and take proper steps for the elimination of taxes on all land set aside under the above classification. These taxes to be rescinded so long as this land is kept out of cultivation—or if such a plan is not practicable and it is wished to keep the plan entirely away from the necessity of political and legislative action, the allocation board to request the supervisors of counties in the United States to reclassify farm lands for tax purposes, making land retired from production under the allocation plan bear a minimum tax. Of necessity the governors of States involved should be asked to cooperate with the plan.

In conjunction with the Federal Reserve bank and the warehouse system to be established, the Federal Farm Board to create through loans, a surplus of all staple farm products, storing this so that in case of shortage they will be able to feed products to the market and keep conditions and prices normal, and at the same time, through their loan and warehouse system, they will be able to pick up any surplus which might occur and hold it until the next year's allocation shall have absorbed it. Allocations to be submitted yearly and seasonally.

No money is to be advanced for the development of land, except in irrigated districts for a period of 5 years.

Associations to be treated the same as individuals under the allocation system.

All loans to be handled through banks connected with the Federal Reserve System and under the control thereof.

BENEFITS OF THE ABOVE SYSTEM

The flow of finances and credit to the farmer is regulated and the allocation system indirecty enforced.

The supply and flow of farm products for and to the market is controlled and regulated.

Semi-Government control of warehouses through bonding and the creating of an es-

tablished surplus will act as a governor of supply and the price of any product can be regulated by use of this surplus.

The reforestation program eliminates land from possible cultivation until needed; assists materially in doing away with the flood hazard and erosion; builds up an underground water supply; picks up and uses a good portion of the present idle labor; removes the temptation to put this land into cultivation, contrary to the wishes of the allocation board, and at the same time, creates a large amount of growing timber and pasture land which will be of increasing value to the country at large as well as a future monetary value to the individual owner of the land.

The elimination of taxation on such land spreads the burden equally over the entire population of the United States and is an incentive to the farmer to work under the allocation system.

The allocation system, as a whole, working through the above channels automatically cuts down acreage in cultivation, and in so doing establishes a firm control on the amount of farm products to be handled, placing them under semigovernmental control.

With the regulation of supply and the setting up of a surplus, demands can be satisfied without any drastic change in price from year to year and the farmer can be assured of a fair price for his products.

NOTE.—The formation of associations and cooperative selling of products should follow rather than go before such a system, for in order to have associations a success a control must be exercised of supply. I fully believe, however, that the allocation system will make unnecessary the formation of associations and if it does this, it will leave undisturbed the great mass of Americans who are engaged in buying and selling farm products. Certainly with Government direction under the allocation system and a warehoused surplus, controlled by loans from the banks, any unfair or unethical move on the part of the middleman can be controlled and checked.

The Federal Farm Board acting as an allocation board can immediately set up the above and it should be possible to make this a working plan within a period of 6 months. No credit already given need be disturbed and the surplus already established can be used as a predetermined surplus until the price of farm products is stabilized.

I would not attempt to regulate the flow of products from irrigated districts unless such action would seem necessary for the carrying out of the general plan. This latter because bonded indebtedness for improvements such as dams and carrying canals makes it impractical unless a moratorium be declared.

FARM PROBLEM

This article is the result of 18 years' experience in cotton growing and marketing and actual contact with the business and ramifications thereof. It will be noted that the writer has very little faith, if any, in associations, especially so far as their beneficial effect is concerned, when they attempt to handle basic crops. He feels that the first regulation must be acreage and that a restricted production is better than an attempt to establish price, and will perforce regulate prices, providing orderly marketing is arranged. In the natural course of events therefore, what was written a year ago is effective today.

Under the plan presented by the cotton members of the Federal Farm Board the cotton farmer, if he intended to stay in business, was to be forced into an association's hands in order to borrow money with which to operate and pay his bills. If he joined, his product was pooled and the mass mistake became his mistake. He ceased to be a businessman and became a simple cog in a huge machine impersonally governed.

Contrary to popular belief, no cotton-growing association or wheat-growing association can effectually represent the wish of the farmer. It can only represent the wish of the directors. It is entirely impersonal in character and consists of hired men holding positions which are more or less political in nature because they are beholden to the mass vote of the farmers or to the influence wielded by this or that director and as a consequence the price received for the farmer's product is not the result of keen competition but is the result of mechanical marketing.

If the Government would confine their efforts to regulating acreage and provide orderly marketing, the farmer's problem would be solved. We men who are actually in the business feel that it should be taken up from a farmer's standpoint and not from the a standpoint of working out an idea, which in practically every instance, has been a failure.

The main cause of the lack of prosperity in the farming industry, when considered as a whole, can be laid to overproduction and to the fact that the farmer is forced, because of economic and operating conditions and his inability to finance himself, to dump his products. Each year he plants with very little idea of price and his returns depend absolutely on market conditions, supply and demand. Cooperative associations for marketing basic products have been founded, apparently to assist the farmer, but if they are scrutinized carefully, except in few instances, it will be found that such associations are not economical from a commercial standpoint and cannot compete with the ordinary middleman except by making the farmer absorb an increased cost of selling, which is a direct loss. In my opinion they are uneconomic and do away with competitive marketing, which we must have if the farmer is to be prosperous. This does not apply to specialties, or to products of which there is a limited production, for associations in these cases have had marked success.

The middleman cannot be cut out of business in the United States. He is a heavy consumer, exists in every form of trade and is a vital factor in the distribution and marketing of products in all forms of business. Cooperative associations are supposed to do away with this man but as stated above, there are too many evils connected therewith for them to succeed.

The furnishing of money by the Government to such associations is only adding fuel to the flame and assisting in the creation of a situation which is socialistic and economically unsound.

Farming, if considered as a whole, is the biggest business in the United States and yet has had less help from our Government than any other form of business. Let us consider its operation in comparison to, say, the steel business. If the price of steel goes down, mills are closed, stocks are lowered, and a general retrenchment takes place. Because of the fact that each farm is an individual factory and each one holds a man and family or several of them, who are dependent for their livelihood upon the operation thereof and also that his crop, once planted, is out of his control, makes it impossible for the farmer to stop production or to shorten production under existing conditions. Yet his ability, in producing, to conform to the market demand is really the only thing that will help farming financially.

The solution of the problem which confronts us today is not difficult if the farmers can be brought together and handled as a unit under the guidance of our Government. It does not require any tremendous outlay of money on the Government's part in the form of loans. Easy money will only lead to overproduction and the development of more land, and will be forthcoming after the crops have passed out of the hands of the farmers and benefit the speculator only. Nor does it require the putting into effect of socialistic ideas or the assuming of a paternalistic attitude on the part of the Government toward this industry. Such an attitude would ultimately ruin not only the farmer but the country as well.

We farmers are businessmen, and if we are such we recognize that our plants or factories are too big for the present requirements of this country. The solution of the entire problem, to my way of thinking, is as follows, so far as the nonperishable crops are concerned:

Let the Government appoint a Federal Farm Commission, which will have at its beck and call, all of the statistical information both present and near future as to crop production and the needs of the world for our products. The Agricultural Department of the Government can furnish this. Each State should have an agricultural commission, and each county one also; each county to be divided into districts where the farmers themselves will organize and appoint their own commission.

The Government sets up and establishes the future needs of the country over a period of, say, 2 years in advance, based on past 10-year production. They send out, as the time for each crop in various parts of the country approaches an allocation based on local past productions, stating how much of each crop should be planted in that particular State. The State commission in turn allocates their commitment to the counties and the counties in turn allocate to the district, and the district commission allocates the commitment to the farmer. The allocations are also based on average past production.

The Government places under governmental control, through bonding, warehouses in various parts of the country. These are to be used for storage of the surplus products to be purchased or controlled by loans through the Federal Reserve member banks with a rotating fund set aside by Congress to take care of two conditions. In case of a surplus it can be stored by the Government until the next year's allocation is made and retrenchment provides a market for the same. A certain predefined surplus should always be carried. In case of crop failure, this surplus will be available for the stabilization of the market in order that the consumer be not forced to pay an exorbitant price for farm products. In this way your farmer is protected and is practically guaranteed a fair price for his products, and your consumer is also protected against the increase of the price due to shortage. This fund and the warehouses can also be used to assist in an orderly marketing of crops and do away with dumping.

Tied into this, there should be a plan of reforestation covering the entire United States. This is to be entirely financed by the Government. It is generally known today that the ground level of the domestic water supply all over the United States is lowering very rapidly. So much land has been developed and so many forests have been cut away that the rapid run-off of rain water and snow are fast destroying vast areas in the United States and each year makes the flood menace greater. Tremendous floods all over the country are simply a prelude and a warning to us that this must be stopped and reforestation is the only proper solution. Ultimately we will be forced to do this anyway and if each farmer knows that when he cuts his acreage that the portion which he temporarily abandons will be put to beneficial use where it will in a measure pay its way and ultimately be of great gain, he will look on such a proposition with more favor.

Necessarily if the farmers do not work together and do not voluntarily come into the above-described organization, it will not succeed but the farmer should be placed on his own and the Government should not attempt to step into the farming picture at all unless the farmers, as a whole, are willing to voluntarily help themselves to this extent.

There will be more or less bootlegging of farm products to contend with. Individuals will say that they will not accept the allocations of the local commission. This can easily be taken care of if the local organization, local bankers, and local buyers work with the district commission. Such bootleg products will naturally be distressed products and the man who raises them will be forced to accept a much lower price than his neighbor who is cooperating and working under the organization plan. The entire plan should not be forced on the farmer but should be so organized that his association therewith, under a term contract, should be voluntary. In this and this way alone each year, as the market contracts and expands, the farmer will be able to plan his operations accurately. Necessarily your land speculators are going to be hurt, but if no further development of farm land was undertaken for a period of 10 years, the industry as a whole would be much better off. So far as the development of our irrigation areas is concerned these are specialty areas where farming of perishable crops make such development profitable and noninterfering with the above plan. They can be mainly devoted to the above or to the growing of alfalfa which needs no governing factor. Necessarily the above plan can only deal with basic crops, such as wheat, corn, cotton, and smaller grains and nonperishable crops. Everything else must take its chance in the open market unless the growers of these products which cannot be stored ask that the Government provide them with a similar organization. The above plan keeps the Government out of the farming business which they will go into just as sure as they start advancing money to stabilize price or to cooperative associations in an attempt to assist the farmer.

The banks all over the country have tried this and today in most parts of the country a loan for the growing of crops, unless it is backed up by liquid security, is a hard thing to get. It can be readily seen that the above system once working will not disturb the business position of any man connected with the farming industry today. The middleman will keep on buying farm products, only the prices will be more stabilized. The reforestation program will take care of whatever surplus labor is created because of the retrenchment or sizing down of farming activity.

Such a system once organized and operating will put the farmer back where his growing crops will be a banking risk and he can get money to operate on without paying penalties and premiums which in many localities he is forced to carry. I believe that cheap money to the operating farmer is unknown today unless, as stated above, he has liquid security. In conjunction with the banking end of farming there could be arranged a form of crop insurance which would insure the crops against natural hazards. Such a form exists in California today and is widely used in the citrus industry. This would provide additional security to the banker for his loan in case of a loss and would enable the farmer to keep his farm and equipment free from debt in case of failure. If the farmer can once get in the position of being a bankable risk and be assured that the market will not be glutted with the products which he is raising so that he is not constantly faced with the bogey of overproduction and the uncertainty of price, his business will be as prosperous as that of any other man and the gradual increase of population and demand for his products will in turn bring his entire farm back into production. No business can be prosperous where the basic producer is face to face with a price variation up and down of from 30 to 50 percent yearly, yet that is exactly where the farmer is today. Supply and demand is the final governing factor in any business and once this is taken hold of and controlled in the agricultural branch of this country's business the farmer will be prosperous.

GAS RATES IN JACKSONVILLE, FLA.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from William M. Madison, city attorney, of Jacksonville, Fla., together with a resolution adopted by the City Commission of the City of Jacksonville, relating to the gas rates in that city.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGAL DEPARTMENT,
CITY OF JACKSONVILLE, FLA.,
January 18, 1950.

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLAND: Recently the Federal Power Commission made three members of its staff available to the City Commission of the City of Jacksonville, which is the regulatory body authorized to establish fair and reasonable gas rates in the city of Jacksonville. This service of the Federal Power Commission and its staff members has been of material assistance to the city of Jacksonville in gas-rate proceedings before the city commission and the Florida Railroad and Public Utilities Commission. These services have been made possible because Federal law permits the FPC to render this aid to city and State regulatory commissions on a repay basis.

The City Commission of the City of Jacksonville has adopted the resolution, a true copy of which, attested by Mr. Earle E. Jones, secretary of the city commission, is herewith enclosed, expressing its appreciation to the Federal Power Commission and its staff for this valuable service to the city of Jacksonville, and I have been directed by the city commission to forward you said true copy and to respectfully request you to obtain permission to have it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order that other Members of Congress may know of this excellent assistance which is being rendered by the Federal Power Commission to city and State regulatory bodies.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM M. MADISON,
City Attorney.

Whereas at the request of the City Commission of the City of Jacksonville the Federal Power Commission made available to the city three of its staff experts in proceedings instituted by the city commission to fix a fair and reasonable rate for the sale of manufactured gas to consumers thereof in the city of Jacksonville by the Jacksonville Gas Corp. and on the appeal by said gas corporation from the action of the city commission to the Florida Railroad and Public Utilities Commission; and

Whereas the services rendered by said staff experts, Messrs. Edward L. Dunn, Carl T. Kallina, and Robert Simonds, have been of invaluable assistance to the city of Jacksonville and to consumers of manufactured gas in this city, and have contributed in a large measure toward the rendition of an order by the Florida Railroad and Public Utilities Commission reducing present rates for the sale of manufactured gas in the city of Jacksonville: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Commission of the City of Jacksonville, That the grateful appreciation of this commission be extended to the Federal Power Commission for the assistance rendered to the city of Jacksonville in the aforesaid proceedings to establish a just and reasonable rate for the sale of manufactured gas to consumers thereof in the city of Jacksonville, Fla.; and be it further

Resolved, That the sincere thanks of this commission are hereby extended individually to Messrs. Edward L. Dunn, Carl T. Kallina, and Robert Simonds for their untiring, efficient, and valuable services rendered to the city of Jacksonville in the aforesaid proceedings; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of this commission to the Federal Power Commission and to Messrs. Edward L. Dunn, Carl T. Kallina, and Robert Simonds.

A true copy.
Attest:

EARLE E. JONES,
Secretary, City Commission.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2520. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Walter Tebo; with amendments (Rept. No. 1235).

ECONOMIC POWER OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS—REPORT OF BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1234)

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Banking and Currency Committee held hearings from July 5 to August 26, 1949, upon the Economic Power of Labor Organizations. Your committee took this action under its general powers derived from the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. However, the committee has determined that if a remedy is needed, the more direct approach would be through a specific amendment of the antitrust laws. Therefore, I submit a report including minority views, and I ask unanimous consent that it be referred to the Judiciary Committee for its study and consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, and, without objection, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as requested by the Senator from South Carolina. The Chair hears no objection.

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC REPORT ON MONETARY, CREDIT, AND FISCAL POLICIES (S. DOC. NO. 129)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, the report of the subcommittee of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, on monetary, credit, and fiscal policies. It is a subcommittee report, and is the first of four studies authorized under Senate Concurrent Resolution 26 of the last session. It is to be regarded solely as the expression of view of the members of the subcommittee. It has not been reviewed by the full committee.

I consulted the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration. The report comprises 50 pages, and I think falls within the rule.

I may say, Mr. President, that a number of requests have already come to the offices of the committee for quantities of this report, and I am asking that it be put on public sale by the Superintendent of Documents. I am informed that the sale price will be 20 cents a copy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report submitted by the Senator from Wyoming will be printed as a Senate document.

ECONOMIC INDICATORS—MONTHLY PUBLICATION NOW ON SALE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in this connection I think the Senate might be interested to know that copies of materials published by the joint committee generally have been in increasing demand through the country. Requests for publication, by mail, wire, telephone, or personal call, are currently running at over 50 per day. On the occasion of issuing the new report, the figure usually exceed 100 requcsts per day. Since October 1949 the committee has distributed to its mailing list and on special request nearly 18,000 committee documents. This is exclusive of the distribution by the Superintendent of Documents of those publications which have been put on sale. It has been the policy of the chairman of the committee to provide for the sale of as many of these documents as possible, in order that the Government may receive an income from their circulation. That was the thought I had in mind last year when I introduced the bill to provide for the publication of the monthly document entitled "Economic Indicators." The publication is for sale by the Superintendent of Documents at $1.75 a year, and the demand is so great that it is now selling at the rate of more than 2,000 copies a month. Other documents of the committee have sold in lots as high as 400 or 500, for use by schools, State and local government agencies, trade associations, large corporations, individuals, and other public interest groups. Economic Indicators is available, of course, without charge to all Members of the Congress, monthly upon its issue. The publication usually consists of the 32 pages, with charts and supporting statistics gathered by Government agencies in an objective way from the best available sources. Business, industry, agriculture, and consumers are all finding valuable information in the document. The demand which is developing for it shows the wide interest among the people of the country in the economic problem.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TYDINGS

S. 2911. A bill to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Col. Charles H. Bonesteel as Executive Director of the European Coordinating Committee under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, without affecting his military status and perquisites; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. ROBERTSON introduced Senate bill 2912, to protect trade and commerce against unreasonable restraints by labor organizations, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 2913. A bill for the relief of Michail Ioannou Bourbakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. HENDRICKSON (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey) introduced Senate bill 2914, to authorize the transfer of funds allocated for expenditure in cooperation with the New Jersey State Highway Department on State Highway Route No. 100 to State Parkway Route No. 4, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 2915. A bill to exempt admissions to activities of educational institutions from the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. MAGNUSON introduced Senate bill 2916, to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to provide for the review of procurement plans and policies of the Military Establishment which involve the relocation of industrial plants and personnel, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. JOHNSON of Texas introduced Senate Joint Resolution 148, to provide for the designation of the Air Engineering Development Center as the Arnold Engineering Development Center, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. KNOWLAND introduced Senate Joint Resolution 149, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States imposing a limitation with respect to taxation of income, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

PROTECTION OF TRADE AND COMMERCE AGAINST UNREASONABLE RESTRAINTS BY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to protect trade and commerce against unreasonable restraints by labor organizations. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement of its provisions by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 2912) to protect trade and commerce against unreasonable restraints by labor organizations, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That—

(a) Section 1 of the act of July 2, 1890, entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," as amended (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 1), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "*Provided further*, That when a labor organization or the members thereof have unreasonably restrained trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, in articles, commodities, or services essential to the maintenance of the national economy, health, or safety, or any substantial segment thereof, such conduct shall not be made lawful, and the jurisdiction of any court of the United States to issue an injunction against any such conduct shall not be restricted or removed, by the act of October 15, 1914, entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies and for other purposes,' as amended, or the act of March 23, 1932, entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes.'"

(b) Section 3 of the act of July 2, 1890, entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," as amended (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 1), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "*Provided*, That when a labor organization or the members thereof have unreasonably restrained trade or commerce between any such Territory and another, or between any such Territory or Territories and any State or States or the District of Columbia, or with foreign nations, or between the District of Columbia and any State or States or foreign nations, in articles, commodities, or services essential to the maintenance of the national economy, health, or safety, or any substantial segment thereof, such conduct shall not be made lawful, and the jurisdiction of any court of the United States to issue an injunction against any such conduct shall not be restricted or removed, by the act of October 15, 1914, entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies and for other purposes,' as amended, or the act of March 23, 1932, entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes.'"

The statement presented by Mr. ROBERTSON is as follows:

STATEMENT ON ANTITRUST LAW AMENDMENT

Labor leaders and labor unions today have the power, and will continue to have the power until Congress acts to amend existing laws, of unreasonably restraining trade to any extent their whims dictate, including control of production and prices, by unlawful means as well as lawful means. Unions are now secure and safe in the realization that the immunizing acts which Congress has passed, coupled with the interpretation the Supreme Court has given to those acts, make all labor and pseudo-labor activities safe from any corrective action by any court of the United States. Rightness or wrongness, wisdom or unwisdom, selfishness or unselfishness, and the gravity of the effect on the national welfare and security, have now become factors which labor unions can, if they desire, disregard. In this kind of a situation John L. Lewis can and has, by his 3-day-a-week work edict, tied up the coal resources of this Nation, for the very obvious purpose of controlling production so that coal supplies will be so curtailed, and the price of coal so held up, that his bargaining position, his arbitrary dominion over the coal industry, and his personal vanity, will be enhanced. This kind of blatant attempt to control production and prices, with only the most tenuous kind of relationship to the good of this Nation, or even the good of the coal miners, would have been unthinkable 20 years ago. It would have been the plainest kind of unreasonable restraint of trade in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act, and could have been prosecuted or enjoined as such. This intolerable situation cries for correction, and the simple amendment to the antitrust laws to which these remarks are addressed offers, in my judgment, the most understandable, effective, and reasonable method of dealing with this situation.

The text of the bill which I have offered is an amendment to section 1 of the Sherman Act (15 U. S. C., sec. 1), as follows:

"Section 1 of the act of July 2, 1890, entitled 'An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies,' as amended (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 1), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: '*Provided further*, That when a labor organization or the members thereof have unreasonably restrained trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, in articles, commodities, or services essential to the maintenance of the national economy, health, or safety, or any substantial segment

thereof, such conduct shall not be made lawful, and the jurisdiction of any court of the United States to issue an injunction against any such conduct shall not be restricted or removed, by the act of October 15, 1914, entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," as amended, or the act of March 23, 1932, entitled "An act to amend the judicial code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes."'"

There is a second section identical in language to what I have just read, amending section 3 of the Sherman Act, which deals with trade and commerce involving the District of Columbia and the Territories of the United States, as distinguished from commerce among the several States and with foreign nations. This second section of the amendment merely conforms section 3 to section 1.

The objective of the bill is not to change the Sherman Act itself in any way, but to restore to the Sherman Act the meaning which Congress always intended it to have, and which the Supreme Court had always said it had, until five members of that Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Frankfurter in the *Hutcheson case* (312 U. S. 219), declared in 1941 that the Norris-LaGuardia Act, an act purporting to deal, and intended by Congress to deal, solely with the availability of injunctive relief, was interpreted by the Court to have modified both the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act, so as to immunize all labor activities from the Sherman Act, a result which the Supreme Court had previously said, time after time, had never been intended by Congress.

In order to understand what the law now is on the applicability of the antitrust laws to labor-union activities, it is necessary to review briefly the history of the Sherman Act, and the amendments to it, as they have been applied to labor unions. The testimony before the subcommittee inquiring into this problem convinced me that when the Sherman Act was passed, in 1890, Congress had no intention of excluding or exempting labor-union activities from its prohibitions. Labor-union activities, like the activities of other organizations and individuals, were to be governed by the language of the act, and were to be outlawed if they involved restraints of trade. The Supreme Court declared in 1908 in the *Danbury Hatters case* (208 U. S. 774) that the Sherman Act did apply to labor unions engaging in restraints of trade, and that labor unions had no blanket immunity from the antitrust laws. A number of later cases reaffirmed this interpretation.

The Clayton Act of 1914 did two things affecting the relationship of labor-union activities to the Sherman Act. The first was a provision that the existence of labor organizations was declared lawful under the Sherman Act (15 U. S. C., sec. 17), a provision made necessary by the fear that the Government might start dissolution suits against labor unions, of the kind which had been successfully prosecuted to a conclusion in 1911 against the Standard Oil Co. and Tobacco Trust. The second pertinent provision of the Clayton Act prohibited the granting of injunctions by Federal courts against certain specific labor activities which even at that time were generally considered legal, such as peaceful picketing (15 U. S. C., sec. 52). Neither of these provisions of the Clayton Act undertook in any way to exempt or immunize labor unions from conduct unreasonably restraining trade, and the Clayton Act specifically confined the immunity to "lawfully carrying out" the "legitimate objects" of unions. The Supreme Court soon declared in the *Duplex Printing Co. case* (254 U. S. 443) that the Clayton Act had not been intended to give labor any blanket immunity from the antitrust laws. In the ensuing years other Supreme Court cases continued to uphold the doctrine that the Sherman Act was a bar against labor's engaging in unreasonable restraints of trade and commerce, the word "unreasonable"—the so-called "rule of reason"—having been read into the Sherman Act by the Supreme Court in 1911.

The next congressional enactment was the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932. That act was an absolute prohibition against any Federal court issuing an injunction in practically any case arising out of a labor dispute. Nothing was said in the Norris-LaGuardia Act that would indicate that that act was an amendment of the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act in defining what was and was not a legal labor activity from the standpoint of substantive offenses. The Norris-LaGuardia Act was by its terms confined to the withdrawal of a particular remedy, the labor injunction. However, in 1941 Mr. Justice Frankfurter's opinion in the Hutcheson case held that activity which could not be enjoined because of the prohibition in the Norris-LaGuardia Act could never be a substantive offense under the Sherman Act. Under the Hutcheson case, not only is it no longer possible to enjoin any case arising out of a labor dispute; in effect, the Sherman Act as now construed by the Supreme Court is declared to mean that nothing can be a criminal offense, or the subject of a treble-damage suit, if it arises out of any kind of a labor dispute. This state of the law gives labor an unlimited license to do anything it chooses, by unlawful as well as lawful means, and still be safe from prosecution, injunction, or liability under the Sherman Act. This is a result which certainly was never intended by Congress, and it should be corrected by Congress without any further delay. The amendment I have proposed would overrule the Hutcheson case to the extent that when a labor union or its members have unreasonably restrained trade in commodities or services essential to the maintenance of the national economy, health, or safety they cannot use the cloak of the Norris-LaGuardia Act or the Clayton Act to escape a criminal prosecution or injunction which Congress in the Sherman Act itself declared were the appropriate and necessary methods for dealing with unlawful activity of this kind.

In the course of our subcommittee hearings, a number of other kinds of legislation were proposed for dealing with this situation. One proposed method was to outlaw union activity on a Nation-wide basis. An extreme measure of that kind cannot enlist my sympathy or support. Another method proposed was to define specifically and to spell out the particular kinds of labor-union activities which are legal, and those which are illegal. Such a task has seemed to me, after studying all the proposals that were made, an almost impossible objective. The difficulty is that once a list is made of the specific activities which are declared to be unlawful, the list must always be qualified by some sort of an exemption of activities of these kinds when they are clearly pursued with the primary purpose of furthering a legitimate union objective. Once such a qualification is introduced, the whole matter of intention and purpose, i. e., whether the primary purpose is in furtherance of legitimate union objectives like bettering working conditions, or whether the primary purpose is to control production or prices, becomes controlling. Thus the final decision of whether the conduct is lawful or unlawful again comes back to a finding by the court to which the matter is submitted, and I believe that the better approach is to let the original, general language of the Sherman Act itself stand, making no attempt to spell out particular kinds of conduct which are lawful or unlawful, but merely prohibiting unreasonable restraints of trade and monopolies.

Some suggestions have been made of modifying the Sherman Act by outlawing labor monopolies, rather than by attacking unreasonable restraints of trade by labor. In other words, such a proposal would amend section 2 of the Sherman Act, dealing with monopolies, rather than section 1, which deals with restraints of trade. However, although either business or labor can engage in restraints of trade which to any fair-minded court would seem to be unreasonable obstructions to the free flow of commerce, and the free play of competition, the monopoly provisions of the Sherman Act cannot be said to have the same sort of application to labor unions as they have to business combinations. Every labor union is seeking to monopolize the supply of labor, either on a comparatively limited scale or on a national scale. That kind of monopolization is the avowed objective of labor unions, and it has been approved as a matter of public policy by Congress, not only in the Wagner Act, but also in the Taft-Hartley law. I have no intention or desire of asking that Congress outlaw that type of labor monopolization, strongly as I do feel that restraints of trade by labor can be as vicious and far reaching as any restraint of trade ever attempted by a business combination.

The original purpose of the Sherman Act was to prevent restraints of trade and monopolization intended to restrict production, fix prices, or otherwise control the market to the detriment of the consuming public. The public can be hurt just as badly when these restraints are imposed by labor unions, as it can when these restraints are imposed by business combinations, and in fact no business combination of which I have ever heard has achieved the kind of arbitrary power and control that John L. Lewis now possesses and wields. My bill will not abolish, or even threaten, the existence of Nation-wide unions, or their right to strike. It will not destroy industry-wide bargaining, as will be obvious to anyone who reads cases like *United Mine Workers* v. *Coronado Coal Co.* (259 U. S. 344 (1922); 268 U. S. 295 (1925)). Nor will my bill undertake to police interstate commerce, or to regulate the internal affairs of unions. Under the doctrine of the *Apex Hosiery Co. case* (310 U. S. 469), decided less than a year before the Hutcheson case, the Supreme Court declared that the regulation of union affairs is not governed by the Sherman Act, but is to be controlled by the acts dealing with labor such as the Wagner Act.

My bill would overrule the Hutcheson case. It would not overrule the Apex case or any of the other cases through which, over a period of 50 years, the Supreme Court of the United States had forged the Sherman Act, pursuant to the will of Congress, into a vital and potent force in keeping our economy a free one—free not only from the unreasonable restraints imposed by business combinations, but also free from the unreasonable restraints which labor had imposed and might seek to impose. The Apex case shows that buried beneath the artificial veneer with which Mr. Justice Frankfurter in the Hutcheson case had coated the Clayton and Norris-LaGuardia Acts, the Sherman Act still condemns restraints of trade, by labor as well as by business, in the same forceful language this Congress enacted in 1890. Labor unions today are immune only because of what I believe was a completely erroneous interpretation by the Supreme Court, in the Hutcheson case, of these two subsequent acts of Congress. The control of production and the fixing of prices by union action, in commodities or services essential to the pub-

lic welfare of the United States, seems to me just as objectionable from the standpoint of the ultimate effect on our economy as similar action by employer groups. The bill which I have offered would in plain and simple language remove the immunizing effect of the Clayton and Norris-LaGuardia Acts from conduct which up until 1941 had been almost universally branded as illegal and against the public interest, and which had always been regarded as outlawed by the Sherman Act. It would leave the Government free to go into a court and it would leave the court free to put a stop to labor-union practices which are so detrimental to the national welfare that some remedy, beyond the temporary stopgap remedy of the Taft-Hartley Act, is essential to protect the people of this country. The Sherman Act would then again serve, as it originally served, as a brake on unions which seek to put their own activities ahead of the national welfare.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FUNDS IN COOPERATION WITH NEW JERSEY STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the transfer of funds allocated for expenditure in cooperation with the New Jersey State Highway Department on State Highway Route No. 100 to State Parkway Route No. 4, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2914) to authorize the transfer of funds allocated for expenditure in cooperation with the New Jersey State Highway Department on State Highway Route No. 100 to State Parkway Route No. 4, introduced by Mr. HENDRICKSON (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the New Jersey State Highway Department, pursuant to act of the legislature of said State approved April 3, 1945 (ch. 83, Laws of New Jersey, 1945), which makes provision for the establishment, construction, and maintenance of freeways and parkways, has embarked upon the construction of its first freeway project located upon State Route No. 100, a new route which is partially graded but on which no road now exists; and

Whereas certain amounts of State and Federal-aid road funds have been allocated and partially expended for the acquisition of portions of the right-of-way required for and for initial construction on said project; and

Whereas by act approved October 27, 1948 (ch. 454, Laws of New Jersey, 1948), the legislature of said State established the New Jersey Turnpike Authority and empowered said authority to construct, maintain, repair, and operate turnpike projects to facilitate vehicular traffic and remove the handicaps and hazards due to the congestion of such traffic on the highways of the State, such projects to be financed by the issue of turnpike revenue bonds payable solely from tolls and revenues derived therefrom and to become free roads on the State highway system upon amortization of such bonds; and

Whereas engineering studies have disclosed that from the standpoint of urgent need, topography, industrial activity, and economy of construction, the most suitable location for a turnpike project that reasonably may be expected to amortize the cost of its construction by tolls and revenues derived therefrom is that selected for State Route No. 100, in view of which the New Jersey Turnpike Authority has decided to adopt said route for such a project and to proceed with the construction thereof pursuant to the act creating said authority; and

Whereas the New Jersey State Highway Department, pursuant to said act of April 3, 1945, has also begun construction, with the aid of Federal funds, of a parkway, designated as route 4 parkway, which will run practically the full length of the State and which the State desires to complete as a Federal-aid project:

Be it enacted, etc., That all Federal-aid road funds heretofore programed for expenditure in cooperation with the New Jersey State Highway Department on State Route No. 100 are hereby authorized to be transferred for programing and expenditure in cooperation with the New Jersey State Highway Department in expediting the construction of route 4 parkway of said State.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY ACT RELATING TO PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY OF DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 and related acts involving procurement authority of the Defense Department, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared in connection with the introduction of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Washington will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2916) to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to provide for the review of procurement plans and policies of the Military Establishment which involve the relocation of industrial plants and personnel, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

Mr. President, I am introducing today a bill proposing certain amendments to the National Security Act of 1947 and related acts involving procurement authority of the Defense Department. The language of the amendments I am proposing should not be considered a finished draft. Study by the appropriate committee of the problem which has stimulated this bill will undoubtedly bring to light the need for changes.

The objectives I am seeking in this bill represent a matter of deep concern, not only to me but to other Senators from the Pacific Northwest, the Great Lakes, and coastal States as well as the people residing therein. Many Senators will recall the agitation in the areas I have mentioned which accompanied the press announcement last fall that production of the Air Force B-47 was being allocated to Wichita, Kans., rather than the Boeing plant in Seattle. One of the reasons given was the relative vulnerability of the Northwest to enemy attack.

Despite subsequent reassurances from the Department of Defense on this score, there still remains in the minds of many of us the conviction that the power to allocate procurement contracts carries with it the power to relocate production and even industry itself.

Under certain circumstances it may be necessary, for security reasons, to disperse or even relocate aircraft or other defense production. Decisions of this magnitude and importance, however, should be made by appropriate civilian authorities or, to put it another way, there should be adequate civilian participation in any military decisions which would tend to disrupt the economy of any great section of this country.

Should the appropriate committee decide that amendments to the national security and related acts are desirable, patterned after the bill I am introducing today, certain types of military decisions would thereafter be reviewed by civilian authority before, rather than after, action is instituted.

Specifically, the bill would require the Munitions Board and the National Security Resources Board to review plans and policies for the procurement of supplies and services by or for the Department of Defense, when such procurement may result in:

"(A) The relocation of private or Government-owned industrial plants or facilities, or of personnel employed in such plants; or

"(B) The transfer of productive activity from private or Government-owned industrial plants or facilities situated in one geographical region of the United States to plants or facilities situated in another such region, or from privately owned industrial plants or facilities to industrial plants or facilities owned or operated by the Federal Government."

I have no desire whatever to interfere with the orderly procurement plans and policies of the Defense Department. I merely seek to insure that when such plans and policies threaten to disrupt and dislocate the economy of a region there be some reasonable review by civilians. The people of this country are willing to do anything that needs to be done to insure our security. Before making sacrifices, however, they want to be sure those sacrifices are necessary. Adequate civilian participation will provide that assurance.

ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT CENTER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to name the Air Force's Air Engineering Development Center for the late Gen. H. H. "Hap" Arnold.

It is fitting, I believe, that the world's greatest aeronautical research and development center should be named for the American airman who did more than any other to guide air power to maturity. General Arnold's active career spanned the whole era of modern military aviation in this country, from the Wright brothers to the triumph of supersonic flight. Throughout that career General Arnold was a visionary who breathed life into dreams which other men discarded or ignored.

"Hap" Arnold's great faith and astounding ability served as an inspiration to the men who sought to master the air frontier. His initiative was an ever-present challenge to the scientists and technicians, as well as the strategists. His influence made our Air Force what it is today. By continuing his influence over the research engineers and scientists, perhaps we can help make our Air Force what it must be for tomorrow.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 148) to provide for the designation of the Air Engineering Development Center as the Arnold Engineering Development Center, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

LIMITATION WITH RESPECT TO TAX ON INCOME—PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States imposing a limitation with respect to taxation of income. The joint resolution reads as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Except during the period of hostilities in any war during which the United States is a belligerent, the Congress shall not lay or collect any tax on taxable income at an effective rate in excess of 50 percent of such income.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

I ask unanimous consent that a tabulation of data secured from the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, showing the top-bracket rate for normal and surtaxes, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the tabulation presented by the Senator from California will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 149) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States imposing a limitation with respect to taxation of income, introduced by Mr. KNOWLAND, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The tabulation presented by Mr. KNOWLAND is as follows:

Top bracket combined normal and surtax rate

Top-bracket rate:	*Percent*
1913	7
1914	7
1915	7
1916	15
1917	67
1918	77
1919	73
1920	73
1921	73
1922	58
1923	58
1924	46
1925	25
1926	25
1927	25
1928	25
1929	24
1930	25
1931	25
1932	63
1933	63
1934	63
1935	63
1936	79
1937	79
1938	79
1939	79
1940	79
1941	81
1942	88
1943	88
1944	[1] 94
1945	[1] 94
1946	[2] 86.45
1947	[2] 86.45
1948	[3] 82.1275
1949	[3] 82.1275

[1] Law provided that no one should pay over 90 percent of income.

[2] After reduction of 5 percent—no one should pay over 85½ percent.

[3] No one should pay more than 77 percent of income.

Data secured from Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION OF BANKING AND CREDIT LEGISLATION, ETC.

Mr. MAYBANK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 218), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 101, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to May 6, 1949 (providing for an investigation of problems relating to banking and credit legislation, small business and economic stabilization), is hereby continued until February 15, 1951.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ENTITLED "PROGRESS ON THE HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS"

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 70), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 5,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 1158, Eighty-first Congress, first session, entitled "Progress on the Hoover Commission Recommendations," of which 3,500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, 1,000 copies for the Senate document room, and 500 copies for the House document room.

AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT OF 1948—AMENDMENT

Mr. TYDINGS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE—AMENDMENT

Mr. PEPPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3905) to amend section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code to give the Commissioner subpena power in cases involving refusal to renew licenses for making industrial alcohol, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN AT NORTHAMPTON COUNTY REPUBLICAN CAMPAIGN DINNER

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the Northampton County Republican campaign dinner, at Easton, Pa., Friday, November 4, 1949, which appears in the RECORD.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN AT FIFTY-FIRST ANNUAL DINNER OF THE PENNSYLVANIA SOCIETY

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the fifty-first annual dinner of the Pennsylvania Society, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, N. Y., on December 10, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHASE NATIONAL BANK FUND TO AID SMALL BUSINESS

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Loan Fund Set Up by Chase National," published in the New York Times of January 20, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

LOUIS HOUCK—ADDRESS BY NORWIN D. HOUSER

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Louis Houck," delivered by Hon. Norwin D. Houser, of Perryville, Mo., judge of the Twenty-seventh Judicial Circuit of Missouri, at the Southeast Missouri State College, Cape Girardeau, Mo., on October 15, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXCERPT FROM INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF CARL B. RECHNER BEFORE REAL ESTATE BOARD OF KANSAS CITY, MO.

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the inaugural address of Mr. Carl B. Rechner as president of the real estate board, Kansas City, Mo., January 6, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

A FORECAST OF CONDITIONS UNDER SOCIALISM—ARTICLE BY WHEELER McMILLEN

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "All of Us," by Wheeler McMillen, editor-in-chief of the Farm Journal, published in the February 1950 issue of that publication, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE COAL SITUATION IN DELAWARE

[Mr. FREAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a telegram sent to him by Leon Walker, president, Delaware State Coal Club, and also a letter from Mr. Walker, which appear in the Appendix.]

ILLUSORY WOMEN'S RIGHTS—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Illusory Women's Rights" published in the Washington Post of July 19, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

WILLIE SIX—ARTICLE BY ALFRED MYNDERS

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relative to the late Willie Six, written by Alfred Mynders, and published in the Chattanooga Times of January 15, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 3 minutes in which to read a brief statement on Federal rent control.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have been concerned about statements which have been made and reports which have reached me—most of which have been rumors and statements of opinion rather than reports—that there will be major opposition in Congress and even on the Democratic side to the extension of Federal rent control for an additional year.

Mr. President, I campaigned last fall on a platform which included a pledge to support the extension of Federal rent controls. I do not think that the results of that election were unnoticed in the rest of the country. To my mind it is inconceivable that the Congress will fail to follow the leadership of the President and his recommendations for the extension of Federal rent control for an additional year, and its strengthening if that is found necessary. No single factor in the national economy is so explosive and so urgently calls for continued control and regulation.

In recognition of these reports and these rumors, I issued a statement to the press yesterday asserting my own opinion that rent control should be extended and that the junior Senator from New York was determined, insofar as it lay within his power, to fight for such extension.

Mr. President, I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to insert that statement in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, the statement issued by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The question has been raised in New York State, as elsewhere across the Nation, as to whether the Federal Government will or should extend rent control for an additional year. I sense a growing apprehension among persons of average and low income who are renters and a growing sense of expectation among landlord groups that there will be no Federal Rent Control after June 30 of this year.

I cannot believe that Congress will permit this to happen. I shall do everything in my own power to prevent it. To allow this to happen would be to set off a bomb in our entire price and wage structure. Whatever the failings of the present rent control situation and whatever the hardships on particular individuals, the no-rent-control cure would be far worse, and might be disastrous.

I noted with much interest the recent analysis by the Office of the Housing Expediter of rental trends in areas which have been decontrolled by local offices.

It shows that in six widely separated cities more than 30 to 67 percent of all of the units which have been decontrolled showed rent increases. In every one of these cities the greatest rent increases have been imposed on persons who pay less than $30 a month for rent. I regret to note that the longer the decontrol has been in effect in a city, the more rents have risen.

For instance, the case in which 67 percent of the units had rent increases occurred in Dallas, Tex., the first city to abandon controls. In Houston, Tex., the last of the six cities to remove controls, the percentage of units showing increases was the smallest—31 percent.

These figures indicate to me that even under the existing law, unjustified rent increases are taking place wherever controls have been removed and that the heaviest burden is falling on those who are least able to pay.

I have not seen any data that proves to my satisfaction that competitive conditions in the housing field are improving fast enough to warrant the repeal of the Federal rent law. On the contrary, conditions in my own State show that Federal controls are not only desirable but that they are absolutely essential. Not a single city, town, or village in New York State has exercised its option under the Federal law to end rent control. I understand that this is also true in about half of the other 48 States.

Many opponents of Federal rent control contend that the basic property rights of American citizens are involved here. But it is my contention that the real issue is whether some property owners have the right to charge exorbitant rents and reap unreasonable profits at the expense of their fellow citizens. I do not see any way to prevent this form of exploitation except through the continued imposition of Federal controls—at least until such a time as when there are enough dwelling units available to maintain competition and keep rents at a reasonable level.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I also ask the unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as part of these remarks, a broadcast by Housing Expediter Tighe E. Woods over the CBS network on January 16. Mr. Woods expresses in this broadcast his own attitude—which I presume is also the attitude of the national administration—on the extension of rent control. Mr. Woods cites some very compelling figures and circumstances which I think should be available to the Members of the Senate and the country generally.

There being no objection, a transcript of the broadcast by Mr. Woods was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At 526 E. Seventh South Street in Salt Lake City, Utah, Nicholas Franks lives with his wife and 6-year-old daughter. Nicholas Franks is a machinist for the Denver & Rio Grande Railroad. In the last few months his take-home pay has dropped about 40 percent. Any decrease in family income is serious enough these days. But it's even more serious for the Franks family, because their rent has been increased. They used to pay $32.50 a month. Now they pay $45.00 a month. And the rent comes due every month.

Salt Lake City is only one of many cities where increases in rent have occurred. These are the cities where rent control has been wiped out, where rent control no longer protects tenants from unreasonable increases in rent.

But what's brought about this situation? How was rent control lifted in these cities?

Under the present rent-control law, Congress provided three ways by which controls can be ended: By States and municipalities, by local rent-advisory boards, and by the Housing Expediter. When a State or local government ends rent control, it cannot be restored, no matter how high rents may go. When controls are lifted on the recommendation of a local rent board, or when the Expediter ends them, they can be put back into effect if rents go up too high.

Since the present law went into effect, last April, four States have taken action to end controls—Nebraska, Texas, Wisconsin, and Alabama. In the same period, local governments have wiped out rent control in 200 towns and cities. Local rent-advisory boards, which are made up of groups of representative citizens in each town where rent control is in effect, have eliminated controls in only five communities. As Housing Expediter, I have lifted control in 467 communities.

I have been criticized for lifting controls in such a large number of towns and cities. But I am under a mandate from the Congress to decontrol wherever possible. However, the Housing Expediter has the authority to put controls back into effect if rents rise unreasonably, but the action of the State or local Government cannot be recalled. In only three of the communities which I have decontrolled has it been necessary to restore controls. In one city, Spokane, Wash., which we decontrolled, about half of the dwellings covered in a recent survey had increases in rent. The increases averaged 18½ percent. We are now making a further study of housing in this city to determine whether controls should be put back into effect.

During the past few months, statements have been made to the effect that rents have not increased very much in communities where State and local governments have ended rent control. Until now we have not had accurate information on these towns and cities. But tonight I can give you the real facts.

Recently, the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics—which is an independent, fact-finding agency—made surveys of rents in six of the largest cities now without rent control as a result of State or local action.

They found widespread rent increases.

In Dallas, Tex., and Knoxville, Tenn., two out of every three of the families in the survey have had their rents boosted.

In Jacksonville, Fla., and Salt Lake City, rent increases hit about half of the families.

Forty percent have had their rents raised in Topeka, Kans.; 31 percent in Houston, Tex.

And in every one of those cities more rents are being raised, month after month.

These increases are not small. They are substantial increases.

In Dallas, these families are paying 35 percent more rent each month.

In Houston, 41 percent; 30 in Topeka; Knoxville, 27; Salt Lake City, 16; and 26 in Jacksonville.

But that is only a part of the story.

The people who are hit the hardest are those who are least able to pay higher rents.

Take Dallas for example.

In Dallas almost three out of every four families included in this survey who earn less than $40 a week have had their rent increased approximately 50 percent.

The rent comes due every month. If you don't pay, you get tossed out. But you can't run the risk of being out in the street, because you can't find another place to rent, at least not at the price a family making $40 a week can afford.

The same thing is true in Topeka, Kans., where Mrs. Erlene Kistler lives. Mrs. Kistler is a widow. She has a 6-year-old daughter whose name is Rita. They live at 417½ West Seventh Street in Topeka. Mrs. Kistler has had a lot of trouble trying to find a place to live where they don't object to children. The apartment where she lives at present used to rent for $45 a month. Now the rent is $60, an increase of almost 35 percent. This winter Rita needed a new coat to wear. But the family budget is too small. Mrs. Kistler has had to make over an old coat of her own.

I told you that in Salt Lake City, where the Franks family lives, half of the families surveyed have had their rent increased. At the time the survey was made, the increases in rent in Salt Lake City averaged 16 percent. Of course, that 16 percent on top of the increases they had already received under rent control. But there's another angle to the story of Salt Lake City that's important.

The Salt Lake Tribune of December 23 printed a news item in which Mr. Darrell Welling, executive vice president of the Salt Lake Real Estate Board, denied reports that landlords were contemplating a new rent increase on January 1. The news story said: "Landlords on January 1 will have a free market on their properties to work out problems with their tenants. Pledges signed by

landlords not to increase rents more than 10 percent will expire at that time." That's the end of the quotation. Mr. Welling added that he thinks some landlords in Salt Lake City may decrease rents. We hope he is right.

I make this point about the rumors of more increases in Salt Lake City because similar conditions apparently apply to other cities where rent control has been ended by State or local governments. On the basis of the BLS survey, it appears that the longer a city has been without rent control, the greater the number of families who receive rent increases. Houston, Tex., had been decontrolled 1 month when the survey was made. Thirty-one percent of the tenants were paying increased rents. Dallas had been decontrolled 5 months when the survey was made. Sixty-seven percent of the families were paying higher rents. This clearly contradicts the contention of opponents of rent control that when a city ends rent control prematurely rents will go up only a little at first and then level off at reasonable rates.

The BLS surveys were made in only a few of the larger cities where controls have been lifted by local and State governments. But hundreds of families in other cities now without controls have reported similar increases.

In Omaha, Nebr., rent control was lifted by action of the State legislature. "Moon" Mullen who lives at 201 South Thirty-sixth Street in Omaha, is only one of many people there who are now paying increases in rents. "Moon" has three children. One girl is in high school. Their rent used to be $42.50 a month. Now it's $80. The children have been needing new shoes for some time. But "Moon" can't afford to buy new shoes now that his rent has been increased about 100 percent.

Day after day, dozens of letters come to me in Washington, asking if there is anything I can do to help families whose rent has been raised. Here is just one example of the kind of letter I receive. It's dated December 20, and it's from a housewife in Oklahoma City. She says, "Dear Mr. Woods: Please put rent control on again in Oklahoma City. Our landlord has raised the rent from $45 to $65 a month, and we can't pay it. We have one boy 11 years old and no one will take a child. We looked at a place Sunday which rented under rent control for $20 a month. Now it is $65. I don't know what we and dozens and dozens of families are going to do."

This housewife went on to say that she would have to move from her home on January 9. That was a week ago. I hope she was able to find a new place to live.

I wish I could have done something to help her. But I couldn't. Oklahoma City was decontrolled by action of the local city council.

There is another factor which now faces families in cities where rent control has been lifted prematurely. It is fear of eviction.

A moment ago, I said to you that hundreds of families have reported increases in rent. But for every family who reports an increase, there are thousands more who are afraid to do so for fear of being evicted. Time after time, as we talked to people in the cities I have told you about, we were met with this statement: "I can't let you use my name because I might be evicted if my landlord found out that I reported the increase."

Some people argue that rent control should be abolished right away. Landlords have been particularly vocal about it. And I am the first to admit that they have their side of the story. In a short time I expect to issue a statement on our present liberal policy for granting increases in rent to landlords.

No one wants controls any longer than is absolutely necessary. But we still have rent control because the need for housing is so critical in many cities and towns that the premature lifting of controls forces tenants to pay exorbitant increases in rent.

I have already told you what's happened to rents in some cities. Let me repeat the amounts of those increases.

In Dallas, rent increases average 35 percent.

In Houston, 41 percent; 30 percent in Topeka; Knoxville, 27; Salt Lake City, 16; and 26 in Jacksonville.

If you want to know what it would mean to you to pay an increase in rent like families in these cities and others are paying, just take a piece of paper and pencil and figure out how much of a dent it would make in your own budget to pay an increase of 35 percent. And then what are you going to cut out to make up this increase?

Last year, committees in the Senate and the House of Representatives held hearings on rent control and reported to the Congress that controls should be continued. Both of these reports made statements concerning the effect of lifting rent control which are very significant.

The Senate report says: "If rent controls are relaxed, or lifted entirely so that rents continue to go up—we are likely to find that the farm groups, industry, retail trade—the whole economy would suffer a severe blow. Any increase in rents today would be at the expense of diets, medical care, clothing, and other necessities of life of millions of American citizens."

This report to the Senate has proven to be "the handwriting on the wall." The prophecy has come true. You have heard what happens when rent control is lifted too soon. The families who are paying increased rents cannot afford clothing they need, and other necessities of life, such as food and medical care. This cut in their purchasing power has already had its effect upon retail trade and will continue to do so, because the increased rents come due every month.

As I said, we still have rent control because the shortage of housing in many cities is still so critical that the lifting of controls forces tenants to pay increases in rent that result in actual hardship. The removal of rent control is not the solution to our continuing housing shortage. That is like taking away a sick man's medicine to see whether he will get worse. The way to end the housing shortage—and get rid of rent control—is to build more homes. And when it is possible for the average family—with an income of around $50 a week—to get a place to rent at a price they can afford, then, and not until then, can we abolish rent control.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL FOREST ADVISORY BOARD OF APPEALS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement from the Department of Agriculture, together with an executive order by the Secretary of Agriculture establishing a National Forest Advisory Board of Appeals.

I may say, Mr. President, in explanation of the request, that last November, in the city of Graybull, Wyo., I attended a meeting of permittees upon the national forests at which was discussed the broad problem of the settlement of disputes between permittees and the Forest Service. More than 200 stockmen were present expressing their interest and concern in the administration of the national forests, particularly with respect to the solution of controversies arising from decisions of the Forest Service on matters affecting grazing.

It seemed to me to be desirable that an appellate procedure should be established for the settlement of such disputes. Thereupon, on returning to Washington I consulted Chief Forester Watts and his aides, discussed the matter at some length with them and suggested that an impartial appeals board should be established. Secretary Brannan wrote me last week saying that after consulting the law officers of the Department he was advised, and I think the advice was correct, that the Secretary had the authority under present law to establish such a board of appeals. The Secretary, in issuing the order, has provided, by establishment of this board of appeals, for an impartial hearing, upon any disputed cases which permittees may appeal, by an impartial board upon which the Forest Service itself is not represented, but before which it may appear. It is to consist of five employees of the Department whose duty will be to hear cases on their merits.

Any permittee who is dissatisfied with a decision of the Chief of Forest Service may make written appeal to the Secretary and will then be entitled as a matter of right to a hearing. I am grateful to Secretary Brannan and to Chief Forester Watts for their spirit of cooperation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not going to object to the unanimous-consent request for the insertion in the RECORD, of course, but I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming if I heard him correctly—and I could not hear everything he said—that authorization has been made by law prior to this time for the establishment of such an appeals board.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Secretary has been advised, and I think the advice is correct, that under the existing law the Secretary does have the authority to establish such an appeals board within the Department. I think that is a very substantial gain in the interest of the users of the national forests.

Mr. WHERRY. What about the appropriations to carry on the work of the board? Will that require any substantial amount of money?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The board will consist of five members, of the staff of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WHERRY. From the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Exactly; and their compensation is already provided for.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. For that reason probably no extra appropriations will be required.

Mr. WHERRY. Probably not.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY BRANNAN TO SET UP NATIONAL FOREST ADVISORY BOARD OF APPEALS

Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan today established a National Forest Advisory Board of Appeals in the Department of Agriculture.

The Board, established by an order of the Secretary, is to advise the Secretary on any appeals to him from decisions of the Chief of the Forest Service involving any public use of the national forests and other lands under administration or control of the Forest Service. The Board will consist of five employees of the Department of Agriculture

selected from agencies within the Department other than the Forest Service. Membership of the new Board will be announced later.

"Upon receipt of a written request of the Secretary from the appellant," the order stated, "the Secretary shall refer the appeal to the Board before which the appellant may appear if he so desires and the Board shall consider the appeal on its merits and furnish its advice and recommendations to the Secretary."

Under existing regulations, users of national forest lands, such as grazing permittees, purchasers of timber, and holders of other permits, may appeal from administrative decisions of the Forest Service to the Secretary of Agriculture. When an appeal comes to him, Secretary Brannan said, it has always been the practice to call upon members of the Secretary's staff to make an objective study of the case prior to his personal consideration and decision. A number of grazing permittees, however, have expressed a desire for a more formal arrangement.

The new National Forest Advisory Board of Appeals should not be confused with the National Forest Board of Review established in 1948. The Board of Review is composed of private citizens. Its purpose is to advise the Secretary on questions of general policy and the solution of major problems arising in connection with administration of the national forests.

NATIONAL FOREST ADVISORY BOARD OF APPEALS

There is hereby established the National Forest Advisory Board of Appeals to advise the Secretary on any appeals to him from the decisions of the Chief of the Forest Service involving any public use of the national forests and other lands under the administration or control of the Forest Service. The Board shall be comprised of five employees of the Department of Agriculture, to be selected from any agencies within the Department except the Forest Service. A majority of the members of the Board shall constitute a quorum. Upon receipt of a written request to the Secretary from the appellant, the Secretary shall refer the appeal to the Board before which the appellant may appear if he so desires and the Board shall consider the appeal on its merits and furnish its advice and recommendations to the Secretary.

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary.

ATTITUDE OF BRITISH TOWARD GERMAN PLAN TO END RATIONING OF FOOD AND GAS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an article from the Washington Evening Star of last Saturday entitled "British Irked at News Germans Plan To End Rationing of Food and Gas."

Mr. President, to my mind, this article demonstrates rather dramatically the complete failure the Socialist experiment in Great Britain has been. It appears from the article that Germany, our defeated enemy, is already better off in many respects and is making faster progress than Britain, one of the victorious allies. It seems that socialism in Britain has been even more disastrous to the welfare of the British people than the destruction of the war. Today, almost 5 years after the end of the war, Great Britain is still suffering from a severe shortage of many of the necessities of life. Germany, on the other hand, which has embraced the free-enterprise system, has been able to end the rationing of practically everything except sugar.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH IRKED AT NEWS GERMANS PLAN TO END RATIONING OF FOOD AND GAS

LONDON, January 21.—The British are unhappy and irritated at news that their exenemy, Germany, is going to take gasoline and all foodstuffs except sugar off ration.

It makes them wonder who won the war, anyway.

There is no prospect of rationing ending in Britain for years. The Socialists defend it on the grounds that it provides fair share for all. And they say that the average nutrition level here is higher than it was before the war.

They admit that food shops in western Germany are stacked high with commodities the British people have been unable to buy for many years. But, they insist, the German cupboard still conceals some terrifying skeletons alongside the juicy steaks.

RECKLESS SPENDING CHARGED

For example, a correspondent in Germany for the British labor paper, the London Daily Herald, writes: "The German Government has ended rationing at the cost of an almost reckless spending of dollar reserves. German exports sank from $93,000,000 in September to $81,000,000 in October. Imports, of which food is the big item, rose by $30,000,000 to an October total of $191,000,000."

The Herald correspondent insists that the purchasing power of the masses is so limited in western Germany that it was easy to end rationing. He says the average German housewife has little left over from her husband's pay packet for butter at 40 cents a pound and geese from $5.60 to $8.40 each. Ruhr miners who are the wealthiest group of workers earn only $14 to $16 a week, according to his reports. He says the basic diet of the German workers is now, as it has been since the latter days of the war, brown bread and potatoes and gravy with occasional sausages but little other meat.

"At the other end of the scale, Germany's employers and the underworld that flourishes in the jungle of currency rackets, night clubs and swagger hotels, live in grand style."

GERMANS DENY REPORTS

German officials themselves, however, insist that butter, meat, fat, eggs, bread, and milk are all available in ample supplies to allow their being sold at prices all can afford.

What it boils down to is that the West German Government under American tutelage and with American dollar support has embraced the free-enterprise system of America. The British Government, which also enjoys dollar aid, has gone in for Socialist-controlled economy. It will be an interesting thing to see which of these two biggest industrial countries in western Europe recovers first.

British car owners are a minority group compared to the millions in America. There are only about 2,000,000 cars here. But Britons don't begin to get the use out of their cars that Americans do—or that 300,000 car owners in western Germany will be able to do after February 1. Here in Britain, the basic gas ration allows for only 90 miles of driving a month.

ASK FOR MORE GASOLINE

Spokesmen for the automobile clubs here, think it is fantastic that gas should be ration-free in Germany and rationed here. In fact they point out that gas is ration-free also in France, Belgium, Holland, Italy, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, and Switzerland.

These spokesmen say: "It would be difficult to sustain the argument that our economic plight is so much worse than that of the rest of western Europe, including exenemy countries. We are convinced that the standard ration could be considerably increased without any adverse effect on the sterling-dollar balance."

Some critics feel that the British Government is keeping gas tightly rationed so that those people who own cars aren't much better off than those who have to ride busses—and thus there are fair shares for all. What "fair shares" means in many instances, say these critics, is a leveling down.

The only break a British motorist gets is in price. He pays about 31 cents a gallon. This may seem high in America, but the Germans have been paying 63 cents a gallon for their rationed gas and 84 cents on the black market.

THE COAL SITUATION IN DELAWARE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement prepared by me on the coal situation in Delaware, and also a letter dated January 20 from Mr. Leon Walker, president, Delaware State Coal Club, Wilmington, Del., which confirms the facts set forth in my statement.

There being no objection, the statement by Mr. WILLIAMS and the letter from Mr. Walker were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, following up the situation which has been described by Senators from various States with respect to the coal crisis, I wish to make a few observations on the coal supply in my own State of Delaware. While at home over the week end, I made it a point to obtain first-hand information on the coal shortage. As a result of the investigation which I have personally made, I find that in my own county of Sussex, where there exists a $100,000,000 broiler industry, stocks of coal on hand for broiler growers have been reduced to about 1 week's requirements. This is a dangerous, low level.

If we should have a prolonged cold snap, the coal situation as it affects the broiler industry, as well as other industries, institutions, and homes, will be alarming. In addition to my own personal investigation, I have received reports that coal dealers throughout the State of Delaware show stocks extremely low and unless relief is provided much suffering and economic loss will be inevitable.

As has been pointed out by the distinguished Senators from Ohio (Senators TAFT and BRICKER) and by many other Senators from various parts of our Nation, the sole responsibility for the continuance of this deplorable situation rests with the President of the United States. It has been and it should be continued to be made clear to the American people that the Congress of the United States in the enactment of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 (the Taft-Hartley law) has given the Chief Executive, President Truman, full authority under which such a crisis as now exists in the coal industry may be speedily ended.

The continued denunciation of the Taft-Hartley labor law by the President of the United States has lent encouragement to the left-wing labor elements in this country to continue to ignore the public interest. This law was passed by the Congress over the veto of the President by an overwhelming vote of both parties, and it is time that the President of the United States, as Chief Executive, recognize that it is his constitutional duty to enforce this law.

DELAWARE STATE COAL CLUB,
Wilmington, Del., January 20, 1950.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Confirming my telegram of date, copy enclosed, reports received from representative retail coal dealers throughout the State show their present stock of prepared sizes of anthracite for domestic heating purposes is extremely low and should we have normal winter weather a critical emergency will exist within a period of 3 or 4 days, or at least a week.

Many dealers are now out of sizes and due to the 3-day operation at the mines, shipments are necessarily confined to those days and if not then made no shipments can be made until the following week, plus a further delay of a week to 10 days for rail movement before any coal can be received. The present 3-day production schedule cannot possibly meet normal winter weather demands and with stocks exhausted and limited shipments, an acute emergency will quickly develop.

Reports from the lower end of the State also indicate that the stocks of nut coal on hand by dealers supplying broiler growers will not exceed 1 week's normal winter requirements. The only solution is for immediate resumption of anthracite production on a normal weekly basis. Should we have a spell of cold weather, further delay in handling the present situation will be disastrous. The President should act before it is too late.

I have taken the liberty of addressing you on the subject because of its importance.

With kindest regards,

Very truly yours,

LEON WALKER,
President.

SERIOUS SITUATION OF COKING-COAL MINERS AND FAMILIES

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, in the county in Pennsylvania which produces the coking coal which is used in the production of steel and certain other metals there is a very serious situation as it relates to the wives and children of the soft-coal miners.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a telegram from Mr. Joe L. Dickson, editor of the Morning Herald, of Uniontown, Pa.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIONTOWN, PA., *January 22, 1950.*

Wives and children of soft-coal miners in district 4 (Fayette and Greene Counties) are suffering hunger and near starvation as the result of circumstances over which they have no control. Their credit at industry-affiliated stores has been discontinued. State relief agency procrastinating and inadequate. Conditions are critical. No one wants that.

The Morning Herald appeals to you as their representative in the Senate of the United States in their behalf. This newspaper suggests that you appeal to John L. Lewis, United Mine Workers of America president, to establish some form of relief and that you renew your efforts to push through a resolution already introduced that President Truman declare a national emergency and enforce provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

THE MORNING HERALD,
Uniontown, Pa.,
JOE L. DICKSON, *Editor.*

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks my reply to the telegram to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the reply was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. JOE L. DICKSON,
Editor, the Morning Herald,
Uniontown, Pa.

I have given a great deal of thought and effort to the appalling situation described in your telegram of January 22.

It is inhuman and un-American that women and children should be deprived of food.

It is outrageous that they should be forced to suffer hunger and misery because they are innocent victims of dictatorial powers over their lives.

In previous strikes, before the establishment of the United Mine Workers welfare fund, some measure of relief was afforded the families of strikers through the United Mine Workers and its local unions.

Such relief, inadequate as it was, is not being given today, even though the unions are in better financial condition than ever before.

It has not been long since John L. Lewis backed up the striking steelworkers with United Mine Workers funds. Yet, money to provide the necessities of life for coal miners and their families has not been made available from the union treasury.

Some way must be found to alleviate the desperate conditions under which these good American citizens are suffering.

I have made a personal appeal to John L. Lewis asking that he use his power and authority to relieve the misery of the miners' families.

I will contact Government agencies in the hope that aid can be extended to women and children who are hungry.

The Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee has before it a resolution of which I am a cosponsor. It calls upon the President to recognize the emergency that unquestionably exists. I appeared before the committee in support of that resolution and will continue to push for its passage by the Senate.

I have read your telegram and my reply on the floor of the Senate, and I am hopeful that this presentation of the situation will be productive of greater sympathy for the plight of the wives and children of the striking miners and will stimulate action in their behalf.

EDWARD MARTIN,
United States Senate.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I have written a letter today to John L. Lewis, setting forth the seriousness of the situation in the county of Pennsylvania to which I have referred, and I ask unanimous consent that my letter be made a part of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. JOHN L. LEWIS,
International President,
United Mine Workers of America.

DEAR MR. LEWIS: This is a personal appeal to you to take such action as comes within your power and authority to relieve the desperate situation into which families of United Mine Workers have been forced by the present coal strike.

I know from personal knowledge and from numerous letters and telegrams that today thousands of women and children are hungry in Pennsylvania and in other coal mining areas.

The messages I have received cry out for relief from the misery that these innocent victims are suffering through no fault of their own.

Shall we stand idly by and permit these terrible conditions to continue until they reach the starvation stage?

Sincere concern with simple human needs demands that something be done without delay.

On behalf of the women and children who are without food I appeal to you to take prompt steps for the relief of their suffering.

With kind regards, believe me,

Very sincerely,

EDWARD MARTIN.

INFORMATION SOUGHT FROM THE STATE DEPARTMENT—THE FORMOSA SITUATION, ETC.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as a further indication of the iron curtain which has been lowered between the activities of the State Department and the Congress of the United States, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter dated January 3, 1950, which I wrote to the Secretary of State asking for a copy of the memorandum of December 23 stating that Formosa had no strategic value. I might say that that information has not, up to this time, been furnished.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 3, 1950.

Hon. DEAN G. ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I understand that under date of December 23 or thereabouts, the State Department issued a memorandum to various military attaches and others, indicating that Formosa could not be held for long and to do everything possible to prepare the public for the loss of the island and to stress the fact it was not needed for the strategic defense of the United States.

As a Member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee, I desire to have a copy of this memorandum at the earliest possible date.

With best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD a copy of a letter dated January 7, 1950, in which I inquired of the Secretary of State the names of the persons who might have drafted the document, so that inquiries might be made as to their competence to make such determination, together with a letter dated January 17 from the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, declining to furnish the information.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 7, 1950.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
State Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I called the State Department this morning to request the names of the committee which had been responsible for drafting the December 23 memorandum advising the State Department personnel that Formosa had no strategic value.

I first attempted to get Mr. Peurifoy in the Personnel Division, but he was out of the city and talked with Mr. Bryan and made the request of him. He said be had to take it up with higher authority. At about 11:15 this morning, I received a call from Mr. George Kennan who stated both Secretary Acheson and Under Secretary Webb were out

of the city. However, he stated that the State Department itself assumed responsibility for any such information sent out and that he felt that he must decline to give me the names of the persons constituting the committee which drafted the document.

I emphasized to him that I felt that as a Member of the Senate of the United States I was entitled to this information and that while there might be some basis for the Department's position to decline to release a document which they themselves had classified, I could see no excuse for not furnishing a Member of Congress the names of such committee.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, January 17, 1950.

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I have your letter of January 7 in which you refer to your effort to obtain the names of those responsible for drafting the December 23, 1949, memorandum, and to your conversation with Mr. George F. Kennan who advised you that he felt he could not furnish you with the information.

I fully agree with the position taken by Mr. Kennan that it would be inappropriate to release the names of the officials who participated in the drafting of this paper. I feel that I, as Secretary of State, have responsibility for the work of officials of the Department. Primary responsibility for this particular document, in my opinion, rests with me and secondary responsibility rests with Mr. Howland Sargeant, Acting Assistant Secretary of State in Charge of Public Affairs.

I hope you will agree with the position I have taken in this matter. The responsibility is mine and I fully accept it.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON.

THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

RECOMMENDATIONS OF HOOVER COMMISSION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared and copies of various communications which I have received on the subject of the present recommendations of the Hoover Commission with regard to the Veterans' Administration. I ask unanimous consent that this material be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, Mr. WILEY'S statement and the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPPOSITION BY WISCONSIN VETERANS' GROUPS TO HOOVER PROPOSALS

Mr. President, the veterans of this Nation are deeply concerned about certain suggestions made by the Hoover Commission on veterans' affairs. These suggestions are found in House Document No. 92 of the Eighty-first Congress, first session.

The national commander of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled Veterans of World War II have all indicated their strenuous opposition to the Hoover proposals.

Some proposed changes, such as structural adjustments in the organization of the Veterans' Administration as recommended by the Hoover Commission, can be made without legislative enactment, at the discretion of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs or by decision of President Truman.

MANY PROPOSALS ON VA NOT YET STUDIED

Other proposals are the subject of legislation such as the idea of creating a veterans' insurance corporation which is embodied in H. R. 5171 and H. R. 5288 now pending before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. Still other bills dealing with home-loan guaranties would have to be considered by the House Committee on Executive Expenditures. The most controversial of all the recommendations—the one dealing with the merging of Veterans' Administration services under a United Medical Administration (which would handle all of the other hospital services of the Federal Government)—that highly debatable suggestion would also have to be referred to the House Executive Expenditures Committee.

The above facts indicate that Congress has not as yet studied these various issues in detail, but will have to give its most serious attention to them.

Like my colleagues, I have received a tremendous number of fine letters, telegrams, and resolutions from veterans' groups in my State which express their deep concern over the net effect of the Hoover reports insofar as America's 18,000,000 ex-servicemen and their families are concerned.

I am sure that my associates and I are agreed that—

1. Congress should take no action which would impair the morale of our veterans or which would lead them to feel that the Government for which they fought and bled on a thousand battlefields has forgotten them.

2. Congress should take no action which would apply a misplaced economy ax arbitrarily into the very heart of veterans' services. We all recall the sorry days in the 1930's when veterans' pensions and other VA services were ruthlessly slashed by the Democratic administration while Government spending for other groups soared. We dare not break the faith with those who by their deeds of valor preserved this Nation.

VETERANS' GROUPS MUST BE HELPED

3. The judgment of the leading veterans' organizations in opposition to the Hoover reports is not one that any public official should lightly dismiss. On the contrary, these organizations, which perform so many services for our veterans, must be given the respect and the heed which their magnificent patriotic record so well deserves. The members of these veterans' groups are, of course, deeply concerned about the issue of Federal economy along with all our other citizens. But they feel as I do, that it would be misplaced economy for the Congress to take any action which would strike at the one group in this Nation—veterans and their families—which deserve the most and the best on the part of a grateful Government and people.

In order that my colleagues might have the benefit of the grass-roots reactions of veterans' posts, I ask unanimous consent that a few of the many splendid letters which I have received from all over Wisconsin be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

CRANDON, WIS., *January 13, 1950.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: As county commander of Forest County, Wis., of the American Legion, I most earnestly request that you use your influence in defeating that portion of the Hoover Commission recommendations dealing with Veterans' Administration, hospitalization, medical care, and insurance. It appears that a thorough and impartial survey of hospital beds was not made, and also that the findings of the Commission relative to the operations of the insurance department were based on a hasty survey. While we do not want too much duplication of facilities, we also do not want the veteran to suffer at the hospital level. Your consideration of the veteran will be most gratifying.

Very truly yours,

VERN RUSSELL,
Forest County Commander, The American Legion, Department of Wisconsin.

TANNER-PAULL POST, No. 120,
THE AMERICAN LEGION,
West Allis, Wis.

Hon. Senator WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Your service and attention to our position on the Hoover report will be appreciated.

Our objection is confined to that portion which applies to the Veterans' Administration. United and firm we stand against this attempt to reduce the veteran and the Veterans' Administration to a state of ineffectiveness and confusion. We protest against the proposed dismemberment of the Veterans' Administration; against the inclusion of nonveteran groups in veterans' rights, and, in brief, against the full meaning of this section of the Hoover report.

We further emphasize that we do not take a stand against the other provisions in Mr. Hoover's report. We do oppose, with all our strength and vigor, the section dealing with the Veterans' Administration.

Your comprehensive analysis will, no doubt, be in close agreement with ours.

Thank you.

Yours respectfully,

BYRON STUART,
Commander.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
KEWAUNEE COUNTY COUNCIL,
Kewaunee, Wis., January 17, 1950.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SENATOR: On behalf of the Kewaunee County (Wis.) Council of the American Legion, I respectfully request that you do all in your power to help defeat the recommendations of the Hoover Commission insofar as it pertains to the veteran. As commander of the Kewaunee County Council of the American Legion, I speak in behalf of approximately 800 veterans of both World Wars I and II, who at their last meeting on January 12, 1950, voted unanimously in their disapproval of the Hoover Commission Report insofar as it pertains to the veteran.

Many of the statements of the Hoover Commission pertaining to hospital facilities and the insurance program of the Veterans' Administration are false, as proven by investigations of the American Legion and other veterans' organizations.

We are opposed to placing the construction of veterans' hospitals under the Department of the Interior, taking of the entire medical program of the veteran from the Veterans' Administration and turning it over to a United Medical Administration, and the transferring of the life-insurance program from the Veterans' Administration to a contemplated Government insurance corporation.

The Hoover Commission is seeking to prevent further hospital construction for veterans on the basis that we now have in excess of 100,000 beds more than are required. When the members of the Hoover Commission were questioned by the representatives of the American Legion, relative to this so-called surplus, they could not state definitely where these so-called surplus beds were. Approximately 80 percent of the beds at all Veterans' Administration hospitals are occupied. To have more than 80 percent occupied continuously would leave an insufficient

number of beds available for emergency cases. A portion of the 20 percent not fully occupied is also due to the daily turn-over at hospitals. To have a larger occupancy is not good medical practice. No doubt the Hoover Commission obtained their figures by counting beds in unoccupied hospitals constructed during the war as emergency hospitals for use during the war and immediately thereafter. Most of these emergency or temporary hospitals are not of a permanent type of construction. The Hoover Commission fails to report that the cost of equipping these temporary hospitals for present purposes is prohibitive that these temporary hospitals were never intended for rehabilitation purposes, and that for such use would cost more in the end than new facilities. Every veteran who has ever attempted to gain admission to a veterans' hospital for treatment knows that there is a long waiting list at practically every veterans' hospital. This proves that there is no surplus of hospital facilities for the treatment of veterans.

The Hoover Commission also presented various facts in regard to the efficiency of the insurance program of the Veterans' Administration. Although the Veterans' Administration has only 30 percent more employees proportionately to the average private insurance company, they handle 100 percent more insurance policies. Whereas each employee of a private insurance company handles on the average of 330 policies, each employee in the Veterans' Administration handles an average of 510 policies.

A private insurance company receives slightly less than two remittances per year for each policyholder, whereas the Veterans' Administration receives three times as many remittances a year from each policyholder. Most private insurance is written as whole life when subscribed to, whereas almost all Veterans' Administration policies begin as term insurance, necessitating later conversion. Due to the great dissimilarity of Government and private insurance, such comparison as above cannot be made with fairness to all concerned. However, since the Hoover Commission was critical of the administration of the Government insurance program, the above tends to disprove their claims.

It is the position of the Kewaunee County Council of the American Legion that creating a new corporation to take over the insurance program will not result in efficiency, and that the most efficient system is to continue with the Veterans' Administration supervising all veterans' affairs, insurance and others.

Therefore your aid is requested to defeat the recommendation of the Hoover Commission insofar as it pertains to the veteran.

Yours truly,

EDWARD E. BISELY,
Commander.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN—PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 25) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I intend to propose to the pending bill. It is very short. I ask that it be read, printed, and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk, without objection, will read the proposed amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, it is proposed to strike out lines 6 and 7 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 5 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress; and, if so satisfied, shall take effect upon the expiration of 1 year after the date of such ratification.

Mr. HAYDEN. I desire to offer an amendment to the pending joint resolution, and ask that it be read by the clerk, and that it be printed, and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, between lines 4 and 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

The provisions of this article shall not be construed to impair any rights, benefits or exemptions conferred by law upon persons of the female sex.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, in opening the discussion on the pending joint resolution, I think it would not be inappropriate to refer in a general way to exactly what we are to do as the Senate.

Within the past few weeks I have received hundreds of communications, as I am sure every other Senator has, to this effect: "Please vote for the equal rights amendment to the Constitution," or, in some cases, "Please vote against the equal rights amendment to the Constitution."

It is unnecessary to recall to Senators that there is no authority vested in the Senate of the United States or the Congress of the United States to vote for or against an amendment to the Federal Constitution. Nor is there at any stage of the amendatory proceedings laid down in the Constitution, nor is there at any point, action by the Senate or the House of Representatives, or both, on the matter of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, the founding fathers, when they framed the Constitution, that remarkable document, in the first article stated that, "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

"All legislative powers." But those legislative powers must be exercised within the framework of the Constitution. If any legislative body assumes or attempts to act outside the purview of that limitation, our courts are established to pass upon whether or not they have exceeded their power.

I also desire to recall to the attention of Senators the fact that in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, there is the express reservation that "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Then, how, Mr. President, are we to tap that reservoir of power which the Constitution has reserved to the people? How is it to be tapped? Is the Constitution to be a strait-jacket down through the years in the form in which it was adopted?

The founding fathers recognized that situation, and provided methods for amendment, but they did not see fit to clothe the Congress of the United States with any power whatever to determine what amendments should be adopted or added to the Constitution. If they had wanted to place that power in the Congress, they would have done so. On the other hand, the mandatory machinery which was set up provided two distinct methods, both for the purpose of tapping this reservoir, and for that alone.

The first was that if Congress wishes to throw into gear machinery for finding out what the people think on a matter, then the Congress by a two-thirds vote of the respective bodies could tap this reservoir of amendatory power of the people. Their function is simply the matter of throwing into gear the tapping of the power which remains in the people.

The other method was that if two-thirds of the States wanted to initiate action and request the Congress to take action, they could do so; to pass on an amendment? No; not to pass on an amendment to the Constitution, but merely to provide the machinery for tapping this same reservoir by calling a constitutional convention of the States. At no point is there any power lodged in the Congress of the United States to pass on a question of an amendment to the Constitution.

Senator GUY M. GILLETTE, of Iowa, has no power, and will have no power, to vote on any amendment to the Constitution of the United States. GUY M. GILLETTE, citizen of Iowa, will have that right and will have that power, as will every other citizen of the United States, when it is presented to them for determination.

Nor, after the ratification by three-fourths of the States, is there any function to be performed by the Congress. As the States ratify, they deposit their ratifications with the Department of State, and when three-fourths of them have ratified, is any further action required on the part of the Congress? Not at all. A certification by the Secretary of State that the last ratification has been deposited makes an amendment a part of the Constitution.

Mr. President, in the consideration of a constitutional amendment proposed to be carried to the people, I can understand opposition to its provisions. There is now on the calendar of the Senate a proposed constitutional amendment, presented by the able junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], for changing the method of electing the President. I have very distinct doubts as to the wisdom of that proposed amendment, but, as a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I voted to report it to the Senate. When and if it is called up, I shall vote for submission of the amendment to the people. As I have said, I can understand an attitude of doubt, I can understand some

qualms as to the wisdom of a proposed amendment, but—and I say this as emphatically as I can—I cannot understand any man wanting to question the right of the people to determine such a matter.

He either fears his fate too much,
Or his deserts are small,
That dares not put it to the touch,
To gain or lose it all.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator from Iowa for saying that he would be willing to see Senate Joint Resolution 2 considered and voted on, even though he himself does not think it has merit. I am glad he is willing to see it come before the Senate. I hope that it will come up, and that at that time I shall be able to convince the Senator from Iowa that it has merit. I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. GILLETTE. As I stated, I now repeat, while I have doubts, and the Senator may be able to dispel them in the discussion here, they would not deter me from voting for the submission of the amendment to the people. The very essence of democracy, the foundation stone under the whole foundation of our Government, is that if the people are given the right and oportunity to discuss matters of public import, to debate them, and to present opposing views, out of that discussion will be crystallized a decision that will be for the best interests of the people. To refuse to submit to them, not a capricious matter, but a matter of genuine concern, to me is to contravene and negate the very foundation on which we build our governmental structure, and to express distrust of it.

Mr. President, in commencing the dedate on Senate Joint Resolution 25, which proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, I should like to try, if I can, to set this proposal in its historical context. I do not mean to say, nor do I wish the statement I have just made to be construed to mean, that the Congress should submit to the people every whimsical matter which may be presented to it; but where there exists such support of a question concerning the public welfare as to justify taking action upon it, or, as the Constitution says, to make it necessary that action upon it be taken, then of course I am convinced, and I think no one can deny, that the people have the right to pass on the question regardless of any individual views. That is why I refer to the historical background.

In the first place, of course, it is a rare occasion when the people of this country are offered the opportunity to amend the basic law. In the first half of this century the Constitution has been altered only six times. In fact, the twenty-first amendment merely repealed the eighteenth, leaving a net change of only four amendments added to the Constitution since the year 1870.

Secondly, this occasion marks the culmination of a 27-year legislative campaign in the Congress to reach a decision on submitting an equal-rights amendment to the States for ratification.

Thirdly, the proposal before the Senate is an expression of the ultimate objective of a popular movement that began more than 100 years ago, a steadily growing movement of both men and women which has sought to guarantee equal rights under the law for all citizens regardless of their sex. The nineteenth amendment, ratified in 1920, assured both male and female citizens of equal political rights as voters. It did not, however, assure them equal legal rights, and from that inadequacy has flowed as a corollary, the effort of the past quarter century to attain full constitutional recognition of the legal right of citizens, regardless of their sex, to be treated equally under the laws of the country.

Lastly, this sketch of the historical setting for the amendment would be incomplete without mention of its significance in the present world-wide ideological struggle between the advocates and the enemies of human rights. What we do here to guarantee equal rights under the law to all our citizens, men and women alike, cannot help but affect our country's success in the global battle to win men's minds away from tyranny and toward free society.

With these considerations in mind, Mr. President, I urge that the Senate move speedily to a decision to submit the proposed amendment to the people.

Mr. President, this joint resolution was introduced in Congress on January 13, 1949. Associated with me as cosponsors of the joint resolution are a very great number of Senators: The distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs SMITH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

I interpolate at this point, Mr. President, that this morning the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] called me by telephone to express his very great regret that the state of his health would not permit him to be present to vote for the joint resolution, but he asked me as a favor to him again to state his deep interest in the measure and his desire to be present to support it.

At the time the joint resolution was submitted, the late distinguished Senator from North Carolina, Mr. Broughton, from Kansas, Mr. Reed, and from Idaho, Mr. Miller, were also sponsors. They have all passed from among us.

Thus, originally, the joint resolution was sponsored by a total of 33 Members of the Senate. Two additional Senators, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], also signified to me their desire to participate as cosponsors of the joint resolution after it was already in print.

Many of us who are sponsoring this proposal in the Eighty-first Congress have been associated with similar efforts for equal rights in previous Congresses. It is one measure of the steadily increasing demand among the American people for this proposed constitutional amendment to find a much larger group of Senators participating in the presentation of the joint resolution in this Congress than ever before.

Not only in the Senate, but in the House as well, the trend has been toward an ever-greater support for a constitutional amendment to provide equal rights under the law for both men and women. This rising curve of support is a reflection of the ever-growing body of public opinion in the Nation at large for such constitutional amendment.

I feel sure it is not necessary—that indeed it would be an imposition on Senators—for me to trace the long struggle through which we have passed in trying to place before the country an amendment to the Constitution providing simply that equality of rights under the law shall not be abridged or denied on account of sex.

It is enough to note that this is the twenty-seventh consecutive year that this proposed amendment, in one form or another, has been before the Congress. Since 1923 there have been 26 different hearings on it—exhaustive hearings—in committees and subcommittees of both Houses of Congress. For 27 years the question has been examined, debated, reexamined and redebated again and again by our citizens and by their elected representatives. In my opinion, it is highly significant that each year a greater number of individuals and a greater number of organizations have endorsed the idea, that each year adds to the number of State legislatures which have memorialized the Congress in favor of the amendment, that each year more and more State Governors have urged its adoption.

It is noteworthy, too, I think, that today there are 10 Members of the Senate who in the past, while serving as Governors of their respective States, wrote strong endorsements of the equal-rights amendment. Of these former Governors now serving in the United

States Senate, seven are cosponsors of the pending joint resolution. Their continued keen interest and their stanch support of equal rights for men and women are, to my mind, further evidence of the widespread and increasing favorable opinion in the Nation regarding the proposed amendment.

Not only has this issue been alive—very much alive—for more than a quarter of a century, but in the last two national elections both of the two major political parties wrote unequivocal endorsement of equal rights by constitutional amendment into their national platforms. Many of the Senators who worked in the drafting committees on the equal-rights plank for their respective party platforms are sitting in the Senate today.

The Republican Party platform of 1940, for example, stated:

> We favor submission by Congress to the States of an amendment to the Constitution providing for equal rights for men and women.

The 1944 Republican Party platform carried a plank in the same language as its 1940 platform.

The Democratic Party platform for the year 1944 declared:

> We recommend to Congress the submission of a constitutional amendment on equal rights for women.

Mr. President, I do not consider that absolutely binding on any Senator. While I go along with the major provisions of my party platform, as, in my opinion, representing on the whole, the better statement of my views on issues, I reserve my right as an individual not to be bound by every line and every paragraph. I simply cite the platform declarations for the purpose of showing that this is not a capricious, a whimsical matter we are presenting to the people, but that behind it is a volume of public interest and public pledge which justifies our giving the people a right to express themselves on the subject.

In the interim between the 1944 and the 1948 national elections, the Senate had an opportunity to vote on a joint resolution calling for submission of the equal-rights amendment to the States. The resolution received a majority of the votes cast at that time, in 1946, but lacked the necessary two-thirds majority, largely because of extremely heavy absences among its supporters in the last days of the session. Had every known supporter been in the country and present in the Senate when the vote was taken, the exact number of votes in the affirmative would have been 56—which is the same number of votes cast when the woman's-suffrage amendment received its final vote in this body.

The pressure of public opinion behind this equal-rights amendment did not abate, however, because of this temporary set-back. Quite the contrary. Responding to massive popular support, the national platforms of the two major parties in 1948 again declared in unequivocal terms the intention of the Republican and Democratic Parties to press for submission of an equal-rights amendment such as we are considering today. It is noteworthy that the equal-rights planks of the two parties in 1948 were written in almost identical language. Both parties favored submission of a constitutional amendment providing equal rights for women.

Thus, there is no possibility of anyone imagining that this is in any sense a partisan issue. A thoroughly bipartisan group of Senators has submitted the amendment as set forth in Senate Joint Resolution 25. This is no party issue; it cannot be, since we are dealing with the basic rights of human beings to which both our great parties are equally dedicated.

In the past session of the present Congress, on March 22, 1949, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, for the first time, reported the resolution unanimously. Every member but one of that distinguished committee of able lawyers, was present and voted affirmatively. There can be no doubt whatever, at this late date, that the text of the proposed amendment has been minutely and meticulously scrutinized by the most capable and judicious legal minds in the Senate, both in past Congresses and in the present Congress. There was in the Seventy-eighth Congress a favorable Senate Judiciary report by Senators Austin, O'Mahoney, Kilgore, and McFarland; in the Seventy-ninth Congress, favorable Senate Judiciary Committee, report by Senator Hatch; in the Eightieth Congress, favorable Senate Judiciary Committee report by Senator Ferguson; in the Eighty-first Congress, favorable Senate Judiciary Committee report by Senator McCarran. There has never been an unfavorable report on the equal-rights amendment. Every legal and constitutional aspect of it has been weighed a score of times. And now at last we are to vote on this issue which has for so long been before the country and before the Congress.

The controlling argument, to my mind, which should guide us in our discussion of the proposed amendment is this: What we do here when we vote on this measure is to allow the people their democratic right to decide, themselves, through their State legislatures, whether or not they want to have the amendment ratified and made a part of the Constitution.

I do not stress the fact that the joint resolution must be passed by a two-thirds majority of both Houses of Congress, nor the fact that before the amendment can become part of the Constitution, it must, of course, be approved by three-fourths of the States.

The founding fathers of our country did not give Congress the authority to amend or change the Constitution.

In their wisdom, the men who drafted the Constitution placed the source of power in the people. The problem, then, was how to tap the reservoir of power in the people so as to make changes in the fundamental law from time to time as circumstances and exigencies might require.

Two methods to which I referred a moment ago were provided: One was by the people's initiative, expressed through the States, requesting Congress to call a Constitutional Convention for the purpose of amending the basic framework of law. This method was difficult and cumbersome. The other way provided that Congress should submit proposed amendments to the States, for the legislature of each State to determine whether it wanted to ratify or not.

The question before the Senate, then, is not "Shall we amend the Constitution?" I cannot repeat that too often. That question is not for us to decide. The States, with at least three-fourths of them concurring, if the amendment is to become part of the Constitution, must make the real decision. No, the question before us is simply this: "Should we now submit this amendment to the States for their decision?" If I were opposed—which I am not—to this amendment to the Constitution, I would vote for submission of the amendment to the people of the United States. I do not distrust the wisdom or judgment of the people of the United States. I do not have such a high regard for the wisdom of my own judgment that I will refuse to submit proposed constitutional amendments to my fellow citizens of the United States, to let them pass judgment in the way that the founding fathers, those who wrote the Constitution, said the people have a right to do.

In other words, our power of determination is limited to deciding whether or not the people should be permitted to express themselves locally in their own States on this issue.

Of course, it goes without saying that the Congress should not—and does not—submit to the people every capricious, whimsical, or captious notion that may be suggested to it. Not long ago, Mr. President, I stood on the floor and argued against the shipment in interstate commerce of colored oleomargarine. I argued as earnestly and as strongly as I knew how. But I would not think of submitting that question to the people of the United States as a constitutional amendment. More recently, we took up the basing-point conference report, a matter of tremendous importance to the people. But that is a legislative matter, not a matter to be submitted to the people as a proposed constitutional amendment. I would not favor doing so.

So, as I have said, Congress does not submit to the people every capricious, whimsical, or captious notion that may be suggested. But I am sure that no one will pretend today, after 27 years of public discussion of the equal-rights amendment, that the proponents of the present joint resolution are moved by caprice, whimsy, or crackpot faultfinding. Nothing new or startling is here being sprung upon the people. I hesitate, in fact, to guess how many pages of testimony are available concerning this long-sought amendment, how many volumes have been written to enlighten the people about it, how many public speeches have been made about it in every State of the land.

Mr. President, I mention here some of the many national organizations which have endorsed the amendment: The National Woman's Party, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Education Association of the United States, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, the National Association of Women Law-

yers, the American Medical Women's Association, the Osteopathic Women's National Association, the National Association of School Secretaries, the National Council of Women Chiropractors, Association of American Women Dentists, the American Federation of Soroptimist Clubs—the largest association of women in our country, the National Association of Colored Women, the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, the Congress of State Societies, the Pilot International, the Alpha Iota Sorority, the Wheel of Progress, Delta Phi Epsilon, the Quota International.

The biennial convention of the National Council of Women of the United States, in May 1946, recommended that its member organizations request the Congress of the United States to follow democratic procedure by submitting the important question of the equal status of women, as embodied in the equal-rights amendment, to the States for action.

Furthermore, hundreds of State, regional, and local organizations of women representing social, political, industrial, business, and religious groups, have endorsed the amendment.

Mr. President, I pause here to say that I understood that there was presented, or was about to be presented, a statement from leading women jurists opposing this amendment. On Saturday, I received the following telegram from Judge Marion J. Harron, whose name appeared or is to appear, if and when that statement is filed:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 20, 1950.*
Senator GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

My name erroneously included in list submitted by committee. Status of women dated January 13 as opposed to Senate Joint Resolution 25, equal-rights amendment, letter, and list may be inserted CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Please request deletion of my name from list of opponents. As a citizen I support equal-rights amendment to guarantee civil rights for all women uniformly in United States and I also support American minimum standards for labor in American industry. Our Nation has advanced beyond both types of nineteenth century backwardness; there cannot be a lasting conflict under law between these two principles if by constitutional amendment equal rights under law for all citizens is established. The temporary period of legal clarification of local statutes after equal-rights amendment is adopted will require relatively small effort and should not prevent the uniting of all women in a common effort for the good of all citizens. You may insert this in RECORD.

Respectfully,

MARION J. HARRON.

Mr. President, I am persuaded that anyone who, after the many years this problem has been before us, still hesitates to submit the amendment to the States is negating the very spirit of the Constitution. Either he mistrusts his own position in the matter and does not dare put it to the test of popular referendum in the States or he is arrogating to himself the aristocratic prerogative of dictating to the people what they shall and what they shall not be allowed to vote upon.

The latter assumption of superior wisdom, I suggest, is an echo from the eighteenth century. It finds its parallel in the attitude of those who, in the early decades of our Nation's life, disdained to trust the intelligence of the people in great public matters affecting their life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. The aristocratic caste of mind, a heritage of British colonial rule, found expression in the days before adoption of the Constitution in remarks such as one made by John Jay to Washington. Jay said:

The mass of men are neither wise nor good.

Or again, the statement made by James Madison to John Randolph in 1788:

There are subjects to which the capacities of the bulk of mankind are unequal and on which they must and will be governed by those with whom they happen to have acquaintance and confidence.

And Washington himself, in a fit of depression, wrote in 1786:

Mankind, when left to themselves, are unfit for their own government.

Alexander Hamilton, who was the epitome of that type of thinking, said:

Unfortunately, they have truth on their side, who say that the great mass of mankind cannot be trusted with decisions for their own welfare. The decisions had better be made by those who, by birth, education, or knowledge, are better enabled to determine what is in their interest, than are the people themselves.

Mr. President, is there any Member of the Senate of the United States at the present time who is of that caste of intellect? Is there among us anyone who is going to subscribe to that thought, which is back of every imperialism the world has ever known—the thought that one group of people can better determine what is best for those whom they consider an inferior group. I shall not refuse to submit for decision any question involving the public interest and welfare to the people of the United States.

We have left far behind the type of society which fostered the aristocratic mentality exemplified in the quotations I have just given. Today, I venture to say, the prevailing attitude in this country—in Government and out—is quite the opposite. Our concept is that, given all the facts, the people will choose, by and large, what is right and what is best.

Mr. President, our function here is to permit the people in each of the 48 States to act upon this proposal, according to the provisions of the Constitution, as they may see fit to act. By this constitutional and traditional method of amendment—which preserves the right of every State, as I have always sought to have States' rights preserved—the joint resolution not only must pass the House, after leaving us, but must be ratified by at least 36 of the 48 States.

I may say in that connection, Mr. President, that under that machinery anyone who is opposed to the amendment, who has doubt as to its wisdom, can go before the people of his jurisdiction, the people of his State, to make his opposition known. I may also say that under the securities established by the amendatory process, 11 States—1 of them being the wonderful State which the Senator who occupies the chair at this time [Mr. HOLLAND] so ably represents—the 11 States, with the addition of 2 of the so-called border States, Oklahoma, Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri, or any other State, could block this or any other amendment to the Constitution. There is no invasion of security. There is no invasion of the rights of the people to express themselves. On the contrary, it is an attempt to open the door by which the reservoir of power which is in the people can be expressed in amending their organic and fundamental law.

Thus everyone who so desires will have his opportunity to debate the proposal when it comes to the several State legislatures. Every citizen will have his chance to understand and evaluate the provisions and effects of the amendment. Each State will be able to determine to its own satisfaction—far better than we can do here—whether it wishes to ratify or not. And there is no reason whatever to suppose that in this case there will be any less opportunity for discussion and understanding than in the case of the various other constitutional amendments that have been submitted in the past.

This is the democratic process—or, if you prefer, the process of representative government—at its best.

As I have said, for me the most compelling reason to vote for Joint Resolution 25 is my profound and unshakable conviction that the time has now come to permit the people of this country to decide locally, in their State legislatures, whether or not they wish to have the equal-rights amendment become part of the Constitution, in order that equal justice will be accorded to all our citizens and the present defects in this regard be corrected.

In a brief submitted to the Senate Judiciary Committee August 15, 1941, by the late George Gordon Battle, distinguished New York lawyer, the question of harmony of this amendment with our system of government was discussed as follows:

It seems strange that there should be any question that all citizens of a republic should have equal rights. Our Supreme Court has repeatedly enunciated this great principle. For example:

"The equality of the rights of citizens is a principle of republicanism. Every republican government is in duty bound to protect all its citizens in the enjoyment of this principle, if within its power" (*U. S. v. Cruikshank* (92 U. S. 542, 595)).

Those are the words of Chief Justice Waite, one of the greatest jurists who ever sat upon the bench of the highest court. The same principle has been enunciated in hundreds of cases in the Supreme Court and other Federal courts and in the State courts of this country.

I will say in all sincerity—as I am sure many other Senators would say—that even if I were personally opposed to the amendment—which I most certainly am not—I would now vote, after 27 years of public discussion and 27 years of congressional examination of all conceivable aspects of the question, to allow the people their democratic and constitutional right to vote on it.

Mr. President, the merits of the proposed constitutional amendment are fully known. Likewise, every objection

to it has long since been thoroughly analyzed. I am familiar with these objections and with the humane motivations which have persuaded certain others to pose them. But, I submit, these objections have more often than not been found to be based on a mistaken notion of the purpose and effects of the amendment. And, most often, too, when these mistaken notions have been swept away by clear and careful explanation, those who held them formerly have become strong advocates, rather than opponents, of the equal-rights amendment.

It seems doubtful, in any case, that anything new in the way of argument either for or against the measure can now be put forward. Nevertheless, those of us—and there are many—who have worked for this proposal for so many years are deeply concerned not only that it be submitted to the States for ratification, but also that everyone will be perfectly clear as to its meaning and its purpose.

This amendment, Mr. President, is concerned with rights. For some this may be the crux of the matter. Its subject is equal rights. It does not, as many suppose, deal with men or women. It deals with governments and the law made by governments. Furthermore, it is not concerned with rights in the abstract, but with a specific set of rights: rights under the law.

Here, in the simplest terms, is what the amendment does. It prohibits inequality of rights under the law on account of sex. It grants no new, as yet unheard-of rights. It says that neither the Federal Government nor the State governments shall deny equality of rights under the law on the mere ground of sex. This is most certainly a rigid limitation upon its applicability.

The amendment in no way suggests uniformity of laws among the States. What it does suggest—what it insists upon—is that no law passed by either the National Congress or by any State legislature shall be constitutional if that law denies equality of rights on account of sex.

Today, of course, that condition which we seek to attain does not prevail in all of our States, although their laws have gone far in the direction of equality of rights. Furthermore, where equality exists because of statutory provisions, there is no guaranty that it will be maintained in the future. Such a guaranty can be made only by writing it into the Constitution of the United States.

We prize and revere our Constitution—and people the world over envy us for it—because it gives to every man certain basic rights which cannot be taken away by the whim of any individual or any legislative body. The inequality based on grounds of sex which today persists in our laws is an anomaly, part of the heritage of a less civilized past. This in equality bears, of course, more heavily against those of the feminine sex, and what the women of this country are asking is that they too be brought under the same general provisions that apply to men, that they be guaranteed equality of rights by the Constitution.

The fourteenth and the nineteenth amendments, as interpreted by the courts, have been insufficient to provide equality of rights as between men and women. The situation requires a constitutional amendment to clarify the application of the earlier amendments.

The Supreme Court decided that women did not qualify as citizens under the fourteenth amendment. It was therefore necessary to adopt the nineteenth amendment providing that the right to vote shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex. Yet, that amendment did not thereby assure equal rights under the law regardless of sex. Otherwise the discriminatory laws that now obtain in some States would have long since been declared unconstitutional and repealed. The necessity for this clarifying and more-inclusive amendment is apparent to the vast majority of our people. That is why we are being asked to permit them, through their State legislatures, to act on it.

In the years of debate that have preceded our present discussion, a considerable number of false assumptions have been made with regard to the proposal. Let me say that the amendment will not have and certainly is not intended to have the results which some have pretended that it will have.

The proposed amendment does not attempt to claim that people of different sexes are identical. Even men who have equal rights one with the other, under the Constitution, are not thereby made identical; but they do have the right to equal treatment as individuals before the law. Thus, this amendment guaranteeing equal rights to persons regardless of their sex does not mean declaring them to be identical human beings. That we could not do. Rather, all are assured the same rights under the law, the right to be treated as legally equal to each other. Likewise, it would preclude that a whole sex be treated on an unequal basis.

Once the amendment is made part of the Constitution, it will in the future protect man as it will protect woman before the law—neither more nor less.

It will guarantee, as I have tried to show, that laws made in the future shall contain no discrimination based on sex.

When the amendment is finally adopted neither man nor woman will, I believe, find reason for complaint. Of course, man, under this amendment, is bound to lose the privileged position he has held in society since the earliest days of civilization, but that privileged position cannot be defended, in all justice, under our form of government. Man, who has been, so to speak, a feudal lord in the domain of his family, will lose his superior prerogatives. But he will lose none of his rights as a citizen of this free country.

The miracle of this constitutional change is that it benefits those who have never had full justice assured them, yet it does so without in any way infringing the rights of others.

Another virtue of this proposal is that it is a self-disciplining measure. No police, no snoopers, no horde of Federal agents will be spawned by it. Where necessary, the legislatures will make alterations in certain laws to conform with the new constitutional provision. The amendment provides time for that. Where necessary, the courts will, of course, test the constitutionality of acts against the new provision. This is another reason why I say the amendment is not concerned with people, but with rights—with rights under laws made by governments.

Now as to the proposition that we have heard advanced that this amendment will wipe from the statute books the so-called protective legislation which has been written on behalf of women I think it proper to point out certain facts. The amendment would not deprive the States of the power to classify for the protection of the health, safety, morals, and welfare of the community. In short, it simply assures that this classification shall not be based on the grounds of sex.

The only way the power of the States would be touched would be that they could no longer establish the arbitrary basis of sex as a classification. They would be bound by the restrictions now applying to legislation affecting men—that classifications shall not be arbitrary or unreasonable or capricious. The Supreme Court, in speaking of limitations on the power to classify, has said in *Connally* v. *Union Sewer Pipe Co.* (184 U. S. 540):

> In prescribing regulations for the conduct of trade, (legislation) cannot divide those engaged in trade into classes and make criminals of one class if they do certain things, while allowing another and favored class engaged in the same domestic trade to do the same things with impunity. * * * Such a statute is not a legitimate exercise of the power of classification, rests upon no reasonable basis, is purely arbitrary, and plainly denies the equal protection of the laws to those against whom it discriminates.

All men now have equal rights under the law. But hundreds of distinctions have been made among men with respect to the varying degree of their duties, whether it is a matter of wartime service or the progressive income tax. Nonetheless, before the law, all men stand equal. This amendment simply proposes to have women stand beside men in that same equality before the law.

There is no question here of forcing anyone, man or woman, to do that which he or she has neither the mental qualifications nor the physical ability to do. We are here dealing with the rights of persons, with their dignity, and with the relationships of persons to the society in which they live. Our goal is to establish a guaranty that this relationship shall be one of equal dignity.

The amendment does not remove from Congress or from any State the power to make reasonable classifications in order to protect persons of a special category by socially desirable legislation. Under the amendment all labor laws would necessarily be equal for men and women, but this would not mean the lowering of labor standards for both sexes. It is probable that the higher standards of women—which are a real handicap to women when not applied to their male competitors—would be extended to cover workers of both sexes. I may say in that connection,

the claim is sometimes made that certain restrictive measures are for the protection of women, which at the same time deprive them of an opportunity for employment they could otherwise have, and in which they could serve with credit. This decision would be in the hands of each State. Equality under the law does not require the abolition of humane laws. Safety and health laws should apply to all workers in a given industry and should be based on the kind of work done, not on the sex of the worker.

A classification should be made on grounds of physical endurance, not on grounds of sex. An analogy, perhaps, can be made with the case of law, let us say, requiring a rest period during working time for all men over the age of 60. Such a classification would be based on the presumed differences in endurance of older and younger men. Yet no one pretends that authorizing this rest period destroys the equal rights of all men before the law.

I have always felt that the question of protective legislation should be handled, not on a basis of the sex of the people one wishes to protect, but from the standpoint of the benefit to the whole population. If we desire to protect some persons against noxious fumes, poor lighting, overwork, unhealthy conditions, and so forth, we should also seek to protect all who work from these threats to their well-being.

Our problem, primarily, is to submit to the States an amendment that will establish the principle of equality of legal rights for all persons in America, regardless of whether they happened to be born male or female. Of course, if by judicial interpretation, after adoption of the proposed amendment, the trend to eliminate unhealthy working conditions for men is accelerated, then I am sure that few of us will regret such an interpretation. In my judgment, the passage of this amendment will accelerate a move toward better working conditions based on the need of the workers, not on their sex.

Mr. President, the purpose and intent of this amendment are clear beyond any doubt or cavil: it is to establish a constitutional guaranty of equal treatment under the law of all our people, regardless of whether they are men or women. So simply stated, it perhaps does not seem revolutionary to us, since we in America are accustomed, in our everyday life, to treat others on the basis of equality and respect for their human dignity. Yet, in large parts of the world where the old feudal patterns of life, with their subjugation of women as a class, still have so powerful a grip, this proposal would be unthinkable and beyond comprehension.

In a society based as ours is, however, on the worth of each individual human being, adoption of the equal-rights amendment will be only one more step in the long series of efforts by the American people to liberate themselves completely and forever from legal concepts of the outworn feudal order of Europe which we have already left so far behind in the political and economic fields.

It is only natural that America, the country that has most successfully and completely freed itself from the dead hand of the feudal past, should sweep away the basis for the last remaining legal discriminations based on sex, and, by adopting this constitutional amendment, assure that "equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex."

When I made the statement that it is fitting that America should continue to take the lead, as she has taken it, I may add that it was with considerable shame I learned that in a conference held at Bogota, Colombia, a conference of American Republics, from March 30 to May 2, 1948, two treaties covering the rights of women were approved by the plenary session. The first treaty provided that among the American Republics the right to vote and hold national office should not be denied on account of sex. The second provided that "The American States agree to grant to women the same civil rights which men enjoy."

The delegation from Uruguay proposed, at first, that there be one single treaty embodying declarations of the rights of women in both political and civil matters.

The United States delegation, however, stated that our country was unable to sign such a treaty because in the United States only political rights have been guaranteed by the national Constitution. Our delegation declared:

> Under our constitutional system, the rights of the National Government are strictly separate from those of the 48 States. A constitutional amendment was required in order to extend to women equal political rights with respect to voting * * *. This action was required because under our constitutional system voting qualifications had been controlled previously by the separate States. With regard to civil rights, almost all of them are * * * controlled in the United States by State law rather than Federal law. Because of this situation the United States can at this time support an inter-American convention which includes only the right to vote and hold national office.

The United States delegation stated that the United States alone, of the republics of the Western Hemisphere, had not afforded equal civil rights to women, and could not sign a treaty such as the other 20 republics of the Western Hemisphere could sign. I thought, Mr. President, that that was a matter which should challenge the attention of each and every one of us. We fancy ourselves to be the leaders in human advancement, the leaders in the Pan American Union, but we alone were unable to sign such a treaty. I hope that when such a treaty is again proposed in an assembly of American Republics, the United States will not be precluded from signing along with the other enlightened nations of the Western Hemisphere a treaty of that kind.

Mr. President, in conclusion, let me say that the Senate is approaching a decision of great historical significance. The international implications of this decision in a world of conflicting values cannot be underestimated. The enormously widespread support of this amendment cannot be denied. The desirability of reinforcing the foundations of our free society cannot be ignored. The amendment we propose is practicable, necessary, and just. What we have to do now, after nearly three decades of debate, and in the light of the ever greater and ever broader popular demand for it—as expressed in the platforms of the two major parties, in the memorials from the State legislatures, in the eagerness of large numbers of Members of both Houses to vote on it—what we have to do now is pass Joint Resolution 25 and send it to the House of Representatives so that from there, in turn, it may go to the States for their approval.

One word more in closing, Mr. President. As I have been speaking here, my mind has gone back to the time when I was a State senator in Iowa, when the nineteenth amendment was under consideration. As a fledgling senator, I sat there and heard the nineteenth amendment discussed. I heard arguments which many of the older Senators will remember, to the effect that we cannot bring woman down from the pedestal which she now occupies — our sweet womanhood—drag her into smoke-filled rooms, into the gutters of ward politics, and see our mothers or our sisters besmirched by such contact. It was argued that it would be destructive of all we cherished in womanhood.

I heard the proponents say, "If we bring woman into politics it will clean politics up. We shall have no more conditions in politics of which to be ashamed. Women, when they participate in politics, will clean up the situation as it has never been cleaned before."

It was all fallacy, and we know it was fallacy.

Women were accorded the right to vote. They did not clear politics of all that was reprehensible and bad. Neither were they dragged down so that we lost our respect for womanhood.

So the arguments which have been made in the recent past are reminiscent of the debates held at that time.

Mr. President, there is only one function we have to perform, whether or not we think this is a wise amendment. We have to determine whether it is a measure in which there is sufficient interest to submit it to the great reservoir of power provided as the source of amendatory process so that we may have the question determined.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I am in favor of the proposed equal-rights amendment to the Constitution for the very reason which causes some women to oppose it. Throughout my service in Congress, I have clung steadfastly to the belief that when women demand equal rights with men they must give up their special feminine privileges. I have urged that in connection with all women's legislation, because women are just as subject as men to the old saying that you cannot have your cake and eat it, too.

But in supporting the equal-rights amendment, I can appreciate some of the difficulties. These difficulties must be overcome, and that may take time. But the more we delay, the harder it will be ever to achieve the objective.

This is not a petticoat measure. It is a measure designed to give fuller meaning and expression to the traditional American way of life. We have heard a great deal about civil rights and no discrimination against anyone because of race, color, or creed. I would add one thing to that no-discrimination code of civil rights—sex. I say that there should not be any discrimination against any person because of race, color, creed—or sex. But I say with equal conviction that neither race, nor color, nor creed, nor sex must be permitted to be the basis for agitation for special rights and special treatment under the guise of no discrimination and equality. There is a danger of losing balance on this subject, and in our zeal for equality to demand unwittingly and grant special treatment and privileges over and above equality.

I think it is high time that we stopped thinking of women as being second-class citizens, as people with less qualifications than men, and secondary in priority. There should be no such thing as priority for or against women or men.

I think that the most effective argument for equal rights is summed up in three simple words—"women are people." One who thinks that over just a little will see the justice and overwhelming merit of the equal-rights measure.

In closing, I desire to pay my respects and express my appreciation to those Senators who are going to vote for the pending measure even though they do not believe in equal rights. In the first place, I respect their opinion even though they differ with me. But more than that, I admire the fair and unselfish attitude they have taken by saying that they are voting for the joint resolution so that the amendment may be referred to the States for ratification or rejection, to give the people of America a more direct vote and voice on this issue. Some of these Senators will fight equal rights back in their States on the question of ratification or rejection. But by male standards they will have manfully faced an issue, rather than have sought to bottle that issue up in Congress without the States having had an opportunity to voice themselves on the proposal.

NOMINATION OF ADMIRAL FORREST P. SHERMAN TO BE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as I promised, I think it was on last Thursday, to discuss some aspects of the Denfeld-Sherman matter, I should assume that the Senators who were present on the floor at that time would desire to be here today to hear the report which I promised to get.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall be glad to yield if I will not lose the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may yield without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request that after a quorum has been developed the Senator from Maryland shall have the floor? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Martin
Anderson	Hoey	Maybank
Benton	Holland	Millikin
Brewster	Humphrey	Mundt
Bridges	Hunt	Myers
Butler	Ives	Neely
Byrd	Jenner	O'Conor
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Connally	Kefauver	Russell
Cordon	Kem	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kerr	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Downey	Knowland	Sparkman
Dworshak	Langer	Stennis
Eastland	Leahy	Taft
Ecton	Lehman	Taylor
Flanders	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Frear	Long	Thye
Fulbright	Lucas	Tobey
George	McCarran	Tydings
Gillette	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Graham	McClellan	Watkins
Green	McFarland	Wherry
Gurney	McKellar	Wiley
Hayden	McMahon	Williams
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Withers
Hickenlooper	Malone	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, last week in a discussion on the floor concerning the filling of the place of Chief of Naval Operations to which Admiral Forrest Sherman had been nominated by the President, and whose nomination had been favorably reported to the Senate, the question arose as to whether there was a vacancy in this office. There was exhibited on the floor of the Senate an alleged commission which Admiral Denfeld allegedly held, and therefore it was assumed from these facts, as I recall the argument, that perhaps no vacancy existed, and therefore the nomination of Admiral Sherman could not be acted upon.

In the course of the colloquy which subsequently took place I told the Members of the Senate that I cared not to discuss the matter that day on the floor, because new points of fact had been raised, but that I would diligently set about trying to secure all the pertinent facts which would throw light on the controversy and bring them before the Senate at the earliest possible moment.

Immediately thereafter I went to the telephone and found that Secretary Matthews was in Omaha, Nebr. I related to him over the telephone what had happened, and told him I should like a complete chronological account of what had taken place.

I likewise communicated with the Secretary of Defense and repeated that request. I also said to him that I should like the action which had been taken in regard to the Denfeld and Sherman equation brought to the attention of the legal counsel of the Navy Department and that a complete legal opinion supporting the action taken be sent to me so I could read it to the Senate.

Both of these documents are now in my possession, and I shall read them to the Senate so the Senate may have the facts as they have come to me not only in the letters and communications I shall read, but as a matter of independent investigation on my own part.

I now request my colleagues not to interrupt me until I have finished reading the communications, so I may present the matter in an orderly, chronological, and, I hope, completely factual way. At the conclusion of the reading of the matter I have in my hand I shall be very glad to submit myself to interrogation in an attempt to answer any questions that may be asked.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, before the Senator starts, will he submit to a question?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is contrary to what I just requested.

Mr. BRIDGES. It is for that reason I want to interrupt the Senator now—so as not to do so while he is reading the communications.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator intend to preclude hearings before the Armed Services Committee, with Secretary Matthews present?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is a subject the Senator from Maryland cannot answer because it would have to be the result of committee action.

Mr. BRIDGES. As the Senator well knows, Secretary Matthews made statements before the Armed Services Committee, in connection with the matter now before the Senate. It is my thought that Secretary Matthews would want to come before the same committee personally to present his case, because it was before that committee he made statements which have since proved to be false.

Mr. TYDINGS. But it was not before the Armed Services Committee that the Secretary of the Navy was said to be either misstating the truth or to be incompetent; therefore the Senator from Maryland thinks the Secretary ought to be "tried," if I may use that word, in the same tribunal in which the charges against him were filed, and that is in the United States Senate.

After the documents I hold in my hand have been read, interrogation of the Senator from Maryland will be in order, but for the time being the Senator from Maryland would rather present the facts before he answers the interrogation of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well. Thereafter the Senator will yield on that point?

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator then asks me.

I now read:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
January 23, 1950.

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: Much to my regret, I was absent from Washington last Wednesday when the discussion over the existence of a vacancy in the office of Chief of Naval Operations and the official issuance of a commission to Admiral Denfeld for reappointment as Chief of Naval Operations for a second term beginning December 15, 1949, was renewed on the floor of the Senate.

The facts pertinent to those two questions are as follows: I stated before the Armed Services Committee of the Senate on January 12:

First. That in my opinion there was a vacancy in the office of Chief of Naval Operations at the time Admiral Sherman was given an interim appointment and assumed office on November 2, 1949;

Second. That the commission for Admiral Denfeld's second appointment for a term of 2 years was never issued to him.

Those statements were made to the committee in good faith. I am of the opinion that they were then, and still are, correct and truthful.

The questions of the existence of a vacancy in the office of Chief of Naval Operations on November 2, 1949, and of Admiral Denfeld's occupancy of that office under an appointment for a second 2-year term are questions of fact and of law.

It is a fact that on my recommendation, President Truman, on October 27, 1949, authorized me as Secretary of the Navy to arrange "the transfer of Admiral Denfeld to other important duties" from the office of Chief of Naval Operations.

A copy of my letter of recommendation to the President and of his written approval of the recommendation and authorization to carry it out are attached to this letter.

Let me say parenthetically that I shall presently read them.

In complying with the President's instructions, the following order was directed to Admiral Denfeld by me as Secretary of the Navy:

NOVEMBER 1, 1949.

From: Secretary of the Navy.
To: Admiral Louis E. Denfeld, United States Navy.
Subject: Orders.

1. Upon receipt of these orders you will stand relieved of your duties as Chief of Naval Operations.

2. You will report to the Secretary of the Navy for duty pending further assignment.

By direction of the President.

FRANCIS P. MATTHEWS.

(First endorsement)

NOVEMBER 2, 1949.

From: Secretary of the Navy.
To: Admiral Louis E. Denfeld, United States Navy.

1. Reported this date.

FRANCIS P. MATTHEWS.

The effect of these orders of November 1—

The orders I have just read—

and the endorsement thereon dated November 2 was to accomplish the removal of Admiral Denfeld as Chief of Naval Operations.

The only way in which the existence of a vacancy could be questioned is by an attack on the constitutional power of the President, as Commander in Chief, to create such a vacancy.

Attached to this letter is a brief of the law applicable to that legal problem. Its reading clearly establishes the unquestionable power of the President to remove a Chief of Naval Operations from office at any time. It follows that a vacancy was created in the Office of Chief of Naval Operations on November 1, 1949.

On November 2, 1949, Admiral Sherman under an interim appointment by the President took the oath of office as Chief of Naval Operations in my office, in the presence of Admiral Denfeld, myself, and a number of other spectators. No protest to the assumption of the office by Admiral Sherman was made by Admiral Denfeld or by anyone acting in his behelf. Admiral Denfeld publicly congratulated Admiral Sherman and wished him "good luck."

Under the facts and the law, there can be no question but that Admiral Sherman legally became Chief of Naval Operations on November 2, 1949.

Since it is clear that Admiral Denfeld was legally removed during his first term as Chief of Naval Operations—a term for which he received a valid commission in 1947, and ceased to be Chief of Naval Operations more than a month prior to the expiration of his first term, the question of whether he received a valid commission for his second term is beside the point. However, in view of the fact that the question of the second-term commission has been the subject of so much misunderstanding and discussion, I am outlining below all of the relevant details with respect to that commission.

To aid in a proper consideration of what now follows, permit me to quote Webster's definition of the meaning of the verb "issue." Quote: "'Issue': to send out officially, to deliver by authority."

In my testimony before the Armed Services Committee of the Senate on January 12, 1950, the members of the committee and I were discussing official action; therefore, when I stated to the committee that a commission of appointment had never been issued to Admiral Denfeld, we all understood that to mean "officially" issued.

Unless officially transmitted to Admiral Denfeld by authorized procedure with proper authority, his possession of a commission for a second term of 2 years would have no legal effect whatever.

It is important, then, to consider how it happens that the commission which was drafted and signed by the President and the Secretary of the Navy to be used on the occasion when Admiral Denfeld was expected to qualify for his second term as Chief of Naval Operations by taking oath of office on December 5, 1949 was irregularly placed in his custody.

The fact that a commission for a second term of office as Chief of Naval Operations is in Admiral Denfeld's possession was not known to me until it was disclosed on the floor of the United States Senate.

However, I never at any time, anywhere, stated that I had not signed such a commission. Statements made on the floor of the Senate that I had so testified before the Armed Services Committee on January 12 are not verified by the record of that hearing. I at all times knew full well that I had signed not only one, but two, commissions, as what follows hereafter will disclose.

The procedure established by the Navy for handling commissions and presidential appointments is as follows:

When notice is received that such an appointment has been confirmed, the Bureau of Naval Personnel prepares the following papers:

(a) Letter of transmittal from the Secretary of the Navy to appointee;

(b) Written acceptance of office to be signed by appointee;

(c) Written oath of office to be taken and signed by appointee;

(d) Commission of appointment, to be issued to appointee after oath of office has been taken and signed by appointee.

Following its preparation, the commission is submitted to the Secretary of the Navy for his signature. When signed, it is forwarded to the White House for submission to the President for his signature. When signed by the President, the commission is returned to the Office of the Secretary of the Navy, and then referred to the Bureau of Personnel where the seal of the Navy is placed on the document after it is signed by the President, as required by law.

The commission is then kept in the custody of the Secretary of the Navy with papers (a), (b), and (c) referred to above, until time to use them when the oath of office is administered to the appointee as he assumes his duties at the beginning of his term. At that time the appointee is given the letter of transmittal by the Secretary of the Navy. He signs the acceptance of his office, takes the oath of office, signs it, and then the Secretary of the Navy officially delivers him the commission investing him with the authority of his office.

This well-established procedure was not followed with respect to the commission now said to be in Admiral Denfeld's possession.

Its history, I am told, is as follows:

When notification was received of Admiral Denfeld's confirmation by the Senate on August 15, last, the Bureau of Naval Personnel, as a routine matter, prepared a commission and submitted it to me, and I signed it. It was then forwarded to the White House. On its arrival there, Rear Admiral Dennison, Naval Aide to the President, examined it and disapproved of its physical appearance. On his own initiative, he arranged for a new form of commission, bearing the same words contained in the form he disapproved—

Parenthetically, let me say that I understand the second commission was on parchment—

to be prepared by a competent script writer. On its completion—

That is to say, on the completion of the second commission—

he returned the newly written commission to my office, where I affixed my signature as Secretary of the Navy, and returned it to the White House to have the President's signature affixed. I was informed by Rear Admiral Dennison on January 19 last—

That was 3 or 4 days ago—

that he secured the President's signature to the commission on September 13, 1949.

Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] will not leave the Chamber while I am reading this letter. I got it at his request.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I assure the Senator from Maryland that I am not leaving. I have a number of questions to ask. I must get some further documents so that I can give the Senator some proof which obviously he does not have at this time.

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well; I see.

I continue to read the letter:

Rear Admiral Dennison also stated to me that on September 14, again on his own initiative, he took the commission direct to Admiral Denfeld's office in the Pentagon.

That is to say, from the White House directly to Admiral Denfeld, not back to the Secretary of the Navy.

I read further:

Rear Admiral Dennison stated that he did not make an official delivery of the document to Admiral Denfeld because, first, he did not have the authority to make official delivery, and, secondly, he did not have the supporting papers which were necessary to constitute official delivery.

The first I knew that the commission had been delivered by Rear Admiral Dennison to Admiral Denfeld was when Rear Admiral Dennison told me during our conversation on Thursday morning, January 19. The President, after signing the commission, had no information regarding any of the details of the delivery of the commission to Admiral Denfeld.

I may say here, parenthetically, the President did not order it to be done that way; the Secretary of the Navy did not do it; the admiral, for reasons perfectly understandable to those of us who have been in the military service, and

others, took it directly to his chief in the Pentagon.

This method, by which Admiral Denfeld acquired possession of the commission 3 months before the time it could become effective, was not the usual method for, and was not and did not purport to be, an official issuance of the commission to him.

Admiral Denfeld never at any time mentioned to me that he had a commission for his second term as Chief of Naval Operations in his possession. I knew that the commission had never been returned to the office of Secretary of the Navy and believed until January 18 that it was still at the White House unsigned by the President.

If I had known then what Rear Admiral Dennison and others have since told me, and what has been revealed on the floor of the Senate, I would, of course, have stated that the commission signed by the President and Secretary of the Navy had, without my knowledge, been put into the possession of Admiral Denfeld through an unusual procedure, that his possession of it has no legal significance, that he has never attempted to qualify for a second term as Chief of Naval Operations by taking the oath of office, and that, by reason of those facts and because he had been officially relieved of his duties as Chief of Naval Operations by direction of the President on November 1, 1949, he has not been Chief of Naval Operations since that date, which fact made the office vacant on November 2, 1949, when Admiral Sherman assumed the position.

From the foregoing it seems to me conclusive that Admiral Sherman, under his interim appointment by the President, has legally held the office of Chief of Naval Operations since he took the oath of office and otherwise qualified to assume the office on November 2, 1949.

Under the circumstances, if the Senate is satisfied with his fitness to serve as Chief of Naval Operations, in my judgment it would be proper that the President's appointment of Admiral Sherman as Chief of Naval Operations for a term of 4 years, now pending before the Senate, be confirmed.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANCIS P. MATTHEWS,
Secretary of the Navy.

The Honorable MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
The United States Senate.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. TYDINGS. No; not until I finish reading the whole thing. I shall then yield. I want to cover all the points that were in dispute first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland declines to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. So the Senate can follow it with more facility, the letter I am about to read is from the Secretary of the Navy to the President of the United States, recommending that Admiral Denfeld be relieved of his post as Chief of Naval Operations upon the conclusion of which I shall read the reply of the President. The letter is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, October 27, 1949.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: When I became Secretary of the Navy on May 25 of this year, I did so realizing that because of certain conditions then existing in the Department of the Navy and which we discussed at that time, the administration of the duties of Secretary would involve grave difficulties. Events which have since transpired have more than justified that apprehension.

You will remember that in our preliminary consideration of my appointment as Secretary, you emphasized that vital importance of the successful implementation of the Unification Act of 1947, as enacted by Congress. I then advised you of my unqualified approval of the policy of unification as embodied in that act and in the proposed amendments to the law which you had submitted to Congress. Furthermore, I pledged my best efforts as Secretary to assist the Navy to function in the utmost good faith as a full member in the unified defense team.

You carefully pointed out how essential it would be to have the proper military personnel in key positions, up to and including Chief of Naval Operations, in order to attain that much-desired result.

You also stated that you would cooperate that, as Secretary, I might be supported at all times by individuals of my own selection in positions of every important subordinate capacity.

Very soon after I assumed office, it became evident to me that there was definite resistance on the part of some naval officers to accepting unification of the armed services, notwithstanding the fact that it was established by law. That condition was reflected by public and private statements from various sources and by other methods. Some of the individuals involved in those procedures held very important assignments in the Navy.

For reasons which I feel adequate, I refrained from promptly bringing that situation to your official attention as Commander in Chief.

One of the first duties to confront me as Secretary was the selection of an appointee to succeed Admiral Denfeld as Chief of Naval Operations for the term beginning on the 15th of next December (December 1948). My final decision, after carefully considering various phases of the problems involved, was to recommend Admiral Denfeld for reappointment, and such a recommendation went forward to you through Secretary of Defense Johnson on August 2, 1949. One of the most persuasive of the considerations which led me to make this recommendation was the value to the Navy, and to the Department of Defense, which I expected to flow from continuity of service by Admiral Denfeld.

At that time, working with Admiral Denfeld whom I highly esteem, I had every reason to believe that we were in complete agreement on all important questions affecting the administration of the Department of the Navy. I felt sure that such a harmonious relationship would continue. Unfortunately, it soon became clear that my expectation would not be realized.

On Tuesday, the 4th of this month (October), events had taken such a course that, in a conference had with Admiral Denfeld early that day, I frankly stated to him that I feared his usefulness as Chief of Naval Operations had terminated. You may recall that I mentioned the possibility of Admiral Denfeld's replacement in the course of our discussion in your office when I was there in company with Secretary Johnson on October 5.

My relations as Secretary of the Navy with Admiral Denfeld as Chief of Naval Operations have finally become such that I find it increasingly difficult to work with him in the harmonious relationship which should prevail between the occupants of those two official positions.

A military establishment is not a political democracy. Integrity of command is indispensable at all times. There can be no twilight zone in the measure of loyalty to superiors and respect for authority existing between various official ranks. Inability to conform to such requirements for military stability would disqualify any of us for positions subordinate to the Commander in Chief.

The existence of the present situation prevailing between the highest civilian and the highest military officer of the Navy makes it utterly impossible for me, as Secretary of the Navy, to administer the Department of the Navy in the manner I believe vital to national security. Believing as I do in the vital importance of maintaining civilian control over the Military Establishment, a continuance of such a condition would be intolerable to me as Secretary of the Navy.

Reluctantly, therefore, but in accordance with what I believe to be for the good of the country, I respectfully request you as President and Commander in Chief to authorize the transfer of Admiral Denfeld to other important duties, and the selection of his successor as Chief of Naval Operations at the earliest convenient date.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANCIS P. MATTHEWS.

Upon receipt of that letter, the President wrote the Secretary, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 27, 1949.

Memorandum for: Secretary of the Navy.
From the President.

Over a long period of time I have devoted considerable thought to various aspects of the problem which you discuss in your letter of today's date.

The action which you recommend meets with my approval. Accordingly, I hereby authorize you to arrange for and carry out the transfer which you recommend.

HARRY TRUMAN.

Having read the letter from Secretary Matthews to the President, and having read the letter from the President to Secretary Matthews, I now desire to read a legal brief which I have requested be prepared concerning the authority for this action. I shall now read the brief to the Members of the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point to tell us who prepared the memorandum?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall read it all. It will be signed at the end. It reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1950.

Memorandum for the Secretary of the Navy.
Subject: Status of the Office "Chief of Naval Operations."

1. You have requested my written opinion as to whether or not a vacancy exists in the Office of "Chief of Naval Operations." You will recall that I advised you orally in the premises at the time of Admiral Denfeld's removal on November 1, 1949. The opinion I gave you at that time was based on the authority hereinafter set forth.

2. Under the authority of the act of March 3, 1915, as amended, Admiral Denfeld was appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to be Chief of Naval Operations for a term of 2 years commencing December 15, 1947. He was duly sworn and in fact entered the office on that date. While he was so serving the pertinent portion of the act of March 3, 1915, was repealed and superseded by the act of March 5, 1948 (Public Law 432, 80th Cong.). Section 2 (a) of the act of March 5, 1948, reads in part as follows:

"There shall be a Chief of Naval Operations who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of not more than 4 years, from the officers of the active list of the line of the Navy who are eligible for the

exercise of command at sea and not below the grade of rear admiral."

Section 2 (b) reads in part as follows:

"It shall be his duty to * * * be the principal naval advisor to the President and to the Secretary of the Navy on the conduct of the activities of the Naval Establishment."

I shall read that again:

"It shall be his duty to * * * be the principal naval advisor to the President and to the Secretary of the Navy on the conduct of the activities of the Naval Establishment."

Also pertinent to the duties of the Chief of Naval Operations is section 10, which reads:

"During the temporary absence of the Secretary of the Navy, the Under Secretary of the Navy, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air; the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Vice Chief of Naval Operations in that order, shall be next in succession to act as the Secretary of the Navy."

This change in the law had no effect on Admiral Denfeld's incumbency of the office.

3. In August 1949 Admiral Denfeld was nominated and confirmed for a second 2-year term to commence on December 15, 1949. Subsequently, however, on November 1, 1949, he was relieved of his duties as Chief of Naval Operations by direction of the President. The question for determination in this case, therefore, is whether or not the President had the power to remove Admiral Denfeld from the office of Chief of Naval Operations prior to the expiration of the period for which he was appointed, and if so, how long the office continued vacant.

4. The case of *Myers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52) was that of a postmaster who had been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of 4 years. The law then in effect provided that such postmasters should hold office for a period of 4 years but further provided that they could be removed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Myers was removed by the Postmaster General with the sanction of the President before the expiration of his term without reference to the Senate either directly, or through nomination of a successor during the 4-year period. Myers protested officially and then sued for his salary in the Court of Claims. The Supreme Court held in this case that the President is empowered by the Constitution to remove any executive officer appointed by him, whether or not the appointment was by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and that this power is not subject in its exercise to the assent of the Senate nor can it be made so by act of Congress. The Court explained its holding by the statement that "the reason for the principle is that those in charge of and responsible for administering functions of Government who select their executive subordinates need in meeting their responsibility to have the power to remove those whom they appoint."

5. Subsequently, in the case of *Humphrey's Executor* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 602), the Supreme Court held—

That is a recent case—

that the President could not remove a Federal Trade Commissioner. The basis of the Court's opinion in that case was that in establishing the Federal Trade Commission and in providing for the terms of office of the Commissioners (their functions being "of legislative and judicial quality, rather than executive") and the conditions under which they could be removed, Congress was within its rights in restricting the President's power of removal (the Federal Trade Commission Act specified that a Commissioner could be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office, and the facts of the case were that none of those conditions was made the basis for the attempted removal). A reading of that opinion leaves no doubt of the distinction made between Government officials who are in purely executive or administrative offices and those who are required to perform judicial functions.

6. Another pertinent authority regarding the President's power of removal is to be found in the case of *Morgan* v. *TVA*—

That is another recent case—

(115 Fed. 2d 990, cert. den., 312 U. S. 701). In that case the President removed from office an individual who was a member and Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. It was argued that the case fell within the decision of the Humphrey case—

Which I have just read—

but the circuit court of appeals of the sixth circuit held that the duties of the TVA Board of Directors were predominantly executive or administrative in character, and that Morgan's removal was within the powers of the President. The case is therefore consistent with the holdings in the Myers and Humphrey cases.

7. The Chief of Naval Operations performs neither quasi-legislative nor quasi-judicial duties. He is strictly an executive officer. It is also pertinent to note that the office of Chief of Naval Operations involves the holding of an office in addition to occupying an officer's status as an officer of the Navy. He is an officer of the Navy Department and as such by law may succeed to the duties of the Secretary. See section 10 of Public Law 432, supra.

8. In addition to and wholly apart from the President's powers of removal as the Chief Executive, is his constitutional power as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. The authority of a Commander in Chief to change the duty assignment of subordinate officers has not, so far as I know, been questioned, but by way of confirmation, the Attorney General of the United States has held that an act of Congress does not curtail the President's power as Commander in Chief to assign officers to any duty (28 Op. Atty. Gen. 270). I am therefore of the opinion that the President had what might be termed twofold authority to remove Admiral Denfeld from the Office of Chief of Naval Operations and that the orders of November 1, mentioned above, were legally sufficient to accomplish that removal.

9. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the question has been raised as to the effect, if any, of the President's nomination and subsequent confirmation by the Senate of Admiral Denfeld for a second term of 2 years to commence December 15, 1949. As previously stated, Admiral Denfeld was so nominated, and the Senate confirmed his nomination on August 15, 1949. About a month later a commission was made up and signed by both you and the President.

That is, the Secretary of the Navy and the President.

My information is to the effect that Admiral Denfeld has this commission in his possession, but that there was no authorized delivery of it to him, and no acceptance by him, and that he did not take the oath of office.

10. In my opinion those acts do not operate to reinvest Admiral Denfeld with the office from which he was removed. In this connection see 12 Opinion Attorney General 229, which states:

"Acceptance is necessary to vest the office in the appointee, and a formal acceptance is the evidence which in the public service generally it has been customary to require."

I state parenthetically that a man could refuse to make out a check to a collector of internal revenue who was not clothed with a commission and duly authorized to receive the payment.

See also 8 Comptroller Decision 521, 19 Opinion Attorney General 284, which state:

"Execution of the oath of office may be regarded as acceptance of the appointment."

It is obvious that when the President directed Admiral Denfeld's removal from the Office of Chief of Naval Operations early in November 1949, he did not intend Admiral Denfeld to become invested with the office for the second term, and it is equally obvious that Admiral Denfeld understood that. So far as I know, Admiral Denfeld has not asserted claim to it, and even if he had, the circumstances of Admiral Sherman's ad interim appointment and the expressed desires of the President would have prevented.

11. To summarize the foregoing, it is my opinion—

(a) That Admiral Denfeld was legally removed from the Office of Chief of Naval Operations on November 1, 1949.

(b) That he did not become reinvested with the Office of Chief of Naval Operations following his nomination and confirmation, or at any other time, notwithstanding the fact that a commission came into his possession.

(c) That a vacancy existed in the Office of Chief of Naval Operations when Admiral Sherman was given his ad interim appointment and continues to exist to the present time, subject to such ad interim appointment.

Very respectfully,

G. L. RUSSELL.

Before yielding to questions, the Senator from Maryland would like to state that in this discussion it has not been his purpose, and he hopes that indirectly no one can draw such a conclusion, that he wishes to cast any reflection, in any manner, shape, or form, on Admiral Denfeld, a man for whom he has an affection as well as a very high regard. I am simply, and as dispassionately as I can, doing what I promised to do, bring the facts to the attention of the Senate; first, to ascertain whether or not there was a vacancy in the Office of Chief of Naval Operations; second, to bring to the attention of the Senate in a chronological manner the various steps which led up to the removal of Admiral Denfeld, and the documents supporting his removal, and, third, to clear up the statement of the Secretary of the Navy that no commission had been issued to Admiral Denfeld, when the Senator from Wisconsin produced one on the floor of the Senate. I believe I have completely discharged the duties which I undertook, and fulfilled the promise which I made to the Senate in all of these categories.

Before yielding to the first question, it seems to me that the matter here is not whether Admiral Denfeld should have been removed or should not have been removed. There are those, no doubt, who feel that he should not have been removed. I know there are those in this body and those on my committee who have openly expressed themselves to the effect that he should have been removed, notwithstanding his high attainments as a naval officer, because of the incompatibility which developed between him and the Secretary of the Navy and the laws passed by the Congress in regard to certain phases of the matter.

Therefore, the question is not whether the President, rightfully, from the sense

of right or wrong—if we put it on that basis—removed Admiral Denfeld, not whether he used bad judgment in removing Admiral Denfeld, not whether he was unfair in removing Admiral Denfeld, not whether he was unjust in removing Admiral Denfeld. The question is whether the President did have the right to remove him. If he had the right to do it, under the Constitution and under the law, whether he acted wisely or unwisely, rightly or wrongly, is for the conscience and the mentality of the President of the United States. If it is, as I believe and know it to be, within the scope and within the purview of the Constitution of the United States, then no man, Chief of Naval Operations or Member of this body, can say "Nay," if that is the President's constitutional prerogative.

Having made this statement, and again paying my respects to both Admiral Denfeld and Admiral Sherman as two great naval officers, and regretting this whole controversy, and wishing to bring the facts to the attention of the Senate, as I have done, I now take the witness stand for such cross-examination as the lawyers on the other side may care to make.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I might first say that I believe I made it clear that if the time comes when the Senate is convinced there is a vacancy in the office of Chief of Naval Operations, I shall be very happy to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Admiral Sherman. He is an outstanding naval officer, and he had a large part in winning the last war.

I should now like to ask the Senator a question. In view of the fact that the legal opinion upon which the Senator from Maryland is relying is based upon the facts set forth by Secretary Matthews; and if I can point out to him that again the Secretary is so careless with his facts that there is either deliberate untruth or an indication of gross incompetence on his part, will not the Senator agree with me that the legal opinion is worthless?

Mr. TYDINGS. Before answering the Senator's question, in view of the fact that he has used the expression "gross untruth"—I think it was—or "gross incompetence"——

Mr. McCARTHY. I said deliberate untruth or gross incompetence.

Mr. TYDINGS. In view of the fact that the able Senator from Wisconsin used those expressions last week on another occasion, and now that the facts presented here show that it was not deliberate untruth or gross incompetence, it would seem, in the interest of orderly procedure, that the Senator should first explain to this body where his charges are supported by any facts in his possession which prove in error the facts which I have read in the letter from the Secretary of the Navy. I do not think we ought to go on with these charges without clearing up the points seriatim as we proceed.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator answer my question?

Mr. TYDINGS. Is the Senator going to take back the charge he made the other day?

Mr. McCARTHY. If he can show that I have been in error in any way, I shall be glad to correct my statement.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am sure the Senator will.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator has read to the Senate a legal document. I am sure that the Senator will agree with me that that legal document is worthless unless it is based upon an existent factual situation. In other words, if the man who wrote the legal opinion did not have the correct factual situation before him, the legal opinion is worthless. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. TYDINGS. I would not want to go to that extreme. I would not want to say that the legal opinion is worthless, because I think the legal opinion is eminently sound. I do not think the Senator can marshal one single case to the contrary. Therefore, I would not be willing to say that the legal opinion is worthless, because as a very humble member of the legal profession myself, it seems to me to be bottomed on extremely good constitutional law.

Even if I were approaching the matter without any examination at all, I know that the Constitution makes the President the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and as such I would assume that he could order around any officer he wanted in that entire military and naval establishment. I do not think there can be any question or any argument to the contrary. Therefore, even though this is a high office, the case is no different, in my book, than if the one involved were a second lieutenant, or a private, or a colonel, or a two-star general, or a 4-star general, or a 5-star general. No matter what the rank, the man who is President of the United States is his Commander in Chief. Therefore he had the right to take the action he took.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me ask another question of the Senator. I think the Senator's answer is important in view of the position which he holds. Last week I came before the Senate and gave the Senate facts which the Members of the Senate previously did not possess.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes, and the Department gave the Senator facts which he did not have, which I read here today.

Mr. McCARTHY. I pointed out that Secretary Matthews told the members of the Armed Services Committee that no commission had been issued.

Mr. TYDINGS. And he was truthful in making that statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Does the Senator wish to propound a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. At that time I pointed out to the Senate that Mr. Matthews came before the Armed Services Committee and said no commission had been issued. He said, "I took the responsibility of advising the President not to sign the commission." When that was disclosed, some of the members of the Armed Services Committee present on the floor said, "These are not the facts as we understood them. We would like a further examination."

The Senator from Maryland, coming before the Senate today, reads a letter from the same man, Matthews. He also reads to us a legal document, an opinion, based upon facts set forth in the letter. I now ask the Senator this simple question: If I can convince the Senator that Matthews has again misinformed the Senator, then would he say that it is necessary for the Armed Services Committee to disregard the facts which Matthews has given the Senator from Maryland and hold a hearing and decide what the facts are, and will the Senator base his legal opinion on the facts as they actually are? That is a simple question, Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator asks me to answer a question which he has not yet seen fit to propound to me. He says if he does certain things. I should like to have the doing of the things precede his question, and then I can answer it. I cannot answer anything I do not know. I do not know what is in the Senator's mind.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me ask the Senator this question: If I show to the Senator that Secretary Matthews has again misinformed him in the letter which the Senator has just read, then will the Senator think the Secretary is worthy of belief in anything he tells the Senator?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Wisconsin made the statement on Wednesday last that the Secretary had done several things which were wrong. The Senator said he had a copy of a commission, and that Admiral Denfeld actually held the commission. We investigated the matter, and found it was taken from the White House by Admiral Dennison, the President's naval aide, to Admiral Denfeld, and Denfeld puts it in his desk, when the normal procedure, as Denfeld knows, is to send it back to the Secretary of the Navy. I read the steps which should accompany the procedure. The Secretary of the Navy should give the commission to Admiral Denfeld on the day he is to take office. He is then to take the oath prescribed by law, receive all the papers, and enter upon the duties of the office.

The Senator from Wisconsin on Wednesday last led the Senator from Maryland to believe that Admiral Denfeld had come into possession of this commission in a perfectly normal and orthodox manner, that it was a fait accompli, that the whole proceeding was normal in every way, and that the Secretary of the Navy knew all about it. I find out on interrogation—I do not think Admiral Denfeld will deny it—that, so far as Admiral Denfeld knows, Secretary Matthews never had any knowledge that this commission had gone from the White House to Admiral Denfeld.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator stop right there?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have before me a telegram from Admiral Denfeld. This is in answer to a telegram which I sent him. I telegraphed him and asked him to inform me how he came to have the commission. I asked him to tell me what the facts were which would indicate whether or not Matthews knew that he had been commissioned. I also asked him to send

me the original of the commission. Here is the telegram:

In reply to your telegram. I received reappointment commission on or about 14 September. It was presented to me by the naval aide to the President, Admiral Dennison, in my office. Consider it a particular courtesy to me as CNO receiving it under those circumstances; otherwise would have received it by internal mail system in the Pentagon. The Secretary knew I had commission as I went into his office after its receipt and thanked him for it. At that time he stated nothing he had done since becoming Secretary of the Navy had given him greater pleasure than having me reappointed as CNO.

I knew that the Secretary was going to claim there was something unusual about the method of delivery. It then occurred to me that there may have been something unusual about this type of delivery. I thought I would endeavor to discover how other admirals received their commissions. So I took it upon myself to try and obtain that information. Now, the Senator knows, in view of the way heads fall when military or naval officers give us any information which the Secretary does not want us to have, it is rather difficult to secure that information. I had Admiral Leahy interviewed this morning. He was questioned as to how he got his commission. He said he got it directly from the President by mail. In this case it was delivered by the President's aide. Now, Mr. Matthews says that was an unauthorized procedure. Frankly I do not know.

The Secretary of the Navy, last week, after my discussion on the Senate floor, called the press in, or called some of the members of the press, and was going to give a statement in answer to this issue. Suddenly he changed his mind, after consultation with others in the Pentagon. I learned then that he was going to make the claim, which he made today; that is that there was no seal on this commission, and that, there being no seal, it was not validly issued.

I thank the Senator for the courtesy of giving me a copy of the letter when he started to read it. Let me read what the Secretary had to say. I think this is very important to the members of the Armed Services Committee and to the Senate, not because the question of Denfeld versus Sherman may be important, but in determining whether or not the Secretary of the Navy is competent to hold his job, whether any credence can be placed upon what he says, or whether the committee must secure its information from some other source.

Now, if the Senator will turn to page 5 of the letter which he has before him, this is what Mr. Matthews says. Here is the way a commission is normally handled. I am leaving out the first half of the page. Will the Senator turn to it?

Mr. TYDINGS. I know what it is. I could recite it by heart.

Mr. McCARTHY. I assume the Senator could.

When signed by the President, the commission is returned to the Office of the Secretary of the Navy, and then referred to the Bureau of Personnel where the seal of the Navy is placed on the document after it is signed by the President, as required by law.

The commission is then kept in the custody of the Secretary of the Navy.

Now turning over to the next page. First he tells about the way Dennison got it at the White House. He said:

Dennison then told me he took the commission directly to Admiral Denfeld's office.

Now turn to the next page.

I knew that the commission had never been returned to the Office of the Secretary of the Navy.

In other words, it never came back to the office for the seal. That is what the Secretary tells the Senator. He says it comes back to my office after the President signs it. Then the seal is placed upon it. He says in this case it was not done.

In my telegram I asked Admiral Denfeld for the original copy of this document. Admiral Denfeld says this:

The facilities of this small town prevent sending the commission through the mail in time.

He said in his telegram of last night:

Large photostatic copy clearly shows the seal in bottom center.

I had the Admiral called on the telephone and he said he did not think it proper for him to let his commission out of his hands except upon the request of the Armed Services Committee. He said if the Armed Services Committee were to subpena the document he would send it. I telegraphed him then and told him that because of the attitude which the chairman of the committee had taken—that is that he would conduct his own personal investigation and that he would not hold a hearing—undoubtedly there was no possibility of the Armed Services Committee seeing this document. I pointed out to him that looking at the large photostatic copy it was difficult clearly to make out the seal because the seal was an imprint.

I told him that a number of Senators had requested that the document be available to the Senate for their scrutiny. Admiral Denfeld then sent me this document. This is the document about which Secretary Matthews said that, first, he signed it, and then it went to the President; and he said that normally it would come back to the office of the Secretary of the Navy, and there the seal would be placed on it.

But in this case, so Secretary Matthews says, that was not done. On the contrary, it was taken to the President, and the President signed it; and then, without authority of the Navy Department, it was taken directly to Admiral Denfeld.

Does the Senator from Maryland care to look at the document?

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to look at both the telegram, which was the first thing I asked for, and then the document.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to have the Senator examine both of them. I do not know whether the Secretary of the Navy was deliberately lying or not.

I have undertaken to find out something about Secretary Matthews. I called some of my friends at Omaha, from which city the Secretary of the Navy hails. They tell me that he has a very good reputation.

I can only assume that Secretary Matthews is so incompetent that he does not know what goes on in the Navy Department. He said the commission did not come back to him; but we find that it did come back to him and he placed the seal on it. Admiral Denfeld says the next day he stopped at Secretary Matthews' office and thanked him for it. So we know that either Secretary Matthews is not telling the truth or else he is so incompetent that he does not know what is going on in the Navy Department. I think the latter is the case. Any man whose only qualification for the office is that he happened to support the winning presidential candidate, and who, as he says, never got any nearer to the water than once in a row boat, I say obviously does not know what is going on in his office in the Navy Department. I think it is clear that he is too incompetent for the job.

In view of the fact that Admiral Denfeld says he has received his commission for a second term as Chief of Naval Operations, and in view of the fact that the seal of the Navy Department and the signature of the President and the signature of the Secretary of the Navy appear on the commission, does the Senator from Maryland think we should confirm the nomination of Admiral Sherman to a position, which many of us have not decided is vacant?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall be delighted to reply to the Senator's question.

First, let me refresh his memory as to why I am here today and why I have read the documents I have just read to the Senate.

The able Senator from Wisconsin on Wednesday of last week addressed himself to this subject, exhibited here on the floor of the Senate a commission, and made some remarks in regard to this entire matter.

When the Senator from Wisconsin had finished, the Senator from Maryland rose, and said that he had no knowledge of the alleged facts which the Senator from Wisconsin had presented, and that he did not wish to proceed in the dark. The Senator from Maryland promised the Senate that he would get a chronological account, from beginning to end, of what had happened, and also would get an able legal opinion as to whether there was a vacancy in the Office of Chief of Naval Operations. The Senator from Maryland said he was going to ask for those forthrightly; that he did not want any evasion; that he was going to let the chips fall where they may; that he wanted to learn exactly how this happened; and the Senator from Maryland promised that as soon as he obtained the facts and the opinion, he would lay them before the Senate.

Subsequent to that promise to the entire Senate, I received in my office this morning signed by five minority members of the Armed Services Committee—five eminent and able members—asking that we have an investigation of Admiral Denfeld's removal, and so forth.

In view of the fact that I had told the entire Senate, including the members of the Senate Armed Services Committee, that I would first try to ascertain all the facts, it looked to me like an attempt to

jump the gun, to get an investigation under way before we found out whether there was enough of a vehicle to carry on an investigation.

Certainly in the interest of fair play and good sportsmanship, we should have found out whether, following the letter, there was still a desire for an investigation. We should not assume that all the statements made willy-nilly are statements of fact, when many of them are not statements of fact.

For instance, take the telegram which I now hold in my hand: Here is confirmation from Admiral Denfeld that the Secretary of the Navy told the truth.

What does Admiral Denfeld say in the telegram? He says:

> In reply to your telegram, I received reappointment commission on or about the 14 September, presented to me by naval aide to the President, Admiral Dennison, in my office.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is not that just as I read the telegram?

Mr. TYDINGS. Wait a moment, please; I have not finished.

Mr. McCARTHY. But is not that just as I read it?

Mr. TYDINGS. Just a moment; I was courteous to the Senator.

Yet the Senator from Wisconsin left in obscurity the entire phase of the matter as to how the commission got to Admiral Denfeld.

I did not think a commission could go to Admiral Denfeld unless it went through the Department of the Navy. If it went from the Department of the Navy to the President, and the President signed it, I would assume that it would go back to the Navy Department; and that was the supposition which Senators had made when they left the Chamber, following the discussion we had here last Wednesday, namely, that Admiral Denfeld had come into possession of this commission through normal channels, and that the Secretary of the Navy did not know anything about it.

However, the truth of the matter is that the commission went to Admiral Denfeld directly from the White House, a thoroughly improper way for it to go, for in the same telegram Admiral Denfeld says, as he has every right to say:

> Consider it a particular courtesy to me as CNO receiving it under those circumstances. Otherwise would have received it by internal mail system in Pentagon.

That is the way commissions are sent to officers generally, and to prove that, there is the Senator's own testimony that Admiral Leahy got his commission throughout the internal mail at the Pentagon.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is not correct, Mr. President; apparently the Senator from Maryland misunderstood what I said. I said Admiral Leahy got his commission from the President.

The Senator from Maryland has said that I left an erroneous impression. Will the Senator point out one word of the telegram which I did not read to the Senate?

Mr. TYDINGS. I said that the Senator from Wisconsin, in the remarks he made last week, left all of us under the impression that the commission had gone from the White House, in the normal way, back to the Navy Department, in the normal way that commissions are returned from the White House to the Navy Department, and had reached Admiral Denfeld in due course, and that the Secretary of the Navy knew nothing about it. How in the name of high heaven was the Secretary of the Navy to know it had come back, if it was taken directly from the White House to Admiral Denfeld and if Admiral Denfeld had it in his drawer?

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator read the remainder of the telegram? If he will, he will know the answer.

Mr. TYDINGS. Admiral Denfeld had not even gone to the Navy Department to be sworn in.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland read the remainder of the telegram?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I shall be delighted to do so.

Mr. BRIDGES. If the Senator will read the remainder of it, he will get the answer to his question.

Mr. TYDINGS. Admiral Denfeld says in the telegram:

> Secretary knew I had the commission, as I went into his office after its receipt and thanked him for it. At that time he stated nothing he had done since becoming Secretary of the Navy had given him greater pleasure than having me reappointed as CNO. Navy Department seal is on commission—

And some other things, which are personal, so I shall not read them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Wait a moment, please.

Mr. President, what do we get from the remainder of the telegram? Let us read it again, so we shall have all of it in mind. The Admiral says that after he got the commission, he went into the Secretary's office and thanked him for it.

This is probably what took place: Admiral Denfeld said to Secretary Matthews, "I want to thank you, Mr. Secretary, for naming me again as the Chief of Naval Operations, for a second term."

Secretary Matthews probably replied, "Thank you, Admiral. It was a great pleasure to nominate you for the second term. It was one of the most pleasant acts since I have been here."

There was no exhibition of any commission; the conversation which occurred at that time was a perfectly normal conversation, having no connotation whatsoever with any knowledge on the part of the Secretary of the Navy that the commission was in the hands of Admiral Denfeld.

However, Mr. President, all this argument is entirely beside the point. Suppose Admiral Denfeld had taken the commission, the very day he received it, to the office of the Secretary of the Navy, and suppose the Navy's seal had been put on it. Suppose Admiral Denfeld had held up his right hand and been sworn in. All that would not make a bit of difference; the President could still remove him.

So what is all this sham battle about?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes, I yield. I yield first to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. There is one important thing before us which the Senator from Maryland seems to overlook.

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will not overlook some of the things he mentioned the other day.

Mr. McCARTHY. One of the matters before the Senate, which I think is of great importance, is the question of whether the Secretary of the Navy, when he appears before a congressional committee, correctly informs the committee, so that the facts on the basis of which the committee acts are the actual facts. There has been considerable weaseling in the letter of the Secretary of the Navy. In the letter he says that he knew not only that it was signed once, but twice. I do not find that point in the document at this moment, but it has been read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Senator will recall that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] said to the Secretary in effect, "Do you take the responsibility for advising the President not to sign the commission?"

And the Secretary said in effect: "Yes, I take full responsibility"—or words to that effect.

Does the Senator from Maryland question it? I will find it, if there is any question.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is absolutely true, because the Secretary said in his statement here that he had no knowledge that the commission had ever come back from the President, and in the interim, he had written to the President asking for the removal, and the President had removed him. There is no proof that Secretary Matthews knew that Admiral Denfeld had the commission. There is no statement from Admiral Denfeld that he took the commission up and showed it to the Secretary.

It looks to me like a sham battle. What difference would it make? The President could have removed him, if he had taken 10 oaths, signed 75 commissions, put 415 seals on it, and if he had held office for 15 years and 6 months.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say I personally think the President could have removed him. As of this date, I do not know whether the President has done so or not. Mr. Matthews originally said the reason for the vacancy which occurred was because the commission was never issued. He says, today, the reason for the vacancy having occurred is because the President had removed the man. I do not know which of the statements by Matthews I can rely on.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have the orders here.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish my question. Reverting to the Senator's statement that Matthews had no way of knowing that the commission was issued, if he will turn to page 5 of Matthews' letter, Matthews says, first, "The commission would be signed by me. Then it goes to the President. Then it comes back to me, and I put my seal on it." On page 7 he says this was never done—that is, that it was never transmitted from the President to the Secretary of

the Navy. However, we have before us a document with the seal affixed, showing that it did come back to Matthews. We know he placed his seal upon it, and then the President, using the same system that was used when Leahy received his commission, as a courtesy, had it delivered to Denfeld. So the Senator cannot conceivably say that Matthews did not know that it came back.

Mr. TYDINGS. With all due respect to the able Senator from Wisconsin, who is my friend, we are discussing a man who holds a very high office, and it seems to me we are trying vainly, in the face of the very well-reasoned and explicit letter which I have just read, to dwell on small points. The truth of the matter is that Admiral Denfeld could not legally have entered upon his term of office without taking the oath, anyway. It is the law that one must take the oath at the time he assumes the office.

I do not know the facts, neither does the Senator, and perhaps they have been lost in the obscurity of time, because so many events happen to all of us, it is pretty hard for any of us to tell what we were doing a month, 2 months, 3 months, or 6 months ago. But I am speculating on this. I do not have any facts to support it, but what I think happened was this: I think Admiral Dennison was of course under the Chief of Naval Operations. He was an aide at the White House. He looked up to his chief, as every Navy man has a right to do, and he thought how nice it would be to go over and tell the Admiral that the President had just signed his commission. The reason they had two commissions, I am advised, was that the first one was the ordinary printed type of commission, and, as it was a great office, and came as the culmination of a long and distinguished career on the part of Admiral Denfeld, they wanted to give him a commission that he could keep as a memento and hand down. Consequently, the commission was prepared, signed by Mr. Matthews, and signed by the President. After that had been done, Admiral Dennison wraps it up and goes over to his chief, feeling great loyalty to the man who headed his branch of the armed services, and he says, "Admiral, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to bring your commission to you." Admiral Denfeld probably said, "Thank you. It was nice of you to attend to it so quickly." He opened it and read it. They both had a pleasant little talk, and he put it in his desk. He then said, "I ought to go up and thank the Secretary for this commission." So he went up to the Secretary's office and said, "Mr. Secretary, I cannot tell you how much I appreciate your confidence in me." The Secretary then probably turned around and said, "It was one of the finest things I could do, to recommend you for this place." It seems to me that what we are trying to do here is to find a man dishonest, deliberately, who has made a perfectly rational statement. I hope I shall never be that small.

Mr. McCARTHY and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin. But nothing the Senator has said shows that the office had been filled. The law still stands. The office is vacant, and we have a nominee on the calendar.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield. It looks to me as if this whole colloquy is over a pretty small peanut, if I may use the word.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let us see whether it is. I think it is not small peanuts to determine whether the Secretary of the Navy comes to the Capitol and misinforms a committee. I should like to know why the Secretary makes certain statements. I cannot find the spot in the letter, but the Senator can, I am sure. Secretary Matthews says: "I was not testifying to facts. I was testifying to the legal import of facts." Is not that what the letter says?

Mr. TYDINGS. The letter was that the removal and replacement of Admiral Denfeld are supported both by the facts and the law. That is what he said.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator will find it in the Secretary's letter. He says, in substance: "I was telling the Senate what I thought the fact was." Here it is:

> Therefore, when I stated today that a commission of appointment had never been issued to Admiral Denfeld, we all understood that to mean no official commission.

Let us see whether that is what he said the day he testified. On page 95 he said the commission was never issued to him. Today he said: "I mean it was never legally issued." Further along on the page he said: "He never issued the commission"—meaning the President. On page 99, after he had testified that the commission was never issued, he was questioned further. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] said:

> Well, this certainly is different from anything I have ever heard before.

Matthews said:

> Do not ask me as a lawyer, now.

He said:

> You have got to get a legal opinion on that, yourself.

So Matthews was before the committee. At that time he was not saying, "What I am giving you is my own legal interpretation of what has happened." He said, "These are the facts." He said:

> These are the facts as they happened. You have to get a legal opinion on that, yourself.

Today, he comes and says, "I knew the facts to be different, of course, but I am a great lawyer; therefore I say the office is vacant."

Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether he will agree with me now, that in view of the fact that it has been definitely established that the Secretary of the Navy gave us erroneous facts in regard to the issuance of the commission, regardless of whether this determines whether there is a vacancy today or not; in view of the fact that the Secretary twice has given us erroneous information, first before the committee, then again later, after he had had much time to think the matter over and refresh his memory, and when he again comes before us and says, "This commission never got back to my office for a seal; it does not have a seal upon it"; does not the Senator now think we should get all the facts from a competent source before we are called upon to pass on the nomination?

Mr. TYDINGS. Has the Senator finished?

Mr. McCARTHY. I, for one, and I assume many other Senators, are put in a very unusual situation. If the Senator calls up the nomination at this time, we shall then have before us the nomination of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, an outstanding naval officer. We shall not know whether there is a vacancy or not. We shall know, if the facts as Matthews has given them to the Judge Advocate General are true, that then perhaps there is a vacancy; but we shall know those facts come from a man who is notoriously inaccurate. Therefore we shall either have to vote to confirm a man to a job that is already filled, or may be filled, or vote against a very competent naval officer. I may say that if the Senator calls up the nomination without taking the matter back to the Armed Services Committee and giving us the benefit of that commitee's study, I, for one, can do nothing except answer "present" when the vote is taken. I can neither vote against the nomination of Admiral Sherman nor for it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to make a very brief statement and then ask the Senator a question. Personally I am very sorry that Mr. Matthews did not ask to come before our committee very promptly when there was a misunderstanding as to what he had previously said before the committee. I think it would have been very helpful if he had come before the committee, instead of asking the chairman to read a statement in his behalf on the floor of the Senate. I say that, because his testimony was given to the committee, and he should have answered the committee. He has done differently.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to correct him? I know he does not want to misstate the case.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should be glad to have the Senator correct me if I am in error.

Mr. TYDINGS. There was never any question about any of these matters, so far as the Senator from Maryland knew, until the question was raised on the floor of the Senate last week by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Maryland then was asked what his attitude would be in certain hypothetical cases. The Senator from Maryland said he would like to investigate the alleged new facts which were brought out, and promised the Senate he would do that and lay the matter before the Senate. There was no request for rehearing before the committee. That only reached my office this morning, and, whether it

had come or not, the Senator from Maryland would have been honor-bound to carry out his promise to the Senate. I do not want the Senator to think that Mr. Matthews was delinquent, because at the time the charges were made Mr. Matthews was in Omaha, Nebr., and did not return as I understand until the end of the week some time, and therefore, of course, he had no opportunity.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator. It seems to me there are two questions presented. The first is the question whether Admiral Sherman is a proper man and should be confirmed. The Navy has not had a head now, except an interim head, for some months. The Navy is a very important branch of our armed services. The Chief of Naval Operations has certain functions to perform. It is difficult for him to perform them unless he is confirmed. That is one question.

The other question involves the veracity or the misinformation of the Secretary of the Navy. I personally have a high regard for the veracity of the Secretary of the Navy. I do not know him well personally, at all, but I believe, from what I ascertained about him, that he is an honest man and intends to b an honest man. That is another question entirely. On that question, it seems to me that if any Member of the Senate or of the committee itself should like to question Mr. Matthews further, it would be helpful to have him come before the committee. As Secretary of the Navy he must come before the committee at some time or other and open himself to questions on any subject about which any Member may want to ask him.

I point out to the Senator from Maryland, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, that as I have listened to the arguments today it has occurred to me that the commission was delivered to Admiral Denfeld in September. Whether it was issued to him by proper authority, as pointed out by the Secretary at that time, does not seem to me to be material, because he was removed from that office on November 1, or was relieved of his command at that time. If the commission is a good commission, issued by proper authority, in every proper way, he was relieved on November 1, an interim appointment was made, which was accepted. If this commission was legally issued by authority, the Admiral would have to take the oath when he received the commission. He has never taken the oath. Therefore the office unquestionably is vacant today, in my humble judgment. We have, as I say, the responsibility to fill that office in order properly to protect the security of the United States.

I hope we shall proceed promptly to confirm the nomination of Admiral Sherman, and then, if I may put it in the form of a question, would the Senator from Maryland be willing to hold a hearing and have Secretary Matthews come before it, opening the meeting to any questions which the members of the committee or any invited Members of the Senate would like to ask him at that time?

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for all he has said. I think the Senator and I are in more or less substantial agreement. Let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I do not believe it is fair to the Navy, to the country, or to Admiral Sherman, there being a vacancy in the Navy Department as to which he himself has testified, to hold off confirmation of his nomination while we have an investigation into some collateral matter having nothing at all to do with the vacancy and having nothing to do with the fitness of Admiral Sherman. The Senator from Maryland has been careful, in answering questions, to try to keep before the Senate the Sherman nomination and the fact that there is a vacancy, if the nomination has been legally made, quite apart from any investigation.

I now come frankly to the second proposition raised by the Senator from Massachusetts. The Senator from Maryland is only the chairman of the Armed Services Committee. That committee meets regularly every Thursday morning at 10:30. Whenever any member of the committee desires that an investigation be made regarding anything under the sun, all he has to do is to make a motion to that effect, have it seconded, and the question is put to the committee and the committee decides whether an investigation should be held. Does the Senator from Massachusetts think it would be becoming for the Senator from Maryland to prejudge what the committee will do, and say, "I shall go ahead and do it anyway?" I think, whatever my faults may be, the Senator from Massachusetts, who has served for a long time on the Armed Services Committee and is one of the ablest and best members of that committee, will accord me at least the small compliment of saying that I have never been a dictator on the committee and have never done anything without the committee's approval. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. I believe the Senator from Maryland is an honorable man. Will the Senator join with me and other Senators in inviting Mr. Matthews to come before the committee?

Mr. TYDINGS. For what purpose?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. For any purpose.

Mr. TYDINGS. No. I do not believe in inviting persons to come before the committee for any purpose. I want to know what I am undertaking. I do not believe in taking a blunderbuss and shooting in all directions at the same time. If there is a proper request for an investigation into a matter which affects the security and welfare of the Nation, we should consider it; but I do not think we should call the Secretary of the Navy before us and go into a blind investigation. It should be an investigation for the purpose of ascertaining this, that, and the other thing. If that is done, perhaps I shall go along. But, so far, I have not seen that kind of a proposition advanced, and I do not believe we should start calling Cabinet officers before a committee and having an investigation which has no limitation. If that sort of an investigation should be held, all they could do would be to spend the time from now until next election day, which is in November, and after that they would not be called at all.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator join with the Senator from Massachusetts and other Senators in inviting the Secretary to come before the committee and give an account of his problems?

Mr. TYDINGS. I have already stated to the members of the committee that so soon as we can get two or three of these matters out of the way we shall call the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary for Air, and the chiefs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, who wear the uniform, to appear before us for a review. I have already made arrangements, about some of which the Senator knows, to have the Committee on Armed Services briefed at the Pentagon Building. So, if we can get time to devote to national defense, rather than going off on tangents, we can all be pretty well informed. But if we are going to try to investigate every little quirk of human nature, we shall never extend the efficiency or the composition of the three branches of our Defense Establishment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. At the time the Secretary comes before the committee, it is the privilege, opportunity, and right of any member of the committee to interrogate him; is it not?

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course it is, as to anything which seems pertinent to our national defense. I do not want to dignify what I believe is a comedy of errors. Everyone has testified in good faith. Certainly the statement of the Secretary is perfectly reasonable and plausible, and is, I believe, an honest and factual one. I do not want to dignify some different idea which someone else entertains as requiring a full-scale investigation by the Armed Services Committee. We might call the Secretary before us and he might say, "What are you going to investigate?" We would have to say, "We do not know." He has been referred to as being either incompetent or a liar. He was examined for 2 hours a few days ago, and at that time he was asked pertinent questions and he supplemented his testimony.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. First of all, Mr. President, I think the record should be kept straight. The Secretary of the Navy, perhaps inadvertently, in answering questions put to him by members of the Armed Services Committee, gave testimony which was not in keeping with the facts. That may have been inadvertent. I am willing to allow the Secretary the benefit of the doubt on that question. But the fact is that the testimony before the committee shows that in reply to a question I had asked him, he said:

> Well, at the present time the vacancy occurs by the fact that Admiral Denfeld's first term has expired, and he never has been appointed for a second term. His name was

suggested. He was confirmed, but the commission was never issued to him.

That stands as the uncontroverted testimony of the Secretary of the Navy before a standing committee of this body, and it was not until the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] produced on the floor of the Senate additional facts that any other members of the committee had any knowledge that there was any controversy as to the testimony of the Secretary of the Navy.

In the second place, the Senator from California had pursued the questioning, going into the matter of whether there was a vacancy, and he began to inquire in the Denfeld matter. Here is what the Secretary of the Navy said at that time:

Secretary MATTHEWS. I did not say that the change of my opinion was due to the hearing; no, sir. I want to say this to the committee, if I may, that if you want to go into the questions of my reasons for my changed opinion in regard to Admiral Denfeld, there are two requests I have to make. I would want some time to go back and look over my records and refresh my recollection on dates you mention, and then I would ask with all deference to Admiral Denfeld that it be a closed meeting.

Senator KNOWLAND. I am personally willing to drop my line of questioning at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that may be done.

Secretary MATTHEWS. I am perfectly willing to give you my innermost motives and everything that may have prompted what I did, but I want to do it properly.

Senator KNOWLAND. I think it is a perfectly reasonable request, and I am willing, at this stage of the proceedings, provided the Secretary says he would be glad to come before us at any time. That satisfies me at that particular point, and I shall be glad to pursue it at some other time.

Mr. President, I think there is a very clear obligation on the part of the Secretary of the Navy to come before the Armed Services Committee of this body and make his explanations in person for the testimony which may have been inadvertently incorrect. I think the basic issue here goes far beyond this particular job. I raise no question as to the right of the President of the United States to remove a chief of naval operations. I clearly recognize that he has that right under the Constitution of the United States. He is the Commander in Chief. I believe that of necessity, by virtue of his office and by virtue of his responsibility, he must have that power. That to me is not in issue. It may be in issue, as the Senator from Wisconsin pointed out, not questioning whether the President has the power, but questioning whether or not he has exercised the power which he otherwise would have.

I believe there is a far more important question before the Senate, and one which should concern the Members of the majority, as well as the Members of the minority on this side of the aisle, because the membership on the two sides changes from time to time, and we who are in the minority today may be in the majority a year from today or 3 years from today. The basic question is, when all Members of the minority on the committee who are in town unanimously sign a letter to the chairman of the committee, asking that the Secretary of the Navy come before the committee and correct misinformation which he gave to the committee, are they to be denied that right? I say to the Senators who sit on the other side of the aisle that in my opinion a very dangerous precedent would be established if the attempt were made to gag us, if the attempt were made to withhold from us that which has customarily been the power of a legislative committee.

The Congress of the United States also has its constitutional obligations. We cannot perform our constitutional obligations if we do not have access to the information upon which to base our sound judgment. I cannot believe that, on sober reflection, Members of the majority or the chairman of the committee would wish to deny to the minority, because we today happen to be in the minority, a right which has always been extended to committees, to make proper inquiry into matters which come before them and which are pertinent.

I make this plea not only to the majority members of the Armed Services Committee, but, indeed, I make it to all the Members of the Senate, because I think it is a very basic issue, going to the very constitutional responsibility of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. CAPEHART obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me before he yields the floor?

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator, provided I do not yield the floor by yielding.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to have unanimous consent that I may ask the Senator from California one question without the Senator from Indiana losing the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. I ask unanimous consent that I do not lose the floor by yielding to the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to ask the Senator a question which I believe to be of tremendous importance. In view of the fact that we are confronted with a legal question of such a nature that the chairman of the committee felt called upon to get a detailed opinion from the Judge Advocate General's office; in view of the fact that this involves not only Admiral Denfeld, but involves the President's right to remove a statutory officer; in view of the fact that as of now I do not know whether delivery of the document, the Commission, for example, was a legal delivery—in view of the fact that we do not know whether Matthews is right or wrong, and in view of the further fact that if the President can remove Admiral Denfeld by merely saying, "You are fired," then, the question is, Can the President circumvent the entire purpose of that part of the Unification Act under which we set up the Joint Chiefs of Staff? In other words, if he can remove Admiral Denfeld with a scratch of the pen, then he can also remove General Bradley tomorrow, and, if he wishes, he does not have to appoint a new man. I am inclined to believe that he can remove the officers in that fashion, and that is unfortunate, in my opinion. I believe the President has the right to remove Admiral Denfeld, and I am rather inclined to think that the office is vacant, if the new facts which Matthews gives us are correct.

I urge that the members of the Armed Services Committee meet tomorrow, or at the earliest possible moment, and go over the facts, and then give the Senate their legal opinion as to whether or not there is a vacancy. There are some very able lawyers on that committee, who have a very competent legal staff to assist them, and if the committee will do what I have suggested, when we vote on the confirmation of Admiral Sherman there will not be any question. I wonder if in fairness to the entire Senate and the country, the Armed Services Committee should not perform that simple function.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am utterly amazed that the Secretary of the Navy himself does not immediately call the chairman of the committee and say to him, "Senator TYDINGS, since I inadvertently made a statement before your committee which turned out not to be the fact, and I did it in testifying before your committee, I think it is due me to afford me an immediate opportunity to come before your committee and correct that record." I think that that is a fair thing to do. I think it is a fair thing for the Secretary of the Navy, and for the committee. I believe, looking over the long-term relationship between the Secretary and the committee, in the middle of a Presidential term, that if the Secretary is properly advised he will ask that that be done immediately. I cannot believe that the Secretary should wish to stand behind any technicality, having given testimony which was not accurate before the committee, in giving an answer with the members of the committee not in a position to examine him on it.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. For what purpose?

Mr. GURNEY. For a short observation on a subject which has been discussed for 2 hours. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Indiana may not lose the floor if he yields to me.

Mr. CAPEHART. Under the circumstances, I shall be very happy to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GURNEY. I hope that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee will not let his decision stand, to the effect that every time there is a request for the calling of a witness by a member of the committee or a group of members of the committee, he will require a committee vote to decide the question of whether or not such witness shall be called. I have not been a Member of the Senate so long as has the Senator from Maryland. Nevertheless, my experience on the committees on which I have been a member has always been along the line that whenever a member asked for a witness, or asked for information, every facility of the committee was put to work to bring the information or the witness to the committee at as early a date as possible. I believe that

the records of the Armed Services Committee will show that that has been the custom of that committee. My memory tells me that that appears in the records.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I do not have the floor with permission to yield to the Senator from Maryland. If I am allowed to finish my statement, I shall be very happy to yield, with the permission of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has asked what I will do.

Mr. GURNEY. No. I am making a statement. It is my hope that the Senator from Maryland will not adhere to his statement that he will require a committee vote. That is my hope. Certainly if we could have had the right to bring such witnesses as five members of the committee indicated in the letter which was transmitted to the Senator from Maryland on Friday afternoon, and which I previously had told the Senator was coming, it would have given the committee an opportunity to join with the Senator in presenting the proper information to the Senate. That was my purpose in signing the letter requesting the Secretary to come before the committee in executive session. I desired to make that statement a matter of record on the floor of the Senate.

I therefore hope that the Senator from Maryland will not consider the request as taken care of by this 2-hour debate on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. I join with the Senator from Massachusetts expressing the hope that we can quickly confirm Admiral Sherman's nomination to be Chief of Naval Operations. But I think we owe it to the Secretary of the Navy to ask the final question which any member of the committee may have in his mind, or which any Member of the Senate may have in his mind and may wish to transmit to the members of the Armed Services Committee.

I hope, therefore, that the Senator from Maryland, as chairman of the committee, will reconsider the statement which he has made.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for 3 minutes, and that at the conclusion of my remarks the Senator from Indiana shall not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I ask unanimous consent that the able Senator from Maryland be given a minute and a half and that the able Senator from Washington be given a minute and a half, without my losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. TYDINGS. These charges against the Secretary of the Navy were not made in the Armed Services Committee. They were made upon the floor of the United States Senate, before all the people of America, and they were printed in the newspapers of America, and here is where the Secretary ought to file his answer. If the Senator from Wisconsin, instead of making the charges, had written the Secretary a letter and said, "Certain information has come to my attention which seems to be contrary to the testimony you gave," and had gotten the Secretary's answer before he smeared him all over the country, there would have been that degree of good faith which ought more or less to characterize the operations of democratic institutions.

The Senator from Maryland is due tomorrow morning to attend a meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and I believe that what will go on there will be of more importance than the question whether the commission was in the first or second or third drawer of Admiral Denfeld's desk. Furthermore, the Committee on Armed Services will meet on Thursday. As I have said repeatedly, all the men I have mentioned, will be called before that committee in due course. But if the Senate wants to take it up in an abnormal way, the Committee on Armed Services can certainly do so next Thursday.

I do not want any investigation because I believe the Secretary has told the truth. I can see nothing to it—and I say this with no reflection on the Senator from Wisconsin—but the pursuit of littleness in trying to twist the Secretary's words so as in some way to make him appear to be either non compos mentis or a consummate liar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Maryland has expired.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as the newest member of the Armed Services Committee I want fully to associate myself with the views as recently expressed by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

As an individual Member of the Senate I am prepared, sir, to vote for the confirmation of Admiral Sherman's nomination this afternoon, or at any other time. I think him an outstanding naval officer, and the Navy Department needs him.

But I have a great hope, sir, that the Armed Services Committee will find it convenient and proper to clarify the contradictions which have been submitted for the record by some of us as Senators and by the distinguished Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Matthews. Mr. Matthews, to be precise, has said on more occasions than one that he knew nothing about the existence of a commission. We have now placed Admiral Denfeld in the position of sending a telegram over his signature to the Senator from Wisconsin in which Admiral Denfeld said, "Mr. Matthews knew all about this." I think it nothing short of simple common sense and decency to call before the Armed Services Committee both gentlemen whose great names have been brought into question before this body, so that we may determine what the facts are, render judgment on the matter, and go on to other public business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is Senate Joint Resolution 25, the so-called equal-rights amendment.

The Chair recognizes once again the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. The business before the Senate is the so-called equal-rights amendment, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; Senate Joint Resolution 25.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the present occupant of the chair if it has come to his attention that it is proposed to bring the matter of the nomination of Admiral Sherman before the Senate for action this afternoon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not informed respecting that matter.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield in order that I may propound a question to the distinguished Senator from Maryland, without the Senator from Indiana losing the floor thereby?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield for the purpose stated, providing I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr President, I should like to propound the following question to the Senator from Maryland: What are his intentions relative to the confirmation of the nomination of Admiral Sherman? I have not been present all the time the matter has been under discussion, and I wondered whether the Senator from Maryland asked for action to be taken today.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to ask this afternoon for unanimous consent to consider the nomination of Admiral Sherman. However, if any Member in the meantime conveys to me the information that he will oppose a motion that the Senate go into executive session and proceed to consider the nomination, I have no desire to prolong the argument; but I should like to say—and I hope the Chair will be indulgent with me—a few words more.

The Navy has had some pretty unfortunate happenings. Unfortunate happenings come to all of us. They come to the Army, to the Air Force, to us as individuals, to parties, to countries. The Navy has had an unfortunate investigation which has hurt its prestige, and which, I think, ought to have been handled in an entirely different manner. I say that without any reflection upon anybody. There has been the dispute over Admiral Denfeld. The largest battleship in the Navy is now aground. There is a certain amount of demoralization in this great arm which has covered itself with luster and written many brilliant pages in American history. I at least hope we can confirm the nomination of an able officer and, regardless of the other matter, let him function as the head of the Department, get the Department going, and build up its morale in the face of the situation which now confronts it.

THE CONVICTION OF ALGER HISS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a jury of loyal Americans in a district

court in New York last Saturday reached a verdict of guilt that we shall find goes far beyond its effect on the lone defendant. That defendant was Alger Hiss. The jury found Hiss guilty on two perjury counts, thus, in effect, finding him guilty of being an espionage agent for a Communist spy ring.

It also, in effect, found him guilty of taking copies of secret documents from the Department of State for use by the Communists.

But, Mr. President, that same verdict stretched a veil of guilt across the souls of others. The others may not have been guilty of espionage, or even of perjury, but they are definitely guilty of laxity, negligence, and disloyalty.

Let us examine the effect of that verdict, Mr. President. Let us see why a verdict of guilt against one man should be so expansive in its effect.

Just who was Alger Hiss? He was not an ordinary clerk in Government service. Alger Hiss was recognized in every position he held as an important person.

Alger Hiss is 45 years old. He is a graduate of Johns Hopkins and Harvard Universities. He was a former secretary to the late Supreme Court Justice, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr.

His first entrance into Government service was in 1933, when he joined the Department of Agriculture and served under Henry Wallace, who was then Secretary of the Department. It was while he was serving under Wallace in the Agriculture Department that Hiss became associated with the Communists. That, Mr. President, was 17 years ago.

Then, in 1936, Mr. Hiss transferred to the State Department and later was loaned to the Nye Committee as a counsel.

The accusations that he had stolen copies of State Department documents, confirmed by his conviction last Saturday, went back to that period—some 14 years ago.

But let us proceed for the moment with a recital of the positions Hiss held in the Government. Later, in the State Department Hiss headed the Department's Office of Special Political Affairs from 1944 to 1946.

He had acted as consultant and assistant to the late President Roosevelt during the conferences in Tehran and Yalta. And we will talk more about that later.

He was Secretary General of the San Francisco United Nations Conference—a position of tremendous importance.

Hiss has boasted that he drew the working draft for the United Nations. And he was the conference Secretary General when the Charter for the United Nations was written and approved.

Since 1946 Hiss has been president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Mr. President, this man Hiss, now facing a prison term as a Russian Communist espionage agent, was an important man in our Government. It has been proved, Mr. President, that he had the support of other important people in the Government.

Let us, Mr. President, recount the steps that Hiss took that have finally led to his conviction.

I have pointed out how he began in the Department of Agriculture under the secretaryship of the man who ran for President in 1948 under a left-wing banner, and how Hiss moved from the Agriculture Department to the State Department where he began filching documents for the Communists.

Is it not rather significant, Mr. President, that it was in 1935 that Hiss first met Whittaker Chambers, a self-confessed Communist and an espionage agent for the Reds?

The testimony shows that Hiss agreed to obtain State Department secret documents for Chambers and the Communists as soon as he entered the State Department.

Mr. President, I think it is fair to raise this question: Could it have been an agreement with the Russian Communists that led to Hiss' interest in shifting from the Agriculture Department to the State Department where documents of more importance to Communists are kept?

However, Hiss had high endorsement for the new position.

From that time until 1938, when Chambers left the Communist Party, Hiss delivered State Department documents to Chambers who in turn gave them to Col. Boris Bykob, a Russian spy agent. Those documents consisted of copies of top secret confidential dispatches and cablegrams. But, more important, is the fact that those documents had been decoded before they were delivered, thus revealing to the Russians in 1938 what was then our top-secret code known as the Gray Code.

That, Mr. President, was prior to the period of the friendly pact between Germany and Russia, which existed from August of 1939 to September 1, 1941. At the very time the Russians were on friendly terms with Hitler, they had the secret of our code. Speaking literally, men have been shot for being less traitorous to their country. That very act might well have cost the lives of millions of American boys had the war taken a different turn—had Hitler kept his word with Stalin.

I want to remind my colleagues that this extremely serious offense took place 10 years ago. Could it have been detected by proper authorities in our Government at that time? Or perhaps, I might even ask: Was this actually detected by authorities in our Government before the evidence was laid before the court of justice in New York in the second trial of Hiss? I ask that question as I proceed to outline the additional steps that were taken in the strange case of Mr. Hiss—steps which now, for the first time, are known to the American people as confirmed facts.

Three days after that German-Russian pact was signed in August of 1939, Whittaker Chambers came to Washington to tell his story of Hiss to the late President Roosevelt. Chambers had been out of the Communist Party for about a year and a half at that time. It was common knowledge among leading newspapermen in Washington that Adolf A. Berle, Assistant Secretary of State at the time, was Mr. Roosevelt's principal intelligence man. So it was not surprising that Marvin McIntyre, then Secretary to President Roosevelt, referred Mr. Chambers to Mr. Berle.

It is now a matter of evidence in the court record that Chambers named 30 workers in the Government, including Alger Hiss and his brother, Donald, as Communists, when he told the story of Communist espionage to Mr. Berle.

Mr. Berle revealed many notes about what Chambers told him in 1938, as he testified before the House Un-American Activities Committee during the investigation of the Hiss matter in 1948.

This is a good time, Mr. President, to identify further Donald Hiss. He is now a member of the law firm from which Mr. Dean Acheson resigned to take over the position of Secretary of State, a position which he holds today.

From the time when Mr. Chambers told his story to Mr. Berle until the House Un-American Activities Committee first touched on the story 2 years ago, the top espionage in the modern history of America rested as a secret in the souls of a few persons. Mr. Berle testified before the House committee that he had taken up the matter of the Chambers story with Mr. Acheson. But nothing was done about the evidence. In fact, Mr. President, it was not long after that that Mr. Hiss received a promotion in rank. His secret of espionage activities buried, Mr. Hiss, through his endorsements and support by persons of importance in our Government, moved on into positions of great influence.

Oh, yes; rumors were floating around for a time that Mr. Berle, as Mr. Roosevelt's top intelligence man, had spoken to the late President about the Chambers-Hiss story, but that the late President shunted the issue aside with the comment that anyone carrying such a foolish tale should jump into the Potomac with it. Then there was the opinion, voiced by some, that Mr. Berle was forced out of the State Department by the Hiss-Acheson combine. Nevertheless, Mr. Berle kept the notes until 1943, when they were placed in the State Department files, and were never made public until the second Hiss trial. They were barred from the evidence of the first trial.

Two years after those notes were placed in State Department vaults, Mr. Hiss accompanied the late President Roosevelt to the Yalta Conference as a chief adviser. He had also gone to the Tehran Conference with the late President, but the importance of Hiss at the Yalta Conference is striking. It was at the Yalta Conference that the great powers were to agree on a postwar peace program. Mr. Hiss had his plans drafted by this time. Stalin demanded 16 votes for Russia's so-called republics. A bitter dispute raged. Some 30 representatives of the powers left the Conference. Stalin remained with a Russian interpreter. President Roosevelt remained. And Alger Hiss remained.

Outside that conference room, Mr. President, waited the then Secretary of State Stettinius; Admiral Leahy, Chief of Staff to the President; Harry Hopkins, Special Assistant to the President; and Justice James Byrnes, then Director of

the Office of War Mobilization. When Mr. Roosevelt and Alger Hiss came out of that room, they advised those waiting outside that an agreement had been reached to give Russia three votes. Keep in mind that the United States has only one vote.

How many other agreements were reached behind closed doors in Yalta and Tehran and other places are just now coming to light in the form of a threatened third world war within a generation.

What part did Mr. Hiss play in this agreement? There is no answer, but when Mr. Roosevelt came out that door and heard the protests of his other advisers against such an agreement, he said:

> I know, I shouldn't have done it. But I was so tired when they got hold of me. Besides, it won't make much difference.

Two months later, Mr. President, Mr. Roosevelt died.

Whom did he mean when he said "they got hold of me?" Could he have meant Mr. Stalin and his interpreter? There was only one other man in the room besides Mr. Roosevelt. That was Alger Hiss.

It seems quite significant that Mr. Berle, in testifying before the House Un-American Activities Committee, should say—just a few years later—that Hiss and Acheson were leaders of a group which took the pro-Russian point of view.

Hiss said in his testimony before the House Committee that he opposed the three-vote phase of the agreement, but endorsed the agreement on the whole. He said:

> I still think it was a very valuable agreement for the United States.

That is an interesting commentary, since it was at Yalta that the final agreement was reached in the betrayal of Poland. Other infamous deals were completed at that conference, too, I might add.

But, through the persistence of the House Un-American Activities Committee, the Hiss story began to unfold on August 3, 1948, when Whittaker Chambers first brought to light his story of espionage. Attempts were made by many influential members of our Government to belittle the story, to mislead the people, to continue to cover up for Hiss, just as they had when FBI inquiries about Hiss from 1945 to 1948 failed to bring to light that which later brought conviction.

Mr. President, we are all quite familiar with the denial by Hiss that he even knew Chambers, and then his admission that he had known him as George Crosley.

We are familiar, too, with the failure of the Attorney General, or any others in the Justice Department who handled criminal prosecutions, to take any action in what the committee reported to be pure perjury.

I shall refer again, Mr. President, to this particular period in the Hiss case, but now I wish to continue to brief the steps that led to conviction.

It was on August 15 of that year—1948—that the Justice Department announced that they would drop investigation of possible perjury charges. Two days later, Mr. Chambers, who faced a $75,000 libel suit filed by Hiss, laid on the conference table in Baltimore, where the libel attorneys were studying evidence to be presented in the case, the copies of State Department secret documents given to him by Hiss. The Justice Department then stepped back into the case and impounded the papers.

Then came the House committee's move to obtain more evidence. It subpenaed Chambers, and his testimony led committee investigators to the pumpkin on Chambers' farm near Westminster, Md., where were hidden microfilms of other secret documents. Some of those had been furnished by Harry Dexter White, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, who died suddenly just 3 days after being questioned by the House committee.

At that point, Mr. President, the Federal Bureau of Investigation stepped in with its full might into a case that was 10 years old. A tribute is due the FBI for its success in uncovering witnesses and evidence, although its agents were forced to follow trails that had long before grown cold.

Then, as we all recall, came the first trial of Hiss on two counts of perjury, on which he was indicted December 15, 1946.

We recall, too, the wide criticism of the judge in that case, Samuel H. Kaufman, a novice jurist hearing his first important case.

The indecision of the jury followed.

It might be well to add that quite a number of persons of importance in the Government here in Washington expressed, before that decision, opinions to the effect that Hiss would not be convicted. Those expressions gained significance as Judge Kaufman continued in the trial to bar testimony by certain Government witnesses—witnesses whose testimony was not barred by Judge Henry W. Goddard, a veteran of 26 years on the bench, in the second trial.

That, Mr. President, is a brief outline of the steps that led to the conviction of Mr. Hiss last Saturday in New York.

But, that is not all the story. That is not all the story of the secret conspiracy to protect Hiss.

On February 28, 1947, in the year after he had been told by Prime Minister Attlee of Great Britain and Prime Minister MacKenzie King, of Canada, that the Canadian Communist atomic spy operations spread to the United States, Mr. Truman belittled the activities of Communists in this country.

Mr. Truman was told by Attlee and MacKenzie aboard the Presidential yacht on the Potomac that the investigation of the Canadian spy ring had disclosed serious American angles.

Yet, on February 28, 1947, Mr. Truman wrote the following passage in a letter he sent to George Earle, former Governor of Pennsylvania:

> People are very much wrought up about the Communist "bugaboo," but I am of the opinion that the country is perfectly safe as far as communism is concerned—we have too many sane people.

Then, on September 28, 1948, President Truman defied the facts of the Hiss case which had been developed by the House committee.

Less than 3 months before Hiss was to be indicted and sent on his way to conviction as a spy, Mr. Truman said these words in Oklahoma City, Okla.:

> Our Government is not endangered by Communist infiltration. It has preserved its integrity and it will continue to preserve its integrity as long as I'm President.

I would say, Mr. President, that in one breath Mr. Truman was right. The Nation had preserved its integrity—far more so than he had accepted his responsibility as President of the United States. I shall prove that point even more in just one moment.

Only a few moments ago I charged that certain persons of influence in this Government attempted to mislead the people and to misrepresent the Hiss case.

One of those persons was President Truman.

On August 5, 1948, just 2 days after Whittaker Chambers had unfolded his story of the Hiss espionage acts before the House Un-American Activities Commitee, President Truman made his now infamous remark at a press conference in answer to questions about Communist activities in the Government.

He said the Hiss story was being used "simply as a red herring."

Mr. President, at the very moment Mr. Truman made that remark, his officials either had in their possession, or could have obtained the very evidence that convicted Alger Hiss as a spy in New York last Saturday.

Now, I want to carry this charge against Mr. Truman even further.

On September 2, 1948, again some 3 months before Mr. Hiss was indicted on evidence that has been in possession of influential officials of the Government for nearly 10 years, Mr. Truman issued this quote at his press conference:

> It's just a plain lie out of whole cloth. I never defended a disloyal person in my life.

This statement was made in reply to a charge that Mr. Truman was protecting Communists within the Federal Government.

In all this time just preceding the House committee disclosures of the Hiss case and his ultimate indictment and conviction, President Truman has denied congressional committees access to the loyalty files on Federal officials.

But, there is still more. Early in 1949, we all recall, Mr. Dean Acheson was nominated by Mr. Truman for Secretary of State. This is the same Mr. Acheson, of course, who had figured in the Chambers testimony in the Hiss case.

So, it was quite natural for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, during a routine discussion with the new appointee, to ask about Mr. Acheson's associations with Mr. Hiss.

Mr. Truman's Secretary of State to be promptly replied that he was a friend of Hiss and would remain his friend. Mr. Hiss had been indicted a few weeks before.

And I should like to add another influential person to this list of those who knew of Hiss's activities for many years. He is Justice Felix Frankfurter. Justice Frankfurter boasted that he sponsored Mr. Hiss in his quest for Government experience. Their associations within the

Government were, according to the testimony, quite close.

Then, in the first Hiss trial, Justice Frankfurter volunteered to be a character witness for Hiss. Judge Kaufman, in the presence of the jury, felt inclined to stand and shake well the hand of the character witness from the high Court. Judge Kaufman also saw fit to smile approvingly at Justice Frankfurter's testimony on behalf of Hiss. Another Justice, Stanley Reed, required a subpena before he would appear.

These Justices sit on the highest Court in the land—the United States Supreme Court. It is possible the Hiss case may find its final hearing before this Court.

One of these men, Justice Frankfurter, either knew that evidence existed in the State Department against Hiss, or he could have known.

At this point I wish to read into the RECORD an editorial from today's Washington Daily News, as follows:

HISS CASE LESSONS

The conviction of Alger Hiss should cause some soul-searching in the White House and the State Department.

This man was found guilty of perjury—of trying to lie himself out of charges that he betrayed his country and its Government, under which he held positions of responsibility and trust.

Yet it has taken 11 years for justice to triumph over political pressures.

The prosecutor who won the case before a Federal court jury sometimes must have wondered which side the Government was on.

President Truman called the congressional investigation which brought to light the charges against Alger Hiss a red herring.

Two justices of the United States Supreme Court testified as character witnesses for Hiss at his first trial last year.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt sought through her newspaper column to create public sympathy for Hiss and discredit his accuser.

Ambassador-at-Large Philip C. Jessup testified in behalf of Hiss at both trials.

Secretary of State Acheson publicly expressed confidence in Hiss as recently as January 1949, although by that time most of the evidence which has resulted in the conviction was known.

Nor was that Mr. Acheson's first introduction to the Hiss case. When existence of a spy ring in the State Department was reported to the Government in 1939, an investigating official was told that Dean Acheson and Justice Felix Frankfurter would vouch for the Hiss boys. (Donald Hiss, brother of Alger, is a member of the Acheson law firm.)

It is admirable for a man to stand by a friend in trouble. But is it pertinent to ask where Secretary Acheson now stands?

For it would be assuming too much to conclude that Alger Hiss was the only person in the State Department or elsewhere in Government service who transmitted official secrets to agents of Soviet Russia.

It would be assuming perilously too much to conclude that the State Department and other Government agencies are now free of traitorous enemies within.

Imprisonment of Alger Hiss will do little to protect this country unless there is drastic change in the attitude of high officials who sought to belittle the charges against him and to help him escape punishment.

Mr. President, behind all these facts—facts which convicted Hiss—lie many more links in a secret conspiracy to deceive and mislead. President Truman is in position to reveal those missing links of conspiracy. If the American people are to have faith in their President and his statements, he should now come forth and apologize to them for making the misleading and misrepresenting statement of "red herring" on the dangers of communism in this Government as revealed by congressional committee investigations. I also demand that he reveal the identity of those who have conspired to protect Hiss so the American public will be fully advised as to just who these people are—and if any of them are still being employed by the Government, they should be kicked out immediately.

Then, Mr. President, I call upon President Truman to ask Secretary of State Dean Acheson to resign in the face of undisputed evidence that he was told of the charges against Hiss and had in his Department the Chambers accusations originally given to Mr. Berle in 1939.

Finally, I feel that Mr. Truman should ask Justice Frankfurter to resign his position, in all decency to the high Court of which he is a member.

This should be prompted by his sponsorship of a convicted spy and because of his close association with Hiss during the period in which Hiss participated in espionage work.

And, in the end, Mr. President, I recommend that the leaders of this great Nation dispense with the practice of placing political gain above their obligation to protect America against its enemies. Neither political party is exempt from this responsibility.

When we ignore—and even protect—our enemies, then America is lost.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KEFAUVER obtained the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield in order that I may, acting as minority leader, ask the majority leader a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Tennessee may yield for that purpose.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois what the plan of procedure is, after the Senator from Tennessee has concluded what he intends to say.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire of the Senator from Tennessee how long he expects to speak upon his amendment?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Approximately 25 or 30 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. There are a number of speeches to be made, as I understand, with reference to the confirmation of the nomination of Admiral Sherman. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has just returned to the Senate floor, and I should like to advise him that the Senator from Tennessee now has the floor and has advised me that he will take approximately 30 minutes to discuss a substitute amendment for Senate Joint Resolution 25. I understand other Senators intend to speak upon the confirmation of the nomination of Admiral Sherman, and it was the thought of the Senator from Massachusetts and myself that in view of the fact that we might be here for a couple of hours, we might take a recess until tomorrow, in executive session, and that immediately upon meeting tomorrow we could proceed to the confirmation of the nomination of Admiral Sherman.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] has told me that he desired to discuss the question. The arrangement as outlined by the majority leader and by the acting minority leader is satisfactory. I only wish to inquire whether the Senator from Missouri will be prepared to proceed with his remarks tomorrow.

Mr. KEM. I shall be prepared. I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to say to the Senator from Maryland that, in addition to the Senator from Missouri, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] will have further remarks, as will possible other Senators. If we recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow, it is agreeable to them, as I understand, to speak on the subject before the confirmation of the nomination of Admiral Sherman is voted upon tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee further yield in order that I may make one further comment on the situation?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. We shall proceed tomorrow with the debate on the confirmation of the nomination of Admiral Sherman, regardless of how long it shall take, until we get a vote by the Senate. Then we shall resume the unfinished business. I understand there will be only a few speeches to be made before we shall be in position to request a vote.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wonder if it would be feasible to set a time now, giving ample opportunity to every Senator to speak sometime tomorrow afternoon, when it might be possible to have the matter come to a vote. I would suggest 4 o'clock. That would give 4 hours.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I do not have the authority to make any agreement at this time without a quorum call, but I believe that what the Senator suggests will come to pass.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from what I know about the situation, I believe we can finish before 4 o'clock.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for one further question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the majority leader expect to take up any other business this evening, after the Senator from Tennessee shall have concluded his speech?

Mr. LUCAS. There will be no further business on the floor of the Senate this afternoon after the Senator from Tennessee has concluded. We shall then take a recess, as in executive session, until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN—PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 25) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the bill which I wish to offer at this time is Senate bill 1430. I shall move to strike out the resolving clause of the so-called equal rights amendment, and the text of that amendment, and to insert in lieu thereof the text of Senate bill 1430, with two short amendments which are included in the motion which is on the President's desk.

In the substitute which I have mentioned, Senate bill 1430, I have been joined, as sponsors, by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

The substitute is not merely a measure in opposition to the so-called civil rights amendment, because it has very substantial backing by many organizations of women who are interested in the political, social, and economic welfare of women. I have here a list of 37 organizations which have expressed opposition to the equal rights amendment but which have joined in the sponsorship of the women's status bill which is known as Senate bill 1430.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the list of these organizations be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN THE UNITED STATES

The following organizations oppose the equal-rights amendment:

American Association of Social Workers; American Civil Liberties Union; Americans for Democratic Action; Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; American Federation of Hosiery Workers; American Federation of Labor; American Federation of Teachers; American Federation of Women's Auxiliaries of Labor; Brotherhood of Boilermarkers, Iron Ship Builders and Helpers Union; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express, and Station Employees; Congress of Women's Auxiliaries of the CIO; Congress of Industrial Organizations; Communications Workers of America; Glass Bottle Blowers Association of the United States and Canada; International Ladies Garment Workers Union; International Womens Auxiliary of United Automobile Workers; Machinists Union; National Consumers League; National Council of Catholic Women; National Council of Jewish Women; National Council of Negro Women; National Farmers Union; National Federation of Post Office Clerks; National Federation of Settlements, Inc.; National League of Women Voters; National Womens Trade-Union League; Textile Workers Union of America; Oil Workers Union of America; United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America; United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers; United Packinghouse Workers of America; United Steel Workers of America; Womens National Homeopathic Medical Fraternity; Women's Society for Christian Service of the Methodist Episcopal Church (eastern division); Young Women's Christian Associations of the United States of America (National Board).

Mr. KEFAUVER. The general position of the various organizations is very well expressed in a resolution which was adopted at the Sixteenth National Conference on Labor Legislation in Washington, D. C., on December 1, 1949. The National Conference on Labor Legislation is a conference attended by the commissioners of labor of the various States, together with representatives of various labor organizations. The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION PASSED AT SIXTEENTH NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON LABOR LEGISLATION, WASHINGTON, D. C., DECEMBER 1, 1949

Resolution VII—Women's status bill

Whereas it is highly desirable to hasten removal of any remaining discriminations against women in the law, as well as any discriminatory policies and practices that may operate against them in the administration of Federal and State law; and

Whereas it is essential to preserve provisions of labor legislation which have proved beneficial to working women over long periods of their experience, and other provisions of law safeguarding the interests of wives, widows, and mothers; and

Whereas the women's status bill of 1949, pending in the Eighty-first Congress (S. 1340, H. R. 2396), would establish a policy for the United States of nondiscrimination on the basis of sex, both in provisions of law and in their administration, while at the same time safeguarding legislation of benefit to women, and further would establish a commission to investigate and report on current discriminations against women in law and practice: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Sixteenth National Conference on Labor Legislation affirm its support of the women's status bill, and urge favorable consideration and action thereon by the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. President, in connection with our substitute for the equal-rights amendment, some confusion has grown up as to what changes women want in this field of so-called equal rights. Let me say that I think it would be difficult to find any American woman today who would be against equality for women. What has not been made clear is what in fact would provide equality for the great majority of American women. Historically, equality or equal rights for women had certain meanings; today, the term has quite different meanings. A hundred years ago equal rights meant that women did not want to be excluded from the franchise and wanted control of their property.

Women now have these rights. Our equal-status substitute takes advantage of the experience women have gained in handling the franchise, in handling property, and in active pursuit of educational and economic interests. Experience has indicated the difficulty of applying the early formulation of equality as identity of treatment with men in all situations. Take, for example, one of the simplest situations, as an illustration—age of majority as between boys and girls. Is identity of treatment here the same as equality? I submit it is not, if physiologists are correct in telling us that girls on the average mature earlier. Probably no great harm would be done if identity of treatment were required in this particular matter. But there are other fields in which enlightened public opinion today is calling for, and is fast achieving, the enactment of laws which treat men and women differently as a matter of principle, and where identity of treatment would be detrimental to women.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I shall be very happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In studying the various States laws, does the Senator find that they deal differently in regard to the treatment of children? Is it not correct that in some States the husband is required to support the children?

Mr. KEFAUVER. In the hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee on Senate Joint Resolution 61 on September 28, 1945, beginning at page 59 of the report of the hearings, are listed the laws which give special privileges and protection to women and to female children in the various States, and any member of the Senate who wishes to see the provisions for necessary protection in the interest of society, and for the benefit of women which have been enacted by the legislature of any particular State can find them in report of the hearings. Certainly it would be very difficult to believe that anyone who is really interested in the welfare of women in his particular State would wish to repeal or to nullify the effectiveness of all these special laws which have been passed for the benefit of women.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. What would happen to the protection which is accorded to children under the various State laws if this proposed constitutional amendment were ratified?

Mr. KEFAUVER. As to female children, the special protections which are now provided for them under State laws, for example, against rape or sexual offenses, and even under the Federal white-slave statute, as I understand it, would be nullified under this amendment.

Mr. President, I refer to provisions of certain State laws which require that in divorce proceedings a judge prefers the mother as guardian of the minor children of the couple, other things being equal. These are merely some of the special laws which have been passed for the welfare and benefit of women, and to which reference was made by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

These illustrations point up the practical problems women face. From their experience they have secured permanently an increasing realization that they gain most by working out each situation as it comes along, that they risk disappointment if they accept any predetermined formula until it is apparent that it also meets the practical realities of their day-by-day needs, and therefore they want no barrier in the way of specific adaptations that seem desirable in their progress. It is this specific, fact-by-fact approach to equality which characterizes my proposals, submitted as Senate bill 1430, on the status of women, and which gives them practical value.

Women's organizations very generally support these proposals, and they demonstrate the lines along which intelligent progress can be sought. Because these revisions deal with specific situations, they are all manageable projects. By that I mean that they can each be considered in relation to particular, known areas of fact and experience, and their effects can be prejudged with sufficient accuracy for reasonable people to make reasonable decisions. This specific, situation-by-situation approach is characteristic of legislation in the United States, and permits us to make our judgments with confidence that we know what we are doing and what we can expect from our actions.

My substitute, S. 1430, declares that it is the policy of the Federal Government to abolish distinctions based on sex in Federal law and its administration, except such as are reasonably justified by differences in physical structure or maternal function. This language is designed to avoid the principal defect of the equal-rights amendment which would eliminate all distinctions in legal treatment of men and women, even where their fundamental reasonableness and common sense is apparent. The new proposal adopts a legislative, rather than a constitutional, method of attack upon unfair discriminations which persist in our laws. It reaches discriminations which are not presently outlawed under the fifth and fourteenth amendments of the United States Constitution or by State constitutions, and which would not be outlawed under the so-called equal-rights amendment.

The bill requires the agencies of the Federal Government to review their regulations and practices in the light of the new declaration of policy and, so far as existing law permits, to revise or modify them accordingly. Each agency is obliged to report its action to a Presidential commission, established by the bill.

This commission would have the duty of studying and reporting on all phases of the legal, economic, and social status of women in the United States today. It would review and evaluate all the significant differences in the legal treatment of the sexes in this country, and determine which are discriminatory, in the light of the declared policy. It would report its conclusions and recommendations to the President. The President, in turn, would transmit the report to Congress with his recommendations for further legislative or other action.

Another major provision of the bill is a recommendation that the several States declare a policy similar to that of the Congress of the United States, and review their own laws and practices with a view to revision and change. The report of the commission would serve as a factual basis for the revision of State codes, and as an economic and social brief for action.

The issue is not whether women should be given equality with men—in that, I am sure, we are all agreed. The problem arises in making that equality effective, in achieving an equality which takes account of the differences between men and women, in physique and function, and also the different situations in which women find themselves today because of historical limitations and restrictions. In some fields, such as the right to vote, we are quite clear that no distinctions should be made. In others, such as provisions for family support and the legal age of maturity, the need for distinctions is clear. Between these is a wide area in which opinions and practices vary. My substitute proposes to declare a general policy as to equality for men and women and then provide for an orderly review of the status of women through which we can determine what changes would actually achieve equality, rather than to impose identity under a masculine pattern.

I should now like to discuss the substitute in some detail. Of first importance is the policy statement in section 1 of the substitute. This reads that "no distinctions on the basis of sex shall be made except such as are reasonably justified by differences in physical structure, or by maternal function." This is careful language. The key words in this statement, as I read it, are "reasonably justified." Differences between the sexes are reflected in many of our laws. The test is whether established legal distinctions are reasonably related to these differences. The substitute focuses attention directly on the distinctions which discriminate against women, discriminations which shock our sense of justice, and which we should seek to eliminate.

The policy statement defines the basis for judgment as to what are reasonable distinctions, namely, "differences in physical structure, or in maternal function." It is hardly necessary to go into detail as to the existence of such fundamental differences. It is generally accepted, for example, that the special responsibilities women carry in bearing and rearing children require recognition in law. The policy recognizes the reasonableness of certain types of legislation based on the fact that women bear children, and that it is to the public interest that this function be protected. Similarly, it is generally recognized that prolonged standing subjects a woman's body to strain, and for this reason many States require employers to provide seats for their women workers. Lead poisoning is considered especially dangerous to women during pregnancy, and some States place restrictions around women in lead industries. However, the policy demands that legal distinctions based on these sex differences must be reasonable. To be reasonable a distinction must be based on more than custom or prejudice, and relate directly to the maternal and family functions women fulfill.

The policy I have just discussed is proposed as "the declared policy of the United States in law and its administration." I should like to emphasize the importance of this proposal in relation to administration. Discriminations against women can creep into administrative practices in ways quite unforseen in an original statute. The substitute, in section 4, recognizes this possibility and directs all Federal agencies and departments at once to conform to the declared policy of the substitute and to modify or eliminate rules, regulations, and practices in conflict with such policy, except as prevented by existing law. Agencies are further required to report on a given date the extent of sex distinctions remaining in their rules, regulations, or practices, with the justification therefore. Such procedure provides an immediate remedy, without further legislation, for discriminations that are now practiced against women through regulations.

The creation of the fact-finding commission is one of the outstanding features of this substitute. It is generally recognized that most of the statutes which deny full legal status and recognition to women were enacted many generations ago, in response to social needs and cultural patterns which differed widely from today. Their revision has not kept pace with social and economic changes. Some of these laws which treat the sexes differently may still embody what we regard as socially desirable provisions. Others are antiquated and should be repealed. The separation of those still useful from those antiquated or actually harmful is a selective process which can only be engaged in conscientiously on the basis of the factual considerations underlying each law. What this substitute really proposes is a fundamental review and revision of Federal and State codes to assure that laws which treat men and women differently are neither unreasonable nor inequitable to either sex.

Some may be under the impression that the facts on which informed legislative action should be based are already known; that therefore no Commission study is necessary. Unfortunately, this is not the case. Review of the Congressional hearings on the Equal Rights amendment reveals little consideration as to whether specific laws, treating men and women differently, are good or bad. Although lists of such laws have been maintained by the supporters of the amendments and the Women's Bureau, no expert and authoritative study has ever been made to evaluate them in regard to their reasonableness and social utility. The Commission established by the substitute will be equipped to make findings of facts and informed judgments which will furnish the basis for well-considered legislative action.

The organizaiton of the Commission appears to be highly appropriate to its purpose. It will be composed of 15 members appointed by the President, not more than three of whom shall be employees or officers of the executive branch of the Government. This makes possible representation from different areas of interest and experience. It would be my hope that the President would find it possible to appoint both men and women on this Commission, and that these persons should represent various points of view. Sections 2 and 3, which describe the Commission, carry also enabling clauses as to staff, including the authority to cooperate with Federal, State and private agencies and to utilize their facilities without compensation. The long experience of cooperation between Government agencies and women's organizations should make work on this project fruitful, particularly in stimulating interest in State and local civic groups affiliated with

the national women's organizations. On the basis of the information this Commission gathers, it is required to report to the President, with recommendations, and the President is required to forward these to Congress within 30 days together with his own recommendations. At this point the life of the Commission terminates, and further action will be the responsibility of the Congress and of the State legislatures. The value of this substitute is therefore to provide a basis for sound action; and aside from the fact that it declares a policy and requires administrative adherence to it, it does not in itself constitute final legislation.

While the Commission report will be helpful to the Congress, to State legislatures, and to other officials, its value will be equally great as a basis for informed public judgment. It will help us all to understand the fundamental problems and the role of legislation in dealing with them. The facts and the experience that can be brought together by the Commission will go far to clarify these issues, some of which are complex, and open the way for women and men to decide together what they want to do with the old and the new in our experience. This substitute strikes me as a good way to get at the specifics in this question, and to determine how revisions in our legal codes can result in a constructive formulation of women's status in modern society.

Even if the equal-rights amendment is passed by Congress, it would probably suffer the same fate as the child-labor amendment. The required three-quarters of the States will not ratify it when they realize that the Nation-wide rule of uniformity it imposes will not only disrupt laws and customs which have become well established and accepted in their States but will also deny to their legislatures any opportunity, now or in the future, to accommodate their laws to local conditions and experience which make distinctions drawn on sex lines wise and desirable for men and women alike.

Amending the Federal Constitution is not necessary. Contrary to the views of some women attorneys who support the amendment, women are clearly "persons" in the constitutional sense, protected from arbitrary and capricious classification by the fifth and fourteenth amendments.

Even if the amendment is ratified, it will not be self-executing. State legislatures will find it necessary to revise their laws to make them conform with the amendment. Thus, in view of the length of time required for State ratification and subsequent code revision, passage of the amendment by Congress would actually hinder and delay rather than hasten the legislative review necessary in any event.

Mr. President, very briefly I think it is important that we consider some of the laws the women of the United States and the people of the United States are going to find automatically repealed if the amendment should become effective. Let me say, in this connection, that all organizations that have as their members women who actually work, are not, I believe, in favor of the so-called equal-rights amendment. Such organizations have fought a long, long time for protective laws for the benefit of women, and they do not want to see them brushed off the statute books in one stroke. The Secretary of Labor, the head of the Women's Division of the Department of Labor, the former Secretary of Labor, Mrs. Perkins, and all the officials of the Labor Department who have expressed themselves, have said that the adoption of the amendment would be injurious to the welfare of women and the welfare of society. It would be destructive of the laws which have been passed for the benefit of women. It would be a step backward. But they do urge the passage of Senate bill 1430 which would declare a policy of equality, except where the distinction is based on the difference between men and women.

First let us consider the family relationship. I assume it to be correct, as was stated by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], that you cannot have your cake and eat it too. You cannot have certain rights unless you are going to assume certain duties and responsibilities. The distinguished Senator from Maine said that was exactly the reason she was in favor of the equal-rights amendment—because she wanted the women to have exactly the same duties and responsibilities that men have.

Mr. President, let us first consider the family relationship. The English common law has always recognized that the man of the family has the primary responsibility for the support and maintenance of the family and the children. Laws passed by any State—and I believe all States have laws to this effect—would be automatically repealed by the adoption of the so-called equal-rights amendment. It would repeal the common-law duty of a man to have the superior duty of supporting his family. The so-called equal-rights amendment would make the man and woman equally responsible, or it would make neither.

How about the marriageable age?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the equal-rights amendment were adopted would it be possible for the husband to sue the wife on the ground that she was not adequately supporting him?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It would be possible, yes. The laws placing a prior responsibility on the husband would automatically be abolished.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And children could demand that their mothers go to work to support them?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is one of the responsibilities that would go with the equal-rights amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator from Illinois has made a very pertinent point.

Let us consider the Army, the Navy, and other armed forces. If the amendment means what the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] said it means, that if women are to have equal rights with men, they must have equal duties; if it means that no laws can be passed that distinguish man from woman, then when we carry on our selective service we shall be obliged to draft into the armed forces women just as we now draft men. That might be all right, although it would give us a few more women in the armed forces than men, because I think the female portion of the population is a little greater than the male. That might be all right if all the women were put in the WAVES or the WACS or the SPARS, and did not have to be placed on front-line duty. But according to this proposed constitutional amendment, no distinction could be made as to whether they would have to carry a rifle or operate a typewriter, or whether they would have to march with a 60-pound pack; no distinction of any kind, because of sex, could be made in respect to the service they would render, once they were in the armed services.

Mr. President, I wonder whether the women of America really want that. What kind of armed establishment will we have if we cannot say that the men will do the actual front-line fighting, while the women serve in the offices or in similar places?

Mr. CAIN rose.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does the Senator from Washington wish to ask a question?

Mr. CAIN. I was curious about the trend of the Senator's present thinking. I wonder whether perhaps he might agree with me, in a military sense, that if and when we have another war, it will be imperatively necessary to find the job which any given individual is best qualified to fill, without relationship or reference to sex. I should like to say to my friend the Senator from Tennessee that I am reminded of the fact that in the last war the Russians appeared to me to have had a far better comprehension and understanding of what total war really meant than all the other nations put together, including Japan and Germany. It was my own impression—perhaps I was wrong—that the Russians let every person qualify for what he or she could do best, to the end that if a woman could become a good sniper because her eyesight was keener, sniper she became, to the end that the Russians promptly set about killing more Germans.

I was struck by the contradiction, because it seemed to me that the Senator was presuming that we would not keep pace with progress in things military, in the future.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I say to the distinguished Senator from Washington that if he would offer an amendment to that effect—namely, that this proposed constitutional amendment shall not apply to the armed establishments—I think it would be very helpful.

I certainly agree with the distinguished Senator from Washington that we should be able to use women where they will do the best jobs in the services, and we should be able to use men where they will do the best jobs. But certainly under the wording of this proposed constitutional amendment, if an equal duty and responsibility go with an equal right—and I think almost any lawyer will argue that if there is a right, it is necessary to assume an equal responsibility—then I do

not see how, on the basis of sex, we can keep women out of the front ranks of the infantry or out of the machine gun corps, because the proposed constitutional amendment would provide that—

Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex.

That means that we cannot make any rules or regulations to the effect that A will be in one place—perhaps in an office—and B will be in the front lines of the infantry, and make any such differentiation because of sex. Of course, we might separate them, and might say that A is not quite so strong as B, so A will be in the office and B will be in the front lines; or we might make a distinction as between the service they would render because of ability to fly an airplane, or something of that sort. But under the proposed amendment, if it becomes a part of the Constitution, certainly we could not make any distinction so far as sex is concerned.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I wonder whether the Senator is suggesting that the women of tomorrow should not be in the front lines in the war of tomorrow.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I did not suggest that to the Senator at all. I said there were very many useful places where the women of today or the women of tomorrow can be used in a war. But in case a married man with children is drafted into the armed services, I do not think we can similarly draft the wife. Yet under this proposed constitutional amendment, no distinction could be drawn as between them.

Mr. CAIN. I think the distinction would be drawn on the basis of the need facing the country at that time.

But the adoption of this amendment would make available to our Government all the people of America, without reference to sex. I think the Senator will agree with me that if and when there is a war in the future we are going to need, more than we have ever previously obtained, the services of every man, woman, and child, in the world of tomorrow.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The adoption of this amendment would add so much confusion and difficulty and would place such a burden on our armed establishments, that I fail to see how we could have a very effective armed establishment at all.

For instance, Mr. President, consider a family consisting of a father, a mother, and three children. If the father is drafted into the armed establishment, someone has to stay with the children. Under this amendment, how could we say that since the mother is the homemaker, she should be the one to stay with the children? That could not be said, because the amendment provides that no distinction on account of sex can be made. In that event, if the father were drafted, it would be necessary to draft the mother also. Perhaps the mother could be drafted, and the father could be left at home to take care of the children; but that has never been in line with our social thinking.

Mr. President, the amendment might very well eliminate rape as a crime, inasmuch as by definition it usually involves an act of aggression on the part of a male. Certainly by any reasonable classification, a law which defined an act of aggression on the part of a man, as distinguished from a woman, would automatically be repealed. It is impossible to foretell what effect the proposed constitutional amendment, if adopted, might have on so-called statutory rape, which concerns intercourse between a man and a woman who has not attained the age of consent, as provided by State law. In any event, the amendment would cast confusion on the status of all laws of that nature, which have been developed out of the sound social experience over a period of many, many years.

How about the divorce laws, Mr. President? I suppose practically all States, with perhaps one or two exceptions, have at the present time laws to the effect that a husband's failure to provide for his family shall be grounds for divorce. Such laws necessarily would be repealed, because there could be no superior duty on the part of the husband to provide for the family.

Then, Mr. President, how about all the laws for the special protection of widows? In Tennessee—and I think this is true in all other States of the Union—if the husband should, by will, leave all his property and all his other assets to someone other than the widow, to the exclusion of the widow, all the widow has to do is, at the filing of the will, to say, "I dissent"; and in that event, she automatically gets her dower right. Is it the intention of the Members of the Senate to take away the dower right of women? Yet that necessarily would have to be the effect of this amendment, because under it no distinction could be drawn as between the sexes; and any State law which provides a special right for women would automatically go by the wayside, into the discard.

Then, Mr. President, under the laws of Tennessee—and I think the same provision is made in the laws of all the other States—women have a right for a year's support, which is always set aside by act of a commission, and very generously so. Such a provision is absolutely necessary in the interest and for the protection of the woman and of the family, in order that she and the children may have a means of support during the period when she must establish herself and get on her own feet. Those laws would necessarily be repealed if this amendment were placed in effect.

Mr. President, almost all our compensation laws, including the United States Compensation Act, make special provision for the welfare of women. The compensation laws of most of the States provide for women benefits which are not provided, on the other side of the picture, for men; that is to say, if a woman sustains an injury or loses her life, under the compensation law her husband may or may not be able to receive a certain amount of money; but under those laws the woman always receives a payment if her husband suffers an injury or loses his life.

Then, Mr. President, the Congress passed the Mann Act, to prohibit and punish the transportation of women across State lines for immoral purposes. Does the Congress wish to repeal the Mann Act by the passage of this proposed legislation? Will anyone deny that the Mann Act is not based upon a distinction on account of sex, a difference of sex? Will any lawyer deny that if we are going to abridge and repeal any law passed by the Congress of the United States on account of a difference of sex, the Mann Act will not be repealed?

Furthermore, Mr. President, how about the divorce and alimony laws? Over a period of a long, long time, the States of the Union have provided for alimony, which is in the public interest, for the protection of women and the support of the children. The divorce laws of all the States provide differences as to the marital conduct or relationship between men and women, requiring that the first burden of responsibility for support of the children be on the husband, and giving the wife a right to secure a divorce if the husband does not support the wife and the children. Mr. President, is it in the public interest immediately to abridge those laws, which are for the protection of women and children?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Does the Senator know of any State in the Union in which husbands can sue their wives for alimony, as of the present time?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It seems to me that I did read that in one State that is authorized; but I am not certain.

Mr. CAIN. I have been told—although I do not know it to be a fact—that there are 13 States in which that question has already been resolved, and in which it is now thought perfectly proper that alimony constitutes a two-way street.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I know that in my own State—and think this is true of most other States—the alimony statute particularly refers to the fact that it shall be available for women; it is not a general alimony statute. But I had the impression that probably one State had such a provision.

There are community-property laws in many of the States, under which property in which the wife has an interest is treated as belonging to both husband and wife. I have read a discussion to the effect that the benefit secured to women in the community-property States would be abolished if the proposed amendment were made a part of the Constitution. Certainly it is a matter which the Members of the Senate from those eight States, who have fought so long and so hard to retain community-property laws, should examine carefully to determine the effect of the proposed amendment. The husband is the manager of the community property during the joint lives, but he cannot dispose of it with intent to defraud the wife's rights, nor can he

dispose of her share by his will. Upon his death, one-half the community property goes to his widow. Under the community property laws, during the continuance of the marriage relation, the wife cannot exercise any of the powers of a coowner either against her husband or against third persons, except that she can bind the community by her contracts for necessities.

The community-property laws are inextricably woven into the entire fabric of the law, institutions and customs in these eight States. The amendment, by requiring a drastic unscrambling and reallocation of rights and duties which presently form the basis in community-property States of a stable society, will shake its very foundations. The proponents of the amendment, in their fervor to eliminate certain inequalities, appear to be willing to undertake a revolution in property and family relations in these States which would be most unsettling.

Let us come now to a consideration of certain of the special laws passed for the protection of women engaged in industry. In the State of Tennessee I think about 22 special laws have been placed on the statute books and constitute a great advancement for the special benefit of women who may be working. In the first place, it is provided that women, as distinguished from men, doing certain kinds of work, must be provided with seats. It is provided that they cannot engage in certain hazardous kinds of work, such as working in lead, when they are peculiarly susceptible to lead poisoning during pregnancy. It is provided that they cannot work in certain kinds of mines.

I think we ought to take the approach of studying what kind of work women can and cannot do by virtue of the difference between the sexes, and let the Commission make its recommendation to the various States. I know, for instance, that it is required in various States, I believe by law, that there be provided separate bathroom facilities for men and for women. I suppose so long as a manufacturer maintains separate facilities, there probably would be no complaint; but suppose a manufacturer should refuse to provide them; what law could be passed to require him to do so? Nothing could be written into the State law with respect to the different sexes. Various city ordinances contain provisions requiring separate facilities for men and women. Perhaps the hotels and the industries would go on providing separate facilities, but suppose they should refuse to do it; how then could a law be passed requiring it, if it were impossible to name men or women in the law, as prohibited by the proposed amendment?

We all know that certain discriminations have been practiced against the women of the Nation, in economic matters, in the matter of service on juries, and with respect to the kinds of work they may do. I think all Senators will agree that women should have an equal opportunity with men, that they should receive the same pay for the same kind of work, that they should enjoy equal political rights, and that certain duties are imposed upon them in connection with the exercise of those rights. But it is difficult for me to think that the Senate by one stroke is going to abolish all the special laws which have been passed for the benefit of the family, laws which have been demanded by society, and which State legislatures over a period of many years have passed. I do not think the Senate, carte blanche, is going to abolish all the laws for the protection of women in industry. We are not going to repeal automatically the Federal statutes, such as the Mann Act, and many others, which have been enacted for the special benefit of women. The subject is one we should consider very carefully before voting upon it.

I am aware that the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] said the Congress and Senate had no responsibility in the matter of constitutional amendments, or but very little responsibility and that the Congress was only the means or the avenue through which the amendments could be submitted to the people. It is impossible for me to go along with that statement. Most of us know that the Congress of the United States must be convinced that the amendment would be in the public interest before submitting it. I have heard Members both of the House and of the Senate today say they did not believe in the amendment, but that they would fight for its submission to the people. That is not carrying out the responsibilities of the Members of the Congress, as I see it, as defined and provided by the founding fathers in the Constitutional Convention. Certainly the very fact that a two-thirds vote of the Senate and of the House of Representatives is required before an amendment can be submitted to the legislatures, or to the people, is evidence that the framers of the Constitution not only thought we should consider but that we should consider carefully such matters, and that two-thirds of the Members should favor the proposed amendment before its submission.

Mr. President, I am not offering the bill, S. 1430, as an amendment, for the purpose of delay or merely for the purpose of opposing the pending joint resolution. I offer it in the full belief that it is the answer to the problem. I hope that before the Senate comes to a final vote, Senators will consider the substitute and the support it has among women workers and among other women generally throughout the Nation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have been impressed by the address which the very able Senator from Tennessee has made, and I wonder if the parliamentary situation is such that I may be privileged to ask a few questions of him?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I shall yield to the Senator for that purpose if the parliamentary situation is such that I may properly do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator claiming the floor again?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not want to claim the floor again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot yield unless he claims it.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is it the intention, after the executive session, to go back into legislative session?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands the intention is to take a recess as in executive session.

Mr. CAIN. I would object to that, Mr. President, only for the reason that I wish to offer a statement of approximately 15 minutes' duration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may offer it in executive session.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington withdraws his objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

The Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

James Michael McInerney, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General to fill an existing vacancy.

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert H. Mollohan, of West Virginia, to be United States marshal for the northern district of West Virginia, vice Russell Nichols, term expired.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, do I understand that the Senator from Tennessee has the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington wish to be recognized at this time?

Mr. CAIN. I should like to be recognized, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

THE COAL SITUATION IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON AND ELSEWHERE IN THE NORTHWEST

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington is of the opinion that everyone who reads or watches television or listens to the radio, knows that the State of Washington is in serious trouble because of the prevailing shortage of coal. It is the considered view of responsible citizens in Washington State that an emergency exists today throughout large areas of the Pacific Northwest. In recent days I have been urged by the State I proudly represent to do everything in my power to prevent and relieve the conditions which are bringing real suffering every day to thousands of citizens whose homes and businesses are situated several thousand miles from here. The only power which I possess as a United States Senator in this national question of whether there is or is not an emergency because of a lack of coal is to make certain that citizens whom I represent are given an opportunity to speak for themselves.

The President of the United States was quoted in the New York Times of Friday,

January 20, as having said that he and he alone had the responsibility for determining whether a national emergency existed. The Times story by Louis Stark said this in part:

Patiently but firmly the President insisted that the decision as to the actual time of a national emergency was his to make. When he felt there was an emergency he promised to so declare and to take whatever action was necessary.

"In other words the emergency is not here?" he was asked.

The President replied in the negative.

Then he was asked: "If things go on as they are how long do you think it will be before there is a national emergency?"

"Your guess is as good as mine," was the reply.

Asked whether an emergency such as is mentioned in the labor-relations law was "threatening," Mr. Truman said he did not care to answer that question.

The junior Senator from Washington has no way of knowing when the President will determine if an emergency exists. I can only conclude that the President is attempting to keep in touch with the acute suffering which has been inflicted upon millions of innocent American citizens. The majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, recently called these conditions to the attention of our Chief Executive. That was some days ago. So far as I know the President has not replied to his Senate majority leader. If an administration spokesman in the Senate fails to secure an answer from the Chief Executive, there is little reason to assume that the President will reply to a member of the opposition party in the Senate.

There is a better chance, I think, that the President of the United States will want to read and consider the statements submitted to me by citizens in Washington State. I do not know that these people are either Republicans or Democrats. They have not written about politics. They are cold, they are miserable, and they are asking for some relief. They say that conditions are bad and are likely to become much worse. All they ask is that the law of the land, which was written and approved by the Congress, ought to be employed for their benefit. I think their advice is both reasonable and pressing, but so far as I know there is nothing that I, as a Senator, can do about it. The President of the United States has said that he will determine the question in due time.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that a handful of the telegrams and letters which I have recently received from ordinary but very responsible individuals be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WENATCHEE, WASH., *January 22, 1950.*
Hon. HARRY CAIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Refrigerator car shortage Pacific Northwest seriously restricting movement of apples imposing additional burden on industry through aggravating an existing critical marketing problem. Understand coal shortage an important factor. Our organization representing 2,000 growers requests you use your influence to relieve this emergency.

WASHINGTON GROWERS CLEARING HOUSE ASSOCIATION.

WENATCHEE, WASH., *January 22, 1950.*
Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Recent order limiting coal-burning railroads contributing to car shortage in Northwest. We have fruit maturing—must continue to move. This is acute emergency and urge you investigate. Use every influence permit coal-burning lines move empty reefers for perishable transportation.

MARTIN A. FOSTER,
Secretary-Manager, Wenatchee Valley Traffic Association.

SPOKANE, WASH., *January 8, 1950.*
Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
Member of United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We ask that you do everything within your power to encourage the full-scale production of coal. Unless full production is resumed immediately the inland empire will face its most serious fuel crisis.

SPOKANE FUEL DEALERS CREDIT ASSOCIATION,
J. C. LANGDON, *Secretary.*

SPOKANE, WASH., *January 7, 1950.*
Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senate Office:

Fuel situation has become critical. We are in the grip of cold snap and it has been snowing steadily for 36 hours. Unless steps are taken immediately to get miners back to work and producing coal there will be great suffering in this area. Will appreciate anything you can do through Government channels.

W. OTTO WARN,
President, Spokane Chamber of Commerce.

SPOKANE, WASH., *January 16, 1950.*
Hon. HARRY CAIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Country schools, hospitals, and industrials closing for lack of fuel. Situation fast becoming tragedy. Mines west of Mississippi should be allowed to work 5 days per week to avoid disaster. Urge NLRB present situation and demand this action of Lewis.

JAS S. RAMAGE,
President, the Continental Coal Co.

KENT, WASH., *January 17, 1950.*
HARRY P. CAIN,
Senator:

State of emergency exists in community. No coal available. Dealers state unable to secure same. Hundreds of orders to be filled. Snow; temperature, freezing. Request your assistance immediately.

DAVE J. MOONEY,
Mayor.

KENT, WASH., *January 17, 1950.*
HARRY P. CAIN:

Coal supply in Kent, Tacoma, Seattle areas extremely critical. Retail and wholesale dealers advise supply on hand for only 3 days. Suggest every effort possible to get mines on full-time production at once.

KENT KIWANIS CLUB.

KENT, WASH., *January 17, 1950.*
HARRY P. CAIN,
Senator:

Coal dealers in Kent and vicinity will reach end of supply in 3 days. Efforts to obtain coal futile. Can any action be taken to extend miners workweek to insure additional and continued coal supplies?

KENT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

SPOKANE, WASH., *January 17, 1950.*
Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
Washington, D. C.:

Today's spot check of eastern Washington and northern Idaho shows that many communities are out of coal. Practically all of them will be out by the end of this week. Spokane is hard-pressed and will be out before supplies can be replenished. This area is 10 days' transportation time from our major source of supply. We depend almost entirely upon Utah and Wyoming mines for our coal and their production has been reduced to less than 50 percent of normal by the 3-day workweek. Railroads have first priority on all production, power plants, hospitals, industrial contracts, and schools come next, there is little left for retail yards to ration out to homes and small businesses. We have just had one of the worst blizzards in the history of this area and extreme cold weather is continuing. We ask that you do everything within your power to hasten the full-time production of coal. An emergency does exist here.

SPOKANE FUEL DEALERS CREDIT ASSOCIATION,
J. C. LANGDON, *Secretary.*

SEATTLE, WASH., *January 11, 1950.*
Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
Senate Office Building, Member United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to take such action as is necessary to resume full-scale coal production unless full production is restored immediatedy. The Pacific Northwest faces most critical coal shortage.

RETAIL FUEL DEALERS ASSOCIATION OF WESTERN WASHINGTON,
R. W. CLARK, *Secretary.*

SPOKANE, WASH., *January 20, 1950.*
Senator HARRY CAIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Spokane coal situation grows critical. Blizzards and deep snows continue. Spokane 10 days from mine supply of Utah and Wyoming. Several island towns out. It is a deplorable state of affairs and our Chief Executive ignores a national emergency and prefers to play political football in preference to use a remedy at hand.

HOME LUMBER CO.,
V. R. KINERT.

SPOKANE, WASH., *January 20, 1950.*
Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Coal situation in this area is getting progressively worse and has reached such an acute stage that some of the country schools have had to close. Stocks of coal are almost exhausted. We simply must have some relief which can only come from having the miners go back to work.

SPOKANE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
W. OTTO WARN, *President.*

POTLATCH YARDS, INC.,
Colfax, Wash., January 7, 1950.
Hon. HARRY CAIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAIN: The coal situation has gotten to the point whereby it is almost unbearable due to the dictates of John Lewis.

If there is any possible chance to enact legislation to the end that these dictates can be ended, I wish you would use your influence.

The schools and hospitals of Colfax and many other businesses and homes are in desperate circumstances due to the shortage of coal.

Mines supplying this community are unable to serve us due to the 2- and 3-day workweek.

Very respectfully yours,

F. R. GREENGO.

UNION COAL CO.,
Yakima, Wash., January 16, 1950.
Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senator of Washington,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAIN: On behalf of the people in this area who rely on us to furnish them with coal, you are now advised that our supply, as of today, is so depleted that we are now down to emergency deliveries only. Within the next few days the public in this area will be actually suffering for lack of heat. This situation applies to all dealers in the Yakima Valley. There are no coal supplies available to us.

Coal supplies for public schools in Yakima and Yakima County are so low that schools will be without adequate heat in a few days and closing is imminent. Heat for Yakima's public buildings served by central heating will be curtailed this week. The coal shortage is so acute and so widespread that outside areas are unable to assist. Having no coal we have no answer to the public except: "Lewis." The people are now becoming bitter and we are helpless to aid or answer them. We can now turn only to you and your fellow Congressmen and Senators to take prompt action to alleviate the drastic situation which is now upon us.

We are now faced with an "emergency." We are in the midst of a crisis which cannot be sidestepped. The interests of this firm are now secondary to the relief of the public. This area is 3 weeks away from the coal supply. Full production in the mines today would still leave us without coal for 3 weeks. The shortage of coal, due to the monopoly of Lewis, is so widespread and so grave that we feel entirely justified in demanding—not pleading for—immediate action. We urgently request that you at once make use of the full extent of your position to invoke the operation of the Taft-Hartley Act and to take any other necessary action to bring about full production of the coal mines now. There is no cause for waiting to see if the relief won't come automatically. Our coal is gone. The dealers in this area and wherever else we inquire are down to emergency deliveries now. The coal supply for this whole area will be completely exhausted in the next few days without the most severe curtailment and refusal of coal to thousands actually in dire need. Curtailment starts this week for public buildings. Lewis must be muzzled.

The interests of the thousands of people in this area, whom you represent, require your immediate action. Certainly we must be able, at least, to count on our own Congressmen and Senators to fight vigorously to alleviate actual suffering. The present outrage can and must be brought to an abrupt end. We confidently expect your immediate and best efforts to bring about full-scale production of coal at the earliest possible moment.

Yours very truly,

NONA L. GOODWIN.

BUCHANAN FUEL CO.,
Yakima, Wash., January 12, 1950.
Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senator,
Fourth Washington District,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAIN: We are writing you in behalf of the people of the Yakima Valley who rely on us to furnish them with coal.

We have been in the fuel business for over 32 years and never in our history have we experienced anything like this, even during the war; emergencies like this didn't exist. In the fall we bought all the supply we could handle just in case of strikes but now things have gone too far. Our supply is completely gone and there is no relief in sight.

If Lewis and his miners can't be controlled, can't something be done to meet this emergency? How about the millions on relief rolls; things just don't add up; here we are paying taxes to support people on relief or one kind of aid or another and we can't get coal just for the mining.

Certainly we can rely on our Senators and Congressmen from our own area to fight vigorously to alleviate actual suffering. We do expect your immediate action to bring about full-scale production of coal at the earliest possible moment.

Yours very truly,

COLIN S. CARSON,
Manager.

POTLATCH YARDS, INC.,
Seattle, Wash., January 9, 1950.
Hon. HARRY CAIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: The writer is associated with a retail firm handling fuel, the Potlatch Yards, Inc., with yards in many towns throughout the State of Washington. My particular work is calling at these yards, trying to assist the managers in their work.

In every place of business, without exception, they plead for coal. You, Senator, cannot realize the true picture without going to the firms that have been the source of supply, whose responsibility to their customers always has been to furnish coal.

These owners and managers need your assistance. You men, representing the families now without coal, are respectfully requested that action be taken to force miners back into the mines, so that schools may remain open, that individual homes may be warm.

Respectfully yours,

C. J. CASEY.

TEKOA, WASH., *January 11, 1950.*
Hon. HARRY CAIN,
Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We respectfully wish to call your very earnest attention to the conditions existing over the Pacific Northwest, which is very much effected and brought about by the demands of the coal labor dictator, and the carrying out of these demands, by the United Mine Workers, which has caused an impossible situation among the mines, that are our sources of supply, of coal for this community.

Should this condition continue, it no doubt will bring much suffering to many families, particularly where there is no natural gas, and many homes and industries depend entirely on coal for fuel for heat.

We urgently ask you to use your influence and power to prevent and relieve these conditions.

Yours truly,

S. H. LEDFORD.

MATSON FRUIT CO.,
Yakima, Wash., January 13, 1950.
Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have been forced just recently to take over the management of the Yakima Cascade Fuel Co., of which I have owned control for the past 3 years.

Our worst problem today is to get supplies of coal to take care of our customers and this situation is getting worse by the hour.

Is Lewis going to run the country or are we going to do something to curb him? You know what should be done and we ask that you move fast.

Very truly yours,

ROY A. MATSON.

YAKIMA, WASH., *January 13, 1950.*
Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senator From Washington,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Your immediate and vigorous action is urged to invoke Taft-Hartley Act at once to break hold of Lewis on coal industry. Crisis exists today in central Washington. Yakima's coal reserves are now gone. Widespread suffering is imminent. Coal supply for public schools is down to a few days only. Supply for central heating of public buildings in Yakima requires curtailment of heat this week. The public is enraged. Full mine production today would still take 3 weeks to relieve this area. The crisis is now beyond political considerations. Only immediate action can avoid severe suffering.

W. L. Burns, Artificial Ice & Fuel Co.; Tom Smiley, Economy Fuel Co.; Ray Tallman, Farmer's Feed & Fuel Co. (Sunnyside, Wash.); Robert R. Garbe, Garbe Ice & Fuel Co.; Willard Plath, Independent Fuel Co.; Terry Jones, Jones Fuel Co.; Joe Klingele, Klingele Fuel Co.; Walter Rovig, Rovig Fuel Co.; Rudy Mullenhoff, Rudy's Transfer & Fuel Co. (Wapato); Warren Scott, Scott Fuel Yard (Zillah, Wash.); Dale Partlow, Selah Fuel Co.; Kenneth Eakin, Triangle Fuel Co.; Jack Goodwin, Union Coal Co.; Otto Ramm, Washington Wood & Coal Co. (Wapato, Wash.); J. B. Huff, Western Fuel Co.; Richard Matson, Yakima Cascade Fuel Co.; C. Carson, Buchanan Fuel Co.

SEATTLE, WASH., *January 20, 1950.*
Hon. HARRY CAIN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Regardless statement President that no emergency exists account Lewis coal program, shortage coal preventing eastern railroads hauling empty refrigerator cars west-bound for delivery their western connections. Only loaded cars and passengers being hauled, so says President Gavin, Great Northern. Today only 350 empty refrigerator cars on line Great Northern. Shortage exists on Milwaukee, Northern Pacific roads. Apple shippers Wenatchee district not furnished fourth cars absolutely necessary daily. Preponderance large-size apples this season makes imperative apples move now not months later. Railroads pay only mileage on refrigerator cars, no cost to them when not rolling. Can you help relieve situation immediately.

GWIN WHITE & PRINCE, INC.

SEATTLE, WASH., *January 21, 1950.*
Senator HARRY P. CAIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Coal condition here very serious. Urgently request you bring pressure to have Taft-Hartley law applied against Lewis to get miners back to work.

GOODFELLOW LUMBER & FUEL CO.
W. FOREST GOODFELLOW.

OPPORTUNITY, WASH., *January 20, 1950.*
United States Senator CAIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Coal situation with me very critical with 20-unit apartment building. Am unable to secure any coal account of dealer entirely out on account of strike. Another, my regular dealer, cutting deliveries 60 percent. Weather down to 20 below.

GEORGE W. MCCALLUM.

RENTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Renton, Wash., January 18, 1950.
Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: Our chamber of commerce, at its regular weekly meeting held

this date, directed me to send to President Truman and the Senators and Representatives from Washington State in the Congress, a copy of a telegram sent to John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, with reference to the coal situation in our city.

The copy of the telegram sent Lewis yesterday is attached hereto.

Yours truly,

HENRY J. REYNOLDS,
Secretary-Manager.

P. S.—A copy of the reply to our telegram has just been received in this office, which is attached hereto. For your information that part of the telegram "He advised this office that he has made suggestions which would eliminate any coal shortage referred to in your telegram" means for the mine operators to sign a contract with the union, which is little comfort to the people faced with the coal situation in our city.

JANUARY 17, 1950.

JOHN L. LEWIS,
United Mine Workers Building,
Washington, D. C.:

At the suggestion of our good friend Sam Nichols, district No. 10 mine president, we strongly urge you to permit more workdays in our local mines whose 3-day effort has been seriously curtailed due to snow, blizzard, and zero conditions unusual to our area, and who have commitments to supply our local housing authority, consisting of nearly 3,000 units, who now have less than 4 days' supply of coal on hand. Aside from the serious impact the lack of coal will have on the economy of our city of 17,000, these people in the emergency war housing for veterans depend solely on coal for their heat and cooking, without which untold suffering will occur and threaten the health of the community. These units have only 1-ton bins, nearly all of which are empty. We appeal to you to seriously consider our situation from a humanitarian standpoint.

RENTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
By HENRY J. REYNOLDS,
Executive Secretary.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 18, 1950.*

HENRY J. REYNOLDS,
Executive Secretary,
Renton Chamber of Commerce:

In the temporary absence of President John L. Lewis your telegram of January 17 has been referred to me for reply. I have discussed the subject matter contained in your telegram with District President Sam Nichols. He advised this office that he has made suggestions which would eliminate any coal shortage referred in your telegram. Under these circumstances there is nothing this office could do at the present time.

W. A. BOYLE,
Assistant to the President, United Mine Workers of America.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, there is small reason to doubt that those who sent the telegrams and letters are telling the truth. They have no reason to exaggerate the suffering. They have no cause to mislead us or the President of the United States. If the President of the United States will only go to the State of Washington to verify the claims he will certainly strive to find a remedy and find it soon.

To my mind, Mr. President, the President of the United States is an outstanding paradox. Admitting my prejudice, I find it difficult to determine what his qualifications are and what he has really been in years gone by. The President of the United States is constantly telling the Congress what it ought to do. Yet, on occasions, he tells groups of citizens that he is not qualified to tell them what ought to be done. I want to offer just one example of what I mean. The President recently spoke at a private dinner of representatives of the Nation's Federal Reserve System which was attended by Governors of that System, by district chairmen, and by directors of the New York and Minneapolis banks. Reporters were not permitted to cover the dinner at the Carlton Hotel but the White House later made public the text of Mr. Truman's impromptu remarks in which he asserted:

I haven't any business to be discussing things financial with the financial brains that are before me tonight. I am just a farmer from Missouri who had bad luck and got kicked into a big job. * * *

I am just an ordinary citizen of this great Republic of ours, who has the greatest responsibility in the world and whose responsibility is your responsibility, and for that reason it is necessary that all of us make every effort possible to make successful the goal which we are attempting to attain.

And that is peace in the world—peace in Europe, peace in Asia, peace in South America, peace in Africa, peace in the Western Hemisphere, and the assumption of the leadership necessary to bring that about.

In these remarks, Mr. President, the President of the United States has said that he does not know anything about finance, because he is just a farmer from Missouri and that the great responsibility which is his ought to be shared with others.

How does one share a responsibility, if the President of the United States maintains that he and he alone bears that responsibility? If the President of the United States thinks he is not qualified to discuss financial affairs with the Federal Reserve Board because of his stated reason that he is only a farmer from Missouri, does it logically follow that he, as a farmer from Missouri, is qualified to determine the coal-shortage question? I am guessing that as a farmer in Missouri our Chief Executive was as little exposed to the problem of coal as he was to the problem of things financial.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington supports the criticisms and the statements which have been offered to him on the coal question by the citizens of Washington State. The statements have been offered for the RECORD where they may be read and understood by others. I hope they will assist, because comparable statements have been submitted from other States in the Union, the President of the United States in reaching an immediate determination. In my considered view, the President of the United States would be well advised to go from Washington, D. C., to Washington State, where he could find out for himself what the average citizen is thinking about and states to be a fact.

He ought to take one of his famed junkets around the country. He seemingly gains great satisfaction from threatening us with one of these trips whenever the Congress hesitates to approve a portion of his Fair Deal program. He blithely tells the country on those occasions that he will come and tell them a thing or two about the dereliction of those in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. The President of the United States is a strong believer, as all of us are, in taking national issues to the people. I think our national coal shortage is a national issue, and the President of the United States ought to remove himself for a time from his well-heated quarters in Washington, D. C., and in Key West, Fla., in order that he might travel among those who suffer, so that he can the sooner answer the question which has been put to him by Americans generally and by Members of both Houses of the Congress: "Mr. President, will you make up your mind—because you say you are the only one who can—concerning whether a coal shortage is present today?" There would be some real point, Mr. President, to a trip like this by the President of the United States, and I would encourage citizens throughout this land to demand their Chief Executive come to them and come now.

The President of the United States will not learn very much about real suffering for as long as he remains in Washington, D. C. To satisfy my curiosity I talked the other day with some of those who are responsible for providing heat for the buildings in which the President of the United States and many of us work and live. These authorities said that Washington, D. C., had nothing to worry about because there was plenty of coal today to keep all of us warm and that more than enough would be available at all times.

SMEAR ATTACK AGAINST J. EDGAR HOOVER—PETITION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we are well aware of the fact that the greatest single enemy of the Communist movement in the United States is the distinguished head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—one of our most able public servants in American life today—the Honorable John Edgar Hoover. Because he has been so effective a guardian of this Republic, as well as being the scourge of organized crime, he has won the undying hatred of every subversive organization of the extreme left, and, we might say, of the extreme right in our country.

The Communists in particular have mobilized every type of devious tactic, every strategem, every cunning approach, in order to smear Mr. Hoover, to seek to put him on the defensive, to neutralize his efforts and hamstring his work.

It is amazing to me, Mr. President, how the Communists have been able to mobilize individuals and groups who have no sympathy with communism but who have fallen for the Red anti-Hoover line hook, line, and sinker.

We are all aware of the fact that the FBI is doing top secret work in protecting American security against internal sabotage, espionage, and so forth.

Americans sometimes forget, Mr. President. But we should remember December 1941. We should remember with what effectiveness America was protected, and how this organization had been able in the previous months to discover and to get its hand on every subversive agent in this country, and we

should remember how free we were from sabotage, and the like.

We must recognize the fact that the FBI cannot fight with kid gloves against a diabolical enemy which does not fight with kid gloves, but which uses the most advanced types of communication, transportation, and propaganda.

I urge my colleagues to consider the fact that the FBI is our foremost advance agent in the cold war against communism and every Senator should ask himself the question, "What are the hidden motives behind the present attack on the part of various sources against the FBI?"

The people of America have faith in Mr. Hoover. It is a faith which has been justified by the keen, responsible discretion and judgment with which he has always exercised his functions. As a token of the faith of the people of America in the chief G-man, I have in my hand the text of a petition just received from Mr. Chester S. Bell, attorney at law in Neenah, Wis. I believe that this petition, which came spontaneously from the grass roots of America, indicates the feelings of our people on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that its text and a list of some of the signers be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition, with some of the names attached, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 20, 1950.

To Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The undersigned American citizens, each a registered voter, hereby request you to oppose any attempt to force the resignation of J. Edgar Hoover. We believe the Federal Bureau of Investigation is the strongest defense of our Government against subversive organizations, and we oppose the opening of FBI files to any Communist group.

Chester S. Bell, Neenah, Wis.; Marion Leisering, Gerald Steffen, William A. Kools, Appleton, Wis.; Lyle C. Parmenter, Neenah, Wis.; Donald C. Christison, Menasha, Wis.; Edward H. Bowman, Berwyn, Ill.; Donald E. Lawrence, Medlothian, Ill.; William P. Grimes, Boston, Mass.; F. F. Martin, Mary Lois Arnold, Charles Holmes, Neenah, Wis.; Herbert Stanyd, Kaukauna, Wis.; Albert J. Sanders, Earl E. Thompson, Neenah, Wis.; Harvey J. Wolfgram, Appleton, Wis.; Ward F. Sullivan, Clarence A. Krull, James Wrase, Neenah, Wis.; C. Florian Merk, Harold Saler, Menasha, Wis.; O. J. Stily, Appleton, Wis.; Martin Phalen, Menasha, Wis.; Ernest W. Neeck, A. A. Anderson, Neenah, Wis.; Jos. Vander Vilden, Little Chute, Wis.; Lee Everts, Appleton, Wis.; H. W. Peck, R. E. Smith, Neenah, Wis.; Vern S. Ames, Appleton, Wis.

RECESS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the very able Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] has completed the scheduled hourly needling of the President, I now move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. CAIN. Reserving the right to object, will my friend, the junior Senator from Illinois, agree with me that on occasions the President not only needs but is deserving of a needle? If we are in agreement on that point, I suggest that the Senate promptly agree to his motion to recess.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am certainly not in agreement with the Senator from Washington that the President deserves to be needled. I am sure that our friends across the aisle would not be happy unless they did it every hour on the hour.

I renew my motion that the Senate recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. CAIN. Reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEFAUVER in the chair). The Chair reminds the Senator from Washington that this is a motion to recess until noon tomorrow and is not a request for unanimous consent, so an objection is not in order. Does the Senator from Illinois withhold his motion?

Mr. CAIN. If the Senator from Illinois is anxious to recess the Senate, it is quite agreeable to the junior Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois that the Senate take a recess until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 24, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 23 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

The following-named persons to be members of the board of directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

William E. Crawley, of Alabama.
Knox T. Hutchinson, of Tennessee.
Elmer F. Kruse, of Ohio.
Albert J. Loveland, of Iowa.
Ralph S. Trigg, of New Mexico.
Frank K. Woolley, of Indiana.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major general

Maj. Gen. Robert Battey McClure, O10356, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Edward Elliott MacMorland, O4653, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Joseph Pescia Sullivan, O5328, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Kirke Brooks Lawton, O6805, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Stanley Raymond Mickelsen, O7042, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Kay Christmas, O7144, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Aaron Bradshaw, Jr., O5290, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Laurence Bolton Keiser, O5316, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Willard Wadsworth Irvine, O5838, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Ward Hale Maris, O6718, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Ralph Julian Canine, O7154, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. John Kirkland Rice, O7183, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Williston Birkhimer Palmer, O12246, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Edward Elliott MacMorland, O4653, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Joseph Pescia Sullivan, O5328, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Kirke Brooks Lawton, O6805, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Kay Christmas, O7144, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Selby Harney Frank, O3546, United States Army.

Col. Joel Grant Holmes, O5272, United States Army.

Col. Alfred Marston Shearer, O6772, United States Army.

Col. Ray Maxey Hare, O6943, United States Army.

Col. Everett Busch, O7260, United States Army.

Col. Norman E. Waldron, O7331, United States Army.

Col. John Hamilton Hinds, O12106, United States Army.

Col. Bertram Francis Hayford, O12272, United States Army.

Col. Edward Haviland Lastayo, O12660, United States Army.

Col. Rex Van Den Corput, Jr., O12700, United States Army.

Col. Leslie Earl Simon, O15567, United States Army.

Col. Luke William Finlay, O288773, Army of the United States (colonel, Transportation Corps Reserve).

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 15, 1950, under the provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Frank W. Abernathy.
Franklin E. Allard.
Olin J. Baird, Jr., O980299.
Clyde E. Bantz, O978818.
Gilbert M. Beatty.
Bruce K. Begasse.
Howard J. Blumhardt.
Lawrence C. Bogenschutz.
Clarence A. Bohleber.
Gordon R. Borcherding, O972375.
William F. Branigan.
Walter I. Brent, O980894.
Adrian W. Brown.
James L. Brown.
Louis Brown.
Robert L. Brown, O974178.
Robert F. Burt.
Rodney T. Carlson.
Richard L. Cary.
Dan C. Cavanaugh, O971021.
Charles N. Childers.
Bruce N. Christy.
James J. Clark, Jr.
Charles L. Clifton.
Junie L. Clough.

Leonard J. Corsentino.
Frank R. Costello.
Donald W. Coulter.
Charles E. Cunningham.
Howard C. Current.
Frank W. Cushing, Jr.
L. Conrad Davis.
Richard F. Daykin.
Thomas J. DePasquale.
Charles R. deZafra, O975140.
John F. Dickson, Jr.
Richard J. Dobmeier.
John G. Dowd.
Neil B. Downey.
Robert C. Ebersberger, O966933.
Jack Elliot, Jr.
George H. Ensley.
Albert J. Fiorella.
Edward M. Ford, Jr.
Traverse S. Foster, Jr.
Eugene J. Friedmann.
Maurice A. Gainey, Jr., O966923.
William G. Gallivan.
Richard E. Galvan, O968712.
Jerry R. Germaine, O972637.
John D. Giannini, O972640.
Joseph Glickel.
Raymond L. Gloeckler.
Newcomb Green, O973336.
Albert G. Greene, Jr.
Conrad A. Grondin.
Robert H. Gulley, O960111.
Richard N. Hammond.
James D. Harvey.
Ferdinand H. Hauser.
William D. Haven.
Robert T. Hayes, O948460.
Richard F. Hirsh.
Bruce K. Houston.
Robert R. Howard.
James H. Howden, O960057.
Carl H. Hudson.
John E. Hudson, O978517.
Robert G. Hunt.
Lorus D. Jewkes.
Edward L. Johnson.
Rodney W. Johnson.
William E. Johnson, Jr.
James A. Jolley.
Carlton A. Judice.
Robert S. Keller.
Preston J. Knight, Jr.
Charles A. Kray.
Benjamin S. Lancaster.
Fred M. Lang, Jr.
William J. Latzko.
James M. Leahy, O978626.
Robert L. Leighton, Jr.
John L. Lillibridge.
John R. Longenecker.
Edwin K. Lucas.
James E. Marck.
Royce L. McClure.
Claude L. McIntyre.
James E. McNiff.
Thomas F. Meagher.
Philip H. Mecom, Jr.
Edward H. Metzger, Jr.
Walter C. Moorman.
Kevin J. Murphy.
Henry C. Newell.
Donald L. Niehaus.
Leo W. Nielsen, O967223.
Emanuel Nobile, Jr.
Robert P. O'Beirne.
Charles D. Parker, Jr.
Frank M. Pender, O955683.
Alvin A. Poag, Jr., O974881.
Norman G. Pohler.
Albert G. Ponte.
John F. Porter, Jr.
Richard J. Potter.
Charles D. Pratt, Jr.
Loren E. Radford.
James A. Ralph.
George Regas.
Rodney R. Rehfeld.
Richard T. Replinger, O967290.
Robert W. Rettger.
William A. Ritchey.
Charles R. Roberts, O967679.
Walter R. Roemer.
Aubrey L. Romine.
Al S. Rosin.
Richard W. Ruehe, O973632.
Gordon C. Russell.
Homer E. Schott, Jr.
Lionel Z. Schubert.
Donald G. Schuerman.
Sherman M. Seltzer.
Richard P. Shyvers, O978734
John W. Simmons.
William P. Smyth.
Robert E. Soden, O957738.
Wallace H. Spaulding, Jr.
Daniel C. Stamer.
Charles D. Stampley, O971389.
Robert G. Steinhoff.
John A. Stevenson.
James W. Stewart, O954516.
Hans W. Strohm.
Berlyn K. Sutton.
Bobby R. Sykes.
Hugh P. Tomlinson.
Ralph S. Treadwell, O954126.
Harry E. Ulmer.
Edmund L. Upp, O917395.
Joseph W. Urbanek, O1848201.
Paul D. Van Gelder.
Spencer B. Vay, O977887.
Charles G. F. Wahle, O968719.
Charles Waldon.
James W. Ward.
Solomon Weinberg.
Rex G. Welty, Jr., O977634.
Landon P. Whitelaw.
Howard D. Wilson.
Wallace L. Wilson.
Marion T. Wood.
Francis J. Woods.
Leigh S. Woodward.
John F. Wortman.
Bruce C. Young, Jr., O968054.
Fletcher R. Young, Jr.
Harold D. Yow.

The following-named Distinguished Military Students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as Distinguished Military Graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Clarence E. Apple, O978925.
Erwin F. Bauer, O973641.
Phillip C. Bowser.
John A. Bryan.
Charles W. Cadrecha.
James J. Cassidy.
George W. Curran.
James H. Davis, O978303.
John P. Dobbins.
William H. Drisko, O969163.
John W. Ekey, O970762.
Charles G. Ferguson, O967459.
William E. Franklin, O956147.
Cecil R. French.
William W. Gilleland.
George B. Harvey, Jr.
James B. Hatch.
Harry C. Henkhaus, Jr.
Fred S. Jones, O976745.
Frank S. Klein.
Robert A. Lettas, O973647.
Henry J. Nachtsheim, Jr., O956847.
Frederick T. O'Neill.
Donald J. Opitz.
Russell Perry, O966930.
William M. Perry, O975749.
William D. Walker.
George W. Weider, O955674.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

William L. Brown.
James F. Exley.
Harry S. Hover, Jr.
James C. Rives, O412993.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 2d day of June 1950:

Dale E. Barck	Russell E. McJunkin, Jr.
George H. Beckman	Richard T. Manning
Albert F. Bender, Jr.	Gene A. Martin
John R. Bond	Joseph A. Meinhard
John W. Bradford, Jr.	Lloyd L. Montague
Leslie G. Bramley	Lewis E. Morrison
William T. Brooks, Jr.	John E. Musch
James W. Brown	William R. Nelson
Floyd T. Bryan, Jr.	John E. Nicklin
Lee C. Bullock	Richard A. O'Connor, Jr.
James Burdenski	Karl E. Ohls
James L. Burton	Philip F. Palmatier
Francis W. Bustard	Frederick A. Prehn, Jr.
John B. Byron	Earl R. Reimers
Howard W. Campbell	Joe A. Reyes, Jr.
Richard A. Chimner	James F. Rodgers
Daniel F. Cross	Richard J. Sample
Richard L. Crowell	Ray A. Schmidt
Chester W. Drawhorn	David B. Seeman
Delma D. Dunn	John B. Shank
Billy C. Edwards	Max L. Slankard
Harold B. Emlet	Thomas M. Smith
James E. Fendorf	David E. Soderquist
Hugh D. Finley	Roger H. Sorensen
James R. Foster	Joseph D. Storey
Gayle "A" Fry	Don M. Sullivan
Frank R. Funk	Clyde W. Summitt
Carl B. Hillesland	Carl W. Swanson, Jr.
Robert E. Hoare	Robert C. Thompson
Michael Hollack	Frank E. Toy
Donald R. Hornbeck	Edward K. Trzcinski
William P. Hugo	Eugene A. Vanderbeck
John E. Jenista	Alvi O. Voigt
Robert W. Johnson	Eugene R. Wagner
Bernard Kelsey	Robert H. Ward
Thomas J. Kerr, Jr.	Raymond A. Warren
Samuel G. Kingery	Ervin E. Wesenberg
Norbert R. Kluga	Donald L. West
Karl B. Kohlsaat	John E. White
Ivan M. Ladner	Donald L. Whitman
Joseph A. Lane	Donald K. Zerbe
Charles F. Lawrence	Stewart T. Zink
Johnny G. Lay	
John R. Leser	
Charles W. Lurcott	

Charles E. Skinner (naval R. O. T. C.) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950.

Richard D. Freeman (naval R. O. T. C.) to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, from the 2d day of June 1950.

John F. Mitchell (naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950, in lieu of ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, as previously nominated.

The following-named (naval ROTC) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, from the 2d day of June 1950, in lieu of second lieutenants in the Marine Corps as previously nominated to correct name:

Fredrick F. Brower, Jr.	Dallas B. Trammell
Darrel L. McCormick	Kenneth W. Younkman

Frederick W. Wertheimer (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy, in lieu of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed to correct name.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, for limited duty only, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Allen W. Bain	Otto A. Fennig
John J. Bartko	Donald R. French
Frederick M. Betts	"J" "C" Hale
George H. Boyer	Edward G. Hatchell
Congrave C. Callaway	Ernest B. Hess
Francis E. Chamberlain	Christian T. Jensen
	Lesley D. McVey
Thomas L. Cleaver, Jr.	James W. Meehan
Joseph W. Dochnahl	John F. Miller
William S. Edwards	Stewart C. Miller

Alonzo R. Moeller
Bascome K. Osborne
Oscar Osheim
Ralph N. Pickles
Albert D. Robbins
Robert R. Ruff
John I. Rustin
John M. Siran
William O. Talley
Sam "O" Violett
Virden J. Wixon

LIEUTENANTS

Theodore F. Aldous
Jessee R. Austin, Jr.
Standlee L. Rank
William E. Barron
Bruce L. Black
Marion L. Bohgren
Frank L. Brimmer
Laurence G. Brooks
Nels E. Brugman
Lester D. Carter
Clinton F. Churchill
Wade H. Cone
Leonard W. Cushing
Joseph D. DeLuca
Paul E. Dickson
Charles M. Dorris
Lewis L. Edwards
Mack D. Ellis
William S. Ellis
Mason O. Erwin
Elton E. Flowers
Emile R. Gemoets, Jr.
David E. Goudy
Rollin F. Heassler
Lloyd E. Helwick
Paul R. Hodgson
William E. Jenkins
Lloyd C. Knowles
Willard Koone
Dale S. Lyons
Herbert W. McGuire
Norman W. McLeod
Clinton J. Merritt
Freeman H. Myers
William J. Norton
Ernest J. Ogilvie
Lester A. Powers, Jr.
Carl O. Quarterman
Richard M. Quattlebaum
James R. Rodman
John B. Saylor
Urban E. Schaffner
William A. Simpson
Mike Stapleton
Paul Stjerne
James B. Taylor
Leo E. Therrian
John S. Tuttle
Elwood Vaughan
Robert N. Vehorn
Joseph W. Wallace, Jr.
Harry E. Weber
Theodore J. Wildman

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Ira H. Ball
Fredrick R. Barker
Charles J. Barr
Lawrance L. Beese
Royal D. Berg
Richard D. Blair
Willis J. Boo
Warren B. Brann
Frederick S. Butz
Gustave L. Caros
Reid E. Coble
Walter R. Crandall
Fred R. Crumbaugh, Jr.
William Q. Damon
Daniel B. Delly
Roger E. Dickeson
Carl B. Ditto
Alfred F. Ferguson
Charles J. Fox
Edmond F. Frazier
Hans P. Hansen
William C. Harrell
Willie W. Harris
Quentin R. Hatchl
Dale C. Hillman
Herbert L. Hope
George D. Jackson
Robert P. Javins
Edwin R. Jenks
Charlie R. Jones
Francis R. Jones
Nathan H. King
Harry R. Kohler
Carl B. Kole
John P. Kreckel
Donald F. Krysan
Raymond A. Kulig
Robert G. Langland
Hugh W. Latham
John D. MacKinnon
James D. March
Howard W. Masterman
John L. Minnick
James D. Moore
Francis C. Moses
Champ C. Mulligan
Alfred F. Norwood
Charles F. Pape
Guy L. Pitsenberger
Harry E. Ramsey
Robert F. Reed
Floyd Robertson
Norbert R. Schneible
Richard F. Schumaker
Kenneth W. Scott
Kenneth L. Shurtleff
Courtenay McK. Stone
Donald D. Stone
Joseph E. Sullivan
Robert E. Tyler
Merle W. Walton
Harold M. Yelton

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy, for limited duty only, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Boyd M. Shaffer
Thomas J. Sikes

LIEUTENANTS

Paul L. Anderson
Fredrick J. Cadotte
John M. Dunn
Eugene G. Greene
Robyn H. Henderson
Morton D. Jones
George Lott
Martti O. Mattila
Horace D. Sharon
Roquel A. Wilson
William D. Wright

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

James F. Armlin
William D. Little
John A. McCormick
Ray L. Rogers

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, for limited duty only, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT

Robert W. Marshall

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Johnnie C. Dennis
William R. Lemmon

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Orval E. Faubus, Huntsville, Ark., in place of Hugh Murphy, transferred.

CONNECTICUT

John F. Heneghan, Hartford, Conn., in place of E. J. Dillon, deceased.

ILLINOIS

William H. Watson, Prospect Heights, Ill., in place of H. L. Galbraith, resigned.

IOWA

William R. Wilson, Hampton, Iowa, in place of R. A. Fox, resigned.

LOUISIANA

Bernard B. Franques, Opelousas, La., in place of L. S. Haas, deceased.

MICHIGAN

James O. Curry, Battle Creek, Mich., in place of F. E. Browning, deceased.

Merwin O. Baker, Hanover, Mich., in place of Arthur Elmore, deceased.

MINNESOTA

Alfred H. Johnson, Belview, Minn., in place of J. A. Peterson, deceased.

Paul J. Kochaver, Hibbing, Minn., in place of M. T. Haley, deceased.

Alfred A. Nelson, Perham, Minn., in place of J. C. Grimm, deceased.

Ethel C. Ebert, Windom, Minn., in place of W. F. Sanger, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI

John M. Allred, Collins, Miss., in place of G. B. McIntosh, resigned.

George Martel Bridges, Ethel, Miss., in place of J. H. Middlebrook, resigned.

Rufina W. Gully, Gholson, Miss., in place of M. M. Whittle, retired.

Debbie W. Miller, Lauderdale, Miss., in place of S. C. Walker, deceased.

James Q. Pylant, Purvis, Miss., in place of A. M. Avery, transferred.

Clyde T. Furr, Wesson, Miss., in place of A. E. McGee, transferred.

MISSOURI

Shannon K. Rhinehart, Houstonia, Mo., in place of M. E. Staples, deceased.

NEBRASKA

Francis C. Green, Dorchester, Nebr., in place of F. L. Danekas, resigned.

NEVADA

Frank A. Phalan, Carlin, Nev., in place of D. E. Kappler, retired.

NEW JERSEY

William H. Claypoole, Mount Holly, N. J., in place of J. A. Wolfrom, resigned.

Jule A. Douglass, Union, N. J., in place of I. D. Harris, deceased.

Michael J. Adelizzi, West Berlin, N. J., in place of S. G. Boland, retired.

NEW YORK

Glenn O. Robinson, Adams, N. Y., in place of J. W. Cain, retired.

Fred R. Davidson, Altmar, N. Y., in place of Mayme Meegan, resigned.

Kenneth I. Swem, Antwerp, N. Y., in place of W. S. Brown, retired.

Bernard J. Buchal, Copenhagen, N. Y., in place of C. L. Ryel, resigned.

Arthur L. Rennie, Cornwallville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

John F. Mahoney, Elizabethtown, N. Y., in place of J. T. O'Donnell, resigned.

George I. Kowalczyk, Florida, N. Y., in place of M. F. Villamil, retired.

Alfred B. Tallman, Hamburg, N. Y., in place of J. F. Schummer, retired.

Howard D. Nicol, Hammond, N. Y., in place of B. J. Smith, resigned.

Arnold D. Case, Hinsdale, N. Y., in place of D. B. Allen, retired.

Rolan E. Rice, Holland, N. Y., in place of J. E. Savage, retired.

Florence L. Emery, Howes Cave, N. Y., in place of Jennie Young, deceased.

Pauline O'Neill, Jefferson Valley, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Alice L. Jones, Middle Granville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

John F. Wheeler, Philadelphia, N. Y., in place of R. E. Purcell, retired.

Mary P. Van de Wal, Schodack Landing, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Orville C. Kalin, Ten Mile River, N. Y., in place of W. G. Keough, resigned.

Sim S. Garrett, Upton, N. Y. Office established August 1, 1947.

William L. Farley, Watertown, N. Y., in place of F. J. McCarthy, deceased.

Mertie Blodgett, West Berne, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

William E. Shirk, Yorktown Heights, N. Y., in place of W. A. Quigley, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA

Walter Kessler, Martin, N. Dak., in place of V. C. Magnuson, resigned.

Mary C. Lamb, Michigan, N. Dak., in place of C. L. Wright, transferred.

Elizabeth N. Fischer, Streeter, N. Dak., in place of Paul Kietzke, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

Martha V. Cowan, Cache, Okla., in place of L. M. Norris, transferred.

Warren W. Pingleton, Haileyville, Okla., in place of J. W. Keith, retired.

Edward Charles Pyle, Marshall, Okla., in place of G. C. Diedrich, transferred.

Dessia Z. Jack, Meno, Okla., in place of H. B. Becker, transferred.

Merton W. Hawkins, Ninnekah, Okla., in place of I. M. Duke, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Owen E. Hartle, Alum Bank, Pa., in place of F. C. Davis, retired.

Cleon R. Wyland, Barnesboro, Pa., in place of D. J. Murphy, retired.

Andrew J. Remish, Bentleyville, Pa., in place of Frank Bertovich, transferred.

John O. Ream, Jr., Berlin, Pa., in place of H. C. Philson, resigned.

Aaron S. Myers, Bird in Hand, Pa., in place of H. V. Miller, transferred.

Carlon B. DeHaven, Blue Bell, Pa., in place of E. D. Jervis, resigned.

Samuel T. Jackish, Clairton, Pa., in place of Leo Walker, retired.

Joseph G. Kibble, Derry, Pa., in place of C. H. Cullen, deceased.

Mary C. Reed, Dunbar, Pa., in place of D. W. Rankin, deceased.

Catharine E. Ottolini, Fallsington, Pa., in place of C. S. Clemens, resigned.

Edith Y. Farley, George School, Pa., in place of M. G. Wilson, retired.

Pauline E. Hutton, Glassport, Pa., in place of W. P. Kohler, resigned.

Mary I. Ahearn, Glen Mills, Pa., in place of M. M. Callahan, retired.

Blanche D. Kilburn, Holtwood, Pa., in place of A. L. Winters, deceased.

John J. McGrath, Houtzdale, Pa., in place of P. A. Saupp, resigned.

Charles W. Wishart, Millsboro, Pa., in place of S. R. Wilson, resigned.

Charles A. Broughton, Morris, Pa. Office become Presidential July 1, 1944.

Vern M. Coe, Pleasantville, Pa., in place of M. C. Beebe, deceased.

Ray L. Hollenbaugh, Strattanville, Pa., in place of G. E. Strattan, retired.

Henry A. Eisenman, Venus, Pa., in place of W. M. Betz, resigned.

Wilbur M. Hodgson, Webster, Pa., in place of D. R. Ayers, resigned.

Florence Layman, Willow Street, Pa., in place of E. N. Nolt, resigned.

Clarence W. Baumgardner, Windber, Pa., in place of O. J. Shank. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1938.

VIRGINIA

Grace F. Hiehle, Mount Vernon, Va., in place of E. J. Monroe, resigned.

WASHINGTON

John P. McMonagle, Tacoma, Wash., in place of G. P. Fishburne, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Morris L. Meadows, Baileysville, W. Va., in place of W. C. Bailey, retired.

WISCONSIN

Arthur T. Gibbs, Bancroft, Wis., in place of F. G. Hutchinson, transferred.

Edward B. Granchalek, Denmark, Wis., in place of R. J. Dufeck, transferred.

Melvin I. Kennedy, Montfort, Wis., in place of H. J. O'Brien, transferred.

Carl A. Lundborg, Prentice, Wis., in place of P. H. Laughrin, retired.

Milton E. Raditz, Salem, Wis., in place of Jossie Loescher, retired.

Robert H. Homb, South Wayne, Wis., in place of D. M. Kading, resigned.

WYOMING

Daniel Gerrard, Evanston, Wyo., in place of F. P. Nelson, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, Thou knowest our frame, and rememberest that we are dust. As we wait in prayer, we ask Thee to bless the sacred silences of every heart, and thus direct us in the performance of the duties of this day.

As guardians and trustees of the future of our country, direct us through the perils of these times. Without hesitation and vacillation, may we work in unison for a common goal, diffused with a consuming energy and devotion that we may do what honor and conscience dictate. Grant that fear and selfish ambition may not disturb our unity nor our decisions, but that we may do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with our God. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 20, 1950, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the conference report on the bill (S. 1008) entitled "An act to define the application of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to certain pricing practices."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its disagreement to the amendments of the House to the above-entitled bill, asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. O'CONOR, and Mr. WILEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 50–14.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to lay before the House a message from the President of the United States.

Mr. RANKIN. Very well, Mr. Speaker, then I will reserve my point of order.

REVISIONS IN TAX LAWS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a message from the President of the United States, which the Clerk will read.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the reading of the President's message prevent the operation of the discharge rule today?

The SPEAKER. Not at all.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I think all of us ought to hear the message of the President, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, my point of order comes first.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi did not make the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. I know, but I reserved it.

The SPEAKER. Both gentlemen may make the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 10]

Barrett, Pa.	Crosser	Kilburn
Bland	Davis, Tenn.	LeFevre
Bonner	Dawson	Lemke
Bulwinkle	Elliott	Mack, Wash.
Burdick	Gilmer	Martin, Mass.
Chatham	Hart	Monroney
Cole, N. Y.	Hébert	Morrison
Corbett	Hobbs	Murphy
Nixon	Rich	Stockman
Pfeiffer, William L.	Sasscer	Walsh
Poulson	Shafer	Withrow
Rains	Simpson, Pa.	Zablocki
Reed, Ill.	Smathers	
	Smith, Ohio	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 392 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REVISIONS IN TAX LAWS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 451)

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the message.

The Clerk read the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The tax policy of the United States Government is of major significance to the national welfare. Taxes are the means by which our people pay for the activities of the Government which are necessary to our survival and progress as a Nation. Decisions about Federal tax policy should be made in full recognition of the economic and budgetary situation, and should contribute to our national objectives of economic growth and broader opportunity for all our citizens.

At the present time, I believe we should make some revisions in our tax laws to improve the fairness of the tax system, to bring in some additional revenue, and to strengthen our economy.

Our general objective should be a tax system which will yield sufficient revenue in times of high employment, production, and national income to meet the necessary expenditures of the Government and leave some surplus for debt reduction. In the Budget Message, I estimated that receipts in the fiscal year 1951 will fall short of meeting expenditures by 5.1 billion dollars. This deficit will be due largely to the short-sighted tax reduction enacted by the 80th Congress, and to the present necessity for large expenditures for national security and world peace. Moreover, owing to the time lag between corporation earnings and tax payments, the 1949 decline in corporation profits will be reflected in lower tax receipts in the fiscal year 1951.

The policies I am recommending to the Congress are designed to reduce the deficit and bring about a budgetary balance as rapidly as we can safely do so. These policies are threefold: first, to hold expenditures to the lowest level consistent with the national interest; second, to encourage and stimulate business expansion which will result in more revenue; and third, to make a number of changes in the tax laws which will bring in some net additional revenue and at the same time improve the equity of our tax system.

First, as to Government expenditures.

I have recently transmitted to the Congress a budget containing recommendations for appropriations and estimates of

expenditures for the fiscal year 1951. This budget was carefully prepared with a view toward holding expenditures to the lowest possible levels consistent with the requirements of national security, world peace, economic growth, and the well-being of our people.

The decisions of the Congress, as well as unpredictable changes in circumstances over the next 18 months, may alter in many particulars the character and amount of the expenditures contemplated in this budget. Nevertheless, I believe the estimates contained in the budget represent the most realistic appraisal that it is possible to make at this time of the necessary expenditures in 1951. I believe the Congress will generally concur in this view after it has had an opportunity to consider these estimates carefully.

The expenditures estimated in the 1951 budget have been reduced by about 900 million dollars below the level estimated for the present fiscal year. The policies recommended in the budget will permit further reductions in subsequent years as the costs of some of the extraordinary postwar programs continue to decline.

To achieve these reductions we must continue to practice rigid economy. At the same time, it would be self-defeating to cripple activities which are essential to our national strength. It will require wisdom and courage to find and hold fast to the course of wise economy without straying into the field of foolish budget slashes.

Second, as to the strength and growth of our national economy.

We cannot achieve and maintain a balanced budget without a strong and prosperous economy. A recession in economic activity would call for increased Government expenditures at the same time that revenues were reduced, thus creating greater budget deficits.

At the present time, the economy of the United States is growing, and we have every reason to expect it to continue to expand if we follow the right policies. It is largely the task of private business to achieve this growth. The Government, however, can and should contribute to it. Through such cooperation, national employment and income will grow. This will result, in time, in increasing Government revenues.

Just as the condition of our national economy has an overriding effect upon our efforts to balance the budget, so do our policies for managing the Federal budget have a decisive effect upon the national economy. Drastic reductions in Federal expenditures in the wrong places and at the wrong time could have serious disruptive effects throughout our economy.

Government revenue policies are as important in our economy as Government expenditure policies. Events of the last few years have proved that our economy can grow and prosper, and that employment, production and incomes can increase, at the same time that individuals and businesses are paying taxes which are high by prewar standards. However, taxes can and do have an important effect upon business conditions and economic activity. It should be our constant objective to improve our tax system so that the required revenues can be obtained without impairing the private initiative and enterprise essential to continued economic growth.

We should always keep in mind that the maintenance of a sound fiscal position on the part of the Government is a long-range matter. Nothing could be more foolhardy than to attempt to bring about a balanced budget in 1951 by measures that would make it impossible to maintain a balanced budget in the following years.

Third, as to changes in the tax laws.

If, over the next few years, we hold expenditures to the minimum necessary levels and at the same time follow policies which contribute to stable economic growth, we can look forward to steady progress toward a balanced budget. Nevertheless, we should not rely only upon budgetary economy and upon economic expansion to produce a balanced budget. We should accelerate the attainment of this objective by changes in the tax laws. Drastic increases in tax rates, just as in the case of drastic cuts in essential expenditures, might prove to be self-defeating. Our primary objective should be to improve and strengthen our revenue system for the long run.

Under these circumstances, I am now recommending a number of important revisions in our present tax system, to reduce present inequities, to stimulate business activity, and to yield about one billion dollars in net additional revenue.

In making changes in the tax laws, we should be sure they move toward, and not away from, the major principles of a good tax system. Our tax structure should recognize differences in ability to pay; it should provide incentives to new undertakings and the expansion of existing businesses; it should support the objective of increasing opportunities for all our citizens to obtain a better standard of living; and it should rigidly exclude unfairness or favoritism.

Over the years, we have made important progress in building a good tax system. However, much remains to be done. There is need further to improve the distribution of the tax load to make it conform better with tax paying ability. There is need to reduce taxes which burden consumption and handicap particular businesses. Moreover, we should eliminate tax loopholes which enable some few to escape their share of the cost of government at the expense of the rest of the American people.

Many of the important and desirable tax revisions which should be made must be postponed until the budget situation improves. Nevertheless, a number of those steps can and should be taken now.

First, I recommend that excise taxes be reduced to the extent, and only to the extent, that the resulting loss in revenue is replaced by revenue obtained from closing loopholes in the present tax laws.

The excise taxes are still at substantially their wartime levels. Some are depressing certain lines of business. Some burden consumption and fall with particular weight on low-income groups. Still others add to the cost of living by increasing business costs.

Since we are limited in the amount of reduction we can now afford, we should choose for reduction those taxes which have the most undesirable effects. I believe that reductions are most urgently needed in the excise taxes on transportation of property, transportation of persons, long-distance telephone and telegraph communications, and the entire group of retail excises, including such items as toilet preparations, luggage, and handbags.

If these revisions are made, we will have reduced the most serious inequities of our present excise taxes. We should go further just as quickly as budgetary conditions permit. At present, however, we should reduce excises only to the extent that the loss in revenue can be recouped by eliminating the tax loopholes which now permit some groups to escape their fair share of taxation.

The continued escape of privileged groups from taxation violates the fundamental democratic principle of fair treatment for all, and undermines public confidence in the tax system. While few of these loopholes by themselves involve major revenue losses, collectively they result in the loss of many hundreds of millions of dollars every year.

I wish to call the attention of the Congress to the more important of these loopholes. While some of them are of long standing, their injustice has been aggravated as the taxes assessed against the rest of the population have been increased. A tax concession to a favored few is always unfair, but it becomes a gross injustice against the rest of the population when tax rates are high. The case for the elimination of these inequities would be strong even if there were no need for replacement revenue. It is compelling when excise relief depends on it.

I know of no loophole in the tax laws so inequitable as the excessive depletion exemptions now enjoyed by oil and mining interests.

Under these exemptions, large percentages of the income from oil and mining properties escape taxation, year after year. Owners of mines and oil wells are permitted, after deducting all costs of doing business, to exclude from taxation on account of depletion as much as half of their net income. In the case of ordinary businesses, investment in physical assets is recovered tax-free through depreciation deductions. When the original investment has been recovered, a depreciation deduction is no longer allowed under the tax laws. In the case of oil and mining businesses, however, the depletion exemption goes on and on, year after year, even though the original investment in the property has already been recovered tax-free, not once but many times over.

Originally introduced as a moderate measure to stimulate essential production in the First World War, this special treatment has been extended during later years. At the present time these exemptions, together with another preferential provision which permits oil-well investment costs to be immediately deducted from income regardless of source, are allowing individuals to build up vast

fortunes, with little more than token contributions to tax revenues.

For example, during the 5 years 1943 to 1947, during which it was necessary to collect an income tax from people earning less than $20 a week, one oil operator was able, because of these loopholes, to develop properties yielding nearly $5,000,000 in a single year without payment of any income tax. In addition to escaping the payment of tax on his large income from oil operations, he was also able through the use of his oil tax exemptions to escape payment of tax on most of his income from other sources. For the 5 years his income taxes totaled less than $100,000, although his income from nonoil sources alone averaged almost $1,000,000 each year.

This is a shocking example of how present tax loopholes permit a few to gain enormous wealth without paying their fair share of taxes.

I am well aware that these tax privileges are sometimes defended on the grounds that they encourage the production of strategic minerals. It is true that we wish to encourage such production. But the tax bounties distributed under present law bear only a haphazard relationship to our real need for proper incentives to encourage the exploration, development and conservation of our mineral resources. A forward-looking resources program does not require that we give hundreds of millions of dollars annually in tax exemptions to a favored few at the expense of the many.

Some tax loopholes have also been developed through the abuse of the tax exemption accorded educational and charitable organizations. It has properly been the policy of the Federal Government since the beginning of the income tax to encourage the development of these organizations. That policy should not be changed. But the few glaring abuses of the tax-exemption privilege should be stopped.

Responsible educational leaders share in the concern about the fact that an exemption intended to protect educational activities has been misused in a few instances to gain competitive advantage over private enterprise through the conduct of business and industrial operations entirely unrelated to educational activities.

There are also instances where the exemption accorded charitable trust funds has been used as a cloak for speculative business ventures, and the funds intended for charitable purposes, buttressed by tax exemption, have been used to acquire or retain control over a wide variety of industrial enterprises.

These and other unintended advantages can and should be removed without jeopardizing the basic purposes of those organizations which should rightly be aided by tax exemption.

A problem exists also with respect to life-insurance companies. The tax laws have always accorded favorable treatment to the income received by individuals from life-insurance policies and have made special provision for the taxation of life-insurance companies. As a result of a quirk in the present law, however, life-insurance companies have unintentionally been relieved of income taxes since 1946. This anomalous situation has meant that neither the companies nor their policy holders have paid taxes on more than 1.5 billion dollars of investment income per year, derived from productive assets worth about 60 billion dollars.

I understand that the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives has already undertaken to correct this situation for the past years. I urge that steps also be taken to develop a permanent system for the taxation of life-insurance companies which will remove the inequities of undertaxation in this field without impairing the ability of individuals to acquire life-insurance protection.

In addition to the tax loopholes I have described, there are a number of others which also represent inequities, and should be closed. Most of these permit individuals, by one device or another, to take unfair advantage of the difference between the tax rates on ordinary income and the lower tax rates on capital gains. As one example, under present law producers of motion pictures, and their star players, have attempted to avoid taxes by creating temporary corporations which are dissolved after making one film. By this device, their income from making the film, which ought to be taxed at the individual-income-tax rates, would be taxed only at the capital-gains rate. Thus, they might escape as much as two-thirds of the tax they should pay.

All these loopholes have been under joint study by the Treasury Department and the staff of the Congressional Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. A practical program which would go far toward closing these loopholes can be enacted during the present session of the Congress. This would be a substantial step toward increasing the fairness of our tax system, and should add several hundred million dollars to its yield— sufficient revenue to permit substantial excise-tax reduction where it is most urgently needed.

I wish to make it very clear that I could not approve excise-tax reductions unless they were accompanied by provision for replacement of the revenue lost, because I am convinced that sound fiscal policy will not permit a weakening of our tax system at this time. Under present conditions, we cannot afford to reduce excise taxes first, in the hope that action will be taken later to make up for the loss in revenue.

Second, I recommend that the Congress enact legislation to provide one billion dollars in additional revenue, by revising and improving the estate and gift tax and the corporation tax laws. I believe that, under present economic conditions, this amount of additional revenue represents a proper balance between the objective of balancing the budget as soon as possible and the objective of coordinating tax adjustments with the requirements of continued prosperity.

A substantial part of the additional revenue should be obtained from revision of the estate- and gift-tax laws.

The Revenue Act of 1948 reduced the yield of the estate and gift taxes by one-third, or nearly 300 million dollars. Even before that act, estate and gift-tax yields were out of line with other revenues, and that act made the situation worse.

In originally enacting the estate tax in 1916, the Congress pointed out that "our revenue system should be more evenly and equitably balanced" and that a "larger portion of our necessary revenues" should be collected from the "inheritances of those deriving most protection from the Government." Our estate- and gift-tax laws at present fall far short of this objective. They now produce less than 2 percent of internal revenues, compared with 7 percent 10 years ago. To the extent that these taxes remain too low, the remainder of our tax structure must bear a disproportionate load.

The low yield from the estate and gift taxes is due to serious weaknesses in the present law.

These weaknesses include excessive exemptions, unduly low effective rates on most estates, and the fact that the law as written favors large estates over smaller ones, and leaves substantial amounts of wealth completely beyond the reach of the tax laws. Large fortunes may be transmitted from one generation to another free of estate or gift tax through the use of life estates. By this means, vast accumulations of wealth may completely escape tax over several generations.

Furthermore, the present law affords excessive opportunities for tax reduction by splitting between the gift and estate taxes the total amount of wealth transferred by an individual. This makes the tax liability depend, not upon the amount of wealth which an individual leaves to his family, but upon the manner in which he arranges the disposition of his wealth. If a man leaves his estate of $300,000 at death, one-half to his wife and one-half to his three children, an estate tax of $17,500 must be paid. If his equally well-to-do neighbor gives away $180,000 to his wife and three children over a 5-year period and leaves them the other $120,000 at death, no estate or gift tax whatever is paid. This difference in tax, whether it depends upon fortuitous circumstances or the caliber of legal counsel, is obviously unwarranted.

To strengthen the estate and gift-tax laws, several steps are necessary. The laws concerning the taxation of transfers by gift and by bequest, by outright disposition and through life estates, need to be coordinated to provide uniform treatment and a base for more effective taxation. In addition, the present exemptions should be reduced and the rates should be revised. These changes will not only bring in more revenue, but they will also improve the fairness of the estate- and gift-tax laws and bring these taxes nearer to their proper long-term place in our tax system.

The rest of the additional revenue should be obtained from adjustments in the corporation income tax. At the same time, certain improvements should be made in this tax.

I recommend a moderate increase in the tax rate applicable to that part of a corporation's income which is in excess of $50,000. At the same time, I recommend that the tax rate on corporate income between $25,000 and $50,000, which is now taxed at the excessively high "notch" rate of 53 percent, be reduced to the same rate that applies above $50,000.

These changes in the tax-rate structure would go far toward removing the handicaps which the present law places upon the expansion of small corporations. The removal of the excessive "notch" rate would reduce the taxes paid by medium-sized corporations whose continued growth is so essential to the dynamic expansion of our economy. The existing favorable tax rates for small corporations with incomes below $25,000 would be retained. The tax increase would be confined to less than one-tenth of all corporations.

Furthermore, I recommend that the loss carry-forward provision be extended from 2 to 5 years to provide more scope for offsetting losses of bad years against profits of subsequent years. This extension will give increased incentive to business investment affected by uncertain profit expectations. It will be particularly helpful to new businesses which, under the present provision permitting losses to be carried forward only 2 years, may be required to pay taxes over a period of several years during which they actually suffer a net loss.

At the same time that we make these changes in the tax laws to stimulate investment at home, we should make certain changes in the tax laws concerning income derived from foreign investments and personal services abroad. This would provide significant support to our efforts to extend financial and technical assistance to underdeveloped regions of the world.

Among the steps which should be taken at this time are to postpone the tax on corporate income earned abroad until it is brought home, to extend and generalize the present credit for taxes paid abroad, and to liberalize the foreign residence requirement for exemption of income earned abroad. These changes, together with the safeguards for our investors which we are in the process of negotiating with foreign governments, will provide real stimulation for the expansion of United States investment abroad.

The tax program I am recommending is designed to strengthen our tax system so that it will yield revenues sufficient to balance expenditures as they are further reduced over the next several years, and to provide some surplus for debt reduction. Because of the time lag in collecting taxes after their enactment, these recommendations will not result in any substantial increase in receipts in the fiscal year 1951, but they will result in larger revenues in subsequent years and, at the same time, substantially improve the structure of our tax system for the long run.

A sharp increase in taxes under present economic conditions would be unwise. However, in line with the policy of gearing changes in revenue laws to the needs of our economy, I would not hesitate, if strong inflationary or deflationary forces should appear, to support the use of all measures necessary to meet the situation, including more pronounced adjustment of tax rates upward or downward, as the case might be.

We have come through the war and a difficult transition period with the financial strength of our Government maintained and an economy producing far above prewar levels. We should continuously seek to sustain and improve these indispensable foundations for progress. The tax program I am recommending is an important and necessary means to that end.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 23, 1950.*

Mr. WILSON of Indiana (interrupting the reading of the message). Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, after the Clerk has concluded the reading of the President's message, will it be in order for the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor to call up the FEPC bill?

The SPEAKER. If he is recognized, yes.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PETERSON. Will it also be in order for the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands to call up a resolution which has been in the Committee on Rules more than 21 days, which resolution has to do with statehood for the Territory of Alaska.

The SPEAKER. If he is recognized, yes.

The Clerk continued reading the President's message.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COLMER (interrupting reading of the President's message). Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and fourteen Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 11]

Barrett, Pa.	Jennings	Rains
Bland	Jensen	Reed, N. Y.
Boggs, La.	Kilburn	Rich
Bulwinkle	LeFevre	Sasscer
Burdick	Lemke	Shafer
Chatham	Mack, Wash.	Simpson, Pa.
Crosser	Martin, Mass.	Smathers
Davis, Tenn.	Monroney	Smith, Ohio
Dawson	Murphy	Stockman
Elliott	Nixon	Walsh
Engle, Calif.	Pfeiffer,	Withrow
Gilmer	William L.	Zablocki
Hébert	Phillips, Calif.	
Hobbs	Poulson	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and ninety-two Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

(The Clerk continued reading the President's message.)

Mr. RANKIN (interrupting the reading of the message). Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] A quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 12]

Barrett, Pa.	Hobbs	Ribicoff
Boggs, La.	Kilburn	Rich
Bulwinkle	LeFevre	Sasscer
Burdick	Lemke	Shafer
Chatham	Mack, Wash.	Simpson, Pa.
Cox	Martin, Mass.	Smathers
Crosser	Murphy	Smith, Ohio
Davies, N. Y.	Nixon	Stockman
Davis, Tenn.	Pace	Walsh
Dawson	Pfeiffer,	Whitaker
Elliott	William L.	Withrow
Engle, Calif.	Phillips, Calif	Zablocki
Gilmer	Poulson	
Hébert	Rains	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 392 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

Without objection, further proceedings under the call will be dispensed with.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia) there were—ayes 144, noes 11.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirty-one Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on this vote.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to dispense with further proceedings on the call was agreed to.

(The Clerk concluded the reading of the President's message.)

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

ADMISSION OF ALASKA INTO THE UNION

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2 (c) of rule XI I call up House Resolution 217, providing for the consideration of H. R. 331, a bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union, which has remained in the Committee on Rules for more than 21 calendar days without being reported or acted upon.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I submit a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and in a division (demanded by Mr. COLMER) there were—ayes 17, noes 145.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the Speaker has counted the Members of the House several times, the roll has been called demonstrating that a quorum is present and that at this point the gentleman's motion is dilatory.

The SPEAKER. Under the circumstances, for the Chair that is a major operation.

The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and nine Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 13]

Barden	Hébert	Poulson
Barrett, Pa.	Hobbs	Rains
Bland	Kilburn	Rich
Boggs, La.	King	Sasscer
Bonner	LeFevre	Scudder
Bulwinkle	Lemke	Shafer
Burdick	McSweeney	Simpson, Pa.
Chatham	Mack, Wash.	Smathers
Crosser	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Ohio
Davies, N. Y.	Miles	Stockman
Davis, Tenn.	Murphy	Vinson
Dawson	Nixon	Walsh
Elliott	Pfeiffer,	Whitaker
Engle, Calif.	William L.	Withrow
Gilmer	Plumley	Zablocki

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and eighty-seven Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

On motion by Mr. McCORMACK, and by unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ADMISSION OF ALASKA INTO THE UNION

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 331) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Florida yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. PETERSON. I would rather not, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida declines to yield.

The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, in order to proceed in an orderly way, I will yield one-half of the time to the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

I now yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. While everything else seems to be going haywire, the clocks in this room are in bad shape; they do not keep the same time as between themselves nor do they show the time that is registered by the watches of the Members of the House. I make the point of order that these clocks ought to be corrected so that the Members of this House could at least tell the time of day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Has the Speaker ruled on the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not a clock fixer.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, further on the point of order, I am not asking the Speaker to fix the clocks. There are clock fixers here who are supposed to keep these clocks in order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will try to take charge of that, too.

The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, this is an honest effort to bring up legislation which has been reported out by one of the legislative committees of the House, reported out last year, on March 10, with only one dissenting vote in the committee. That was not actually a dissenting vote but more or less a reservation so that the vote would not be unanimous. A series of hearings was held on the bill extending back into previous Congresses.

The bill was reported out of the Committee on Public Lands. The committee instructed its chairman, after time had elapsed, to prepare a resolution under this rule to bring it up, when the Committee on Rules did not report it and after we had used every reasonable effort to get a rule under the orderly procedure of the House. This year the Committee on Public Lands again instructed its chairman to utilize this method. So that you may know that we have not tried to rush the thing, that we have tried to be fair and proceed in an orderly way, let me remind you that this bill was reported on March 10, 1949. The resolution to bring it up was filed on May 14, 1949. I would have brought it up in the latter part of the last session, but you will recall that at that time great uncertainty prevailed as to when the session would adjourn. Time ran along, 3 or 4 weeks at a stretch. In the closing days of the session I did not want to do anything to complicate the legislative program.

At the present time, therefore, having been instructed by the committee, the chairman of the committee is calling it up under the rules of the House, and this is an honest effort to pass a bill which has been reported favorably, a bill on a subject contained in the platforms of both the major political parties in which they pledged statehood to Alaska and Hawaii.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I support the resolution and I support the bill, but I want to say to the chairman of the committee that in having called up this bill at the present time to block the calling up of the FEPC bill, the gentleman has injured the chances of statehood for Alaska.

Mr. PETERSON. I do not feel that way because we were the first ones to introduce our resolution. I want it considered in an orderly way. Our resolution was actually introduced before the FEPC bill was.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. But the gentleman had a chance to call it up on January 9 and he did not. It is a strange coincidence that he calls it up this morning when the proponents of FEPC were seeking recognition.

Mr. PETERSON. On January 9 there were a great many Members of the House who had not arrived.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Of course, the Speaker could have used his discretion and could have recognized the gentleman from Michigan to call up FEPC.

Mr. PETERSON. On January 9 a great many Members of the House had not arrived because they know that there is not a great deal of controversial business brought up in the first few days of the session.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, Chairman LESINSKI could have called up his FEPC bill during the last session of the Congress.

Mr. PETERSON. I was waiting for a longer period than he was. It will be recalled that during the last session we were not sure exactly when the adjournment date was going to be. We would take on a drive and go steadily, then there would be a lull. I did not want to do anything to complicate the orderly procedure at that time. This is the second session of the Congress and unless we act during the early part of the session we will come to the time again when there will be complications.

I felt it my duty to do this. In addition to that, may I say that the President of the United States in his message to the Congress at the opening of the session called particular attention to the

statehood bills for Alaska and Hawaii and said that even those who might object to it should not object to its coming up and having a fair vote by the elected representatives of the people.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. REDDEN. I take it that it was not up to the gentleman to determine whether he would be recognized this morning nor was it up to the gentleman from New York as to who would be recognized but that it was up to the Speaker who is the one to determine that. He recognized the gentleman from Florida to bring up his bill.

Mr. PETERSON. In all fairness, may I say that I was trying my best to get recognized and I am making a presentation showing how long the bill has been pending.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of a standing committee, I feel it my duty to carry out the mandate of my committee. In this instance I heard the testimony given before the committee and I feel therefore that the bill is meritorious and that it should be passed. This is the only procedure we have left to us.

I hope the Members will vote favorably on the rule and ultimately vote favorably for statehood.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman's point of order is dilatory.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-four Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. If the sponsors of this bill for Alaska know that they will be injuring the cause of Alaska statehood by getting themselves tangled up in a political dispute of precedents between the Alaska bill and the FEPC bill, would the gentleman be willing to step aside for the FEPC bill?

Mr. PETERSON. At the present time that is not in my hands. I have now been recognized and the bill is before the House under the rules of the House. However, I will say in all fairness, I have felt that we were entitled to first recognition. The rule is silent as to whom the Speaker shall recognize. Our resolution antedates the FEPC resolution. The Alaska bill was reported out of committee a long time ahead of the FEPC bill, and the 21 days had run a long time before the rule would be made applicable to the FEPC, and my committee instructed me to bring it up. But, during the closing days of the last session there was a period of time when we did not know when we were going to adjourn from one week to another, and I just thought that we should not bring it up then. Now we face the point that if we do not bring it up it will be longer delayed, and it will be dead in this session.

Mr. FULTON. Was there any prior arrangement with the gentleman and any of the so-called coalition group to try to get prior recognition for another purpose?

Mr. PETERSON. There was not. In fact, some are filibustering against my bill right now, and I wish they would not. If we can get into the Committee of the Whole, I will take it up in good time.

I now yield 10 minutes to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I fervently hope that there will not intervene in the consideration of this resolution making in order H. R. 331 any factor or factors that are not directly related.

Alaska has been waiting for statehood for many, many years. The people of Alaska come before the House of Representatives today seeking the enactment of H. R. 331, the Alaska statehood bill, so that they may have all the privileges of American citizenship and so that Alaska may go forward, so that its advancement may contribute to the well-being of the Nation.

It was in 1867 that Alaska was purchased from Russia by the United States. That was 83 years ago. Until 1884 we had no form of government in Alaska at all. In 1884 Congress enacted the first legislation dealing with the civil government in Alaska, but gave us very limited powers. It was not until 1900 that further steps were taken. It was not until 1906 that the Congress permitted Alaskans to send a Delegate to Congress, and it was not until 1912 that the Congress passed, and President Taft approved, an organic act for Alaska.

The question of whether Alaska should have statehood was settled in 1912. Then the Territory was formally incorporated as a Territory of the United States. The Congress said by passage of that organic act that Alaska should become a State of this Union and that thereafter it must serve only a sufficient period of tutelage to come into the Union under the proper auspices.

We now contend that that time has arrived; in fact, it arrived some years ago. We submit that under the organic act, which gave to the Territory fewer privileges of home rule than any other Territory in the history of the United States has had, we cannot progress much further. We can make the kind of progress our resources entitle us to only by becoming a State of this Union.

It has been argued that Alaska is not contiguous to any other State of the Union. Neither was California when California was admitted. We are closer to Washington, D. C., today by air travel than Washington was to Philadelphia not too long ago. A Member of this House can leave this city this afternoon and be in Alaska tomorrow. We are close. Air transportation has joined us.

During the postwar period many newcomers have gone to Alaska to settle. These are made up principally, I think, of younger people, and especially veterans. They are in the forefront of those demanding statehood. They do not like to be taxed without representation in the Congress. They do not like to be bound by national laws without having any voice in the making of those laws. Today they have only a nonvoting Delegate in the House of Representatives, but all the Federal income taxes that apply to American citizens in the continental area apply to Alaskans, and so do all other national laws.

Americans do not like that kind of a situation to continue for too long, wherever they may be. They want a voice in the making of their laws. They want to be real Americans, complete Americans, not halfway Americans as the Alaskans are today.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. From my viewpoint, the greatest discrimination I have ever known to be practiced against any people under the American flag is that now practiced against the people of Alaska in denying to them the right to fish in their own waters.

The fish taken out of Alaskan waters every year bring more money than the cotton crop of Louisiana or the wheat crop of Ohio, yet the Department of the Interior has sold to the big canning corporations the right to put their traps across the mouths of those streams that come out of Alaska, in which the salmon are spawned, and deny to the people of that country the right to fish for a living.

They will not allow those traps in British Columbia. You can go along the coast of British Columbia and see thousands of little fishermen out fishing for a living. You can see the same thing along the Gulf Coast of Mississippi. But when you go to Alaska, you find those people have been driven from the fishing grounds, and the fishing grounds have been turned over to certain monopolies.

I think that is one of the greatest injustices I have ever known. I am speaking by the cards, because I was on the Committee on Territories for 18 years and I went to Alaska one time and investigated this very question.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman for his observation. That is one of the discriminations that we are suffering under.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REDDEN. Along the line of what the gentleman from Mississippi said, at these hearings the principal objectors to statehood for Alaska were among the very ones who were the beneficiaries of that unjustifiable lease.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is one of the discriminations that we suffer. In the Territory of Alaska we have no authority over the fishery. The Congress expressly reserved it to the administration with respect to our fisheries.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman knows I favor statehood for Alaska. I

want that to get in the RECORD. Does the bill, as drawn, impose any restrictions or unwarranted conditions upon the new State which we hope to see born?

Mr. BARTLETT. In my view, no. I should add that in the committee the only controversy which arose was as to the amount of land which ought to be granted to the new State. Some Members thought we ought to have more than the four sections for every township which the bill contains. In a way, I did, too. But I felt that in some of the Eastern States, and in the executive department of the Government there might be opposition to that. I know that we can support statehood adequately with four sections.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VURSELL. I am asking the gentleman for information. What is, let us say, the registered voting population of Alaska, and what is the general population?

Mr. BARTLETT. As I recall it, the voting population of Alaska in 1948 was in the neighborhood of 21,000 persons. In 1939 the population of Alaska was about 72,000 people, at that time divided half between the natives—Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts on the one hand—and whites on the other. Today we estimate the population as being somewhere between 110,000 and 125,000.

Mr. VURSELL. And your legal voters number about 21,000?

Mr. BARTLETT. That is the number that voted in 1948. The increase in population which, percentagewise, has been startling and would be even greater under statehood, I submit, has been on the part of the white people. The white population has moved in and has accounted for the gain in population in the last 10 years.

Mr. VURSELL. In other words, if Alaska was admitted as a State, you would have one Congressman and two Senators?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes. In the early days of the Republic every Senator represented an average of 13,000 people.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. What was the population of most of the States when they came into the Union? I wonder if the gentleman might have some figures on that.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do have some figures on that. I find that Alaska today has a population greater than six of the last Territories admitted. For example, its population is larger than the populations of Nevada, Vermont, Kentucky, Tennessee, Ohio, Louisiana, Indiana, Mississippi, Illinois, Missouri, Arkansas, Florida, California, Oregon, Idaho, and Wyoming when they came into the Union. So, from the standpoint of population I submit that we are eminently well qualified.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. Is it quite clear that the figures the gentleman has just given relate to the populations at the time, many years ago, when those present States were first admitted to the Union?

Mr. BARTLETT. To the best of my belief.

Mr. COUDERT. Will the gentleman tell us, if he can, what proportion of the present American population of Alaska consists of Government employees?

Mr. BARTLETT. I should be able to give that figure off-hand because a study was made last year. As I recall it, and I do not want to be too positive about this, the figure is somewhere in the neighborhood of 4,000.

Mr. COUDERT. That represents what percentage of the total American population, as opposed to the native population?

Mr. BARTLETT. That would be about one-eighteenth of the population.

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman stated that the voting population, the actual votes cast in 1948, were in the neighborhood of 21,000?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. COUDERT. When was the referendum upon which the gentleman relies in asking for a grant of statehood taken?

Mr. BARTLETT. In 1946.

Mr. COUDERT. Does the gentleman recall what the voting population that year was?

Mr. BARTLETT. I cannot say, but again, without any pretense of absolute accuracy, it was around 16,000 or 17,000.

Mr. COUDERT. So it is stated in the committee report. Will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. BARTLETT. Certainly.

Mr. COUDERT. I gather from the committee report that the vote on statehood was decided in the ratio of 3 to 2, in favor. Does that mean that something like 10,000 people voted for statehood, and that is all, and that you are on the floor today because 10,000 individuals in Alaska asked for statehood?

Mr. BARTLETT. That is correct. I submit that when Americans have reached the old standard of 60,000, which has been followed, with only one exception, when statehood was asked by other and previous Territories and when they say they can support a State, they ought to have it. I think a 3 to 2 vote is a pretty heavy plurality.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. After all, we operate down here under the democratic procedure of majority rule. I would like to say for the benefit of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] that insofar as Federal employees are concerned there are a great many natives as well as whites employed by the Federal Government.

One thing more: I think you are to be complimented for the fine work you have been doing in behalf of statehood for Alaska since you have been here. One way to break the monopolistic stranglehold which some of these fishing companies and other companies have on the Territory is to see that Alaska becomes a State and is given two United States Senators and one Representative so that they can have a voice in our Government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the Delegate from Alaska has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me to permit a comment on the remark made by the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman from Montana says we operate here by majority rule. I wonder if it is by majority rule that this resolution is before the House now, rather than another bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. I think the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Florida, has answered that question already.

Mr KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inqury?

Mr. BARTLETT. Certainly.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the gentleman to yield for the purpose of propounding a parliamentary inquiry.

After this bill is disposed of, will there be opportunity to consider any other bills today under the 21-day rule?

The SPEAKER. That problem is not within the sight of the Speaker as yet.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes from my time.

First, I want to ask the gentleman when Alaska became an American Territory.

Mr. BARTLETT. In 1867; 83 years ago.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Have you any figures to indicate the age of the oldest people in Alaska, and what age they are at the present time?

Mr. BARTLETT. Of course, the native people have been in Alaska all of their lives.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to establish some American citizenship here. It has been American Territory for more than 80 years. Is that correct?

Mr. BARTLETT. I will say to the gentleman that the postmistress at Juneau, Mrs. Crystal Lyow Jenne, who confesses to being around 60 years old, was born right there. Many other white persons have lived in Alaska all their lives.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And whether she is an Indian or an Aleut or a white person, or what not, is she an American citizen?

Mr. BARTLETT. She is an American citizen.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then she has the same rights as I have, has she not?

Mr. BARTLETT. She ought to have, but under Territorial government——

Mr. CRAWFORD. She ought to, and that is the point I want to make, because there has been the thought injected that simply because there are some people up there who do not happen to have Caucasian blood in their veins they are not Americans. I take the position that it is about time the Members of this body recognized that all of the people who are

citizens of the United States have a few rights. Those citizens are superior citizens.

Let me ask the gentleman another question: Does the gentleman know of any citizen in my district or any other district represented here who does not vote?

Mr. BARTLETT. I think they all have the privilege of voting.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But the gentleman knows that throughout all our districts there are millions of people who do not vote, and the same probably applies in Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. As to our 21,000 voting population compared to our total population, it is very favorable by comparison to the United States as a whole.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Of course it is; it compares favorably with the voting record in my district. We do not want to slip here and leave the idea that the people of Alaska are not citizens of the United States. They are entitled to some rights.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. D'EWART. I wish to follow a little further the line of interrogation initiated by the gentleman from Michigan. I understand that just before the last Secretary of the Interior resigned he set up two more Indian reservations in Alaska. I have two questions: Does that not tie up a large section of Alaska's economy? And, second, does not that put those citizens who live within those Indian reservations in the status of wards rather than people of equal citizenship as the others?

Mr. BARTLETT. The Interior Department says not. But further answering the gentleman, one reason why we are so anxious to achieve statehood without further delay is that the Federal Government is constantly withdrawing from the public domain land all over the Territory.

Mr. D'EWART. And the gentleman objects to that procedure.

Mr. BARTLETT. I think it is basically wrong.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I wish to take this opportunity to compliment the gentleman for his untiring efforts on behalf of statehood for his people. I wish to make the observation in connection with the number of people in Alaska who vote, that it should be said that some of those people have to travel hundreds of miles in order to cast their ballots. I think it is an excellent showing when some 20,000 people cast ballots in a general election in one of the most remote areas on the North American Continent.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. HUBER. We gave statehood to California and Texas. They now assert that the oil deposits belong to the State. Is it possible that were statehood given to Alaska she would claim jurisdiction of the fisheries?

Mr. BARTLETT. Fisheries, of course, are under the jurisdiction of the several States. That was settled long ago.

The SPEAKER. The time of the Delegate from Alaska has again expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the Delegate from Alaska two additional minutes.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the Delegate from Alaska for his several years of faithful service in the House and for these many years he has served so diligently, yet without the right to cast a vote. I sincerely trust that the House will approve the rule. Let me make the comment that during the recess a few of us had the opportunity of visiting Anchorage, Alaska. We talked with our military leaders; we talked with businessmen in Anchorage, and we found them united in their interest in this legislation which is characteristic of the people throughout Alaska. We found the people faithful, honest, and sincere in asking the Congress to follow through on this long-promised legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am grateful for the gentleman's observation.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I wish to compliment the Delegate from Alaska on the great work he has done for the people of Alaska and to say that I and the people of West Virginia are happy to support this bill.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I wish to commend the Delegate from Alaska, Mr. Speaker, for his work on behalf of Alaska statehood. I, too, recently went to Alaska and found the people of the Territory anxious for statehood. As a relative of Wickersham, who was Delegate from Alaska, I would be most happy should his wish, as well as mine, be fulfilled.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman. There is a certain affinity between Alaska and California because just 100 years ago the same arguments that are being made on the floor of this House against the admission of Alaska were made against the admission of California to the Union. We were far more remote in those days than Alaska is at the present time. I am very hopeful we will see the culmination of statehood for Alaska come out of this session of Congress.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. It is important in this instance to have the record show that there is absolutely no political tinge to this issue. While the gentleman is of the majority party, he has been very active and very cooperative with the Members on this side of the aisle. He and I have cooperated 100 percent.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes, and the gentleman has assisted Alaska greatly, may I say.

Mr. JENSEN. There was a time not long ago when I felt it was not advisable to give Alaska statehood; but under present conditions with Alaska situated as it is in this defense program that we have, and the situation in which we find ourselves today, I believe the Congress should show the people of Alaska that they want them to have the same privileges as the people do on the mainland of the United States because certainly they are patriotic people and they do deserve this recognition.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alaska has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since the Speaker has recognized the chairman of a standing committee, although I hoped I would be recognized, may I say that on tomorrow, Tuesday, the Rules Committee will have a meeting. Knowing that certain members of the Democratic Party are against FEPC, I wonder if the leadership of the Republican Party is sincere in the statements that it has made that it is for FEPC, and would it instruct its members on the Rules Committee to vote the rule out tomorrow?

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 14]

Barrett, Pa.	Elliott	Rich
Bland	Gilmer	Sasscer
Blatnik	Hébert	Shafer
Boggs, La.	Hobbs	Simpson, Pa.
Bolling	Johnson	Smathers
Bonner	Kilburn	Smith, Ohio
Boykin	Kruse	Staggers
Bulwinkle	LeFevre	Stigler
Burdick	Lemke	Stockman
Byrne, N. Y.	Mack, Wash.	Tackett
Celler	Martin, Mass.	Underwood
Chatham	Miles	Wadsworth
Crosser	Morton	Walsh
Curtis	Murphy	Willis
Davies, N. Y.	Noland	Withrow
Davis, Tenn.	Pace	Zablocki
Dawson	Rains	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 381 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ADMISSION OF ALASKA TO THE UNION

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, on great issues such as we now have before us, I feel that the opposition should be permitted to present its case. I have said to the Members on this side of the aisle who oppose this measure that I would try and give them some time. At this moment, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, I certainly would have been surprised and incredulous if somebody had told me this morning that when I arrived at the Capitol I should find myself discussing this bill rather than the bill which we had all come to act upon and which we had every reason to expect would be before us. I was reluctant to take time that might have postponed consideration of that bill which must ultimately reach the House, which everybody is waiting to act on.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. Later, not now.

Mr. Speaker, the only reason that impels me to speak at this time is a sense of duty inspired largely by the remarks of the distinguished gentleman who occupies the chair. Three years ago a similar bill was on the calendar of the House. I think it was during a 1-minute speech that I had occasion to read Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler's letter objecting to statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. When I got through the then minority leader, now the distinguished Speaker of this House, rose in his place, and these are the remarks that he made; remarks, I submit, that could not be more pertinent to the present situation. Hear me now for a moment. I am quoting. Mr. RAYBURN, after stating that this was a very interesting and important question, concluded:

> I want to say that I think this goes to the fundamentals, and the question we have to ask is whether we are going to begin making States out of possessions not contiguous to the United States of America.

Now, hear this. Mr. RAYBURN is still speaking:

> I think it is a deep, fundamental question that we will have to meet one day, and we had better put our best thinking on it.

Mr. Speaker, is this the way to put our best thinking on this? This is a bill of which we have had no advance notice, it does not appear in any notice, no one had any reason to expect consideration of the matter today. This bill is up here solely for the purpose of preventing consideration of another bill. Is that the way to give a bill our best thinking?

My confidence in the judgment of the Speaker when he was minority leader is such that I think this rule should be defeated. The problem should be put over until such time as we have given due notice to the membership so that it may have the opportunity to give the matter its best thinking, not merely use this bill as an excuse for not doing something else.

I have another reason that I think is a good one for postponing consideration of this matter, and therefore to beat the rule at this time. It is fundamental, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] stated.

Some time ago I offered a constitutional amendment, which is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary, to deal with the one great objection, the one insuperable objection to the admission of these small outlying areas with tiny populations. That is an amendment which would permit the Congress of the United States in admitting new States to prescribe that such States shall have one or no or two Senators. After all, the chief objection to this, is that admission of one of these areas means necessarily the admission of two or three or a large addition to the number of Senators in the Senate of the United States, a further violent addition to the already shocking distortion in representation in the Senate of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON].

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise for two purposes, first to say that I am emphatically and completely in favor of the admission of Alaska to the Union of the States. I believe that the admission of both Alaska and Hawaii at the present time is imperative so that the people of the Pacific area will know that the United States is not retreating from the position it won at great sacrifice during the recent war. If you will take into consideration all the factors that enter into the question of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, I am sure you will not have any hesitation about the vote you will cast.

I am also interested in the admission of Hawaii into the Union, as I said. I have no argument on the question of procedure. I am perfectly willing to accept the decision of the leadership of the House on that. I discussed this question with the majority leader as far back as 3 months ago and he informed me it was his purpose to bring both measures to the floor of the House, but that he would bring up the Alaska bill first. I said that if he would then bring up the Hawaii bill it would be agreeable to me. Inasmuch as many Republicans have inquired about parliamentary position, of this legislation, I am going to ask the majority leader to inform the House at the present time what he plans to do.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has quoted me absolutely correctly. I said to the gentleman further back than 3 months ago, and on various occasions, that I think both of these bills should come up one after the other. I frankly told him I thought Alaska should come up first. That is the gentleman's agreement that I made with the distinguished Delegate from Hawaii, and if anyone had asked me the question, I would have told them the same thing.

Insofar as I am able to keep my agreement, I intend to do so. I hope the House will enable me to carry out an agreement that I think is fair, an agreement that I think is just, and an agreement that I think is honest. Both great political parties in their platforms have come out emphatically in favor of the admission of Alaska and Hawaii as States of the Union. I intend to keep my word. Of course, the House is supreme, and I am but a servant of the House. I will keep my word unless the House insists otherwise. If this rule is adopted today, which I hope it will be, I also have a hope that the other rule might be adopted, but if not, it is my intention not to bring the consideration of the Alaska bill up until the Hawaii rule is adopted. That is my intention. Now, I am just an individual, but I have made an agreement, and my agreement means something to me. I think it is the fair thing to do, and I think the proponents of both bills ought to recognize from a practical angle as to their mutual advantage to have the House know of both coming up one after the other, and to have a situation exist where this can be done.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from Massachusetts has said that he insisted on the Alaska bill coming up first. I wonder if he could tell us why he was so insistent about that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly, I do not want Hawaii to go through and have Alaska defeated, or have Alaska encounter difficulty. We are all practical men. You cannot object to my doing that. I am keeping my word with the gentleman. I have said that both should come up with Alaska, in my opinion, coming up first. Alaska is a good Democratic Territory and Hawaii is Republican. Let us be frank about that. Does the gentleman object to that?

Mr. HALLECK. Certainly not. The gentleman realizes that on most serious cases we can yet enjoy a little good humor.

Mr. McCORMACK. You bet.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would just like to remark that being a great follower of the titular head of my party and the believer in unity that I am, I am pleased to say that there is a great unanimity of feeling in this House that both the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Indiana are very practical men.

Mr. McCORMACK. Coming from the most practical Republican in the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], that is, indeed, flattering to both the gentleman from Indiana and myself.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I am sure we admire the gentleman from Massachusetts for keeping his word with the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii in calling this bill up first. I did not

know that he had taken the responsibility for recognizing the gentleman from Florida for calling this bill up. Now I wonder if he is going to keep faith with the gentleman from Michigan, or I wonder if he had any such agreement with the gentleman from Michigan that this bill would be called up before his bill, the FEPC.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman, of course, cannot, in the mind of any Member of the House, make that statement and make any impression upon them. The fact is that the Speaker, in the exercise of his judgment, has recognized the gentleman from Florida. The fact is that I find myself, in connection with the distinguished Delegate from Hawaii, in a position where I have a word involved, and so far as I am personally concerned, I am going to keep the word that I give to any Member of the House insofar as I am able to do so. I have said to the distinguished Delegate from Hawaii repeatedly, and now I am going to say it publicly, and I am glad to state it now so that it will be understood, that I had a gentleman's agreement with him that both bills should be brought up one after the other, and insofar as I am able, I intend to keep my agreement, and I hope the House will permit me to do so.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order that I might have an opportunity to discuss for a moment the query of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] made on the floor a few minutes ago as to what the Republican members of the Committee on Rules might or might not do tomorrow if given an opportunity to express themselves when the Rules Committee convenes, if it does convene.

I have served a long, long time in political office. I have seen and heard many, many strange things, but I have never in all my life, and I say this with all the friendship in the world for the gentleman from Michigan, seen a man display the unmitigated gall that he has displayed here today when, after voting on Friday to take away from the Rules Committee all of its power and discretion, or practically so, he comes here and asks what the four members of the minority party on the Rules Committee are going to do to take him off the spot.

Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan for his enlightenment and, if possible, for his information, that in the Seventy-ninth Congress the four Republican members of the Rules Committee did vote to report FEPC legislation, and only two out of eight of his party voted to report it. Still the gentleman has the effrontery to stand here on the floor of the House and attempt to mislead us and the country into thinking the Republicans can control future action on this legislation which he failed to call up here today.

I want to remind him, and I want to remind every Member of the House, and I hope that the press will be listening in, that the gentleman from Michigan had the opportunity to call this civil-rights legislation up, which he tried so hard to get considered here today, day after day all through the last session of Congress, from August 22 on, to have the FEPC bill considered and voted on in the House.

No, you cannot shift the responsibility, you must accept it. The time must come when the minority groups of this country, whom the gentleman and some other members of his party have been kidding along, will learn the truth and know the truth.

I have just read the press reports from down at the White House. I understand that the Representatives of the gentleman's Democratic Party, the leadership of this House, when they came out of the White House today and were interviewed by the press, one of them, when asked what was decided about FEPC, made the statement, "Why, the President didn't even mention FEPC."

When your President, who pledged himself to this legislation, and your party leaders, the spokesmen of your party which is in power, failed to even discuss this legislation, do not try to pass the buck to somebody else. You cannot get away with it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has spoken of the action of certain members of the Rules Committee in the Seventy-ninth Congress. I was at that time a member of the Rules Committee. I voted to send the measure to the floor for consideration.

The so-called parliamentary inquiry by the gentleman from Michigan, I am quite sure he well knew, was no parliamentary inquiry at all, and, of course, under the circumstances no response could be made, but certainly anyone with eyes to see and ears to hear can understand that, just as the gentleman from Ohio has said, the gentleman from Michigan is engaged in some sort of a frantic endeavor to extricate himself and his associates from the dilemma in which they presently find themselves.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No; I have already heard enough from you today. I am sure the gentleman can make no worth-while contribution to this debate.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by saying that the gentleman from Michigan and his cohorts decided to adopt the 21-day rule policy as their method of parliamentary procedure on civil-rights legislation. You control the chair and you control a great majority of the votes in this House. You proved that last Friday. Why do you not go ahead and use this 21-day rule which you adopted? Why do you not proceed under it, and why do you not get the action that you promised these minority groups you would get for them? Can it be that your heart is not in it, sir?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] does not need any defense from me or anyone else. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is an expert at criticizing and unfortunately for him, perhaps it is due to his age, he misstates facts. I do not think, however, that he does so willfully or deliberately. I would not charge him with that.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] states that in the Seventy-ninth Congress the Republicans voted to report a rule on the Federal Fair Employment Practice Act. As a member of the Committee on Rules at that time, and as its chairman, I recollect that I tried my very best to obtain a rule on FEPC making in order its consideration. I recall how vehemently President Roosevelt urged and advocated that we grant a rule, but regrettably, I never could obtain a majority of the Committee on Rules to so vote. The four Republican members of the Committee on Rules, including the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], whenever they had an opportunity, be it on one pretense or another, would demand postponement, delay, or a continuance of consideration on FEPC and they invariably succeeded in forcing a delay notwithstanding the fact that on several occasions it was positively set for a vote. I recall further, that the last time the fair-employment-practice bill was scheduled for consideration in the Seventy-ninth Congress, one gentleman opposed to the rule was absent. Had the Republicans been ready to vote on that occasion we would have had six votes in favor of a rule on FEPC, and five against. But again, because one member was opposed to it, as I said previously, the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Slaughter, who on the pretext of bad flying weather could not be present, these same Republicans insisted that he should be given a chance to express his vote, thus delaying the vote until he arrived in Washington knowing full well that his negative vote would be the tie vote. Consequently, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] cannot maintain or claim that they voted for the rule in the Seventy-ninth Congress under these circumstances; yes, they promised many times that they would vote for a rule on FEPC, but thus far they have failed miserably to keep their promise. These Republican members of the Committee on Rules will be given another opportunity tomorrow to vote in favor of a rule thereon. Even if three of the four Republicans vote for a rule, I feel that I will be able to report the rule.

The facts are that last Thursday when I endeavored to obtain a vote on FEPC, the Republican members of the committee insisted that we owe it to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] to let the matter go over until Tuesday—tomorrow—for a vote owing to the absence of the latter gentleman. It was in deference to these two gentlemen that I postponed action until tomorrow. Tomorrow I will demand a vote regardless.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] makes the statement that the President has not said anything to indicate his interest in the FEPC measure. I did not understand whether he was alluding to the President's press conference today or to the last time that I saw the President. Nevertheless, I want to inform the gentleman from Ohio that, regardless of what statements were made by the press, not only has President Truman urged and advocated favorable action on the FEPC bill, but he assured me that he was doing everything humanly possible to defeat the Cox resolution which would have, had it passed, killed the Lesinski discharge rule and many others. In addition, both the Democratic and Republican Party platforms contain planks supporting this FEPC measure in unmistakable language.

I assure the gentleman from Ohio, the House, and the country that I shall call up the FEPC bill tomorrow morning for consideration before my committee, regardless of statements made by anyone at any time, and I shall force a vote thereon.

Tomorrow's vote will tell the real story.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like to make the observation that so far as President Truman is concerned, everybody knows his position on the FEPC, and the attempt of my friend from Ohio to discolor it because nothing was mentioned at the leaders' conference this morning about it is clearly understood by every intelligent person.

Mr. SABATH. You ought to understand, sir, that the gentleman from Ohio is an expert in misstating facts, unfortunately, when he believes there is something to be gained politically by his side.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield, for a question.

Mr. COLMER. I want to clarify one matter. Did I understand the gentleman to say that it was agreed in the Committee on Rules last week that the two gentlemen who were absent would vote to report the rule out?

Mr. SABATH. It has been stated by the gentlemen who were present at our last meeting that, although they were not binding the two members who were absent, if the matter would be put over until tomorrow—Tuesday—they will be ready to vote on the rule.

Mr. COLMER. I just want to say to the gentleman I was present and I heard no such statement made in the committee.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] never hears anything that he does not conveniently want to hear. Nevertheless, the above statement was made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] that if the matter goes over until Tuesday, they will be ready to vote on Tuesday. Regardless of what the gentlemen from Mississippi, Illinois, or Ohio might say, I call upon the 25 or 30 members of the press who were present at the meeting to substantiate my statement.

I repeat, in view of the statement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] that they voted for FEPC in the Seventy-ninth Congress, I do not see how they can refuse to vote for it tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that we need look much farther to see that this House of Representatives is in a very chaotic condition. We have the chairman of the Committee on Rules saying that they have an agreement about bringing out a rule tomorrow. That was not my understanding.

Mr. SABATH. Did you not say we will vote Tuesday if we will let the thing go over until Tuesday?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I distinctly did not, and the record in your own office will prove that, if you will look at the motion I made. The motion was that FEPC could not come up until next Tuesday, not that it was to come up.

Mr. SABATH. I am amazed.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Another thing, Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress in 1933, and at that time we heard the late President of the United States (Mr. Roosevelt) say a great deal about taking care of civil rights for certain minority groups. We know that was 16 years ago and you heard that at that time. We all know that Congress after Congress, after Mr. Roosevelt came in, would do his bidding with the slightest nod. They closed the banks in 5 minutes; but still the buncombe goes on, after 16 years of the New Deal, promising civil rights, and we still do not have it. Why do we not have it? You can say what you want about the Republican Party, but the fact is that the Democrats have controlled this Nation for 16 years. If they are standing sincerely for civil rights, why kid these minority people further?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What is the subject under discussion? We are supposed to be taking time to discuss the matter of Alaskan statehood. I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Debates of this kind take a wide range. Members may speak out of order unless a point of order is made against their speaking out of order and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REDDEN].

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say it is perfectly apparent that the overwhelmingly majority of the Republicans and the overwhelming majority of the Democrats who live north of Mason and Dixon's line want FEPC brought up, but the boys down South just will not allow it, and we will take that responsibility.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I think it is obvious to everybody in this House, and to the whole country, in light of the events that have taken place today, that everybody wants civil rights as an issue but not as a law. That goes for Harry Truman, the Democratic Party, and the Republican Party.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, if I understand the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], he said there was some agreement or some statement in the Rules Committee undertaking to pledge two members who were unavoidably absent at the time of the meeting of the committee, not only that they would vote on the resolution but would vote for it. Knowing those two gentlemen, that seems rather inconceivable to me. In view of the issue that has been raised, I wonder if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] still insists that such a statement was made.

Mr. SABATH. I will leave it to the 30 members of the press who were present at the open meeting when this statement was made, that if the matter will go over until Tuesday that they will vote on the question and vote for the rule.

Mr. HALLECK. But vote on the question is an entirely different matter from someone making the statement to the effect that not only would they vote on the matter but would vote for the matter. That is the point that I think should be clarified.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. COX. No such statement was made, as made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] in the Rules Committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us at this time a rule on H. R. 331, a bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union. This proposal was reported to the House by the Public Lands Committee, report 255, on March 10, 1949. As far as I know, by far the majority of the Committee on Public Lands is very much in favor of the adoption of this rule and the passage of the bill.

I wish to say to the Members of the House that, insofar as my position is concerned, I am positively in favor of adopting the rule and the bill making Alaska a State of the Union, as well as the adoption of the rule and the bill on the proposal to make Hawaii a State of the Union. The two issues have been before this country for several years; and, certainly, during the past 24 months. It is my understanding, both major political parties have wholeheartedly endorsed the bringing in of Alaska and Hawaii as States in the Union. Certainly polls which have been conducted by the various newspapers in the congressional districts throughout the United States have shown an overwhelmingly opinion in this country in favor of making these two areas States of the Union.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that now is as good a time as we shall ever have for the House to indicate its opinion on these two issues and I sincerely hope that

this particular rule now before the House will be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, formerly I was a member of the Committee on Territories before the Reorganization Act went into effect. As a member of that committee I made an extensive trip over Alaska. I went to Alaska another year with the committee, giving this question very, very careful consideration. We reached the conclusion that Alaska certainly was entitled to statehood, and I am still of that opinion. I believe that we have too long delayed admitting into the Union both Alaska and the Hawaiian Islands. They have the population; they have the industry; they have the intelligence; certainly, they have the right; and it is to the best interest not alone of te Territories but also to the interest of all of the United States that these two Territories be admitted to statehood.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish for the time being to get away from the FEPC bill and back on to the rule which we are considering. This is a vital question, and from the foreign policy point of view, Alaska is one of our stout bastions. I think that Congress would be helping to strengthen the defense of America and strengthen the people of Alaska as being part of this country if we were to adopt this rule at this time.

As a newspaperman I attended the Speaker's press conference this morning and heard the statement made that the Rules Committee was going to meet at an early date to consider and report on FEPC.

I heard the further statement made that this was not the time for a fight. This means that now is not the time for FEPC. I can hardly feel that this is a correct estimation of how the Congress feels about this issue, because some of us got up at 3:30 this morning to make a 5 o'clock plane to get here to vote on FEPC.

Mr. Speaker, when this rule on the bill admitting Alaska to statehood came up, it was a great shock to many of the people who felt that now was the time that everyone in this Congress should be given a free right to express his position definitely on FEPC.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, Americans generally realize the wisdom of statehood for Alaska. Both political parties in their platforms have urged that statehood be granted to both Alaska and Hawaii.

With the Soviet Union threatening the peace of the world as an aggressor nation, the fact that Alaska is but a few miles from Soviet territory and only minutes away as war planes travel is an important argument for the admission of Alaska into statehood now.

Very thorough plans should be made to rebuild Alaskan defenses and to man World War II air bases in Alaska by additional ground forces. In fact, admission of Alaska to statehood will serve notice upon the Communists of Russia that we realize the importance of Alaska in the defense of this Nation against dictatorship aggression, and that we propose to build our defenses in Alaska to a strength sufficient to repel any attack from the Soviet Union and that this forty-ninth State will no longer be a vulnerable spot for the defense of the United States.

To the argument that admission of Alaska to statehood would give two votes in the United States Senate for a population of somewhat more than one hundred thousand, those of us who favor immediate admission of this frontier territory assert that a glance back over the years will demonstrate that some of our greatest Senators have come from States of small populations. One example would be Senator Norris, of Nebraska. A present example would be Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming. Truly, one cannot say that the votes of Senators from States such as Ohio have been more noticeably in the Nation's interest than have those from Nebraska, Nevada, Colorado, and other States of small populations.

It is my earnest hope that during the present session of this Congress both branches of this Congress will vote affirmatively for admission of Alaska and Hawaii as States in the Union.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Pacific Ocean will in future be the ocean of commerce, just as the Atlantic Ocean in the past has been the ocean of commerce, I have felt that both Alaska and Hawaii should be admitted to statehood. As has been pointed out, both occupy a position of great strategic importance, which fact I recognize as significant in our national defense. Therefore, I favor statehood for both possessions because of their significance in national defense and global security and as stepping stones in global commerce and trade with all other nations.

In the Public Lands Committee, when we considered the two statehood bills, I had little to say, but I thought a great deal about a number of matters connected therewith. I recall that when Delegate FARRINGTON called attention to the fact that Hawaii had knocked on the door of the Union for a half century, I sympathized with him and explained that Arizona Territory knocked on the door of the Union for about the same length of time before her admission. When statehood for Alaska was considered and it seemed that powerful and selfish interests operating in and exploiting Alaska were opposing admission, I explained to Delegate BARTLETT that the same occurred when Arizona asked for admission as a State. And to both Delegate BARTLETT and Delegate FARRINGTON I expressed a hope that when their respective territories were admitted as States that there would be no onerous or crippling conditions imposed as the price of admission as had been imposed upon the forty-eighth State to be admitted.

I have often praised the wisdom and the justice of the founding fathers who in two memorable documents of 1787 encouraged the formation of new States out west and facilitated the settlements of new commonwealths and planned that they should attain statehood on terms of equality with the Original Thirteen States. Of course, I refer to the ordinance of 1787 covering the Northwest Territory and the present Constitution of the United States. The spirit of these two basic instruments is both wise and generous, but I am sorry to say the same generosity has not been evident always in the carrying out of that philosophy. Too often the admission of a Territory to statehood has been made a football of politics. Almost every new State admitted has had a part to play in partisan politics, and political considerations have sometimes clouded the merits of the bid for statehood.

When Missouri asked for admission into the Union as a State, she was admitted with a condition. Many leaders in Missouri raised a constitutional question then as to whether Congress had a right to impose a condition of admission and contended that if any condition were imposed on a new State the State thus admitted would not be on terms of equality with the other States according to the Constitution. Therefore, as a student of history and now a Member of Congress, I am always interested in whether anyone seeks to impose any condition upon a Federal Territory making application for statehood. I suppose there may be good conditions or bad conditions imposed. It depends upon whether wise statesmanship imposes the condition or selfish interests seek to impose some unwise condition in their own favor.

A significant fact in the admission of Arizona Territory, which has a very vital bearing on the future on the youngest State, is this: That by the enabling act of June 20, 1910, in which Congress authorized statehood for Arizona, there was a condition imposed upon the new State whereby a strip of land 6 miles wide along the Colorado River within Arizona was withdrawn by the Federal Government. The Constitution of Arizona recognized this power of withdrawal and confirmed it. The land was withdrawn, thus making it impossible for anyone in Arizona to obtain water or power from the Colorado River without the consent of Congress, although the

Colorado River flows for more than 300 miles within and across the State of Arizona. For these benefits, Arizona absolutely depends upon the consent and authorization of Congress. Saying nothing about the wisdom or lack of wisdom which prompted the imposing of this condition, it is a significant legal fact not very generally understood even by the people of Arizona. In other words, something written into basic law before Arizona became a State now makes Arizona absolutely dependent upon the Federal Government for obtaining any benefits from the Colorado River, which is her greatest natural resource.

It pleased me greatly to hear Delegate BARTLETT say earlier today that he did not feel that any bad conditions had thus far been imposed upon Alaska. He has put up a good fight for statehood, and I hope he succeeds without any unwise restriction.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, the debate this afternoon has wandered far afield; but as I stated in my opening talk the purpose of this resolution is to make in order consideration of the bill granting statehood to Alaska, a bill which has had the approval of both of the major political parties, a bill upon which extensive hearings have been held by the committee. The bill came out with practically the unanimous approval of the committee. Alaska is an area with more population and of greater economic worth than many of our States. I feel the same way so far as Hawaii is concerned. I acted in good faith in calling up this bill and trying to carry out the directions of my committee.

Let us not lose sight of the fact that there has not been any effort to crowd anybody else out. This is simply an effort to comply with the rules of the House in an effort to get the rule brought to the floor in an orderly procedure. This was the only recourse left to me. The Members asked me to bring the matter up.

I hope the Members will vote favorably on the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CORBETT. What would be the order of business in the event this rule is defeated?

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot answer that question because he does not know at this time who will rise seeking recognition.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. In the event that the Chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], sought recognition, if this rule were defeated, could the Speaker tell us what would be the order of business?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will attend to that matter when he reaches it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under the rule under which we are proceeding only one motion to adjourn is permissible. That motion was offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] after the resolution was called up. I therefore make the point of order that a motion to adjourn is not in order at this time.

The SPEAKER. If the Chair remembers correctly, the motion to adjourn was made before the resolution was called up.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do not want to disagree with the Speaker, but I think he is mistaken.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will refer to the record.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It was after the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] had been recognized and the resolution had been called up.

The SPEAKER. The Chair distinctly remembers now that the gentleman from Florida had been recognized, but the resolution had not been reported and, therefore, it was not before the House.

The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHEELER) there were—ayes 78, noes 169.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas, 373, nays 25, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

YEAS—373

Abbitt	Bolling	Chelf
Addonizio	Bolton, Md.	Chesney
Albert	Bolton, Ohio	Chiperfield
Allen, Calif.	Bonner	Christopher
Allen, Ill.	Bosone	Chudoff
Allen, La.	Boykin	Church
Andersen, H. Carl	Bramblett	Clemente
	Breen	Clevenger
Anderson, Calif.	Brehm	Cole, Kans.
Andresen, August H.	Brooks	Cole, N. Y.
	Brown, Ga.	Combs
Andrews	Brown, Ohio	Cooley
Angell	Bryson	Cooper
Arends	Buchanan	Corbett
Aspinall	Buckley, Ill.	Cotton
Auchincloss	Buckley, N. Y.	Crawford
Bailey	Burke	Crook
Barden	Burleson	Cunningham
Baring	Burnside	Dague
Barrett, Wyo.	Burton	Davenport
Bates	Byrne, N. Y.	Davies, N. Y.
Battle	Byrnes, Wis.	Davis, Ga.
Beall	Camp	Davis, Wis.
Beckworth	Canfield	Deane
Bennett, Fla.	Cannon	DeGraffenried
Bennett, Mich.	Carlyle	Delaney
Bentsen	Carnahan	Denton
Biemiller	Carroll	D'Ewart
Bishop	Case, N. J.	Dingell
Blackney	Case, S. Dak.	Dollinger
Blatnik	Cavalcante	Dolliver
Boggs, Del.	Celler	Dondero
Donohue	Kearney	Philbin
Doughton	Kearns	Phillips, Calif.
Douglas	Keating	Phillips, Tenn.
Doyle	Kee	Pickett
Durham	Keefe	Plumley
Eaton	Kelley, Pa.	Polk
Eberharter	Kelly, N. Y.	Potter
Ellsworth	Kennedy	Poulson
Elston	Keogh	Powell
Engel, Mich.	Kerr	Preston
Engle, Calif.	Kilday	Price
Evins	King	Priest
Fallon	Kirwan	Quinn
Feighan	Klein	Rabaut
Fellows	Kruse	Redden
Fenton	Kunkel	Reed, Ill.
Fernandez	Lane	Reed, N. Y.
Fisher	Lanham	Rees
Flood	Larcade	Regan
Fogarty	Latham	Rhodes
Forand	LeCompte	Ribicoff
Ford	Lesinski	Riehlman
Frazier	Lichtenwalter	Rivers
Fugate	Lind	Rodino
Fulton	Linehan	Rogers, Fla.
Furcolo	Lodge	Rogers, Mass.
Gamble	Lovre	Rooney
Garmatz	Lucas	Roosevelt
Gary	Lyle	Sabath
Gathings	McCarthy	Sadlak
Gavin	McConnell	Sadowski
Gillette	McCormack	St. George
Goodwin	McCulloch	Sanborn
Gordon	McDonough	Saylor
Gore	McGrath	Scott, Hardie
Gorski	McGregor	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Gossett	McGuire	
Graham	McKinnon	Scrivner
Granahan	McMillan, S. C.	Scudder
Granger	McMillen, Ill.	Secrest
Grant	McSweeney	Shelley
Green	Mack, Ill.	Sheppard
Gregory	Macy	Sikes
Gross	Madden	Simpson, Ill.
Gwinn	Magee	Sims
Hagen	Mahon	Smith, Wis.
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mansfield	Spence
	Marcantonio	Staggers
Hall, Leonard W.	Marsalis	Stanley
	Marshall	Steed
Halleck	Martin, Iowa	Stefan
Harden	Mason	Sullivan
Hardy	Merrow	Sutton
Hare	Meyer	Tackett
Harris	Michener	Talle
Harrison	Miles	Tauriello
Hart	Miller, Calif.	Taylor
Harvey	Miller, Md.	Teague
Havenner	Miller, Nebr.	Thomas
Hays, Ark.	Mills	Thompson
Hays, Ohio	Mitchell	Thornberry
Hedrick	Monroney	Tollefson
Heffernan	Morgan	Towe
Heller	Morris	Trimble
Herlong	Morrison	Underwood
Herter	Morton	Van Zandt
Heselton	Moulder	Velde
Hill	Multer	Vinson
Hinshaw	Murdock	Vorys
Hoeven	Murray, Tenn.	Wagner
Hoffman, Ill.	Murray, Wis.	Walter
Holifield	Nelson	Weichel
Holmes	Nixon	Welch
Hope	Noland	Werdel
Horan	Norblad	Wheeler
Howell	Norrell	Whitaker
Hull	Norton	White, Calif.
Irving	O'Brien, Ill.	Whittington
Jackson, Wash.	O'Brien, Mich.	Wickersham
Jacobs	O'Hara, Ill.	Wier
James	O'Hara, Minn.	Wigglesworth
Javits	O'Konski	Willis
Jenison	O'Neill	Wilson, Ind.
Jenkins	O'Sullivan	Wilson, Okla.
Jennings	O'Toole	Wilson, Tex.
Jensen	Passman	Withrow
Johnson	Patman	Wolcott
Jonas	Patten	Wolverton
Jones, Ala.	Patterson	Wood
Jones, Mo.	Perkins	Woodhouse
Jones, N. C.	Peterson	Woodruff
Judd	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Worley
Karst		Yates
Karsten	Pfeiffer, William L.	Young
Kean		

NAYS—25

Abernethy	Hale	Lynch
Colmer	Hand	Nicholson
Coudert	Hoffman, Mich.	Pace
Cox	Huber	Poage
Golden	Jackson, Calif.	Rankin

Richards	Smith, Va.	Williams
Shafer	Taber	Winstead
Short	Vursell	
Smith, Kans.	Whitten	

NOT VOTING—33

Barrett, Pa.	Gilmer	Rich
Bland	Hébert	Sasscer
Boggs, La.	Hobbs	Simpson, Pa.
Bulwinkle	Kilburn	Smathers
Burdick	LeFevre	Smith, Ohio
Chatham	Lemke	Stigler
Crosser	Mack, Wash.	Stockman
Curtis	Martin, Mass.	Wadsworth
Davis, Tenn.	Murphy	Walsh
Dawson	Rains	White, Idaho
Elliott	Ramsay	Zablocki

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Previous question general pairs until further notice:

Mr. Murphy with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Gilmer with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. LeFevre.
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Mack of Washington.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Smathers with Mr. Rich.
Mr. Stigler with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Walsh with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Lemke.
Mr. Sasscer with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. GREEN and Mr. CORBETT changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. WILLIAMS changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADMISSION OF HAWAII INTO THE UNION

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2 (c) of rule 11, I call up House Resolution 218, which has remained in the Committee on Rules for more than 21 calendar days without having been reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] so that an orderly division of the time may be had and at this time I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is in about the same situation as I explained with reference to the bill involving statehood for Alaska and is a resolution which makes in order the bringing up of a bill providing for statehood for Hawaii. Many Members were on the floor a few minutes ago when there was colloquy between the Delegate from Hawaii and the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], in which it was stated that, as a matter of fairness, both bills should come up for consideration at the same time. It was stated clearly that both of them were planks in the platforms of the two major political parties.

I sought recognition to bring up this particular bill by reason of that understanding and by reason of the fact that my own committee on the same day authorized and directed me to proceed under this method in order to see that both bills were brought up.

Mr. Speaker, I may say that in the Committee on Public Lands there has been no party politics. While we have divided votes in a few instances, we have never divided along strictly party lines. All bills that have come before that committee have been carefully considered by it.

In a spirit of fairness, it is felt that the presentation we are making here under the parliamentary situation is the solution. We have previously adopted a rule making in order the Alaska bill. We are following that with a resolution making in order the bringing up of a bill providing for statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say for the benefit of the Members of the House so that they will know the situation that after this rule is adopted, if it is, and I hope it is, I do not intend to program either of the bills this week. I have no knowledge now when I shall, but it will enable me to carry out an agreement I made. I appreciate the action of the Members in enabling me to keep my word with one of our distinguished delegates, but for the benefit of our Members I may say that neither of these bills will come up this week.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Do I understand correctly from the distinguished majority leader that after this rule is disposed of neither bill will be considered upon its merits today?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. COLMER. Then would the majority leader tell us what the program will be for the rest of the day?

Mr. McCORMACK. I know of no program for the rest of the day.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. What is the underlying reason for postponing the consideration of the Alaska bill, on which a rule has been adopted? Is there any special reason for it? This could wait until we dispose of the Alaska bill. We cannot pass both of them at one and the same time.

Mr. PETERSON. The distinguished majority leader has said that he told the Delegate from Hawaii that he thought as a matter of fairness one should immediately follow the other. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts to let him speak for himself.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might say to my friend from Illinois that I wanted, if possible, to have both rules adopted. With the adoption of the rules today I can program the bills later. If neither one of the rules was adopted today I could not do that. These bills will be programed. They are in both party platforms. I wanted to advise the Members of the House that insofar as this week is concerned I do not intend to program the bills, so that the Members will have the benefit of that information and they can govern themselves accordingly.

Mr. SABATH. What is on for tomorrow if, as the gentleman says, he will not call up one of these bills?

Mr. McCORMACK. Tomorrow there is no program. I made an agreement that there would be no legislative business tomorrow.

The next order of business, unless the gentleman's committee reports out some rules, will be a bill coming out of the Committee on Ways and Means relating to retroactive taxes on life-insurance companies for 1948 and 1949, and I understand a large majority of the members of both parties on the Committee on Ways and Means voted in favor of reporting this bill.

Mr. SABATH. I do not know whether or not the gentleman is aware of the fact, but the Committee on Ways and Means has not yet asked for a rule. I do not even know whether they have reported the bill. Consequently, the Committee on Rules, even if it were inclined to grant a rule on it, could not do so before the bill is reported.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not know whether the Committee on Ways and Means will request a rule, or whether it is necessary on a tax bill. I had an idea that it had a privileged status. I do not know whether this particular bill calls for a rule or whether it has a privileged status. If it is necessary to have a rule, they are going to seek a closed rule. As far as I am concerned, I like to have as much legislation as is possible considered under the general rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself four additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of the distinguished majority leader to this, with reference to scheduling these bills for consideration. Of course, I like to cooperate with the gentleman, but the House definitely has assurance that the bill will come up later? That is correct, is it not? When we adopt this rule, it

becomes a matter of privilege and the chairman can bring it up?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a matter of recognition. There is a difference between privilege and recognition.

Mr. PETERSON. That is right. What I wanted to know was whether the House in voting for the rule would be entitled to feel that it would have a right to have the bill come up.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Florida knows that the gentleman from Massachusetts will program these bills. There is no misunderstanding about that in the gentleman's mind, is there?

Mr. PETERSON. No; that is right.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I do this in order that I may understand definitely what is in contemplation for the balance of the day. A number of Members on our side have inquired from me about it. Some of them have engagements for the evening. As I understood the majority leader, he said that after the adoption of this rule, which probably will be some time along toward 5:30 or 6 o'clock, he has no further program. Does that mean that he contemplates moving to adjourn the House at that time?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's interpretation of what I intend to do is absolutely correct.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished majority leader, replied to an inquiry of the gentleman from Mississippi regarding the program for the balance of the day. I assume that that is subject to the exception that if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] should seek recognition following this matter and if the Speaker should recognize him, we would then take up the matter which he has in mind.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from New York imposes a number of if's. Of course, all these if's are possible, and that can only be determined when the time arrives when the if's must be met.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. If the gentleman wishes to speak on this particular matter. I do not want to wander too far afield and take up the time of the House. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. If I understood the distinguished majority leader correctly, he will move that the House adjourn when this rule is disposed of.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. PETERSON. If it is about this particular bill. I do not want to wander afield. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I will be very brief. I simply want to say this: The duty of every friend of FEPC is to vote down the majority leader's motion to adjourn.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from New York sometimes makes me wonder whether the tactics employed by him are consistent with the best interests of what some of us seek. The gentleman from New York is not putting me on the spot to call up anything after 5 o'clock. The gentleman himself knows what the situation is.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is because I know the situation.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. We ought to stay here until the FEPC is voted on tonight.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, it seems as if I am destined to have the FEPC debate come up anytime I try to bring up anything else. But this is an effort, again I say in good faith, to carry out an understanding based on fairness that if one Territory has its opportunity to be heard before the elected Representatives of the people that the other would have the opportunity to be heard immediately following. This is in accord with the resolution passed by both parties and contained in their platform and is in accord with a resolution passed by the Committee on Public Lands directing the action of the chairman of that committee. For that reason I hope we will not wander into other fields and will vote for this resolution when the time comes to vote.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON].

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to prolong this matter. I am as anxious as anyone in the House of Representatives that this question be brought to a vote. The only question, too, is whether or not the House shall debate a rule under which statehood for Hawaii can be brought before the House for consideration after it has considered statehood for Alaska. I think that is only fair. I think it is a sound method of approaching this question. I do not have to tell you that for a long period of time the people whom I have the honor to represent have looked forward to the time when they could enjoy the full privileges of American citizenship. The House has undertaken more than one investigation of our ability to discharge the responsibilities of statehood. Over a period of 10 years some six different committees have made exhaustive inquiries, and each one has come to the conclusion we have met all the requirements of statehood. We have the population, we have the wealth, and we have the ability to manage our own affairs.

I think it is in the national interest that in view of the situation that has developed, particularly in the Far East, we should admit Alaska and Hawaii to the Union as States. The least we can do this afternoon is to agree that this issue shall be brought to a vote. I want to say most earnestly that I trust you will vote in the affirmative on this rule.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I say to the Delegate from Hawaii that the people of Alaska are in favor of statehood for Hawaii. May I say further that if every Member of the House could have been in the committee room of the Committee on Public Lands when Admiral Nimitz testified in favor of statehood for Hawaii, I believe his doubts would have been resolved.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I compliment the Delegate from Hawaii for the fine work that he has done over the years in his attempt to achieve statehood for the Territory. Hawaii has had an outstanding representative in the Congress of the United States. The people of Hawaii should be congratulated for the fine work that he has done in their behalf in this movement.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe that all Members, despite the fact that so many of us feel chagrined and disappointed for the failure of the FEPC matter to come up are happy that this question is now before us and about to be disposed of, and we all wish Hawaii well and trust that she will get her statehood.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the question has now come up whether we are going to extend statehood so that we can have a strategic area which we will call the United States, even apart from the continental United States?

I think the administration and the Congress is actually prepared for it, because if you look up at the ceiling of this Chamber, you will note that the spaces for the seals are already there, and there are two extra spaces. Should I say "were," as it seems that the spaces have been filled in since I looked up at the ceiling the last time.

Mr. FARRINGTON. If you will look, you will find the coat of arms of Hawaii, with the motto: "Ua mau ke ea o ka aina i ka pono—The life of the land is perpetuated in righteousness."

Mr. FULTON. And that is where it ought to be. I am glad to see that a committee of Congress is ahead of us, because they now have the seals up there.

May I say that I am willing to stay in session this afternoon and this evening to put FEPC through, and I will ask for a roll-call vote on adjournment to see who are the friends of FEPC. So that it may be clear in the RECORD, a vote for adjournment is a vote against FEPC.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this proposition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, I realize the impatience of my colleagues. In view of the remarks of the majority leader, they realize that at the end of this, the day's burdens will be over and we can retire to other fields and other problems. But it does seem to me that it would be an utter travesty upon parliamentary procedure if there were no voice raised to present the other side of this searching, fundamental issue.

I know I am not going to succeed in blocking the rule, but I do want to protest with the utmost vigor of which I am capable the tragic travesty that is being perpetrated today, a travesty upon parliamentary procedure.

Now, just stop for a moment and contemplate what is being done. Every Member of this House came to this chamber today prepared to vote on a matter of great importance, long debated and bitterly fought, and we are confronted suddenly, without the slightest notice, without any opportunity to give it close and important consideration, with two bills involving the fundamental question of constitutional construction, involving the question of the security of the United States. Both of those bills are thrown in our teeth, solely because, for parliamentary reasons, it is the only way to prevent consideration of FEPC.

If we have any consideration for our own dignity, for our own role in this Government of the United States, then at least let us postpone consideration of these matters. Let us postpone action on this rule until it can be given the importance to which it is properly entitled. Do you not realize that if these two rules and the bills for which they are here, are adopted, that we will add four Senators to the United States Senate? Each one of those four exercises power and influence greater than the power and influence of any one of the biggest delegations in this House. One Senator representing 10,000 citizens of Alaska, one Senator representing 80,000 citizens of Hawaii, will be able, by their freedom of speech to neutralize and to overcome the over 45 Members from the State of New York in this House, and Members from all of the other great States. We ought to postpone this thing. We ought to postpone action on the rule and beat it now, and give ourselves and our people an opportunity to consider what this means before we blindly, blithely, gaily charge into the thing.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] I think said a little too much, perhaps more than he intended, when he looked at that ceiling and said, "There are two places for the seals of these two proposed States."

He is quite wrong. If you will look at this ceiling, you will see dozens and dozens of places where seals can be put and, believe me, if you enact these two rules and the bills that go with them, those places will be filled, and of right, with new States from the Pacific, Guam, the Virgin Islands, our other island possession, who will come here with attractive, genial, persuasive delegates, like the two gentlemen who represent Alaska and Hawaii with such dignity in this House. Why do they want representation? Their people are represented here by two such persuasive, genial, distinguished gentlemen that they can whip the Membership of this House around their fingers. They are taking us with them. They are taking for themselves statehood and all that it means and all the power and all the influence and all the dignity it means for 20,000 voters in Alaska and a hundred-odd-thousand voters in Hawaii. Please consider before you vote.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, when I was addressing the Chamber a few minutes ago doubt was expressed that I had given sufficient facts regarding the economy and population of the islands. I think these subjects are of interest to the membership. I did state that thorough investigation had been made and hearings held previous to the time that I became chairman of the committee, held under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH]. Under his chairmanship subcommittees went into the area from time to time. During the last session of Congress the statehood bill passed the House. The committee resumed its hearings this year and went into the question extensively and brought the figures up to date.

I think it will be of interest to the House to learn some of the population figures in the case of States admitted into the Union in the past. It ran around 60,000 in a number of instances, and in some instances States came into the Union with less population than that. Nevada came in with a population of only 42,000; Louisiana with a population of 76,000. My own great State of Florida came in with only 72,000 and had a rather hard time getting into the Union. There was a tie vote in that case at one time, and the chairman of the Committee broke the tie. So we came in by one vote, but we have paid our way. At that time the question arose as to whether we could pay our territorial debts. But let it be said that the great State of Pennsylvania let us have, through one of its citizens, enough money that we paid our territorial debts. Another question that arose was that of the balance between slave and free States. The question of population likewise came up.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I suppose the gentleman will agree that my great State of Pennsylvania has continued to contribute to Florida through horse races and dog tracks, will he not?

Mr. PETERSON. That is not on my side of the State. I do know, however, that in my part of the State Pennsylvanians own substantial orange groves; and the old Empire Land Co., and the Diston Co. made large purchases in our State and were substantial taxpayers. But enough of that.

What I wish to bring out clearly is that 12 States were admitted to the Union with populations of less than that of Hawaii. In 1945 the population of Hawaii was 502,122. Hawaii had 33,000 citizens in the armed forces of the United States.

As to the financial condition of Hawaii the report compiled after a rather extensive study of the finances of the Territory show that they have been well managed. At the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1945, the total budgetary resources of the Territory amounted to $68,339,384, with total obligations reserved in the amount of $57,000,000, leaving an unappropriated surplus of $10,500,000. The bonded debt of the Territory was $16,000,000, with about half of that in the sinking fund at that time.

So, as far as the population is concerned, as far as the economic feasibility is concerned, and as far as the political aspect is concerned—both parties having planks in their platform pledging statehood to Hawaii—they meet the requirements. They are well able to take care of themselves financially, and they have a population as great as some nine States originally had.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. I think it also should be brought out that Hawaii pays more taxes into the Federal Treasury than 14 other States in the Union.

Mr. PETERSON. That is my understanding, and that fact is set forth in the report. Those who are interested should get the report. The subcommittee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REDDEN], made an exhaustive study. I was not chairman at the time these figures were reported; I became chairman later.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. The gentleman has made a fair and honest presentation and, with apologies to him, what he is bragging about is citizenship, and I would like to know whether he claims Bridges or not as a citizen.

Mr. PETERSON. No; I do not.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself one additional minute.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. The gentleman has stressed a great deal about the popula-

tion of Hawaii, which contains about a half million people. Of course, the House approved statehood for Hawaii at one time. Now, is it his opinion that that is about the right population in order to become a State?

Mr. PETERSON. I would not say that, but we did let a large number of States come in with populations from 42,000 upward. However, for a long period of time the population seemed to be around 60,000.

Mr. JOHNSON. Conditions were entirely different when those States with 60,000 came in than they are now.

Mr. PETERSON. That is true; but history shows that after statehood there has been an economic improvement and development in each instance.

Mr. JOHNSON. They were all in the continental area, too.

Mr. PETERSON. Yes.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. May I say to the gentleman that I was a member of the Committee on Territories that held very extensive hearings in the Territory of Hawaii. We held hearings on all of the major islands and we made a very careful investigation of all the factors which enter into statehood. It was the unanimous conclusion of that committee, as I recall it, that Hawaii was entitled to statehood, not only from the standpoint of population but also from the standpoint of industry and in educational facilities, in the character of the people, and also as a matter of national defense it would be advisable to admit Hawaii to statehood.

Mr. PETERSON. The gentleman has more first-hand knowledge of that than I have, and I thank him for his contribution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I shall not worry the Members of the House with the great speech I have prepared on this subject because the Members are anxious to attend to their congressional duties. I do want to say, however, that I am very much in favor of this rule and again I want to say that I am emphatically in favor of statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

SAMUEL GOMPERS VERSUS JOHN L. LEWIS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, on August 18, 1937, nearly 13 years ago, speaking in the House on the subject, John L. Lewis versus Samuel Gompers, I pointed out the difference between the rule-or-ruin policy of Lewis as a labor leader, and the constructive, unselfish, impersonal leadership of Samuel Gompers, the grand old man of the American labor movement. Among other things in that speech 13 years ago, I said:

> The outstanding present-day example of a labor racketeer is John L. Lewis. His record is a record of ruthlessness and recklessness. His policy has been one of rule or ruin. He prates about democratic government, yet refuses to abide by majority rule when it goes against him. He now proposes to break up and destroy the American Federation of Labor, the organization that the grand old man of labor, Samuel Gompers, created and built up. Lewis has succeeded in dividing American labor into two hostile camps, not realizing that the saying "united we stand, divided we fall" applies particularly and especially to organized labor. I recommend that John L. Lewis refresh his mind by reading Gompers' autobiography entitled, "Seventy Years of Life and Labor."

Mr. Speaker, that speech contrasting the labor policies and objectives of Lewis and Gompers was made when Lewis broke away from the A. F. of L. the first time, and formed his rival labor organization, the CIO. During the past 13 years Lewis has pursued his rule-or-ruin policy consistently, with results that are well known, being very evident in the coal emergency that confronts this Nation today.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it is both pertinent and timely at this time—facing a national emergency brought about by John L. Lewis and his planned coal shortage, and while the Nation is at the same time celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Samuel Gompers—to review and reemphasize the principles that Samuel Gompers followed in creating and establishing the American Federation of Labor. Those principles may be summarized as follows:

First. The main concern of organized labor should be to improve the economic position of wage workers and to obtain general acceptance by employers of the principles of collective bargaining and the closed shop.

Second. The cause of labor should not be identified with any political party and, apart from certain protective legislation, labor should have no long-term political objectives.

Third. The maintenance of the profit system.

Fourth. The virtual autonomy of each international union.

Our present-day labor leaders have departed very far from Gompers' labor principles. If our labor leaders today would follow the principles that guided Sam Gompers we would have no need for the Taft-Hartley law. It was Mr. Lewis' arrogant abuse of power under the Wagner Act that induced Congress 2½ years ago to pass the Taft-Hartley Act over the President's veto.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot refrain at this time from paying my tribute to Samuel Gompers, the founder of the American labor movement, "the greatest Roman of them all." I do so in the words of his devoted secretary, Florence Calvert Thorne:

> The soul of Samuel Gompers lives in its potent influence on national life and customs. It lives in the daily lives of millions of Americans, in the higher standards of life and work generally prevailing; in the higher concept of duty which man owes to those with whom he works and for whom he works; in our enriched understanding of human justice; in an understanding of the finer effects of democracy in daily life; in the realization that human brotherhood is after all a thoroughly practical idea and the only lasting basis for human relations.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. NIXON (at the request of Mr. MACY) was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Wednesday, January 25, 1950, following the legislative business of the day and other special orders.

Mr. MACY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Wednesday, January 25, 1950, following the special order granted to Mr. NIXON.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include an address by Mr. Farley.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WALSH (at the request of Mr. MADDEN), for an indefinite period, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. CURTIS, after 2:30 p. m., for the balance of today, on account of illness in family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER [after counting]. Fifty-four Members have arisen, not a sufficient number.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. There were many Members who came in and were counted after the standing count was taken. I ask that the vote be taken again.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not going to make the count again because he has just counted both the total number of Members and the number standing to demand the yeas and nays.

The question is on the motion to adjourn.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. On that I demand tellers, Mr. Speaker.

Tellers were ordered, and the Speaker appointed as tellers Mr. McCORMACK and Mr. MARCANTONIO.

The House divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 167, noes 109.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 24, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1148. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1149. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a list of the number of officers in the Coast Guard with the rank of lieutenant commander or over; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1150. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1151. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the provisions of 28 United States Code that no claims were paid from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary of Defense," ending December 31, 1949; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1152. A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting reports of the regular annual meeting and a special meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States held at Washington, D. C., September 22–24 and November 29, 1949, respectively (H. Doc. No. 452); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1153. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the status of permanent residence to the subjects of such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1154. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the laws enacted by the Legislative Assembly and the Municipal Council of St. Croix and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1155. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting tabulations submitted by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management showing the withdrawals and restorations of public lands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1156. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of an order canceling certain charges existing as debts due the United States by individual Indians and tribes of Indians; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1157. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting the annual report for fiscal year ending June 30, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 396); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 398. Joint resolution relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; without amendment (Rept. No. 1509). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York:

H. R. 6918. A bill to provide for the posthumous award of the Purple Heart to members of the armed forces of World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 6919. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to undertake the North Fork Kings River development, California, as an integral part of the Central Valley project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 6920. A bill to provide for the carrying out of the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government relating to the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 6921. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. R. 6922. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise taxes on refrigerators, stoves, electric light bulbs, and photographic apparatus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6923. A bill to terminate the war tax rates on retail sales of jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6924. A bill to terminate the war tax rates on admissions, transportation of persons, and telephone and other communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 6925. A bill to amend section 1342 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to action by State agencies affecting public utilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON.

H. R. 6926. A bill to establish a United States Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee:

H. R. 6927. A bill to authorize the development of Rhododendron Gardens, in Pisgah and Cherokee National Forests, as a recreational area; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 6928. A bill to terminate certain wartime and other excise tax rates on transportation, communications, contracts, luggage, furs, jewelry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 6929. A bill to authorize the acquisition by the United States of the remaining non-Federal lands within Big Bend National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 6930. A bill to establish a United States Air Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SUTTON:

H. R. 6931. A bill to provide for the issuance of currency of a new design and color as a means of detecting violations of the Internal Revenue Code and tariff laws of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 6932. A bill exempting admissions to activities of elementary and secondary schools from the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAGNER:

H. J. Res. 400. Joint resolution designating the 7-day period beginning October 22, 1950, as Smoke Abatement Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 436. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 22; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 6933. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alexander Fiala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 6934. A bill for the relief of E. H. Corrigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREEN:

H. R. 6935. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ingeborg Bastian and Miss Elizabeth Glaser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 6936. A bill for the relief of Jack A. Witham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 6937. A bill for the relief of Jorge Borges deFrias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FURCOLO (by request):

H. R. 6938. A bill for the relief of Stanley Kapinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 6939. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose Ciraco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 6940. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth DeCourcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 6941. A bill for the relief of Frederick Edmond Tomkins, Mary Ann Tomkins, and Edward Marshall Tomkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 6942. A bill for the relief of Miss Hisako Nakane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 6943. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 6944. A bill for the relief of Giovannina Vernacchia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 6945. A bill for the relief of Jerzy Makowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 6946. A bill relating to the conveyance of certain property in Shawnee, Okla., by quitclaim deed, to Alfred F. Hunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 6947. A bill to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Col. Charles H. Bonesteel as Executive Director of the European Coordinating Committee under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, without affecting his military status and perquisites; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 6948. A bill for the relief of Ralph W. Pfeiffer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1713. By Mr. HAGEN: Petition of Roger Skoglund, chairman, and other officers of the

Ringbo Farmers Union Local, Holt, Minn., endorsing the Brannan farm plan and other remedial legislation in behalf of the farm, dairy, and poultry producers of Minnesota; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1714. Also, petition of the Henning Women's Reading Club, signed by Mrs. Nora Stewart, president, and Mrs. Edith Iverson, secretary, in opposition to compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1715. By Mr. JUDD: Petition of Mrs. A. L. Bigham and other citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., urging consideration and support of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2428, and a Senate counterpart of that measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1716. By Mr. RICH: Petition of the Lookout Club, of Emporium, Pa., endorsing resolution of General Federation of Women's Clubs against Government control of health services which would jeopardize free enterprise; and resolution of the board of directors of the Pennsylvania Federation of Women's Clubs in opposition to the proposed compulsory health-insurance plan; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1717. By Mr. SHAFER: Petition of the Rotary Club of Kalamazoo, urging adoption of recommendations of the Hoover Commission; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1718. By Mr. TAYLOR: Petition of Mrs. John Hager and 14 other citizens of Fort Edward, N. Y., urging the passage of Senate bill 1847 and House bill 2428; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1719. Also, petition of Mrs. Isabelle F. Wilson and 18 other citizens of Mooers, N. Y., urging the passage of Senate bill 1847 and House bill 2428; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 24, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

The Senate met, in executive session, at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal spirit, everywhere present but often unreal to us because we willfully block the channels of our being by which Thou wouldst reach us, open our hearts now to one another and to Thee, as together we bow at this altar which the fathers builded.

We pray for ourselves and for the people of this dear land that genuine fraternity may increase among us and that intolerance and the mutual suspicions of class hatred may not shake our democracy. As we have undertaken here a government of, by, and for the people, may we not lack the spiritual quality without which no such government can long endure. Guide our Nation, in this solemn day of our responsibility and opportunity, to such use of its vast power as may cause all the peoples of the earth to rise up and call us blessed. We pray in the spirit of our Lord and Master. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 23, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. GEORGE, and by unanimous consent, the Finance Committee was authorized to hold a hearing during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

On request of Mr. FREAR, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee was authorized to hold a meeting this afternoon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SCHOEPPEL was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from tonight through Monday because of a death in his immediate family.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KEM obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] desires to speak upon the pending question, which is the confirmation of the nomination of Admiral Sherman. Will the Senator from Missouri yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Maybank
Anderson	Hoey	Millikin
Benton	Holland	Mundt
Brewster	Humphrey	Murray
Bricker	Hunt	Myers
Bridges	Ives	Neely
Butler	Jenner	O'Conor
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Connally	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kem	Schoeppel
Donnell	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Downey	Knowland	Sparkman
Dworshak	Langer	Stennis
Eastland	Leahy	Taft
Ecton	Lehman	Taylor
Ferguson	Lodge	Thye
Flanders	Long	Tobey
Frear	Lucas	Tydings
Fulbright	McCarran	Vandenberg
George	McCarthy	Watkins
Gillette	McClellan	Wherry
Graham	McFarland	Wiley
Gurney	McKellar	Williams
Hayden	McMahon	Withers
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Young
Hickenlooper	Malone	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

When the Senate recessed yesterday it recessed in executive session, but technically no nomination was before the Senate for consideration. Therefore the Chair will direct the Secretary to state the nominations on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of admiral, for a term of 4 years.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask that that nomination be passed over temporarily until the other nominations are acted upon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, there are two other nominations on the Executive Calendar. I do not think there will be any question about them. I ask that they be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senate will consider the other two nominations.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Michael McInerney, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General to fill an existing vacancy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert H. Mollohan to be United States marshal for the northern district of West Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified of the nominations which have just been confirmed.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FREAR, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Edward T. McCormick, of Arizona, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1952, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate; and

Donald C. Cook, of Michigan, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1954, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as in legislative session, Senators may introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and submit routine matters for the RECORD without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BOARDS OF VISITORS TO MILITARY, NAVAL, COAST GUARD, AND MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMIES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, pursuant to law, makes the following appointments to the boards of visitors hereinafter named:

To the United States Military Academy: The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

To the United States Naval Academy: The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

To the United States Coast Guard Academy: The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS]. On January 17, 1950, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce appointed the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] members of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy.

To the United States Merchant Marine Academy: The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND]. On January 17, 1950, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce appointed the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF STATE

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by the Department of State pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act, for the calendar year 1949; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON FLIGHT PAY OF CERTAIN COAST GUARD OFFICERS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, on the number of officers above the rank of major of the Army or lieutenant commander of the Navy who received flight pay in the Coast Guard, their age groups, and the average monthly flight pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON MEETINGS OF JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the proceedings of the regular annual meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, and a report of a special meeting of the conference (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, as Chairman of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

CANCELLATION OF CERTAIN CHARGES OF UNITED STATES AGAINST INDIVIDUAL AND TRIBES OF INDIANS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of his order canceling certain charges existing as debts due the United States by individual Indians and tribes of Indians (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

WITHDRAWALS AND RESTORATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, tabulations submitted by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management showing the withdrawals and restorations of public lands made during the period from January 1, 1949, through December 31, 1949 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON RESERVATION OF CERTAIN LANDS WITHIN INDIAN RESERVATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that no reservations of land within Indian reservations valuable for power or reservoir sites or necessary for use in connection with irrigation projects were made during the calendar year 1949; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. CROIX AND ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislative Assembly and Municipal Councils of St. Croix and St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers), to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON PERMANENT RESIDENCE GRANTED TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, together with a complete and detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law, and the reasons for granting such status (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, together with a detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reason for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work for the period July through December 1949 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the New Orleans Area Rent Advisory Board, of New Orleans, La., favoring the extensión of Federal rent control beyond June 30, 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the States of New York and California, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 2181, providing old-age insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by the Fifth Congressional District Council of Townsend Clubs, at Orlo Vista, and the Cassadaga Townsend Club, No. 1, of Cassadaga, both in the State of Florida, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 2181, providing old-age insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations, Inc., of New York, N. Y., favoring the ratification of the convention on genocide; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition signed by Dorothy Kavaler, social actions chairman, Sisterhood of the Laurelton Jewish Center, Laurelton, Long Island, N. Y., praying for the ratification of the convention on genocide; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Joe A. Saracini, of St. Louis, Mo., relating to the oath of allegiance to the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Junior Order United American Mechanics, United States of North America, Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the enactment of House bill 4567, to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by H. W. Henry, of Cowpens, S. C., relating to the claim of James and Porter Henry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Florida State Dental Society, of Bradenton, Fla., the Indiana State Dental Association, of Indianapolis, Ind., the Allegany-Garrett County Dental Society, of Cumberland, Md., and the Third District Dental Society, of Butte, Mont., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from George Franklin Stoner, of Fayette County, W. Va., relating to conditions of employment in the coal industry; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from George W. Williams, of Baltimore, Md., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for a memorial to the late President Roosevelt; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A resolution adopted by the Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc., assembled in New York, N. Y., October 31 through November 3, 1949, protesting against the closing by the Navy Department of the Long Beach Navy Shipyard; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Jack R. McMichael, executive secretary, the Methodist Federation for Social Action, of New York, N. Y., praying for the enactment of the administration's civil-rights program; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Holdover Committee of the Twenty-fifth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution 38

"Resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to repeal the Federal tax on the transportation of persons as the same affects interisland transportation and transportation between the Territory and the mainland United States

"Whereas the United States now levies a tax of 15 percent of the amount paid for the transportation of persons between the Territory and the mainland United States, and between the several islands of the Territory of Hawaii; and

"Whereas this tax was imposed as a wartime excise to discourage unnecessary transportation of persons, which reason is no longer sufficient to justify continuing its levy; and

"Whereas due to the geographic make-up of the Territory virtually all transportation of persons must be accomplished by commercial means and is therefore subject to the payment of this tax, a condition not true on the mainland with regard to either intrastate or interstate transportation; and

"Whereas this tax materially increases the cost of transportation of persons both from the mainland to the Territory and within the Territory, thus directly contributing to the high cost of living in the Territory and working great hardship on the people of the Territory; and

"Whereas the cost to the carriers of collecting this tax substantially increases the cost of transportation, which cost is ultimately paid by the users of such transportation facilities and results therefore in an additional and unnecessary charge upon the public; and

"Whereas this tax puts Hawaii in a very unfavorable position in its competition with Europe, South and Central America, the Caribbean area, and other southern areas for tourist business, which is Hawaii's third ranking industry and is rapidly increasing in importance, inasmuch as transportation to and from the aforesaid-mentioned areas is not subject to these taxes; and

"Whereas the present unemployment situation in the Territory of Hawaii is such as to make it imperative that every encouragement be given to Hawaii's industries with a view to strengthening Hawaii's economy; and

"Whereas this tax definitely discourages passenger travel via commercial means at a time when transportation systems generally are hard-pressed financially, which is particularly detrimental to the low-income groups in the Territory who cannot afford the resultant higher travel costs in the Territory: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Holdover Committee of the Twenty-fifth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully requested to repeal the Federal tax on the transportation of persons as it applies to travel within the Territory of Hawaii and as it applies to travel between the mainland United States and the Territory of Hawaii; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

By Mr. EASTLAND:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution 16

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to take immediate steps to correct inequities in the present cotton-allotment law

"Whereas the 1950 cotton-acreage-allotment program, as administered under the law from the county level, is obviously penalizing the cotton farmer who, by his history of planted cotton acreage, has been responsible largely for the acreage of cotton allotted to the county; and

"Whereas the county system of making allotments to individual farms is bringing about a state of panic from the standpoint of displacing numerous tenant families from the larger farms, where they have housing facilities and other advantages not available on other farms; and

"Whereas under previous allotment programs, 5 to 8 percent of the allotments were never planted; and

"Whereas it would not jeopardize the welfare of cotton or the cotton farmer if an increase of 1,250,000 acres were granted in the national minimum acreage to be used to correct the inequities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring therein), That the United States Congress be memorialized to the effect that the present cotton allotment law will disrupt the economy of Mississippi and will make homeless and destitute thousands of tenant families, and that immediate steps should be taken to correct the inequities of the present law.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, December 14, 1949.

"WALTER SILLERS,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the Senate, December 14, 1949.

"SAM LUMPKIN,
"President of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Concurrent Resolution 8

"Concurrent resolution memoralizing Congress to make an appropriation of $250,000,000 for construction and reconstruction of United States Highway 90

"Whereas section 2 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1948 provides that—

" 'The Commissioner of Public Roads is hereby directed to cooperate with the State highway departments in a study of the status of improvement of the national system of interstate highways, designated in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944; to invite the cooperation and suggestions of the Secretary of Defense and the National Security Resources Board as to their indicated or potential needs for improved highways for the national defense; and to supplement not later than April 1, 1949, the report dated February 1, 1941, entitled "Highways for the National Defense" to reflect current conditions and deficiencies,' and

"Whereas pursuant to said provision a detailed study of the status of improvement of the national system of interstate highways has been made with the complete cooperation of every State highway department and with the cooperation and suggestions of the Secretary of Defense and the National Security Resources Board as to the indicated or potential needs for improved highways for the national defense; and

"Whereas United States Highway 90 was especially designated as a part of the interstate transcontinental highway system and of strategic importance to the national defense, and was shown to be wholly inadequate to safely and properly handle the volume of traffic shown to be using said highway; and

"Whereas the report shows that a portion of Highway 90 traversing the State of Mississippi carries a traffic load considerably in excess of the major portions of Transcontinental Highway 90, and the immediate improvement and construction of this highway to the required standards of the Bureau of Public Roads, particularly that portion traversing and crossing the State of Mississippi, is deemed to be of vital, necessary, and immediate importance to the national defense, serving as it does more permanent Military Establishments of the United States than any other transcontinental highway, and being the major all-weather road in the said national system of interstate highways: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Mississippi Legislature (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States of America be memorialized to appropriate not less than $250,000,000 for immediate construction and/or reconstruction of said Highway 90 from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean, following generally the present route of said Highway 90, and in conformance to the highway needs of the national defense, and that the priority of said construction and/or reconstruction of said Highway 90 shall be based on the traffic needs as determined by the traffic load or count, as determined by the several State highway departments in cooperation with the Public Roads Administration; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each member of the Mississippi delegation in Congress, and to the Mississippi Senators in the United States Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives November 17, 1949.

"WALTER SILLERS,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the senate November 29, 1949.

"SAM LUMPKIN,
"President of the Senate."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Resolution

"Resolution memorializing Congress of the United States to take such action as it may deem necessary to bring about a more careful selection of displaced persons before admission of such persons to the United States of America; requesting the Congress of the United States of America to take such action as may be necessary to bring about the deportation of undesirable persons that have been admitted to the United States of America

"Whereas since the close of World War II the United States of America, in an effort to relieve suffering and bring aid to those persons displaced and made homeless as a result of World War II, has admited to the United

States of America a large number of displaced persons; and

"Whereas a large number of the people of the State of Mississippi, in an effort to help relieve suffering and to furnish a home for such displaced persons have in good faith spent time and money in bringing about the admission of displaced persons to their farms in the State of Mississippi; and

"Whereas a number of said displaced persons who have been brought into the State of Mississippi have made a good adjustment to the American way of life, and are therefore well started on the road to becoming good citizens, thus deserving the encouragement and best wishes of the people of the State of Mississippi; but

"Whereas it is reported that some of these persons admitted to the United States of America and offered homes and employment have not accepted their admission to the United States in good faith and have not kept faith with their stated purpose and mission in coming to the United States but on the other hand have taken advantage of the attitude of the people of the United States and have used their passport and admission solely for the purpose of getting into the United States with no intention whatsoever of carrying out their agreement and stated purpose of wanting to come into this country and are therefore undesirable citizens; and

"Whereas it is the sense of the Mississippi Legislature that displaced persons who may be found to be undesirable citizens should be deported: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Mississippi House of Representatives, That Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby memorialized, and urged to take such action as it may deem necessary to bring about a strict and careful selection of displaced persons to be admitted to the United States, and that no legislation be enacted by the Congress relaxing the rules or increasing the number who may be admitted to this country. The Congress is further urged to take such action as it may deem necessary to bring about the immediate deportation of all displaced persons who have been admitted to the United States of America and have proved themselves to be undesirable citizens; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be spread at large upon the journals of the House and that copies of this resolution be forwarded by the Clerk of the House to Members of the United States Senate and Members of Congress of the State of Mississippi, and that copies of this resolution be furnished to the press.

"Adopted by the House of Representatives December 15, 1949.

"WALTER SILLERS,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

INVESTIGATION OF PRICES OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS — RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of St. Paul, Minn., favoring an investigation of petroleum prices in St. Paul and adjacent areas.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the oil companies supplying fuel oil to this area have recently simultaneously announced an increase in the price of fuel oil, which is the second increase in the price during the current heating season, and

Whereas similar increases in the price of gasoline have likewise been made simultaneously by said companies; and

Whereas substantially all the fuel oil, gasoline and other petroleum products used in this area are brought to St. Paul by barge line during the navigation season on the Mississippi River, and by pipe line from the oil fields and refineries, and

Whereas when the improvement of navigation on the Mississippi River was inaugurated and during the completion thereof it was represented that the cost of transporting commodities, including petroleum products, by river would be substantially less than the cost of transportation by rail, and likewise when the said pipe line was installed it was also represented that the cost of transporting gasoline and oil by pipe line would be substantially less than the cost of transportation by rail, and the City Council of the City of St. Paul is informed and believes that such is the fact but that said council has no means available to secure definite data relative to such cost of transportation, and

Whereas it appears that the prices charged to dealers in this area for such petroleum products are as high or higher than the prices in other areas served only by rail and not served by pipe line or barge line,

Resolved by the City Council of the City of St. Paul, That our representatives in Congress are hereby requested to cause an investigation to be made into the prices of such petroleum products in St. Paul and adjacent areas, including the relative cost of transportation of the same by rail, pipe line and barge line, and whether or not such concerted action by the oil companies in simultaneously raising the prices of petroleum products is a violation of the law respecting restraints of trade.

Resolved further, That the city clerk is directed to send copies of this resolution to United States Senators EDWARD J. THYE and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Representative EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, and the Minneapolis City Council.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. Res. 218. Resolution continuing the authority for investigation of banking and credit legislation, small business, and economic stabilization; without amendment (Rept. No. 1236).

INVESTIGATION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND ITS SUBSIDIARIES

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 219), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete inquiry into the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries, with special attention given to the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government with respect to such Corporation and its subsidiaries.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than June 1, 1950.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. SALTONSTALL introduced Senate bill 2917, to promote the foreign policy of the United States and to authorize participation in a cooperative endeavor for assisting in the development of economically underdeveloped areas of the world, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS (by request):

S. 2918. A bill for the relief of E. G. Morris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 2919. A bill relating to farm-acreage allotments for cotton under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 2920. A bill to extend for 1 year the authorization for an appropriation for the International Children's Emergency Fund; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 2921. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Stavros S. Niarchos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution designating the third Sunday in September of each year as Children's Day in Sports; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MALONE introduced Senate Joint Resolution 151, to prohibit financial aid to any foreign country engaging in trade with Russia, her satellite countries, or any other area dominated or controlled by Russia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

ASSISTANCE TO UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS OF THE WORLD

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to implement point 4. On September 15, 1949, I introduced a similar bill, S. 2561. It was identical to a bill introduced by Representative HERTER in the House of Representatives. When this bill was introduced it was with the intention of bringing about discussion and criticisms to see if there could not be a meeting of minds among various interested parties. Since that time a number of conferences have been held and discussions taken place between those interested in industry and labor, various executive departments of the Government, and other persons interested in foreign trade and the welfare of friendly nations. As a result, Representative HERTER introduced on January 18 H. R. 6835, which goes a long way toward resolving differences of opinion as to the implementation of point 4, which existed 6 months ago.

I am now introducing the same bill so that the Senate may have before it an up-to-date expression of minds upon this problem. I am sure even this bill can be improved after more study.

The bill (S. 2917) to promote the foreign policy of the United States and to authorize participation in a cooperative endeavor for assisting in the development of economically underdeveloped areas of the world, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS AND RECORDS TO NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an order and ask for its immediate consideration and adoption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the order for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the order, as follows:

Ordered, That the Sergeant at Arms be, and he is hereby, authorized to transfer to the National Archives and Records all documents and records now in his possession impounded and received pursuant to Senate Resolution 295, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, agreed to June 16, 1938, in connection with the investigation of air-mail and ocean-mail contracts, under Senate Resolution 349, agreed to February 25, 1933, as amended and supplemented.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the order?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me inquire of the distinguished majority leader what makes this order necessary. Is it because of a lack of space?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. A number of documents involving the investigation dealing with these contracts are now ready to be removed to the National Archives, and the Sergeant at Arms merely wishes to have the order to do so, so that it will be possible to get them out of the way, to permit more space for other records.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the order is adopted.

HOW CONGRESS MAKES A LAW—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject How Congress Makes a Law, broadcast by him to the people of Pennsylvania, which appears in the Appendix.]

FORMOSA AND THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Tears of the Crocodile," published in the Washington Post of January 24, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LAWYER—EULOGY BY LOUIS LANDE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a eulogy of the American lawyer, by Louis Lande, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE QUACK—EDITORIAL FROM THE OMAHA EVENING WORLD-HERALD

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Quack," published in the Omaha Evening World-Herald of January 20, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHEAT FOR INDIA

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter regarding wheat for India, written by Mr. J. J. Singh, president of the India League of America, and published in the New York Times of December 25, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT AND PAY IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, conforming with the practice followed over the past 7 years, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on civilian employment and pay in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of November 1949, together with a statement by me, with the request that the statement and report be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD, CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, IN CONNECTION WITH THE MONTHLY REPORT ON FEDERAL PERSONNEL AND PAY, OCTOBER–NOVEMBER 1949

Civilian employment in the Military Establishment was reduced by 90,124 in the first 3 months under the personnel-retrenchment order by Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson.

Civilian employees on the pay rolls of the Army, Air Force, Navy, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense totaled 858,786 when the Secretary's order was issued in August. In November the total had been reduced by 10½ percent, to 768,662.

Army civilian employment in the 3-month period was reduced by 33,357 (9½ percent) to 320,995. Air Force civilian employment was reduced by 17,633 (10½ percent) to 151,650. Navy civilian employment was reduced by 39,290 (nearly 12 percent) to 294,296. Civilian employment in the Office of the Secretary was increased by 10 percent, to 1,721.

INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT HIT

Seventy percent or 67,760 of those separated from the civilian rolls were industrial employees, largely outside the classified civil service. Of the total separations 18,468 were employed outside continental United States.

UNIFORMED PERSONNEL ALSO REDUCED

Accompanying the reduction in civilian employees, there was also a reduction in the uniformed personnel of the armed forces. In the same 3 months' period the number of uniformed personnel dropped by 29,000.

There was still more than one civilian employee in the Military Establishment for each two men in uniform.

The President's budget proposals for the new fiscal year beginning next July would provide for an average civilian employment through the year of 725,000 in the Military Establishment.

SLIGHT DECREASE IN CIVILIAN AGENCIES

While civilian employment in the Military Establishment was being reduced by 90,124 the number of employees on the pay rolls of the civilian agencies in the executive branch decreased by 14,020 during September, October, and November. The total reduction during the period totaled 104,144.

LOWEST SINCE 1942

These reductions brought the total employment in the executive branch in November down to 1,985,965, the lowest point since 1942.

These figures were revealed in the current compilation, by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, of personnel reports submitted to the committee by the various agencies of the Federal Government.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT STILL INCREASING

Reductions in the Military Establishment were steady during all 3 months, including November. And in November there were some substantial reductions also in Agriculture, Commerce, and Interior Departments among the civilian agencies.

The principal increase was reported by the Post Office Department where employment continued its continuous rise. With a November increase of 2,709, post-office employment rose to another all-time peak of 533,370.

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OCTOBER–NOVEMBER 1949, AND PAY SEPTEMBER–OCTOBER 1949

Note with reference to personal service expenditure figures: It should be noted that the latest expenditure figures for personal service shown in table I of this report are for the month of October, and that they are compared with personal service expenditure figures for the month of September, whereas the latest employment figures covered in this report are for the month of November and are compared with the month of October. This lag in personal service expenditure figures is necessary in order that actual expenditures may be reported.

(Figures in the following report are compiled from signed official personnel reports

by the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Table I shows total personnel employed inside and outside continental United States, and pay, by agency. Table II shows personnel employed inside continental United States. Table III shows personnel employed outside continental United States. Table IV gives by agency the industrial workers employed by the Federal Government. For purposes of comparisons, figures for the previous month are shown in adjoining columns.)

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

According to monthly personnel reports for November 1949 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures:

Agency	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Pay roll (in thousands of dollars) in executive branch		
	In November numbered—	In October numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In October was—	In September was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	1,985,965	2,006,373	−20,408	528,383	547,230	−18,847
1. Agencies exclusive of National Military Establishment	1,217,303	1,221,367	−4,064	314,512	324,611	−10,099
2. National Military Establishment	768,662	785,006	−16,344	213,871	222,619	−8,748
Within National Military Establishment:						
Office of Secretary of Defense	1,721	1,740	−19	611	608	+3
Department of the Army	320,995	326,494	−5,499	84,989	87,526	−2,537
Department of the Air Force	151,650	154,814	−3,164	41,816	42,707	−891
Department of the Navy	294,296	301,958	−7,662	86,455	91,778	−5,323

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agency.

Tables II, III, and IV break down the above employment figures to show the number inside continental United States, outside continental United States, and the number in the so-called industrial categories. This further break-down in tables II, III, and IV does not include pay figures because pay-roll reports submitted to the committee by some agencies are inadequate for this purpose.

INSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(See table II)

Federal personnel within the United States decreased 15,054 from the October total of 1,847,203 to the November total of 1,832,149.

Exclusive of the National Military Establishment there was a decrease of 3,508 from the October total of 1,163,677 to the November total of 1,160,169.

Total civilian employment within the United States for the National Military Establishment for November was 671,980, a decrease of 11,546 under the October total of 683,526.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense decreased its personnel 19 from the October total of 1,735 to the November total of 1,716.

The Department of the Army civilian personnel within the United States decreased 4,139 from the October figure of 281,576 to the November figure of 277,437.

The Department of the Air Force civilian personnel within the United States decreased 2,117 from the October figure of 128,666 to the November figure of 126,549.

The Department of the Navy civilian personnel within the United States decreased 5,271 from the October figure of 271,549 to the November figure of 266,278.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(See table III)

Outside continental United States, Federal personnel decreased 5,354 from the October total of 159,170 to the November total of 153,816.

A decrease of 556 was reported by the departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment from the October total of 57,690 to the November total of 57,134.

Total civilian employment outside continental United States for the National Military Establishment decreased 4,798 from the October total of 101,480 to the November figure of 96,682.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense reported no change in its staff overseas.

The Department of the Army reported a decrease in overseas civilian employment of 1,360 from the October figure of 44,918 to the November figure of 43,558.

The Department of the Air Force reported a decrease in overseas civilian employment of 1,047 from the October figure of 26,148 to the November figure of 25,101.

The Department of the Navy reported a decrease in overseas civilian employment of 2,391 from the October figure of 30,409 to the November figure of 28,018.

INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT

(See table IV)

Total industrial employment during the month of November decreased 11,928 from the October figure of 483,485 to the November figure of 471,557.

Industrial employment in departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment decreased 561 from the October figure of 20,694 to the November figure of 20,133.

The National Military Establishment decreased its total industrial employment 11,367 from the October figure of 462,791 to the November figure of 451,424.

The Department of the Army reported a decrease of 3,167 from the October figure of 173,081 to the November figure of 169,914. Inside continental United States Army industrial employment decreased 2,804 while outside continental United States there was a decrease of 363.

The Department of the Air Force reported a decrease of 2,371 industrial employees from the October figure of 91,622 to the November figure of 89,251. Inside continental United States Air Force industrial employment decreased 1,541 and outside continental United States there was a decrease of 830.

The Department of the Navy decreased its industrial employment 5,829 from the October total of 198,088 to the November total of 192,259. Inside continental United States Navy industrial employment decreased 3,918 while outside continental United States there was a decrease of 1,911.

The term "industrial employees," as used by the committee, refers to unskilled, semiskilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government who are working on construction projects such as airfields and roads, and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees.

NOTE.—Table V shows civilian personnel reduction in the Military Establishment (August–November 1949) under retrenchment order by the Secretary of National Defense. (Showing industrial employment and uniform personnel for comparative purposes.)

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1949, and comparison with October 1949; and pay for October 1949 and comparison with September 1949*

Agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	September	October	Increase	Decrease	October	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):								
Agriculture	22,386	19,990		2,396	76,446	75,236		1,210
Commerce	15,022	14,179		843	49,010	47,575		1,435
Interior	16,400	15,438		962	55,567	51,155		4,412
Justice	9,440	9,102		338	26,353	26,376	23	
Labor	1,631	1,585		46	4,956	5,109	153	
Post Office	125,065	125,164	99		530,370	533,079	2,709	
State	6,551	6,216		335	22,178	22,120		58
Treasury	26,616	25,709		907	85,149	85,441	292	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	104	95		9	246	246		
Bureau of the Budget	242	235		7	533	536	3	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	15	15			64	74	10	
National Security Council [1]	8	8			17	17		
National Security Resources Board	146	140		6	301	285		16
Council of Economic Advisers	22	22			37	36		1
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion	2	2			5	5		

[1] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1949, and comparison with October 1949; and pay for October 1949 and comparison with September 1949*—Con.

Agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	September	October	Increase	Decrease	October	November	Increase	Decrease
Postwar agencies:								
Displaced Persons Commission	92	102	3		264	259		5
Economic Cooperation Administration	1,270	1,281	11		3,794	4,134	340	
Motor Carrier Claims Commission	1	2	1		4	7	3	
Office of the Housing Expediter	1,931	1,629		302	4,423	4,396		27
Philippine Alien Property Administration	16	15		1	86	81		5
Philippine War Damage Commission	235	225		10	1,074	1,076	2	
War Claims Commission	3	11	8		36	46	10	
Independent agencies:								
American Battle Monuments Commission	29	28		1	228	228		
Atomic Energy Commission	1,744	1,660		84	4,774	4,819	45	
Civil Aeronautics Board	262	254		8	657	650		7
Civil Service Commission	1,161	1,104		57	3,701	3,693		8
Export-Import Bank of Washington	60	60			127	126		1
Federal Communications Commission	509	488		21	1,322	1,323	1	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	390	371		19	1,092	1,091		1
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	194	177		17	341	344	3	
Federal Power Commission	308	296		12	767	760		7
Federal Security Agency [2]	9,229	9,076		153	34,616	34,583		33
Federal Trade Commission	285	268		17	641	640		1
General Accounting Office	2,773	2,655		118	8,647	8,646		1
General Services Administration	6,725	6,327		398	24,192	23,969		223
Government Printing Office	2,421	2,266		155	7,067	7,092	25	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	3,595	3,650	55		11,628	11,887	259	
Indian Claims Commission	6	6			11	11		
Interstate Commerce Commission	814	772		42	2,156	2,163	7	
Maritime Commission [3]	1,641	1,676	35		5,611	5,589		22
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	2,302	2,219		83	7,381	7,414	33	
National Capital Housing Authority	81	77		4	318	316		2
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	8	7		1	20	20		
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	1	2	1		5	11	6	
National Gallery of Art	81	77		4	316	320	4	
National Labor Relations Board	534	521		13	1,554	1,605	51	
National Mediation Board	54	48		6	114	111		3
Panama Canal	3,155	3,441	286		21,504	21,276		228
Railroad Retirement Board	690	708	18		2,501	2,459		42
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,808	1,712		96	4,460	4,441		19
Securities and Exchange Commission	451	426		25	1,054	1,052		2
Selective Service System	610	452		158	3,518	3,502		16
Smithsonian Institution	170	159		11	[4] 554	555	1	
Tariff Commission	102	95		7	222	[4] 221		1
Tax Court of the United States	59	57		2	131	130		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	3,836	3,765		71	13,142	13,068		74
Veterans' Administration	51,318	48,447		2,871	196,082	195,899		183
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	324,611	314,512	517	10,616	1,221,367	1,217,303	3,980	8,044
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment			10,099				4,064	
National Military Establishment:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	608	611	3		1,740	1,721		19
Department of the Army:								
Inside continental United States	74,887	73,458		1,429	281,576	277,437		4,139
Outside continental United States	12,639	11,531		1,108	44,918	43,558		1,360
Department of the Air Force:								
Inside continental United States	38,141	36,947		1,194	128,666	126,549		2,117
Outside continental United States	4,566	4,869	303		26,148	25,101		1,047
Department of the Navy:								
Inside continental United States	83,854	79,917		3,937	271,549	266,278		5,271
Outside continental United States	7,924	6,538		1,386	30,409	28,018		2,391
Total, National Military Establishment	222,619	213,871	306	9,054	785,006	768,662		16,344
Net decrease, National Military Establishment			8,748				16,344	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	547,230	528,383	823	19,670	2,006,373	1,985,965	3,980	24,388
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			18,847				20,408	

[2] Includes personnel and pay for Howard University and the Columbia Institution for the Deaf.
[3] Exclusive of 90 seamen and 2,349 trainees on the rolls of the Maritime Commission and their pay.
[4] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during November 1949 and comparison with October 1949*

Department or agency	October	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):				
Agriculture	73,836	72,654		1,182
Commerce	44,933	43,624		1,309
Interior	49,421	45,450		3,971
Justice	25,873	25,893	20	
Labor	4,878	5,022	144	
Post Office	528,514	531,217	2,703	
State	8,304	8,363	59	
Treasury	84,456	84,721	265	
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	246	246		
Bureau of the Budget	533	536	3	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	64	74	10	
National Security Council [1]	17	17		
National Security Resources Board	301	285		16
Council of Economic Advisers	37	36		1
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion	5	5		
Postwar agencies:				
Displaced Persons Commission	87	85		2
Economic Cooperation Administration	996	1,022	26	
Motor Carrier Claims Commission	4	7	3	
Office of the Housing Expediter	4,398	4,371		27
Philippine Alien Property Administration	2	2		
Philippine War Damage Commission	6	6		
War Claims Commission	36	46	10	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	15	16	1	
Atomic Energy Commission	4,771	4,816	45	
Civil Aeronautics Board	638	631		7
Civil Service Commission	3,696	3,688		8
Export-Import Bank of Washington	125	124		1
Federal Communications Commission	1,291	1,292	1	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,092	1,091		1
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	341	344	3	
Federal Power Commission	767	760		7
Federal Security Agency [2]	33,855	33,807		48

[1] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[2] Includes employees of Howard University and the Columbia Institution for the Deaf.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during November 1949 and comparison with October 1949*—Continued

Department or agency	October	November	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued				
Federal Trade Commission	641	640		1
General Accounting Office	8,647	8,646		1
General Services Administration	24,181	23,952		229
Government Printing Office	7,067	7,092	25	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,582	11,843	261	
Indian Claims Commission	11	11		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,156	2,163	7	
Maritime Commission [3]	5,588	5,572		16
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,381	7,413	32	
National Capital Housing Authority	318	316		2
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	20	20		
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	5	11	6	
National Gallery of Art	316	320	4	
National Labor Relations Board	1,538	1,591	53	
National Mediation Board	114	111		3
Panama Canal	632	634	2	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,501	2,459		42
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	4,447	4,428		19
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,054	1,052		2
Selective Service System	3,433	3,417		16
Smithsonian Institution	[4] 550	551	1	
Tariff Commission	222	221		1
Tax Court of the United States	131	130		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,142	13,068		74
Veterans' Administration	194,462	194,257		205
Total, exclusive of National Military Establishment	1,163,677	1,160,169	3,684	7,192
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment			3,508	
National Military Establishment:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,735	1,716		19
Department of the Army	281,576	277,437		4,139
Department of the Air Force	128,666	126,549		2,117
Department of the Navy	271,549	266,278		5,271
Total, National Military Establishment	683,526	671,980		11,546
Net decrease, National Military Establishment			11,546	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	1,847,203	1,832,149	3,684	18,738
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			15,054	

[3] Exclusive of 90 seamen and 2,349 trainees on the rolls of the Maritime Commission and their pay.
[4] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1949, and comparison with October 1949*

Department or agency	October	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):				
Agriculture	2,610	2,582		28
Commerce	4,077	3,951		126
Interior	6,146	5,705		441
Justice	480	483	3	
Labor	78	87	9	
Post Office	1,856	1,862	6	
State	13,874	13,757		117
Treasury	693	720	27	
Postwar agencies:				
Displaced Persons Commission	177	174		3
Economic Cooperation Administration	2,798	3,112	314	
Office of the Housing Expediter	25	25		
Philippine Alien Property Administration	84	79		5
Philippine War Damage Commission	1,068	1,070	2	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	213	212		1
Atomic Energy Commission	3	3		
Civil Aeronautics Board	19	19		
Civil Service Commission	5	5		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	2	2		
Federal Communications Commission	31	31		
Federal Security Agency	761	776	15	
General Services Administration	11	17	6	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	46	44		2
Maritime Commission	23	17		6
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	0	1	1	
Independent agencies—Continued				
National Labor Relations Board	16	14		2
Panama Canal	20,872	20,642		230
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	13	13		
Selective Service System	85	85		
Smithsonian Institution	4	4		
Veterans' Administration	1,620	1,642	22	
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	57,690	57,134	405	961
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment			556	
National Military Establishment:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	5	5		
Department of the Army	44,918	43,558		1,360
Department of the Air Force	26,148	25,101		1,047
Department of the Navy	30,409	28,018		2,391
Total, National Military Establishment	101,480	96,682		4,798
Net decrease, National Military Establishment			4,798	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	159,170	153,816	405	5,759
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			5,354	

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during November 1949, and comparison with October 1949*

Department or agency	October	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):				
Commerce	1,380	1,222		158
Interior	5,700	5,439		261
State	343	333		10
Treasury	4,299	4,275		24
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	124	136	12	
General Services Administration	115	139	24	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13	14	1	
Panama Canal	1,824	1,776		48
Smithsonian Institution	8	6		2
Tennessee Valley Authority	6,888	6,793		95
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	20,694	20,133	37	598
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment			561	
National Military Establishment:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside continental United States	147,561	144,757		2,804
Outside continental United States	25,520	25,157		363
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside continental United States	71,793	70,252		1,541
Outside continental United States	19,829	18,999		830
Department of the Navy:				
Inside continental United States	176,239	172,321		3,918
Outside continental United States	21,849	19,938		1,911
Total, National Military Establishment	462,791	451,424		11,367
Net decrease, National Military Establishment			11,367	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	483,485	471,557	37	11,965
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			11,928	

TABLE V.—*Civilian personnel reduction in the National Military Establishment (August–November 1949) under retrenchment order by the Secretary of National Defense (showing industrial employment and uniform personnel for comparative purposes)*

Department	August	November	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	Percentage
V-1. CIVILIAN PERSONNEL (INCLUDING INDUSTRIAL)				
Office of the Secretary of Defense:				
Inside continental United States	1,565	1,716	+151	9.65
Outside continental United States	0	5	+5	
Total	1,565	1,721	+156	9.97
Department of the Army:				
Inside continental United States	304,319	277,437	−26,882	8.83
Outside continental United States	50,033	43,558	−6,475	12.94
Total	354,352	320,995	−33,357	9.41
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside continental United States	137,497	126,549	−10,948	7.96
Outside continental United States	31,786	25,101	−6,685	21.03
Total	169,283	151,650	−17,633	10.42
Department of the Navy:				
Inside continental United States	300,255	266,278	−33,977	11.32
Outside continental United States	33,331	28,018	−5,313	15.94
Total	333,586	294,296	−39,290	11.78
Total, National Military Establishment:				
Inside continental United States	743,636	671,980	−71,656	9.64
Outside continental United States	115,150	96,682	−18,468	16.04
Total	858,786	768,662	−90,124	10.49

Department	August	November	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	Percentage
V-2. INDUSTRIAL PERSONNEL				
Department of the Army:				
Inside continental United States	163,694	144,757	−18,937	11.57
Outside continental United States	28,768	25,157	−3,611	12.55
Total	192,462	169,914	−22,548	11.72
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside continental United States	77,565	70,252	−7,313	9.43
Outside continental United States	25,151	18,999	−6,152	24.46
Total	102,716	89,251	−13,465	13.11
Department of the Navy:				
Inside continental United States	199,571	172,321	−27,250	13.65
Outside continental United States	24,435	19,938	−4,497	18.40
Total	224,006	192,259	−31,747	14.17
Total, National Military Establishment:				
Inside continental United States	440,830	387,330	−53,500	12.14
Outside continental United States	78,354	64,094	−14,260	18.20
Total	519,184	451,424	−67,760	37.90
V-3. MILITARY PERSONNEL				
Department of the Army	655,807	658,257	+2,450	0.0037
Department of the Air Force	419,919	416,316	−3,603	.0085
Department of the Navy	529,903	[1] 502,038	−27,865	.0526
Total, National Military Establishment	1,605,629	1,576,611	−29,018	.0181

[1] Marine Corps personnel estimated by Marine Corps Headquarters.

CHANGES IN NUMBER OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES AND COST OF PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, among the services rendered the Congress and the public by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is the compilation of the civilian-employment record of the agencies in the executive branch of the Federal Government.

Due to the recess several months have elapsed since the last monthly report of the committee on this subject was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I submit two tables which set forth the changes in the personnel situation since that time, covering the period from June to November 1949.

The first table sets forth the changes in the number of employees in the various agencies of the executive branch. The second table sets forth the changes in the costs of personal services in these agencies.

It may be noted that the first table is broken down to show total employment, employment inside continental United States, employment outside continental United States, and industrial employment.

I request publication of the tables in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I-A.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during the period June 30 through Dec. 31, 1949, with comparison by months* [1]

Department or agency	June	July	August	September	October	November	Comparison, June-November	
							Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):								
Agriculture	89,518	84,205	84,099	79,120	76,446	75,236		14,282
Commerce	46,892	47,028	50,703	49,840	49,010	47,575	683	
Interior	57,960	58,766	59,243	56,753	55,567	51,155		6,805
Justice	26,016	26,342	26,467	26,270	26,353	26,376	360	
Labor	3,661	3,605	4,655	4,781	4,956	5,109	1,448	
Post Office	517,538	523,955	526,634	528,594	530,370	533,079	15,541	
State	21,278	21,606	22,192	22,342	22,178	22,120	842	
Treasury	88,740	84,439	84,356	84,786	85,149	85,441		3,299
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	228	238	237	242	246	246	18	
Bureau of the Budget	530	501	508	520	533	536	6	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	71	63	66	63	64	74	3	
National Security Council [2]	20	18	17	17	17	17		3
National Security Resources Board	341	309	300	296	301	285		56
Council of Economic Advisers	39	36	36	37	37	36		3
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion [3]		4	5	5	5	5	5	
Emergency War Agencies: Office of Defense Transportation [4]	9							9
Postwar agencies:								
Displaced Persons Commission	256	264	265	273	264	259	3	
Economic Cooperation Administration	3,595	3,700	3,704	3,754	3,794	4,134	539	
Motor Carrier Claims Commission [5]				2	4	7	7	
Office of the Housing Expediter	5,231	5,373	5,262	4,581	4,423	4,396		835
Philippine Alien Property Administration	97	93	87	87	86	81		16
Philippine War Damage Commission	1,046	1,052	1,087	1,083	1,074	1,076	30	
War Assets Administration [6]	4,019							4,019
War Claims Commission [7]				12	36	46	46	
Independent agencies:								
American Battle Monuments Commission	158	205	202	226	228	228	70	
Atomic Energy Commission	4,639	4,662	4,730	4,725	4,774	4,819	180	
Civil Aeronautics Board	682	675	666	661	657	650		32
Civil Service Commission	4,098	3,837	3,686	3,691	3,701	3,693		405

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I–A.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during the period June 30 through Dec. 31,1949, with comparison by months* [1]—Continued

Department or agency	June	July	August	September	October	November	Comparison, June-November	
							Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued								
Export-Import Bank of Washington	126	127	126	126	127	126		
Federal Communications Commission	1,340	1,332	1,328	1,323	1,322	1,323		17
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,089	1,099	1,089	1,087	1,092	1,091	2	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	364	368	361	346	341	344		20
Federal Power Commission	791	786	781	777	767	760		31
Federal Security Agency [8]	36,000	35,403	34,139	34,268	34,616	34,583		1,417
Federal Trade Commission	655	659	647	640	641	640		15
Federal Works Agency [9]	24,139							24,139
General Accounting Office	8,857	8,757	8,714	8,690	8,647	8,646		211
General Services Administration [9]		30,540	25,325	24,604	24,192	23,969	23,969	
Government Printing Office	7,017	7,017	7,057	7,059	7,067	7,092	75	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,362	11,257	11,282	11,383	11,628	11,887	525	
Indian Claims Commission	11	11	11	11	11	11		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,184	2,140	2,124	2,127	2,156	2,163		21
Maritime Commission [10]	6,032	5,375	5,380	5,581	5,611	5,589		443
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,134	7,070	7,151	7,300	7,381	7,414	280	
National Archives [6]	362							362
National Capital Housing Authority	310	310	319	314	318	316	6	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	20	20	20	21	20	20		
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	2	2	2	2	5	11	9	
National Gallery of Art	317	320	323	318	316	320	3	
National Labor Relations Board	1,523	1,537	1,545	1,531	1,554	1,605	82	
National Mediation Board	111	115	112	110	114	111		
Panama Canal	22,174	21,790	21,707	21,703	21,504	21,276		898
Railroad Retirement Board	2,386	2,436	2,412	2,473	2,501	2,459	73	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	4,601	4,582	4,579	4,520	4,460	4,441		160
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,127	1,127	1,081	1,061	1,054	1,052		75
Selective Service System	4,919	4,778	3,823	3,547	3,518	3,502		1,417
Smithsonian Institution	545	538	537	539	554	555	10	
Tariff Commission	239	223	219	224	222	221		18
Tax Court of the United States	124	126	126	128	131	130	6	
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,174	13,513	13,674	13,550	13,142	13,068		106
Veterans' Administration	195,488	195,729	196,122	195,520	196,082	195,899	411	
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,231,185	1,230,063	1,231,323	1,223,704	1,221,367	1,217,303	45,232	59,114
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment								13,882
National Military Establishment:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,530	1,541	1,565	1,555	1,740	1,721	191	
Department of the Army:								
Inside continental United States	307,246	307,575	304,319	296,049	281,576	277,437		29,809
Outside continental United States	61,714	53,977	50,033	48,296	44,918	43,558		18,156
Department of the Air Force:								
Inside continental United States	138,636	138,102	137,497	133,360	128,666	126,549		12,087
Outside continental United States	30,322	32,145	31,786	30,825	26,148	25,101		5,221
Department of the Navy:								
Inside continental United States	309,364	305,563	300,255	291,053	271,549	266,278		43,086
Outside continental United States	35,916	34,020	33,331	32,234	30,409	28,018		7,898
Total, National Military Establishment	884,728	872,923	858,786	833,372	785,006	768,662	191	116,257
Net decrease, National Military Establishment								116,066
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	2,115,913	2,102,986	2,090,109	2,057,076	2,006,373	1,985,965	45,423	175,371
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment								129,948

TABLE I–B.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during the period June 30 through Dec. 31, 1949* [1]

Department or agency	June	July	August	September	October	November	Comparison, June-November	
							Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):								
Agriculture	87,024	81,558	81,471	76,491	73,836	72,654		14,370
Commerce	43,469	43,586	46,469	45,705	44,933	43,624	155	
Interior	51,460	51,903	52,305	50,159	49,421	45,450		6,010
Justice	25,539	25,869	25,995	25,800	25,873	25,893	354	
Labor	3,624	3,568	4,579	4,704	4,878	5,022	1,398	
Post Office	515,732	522,109	524,774	526,729	528,514	531,217	15,485	
State	8,262	8,305	8,300	8,308	8,304	8,363	101	
Treasury	88,052	83,756	83,662	84,096	84,456	84,721		3,331
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	228	238	237	242	246	246	18	
Bureau of the Budget	530	501	508	520	533	536	6	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	71	63	66	63	64	74	3	
National Security Council [2]	20	18	17	17	17	17		3
National Security Resources Board	341	309	300	296	301	285		56
Council of Economic Advisers	39	36	36	37	37	36		3
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion [3]		4	5	5	5	5	5	
Emergency War Agencies: Office of Defense Transportation [4]	9							9
Postwar agencies:								
Displaced Persons Commission	82	83	86	95	87	85	3	
Economic Cooperation Administration	947	975	997	1,004	996	1,022	75	
Motor Carrier Claims Commission [5]				2	4	7	7	
Office of the Housing Expediter	5,203	5,348	5,235	4,556	4,398	4,371		832
Philippine Alien Property Administration	2	2	2	2	2	2		
Philippine War Damage Commission	6	6	6	6	6	6		
War Assets Administration [6]	4,018							4,018
War Claims Commission [7]				12	36	46	46	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I-B.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during the period June 30 through Dec. 31, 1949* [1]—Continued

Department or agency	June	July	August	September	October	November	Comparison, June-November	
							Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies:								
American Battle Monuments Commission	14	14	14	14	15	16	2	
Atomic Energy Commission	4,636	4,659	4,727	4,722	4,771	4,816	180	
Civil Aeronautics Board	663	655	647	642	638	631		32
Civil Service Commission	4,093	3,828	3,681	3,686	3,696	3,688		405
Export-Import Bank of Washington	124	125	124	124	125	124		
Federal Communications Commission	1,308	1,302	1,295	1,291	1,291	1,292		16
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,089	1,099	1,089	1,087	1,092	1,091	2	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	364	368	361	346	341	344		20
Federal Power Commission	791	786	781	777	767	760		31
Federal Security Agency [8]	34,989	34,460	33,393	33,495	33,855	33,807		1,182
Federal Trade Commission	655	659	647	640	641	640		15
Federal Works Agency [6]	23,338							23,338
General Accounting Office	8,857	8,757	8,714	8,690	8,647	8,646		211
General Services Administration [9]		29,745	25,309	24,648	24,181	23,952	23,952	
Government Printing Office	7,017	7,017	7,057	7,059	7,067	7,092	75	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,322	11,216	11,239	11,339	11,582	11,843	521	
Indian Claims Commission	11	11	11	11	11	11		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,184	2,140	2,124	2,127	2,156	2,163		21
Maritime Commission [10]	6,000	5,347	5,352	5,554	5,588	5,572		428
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,134	7,070	7,151	7,300	7,381	7,413	279	
National Archives [6]	362							362
National Capital Housing Authority	319	310	319	314	318	316	6	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	20	20	20	21	20	20		
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	2	2	2	2	5	11	9	
National Gallery of Art	317	320	323	318	316	320	3	
National Labor Relations Board	1,511	1,525	1,533	1,518	1,538	1,591	80	
National Mediation Board	111	115	112	110	114	111		
Panama Canal	635	635	637	632	632	634		1
Railroad Retirement Board	2,386	2,436	2,412	2,473	2,501	2,459	73	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	4,590	4,570	4,566	4,507	4,447	4,428		162
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,127	1,127	1,081	1,061	1,054	1,052		75
Selective Service System	4,772	4,634	3,732	3,461	3,433	3,417		1,355
Smithsonian Institution	540	533	532	535	550	551	11	
Tariff Commission	239	223	219	224	222	221		18
Tax Court of the United States	124	123	126	128	131	130	6	
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,174	13,513	13,674	13,550	13,142	13,068		106
Veterans' Administration	193,869	194,130	194,555	193,958	194,462	194,257	388	
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,173,336	1,171,714	1,172,579	1,165,214	1,163,677	1,160,169	43,243	56,410
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment							13,167	
National Military Establishment:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,530	1,541	1,565	1,551	1,735	1,716	186	
Department of the Army	307,246	307,575	304,319	296,049	281,576	277,437		29,809
Department of the Air Force	138,636	138,102	137,497	133,360	128,666	126,549		12,087
Department of the Navy	309,364	305,563	300,255	291,053	271,549	266,278		43,086
Total, National Military Establishment	756,776	752,781	743,636	722,013	683,526	671,980	186	84,982
Net decrease, National Military Establishment							84,796	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	1,930,112	1,924,495	1,916,215	1,887,227	1,847,203	1,832,149	43,429	141,392
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment							97,963	

TABLE I-C.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during the period June 30 through Dec. 31, 1949* [1]

Department or agency	June	July	August	September	October	November	Comparison, June-November	
							Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):								
Agriculture	2,494	2,647	2,628	2,629	2,610	2,582	88	
Commerce	3,423	3,442	4,234	4,135	4,077	3,951	528	
Interior	6,500	6,863	6,938	6,594	6,146	5,705		795
Justice	477	473	472	470	480	483	6	
Labor	37	37	76	77	78	87	50	
Post Office	1,806	1,846	1,860	1,865	1,856	1,862	56	
State	13,016	13,301	13,892	14,034	13,874	13,757	741	
Treasury	688	683	694	690	693	720	32	
Postwar agencies:								
Displaced Persons Commission	174	181	179	178	177	174		
Economic Cooperation Administration	2,648	2,725	2,707	2,750	2,798	3,112	464	
Office of the Housing Expediter	28	25	27	25	25	25		3
Philippine Alien Property Administration	95	91	85	85	84	79		16
Philippine War Damage Commission	1,040	1,046	1,081	1,077	1,068	1,070	30	
War Assets Administration [6]	1							
Independent agencies:								
American Battle Monuments Commission	144	191	188	212	213	212	68	
Atomic Energy Commission	3	3	3	3	3	3		
Civil Aeronautics Board	19	20	19	19	19	19		
Civil Service Commission	5	9	5	5	5	5		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	2	2	2	2	2	2		
Federal Communications Commission	32	30	33	32	31	31		1
Federal Security Agency	1,011	943	776	772	761	776		235
Federal Works Agency [6]	801							801
General Services Administration [9]		795	16	16	11	17	17	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I–C.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during the period June 30 through Dec. 31, 1949* [1]—Continued

Department or agency	June	July	August	September	October	November	Comparison, June–November	
							Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued								
Housing and Home Finance Agency	40	41	43	44	46	44	4	
Maritime Commission	32	28	28	27	23	17		15
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics						1	1	
National Labor Relations Board	12	12	12	13	16	14	2	
Panama Canal	21,539	21,155	21,070	21,071	20,872	20,642		897
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	11	12	13	13	13	13	2	
Selective Service System	147	144	91	86	85	85		62
Smithsonian Institution	5	5	5	4	4	4		1
Veterans' Administration	1,619	1,599	1,567	1,562	1,620	1,642	23	
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	57,849	58,349	58,744	58,490	57,690	57,134	2,112	2,827
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment							715	
National Military Establishment:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense				4	5	5	5	
Department of the Army	61,714	53,977	50,033	48,296	44,918	43,558		18,156
Department of the Air Corps	30,322	32,145	31,786	30,825	26,148	25,101		5,221
Department of the Navy	35,916	34,020	33,331	32,234	30,409	28,018		7,898
Total, National Military Establishment	127,952	120,142	115,150	111,359	101,480	96,682	5	31,275
Net decrease, National Military Establishment							31,270	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	185,801	178,491	173,894	169,849	159,170	153,816	2,117	34,102
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment							31,985	

TABLE I–D.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during the period June 30 through Dec. 31, 1949* [1]

Department or agency	June	July	August	September	October	November	Comparison, June–November	
							Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):								
Commerce	1,445	1,473	1,530	1,512	1,380	1,222		223
Interior	6,723	7,048	6,098	6,329	5,700	5,439		1,284
State	355	356	341	344	343	333		22
Treasury	4,457	4,356	4,340	4,301	4,299	4,275		182
Independent agencies:								
Atomic Energy Commission	114	114	118	126	124	136	22	
General Services Administration [9]		110	122	122	115	139	139	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	2	16	15	14	13	14	12	
Panama Canal	1,814	1,857	1,837	1,844	1,824	1,776		38
Smithsonian Institution				2	8	6	6	
Tennessee Valley Authority	6,767	7,172	7,402	7,239	6,888	6,793	26	
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	21,677	22,502	21,803	21,833	20,694	20,133	205	1,749
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment							1,544	
National Military Establishment:								
Department of the Army:								
Inside continental United States	164,632	158,165	163,694	151,372	147,561	144,757		19,875
Outside continental United States	39,865	32,566	28,768	27,140	25,520	25,157		14,708
Department of the Air Corps:								
Inside continental United States	78,582	77,907	77,565	74,903	71,793	70,252		8,330
Outside continental United States	23,835	25,504	25,151	24,385	19,829	18,999		4,836
Department of the Navy:								
Inside continental United States	207,734	203,996	199,571	192,489	176,239	172,321		35,413
Outside continental United States	26,625	25,031	24,435	23,362	21,849	19,938		6,687
Total, National Military Establishment	541,273	523,169	519,184	493,651	462,791	451,424		89,849
Net decrease, National Military Establishment							89,849	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	562,950	545,671	540,987	515,484	483,485	471,557	205	91,598
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment							91,393	

TABLE II.—*Table of pay, in thousands of dollars, of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during the period June 30 through Nov. 30, 1949* [1]

Department or agency	June	July	August	September	October	Comparison, June–October	
						Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):							
Agriculture	21,343	21,237	23,282	22,386	19,990		1,353
Commerce	13,497	14,813	15,607	15,022	14,179	682	
Interior	15,144	15,314	17,221	16,400	15,438	294	
Justice	9,199	8,805	9,632	9,440	9,102		97
Labor	1,170	1,120	1,389	1,631	1,585	415	
Post Office	124,671	124,914	125,794	125,065	125,164	493	
State	6,041	5,888	6,733	6,551	6,216	175	
Treasury	27,816	24,834	27,092	26,616	25,709		2,107
Executive Office of the President:							
White House Office	104	105	112	104	95		9
Bureau of the Budget	288	227	247	242	235		53
Executive Mansion and Grounds	15	14	16	15	15		
National Security Council [3]	8	7	8	8	8		
National Security Resources Board	163	141	160	146	140		23
Council of Economic Advisers	22	23	22	22	22		
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion [3]		2	3	2	2	2	
Emergency War Agencies:							
Office of Defense Transportation [4]	17						17

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—*Table of pay, in thousands of dollars, of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during the period June 30 through Nov. 30, 1949* [1]—Continued

Department or agency	June	July	August	September	October	Comparison, June-October	
						Increase	Decrease
Postwar agencies:							
Displaced Persons Commission	83	89	113	99	102	19	
Economic Cooperation Administration	1,152	1,203	1,245	1,270	1,281	129	
Motor Carrier Claims Commission [5]				1	2	2	
Office of the Housing Expediter	1,762	1,847	1,824	1,931	1,629		133
Philippine Alien Property Administration	59	17	18	16	15		44
Philippine War Damage Commission	218	223	244	235	225	7	
War Assets Administration [6]	2,261						2,261
War Claims Commission [7]				3	11	11	
Independent agencies:							
American Battle Monuments Commission	28	19	30	29	28		
Atomic Energy Commission	1,714	1,642	1,797	1,744	1,660		54
Civil Aeronautics Board	271	254	285	262	254		17
Civil Service Commission	1,254	1,149	1,226	1,161	1,104		150
Export-Import Bank of Washington	58	57	62	60	60	2	
Federal Communications Commission	516	481	529	509	488		28
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	386	372	406	390	371		15
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	196	186	200	194	177		19
Federal Power Commission	321	296	324	308	296		25
Federal Security Agency [8]	10,090	9,203	9,764	9,229	9,076		1,014
Federal Trade Commission	286	324	299	285	268		18
Federal Works Agency [6]	5,942						5,942
General Accounting Office	2,966	2,683	2,898	2,773	2,655		311
General Services Administration [9]		6,548	7,155	6,725	6,327	6,327	
Government Printing Office	2,429	2,301	2,533	2,421	2,266		163
Housing and Home Finance Agency	3,663	3,763	3,766	3,595	3,650		13
Indian Claims Commission	6	6	7	6	6		
Interstate Commerce Commission	860	781	869	814	772		88
Maritime Commission [10]	1,811	1,520	1,632	1,641	1,676		135
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	2,239	2,131	2,350	2,302	2,219		20
National Archives [8]	118						118
National Capital Housing Authority	79	75	84	81	77		2
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	9	7	8	8	7		2
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	1	1	[11]	1	2	1	
National Gallery of Art	88	76	86	81	77		11
National Labor Relations Board	535	506	560	534	521		14
National Mediation Board	48	52	75	54	48		
Panama Canal	3,182	3,448	3,870	3,155	3,441	259	
Railroad Retirement Board	684	682	733	690	708	24	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,835	1,734	1,880	1,808	1,712		123
Securities and Exchange Commission	469	441	478	451	426		43
Selective Service System	1,012	831	981	610	452		560
Smithsonian Institution	157	160	177	170	159	2	
Tariff Commission	103	97	106	102	95		8
Tax Court of the United States	61	56	60	59	57		4
Tennessee Valley Authority	3,832	3,573	4,106	3,836	3,765		67
Veterans' Administration	55,290	48,265	52,822	51,318	48,447		6,843
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	327,572	314,543	332,920	324,611	314,512	8,844	21,904
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment						13,060	
National Military Establishment:							
Office of the Secretary of Defense	568	576	C31	C08	611	43	
Department of the Army:							
Inside continental United States	82,934	72,574	75,870	74,887	73,458		9,476
Outside continental United States	15,337	10,728	13,146	12,639	11,531		3,806
Department of the Air Force:							
Inside continental United States	39,418	35,009	39,084	38,141	36,947		2,471
Outside continental United States	5,306	5,437	5,674	4,566	4,869		437
Department of the Navy:							
Inside continental United States	87,186	81,659	88,946	83,854	79,917		7,269
Outside continental United States	8,776	7,990	7,545	7,924	6,538		2,238
Total, National Military Establishment	239,525	213,973	230,896	222,619	213,871	43	25,697
Net decrease, National Military Establishment						25,654	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	567,097	528,516	563,816	547,230	528,383	8,887	47,601
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment						38,714	

[1] It should be noted that figures in this compilation represent all revisions which have been submitted by agencies as a result of review since original reports were transmitted.
[2] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[3] Commission established pursuant to Public Law 40, 81st Cong., approved Apr. 14, 1949, and activated July 19, 1949.
[4] Liquidated June 30, 1949.
[5] Commission established pursuant to Public Law 880, 80th Cong., dated July 2, 1949; activated Sept. 19, 1949.
[6] Agency transferred to General Services Administration July 1, 1949, under Public Law 152, 81st Cong.
[7] Commission established pursuant to Public Law 896, 80th Cong., dated July 3, 1948; activated Sept. 14, 1949.
[8] Includes personnel and pay for Howard University and the Columbia Institution for the Deaf.
[9] New agency established July 1, 1949, under Public Law 152, 81st Cong.
[10] Exclusive of seamen and trainees and their pay on the rolls of the Maritime Commission.
[11] Pay advanced by the District of Columbia government.

THE ST. LAWRENCE POWER AND SEAWAY PROJECT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present, for 3 minutes, some remarks in regard to the St. Lawrence power project.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, one of the most urgent and vital problems confronting New York State, the entire Middle West, and the entire northeastern section of our country is the question of the development of the St. Lawrence River and its power and navigational potentialities.

As everyone knows, the national administration, under both Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, has been seeking to obtain congressional approval for a St. Lawrence seaway and power development agreement with Canada since 1933. Today, 16 years later, that agreement is still pending in the Congress. The New York State Power Authority has applied to the Federal Power Commission for permission to undertake the St. Lawrence power project alone, and is seeking at the same time approval for this project from the International Joint Commission, a United States-Canadian body set up to review these matters.

An examiner for the Federal Power Commission recently recommended that the application of the New York Power Authority be denied. The Federal Power Commission is considering, or will consider, the recommendation of its examiner in this regard. It is at the moment considering a request by the New York

Power Authority for a hearing on this question.

As some of my distinguished colleagues in the Senate may know, the junior Senator from New York, in his previous capacity as Governor of New York, was, and continues to be, a wholehearted advocate of the St. Lawrence seaway and power development project. I shall fight for that project in every way I can as a Member of the Senate.

Meanwhile, however, it is the fervent hope of the junior Senator from New York that the application of the New York Power Authority will not be turned down by the Federal Power Commission, merely in anticipation of what Congress may or may not do on the dual-purpose project. I have, therefore, asked the Federal Power Commission to refrain from allowing its anticipation of what Congress may do to prejudice its decision on the application of the New York Power Authority. I have asked that, as a minimum, the Power Commission postpone its final decision on the application of the New York Power Authority until the congressional outlook on this matter is clarified. I have written a letter to this effect to the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. President, I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that I may be permitted to insert in the body of my remarks here today the letter referred to above, which was addressed to the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. NELSON LEE SMITH,
Chairman, Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: I understand that on January 12 the Federal Power Commission announced that it would review the proposed order and decision of the examiner on the application of the Power Authority of the State of New York for a license on what is known as project No. 2000 in St. Lawrence County, N. Y., the proposed construction of a power development system on the St. Lawrence.

As you may know—and as is brought out in the record of the proceedings before you—I have worked for many years for the development of the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence, both for navigation and for power-development purposes. My wholehearted support of the undertaking was set forth in my message to the New York State Legislature on January 14, 1941, and is, I believe, referred to in the proceedings. I have made many other official statements in support of this program.

As you know, the Federal-State accord of 1933 provided for the ownership and the operation of the power facilities on the New York side of the St. Lawrence by the State of New York, upon the assumption by the State of the allocated cost. This accord was arrived at during my administration as Governor and has since been included in all proposed legislation and international treaties covering the St. Lawrence project. I see no reason to change my position on this matter.

I intend, as a Member of the Senate, to continue to press, with all my efforts and energies, for the approval by Congress of the necessary arrangements to see the St. Lawrence power and seaway project become a reality. In the past I have testified before the appropriate congressional committee in support of this legislation. I am prepared to do so again, as a Member of the Senate, if and when hearings are held.

The congressional schedule for the consideration of this matter in the Senate is, at this moment, far from clear. I have always taken the position—and I still maintain it—that, if some insuperable obstacle should hold up the dual project, the power project at least should be approved forthwith, and the fight for the seaway project carried on with unremitting vigor thereafter.

It is for this reason that I should like to submit to the Commission my earnest opinion that the application submitted by the State of New York to your Commission should, at the very minimum, remain pending without prejudice until the legislative situation with regard to the dual-purpose project is clarified and the attitude of the administration is further defined. You realize, I am sure, that the application presented by the State of New York was the result of years of preparation, involving substantial cost to the taxpayers of New York. It should not be prejudiced by a summary anticipation of what the Congress may or may not do with regard to the dual-purpose project.

I hope to present a formal statement to the Commission before a decision is reached in this proceeding and shall greatly appreciate your keeping me advised of the status of your considerations.

Yours very sincerely,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

AMERICAN POLICY IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on January 9 I delivered an address in this body on American policy in the Far East. Therein I endeavored to outline a proposal for American action with respect to Formosa, which is threatened with invasion by the Chinese Communists. Stated briefly, my proposal was that the United States should sponsor and support a program of political reform and economic rehabilitation on the island, by agreement with the Chinese Nationalists and the Formosan people; that negotiation should be undertaken to the end that aggressive hostilities from Formosa against the Chinese mainland should be suspended; and that the United States should undertake to join in the defense of Formosa, together with the existing defending forces there, in the case of an actual invasion attempt by the Chinese Communists on the mainland. I stressed my belief that we, as the occupying power in Japan, had a definite responsibility for Formosa, a former Japanese possession whose sovereignty is still uncertain pending the completion of a peace treaty with Japan.

Since making that address, I have been disturbed by continued reports in the press that I was advocating forcible American seizure of Formosa, or an indefinite military occupation there with American troops. In particular, I noticed a column in the New York Times of Sunday, January 15, by the distinguished journalist Arthur Krock, which described my position as a maximum proposal that the Army should occupy Formosa indefinitely.

Because of my feeling that this statement reflected a seriously mistaken impression as to my real position on this vital question, I prepared a detailed letter to Mr. Krock setting forth the background of my views, which I sent to him on January 18. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this letter inserted in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in Formosa the United States has a priceless opportunity to take peaceful action in support of democracy and economic reform, and against the further encroachment of communism in the Pacific. I believe that we can find a way of making our ideal effective in the Formosa situation without involving ourselves in a vast and unpredictable military commitment. As I have said repeatedly, I see no need to send a single American soldier to Formosa. I still hold to my belief set forth in my report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on December 1, that one of the crucial errors of recent American policy in China has been the conclusion that the only alternative to further military aid was complete abandonment or at least temporary inaction.

The future of Formosa is an unwritten page of history. There is today a possibility that an independent republic can eventually be established there. There is today a strong possibility for a peaceful development on that island which will implement the ideals which America holds in common with the vast majority of far-eastern peoples—national independence, economic development, and personal freedom. It is up to the United States to face the ruthless ideological power of communism by exerting itself in this area, everywhere in the world, in support of the precious human values, which we Americans believe in.

EXHIBIT 1

JANUARY 18, 1950.

Mr. ARTHUR KROCK,
New York Times Bureau,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR ARTHUR: I very much appreciate your letter of January 16 with the clippings from the New York Times (which I return herewith), giving your reasons for stating in your column of January 15 that my proposal was "that the Army should occupy Formosa indefinitely."

From various press accounts, including those in the Times, I had been aware for some time that the press had not fully understood my position on the Formosa question. In my speech in the Senate on January 9 I endeavored to make that position entirely clear, but I quite understand how you and other members of the press, on the basis of my earlier statements, might have mistaken my true meaning.

In the hope of clarifying this misunderstanding, I am writing now to give you some of the background of my thinking on the Formosa problem, and particularly on the question of occupation. I appreciate your courteous offer to write further on this subject, and leave it to your judgment whether or not to do so in light of what follows. * * *

Most of what I have said on this subject appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 9, pages 150 to 170. Let me first quote certain passages bearing on the matter of occupation.

1. From my letter to Secretary Acheson, November 4, 1949:

"If we can still take the position that technically it (Formosa) is part of Japan, and that as we are occupying Japan we have a responsibility for all Japanese possessions, we could, I believe, perfectly consistently take it over by our occupancy, with notice to the United Nations that it might be made a trusteeship area. This should be done in collaboration with the Nationalist Govern-

ment that is there and with the Taiwan people themselves, who I believe would be anxious to take such a step. If this were done, the Chinese Communists would be faced with the responsibility of attacking the United States if they attacked Formosa under these conditions."

2. From my report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, December 1, 1949, the following item 4 in my list of Specific Immediate Recommendations:

"4. Program of reform and rehabilitation—no military aid.

"While I would recommend that we continue our present recognition of the Nationalist Government as long as it survives, I would leave the question of further military aid to the discretion of the President. * * * As a policy we should emphasize primarily the importance of the development of an ideological program of reform and rehabilitation, which should be practically applied immediately in the areas still occupied by the Nationalists.

"What I mean by this is that there should be developed a reform program in the non-Communist western provinces, in the area of Chungking (until and unless Chungking falls), on the island of Hainan, and particularly on the island of Formosa. On the island of Formosa there is an outstanding opportunity to develop for the Formosan people themselves a program which would mean the assurance of their freedom and the rehabilitation of their industries, and especially of their agriculture. I believe that this possibility should be explored immediately with the Nationalist Government now in control of Formosa and with the Taiwan people themselves, who are opposed both to the Chinese Communists and also to the Nationalists. I believe that the Taiwan people would cooperate with the Nationalist Government in setting up through our ECA operations a type of recovery which might be an example to other provinces in China now in desperate need. Furthermore, Formosa is ideally located for the development of our Voice of America program which, however, I would not call the Voice of America, but rather the voice of the New China."

3. And, immediately following, this passage from my fifth recommendation:

"5. Formosa must not fall into hostile hands.

"At the present moment Formosa has an uncertain legal status. It was a part of Japan prior to World War II. It is occupied today by the Chinese Nationalist forces because it was agreed at Cairo that it would be returned to China at the conclusion of the Japanese war. Technically, however, until the peace treaty with Japan is ratified the area is still a part of Japanese territory and could be included in our Japanese military occupation. I recommend that this situation be carefully explored with the further recommendation that any possible steps taken should be reported at once to the United Nations with an expression of determination on our part to keep the island out of the war area and to assist in its economic development."

4. From my letter to Secretary Acheson, December 27, 1949, the first two of the four recommendations I made therein:

"I. The United States should immediately engage in informal conversations with Mr. K. C. Wu, the new Governor of Formosa, with the purpose of arranging for the occupation of the island by the United States. Since the United States, representing the conquerors of Japan, is now in occupation of Japan the logic of the situation would seem to suggest that the United States should also be in friendly and peaceful occupation of Formosa until such time as the ultimate sovereignty of the island is determined. Inasmuch as the Chinese Nationalist Government was our ally in the last war and is still recognized as the legitimate government of China, we might consider a joint occupation pending the conclusion of the Japanese peace treaty.

"II. The United States should explore with the Nationalist Government the possibility during the occupation of either (a) the suspension of aggressive hostilities against the Communists, including the blockade, or (b) carrying on such activity from some base other than Formosa, such as Hainan. The success of any further aggressive action on the part of the Nationalist Government appears extremely doubtful and the Nationalist Government might welcome the opportunity for the temporary cessation of hostilities during the period of this occupation. The Nationalist Government would be supported by the United States if necessary against aggression by any outside force, but it should preferably not be used during the period of occupation as a base for aggressive operations against the Communists on the mainland."

5. From my January 9 speech itself, in which I discussed the above recommendations as follows:

"Here I want to make it clear, Mr. President, that by the word 'occupation' I do not mean to imply the sending of American troops to Formosa, but simply the establishment of a joint political authority and responsibility there between ourselves, the Nationalists, and the Formosan people. I do not think it is necessary to send a single soldier there. I think this matter can be approached from the other angle."

And after this discussion I continued as follows:

"My purpose in proposing such a policy is twofold: to avoid the antidemocratic and antiprogressive influence of the armed camp on Formosa, so that reasonable hope may be entertained for political and economic progress; and—even more vital from the standpoint of American interests—to avoid the possibility that our intervention in Formosa would draw us into an unlimited military commitment and an eventual shooting match with the Communists and even the Russians.

"For this purpose the United States might well go beyond the above suggestion. I believe the United States could and should make the following stipulations, or should at least explore them, as a prior condition of our giving aid to the Formosa regime:

"First. All aggressive action against the Communists from Formosa shall cease. Remaining military activity on Formosa shall be restricted entirely to a defensive state of readiness against the possibility of Communist assault on the island from the mainland.

"Second. Formosa shall be governed by a regime jointly agreed upon by the Chinese Nationalists and by representatives of the native population. The policy of this regime shall be to develop the economy of the island for the benefit of the population, and to establish firmly the institutions and practices of democratic self-government.

"I ask my colleagues to note this (next) point, because this is one, of course, which has controversial features, but I submit it as a sound approach:

"Third. Under its authority as the occupying power in Japan, the United States will supervise the carrying out of these conditions and will guarantee the nonaggressive status of the island. American authority over Formosa will continue, on the terms laid down, until further determination of the island's status under the Japanese peace treaty. All these steps, and the policy underlying them, would be reported by us at once to the United Nations. * * *

"Under such a formula, in my judgment, the United States could still pursue its historic policy of friendship and support for a free Chinese people without assuming a dangerous and unlimited military commitment, and without giving aid and comfort to any Nationalist leaders who may entertain the foolish notion that American aid will help them reconquer China from Formosa by force of arms. I think such a formula, by granting an adequate defense to the Nationalists on Formosa—because that is what we would do—while committing them to foreswear any aggressive intentions, would go far to deter the Communists from an invasion attempt. But at that point, we can think in terms of the suggestion by former President Hoover and by our colleague the Senator from Ohio, Mr. TAFT, namely, that on the defensive side it might be well or necessary to send a few warships into the area. I am thinking only in terms of defense and eliminating all possibility of aggressive warfare on the island."

6. From a list of questions which I submitted to the Secretary of State, at a meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee on January 13:

"Would you as Secretary of State be willing to recommend to the President that the United States cooperate in exploring the possibility of making Formosa a neutralized independent republic with a democratic form of government under the defensive protection of the United States for a fixed period of time until the disposition of the island has been determined by the Japanese peace treaty, or until the United Nations is willing and able to assume full protective responsibility?

"Would the Department of State and the administration be willing to consider the submission to the World Court the question of the legal status of Formosa pending the signing and ratification of the Japanese peace treaty?"

From this record it seems to me that the following points deserve to be made respecting my position:

1. I have never recommended sending American troops to Formosa.

2. I have never suggested that the United States seize the island, or that we undertake any responsibility there without the full agreement of the Chinese and Taiwan people.

3. I have never proposed an American intervention of indefinite duration, but have always urged that it end with the determination of the legal status of Formosa under the Japanese peace treaty, which I hope will be concluded at an early date.

4. I have never proposed that the United States underwrite a Nationalist counteroffensive from Formosa against the mainland.

5. I have repeatedly sought to emphasize peaceful and constructive activity and to avoid an over-emphasis on military activity, which, in my view, has hitherto characterized our policy in China and has contributed to the collapse of the Nationalist cause. This is in line with my conviction that the Communist success has been due fundamentally not to military but to psychological factors, and that we must win over them in the war of ideas if we are to win at all.

I stress these points because there has been a tendency in the press, which has disturbed me greatly, to interpret my position as an advocacy of an American imperialist venture of some sort, backed up by military might and nothing else. I am entirely opposed to any such course, as a reading of my public statements will show. To reemphasize this, let me add only these two statements from my report of December 1:

(a) At the end of part III, the Problem of China:

"In my judgment, we have overlooked a far more important factor than mere military might. That factor is what might be called the psychological or ideological factor which could have meant support and backing for those high-minded Chinese whom we well knew and who were seeking reform and who should never have been given the discouragement that came from the feeling that their old traditional friend, the United States, had abandoned them in their time of greatest crisis."

(b) From item No. 1 in part IV, "Overall Observations":

"It is immediately obvious to anyone visiting the Far East that there is a widespread yearning among the peoples in this area to express their own nationalism and to be free from external controls. There is definitely a revolt against imperialism in any form and the traditional colonialism. * * * Whatever policy we adopt in the future must recognize this normal and commendable urge for self-expression."

In light of the foregoing, I cannot help thinking that to say I propose "That the Army should occupy Formosa indefinitely" does not accurately reflect my position, not only as to what I have specifically proposed in a military way, but—more important—as to the peaceful, constructive, nonmilitary approach which I believe is of the highest importance and which I have always sought to emphasize.

I very much appreciate your thoughtfulness in this matter, and will be happy to talk further with you about it at any time.

Always cordially yours,

H. ALEXANDER SMITH.

NOMINATION OF ADMIRAL FORREST P. SHERMAN TO BE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination temporarily passed over will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of admiral, for a term of 4 years.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I wish to make it clear at the outset of what I have to say that I do not oppose the confirmation of the nomination of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman. I am told, and I believe, that he is a man of high character and distinguished achievement, and that he is qualified to act in the important position of Chief of Naval Operations and to serve as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

My purpose is to register my emphatic disapproval of the removal of Admiral Louis E. Denfeld from the post now to be occupied by Admiral Sherman and the manner in which the removal of Admiral Denfeld was brought about. I believe that the facts connected with Admiral Denfeld's removal, if fully understood by the Congress and by the American people, "will plead like angels trumpet tongued."

In order to make my position known, I should say that I do not have the pleasure of a personal acquaintance with either Admiral Sherman or his predecessor, Admiral Denfeld. My only personal experience in the armed forces has been in the infantry. I have never had, and do not now have, any personal contact with the Navy. In this matter my interest is, not in personalities, but in principles. I am against neither the Army, nor the Navy, nor the Air Force. I am for justice. I am for the Constitution.

Two important principles are here involved:

First, justice is the end of government; and a grave injustice has been done a distinguished officer.

Second, the dignity and the position of the Congress as a separate and coordinate branch of the Government are challenged.

I realize fully the power and the authority of the Presidency that is marshaled to sustain and support what has been done. I am encouraged, Mr. President, by the knowledge that in a really just cause the weak in the end may conquer the strong.

APPEARANCE OF ADMIRAL DENFELD BEFORE A HOUSE COMMITTEE

As Senators will recall, last fall grave charges were made involving our national defense. Accusations were voiced that the security of the Nation was imperiled by basic disagreements within the Department of Defense, particularly with regard to carrying out the so-called unification law. The House Armed Services Committee, after deliberation, ordered an investigation. Admiral Denfeld was called as a witness. No one can question at this late date the constitutional right of the House to inform itself, through committees of inquiry, on subjects which fall within its legislative competence. In the case of *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* (273 U. S. 135, decided in 1926), the Supreme Court said:

. A legislative body cannot legislate wisely or effectively in the absence of information respecting the conditions which the legislation is intended to affect or change; and where the legislative body does not itself possess the requisite information—which not infrequently is true—recourse must be had to others who do possess it.

It is well understood that this prerogative in Congress is limited by the right of the President to have his subordinates refuse to testify either in court or before a committee of Congress concerning matters of confidence between them and himself.

At the time when this matter arose, Admiral Denfeld was a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Section 202, subsection (c), paragraph 6, of the National Security Act, as amended, provides:

No provision of this act shall be so construed as to prevent a Secretary of a military department or a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff from presenting to the Congress on his own initiative, after first informing the Secretary of Defense, any recommendation relating to the Department of Defense that he may deem proper.

It is unnecessary for us to consider whether or not the President could have prevented Admiral Denfeld's appearance before a committee of the Congress if he had desired to do so. That is beside the point. The President, in fact, offered no objection. Admiral Denfeld appeared with the knowledge and approval of the Secretary of Defense. Once having appeared before the committee, it became his duty as a witness to give the committee his best judgment, without bias or reservation, on such matters involving the national defense as to which inquiry should be made of him.

For Admiral Denfeld or any of the other witnesses to have done otherwise would have reflected on their good faith and their qualifications to hold a high place in the armed forces. Admiral Denfeld, therefore, had no alternative but to present the facts as he saw them.

PROMISE OF IMMUNITY

Now we come, Mr. President, to the real crux of this matter, as I see it. Admiral Denfeld and other witnesses who appeared before the House committee were promised that there would be no reprisals as a result of their testimony.

Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, testifying before the House committee on August 23, 1949, in connection with the investigation of the B–36 bomber program, stated:

Every department, agency, and individual has been and will be available for free and complete testimony at your call.

After Mr. Johnson had concluded his prepared statement on that question, Representative DEWEY SHORT, a distinguished Member of the House from my State of Missouri, questioned Mr. Johnson closely on this phase of his testimony. Here verbatim is the colloquy which occurred:

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Secretary, it is very reassuring to have you state in your well-prepared statement that there was no censorship, no suppression, and there will be none.

Secretary JOHNSON. That is right.

Mr. SHORT. One of the finest sentences in your entire statement is on page 1 where I think you correctly stated, in discussing the cooperation of your Department with counsel and this committee, at the end of the first paragraph: "Every department, agency, and individual has been and will be available for free and complete testimony at your call."

Secretary JOHNSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHORT. Without any witness having entertained the slightest notion of suffering reprisal.

Secretary JOHNSON. That is correct.

Mr. SHORT. It is unthinkable that a man, occupying your high office, which perhaps is the most powerful next to the President of the United States, would penalize any department or any agency or any individual to be called here to testify before this committee.

Secretary JOHNSON. They will not, and have not.

Mr. SHORT. I have felt that and I am very glad that you incorporated that statement in your prepared testimony, so that if we happen to have some members of other branches of the armed services testify here, whose testimony would conflict with the testimony that other witnesses have given, they need not fear any reprisal or suffer any reprisal.

Secretary JOHNSON. You may from this record reassure them if they need such, which I doubt.

On October 6, 1949, the House Armed Services Committee began hearings on unification and strategy affecting the national defense program. Before commencing with the testimony of the witnesses, Chairman VINSON, of the committee, made a brief introductory statement. He said:

I would like to say on behalf of the committee, although I believe this comment is probably unnecessary, that it is the intent of the committee that all testimony given shall be frankly and freely given and be given without reprisals in the Department of Defense against any individual presenting testimony during the course of these hearings.

This committee will not permit nor tolerate any reprisals against any witness in these hearings, nor will we permit nor tolerate any shepherding of the testimony being presented. We want these witnesses to speak what is in their minds, to put their cards on the table, and to do so without hesitation or personal concern. We are going to the bottom of this unrest and concern in the Navy. And the committee expects full cooperation in this effort from the Department of Defense.

Secretary of the Navy Matthews, when he testified a few minutes later, stated:

All of us in the Navy desire to cooperate with your committee in every possible way. To that end, let me assure the committee that any naval officer or enlisted man or any Navy civilian whom your committee wants to hear, or who desires to be heard by your committee, is completely free to testify. There has been no censorship. There will be none.

THE TESTIMONY OF ADMIRAL DENFELD

On the basis of the unequivocal assurance given by the administration that there would be no reprisals, no walking the plank, Admiral Denfeld proceeded to present to the House committee certain criticisms of the policies then being carried out by the Department of National Defense. For example, the admiral gave it as his opinion that "the Navy is not accepted in full partnership in the national-defense structure."

THE IMPLICATIONS OF ADMIRAL DENFELD'S REMOVAL

The committee hearings were concluded on October 21, 1949. On October 27, 6 days later, President Truman appointed a successor to Admiral Denfeld and thereby brought about his removal. Admiral Denfeld was summarily removed from his post, despite the fact that he had been reappointed to a second term of 2 years as Chief of Naval Operations less than 2 months before he was removed. Despite the denial of the administration that Admiral Denfeld's removal was an act of recrimination, it is apparent that what caused the change of heart in the 2 months' interval was the fact that the admiral had seen fit to express, with commendable frankness, his deeply felt conviction before a committee of the Congress. There is ground to believe that the manner in which the announcement of the admiral's removal was made—that is, the President made his action known to the press before notifying Admiral Denfeld—was part and parcel of a calculated pattern of intimidation. At any rate, it emphasizes the extent to which the administration may go to slap down those who dare oppose it.

Mr. President, far more is involved here than the scuttling of the career of a single officer, a fine and valuable officer though he may be. The well-being of the Republic is endangered by the dictatorial attitude and actions of the administration. Basically, what is involved is this: Is the Congress to continue as a coordinate branch of the Government, as provided by the Constitution, or will it permit itself to be relegated to the status of the Roman Senate under Diocletian, to the condition of the Estates General under Louis XIV, to the state of the Reichstag under Hitler?

Unless the Congress through its committees is able to obtain factual and unbiased information from the administration, unless the members of the Military Establishment and those of all executive agencies of the Government are permitted to express their opinions without fear of reprisal and recrimination, then Congress cannot obtain the facts it requires. It will no longer be able to legislate wisely. Its functions would be usurped by the executive branch. Representative government, for all practical purposes, would no longer exist in the United States.

Mr. President, Secretary of the Navy Matthews appeared before the Senate Armed Services Committee on January 12. As shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 18, 1950, at page 534, Secretary Matthews summed up his position in the following language:

Secretary MATTHEWS. It is not a matter, in my judgment, as to where he expresses that opinion. The important thing is that he entertains that conviction in opposition to his superior officer.

Admiral Denfeld was purged, then, not because he failed to execute his duty as a member of the armed forces, but because he chose to exercise his prerogative—his precious privilege as an American citizen—to think. There is no evidence indicating that Admiral Denfeld at any time refused or failed to carry out an order from his superiors or to perform his duties to the best of his ability. But because he happened to entertain thoughts at variance with certain of the policies laid down by his superiors, and because he exercised the privilege accorded him by law to inform the Congress of his belief, he was dismissed.

Has the administration instituted a thought-control policy designed to snuff out independent thinking on the part of the members of the armed services?

Do those who dare to entertain thoughts of their own, or to present their honest views when called on to do so by the Congress, face humiliation, degradation, and the loss of their careers?

The administration's program to control the thoughts and to standardize the mental operations of our high-ranking military officers will surely have a profound effect on officials of the other executive agencies. How many of those officials who value their positions and reputations will dare to come before the Congress and testify fully, freely, and frankly when their views are in conflict with policies laid down by the administration?

Mr. President, we should never forget that the Chief Executive of the United States possesses what our forefathers referred to as the "power of the sword." Our forefathers realized the importance of checks on this power if our Republic was to avoid the fate of other nations that have passed into oblivion in the processes of time.

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution provides:

The Congress shall have power * * * to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

Congress alone can declare war.

It is the responsibility of the Congress "to raise and support armies."

In passing the unification law it was not the intention of the Congress to forfeit these constitutional powers to the executive branch of our Government. Indeed, any such action would be a fatal blow to freedom. The liberty of the people depends on the steadfastness with which Congress can impose proper restraints upon him who possesses, for the time being, the "power of the sword" and, incidentally, upon the bureaucrats appointed by him.

Mr. President, the independence, the honor, and the constitutional prerogatives of the Congress have been directly challenged. We want no dictators in this country, either civilian or military. There is no room for them on the free soil of America. Congress must not permit itself to be thwarted and its lawful functions undermined by the executive branch of the Government. The separation of the powers of government provided in the Constitution must remain intact. The Congress must continue to operate as the founding fathers intended. It must persist as a coordinate branch of the Government.

Mr. President, it is unnecessary for me to say that our Committee on Armed Forces has the confidence of this body. I express the hope that two matters of great urgency will receive its prompt attention. I trust the committee will proceed:

First, to investigate and lay before the Senate all of the facts and circumstances connected with the removal of Admiral Denfeld from his post as Chief of Naval Operations. This is the people's business. It involves the national defense, the safety, and security of us all. The people want the facts and are entitled to no less than all the facts.

Second, to bring in, if possible, legislation that will (a) safeguard the right of committees of the Congress to receive the unbiased and uncoerced testimony of members of the armed forces; (b) protect from reprisal and disciplinary action any members of the armed forces—from private to general, from seaman to admiral—who may, in good faith, give testimony before a committee of the Congress not in accord with the ideas entertained for the time being by the administration or their superior officers.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief statement for the RECORD. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] that it is most unfortunate that in attempting to unify the military services the impact which has occurred from the removal of Admiral Denfeld and the nomination of Admiral Sherman to take his place has had such an effect upon the Navy and upon all the military branches of the service.

I voted for the unification bill. I believe in it, and I think the sooner the provisions of the unification law are placed in full operation the sooner there will develop a more efficient and a more economical military service all the way through, and I am satisfied that the results will be most gratifying.

I also feel that it has been rather difficult, possibly, to merge the three military branches. For that reason the impact which I have referred to has been severe. Whether what was done could have been done in some other way, of course, is a matter of opinion. I think it should have been done according to the constitutional processes so ably discussed by the junior Senator from Missouri.

With that preface, Mr. President, let me say that on the showing which has

been made I should very much have preferred to have the matter cleared up in the Armed Services Committee, and then to accept or reject the report of the committee in connection with the confirmation of the nomination of Admiral Sherman. I shall vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Admiral Sherman. In so doing, however, I do not want my vote to be taken as being in any way a criticism of the efficient work done previously by Admiral Denfeld.

I do not know Admiral Sherman. I have met, consulted, and conversed with Admiral Denfeld many times. I always found him to be a very courteous gentleman, and, so far as my contacts with him are concerned, the information he gave me was trustworthy. I believe him, and I think he is a very fine gentleman.

Neither do I want to say, Mr. President, that my vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Admiral Sherman enters at all into the discussions had with the Secretary of the Navy. We have, up to this moment, certain allegations presented on the floor of the Senate. As I have said before, I think all that should have been adduced before the Armed Services Committee, with a report by the committee for the Senate to accept or to reject. The charges made relative to the Secretary of the Navy might have been used as possible guideposts in voting for the confirmation of the nomination of Admiral Sherman.

Mr. President, as a Nebraskan, I wish to say unqualifiedly, without regard to the charge of incompetency, or to the politics of the situation, that the Secretary of the Navy is a man who is held in unquestioned repute in my State. His veracity, to my knowledge, has never been questioned. He is a fine man and he has a fine family.

I desire the RECORD to show that, as I said in the beginning, as I vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Admiral Sherman the question of competency of the Secretary of the Navy does not enter into the question at all. Allegations have been made, but evidence supporting them has not been adduced, and we are not passing upon that question in the vote on the confirmation of the nomination of Admiral Sherman.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say while the impact has been severe, it is the job of the administration to effect and perfect unification. It must be done in order to reduce the amount of money required for our national defense at this time. We need every dollar to provide the best and the most efficient national defense possible. Therefore we must unify the services at all costs.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished minority leader for the fine attitude he takes toward a fellow citizen of his home State. The recommendation which has been given by the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska coincides with what the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] said only 2 or 3 days ago with respect to Mr. Matthews. I think their attitude is very praiseworthy and I feel that the majority leader should compliment both Senators from Nebraska with respect to the remarks they have made regarding the distinguished Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Matthews. It is especially gratifying that both of the Senators who have spoken so highly regarding the honesty and integrity of Mr. Matthews are Republicans, while Mr. Matthews is a Democrat.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have a message which I should like to impart to the Senator. I wish to repeat to the Senate a telephone conversation I had this morning with Admiral Denfeld, which I think will be of interest to all Senators. But first I should like briefly to touch upon what came before the Senate yesterday.

Yesterday we were presented with a letter from Matthews in which he stated that the President had removed Admiral Denfeld. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] who, I am sorry to say is not on the floor at this time, submitted certain documents. Today I asked the Senator if those were the only documents dealing with this subject, and he said they were.

Mr. President, I find, surprisingly, that there is nothing in those documents to indicate that the President ever removed Admiral Denfeld.

After discovering that the President had never himself accomplished this removal, I started checking into the legal question of delivery of Admiral Denfeld's commission. That question was raised by Secretary Matthews in his letter to Mr. TYDINGS. The Secretary said that there had never been a legal delivery of the commission, and therefore that Denfeld had never been appointed.

In going over all the available cases, I found the decision rendered by Chief Justice Marshall in the case of Marbury against Madison, which I think is directly in point. In that case Chief Justice Marshall said that the signing and the affixing of the seal were sufficient. The Marbury case was an action to obtain possession of a commission. The appointed officer had never been given possession of the commission, and Chief Justice Marshall said that the signing and the affixing of the seal were sufficient without physical delivery.

The President never having removed Admiral Denfeld as Chief of Naval Operations and the commission having been properly issued it would therefore appear that Admiral Denfeld is still Chief of Naval Operations. I therefore took it upon myself to call Admiral Denfeld. I told him that I and a number of other Senators were in a very embarrassing position today. I told him that we either had to vote against the confirmation of Admiral Sherman, a man whom I consider an outstanding officer, or to vote to continue to have no recognized Chief of Naval Operations; that if, on the other hand, we voted for the confirmation of Admiral Sherman, such a vote could be misconstrued in some quarters as an indication that we were placing our stamp of approval upon the very shoddy treatment given to Admiral Denfeld, and it might mean we were placing our stamp of approval upon the method of his dismissal; but, more important still, in the future it might be taken as a precedent for the legal proposition that the President or the Secretary of the Navy, as in this case, could remove at will, and without stating any cause therefor, a statutory officer who had been appointed for a specific term and whose nomination had been confirmed by the Senate.

I told Admiral Denfeld that I was very curious to know what his position was, whether he claims that he is the Chief of Naval Operations or not. He agreed with the statement, without referring to it, made on the floor the other day by several Senators, including the Senator from Massachusetts, that it would be unfortunate for the Navy and for the entire Defense Establishment to continue without a recognized Chief of Naval Operations. He agreed with me that those of us who felt strongly on this legal proposition as to whether or not there was actually a vacancy were in an unusual position. He did, however, wish to discuss that legal proposition. He told me, however, that in order to remove any doubt, he is now resigning as Chief of Naval Operations, so that the Senate may freely vote on the confirmation of Admiral Sherman. He also told me that he considered Admiral Sherman to be an outstanding naval officer, and that in his opinion he would make an exceedingly able Chief of Naval Operations. Admiral Denfeld did not give me this message for formal transmission to the Senate. He is not in a position to do that. However, I am sure that he would have no objection whatever to my telling the Senate, first, that he is going to resign as Chief of Naval Operations, so that there will be no doubt whatsoever about a vacancy in the Office; and, second, that he considers Admiral Sherman to be a highly qualified officer for the position to which he has been nominated.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Keeping in mind the discussion which took place yesterday, to the effect that the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, under the Constitution has the power to remove a military officer and to make changes in the Military Establishment, does the Senator not also have in mind that even that power of the President has certain limitations placed upon it, namely, that an officer cannot be thrown out of the Army, for instance, without having an opportunity to appear before a court martial, or a board where his case may be outlined, and that an enlisted man cannot be summarily removed from the service without being given the opportunity to present his case? While no restrictions are placed on the President of the United States in exercising his constitutional power as Commander in Chief, there is a proper way in which that should be done, and unless that proper method is followed, the Unification Act, which sets up the Joint Chiefs of Staff, might itself be placed in jeopardy. Has the Senator gone into that phase of the matter at all?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, to a considerable extent. I had not planned to dis-

cuss it, but the Senator is 100 percent correct. Let us take the case of a second lieutenant in the Army. The President cannot remove him. He can suspend him and order a court martial. There the young officer has a right to defend himself, and the charges against him must be proved. That is the procedure up and down the line, and I think it is doubly applicable to a situation involving officers whose nominations must be confirmed by the Senate. Of course, the appointment of every commissioned officer must be confirmed by the Senate. However, in this case an officer was confirmed by the Senate to hold an office for a specific period of time, and the Secretary of the Navy obviously did not have the power to remove him, as he did. It must be understood that the President did not remove him, even though Mr. Matthews so indicates in his letter. When I say that, Mr. President, I am assuming that the Senator from Maryland has submitted all the documents on this matter. I have no personal investigation for such documents.

Returning to the letter of Secretary Matthews, let me say that I have had some experience as a lawyer, I have had some experience as a judge, and while I was in the service, between combat tours, I had considerable experience in representing men in my unit before courts martial. I am firmly convinced that the President could not in this case remove Admiral Denfeld in the manner in which Mr. Matthews indicated the President had removed him. That is one of the reasons I am happy that Admiral Denfeld has said he is resigning, in order to clear up the matter. I believe it is very important to have it clear in the RECORD at this time—and I am sure other Senators feel the same way—that we are not establishing any legal precedent, which might in the future be misconstrued, giving the President a power which many of us believe he does not possess.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an additional question?

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Keeping in mind the Unification Act, which sets up the Joint Chiefs and provides for their confirmation by the Senate, and now the chairman of the Joint Chiefs, who is also subject to confirmation by the Senate, certainly there must be some limitations meant by the Congress, so that any removal at least would follow an orderly procedure. I think a person can maintain that position without in any way questioning the ultimate legal authority of the President to make a change. But I believe it certainly is indicated that changes should not be made haphazardly, and certainly not without giving the officer involved an opportunity at least to present his side of the case, which is the customary practice.

The President could even suspend, I rather assume, either the chairman of the Joint Chiefs——

Mr. McCARTHY. I think he could do that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Or the Chief of Naval Operations, or the Chief of Staff of the Air Forces, or the Chief of Staff of the Army, temporarily relieve him from his duties, and then set in motion whatever the proper procedure would be to create a vacancy. But it seems to me that in view of the fact that the Congress provided that those appointed to these positions should be subject to Senate confirmation, and also in view of the fact that, for instance, the Joint Chiefs, and in some cases the Chiefs themselves, serve on other bodies, such as the War Council, there are of necessity certain restrictions which should surround the position an appointee to which has to be confirmed by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in my opinion that is the best legal statement of the situation I have ever heard, either by a lawyer or a nonlawyer—and I understand the Senator from California is not a lawyer. I think he would make a good one.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WITHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to address a question to the distinguished Senator in order to make the situation a little clearer in the RECORD. Is it now the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin that Admiral Denfeld, rather than to rely upon any legal question, and in the interest of the Navy and the interest of the Nation, lays no claim whatever to occupying at this time the post of Chief of Naval Operations?

Mr. McCARTHY. He is ready to submit his formal resignation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Pursuing the matter further by an additional question, it seems to me that two different things are mentioned in the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin. One, the intention to make a resignation effective, and the other, the question of laying no claim at this time to occupancy of the office. I was strongly hopeful that the Senator would be able to say to the Senate that the distinguished naval officer, Admiral Denfeld, now lays no claim whatever to the post by reason of the fact that he does not desire to rely upon mere legal questions, and does place the good of the Navy and the good of the Nation first, and for those reasons has decided to advise the Senate that he lays no claim whatsoever at this time to occupancy of the distinguished office.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not sure that I follow the Senator. The Senator understands that Admiral Denfeld, so far as I know, is not a lawyer. I would not under any circumstances ask him to pass upon such an involved constitutional question. The courts have differed upon such questions. For example, in the decision in the Humphrey case, the Court stated that there remains an area in which there is doubt, which is left to the future for legal decision. Admiral Denfeld's case may be in that area.

I would not ask the admiral to pass upon that legal question. When he says, in order to leave no questions in the minds of any Senators, "I am submitting my resignation," that is certainly all he could possibly do.

I may say that if Admiral Denfeld had tried to give me a legal opinion—which he did not—as to whether he is legally Chief of Naval Operations as of today, I would not have transmitted that to the Senate, because I do not think the admiral has the legal background which qualifies him to answer that technical, involved constitutional question.

Mr. President, in view of the decision in the case of *Marbury* v. *Madison*, which holds that when a commission is signed and sealed the appointment has been accomplished, in view of the fact that the President has not taken any action whatsoever—the Senator understands that I qualify this by saying I am relying upon the documents submitted by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]—in view of the fact that the President took no action whatsoever except in his memo of October 22, in which he said to the Secretary of the Navy, "I accordingly hereby authorize you to arrange for and carry out the transfer which you recommend," in which memorandum he does not refer to Admiral Denfeld (but is a part of a sequence of documents, which may indicate that he had Admiral Denfeld in mind); and, plus the fact that the Secretary of the Navy does not have the power of removal, as of this moment Admiral Denfeld is Chief of Naval Operations.

Therefore I think we owe Admiral Denfeld a deep vote of thanks for saying, "So far as I am concerned I am going to create a vacancy so the Senate may act on Admiral Sherman's nomination. I am submitting my resignation." That is certainly a highly patriotic thing for him to do. Then he goes further and says, "I think the new appointee whose nomination you are considering, Admiral Sherman, is an outstanding naval officer, and I believe he will do an excellent job as Chief of Naval Operations." There is most certainly nothing more that anyone could ask of Admiral Denfeld after the very shabby treatment he has received.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Missouri, unless the Senator from Florida has not completed his questioning.

Mr. HOLLAND. I had another question, but that is all right.

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] inquired whether or not the Senator from Wisconsin is stating that Admiral Denfeld lays no claim to the office. Does the Senator from Wisconsin understand that whether or not Admiral Denfeld lays claim to the office is determinative of the legal situation, of the right of the President to nominate Admiral Sherman? Let me perhaps clarify the question a little.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think I understand it.

Mr. DONNELL. If at the time the nomination was made by the President there was no vacancy, can Admiral Denfeld now, weeks or months after the nomination was made, come forward and, by laying no claim to the office, make valid a nomination which, I take it, in

the opinion of the Senator from Wisconsin, was void at the time it was made?

Mr. McCARTHY. I would not agree with the Senator from Missouri on that. Let us go back a step. Many times in the past we have confirmed men for positions in which there was presently no vacancy. The confirmations were to take effect at some future time. For example, when the Senate confirmed Admiral Denfeld on August 15, we confirmed him for a term starting December 15. I think we could have confirmed Admiral Sherman, or any other admiral, on August 15, for a term that was to commence on December 15.

Now, I sincerely hope that the waters are not muddied by the issuance of a commission dated prior to Admiral Denfeld's resignation. We have the situation cleared up now, and I sincerely hope that Admiral Sherman will not be sworn prior to Admiral Denfeld's resignation.

I repeat: I think that regardless of whether there was a vacancy at the time the President made the nomination we can confirm now that we know there will be a vacancy in the very imminent future.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What the Senator from Wisconsin is saying in substance is that Admiral Denfeld says he is no lawyer, he does not know the effect of his resignation, but in the interest of clarifying the whole situation, in the interest of the country, and of the Navy, he is submitting his resignation for what that piece of paper may be worth. Is not that the situation? He does not claim to go into the legal effect of his resignation at this time; he simply submits it in order to make the situation perfectly clear?

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say I recited to Admiral Denfeld the statement which the Senator from Massachusetts made on the floor of the Senate yesterday, the position which the Senator took that we should have a Chief of Naval Operations, and that is how Admiral Denfeld feels also. I think I have answered the Senator's question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. It will be necessary for me to make a brief statement prior to the phrasing of my question. I am not disturbed by the question which seems to be disturbing the Senator from Wisconsin. I do not believe that there is a situation under which there is a question as to whether a vacancy existed at the time of this appointment. It seems to me that this is the situation: We are concerned with two terms of office, one of which would have expired on December 15, and a new one which would have begun on December 15 for a term of 4 years. At the time of the appointment of the successor, Admiral Sherman, on November 2, the opinion of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy shows two ample reasons, in my judgment, for his finding that the post was then vacant, and that the appointment was a valid appointment at that time, because, first, by citing the law and the authorities he makes it perfectly clear that the President was given, by a specific law, the right of removal, and that he exercised that right, and, secondly, he calls attention to the constitutional aspects of the situation under which the President as Commander in Chief has the complete right at any time, by change of the assignment of the officer in question, to accomplish the same result, that is the vacation of his office as Chief of Naval Operations.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me interrupt the Senator at that point.

Mr. HOLLAND. Please let me finish.

Mr. McCARTHY. Very well. I am sorry.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then the Judge Advocate General very tersely, and, I think, successfully, finds that on both grounds he feels that a vacancy existed, and that the interim appointment of November 2 was a valid one.

The other question that comes up has to do with the term of office.

I have read the record carefully. The question has to do with the term of office which would have begun on December 15 of last year under the appointment made by the President, as sent to the Senate and confirmed far ahead of time. It appears that a commission was issued and irregularly delivered, but whether regularly or irregularly delivered, was not accepted. There is no showing of acceptance in the record, no showing of the taking of the oath. There is no showing that anything that transpired did transpire on December 15, but long prior thereto, long prior to the date when that particular appointment for that particular term could have begun and could have been effective.

I fail to find in the RECORD—and I reread it very carefully this morning—anything that even remotely indicates that that particular commission could have become effective, or the appointment under it could have become effective, or the term could have ever begun. So there is nothing to indicate that Admiral Denfeld was there in the office or anywhere about it at that time, that he accepted the appointment as of that date, that he took the oath of office as of that date, or that the term ever began to run; but the record shows quite clearly and to the contrary that the interim appointment to another, to Admiral Sherman, was made back on November 2, was then in force and was operative, and that that interim appointee was in possession of the office and was serving in it on that date, and that there has been no claim whatever on the part of Admiral Denfeld to the occupancy of that office, and no physical occupancy of it since that time, and, in short, no showing whatever that that term ever validly began.

So that now we have before us only the new appointment, which was sent to the Senate by the President on January 5 for a new term of 4 years of the new appointee, Admiral Sherman. So, I am not laboring under any disturbance whatsoever from the question suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The reason for my prior questions is this: I thought that it would be entirely conclusive of the whole matter to have the record clearly show, as I understand is the case, though the Senator has used, I think, confusing words in stating that fact to the Senate, that at this time Admiral Denfeld makes no claim whatever to occupancy of the office, and is erasing himself informally from any position where he might disturb the situation or take a position contrary to the welfare of the Navy or the welfare of the Nation. I think that such a statement would clearly and conclusively clear the deck and clear the record so that there could be no possible feeling that there is any handicap now existing or any obstruction to prevent the early—and I hope it will be early—confirmation of the distinguished officer who succeeds Admiral Denfeld. Both these officers are of such distinction and such patriotic character, and the Nation has so clearly been well served by both of them, and the earlier appointee now removes himself from the picture so graciously, as I understand, that I think it is a pity even further to continue the discussion of something on which there is no difference between the officers, no difference of opinion among us here as to the issue as to how we can best serve the interests of the Navy and the interests of the Nation.

So my question would be this: Is the Senator from Wisconsin now in effect stating to the Senate that, by whatever term he may call it, the distinguished former occupant of the position of Chief of Naval Operation, Admiral Denfeld, is, through the Senator from Wisconsin, advising the Senate that he does not wish longer to hold up in any way or obstruct consideration and confirmation of the appointment of his successor, Admiral Sherman, for whom he has the highest regard, and that he is taking whatever means are necessary immediately to remove himself from the field, and to make it clear that under no circumstances does he want to be regarded as obstructing the immediate confirmation of the nomination of Admiral Sherman? Is that the position of Admiral Denfeld?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator has stated some facts. He said that the Judge Advocate General stated that the President has the authority to remove, and the Senator said that in view of the fact that the President did remove Admiral Denfeld, he was not in office. I point out that that is not the factual situation in which we find ourselves. We have Secretary Matthews' statement that the President removed Admiral Denfeld. However, yesterday the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] submitted certain documents. I asked him earlier today whether those were the only documents available on this subject. He said they were. Those documents indicate that the President never did take that action. Of course, I agree that we are now discussing a moot question. The Senator says we can confirm the nomination of Admiral Sherman because there is, and has been, a vacancy. I say I intend to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Admiral Sherman because Admiral Denfeld, by his action, is creating a vacancy.

But in order that the record may be clear in regard to the type of information Secretary Matthews is giving us, let us

have it understood that there is nothing whatsoever in the record today to show that the President ever did remove Admiral Denfeld. The only document on that subject—and I shall read all of it, because it is short—reads as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., October 27, 1949.

Memorandum for: The Secretary of the Navy, from the President.

Over a long period of time I have devoted considerable thought to various aspects of the problem which you discuss in your letter of today's date.

So as to make the situation clear, let me point out that the Secretary had written the President on that date, saying that he would like to remove Admiral Denfeld. How many other letters he wrote to the President on that day, I do not know.

The President further said:

The action which you recommend meets with my approval.

Accordingly, I hereby authorize you to arrange for and carry out the transfer which you recommend.

So far as we know, the President never even affixed his name to any document saying that Admiral Denfeld was removed from that office. In the document which is produced, he does not mention the position of Chief of Naval Operations; neither does he mention Admiral Denfeld's name. Therefore, so far as I am concerned, there is nothing in the document to show that the President even attempted to remove Admiral Denfeld.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the Senator has taken Secretary Matthews' unsupported statement, when the Senator says the commission was delivered irregularly. I do not know where the Senator gets his information as to what regular delivery is. My thought is that when a document which the President has signed, which the Secretary of the Navy has signed, and which the Secretary of the Navy has sealed, is taken by the President's naval aide to Admiral Denfeld, who is told, "Here is your commission," and then when the Admiral walks into the office of the Secretary of the Navy and says to him, "I have it. Thanks very much," I do not think we can ask for a more complete legal delivery.

I do not think the Senator from Florida is aware of another fact, namely, that the present law provides for a term of office of not less than 4 years for the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. When I state the period for which the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were appointed, I am relying upon my memory. I understand that both the other two members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have been appointed for a 4-year term. However, Admiral Denfeld had previously been appointed for a 2-year term, and the second commission merely extended his term for an additional period of 2 years, so as to make his full term equal to those of the other two members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Whether Admiral Denfeld had to be resworn, I do not know. I think that is a question which the committee should have determined; but, again, it is moot, in view of the fact that Admiral Denfeld is resigning. On that question, I have talked to a number of naval officers of the highest rank available to me. Their opinion differs. Most of them say there is no necessity for a new swearing in, in view of the fact that the commission merely extends the term for which he was originally sworn in. One felt that he had to be resworn.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I merely wish to say that I understand that when such an officer has his term of service extended, it is not customary for him to be sworn again.

Mr. McCARTHY. That seems to be the consensus of opinion among the officers I have contacted, but I may say there is a difference of opinion.

So, Mr. President, now we are discussing a moot question. I agree that with Admiral Denfeld saying, "I am going to file my formal resignation," I now can freely vote for confirmation of the nomination of Admiral Sherman, who is a competent officer.

The Senator says he can vote for confirmation of his nomination because the Secretary of the Navy effectively removed his predecessor. At least, we agree on the end result.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Florida for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Regardless of the fact that I do not at all agree with the Senator from Wisconsin as to the reasons for his position, I compliment him upon that decision. I hope the Senate may now vote, without further delay, upon confirmation of the nomination of a patriotic American to be Chief of Naval Operations, so that this question may become a matter of history, and so that we can proceed to consider other important matters which are pending.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is that a question?

Mr. President, although this disposes of the very important question of confirmation of the nomination of Admiral Sherman to be Chief of Naval Operations, yet there is another matter which during all this discussion I have considered to be of infinitely more importance, a subject which I am afraid has been hidden under the more spectacular developments.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would the Senator from Wisconsin agree to permit the nomination of Admiral Sherman to be confirmed, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. McCARTHY. I prefer to proceed with the discussion.

Mr. President, there is a matter of considerably more importance which is tied into the subject of confirmation of the nomination of Admiral Sherman. I intend to discuss that question at this time. I shall do so very briefly. I share with the two Senators who have just suggested that the Senate speedily confirm the nomination of Admiral Sherman, their sentiments that his nomination should be confirmed. However, whether that is done at this moment or 5 minutes from now does not concern me greatly. For that reason, I intend to discuss this matter, which I consider to be of the utmost importance.

Mr. President, the Secretary of the Navy appeared before the Armed Services Committee. At that appearance, he misstated the facts. As to that, there can be no question. Later, when his erroneous statements were disclosed, a sizable number of the members of the Armed Services Committee—all the members on this side of the aisle, I believe—said that with those new facts at hand, they would like to have the Secretary appear again before the committee, and would like to question him and find out why the committee was misinformed by him. When that statement was made by those members of the committee, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee saw fit to conduct his own personal investigation, chiefly by obtaining a letter from Secretary Matthews. That letter was presented yesterday on the floor of the Senate. In the letter we find that, again, the Secretary of the Navy misinforms the Senate. In the letter he said, in effect, "I signed the document. It went to the President. Then someone delivered it, without authorization, to Admiral Denfeld. I never knew Admiral Denfeld got it. Normally it would not go directly to Admiral Denfeld; it would come back to my office, and have the seal affixed thereon. But that was not done in this case."

Again, Mr. President, documents speak much louder than words. So we presented the document, and it showed that the seal was regularly affixed to it, and that, again, the Secretary of the Navy was in error.

The Secretary of the Navy requested an opinion from the Judge Advocate General as to whether or not the President could remove Admiral Denfeld. I assume he informed the Judge Advocate General that the President had attempted to accomplish removal of Admiral Denfeld. Again the Secretary of the Navy was in error; for, if we examine the documents which the Senator from Maryland has given us, we find that at no time did the President take any steps to remove Admiral Denfeld. We find that the only thing which might even remotely be interpreted as indication of an attempt to remove Admiral Denfeld is a document in which neither Admiral Denfeld's name nor the post of Chief of Naval Operations is mentioned.

Although I do not consider to be the most important question before the Senate the question of whether Secretary Matthews is deliberately attempting to deceive the Senate or is so incompetent that he does not know what he is doing, yet of course that is an important question. However, I think it is of infinitely more importance for us to consider the Johnson-Matthews recently imposed rule of secrecy, as to which Secretary Matthews said—and I think his is the most fantastic statement I have ever known a Cabinet officer to make—that if any military officer told the Congress the truth, and the whole truth—I do not attempt to quote the statement exactly

until I can find that point in the record—he would have to take the consequences. If that is not an attempted intimidation of every prospective witness from the military who will ever appear before any committee, then my legal interpretation of "intimidation" is entirely wrong. He does not stop there but demonstrates very clearly what the consequences are. The consequences are humiliation, embarrassment, and transfer to the Siberia of an unimportant position, a position far below the rank of the officer who may be affected. If the Senate and the House of Representatives, constituting the Congress, do nothing about it, it means that we of the Congress place our stamp of approval upon the rule that never again can the officers of the military come before committees to tell the truth. It means we are placing our stamp of approval upon perjury, Mr. President, if you please. It means that if a witness from the military comes before a committee, is sworn as a witness, is asked questions, and tells what he believes the facts to be; if he makes recommendations which he thinks properly should be made, then, as the Secretary of the Navy said, he must suffer the consequences. We have known what the consequences have been to three of the five naval officers who testified.

Mr. President, if the Senate had the right to impeach, I would suggest that impeachment proceedings against Mr. Matthews be instituted. The Senate, however, does not have that right. If the Senate had that right, I would suggest that he be impeached on four separate grounds:

First. Untruthfulness before the committee.

Second. Being completely incompetent to perform the duties of Secretary of the Navy.

I may point out that I do not think Matthews can be blamed too much for being an incompetent man and for his inability to perform his job. The blame must rest upon the appointing power.

Third. His complete disloyalty to the branch of the service for which he should be fighting. This is something for which the Secretary himself can be blamed. Why this disloyalty to the Navy, I do not know, but apparently he thinks he does not have the support from the naval officers which he should have. This is not surprising. When a man is placed in that position, with no experience whatever, and shortly afterward he comes before a Senate committee and says, in effect, "I am the great naval strategist, and if any one of the admirals, who have served for 30 or 40 years, disagrees with me"—he does not even say they must state their disagreement; he says the important thing is—and I quote him—

> The important thing is that he entertains a conviction in opposition to mine.

With a Secretary of the Navy who knows nothing about naval affairs saying that of men who have devoted their entire lives to the naval service, and when he says to them, "If you entertain an idea different from mine, then you will suffer the consequences," it is not surprising that he cannot command any loyalty from those men.

Fourth. The new and dangerous rule which the Secretary is enforcing—the rule that if anyone appears before a Senate committee and tells the truth, he must take the consequences. Let me read it into the RECORD again. It appears on page 111 of his testimony given on January 12. He starts out by saying:

> The individual should have not only the right but the duty to testify, to be absolutely sure that he will not suffer any reprisal by so doing.

So far so good. He then says:

> But I also think that when a member of the Military Establishment does that, that he must be prepared to, in a sense, take the consequences.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will unanimously confirm the nomination of Admiral Sherman for the position of Chief of Naval Operations.

Mr. CAIN rose.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have not yielded the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thought the Senator had yielded the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. I yielded to the Senator from Washington for a question.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I think it is safe to say that the Senator from Wisconsin has disturbed probably every other Senator on the floor of the Senate by the character of what he has said and the charges which he individually thinks should be preferred against the Secretary of the Navy. The Senator from Wisconsin is aware of the fact that the minority members of the Armed Services Committee have requested of the chairman that the committee hold a hearing, at which time Secretary Matthews would be encouraged to come before the committee to speak for himself. If there is to be such a meeting, I wonder whether the Senator from Wisconsin would be inclined, on the assumption that the hearing was thorough and conclusive, to be guided by the verdict which the committee might reach with reference to the degree of guilt, if any, of the Secretary of the Navy. That is to say, would the Senator from Wisconsin, even at this late day, think it both proper and imperatively important that the Secretary of the Navy be called before the Armed Services Committee in order that there may be a most thorough exploration into every one of the serious contradictions which the Senator from Wisconsin has pointed out so ably in recent days?

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say I heartily agree with the minority members of the Armed Services Committee, who said, "Let us have Secretary Matthews come before the committee; let us get the truth."

I may say this. The Senator has used the word guilt. I have tried to make it clear that I do not think the Secretary, in his mind, was lying. I think in order to constitute a lie a person must know that what he is saying is untrue. Frankly, I think that in the tremendous task which has fallen into the lap of the Secretary, he does not remember from day to day what he has done. Frankly, I do not think he knew he had signed the document, when in the record he says, "I was the man who advised the President not to sign." I think he thought he had so advised the President. I believe he felt that in some of those documents he had so advised the President. I think, for example, when the Secretary says that "If any naval officer differs with me in any respect, or entertains a difference in his mind, then his head must fall," he feels he is doing right.

The Secretary apparently does not realize that some of the great naval officers know more about the Navy than he does. That cannot be labeled guilt. A man cannot be said to be guilty of being incompetent, in the criminal sense of the word. I think Mr. Matthews would like to be a great Secretary of the Navy.

As I have said, when I found this unusual document, and these unusual statements, I talked to both Senators from Nebraska. I inquired what kind of man Matthews was. Both Senators had the finest things to say about his reputation and about his truthfulness. I did not question them about his competence to act as Secretary of the Navy. I took the trouble to call several of my personal friends in Omaha, none of whom had anything but the finest things to say about Mr. Matthews. I therefore wish to make it clear that when I refer to impeachment, I am not concerned about establishing that the man is guilty of any crime; I merely think he is so incompetent he should not be holding the job. I think the President was very unkind to him when he appointed him to that task, and I hope that very soon the President will find some other task for him.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to say to my friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, that I think he has made himself perfectly clear in recent days. One thing of which I have in mind is whether the matter concerning the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Matthews, should stop here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington desire to be recognized in order to make a speech?

Mr. CAIN. I was merely laying the foundation for a question. I should like to think that we would not leave the matter concerning the Secretary of the Navy dangling, and never resolve the serious charges preferred by the Senator from Wisconsin. Against that feeling, I wonder whether the Senator from Wisconsin thinks it would be both a service to the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Matthews, and to the country at large, if the Armed Services Committee of the Senate were to agree to call Mr. Matthews before it, to give him an adequate and full opportunity to speak for himself, and to explain, if he can, the contradictions which the Senator from Wisconsin has pointed out, and which the

Secretary of the Navy himself wrote into the record when he last appeared before the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me first say, the Senator refers to charges made by the Senator from Wisconsin. The Senator does not recall that he has made any charges. The Senator from Wisconsin disclosed facts. I stand corrected—I have made the charge that the facts prove the man to be either untruthful or incompetent. I beg the Senator's pardon; I did make that charge. The remainder of the matters I have brought before the Senate have merely been in the nature of disclosures of facts.

Second, in answer to the Senator's question as to whether I think there should be an investigation by the Armed Services Committee, I answer "Yes."

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question and a very brief statement?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am not here to attack the veracity of Secretary Matthews. I personally believe he intends and wants to tell us the truth. He was not under oath when he made any statements before the Armed Services Committee. He stated at that time that he would be glad to tell the committee, in executive session, any of the facts concerning Admiral Denfeld's relief from duty, if the committee so desired. I personally agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that the Committee on Armed Services should have had an opportunity to hear Mr. Matthews' statement, in the first place. But that is water over the dam. It is my inference, from what the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] said yesterday, that there will be an opportunity for the Armed Services Committee to discuss the question with Mr. Matthews, and I personally hope that opportunity will come very soon. At that time and after it we can better determine whether the very serious statements which the Senator from Wisconsin has made have any background in fact.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall not attempt at this time to make any answer to the serious charges incorporated in the statement of the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin. I will say that I have not been one of those who have excoriated the junior Senator from Wisconsin. I think he has a right to say, within reason, what he wishes to say. But I do call attention to the fact at this time that I think it is highly improper for a Member of the Senate who, in the event of impeachment, would sit as a judge, to assume to say what should be done, what sort of proceedings should be initiated, and what sort of charges should be brought by the other House of Congress, which, under the Constitution, is the only one which can originate charges of impeachment——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is the House which must vote impeachment proceedings and not the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator is not accurate in his statement. The House has the power to initiate impeachment proceedings and to bring articles of impeachment, but the Senate sits as a court upon those articles of impeachment.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Florida is correct in his statement.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I simply want to read for the RECORD one paragraph from the very able statement made by the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, which, it seems to me, completely disposes of the technical questions which have been brought into the matter and which I now understand are entirely out of the discussion, due to the position taken by Admiral Denfeld.

The paragraph to which I have referred is as follows:

> It is obvious that when the President directed Admiral Denfeld's removal from the Office of Chief of Naval Operations early in November 1949, he did not intend Admiral Denfeld to become invested with the office for the second term, and it is equally obvious that Admiral Denfeld understood that. So far as I know, Admiral Denfeld has not asserted claim to it, and even if he had, the circumstances of Admiral Sherman's ad interim appointment and the expressed desires of the President would have prevented.

It seems to me to be thoroughly clear that the term which would have begun on December 15 has never begun and that the Senate is completely within its rights in now acting upon the confirmation of the nomination of Admiral Sherman, that I hope the Senate will now confirm the nomination of this distinguished naval hero.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman to be Chief of Naval Operations?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of legislative business.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4692) to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BRYSON, Mr. WILLIS, and Mr. BOGGS of Delaware were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN—PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 25) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 25 has been before the Senate, in some form, since December 1923. While designed to meet a very real situation, this proposal, in my judgment, would not hasten the day of a real and constructive solution of the problem the amendment purports to solve. Rather the proposed constitutional amendment would add only confusion and uncertainty to the achievements we have already made in the area of equal rights for women.

Full and vigorous opposition to this amendment is offered, as we all know, by large numbers of women including the leaders of a good portion of our 17,000,000 working women—a sizable group of whom are in the trade-unions. In addition, Mr. William Green of the American Federation of Labor and Mr. Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations are opposed to this amendment. Moreover, many legal scholars and lawyers who have submitted this proposal to careful scrutiny have concluded that it is not a sound method of eliminating discriminatory treatment of women, and that it would interfere drastically with long-established and accepted family, property, and other relationships.

Everyone in the United States who understands what democracy is, is in favor of equality of economic, legal, and political opportunity for women. The proponents of this joint resolution seek the same ends that we all seek. The only question is how to arrive at a common objective.

A few years ago a distinguished Secretary of Labor, herself a woman, Frances Perkins, defined the proposal set forth in this amendment in the following words:

> The proponents make the serious mistake of attempting to operate on the delicate and complex structure of family, property, and other laws with the bludgeon of an amendment instead of the scalpel of specific corrective legislation.

We have come a long way since the day when the great lawyer, Blackstone, said, "The husband and wife are one, and that one is the husband." Enacted on the statute books of my own State of New York there is, as in other States, an imposing list of statutes for the protection of wives and mothers, widows, and working women.

In New York State a partial list would include legislation for workingwomen such as minimum wages, maximum hours of work, meal periods, night work, industrial housework, and employment of women before and after childbirth. That list also includes much legislation for protection of wives, mothers, and widows, such as the right to protection through

legal separation when the husband neglects or refuses proper support. It also includes many divorce and alimony laws.

I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to include at this point in my remarks a partial list of the New York State laws specifically aimed at the protection of women.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. For wives and mothers:

The husband's primary legal obligation to support his family (common-law rule).

Security for support required from the husband for the wife when he annuls the marriage because of her insanity (Cahill's Consolidated Laws, 1930, ch. 14, sec. 7; supp., 1936, ch. 14, sec. 7-a).

Right to protection through legal separation when the husband neglects or refuses proper support (Civil Practice Act, sec. 1161).

Age of consent to marriage lower for females (Cahill's Consolidated Laws, 1930, ch. 14, sec. 15; supp., 1931-35, ch. 14, sec. 15).

II. For widows:

Right of the widow to occupy rent-free for a 40-day period her husband's dwelling; also, to have her living expenses for that period from the estate (Cahill's Consolidated Laws, 1930, ch. 51, sec. 204).

Continuance of the husband's homestead exemption to his widow for her lifetime (Civil Practice Act, sec. 674).

III. For working women:

Hours of work: 8 a day, 48 a week (Consolidated Laws (Cahill), 1930, ch. 32, sec. 173; Cumulative Supplement, 1931-35, ch. 32, sec. 172; Session Laws: 1937, chs. 281, 282, 283, 660; 1938, ch. 651; 1939, ch. 499; 1940, ch. 216; 1941, ch. 33; 1942, chs. 778, 554 (art. 8); 1943, chs. 171, 315; 1944, ch. 412).

Day of rest (for men also) (Session Laws, 1941, ch. 281).

Meal period (for men also) (Session Laws, 1937, chs. 84, 283).

Night work (Consolidated Laws (Cahill), 1930, ch. 32, secs. 172, 172 (2); Session Laws: 1937, chs. 281, 282, 283; 1938, ch. 651; 1939, ch. 499; 1940, ch. 216; 1942, ch. 778).

Providing seats (Consolidated Code (Cahill), 1930, ch. 32, secs. 2, 150).

Prohibitory: In or in connection with a mine or quarry (ibid., ch. 32, sec. 146 (6)); conductors or guards on any type of railroad (for females under 21) (ibid., sec. 146 (9)); messenger for telegraph or messenger company (for females under 21) (ibid., sec. 146 (10)).

Lifting or carrying heavy weights (ibid., ch. 32, secs. 383, 146 (7), 147; Session Laws, 1938, ch. 657; Department of Labor, Industrial Code, rule No. 10 (1942)).

Equal pay (Session Laws, 1944, ch. 793).

Minimum wage (for men also) (Consolidated Laws (Cahill), supp., 1937, ch. 32, secs. 550-566; Session Laws; 1939, chs. 244, 499; 1942, ch. 693; 1944, ch. 792).

Industrial homework (Consolidated Laws (Cahill), supp., 1931-35, ch. 32, arts. 4, 5, and 13, secs. 350-363; Session Laws: 1940, chs. 386, 422; 1942, ch. 659; Department of Labor, homework orders, 1-4).

Employment before and after childbirth (Consolidated Laws (Cahill), 1930, ch. 32, sec. 148).

Mr. LEHMAN. These laws—which I repeat are only partial in coverage—took into account the differences between men and women in physique and function, and also the difference in the situations in which women find themselves today because of historical limitations and restrictions. These achievements on State legislation are good, but they were not made without great struggle and effort. I would not wish to see that effort, to which I was happy to contribute my share in the past, put to naught or jeopardized, however well-meaning the objective.

But there still remain in our country some discriminatory practices toward women. Some of these discriminations are found in the common law and in some State statutes. However, the most important and significant discriminations are the result of practices and traditions that are not touched by this amendment. Therefore, it seems to me wise to establish a general policy as to equality for women, and then proceed to an orderly study of the status of women. Thus, we could determine what specific changes are actually necessary to achieve equality, rather than impose, as we would by this amendment, an identity of treatment under a masculine pattern.

Such a plan of action was embodied in the women's status bill which was considered by the Congress in 1948. This measure sought to establish as the declared policy of the United States that there should be no distinctions on the basis of sex except such as are reasonably justified by differences of physical structure and biological or social function.

That bill also provided for an investigation and review of the economic, civil, social and political status of women, and the nature and extent of discriminations based on sex throughout the United States.

Some of these provisions are included in the Kefauver proposal, in whose sponsorship I have joined, and which is pending before the Senate today. I hope the Senate will approve that measure.

In conclusion, I am against Senate Joint Resolution 25 for two reasons. One, I do not think it is an effective way to eliminate these discriminations against women which we all deplore; and two, I think its enactment would weaken if not wipe out existing protective labor and social legislation. Congressional approval of Senate Joint Resolution 25 would be a major step backward on the road we are taking toward that aspect of social justice which demands safeguards for the health and well-being of women workers. Such action by Congress—if our vote were followed by the State legislatures—would also result in a vast confusion of rights and duties already defined in existing State laws in the field of family relations and property—thus provoking unlimited litigation.

I am for equal rights for women. I shall continue to work for them. But I am strongly of the opinion that Senate Joint Resolution 25, far from assuring these rights, will hinder the orderly attainment of them.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. The senior Senator from New York wishes to concur with the observations of the junior Senator from New York in connection with the desirability of making certain that the statutes which now exist in the several States for the purpose of protecting women would be in no way harmed, injured, or eliminated by any constitutional amendment of the type now before the Senate.

However, the senior Senator from New York would like to inquire of the junior Senator from New York if he thinks there is any possibility that the amendment which has been proposed by the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] would meet the problem which has just been cited by the junior Senator from New York. The proposed amendment reads as follows:

On page 2, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

"The provisions of this article shall not be construed to impair any rights, benefits, or exemptions conferred by law upon persons of the female sex."

Mr. LEHMAN. My opinion is that it would, of course, strengthen Senate Joint Resolution 25, in that it would add a declaration of intention. At the same time, I have been told by many lawyers, and by some judges, that even the inclusion of an amendment of this character would not assure a safeguarding of the great code of social and labor legislation which the senior Senator from New York and I had a part in setting up in our State of New York.

Mr. IVES. We certainly have.

Mr. LEHMAN. I believe the adoption of such an amendment to the proposal as that suggested by the Senator from Arizona would open the way to an endless amount of litigation, the outcome of which, obviously, would be in doubt.

Mr. IVES. There is one more question I should like to ask the distinguished junior Senator from New York. Does he feel that it would be possible to formulate an amendment along the lines proposed by the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona which in and of itself would be sufficient to meet the problem which the junior Senator from New York has cited?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not think it would be possible to do it in the case of a constitutional amendment. I believe a great many of the purposes of the amendment could be gained by the enactment by the Congress of the United States of the bill which was introduced yesterday by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. IVES. I thank the distinguished junior Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the position taken by the distinguished senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the present occupant of the chair, in relation to Senate Joint Resolution 25. It is, of course, with personal pride that I state that in 1923 it was by Senator Charles Curtis, from my own State of Kansas, later Vice President of the United States, and by Representative Daniel Anthony, Member of the House from Kansas, who was a nephew of the late Susan B. Anthony, that the proposed amendment to the Constitution, in practically the same form as now proposed, was first offered.

There have been repeated Senate hearings in Senate Judiciary Committee subcommittees on equal-rights amendments. Such an amendment has been favorably reported to the Senate by large majorities from the full Judiciary Com-

mittee at least four times. I think that should be definitely stated for the RECORD. Going back to the record, we find such reports were made in the Seventy-eighth Congress, the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Eightieth Congress, and now in the Eighty-first Congress. There has never been an unfavorable report on the equal-rights amendment, a fact which I think is significant.

The equal-rights amendment is necessary, in my judgment, in order to establish the principle of equal rights for men and women as one of the fundamental principles underlying our system of law. To limit equality is to deny it. The adoption of the equal-rights amendment would strengthen women's position in every field, in business, in the professions, and in industry.

The adoption of the amendment would bring women under the full protection of the Constitution of the United States. It would make them "persons," "people," and "citizens," as those words are used in the Constitution. It would abolish the principle that women are still subject to the common law of England as it existed at the time the Constitution was adopted, unless women, by specific statutes, had been released from that rule. It would establish, instead, the principle of equality of rights of men and women under the laws of the Nation and the States for the future guidance of legislators, judges, and other civil officers.

We are told that today we are engaged in a cold war. No quarter, apparently, is being given in that war. We might as well be frank about it. At present Russian authorities are circulating documents in vast quantities and sending propagandists in great numbers to work for communism among the women of the East, in Indochina, Malaya, Burma, India, and Indonesia. The purpose is to advance communism.

One of the great weapons used in propaganda against the United States in these Near East countries is the failure of the United States to give equality to its women. I think we can most effectively answer this type of propaganda by our action in the affirmative when the vote is taken on the equal-rights amendment proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 25.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent from the Senate today on official business. If he were present he would vote against the pending joint resolution relative to equal rights.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by my colleague relative to the joint resolution.

There being no objection, Mr. GREEN'S statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, OF RHODE ISLAND, ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 25

This is a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women. The title of this resolution is noncommittal, since the resolution certainly relates to this subject—equal rights for men and women.

The purpose of this resolution is in the opinion of most of us, admirable. It seeks to relieve women from unfair discrimination in our laws. But, is this purpose carried out by the provision of the resolution itself? It does not propose any specific means to carry out this purpose. Many changes have been made in our laws, both State and Federal, whereby some unfair discriminations have been done away with. In all these cases, the effort has been to increase the rights of women, not to decrease them. This proposes instead of legislation, a constitutional amendment, and as worded the amendment does not state that discriminations against women are to be removed or their status alleviated or their rights increased. In other words, in my opinion, the proposed article does not carry out the purpose for which it was drafted. It is not enough to state that equality of rights under the laws shall not be denied or abridged. Equality of rights between men and women may be attained either by increasing the rights of women or decreasing the rights of men. The purpose in view is not to decrease the men's rights. However, the purpose of the amendment is assumed to be the former, not the latter, although it may equally apply to the latter.

Suppose, for example, in some State the dower rights of a woman in her deceased husband's estate is less than the curtesy rights of a husband in his deceased wife's estate. It is not enough to say that "these shall be equal." They can be made equal by changing the one or changing the other and the amendment leaves it quite uncertain as to which shall be changed. How can the courts decide when the purpose of the amendment is so inadequately expressed and the means of attaining it so entirely indefinite?

I want to see women's rights increased. They have been increased from time to time in many States, as well as in the United States. I have advocated such measures. I presided at the Rhode Island State Convention when the first resolution ever passed in my State in favor of giving the vote to women was adopted. When I was chairman of the Rhode Island Democratic State Committee I advocated and secured the adoption of a change in the rules whereby women had membership in the State committee in exactly the same manner men alone had had it previously. In both of these cases additional rights were given to women; but if equality alone had been advocated, equality might have been provided by taking these rights away from the men.

Furthermore, nothing is said about duties. Men have certain duties in connection with many of the rights they exercise. Women should have the same duties if they have the same rights, and before we impose such duties we must be sure that women are competent to perform them. I have time and again during the past years drawn attention to this serious fault in the wording of the proposed amendment to the Constitution. Over and over again I have stated that while I favored the purpose of such legislation, I was opposed to this particular wording. It is not only inadequate, but it is so ambiguous as to defeat the very purpose for which it is to be enacted.

I have at political convention after convention favored an amendment dealing with this subject. I served on the platform committee of the Democratic National Convention in 1944 and favored the insertion of a plank relating to this subject. It reads as follows:

"We recommend to Congress the submission of a constitutional amendment on equal rights for women."

At the Democratic National Convention of 1948 I again served on the platform committee and again a plank was adopted which read exactly like the one 4 years before, as follows:

"We recommend to Congress the submission of a constitutional amendment on equal rights for women."

There is nothing in either of these planks approving the language of this amendment to the Constitution stated in this joint resolution.

Again and again I have talked with advocates of this proposed amendment, I have urged upon them the futility of the proposed amendment which I have tried to expose, but have received no evidence of agreement or even conciliation. I have been told over and over again this is the amendment, and this amendment must prevail. This attitude seems to me unreasonable. Worse than that, it seems to me futile to pass an amendment which on the face of it is indefinite and uncertain of accomplishing the worthy purpose we both hold in view. When women and men both find out how little these words mean, how they are nothing more than a slogan to catch the ear, instead of fundamental truths to convince the mind; they will ask for the submission of a constitutional amendment on equal rights for women which will insure new rights being given them and not old rights being taken away. This will be in accord with the planks of our Democratic platforms.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, as one of some 33 cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 25, I rise to speak briefly upon it. When I say briefly, Mr. President, I mean just that, but I would not have the term construed in any manner as a lack of either interest in or enthusiasm for this important measure.

To the contrary, its merit speaks more eloquently than all the debate which we have heard or may hereafter hear on the subject.

I know that there are those who would belabor the question by involving it in legalisms, and, although I do not question either the legal talents or the sincerity of such opposition, I am convinced beyond any shadow of doubt that the clarity with which Senate Joint Resolution 25 bespeaks its purpose, is conclusive as to the legal side of the issue.

What does it say, Mr. President?

Merely that the equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex, then it goes on to give the Congress and several States power within their respective jurisdictions to enforce this provision by appropriate legislation.

Personally, I am satisfied that the adoption of this amendment will not impair any existing rights or privileges of the women of our Nation.

However, as a safeguard and precaution, I shall support the Hayden amendment.

Clearly if this amendment is incorporated in Senate Joint Resolution 25, all existing rights and privileges would be expressly reserved, but with or without it, I shall support the equal-rights amendment, because I am convinced from experience in my own State that the legal aspects of the problem will settle themselves.

Here may I say, Mr. President, that it is with genuine pride today that I stand upon the floor of the Senate of the United States and make the observation that New Jersey has already met this issue squarely and unequivocally, not by mere legislation, but by constitutional mandate.

In the new Constitution of New Jersey, which was ratified November 4, 1947, by

an overwhelming vote of the people, we said in article 1, among other things, that all persons are by nature free and independent, that all political power is inherent in the people, and that no person shall be discriminated against in the exercise of any civil rights.

Up to this point, Mr. President, you have heard nothing about equal rights, but article 10 of the Constitution of New Jersey provides specifically that wherever therein the term "person," "persons," "people," or any personal pronoun is used, the same shall be taken to include both sexes.

This action was interpreted by many throughout the Nation as having even greater significance in the progress of women than Wyoming's act in 1869 in granting women the right of franchise.

Actually, Mr. President, I think it can be said without fear of contradiction that for the first time in the history of the United States women have been given equal constitutional rights under New Jersey's new charter.

How did this historic decision come to pass in New Jersey?

Mr. President, women lawyers led the way and the New Jersey Bar Association added its full strength to the cause. Furthermore, the New Jersey Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs entered the fray at the most critical moment, and here it should be noted that the first woman admitted to the bar in New Jersey, Mary Philbrook, of Tenafly, was one of the great leaders in this fight.

It was Mrs. Philbrook who induced me to support the first appropriate legislation on this subject in the Senate of New Jersey. It was Mrs. Philbrook who convinced the New Jersey Bar Association that equal rights for men and women should be embodied in New Jersey's new charter of government.

Among other leaders were attorneys, the Misses Evelyn Seufert, of Bergen County, and Mary Carpenter, of Newark, and Judge Libby Sacher, of Elizabeth.

I only wish these women were here today to speak in my stead because they could do it so much more fervently and with a much superior eloquence.

But New Jersey's fight on this issue is, I am happy to say, a matter of history.

I only hope, Mr. President, that in the proceedings of the Eighty-first Congress we will follow the very admirable example which New Jersey has established by declaring to the people of the Nation that both major parties meant what they said in their respective conventions in Philadelphia, in 1948, when they promised the people of the Nation an equal-rights amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. We, in New York, of course, have provision for the observance of equal political rights for women just as the State of New Jersey has. But may I ask whether in New Jersey there have been any laws passed, and whether they are now in existence, giving special protection to women in industry, with regard to hours of work, with regard to minimum wages, with regard to conditions of work, and looking after the comfort of women, their health, and their well-being?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I am proud to say that in New Jersey we have laws covering all the matters to which the distinguished Senator from New York has referred. I might add that I have no fear at all that the amendment in its application will impair or jeopardize or endanger any of the rights established under those laws.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the Senator believe that the adoption of an amendment such as is now proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 25 could bring about a change in the State of New Jersey or the State of New York with regard to the minimum wages paid to women in industry in intrastate commerce?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I have already answered that in my original remarks, but I shall repeat, that I have no concern about the application of the amendment with respect to the group of laws to which the Senator has referred, and of which we are all so greatly proud.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I ask whether it would be possible for the distinguished Senator from New Jersey to have prepared a list of the statutes in his State concerned with labor and social legislation and with divorce and alimony procedures, which today give greater protection to women than to men? I think it would be a very interesting document for all of us to see, and I believe it would probably show the existence in New Jersey of the same situation we have in New York, to which I have made reference.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I realize that the distinguished Senator from New York has great concern over the possible effect of the amendment on this particular group of State statutes, but I say again on good legal advice—I know the distinguished Senator from New York also has good legal advice—that I myself have confidence that there is not any danger in supporting the amendment. Moreover, I feel that with the addition of the Hayden amendment we will definitely safeguard against all those dangers about which concern has been expressed on the floor of the Senate for the past 2 or 3 days.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, with the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and in company with other Members of the Senate, it has been my privilege to give approval to the pending measure.

The women of America have been waiting for 27 years for the Congress to take the first step to assure to them the rights which as free American citizens should long ere this have been incorporated as explicitly as for one-hundred-and-sixty-odd years they have been contained implicitly in the provisions of our great Constitution.

That the proposals contained in Senate Joint Resolution 25 and in similar previous measures have been introduced in each successive Congress since 1923 without ever an unfavorable report, and yet without favorable final action, must seem an anomalous situation to the women of our country.

If, through this proposed constitutional amendment, the women of America were seeking to gain an advantage to which they were not rightfully entitled, one might find it possible to appreciate the stand, or rather the lack of stand, which has marked congressional consideration of this proposal. But, Mr. President, the amendment seeks no such unreasonable advantage. Stated quite simply, it merely proposes to establish equality of rights for men and women under the Constitution and the laws of the respective States and under Federal statutes. It merely seeks to attain for one-half our population what the other half has always enjoyed; to wipe out the discriminations which they, simply by reason of their sex, have been forced to endure these many years.

It must be noted that all that this proposal contemplates is that the citizens of the United States, through their elected representatives in the various States, should have the opportunity of expressing themselves on this question. It would be for each State to vote the proposal up or down; so our action will not be final by any means if we submit it to the States.

Mr. President, we are prone to be somewhat smug in boasting of our freedoms, as compared to those enjoyed by the citizens of other countries of the world. Yet we have consistently disregarded the fact that the laws and practices of our land have discriminated against women, in three respects:

First, they have worked to the disadvantage of married women, by preventing them from making contracts in their own names, from controlling property or earnings, or from engaging in business in their own names.

Second, they have discriminated against women as workers, as for example, in the so-called protective labor laws for women, which fix minimum wages, maximum hours, and limit type and time of employment.

Third, and finally, they have discriminated against women as citizens, as for example, the laws which bar women from jury service.

The only way to insure prompt action by the States toward the desired equality of rights of women is through an amendment to the Federal Constitution. This method, in addition, is more permanent than State legislation. It would not interfere with States' rights, except to require recognition of the equality of rights of men and women under the law. It would not require uniformity of law on the subject among the various States.

The women of our country have found it difficult to understand, as I have attempted to point out, the many refusals of the Congress to place them on a basis of equality with their husbands and brothers and fathers these many years. Now, with the approval which has been given the equal-rights proposals in the platforms of both major parties, what could we say to the women of the United

States to explain any further refusal to carry out the expressed wishes of the two conventions?

Could we go back to the many splendid organizations of women which have endorsed this amendment—and there are numerous ones on record to this effect—and tell them that we, their Representatives in Congress, do not yet consider them qualified for acceptance as full-fledged citizens of this great country?

Can we ignore the remarkable progress which the women of America have made, particularly in recent years, in all fields of endeavor, the professions, the industries, and the arts—yes, and in public office—and tell them that even these accomplishments are insufficient to warrant removal of the discriminatory restrictions under which, and despite which, they have made such outstanding progress?

Certainly, in the field of government there is not only wide opportunity, but great need, for the peculiar talents and abilities which the women of America can bring to bear upon today's problems. In my own State of Maryland, during the 8 years in which I was privileged to occupy the Governor's chair, we found it desirable, and in many cases I might even say necessary, to call upon outstanding women of the State for assistance in matters of government, and particularly in matters affecting the welfare and safety of our people during the emergencies of the war years. I can say without reservation that all those called upon to perform those important duties, together with the other women who during those years served in the State legislature, discharged their tasks satisfactorily and with credit to their sex. In many cases they were able to make contributions which, I believe, were above and beyond any similar contributions which could have been made by men in the same positions and under the same circumstances.

My colleague the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the chief sponsor of the amendment in the Senate, has made the statement that the large group of Senators who have joined him in sponsoring this measure, or who have given promises of support, are anxious to honor the pledges of both party platforms recommending favorable action on this measure of essential justice to women. Let me again assure the Senator that he has my complete support in this matter. As the list of sponsors will show, this amendment is a bipartisan measure, drawing strong support from both sides of the aisle. It is significant that one of its sponsors is the able junior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. It is also significant that the former Senator from Arkansas, Mrs. Hattie W. Caraway, during her service in this body was an advocate and sponsor of the equal-rights amendment.

Mr. President, the equal-rights movement began at Seneca Falls, N. Y., in 1848—over 100 years ago. It was just after the conclusion of the First World War that the women of America won national suffrage for the first time. Their contribution to victory in that conflict was great; but the production miracle of the Second World War, for which the women of our Nation were also partly responsible, has earned them, at the very least, equality of economic opportunity and equal rights under the laws of our land. We can no longer tolerate discrimination against American women, either in the Nation as a whole or in the several States. The equal-rights amendment is the instrument by which this discrimination can be eradicated.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BRIDGES obtained the floor.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire, who has been recognized, yield for the purpose of the suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Maybank
Anderson	Hoey	Millikin
Benton	Holland	Mundt
Brewster	Humphrey	Murray
Bricker	Hunt	Myers
Bridges	Ives	Neely
Butler	Jenner	O'Conor
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Connally	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kem	Schoeppel
Donnell	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Downey	Knowland	Sparkman
Dworshak	Langer	Stennis
Eastland	Leahy	Taft
Ecton	Lehman	Taylor
Ferguson	Lodge	Thye
Flanders	Long	Tobey
Frear	Lucas	Tydings
Fulbright	McCarran	Vandenberg
George	McCarthy	Watkins
Gillette	McClellan	Wherry
Graham	McFarland	Wiley
Gurney	McKellar	Williams
Hayden	McMahon	Withers
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Young
Hickenlooper	Malone	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The Senator from New Hampshire may proceed.

(At this point Mr. BRIDGES yielded to Mr. LUCAS for the submission of a unanimous-consent request, and debate ensued, which, on request of Mr. BRIDGES, and by unanimous consent, was ordered to be printed at the conclusion of his speech.)

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN A DECADE OF DECISION

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I feel compelled to speak today. I am speaking not alone to the Members of the Senate, but also to the American people.

It is January 24, 1950. We have advanced 24 days into a decade of decision. The American people have a right to know where we are going in this decade. They have not been told by the present administration.

I prophesy that during the next 10 years the people of the world will either be enslaved by Red fascism or communism as it is commonly known, or they will contain, resist, and finally destroy this aggressor. There are many responsible persons of both political parties who agree with me. I noticed yesterday that Mr. Will Clayton, former Assistant Secretary of State, who until recently has been a prominent spokesman for the administration, says that by 1955, if we continue our present foreign policy, this continent will be but a little island in a Communist world. But this is not a political issue. No issue which involves the destiny of the United States can be made a partisan political issue.

This is a question which involves America's place in the family of nations. Let me state this issue:

"Shall the United States continue to be the principal nation in the world in which the dignity of each free man is more important than the sovereignty of the state; or shall the United States become a satellite slave state, operated by the criminal conspiracy in the Kremlin?"

I believe America will remain the home of the free. I caution that it will not so remain unless it is likewise the land of the brave.

Our freedoms have been won by heroic souls during three centuries of achievement—through struggle. We have wrought freedom through the sacrifices of countless individuals who have devoted themselves to a cherished cause.

But we can lose our freedoms by assault. We can lose them by default. We can also lose them by muddle-headed appeasement of Joseph Stalin, a man who stands convicted by world opinion as the greatest imperialist aggressor of all times.

Now, there are many facets to this issue. The most timely of these, on January 24, 1950, is the question, "Is the United States to recognize the Kremlin as the sovereign government of the people of China?"

Since July 22, 1937, and from time to time, I have been standing in this Chamber, Mr. President, pleading the cause of the people of China. It was on that date that I submitted a resolution calling for an investigation of scrap iron and steel shipments to Japan, and calling for a cessation of such shipments. Why do I plead for the people of China? It is because I recognize the validity of an ancient truism—"The master of China is the master of the Orient."

For more than a century—since 1843—the United States has stood before the world as a friend of China; not the master of China, for even when this Nation was accused of imperialistic intentions, we stood for the open door in China. We wanted the Chinese themselves to be the masters of China. We have never feared the Chinese people, because they have been our friends.

Joseph Stalin also knows that the master of China is the master of the Orient. His agents in China began a civil war to win control of that nation 27 years ago, long before many Americans had heard of Joseph Stalin. These servants of the Kremlin were opposed at that time by Sun Yat-sen's heir, Chiang Kai-shek.

The story of Chiang, the man of Asia, is too well known to bear repetition. It is sufficient to recall that for nearly three

decades he has been steadfast in his struggle against communism. Chiang was once a Communist. He was converted to Christianity. Whittaker Chambers was once a Communist. He returned to the faith of his fathers. Both of these men, in my opinion, have exhibited moral courage of the highest order. Both have been steadfast when the easy way would have been appeasement, compromise, or surrender.

Chiang was steadfast when our Government wavered. When we permitted Japan to buy from us the materials needed to invade his country, he not only fought the Japanese Imperialists, but he also continued to fight the agents of the Kremlin. When we finally admitted the Chinese Nationalists to full partnership in our common effort against the Hitler-Tojo Axis, they pinned down our enemy in the Far East while we devoted ourselves to the struggle in Europe. Chiang saved thousands of American lives when, with Chinese Nationalist troops, he pinned down 1,000,000 Japanese troops in Asia, while we centered our operations in the African-European theater. This was the era when the Chinese Nationalists fought while we promised. We promised them aid and our intentions probably were good. We did not deliver much aid or assistance.

On December 1, 1943, the people of China reached a high point in their struggle. With Roosevelt and Churchill, Chiang signed the Cairo agreement. The signatories agreed that "all the territories that Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores shall be restored to the Republic of China."

A few weeks later, at Tehran, our ally, Chiang, was stabbed in the back. The Cairo agreement was repudiated at the demand of Stalin. From that day on, if Stalin himself had been our Secretary of State, he could scarcely have done a better job for Stalin, in China, than our State Department has done.

Let us look at our record.

We disregarded China from 1937 to 1940. During this period Hitler was appeased in Europe. Finally the appeasement ended and Hitler launched the so-called phony war. Then we were told that the Rhine was our frontier. We finally had a policy. The outposts of our military security in Europe were established as being on the Rhine.

In 1941 President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull finally harkened to warnings regarding China. It became apparent to them that if we had a frontier on the Rhine we also had a frontier in the Pacific. As the result they wrote the famous Hull notes to Japan in an effort to establish our Pacific frontier. The appeasement of Japan, the Pacific aggressor, ended when these notes were delivered.

Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hull believed that China was important to our security. They risked war because of this conviction.

At any time Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Hull and the American Government had wanted to acknowledge the conquests of Japan in China and let Japan have her sweep they could have avoided World War II and the disastrous attack on Pearl Harbor. But Franklin D. Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull thought the control of China by a power hostile to the United States was sufficiently dangerous to our own security to risk a war. If Franklin D. Roosevelt and Cordell Hull were right then, the Truman administration is wrong at this time.

Tens of thousands of our sons and brothers fought a deadly bloody war in the Pacific to protect America from the Japanese aggressor. They won that war. They won with Chiang's help. They won virtually without assistance from Stalin.

I say virtually without assistance from Stalin, for Russia actually was at war with Japan but a few days. For such assistance as Stalin rendered or promised to render against Japan he exacted a high price. We agreed to Stalin's demand that Outer Mongolia be detached from China forever and made into another Soviet Socialist Republic.

We restored to Russia the rights which the imperialist czars had wrested from China in Manchuria. True, Japan, then our enemy, had taken these rights from Russia by war in 1904. But, did we divide the booty evenly between our friend Chiang and our friend Stalin? No, Mr. President, we did not. We gave it all to Stalin.

These were the territories, for which, for 20 years the Chinese Nationalists had been fighting. This was the enemy Chiang and the Chinese Nationalists had recognized first.

Did the Chinese people abandon the United States? When Chiang heard of the sell-out 4 months after Yalta, did he surrender? Did China make a deal? Did the Chinese Republic appease Stalin?

No; the Chinese Nationalists believed we were their friends; that these undercover agreements were wartime expedients. They thought the United States would not appease Stalin. Besides, they were promised assistance.

In addition to the promises, Chiang could see for himself our policy in Europe. After Stalin swallowed Poland, Hungary, Austria, Bulgaria, and Roumania, he saw the United States adopt a realistic policy and he saw the march of communism stopped or contained in Europe. The Chinese Nationalists were accustomed to waiting. They knew China came after Europe. Their turn for assistance would come.

Their turn came, but the assistance did not. China asked for arms and ammunition, and we sent General Marshall and a mission to demand that they take the Communists into their government. The Chinese Nationalists asked for gasoline and our exporters could not get a license to ship it to them. They requested war planes, and parts for those planes, and we sent them medical supplies.

Oh, yes, our people thought they were helping Chiang and the Chinese Nationalists. Did not our State Department officials say we were giving them billions of dollars' worth of aid?

This insidious propaganda created a widespread misapprehension in this country. What are the facts regarding aid to China?

From the records of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I find that from July 1, 1940, until June 30, 1949, a 9-year period which embraces the war and the postwar periods, a grand total of $3,112,000,000 has been furnished by the United States to aid China.

This total of three and one-tenth billions represents the piecemeal assistance which China received as lend-lease, stabilization funds, UNRRA aid, China aid, American Red Cross aid, and Import-Export Bank credits, over a period of 9 years.

That seems like quite a lot of assistance for China. Three and one-tenth billions of dollars is unquestionably a lot of money, even if it was granted piecemeal. But from the same committee records and for the same period of 9 years I also obtained the grand total of assistance we gave Stalin. The total in lend-lease, UNRRA, and American Red Cross assistance amounts to slightly over $11,000,000,000.

Think of that. Chiang, our steadfast friend and ally, has received less than one-third of the amount that Stalin, our one-time ally, has received. Chiang and China have rendered real service to our Nation when it would have been easier for China to appease and surrender. Stalin and Russia rendered service to this Nation on the eastern front in Europe because they had no alternative.

Do not forget that Stalin was Hitler's helper in the dismemberment of Poland in 1939 and 1940. Stalin did not fight Hitler until Hitler attacked Russia. Stalin had to fight to protect his homeland and the gangster regime which is master of the Russian people.

But that is not all the story on our aid to China. The $11,000,000,000 for Russia and the $3,000,000,000 for China are not the whole picture.

How many billions have we actually given China in postwar assistance? The aid we have given since January 1, 1946, is the true measure of our China policy, for it was in the last 4 years that the Communist armies have over-run that nation.

According to the State Department figures we have given less than $1,000,000,000 to China in the past 4 years. When China needed military assistance most, when we did not have to fly it over the hump or truck it over the Burma Road, how much aid did we provide?

The State Department figures add up to $962,000,000. About one-third of this amount, however, is charged to China for services we rendered in disarming and repatriating Japanese troops. That should have been a great help. This service could scarcely have been vital to Chiang in his fight against communism.

Of this amount—the $962,000,000 which the State Department claims we gave China in the postwar period—the Chinese Government offers to produce documentary proof that only $110,000,000 represented arms and ammunition for shooting Communists.

But what the State Department neglected to explain was what these other millions of dollars represented. A major portion was the value of unexpended war assets, most of which were of no value to the Chinese Nationalists. We sold China supplies which had rotted in Burma jungles. We furnished China, often at 100 cents on the dollar, such equipment

as trucks, which were defined as vehicles that had less than 20 percent of their parts missing. We charged China the full price for materials delivered in the United States of America. We let Chiang worry about transportation and freight charges. This was the billion of dollars' worth of assistance we rendered to our Chinese friends when they needed it most.

We have still another item to consider in the matter of our postwar aid to China. This is an item which does not show on a statement of funds rendered. It was the gratuitous advice given by the Marshall mission.

This was the United States mission, you, as Senators, will recall, that insisted that the Chinese Nationalists admit Communists to their government. Does it seem possible that our Government could propose that a man who had fought Communists for two decades should take his enemies into his official family?

What would we do if the Socialist government of England, for example, were to tell us that we had to take Socialists into our Government? We would say "No," I hope. But this would not be nearly as preposterous a request as we made of China; for Socialists control the British Government and it would be in their interest to have Socialists in our Government.

Think of this proposal. The same man who so courageously enunciated the Marshall plan for aid to the governments of Europe which resisted communism, the same General Marshall, demanded that Chiang stop his resistance and invite them into his government. How could it possibly be in the interests of the United States to have Communists in the Government of China?

Chiang Kai-shek did the only thing he could do. He turned down this demand. Chiang knew as I know and as everyone should know that it is not possible to cooperate with Communists. Every European country which has tried this form of appeasement has ended as a satellite slave state.

What happened when Chiang refused to concede an inch to the Communists in 1946. For nearly a year, until the summer of 1947, we clapped an arms embargo on the Chinese Nationalists.

This embargo was supposed to stop the civil war since it applied to both the Communists and the Nationalists. Since we were not supplying the Communists with arms during that time, at least to my knowledge, our embargo had the effect of holding Chiang's hands behind his back while the Communists punched him.

So the Chinese Nationalists suffered defeats.

Stalin did not renege on his promises. He furnished rifles and ammunition to his friends, not rusty trucks. We grabbed our man's arms right here in Washington; and when he was beaten and finally forced out of China, we said—here in Washington—that he would not fight; that the reason he lost the war was that he would not fight.

Now Chiang Kai-shek and the remnants of the Nationalists are in Formosa. Stalin has not been able to capture Chiang for trial or force him to suicide as he did Masaryk and Mindszenty. When we appease Stalin we want to be sure we do a good job. We must be sure he has a bloody head to show his slaves. So we write off Formosa.

Regardless of the moral or legal aspects of the situation, Mr. Acheson tells us Formosa is of no value, at least so long as Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalists are there. Perhaps if Chiang was captured by the Communists, Mr. Acheson would revert to the position his Department held in 1945. It is very interesting that on June 3, 1945, the State Department, which today says Formosa is of no value, in an official bulletin said, "* * * with the exception of Singapore, no location in the Far East occupies such a controlling position * * *." That is a reference to Formosa in a Department bulletin. (Department of State Bulletin dated June 3, 1945, vol. 12, No. 310, p. 1019.)

Much has been said, Mr. President, in this Chamber in recent weeks with regard to Formosa. In answer to his critics, Mr. Acheson, supported by the President of the United States, has written off Formosa and Chiang's government-in-exile.

Formosa, we are told by Mr. Acheson, has no strategic value.

It has been pointed out that Mr. Acheson is not a military expert. He is suave, he has a fine appearance, he has the marks of a diplomat, but he is no military expert. We asked if we could have the views of our Nation's military men. Now we are about to hear from the military experts.

We are about to witness a curious thing. We shall shortly hear from at least two men in the Military Establishment. Both, I believe, will support Mr. Acheson's position that Formosa has no strategic importance. The recent pattern of events in the executive department has indicated that if a top-ranking policy maker is to retain his position, he must unhesitatingly follow the line laid down by the President.

I shall be very interested in what these men have to say. Both know that if they fail to support Mr. Acheson they will be summarily fired by a Commander in Chief who will brook no insubordination or division of opinion. I know the men who will testify are honorable men; but they will by necessity have to choose their language carefully.

The net effect of their testimony will be interpreted as a whitewash for Mr. Acheson's position on Formosa.

But the fundamental question will remain, How long must we tolerate an Asian policy that constantly needs whitewash to obscure its sordid, muddleheaded failure? Our policy is a failure. Repeated attempts to explain our policy prove it to be a failure.

In 1946, at the time of the Marshall mission, the Communists were called liberals and agrarian reformers.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is now speaking about the testimony of the military experts as to the strategic value of Formosa?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. He is already condemning them, in advance, without hearing their testimony, is he not?

Mr. BRIDGES. I said they were honorable men, but knowing the policy of the administration, that if one does not follow the line, his head comes off, they will have to choose their language very carefully. I believe that is a conservative statement.

Mr. CONNALLY. If their testimony regarding Formosa is that from a military standpoint it does have value, that contemplates our sending an army or a navy to Formosa; does it not?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; it does not.

Mr. CONNALLY. If Formosa is not to be used for military purposes, what would be the value of testimony on its importance from a military standpoint?

Mr. BRIDGES. They might testify that it was advisable to send military supplies to Formosa so that the Chinese Nationalists might have one little spot in Asia from which they could combat communism.

Mr. CONNALLY. Supplies are not self-executing. They do not shoot. They do not fight.

Mr. BRIDGES. No; but the supplies which we sent there were not of a type which the troops of Chiang Kai-shek could use in a shooting war.

Mr. CONNALLY. Most of the supplies could not be used for that purpose, because they fell into the hands of the Communists. We found that a great amount of the supplies we sent, such as guns and ammunition, were in the hands of the Communists. I should like to ask the Senator this question: Does he favor sending an army to intervene in Formosa?

Mr. BRIDGES. No. Let me explain.

Mr. CONNALLY. That will take a lot of explaining.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well. My answer is "No." But I say that the Formosa incident is merely one of a series of events over a period of years. In itself, Formosa is not important, but it is a part of the pattern we have been following. I am not advocating, by any means, sending American soldiers to Formosa at this time, but I would send military supplies to the Chinese Nationalists, who are fighting the Communists, and I would send an American mission to see that the supplies were used properly, and used to fight the Communists.

Mr. CONNALLY. Then the Senator would favor a war of intervention. While he would send no army, he would send a military mission to tell them how to fight and to conduct the war.

Mr. BRIDGES. I would follow the lead of the distinguished Senator from Texas. I would follow his lead as I did when he advocated doing the same thing in fighting the Communists in Greece. I followed his able leadership then, and I would do the same thing in regard to Formosa.

Mr. CONNALLY. We did not send any soldiers to Greece——

Mr. BRIDGES. We sent a military mission.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator did not let me finish. We sent no combat soldiers. How far does the Senator's view on Formosa represent the view of the other side of the Chamber?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not know. I speak only for myself.

Mr. CONNALLY. One Senator cannot save Formosa.

Mr. BRIDGES. No; and I do not think that the Senator from Texas can, although I believe that with the position he holds as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, if he would speak up as courageously as he did when we sent arms and supplies and a military mission to Greece, it would have tremendous influence.

Mr. CONNALLY. The military mission to Greece and our intervention there were successful, and the war in Greece is over. The Senator now desires to embark on a war in the East without any soldiers and without anything except some ammunition which he would send there, although we sent millions upon millions upon millions of dollars worth of ammunition while the Nationalists were still in possession of the mainland of China, and they could not support themselves, and did not fight, and did not stand up.

Mr. BRIDGES. When it came to containing communism in Europe, the Senator very courageously in his committee and on the floor of the Senate stood up and we heard his clarion voice from the Texas plains cry out for containing communism. When it came to sending supplies into Greece, when there was a bloody war in Greece, he did not hesitate. When the question arose as to sending a military mission to Greece, he did not hesitate. I admired the Senator for his attitude. I felt as he did. Now I ask the distinguished Senator from Texas only to be consistent and to lend his clarion voice and his great leadership to doing the same thing for China he did for Greece.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from New Hampshire undertakes to draw a comparison between what happened in Greece and the Chinese situation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. We furnished Greece a few hundred million dollars—I do not now remember the exact amount—and Greece made use of it. She fought. She brought the war to an end. She stopped the Communists from coming down into Greece. That was Greece. The Senator approved that, he said.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. According to the Senator's own figures, we have given China $3,000,000,000. With the $3,000,000,000 given to China, she has not stopped anything. She did not stop the onrush of the Communists. She did not win the war. She did not bring it to an end. She wound up in possession of many of the arms and supplies and munitions which we as a generous Government, a generous people, who have always been attached to the Chinese, sent her. But she made no use of them.

Does the Senator contend that that is parallel to the case of Greece?

Mr. BRIDGES. The $3,000,000,000, made available to China, was not, as the Senator well knows, represented wholly by actual military supplies which could be used for fighting purposes. Only a small part of that amount represented such supplies. A considerable part of the amount represented planes without parts, trucks without wheels or brakes, all kinds of equipment which had rusted and rotted in the jungles of the Pacific, but which we sold to the Chinese at full value. The unfairness of the thing is that while we were selling to certain countries—I cannot give the Senator the exact figures, but I know the general proportions—for instance, to Greece, and some other countries in Europe, ammunition for a certain price, which was only a small fractional part of the cost, at the same time we were selling the same kind of ammunition to China at replacement cost. We charged China at least 15 or 20 times the price we charged other countries for the same articles.

The Senator from Texas has spoken today, and he spoke the other day also, about the dangers in which we might become involved in China. The Senator, however, did not hesitate, when it came to the question of the Berlin air lift, to stand up on the floor of the Senate and be courageous. The Senator has not hesitated to lift his golden voice in this Chamber and in committee in support of our stand in Europe. I agree with the Senator's position in that regard. However, I should like to have the Senator, who holds so powerful a position and who is able to lead and convince others, show the same consistency respecting the East that he has shown respecting the West.

I wonder if the Senator read the statement by Will Clayton, a friend of his—I believe he is a fellow Texan—former Assistant Secretary of State. Yesterday Will Clayton, who has been active in our foreign affairs from the beginning of the war, but who is now out of the Government and can state his mind freely, said that if the present trend continues the continent of North America will be a little island in a Communist world by 1955. That is something we must recognize as being vital at such a time as this. We have to view the picture in a realistic way.

Mao, Stalin's No. 1 puppet in China, exploded the myth which many in our State Department and other liberal left-wingers in our country have been promoting throughout the Nation, that the Communists of China were not real Communists, that they were agrarian reformers, when in April 1949, Mao announced that in the event of war between the United States and Russia, the Chinese Communists would fight on the side of Stalin and Russia. That statement by Mao was somewhat embarrassing to Mr. Acheson and the State Department, who are directing our far-eastern policy. It called for another coat of whitewash. So the August alibi—the State Department's white paper on China—was the result. At that time, together with colleagues from both political parties in this Senate, I branded this document a whitewash for a wishful do-nothing policy.

Mr. Acheson recently wielded another broad brush, but his calcimine mix was thinner than ever. I have read his speech before the National Press Club. That speech is a masterful example of performing a stately quadrille in midair. As nearly as I can understand Mr. Acheson, he seemed to say that those who claim that the real interest of the United States is to stop the spread of communism are putting the cart before the horse. Through the whitewash, it appears, Mr. Acheson thinks that Stalin will not be able to rule China because Mao is likely to become another Tito, and at the insistence of the Chinese people, he will refuse to cooperate with the Kremlin.

If one wishes to be unrealistic, this thought can be very comforting. But a few paragraphs south of this wishful thinking, Mr. Acheson announced that Russia had detached certain northern provinces of China and incorporated them in the Soviet Union.

Mao will not have to cooperate with Stalin in these northern provinces. They no longer are a part of China. They are now a part of Russia.

Apparently, Mr. Acheson is anticipating the need for further whitewash, for he has dispatched a man to the Far East to view the situation at first-hand. When this man returns he will make a report. Any further explanations of our failure in Asia can be incorporated in his report. The man who Mr. Acheson sent to the Far East to make the first-hand survey had one little duty to perform before he left for the Far East. His name is Philip C. Jessup, and before he left he had to go to New York to interrupt the Alger Hiss perjury trial to testify in behalf of Alger Hiss. He told the jury about the former Russian espionage agent's excellent reputation for truth and honesty. He testified as a general character witness. He said he was sorry to interrupt the trial because he had to hurry to Asia where he was going to survey what was going on there.

Mr. President, think of sending to the Far East to determine what is the Communist situation in Asia, Mr. Jessup, a man who has so misjudged another man in his own department by the name of Alger Hiss, a man who has the nerve and the gall to intervene in a case in which the United States Government was prosecuting a man for perjury in connection with charges of espionage for Russia. Think of it. This man Jessup has confidence in such a man as Hiss. How can I have confidence, how can any American have confidence in any report Mr. Jessup makes on China?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it the attitude of the Senator from New Hampshire that because Dr. Jessup appeared as a witness in that case—I care not what he testified to—therefore we ought to intervene in Formosa?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is attempting to make a burlesque out of this matter. I wish the Senator would approach such matters as this with the same deadly seriousness he approaches many other questions. The Senator likes to have his little joke and to play his little burlesque, and I am always glad to hear him when he does so. However, I do not take his side remarks too seriously because I know that if he could simply give play to the inspiration in his soul and heart he would stand up and fight for the east as well as he has done for the west. This burlesque is simply a cover-up for the State Department's weakness, and is indulged in because it is obnoxious to him really to get up and defend what has been done, because down in his heart I think he knows that what has been done is wrong.

Think of it, Mr. President. Mr. Jessup has been sent to China to determine the situation that exists there. But first Mr. Jessup testified for Alger Hiss. He whitewashed and gave a good name, and so forth, to this man who has been convicted of perjury in connection with the furnishing of secret information to the Russians. Hiss has been convicted of perjury in connection with the charge of being a former Communist agent. What confidence can we have in a man who testified as Mr. Jessup did? I will admit that Mr. Jessup's word can be taken with as much confidence and reliance as that of some who are conducting affairs for the State Department. But what if Mr. Will Clayton's prediction that by 1955 the North American Continent will be a little island in the midst of a Communist world, is true, Senators, do you know what will then be the feeling of the American people toward the Jessups, the Butterworths, the Achesons? I hope we will be around to take note, if it should happen, because in my judgment there will be strong feeling against those who have helped to bring it about.

How long must we go on attempting to justify Mr. Roosevelt's mistake at Yalta? That was the original error. Let us assume for the sake of debate that Mr. Roosevelt, as his New Deal adherents claim, was the greatest President of all time. Can we not admit that even he could make a mistake, instead of trying to cover up everything?

We can perhaps excuse this fatal mistake. His health was shattered. On February 11, 1945, at Yalta, he was a broken man. He was nearly exhausted after a hard political campaign. He had at his elbow there at Yalta, as a trusted adviser, Alger Hiss, the same Alger Hiss convicted as a liar and perjurer last Saturday.

Let us be honest with the American people. Let us tell them that Mr. Roosevelt made a mistake. Roosevelt thought he could appease Stalin, and he was wrong.

I venture to say that if Franklin D. Roosevelt were alive today, and in good health, he would admit his error and set about to correct it. I do not think he would want the United States of America to compound his error time and time again.

Mr. President, we have confessed to the world that in Europe we made a mistake when we tried to appease Stalin. Let us do likewise respecting Asia.

Surely, the pattern of appeasement is clear to us now. It was clear to me from 1937 to 1941. I was one of those who shared the abuse which was heaped on any man who would have stopped Hitler while there was yet time.

We were called interventionists. It was a vile name. We were accused of beings tools of munitions interests. It was said we wanted to plunge the world into a blood bath. It was claimed we wanted to sacrifice the lives of American boys on foreign soils. Senators know how this pattern of appeasement led to World War II.

The same path will lead to world war III.

We are asked to support a bipartisan—a nonpartisan foreign policy. It would be an ideal situation. But tell me, tell all of us, where can we begin? What nation, what treaty, what territory, what national leader can we support?

Every time the Communist imperialists start a civil war in Asia—to swallow more of the people of the earth, must we wait until the dust settles? Is there any point where we can draw a line and say this island, this country, this meridian is of strategic importance to us?

I believe China was essential to the defense of the United States, but we sold China like Chamberlain sold out at Munich. We had been told, even by the State Department, that Formosa was vital to our interests, but we have used Formosa as Chamberlain used Czechoslovakia.

Now we are told that we will extend economic aid to Indochina, Burma, India, Pakistan, and South Korea. Does this mean these countries are vital to our interests? Or does it mean we intend to fatten them for the Red imperialists?

Apparently Members of the House of Representatives are confused on this question, for last week they voted not to appropriate funds for economic assistance to South Korea.

Are the other nations of Asia vital to the military defense of the United States? Does the security of our Nation have any relation to the foreign policy of the United States?

Mr. President, is Japan essential to the defense of the United States? Is Okinawa essential to our defense? Are the Philippines essential to our defense? Is Alaska of strategic importance to the United States? Is Hawaii important to our defense? What are we to do if they are threatened by "agrarian reformers"?

If none of these is important, then the Pacific is not important. Then we need vote no more funds for these countries, because Stalin will take care of them after they have been stirred by a gentle agrarian reform.

Then I shall ask whether California and Oregon and Washington are important. Then perhaps Mr. Acheson and his Charley McCarthys will tell us that the Rocky Mountains are actually our first line of defense.

Mr. President, I am no warmonger, and I am no jingoist. I am not an imperialist, nor am I an insolent megalomaniac. But Joseph Stalin is all of these things. And the Communist totalitarian system will produce one Stalin after another.

The conviction of Alger Hiss made these questions occur to me:

First. Is all of our foreign policy aimed at concealing the error of a war-weary President or is there a more positive motive?

Second. Does the Communist conspiracy, headed in the Kremlin, still have its agents working in our State Department?

Third. Because of the appeasers—this is a nice name for them—who were, and still are in our Government, have the United States and the other peace-loving peoples of the world lost the peace?

Mr. President, since 1937 I have stood in this Chamber many, many times and have offered suggestions as to our policy in Asia. I believe it is my constitutional duty as a United States Senator to offer my advice and my judgment on such matters.

My suggestions that we stop appeasing aggressors and exert a positive influence toward peaceful settlement of territorial disputes have been ignored. Time and again I have asked that we draw a line against small aggressions before the aggressor becomes a hungry monster.

The failure to stop Hitler and Mussolini in Europe and the failure to stop Tojo in Asia led to World War II. American blood was shed in steaming jungles and on frozen plains, American homes were broken, and American hearts were shattered. We won the war at great cost in blood and treasure. Must we blindly follow the same course to world war III?

Can we contain communism in Europe, and yet allow communism to run rampant in Asia? Is Europe vital to our defense, but Asia of no consequence? Can we win the cold war in the west, while we lose the cold war in the Far East? Is the Atlantic a rampart we watch and the Pacific a redoubt we abandon?

Mr. President, I appreciate the argument that a policy of appeasement is based on the Christian principle of turning the other cheek. I have considered this argument carefully and thoughtfully.

I believe in Christian principles. I think we should apply them. But, I submit, Christianity has no meaning to Joseph Stalin. Communists reject our Christian faith. They despise and defame our Saviour. Can we who believe in Christ appease those who would destroy Him?

I cannot believe that Christ would have us surrender to those who would deny us the freedom to worship Him, our most sacred right.

Mr. President, this freedom—all freedom—has been hard won. Other peaceful peoples of the world expect that we will not tire of the struggle for liberty. These peoples look to us for leadership in this decade of decision.

Let us lead all the world to lasting peace. Let us contain the Red monster while there is yet time. Let us work from the Atlantic alliance to an effective United Nations, firm in the conviction that we cannot appease Communist imperialism and that we will not surrender to the enemies of Christ.

PROPOSED UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT ON EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

During Mr. BRIDGES' speech,

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield that I may submit to the Senate a unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, tomorrow at 1 o'clock, the Senate vote on the pending measure and all amendments thereto, the time between 12 and 1 o'clock to be divided equally and to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and that no amendments be submitted which are not germane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I have no desire to object to the reaching of the unanimous-consent agreement—is it not the customary practice to have a quorum call as a preliminary to the propounding of a unanimous-consent request of this kind?

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to my distinguished friend from California, there was a quorum call immediately preceding recognition of the Senator from New Hampshire for the purpose of the delivery of his speech. The Senator from New Hampshire had only been talking about 3 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder whether the Senator will temporarily hold the request in abeyance?

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to do so.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AND REGULATION OF TRADE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, today I intend to introduce a joint resolution which would stop any assistance of any kind whatsoever, on our part, to any nation now having trade agreements with, or engaging in trade or commerce with, or assisting in any manner any Communist nation or Communist-controlled nation or areas.

Mr. President, early next week—on Monday or Tuesday—I intend to address the Senate on the question of what is a sensible domestic policy for our Nation. At that time I shall discuss whether we should have a policy by which the people of the United States would have the equal access to their own markets that foreign countries have been given under the Trade Agreements Act—in other words I will show that the flexible import-fee principle should be substituted for the Trade Agreements Act, and that the enactment of the proposed International Trade Organization legislation should be stopped. I shall address the Senate, early next week, on that subject.

Today I intend to show, first, Mr. President, that we have no definite foreign policy; second, that we are aiding Russia to consolidate her gains in eastern Europe and in Communist China; third, that we are assisting Russia to arm for a third world war; and fourth, that the Secretary of State should make up his mind, relative to our foreign policy, as to whether the Russian Communists are dangerous to us; and, if so, that we should stop all aid to nations which are assisting Russia—the iron-curtain countries—China, or any Communist area; and that we should form our own policy, and not be pushed into it by other nations with whom we are dealing.

Mr. President, at this point, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution to prohibit financial aid to any foreign country engaging in trade with Russia, her satellite countries, or any other area dominated or controlled by Russia. I ask that the joint resolution be read and inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Without objection, the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution to prohibit financial aid to any foreign country engaging in trade with Russia, her satellite countries, or any other area dominated or controlled by Russia.

Whereas one of the alleged basic purposes of the Marshall plan is the restoration or maintenance in European countries of principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence through a joint program based upon self-help and mutual cooperation; and

Whereas Russia and other Communist-dominated and controlled countries and areas have refused to participate in such joint program; and

Whereas Communist actions have endangered world peace; and

Whereas certain participating nations under the Marshall plan by trading with Russia and other Communist-dominated and controlled countries and areas and through nonaggression pacts and treaties are violating the basic principles of the Marshall plan and are aiding and fostering communism in other areas of the world through furnishing the necessary equipment, machinery, and supplies to consolidate Communist gains in eastern Europe and in Asia; and

Whereas such nations are furnishing Russia and the Communist areas necessary equipment, machinery, and supplies for world war III; and

Whereas it is the sense of the Congress and the basic policy of the Marshall plan and its enabling legislation that assistance to any participating country which fails in any way to meet its obligations to sustain and strengthen the principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence, through cooperating with such Communist nations and areas, should be terminated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That on and after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, no financial aid shall be given by the United States or any agency or officer thereof (whether by loan, grant, lend-lease, or in any other manner) to any foreign country which engages in trade or commerce on or after such date with Russia, her satellite countries, or any other Communist-dominated or controlled area in any other country.

SEC. 2. It is the sense of the Congress that no moneys shall hereafter be appropriated and no loans shall hereafter be made and no equipment or supplies of any kind shall be furnished to any nation engaging in such trade or commerce or permitting its nationals to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, where it is hoped deep, searching, profound, and sincere consideration will be given thereto, and in due course of time report made to the Senate of the United States, for the enlightenment of those who represent the 48 States.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Chair.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 151) to prohibit financial aid to any foreign country engaging in trade with Russia, her satellite countries, or any other area dominated or controlled by Russia, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I submit and ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point a list of 95 trade treaties, which are at this moment in good standing, that were made by the Marshall-plan nations, now known as the 16 ECA nations, with Russia and with the iron-curtain countries. Of these trade treaties 88 were in full force and effect in March 1949, when the junior Senator from Nevada debated the extension of the Marshall plan or ECA; but since that time those that have expired have been renewed, and 7 new treaties made. I submit the list to be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the list submitted by the Senator from Nevada will be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 1.)

EXHIBIT 1

List of most recent trade agreements between OEEC countries and countries of eastern Europe

NOTE: Insofar as possible the effective date, the date of signature (in parentheses) and the expiration date are noted under "Period."

Agreement partners	Period	Special features
Austria-Bulgaria	Dec. 17, 1948, to Dec. 31, 1949; supplemental July 7, 1949; unless notice given, continues, then 90 days' notice to terminate.	
Austria-Czechoslovakia	July 1 (July 15), 1949, to June 30, 1950	
Austria-Hungary	Sept. 1 (Sept. 13), 1949, to Aug. 31, 1950	
Austria-Poland	July 15 (July 5), 1949, to July 31, 1950	
Austria-Yugoslavia	Oct. 25 (Nov. 12), 1949, to Oct. 24, 1950	

List of most recent trade agreements between OEEC countries and countries of eastern Europe—Continued

Agreement partners	Period	Special features
Belgium Luxemburg-Bulgaria	Apr. 21, 1947, to Apr. 21, 1948	
Benelux-Czechoslovakia	Oct. 1 (Nov. 30), 1949, to Sept. 30, 1950	
Belgium-Luxemburg-Finland	Nov. 6 (Dec. 16), 1948, to Nov. 5, 1949	
Belgium-Luxemburg-Hungary	Feb. 18 (Feb. 18), 1949, to February 1950	
Belgium-Luxemburg-Poland	Nov. 1 (Nov. 11), 1948, to Dec. 31, 1949	
Belgium-Luxemburg-Rumania	Sept. 3, 1948, to Sept. 3, 1949	
Belgium-Luxemburg-Yugoslavia	Sept. 11, 1948, to September 1949	
Belgium-Luxemburg-U. S. S. R	January (Feb. 18), 1948, to 1949	Soviet deliveries scheduled for 1948. Belgium deliveries scheduled for 1948-49.
Belgium-Luxemburg-Germany (Soviet zone).	Nov. 10, 1947, to Nov. 9, 1948	
Denmark-Bulgaria	May 9, 1947, to May 9, 1948	
Denmark-Czechoslovakia	Oct. 1 (Nov. 30), 1949, to Nov. 30, 1950	
Denmark-Finland	May 1 (Mar. 22), 1949, to Apr. 30, 1950	
Denmark-Hungary	Mar. 1 (Mar. 22), 1949, to Feb. 28, 1950	
Denmark-Poland	Oct. 1 (Dec. 7), 1949, to Sept. 30, 1950	
Denmark-Rumania	Aug. 3, 1949	
Denmark-Yugoslavia	Apr. 1 (Apr. 8), 1949, to Mar. 31, 1950	
Denmark-U. S. S. R	July 1 (July 8), 1948, to Dec. 31, 1949	
Denmark-Germany (Soviet zone)	Jan. 1, 1949 (Dec. 20, 1948), to Dec. 31, 1949	
France-Bulgaria	June 15 (June 10), 1947, to June 1, 1948	
France-Czechoslovakia	Aug. 1 (Aug. 6), 1948, to Aug. 1, 1949; supplemental March 1949; extended to Dec. 31, 1949.	
France-Finland	May 1 (May 20), 1949, to Apr. 30, 1950	
France-Hungary	Nov. 1 (Nov. 22), 1947, to Nov. 1, 1948; protocols: supplementing and extending agreements to Oct. 31, 1949; June 18, 1948, December 1948, April 1949, August 1949.	
France-Poland	Jan. 1, 1949 (Dec. 29, 1948), to Dec. 31, 1949	Investment agreement Mar. 19, 1948 to 1952.
France-Rumania	July 15 (July 6), 1946, to completion	
France-Yugoslavia	May 21, 1949, to May 21, 1950	
Greece-Czechoslovakia	Aug. 1 (July 30), 1947, to August 1948	
Greece-Finland	Mar. 24, 1949, indefinite period	
Iceland-Czechoslovakia	Mar. 1 (Feb. 16), 1949, to Apr. 30, 1950	
Iceland-Finland	June 1 (May 29), 1949, to June 30, 1950	
Iceland-Poland	Jan. 1, 1950 (Nov. 18, 1949), to Dec. 31, 1950	
Iceland-U. S. S. R	No renewal of 1946 agreement	
Italy-Bulgaria	November 1948 to November 1949	
Italy-Czechoslovakia	October 1948 to July 1949	Barter deals within framework of agreement of July 2, 1947.
Italy-Finland	Nov. 1, 1949, indefinite	
Italy-Hungary	Dec. 16 (Dec. 20), 1948, to Dec. 31, 1949	
Italy-Poland	July 1 (July 15), 1949, to June 30, 1952	Investment agreement: Nov. 1, 1949 (Jan. 23, 1950), to Nov. 1, 1952.
Italy-Yugoslavia	Aug. 4, 1949, to Aug. 3, 1950	Investment agreement Nov. 28, 1947, to November 1952.
Italy-U. S. S. R	Dec. 11, 1948, to Dec. 31, 1949	Investment agreement, December 1948, to December 1951.
Italy-Germany (Soviet Zone)	June 1949 to completion	Interim agreement.
Netherlands-Bulgaria	March 1949 (Oct. 30, 1948) to Dec. 31, 1949	
Netherlands-Czechoslovakia	May 19 (May 10), 1949, to Apr. 30, 1950	
Netherlands-Finland	June 1, 1949, to May 31, 1950	
Netherlands-Hungary	Jan. 1, 1949 (Dec. 20, 1948), to Dec. 31, 1949; supplemental Sept. 23, 1949	
Netherlands-Poland	Jan. 1 (Feb. 16), 1949, to Dec. 31 1949	
Netherlands-Rumania	Feb. 16, 1948, preliminary agreement	Efforts for new agreement unsuccessful, February 1949.
Netherlands-Yugoslavia	Nov. 1 (Nov. 7), 1949, to Nov. 1, 1950; investment agreement, Feb. 1, 1948, to January 1951.	
Netherlands-USSR	June 10 (July 2), 1948, to 1953	Investment agreement.
Netherlands-Germany (Soviet Zone)	July 30, 1949, to June 30, 1950	
Norway-Czechoslovakia	Mar. 1 (Mar. 30), 1949, to Feb. 28, 1950; Supplemental, July 16, 1949	
Norway-Finland	Nov. 1 (Sept. 30), 1949, to Oct. 31, 1950	
Norway-Hungary	Nov. 4, 1947, to Aug. 31, 1949; extension to Dec. 31, 1949	
Norway-Poland	Jan. 1, 1950 (Dec. 21, 1949), to Dec. 31, 1950	
Norway-Yugoslavia	Apr. 30 (Apr. 2), 1949, to Apr. 30, 1950	
Norway-U. S. S. R	Jan. 1 (Jan. 10), 1949, to Dec. 31, 1949	
Norway-Germany (Soviet zone)	Jan. 1, to Dec. 31, 1949	
Sweden-Bulgaria	October (Sept. 22), 1947, to December 1948; extension to Dec. 31, 1949	
Sweden-Czechoslovakia	Feb. 1, 1949, to Jan. 31, 1950	
Sweden-Finland	Apr. 1 (Mar. 19), 1949, to Mar. 31, 1950	
Sweden-Hungary	Dec. 1 (Nov. 30), 1949, to Nov. 30, 1950	
Sweden-Poland	Oct. 1 (Oct. 29), 1949, to Oct. 31, 1950	Investment agreement: Mar. 19, 1947 to 1954.
Sweden-Yugoslavia	Apr. 15 (Mar. 22), 1948, to Apr. 15, 1949; supplemental, Jan. 2, 1950	Investment agreement: Apr. 15 (Apr. 12), 1947, to Apr. 15, 1954.
Sweden-U. S. S. R	Jan. 1 (Apr. 2) to Dec. 31, 1949	Investment and credit agreement October 1946 to Dec. 31, 1951.
Sweden-Germany (Soviet zone)	July 1 (July 19), 1949, to June 30, 1950	
Switzerland-Bulgaria	Jan. 1, 1949 (Nov. 9, 1948), to Dec. 31, 1949	
Switzerland-Czechoslovakia	Jan. 1, 1950 (Dec. 22, 1949), to Dec. 31, 1950	
Switzerland-Finland	Sept. 1 (Aug. 21), 1948, to Feb. 28, 1950	
Switzerland-Hungary	Oct. 1 (Oct. 22), 1948, to Sept. 30, 1949	
Switzerland-Poland	July 1 (June 26), 1949, to 1954	Investment agreement.
Switzerland-Rumania	March 4, 1947, to March 1950	
Switzerland-Yugoslavia	Oct. 1 (Sept. 27), 1948, to Sept. 30, 1949	Investment agreement: October 1948-53; annual quotas.
Switzerland-USSR	Apr. 1 (Mar. 17), 1948, to Apr. 1949; extension to December 1949	Investment schedules: Apr. 1, 1948, to 1951.
Switzerland-Germany (Soviet Zone)	July 20 (July 20), 1947, to July 20, 1948	
Turkey-Czechoslovakia	July 1 (July 9), 1949, to June 30, 1950	
Turkey-Finland	June 20 (June 12), 1948, to June 1, 1949	No quotas scheduled.
Turkey-Hungary	June 1 (May 12), 1949, to June 1, 1950	
Turkey-Poland	Aug. 1 (July 18), 1948, to July 31, 1949; extension to July 31, 1950	
Turkey-Yugoslavia	June 5, 1950	
United Kingdom-Czechoslovakia	Sept. 28 (Sept. 28), 1949, to June 30, 1950	
United Kingdom-Finland	Jan. 26, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1949	
United Kingdom-Hungary	Aug. 1 (Aug. 9), 1947, to July 31, 1950	
United Kingdom-Poland	Jan. 14, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1953, annual quotas	Investment agreement: not all goods have annual quotas.
United Kingdom-Yugoslavia	Dec. 26, 1949, to 1954	
United Kingdom-USSR	Dec. 27, 1947, to 1951	Investment agreement: U. S. S. R. deliveries Feb. to Sept. 1948, U. K. deliveries, 1948-1951.
Germany (Trizone)-Bulgaria	Oct. 4, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1947; extension to Dec. 31, 1949	
Germany (Trizone)-Czechoslovakia	Dec. 3 (Oct. 1), 1948, to Sept. 30, 1949; protocols supplementing and extending agreement to Sept. 30, 1950; Mar. 16, 1949; and Oct. 1, 1949.	
Germany (Trizone)-Finland	Mar. 16 (Feb. 3) 1949, to Dec. 31, 1949; supplemental July 11, 1949	
Germany (Trizone)-Hungary	Oct. 1, (Oct. 20), 1949, to Sept. 30, 1950	
Germany (Trizone)-Poland	July 5, 1949 to June 30, 1950	
Germany (Trizone)-Yugoslavia	Jan. 1, 1950 to Dec. 31, 1950	
Germany (Trizone)-Germany (Soviet Zone).	Oct. 8, 1949, to June 30, 1950	

Mr. MALONE. The 95 separate treaties made by the ECA nations with the iron-curtain countries and Russia since World War II cover hundreds of products, but they particularly cover the important products, such as steam and Diesel engines, locomotives, electrical equipment, heavy farm machinery, heavy road machinery, tool steel, ball bearings, and practically all kinds of products, made from strategic and critical minerals and materials, such as machine tools, many kinds of machinery and processed and manufactured equipment, clothing, and everything that is necessary for the consolidation of their gains in eastern Europe and in China, and also, which is more important to our national security, to wage war on the United States of America.

I ask that only the tabulated part of the list of equipment and supplies which is to be sent to Rumania from Belgium—to digress, out of the whole 95 treaties, I intend to submit for the RECORD only four or five, merely to show the range of equipment and material covered in those treaties, not the texts of the treaties, which will be available at the State Department, although I may say that many of these 95 treaties, were entirely secret. The junior Senator from Nevada was not allowed to keep some of them in his office, they were so secret. Others were restricted; that is to say, we were allowed only to read them ourselves, we could not make the contents public. I may also say a considerable number of the treaties were in foreign languages, making it impossible to submit them for the RECORD. They were really secret treaties which a representative of the State Department brought to the office of the junior Senator from Nevada, carefully holding them in his hands, they were so vital and secret. For the RECORD, I submit merely the tabulated list of the material that is to be shipped from Belgium to Rumania under the treaty which is now in full force and effect between Belgium and Rumania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the list will be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, from another such treaty, I submit for the RECORD, not the treaty itself, but a list of the material which is to be shipped from Italy to the Soviet zone in Germany. I submit the tabular list for the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I refer now to a further treaty between Austria and Czechoslovakia. Excluding the text of the treaty, I desire to place in the RECORD merely the tabular list of exports from Austria to Czechoslovakia, the purpose in submitting the lists for the RECORD being merely to show the type of material included in the treaties in the nature of trade agreements—material shipped from ECA nations to the iron-curtain countries and to Soviet Russia—as a result of our assistance to these nations. I submit the list and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I submit a further list of materials covered by a treaty between Sweden and Bulgaria, the treaty being in full force and effect, having been made since World War II. I submit for the RECORD only the classified list of the materials to be shipped from Sweden to Bulgaria.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 5.)

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I submit a further list of materials to be shipped from Sweden to Russia, under a trade agreement made between those two countries, now in full force and effect. It is a classified list of materials to be shipped to Russia from Sweden.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the list will be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 6.)

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, from another such trade treaty made between Austria and Poland, now in full force and effect, I submit the classified list, to be printed in the RECORD, showing materials to be shipped from Austria to Poland.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the list will be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 7.)

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask that the classified lists in the trade treaties themselves appear at the end of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7.)

BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the bipartisan foreign policy has resulted in a demand on the part of our high-placed Government officials that the Government and anything its officials may do be above criticism.

That may be all right for Mr. Stalin in Russia, but it is not all right for the United States of America. This Government has already made an unholy mess of every problem and every policy that has been adopted since World War II. They have finally succeeded in wrecking our control and prestige in world affairs.

Where, at the end of World War II, we were the strongest nation in the world, both economically and militarily, we have allowed ourselves to grow progressively weaker in performance, and the Russians, through our indirect help to that nation and to their satellites in eastern Europe and China, to grow progressively stronger. So I say that an administration that has made these terrible mistakes has no right to demand that everything they do should be above criticism. In fact, criticism is the one thing urgently demanded at this time.

They have made a colossal failure, including the Yalta Conference, where Russia was given control of Manchuria, the bread basket and the key to China and Asia, and also given Berlin, which gave them a foothold in Europe. The State Department has stood idly by without any definite foreign policy whatever and, in fact, indirectly assisted Russia to consolidate their gains in eastern Europe and to conquer area after area in China, so that entire great nation is now under Russian control.

China is only a start. Indochina will be next, and then perhaps the Malay States, Siam, and even India.

That is why the Senate of the United States should hold the executive department of the Government accountable for its action. It is on account of such criticism over the past critical periods that we are still a free government and not the government of some totalitarian area like Soviet Russia.

The bipartisan policy has supported the three-part free-trade program of the administration. It has helped Congress to abdicate its position of constitutional control of the economy of our Nation in favor of the State Department through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended, which puts into the hands of an industrially inexperienced State Department the right to say what industries in this country shall survive and what industries shall be scrapped.

FATE OF JOBS AND INVESTMENTS

Through the Trade Agreements Act, the Congress of the United States put in the hands of a Secretary of State the fate of practically every workingman's job and every investment in the United States of America.

The Congress of the United States must take full responsibility for the results when they yield their constitutional responsibility to the executive department of the Government.

MUST MAKE UP OUR MINDS

We must make up our minds whether or not we are engaged in a cold war and whether or not we are against communism.

If we are against communism, then we are engaged in a cold war with Communist Russia and if the Russians are still attempting to conquer the world and bring disaster to us, which the Secretary of State has so often said in his many addresses—then we have no choice but to refuse to assist the Communists under any circumstances, either directly or indirectly with Russia or with her satellite nations in eastern Europe and in Asia—in the hope that they will collapse and fail to consolidate their gains, and will be pushed back by the very people that they are endeavoring to conquer.

It is the only alternative to defeat their purposes, except to engage in a shooting war with them.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN POLICY

The Executive Department, including the Department of State, is charged by the Constitution of the United States with fixing our foreign policy. If any arrangement with a foreign nation comes before the United States Senate, in the form of a treaty, the Senate can only accept or reject their conclusions.

It is in the hands of the State Department to make the decision whether or not we are in a cold war, as they have so often stated, and whether or not Russia and her satellite countries, including the Communist areas, are a threat to

our existence as a free nation—and if the answer is "No, they are not a threat and we are not engaged in a cold war with them," then we should include all such areas in our regular trade and quit deceiving the American public.

SHOULD CEASE GIVING INDIRECT ASSISTANCE

Mr. President, if the decision of the executive department of our Government is that we are in a cold war with Russia and that our system of Government is threatened through the spread of the Communist doctrine, then we should forthwith cease all assistance of any kind whatsoever to nations which are rendering such assistance through trade agreements, loans, and other arrangements, to Russia, her satellite countries in eastern Europe, China, or any other Communist areas.

ASSISTING RUSSIA FOR WORLD WAR III

Up to this time we have taken no position. We are furnishing substantial assistance to the very nations who have made the 95 trade treaties with Russia and her satellite eastern European countries and are sending them everything they need to consolidate their gains in eastern Europe and in China and to fight world war III.

We are continuing to finance such nations, as for example, England, which country has made several such trade treaties with Russia and the iron-curtain countries. These countries have continually furnished such material to Communist China through Hongkong, including heavy-duty material, consumer goods, and the very products which are necessary for the Communists to consolidate their gains in China. This procedure means that we are willingly indirectly assisting such nations, while we are telling the American people that we shall not trade with them directly, and it means that our foreign policy is being fixed for us, when Britain, India, and other nations recognize Communist China while we have no definite foreign policy at all.

The American people are entitled to know these facts. Our foreign policy is being made for us and, of course, there is a strong assumption by informed persons that the executive branch through the Department of State, has agreed to follow England in recognizing Communist China. The furor raised by persons who want to see a definite policy established before such recognition is made has postponed such recognition. Probably it is only postponed.

MAKE UP OUR MINDS

Mr. President, the Secretary must make up his mind what is important, what we are for, and what we are against as a foreign policy, take a definite position, and deny assistance to any nation which will not cooperate with us, and especially those which go further and cooperate with our potential enemies. We must make our own foreign policy and quit letting other nations push us around. Otherwise, we are slowly being pushed toward world war III, and we shall have very little to say about it when it comes.

FRIENDS OR ENEMIES

It simply means that the ECA nations, including England, which are furnishing the goods to eastern Europe and to Communist China to keep them from floundering and to help them to consolidate their gains are actually in a sense our enemies. They are operating only for profit, while we are taxing our own American citizens to the quick to pay for what eventually will be a hot war undertaken by the Communists against us.

SAME MISTAKE TWICE IN 15 YEARS

Mr. President, we are simply making the same mistake over again. Twice in 15 years we are arming our potential enemies—we assisted Japan in arming for World War II by shipping them petroleum and scrap-iron supplies, and then when they hit Pearl Harbor we sent our boys into the Pacific to catch that scrap iron coming back out of Japanese guns, and it was not pretty. We are now doing the same thing on a larger scale. We are indirectly furnishing Russia and the satellite countries the processed and manufactured supplies which they need for world war III and to consolidate their gains in their acquired areas. It is dangerous to any peace and safety—and ruinous tc our national economy.

ALICE IN WONDERLAND

As a matter of fact, the evidence which is coming out of the State Department, including statements by the Secretary of State himself, in his recent remarks about Russia dividing China, reads like Alice in Wonderland.

The fact of the matter is, according to informed observers, that the Russians are not detaching the northern Chinese provinces and adding them to the Russian orbit, but, under the Communist scheme of things, all of the Communist states, wherever located, whether in eastern Europe or in Asia, will be all united in one league of nations, and by winning the Communist battle in China all of China has become a part of this big totalitarian complex.

The Russians have not only added the northern area of China; they have added the entire area of China to their kingdom.

As a matter of fact, they have aided the Chinese ruler, Mao Tse-tung, in his ambitions and have undoubtedly promised him complete control of the rice and other food-bearing areas to the south, including Indochina, and later the Malay States, Burma, and Siam.

Mr. President, I visited those areas late in 1948. I was there in November and December of that year. What is happening in those areas? We are furnishing the money to support the colonial areas, to support the empire-minded nations in keeping control of those colonial areas in the Far East and the South Seas as well as Africa, whereas Russia is promising them relief from the colonial yoke. So it takes only a couple of trials to guess whom they are for, because they cannot imagine anything worse than being under the yoke of imperialism, called colonialism. The fact that it might be worse under Russian control does not occur to any of them.

I was in Saigon, only a small portion of which is occupied. If anyone tried to live in a house outside of that core of occupied area he was killed. While we were eating dinner one night with the Ambassador, we heard shooting going on about the town. Only a few days before, a sergeant had been killed by a thrown bomb, and previous to that a couple of employees of the State Department had been killed on the road to the airport. It is not a safe country. Even at that time the Communists were really on the way to control of the area simply because we did not sense the situation.

I think many Members of this body will remember that at San Francisco, when the United Nations was formed, I happened to be there under the auspices of the Senate Military Affairs Committee. We remember all the talk about the United Nations—protection of small and defenseless nations, that great forward-looking body which was going to take care of all the small member nations; they would be taken care of under the auspices of the United Nations, and helped in their development. In 4 short years we changed our policy entirely and financed the imperialistic-minded countries in order to enable them to hold their colonial possessions. The people in China, the Malay States, and in Africa are simply slaves. We have forgotten all our high ideals.

NO FOREIGN POLICY

We have absolutely no definite foreign policy and have not had since World War II. We have had a series of financial programs which has resulted in indirectly financing our enemies.

It all simply adds up to the fact that if the final decision is that we cannot deal with the Communists and that they are our enemies, but allow other nations to receive our help while dealing with such nations and forming our foreign policy, it means that we will foot the bill to turn all of Asia Communist and eventually most of Europe Communist. This means that this vast area of China, Russia, and Germany will come into this deal because the Germans have already been told that they can sell all the goods they can produce in China's tremendous markets, while they know from long experience that they will not have such markets in the west. Therefore, we are building up a vast enemy area which in the long run would put us in a very difficult military and economic position.

MUST ESTABLISH A PATTERN THAT MAKES SENSE

Our State Department must establish a definite foreign policy; a pattern which will make sense. It makes no sense at all continuing to finance the British and other European Socialist nations who, in turn, are financing and underwriting the Chinese Communists as well as furnishing the material to consolidate the Russian gains in eastern Europe, while the Chinese Communists in turn are seeking all of southeastern Asia and have already announced their intention of recognizing the Communist guerrillas and making it the official government of Indochina, and which will eventually spread throughout that area of Asia.

It is well known that the Chinese ruler, Mao Tse-tung, and Foreign Minister Chou En-lai have recently spent weeks in Russia, being received cordially and with a great ovation, and Mao Tse issued an official statement in which he ridiculed the idea of severing his domain from the Soviet orbit.

HOW STUPID CAN WE BECOME?

Mr. President, I wish to cite briefly a statement which I made on March 5, 1948, when I quoted from Mr. Bevin and Mr. Wilson, of England. Mr. Wilson was president of the board of trade at that time. At that time I quoted them as saying, "We want to remain neutral." It was made very clear by Mr. Bevin and Mr. Wilson that they wanted to trade with Russia and wanted to remain neutral. They wanted to be the bridgehead—that was the exact word they used—between the Soviets and the United States. I remember their saying that previous to March 1948. I think they are, perhaps, in a fair way of doing just that. Their interests are with Russia, since they are primarily processors and manufacturers of goods, as we are in this Nation, while Russian can furnish mainly the necessary raw materials.

ENGLAND REMAINS NEUTRAL

Mr. President, no one seemed to take that quotation seriously in March 1948, before we had passed the first Marshall Plan Act. I might mention in passing that I visited England prior to that time, late in 1947, as I visited most of the other European nations. At that moment England—taking 1 nation of the 16 proposed Marshall-plan countries—was already 107 percent recovered compared to the 1937 industrial index, meaning that industrial recovery was not the reason behind what we were doing.

It will further be remembered that I proposed at that time that if we wanted to stop communism, if we wanted to rehabilitate industry, and to feed hungry people, we should lend money to private industry in England and the 15 other Marshall-plan countries in exactly the same manner—through the World Bank, I suggested at that time—as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of America loaned to private industry in the United States when private industry was in distress.

I also made suggestions, after visiting Greece and other nations, where groceries were for sale on the streets in large quantities. For 30 cents a can I bought California olives which had been shipped to Greece, and the olive crop of course was Greece's main crop. But we also purchased other canned goods. There was no shortage, if one had the money, about 30 cents a can, or approximately 3,000 drachmas. This indicated that the supplies were not going to hungry people, but were going to people in Greece who had money, and the money was going into the treasury in Greece. It was not used for the purpose of feeding hungry people.

I suggested at that time that we appropriate money to send groceries and whatever was necessary into certain areas and that the effort be properly organized so that we would know that the groceries and clothing were reaching the hungry and needy people, as was not being done at that time.

Then, in order to stop communism, it will be remembered, I suggested that we name the areas and nations whose integrity was important to the ultimate safety of the United States, and that we extend the Monroe Doctrine to include such areas—the 125-year-old Monroe Doctrine which has worked so well in the Western Hemisphere, without signing up with other nations and thereby enable them to drag us into a war whether we decided at the time that our safety was threatened or not.

Mr. President, at the same time, March 1948, I inserted in the RECORD a trade treaty, just as I inserted five or six detailed lists of material to be shipped to the Soviet satellite nations and to the Soviet nation directly by the ECA nations. This one treaty I thought would be enough at that time to cause serious thought. It was a treaty which had been made by the United Kingdom with the U. S. S. R., the Soviet Republic.

The first item in that treaty—and I shall not read them all, because it is available in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the previous date—was 1,100 locomotives. The second item was 2,400 flat trucks, which we call freight cars in this country. The list goes on with electrical equipment, and samples of all the things needed to consolidate gains and win wars.

Apparently not much was thought about the matter, and it was passed over. The Marshall Plan Act was passed.

Then we went into 1949, and what happened? Mr. Nehru, while he was here, said he intended to remain neutral, that he did not intend to take sides between Soviet Russia and capitalistic America. I am not quoting his exact language, but that is what he said. That was the follow-up of what Mr. Bevin and Mr. Wilson had said more than a year and a half previously.

The evidence is cumulative, Mr. President, that not only England but the sterling-bloc countries intend to recognize Communist areas, they intend to trade with the Communist areas, and there is a serious doubt as to the number of ECA nations which will remain neutral if in the future there should be war between the United States of America and Russia. It may be that Switzerland and some of the other nations, like Sweden and Norway, have set a precedent in remaining neutral.

Mr. President, I wish to mention again some of the things I spoke of in March 1949 on the occasion of the debate at that time on the extension of the Marshall plan, to become known as ECA, the Economic Cooperation Administration. The debate took place over the period from March 30 to April 21. It was early in March when I put into the RECORD the nonaggression pacts. I shall not insert them in the RECORD again, but I wish to quote briefly from each one of them, and to say that perhaps since Mr. Nehru has spoken, perhaps since Mr. Nehru preceded England in recognizing Communist China, and England has followed Mr. Nehru and India in recognizing Communist China, and other nations of the sterling bloc and of the ECA nations are following, what has happened, heretofore, is indicative of exactly what is going to happen, regardless of what we do.

As I previously said, it is the opinion of many informed people that last fall, when the conference took place here between England, Canada, and the United States, our State Department agreed with England to follow in the recognition of China, and many people believe now that even with the furor that has been raised, with the suspicion that they may recognize Communist China, that the State Department is still selling a bill of goods to the American people, and will recognize Communist China at the first opportunity when they think the people of the United States will take that bitter dose.

NONAGGRESSION PACTS

I shall quote briefly from a nonaggression pact signed by Anthony Eden, representing Britain, and V. Molotov, representing Communist Russia. This treaty, signed by these two men representing their respective countries of Britain and Russia, which is still in full force and effect, contained two significant articles. Article 6 in the Soviet-Britain Pact provides:

> The high contracting parties agree to render one another all possible economic assistance after the war.

Article 7 reads:

> Each high contracting party undertakes not to conclude any alliance and not to take part in any coalition directed against the other high contracting party.

Mr. President, those provisions read startlingly like the North Atlantic Pact. Since they have pacts now with both the Soviet Empire and the United States of America, it is difficult to see how they could lose in any emergency which might occur later. They have signed up with both Russia and the United States.

In the treaty signed by Mr. Molotov, again, and Mr. Bidault, representing France, which was signed in Moscow, the two articles corresponding with the two just read taken from the British Empire and the Russian Empire treaty, are article 5 and article 6. Article 5 of the French-Russian nonaggression pact reads:

> The high contracting parties undertake not to conclude any alliance and not to take part in any coalition directed against either of the high contracting parties.

Article 6 reads:

> The high contracting parties agree to render each other every possible economic assistance after the war.

Mr. President, both these nonaggression pacts are in full force and effect. All the 95 trade treaties mentioned in the debate today are in full force and effect, meaning that the parties are continuing at all times to send all the material necessary not only to Russia to consolidate her gains in eastern Europe and in Communist China, and to make war quietly and secretly, as they have in the past in China and Indochina and the Malay States and the rest of the Far East, but they are sending them mate-

rial to make war on the United States of America, if they have that idea in their minds. The State Department and the bipartisan group in this body sold that idea, that Russia was and is our potential enemy, thoroughly to the United States Senate during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, and all through the second session of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Senator Seeks Ban on United States Aid to Red Traders," written by Walter Trohan and published in the Chicago Tribune. The article is dated January 15, and describes the joint resolution I have just introduced.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR SEEKS BAN ON UNITED STATES AID TO RED TRADERS—MALONE WILL OFFER JOINT RESOLUTION TODAY

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, January 15.—A joint congressional resolution to prohibit financial aid to any nation engaged in trade with Soviet Russia, Red satellites, or areas dominated by the Kremlin will be introduced in the Senate tomorrow by Senator MALONE (Republican, Nevada).

MALONE has called upon the State Department to give him a list of all known trade treaties with Soviet Russia and her satellites executed by nations receiving American aid billions.

Last spring, he made public 88 trade treaties by which the Soviet Union is being provided with hundreds of products either directly or indirectly through satellites.

MALONE said he will offer his resolution in the interests of promoting peace. He said communism may be made strong enough to dominate the world if the present flow of vital and strategic materials is continued by countries receiving American foreign aid.

TWO COURSES CITED

"Soviet Russia is being given the materials to consolidate Red gains," Malone said. "If materials are not sent to help Russia, the Kremlin will face uprisings and be pushed back into Russian borders.

"We can call upon Russia to withdraw to her own borders or we can stop sending goods to Russia. If we continue to permit goods to be sent in Russia, the Soviets will be so strong in 2 years that they can tell us where to get off."

MALONE said his resolution also was calculated to halt recognition of communism in Asia by nations receiving funds to fight communism in Europe. Norway and Britain have recognized the Red regime in China. The Communist Chinese have spurned a recognition bid from Tito's Yugoslavia, which is out of grace with Dictator Stalin and is receiving American aid. The British have sent jet engines, locomotives, and other goods to Russia.

TEST OF RESOLUTION

The resolution MALONE will present reads:

"Whereas one of the alleged basic purposes of the Marshall plan is the restoration or maintenance in European countries of principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence through a joint recovery program based upon self-help and mutual cooperation; and

"Whereas Russia and other Communist dominated and controlled countries and areas have refused to participate in such joint recovery program; and

"Whereas such Communist action has endangered world peace; and

"Whereas certain participating nations under the Marshall plan by trading with Russia and other Communist dominated and controlled countries and areas are violating the basic principles of the Marshall plan and are aiding and fostering communism in other areas of the world through furnishing the necessary equipment, machinery, and supplies to consolidate Communist gains in eastern Europe and in Asia; and

"Whereas it is the sense of the Congress and the basic policy of the Marshall plan and its enabling legislation that assistance to any participating country which fails in any way to meet its obligation to sustain and strengthen the principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence, through cooperating with such Communist nations and areas, should be terminated: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved, etc.*, That on and after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, no financial aid shall be given by the United States or any agency or officer thereof (whether by loan, grant, lend-lease, or in any other manner) to any foreign country which engages in trade or commerce or permits its nationals to engage in trade or commerce on or after such date, with Russia, her satellite countries, or any other Communist dominated or controlled area in any other country.

"It is the sense of the Congress that no moneys shall hereafter be appropriated and no loans shall hereafter be made to any nation engaging in such trade or commerce or permitting its nationals to do so."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Truman Policy Will Open United States to Cheap Imports, Says MALONE," written by William Moore, and published in the Washington Times-Herald of January 4, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN POLICY WILL OPEN UNITED STATES TO CHEAP IMPORTS, SAYS MALONE—SENATOR STARTS DRIVE TO EDUCATE NATION TO NEW THREAT OF ECONOMIC COMPETITION

(By William Moore)

Senator MALONE (Republican, of Nevada) launched a crusade yesterday to awaken the American people to the purpose of the Truman administration's bipartisan foreign policy before it is too late.

That purpose, he said, is to lower the living standard of American workers to that of the rest of the world by permitting foreign nations to divide up the world markets and flood this country with the products of cheap foreign labor.

The plan, he said, is to place the United States on an equality with such countries as Siam in a global political and economic federation with three-score members.

ONLY ONE MORE STEP

Every step but the final and vital one, he said, had already been taken—to win congressional approval of American entrance into the International Trade Organization, a major project of the administration at this session.

The entire plan can still be scrapped, MALONE said, by rejecting ITO.

MALONE said some of his Republican colleagues have been taken in by the bipartisan policy because, like many of the American people, they do not understand its intent.

He called upon those Republicans to join him and the other Republicans in preventing the United States from joining ITO. He called upon the American people to wake up.

IMPORT FEES PROPOSED

MALONE did not begin his campaign without a substitute for ITO. He offered in its place his flexible-import-fee plan, under which he said imports would be encouraged but duties would be kept high enough to protect American workers against the competition of cheap foreign labor.

This principle, he said, would accomplish the same purpose which the sponsors of ITO profess—the raising of living standards everywhere—since it would permit lowering import fees and tariffs for products of those countries which raised wages.

American entrance into a world political government, he said, has been accomplished by our participation in the United Nations.

TRADE PACTS ATTACKED

Two of the three steps necessary to complete the global economic part of this Government, he said, have already been taken:

1. Establishment of the so-called reciprocal trade agreements systems, which he said have produced not reciprocal trade but free trade.

2. Establishment of the economic cooperation administration or Marshall plan, which MALONE said was not understood even by General Marshall, who proposed it. It was actually the Bevin plan, devised by British Foreign Minister Bevin, MALONE said, and foisted upon Marshall.

The United States is still free, MALONE said, as long as it does not join ITO, in which it can be outvoted 48 to 1 at present and by larger votes as more nations join.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Malone Calls for Halt on Aiding Reds," written by Walter Trohan, and published in the Washington Times-Herald of January 16, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MALONE CALLS FOR HALT ON AIDING REDS

(By Walter Trohan)

A joint congressional resolution to prohibit financial aid to any nation engaged in trade with Soviet Russia, Red satellites or areas dominated by the Kremlin will be introduced in the Senate today by Senator MALONE, Republican, of Nevada.

The Nevada Senator has called upon the State Department to give him a list of all known trade treaties with Soviet Russia and her satellites, executed by nations receiving American-aid billions.

Last spring, MALONE made public 88 trade treaties by which the Soviet Union is being furnished hundreds of products either directly or indirectly through her satellites.

MALONE said he will offer his resolution in the interests of promoting peace. If the present flow of vital and strategic materials is continued by the countries receiving American foreign aid, communism may be made strong enough to dominate the world, he said.

"Soviet Russia is being given the materials to consolidate Red gains," MALONE said. "If materials are not sent to help Russia, the Kremlin will face uprisings and be pushed back into Russian borders.

"We can call upon Russia to withdraw to her own borders or we can stop sending goods into Russia. If we continue to permit goods to be sent into Russia, the Soviets will be so strong in 2 years that they can tell us where to get off."

MALONE said his resolution was also calculated to halt recognition of communism in Asia by nations receiving funds to fight communism in Europe.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, Soviet Russia rung down the iron curtain—England and France each have a nonaggression pact with Russia.

The 16 Marshall-plan, ECA nations have 95 important trade treaties with Soviet Russia and such iron-curtain countries, shipping them everything they need to consolidate their gains and to make war.

Both England and India, through their spokesmen, Bevin and Nehru, have said that they intended to remain neutral, they wanted to trade with Russia and the Communist countries.

Now, these same nations, erstwhile allies, and other nations, have recognized Communist China without consulting this Nation, at least without the American people being informed, thus leading us into a foreign policy not only distasteful but which may be definitely dangerous.

Therefore, it is high time that the State Department discharge their constitutional responsibility and make up their mind and inform the American people and the Congress of the United States just what our foreign policy should be before it is too late. It is later than we think.

EXHIBIT 2

List B

Commodities	Quantity in metric tons	Value in 1,000 Belgian francs
Agricultural products: Breeding animals, seeds, plants	-------	[1] 2,000
Aniline dyes, oil creosote and other chemical, pharmaceutical, photographic products, and phosphate fertilizers	-------	100,000
Skins and hides and products thereof, in particular transmission belts, industrial articles of hides, leather for hats, footwear, etc	-------	15,000
Woodenwear	p. m.	-------
Special paper	-------	8,000
Textile raw materials, including floss silks, waste, and chiffon	-------	15,000
Nets, cord, including cord for retail sale, binding string, sisal or manila string	-------	45,000
Tissue, hosiery and ready-made articles, including camel-hair belts	-------	20,000
Grindstones, natural and artificial Graphite melting pots Special fireproof products Miscellaneous glass items	-------	15,000
Rubber ware, including tires and belts	-------	20,000
Asbestos articles	-------	1,000
Industrial diamonds	-------	2,000
Electrolitic copper	1,500	-------
Granulated copper	1,000	-------
Semifinished copper goods	500	-------
Copper and alloys in scrap or ingots of second melting	p. m.	-------
Lead-tin alloys in ingots and semifinished forms	200	-------
Aluminum, raw, second melting	100	-------
Cadmium	2	-------
Metal, cobalt	3	-------
Streetcar rails and accessories	4,000	-------
Railroad rails	p. m.	-------
Plates, steel, for dynamos	300	-------
Siderurgical products	-------	70,000
Rolling mill cylinders	-------	10,000
Rolling mill equipment (2 installations)	-------	100,000
Machine tools for metals and wood	-------	50,000
Machinery and apparatus, particularly for textile, food, and glass industry; compressors, pumps, engines, and Diesel locomotives, pneumatic equipment, locopulseurs (?)	-------	-------
Carding machine sets, etc	-------	45,000
Cocks, large, for petroleum, naval construction, and mining industries	-------	10,000
Electric generators and turbines	-------	85,000
Electrotechnical equipment, particularly industrial electric equipment and apparatus, telephone equipment, household electric equipment, radios, electric lamps, brooms, etc	-------	90,000

[1] Increasing possibility.

List B—Continued

Commodities	Quantity in metric tons	Value in 1,000 Belgian francs
Insulating and protection material	-------	5,000
Insulated wires and cables	-------	10,000
Electric, gas, and water meters; measuring and control apparatus	-------	5,000
Electrodes and maces for electrodes	-------	10,000
Railway rolling stock	p. m.	-------
Automobile vehicles, motorcycles, accessories	-------	25,000
Semifinished products such as cast steel, wire-drawn steel, special steel, cold-rolled steel, forges parts, foundry parts, wire-drawing products, etc	-------	20,000
Other metallurgical products, particularly hand and workshop tools, edge-tool products, galvanized and other household items, heating apparatus, hunting arms, bicycle parts, surgical and dental equipment, hardware, etc	-------	25,000
Miscellaneous commodities	-------	20,000

EXHIBIT 3

Italian exports to Soviet zone of Germany

	Values in dollars
Hemp, raw and combed	100,000
Hemp yarn	50,000
Pyrites	100,000
Mercury	100,000
Talc	98,000
Citric acid	5,000
Tires	56,125
Seeds	50,000
Lemons	60,000
Oranges or lemons	30,000
Almonds	30,000
Wines and vermouth, bottled	50,000
Asbestos fiber	20,000
Borax	100,000
Ball bearings	70,000
Cork	25,000
Raw hides	25,000
Chemical products	40,000
Silk sifting mesh for mills	20,000
Artificial silk yarns	25,000
Other goods	135,000
Total, about	1,190,000

Italian imports from the Soviet zone of Germany

	Values in dollars
Washed kaolin	160,000
Baked and raw clay	20,000
Forage beet seeds	50,000
Handicraft products	35,000
Musical instruments, including pianos	30,000
Electrical instruments	50,000
Mechanical instruments, optical and precision goods, including adding machines, cameras, and projectors and parts	75,000
Glassware and ceramics, also for technical uses, thermometers, etc	30,000
Artistic glassware, ceramics and porcelains	50,000
Paper and printing machinery	60,000
Industrial sewing machines and parts	75,000
Pharmaceutical preparations	80,000
Wax	75,000
Fur dyes	40,000
Caustic potash	30,000
Igolit	80,000
Saltpeter for technical use	20,000
Sodium nitrate for technical use	5,000
Chemical products	75,000
Other goods	150,000
Total	1,190,000

EXHIBIT 4

List B—Exports from Austria to Czechoslovakia

Item	Quantity in tons	Value in 1,000 Czech crowns
01. Breeding cattle	-------	25,000
02. Special brands of wine	-------	5,000
03. Salt	-------	6,000
04. Coniferous round timber from border slopes	-------	[1]
05. Rods from cherry and plum wood	-------	2,000
06. Crude gypsum (possibility of increase)	-------	1,000
07. Calcined gypsum, including gypsum for dental purposes	-------	6,000
08. Ground chalk	-------	8,000
09. Graphite	-------	3,000
010. Talc	-------	5,500
011. Dolomite	300	-------
012. Vienna polishing lime	-------	2,000
013. Powdered asbestos	-------	1,500
014. Powdered limestone and other stones and earths	-------	1,500
015. Granite paving stones	-------	[1]
016. Wood grinding stones	-------	1,500
017. Abrasives	-------	1,000
018. Caustic burnt magnesite	-------	10,000
019. Sintered magnesite	1,000	-------
020. Magnesite and chrome magnesite bricks and magnesite cement	-------	27,000
021. Powdered wood	-------	6,000
022. Wooden prefabs including installations	-------	70,000
023. Wood for boxes and fruit crates	-------	[1]
024. Oak wood for casks	-------	1,500
025. Wood fiber slabs	-------	2,500
026. Accessories for umbrellas, umbrella sticks, and handles	-------	8,000
027. High-grade furniture	-------	3,000
028. Cellwool (synthetic staple fiber)	500	-------
029. Viscose cellulose	500	-------
030. Cow hair	-------	[1]
031. Hemp yarn	-------	5,000
032. Cord rayon	-------	[1]
033. Technical felts	-------	1,000
034. Knitwear and jersey goods including woolen sports stockings	-------	8,000
035. Miscellaneous textile goods, including ladies' blouses	-------	5,000
036. Vorarlberg type embroideries	-------	2,000
037. Reprocessed wool and cotton, spinning waste including rayon waste	-------	20,000
038. Asbestos filter layers	-------	1,000
039. Brown white and gray cardboard	500	-------
040. Paper goods	-------	2,000
041. Oilcloth and linoleum	-------	2,000
042. Vienna leather goods	-------	500
043. Nonvulcanized rubber plates	-------	1,000
044. Miscellaneous technical rubber goods including accessories for printing block installations	-------	5,000
045. Klingerit gasket materials (high pressure gasket plates, gaskets and valve rings, brake and clutch linings)	-------	23,000
046. Water level gages	-------	6,000
047. Lead glass tubes and rods for the production of incandescent bulbs	-------	8,000
048. Charcoal pig iron	-------	4,000
049. High-grade steel and steel products (according to agreement between the 2 industries)	-------	440,000
050. Gray castings	-------	5,000
051. Wood screws	-------	2,000
052. Scythes and sickles	-------	32,000
053. Special tools, including large knives, saw blades, saws and machine knives	-------	4,000
054. Miscellaneous tools and implements	-------	8,000
055. Aluminum	-------	4,000
056. Book printing types	-------	3,500
057. Stamping foils	-------	1,000
058. Perforated copper sheet	-------	1,000
059. Molybdenum and tungsten wires, sheet and other products	-------	12,000
060. Sintered iron and cemented carbide products	-------	6,000
061. Paper machine sieves	-------	3,000
062. Valves and fittings	-------	20,000
063. Ferlach type shotguns and parts for hunting ammunition	-------	1,000

[1] Token item.

List B—Exports from Austria to Czechoslovakia—Continued

Item	Quantity in tons	Value in 1,000 Czech crowns
064. Miscellaneous iron and metal goods (including ring book fittings, breath protecting devices and Ditmar strong light lamps)		15,000
065. Farm machinery, especially grain-screening machinery and parts		2,000
066. Miscellaneous machinery and parts for woodworking, paper industry, metalworking and metallurgical industries, chemistry, ceramic, graphic, etc.		48,000
067. Automatic regulating devices for water turbines, gear rims, and gear wheels		5,000
068. Miscellaneous pumps		2,500
069. Ropeways and spares		20,000
070. Scales (weighing bridges)		1,200
071. Cranes		75,000
072. Petroleum drilling equipment		50,000
073. Injectors for locomotives		1,500
074. Turntables for locomotives		18,000
075. Miniature lamps, motorcar bulbs, and strong light lamps (over 100 watts)		8,000
076. Spirals and electrodes for incandescent lamps		1,000
077. Nickel tubes for cathodes		2,000
078. Electrolyte condensaters		2,000
079. Electromagnetic clutches		8,000
080. Ignition machines, instantaneous weatherproof fuses and fuse combs		6,000
081. Electrical precision measuring and control instruments		5,000
082. Miscellaneous electrical machinery and instruments (transformers, current converters, thermostats, telecommunication equipment, electromedical apparatus, etc.)		7,000
083. Precision mechanic products		2,000
084. Microscopes, microtones, diagnostic and therapeutic apparatus, and spares		5,000
085. Medical, surgical, and dental apparatus and instruments, including skin thermometers and dental items		7,000
086. X-ray protective material		3,000
087. Ball bearings		50,000
088. Spares for motor vehicles		2,000
089. Calcined soda	14,000	----
090. Sodium sulfate		1,500
091. Hydrogen peroxide		5,000
092. Calcium carbonate, precipitated		2,500
093. Enamel clouding agents	50	----
094. Enamel		(1)
095. White lead and red lead		5,000
096. Earth colors, crude		500
097. Mazeut and other distillation residues		(1)
098. Gas oil	5,000	----
099. Distilled petroleum	10,000	----
0100. Miscellaneous technical oils and fats		2,000
0101. Venetian turpentine		(1)
0102. Pyrite cinders		(1)
0103. Ichthyol	10	----
0104. Pharmaceuticals, including penicillin and veterinary specialties		5,000
0105. Musical instruments, all types of toys and miscellaneous wooden goods, including sporting and smoking utensils		3,500
0106. Books, fashion magazines, periodicals, newspapers, and music		10,000
0107. Miscellaneous items		120,000

[1] Token item.

NOTE.—The values indicated above are understood at the exchange rate of $1 equals 10 shillings equals 50 Czech crowns.

EXHIBIT 5

January–April 1949—Actual exports to Bulgaria f. o. b. Sweden (unit, Swedish kronor)

Nonprecious metals and manufactures thereof	363,000
Live animals and animal products	357,000
Machinery, apparatus, electric material	243,000
Instruments, scales, clocks, and watches	121,000
Rubber, guttapercha, balata, and manufactures thereof	8,000
Chemical products, pharmaceuticals, paints, dyes, varnishes, aromatic substances, soap, candles, and other products of oils, fats, and wax, glues, pastes, gelatine, explosives, fertilizers	2,000
Total	1,094,000

In addition to the above, there were also exports under the commodity group "wood pulp, pasteboard, paper, and manufactures thereof, including printed matter," to a total value of less than 1,000 Swedish kronor.

Swedish imports from Bulgaria during the same period of 1949 were as follows:

January–April 1949—Actual imports from Bulgaria c. i. f. Sweden (unit, Swedish kronor)

Vegetable products	537,000
Products of foodstuffs industry, beverages, tobacco, feedstuffs	245,000
Live animals and animal products	15,000
Textile materials and manufactures thereof	1,000
Total	798,000

EXHIBIT 6

(5) Principal commodities for exchange

A. Swedish exports	Quantity in metric tons	Value in 1,000 Swedish kronor
Ball and roller bearings		6,000
Storage batteries, and other than alkalic		3,500
Tungsten and molybdenum wire		2,500
Welding machines		2,500
Woolen rags		2,000
Quality steel	3,235	----
Tubular drill steel	2,500	----
Ball-bearing tubing	1,000	----

B. Swedish imports	Quantity in metric tons	Value in 1,000 Swedish kronor
Lint		500
Medical thermometers		200
Bristles		100
Pharmaceutical raw materials		100
Potassium salt	60,000	----
Apatite concentrate	30,000	----
Glauber's salt	10,000	----
Manganese ore	10,000	----

NOTES.—None.

(6) Foreign trade (unit, 1,000 Swedish kronor)

	Exchange planned for 1949 under protocol of Apr. 2, 1949	1938 [1]	1947 [2]	1948 [3]	January–February 1949 [3]
Exports	45,000	17,614	40,961	60,988	6,435
Imports	[4] 25,000	9,213	35,369	43,697	948
Balance	+[4] 20,000	+8,401	+5,592	+17,291	+5,487

[1] Final figures of the Swedish Royal Board of Trade.
[2] Revised preliminary figures.
[3] Preliminary figures.
[4] According to unofficial Swedish press estimates.

NOTE.—Average exchange rate for United States dollar in 1938 was 3.9766 Swedish kronor. Subsequent to July 13, 1946, $1 equals 3.60 Swedish kronor.

List No. 2—Quotas for commodity deliveries from Sweden to the Soviet Union

No.	Commodity	Quantity or value	
		Swedish kronor	Metric tons
1	Ball and roller bearings	6,000,000	----
2	Ball bearing tubing	----	1,000
3	Ball wire	----	600
4	Heat changer pipe	----	500
5	Smoke pipe	----	500
6	Tubular drill steel	----	2,500
7	Quality steel	----	3,325
	Including—		
	Tool steel	----	850
	Stubbs steel	----	130
	Cold-rolled band steel	----	800
	Cold-drawn steel wire	----	900
	Speed-lathe steel	----	465
	Stainless plate	----	180
8	Steel cable	----	140
9	Sealed cable	----	150
10	Anchor chain	----	500
11	Welding electrodes	----	300
12	Tungsten and molybdenum wire	2,500,000	----
13	Metal screen-cloth and nickel wire cloth	475,000	----
14	Drills of speed-lathe steel	150,000	----
15	Files	100,000	----
16	Storage batteries other than alkalic	3,500,000	----
17	Welding machines	2,500,000	----
18	Spare parts for turbogenerators and other machines	550,000	----
19	Circular and band saw blades for woodworking	300,000	----
20	Egoutteurs	250,000	----
21	Woolen rags	2,000,000	----
22	Cattle for breeding stock	----	[1] 2,000
23	Swine for breeding stock	----	[1] 1,000
24	Sundry equipment and material	----	[2]

[1] Number of head.
[2] Not stated.

In regard to a payment deficit outstanding since the preceding year, Swedish exports, projected at about 45 million kronor, have been planned to exceed imports from the Soviet Union, by value.

EXHIBIT 7

List A—Goods to be supplied by Austria

No.	Item	Value in dollars	Quantity in tons
R1	Graphite	35,000	----
2	Talc	----	4,000
R3	Mica	10,000	----
4	Fireclay bricks	----	3,000
5	Sinter magnesite	----	6,000
6	Magnesite bricks, normal and chrome magnesite types	----	4,400
R7	do	----	2,900
8	Electric corundum	----	600
R9	Abrasive wheels	----	30
R10	Dental abrasives	----	[1] 200
R11	Wood grindstones	5,000	----
12	Cellwool	----	750
R13	do	----	750
14	Wool rags	----	2,000
R15	Novelty items and leather goods	20,000	----
R16	Nutwood and special veneer wood	100,000	----
R17	Paper felt	25,000	----
18	Aluminum (minimum content 99.5 percent)	----	500
19	High-grade steel and products therefrom	700,000	----
20	Shipbuilding steel plate	----	6,000
21	Boiler plate	----	3,000
22	Pit bows	----	3,500
23	Molybdenum and tungsten products	35,000	----
R24	Water-level indicator glasses	----	[2] 15,000
R25	Klingerit gasket plates	----	100
R26	Plate valves	100,000	----
27	Fittings, including valves for oxygen bottles	----	300
R28	Machine knives for the paper industry	30,000	----
29	Metal sieves for the paper industry	250,000	----

[1] Kilograms.
[2] Pieces.

List A—Goods to be supplied by Austria— Continued

No.	Item	Value in dollars	Quantity in tons
R30	Miscellaneous tools, including saw blades	250,000	
31	Pneumatic tools and spares	200,000	
R32	Railroad equipment	300,000	
33	Ball bearings	1,000,000	
R34	Hobnails	10,000	
35	Scythes and sickles	50,000	
R36	Farm machinery	100,000	
R37	Sausage and butcher machinery	170,000	
R38	Office machinery	80,000	
39	Automatical industrial weighing machines	50,000	
R40	Machinery and automobile spares, electrical automatical equipment	100,000	
R41	Steyr-type trucks (3½ tons)		[2] 2
R42	Steyr Diesel trucks	1,000,000	
R43	Material for telephone, telegraph, signals, and radio	30,000	
R44	Incubators	20,000	
R45	Laboratory apparatus	150,000	
R46	Medical and dental apparatus and instruments	30,000	
R47	Microscopes, microtomes, geodetic and other precision instruments and apparatus	100,000	
R48	Electrical measuring instruments	50,000	
R49	Hydrogen peroxide		90
50	Nitrogenous fertilizer		30,000
51	Carbon disulfide		1,000
R52	do		1,000
R53	Tin oxide		50
R54	Enamel clouding agents		50
R55	Various chemical and pharmaceutical products	100,000	
R56	Aluminum foil		20
R57	Aluminum bronze, also powder		20
R58	Incandescent gas light materials		20
59	Automobile tires	200,000	
60	Rubber conveyor bands	p. m.	
61	Acalit plates, bars, and other articles	p. m.	
R62	Linoleum	15,000	
R63	Asbestos filters	15,000	
R64	Catgut		[3] 20,000
R65	Egoutteurs	12,000	
R66	Sports items	20,000	
R67	Films	10,000	
R68	Books, newspapers, literature, periodicals, music and fashion journals	40,000	
69	Payments due and down payments during the contractual period for new orders of industrial capital goods as follows: boilers and boiler components, 5,500,000, electrical machinery 900,000, Diesel locomotives and engines, pumps, and cranes 1,000,000, miscellaneous machinery and apparatus 400,000, pneumatic tools 200,000, deep-drilling equipment 200,000	2,280,000	
70	Miscellaneous	400,000	
R71	do	400,000	

[2] Pieces.
[3] Meters.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN—PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The Senate resumed consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 25) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I inquire what is now pending before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The measure now pending before the Senate is Senate Joint Resolution 25, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women. The joint resolution is open to amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Maybank
Anderson	Hoey	Millikin
Benton	Holland	Mundt
Brewster	Humphrey	Murray
Bricker	Hunt	Myers
Bridges	Ives	Neely
Butler	Jenner	O'Conor
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Connally	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kem	Schoeppel
Donnell	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Downey	Knowland	Sparkman
Dworshak	Langer	Stennis
Eastland	Leahy	Taft
Ecton	Lehman	Taylor
Ferguson	Lodge	Thye
Flanders	Long	Tobey
Frear	Lucas	Tydings
Fulbright	McCarran	Vandenberg
George	McCarthy	Watkins
Gillette	McClellan	Wherry
Graham	McFarland	Wiley
Gurney	McKellar	Williams
Hayden	McMahon	Withers
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Young
Hickenlooper	Malone	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to submit to the Senate a unanimous-consent request with respect to the joint resolution which is now before the Senate: I ask unanimous consent that on the calendar day of Wednesday, January 25, 1950, at the hour of 1:30 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment that may be pending or that may be proposed to Senate Joint Resolution 25, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women, and upon the final passage of the joint resolution in whatever form it may be amended; provided that no amendment which is not germane to the subject matter shall be received; and provided further that the time between 12 o'clock and 1:30 o'clock p. m. on said day be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the joint resolution, and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to make an announcement to the Senate in respect to the business which will be transacted during the next week or 10 days.

There is now on the calendar House Joint Resolution 184, authorizing the President to proclaim February 6, 1950, as National Children's Dental Health Day. Because of the limitation of time, that measure will be called up tomorrow. No appropriation is involved in the joint resolution. It was unanimously passed by the House of Representatives.

Following that, there will be called up Senate Joint Resolution 2, Calendar 601, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President. It is the joint resolution which abolishes the electoral-college system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States. There will be considerable discussion of that joint resolution, no doubt. It is my understanding that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] probably will offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute, and probably other amendments will be offered.

Following the disposition of that joint resolution one way or the other, we shall proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 75, Calendar 839, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River, at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes.

That is the order of business which has been agreed upon by the Democratic policy committee in session as of this date.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I regret very much that the Senator from Illinois feels called upon to call up, on 1 day's notice, the joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment providing for a complete change in the entire method of electing presidential and vice presidential electors. That measure was considered last year without action, quite early in the session; but no notice has been given thus far about when it is to be further considered. It is a matter of vital national importance; and it seems to me that the notice given is very short. I personally have to be away the remainder of this week. I hope very much the Senator in some way will be able to postpone consideration of that measure at least until next week and until Senators may have some opportunity to study the matter, which is not one which we ordinarily get into until and unless we have to. I did not know the Senator was even considering bringing up that measure soon, until I heard of it earlier today.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in reply to the able Senator from Ohio, I should like to observe that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who is one of the sponsors of the joint resolution, has written to me on two different occasions this year, requesting that I call up Senate Joint Resolution 2 for consideration as soon as possible. The Senator from Massachusetts and other Members of the Senate who are interested in the measure have appeared before the Democratic policy committee, as I recall, upon two different occasions, urgently requesting that the Senate give early consideration to the joint resolution during the second half of the Eighty-first Congress. Only last week, in a short colloquy which I had with the Senator from Massachusetts, I advised him that we would consider at the policy committee meeting the advisability of taking up the Senate joint resolution, with a view to having it disposed of one

way or the other. I agree with the Senator from Ohio that perhaps the notice is short, and I regret that the Senator from Ohio will be compelled to be out of the city. But it seemed to the Democratic policy committee that these two measures were about the only ones which were ready for consideration at this time; and we felt obliged to advise the Senate that this was the plan proposed by the policy committee.

Mr. WHERRY rose.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I noticed that the distinguished majority leader stated in a press conference that there is a possibility of bringing up one of the resolutions to create a permanent Small Business Committee. I do not wish in any way by interrogating the majority leader to get a commitment in that respect; but let me inquire whether he feels that there is a possibility that one of those resolutions might be taken up soon for debate. If that could be done, the resolution might supplant Senate Joint Resolution 2, until the consideration of the Small Business Committee resolution could be concluded, if it is in the mind of the majority leader to have the Senate do so.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad the Senator from Nebraska has raised the question as to Senate Resolution 58, which was submitted by him and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], to create a standing Committee on Small Business. I should like to advise the Senate that a conference is being held by the Democratic Members on Thursday of this week, primarily for the purpose of discussing that very resolution, which has been reported favorably by the Senator's committee. It seemed to me to be impossible, probably, for the Senate to take it up before next Monday, because I am sure there will be considerable discussion behind closed doors in regard to the resolution, and probably more discussion of it, I say to my friend the Senator from Nebraska, when the resolution finally is brought up on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. LUCAS. But we shall take it up at some time in the near future.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEFAUVER rose.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to ask the distinguished majority leader whether he has in mind having the Senate take up at any time soon Calendar 481, House bill 4080, to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War. That measure passed the House of Representatives after a great deal of consideration; and the Senate Armed Services Committee has had extended hearings on the question. I know the Secretary of Defense is anxious that the bill be expedited as much as possible.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Tennessee that he take up that matter with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], chairman of the committee, is a member of the Democratic Policy Committee; but unfortunately he was absent from its meeting today, and this question was not discussed. We shall be glad, however, to take it up a week from today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me supplement what the Senator from Illinois has just stated. I can assure the distinguished majority leader that the Senator from Maryland is most anxious to have this measure taken up by the Senate. The Senator from Tennessee is in charge of it, and did much work on it. From what has been said to me, I know it is the hope of the Armed Services Committee that House bill 4080 may be considered and some decision arrived at regarding it as soon as possible. The measure is a highly technical one.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

PROSPECTIVE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Illinois when he contemplates a call of the calendar?

Mr. LUCAS. I may say in answer to the inquiry, that, as I understand, only a relatively small number of new bills have been reported by the committees. In view of that fact I feel that it is not proper as yet to call the calendar. Most of the bills on the calendar at the present time will be objected to, as they have been objected to in the past, on previous calls of the calendar.

Mr. TAFT. There are some bills on the calendar to which I think there will be no objection. They were objected to in the latter part of the last session, in October, for various reasons—the absence of Senators and so forth—but I think there are several bills on the calendar which might very easily pass.

Mr. LUCAS. I am very happy to have that reassurance from the Senator from Ohio. One of the ways by which we can expedite matters in the Senate is to have Senators present on days when the calendar is called. Then perhaps after a brief explanation, bills may be passed without making them special orders of business.

SUGGESTED PAIRING ARRANGEMENT FOR ABSENT SENATORS

Mr. President, there is one other matter I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate while I am on my feet. During the past 2 or 3 years, it has been customary to hold Lincoln Day and Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners, extending over a period of 2 or 3 weeks, or perhaps longer than that. First, the Republicans go forth for a week or 10 days to sell their goods and wares to the public; then we follow with the Jefferson-Jackson Day speeches. We do a little better job perhaps than the Republicans. But what I should like to suggest to my able friend from Nebraska and other Members on his side of the aisle is, that instead of merely more or less marking time and doing nothing perhaps for 3 weeks, we go ahead with the business of the Senate, and arrange that when Senators on the other side of the aisle leave to make speeches anywhere in the country, we on this side of the aisle will give them live pairs, and thus assure them that they will be recorded in line with their thoughts. In that event, when Senators on this side of the aisle are called upon to perform a similar duty, under the Jefferson-Jackson creed of democracy, we will expect Senators on the other side to reciprocate. I should like to ask my distinguished friend whether he believes such an arrangement might be effected between both sides of the aisle.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as usual, the minority wishes to cooperate with the majority leader. I should like to ask, does the majority leader expect to have any period of vacation at all, say either from Friday until Monday, or from Thursday until Monday? As I understand, the Lincoln Day dinners will probably come on the 10th and 11th of February, Friday and Saturday. I am wondering whether the majority leader contemplates a recess possibly from Thursday until Tuesday, or from Friday until Tuesday, or is there to be any recess? I merely ask the majority leader to take the suggestion under advisement, because I feel that if the dinners or celebrations are held at the week end, the matter may be arranged without any difficulty.

About the Democrats doing a better job than the Republicans do in their speech making, I may say the speakers from the other side of the aisle may get more money than we on this side get. If that is what the Senator means, I think perhaps it is true. [Laughter.] But it takes a longer time for us to do the work than it does the speakers on the Democratic side. So if we could have another day, preferably a weekday, we should deeply appreciate it.

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to my friend, he will need more than 3 or 4 days for the Lincoln Day dinners.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], about a week ago, stated on the floor of the Senate he had about nine Lincoln Day speeches to make in the Dakotas. I agreed that I would try to get him a live pair while he was absent making Lincoln Day speeches, because I want Senators on the other side of the aisle to do everything they can in memory of the patron saint of their great party.

Mr. WHERRY. We appreciate that, and the Senator may rest assured we are going to do everything we can. I should merely like to ask the majority leader to please take under advisement the suggestion of a short vacation, and to make an announcement about it as early as possible. I feel that inasmuch as the days for the dinners, speeches, and so forth, are the 10th and 11th of February, possibly a recess could be taken from Thursday until Monday, or perhaps from Friday until Tuesday. If so, it would be deeply appreciated. It would evidence the splendid cooperation which the minority leader feels we should have in making Lincoln Day speeches throughout the country.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am glad to hear the majority leader say he would like to continue the work of the session during this week because I think we are all anxious to expedite the work so we can at least get home in time for haying. But I realize that a good many speakers who are planning to be away for a week or so might be a little apprehensive lest a vote should come up during their absence. So I should like to suggest that the majority leader bring up the FEPC bill just before the beginning of that week so that any Members who happen to be away for a week or two will be reasonably sure that no important yea-and-nay vote will be taken during their absence.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate the very constructive suggestion made by my friend from Vermont. I shall take it under advisement.

Mr. President, there is one other suggestion I should like to make. The Lincoln Day dinners usually come about the same time, although I know that there have been different dates even for Lincoln Day dinners held by the Republicans throughout the country.

Mr. WHERRY. That is true.

Mr. LUCAS. If we enter into the amicable understanding whereby pairs are to be arranged, since, although the principal Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners usually take place during one week, sometimes another one is held a couple of weeks later, and some Senator might be away at that time, I should like to have it understood that pairs will be arranged under those circumstances.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the distinguished majority leader will take that matter up with me, I assure him we will do our level best to work out an arrangement which will be satisfactory to both sides.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the able Senator from Nebraska. I believe we could expedite business a little more if we were a little more generous with our pairs. Sometimes when a number of Senators are away pairs cannot be obtained. I believe if we were a little more generous in regard to the pairing procedure we could get along better and transact a little more business. I shall be glad to talk to the minority leader along that line and with other members of the Republican Party. I know I personally feel that any Senator who is at home on necessary business while an important measure is being considered by the Senate should have a live pair. That is the way I personally feel about it, and I think perhaps we might make better progress if we were more generous along that line, because at various times the pair question has been rather troublesome.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I assure the majority leader once again we shall endeavor to work out some arrangement that will be satisfactory. I should like the majority leader to know that I personally have some very strong opinions about pairs, and I was glad to hear him say that Senators who are absent on official business or those who have to be at home should be protected. I think there are times possibly when a live pair is all right. On the other hand, I do not want the pair system abused, and I know the majority leader does not. In all the years I have been here I have never indulged in it myself, except once or twice when I went across the country, and I think one other time. So I have those feelings about it. I want to assure the majority leader that so far as the minority are concerned we shall do our level best on the occasions to which he has referred to see what can be done to cooperate to the fullest with the request he has made.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN—PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 25) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in the interest of accuracy, I rise to clarify two statements which I made on the floor of the Senate on yesterday during the debate on the effort of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] to substitute the so-called equal-status bill for the so-called equal-rights amendment.

In the course of the discussion, I stated that the women who favor the equal-rights amendment, and therefore the passage of Senate Concurrent Resolution 25, are not working people. Of course, that statement is in error. One of the major proponents of this resolution is the Business and Professional Women's Club. A requirement for membership in that splendid organization is that the applicant for membership be engaged actively in some business or profession.

In the course of the discussion, also, in a colloquy with the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], I may have left the impression that women could not escape, as a legal matter, a particular type of service while serving in the armed services if the equal-rights amendment should be ratified.

It has been called to my attention that, as a matter of fact, the type of military service for men is probably not established as a legal right, but as an administrative matter, at the present time. I assume the same situation would be true regarding women.

I do not ask that the RECORD be corrected, but I did want to clarify these points before our proposed substitute is considered further by this distinguished body.

In conclusion, I want to apologize to the Business and Professional Women's Club for my error in having said they are not working people. Of course, they are.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the apology will be recorded.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, for the information of Senators on the important questions raised by Senate Joint Resolution 25, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a compilation which has been prepared for me by the National Consumers League showing State laws that would be jeopardized by the measure under consideration.

There being no objection, the compilation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE LAWS JEOPARDIZED BY THE PROPOSED EQUAL-RIGHTS AMENDMENT

ALABAMA

(Source: 1940 Code)

I. For wives and mothers:

The primary obligation of the husband to support his family (common law).

Protection of the wife's separate property from debts by the husband (constitution, sec. 209).

Relief from the husband's persistent nonsupport, and from his dangerously violent conduct toward the wife (T. 34, sec. 20).

Legal age of consent to marriage lower for females (T. 34, sec. 10).

II. For widows:

Right to occupy the husband's residence rent-free until dower is assigned (T. 34, sec. 50).

Allowance of 1 year's support from the husband's estate during its settlement (T. 7, sec. 664).

Allowance of personal property up to $1,000 in value (including right to collect wages up to $300 due the husband at the time of his death) (T. 7, sec. 665; 1947 laws, act 233).

Protection against disinheritance or insufficient provision by the husband's will (T. 61, sec. 18).

Exemption from the husband's debts of his life insurance made payable to the wife (T. 7, sec. 624).

III. For workingwomen:

Providing seats (T. 26, sec. 337).

Prohibitory: In or about a coal mine (T. 26, sec. 158).

ARIZONA

(Source: 1939 Annotated Code)

I. For wives and mothers:

The husband's prior liability for support of his family (secs. 63–305; 21–516).

Wife's right to her earnings and those of her minor children, when living separate and apart from her husband (secs. 63–302).

Wife's right, when separated from her husband and earning a living for herself and children, to sue for and keep as her separate property damages on account of personal injuries to her (*City of Phoenix* v. *Dickson*, 40 Ariz. 403; 12 Pac. 2d 618).

Right of wife to relief for husband's willful failure to support her (secs. 27–802).

Legal age of consent to marriage lower for females (secs. 63–102).

II. For widows:

Right to remain in the family home for a prescribed period, and be allowed a reasonable amount of support from the estate during its settlement (sec. 38–901).

Right to the proceeds up to $10,000 of insurance on her husband's life, free from claims of his creditors, when received by or payable to her (sec. 24–601).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 8 a day, 48 a week (sec. 56–320).

Day of rest (ibid.).

Providing seats (secs. 56–301; 56–319).

Prohibitory: In or about a mine, quarry, or coal breaker (ibid., sec. 56–319).

Other conditions: No female shall be employed in any capacity where employment compels constant standing (ibid.).

Minimum wage (ibid., secs. 56-401 to 56-413, 56-901. Industrial Commission Orders).

ARKANSAS

(Source: 1937 Statutes (Pope's Digest))

I. For wives and mothers:

The primary responsibility of the husband to support his family (common law).

Remedies to enforce the husband's responsibility (1937 Statutes, sec. 3284; 1943 Laws, ch. 428).

Wife's free control and disposition of her separate property as if she were unmarried (Constitution, art. 9, sec. 7; 1937 Statutes, sec. 7223).

Legal age of consent to marriage lower for females (1941 Laws, p. 66).

Earlier age of majority for females (sec. 6215).

II. For widows:

Right to remain in the family home rent-free for a prescribed period, and to have reasonable allowance for support during that time (secs. 82, 83, 4415, 4416).

Right to have the family home during her lifetime, free from claims of the husband's creditors, if she has no homestead in her own right (Constitution, art. 9, sec. 6; Statutes, sec. 7162).

Right to certain household goods, and to 1 year's support (sec. 84).

Right to certain allowances of personal estate (secs. 80, 86).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 8 a day (secs. 9087-9090, 9100; Session Laws 1943, Act 70).

Day of rest (ibid.).

Meal period (secs. 9100, 9102; Session Laws 1943, Acts 274 and 284).

Providing seats (sec. 9082; Session Laws, 1943, Act 284).

Prohibitory: Not to be permitted to enter any mine to work therein (sec. 9322).

Minimum wage (women and girls) (secs. 9084, 9094 to 9100; Session Laws 1943, Act 70).

CALIFORNIA

(Sources: as shown)

I. For wives and mothers:

The primary obligation of the husband to support his family (common-law provisions; *Lane* v. *McAlpine* (115 Cal. App. 607, 610 (2 Pac. 2d 124)).

Protection as wife's separate property of her earnings and those of her children when she is living separate from her husband (1937 Civil Code, sec. 169).

The presumption of law that whatever property is acquired by a married woman, through a written instrument, is her separate property (1937 Civil Code, sec. 164).

Age of consent to marriage, lower for females (Civil Code, sec. 56).

II. For widows:

Allowance for support during settlement of the husband's estate (1937 Probate Code, sec. 1680).

Right to have set off absolutely the husband's net estate up to $2,500 in value, as provided by law (1937 Probate Code, secs. 640-646).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 8 a day; 48 a week (Labor Code (Deering) 1937, sec. 1352; Session Laws, 1939, ch. 1072; 1943, ch. 14; Industrial Welfare Commission Orders).

Meal period (Industrial Welfare Commission Order).

Rest period (Industrial Welfare Commission Order).

Night work (ibid.).

Providing seats (Labor Code (Deering) 1937, sec. 1253, Industrial Welfare Commission Order).

Prohibitory: May not mix alcoholic beverages containing distilled spirits on premises used for the sale of alcoholic beverages, unless she is the licensee or wife of any such licensee (General Laws (Deering) 1937, act 3796, sec. 56.4). Employment on portion of premises used for sale and service of alcoholic beverages for consumption on premises (for persons under 21) (ibid., sec. 56).

Lifting or carrying of heavy objects (Labor Code (Deering) 1937, secs. 1250, 1251, 1252; Industrial Welfare Commission Orders).

Minimum wage (Labor Code (Deering) 1937, secs. 61, 70-73, 1171-1203; Industrial Welfare Commission Orders).

Industrial home work (1939 General Laws, Supp. (Deering) p. 755; Labor Code, secs. 2650-2668; Industrial Welfare Commission Order).

COLORADO

(Source: 1935 Statutes Annotated)

I. For wives and mothers:

The primary obligation laid by law on the husband to support his family (common law; also sec. 83).

Admission of testimony from a wife against her husband in nonsupport proceedings (ch. 83, sec. 5).

Relief through divorce and alimony from the husband's unjustified desertion or his willful nonsupport for a year or more (ch. 56, sec. 1).

Right to sue for divorce and alimony without court costs, if unable to pay (ch. 56, sec. 21).

Guaranteed alimony right to wife whose husband divorced her because of her insanity (ch. 56, sec. 2).

II. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 8 a day (Statutes annotated, 1935, ch. 57, secs. 112, 246; Industrial Commission orders).

Day of rest (ibid.).

Meal period (Industrial Commission Order No. 5).

Rest period (ibid., No. 2).

Providing seats (Statutes annotated, 1935, ch. 97, sec. 124).

Prohibitory: In or about coal mines or coke oven (ibid., ch. 110, sec. 98).

Minimum wage (Statutes, 1935, ch. 97, secs. 5, 236-256; Session Laws, 1937, ch. 189; Industrial Commission orders).

Industrial home work (Industrial Commission Order No. 2 (1938), pursuant to 1937 laws, ch. 189).

CONNECTICUT

(Source: 1930 General Statutes (revision))

I. For wives and mothers:

The husband's primary responsibility for family support (sec. 5157; 1935 Supp., sec. 1596c; *Dubow* v. *Gottinello*, 111 Conn. 306 (149 Atlantic 768)).

II. For widows:

Allowance of household goods and other property exempt from the husband's debts when his personal property is insufficient to satisfy creditor's claims (sec. 4955).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 8 a day, 48 a week (1943 Supplement to General Statutes, secs. 6929, 693g; first special session 1943, H. B. No. 4-x, General Statutes, 1930, secs. 2363, 5197; Supplements 1939, sec. 1317e; 1935 Supplement to General Statutes, sec. 1605c).

Night work (General Statutes, 1930, secs. 2363, 5197; 1941, sec. 701f; 1935 Supplement to General Statutes, sec. 1605c; first special session 1943, H. B. No. 4-x).

Prohibitory: In any tavern, unless employee is wife or daughter of proprietor (1943 Supplement to General Statutes, sec. 534g).

Industrial home work (1939 Supplement to General Statutes, ch. 131, sec. 836e).

Providing seats (General Statutes, 1930, sec. 5212).

DELAWARE

(Source: 1935 Revised Code)

I. For wives and mothers:

The primary responsibility of the husband to support his family (common law).

Legal age of consent to marriage lower for females (Revised Code, 1935, sec. 3491).

II. For widows:

Allowance of personal property, including cash, and husband's unpaid wages up to $75 (1935 Code, secs. 3838, 3876, 3845).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 10 a day, 55 a week (Revised Code, 1935, sec. 3592).

Day of rest (ibid.).

Meal period (ibid., sec. 3594).

Night work (ibid., sec. 3592; Session Laws, 1943, chs. 160, 161).

Providing seats (Revised Code, 1935, secs. 3633, 3634).

FLORIDA

(Source: 1941 Statutes)

I. For wives and mothers:

The primary responsibility of the husband for support of his family (common law).

Protects share in husband's estate by giving her right to renounce favorable provisions in his will and accept, instead, the portion allowed by statute when there is no will, without providing similar right to a surviving husband (sec. 731-34).

II. For widows:

Right of dower in the husband's estate (sec. 731-34).

Right to an allowance for support from the estate during its settlement (1941 Statutes, sec. 733, 20).

Rights in the family home, regardless of the husband's will or her selection of dower (Constitution, art. 10, secs. 1-2); (Stats., sec. 731.05, 731.27).

GEORGIA

(Source: 1933 Code)

I. For wives and mothers:

The husband's primary responsibility for support of his family (common law).

Right to give testimony in actions against the husband for maltreatment (sec. 26-1410).

II. For widows:

Right to support during settlement of the estate (secs. 113-1002, 113-1004).

Right to estate without administration in certain cases (sec. 113-903).

Right to occupy family dwelling (sec. 31-102).

Right to take dower if she chooses (secs. 31-101, 31-109).

III. For workingwomen:

Providing seats (sec. 54-401).

The law regulating hours of work—10 a day, 60 a week—applies alike to men and women.

IDAHO

(Source: 1932 Annotated Code)

I. For wives and mothers:

Right of support from the husband (common law).

Age of majority earlier for females (sec. 31-101).

II. For widows:

Right to continue in the family home, to use the household equipment, and to receive a reasonable allowance for support during inventory of the estate (sec. 15-501).

Right to receive without further administration the property remaining after payment of expenses for the husband's last illness and funeral, and necessary court costs, in small estates not over $1,500 in value, if there are no conflicting interests (sec. 15-506).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 9 a day (sec. 43-707).

Providing seats (sec. 43-708).

ILLINOIS

(Source: 1947 Revised Statutes)

I. For wives and mothers:

The primary obligation of the husband to support his family (common law).

Age of consent to marriage lower for females (ch. 89, sec. 3).

II. For widows:

Allowances of certain personal property and 9 months' support from the husband's estate (ch. 3, sec. 330).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 8 a day, 48 a week (ch. 48, secs. 5, 5a, 8.1).

Meal period (Department of Labor minimum-wage order No. 2 (1941)).

Prohibitory: Manual labor in or about a mine (ch. 93, secs. 27 and 129). Municipal authorities are empowered to prohibit by ordinance employment of women (other than a licensee or wife of licensee) as dispensers in retail liquor establishments (ch. 43, sec. 110).

Minimum wage (ch. 48, secs. 238–256; Department of Labor minimum-wage orders).

Industrial homework (ch. 48, secs. 251–260; Department of Labor minimum-wage order).

INDIANA

(Source: 1933 Statutes (Burn's))

I. For wives and mothers:

Right of support from the husband (common law).

Relief through divorce for husband's failure to make reasonable provision for his family (1935 Laws, p. 248).

II. For widows:

Allowance of family support during settlement of the estate (sec. 6–703).

Right to occupy the family home and have the use of adjacent lands up to 40 acres for 1 year free of rent (sec. 6–704).

Right to personal property from the estate up to $500 value (sec. 6–711).

III. For workingwomen:

Providing seats (1934 Anno. Statutes, Baldwin's, secs. 10065, 10067; sec. 2895).

Prohibitory: Within a coal mine (ibid., secs. 11074, 11052).

Industrial homework (secs. 10071, 10072).

IOWA

(Source: 1946 Code)

I. For wives and mothers:

The primary responsibility of the husband to support his family (common law).

II. For widows:

Family support during settlement of the estate, if required (sec. 635.12).

Right to the personal property exempted to her husband from creditor's claims (sec. 635.7).

Right to the proceeds of insurance on her husband's life payable to her up to $15,000, exempt from her own debts contracted before the husband's death (sec. 511.37).

III. For workingwomen:

Providing seats (sec. 88.4).

Prohibitory: No female under 21 years of age shall be employed in any capacity where duties compel constant standing (sec. 92.11).

KANSAS

(Source: 1935 General Statutes)

I. For wives and mothers:

The husband's responsibility for support of his family (common law).

II. For widows:

Allowance for family support up to $250, during settlement of the estate (secs. 22–511, 22–512).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 8 a day, 48 a week; 9 a day, 49½ and 54 a week (industrial welfare order).

Day of rest: 6-day week (ibid.).

Meal period (ibid.).

Night work (ibid.).

Providing seats (sec. 44–111; industrial welfare order).

Other conditions: It shall be unlawful to employ women in any industry or occupation under conditions of labor detrimental to their health or welfare and for more hours in a day than is consonant with their health and welfare (sec. 44–640).

Minimum wage (secs. 44–637, 44–639 to 44–650; supp. 1939, secs. 75–3401 to 75–3405).

KENTUCKY

(Source: 1946 Revised Statutes)

I. For wives and mothers:

The husband's responsibility for support of his family (common law). (See *Atkins* v. *Atkins' Admr.* (203 Ky. 291, 294; 262 S. W. 268).)

Legal age of consent to marriage lower for females (sec. 402.020–5).

II. For widows:

Allowance of personal property or cash up to $1,500 from the husband's estate (sec. 391.030).

III. Workingwomen:

Hours of work: 10 a day, 60 a week (secs. 337.370, 337.380).

Minimum-wage orders.

Meal period (ibid.).

Providing seats (sec. 338.110).

Prohibitory: No female under 21 years of age shall be employed or permitted to work at any occupation that compels her to remain standing constantly (sec. 339.410).

Employment by retail liquor license for duties other than as waitress, cashier, or usher (sec. 244.100).

Minimum wage (secs. 337.210 and following).

LOUISIANA

(Sources, as shown)

I. For wives and mothers:

Enjoyment of her personal earnings as her separate property when living separate and apart from her husband (1932 General Statutes (Dart), secs. 2170, 2172).

Written consent of wife necessary for husband to make valid assignment of his future earnings in wages or salary while the spouses are living together (ibid., sec. 4376).

Legal age for marriage lower for females (ibid., art. 97).

II. For widows:

Right to use the family residence rent-free and to have a moderate allowance for support, during a prescribed period (Civil Code, art. 2422).

Right to have an allowance during widowhood from the husband's estate, if she has no means of support from property of her own (Civil Code, art. 3252).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 8 a day, 48 a week; 9 a day, 54 a week (Session Laws 1942, acts 183, 341, and 41; 1944, act 246).

Day of rest (ibid.).

Meal period (General Statutes (Dart), 1932, sec. 4354; Session Laws 1942, acts 341 and 41; 1944, act 246).

Rest period (ibid., 1942, acts 183 and 41; 1944, act 246).

Providing seats (1935 cumulative supplement to General Statutes (Dart), secs. 4331, 4356).

Prohibitory: In any concert hall or saloon where spiritous liquors, wines, or malt are sold in the dispensing or distributing of such liquors (Criminal Code (Dart) 1932, sec. 1367). To clean any part of the mill, gearing, or machinery while the same is in motion (General Statutes (Dart) 1932, sec. 4335).

Minimum wage (Session Laws 1938, act 362).

MAINE

(Source: 1944 Revised Statutes)

I. For wives and mothers:

The primary obligation of the husband under the law to support his family (common law).

Remedies to enforce this obligation (ch. 153, sec. 43; 1947 Laws, ch. 369).

Relief through absolute divorce from husband for willful nonsupport (ch. 153, sec. 55).

II. For widows:

Right to occupy the husband's home rent-free for 90 days after his death and reasonable support (ch. 143, sec. 17).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 9 a day, 54 a week (ch. 25, secs. 22, 24).

Meal and rest period (ch. 25, sec. 25).

Providing seats (ch. 25, sec. 36).

Minimum wage (Session Laws, 1939, ch. 289; Order April 11, 1940).

MARYLAND

(Source: 1939 Code (Flack))

I. For wives and mothers:

The husband is bound by law to support his family (common law). (See *Farver* v. *Pickett*, 162 Md. 10, 12 (158 Atl. 29).)

Husband and his property primarily liable for family support (*McCubbin* v. *Patterson* (1860), 16 Md. 179, 184).

Husband has ownership and control of property accumulated during the marriage by cooperative efforts of both spouses, unless joint ownership established by voluntary legal transaction (common law). But wife's earnings in outside employment are her separate property by positive statute law (art. 45, secs. 1, 5).

Age of consent to marriage lower for females (art. 62, sec. 7).

II. For widows:

Right to proceeds of insurance on the life of the husband free of claims of his creditors, when policy provides for payment to widow (art. 45, secs. 8, 9).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 10 a day, 60 a week (art. 100, sec. 53; Session Laws, 1943, ch. 22).

Meal period (art 100, sec. 53; Session Laws 1943, ch. 22).

Night work (ibid.).

Providing seats (art. 27, sec. 365).

Prohibitory: In connection with any mine (other than office) (ibid., art. 89, sec. 174).

No minor under 21 years of age to work in, about, or in connection with, any saloon or barroom where intoxicating liquors are sold (ibid., art. 100, sec. 23).

Industrial homework (ibid., art. 27, secs. 371–375).

MASSACHUSETTS

(Source: 1932 General Laws)

I. For wives and mothers:

The husband has the primary responsibility for family support (common law).

Age of consent to marriage lower for females (ch. 207, sec. 7).

II. For widows:

Right to remain in the family home rent-free for a 6-month period (ch. 196, sec. 1).

Immediate temporary allowance for necessaries, if required (ch. 196, sec. 2).

Right to a continuation of the husband's estate of homestead (that is, the exemption of the family home from creditors' claims) if it existed at his death (ch. 188, sec. 4).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 9 a day, 48 a week (ch. 149, sec. 58, and amendments).

Meal period (ch. 149, sec. 58, and amendments).

Night work (ch. 149, secs. 58, 68).

Providing seats (ch. 149, sec. 103).

Prohibitory: Persons under 21 in, about, or in connection with, a saloon or barroom where alcoholic liquors are sold (ch. 149, sec. 64).

Lifting of heavy weights (ch. 149, sec. 53; industrial bull. No. 10, secs. 28–30 (1940)).

Minimum wage (session laws, 1937, ch. 401; 1938, ch. 237; 1939, ch. 275; orders).

Industrial homework (Session Laws, 1937, ch. 429, p. 556; 1939, ch. 461, p. 629; industrial bulletin No. 20 (1937)).

MICHIGAN

(Source: 1929 compiled laws and supplements)

I. For wives and mothers:

The primary duty of the husband to support his family (common law).

Admission of the wife's testimony without consent of the husband in desertion and nonsupport cases (sec. 17115–17166).

Wife's freedom in disposing of her property by will without regard to provision for her husband (constitution, art. XVI, sec. 8; comp. laws, secs. 13057, 13478).

Legal age of consent to marriage lower for females (secs. 12690, 12704, 12717).

Protects wife's dower (or its substitute) when the husband conveys his lands by his sole deed or mortgage, without providing a similar protection to the husband as to his wife's property (sec. 13072).

II. For widows:

One year's residence, rent-free, in husband's home; also 1 year's support from the estate, and an allowance up to $200 value in house furnishings and personal property (secs. 13090, 15726; 1939 Laws, Act 288).

Right to select, according to the resulting best advantage to her, (1) the provision for her by the husband's will, (2) her legal share of his estate, or (3) her dower (if she is entitled to dower) (1935 Supp., sec. 13085).

Inheritance advantage in cases provided for by statute (sec. 15726).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 9 a day, 54 a week (sec. 8324; department of labor and industry, regulations affecting employment of females and minors).

Meal and rest period. (The granting of definite rest periods of 15 minutes' duration, morning and afternoon or on swing shifts, etc., is a recommendation of the State labor department.)

Lifting or carrying. (The department of labor and industry, regulations on employment of women.)

Equal pay (Public Acts, 1931, Act 328, sec. 556, reenacting Act 239 of Public Acts of 1919).

Industrial homework (sec. 8337).

MINNESOTA

(Source: 1945 Statutes)

I. For wives and mothers:

The husband's responsibility to support his family (common law). (See *Kesanke* v. *Kesanke*, 137 Minn. 115; 162 N. W. 1060.)

Legal age of consent to marriage lower for females (secs. 517.02, 517.08).

II. For widows:

Right to receive free of claims of estate creditors, proceeds of insurance on the husband's life, up to $10,000 (sec. 550.37).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 54 a week (sec. 181.18).

Providing seats (secs. 182.44, 182.29).

Prohibitory: No girl under 21 as messenger for a telegraph or messenger company (sec. 181.41); placing cores into ovens or in taking cores out of ovens (sec. 183.24); oil or clean moving machinery (sec. 182.09).

Lifting of heavy weights (sec. 183.25).

Minimum wage (secs. 177.01–177.19). Orders.

MISSISSIPPI

(Source: 1942 Code Annotated)

I. For wives and mothers:

The primary obligation of the husband under the law to support his family (common law).

II. For widows:

A full year's support from the husband's estate (sec. 561).

Exclusive right during widowhood to the benefits from the homestead and personal property exempted to the husband from his creditors (secs. 478, 552, 561).

MISSOURI

(Source: 1939 Revised Statutes)

I. For wives and mothers:

The responsibility of the husband for support of his family (common law).

II. For widows:

Right to occupy the family home during widowhood (sec. 612).

Right to receive, free of claims of creditors against the estate, proceeds of insurance on the life of the husband for her benefit, to the amount purchasable by $500 annual premiums (secs. 5847–5850).

III. For unmarried women:

Right to receive insurance to the amount covered by annual premiums up to $500 issued for her benefit on the life of her father or brother, free of creditors' claims against the deceased person (secs. 5847–5850).

IV. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 9 a day, 54 a week (Session Laws, 1913, p. 400).

Providing seats (sec. 10193).

Prohibitory: To enter any mine to work therein (sec. 14831); to clean any part of the mill, gearing, or machinery while it is in motion (sec. 10184); to work between the fixed and traversing parts of any machine in motion by the action of any mechanical power except the machine she is operating (idem).

Industrial homework (ch. 68, secs. 10236–10237).

MONTANA

(Source: 1935 Revised Codes)

I. For wives and mothers:

The husband's responsibility for support of his family (sec. 5784).

Right of wife to sue for divorce without court costs, on proof of her inability to pay (sec. 5780).

Relief through divorce or separate maintenance for the husband's willful neglect (sec. 5747).

Legal age of consent to marriage lower for females (sec. 5696).

Age of majority earlier for females (sec. 5673).

Wife's dower (or its substitute) protected when husband conveys his lands by his sole deed or mortgage, without providing a similar protection to husband as to his wife's property (sec. 5813).

II. For widows:

Right to remain in possession of the family home and the household furniture, and to have reasonable support from the estate, until inventory of the estate is completed (sec. 10144).

Right to receive absolutely the whole of an estate valued at not more than $1,500, subject only to payment of expenses of husband's last illness, funeral, and administration of the estate (sec. 10149).

Right to dower in the husband's lands (sec. 5813).

III. For workingwomen:

Providing seats (sec. 3077).

Equal pay (secs. 3090-3091).

NEBRASKA

(Source: 1943 Revised Statutes)

I. For wives and mothers:

Husband's obligation to support his family (common law).

Relief through divorce for the husband's willful failure to provide suitable maintenance for her (sec. 42–302).

Admission of wife's testimony against her husband in an abandonment suit (sec. 25–1203).

II. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 9 a day, 54 a week (sec. 48–205).

Providing seats (sec. 48–203.)

NEVADA

(Source: 1929 Compiled Laws (Hillyer's))

I. For wives and mothers:

Husband's primary responsibility for support of his wife (sec. 3376).

Right to hold as her separate property the earnings of herself and her minor children when living separate and apart from her husband (sec. 3368).

Legal age of consent to marriage lower for females (sec. 4051).

Age of majority earlier for females (sec. 300).

II. For widows:

Right to remain in possession of the family home and household furnishings during settlement of the husband's estate, and to receive a reasonable support allowance for that period (sec. 9699).

Right to receive the personal property and the family home declared by law to be free of claims from creditors of the estate (sec. 9700).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 8 a day, 48 a week (1941 Supplement to Compiled Laws, sec. 2825.46; Session Laws, 1943, chs. 75 and 78).

Day of rest (ibid.).

Meal period (1941 Supplement to Compiled Laws, sec. 2825.47).

Providing seats (sec. 2791).

Minimum wage (women and girls) (Session Laws 1937, ch. 207; 1939, ch. 78).

NEW HAMPSHIRE

(Source: 1942 Revised Laws)

I. For wives and mothers:

The primary obligation of the husband to support his family (common law).

Relief from the husband's desertion and failure to provide for her support (ch. 339, sec. 6).

Age of consent to marriage lower for females (ch. 338, secs. 4 to 7).

II. For widows:

Right to occupy the family home rent free and to have reasonable support for a prescribed period after her husband's death (ch. 359, sec. 2).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 10 a day, 48 a week; 10¼, 54 (ch. 212, secs. 4 to 7; Session Laws, 1943, chs. 31 and 71).

Day of rest (ch. 212, secs. 36–39; Session Laws 1943, ch. 71).

Night work (ch. 212, secs. 3, 4, 7; Session Laws, 1943, chs. 31 and 71).

Providing seats (ch. 215, secs. 1 and 4).

Minimum wage (Session Laws, 1933, ch. 87; Department of Labor, orders).

NEW JERSEY

(Source: 1937 Revised Statutes)

I. For wives and mothers:

The husband has the responsibility to support his family (common law). (See *Rich* v. *Rich* (12 N. J. Misc. 310, 315; 171 Atl. 515).)

If a married woman offers to testify against her husband in a criminal action in which she is the complaining party, she may do so (sec. 2: 97–4).

II. For widows:

The right to have exempt personal property up to $200 value set aside for herself and family (sec. 3: 9–7).

If probate of the husband's will is contested the widow may have support for herself and children from the income of the estate, as the court directs (sec. 3: 2–29).

The right to receive unpaid wages due her husband at the time of his death up to $75 without formal administration (sec. 34: 11–30).

Right to have continued to her during her occupancy of the family home, the exemption of property from creditors' claims allowed her husband in his lifetime (sec. 2: 26–111).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 10 a day, 54 a week (sec. 34: 2–24).

Day of rest (ibid.).

Night work (1941–43 Cumulative Supplement to Revised Statutes, sec. 34: 2–28).

Providing seats (sec. 34: 2–29).

Prohibitory: In the manufacture of nitro and amido compounds (exemption of office, works hospital, or welfare room or building. Department of Labor, safety standards for the manufacture of nitro and amido compounds, sec. 9 (h) 1917; handle any dry substance or dry compound containing lead in any form in excess of 2 percent (ibid.,

Safety standards for lead corroders and oxidizers, sec. 2, 1917).

Minimum wage (secs. 34: 1–1, 34; 11–35 to 46, 34; 11–48, 34: 11–53 to 56; Session Laws 1941, ch. 321, orders).

Industrial homework (Session Laws, 1941, ch. 308. Minimum-wage orders).

NEW MEXICO

(Source: 1941 Statutes Annotated)

I. For wives and mothers:

The husband's primary responsibility to support his family (common law).

Relief through divorce for the husband's neglect to support her according to his ability, means, and social position (sec. 25–701).

Property conveyed to a married woman by written instrument is considered her own separate property until proved otherwise (sec. 65–401). But property conveyed to the husband in his name will be considered community property unless proved otherwise. (See *Fidel* v. *Venner* (35 N. M. 45, 47; 289 Pac. 803).)

Remedies provided for the wife to enforce the husband's legal obligation of family support (secs. 25–706; 65–203, 204).

Legal age of consent to marriage lower for females (sec. 65–105).

II. For widows:

Support allowance over a 6-month period (sec. 33–401).

Right to receive the personal property which the law exempts from claims of creditors to the head of the family (sec. 31–111).

III. For unmarried women:

Specific exemption from creditors' claims of clothing up to $150 in value, 1 sewing machine, 1 knitting machine, 1 piano or organ (to a music teacher), and books up to $50 in value (sec. 21–502).

IV. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 8 a day, 48 a week (secs. 57–401, 57–404, 57–405, 57–407).

Meal period (secs. 57–401, 57–404).

Providing seats (sec. 57–410).

Prohibitory: Girls under 21 as messenger for telegraph, telephone, or messenger company (exemption permit may be granted during war emergency). (Session Laws, 1943, ch. 112).

NEW YORK

(Sources as shown)

I. For wives and mothers:

The husband's primary legal obligation to support his family (common-law rule).

Security for support required from the husband for the wife when he annuls the marriage because of her insanity (Cahill's Consolidated Laws, 1930, ch. 14, sec. 7; Suppl., 1936, ch. 14, sec. 7-a).

Right to protection through legal separation when the husband neglects or refuses proper support (Civil Practice Act, sec. 1161).

Age of consent to marriage lower for females (Cahill's Consolidated Laws, 1930, ch. 14, sec. 15; Suppl., 1931–35, ch. 14, sec. 15).

II. For widows:

Right of the widow to occupy rent-free for a 40-day period her husband's dwelling; also, to have her living expenses for that period from the estate (Cahill's Consolidated Laws, 1930, ch. 51, sec. 204).

Continuance of the husband's homestead exemption to his widow for her lifetime (Civil Practice Act, sec. 674).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 8 a day, 48 a week (Consolidated Laws (Cahill), 1930, ch. 32, sec. 173; Cumulative Supplement, 1931–35, ch. 32, sec. 172; Session Laws: 1937, chs. 281, 282, 283, 660; 1938, ch. 651; 1939, ch. 499; 1940, ch. 216; 1941, ch. 33; 1942, chs. 778, 554 (art. 8); 1943, chs. 171 and 315; 1944, ch. 412).

Night work (Consolidated Laws (Cahill), 1930, ch. 32, sec. 172, sec. 172 (2); Session Laws: 1937, chs. 281, 282, 283; 1938, ch. 651; 1939, ch. 499; 1940, ch. 216; 1942, ch. 778).

Providing seats (Consolidated Code (Cahill), 1930, ch. 32, secs. 2, 150).

Prohibitory: In or in connection with a mine or quarry (ibid., ch. 32, sec. 146 (6)); conductors or guards on any type of railroad (for females under 21) (ibid., sec. 146 (9)); messenger for telegraph or messenger company (for females under 21) (ibid., sec. 146 (10)).

Lifting or carrying heavy weights (ibid., ch. 32, secs. 383, 146 (7), 147; Session Laws, 1938, ch. 657; department of labor, Industrial Code, rule No. 10 (1942)).

Equal pay (Session Laws, 1944, ch. 793).

NORTH CAROLINA

(Source: 1943 General Statutes)

I. For wives and mothers:

The husband is bound to support his family (common law).

A wife's testimony is admitted against the husband in criminal prosecutions for his desertion, nonsupport, or assault and battery (sec. 8–57).

The power to defeat by her will her husband's curtesy right in her separately owned property (constitution, art. 10, sec. 6) (sec. 52–1).

II. For widows:

One year's support (up to $500) from the husband's personal estate, when his will fails to provide sufficiently for his widow (sec. 30–15).

The right to reject the husband's will and take instead the portion given her by law, if more advantageous to her (sec. 30–2).

The advantage she enjoys in her dower right as compared with the husband's curtesy right (secs. 30–3, 30–6).

Right to proceeds of insurance on the husband's life free from claims of his creditors or heirs, when payable to the widow (constitution, art. 10, sec. 7).

Right to use any income of her husband's home during her widowhood free of creditors' claims, unless she has a home of her own (constitution, art. 10, sec. 5).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 9, 10, 11 a day, and 48 to 55 a week, according to industry (secs. 95–17, 95–26, 95–27).

Day of rest (sec. 95–17).

Meal period (sec. 95–27).

Providing seats (sec. 95–29).

NORTH DAKOTA

(Source: 1943 Revised Code)

I. For wives and mothers:

The husband's primary obligation to support his family (common law).

Legal age of consent to marriage lower for females (sec. 14–0302).

Age of majority earlier for females (secs. 14–1001, 14–1002).

II. For widows:

Reasonable allowance for family support during settlement of the estate as the court finds necessary (sec. 30–1610).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 8½, 9 a day, and 48, 54, 58 a week according to industry. (Session Laws, 1939, ch. 153; 1943, ch. 222).

Minimum-wage department (orders Nos. 1, 3).

Day of rest (Session Laws, 1939, ch. 153; 1943, ch. 222).

Meal period (minimum-wage department orders).

Night work (ibid.).

Providing seats (ibid.).

Minimum wage (Supplement to Compiled Laws, 1913–25, secs. 396b3, 396b6–396b9, 396b11–396b16; Session Laws, 1935, ch. 162; orders).

OHIO

(Source: 1940 Code (Baldwin's))

I. For wives and mothers:

The husband's primary obligation under the law to support his family (sec. 7997).

Age of consent to marriage is lower for females (secs. 11181, 11181–1 as amended).

II. For widows:

Right to occupy the husband's home, and to have the benefit of its exemption from creditors' claims (sec. 11732).

Right to 1 year's support from the husband's estate during its settlement (sec. 10509–74).

Exemption from claims of creditors or heirs of the husband on life-insurance proceeds payable to the wife (secs. 9397, 9398).

Allowance in lieu of homestead in certain cases (sec. 11733).

III. For unmarried women:

Certain property exemptions up to $500 value, if unmarried woman is responsible for support of a minor relative (sec. 11733).

IV. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 8 a day, 45 a week (Session Laws, 1941, H. B. 351, S. B. 135; 1943, S. B. 126, and H. B. 311).

Day of rest (idem).

Meal period (Code, Throckmorton, 1940, sec. 1008; Session Laws: 1941, H. B. 351, S. B. 135; 1943, S. B. 126).

Night work (Code, Throckmorton, 1940, secs. 1008–1, 12993; Session Laws 1943, S. B. 126, H. B. 311).

Providing seats (Code, Throckmorton, 1940, sec. 1008).

Prohibitory: Baggage handling; barroom and saloons or public drinking places which cater to male customers only and in which substitutes for intoxicating liquors are sold.

Blast furnaces: "Mines; quarries, or smelters (executive office)"; bowling alleys; delivery service; freight handling, operating freight or baggage elevators; pool rooms; shoe-shining parlors; metal molder.[1]

Lifting or carrying heavy weights (ibid., sec. 1008–1; Session Laws. 1943, S. B. 126).

Minimum wage (Code, Throckmorton, 1943, secs. 154–45d to 154–45t).

OKLAHOMA

(Source: 1941 Statutes)

I. For wives and mothers:

The husband's primary obligation to support his family (common law).

Legal age of consent to marriage lower for females (sec. 43–3).

Age of majority earlier for females (sec. 15–13).

II. For widows:

Right to receive without prolonged administration specified small estates after payment of court costs and the expenses of the husband's last illness and funeral (sec. 58–317).

Right to receive net proceeds of insurance on the husband's life that was issued for her use, free from claims of creditors (secs. 36–211, 36–212). See *Johnson* v. *Roberts* (124 Okla. 68, 71; 254 Pac. 88).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 9 a day, 54 a week (title 40, secs. 81–82).

Providing seats (title 40, sec. 83).

Prohibitory: Employment underground in the operation of a mine, or in any quarry (office work exempted if on top of ground) (constitution, art. XXII, sec. 4, statutes, 1941; title 40, sec. 85).

OREGON

(Source: 1940 Compiled Laws)

I. For wives and mothers:

The husband is primarily liable for support of his family (common law).

Legal age of consent to marriage lower for females (sec. 63–101).

II. For widows:

The right to remain in the family home for 1 year rent free and to have reasonable support from the estate during its settlement (sec. 17–118).

The right to have set apart to her the necessary household goods and supplies, whether or not she accepts the terms of her

[1] During the war emergency, only these are code (Throckmorton), 1940, secs. 1008–1, 12993; Session Laws 1943, S. B. 126.

husband's will; also support for herself and children until the estate inventory is made (secs. 19–601, 19–603).

The right to receive the net proceeds of certain small estates without prolonged administration (sec. 19–604).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work (various regulations) (wage and hour commission orders) (sec. 102–323).

Day of rest (ibid.).

Rest period (ibid.).

Providing seats (sec. 102–324; wage and hour commission orders).

Lifting or carrying heavy weights (ibid., No. 18, 1942).

Minimum wage (secs. 102–302, 102–304 to 320; Session Laws, 1941, ch. 10; wage and hour commission orders).

PENNSYLVANIA

(Source: 1936 Statutes (Purdon's))

I. For wives and mothers:

The primary legal duty of the husband to support his family (common law; also title 48, sec. 116).

Remedies given to compel this support.

Safeguards against the claims of a deserting or profligate husband to his wife's earnings and property (title 48, secs. 42, 44).

Relief from the malicious abuse and cruelties of a brutish husband (title 23, sec. 11).

II. For widows:

Exemption of certain insurance proceeds from the husband's debts (title 40, sec. 517).

Allowance of $500 from the husband's estate (title 20, secs. 471, 477).

Authority to collect without court procedure up to $150 of wages due her husband at the time of his death (title 20, sec. 867).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 8 a day, 44 a week (Session Laws, 1937, act 322; 1943, act 183; department of labor and industry; regulations governing the hours' provision of the woman's law, 1942).

Day of rest (ibid.).

Meal period (Session Laws, 1943, act 183; department of labor and industry; regulations affecting employment of women, 1943).

Night work (Session Laws, 1943, act 183; Statutes, title 43, sec. 47).

Providing seats (Statutes, title 43, sec. 108; department of labor and industry. Regulations affecting women (1943)).

Prohibitory: Reading or testing meters; messenger for railroads in calling train crews; crane operator; welding and cutting; on railroad tracks and at trucking; maintaining fires in hand-fired boiler furnaces (department of labor and industry, regulations affecting employment of women, 1943); in or about a mine (Statutes, title 52, sec. 32).

Minimum wage (Session Laws, 1937, act 248; department of labor and industry, order No. 2 (replaces No. 1)).

RHODE ISLAND

(Source: 1938 General Laws)

I. For wives and mothers:

The husband's primary responsibility for family support (common law).

Relief by divorce for husband's failure to provide necessaries for his wife (ch. 416, secs. 1, 2, 3, 8).

Legal age of consent to marriage lower for females (ch. 415, sec. 11).

II. For widows:

The right to have the use of necessary household equipment and supplies (ch. 577, secs. 6, 7).

The right to an allowance for support for a period up to 1 year during settlement of the estate (1926 Session Laws, p. 233).

The right to use of a portion of the husband's lands in addition to dower, under specified conditions (ch. 577, sec. 9).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 9 a day, 48 a week (Session Laws, 1943, ch. 1312, secs. 4 and 6).

Meal period (ibid., ch. 1377).

Providing seats (ibid., ch. 1313, sec. 1).

Minimum wage (General Laws, 1938, ch. 289; Session Laws, 1941, ch. 1065; minimum-wage orders).

Industrial homework (General Laws, 1938, ch. 293; mandatory minimum-wage orders).

SOUTH CAROLINA

(Source: 1942 Code)

I. For wives and mothers:

The husband's primary responsibility for support of his wife and children (sec. 256–45).

Legal age of consent to marriage lower for females (sec. 8558).

Wife's dower (or its substitute) protected when husband conveys his lands by his sole deed or mortgage, without providing a similar protection to the husband as to his wife's property. (See *Bomar* v. *Wilkins* (1930), 154 S. C. 64, 68, 151, S. E. 110) (secs. 8586–8590).

III. For workingwomen:

Day of rest (secs. 1735–1, 1735–2; Session Laws 1942, act 708, 709).

Night work (secs. 7033–5, 7033–6).

Providing seats (ibid., sec. 7032).

SOUTH DAKOTA

(Source: 1939 Code)

I. For wives and mothers:

The husband's primary legal obligation to support his family (sec. 14.0209).

Right to hold as separate property earnings and accumulations of self and minor children in her custody, while living separate from her husband (sec. 14.0206).

Legal age of consent to marriage lower for females (sec. 14.0109).

Age of majority earlier for females (sec. 43.0101).

II. For widows:

Right to receive in specified cases the entire personal estate of the husband after payment of expenses for his last illness and funeral, also the costs of administering the estate (sec. 35.1303).

III For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 10 a day, 54 a week (sec. 17.0601; Session Laws 1943, ch. 151).

Providing seats (sec. 17.0606).

Minimum wage (women and girls) (secs. 17.0607 to 17.0608, 17.9901; Session Laws, 1943, ch. 76).

TENNESSEE

(Source: 1934 Code)

I. For wives and mothers:

The husband's responsibility for support of his family (common law).

Remedy of separation or divorce on the ground of the husband's abandonment and refusal or neglect to provide for her (sec. 8427).

II. For widows:

Exemption of proceeds of insurance on the husband's life from creditors' claims, when the insurance was issued for benefit of the widow, or for the widow and children (secs. 8456–8458).

Right to have for her lifetime the enjoyment of the family home and its income free from claims of the husband's creditors, where the exemption existed in the husband's right at his death (sec. 7728).

Right to receive for herself and children whatever property is exempt to her husband at his death from claims of creditors (sec. 8234).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 10½ a day, 57 a week (Code, 1932, secs. 5322–5324; Session Laws 1943, ch. 151).

Providing seats (Code, 1932, sec. 5307).

TEXAS

(Source: 1936 Statutes (Vernon's))

I. For wives and mothers:

Husband's primary responsibility to support his family (common law).

Legal age of consent to marriage lower for females (art. 4605).

II. For widows:

Right to have 1 year's support from the husband's estate, in specified cases (arts. 3476–3478).

Right to receive all of the property of the husband's estate which is exempt by law from creditors' claims, when the estate cannot pay its debts. This includes the family home, clothing, house furnishings, and certain personal articles (arts. 3485, 3494, 3832, and 3833).

III. For unmarried women:

Daughters remaining in the household of the deceased father have the same right to his exempt property as that described for widows in their husband's property. (See last preceding item.)

IV. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 9 a day, 54 a week (Session Laws, 1943, ch. 68).

Providing seats (ibid.).

UTAH

(Source: 1943 Annotated Code)

I. For wives and mothers:

The primary duty of the husband under the law to support his family (sec. 40–4–1).

Legal age of consent to marriage lower for females (Revised Statutes, sec. 40–1–2, subsec. 4).

Protects wife's dower (or its substitute) when husband conveys his lands by his sole deed or mortgage, without providing a similar protection to husband as to his wife's property (101–4–3).

II. For widows:

The protection against disinheritance, injustice, or improvidence under the husband's will, in the widow's right to choose between the provision of the will and that of the law, whichever is best for her (secs. 101–4–3, 101–4–4).

III. For any woman:

The exemption from jury duty if she has the active care of minor children (secs. 48–0–10, 11).

Earlier age of majority for females (sec. 14–1–1).

IV. For workingwomen:

Hours of work, 8 a day, 48 a week (sec. 49–4–3).

Day of rest (industrial commission, minimum-wage orders).

Meal and rest periods (standards for women and children in industry (1937); industrial commission orders).

Providing seats (sec. 49–4–2).

Lifting or carrying of heavy weights (industrial commission, standards for women and children in industry (1937)).

Prohibitory: Employment in mine or smelter (sec. 49–4–1).

Minimum wage (secs. 42–1–1, 103–1–16, Session Laws; industrial commission orders).

VERMONT

(Source: 1947 Statutes (Revised))

I. For wives and mothers:

The husband's primary responsibility for family support (common law).

Remedy through divorce against the husband's failure to support her (sec. 3205).

Right to testify against the husband in protection of her bank deposits (sec. 8783).

Legal age of consent to marriage lower for females (secs. 21, 4131).

II. For widows:

Right to allowance of reasonable support from the husband's estate during its settlement (sec. 3021).

Right to occupy the family home until her portion of the estate is available to her or receive one-third of the estate income (secs. 3027, 3036).

Right to receive without administration the husband's property if not over $300 in value (sec. 3026).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work, 9 a day, 50 a week (code, 1933, sec. 6593, Session Laws, 1943, Act 130).

Providing seats (Code, 1933, sec. 8643).

VIRGINIA

(Source: 1942 Code Annotated)

I. For wives and mothers:

The husband must support his wife in keeping with his circumstances and her needs (*Hall* v. *Stewart* (1923), 135 Va. 384, 389, 116 S. E. 469; *Mihalcoe* v. *Holub* (1921), 130 Va. 425, 429, 107 S. E. 704).

II. For widows:

Right to receive the personal property from the husband's estate which is exempt by law from claims of his creditors (secs. 6552, 6562).

Right to occupy the husband's home free of charge, and to receive one-third of the income from any other real estate, until her dower is made available to her (sec. 5124).

Right to enjoy the husband's home, or the $2,000 allowance in its stead, during her lifetime or widowhood against the claims of his creditors, when she has not accepted dower or its substitute in a jointure settlement (secs. 6536, 6538–6539).

III. For unmarried women:

Right to receive from the father's estate his personal property which is exempt by law from claims of his creditors (secs. 6552, 6562).

IV. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 9 a day, 48 a week (sec. 1808).

Night work (sec. 1808n).

Providing seats (sec. 1870).

Prohibitory: Employment in or around a mine or quarry (sec. 1887a).

WASHINGTON

(Source: 1932 Revised Statutes (Remington))

I. For wives and mothers:

The husband's primary responsibility to support his family (common law). Relief through divorce for the husband's failure to support the wife (sec. 982).

Right to keep as separate property her earnings and those of her minor children with her when she is living separate from her husband (sec. 6896).

Legal age of consent to marriage lower for females (sec. 8437).

II. For widows:

Right to allowance of clothing and necessaries for support of herself and family, during settlement of her husband's estate (secs. 1364, 1473, 1474, 1476).

Right to receive free of creditors' claims the proceeds of life insurance payable to the wife, unless the premiums were paid to defraud creditors (secs. 7230–7231).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 8 a day, 48 a week. (Statutes (Remington), 1931, sec. 7651, Industrial Welfare Committee Orders.)

Day of rest (ibid., No. 23, 35a, 37, 40, 41).

Meal period (ibid., Nos. 23, 25, 27, 35a, 37, 38, 39, 41).

Night work (ibid., No. 23).

Providing seats (ibid., secs. 7615–7617. Industrial Welfare Committee Orders).

Prohibitory: In or about a mine or quarry (except in clerical or messenger duty about the surface workings) (ibid., sec. 8800); as bellhops (Industrial Welfare Committee Order No. 23).

Lifting of heavy weights (Industrial Welfare Committee Orders—working conditions in manufacturing or other mercantile establishments (1922); Canning (1942); Packing 1942).)

Equal pay (Session Laws, 1943, ch. 254).

Minimum wage (Statutes (Remington), 1931, secs. 7623–7641, 10833, 10835, 10840, 10895; Session Laws, 1935, ch. 176. Industrial Welfare Commission Orders).

WEST VIRGINIA

(Source: 1943 Code, Annotated)

I. For wives and mothers:

The primary responsibility of the husband to support his family (common law; secs. 4752, 4754).

Legal age of consent to marriage lower for females (sec. 4679).

II. For widows:

Right to the proceeds of certain insurance on the husband's life, when payable to her, free from claims of the husband's estate or creditors. (Within amount purchased by an annual premium of $300 or less) (sec. 4753).

III. For workingwomen:

Meal period (department of labor, regulations for the protection and preservation of lives, health, and safety of women in industry, 1943).

Providing seats (Code, 1931, sec. 21–3–11).

WISCONSIN

(Source: 1947 Statutes)

I. For wives and mothers:

The responsibility of the husband for support of his family (common law).

Remedies for compelling support (sec. 247.095).

Relief through separation or divorce on the ground of the husband's willful nonsupport (secs. 247.08, 247.09).

Legal age of consent to marriage lower for females (secs. 245.02, 245.16).

Wife's dower (or its substitute) protected when the husband conveys his lands by his sole deed or mortgage, without providing a similar protection to the husband as to his wife's property (secs. 233.01, 237.02).

II. For widows:

Allowance of clothing, provisions, fuel, housefurnishings, and other personal property from the estate to the value of $200 (sec. 313.15).

Allowance of family support according to estate resources and family requirements, during settlement of the estate (ibid.).

Exemption of $5,000 from creditor's claims in insurance funds payable to her (sec. 246.09).

Widow's share in the husband's estate protected by giving her the right to renounce unfavorable provisions in his will and accept instead the portion allowed by statute when there is no will, without providing a similar right to a surviving husband (secs. 233.13, 233.14, 233.23).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 9 a day, 50 a week (8, 9½, 10, and 55, 56, and 60 a week, for various occupations) (secs. 103.01–103.02); industrial commission general orders; special orders, canning factories (season 1944).

Meal period (secs. 103.01–103.02; industrial order No. 5, special orders No. 12 and for canning factories (season 1944)).

Night work (secs. 103.69 (1), 103.02; industrial commission general orders).

Providing seats (sec. 103.16).

Prohibitory: Employment in or about a mine or quarry (sec. 103.69w7); employment in place established by court order as a disorderly house or employed to work for any person convicted as keeper of a disorderly house; employment of girl under 21 as bellhop in hotel; employment of girl under 21 as caddy on golf course; any employment of girls under 18 requiring constant standing (sec. 103.69; industrial commission order 1933).

Minimum wage secs. 101.01 to 101.28, 104.01 to 104.12, 319.01. Industrial commission order No. 1, special order (season 1942).

WYOMING

(Source: 1945 Compiled Statutes)

I. For wives and mothers:

The husband is bound to support his family (common law).

Relief through divorce for husband's continued refusal to provide necesary support (sec. 3–5905).

Legal age of consent to marriage lower for females (sec. 50–102).

II. For widows:

Reasonable allowance for support of self, and of her minor children, as circumstances require, during settlement of the husband's estate (sec. 6–1501).

III. For workingwomen:

Hours of work: 8 a day, 48 a week (1940 supplement to revised statutes, sec. 63–109; session laws, 1943, ch. 30).

Prohibitory: Employment in or about a coal or iron mine or in any other dangerous place (except in office or clerical work) (revised statutes, 1931, sec. 20–106).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. TAFT was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of this week.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 25, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 24 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR LIBYA

Lewis Clark, of Alabama, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be the representative of the United States of America on the United Nations Advisory Council for Liby.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Karl R. Bendetsen, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 24 (legislative day of January 4, 1950):

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of admiral, for a term of 4 years.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

James Michael McInerney, to be an Assistant Attorney General to fill an existing vacancy.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Robert H. Mollohan, to be United States marshal for the northern district of West Virginia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 24, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Edward Gardiner Latch, D. D., Metropolitan Memorial, the National Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, eternal source of wisdom, power, and love, in the quiet of this moment help us to be still and to know that Thou art God. Lead us, we pray Thee, through all the changes of this earthly life to rest our spirits upon Thee and upon those eternal foundations of truth and love which Thou hast laid for us in Jesus Christ.

With the assurance of Thy presence we take up the duties and the responsibilities of this day. May we not listen to the lower voices which call us to compromise, which tell us of the easy way,

and which say that to be selfish is to be wise; but may we listen to the higher voices which call us to be courageous, which tell us of the right way, and which say that only in truth is there wisdom and strength and peace. So we pray for courage to take the right way in truth that wisdom and strength and peace may be ours.

In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE FUR INDUSTRY

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

THE ISSUES

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the fur industry in the United States is well on the road to extermination unless we come to the rescue. I have devoted much of my time to a careful study of the problem and I have come to the conclusion that the predicament in which the fur industry, which is so vital to my own district in Louisiana, finds itself, stems from two causes; namely, the burdensome wartime excise taxes on furs and the fact that the United States has become the dumping ground for foreign furs, especially Russian furs. To cure the disease we must remove the causes. Accordingly, I advocate two measures which, in my judgment, would save our fur industry from destruction.

First, we should repeal all wartime excise taxes, especially the tax on furs.

Second, we should adopt legislation to control the importation of furs and fur articles in order to prevent injury to our domestic fur-producing industry.

Mr. Speaker, I am keenly aware of the necessity for such legislation because I represent one of the greatest fur-producing districts in the entire United States, but I realize that no one Member of this body can bring it about alone. I, therefore, invite all Members of this House, and especially my colleagues from fur-producing areas, to join me in the movement. Within the limits of my humble ability I want to take this occasion to give you the benefit of my research with the hope that I can help to develop concerted thinking along that line. It is a very interesting and challenging story.

IMPORT INCREASES

An examination and analysis of the figures compiled by the Tariff Commission covering the prewar and postwar periods is enlightening and startling. For instance, the value of furs imported into the United States in 1938, the year before the war in Europe, was $42,000,000; while in 1946, the year after the war, the value was $241,500,000.

Mr. Speaker, Louisiana is the largest fur-producing State in the Union, and the Third Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, produces more muskrat fur than any other section of the entire United States. Let me illustrate what the official figures of the Tariff Commission show with regard to muskrat furs. They reveal that imports of muskrat pelts have increased about 500 percent since the war. For example, in 1938, the year before the war, 514,000 muskrat pelts were imported into the United States; while in 1946, the year after the war, the total was 3,164,000.

SOURCE OF IMPORTS—RUSSIA

Mr. Speaker, hostilities are over but the cold war still goes on. It is no wonder that we find Russia at the root of the evil.

The American dollar commands respect in all the trading centers and money marts of the world. All foreign countries are hungry for our dollars because with them they can trade and buy goods anywhere, any place, any time. It is not surprising, therefore, that Russia is bent on getting her hands on our American dollars in order to finance her program in the hard-pressed currency areas. Why not then dump her furs at practically any price in order to secure American dollars? Russia is in a peculiar position to do so. The Soviet Union is doing just that, and I will tell you how.

In his testimony before the Special Subcommittee on Fur of the House Committee on Agriculture, Mr. E. C. Ropes, Chief of the Russian Unit of our Department of Commerce, on April 17, 1949, said:

Mr. ROPES. In connection with my work there for some twenty-odd years, I have had occasion to study the fur industry, not only since the revolution, but also before. The part that is of interest to people here as of the present time is the organization of the fur industry in Russia and the method by which they dispose of the catch abroad, particularly in the United States which is the largest customer for Russian furs.

Congressman GRANGER. The Government does the purchasing?

Mr. ROPES. Yes, sir, the Government does it. The agency set up for that purpose, which handles both the purchasing, collection, and export, is called the Soyuspushnina, which means the All Union Corporation for Furs—the fur industry, the fur sales, the fur exports, the aggregate in their purview and field of activities, all these operations.

So much for the acquisition of the furs in Russia by the Russian Government. Now, how does the Russian Government sell the furs in the United States? Why, through the same or similar agencies, of course. I have before me the December 21, 1949, issue of the Women's Wear Daily, a fur-trading paper. The headline is entitled "Silberman Signs Russian Contract for Wild Furs," and the article goes on to say, "This was made known at the week end by J. D. Silberman, vice president in charge of the New York branch. He said a quantity of Russian wild furs has been purchased after negotiations with representatives of Soyushpushnina, Soviet Fur Trust here in New York."

I also hold in my hand the June 1, 1949, issue of the Women's Wear Daily. The headline reads, "Amtorg closes large deals here for Russian squirrel." The article reads in part as follows:

A substantial quantity of squirrel skins, totaling about three-quarters of a million, has been purchased from the Russian Government at prices unofficially estimated to be at a new low for the year. * * * The transaction was made by Amtorg Trading Corp.

The Amtorg Corp. is owned and operated by the Russian Government, and is known to be carrying on espionage activities in the United States. As a matter of fact, last fall six top officials of this outfit were arrested by the FBI.

It is clear, therefore, that the Russian Government acquires the furs from the Russian people and sells them to the United States on a state-trading basis, with obviously no high standard of living wages paid to the trappers and laborers abroad; certainly no fancy salaries paid to white-collar employees; evidently no commissions at all paid to middlemen. It must always be kept in mind that selling policies of Russian agencies are not governed by costs based upon private ownership such as prevail in a free economy. They do not have to worry about these details, because big brothers Soyushpushnina and Amtorg take care of everything. How can we possibly compete under these circumstances?

So that is how the Russian Government does business with us in furs, and what a business.

I have demonstrated that foreign-fur imports into the United States have increased by leaps and bounds since the war. A further analysis of the official figures of the Tariff Commission proves that the Russian fur dumping practices primarily account for the increase. For example, in 1930 the total fur imports from all countries to the United States were $57,000,000. Of this amount Russia supplied us with $3,000,000, or 5.2 percent. In 1948 the total imports into the United States amounted to $161,000,000, and the Russian imports accounted for $38,000,000, or 23.6 percent. As a matter of fact, since the war, an average of 30 percent of all imported furs came from Soviet Russia and satellite countries under her control, whose fur industry is operated entirely on a state-trade basis.

But that is not all, Mr. Speaker, the record proves beyond question of doubt that Russia has found out that her cheap furs are the commodity best suited for export into the United States to secure American dollars at any price, in order to carry out her program. Furs account for 59 percent of the total Russian exports into the United States since the war. This is shown by the following table compiled by the Tariff Commission:

Value of Russian exports to United States

[In thousands of dollars]

Year	Furs	All other goods	Total of all exports to United States	Percentage of furs to total
1946	69,735	30,837	100,572	69
1947	43,308	33,794	77,102	56
1948	40,522	38,252	78,774	52
Total	153,565	102,853	256,448	59

Again referring to muskrats, in which I am profoundly interested, I observe that during the year 1948 Russian exports into the United States amounted

to over 60 percent of our total muskrat imports from all foreign countries. And from figures received from the Tariff Commission during the last 9 months of 1949, it is clearly evident that even a larger volume of muskrat fur was imported last year.

I say to you that Russia dominates our American raw-fur market and is crushing and strangulating our fur-producing industry. It is high time that we do something about this critical situation.

OTHER FOREIGN BARRIERS

It is true that the United States always absorbed some of the furs of friendly foreign countries, but in limited quantities. The Russian dumping practice since the war, which I have already described, is not only stifling our domestic fur-producing industry but is also operating to the great harm of our friendly countries. In order to meet the Russian competition, I should like to point out some of the discriminating and abusive trade practices that friendly nations have had to resort to in order to sell their furs on our market as they did before the war.

Our close and friendly neighbor to the north, Canada, has had to place in operation an export subsidies program. This is shown by the following article which appeared in the Women's Wear Daily of February 19, 1947, from which I quote in part:

Canada too guarantees silver-fox prices.

The Dominion Government is undertaking to guarantee a minimum price for silver-fox pelts, ranging up to $62.50 for the top grade, provided they are delivered by ranchers before May 1 of this year, it is learned today.

Appearing in the same trade paper of January 28, 1949, is an explanation in part of the export compensating rebates program that Denmark is operating under:

Mink levels steady at Danish auctions: United States buyers active.

A good part of the mink will go to the United States via London, Max Weiss, London representative of Scandinavian Fur Auctions, points out and that all quoted prices are subject to a compensation rebate of 25 to 30 percent for goods earmarked for export.

For example—

You purchase in Denmark a mink pelt for $10 and export it to the United States. The Danish Government will rebate $3 to enable you to sell the mink pelt on the United States market for $7.

Most, if not all, other friendly nations engage in similar subsidy and rebate practices. It is no wonder that the domestic raw-fur market is demoralized and that the domestic fur producer is being destroyed.

Our friends in Canada are also very much alarmed about the Russian dumping practices. As proof of that statement, I quote from an article appearing in the Fur Reporter, a Canadian publication, of October 19, 1949:

Great quantities of these Russian furs are sold with utter disregard as to price, and, naturally, such transactions have had a depressing effect upon the market for our domestic furs, as well as being largely responsible for precipitating the downward trend in price levels experienced by the industry to an increasing degree during the past three seasons.

It would seem to be the opinion of the author of the above article appearing in the Fur Reporter, Mr. Arthur Prentice, general manager, Canadian Fur Auction Sales Co., Ltd., of Quebec, Montreal, that, far from offending them, friendly nations would welcome legislation along the lines I advocate because in that article Mr. Prentice states:

In view of the uncooperative attitude of Russia toward every effort to establish peace and prosperity in the world, a situation has developed which is costing the taxpayers of Canada and the United States billions of dollars in defense and foreign aid and therefore it would seem that the North American market should at least be restricted on a tariff basis, as far as the importation of Russian commodities are concerned. Such a step would reestablish the demand for many American furs and relieve the burden of heavy imports to this continent.

ONE-WAY TRAFFIC

Mr. Speaker, the dumping practices of Russia and the subsidy-rebate programs of friendly nations do not tell the whole story. Our domestic fur industry is being squeezed in other ways, both abroad and at home.

Our doors are wide open for foreign furs to come into the United States from Russia and all other countries. All raw furs of every type and description, with the single exception of fox furs, have always entered this country duty-free. We have no restrictions whatever to prevent or in any way control foreign furs entering the United States. Our international fur policy constitutes a one-way traffic because foreign countries, for the most part, do have practical restrictions against our shipping furs abroad. For example, as a practical proposition, we can only ship one type of furs to France if we import an equal quantity of a different type. Thus, if we ship muskrats to France, we must be prepared to import into the United States an equal quantity of some type of French furs, and before we can ship furs to Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, we must obtain import licenses, and to obtain such import licenses is well-nigh impossible. The net result, on the whole, is that the fur channel coming into the United States is wide open, while our fur channel going abroad is fraught with such barriers, import licenses, and other obstacles that we cannot effectively use it.

The point I am making about foreign barriers and restrictions is discussed in an article appearing in the July 6, 1949, issue of the Fur Reporter. The article is entitled "One-Way Trade Dangerous to United States," and reads as follows:

The entire situation is discouraging and very dangerous because the United States cannot continue to consume furs from all over the world, spend American dollars for their purchase, and not be able to sell any furs or fur merchandise to these countries because of Government restrictions. It is a very disturbing situation and it is no wonder that there are protests arising in the United States by the fur farmers and the raw-fur collectors and trappers against the influx of fur skins from everywhere, but barriers against American furs in so many different markets.

To add to our fur troubles abroad, our domestic industry is being penalized at home. Thus, in peacetime, our domestic fur industry is still saddled with wartime excise taxes.

LEGISLATION NEEDED

Mr. Speaker, I have already introduced a bill to repeal wartime excise taxes. I understand that there is pending in the Senate a bill to which there was added a rider to control the importation of furs and fur articles. I am watching the outcome of the latter bill and if it does not pass, I intend to introduce legislation in the House along the same lines. I respectfully solicit the support of all Members of this body of such legislation.

RUNAWAY "PAPPY" BILL

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, there are approximately 1,000,000 deserted wives and children in the United States. Their fathers and husbands in many cases have crossed State lines. Many of these deserted wives and children are public charges because of such desertion. It has been proven that States are utterly unable to cope with this problem; accordingly, last session I introduced a measure to empower the Federal courts in the district in which a fugitive father might be found to order him to pay support for the children he deserted.

I hold in my hand, a record sent me by Judge Donald E. Long of Oregon, of a case where a father deserted his wife and six children, went to California, and was gone for 7 years. During those 7 years he contributed exactly $10 to their support. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is no more important legislation pending before this Congress than the bill introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] and me, to bring what we call the runaway "pappies" to their senses, and cause them to meet their moral obligations as fathers; an obligation which even the lower animals do not shirk. I commend it to your consideration. I hope that all of you will become interested in the matter.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I know of a case where a mother ran away from her children. Does not the gentleman agree that the legislation should be broadened to cover such cases likewise?

Mr. JACOBS. The bill would include the mother; it includes any parent who deserts his or her child, and empowers the Federal court in the district where the deserting parent may be found to order the parent to contribute to the support of the children he has deserted. Because the father is the most frequent offender I coined the phrase "Runaway 'pappy' bill."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KARST asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. THOMPSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DOLLINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

HENRY J. BACKOF

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it was with the deepest regret that I learned of the sudden death of Mr. Henry J. Backof, who died while on his way to work yesterday morning. Mr. Backof was a resident of my district; and an employee of the House of Representatives. He was a devoted husband, the father of four fine children; and a real family man.

Most of us knew Henry Backof as a genial man, who was always willing to do a favor for anyone. He worked in the House library for more than 10 years; and in spite of a change in the majority leadership in the House, Mr. Backof was continued on in the library because of his intimate acquaintance with his duties and his pleasing and accommodating disposition. He will be greatly missed by all of us who knew him, and particularly by his associates in the library. My deepest sympathy goes out to his wife and family in their hour of sorrow. May his soul rest in peace.

ALGER HISS AND HIS FRIENDS

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, some of the people who helped place Alger Hiss in high place in our Government, where he could betray us, are still holding positions of power and influence. They are still in positions where they can strike powerful blows to weaken our Government.

One of the chief sponsors of Hiss was Felix Frankfurter, now occupying, as Justice of the Supreme Court, one of the positions of greatest power in our entire Government. He has gone to great lengths to aid Hiss to escape his just punishment for betraying his country. So has another powerful figure in the Government, Secretary of State Acheson. If there are any two people in Hiss' circle of friends and acquaintances who ought to know his character, these two are in position to have intimate knowledge regarding him.

Hiss has finally been convicted in spite of their efforts, of aiding the Communist spy ring, which has been exposed both here and in Canada.

In my opinion, the conviction of Hiss for his betrayal of America to the Communists is but a scratch on the surface. It is only a small part of the clean-up which is going to have to be made if we expect to save our country and our Government, and defeat the announced intention of the Communist Party to destroy our free government and set up in its place a Communist dictatorship.

It is a shocking thing that one who occupied positions of power and trust as Hiss did, should betray his Government and people. It is also a shocking thing that other high-placed and powerful officials of our Government rushed to his aid and assistance and threw their weight and the influence of their high offices to his side of the fight. Hiss is but a symptom, and the real causes should be eradicated. When that is done, the symptoms will disappear along with them.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TACKETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. LUCAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the Independent Petroleum Association of America on the subject the Present Oil Situation.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO FEPC ACT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, when and if the FEPC measure comes before this House I shall offer an amendment which I shall read to you so that the Members may understand just exactly what they will have before them at that time. I shall suggest that the House accept the following amendment:

This act shall take effect in each State on the date on which the State by law (1) declares that the rights of some persons within the jurisdiction of the State to employment without discrimination because of race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin are being denied, and (2) establishes or designates an agency of the State to accept jurisdiction of cases under section 7 (a) of this act.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to require that the States make a finding that there is discrimination within those States and take some positive step to cooperate with the Federal Government in ridding the State of any such discrimination.

In my opinion, there is abundant precedent in our national laws where the National Government has enacted legislation of this character expecting cooperation of the States.

I shall offer this amendment for the consideration of the Members when and if FEPC legislation comes before us.

Amendment to H. R. 4453 proposed by Mr. LUCAS.

"Page 22, after line 17, add the following new section:

"'EFFECTIVE DATE IN STATES

"'SEC. 16. This act shall take effect in each State on the date on which the State by law (1) declares that the rights of some persons within the jurisdiction of the State to employment without discrimination because of race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin are being denied, and (2) establishes or designates an agency of the State to accept jurisdiction of cases under section 7 (a) of this act.'"

REFUSAL OF COAL MINERS TO WORK

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, the Associated Press, in dispatches to its morning clients for today, reported from Pittsburgh that 63,000 miners were refusing to return to the pits, even though the President of the United Mine Workers of America, Mr. John L. Lewis, had so requested. Newspapers variously headlined this dispatch, and one of similar vein yesterday, using the word "rebellion," or a synonym.

This, Mr. Speaker, is significant, especially in relation to that vicious law, the Taft-Hartley Act.

Proponents of that law—and I am certainly not numbered among them—have defended their position by claiming the Taft-Hartley Act is not aimed at workingmen, but at freeing labor from what they assert is dictatorship of labor bosses. This law, they would have us believe, is labor's emancipation.

Now these same proponents also are most vigorous in calling the United Mine Workers' president, Mr. Lewis, a labor boss.

They are also the same individuals who daily, through press and radio and in Congress, are demanding that the Taft-Hartley law be invoked in the coal dispute to force miners back to work.

Mr. Speaker, we have here, according to the Associated Press, which is known as the world's greatest news gathering organization, and which has a high reputation for accuracy, more than 60,000 miners who do not want to go back to work. Now, if the Taft-Hartley law is invoked and these men are forced back to work—assuming that you can make them work against their will—will it be used against a labor boss or will it be used against a group of individual miners who do not want to work without a contract? A group of miners who are striking, not under compulsion from a labor leader, but because their desire to strike is stronger than the requests of their duly elected national head.

The answer, of course, is obvious. Invoking the Taft-Hartley law—still assuming you could force these so-called

rebellious miners back to the pits—would be using it against individual workers.

Thus the real purpose of the Taft-Hartley law—its antiunion and anti-worker philosophy—is clearly illustrated. There can be no longer any question about the law, why all labor considers it a slave-labor bill is clearly shown. Supporters of this act can no longer hide behind the smug phrases about curbing labor bosses.

And perhaps, if these miners can be made to work, against their will, by injunction, millionaires, ex-Congressmen, lawyers, and other never-sweats could also be forced to work in industry—also against their will.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include excerpts.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "Real Democrats Given Wrong Name."

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances; to include in one a radio speech, in one a resolution, and in one an editorial.

AMENDING COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, H. R. 6949, containing several amendments to the radio provisions of the Communications Act of 1934. I believe that the amendments contained in this bill, particularly those dealing with the subject of allocation and assignment of frequencies, go to the very heart of the Communications Act of 1934.

The bill deals with three subjects: First, it would provide for the creation of an independent five-member Frequency Control Board to deal with allocation and assignment of radio frequencies. Secondly, it would give the Federal Communications Commission additional administrative sanctions with respect to radio station licenses and holders of construction permits. Third, it would render radio station licensees immune from criminal or civil actions for statements made in the course of political broadcasts, and would clarify section 315 of the Communications Act relating to such broadcasts.

It is my belief that the subjects dealt with in my bill need intensive study and I believe further that these subjects can be studied better if a concrete proposal is placed on the table for discussion purposes. In introducing this bill, I am simply seeking to place before the Congress, the executive branch of our Government, and all those who are concerned with problems of radio communications such a concrete proposal.

There has been a great deal of pressure emanating from various quarters including the radio trade press that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, before taking up any of these subjects, should concentrate on S. 1973, the so-called McFarland bill. There are demands even to the effect that the committee should report this bill out without holding any hearings whatsoever.

As stated by the sponsors of S. 1973, their bill deals exclusively with the organizational and procedural provisions of the Communications Act. I believe firmly that the impact of the amendments contained in that bill cannot be properly evaluated by this committee unless it has a thorough understanding of the functions and operations of the Federal Communications Commission in the field of radio.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has not had an opportunity to study these substantive problems since it held its last comprehensive hearings on amendments to the Communications Act in the summer of 1942. Since then, many new problems, I need mention only television, have arisen, and many new members have joined the committee who have never had occasion to study the problems connected with the various aspects of radio and radio communications. I believe it would be unreasonable to expect this committee to do, in connection with the consideration of S. 1973, the kind of job which it is accustomed to do unless the committee first gains a clear understanding of the substantive problems involved. Therefore it is my purpose to bring before the committee some of the most important substantive problems connected with radio and to do that in the most concrete form possible, namely, that of placing before the committee appropriate amendments to the Communications Act in the field of radio. That is the sole reason for my introducing this bill at the present time.

FREQUENCY CONTROL

Title I of the bill would add to title III of the Federal Communications Act of 1934 a new part entitled "Frequency Control."

In 1943 the House of Representatives of the Seventy-eighth Congress passed House Resolution 21, creating a Select committee to investigate the Federal Communications Commission. On January 2, 1945, Hon. Clarence Lea, the chairman of the select committee and also the chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, submitted the select committee's final report. The select committee had gone in great detail into the question of the operation of the Interdepartment Radio Advisory Committee. In reporting on its study and investigation, the committee made the following statement:

> The select committee notes that section 305 of the Federal Communications Act of 1934 places personal responsibility on the President to make assignments to governmental radio stations; and it believes that before such power is delegated to a body with an independent rather than advisory character, the whole problem should be considered by Congress.

Title I of my bill would provide for the creation of an independent body, and I hope that this proposal will thus place before the Congress the very problem that the select committee recommended for study by the Congress.

As stated by the select committee, the Federal Communications Act grants to the President the power to assign radio frequencies to Federal Government stations. The act charges the Federal Communications Commission with the responsibility for the assignment of frequencies to all other stations, including private, State, and local government stations. Within their respective areas, both the President and the Commission have unlimited power to assign frequencies. Neither has authority over the other in this respect.

For many years this machinery was adequate because the uses to which the spectrum was put both by the Government and by non-Government operators were not as varied and as many as they are now. Nor was there any keen rivalry between nations for the use of the same parts of the radio spectrum. As the uses of radio have been increased, however, so has the difficulty of reconciling the actions of these two authorities, namely, the President and the Commission.

The President informally has delegated to the Interdepartment Radio Allocation Committee, known generally as IRAC, his functions of assigning frequencies to Government stations. IRAC has not been established by Executive order but has been created on a voluntary basis by the Government agencies that are using radio. The following are members of IRAC: Army, Navy, Air Force, Commerce, Treasury, Agriculture, Interior, Justice, State, Maritime Commission, and finally the Federal Communications Commission. IRAC has been in existence since 1922, but its membership and organization has never been formalized by Executive order or in any other manner. Nevertheless, it is the recognized public body which exercises on behalf of the President the authority granted in the Communications Act to the President to assign radio frequencies for Federal Government uses.

In apportioning radio frequencies as between the Federal Government and private users (including State and local governments), the Federal Communications Commission and IRAC have dealt with each other pretty much on the same basis that two sovereign governments would deal with each other. Each put forward its particular claims to particular portions of the spectrum, and if any conflict arose as to these claims, they were compromised as best possible.

There is no criticism whatever of this operation. It is the best possible that can be devised to carry out the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934, which established the dual authority of the President and the Federal Communications Commission with respect to the assignment of radio frequencies. As a matter of fact, I feel that both the Federal Communications Commission and

IRAC should be congratulated for having operated this inadequate machinery so long without a serious break-down.

However, as I have stated, the demands for space in the radio spectrum both on the part of the Federal Government and private applicants have been increasing constantly. Simultaneously, the difficulty of reconciling the actions of these two authorities has grown. As a matter of fact, the charge has been made publicly that as a result of the inadequacy of this machinery, private applicants for space in the spectrum have come out second best. It has been contended that the Federal Communications Commission has been given to distribute among private applicants that portion of the spectrum that has been left over after the Federal Government agencies took the space that they desired.

This is a serious charge, indeed, and in a democracy it is poor business to leave the apportionment of an important natural resource like the radio spectrum, as between Federal Government and non-Government uses, to a planless system of compromises between two public bodies, each sovereign in its own field, neither of which is responsible to the people for the apportionment that results from their respective actions. And yet, under the Communications Act as it now stands, this procedure is the only possible one.

It is my belief that under our system of government the apportionment of the radio spectrum as between Federal Government and non-Government uses must be entrusted to public officials responsible to the President and the Congress and through them to the people.

I have not been unmindful of the fact that a substantial amount of time is being spent by individual members of the Federal Communications Commission and by the Commission staff on general frequency allocation problems and international negotiations with regard thereto. At the same time, it is well known that the Commission has a large backlog of applications for the assignment of frequencies and hearings with regard thereto whose processing has been delayed for months, and in many instances for years. It is my hope that my proposal to create a Frequency Control Board will so lighten the workload of the Commission that the aforementioned backlog can be eliminated and that the Commission can become current in its work.

Title II of the bill deals with two very important aspects of the Federal Communications Act: First, the question of what administrative sanctions shall be available to the Federal Communications Commission to enforce the radio provisions of the act and the rules and regulations of the Commission. Secondly, what specific requirements shall be imposed on licensees with respect to political broadcasting and, as a consequence thereof, in what instances shall such licensees be immune from actions for libel or slander in connection with statements made in the course of such political broadcasts.

ADMINISTRATIVE SANCTIONS

The Communications Act, in section 312, provides the conditions under which the Commission is authorized to revoke a broadcasting station's license. Revocation of a license is the only sanction given to the Commission to enforce the provisions of the act and the rules and regulations prescribed by the Commission.

The recent decision of the Commission in the case of the Don Lee Broadcasting System well exemplifies the need for additional administrative sanctions less severe than revocation. Here are the words of the Commission:

> We find ourselves in a difficult situation in deciding this case. This is not due to any deficiency in the record for we are convinced that the attitude which responsible Don Lee officers displayed in this record with respect to the Commission's chain broadcasting regulations—an attitude which can at best be characterized as one of indifference—warrants critical examination of the qualifications of the applicant to be a broadcast licensee. We are, however, faced with important practical difficulties in this case which arise from the fact that the only sanction we have the authority to apply is denial of license—an action which will put the licensee out of business. Except in an aggravated case, the Commission is reluctant to impose a sentence on a licensee which not only terminates his existing operations but would preclude him from holding any other radio licenses. Had we the authority to order a suspension, assess a penalty or impose some other sanction less than a "death sentence" we should have no hesitancy whatsoever in doing so in this case.

Commissioner Hennock, who dissented from the decision of the majority to renew, notwithstanding the violations of the Commission network regulations, the station licenses of the applicant, nevertheless agreed with the views of the majority concerning the need for additional sanctions:

> In this connection, I should like to say that I feel as do most of the other members of the Commission, that in some cases we are definitely hampered in the exercise of our regulatory authority by the fact that virtually the only substantial sanction available to us for violation of the Communications Act or our rules and regulations is the deprivation of the broadcast license. Even the other sanctions available are extremely burdensome, and not suited for the day-to-day regulation which the act entrusts to the Commission. It would certainly be salutary for the Congress to give some consideration to the problem here raised, and, if possible to design some other sanctions to add to those already available sanctions of intermediate severity which might be applied more expeditiously.

The first provision of title II of my bill would give the Commission, in addition to the power of revoking a license, the power (1) to suspend a license for a period not to exceed 90 days, (2) to issue cease-and-desist orders, and (3) to order a forfeiture to the United States by a station licensee or holder of a construction permit of not to exceed $500 for each day during which a violation continues.

POLITICAL BROADCASTS

Section 315 of the Communications Act, while leaving station licensees free to determine whether their stations shall be available for political broadcasts, imposes the obligation on licensees who open their stations to any one political candidate to afford equal opportunities to all other political candidates. This section further provides that licensees may not censor any statements made in the course of such political broadcasts.

A serious question has arisen as to whether the obligation to afford equal opportunities on the one hand and the prohibition of censorship on the other hand automatically renders the licensee immune from actions for libel and slander brought on account of any such statements.

It seems to me highly desirable that this matter be clarified by Congress. My bill would render licensees immune from any action in any local, State, or Federal court, based on the material contained in a political broadcast. In addition, the bill would specify in greater detail than is the case in the present section 315 the instances in which the law would impose the obligation on a licensee to afford equal opportunities in the use of such broadcasting station.

SUMMARY OF TITLE I—RADIO FREQUENCY CONTROL

Section 1 of the bill would add a new part, entitled "Part III—Frequency Control" to title III—entitled "Provisions Relating to Radio" of the Communications Act of 1934. It would create a new independent agency in the executive branch of the Government to be known as Frequency Control Board. The Board would consist of five members to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The members of the Board are to be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service in either of the following two fields: (1) Radio and the civilian or military uses of radio, and (2) public affairs.

It would be the function of the Board to formulate such plans and policies with respect to the utilization of the radio spectrum, with particular reference to the apportionment of radio frequencies between Government and non-Government uses, as it deems necessary to accomplish the purposes declared in the Federal Communications Act of 1934. These purposes are to provide for regulating interstate and foreign commerce in communications by wire and radio so as to make available, so far as possible, to all the people of the United States a rapid, efficient, Nation-wide, and world-wide wire, radio, and commmunication service with adequate facilities at reasonable charges; to promote the national defense; and to promote safety of life and property through the use of wire and radio communication.

In order to effectuate such plans and policies, the Board would be authorized and directed to do the following: (1) Allocate frequencies and bands of frequencies and cancel or modify any such allocation; (2) assign frequencies to Government stations and cancel or modify any such assignments; and (3) prescribe regulations to govern the assignment by the Federal Communications Commission of frequencies to non-Government stations.

Finally, the Board would be directed to disapprove the proposed assignment or renewal of assignment of any frequency by the Federal Communications

Commission to a non-Government station where such assignment (A) would cause harmful interference to any Government use of radio or (B) would violate any regulation prescribed by the Board with respect to the assignment, by the Federal Communications Commission, of frequencies to non-Government stations.

The bill would create a Military Liaison Committee consisting of representatives of the National Military Establishment detailed or assigned to this committee. The Board would be directed to advise and consult with the committee on the allocation or assignment of radio frequencies required for the purpose of the national defense. If the committee should at any time conclude that any action or failure to act on the part of the Board with respect to the allocation or assignment of radio frequencies for the purpose of national defense would be adverse to the responsibilities of the National Military Establishment, the committee would be authorized to refer such action or failure to act to the Secretary of Defense. If the Secretary concurred with the committee, he would be authorized to refer the matter to the President, whose decision would be final.

The bill would further provide for the appointment by the Board of such advisory committees as the Board deems necessary to advise it on any matters arising in connection with the discharge of the Board's functions.

The Board, acting in accordance with the directions of and subject to the control of the President, would negotiate agreements with foreign governments which affect the allocation and assignment of frequencies. The State Department would be directed to assist the Board in the arrangements for and the conduct of such negotiations.

The Board would be directed, after consultation with the Military Liaison Committee, to establish regulations and procedures for the security classification of information related to the work of the Board and for the proper safeguarding of any information so classified.

The Board would further be directed to render an annual report to the President and the Congress, summarizing the activities of the Board and making appropriate recommendations. Minority views and recommendations, if any, of members of the Board would have to be included in such report.

Section 2 of the bill proposes to rewrite section 1 of the Communications Act, which contains the general declaration of policy and provides for creation of the Federal Communications Commission. The need for rewriting this section arises from the fact that the proposal to create the Frequency Control Board makes it desirable to eliminate from section 1 the language relating to centralization in the Federal Communications Commission of all authority and powers with respect to wire and radio communication. The amendment made by this section does not, of course, affect the membership or organization of the Federal Communications Commission.

Sections 3, 4, and 5 of the bill make other incidental changes in the Communications Act which are necessary in view of the powers proposed to be granted to the Frequency Control Board.

Section 6 of the bill contains saving provisions with respect to allocations and assignments of frequencies made under the law as it now exists.

Section 7 of the bill relates to the time of taking effect of the provisions contained in title I.

SUMMARY OF TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS—ADMINISTRATIVE SANCTIONS

Section 201 of the bill would amend section 312 of the Communications Act. Section 312, as amended, would authorize the Federal Communications Commission to revoke any station license, or suspend any station license for a period not to exceed 90 days, and would authorize the Commission to revoke—but not to suspend—any construction permit, for any of the following reasons:

First. For false statements knowingly made either in the application or in any statement of fact which the Commission may require under section 308 of the act.

Second. Because of conditions coming to the attention of the Commission which would warrant it in refusing to grant a license or permit under an original application.

Third. For willful or repeated failure to operate substantially as set forth in the license,

Fourth. For willful or repeated violation of—or failure to observe—any provision of the act or any rule or regulation of the Commission authorized by the act or by a treaty ratified by the United States,

Fifth. Because the station licensee or holder of a construction permit—or any affiliated company—has engaged in a course of conduct designed to persuade, induce, or coerce any other station licensee or holder of a construction permit to do one of the following acts: (A) to violate—or to fail to observe—any of the provisions of the act or any rule or regulation of the Commission; or (B) to engage in any course of conduct which would warrant the Commission in refusing to grant a license or permit to such other station licensee or holder of a construction permit,

Sixth. For violation of—or failure to observe—any cease and desist order issued by the Commission.

Section 312, as amended, would further authorize the Commission to order any person to cease and desist from such action where such person

First. Has failed to operate substantially as set forth in his license,

Second. Has violated—or has failed to observe—any of the provisions of the act,

Third. Has violated—or failed to observe—any rule or regulation of the Commission.

In all cases where, under this section, as amended, the Commission would be authorized to suspend or revoke a license, or to revoke a permit, or to issue a cease and desist order, the Commission in lieu of such action—or, in case of a cease and desist order, in addition to such order—may order a licensee or permittee to forfeit to the United States $500—or such lesser sum as the Commission may find appropriate in the light of all the facts and circumstances of the particular case—for each day during which the Commission finds that any offense has occurred.

POLITICAL BROADCASTS

Section 315, as amended, would impose on station licensees the following obligation with respect to political broadcasts:

First. If a licensee permits any legally qualified candidate for public office to use a broadcasting station in furtherance of his candidacy, the licensee must afford equal opportunities in the use of such broadcasting station to each of the other legally qualified candidates for that office or to any person or persons designated by such other candidate.

Second. If a licensee permits any person to use a broadcasting station in support of a legally qualified candidate for public office, the licensee must afford equal opportunities in the use of such broadcasting station to each of the other qualified candidates for that office or to a person or persons designated by each such other candidate.

Third. If a licensee permits any person or persons to use a broadcasting station in opposition to a legally qualified candidate for public office, the licensee must afford equal opportunity in the use of such broadcasting station to the candidate so opposed, or to a person or persons designated by the candidate so opposed.

Fourth. If a licensee permits use of a broadcasting station in support of or in opposition to a public question to be voted upon in any referendum, initiative, recall, or any other form of public election, the licensee must afford equal opportunities in the use of such broadcasting station for the presentation of opposition views on such public question.

Section 315 would leave unchanged, in substance, the provision that a licensee may not censor, alter, or in any manner affect or control the material broadcast by any person whom he permits to use his station in any of the afore-mentioned cases, or who uses such station as a matter of right in accordance with the aforementioned provisions. Section 315 would be amended by providing that in any of these instances the licensee shall not be liable in any civil or criminal action in any local, State, or Federal court because of any statement made in such broadcast. The licensee, however, would remain civilly and criminally liable for any statements made personally by such licensee or by any person who is under his control.

The rule-making function of the Commission with respect to the provisions of this section is retained unchanged. Also, as in case of the present provision, it is left to the discretion of the licensee to determine whether or not initially to make available his station for political broadcasts.

POLIOMYELITIS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a newspaper clipping.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, emphasis is now being placed on the campaign to raise funds to fight the awful plague of poliomyelitis.

Surely there is no more worthy cause than of promoting every possible effort to discover a preventive or cure from the dreaded disease of polio. All of us are in the fight to win, and we simply must reach our objective.

In this connection, I call attention to the attached Associated Press release of yesterday, in which it is pointed out our State of South Carolina has been more fortunate than any of the other States in that we had less polio per capita in 1949. Our percentage of cases was 5.4 per 100,000 population, the lowest of all the States.

We very humbly give thanks for this favored position of our State, and pledge ourselves to continue to battle for the day when all of our States may be safe from this terrible disease.

The release is as follows:

NEW YORK, January 21.—Idaho led the Nation last year in the percentage of polio cases, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis announced today.

There were 511 cases in the State, or 86.3 cases per 100,000 persons. The national figure was 42,375 cases, or 28.5 per 100,000 population.

South Carolina was the most polio-free State. There were only 109 cases there, or 5.4 per 100,000 residents.

The figures were announced as the foundation pushed its March of Dimes compaign after a record high polio year in 1949.

"Infantile paralysis is shown not only to be on the rise but outbreaks are becoming more general than sporadic," the foundation said.

Some $31,000,000 was spent on care and treatment alone by the foundation last year, its report disclosed.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and include extraneous material.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include newspaper articles, editorials, and letters.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include extraneous material.

FORMOSA

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, some days ago I suggested that the Speaker call the Secretary of National Defense and the Secretary of State to appear before the Members of Congress in order that they might give us more information regarding the conditions in Formosa and in the Far East. In this Associated Press news item I have in my hand which appeared in the Lowell Sun, Saturday, January 21, Secretary Acheson said at a luncheon in the Senate restaurant that President Truman very likely would sit in at the defense hearings. Certainly, if the President is to sit in at defense hearings, the Members of Congress ought to be given all the facts regarding our national defense in Formosa and other places. We are responsible for the defense of America. We are the ones who vote to send our boys to war if war is ever declared.

The article I referred to reads as follows:

HARRY S. TRUMAN MAY SIT IN

WASHINGTON.—President Truman may be invited to sit in on a forthcoming briefing of Senators by defense leaders on the world military situation.

Secretary of Defense Johnson was reported to have told Senators who lunched with him at his Pentagon offices yesterday that Mr. Truman is vitally interested and may meet with the Senators if he can find the time.

Armed Services Committee members said they were told that some time after February 14 they will be invited to listen to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, headed by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, review the world military situation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the coal shortage at Pontiac, Mich., and include a report from the Coal Dealers Association of that city.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject The Real Issue This Fall and include therein an article along the same line by Samuel J. Kornhauser, of the Cleveland bar, on Why Labor Leaders Assail Senator ROBERT A. TAFT.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a set of resolutions of the Lucas County, Iowa, Farm Bureau.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a tribute to Gen. H. H. Arnold by Paul A. Johnson, a constituent of his.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

MUST WE WAIT FOR A CATASTROPHE?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the sections of the labor-management relations law dealing with strikes imperiling the national health or safety are entitled "National Emergencies." Whenever the President thinks "a threatened or actual strike or walk-out affecting an entire industry or a substantial part thereof * * * will, if permitted to occur or continue, imperil the national health or safety," he is authorized to appoint a board of inquiry to inquire into the issues involved in the dispute and make a written report to him about them. Then, after he receives this report, if he feels the situation is sufficiently critical, he is authorized to direct the Attorney General to petition the court to enjoin the continuance of such a strike for a 60-day period. After this period is up or if the parties reach a settlement in the meantime, then, under the law, the Attorney General must ask the court to end the injunction. Before the court acts, it, like the President, must affirmatively find that the strike affects an entire industry or substantial part of it and will imperil the national health and safety if it is permitted to continue.

The very purpose of these provisions is to prevent a national emergency from developing into a national catastrophe.

Yet the unwillingness of the President to lift a finger in the face of the danger now facing our Nation due to the coal shortage, daily brings us nearer to the brink of a national disaster.

Reliable information has reached me that today the Gas & Electric Co. in my home city of Rochester, N. Y., has only 14 days of coal stocks for gas and only 21 days for electric and steam needs. It is stated that if a severe snow storm or cold spell should develop, real hardship would immediately result. Historically, the next 3 weeks are usually the most severe of the winter.

If the Nation's coal supply gave out tomorrow, the wheels of industry would stop, men and women would walk the streets out of jobs, our homes, our hospitals, our factories and our office buildings would be without heat or light, in most cases we would be unable to cook our food, any refrigeration run by electricity would stop, our trains would stop running, our schools and churches would have to close, and thousands of other activities would cease. The results flowing from a stoppage of gas, electricity and steam are simply unthinkable in our complex, modern life. Perhaps it is unfortunate that our economy is so dependent on coal supplies, but there is no escape from that fact.

My information is that the normal supply of coal stocks which a gas and electric company carries is about 45 to 60 days. In other words, these stocks are down to one-fourth to one-third of normal for gas and one-third and one-half of normal for electricity and steam. Due to this emergency situation, I have presented this serious problem to the Chief Executive urging that he take appropriate action immediately to prevent the national disaster which would follow

from running out of coal. The Congress has provided the President with the necessary machinery to protect the jobs, the comfort and the lives of our people and to prevent the unemployment and suffering which must shortly flow from his failure to act. The responsibility rests squarely with him. It is too serious a situation to receive purely political treatment.

It should be borne in mind that even if the President acts today and appoints a board of inquiry it will take that board several days to assemble, make official inquiry into the dispute, and prepare its findings for a report back to the President. In other words, necessarily under the law, it will be a substantial number of days before coal production could be resumed, even if the President acts at once.

The action taken this week by the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board must not be allowed to fool anyone. It is directed to alleged unfair labor practices and, at a maximum, could only result in a court order restraining such practices. It has nothing to do with the national emergency which the country faces. It is not designed to be, nor could it be, an effective means for restoring full production of coal.

Daily we approach closer to the brink of a catastrophe. It is difficult to conceive of a more genuine peril to the national well-being than the situation we face today.

This is a frank and earnest appeal to my colleagues in the House, regardless of political affiliation, to join in urging that the President take immediate action. I do not know the situation in other communities than my own. I do know from reliable information that conditions there are critical and acute.

If the President, for political reasons or otherwise, does not wish to proceed under the terms of a law which he vetoed, he should act under the inherent powers which he contends that he has to meet such an emergency situation as now confronts the Nation. The House will remember that one of the reasons which he gave for opposing the provisions of existing law dealing with national emergencies, was that such provisions are not necessary, due to the fact that he possesses all of the power he needs by virtue of his office. Certainly this power, if it exists, should now be exercised. I appeal to my colleagues to exert every legitimate influence on the Chief Executive to convince him of the need for action.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the message which the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] has just brought to the House is in keeping with the thoughts of every Member here who comes from the northern part of the country where the weather is cold, where blizzards are raging, and where the people are suffering because they have no heat. Tolerance is a splendid virtue, but there comes a time when even tolerance reaches its limit.

For weeks the coal situation has been growing steadily and rapidly more desperate, yet the President obstinately opines that there "is no emergency yet," and, therefore, refuses to use the Taft-Hartley law provided him by the Congress to supply coal where coal is desperately needed.

On January 12 I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 163, requesting the President to act, and explained the necessity for action on his part. Those remarks will be found on page 360 of the RECORD of January 12. Since that date conditions have grown steadily worse, yet the President is apparently blind to the situation. There is no immediate action that the Congress can take that will get coal. There is immediate action the President can take that will get coal.

Illustrative of the situation in Michigan, permit me to read a copy of a telegram this day sent to President Truman:

DEAR PRESIDENT TRUMAN: The coal situation in Ypsilanti, Mich, has assumed critical proportions. One of our six coal dealers is now entirely out of supply and none expected. The remaining five have less than a week's supply. Four of our industries have less than a week's supply on hand. Three others have less than 2 weeks' supply. Michigan State Normal College is on emergency basis, lowering pressure and rationing heat. City Hospital is on day-to-day rationing by one of the five local dealers. Ypsilanti State Hospital uses one car per day, and is down to a 3-day supply.

I appeal to you for assistance. An emergency does certainly exist in Ypsilanti. Any further shut-down in industry would aggravate an already serious unemployment problem and would create an untenable situation in the life of our community. May I hear from you, please? Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

DAN T. QUIRK,
Mayor, City of Ypsilanti, Mich.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I understand the State premiere of the picture "When Willie Comes Marching Home" will be shown in Punxsutawney, Pa., the one and only Punxsutawney in the United States, on February 4, 1950. The picture deals with Punxatawney, W. Va., and Colleen Townsend is the star.

Now, everybody knows that there is no such place as Punxatawney, W. Va., and I understand that West Virginia is working up a lot of ballyhoo trying to change the name of some village down there so that they might have legitimate claim to the film's first appearance in the East.

Certainly I want to register objection to West Virginia's effort to grab the fair name and fame of Punxsutawney, Pa.—the only Punxsutawney that is in existence anywhere is Punxsutawney, Pa., a town well known to every American. Punxsutawney is the home of that great prognosticator of the weather, the groundhog, and you will hear from him on February 2, Groundhog Day.

I am presenting herewith a letter received from the Punxsutawney Chamber of Commerce directed to the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress requesting necessary forms and applications for copyrighting the name of Punxsutawney to protect the name against the infringement of those who would like to reflect in the glories of that great groundhog city, Punxsutawney, Pa.

PUNXSUTAWNEY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Punxsutawney, Pa., January 18, 1950.

COPYRIGHT OFFICE,
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C.

SIRS: On the above date this organization dispatched a telegram to your offices applying for copyright of the name "Punxsutawney" which has been the proper name of our municipality for more than 100 years.

It was stated in the telegram that we were airmailing necessary forms and applications to properly apply for this copyright and thereby prevent other municipalities from adopting our name. However, we later learned that these forms were only available from your Department.

Please forward necessary forms and applications immediately so that we may institute proceedings to protect the name of our city from upstart municipalities seeking to use this name for publicity purposes.

For more than a century our city has been recognized nationally as the city from which eminates the annual groundhog weather prediction and it is our contention that this name by virtue of honorable usage over the years be made exclusively ours.

We would deeply appreciate your forwarding forms and your valued advice in this matter posthaste.

Sincerely yours,

PUNXSUTAWNEY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES COMMISSION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, after the events of Friday and yesterday, it is to be hoped that there will be a cessation of claims about a mandate that the people gave the administration on civil rights in the Presidential election of 1948. The Rules Committee was denied its old powers on Friday, and the road was kept open for FEPC only because 64 Republicans voted "No." The majority on that vote was 53; hence without Republican votes the rules would have been changed and the chance for FEPC probably ended for this Congress.

It should be clear by now what kind of mandate there is on civil rights. It is a mandate from the people which runs to every Member and not to any party. It is a question of individual record and not party responsibility. The only sure hope for passage of FEPC is a bipartisan coalition of liberal Democrats and progressive Republicans who will by discharge petition bring FEPC to the floor, if it is not otherwise brought before us by the next discharge day.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from James Boyd, Director of the Bureau of Mines.

AMERICA'S COAL SUPPLIES

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, because so many different figures have been given the American people as to the supplies of coal above ground, I took it upon myself to ask Dr. Boyd, the Director of the Bureau of Mines, a few days ago when he appeared before our Subcommittee on Appropriations to give us the real facts as to exactly how many tons of coal were now above the ground, and in the hands of the retail coal dealers. According to Dr. Boyd, who knows because he is required by law to publish such facts and figures, on January 1 last past there was only 4 days' supply of coal in the hands of the coal dealers of the Nation, and the supply is dwindling day by day. The situation does not seem to worry President Truman, who has the power under laws passed by Congress to solve it. Thousands of our people are now suffering from the lack of coal. Must people freeze to death before the President acts?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

ALGER HISS

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the present administration's keen and unfailing sense of bad judgment has been again sustained with the conviction of Alger Hiss, which stamps that worthy both a liar and a spy. The former "bright boy" of the State Department, confidant and one-time adviser of highly placed administration officials was last Saturday found guilty in the New York Federal Court on two counts of perjury. The finding of the jury was made in spite of frantic efforts on the part of many highly placed officials in the present administration to prevent the case ever coming to court. Hiss was the leading exponent of policies which have led to disaster in China. Together with others of like mind in the Department of State he advocated long ago the abandonment of our Chinese allies. He was part and parcel of the international conspiracy which sought a world-wide vote of no confidence in the Chinese Nationalist Government. He was a mental carpetbagger who served the cause of world communism with vigor, with energy, and with enthusiasm. His conviction will certainly meet with the approval of all good Americans.

Congratulations and the thanks of all America are due Judge Henry W. Goddard, who presided at the Hiss trial, to the jury which made the finding, to Prosecutor Murphy, and to our own distinguished colleagues, Representative RICHARD NIXON, of California, and Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, who almost single-handed forced the present administration to bring the Hiss case to trial.

The American people themselves will decide whether or not such trials are worth while or whether the President was being honest or just political in branding investigations of this kind as "hysteria and a red herring."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and a report from a dairy farmer in her district.

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

COAL CRISIS

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks I have been receiving numerous complaints about the coal shortage in the Fifth Congressional District in Michigan as well as in other sections of my great State. The complaints have become more numerous due to the wave of cold weather which has gripped the Midwest during this time. As an example, I should like to read to the House a telegram and an excerpt from a letter which I received a few days ago:

Although we have about 30 days' supply of coal we have been notified by St. Joseph Lead Co., Josephtown, Pa., that they cannot ship zinc oxide after Friday this week. Also notified by Pennsylvania Industrial Chemical Corp., Clairton, Pa., and the Neville Co., Neville Island, Pittsburgh, Pa., that they are both shutting down January 20. Without supply of raw materials we cannot operate. What do you mean there is no coal emergency?

The excerpt from the letter reads as follows:

Because of the coal situation which has prevailed for some months past, we have been unable to store up stocks of coal adequate for reasonable insurance against curtailment, or perhaps, entire stoppage of our plant activities, involving employment of over 2,500 employees. No doubt our own situation is paralleled in innumerable cases all over the country.

I want to go on record and state that the present coal crisis is not a dream as the executive branch of our Government seems to think, but rather a diabolical reality of pain and suffering as well as economic instability. The situation is grave now and is becoming more so with each passing day. It is a well-known fact that there is a pressing need for domestic fuel and if conditions do not change human suffering will prevail.

This question may be asked in the crisis. Does John L. Lewis control the economic destiny of our country? One would seem to think so judging from the conduct of our executive department. As one of my colleagues said a few days ago, and I quote:

This is no time to toy with words, to play politics, or to try to escape responsibility because of technicalities. Affirmative and decisive action is essential on the part of the President. Joe Stalin may control Russia, but John L. Lewis must not be permitted to control the United States. The Taft-Hartley law may have its defects but certainly it contains language giving ample authority to the President and the executive agencies to intervene in behalf of our people and put an end to this emergency which is not only already a calamity but, in many instances, disastrous.

That, gentleman, is my sentiment.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

HON. ISAAC BACHARACH

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I trespass upon the time of the House for the very pleasant purpose of advising the membership that my distinguished predecessor, the Honorable Isaac Bacharach, of Atlantic City, recently celebrated his eightieth birthday.

The senior Members of the House, in particular, will welcome the news that our friend and former colleague is still enjoying good health and an active life.

Congressman Bacharach served the Second Congressional District of New Jersey in this great body for 22 years. His representation of our district was exceptionally meritorious. The magazine Time once characterized him as one of the most influential men in the Capitol. He was a warm personal friend of the late and great Speaker, Nicholas Longworth, and I am sure an equally warm friend of our present beloved Speaker.

One of the things that made his birthday very happy was messages of friendship from his former colleagues, and particularly from the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

My own friendship with Ike Bacharach has been of more than 20 years' duration. I rejoice, as I know you do, in his continued health and happiness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper editorials.

Mr. ANDERSON of California (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD in two instances and include an editorial and a petition.

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a table.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and insert an article.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and to include extraneous matter in each instance.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

DRIED EGGS

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Brannan is sponsoring a new kind of give-away program costing the taxpayers well over a million dollars a week. Stranger still, neither the farmer or the consumer benefits. Ten days ago, the Commodity Credit Corporation purchased 753,630 pounds of dried eggs, and last week they purchased 1,530,490 pounds of dried eggs. Both purchases were made at a cost of 96 cents a pound. This does not include storage or handling. The CCC owns over 73,000,000 pounds of dried eggs, most of which are close to 2 years old. Secretary Brannan is incidentally offering these same dried eggs for export at 40 cents a pound and is getting no takers.

The egg driers are supposed to pay the farmer 25 cents a dozen, actual prices in the Midwest are 18–20 cents a dozen. The trick is that the Department of Agriculture permits the egg drier to average his purchases during the life of the program, which, in the past, has been the whole year. The program as now set up and continued by Secretary Brannan is a complete waste of the taxpayers' money. There is just no market for dried eggs; the British who were forced to eat them during the war, have refused them even as a gift. But Secretary Brannan insists on buying and storing more millions of pounds of dried eggs in the Kansas cave until it will be necessary to dump them. The cost of the dried eggs in terms of shell eggs as purchased from the farmer is 32 cents a dozen. The present program should be terminated immediately, and a program for the purchase of shell eggs substituted that will assure the farmer his full support price and stop the waste of good food that could be used by the millions now on welfare or unemployment rolls.

OIL DEPLETION PROVISION OF INCOME-TAX LAW

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, like many of the oil producers in the United States, I was shocked by President Truman's attack on the depletion provision in the income-tax law which applies to oil and gas production. All natural resource industries have such a taxation principle. It is a bit complex, and therefore the President may have missed its meaning, but the Congress which first put the provision into the law and the others which have since reviewed and approved the operation of the depletion allowance have had no difficulty with it. They proceeded, however, on the evidence and not upon the prejudices and ambitions of a few tax gatherers and tax spenders.

I do not believe that the President is hostile to the oil industry but a course of action based on ignorance can be as harmful as one of malicious intent. I feel certain that the oil men have no doubt that through appropriate hearings the present Congress will conclude as did those of the past that the depletion provision is in the public interest. It is too bad though that a busy industry and a busy Congress must waste time threshing the same straw that has been threshed so many times before.

THE EGG SITUATION

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter and some telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, on December 27 I addressed a letter to Secretary Brannan which reads as follows:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: A copy of your announcement of December 21 of a support program for eggs in 1950 has just reached my desk. I note that this program calls for approximately 75 percent of the modernized parity. What steps have you taken to assure the operation of this support, low as it is?

Today eggs are selling for 20 cents per dozen in southwestern Minnesota and producers in the Seventh Congressional District are losing approximately $15,000 daily because there is no established market for eggs. Your Department has had ample time to work up a price-support program and it should have been ready for announcement by December 1. Today there is chaos because of this delay.

Since your announcement of last Wednesday, the 21st, nothing concrete in the line of actual support buying has been done in southwestern Minnesota with the exception of the continuance of the contracts under the 1949 program with egg driers for the balance of this month.

I am asking that you immediately institute an effective program of egg-price support and that program must, in my opinion, call for the offer by the Department to buy eggs in the shell, based on grade, directly at the producing points throughout the egg surplus area of the United States. I have been urging Mr. Trigg, Administrator of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and others in the Department, to take this action for the past 3 weeks. Awaiting your early reply, I remain.

To date I have not had the courtesy of a response from Mr. Brannan.

Mr. Speaker, the egg producers and poultry men in my district are beginning to lose confidence in the Department's administration of the support program provided by Congress. The situation is grave and unless something concrete is done to alleviate it immediately, I believe Congress should take steps to enforce the law which it passed for the protection of the American farmer.

I ask leave, at this point, to include a number of wires which I have received within the last 2 days, and which will serve to point this situation up to the House Membership.

LYND, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*

H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Member of Congress:
When will Government support price on eggs be effective? Our town down to 20 cents again today.
CLARK LONDGREN.

RAYMOND, MINN.

Representative H. C. ANDERSEN,
House of Representatives:
Egg prices down to 20 cents a dozen. What happened to promised support price? Farmers will kill the chickens at this price.
ALBERT ALVEEHOLTZ, *Farmer.*

FRANKLIN, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*

H. CARL ANDERSEN,
House of Representatives:
Egg market down to 20 cents again. How about support?
FRANKLIN PRODUCE.

FRANKLIN, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*

H. CARL ANDERSEN,
House of Representatives:
Got 20 cents for eggs again. How about support price?
CLINTON FULLERTON.

PORTER, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*

H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Member of Congress:
Egg price way below support in our town. Why is egg support program ineffective?
DONALD DOWNING.

ORTONVILLE, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*

H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.:
Egg prices are 20 cents here again. What's wrong with support deal?
ED TYLER, *Clinton, Minn.*

ORTONVILLE, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*

H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Congressman:
Egg prices are down to 20 cents again. What goes?
ERNEST STOEHR, *Appleton, Minn.*

ORTONVILLE, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*

H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Congressman:
Why are we not receiving promised support price for eggs?
MOURISE BRYAN, *Appleton, Minn.*

ORTONVILLE, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*

H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Congressman:
Egg price 20 cents again. What's wrong?
JOSE PERRY, *Appleton, Minn.*

AMIRET, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*
H. CARL ANDERSEN:
Need action quickly on egg support program. Amiret 20 cents today.
AUGUST OLSON.

OLIVIA, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*
H. CARL ANDERSON,
House of Representatives:
Egg market demoralized. Dropped to 20 cents dozen. Where is support?
ANTHONY M. SINDELIN.

IVANHOE, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*
H. CARL ANDERSON,
Washington, D. C.:
Our patrons much alarmed about lower egg prices; 20 cents our town today. Why don't we get support prices?
IVANHOE COOPERATIVE CREAMERY.

TAUNTON, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*
H. CARL ANDERSON,
Washington, D. C.:
Egg price here down to 20 cents again. Why is not Government supporting price as promised?
JOHN VAN DEBROEKE.

LYND, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*
H. CARL ANDERSON,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:
We farmers need action now. Egg prices low. Price below support.
MARVIN JOHNSON.

MINNEOTA, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:
Eggs 20 cents again today. Is there no more support price?
BERNARD MOORSE,
Taunton, Minn.

ORTONVILLE, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*
Congressman H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Washington, D. C.:
Eggs down to 20 cents again. Why don't you support as promised?
HUGO SCHLIMINNE,
Clinton, Minn.

MINNEOTA, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:
Why doesn't Government support egg market at 25 cents as promised. Losing money on our flock. Eggs 20 cents here today.
NELS KOMPLEIN.

COTTONWOOD, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:
What is wrong with egg program? Prices very low here; 20 cents today.
FRANCIS POLFLIET.

ORTONVILLE, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*
Congressman H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Washington, D. C.:
Eggs supposed to be supported at 25 cents. We receive 20 cents. What's the deal?
BRONZE FEATHER FARM,
Odessa, Minn.

ORTONVILLE, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*
Congressman H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Washington, D. C.
In our town eggs are 20 cents again. What's wrong with price-support prices?
ROY WAGNER,
Clinton, Minn.

GHENT, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:
Eggs have dropped again to 20 cents here. Why doesn't Government support egg market?
LOUIS SENDEN.

HENDRICKS, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Washington, D. C.:
Our patrons refusing sell eggs at present prices, as market has dropped to 20 cents again here. Urge quick action make egg program effective.
HENDRICKS COOPERATIVE CREAMERY.

ORTONVILLE, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.:
We farmers don't like this run-around in this egg deal. Prices are again 20 cents.
JOE EIMINGER,
Graceville, Minn.

ORTONVILLE, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.:
Why aren't we receiving 25 cents for eggs as promised prices are 20 cents again here?
ART THORSON,
Clinton, Minn.

MINNEOTA, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:
How about the support on eggs? Twenty cents here today.
NORMAN HAUGEN,
Lynd, Minn.

MINNEOTA, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Member Congress, Washington, D. C.:
Why 20 cents for eggs. What about the support price?
STANLEY FLYNN, *Porter, Minn.*

MINNEOTA, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Member Congress, Washington, D. C.:
Current receipt eggs 20 cents today. Did support price go off?
LEONARD VAN HYFTE, *Porter, Minn.*

MINNEOTA, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Member Congress, Washington, D. C.:
Eggs down to 20 cents today. Why? Where are the supports?
J. P. VAN OVERBEKE.

MINNEOTA, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:
Why are eggs 20 cents per dozen our town today? How about the support prices?
LEROY KOBBE, *Canby, Minn.*

MINNEOTA, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Member Congress, Washington, D. C.:
Eggs dropped to 20 cents today. Thought there was a support price.
NELS MYHRE.

MINNEOTA, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Member Congress, Washington, D. C.:
Eggs our town down to 20 cents today. Where is our support price?
JOHN LACEK, *Canby, Minn.*

MINNEOTA, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Member Congress, Washington, D. C.:
Twenty-cent eggs again. Where is the new support price?
GEORGE KERI, *Lynd, Minn.*

PARITY PRICE OF EGGS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a situation that exists at this time. The parity price of eggs on January 15, 1950, was and is 51.6 cents per dozen. Eggs in the Midwest are 20 cents per dozen at this time. That is 39 percent of parity.

Eggs in the Midwest were 20 cents per dozen in November 1932 when Mr. Hoover was defeated for President. The parity price as figured by Mr. R. E. Johnson, of the BAE, for November 1932 was 25.8 cents per dozen. This was 77 percent of parity. Are the egg producers back to where they started? Or further back yet?

How much longer are you going to allow this situation to exist? How much longer are we going to have this kind of situation in these days when we are tossing millions and billions of dollars all around the world?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

THE PRICE OF EGGS

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I have been hearing about eggs this morning—the price of eggs, the disposition of dried eggs. I know eggs are too cheap. I know the price the farm woman is receiving for her eggs is a disgrace, but I do not see how we can blame Secretary Brannan for it. The only thing Secretary Brannan has the power to do, the only thing the Department of Agriculture can do, the only thing Commodity Credit Corporation can do, under the law, is to go into the markets and attempt to buy enough eggs to make an artificial scarcity and hereby hope to raise the price to 27 or 30 or 35 cents, whatever place they attempt to stabilize the farm price of eggs. Secretary Brannan wanted to do something about situations like this, but this House absolutely refused to allow him to even give his plan a trial. Let us not now blame him for our own shortcomings.

REREFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the bill (H. R. 2932) for the relief of Horace J. Fenton was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. A like bill offered in the Senate was referred to the Committee on Armed Services of that body, and

the bill was passed by the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be rereferred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF THE TERM OF CERTAIN PATENTS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4692) to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BRYSON, WILLIS, and BOGGS of Delaware.

ALGER HISS

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, regarding Alger Hiss, Secretary of State Dean Acheson made the statement that "Alger Hiss is my friend, and I do not give my friendship lightly." He might well have added, "or wisely."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Mr. O. R. Strackbein.

Mr. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the January issue of the Railway Journal of the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GORE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include an article by Mr. Robert F. Jones, Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission, and in the other an address by Mr. Allan B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

Mr. CLEMENTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of civil defense and include an editorial from the New York Times of today.

LAFAYETTE COLLEGE, AN INSTITUTION IN THE TRUE AMERICAN TRADITION

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the founding fathers of this country were successful in establishing a great Nation because it was based primarily on the principle of democracy and a true understanding of toleration which took deep roots among the American people for these many generations. Racial or religious discrimination was regarded by them as the poison which was driving the Old World in Europe to its doom, as the evil heritage of the Dark Ages which knew only hatred for those who stemmed from a different race or expressed their concept of God by a different ritual.

Here in this new country, where the founding fathers were building a new life and a new civilization which is today the envy of the entire world, they wanted no part or parcel of that evil heritage of the Old World. Since 1776 this country has been markedly successful in abiding by the principles of democracy and toleration. The peddlers of racial and religious hatred were never able to make great inroads among our people, who still regard freedom and equality as the highest expression of American ideals.

I am prompted to make these remarks by the recent happenings at Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. This college is named in honor of that great Frenchman, the Marquis de Lafayette, whose services to our country at the time of the American Revolution are known to every school child in the United States and who was also known as a fighter for religious tolerance in his day. When the college was recently bequeathed the sum of $140,000 by an individual who stipulated that no Jewish or Catholic students should benefit from it, the board of trustees refused to accept the bequest because of this discriminatory clause.

The action of Lafayette College is highly commendable because it is in the spirit of American ideals as understood by the founders of this country and it is also in the spirit of the life and thinking of Lafayette. I trust this action on the part of Lafayette College will serve as a reminder to those college authorities who still practice discrimination against students who represent minority groups. They should have the moral backbone to admit to themselves that they are violating the teaching of God as well as the precepts and the spirit of American ideals and American tradition. They then would take the necessary steps to amend their wrongful practices.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

SHIPMENT OF BENZINE TO THE FAR EAST

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have a bit of information here that I think will be interesting to the Members of the House. On January 8 the United States tanker *Kettleman-Hills* sailed through the Suez Canal en route to the Far East destined for Tsingtao, China. This tanker is loaded with benzine and is one of several ships that is destined for Communist China.

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if these shipments have the approval of the State Department.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Mr. David M. Brown, national commander of the Disabled Veterans.

TREASON AT YALTA—ONE OF MOST TERRIBLE BLUNDERS IN HISTORY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, when Congress convened in 1945 I secured the adoption of an amendment to the rules making the Committee on Un-American Activities a standing committee of the House.

That committee has done more to expose the enemies within our gates than any other agency of this Government, or probably every other agency.

I have kept quiet until the Hiss trial was over, which took a year and a $1,000,000 expenditure and finally resulted in the conviction of Hiss, which proved to the American people that there was a conspiracy, a treasonable cabal, if you please, that dominated the Yalta Conference.

President Roosevelt was a sick man, mentally and physically, at Yalta, yet this same cabal with its far-reaching influences misled President Truman into committing one of the most terrible blunders in history by ordering General Patton and his Third Army to move south away from in front of Berlin, after the Germans in Berlin had raised the white flag of surrender, and turned the victory our boys had won over to Com-

munist Russia, the worst enemy civilization has ever known.

I hope the Committee on Un-American Activities will renew the investigation of that treasonable cabal, expose every individual and every organization connected with it; so that Congress can drive them from power and save our country from the wreck and ruin which they and their Communist cohorts have been planning for the last 15 years.

FEPC LEGISLATION

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, in the light of what happened on yesterday, I would like at this time to set forth the four avenues that are left open to those of us who are advocating enactment of FEPC.

First, of course, is continuation of the struggle in the Rules Committee;

Second, insistence on bringing up the FEPC bill under the 21-day rule;

Third, the discharge petition; and

Fourth, Calendar Wednesday.

We must avail ourselves of all four. I shall continue to object to dispensing with Calendar Wednesday and I shall object to any unanimous consent to adjourn the House over Wednesday. It is the duty of all friends of FEPC to be on the floor throughout the day on Wednesday and vote down all motives to adjourn and block the filibuster moves of the opponents of FEPC. We may as well face it, gentlemen, irrespective of the maneuverings that are going on in this House, the American people are going to have their way with respect to FEPC. The majority of the American people want it. All attempts to negate their will will fail, because on this issue more than on any other issue the American people will make themselves heard. The people will win this fight despite the Truman double talk and the maneuvers of the leaderships of the Democratic and Republican Parties.

LILLIAN VAN STEENBURGH

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 416), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to the estate of Lillian Van Steenburgh, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate she was receiving at the time of her death, and an additional amount not to exceed $350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said Lillian Van Steenburgh.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand from the gentlewoman from New Jersey that these are unanimous reports from the committee?

Mrs. NORTON. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE HEARINGS RELATIVE TO THE FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT HEARINGS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit the following privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 152), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before a special subcommittee of said committee relative to the Federal Fair Employment Practice Act.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL LABORER

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 414), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 1, 1950, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation for the employment of one additional laborer (cloakroom), Doorkeeper's Department, at the basic salary rate of $1,380 per annum.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution which I have introduced today be inserted in the RECORD after the remarks which I am about to make.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

OUR CHINA POLICY

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution of inquiry into certain aspects of American foreign policy in the Far East and with particular reference to Formosa. I have asked for this time in order to give my colleagues a brief statement as to why I have done this.

It must be quite obvious that the Soviet Union is proceeding with great speed and efficiency with its plan of world conquest. Already more than 800,000,000 people are ruled by the Kremlin despots. At the end of the war they ruled over less than 200,000,000 people. It is also quite obvious that, whatever our excuses may be, we have failed completely to stop Communist aggression in the Far East. I need hardly point out that the conquest of the mainland of China by the Communists and the decision of the President to do nothing other than ECA aid to help the anti-Communists on Formosa, constitutes a threat not only to the nations of southeast Asia, to Indochina, Siam, Malaya, Indonesia, and Burma, but also to the American chain of island defenses, Okinawa, the Philippines, and Japan. Certainly the quite moderate success which we have achieved in the cold war in western Europe will soon be threatened with destruction by events in the Far East unless the United States decides to take some action. Surely whatever else may be said in favor of the President's far eastern policy, it cannot be asserted that it is calculated to stop the ominous threat of Communist aggression. Rather, it relies on the elements of self-destruction which, it is hoped, are implicit in the Communist movement.

I suggest to you most forcefully that it is time that we found reasons why we can do things in our own interest rather than to search for reasons why we can do nothing to protect American national security in the Far East and safeguard the peace of the world.

I venture the thought that there are four principal elements of power: First, there is industrial capacity, and in this the United States stands supreme. No nation has come even close to our mass-production methods. The United States and the nations of western Europe contain the world's great workshops. Second, there is the element of population. Here the Communists have overcome the western democracies. Third is territory. Here, too, the Communists are reaching out apace. Fourth is the element of raw materials. Here, also, the Communists are making great progress. What are we to draw from this brief analysis? It is quite obvious that if the Communists achieve predominance in population, territory, and raw materials, they can in time overcome our lead in industrial capacity. It is also clear that the nations of western Europe need raw materials in order to rehabilitate their economies. These are the remorseless facts of the world we live in.

And so it has seemed to me useful that a matter of such grave importance to the people of the United States should be ventilated on the floor of the House in order to expose it to public view.

In his January 5, 1950, statement on Formosa, the President describes the war in China as a civil war. Yet, the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, in his letter of transmittal of the white paper to the President, states that the war in China is a war of foreign domination which has been "masked behind the facade of a vast crusading movement." Surely this contradiction between the President and the Secretary of State

needs clarifying. Surely, also, we are entitled to know, since we are the people who appropriate the dollars for our foreign policy, why it is that the President made his statement on Formosa prior to the return from that area of Dr. Philip Jessup, who, as you will recall, was appointed by the President to be the head of the commission to investigate the far-eastern situation and make recommendations which might serve as a basis for a useful foreign policy. Furthermore, why did the President make his statement on Formosa before the Joint Chiefs of Staff had returned from the survey tour which they are scheduled to make in February? Would not the Communist conquest of Formosa and Hainan with the rice and iron ore which these islands produce result in substantially increasing the cost to the American taxpayers of the occupation of Japan? Why is it impracticable to resort to the same type of operation in Formosa which is a hundred miles off the mainland of China as we resorted to so successfully in Greece which is attached to the mainland of Europe? Why has the Truman doctrine, which is world-wide in its statement of aims, been abandoned in the Far East?

These are but a few of the questions which I believe should be clarified, and, in an attempt to rescue something of what has been referred to as the bipartisan foreign policy, I have introduced this questionnaire in order that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle should have the information to which they are entitled as participants in the implementation of foreign policies. If I refer to the bipartisan foreign policy in this fashion, it is because, as far as I know, no Republicans have been consulted regarding our policy in the Far East. This circumstance is somewhat difficult to understand, since, if our foreign policy in China had been the result of bipartisan consultations, then surely the Republicans would have to share with the Democrat administration some of the blame for the present awful cataclysm. There is, unfortunately, plenty of blame, and it is all at the doorstep of the executive branch.

My desire, however, is not to recriminate but to help to retrieve the situation insofar as we can. In view of the unconvincing and lamentable state of our far-eastern policy, I think it would be just as well for the consultation to be somewhat broad. I propose to include the Congress of the United States and through them the people whom we represent.

The suggestion has been made that the Chinese will eventually become so angry over the annexation of Manchuria, Outer Mongolia, Inner Mongolia, and Sinkiang that Mao Tse-tung and his followers will have great trouble. We are also being exhorted to do nothing which could possibly deflect that anger onto the United States. In other words, although we know of Communist methods, although we are aware of the reign of terror which they have saddled on the long-suffering Chinese, we should, for fear of incurring the displeasure of the Chinese people, do nothing to help them to "throw off the foreign yoke" which is the phrase used by Mr. Acheson in his letter of transmittal of the white paper. It is apparently just as well for the anti-Communists to be defeated by the Communists; but because we recognize that Chinese communism is an arm of Russian imperialism and therefore is hostile to the real interests of the people of China, the Chinese people will revolt without the aid of the anti-Communists who are still fighting Russian imperialism. Indeed, it is now a cornerstone of United States far-eastern policy that we must rely mainly on Chinese anger for the deliverance of the Chinese people and the removal of this particular threat to American national security and to world peace. This theory is, let us say, more clever in defense of the errors of the administration than it is useful in forging an affirmative, constructive Asiatic foreign policy in a turbulent and dangerous world. It has been said that the State Department has an investment in defeat.

Perhaps the anger of the people of Poland has not yet filtered through to the Department of State. Is it really thought that the Polish people are pleased with their condition of life? Perhaps the State Department has not yet heard of the helpless anger and indignation existing among the people of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, of Hungary, of Bulgaria and Rumania, and of Czechoslavakia and Albania. Should we then have allowed Hitler to conquer the world relying upon the anger of the people in his concentration camps to carry on a successful revolt? Surely the people of Manchuria and Outer Mongolia, surely the people of China, are not the only people capable of anger or are they perhaps the only ones who can defeat the machine guns and bayonets, the prisons and concentration camps, the torture and slavery of the Soviet state with the power of unarmed and defenseless anger. And while, of course, we must not arouse the anger of the Chinese while we are to a great extent engaged in a battle for men's minds, it is also true that the battle will not be won by a passive acceptance of Communist conquests.

The dialectical devices, the tailor-made logic and the artful sophistries with which the Department of State has attempted to cover up its own clumsy efforts to form a coalition government in China are a far cry from the brilliant and resourceful statesmanship shown by the late Congressman Anson Burlingame who was sent by Abraham Lincoln as Minister to Peking. He not only opposed the partition of China which was later accomplished at Yalta with our participation and connivance, but, although the diplomatic representatives in Peking were far more experienced than he, it was his leadership which brought about the cooperation expressed by the agreement among the ministers to withstand the pressure of the treaty-port merchants. It was his foresight and courage which resulted in the suppression of the Taiping rebellion. It was he who was responsible for the policy which was aptly referred to as "based upon justness and free from prejudice of race." And it was on July 28, 1868, that Burlingame and Secretary of State Seward signed a convention which pledged the American Government to respect Chinese sovereignty. Certainly our present China policy is distressingly different from these statesmanlike accomplishments of the Lincoln administration plagued as it was by a cruel civil war. Certainly we have come a long way from the enlightened and forceful precepts on which we acted in connection with the Boxer Rebellion.

Of course there is resentment among the peoples of the Far East against alien domination and it is most devoutly to be hoped that the annexation by Soviet Russia of China's four northern provinces will convince the people of China, if they are not already convinced, of the true intentions of the Soviet Union. Moreover, conditions in China are far different from conditions in Europe. And yet it is quite obvious that had we been afraid of what people in Europe would say about us we would not have provided military aid to Greece and Turkey when they were threatened, we would never have enacted the Marshall plan, and we would certainly have shied clear of the Atlantic Treaty and military aid.

It is by no means clear that any of these measures have increased our popularity in the areas in which they have been applied. I assure you that I did not vote for the Marshall plan because I thought that it would induce the people of Europe to love us. And most assuredly the Russians and their lackeys have been shouting all over Europe about American imperialism and monopolistic capitalism and all the other tired clichés of Soviet propaganda and we have not allowed those cries to dissuade us from our great purpose.

In spite of Secretary Acheson's reported comment of a few weeks ago that the idea of face is a foolish oriental conception, it looks distressingly as though in Asia and indeed in the United States the administration is more interested in saving its face than in saving the peace. Now, of course, the peoples of Asia dislike outside interference and naturally they want to climb up to a place in the sun and we should help them. And since we have no imperialistic intentions or colonial designs, we should, of course, do our best to avoid any appearance that we have. But must we wait until the Communists have fastened their grip on hundreds of millions of people for fear that we may lose face and must we rely on their impotent anger to throw off the foreign yoke? This argument is glib and may at first blush appear deft; but essentially it is a counsel of despair from an administration which, as far as Asia is concerned, appears to be committed to a policy which is based on defeat by default. It is characteristic of the tactics of a counsel for the defense. It has none of the affirmation, none of the dynamism, none of the creativeness which the United States should have at this time of crisis and challenge.

And it is disturbingly reminiscent of one of the arguments advanced against the Marshall plan in 1948, an argument which ran like this: Let us not spend our substance in Europe; if the Russians conquer Europe they will not be able to

digest it anyway. The Europeans will revolt and overthrow them. Mr. Speaker, what would we find in Europe if we decided not to protect them from conquest but instead to promise them liberation? What shall we find in Asia if we wait for the effective anger of the Asiatics to "throw off the foreign yoke?" For my part, I am unwilling that American foreign policy in the Far East should rest upon such a slender reed.

Aside from the anger of the unarmed, downtrodden, enslaved Chinese, we are resting our Asiatic policy upon the hope of Titoism. Indeed, these two are related since it is hoped that Chinese anger will precipitate Titoism. Now surely Titoism is highly significant. But in order for any anti-Kremlin movement to gather effective strength we must do more than hope. We must use every possible means, clandestine and otherwise, to create a sturdy irredentism among the people of those provinces which the Soviet Union has dismembered from China and we must endeavor to encourage revolt against the Communists in all parts of China. But in the meantime is it not better to help the 1,000,000 organized anti-Communist guerrillas now on the China mainland and the 300,000 anti-Communist troops on Formosa; is it not better to use the military leadership which remains rather than wait in the hope that Titoism will rise from the ashes of anti-Communist anger? Is it not clear that the anti-Communists are our friends whereas the Tito apostate Communists are merely the potential rivals of the Soviets? Do not the Chinese who are still fighting express the righteous wrath of the freedom-loving Chinese?

Furthermore, since the State Department places such emphasis on the impression which we make in Asia, and the impression is important, let us also remember that we have given an impression of vacillation and indecision toward communism which has done much, if it has not been entirely responsible, for the recognition of the Communist regime in China by a number of countries. For instance, had we indicated our willingness to help the British in the Far East, would the British have granted recognition? And if the British had stood firm would the Indians and the Burmese have recognized the Chinese Communist regime? The attitude of conciliation toward communism which permeates Asia at this time is easily understood when you look at it against the background of defeatism and appeasement which characterizes our posture in the Far East.

Because of the vulnerability of the State Department's position it was apparently also considered clever to resort to derisive and partisan insinuations at a time when a constructive plan and a note of unity were called for. This has taken the form of branding congressional criticism as coming from Republicans who had voted consistently against foreign-affairs legislation. One was given to understand that these Republicans are not interested in China or in America or indeed in world peace but only in partisan advantage. Surely this is the most wicked and effective way to inject partisanship into the issue of life and death which is involved in our foreign affairs.

Now, it so happens that many patriotic Democrats are utterly appalled by what has been happening in the Far East. It is perhaps only human that they should not press the administration too hard. It happens also that it is extremely dangerous business to attempt to assess motives to some of those Republicans who have been attacking the President's China policy. But the fact is that the principal critics in the Republican Party are those very Congressmen and Senators who have been associated with the international view. And the further fact is that a matter of such grave importance should be discussed on its merits and not on any basis of cynical partisan recrimination. Surely it is a good thing that the American people should have the benefit of these criticisms. Certainly the people of America are entitled to a second voice on these vital issues. And assuredly it is our solemn duty to speak our minds, to proclaim our convictions, even though we are thereby exposed to the most expert irony, the most exquisite sarcasm, and the most agile broken field running which the State Department can produce.

Mr. Acheson favored military aid and advice to Greece and Turkey but he does not favor such aid to Formosa. In that connection, he states that he is not shackled by the need for consistency. But aside from this determination to be inconsistent what are some of the reasons given for this difference of policy, for this abandonment of the Truman doctrine?

First it is asserted that Greece is of greater strategic importance than Formosa. Yet the State Department itself in an official bulletin stated in June 1945 "With the exception of Singapore, no location in the Far East occupies such a controlling position * * * Formosa * * * stands in a strategic relation to the China coast comparable for the United States to an island of such size 100 miles off the coast of North Carolina, 400 miles from New York City. Every point on the entire coast of China falls within a radius of 1,100 miles. A radius of 2,000 miles includes Burma, Singapore, Borneo, Guam, and Japan, including Hokkaido." Are we to understand that the strategic importance of Formosa has changed in the past 4½ years or does the desire for inconsistency justify the impromptu accommodation of military strategy to the political exigencies of the moment?

Surely even admitting that Greece is more important strategically, this cannot be the sole basis for a different policy. It is argued that in the Greek war the Communist guerrilla troops retired across the borders of Russian satellite countries from whom they also received aid. But there is no proof that Russia has not aided Mao Tse-tung and certainly the Japanese arms captured by the Russians in Manchuria were used in large quantities to equip the Chinese Reds. Accordingly, this would appear to be a distinction without a difference.

It is contended also that in the case of Greece it was essentially a question of an alien effort at domination. Yet, as I have already stated, Mr. Acheson in his letter of transmittal of the white paper asserts that the war in China is Soviet imperialism masked behind "the facade of a vast crusading movement." It has been asserted that to render aid to Formosa on the Greek pattern will precipitate a war. This argument was also advanced against aid to Greece and in reply the State Department, indeed Mr. Acheson, stated that it was a calculated risk which we should take. In fact, no war has ensued. I suggest to you most forcefully that the abandonment of Formosa increases the danger of eventual war and multiplies the hazards of that war if it should occur. It has been labeled surrender on the installment plan.

But the problem of Formosa, important as it is, is essentially a symbol of the complete and utter failure of our entire far-eastern attitude. Let us not allow the dispute over Formosa to obscure the fact that we have no Asiatic policy worthy of the name and that because of that shocking absence we are being shunted from one disastrous Munich to another. What is needed is an over-all explicit, courageous Asiatic policy. Certainly that policy must be accommodated to the particular problems in each area. Yet today, as far as I can make it out, our policy in Asia consists of the following factors:

First. Point 4 legislation.

Second. Hope for the spread of Titoism.

Third. Reliance on the eventual and effective anger of the Chinese because of the annexation by Russia of Manchuria, Mongolia, and Sinkiang.

Fourth. The determination not to help the forces of freedom because if we did it would "deflect" the anger of the Chinese from the Russians to us.

None of this takes into consideration the open-door policy or the real integrity of China. None of it considers the anger, the indignation, and the frustration of millions of Chinese because we are unwilling to help them in their desire to be free. None of it takes account of the basic human factors involved.

It is a soulless, arid, unimaginative, and defeatist policy. It is unworthy of our traditions and of our present position of responsibility for leadership in a troubled world.

The Secretary of State has been enormously skillful in covering up the persistent ghost of Yalta where, in spite of the Cairo declaration we threw Manchuria to the wolves, where without Chiang Kai-shek's consent we helped to carve up our Chinese friends at the same time as we betrayed our ally Poland. The sad events of today are all part and parcel of this same original sin.

We tried to persuade Chiang to stop fighting the Communists, to make friends with them through a coalition government and then we blame the Chinese because we say that they have no will to fight the Communists. Today, in spite of their demonstrated desire to fight, we refuse them military aid and advice. We criticize Chiang's government for inefficiency and corruption and help to bring on more corruption and a highly efficient despotism. We carp at them for not being sufficiently democratic and help to deprive them of their freedom.

Had China been our enemy she would probably have suffered less than she has by being our friend.

How long shall we allow short-term expediencies to overcome long-term principles? How long shall we continue with the policy of hoping for the best while we fail to prepare for the worst? Where shall we draw the line? Where shall we make a stand? Or are we to sit on the sidelines as derisive spectators and watch the rapid shrinking of the free areas of this planet until finally, friendless and alone, we are routed and overwhelmed in an apocalypse of our own creation?

The resolution of inquiry is as follows:

Whereas Communist ideology and objectives are directed toward the impairment and dissolution of political, economic, and social institutions cherished by the United States of America and the other free peoples of the world, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has succeeded in imposing communism by coercive measures upon substantial areas of eastern Europe and is engaged in accomplishing similar results by force in territories of the Republic of China; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America, acting in cooperation with the free peoples of Europe, has taken certain measures to counteract and overcome by peaceful means the expansion of Communist aggression in Europe, but has not met with equal vigor or effect the equal or greater threat to the security of the United States of America and of international peace arising from Communist aggression in Asia; and

Whereas these circumstances are of great and growing concern to this House and to the American people and further information is necessary to enable this House to consider and act upon legislation affecting the foregoing situation:

Resolved, That the State Department be and is requested to furnish this House within 15 days after the adoption of this resolution with full and complete answers to the following questions, namely:

1. Did the Department of State solicit the views of the Secretary of National Defense, of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and of the Joint Chiefs of Staff regarding the United States policy toward Formosa? If so, were these views presented to the National Security Council?

2. Is the President's January 5, 1950, statement on Formosa in agreement with the views of the Secretary of National Defense, of General MacArthur, and of the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

3. Why did the President make his January 5, 1950, statement on Formosa prior to the return and report of Dr. Philip Jessup?

4. Why did the President make his January 5, 1950, statement on Formosa prior to the report of the Joint Chiefs of Staff following their scheduled survey tour of the Far East in February?

5. Will the Joint Chiefs of Staff visit Formosa on their survey tour?

6. Was it intended to include Hainan in the President's statement on Formosa?

7. If Formosa and Hainan are captured by the Chinese Communists, where and how will the Japanese be able to procure such essential commodities as rice and iron ore to replace those now procured from Formosa and Hainan?

8. Is it likely that the occupation of Japan will cost the American taxpayers an appreciable additional amount if Formosa and Hainan are captured by the Chinese Communists? If so, approximately how much?

9. In his January 5, 1950, statement on Formosa the President states: "The United States Government will not pursue a course which will lead to involvement in the civil conflict in China." Yet the President himself initiated involvement of the United States in the civil conflict in Greece and has repeatedly pledged the assistance of the United States in the cause of the survival of free states against the depredations of aggressive communism. Indeed, in his address to the Congress on March 12, 1947, the President stated: "I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by pressures." Why are not the principles of the so-called Truman doctrine applied to Formosa and Hainan as they were applied to Greece and Turkey?

10. If the so-called Truman doctrine is not to be applied to the case of Formosa and Hainan, to what countries in Asia is it to be applied and why?

11. Is it planned to aid the anti-Communists in Indochina with the same pattern of aid as that involved in aid to Greece and Turkey?

12. Is it considered better policy to help later to defend the French and British colonial empires in southeast Asia than to help the people of China now to protect themselves against what the Secretary of State refers to in his letter of transmittal of the white paper as foreign domination?

13. Has the State Department formulated a plan for the protection from Communist aggression of the countries of southeast Asia for which the point 4 program is intended? If not, why not?

14. What is the State Department's estimate of the will to fight of the Chinese anti-Communist forces now based on Formosa as demonstrated in the battle of Kinmen Island in October 1949?

15. What is the State Department's estimate of the land tenure reforms and other measures to improve the welfare of the people of Formosa as carried out by the provisional government of Formosa with the advice and assistance of the Joint Commission for Rural Reconstruction?

16. In his January 5, 1950, statement on Formosa the President refers to the "civil conflict in China." How can this statement be reconciled with the statement by the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, in his letter of transmittal of the white paper in which he says: "The Communist leaders have foresworn their Chinese heritage and have publicly announced their subservience to a foreign power, Russia, which during the last 50 years, under czars and Communists alike, has been most assiduous in its efforts to extend its control in the Far East. In the recent past, attempts at foreign domination have appeared quite clearly to the Chinese people as external aggression and as such have been bitterly and in the long run successfully resisted. Our aid and encouragement have helped them to resist. In this case, however, the foreign domination has been masked behind the facade of a vast crusading movement which apparently has seemed to many Chinese to be wholly indigenous and national."

17. In his January 5, 1950, statement on Formosa the President states: "It is the view of the United States Government that the resources on Formosa are adequate to enable them to obtain the items which they might consider necessary for the defense of the island." Does this statement mean that we refuse to grant military aid and advice because in the President's judgment they are not necessary? Has the Department of Defense made a recent survey to determine what resources are now available for this purpose? If so, when? If not, when will such a survey be made?

18. Do the "resources" on Formosa referred to in the President's statement include any part of the $75,000,000 which the President was authorized by the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 to spend in the China area? If not, why not?

19. Has the President spent any part of such $75,000,000 for military aid in the general area of China? If not, why not? If so, how much, where and on what items?

20. In his January 5, 1950, statement on Formosa the President states: "The United States Government proposes to continue under existing legislative authority the present ECA program of economic assistance." For what purposes and in what amounts has this assistance been rendered during each quarter of the past calendar year?

21. To what extent has the Economic Cooperation Administration put into operation the $17,000,000 program of capital improvements presented to the Committee on Foreign Affairs in March 1949 during the consideration of the bill to extend the China Aid Act (H. R. 3830)?

22. Is it contemplated to spend in Formosa all the unspent balance of ECA funds for China and for that purpose to request an extension of existing legislative authority which otherwise will expire on February 15, 1950?

23. What are the views of the State Department with regard to the following proposals:

(a) Insist on the terms of the Cairo declaration which provided that Formosa should be returned to the Republic of China;

(b) Consider Formosa as a possession of Japan, despite the Cairo declaration, until final disposition is determined in an eventual Japanese peace settlement;

(c) Conduct a plebescite in Formosa, perhaps under the auspices of the Far Eastern Commission or a special United Nations commission, to determine whether the people desire:

(1) To continue as a province of and the seat of government of the Republic of China;

(2) To be placed under a United Nations trusteeship;

(3) To become an independent nation.

24. The President's Ambassador Extraordinary, Dr. Philip Jessup, declared in Tokyo on the day of the President's January 5, 1950, statement on Formosa that "we have no intention of abandoning China." Does this mean Communist China or does it mean the legal government of China which President Truman's statement on Formosa indicates that we are in effect abandoning?

25. Does the State Department contend that the United States has encouraged and is encouraging "all developments in China which now and in the future work toward" the end of throwing "off the foreign yoke"? (The words in quotation marks are from Mr. Dean Acheson's letter of transmittal of the white paper.) Does the State Department feel that the President's January 5, 1950, statement on Formosa and Mr. Acheson's recent declaration will work toward that end?

26. Has the State Department any information that, while the United States refuses aid to the Chinese anti-Communists, the Russians are delivering amphibious assault equipment to the Chinese Communists and in particular from Vladivostok?

27. What is the State Department's position with respect to the recognition of the Communist regime in China by the British Government and the automatic rupture of relations with the duly constituted Government of China which such recognition entails?

28. Is it the view of the State Department that an essential criterion for the recognition of a government is the free approval of that government by a majority of its citizens and that there must be incontrovertible evidence of such approval before recognition is granted?

29. Will the State Department through its delegates to the United Nations oppose the admission of the Communist regime in

China as a member of the United Nations? If not, why not?

30. On December 3, 1949, the General Assembly of the United Nations voted to refer the Chinese complaint against the Soviet Union to the Little Assembly for study and report to the next session of the General Assembly next November. Prior to such study several members of the United Nations have withdrawn recognition of the Republic of China, and some now propose to expel her from the United Nations. Is it the view of the State Department that this procedure will be a useful precedent in connection with any future complaints against the Soviet Union?

31. In the Sino-American agreement of December 8, 1947, the United States was to transfer to China naval vessels and craft "not to exceed 271 in number."

(a) How many naval vessels and craft have been transferred under this agreement?

(b) What was the condition of the naval vessels and craft so transferred?

(c) Why have not 271 naval vessels and craft been transferred?

(d) When is it expected that the balance of the 271 naval vessels and craft will be transferred?

32. When, in the opinion of the State Department, did it become too late to aid the anti-Communists in China?

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 437, Rept. No. 1514), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6616) to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a report on House Joint Resolution 371, the insurance bill, and that the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means may have the same time in which to file a minority report.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the understanding is, of course, that that applies to me; that I may have the right to file a minority report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I wonder if the majority leader could tell us when it is contemplated that the measure might be considered on the floor?

Mr. McCORMACK. I announced last week that if House Joint Resolution 371 is reported and a rule is granted, that notice of consideration would be given as soon as possible. I would like to bring it up Thursday, to be perfectly frank, if that can be done.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder if it is going to be necessary to get a rule on the measure.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish I could answer my friend now, but I am unable to.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, if it required a rule and the Committee on Rules met tomorrow and filed a rule tomorrow, it could come up on Thursday. However, I guess it is not material at this point, except as it might give some further light as to whether or not it would come up.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish I were in a position where I could advise the House, and my friend who made the inquiry, but I am not now.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder if the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means could give us any light on that. If I might speak to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I was inquiring whether or not the bill was such that the Committee on Ways and Means would request a rule on the measure, or whether it will be brought up without a rule.

Mr. DOUGHTON. We will determine that sometime today.

Mr. HALLECK. Then that will be determined during the day?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. That was my understanding. That is why I could not give a definite answer to the inquiry made of me.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand the previous statement of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of the week, this is the only measure that is in contemplation for the balance of the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would rather not be held strictly to that just now.

Mr. HALLECK. Very well.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might say that that is the probable situation, but I will announce that tomorrow or Thursday. There have been four rules reported out by the Committee on Rules to date, and I am going to examine them this afternoon. I do not see any one of them that requires consideration this week, but I would not want to make a definite answer which would definitely commit me because, as you know, if I make a definite answer, I will keep my word.

Mr. HALLECK. I appreciate that, and I can understand the situation that confronts us. I have had special inquiry regarding the cotton-quota bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the one possibility. I understand the Committee on Rules is meeting again Thursday on that, and that is the reason I am unable to give a definite answer now because of that particular bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BARING (at the request of Mr. MULTER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. MULTER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE JEWS IN SPAIN

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this time to tell the House about the Jews in Spain.

This is not a plea for resumption of diplomatic relations with Spain. Whatever our course of conduct with any country, it should be based upon principle and upon truth.

I love freedom and democracy. I will never embrace any form of totalitarianism. I therefore despise every type of dictatorship, political or religious, vicious or benevolent. But the type of government of any nation is not to be decided by outside sources. One of the fundamental features of the United Nations Charter is the right of each country to determine for itself how it shall be governed. My thoughts and feelings on this subject have been openly and freely declared and publicized.

Accordingly, I had never had any desire to visit Spain. In fact, I felt that my vigorous, if not violent, denunciation of Franco would, to say the least, make me unwelcome there. More than a year ago I had been told that my antagonism against the Spanish Government was engendered by misinformation and that the Jew in Spain was accorded the same privileges as any other Spaniard. I made no effort to hide my disbelief. In fact I said that if that were true, the Jews would be the first to proclaim it. Why not, said I, have one or more of the leaders of Spanish Jewry come to the United States and tell it to us. The response was that such procedure would be derided in the American press as paid propaganda.

I continued to believe the newspaper and magazine articles about the terribly oppressive conditions under which Jews lived in Spain, confined in ghettos, denied the right of religious worship and the pursuit of the traditional rites of practicing Jews.

When my wife and I planned a trip to the European Continent and the Middle East last year, Spain was not on our itinerary. It was not even once considered as a place we cared to see. My mind was closed on Spain and on the possibility of any good coming out of it. Incidentally, even though I planned and did devote much time on that trip to matters of official interest to me as a

Member of Congress, I bore the full expense thereof personally.

On the start of our journey, aboard the *Queen Mary*, I heard much talk from apparently responsible sources directly at variance with my beliefs about Spain. In London and Paris I heard more of the same tenor. I continued to hold to my own ideas on the subject.

In Paris we attended the Rosh Hashana—Jewish New Year—services in the famous Rothschild Synagogue. It overflowed with worshipers. There was standing room only. During the portion of the services devoted to meditation I thought of the fact that here were thousands of free men and women praying according to their ancient tradition in a place but so recently occupied by Hitler's Nazis. Through my mind ran the places where freedom of worship was still proscribed. Communist Russia and her satellites came to mind, some Arab countries, and then Spain. An inspiration struck me. At least some of my colleagues were going to Spain and might be misled by false propaganda into bringing tales to the United States that all was well there with the Jew. I could scotch such tales if I could go there and bring home first-hand knowledge of the true situation.

Fearful that my request for a visa would be denied, I did not present myself at the Spanish Embassy in Paris. Instead I asked the American Embassy in Paris to obtain our Spanish visas. In due course our passports came back with the visas affixed.

From France we proceeded to Spain instead of going to Italy as originally planned. Obviously, I had no interest in Generalissimo Franco. I had no desire to see him and I did not see him.

We spent most of our time with the members of the Jewish communities. We conversed in English, Yiddish, and German. We were in their places of business, in their homes, and in their synagogues. We were shown around Barcelona by native Jews who were as proud of their city as any Brooklynite is of his Brooklyn—than whom there is no prouder native son. I know it will sound incredible to the average American but here is the truth and I will document it for you.

There is no discrimination against the Jew in business or in employment in Spain. The Jewish employee and the Jewish employer have the same privileges and the same rights as any Spaniard. No one asks him his religion. It is the only place in the Eastern Hemisphere, outside of Israel, where I observed Jews proudly wearing in their lapels the gold Mogen Dovid, the shield of David, colloquially referred to as the Jewish star. The Jews are engaged in business as merchants, exporters, importers, and manufacturers.

They live wherever they can afford to rent or buy a home. There is no ghetto. No one asks their religion before they rent or sell a home to a Jew.

They make no attempt to hide their Judaism. They are not afraid of persecution because they happen to be Jews.

I had been told that they were not permitted to acquire Torahs—Holy Bibles, handwritten in Hebrew upon parchment scrolls. Here is a photostatic copy of an original certificate by the Spanish authorities permitting Mr. D. Salomon Romano, as secretary of the Jewish community of Barcelona, to import a Torah, free of duty or other payment.

Shortly after our arrival in Barcelona the local Jewish community tendered a testimonial dinner to me at the Ritz Hotel. Not only was the dinner publicized but the printed menu cards—I hold an autographed copy of one in my hand—said in Spanish that it was tendered by the Jewish community of Barcelona. The place cards carried the names of every person in attendance. Pictures were taken by a commercial photographer. I have several of them here. That is certainly not the conduct of a minority group of people which is faced with persecution or is fearful of oppression.

Congressman EUGENE J. KEOGH, of New York, made an inspiring talk at this dinner, which was gratefully acknowledged by those in attendance. I visited their synagogue which is used for daily prayer. Here are the photographs of the interior of that synagogue. One of these shows the rabbi in the pulpit. I worshiped with them at their Sabbath services.

Any Christian entering that place of worship will see at a glance that it is not a Catholic church. Any Jew will observe at once that it is a synagogue.

As in most Jewish communities, the synagogue customarily used for daily prayer is not large enough to accommodate the large number of worshipers on the high holy days. In Barcelona, they solved their high holy day problem by renting a theater which they equipped for use as a synagogue during those holidays. I was there between New Year's Day—Rosh Hashanah—and the Day of Atonement—Yom Kippur. Here are the pictures of the interior of that building as it was prepared for use as a synagogue. Note please that the names of the pew holders appear on every seat.

It was in Barcelona that I first learned of the thousands of Jews that were rescued with the aid of Spain from the Nazis. That was told to me by a Jew who had been interned in a concentration camp and who was not only rescued by Franco's men but was given the very job he holds today by one of them.

I later had the fact confirmed to me by a representative of the American Joint Distribution Committee that during the height of Hitler's blood baths, upward of 60,000 Jews had been saved through the generosity of Spanish authorities who permitted them to enter into Spain and then helped them proceed to places of safe refuge.

Upon my return to this country I contacted the World Jewish Congress and received from its representative a copy of the resolution it adopted in November 1944 in Atlantic City, N. J. Let me quote this sentence to you from that resolution:

> The War Emergency Conference extends its gratitude to the Holy See and to the Governments of Sweden, Switzerland, and Spain and to the International Committee of the Red Cross for the protection they offered under difficult conditions to the persecuted Jews in Hungary. It is confident that this protection will be continued and its scope enlarged in accordance with the contingency of the situation.

From Barcelona we flew to Madrid. Again we devoted ourselves to the Jewish community. There are only about 500 Jews in Madrid and about 3,500 in Barcelona. I since learned that there are also two very small communities in Valencia and Seville. The total population of Spain is 28,000,000 of whom between 4,000 and 5,000 are Jews.

In Madrid we attended the Yom Kippur services in their synagogue. I participated in the prayer services, wherein we used Torahs which in 1939 had been secreted for safekeeping in a Catholic monastery and later returned by a Catholic bishop to Dr. Ignacio Bauer, as president of the Jewish community in Madrid. Dr. Bauer is a lawyer and a professor of law at the University of Madrid. A teacher of English in a Catholic high school there assured us that the school authorities have known from the day they hired her that she was an orthodox Jewess.

I inquired in both cities about restrictions against the practice of traditional Jewish rites. I was assured that there was no restriction against kosher slaughtering of fowl and cattle.

The Jews are required to obtain permits to maintain their synagogues. The same is true, however, of all non-Catholic places of worship. Having in mind that Spain, like certain other European countries, has a state religion, I thought this was an unfair requirement imposed for the benefit of the Catholic Church. England and the Scandinavian countries have state religions, but no such requirement.

Italy, which has no state religion, does have such a requirement. The reason given for the requirement in Spain and in Italy was that the government desired to be in a position of assuring itself that no religious institution would be used as a cover for revolutionary or antigovernment activity.

While understanding the reason I do not approve the regulation. I think both Italy and Spain stand to gain more in the eyes of the free world by abolishing such regulations.

What bothered me greatly, however, was the fact that although both the Barcelona and the Madrid Jewish communities had been assured by authorities that their applications for permits were in order and that they could function, no written permits had been issued by the authorities. I also learned that in Barcelona the Jews were not permitted to bury their dead, but were required to seal the bodies in vaults in a wall maintained at one side of the civil cemetery. This condition did not prevail in Madrid, where the civil cemetery was divided by a wall into what became two cemeteries, one for the Jews and the other for the Protestants.

I was assured by Mr. Enrique Benarroya, president of the Jewish Community in Barcelona, and by Dr. Ignacio Bauer, president of the Jewish Community in Madrid, as well as by many others in both cities, that they were quite happy

with their lot in life, that the Spanish authorities extended every cooperation to them and their co-religionists, and that they suffered no discrimination at the hands of the authorities or of private citizens.

Before leaving Madrid I called on the Foreign Minister. I told him of the things I had learned about the Jews in Barcelona and Madrid. I told him how very glad I was about some of the things I had learned. I also told him about the things I did not like.

I emphasized particularly that, while I did not approve of the regulations requiring permits to maintain places of worship, at least the written permits should be issued if governmental requirements were met. I also said that the cemetery situation was not only intolerable but irreligious.

I was most agreeably surprised to find that the Foreign Minister was in accord with my thinking on both subjects. While he knew that both Jewish communities were maintaining synagogues, he professed not to know that written permits had not been issued by the local authorities. He assured me he would inquire into the matter and see that they were promptly issued. He was disturbed to learn about the cemetery situation, and promised me that if my facts were correct those regulations would be rescinded at once.

After discussing these matters with my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], he suggested that we discuss them with the Spanish Ambassador at Large, Jose F. de Lequerica. Upon our return to Washington, D. C., we did just that, and the Ambassador offered to follow the matter with his Government to a satisfactory conclusion.

I am happy to announce today that I have before me confirmation of the fact that formal permits have been issued by the proper Spanish authorities for the maintenance of the Jewish synagogues, and for the burial of Jewish dead in accordance with orthodox religious requirements.

This confirmation comes to me from many sources. Ambassador de Lequerica has so advised me orally and in writing. An American friend in Spain who has nothing to fear from any source has so advised me in writing. The World Jewish Congress and the American Joint Distribution Committee have likewise confirmed those facts.

The World Jewish Congress wrote me:

We received direct confirmation from our friends in Spain that the Barcelona community was granted official recognition, and that the communities of Barcelona and Seville were given permission to maintain their cemetery.

Dr. Bauer wrote me from Madrid:

I am certain you are already aware of your great personal success. Thanks to your intervention, the Barcelona community is already officially recognized, and we hope that the Madrid community will also be approved shortly. I consider this as being really a great feat.

The American Joint Distribution Committee wrote me under date of January 12, 1950:

The efforts you made while in Madrid apparently have borne early and productive fruit.

Mr. Benarroya wrote me from Barcelona as follows:

Since your visit things have been happening very fast and in our favor. On the part of the civil governor and in accordance with instructions from Madrid, we have obtained official recognition for our community, which puts us in the same situation as all other communities in other countries. We are under the impression that this was due to the influence of the United States of America, and knowing that you dear Mr. MULTER had something to do with this, we send you our thanks, and ask that you send same along to the other people who intervened.

I take this occasion to extend such thanks publicly to all those who lent their good offices to the excellent results obtained and especial thanks to my good friend and distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] has expired.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, permit me to commend my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] for his typically intelligent address. He has been overly generous in his treatment of me for which, of course, I am grateful. My knowledge of the matters about which he has spoken leads me to observe that he has rendered our country a great and courageous service, in addition to which he has been an important factor in further removing some of the real or fancied differences that have tended to separate us from the people of Spain—a separation which, if removed ,would better serve the interests of all peaceful and freedom-loving people. You have listened to a well-documented report from one of our most energetic and capable Members from New York. The long-time effect of his conscientious and successful efforts to improve the situation of the Jews in Spain will become the greater as time goes on. He has well served the cause of peace and has well served the Spaniards of Jewish faith.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MONRONEY (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and in one to include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, must every coal bin in every American home be absolutely empty, every school closed and every hospital on rationed heat and light—must every power plant be shut down, whole cities in darkness and every major manufacturing plant unable to operate—must our whole economy be at a standstill and there be wholesale unemployment—must our people actually starve and freeze—must all these things come to pass before the President of the United States is willing to recognize that the national health and safety are being imperiled by the current coal shortage resulting from the current strike?

How long does the President intend to play this shameful game of politics, with helpless American people as mere pawns? Must the welfare of all the people be sacrificed in order that the selfish ends of a few arrogant labor union leaders may be served by a subservient administration?

Mr. Speaker, these are questions which are being asked by the people we represent as they find themselves on a rationed coal supply, having to pay black-market prices for whatever coal may be available, and having to burn wood to secure heat enough to survive. Those are questions being asked by an ever-increasing number who are filling the ranks of the unemployed, as the coal supply diminishes and manufacturing operations are curtailed.

On three previous occasions I have addressed this House to call attention to the acute coal shortage resulting from the current strike. Last September, and again on January 12 of this year, I introduced a resolution calling upon the President to invoke the national-emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. Several Members have addressed this House on this matter, and around 24 such resolutions have been introduced. Several Senators have sponsored a like resolution in the other body.

But notwithstanding all such efforts calling the attention of President Truman to the critical coal situation in the country, with innocent people and whole communities enduring great hardship and suffering, he stubbornly refuses to exercise the authority vested in him under existing law to meet just such an emergency as this. He has persisted in saying that no emergency exists. But, as I stated in my letter to the Chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], if he would grant us a hearing we would present to his committee persuasive and compelling evidence that this coal strike imperils our national health and safety.

During this past week end, Mr. Speaker, I visited my home State of Illinois. I canvassed the coal situation myself. The Illinois Fuel Merchants Association also conducted a comprehensive canvas of the entire State. I hold in my hand the reports up to date received from the various cities, towns and villages. I have here in my hand, first-hand conclusive evidence of the exact situation.

The reports I have here are not estimates of last month's coal supply prepared by some long-haired Department of Interior statistician to support a preconceived political conclusion of an administration that hired him and can fire

him. The reports I have here are the hard, cold, bitter, distressing facts of the actual situation.

The J. H. Catlow Coal Co., of Barrington, Ill., which is in my district, wired me as follows:

Coal situation serious Barrington. Rest home, 52 patients, now burning wood. Many homes have only a few days' supply.

A careful check was made of the situation in Barrington, which is a community of around 4,800 people. The coal supply in that little community has been so low that for the past 3 months the dealers have been obliged to ration their limited supply. They have been able to obtain some coal only by paying black market prices of $4 and up per ton more than the normal consumer price.

The rest home, referred to in the telegram, is an institution with 52 aged inmates. What coal it has on hand, with no coal in transit and no immediate prospects of obtaining any, is being used to bank the fire at nights. In the daytime they burn wood.

If there should be a severe cold spell, this whole community will almost overnight be completely without any coal whatever. And there are other communities in the same trying predicament. But, apparently, in the eyes of the President there can be no emergency until every lump of coal above the ground has been burned.

Speaking of having to burn wood in order to get heat, I have here a clipping from a newspaper in St. Charles, Ill., which is ably represented by my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED]. It states that with only 90 tons of coal on hand for a normal weekly consumption of 800 tons, the city has invited the people to use the woodpile accumulated by the city in its tree-removal program in which about 1,000 trees were cut down.

Of course, people are not going to freeze so long as they can find something to burn. It sounds ridiculous, and it would be; but I would not be at all surprised if the Department of Agriculture released some figures within the next few days to show that there is an abundance of wood available for home-heating purposes to support the administration's absurd contention that there is no emergency in the coal industry.

Mr. Speaker, let me call attention to one or two other items in this careful survey of the coal situation in Illinois. No one can look at these first-hand reports without being startled at the number of communities that are on a day-by-day existence in their coal supply.

In Gurnee, Ill., for example, which is a community of about 1,800 people, there is only tonnage available for 1 day. This community is able to meet its barest needs only by obtaining from a neighboring city of Waukegan coal in 1-ton lots to meet emergency needs. A few days of severe cold weather, and the people of Gurnee will be completely helpless.

The same situation exists in Normal, Ill., which has a population of around 8,500. The Illinois Soldiers and Sailors home, located there, the Illinois State Normal, and the schools have on hand only enough coal to last 24 hours.

In Rockford, Ill., the St. Anthony Hospital has only 1 day's supply. At the very best the city has on hand only 3 days' supply for all its needs, and it is able to get along in this relatively mild weather only by purchasing coal at black-market prices of from $2 to $3 a ton more than the normal price.

The reports I have here show that the city of Elgin, Ill., of around 45,000 people, has on hand only a little over 2 days' supply. The two hospitals in the city have less than 2 days' supply, and the industries there are facing sharp curtailment in their operations as their coal supply continues to diminish.

And so on through this pile of reports, there is this showing of large black-market operations, churches, schools, and hospitals with hardly any coal, and people having to find other means of heating their homes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the record at this point a resolution adopted by the village of Libertyville, Ill., on January 17.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Whereas more than 60 percent of the homes within the corporate limits of the village of Libertyville, Ill., are dependent upon coal for heating purposes and, with the large increase in population which has taken place in the village since the last Federal census, the population of this village is now in excess of 6,000 persons; and

Whereas all the schools, the main water plant, and the sanitary sewerage plant in this municipality are dependent upon coal for heating purposes; and

Whereas the vast majority of the business buildings and industries of this village are dependent upon coal for heating and operation purposes; and

Whereas a large area surrounding the village is dependent upon the coal distributors of this village for coal for heating and other purposes; and

Whereas a thorough survey of the existing coal stocks in this village discloses that said stocks will be exhausted on or about January 27, 1950, that no coal supplies are in transit to supply the needs of the village and that there exists at present no promise of any future delivery of coal to the village; and

Whereas there is now imminent danger of large numbers of homes in the village being without heat during the heart of the present winter, in probable subzero weather, of the schools being closed and of businesses and industries being shut down; and

Whereas the health of our people and the safety of the community are now in great jeopardy: Now, therefore, be it and it is hereby

Resolved by the president and board of trustees of the village of Libertyville, Ill., That a serious emergency exists in this municipality by reason of the depleted coal supplies of the village and the present dark outlook with reference to obtaining adequate additional supplies, all occasioned by coal strikes and related causes limiting coal supplies at the source on a national scale; and be it further

Resolved, That Federal and State authorities be and they are hereby memorialized to take prompt action to cope with the present emergency; and be it further

Resolved, That the village clerk be and he is hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, each of the United States Senators from Illinois, the Congressman from this district, the Governor of Illinois, the Illinois Municipal League, and the public press.

Passed January 17, 1950.

Approved January 17, 1950.

J. J. JAEGER,
President.

Attest:

C. O. CARLSON,
Village Clerk.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to represent the more than 6,000 people who live in Libertyville, and it is my duty to them, as well as to all the people, to try to secure prompt action in the emergency situation that presently confronts us.

As I stated at the outset, the coal shortage is so acute that industries are beginning to curtail operations and unemployment is increasing. Last Friday the Inland Steel Co. announced that it had been compelled to shut down its blast furnace at the Indiana Harbor plant because of the shortage of coking coal. As this blast furnace produced iron for foundries and for steel manufacturing, the stoppage of its operations will have its adverse effect on other industries.

And other steel companies, such as the Republic Steel Co. and the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Works in Gary, Ind., and South Chicago are carefully surveying their low coal supplies, with the possibility of a cut-back in their operations.

All this President Truman ignores. And you will recall that he told us in one of his messages that steel production was so important to our national economy that unless there was an increase the Government itself should go into the steel business.

If there is no national emergency in the coal situation, why was it necessary for the Interstate Commerce Commission to issue on December 23, 1949, what is known as Service Order 844, which provides priority in coal for locomotive consumption where the supply on hand is less than 9 days? Why was it necessary for the Commission to issue Service Order 845 on January 8 of this year by which passenger service was curtailed by 33⅓ percent on coal-consuming runs?

Mr. Speaker, I should like to read to the House the following telegram dated January 20 which I received from Mr. W. A. Johnston, president of the Illinois Central Railroad:

The fact that the United Mine Worker mines in our territory are only working 3 days a week, and being subject to wildcat strikes on the permissive days, is creating a very acute coal shortage all over our territory and we on the Illinois Central are having extreme difficulty securing from our operators sufficient coal to keep our road in operation. We are down today to about 5 days total supply in cars, in chutes, and on the ground and have been for weeks living from hand to mouth.

Should there be a cold snap we would very likely have to retard our freight-train operation and there would be extreme suffering because of lack of coal in retail yards. Cannot something be done by the Government to overcome this predicament?

In order that we, as representatives of the people, might somehow impress upon the President the seriousness of the situation confronting our people, I introduced the resolution calling upon him to

invoke the Taft-Hartley Act. By asking him to invoke the national emergency provisions of that act we are not asking him to have the Attorney General obtain a court injunction. We are asking him to take the initial step provided by the Taft-Hartley Act, and that is to set up a board of inquiry to ascertain the facts in the coal dispute and the issues involved.

It seems strange indeed that the President is not even willing to have such a board inquire into the existing coal situation. There is nothing in the act which requires that the President take any action on the board's findings. The board does not even make recommendations. In fact, the act specifically states that its report on the facts shall not contain any recommendations.

Why, then, does President Truman refuse to establish such a board? Is it that he is afraid of the truth? The Taft-Hartley Act provides that the board's report shall be made public. Is it that the President is afraid that the board's report will publicly show such a shockingly critical situation resulting from the coal strike that he will find it politically impossible to continue to play politics at the expense of the American people for the benefit of a few?

The responsibility for this very serious condition in the United States, with whole communities without sufficient fuel and the prospects of a complete break-down of our whole economy, rests squarely on the shoulders of President Truman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. DONDERO. In conjunction with what the gentleman from Illinois has said, I hold in my hand a part of the front page of the Pontiac Daily Press, published in a city of 80,000 people. The headline is, "Coal piles dwindle in cities and States." The subheadline is to the effect that they have between 5 and 7 days' coal supply left in my State of Michigan.

Mr. CHURCH. I want to thank the gentleman for his additional evidence. If the Members will read Senator CAIN'S speech of yesterday in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD they will find three pages of additional evidence there, especially with reference to his State of Washington.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I want to compliment the gentleman on the statements he has made with reference to this situation. His district borders mine. The statement he has made with reference to the shortage of coal and its effect upon unemployment is absolutely true.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. May I say that the mayor of my home city has sent me a wire saying that they have 2 days' supply left in Royal Oak, Mich.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Does not the gentleman think that if some of these wires were sent to the coal operators and the mine owners, where the responsibility actually rests, you might get better results? What we are doing here is placing the blame on the miners, on the workers, when the blame rests squarely on the shoulders of the mine operators and the mine owners, who will not concede to these men that which rightfully belongs to them.

Mr. CHURCH. But the strikers are demanding concessions specifically prohibited by law. At any rate, what objection can there possibly be to having a board of inquiry ascertain the facts in the dispute and the matters in issue?

May I say to the gentleman that if the President of the United States would follow the law of the land and encourage respect for the law, we would not have such headlines that appear in today's Times-Herald, "Union Tells Strike Plan to Jam Phones"; "Workers Told to Overload Dial System"; "CWA Boss Asks for CIO Support." Here is a proposal to make it impossible for dial phones to be used. Here is a proposal to disregard the rights of others.

Let me say further to the gentleman from New York that I believe he should encourage the President of the United States to follow the law and the moral principle that the industry and the workers must have respect for the law of the land, even though they may not like the particular law in question. The workers have their rights and the operators have their rights, but the paramount right is that of the general public. It is this paramount right that we are asking the President to recognize.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday and on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of those days and following any special orders heretofore entered.

FOREIGN SKILLED PERSONNEL ADMISSION BILL

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 438, Rept. No. 1519), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3001) to authorize the admission into the United States of certain aliens possessing special skills. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FALLACIES OF WORLD FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the issue of world government has been placed before the House by a set of concurrent resolutions, all of similar language, seeking to put this House and this Congress on record as stating the project of world government to be an aim of United States foreign policy. These resolutions have been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which has made them the subject of hearings. The Committee has not yet acted on them.

The implications of the proposal are so vast, however, as to merit the attention of every Member of this House. It is my purpose to discuss these implications as I see them.

The proposition contained in these resolutions sounds very persuasive as long as it is considered on the level of abstractions. No one can take issue with the idea of adequate safeguards for peace. No one can object to the ideal of justice under law throughout the world. No one can grapple with purely imaginary concepts such as a world sovereign or a world federation.

It is only when one gets down to cases and attempts to see the proposition in concrete application that one comes to question whether the proposition is a sound one.

This Congress should not put forth this proposition if it is an unsound one. After careful consideration, I have come to the conclusion that the proposition is not sound but fallacious.

Even if the proposition were sound, a concurrent resolution would be an entirely inappropriate way of proclaiming it to the world. It would not be effective. It would not be convincing. It would be legally questionable. The only proper course would be that of a constitutional amendment.

I shall discuss, therefore, the fundamental fallacies of the proposition for a world state, the inappropriateness of a concurrent resolution as a means of registering the national will on the proposed world state and the idea of a constitutional amendment as the only proper procedure.

Let us see precisely what is proposed before we develop the fallacies.

The resolutions state that it is the sense of the Congress that it shall be the policy of the United States to strengthen the United Nations to the end that it shall become a world government having the attributes of making, interpreting, and enforcing law on a world scale.

On a proposition of such importance it behooves the Congress to withhold an expression of approval unless and until the support of the American people has been amply demonstrated. It would be a reckless imposture for the Congress to announce an intention of such world-wide and historic significance if the

American people had not first resolved their will to support and carry through a design for world government. Such an expression by the Congress would be a gesture of misrepresentation. It would be the very negation of the Congress' function and duty of representing the people of the United States.

No evidence at hand indicates that the American people support this proposition. Proponents of the resolution have cited the results of public-opinion polls, expressions of view by several of the State legislatures, and the like to support the assertion of public approval. Such generalized expressions of sentiment and mood are inadequate as evidence of a considered judgment and a sustained will to submit to a world state. It is not enough to assert that such judgment and will exist. It would be necessary to prove their existence before the Congress would be entitled to announce to the world a statement of policy premised upon their existence.

The lack of proof of public support for this proposition is easy to demonstrate.

First of all, this is a proposition to destroy the United Nations.

That is not what the resolutions say in so many words. They use the word "strengthen" rather than the word "destroy." An analysis will show very readily, however, that it is not the strengthening of the United Nations which these resolutions propose. The United Nations—the organization that now exists—does not have the attributes that this proposed world government would have. The attributes of the United Nations are those set forth in its Charter. The Charter is in principle entirely different from the charter that the international state proposed in these resolutions. The attributes being different, then the things themselves would be different. Only the names might be the same. Let us not be deceived by names. To be accurate, to avoid deception, these resolutions should not talk of strengthening the United Nations. They should talk of discarding the United Nations and setting up something entirely different in its place. The mere rhetorical use of the same name should not be permitted to obscure the fact that this is a proposal to jettison the United Nations as it now exists.

Nothing adduced in the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs or elsewhere indicates that the American people wish to discard the United Nations. Nothing has been shown to indicate that they now wish to turn their backs on that experiment, after some 4 years of trial, and take off on a fanciful flight into the hypotheses of world government.

Second, this is a proposition to supersede and extinguish the Constitution of the United States.

Again, the resolutions do not say so in precise words. The conclusion is inevitable, however, if one looks analytically at what they do say.

World government—a world federal state going by the name of the United Nations or any other name—would necessarily have the attributes of government. The resolutions do not conceal this. They speak of a world government capable of making, interpreting, and enforcing world law.

Before examining all the implications of this, it is well to allude to the argument, as put forth by the proponents, that the world government would necessarily be limited. This formula for limited unlimited government, for a state which is universal in particulars, is somewhat vague. It is difficult to find substantial meaning in the assurances, as given in testimony, that the world government will be primarily to prevent violence and enforce peace in the world and to run a world police force capable of enforcing the world will on any member—just that and nothing more.

All of us should have realized by now that war has become totalitarian not only in its impact but in its roots. Any social stress, any friction or sag in the economy, or any frustration of a people's aims is potentially a factor in disrupting the peace of the world. A world government with power to take jurisdiction over all matters that bear on war and peace would be capable of taking jurisdiction over everything.

We are reminded by the proponents, however, of the experience of our own Government. The Thirteen Original States were not completely supplanted by the Federal Government. The American experience, the proponents assert, demonstrates that a government can be both central and universal on the one hand and limited on the other.

The rejoinder is that the American experience does not lend an appropriate comparison. The men of the Thirteen Original States had not only language in common; they were versed in Blackstone, Coke, and John Locke. They had a common concept of public law. The concept of limitation of power and of constitutional right was inherent in their thought and action. Upon the basis of this community of precept and understanding they were able to form a national Government of limited powers and constitutional principles.

The world with which we are now invited to amalgamate, in whose great central sovereign we are now invited to submerge our rights, presents no such general concept of limited government. We might as well admit that, with all our enshrinement of democratic principles, absolutism and capricious use of power now characterize government over the larger part of the world's peoples. Nothing could be more misleading than the expectation that a world government would necessarily emerge in the pattern of the American Constitution—that somehow the principles of the American experience would be engrafted upon a world state formed largely of peoples who are unfamiliar with, and perhaps even inherently hostile toward, the sort of principles that we live by in the United States.

This line of argument, however, is not a determining one. Let us assume for argument that a world government would emerge in line with the principles upon which our own Government rests. Let us evaluate the case on that premise.

Such a government would be clothed with sovereign powers similar to those of the United States. It would have the power to tax and to appropriate. It would have power to raise and support its own armed forces, and would have authority to use them wherever in its sovereign wisdom it might choose. It would have the power to coin money and determine the value thereof. It would control commerce throughout the world. It would be empowered to take over and use property for its own purposes. It would have a universal claim upon allegiance and in return would have the obligation to give protection universally throughout its domain. It would have the power to enforce its own law throughout its entire area.

Let us look at the question of vesting the proposed world state with power to tax and appropriate.

Are the American people ready to yield up to an hypothetical world legislature the power to levy world taxes against their property, transactions, and incomes? Are they ready to permit the world legislature to determine where and how the wealth exacted from them by world taxation shall be spent? It may be that they are. Perhaps it is their sentiment that such power over American wealth and American destiny should be surrendered to a sovereign body in which America would have a small voice, a very small voice indeed. Nothing in the hearings shows this, however, and in the absence of clear proof it would ill become the Congress to proclaim a proposition premised on the supposition that the American people are ready and willing for such an undertaking.

Let us look next at the implications of the military powers of the envisaged world government.

Is this Congress really willing to give up its constitutional prerogative in matters of declaring war and exercising control over the armed forces? Do the American people wish such a course? Nothing adduced in the hearings supports an affirmative answer.

It is easy and beguiling to imagine, as the proponents of world federation do, a world government in which all the military resources of all the peoples would be pooled in something called an international police force. Some rather like to imagine a dedicated army of idealistic youths marshaled by some mythical Eisenhower and working under the peace plans of some enlightened world general staff. Somehow the idea seems to escape them that the world army might be a ruthless army, that its commanders might be men of overweening ambition, and that its world general staff might have in its hands power vastly in excess of its sense of responsibility.

How many world army divisions of Communist troops would we want to have garrisoned in the United States? How much control over American resources in men and armament would we want to yield to a world government and its general staff, on which American representation would constitute only a small minority? We had better ask the questions now. After the world federal constitution should have taken effect it would be too late. The power to determine the answers would have passed from America's hands; the world government would be making the decisions.

One should not overlook that such a world government would necessarily have power to levy forces. That would entail the power to conscript. That would mean the conscription of Americans for military service in such number, in accordance with such standards, and for service in such parts of the world as the world authority might decide. Americans have adopted conscription as a basis for raising their own armed forces only in times of great emergency and with great reluctance. That they are now willing to yield such power over American lives to a world authority in which this country would have a minority voice is, to say the least, open to serious question.

Let us look next at the implications of yielding to a world government power to coin money and regulate the value thereof.

Do the American people wish to do away with the dollar—to have it absorbed in, and supplanted by, some new world currency?

Let us assume that the unit of the new world currency will be called the global. How many globals will a dollar be worth when the great transition is made? How many francs will be counted equivalent to a global? How many pesetas? How many rubles? The world legislature can decided all that. The great world-wide share-the-wealth plan can be put through as one of the first acts of the new world legislature.

Maybe the American people are ready for that. But if so, there is nothing in the hearings to show it.

Let us consider next the control of commerce.

This is an inherent power of government. A world government would necessarily control commerce, and all that bears on commerce, among the component parts and, for that matter, within them as well. The plea for world government is a plea that the American people should divest their own Government of control of commerce with other nations and place that control in a superior state. Along with it, just as surely, would go control of commerce within the Nation.

Perhaps that is what the American people want. One must emphasize the necessity of making completely sure of it first lest we deceive ourselves and the world by a false declaration of intention.

Let us consider next another inherent power of government, the power to take over property and control it for its own use.

The world government would be able to exercise eminent domain anywhere in the United States. It would do so in accordance with its own procedures and for such purposes as it might deem proper. Its power to do so would be beyond challenge by any local unit of government. Have the proponents of this measure adequately considered the implications of this? Have they revealed those implications to the American people? Do the American people concur? No evidence at hand indicates an affirmative answer to any of these questions.

Let us consider the matter of universal allegiance and universal protection. The reciprocal relationship between them is basic to all political organization.

The new world state would impinge directly upon every inhabitant's life in its claim of allegiance. It would be universal throughout its domain. On the other hand, the world citizen would have the right to claim the world government's protection wherever he might go. In our own constitutional history it was early developed that the right to move freely about in the area of the sovereign was inherent in the individual's claim of protection in return for the obligation of allegiance. The protection which the Federal Government extended to a New Yorker was not confined to the limits of New York. The man of Wisconsin did not cease to have a claim for protection at the moment of passing into Illinois. The right to move about within the area covered by the sovereign's protection was inherent in the reciprocal obligation of allegiance and protection.

What does that mean when applied to the proposed world state? It means, for one thing, the end of immigration restrictions in the United States. If it does not mean that, then there is no good to be served in talking about the world state, for a state in which the obligation to protect was compartmentalized would be a state without a universal claim upon allegiance, and therefore no state at all.

Now it may be that the American people are ready to knock down the immigration bars and invite the whole world in. It may be that they are ready to yield control over such things to a working majority of a mythical world legislature. Nothing in the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs indicates this, however, and in the absence of clear proof, it would be presumptuous of the Congress to issue a declaration indicating any such willingness.

Let us look also at the implications of the universality of impact of a world government.

The world government would govern in every section of every land, including this land. Its writ would be effective in every neighborhood. Its marshals, its agents of investigation and enforcement, of whatever national origins, would be empowered to proceed on their business independent of local restrictions. Its power could reach down and touch every individual. Its courts could take cognizance of offenses against the world law wherever committed. The citizens of every American town would be subject to trial before the world judges in whatever venue might be appropriate under the procedure of the world courts.

Is that what the American people and their Congress want? If they do, they should say so more clearly. If they do not, they should not say anything to mislead anyone into thinking they do.

Some exponents of world government contend, of course, that the desire for peace is so great that such considerations as the ones expressed above are of secondary importance. Their plea stems from the sincere belief that the urgency for security among the American people and other peoples is so compelling that, given the opportunity, they would all willingly merge their national prerogatives in one central governing power to the degree necessary to insure tranquillity throughout the world. One cannot question the desire for peace or the need of it. One may, however, question the historical validity of the hope that peace is necessarily to be achieved through widening the area of sovereignty.

This hope is only a postulate. It rests on no historic experience. It is asserted, like the dogmatic panacea of the classless society, as a simple refuge from the complexities of reality. People who find the burdens and anxieties of the world about them intolerable have ever been wont to recreate the world in the image of their wishes. It is seductively easy to alleviate the threat of war first by identifying it with the circumstances that the world is divided into many states and second by imagining a world consisting of only one state.

The fallacy is exposed by a glance at history.

Peace can break down within a sovereign's domain as well as upon the periphery. There are civil wars as well as international wars. History gives examples without number. Only one needs to be cited, however. The great constitutional experiment of 1787 in our own country did not resolve the fundamental issues for the American people. Those issues remained to be resolved on the battlefield in the 1860's.

The memory of this is strong in the American consciousness. The American people will want and are entitled to ask, and to have answered, one very fundamental question before the Congress undertakes to pledge them in the cause of a world state. That question is this: Is the world state essentially a formula for abolishing international wars, or is it essentially a pattern for widening the scope, and therefore the tragedy, of civil wars?

Until that question has been explored and unless the American people are satisfied that world government would indeed be an avenue to the hopes which its proponents assert, this Congress would be ill-advised to pledge them in support of the proposition.

I turn now to a discussion of the inappropriateness of a concurrent resolution as a means of registering the national will on this matter of such vast importance, and of the necessity of cleaning up the constitutional obstacles before taking action leading toward establishment of a world state.

One thing in the American experience germane to the issue is the fact that the constitutional fathers realized that no agent of government could properly be called upon to destroy that which he had been sworn to uphold. They realized that the Federal Constitution, as a successor to the Articles of Confederation, would destroy the Articles. They realized that the Federal Constitution, in impinging upon the States, would destroy in a measure powers which the States had under their constitutions. They realized, therefore, that the Federal Constitution had to be brought into effect by a process independent of existing agencies of government. Accordingly they went directly to the people.

We must apply the same principles in this instance.

A world federation enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world law would supersede and extinguish the Constitution of the United States.

The Congress cannot properly call upon the members of the executive establishment to work for the impairment and extinction of the Constitution—the very instrument that members of the executive establishment are sworn to uphold and defend.

No member of the executive establishment could properly work toward the establishment of a world state even with the passage of one of these resolutions, which would merely be an expression of the sense of the Congress. Section 1037 of Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives says:

> A concurrent resolution is without force and effect beyond the confines of the Capitol.

We cannot realistically expect such a resolution to have any effect on the ends of American foreign policy. It would be nothing but an expression indicating a pattern of piety in our wishes. It could not possibly prevail as against the power of the oath taken by members of the executive establishment to uphold and defend the Constitution.

One may doubt that the Congress could properly pass such a resolution even if it had binding effect. This doubt is based upon consciousness of the oath taken by all Members to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. It binds them just as definitely as it binds the members of the executive establishment.

Some proponents of the resolutions in question have cited as precedents House Concurrent Resolution 25 and Senate Resolution 192, Seventy-eighth Congress. The former, known generally as the Fulbright resolution, passed the House of Representatives on September 21, 1943. The latter, known generally as the Connally resolution, passed the Senate on November 5, 1943. A careful examination of their language shows that neither is a proper precedent for the present resolutions.

The Fulbright resolution was an expression favoring "the creation of appropriate international machinery adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace, among the nations of the world, and * * * participation by the United States therein through its constitutional processes."

The Connally resolution favored United States participation "with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world." It recognized "the necessity of there being established a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states."

Neither of the above resolutions attempted to predetermine the attributes of the organization envisaged. Neither aimed at the creation of a world superstate. Neither aimed at the creation of a new political authority which would supersede the authority of the Constitution of the United States. Neither of them attempted in any measure to extinguish powers vested under the Constitution. Both of them were entirely appropriate as expressions of the will of the Congress or one of its bodies completely in keeping with their constitutional responsibilities. Neither of them sought to impose upon the Executive a line of policy which the Executive's constitutional obligations could not tolerate.

To undertake the course envisaged in the present resolution—or to attempt to lead the world into thinking we are undertaking such a course—without thoroughgoing debate into all the particulars would be dangerous in the extreme. The proposition in these resolutions should be rejected. It is an invitation for a sentimental journey into a blind alley.

The implications of the resolutions are so vast as they concern our constitutional system that the course proposed should not be undertaken except through a solemn constitutional process. The Constitution provides an appropriate procedure in the amendment process.

An appropriate amendment would be one to authorize the President to enter into negotiations looking toward a world government under which characteristics of the American Constitution would be submerged and destroyed to the extent necessary to make such a world government possible. It might also authorize the Congress, specifically the Senate, to take action on such an instrument of government once it had been formulated.

With such an amendment before the American public, that public would be able to see steadily and wholly what the implications of world government are. After such debate, and after a solemn referendum, we should then know what we mean and what we are doing. The world, furthermore, would be assured that our intentions are deliberate and firm and not the mere expression of a passing aspiration arrived at after negligible consideration.

There could be no doubt that the Executive would be empowered to proceed along the path of negotiations toward world government if a constitutional amendment were put into effect authorizing him to do so. There could be no doubt of the power of the Congress, or of the Senate in particular in regard to its share in the treaty-making procedure, to participate in the process if the Constitution were so amended as to open up the avenue to a supersession of the Constitution. The Constitution would not impose an impediment in the path to world government if the Constitution were so amended as to clear the way.

The impulse for such an amendment should come from the States. The States, by affirmative action of the legislatures of a two-thirds majority of them, can bring about a national convention to originate amendments to the Constitution. Such amendments become fully valid when affirmed by the legislatures or by conventions in three-fourths of the States, whichever course may be determined upon in the proposal. The reason for the suggestion that any movement to supersede the Constitution should be under the process indicated is that it would ill become any agents of this Government, having direct constitutional responsibilities, whether in the executive branch or the legislative branch, to originate a formal effort to supersede the Constitution.

If the sentiment for world government is as great as the proponents of these resolutions assert it is, then there could be no doubt that the great referendum on this issue would provide an affirmative result. If it is not sufficiently great to produce this result—and one may surely doubt that it is—then this Congress and this Nation should withhold any action that might mislead the world about our intentions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVENPORT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

TREATY WITH IRELAND

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the papers of Sunday last that a Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation had been concluded on Saturday and signed in Dublin by the Government of the United States and by the Government of Ireland. I should like to take this opportunity of conveying my congratulations, through the medium of this House and its record, to the State Department for their wisdom in concluding such a treaty with a country which has always been friendly to us and with a country which, as I pointed out in my speech of September 26, 1949, in this House, has contributed so many of its people to this great country of ours. No Member will dispute with me that friendship, amity to the greatest extent has always existed between Ireland and the United States, but I am glad, I am proud, to see this friendship registered by the treaty to which I now refer. We have always had the friendship of Ireland. We always will have it. But I can assure the Members of the House, and I know that I speak for a great many of them, that this is one treaty which will be upheld by the signers not only in the letter, but in the spirit. This will be no mere scrap of paper to be discarded when expediency or opportunity makes it appear profitable. No, indeed. This, I am sure, will be a treaty which will be adhered to completely and again I should like to congratulate most wholeheartedly those officers of the State Department who have concluded this treaty and I venture to prophesy that this is one treaty which will encounter no obstacle in the Senate when the time comes to ratify it there.

There was a feeling around—one felt it in the air—that our great State Department was not quite as interested in Ireland as it might be. I am pleased, therefore, to see this evidence of the actual work of the State Department in promoting friendship with Ireland and I hope that it will give the lie to those who say that America is not interested in the fate of Ireland. There are other aspects of our relationship with Ireland which are not treated in the document that was signed in Dublin on Saturday by our Minister to Ireland, the Honorable George Garrett, and by the very able Irish Minister of External Affairs, the Honorable Sean McBride, but I do not

propose at this stage to raise those questions which I mentioned in my previous speeches on the floor of this House. I can only say that I sincerely hope that before too long other evidences of the friendship borne by this country to Ireland will be made public.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I compliment the gentleman on making this observation at this time. May I ask the gentleman this question. In his opinion does he think it is not about time for the United States to send an Ambassador instead of a Minister to a country as prominent as Ireland among the nations of the world?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I am glad the gentleman brought that question up. We have small nations like Pakistan and Afghanistan which have the status of an embassy. Yet, the Irish representation here has the status only of a legation. I know the deep interest of the gentleman in the matter, and I hope that within a matter of a month or perhaps 2 months, we may have news that the representation will be raised to that of an embassy.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I yield.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. I agree most heartily with the worthy gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVENPORT] in all that he has said today, and join with him in his rejoicing that the initial step has been taken, most probably, to make a great free Ireland, eventually a country with an ambassador status. A united Ireland, territorially, as it has been always heroically since the very twilight of civilization on down through the years when it was the educational and religious fountainhead of the world and through the dark days of persecution and up to this very important hour in this world's peculiarly patterned history.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I yield.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Your utterances have always been timely and worth while on the floor of the House. I appreciate the gentleman's reference to this very important treaty between the Irish people and the people of America. At my own expense last fall I went to Ireland, as well as to other European countries. While there I met our Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, George A. Garrett and his gracious wife. I hope he will be given his share of the credit in bringing about this very fine and friendly relationship which has grown up between our two countries and which has resulted in this fine treaty.

I also hope that he may be the first to enjoy the status of Ambassador to the great land of Ireland.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. I assure you sir, that the sons of Aaron join with the sons of Erin in their rejoicing on this momentous occasion.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made by the Commander of the AMVETS, the American Veterans of World War II, before the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 25, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 1941. A bill to provide for limiting participation as beneficiary under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1510). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 416. Resolution granting 6 months' salary and $350 funeral expenses to the estate of Lillian Van Steenburgh, late an employee of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1511). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 152. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings relative to the Federal Fair Employment Practices Act for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor; without amendment (Rept. No. 1512). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 414. Resolution providing for the employment of one additional laborer (cloakroom), doorkeeper's department; without amendment (Rept. No. 1513). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 437. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 6616, a bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1514). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. REDDEN: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5282. A bill to amend section 3 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1515). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 6552. A bill to correct a clerical error in section 2 of the act of January 16, 1883, an act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States, as amended by Public Law 425, Eighty-first Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1516). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 438. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 3001, a bill to authorize the admission into the United States of certain aliens possessing special skills; without amendment (Rept. No. 1519). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 371. Joint resolution relating to the income taxes of life-insurance companies for 1948 and 1949; with amendments (Rept. No. 1522). Referred to the Committe of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5609. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to B. M. (Bud) Phelps; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1517). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5610. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Emma Phelps Glenn; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1518). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5611. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Charles W. Phelps; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1520). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5860. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Frank Phelps; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1521). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 6949. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to certain matters related to radio communications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 6950. A bill to provide for the promotion of certain employees in the motor vehicle service of the postal field service in recognition of longevity of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 6951. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit retirement at age 62 and to provide for payments of $75 per month to widows regardless of age; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 6952. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended, to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 6953. A bill to prevent military personnel from replacing civilians in the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOLTON of Maryland:

H. R. 6954. A bill to exempt from the manufacturers' excise tax certain articles sold to fire-fighting companies not organized for profit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6955. A bill to provide that contributions or gifts to volunteer fire companies shall be deductible for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:
H. R. 6956. A bill to amend section 128 of Public Law 76, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma:
H. R. 6957. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of Army and Air Force Exchange Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMAS:
H. J. Res. 401. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the Housing Industrial Exposition, to be held at Houston, Tex., May 10 through 14, 1950; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WELCH:
H. J. Res. 402. Joint resolution giving the consent of Congress to an agreement between the State of Missouri and the State of Kansas establishing a boundary between said States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:
H. J. Res. 403. Joint resolution to authorize special emergency assistance for welfare programs for Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KLEIN:
H. Res. 439. Resolution to authorize the study of the feasibility and desirability of purchase and operation of the Capital Transit Co. by the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LODGE:
H. Res. 440. Resolution requesting the State Department to furnish full and complete answers to questions relating to the foreign policy of the United States in the Far East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. D'EWART:
H. R. 6958. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Francis Lee Edwards; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 6959. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to William Watt; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 6960. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to James Wilbur Watt; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 6961. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mary E. White Watt; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 6962. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Minnie M. Watt Kopac; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 6963. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Guy C. Hickenlively; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 6964. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Josephine Stevens Goering; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 6965. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Harvey Young Swallow; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FUGATE:
H. R. 6966. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on the claim of the legal representatives of the estate of Robert Lee Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:
H. R. 6967. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Masumi Takashima (Susy) Jensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:
H. R. 6968. A bill for the relief of Poulikis S. Loukakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHENER:
H. R. 6969. A bill for the relief of Ralph E. Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:
H. R. 6970. A bill for the relief of Karel Vaclav Malinovsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1720. By Mr. TAYLOR: Petition of Mrs. L. Marion Luther and 17 other citizens of Hudson Falls, N. Y., urging the passage of Senate bill 1847 and House bill 2428; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1721. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition of Mrs. H. J. Hill and others, urging the passage of a bill to prohibit alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1722. By Mr. HOLMES: Petition of the Wallalu, Wash., WCTU, containing 84 signatures, urging legislation outlawing alcoholic-beverage advertising over the air and through the channels of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1723. Also, petitions by residents of the Walla Walla, Wash., area, bearing 60 signatures, urging the outlawing of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the air and through the channels of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1724. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of members of the Arena Club, of Meade, Kans., asking for passage of House bill 331, admitting Alaska to statehood; to the Committee on Public Lands.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 25, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who art the light of all our seeing, we thank Thee for this quiet moment when facing bewildering human issues, with heavy responsibilities committed to our hands, we can look away from things seen to things unseen and confidently express our faith in God we trust. We come asking that in the secret places of the inner life there may be those spiritual deposits and resources, that strength of conviction, that loyalty to ideals, that scorn of cowardly expediency, that shall give poise and courage and an undeviating devotion to the right as Thou dost give us to see the right. We ask it in the name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HAYDEN, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 24, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 152) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings relative to the Federal Fair Employment Practices Act for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday, the time today until the hour of 1:30 o'clock is to be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the pending joint resolution, and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. HAYDEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. It is understood, I assume, that the time consumed by the quorum call will be taken equally from the proponents and the opponents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so understands.

The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Martin
Anderson	Hoey	Maybank
Benton	Holland	Millikin
Brewster	Humphrey	Mundt
Bricker	Hunt	Murray
Butler	Ives	Neely
Byrd	Jenner	O'Conor
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Cordon	Kefauver	Russell
Donnell	Kem	Saltonstall
Douglas	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Downey	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Knowland	Sparkman
Eastland	Langer	Stennis
Ecton	Leahy	Taylor
Ferguson	Lehman	Thomas, Utah
Frear	Lodge	Thye
Fulbright	Long	Tobey
George	Lucas	Tydings
Gillette	McCarran	Vandenberg
Graham	McCarthy	Watkins
Green	McClellan	Wherry
Gurney	McFarland	Wiley
Hayden	McKellar	Williams
Hendrickson	McMahon	Young
Hickenlooper	Magnuson	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is absent on important public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is unavoidably absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire

[Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are necessarily absent.

The junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. GEORGE, and by unanimous consent, the Finance Committee was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. MAYBANK, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on the Treasury and Post Office of the Appropriations Committee was authorized to meet during the remainder of the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN—PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 25) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As the Chair has stated, the time from now until 1:30 o'clock is equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the joint resolution and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to say a word on the subject of the equal rights amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 25, now pending before the Senate. As a long-time cosponsor of this proposal it has been my firm conviction that the time is overdue for the submittal to the respective States of this proposed constitutional amendment in order that they in turn may come to a decision on this long-debated theme.

I call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the amendment does not of itself have the force of law even following a two-thirds vote of both Houses. Rather, its validation is dependent upon ratification by three-fourths of the States.

I congratulate all the many alert women of our Nation banded together in organizations which have fought the good fight for a full century in order to assure fair and equal treatment for the members of their sex. They secured a partial victory when the nineteenth amendment was ratified in 1920, assuring both male and female citizens equal political rights as voters. However, that amendment did not assure them equal legal rights and from that flaw has stemmed the demand for enactment of the current amendment.

During the Eightieth Congress, it was my pleasure to serve as chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary which favorably reported the amendment to the Senate. However, that was but one occasion in the 27 consecutive years in which the proposed amendment, in one form or another, has been before the Congress. Since 1923, as cited yesterday by my able colleague from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], 26 different hearings have been held on it.

I call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that both major party platforms have endorsed the amendment. I believe, Mr. President, that a promise is a promise, that a platform pledge should not be broken, and that it is altogether fitting and proper that we keep the faith with the women of the Nation and submit the amendment to the States for ratification. Surely that is in keeping with the spirit of democracy.

We all recognize that some of the leading legal minds in the land have given different analyses of the effect of the amendment. However, it is a fact that the respective State legislatures are more than competent to evaluate those legal analyses and come to their own decision. Surely the judgment of such outstanding organizations as the National Women's Party, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, and many other outstanding groups which have endorsed the amendment cannot lightly be dismissed.

The amendment does not require uniformity of laws among the 48 States. It grants no new rights. It merely declares that no law passed by either the Congress or by any State legislature shall be constitutional if such law denies equality of rights on account of sex.

It is my hope, therefore, and I believe it is the hope of the women of Wisconsin, that the Congress will pass the pending joint resolution and refer the amendment to the States for their own judgment. Our action will mark another forward step in the progress of womankind.

Mr. President, I will vote against all pending amendments offered from the floor, because I feel that it is rather inappropriate for the Senate to decide in a few moments on entirely new amendments which have never been submitted before but which should more appropriately have been presented for debate long before this. With all due respect to my able colleague from Arizona, I feel that the Hayden amendment is particularly unjustified, because it offers in one breath a constitutional change and in the next embodies a direct contradiction of that change. In one paragraph it would grant women equality and in a second wipe out that equality by granting special benefits and exemptions. The confusion that would result from the Hayden amendment would becloud all possible action in the States. I feel that out of respect for the 30 national women's organizations with a membership of approximately 40,000,000, we in the Senate should adopt the original amendment as offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and cosponsors.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I now yield 10 minutes to the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Wyoming is proud to have the privilege of sponsoring, together with some 30 other Members of this distinguished body, the equal-rights amendment. In doing so I am carrying on a tradition which has been in vogue in the State of Wyoming for some 81 years, for it was in the year 1869 that the first territorial legislature of my State convened, and it passed a women's suffrage act which was not only the first of its kind to be adopted in this Nation, but, I am advised, the first in all the world.

Again, Mr. President, in the Wyoming constitutional convention of 1889 proposition No. 25, providing for equal suffrage for women, was written into the State constitution. So I am pleased to support in the Senate of the United States a theory which has been in vogue in my own State so long and from which the State of Wyoming takes its name as the Equality State.

It is strange to relate, however, Mr. President, that it was only last year, 1949, or 80 years later, that the Equality State finally, by an act of the legislature, permitted women to serve on juries in the district courts of the State. It is to obviate such situations or such injustices at this time that I have lent my wholehearted support to the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 25.

Mr. President, in passing I might say that in the original act of 1869 in the Wyoming Legislature crippling amendments were submitted. It would be very interesting, I think, if I were to comment briefly on some of those amendments. The original bill referred to the fair sex as "ladies." An amendment was submitted, the purpose of which was to delete the word "ladies" and insert the words "squaws and colored women."

Another crippling amendment, as I remember from reading Wyoming history, was submitted, the purpose of which was to lay the bill on the table until July 4, 100 years hence.

Mr. President, the enactment of the nineteenth amendment was thought to give women full equality with men. Actually, however, all it accomplished was simply to provide all women who were citizens of the United States with the unquestionable right to vote. It was then necessary for them, through efforts exerted in the legislatures of the several States, to attempt to get the other discriminatory statutes written off the books. In this effort they have been partially successful, but many States still maintain and enforce laws which are discriminatory against both married women and employed women.

I cannot help but feel, and in this I know thousands of men and women in

all walks of life join me, that it is unfair with one hand to give to a woman the right to vote in a democratic system of government and with the other hand make it impossible for her to follow her chosen line of work, which may be the only work in which she is trained or which she is capable of doing, by allowing, as I have said, discriminatory wage-and-hour legislation to be written into State laws. Nor is it fair and equitable for an individual State to determine that a woman citizen of the State cannot bring a tort action for injury received to her own person unless her husband joins in the action, or cannot deed her own property without having her husband as a cograntor, or that a woman must have a court order or her husband's consent before she can establish a business or keep the profits from such business. Laws such as these make one gasp by their outmodedness and discrimination, but they exist in some States. In the States where they do exist, by the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 25, we shall make it possible for a constitutional amendment on the subject subsequently to be adopted, thus removing any such discriminations.

Mr. President, our Constitution does not specifically differentiate between men and women, nor do the constitutions of the States having laws such as those just cited. But our courts, following the old English law, have interpreted the constitutions to apply only to men, thus making it necessary to specifically provide for the women of this country.

Mr. President, during the recent war, many of the barriers against women were dropped entirely or partially relaxed through necessity, and we found that the women of the United States willingly accepted the burdens cast upon them in military service and in war production; they joined shoulder-to-shoulder with the men of the Nation in our gigantic effort. Let us, therefore, before these barricades become inalterably entrenched again, amend our Constitution to provide "equal justice under law"—the motto which we have caused to be carved on our Supreme Court Building. The one and only way of assuring this equal justice is by passage of Senate Joint Resolution 25 by this body, and then by untiring work to secure the ratification of the amendment by the necessary number of States.

Mr. President, in the event this body, the distinguished United States Senate, should deem it necessary to withhold equal rights from one-half of our population, I contend that they should not be withheld from the better half.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa yielded 10 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming, and 2 minutes of that time remain. Does the Senator from Iowa wish to use further time at this point?

Mr. GILLETTE. No, Mr. President; I am glad to have the opponents now use some of their time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, how much time remains to those on our side of the question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-seven minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] 7 minutes, or as much thereof as he wishes to use.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The junior Senator from New York is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise for the second time in the last 2 days to oppose the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 25. I do so because I believe the joint resolution, far from conferring additional rights on women, may greatly curtail or destroy the rights they have today.

For 40 years, both before I entered public life and since then, I have been working in behalf of the safeguarding and protection of the rights of women. Women have made tremendous progress in the rights they have obtained in the various States of the Union. In the State of New York, which I have the honor in part to represent, and I am sure in all the other States of the Union, there has developed during those 40 years a great mass of social and labor legislation in protection of women. Moreover, there have grown up important legal traditions and court decisions. Today, in most States, women are being protected in connection with conditions of work, minimum wages, maximum hours, domestic relations, divorce and alimony proceedings, in support of the family and in many other ways. I am convinced that all these protections will be placed in great jeopardy if Senate Joint Resolution 25 is enacted. No judge or responsible lawyer has told me that there can possibly be any assurance that the great mass of legislative enactments and legal traditions and decisions which have been built up over many decades will be safeguarded if the pending joint resolution is passed. I doubt very much whether they will be safeguarded even if the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is adopted, since I believe there will always be a legal question with regard to whether a law now on the statute books or to be passed at a later date will be construed to impair any of the rights, benefits, or exemptions which may be conferred by law upon persons of the female sex, or whether such enactments are contrary to the body of the joint resolution and the subsequent amendment proposed to be incorporated into the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator object to yielding for an inquiry?

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should prefer to continue, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Certainly.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, what is to be gained by the passage of this joint resolution? I know of no State in the Union in which women suffer political disabilities at the present time. They can run for office, whether it be that of President of the United States or Vice President or Member of the Senate or Member of the House of Representatives, or officer in any unit of government within the United States. Women can hold any office, either in public or in private life. There are today virtually no limitations on the employment of women. The only one I know of in the State of New York is a prohibition against permitting women to work in the mines of the State.

Mr. President, in my opinion this joint resolution confers absolutely no additional rights of any kind upon women. It seeks to correct some of the disabilities which exist because of prejudice or because of custom. But the proposed constitutional amendment will not serve that purpose. If a man wishes to employ a man doctor, he is not going to employ a woman doctor simply because of the amendment which it is proposed to have incorporated in the Constitution. If a man wishes to employ a man lawyer, he is not going to be forced into employing a woman lawyer. If a man wishes to promote someone in his office or give employment to someone, he is not going to be compelled by the passage of this joint resolution or any other measure or by any provision in the Constitution of the United States to act contrary to his judgment.

Mr. President, I think the risk involved in passing this joint resolution is far too great. Undoubtedly if the amendment to the Constitution shall finally be adopted, we shall jeopardize the great mass of protective, social, and labor legislation which has been built up; we shall risk and shall place in jeopardy the court decisions and the legal traditions which have been established. Certainly at best there cannot possibly be any doubt in the mind of anyone that the passage of the joint resolution will place in great jeopardy all the enactments I have enumerated, and hundreds in addition thereto.

I think the joint resolution, if passed, will do a great disservice to the women of the country. I deeply hope it will be defeated in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York has half a minute remaining.

Mr. PEPPER. I beg the Senator's pardon; I did not know he was speaking under a limitation of time.

I was going to ask the able Senator what type of legislation favorable to women, now upon the statute books, does he believe would be impaired or invalidated if the proposed constitutional amendment were adopted.

Mr. LEHMAN. In my State, I think the statute covering minimum wages for women, inasmuch as under the State constitution no minimum wage is permitted for men, would certainly be declared unconstitutional. I believe the limitation on hours of work of women would be declared unconstitutional, because in our State there is no limitation upon the hours of work of men. I believe the question of support of children and alimony would certainly be placed in very great jeopardy. These are only a few of our statutes which might be destroyed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, yesterday and again today in this debate on the proposed constitutional amendment aimed to provide equal rights for women, a strong case has been made against the amendment itself. Amendments to the amendment are being offered, and it would appear that on the basis of the intrinsic merit of the proposed constitutional amendment alone, as it stands and of itself, it might not receive sufficient support in the Senate to permit its approval.

I listened yesterday with much interest, as I have again today, to the remarks of my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], in which he gave a partial outline of the many legislative enactments in our State which, over the years, have been provided for the special protection of women. As he so generously indicated in his remarks, I also contributed in substantial degree in promoting many of these legislative enactments. I concur with many of his observations regarding the merit of the proposed constitutional amendment itself, although I feel that the situation which it provokes is one open to broad and searching debate and probable court determination.

I am not speaking in favor of the proposed constitutional amendment. I am speaking on what I consider to be the primary question before the Senate—the matter of the submission of this amendment to the States for ratification or rejection.

As has been pointed out so frequently in this debate, this question has been before the Congress for 27 years. During this same period the submission of the amendment to the States for ratification has frequently been advocated in platform planks of both major political parties. It has been a constantly recurring question. It is one which cannot be ignored.

Neither do I believe that it can be resolved satisfactorily by the alternative proposal in the form of the substitute amendment, meritorious though such a proposal may be in and of itself and apart from the main question of the proposed constitutional amendment. It seems to me that this proposed constitutional amendment is so vital and so far-reaching in its implications and potential consequences that it should be submitted for the individual consideration of the several States.

Affecting the fundamental rights of the States themselves to so great degree as does this proposed constitutional amendment, the States in turn by direct action should be required to make the decision. Each State knows far better than can we in the Congress how the proposed amendment might affect it.

Furthermore, this is a very basic matter in our society which would have a direct and powerful effect upon the well-being of at least half of our population. Probably no amendment to the Constitution having a greater effect upon more people in the United States has ever been proposed. Here again it seems to me to be of the utmost importance that the States themselves should be called upon to make direct and individual determination.

At the same time, two of the amendments which have been proposed, the one by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], which would place a time limitation for ratification, and the one offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], which is aimed to prevent any impairment of "any rights, benefits, or exemptions conferred by law upon persons of the female sex," seems to be most desirable.

As a former member of the legislature of my State for many years, I long ago became convinced of the ever present need for a time limit for the ratification of amendments to the Constitution of the United States, and I long ago reached the personal decision that I would not support any proposed constitutional amendment, no matter how meritorious, unless it carried with it such a time limitation provision.

For the reasons I have briefly indicated, I expect to vote in favor of Senate Joint Resolution 25, if either the amendment to it offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] or one of a similar nature is adopted. In so voting, however, I do not wish my action to be construed in any sense as an endorsement of the proposed constitutional amendment itself.

I thank the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am unable to treat lightly any proposal to change or alter the organic law of our country. In my opinion any measure seeking to change or repeal any provision of the Constitution of the United States or to insert a new section should be weighed most carefully by the Members of the Congress before it is passed to the States with our approval. The mere fact that the amendment has been pending in one form or other before the Congress for a number of years is, to me, of itself no endorsement. Believing that it is neither necessary nor desirable, I shall vote against the submission of the amendment to the States.

Mr. President, the amendment is a Pandora's box. If it is opened, no living human being can possibly estimate the consequences that will flow from such action. It will cause confusion unspeakable. It will strike down any number of salutary statutes enacted by the legislatures of the 48 States for the protection or for the benefit of women. It will likewise jeopardize or eliminate any number of ordinances approved by the governing bodies of the municipalities of the Nation dealing with the same subject. It will be a blow at the philosophy of local self-government, in which I firmly believe. Approval in its present form will be more dire in its consequences than any man can possibly predict at this juncture. It bears a euphonious title, the title of "Equal Rights." Of late, Mr. President, we have frequently seen legislation submitted to the Congress that had little to commend it other than the euphony of the title of the proposed act. We should not enact legislation merely because it is given an attractive label.

I have made no study of this subject in detail, but I know that in my own State the adoption of the amendment would take away rights which are absolutely vital to the women of my State. We have provisions in the laws of my State under which any woman and her minor children may obtain a year's support from the estate of a decedent husband, even prior to many claims of creditors which may be involved. What would be the effect of the amendment? Would it be to deny the women of the States which have the year's support law or similar statutes, the right to a year's support, or would it confer a year's support upon the husband in case of the death of a wife who owned property?

In my own State we have statutes which entitle women to alimony and to support, and even criminal statutes, under which a husband can be punished for failure to support his family. What would be the effect of the amendment upon those statutes? Would it deny those rights to all married women or would it create for all husbands the right of alimony and the right of support from the wife.

I could proceed almost without end to recite various laws which exist in practically all the States, and which are very beneficial to the women of the country, and, more than that, to the children for whose care they are especially charged. We have a rule of law in my own State, and I am sure it obtains in a great many other States, that, unless there is some overriding reason to the contrary, based upon the bad character of the wife, she is entitled, in case of separation, to have the custody of minor children. What effect would the amendment have upon those laws? No man can safely predict. We have statutes which have been enacted to protect women who are now engaged in earning their livelihood in my State, and in nearly all others. Would the amendment strike down those statutes, or would it give the same rights and privileges to men, and thereby stop the operations of hundreds of industries which are compelled to perform certain types of work which women cannot do under laws for their protection.

Mr. President, I cannot conceive of a more mischievous proposition than the one now pending before the Senate. It would take away from city councils and city aldermanic boards the right to pass any regulation or ordinance for the benefit of women, unless it applied equally to men. It would deny to the legislatures of the 48 States the right to legislate for the protection of women in any degree, unless the same rights were conferred upon men. It would deny to the Congress of the United States the right to enact legislation for the benefit and protection of women, unless the same rights were accorded to men.

Mr. President, my objections to the amendment are many. There is another fundamental objection to the proposal. It not only denies to the State legislative bodies, the municipal law-making agencies, and the Congress the right to enact laws in this field, but it transfers law-making power in the fields of descent and distribution, domestic relations and the protection of women in industry, from all the State legislative bodies, who are elected by the people for that purpose, to the Supreme Court of the United States. In the last analysis, if the amendment be approved, that is where the laws will be written in those fields. Almost every question that can be conceived of, dealing with these subjects will become immediately a constitutional question in the Federal courts of the land, and it will give to the Supreme Court a tremendous legislative power in the field of policy, which I do not think should be vested in that Court.

Indeed, Mr. President, the Court has shown a disposition, particularly of late years, to invade the legislative field, and to legislate in areas where it claims to find a vacuum, or no law. If we strike down the great mass of these laws, which either stem from the common law or have been enacted over a period of 200 years, it will be an invitation to the Supreme Court of the United States to legislate and declare policy in detail in the field of domestic relations, laws of descent and distribution, and laws that pertain to the protection of women in industry. I cannot conceive of a more grievous blow to the right of local self-government in this country, with the centralization of power over the lives of our people in one building here in Washington, than would result if the amendment were adopted.

Mr. President, I have often inquired of those who have approached me and have sought to enlist my support of the amendment as to just what rights they were seeking. I knew a great many rights which would be taken from women, but I have asked as to the rights which would be conferred upon them if the amendment were adopted. I have had a number of answers to the question, but the most substantial one has been that it would confer the right to serve upon juries in every State. I am not too sure of that, as a matter of law, because there is a grave question as to whether service on a jury is a duty or a right. I do not know whether the proposed constitutional amendment would even confer that as a right, but if it did, it is absosolutely unnecessary, for the Congress to take this drastic step in other fields, in order to assure the right to serve upon juries. Mr. President, I make the statement, without fear of successful contradiction, that when any considerable number of women in any State of the 48 States desire to serve upon juries, all that it is necessary for them to do is to go to the State capital of their State and they will be granted the right immediately by the State legislatures. The State legislatures seek the votes of women, just as we seek them when we are candidates for Federal office, and the political power of women in the several States would be as great or greater than it would be here to secure the right to serve upon juries, if they so desire. I, for one, Mr. President, am not in favor of forcing the women who might not choose to serve on juries to do so through a constitutional amendment, particularly in view of the unrelated evil consequences which would flow from adding this unnecessary language to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, I do not believe any considerable number of women in this Nation desire this constitutional amendment. It is claimed that there is a great body of sentiment in favor of it, but, in my opinion, the fact that resolutions of this character have been presented from year to year is the clearest illustration of the danger in which the country stands of succumbing to the clamor of minority groups who are vocal and who constantly press their claims upon the Congress and upon the other organizations which contribute to the operations of our Government.

That declarations in favor of such an amendment have appeared frequently in the platforms of both political parties, in my opinion, is due to the fact there have been a few good women, who, in their mistaken zeal, have appeared before the platform committees in political conventions and have insisted upon the inclusion of this subject in the catch-all platforms of the political parties. I do not believe that there is any ground swell from the masses of women of the Nation in favor of any such legislation. On the contrary, I am confident that if the effect of the proposition were fully explained to all of the women of the United States, they would bitterly oppose it. A great many women's organizations are already fighting against its adoption and it is unlikely that a majority of the women favor it now, even with its attractive title.

It so happens that the women who are engaged most actively in rearing families or in industry sometimes do not have the means of expression through organizations such as are possessed by other groups. It is no commendation of the merits of the issue that it has been contained in party platforms and has been pressed from year to year. To me it is only an indication of the unwholesome effect of the power of pressure groups and organizations which is made manifest in many other ways than in this proposed amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. President, I have proposed an amendment to the resolution providing that if enacted, the proposed constitutional change may be permitted to pend before the State legislatures for only 5 years. I have discussed the time limit with a number of Senators favoring the resolution, and I think there is very general agreement that it is unwise not to adopt some time limitation on the constitutional amendment if it be proposed to the States. The most recent amendment provided for a period of 7 years, and my amendment, as modified now, provides for a period of 7 years for the proposal to be before the legislatures of the several States.

Mr. President, I ask at this stage to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I received this morning from Mr. William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, in opposition to the joint resolution; a letter from Mr. Nathan E. Cowan, director, legislative department, Congress of Industrial Organizations, opposing the adoption of the joint resolution, and a statement signed by a number of eminent jurists and lawyers, and deans of law schools, pointing out a few of the evil consequences which will flow from the adoption of the resolution.

There being no objection, the letters and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1950.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The American Federation of Labor firmly opposes the enactment of the equal-rights amendment now under consideration by the Senate, and supports the women's status bill. The American Federation of Labor believes in actual equal rights for men and women which will protect the status of all women and not merely wealthy women. Furthermore, being especially interested in the home and the well-being of the child, it is seriously alarmed because the equal-rights amendment will destroy all laws which recognize a specific responsibility for the support of minor children.

We believe in specific legislation through which to wipe out specific inequalities which work to the detriment of women. The proposed equal-rights amendment would destroy all existing legislation which recognizes different but not lesser responsibilities of women. We quote the late Mr. Justice Hughes who stated, in upholding a minimum wage law for women, "You cannot change the sex of a person by a mere stroke of the pen." We recognize not only the different physical capacities of women and hence the need for different standards of employment in certain cases, but we recognize also the actual fact that until women have reached a period of organization through which they may bargain effectively along with men, that it is necessary to give them a base below which no employer may place them in regard to wages, hours, and other working conditions.

While we realize that in time each State would no doubt enact laws which would protect the well-being of the child, we submit that until such laws are enacted the wiping out of present support laws would work a tremendous harm to thousands of our children.

We, therefore, will continue to urge specific laws to repeal specific inequalities, and oppose blanket legislation as contained in the equal-rights amendment through which much more harm than good would be accomplished.

We urge that you support and vote in accordance with our position regarding this proposal as set forth above.

Very truly yours,

W. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1950.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, I am writing you to once more state our opposition to the so-called equal-rights amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 25.

The CIO has consistently opposed this proposed amendment on the basis that it strikes down all State and Federal labor laws enacted for the benefit of women. Utter chaos would result in this field were the amendment to be adopted.

Mr. Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, has previously pointed out that the proposal "actually conceals the means of robbing women of the rights and protections that have been won for them."

Mr. Murray has further stated: "It would not secure equality of treatment for women, except at the heavy cost of abandoning the great body of laws that protect women workers from exploitation.

"Laws limiting the hours women may be required to work, regulating health and other working conditions, securing minimum-wage rates in traditionally low-paid industries, and the like, would cease to be effective if this amendment were to become part of our Constitution.

"In addition, laws and other beneficial provisions such as maternity aid, widows' pensions, aid for dependent children, and other social-security protective measures that apply 'unequally' to women would also be abolished.

"We submit that this would not mean 'equal rights,' but would return women workers to conditions that they and the organized labor movement, together with Congress, have long sought to eliminate."

For these reasons we urgently request you to vote against Senate Joint Resolution 25 when it comes before you for consideration.

Sincerely yours,

NATHAN E. COWAN,
Director, CIO Legislative Department.

These lawyers and legal scholars—regardless of party, and regardless of political or economic views—oppose the so-called equal-rights amendment and endorse the statement set forth herein, on the legal implication of the proposed amendment, prepared by Prof. Paul Freund, of the Harvard Law School.

Clarence Manion, dean of the College of Law, University of Notre Dame, Indiana.

Silas Strawn, former president, American Bar Association.

Charles Warren, constitutional lawyer and author of "The Supreme Court in United States History," Washington, D. C.

George Maurice Morris, former president, American Bar Association, Washington, D. C.

Marion J. Harron, judge, Tax Court of the United States.

Walter Gellhorn, professor of law, Columbia University Law School.

Glenn A. McCleary, dean of the law school, University of Missouri.

Dorothy Straus, lawyer, New York City.

D. W. Woodbridge, acting dean, department of jurisprudence, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.

Marvin C. Harrison, lawyer, Cleveland, Ohio.

M. R. Kirkwood, professor of law, Stanford University Law School, California.

Joseph Padway, general counsel for the A. F. of L., Washington, D. C.

Leon Green, dean of the law school, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

Dorothy Kenyon, lawyer and former judge of municipal court, New York City.

E. Blythe Stason, dean of the law school, University of Michigan.

Morris Ernst, lawyer, New York City.

William Draper Lewis, former dean, University of Pennsylvania Law School, Philadelphia.

Charles C. Burlingham, lawyer, New York City.

Patrick O'Brien, probate judge of Wayne County, Detroit, Mich.

Godfrey Schmidt, professor of law, Fordham University, New York City.

Robert H. Wettach, dean of the school of law, University of North Carolina.

Isabel Simons, lawyer, Highland Park, Ill.

Patrick Nertney, lawyer, and chairman, Detroit Chapter, National Lawyers Guild, Detroit, Mich.

Walter Frank, lawyer, New York City.

Harry R. Trusler, dean of the college of law, University of Florida.

Douglas B. Maggs, professor of law, Duke University School of Law, and former solicitor, United States Department of Labor.

George Burke, former general counsel, OPA, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Gerard Reilly, lawyer, and member National Labor Relations Board.

William H. Holly, United States district judge, Chicago.

Roscoe Pound, former dean, Harvard Law School.

Everett Fraser, dean of the law school, University of Minnesota.

Monte M. Lemann, lawyer, New Orleans, La.

Albert J. Harno, dean of the college of law, University of Illinois.

Lowell Turrentine, acting dean, school of law, Stanford University, California.

Willard Hurst, professor of law, University of Wisconsin Law School.

Francis Swietlik, dean of Marquette University Law School, Milwaukee, Wis.

N. Ruth Wood, lawyer, St. Louis, Mo.

Henry B. Witham, dean of the law school, Indiana University.

C. M. Finfrock, dean of the school of law, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

Sayre MacNeil, dean of the school of law, Loyola University, Los Angeles.

Frank Donner, counsel for the CIO, Washington, D. C.

E. Merrick Dodd, professor, law, Harvard Law School.

Harry Shulman, professor of law, Yale University Law School.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON THE
STATUS OF WOMEN
IN THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.

The following statement on legal implications of proposed Federal equal-rights amendment has been endorsed by deans and professors of 21 leading law schools and by eminent attorneys, jurists, and constitutional lawyers, including former presidents of the American Bar Association and the general counsel for the two great labor organizations.

"The proposed amendment to the Constitution reads as follows:

" 'That equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

" 'This amendment shall take effect 3 years after the date of ratification.'

"If anything about this proposed amendment is clear, it is that it would transform every provision of law concerning women into a constitutional issue to be ultimately resolved by the Supreme Court of the United States. Every statutory and common-law provision dealing with the manifold relation of women in society would be forced to run the gauntlet of attack on constitutional grounds. The range of such potential litigation is too great to be readily foreseen, but it would certainly embrace such diverse legal provisions as those relating to a widow's allowance, the obligation of family support and grounds for divorce, the age of majority, and the right of annulment of marriages, and the maximum hours of labor for women in protected industries.

"Not only is the range of the amendment of indefinite extent but, even more important, the fate of all this varied legislation would be left highly uncertain in the face of judicial review. Presumably the amendment would set up a constitutional yardstick of absolute equality between men and women in all legal relationships. A more flexible view, permitting reasonable differentiation, can hardly be regarded as the object of the proposal, since the fourteenth amendment has long provided that no State shall deny to any person the equal protection of the laws, and that amendment permits reasonable classifications while prohibiting arbitrary legal discrimination. If it were intended to give the courts the authority to pass upon the propriety of distinctions, benefits, and duties as between men and women, no new guidance is given to the courts, and this entire subject, one of unusual complexity, would be left to the unpredictable judgments of courts in the form of constitutional decisions.

"Such decisions could not be changed by act of the legislature. Such a responsibility upon the courts would be doubtless as unwelcome to them as it would be inappropriate. As has been stated, however, the proposal evidently contemplates no flexibility in construction, but rather a rule of rigid equality. This branch of the dilemma is as repelling as the other. It appears to be accepted by what is currently the most authoritative statement on this amendment—the report of the House Judiciary Committee, House Report 907, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, on House Joint Resolution 49, dated July 12, 1945. The majority of the committee appears to recognize that, under the amendment, the many laws protecting the safety and welfare of women in industry would necessarily fall. The committee states: 'To say the least of the matter, many of the large organizations of women represented in hearings before the committee have expressed a sincere desire to waive the so-called preferential benefits now accorded to women by various laws so as to permit them to follow economic activities from which they are now excluded.'

"It would not be feasible to attempt to enumerate the wide variety of laws and rules of the common law which would fall under the impact of the amendment. Some conception of their scope may, however, be given by recalling the variety of relationships in which women stand in the community. These relationships may be summarized as (a) wage earner, (b) member of a family, (c) citizen, (d) individual. The law has recognized and attempted to deal with these relationships in a concrete way. Doubtless there are difficulties and anachronisms in the law which should be remedied. But the method adopted by the amendment is to ignore the basis for all that has been at the foundation of these measures, and to substitute an abstract rule of thumb. The practical effect of such a course can be suggested by referring briefly to each of the four categories mentioned above.

"(a) As wage earners: One of the most familiar forms of legislation is that which confers special protection on women in industry, through the prohibition of employment in hazardous occupations and through regulation of night work and maximum hours of labor. Presumably the long struggle to place these protective measures on the statute books would be set at naught by the adoption of the amendment. Specifically, such statutes would apparently have to be held invalid as denying to women the equal right to work or as denying to men the equal right of protection under the law, for, it is to be noted, the amendment requires equality of rights under the law, permitting either men or women to claim exact equality. How the problem would be met can only be left to conjecture. If a State legislature failed to revise the laws giving special protection to women in certain industries, it is left uncertain whether the entire pattern of industrial legislation would be torn apart by judicial decision or whether a court would undertake to legislate by raising the same protection for men. Surely the work

of generations ought not to be left to this blind hazard.

"(b) As members of the family: Legislation in the latter part of the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth century, commonly known as married women's acts, fairly universally, in this country removed the disabilities which the common law had placed upon married women with respect to the right to sue and be sued, the right to own separate property, and the right to engage in commercial transactions. It is true that in some States certain remnants of these disabilities have persisted. In a few States, for example, a married woman may not become a surety for her husband's debts, on the theory that she might otherwise be imposed upon; if the reason which has led some States to retain this disability is not a sufficient one, the disability should, of course, be removed by further legislation.

"Similarly, in a few States a married woman's earnings, while belonging to her if they result from work outside the home, are held to inure to the husband if they are produced by working inside the home. Whether this is a fair adjustment in view of the husband's primary duty to support the family may be a fairly debatable question, which again can be resolved by further legislation if further reform is thought desirable. The proposed amendment would leave no room for legislative experiment along these lines, but would impose a requirement of absolute equality in the property rights of husband and wife.

"More seriously, it would presumably abolish the common rule whereby a husband has the primary duty of support toward his family, and whereby in many jurisdictions failure to render such support is a ground for separation or divorce. Precisely how the law of support is to be transformed as a result of the amendment is by no means clear. The concept of a primary duty does not lend itself to a rule of equality.

"The very least that can be said is that the complex and delicate field of marital relationships and divorce, into which Congress has sedulously declined to enter in the past, would now be gravely affected by the tangential force of a constitutional amendment, which would not even rest on a study of the manifold problems involved.

"It is worthy of note that the community-property systems of eight Western States, which have evolved differently from the common-law systems and which, in general, have recognized for a longer period the coordinate status of husband and wife, nevertheless contain inequalities which would doubtless be rendered invalid under the amendment. Thus the husband is generally regarded as a kind of managing partner with special powers not possessed by the wife in respect of community property. Legislation would doubtless be required to produce conformity with the dictates of the amendment, and the ramifications of such legislation, particularly with respect to the special tax status of persons owning community property, cannot be predicted with certainty.

"(c) As citizens: While the suffrage amendment and other legislation have generally guaranteed to women an equality of civil and political rights, there remain some gaps which it is undoubtedly one purpose of the amendment to close. One of these is the distinction drawn in some States between the obligation of men and that of women for jury service. But whether the amendment would in fact require a change in this field is itself uncertain, since it is fairly arguable that jury service is not a right but a duty and hence not within the scope of the amendment. Indeed, the amendment opens up a whole field of potential controversy turning on distinction between rights and duties.

"(d) As individuals. A common legislative difference in the treatment of men and women concerns the age of majority, which is generally lower for the latter. This difference has long been accepted as reflecting physical realities. Presumably the distinction would no longer be valid. But if a legislature failed to change the law, the outcome would present something of a legal puzzle. If the age of majority for men is 18 and women 16, it can hardly be foretold whether equality would require a lowering of the former or a raising of the latter. If the standard be that of the greater right, it could be asserted that the lower age for women provides a greater right to marry but at the same time a more restricted right to annul on the ground of minority. How a court would solve the conundrum is, like most problems created by the proposed amendment, a matter purely of speculation.

"The basic fallacy in the proposed amendment is that it attempts to deal with complicated and highly concrete problems arising out of a diversity of human relationships in terms of a single and simple abstraction. This abstraction is undoubtedly a worthy ideal for mobilizing legislative forces in order to remedy particular deficiencies in the law. But as a constitutional standard, it is hopelessly inept. That the proposed equal-rights amendment would open up an era of regrettable consequences for the legal status of women in this country is highly probable. That it would open up a period of extreme confusion in constitutional law is a certainty.

"PAUL FREUND,
"Professor of Law, Harvard Law School."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in my opinion, no rights which are substantial in nature would be conferred on the women of America by the submission and approval of this proposed constitutional amendment. To the contrary, it would result in the deprivation of substantial rights to which the women of the Nation are entitled and which they today enjoy.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject the joint resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Has the Senator from Georgia offered his amendment changing the time from 5 to 7 years?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, it is proposed to strike out lines 6 and 7, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress; and, if so ratified, shall take effect upon the expiration of 1 year after the date of such ratification.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, having consulted with some of the leaders on our side of the controversy, I will say that we shall be glad to accept the amendment as modified.

Mr. President, I yield 9 minutes to the senior Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I shall take only 5 minutes, and I ask that the Senator from Iowa yield the remainder of the time to the eloquent senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. President, the truth of the situation is that American women today have only two rights which cannot be taken away from them by their respective States. One is the right to vote, which has been granted to them by the nineteenth amendment. The other is the right to choose their citizenship if they marry aliens, which is a right granted as a result of an international treaty.

My distinguished friend from Georgia stated a while ago that if only the women of the country were informed, how differently they would feel about the matter. Let me tell my distinguished friend that for nine long years hearings after hearings were held by the Judiciary Committee, notices of which were given——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I refuse to yield. I have only 5 minutes.

Let me say to my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], that women belonging to labor unions from the State of New York appeared before the committee and testified at the very time that the Senator was Governor of New York, that they were unable to receive salaries which they earned as foremen on union jobs, because when inspectors came around the women were shoved aside, and men were put in their place temporarily, so that the inspectors would not know that women were earning the money or were doing the work.

That is not all, Mr. President.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I refuse to yield.

I wish to say, further, Mr. President, that it is strange that the women folk, who rear the families, were not permitted to be on a single draft board during World War I and World War II. It is all right for them to rear the families, but when the Government stepped in and said, "We are going to take your boy and use him for cannon fodder," not a woman was allowed to be on a draft board anywhere in the United States of America. The Government said that the reason for their exclusion was that they were only subcitizens. More recently the Comptroller ruled that women were not persons. Since women were not persons but "females" it took a special statute to enable them to serve their country as physicians.

Why did not the Senators who are opposed to the resolution come before the Judiciary Committee, which considered this measure for nine long years? The arguments that some Senators have made today were never made before that committee at all. I remember very well that when the question of woman suffrage was being considered some years ago a girl from my State, Beulah Amidon, was nearly put in jail in Washington for picketing the White House in favor of woman's suffrage.

The Committee on the Judiciary has studied this subject for 9 years. I, as one of the sponsors of this measure, together with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], am proud of the fact that the women of North Dakota and, I believe, of the Nation, have shown in medicine, in the arts and sciences, and, yes, even in the operation of farms that they are on an equality with men; and I am not at all worried at

the arguments of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that they are going to lose all the rights and protection afforded them by the various States up to this time.

So, Mr. President, I shall support the resolution without any amendment of any kind or character.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I yield 12 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 12 minutes.

ISSUE SHOULD BE REFERRED TO THE STATES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to make it clear that, so far as I am concerned, since the Judiciary Committee has unanimously recommended the submission of this constitutional amendment to the several States since the Congress of the United States has seen the resolution endorsed and recommended by committee after committee over several years, and since the matter deals with a subject which can be finally settled only by the States themselves, it is absolutely impossible for me to understand why some of our friends seek, first, to cripple the proposed amendment, as by the proposal suggested by my good friend, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], or seek to defeat it upon the floor by arguments such as those advanced by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If it be the fact—and I deny it to be the fact—that the proposed amendment to the Constitution is offered only because a vocal minority has repeatedly urged it upon the Congress, certainly such a puny minority cannot sway the legislatures of the several States to ratify the amendment.

The charge is made that the adoption of the amendment would undo benefits and exemptions which are granted by State laws. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona was not presented for consideration to the Judiciary Committee, and no one would be able to define the benefits or exemptions to which this crippling amendment refers, if I may say to my good friend from Arizona. There is no doubt, on the other hand, about the meaning of the word "rights." That word appears in a half dozen or more places in the Constitution of the United States. It is understood in fact as well as in theory.

MODERN WORLD RECOGNIZES EQUAL RIGHTS

I really believe, Mr. President, that those who are opposing the joint resolution are living in the past. They are living with those gentlemen who, in the Constitutional Convention of the State of Wyoming, to which my colleague referred in his address a few moments ago, jeered at the thought of allowing women to vote, and sought by all manner of means to prevent them from obtaining that right. But we are living at a time when all those old inhibitions, it seems to me, have been undone by the very facts of our living.

Mr. President, we have not only granted women the right to vote, but we have taken them into Congress, even into the Senate, and into the Army and the Navy. The modern world needs the services of women and requires the equality provided by the equal-rights amendment. It is merely a recognition of the conditions which exist.

ALLEGED BENEFITS REALLY HANDICAPS

If it be said on the merits that benefits and exemptions granted to women by State laws, in labor legislation, for example, would be lost, I believe there is a simple, plain argument to rebut that contention. I remember when I was a member of the Judiciary Committee, several years ago, before the Reorganization Act compelled Members of the Senate to choose only two standing committees on which to serve, women representatives of trade-unions appeared before the committee and told us how the so-called benefits were really handicaps. There was a provision of law in one State, for example, which required that no woman should be permitted to engage in night work, and the result of that was simply that competent woman proofreaders, members of the union, who were fully equipped to read proof as well as any man, and to have equal pay for the work, were denied the privilege of going on a night shift because of this mistaken benefit, which was really a handicap, which had been handed down from the dim ages of the past.

Mr. President, I say, first, to my friends who are worried by the thought that perhaps benefits and exemptions will be denied, let the people in the States solve that question. The members of the State legislatures are close to the conditions that now are found in business and industry. I say, second, let us not forget that repeatedly these so-called benefits and exemptions are used to bar women from employment they are capable of filling.

I believe the time has come to raise the standards of labor all the way down the line, and if there are any really beneficial laws applying only to women, let them also apply to men.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator knows that I am operating under a time limit.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to yield the Senator 1 minute of my time if he will yield to me now.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator exactly how he would apply the law which prevents women in some States from engaging in vocations where they have to lift packages of a certain size. Would he apply that law to men?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am inclined to believe that the illustration is evidence from a bygone era. Of course, neither men nor women are working nowadays like the singer in Old Man River. They do not have to "tote that barge" or "lift that bale," now as they used to. Modern technology has been doing away with labor of that kind. We have machines today to do that sort of work.

Mr. RUSSELL. So the Senator would be willing to apply to men the laws prohibiting the lifting of packages weighing as much as 50 pounds, and require every retail grocery store to install a lifting machine to lift a case of tomatoes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I recognize the great ability of the Senator from Georgia in extemporaneous debate, but I am willing to permit this matter to be handled by the people in the several States.

It is said that the proposed amendment would do away with special legislation in the States for widows or for expectant mothers, and the like. There is nothing in this amendment which would have the slightest effect in preventing the State legislatures from making such classifications. The equal-rights amendment would not deny and could not deny to any State the authority to pass a law providing special benefits for veterans, for example, on the ground that only equal rights could be granted and, therefore, that no reward could go to veterans unless it went to all men and women whether they were veterans or not. The power of the State legislatures to provide for classifications and categories of women cannot be denied.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. Knowing the attitude of my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming, for a long period of years, and in view of the very fine statement which he has just made of his position, I should like to ask him three direct questions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the senior Senator from Wyoming yield to his colleague for that purpose?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. HUNT. I ask my colleague, first, is he not for the joint resolution because it is fair?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely.

Mr. HUNT. Second, is not my colleague in favor of the joint resolution because it is just?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think it is eminently just.

Mr. HUNT. Third, is not my colleague in favor of the joint resolution because it is right?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The junior Senator from Wyoming has precisely stated my attitude. I might add that I am not one of those who believe that party platforms are to be lightly dismissed as merely the declarations of a few delegates who gather in convention, and who will make promises without the intent to fulfill them merely because they think they may gather in a few votes here or there. Over and over and over again the national conventions of both political parties have declared that it was the policy of the respective parties to submit an equal-rights amendment to the people of the States for decision by them.

PARTY PLATFORM PLEDGES BINDING

I submit, Mr. President, that no Member of the Senate can lightly violate the pledge—the repeated pledge—of the party platforms. I believe that a party platform should be regarded as meaning what it says, and as binding upon the members of the respective parties. I do not take these platform declarations lightly. If there should be a pledge in

the platform to which I was not willing to give my adherence, I would say so at the time. I marvel at Members of the Senate who have declared themselves as supporting fair employment practices, as supporters of the FEPC, saying, "Well, we are for the FEPC, but not when it comes to women."

Why should men and women not have equal rights? Why should we not permit the legislatures of the several States to settle this issue? It has been before the Senate year after year after year, but now, as in the past, the effort is made to defeat it by amendments which contradict the very terms of the joint resolution itself. If this measure is to be voted up or voted down, it should not be upon this floor or upon the floor of the House of Representatives; it should be voted up or down by the legislatures of the several States.

Mr. President, I am glad that the Senator from Iowa, in charge of the joint resolution, has accepted the time amendment of the Senator from Georgia. That is not a crippling amendment. It is a customary limitation of time on the process of ratification.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator from Iowa yield me one more half a minute?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield the Senator half a minute.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was about to say that I hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona and the substitute of the Senator from Tennessee will both be rejected, as totally opposed to the plain intent and purpose of the proposed equal-rights amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of our time, which I believe is 15 minutes, to the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia has 14 minutes remaining at his disposal.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] has 5 minutes under his control.

The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 14 minutes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I formally offer the amendment to which I shall address myself, and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, between lines 4 and 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

> The provisions of this article shall not be construed to impair any rights, benefits, or exemptions conferred by law upon persons of the female sex.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Under the language of the distinguished Senator's proposed amendment, as it now stands, I suggest that there might be a construction limiting its effect to laws of the type described which are now in existence. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator will be willing to accept an amendment as follows: After the word "exemptions" in line 2, add the words "now or hereafter."

Mr. HAYDEN. I have great respect, Mr. President, for the legal judgment of the senior Senator from Colorado, and I believe he is right. I accept the suggestion made that the words he proposes be inserted in the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be modified accordingly.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the proposed amendment to the Constitution, as reported to the Senate, is based upon the fallacy that men and women are so much alike that they should, under all laws, be considered as equals. The truth is that they are not alike to any such degree. In the beginning, God made them different when male and female created He them.

No one can be born without a father and a mother, but my mother did for me what my father could not do. She brought me into the world and as a babe she took me to her breast. My father did for me what my mother could not do. He came to the wild, Apache-infested frontier and there accumulated the means to build the home that sheltered me. He provided my food and my clothing and later for my education. I always honored my father, but it was my mother who constantly watched over my health, who taught me to tell the truth, and not to cheat. It was she who instilled in me the ambition to amount to something among men. It is a treasure in my memory that shortly before she passed away my mother said that I had been a dutiful son and had never spoken an unkind word to her.

Knowing that men and women are inherently different, plain common sense tells me that the law can recognize that difference by granting rights and benefits and exemptions to women which need not necessarily be granted to men. And that is what is now done by the laws of every State in the Union. It is to preserve those laws, beneficial and protective to women, that I offer this amendment.

What the term "rights" means, either in the text as reported to the Senate or in my amendment, is difficult to define. Look up the word "right" in any dictionary and one will find that it has as many different meanings as any other word in the book. But, whatever the meaning may be, it is intended to be the same in both instances.

Webster's dictionary quotes the words of Edmund Burke who said that "men have no right to what is not for their benefit." If that is sound doctrine, it follows that the law can define what is and what is not beneficial to men and to women. Since men and women are different, the laws applicable to them need not be identical.

The term "exemption" as used in my amendment recognizes that there are laws which grant to women freedom from liabilities and burdens to which men are subject.

I offer this amendment because there can be no question that it is the deliberate intention of those who sponsor this change in the Constitution completely to eradicate from the statute books every law in every State which confers any right, benefit, or exemption to women which is not also available to men. The courts lay great stress upon what was said by its proponents at the time of the enactment of any measure and consequently the following words spoken by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] in his address to the Senate on January 23 are of the highest importance:

> The amendment would not deprive the States of the power to classify for the protection of the health, safety, morals, and welfare of the community. In short, it simply assures that this classification shall not be based on the grounds of sex.

Later in his remarks the Senator from Iowa recognized that the question of interpreting and deciding just what the proposed constitutional amendment means would be before the courts when he said:

> Our problem, primarily, is to submit to the States an amendment that will establish the principle of equality of legal rights for all persons in America, regardless of whether they happened to be born male or female. Of course, if by judicial interpretation, after adoption of the proposed amendment, the trend to eliminate unhealthy working conditions for men is accelerated, then I am sure that few of us will regret such an interpretation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the junior Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I ask the Senator if the majority of the legal experts who appeared before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and also before the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives did not feel that all the protective legislation passed by the various States for the benefit of women, as set forth in yesterday's RECORD beginning on page 828, would be in jeopardy?

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no question that the best legal opinion is to that effect. I am very glad that the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] had the information relative to the laws of the several States beneficial to women printed in the RECORD, so as to clarify the issue.

The Senator from Iowa listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a considerable number of national organizations which have endorsed the equal-rights amendment. A longer list prepared by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] appears at page 758 of the RECORD. In his list are organizations which represent a very much larger number of people than the organizations named by the Senator from Iowa. I should like particularly to invite the attention of the Senate to some of the women's organizations named by the Senator from Tennessee as being on record in opposition to the proposed equal-rights amendment to the Constitution:

The National League of Women Voters; the National Council of Catholic Women; National Council of Jewish Women; National Council of Negro Women; National Women's Trade-Union League; Women's National Homeopathic Medical Fraternity; Women's Society for Christian Service of the Methodist Epis-

copal Church (eastern division); Young Women's Christian Associations of the United States of America, through its national board; the American Federation of Women's Auxiliaries of Labor, and the Congress of Women's Auxiliaries of the CIO.

The organizations listed by the junior Senator from Tennessee represent millions of men and women who are opposed to the enactment of the equal-rights amendment as reported to the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] at page 740 of the RECORD, quoted the 1944 national platforms of the two political parties, the Republican platform stating:

> We favor submission by Congress to the States of an amendment to the Constitution providing for equal rights for men and women.

The Democratic platform declared:

> We recommend to Congress the submission of a constitutional amendment on equal rights for women.

I was somewhat surprised to have my good friend the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] insist that these two political platforms endorse the exact words of the equal-rights amendment. That cannot be true, because the exact words of the pending amendment do not appear in either the Republican or the Democratic national platforms. What each of the two national conventions had in mind was an endorsement of the general idea of equal rights for women, without specifying just how that result would be attained. It is my contention that Senators can completely comply with the pledges made in the Democratic platform and the Republican platform if they vote for the equal-rights amendment with my amendment added to it. If both branches of the Congress approve of an amendment to the Contitution in that form, it will be submitted to the States for ratification, as requested by both of the great political parties.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. I ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona if it is not a fact that the sole purpose of his amendment is to protect women against the loss or impairment of rights, privileges, or benefits which they now enjoy under the law?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is exactly its intendment, and that is exactly what those had in mind who have examined into the question, as did the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and as did the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] in endorsing what the Senator from Illinois placed in the RECORD, namely, the long list of State laws beneficial to women, which they, as good lawyers, are convinced will be imperiled.

Mr. NEELY. I have received many letters and telegrams from labor organizations and some from women's associations and clubs urging me to oppose the pending resolution on the ground that if it should be adopted and the proposed constitutional amendment should be ratified, the women would thereby suffer losses infinitely greater than their gains.

In my opinion, the adoption of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arizona would eliminate every valid objection that has been voiced against this measure. Therefore, I shall support the able Senator's amendment, and if it be adopted, I shall vote for the resolution. To my unfeigned regret, if the amendment should be defeated, I shall be impelled to vote against the resolution. I am eager to increase women's blessings. I will not knowingly help to diminish those they now enjoy.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me point out, if I may, in the brief time that remains——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has one more minute.

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall use an exemption as an illustration. In the laws of Arizona there is contained this provision:

> Any woman shall be exempt from jury duty by requesting her name be stricken from the jury list. Such request shall be in writing and placed on file with the county board of supervisors.

That means that an exemption has been granted to women in my State, so that if their family duties are thereby interfered with they cannot be placed upon a jury and locked in a jury room overnight. They may serve if they so desire. But under this equal-rights amendment, that privilege would also be extended to all men, and they could exercise their own judgment as to whether or not they would serve upon a jury.

In Arizona a provision of law specifies the minimum age at which young people may marry. It is fixed at 14 years of age for young men and 12 years of age for young women. Under this proposed equal-rights amendment, that minimum age must be either 12 or 14. Would it be scaled downward, so that the minimum marriage age for both young men and young women would be 12, or would it be scaled upward, so that the minimum age for both would be 14?

Mr. President, such questions are bound to be raised in the courts of every State and in the Supreme Court of the United States with respect to each and every law which grants a right, a benefit, or an exemption to women which men do not now have.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Arizona has expired.

The Senator from Iowa has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, let me immediately disavow any intention on the part of the advocates of this proposal to abolish the distinctions of sex. The glory of each is a part of the lore of all literature.

But, Mr. President, what is proposed by the advocates of this constitutional amendment is that no longer may it be true in America that a woman can proclaim, with Euripides' wretched Medea, that—

> Of all things on earth that breed and grow,
> An herb most bruised is woman.

In short, Mr. President, the amendment proposes that at long last women shall be emancipated and placed before the law equal with the masculine portion of the population.

Mr. President, it cannot be proclaimed that what is the solemn profession of the two major parties of America, who receive, together, almost the entire electoral vote, is the expression of a minority group of this Nation. What is today proclaimed as the aspiration and proposal of this amendment is not only a national sentiment but an international expression.

In 1945 the United Nations Charter proclaimed the equal rights of men and women.

In 1948 the Universal Declaration of Human Rights proclaimed the equal rights of men and women.

In 1949 the draft International Covenant on Human Rights proclaimed the equal rights of all people to enjoy status before the law, regardless of sex.

In 1949 the draft Declaration on the Rights and Duties of States proclaimed the same rights for women and men.

So what we propose today is to accord women equal rights with men—to give women the full status of citizenship.

The amendment proposed by the able Senator from Arizona has a laudable purpose, Mr. President. The advocates of this joint resolution fear, however, that the technical and legal effect of that amendment might be to emasculate the effect of the proposed constitutional amendment itself, if it should finally be adopted. Therefore, they oppose that amendment, first, because it might make ineffectual what the States might ratify as an amendment to the Constitution; and, second, because, with all deference to the honored and able Senator from Arizona, we do not deem his amendment necessary. This constitutional amendment proposes to accord equal rights to women. It does not take away from the Congress or from the several legislatures the privilege and power of making justifiable classifications so as to protect women in proper cases.

Mr. President, men are equal before the law, yet not before the draft. Men have sometimes to serve in the front lines and sometimes to serve in other designated areas of warfare. All women may be drafted, as England did in the war, but England did not assign drafted women and drafted men to the same duties. Yet they were all equal in the necessity of response to the national call. But a difference in positions for them was a reasonable classification.

The courts are not blind to what everyone else knows. They will take judicial knowledge of the purpose behind this proposed constitutional amendment. They know the long struggle to give women equal dignity before the law, equal protection of the law, equal rights with men.

Mr. President, those who say now that only a few women want this equality of right are the same ones who a few years ago were saying that only a questionable part of the feminine population wanted the right to vote, that the good women of America wanted to stay at home and nurse the children.

Mr. President, speaking about children, I have not heard that any State law limiting the load which women can lift

excludes them from lifting the children. If men are so anxious to help lighten the burdens on women, the men might be a little more generous in helping the women lift the babies and the things around the home.

So, Mr. President, we who are the advocates of this proposed amendment want to preserve every humanitarian statute which has been adopted in America for the benefit of women; but we think the time has been too long delayed when we shall actually, in legal status, lift women to the exalted pedestal on which we so often profess to place her, but upon which we all too seldom install her.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired. All time has expired.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the time has arrived for the Senate to vote on all amendments to the joint resolution and on the joint resolution itself.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	Maybank
Anderson	Holland	Millikin
Benton	Humphrey	Mundt
Brewster	Hunt	Murray
Bricker	Ives	Neely
Byrd	Jenner	O'Conor
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Cordon	Kefauver	Russell
Donnell	Kem	Saltonstall
Douglas	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Downey	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Knowland	Sparkman
Eastland	Langer	Stennis
Ecton	Leahy	Taylor
Ferguson	Lehman	Thomas, Utah
Frear	Lodge	Thye
Fulbright	Long	Tobey
George	Lucas	Tydings
Gillette	McCarran	Vandenberg
Graham	McCarthy	Watkins
Green	McClellan	Wherry
Gurney	McFarland	Wiley
Hayden	McKellar	Williams
Hendrickson	McMahon	Young
Hickenlooper	Magnuson	
Hill	Martin	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], which will be stated.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. For what purpose does the Senator from New York rise?

Mr. IVES. To ask if it will be possible for the resolution as it now is to be read before the decision on the amendment is made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has just directed the Secretary to read the amendment.

Mr. IVES. I thought the Chair had directed the clerk to read the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia offered an original amendment with a provision for 5 years, which has been modified to a provision for 7 years.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York asks that the joint resolution itself be read, so that we shall know how it stands, before we vote on amendments to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the original joint resolution and the proposed amendments, so as to show how it will read if it is amended.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"The Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress; and if so ratified, shall take effect upon the expiration of 1 year after the date of such ratification."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading of the resolution——

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have an amendment pending.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment was read for the information of the Senate. It has not actually been offered.

Mr. HAYDEN. I offer it, and I ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona offers an amendment, which will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, between lines 4 and 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

The provisions of this article shall not be construed to impair any rights, benefits, or exemptions now or hereafter conferred by law upon persons of the female sex.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. WILEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is absent on important public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is unavoidably absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], who is absent on official business, is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—51

Anderson	Hoey	McKellar
Benton	Holland	McMahon
Bricker	Humphrey	Magnuson
Byrd	Ives	Maybank
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Millikin
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Mundt
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Douglas	Kefauver	Neely
Dworshak	Kem	Russell
Eastland	Kerr	Saltonstall
Frear	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Fulbright	Lodge	Sparkman
Graham	Long	Stennis
Gurney	Lucas	Taylor
Hayden	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Hendrickson	McCarthy	Thye
Hill	McClellan	Williams

NAYS—31

Aiken	Hunt	Robertson
Brewster	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Cain	Kilgore	Tobey
Donnell	Knowland	Tydings
Downey	Langer	Vandenberg
Ecton	Leahy	Watkins
Ferguson	McFarland	Wherry
George	Martin	Wiley
Gillette	O'Conor	Young
Green	O'Mahoney	
Hickenlooper	Pepper	

NOT VOTING—14

Bridges	Ellender	Schoeppel
Butler	Flanders	Taft
Capehart	Malone	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Morse	Withers
Darby	Myers	

So Mr. HAYDEN'S amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment lettered "D," which I offered for myself, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Secretary will state. Does the Senator wish the entire amendment read?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to have the entire amendment read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out the resolving clause, together with the text, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

Whereas the economic, civil, social, and political progress of women has been burdened and impeded by discriminations arising in part from assumptions embedded in the common law; and

Whereas, notwithstanding notable legislative achievements in modern times, there remain in effect statutes, regulations, rules, and governmental practices which discriminate unfairly on the basis of sex; and

Whereas the authority and jurisdiction to remove existing burdens and impediments upon the status of women resides, to a great extent, in the legislatures of the several States; and

Whereas the present is an appropriate occasion to review the political, civil, economic, and social status of women for the purpose of modernizing applicable legal codes and administrative practices: Now, therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That it is the declared policy of the United States that in law and its administration no distinctions on the basis of sex shall be made except such as are reasonably justified by differences in physical structure, or by maternal function.

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established a Commission on the Legal Status of Women (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") to be composed of 15 members appointed by the President, not more than 3 of whom shall be employees or officers of the executive branch of the Government. One of the members shall be designated by the President as Chairman. Vacancies in the membership of the Commission shall not impair its powers to exercise its functions and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of original appointments. Members of the Commission shall receive their necessary travel expenses and a per diem allowance of $50 in lieu of subsistence.

(b) The Commission is authorized without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions and to use voluntary and uncompensated personnel. The Commission may make such expenditures as may be necessary for the performance of its functions. The Commission may, with the consent of the department, independent establishment, or agency, or authority concerned (Federal or State), utilize their facilities, services, and personnel. The Commission may in cooperation with private agencies utilize their facilities, services, and information with or without compensation therefor.

(c) The Commission shall make a full and complete study, investigation, and review of the economic, civil, social, and political status of women, and the nature and extent of discriminations based on sex throughout the United States, its Territories, and possessions. In carrying out its study and investigation, the Commission is further authorized to make such investigations and studies of the regulations, rules, practices, procedures, and files of all departments, independent agencies and establishments, and all other agencies of the United States in the executive branch of the Government as is necessary for the performance of its functions.

(d) Prior to March 1, 1951, the Commission shall submit to the President its final report which shall include recommendations for such legislation as may be necessary to cause the laws of the United States and their administration to conform with the policy set forth in section 1 of this act.

SEC. 3. Within 30 days after its receipt, the President shall transmit the report and recommendations of the Commission to the Congress, together with his own recommendations, as to any further action by Congress which may be necessary to cause the laws of the United States and their administration to conform with the policy set forth in section 1 of this act, and when such report of the President is so transmitted, the Commission and all authority, powers, and duties conferred upon it in this act, shall terminate.

SEC. 4. (a) Insofar as may be authorized by existing law, every department, independent agency, or establishment, and all other agencies of the United States in the executive branch of the Government—

(1) shall cause all regulations and rules issued or practice engaged in by them to conform to the policy set forth in section 1 of this act; and

(2) shall modify, amend, repeal, or eliminate such regulations, rules, or practices as may not be in conformity with the policy set forth in section 1 of this act.

(b) After complying with the provisions of subsection (a) every such department, independent agency and establishment, and such other agencies shall inform the Commission prior to November 1, 1951, of the extent to which its regulations, rules, and practices continue to embody distinctions on the basis of sex and the statutory or other justification therefor.

SEC. 5. The legislative bodies of the several States and their political subdivisions are urged to declare, by resolution or other appropriate form of procedure, the adoption of a legislative policy in conformity with the policy of the United States as expressed in section 1 of this act, to review legislation, regulations, ordinances, and governmental practices, and to take such further action, including, but without limitation, passage of legislation, as will insure that law and its administration within their respective jurisdictions will be in conformity with such policy. The President is directed to transmit a copy of this act and the report of the Commission to the executive head of the several States, Territories, and possessions.

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Change the joint resolution in form to that of a bill, with the following number, S. ——, and in lieu of the title of the joint resolution insert the following: "A bill to provide for the investigation of discriminations against women on the basis of sex, to establish policies for the removal of such discriminations, and for other purposes."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. GILLETTE rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. For what purpose does the Senator from Iowa rise?

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa rises for the purpose of making a point of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the point of order.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, the amendment by way of a substitute is not in order, because even without the unanimous-consent agreement under which the Senate is operating, it would change entirely the character of the proposal which is before the Senate. The measure which is before the Senate is a functional measure; it is not legislation. It is a measure which is designed to lay before the States, by a two-thirds vote, the privilege of passing on whether the proposed amendment shall become part of the Constitution. If such an amendment by way of a substitute were adopted it would become legislation requiring a majority vote for its passage. It would have to go to the White House for the signature of the President, or be vetoed by him, and it could be passed over the veto of the President by the requisite number of votes of this body.

The joint resolution does not have to go to the White House. After the two Houses have acted on it the function of the Congress is complete. It cannot be returned to the Congress for consideration. The proposed amendment by way of a substitute entirely changes the character of the measure which is before the Senate.

Even if that were not true, as we are operating under the rule of germaneness, I trust the Chair will bear with me in calling attention to the precedents on germaneness and reading the following:

The mere fact that an amendment proposes to attain the same end sought to be attained by the bill to which offered does not render it germane.

One of the functions of the rule requiring germaneness is to preclude consideration of legislation which has not been considered in committee and for this reason the rule should be invoked with particular strictness against amendments proposing substitutes for an entire bill.

Mr. President, there are precedents whereby the character of a joint resolution has been changed to that of a bill by changing the preliminary language, but that simply changed the legislative character of it, and both the joint resolution and the bill were subject to the signature of the President or his veto, and if vetoed, further action by the Congress.

The proposal we have before us is sui generis, if I may use the term, and cannot be changed, in the opinion of the Senator from Iowa, by offering a measure attempting to make it legislation of an entirely different character and entirely not germane to the subject before the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will hear the Senator briefly on the point of order, but not upon the merits of the proposal.

Mr. HAYDEN. I was aware that the junior Senator from Tennessee desired to offer his substitute. I advised him that it could be done, having in mind that when a poll-tax bill was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, proposing a legislative enactment on the subject, I offered a substitute the text of which was submitted in a minority report to the Senate, to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill which had passed the House of Representatives and to substitute therefor provision for a constitutional amendment. I was advised by the Parliamentarian that a constitutional amendment could be submitted in the form of a bill as well as in the form of a joint resolution, and that it was proper to do so. So I submitted a proposed constitutional amendment dealing with the same subject matter as a substitute for the entire poll-tax bill. I am sure that the junior Senator from Tennessee is in order in offering his substitute.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on the question of germaneness, I think the situation we have before us is parallel to the situation in connection with the question raised in the matter of the poll-tax bill. In one case a bill was presented,

and as a substitute a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment was ruled to be in order. They both dealt with the same subject matter. In this case it is the other way around. It is my understanding, from consulting with the Parliamentarian, that this question has been ruled on on other occasions, and that a bill can be offered as a substitute for a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment, just as a resolution proposing a constitutional amendment can be offered as a substitute for a bill. The only difference is in the number or percentage of votes required for passage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is ready to rule.

On the question of germaneness, which is governed by the unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair thinks that the substitute is germane. It deals with the same subject, though in a little different way.

On the question of whether an amendment to the Constitution must be submitted in the form of a joint resolution or in the form of a bill, the only requirement of the Constitution is that the question shall be submitted by a two-thirds vote. It does not require that it be done by joint resolution. It may be done in the form of a bill. Therefore, the Chair holds that, since the amendment offered is a substitute for a joint resolution, in the form of a bill, the point of order is not sustained.

The Chair has looked into the matter, anticipating that the question might be raised, as it has been a number of times in the past, and the Chair has found it to be held that a bill before the Senate may be amended to make it a joint resolution. In one case a joint resolution was before the Senate, and the Presiding Officer held that it could be changed to a bill by an amendment or a substitute. Therefore, the Chair is constrained to hold——

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Chair permit an inquiry before the announcement of the decision?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. PEPPER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Florida inferred from the remarks of the distinguished Vice President that he was proceeding on the assumption that the proposal of the Senator from Tennessee was a constitutional amendment to be proposed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Oh, no; the Chair is not assuming that. By its very terms it is a bill.

Mr. PEPPER. It is only legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It becomes legislation, and is not a constitutional amendment. It can be adopted by a majority vote, whereas if it proposed a constitutional amendment it would have to be adopted by a two-thirds vote.

The Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is absent on important public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is unavoidably absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is absent on official business, is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], who is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 65, as follows:

YEAS—18

Benton	Humphrey	Lehman
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Long
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	McCarran
Green	Johnston, S. C.	Magnuson
Hayden	Kefauver	Murray
Holland	Leahy	Taylor

NAYS—65

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Neely
Anderson	Hill	O'Conor
Brewster	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hunt	Pepper
Butler	Ives	Robertson
Byrd	Jenner	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Connally	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Knowland	Sparkman
Downey	Langer	Stennis
Dworshak	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	Lucas	Thye
Ecton	McCarthy	Tobey
Ferguson	McClellan	Tydings
Frear	McFarland	Vandenberg
Fulbright	McKellar	Watkins
George	McMahon	Wherry
Gillette	Martin	Wiley
Graham	Maybank	Williams
Gurney	Millikin	Young
Hendrickson	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—13

Bridges	Flanders	Taft
Capehart	Malone	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Morse	Withers
Darby	Myers	
Ellender	Schoeppel	

So Mr. KEFAUVER's amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is absent on important public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is unavoidably absent.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY] and the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the junior and the senior Senators from Kansas would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire, the Senator from Indiana, and the Senator from Vermont would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 19, as follows:

YEAS—63

Aiken	Hoey	Martin
Anderson	Holland	Millikin
Benton	Humphrey	Mundt
Brewster	Hunt	Neely
Bricker	Ives	O'Conor
Butler	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Donnell	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Downey	Kem	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Ecton	Kilgore	Taylor
Ferguson	Knowland	Thomas, Utah
Frear	Langer	Thye
Fulbright	Lodge	Tobey
George	Lucas	Tydings
Gillette	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Graham	McClellan	Watkins
Gurney	McFarland	Wherry
Hayden	McKellar	Wiley
Hendrickson	McMahon	Williams
Hickenlooper	Magnuson	Young

NAYS—19

Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Connally	Leahy	Russell
Douglas	Lehman	Sparkman
Eastland	Long	Stennis
Green	McCarran	
Hill	Maybank	

NOT VOTING—14

Bridges	Ellender	Schoeppel
Cain	Flanders	Taft
Capehart	Malone	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Morse	Withers
Darby	Myers	

The VICE PRESIDENT. More than two-thirds of the Senators present, a quorum being present, having voted in the affirmative, the joint resolution is passed.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 25, 1950.*

(The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.)

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 4567. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; with amendments (Rept. No. 1237).

MEMBER OF JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 220), which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Mr. HENDRICKSON, of New Jersey, be, and he is hereby, elected a member on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, vice Mr. IVES, of New York.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Claude H. Broach and sundry other persons for appointment in the United States Coast Guard; and

Ernest B. Lewey and sundry other employees for appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. HUNT, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

James E. Friend, of Texas, to be Assistant Director of Locomotive Inspection, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2922. A bill for the relief of Chuko Murato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 2923. A bill to authorize the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to acquire or construct, with its own funds, a building within the District of Columbia suitable for the Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 2924. A bill to establish for individuals who served in the armed forces during World War II a presumption of service-connected disability in the case of tuberculosis existing within 3 years after discharge from such forces; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 2925. A bill to incorporate the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, and for other purposes; and

S. 2926 (by request). A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Eugen Jose Singer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

S. 2927. A bill for the relief of Edmon Burgher; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2928. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to prescribe a uniform dress for groups of postal employees and to extend existing penal provisions covering unauthorized wearing of uniforms to these groups; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2929. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, so as to permit the return under such section of property which an alien acquired, by gift, devise, bequest, or inheritance, from an American citizen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 2930. A bill to amend and clarify the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN METHOD OF ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT—AMENDMENT

Mr. LANGER submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS RELATING TO FEDERAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 152, which was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before a special subcommittee of said committee relative to the Federal Fair Employment Practice Act.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House concurrent resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator state what is proposed to be done by adoption of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senate would extend a courtesy to the House by allowing a House committee to have some additional copies of hearings printed.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The motion was agreed to.

THE HISS VERDICT—EDITORIAL FROM THE INDIANAPOLIS NEWS

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Hiss Verdict," published in the Indianapolis News of January 23, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

HISS CASE LESSON—EDITORIAL FROM THE INDIANAPOLIS TIMES

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hiss Case Lessons," published in the Indianapolis Times, of January 23, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

HISS IS GUILTY—EDITORIAL FROM THE RICHMOND (IND.) PALLADIUM-ITEM AND SUN-TELEGRAM

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hiss Is Guilty," published in the Palladium-Item and Sun-Telegram, of Richmond, Ind., of January 23, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

OTHER ACCUSED SUBVERSIVES—EDITORIAL FROM THE COLUMBUS EVENING DISPATCH

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Next?", published in the Columbus Evening Dispatch of January 25, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. DAVID L. BAZELON TO BE JUDGE, UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, February 2, 1950, at 1:30 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. David L. Bazelon, of Illinois, to be judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. Judge Bazelon is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman; the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. H. NATHAN SWAIM TO BE JUDGE, UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS, SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, February 2, 1950, at 1:30 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. H. Nathan Swaim, of Indiana, to be judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. Judge Swaim is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman; the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. JAMES R. KIRKLAND TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, February 2, 1950, at 1:30 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. James R. Kirkland, of Delaware, to be United States district judge for the District of Columbia. Judge Kirkland is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman; the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. CHARLES F. McLAUGHLIN TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, February 2, 1950, at 1:30 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Charles F. McLaughlin, of Nebraska, to be United States district judge for the District of Columbia. Judge McLaughlin is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

THE COAL-MINE SITUATION—LETTER FROM JOHN L. LEWIS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of, and acting for, my colleague, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, a letter which has been received by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1950.

Hon. EDWARD MARTIN,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: Your letter reached me today after you introduced it into the Senate RECORD yesterday.

I assume your letter refers to the situation in western Pennsylvania, where the principal mines affected are those owned by the United States Steel Corp. and the Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co., owned by M. A. Hanna & Co. I assume also, that you read the financial reports, and are aware that these two corporations are earning very large dividends and could afford to make an honorable contract with the mine workers They have not done so, and they refuse to do so.

Approximately 1,600 coal companies, producing 35,000,000 tons of coal annually, have executed a contract with the United Mine Workers of America, and are working 5 and many of them 6 days per week. The contract that they have signed merely adds about 15½ cents per ton to their previous cost of production after tax deductions. Surely, Senator, this is not too much for the United States Steel and M. A. Hanna to pay, either out of their present earnings or from the extra coal prices which they are now charging the public. If your sympathy for the coal miners, Senator, is as deep as you profess, and I am sure that it is, why not raise your eloquent voice to urge these powerful corporate interests to abate their warfare against the mine workers and their union, and execute a wage contract on the same basis as other operators have done?

Each of these corporate interests receive many favors from Government. Each of them will look for more. M. A. Hanna & Co. wants to borrow $100,000,000 from the Import and Export Bank to exploit their Labrador iron holdings. They also wish the Government to develop the St. Lawrence waterway to take care of water shipment of their iron from Labrador to the steel mills contiguous to the Great Lakes. You are a Senator and know about these things. Why not approach them in a practical way? The mine workers have no concern with your sympathy for them. They would prefer that you exercise your great talents to secure for them some modicum of justice in their dealings with the corporations which exploit them.

If the mood comes upon you to introduce this letter in the Senate RECORD in supplementation to your previous remarks, I shall indeed have no objections.

In the meantime, I reciprocate your kind respects, and believe me, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. LEWIS.

COAL SUPPLIES IN MARYLAND

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, as indicative of the situation existing in many parts of Maryland with regard to coal supplies, I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. S. Norman Holland, one of the proprietors of Pocahontas, Inc., Salisbury, Md.

This letter would seem to point up the dangers that threaten not only our own State but many of the States of the Union if the coal situation is permitted to deteriorate further.

It is a matter of moment to all our people everywhere that demands the most intelligent handling possible. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POCAHONTAS, INC.,
Salisbury, Md., January 17, 1950.

The Honorable HERBERT O'CONOR,
Senator from Maryland,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: It seems that the big problem of our country today is a fuel shortage and without question this is true (regardless of what our President says about the shortage not being acute). I would like to ask him today just how bad it has to get to come to that stage.

We have been in the wholesale and retail coal business for 24 years and serve a big share of the Eastern Shore of Maryland. Never before, regardless of the two wars, has there been anything like this shortage. While I am writing this letter, four telephones in our office are ringing and not a pound of coal in our yard which covers about 2 acres of ground, except one pile of No. 3 anthracite which will be gone overnight. Our principal sales are of bituminous coals. We have contracts for all of the county schools, different hospitals, and a big share of the poultry industry which, as you know, is using a great part of the coal today. We are having to say "No" all day and do not know when more will be rolling. We are continuously talking to the mines and getting the answer, "Sorry, but no coal mined today." I have talked to many other coal people, not only in Maryland but in other States, and I find the same thing. I think it is high time for you and all the officials to make a special effort overnight to do something about this shortage if you expect to save a lot of people from freezing in case of a cold storm which we have been very fortunate not to have up to now. I cannot express in words just how bad it is. We retail coal men over this whole land will be out of business if something doesn't happen and happen soon. As a Senator of Maryland, I am pleading to you to make this appeal immediately.

If there is anything I can do please call on me at any time to help in this crisis.

Sincerely,

S. NORMAN HOLLAND.

REMARKS ON THE OCCASION OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1949 BECOMING EFFECTIVE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, today the amendments which Congress adopted to the Fair Labor Standards Act went into force. I have prepared a statement relating to those amendments. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ELBERT D. THOMAS, CHAIRMAN, SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, ON THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1949

Mr. President, it is the Senate's time-honored custom—one which I believe should be and hope will be, maintained—of noting past events of significance in the history of our Republic. I take the occasion today to call to the attention of the Senate an event that did not occur long ago, but one which is occurring today. It, too, however, is one of considerable significance to the Nation, and particularly to those of our people whose needs are great but whose voices are often lost amidst the cries of the many organized and highly vocal groups in our society.

Today the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1949 became effective. This legislation is, I believe, the first major piece of legislation for the welfare of our wage-earning population to become effective in more than a decade.

There is no need for me to discuss in detail the beneficial effects which the provisions of this act will have. They were discussed at length here on the floor of the Senate during the debates on the measure in the closing days of the last session. Only the die-hard opponents of effective wage-hour legislation—men more concerned with their privileged position rather than with the health and vitality of our economy—would dare to deny that we have taken, through this legislation, great strides forward in eradicating the evils of the sweatshop and of child labor. Who can foretell the untold benefits accruing to the youth of our Nation through the effective prohibition, now in the law by virtue of these amendments, against the employment of oppressive child labor in interstate industry and commerce? Who can fully foretell the "chain reaction" benefits accruing to the tradesmen and farmers throughout our country as a result of fatter pay envelopes at the end of the week for a million and a half of our industrial workers?

Our highly complex interrelated industrial system is the generator of our strength and vitality, and the mechanism which has enabled us to attain world leadership. It is the most valuable machine which the democratic world possesses, and one which we must constantly maintain, repair, and improve. By these amendments to the wage-and-hour law, we have replaced worn-out parts with new and improved ones. Today the motor's hum sounds better, and it is a hum which says, at least to me, that we live in a healthier and stronger land.

Healthier and stronger internally because the fruits of our technology are being more widely distributed so that we may have a better housed, fed, and clothed citizenry. Healthier and stronger externally because we give to the world another concrete demonstration of how an expanding standard of living can be achieved through the democratic process.

I am humbly grateful that I was able to take part in this effort to provide a better life for all our people, and I congratulate the Members of this body and of the House of Representatives whose devotion to the general welfare of our Nation made possible the developments which are occurring today.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, as Senators know, 1 minute after midnight this morning the minimum-wage-law amendments went into effect. It had been my purpose to make a comment on that legislation, the essential character of it, and what it meant to the Nation and to my State of Florida. In order to keep from trespassing upon the time of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared, and, as I have said, which I expected to deliver, together with an additional presentation dealing with the effect of the new minimum-wage law on Florida, may be printed in full in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, Mr. PEPPER's statement and the memorandum showing the effect of the new minimum-wage law on the State of Florida were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLAUDE PEPPER

Mr. President, at 1 minute after midnight this morning, the amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act which were passed in the closing days of the first session of this Congress went into effect. This is one of the great achievements of the Eighty-first Congress for the welfare of our working men and women and the Nation.

These amendments have raised the legal minimum wage from 40 to 75 cents an hour. The 1,500,000 workers covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act, who were getting less than 75 cents an hour yesterday, did not have the protection under the law which they needed. These 1,500,000 working people are now getting a fair wage which is more nearly in line with our present national income.

The raise in the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour will result in their having $300,000,000 more a year in purchasing power. Fifty thousand wage earners in Florida, who will also benefit from this increase, will receive over $10,000,000 more a year in wages. Most of the increases will range from 5 to 15 cents an hour.

This will mean more milk for children of our working people and a general improvement in the diets of their families, a chance to secure better housing, and to provide for their education and general well-being. The raise in the minimum wage will mean that everywhere in the Nation—stores in every community will have more business. It means higher profits for businessmen.

The 22,000,000 employees who are now covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act, and who are now receiving more than 75 cents an hour, will benefit by the improvement of the legal floor under their wages.

The 630,000 business establishments in the United States, which are now covered by the act will be relieved from the unfair competition of employers who pay low wages.

The amendments greatly extend the prohibition against oppressive child labor. They virtually outlaw a sweat-shop and drive out the unscrupulous employers who use child labor to undermine the fair labor standards and working conditions of conscientious and efficient manufacturers and businessmen.

Prior to the passage of the amendments the law sought to prevent oppressive child labor in an indirect way by prohibiting the shipment of goods in interstate commerce if oppressive child labor had been employed in the establishment where such goods were manufactured during the 30 days before they were shipped. Under the amendments effective today, oppressive child labor is directly prohibited in the production of goods for commerce. For the first time also the act prohibits the employment of child labor in commerce thus giving the protection of the law to young people in such interstate activities as transportation, communications, and warehousing.

The new law gives the Wage and Hour Administrator certain powers which will improve the administration and result in better enforcement. It gives him authority to protect the wage standards set in the law through controls over manufacturing activities moving into the homes of our people.

Mr. President, the amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act is just one of the many efforts of the Eighty-first Congress to meet the unfilled needs of our people. These amendments will become a great stabilizing force in our economy and will contribute to the continuation of prosperity in the Nation.

EFFECT OF THE NEW MINIMUM-WAGE LAW ON FLORIDA

1. There are approximately 189,000 employees in Florida to whom the minimum-wage provision of the act applies.

2. There are about 8,900 establishments in Florida with employees to whom the minimum-wage provision applies.

3. About 50,000 of the 189,000 covered employees are being paid less than 75 cents an hour.

4. In the fiscal year 1949 investigations were carried on by the Divisions in 1948 establishments with employees covered by the law. In 336 of these establishments underpayments to 5,297 employees were found, including 466 who had been underpaid on the 40-cent-an-hour minimum wage. (The other employees were owed back wages for overtime.) The total amount of back wages due under the law was $272,866. Of this amount $80,988 was actually paid to the employees. Under the fair-labor standards amendments of 1949, section 16 (c) authorizes the Administrator to supervise the payment of back wages found due, and to sue for the money in court at the request of the employee under certain conditions. It is expected that this amendment to the law will correct the situation in which less than one-third of the money found due employees under the law is actually paid to them.

5. In the fiscal year 1949, there were 121 Government purchase contracts awarded to Florida firms, amounting to $8,042,694 in value. Only a small part of these contracts were subject to recent wage determinations under the Public Contracts Act. However, the Divisions are now starting on greatly accelerated wage determinations in line with the prevailing minimum wages in these industries as they are today, and to establish wage determinations in additional industries where such action is needed. These wage determinations may be considerably higher than 75 cents; there is no statutory ceiling, and the rate is set at the figure shown by the facts to be the present prevailing minimum in the industry.

6. While fish canning is at present a small industry in Florida (2 establishments as far as we know), the amendment bringing employees of fish and seafood canneries under the minimum wage will immediately afford protection to the pay of these workers, and any further growth in this industry will be on the sound basis of decent minimum-pay standards for the workers involved.

ATTITUDE OF PEOPLE OF FORMOSA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article by Clyde Farnsworth, out of Taipeh, Formosa, which is self-explanatory.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of January 20, 1950]

CORRESPONDENT FINDS FORMOSANS FULL OF FIGHT

(By Clyde Farnsworth)

TAIPEH, FORMOSA, January 20.—Even without American aid to the Chinese Nationalists, Formosa would be no push-over for the Communists.

That's one of the first impressions you get after landing at this refugee capital of the Chinese Government. And there's something unusual here for Nationalist China—enthusiasm of a local population for its own defense.

Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, arriving here yesterday, ran into widespread demonstrations not of welcome to her (her "homecoming" was quiet and unostentatious) but rather of Formosan support for the Nationalist Government's first Formosa conscription campaign. It's supposed to add 35,000 men to the island's defense forces.

VOLUNTEER

The first 1950 quota—4,500 by January 15—is likely to be oversubscribed. Amazed officials tell of Formosans who failed to make the conscription lists petitioning to be accepted as volunteers. For a Chinese conscription program this is unheard of. The Chinese conscript too often has been a man

who has to be peeled of his civvies, but quick, to keep him from going back home at the first chance.

But at Taipeh and at Keelung and other cities where Formosans as well as mainland Chinese have been given a chance to join in their own defense, the conscripts are being wined and dined by their neighbors and district leaders. Girl students place flowers around the conscripts' necks and the bands play on.

Considering the way Washington has been pouring cold water on Formosa's chances of American help, or even of unassisted survival against international communism, it's a wonder that a single string of firecrackers was touched off here in the draft campaign, or that a single papier mâché dragon danced in the streets.

There has been no black-out here on the bad news from Washington, but Formosa's enthusiasm is undampened. If the United States were still looking for will to fight among the Chinese, it could find plenty here.

ASSAULTS REPULSED

Troops graduating from Gen. Sun Li-jen's 5-months' training centers as well as old-line troops have distinguished themselves in recent months in halting amphibious assaults on Kingmen Island and at Tengpu in the Chusan Islands.

General Sun, a distinguished alumnus of Virginia Military Institute, commands the ground forces for defense of Formosa. One of his aides said last night: "Of one thing we are certain—our troops will fight."

A similar rebirth of spirit is reported among the navy and air force troops upon whom much of Formosa's fate may depend. In fact, the defense potentialities of Formosa for the next few months, at least, are so high that the Communists probably will postpone any direct assault.

It would be wiser for them to let the Nationalist Government dangle here and count upon its isolation by western powers and the economic burden of maintaining Formosa as an armed camp to sap Nationalist strength.

Meanwhile the Reds can gobble up Hainan and toy with French Indochina.

BIRTHDAY GREETINGS TO GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR AND INVITATION TO HIM TO ADDRESS A JOINT SESSION OF SENATE AND HOUSE ON FAR EASTERN CRISIS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, tomorrow, January 26, 1950, marks the seventieth birthday of one of the greatest American military leaders and statesmen of our times. I refer, of course, to Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who, while he was born in the State of Arkansas, where his father was serving, has always considered Milwaukee as his legal residence.

Wisconsin, proud of the MacArthur family's deep roots in her soil, has always rightly claimed a share of the honor of being Douglas MacArthur's native State.

I suggest that the best birthday tribute that we in the Congress can pay to General MacArthur is twofold:

WE MUST LIFT IRON CURTAIN FROM FAR EAST

First. By securing all of the facts regarding General MacArthur's recommendations to the Joint Chiefs of Staff for defense of besieged Formosa, as well as regarding our general position in the Far East. Then, having secured those full facts, it is up to us in the Congress to weigh his able recommendations most carefully and to take such immediate steps as are best calculated to stop the victorious march of communism throughout Asia.

There has been a shocking iron curtain set up between Douglas MacArthur and the American people, through no fault of the general. While no Senator would ask that military security regulations be violated, it is quite clear that neither Congress nor the people have been given the necessary facts on the true situation, as reported by General MacArthur, in the explosive Far East.

WE NEED OPEN COVENANTS OPENLY ARRIVED AT

I am not criticizing any single individual or invading the jurisdiction of the executive branch when I say that, time and time again, the shop-worn excuse of military security has been used as a cloak over diplomatic blunders. What is there about foreign policy that is so hard to comprehend or so secret that it must be kept from the intelligent American people? The time is long overdue for the present administration to follow the principle of Woodrow Wilson of open covenants openly arrived at.

MAC ARTHUR SHOULD ADDRESS JOINT SESSION

Second. The second best way for us to send birthday greetings to General MacArthur is for my colleagues and myself to indicate in no uncertain terms that it is our earnest desire that General MacArthur return to the United States to address a joint session of Congress on the crisis in the Far East. I do not suggest an immediate date for such a return, because I believe that the general himself is best able to judge when the situation in troubled Japan would permit his leaving as supreme commander of the Allied occupation forces.

On several occasions, various committees of the Congress have invited the general to testify before them on the deteriorating situation in Asia. But each time the general has respectfully declined, in order that he might remain on hand at his post, so as to continue to steer the Japanese ship of state along peaceful, democratic channels. I am hoping, however, that the hero of Bataan will feel that the time is near for him to return, at long last, to the shores of the country that he has served so well for so long.

No single individual in the Far East or at a Pentagon or State Department desk has a better grasp and understanding of all that is necessary to stop the triumphant march of communism in the Far East.

I do not believe that General MacArthur should merely testify before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee or before the House Foreign Affairs Committee or a joint meeting of those committees. On the contrary, I believe that his words would be of more than enough significance to justify a special joint session of the Senate and House and a broadcast to all the world. We have on occasion met to hear many foreign dignitaries, and I feel that it is only fair and wise that the 531 Members of the Senate and House assemble together to hear the words of this great American spoken from his own lips without iron-curtain censorship.

DOUGLAS MAC ARTHUR'S FAMILY ROOTS

I would not want this opportunity to pass without saying just a word about his magnificent record. As I have indicated, we in Wisconsin are proud to share him as a native son. His Scottish-born grandfather, Arthur MacArthur, arrived in Milwaukee 101 years ago, in 1849, and later became city attorney. He was elected lieutenant governor, and thereafter served briefly as governor in 1856. His son, in turn, Arthur MacArthur, Douglas' father, joined a Wisconsin Civil War regiment at 17, and won the title of "The Boy Colonel of the West," being awarded a Congressional Medal of Honor. At the age of 18, while his father was fulfilling a military mission in the Philippines, Douglas and his mother moved to the Plankinton House in Milwaukee. He performed engineering duty in Milwaukee during his early professional years.

MAC ARTHUR'S EPIC MILITARY ACHIEVEMENTS

Few military records in the annals of American warfare have been more crowned with honors than is that of General MacArthur. During the First World War he was wounded twice, decorated 13 times, and cited 7 additional times for extreme bravery under fire. In the Second World War, he won, among other honors, 17 American decorations and 23 decorations from foreign countries. He was awarded the thanks of the Congress, and received many honorary degrees, including that of the University of Wisconsin. His magnificent return to the Philippines is one of the most glorious chapters in American history. His epic achievements in the Pacific, although receiving a minimum of military aid, equipment, and personnel, his victories gained with a minimum of casualties, are the sort of military record of which every branch of our service is proud.

He was the youngest man ever to hold the position of Superintendent of West Point. Incidentally, his own 4-year scholastic average while a student at West Point was the highest in 25 years, and still tops the records. In World War I he was the youngest division commander in the United States Army. He was the youngest man ever to hold a position as Chief of Staff. He was rated by Secretary of War Newton D. Baker as America's best World War I front-line general. He emerged from retirement in 1937 to become the only field marshal in United States Army annals. At the expiration of his 4-year term as Chief of Staff, precedent was broken when he was reappointed.

CONCLUSION

Perhaps his greatest of all achievements has been his amazing record of occupying Japan and then steering that country's reconstruction. No individual, least of all Douglas MacArthur, would claim that all of Japan's problems are solved or that the job is done in Japan. On the contrary, we still have a tremendous task there, particularly now that it has been complicated by the Red conquest of China and the Red advances throughout much of southeast Asia. It is in the Orient that, paradoxically enough, the future of western civilization may be decided. We need Douglas MacArthur's judgment, therefore.

The best tribute we can pay to this great American is not by our words, but, rather, by the deeds we perform in line with his spirit and his recommendations.

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S DENTAL HEALTH DAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, there is on the calendar House Joint Resolution 184, Calendar No. 1242, which would authorize the President of the United States to proclaim February 6, 1950, as National Children's Dental Health Day. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 184) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim February 6, 1950, as National Children's Dental Health Day, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after the word "authorized", to strike out "and directed."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there any appropriation connected with the joint resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. There is no appropriation connected with it. The joint resolution was reported unanimously from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WHERRY. The purpose of the joint resolution is simply to set aside a day for the purposes indicated in the measure.

Mr. LUCAS. Precisely so.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The joint resolution does not establish a legal holiday?

Mr. LUCAS. It does not.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 184) was read the third time and passed.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN METHOD OF ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 2, Calendar No. 601, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; doing away with the electoral college.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before the Senate proceeds to the consideration of and debate upon Senate Joint Resolution 2, I should like to make an announcement. On yesterday I announced that the Senate would take up a bill in which the two Senators from Arizona and the two Senators from California are very much interested, following the disposition of the joint resolution I have just moved be considered by the Senate. I had temporarily forgotten that I had agreed with the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] that he should have at least 10 days' or 2 weeks' notice before the Senate considered that bill. The bill to which I have reference is Senate bill 75, Calendar No. 839, authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes. I have talked with the Senators who are particularly interested in the bill, and I have agreed that the Senate will not take up that measure until a week from the coming Monday. I wanted the Senate to know that. As to what will follow consideration of the joint resolution now about to be considered I am not certain. I must call a meeting of the policy committee to make that determination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 2, Calendar No. 601.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to make a presentation concerning Senate Joint Resolution 2, which proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, abolishing the electoral college and providing for the counting of the electoral vote for President and Vice President in proportion to the popular vote.

My remarks will, first of all, summarize the provisions of the proposed amendment; second, I shall outline the defects in the present system; third, I shall give the advantages of the proposed system; and, finally, I shall discuss the objections which have been made to this proposal, and I shall endeavor to rebut them.

Of course, I shall be glad to yield for questions.

Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 2 is similar to Senate Joint Resolution 200, of the Eightieth Congress, which was reported favorably by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate on May 3, 1948. It was reintroduced in 1949 under the sponsorship of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and myself. It is identical with House Joint Resolution 2, which was favorably acted upon by the House Committee on the Judiciary on April 7, 1949.

Extensive hearings have been held on the joint resolution. The hearings have been printed, and copies are on the desk of each Senator. I hope all Senators will read the hearings, because they are a gold mine of information on this subject.

In addition to the Senators who appeared in support of the proposal, statements were filed by students of the problem. In particular, there was an endorsement by a very distinguished institution whose authority in the field of public questions is unchallenged. I refer to the Brookings Institution. There was one witness who appeared in opposition.

Mr. President, I shall insert in the RECORD a detailed analysis, sentence by sentence, of the provisions of the proposed constitutional amendment. But let me say now that it does three things, principally:

First, it abolishes entirely the office of Presidential elector. The electoral vote per State, which is equal to the total number of Representatives and Senators, is retained, but purely as an automatic counting device.

Second, it eliminates any possibility that an election may be thrown into the House of Representatives—a possibility which, as Senators know, was a very real one in connection with the 1948 election.

Third, it does away with the so-called unit-rule system of counting electoral votes. Under the existing system, the candidate receiving a plurality of the popular vote in any given State is credited with all the electoral votes of that State, regardless of how infinitesimal the plurality. Under the proposed system, the electoral votes in each State are automatically divided among the candidates in direct proportion to the popular vote.

Let me illustrate: Let us assume that a certain State has 12 electoral votes. Of the 2,400,000 popular votes cast in that State, R, the Republican, received 1,600,000. D, the Democrat, received 600,000. T, the third party candidate, received 200,000. Under the present system, all of the State's 12 electoral votes would go to R. Under the proposed system, the electoral vote would be divided in proportion to the popular vote as follows: Eight electoral votes for R; three electoral votes for D; and one electoral vote for T.

The electoral votes are computed to three decimal places. In the very remote, but mathematically possible, event of a tie, it is provided that the candidate receiving the most number of popular votes wins the election.

The electoral votes which each candidate receives, therefore, represent his proportional strength in the State. These votes are then taken and added to the electoral votes received in all the other States. The candidate having the greatest number of electoral votes wins the Presidency. Votes for Vice President

are counted in precisely the same manner.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

So much for a summary of the proposal. Now let me give a brief historical background.

Since January 6, 1797, when Representative William L. Smith, of South Carolina, offered in Congress the first constitutional amendment proposing reform of our procedure for electing the President, hardly a session of Congress has passed without the introduction of one or more resolutions of this character. All these proposals recognized, as does the reform embodied in Senate Joint Resolution 2, that the so-called electoral-college system has never functioned as contemplated by the framers of the Constitution.

The delegates to the Constitutional Convention were, for the most part, definitely opposed to electing the President by direct popular vote. They seemed to agree with George Mason, of Virginia, that "it were as unnatural to refer the choice of a proper character for Chief Magistrate to the people, as it would be to refer a trial of colors to a blind man." The delegates distrusted the ability of the average citizen of that day to decide questions of such great gravity. Moreover, the discussions of the Convention reveal that the delegates did not believe that it was possible for a voter in one State to know anything about the ability or character of public men in the other States scattered along our 1,500-mile shore line. In addition, those representing the smaller States believed that popular election would somehow increase the power and prestige of the more heavily populated States.

These considerations, after probably the most prolonged debate of the Convention, led to adoption of the indirect method of electing the President. Under this plan, the States were to select well-informed public men who were to look the field over and elect a President and Vice President. In selecting these electors, each State was left free to use any procedure it might see fit to adopt—direct popular election of the electors on a general, blanket ticket (the procedure used in all States today); or by single member districts; or by the vote of the legislature itself (a procedure which all the States had abandoned by 1860).

The electors so selected by each State should meet, it was decided, on a given date at a designated place within the State and vote by ballot for two persons. They were required to send a list of all persons voted for and the number of votes for each, to the President of the Senate, where, on a date fixed by law, they were to be opened in the presence of the two Houses, and the vote counted. The person having the largest number of votes was to be declared President if such number were a majority of all the votes cast. The runner-up should be declared Vice President, whether he had a majority or not. This was later modified by the twelfth amendment.

This is the system which, modified by the twelfth amendment, has continued in effect up to the present time. It has retained the original form, even though all reason for this form has long since disappeared. The historian, Arthur M. Schlesinger, recently wrote in his book, Paths to the Present:

> What demoted the electoral college from a deliberative body to a puppet show was the rise of political parties. As people began taking sides on public questions they were unwilling to leave the crucial choice of the Chief Executive to a sort of lottery. Instead, each party publicly announced its slate of electors and the candidate they would support. This usurpation of the electors' functions, though peaceably achieved, amounted to a coup d'état. It was an amendment of the written Constitution by the unwritten Constitution. The electors, while retaining the legal status of independence, became henceforth hardly more than men in livery taking orders from their parties.

Individual Members of Congress, of course, have always been mindful of the fact that this indirect method of electing the President stood in need of modernization. As stated before, the first legislative proposal for reform came in 1797, only 10 years after the Constitutional Convention itself. In the 50-year period between 1889 and 1947, 123 amendment proposals relating to the election of the President were introduced in Congress. Prior to that time, proponents of the twelfth amendment were successful in their efforts to correct the situation created by the Jefferson-Burr electoral vote tie in 1800. Senator Thomas Hart Benton, of Missouri, with the strong support of President Andrew Jackson, made this a prime object of his concern over a period of 20 years in the 1820's and 1830's. Senator Oliver H. P. Morton, of Indiana, led the fight in the 1880's. The late Senator George W. Norris was the principal proponent of reform in more recent times; his proposal for direct popular election of the President failed to command the necessary two-thirds of the Senate in 1934. In both the Seventy-second and Seventy-third Congresses, House committees unanimously reported resolutions calling for abolition of the electoral college. In the Eightieth Congress, another unanimous House Judiciary Committee report was submitted.

In fact, the first legislative proposal for a division of electoral votes on the basis of the popular vote was introduced in Congress just 102 years ago by Representative Lawrence of New York, in 1848.

A detailed statement prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, setting forth the historical background of the electoral college appears in the record of hearings, commencing at page 199. The full text of Arthur M. Schlesinger's analysis, from his 1949 book, Paths to the Present, is incorporated in the record of hearings, commencing at page 201. They are both worth reading. So much for the history. Let me now outline the principal evils of the present system.

PRINCIPAL EVILS OF THE PRESENT SYSTEM

Since the constitutional amendment proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 2 has as one of its objectives the correction of certain evils in our present method of electing the President, the need for reform is high lighted by a discussion of both the obvious and latent effects inherent in the electoral college—unit-rule system of choosing our President.

The indictment that can be drawn up against the present procedure is an impressive one. In general, there are three principal counts in this indictment:

First. The evils arising from the retention of the "dummy" office of presidential elector.

Second. The method of selecting a President when no candidate commands a majority of electoral votes.

Third. The defects and dangers which derive from the so-called unit-rule method of crediting all of a State's electoral votes to the plurality candidate.

An analysis of each of these three broad counts of the indictment follows:

1. RETENTION OF THE OFFICE OF ELECTOR

As stated by Schlesinger in the quotation appearing on page 3 above, the electoral college has degenerated into a mere rubber stamp. What is even worse, this rubber stamp has become an inaccurate rubber stamp. If there is anything any more useless than an inaccurate rubber stamp, I should like to know what it is. It has been also graphically stated that the electoral college is like the vermiform appendix in the human body. While it does no good and ordinarily causes no trouble, it continually exposes the body politic to the danger of political peritonitis. Any organ which has ceased to perform its function is sure to work mischief, if not positive detriment.

As was stated earlier, the framers of the Constitution visioned the individual member of the electoral college as an official who would exercise independent judgment. His responsibility was a grave one and it was thought that only men of prestige and ability would be selected for that office. These characteristics no longer are associated with the office of elector. In most instances today men elected to the post of Presidential elector are men whose names mean nothing whatsoever to the average voter. He is simply a straw man, or, as the phrase goes, a "man in livery" pledged in advance to vote for a certain candidate.

But it is most important to note that the individual elector is only morally bound to vote for candidates of his party for President and Vice President. He is not legally bound. In fact, recent State and Federal decisions make it very doubtful, indeed, whether a State can constitutionally impose a legal obligation on an elector to cast his vote for his party's candidate. It is possible, therefore, for individual members of the electoral college to cast their votes for whomsoever they please, utterly ignoring the mandate of the people and disregarding, if they so choose, their own pledges. Indeed, there have been several examples in the past of what I call the free-wheeling elector. In the 1948 elections a Tennessee elector, running on both the Democrat and Dixiecrat slates, cast his vote for the Dixiecrat candidate despite the fact that the State turned in a substantial plurality for the Democratic candidate.

This possibility that electors may legally disregard their pledges and, as we might say "desert to the enemy," creates a dangerous situation. If, on election day in November, it appeared that one candidate needed but one electoral vote

to command a majority in the electoral college, the pressure on individual electors to do what the Tennessee elector did in 1948 would be tremendous. In fact, it is recalled that in the famous Tilden-Hayes contest of 1876, James Russell Lowell—who was a Hayes elector in Massachusetts—was most vehemently urged to cast his vote for Tilden, thus giving Tilden his necessary majority. Lowell turned a deaf ear on these pleas because of his firm belief in the moral duty of electors. Had he been a man of less tough moral fiber, his unilateral decision would have elected a President of the United States.

Another practical, harmful effect flowing from the retention of the office of elector is the unnecessary confusion caused the voter by printing on the ballot all the names making up the various slates of candidates for the office of presidential elector. It is a proven fact that this proliferation of names on the ballot all too frequently causes the confused voter to invalidate his ballot and thereby unintentionally disfranchise himself. Although many States have cured this particular evil by providing for the so-called short ballot, 26 States still print the long, and actually meaningless, list of all the candidates for the office of elector. In these States, complicated ballots make the splitting of ballots a nightmare, and the voter who attempts this futile—but often attempted—gesture finds his vote invalidated. This will explain cases where, as in Ohio in 1948, the vote for governor exceeded the valid vote for President. The invalidation of ballots caused by the fact that the voters have become confused by the printing of long lists of meaningless names might well spell the difference between one presidential candidate's carrying that State or not—and upon this, in turn, might rest the entire election.

Another complication which frequently arises in connection with the individual members of the electoral college concerns the qualification of electors. The Constitution provides that Members of Congress and Federal office holders are ineligible to serve as Presidential electors. Surprisingly enough, it happens not infrequently, as illustrated subsequently in this report, that ineligible electors successfully run for that office with the result that their votes for President and Vice President, if cast, are invalid. It might well happen that these invalidated electoral votes could spell the difference between success and disaster for a Presidential candidate.

There are also examples in our history where electors as a group have either failed to comply with law in the manner or time of casting their votes, or have been prevented by forces beyond their control from casting their votes upon the appointed day. Again, technicalities such as these could make a vital difference in the final tabulation of the electoral vote.

Perhaps the most alarming possible consequence of the electoral college system is the prospect that the electors, lacking the distinguished qualities envisioned by the framers of the Constitution, might be called on to exercise independent judgment in the election of the President. This would occur if the successful candidate on election day in November became incapacitated, either by reason of death or other disability, between election day and the day upon which the electors meet in the several States to cast their ballots. That is, the candidate might die after he had been elected. A similar, but not identical, situation occurred in 1872, when Horace Greeley, the Liberal Republican candidate, died shortly after the November elections. He was, however, in the minority, so that the precise problem under discussion did not arise.

It is certainly far from being a remote or improbable contingency that the successful candidate might become legally incapacitated from being eligible for the votes of the electoral college. Our practice of electing 531 relatively obscure individuals to the electoral college would indeed, under these circumstances, prove a boomerang. For the electors would then perforce have to exercise independent judgment in their selection of the President, and the resulting chaos, turmoil, and possible intrigue might well spell disaster for the Republic.

If a man who had been elected in November should die in December, the choice of the President of the United States would devolve on the presidential electors who are certainly not intended to perform the function which the people ought to perform for themselves.

One of the outstanding features, therefore, of the constitutional amendment proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 2 is its abolition of the fictitious and anachronistic office of Presidential elector, and its elimination of the complications and dangers which flow from retention of this "vermiform appendix" in the body politic.

2. ELECTIONS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The second count in the indictment against the present method of electing the President concerns the constitutional provision which designates the House of Representatives as the final umpire of presidential elections in which no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes.

A candidate, in order to win the election, must secure a majority of the whole number of electors, which at present means 266 votes. In case no person receives an electoral majority for President, the House of Representatives, voting by State units, elects the President from those receiving the three highest totals of electoral votes. A majority of the State votes—in other words, 25—is required to settle the issue.

Each State delegation is given one vote. New York has one vote, New Jersey has one vote, Connecticut has one vote, Texas has one vote. This vote is determined by the majority of its delegation. In the event a State delegation is evenly split, the State has no vote.

I believe that at the present time the State of New York has an odd number of Representatives, but if in a redistricting there should be 48 or 46, and the election of the President were thrown into the House of Representatives, and there were 23 Representatives voting for A and 23 voting for B, the entire vote of the State of New York would be excluded, and the approximately 14,000,000 persons in New York State would be completely disfranchised.

If no candidate for Vice President receives a majority of the electoral votes, the Senate proceeds to choose one of those who received the two highest totals of electoral votes. A majority of the Senators is required to elect.

This particular aspect of our election machinery has found very few, if any defenders. The chief criticism, of course, is the inequity that results from giving to all States, without regard to differences in population, equal power in electing the President. This procedure, it may be noted, entirely abrogates the basic principle upon which our whole approach to Presidential elections is predicated, namely, that each State's relative voting power shall be measured in terms both of the State as a unit, represented by the two electoral votes for the two Senators, and the State in terms of relative population, represented by the number of electoral votes for the number of Representatives. This means, simply, that each State has the same number of electoral votes as it has votes in Congress. But when an election is thrown into the House of Representatives, this principle is wholly disregarded and each State stands on an equal basis with every other State.

The fundamental evil, therefore, in this system is that it furnishes no accurate or assured way of reflecting the popular will.

The notable example in our history of an election in the House occurred in 1824. In the November elections, Andrew Jackson led his nearest opponent, John Quincy Adams, by approximately 50,000 popular votes. But Jackson lacked a majority in the electoral college, so the House of Representatives was called upon to umpire the decision. As a result of the manipulations of Henry Clay, who is supposed to have traded his support of Adams in return for a promise of the post of Secretary of State, Adams—the minority popular choice—was elected over Jackson and there followed what most historians describe as the "futile" administration of Adams.

Serious as is this possibility that the House of Representatives may completely thwart the popular will, a still more dangerous evil lurks behind the provision that the House shall umpire deadlocked presidential elections. It is entirely possible that the House itself might become deadlocked, with the result that Inauguration Day might come and go without a duly elected President.

Political analysts have demonstrated how the 1948 elections illustrate the possibility of this danger. A change of less than six-tenths of the votes from Mr. Truman in two States would have thrown the election into the House. A careful analysis of the 48 State delegations in the House have revealed that neither the Republicans nor the Democrats would have been able to command the constitutional majority of 25 States necessary to elect. At the outset of the Eighty-first Congress, 21 delegations had a Democratic majority, 20 delegations had

a Republican majority, 3 were evenly divided, and 4 delegations represented States which were carried by the Dixiecrat candidate. That brings it very close to home, Mr. President. On the first ballot, consequently, the result would have been: For Mr. Truman, 21; for Mr. Dewey, 20; for Mr. Thurmond, 4. Assuming that the delegations from the 4 States carried by Mr. Thurmond had held fast, even the shift of the 3 evenly divided delegations either to Mr. Truman or to Mr. Dewey would not have commanded the requisite constitutional majority of 25. There is something to think about. It would have left Mr. Thurmond as the arbiter of the whole situation.

The result would have been a deadlock, with unbelievable pressures being brought to bear on the seven State delegations who held the balance of power. It is wholly probable that Inauguration Day would have arrived with no duly elected President. The twelfth amendment, the twentieth amendment, and the 1947 statute of succession are not clear as to precisely the manner in which this deadlock would have been resolved.

An election procedure which is so full of dangerous uncertainties as to leave the whole result of the election unresolved, even though a plurality of the people had expressed their preference at the polls in November, is certainly one which a country founded on the principle of popular government can ill afford to condone. This danger is indeed one which needs only to be stated, not argued.

The procedure contained in the constitutional amendment proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 2 makes this danger an impossibility. The successful candidates for President and Vice President need not obtain a majority of electoral votes; the person, to quote the language of the amendment, "having the greatest number of electoral votes for President shall be President. If two or more persons shall have an equal and the highest number of such votes," the amendment continues, "then the one for whom the greatest number of popular votes were cast shall be President." There can be no deadlocked decisions, and the universally condemned procedure of casting Congress in the role of final umpire is wholly eliminated.

3. THE UNIT-RULE METHOD OF COUNTING ELECTORAL VOTES

The third count in the indictment against our existing system for electing the President deals with the unit-rule method of awarding all of a State's electoral votes to the candidate commanding even a bare plurality of the State's popular vote. This method is sometimes known as the general ticket method of selecting electors.

It should be observed here that from the point of view of constitutional authority the States are free to adopt more equitable methods of selecting presidential electors, for article II, section 1, of the Constitution provides simply that each State shall appoint its electors in "such manner as the legislature thereof may direct." It is extremely unlikely, however, from a purely practical point of view, that the States could be induced severally and individually to switch from the prevailing general-ticket method. It is generally assumed, therefore, that a constitutional amendment is necessary to uproot the present system in order to establish a uniform and more accurate method of reflecting the popular will of the people.

The defects, unhealthy practices, and potential evils of the unit-rule or general ticket procedure for counting electoral votes are many and varied. Only those of particular importance will be outlined here.

(A) THE DISFRANCHISEMENT OF VOTERS EVIL

In effect, literally millions of American voters are disfranchised in every presidential election because of the unit-rule system.

This contention is more than a figure of speech. It is an actuality. The 1948 elections furnish an excellent example of this point.

Mr. Dewey received in the 16 States which he carried a total of 8,600,000 votes. These 16 States gave him a total of 189 electoral votes. But in the 32 States which Mr. Dewey failed to carry he had a total of 13,300,000 votes. This great mass of popular votes for Mr. Dewey gave him not one single electoral vote and, therefore, counted for naught. They were of no more effect than if they had not been cast at all.

In no other Federal election in our country does such a system for disregarding votes obtain. If A and B are running against each other for Senator in the State of Ohio, for example, each is credited with all the votes cast for him. Ohio does not provide that if A obtains 50.1 percent of the votes in Cleveland, then A shall be credited with all of Cleveland's votes and the 49.9 percent of popular votes cast for candidate B shall be wholly disregarded.

Yet that is the theory upon which our existing unit-rule system operates in the case of the election of President. And what is worse, not only are the votes which are cast for the candidate failing to command a plurality in a given State lost: they are taken away from that candidate and credited to his opponent. For example, in the 1948 elections, Mr. Dewey was credited with all of Connecticut's eight electoral votes, even though he commanded but a bare plurality of the popular votes. Some 423,000 votes were cast for Mr. Truman, but these votes were wholly disregarded in the computation of Mr. Truman's electoral strength, and, actually, they were all credited to Mr. Dewey. In other words, these 423,000 votes were computed precisely the opposite of the way they were cast.

It is this aspect of our present procedure which led former Representative Clarence F. Lea, of California, long an advocate of election reform and one of the leading experts on this subject to observe:

> Recently the Nation was shocked on learning that minor election officials out in Kansas City had used their position to make a theft of votes by counting them contrary to the way they were cast. A few hundred votes, or possibly a few thousand, were involved in the election to nominate a candidate for Congress.
>
> In the Presidential election of 1944, 21,384,797 votes, with the approval of the law under which we elect the President, were counted exactly contrary to the way they were cast.
>
> The difference, of course, in the two cases is that the Kansas City counting was illegal, and the Presidential counting is legal. The illegitimate effect, however, was the same—taking votes from one candidate and crediting them to another.

(B) THE "MINORITY PRESIDENT" EVIL

The term "minority President" is frequently used with two different meanings. It may refer to a President who is elected without a majority of the popular vote, but nevertheless with more popular votes than any of his opponents. This has happened in almost half—14—of the 32 elections for President between 1824 and 1948, inclusive.

It may also refer to a President who was elected despite the fact that he had fewer popular votes than his leading opponent. This has happened three times in our history—Adams in 1824, Hayes in 1876, and Harrison in 1888. It is in this latter meaning of the term "minority President" that we discuss the phase here.

Such a result as this is directly attributable to three characteristics of our election procedure: (a) The unit-rule method of counting electoral votes; (b) the distribution of electoral votes to States on the basis of the number of votes each State has in Congress; and (c) the fact that all save two of each State's electoral votes are awarded on the basis of population, rather than voting strength.

An extended analysis of how these three factors make possible the election of minority Presidents can be found in the record of hearings, pages 74–77.

The point which should be emphasized in this report, however, is the fact that it is primarily the unit-rule method of counting electoral votes which contributes to such anomalous results.

Allusion was made earlier to the fact that the electoral college has become a mere rubber stamp, and that it is, in fact, an inaccurate rubber stamp. When a rubber stamp begins to make mistakes, the time for discarding it is at hand. A very recent example of how this rubber stamp nearly made another mistake is in the 1948 elections. Here again we came dangerously close to electing a President even though he had fewer popular votes than his opponent. A shift of approximately 17,000 votes in Illinois, 3,500 votes in Ohio, and 9,000 votes in California would have transferred 78 electoral votes from Mr. Truman to Mr. Dewey, and the latter would have been elected President in spite of the fact that his opponent would have polled 2,000,000 more popular votes.

Former Representative Lea summarized this evil as follows:

> It is a mathematical certainty, confirmed by experience, that the electoral vote cast as a unit cannot accurately reflect the will of the population of the State or of its voters.
>
> The electoral vote cast as a unit has no logical mathematical relation to the popular will. A system under which a plurality of the popular vote can swing the whole 47 electoral votes of New York, or any other State, regardless of minority votes, totally lacks any mathematical justice in measuring

the voting power of a State, or as between the States. There is no common denominator for such a calculation.

If we want to reach anything like an accurate reflection of the popular will in the election of a President, we must abolish the unit vote and let the electoral votes more accurately reflect the will of the voters of each State. That is the basic requirement of any just system. That means a method of counting votes that is just within the State and as between the different States.

The proponents of this constitutional amendment make no claim that it will wholly abolish the possibility of minority Presidents. But because this reform eliminates one of the three—and the principal—factors which foster such results, it is believed that possibility is greatly reduced. It can never be entirely eliminated without doing away with the two-electoral-vote bonus awarded each State regardless of population and without resorting to a direct popular election of the President, thus voiding the underlying Federal principle of equality of States in the Senate which made possible the adoption of the Constitution.

In other words, so long as each State has credit for two votes, representing each Senator, we are never going to get an accurate picture of the popular will. I do not claim that the proposed amendment will result in a completely accurate picture, but it will greatly improve the situation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERGUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I take it the Senator would not have any objection to the elimination of the provision that two electoral votes shall be counted in the electoral college for the two Senators from a State; would he?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, I am not advocating that. I am keeping the electoral vote as a counting device, but I am doing away with the office of Presidential elector.

Mr. LONG. Then it would still be possible, even under the Senator's amendment, for a President to have the most popular votes, and yet not have the most electoral votes; would it not?

Mr. LODGE. It would still be mathematically possible, but it would be very unlikely indeed. It would be theoretically possible.

Mr. LONG. I notice that the committee amendment on page 3 suggests striking out the words "unless a more detailed calculation would change the result of the election." Will the Senator explain the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. LODGE. I shall be glad to. The amendment was recommended by the committee to take care of a theoretically possible, but practically most unlikely, situation. The words which are to be stricken out are "unless a more detailed calculation would change the result of the election." Conceivably a situation might arise in which, if the computation were carried out to four decimal places, the result of the election might be changed in favor of one candidate, whereas carrying the computation out to five places might favor the other candidate. This is an admittedly extremely improbable and remote contingency, but it was pointed out by a mathematician that it is mathematically possible, and that is the reason for the amendment.

Mr. LONG. Would it not seem fairer to carry out the calculation, if it is desired, to see who had the highest vote in the electoral college?

Mr. LODGE. The point is that if the calculation were carried out to four places, one result might be reached, and if it were carried to five places another might be reached, and the counting might never end at all. So, in view of that mathematical possibility, it was thought better to strike out this particular language.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. I am glad the Senator raised that point, because I do not want anyone to think that the proposed constitutional amendment which I am advocating will completely eliminate the possibility of a man being elected President even though he has a minority of the popular vote. So long as we have the two-vote bonus for the two Senators from a State, we will never be able to do that. But let me call attention to what the Brookings Institution has to say on that point; and I submit, in all candor, that there is no institution of its kind which speaks with more authority. The Brookings Institution said, as appears on page 15 of the hearings, that the proposed system "has great advantages over the existing system in that it will practically eliminate the chance that a President will receive a majority of electoral votes despite the fact that his opponent polled a majority of the popular vote." Please note the words "practically eliminate."

I now come to what I call the doubtful State evil.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question at that point?

Mr. LODGE. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. I notice that the Senator would not have anything in the nature of a run-off, under his amendment. That is, if there were a third party, and the candidate of the third party might have sufficient votes to represent the difference between the other two candidates, there would not be a run-off between the two high candidates, would there?

Mr. LODGE. No; it would not be necessary or desirable. Under my proposal the candidate who carried each State would be affected by the reflection of the popular vote in the electoral vote count, whereas under the present system if a candidate gets a plurality of the vote of a State, he gets a hundred percent of the electoral vote. I do not think it would be necessary or desirable to have a run-off.

Mr. LONG. It occurs to me that if a third or even a fourth party had a substantial number of votes, it might be well to find out whom the majority of the people wanted to be President, rather than have one who could still be a minority President by virtue of the fact that there might have been a third or fourth party which might have polled a substantial number of votes, which would amount to the difference between the votes for the two other candidates.

Mr. LODGE. I do not think a run-off would be a desirable thing to have, I will say to the Senator from Louisiana.

(c) THE "DOUBTFUL STATE" EVIL

A further charge against the unit-rule system is that it strongly tends to overemphasize the political importance of the large politically doubtful States.

Mr. President, this has two significant effects. First, it means that presidential candidates from these States have a marked advantage over rivals from other States in the nomination struggle. Sixteen of the 26 major-party candidates since 1900—17, if Theodore Roosevelt be considered a major-party candidate in 1912—have come from New York or Ohio. It is a fact that the electoral vote power—unduly enhanced by the unit rule—and the close division of party strength in these States give them, in the words of Prof. Joseph E. Kallenbach of the University of Michigan, "a most salubrious climate for the growth of presidential timber." The Brookings Institution, commenting on this aspect of the proposed reform, stated—record of hearings, page 15:

In the selection of candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency the parties will be concerned with the capacity of the persons chosen to command the support of voters thrroughout the Nation and not upon their capacity to carry certain pivotal States or even big cities. Able men from small States will not be handicapped as they are at present.

The second effect of this doubtful State evil is of even greater importance. The so-called doubtful or pivotal States monopolize the attention of the candidates and the campaign-fund spenders during the canvass for popular votes, while other areas not regarded as doubtful are generally ignored. The testimony of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] on this point is relevant—record of hearings, page 39:

Very important to the Nation is the fact that this new system would require the Presidential campaigns to be waged in every State. This would provide a great educational process in every section of the country. As matters now stand, there are hardly any campaigns in certain of the Southern States or in New England. The strategists of the party get together in advance, claim some States, concede others, and wage their campaigns in the doubtful States. The pivotal States are the only ones that really enjoy the full benefits of a political campaign.

The President of the United States is the President of all the people. Certainly the voters before whom he must present his case have a right to expect that they will be included in his campaign for the highest office in the Nation. Citizens in the smaller populated States and in the so-called sure States have that right just as much as do their fellow citizens in the pivotal, doubtful States. They have an equal right to see the candidates for President, to judge him by his spoken words and his appearance, and to be educated on the issues. But so long as the Presidency turns upon

a few doubtful, pivotal States it is natural to expect that they will be denied this right.

(D) THE "SURE STATE" EVIL

Another charge which can be leveled against the unit-rule system is that it perpetuates so-called solid or one-party States.

Voting statistics show a high correlation between the degree of closeness of the State-wide popular vote and the amount of popular participation. In the doubtful State there is a strong incentive for the voter to vote; in States where the outcome on a State-wide basis is a forgone conclusion, there is little incentive for the voter, regardless of his political inclinations, to take the trouble to register his preference.

The striking examples of solid States, of course, lie in a dozen States in the South and a few States in New England and the North Central area. Insofar as the situation in the South is concerned, Mr. C. S. Potts, dean emeritus of the Law School, Southern Methodist University, surely a notable authority, has stated the case forcefully, and I want to read an excerpt from his testimony—record of hearings, page 89:

The writer is convinced that the electoral college is largely responsible for keeping the solid South solid. * * * Is it a matter of wonder that States that are never visited by candidates and campaign speakers, States to which no literature or campaign workers are ever sent, continue to vote the same party from year to year, even from generation to generation? What influence is ever brought to bear upon them to change their political allegiance?

The politicians in these States are active and the masses of people are sometimes mildly excited until the national conventions have been held and the rival candidates are placed in the field. But from that day until the November election, the "solid" States only catch faint echoes of the great struggle that is going on in a narrow belt of States farther north, and the citizens of these States are almost as completely idle spectators of the contests as are the people of Mexico or Canada.

The only part they have in the campaign is to be called on from time to time to contribute money to help pay the expenses of the campaigns, but no part of the money is ever spent within their borders. It is safe to say that south of Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri there are 6,000,000 voters who have never heard a campaign speech delivered by the Presidential candidate of either of the two great parties, after their nomination for office.

The writer—

This is Mr. Potts, dean emeritus of the Law School of Southern Methodist University, speaking—

believes that the abolition of the electoral college would work the political readmission of the solid South into the Union. When the votes in Georgia are worth just as much as votes in Indiana, Georgia will be cultivated by the parties just as assiduously as Indiana is now cultivated.

As it is now, the voter says to himself, "What is the use of my going to the polls in November? There is no chance that my vote will do any good, for everybody knows beforehand that Georgia will give her electoral vote to the Democratic candidate."

The result is that there is an enormous stay-at-home vote, alike of Republicans and Democratic voters. Not only so, but the Republican Party finds it impossible to win new recruits among the native southern population or to hold its members who move into the solid South from elsewhere. The voter realizes that as a Republican his vote is utterly worthless so far as the result of the national election is concerned, but by becoming a Democrat, he can go into the Democratic primaries and have a real share in settling State and local matters. Hence, we find that most Republicans, upon moving into the Southern States, soon cease to affiliate with their party and vote the Democratic ticket.

That is the testimony of Mr. Potts, formerly dean of the Law School of Southern Methodist University, who, I think, is well qualified to have an opinion on a question of this kind.

Of course, in slightly varying degrees, this analysis applies with equal logic to the other one-party areas in the country.

It is sometimes emphasized that in the so-called solid States one electoral vote represents far fewer votes than does one electoral vote in other parts of the Nation. It has been pointed out, for example, that each electoral vote in the South represents an average of 40,000 popular votes, as against an average of 110,000 votes per electoral vote in the remaining 37 States of the North and Central States.

To a very substantial extent, the unit-rule system is responsible for this disparity between the relative weight of electoral votes throughout the country. So long as States have a bonus of two electoral votes regardless of population, some disparity, of course, will always exist. But because the unit rule perpetuates solid areas and because in solid areas the general election vote is always comparatively light, the principal contributing factor remains the unit rule.

It should be observed that when statisticians compute how much weight is to be given to an electoral vote they always use the general election figures. These figures are usually very markedly smaller than the primary election figures in one-party States. The 1948 statistics are not presently available, but in 1946, in South Carolina, for example, 13 percent of the population voted in the primaries, while only about 1½ percent voted in the November elections. Think of that. In Georgia the relationship was 15 percent in the primaries and 4½ percent in the general elections. In Mississippi it was 6 percent in the primaries and 0.2 percent in the general elections. In Texas 28 percent of the population voted in the primaries; only 5 percent turned out for the general elections. A similar pattern recurs in other Southern States. These figures are significant for two principal reasons: (a) They clearly demonstrate that the statistics showing how many popular votes one electoral vote represents are not based on the real voting strength of the South. Real voting strength is more accurately reflected, in most cases, in the primary elections. (b) The real voting interest in the South is manifest in primaries where there is a real contest. When there is no contest, apathy is the natural result to expect.

The Brookings Institution, referring to Senate Joint Resolution 2, summarized this whole problem in these words—record of hearings, page 15:

Sure States will no longer be neglected as they are at present both in nominations and campaigns because a substantial minority vote in these States will result in electoral votes for the candidate of their party. Voters opposed to the dominant party in their respective States will be encouraged to work and vote for their candidates because their work and votes may actually affect the results. Their votes will be cast and counted for the candidates of their choice and not thrown away as under the present system.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that if the election of a President were to be decided on the basis of the popular vote, there would be a much greater attendance at the polls than there would be if the measure sponsored by the Senator from Massachusetts should go into effect?

Mr. LODGE. I think that is true. I think there would be a greater attendance, yes. As the Senator from North Dakota knows, I have been in favor of a direct popular vote, but, being a realist, I discovered some years ago that it was an impossibility to achieve, because it did away with the principle of equality of States in the Senate. But I think unquestionably a direct popular vote would increase interest very much.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or would he rather not be interrupted?

Mr. LODGE. I am delighted to be interrupted.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator, from his study of the subject, give us assurance, if the joint resolution is passed and the constitutional amendment ratified, that in the South, members of either or both major parties will take advantage of the situation which will then exist? How does the Senator really know that, in the final analysis, it would develop a two-party system, and that interest would be developed in another party than the one in which there seems to be the greatest interest now? My reason for asking the question is that people belong to this or that party, they belong to this or that church, and it seems to me very difficult to get them out of one into the other. Change from one party to the other, it seems to me, could be brought about only after long effort and much education. Does the Senator have any observations to present, other than those he has presented, to indicate that, if the proposed amendment were to be ratified, in the South greater interest would be taken in another party than the one which dominates the South today?

Mr. LODGE. Of course, that is a very important consideration, and one to which I have given a great deal of thought.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an observation?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. From my own experience, I know what it means in a general election to lose a ward or lose a precinct which is 99-percent Democratic. It is possible that a person who registers as a member of one party, may vote with another in the general election.

Mr. LODGE. My answer is that of course this question involves a guess as to the future. Everything we do in the Senate involves a guess as to the future.

So this proposal is not different from any other proposal, in that respect.

Some persons have said, "Oh, you want to change the system because of some guess you are making about the future."

Of course, Mr. President, as I have said, everything we do here involves a guess about the future. We are not legislating about the past. Every time a Senator reaches an opinion, he is making up his mind about what the future will hold.

For instance, if in a room there is a hungry dog that has not had anything to eat for a long time, and if in a corner of the room there is placed a dish with some meat in it, the dog will go to that corner of the room to get the meat.

That is the kind of judgment I am making here. It seems to me that I am making a rather conservative assumption; I do not think it is a rash assumption at all. Given the natural inclination of Americans to take part in political activity, and given the fact that we have a competitive party system in the United States, in which two parties are competing with each other—although in the past few years one of them has been winning the competition from time to time, and the other has been losing it—and given the temperament of the American people and the competitive nature of the party managers of the two political parties, it seems to me simply inconceivable that the adoption of this proposed constitutional amendment would not result in a change in the voting complexion in the so-called politically solid areas.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not mean to have my question interpreted so as to indicate that I was worried too much about the future. Of course, I should like to see a strong two-party system, as the Senator from Massachusetts well knows, not only in the South, but throughout the United States. I favor that. But, referring to the illustration the Senator gave, let me say that in putting the meat in one place in a room, rather than in another, we must be sure that it will attract both, not just one. That is the idea.

My point was not in regard to where the meat would be placed or where the dog would go to get the meat; but I should like to know whether the Senator has any other observations to offer in regard to the question of whether by opening up the system so that the popular vote will be registered, the result will be to produce any more effective organization in another party than has already been accomplished.

Mr. LODGE. Let me give the Senator another answer to that question. Let us say, for purposes of making the arithmetic simple, that a certain State has 10 electoral votes. Let us say that it is located in a one-party area—either in the Solid South or in northern New England or in the North Central area from which the Senator from Nebraska comes. Let us say that in the election the Democrats get 80 percent of the popular vote and the Republicans get 20 percent of the popular vote. Under the present system the Democrats would get all 10 electoral votes and the Republicans would get none. Under such a system there is no incentive for any Republican Party worker or candidate or bright young man or anyone else to lift his finger to get out the Republican vote or to try to persuade persons to become Republicans. But under the system which I now propose, the Republicans, who constituted 20 percent of the total vote, would get two electoral votes, and those two electoral votes would be added to whatever other electoral votes the Republicans got in other States. As the Senator knows, with that possibility in existence there would be a tremendous incentive to organize torchlight parades, moonlight sails, and party meetings of all sorts, in order to get as many votes as possible, because credit would be received for all the votes which were obtained, whereas under the present system that is not the case.

Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. WHERRY. That is a part of the question, and I appreciate the Senator's reply. It brings out what the Senator has in mind, namely, that if the popular vote is taken, at least the minority will receive credit for what it has done in the States, and therefore that, of itself, will strengthen the interest in developing a stronger party organization.

Perhaps the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has already mentioned that point in his speech. I have not heard all his speech, I regret to say, although I have tried to be here. But I think that point should be brought out, because it is my feeling that if the so-called solid States, in various sections of the country, are to give up the electoral college system, under which one party now gets credit for all the electoral votes, naturally that party would have to make a gain in the marginal States or the closely contested States and in the solid South, where it now is not getting credit for its votes.

So it seems to me that it is one thing to say that a popular vote would do that, and another thing to show how it might be done. In other words, in order to convince those who might feel that to give up the unit rule, under which their party now enjoys a solid vote, would be a handicap to them, it is obviously desirable to show them that to make the exchange might result in some advantage to them in other areas.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, that is an absolutely correct point. I hope I have given the Senator two intelligent answers; at least, I have tried to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. Of course, torchlight parades would increase the interest in the party any way. But I am interested in this matter because under the proposed system the individual will get credit, in the electoral vote of the State, for the work he does, and therefore that will increase the interest generally, and will increase the activities of the party and the interest in the party system.

Mr. LODGE. That is correct. The dean of Southern Methodist University and many others of equal political stature unanimously believe that if this system were in effect, the party line-up in the one-party areas would change.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I am delighted to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If we analyze the vote taken in the last presidential election, would the result have been any different under the system proposed by this measure than it was under the electoral college system?

Mr. LODGE. Of course, if the system now proposed had been in effect at the time of the last election, people would have voted differently. That is the first point. But in order to show how it would work out as a matter of mechanics, let us assume that the popular vote would have been cast as it actually was cast, although, of course, that would not have been the case. But assuming that, we find that whereas under the present system President Truman received 303 electoral votes and Mr. Dewey received 189, under the proposed system, Mr. Truman would have received 258 electoral votes, Mr. Dewey would have received 221.4 electoral votes, and Mr. Wallace would have received 9.4. That is merely an illustration of the mechanical workings of the system now proposed, if we assume that the popular vote would have been cast in the same way, although, of course, that would not have been the case, because the Republicans would have made tremendous efforts to obtain votes in the solid South, and those efforts undoubtedly would have achieved something; and the Democrats would have made great efforts in northern New England and in the North Central States, and their efforts also would have achieved something. So the efforts thus made would have achieved definitely different results. But the illustration I have just presented gives an idea of how the proposed system would work.

(E) THE PRESSURE-GROUP EVIL

Now, let me come to what I call the pressure-group evil. One of the most serious charges against the unit-rule aspect of our present system is the undeniable fact that it not only permits but actually encourages and invites the domination of presidential campaigns by small, organized, well-disciplined minority or pressure groups within the large so-called pivotal States. These pressure groups may or may not be organized into splinter parties with candidates of their own in the field, but whether they go under a party label or whether they simply operate as a bloc of votes, their influence is frequently a key factor in determining whether all of a State's electoral votes will go to one or the other of the major party candidates.

Commenting on this phase of the problem, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] testified—record of hearings, page 42:

> It seems to me that splinter parties would have less bargaining power than at present, since their influence on the electoral vote of the States would be in direct proportion to their popular vote, whereas at the present time a splinter party has a tremendous

power in a State if it is a balance-of-power party and its minority votes can determine completely how the electoral vote of the State will go.

The fact that pressure groups do hold a balance of power in States where the contest between the two major parties is close—and I call attention to the situation in New York State in the 1948 election, where Henry Wallace's party certainly exercised very great power—is an evil of the unit-rule system that has far-reaching but understandable effects. It causes both of the major parties to give undue attention to the demands and programs of relatively unimportant groups or factions. Because of the strategic position which these groups may occupy, even though in the over-all national scene the particular group may not be numerically important, they may be the vital pivot upon which a large block of electoral votes will turn. Hence, the major parties feel it necessary to make large concessions and enter strong bids for their support.

Representative ED GOSSETT, of Texas, had this comment to make during the course of the hearings:

> Of late we have become rightly alarmed over the activities of the Communist Party in the United States. Strange to say, this party has its greatest following and influence in the large pivotal States. This party and its fellow travelers are shrewd political manipulators. What grim irony it would be if they should swing the balance of power and be responsible for the election of a President of the United States.

In its report on the constitutional amendment proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 2, the Brookings Institution summarized this particular condition as follows—record of hearings, page 15:

> This constitutional amendment will practically remove the chance that small minority groups can attain and exercise great power over Presidents, presidential candidates, and political parties because they hold the balance of power in certain pivotal States. These minority groups will have no power beyond that justified by their number of voters in a presidential election.

(F) THE "LANDSLIDE PSYCHOLOGY" EVIL

Finally, in the list of evils of the present system which I am making, I come to what I call the "landslide psychology" evil.

Because the electoral college, through the operation of the unit-rule system, is an inaccurate rubber stamp, it grossly magnifies the victory of the winner and exaggerates the defeat of the loser. Because it fails to reflect the will of the people, it frequently gives a false impression of a sweeping triumph, coupled with an ignominious rout for the candidate placing second. This is due, of course, to the fact that the illogical unit-rule system seldom permits the electoral vote figures to correspond at all with the popular vote figures.

One of the most striking examples of this gross distortion of popular sentiment occurred in the 1936 elections. Mr. Landon received almost 39 percent of the popular vote, yet the electoral college tally credited him with only 1½ percent of the electoral vote. Other illustrations compiled by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] appear in the record of hearings at page 75.

As the popular vote and the electoral vote more nearly correspond, the illusion of a landslide is dispelled. It is certainly doubtful whether a false landslide psychology is good for a democracy, which needs stability as well as ferment. Much violent energy may be lost in apparently violent swings of the pendulum.

The natural effect of landslide psychology is, of course, obvious. Legislators, high officials in the executive branch of the Government, and organs of public opinion may be deceived largely because of the exaggeration that characterizes the distribution of the electoral votes. A system, such as that proposed in this constitutional amendment, which seeks a more equitable distribution of electoral votes has the virtue of giving both victors and the vanquished a better understanding of their responsibilities and opportunities. It affords a more accurate yardstick whereby "mandates" can be measured.

ADVANTAGES OF THE PROPOSED SYSTEM

I now desire to discuss the advantages of the proposed system, having stressed the evils of the present system.

In the preceding section, the principal evils, dangers, and defects of the present method of electing the President and Vice President were discussed. In this section, the committee lists those features of the constitutional amendment proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 2 which are of affirmative benefit.

These advantages are of two types: First, those which correct specific defects; and, second, those which have an independent positive benefit of their own.

The corrective features of the proposed reform may be very briefly listed, since a discussion of the defects of the present system necessarily included some mention of the manner in which the proposed amendment seeks to meet them.

(a) Since the new system entirely does away with the office of presidential elector, all of the disadvantages of this clumsy arrangement disappear. The amendment recognizes that the electoral-college system has never functioned as originally conceived by the framers of the Constitution. The ghost elector becomes a thing of the past, and with his demise there perishes also the possibility that individual electors may go directly counter to the expressed will of the voters—as has happened—and cast their ballots because of personal preference, or even whim or caprice. That happened in the case of a Tennessee elector in the 1948 election. There can be no so-called desertions to the enemy when the procedure for counting electoral votes is automatic and fixed by law.

The abolition of the electoral college will prevent a countless number of votes from being invalidated in many States because of the complications and confusion resulting from the printing of long lists of electors' slates on the ballot.

The proposed amendment eliminates the possibility that an election of the President might turn on whether a given slate of electors were prevented from gathering on the legally appointed day to cast their pro forma ballots for President and Vice President. In 1857 the whole electoral vote of Wisconsin was challenged because that State's electors had been held up by a blizzard and were not able to meet at the State capital to cast their votes on the day appointed by law. Fortunately, their votes were not decisive.

It obviates the chance that a whole election might turn on whether a single elector in a given State was legally eligible to hold that office. After the 1948 November elections, several of the duly chosen electors in Virginia discovered they were ineligible to serve by reason of their holding Federal offices of one sort or another. Had their ineligibility not been discovered in time and had they cast their votes as electors, the revelation later that they were ineligible would have caused these votes to be invalidated. In an extremely close division of the electoral vote the result of the election could thus be affected.

The uncertainty and the element of human frailty is an inevitable part of the present system of human electors. These uncertainties and possibilities that entire elections might turn on the qualifications or whims of a single individual elector are abolished forever.

Then, too, the elimination of the electoral college prevents a group of relatively obscure men from electing the President in the event the successful candidate, according to the preference expressed in the November elections, dies or becomes otherwise disqualified prior to the legal election by the electoral college. The President, under the new system, is elected on election day in November. The voters will not be expressing a mere preference by voting for electors. The voters will be voting directly for President, with the electoral-vote system retained merely as a counting device, stripped of the perils of human behavior.

(b) The present uncertainty inherent in our existing system whereby the failure to gain a majority of electoral votes throws the election into the House of Representatives is eliminated. The nightmarish prospect of the United States being without a duly elected President on Inauguration Day is forever dispelled. The turmoil, unrest, intrigue, and possible frustration of the popular will by an election of the President in Congress will no longer confront us. The long period of uncertainty, which might have very grave effects on our foreign as well as domestic policy, intervening between November election day and the convening of the new Congress, would no longer be possible.

The proposed new system has the great advantage of promoting absolute certainty in the election of the President. Unresolved deadlocks become absolutely out of the question.

(c) Because the proposed constitutional amendment provides for the automatic division of a State's electoral votes on the basis of the popular vote, all the evils inherent in the unit-rule method of counting electoral votes are either wholly eliminated or greatly minimized.

The counting procedure would be legally uniform in all the States.

No longer would millions of voters be disfranchised and their votes appropri-

ated to the candidate against whom they voted. No votes would be lost. Every vote for President would count.

The possibility that a President might be elected in spite of the fact that he polled fewer popular votes than his opponent would be virtually eliminated for the simple reason that the new system would bring the electoral vote and the popular vote much closer together.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I was interested in the observation of the Senator that the electors might not vote for the choice of the party by which they were elected. I ask the Senator if there does not seem to be an increasing tendency on the part of electors to vote for a candidate other than the candidate of their party? For example, in the 1944 election there were a great many rumors to the effect that some of the electors in certain States were not going to follow the party dictates, and, as the Senator has pointed out, in the 1948 election there were not only rumors to that effect, but one elector actually voted differently from the slate upon which he was elected. Does not the Senator feel that, in years to come, the tendency might grow and that we might as the result have a very troublesome situation?

Mr. LODGE. I think the Senator is entirely right. Not only in the 1944 election but also in the 1948 election there were instances of what might be called free-wheeling electors, who ran ostensibly as rubber stamps, with an agreement to vote for the Democratic candidate, if he carried the State, or for the Republican candidate, if he carried it, but who then voted as they personally, individually pleased. The Senator is quite right that if two or three electors can do that, then there is no reason why a great many more cannot do it; and, if that happens the whole system of electing the President is dangerously subverted.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may ask the Senator if that does not mean, then, that not only is the voter voting in the dark, but actually in the case of Tennessee in the last election, a voter who thought he was voting for the Democratic candidates was actually casting only eleven-twelfths of a vote; he did not have the right to his full vote when he cast his ballot?

Mr. LODGE. Of course, there can be no question about that. In such a case the voter does not really vote for President at all.

I am now summarizing, Mr. President, the advantages of the system here proposed.

Presidential campaigns, campaign effort, and campaign funds would no longer be almost exclusively concentrated in the big pivotal doubtful States, to the exclusion of the smaller populated States or sure States. This method of making every vote for President count would tend to spread the campaign and any subsequent presidential activity into all the 48 States.

It would therefore, politically speaking, also tend to break up so-called solid or one-party areas.

It would discourage the prevailing tendency to nominate presidential candidates only from among the residents of those States having a large electoral vote. The danger and detriment to the general welfare is obvious when the field of presidential possibilities is so restricted. The whole Nation should be the field from which to select Presidents.

It would effectively and substantially reduce the undue influence which balance-of-power minority, pressure, or "splinter" factions exercise in the large pivotal States and the big cities. No longer would these groups be capable of swinging large blocks of electoral votes—and perhaps the election. These factions, if they enter the arena of presidential politics at all, would have to do so purely on the basis of their own merit. They would be no stronger than the number of votes actually cast for them. Because their numbers are small, they would in all probability receive little national attention. Their frequently assumed role of pivot in key States would no longer give them their presently exaggerated importance.

The illusion that a relatively close election was an overwhelming victory for the successful candidate and a crushing defeat for the loser would be dispelled.

Aside from these corrective advantages of the proposed procedure for election of the President, some independently affirmative benefits would result.

(a) By effecting a compromise between the existing system and the idea of a direct, popular election of the President, the amendment would completely preserve and protect the rights of the small States. No State is given any greater power in electing a President than it has in passing a bill through Congress, and by retaining the distribution of electoral votes on the basis of each State's number of Congressmen and Senators, this power is in no way diminished. The rights of the small States, as effected in the so-called great compromise of the Constitutional Convention in 1787, are in no way abridged under this new arrangement.

(b) The proposed system of dividing each State's electoral vote in proportion to its popular vote offers a far more accurate and equitable method of reflecting popular sentiment within that State. Under the existing procedure, were one denied access to the popular-vote totals, it would be completely impossible to tell whether a State had voted overwhelmingly in favor of the candidate carrying that State or whether he had gained all of its electoral votes in a photo-finish. Considered from that point of view, therefore, this new system enhances a State's voice in presidential politics because of the accurate barometer it furnishes of the popular will in the State.

(c) Perhaps the greatest benefit which the proponents and supporters of this reform believe would result from its incorporation into the Constitution is the prospect that it would greatly enhance and invigorate the two-party system in the United States. The record contains many strong expressions of opinion on this point. I should merely like to read two of them. One is from the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who, as shown by the record of the hearings at pages 25 and 26, observed:

> There are still great variations in the economic, educational, and cultural patterns of this country, from State to State and region to region, which still need the protection which our system of checks and balances gives. We protect this diversity of interests, by our constitutional system and by our two-party Government, in such a manner that our Government is rarely perfectly representative of any of its people in all its programs, but is generally a common meeting ground of a great number of its people.
>
> This system of checks and balances, of which the electoral vote is a part, is the result of basic compromise, and is itself properly to be used as a lever of compromise, avoiding extremes, and requiring our people and our Government to pursue a course which is fair to the country as a whole.
>
> We are not changing this system by Senate Joint Resolution 2, but rather we are attempting to make it work better, to be more expressive of its underlying concept. We are attempting to perfect a part of the great compromise which made our federation successful.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] made the following observations regarding the effect of the proposed amendment on the two-party system—record of hearings, page 39:

> Insofar as advantages to one party or the other are concerned, it is my impression that both would benefit. The adoption of this system would make the Republican Party a Nation-wide instead of a sectional party. The Democratic Party is already Nation-wide. But under the new system, we would have stronger party control in this Nation which is based on the strong two-party plan. A vote in Mississippi or Maine, for example, would count just as much as a vote in Pennsylvania or Ohio. All our people would have the great benefit of considering the issues, of having candidates or top-flight speakers explain the issues to them in person. This will do much toward giving us an enlightened electorate which is very desirable.
>
> You may think that some of us from the South would prefer not to have a strong two-party system. I do think it is important that we do have a real two-party system in the Nation; it is the only manner in which we can operate successfully our republican form of government. The election processes and the party processes would be strengthened greatly in all parts of the Union if the people were able to choose between party philosophies.

To that I should like to add this personal observation, that every State stands to gain when there is a competitive party situation within the State. If there is not, then the State is taken for granted. It is taken for granted in the councils of the party in power, because it is said, "We have you, anyway; we do not need to bother with you." It is taken for granted by the party out of power because it is said, "There is no use in our paying attention to you, because the cards are too hopelessly against us, anyway." So, Mr. President, a State in which there is no competitive situation between the two parties suffers in comparison with States in which there is a competitive situation.

Mr. President, I should like to list the objections which have been made to this proposal and to answer them briefly.

Certain objections were heard. These objections related chiefly to those portions of the proposed constitutional amendment which provide for a division

of a State's electoral votes in proportion to its popular vote. No testimony was heard in objection to the provisions which abolish the office of presidential elector and which eliminate elections in the House of Representatives.

The three principal criticisms were: First, that the new system would encourage proliferation of multiple parties; second, that it would introduce the principle of proportional representation at the presidential level; and, third, that the proposed method for counting the electoral vote would work to the disadvantage of one or the other of the two major political parties.

There were detailed answers made to those objections with which I shall not burden the Senate, but the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] propounded a number of questions which were penetrating and intelligent, and I furnished answers which I hope were intelligent, and they will be found on pages 73 to 78 of the hearings. They contain most of the criticisms of the proposal, together with the answers directed thereto. But let me briefly summarize the answers to the objections.

The answer to the objection that this new system would greatly encourage and give increased power to splinter parties and various minority groups has been stated earlier in this report.

Actually, as it has been stated before, this method of counting the electoral vote so as more exactly to reflect the popular will would have the effect of minimizing, rather than encouraging, the influence of multiple parties and pressure factions. For example, in the 1948 elections the Wallace vote, though meager by comparison to the total vote cast, threw two States to Mr. Dewey. Small groups in the large pivotal States now hold an enormous bargaining power because they may add enough votes to either party—or withhold enough votes from either party—to swing 47 electoral votes in New York or 35 electoral votes in Pennsylvania, one way or the other.

If the electoral votes of these and all other States were divided among the candidates in accord with their relative standing at the polls, the influence of minority groups would be measured by their numbers or the merits of their case, rather than on the basis of their bargaining power. Against this prediction that the reasonable effect of this new system would be to deflate splinter parties, the fact that some minority parties might get a small fraction of electoral votes equivalent to its fraction of the popular vote seems utterly insignificant.

I have heard persons say that because in the 1948 election Wallace would have received 9.4 electoral votes, assuming that the popular vote had been cast the same way, instead of nothing, as was the case under the present system, a great lever would be afforded for building up a third party. I cannot understand that argument. It seems to me it is not an advantage at all. Certainly, it is no advantage when we compare it with the advantage which splinter parties now have of being able to throw the whole vote of a large State one way or the other.

The second objection relates to what is termed proportional representation. The contention was made that this new method of counting the electoral vote for President and Vice President would introduce the principle of proportional representation at the Presidential level. This was dealt with very thoroughly in the hearings. This new system has no similarity to proportional representation. Proportional representation is a means of reflecting every shade of popular opinion in a legislative body. It does encourage splinter parties, of course, and thus makes it more difficult for any dominant group to carry out a consistent policy.

In a city council or a legislature there could be a perfect rainbow of parties. That is true in some European countries. It is completely inapplicable to the election of a single official to one position, such as the President of the United States. Even the cleverest surgeon cannot divide one man up—proportionally or otherwise—and expect him to live. The argument of proportional representation simply does not apply at all in the case of the election of a single official. The only place it could be applied would be in a city council or a legislature, where there are many persons elected by the people.

The third objection I label "political disadvantages." Some people say the proposed amendment would give the Republican Party a legalistic advantage over the Democratic Party, or would operate to the advantage of the Democratic Party at the expense of the Republican Party. I have heard both statements made. I categorically deny either of those contentions. It seems to me that this joint resolution removes obstacles in the way of a vigorous and healthy two-party system. The question of partisan advantage depends on the energy, imagination, and ability of American party leadership. These are qualities which cannot be created by constitutional amendment.

I think we must agree that if the present system is wrong, dangerous, and unfair—which I believe it to be—then it should be reformed regardless of party advantage. There are many people today who believe that our political parties give altogether too much thought to the political advantage which accrues to a party organization and not sufficient thought to the consideration that our parties exist to serve the people and have no other excuse for being. I think it depends on the imagination and the energy which both parties show in taking advantage of the situation. But if a reform needs to be made, let us make it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a detail line-by-line analysis of this amendment.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 2

In this analysis, the provisions of the joint resolution are quoted sentence by sentence with a brief explanation of each.

Page 1, line 9, of the proposed amendment reads:

"SECTION 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of 4 years, and together with the Vice President chosen for the same term, be elected as provided in this Constitution."

This is a reenactment of paragraph 1 of section 1 of article II. The only difference from the present paragraph is that the paragraph which now provides that the President be elected "as follows" is proposed to be changed to read, be elected "as provided in this Constitution."

When this paragraph was originally written, it was followed by the paragraphs providing the manner of electing the President. The twelfth amendment was later adopted and also the twentieth amendment. This change in the language of paragraph 1 simply conforms to the newer arrangement of the provisions relating to the election of the President.

Page 2, line 3:

"The electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States is hereby abolished."

The electoral college system was originally created by article II, section 1, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Constitution and later by the twelfth amendment. These provisions specify the number of electors to which each State is entitled, and the time and method of choosing them. The sentence quoted would abolish these features of the Constitution. The electoral college would cease to exist. There would be no presidential electors.

This general provision is implemented in section 2 by repealing paragraphs 2 and 3 of section 1 of article II and the twelfth amendment.

Page 2, line 5:

"The President and the Vice President shall be elected by the people of the several States."

That language conforms to article I, section 2, providing for the election of Representatives, and to the language in amendment XVII providing for the direct election of Senators.

Page 2, line 6:

"The electors of each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

This language conforms to article XVII providing for the election of Senators and to article I, section 2, providing for the election of Representatives. This provision follows the general policy of the Constitution in leaving the qualifications of voters to the States. It prescribes the same qualifications for the presidential election that the State prescribes for members of the most numerous branch of its legislature.

This provision requires no uniformity of qualification of voting as between the different States. It in no way disturbs the jurisdiction and authority of the States over the franchise and elections. It in no way meddles with State sovereignty or the right of States to specify the qualifications of its voters or the manner in which they shall vote or have their votes counted. The purity of the ballot box is left entirely within State control.

This provision is, of course, now subject to the possible reduction of representation in the House under the fourteenth amendment or to a denial of the right to vote because of sex.

Page 2, line 8:

"Congress shall determine the time of such election, which shall be the same throughout the United States. Unless otherwise determined by the Congress, such election shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November of the year preceding the year in which the regular term of the President is to begin."

This is substantially the language of article II, section 1, clause 3, of the Constitution, which refers to the selection of presidential electors.

This language, of course, provides for the election of the President in November at the

date on which we now select presidential electors who later elect the President.

Page 2, line 14:

"Each State shall be entitled to a number of electoral votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which such State may be entitled in Congress."

This is the substance of the language in article II, section 1, paragraph 2 of the Constitution, fixing the number of electors to which each State is now entitled.

This provision retains the present voting power of the State in the election of the President in precisely the same degree as now established. In other words, the vote of the State will be translated into electoral votes as at present, but without the intervening device of the presidential electors.

This provision assures each State that it will retain its electoral voting strength as at present.

Page 2, line 18:

"Within 45 days after such election, or at such time as the Congress shall direct, the official custodian of the election returns of each State shall make distinct lists of all persons for whom votes were cast for President, and the number of votes for each, and the total vote of the electors of the State for all persons for President, which lists he shall sign and certify and transmit sealed to the seat of the government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate."

This language is similar to article XII in reference to the report of the vote of the presidential electors (the electoral college).

At the present time, the members of the electoral college sign and certify and transmit the returns directed to the President of the Senate. Under the language just quoted, the official custodian of the election returns of each State shall make the lists and transmit them directly to the President of the Senate. The election returns of each State are placed in the custody of some official by State law.

The provision requiring the election returns to be made in 45 days is for the purpose of fixing a definite day so that the returns will reach Congress well in advance of the time now fixed for counting votes in the House.

Page 3, line 1:

"The President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all certificates and the votes shall then be counted. Each person for whom votes were cast for President in each State shall be credited with such proportion of the electoral votes thereof as he received of the total vote of the electors therein for President."

This provision may be regarded as one of the dominating features of this proposal. It is included in the firm belief that there can be no fair system of electing the President that does not provide for a division of the electoral votes of each State to be credited to the candidates for whom the votes were cast.

This provision requires that each candidate in the State be credited with the same proportion of the electoral vote as he received of its popular vote.

It preserves the relative voting strength of the State as at present.

This provision assures that every vote for President and Vice President will count. It eliminates the wholesale disfranchisement of minority votes to which reference has been made earlier in this report. The States are given electoral votes in proportion to their population, plus the two votes regardless of population.

In the last analysis, the purpose of an election is to register the will of the people. This cannot accurately be accomplished, with certainty and justice, unless the votes as counted reflect the will of those who cast them.

Page 3, line 7:

"In making the computations, fractional numbers less than one one-hundredth shall be disregarded."

In dividing electoral votes among candidates in proportion to the popular vote, it is desirable to include fractional numbers, inasmuch as in some instances 1 electoral vote may represent 100,000 or more popular votes. These fractional numbers are counted up to three points beyond the decimal, but beyond that are eliminated in order to avoid the use of inconsequential fractions, and also to provide a uniform treatment in the interest of simplicity.

As originally introduced in Senate Joint Resolution No. 2, this sentence contained the phrase "unless a more detailed calculation would change the result of the election," following the period. The committee, in order to conform with the language of the companion joint resolution, favorably acted on by the House committee, has made a minor perfecting amendment here by striking out that phrase.

Senator LODGE pointed out that the words "unless a more detailed calculation would change the result of the election" are ambiguous. Conceivably a situation might arise where carrying out the computation to four decimal places might change the result of the election in favor of one candidate, while carrying the computation out to five places might favor the other candidate. This is admittedly an extremely improbable and remote contingency, but it has been pointed out that it is mathematically possible where the election returns result in just a hairbreadth short of a tie.

Carrying out the result to three decimal points and terminating the computation there in all cases furnishes a sufficiently detailed calculation in order accurately to reflect the will of the people.

Page 3, line 10:

"The person having the greatest number of electoral votes for President shall be President."

This provides for the election of the President by a plurality vote of the electoral votes.

While the present method requires a majority of the electoral votes to elect, it must be remembered that in almost half of the elections between 1824 and 1948, inclusive, the successful presidential candidate was a plurality and not a majority choice in terms of popular votes.

Accordingly, it becomes immediately apparent that if the electoral votes accurately reflect the popular vote (which they do not under the present unit-rule system), these candidates could not have been elected for lack of a majority. There would have been no majority of electoral votes.

To illustrate: In the 1948 elections, the electoral vote was distributed as follows: Truman, 303; Dewey, 189; Thurmond, 39. Assuming that citizens had voted in precisely the same numbers and in the same manner, the new system, had it been in effect in the 1948 elections, would have distributed the electoral votes as follows: Truman, 258.0; Dewey, 221.4; Thurmond, 38.6; Wallace, 9.4; others, 1.8.

Hence, Mr. Truman, with 258.0 electoral votes, would have lacked the necessary majority of 266, but would, of course, have been elected President because of having received a plurality.

It will be remembered, in this connection, that Mr. Truman did not have a majority of the popular vote. He had 49.5 percent. This is mentioned here to emphasize how the proposed method of counting the electoral vote more nearly corresponds to the popular vote.

Election by plurality introduces no novel theory into American elections. Indeed, election by majority is the exception rather than the rule. We elect local officials, State legislatures, Governors, Representatives, and Senators by plurality. In fact, it has been pointed out that in actuality we elect the President today on a plurality basis, because it is a mere plurality of the popular votes of a State which determines to whom all the electoral votes of that State shall go. This is, indeed, putting almost an undue premium on the plurality principle, for the rewards of the bare—or photo-finish—plurality are all out of proportion under the unit-rule method of distributing electoral votes.

As the electoral vote is made more exactly to reflect the popular vote, the margin of difference between the candidates in electoral votes—is bound to diminish in size. Accordingly, it must be expected that comparatively few candidates (except in true landslides) will receive a clear majority of electoral votes under the proposed system. Indeed, to insist upon a majority to elect would mean frequent inconclusive elections. The only feasible ways to resolve such deadlocks would be either by having run-off elections, which on a national scale would be expensive, delaying, confusing, and possibly volatile, or by an election in Congress, a procedure against which many arguments could be made.

Page 3, line 11:

"If two or more persons shall have an equal and the highest number of such votes, then the one for whom the highest number of popular votes were cast shall be President."

This provision is purely a perfecting precautionary measure to avoid any possibility of deadlocks. It is certainly virtually inconceivable that a tie vote could occur, but this provision is designed to take care of such a remote contingency.

One of the most important phases of a good system of electing a President is to have a method that will give, as nearly as possible, absolute assurance that the election will result in the election of candidate. Great refinements are justified if necessary to create a certainty of election in every such contest.

If such a thing were possible that there should result an exact tie in the electoral vote, then a decision by giving the election to the candidate who received the greatest number of popular votes would undoubtedly lead to the selection of the President.

It will be observed that the above provisions eliminate the possibility of there being a deadlock which would take the decision to the House of Representatives. The provision in the Constitution requiring the umpirage of the House is no longer necessary and is done away with entirely.

In any event, the twentieth amendment provides an additional method to break a deadlock in case of the failure to elect one of the candidates. In substance, the twentieth amendment authorizes the Congress to provide for filling vacancies in the office of President when, for any reason, there may be no qualified person to act. That would be the case if no President were elected, or if the elected President, because of death or for any other reason, fails to qualify.

Page 3, line 15:

"The Vice President shall be likewise elected at the same time and in the same manner and subject to the same provisions, as the President."

This provision is self-explanatory.

Page 3, line 17:

"But no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the United States."

Paragraph 4 of section 1, article II requires citizenship by birth for eligibility to the Presidency. Persons who have not attained the age of 35 and have not been 14 years a resident within the United States are also ineligible.

Inasmuch as this amendment would repeal the twelfth amendment, the last sentence of which provides that no person ineligible for President can be Vice President, it becomes

necessary to include the above language in order to maintain the same eligibility as the Constitution now requires.

Page 3, line 20:

"SEC. 2. Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of section 1, article II, of the Constitution and the twelfth article of amendment to the Constitution are hereby repealed."

Paragraph 1 of section 1 of article II is the same as the existing provision except that the words "be elected as follows" are stricken out and under the terms of the amendment the words "be elected as provided in the Constitution" are substituted. The original Constitution provided for the election of the President under article II. The twelfth amendment was subsequently added to supplement the provisions for the election. So paragraph 1 is repealed and reenacted simply to give it its proper place and to make the paragraph conform to the newer arrangement of the related provisions.

Paragraph 2, section 1, article II, provides for the appointment of electors. Inasmuch as the electors would be abolished by this proposed amendment, that paragraph would no longer be applicable.

(It should be remembered, in passing, that the Constitution uses the word "elector" in two different meanings—in some places it means presidential elector; in others it means individual voter. Although this use of the word in two different meanings may be confusing to the unwary, nevertheless, the distinction in meaning has long been clearly established.)

Paragraph 3, section 1, article II, provides that Congress may fix the time of choosing the presidential electors and the day on which they shall vote. As the proposed amendment would abolish presidential electors, this paragraph would have no further application.

The above provision also repeals the twelfth amendment. Adopted in 1804, this amendment provided for the meeting of the presidential electors and the election of the President and Vice President by the electors and the method of counting the votes.

It carried a provision that no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President, which is the same provision carried in the amendment proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 2. Otherwise the twelfth amendment is of no practical application under the proposed amendment. It is provided, therefore, that the twelfth amendment be eliminated as dead timber.

The twelfth amendment also has a provision which prohibits the presidential electors, in voting for President and Vice President, from voting for more than one of whom "shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with themselves." Under the electoral-college system the presidential electors are a selected group to elect the President for the Nation. This provision in article XII, in effect, instructed the electors against voting for two from the same State.

Manifestly, this provision has no practical application to the case where the voters themselves elect the President. Therefore, this provision is eliminated by the repeal of the twelfth amendment.

Senate Joint Resolution 2, section 3 reads:

"This article shall take effect on the 10th day of February following its ratification."

This provision recognized that the amendment, if adopted, should go into effect sufficiently in advance of the first election to which it would apply as a matter of convenience to the States in adjusting their laws to the new system of election.

This provision would leave at least 8 months.

The States should not find it difficult to adjust their election laws to a simpler system of voting directly for the President, without the intervention of the electoral college. The problem as to the proper length of time to allow the States to adjust themselves is a discretionary matter, and any time in advance that would permit reasonable convenience for the change of these laws would serve the purpose.

Senate Joint Resolution 2, section 4, provides:

"This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to add this statement: I have been asked by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska and by many other persons regarding the mechanical application of this proposition and what would have occurred in past campaigns if this proposal had been in effect.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that while it is, of course, easy to apply the amendment retroactively—by adjusting the new rules to the old figures—it is useful to do so only as a means of illustrating how it would have operated mechanically. One cannot assume—as some have, erroneously—that citizens would have voted identically or in the same volume under this new system as they actually did vote under the existing procedure.

Indeed, had this amendment been in effect in the past, the whole composition of the popular vote would have been different. Candidates and issues would have been different. Campaigning would have been carried all over the 48 States instead of being concentrated in a few key pivotal States. Interest in the elections in the so-called one-party areas would have been greater. The stay-at-home vote would doubtless have been much smaller because of the realization that every vote for President would count.

I say that, Mr. President, because I wish to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation showing how the popular vote of 1948 actually was translated into electoral votes under the present system and how the same popular votes would have been translated into electoral votes under Senate Joint Resolution 2.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

States	Popular vote		Electoral vote (under present system)		Electoral vote (under S. J. Res. 2)	
	Truman (Democrat)	Dewey (Republican)	Truman (Democrat)	Dewey (Republican)	Truman (Democrat)	Dewey (Republican)
Alabama	(1)	40,930	(1)		(1)	2.0
Arizona	95,251	77,579	4		2.1	1.8
Arkansas	149,659	50,959	9		5.6	1.9
California	1,913,134	1,895,269	25		11.9	11.8
Colorado	267,288	239,714	6		3.1	2.8
Connecticut	423,297	437,754		8	3.9	4.0
Delaware	67,829	69,595		3	1.5	1.5
Florida	281,988	194,280	8		3.9	2.7
Georgia	254,646	76,691	12		7.3	2.2
Idaho	107,370	101,514	4		2.0	1.9
Illinois	1,994,715	1,961,103	28		14.0	13.8
Indiana	807,833	821,079		13	6.3	6.4
Iowa	522,380	494,018	10		5.0	4.8
Kansas	351,902	423,039		8	3.6	4.3
Kentucky	466,756	341,210	11		6.2	4.6
Louisiana	136,344	72,657			3.3	1.7
Maine	111,916	150,234		5	2.1	2.8
Maryland	286,521	294,814		8	3.8	4.0
Massachusetts	1,151,788	909,370	16		8.8	6.9
Michigan	1,003,448	1,038,595		19	9.0	9.3
Minnesota	692,966	483,617	11		6.3	4.4
Mississippi	18,848	5,466			.9	.3
Missouri	917,315	655,039	15		8.7	6.2
Montana	119,071	96,700	4		2.1	1.7
Nebraska	224,165	264,774		6	2.7	3.3
Nevada	31,291	29,357	3		1.5	1.4
New Hampshire	107,995	121,299		4	1.9	2.1
New Jersey	895,455	981,124		16	7.3	8.0
New Mexico	105,464	80,303	4		2.3	1.7
New York	2,780,204	2,841,163		47	21.2	21.6
North Carolina	459,070	258,572	14		8.1	4.6
North Dakota	95,812	115,139		4	1.7	2.1
Ohio	1,452,791	1,445,684	25		12.4	12.3
Oklahoma	452,782	268,817	10		6.3	3.7
Oregon	243,147	260,904		6	2.8	3.0
Pennsylvania	1,752,426	1,902,197		35	16.4	17.8
Rhode Island	188,476	134,880	4		2.3	1.7
South Carolina	34,423	5,386			1.9	.3
South Dakota	117,567	129,651		4	1.9	2.1
Tennessee	270,402	202,914	11		5.9	4.4
Texas	750,700	282,240	23		15.0	5.6
Utah	149,151	124,402	4		2.2	1.8
Vermont	45,447	75,926		3	1.1	1.8
Virginia	200,786	172,070	11		5.3	4.5
Washington	476,165	386,315	8		4.2	3.4
West Virginia	429,188	316,251	8		4.6	3.4
Wisconsin	647,310	590,959	12		6.1	5.6
Wyoming	52,354	47,947	3		1.5	1.4
Total	24,104,836	21,969,500	303	189	258.0	221.4

[1] Not on ballot.

NOTES

1. Governor Thurmond, States' Rights candidate, polled 1,169,312 popular votes and received 39 electoral votes. Under S. J. Res. 2, he would have received 38.6 electoral votes.

2. Henry Wallace, Progressive candidate, polled 1,157,100 popular votes and received no electoral votes. Under S. J. Res. 2, he would have received 9.4 electoral votes.

3. Other candidates (Socialist, etc.) polled 279,668 popular votes and received no electoral votes. Under S. J. Res. 2, they would have received 1.8 electoral votes.

4. Division of a State's electoral vote would be carried to 3 decimal points.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I wish to repeat that if the proposed amendment had been in effect the popular vote would not have been cast in the same way.

Mr. President, I now conclude. This is an amendment which I believe would give a more truly national character to both our major parties, and would greatly enhance and invigorate the two-party system in the United States. It would neither help nor hurt either party. It is sponsored by Senators from both parties, representing all sections of the country.

It would eliminate completely any possibility of an election being thrown into the House of Representatives; it would establish the constitutional right of the people to direct vote, and it would do away with the so-called unit-rule system of counting electoral votes whereby the candidate receiving a plurality of the popular vote in any given State is credited with all the electoral votes of that State regardless of how small the plurality may be.

I believe that upon careful study Senators of both parties will conclude that it simply eliminates restraints on the two-party system as a whole, and thus opens up the field for imaginative and courageous political leadership in the future, the ultimate advantage of which none of us can predict and which challenges the imagination. That is what I hope for; but, as a minimum, I say it is a vitally important measure to eliminate the dangers in the present system which might some day have fateful and perilous consequences for our country.

WHAT THE HISS TRIAL ACTUALLY MEANS

Mr. MUNDT obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield without his losing the right to the floor?

Mr. MUNDT. If I may retain the floor, I am happy to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the parliamentary suggestion of the absence of a quorum be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, throughout the trial of Alger Hiss, since his indictment by the grand jury in New York, I have refrained from discussing the far-flung aspects of the Chambers-Hiss hearings and investigation by the House Committee on Un-American Activities—an investigation and public hearing which has now resulted in the trial and conviction of Alger Hiss by a jury of his peers in New York City.

After sitting as a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities throughout all the hearings, and after serving as chairman of the special subcommittee that handled the espionage phases—the so-called pumpkin papers—of the Hiss case, I was convinced in my mind that Alger Hiss was a faithless public servant who permitted his zeal for communism to induce him to betray his country. However, like all Americans, I believe every man is entitled to his day in court, and so, even after his indictment by the grand jury, I decided not to discuss the deep significance of this unfortunate affair until the verdict of the jury was in.

Now, however, Alger Hiss has been found guilty after a fair, full, and impartial trial and after being given every conceivable opportunity to produce witnesses and testimony to substantiate his protestations of innocence. Undoubtedly, Hiss will finally receive a penitentiary sentence for his treachery, but the public interest would be inadequately served and the vast expenditures of time, effort, and money scarcely justified if all that America were to gain from this experience were to be that one high Government official was being punished for telling falsehoods under oath concerning the espionage activities in which he was engaged through the delivery of highly classified State Department documents to a paid Communist functionary by the name of Whittaker Chambers. It is with the hope that all conscientious and patriotic American citizens may have their attention focused upon some of the pertinent problems of our time as a consequence of the strange and sordid chain of circumstances which have brought Alger Hiss before the bar of justice confronted by the verdict of guilty that I have decided to address myself to this significant sequence of events today.

Mr. President, to recognize the Alger Hiss conviction in its proper proportion, we must realize that except for a stupid statute on our laws permitting the statute of limitations for his crimes to expire in 3 years, Alger Hiss would have been found guilty of treachery and treason instead of for the crime of perjury. It must be clearly understood that the perjury for which Alger Hiss was convicted was his lying under oath about the fact that he was consorting with Whittaker Chambers during a specified period of history and, on his second count of guilty, that he was lying under oath when he denied that he had smuggled State Department secret documents from his post of duty and delivered them to Whittaker Chambers at the time when he was known to be a Communist functionary under the pay of an alien creed and cause. Thus this trial dealt with no ordinary falsehood but it convicted Alger Hiss of lying when he denied that he was working against the security of his country and the maintenance of our way of life by conspiring with his Communist associates to betray his country and to decrease our ability to preserve our peaceful independence as a God-fearing republic of freemen.

Unless the real magnitude of the crime involved is understood there is small likelihood that Americans will draw from this history-making case the lessons so essential if we are not to have a repetition of such incidents and perhaps have our country weakened and embroiled by faithless men in high office to the point where neither our peace nor our security can be preserved.

Let me next emphasize, Mr. President, that despite the fact that I concluded early in the testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities that Alger Hiss was evading the truth and endeavoring to cover his past associations with the Communist apparatus of the State Department, I am not one of those who gets any gratification from the fact that it was necessary to ferret him out, expose him to the public, and to bring him to the bar of justice. In fact, I cannot help but feel sorry for a young man having all the educational and family advantages of Alger Hiss who so perverts his talents and deceives his friends as to use his admitted talents and abilities to disserve rather than to serve the country of his origin. But sympathizing with his family and feeling sorry for the individual human being who is the center of this case, as I do, cannot compel me now, as it could not induce me when I was confronted with the ugly task of having to head the subcommittee that brought his faithlessness to light, to refrain from pointing up the issues involved, the situations disclosed, and the future courses of action which it seems to me greatly exceed in importance the fate of any individual in America. It is easy, human, and natural to sympathize with the family of Alger Hiss and to feel sorry for the man himself, but it is impossible and unreasonable to condone his activities and to ignore their importance and significance and the part they may have played in shaping the history of the world.

Let us go now to a review of the activities and developments which led first to the indictment of Alger Hiss by the grand jury in New York and finally to his conviction through a finding of guilty by the trial jury in the verdict which was pronounced last Saturday afternoon.

The name of Alger Hiss first came into the public hearings and his Communist activities were first disclosed to the public view when Whittaker Chambers, former $30,000-a-year member of the editorial staff of Time magazine, testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in the Ways and Means Committee room of the New House Office Building on the morning of Tuesday, August 3, 1948. In addition to the junior Senator from South Dakota, who was the presiding chairman at that hearing, there were present Representative John McDowell, of Pennsylvania; Representative Richard M. Nixon, of California; Representative John E. Rankin, of Mississippi; Representative J. Hardin Peterson, of Florida; and Representative J. Edward Hébert, of Louisiana. The chief investigator of the Un-American Activities Committee, Robert E. Stripling, whose contribution to the cause of freedom and against the success of the conspiratorial Communist apparatus, I may say, were both great and many during his tenure of service as chief investigator of the committee, was present serving as our chief interrogator, and he

was accompanied by the following members of his staff: Louie Russell, William Wheeler, Donald T. Appell, and A. S. Poore.

Early in his sworn testimony before the committee that first morning, Whittaker Chambers made the following statement with reference to the communistic conspiratorial apparatus to which he had been attached here in Washington as intermediary for his Communist overlords in New York and Russia. Chambers said:

> It was an underground organization of the United States Communist Party developed to the best of my knowledge by Harold Ware, one of the sons of the Communist leader known as Mother Bloor. I knew it at its top level—a group of seven or so men, from among whom in later years certain of Miss Bentley's organizations were apparently recruited.

Mr. President, it will be recalled that the Miss Bentley to whom Whittaker Chambers has referred was Miss Elizabeth Bentley, whom our committee had previously investigated and interrogated with the result that it was established that Miss Bentley had earlier held a position similar to that of Whittaker Chambers as a courier and intermediary for the American flank of the international Communist conspiracy. It was Miss Bentley, many Senators may recall, who "developed," to use the Communist vernacular, one W. K. Remington, who was, as it was disclosed by the Ferguson committee of the Senate, in charge of making important decisions as to what type of critical materials should be exported to Russia at the same time he was associating with Miss Bentley and cooperating with her Communist assignment here in Washington. It was also Miss Bentley who, as a voluntary agent for the FBI, later received $2,000 from Anatole Gromal, of the Russian Embassy, for services rendered the cause of the Russian Communists through her contacts and influence with Communists strategically placed in the Government of the United States. Miss Bentley received this $2,000 for services rendered which she turned over to the FBI, and it was subsequently impounded.

Now, continuing with the quotation of Whittaker Chambers that first morning when he appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

> The head of the underground group at the time I knew it was Nathan Witt, an attorney for the National Labor Relations Board, later, John Abt became the leader. Lee Pressman was also a member of this group as was Alger Hiss, who, as a member of the State Department, later organized the conferences at Dumbarton Oaks, San Francisco, and the United States side of the Yalta Conference. The purpose of this group at that time was not primarily espionage. Its original purpose was the Communist infiltration of the American Government. But espionage was certainly one of its eventual objectives.

I emphasize that, Mr. President, because some of us may naively believe that when a Communist is placed in the Government his only reason for being there is to ferret out Government secrets and place them in the hands of Communists. Quite the contrary is true, as testified to by Whittaker Chambers before the Committee on Un-American Activities. Their primary objective in placing Communists and Communist sympathizers in Government positions is to influence American policy so that the entire policy of this great Republic may be diverted so as to aid and give comfort to the Soviet rather than to serve the cause of freedom in this country.

Mr. President, as events of history have unfolded, it is altogether probable that serious as were the espionage activities of this little group of disloyal men working in this Chambers Communist apparatus, its most devastating work against the cause of freedom was carried out by the manner in which these talented and brilliant but perverted minds made their influence felt in forming policies in the Roosevelt administration of that day and era.

A little later that morning, Mr. Chambers was asked for additional names of members of his apparatus here in Washington, at which time he added on page 567 of the hearings the names of Henry Collins, then in the Department of Agriculture, and Donald Hiss, the young man who after terminating his service, became a partner in the law firm of Dean Acheson, where the two were associated together until Mr. Acheson was confirmed as Secretary of State, at which time he told the committee he was severing completely his relationship with the law firm of which he was a senior partner.

Long before our committee was aware of the fact that Alger Hiss was operating a transmission belt ferrying State Department secrets out of their security files and into the hands of the Russians, via Whittaker Chambers, it was developed that Alger Hiss had held many important positions in Government permitting him to exercise vast influence at Dumbarton Oaks, at the San Francisco Conference, and most significantly and most tragically at the Yalta Conference where he served as a personal adviser and assistant to President Roosevelt.

It was also developed that part of his career in the State Department was devoted to an assignment in the far eastern division where it seems entirely probable that his influence helped in the formation of a policy and the staffing of a section of the State Department which has helped bring about the entire subjugation of China by the Communist forces directed from Moscow. In any one of these positions, Alger Hiss was in a position to render sufficient service to the cause of communism and to the defeat of sound American policy, to do almost irreparable damage to the security and the best interests of the United States. In any one of those positions, his influence could have been exerted to that dangerous degree—functioning as he did in four strategic locations during his career in the State Department.

It is impossible to estimate or perhaps overemphasize the complete sum total of the disservice rendered by Hiss to the cause of freedom and his assistance to the Communists who now threaten our interests and freedoms at every point around the globe. Mr. President, history may never show and our citizens may never completely understand the full significance of the part played by Alger Hiss and those brought into Government as friends of his, or his classmates, or his associates, in the determination of daily decisions in foreign policy which, added together, formed the matrix of developments beginning at Yalta and stemming out to boundaries which are yet untouched and undefinable.

It is now a matter of public record, however, that the House Committee on Un-American Activities gave Alger Hiss a full and free opportunity to appear before the committee, at which time he denied every statement and every charge and every accusation made by Whittaker Chambers. He even went so far as to say he had never seen the man or known a man resembling Mr. Chambers, that he had never known anybody by the name of Chambers, nor had he known a man who could conceivably be mistaken for Whittaker Chambers.

Subsequent testimony, however, clearly demonstrated the inaccuracy and unreliability of the denials made by Alger Hiss.

On August 25, months before the discovery of the microfilms and photostatic documents which finally led to the complete collapse of the Hiss denials, I endeavored to summarize the progress of the testimony, so as to provide Mr. Hiss with yet another opportunity, in the remote event that he were innocent, to clear himself from the fate which faced him as a consequence of the tangled web of contradictions and falsehoods he had fashioned around himself by the testimony which he gave before our committee. Let me quote, from page 1157 of the printed hearings, a summary I had made of developments up to that point in the case:

> Mr. MUNDT. Now, Mr. Hiss, these hearings are drawing to a close, and I want to review with you briefly, as briefly as I can, the reactions of just one member of this committee to the testimony in which you are involved; and after I conclude my statement, which I shall make without interruption, you may then make the statements that you have to make, without interruption. But I wish you would take notes on what I am going to say, so that you can correct me in your statement where you think I am in error, or where you wish to set my trend of thinking right, where you think it is deviating from a logical course.
>
> We started out in these hearings simply to get at the truth concerning espionage activities in Government. One of our early witnesses, Mr. Whittaker Chambers mentioned your name and the name of your brother, Donald Hiss, in connection with other individuals, most of whom have refused under oath to deny the charges or to deny the fact that they are members of the Communist Party.
>
> You suggested, when you first came before the committee, that in an effort to get at the facts, we take certain steps, one of which was to go to the records, wherever the records are available. We have done that, and we have spread those records, wherever available, into this testimony.
>
> You suggested that you be confronted with your accuser. We have done that, both in executive session and in open session.
>
> You suggested that we check all the verifiable details, which we have done.
>
> Your testimony that first day was that, to the best of your recollection, you did not know Whittaker Chambers, and that the picture which was presented to you by counsel, Mr. Stripling, did not bring back

the memory of anybody whom you had seen, by that picture.

The next step in this proceeding was—and I might say here that you made a very fine impression on me, as acting chairman, that first day. I was inclined to be in your corner, from the standpoint of accepting the validity of what you said.

You were given every consideration by the committee and not cross-examined very clearly or carefully by the committee on that first day, and that, despite the fact that, as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I had frequently heard the name of Alger Hiss bandied around as having possible Communist connections in years past. I never had seen you; I never had met you; I do not believe your name had ever passed my lips or had been written by me in any correspondence up to that time. But it was, as you have later testified, rather common scuttlebutt, should we say, around Washington that one Alger Hiss had been labeled by some as a fellow traveler or Communist. The most recent indication of that is a statement in the morning paper, by George E. Sokolsky. I will read you just two paragraphs from his column, These Days. It says: "Way back in 1941, I came across the existence of the Ware group——" that is the Harold Ware whom you testified that you knew—"the Ware group in Washington, who were engaged in placing Communists in the most critical positions in the Federal Government. I was then told who the original 10 were, and among them was mentioned Alger Hiss."

In spite of that, after hearing your testimony, I was convinced that either Whittaker Chambers must have been falsifying before this committee or else there was a mistaken identity. It seemed doubtful, then, that you were lying.

So, I asked a subcommittee to go to New York for the purpose of interviewing Mr. Chambers to see whether, by some chance, he had confused Alger Hiss with someone else, whether or not he could substantiate his statement that he knew Alger Hiss, and, if so, how well, and what details he could supply, which are verifiable. He supplied a great many details, all of which are in the executive testimony, which has been released to the press today, and are available to you.

Then, you were again interviewed in Washington, and at that time you verified these same details, which were given us by Mr. Chambers, intimate details about your family, about your hobby, about your pets, about the decorations in the room; and after verifying a number of these details, you said, "I might have known a man who had access to that information," and you said that man, if you knew him at all, was one George Crosley.

The next day the committee went to New York City and brought you and Mr. Chambers together, at which time you identified him positively; you identified him as the George Crosley, but you said then that you sublet him your apartment. You said then that you gave or sold him an automobile. You said then that you had him living with you several days in your own home. You said then that you had also seen him at some time later than the time when he occupied your apartment, and you said then that you had made a series of small loans.

I think this is important, for the reason that, strangely enough, there are in this country people who, after Mr. Hiss has been convicted of perjury, still seem to feel it inconceivable that a man who looks so smooth and so intelligent and speaks such an effective Harvard accent, could be considered guilty of such a charge.

I point this out to call attention to the fact that the testimony of Alger Hiss on Alger Hiss is in itself sufficient to demonstrate his connections and his relationships with Whittaker Chambers, the Communist. Regardless of what might be decided at any trial or regardless of what any appellate process might disclose, we have the sworn testimony of Alger Hiss himself that he was a close associate and friend of, and indeed lived in the same apartment with Whitaker Chambers at the time when Chambers was a paid espionage agent for the Russians and the Communists, and he knew Chambers so well that finally he said the only way he could recognize him for sure was by an examination of his dentures; and Chambers had to open his mouth and let Hiss explore the fillings of his teeth before Hiss would venture to say, "That is the man I knew."

Mr. President, I think the time has long since passed when we can afford to have working for us, in positions of high trust in the Federal Government, Communists and Communist sympathizers so well known to each other that they recognize each other in the darkness by the fillings of their teeth. That is too close a relationship for Communists or Communist sympathizers and highly placed employees of our Government to have. But it is precisely the relationship which Mr. Hiss admitted he had with Mr. Chambers.

I continue now with the summary of the testimony, before Mr. Hiss made his reply:

We have tried since then to verify further the testimony of both yourself and Mr. Chambers. We have been unable to find anybody who knows or who has seen George Crosley. You have been unable to produce anybody for us who knows or has seen George Crosley.

Therefore, in summary, it would seem to me that you have left me, as one member of the committee, in this position—and I came back from South Dakota by air to get at the facts of this case because, as I say, when you first appeared before the committee, you left me with the feeling that you were telling the truth and that you were not concealing or evading information which we needed to have in this committee.

Now, I find that while you said earlier that you did not know Mr. Whittaker Chambers, or any man answering that description or looking like him, it is now established testimony that you did know him and that you do know him.

There is some doubt about the name, but there is no question about your having known the individual, and I find that while you said in the testimony that you were sure anybody who could have lived in your house over a period of time would be somebody whose picture you would be able to identify, but I find that you were unable to identify from the picture, although you now testify that this man did live in your home over a period of days.

You said that you gave Chambers your car, that you sold or traded it to him, and now the written records show that you signed a transfer of your car to the Cherner Motor Co., or else to one William T. Rosen.

You testified that you had given money to Crosley in the nature of a loan. He testified that he had received money from you in the nature of payment of Communist dues.

The points in agreement, as they looked to me, are these:

You knew this man; you knew him very well; you knew him so well that you even trusted him with your apartment; you let him use your furniture; you let him use or gave him your automobile; you think that you probably took him to New York; you bought him lunches in the Senate Restaurant; you had him staying in your home when it was inconvenient for him to stay in the apartment and made him a series of small loans. There seems no question about that.

In other words, there seems no question about your associations with a man who told this committee that he associated closely with you.

The points in disagreement, Mr. Hiss, as I see them, are these:

Were you or were you not a Communist? This committee never had any illusions that we would be able to prove definitely whether or not you are a Communist, because in dealing with people charged with being Communists over a period of years, we have found that those who are guilty, refused to admit it and dodged the question or deliberately lied.

We know that we cannot get the records of the Communist Party. We cannot get their membership cards, but that was a point we could not hope to establish by verifiable evidence, and it is now a point in dispute.

The second point in dispute is that were you a member of the so-called Ware group who were alleged to have worked together to promote their associates into key positions of Government? You say you were not. Mr. Chambers says that you were. Mr. Chambers said that you were and that you were associated in this activity with John Abt, Lee Pressman, Nathan Witt, Henry Collins, Harold Ware, and Charles Kramer. You admit that you knew John Abt, Lee Pressman, Nathan Witt, Henry Collins, Harold Ware, and Charles Kramer, but you did not know whether or not they were Communists and that whether or not they were, that you were not associated with them in an effort to promote your associates into key Government positions.

There is one other point in dispute, and that is, while you both admit this association at the time when it was supposed to have taken place, Mr. Chambers said that you knew him as Carl, and you say that you knew him as Crosley. To me, that is not a very important distinction. The important thing is how close your associations were with this man, who is admittedly a Communist at that time.

He is a Communist functionally. Whether he was living in your home as George Crosley or Carl or Whittaker Chambers is comparatively immaterial. The important thing to me, Mr. Hiss, is that he was living in your home, that you were associating with him, that you were taking him out in the car, that you were letting him use your car, that you were letting him use your apartment, and making him loans and having associations with him of that nature.

In an endeavor to determine the credibility of two witnesses whose testimony conflicts on so many of these points, which are still in dispute, we endeavored to establish that by checking, first, Mr. Chambers' testimony to see whether or not it would stand up, to see whether or not you were an ornithologist, to see whether or not you had a car which had a hand windshield wiper, to see whether or not he had this rather intimate association with you, which the testimony of both of you now conclusively proves did exist.

We also endeavored to check the fact as to whether he lived in your home or spent time in your home, as he said he did. Now, both of you testify to the fact that that actually took place.

We endeavored to verify other aspects of his testimony, about transfers that your son made in school, about certain intimate details of the furniture and material in your home, and on every point on which we have been able to verify, on which we have

had verifiable evidence before us, the testimony of Mr. Chambers has stood up. It stands unchallenged. Most of it you admit, although you place understandably a different interpretation upon it from what he has.

You, on the other hand, have also supplied some verifiable data. You have talked about an automobile; you have talked about these pictures of identification; you have described the conditions under which he occupied your home; but in the matter of the car your testimony is clearly refuted by the tangible evidence of the sales slips from the Cherner Motor Co., by the registration material.

On some of the other items your testimony is clouded by a strangely deficient memory. You can recall vividly certain very specific details, but you cannot recall at all whether this automobile that meant so much to you was ever given to Crosley and returned to you, whether you sold it to him, or what the eventual disposition of this car was; and that car plays a very important part, as does the subletting of the apartment in the whole testimony, because in testing the credibility of your testimony and that of Mr. Chambers we have to rely on those pieces of evidence which are verifiable, and those happen to be verifiable items.

We proceed on the conclusion that if either one of you is telling the truth on the verifiable data, that you are telling the truth on all of it. And if either one of you is concealing the truth from the committee on verifiable data, it points out that you are concealing from us the truth on the points that we cannot prove.

In our committee report following this phase of the Hiss case—a report which it should be emphasized was signed unanimously by both the Democrats and the Republicans on our committee, and I am going to have more to say about that as I get to some of the more important aspects of the case since every committee report was signed unanimously by Democrats and Republicans alike. We said—and I quote from the report:

Chambers testified on August 3 that Hiss was a member of the Communist underground group of Government workers during the period 1934 to 1937 when Chambers was serving as a Communist Party functionary in Washington. On August 5 Hiss categorically denied the charges of Chambers' that he was or ever had been a member of the Communist Party and further denied ever having known Chambers or "having laid eyes upon him." As a result of exhaustive investigation by the committee's staff and of hours of executive session testimony from Hiss, Chambers, and all others who had information concerning the conflicting stories, Hiss finally admitted on August 17 for the first time that he actually had known Chambers as George Crosley, during the period in question. As a result of the hearings and investigations which have been conducted by the committee to date, these facts have been clearly established.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement of facts set forth in this report be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. There is no doubt whatever but that Chambers from 1931 to 1938 was a paid functionary of the Communist Party and that from 1934 to 1937 he operated as a member of the Communist underground among Government workers in Washington.

2. The refusal of Nathan Witt, John Abt, Henry Collins, Lee Pressman, and Victor Perlo to answer any questions concerning their activities as members of this group on the ground of self-incrimination and to answer as to whether or not they were members of the Communist Party during that period is in itself strong corroborative evidence for Chambers' story.

3. By his own admission Hiss knew Chambers for a period of at least 10 months during the period in question and possibly longer. It is also clear that Hiss knew Chambers very well as indicated by his admission that he sublet his furnished apartment to him, that he met him on various occasions for lunch, that on at least one occasion he gave him a ride to New York from Washington, that for several days the Chambers family visited in the Hiss home, and that he loaned money to Chambers, and that he gave him an automobile.

4. While admitting that he knew Chambers, Hiss still denies that he knew Chambers was a Communist, and that he, Hiss, was a member of the Communist Party at any time.

Mr. MUNDT. In supplementing the foregoing statements our unanimous committee report of August 27, 1948, went on to say in summary:

1. Despite his denial that he has ever been a member of the Communist Party or had any friends who were Communists, Hiss has admitted knowing and associating with Harold Ware, Nathan Witt, John Abt, Henry Collins, Lee Pressman, and Whittaker Chambers, all of whom are either known or admitted members of the Communist Party, or who have refused to answer the question as to whether they were members of the Communist Party on the ground of self-incrimination. It stretched the credulity of the committee to believe that Hiss could have known these people, including Chambers, as well as he did without at some time suspecting that they were members of the Communist Party.

2. The committee believes that Mr. Hiss was not completely forthright in his testimony before the committee on August 5 when he failed to tell the committee that he noted a familiarity about the features of Whittaker Chambers when a picture of Chambers was shown to him. He has since admitted that he told several friends before the hearings of his noting this familiarity but when shown a picture of Chambers he deliberately created the impression that the face meant nothing to him whatever. It is hard to believe that Hiss could have known Chambers as well as he admits he knew Crosley without being able to recognize the picture which was shown him during the hearing of August 5.

3. Hiss has either failed or refused to tell the committee the whole truth concerning the disposition of his 1929 Ford automobile. It is inconceivable that a man would not remember whether he had given a car away twice or at all and it is just as inconceivable that he would not recall whether a person to whom he had given the automobile had later returned it to him.

4. Despite the fact that Hiss says he knew Chambers under the name of Crosley, a thorough investigation by the committee has failed to date to find any person who knew him by that name during the period in question. The committee believes that the burden is upon Hiss to establish that Chambers actually went under the name of Crosley at the time he knew him and that Hiss knew Crosley as a free-lance writer rather than as the admitted Communist functionary which Chambers actually was during that period.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. First, I want to compliment the Senator upon the very able speech he is making, in which he is revealing evidence elicited through his work on the Committee on Un-American Activities. One thing which has always aroused my curiosity is the disclosure of how Whittaker Chambers came to give this evidence. If it is not a violation of any of the committee's secrets, I should like to inquire, Does the Senator know whether Whittaker Chambers came before the committee voluntarily to give evidence, or how the committee came to get his evidence? In view of the relationship existing between the two men, which has just been explained, I wonder whether it has ever been disclosed to the public how Chambers' evidence was obtained. It has been puzzling me, and I should like to know the answer to it, if the Senator feels he is in a position to inform Senators.

Mr. MUNDT. I must say in response to the question, that, so far as I know, that information has never been disclosed or revealed. I see no good reason why it should not be revealed, however, because I know there is a considerable amount of misunderstanding throughout the country about Whittaker Chambers. Some people have assumed that he went into the matter with malice aforethought, in an effort to "get" someone with whom he had formerly been associated, when, as a matter of fact, it is pretty clearly demonstrated by the record that he had previously made the information available to Adolph Berle, who was then in the State Department; that, through the President's Secretary, Mr. McIntyre, he had made the information available to the White House; and that it had been made available to the Department of Justice.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. Obviously it sounded like a pretty preposterous and fantastic story to some of these people, I think, and the first time that anyone on our committee was contacted about the evidence was when I received a call at my apartment one night, shortly after midnight, from a friend of mine in New York, at a time when the committee was working on the Miss Elizabeth Bentley case. The friend said, "Karl, you are working on a rather important case, I presume, in connection with the Miss Bentley inquiry, but you are really missing the big bus." I said, "What is the big bus?" He said, "The most important one is, if you could contact Whittaker Chambers." I said, "Who in the world is Whittaker Chambers?" I did not have any idea who he was. He went on tc tell me something about him. He explained his contacts; he knew something about the information Chambers had previously given the FBI; and he said, "Your committee might do a more thorough job on this phase of the matter. Why do you not contact him?"

I went to the committee and talked to Mr. Stripling, who sent an investigator to the office of Time in New York City to contact Mr. Chambers, who agreed to testify. None of us then realized, of course, the far-flung ramifications his testimony would have, except, when he brought in certain names, we felt we had a duty as a congressional committee not to cast them aside or

ignore them, as it appears had been done by others who had heard about it, but to follow the thing through, to see which of these two distinguished Americans was falsifying the evidence—one, a $20,000 president of the Carnegie Peace Foundation, the other, a $30,000 editor of Time magazine. Certainly, we thought the public was entitled to have the thing ventilated, and brought to a conclusion; and so we served a subpena on Chambers. He came before the committee, not voluntarily, but in response to a subpena issued by the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. His statement is most revealing to me. It appears, then, that a subpena was served on him, and it was after the service of the subpena that Chambers came before the committee, and that his evidence was adduced before the committee. Is that correct?

Mr. MUNDT. He was in no sense a voluntary witness. He had never voluntarily approached our committee, or any member of the committee, with his offer to testify. The information came to me, as I say, from a friend in New York, who happened to have access to the fact that Adolph Berle had been tipped off some time ago. That was the first I had ever heard of it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator state when the story was supposed to have been related to the White House and to Mr. Berle in the State Department?

Mr. MUNDT. I cannot give the exact year, but it was early in 1940 or late in 1939, shortly after Chambers had broken from the apparatus. He separated himself from the apparatus and decided to reveal what he knew, at the time the von Ribbentrop-Molotov pact was signed, because then, for the first time he said, he recognized that the business in which he was engaged was detrimental to the national security of this country, in the event of war occurring between the United States and Germany. He knew about the von Ribbentrop-Molotov pact. He knew about the Communist apparatus he had established in the State Department, and he decided that in the event of a war possibly with Russia and Germany on the same side against us, we could not afford to have the Government of the United States permeated with disloyalty. That was when he went to Mr. Berle, and the information was sent to Mr. McIntyre, of the White House staff.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did it ever come to the attention of the Senator that when the story was related to the State Department and to the White House Mr. Chambers had requested that they waive prosecution against himself and that they wait until the statute of limitations had expired in connection with Mr. Chambers' crime?

Mr. MUNDT. At no time did we have any such testimony before our committee, and I should be very much inclined to doubt that, because at no time did Mr. Chambers, unlike Julian Wadleigh, inquire about the statute of limitations, or inquire about his own status when he testified before the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has the Senator any information as to why this case was not taken up at the time by the State Department, the White House, and the FBI?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. We have direct testimony on that from Mr. Berle himself.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator intend to cover that by what he has to say?

Mr. MUNDT. I intend to cover it in some of the insertions which I expect to place in the RECORD. Mr. Berle understood the President thought it was a little bit preposterous, and that the President was not prepared to accept it.

Continuing, Mr. President, I think it is interesting to recall that in those days of August 1948 the House Committee on Un-American Activities was confronted with perhaps the most formidable resistance from high places and, in fact, probably had to pursue its course against more sizable obstacles than ever before confronted a congressional committee. Not only was there a united chorus in the left-wing press of America and a steady tattoo of the most critical and castigating statements from columnists and commentators who were former friends and associates of Alger Hiss, but our committee suffered severely from obstructive tactics in the executive agencies and from a persistent noncooperation, because of which it was found necessary to include, by unanimous action of our committee, mind you, the following observations in our report of August 27, 1948. I read from page 1354 of the report, for the permanent RECORD, a strange passage from the investigating committee's report, a passage unanimously subscribed to by the Democratic as well as the Republican members of the committee.

We could not secure cooperation from the White House, and we had to do this in simple justice to the American people. The subheading is "Obstructive tactics by the White House," and the committee's statement is as follows:

> The committee's investigation of espionage among Government workers has been hampered at every turn by the refusal of the executive branch of the Government to cooperate in any way with the investigation due to the President's loyalty freeze order. Not only have the executive agencies refused to turn over to the committee the loyalty files of the suspected members of the spy rings but they have even gone so far as to refuse to turn over the employment records of these individuals. The committee can see no excuse whatever for such arbitrary action since it is obvious that turning over employment records would in nowise involve disclosing sources of information or confidential data. Had the executive agencies of the Government cooperated with the committee in its investigation, there is no question but what the public would now have full information concerning all the ramifications of the espionage rings. The committee had proceeded to obtain this information in every way possible and eventually will see that it is presented to the public, but the committee deplores the fact that the executive branch of the Government will in no way aid the committee in its efforts to protect the national security from those who are doing everything they can to undermine and destroy it.

The reason why that strong language was incorporated was not only because the President tried to belittle the importance of the whole investigation by referring to it insultingly as a "red herring," not once, but in two press conferences, but when we endeavored to get employment files made available to the Congress we were unsuccessful. Not yet can any Member of this body find out, for example, the names, the recommendations, and the backgrounds of persons brought into the State Department by Alger Hiss and who continued to carry on his program and purposes after he moved on to a higher position of importance.

I call attention to the fact that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of this body has tried to get such files. We were not asking for loyalty files. There was no question of security involved. There was no question of maintaining confidential sources of information. I agree that confidential sources of information must be maintained. We were simply trying to ascertain what part Alger Hiss had played in connection with placing Communists in positions of influence in the Government. Up to this time the great United States Senate has no way of finding out how far the ramifications may go, because the President refuses to turn over to the Congress the files which alone can tell the story.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota is rendering a service of incalculable value to the people of the United States under our system of justice, fair play, and sanitation in public office. I feel that what the Senator has just said in calling additional attention to the difficulties caused by "road block" thrown in the way of the proper investigation of the shortcomings of public officials is a matter of great importance. That such has been the custom and the habit of the administration for a considerable period of time in the past is very important, indeed.

I am glad the Senator has dwelt on this point at some length, and I emphasize, so far as my personal opinion is concerned, that the Senator has touched a most sensitive spot in the weakness which congressional committees find in attempting to ascertain the truth. To my own knowledge, the administration has, on repeated occasions, through aiding and abetting the concealment of records, the intimidation of witnesses, and the threatening with political extinction and loss of their jobs, or persons who would like to tell the facts as they saw them, prevented the full exposition of the truth to the American people about conditions, which, if they had knowledge of and realized their import, would produce a tremendous revolt in the country against the customs, practices, and administrative policies which

have been steadily taking us down the road in shaping policies favorable to the Communist Party, which the Senator and I, and practically every other American, desire to resist.

I think the Senator has rendered an outstanding service in clarifying the matter. Regardless of what the Senator says today, only a minute portion of the truth of what has occurred in the past few years can probably be brought out.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Iowa for his kindly words and for his contribution to the subject. I know the Senator from Iowa speaks from the experience which he has had as an important member and former chairman of the Senate section of the Atomic Energy Committee.

It is a deplorable fact that a country which assumes that we have coordinated branches of government still has not found its Congress quite active, alert, and courageous enough to insist on its rights to certain facts and records from the executive agencies. Sometime we shall have to measure up to the dimensions of men, in my opinion, in our relationships with the executive agencies, to insist that we be given the facts we need in order to do our job constructively and well.

I call attention to the fact that this statement of White House obstruction was written after Alger Hiss had admitted under oath his relationship with Whittaker Chambers. We were simply trying to find out how the trail led from Hiss to some other source, and the White House denied us cooperation, but insisted on trying to reduce the investigation to comic-opera proportions by sneeringly referring to it as a "red herring." I hope the President saw, in the Washington Star a few days ago, how Mr. Jim Berryman placed the "red herring" in its proper proportions in that never-to-be-forgotten cartoon.

I now read further from the report of the committee:

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

The committee again calls upon the Attorney General of the United States to vigorously enforce the existing espionage and other laws against those who are participating in the Communist conspiracy. These laws should be enforced without regard to partisan or political considerations because the very security of the Nation is at stake. The failure of the Attorney General to enforce the laws as vigorously as he should has been in a large part responsible for the growth and power of the Communist conspiracy in the United States.

The Attorney General has from time to time inferred that those who participated in the Bentley spy ring might be immune from prosecution under present laws because of the inadequacy of those laws. This investigation has shown clearly that a well-organized and dangerous espionage ring operated in the Government during the war; and if present laws are inadequate, as the Attorney General has inferred, to prosecute the members of this ring, it is the solemn responsibility of the Attorney General to forward to the Congress immediately his recommendations for needed changes in the espionage laws so that the national security can be protected.

It is also imperative that the Attorney General proceed promptly to call the New York special grand jury back into session to consider his recommendations on the disposition of the evidence he has placed before it. The public has the clear right to have this proceeding concluded by indictments where indicated, by a no-true bill where warranted, and by a full report by the Attorney General on his disposition of the case.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Referring to the matter of the iron curtain in America, is it not true that this case was exposed by the Congress through a telephone call by a man from New York, and that it was necessary for the congressional committee to proceed without any aid whatever from the files of the Department of Justice, the State Department, or the White House? Is that not a fact?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. We had only a very small staff. The Senate and the House both have very small staffs as compared to those of any executive department.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not also a fact that, so far as the American people are concerned, and insofar as espionage in the United States is concerned, there has been an absolute iron curtain thrown around all information in the possession of the executive branch of the Government, which prevented the Congress from exposing to the people the various espionage cases?

Mr. MUNDT. There is no question about that. The Judiciary Committee, of which the Senator from Michigan is a very important member, has been trying for some time to give the American people the facts which they are entitled to have, to give the American public the names of Communists and Communist sympathizers who have been removed from the State Department because of disloyalty and who have been appointed to important positions in the United Nations. You cannot get these names. Our committee cannot get that information. It is not available. The President's freeze order denies those facts to the Members of the Congress.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe that the Senator from South Dakota is making a valuable contribution to the American people by his address today. I fully agree with him that the Congress of the United States has the power to get this information if it will use intestinal fortitude to get it.

Mr. MUNDT. Exactly. We have the power if we have the courage.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct. I am prepared, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, to join with other members from this side of the aisle and with members from the other side of the aisle, who I hope will join us, to serve notice on the State Department that we will withhold the appropriations for that Department until the information to which the Congress of the United States is entitled is received from them.

From time immemorial the legislative branches of government, the parliaments and legislative bodies of the Old World, as well as of the New World, have had control of the purse strings, and the reason why the people have given to their legislative representatives the control of the purse strings is to prevent the executive branch of the Government from becoming arbitrary in the use of its power. If we will exercise our congressional control of the purse strings and say, "We can wait this out just as long as you can wait it out, and unless we are furnished the information to which we are entitled, you do not get a single cent for the operation of your Department," I believe we can get the information to which we are entitled.

Mr. MUNDT. I know we can, and I think I can offer documentary proof from the archives of history. For a short period of time, the Eightieth Congress, the Republicans were in control of Congress. It happened at that time that I was a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, and Dean Acheson was before our committee trying to get us to accept the Truman doctrine, and the proposal for Greek-Turkish aid under the system worked out by the State Department. But because we had a majority in the committee we decided that we would not vote for Greek-Turkish aid, until Dean Acheson finally at long last published the secrets of the Yalta agreement. We told him so in public hearings. It is a matter of public record. He called at my office, telephoned me, begged me, and insisted that the matter be not pressed. We said, "You have concealed the facts long enough." Finally he called me up one night at 12 o'clock midnight and said, "The reports will be published in the Sunday morning papers tomorrow." They told us they had revealed all the secrets of the Yalta agreement. I am still a little curious to know whether they have all been disclosed. But finally the documents came, because we were talking a language the executive department understood. We were sitting on the purse strings until they gave us some facts. We can do that again. Congress can do that at any time.

Any time the Senate or the Congress of the United States wants some facts, all we have to do is to exercise the power we have in control of the purse strings, and we can make any recalcitrant executive produce the facts. If we do not, I think we might almost as well put the carpenters back in and a sign on the front door, "The place is vacant. The legislators have all moved out."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true, then, that if the Congress wants information it can by the appropriate method, through control of appropriations at least, without using the contempt process which is usually suggested, obtain all the information desired?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. As to the information the Senator was trying to get from the office of the Secretary of State, as to persons in the State Department, or various other departments of the Government, whom Alger Hiss was responsible for sponsoring or hired. Does he know of anything in connection with those facts the disclosure of which would

jeopardize the national security? Would the disclosure of the facts for which the Senator is asking in any way affect the national security?

Mr. MUNDT. Not in the slightest.

Mr. FERGUSON. Was the information refused on the ground that it would jeopardize the national security of the United States of America?

Mr. MUNDT. No. The only way in which the security of the United States was involved in the whole hearing was in connection with the releasing of the text of the documents in the "pumpkin papers." In that case we had perfect cooperation from the State Department, and they had perfect cooperation from us, and to this late date nine of the documents have never been disclosed. To have disclosed them would have served no useful purpose, and might have been a disservice. No other question was raised about the national security being involved.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator feel it is very vital to the American people and to the Congress of the United States to ascertain the facts as to whom Mr. Hiss might have taken into the Department, what their functions were, and what they did at various international conferences? Does he not feel it would be important to know what such persons have done at international conferences?

Mr. MUNDT. I completely concur with the Senator, and I shall devote the greater portion of the remainder of my address to discussing that theme, and perhaps I should get back to it, because we have made a very careful and comprehensive study looking at the matter from the outside, as to the things Alger Hiss was in a position to do. We are not in a position at the moment to name all the people he brought into the State Department to carry out his purpose.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I shall once more, and then I wish to proceed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There is in being at the moment an illustration which is very apt, and I merely wanted to call the Senator's attention to it in connection with the very things he has been discussing.

At the moment the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has been zealous in seeking to ascertain from the State Department the names of certain people who prepared a document, who were actually the writers of the document. As I understand, the Senator from California was refused and ignored in his quest for that information, and at least one or two members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations have in committee meetings specifically asked for the information, and it has been denied and refused to the committee. What was sought was the identity of the individuals who were the writers or the preparers of a certain document, and to that extent again, under present circumstances, properly constituted committees of Congress are being refused merely factual information, not information which would reveal any national secrets.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I use that merely as an illustration.

Mr. MUNDT. In the remainder of my address I shall devote myself to suggesting some things which I think Senators should do if we propose actually to do something besides grumble and grouch about the development of a healthy foreign policy concerning which we have little to do besides sign the checks and authorize the payments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Is not this an illustration of the fact that the difficulty is we have a Government of men, not a Government of law? The secret agreement at Yalta, and what happened from then on, deny and bypass the very procedures the distinguished Senator is advocating.

I join in the sentiments expressed by a member of the Committee on Appropriations, that there is one way to handle this matter, namely, by withholding appropriations. But I submit to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that that is certainly an unusual procedure to have to adopt, to see to it that the Government at home and abroad is operated under the constitutional processes established by the Constitution and all our statutes.

Mr. MUNDT. However, the Senator lives, as I do, in a section of the country, where, if we cannot attain a result by following the usual processes, we use an unusual one.

Mr. WHERRY. I am in favor of following any effective processes; but the Senator mentioned the Yalta agreement. He certainly knows that the Secretary of State, while he might have been familiar with all that occurred at Yalta, was at meetings at which was done the very thing he is discussing.

Mr. MUNDT. I intend to discuss that.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wonder if the Senator is aware of a most fantastic statement the Secretary of State made in the last few minutes. At a press conference he was asked to comment on the conviction of Alger Hiss. I should like to have the Senator's comment on the Secretary's statement. This is what Dean Acheson said:

> Regardless of the outcome of the appeal, I shall never turn my back on Alger Hiss.

Mr. MUNDT. Of course, he speaks from the affinity of a close and long-established friendship, and a business relationship with his brother, with whom he was a partner in the law business. So I do not think he is exactly what we would call an objective witness as to the loyalty of Alger Hiss. Furthermore, I am not greatly concerned about what influence Alger Hiss has on the position of Dean Acheson's back but a great many Americans are concerned about the degree of influence Hiss may have had upon the position of Dean Acheson's mind.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am now more proud than ever of the fact that I voted against Acheson's confirmation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator from South Dakota yield for one final question?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Would the Senator think the statement I have read might be an indication that the Secretary of State is also telling the world that he will not turn his back on any of the other Communists in the State Department, in other words, that this statement may go beyond Alger Hiss?

Mr. MUNDT. Before generalizing too much on a press statement made by the Secretary of State, I wish to continue with the body of the theme I hope to develop this afternoon.

I was quoting our committee report of August 27, and I now desire to call attention to one additional paragraph from the unanimous committee report, a short paragraph appearing on page 1356. I do this to put into the RECORD the incontrovertible fact that those who seek to denounce congressional committees, and more especially the House Committee on Un-American Activities—and that applies to President Truman and on down—and to laud the position of the administration on matters of protecting our security against disloyal agents, do so today with the full knowledge of the methods by which the executive agencies under the Truman administration are required to conceal and withhold records from Congress while availing themselves of whatever information congressional committees can supply to them. I call attention to the following paragraph therefore, Mr. President, in the hope that a way will be found so that information between our congressional committees and the executive agencies can become a two-way street to the mutual advantage of both and to the definite betterment of the position and security of our entire National Government set-up. Our committee report said:

> As evidence of this committee's sincerity in desiring to cooperate fully with the executive agencies in the ferreting out of all disloyal and un-American practices in Government during our committee's existence, we have opened our files to the security officers and loyalty board representatives of the executive departments. This year alone these representatives of the executive departments have paid over 14,000 official visits to our file rooms. They have been accorded full cooperation. Contrariwise, under the President's executive order, the files and records of the executive departments on all matters of loyalty and security have been firmly closed, not only to our committee but to all committees of Congress and to the general public. We hold that this is an unwholesome, and unwise, and an unsafe situation.

As a Representative looking longingly down the long corridor from the lower House to the upper House, as I approached service in this body, I hoped in those early days that when I got here I would be connected with a body which would have a firm determination to maintain its right and uphold its prestige and insist on such records. But I find that here, too, when the Executive slams

the door, we have not yet found men who have developed a formula or a fortitude for prying the door open. So we still move in the darkness of legislating without facts insofar as loyalty is concerned, and, as I know after 10 years of experience on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, to a surprising degree so far as foreign policy is concerned.

We come next, Mr. President, to the damaging developments growing out of the fatal mistake that Alger Hiss made in trying to put a good front on a bad case through suing Whittaker Chambers for slander because of the fact that Chambers on the Meet the Press radio program had voluntarily offered to renew his charge that Hiss was a Communist at the time he was working in the State Department. At the pretrial examination occurring in the civil suit in Baltimore, it was disclosed for the first time that Whittaker Chambers had in his possession actual documentary evidence to support his testimony. In fact, this documentary evidence becoming available for the first time in December, went far beyond the original charge which Chambers had made before our House Committee on Un-American Activities. Some of the documents produced during the examination in Baltimore were in the handwriting of Alger Hiss and others were typed on the now famous Hiss Woodstock typewriter. All of the documents dealt with State Department information which Hiss had supplied to Chambers for the purpose of relaying to his Communist contacts in New York and Russia.

When the startling and significant nature of these documents were disclosed at the pretrial hearing in Baltimore, they were deemed of such consequence that they were delivered to the Department of Justice and there impounded. At this point, were it not for the quick-witted and courageous effort of Congressman NIXON, of California, who was a member of our subcommittee conducting the Hiss-Chambers hearings, it is possible that Hiss might yet have escaped the full consequences of his acts, because a United Press statement, which I propose to incorporate in the RECORD later, quoted the Department of Justice as saying that the Whittaker Chambers-Alger Hiss controversy was being dropped. The executive agencies were content once again to let things ride.

However, when the chief investigator of our committee, Robert E. Stripling, learned from a confidential source of what had taken place in Baltimore he conferred with Representative NIXON who happened to be in Washington during that portion of the congressional recess, and at NIXON'S suggestion a subpena duces tecum was promptly served on Whittaker Chambers to produce any and all other papers or documentary evidence involving Alger Hiss which might be in his possession. NIXON'S action on this matter proved to be a stroke of genius since Whittaker Chambers when served by this subpena took our investigators to the now celebrated pumpkin patch and there extracted the aluminum tubes of microfilm and documents which have played such an important part in getting the actual story before the public and in bringing Alger Hiss to justice.

As soon as these microfilms had been developed in a Government laboratory and their startling significance thus made apparent Congressman NIXON telephoned to me in South Dakota and I summoned a call for our special committee to convene in Washington as fast as we could reach the National Capital by air. Hearings were resumed on Tuesday, December 7, 1948, and since some apologists for Alger Hiss have tried to minimize the importance of the documents which he delivered to his Communist contacts it might be well to include in this report for the permanent record a few direct quotations from the hearings on December 7 dealing with the significance of the documents procured from the pumpkins as well as the copies provided by Chambers of the exhibits he displayed in Baltimore.

The first witness called on December 7 was Mr. Sumner Welles since he was serving as Under Secretary of State at the time the documents were delivered by Hiss to Chambers. Our committee was in a quandry as to how significant to our national security these State Department papers might be even though a number of years had passed since their disappearance from the State Department files. It was in an effort to determine what action we should take on this point that Mr. Welles was called as a witness.

As appears on page 1387 of hearings, Mr. Welles was asked by Mr. Stripling:

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Welles, I would like to ask you if in 1938 a document was marked whether or not it would be classified as a "strictly confidential, for the Secretary" whether or not it would be classified as a "top secret" document?

Mr. WELLES. Decidedly so, Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. One of these documents, which has been turned over to the committee in response to the subpena served on Mr. Cleveland, is dated February 15, 1938, 4 p. m. It says: "Telegram sent Amlegation, Vienna." I will ask you, Mr. Welles, to examine this document and tell the committee whether the public interest would be violated, or the national interest and security would be violated by the publication of that document.

Mr. WELLES. Mr. Chairman, I believe that this document also if published now would be prejudicial to the Nation's interests.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Welles, were any of these messages which I have shown you, would they be sent in code? Is there anything to indicate that they were sent in code originally?

Mr. WELLES. All of these messages, Mr. Stripling, originally were sent in code and undoubtedly those marked "strictly confidential" or "strictly confidential, for the Secretary," would presumably be sent in one of the most secret codes then in our possession.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would the possession of the document as translated, along with the original document as it appeared in code, furnish an individual with the necessary information to break the code?

Mr. WELLES. In my judgment, decidedly yes.

Having thus established the significance of these documents and the fact that it would be injurious to our national security to publish them the following statement appears in the hearings:

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Stripling, it would occur to me that inasmuch as these documents are quite apparently of such significance that the contents cannot be disclosed at a public hearing of this nature without certainly examining each one in detail, that we should not take the time to do that at this hearing today; that Mr. Welles has served his purpose as a witness at a public hearing, and at an executive session we could go into this matter in further detail, for the purpose of helping to sort out the evidence to make sure that nothing of vital danger to our national security is made public.

Then, Mr. President, to make a double check on the actual significance of the documents relayed by Hiss to Chambers our committee called before it Mr. John Peurifoy, Assistant Secretary of State in the State Department. On page 1391 of the hearings the following testimony appears:

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Peurifoy, I believe your title is Assistant Secretary of State in charge of security; at least that describes the purview of your authority; is that correct?

Mr. PEURIFOY. In charge of administration, sir, which includes security.

Mr. MUNDT. You have been in the room, have you not, and have heard all of the testimony given by Mr. Sumner Welles?

Mr. PEURIFOY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Stripling will now show you the documents which he showed to Mr. Welles and ask you some questions concerning them.

Mr. PEURIFOY. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, I will show him the same three documents, ask that he read them all three carefully, and then we will take them up in the order in which Mr. Welles considered them.

Without burdening the RECORD with all the questions and answers, Mr. President, let it be recorded here that Mr. Peurifoy supported completely the statement of Mr. Welles that release of these documents, even in 1948, would be detrimental to our national security and our foreign policy.

I think it illuminating, however, to call attention to the fact that on page 1393 of the hearings, Representative HÉBERT, of Louisiana, who also rendered Trojan service as a member of our special subcommittee asked this question:

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Peurifoy, in your position in charge of security for the State Department, would you say that documents in the number of 200 pages removed from the Department would prima facie indicate that they had been taken for a purpose detrimental to the United States Government?

Mr. PEURIFOY. I would so.

Mr. HÉBERT. And anybody taking them could not be perchance, or by accident; it would have to be some systematic removal of these documents from the files for a purpose not in the interests of the United States Government?

Mr. PEURIFOY. I would agree with that, sir.

A little later, Representative NIXON took over the questioning of Mr. Peurifoy and said:

Mr. NIXON. I understand that where a document is classified, at least where it is classified to the extent of "Strictly Confidential" or "Strictly Confidential for the Secretary," that the document is not supposed to be removed from the Department to the person's home?

Mr. PEURIFOY. That is right, sir.

Mr. NIXON. And if a document of such a nature were removed to a person's home, and there copied or there digested by that person,

that in itself would be a breach of the State Department's rules.

Mr. PEURIFOY. It would, sir.

In concluding that day's testimony, Mr. President, and dismissing Mr. Peurifoy, I made a statement which I felt to be true then and which I feel to be even more emphatically true today. I quote from page 1397 of the record:

Mr. MUNDT. Thank you very much, Mr. Peurifoy, and I might say before we break up it is a sad commentary, but it certainly stands axiomatically before us all when we find in the possession of Russian agents in this country material so secretive and so vital to our national defense that we cannot make it available to the American public. That seems to be the situation we are now confronted with. The meeting stands adjourned.

Mr. President, insofar as the chronology by which the original testimony of Whittaker Chambers was slowly but surely substantiated by confessions, witnesses, and documents and finally corroborated by the grand-jury indictment and verdict of guilty by the trial court in New York, that pretty well completes the record. However, in response to requests which have come from several Senators for a more detailed chronology of the manner in which this strange and startling case evolved, and inasmuch as the hearings and reports have been in such great demand for so long a time that they are now completely exhausted, I have compiled for the information of those desiring it a chronological record of the Whittaker Chambers-Alger Hiss case before the House Committee on Un-American Activities of the Eightieth Congress, second session, which, with the permission of the Senate, I will insert at this point in the RECORD. Following this insertion I wish to call attention specifically to some of the issues which are raised and some of the questions left unanswered as a consequence of the conviction of Alger Hiss and the clear-cut realization that Communist contacts of the Russian agents received for many years a highly placed and highly influential member of our State Department.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the chronological record of the Whittaker Chambers-Alger Hiss case before the House Un-American Activities Committee.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHRONOLOGICAL RECORD OF WHITTAKER CHAMBERS-ALGER HISS CASE BEFORE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

August 3, 1948, David Whittaker Chambers appeared as a witness before the Committee on Un-American Activities, United States House of Representatives. He gave the following testimony:

He was senior editor of Time magazine in New York City.

He was born April 1, 1901, in Philadelphia.

He had been associated with Time magazine for 9 years.

Prior to that time he was a member of the Communist Party and a paid functionary of the party.

He first joined the Communist Party in 1924 in New York City.

He remained a member of the Communist Party until 1937.

For a number of years he had served in the Communist underground, chiefly in Washington, D. C. The underground organization was developed, to the best of his knowledge by Harold Ware, one of the sons of the Communist leader known as Mother Bloor (Ella Reeve Bloor).

He knew it at its top level, a group of seven or so men, from among whom in later years certain members of Miss Bentley's organization were apparently recruited. (The reference was to Elizabeth Terrill Bentley, who had testified before the committee July 31, 1948.)

The head of the Washington underground at the time he knew it was Nathan Witt, an attorney for the National Labor Relations Board. Later, John Abt became the leader. Lee Pressman was also a member of this group, as was Alger Hiss, who as a member of the State Department, later organized the conferences at Dumbarton Oaks, San Francisco, and the United States side of the Yalta Conference.

The purpose of this group at that time was not primarily espionage. Its original purpose was the Communist infiltration of the American Government. But espionage was certainly one of its eventual objectives.

Other members of this group were Donald Hiss, Victor Perlo, Charles Kramer (Kramer's original name was Krevitsky), and Henry Collins.

During the period he was with the underground group in Washington, Henry Collins was in the Department of Agriculture, Alger Hiss was, he thought, in the Munitions Investigation Committee (Special Senate Committee Investigating the Munitions Industry), and Donald Hiss, he thought, was in the Labor Department, connected with immigration. A number of these men had been in the AAA, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. He thought at that time Witt had already entered the National Labor Relations Board. Lee Pressman was in the AAA at one time. He had forgotten where John Abt was employed at that time. He believed Victor Perlo was employed by the Brookings Institution at that time.

He knew Donald Hiss as the younger brother of Alger Hiss.

Originally he came to Washington to act as a courier between New York and Washington, which in effect was between this apparatus and New York.

He met with the men he mentioned at the apartment of Henry Collins, which was at St. Matthews Court here in Washington. It wasn't called a headquarters, but the St. Matthews Court apartment was the closest thing to headquarters it had.

Hal Ware undoubtedly had an apartment, but no one met there that he knew of. Ware's sister had a violin studio near Dupont Circle, which was used as a kind of casual meeting place or rendezvous for members of the group.

All the group meetings were held in Henry Collins' apartment, not in the studio.

The woman who ran the studio was Helen Ware.

When he met with these people at Mr. Collins' apartment, he did not collect Communist Party dues from them, but the Communist Party dues were handed over to him by Collins, who was the treasurer of that group.

All of these people were members of the Communist Party.

J. Peters was, to the best of his knowledge, the head of the whole underground United States Communist Party. He, from time to time, came to Washington.

Ultimately Peters must have been responsible for the setting up of this group. He was certainly Harold Ware's superior.

He had been told what J. Peters real name was, he thought it was Goldenweis, or some such name. (Robert E. Stripling, the committee's chief investigator, asked Chambers if it was Goldberger, and Chambers repeated that name.)

Peters was known to him for years simply as Peters.

Peters told him at one time that he had been a petty officer in the Austrian Army during World War I. After the Bela Kun revolution in Hungary, he was a member of the Soviet Government of Hungary, he thought, in the agricultural commissariat.

When Mr. Stripling asked Chambers if it was his understanding that, in Communist Party circles, he (Peters) had for years been known as the head of the underground, Chambers replied that it was.

When asked if he knew whether Peters ever became an American citizen, Chambers said he did not know. He thought the presumption was probably he did not. When Mr. Stripling said Peters was not an American citizen, Chambers said he was not surprised.

Peters once explained to him his process of securing false passports. He told him with great amusement because of the simplicity of the scheme. He had sent up to the genealogical division of the New York Public Library a group of young Communists, he presumed, who collated the birth and death records; that is, they found that a child had been born, let us say, in 1900 and died a month or so later or several months later. The party through some members then wrote to the proper authorities in New York for issuing birth certificates and asked for a birth certificate in the name of that dead child. The certificate was forthcoming and a passport was then applied for under that name by someone using that birth certificate.

The dues Chambers collected at the apartment of Collins were not simply from the seven people. Dues were from the whole apparatus, cells which were headed by these seven people.

He didn't know how much money was turned over to him from time to time. His impression was that it was a considerable sum. He believed he heard that because at that time the dues were 10 percent of whatever the individual's salary was.

He brought Communist literature and instructions from New York to Washington as well as to collect the dues.

Chambers was for 3 years the actual editor of the Daily Worker. The nominal editor was Robert Minor. That was from about 1926 until 1929.

When he left the Communist Party in 1937 the only one of the seven in the Washington underground he approached to break with him was Alger Hiss. He went to the Hiss home one evening with what he considered considerable risk to himself and found Mrs. Hiss at home. Mrs. Hiss was also a member of the Communist Party. Mrs. Donald Hiss, he believed, was not.

Mrs. Hiss attempted while he was there to make a call which he could only presume was to other Communists, but he quickly went to the telephone and she hung up, and Mr. Hiss came in shortly afterward, and they talked and he (Chambers) tried to break him away from the party. As a matter of fact, Hiss cried when they separated, but Hiss absolutely refused to break.

He was very fond of Mr. Hiss. Hiss' reasons why he did not want to sever the relationship were simply the party line.

He (Chambers) knew Harry Dexter White. He couldn't say positively that White was a registered member of the Communist Party, but he certainly was a fellow traveler so far within the fold that his not being a Communist would be a mistake on both sides.

When he left the Communist Party he (Chambers) also went to White to ask him to break away from the Communist movement. White left him in a very agitated frame of mind, and he thought he had succeeded. Apparently he did not. Miss Bentley's testimony and certain things he heard from other sources assured him that he had

failed. (Harry Dexter White was identified as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and head of Monetary Research.)

After he had been in Washington a while it was very clear that some of the members of these groups were going places in the Government. That was about 1936. One of them clearly was Alger Hiss, and it was believed that Henry Collins also might go farther. Another was Lee Pressman. So it was decided by Peters, or by Peters in conference with others, that they would take these people out of that apparatus and separate them from it physically—that is, they would have no further intercourse with the people there—but they would be connected with that apparatus and with Peters through him (Chambers). It was also decided to add to this group certain other people who had not originally been in that apparatus. One of those people was Harry White.

These people were specifically not wanted to act as sources of information. These people were an elite group, an outstanding group, which it was believed would rise to positions—as, indeed, some of them did—notably Mr. White and Mr. Hiss—in the Government, and their position in the Government would be of very much more service to the Communist Party.

Asked if he knew where Alger Hiss was then employed, Chambers said he believed Hiss was the head of the Carnegia Foundation for World Peace.

He thought Donald Hiss, who was also in the State Department, was then in Mr. Corcoran's (Tommy Corcoran) law firm in Washington, and was connected with the negotiating of the loan to Poland.

He couldn't say where any of the other seven people were then employed.

In 1939 about 2 days after the Hitler-Stalin pact, Chambers came to Washington to report to the Government authorities concerning the Communists who were in the Government.

Isaac Don Levine, now the editor of Plain Talk, approached the late Marvin McIntyre, Mr. Roosevelt's secretary, and asked him what would be the most proper form in which the information Chambers had to give could be brought before President Roosevelt. Mr. McIntyre told Mr. Levine that Mr. A. A. Berle, the Assistant Secretary of State, was Mr. Roosevelt's man in intelligence matters. Chambers then went to see Mr. Berle and told him much of what he was telling the committee. When he saw Mr. Berle, he named specific names, Mr. Hiss among others.

He didn't mention Mr. White to Mr. Berle because at that time he thought he had broken Mr. White away. It was about 4 years later that he first told the FBI about Mr. White.

He was not informed of any action taken as a result of his report to Mr. Berle. A great deal later he discovered apparently nothing had been done.

August 5, 1948, Alger Hiss appeared before the committee at his own request. He denied unqualifiedly the statements about him which were made before the committee by Whittaker Chambers on August 3.

Hiss told the committee:

"I am not and never have been a member of the Communist Party. I do not and never have adhered to the tenets of the Communist Party. I am not and never have been a member of any Communist-front organization. I have never followed the Communist Party line, directly or indirectly. To the best of my knowledge none of my friends are Communists.

"As a State Department official I have had contacts with representatives of foreign governments, some of whom have undoubtedly been members of the Communist Party, as, for example, representatives of the Soviet Government. My contacts with any foreign representative who could possibly have been a Communist have been strictly official.

"To the best of my knowledge I never heard of Whittaker Chambers until in 1947, when two representatives of the Federal Bureau of Investigation asked me if I knew him and various other people, some of whom I knew and some of whom I did not know. I said I did not know Chambers. So far as I know I have never laid eyes on him, and I should like to have the opportunity to do so.

"I have known Henry Collins since we were boys in camp together. I knew him again while he was at the Harvard Business School while I was at the Harvard Law School, and I have seen him from time to time since I came to Washington in 1933.

"Lee Pressman was in my class at the Harvard Law School and we were both on the Harvard Law Review at the same time. We were also both assistants to Judge Jerome Frank on the legal staff of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. Since I left the Department of Agriculture I have seen him only occasionally and infrequently. I left the Department, according to my recollection, in 1935.

"Witt and Abt were both members of the legal staff of the AAA. I knew them both in that capacity. I believe I met Witt in New York a year or so before I came to Washington. I came to Washington in 1933. We were both practicing law in New York at the time I think I met Witt.

"Kramer was in another office of the AAA, and I met him in that connection.

"I have seen none of these last three men I have mentioned except most infrequently since I left the Department of Agriculture.

"I don't believe I ever knew Victor Perlo.

"Except as I have indicated, the statements made about me by Mr. Chambers are complete fabrications. I think my record in the Government service speaks for itself."

Hiss said he entered the Government in 1933 at the urging of Jerome Frank, Felix Frankfurter, and other Government officials.

He said he was urged to become president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in 1947 at the urging of John Foster Dulles and other members of the board of trustees.

He denied also that his wife had been a Communist or a member of any Communist front.

August 7, 1948 (executive session testimony made public August 25, 1948): Chambers told the committee he knew Hiss, roughly, between 1935 and 1937. He said Hiss knew him by the party name of Carl.

He again stated Hiss was a member of the Communist Party. He said he had been told that by Mr. Peters.

Chambers gave many details about Hiss, his family, different houses in which the Hisses had lived, etc. He said he stayed with Hiss one time for as long as a week.

He told of a Ford roadster, very dilapidated, with hand windshield wipers which he said Hiss insisted that he wanted to turn over to the open party so it could be of use to some poor organizer in the West or somewhere. He described a new Plymouth which he said Hiss got in 1936.

August 16, 1948 (executive session testimony made public August 25, 1948): Hiss testified that he did not recall anyone by the name of Carl "that could be remotely connected with the kind of testimony Mr. Chambers has given."

He denied knowing J. Peters. He said he thought he had been in the St. Matthew's Court apartment of Henry Collins on social occasions.

At this hearing Hiss thought he remembered Chambers as a man he had known by the name of George Crosley. He said he had met Crosley when he (Hiss) was working for the Nye Munitions Investigating Committee, that Crosley was a free-lance writer who had come to him for information because he was hoping to sell articles to magazines about the munitions industry. Hiss said he had sublet his apartment to this George Crosley on Twenty-ninth Street for the summer months of 1935 and had thrown in his old Ford as part of the deal. He claimed he handed over the title of the car to Crosley and had no idea if Crosely had recorded the title.

He said that Crosley and his wife and infant had stayed with the Hisses a couple of nights in their house at 2905 P Street because their moving van had been delayed. He also told of making a loan of cash to Crosley. He said he hadn't seen Crosley since 1935.

August 17, 1948 (executive session testimony made public Aug. 24, 1948): At this hearing Hiss and Chambers confronted each other. Hiss examined Chambers' teeth because when he had known him as George Crosley he said Chambers had very bad teeth. Chambers testified that he had had dental work since 1934 of a substantial nature.

Hiss made positive his identification of Chambers as the George Crosley he had known.

Hiss challenged Chambers at this hearing to make the statements he had made before the committee in public.

August 25, 1948: The public confrontation of Alger Hiss with Whittaker Chambers took place at this hearing.

Hiss identified Chambers as the man he had known as George Crosley. He said he first knew Crosley in the winter of 1934 or 1935, and last saw him in 1935.

Chambers identified Alger Hiss. He said he first saw him about 1934 and last saw him about 1938.

Hiss repeated his recollection of Chambers as Crosley, of having orally arranged the sublease of his apartment on Twenty-eighth Street (apartment 42, 2831 Twenty-eighth Street NW.) to Crosley in the summer of 1935, and of turning his 1929 Ford roadster over to Crosley, and loaning Crosley some money.

Records introduced showed the Hiss tenancy in the Twenty-eighth Street apartment began July 1, 1934, for 1 year; that Hiss vacated it on June 28, 1935; that the apartment was vacant for the month of July 1935, and on August 1, 1935, was rented to W. E. Isemann.

Records also showed the house to which the Hiss family moved from the Twenty-eighth Street apartment was rented to Priscilla Hiss for 1 year from May 1, 1935, to June 15, 1936. The address of the house was 2905 P Street NW.

Hiss testified he had not been able to find any witness other than his wife who remembered Chambers as George Crosley.

Hiss recalled having two autos at one time. Records showed Hiss bought a new Plymouth September 7, 1935. (This was after the time he had said he had given Crosley his old Ford which he didn't need because he had another car but had been keeping for sentimental reasons.)

Hiss repeated his recollection that he gave Crosley the use of the Ford car, as he gave him the use of the apartment on Twenty-eighth Street.

Records introduced showed that on July 23, 1936, Hiss assigned title to the Ford car to the Cherner Motor Co., of Washington. The reassignment of title reflected that on the same date, July 23, 1936, one William Rosen became the purchaser of the car.

Confronted with a photostatic copy of the assignment of title, Hiss admitted the signature on it of Alger Hiss looked like his signature. He said, however, his best recollection was that he gave the car to Crosley, either for a loan or by transfer, and had no recollection of transferring the car to the Cherner Motor Co., and no recollection of receiving any payment for it. He had no recollection of the name Rosen.

Hiss recalled that shortly after he was elected president of the Carnegie Endowment but before he assumed office, he had a con-

versation with John Foster Dulles in which Mr. Dulles told him he had heard reports that people had called him (Hiss) a Communist.

"I can only assume—this being at least a month before I assumed office—that Mr. Dulles was satisfied that there was nothing to the reports, as I was myself."

Hiss said the matter was discussed with Mr. Dulles sometime in December 1946. He assumed office as president of the Carnegie Endowment on February 1, 1947.

Hiss recalled how, in 1946, he had gone to the FBI office to offer himself for an inquiry into charges that he was a Communist after Justice Byrnes, then the Secretary of State, told him several Members of Congress were preparing to make statements on the floor of Congress that he was. He said Justice Byrnes asked him if he was and he told Mr. Byrnes he was not. He said he thought his meeting with the FBI people then had disposed of the matter.

Hiss said he never heard until August 3, 1948, that Whittaker Chambers had made accusations about him to Mr. Berle in 1939. However, he said he heard in the winter of 1948 that a man named Chambers had said he was a Communist.

Mr. MUNDT reviewed the testimony of Chambers and Hiss up to this point and called attention to the conflicts in the stories of the two men.

Hiss read a statement he had prepared into the record, mentioning the names of prominent Government officials and others who he said knew of his character and work. In the statement Hiss raised a question about Chambers' sanity.

Hiss had no recollection of seeing Crosley in the Collins' apartment in St. Matthew's Court, nor any recollection of seeing Crosley in Hiss' house on Thirtieth Street. He took the Thirtieth Street house in July 1936.

Hiss was reasonably positive he didn't see Crosley in 1936 or 1937.

He repeated that, to the best of his recollection, he never saw Crosley except at the Twenty-eighth Street apartment, in his (Hiss') office in the Senate Office Building when he was chief attorney for the Nye Investigating Committee, in Hiss' home on P Street, when he had lunch with Crosley, and "perhaps if" he drove Crosley to New York one time.

Chambers gave his full name as J. David Whittaker Chambers. He gave the positions he held in the Communist Party as follows: One time a writer on the Daily Worker, later foreign news editor of the Daily Worker, editor of the New Masses, and a functionary in the underground.

He testified he was first introduced to Hiss by Harold Ware and J. Peters, in a Washington restaurant. He said he then continued to know Mr. Hiss until he broke with the Communist Party in early 1938, and saw Mr. Hiss once again toward the end of 1938.

He denied ever meeting Hiss at the offices of the Nye Investigating Committee in the Senate Office Building.

He said he saw Hiss at the latter's Twenty-eighth Street apartment around 20 times. He denied being known to Hiss as George Crosley, and denied Hiss had subleased the Twenty-eighth Street apartment to him, or had sold him a 1929 Ford.

Chambers said Hiss let him and his family occupy the Twenty-eighth Street apartment for several weeks in the early summer of 1935, and it was at Hiss's suggestion they did. Also, Chambers testified, he and his family were guests in the Hiss home on P Street.

Chambers described the set-up of the Communist underground in Washington, as follows: "Mr. Harold Ware, who is the son of Ella Reeve Bloor, a well-known Communist, had gone down to Washington, to the best of my knowledge, about 1933. He was chiefly interested in farm activities of some kind, but he discovered, after he got there, that he could recruit a large number of people in the Government for the Communist Party. It is possible that some of the people were Communists already, and he simply came in touch with them; others, I am sure, he recruited himself. He set up, perhaps with the help of J. Peters, an apparatus consisting of a number of organizations, a number of cells, each cell being led by a man who formed part of a committee, and an underground committee which met regularly at the home of Henry Collins in St. Matthews Court."

Chambers said he saw Alger Hiss at the Collins' apartment about five times. Hiss was separated from that group rather early, he explained, because "the intention was to set up a parallel group of men whose opportunities for penetrating into the Government and arriving at positions of power and influence seemed best."

Chambers said "Hiss obeyed party discipline in every respect."

When he and his family moved into Hiss's Twenty-eighth Street apartment, they brought no furniture, Chambers related. Hiss let him occupy the apartment for nothing, Chambers added, "because Mr. Hiss and I were Communists, and that was a comradely way of treating one another. There is nothing unusual in such a procedure among Communists."

Chambers testified when he first knew him Hiss had a Ford, and after that got a Plymouth. He said he and Hiss made one trip together in the Plymouth to New York, and he believed Mrs. Hiss went along, some time in 1936 or 1937. Hiss had the Ford for some time after he got the Plymouth, Chambers said. As he had previously, Chambers told how Hiss disposed of the Ford through an individual in the Washington Communist Party who owned or worked in a service station and old-car lot. "The plan was for Mr. Hiss to take the Ford and leave it at the car lot, which he did."

Chambers told the committee he saw Hiss constantly during 1936 and 1937, as often as once a week, or "once a fortnight, to be on the conservative side."

Asked if he had any comment on the charge made in the hearings that he had been treated for a mental illness, Chambers replied, "Yes; I have never been treated for a mental illness—period." He said he had never been treated in a mental institution and had never been charged or convicted of a crime.

Chambers again related the story of how he tried to get Hiss to break away from the party.

He testified he was very fond of Hiss; that Hiss was "perhaps my closest friend * * * certainly the closest friend I ever had in the Communist Party."

Asked what motive he had for accusing Hiss of being a Communist, Chambers replied:

"The story has spread that in testifying against Mr. Hiss I am working out some old grudge or motives of revenge or hatred. I do not hate Mr. Hiss. We were close friends, but we are caught in a tragedy of history. Mr. Hiss represents the concealed enemy against which we are all fighting, and I am fighting.

"I have testified against him with remorse and pity, but in a moment of history in which this Nation now stands, so help me God, I could not do otherwise."

Mr. MUNDT brought out at this point that Chambers did not come to the committee voluntarily for the purpose of testifying against Hiss or anybody else, but was subpenaed without advance notice by the committee.

Chambers said it was 5 days after the Hitler-Stalin pact of August 26, 1939, not 2 days after, as he had testified previously, that he told Adolf Berle, who was then the Under Secretary of State, about the underground apparatus. He reiterated the circumstances of that meeting with Mr. Berle.

Chambers repeated that the Hisses always knew him as Carl. He said Mr. or Mrs. Hiss, at his last meeting with them in 1938, told him Peters had told them, or the party had told them who he was, so he assumed they knew his real name, but they didn't tell him what the name was.

Chambers ended his testimony this day with the following statement in reply to a question from Mr. MUNDT:

"It is unquestionable that they (Communist cells) are still functioning in government, and will continue to function until they are rooted out. It may be during a period like this when a number of investigative agencies are looking into the matter, they are resting on their oars for a while, but they remain in being."

August 27, 1948 (executive session testimony made public in printed hearings):

Chambers was called before the committee to give information concerning his acquisition of a piece of property in Westminster, Md. He said he and Hiss had talked of getting a small place in the country somewhere; later Hiss unearthed an advertisement of the Westminster place and made a down payment. Hiss then took Mrs. Hiss to the place, and she didn't like it or the countryside, whereupon Hiss called off his arrangement with the real-estate dealer, Chambers testified. Chambers said he made one trip to the place with Hiss in the latter's Ford. Chambers added that sometime later he acquired the place under his name but didn't let Hiss know he had, because he didn't want Hiss to know his real name.

In the course of this hearing Chambers said he had frequently discussed communism with Hiss. Asked if Hiss had pronounced views on communism or interpretations of Marxism, Chambers replied: "He had not unusual interpretations. His views—he understood Marxism very well, and had accepted it very completely. There wasn't very great ground for theoretical discussion. In other words, we talked more, I think, in the realm of current affairs, interpretations of current affairs, in the light of communism."

Asked if he and Hiss had discussed likely prospects for the underground apparatus with which they were connected, Chambers replied:

"Yes; we did, and the one whom Mr. Hiss believed to be the most likely was a man named Noel Field. Mr. Field was in what was then the West European Division of the State Department. I don't know what his position was, but he may have been head of the Division. Hiss believed that Field was already very strongly pro-Communist.

"Now, how he knew that I have forgotten, but I presume by conversation. He made a number of attempts to draw Field in and only to discover at the show-down that Field was connected with another apparatus."

August 30, 1948:

At this hearing Chambers identified Alexander Stevens, who had been subpenaed before the committee in New York, as the person who went under the name of J. Peters and with whom Chambers said he worked in the Communist apparatus in Washington.

Chambers told how, when he decided to get a job in the Government in Washington in 1937, Communists to whom he communicated this desire got him one very quickly paying more than $6,000 a year with "the so-called national research or Federal research project." He said the job was arranged for him within a matter of days, probably within 24 hours or so. "I would say that this is a spectacular instance of the ease with which a Communist could at all times slide other Communists into practically any Government agency in which they had a foothold," Chambers testified.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I think there are four or five unanswered questions and prevailing issues leading to recommended action which grow out of the conviction of Alger Hiss. One is that many Americans are rightfully concerned, Mr. President, about what impact Alger Hiss had, and, more important, what influence do his friends and ideological associates in the State Department today have in the formation of our foreign policy?

The first part of this question is easier to answer than the second. Alger Hiss held at least four strategic positions in the State Department in which to smuggle out information, and, of even greater significance, in which to influence foreign-policy decision both through his personal powers of persuasion and by staffing the post with other Communist sympathizers willing to carry on for him after he moved up to a new vantage point of operations.

These four strategic positions were as—

(a) A high functionary in the Far Eastern Division making recommendations on our policy toward China.

(b) The executive secretary of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference.

(c) The Secretary General of the San Francisco Conference.

(d) A personal and confidential adviser to President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Stettinius before and during the entire Yalta Conference.

To that we might add that he was American adviser to the United States delegation in London for a time, after the Charter was approved.

While each of these positions was of major magnitude and offered great opportunity for injury to the free side of the ideological contest being waged against international communism, the activities of Alger Hiss in helping to frame our foreign policy toward China and his influence at Yalta are by far the most significant of the four from the standpoint of protecting our security and preserving our peace. Therefore, in connection with the activities of Alger Hiss at San Franciso, in the writing of the United Nations Charter, it suffices for me to give the following quotation from page 27 of Time magazine for April 16, 1945, and I quote from Time magazine appearing under the heading of "Conferences":

> The Secretary General for the San Francisco Conference was named at Yalta but announced only last week—lanky, Harvard-trained, Alger Hiss, one of the State Department's brighter young men.

Mr. President, I call attention to the point that he was named at Yalta. As I continue with the disclosures of what happened at Yalta, I think it will become clear how it happened that he was named in the Crimea, instead of here in Washington, D. C.

I read further from the Time magazine article:

> Alger Hiss was one of the Harvard Law School students whose records earned them the favor of Prof. (now Justice) Felix Frankfurter—

That is the Frankfurter who testified as a character witness, by the way, at the first trial of Alger Hiss, the Frankfurter who dragged the hallowed robes of justice from the Supreme Court to the criminal court, to testify for a man who now has been found guilty of perjury.

I repeat what I was reading from the Time magazine article:

> Alger Hiss was one of the Harvard Law School students whose records earned them the favor of Prof. (now Justice) Felix Frankfurter and a year as secretary to the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. He was drafted from a New York law firm by the New Deal in 1933, joined the State Department in 1936, accompanied President Roosevelt to Yalta.
>
> At San Francisco he and his secretariat of 300 (mostly Americans) will have the drudging, thankless clerk's job of copying, translating, and publishing, running the thousands of paper-clip and pencil chores of an international meeting. But Alger Hiss will be an important figure there. As Secretary General, managing the agenda, he will have a lot to say behind the scenes about who gets the breaks.

Mr. President, I have been quoting from an article published in Time magazine.

It was important, was it not, to know who was going to get the breaks as we were writing the United Nations Charter, which became the over-all charter for the world after the war. A little break here and a little break there, something of advantage here, something slipped under the table there—what an advantage it was to have a pal at that post. It disturbs many Americans, these days, to know that the man then in a position to hand out the breaks, last Saturday afternoon in New York was found guilty of disloyal actions to this country, confirming the startling and astounding testimony of Whittaker Chambers about the whole insidious course of action of Alger Hiss in the State Department.

Insofar as the opportunities for Alger Hiss to exert his pro-Communist influence at Yalta are concerned, permit me, Mr. President, to quote from two authentic books written on the subject of the Yalta Conference. Former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, in his book, Speaking Frankly, frequently refers to the fact that President Roosevelt at Yalta was in ill health, and virtually all of those writing about Yalta from an intimate knowledge of the facts agree that the President was not in physical or mental vigor sufficient to permit him to devote to that conference the careful study and advance preparation which our national interests warranted and which that all-important conference deserved. For example, on page 23 of the book, Speaking Frankly, former Secretary of State Byrnes says flatly:

> So far as I could see, the President had made little preparation for the Yalta Conference.

Mr. President, perhaps I should read that again, because we had won a great military victory, and that was a conference which was going to determine the peace, and that was the President who was going to represent American interests at the writing of the peace. Because he was ill, because he was fatigued, because he was just recovering from the rigors of his fourth-term campaign, it is understandable that he could not spend too much time getting ready. But I think we should know that Secretary of State Byrnes says this, in so many words—and Secretary Byrnes was there at the time:

> So far as I could see, the President had made little preparation for the Yalta Conference.

That is the statement made by Jimmy Byrnes, a great friend of the late President. He says plainly that the President had made little preparation for the Yalta Conference. I read that statement in no criticism of President Roosevelt. I say that simply to highlight the fact that someone had to make some preparations for Yalta. Since the President did not make them—since he was too tired, since he was too sick, since he was too worn from his fourth-term campaign—he could not make them. Someone made them. Mr. President, I should think that students of foreign policy and defenders of America would be curious to know who made the studies before Yalta, who was providing the advice, who was laying the ground work, who was preparing the guns, so to speak, for the President to fire. Secretary Byrnes says the President did not make the preparations for the Yalta Conference.

Secretary Byrnes also relates that the advisers of the State Department had gone ahead as far as Malta, and that the President met with Stettinius and his advisers at that outpost, in preparation for the Yalta Conference.

So now we see the picture. The President proceeded by ship—ill, tired, recovering from a hard campaign, unable to prepare for one of the most important global conferences in history; and a group of men had gone ahead to Malta to fix up the decisions President Roosevelt was supposed to plead for when he got to the Crimea, to the Yalta Conference. Therefore, I wish to bring into evidence a few other witnesses in regard to the status of the President's health at that time; because, if we are going to assay properly the consequences at Yalta, it is imperative that we Americans know who made the decisions, who prepared for them, what was back of them.

Perhaps Jimmy Byrnes' testimony alone might be disputed when he observed that the President was not making the preparations. Perhaps the President was in the bloom of health. Perhaps Jimmy Byrnes' testimony alone might be disputed. So let us look to see what were the statements of other witnesses, other Americans, who were there at the time. I now give the Senate the statement of Henry L. Stimson, as found in his book, On Active Service, published in 1948. The statement appears at pages 574 to 575, if there are those who would like to pursue this matter further. In commenting upon the President's state of health preceding that important conference, we find these words—and I quote now the words of Henry L. Stimson:

> I have been much troubled by the President's physical condition. He was distinctly not himself Saturday (September 9). He had a cold and seemed tired out. I rather fear for the effects of this hard conference upon him. I am particularly troubled

* * * that he is going up there without any real preparation for the solution of the underlying and fundamental problem of how to treat Germany. So far as he had evidenced it in his talks with us, he has had absolutely no study or training in the very difficult problem which we have to decide.

Mr. President, someone had to study those problems; someone had to say, "I am the man with the training and the bright ideas." I shall come to some suggestions, after awhile, to indicate, perhaps, who were those who filled the vacuum caused by the fact that the President was old and the President was ill and the President was tired and the President was badly worn from a harrowing political campaign. I wish to quote the words of another witness on this important subject of why and how Hiss was in a position to use his abilities and his personal charm and his loquacity, while serving at Yalta, to serve, shall we say, the Soviets, instead of the United States of America. So let us look further into the record. James A. Farley wrote a book entitled "Jim Farley's Story." That book also was published in 1948. I wish to quote a little of the information to be found in it. I refer to pages 363 to 377:

In our evaluation of President Roosevelt, Cordell—

Meaning Cordell Hull—

and I agreed that he was a sick man at Yalta and should not have been called upon to make decisions affecting his country and the world. Physical illness, we knew, taxed the mind and left him in no shape to bargain with such hard bargainers as the Russians and such astute diplomats as the British.

On every side, I heard expressions of regret that he was not himself in the most critical days of world history. Had he not been physically and mentally tired at Teheran and Yalta, and at home, and had America had a more vigorous voice in international affairs, statesmen of the world are agreed almost without exception that many of the troubles vexing the world today would not have arisen.

Mr. President, I have just quoted, not the words of a Republican campaign manager or Republican campaign orator, but the uncolored, objective testimony of James A. Farley in his book Jim Farley's Story, published in 1948.

Let me quote one other authority along a similar line. I quote now from a book published in 1948, entitled "I saw Poland Betrayed," by Arthur Bliss Lane, of the State Department. He says:

The Department of State was not kept advised of the progress of the Crimea Conference (Yalta). * * * The first word regarding the conference which reached the State Department in Washington was the report by Jonathan Daniels, administrative assistant to the President. * * * A copy was immediately brought to me at my desk in the State Department. As I glanced over it, I could not believe my eyes. To me, almost every line spoke of a surrender to Stalin.

Mr. Roosevelt returned to Washington from the Crimea Conference, mortally fatigued by his journey. * * * On March 1 (1945) he addressed a joint session of Congress to report on the decisions reached at Yalta.

I think that is important background, because we are pursuing the question, if the President was not in a position to make the decisions at Yalta, who was to make them? Who else was there?

Edward R. Stettinius was Secretary of State at the time. I knew Ed Stettinius well, and admired him. I think he was an able, loyal American. When he came to the State Department, with no background or experience, and without any diplomatic training, he was cast immediately into some of the major roles of international policy, for which neither he nor any other human being could be adequately prepared. So he had to rely, as any of us would have done, upon advisers. I think students of history should try to determine the identity of the advisers. It becomes of tremendous significance to know just who comprised the coterie of advisers working with Mr. Stettinius and upon whom both the Secretary of State and President Roosevelt had to depend, in large part, for the facts and data and historic background so essential in the discussions and deliberations of the Yalta Conference. That brings us to another authentic book on the subject, this one written by Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., entitled "Roosevelt and the Russians—the Yalta Conference." It would be remembered, of course, that our Secretary of State at Yalta was Mr. Stettinius and not Mr. Byrnes.

From page 30 of the Stettinius book on Roosevelt and the Russians, I shall quote the testimony of Stettinius, the man, who, in the absence of an active, alert President, able to study the necessary background in order to make decisions, had to make them. I quote now the testimony of the man who made our decisions at Yalta, as to where he received his information and as to what kind of decision should be made. It is imperative, I think if we are properly to evaluate Yalta and to answer the questions which the honest men and women all over America are asking, and to make this plain. Honest men and women all over America tell me, "Senator, I cannot understand. How could we have failed so abysmally at Yalta?" As for me, I think we were lucky we did not give away twice as much as we did, when one really understands the kind of situation which existed at that point and at that time.

From page 30 of the Stettinius book, Roosevelt and the Russians, I quote the following:

At the President's suggestion the State Department delegation flew to north Africa to spend a few days reviewing the American position on the various problems to be discussed in the Crimea, and then flew to Malta to conduct discussions with the British before he arrived.

The State Department experts who traveled with me to the conference were H. Freeman Matthews, director of the Office of European Affairs; Alger Hiss, deputy director of the Office of Special Political Affairs; and Wilder Foote, assistant to the Secretary of State.

Three advisers, and three only, are headlined there as those helping Stettinius, coming freshly and inexperienced to the job, to make decisions, to determine whether the victory we won in the war could preserve the definite peace and establish reasonable conditions throughout the world. Stettinius further writes:

At Malta and Yalta Ambassador Harriman and Charles Bohlen were also part of the State Department delegation. While I was in London in April 1944 Hiss had been transferred from the Office of Far Eastern Affairs—

Helping formulate the beginnings of a Chinese policy there, I presume—

to the Office of Special Political Affairs.

In his book, Mr. Stettinius pays high tribute to the brilliant mind and to the important part Mr. Hiss played at the Yalta Conference. Mr. Stettinius had great confidence in Mr. Hiss, as demonstrated by comments over and over again in his book. Due to the untimely death of former Secretary of State Stettinius, he has been mercifully spared the unhappy realization of his betrayal by a man in whom he reposed such great confidence.

In all events, Secretary of State Stettinius, writing as a friend of Alger Hiss at a time when his disloyalty had not been established in a court of law, surely had no reason either unduly to expand upon or to minimize the part that Alger Hiss played in the deliberations at Yalta. Consequently, the following statement from the book authored by Mr. Stettinius takes on tremendous significance. He was the man who was seeking advice. He was the man who had to formulate the decisions. He was the man on whom Roosevelt had to depend for making the preparation which those who saw Roosevelt unanimously agreed he was unable to make by reason of the state of his health at the time of Yalta. Here is what Mr. Stettinius, in his book Roosevelt and the Russians, says. He begins on page 36 a delineation of the part which Hiss played at the Yalta Conference and at the deliberations, by saying, for example:

Among the questions reserved for subsequent discussion with the President at Yalta, which I reviewed with Matthews, Hiss, and Foote, were—

There were many interesting questions, as they appear in retrospect, when we consider Mr. Hiss, conniving at Yalta, getting read for decisions at Yalta to affect the following nine points of decision:

1. The establishment of a European High Commission composed of Great Britain, the Soviet Union, France, and the United States.

Perhaps that was the one that served as the background to the commission system in Europe. It does not say in detail, and it had no great significance, perhaps.

2. The treatment of Germany.

There was the scheme to make Germany a pastoral state, the scheme to keep a cancer operative in the central part of Europe, so there could be no recovery of Europe; and, without a recovery of Europe, there is always a vacuum into which the Communists are likely to pour. There were the preliminary decisions, ratified at Potsdam, to place the great Army of the United States in a tight little box in Berlin, with no access to our troops by way of canal, highway, or railroad. There for the first time in history, this most powerful of countries put an army of occupation in a doughnut ring surrounded by the iron steel of the Communist Army. The one who thought that up, at Yalta, certainly was not

thinking primarily of protecting the United States.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. THYE. The same situation exists at Vienna, Austria. It is occupied by Allied troops, and Austria is encircled by territory entirely within the control of the Russian Government.

Mr. MUNDT. Precisely. Merely to look at the situation and at the results, it seems to me, would drive an ordinarily alert individual to question what was going on at Yalta. The course of events and careful research now enable us to piece the pattern together—the position of the President, unable to think things through, himself, by reason of his health and his fatigue; the situation of the advisers meeting in advance, the identity of the advisers, the conviction of the chief adviser, not once, but five times, for guilty association with Communists and communism.

The first time Hiss was convicted, he convicted himself when he admitted in his own sworn testimony that he had lived as a friend in the home of the Communist conveyor and agent, Whittaker Chambers. The second time he was convicted was by a reluctant House Committee on Un-American Activities, which finally, after following the evidence for months, came to the inescapable conclusion that Hiss alone was the one who could deliver the secret State Department documents to Whittaker Chambers. The third time he was convicted was when the grand jury in New York indicted him for perjury. They said, "Mr. Hiss, you lied to us when you denied you took the highly classified State Department documents from the security files and delivered them to a foreign Communist agent." That was the indictment of the grand jury. The fourth time, I suppose it could not quite be said he was convicted, because 4 of the jurors held out, but 8 of the 12 found him guilty then. The fifth time, he was convicted by all 12. Now, a few of those who rallied to his defense too soon, who got caught trying to defend him at a time when the evidence had not all been disclosed, still say, in the face of the sworn testimony and confession of Alger Hiss, that he was just a nice young man, with a Harvard accent, and with a neat crease in the front of his trousers.

But I desire to talk a little bit more about what Alger Hiss had to do in the shaping of world history. The third thing they took up at Yalta was the Polish question. How convenient to have, on the American team, someone willing to say "yes" to Stalin, when he said at Yalta, "We Russians want to continue to keep and to control the portion of Poland that we won while fighting as an ally of Adolf Hitler in the early days of the war." The Communists do not like to hear about that. Even the psuedo progressives and the progressive liberals do not like any longer to hear about that. They like to forget the fact that in the early stages of the war, Russia and Germany were on the same side. The Nazis and the Communists had made common cause, as they should, because the distinctions and differences between them are most insignificant. At all events, when, without warning, the fiendish Nazis attacked Poland and the Poles were driven back toward Warsaw in that blitzkreig, suiting the occasion to the hour and undoubtedly to the secret commitments of the von Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement, the Communists attacked the Poles from the rear and obtained by bloodshed and force the portions of Poland east of the Curzon line.

It was thought necessary to have on the advisory staff someone who thought communism was a noble thing to make it easy for a tired individual, unable to prepare adequately for the occasion, to acquiesce in that kind of demand. Of course Russia took Poland and a portion of Germany as well, but that was not with our concurrence, at least, at Yalta, as it was with our concurrence when we said—and how shamefully, in my opinion—for the first time, and, I hope, for the only time in history, to the people of Poland, "We are going to try to buy security for America by driving Poland into slavery." We gave away into the black night of slavery the portions of Poland which Stalin said he wanted, because, after all, he and his pal, Adolf Hitler, had seized them while fighting together on the same side in the war.

We now come to the relations between UNRRA and the Soviet Government. If I could have started this speech earlier I could have dwelt at length on that subject, because I was assigned to study UNRRA in Europe, and I know from personal observation the facts upon which the congressional report was made. But few persons ever read a congressional report, so I would not expect the Senate to know about it. Yet that report shows that the UNRRA offices in Czechoslovakia and in Poland were openly and unashamedly being operated by the Communists, who tore the labels off UNRRA goods and frequently wrapped the goods in packages saying, in effect, "This is a gift from Uncle Joe."

We paid 74 percent of the cost and gave the Russians 50 percent of the authority at the top and put them in as managerial officers in most of the important outposts of the world. No wonder UNRRA died an unhonored and an unsung death, because in many areas it contributed to the growth of communism.

I salute the work which UNRRA did in Greece. There it served the cause of humanity and met the needs of little children. In Greece, however, a Canadian rather than a Communist was in charge of UNRRA.

The fifth question taken up at Yalta was the rights of American representatives on the Allied control commissions for Bulgaria, Rumania, and Hungary.

We were asked in Budapest one night by a very fine, able, and distinguished general from Oklahoma, by the name of Kee, to get them out of Hungary because the Allied commission was run by the Russians. He said, "We have no authority whatsoever as members of the Allied control commission in Hungary."

Maybe it was planned that way at Yalta. I do not know.

The sixth question referred to Iran. The seventh referred to China.

Mr. President, I am not going to succumb to the temptation to discuss China at any length. Certainly it does not test anyone's credulity very much to ask that we ponder a little bit what influence Alger Hiss might have had in writing a pro-Soviet foreign policy toward China when he was there, and in bringing about that most calamitous of all decisions at Yalta by which we agreed to give to the Russians control of the Communists in China and important installations in Manchuria.

For the record I should like to interpolate the statement that, in my opinion, America never has had so good a friend at any time as it had in the Nationalist Government of China when the bombs came dropping down on us at Pearl Harbor. I challenge anyone to show another country in the history of this Republic that ever fought a war for us. We have helped many other peoples. We have been in many contests. We have gone to the aid of other peoples and joined them in common cause. But here was a country willing to fight a war for us. After Pearl Harbor we were unable to fight with equal vigor the Nazis, the Fascists, and the Shinto priests of Japan. So we conferred with Chiang Kai-shek and said, "How about it, old fellow? Will you keep on trading dead Chinese soldiers for supplies for a little while? We want to concentrate our efforts in Europe against the Nazis and the Fascists."

I thought that was wise. I was a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee at the time I heard of the plan and I said, "I think that is sound, wise, and good."

We said to China, "If we can do that, you keep on fighting the Japs for a while, the little yellow men who killed our American boys at Pearl Harbor. When we finish in Europe fighting the Italians and the Germans, who do not mean anything to you, we shall come over and help defeat the Japs."

The Nationalists agreed. They fought for us. We made them one magnanimous promise. We said, "If you do that, we will promise not to send any more scrap iron during the period of the war in which we find ourselves your ally."

China may not have a liberal government; I do not know. It may have many things wrong with it; I do not know. But I shall always remember that no other country in history, before or since, ever fought a war for us.

However, at Yalta we signed documents agreeing to turn over the prize possessions of our most unselfish ally to the Communists, for the second time at Yalta trying to buy security for ourselves by selling a friend into slavery and floating him down the river of despair.

Mr. President, in Mr. Stettinius' book he said he and Alger Hiss and a few others at Yalta were figuring out what to tell the President regarding China.

A close reading of the Stettinius book indicates the unique capacity which Alger Hiss demonstrated over and over again in his Government service for working his way into the confidence of persons in high position and for gradually assuming more and more control

in the particular position to which he was assigned. It was also indicated by the telegram read into the RECORD by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] from poor, befuddled Dean Acheson this afternoon.

The following quotation from the book by Stettinius indicates that the favorite formula by which Alger Hiss expanded his influence was clearly operative at the Yalta Conference. On page 49 of the book Roosevelt and the Russians, Stettinius says:

Before dinner Hopkins, Bohlen, Kirk, Matthews, Hiss, and I had a discussion of the political and economic situation in Italy.

Later in the book, on page 83, Stettinius writes:

After these dinners, I usually conferred again with Matthews, Bohlen, Hiss, and Foote, read cables from Acting Secretary of State Grew in Washington, drafted cables to the Department, and then went to bed often as late as two in the morning.

On page 84 Stettinius writes referring to a different episode:

The next morning at 10:30 Harriman, Matthews, Hiss, Bohlen, and I met with the President of the sun porch, overlooking the sea, to review our proposals for the Conference agenda.

Later in the book, on page 103, Stettinius writes, in describing the manner in which the Conference officials gathered around the council tables:

The Americans, sitting behind the President, varied somewhat from session to session but usually included Hopkins, Matthews, and Hiss, and sometimes Foote.

On pages 195 and 196, Stettinius writes:

I pointed out to the President that I had reserved the American position on extra votes for the Soviet Union at the Foreign Ministers' meeting until I could talk to him again and that, as a result, a subcommittee, consisting of Gladwin Jebb—

Who was the British representative—

Gromyko—

Who was the Russian representative—

and Hiss, representing the three nations, was now at work preparing a report.

A report, incidentally, Mr. President, which gave the Russians three votes to our one.

What a triumvirate. Poor Gladwin Jebb, with Gromyko and Alger Hiss, trying to figure out what to do to help free men.

It is more than an item of passing curiosity, Mr. President, that we hear how Alger Hiss was moving into positions of influence and authority at Yalta. First he was one of a group of six advisers to the Secretary of State to make the advance preparations for Yalta and to prepare information for the study of the President when they met at Malta before proceeding to the Crimea. Then we find him being included among those sitting with the President on the porch reviewing proposals for the daily agenda at the Conference. Then we see him selected as one of those sitting behind the President in the inner council chambers and to counsel with him, to whisper suggestions to him, to make his influence felt on matters of vital significance, and to supply the President with information, or misinformation, as the case might be, for making world-shattering and world-shaking decisions.

Then, Mr. President, we find Hiss the sole American representative on a committee of three, one of whom is the Communist Gromyko, preparing a report to determine how many extra votes should be given the Soviet Government in the forthcoming United Nations Charter.

Reading on in the book, Mr. President, one finds Ed Stettinius writing on page 238:

Fortunately, at this point, there was a short intermission. I asked Hiss to do a quick summary of the State Department's memorandum on the trusteeship issue. Byrnes and I talked it over with the Prime Minister, and I seemed to satisfy him when I showed him the memorandum just written by Hiss.

One of six, one of five, one of four, one of three, with Gromyko and Jebb, and then the man who writes the memorandum. This time just Mr. Hiss alone.

No wonder he can fool Dean Acheson, no wonder he can fool so many eminent Americans—suave, able, ingenious, but not smart enough to be able to cover up his tracks, so that he did not find it necessary at first to decline to admit in his own words under oath before the House Committee on Un-American Activities that he was living with a Communist spy by the name of Whittaker Chambers.

No one is going to challenge the fact that the man who wrote the memorandum alone at Yalta himself declares under oath:

When I was back in Washington, I was living with a fellow by the name of Whittaker Chambers, a Communist spy, a man I knew so well that to recognize him some years later I had to look down his throat to see if his dentures were still just the same.

Mr. President, the serious part of this is not the Alger Hiss part. The serious part is the befuddlement which has come over the world because of the miserable mess which has stemmed from Yalta. But who could expect anything else, once the record is clear?

This time without benefit of conference with Gromyko, or with Gladwyn Jebb, we find Hiss, the author of an important memorandum, about to be accepted by the Conference.

On page 270 Stettinius writes of still another incident when he says:

During one adjournment that afternoon the President asked me to get a lawyer to consult with him over the wording of the Polish boundary statement. I called Alger Hiss.

Ah, these liberal commentators, now running to cover, trying to defend themselves because they had said Alger Hiss was right and the committee was wrong. What are they going to say about the fact that the man who was called was Alger Hiss, to discuss the Polish boundary question, on which, as I have previously indicated, we first sold out a friendly ally in a victorious war and tried to buy security for ourselves, or perhaps something for the Soviets, by trading away countries which did not belong to us, and freedoms that used to belong to the Poles. These liberal commentators told us, "Hiss was at Yalta, but he did not do very much. He sort of delivered the ash trays around and collected the lead pencils."

But the man who did the work at Yalta, Ed Stettinius, by the uncontrovertible testimony of the President's friend, writing about his inability to make decisions himself at Yalta says that when the President wanted a lawyer for an important decision on Poland, "I called Alger Hiss."

Mr. President, if Alger Hiss had been a loyal as well as an able adviser to the Department of State, the important part he played over and over again in determining the decisions at Yalta would be no cause for worry or alarm. But in view of the verdict of the New York jury, coming, as it did, after the indictment of the grand jury of New York, and following his first trial, at which 8 of the 12 jurors determined Hiss was guilty, and recognizing that all of this follows the admission by Hiss, himself, before the House Committee on Un-American Activities concerning his close associations and contacts with Whittaker Chambers, who was a paid Communist agent, one shudders to contemplate the full potentiality for service to communism and to Russia and for disservice to the cause of peace and freedom which was exercised, which was planned and implemented by Alger Hiss at the Yalta Conference.

Mr. President, one rightfully wonders concerning the influence of Alger Hiss in the State Department in the formation of our policy toward China which has resulted in the disastrous collapse of autonomous China and the complete domination of that once great ally of ours by the Moscow-supported armies of communism.

In that debate, incidentally, Mr. President, I take the side of Dean Acheson, because a week ago last Friday, on the front page of the Washington Star, appeared an account of one of the most intriguing intradepartmental debates I ever read about, which took place in Washington, and was set forth in adjacent columns of the Star. That night the Star carried the report of the speech which Dean Acheson made on China at the National Press Club, where he said, and rightfully so, that China is being attacked and being controlled and being manhandled by forces of the Communists directed from Moscow, and that with Moscow leadership and assistance the Chinese Communists are separating some of the northern provinces from China for Russia. I agree with that. But his Assistant Secretary of State disagreed with him.

Dean Rusk, his assistant, was talking in Philadelphia about the same situation, and he said to the good people of the Quaker City, as reported in the parallel column of the Star, "We have got to remember that the Communist forces in China are just a group of indigenous patriots, reminding one of the American loyalists in the days of the Revolution."

That was a complete contradiction, and a complete manifestation, to me, of the utter confusion existing in our State Department toward China, when the

head of the Department and his associate on the same day each refutes everything the other one says about China. Perhaps the confusions that swirled out of the Far Eastern Division when Hiss was there have made their job unduly difficult. I am not so sure.

No one can be just sure how many people in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department secured their appointments through their connection and association with Alger Hiss. There is ample demonstration from the record, however, which indicates that for many years, both prior to Yalta and since, a considerable coterie of Communist sympathizers have held influential positions in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department. For example, on November 26, 1945, in resigning his position as the President's personal representative in China, Gen. Patrick Hurley, former Secretary of War, made this statement as it is found on page 21 of the Hurley hearings:

> It is no secret that the American policy in China did not have the support of all the career men in the State Department. The professional Foreign Service men sided with the Chinese Communist armed party. * * * Our professional diplomats continuously advised the Communists that my efforts in preventing the collapse of the National government did not represent the policy of the United States.

Many will remember, although most, I am sure, have forgotten, the strange and never satisfactorily terminated Amerasia case, which, unfortunately, instead of being brought to light by a committee of Congress, which would have followed through, even when the Executive would not cooperate by giving it access to information, was handled instead by the Attorney General's office, which never pursued the clues discovered in that case to a convincing conclusion. However, 5 months after Patrick Hurley resigned and issued the statement which I have just quoted, six Government employees were arrested in the Amerasia case, on June 7, 1945.

Amerasia, it will be recalled, was a New York periodical dealing with far-eastern affairs, published by an enthusiastic popular-fronter named Phillip Jaffe. The periodical was a strong supporter of the Chinese Communist cause. There were discovered in the Amerasia office numerous papers and documents from the State Department, War Department, and other agencies, most of the papers dealing with far-eastern affairs. But following them through, as the committee did in following other papers which were found in a pumpkin, we found what happened to those who stole these papers and delivered them to a front organization in New York. Those arrested included John S. Service, Phillip Jaffe, Kate Mitchell, the coeditor of Amerasia, Mark Gayn, a journalist and contributor to the paper, Lt. Andrew Roth, a liaison officer at the State Department from Naval Intelligence, and Emmanuel S. Larsen, a civilian expert on far-eastern affairs in the Office of Naval Intelligence. These persons were charged with espionage and the possession of stolen documents. But, on August 10, 1945, it was announced that the grand jury had refused to indict Gayn, Service, and Miss Mitchell. True bills were returned, however, against Jaffe, Larsen, and Roth, charging them not with espionage but with "violation of section 88 of title 18 of the United States Code by conspiring to violate sections 100, 101, 234, and 235 of title 18, United States Code"—embezzling public property, receiving stolen public property, destroying public records, and destroying records by officer in charge.

Eventually, Jaffe pleaded guilty and was fined $2,500, which is certainly, I would say, a reasonably small fee to pay for a scoop such as that. I know many magazines that would consider the payment of $2,500 to obtain classified State Department secrets cheaper than paying reporters of their own.

Larsen pleaded nole contendere and was fined $500. The Department of Justice in both cases stated that the actions "did not involve any element of disloyalty." In other words, stealing these documents and giving them to a Communist was merely the result of a species of State Department absentmindedness; there was no disloyalty involved at all; and all that should be done was to give the ones who did it a slap on the wrist and they could then continue working for the Government.

On February 13, 1946, the Justice Department entered a nolle prosequi in the case of Roth. The disposition of the Amerasia case was done with such thoughtful consideration of the people who took or delivered the stolen documents to Amerasia that it completely failed to satisfy the American public and in 1946 a subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary investigated the case in closed session. The testimony was sealed and is not now available. Finally, the Committee of the Judiciary of the House brought in a divided report in which the majority and the minority very violently disagreed about the Communist associations and contacts and loyalties of the people involved.

I mention the foregoing, Mr. President, not in an effort to reopen the Amerasia case, but to record that when it was left to one department of the executive Government to investigate another department of the executive Government the result was a glorious whitewash, incomplete, inconclusive, inadequate, and so unsatisfactory as to necessitate a congressional inquiry to try to get at the facts. I contrast that with the Alger Hiss case, which was the same kind of case, involving stolen documents. In that case the House Committee on Un-American Activities stayed with the problem of discovering why stolen documents were secreted from the State Department, and who stole them, until the culprit was brought to justice in a court of law and compelled to confess in his own words about his associations with the man to whom he gave the documents. The contrast in the methods used and the results obtained clearly justify the functions of a congressional investigating committee.

In my opinion, the colloquies we had earlier in the course of my remarks this afternoon point out that the Senate itself must assert its power to insist on securing from Government agencies every fact we need which is not detrimental to the national defense or the national security. So long as we continue to shoot fish in a barrel we will never be given a chance to shoot ducks on a duck pond. But once we insist on our rights as legislators, if we think we have rights, we then establish a two-way street that can save America. There should not be consideration merely of political advantages or the personal popularity of an individual in any office, either executive or legislative.

Getting back again, however, to the part played by Alger Hiss in the formation of our State Department policies toward China, we certainly cannot ignore the fact that the man selected by President Truman to study foreign policy in China and to prepare recommendations for him and Mr. Acheson to submit to Congress, was one Prof. Philip Jessup.

Who is Jessup? When did he get to be such a famous authority on China? I do not know about his experience or his associations with China, but he has had a tremendous backlog, apparently, of experience and association with one Alger Hiss. The man President Truman selected to come before Congress and tell us what our new foreign policy toward Asia should be apparently has found no fault with the policy up to now and seems perfectly satisfied with the consequences. But he is going to tell us what the policy should be now. What is his position in China? He is ambassador at large. Not once but twice Philip Jessup appeared in the New York criminal trial as a character witness for his friend and associate and mental mentor, Alger Hiss. I think no one can be excused from wondering a little bit about the close relationship between the convicted Communist contact man, Alger Hiss, and the man selected by President Truman to recommend a new foreign policy toward China, to follow the one which Professor Jessup apparently approved, of bringing China to its knees and Russia into control of the vast population and resources of that unhappy land. One can wonder, too, how much Alger Hiss may have influenced the thinking and the philosophy and the attitudes of Professor Jessup, whose admiration for Alger Hiss was so great that he continued to testify for him as a character witness until shortly before the time of his conviction in New York.

A second issue growing out of this tale of treachery and deception in high places and in history-shaping international conferences, Mr. President, is what is the responsibility of Congress—of this great Senate and the House of Representatives—when we find ourselves confronted as we do with the awful realization that one of the important architects of our foreign policy and our international commitments at Yalta now stands convicted of perjury by a court that heard him deny that he smuggled State Department secrets of a high-security classification out of their files and delivered them to a paid agent of Communist Russia and then concluded by its unanimous verdict of guilty that Hiss was lying under oath.

Should we be content to assume there can be no correction of the grave and grievous mistakes made at Yalta and by our do-nothing foreign policy toward China? Dare we assume that all those who were brought into positions of responsibility and importance in the State Department through their connections with Hiss and his miguided friends, mentors, and associates are now dismissed?

Clearly we do not want to punish innocent associates of Alger Hiss who were deceived by his virtuous front and his cultivated manner and who never dreamed that he was working in their midst as a confidant of Whittaker Chambers and a conveyor belt for Communists. Just as clearly, we must not blandly assume that by the arrest, conviction, and punishment of Alger Hiss we have rid the State Department of all its foreign-minded operatives or Communist sympathizers. One also wonders how greatly the past persuasive powers of Alger Hiss continue to influence the attitudes, the thinking, and the decisions of those who now make our State Department policy, and those who still say that they think Alger Hiss and his attitudes and his opinions and his behavior and his associations were appropriate and good, even though a court of the land has found them to be otherwise, and even though Hiss in his own testimony has said "Yes, I was an associate and confidant of the Communist conveyor agent, Whittaker Chambers." Surely those who think of him so highly must be motivated at least in part by the seductive suggestions this persuasive young man so willingly, so freely, and so frequently imparts.

If nothing else, these unanswered questions and the unsavory status of our foreign affairs indicate to me that when there is too much so-called bipartisanism in foreign policy the Nation suffers and our security is jeopardized. Perhaps a more alert and critical attitude by the Republican Party would have at least compelled this Democratic administration, and Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, to clean house more thoroughly and to have relied less upon attempts to ridicule disclosures as "red herring" activities or witch-hunting publicity stunts. Perhaps, too, a more vigorous and constructive criticism of State Department proposals in foreign policy would have earlier disclosed some of the flaws and futilities now so manifest for all to see in China, in Poland, in Berlin, and elsewhere around the world. Perhaps if we Republicans had insisted sooner and more ardently on a disclosure of the secret agreements made at Yalta we would have discovered much sooner that there must have been influences at work at that unfortunate conference which had other causes to serve and other motives to fulfill than a consideration of American interests and world security and integrity.

Perhaps if we Republicans had measured up a little more to our responsibility as a great minority party we could have come sooner to the rescue and it would have been easier to undo some of the dreadful damage which now so clearly is shown to have been done.

In my studied opinion, Mr. President, there are other positions for the Republican Party to take than blindly to follow or to follow too blindly the recommendations of a State Department and a Chief Executive which in the field of foreign policy have lost China to communism, which have placed our occupation forces in Berlin hemmed in by a circle of cold steel in the hands of Communist armies, which have failed completely to work out and win acceptance for an effective international protection against the fearful consequences of a possible atomic war, and which have permitted Poland to tumble from the pinnacle of victory into the abyss of slavery, while the countries of the Balkans and of central Europe have escaped a Nazi tyranny only to be turned over to an even more ruthless form of Asiatic cruelty operated by the Communist tyrants of Russia.

I suggest respectfully, Mr. President, that the alternative to a Republican "me, too" position which seems too tired or too timid to make positive, constructive, proposals of its own in the field of foreign policy, is not blind opposition to what the State Department or the President may propose. And I submit that the alternative is not isolationism. I agree with those who hold that isolationism is wrong and unworkable in our day and age. Neither is the alternative narrow nationalism, Mr. President. Despite those who would throw dust in our eyes and confuse us and keep us from thinking clearly, we Republicans do not confront the alternative of supporting unchallenged and uncriticized what we are handed by the State Department and the President or else supporting a program of isolationism or narrow nationalism which the march of time and events has proved to be unsound, unworkable, unjust, and unwise.

Between these two extremes, a great party of opposition—a vigorous minority party charged with responsibilities of constructive criticism and alternative suggestions, a party seeking to get people to vote for it and its candidates for office—has a responsibility, I think, to take those whose support it seeks into its confidence in respect to where the party stands. Therefore, I think the party of opposition, if it means business, has the responsibility of constructive criticism and alternative suggestions which, in my opinion, should find a formula for insisting that our American foreign policy be a true product of the meeting of minds among the majority of the members of both major parties, as reflected by their congressional representatives. Such a truly American product, derived from the American process of using the virtues attendant upon a biparty political system in hammering out well-considered and public-serving programs, should then merit and receive the support of all Americans, without considerations of partisanship of any kind.

To me, Mr. President, the far-flung ramifications of the Hiss conviction are sufficient in dire potentiality to merit a reappraisal, by both our major political parties, of the processes by which our foreign policies have been and are now being formulated. In my opinion, the place to seek bipartisan support for foreign policy is on its merit, before it is announced and established, rather than in suggesting to a minority party that it will be permitted to make some minor amendments to a proclaimed policy, after it has been enunciated.

A third consideration which I think flows out of this strange sequence of events, Mr. President, as I have lived with them now for 18 months, is this—and it is brought into focus by the developments in the case of Alger Hiss: Certainly and clearly, the time is here and now when this Congress without further delay or temporizing, should revise its statute of limitations so that the elapse of a short 3 years cannot buy immunity from punishment for anyone guilty of a crime against the security of his government. Such is the law which now gives basic protection to men like Alger Hiss and Henry Julian Wadleigh. We should correct that situation without delay.

A fourth condition, highlighted and emphasized by the Alger Hiss experience, is the fact that at present there is not a single law or limitation denying Communists the right to work for the Federal Government, or punishing faithless or gullible public officials who knowingly employ them.

During the Eightieth Congress, the so-called Mundt-Nixon bill was passed in the House to achieve this purpose. The vote was 319 to 56, on a recorded vote. Since the Senate failed to act, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and I joined this year in introducing similar proposed legislation in the Senate. The subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee considering that measure and holding hearings on it has unanimously recommended its passage to the Senate Judiciary Committee as a whole. In my opinion, this measure should be passed by the Senate without delay, so that the House will have time to act before adjournment, so as to give this country at least some protection in the law against those who would use positions of high trust in public office as operating posts from which to spy on our security provisions or to pervert our policy decisions.

Mr. President, up to now the Congress of the United States has been tremendously "long" in conversation castigating communism, but completely lame in respect to passing laws to do something about it. I hope the Judiciary Committee of the Senate will promptly report that bill and will give us a chance to vote on it, so that we shall have an opportunity to take effective action to stop this business of secreting Communists in high positions of government.

Finally, Mr. President, because of my long experience on the House Committee on Un-American Activities, dating back to service under its founder, Representative Dies, of Texas, I should like to say I think the country should recognize, as a consequence of the Alger Hiss case—which never would have seen the light of day save for that House committee—that

it is imperative that a vigorous, courageous, active congressional committee, or more than one, stand guard at all times to help expose and detect those who would destroy our freedoms and our way of life by subversion and by conspiratorial treachery. It stands without contradiction, Mr. President, that had it not been for the Dies Committee on Un-American Activities, there would have been no conviction of Alger Hiss and no exposure of the espionage Communist rings operating within our Government. No one speaking for the administration can deny those facts, and an ocean full of red herring cannot obscure them.

Having served as chairman of the subcommittee handling the "pumpkin paper hearings," as they we called, Mr. President, and which resulted in the indictment and conviction of Alger Hiss, I wish to give credit where credit is due for the long, hard, thankless, and abuse-collecting effort made by those who gave up their congressional recess and their Christmases at home to come to Washington in 1948 to see this investigation through to a conclusive finish.

Mr. President, exposing the infidelity of Alger Hiss was not a one-man task. It required the best collective efforts of many minds and talents, and the stout-hearted ability to overcome heartbreaking obstacles and malicious criticisms from persons in high positions. It required patience to persist when the result seemed shrouded in contradictions and confusion, and it called for the united determination of many men dedicated to getting at the truth and to following the trails wherever they might lead, whether to obscure little men in out-of-the-way places—whom everyone is always ready to find guilty—or to men in high and respected positions of trust who were placed there by the administrations of President Roosevelt and President Truman, whom persons in the executive agencies understandably dislike to have found guilty.

High on the list of those entitled to an accolade from the public for his work in this case is Representative RICHARD M. NIXON, of the Twelfth District of California. Mr. NIXON brought to the committee his great talents as a lawyer, combined with a devotion to the principles of fair play, and a bulldog, Churchillian determination which never takes "no" for an answer and never stops following a trail until it reaches its end. By his brilliant decision to serve a new subpena upon Whittaker Chambers at the propitious time, Mr. NIXON brought to the committee room the documentary evidence from the microfilms found in the pumpkin, evidence which eventually played such an important part in the conviction of Alger Hiss. His interrogations of the witnesses were firm, fair, and fact-procuring.

With him on the Republican side of the committee was Representative John McDowell, of Wilkinsburg, Pa., whose persistence equaled that of any member of our group, and whose ingenuity and industry in asking searching questions produced many helpful answers essential to building the great body of evidence in this case. Another Republican Representative, Richard Vail, of Chicago, Ill., although hampered by illness, jeopardized his recovery from an operation to attend the hearings and to participate in the inquiry. His penetrating questioning aided greatly in developing some of the inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the long testimony of Alger Hiss.

Mr. President, let it be recorded here, in what may be the only place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where future historians can find the full, detailed account of this strange case, that the Democrats on our subcommittee served with patience, courage, and patriotism equal to that of the Republicans I have enumerated.

Representative JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, and Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, of Lousiana, were always in committee attendance, and their zeal for getting at the ultimate truths involved was no less than that of any of their Republican colleagues. Both Mr. RANKIN and Mr. HÉBERT hewed to the line and devoted time, study, and effort to the case to a degree well reflected in the productive suggestions they proposed and the intelligent and effective nature of their questions.

Be it said to their eternal credit, Mr. President, that these two Democratic Representatives in Congress pulled no punches and sought no easy outs for Alger Hiss when it became apparent from the evidence that he was lying to our committee and that he was confessing to associations with the Communist Chambers that in themselves marked Hiss as unfit for the high offices he held. Representative RANKIN and Representative HÉBERT repeatedly placed patriotism above party during these long hearings and throughout the tedious, time-consuming investigation. All of us frequently disagreed about methods and motives as the work wore on but they were never differences along partisan lines nor disputes for political advantage. The arguments were always as to what tactic or what course would best take us to the hard core of truth in the case. Every report issued by our subcommittee was unanimous.

Finally, Mr. President, the results of the Hiss case crowned the long anti-communistic efforts of a great American and a great Texan, Robert E. Stripling, chief investigator of the committee throughout the case, and, except for his war service, throughout the history of the committee from the time another great Texan, Martin Dies, created the committee until the end of the Eightieth Congress.

The investigative genius and the stupendous knowledge of Communist tactics and methods brought to bear by Bob Stripling contributed mightily to the successful conclusion of this case. Stripling is now out of Government service, but America owes him much for his great work in helping to expose and curtail the activities of Communists throughout our land. The entire staff of associate investigators, many of them still with the committee, and the employees of the committee who worked nights, Saturdays, and Sundays so that the limited personnel available to the committee might bring this case to an intelligible and factual conclusion should share in the credit awarded by those who are grateful that for every American public official or Government employee who is faithless and disloyal there are more than half a hundred who are hard-working, patriotic, and devoted to their duties. Special mention should be made of the good work done by Ben Mandel of our committee staff.

I want to say that the FBI, operating under the tremendous handicaps of an official attitude on the part of the executive agencies, restraining it from cooperating with our committee openly, did cooperate to the full extent that it was permitted under the circumstances, in helping to bring to a correct conclusion one of the most disturbing cases in our American history. Incidentally, I should like also to say a special word in tribute to attorney Tom Murphy of the Department of Justice, for the excellent work done by him in both trials.

As for me, Mr. President, I am simply grateful that the long case is concluded and that my transfer to the Senate has relieved me of the arduous, distasteful, although at times highly interesting, duties attendant upon membership on a committee charged with disclosing and curtailing subversive activities in these United States. Heading this committee assignment was the hardest, most difficult task I ever had in Congress.

History will write the ultimate verdict on the significance of the disclosures revealed by the so-called Hiss-Chambers investigation and hearings. Alger Hiss has been convicted in a fair and dispassionate trial. He has been sentenced to serve 5 years in the Federal penitentiary. Henry Julian Wadleigh and Whittaker Chambers have both confessed to the parts they played in this Communist conspiracy. Others accused by Chambers were driven from Government by confessions, by their inability to deny the charges without risk of perjury trials, or by departure from the country so no longer are a threat to our internal security.

It may well be that in the retrospect of history the Alger Hiss case will rank of greater importance than the Teapot Dome scandals of an earlier era. In the Teapot Dome case men were found guilty of faithlessness in public office in the protection of the public purse. They placed private profit above public service. In the case of Alger Hiss and Julian Wadleigh and others of their group, men were found guilty of faithlessness in public office in the protection and safeguarding of their country's national security and traditional freedoms. They placed faith in a foreign creed above devotion to the principles, the purposes, and the people of America.

Out of this whole unsavory and sordid experience, Mr. President, let us hope we can have a rallying of the patriotic and sound-thinking forces of the free people of our great Republic. The time is fast approaching when the people of America who cherish their political freedoms and their rights of private enterprise and individual initiative must close ranks and work together if we are to defeat the plans and programs of those who would centralize all authority in the hands of a few men to be administered autocratically according to the formula of com-

munism or of nazism or of some form of national socialism whereby either misguided Americans with love for power or aggressive foreigners with alien creeds become the masters of our common destiny.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD certain printed material dealing with various aspects of the subject I have been discussing. The first is an editorial from the Daily Argus Leader, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., entitled, "That 'Red Herring' Becomes a Whale." It was published on January 23, 1950, by the leading newspaper in five States, in the South Dakota area, and I think is of pertinent information to the Senate.

The second is an editorial published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of Friday, December 30, 1949, entitled, "All Traveling in the Same Direction," which I insert primarily to point out that at least everyone outside the Committee on Un-American Activities was not fooled about the true implications of the Hiss trial, back as far as December 30, 1949, at any rate, while the trial was still in progress.

Finally, I have prepared, at the request of Members of the Senate, to supplement the summation I have already placed in the RECORD, in the form of a chronology, a summary of some of the disclosures in the Chambers-Hiss case following the August 1948 hearings, which I am placing in the RECORD with complete documentation as to their sources in the public reports and the hearings of the committee. I ask unanimous consent to put this in the RECORD, because I have had numerous requests from colleagues in the Senate and from the constituents of Senators. Copies of hearings and copies of reports have all been exhausted, and none are available. I have tried to get the pertinent points together in this way for the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorials and the summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Daily Argus Leader, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., of January 23, 1950]

THAT RED HERRING BECOMES A WHALE

It was, to quote President Truman, "just a red herring." But that was a year or so ago.

But the whole Alger Hiss case became something else officially late Saturday when a Federal court held that the former high representative of the Department of State was guilty of the charges brought against him.

No longer is this matter just a red herring. It is an astounding revelation of perfidy, espionage, and abuse of public trust.

Hiss wasn't just a routine clerk in the Department of State. He was one of its most important functionaries. He had access to the department's top secrets. He dominated the secretariat of the formative meeting of the United Nations Organization in San Francisco. He was President Roosevelt's right-hand man at the epochal conference at Yalta with Stalin.

RED INFILTRATION

Technically Hiss was convicted of perjury. Actually he stands before the Nation as a man who has been exposed as a traitor to his Nation.

The pattern of odd events in the hectic days immediately preceding the war and during it becomes clearer in consequence. Thoughtful observers saw in many Washington transactions an inspiration that seemed more concerned with the advancement of Russia than that of the United States.

Hiss fooled many, among whom was President Roosevelt. He fooled the trustees of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He made dupes of many Washington columnists.

But he did not fool the House Un-American Activities Committee. It was this committee that persistently and vigorously pushed the investigation that resulted in the development of the charges against Hiss. The committee worked toward its objective despite the fact that one of the worst smear campaigns in American history was directed against it.

MUNDT'S GOOD WORK

And South Dakotans may well be proud to realize that a man from their State—Representative KARL MUNDT—took the leadership on the committee to expose Hiss. If it hadn't been for MUNDT'S determined work, the probabilities are that the nefarious activities of Hiss would not have been exposed.

While the investigation was under way, the committee as a whole, and particularly MUNDT, were subjected to terrific abuse. Even the President of the United States participated in the campaign to belittle the probe. Subtly vicious charges were brought against the committee in an attempt to discredit it. Looking backward, it now appears to be quite reasonable to assume that some of this criticism was Communist-inspired. Much was said about the noble character of Hiss and how the committee was assassinating his character and trampling his honor in the dust.

OTHER QUESTIONS ARISE

Now the Hiss phase of the story has been told. But, Americans may wonder, what else remains untold. Was Hiss the only darling of the Russians who held a high Government office? How many others were there then? How many—the most important question—are there in high office now?

It seemed—and was—easy for men with extreme liberal and pinkish trends of thought to enter Federal office during the New Deal. They were welcomed and promoted. Some of them, to be sure, were good Americans but more than a few, it appears obvious, were unduly friendly toward Russia.

Now that Hiss has been convicted and that even President Truman himself is probably ready to say that it's something more than "just a red herring," perhaps we can hope that an active campaign will be instituted to ferret out other Red emissaries in the Capital.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of December 30, 1949]

ALL TRAVELING IN THE SAME DIRECTION

The cross-examination of Alger Hiss brought out an extraordinary story of interlocking relationships which inescapably reminds one of what Lincoln had to say on the subject of framed timbers before the Republican State convention at Springfield in 1858. It is the contention of Mr. Hiss that he was never a Communist, never spied for Russia, and never sympathized with communism. Why, then, by his own testimony, did he invariably find himself mixed up with people who were these things and did these things?

Mr. Hiss concedes that in the prewar days in the State Department, when he is accused of having abstracted secret documents for a Soviet espionage ring, he knew his accuser, Whittaker Chambers, who admits he was a Communist who carried the papers to Soviet agents. But Mr. Hiss says that he didn't know Chambers by that name, but as one George Crosley. He didn't know him as a fellow Communist, Mr. Hiss continues, but as a free-lance writer.

Mr. Hiss says that he was so far from being on intimate terms with "Crosley" that he had difficulty recognizing him some years later when his accuser confronted him. Yet he gave him his Washington apartment rent free, paid his utility bills, gave him his automobile, paid the insurance on it, lent him money, and accepted in return a valuable oriental rug as a present.

This in itself would be a strange story. The story, as it unfolds, is a good deal stranger. There was, in the State Department, a contemporary of Mr. Hiss named Noel Field, who left for Europe on other business in 1936, a year or two before Mr. Chambers says that Mr. Hiss began purloining official secret papers for Russian espionage. Mrs. Hede Massing, an admitted former Communist agent, who also was a witness against Mr. Hiss, stated that he and she wrangled over which was to have Mr. Field's underground services when he was still in Washington as a member of the Communist Party. Mr. Hiss also denies this.

Yet Mr. Hiss admitted under cross-examination that some years later, when Mr. Field, still in Europe, was on his uppers, a request was received from him asking help. Mr. Field addressed this to his friend, Laurence Duggan, president of the Institute of International Education, a Carnegie agency, suggesting that Duggan might induce Hiss to accept some reports on eastern European affairs.

Mr. Hiss had by this time graduated to the presidency of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and Mr. Field thought that organization might be interested in his writings. In reply Mr. Hiss wrote a "Dear Noel" letter to Mr. Field, explaining that the Carnegie group did not hire reporters, but stating that he had spoken in Mr. Field's behalf to Frieda Kirchwey, editor of the left-wing weekly, the Nation. He also suggested that Mr. Field try Michael Straight, editor of the New Republic, another periodical cut to the same jib.

Mr. Hiss also thought that Mr. Field could lose nothing by trying to place his stuff with Harpers magazine, which, at the least, reflects the New Deal national Socialist viewpoint these days, and he also proposed a flier with United Nations World.

None of the participants in this chummy correspondence club fared very well. Mr. Duggan, 5 days after the indictment of Mr. Hiss, and shortly after he had heard that he, too, had been mentioned in the investigation of Mr. Chambers' charges, plunged 16 floors to his death from the window of his New York office. The distance of his body from the building wall seemed to exclude accident, suggesting that he had been launched from the window with considerable initial momentum, but incurious official inquiry never established whether it was murder or suicide.

Mr. Field, charged by various renegade Communists with having been a Soviet spy in the United States, later was charged during spy trials in Hungary with having afterward been an American espionage agent against the Soviet Union and its satellites. In any event, he vanished last May in Czechoslovakia, now one of Stalin's kept countries, and when his brother and sister-in-law went looking for him behind the iron curtain they disappeared, too.

This network of Communists, left wingers, and persons of dubious associations and loyalties were friends of Mr. Hiss by conscious selection and he was most familiar with publications of the same orientation. When he says he did not share their outlook or join in their activities, he must answer to Lincoln's charge that, though preconcert cannot absolutely be known, when timbers are joined by different hands at different times and places,

and fit exactly together, "we find it impossible not to believe that * * * all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common plan or draft, drawn up before the first blow was struck."

[From second report of Committee on Un-American Activities on Soviet espionage within the United States Government, December 31, 1948]

SUMMARY OF 1948 DISCLOSURES IN CHAMBERS-HISS CASE FOLLOWING AUGUST 1948 HEARINGS

RECENT DISCLOSURES

Subsequent to the public confrontation before this committee, Chambers repeated his charges against Alger Hiss in a radio program in response to a challenge by Hiss to do so. Thirty days later, Alger Hiss brought suit against Whittaker Chambers in Federal court in Baltimore, Md., charging libel and slander. On November 17, pretrial depositions were being taken by the attorneys for Mr. Hiss, and during the examination of Chambers he was asked, in substance, whether he had any documentary material to support his allegations.

Thereupon Chambers submitted a number of typewritten documents which he said Hiss had given him. Chambers said these documents had been copied from State Department records, most of which were very confidential and classified as restricted to high Government officials for use and knowledge.

Alexander Campbell, head of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, was called in immediately, and the material was turned over to him. The various participants in the deposition were directed, in the interest of national security, to keep silent on the whole matter. On December 1, 1948, there appeared in a Washington newspaper an item to the effect that new and sensational information had been submitted in the Hiss-Chambers controversy. Later the same day, the United Press stated:

"[From the Washington Daily News of December 1, 1948]

"HISS AND CHAMBERS PERJURY PROBE HITS DEAD END

"The Justice Department is about ready to drop its investigation of the celebrated Alger Hiss-Whittaker Chambers controversy, it was learned today.

"Department officials still have under study the question of a possible perjury prosecution. But officials said privately that unless additional evidence is forthcoming, they are inclined to forget the whole thing.

"The perjury question arose when Mr. Chambers, an admitted ex-Communist who is now with Time magazine, charged under oath that Mr. Hiss was a member of a pre-war Communist underground in official Washington. Mr. Hiss, a former State Department official, denied it—also under oath.

"Their conflicting statements were made during House Un-American Activities Committee's hearings last summer on Communists in the Government. The committee turned their testimony over to the Justice Department for a perjury investigation.

"One Department source said that on the basis of available evidence, officials in charge of the case believe it would be unwise to take it before a grand jury. But he emphasized this attitude could change overnight if the House committee or the Department investigators dig up some new evidence.

"The FBI has taken part in the Department's investigation. Attorney General Tom C. Clark has assigned the case to Special Assistant John Ford Baecher and United States Attorney George Morris Fay."

The suggestion of the United Press story greatly disturbed members of the committee who had, all this time, continued to press their own investigation. On the same day Representative RICHARD NIXON and the chief investigator to the committee, Robert E. Stripling, proceeded to Westminster, Md., to question Mr. Chambers, and to obtain, if possible, any evidence in his possession which related to espionage or other illegal activities. Mr. Chambers, when questioned by Mr. NIXON, stated that he had been informed he would be in contempt of court if he discussed what he had submitted at Baltimore, at the pretrial hearing.

Chambers did not tell Mr. NIXON what evidence he had submitted at the pretrial examination except that he indicated it was highly important. That night when the chief investigator and Mr. NIXON returned to Washington, representatives of the FBI were immediately informed of the conversation.

The following morning, upon instructions of the committee, a subpena was issued for Chambers calling upon him to produce all documents or material in his possession dealing with this case. While this was not the first subpena served upon Chambers by the committee, it was the first subpena calling for documents.

It should also be remembered that no other Government agency had ever before issued a subpena upon Chambers calling for documents, though he had, in September, been summoned to New York before a special Federal grand jury on espionage as a result of the disclosures he had made in his first public hearings by this committee. When he received the committee subpena for papers on December 2, Chambers said he was prepared to turn over all information in his possession, and thereupon he was accompanied by Committee Investigators Wheeler and Appell to his home in Westminster, Md., where he produced the five rolls of microfilm.

Three rolls were encased in a lightproof metal cylinder sealed with tape. However, one of the cylinders had been mashed or opened previously, and Chambers informed the investigators at the time of handing them over that he felt sure that this roll had been light-struck and would be worthless. These three rolls of film, he informed the committee agents, were undeveloped. The other two rolls had been developed and were wrapped in oilpaper.

The two agents marked and identified the developed film and unopened containers and returned to Washington, arriving about midnight. Investigator Appell locked the film in his bureau in his home and brought it in to the committee offices at 9:15 the following morning. It was submitted to the chief investigator, who examined the developed film through an enlarging equipment and determined that secret and confidential documents of the State Department were pictured thereon.

He then instructed Mr. Wheeler to proceed with the developed film to the laboratory of a photographic technician in the Treasury Department, for the purpose of taking enlarged pictures.

Mr. Appell, upon instructions, proceeded to the photographic laboratory of the Veterans' Administration with the undeveloped film and preserved the evidence in full.

The committee wishes to emphasize that this film received expert technical attention from the time it was received by the committee from Mr. Chambers to the present time, and that none was destroyed or light-struck after it was surrendered to the committee.

IMPORTANCE OF THE EVIDENCE

State Department officials have testified before the committee that publication of some of these documents even today, more than 10 years after they were originally written, would endanger the national security.

An indication of the wide diversity of the subjects covered, and the confidential character of the messages involved, can be obtained by referring to the appendix of this volume, in which are reproduced those documents which have been approved for release by the State Department.

Perhaps the most significant and disturbing feature is the fact that Messrs. Sumner Welles, John Peurifoy, and Francis B. Sayre, present or past high State Department officers, all agree that with documents of this type in their possession, agents of foreign governments would be able to break the most secret diplomatic codes of the United States.

Following is an excerpt from the testimony of Mr. Sayre:

"Mr. NIXON. Mr. Sayre, in this connection I have been somewhat interested in comments of some columnists and, in fact, one case attributed to an anonymous source in the State Department—I say 'anonymous' because the official sources have spoken completely to the contrary on this point—to the effect that the information contained in these documents wasn't important anyway and it didn't make much difference if the Russians did get it or anything else.

"Do you agree there was nothing important or nothing wrong with turning this stuff over?

"Mr. SAYRE. I violently disagree, not only because of substance of these cables, but because some of them were in the highly confidential codes.

"Now, some of those codes—for instance, the Gray code, so-called—I suspect that other governments had that, but they didn't have these highly confidential codes; and for these telegrams to get out at the time they did meant that other governments could crack our codes, and that, I think, is indescribably horrible.

"Mr. NIXON. In other words, it is not only a question of this information, but it is the question of the potential information which they might have obtained?

"Mr. SAYRE. By cracking the code, which gives them the run of the whole thing."

This, in fact, means that not only did the government which received these identified documents have access to the information available in them, but that they, without question, also had complete access to all of the secret and confidential messages transmitted by the State Department during the period involved, through knowledge of the code system. Since this was in the general historical era of the Stalin-Hitler pact, it is also likely that Nazi Germany and subseqently Japan may have known our State Department secret codes and communications, before and during the war.

It should also be kept in mind that the documents which Mr. Chambers turned over to the committee, and in the pretrial hearing, constitute only 1 week's supply of information and a very small proportion of the total volume which Chambers had transmitted to the Soviet Union prior to the time he decided to break with the Communist Party.

Chambers' testimony is that he first started to microfilm documents and transmit them to the Soviet Union in the early part of 1935, and that the operation had continued weekly until April 1938.

If the documents which have been released by the committee, only 1 week's fraction of the total volume which Chambers had obtained and transmitted to the Soviet agents, were the only documents which reached the Soviet Union, the committee would consider the effect on United States security serious enough.

However the testimony of Whittaker Chambers is that during the 2 years previous to the receipt of this particular batch of documents, he had been running a veritable espionage production line out of the State Department and other departments of the Government, the output of which was being funneled to Moscow by way of a skillfully run transmission belt.

HOW CHAMBERS GOT THE DOCUMENTS

Chambers testified that he had two sources of information in the State Department. His principal source, from which he obtained most of the strictly confidential documents, operated in the following manner:

The source would bring the documents out in a brief case and take them home. There, Chambers would take over the brief case and go on to meet a photographic expert at a prearranged place. The expert would take the brief case and documents to a laboratory in Baltimore, put the documents on film, and would return the brief case and contents to Chambers the same night.

Sometimes Chambers stated it would be as late as 1 in the morning before he got the brief case back. He would then proceed to the home of his source, deliver the brief case, and the documents would be returned to the State Department files.

Chambers would then pick up the microfilm in Baltimore; place them in a tobacco pouch, and carry them to New York, where he would deliver them to a Colonel Bykov, of the Soviet espionage system, who was at that time known to Chambers only as Peters.

Because the committee does not wish to hamper the prosecution of cases under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice, we are not making reference at this point to the names of the people whom Chambers has given as coconspirators in this criminal activity.

As far as the committee has been able to determine, Colonel Bykov had no official position in this country and was an illegally present alien spy.

The committee has taken the detailed testimony in as many aspects of this case as possible without interfering with the grand jury. It has before it evidence of the manner in which Colonel Bykov approached the sources of information within the Government and arranged, in cooperation with Chambers, for the furnishing of this information which Chambers swears was sent to the Soviet Union.

The leaders of the Russian underground in this country caused to be delivered to four high sources in the Federal Government, who had been unusually productive, expensive Russian Bokhara rugs, in appreciation for their unusual service to the Soviet Union. The committee at this time is withholding the names of the recipients and the interrogating details in order not to interfere in the present investigation of the Federal grand jury on espionage now convened in New York City.

However, at the proper time, we intend to make full disclosure, not only of this rug deal, but all matters of evidence, with specific details, as to one of the most serious espionage cases in United States history.

Chambers testified that between 1932 and 1938 he obtained documents from the State Department, the Bureau of Standards, the Aberdeen Proving Ground, and certain information from the Navy; also that the same ring with which he worked got vital information from key United States industries. The documents pictured on the microfilm, which had been developed at the time we secured them from Chambers, were highly confidential and classified documents from the Department of State, the most important of which came from the office of Assistant Secretary of State Francis B. Sayre.

These documents bore the official stamp of Mr. Sayre and have been identified by him as having been taken from his office. Four people had access to these documents once they arrived at Mr. Sayre's office, namely: Francis B. Sayre; Alger Hiss, his first assistant; Eunice Lincoln, his administrative assistant, and Anna Belle Newcomb, secretary and stenographer for the office.

The committee had before it Mr. Sayre, Miss Lincoln, and Miss Newcomb; all emphatically denied under oath that they had ever turned any documents over to any unauthorized person.

The microfilmed documents in question, which were secret and confidential for the Secretary of State only and which were sent in the highest code, were delivered to Mr. Sayre's office from the code room of the State Department in a black metal box. When this box arrived at Mr. Sayre's office, it was opened by Miss Lincoln with a key provided for the office by the code room for that purpose only.

When Mr. Sayre's office had finished studying the documents, which sometimes took several days, the documents were placed back in the black box, locked by Miss Lincoln, and returned to the code room by code-room messengers, where, with duplicate key, the box was reopened and the contents filed in the code room's guarded record office.

The testimony of Mr. Sayre and Miss Lincoln brought out that it was a practice for both Mr. Sayre and Mr. Hiss to take documents in their brief case from the Department of State at night to their homes for study. Miss Newcomb and Miss Lincoln both testified that they had never taken any documents themselves from the State Department.

When Miss Lincoln and Miss Newcomb were shown photostatic copies of the typewritten and handwritten documents which were submitted by Whittaker Chambers at the pretrial examination in Baltimore, both testified that these documents were not typed in the State Department and that the character and form of the documents were such that they could not have been prepared for the purpose of transmitting information in the regular course of State Department business.

Mr. Sayre testified that the handwritten memos had not been prepared by Mr. Hiss for him or under his instruction. Mr. Sayre also testified that he could see no reason why the typewritten documents could or would have been prepared in the regular course of State Department business. He denied that these typed or handwritten documents were brought to his attention.

The committee is satisfied, as a result of the technical investigation and determinations which have been made by typewriter experts, that it has been conclusively established where and on what machine these documents were typed.

In addition to the typewritten documents submitted at the pretrial examination in Baltimore, and in addition to the microfilms which Mr. Chambers submitted to the committee, Mr. Chambers also produced, at the pretrial examination, three documents written in the hand of Alger Hiss, the text of which appear in the appendix of this report.

When these documents were shown to Miss Newcomb, she testified that they were not of the type which Mr. Hiss would prepare in connection with the regular duties he performed in the office of Mr. Sayre.

Mr. Chambers also testified that he received and transmitted to Russian agents information concerning a new self-sealing aviation tank developed by the Navy, the metallurgical formula dealing with the Norden bombsight, and the lists of foreign intelligence agents and naval intelligence reports.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edward T. McCormick, of Arizona, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Donald C. Cook, of Michigan, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed. Without objection, the President will be notified immediately of the confirmations. That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. HOLLAND. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, January 26, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 25 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Brig. Gen. Don G. Shingler (colonel, Corps of Engineers) to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, under the provisions of section 2 of an act of Congress approved June 28, 1879 (21 Stat. 27; 33 U. S. C. 642), vice Col. Clark Kittrell.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officer for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States without specification of branch, arm or service:

First Lt. George Raymond Krough, O38580, Medical Service Corps, United States Army.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) have been examined for physical fitness and found physically qualified for promotion. All others are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be lieutenant colonels

Louis Russell Delmonico, O17287.
Sidney Irving Parsell, O28937.

To be majors

John Edwards Diefendorf, Jr., O40009.
Howard Duone Dodge, O51550.
John Delmont Flewelling, O38818.
Wendell Wright Gaffney, O44235.
Allan Clarke Hamilton, O42456.
×Lester Hanks, O30339.
Patrick John Healy, O30657.
Willard Richard MacAllaster, O51678.
Kenneth Maguire, O39980.
Arthur George May, O30335.
Joseph Hope Morgan, O51743.
Charles Bernard Rynearson, O19722.
Kenneth Christian Shrader, O30397.
John Eidell Slaughter, O19921.
Dallas Clayton Wade, O30319.
Charles Phelps Walker, O19903.

To be captains

Robert Frank Barrett, Jr., O37161.
Patrick Henry Donahue, O34885.
James Lee Spratt, O39233.
Donald Arthur Synnott, O48542.

To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Corps

Arnold Lorentz Ahnfeldt, O21018.
William Harry Amspacher, O22703.

Ralph Townsend Artman, O21023.
Joseph Wallace Batch, O20864.
Milward William Bayliss, O41743.
Wilbur Carmen Berry, O20410.
John Dennis Blair, O41736.
Hal Bridges, O20917.
Ogden Carr Bruton, O29283.
Raymond Harold Bunshaw, O21024.
Roosevelt Cafarelli, O22265.
Charles Crawford Canada, O29257.
Donald Edgar Carle, O20953.
Joseph Sibley Cirlot, O19311.
John Boyd Coates, Jr., O20924.
Charles Edward Cocks, Jr., O29279.
Walter Richard Cook, O20112.
Francis S. Crane, O39664.
John Russell Darrah, O38650.
Merrill Clark Davenport, O21479.
John Kemp Davis, O20408.
Frank Rodney Drake, O20863.
Raymond Edward Duke, O20110.
Melvin Frederic Eyerman, O21026.
Thomas Gideon Faison, O29254 .
Horace Craig Gibson, O20568.
Henry McClellan Greenleaf, O20983.
Oscar Broughton Griggs, O29315.
Romeyn James Healy, Jr., O20918.
×George Allen Heffernon, O29273.
Arthur Laurence Hessin, O41757.
B. Dixon Holland, O20539.
Robert Paul Hughes, O22769.
James Gilomen Inman, O41734.
Eugene Richard Inwood, O20993.
Oswald Raymond Jensen, O21461.
Clarence Edward Johnson, O41747.
Robert James Kamish, O29295.
John William Kemble, O20398.
Frederick James Knoblauch, O21672.
John Herman Kuitert, O41753.
Louis Samuel Leland, O20990.
×Santino Joseph Lerro, O20540.
Carl John Lind, Jr., O29322.
Arthur Paige Long, O29287 .
Earl Cranston Lowry, O20992.
Philip Wallace Mallory, O20916.
Irvine Hartford Marshall, O39658.
Richard Patrick Mason, O20928.
George John Matt, O20988.
Clinton Shockey Maupin, O56804.
Thomas Donald McCarthy, O20954.
James Thomas McGibony, O20406.
Patrick Ignatius McShane, O20989.
Clark Boluton Meador, O20395.
Conn Lewis Milburn, Jr., O20405.
Charles Henry Moseley, O20402.
James Peter Pappas, O21017.
Norman Everett Peatfield, O21027.
John Joseph Pelosi, O21020.
Byron Edward Pollock, O20925.
Adam Jozef Rapalski, O41760.
John William Raulston, O20401.
Robert Lee Rhea, Jr., O29285.
Roy Foster Roberts, O29301.
Andrew Fredrick Scheele, O21475.
James Bernard Seaman, O20955.
Jack Segal, O21710.
Daniel Joseph Sheehan, O20929.
Michael Louis Sheppeck, O21478.
Edward Sigerfoos, O20414.
John Washington Simpson, O21480.
Edward Gabriel Sion, O41744.
Bernard Nathaniel Soderberg, O51171.
Kenneth Somers, O20413.
John Henry Taber, O20987.
James Edward Tate, O21709.
Frank Wilson Threadgill, O21019.
Howard Amos Van Auken, O20096.
Winston Hunter Vaughan, Jr., O20927.
Harold Augustus Vinson, O21711.
Paul Owen Wells, O20536.
Clark Batchelder Williams, O20995.
George Zalkan, O21000.
Peter Zanca O51167.

To be majors, Medical Corps

Howard Hathaway Angell, O31045.
Albert Junior Bauer, O25839.
Philip Rains Beckjord, O31051.
Morris Eldred Brackett, O25162.
John Charles Cressler, O25157.
Wright Addison Gates, O24338.
Robert Charles Greenwood, O56833.
Hal Bruce Jennings, Jr., O26995.
Paul Victor Kiehl, O26397.
Francis William Lanard, O25155.
Thomas Hamilton Lane, O51992.
John Bradley Moring, O25424.
Philip Jordan Noel, Jr., O25164.
Kenneth Dew Orr, O31042.
Thomas Lewis Ozment, O25425.
Woodrow Louis Pickhardt, O39497.
Charles Herman Ransom, O25841.
Edward Alton Ricketts, O25423.
Samuel Hope Sandifer, O25158.
Edward Patrick Shannon, Jr., O25165.
Edward Bayard Smith Shires, O51998.
Lowell Richard Steele, O25167.
Gerald Myles Tierney, O31030.
James Klinton Tillotson, O52001.
Victor Bradley Vare, Jr., O27045.
Bertram Allen Weeks, O26368.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Ernest Foss Adams, O57830.
Charles Frederick Althaus, O57406.
James Donald Amos, O57990.
Theodore Bacharach, O57987.
Stewart Lee Baker, Jr., O57547.
Clifford Ashton Baldwin, Jr., O57029.
Tucker Alexander Barth, O60026.
John Curtiss Bates, O57828.
Roberto Enrique Benitez O58706.
Robert Bernstein, O60025.
John Richard Black, O57408.
Raymond William Blohm, Jr., O57559.
Peter Robert Brady, O57031.
John Wesley Burkett, O57731.
Bruce Lauren Bushard, O57730.
Robert Ernest Campbell, O57737.
Thaddeus Walter Cap, O59681.
Robert Lloyd Christensen, O57035.
Ralph William Clemments, O57411.
Alvin Cohen, O57061.
Ray Garn Cowley, O57992.
Robert Edwin Crompton, O57025.
Clem Casper Crossland, Jr., O59683.
×Estill Nickell Deitz, O59684.
Charles Albin De Kovessey, O57562.
James Francis Donovan, O57546.
Cloyce Louis Duncan, O57412.
Warren Day Eddy, Jr., O57567.
Lyle Harris Edelblute, O57057.
John Thomas Elston, O57721.
William Francis Enos, Jr., O57402.
Henry Franklin Fancy, O59523.
Joel Charles Fink, O57727.
Norman Fisher, O58204.
Albert Sargent Freed, Jr., O57898.
Lyman Conrad Gabrielsen, O59437.
Samuel Charles Gallup, O57019.
Frederic Strayhorn Glazener, O57554.
Russell Enoch Graf, O59685.
Dell Moore Gray, O59440.
James Dahle Green, O57414.
Harold Leroy Guard, O57729.
Edward Franklin Gudgel, O57836.
James Lawrence Hansen, O57011.
Frederick Gentry Harris, O57015.
×Payne Senseman Harris, O57023.
Thomas Burke Hauschild, O57020.
Harry McCorry Henderson, Jr., O57409.
Euclid Garland Herndon, Jr., O59435.
Frank Hladky, Jr., O57033.
David Irvine Hull, O58760.
Laurence Steuart Jackson, O58201.
John Andrew Jenicek, O57989.
Robert Leroy Johnson, O57013.
James Harold Johnson, O57065.
Robert Elmer Johnston, O57838.
Augustus Benjamin Jones, Jr., O57733.
Irvine Glen Jordan, Jr., O59532.
Donald John Joseph, O60027.
Roger Allen Juel, O58193.
Marvin Myrl Keirns, O58200.
Allen Frederick Kingman, Jr., O57556.
Robert Louis Koenig, O57022.
Duval Holtzclaw Koonce, O58759.
Frederick Franz Krauskopf, O57053.
Edward Allen Langdon, O57722.
Samuel Lee, O59687.
Arthur Edgar Levy, O57026.
×Charles Keally Liddell, O59438.
Joseph Nicholas Lionti, O57985.
Albert Bela Lorincz, O57834.
Jack Beltman Lowrey, O59688.
John Frederick Loyd, O57732.
Robert Colton MacDuffee, O57032.
Norman Freeman Marshall, O58763.
Thomas Sterling Martin, O59528.
Sidney Lewis Marvin, O57063.
Stephen Graham May, O57028.
Marion Edward McDowell, O57399.
Kenneth Lindsay McEwen, O57991.
Worthy William McKinney, O57725.
William Hyde Meroney 3d, O57010.
Clarence Stockton Miller, O57946.
Frank Lewis Miller, O57564.
James Benjamin Moffett, O59441.
Charles Franklyn Moller, O57726.
Robert Martin Moore, Jr., O59530.
Francis Donal O'Brien, O57007.
Gerald Arnold Orken, O58194.
Marvin Earl Perkins, Jr., O57899.
Irvin Chaffee Plough, O57055.
Ralph Hubert Potter, Jr., O57017.
Stanley Demitry Rapinchuk, O57059.
Roger J. Reynolds, O60131.
Thomas Leonidas Robbins, O57551.
John Edward Roberts, O57833.
Donald Herbert Robinson, O57012.
Aloysius Ignatius Rowan, Jr., O59690.
Edmond Scavone, O57396.
Martin John Schumacher, O57401.
Norman McLean Scott, Jr., O57569.
Henry Albert Segal, O57062.
Leonard Harold Seitzman, O60028.
George Ward Shannon, O58247.
John Joseph Sheridan, O57550.
Walden Rogers Smith, O58023.
John Keith Spitznagel, O59436.
James Francis Stag, O57553.
Edwin Severance Stenberg, Jr., O60029.
Richard Urias Stern, O57952.
Donald James Strand, O57067.
Herbert Paul Sube, O57723.
Donald Ross Taylor, O57947.
Vann Shaw Taylor, O58025.
Acors William Thompson, O57986.
Robert Scott Tolmach, O57060.
Harry Jacob Umlauf, Jr., O58198.
Kent Paschal Upchurch, O58705.
Donald Norman Vivian, O59691.
Harvey Harmon Waldo, O57052.
George Clair Walter, O57403.
William P. Walton, O58195.
Gordon Taylor Wannamaker, O57413.
Willard Russel Warren, O58079.
Thomas Joseph Whelan, Jr., O59531.
Daniel Coyle Wilkerson, Jr., O57549.
David Hughes Wilson, O57552.
Samuel Paul Wise 3d, O57565.
Forrest Jackson Woodman, Jr., O58252.
Donald Munroe Wright, O57058.
Ralph Denny Wright, O57030.
Paul George Yessler, O57027.
Reginald Jack Monroe Zeluff, O58024.

To be lieutenant colonels, Dental Corps

Edward Goodwin Austin, O21046.
William Harold Bowers, O29264.
Horace Arthur Brayshaw, O29307.
William Harold Day, O20957.
Charles Max Farber, O20473.
Joseph Nevin Faw, O51164.
Cephas William Gary, O20477.
Bernard Charles Hammon, O20922.
Wayne Alden Hayes, O20486.
William Victor Hill, O20482.
Harry Christian Holmes, O29286.
Paul Wilson Holter, O20483.
Ellsworth Kessler Kelley, O20488.
Robert Bruce Loos, O20478.
John Wesley Mainwaring, Jr., O30865.
Alva Milton McConahay, O51163.
Marion Lawerance Mills, O20038.
×Stuart McNair Mitchell, O29305.
Clyde Danford Oatman, Jr., O20964.
George Losere O'Grady, O29282.
Leo Camillus Sexauer, O29251.
Stanley Foster Steele, O20474.
Martin Frederick Sullivan, O20958.
George Henry Timke, Jr., O20963.
Edmund Harold Van Dervort, O20476.
Maurice Edson Washburn, O20475.

To be majors, Dental Corps

Russell Henry Augsburger, O24376.
S. Kingdon Avery, O23684.
Richard James Farrell, O25168.
William Benjamin Irby, O31035.
Justin Ellis McNelly, O31026.
Edward Paul Quarantillo, O31002.
Roger Powell Rogers, O38858.
Julius Calvin Sexson, O24630.
Kenneth William Siegesmund, O43149.
×Edwin Howell Smith, Jr., O24629.

To be majors, Veterinary Corps

Nels Frank Christensen, O40100.
James Pingree Crawford, O30906.

To be majors, Medical Service Corps

John William Sheridan, O43156.
William Clay Waddill, O31063.

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Jack Kenneth Clark, O37524.
Leonard Andrew Crosby, Jr., O49967.
Jack Warren Gwin, O37598.
Chester Clarence Holloman, O41159.
Robert Louis Hughes, Jr., O37591.
Russell Edgar Julian, O37590.
Joseph Marlin Kilmer, O37498.
Edward Charles Knoblock, O41158.
Jack Warren Munson, O39349.
Joseph Martin Normington, O41157.
Thomas James Reilly, O37592.
Francis John Ryan, O56957.
Lionel Harry Schmahmann, O37583.
Frank Herbert Smiley, O37582.
Robert Louis Smith, O39350.
Howard John Spika, O37593.
William Ellsworth Stock, Jr., O37595.
Edward Martin Strobel, O37584.
Robert George Valentine, O37585.
Glen Michael Walsh, O41156.
Henry Louis Wamble, O41160.
William Franssen White, O37597.

To be lieutenant colonel, Chaplains

Samuel Overstreet, O41703.

To be majors, Chaplains

Rex Stone Kendall, O43123.
Gregory James Lock, O51957.
Luther George Herold Schliesser, O40099.
John William Sparks, O30900.
Herman Vestal Tarpley, O43121.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) have been examined for physical fitness and found physically qualified for promotion. All others are subject to physical examination required by law. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (*) were promoted during the recess of the Senate.

To be first lieutenants

×*Frederic Ackerson, O50562.
Walter Thomas Austin, O50572.
×*Hugh Boyd Casey, O56763.
Kenneth Eugene Davidson, O50569.
Edward Charles Ganz, Jr., O50570.
Thomas Dixon Holladay, Jr., O50571.
×*Herbert Lee Jordan, O50564.
Marshall Dickerson McClure, O56767.
×*Clarke Lewis Shumaker, Jr., O50568.
×*Frank Clyde Stewart, Jr., O50563.

To be first lieutenants, Women's Army Corps

×*Fannie Lyle Davis, L200.
×*Johnita Heslinga, L292.
×*Virginia Helen Kaufmann, L199.
×*Marie Louise Malone, L198.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) have been examined for physical fitness and found physically qualified for promotion. All others are subject to physical examination required by law. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (*) were promoted during the recess of the Senate.

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Melba Larue Adams, N1424.
Frances Jane Bilisky, N758.
×*Ethel Jane Britt, N753.
×*Virginia Monica Brychel, N925.
Rita Cecilia Burns, N759.
Grace Angela Crate, N1113.
×*Barbara May Cullom, N1101.
×*Florine Hughes Cutts, N1393.
×*Elmira Dalrymple, N922.
Ruby Izora Easter, N1590.
Marion Eskeldson, N1678.
×*Hazel Louise Evans, N1404.
×*Mildred Marie Furlong, N1401.
Gladys Louise Fusselman, N1419.
×*Agnes Cordelia Glunt, N1400.
Anna DeLena Harkins, N1416.
Wanda Marjorie Hartman, N933.
×*Margart Elizabeth Jackson, N918.
Mary Elizabeth Jordan, N756.
×*Florence Louise Kimmel, N917.
×Arlene Elizabeth Kind, N1408.
×*Eleanora Scheessele Lathery, N1402.
Harriet Theresa Laubacher, N1112.
Helen Logan, N1736.
Frances Agnes Lusas, N1735.
Mary Carolyn Mallette, N1114.
Alice Sledge Marks, N1418.
×*Mary Anne Massoni, N927.
Marjorie Matheson, N928.
×*Marjorie Moser Mohler, N919.
Mary Frances Morse, N1417.
Mary Anne Mulholland, N1588.
Reverdy Maxine Overbey, N1423.
×*Mary Kate Platt, N1405.
Jacqueline Hellena Sellars, N931.
×*Dorothy Fern Shaw, N1731.
Florence Marie Siems, N934.
Anna Beryl Skidmore, N760.
Corinne Elizabeth Snaadt, N932.
×*Marjorie Elizabeth Sodt, N1676.
Cecelia Ann Sulkowski, N1420.
Estelle Virginia Lee Tamalis, N1105.
Louise Ann Whalen, N1586.
×*Mary Willie Wilborne, N1728.
×*Lurline Virginia Zuerner, N1673

To be captains, Women's Medical Specialist Corps

Isabelle Mary Desmond, M10010
Nannie Rudd Evans, R10019.
Nevella Stella Harris, R10020.
Nettie Blake Jones, M10078.
Rose Marie MacKellar, R10097.
Doris Louise Parker, R10018.
×*Solveig Christi Peterson, R10048.
×*Mabel Elizabeth Pierce, J39.

To be first lieutenants, Women's Medical Specialist Corps

×*Tommye Jean Duncan, J24.
Louisa Rose Lindow, J27.
×*Marian Margaret Poitrast, R10060.
Bertha May Schrack, J26.
×*Eleanor Maye Vance, J25.
Helen Louis Wood, J53.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of subsection 104 (j), Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be lieutenant colonels, Women's Army Corps

Cora Marie Foster, L33.
Irene Otilla Galloway, L50.
Mary Agnes Hallaren, L1.
Charlee Lillian Kelly, L24.
Elizabeth Cordelia Smith, L48.

To be majors, Women's Army Corps

Martha DeGroat Allen, L235.
M. Frances Aman, L72.
Mary Olds Anderson, L86.
Hortense Mae Boutell, L94.
Florence Marie Clark, L90.
Kathryn Dorothy Cleveland, L61.
Robin Elliott, L64.
Aida Genevieve Esposito, L296.
Eda Josephine Flanigan, L70.
Margaret Davis Hallowell, L233.
Winifred Evelyn Ham, L237.
Hope Harrin, L295.
Lillian Harris, L96.
Catherine L. Hart, L65.
Helen Hazel Hart, L98.
Helen Harriet Hickman, L71.
Margaret Beckett Johnson, L238.
Sue Lynch, L81.
Catherine Jane Lyons, L73.
Marie Janet Madigan, L69.
Mary Louise Milligan, L80.
Mary Kathryn Moynahan, L77.
Bertha Grace Moser, L60.
Ethel Charlotte Munson, L91.
Billie Lois Murray, L84.
Emily Clark Newell, L300.
Lucile Gleason Odbert, L68.
Florence Marie Packard, L239.
Jane Howell Parsel, L67.
Marjorie Elizabeth Schulten, L249.
Teresa Rose Scullion, L297.
Mildred Ethel Smith, L299.
Nora Gray Springfield, L62.
Ernestine Loring Stephenson, L245.
Anne Eloise Sweeney, L119.
Winifred Thomas, L236.
Lois Aline Wassom, L63.
Margaret Rector Wharton, L66.
Margaret Jane Wehrle, L240.

To be captains, Women's Army Corps

Onolette Apley, L155.
Mary Jane Bailey, L144.
Mary Olive Boggess, L141.
Irma Verdilla Bouton, L195.
Elizabeth Helen Branch L147.
Jane Gail Brister, L289.
Kathleen Burns, L145.
Hedwig Jean Cadell, L136.
Miriam Annetta Cameron, L142.
Ellen Virginia Dunbar, L138.
Katherine Josephine Flaherty, L131.
June Paula Gonzalez, L274.
Patricia Ethel Grant, L181.
Elizabeth Paschel Hoisington, L164.
Alice Nora Howes, L146.
Mary Oressa Kennedy, L140.
Ethel May Martin, L182.
Agnes Alexandra Mashidlausky, L171.
Helen Barbara Meisner, L148.
Mary Katherine Flannery Miller, L133.
Louise O'Nale, L273.
Lenore May Price, L177.
Ruth Susannah Reece, L134.
Veronica Anna Reilly, L135.
Eleanor Marguerite Roberts, L270.
Barbara Eno Root, L162.
Sarah Lynn Sanders, L269.
Martha Elizabeth Saxon, L272.
Alice Veronica Sawyer, L132.
Faye Sloan, L143.
Betty Jane Truax, L149.
Sue Baylor Trulock, L188.
Charlotte Ives Woodworth, L137.
Hope Wray, L174.
Frances Mary Yoniack, L157.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from December 21, 1949

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Abbott, Henry Eugene, Jr., 2311A.
Adams, Hubert, 2457A.
Addleman, William Clair, 2164A.
Aertgeerts, Jerome Edward, 2825A.
Agnell, Peter Walfrid, 2432A.
Alexander, William Brinan, 2340A.
Alison, John Charles, 2456A.
Allen, John Eugene, 2546A.
Allen, Robert Hamel, 2512A.
Andry, Fernand Louis, 2632A.

Ashwick, Edwin William, 2459A.
Ashworth, Wilfred Bailey, 2218A.
Asp, John Ellsworth, 2403A.
Atkins, Ernest Graves, 2315A.
Atkins, Henry Venton, 2791A.
Atkinson, Charles Walter Thomas, 2861A.
Augustinus, Robert Herman, 2724A.
Ault, John Willard, 2783A.
Austin, Sewall Young, 2194A.
Bacon, John William, 2548A.
Bacon, Lewis Harrold, 2860A.
Badger, Thomas, Jr., 2830A.
Bailey, William Wallace, 2834A.
Baird, William Charles, 2493A.
Baker, Ernest, 2276A.
Baker, Ralph Eugene, 2593A.
Baker, Robert Britton, Jr., 2814A.
Baldick, Carl Joseph, 2616A.
Bandlow, Richard Otto, 2279A.
Bangham, Joseph Frederick, Jr., 2157A.
×Barlow, James Craig, 2224A.
Barney, Robert Burns Smeaton, 2427A.
Barrett, Richard Adrian, 2586A.
Barron, James Patrick, 2502A.
Barrow, Robert Lee, 2687A.
Bartlett, John Donnington, 2682A.
Bartling, Wray Bacon, 2572A.
Barton, William Igleheart, 2192A.
Bean, Gerald Edward, 2595A.
Beattie, Aldridge Nelson, 2832A.
Beebe, James Allen, 2622A.
Beeghly, Murray J., 2499A.
Bell, Maynard William, 2515A.
Bell, Raymond Lester, 2780A.
Benn, Robert Willallen, 2624A.
Bennett, Burlin Samuel, 2165A.
Bennett, William Thomas, 2594A.
Berkeley, William Patrick, 2236A.
Berryhill, Earl John, 2581A.
Blackstone, John Everett, 2785A.
Blackstone, Kenneth Lloyd, 2495A.
Blevins, Edwin, 2835A.
Blondis, Oscar Don, 2146A.
Bloxsom, Clyde Harold, 2384A.
Blunda, Gaspare Frank, 2330A.
Bockman, Charles Eugene, Jr., 2338A.
Bodley, Harvey Hawley, 2334A.
Boger, Martin Kroninger, 2352A.
Boogher, Arnold, 3994A.
Booth, Leon, 2321A.
×Bostick, John, 2364A.
Boucher, Paul, 2424A.
Boughner, Kenneth Theodore, 2235A.
Bower, Robert Sharon, 2443A.
Bowman, Harry Guy, 2577A.
×Bowman, Jack Whitridge, 2190A.
Bradley, Elbert J., Jr., 2426A.
Branch, Gerald Ellis, 2788A.
Brannan, Rudolph, 2827A.
Brewer, Samuel Martin, 2422A.
×Brewster, James Henry, Jr., 2324A.
Brill, Ray Samuel, 2602A.
Brown, Allen K., 2539A.
Brown, Charles Arthur, 2801A.
Brown, Douglas Rudie, 2245A.
Brown, Isidore, 2286A.
×Brown, Kenton Scott, 2589A.
Brown, Wilfred Elmer, 2319A.
×Brumfield, Henry Anderson, 2753A.
Bryan, Calvin Mitchel, 2325A.
Buchanan, Kenneth Wiley, 2668A.
Buelow, Albert Gustav, 2714A.
Burden, Oliver Dudley, Jr., 2461A.
Burke, Leo Raymond, 2840A.
Burns, Don Robert, 2366A.
Burns, Edgar John, 2222A.
Burnside, John Marion, 2777A.
Burris, Robert Francis, 2520A.
Burroughs, Orval Neal, 2302A.
Bush, Morris, 2776A.
×Cameron, Arthur Thomas, 2728A.
Campbell, Ivan Earnest, 2775A.
Carlberg, Lawrence Ferdinand, 2693A.
Carlos, Bernard Cooper, 2744A.
Carpenter, Clarence Coe, 2640A.
Carter, Wilbur Robert, 2562A.
Cathcart, Norman Ryan, 2398A.
Chapman, James William, 2431A.
Charlton, George Randolph, 2607A.
Charron, Roland Bartholomew, 2563A.
Chase, George Humphrey, 2703A.
Chenette, Joseph Richard, 2701A.
Christopher, George William, 2612A.
Churchill, Randolph Emerson, 2496A.
Clark, Albert James, 2571A.
Clark, Joseph Thomas, 2331A.
Clark, William Shelby, 2182A.
Clarke, Roy Laverne, 2300A.
Clough, William Rockwell, 2554A.
Cluxton, Donald Edwin, 2400A.
Coate, Raymond Lamar, 2773A.
Cofield, Emory Woodfin, 2734A.
Cole, Lawrence Elroy, 2511A.
Collins, Robert Blackmore, 2258A.
Condron, John Eugene, 2692A.
Cook, Eugene Glynn, 2380A.
Coolidge, John Reid, 2633A.
Cooper, Robert Neville, 2743A.
Cooper, William Charles, 2291A.
×Cornell, Loren, 2193A.
Corwin, Alexander, 2553A.
Cosgrove, John Aloysius, 2262A.
Costello, Maurice Joseph, 2570A.
Courtney, James Hiram, 2561A.
Covington, Fredrick Sturdivant, 2555A
Cowan, James Albertson, 2536A.
Cox, Arthur Cornell, 2347A.
Cox, Homer Mead, 2824A.
Craft, Robert Patterson, 2470A.
Craig, Earl Burrell, 2254A.
Crakes, Joe Henry, 2654A.
Crawford, John, 2627A.
Crawford, Marshall James, 2709A.
Cropper, Eugene Charles, 2564A.
Culler, Harry Hillus, 2525A.
Cummins, Tristram James, Jr., 2678A.
Curl, Lester Clarence, 2418A.
×D'Ettore, William Nicholas, 2542A.
D'Orsi, Albert, 2816A.
Da Vania, Richard Walton, 2639A.
Dahlstrom, John Robert, 2385A.
×Dargusch, Julius Theodore, 19666A.
Dart, Roy Whitman, 2698A.
Dash, Lawrence Peck, 2494A.
Daugherty, James Ferdinand, 2759A.
Daum, Max Van Rossum, 2154A.
Davidson, Harvey Drayton, 2206A.
Davidson, Roy Alvin, 2339A.
Davis, Albert F., 2505A.
Davis, Lester Carl, 2172A.
Day, Robert Stanley, 2609A.
deCisneros, George Jimenez, 2696A.
×de La Vigne, Ferdinand Andre, 2504A.
De Longe, Merril Edwin, 2265A.
De St. Jeor, Wallace Bramwell, 2306A.
de Tolly, Nicholas Semigradov, 2623A.
DeFord, Deane Corwin, 2328A.
×DeGroot, Edward Burton, Jr., 2386A.
Dehle, Alfred Hugo, 2487A.
DeHorn, John Gerrit, 2434A.
Delaney, Francis Robert, 2826A.
Denison, Jack Alden, 2819A.
Deverall, George Grace, 2478A.
Dewey, Charles Myrle, 2173A.
Dick, Chester Arthur, Jr., 2842A.
Dickey, Robert Russell, Jr., 2358A.
Dieterle, William Howard, 2667A.
Dietze, Herman Verne, 2441A.
Dillingham, Maurice Stanley, 2551A.
Dixon, Charles Allen, 2204A.
Dixon, Harold Perkins, 2249A.
Dolan, Paul Gerald, 2440A.
Dollerhide, Charles Louis, 2145A.
Dooley, Franklin Wayne, 2620A.
Douglas, Richard Maginis, 2838A.
Douglass, Charles Reid, 2845A.
Doyle, C. Ervin, 2332A.
×Drake, Robert Sebastian, 2220A.
Dreier, Wendell Carl, 2226A.
Dreyer, Louis Edward, 2754A.
Dufour, John Guilbert, 2722A.
Dulevitz, Alexander, 2552A.
Dundas, Donald Sears, 2468A.
Dustin, Roland Lewis, 2481A.
Eason, Robert Kelton, 2159A.
Edenfield, Marshall Calder, 2248A.
Edwards, Charles William, 2375A.
Egge, George Vernon, 2831A.
Ellis, Clay Donald, 2590A.
Elver, Carl Leonard, 2396A.
Ely, Lawrence Daniel, 2378A.
Engelman, Elton Clarence, 2428A.
Enyart, Byron K., 2406A.
Erickson, Allen Leonard, 2242A.
Estes, Murl, 2213A.
Ettenger, Clayton Warner, 2544A.
Farber, Morris, 2606A.
Fee, Francis Raymond, 2712A.
Felknor, Robert Snoddy, 2810A.
Fellows, Paul Dewitt, 2718A.
Fenske, Leslie Claude, 2675A.
Fernandez, Manuel, 2184A.
Field, Eugene Hollister, 2818A.
Finnegan, Julian Pat, 2371A.
Fisher, John Logan, 2790A.
Fleming, Arch Charles, 2413A.
Freiburger, Paul Ignatius, 2729A.
Freshour, Beryl Harry, 2735A.
Friedlander, Edward Allen, 2755A.
Fuller, Benton Franklin, Jr., 2786A.
Fuller, Harold Lafayette, 2257A.
Fullerton, Donald Joseph, 2365A.
Fulton, Charles Everett, 2458A.
Gadler, Steve Joseph, 2360A.
Gallagher, Robert Emmett, 2575A.
×Galletly, Alan Millar, 2255A.
Gallo, Frank Paul, 2392A.
Garber, James Franklin, Jr., 2661A.
Geary, George Kenneth, 2796A.
×Geismer, Oscar Henry, 2820A.
Gentry, Elbert Bailey, 2477A.
Gibson, William Louis, 2359A.
×Giuliano, Albert, 2408A.
×Glassman, George Henry, 2518A.
Godfrey, Milton Edwin, 2241A.
Goldinger, Milton, 2725A.
Golledge, Kenneth Kingman, 2700A.
Goodhart, Morgan, 2469A.
Goodloe, John Hill, 2463A.
Gottlieb, Ellis Lewis, 2244A.
Graalman, Walter Raymond, 2274A.
Graham, Floyd, 2811A.
Graham, George Harold, 2189A.
×Graham, Marion Richmond, 2474A.
Graham, William Robert, 2642A.
×Grant, Thomas Joseph, 2770A.
Gray, Russell William, 2270A.
Greelis, Don Kay, 2299A.
Green, Robert Wayne, 2162A.
Greene, Edward Chace, Jr., 2462A.
Gregory, William Lyte, 2736A.
Greiner, Reginald Romine, 2533A.
Grek, Robert Marshall, 2839A.
Grey, Joseph Robert, 2167A.
Grimes, Lyle Clark, 2538A.
Grower, Mason Henry, Jr., 2854A.
Gwynn, Edward Owen, 2168A.
Haas, Wilford Norman, 2848A.
Haase, Charles Hermann, 2409A.
Hagins, Newton Doris, 2799A.
Haile, Roland Reed, 2582A.
Hairston, Francis Booth, 2763A.
Hall, William Jarvis, 2807A.
Hamilton, Harry Starr, 2626A.
Hampton, John Alexander, 2588A.
Hardwick, Walter Amile, 2688A.
Harris, Robert Alfred, 2215A.
Harrison, Ike Henry, 2771A.
Hartman, Frank Althoff, 2853A.
Haskins, Charles Gregg, 2684A.
Hastings, George David, 2161A.
Hatlem, John Carsten, 2471A.
Hauck, Herman Albert, 19650A.
Hawes, Ivan Ignatious, 2650A.
Hazard, John Thomas, 2672A.
Heavner, William Stewart, 2769A.
Hedleston, Robert Webb, 2625A.
Henderson, Richard Harrison, 2613A.
Herbison, Robert, 2757A.
Hidden, Eugene Albert, 2345A.
Hikel, Theodore Roosevelt, 2239A.
×Hileman, Cecil Alpheus, 2817A.
×Hill, Alvin Martin, 2187A.
Hilliard, Robert Christy, 2323A.
Himes, Charles John, 2197A.
Hippler, William Paul, 2697A.
Hixson, Samuel Thurston, 2643A.
Hoelscher, Elmer John, 2176A.
Hogan, Patrick Joseph, 2849A.
Holbein, Fred William, 2663A.
Holland, Harold Laverne, 2341A.
Holt, Francis William, 2578A.
Hood, William Clark, Jr., 2201A.

Hope, John Warren, 2778A.
Hornsey, William C., 2645A.
Hotmann, William August, 2863A.
×Hough, Ernest Alton, 18666A.
Howell, Quincy Douglas, 2580A.
×Howell, Thomas Alexander, 2540A.
Huckaby, Roy Alvin, 2155A.
Humphreys, Robert Willis, 2410A.
Hunsucker, George Eugene, 2256A.
Hunt, Edward Everhart, 2445A.
Hunt, Leigh Hale, 2350A.
Hurley, Arthur Francis, 2322A.
Hurley, Charles, 2521A.
Hurley, Robert B., 2648A.
Hutchins, Frank Douglas Burlingame Greene, 2438A.
Hutchison, John Joseph, 2451A.
Hynd, William Brown, 2420A.
×Ice, Thew Joseph, Jr., 2716A.
Israel, Lawrence Joseph, 2414A.
Jacobsen, Walter Vincent, 2393A.
Johnson, Charles R., 2415A.
Johnson, Paul Adrian, 2401A.
Jones, Donald Theodore, 2484A.
Jones, Harry, 2707A.
Jones, Harry Henderson, 2381A.
Jones, Robert Stewart, 2336A.
Jones, Wayne Emery, 2601A.
Jordan, John Alton, 2510A.
Judkins, William T., 2862A.
Kalberer, Karl Hubert, 2691A.
Keach, Thomas Carroll, 2617A.
Keefe, Don Robert, 2333A.
Keeler, Raymond Hager, 2749A.
Keene, George Francis, Jr., 2305A.
Kelly, Howard, 2160A.
Kerbel, Walter, 2507A.
Kiefer, Paul Clifford, 2475A.
Kieling, Harry Joseph, 2615A.
Kienth, Kenneth Dietrich, 2237A.
Killgore, Earl Henderson, 2673A.
Kincheloe, Charles M., 2733A.
King, Hall, 2486A.
King, Herbert Thompson, 2855A.
Kingham, Arthur Raymond, 2367A.
×Kirton, Edwin Malcolm, 2765A.
Klein, Edward Colburn, 2761A.
Klein, Frederick William, 2351A.
Kohlrieser, Francis Louis, 2453A.
Kracman, Miles, 2501A.
Kroeber, Adolf, 2421A.
LaBarr, William, 2847A.
LaBuda, Joseph Edward, 2419A.
Ladd, Avery Jackson, 2345A.
LaGrippo, Antonio Natle, 2391A.
Laking, Percy Albert, 2468A.
Lange, Harry Alfred, 2390A.
Landsdale, Edward Geary, 2534A.
LeBell, Arnold, 2659A.
LeMaster, Douglas Ray, 2318A.
LeMay, Lloyd William, 2706A.
Leach, William Hinman, 2647A.
Lee, Thomas Andrew, 2149A.
×Lehman, Ted R., 2516A.
Lesh, Newton Doremus, 2435A.
Levering, John Robert, 2524A.
Lewis, Earl Westlake, 2288A.
Lindstrum, Herbert James, 2327A.
Lockman, John Murk, 2399A.
Logan, Arthur Lawrence, 2303A.
Loggins, Lloyd Burnett, 2587A.
Lollar, William Houston, 2450A.
Long, David Winston, 2794A.
Long, Lewis Rex, 2638A.
Loomis, Richard, 2747A.
Lounsbery, Arthur Heath, 2621A.
Luten, Ralph William, 2228A.
Lutz, Simon Michael, Jr., 2808A.
Mack, Ingham Gallinger, 2344A.
Magid, Louis Borris, Jr., 2636A.
Magness, Walter Bays, 2205A.
Mainor, Andrew, 2579A.
Malony, Robert Emmet, 2151A.
Manion, Thomas Francis, Jr., 2662A.
Manss, Robert William, 2713A.
Mapes, Lynne Richmond, 2251A.
Marchant, John Chesley, 2677A.
Mare, Donald, 2148A.
Marsh, Charles Stewart, 2730A.
Marshall, Raymond H., 2740A.
×Marshall, Slater Eugene, 2231A.
Martin, Charles Patrick, 2449A.
Martin, William Arthur, 2756A.
Mason, Albert Joseph, 2748A.
Mason, Clarence Owen, 2261A.
Mason, Lassiter Albert, 2574A.
Matthews, Joseph Walter, 2635A.
Matthews, Luther Bailey, 2802A.
Mattia, Hugh John, 2689A.
May, Russell George, 2150A.
Mayall, Broun Hunt, 2527A.
McAdams, Clayton Aubry, 2634A.
McCall, Clarence Joseph, 2250A.
McCarthy, Fred Morton, 2301A.
McClenahan, Edward Franklin, 2809A.
McClure, William Horace, 2439A.
McCollum, Hugh Archie, 2774A.
McCown, James Harlan, 2800A.
McDermott, Charles Michael, 2447A.
McDonald, Audley Clifford, 2851A.
McDuffee, Ray Wilbur, 2266A.
McFarland, Thomas Stuart, Jr., 2651A.
McGary, Alvin, 2549A.
McGrath, Thomas Joseph, 2541A.
McGuire, William Henry, 2695A.
McKnight, William Louis, 2803A.
McLean, Michael Turner, 2591A.
McMahan, Thomas Edward, 2225A.
McNamara, Eugene Addis, Jr., 2608A.
×McNamara, William Joseph, 4988A.
McNeil, Joseph Leonard, 2498A.
Meeks, John Andrew, Jr., 2760A.
Merrill, William Boland, Jr., 2277A.
Metcalf, John Kenneth, 2556A.
Meyer, William Joseph, 2742A.
Middleton, Willard Rufus, 2429A.
Miller, Alsey Coleman, Jr., 2726A.
Miller, Blake Charles, 2758A.
Miller, David Kenneth, 2529A.
Miller, DeWolfe Hugo, 2482A.
Miller, Ernest Randall, 2273A.
Miller, Oliver William, 2787A.
Miller, William Brumfield, Jr., 2669A.
Miller, William Glen, 2180A.
Mills, Morris Hammond, 2600A.
Mills, Ray, 2454A.
Milroy, Charles Knox, 2815A.
Mitchell, Irvin Francis, 2280A.
×Mitchell, Philip Harold, 2216A.
Moen, Philmore Leonel, 2272A.
Mogford, Ronald, 2766A.
Mohr, Clifford Frandsen Luck, 2357A.
Montgomery, Lee Ward, 2710A.
Moomaw, Chester Carl, 2271A.
Moomaw, Lorris William, 2762A.
Moore, Andrew Dale, 2841A.
Moore, John Warner, 2238A.
Moran, James Joseph, 2619A.
Morgan, William Richard, 2190A.
Morrison, Albert Morris, 2519A.
Moss, Henry James Yancy, 2213A.
Moynihan, William Laurence, 2592A.
Mulligan, John Patrick, 2202A.
Mulligan, William Thomas, 2179A.
Murphy, Robert Joseph, Jr., 2738A.
Murphy, Vance Edward, 2246A.
Musgrove, Albert Millard, Jr., 2472A.
Mussler, Malcolm Edwin, 2181A.
Mutschler, Gustave William, 2349A.
Nalewaik, William Joseph, 2537A.
Natt, Theodore Manfred, 2813A.
Nay, Paul Franklin, 2584A.
Nelson, Harlan McKendra, 2416A.
Neusse, Henry John, Jr., 2269A.
Newkirk, Charles Harold, 2264A.
Newlon, Frank Clarke, 2232A.
Nichols, Guy, 2433A.
Noland, George Lee, 2191A.
Noonan, Thomas Michael, 2585A.
Norton, Paul Weddell, 2679A.
Norwood, Frank, 2153A.
O'Connell, Joseph William, 2290A.
O'Connor, George Brendan, 2829A.
O'Connor, John Peterson, 2604A.
O'Donnell, Edward John, 2171A.
O'Leary, John Arthur, 2797A.
Ochs, Henry John, Jr., 2737A.
×Oldenburg, Harold Leo, 2243A.
×Oldfield, Arthur Barney, 19649A.
Olmsted, Joel Burlison, 2174A.
Olson, Harry Armand, 2858A.
Paden, Kenneth William, 2547A.
Pankey, Russell George, 2812A.
Pannis, William Walter, 2466A.
Parham, Harry Crosswell, 2356A.
Parker, Rudolph Alvin, 2630A.
Parrish, Bishop Pershaw, Jr., 2183A.
Pascoe, William Watson, 2348A.
Payne, Jack, 2565A.
Payne, John Daniel, 2526A.
Peel, Robert Taggert, 2856A.
Peters, Frederick Irving, 2436A.
Peterson, Cleo Forrest, 2233A.
Phifer, Charles William, 2211A.
Pickens, William Hopkins, 2721A.
×Pidgeon, Arthur Robert, Jr., 2388A.
×Pinnegar, Frederick George, 2653A.
Plihal, Joseph Anton, 2859A.
Poole, Charles Robert, 2329A.
Poor, George Lovelace, 2732A.
Porter, George Worth, 2178A.
Pribble, Holton Houston, 2665A.
Pritchard, Charles Henderson, 2362A.
Prochazka, Theodore Vincent, 2535A.
Pryber, Jerome Anton, 2263A.
Raudabaugh, Albert Snyder, 2857A.
Redburn, Ralph Albert, 2397A.
Redd, Denny Lee, 2717A.
Reed, Darrell Leonard, 2503A.
×Reed, Robert Muirhead, 2281A.
×Reed, William Smith, 2147A.
Regan, Ralston Byrnes, 2514A.
×Reid, Archibald Campbell, Jr., 2641A.
Reid, John, 2599A.
Reinhardt, Arthur Frederick, 2186A.
Rhea, Fred, 2373A.
Rhodes, James Mauran, 3d, 2752A.
Richard, Newton Mansel, Jr., 2656A.
Richardson, Guy Brooks, Jr., 2363A.
Richardson, James Clarke, 2185A.
Richardson, John, 2465A.
Richardson, Orin Shelby, 2676A.
Richer, Marcel Andre, 2837A.
Richter, Eugene Paul, 2637A.
Rieske, Forrest Otto, 2479A.
Riley, Edward Thompson, 2298A.
Riley, William Bryant, Jr., 2442A.
Rinehart, Howard Elon, 2583A.
Robbins, Edwinston Lewis, 2158A.
Robbins, Richard Barclay, 2708A.
Robinson, George Lexemuel, 2405A.
Robinson, James, 2317A.
Robinson, William Wallace, 2655A.
Robinson, Raymond Duke, 2196A.
Rogers, Norman Elliott, Jr., 2852A.
Rohrs, Leonard John, 2779A.
Ronka, George Raphael, 2699A.
Rooks, John Gerard, 2407A.
Rose, Orville Vern, 2685A.
Roy, Mark Joseph, 2177A.
Roylance, John Gunter, 2528A.
Sadow, Peter Thomas, 2297A.
Sager, Harvid, 2631A.
Sampson, Roy Paul, 2823A.
Savage, Lawrence Brownlee, Jr., 2781A.
Schaller, Ralph Howard, 2444A.
Scherrer, Arthur Burton, 2374A.
×Schliecker, Charles Lenard, 2723A.
Schoenfeldt, Paul John, 2792A.
Scholes, Wallace Burnham, 2219A.
Schrock, Ray Ebolin, 2843A.
Scollay, Loren Perry, 2304A.
Sears, Herbert Edward, 2833A.
Seashore, Malcolm David, 2666A.
Shachtman, Hyman, 2674A.
Shaw, Jay Bartley, 2309A.
Shaw, Leslie Burkett, 2705A.
×Shipp, Claude Lee, 2253A.
×Shipp, Travis, 2267A.
×Shown, James Joseph, 2207A.
Siebert, Fred William, 2618A.
Silver, Richard Fordyce, 2768A.
Singleton, Loy Alonzo, 2473A.
Sinton, Russell Luis, 2293A.
Skelton, John William, 2545A.
Skinner, Leo Victor, 2560A.
Slaughter, Earl, 2221A.
Smith, Arnold Livesey, 2850A.
Smith, Derryfield Nathaniel, 2568A.
Smith, Harry Russell, 2480A.
Smith, Marion Charles, 2751A.
Smith, Vernon S., Jr., 2522A.
×Somerby, William Alden, Jr., 2195A.

Spahr, Paul Moses, 2361A.
Spitz, Charles Ernest, 2690A.
×Stancook, Joseph Cobb, 5218A.
Stansbury, Edgar Bryant, 2337A.
Stapleford, Zeb Vance, 2395A.
Stark, John Jacob, 2715A.
Stears, Paul Aloysius, 2603A.
Stebbins, Luther Russell, 2467A.
Stefansson, Ragnar, 2683A.
Steiner, Wilfred Adolphus, 2314A.
Stephens, William Alton, 2188A.
Stogner, Ben T., 2569A.
Stoltz, LaRoy Richard, 2532A.
Stoup, Hugh Clarence, 2767A.
Stradleigh, Norman Farrington, 2795A.
Strati, Gaetano Vincent, 2208A.
Striplin, Charles Forrest, Jr., 2806A.
×Stuart, William Harland, 19651A.
Sturdivant, Hubert Nelson, 2260A.
Sullivan, Harold Joseph, 2764A.
Summerfield, Ellison Saint Clair, 2711A.
Summers, Paul Walter, 2372A.
Sweeney, Henry Morrow, 2210A.
Swigart, John Kenneth, 2798A.
Taaffe, George Thomas, 2557A.
Tangen, Orville Clarence, 2702A.
Taylor, Henry Joe, 2567A.
Taylor, Ray Ward, 2611A.
Teed, Willard Golding, 2610A.
Tempske, Paul Theodore, 2846A.
Thomas, William Jerome, 2488A.
Thompson, Walter Alexander, Jr., 2605A.
Thomson, Robert Sidney, 2389A.
Todd, William LeRoy, 2320A.
Toomey, Frederick Walter, 2394A.
×Townsend, Charles Manuel, 2278A.
Townsend, James Watson, 2629A.
Tucker, John McKinney, 2355A.
Turner, William Millard, 2694A.
Tyler, John, 2727A.
Urquhart, Lloyd Clarence Emerson, 2446A.
Valle, Calixto Cecilio, 2376A.
Van Blarcom, Earl Bruce, 2746A.
Vaughn, Virgil Allen, 2664A.
Veillard, Paul George, 2163A.
Vernon, Wesely Harold, 2750A.
Virden, John Marion, 2614A.
Wade, Ralph Harrison, 2285A.
Waldron, Clarence Loring, 2680A.
Walker, Paul, 2212A.
Wall, Clement James, 2342A.
Wallis, Howard George, 2490A.
Walls, John Hancock, Jr., 2805A.
Walsten, Carl John Edward, 2543A.
×Walter, George Clarage, Jr., 2739A.
Ward, Rufus King, 2423A.
Ward, William Henry, Jr., 2720A.
Waring, Francis Malbone, 2821A.
Warner, Charles Artemus, 2546A.
Washington, Dudley Sherrill, 2370A.
×Waugh, Richard Gordon, 2598A.
Weaver, Lester Clark, 2485A.
Webster, Harry William, 2731A.
Webster, Howard Elwyn, 2573A.
Wells, Bradford Hayes, 2782A.
Welter, William Theodore, 2460A.
Wert, Jack Emmert, 2671A.
West, Frank Thornton, 2719A.
Wheeler, Fred John, 2382A.
Wheeler, Merwin Benton, 2566A.
Whelchel, Robert, 2316A.
Whipple, Abram Ladue, Jr., 2214A.
White, William Berry, 2411A.
Wicker, Jamie Loran, 2377A.
Wickland, Daniel William, 2628A.
Wilde, Kenneth Clark, 2217A.
Wildes, Thomas, 2828A.
Wilhite, Robert Theadore, 2576A.
Williams, Cecil Clinton, 2383A.
Williams, Francis Ward, 2308A.
Williams, James Loyd, 2284A.
Williams, James Robert, 2704A.
Williams, Warren Candler, 2455A.
Willoughby, Earl, 2430A.
Wilson, Charles Frederick, 2558A.
Wing, John Clark, 2252A.
Witsell, Benjamin Fishburn, 2464A.
Wittrock, Henry Ernest, 2268A.
×Wolters, Delevan Edward, 2652A.
Woodward, Wayne Wilbur, 2784A.
Wright, Clifton Dukes, 2517A.
Wyckoff, Elmer Rufus, 2326A.
Young, Lewis Guy, 2144A.

MEDICAL

Atria, Nicholas Fred, 19120A.
Blount, Robert Henry, 19118A.
Browning, Levi Martin, 19116A.
Bruce, Charles Olin, Jr., 19597A.
Cook, William Ferrall, 19117A.
DeBaun, Charles Witter, 19112A.
Englehart, Charles Edward, 19130A.
Ferris, Donald Lockhart, 19110A.
Gingles, Charles H., 19598A.
Gray, James Karadine, 19114A.
Hoey, Patrick Henry, 19122A.
Houghton, Karl Herbert, 19119A.
Jarman, Julian Adolph, 19634A.
Linfesty, John William, 19131A.
Love, Robert Campbell, 19126A.
McCarroll, William Harroll, 19111A.
McGraw, John Robert, 19123A.
Morris, Charles Kasile, 19133A.
Niemi, Osmo Ilmar, 19113A.
Oliver, Andres Gilberto, 19127A.
Pittman, Wayne Creekmore, 19124A.
Preston, William Donald, 19129A.
Rounds, Roy Clayton, 19132A.
Sheldon, Paul Charles, 19115A.
Switzer, Ralph Eugene, 19121A.
Van Sickle, Albert Wilson, 19128A.
White, Claude Benjamin, 19632A.

DENTAL

Bird, Walter Harned, 18853A.
Cummings, Francis Emmett, 18860A.
Gunther, Edgar, 18852A.
Harlan, Maurice Cooper, 18858A.
Hawkins, Jack Monroe, 18854A.
Hays, Stuart E., Jr., 18856A.
Johnson, Robert Donald, 18851A.
McAllister, Donald Byron, 18855A.
Mitchell, James O'Neil, 18859A.
O'Hara, Donald Malcolm, 18862A.
Reuter, Walter John, 18857A.
Ryan, Maurice Patrick, 18850A.
Widner, Glynn Bryan, 18861A.

VETERINARY

Kester, Wayne Otho, 18976A.

MEDICAL SERVICE

Jobe, George Russell, 19382A.
Nolan, Elmo Dorman, 19389A.
Parsons, John Bernard, 19383A.

CHAPLAINS

Baechler, Ildephonse Charles, 18722A.
Davis, Willard Graham, 18720A.
Hanner, James Zigler, 18717A.
×Lack, Charles Lester, 18719A.
Marteney, Charles Walton, 18714A.
Priest, Leroy Richard, 18715A.
Rosen, Samuel, 18718A.
Strippy, Clarence Gremphler, 18712A.
Tatar, Stephen Anthony, 18711A.
Taylor, William Franklin, Jr., 18716A.
Wicher, Herbert Woodmore, 18721A.

To be majors with rank from December 21, 1949

Abdalah, Ernest George, 5403A.
Acker, Halbert Hammond, 5775A.
Adams, Bill, 5480A.
Adams, Ralph Wyatt, 5548A.
×Aebischer, Joseph Edward, 5413A.
Agin, Edward James, 5825A.
×Ahrens, William Carl, 5744A.
Allen, Samuel Lawrence, 5965A.
Allen, Wendell Gerow, 5549A.
Allensworth, Hubert Lasater, 5990A.
Almy, Donald Comstock, 5463A.
×Alyea, Louis French, 5484A.
Anderson, Arlo Sell, 5696A.
Anderson, Glenn Preston, Jr., 5641A.
Anderson, Holly Winfred, 6112A.
×Anderten, Irwin William, 5620A.
Archer, Oneal John Thomas, 5858A.
Archlueta, Rubel Vigil, 5963A.
Arendt, Harry Stanley, 5550A.
Armstrong, Richard Elliott, 5591A.
Arnold, Roy Addison, 6166A.
Atwell, Lawrence Austin, 5683A.
Austin, James Manning, 6058A.
Babb, Claude Andrew, 5773A.
Bailey, Harry Banks, 5730A.
×Baker, Ancil David, 5924A.
Bankert, Ward Earl, 5399A.
Barker, Paul Bernard, 5606A.
Barr, Jennings Monroe, 5720A.
Barrett, John Patrick, 5987A.
Barrow, Tom Lee, 5781A.
Bartlett, Edgar Earl, 5553A.
Bates, Frederick Reed, 5404A.
×Bauer, Christian Schmid, 5646A.
Bazan, Edward Theodore, 5794A.
Beam, Howard Earl, 5496A.
Beamer, Harry Raymond, 5541A.
Beasley, Everett Lyn, 5477A.
Beck, Abe Jack, 5831A.
×Behrens, George Herman, 5859A.
Bennett, Herbert Hollinworth, 5661A.
Beno, Kenneth Richard, 6079A.
Berger, Kenneth Stephen, 5872A.
Bergin, Joseph Andrew, 5562A.
Berry, Secrest Laughlin, 5361A.
Bertoni, Louis, 5522A.
Betts, Francis Arnold, 5800A.
Betz, Albert Leslie, 5634A.
Beville, Claude, Jr., 5999A.
Bickford, James Wendell, 6172A.
Black, John Orville, 5455A.
Blalock, John Wilmer, 6043A.
Bliss, Charles Cushman, 6165A.
Blume, Frederick Julius, 6132A.
Blume, Irving, 5508A.
Bobela, Michael, 5507A.
Bogue, Jay Deam, 6108A.
×Bolen, William Francis, 5400A.
Bonvicin, Emanuel Frank, 5985A.
Botsford, Charles Goddard, 5546A.
Bottoms, Robert Leland, 5845A.
Bowden, William Martin, 5790A.
Bowen, Robert Lee, 5370A.
Bowman, John Sterling, 6163A.
Bowman, Richard Elworthy, 6034A.
×Bradley, Francis Trenholm, 5795A.
Brandau, Otto Henry, 5910A.
Breeden, Lindsey Carlisle, Jr., 5555A.
Brill, Norris, 5700A.
Brittain, Gerald Frederick, 5665A.
×Brown, Harvey Coleman, Jr., 5559A.
Brown, Kenneth Elmo, 6092A.
Brown, Robert William, 5485A.
Brown, Ted, 5603A.
Brubeck, Edwin Howard, 6095A.
Bryan, Loren Andrew, 5270A.
Buchmeier, George Thomas, 6153A.
×Budway, George, 5430A.
×Bunker, Walter Irvin, 6115A.
×Burgner, Newton Milton, 5427A.
Burgy, Eldred John, 5585A.
Burkett, Bernard Julius, 6074A.
Burns, Charles Timothy, 5631A.
Burns, Jackson Ralph, 5618A.
Butler, Charles Duane, 5458A.
Buttmann, Oscar, 5761A.
Buttrill, Harlan Crawford, 6107A.
Cady, William Francis, 6183A.
Callaway, Richard Dowdy, 5917A.
Campion, Norman Woodrow, 6032A.
Cappucci, Joseph John, 5577A.
Carmack, John Edgar, 5928A.
Carney, John Franklin, 18070A.
Carney, John Kilker, 5703A.
Carpenter, Donald Charles, 5625A.
Carpenter, Neal Holton, 5596A.
Carr, Richard Pendleton, 5913A.
Carrithers, Judd McClelland, 5469A.
Carroll, James Vincent, 5581A.
×Carson, William James, 5788A.
Carver, Charles Frank, Jr., 6057A.
Cassell, Ernest Murray, Jr., 5462A.
Caulfield, Donald Brown, 5481A.
Cavender, Joe Judson, 5622A.
Chick, Lewis William, Jr., 5921A.
Chilcote, Charles Arthur, 5718A.
Clarke, Thomas Thurman, 6033A.
Coffey, John Donald, 6010A.
Cofield, Gene, 5597A.
Coleman, Harry Southside, Jr., 5633A.
Comer, Hubert Walker, 5436A.
Commons, Enos Larrance, Jr., 5663A.
Condon, Joseph Francis, 6103A.
Conkling, Emmett Virgil, 5688A.
Cooke, Gilbert Cady, 5385A.

Cope, William Samuel, 5684A.
Copeland, Lewis Anderson, 5826A.
Correll, Victor Crosby, 5653A.
Couch, Alexander Pritchard, 5918A.
Couch, Benjamin John, 6085A.
Cowan, Marion Glenn, 5873A.
Cowan, William Vincent, 5489A.
Cox, Robert Lewis, 5970A.
Craig, Joe Congdon, 5895A.
Cram, Reginald Maurice, 5812A.
Curtis, Jack Harry, 5592A.
Curtiss, Philip Hildreth, 5779A.
d'Acosta, Uriel Pereira, 5613A.
D'Annibale, Vincent James, 6004A.
Dalto, John, 5897A.
Dalton, Bernard Vincent, 5886A.
Dameron, Claiborne, 5547A.
Darnell, George William, 5369A.
Darnold, Charles Reese, 6008A.
Davey, Kenneth William, 5909A.
Davies, William Velasko, 5582A.
Davis, James Werner, 6059A.
Dawson, Harold Cleveland, 5612A.
Dawson, Van Brunt, 5396A.
Dean, David Kennedy, 5714A.
de Bourbon Condé, Bruce Alfonso, 5727A.
Decker, Robert Young, 5758A.
Del Missier, Bruno Carl, 5962A.
Dempsey, Jack Donald, 6030A.
×DesGeorges, Herbert Etienne, 5699A.
Desmond, Arthur Peter, 6179A.
Dewey, Willis Alonzo, 5658A.
Dice, Evan Adams, 5983A.
Dick, Robert Marcus, 5594A.
Dinsmore, Dwight Reginald, 5856A.
Disana, Joe Vincent, 5654A.
Dixon, Brendan, 5998A.
Dodds, William Clarence, 6157A.
×Dolezel, Edward Joseph, 5453A.
Dolph, Herbert Arden, 6170A.
Donohue, Elwood Paul, 5852A.
Dooley, Benedict James, 6176A.
Doornbos, Philip Ogden, 5757A.
Dorsey, Herbert Grove, Jr., 5532A.
Dougal, Robert Elliot, 5754A.
Driggs, Chase, 5535A.
Druhe, Hubert Kenneth, 5944A.
Dubose, Robert Lee, 5608A.
Duke, James Laran, 5511A.
Dunn, Hardie McKowen, Jr., 5412A.
×Durham, Benjamin Jasper, Jr., 5957A.
Durni, Fred Kenneth, 5531A.
Dutcher, Richard Fields, 6073A.
Duty, William Burkett, 5739A.
Dyer, Richard Willerton, 6151A.
Eckert, Jacob Clayton, 5643A.
×Edmisten, Herbert Wilbert, 6064A.
Edwards, Robert Bruce, 5687A.
Egerland, Arnold Victor, 5648A.
Eichholz, Jerome Charles, 5882A.
×Eichorn, John Dunn, 5578A.
Eisner, Friedrich, 6040A.
Eliasen, Arnold Clarence, 5770A.
Ellis, John Edward, Jr., 5456A.
Emery, Daniel Breen, 5382A.
Emmertz, Roger Nelson, 5602A.
Etter, Richard William, 5386A.
Evans, Philip Gordon, 6081A.
Evers, Vincent August, 5518A.
Ewing, Donald Edwin, 5981A.
Fallows, Albert Dunn, 5666A.
Fantone, James Earl, Jr., 5499A.
Farnell, William Robert, Jr., 6127A.
Fawcett, Willard Ellis, 6091A.
Finley, William H., 5755A.
Fisher, Philip Fitzgerald, 6028A.
Fiss, Robert Wendell, 5829A.
×Fornal, Joseph John, 5991A.
Forrest, Edward Lester, 5988A.
Forwood, William Garland, 5429A.
Foster, Gilbert, 5824A.
Foster, Herbert Moffatt, 5601A.
Foster, Ross Johnson, 5599A.
Fowell, Byron Ronald, 5834A.
Fox, John Edward, 5610A.
Frankel, Arthur Grover, Jr., 5423A.
Frantz, James Tilden, Jr., 5371A.
Freeman, Forbes Snow, 5369A.
Freeman, Lloyd Atmer, 5409A.
Fuller, George Alvin, 5398A.
Fulton, Gorden Roy, 5556A.
Gaddis, Albert Crawford, 5980A.
Gallagher, John Vincent, 5579A.
×Gammon, Wilson Campbell, 6102A.
Gardner, Laurence Ernest, 5974A.
Garland, Lloyd Hundley, Jr., 6147A.
Garrett, Skidmore Neale, 5915A.
Garrison, Eskelle Victor, 5709A.
Gaumond, Harry Joseph, Jr., 5881A.
Geanetos, George Stephen, 5950A.
Gentry, Allison Phy, 5391A.
George, Dominic John, 5438A.
George, John Louis, 5768A.
Gibson, William Herf, 5896A.
Giegel, John Stanley, 5374A.
Gill, John Edwards, 5660A.
×Gilmore, George Washington, Jr., 6062A.
Gilmore, John Thomas, 6016A.
Gire, Henry Lewis, 6156A.
Glaenzer, Charles F., 5707A.
Goetzke, Kenneth Herman, 5839A.
Goldenberg, Carl Theodor, 5394A.
Goodell, John Carleton, 5708A.
Goodmanson, Murel Matthew, 5681A.
Goodwin, Vaughn Kirk, 5801A.
Gordon, Michael Jacob, 5419A.
Gordon, William Price, Jr., 5771A.
Gosling, Kenneth Reginald, 5635A.
Gover, Leroy, 5819A.
Gowdey, Hodges Clarence, 5392A.
Graham, Edward, 6063A.
Graham, James Edward, 5604A.
Grashoff, William Henry, 5588A.
×Gravin, Irving Henry, 5626A.
Gravitt, Frank William, 6042A.
Gray, George Arnett, 5498A.
Gray, Richard Robert, Jr., 5406A.
Gray, Russell Earl, 5726A.
Green, Franklyn Thomas, 5925A.
Greene, Benjamin Olin, Jr., 5866A.
Greene, Russell John, 6060A.
×Greer, Robert William, Jr., 5472A.
Gregg, William Eugene, 6130A.
Griffin, Charles Webster, 5630A.
Griffin, Harry Norvall, 5894A.
Griffin, Julious Columbus, 5733A.
Grimm, Charles Burton, 6027A.
Grimmar, Philip William, 6041A.
Gromak, Anthony Edward, 5713A.
Grove, James Chisholm, 6149A.
Guerin, Bernard Peter, 5435A.
Gullette, Jesse Marcellus, 6173A.
×Gunter, George Cleveland, Jr., 5467A.
×Gwinn, John Wesley, Sr., 6072A.
Hajek, Raymond Rowland, 5973A.
Halfman, Rollie Joseph, 5491A.
Hall, Charles Edward, 5911A.
Hallam, Louis Carlyle, 5704A.
Hamill, Estil Lee, 5474A.
Hammer, Wendell Austin, 5523A.
Hancock, John Albert, 5377A.
Hansen, Robert Peter, 5677A.
Harlow, Paul Norman, 5816A.
Harrell, William Hasel, 6031A.
Harrington, George Elliott, 5948A.
Harrington, John Daniel, 6139A.
Harris, Riley Wickliffe, 5537A.
Harris, Schuyler Spottswood, 6135A.
Hartbrodt, Frederick Alexander Vincent, 5842A.
Hartless, William Elbert, 6066A.
Hastey, Raymond Lester, 5640A.
Haun, James Robert, 5415A.
Hays, John Bennett, 5756A.
Heald, Edgar Henry, 6048A.
Hedrick, Wyatt Smith, 6124A.
Heene, Fred Lewis, 5954A.
Helfort, Albert Francis, 5959A.
Henderson, William Dalton, 6167A.
Hennessy, Robert John, 5907A.
Hensch, Edward Konken, 5433A.
Hensley, Joseph Woodrow, 5719A.
Henss, Arthur Charles, Jr., 6141A.
Heran, Paul James, 6018A.
Hertzler, John Garman, 5566A.
Hibbits, Francis Leonard, 5705A.
Hickman, David Elwyn, Jr., 6036A.
Higginbotham, Raymond, 5461A.
×Hilderbrand, George Paine, 5495A.
Hill, Albert Ray, 6082A.
Hill, Jesse Gorham, 5664A.
Hiller, Martin William, 5611A.
Hillery, Edward Gerald, 5691A.
Hilley, William Allen, 5675A.
Hills, Kenneth Bruce, 5680A.
Hobbs, Gregory James, 6133A.
Hogg, Robert, 5701A.
Hoglund, Glen Arnold, 5457A.
Hohs, Robert Leo, 5697A.
Holden, Paul Cole, 5682A.
Hollier, Frederick Frank, Jr., 5937A.
Holmes, Merrill Dennis, 5751A.
Holmes, Robert Greenwood, 6051A.
Hoover, Edward Daniel, Jr., 5570A.
Horvath, John, 5828A.
Hounshell, Claude Eugene, 5994A.
Howell Edwin Shelton, 5425A.
×Hower, Henry Haines, 5405A.
Howland, Clark Boyden, 5774A.
Hubbard, Raymond Marvin, 5586A.
Hudson, John Henry, 5878A.
Huffaker, Kenneth Ellsworth, 6090A.
Hughes, Robert Calvin, 5564A.
Hull, James Jacob, 6050A.
Hunt, Edward Herman, 5628A.
Hunt, Gilbert Wayne, 6088A.
Hunt, Robert Fletcher, Jr., 5676A.
×Hunter, Russell Bruce, 5750A.
Hunter, William Campbell, 5650A.
Hurd, Harlan Francis, 6035A.
Hurd, Richard Perkins, 5524A.
Hurley, Edward Phillip, 6096A.
Huston, Sherman Leroy, 5968A.
Hutto, Earl Barry, 5450A.
Irvine, David Raymond, 5505A.
James, Newton Elder, 5854A.
Jarcho, Louis Morton, 5574A.
Jenkins, Leaton Elbert, 5749A.
Jensen, Ralph Soren, 5793A.
Johnson, Arnold Rudolph, 6089A.
Johnson, Darwin Allen, 6038A.
Johnson, Donald Walter, 5410A.
Johnson, George Hill, 2d, 5520A.
Johnson, Howard, 6093A.
Johnston, Warren Montgomery, 6039A.
Johnston, William Edward, 5717A.
Joiner, Reese William, 6084A.
×Jones, Allen Newton, Jr., 5862A.
Jones, George Robbins, 5876A.
Jordan, Ralph Schaffer, 5879A.
Joseph, Franklin Arthur, 5947A.
Joy, Wilbur Rolland, 5441A.
Kage, Gordon Dayton, 5478A.
×Kandel, Edward Robert, 5647A.
Kappeler, Frank Albert, 5747A.
Kay, Charles Woodford, 5609A.
Kay, Kenneth Edmond, 6121A.
×Keesling, James Clarence, Jr., 5437A.
Kehrer, Kenneth, 5908A.
Kellams, Clinton Moore, 6155A.
Kelley, Charles Williams, 5383A.
Kelley, George Thomas, 5554A.
Kellum, George Glenn, Jr., 5799A.
Kerner, Robert Francis, 5838A.
×Kingston, Jarvis Rowland, 5519A.
Kirkpatrick, Marshall Armine, 5891A.
Kluever, Arnold Frederick Adolph, 5922A.
Knoll, Jasper George, 6168A.
Knouse, Lloyd Berton, 5565A.
Knowles, Kenyon Leroy, 6025A.
Koby, Francis Robert, 5473A.
Koenig, Perier Arnold, 5738A.
Kogan, Edward Mart, 5483A.
Kolpin, Shirley Andrew, 6071A.
Konopacki, Hubert John, 5923A.
Koontz, Thomas Gale, 5992A.
Lacombe, Raymond Joseph, 6128A.
Lamback, Charles Hett, 6123A.
×Langford, Karl Albert, 6007A.
Langley, Samuel Firth, 5614A.
Larson, Edwin Cecil, 5808A.
Lash, Robert Louis, 5580A.
Leavitt, William Job, 5764A.
Leclaire, Wilfred Brassard, 5514A.
Lee, Donald Edgar, 6182A.
Leet, Jonathan, 5902A.
Leverette, William Lawrence, 5685A.
Levi, James Cobb, 5521A.
Lewis, Dwight Francis, 5624A.
Lewis, Samuel Henry, 5835A.
Leyendecker, Max Thomas, 5515A.
Lichter, Carl Jerome, 5817A.
Lind, Harold August, 6012A.

Lindenmeyer, John Henry, 6152A.
Lindhard, Povl Verner, 5526A.
Lisecki, John Richard, 6143A.
Liston, Walter Fillmore, 6053A.
Lock, Raymond Harold, 5527A.
Lockman, Daniel Barkley, 5765A.
Longino, Dick Randolph, Jr., 5864A.
Lovette, James Kimble, 6068A.
Loving, Lee Wall, 6067A.
Lucas, George Garland, 6136A.
Luck, Ellis Chester, 5616A.
Lulejian, Norair Melkon, 5589A.
Lund, Theodore Karl, 5651A.
Lundak, Edward Everett, 6105A.
Lyons, Charles Maxwell, 5836A.
Maas, Charles Fundin, 5936A.
MacTaggart, Irving Paul, 6104A.
Magee, Ernest Maurice, 6006A.
Magrath, Joseph Stephen, Jr., 5443A.
×Mahan, Fulton Samuel Duval, 5538A.
Mann, Edward Milton, 5796A.
Manning, Melvin Andrew, 5486A.
Manthos, Atlee George, 5906A.
Markovich, George Michael, 5843A.
Marks, Russell Herbert, 6000A.
Marston, Glenn Fredrick, 5459A.
Marthens, George Walker, 5621A.
×Mason, Arthur Livingston, 5407A.
×Mathews, Francis Joseph, 5387A.
Matthews, Edward Everett, 5901A.
Mattison, Robert Martin, 5877A.
Mattison, William Theodious, 5982A.
Mattoon, Ernest Ray, 5497A.
Mauldin, Osberne C., 5534A.
Mayberry, Samuel Waller, Jr., 5716A.
McBee, Shannon Cleo, 5587A.
McCarthy, John Francis, Jr., 5904A.
McCash, Donald Kendall, 5892A.
McCaskill, Bernard Laspeyre, Jr., 5490A.
McCauley, Clarence Vernon, 5920A.
McCombs, Harold Kelly, 5725A.
McComsey, Robert Marvin, 5884A.
McCracken, Dwight Henry, 5492A.
McCracken, Rufus Leroy, 5813A.
McDavid, Andrew Eugene, 6114A.
McDonald, Claud Wayne, 5659A.
McDouall, Bradford Houghton, 5645A.
McElroy, Edgar Earl, 5475A.
McFatridge, James Morgan, 6029A.
McGarry, James Michael, Jr., 5976A.
McGibeny, Arthur David, 5623A.
×McGinnis, Paul Benedict, 6019A.
×McIlroy, James Garfield, Jr., 5975A.
McIntire, Ralph Oliver, 5939A.
McNally, Joseph Edward, 5971A.
×Mellinger, Robert Thomas, 5706A.
Mellor, Alfred Lionel, 5743A.
Merritt, Willard Earl, 5529A.
Michael, Pierce Baynard, 5632A.
×Micka, Louis Joseph, Jr., 5576A.
Miles, George William, 6131A.
Miller, Sidney Leonard, 6094A.
Miller, Thomas Aldred, 5797A.
Miller, Walter Frederick, 5885A.
Milliff, John, 19652A.
Mills, Eugene Spencer, Jr., 5762A.
Minahan, John Carroll, 5832A.
Mixon, Carmel Astor, 6116A.
Moist, Robert Elrose, 5678A.
Montgomery, Guilford Roland, 5919A.
Moore, John Alton, 5951A.
Moquin, Wilfrid Vincent, 5378A.
Moran, Frederick Andrew, 5561A.
Moran, John Patrick, 5431A.
Moritz, Gene Phillip, 5941A.
Morris, Robert John, 6162A.
Morrison, Cleo Elwin, 5476A.
Morrison, Harry James, 5767A.
Mosman, Ormond John, 5916A.
Motyl, James Dimitri, 5551A.
Mulholland, Howard, 5568A.
Mullen, Peter Vincent, 5867A.
Murphy, Paul Cashman, 6140A.
×Myers, Earle Russell, 5746A.
Myers, Lawrence Talbot, 5672A.
Myers, Robert Martin, 5381A.
Myszewski, Chester Frank, 5513A.
Nall, Harrold Edward, 5424A.
Neely, Russell Wayne, 5984A.
Neighbors, Lloyd Wash, 6125A.
Nelson, Carl George, 5504A.
Nettles, Jesse Eugene, 5656A.
Newton, Everette Charles, 6061A.
Nichols, Thomas Brooks, 6015A.
Nickels, Loren Smith, 5777A.
Nied, George John, 5593A.
Nixon, Perry Edward, 5572A.
Njus, Olav, 6083A.
Norcia, Benjamin, 5694A.
Norman, William Roy, 5732A.
Nothstein, Charles Lewis, 5933A.
Nudell, Fred Wellington, 5711A.
Nyblade, Walter Frederick, 5815A.
O'Brien, Frank Edwin, 6054A.
O'Brien, Raymond Ransom, 5583A.
×O'Bryan, Joseph Earl, 5540A.
O'Neale, Malcolm Lindsay, Jr., 6065A.
O'Neil, Raymond Francis, 5605A.
O'Neill, James Leo, 6158A.
Oliver, Robert Russell, 5967A.
Olmsted, Charles Thaddeus, 5927A.
Owens, Harris Richard, 6098A.
Pardee, Elliott Thomas, 5926A.
Parkins, William Howard, 5629A.
Parks, Gordon Thomas, 5439A.
Parr, Albert Thomas, 5772A.
Patton, Joe Robert, 5571A.
Patty, Homer Emmitt, 18102A.
Payne, Carroll Herndon, 6056A.
Payne, Roger Barton, 5493A.
Payton, Theodore Franklin, 5961A.
Peake, William Kilbourne, 5590A.
Pedersen, Carl Emil, 5789A.
Perkins, Willie Howard, 6100A.
Perry, Edward Lloyd, Jr., 5448A.
Perry, Horace Edward, 5871A.
Persky, Jacob, 5567A.
Peters, Bernard, 5573A.
×Peterson, Lyle Everett, 5853A.
×Pettit, Weldon Monroe, 5695A.
Phillips, John Thomas, 6179A.
Pike, Robert Francis, 6009A.
Pittman, Bernard Merrill, 5823A.
Plate, Stanley William, 6171A.
Pollock, Keith Kermit, 5841A.
Powell, Joseph Harllee, 5940A.
Pozerycki, John Joseph, Jr., 6178A.
Prewitt, Jack Kenneth, 5890A.
Price, James Albert, 5372A.
Pryor, Charles Donald, 5736A.
Pucilowski, George Andrew, 6037A.
Purcell, Charles Jacobs, 5849A.
Query, Jack DeWitt, 5868A.
Quillman, Earl William, 6154A.
×Quin, Harold Joseph, 5482A.
Quinlan, Francis Emmet, 5671A.
Raaz, Dean John, 6049A.
Rafay, Stephen, 5411A.
Raley, Claude Mason, 5787A.
Ranck, Nathan Hoover, 5935A.
Rauen, Robert L., 5373A.
Ray, Robert Homer, 5698A.
Reece, Robert Carl, 6180A.
×Reeves, Elmo, 5723A.
Reeves, Ernest Arthur, 5935A.
Reichert, Earl Theodore, 6070A.
×Reising, Albert John, 5735A.
Renshaw, Donald Earl, 5503A.
Rethke, William Henry, 5539A.
Reynolds, Douglas Hanford, 5466A.
Rhode, John Edward, 5446A.
Richardson, Paul Ames, 6160A.
Richman, Charles Phillip, 5426A.
Rigney, Charles Edward, 5734A.
×Riley, Joseph Richmond, 5811A.
Rinn, Frank Burton, 6109A.
×Riordan, Leonard Daniel, 5557A.
Ritter, Robert Joseph, 5384A.
Robbins, Carl William, Jr., 6055A.
Roberts, Gore Fredericks, 5759A.
Rodzankas, John Frank, 6044A.
Rosno, Raymond Joseph, 5674A.
Ross, John Samuel, 5782A.
Rotkis, Walter Anton, 5883A.
Rowan, M. C., Jr., 5993A.
Royal, Benjamin Ellis, 5375A.
Ruby, Ishmael Elmo, 6184A.
Rush, Donald Wesley, 5655A.
×Ryan, Frank LeRoy, 5506A.
Ryker, Frederick Arthur, 18096A.
Salisbury, George Robert, 5946A.
Salome, Richard Arlan, 5889A.
Sanders, Roger Lowell, 6169A.
Sansone, Rocco, 5953A.
×Sawhill, Edgar Lewis, 5560A.
Sawrie, William Ernest, 5855A.
Schaffner, William Joseph, 5996A.
Schmidt, John Max, 6046A.
Schmidt, Nathan Guelzow, 19653A.
Schrader, Lawrence Wilford, 6113A.
Schudel, Charles Richard, 5833A.
×Schwandt, Harold Albert, 5388A.
Schweitzer, John Henry, 5814A.
Scruggs, John Alexander, 5702A.
Sellers, Coleman, 6045A.
Shaka, Napoleon Athan, 6013A.
Shanklin, William Frank, 6120A.
Shaw, Donald Adrian, 5783A.
Shealy, William Thomas, 5662A.
Shepperd, Virgil Earl, 6002A.
Sherborne, Henry Hall, 5803A.
Shewbart, William Monroe, 5627A.
Shinnamon, Charles Wesley, 6097A.
Shipe, Fredrick William, 5401A.
Shreve, Taylor Staats, 5355A.
Simmons, Joe Linn, 5880A.
Sinex, Charles Helm, Jr., 5667A.
Singleton, Emmett Foye, 5444A.
Skinner, Paul McDonald, 6134A.
Slough, Andrew Elmer, 5741A.
×Smith, Clark Jackson, 5542A.
Smith, Clyde Harrison, 5763A.
Smith, David Gage, 5460A.
Smith, Don Ansel, 5638A.
Smith, Frank Malone, 5494A.
Smith, Leland Prather, 5422A.
Smith, Lynn Powers, 5509A.
Smith, Reet Poe, 6118A.
Smith, Robert Channell, 5978A.
Smith, Rodney Ellsworth, 5995A.
Smith, Vernon Arthur, 5715A.
Smith, Vincent Edgar, 5619A.
Smoot, Oliver Reed, 6117A.
Spees, Everett Kencheon, 5420A.
×Spieth, Robert, 5806A.
Spooner, Julius Leonard, 5649A.
Spurrell, William Alfred, 6150A.
Stachura, Walter, 5530A.
×Stampados, Demetrius George, 5479A.
Staskewitz, Benjamin Edward, 5712A.
Stattler, Cornelius James, Jr., 5379A.
Steele, William, 5669A.
Stephens, Elmer Shand, 5449A.
×Stevens, John Lurae, 5636A.
Stiglich, John Jack, 5748A.
Stitt, Glenn Theodore, 5958A.
Stockett, John Clifton, Jr., 6087A.
×Stompler, Russell, 5288A.
Stratton, Max Millard, 5452A.
Strieber, Edward Miles, 5447A.
Strom, Charles Walter, 5986A.
Stuart, John Montgomery, Jr., 5893A.
Sturges, Claude C., Jr., 5929A.
Sturgis, James Edwin, 5769A.
Sullivan, Daniel Francis, 5844A.
Sullivan, Frederick Edward, 5830A.
Sulloway, Alexander Mark, 5955A.
Summers, Clarence Eugene, Jr., 5899A.
Sun, Jack Klotz, 6126A.
Suttle, Dale Davenport, 5584A.
Sutton, John Liggitt, 5729A.
Swanson, Arthur Robert, 5432A.
Swanson, Charles Kenneth, 5752A.
Swanson, Clyde William, 5528A.
Taylor, Ben, 5964A.
Taylor, Thomas Edward, 5690A.
Taylor, William Vaughn, 5875A.
Tebbs, Jim Reid, 5607A.
Tennis, Langdon Carlyle, 6145A.
Therrien, Patrick Elogius, 5780A.
Thiele, Harold Edwin, 5809A.
Thomas, Clarence Lamar, 5822A.
Thomas, George Oscar, 5552A.
Thompson, Dillard Norman, 5804A.
Thornton, Julian Roy, Jr., 5942A.
Thornton, Raymond Allen, 5545A.
Thrash, Joe Merriwether, Jr., 5644A.
Tigner, Edwin Brown, 5745A.
Tillery, James Hightower, 5979A.
Timmons, Herschel Marvin, 6110A.

Toolin, Brendan Emmett, 5512A.
Townsend, Barry Baldwin, 6847A.
Toye, Edward Eugene, 5792A.
Trenkle, Robert Anthony, 6181A.
Tribble, Randolph Lewis, 6011A.
Trojanowski, Maurice John, 5673A.
True, Oscar Harold, 5869A.
Truesdell, Ebin Trantham, 5487A.
×Tunks, Emerson Ambrose Anthony, 6014A.
Turner, Billy Markley, 6026A.
Turner, Egbert Snyder, Jr., 6122A.
×Turner, Howard Edwin, 5390A.
Uhrig, Robert A., 6021A.
Upchurch, Terrell Martin, 6101A.
Updike, Perry Collier, 5434A.
Urbach, Leonard Henry, 5874A.
Utley, William Andrew, 6047A.
Van Buskirk, Arthur Brown, 5595A.
×Van Wagoner, Robert Norton, 6146A.
Vann, James Oliver, 5500A.
Vaughan, Francis Lyle, 5367A.
Vaughan, Clare Ray, 5888A.
Verbeek, Harry Peter, 5786A.
Vestal, Waymoth Delmar, 5569A.
Vickers, Roth Edward, 5861A.
Vickery, Benjamin Patterson, Jr., 5857A.
Voss, Nathaniel Reid, Jr., 5898A.
Wagner, Edward John, 5558A.
Walker, Roy Ralph, 5846A.
Walker, Templeton S., 6148A.
Walker, Walter Bertram, Jr., 6111A.
Walker, William Jennings, 6177A.
Wallace, James Hampton, 5516A.
Walrod, Harold Henry, 5525A.
Walsh, Michael Joseph, 5689A.
Walters, Joseph Carl, 5408A.
Wansley, Theodore, 5784A.
Ward, P. J., 6138A.
Ware, William, 5668A.
Warren, John Edgar, 5912A.
Watkins, Guy Leroy, 5454A.
Watts, John Reuben, 5943A.
Watwood, Louis V., 6024A.
Wayshak, Abraham Edward, 5575A.
Weaver, Frederick, 5820A.
Weber, Robert Herman, 5536A.
Weikel, Paul Wilson, 5742A.
Welch, Robert Newman, 5442A.
West, Robert Willard, 6164A.
Westwood, John Raymond, 5821A.
White, Richard Durwin, 5728A.
White, Warren Mason, 5465A.
Whitenack, George Minor 3d, 6075A.
Whittle, Frederick James, 5840A.
Wiesner, Paul Francis, 6076A.
Wildinger, Joseph Valentine, 6022A.
Williams, Carl Felton, 5818A.
Williams, Donald Grant, 5679A.
Williams, James Willis, 6020A.
Williams, Leslie Benjamin, 5949A.
Willis, Donald Kenyon, 5402A.
Wilson, Charles Smith, 5952A.
Wilson, Frederick William Hildebrand, 5865A.
Wilson, John McLain, 5997A.
×Wilson, Lewis Barron, 5470A.
Wilson, Walter George, 5710A.
Wolcott, John Payne, 5598A.
Wolf, Harold Clair, 5380A.
Wolf, John Joseph, 5870A.
Wolfsohn, Robert Soloman, 5440A.
Wood, Joseph Thomas, Jr., 6137A.
Wood, Thomas Donnelley, 5798A.
Woods, Everett Newton, 5969A.
Woods, James Russell, 6080A.
Woolever, Marshall Edwin, 5445A.
Works, Le Eustis, 5960A.
Wright, Lewis Walter, 5670A.
Wyatt, Harold Erskine, 5807A.
Wyatt, William Henry, 6069A.
Yates, Joel Hume, 5397A.
Youngblood, Curtis Noland, 5903A.
Youngman, Reginald Bunker, 5760A.
×Zeller, Winn Fredrik, 5451A.
Zitar, Edward Robert, 6174A.

MEDICAL

Danbridge, William Shelton, 19238A.
Ellingson, Harold Victor, 19235A.
Frediani, Alexander William, 19236A.
Johnston, Maurice Blair, 19232A.
Kennett, Donald Michael, 19228A.
McCall, Robert Alfred, 19233A.
McFall, Voris Francis, 19234A.
Nuttall, James Baker, 19239A.
Perri, Frank Adrian, 19230A.
Schaeffer, Joseph Negley, 19237A.
Twichell, Gilbert Alfred, 19231A.
Wright, Paul Eugene, 19229A.

DENTAL

Gibson, Joseph Robert, 18912A.
Hester, Warren Reid, 18919A.
Johnson, Franklin Andrew, 18917A.
Kartman, Jules David, 18918A.
Kephart, Norbert Corbin, 18914A.
Miller, Ernest Leroy, 18915A.
Morgan, Bernard Barker, 18910A.
Schulte, George Nicholas, 18913A.
×Zuber, Jack M., 18911A.

VETERINARY

Clark, Marley Charles, 18984A.
Scott, Rolland Orno, 18985A.
Snodgrass, William Birchard, 18983A.

MEDICAL SERVICE

Baer, Reuben Albert, 19428A.
Bovee, Clifton Willard, 19459A.
Clark, Robert Emory, 19430A.
Currier, Clyde Charles, 19432A.
Doyle, James Michael, 19425A.
Hurd, Earl Keith, 19460A.
Killian, Frank, Jr., 19433A.
Miller, Rahe August, 19429A.
×Moore, James Henry, 19424A.
×Runyon, Merlyn Walker, 19427A.
Shutt, William Franklin, Jr., 19426A.
Stine, Robert Christian, 19423A.

To be captains with rank from December 21, 1949

MEDICAL

Aiken, David Wyatt, 19341A.
Barry, Francis Edward, 19350A.
Brezina, Edward Sharp, 19337A.
Chancey, Robert Lee, 19333A.
Class, Robert Nelson, 19662A.
Coffey, John Joseph, 19349A.
Culver, Warren Tuttle, 19346A.
Dugan, Charles Clark, 19592A.
Giffen, Martin Brener, 19319A.
Hansen, Carl Ludwig, Jr., 19353A.
Harten, James Nash, 19321A.
Hood, Oliver Clough, 19325A.
Kellsey, David Canfield, 19348A.
Ketring, Eldon Grant, 19347A.
Kollar, Edward Joseph, 19344A.
Marsh, Frank Fontaine, 19328A.
Mays, Oliver Aiken, 19332A.
Mebane, John Cummins, 19336A.
Midgley, Elwin Wilmer, 19354A.
Misch, Harry James, 19322A.
Moore, Alfred Erwin, 19343A.
Moorehead, Si Fried, Jr., 19342A.
Mullins, Robert Bruce, 19350A.
Nauert, Nicholas Henry, Jr., 19606A.
O'Grady, Thomas Mathew, 19329A.
Osborne, Horace Henry, 19605A.
Osetinsky, Venedict Michaelovich, 19334A.
Peat, Alexander Cranston, 19324A.
Plowright, Thomas Rider, 19339A.
Quinnell, Robert Kay, 19323A.
Randel, Hugh Wayne, 19357A.
Rosen, Irwin Elwood, 19326A.
Schafer, George Ezra, 19345A.
Schear, Evan Weible, 19352A.
Shirer, Ralph Francis, Jr., 19351A.
Simons, David Goodman, 19331A.
Thomason, Edgar Maurice, 19340A.
Van Vranken, Eugene Edward, 19356A.
Westbrook, William Hudson, 19327A.
Wiedershine, Leonard Jack, 19355A.
Wimberley, Norris Adron, Jr., 19338A.
Wright, Thomas Clinton, 19320A.
Zec, Branko Kosta, 19335A.

MEDICAL SERVICE

Burke, Charles Samuel, 19514A.
Carter, Russell Joseph, 19515A.
Cooper, Nathan, 19521A.
Deverick, Theodore Roosevelt, 19513A.
Henry, James Edgar, 19517A.
Hill, Leonard D., 19516A.
McGovern, John Joseph, 19519A.
×Morden, Harold Ross, 19510A.
Morgan, Floyd Edward, Jr., 19512A.
Schwartz, Seymour, 19518A.
Sterzinger, Morris Matthew, 19594A.
Washburn, Robert Ernest, 19511A.
Willett, Joseph Earl, 19520A.

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947. All officers have been found professionally qualified as required by law. The officer whose name is preceded by the symbol (×) is subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from December 21, 1949

AIR FORCE NURSES

Boswell, Monta Rey, AN43.
Elsner, Bertha, AN542.

To be majors with rank from December 21, 1949

AIR FORCE NURSES

Hogan, Rosemary, AN574.
Kehoe, Doris Angela, AN115.
Kowaleski, S. Margaret, AN138.
Wimberly, Edith Marie, AN130.

WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALISTS

×Lawrence, Dorthea Mable, AM10005.
Underkofler, Audrey Agnes, AM10037.

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of section 306 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 and section 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. The other officer has been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be first lieutenants

WOMEN'S AIR FORCE

Fox, Victoria Elizabeth, AL80115, with rank from October 22, 1948.
×Humm, Katherine Anna, AL80116, with rank from August 18, 1948.
×Knapik, Delores Marie, AL80258, with rank from December 20, 1949.

NOTE.—All officers named on this nomination received recess promotions during the recess of the Senate.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be major

CHAPLAINS

Powers, William Edward, 18760A.

To be captains

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Abbott, Elmond Hoyet, 12709A.
Abbott, Fred Eugene, 12959A.
×Abbott, Woodrow Acton, 12763A.
Adams, Gail John, 12622A.
Adams, James Addison, 12893A.
Alagna, Antonito Frank, 12585A.
Allen, Donald Wellington, 12715A.
Allen, Frank Wynter, 12972A.
Anderson, Edgar Harold, Jr., 12752A.
Anderson, James Ellis, 12562A.
Anderson, John Burton, 12964A.
Andrew, James Ward, 12795A.
Annis, Ross Evered, Jr., 12669A.
Apgar, Paul Donald, 12832A.
Arey, Warren Fredrick, 13029A.
Armijo, Joseph Fernand, 12534A.
Armstead, Seth Abraham, Jr., 12947A.
Armstrong, George Valentine, Jr., 13002A.
Arneson, Kenneth Lincoln, 12992A.
Ascherfeld, Karl Cousins, Jr., 12936A.

Ashworth, Kenton Lee, 12536A.
Austin, Paul Felder, 12691A.
Bach, John Verdell, 12953A.
Bailey, Gordon Anderson, 12918A.
Bailey, Lawrence Oscar, 12640A.
Bailie, Irwin Levi, 12937A.
Bales, Jack Truitt, 13086A.
Bare, Harold Francis, 12841A.
Barnidge, William Hall, 12915A.
Barton, Roger Darl, 12904A.
Beales, John McReynolds, 12988A.
Beck, Howard George, 13020A.
Beck, Joseph Pershing, 12578A.
Beeson, Jack Toll, 12778A.
Beighley, Joe Willard, 12977A.
Belk, Claudius Earle, 12692A.
Bell, John Arnold, 12627A.
Bellows, Clyde Lee, 13088A.
Benedict, Paul Miller, 12874A.
Bennett, Walter Donald, 12563A.
Bennett, Walter Wilson, 12942A.
Bergstrom, John Arthur, 12994A.
Berry, John Morrison, 12561A.
Bevard, Franklin Blake, 13041A.
Beveridge, Andrew Lowman 12781A.
Bigum, Alfred Clark, 12796A
Black, Jim, 12717A.
Black, William Talbott, Jr., 12744A.
Blomgren, Norman Edwin, 12580A.
Boaz, Reynolds Ollie, 13024A.
Bogard, Lawrence Miller, 12550A.
Bohart, Chester Herbert, 13091A.
Bollinger, George Wayne, 12544A.
Bormann, Frederick Eugene, 12842A.
Bowman, Joseph Wisler, 12733A.
Bowry, Donald Wesson, 12620A.
Boyd, Robert Richardson, 13075A.
Bradshaw, Morris Harold, 13105A.
Bregar, Adolph Joseph, 12611A.
Britt, Daniel Turner, Jr., 13061A.
Brooks, James Bruce, 12742A.
Brooks, William Clifford, Jr., 12663A.
Brown, Robert Curtis, 12961A.
Buffenbarger, Harold Lee, 12724A.
×Bujol, George Warren, 12660A.
Burke, John Francis, 12997A.
Byrne, James Fredrick, 12662A.
Canny, Robert William, 12700A.
Carey, Constantine George, 12767A.
Carey, George Francis, Jr., 13104A.
Carmack, Harold Horton, 12998A.
Carpenter, Claude S., 13054A.
Carpenter, Dustin Edward, 12974A.
Carter, Frank Maynard, Jr., 12815A.
Carter, James Barney, 12743A.
Caudill, Orley Brandt, 13074A.
×Cavanaugh, William Daniel, 12938A.
Chandley, Sherley Sevier, 12775A.
Chapman, George Wesley, 12809A.
Charbonneaux, Dorwin Douglas, 12731A.
Chavez, Manuel Jose, Jr., 12828A.
Cheatham, Richard Blake, 12777A.
Cherry, Clyde Stephen, 12952A.
Chesser, Alvin James, 12996A.
Christian, Clarence Duane, 12917A.
Churchville, Louis Joseph, 12635A.
Cichy, George Edward, 12629A.
Clark, Robert Samuel, 12565A.
Clark, Waymon D., 12749A.
Clark, Wayne Elmus, 12783A.
Clarke, Donald Leon, 12531A.
Claunch, John Gary, 12604A.
Cleaveland, Arthur Bernard, 12650A.
Clements, Lawson Woodrow, 12707A.
Clifford, Raymond Verl, 12564A.
Cloud, Carl Everett, 12780A.
Cobb, James William, 12615A.
Coble, Walter Monroe, 12979A.
Cole, Henry Ward, 12672A.
×Collier, Francis Bernard, 12689A.
Collier, Robert Edward, 12770A.
Combs, Edward Emmerson, 12769A.
Conway, Thomas Herbert, 12559A.
Cooper, Harold Myron, 12894A.
Corn, Cecil Paul, 13016A.
Coursey, Robert Joseph, 12971A.
Cox, Samuel Jack, Jr., 12960A.
Crandall, Edmund Billings, 12642A.
Crone, Douglas Arthur, 13072A.
Cummings, Jesse Milburn, 12908A.
Darby, Wilbur Smith, 12895A.
Davis, George Andrew, Jr., 13035A.
Davis, Murrit Herman, 12729A.
Dawson, Albert Eugene, 12757A.
×Dean, Frederick Funston, 12552A.
Dean, Preston Minor, 12703A.
Dean, Robert Murry, 12533A.
DeGroat, Russell Ellsworth, 13064A.
DeLoughary, Robert David, 12939A.
Deutsch, Ainsley, 12643A.
Dietrich, Leroy Schantz, 12785A.
Dobson, Robert Eugene, 12680A.
Donnelly, James Edward, Jr., 12914A.
Dover, Joseph Harrison, 12850A.
Duke, Robert Harold, 12739A.
Dunn, Donald Wayne, 12879A.
Dyas, David Dean, 12340A.
Edwards, Elmer Thomas, Jr., 12613A.
×Eichman, Edward Aloysius, Jr., 12571A.
Eiser, John Leigh, 12889A.
Elrod, Erwin Brice, 12607A.
Emerson, Jack Gorman, 12697A.
Enders, Orville Edward, 12826A.
×Epperson, George Marion, 12574A.
Erdman, John Muttart, 12800A.
Erickson, Arthur, 12528A.
Erickson, Orin Horgan, 12772A.
Fahringer, Frederick Harrison, 12645A.
Festini, Steve Joseph, 13030A.
Fikes, Charles Wilson, 12791A.
×Finnerty, William Joseph, 12957A.
Fisher, Earl, Jr., 12833A.
Fisher, Roger Louis, 12861A.
Fisher, Thurman Danton, 12836A.
Fitschen, Iver Clarence, 12712A.
Fortin, Floyd Francis, 12954A.
Freas, Luther Wayne, 12821A.
Frederick, Paul Alphonse 3d, 13062A.
French, George Edward, Jr., 13063A.
Friedrich, Walter Rudolph, 12589A.
Fristoe, James Poor, 12887A.
Fritsch, Edward Martin, 12790A.
Frobom, Leo, 12664A.
Furey, Francis Joseph, 12843A.
×Gallerani, Alterio, 12746A.
Garvin, Louis Allen, 12676A.
Gentry, James Elbert, 12706A.
George, Mario Frank, 13093A.
Gerdes, Donald Richard, 12834A.
Gettelfinger, Robert Jerome, 13066A.
Gibbons, Russell McCullough, 12747A.
Gibson, Marion Barnett, 12695A.
Glasgow, Charles Glenn, 12847A.
Godbey, Donald Edward, 12705A.
Gorder, Robert Alexander, 12628A.
Grabowski, Francis Theodore, 13101A.
Gradel, George Anthony, 12991A.
Gray, David Fletcher, 12678A.
Green, Joseph, 12921A.
Green, Robert Vestry, 12967A.
Greene, Clarence Raymond, 12745A.
Greer, Edwin Harry, 12540A.
Grey, Walter Forrest, 12995A.
Griffin, Ralph Oliver, 12648A.
×Grosse, William Richard, 12768A.
Grottle, George Tibor, 12776A.
Grubb, Royal Harwood, 12835A.
Guerrein, Carl Joseph, 12716A.
Hague, Owen Earl, 12558A.
Haggerty, Frank Richard, 13058A.
Hall, Edwin Thomas, 12670A.
Halliday, Robert Wallace, 13098A.
Halpin, Edward Vincent, 12940A.
Hamilton, Julian Wyatt, 12602A.
Hamilton, Richard Louis, 13042A.
Handy, Paul, 13031A.
Hanner, Charles Kirkman, Jr., 13079A.
×Hansen, Paul Herman, 12665A.
Harbula, Edward Albert, 12902A.
Hardin, Neal Harris, Jr., 12687A.
Hargett, Joe Thurman, 13018A.
Harris, Robert Wilson, 12704A.
Harris, Willie Marvin, 12907A.
Helms, Willard Bryce, 12949A.
Henley, Robert Max, 13033A.
Herold, Joseph Victor, 12631A.
Heslep, Alvin Ray, 12931A.
×Hester, James Alexander, 12625A.
Hicks, Lindsey, 12573A.
Hill, John Francis, 13077A.
Hobbs, Harold Widenhouse, 12609A.
Hodges, Millard Upton, 13025A.
Hodkins, Chester Allen, 12932A.
Hogan, Miller E., 12993A.
Holley, Roy Lamar, 12773A.
Hollingsworth, James Spencer, Jr., 12551A.
Holt, Charles Asbury, 3d, 12849A.
Horn, John David, 12714A.
Horrigan, Robert James, 13071A.
Horton, Jack O'Quin, 13012A.
Horton, William Joseph, 13107A.
Hotard, Ernest Lee, 13007A.
Howell, James Robert, 12933A.
Hughes, John Francis, 12766A.
Hughes, Robert Lee, 12944A.
Hughes, William, 12554A.
Hundley, Everett Lee, 12686A.
Hyland, Edward John, 12538A.
Irvin, Frank Ward, Jr., 12934A.
Jackson, Earl E., Jr., 13040A.
Jackson, Harley Franklin, 12683A.
Jacobs, William Paul, 13052A.
Jane, Edwin George, Jr., 13085A.
×Janek, Lewis Frank, 12872A.
Janssen, Carl Andrew, 13038A.
Jerman, Charles Elwood, 12897A.
Johnson, Jack Dewey, 13047A.
Johnston, Ben Doom, Jr., 12792A.
Jonas, Gordon Elester, 12812A.
Jones, Henry Lee, 12891A.
Jones, Kenneth Leroy, 12587A.
Jones, Melbern Robert, 12965A.
×Jones, William Aubrey, 12846A.
Jungman, Clarence Adolph, 12659A.
Justin, Chester Anthony, 12597A.
Karnezis, Demetrios, 12740A.
Keator, John Elmer, 12830A.
Keeffe, Donald James, 12632A.
Keish, Frederick Charles, 12738A.
Kellogg, Robert Edwin, 12575A.
Kelly, James Douglas, 12728A.
Kelso, William Robert, 12822A.
×Kennedy, Thomas Barrett, 12723A.
Kerr, Robert Augustus, 12804A.
Kessler, Donald Lee, 12750A.
Kettler, William Herman, 12877A.
Kille, Wesley Grant, 13001A.
Kinchla, Edward Francis, Jr., 12735A.
King, Frederick Martin, 12852A.
Kirby, Julian Benton, 13017A.
Klonowski, Joseph James, 12926A.
Korbol, Clifford Oscar, 12929A.
Krause, Arthur Fox, 12532A.
Krause, Francis Raymond, 12983A.
Kuldau, Parker Charles, 13069A.
Lackey, James Clifton, 12786A.
Laden, Robert Edward, 12684A.
Lane, Franklin Kenneth, 12623A.
Langford, Floyd J., 12844A.
Lappin, Lyle Marvin, 12868A.
Latham, Seymour Eugene, 12548A.
Lawyer, John Edward, 12638A.
Leary, Dodge Edwin, 13089A.
Leaser, Earl Robert, 13036A.
Leeds, John Corbett, Jr., 13103A.
Lent, Robert Ralph, 12688A.
Levine, Arnold, 12653A.
Lewis, Jack, 12658A.
Lewis, Jack Miller, 12732A.
Liniger, Vaun Neal, 13048A.
Linn, Howard Anthony, 12862A.
Little, Homer Francis, 12990A.
Littleton, Franklin Walter, Jr., 12896A.
Livesay, Robert Groves, 12616A.
Livingood, Galen Aldo, 12803A.
Locy, James Allen, Jr., 12576A.
Lodge, James Delvin, 12666A.
Logan, Douglas Harold, 12925A.
Logan, Roy Buel, 12651A.
Long, Clifford George, 12756A.
Lonski, Charlie John, 12681A.
Loring, Charles Joseph, Jr., 13008A.
Lowe, Ralph Zelmore, Jr., 12807A.
Lowman, Raymond Paul, 13049A.
Lutrey, Theodore Thomas, 12865A.
Lux, Frank Orf, 13004A.
Lyle, Vernon John, 12759A.
McBride, Elmer Thomas, 12799A.
McCaslin, Kenneth Roswell, 12603A.
McCullough, Campbell Boyer, 12734A.
McCann, James Joseph, 12924A.
McFarland, Kenneth Thomas, Jr., 13023A.
McGrain, Thomas Wood, 12912A.
McGrew, Kenneth Gordon, 12813A.
McKibban, Robert Vernon, 12649A.
McKinney, Baylus Benjamin, Jr., 12590A.

McKinney, Clell Homer, Jr., 12639A.
McKown, Robert Emery, 12939A.
McLain, Steven James, 12545A.
McMahon, James Joseph, Jr., 12805A.
Mabrey, Owen Dewey, 12598A.
Machado, Joseph Gilbert, 12537A.
Mahoney, Edward Francis, 13037A.
Mandell, Robert Irving, 12570A.
Marston, Arthur Anson, 12854A.
Mask, Kenneth James, 12690A.
×Mason, Robert Junior, Jr., 12577A.
Masonheimer, Robert Harvey, 12727A.
Masters, Edgar James, 12886A.
Masterson, Robert James, 12901A.
Matthews, Richard Glen, 12674A.
Mattson, Joseph Albert, 13006A.
Meacham, Gerard Stewart, 12719A.
Meibohm, Winfred Herbert, 13083A.
Meltzer, Lester, 12867A.
Metcalf, Curtis Newborn, 12668A.
Metzger, Robert Earl, 12787A.
×Meyer, Gilbert Edgar, 12930A.
×Meyers, Oliver Harold, 12794A.
Mickish, William Jack, 12819A.
Middleton, George Alvin, 12899A.
Miele, Alfonse Ralph, 12754A.
Miller, Monroe Marchbank, 12922A.
Miller, Richmond Lee, Jr., 12718A.
Miller, Robert Thorn, 12810A.
Mills, Robert John, 12661A.
×Minihan, Charles Edward, 12652A.
Mitchell, Ralph Waymon, Jr., 13096A.
Moelich, William Edward, Jr., 12725A.
×Molloy, Paul Francis, 12882A.
Moore, Andy Barry, Jr., 12557A.
Moore, Donald Fred, 12568A.
Moore, Ernest Francis, 12693A.
Moore, Herbert Warren, Jr., 12779A.
Morel, Raymond Ernest, 13026A.
Mouat, John Charles, 13045A.
Murphy, William Michael, 12599A.
Murray, Loren Purdy, Jr., 13055A.
×Murray, William George, 12927A.
Murray, William Marvin, 12758A.
Myers, George Grant, 12560A.
Neal, Harold Lord, Jr., 12802A.
Neal Robert Eugene, 12987A.
Netherwood, Douglas Blakeshaw, 12857A.
Newsom, B. W., 12831A.
Newton, James Harold, 13084A.
Niersbach, Norman George, 12760A.
Nogar, Eugene Thomas, 12814A.
Nowell, Rufus Homer, Jr., 12614A.
Nowlin, David McBroom, 12892A.
Oakes, Russell Eugene, 12549A.
Obenshain, Ray Lealand, Jr., 12923A.
O'Connell, Ellis Stanley, 12619A.
×O'Hearn, Daniel Robert, 12978A.
Ohlmeyer, Harold Zachary, 12656A.
O'Leary, John David, 13010A.
Orlando, Michael Joseph, 12682A.
Orme, Griffith, 13090A.
×Oswald, Garth Barnes, 12876A.
Ottaway, Harold Edward, 13065A.
Owens, Melvin Odell, 13100A.
Page, Jack Clifford, 13032A.
Palmer, John Franklin, 12986A.
Palmer, Robert Thomas, 12569A.
×Palowez, John, 12667A.
Parsons, Robert Pulver, 12553A.
Parsonson, Ernest Charles, 12973A.
Partrick, Richard Harding, 13034A.
Peattie, Harry Andrew, Jr., 12801A.
Peightel, James Lloyd, 12784A.
Penton, Austin Douglas, 12755A.
Peratt, J. D., 12594A.
Perkins, Donald Foss, 12711A.
Phillips, Robert Preston, 12595A.
Piggott, Myron George, 12917A.
×Pollen, Milton Thomas, 12875A.
Popson, Raymond Andrew, 12634A.
Porter, Frederick Sherwood, Jr., 12848A.
Price, Leroy Burroughs, 13027A.
Price, Richard Ford, 12641A.
Price, Robert Doyle, 12736A.
Prochoroff, George, 12984A.
Pullen, Howard Vere, 12884A.
Reavis, Cecil Leon, Jr., 12909A.
Recher, John Henry, 13059A.
Reed, Charles William, 12722A.
×Reilley, Robert John, 13022A.
Remick, John Henry, 12838A.
Renk, Norman Grover, 12671A.
Rice, William Lewis, Jr., 12699A.
×Ridenour, Paul Wesley, 13019A.
×Rife, Wayne Richard, 12975A.
Roberts, Charles Anthony 12948A.
Roberts, Harry Warren, 12818A.
Roberts, James Bourbon, 12584A.
Roberts, John Edward, 12864A.
Robertson, Thomas Dillon, 12751A.
Rockey, Carlton George, Jr., 12708A.
Rorrer, Marvin Thomas, 13070A.
×Rothaus,, Jack Nick, 12555A.
Rounds, James Maurice, 12955A.
×Rountree, Malcolm Stuart, 12774A.
Russell, Norman, 12761A.
Rutt, Ronald Gordon, 12654A.
×Ryan, Neil Brammer, 12885A.
Sanderson, Duncan McAuley, 12970A.
Schaefer, Jack Charles, 12556A.
Scharf, Richard Edwin, 12596A.
Schaunaman, George Samuel, 12588A.
Schiavoni, Vincent Peter, 12572A.
Schmidt, Robert Charles, 12962A.
Schreffler, Charles Euterline, 12542A.
Scott, Robert Isham, Jr., 12905A.
Scurlock, James Gordon, 12946A.
Seaman, Robert Atkins, 12610A.
Secrest, Edgar Lee, Jr., 12621A.
×Seifert, Henry Lee, 12702A.
Sert, Louis Robert, 12657A.
×Sewall, Eugene Trafton, 13009A.
Shaber, Bert, Jr., 13021A.
Shafer, Philip Stuart, 12647A.
Shaffer, John Hixon, 12856A.
Shaw, Allan White, Jr., 12535A.
Shepard, William Ackinson, Jr., 12579A.
×Sherman, Ocea D., Jr., 13082A.
Shuck, John Flory, 12913A.
Simmons, Malcolm Clifford, 13013A.
×Simmons, Willis Madison, 13057A.
Simons, Doyle Evert, 12677A.
Simpson, Dale Patterson, 12679A.
Singleton, Floyd Edwards, 12748A.
Slaughter, Clarence Benton, Jr., 12673A.
Sledge, Thomas Edward, Jr., 12698A.
Smith, Eldon Vernon, 12980A.
Smith, Jack Arthur, 13078A.
Smith, James Wesley, 12600A.
×Smith, James William, 12583A.
Smith, Robert London, 12880A.
Smith, Willard Edward, 13014A.
Smith, William Bernard, Jr., 12853A.
Smithwick, Fred Barksdale, Jr., 12816A.
Sommers, Harold Lee, 12999A.
Spear, Robert Brinkerhoff, 12605A.
Stabler, Tarlton Brooke, 12820A.
Staylor, LeRoy William, 12530A.
Steen, Clarence Herbert, 12823A.
Stevenson, William LeRoy, 12782A.
Stewart, Hugh William, 12539A.
×Stewart, Thomas Earl, 12945A.
Stokes, Louis Samuel, 12626A.
Stoll, Albert Earl, Jr., 12860A.
Stone, Robert Errol, 12618A.
Sullivan, Charles Luther, 13000A.
Sullivan, Robert, 13081A.
Sutton, Robert Clifton, 12985A.
Swanson, Dustin Herbert, 12581A.
Swayze, Jack, 12546A.
Symmes, Roderick Ormsby, 12710A.
Talbot, Philip Burne, 12966A.
Tammenga, Henry Lubertus, 12811A.
Thaler, Melvin Sidney, 12870A.
Thomas, Frank Maguire, 12624A.
Thompson, Allen Wesley, 12789A.
Timmermans, Henry Louis, 12817A.
Torpey, Charles Louis, 12644A.
Tucker, Charles Lewis, 12890A.
Tucker, Claude Jordan, 12903A.
Urban, Harry, 12582A.
Valentine, Dwane Robert, 12694A.
Van Bruggen, Richard, 12713A.
×Van Der Beek, Louis Marshall, 13099A.
Vandiver, Robert Samuel, 12586A.
Van Sickle, Philip Hugh, 13043A.
Vaughan, Haywood Cooper, 13051A.
Vaughan, Thomas Wallace, 12981A.
Vocke, Robert Donald, 13102A.
Voss, Kenneth William, 12976A.
Wakefield, Harry Adams, 12825A.
Walmer, Harry Elmer, 12633A.
Warner, James Aldo, 12741A.
Warner, Robert Leonard, 12592A.
Way, Jack, 12928A.
Weaver, Carl Turner, Jr., 13011A.
Weaver, Donald Mouzon, 12529A.
Webb, James Henry, 12543A.
Weed, John Barton, 12765A.
Weigle, Vincent Joseph, 12793A.
Welch, Eugene Clair, 13068A.
Welch, Norman Ernest, 12824A.
Wells, Charles Brinton, Jr., 12919A.
Wells, Harold Eugene, 12943A.
Welsh, James Harry, 12935A.
Wheeler, Kenneth Robert, 12806A.
Wheeler, William James, 12646A.
×White, Thomas Arthur, 12567A.
Williams, Donald Elmer, 12958A.
Williams, Irwin Lynn, 12906A.
Williams, Lewis Harris, 12963A.
Willis, W. B., 12982A.
Wilson, Robert Crane, 12839A.
Wilson, Woodrow William, 12788A.
Wink, Eugene August, Jr., 12871A.
×Wise, Billie Reford, 12798A.
×Withers, Lloyd Lewis, Jr., 13046A.
Withers, Raymond Rankin, 13015A.
Wolfe, Lawrence John, 13073A.
Wolfe, Roland L., 12771A.
Wood, Horace Dula, 13076A.
×Wood, Thomas Walley, 13044A.
Woods, Roy Douglas, 12808A.
×Wynne, Lawson Paul, 12591A.
Wywal, Felix Benard, 13028A.
Yochim, Frederick Anthony, 12720A.
Young, Fred William, 12608A.
Zelenka, Raymond Emil, 12701A.
Zigrang, William John, 13095A.
Zimmerman, Max George, 13087A.

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947. All officers have been found professionally qualified as required by law. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be captains

AIR FORCE NURSES

×Collins, Sabre Genevieve, AN930.
Gomez, Lu, AN1733.
×Horton, Marjorie O., AN1411.
Mowatt, Mary M., AN757.

To be first lieutenant

WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST

×Boman, Mary L., AJ10.

NOTE.—The officer named on this nomination for promotion to major will complete 14 years' service for promotion during the month of January. All officers named on this nomination for promotion to captain complete 7 years' service for promotion during the months of December 1949 and January and February 1950. All officers nominated for promotion to captain who completed 7 years' service prior to December 31, 1949, received recess promotions during the recess of the Senate. The officer nominated for promotion to first lieutenant will complete 3 years' service during the month of February. Dates of rank of all officers will be as determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 25 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Edward T. McCormick to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1952.

Donald C. Cook to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1954.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 25, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Francis Przybylski, Wausau, Wis., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, father, and protector of mankind, author and defender of justice and love, look down with favor upon the Members of the House of Representatives of this great country this day.

Mindful of Your blessings on our Nation and on us, we thank You, Lord. Today, in these trying times, when so often justice and love of man are clouded by misunderstanding and other considerations, give us the wisdom, in the problems that confront us, to understand what is right; to judge with justice tempered with charity. Give us the courage to do what is just for our Nation and other nations, and to speak for it with eloquence, that peace may reign within nations and among nations.

In the words of St. Francis—

Lord, make me an instrument of Your peace.

Where there is hatred, let me sow love; where there is injury, pardon; where there is doubt, faith; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; and where there is sickness, joy.

Oh, Divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek to be consoled as to console; to be understood as to understand; to be loved as to love.

This we ask in the name of the Father who created us, the Son who redeemed us, and the Holy Spirit who inspires and sanctifies us. Amen.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 16]

Beall	Fernandez	Norton
Bland	Flood	O'Neill
Boggs, La.	Fulton	Pfeifer,
Bolling	Gamble	Joseph L.
Bosone	Garmatz	Pfeiffer,
Brown, Ga.	Gilmer	William L.
Buckley, N. Y.	Hart	Rees
Bulwinkle	Hébert	Ribicoff
Burdick	Heller	Richards
Burton	Hobbs	Rivers
Cavalcante	Hope	Smathers
Celler	Irving	Smith, Ohio
Cole, Kans.	Jacobs	Steed
Coudert	Keefe	Stockman
Curtis	Kennedy	Taylor
Davenport	Kunkel	Vursell
Davies, N. Y.	LeFevre	Wadsworth
Davis, Tenn.	Lichtenwalter	Walsh
Dingell	McMillan, S. C.	White, Idaho
Douglas	Monroney	Wilson, Ind.
Elliott	Morrison	Withrow
Engel, Mich.	Murphy	Young

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 367 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

HON. PAUL BROWN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the roll call which has just ensued, in which, for the first time in 17 years, my colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] failed to answer to his name.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] is sick. I am glad to report to the House, however, that he had a very restful night and is improved.

I believe his is one of the most remarkable records of promptness, diligence, and fidelity to duty ever made in this House. I think this House will appreciate it and will be glad to know that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] is recovering and will soon be back at his post of duty.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] was the first Member of Congress to answer every roll call for more than 10 consecutive years.

I was the first man in Congress to answer every roll call for 10 consecutive years. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] has exceeded my record.

When the late Speaker Champ Clark wrote his book, no man had answered every roll call for more than seven consecutive years. I came to Congress about the time that book was published.

So the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] has by far the best record, from that standpoint, of any man who has ever served in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. CAMP. He has been a Member of Congress since July 5, 1933.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a dental-health program proposed by the American Dental Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I am constrained to object to the transaction of any other business except the call of the committee at this time, since this is Calendar Wednesday. After the committees have been called, I will not object.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object to extension of remarks and 1-minute speeches by anybody?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. At this time, Mr. Speaker, until the committees are called.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY (H. DOC. NO. 455)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 25, 1950.*

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 441) providing for the consideration of the bill (S. 88) to amend section 60 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended (Rept. No. 1523), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 88) to amend section 60 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken.

The motion was rejected.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the Calendar Wednesday rule.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. This motion in order to succeed must receive a two-thirds vote, if I remember the rules correctly.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

The question was taken.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof, the motion is lost.

The Clerk will call the committees.

TERMINAL-LEAVE PAY

Mr. KILDAY (when the Committee on Armed Services was called). Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Armed Services, I call up the bill (H. R. 3205) to provide a 1-year extension of the time for making application for terminal-leave pay.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. This bill appears on the Union Calendar and under the rule the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3205) to provide a 1-year extension of the time for making application for terminal-leave pay, with Mr. HARRIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] is entitled to 1 hour and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] is entitled to 1 hour.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the majority leader what is going to be called up on tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, House Joint Resolution 371 out of the Ways and Means Committee, a bill I referred to yesterday, will be called up. I could not give definite information to the House on yesterday, but I can say now that that resolution will come up for consideration on tomorrow. It is a bill relating to the retroactive taxes on life-insurance companies for 1948 and 1949.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is that bill going to be brought up under an open rule?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. May I advise the gentleman from Massachusetts and the House that it is not a rule; it is a privileged matter but under the rules of the House it will be open to amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman does not know about Friday?

Mr. McCORMACK. That will depend on what the Rules Committee does tomorrow on the cotton acreage quota bill. If that committee reports out a rule the probabilities are it will come up on Friday. Again I would like to leave a slight qualification there.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Have any arrangements been made for Saturday?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; there is nothing for Saturday. I hope we can adjourn over.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to announce to the House that Hiss got 5 years in the penitentiary for perjury.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I now yield myself such time as I may desire to use.

Mr. Chairman, the bill (H. R. 3205) has been reported to the House by the Committee on Armed Services and provides for an extension of time for making application for terminal-leave pay. This bill was offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN]. He would have fixed the termination date as September 1, 1949.

It will be recalled that at the time the bill authorizing payment of terminal-leave bonds was passed it provided that applications for payment of terminal leave had to be filed prior to September 1, 1947.

Thereafter, when the law was amended permitting these bonds to be cashed, the application date was extended to September 1, 1948.

Therefore, since 1948 it has not been possible for anyone to apply for his terminal-leave pay. It has developed that the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard have rejected 16,303 claims which were filed after September 1, 1948. It will be necessary for these applications to be resubmitted to the Departments concerned, along with other applications by persons entitled to payment who have not heretofore filed for such pay.

The situation is this: Those who very promptly sought to take advantage of the terminal-leave law received their pay. However, there were those who might, at that time, have been in such financial condition that they did not feel that they wanted to take advantage of the law; others were misinformed as to the necessity for applying, and some few upon discharge were misinformed as to the method for applying. We are in the situation that those who very promptly sought to take advantage have received the benefits of this law, and those who may have delayed because they originally did not intend to take advantage of it have since found, because of personal circumstances, that it is necessary to do so and now are not permitted to accept it.

I want to point out that funds were appropriated when this law became effective for the purpose of paying all of the terminal-leave pay. At the present time it is believed that it will not be necessary to make any additional appropriations for the payment of the terminal-leave pay. However, it will be necessary to make a small appropriation of $69,000 to be used in the administration of this measure.

The committee amended the bill as originally offered, which had provided for its termination on September 1, 1949. We have provided for a termination date of June 30, 1951, and we have selected June 30, 1951, in order to have the termination date coincide with the termination of the fiscal year so that the Departments will be able to calculate with some accuracy what the administrative expense is going to be. This will permit the Departments to terminate the activities of these administrative departments at the end of that fiscal year. We believe this date will be greatly to the advantage of economy in the costs of administration.

It is the view of the committee that there should be no further extension of the termination date of this act. It has been previously extended. We believe that adequate publicity should be given that this extension is to be the last extension, and that those who are entitled to apply for terminal-leave pay under the provisions of this proposed law must act diligently or they will not be entitled to any other chance to secure payment of their terminal leave.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to inform the gentleman that I have a case of a man who was in the Government service out of the country, and for that reason was in no position to file his claim. He did not know about it.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct. There are a number of cases of people who did not have such an opportunity.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very glad to see this bill brought up.

Mr. KILDAY. It has been pointed out in connection with this bill that the original Terminal Leave Pay Act came out on a discharge petition. As a result it never had that careful committee consideration that a bill should have, and these matters could not have been considered or foreseen at that time. The committee was discharged from its consideration before it held any hearings on it, so that that must be borne in mind. It could not be expected to be in such perfect condition as if it had orderly committee consideration.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it correct to say that the purpose of this bill is to give simple justice to those who for one reason or another may have failed to file application for terminal leave?

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman is correct. You could not justify a terminal-leave pay provision on any ground other than that it was something the men had earned and to which they were entitled. The committee feels that if there were various circumstances that made it impossible or impracticable for the men to apply they ought not to be now cut off from receiving payment of that which they earned and to which they are entitled, but we do feel that there must be a termination to the program and that no further extensions should be considered after this law is enacted.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, so that I may understand the gentleman who just left the floor, may I ask, so that I may be sure of my understanding, if this bill goes through will that on the day named end the opportunity to take terminal leave?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not exactly understand the question. Does the gentleman mean that it is intended that that will terminate the right to apply for leave that has heretofore accumulated?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. KILDAY. That is the idea of the committee, that it should be done that way. We realize that we cannot bind any future Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Your idea is that we should not have a sort of contingent liability running on indefinitely?

Mr. KILDAY. That is right, that it should be terminated. We fixed a termination date originally, and I think this is the last time it should be extended.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. May I ask, just who are the sponsors of this bill?

Mr. KILDAY. I think we had six bills pending before the committee providing various dates at which the extension should terminate. We happened to report the one sponsored by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Was there any particular group?

Mr. KILDAY. All I know of is these individuals.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I ask that because there came to my desk this morning a letter which has this paragraph in it. It has something to do with this discharge petition on FEPC. The last paragraph states this:

> May I earnestly request that if you support FEPC you sign this discharge petition at the earliest possible moment, since we want to bring it up as soon as we can.

It is signed, "FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR."

It is hard to tell just what and who is back of some of the proposed legislation. I had always thought that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] was one of the original, enthusiastic and sincere supporters of this FEPC proposed legislation which had consideration by the Labor Committee. Now in that letter the word "we"—I do not know what "we" as carried in that letter means. Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. KILDAY. I am sure the gentleman knows that I know nothing about that. I know of no reason why I should become involved in any of those controversies.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I try to keep informed somewhat of what is coming up in the House and who is back of this, that, and the other, and what is going on, but I find it extremely difficult, especially in the last week or two.

I notice the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is on the floor. Maybe he can explain this little two-letter word "we."

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, but I am interested in that, and I would like to know, what does "we" mean in that letter from the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-two Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 17]

Bailey	Gwinn	Pfeiffer,
Bland	Hart	William L.
Boggs, La.	Hébert	Plumley
Brown, Ga.	Heller	Rabaut
Buckley, N. Y.	Hobbs	Ramsay
Bulwinkle	Hope	Reed, N. Y.
Burdick	Irving	Rees
Burton	Javits	Ribicoff
Cannon	Jennings	Rich
Cavalcante	Kearns	Richards
Celler	Kennedy	Rivers
Coudert	Kunkel	Scott, Hardie
Davenport	LeFevre	Shafer
Davies, N. Y.	Lichtenwalter	Short
Davis, Tenn.	Lyle	Smathers
Dingell	McMillan, S. C.	Smith, Ohio
Doughton	Marshall	Smith, Wis.
Douglas	Monroney	Stigler
Eaton	Morrison	Stockman
Engel, Mich.	Murphy	Taylor
Fellows	Nixon	Wadsworth
Fernandez	Norrell	Walsh
Fulton	Pace	White, Idaho
Gamble	Pfeifer,	Wilson, Ind.
Gilmer	Joseph L.	Withrow
Gore		

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3205, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 358 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, now that New York State's difficulties have been ironed out to the satisfaction of some people may we not get back to the business that is before the House? We have before us a bill which proposes to extend the time within which applications may be filed to ensure the payment of terminal leave. I am for that bill, but it raises a very serious question in my humble opinion which I, as a member of the Appropriations Committee of this House, would like to see resolved. You will observe that in presenting this bill the committee states:

> While no additional appropriations will be necessary for the payment of unused leave, the various departments concerned indicate that an additional cost to the Government of some $69,000 will be involved for the administration of the proposed measure.

Thus the Members of Congress are told that the only cost involved in the adoption of this proposed piece of legislation is the alleged $69,000 that will be needed in direct appropriation to provide for the cost of administration.

I have endeavored to make inquiry as to why that is true. It is alleged that there are some 21,000 people who may be eligible under this extension to file applications for terminal leave. If those applications are filed and approved under existing law and the extension granted under this legislation, where is the money coming from to pay that terminal leave? I was told that the appropriation which was originally made to implement the act passed in August of 1946 is still available with which to pay this terminal-leave obligation that will accrue under this particular bill.

Now, a query. I am seeking information and raising this question in order that we may have some clarification and some understanding as to the meaning of the constitutional provision which gives to the Congress the right to raise and support armies but says "No appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years."

It has always been my understanding that an appropriation made for the support of the armed services of this Nation is available for expenditure for a period not to exceed 2 years. If that is true, and if the appropriation to implement the terminal-leave pay was made in 1946 or even in 1947, why, after the expiration of 2 years for which that appropriation is available for expenditure, has not any unused balance of that appropriation been returned to the Treasury of the United States? And if the armed services, in the event my premise is accurate, can have unused and unexpended balances lying around in their funds which they can put their hands on by transfers or reapportionment of appropriations already made, if they can use money that way to implement this bill and pay the terminal leave without a new appropriation being made, then what is the need for the constitutional provision and what need is there for making direct project appropriations with the usual provision that within those appropriations transfers may be limited to not to exceed 5 percent?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, we all favor the passage of this bill, but the gentleman from Wisconsin has certainly raised an interesting point as to the availability of certain funds to carry it out. I am not now a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee which deals with the Army but was for a number of years, as the gentleman knows. This question was raised with regard to the continuing availability of funds for several of the projects for which appropriated in bills for the Army. It was generally held then that appropriations which related to equipment might be made for a period in excess of 2 years, but that appropriations under the heading of subsistence and pay were appropriations for the support of the Army and they could not be made available for more than 2 years.

This is a very interesting question because it relates to terminal-leave pay; that is, pay for terminal leave acquired during the pay period.

I think the gentleman has very properly raised a very important ques-

tion, and offhand, consistent with the interpretations I have heard expressed, I would question the availability of 1946 Army money for this purpose.

Mr. KEEFE. I may say to the gentleman, from my service on the Committee on Appropriations over quite a period of years, I realize that in connection with appropriations of money made for housing, for the installation of equipment, and all that sort of thing, no one has ever questioned the availability of those funds for the necessary period of time in order to provide those installations. Here is an item that seems to me to relate specifically to the constitutional prohibition.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It seems to be a pay item and should provide an interesting question for the constitutional lawyers in the General Accounting Office——

Mr. KEEFE. To raise and support armies, and it is directly and intimately associated with the pay and subsistence items which I have always understood heretofore Congress had no authority to make for a period of more than 2 years.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who has served for many, many years on the Committee on Appropriations of the House.

Mr. TABER. There is another question, in addition to that, that would come up, and that is that these appropriations for pay of the Army and for such items as this are made on an annual basis, and this being a statute which extends and changes the law which was in effect at the time those appropriations were made, for the funds that were there appropriated, would not be available, because the particular statute that this bill creates was not in effect at the time those appropriations were available, nor during their availability.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, that is the way it looks to me, and it seems to me that there is a fundamental question involved, may I say to my very distinguished friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], in charge of this bill. I am not raising this question just for mere interference or to take up and consume time, but there is a very fundamental question relating to appropriation machinery.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KFEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin. Of course, there is a definite constitutional limitation on the maintenance of arms, but I think you will agree with me that that constitutional limitation does not apply, and that the Navy has never been subject to that limitation, nor the Coast Guard nor the Marine Corps, which are part of the armed forces, so that as to that phase of the bill which covers all of the services there could be no question from a constitutional standpoint. Now, as to the availability of the funds, we inquired into that, as our hearings will show. The message that came over to the Speaker reporting this bill mentions only the administrative cost. We had representatives of the Army, including the Air Force and the Navy, before us, and they all testified that they had on hand from previous appropriations a sufficient amount of money to pay the claims which are anticipated, averaging about $240 apiece, or about $5,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Of course, the question of what is included in the appropriation, its language, or the authority that the committee of the Congress might have, we, as a legislative committee, properly go along with the Committee on Appropriations. Representatives of the Departments told us that they had received appropriations, and now have on hand from previous appropriations sufficient funds for the discharge of the anticipated claims. That is as far as we went into that.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman that I, in conjunction with his colleague read some portions of that testimony, and I gained the impression that the Navy and its component parts had sufficient funds that they could lay their hands on.

Mr. KILDAY. They mentioned specifically $5,500,000.

Mr. KEEFE. But there was a question raised as to the availability of funds as far as the Army was concerned, and the Air Corps, as I read that testimony.

Mr. KILDAY. Captain Rotz appeared for the Army. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] asked him if the money was available. Captain Rotz replied, "That is the Army share." There was some question as to allocation and the difference between an allocation and an appropriation, but to the specific question the representative of the Army, and, of course, the Air Force was included in the Army during this period of time, replied definitely that it was not.

Mr. KEEFE. If the gentleman will read that testimony carefully he will see that the availability of the funds is predicated upon reallocation of funds. Just what that means I do not know. Does that mean that the Army can reallocate for this purpose funds that may have been appropriated for some other purpose, that are available for expenditure longer than 2 years, and reallocate them for this purpose as to which a 2-year limitation would apply under the Constitution? I do not understand that testimony. I think I am fair in stating to my friend that any reasonable interpretation of the testimony of this Army officer would lead me to believe, at least, that it was very inconclusive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Would the gentleman agree that under the comity between committees that has always existed here we went as far as the gentleman would have expected us to go in inquiring into the Appropriations Committee's business?

Mr. KEEFE. Of course, I realize that thoroughly. I am raising this question not because of any particular brief I am holding for the Committee on Appropriations. That is not involved at all. I am raising what appears to me to be a very fundamental question.

Mr. KILDAY. If the funds are available it would only be as a result of a bill reported by the gentleman's committee under which the funds were appropriated.

Mr. KEEFE. No, that does not necessarily follow at all.

Mr. KILDAY. Where would they have gotten them?

Mr. KEEFE. Funds made available to the Army within the limitations of the constitutional provisions. If they did not expend the funds that were thus made available, have those funds lapsed into the Treasury under the constitutional provision, or are they made available through reallocation for a period longer than the 2 years? That is the question I am trying to get to.

Mr. KILDAY. The question of reallocation would be whether you had hedged your appropriation bill around in such a way that it could not be reallocated. From our standpoint, if they need the money, then they are going to have to deal with you. Is not that correct?

Mr. KEEFE. Neither the Appropriations Committee nor the gentleman's committee can change the plain mandate of the Constitution itself. That is why I have raised this question, so administratively we may be sure that in the administration and carrying out of the very worthy purposes of this bill, no question will arise in the future that will prevent the purposes from being carried out because of unavailability of funds.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I recognize fully what the gentleman says about the constitutional limitation of 2 years. Perhaps it might have been that when this bill was written and appropriations were made the money might have been made available to the President of the United States, and for that reason it is not necessary to make any direct appropriation now, because it all may not have been spent. In other words, it all depends on how the appropriation was originally made. Unfortunately, we do not have the information as to how the appropriation was originally made.

Mr. KEEFE. I am raising the question, as the gentleman well knows, so that this question may be fully explored and that we will not just rest on our oars and then wake up finally and find that some smart fellow down in the executive department has made a ruling that there are no funds available to carry out the splendid purposes of this act.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman.

I would like to ask the gentleman, who is one of the able members on the Committee on Appropriations, if this legislation should pass and it should be determined that the funds heretofore appropriated could not be used, whether the Committee on Appropriations could not simply reappropriate the unexpended balances and make it available.

Mr. KEEFE. There is no question about that at all, and the supplemental

estimate to implement this could be sent up here by the Bureau of the Budget to implement the Army's share of the payment of terminal leave. The Committee on Appropriations has the power and authority to make that appropriation. But that is a vastly different question than to say that the Army itself can, through processes of reallocation of funds, take away from the Congress itself the right to determine ultimately and finally whether they intend to implement this legislation by appropriation. That is the question which I am raising, to protect the constitutional integrity of the appropriating machinery and to protect the constitutional rights and prerogatives of the Congress itself.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KEEFE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the gentleman recalls, several years ago, when the terminal-leave bonds were issued, there was quite a bit of difference in the law regarding the payment of terminal leave as it applied to officers and to enlisted men.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; I recall that very distinctly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wonder if the gentleman is able to tell us whether those differences have now been reconciled and whether the law is the same as it applies both to officers and enlisted men.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman will have to get that information from the distinguished gentleman on the Committee on Military Affairs. Thank God, I have enough problems dealing with my own field, without being a walking encyclopedia so that I could be able to answer the question for the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a very important event has taken place today which I heartily approve and which the people of our country, I know, will approve in as complete a manner as is possible, bringing pleasure not only to Americans, but to the people of Ireland. The President today has approved the recommendation of the State Department which was made upon the request of the Government of Ireland that the diplomatic relations between the two countries be raised to a complete diplomatic status of Ambassadorship, which means that no longer will our diplomatic relationship be carried on by a legation in the United States and a legation in Ireland, but that the American diplomatic representative to Ireland will be an Ambassador, and the Irish diplomatic representative to the United States will also be an Ambassador.

This is something I felt should have taken place many years ago. The fact that it has taken place today brings pleasure not only to the people of Ireland but to all Americans, without regard to their racial origin.

I congratulate President Truman in approving the recommendation of the State Department.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want to express my approval, too, if I may, and join with the gentleman. To show my sincerity, I move that the House adjourn, to celebrate the event.

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

CLOSING OUR TAX LOOPHOLES

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, President Truman in his tax message to the Congress recommended that we close by legislation many of the tax loopholes through which hundreds of millions of dollars in taxes are escaping the tax collector. With this part of the President's tax message I am in full accord. For 2 years now I have been urging the same action. In connection with the President's tax message, I have sent the following open letter to Mr. John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, calling his attention to the extent and numbers of these loopholes, and asking his aid in closing the same:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 23, 1950.

AN OPEN LETTER

Hon. JOHN W. SNYDER,
The Secretary of the Treasury,
Department of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Congress will shortly undertake the revision of our tax statutes, looking particularly to the closing of loopholes through which scandalous sums of tax revenue are now escaping. My own estimate is that more than $1,000,000,000 of new revenue would immediately result from the adoption of my bill, H. R. 5064, to impose income tax on the business earnings of presently tax-exempt organizations and corporations, regardless of who owns them. One of my Democratic colleagues on the House Ways and Means Committee recently published his estimate that $5,000,000,000 of new tax income is available if loopholes in the law are closed and tax evaders are made to pay up.

But, Mr. Secretary, besides closing loopholes in the law, we must see to it that loopholes in Treasury rulings and regulations are also plugged. In the case of cooperatives, the Treasury has been exceedingly liberal over the years. Many times, as the record clearly shows, Treasury rulings have permitted the co-ops to escape even more tax on earnings than Congress contemplated when writing the exemption provisions of section 101, IRC. Today, as you can easily ascertain, more than half of all cooperatives prefer to escape taxation under Treasury rulings rather than under the law—because the advantage is just as great and there are no hampering legal restrictions.

A recent return on certain tax exempts, published by the Treasury, stated that eight to nine billion dollars of business volume was escaping income taxation. If ever an understatement was made, that is one. Actually, forty to fifty billion dollars of business volume is now being done by tax-exempt corporations and organizations. And, most amazing of all, it now appears that nearly one-third of the total wealth of the United States has got into the hands of tax exempts, $157,000,000,000 out of a total of $540,000,000,000. That is more than twice the value of all stocks listed on the New York Stock Exchange.

Mr. Secretary, tax-exempt organizations are out of hand. A snowball of yesterday has become an avalanche today—an avalanche that threatens the very existence of our private enterprise system. Public resentment against this octopus is mounting. The day of reckoning is at hand. Doing business without paying taxes has become the biggest racket in the United States. It is relentlessly pushing our long-established system of profit enterprise toward socialization and destruction. Absorption of independent tax-paying business by nontaxable organizations will go on at a constantly accelerated pace unless we take drastic action to prevent it.

Mr. Secretary, the two greatest demands from American taxpayers today are for immediate repeal of wartime excise taxes and the plugging of loopholes in our present-day tax laws. These two demands dovetail perfectly. Put them together in one package and you have a real solution of two perplexing problems. If this is done, taxpayers will be pleased; business will be given new incentive to expand and go forward; the Treasury will gain in revenue; and at the same time we will ease the tax load that now rests so heavily upon the overtaxed.

Members of both parties on the Ways and Means Committee are urging that such corrective measures be made a part of the 1950 revenue bill. I am writing you to enlist your interest and your assistance. The stake is $1,000,000,000. This will permit the reduction of wartime excise taxes without placing any added burden on those who are now carrying more than their fair load of taxation. Will you help us establish tax equality and at the same time lighten the tax load?

Respectfully submitted.

N. M. MASON,
Member of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 18]

Abbitt	Davis, Tenn.	King
Andresen, August H.	Dingell	Kunkel
Bentsen	Douglas	LeFevre
Bland	Engel, Mich.	Lichtenwalter
Boggs, La.	Engle, Calif.	McMillan, S. C.
Bolling	Fellows	Mack, Wash.
Bosone	Fugate	Monroney
Brown, Ga.	Fulton	Morrison
Buckley, N. Y.	Gamble	Morton
Bulwinkle	Gilmer	Murdock
Burdick	Hart	Murphy
Burleson	Hébert	Murray, Tenn.
Burton	Heller	Nixon
Byrne, N. Y.	Hill	Pace
Carlyle	Hobbs	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Cavalcante	Hoffman, Ill.	Pfeiffer, William L.
Celler	Hope	Plumley
Coudert	Howell	Poulson
Davenport	Jackson, Calif.	Ramsay
Davies, N. Y.	Kearns	
	Kennedy	

Rees	Scudder	Wadsworth
Ribicoff	Shafer	Walsh
Rich	Short	White, Idaho
Richards	Smathers	Withrow
Rivers	Smith, Ohio	Woodhouse
St. George	Taylor	Young
Sasscer	Vinson	
Scott, Hardie	Vorys	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3205, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 349 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG].

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, I am here today to speak for this bill. At the outset I should like to pay tribute to my beloved and distinguished colleague from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] for his efforts in originally sponsoring the legislation that resulted in the veterans getting terminal-leave pay. He has done a great service for the veterans. I want to pay tribute to him for that service.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERLONG. I yield.

Mr. PETERSON. I want to join with my colleague in paying tribute to our colleague. We in Florida are grateful to him. We know of the work that he has done from the very beginning on the original bill and the interest he has manifested in this bill and in all matters affecting veterans. I know that our veterans realize that, but I thought I would be remiss in my duty unless I called attention to it in the RECORD that is being made here today, so that our veterans should know that we feel the same way.

Mr. HERLONG. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to say further, I am sure all veterans understand and appreciate the devotion of the gentleman from Florida to their cause. He has worked diligently and capably for them.

As has been already explained, this bill extends the privilege of a veteran to apply for his terminal-leave pay to June 30, 1951. This does two things. It gives the veteran a little more time to file an application, and further, it places it on a fiscal-year basis. No further money will have to be appropriated.

There has been delay, of course, in getting these applications in. Some 21,000 people have not received the money which the rest of the veterans have received. We want to see that they are properly compensated along with the rest of them.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERLONG. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Does the gentleman know how many applications have been submitted which have not been passed upon for the reason that the time for applications had expired?

Mr. HERLONG. I think it is around 13,000, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. If this bill should be enacted, will it have the effect of reopening the matter so that those veterans who have already applied and whose applications have been denied may again apply and have their applications passed upon just as though the application had not been denied?

Mr. HERLONG. That is correct. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

May I say that while the total number of veterans who have not received their pay under this provision of the law seems comparatively small, at the same time it is important to so many of them who have applied and who were turned down because they were late and many times the tardiness was through no fault of their own.

One of the first cases I ever had in court involved something about $25,000. I remember at that time the judge told me to hurry up and get through with that case because he had an important case coming up. To me that was the most important case in the world, because it dealt with something that was mine. If we treat these things as unimportant because there are just a few or because only a small amount is involved, we are overlooking the individual, and it is not doing justice to the individual who cannot help himself. It may seem small to us, but it is most important and is a mighty big thing to the individual who has been left out. I hope we will take this into consideration in voting on this bill today.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERLONG. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not these applications could be processed by employees of the Government who are already holding positions with the Government, or whether or not it would require the reestablishment of an agency or bureau or department in order to process the application.

Mr. HERLONG. I understand it would not require the reestablishment of any agency or department, or the creation of any new agency; that the same agencies or bureaus can handle it as are handling it at this time.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Over a period of something like 15 months, which would be provided by this amendment, the gentleman feels it would be possible for existing facilities to process this number, even if all of them should apply during that period of time?

Mr. HERLONG. Yes, sir; I do.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. And it would not bring on any additional expense to the Government?

Mr. HERLONG. That is correct, and I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I can say this, that we are receiving letters every day from veterans asking us to explain why they have not gotten their money, and we find it very hard to say, "You did not file by a certain date and therefore you cannot get your money." Government red tape is not a popular thing and is very difficult for many people to understand. They look to the equities of each case rather than to any technical ground upon which their applications may be refused.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERLONG. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Does the gentleman know the major reason or reasons for the failure of these 21,000 to apply?

Mr. HERLONG. Of course, it had been called to their attention through advertisements, but at the same time a great many of these people did not get this information, and in some cases the veterans' agencies in the counties and States did not properly process their applications in time. I think that is one of the main reasons for it.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERLONG. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. The trouble is not on the part of the Government, is it?

Mr. HERLONG. No, sir. It is on the part of the local agencies.

Mr. MICHENER. I have had a great many of these letters, but some of the men did not know they had to make application. They knew something had to be done, but they just expected it to come through. I think the Government is doing a pretty good job in trying to get these things out.

Mr. HERLONG. At the time of the original debate on this bill it was called to our attention, and placed in the RECORD, that these people could not expect to get their checks the next day or the next week after the bill was passed. At the same time, there was a natural reluctance on the part of the veteran to push himself forward to get this money when it was there available for him. He just thought he was going to get it as a matter of course, in spite of the newspaper stories that were printed.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HERLONG. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Assuming that 5,000 veterans fail to apply this year, does the gentleman know whether or not there is any proposal which would again extend it for another year?

Mr. HERLONG. There is no proposal to extend it for another year. As I understand the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, who has written a letter which appears in the report, states that they would not agree to any further extension of this time.

Mr. WHEELER. The point I was attempting to make was simply that if, under the first act, there were 21,000 people who did not know the proper procedure which they should follow in order to get their terminal-leave pay, then it is possible to believe that there would be some number who would still not know about it when this date shall have expired.

Mr. HERLONG. That might possibly happen, although I think the veterans' organizations are so well organized now that the information will be brought to their attention that this is their last chance and that they will not have another opportunity. I think the applications will be filed on time.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERLONG. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. The opinion of the subcommittee that studied this bill—and I was a member of it—was that this should be the last extension granted in this matter.

Mr. HERLONG. That is the way I understand it.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it thoroughly known to everybody that they still have 3 years to file their claims? I cannot see very much excuse for extending it beyond the 3-year period.

Mr. HERLONG. I agree with the gentleman. I think it should be given proper publicity all over the country and I believe that the veterans' organizations will see to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERLONG. I yield.

Mr. BISHOP. Is it not true that this Congress could not bind the next Congress in that program?

Mr. HERLONG. Certainly that is true.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the bill passes unanimously.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, referring to the questions asked by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], I wish to insert in the RECORD a portion of the First Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1947 under the title "Executive Office of the President, Armed Forces Leave Payments":

Payments under the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946: For all expenses necessary to enable the President through the Treasury, War, and Navy Departments to carry out the provisions of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, including cash payments to members and former members of the armed forces, payments to the Treasurer of the United States of amounts representing the face value of bonds issued to such servicemen, and administrative expenses until June 30, 1948, including printing and binding, penalty mail costs, and personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere without regard to section 14 (a) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, $2,431,708,000, to be available (except as to administrative expenses) until expended and for allocation to said departments by transfer to and merger with appropriations thereof or otherwise, in the amounts respectively as may be determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fourteen Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN], author of the bill under consideration.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, may I say that I have had a number of instances similar to those envisioned by this bill where men have failed to apply in time for their terminal leave. I very vigorously support the measure and commend the gentleman from Massachusetts for introducing this bill, which I feel will be very helpful to veterans who through no fault of their own failed to get what was coming to them.

Mr. PHILBIN. I thank the gentleman from New York, one of the most able Members of the House, for his very kind observation.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank my very able and distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], for the excellent statement he has made in support of this bill.

The bill is a very simple one. There is nothing mysterious or complex about it.

In 1946 the Congress enacted legislation which granted credit to the enlisted personnel of the armed services for unused terminal leave and authorized the issuance of bonds for such unused leave. Under the particular measure it was required that all applications for terminal leave should be filed prior to September 1, 1947.

In 1947 when we passed legislation permitting terminal-leave bonds to be cashed, we extended the limitation date until September 1, 1948.

Recently through many communications, letters, and reports we have received from veterans throughout the country, it would appear there are several thousand veterans who for one reason or another did not apply for their terminal-leave payment prior to September 1, 1948. There were many reasons given and assigned by these veterans for failure to file in time. In some cases it may have been ordinary inadvertence. In other cases the veterans concerned were in veterans' hospitals under treatment for war-incurred disabilities or sickness. But whatever may be the cause, in every instance which this bill seeks to relieve, the terminal-leave credit was definitely earned by the veteran. It is not a gift, bounty, or gratuity.

It is now merely a question whether the Congress will continue and extend the filing date so as to permit these veterans who have not filed up to this time to make their applications for this entitlement.

Like other colleagues who have preceded me in discussing this measure and who have contributed so much to the debate, I am very conscious of the fact that the Congress cannot be expected to continue this limitation indefinitely. Nevertheless, it seems to me that in fairness, in simple justice, and in equity to many thousands of veterans, we should at this time extend the filing date as provided by the pending bill to June 1951 so as to give those who have not filed up to this time another opportunity to secure the benefits to which they are entitled under the provisions of the law.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I want to commend the gentleman for his diligence in pursuing this legislation and may I say that I filed one of the regional terminal-leave-pay bills. I also was a member of the small subcommittee which worked out the original terminal-leave-pay bill.

This character of legislation, of course, differs very greatly from the type of legislation where there is a gift or bonus given to a veteran. This is a case where a man has earned the money and I think our limitation laws, as the gentleman so well said, should be much more lenient in letting a man claim what he has earned than claiming what is given to him as a beneficence or a gift; therefore I think the legislation is most proper.

Mr. PHILBIN. I appreciate the gentleman's views, because he has made conspicuous contributions to this and other legislation on behalf of the veterans.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know many veterans will be very grateful to the gentleman who is the author of this bill. There is no better friend of the servicemen than is the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN. I exceedingly appreciate the kind and gracious observation of the gentlewoman, who is an outstanding friend of the veteran in the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the objectives of this measure are entirely reasonable, and I believe, if the Members will reflect on those objectives, that they will come to the same conclusion. I hope that the House will be disposed to take favorable action on this measure so that the veterans will be given another opportunity to file.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I gladly yield to the able gentleman from North Carolina, an invaluable member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. DURHAM. I also wish to congratulate the gentleman for introducing this measure. It carries out an obligation which I feel we should extend to these veterans so that every individual can avail himself of the opportunity to receive it. There is no difference in this policy and the policy that has been adopted in regard to veterans over the past 25 years. We veterans of the First World War were given every consideration by the Congress in extending applications for insurance policies and other things.

Mr. PHILBIN. That is quite true—a most timely comment.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I am pleased to yield to the talented gentleman from California, who serves so ably and effectively on the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON. I would also like to add my commendation to that of the others to the gentleman for his diligence in proposing this legislation. To show you how much we all thought of his idea,

as well as of him personally, you will remember that the committee unanimously voted to report the bill out. I am also pleased to hear the gentleman say that he feels that perhaps this should be the last extension of terminal-leave pay; in other words, in 3 years everybody who is diligent in the slightest degree ought to be able to get his claim in and get it paid. I think it is a very just bill, and I hope it will pass by a unanimous vote.

Mr. PHILBIN. I thank the gentleman for his generous observation, which, as usual, contributes so appropriately to this discussion.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I too yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] for permitting me to use 10 minutes discussing what I think is a very important measure.

Mr. Chairman, this measure extends the provisions of H. R. 4051 to those veterans who have not taken nor had an opportunity to take advantage of the provisions of that bill. In order that the House and the new Members, who were not here during the Seventy-ninth Congress, might know something of the history of this bill, I would like to relate it, because this bill had a very rough road to travel, and I do that in order that they might fully understand the matter now before the House.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, I recall that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], now at the microphone, is the author, and the originator, and the man who pushed through the original legislation to pay terminal leave for the privates and the noncommissioned officers of the last war. Am I correct about that, sir?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. That is correct.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I want to compliment the gentleman for a fine piece of work.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, and I also appreciate the kind remarks of the gentlemen from Florida [Mr. HERLONG and Mr. PETERSON].

On September 13, 1945, I introduced H. R. 4051. That bill lay in the Committee on Military Affairs until just before we went home for the Easter holidays in 1946. It came out, not from the Committee on Military Affairs, but upon a discharge petition which I filed in the well of the House, and through the efforts of a number of Members here, including the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] and others who worked very arduously on this measure, we were able to secure the required number of signatures to that petition shortly before Easter 1946. We got 218 Members to sign it. As a consequence it came out on the floor. After it did come out, the Committee on Military Affairs reconsidered it, and came out with my bill, H. R. 4051, with amendments. The amendments made by that committee of course were satisfactory to me.

The bill had a very easy time passing the House when we got it to a vote. There was not a single Member of the House who voted against it. Then it went to the Senate, and Senator ED JOHNSON led the fight for it there. However, they amended the bill in the Senate by providing that terminal-leave pay should be made in bonds instead of in cash. This was right at the last of the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and when the measure came back to the House, and when conferees were appointed, they agreed to accept the Senate amendment, because we could not get anything else through at that time. As the author of the bill, I rose on the floor and argued for the passage of the bill with the Senate amendment, with the proviso that the first bill I would introduce in the first session of the Eightieth Congress would be a bill to provide that these bonds be paid in cash.

I got permission from the then Clerk of the House, the Honorable South Trimble, to have the No. 2 place on the calendar of the Eightieth Congress. There was one man who beat me to the No. 1 place. Unfortunately, the Republicans got control of the House in the Eightieth Congress, and what Mr. Trimble had promised me would be the No. 2 place became No. 3, of which I was proud. May I say for Mr. Andrews, who was the Republican Clerk of the House, that he was nice to me in giving me No. 3. That was the bill providing for the payment of these bonds in cash.

The bill finally was reported, and came out as a new bill from the committee. The bill provided that these bonds should be redeemable in cash upon the application of the holder of the bond.

That is the history of terminal-leave pay.

This is an illustration of how the will of this House can be worked without the rule that we adopted the first of the last session, the so-called 21-day rule. When a majority of the Members of this House want legislation they can get it, and they could get it without the rule we adopted and over which we had a fight a few days ago, because we have Calendar Wednesday and we have the discharge petition by which, when we can get 218 signatures, we can get a measure before the House.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. We in the House all know how diligent the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] has been in taking care of matters pertaining to the veterans. In the early days, of course, with expenditures running rather high, it was somewhat difficult for some of us to arrive at a conclusion as to what was the best thing to do with regard to the expenditure of funds. The gentleman from Florida got his bill to the floor and the House voted unanimously for it. I congratulate him on his interest in this measure today.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman gave me his cooperation at every stage in connection with this bill. His was a great contribution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We all know the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] is the father of the terminal-leave-pay bill. I think it only fitting that the Members should come here to hear him.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. A quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 19]

Baring	Gilmer	Pfeiffer,
Bland	Gossett	William L.
Boggs, La.	Hart	Plumley
Bolling	Hébert	Powell
Brown, Ga.	Heller	Ramsay
Buchanan	Hobbs	Reed, Ill.
Buckley, N.Y.	Hoffman, Ill.	Rees
Bulwinkle	Hope	Ribicoff
Burdick	James	Rich
Burton	Jennings	Richards
Byrne, N.Y.	Keefe	Rivers
Carnahan	Kennedy	Scott, Hardie
Cavalcante	Kirwan	Shafer
Celler	Kunkel	Short
Chudoff	Latham	Smathers
Coudert	LeFevre	Smith, Ohio
Davenport	Lichtenwalter	Stockman
Davies, N.Y.	Lucas	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	McMillan, S.C.	Van Zandt
Dawson	Merrow	Velde
Dingell	Monroney	Wadsworth
Douglas	Morrison	Walsh
Engel, Mich.	Murdock	White, Idaho
Engle, Calif.	Murphy	Wilson, Ind.
Fogarty	Nixon	Withrow
Fulton	Pace	Woodhouse
Furcolo	Patman	Young
Gamble	Pfeifer,	
Gathings	Joseph L.	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3205, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 348 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, to continue my remarks on the bill, H. R. 3205 with reference to extending the time for filing applications for terminal-leave pay, may I conclude by saying that the original bill, H. R. 4051, was passed to take care of every veteran who had terminal-leave pay coming to him.

I hope this House will unanimously pass this bill. Irrespective of whether or not a veteran has filed his application up to this time, he still should be permitted to take advantage of the provisions of this bill. This bill extends the time for filing applications to June 30, 1951. A veteran came into my office last year who was entitled to his terminal-leave pay. He had been at sea all the time, he said, and had no opportunity to file an

application, yet the first time he did have an opportunity to file it he came in to file it, I sent it in, and he could not get his terminal-leave pay. This will take care of just such injustices as that.

As I previously said, on the floor of this House, on veteran legislation, and I say again, "There is nothing too good for our veterans."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, the damage from the coal strike continues to expand. Yesterday I received the following wire from the Growers' Clearing House Association of the State of Washington:

Refrigerator-car shortage Pacific Northwest seriously restricting movement of apples imposing additional burden on industry through aggravating an existing critical marketing problem. Understand coal shortage an important factor. Our organization representing 2,000 growers request you use your influence to relieve this emergency.

Other telegrams I have received are along the same lines. For instance, the Wenatchee Valley Traffic Association has wired me:

Recent order limiting coal-burning railroads contributing to car shortage in Northwest. We have fruit maturing; must continue to move. This is acute emergency and urge you investigate. Use every influence permit coal-burning lines move empty reefers for perishable transportation.

And a telegram from Gwin, White & Prince, Inc., Seattle, states:

Regardless statement President that no emergency exists account Lewis coal program shortage coal preventing eastern railroads hauling empty refrigerator cars west-bound for delivery their western connections. Only loaded cars and passengers being hauled so says President Gavin, Great Northern. Today only 350 empty refrigerator cars on line Great Northern. Shortage exists on Milwaukee, Northern Pacific roads. Apple shippers, Wenatchee district, not furnished fourth cars absolutely necessary daily. Preponderance large-size apples this season makes imperative apples move now, not months later. Railroads pay only mileage on refrigerator cars; no cost them when not rolling. Can you help relieve situation immediately?

Thus we see that work stoppages and enforced idleness not only destroy the American farmer's market but also restrict his ability to transport his goods to it.

The President should act, and act at once.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this bill. It received a unanimous report from the Committee on Armed Services, and I have not received a request for time from any Member of the House in opposition to its provisions.

Mr. Chairman, if the purpose of this bill was to permit only those veterans to file applications who have been negligent in the presentation of their claims, I would not favor it. But the record before our committee indicates that a great many injustices would be done if this bill is not passed. Some cases are those of veterans in hospitals who never knew that they were entitled to terminal leave. Some are cases of veterans whose return from overseas was delayed. If this bill does not pass they will have no opportunity to make claim for their terminal-leave pay.

The pending bill should receive the unanimous vote of the House.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, originally I had no intention to speak on this measure, because most, if not all, Members favor it; but after listening to the debate and observing the procedure here today, I cannot help but be reminded of the story of the three bulls—the big bull, the middle-sized bull, and the little bull. The big bull could always run up to the pasture fence and jump right over it without any trouble at all. The middle-sized bull could run up to the pasture fence and would have to run down the fence a little piece before it could get over. But the little bull could run up to the fence and he would have to run a long way down the fence before it could get over. The moral to that story is that a little bull must go a long way.

After listening to the debate and observing the proceedings, I think we all appreciate that today a little bull must go a long way.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose behind this measure, as I understand it, is to enable a number of veterans of the last war, the enlisted personnel, to avail themselves of provisions of the law which, for some reason or another, they have not had an opportunity to do heretofore. That being the case, it is absolutely incumbent upon this Congress to take care of them and permit them to do so. I will call your attention to the fact that the officer personnel, upon their release from the armed services following the last war, were paid a terminal-leave bonus, so to speak, at the time. Why the enlisted personnel were not I do not know.

But, the Congress, in its wisdom, saw fit to make provisions for enlisted personnel some time later. It is now up to us to continue, in order that we can keep faith with the intent of the Congress in the enactment of the original legislation.

With the permission of the Chairman, and the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, I was granted unanimous consent to digress from the subject a little bit. Today we have heard a great deal, as we have in the past few days, about this unfortunate piece of legislation known as the FEPC.

Coming from the State of South Carolina, my position is well known, and it is an unalterable position. However, I would like to call the attention of the Congress to a piece of legislation that is now pending, which, in my opinion, is far more important to the American public, because of its relation to the economic status of this country, than the FEPC. I am not sure of the exact number, but I think it is House Joint Resolution 398. In any event, it is a resolution sponsored by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, which will amend the existing acreage allotment and marketing quota provisions of the law that we passed during the recent session of the Congress. It is my impression, and I hope I am incorrect, that the Department of Agriculture, without laying specific blame on any individual, is certainly not administering the law within the complete intent of this Congress.

I might cite an illustration. In a county in my district, Greenwood County, they normally plant 8,000 acres of cotton without any acreage regulations in force. Under the existing acreage-allotment law they are allotted 9,000 acres of cotton, an increase of 1,000 acres. Yet there are farmers, one-horse and two-horse and larger farmers, who have been cut in their cotton acreage as much as 60 and 75 percent. I am sure that this Congress had no intention of doing that, and I am convinced that their cut is due primarily to the administration of the law by the Department of Agriculture and the Production and Marketing Administration.

The purpose of the Cooley resolution is to aid in rectifying such an injustice as that. If the farmers of this country are going to be penalized and deprived of a normal livelihood, then the only thing that we can expect in the immediate future is a recession on all of the economic fronts in this country. That is, the farmer as a group is, by and large, the greatest purchaser of commodities in this country. If he does not have any purchasing power, how can the employers and employees of manufacturing industries expect to survive? Employees will be out of employment because the manufacturer will have no outlet for his goods. If that should become the case, how damaging could it be on our economy, and where would the Federal Government get its forty or fifty billion per annum to spend in support of the Government and to take care of the foreign nations to which we have obligated ourselves?

I bring that to the attention of this Congress with the hope that on tomorrow the Committee on Rules will see fit to grant a rule on this resolution, in order that it may come up for consideration.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman has referred to the cotton acreage situation in the State from which he comes, and the manner in which it has been administered. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has had any complaints with re-

spect to the accuracy of that base year—that is, the acreage planted. I understand that the Department has depended upon the Bureau of Agricultural Economics for the figures. I know a number of cases where those figures have not been accurate. I think they have been accurate generally on a Nation-wide or perhaps a State-wide basis, but when reduced to the county level or the individual farm level they have not been accurate. That is not particularly the fault of the BAE, because the facilities they have to observe individual farm acreage situations is limited. They have depended upon the ginning records and spot checks of individual farms in various counties; but I know a number of situations where those checks have not resulted in accuracy. I am wondering if the gentleman has observed that situation in the State from which he comes?

Mr. HARE. I certainly have; the gentleman is absolutely correct.

The figures of the BAE, by and large, from a National or State basis are just about as accurate as can be had; but from the county standpoint they are absolutely inaccurate, from cross-county ginnings, failure of ginners to report the county in which the cotton was produced, and for a number of other reasons. I think the distribution of acreage on the adjusted BAE figures is the primary cause for so much unrest and the many inequities that now exist. The only way, in my opinion, to correct the situation is to change the law so that acreage allotments hereafter will be based on actual plantings by the individual farmers; that is, the plantings he can prove. Of course I am opposed to any control of acreage and I think the law should be repealed. Acreage control is nothing more than governmental regimentation of agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has 12 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Texas has 6.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, I wish to devote these 5 minutes to a discussion of the matter on which the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] has just spoken. I am sorry to say that I must entirely disagree with the gentleman in his statement that the trouble with the existing cotton acreage law is its administration by the Department of Agriculture. I believe that anyone who has really studied the situation will grant that the trouble has come about through the administration by the county committees. Everyone knows that the county committeemen are elected by the farmers; they are farmers themselves. The Department of Agriculture has absolutely nothing to do with directing those people; that is, directing their decisions, and the bill which we passed in this Congress states very plainly in the reserving of the 15-percent reserve designed to cure the so-called hardship cases, that it rests entirely in the discretion of the county committee. I ask you in view of that, How can the Department of Agriculture be blamed?

Getting down to the BAE figures, we must not forget that we had this long hiatus during the war years when they did not keep figures because the personnel had gone away to war and because there were no control programs. The Department had to do the best it could in order to get some figures to go back under crop-production controls, and they had to ask the farmers how much acreage they had planted in certain years. The farmers reported too many acres, and the Department had to squeeze the water out of them. Certainly, it is going to be unjust to the people who are honest in favor of those who are dishonest; but if there is any individual who has been unfairly treated and he can prove it, all he has to do is to appeal to the State appeal committee. If that committee grants his request and finds he has told the truth, all the committee has to do is to pull that acreage out of thin air and give it to that farmer under existing law. All those cases can be rectified in that manner if the grower appeals in time. So I hope everybody will quit talking about these BAE figures and damning the Department of Agriculture because it is not their fault. The fault lies, Mr. Chairman, in the way the law was set up.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. Is the gentleman talking now about existing law or the Cooley resolution?

Mr. WHITE of California. Existing law. This relief is available under existing law when the grower files his appeal in time, but the time has now expired for filing appeals but this time would be renewed for 15 days under the Cooley resolution.

I would like to go on now, because I want to make an additional point. The Farm Bureau circulated a letter here today which, in effect, would nullify the Cooley amendment, if their amendments are adopted. This is the same group that wrote the last law. I fought it tooth and nail and I will fight them again, because they are trying to convert this cotton-acreage allotment business into one of putting it on the basis of how much land a man has instead of how much cotton has been planted. There is no justice in it and the Farm Bureau amendment should be defeated. The Cooley amendment should prevail just as it left the committee, except that I hope the 40-percent limitation on cropland will be removed.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. As the gentleman says, that is the law now and they can appeal to the State committee and have their complaint heard. The acreage may be increased if the claim is supported. Is that the gentleman's statement?

Mr. WHITE of California. That is correct, except that the appeal time has expired under present law but would be renewed by the Cooley resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN (after counting). One hundred and seventeen Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, for a change I shall discuss the bill before the House.

Mr. Chairman, on February 9, 1949, I introduced H. R. 2594 to further amend section 5 of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 by extending the time for making applications for terminal leave pay to September 1, 1951. This was the first bill introduced on that subject. Now, I am not going to fuss with the committee for reporting out the bill of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN], a member of the committee, rather than my own. In the words of the immortal poet, Omar Khayyám, I am perfectly willing to take the cash and let the credit go.

I voted for the terminal leave pay bill when it was first before this Congress because I felt at that time that the officers having received terminal leave pay, it was a rank injustice not to give it to the enlisted men also. The bill passed the House almost unanimously.

There are approximately 21,000 GI's who have not received their terminal-leave pay simply because they did not file their applications within the time prescribed by that act. They are just as much entitled to it as anyone else who was a member of the armed forces. I am advised that the Navy Department alone reported that on October 12, 1949, claims of naval and former naval personnel numbering 1,746 had been rejected due to late filing by claimants, and that in 21 cases of the claims rejected failure to file in time was not due to the fault of the veterans but rather to delays caused by non-Federal agencies. Two cases have come to my attention in which the veteran was not at fault. One involved a veteran who because of a nervous disorder has not filed an application, and the other a veteran living in a rural district who was not aware until recently that he was entitled to terminal-leave pay.

It would be a great injustice to those veterans who are entitled to their terminal-leave pay if they were denied that pay merely because of failure to file an application. Especially is that true in those cases where the failure was caused not by the fault of the veteran, but because of some other circumstance.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it gives me very great pleasure to endorse the bill which is now before this body. Although my bill would have extended the time to September 1, 1951, I think there is sound reason for closing the time for filing these applications on June 30, 1951, which is the end of the fiscal year. This, as the committee reports, will permit better fiscal planning for the administrative costs involved.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, we have debated almost everything that might appear on the calendar, whether on Calendar Wednesday or any other day, but now that we are terminating general debate I do want to get back to the bill. It is a bill which should be passed today. I can assure all of you that the Committee on Armed Services has adopted a resolution directing several of us to call up some six or seven additional bills which would be in order today. I personally have two more which were considered by the subcommittee of which I am chairman. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] has three which were considered by his subcommittee, and I believe the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has either two or three which were considered by the full committee. So there is plenty of additional work if that is what you want.

This bill does create a situation in which justice may be done to a group of men who are as much entitled to their terminal leave pay, as those who collected it very promptly. I hope that we can terminate the debate this afternoon and vote on it. It seems at this time as if most likely there would be a roll call on final passage of the bill, which would run us rather late in the afternoon. This is a bill of importance, and one that I hope will be passed today without fail.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. After the passage of this bill today, is it the purpose of the committee to call up another bill, or do we then adjourn?

Mr. KILDAY. The purpose of the committee is to do whatever is required of it, because it is Calendar Wednesday, and our committee has the call. We have some five or six bills that we are ready at this time to call up and attempt to have considered. Whether the House remains in session or adjourns is not in our control; it is in the control of the majority of the House. If they want to stay here until midnight we can keep them occupied until midnight.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is it your purpose to continue to call up bills if the House stays in session?

Mr. KILDAY. If the House stays in session, I am sure the three I have mentioned will be able to keep you busy until midnight.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then the FEPC supporters might just as well adjourn, because they will not get on today, anyway?

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman can have his argument. I am going to talk about the bills brought up by the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Of course, we are anxious to expedite the business here today so that we can get on with the call of the other matters that would come up on Calendar Wednesday. Does the gentleman know of any reason for a roll call? Is there any opposition to this measure?

Mr. KILDAY. I know of none, but we have had many roll calls today. I am being a little bit practical. You know I am supposed to be in charge of the bill. Apparently I am, after 8 or 10 other Members have completed controlling the time for us. So I am not in a position to say, as you might be able to say when handling a bill, just what you might expect. But we are willing, able, and ready to do whatever the majority says they want done on Calendar Wednesday. We are perfectly willing to stay until midnight. I hope this bill will be passed today without delay.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended (37 U. S. C., sec. 34), is hereby amended by striking out "September 1, 1948" wherever it appears in such section and inserting in lieu thereof "September 1, 1949."

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 6, strike out "September 1, 1949", and insert "June 30, 1951."

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the 5 minutes allotted to me since I only want to say that there never was any rhyme or reason for the War Department or for the Navy Department paying terminal leave to officers and not extending terminal-leave pay to the enlisted men. I have never been able to find out from the members of the Committee on Armed Services, or from anyone connected with the War Department, just what the statutory authority was for paying officers terminal-leave pay at the rate of 2½ days per month, which amounted to 30 days a year, with no terminal leave for the enlisted men.

The Congress, finally, in desperation, in order to do justice to the great body of enlisted men, passed an act which gave terminal leave to all of the enlisted men in the armed services, thus doing only simple justice to these heroic men.

I hope this bill will be passed today without any delay and without serious opposition because it extends to those who, for one reason or another, have not been able to or have overlooked the opportunity of putting in their applications for terminal leave another year in which to file their claims.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I notice this terminal leave date is June 30, 1951. There was some talk here, not from the well of the House, but from other parts of the House, that that date should be moved ahead, let us say, to January 1951. I was not in favor of that, because I thought we ought to give the veterans the full time to June 30, 1951. This terminal date calls to mind a point which I would like to make in answer to the gentleman who spoke about the cotton, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE], that is, the farmer prospers, then everybody prospers. I have heard that argument ever since I came here.

The first time I heard it was from the Townsendites who wanted $200 a month for pensions. Their argument was that if we gave every person over a certain age $200 a month, everyone would be prosperous. A fellow would get $200 a month, and his wife $200, and they would spend that money every month. In fact, there was one provision in one bill that the money must be spent in the current month. That would grease the old machinery and start it going and keep it going. It would be sort of a revolving fund. Too bad that instead of giving our own old people something we gave the billions to folks abroad.

I recall when some of us did not want subsidies. We were fearful we would sell ourselves into Government control. You gentlemen on that side are getting Government money for peanuts, tobacco, cotton—oh, everything, I guess, that you grow there in the South. If you have overlooked anything, it was because of a mistake. You put on subsidies with the result, the natural and inevitable result, that you have plenty of the subsidized crop. Yes; too much of it. Billions of dollars' worth of potatoes, eggs; at times too much butter, cheese, dried milk. We had eggs in the North, and I guess corn and wheat—I do not know what all. Apples and pears to some extent. Little pigs and old sows. Everybody received a payment—all to boost the ability to spend—and those who received the payments were expected to vote right. Some did, to their sorrow.

Now you got just exactly what you might have expected you would get. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], a very fine young man, a good legislator, was speaking the other day. I know that when you started that legislation you thought you were going to help your farmers. There was no doubt about that. But every time you put on a subsidy then some time or other you must have controls. If you do not, everybody goes into the business that is profitable. Now, what you cotton gentlemen from the South and the gentleman from California, yelling your heads off here because there are controls on cotton——

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman mentioned my name.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, I did not mention your name. I said the gentleman from California.

Mr. WHITE of California. Well, I am one of the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You are just one of many.

Mr. WHITE of California. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Some of my folks went out there to get in on that $100-a-month pension, or whatever, and then after they got out there, what did you do? You amended the law and fixed it so they could not get it. Now they are coming back to Michigan.

Mr. WHITE of California. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did yield.

Mr. WHITE of California. I am not objecting to controls. I am objecting to the gang that came in here from the gentleman's party——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, wait a minute. O Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield for anybody to be called a member of a gang not unless it is a goon squad which is rioting or beating up someone.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman has implied that the cotton farmers have been getting a subsidy.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did they not get it?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then I am mistaken again. You fellows must have fallen down on the job. That is what you intended to give them—call it what you will your cotton farmers got a payment or a price fixed on your cotton.

Mr. FISHER. Let me tell the gentleman something. This may really open the gentleman's eyes. The cotton program since its inception——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Will the gentleman let me finish my sentence? What I was trying to say when I was interrupted was that since the cotton program went into effect 13 years ago, instead of being in the form of a subsidy and a cost to the taxpayers, up to the 1st of July it has netted the Government $237,000,000 over and above operating expenses.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Income or outgo?

Mr. FISHER. Income.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It has?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, indeed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I am glad of that, and if there was just more of it we might pay off the national debt. What?

I thought you fellows were for it because your farmers were getting the money. I did not know the cotton farmers were contributing more than $200,000,000 to balance the budget. But live and learn. You go back home and tell your constituents that what you got through was a law making your farmers pay more, and see whether you come back.

Now, you may laugh at that all you want, but this is a serious proposition. Every time you make payments of that kind to first one group and then another, then you later get control and regulation. My farmers were just so happy to get hold of these subsidies, but now they are yelling their heads off because they are being told what they can do—how many acres and planted to what. You get the dough, but you surrender the right to run your own business. A handout from the Government is a high price for the loss of one's freedom.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, my time is not up yet. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is going to tell us the cotton farmers are the poorest-paid men in the whole wide world; he only gets a half a cent an hour for the work that he puts in. I have heard it. No doubt it is true, the gentleman is accurate in his statements. You come in and visit with me almost twice a week and you have told me how hard up you are.

Mr. RANKIN. I have tried to educate the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And I have thanked the gentleman and to a certain extent you have succeeded. Of your sincerity and patriotism I have no doubt; nor of your ability, I might add.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] is saying is correct, about the Government showing a profit, but I want to point out, just to correct the gentleman's statement, that we have been shipping out two or three or four million bales of cotton a year that has been paid for by American taxpayers through the European recovery program, so the taxpayers have paid that money which makes it possible for the Commodity Credit Corporation to show a profit.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course I knew the taxpayers got gypped some way, but I did not know how. As I get it now the taxpayers finance the CCC which pays the cotton farmer for his crop a price which is higher than he would otherwise get. In the end everyone gets soaked for the cotton growers' benefit.

I yield back the balance of my time. I give the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] my extra minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

COMMUNISTIC FEPC BILL—RACIAL DISCRIMINATION—POWELL VERSUS ROOSEVELT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, we have witnessed a most ridiculous performance here today over the so-called FEPC bill—the most dangerous piece of communistic legislation that has ever been proposed in the Congress of the United States.

I am not trying to reconcile the differences between the two Members who went at each other's throats this morning, Representatives POWELL and ROOSEVELT. I am like Carmack, I do not believe in attempting to weld a wooden handle to a pewter spoon.

I never try to graft a dead bough to a living trunk and make it blossom as the rose.

I never try to mix oil and water together placidly in the same bottle, or to make boon companions of a spider and a fly.

I agree with Brann, the great iconoclast, who said: "You cannot explain a dead cat out of the family cistern."

But here we are in this ridiculous position: The Member from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] cannot withdraw his petition; the other Member from New York, Representative POWELL, threatens to file a separate petition.

That would put every Member of Congress who favors this monstrosity on the spot. If he signs the Powell petition then the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] can accuse you of discrimination because of race, creed, or color; if he signs the Roosevelt petition, then he can be accused of discriminating against the Member from New York, Representative POWELL, because of race, creed, or color.

So they have hit into a double play. It just shows the ridiculousness of the whole FEPC program.

I hope the House will take the hint and bury it so deep that it will never be heard of again.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. PRIEST having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HARRIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3205) to provide a 1-year extension of the time for making application for terminal-leave pay, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide an extension of the time for making application for terminal-leave pay."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. DOUGLAS (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK, for 1 day, on account of illness.

To Mr. HELLER (at the request of Mr. MULTER), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. BROWN of Georgia (at the request of Mr. VINSON), indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 26, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1158. A letter from the Vice Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the Annual Report of the United States Maritime Commission, for the fiscal year 1949; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1159. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Julius Elzas"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1160. A letter from the chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting the Second Annual Report on the Operation of the Trade Agreements Program, pursuant to provisions of Executive Order 10004; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1161. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 10, 1949, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Wallace Channel, Pamlico Sound, N. C., submitted under the authority for a preliminary examination and survey of cross-rock channel, between Wallace Channel and Sheep Island slough, via Casey Island, Pamlico Sound, N. C., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on July 24, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 453); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1162. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 14, 1949, submitted a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative study for beach erosion control of the shore line of the State of Connecticut, area 1, Ash Creek to Saugatuck River. This investigation was made under the provisions of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 454); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with 19 illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 441. Resolution for consideration of S. 88, an act to amend section 60 of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1523). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 6559. A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide a minimum rate of compensation for World War II veterans who have arrested tuberculosis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1536). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 6561. A bill to extend certain veterans' benefits to or on behalf of dependent husbands and widowers of female veterans; without amendment (Rept. No. 1537). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 6562. A bill to amend the Veterans' Regulations to provide additional compensation for the loss or loss of the use of a creative organ; without amendment (Rept. No. 1538). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 6673. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, by providing for treble damage actions; without amendment (Rept. No. 1539). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 597. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of J. T. Melson against the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1524). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1026. A bill for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1525). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1479. A bill for the relief of Michael A. Driscoll; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1526). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1481. A bill for the relief of the estate of Julius Zaffareni; without amendment (Rept. No. 1527). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary: H. R. 2230. A bill to reimburse Arthur S. Horner, Leah B. Horner, and Maude Brewer, partners composing a firm, doing business as A. S. Horner Construction Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1528). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2351. A bill for the relief of Alleen L. Sherwood; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1529). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3306. A bill for the relief of Antonio Rojas Vélez; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1530). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3309. A bill for the relief of the guardian of Ividio Vázquez; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1531). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3315. A bill for the relief of Alejo Padilla; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1532). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3319. A bill for the relief of Juana Pagán; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1533). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5682. A bill to authorize Public Housing Administration to pay charges awarded against it by judgment of the Sixtieth District Court of Jefferson County, Tex., and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1534). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6323. A bill for the relief of Raymond B. White; without amendment (Rept. No. 1535). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 6971. A bill to authorize the transfer of funds allocated for expenditure in cooperation with the New Jersey State Highway Department on State Highway Route No. 100 to State Parkway Route No. 4; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 6972. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide increased retirement benefits for post-office inspectors; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 6973. A bill authorizing and directing the United States Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to undertake a continuing study of the shortage of croakers and other fish in the Chesapeake Bay and tributaries with respect to the biology, propagation, and abundance of such species to the end that such service may recommend appropriate measures for arresting the decline of valuable food fish and for increasing the abundance and promoting the wisest utilization thereof; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 6974. A bill appropriating to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service the sum of $55,000 for a continuing study of the shortage of croakers and other fish in the Chesapeake Bay and tributaries with respect to the biology, propagation, and abundance of such species to the end that such Service may recommend appropriate measures for arresting the decline of valuable food fish and for increasing the abundance and promoting the wisest utilization thereof; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 6975. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6976. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code relating to bank robbery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 6977. A bill to establish an Armed Forces Reserve Medal; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6978. A bill to provide a reimbursement for uniforms and equipment for officers of the Reserve components of the Army,

Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6979. A bill to establish an Armed Forces Reserve Commendation Ribbon; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GORSKI:

H. R. 6980. A bill to increase from $600 to $750 the income-tax exemptions of an individual taxpayer for himself and for his spouse or other first dependent, and to increase the amount of credit for a dependent from $600 to $750; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 6981. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize assistance to States and political subdivisions in the development and maintenance of local public-health units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 6982. A bill to authorize grants and loans to cooperatives and nonprofit associations, operating medical and hospital-care plans, for the acquisition, construction, and equipment of needed facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 6983. A bill to amend section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6984. A bill to amend section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 6985. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) with respect to the computation of estimated costs of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction in the case of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

H. R. 6986. A bill relating to the acquisition and addition of certain lands to Fort Frederica National Monument, in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 6987. A bill to provide that the Attorney General shall make periodic reports to the Congress with respect to consent decrees and pleas of nolo contendere in certain antitrust proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. Res. 442. Resolution to direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to recommend a national fuel policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. Res. 443. Resolution providing an amount not to exceed $50 for the official use of the office staff of a deceased or resigned Member; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 6988. A bill for the relief of Hendryk Kempski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 6989. A bill for the relief of Harry E. Lauder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 6990. A bill for the relief of Christina Karamanos Demas and Antonia Karamanos Demas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 6991. A bill for the relief of E. G. Morris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 6992. A bill for the relief of Kirocor Haladjian, Tacouhi Haladjian, Gulunia Haladjian, and Virginie Haladjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARST:

H. R. 6993. A bill for the relief of Francis K. Gillen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY (by request):

H. R. 6994. A bill for the relief of Miss Karen R. McAndrews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 6995. A bill for the relief of Sister Giustino Valo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER:

H. R. 6996. A bill for the relief of Manuel Do Couto Ramos or Manuel Ramos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 6997. A bill for the relief of Lore Roeder and daughter, Jutta Roeder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1725. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Edmond C. Fletcher, Washington, D. C., requesting the impeachment of Hon. Morris A. Soper, of Baltimore, Md., circuit judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1726. By Mr. COLE of New York: Petition of residents of Canisteo, N. Y., for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1727. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Mrs. H. A. Cordes and other citizens of Moravia, Iowa, who are opposing passage of H. R. 2945, a bill to increase postage rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1728. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of sundry citizens of Brodhead, Wis., against use of public funds for religious schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1729. Also, resolution of Country Efficiency Club of Delavan, Delavan, Wis., protesting against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1730. Also, resolution of Thursday Club, of Beloit, Wis., protesting against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1731. Also, petition of Three Lakes Womans Club, Three Lakes, Wis., protesting against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1732. Also, petition of Mothers' Club, Beloit, Wis., protesting against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1733. Also, resolution of Junior Club of Kenosha, Kenosha, Wis., protesting against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 26, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, whose goodness and mercy has followed us all our pilgrim years and whose love will not let us go, this day may the meditation of our hearts and the words of our lips, unstained by malice, selfish interest, or personal pique, be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord our strength and our Redeemer. And in this forum of a nation's life may these servants of the people's will be so guided by Thy spirit that all their deliberations may be begun, continued, and ended in Thee. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HAYDEN, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 25, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3205) to provide an extension of the time for making application for terminal-leave pay, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CAIN was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MCCLELLAN, because of necessary business, was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until Tuesday next.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HAYDEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	Ives
Anderson	Flanders	Jenner
Benton	Frear	Johnson, Colo.
Brewster	Fulbright	Johnson, Tex.
Bricker	George	Johnston, S. C.
Butler	Gillette	Kefauver
Byrd	Graham	Kem
Capehart	Green	Kerr
Chapman	Gurney	Kilgore
Connally	Hayden	Knowland
Cordon	Hendrickson	Langer
Donnell	Hickenlooper	Leahy
Douglas	Hill	Lehman
Downey	Hoey	Lodge
Dworshak	Holland	Long
Eastland	Humphrey	McCarran
Ecton	Hunt	McCarthy

McClellan	O'Conor	Thye
McFarland	O'Mahoney	Tobey
McKellar	Pepper	Tydings
McMahon	Robertson	Vandenberg
Magnuson	Russell	Watkins
Martin	Saltonstall	Wherry
Maybank	Smith, Maine	Wiley
Millikin	Smith, N. J.	Williams
Mundt	Sparkman	Withers
Murray	Stennis	Young
Myers	Taylor	
Neely	Thomas, Utah	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is unavoidably absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HAYDEN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MCKELLAR, and by unanimous consent, the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

REPORT ON FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY DISPOSAL BY NAVY DEPARTMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the disposal of Navy excess property in foreign areas, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1949, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Michael B. Brubaker, secretary, Voters' League, of Port Trevorton, Pa., relating to present-day pricing systems; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Resolutions adopted by the Bradenton Townsend Club, No. 1, of Bradenton, the Daytona Beach Townsend Club, No. 2, of Daytona Beach, and a mass meeting of citizens at Sarasota, all in the State of Florida, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 2181, providing old-age insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GREEN:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; ordered to lie on the table:

"Resolution memorializing Congress with relation to the United States constitutional amendment on equal rights for women

"Whereas after years of effort and innumerable hearings, with never an unfavorable committee report and with strong recommendations for its passage, the equal-rights amendment to the United States Constitution has now reached the stage where its passage by Congress and submission to the States seems close at hand; and

"Whereas early in the first session of the present Congress, the Senate Judiciary Committee, composed wholly of lawyers, favorably reported the equal-rights amendment without a dissenting vote and presiding at this meeting was the chairman of the committee, Senator PAT MCCARRAN, and included among its members voting the favorable report, was Senator J. Howard McGrath, then chairman of the Democratic national committee, now United States Attorney General; and

"Whereas progress is truly being made; support for the cause has gained steadily since the amendment was first introduced in 1923: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the general assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations now goes on record in support of the submission of a United States constitutional amendment on equal rights for women which shall say:

" 'Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

" 'Congress and the several States shall have the power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

" 'This amendment shall take effect 1 year after the date of ratification'; and the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States are earnestly requested to work for the passage of this constitutional amendment; and the secretary of state is hereby authorized and directed to transmit to said Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island duly certified copies of this resolution."

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there is now pending before the House Agricultural Committee a new bill, H. R. 6782, introduced by Representative TACKETT.

I have already heard from many rural-electrification cooperatives in my State who have expressed their deep concern over this legislation and their strenuous objection to it. I have in my hands, for example, a very fine message which I have received from my friend, Mr. R. L. Cleaves, of Cornell, Wis., manager of the Chippewa Valley Electric Cooperative. Another message comes in the form of a resolution from Mr. W. E. Rabe, secretary of the Dairyland Power Cooperative. I believe that this resolution will be of interest to my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that its brief text be printed in the RECORD at this point, and appropriately referred.

I have previously commented on the Senate floor on the vital role of rural electrification on the American agricultural scene, and the necessity for its continuation, so as to make sure that America's farmers maintain and improve a still higher standard of living which they so justly deserve for their hard labor.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF DAIRYLAND POWER COOPERATIVE FRIDAY, JANUARY 20, 1950

The board of directors of Dairyland Power Cooperative has given consideration to bill H. R. 6782, introduced by Congressman TACKETT on January 16, 1950, and to his press release issued in connection therewith.

We are firmly convinced that the passage of this bill would be against the best interests of farmers and rural electrification and should be unalterably opposed. The effect of this bill would be to cripple the right of farmers to generate their own power and to purchase cheap power Government-owned hydro developments.

We urge our Congressmen and Senators to oppose bill H. R. 6782.

PRESIDENT'S CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF FAR ROCKAWAY DEMOCRATIC CLUB, NEW YORK

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Far Rockaway Democratic Club of New York, favoring the President's civil-rights program.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas one of the foremost planks of the Democratic Party in the 1948 national elections consisted of the enactment of civil-rights legislation; and

Whereas the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of these United States has repeatedly urged upon the Congress of the United States, passage of adequate civil-rights legislation; and

Whereas the Far Rockaway Democratic Club, in its campaign activities and support of the Democratic candidates for office, pledged itself to further the enactment of adequate measures of this kind, to the members of the community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Far Rockaway Democratic Club reiterates its support of the President's civil-rights program and urges upon the Representatives and Senators representing our community to support and assist the President of the United States in obtaining the passage of H. R. 4453 and S. 1728, more popularly known as the Fair Employment Practices Commission law, together with any other measures of the President's program that may come before the Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all the Members of Congress from this district together with a copy to William M. Boyle, Jr., Chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Respectfully submitted.

WILLIAM KATZ,
President.
MARTIN STECHER,
Recording Secretary.

THE FAR EAST—RESOLUTION OF MANCHESTER (N. H.) YOUNG REPUBLICANS

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Manchester (N. H.) Young Republicans, relating to conditions in the Far East.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the Manchester Young Republicans denounces the present policy of passive retreat in the Far East and places itself on record as favoring the taking of affirmative steps by the executive branch of our Government, pursuant to appropriate legislative mandate, to help hold the line against communism by holding the island of Formosa through whatever means may become necessary, including but not limited to the use of United States naval protection, and United States military advisers to the Chinese Nationalist Government on Formosa as necessary. This association condemns the appeasement and retreat which has characterized our foreign policy in China since General (Ambassador) Hurley resigned in the fall of 1945. The association finds ordinary people in this vicinity overwhelmingly in favor of helping hold Formosa, and notes with amazement the apparent refusal of the President of the United States and of the Secretary of State to carry out this obvious will of our people; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of the foregoing resolution be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Governor of this State, to the New Hampshire congressional delegation, to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to the Secretary of the United States Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 2911. A bill to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Col. Charles H. Bonesteel as Executive Director of the European Coordinating Committee under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, without affecting his military status and perquisites; without amendment (Rept. No. 1238).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2507. A bill to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to grant to the East Bay Municipal Utility District, an agency of the State of California, an easement for the construction and operation of an interceptor sewer pipe line in and under certain Government-owned lands comprising a part of the Maritime Alameda Shipyard, Alameda, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1239).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 198. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in its investigation of matters relating to crop production; without amendment (Rept. No. 1240);

S. Res. 208. Resolution further increasing the limit of expenditures for hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency; without amendment (Rept. No. 1241);

S. Res. 217. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures for investigation of the field of labor-management relations; without amendment (Rept. No. 1242); and

S. Res. 219. Resolution to investigate the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries; without amendment (Rept. No. 1243).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2931. A bill for the relief of George Papayanaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2932. A bill for the relief of Julia Sanchez Andaluz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 2933. A bill authorizing an appropriation for the construction of a high school and junior high-school building at Blackfoot, Idaho, for district No. 55, Bingham County, embracing the southeast portion of Bingham County and including the Fort Hall Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2934. A bill for the relief of Julius Elzas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2935. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1945 (Public Law 106, 79th Cong.), as amended, to provide true time and one-half for overtime and true double time for Sunday and holiday duty, and for other purposes; and

S. 2936. A bill to permit certain Government employees to receive credit for military service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 2937. A bill to establish the United States Air Academy at or near the Rapid City Air Force Base, Rapid City, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

INCORPORATION OF FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2868) to incorporate the Future Farmers of America, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN METHOD OF ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT—AMENDMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3205) to provide an extension of the time for making application for terminal-leave pay, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

JUSTICE FOR POLAND—ADDRESSES BY SENATOR LODGE AND JOSEPH A. NOWAK

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD addresses delivered by himself and Joseph A. Nowak in a radio broadcast from station WSPR in Springfield, Mass., January 8, 1950, which appear in the Appendix.]

PRESERVATION OF OUR NATIONAL FORESTS

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Greatest Good of the Greatest Number," delivered by Lyle F. Watts, Chief, United States Forest Service, at the dedication of the Gifford Pinchot National Forest, on October 15, 1949, and an address delivered by Mrs. Gifford Pinchot on the same occasion, which appears in the Appendix.]

DOUBT AS TO SOUNDNESS OF OLD-AGE SYSTEM—ARTICLE FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Casts Doubt on Soundness of Old-Age System," from the Chicago Tribune of January 25, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

YOUR DOLLARS FOR A DELUSION—EDITORIAL BY E. F. TOMPKINS

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Your Dollars for a Delusion," written by E. F. Tompkins, and published in the Chicago Sunday Herald-American of January 8, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE STRANGE CAREER OF TEDDY HAYES

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Strange Career of Teddy Hayes," written by Joe Williams, sports columnist of the New York World-Telegram and the Sun, which appears in the Appendix.]

IS HISS ALONE?—EDITORIAL FROM THE INDIANAPOLIS STAR

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Is Hiss Alone?" from the Indianapolis Star of January 22, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOCIALISM IN BRITAIN HITS CHURCH AND HOME—ARTICLE BY STEPHEN C. NOLAND

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Socialism in Britain Hits Church and Home," written by Stephen C. Noland and published in the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune of January 19, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHAKY UNITED STATES ECONOMY RESULTING IN NEW KIND OF ISOLATIONISM—ARTICLE BY CONSTANTINE BROWN

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Shaky United States Economy Resulting in New Kind of Isolationism," written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer, of January 15, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

MONEY, INFLATION, AND SOCIALISM—EDITORIAL BY BURRIS JENKINS, JR.

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Money, Inflation, and Socialism," from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer for January 10, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. FRANK A. HOOPER TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, February 3, 1950, at 1:30 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Frank

A. Hooper, of Georgia, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Georgia. Judge Hooper is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. OWEN McINTOSH BURNS TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, February 3, 1950, at 1:30 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Owen McIntosh Burns, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania. Judge Burns is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. THOMAS J. CLARY TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, February 3, 1950, at 1:30 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Thomas J. Clary, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania. Judge Clary is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

TRIBUTE TO GEN. DOUGLAS MacARTHUR ON HIS SEVENTIETH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, with our Nation called upon to play such a vital part in world affairs today, I believe it appropriate to call to the attention of this distinguished body the fact that today marks the seventieth birthday of one who has made a most remarkable contribution in the field of foreign relations, both throughout the critical days of World War II and in the years of world confusion resulting therefrom. During a portion of his illustrious career his official headquarters and his private residence were in the State of Maryland.

History records few parallels, if, indeed, there is any, to the extraordinary achievements of Gen. Douglas MacArthur during the past decade. As a military commander throughout the Pacific campaigns he was both an outstanding leader and a symbol of hope to our own people as well as to our allies. In the crucial postwar period, and down to the present day, as Administrator and Chief for the Allied Powers in Japan, he has had to cope with political and economic problems of the utmost complexity. As evidence of his capabilities, it need only be recalled that he has continued to administer affairs in Japan successfully over a period which has witnessed continual shifts and changes in policy and leadership in other areas where American interests were involved.

At a time of life when the average man is seeking relief from arduous duties which tax both his mental and physical resources, General MacArthur has continued to discharge his official responsibilities with never a thought or suggestion that he be relieved of the task to which he has so ardently dedicated himself.

On this seventieth anniversary of his birth General MacArthur richly merits the many expressions of appreciation and admiration which will be showered upon him for his valorous leadership in war and his intelligent handling of the complex questions of peace. In this tribute to his accomplishments I am sure millions of his fellow countrymen in every section of our land will gladly join, and in their behalf I voice to General MacArthur the sincere regard and respect which he has so well earned.

May divine providence accord him the fullness of time necessary to complete his appointed task, and to enjoy, thereafter, many years of fruitful life, enriched by the inner satisfaction that can be his, of a task well performed.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES ALDEN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared in tribute to a fine employee of the Senate and his half century of service.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRIBUTE TO A FINE EMPLOYEE OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE AND HIS HALF CENTURY OF SERVICE

Mr. President, on Wednesday, January 25, I spoke on the floor of the Senate on the subject of a truly great American known to us all, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who yesterday observed his seventieth birthday.

Today, Mr. President, I should like to say a few words in tribute to another fine American—an individual whom comparatively very few folks know, but who I think symbolizes the finest in public service. This individual on this coming Sunday, January 29, will celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of his coming to work for the United States Senate—the golden wedding, so to speak, of his service. Yes, on January 29, 1900, Mr. Charles Alden went to work for Senator Foraker, of Ohio. Since then and even prior to then, he has served ably, diligently, and loyally to various Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

HONORING ALL CONGRESSIONAL EMPLOYEES

It may seem a bit strange that I take even these few moments of the time of the Senate to comment on this single employee. But I think that there is a larger meaning to Charlie Alden's half century of service to the Congress. And I feel that we, as Senators, would be remiss indeed if we did not express our public appreciation to Charlie and to all the other grand workers in the Capitol, in the Senate and House Office Buildings who patiently, anonymously, devotedly perform their duties for the United States Government.

Charlie has now reached the ripe young age of 77, having been born on August 27, 1872. The years have given him the type of wholesome, genial philosophy from which every man can benefit. There is always a genuine smile on his face, sincere courtesy in his manner, warm consideration in his actions. He is young in spirit, young in heart, and the whiteness of his hair merely reflects the passing of time, but definitely not the passing of vitality, alertness, and a keen appreciation of life's true values.

He is a man of many talents and many interests. Away back in 1905 he organized a string quartet which meets every Tuesday to this day with Charlie alternating on the stringed instruments. Every job he has tackled he has done well, and he is living proof of the fact that a humble job, greatly performed, is a great job.

EVERY LEGISLATOR NEEDS AN EFFICIENT TEAM

No man who has observed at close hand the operations of the United States Government, including the Congress, the Supreme Court, and the executive branch, can help but notice that every individual in high public office must have an efficient, hard-working team with him, if he is to be adequate to his responsibilities. This is particularly true of the Congress, whose responsibilities have multiplied a hundredfold in this generation and whose committee staffs, office employees, building workers, official reporters, etc., are an indispensable element in a smooth functioning legislative branch.

Only an ungrateful Government or an ungrateful Congress would fail to note that fact. We, however, are indeed grateful and are sincerely appreciative of Charlie Alden and all the fine things he symbolizes. His work embodies the true concept that "public office is a public trust" and this goes for all those folks associated with public office.

To complete my comments, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed a brief summary of Charlie's work. We hope that in his many, many additional years of service, he will find the continuing fulfillment of the poet's words: "Grow old with me, the best is yet to be." Although his dear wife passed on 8 years ago, Charlie's life is rich in activity, in friends, and in golden memories.

Happy anniversary of service, Charlie, good luck, good wishes, and Godspeed to you.

SUMMARY OF CHARLES ALDEN'S SERVICE

During the years 1897 and 1899, worked on House side for Congressman Hooker, New York; Ward, New York; Southwick, New York; O'Grady, New York; Heatwole, Minnesota.

Also did extra work for Senators Wilson, of Washington, and Martin of Virginia.

In December, 1899, was employed as an amanuensis in the Senate Official Reporter's room.

On January 29, 1900, went to work for Senator Foraker, of Ohio, as assistant clerk to Committee on Pacific Islands & Puerto Rico, of which Foraker was chairman, and became clerk and his secretary the following year. Was with him until he left in March, 1909.

Secretary to Senator Aldrich of Rhode Island for 1 year, having previously served for 2 years as assistant clerk of the Finance Committee.

Secretary to Senator Page, of Vermont, for 5 years and of Oddie, of Nevada, for 8 years.

Custodian of Senate Office Building from 1929 to 1933, and has remained in that branch of work to this time—February 1950.

DECENTRALIZATION OF GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared relative to the necessity for the decentralization of Government operations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT MUST DECENTRALIZE ITS OPERATIONS RIGHT NOW, PARTICULARLY FROM WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. President, the morning's paper contains a confirmation of a warning which I have addressed to my colleagues for many years now, particularly since the discovery of the atomic bomb. Testifying before the House Armed Services Committee, Defense Chiefs yesterday presented once more the ominous fact that the Nation's Capital "would probably be a high priority target" in the event of a third world war. Gen. Omar Bradley stated very clearly that in the event of another war, "he could imagine conditions under which there might be several months' delay in convening Congress."

Obviously, every potential aggressor has learned this lesson from two World Wars: No power can control Europe, if it gives the United States sufficient time to mobilize its tremendous industrial and military establishment to launch a counter offensive. That means that every major industrial center of our country would become a ripe target in the first minute of war, and it means, in particular, that Washington, D. C., as the central nervous system of our entire defense effort, would have number one priority.

Gen. Lawton Collins, Army Chief of Staff, stated yesterday:

"We cannot rule out the possibility that aerial attacks may be launched against our cities in a future war."

That is certainly a masterful understatement of the case. The Atomic Energy Commission in its previous report on the danger to Washington, D. C., advised us many months ago of the horrible destruction that a single atomic bomb bursting on or above Washington, D. C., could cause.

PANIC OR HYSTERIA ARE NOT THE ANSWERS

Now, Mr. President, the answer to this situation is not a feeling of hysteria or panic or morbid fear. Obviously, we have a splendid chance of maintaining the peace, if we redouble our effort through the United Nations and if we maintain the strongest possible armed forces set-up. At the same time, we dare not risk the possibility of another Pearl Harbor in the form of a blitz attack against our Nation's Capital.

For years now, I have exchanged correspondence, phone calls, and visits with the White House, with the National Security Resources Board, with the United States Bureau of the Budget, and with other Government agencies involved in this decentralization problem. I have pleaded for the immediate decentralization of all high priority Government agencies from our congested Nation's Capital. I refer, in particular, to the key units of the National Defense Department, to the Atomic Energy Commission, and to the other vital units.

Obviously, if an atomic bomb were to strike Washington, D. C., Congress could not meet because there would be no Capitol, and if the attack were to take place during a legislative session, there would be no Congress to meet in the first place.

MOSCOW RADIO DENOUNCED MY DEFENSE PLEA

For years now, so-called wise guys have sneered at the warnings which others and I have presented to our people. These wise guys have sat smugly on their false dignity, deriding such talk as "Buck Rogerish" nonsense. Moreover, the Moscow radio made a specific point of denouncing me because I had warned my Nation to be on guard against such an atomic emergency.

Mr. President, the Moscow radio is not in business for nothing. It does not attack any individual or any idea unless it feels that the world-wide revolutionary purposes of the Kremlin are involved. I wish that our own Government and our own people were as keenly aware of the facts in this situation as the Politburo and as the Moscow radio are aware.

CONGRESS' COMMITTEES SHOULD DECENTRALIZE BUREAUS UNDER THEIR REVIEW

I urge my colleagues, therefore, in their respective committees to evaluate the situation and to see that the Government agencies under their particular jurisdiction cease the suicidal overcentralization of personnel in the Nation's Capital, and begin to reverse the trend away from centralization. What is true of Washington, D. C., is also true of such congested centers as New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, etc., all of which are ripe for an atomic attack.

I urge the Defense Department, moreover, to quit concentrating on merely talking to Congress about this emergency and to start doing something about it; start moving key defense offices from the Pentagon.

THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks a brief editorial entitled "It's Our Own Congress," which appeared in the January 14 issue of the Minneapolis Morning Tribune. I hope all Senators will read it, and, in doing so, feel that it represents the attitude of the thinking people of a great State toward the Members of the United States Senate and likewise our colleagues in the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S OUR OWN CONGRESS

As the new session gets under way it is well to remember that Congress, for all its frailties and faults, consists largely of conscientious Americans who are trying to do a good job according to their lights. The tendency to hold Congress up to ridicule, and to impugn its sincerity and good faith at every opportunity, is not a wholesome one, in our opinion.

There are, to be sure, charlatans and demagogues in every legislative body, but we should be careful not to judge the whole by its least admirable parts. Congress is a product of the American system of representative government, and the chronic scoffers at Congress are in effect belittling and deriding that system.

Selective criticism of Congress is proper and desirable, but steady sniping for the sake of sniping is a bad habit. In the last analysis, the American people are responsible for Congress, and regardless of the party controlling it, it remains a symbol of some of our best American traditions.

EXTENSION OF TERMS OF CERTAIN PATENTS OF PERSONS WHO SERVED IN MILITARY OR NAVAL FORCES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4692) to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. O'CONOR, and Mr. WILEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN METHOD OF ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, to Senate Joint Resolution 2, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

RETURN OF PROPERTIES HELD BY ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, 2 days ago, I introduced a bill in the nature of an amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act. The bill provides for the return of properties held by the Alien Property Custodian. I introduced the bill in my own behalf and in behalf of the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER and Mr. WHERRY]. I find that the bill has not yet been printed, and therefore has not been distributed. But I wish very briefly to state why it was introduced.

Mr. President, I believe it will surprise all Senators when I state that the Alien Property Custodian still has in his custody millions of dollars' worth of assets remaining from World War I. That office has had charge of those millions upon millions upon millions of dollars' worth of assets; and up to the present time the office of the Alien Property Custodian has not even returned the property or disposed of it, but still has actual custody of it. That situation was testified to only a short time ago by the Alien Property Custodian.

The bill I have introduced is in the nature of an amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act. I have introduced the bill in behalf of the three other Senators I have named, as well as myself. The present act provides for the return of property vested in the Alien Property Custodian to German nationals—and by

"German," I mean nationals of Rumania, Estonia, Poland, and many other countries, as well as Germany—provided they were subject to political, racial, or religious persecution, amounting to a denial of their rights of citizenship. Under this law, to my knowledge, no properties have been returned by the Alien Property Custodian to German nationals. Property has been returned by the Custodian's office to certain German charitable and religious institutions and, of course, to residents and former residents of Germany who lost their citizenship by the Hitler decrees.

We have here in the United States, Mr. President, many millions of good citizens who emigrated to our country from Germany, Austria, and other central European countries. They are found in every field of endeavor. They are farmers, laborers, craftsmen, in business, and in the professions. The greater majority have been good and faithful American citizens, as testified to by their record and the record of their sons and daughters in the service of the United States during the recent war.

These people have next of kin in Germany. They have there mothers, fathers, sisters, brothers, cousins, friends of their school days or preschool days. In many cases, these American citizens, realizing that the terrible aftermath of the war, with the total defeat of Hitler, would bring great suffering and misery to their relatives and friends, tried to provide for them. Those who felt that they would continue to live are providing for them today, but those who were getting older and who knew they only had a short time to live tried to provide for their kin by making wills.

The property thus provided by these American citizens, through their own industry and hard work and thrift, was American property, created by American citizens. It was not Nazi property or property of German nationals, but German nationals received only an interest in that property upon the death of that American citizen, by will, through bequest or devise, in trust, or otherwise, or by gifts in contemplation of death and the like.

To make the matter clear, Mr. President, let me state the case of a man of German ethnic origin, who lived in Montana, and had lived in the United States for 50 years. Perhaps his sons had served in the United States Army in both World Wars. If that man had living in the old country a brother who hated Hitler and figured that Hitler was leading Germany to ruin, the American citizen living in Montana might well say to himself, "I have made considerable money in Montana. I am going to make a will or bequest or devise. I am going to leave $100 a month so that my brother in Germany"—or Austria, or Rumania, or one of the other central European countries—"will not be hungry, because, after all, he is my brother."

Now what has happened, Mr. President? Our Government has divested not only the ownership of the property formerly in the name of German nationals, but has taken the property of American citizens simply because they were unfortunate enough to have relatives or kin in Germany, Austria, or some of the other countries to which I have referred. Our Government has taken it away from them.

Since the end of the war, American citizens of German birth have made untold sacrifices to assuage the hunger and need of their kin in Germany. For instance, in the month of October a year ago they shipped 41,000,000 pounds of food and clothing to Germany and to Austria. I might call the attention of the Senate to the fact that we have in the United States 33,000,000 of such Americans of German ethnic origin, including many leaders in the Army and the Navy, and leaders in the arts and the sciences. The very man who designed the dome of this Capitol Building was one of them. The man who designed the Library of Congress was another of them. The man who built the post office next to the Union Station was one of them. There are others, including Eisenhower, Spaatz, Willkie, Stassen, whose names I need not mention.

Many of them were no more responsible for Hitler and the Nazi Party than you, Mr. President, or I. There have been to the best of my knowledge, approximately 10,000 estates in the United States, throughout the 48 States, in which American citizens of German birth left sums of money to help their relatives and friends in the old country, and in many of these cases they did so, even though they had children in the United States. They thus decreased the amount that they left to their own families in order to help their other kin in the old country. And now that the United States Government has taken the properties which, under the circumstances mentioned, an American citizen may have left to his mother, or to his father, or to his other kin in a foreign country, an extra burden is placed upon the surviving members of the family in America.

Except for the fact that that good American citizen, father or mother, who died had such great faith in the United States of America, other arrangements which the United States Government could not stop would have been made. A father could have called in his son and said, "John, grandma is in dire straits," or "Aunt Susie is in dire straits in Germany. I want to take care of her. If I make a will and give her $500, then the United States Government will take it away. Therefore, I am going to give an extra $500 or an extra $1,000 to you so that you will be able to take care of her."

He could have done that, but he did not do it because he had faith and confidence in the fairness of the United States Government, he believed that the United States Government would hold inviolate his right to dispose of his property by devise or bequest, or by gift in contemplation of death, where the transfer could not aid the enemy and could not be made until hostilities came to an end.

American people of German extraction throughout the United States feel that a distinction should be made between properties which represented investments by German nationals in corporations in the United States, or patents and copyrights owned by German nationals, and property rights that came into being from American citizens. I want to make that very clear. I am not talking about money sent into the United States by German nationals. I am not talking about patents secured by German citizens residing in the United States. I am talking about American citizens of German ethnic origin, 33,000,000 of them, some of whose forefathers had come to this country 150 years previously. They wanted to take care of relatives in Europe who were against Hitler and who fought Hitler and were opposed to everything he stood for. They wanted to take care of their relatives by a little remembrance in a will or by a devise, leaving an estate that would produce, let us say, $100 a month. American citizens of German extraction throughout the United States feel that a distinction should be made between the kinds of property I have mentioned.

I know of one case—and there are many more like it—where a young man emigrated from Germany to the United States shortly before we entered the war. He had only a mother living in Germany. He intended to become a good American citizen and then bring his mother to the United States. The war broke out and he joined our armed forces. He was killed in action fighting for the United States, but the little property he left and his insurance were taken by the United States Government, and his poor mother, who was the beneficiary and his sole heir, was left in dire straits, simply because she happened to be a resident of Germany.

Under the present law she cannot receive his inheritance, or his insurance, unless she, as an old lady, can prove that she was denied substantial rights of citizenship by the Nazis. It is not enough for her to prove that the Nazis made her life miserable because she had a son fighting in the United States Army. It is not enough that she might have been discriminated against in the giving out of food rations. It is not enough for her to prove that she was taken from her home and the home turned over to Nazis. The way the law reads today she practically had to be in a concentration camp in order to qualify for a return of the property to her.

There are in the United States thousands of cases of American citizens who, as far back as 1920 and 1925, in the early thirties, before Hitler, provided in their wills for trust arrangements whereby certain small sums would be paid to needy relatives in Germany. Even these trusts were vested by the Alien Property Custodian, and not only was the income taken but the entire trust was taken. Surely that American citizen who was the testator had no intention of helping Hitler or the Nazis. He only wanted to eliminate and alleviate human suffering and to help the needy.

Our Government set a cut-off date after which the interest of German nationals would no longer be vested by the United States. That cut-off date was January 1, 1947, 1¾ years after the end of hostilities in Germany. In other words, if an American citizen, with rela-

tives in Germany, was unfortunate enough to have died at 11 p. m. on December 31, 1946, the small interest he might have provided in his will for his relatives in Germany would be taken by the United States Government. However, if he had good doctors who could have kept him alive until 1 a. m. January 1, 1947, the United States Government would not take what he provided in his will or what might have gone to his next of kin by the laws of descent and distribution. Anyone can see how unfair that is.

The amendment to the act which is here proposed provides that return of the property may be made by the United States Government in cases where the interest of the German national in the property arose through gift, devise, bequest, or the laws of descent and distribution in the estate of an American citizen, provided that the German national was not a member of the Nazi Party. This amendment should be made in justice to American citizens who have passed on and to their next of kin in this country who have assumed the burdens of their deceased relatives here to take care of their kin in the old country.

The amendment to the act would not only secure inheritances to German nationals, but it would also secure them for nationals of other enemy countries in central Europe, such as Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania.

The amendment further provides that where an American citizen is the successor in interest to the European national such American citizen could secure for himself the property taken by the Alien Property Custodian. For example, if an American citizen left a certain sum to relatives in Germany and that sum was taken by the Alien Property Custodian, and thereafter the person in Europe died, leaving a will, or by intestacy—it makes no difference—leaving his property to an American citizen, such American citizen should be entitled to have the property returned to him as successor in interest.

There are many American citizens in the United States whose relatives here provided for their mutual relatives in the old country. The provisions for their relatives in the old country fell with the taking of the property by the custodian. This amendment would permit the American citizen, as successor in interest, as heir at law, or as devisee or legatee, to take that interest.

Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that the appropriate committee take this amendment and give it very prompt and immediate attention, so that the American citizens who are anxious to get their property back may get it back at the very earliest opportunity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has heretofore been referred to the appropriate committee.

WARNINGS IN LIQUOR ADS—ARTICLE BY W. LOWRIE KAY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, there is another serious matter which I wish to discuss. I ask unanimous consent that in the RECORD it may appear under the heading "Warnings in liquor ads."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a few days ago there was a hearing on Senate bill 1847, introduced by me, to prevent the advertising of liquor in newspapers, over the radio, and by television, in interstate commerce. I have here an article entitled "Warnings in Liquor Ads—The Wide Horizon," written by W. Lowrie Kay, which appeared on January 21, 1950, in the Christian Science Monitor. It is an article which I believe every Senator should read. It brings to the attention of the Senate and, I believe, to the attention of the Department of Justice, a statute which has not been enforced apparently up to the present time, and which will make the passage of the bill which I introduced unnecessary. The article is as follows:

A heart-warming and challenging interpretation of provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act covering false advertising was offered in Washington, January 12, during Senate hearings on the Langer bill. If accepted and enforced, the interpretation would have broad consequences in the advertising of alcoholic beverages. It should promote temperance and abstinence.

Advertisements of alcoholic drinks would be required to warn consumers of the consequences of using the product—such as possible addiction, intoxication, or illness. The warning statements would be compulsory to prevent the advertisements from being misleading in a material respect.

William N. Plymat, Des Moines lawyer and insurance executive, read before Senator MAGNUSON'S committee section 315 of the act, dealing with misleading advertising which is illegal in interstate commerce as an unfair method of competition. The section is explicit.

I submit, Mr. President, that the present law has been ignored, just as has been the Sherman Antitrust Act. The Sherman Antitrust Act was passed in 1891, nearly 60 years ago. It particularly provides that where a group of persons get together in order to raise the price of a commodity, so as to establish a monopoly, they can be put in jail for 1 year. There have been Republican Attorneys General and Democratic Attorneys General since that act was passed, but not a single person has ever been put in jail under that provision. Yet Eugene Debs was put in jail for violating an injunction.

We find another case, Mr. President, and I submit that law has not been enforced. Of course, under the antitrust statutes, if a soldier came home from World War II and found his family hungry, and he could not get a job, and he stole three or four loaves of bread, he would be put in jail; but if four or five men get together and raise the price of bread, the price of ice cream, or the prices of other food products, so that widows and orphans cannot afford to buy them, they would not be put in jail. They might receive diplomatic posts. One of them might be sent as Ambassador to Argentina, as was Mr. Bruce a while ago.

I read further from this article:

"In determining whether any advertisement is misleading," the act says, "there shall be taken into account (among other things) not only representations made by suggested statement, word, design, devise, sound, or any combination thereof, but also the extent to which the advertisement fails to reveal facts material in the light of such representations or material with respect to consequences which may result from the use of the commodity to which the advertisement relates under the conditions prescribed in said advertisements, or under such conditions as are customary or usual."

That beer, whisky and certain other beverages contain alcohol is an established fact. Mr. Plymat holds illegal, under the act, advertising of such products which "fails to reveal facts material, * * * with respect to consequences which may result from the use of the commodity." At one stroke, he indicts all such advertisements which cross State lines.

Care is taken by manufacturers of combustible products to warn users regarding possible results, the products being described as "inflammable" or "explosive." Not only is such information required by law, but it is a precaution in the interest of public and personal safety.

That the manufacturer and advertiser of a beverage containing alcohol, itself inimical to both personal and public welfare and safety, may boldly advertise his product without warning of the consequence of its use, and yet escape prosecution under the Trade Commission Act, is a matter of public concern. Surely the Des Moines' lawyer's interpretation is sufficiently valid to warrant at least a test case in the Federal courts.

A striking point in Mr. Plymat's testimony was his pinioning of alcoholic-beverage advertisements slanted to create new customers. Many such customers, he pointed out, are youths who are unaware of the disastrous results of drinking these products. To them especially is owed the duty of complying with the act's provision against failing to reveal material facts.

Were the Trade Commission Act enforced in this manner in interstate advertising of alcoholic beverages, there would be less need for the Langer bill—successor to the Capper bill. The proposed legislation would forbid all interstate advertising of liquor—a step beyond requiring warning of consequence of its use.

To publish warnings within the advertisements themselves would, however, serve a good purpose. It would not be surprising if some readers would promptly come to the logical conclusion, why, if the beverage is so potentially harmful that the law requires a warning, should it be used at all? If an alcohol beverage is capable of producing intoxication, illness, or addiction, why go to bat with two strikes on themselves?

Mr. President, I hope the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which is considering this question will report to the full committee and that within a short time the bill will be brought to the floor of the Senate so that we may have a chance to vote on it.

Mr. President, I now desire to refer to another matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

THE SITUATION CONFRONTING THE MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to discuss an article appearing in the November 1949 issue of the Mining Congress Journal, entitled "Going, Going, Gone!" It is a very interesting article, and it reads as follows:

In May 1948 we questioned "Must Mercury Die?" Since then inaction at home and revaluation of foreign exchange have given this

vital metal-mining industry a further push down the road to oblivion. A few operations cling on doggedly in the hope that some last minute action may revitalize them. In the meantime, one principal producer is mining its shaft pillars and another plans to follow suit in the spring.

I call this to the attention of every Democrat in this Chamber, Mr. President, because it relates to the action of the Democratic Party. The fur industry has already been ruined. The mining industry is now being ruined, and if the Democrats are not careful they will ruin the farming industry. I read further from the article:

Evidence was shown in these columns in June 1948 that tungsten was next on the list for tough sledding and possible exclusion from the roster of domestic metal mining industries. Revaluation speeded up the patient's decline when the price of foreign tungsten ores dropped to $18.50 to $19.50 per short ton unit of WO_3, a price which no domestic mine can meet and still realize a profit.

Immediately following revaluation, the price of antimony plummeted almost overnight from 40⅜ to 26 cents per pound, with extensive offerings at this low figure.

An obvious result of the absence of a policy protecting these industries is complete dependence on Spain, Italy, and Yugoslavia for mercury; on Communist China, Korea, and Bolivia for tungsten; and similar uncertain sources for antimony.

We have long depended upon the Philippines, Turkey, and Africa for chromium and upon Russia, Africa, and India for manganese, two other minerals equally important to national defense.

Why no positive policy has been developed to prevent utter dependence on foreign sources we know not. Without adequate supplies of these five metals we cannot fight a war, and yet if these mines finally close it may well take as much as 4 years to again reach maximum production—far too long in this atomic age. A healthy nucleus of production should be maintained in order to perfect the techniques for utilizing marginal or subeconomic resources so they may serve in an emergency. If this basic policy is not implemented, and another emergency arises, the economy doctors that dismembered these strategic metal-producing industries will have some unburied corpses to explain.

I say, again, that I call the matter to the particular attention of the Democratic Party, because that party is to blame for the fact that today every mercury mine in America is closed. Practically every tungsten mine is closed, and the antimony mines are going to be closed within a short time. I wonder if the average Senator realizes that this country was very seriously handicapped by the lack of tungsten, and if it had not been for the fact that in Idaho, at about the time of the beginning of the war, tungsten was discovered, with the result that approximately 92 percent of all the tungsten we had in this country was produced in the State of Idaho, we would have been in a very bad situation. Enough was produced to keep us going. If it had not been for that fact, we would have had to import from Africa every single ton we used.

Mr. President, it is my purpose now to discuss the so-called Brannan plan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

THE BRANNAN PLAN FOR AGRICULTURE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, there is another subject which I wish to discuss at this time. I refer to the so-called Brannan plan for agriculture.

Mr. President, when Congress convened I had just returned from a 2 months' trip through the United States. I understand that a great many other Senators went to Europe. Some of them went to China. I felt that I could do more good here in the United States than by chasing to any foreign country. Very humbly and most respectfully, I suggest to my colleagues that they would be doing a much better job for their constituents by remaining in the United States and taking care of the 150,000,000 people in the United States than by chasing all over the world trying to promote the idea of 7 percent of the people saving the other 93 percent.

I found to my surprise that approximately half of the Senators whom I interrogated had never even been in North Dakota, but they had been all over Europe, visiting the crowned heads over there, dining and wining and being entertained by them, going from one country to another, visiting the rulers. As a matter of fact, they do not understand their own country at all.

When it comes to agriculture, I found as I went along that the people of this country did not thoroughly understand what is known as the Brannan plan. Let me say first of all that both the Republican and Democratic Parties, whenever they want the farmer's vote, when they want the votes of the farmers in the dairy State of Wisconsin, when they want the vote of the wheat-producing farmer in the Northwest, say what a great friend they are of the farmer.

Not only in 1948, 1944, and 1940, but in times past, the platforms of both parties have said that they stand for absolute parity, absolute equality, between agriculture, industry, and labor. That statement is found in all the platforms. I have them before me.

What is the situation today? Take my own State of North Dakota. In the first 9 months of this year our farmers received $131,930,000 less for their products than they received during the first 9 months last year. What I say about my State holds true all over the United States because the farmer's income has decreased approximately one-third. It is true in Oklahoma; it is true in Tennessee; it is true in Wisconsin. If the farmers in North Dakota had received the $131,930,000 which they received the previous year, who would get the benefit of it? The businessmen. The farmers can buy more radios, more automobiles, more luxuries of life than they can buy if they have not got those $131,930,000.

So it seems to me that the businessmen ought to be just as much interested as the farmer, if not more so, in seeing that the platforms of the Republican and Democratic Parties are carried out.

What is the situation today? I repeat, the Republican and Democratic platforms say that they stand for equality and parity between agriculture, industry, and labor. Labor has already had three increases in wages, and is asking for a fourth increase. Wages have gone up, and up, and up.

What about industry? The other day the United States Steel Corp. raised the price of steel $4 a ton. The steel industry has continually increased the price of steel. Steel is the barometer of industry. As a matter of fact, the price of steel has dropped only 4 percent since the war ended. After World War I, as every Senator knows—and this is the pattern that is now being followed—the price of wheat dropped from almost $3 a bushel to 20 cents a bushel. However, the price of farm machinery which the farmer had to buy did not drop a single index point. All that the farm-machinery companies had to do was to get together and agree not to manufacture a surplus.

But the farmer is not in such a fortunate position. He has his farm, his land, and he must do something with it. He must raise a crop. He has his money invested in the land and he must do something with it. The result was that there was a surplus. The price of wheat dropped from nearly $3 a bushel to 20 cents, and we had a terrible depression.

During the past few summers as I went along through many States, including the Northwestern States as far as the Pacific coast, and down south in Texas, I visited practically every State except the New England States. I found that people knew nothing about the Brannan plan. I would walk into a banker's office and find that all that the banker knew about the Brannan plan was that he was against it. When asked what it was, he did not know any more about it than I know about what kind of food Julius Caesar ate. But the bankers were against it. They were against it because the big-business interests and the newspapers were against it.

When I asked them what the law provided for they did not know. They had no idea. I received petitions from clubwomen saying that they were against the Brannan plan because it was socialistic. When they asked me if I would send them a copy of it, I found that they had not even read it.

Being a Republican Senator, I decided thoroughly to educate the people and to advise with any of my colleagues who may wish to consult with me relative to the Brannan plan. One thing is certain, and that is that until the term of the present President of the United States expires, he is going to name the Secretary of Agriculture. One thing is as certain as that two and two make four, and that is that the Secretary of Agriculture will be a Democrat. It is as certain as that three and three make six that no agricultural law will be enacted which is not endorsed by the Secretary of Agriculture, appointed by a Democratic President.

The prices of farm products are already down 33 or 34 percent and are still going down. The cost of labor is going up, and industry is making more and more money all the time. Both the Republican and the Democratic platforms state that they stand for equality and

parity between agriculture, industry, and labor. In making my investigation of the Brannan plan, for which I declared myself, and which is the plan proposed by the Secretary of Agriculture, I decided to let the American people ask me questions, which I in turn could answer. The first question which they asked was, What is the so-called Brannan plan, which the newspaper columnists call one of the most significant questions before the Congress? My answer to that question is as follows:

Answer. The name "Brannan plan" has become attached to the administration's farm program, which is based upon the Secretary of Agriculture's recommendations for changes in our price-support system to adapt it more realistically to the needs and conditions of the present. It is no panacea or cure-all. It is a set of forward-looking principles which would help farmers to keep going ahead with their revolutionary progress of recent years. It is aimed at providing farm purchasing power with the realistic protection necessary to prevent farmers from bringing back the old and wasteful methods that add to the Nation's food bill the very real but hidden cost of resources lost through overworking our farms and our farm families.

The Brannan plan starts from the concept that there is a point below which it is in the public interest not to let farm purchasing power fall.

In other words, Mr. President, it carries out the platforms of the Republican and Democratic Parties. I repeat, Mr. President, the politicians want the farmer at election time. They woo him at election time; they say what a lovely man he is, and how much he does for the country. But the records show that just so soon as the election is over they forget about him until the next election, as proved by the fact, I repeat, that the prices the farmers receive for their products have already dropped one-third, while everything the farmers buy has gone up in price. Labor has received three wage increases and now wants a fourth, and is striking to obtain it.

I continue the answer to the first question:

It seeks to maintain that purchasing power more realistically by using an income objective as the standard for support prices, and would broaden our support system to extend such protection to perishable commodities producing three-fourths of our farm income instead of just the basic commodities producing only one-fourth of that income. It adds production payments to the present purchase and loan methods of supporting prices to the producer, so that the consumer need not be penalized by vast quantities of food being held off the market.

That is the answer to question 1. I may say, Mr. President, that I shall invite every Member of the Senate, and every Member of the House of Representatives, all 435 of them, to write me asking any questions they may want to about the Brannan plan, and I shall see to it that their questions are answered.

I come now to the second question the people of the ccuntry are asking. It is as follows:

Question No. 2: What is there about farming or agriculture which makes Congress continually treat it as a special subject as if it were the most important existing endeavor of mankind?

I may say that question is asked by many hundreds of people. It is asked by many who are receiving one wage increase after another. I am not talking, however, about the white-collar workers. Heaven knows they are starving. The white-collar class is worse off than the farmers. I am talking about persons who belong to unions, who have received three wage increases, and are asking for a fourth.

The answer to the second question is as follows:

Answer. The welfare of agriculture, as a basic productive industry, vitally affects the welfare of the rest of the Nation's economy.

Farmers are only asking economic justice, not special privilege. They are only seeking a fair share of the national income in proportion to what they contribute to that income.

As a matter of fact, the main reason agriculture does need Government intervention to achieve a fair position of equality with other groups is because these other groups have been given special legislative treatment in the past to upset the normal economic relation between groups. Industry, commerce, financial institutions, labor have all been given special protection at various times in our history, making similar action necessary for agriculture to restore the proper balance.

What did President Truman say to Congress in his last message relating to excise taxes? He called attention to the fact that in the oil industry an individual can make $1,000,000 a year, but does not have to pay any income tax on it. But the poor farmer, who may have had no crop for 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 years—and during the drought farmers did not have a crop for 9 years, I may say, Mr. President—the poor farmer who happens to have a good crop this year is soaked, he must pay an income tax on what he earns. The farmer is not permitted to offset his good years by his poor years. Yet in the oil industry, as President Truman stated in his message on excise taxes, a man may receive an income of a million dollars a year, and may receive such an income for five continuous years, and yet not be obliged to pay an income tax on it.

I continue my answer to question No. 2:

The city man has just as much stake in a sound farm economy as the farmer. Prosperity in the farm market always means more dollars in real wages in cities and towns. When farm purchasing power is up, industry and labor can count upon a steady market for the indispensable tools of an efficient agriculture—tractors and corn pickers, electric motors, milking machines, gasoline and oil, insecticides and weed killers, fertilizers and lime, and so on through all the assorted equipment and supplies needed in modern farming. The Nation would find itself strengthened to resist the paralysis of depression. We might discover little real need to use the support prices by which the plan would protect farm income.

But when farm prices start falling, like they are doing now, it's everybody's concern—not just the farmers. Because collapse of farm purchasing power can start the familiar old spiral into depression.

I think the entire thing was summed up pretty well last week by Representative CANNON, of Missouri, when he declared at a House Appropriations Committee hearing:

"You cannot burn down the kitchen where the farmer is working and expect the rest of the house to stand. Sooner or later the fire spreads to the parlor, where labor and industry and finance and transportation are sitting on the plush with their feet on the mantelpiece. If the kitchen burns, the parlor will burn with it."

I now come to question No. 3, which people ask me relative to the Brannan plan. I may repeat that the question has come to me from all over the country, and I say that the question will be answered correctly, so that the people will no longer be deceived as to what the Brannan plan really is. The third question which has been asked me is as follows:

Question No. 3: The United States has grown strong through the competitive enterprise system, where each individual can engage in the economic activity of his choice. Why cannot the farmer supply the experience and judgment necessary to make his enterprise function, and accept the risk of success or failure, the same as any other businessman?

This is the answer:

Answer. Farmers are confronted with many hazards entirely beyond their control that make agriculture's situation far different from that of any other business or industry. Most industries can quickly adjust themselves to changed conditions of supply and demand, shutting down almost overnight if products are in excess supply.

For example, if United States Steel, with all its manufacturing plants, produces too much steel, the corporation shuts down. A farmer cannot do that, because his land is his capital investment, and he is obliged to do something with it.

I continue to read my answer to question No. 3:

And when industry restricts production to maintain profitable prices, its heaviest fixed costs of labor and raw materials are cut proportionately. But not so with the farmer. Nature does not always cooperate. The farmer cannot adjust as quickly to necessity for change, and even when he does try to curtail production his fixed costs are relatively inflexible and continue high. He cannot fire his wife and children. Bumper crops and crop failures are often the results of conditions entirely outside of the farmer's control, and occur without regard to market needs.

Let us consider, for example, a drought. Certainly the farmer is not to blame when a drought occurs.

I am particularly delighted to see present the leader of the minority [Mr. WHERRY] who comes from the great farming State of Nebraska. I hope he will listen carefully so that he may finally come to understand what the Brannan plan really is. I may say that he is not alone in not thoroughly understanding it. As I said in the beginning of my speech, very few people in the entire country know what it really is. I repeat: If any Senator or any Representative wishes to ask me any questions about the Brannan plan I should be glad to have them write me. The writer will receive an answer containing a thorough explanation of his question.

I now read the fourth question I have been asked by the people:

Question No. 4. How long has our Government carried on a program of providing special protection for agriculture?

If one reads newspapers he finds that much is written in them about free enterprise. Some call the Brannan plan socialism. They say that if the Brannan plan is enacted it will mean the end of free enterprise, that it will result in regimentation. What is the real fact, Mr. President? It is to be found in my answer.

Answer. Our Government's interest and concern for agriculture dates back far in our history. A Federal Department of Agriculture was founded in 1862, but it was actually the result of almost a hundred years of preliminary steps. Growth of industrialization put agriculture on the defensive and business enterprise on the ascendency after the Civil War, resulting in frequent farm revolts for legislative protection starting with railroad reform and regulation.

Mr. President, I remember the time when there did not exist even a railroad commission in the various States, when there did not exist even a tax commission in the various States, and it took old fighting Bob La Follette, of Wisconsin, to get them for us. When Bob La Follette ran for President and said that the railroads should be evaluated so that the people would not have to pay more than a fair rate on the railroads as passengers, or for freight, do Senators know what he was called by the New York newspapers? He was called an anarchist, Mr. President. If anyone has any doubt about that, let them read the newspaper reports on the speeches he delivered at that time. They did not say he was a socialist; they did not say he was an IWW; they said he was an anarchist, trying to overthrow the Government of the United States.

I further answered by saying:

The agrarian reform movement spread around the turn of the century, but it was the collapse of agricultural prices in 1920 that proved to be a turning point that compelled a reorientation of our entire farm economy. Growing demand and pressure on lawmakers for equality for agriculture, continuing through the years, has been primarily responsible for the sweep of farm legislation from the early 1920's to the present day. Recognition of agriculture's right to Government intervention in its behalf, in the Nation's interest, came from the Businessmen's Commission on Agriculture of the United States Chamber of Commerce in 1927.

That statement came from businessmen, Mr. President, just as I say that today businessmen should be more interested in the Brannan plan than the farmer himself should be, because the Brannan plan may mean the businessman's very survival. The very chambers of commerce should be studying the Brannan plan and should be petitioning the Congress to pass it, instead of calling it socialism, regimentation, an enemy of free enterprise, and all the other names that businessmen are calling that plan.

Mr. President, what did the Businessmen's Commission on Agriculture, of the United States Chamber of Commerce, say in 1927? It declared:

Agriculture was left largely to the mercy of laissez faire, while governmental support went to the building up of commercial and industrial enterprises. The pursuit of agriculture, however, has at no time enjoyed protection such as was extended from the very beginning to commerce and industry through national legislation.

Mind you, Mr. President, that is the statement of businessmen. I am sorry there are not more businessmen now on the floor of the Senate. Of course, there is not a single laboring man in this body, not a single Senator who carries a union card, so far as I know. Yet the laboring men are doing all the work, of course. We hear men shout what a bad man John Lewis is and what a bad man Bill Green is and what a bad man Phil Murray is. There are in this entire body only four or five farmers. In this entire body there is not one laboring man, and only four or five farmers. As I recall, approximately two-thirds of the Members of the Senate are lawyers. When Senators speak in favor of agriculture and the farmer, sometimes it seems to me—I say this most respectfully—as though we were in the hopeless minority.

I repeat some of the statement by the Businessmen's Commission on Agriculture, of the United States Chamber of Commerce, in 1927:

The pursuit of agriculture, however, has at no time enjoyed protection such as was extended from the very beginning to commerce and industry through national legislation.

Mr. President, in the old days the Senate took care of industry. Senators and Representatives in the old days took care of the business interests. But, as the Businessmen's Commission on Agriculture, of the United States Chamber of Commerce, declared in 1927, agriculture was neglected.

I read further from their statement:

Only now—

In 1927—

have we come to recognize the need of more equitable conditions, if agriculture is to sustain its position of relative importance in the entire economic system. It constitutes a challenge to modern statesmanship; and whatever else may be true, it is clear that the solution will not be had upon conventional lines.

Mr. President, the statement I am now reading is not the statement of WILLIAM LANGER, not the statement of a Communist or a Socialist or an anarchist or an IWW, but this is a statement by the Businessmen's Commission on Agriculture, of the United States Chamber of Commerce. I continue to read from their statement, issued in 1927:

We dare not forget what has been done for financial and industrial development. Why not for agricultural interests? The farmer's cause is the businessman's, from both the humanitarian and the economic point of view. We are forced to the conclusion that the accepted economic measures do not fit, at least do not cover the farmer's case; and that this situation presents a new challenge to economic and political advisers that cannot be evaded or met with slogans. Agriculture is affected with a clear and unquestionable public interest, and its status is a matter of national concern, calling for deliberate and far-sighted national policies, not only to conserve the natural and human resources involved in it, but to provide for the national security, promote a well-rounded prosperity, and secure social and political stability.

But, Mr. President, where were those gentlemen when a Republican President vetoed the McNary-Haugen bill—vetoed it twice, in fact. Where were they?

Talk with the leaders of any farm organization today, and they say the entire trouble of agriculture in the twenties stemmed from the fact that the McNary-Haugen bill was vetoed.

Mr. President, in my travels during the past year I was asked another question, as follows:

Question No. 5: It is my understanding that at the present time the Government carries on a price-support program to prevent disastrous declines in farm income. How does the price-support program work?

Mr. President, to my amazement, let me say, I found that very few of the taxpayers know how the price-support program works. And I may say, Mr. President, many citizens do not care how it works. They are far more interested in going to a night club, having a good time, rather than in sitting down and studying the price-support program and what it really is.

To the questions I have been asked about the program, I have replied as follows:

Answer. The present price-support program applies to a limited number of commodities, with prices supported to a flexible percentage of a parity tied to a fixed period in the past. The prices are supported through Government purchases and loans, withholding sufficient quantities from the market to force market prices up to the desired levels. Such methods work fairly well for storable commodities, but are not satisfactory for the perishable commodities making up three-fourths of our farm income.

In other words, the price-support program applies to only one-fourth of the farmers' products. The price-support program does not apply at all to three-fourths of the farmers' products. But how many persons know that?

I further answered as follows:

The fact that present legislation is inadequate to accomplish the objective of maintaining fair farm-purchasing power is reflected in the present trends of farm prices and farm income. Farm prices have dropped an average of 23 percent in less than 2 years and are still going down.

In my State farm prices have dropped nearly 34 percent, Mr. President.

I repeat that in the first 9 months of this year the farmers of North Dakota got $131,930,000 less than they got in the first 9 months of last year; and conditions are no different in Nebraska, Tennessee, or any other farm State.

We hear politicians and orators shout that the Brannan plan is no good, that it is socialism, that it is regimentation. But, Mr. President, they offer nothing in its place. They criticize, criticize, criticize; but nothing constructive comes from their lips.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. No; I refuse to yield. The distinguished Senator will have ample time upon this floor to explain his opposition to the Brannan plan when the time comes.

Mr. President, I might add that the Republican Party was in power in the Congress for from 1947 to 1949—2 years. They passed their agricultural bill on the last day of the session. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] said they did not have time, and he was not satisfied with it, and put it off 2 years. That is the treatment the farmer got. Then Republicans wonder why Iowa and some of the other States went Democratic. The Republican Party might as well realize today, Mr. President, that one of the main issues in 1950 is going to be the Brannan plan, whether they like it or do not like it. That is going to be an issue in the farm States. Any Republican who is interested merely has to take a trip among the farmers—I care not whether he goes among the farmers of Nebraska or of South Dakota, or of North Dakota, or of Montana, or of Wisconsin—and he will find that what I have said is correct. That is the issue.

I repeat, Mr. President, that in reply to the fifth question I was asked during my recent trip, I said that—

The fact that present legislation is inadequate to accomplish the objective of maintaining fair farm-purchasing power is reflected in the present trends of farm prices and farm income. Farm prices have dropped an average of 23 percent in less than 2 years and are still going down. But farmers still have to pay within 4 percent as much for what they buy as they paid 2 years ago. In 1947 farm operators had a net income of nearly $18,000,000,000. Last year it was down to around fourteen billion. The forecast for 1950 is for a net income of under $12,000,000,000.

A drop of one-third, Mr. President.

I merely venture to suggest that perhaps some of the Senators who are today absent may wish they had been present, when the votes are counted in 1950. Do they think the farmers are going to accept a cut of one-third, that they will accept a reduction of their income from $18,000,000,000 in 1947, to an income of less than $12,000,000,000, a drop of $6,000,000,000, in 1950, and not rebel? Do they think the farmers will not get rid of Senators and Representatives responsible for this drastic reduction? If Senators and Representatives think that way about it, then in my judgment they underestimate the intelligence of the producers in the United States. I continue the answer:

That is a decline of one-third in net farm income at a time when national income is at or near its all-time peak. Even in 1948, before the present declining trend got into full swing, the Bureau of Census estimated that 3,300,000, or about half of all the families in agriculture, received family cash incomes from both farm and nonfarm sources of less than $2,000, and that one-fourth received less than $1,000.

For whom do Senators think the farmers are going to vote under those circumstances? President Truman says, "We want the Brannan plan." The Republicans say, "Oh, no"—and they are joined by many Senators on the other side of the aisle—"you cannot have it. It is socialism. It is against free enterprise. It is regimentation." With one-fourth of all the farm families receiving less than $1,000 a year, how do you think they will vote, Mr. President?

I continue the answer:

Even at the peak of agricultural income, total per capita income of persons on farms was only about 60 percent as high as for persons not on farms. In 1949 this income gap was widened, and in 1950 it is expected to become still more disproportionate.

The farmer will be worse off.

The people on farms make up 20 percent of the Nation's population, yet they get less than 10 percent of the national income.

Are there those who think, in these days of the radio, when some of us fight for the farmers, and when we fight to get on the radio, that we will not let the farmers know about the situation? If any politician in America thinks that is going to happen, he will have another think coming.

Another question asked me as I went throughout the country was this:

Question No. 6: Many opponents of the Brannan plan say that it will give to the farmer an actual cash subsidy or dole, instead of price support for his products, and will make the farmer a public beggar for a fair income. What is your comment?

Answer. Certainly no one should imply that assurance of a fair return for the farmer's product is a dole, and the farmer certainly cannot be called a public beggar in accepting such assurance.

The Brannan plan rewards individual initiative, rewards efficiency in producing high-quality products and in sound marketing; it does not reward the inefficient or those too lazy to produce.

We know of the criticism of the Brannan plan. They will pay you for not raising pigs. They will pay you for not raising crops. I say not a word of it is true. I continue the answer:

We have a minimum-wage law because we believe it is sound national policy, but it certainly isn't a dole; the man who refuses to work or is inefficient in his work is replaced with someone else.

The least we can do is provide the same kind of protection to agriculture—to see that the efficient producer gets fair returns for his toil, even if it means Government aid when conditions beyond the farmer's control prevent such fair returns in the normal market.

We don't regard tariffs as "dole" for industry; we don't consider those using the mails "beggars" because the Government assumes a share of the costs.

Look at Time, Fortune, Newsweek, Life magazine, which cost the taxpayer $9,000,000 a year by way of postage to send through the mail. The magazines and newspapers do not come within $9,000,000 of paying their postage. The taxpayers pay it. We do not call it a dole, do we? But if the farmer is given a small amount, it is a dole, it is a subsidy. We say to the airplane companies who fly their planes all over the country and who carry the mail, "We will give you $45,000,000 a year. We will give it to you as a subsidy." And the air lines get it. When the farmer gets a little something, it is a dole, and he is a beggar. I continue reading my answer:

I think it is unfair to use such terms in regard to aid to agriculture that has been justified by historic tradition and economic necessity.

I now come to question No. 7. It is what the average man says who has not studied the Brannan plan. I read:

Question No. 7: Congressman MONRONEY of Oklahoma says, "This program, the more I study it and look at it and see it, makes me think of OPA—production payments, subsidies, low consumers' prices, high producers' prices, billions from the Treasury. It seems to me we are inadvertently drifting back to the old days of the OPA again." Do you see any similarity to OPA?

Answer. No; not at all. The OPA was aimed at preventing inflation, and put a ceiling on prices. The Brannan plan seeks to maintain the purchasing power of farmers, but leaves a free market for the dealer and consumer. It takes the Government out of the food-brokerage business in perishable farm products. The OPA curbed the normal trends of supply and demand, but the Brannan plan would allow prices to find their natural supply and demand level.

Then, as I went through the country, I was asked another question:

Question No. 8: The philosophy of the Brannan plan seems to be a high income for the farmer and cheap prices to the consumer. That sounds, of course, like magic. Many critics of the proposal say that somebody is going to have to pay the bill. Is there a danger that the cost of the program will be ruinous?

How often have we heard these words upon the Senate floor? Here is the answer:

Answer. There is a difference between cheap prices and normal prices, which is all the Brannan plan proposes. Of course, somebody is going to have to pay the bill for any Government aid to agriculture—they have to pay it right now. But the real cost of any Government farm program is the total food bill plus the Government expense. And the Brannan plan's proposal to allow consumers to share in the abundance of perishable products would not only avoid artificially maintained high food prices, but would save the Government the tremendous present cost in transporting, handling, processing, and storage of perishable products. The cost in the tax bill would be offset to a great extent by savings in the food bill, instead of the consumer being penalized by paying double as at present—both in taxes and higher food costs.

Mr. President, the present prices are so high in some instances that recently it was stated upon the floor of the Senate that one-third of the population is still undernourished.

On this question of cost, we must also consider the bigger question of avoiding a farm-led depression which would be far more costly than any farm aid now.

Instead of ruinous costs, as the question implies, the administration program could in effect be self-supporting by helping maintain the general economy at a full-employment level, increasing the national income and thereby increasing Government revenue without more taxes.

As I went around the country, Mr. President, I was asked question No. 9, which is as follows:

Question No. 9: Senator AIKEN has characterized the Brannan plan as an attempt to subsidize the food bill of all the American people and charge the cost up to a farm-support program. Do you think the Brannan plan will make the farmer appear to be the recipient of benefits which are really derived by other people?

Here is my answer to that question, Mr. President:

Perhaps the best answer to that is to quote Senator AIKEN. As you know, he is a good friend of the American farmer, although there are some points of difference between him and certain other friends of the farmer.

Mr. President, I doubt that there is a better friend of the American farmer sitting upon the Senate floor—I mean, when the Senators are all present. [Laughter.]

I repeat:

As you know, he is a good friend of the American farmer, although there are some points of difference between him and certain other friends of the farmer.

Senator AIKEN said in Senate committee hearings where Secretary Brannan's recommendations were being discussed that there were not irreconcilable differences. He went on to say, and this I am quoting: "As far as I am concerned, we can make a few minor amendments to title II of the Agricultural Act of 1948 and let it go into effect on January 1 and say that three-quarters of the Brannan plan is now in operation." That ends the quotation.

Again, let me say that there might be differences of opinion about the accuracy of that statement, but it indicates how Senator AIKEN was thinking.

The question is whether the people of this country would really charge the production payment part of the Brannan plan against the farmer as they now charge against the farmer the outlay for loans and Government purchases. Personally, I think the town and city people of this country will see that the payments are the sensible means of supporting perishables because they protect farm returns and let consumers buy at regular market prices. Our friends in organized labor have indicated this makes good sense to them. Many of them have always supported farm price-support legislation because they thought it served the general welfare even though it sometimes seemed to be hard on low-income workers.

Now the farmer has a chance to make even closer friends of the American laboring men and women, because this proposal by Secretary Brannan makes good sense to labor as well as to agriculture.

But before anybody gets any funny ideas about that, let me say that the Brannan plan does not propose to subsidize consumers. It is a farm program. It is a sensible way of supporting farm returns without holding up consumer prices.

Again I say, Mr. President, I hope that in the weeks and months to come anyone opposing the Brannan plan will write me regarding it. That goes for Senators and for everyone in the United States, because there will be one Senator upon this floor who will actively support the Brannan plan, and he will not be giving it merely lip service.

Mr. President, here is another question which was asked me at the time I was traveling through the farming area. It is question No. 10:

Question No. 10: The American Farm Bureau Federation takes the position that if the Brannan plan becomes law, the farmer's only hope for a fair income will depend on Government hand-outs from annual appropriations by Congress, and that the cost will be staggering. Is that a fair charge?

My answer is as follows:

Answer. That question is, in football language, a triple threat. At least it has three parts. Let us take the last one first. Is this a fair charge? My answer is "No, it is not a fair charge." Why do people say the cost will be staggering? Price supports do not go into effect, under the Brannan plan or any other plan, until the prices of farm commodities go down out of line with the prices that farmers pay for the things they have to buy.

It is only when the price of grain goes down and the price of farm machinery goes up that the Brannan plan would apply.

I continue reading:

In other words, price supports do not go into effect until farm commodity prices become unfairly low. The cost of price support cannot be staggering before farmers are in a depression, which is just one step from national depression. Those who say that the cost will be staggering are really saying that we are going to have a depression and had just as well make up our minds to it.

They are not optimists, Mr. President; on the contrary, they are pessimists. They say, "There is bound to be a depression." We have been hearing that for at least 18 months. Even some of the persons who send out little pamphlets for which they charge from $15 to $18 a year have been prophesying a depression.

In the Brannan plan, the administration is seeking to swing the full force of the Nation's effort into the fight against the start of depression. That is far different from waiting for a depression to develop before starting to fight. The people who want very low, or so-called stop-loss price supports, are really saying, "Let's wait until depression gets here before we do anything."

I might say, Mr. President, that some of my Republican colleagues, aided by a few Senators on the other side of the aisle, think in that way.

Let me point out something else about this business of "staggering cost." A lot depends on whose viewpoint you use to look at the problem. I think farm organizations should be expected to use the farmer's viewpoint. And from the farmer's viewpoint the cost is staggering whenever prices become unfair. Compared with 1947, farmers lost $2,000,000,000 of purchasing power in 1948 and another $2,000,000,000 of purchasing power in 1949. They are likely to lose another $2,000,000,000 of purchasing power in 1950. That is what I call a staggering cost. In this case the farmers are bearing the cost. Although they make up nearly 20 percent of the national population, they have been getting less than 10 percent of the national income, and last year they got less than 8 percent of the national income. Farm people can't afford the staggering cost of unfair prices, and I'm tired of hearing about the staggering cost of a decent level of prices.

As I said a few moments ago, last summer certain Republicans went on the radio and condemned the Brannan plan as being socialistic, regimentation, and all that sort of thing, but they offered no other plan in place of it. They were speaking at a time when prices of farm products were going down. The price of barley dropped from nearly $1.98 a bushel to approximately 76 cents a bushel. That did not bother some of those politicians. They are still against the Brannan plan, Mr. President.

I read further:

Now let's get back to that first part of the three-part question—whether farmers can depend upon Congress to provide decent price supports. I say that Congress has a good record on doing what it promises to do. If Congress enacts the Brannan plan, it will make good on this compact with the people. Let me point out also that the Brannan plan includes exactly the same kind of price-support program we now have for the storable crops. It includes loans and purchase agreements for cotton, corn, wheat, and tobacco just as we have now. How can anybody say that a program continuing what we have now would make farmers dependent on Congress for annual appropriations? They base their unfair charge upon the fact that the Brannan plan proposes to extend mandatory price support to some commodities that can't be adequately supported with our present legal machinery.

Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, at the present time loans are included on cotton, corn, wheat, and tobacco. What does the Brannan plan include in addition?

These commodities include some of the most important ones from the standpoint of farm income—milk—

Why should not the consumers, the women and the children, get milk cheaply?—

hogs, beef cattle, lambs, eggs, and chickens. True enough, the Brannan plan proposes to support these perishables by means of production payments, because that seems to be the only means of supporting them without taking them away from the consumers who want more of these nutritious foods.

The people in the cities want milk, they want eggs, chickens, lambs, and beef. Why should they not get them at fair prices?

It is also true that payments will require congressional appropriations. But the consumers will be able to see direct benefits to themselves from this type of price support. City Congressmen will gladly vote for this type of price support because it makes such good sense. Farmers will have new allies in their efforts to maintain a decent farm income.

Some people try to tell you that tax money for payments would be a subsidy while tax money for commodity loans and Government purchases of farm commodities does not amount to a subsidy. But that is drawing such a fine line that you can't see the line.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield at this time, very much to my regret.

Mr. MCCARTHY. That is all right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Did the Senator desire that I yield for an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I have some information I wish to give the Senate; but I shall wait.

Mr. LANGER. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator without losing the floor, on the condition that what the Senator says will come after my address about the Brannan plan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER. I always like to yield to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, he is so very courteous, and always yields to any Senator who asks him to.

(Mr. McCARTHY thereupon made a statement, which appears at the end of Mr. LANGER's remarks.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I now take up question No. 11 relative to the Brannan plan:

Question No. 11: Is there a possibility that the Brannan proposal would place a ceiling on opportunity in agriculture, which would result in penalizing efficiency so that food prices would go up and up?

My answer to that question is as follows:

Answer. The people who make that charge are always afraid to spell it out when they talk to a general audience. It comes from the fact that Secretary Brannan said there ought to be a limit on the amount of price support extended to any one farm. He suggested a very high limit that would cover the biggest family-sized farming operation in the country. He just pointed out that it has long been the policy of the Congress and the people of this country to encourage family-sized farming operations. Yet if we use tax dollars to support the biggest, most industrialized farming operations in the country, we will be encouraging them more than we encourage family farming. It just does not make sense.

Let me say that, for example, under the AAA program some farmers received as much as $25,000, when as a matter of fact some of us sought to place a limit of $1,000 to take care of the family size and type of farm. We did not succeed in having such action taken. The Tom Campbell farm in Montana received literally thousands upon thousands of dollars in soil-conservation payments. I repeat, that does not make sense. That is why Mr. Brannan's plan is preferable.

I continue to read my answer to question No. 11:

Maybe it puts a ceiling on opportunity to say that the Government is not going to use your tax dollars to encourage big-scale industrialized farming, but I do not see it that way. That is an argument that appeals to those who might like to get a Government check for half a million or a million dollars, but it does not have any appeal to the farmer who is struggling to put the children through school and pay off a $5,000 mortgage.

I come now to the twelfth question, as follows:

Question No. 12: As I understand the Brannan plan, the Government would pay to the farmer the difference between the price for which he sold his produce and the price the Government thinks he ought to get. Would the task of obtaining proof of bona fide sales by farmers not become an administrative and policing job of tremendous, bureaucratic proportions?

My answer is as follows:

Answer. That is a two-headed question, and both heads are wrong. First, the Government would not pay any farmer the difference between the support price and his actual selling price. Many people have got that idea and it's wrong. The production payment would cover the difference between the support price and an average market price. Look at what that means. Basing the payment on the average market price, the Government does not have to ask any farmer how much he got. There is no point in knowing. All the Government has to know is the quantity the farmer sold. The payment would be number of pounds times the payment per pound. The payment per pound would be the difference between the support price, as defined by law, and the average market price.

The individual farmer would have just as much advantage as ever in selling a premium product. He would have just as much advantage as ever in getting a better price in the market place. Suppose you sold a 200-pound hog for $13 a hundred. That is $26. Then suppose you got a payment of a dollar a hundred or $2. That would make a total of $28 that you received for the hog. But suppose your neighbor sold his hog for $13.50 a hundred or $27 plus the payment of $2 for a total of $29. The two of you would have exactly the same payment but your neighbor would have a dollar more for his hog, just as he would have had if there had been no payment. If that happened, I think you would feel you had not done a very good job of marketing and would try next time to get that extra dollar out of the market.

If the Government tried to support your hog price by buying pork from the packer, you do not know whether you would get the support price or not. With the payment, you would know for certain.

I remember an actual situation which existed 3 or 4 years ago. The farmers were unable to sell in the nearest towns the hogs they butchered. The packers received the bulk of the profit. Farmers sold hogs for as low as $3 apiece.

I continue to read my answer to question No. 12:

Take another illustration. Suppose you take a loan on your wheat or corn. Somebody has to make sure how much wheat you put in the bin as collateral for the loan. That is only a fair business procedure. Well, it would be exactly the same kind of information in the case of a payment—merely, the amount you sold.

What is so complicated about that? Why should anybody say that would be a tremendous administrative and policing job? The same farmer-committeemen who handle the loan program—your own neighbors—would handle the payment program. In fact, Secretary Brannan says it would take fewer officeholders to handle payments than it does the present Government purchases. When the Government goes into the market and buys stuff, it has to have experts who know what they are buying; it has to have men who know the processing businesses, and transportation and storage experts. It has to pay the high costs of buying, storing, and transporting what it buys and then has to either sell the stuff to some foreign country at a cut rate or give the stuff away or let it rot. Talk about bureaucratic red tape and expense. Huh.

Just as was said by my distinguished friend the Senator from Wisconsin respecting eggs a little while ago. Talk about bureaucratic red tape and expense.

Finally, I was asked this question:

Question No. 13: Where, in your opinion, does the best interest of the American public lie in this whole business of protecting the farmer?

My answer is as follows:

Answer. I think I have already answered that question. But I will say it again. First, we cannot afford to let the farmer subsidize the rest of the American people out of his own pocket. He cannot do it very long. He goes broke, and then all the rest of us start going broke. That is not fair anyway, and democracy cannot afford that kind of unfairness.

So we have got to have a reasonable price-support program.

Second, I think a reasonable price-support program is one that will keep farm prices and income from sliding very far at any one time, regardless of where they start from. Any big drop is going to hurt a lot of people. So we have got to have supports based on some recent period.

Third, we might as well learn that you cannot build bricks with straw alone. If our objective is a decent farm income, we have got to support more than just a few storable commodities. We have got to support commodities that are most important to farm income, even if they happen to be perishable.

Fourth, we have to find some means of supporting perishables that will not just take food away from consumers and make everybody mad. Let us be sensible about that.

Fifth, we might as well realize that neither farmers nor anybody else can prosper unless we keep our economy growing. If the time comes when we have got to fight the wolf of depression on our own doorstep, O. K., we will do it. But first let us at least try to keep him off in the hills. Let us put our effort on building a bigger and a stronger economy—not in worrying about what we would need to do if depression came. The best interests of the American public lie in maintaining a strong and healthy agriculture—not just at some future time but now.

Mr. President, I understand that my distinguished friend the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] desires to address himself to the Brannan plan, and I shall be very glad to yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to say, first, that I very heartily disagree with the Senator that the enactment of the Brannan plan will be of any benefit either to the farmer or the consumer. I think it would be economically unsound to undertake to subsidize 140,000,000 people. As one Senator said the other day, we can simply and easily explain the Brannan plan in this fashion: It would mean that the housewife would go to the grocery store and would pay one-half or three-quarters of the cost of the food. On the face of things, it would seem that the housewife would then be getting a bargain. But thereafter her husband would have to pay the tax collector not only the balance of the cost of the food but also the cost of collection.

I agree with the Senator that there is something basically wrong with a farm program which piles up millions and millions of dollars' worth of eggs in the limestone caves of Kentucky, where they will spoil, and which also accumulates millions of bushels of potatoes, which also will spoil.

I think many other Senators must have had the same experience I had recently when I received a letter from one of my constituents, in which she said:

I have six children. My brother-in-law lives outside the town. He is raising hogs. He can buy grade A potatoes at 25 cents a bushel to feed to his hogs. But when I go to the grocery store I have to pay 85 cents a peck for No. 2 potatoes. My question is, Are his hogs more important to the Nation than my children are?

Mr. President, it is rather difficult to answer that question under the present system of building up surpluses.

So I agree with the Senator that any farm program which continues to build up surpluses is bad. I disagree when the Senator says the present difficulties would be cured by the Brannan plan.

I should like to ask the Senator this question: Instead of undertaking to subsidize 140,000,000 people, many of whom do not need food subsidies, but can afford to pay a reasonable price for the food they require, such a price as will give the farmer a fair profit, why would it not be much more sensible to inaugurate some type of food-stamp plan, so that when there was a surplus of eggs, butter, potatoes, or any of the other farm products there would simply be issued enough food stamps to those in the lower income groups so that surplus products would be eaten, instead of piled up and allowed to go to waste?

I may say that suggestion is somewhat along the lines of the plan which is the basis of the bill of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who is now on the floor, except I think his bill goes too far in covering not only products in surplus, but all food products.

But I believe it can be applied to food products which are in surplus supply. Then, instead of having those products piled up and allowed to spoil, they would be made available to families who otherwise could not purchase sufficient food.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] was Governor of Vermont at the time when I was Governor of North Dakota. We had the food-stamp plan in operation at that time, as the Senator knows. So I am delighted to yield to him.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think it is generally agreed that the food-stamp plan worked better than any of the other plans which were tried in the places where it was tried during the depression days of the thirties.

This bill, which I have introduced every session in the Senate, was originally introduced by the predecessor of the Senator from Wisconsin, former Senator La Follette, and myself. The bill provides for making available enough of the right kinds of foods to persons of low income to permit them to enjoy a reasonably adequate diet. It was not intended, however, solely as a surplus-food-disposal plan, but the primary purpose was to make sure that the people of the Nation have sufficient to eat to keep them healthy.

There are probably approximately 50,000,000 people, or about one-third of the population of the country, who today do not have sufficient income to enable them to buy enough of the right kinds of food to keep them in proper health. If those constituting that one-third of our people were able to purchase enough such foods, they would increase their consumption of the resistance-building foods—such as citrus-fruit juices, lettuce, and tomatoes—by approximately 60 percent. They would increase their consumption of milk, dairy products, poultry products, and meats approximately from 30 to 33 percent. They would increase their consumption of other fruits and vegetables approximately 20 percent. They would not increase their consumption of cereals as such. However, if they were able to purchase meats, poultry products, and milk, instead of cereals—of course they have to purchase cereals when their income is too low—that would mean that instead of consuming 1 bushel of wheat, corn, rye, or whatever might be the cereal they otherwise would eat, they would be consuming from 4 to 7 bushels of grain in the form of animal products, and thereby would provide an outlet for probably all the surplus grains we would have.

Indirectly, that would provide an outlet for all the farm surpluses we have today, and more besides. However, that was not the primary purpose of the bill. Its primary purpose was to make sure that everyone would have enough of the right kind of food to eat.

Much to the surprise of some persons, those who are not able to buy sufficient to eat are not loafers. To the contrary, they are old people, people living on pensions, people living on very low incomes, widows and families of servicemen, and persons of similar types. The estimate of from 40,000,000 to 50,000,000 was made several years ago by some of the experts of the Department of Agriculture; but I daresay that if the persons in that category had enough food made available to them through the normal channels of trade, we would not have a surplus of food in the United States.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield, to permit the Senator from Wisconsin to ask a question of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from North Dakota may not lose the floor by doing so, so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LANGER. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Unanimous consent is requested for that purpose. Without objection, consent is granted.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont a question. I believe he will agree with me that there is very slight possibility that his bill, in its present form, will pass the present Senate or the present House of Representatives; and I believe the Senator also will agree with me that if his bill, insofar as it would apply to surpluses, were passed, it would very well dispose of our surplus-food problem. Here is what I have in mind: At the present time we are supporting the price of butter. The Government is buying tremendous quantities of butter. We are building up a huge stock pile of butter; and with the Lever Bros. oleomargarine bill having been passed by the Senate, if more people eat oleomargarine, as the oleomargarine companies think they will, it will mean that the Government will have to buy even more butter, and the problem will become even more acute than it is at the present time. The same situation will apply to eggs and other farm products. Unless something is done vast quantities of foodstuffs will spoil; there can be no question about that.

I wonder whether the Senator will agree with me that it would be an excellent thing to support his bill, insofar as it would apply to surplus farm products. I do not think anyone will attack the reasoning behind that suggestion. No one will say that instead of permitting eggs to spoil in the limestone caves of Kentucky, and ultimately having them dumped into the ocean, it would not be better to use them in the way suggested in the Senator's bill.

If we would make such food available to the low-income families, at least it would solve the tremendous problem of surpluses. Does the Senator agree with me as to that?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, let me say that I regard the bill itself as more in the nature of an authorization to do these things. The extent to which it would be applied would be the extent to which Congress provided the details and the means.

As the bill is written, my recollection is that it provides that up to 10 percent of the coupons provided to the low-income families would have to be used in purchasing foods which happened to be in surplus at the time.

There is no reason why the Congress could not cut the cloth to fit the pattern, or whatever the expression may be; and it would be much better to have spoilable surpluses used by low-income persons who cannot afford to buy such food, than it would be to let the food spoil. I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin to that extent.

I think our ultimate objective should be an adequate and proper diet for all our people. Each step we take in that direction would be for the good of the country as a whole.

During the delivery of Mr. LANGER's speech:

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, my only reason for asking the Senator from North Dakota to yield at this time is to correct what I think is an erroneous impression, upon the part of a great number of farmers, especially, to the effect that the Brannan plan would afford them higher support prices than they receive under the Anderson plan.

I have before me a document issued by the Department of Agriculture. We can assume certainly that it is not unfriendly toward the Brannan plan, in view of the fact that the Secretary is Mr. Brannan. The document lists in detail the support prices under the Brannan plan and under the Anderson plan, which the Congress adopted. The Anderson plan, of course, takes its name from the former Secretary of Agriculture, now the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

I should like to read these figures into the RECORD. This table gives the support prices for selected commodities under various alternative plans.

Wheat, under the Anderson plan, $1,90; under the Brannan plan, $1.84.

Corn, under the Anderson plan, $1.49 a bushel; under the Brannan plan, $1.44 a bushel.

Butterfat, under the Anderson plan, 71.6 cents a pound; under the Brannan plan, 65.8 cents a pound.

I might say that the following item is of great interest to the Senator from Wisconsin, and I am sure to the Senator

of North Dakota, because of the amount of milk products our States produce:

Milk, under the Anderson plan, $4.48 a hundredweight; under the Brannan plan, $4.16 a hundredweight.

Hogs, under the Anderson plan, $19.20 a hundredweight; under the Brannan plan, $18.60 a hundredweight.

Eggs, under the Anderson plan, 46.5 cents a dozen; under the Brannan plan, 45 cents a dozen.

Chickens, under the Anderson plan, 29.5 cents a pound; under the Brannan plan, 28.5 cents a pound.

Flaxseed, under the Anderson plan, $4.37 a bushel; under the Brannan plan, $4.23 a bushel.

Potatoes, under the Anderson plan, $1.64 a bushel; under the Brannan plan, $1.57 a bushel.

Beef cattle, under the Anderson plan, $17.30 a hundredweight; under the Brannan plan, $16.60 a hundredweight.

Lambs, under the Anderson plan, $18.90 a hundredweight; under the Brannan plan, $18.10 a hundredweight.

Oats, under the Anderson plan, 83.8 cents a bushel; under the Brannan plan, 81.2 cents a bushel.

Barley, under the Anderson plan, $1.24 a bushel; under the Brannan plan, $1.20 a bushel.

Wool, under the Anderson plan, 5.07 cents a pound; under the Brannan plan, 4.91 cents a pound.

My reason for asking the Senator from North Dakota to yield was that I might introduce these figures into the RECORD at this time, because of the completely erroneous idea, many have, as to support-prices under the Anderson plan as now in effect, and the Brannan plan as proposed. A considerable number of the farmers of my State write me saying, "Why do you not support the Brannan plan? It will give us more money." I thought they should know that under the figures issued by the Department of Agriculture itself, the support-prices under the Brannan plan would be considerably lower than those under the Anderson plan.

I should like to say also that many people throughout this Nation, I believe, lose sight of the inherent, basic difference in the reasoning of those who support the Anderson plan and those who support the Brannan plan. The reasoning of those who supported the Anderson plan was that the farmer should get a reasonably fair price for his products, and that labor should receive a sufficiently high wage so that the laborers could pay that fair price, and that if we start subsidizing the farmer, we must in turn and in fairness also subsidize everyone else.

I thank the Senator from North Dakota very much for allowing me to introduce these figures. Let me repeat, for the benefit of my colleagues, that the figures I have offered were issued by the Department of Agriculture, showing support prices which the farmers would receive under the Brannan plan, and the support prices which they are now receiving under the Anderson plan. With no exception whatever the figures under the Anderson plan indicate a higher support price than those under the Brannan plan.

For the first time under any farm legislation which has been put into effect, dairy farmers are treated with some degree of equality, under the Anderson plan. The Anderson plan has for the first time recognized that the dairy industry is important, and that so long as we support the price of cattle feeds then in fairness we must also support the price of milk; otherwise the dairy farmer will be caught between the upper and the nether millstones. One of the reasons why I favored the Anderson plan above the Brannan plan is that it does give the dairy farmer a much fairer deal than he would receive under the Brannan plan. Obviously there were many other reasons.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. I might say to the Senator that he is not including many other things, such as eggs, chickens, and some of the other products, as to which the Brannan plan is much better than the Anderson plan, taking the general average.

The schedule from which the Senator has been reading was put into the RECORD by my colleague the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], at an earlier time.

Mr. McCARTHY. While the Senator is scrutinizing the list I have been using, I wish to call a matter to his attention? He has mentioned eggs. Congress has given the Secretary of Agriculture the power to establish a support price for eggs which would be higher than under the Brannan plan. Secretary Brannan has not done that. Perhaps he may have some justification because of what we failed to do when we enacted the Anderson plan. The Senator will recall that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] offered an amendment to the Anderson plan which provided that the President would have the power to cut off the importation of any farm products which were being price-supported and which were in surplus. The representatives of the State Department came to the Capitol and did a very good job of lobbying, and succeeded in defeating the amendment in conference. The end result is that as of today, if we establish a fair support price for eggs for the American farmer, we will promptly have a tremendous flood of eggs coming from China and from other foreign countries. We have dried and stored, in the caves in Kentucky, I do not know how many million dollars' worth of eggs. Those eggs will last about 16 or 17 months, and then they will be taken out and dumped into the ocean. So the end result is that it is extremely difficult for Secretary Brannan to establish a fair support price for eggs, because once he does that we will drain the eggs from every poverty-stricken area of the world, because the people there cannot afford to pay the support price of eggs, while our people can.

As of today the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, who, of course, advocates the Brannan plan, has the power to fix a support price for eggs and the other farm products the Senator mentioned, at a figure higher than those contained in the Brannan plan itself. He has failed to do so. As I said, there are some hazards brought about by the antifarmer lobbying of the State Department and the failure on the part of the Senate and the House to realize that if we do not give the President the power and the duty to say, "We will not allow this country to be flooded with farm products which are in surplus and which are price supported," we may wreck the farm program.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the price has been fixed at 25 cents a dozen. That is not the only trouble, however. The trouble comes about because of powdered eggs. If the price of powdered eggs could go up to 96 cents a hundred pounds, instead of 93 cents, the entire matter might be adjusted satisfactorily. At Jamestown, N. Dak., some farmers are receiving only 20 cents a dozen. As the Senator from Wisconsin undoubtedly knows, the Secretary of Agriculture has been working on that matter for a couple of weeks. It is possible he may arrive at a satisfactory solution of the problem.

Mr. McCARTHY. I lived on a farm for a good many years. On that farm we raised a good many chickens and produced eggs. The Senator and I know that a farmer would go broke if he were obliged to produce eggs at a selling price of 25 cents a dozen.

Mr. LANGER. Certainly.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, what I may not have made clear is: First. The Secretary has the power to fix the support price of eggs at a figure higher than at which it could be fixed under the Brannan plan. Second. We are in grave danger of wrecking any farm-support program if we continue to accede to the State Department's demands. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] submitted an amendment to the Anderson bill, because of the fact that he recognized this dangerous situation. His amendment would result in avoiding that danger.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. That amendment contemplated this situation: In case of the existence of a support price for eggs, if there is already a surplus of eggs—and the same applies to potatoes, or whatever the product may be for which there is a support price—and if in turn we are destroying those food products, then we are not doing the American farmer, the American producer, or the foreign consumer any good by allowing a flood of foreign products into the United States, because this is what would happen. Let us consider eggs. If we support eggs at a figure which the laboring man can afford to pay, at a figure which will give the farmer a fair profit, then we know that the Chinese housewife cannot purchase Chinese eggs, because the Chinese producers will ship them into this country and sell them at our support price. That is what is happening today.

That is what the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], by his amendment, was trying to avoid. That amendment was agreed to by a substantial majority. It went to conference, and, as so often happens, the bright boys from the State Department came to the Capitol and put on a tremendous lobby and, unfortunately, they convinced—they did

not convince me nor did they convince the Senator from North Dakota—a majority of both Houses, and a majority of the conferees that we should continue a practice which may well wreck the farm support program.

I realize that this may be getting slightly away from what the Senator had in mind, but in view of the fact that he mentioned the support price under the Brannan plan I wanted him to have it in mind, and to get the benefit of his comments thereon.

Mr. LANGER. What the Senator has said about eggs is, of course true, due to the entire tariff policy of the Democratic Party. That is why we in the West are opposed to that policy. If the Democratic Party had its way in carrying out that policy, it would result in bringing cattle into the United States from Canada, and in bringing into the United States wheat, oats and barley, all in competition with the farmers of Wisconsin, Minnesota and North and South Dakota. The matter of the peril point, on which the Republican Party is solidly united, is involved in that very question.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN METHOD OF ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a compilation which has been prepared for me by the Library of Congress, which shows that in the past hundred years there were 12 Presidential elections in which the candidates who became President did not receive a majority of the popular vote. This tabulation lists the Presidents, the years, and the percentages. It is of interest to note that Lincoln, for example, received only 39 percent of the vote in 1860.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINORITY PRESIDENTS

In the past 100 years (27 elections), the following were elected President even though they did not have a majority of the popular vote:

	Percent of popular vote
1844, Polk	49.6
1848, Taylor	47.4
1856, Buchanan	45.4
1860, Lincoln	39.9
1876, Hayes	47.9
1880, Garfield	48.3
1884, Cleveland	48.9
1888, Harrison	47.8
1892, Cleveland	46.0
1912, Wilson	41.8
1916, Wilson	49.3
1948, Truman	49.5

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] submitted his joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, providing for a change in the method of election of President and Vice President. At that time I sent to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute. I ask unanimous consent that it be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of 4 years, and, together with the Vice President chosen for the same term, be nominated and elected as hereinafter provided.

"SEC. 2. The official candidates of political parties for President and Vice President shall be nominated at a primary election by direct vote of the qualified voters who are members of the respective political parties in the several States. The time of such primary election shall be the same throughout the United States, and, unless the Congress shall by law appoint a different day, such primary election shall be held on the first Wednesday after the first Monday in June in the year preceding the expiration of the regular term of President and Vice President. Persons voting in primaries for candidates for President and Vice President in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of such State, and shall have been members of their respective political parties for not less than 6 months prior to the holding of such primaries.

"The names which shall appear in each of the States on the primary ballots for candidates of the respective political parties shall be only of those persons who shall have filed petitions at the seat of the Government of the United States with the Secretary of State. Such petitions shall be valid only if filed at least 60 days prior to the day of primary election and if signed by qualified voters in any or all of the several States, equal in number to at least one-tenth of 1 percent of the total number of popular votes cast throughout the United States for all candidates for President (or, in the case of the primary election first held after the ratification of this article, for electors of President and Vice President) in the most recent previous Presidential election.

"SEC. 3. Within 30 days after such primary election, the chief executive of each State shall make distinct lists of all persons of each political party, for whom votes were cast, and the number of votes for each such person, which lists shall be signed, certified, and transmitted under the seal of such State to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the Secretary of State, who shall open all certificates and count the votes. The person receiving the greatest aggregate number of popular votes of any party for candidate for President shall be the official candidate of such party, throughout the United States, for President; and the person receiving the greatest aggregate number of popular votes of any party for candidate for Vice President shall be the official candidate of such party, throughout the United States, for Vice President.

"SEC. 4. In the event of the death or resignation of the official candidate of any political party for President, the person nominated by such political party for Vice President shall be the official candidate of such party for President. In the event of the death or resignation of the official candidate of any political party for Vice President, a national committee of such party shall designate a candidate for Vice President, who shall then be deemed the official candidate for Vice President of such party, but in choosing such candidate the vote shall be taken by States, the delegation from each State having one vote. A quorum for such purpose shall consist of a delegate or delegates from two-thirds of the States, and a majority of all States shall be necessary to a choice.

"SEC. 5. The electoral-college system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States is hereby abolished. The President and Vice President shall be elected by the people of the several States as shall be determined by direct vote of the qualified voters at a general election. The time of such election in each State shall be the same throughout the United States, and unless the Congress shall by law appoint a different day, such election shall be held on the first Wednesday after the first Monday in November in the year preceding the expiration of the regular term of the President and Vice President. The voters in each State shall vote directly for President and Vice President and shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. The names of candidates officially nominated in primaries as herein provided, and in addition the names of any independent candidates, shall appear in every State upon the official ballot for the offices of President and Vice President, but names of any such independent candidates shall so appear only following the filing with the Secretary of State of the United States, at least 60 days prior to the day of the election, of petitions signed by qualified voters in any or all of the several States, equal in number to at least one-half of 1 percent of the total number of popular votes cast throughout the United States for all candidates for President.

"SEC. 6. Within 30 days after such election, the chief executive of each State shall make distinct lists of all persons receiving votes for President and all persons receiving votes for Vice President, and the number of votes cast in such State for each, which lists shall be signed, certified, and transmitted under the seal of such State to the seat of the Government of the United States directed to the President of the Senate. The Congress shall be in session on the 6th day of January, or if such day shall fall on Sunday on the 7th day of January, and on that day the President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted. The person having the greatest aggregate number of popular votes for President shall be President, and the person having the greatest aggregate number of popular votes for Vice President shall be Vice President. No person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the United States.

"SEC. 7. In the event that it is shown by such certificates that the two persons receiving the greatest number of votes for President have received an equal number of such votes, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. In choosing the President the votes shall be taken by States, the representation from each State having one vote. A quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two-thirds of the States, and a majority of all the States shall be necessary to a choice. If the House of Representatives shall not choose a President whenever the right of choice shall devolve upon them, before the 20th day of January next following, then the Vice President shall act as President, as in the case of death or other constitutional disability of the President. In the event that it is shown by such certificates that the two persons receiving the greatest number of votes for Vice President have re-

ceived an equal number of such votes, the Senate shall choose the Vice President. A quorum for this purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice.

"SEC. 8. The Congress shall have power to provide by appropriate legislation for methods of determining any dispute or controversy that may arise in the counting and canvassing of votes for President and Vice President in any such primary or general election. The places and manner of holding such primary or general election shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations. The Congress and the several States shall have concurrent power to prevent fraud and corrupt practices in connection with such primary or general elections.

"SEC. 9. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States as provided in the Constitution."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, very briefly stated, the substitute provides for the abolition of the electoral college and for direct election of the President and Vice President of the United States by the direct vote of the people of the country. Yesterday, when the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts was speaking in behalf of his resolution, he very kindly yielded to me for a question. I asked the Senator this question:

Is it not true that if the election of a President were to be decided on the basis of the popular vote, there would be a much greater attendance at the polls than there would be if the measure sponsored by the Senator from Massachusetts should go into effect?

I may say the Senator had just been showing that for quite a number of years there had been in some of the States of the Union a very, very light vote for the candidates for various offices, and that the voting was, and is, at a very low ebb.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts replied to my question as follows:

Mr. LODGE. I think that is true. I think there would be a greater attendance, yes. As the Senator from North Dakota knows, I have been in favor of a direct popular vote, but, being a realist, I discovered some years ago that it was an impossibility to achieve, because it did away with the principle of equality of States in the Senate. But I think unquestionably a direct popular vote would increase interest very much.

Naturally, Mr. President, I appreciated the open and frank statement of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. As always, he was frank in his answer.

Mr. President, by direct vote of the people we elect the mayors of our cities; we elect the governors of our States; we elect Representatives in Congress and we elect United States Senators. No good reason has ever been shown to me why the people of the United States should not go to the polls and elect their President and Vice President by direct vote. Surely the heads of good, patriotic Americans must hang in shame when we think back to the Republican convention at Chicago at the time when General Leonard Wood and some other Republicans were running for the Presidency, and it was shown that some of the delegates were paid as much as $100,000 for their votes. Surely the heads of patriotic Americans ought to hang in shame when they consider the nomination of attorneys for the House of Morgan by the Democratic Party—Alton B. Parker and John W. Davis. I remember, as a youth, sitting on the front porch of my ranch home when the Republican Party waited in their convention and let a whole day go by because Andrew Mellon was busy and could not get there. They had to wait for him to tell them whom to nominate for President of the United States on the Republican ticket.

More recently, all of us remember when the Republican Party nominated Wendell Willkie, and the book which was written telling how that nomination was secured. I talked with some of the delegates and was informed that they were paid $25 apiece to sit in the gallery from morning until night and to chant "We want Willkie." They were headed by Tom Lamont of the House of Morgan, who went to Philadelphia to secure the nomination of Wendell Willkie, a great power magnate.

What did we see in Chicago when Mr. Roosevelt was nominated again? A man was stationed in the sewer with broadcasting equipment, and at the appropriate time he shouted, "We want Roosevelt." It was planned by a gang in Chicago when the Democratic Convention took place. I call them gangsters, for want of a better term. Some people call them politicians. Anyway, a similar gang nominated Wendell Willkie on the Republican ticket. A couple of weeks later, after meeting in a smoke-filled room, after they had made their deals, the other party nominated a man. There was not much choice. The big business interests nominated both of them, and the leaders of the big business interests went to a cocktail room and drank their gin and bourbon and said to the American people, "Go out and fight and see which of the two will be elected." They did not care, much, which of the two it would be.

That is the kind of thing, Mr. President, that my substitute amendment is designed to stop. Surely, when our forefathers came to this continent they intended to make this Government a government of, for, and by the people.

In my substitute I have gone further than to provide a direct primary in which any man or woman may be nominated for President. I have gone further, and have provided that even though that man or woman shall become the candidate of the party, anyone else who can get a certain percentage of signers to a petition may also run, if he so desires.

My distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] stated yesterday that in one State only 1½ percent of the people voted. Think of it, Mr. President, only 1½ percent of the people voted. One gang names one candidate, the other gang names another candidate, and then they call on the American people to campaign for their election. The people do not have a thing to say as to whom the candidate will be. Why should they be interested? What difference has it made in the past three or four elections, so far as policy was concerned, who would be President?

I do not agree with the bipartisan policy of the Democrats and Republicans, and as an American who does not believe in it I am entitled to be heard. Before this bipartisan policy began to operate 108,000 persons in Los Angeles went to hear Burton K. Wheeler. There are millions of persons in this country who do not agree with the bipartisan policy which we have had in the past 5 years. Billions of dollars have been given away, Mr. President. I certainly do not agree with it. I did not vote for it. Already some persons have started to apologize, and are saying, "I did not vote to give all that money to China. I did not know that the Communists were going to get nine-tenths of all that material." Let them go out among the voters who have to pay income taxes and explain why they voted to send billions upon billions of dollars to almost every foreign country on the face of the globe. The United States Government has given away a sum larger than the assessed valuation of 11 States of the Union. We have given away $3,750,000,000.

Some persons have had the temerity to say, "If you do not vote for it, we will have war." They said, "We are for peace."

I voted against it, Mr. President. I said the Democratic Party ought to throw away the donkey emblem and the Republican Party ought to throw away the elephant emblem, and both parties should agree on the same emblem, namely, the scoopshovel.

Surely, Mr. President, we are all familiar with the book written by Mary Sparks telling about the meeting arranged by Whitelaw Reid and Mrs. Reid in New York at which the British Ambassador, Lord Halifax, was present. Whom did they invite to that little, select group? The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and Mrs. Taft. A waiter was standing behind each chair. One of the greatest things BOB TAFT ever did in his life occurred when they wanted to commit him to the British policy of plunging this Nation into war and giving away money to Great Britain. BOB TAFT walked out of that room. He was too big an American to stay there. Some people say that when he walked out he lost to Wendell Willkie the Republican nomination for the Presidency.

Mr. President, I introduced this substitute as an original bill 4 years ago, 3 years ago, and 2 years ago. The last time I introduced it, the Christian Science Monitor published an article entitled "Let the People Elect the President."

I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET THE PEOPLE ELECT THE PRESIDENT—VOTERS OF UNITED STATES URGED TO RISE UP AND DEMAND ABOLITION OF ELECTORAL COLLEGE

(By Hon. WILLIAM LANGER, United States Senator from North Dakota)

The Republican Party hopes next year to elect its first President in 16 years. But, even though its candidate polls a clear-cut majority of the total popular vote and wins the election in more than two-thirds of the States, he still may never become President.

Instead, his Democratic opponent could be declared the victor and sworn in for a 4-year term, and the Republicans would be helpless to do anything about it.

You may say that for that to happen would be a rank miscarriage of justice; a violation of the principles of democratic government. Very true. But it has happened before and can happen again. Twelve of our 32 Presidents have been elected to that high office without the benefit of a majority of the popular vote. All because we have neglected to make a very necessary change in the Constitution and to replace a worn-out part of the election machinery which it set up.

I think the people of the United States will make that change if given an opportunity to do so. To afford them that opportunity, I have introduced in the Senate a constitutional amendment to abolish the electoral college and provide for the election of the President and the Vice President by a direct popular vote of the people.

My resolution would make one other very important change; it would take the job of nominating the candidates for President and Vice President out of the hands of the politicians and place that solemn responsibility where it belongs—squarely on the shoulders of the American people. I think we ought to take the selection of our highest executive officers out of the atmosphere of smoke-filled back rooms and political horse-trading.

I want to make absolutely certain that the man sworn into the Presidency of the United States is the man that the majority of the people want.

We certainly have no guarantee of that now, under the electoral-college system. In most States, the people never have a chance to vote directly for either President or Vice President. They vote for electors who in turn are pledged, but not legally bound, to cast their ballots for the respective candidates of the Republican or Democratic Party?

Each State has the same number of electoral votes for President as it has Representatives in Congress. My State (North Dakota), for example, has four. Wyoming has 3, New York 47, Massachusetts 17.

Under the unit or bloc-voting system of the electoral college, each State is required to cast all its electoral votes for one candidate, the candidate having the highest popular vote. If the Republican candidate carries New York, he gets all 47 of the State's electoral votes, even though his margin over the Democratic candidate in the popular vote may be only a single ballot.

To see what a threat to democracy this electoral-college system is, and how easily the will of the people could be thwarted, let's take a look at what might conceivably happen in the presidential election next year.

A bitter battle is now raging in Congress over labor legislation. Regardless of the outcome of that battle, the labor question is going to be one of the burning issues of the 1948 campaign. The election could very well turn on that one issue.

In the heat of that congressional battle, you are likely to see the two great labor organizations, the CIO and the AFL, welded together in a solid front for the next campaign. In that union, it is obvious that neither love nor votes will be wasted on the Republican Party.

Suppose that labor, solidly united behind the Democratic candidate, concentrates its vote drive on 12 pivotal States in which it swings the balance of power—Pennsylvania, Illinois, California, Missouri, Kentucky, Indiana, New York, New Jersey, Ohio, Massachusetts, Texas, and Wisconsin.

Assume that this revenge campaign of labor is successful and that the Democratic candidate for President carries these 12 States, and that he gets a total popular vote of more than 25,000,000.

To offset this Democratic victory in 12 States, suppose the Republican candidate carries all the other 36 States and rolls up a thumping total of 60,000,000 in the popular vote.

After counting up these respective votes, the logical assumption would be that the final curtain had come down on the New Deal and that the Republicans would be moving into the White House next January.

Such would not be the case. An election is never won until the last vote is counted, and in this instance the electoral college casts the last vote—and the only vote that counts. We would have a Democratic President for another 4-year term.

The 12 States carried by the Democratic candidate would have 268 electoral votes. The 36 States carried by the Republicans would have 263 electoral votes.

The fact that the Republicans had piled up a 35,000,000-vote majority in the popular vote would have no bearing whatsoever on the final outcome. Thus we see that the electoral-college system, instead of protecting democracy, could actually become the instrument for its destruction.

There are many other reasons why this obsolete, dangerous, and completely illogical method of electing the President should be abolished. It concentrates too much political power in too few States. It lends itself too easily to the machinations of crooked politicians and has helped spawn the big-city bosses and their political machines. It is a constant threat to majority rule of the people, and could very readily provide the back-door entrance for the rise of a dictator in this country.

The electoral college is a relic of the stagecoach era. In fact, one of the primary reasons for its adoption in the first place was the lack of facilities for rapid communication and transportation. It took months to complete the count on the popular vote. Electors, on the other hand, could be readily determined in most States on the basis of voting trends. The rise of political parties and the emergence of the two-party system, developments which the founding fathers did not foresee, has further eliminated the need for continuing the electoral-college system.

Let me point out also that if my amendment is adopted, it will not be the first change we have made in the manner of electing the President. Originally, the Constitution provided that the candidate who received the highest electoral vote should be the President and the one receiving the next highest vote should become Vice President. The twelfth amendment to the Constitution, adopted in 1804, changed that to provide for separate ballots for each office.

I hope that the people of the United States will rise up in their might and demand the abolition of the electoral college; that they will insist upon their fundamental right to nominate and elect the President and the Vice President by a direct popular vote.

The people can have that right if they want it, and as soon as they want it. But they will never get it if they wait for the politicians to give it to them on a silver platter. They must fight for it. They must prod Congress into action. The all-important first step is to get the amendment approved by the Senate, and I hope that an aroused public opinion will bring that about at the present session.

Mr. LANGER. At the same time, Mr. President, from all over the country I received thousands of letters. I ask unanimous consent to have one of them printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. It was written to me by Miss Ella M. Kinsley, whom I have never met. The letter is typical of a great number of letters which I received from all over America.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PASADENA, CALIF., *July 10, 1947.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have read, reread, and carefully considered your most valuable and interesting article in the magazine section of the Christian Science Monitor of June 21.

It gives me a ray of hope. For some time I have felt that it was of no use for me to vote, and yet I have kept up the habit of years.

It would be a pleasure to me to aid in the promotion of a change such as your article suggests. I am today writing to our Senator and Representative in Congress, and could write to others if I had their Washington addresses.

I have called the attention of a few friends here to the proposed change, and in my correspondence with friends in the East, will mention your plan and suggest that they write to their respective Congressmen.

The idea of the President and Vice President being elected directly by the people agrees perfectly with that of the people's section of the United Nations, which is being ably promoted by Mr. Carlyle Morgan. As you may have noticed, his reports of progress are from time to time published on the editorial page of the Christian Science Monitor.

With best wishes for a successful outcome, I am,

Very respectfully,
(Miss) ELLA M. KINSLEY.

Mr. LANGER. I have before me an editorial which appeared in the Times Leader of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., on April 17, 1947. I should like to read a few lines from the editorial:

In the 157 years since the Constitution was ratified, four amendments have been passed which affected the methods or participants of national elections. The twelfth amendment made the office of Vice President subject to election, rather than giving it to the losing candidate in the race for President. The fifteenth amendment gave the vote to Negro citizens; the seventeenth provided for popular election of Senators; the nineteenth lagalized woman suffrage.

Now Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, has proposed another change. He would give the people the privilege of selecting candidates for President and Vice President through direct national primaries conducted by both major parties.

In the rush of recent events, Mr. LANGER'S suggestion hasn't caused much popular excitement. Yet it is sound enough to merit wide discussion.

The biggest, most obvious advantage of the proposal would be to remove the chance for bosses or small political groups to frustrate the people's will. This is not the rule, but it has been done.

Theodore Roosevelt's defeat in the 1912 Republican convention was pretty clearly a defeat for rank-and-file sentiment. Warren G. Harding emerged from the fog of a smoke-filled room as a boss-picked Republican candidate in 1920. There is reason to believe that Al Smith, not John W. Davis, was the popular Democratic choice in 1924. In fact, Wendell Willkie's nomination is about the only recent example of direct public influence in picking a new candidate.

Mr. President, that was done by Tom Lamont. He went to Philadelphia and took charge, paying $25 to every man

and woman who went in the gallery and shouted, "We want Willkie; we want Willkie." I say that because Republican delegates who were there told me about being participants in handling some of the money and hiring some of the people.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial may be printed as part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIRECT PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES

In the 157 years since the Constitution was ratified four amendments have been passed which affected the methods or participants of national elections. The twelfth amendment made the office of Vice President subject to election, rather than giving it to the losing candidate in the race for President. The fifteenth amendment gave the vote to Negro citizens; the seventeenth provided for popular election of Senators; the nineteenth legalized woman suffrage.

Now Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, has proposed another change. He would give the people the privilege of selecting candidates for President and Vice President through direct national primaries conducted by both major parties.

In the rush of recent events Mr. LANGER's suggestion hasn't caused much popular excitement. Yet it is sound enough to merit wide discussion.

The biggest, most obvious advantage of the proposal would be to remove the chance for bosses or small political groups to frustrate the people's will. This is not the rule, but it has been done.

Theodore Roosevelt's defeat in the 1912 Republican convention was pretty clearly a defeat for rank-and-file sentiment. Warren G. Harding emerged from the fog of a smoke-filled room as a boss-picked Republican candidate in 1920. There is reason to believe that Al Smith, not John W. Davis, was the popular Democratic choice in 1924. In fact, Wendell Willkie's nomination is about the only recent example of direct public influence in picking a new candidate.

Another advantage is the possibility that a presidential primary might give some voice to the impotent and virtually disfranchised Republican minority in the South. As it is now, the votes of southern delegations to Republican conventions are numerically important and politically powerless. They can be manipulated to influence, even decide, the choice of candidate without any pretense of popular representation.

Objections to the Langer proposal naturally have been raised. It has been said that primaries would give no clear majority to one candidate. It has been predicted—though this is open to serious question—that most States would simply pick a favorite son. It has also been claimed that direct primaries would destroy that geographical balance, so dear to the professional politician's heart, between the home States of the presidential candidate and his running mate.

Our technique of elections is not so perfect or the conduct of our national party conventions so high-minded as to bar any thought of change. One of our country's great needs is to make its Government function more democratically (with a lower case "d") within its republican (lower case "r") framework. It is at least worth considering whether Senator LANGER's proposal is a step in that direction.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in the Committee on the Judiciary, after my amendment was offered and was defeated, I voted for the Lodge joint resolution. I wish to say very frankly that if my substitute cannot be adopted, I intend to support the Lodge joint resolution. I believe I cast the deciding vote to report the joint resolution from the Committee on the Judiciary.

I might say that this proposal is nothing new. A Democratic Senator, Senator Smith, of South Carolina, tried to get such a resolution adopted years ago, as the records of the committee will show. George Norris, of Nebraska, devoted weeks, when he was chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, to getting this kind of an amendment to the Constitution adopted, but he could not get it through the Senate. I have read and reread every single word of the debates uttered on this floor on that subject. The measure introduced by poor George Norris was amended and amended and amended and amended upon the floor of the Senate until he could not recognize it himself. Each amendment offered, if it had been adopted, would have taken more power away from the people of the United States.

Mr. President, before we come to a vote upon this subject, I intend to speak upon it again. The speech I intend to deliver is all prepared, but I think I have said enough at this time so that any of my colleagues who are interested in giving the people the power to elect their own President will be put upon notice and will not be able to say later that my proposal came up without their knowledge, or before they had sufficient time to digest it thoroughly and study it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Millikin
Anderson	Hoey	Mundt
Benton	Holland	Murray
Brewster	Humphrey	Myers
Bricker	Hunt	Neely
Butler	Ives	O'Conor
Byrd	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cordon	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kem	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Downey	Kilgore	Sparkman
Dworshak	Knowland	Stennis
Eastland	Langer	Taylor
Ecton	Leahy	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Lehman	Thye
Flanders	Lodge	Tobey
Frear	Long	Tydings
Fulbright	McCarran	Vandenberg
George	McCarthy	Watkins
Gillette	McClellan	Wherry
Graham	McFarland	Wiley
Green	McKellar	Williams
Gurney	McMahon	Withers
Hayden	Magnuson	Young
Hendrickson	Martin	
Hickenlooper	Maybank	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I wish to propose a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the unfinished business. The unanimous-consent agreement which I propose reads as follows:

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That on the calendar day of Wednesday, February 1, 1950, at the hour of 3 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate upon amendments to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, and upon the final passage of the said joint resolution: *Provided,* (1) That no amendment that is not germane to the subject matter of the said joint resolution shall be received; (2) that no vote on any amendment shall be taken prior to the said hour of 3 o'clock; and (3) that no amendment shall be in order which has not been formally offered or submitted as a proposed amendment prior to the hour of 1 o'clock p. m. on said day.

Ordered further, That the time between 1 o'clock and 3 o'clock p. m. on said day be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the said joint resolution and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that proposal be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I notice a new phase in the proposed agreement, the phase dealing with germaneness. It is the first time it has been brought to my attention that the question of germaneness has arisen here. The requirement of germaneness has never been made by the Senate. In other words, we have never excluded amendments on the ground of nongermaneness, if they were at all in keeping with the subject matter. Notwithstanding that fact, perhaps I might not object to the unanimous-consent agreement, except that it seems to establish a precedent. If it establishes a precedent, I do not propose to agree to it. I am going to ask that that phase of the proposed agreement be stricken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair might state to the Senator that the last unanimous-consent agreement, under which the Senate voted on the equal-rights amendment a day or two ago, contained a provision in regard to the germaneness of amendments.

Mr. McCARRAN. That may be true. I apologize for not having been present. I shall never agree to any proposed unanimous agreement which carries with it the requirement of germaneness. It has never been a part of the rules of the Senate that amendments had to be germane to the subject, and I am not going to agree to this proposal. Having stated the reasons for my objection, I object.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, for the present, I withdraw the request. I should like to confer with the Senator from Nevada for a few moments, after which I may renew the request. At the present time I withdraw it.

RESIGNATION OF SENATOR VANDENBERG FROM JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY AND APPOINTMENT OF SENATOR BRICKER

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication, which he asks the Secretary to read.

The Chief Clerk read, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1950.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I present my resignation as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully yours,
A. H. VANDENBERG.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is sure that all Senators regret the resignation of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] from the joint committee. At the request and on the recommendation of the Republican steering committee, and the Republican committee on committees, under a policy which they have adopted, the Chair appoints the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, in connection with the appointment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, I wish to say that he was at one time a member of that committee, but lost his membership because of a change of committee ratios as the result of the change in the control of the Senate.

On January 10, this year, the Republican conference adopted the following resolution:

Where a Senator has served on a committee, and has lost his membership thereon by a change of committee ratio as a result of a change in control of the Senate, he shall have seniority over any and all other Senators to the first vacancy on the committee from which he was removed.

The recommendation of the conference of the appointment of the Senator from Ohio follows that resolution, and I may say, also, that the chairman of the committee on committees was consulted and he is entirely agreeable to the recommendation.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief statement concerning the resignation of our friend the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I think I can speak for all members of that committee when I say that I very greatly regret that circumstances have dictated the Senator's resignation. His contributions to the work of the committee are known perhaps most intimately to those who are members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, but I am sure they are also appreciated by the people of the United States. I am pleased, indeed, that we are going to have an opportunity, as he has assured me we shall have of consultation with him in the future work of the committee, although it may be on an entirely unofficial basis. I feel certain that all members of the committee will value that assurance.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] has again become a member of the joint committee, and I am certain he will give his earnest and diligent attention to the very weighty and grave matters coming before the committee, whose wise consideration is very important to the people of the United States and, indeed, to the whole world.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and of the Special Committee of the Senate on Atomic Energy, I have been intimately associated with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] ever since the appointment of the committees, both special and joint, on atomic energy.

I have the deepest regret that personal matters and conditions have led to the resignation from the joint committee of the Senator from Michigan. In view of his very valuable and able counsel and advice as a member of the Senate's Special Committee on Atomic Energy, and of the joint committee, and the great and far-reaching contributions his judgment and wisdom have made in the activities of the committees, continuing through for some time, I personally am sorry, as I know the other members of the joint committee are sorry, that circumstances will cause us to lose his services and advice, especially in times of doubt and difficulty in this field.

I am certain, from his statements to me, that he stands ready in any way he can to contribute his counsel and advice in the future whenever we may ask for them.

As the ranking member of the Senate side of the joint committee, I welcome the reappointment of Senator BRICKER as a member of the committee. I am sure we can look forward to cooperative action and progress in the future.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I, too, have served on the Atomic Energy Committee from its beginning and also on the special Senate committee which preceded it. The contributions of Senator VANDENBERG were always immensely valuable. I recall that in the formulation of the law, through his brilliance and his ability to achieve adjustments, he perhaps saved the law from becoming a source of destructive controversy. The distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut will remember that we had grave questions as to the influence to be accorded to civilian and military agencies. Senator VANDENBERG's contributions in resolving those conflicts, and in shaping a bill all of us could support, will form a very bright chapter in his great career. Since the beginning of his service on the joint committee, I can recall offhand three or four occasions when his wise counsel and courageous positions in the committee led to actions which time may show saved this country.

I wish the subject were one which could be talked about freely, so that those contributions could be assessed as of today. But that cannot be done, and I simply wish to join with my colleagues in expressing my own appreciation for the great honor of having been permitted to serve with him.

I, too, wish to say that Senator BRICKER has always been intensely interested in the subject of atomic energy. He has kept himself informed, as well as he could while off the committee, and he will again make a valuable member of it.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I propose that by unanimous consent, when the Senate recesses today, it take a recess until Monday at 12 o'clock noon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1243) to amend the Hatch Act; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mrs. NORTON, Mr. HARRISON, and Mr. LECOMPTE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Edward W. Barrett, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of State; and

John Shaw Young, of New York, to be United States commissioner to the International Exposition for the Bicentennial of the Founding of Port-au-Prince, Republic of Haiti, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that certain routine nominations and promotions in the Army, Navy, and Air Force may be confirmed, and that the President be notified immediately. In support of that request, let me say the nominations come from the Committee on Armed Services unanimously. They conform to the normal, orthodox operations of the three services dealing with the uniformed officers.

In addition to the nominations of the service officers there is the nomination of Mr. Karl R. Bendetsen, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army, and I include him in the recommendation, at the request of the Secretary of the Army and the committee, for the following reason: The law provides that Assistant Secretaries shall serve on boards and commissions. Mr. Bendetsen has been serving on certain boards and commissions by direction of the Secretary of War since last August, but, strictly speaking, he is not in a legal status to serve on them, because his nomination has not been confirmed. The Secretary of the Army is anxious to have it confirmed so as, speaking in a humorous way, to make the Secretary of the Army honest and compliant with the law. Mr. Bendetsen has the highest recommendations, particularly from the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who knows him. I ask that

his nomination be included in the unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, my understanding is these are the usual routine nominations.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The reason for their confirmation in this manner is that it is quite expensive to print the lists, and it obviates much detail, if it can be done without objection. I did not hear all the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Maryland. I was conversing with the Senator from Nevada. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator, does the report from the Armed Services Committee unanimously recommend the confirmations?

Mr. TYDINGS. It does.

Mr. WHERRY. And the one exception the distinguished Senator has called to our attention also comes in that way, does it?

Mr. TYDINGS. It does.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the confirmation en bloc of all these nominations? The Chair hears none, and the nominations are confirmed. Without objection, the President will be notified immediately.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as in legislative session——

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me for a moment, while the Senate is proceeding as in executive session?

Mr. TYDINGS. I will be through in a moment. But I will yield to the Senator, if he wants something done as in executive session.

NOMINATIONS IN UNITED STATES COAST GUARD, COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, AND INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, there has been handed to me the Executive Calendar for Thursday, January 26, which contains routine nominations in the Coast Guard, the Geodetic Survey, and also the nomination for Mr. James E. Friend to be Assistant Director of Locomotive Inspection in the Interstate Commerce Commission. I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, these nominations be confirmed and that the President be notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed, and the President will be notified.

EUROPEAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE—LT. COL. CHARLES H. BONESTEEL

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, when the arms-implementation bill was passed provision was made for the European Coordinating Committee and for the Office of Executive Director to administer the program. The President is anxious to nominate a lieutenant colonel in the Army by the name of Charles H. Bonesteel, who has had a long connection with the program. It turns out that if he accepts the position of director he will forfeit certain promotions, pensions, and retirement rights which he now has as a member of the armed services. We have tried to find if it were not legally possible to appoint him to this office without legislation. The best legal advice we can get is that if he accepts the nomination he will forfeit some of his retirement and military rights as an officer in the United States Army.

Therefore, today, since this officer is already administering the program unofficially, in the Armed Services Committee, we were requested to ask that the Senate bill 2911, which has been reported from the committee unanimously, be passed, so that the House may act on it and the President may send to the Senate in due time a regular formal nomination which will then have to be acted on by the Senate. The bill is S. 2911, to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Col. Charles H. Bonesteel as Executive Director of the European Coordinating Committee under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, without affecting his military status and perquisites.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I will yield to the Senator in a moment. The bill is simply permissive, and allows him to accept the position without losing his Army standing in the promotion list, retirement list, and so forth.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the bill on the calendar?

Mr. TYDINGS. The bill is on the calendar, having been reported favorably by the Armed Services Committee unanimously.

Mr. WHERRY. When was it reported?

Mr. TYDINGS. It was reported today. The reason I am asking for its immediate consideration is that it is desired to appoint this man. The bill has to pass both Houses before he can be appointed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the bill establish a precedent of any kind?

Mr. TYDINGS. It does not.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it merely permissive, and does it apply only to this individual?

Mr. TYDINGS. He is named in the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. What happens after the act itself has terminated?

Mr. TYDINGS. He goes back to his place in the Army. He does not want to lose his standing because of the service on the Coordinating Committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am in complete sympathy with the bill. I think it is a constructive piece of legislation, and I have no objection to its immediate consideration.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I was interested in the colloquy in which the distinguished minority leader asked whether a precedent would be established, and the Senator from Maryland said it would not.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. TOBEY. I point out that establishing precedents is a concomitant of progress.

Mr. TYDINGS. It was Emerson who said, "A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds." But none of us have little minds.

Mr. TOBEY. Oh, no.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2911) to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Col. Charles H. Bonesteel as Executive Director of the European Coordinating Committee under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, without affecting his military status and perquisites.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the existing provisions of law or any rules or regulations issued thereunder, the President, acting by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint Lt. Col. Charles H. Bonesteel, an officer in the Army of the United States, as Executive Director of the European Coordinating Committee and Lieutenant Colonel Bonesteel's appointment to, acceptance of, and service as such Executive Director of the European Coordinating Committee shall in no way affect any status, office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold in the Army of the United States or any component thereof, or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, eligibility for promotion, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade: *Provided*, That so long as he remains Executive Director of the European Coordinating Committee, Lieutenant Colonel Bonesteel shall retain the rank and grade of lieutenant colonel which he now holds in the Army of the United States, but during such time shall receive the salary and allowances as Executive Director of the European Coordinating Committee as one of the persons authorized to be employed under section 406 (e) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, payable from funds made available by law for the Department of State, in lieu of his military pay and allowances.

SEC. 2. In the performance of his duties as Executive Director of the European Coordinating Committee, Lieutenant Colonel Bonesteel shall be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition, military or otherwise, other than would be operative with respect to him if he were in no way connected with the Department of Defense or the Army of the United States or any component thereof.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland what the colloquy between him and the Senator from New Hampshire had to do with the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Anything a Senator says to the Senator from Maryland while the Senator from Maryland is endeavoring to have passed an important piece of legislation deserves the utmost consideration.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN METHOD OF ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, a conference has been held with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and

it has been explained to him that there is no desire to create any precedent if the Senate agrees to the form of unanimous-consent request which I have previously read. I now understand that the Senator from Nevada will withdraw his objection.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on the basis of the statement that no precedent will be established by the approval of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, I withdraw any objection I had.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It might be useful to the Senate to state that every unanimous-consent agreement stands on its own basis. It establishes no precedent, because any Senator may object to any unanimous-consent request at any time.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is entirely correct, Mr. President, but when the statement is hurled back that a Senator has agreed to this unanimous-consent request in the past, and therefore he should not disagree now, it puts that Senator in a corner, so to speak; and I do not propose to be put into a corner unless I control the corner.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada for withdrawing his objection to the unanimous-consent request. As the Chair has already observed, of course the distinguished Senator can object to the next unanimous-consent request. But I think the Senator has raised a good point. I personally want to thank him in this particular instance for withdrawing his objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

INDIA'S REPUBLIC DAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, India's Republic Day celebrates the unfolding of tremendous opportunities for human welfare. Not only the people of India, but all the peoples of the world will mark this day as a high point in progress toward a fuller, happier life.

Henceforth, India belongs forever to the family of free nations. Americans send their greetings with joy and hope. We are overjoyed to welcome 340,000,000 brothers into our democratic fellowship. Our hopes rest on respect for India's spiritual and material strength.

As partners in democratic faith, India and America can help meet the moral and material needs of mankind. The peoples of India and the peoples of America share a spiritual strength. With the combined genius and energy of our peoples combined with a sharing of our technical skills we can go far together to free the world from want and fear. Together, India and America can make the four freedoms real for all races and nations. That remains our common goal. Republic Day dramatizes a great advance toward its attainment.

It is a pleasure and a privilege to join India's friends all over the world in celebrating the auspicious occasion of the coming into effect of the new Contution of the Indian Republic. The arduous efforts of the people of India over the years have now come into fruition.

To the people of India and to its distinguished leaders we say, "Long live the Republic of India."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have another matter.

Mr. FERGUSON. Very well.

STAKE OF THE UNITED STATES IN FORMOSA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in view of the prolonged discussion which has occurred on the floor of the Senate with reference to the Chinese situation, and particularly as to Formosa, I should like to have included in the body of the RECORD a very important article published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer and written by Fletcher Knebel, who has brought to our attention some of the economic values at stake in Formosa which might have some influence upon some of the statements pertaining to American foreign policy with regard to Formosa.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTY-MILLION-DOLLAR STAKE IN FORMOSA HELD IN UNITED STATES

(By Fletcher Knebel)

WASHINGTON, January 21.—American investors have a stake of more than $20,000,000 in the embattled island of Formosa, Government sources disclosed today.

Private United States capital, it was learned, was chiefly responsible for the development of extensive electric power installations on the 14,000-square-mile island.

Hopes of recapturing a share of the original investment are dwindling as the chunk of land 100 miles off the Chinese mainland becomes a prize in the struggle between opposing Chinese Nationalists and Communists.

Formosa has been the center of a swirling foreign policy debate since President Truman rejected Republican demands that United States forces bar the island to Chinese Communists expected to invade from the mainland.

The island, held by Japan during the development period, was turned over to Nationalist China in 1945 following agreements at Cairo and Potsdam. In recent months it has served as a haven for Chiang Kai-shek and other Nationalist leaders who fled the Red sweep through China proper.

STAKE DATES BACK TO 1931

The American financial stake in Formosa, it was revealed, dates back to 1931 when the Taiwan Electric Light & Power Co. of Japan floated a bond issue in this country.

The Japanese power company was named for the island it developed. Taiwan is the official local name as contrasted with the western use of Formosa, a Portuguese word meaning "beautiful."

Seeking American capital in 1931, officials of Taiwan Light & Power floated a bond issue of $22,800,000 in this country.

The issue was handled by J. P. Morgan & Co., Kuhn Loeb & Co., the National City Co., the First National Bank of New York, and the Yokohama Specie Bank, Ltd., of New York.

The bonds, in blocks of $1,000, were purchased for the most part by "well heeled" investors along the eastern seaboard.

The bonds, according to information supplied by Fitch Publishing Co., Inc., bore interest at 5½ percent with a maturity date of July 1, 1971.

SOLD AS HIGH AS $104

At the time of issue the bonds were guaranteed as to principal and interest by the Government of Japan. The $100 par bonds were offered at $93.50 and fetched as high as $104 during the thirties.

In the last year of trading before Pearl Harbor, however, the price fluctuated from a high of 50¾ to a low of 34.

The New York Stock Exchange suspended trading in the security on December 12, 1941, and since that time the Securities and Exchange Commission's ban on trading in securities of enemy countries has applied to the Taiwan issue.

Taiwan Light & Power used the American capital to good advantage, building nine hydroelectric plants and three steam generating plants on the island.

When trading in the bonds ended in this country, there were still $20,151,000 worth outstanding in the hands of American investors who had received interest regularly from 1931 through 1941.

While there is no evidence that the American financial stake inspired phases of the debate over Formosa, eventual control of the island does effect chances of the bondholders in gaining a settlement.

As long as the island remains in Nationalist Chinese hands, the American investors have a chance of being paid off eventually, according to State Department sources.

Should the island fall into Chinese Communist hands, however, there is no assurance whatever that the bonds will be worth more than the paper.

Government sources say there is doubt as to whether the foreign share of the Taiwan issue is now an obligation of the Japanese or the Nationalist Chinese. The subject would have to be resolved in final treaty arrangements.

With Formosa in the hands of Chinese Communists, however, any such discussion would be purely academic.

AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT—LEAVE TO FILE MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask unanimous consent that the members of the Committee on the Judiciary may have consent of the Senate to file minority views, if they desire, on the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which bill was reported on January 25, yesterday, in compliance with the order of the Senate.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I inquire if the Senator has discussed the matter with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have.

Mr. McMAHON. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRESS IN CANCER RESEARCH

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as one who has always taken a special interest in the advancement of the national health—and my interest is a personal one, because I am the son of a physician—I wish to pay tribute at this time to those devoted workers throughout the country, and particularly in my own State of New Jersey, who are engaged in the long battle against the terrible disease of cancer. Nearly 200,000 Americans die every year from this baffling disease, and it is heartening to reflect that determined and increasingly successful efforts are being made not only to control it but also to discover its fundamental cause and cure.

The American Cancer Society is foremost among the volunteer organizations waging this war on cancer. This group has enlisted Nation-wide financial sup-

port, and has already made some $6,000,000 in grants for cancer research. Government, too, has been active in this research effort, particularly through the National Cancer Institute, as the present Presiding Officer [Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair], who is a member with me of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, will recall.

In addition to research, educational programs are being carried on by both public and private agencies. The emphasis in these programs is on the need for detection of cancer in its early stages, when surgery, X-ray or radium treatments can still be helpful. People are especially urged to visit their family physicians at regular intervals. We have reports that increasing numbers of cases are being found in early stages, indicating that this educational effort is bearing fruit, and establishing a first line of defense against cancer.

The New Jersey division of the American Cancer Society, in my own State of New Jersey, under the very able presidency of Mr. George E. Stringfellow, has been especially active and successful in this educational aspect of the fight on cancer. I desire to pay tribute to Mr. Stringfellow and his associates for the very capable and generous leadership which they have given to this cause.

A particularly noteworthy feature of the New Jersey division's program is the annual editorial contest conducted among the daily and weekly newspapers of the State. Every year Mr. Stringfellow presents a plaque to one daily newspaper and one weekly newspaper for the best editorials of the year on this important subject. This contest has contributed materially to the high level of interest in the fight against cancer among the newspapers and the general public in New Jersey.

The winning editorials for the year 1949 were chosen by a board of judges from among more than 300 New Jersey newspapers. The award in the daily field was won by the Paterson Evening News, of which my friend, Mr. Harry B. Hames, is editor, and in the weekly field by the Westwood Chronicle, of which my friend, Mr. E. S. Guild, is editor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two winning editorials on this important subject of cancer control be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, together with a list of those papers, with the names of their editors, receiving honorable mention in the contest.

There being no objection, the editorials and the list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Paterson (N. J.) News of April 5, 1949]

THE LORD IS GOOD TO HIS CHILDREN, BUT HE WANTS HIS CHILDREN TO BE GOOD TO OTHERS AS WELL

(Winning editorial in the daily newspaper field, 1949 editorial contest of the New Jersey Division, American Cancer Society.)

Let's pull up a chair, folks, and have a friendly little chat.

The weather's fine, spring is here, trees and grass are growing green, the little flowers beginning to burst through the buds.

All's well with the world, isn't it? Mother all right? Dad in tiptop condition? Children nimble and active?

God's good to you children, isn't He? Good health, enough of the world's goods to provide the little comforts that go to make for a happy contented brood.

You retired last night, all of you, with a prayer for a good night and a safe awakening. Came the morning, and mother was well and able to prepare a nice piping hot breakfast, the kids were around the house romping with the exuberance of youth. And dad was off to work for another busy day.

It's a pretty picture, isn't it? And for all these bounties, we thank the Lord for His grace and continue to pray that nothing may mar the tranquillity of the home.

Now let's face reality.

One of every eight persons in America is stricken with cancer. The dread killer takes the lives of 200,000 people in this country. When we speak of people, we don't mean abstract individuals, far removed from our neighborly scene. Those 200,000 people include our very own, members of our families, our neighbors. Even now, while you read this message, someone you know is either dying with the dreaded scourge, or is being afflicted.

Have you ever stood by the bedside of a person stricken with cancer? Have you seen the pain, the anguish, the pleading in their eyes for some relief from the unbearable distress? Have you seen the frame of some person who a few brief months before was healthy and alive and filled with the love of life, melting away as snow vanishes before the rays of the sun?

And seeing the loved one fading as if from your very grasp, had the feeling of complete and desperate futility because you haven't been able to help? And wished you could swap places, you to suffer, the loved one to be spared the indescribable horror of it all?

What's money to you, neighbor? It's only a medium civilized man has devised with which to purchase the little niceties the good Lord is able to spare to each of us, His children.

But money, properly placed, can do a magnificent job.

It can, for instance, help open and build up the clinics where those who are stricken can go for some relief.

It can make available a place where a stricken parent can take a child to be diagnosed, where a mother or a father can go to learn what's wrong, and learning, do something about it.

In Passaic County, for instance, the American Cancer Society seeks a miserly $68,310. Paterson's share would be $28,000.

Why, we in this city spend that much, undoubtedly, in a day for a fleeting pleasure-bender.

But the heroic campaigners seeking these paltry sums can't even raise these small sums unless you and you and we give to the cause.

Of the $68,310, 50 percent stays right here at home, for diagnosis, for clinics, for treatments. Of whom? Why, neighbor, of you and your family and your friends. The balance goes to the great fight to meet the killer face to face, God willing, in the not so distant future.

There are some mighty busy people giving of their time and energies to raise these funds. Such a man, for instance, as Jack Stern, the Paterson chairman, who is busily occupied in so many civic and charitable enterprises. He can give his money, and his time, and his health, too. So, too, with Leo Eirich, the county chairman.

Surely, the least you and you and we can do is to give as generously as we can to help lighten their task and help, perhaps, restore hope to someone stricken with cancer.

One out of eight people of the country faces the dastardly menace—one out of every eight people in Paterson, in Passaic County, in America.

Do you feel well neighbor?

Thank God, and then send in your check or bring in your contribution to the Paterson Cancer Campaign Committee, at 169 Van Houten Street, Paterson.

[From the Westwood (N. J.) Chronicle]

TAKE HIM HOME TO DIE

(Winning editorial in the weekly newspaper field, 1949, editorial contest of the New Jersey Division, American Cancer Society)

It is not difficult to write an editorial on cancer when one's own father was a victim of the dread disease. It is true that he was 81 years of age, but it is also true that the surgeons, after an autopsy, declared that he had the vital organs of a man of 60.

Early in March, some years ago, we talked with him. He had been sent home from a Boston hospital to die. Our mother had been instructed in the best methods of making things as easy as possible for him for the few months that he had to live.

"Son," he said, "I don't mind dying. I've had my life. It's just this dying by inches that I don't like. And it's going to be tough on your mother."

He lingered on until the middle of July—dying by inches. Of course, he suffered—in spite of the opiates.

If he had been 51 instead of 81 his death would have been a tragedy to all who knew him. His advanced years made death a more natural thing—less poignant, less pitiful.

Most of us have quite a few years to go before we reach 81. And we have some hope that if cancer does strike in the next 5 or 10 years the scourge will have been conquered—and our lives will have been saved.

Whether we are 60, 70, or 80 we don't want the doctor, after proper examination, to say to our loved ones: "There is no hope. Take him home to die."

War has been declared against cancer. This month is Cancer Control Month. The American Cancer Society, through its New Jersey division, is waging a valiant battle against this public enemy, right here in our own State.

It takes money to win any war. No price is too high to win the war against cancer. It's everyone's fight—and everyone's help is vitally needed.

NEWSPAPERS RECEIVING HONORABLE MENTION—1949 EDITORIAL CONTEST OF THE NEW JERSEY DIVISION, AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY

DAILY NEWSPAPERS

Bergen Evening Record, Donald G. Borg, editor.

Atlantic City Press, Francis C. Croasdale, editor.

Paterson Morning Call, Harry A. Williams, editor.

Elizabeth Daily Journal, Robert C. Crane, editor.

Hudson Dispatch, John Mitchell, editor.

WEEKLY NEWSPAPERS

West Essex Tribune, Livingston, William Klaber, Jr., editor.

Penns Grove Record, Thomas C. Summerill, editor.

Bloomfield Independent Press, Charles E. Moreau, editor.

Maplewood-South Orange News-Record, Gregory Hewlett, editor.

East Orange Record, John A. Mead, editor.

New Jersey Courier, Toms River, Richard T. Hopper, editor.

Madison Eagle, Charles A. Betts, editor.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. FERGUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, would the Senator from Michigan prefer

to make his address on Monday at noon, instead of proceeding this evening?

Mr. FERGUSON. Because of the lateness of the hour, the Senator from Michigan would prefer, having obtained the floor, to proceed at noon on Monday.

Mr. McMAHON. Some Members of the Senate have considerable office work to do and numerous appointments to keep, and, since it suits the convenience of the Senator from Michigan, I now move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon, at which time the Senator from Michigan will be recognized.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until Monday, January 30, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 26 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

J. Vincent Keogh, of New York, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of New York. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires February 8, 1950.

IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. Edward Fuller Witsell, O3455, The Adjutant General (colonel, U. S. Army), for appointment as The Adjutant General, United States Army, and for appointment as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 6, National Defense Act, as amended, and title V, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Brig. Gen. William Edward Bergin, O7127, United States Army, Assistant The Adjutant General, for temporary appointment as major general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

IN THE NAVY

Admiral William H. P. Blandy, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list of the Navy with the rank of admiral.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, January 26 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Karl R. Bendetsen, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Lynde D. McCormick, United States Navy, to be Vice Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy, and to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while so serving under a Presidential designation.

Rear Adm. Joseph F. Jelley, Jr., Civil Engineer Corps, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

James E. Friend to be Assistant Director of Locomotive Inspection.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

To be commander

Claude H. Broach

To be lieutenant commanders

Axel B. Axelson	Thomas N. Kelley
Ashton H. Barnes	Arthur M. Davison
Martin D. Berg	William R. Sayer
Frederick B. Thatcher	William B. Durham

To be assistant professor with the grade of lieutenant commander

Robert E. Reed-Hill

To be commissioned instructor with the grade of lieutenant

Raymond J. Perry

To be lieutenants

Nathan L. Fendig	Clyde J. Miller
Edwin S. Radford	Alfred J. Unger
Andrew J. Grogard	John M. Nagy

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Frederick C. Thomas	Edward F. Oliver
Vincent J. Wernig	William L. Russon, Jr.
Franklin J. Miller	Robert H. Wertham
Edward F. Boyle	Leonard M. Unterein
William M. Barney	Edgar W. Dorr
William C. Behan	

To be chief boatswains

Kenneth Templeton	Nulland E. Mahar
George H. Rollinson	Ralph A. Palmer
Wayne E. McElroy	Thurman Salter
Edward L. Openshaw	James E. Bill
Ward R. Turner	Harold G. Weber
John M. Lydon	Hubert R. Lindsey
Harvey E. Willis	August Lays

To be chief gunners

Lewis A. Johnson
Hiram B. Rodman

To be chief radio electrician

John L. Price

To be chief machinists

Carl A. Stanton	Alvie McCool
Lonnie Bridges	Herman Schenauer
Clifford J. Hudder	Pernell Kelly
Carl A. Fenske	George W. Thomas
Frederick E. Sanderson	

To be chief ship's clerks

Earl Elder
Samuel Brown
Michael Herko

To be chief carpenter

Herman J. Boudreau

To be chief pay clerks

Henry J. Burness
Louis C. Spaniol
Thomas P. Festo

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

To be commanders, Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective from date indicated with each name

Ernest B. Lewey, January 5, 1950.
John C. Mathisson, January 5, 1950.
George E. Morris, January 5, 1950.
Roswell C. Bolstad, January 5, 1950.
A. Newton Stewart, January 5, 1950.
Max G. Ricketts, January 5, 1950.
Clarence A. George, January 5, 1950.
Robert A. Earle, January 5, 1950.
Harry F. Garber, January 5, 1950.
Karl B. Jeffers, January 5, 1950.

To be lieutenants, Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective from date indicated with each name

Gerald L. Short, January 18, 1950.
John O. Phillips, January 18, 1950.

To be ensigns, Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective from the date indicated with each name

Robert L. Kneedler, Jr., December 23, 1949.
Omar H. Quade, Jr., December 27, 1949.
William R. Kachel, January 1, 1950.
Thomas M. Krall, January 5, 1950.
Pentti A. Stark, January 18, 1950.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AND IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Brig. Gen. Ernest Marion Brannon, O12292, for appointment as The Judge Advocate General, United States Army, and for appointment as major general, Judge Advocate General's Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Franklin Prague Shaw, O8168, for appointment as Assistant Judge Advocate General, United States Army, and for appointment as major general, Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Regular Army of the United States.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be qadier generals

Col. Robert Washington Brown, O4834.
Col. Claude Bayles Mickelwait, O10287.

APPOINTMENT IN REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Maj. Gen. Edgar Erskine Hume, O4033, for appointment as major general, Medical Corps.

APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AND IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Brig. Gen. George Jacob Nold, O8888, for appointment as assistant to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and for appointment as brigadier general in the Regular Army of the United States.

NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals of the line, to date from October 17, 1949

H. Miller Ainsworth
Albert Sidney Johnson
Donald Wilson McGowan
Jesse Eschol McIntosh
Otto Edward Sandman

To be brigadier generals of the line, to date from dates indicated

William Henry Abendroth to date from July 25, 1949.

Hampton Anderson, to date from July 25, 1949.

William Michael Flanigan, to date from July 25, 1949.

Julius Klein, to date from November 10, 1949.

To be brigadier generals, Adjutant General's Department, to date from July 25, 1949

Rhodolph Leslie Esmay
James Alvin May

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, with dates of rank to be established under the provisions of the afore-mentioned title:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Fred Sidney Borum, 45A.
Maj. Gen. John Edwin Upston, 49A.
Maj. Gen. Laurence Carbee Craigie, 61A.
Maj. Gen. David Myron Schlatter, 62A.
Maj. Gen. Otto Paul Weyland, 63A.
Maj. Gen. Robert Wells Harper, 53A.
Maj. Gen. Richard Emmel Nugent, 57A.
Maj. Gen. Earl Walter Barnes, 67A.
Maj. Gen. Charles Pearre Cabell, 70A.
Maj. Gen. Charles Bertoddy Stone III, 66A.
Maj. Gen. Laurence Sherman Kuter, 89A.
Maj. Gen. Joseph Hampton Atkinson, 90A.
Maj. Gen. Gordon Philip Saville, 48A.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Warren Rice Carter, 181A.
Brig. Gen. Thomas Herbert Chapman, 189A.
Brig. Gen. Charles Edwin Thomas, Jr., 192A.

Maj. Gen. Francis Leroy Ankenbrandt, Jr., 267A.
Maj. Gen. Morris Robert Nelson, 277A.
Maj. Gen. Kenneth Perry McNaughton, 278A.
Brig. Gen. Elmer Joseph Rogers, Jr., 294A.
Brig. Gen. Clarence Shortridge Irvine, 296A.
Brig. Gen. George Robert Acheson, 335A.
Brig. Gen. George Warren Mundy, 35?A.
Brig. Gen. Roscoe Charles Wilson, 360A.
Maj. Gen. Walter Edwin Todd, 361A.
Maj. Gen. Bryant Le Maire Boatner, 362A.
Maj. Gen. Samuel Robert Brentnall, 364A.
Maj. Gen. Frank Fort Everest, 366A.
Maj. Gen. William Henry Tunner, 374A.
Brig. Gen. August Walter Kissner, 386A.
Maj. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, Jr., 387A.
Brig. Gen. William Maurice Morgan, 439A.
Maj. Gen. William Evans Hall, 460A.
Maj. Gen. Frederic Harrison Smith, Jr., 461A.
Maj. Gen. William Fulton McKee, 467A.
Maj. Gen. Richard Clark Lindsay, 476A.
Maj. Gen. Thomas Sarsfield Power, 481A.
Maj. Gen. Donald Leander Putt, 494A.
Brig. Gen. Alfred August Kessler, Jr., 216A.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Air Force of the United States under the provisions of section 515, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Hugo Peoples Rush, 75A.
Brig. Gen. Charles Edwin Thomas, Jr., 192A.
Brig. Gen. Frank Alton Armstrong, Jr., 209A.
Brig. Gen. August Walter Kissner, 386A.
Brig. Gen. Archie Jordan Old, Jr., 605A.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Joseph Henry Davidson, 121A.
Col. Edward Holmes Underhill, 421A.
Col. Albert Boyd, 424A.
Col. Kingston Eric Tibbetts, 436A.
Col. Frederick Rodgers Dent, Jr., 444A.
Col. Stuart Phillips Wright, 510A.
Col. Mark Edward Bradley, Jr., 552A.
Col. Robert Edward Lee Eaton, 594A.
Col. Sydney Dwight Grubbs, Jr., 660A.
Col. Phillips Walter Smith, 897A.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The officers named herein for appointment in the Air National Guard of the United States of the Air Force of the United States under the provision of section 38 of the National Defense Act as amended:

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Chester Andrew Charles, AO132773.
Brig. Gen. Clyde Henry Mitchell, AO263935.
Brig. Gen. Oliver Hart Stout, AO120652.
Brig. Gen. James Lawton Riley, AO426156.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. William M. Fechteler, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of an admiral while serving as commander in chief, Atlantic and United States Atlantic Fleet.

Rear Adm. John H. Cassady, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air).

Vice Adm. Francis S. Low, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Logistics).

Vice Adm. Robert B. Carney, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Second Task Fleet.

Vice Adm. John J. Ballentine, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Sixth Task Fleet.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the United States Navy to the grades and corps indicated:

Captains, line

Bon, Francis J.
Eagleton, William L.
Walker, Philip A.
Ward, Chester C.

Commanders, line

Abercrombie, Theodore J.
Albrink, Frederick S.
Bodziak, Edmund J.
Boyle, John J.
Brooks, Tilden L.
Burke, Edmund, Jr.
Cole, Charles T.
Davis, Jack C.
De Vico, Anthony J.
Di Pirro, Charles
Fisher, Guin M.
Greenberg, Mack K.
Harrison, Cecil R.
Hogan, Richard J., Jr.
Humphreys, Thomas H., Jr.
Hunsicker, Charles, Jr.
Kenny, Edward T.
Lowe, Frank W., Jr.
Miller, Hugh B., Jr.
Moloney, Ralph T.
Nichols, Edwin H.
O'Bannon, Albert L.
Page, James C.
Robinson, Martin W.
Ryan, Richard E.
Smith, Emory C.
Whiteman, Armand D.

Lieutenant commanders, line

Bradbury, Malcolm J.
Carlisle, Geoffrey E.
Forshee, Francis L.
Gibbons, John P.
Groom, Ralph A.
Hughes, James L., Jr.
Hutchinson, Harold
Katz, Saul
Kiracofe, Warren C.
Krouse, Gale E.
Larkin, Murl A.
Miller, Ashton C., Jr.
Mazalewski, Raymond A.
Smith, Thomas P., Jr.
Warnes, James T.

Lieutenant, line

Kelley, Fonville

Lieutenant, Dental Corps

Steinauer, Jerome J.

Lieutenant commander, Medical Service Corps

Shifflette, Charles H.

Lieutenant, Nurse Corps

Davis, Bertha M.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment in the United States Navy to the grades and corps indicated:

Lieutenants (junior grade), line

Adams, Alfred E.
Grantham, Delbert D.
Kosnik, Joseph T.
Marshall, Frank D.
Matthews, Pierce Y., Jr.
Wood, William D., Jr.
Woods, Kenneth

Ensign, line

Remsen, Henry

Lieutenant commanders, Supply Corps

Hoffman, Lloyd K.
Richardson, William C.

Lieutenant, Supply Corps

Sanders, Roy N.

Lieutenants (junior grade), Supply Corps

Johnson, John T.
Thompson, Robert W.

Ensign, Supply Corps

Ward, Gretchen M.

Lieutenants (junior grade), Civil Engineer Corps

Deitrich, Neff T., Jr.
Rumble, James D.

Lieutenant commander, Nurse Corps

Pennington, Clyde B.

Lieutenant (junior grade), Nurse Corps

Brennan, Muriel L.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment in the line of the Naval Reserve to the grade indicated:

Lieutenants (junior grade)

Boeckh, Victor H., Jr.
McDaris, Charles H.
Pevear, Roger
Skelly, William J.
Stanford, Robert F.

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 2d day of June 1950:

Alfred R. Ackley
Emmett R. Aillaud, Jr.
Robert A. Beavers
Daniel Bergman
Joel T. Biles
David A. Bialock
Fred H. Bonekamp
Leo Boston
Richard S. Bradley
Elwood E. Brey
James Brogan
Andrew G. Brtis
Robert B. Cavanagh, Jr.
Thomas J. Cawley
David Cheney
Edwin H. Cherry, Jr.
John J. Cotchen
William D. Cracraft
Otho W. Crowl
Warren J. Cusack
Ralph F. Daly
Allen A. Denton, Jr.
Ralph G. Dermott
William R. Dinsmore
Fred S. Etherton
Albert D. Fox
Charles L. Gibson
Kevin Giffen
Burton H. Gilpin
Niles R. Gooding, Jr.
Richard E. Gregory
James A. Guggenbiller
Lealand P. Hage
Paul R. Harlin
Donald E. Herbert
Alexander A. Holeczy
Daren W. Johnson
Everett E. Kelley
Russell M. Killingsworth
Robert L. McCombie
Dewey W. McCrary
Emiddio Massa
Orman V. Mehner
Donald S. Munger
William I. Parrish
Robert L. Pelton
Charles T. Phillips
Robert W. Pollard
William J. Powell
James W. Roebuck
Wayne E. Severson
Gilbert L. Summers
Alex L. Sundstrom
Thomas H. Thornburg
Elmer M. Tollgaard
Donald S. Ward
Carlton L. Wilgus
Neal R. Wooden

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949 in lieu of ensigns in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed to correct name:

Albert G. Kuehnapfel
Wencil M. Stanek

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 2d day of June 1950:

Thomas S. Bryan
Walter D. Chaney
Melvin "S" Cook
Ronald F. Dick
Herbert C. Oakes
John E. O'Drain
John McN. Pulliam
Winston W. Salter
Edward L. St. Ville
Edward J. Walsh

James Thrash (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be an ensign in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 2d day of June 1950:

Samuel D. Dawkins, Jr.
George P. Kramer
Edward G. Smith

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from the 2d day of June 1950:

Donald C. Harder, Jr.
Thomas E. McHale
John F. Mitchell

The following-named women (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Rosemarie S. Armstrong
Emily C. Bittner
Betty J. Bloxsom
Dorothy A. Borbidge
Bonnie M. Brunner
Beverly J. Cytron
Dorothy J. Darr
Barbara J. Dobson
Ludean S. Earnest
Eleanor M. Edwardson
Gloria J. Folger
Jimmie R. Fralic
Dorothy M. Funk
Maryvonne L. Herron
Dolores T. Heutte
Peggie R. Holliday
Margaret A. Hubbell
Kathrine V. Iams
Betty M. Krett
Donna J. Mueller
Audrey R. Murray
Rhea N. Parker
Elizabeth A. Read
Ada L. Reed
Susan K. Reed
Marjorie L. Richardson
Jeanne M. Schrumpf
Mary A. Wilkinson
Joan E. Zook

Bennett F. Avery (civilian college graduate) to be a commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

John D. Bealer	James J. Humes
Deck E. Chandler	Maurice N. Johnson
Konstantin H. Geocaris	Billy D. McKneely
	Donald J. MacPherson
Robert C. Hastedt	Pierce P. Newman, Jr.
Dale A. Hudson	Joseph A. Witt

The following-named women (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Elizabeth Baker	Alys I. George
Patricia E. Blakely	Barbara J. Peterson
Elizabeth Campion	Elizabeth C. Schwartz
Ruth A. Dinsmore	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949:

Frederick B. Bunke	Robert T. Mayo
Stephen R. Edson, Jr.	Elvin L. Van Zee
Alfred S. Kulczycki	

Chester T. Radecki (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Milton C. Kohler	Ray A. Rigterink
Philip E. McLaughlin	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Travis W. Drummond
Ray F. Paige

Vera L. Ortynsky (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Helen M. Balashek	Dolores G. Irion
Ella Barber	Kathryn D. Kutina
Myrtis R. Beaudrot	Betty J. Lewis
Dorothy E. Blackmore	Gloria L. McIntyre
Lola C. Bull	Mildred J. Pastrana
Mattie L. Chandler	Ruth A. Petchesky
Irene M. Chulack	Onis Spinks
Audrey M. Devaney	Vivian I. Tedder
Mary T. Duhamel	Loraine H. Tourville
Bernice E. Fenn	Joan Warmack
Pearl Y. Gasper	Fern R. Warnes
Helen M. Gustas	Charlene T. Yasiunas
Eva V. Haring	JoycElaine M. Zimmerman
Olive J. Haskew	
Betty J. Hogan	Adela DeL. Zubke
Mary N. Hood	

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Commander

LeRoy F. Friend

Lieutenant commander

George M. Bell

Lieutenants

David J. Greiner
Harold V. Palmer

Lieutenants (junior grade)

Richard H. Lee	Willard P. Arentzen
Markham J. Anderson	Donald T. Kelley

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenant

Thomas J. Hanson

Lieutenant (junior grade)

James E. Naser

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenant

Clarence W. Bowman

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenant

Emma H. Lichtenwald

Lieutenants (junior grade)

Kathryn C. Duprea
Mae I. Schumm

IN THE MARINE CORPS

QUARTERMASTER GENERAL

Maj. Gen. William P. T. Hill, United States Marine Corps, to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major general, for a period of 2 years from February 1, 1950.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of June 1950:

Robert G. Acheson	Albert B. Jeffers, Jr.
Peter F. C. Armstrong	Homer E. Johnson
Edwin H. Arnaudin, Jr.	Warren R. Johnson
	Gale A. Katz
Harold Arutunian	Paul X. Kelley
Joe M. Barnes	Kenneth J. Killgore
Robert H. Berkshire	Raymond H. Koch
James L. Black	Jered Krohn
Malcolm R. Blakeslee, Jr.	Ronald H. Laack
	Richard E. Lafreniere
James M. Brannaman	Richard M. Larsen
Paul W. Brosman, Jr.	Robert L. Larson
Frederick F. Brower, Jr.	James S. LeVoy
	Richard D. Lindow
Francis A. Brewster	Robert A. Louis
Robert H. Brunker	Louis P. Louro
Richard H. Burnett	Nolan Lushington
Franklin K. Burns	Paul F. McBain
James B. Callahan	Bain McClintock
Donald A. Campbell	Darrell L. McCormick
Richard E. Campbell	Robert F. McCulloch
Gary J. Carle	Keith E. McKee
Ralph W. Carver	Paul S. Maeder
Bruce Chandler	Robert B. March
Will J. Clardy, Jr.	Jerry F. Mathis
William F. Clarkson, Jr.	Eric T. Miller
	Roddey B. Moss
John T. Cooper	Stewart A. Munroe, Jr.
Lawrence G. Copeland	Walter F. Murphy, Jr.
Eugene T. Corcoran	Harvey A. P. Myers III
John E. Courtney	James W. Myers
James P. Cowley	Hal S. Needham
Randle C. Cox	Murray L. Nelson
James J. Creamer	Aloysius E. O'Flaherty III
James P. Cruise	
David I. Curtis	Howard B. Olson
John S. Daggett	Glenn E. Omholt
Albion C. Deane III	Peter G. Paraskos
Claude E. Deering, Jr.	Davis R. Parker
Lawrence E. Donegan, Jr.	David A. Patriquin
	Robert C. Phelps
Tommie G. Dudley	Jack N. Phillips
Maurice G. Duncan	Reagan L. Preis
William D. Duryea II	Robert E. Presson
Robert A. Eccles, Jr.	Kenneth F. Provost
Robert LaM. Egbert	David J. Pudas
Vernon G. Eisenbraun	Joseph D. Reed
Adolf F. Ems	James L. Rice
Robert B. Farrell	Nicholas E. Ries, Jr.
Don P. Ferguson	Elmer P. Rieser
James J. Ferro	Harvey F. Robbins
William B. Fleming	Ray C. Roberts, Jr.
Ernest C. Friesen, Jr.	Donald E. Ross
Winfield P. Fuller, Jr.	Philip F. Ruppel
Robert B. Gawne	Richard W. Scott
Walter Gibbs, Jr.	William E. Shackelford
Hobart C. Gottlieb	
Edward F. Green	Donald DeL. Shrier
Herman H. Hamilton	Charles A. Sloan, Jr.
Orville W. Hampton	Erin D. Smith
Eugene F. Hertling	Richard J. Smith
William L. Heuser, Jr.	James E. Spangler
John H. Hews	David M. Staples
Charles J. Hoffman	John S. Steel
Kenneth D. Hornbacher	Richard B. Steinmetz, Jr.
Richard L. Stenshoel	Wendell N. Vest
Alexander M. Stewart	Paul G. White
Samuel T. Stumbo	Robert M. Wilkins
Joel D. Sugg	David W. Wilkinson
Oral R. Swigart, Jr.	Walter G. Wilson
Aubrey W. Talbert, Jr.	William B. Wilson, Jr.
Arvin C. Teschner	Edwin W. Wislar
Richard L. Thompson	Frederick M. Woeller
William S. Torrance	Roger Wolin
Dallas B. Trammel	James L. Wood
Richard E. Tremblay	Kenneth W. Yonkman
Thomas G. Troxel, Jr.	Thomas S. Young III
George F. Tubley	Marvin H. Zelibor
Edward F. Tucker	Joe F. Zuccarello
Thomas A. Tweedy	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 26, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou art man's refuge in the stillness of the night and his strength in the struggles of each new day.

We are again approaching Thy throne through the old and familiar way of prayer which is never closed to those who come with a humble spirit and a contrite heart.

May this be a day of unclouded vision when we shall see more clearly the peerless worth of the ideals and principles of democracy and the certainty of their ultimate triumph.

Grant that our President, our Speaker, and all the chosen representatives of our beloved country may have the guidance of Thy spirit in their deliberations and decisions.

Inspire them with those desires which Thou dost delight to satisfy and may they hold their own wishes in abeyance until Thou dost declare Thy will.

May we be loyal partners with all who are seeking to bring in that glorious day when men and nations everywhere shall walk together the highways of brotherhood and good will.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 152. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings relative to the Federal Fair Employment Practice Act for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 25. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim February 6, 1950, as National Children's Dental Health Day.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Messrs. NIXON and MACY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) were given permission to address the House today for 1 hour each following disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JANUARY 26, 1950.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Respectfully yours,
PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 444).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That PETER W. RODINO, JR., of New Jersey, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on the Judiciary.

The resolution was agreed to.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 445) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That EDNA F. KELLY, of New York, be, and she is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 446) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That JOHN F. SHELLEY, of California, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BREHM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include resolutions.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an editorial.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Mr. Girard Davidson.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by William A. Price.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an editorial appearing in the Brooklyn Eagle, and in the other a limerick by Mr. James Ryan.

Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he made before the Civil Functions Subcommittee.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a digest of the legislative objectives of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

INDIAN CONSTITUTION DAY

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of joy that I pay tribute and honor to the people of India who are celebrating this day, January 26, 1950, as Constitution Day, marking the inauguration of a new constitution which transforms their great country into a sovereign democratic republic—another milestone in the long march of man toward self-government and freedom.

All over the world men are reaching out to find formulas for self-government. All over the world men are seeking freedom from the domination of concentrated power and alien control. After 200 years of British rule, India is taking her place among the nations as a free, independent republic.

People of India, we of this young Republic of the New World welcome you into the sunlight of responsible citizenship.

How reminiscent is this of our own early days of 160 years ago, when 13 sovereign States joined together for mutual benefit and common strength, in order to form a more perfect union. We believe that men can govern themselves, indeed our whole political and economic structure is built upon that certainty.

We know that a nation is not a tangible thing that can be built with hands. We know that a nation is not its laws, its customs, its behavior, or even its history. It is more an echo of the past and a whisper from the future, the whole bound together with the lives, the hopes, and the endeavors of millions of men and women.

We hold the individual to be of importance because we know, even as do the people of India, that the individual is part and parcel of the Infinite One, from whom all doth proceed and to whom all must return. We believe that the varying paths men choose to take, according to their individual ideals and aspirations, are as mountain streams which, though having their sources in different places, ultimately mingle their waters in the same great sea.

I know that I am expressing the sense of this great body of which I am a Member, the House of Representatives of the United States of America, when I extend our hand across the world and grasp yours in true brotherhood, with a deep understanding of your need to work out your own pattern of freedom. We pray the Infinite One that His blessing may rest upon each one of you, upon the government you are establishing, and upon Rajendra Prasad, your first president, under whose able leadership you will go forward.

In this hour, pregnant with the need for spiritual guidance of freemen everywhere, may our two Nations press forward together, and in the words of our own Abraham Lincoln:

With firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right * * * strive on to finish the work we are in.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it in order for any Member to move to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business at any time?

The SPEAKER. With the Chair's recognition; yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Must not that motion be made on Wednesdays, or can it be made at any time?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the proper time to make the motion would be on Wednesday, when the proper time arrives.

Mr. RANKIN. We have been dispensing with Calendar Wednesday business by unanimous consent days ahead.

The SPEAKER. That is by unanimous consent.

Mr. RANKIN. The point I am raising is whether or not it would be in order to

move to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business before Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks a Member should wait until Wednesday to make that motion.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the Marine Corps.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in regard to the Sabine watershed in Texas.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ROGERS of Flordia addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE COTTON BILL

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I think tomorrow the cotton bill will be before this House for consideration. I have been in touch with the Department of Agriculture and asked them if they have information, county by county, throughout the cotton-growing area of this Nation as to how much, substantially, the new proposal we shall vote on will give to each county. In the main the Department has this information. I think that any Member who has a cotton-acreage problem could well afford to take the time to find out approximately how much the legislation will help his distressed county or counties. It is my hope a live-and-let-live law will be the result of the work of this Congress this session.

Mr. Speaker, I include some letters I have received from Texas:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Abilene, Tex., January 18, 1950.

Re memo of January 14, 1950.
Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: The County Committee of Taylor County, Tex., reserved the full percent of the 1950 cotton allotment for adjusting genuine cotton farms.

The amendment setting up 70 percent of the average actual acreage (as adjusted to BAE) planted in 1946, 1947, and 1948 will give Taylor County approximately 4,000 additional acres of cotton allotment.

Taylor County needs an additional 15,000 acres to keep genuine cotton producers farming.

The amendment referred to above will alleviate our troubles if BAE figures are not used but if the BAE figures are used it will help some individual farmers and hurt some worse than we are now, thus increasing the administrative problems.

Very truly yours,

PMA TAYLOR COUNTY COMMITTEE,
W. O. HIGGINS,
G. L. STEWART,
Members.

(Copies to Hon. W. R. POAGE, Hon. OMAR BURLESON.)

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Garden City, Tex., January 17, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: With reference to your letter of January 13, 1950, our county committee did not reserve the full percent because we did not wish new growers to have a larger cotton allotment than old growers. We reserved 5 percent. The 70 percent amendment would not give us any additional acreage. It would hurt us worse if BAE figures must be used.

Cotton acreage, 1946:	
BAE figures	2,670
Farmer figures	5,253
Cotton acreage, 1947:	
BAE figures	5,200
Farmer figures	8,644
Cotton acreage, 1948:	
BAE figures	6,000
Farmer figures	13,043

We have in Glasscock County 102 cotton farms eligible for an old-grower cotton allotment. These farms have an adjusted cropland acreage of approximately 23,100 acres. Two-thirds of our cotton farms join Midland and Howard Counties, lying just to the south of these counties and having the same type of sandy-loam soil. (These counties have allotment ratios around 45 to 47 percent; we have a ratio of nearly 20 percent.) One-third of our farms, located in the south part of the county, have been put into cultivation in the last 3 years, beginning with the year 1947. These farms are farmed by young veterans, and there are GI loans on 25 farms in this area. Their crop has been and is 95 percent cotton. These veterans are, of course, clearing more land every day to put into cultivation. They have had a gin in their community for the last 2 years. There is no other gin in the county, and cotton from the north part of the county continues to be ginned in Martin and Howard Counties.

Our trouble lies entirely with the BAE figures. Until September 1949, when we started checking with them on their figures, they had no record of a gin in this county. At that time their records showed that Glasscock County had ginned a total of 299 bales of cotton in 1948. After our county gin sent them a report they corrected their figures to 1,099 bales. Since the latter part of November we have checked 13 out-of-county gins in an attempt to get additional corrections from them. We do not know whether or not we have been successful, since the gin statements mailed to them on December 16 have not been acknowledged. We have found that records for these gins have been scattered from Lubbock to Sweetwater to San Angelo, and it is always necessary that a personal visit be made before we can secure access to the records.

Yes; we do need additional cotton acreage to keep genuine cotton farmers and genuine cotton tenants farming. We need a minimum addition of 5,000 acres.

We will appreciate all aid you can give us. We have not heard of any proposed amendment that will help us if we must use present BAE figures.

Very truly yours,

ASTA M. ALLEN,
Secretary, Glasscock County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
San Antonio, Tex., January 18, 1950.

Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is with reference to your letters dated January 10 and January 12 concerning cotton allotments in Bexar County.

Bexar County received a cotton allotment of 5,283 acres. The allotment was based on the cotton actually planted in the county during the years 1947 and 1948. In 1947 and 1948 we had 210 farms on which cotton was planted. Regulations required that this allotment be distributed to 522 farms. Our final county factor is 0.0847.

The amendment proposed by Houston County would give Bexar County approximately 2,000 acres of additional allotment.

We have 26 acres to be distributed to new cotton farms. To date we have 8 farms applying for new grower allotments.

The county committee reserved the full percentage that they were permitted to reserve for adjustments.

Our present cotton allotments will put Bexar County farmers out of the cotton business. The additional acres of cotton that Bexar County will need will depend on the method of distribution of the acreage.

In my opinion equitable allotments can never be established by applying a factor to cropland acreage for this method of establishing allotments will force the farmer planting a higher percent of his land to cotton to take all of the reduction and the farmer planting a low percent of his land to cotton will take no reduction.

Trusting that this will give you the desired information, I am,

Yours very truly,

C. A. KING,
Administrative Officer,
Bexar County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Menard, Tex., January 17, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: In reply to your letter of January 13, will state that Menard County committee did not reserve any percent of cotton allotment because our allotment was too small.

Our official county allotment was 332 acres for 1950, where our 1942 allotment was 3,042 acres. Our highest war-crop credits of planted acreage in years 1946, 1947, and 1948 was 1,522 acres whereas 70 percent of this would give us an allotment acreage of 1,065 acres or additional 733 acres but if we have to use the BAE established acreage we would still be out.

Our present allotment is going to ruin our cotton farmers and tenant farmers who depended on cotton for cash crops on farms.

If there could be a clause written in law whereby farms that are going out of production be adjusted downward and farms going into production be adjusted upward it would help a lot.

Thanking you for asking for this information and we hope the information given will help our farmers.

Very truly yours,

BEN P. PALMER,
Chairman, Menard County PMA Committee.

RAY R. ELLIS,
Vice Chairman, Menard County PMA Committee.

IRVIN POOL,
Member, Menard County PMA Committee.

FRANCIS W. KIDD,
Secretary, Menard County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Floresville, Tex., January 18, 1950.

Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Third District, Texas,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE MR. BECKWORTH: With reference to your letter of January 14, 1950.

The Wilson County PMA committee held the full 15 percent for reserve to be distributed to genuine cotton growers, or, to those who planted cotton in 1946, 1947, and 1948. With that small reserve it was still not enough to increase the individual allotment to where they would have enough cotton acreage to justify planting.

With reference to how many acres Wilson County would receive, should the amendment you mentioned in your letter carry, it is impossible for me to say, but, I am sure it will allow more acreage than the plan we now have.

In 1942 the cotton allotment was 33,000 acres; 1950, area I, 5,916 acres; area II, 206 acres. This was divided among 793 farms, about half of this number received their allotment due to war crop credits and they planted cotton in 1941 only. The cotton acreage factor for area I is .0621 and for area II, it is .0175, you can readily see with such low factors what kind of cotton allotment each could receive.

Our county certainly needs additional acreage, especially for those who have planted cotton regularly every year. I talked with two of our committeemen today and they agreed and thought about 8,000 additional acres would in all probability be enough for distribution to the genuine cotton farmers.

We think every part of our farm program is good, and, all agree that we need acreage allotments to maintain prices received for farm commodities, and, too, we hope our cotton-allotment deal will be corrected to where it will be satisfactory to all concerned.

We thank you for your interest and sincerely appreciate your efforts in trying to correct the distribution of individual cotton allotments.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. MOSS,
Secretary, Wilson County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Livingston, Tex., January 18, 1950.

Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are unable to answer your question with reference to the 10-percent reserve. If such reserve was made it was done by the State PMA office.

We should like to call your attention to the BAE figure which Polk County and all other counties had to use in making adjustments for cotton planted in 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

The BAE figures for the years in question are out of line with the information taken by our reporters last spring. Should we be forced to use the BAE acreage figures for those years it is not believed that a 50 or 70 percent plan will help.

Will you please explain why we spent so much time and money interviewing farmers and having them file a 532–C, and then at a later date we are asked to reduce the figures submitted by the farmers to agree with a BAE estimate?

Very truly yours,

J. G. BROCK,
Chairman, Polk County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Throckmorton, Tex., January 17, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Throckmorton County Cotton Committee reserved the full percent for the county reserve. The amendment whereby the farmer can receive 70 percent of acreage (adjusted to BAE figures) will require 515 additional acres, which will not materially help this county. The greatest help in this county, and probably all other counties, would be that the counties be allowed to count the actual acres instead of bringing them to BAE figures. Also, the actual acres reported by the farmers should be more accurate than BAE figures according to the farmers in the county.

This county needs additional cotton acreage to keep genuine cotton farmers and genuine cottoh tenants farming. An additional amount of 1,500 acres is badly needed for this purpose.

Very truly yours,

ZADA K. HETHCOCK,
Secretary, Throckmorton County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Fredericksburg, Tex., January 16, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter dated January 13 with reference to 1950 cotton-acreage allotments in Gillespie County.

The county committee reserved the maximum 15 percent of the original 330 acres allotted to the county. The amendment setting up 70 percent of the actual acreage, including war crops in 1946, 1947, and 1948, would increase our acreage approximately 60 acres.

The only way cotton farmers would be benefited in Gillespie County would be if the law were amended to provide for releasing acreage and reapportioning it to producers wanting to plant cotton in 1950.

Very truly yours,

WESLEY A. GOLD,
Secretary, Gillespie County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Ballinger, Tex., January 17, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Listed below please find the information as requested in your letter of January 13, 1950.

1. Did your county committee reserve the full percent you could reserve? Yes.

2. What percent did you reserve? Fifteen percent.

3. How many additional acres will the enclosed amendment give your county? None.

Farmers' actual acreage

1946	96,758
1947	103,657
1948	113,788
Total	314,203

Divide the total acreage by 3, we get 104,734. Multiply 104,734 times 70 percent, would be 73,313.8.

4. Does your county need any additional cotton acreage to keep genuine cotton farmers and genuine cotton tenants farming? Yes.

5. How many acres? Fifteen thousand.

We believe that if our county had been given credit for war-crop credits for the years 1945, 1946, and 1947 that would alleviate our trouble, but if the BAE figures are used we would be hurt more.

Your very truly,

SYLVAN E. CLONINGER,
Secretary, Runnels County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Comanche, Tex., January 17, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is in reply to your letter of January 13, 1950, asking for additional information regarding 1950 cotton-acreage allotments for Comanche County, Tex.

Our county committee did reserve the full 15 percent as allowed under amended Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress.

An amendment to the present law setting up 70 percent of the farmer's actual acreage in 1946–47–48 would alleviate a lot of our troubles; but if the BAE figures are used, we would not be helped any.

Our county does need additional cotton acreage to keep genuine cotton farmers and genuine cotton tenants farming. We feel that if Comanche County could receive an additional 500 acres and that if we were allowed to allocate this to actual cotton farmers that our county would be in good shape.

An amendment to the effect that if unused cotton acreage could be released and reallocated to cotton farmers it would help our county to some extent.

We trust this is the information you desire.

Very truly yours,

O. D. JOHNSTON,
Acting Administrative Officer,
Comanche County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Marshall, Tex., January 18, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: The Harrison County PMA Committee set aside a reserve of 14 percent of the county 1950 cotton acreage. The bulk of this was used in adjustments for 5- to 10- to 15-acre farms and most of the rest was used for adjustments on larger farms where the cut was unusually severe.

The amendment to limit the cut to 70 percent of the 1946–1947–1948 average, or 50 percent of the highest planted year would give Harrison County 1,200 additional acres if the cotton history used is the history after cutting the county to BAE figures.

With the present allotments there will be up to 200 or 300 genuine cotton farmers, mainly tenants that cannot be furnished by the banks or others and be forced off the farms or into odd jobs, and so forth. It would take 1,500 to 2,500 additional acres to keep them farming.

We believe the most or all of these acres can be secured by reallocating allotments that

will not be used, particularly if those with unneeded allotments can be assured that they will not be penalized if they voluntarily turn in their acres to the county committee for this purpose.

Another real problem here, and I believe all over East Texas, is the large number of good farms without allotments. Potentially there are 2,000 in Harrison County and we expect at least 300 applications for new growers' allotments with not enough acres to give any of them enough to justify planting.

We all deeply appreciate your efforts toward solving our problems.

Yours very truly,

WALCOTT S. BLACK,
Administrative Officer, Harrison County PMA.

GEORGE D. ROBERTS,
Chairman, County Committee of Harrison County PMA.

WILLIAM A. ONEY,
CHARLES J. GREEN,
Members, County Committee of Harrison County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Hereford, Tex., January 17, 1950.

Re: Cotton-acreage allotment.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Representative, Third District of Texas, Washington, D. C.:

Our county committee did not use full 15 percent as reserve, as was provided in the regulations in order that as much of the acreage would be immediately available for our old growers as was possible. Committee retained only 7-percent reserve rather than the 15 percent allowed in the regulations.

The proposed 70-percent plan would increase our county allotment 69.5 acres. We should possibly explain that our county is a new area, having history on only the years 1946, 1947, and 1948. Our largest year, 1948, shows a planted acreage of 2,214 acres. Our county allotment amounted to 1,517 acres for 41 old cotton farmers. We have had requests from approximately 40 new growers, asking for approximately 3,000 acres new grower allotment. Were it possible that this county could receive 3,000 acres additional, we could keep our cotton growers in business.

Since we are a new area, comparatively speaking, we are definitely left out of any consideration it appears; the result being that cotton farmers will be unable to move in our area and purchase land and plant cotton, which is in so many cases the only crop with which they are familiar.

F. G. COLLIER,
Secretary, Deaf Smith County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Hebbronville, Tex., January 17, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of January 13, 1950.

The county committee did not reserve the full percent it could reserve. Reason, official allotment granted to county is 1789 acres, which is not sufficient to justify the committee to hold the full percentage. Percent reserved 13.4. The amendment of 70 percent taking into consideration the BAE figures for 1946, 300 acres; 1947, 1,200 acres; and 1948, 1,880 acres. Total for 3 years, 3,380 acres. 70 percent of 3,380 acres, 2,366. Our total county allotment, 1,925.6. This would increase our allotment to 440.4.

If the farmers' reports are used before BAE adjustments we have for 1946, 381 acres; 1947, 1,429 acres; 1948, 2,060 acres, which makes a total of 3,870 acres. 70 percent of this is 2,709 acres. This would give our county 783.4 acres.

We need additional acreages to keep our farmers in business. Most of our farmers received allotments from 5 acres to 20 acres. This is the general rule. We need about 1,000 acres to more or less stabilize our allotments.

Yours very truly,

MANUEL R. RAMIREZ,
Administrative Officer, Jim Hogg County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Jourdanton, Tex., January 16, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is in reply to your letter of January 12, 1950, addressed to the county PMA committee regarding 1950 cotton allotments. I will reply to it for them as their secretary.

Our county committee withheld the full percentage allowed for a reserve to help out in the sore spots. The percentage was 15 percent.

The answer to your question about the additional acreage which the amendment quoted in the copy of the wire would give us in answer fully in my other letter which is enclosed.

Speaking for the county committee, we certainly do need additional cotton acreage to keep genuine cotton farmers and genuine cotton tenants on farm. I would estimate this need at 3,000 more acres.

For the county PMA committee.

A. A. JENDRY,
Secretary, Atascosa County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Jourdanton, Tex., January 16, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is in reply to your letter of January 12, 1950, addressed to me as secretary, county PMA committee, relative to 1950 cotton-acreage allotments.

In reply to your question regarding how much the 70 percent of actual 1946–47–48 cotton-acreage amendment proposed would help our county, I have this to offer. We would be about in the same shape as Houston County if under this amendment we would still be forced to hold down our reported acreages to within the BAE totals for the county. A 70-percent amendment would be of big help to us if in arriving at the average we would be permitted to include war-crop credits. I estimate that the amendment as read in the copy of the wire would only give us about 277 acres more of cotton allotment. An amendment to provide at least an allotment of 50 percent of the highest year, including war-crop credits, would give us 724.6 more acres. A combination of these two amendments would give us 799.1 acres more.

We have a reserve of 103.4 acres set up to take care of farms planting cotton for the first time in 1949 and to new farms. We have had, and will have all together, I estimate, about 75 applications for new allotments out of this reserve.

Yours truly,

A. A. JENDRY,
Secretary, Atascosa County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Carthage, Tex., January 16, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will acknowledge your letters of January 12.

I am not in position to say why the State office set up less than 4 percent when the maximum reserve was 10 percent.

The county office did reserve the full amount of reserve that was set aside for hardship cases, correction of errors and for new growers including old growers that had no cotton and/or war crops in 1946–47 or 48. This being 15 percent.

Judge Roy Selman is correct. Seventy percent of the average reported acreage in 1946–48 would help; however the method used in adjusting to BAE figures would not help. Personally, I'd like to see 70 percent of average reported acreage not to exceed, say 30 or 35 percent of the cropland.

An additional 3,500 acres for hardship cases and new growers—genuine cotton farms that planted no cotton in 1946–47–48 because of abnormal conditions—would help very much.

When this office can be of further assistance, please command.

Yours very truly,

T. L. VINCENT,
Administrative Officer, Panola County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Archer City, Tex., January 16, 1950.

Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your letters of January 10 and 12 in regard to the cotton allotment situation in Archer County.

Archer County's 1941 cotton acreage was 5,800; the 1950 cotton acreage is 1,377. Reported acreage for 1946 was 1,979, while BAE figures brought it down to 1,050. Reported for 1947, 1,370; BAE, 960. Reported for 1948, 1,368; BAE, 1,200.

Archer County has 109 acres to distribute to all new cotton growers, including those who grew cotton for the first time since the war in 1949. We now have 14 requests on file for new-grower allotments, and the deadline for making applications has been set for March 1.

Yes, Archer County did reserve the full amount that could be reserved.

The amendment giving 70 percent of the 3-year average, during 1946, 1947, and 1948, should add about 105 acres to the Archer County allotment when using BAE figures. However, attempting to explain the BAE cuts to the farmers again might be more trouble than the additional acreage is worth.

Yours very truly,

SAMUEL B. MARTIN, *Secretary,*
Archer County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Bryan, Tex., January 17, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: We have your letter of January 12, 1950, requesting information on the cotton-allotment situation in Brazos County, and we appreciate the opportunity of giving you our views on the subject.

Brazos County has two administrative areas consisting of the bottom land of Brazos River and hill land typical of most of east Texas.

We held only a small reserve for the bottom land as practically all of these farms have been planting each year an acreage large enough to receive their share of the allotment for the area. The situation is entirely different in the hill land. Many farms planted cotton only one of the years, 1946, 1947, 1948, but would receive the same percentage of the cropland as farms planting each of the 3 years. It was obvious that this would cause a reduced factor so the committee reserved 14½ percent of the allotment in this area and distributed this reserve to farms that had been consistently planting cotton.

We have made a tabulation in the county of the proposed 70-percent amendment and find that 93 farms in the county would receive 739.6 acres. This represents approximately 18 percent of the farms receiving allotments. However, most of this acreage will go to farms in the Brazos bottom and we will still be unable to make some needed adjustments on hill farms that should be made.

We are of the opinion that the old release-and-reapportionment clause would be adequate to take care of these needed cases. We have estimated that approximately 1,500 acres would be voluntarily released in the county and this acreage could be used to keep genuine cotton farmers in the business. We suggest that all such released acreage should be handled through county committee reserves and not through transfers from one farm to another.

At any time we can supply you with information relative to this section of the State, please call on us.

Very truly yours,

H. C. SEALE,
Brazos County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
La Grange, Tex., January 16, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of January 13, in regard to the Fayette County cotton allotments for 1950: County committee reserve for Fayette County is 15 percent for all farms. The enclosed 70 percent amendment will not help very many farms in this county.

If frozen acreage were to be released to the county committee for redistribution more could be accomplished in placing acres where needed.

More acres needed for farmers that planted cotton for the first time in 1949.

Very truly yours,

KENNY L. STORK,
Administrative Officer,
Fayette County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Belton, Tex., January 16, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your request with reference to 1950 cotton-acreage allotment we wish to advise that Bell County committee reserved approximately 4 percent.

The reason for not holding out more reserve was to keep from lowering the county factor thereby giving regular cotton farms a better percentage of the cotton acreage.

The enclosed amendment would give Bell County farmers about 2,700 additional acres.

We have a number of small farms that this amendment will not help and who should have additional help. This county should have at least 4,000 additional acres.

We have a reserve of 546.3 acres for new growers and we have requests on file now by about 150 farmers.

This county committee will appreciate all the help the Congress can give us.

Yours very truly,

O. C. GEISELBRECHT,
Chairman.
C. E. LLOYD,
Vice Chairman,
TOM L. HATTER, *Member.*
A. J. PETERS,
Administrative Officer.
County Committee, Bell County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Eastland, Tex., January 17, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: In regard to your inquiry of January 13 pertaining to cotton allotments in Eastland County, I wish to state that the committee used the full percentage allowed when setting up reserves for adjustments of cotton allotments.

Due to the BAE figures and war-crop credits in this county it is very doubtful if the 70-percent amendment would help us. I believe that 1,000 acres would be sufficient to keep our genuine cotton farmers and tennants on the farm. This acreage would enable them to have enough cotton to furnish them respectable living.

Yours very truly,

EMMETT E. POWELL,
Secretary, Eastland County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Stephenville, Tex., January 16, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of January 13, the county committee set aside 12 percent for reserve in cotton. The maximum amount was 15 percent and the reason the full amount was not set aside was because we had so little acreage to start with that 15 percent was not enough to touch our troubles in high places.

If we were allowed 70 percent of the farms actual cotton acres for 1946, 1947, and 1948, we do not think our county would be hurt. If the BAE figures are used we would be hurt still further. Due to the war-crop credit 500 farms shared in the county allotment that should have been given to 700 regular cotton farms, and we got no additional acres to take care of the war-crop credit farms. Our factor used in the county was .0819 per 100 acres.

Yours very truly,

WILEY B. THOMPSON,
FRED N. CAREY,
E. G. RUSSELL,
Member, County Committee, Erath County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Alice, Tex., January 17, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of January 13, 1950, the Jim Wells County Committee reserved 3 percent of the county allotment for new growers and for farms in the 5- to 15-acre group.

The county committee did not see fit to reserve a larger amount and attempt to establish a larger allotment for the genuine cotton farmer or genuine cotton tenant for the following reasons:

(1) The county allotment was very small due to the use of 95 percent of the 1947–48 actual acreage and the 15-percent reserve would not have provided enough acreage to provide enough allotment for all of the genuine cotton men.

(2) Those farmers who had consistently planted war crops had been told that their cotton history and allotment was being protected and preserved under Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress; consequently to reduce the county factor and raise the genuine cotton farmer by means of a 15-percent reserve would have discriminated against the war crop farmer.

Jim Wells County had a cotton allotment of 43,000 acres in 1942; a cotton factor of 37.37 percent. For 1950 our cotton allotment is 20,417 acres; our cotton factor is 0.1425 percent. The situation for our cotton farmer is serious. The economic well-being of the entire Coastal Bend area is threatened.

The proposed 70-percent to 50-percent amendment would add 6,900 acres to our county allotment. To keep genuine cotton farmers and cotton tenants Jim Wells county needs a minimum allotment of 35,000 acres. This could be achieved by crediting the county with war-crop credits and the 70-percent or 50-percent amendment now before the House of Representatives.

The Jim Wells County Committee appreciates your interest in this matter and will be glad to be of further assistance.

Yours very truly,

EWALD G. HARTMAN, *Secretary,*
Jim Wells County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Meridian, Tex., January 16, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Bosque County should have a war-crop credit acreage appropriated in addition to the regular cotton-allotment acreage. At present war-crop credit acreages come out of the regular cotton-allotment acreage, thus penalizing the old growers.

The 70-percent factor, based on BAE figures, would not help us.

Respectfully submitted.

WILL C. PALLMEYER,
Chairman, Bosque County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Quanah, Tex., January 16, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congressman, Third District, Texas,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 13, 1950, with respect to cotton reserves, etc., of the 1950 cotton-allotment law.

The Hardeman County (Tex.) county committee did not reserve the full percent that they could have reserved. The reason the committee did not withhold the full reserve was that it was their opinion that the reserve was larger than necessary to adjust the hardship cases, etc., and should be issued to the cotton farmers and used rather than be dormant. The amount of reserve the committee withheld was 0.01927 percent for new growers, 0.07544 percent for other farms (which was issued to all farms on percent basis), 0.02659 percent for lates, corrections, and reconstitutions.

The 70-percent law will give this county 997.2 additional acres of cotton if the original cotton-acreage figures as the farmers turned in are used. If the BAE figures are used we will lose 8,958 acres of cotton.

This county received 59,061.7 acres of cotton that was originally issued to cotton producers in 1942. In 1950 this county received 36,192 acres of cotton that was originally issued to cotton producers. The producers having 200 acres of cropland all in cotton received 38.2 acres per 100 acres.

This county does need additional cotton acreage to keep genuine cotton farmers and tenants farming. In the opinion of the county committee this county needs 20,000 acres additional cotton acres.

Trusting this is the desired information, I am,

Yours very truly,

WELDON P. HERMAN,
Administrative Officer, Hardeman County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Gatesville, Tex., January 16, 1950.

Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Third District, Texas,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of January 13, 1950, requesting information concerning cotton allotments in Coryell County, please be advised as follows: The Coryell County committee did not reserve the full percent that could have been reserved; the primary reason the county committee did not reserve the full amount was because they felt that an equitable distribution could not be made to those who had continuously grown cotton through 1946, 1947, and 1948, if a large acreage was reserved. Coryell County reserved approximately 11 percent and could have reserved 15 percent.

The 70-percent amendment will only give this county approximately 2,000 acres more cotton on approximately 1,400 cotton farms, which is a very small amount. We feel that Coryell County needs additional cotton acreage to prevent drastic reductions on farms which are cotton farms and which have been growing cotton during the years of 1946, 1947, and 1948. Our cotton allotment for 1942 was approximately 50,000 acres, and the 1950 acreage allotment is approximately 23,000 acres.

Without running a tabulation, it appears that the proposed 70-percent amendment would help us very little, if the BAE figures are used. The factor for Coryell County was approximately 30 percent in 1942, the present factor is approximately 15 percent. We feel that we could reasonably well satisfy our producers and at the same time accomplish a reasonable reduction in the cotton acreage to comply with the fundamental basis of the cotton program if we were allowed approximately 7,000 additional acres of cotton. With this additional acreage we could bring our factor up to about 20 percent of the tilled acreage.

Yours truly,

N. FOOTE,
Chairman, Coryell County PMA.

(Copies to Hon. B. F. Vance and Hon. W. R. POAGE.)

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Pecos, Tex., January 17, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Listed below is cotton acreage and tilled acreage for Reeves County, Tex., as per accurate tabulations maintained in the county PMA office each year:

	Actual harvested cotton acres	BAE final approved acres	Total tilled acres
1945	5,466.0	5,060	21,014.6
1946	6,153.0	5,800	22,179.2
1947	9,724.0	9,330	23,281.0
1948	30,527.0	30,000	53,996.5
1949	52,521.4		72,630.2
1950			[1] 80,000.0

[1] Estimated.

We received an official cotton allotment of 20,325 acres for the county, of which 18,067 has been distributed to old-farmers. The full 15 percent of the county reserve was held, of which all has been used for corrections, lates, reconstitutions, and old farms which were in cultivation prior to 1948 and some 1948 farms which did not receive an allotment in line with other farms that went into cultivation that year. Of this reserve 448 acres was held to be added to the 1,552 acres received from the State Reserve for new-grower allotments.

We have approximately 21,000 acres of land eligible for new-grower allotments, of which we only have 2,000 acres to distribute among them.

The amendment plan of 70 percent of the past 3-year average would give Reeves County 350 acres more, and the 50-percent plan of 1948 planted acreage would give 1,500 additional acres to the county.

Seventy percent of the 1949 planted cotton acreage (52,521 acres) would be 36,764.7 acres, which would be enough acreage to keep genuine cotton farmers and genuine cotton tenants farming in Reeves County.

Yours very truly,

NEIL THOMPSON,
Chairman, Reeves County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Bellville, Tex., January 19, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH: In reply to your letters of January 10 and 12 concerning the proposed 1950 cotton allotments, the county committee of the Austin County PMA selected every fifth cotton farm in the county and on this basis estimated that the additional cotton acreage needed to set up allotments of 70 percent of the farm actual acreage history in 1946, 1947, and 1948 is 4,360 acres.

We will have approximately 50 new cotton farms in the county and have 174 acres to establish the allotments on these farms.

The county committee reserved 9 percent of the county allotment.

An additional cotton acreage of approximately 3,000 acres is needed to keep genuine cotton farmers and genuine cotton tenants farming.

Yours very truly,

LENARD O. SAGER,
Secretary, Austin County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
San Diego, Tex., January 18, 1950.

Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Under the 50- to 70-percent plan it appears that this county would receive only 1,048 acres more.

In 1942 this county's cotton allotment was 30,746.6 acres with a .3742 factor. At present the allotment is 17,680 acres with a .2388 factor.

We feel that we should at least get as much allotment as the county had in 1942, and even that would not take care of the additional acreage that has been put in since that time. The BAE figures greatly reduce our acreage also.

We thank you for your interest in this matter.

Yours very truly,

LOONEY R. FREEMAN,
Secretary, Duval County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Athens, Tex., January 18, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Henderson County reserved 1,450 acres of its official county allotment, all but 334 acres were used in adjusting 5- to 15-acre and other farms.

The chief concern of the committee is new-grower allotments as you see we only have 334 acres for this purpose, which will only be a drop in the bucket when distributed among 1,000 new growers.

We think you could relieve the situation in east Texas if you could get a price support on dry black-eyed and cream peas. Understand the State of California has one on black-eyed beans, which is the same as our peas.

The county committee concurs with Houston County in that the amendment will not help this county if we have to use the BAE acreage for the county. I am enclosing copy of a letter we sent Tom Pickett.

If we can be of further help, please advise.

Yours sincerely,

RAYMOND G. MAGERS,
Chairman, PMA Committee of Henderson County.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Cotulla, Tex., January 17, 1950.

To: Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.
From: La Salle County PMA Committee.

We of the county committee are willing only to settle for 70 percent of actual acreage in the highest year of 1946, 1947, 1948, which is 1947, plus 70 percent of war crop credits, which would be 1,797.6 less 1,379 acres 1950 allotment. This would be an additional allotment of 418.6 acres plus 182 acres increase in new grower allotment. This would increase our total to 1,947.6 acres.

Thanking you for the inquiry, we remain,

Respectfully yours,

LOUIS E. SCHULZE,
Chairman, La Salle County Committee

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Plains, Tex., January 18, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congressman, Third District, Texas,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter dated January 14, 1950, PMA committee did not reserve the full percent; they felt like the total cotton allotment here too small to cut them (the farmers) further. They did reserve approximately 10 percent.

If I understand the Cooley bill, it would give the county some 1,800 additional esti-

mated acres (not enough); BAE figures too low.

County does need additional allotment to keep genuine cotton farmers farming. Failure to give any credit for acreage planted for the first time in 1949 is working severe hardship on many farmers. We have a new irrigated farming district, new homes have been built, pumping equipment installed, and hundreds of acres of cotton planted in 1949 for the first time.

Yoakum County cotton factor 12 percent, adjoining county approximately 30 percent, farms near the line similar to farms in other county percent cropland planted to cotton in the part near the same.

Yours very truly,

W. M. OVERTON,
Secretary, Yoakum County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Crosbyton, Tex., January 17, 1950.

The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: With reference to your letter of January 13, 1950, in regard to the cotton allotments for Crosby County, Tex., this is to advise that our county committee reserved approximately 10 percent of our county allotment. They did not reserve the full percent since we have very few farms limited by the highest planted acreage, very few new grower cotton farms, and did not anticipate many corrections due to errors.

The amendment you enclosed would give Crosby County approximately 4,254 additional acres. We do not know how much additional cotton acreage the county needs to keep genuine cotton farmers and genuine cotton tenants farming. A number of farmers have remarked that they would have to quit farming, but whether or not they will actually do so is not known. We feel that the proposed amendment whereby no producer shall receive less than 70 percent of his 1946–47–48 average, or 50 percent of his highest planted, whichever is the larger, would be very difficult to administer. BAE estimates were so different from the acreage reported by the farmers that very drastic adjustments by the committee were necessary. These adjustments will be very difficult to justify. We feel that genuine cotton farmers that planted cotton in the 1946–47–48 period and lost their crops before July 1, in one or more of the years, will suffer; also the farmer practicing diversified farming would not receive his full share of the allotment. Our records are unreliable and there is not a possible way of securing reliable acreages. Therefore, we believe that the gain in county acreage would not be worth the problems involved in administering the proposed amendment. As in the past, we believe it would give the biggest liar more than he deserves.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES E. WINTER,
Administrative Officer, Crosby County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Pampa, Tex., January 20, 1950.

The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
United States House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: Regarding your letter of January 13, 1950, our county committee did not reserve the full percentage that it was allowed to reserve because the members felt that as much acreage as possible should be allotted to the regular cotton growers.

The proposed amendment to give the farmers 70 percent of their actual 1946, 1947, 1948 acreage would give our county an additional 655.4 acres.

Gray County does need additional acreage to keep genuine cotton farmers and tenants farming. The majority of cotton farmers feel that the small cotton allotments they received are not large enough for them to realize any profit on their cotton crop and many of these farmers depend entirely on this crop. They feel that a more equal distribution of the allotment among the various counties would probably be more satisfactory.

Very truly yours,

EVELYN J. MASON,
Secretary, Gray County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Bowie, Tex., January 20, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LINDLEY: The Bowie County Committee failed to hold the full limit of county reserve. About 4 percent was reserved because it was felt that this amount was enough to take away from the producers who had been planting cotton during the period 1946–48. Since the history for that period was so low, it was realized that our county factor would be extremely low even if no county reserve was subtracted from the original county allotment.

This county does need additional allotment for distribution to new farms and to hardship cases. We have estimated that 4,000 acres would be sufficient for this purpose.

Yours very truly,

HARMON W. JONES,
Administrative Officer, Bowie County PMA.

COLORADO CITY, TEX., *January 18, 1950.*

The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress, Third District,
Texas, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to letter of recent date relative to 70 percent of the farmers' actual cotton acreage in 1946, 1947, and 1948, we submit the following data from Mitchell County, Tex.

Please note BAE acreages which are off bad and would not be fair should a 70-percent amendment be enacted that required their estimates:

Year, 1945:	
BAE acreage	70,000
Farmers' acreage	86,657
Year, 1946:	
BAE acreage	74,500
Farmers' acreage	98,649
Year, 1947:	
BAE acreage	75,800
Farmers' acreage	99,168
Year, 1948:	
BAE acreage	81,000
Farmers' acreage	98,881
Average, 1946, 1947, and 1948:	
BAE acreage	77,100
Farmers' acreage	98,900
Seventy percent:	
BAE acreage	53,970
Farmers' acreage	69,230

Original 1950 county cotton allotment, 67,381.

War crop credits, 1945:	
Number of farms	219
Acres	9,173
War crop credits, 1946:	
Number of farms	151
Acres	5,102
War crop credits, 1947:	
Number of farms	124
Acres	5,370

You will note we included 1945 merely as a matter of comparative record. We also are sending war crop data relative to Public Law 12 which would increase the acreage credits for 1945, 1946, and 1947.

We regret that BAE county acreage estimates were included in the marketing quota law. For large areas such as States, possibly they are fairly accurate, but when broken down to local units as small as counties, we cannot agree to their accuracy.

Very truly yours,

WILL H. JONES.

(Copy to Hon. GEORGE MAHON, Nineteenth District.)

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Coldspring, Tex., January 18, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congressman, Third District, Texas,
Tyler, Tex.

DEAR SIR: The San Jacinto County Committee reserved only 12 percent of the original allotment as they wanted the old cotton farmers to get as near the same percentage of allotted acres as possible.

If the present amendment of 70 percent of the 1946–47–48 average or the 50 percent of the highest planted acres in these years is passed and the BAE figures for these years are used, this county will be in a worse condition than it is now. The committee in adjusting the reported planted acres on the 532c's down to the BAE figures had to actually cut off acres that they knew were planted.

It will take at least 500.0 acres more of cotton in this county for the old cotton farmers and their tenants to continue to stay on their farms. If the acreages are reduced, some landlords and tenants will have to leave the farms with no place to go.

Yours very truly,

JIM P. COUNTS,
Secretary, San Jacinto County PMA.

TEXARKANA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Texarkana, Ark.-Tex., January 17, 1950.

Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of January 3, requesting information on how many fewer jobs are in our locality than were here at the height of the war employment, we have now received this information from the employment bureau.

They advised there are about 7,500 fewer people working in this area now than there were during the peak of the employment during the war.

We trust the above answers your inquiry; but if we can be of further service, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Sincerely yours,

L. E. GILLILAND,
Manager.

WILLS POINT, TEX., *January 23, 1950.*

MR. BECKWORTH: Kind friend, with pleasure I ask you for help. I have helped you when you were running for office and will help you again. Now I am asking you for help. My cotton acreage is 10 acres and I ask for 15. Will you please help me get more cotton acreage. If I don't get more than 10 acres, I will have to have help. My land is poor and I can't make much on 10 acres of cotton, so please help me get this acreage up to 15 acres if you can. I hope you will do all you can for me. You know things we have to buy are high; and if we have no money, we can't buy—and we all feel good when we have money to pay our bills.

Hoping to hear from you and hoping you will help me—and if you run for office I will still have you in mind.

Yours truly, and by-by,

ED WEST.

[Telegram]

COLLEGE STATION, TEX., *January 24, 1950.*
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives:

Total State committee reserve 22,371 acres for assisting with new farm allotments distributed to counties during November.

B. F. VANCE.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., January 19, 1950.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of December 30 in which you requested my opinion on whether Texas needs additional cotton-acreage allotment or a redistribution of the available allotment, or a combination of these two provisions.

At the time the State committee reviewed and adjusted computed county allotments, it was our feeling that the allotment that each county committee was notified of was adequate in view of the acreage of cotton that had been planted in recent years. However, the method of distribution of the county allotment to farms required that the county allotment be apportioned not only to farms on which cotton had been planted in 1946, 1947, or 1948, but also to farms on which no cotton had been planted in one or more of these 3 years but on which designated cotton war crops were produced instead of cotton in 1946 and/or 1947. On the basis of experience during the 1938–42 cotton-allotment programs, and from information received from various county committees, we feel that from 10 to 20 percent of the 1950 cotton allotments will not be planted in the East Texas area. Many county committees have expressed to me the opinion that the total county allotment is sufficient for establishing fair and equitable allotments for all genuine cotton farms in the county but under the provisions of law they are, of course, prevented from doing so.

Consequently, a release and reapportionment provision similar to that used under other programs will help some in the proper distribution of 1950 cotton allotments. Also, some provision should be written that will establish a floor under the 1950 farm-cotton allotments. Probably the 70–50 plan would be satisfactory. However, in the long pull, it is my opinion that Public Law 272 passed by the Eighty-first Congress in August of last year must be rewritten to give county and community committeemen considerably greater latitude in making farm-cotton allotments. We are currently operating allotment programs for wheat, peanuts, and potatoes in Texas with considerable success and with very little complaint from farmers affected. It is my feeling that in most Texas counties farm-cotton allotments should be made on a plan similar to that for making peanut, wheat, and potato allotments. Nevertheless, there are many blackland and West Texas counties in which the cropland percentage approach to farm-cotton allotments is satisfactory and need not be disturbed.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

COLLEGE STATION, TEX., *December 8, 1949.*
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
United States Representative,
Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of December 5 in which you requested detailed statistical information on the 1950 cotton allotment for Panola County.

We have developed these data for the county in three parts and have shown comparable data for Dawson County, as follows:

TABLE I

County	1947 acres	1948 acres	1947–48 average	1950 total allotment	Percent allotment is of average
Dawson	266,000	270,000	268,000	228,755	85
Panola	14,600	17,300	15,950	17,367	109

TABLE II

County	1946 acres	1947 acres	1948 acres	1946–48 average	Percent average is of allotment
Dawson	127,765	267,591	270,000	221,785	103
Panola	14,998	16,814	17,300	16,371	106

TABLE III

County	Cropland	1947–48 average acreage	1950 total allotment	Percent average acreage of cropland	Percent allotment of cropland
Dawson	408,000	268,000	228,755	65.7	56.1
Panola	109,300	15,950	17,367	14.6	15.9

In the first table the 1947 and 1948 actual acreages of cotton are given and are compared with the 1950 total county allotment. All Texas county allotments were computed on the basis of 95 percent of the 1947–48 average acreage, with adjustments for trends, abnormal conditions, for small farms, and for new farms. The Panola County allotment was adjusted for abnormal conditions in the amount of 2,357 acres and for small farms in the amount of approximately 1,300 acres.

Many contend that if cotton war-crop credits (acreage of designated cotton war crops that was grown instead of cotton in 1945, 1946, and 1947) had been given in the apportionment of the national allotment to States and the State allotment to counties, some counties would have received better allotments. Table II illustrates the relationships between the allotment and 1946, 1947, and 1948 county acreages plus war-crop credits.

Table III is designed to show that about two-thirds of the cropland in Dawson County was devoted to cotton in the years 1947 and 1948 as compared to less than 15 percent in Panola County. The cropland factor for Dawson County is .5600 and for Panola is .1398.

As is shown in table I, all county cotton allotments are required to be computed on the basis of 95 percent of the 1947–48 average acreage. However, the county allotment is required to be apportioned not only to farms on which cotton was planted in one or more of the years 1946, 1947, or 1948, but also to other farms on which designated cotton war crops were produced instead of cotton in 1946 or 1947. This apparent inadequacy of the law has led to much of the dissatisfaction arising from 1950 allotments in a rather large number of our counties. Congressman BOB POAGE contends that the solicitor's office has incorrectly interpreted the intent of the Congress in a determination of county allotments, while on the other hand the solicitor has ruled that as the law is written it is impossible to compute county allotments on the basis of planted acreage and cotton war-crop credits if the State allotment is computed on the basis of planted acreage only.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
College Station, Tex., December 16, 1949.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
United States Representative,
Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of December 12 with which you returned my letter of December 8 and requested that additional information be shown for Dawson and Panola Counties.

These data are as follows:

County	1942 cropland	1950 cropland	1942 allotment	1950 allotment	Percent 1950 allotment is of 1942 allotment
Dawson	277,500	408,000	126,188	228,755	181
Panola	152,900	109,300	52,883	17,367	33

Any comparison of the 1950 county cotton allotment with the 1942 county cotton allotment should be made on the basis that the 1950 county cotton allotments were computed, using only 1947 and 1948 cotton acreages, whereas 1942 cotton allotments reflect in part the acreage of cotton produced in each county during the years 1928–32 and in part numerous gadgets included in the old law that provided for minimum county allotments and minimum farm allotments. It is also correct to point out that the acreage of cotton has been steadily increasing in west Texas counties and has been steadily decreasing in east Texas counties for the last 15 years. It is my opinion that the cost of production of cotton in east Texas is too high as compared with the cost of production in west Texas so as to result in farmers in both areas being on a competitive basis. East Texas farmers could probably make more money by taking up some livestock or poultry enterprises along with the production of feed and food crops that are locally adapted and can be used where produced.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
College Station, Tex., December 28, 1949.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of December 23 in which you have raised two questions as to how the cotton allotment and marketing quota program will affect cotton farmers.

Section 344 (f) of the AAA Act of 1938, as amended, provides that "the county acreage allotment less not to exceed the percentage provided for in paragraph 3 of this subsection shall be apportioned to farms on which cotton has been planted (or regarded as having been planted) in any one of the 3 years immediately preceding the year for which such allotment is determined."

As we understand this provision, 1950 cotton allotments are determined for farms and not for farmers. Also, for 1950 the allotment is based on the history of the farm during the years 1946, 1947, and 1948, as well as the amount of cropland in the farm. Conceivably then, there might be genuine cotton farmers who will operate farms in 1950 for which allotments cannot be established under the provisions of the law. Even in these few cases, it is possible for county

committees to establish group II or new farm allotments to the extent that the county reserve acreage set aside for this purpose will permit.

It is my opinion that very few, if any, genuine cotton farmers will be denied the privilege of growing some cotton during the 1950 crop year.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I submit some additional information:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., November 16, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your two letters of October 18, 1949, with respect to methods of supporting fruits and vegetables.

There is enclosed a copy of Miscellaneous Publication 683, Price Programs of the United States Department of Agriculture, 1949. This publication will provide you with much of the detailed information in which you are interested.

Price-support operation for fruits and vegetables are limited to dry beans and peas, potatoes and sweetpotatoes. Assistance is provided growers of other fruits and vegetables by means of surplus-removal purchase operations as needs arise, depending upon the funds and outlets available to the Department and other considerations.

Dry beans of specified classes, including baby lima and pinto, are supported, since they were Steagall commodities. Dry whole peas are similarly supported, but black-eyes are not supported. In our normal classification we consider black-eyes as beans rather than as peas. Black-eyes are not supported because the Department did not ask for increased production of this class during the war, since outlets outside of the United States were practically nonexistent.

Support of the 1949 crops of dry beans is at 80 percent of parity, and the support on dry peas is at 60 percent. In each program the support is given by means of loans and purchase agreements available to producers. On dry peas the Department supports the price of the commodity as it comes from the thresher; whereas on dry beans the support is on a cleaned-and-graded basis, which service is normally done by local warehousemen. The reason for the distinction is that excess peas which might be acquired under the price-support program could very well have only a feed outlet. For feed purposes the amount by which the value of cleaned peas would exceed that of thresher-run peas would be insufficient to cover the cost of cleaning.

Copies of the press releases and the program regulations for the 1949 support programs on dry beans and peas are enclosed.

In the case of vegetables other than potatoes and sweetpotatoes for fresh-market sales, price support is not mandatory. Our operations are limited by available funds and outlets and the perishable nature of the commodity. These commodities are grown commercially in nearly all of the States. The period between planting and harvesting is short for most of these vegetables. Areas planted vary from a fraction of an acre to large-scale operations. Double and even triple cropping is not unusual. Marketing seasons between areas are finely drawn and frequently overlap because of variable weather conditions. Prices during a market season vary widely, frequently from very high to very low levels. Consequently, we do not announce in advance support-price levels. To do so would tend to encourage acreage expansion and we have no practical means of acreage allotments. We are compelled to confine our operations to surplus-removal programs as market gluts arise and to a few important commodities for which outlets to school lunch and other eligible institutions are available. The thinking behind this type of program simply is that by removing the spot surpluses, market prices will improve sufficiently to be of benefit to the grower. Our maximum purchase prices for these operations are based on 75 percent of the individual commodity parity prices.

Mandatory price support for potatoes has been in effect since in 1943, first as a Steagall crop, and presently under the Agricultural Act of 1948. The principal support method is by purchases, particularly in connection with the early crop but loans have been an important supplement in the late-producing areas where large quantities are stored and where markets frequently are depressed as a result of growers' needs for cash at harvest time. Price-support announcements for the ensuing crop season usually are made in the late fall or winter. They contain an outline of the basic plan, including conditions of eligibility. Beginning in 1947, only growers planting within their individual farm potato acreage allotments have been permitted to participate.

Under prewar conditions, it was assumed that for all consumption purposes, production of about 360 to 370 million bushels was needed. More recently 350,000,000 bushels has been the production goal, but there is some evidence that even this figure is too high and that with normal quality a supply as low as 335,000,000 bushels would be adequate. On a per capita basis, annual consumption has been declining steadily for over half a century at a rate close to 1 percent per year. More recently the rate of decline has been accelerated, and 1948 consumption is estimated at 108 pounds per capita compared with averages of 182 pounds for the 1909–13 period and 131 pounds for the 1935–39 period. As to crop disposition, data for the 1944–48 period show an average of 79 percent of the potato crop sold for food and seed, the balance being consumed as food and seed on the farms where grown, and wasted or fed to livestock. It should be observed, however, that the percentage sold includes sales to the Department under price-support programs.

Price support of sweetpotatoes is mandatory through December 31, 1949, because it is a Steagall commodity. The current crop will be supported in accordance with the Agricultural Act of 1948 at prices which will return growers not less than 60 percent or more than 90 percent of parity at the beginning of the marketing season (July 1, 1949). Beginning January 1, 1950, sweetpotatoes will be in the same category as other vegetables on which price support is optional. However, since December 31 is about the middle of the sweetpotato marketing season and a basic change in support was undesirable in the middle of the season, the Department committed itself to support the 1949 crop of sweetpotatoes at an average of 80 percent of the July 1, 1949, parity. A press release giving the schedule of prices and details of the 1949 sweetpotato price-support program is enclosed.

During the 5-year period (1943–47) the Bureau of Agricultural Economics estimates that approximately 43 percent of the total production of sweetpotatoes was sold. They estimate that about 32 percent was used in the farm household. The remainder was used for seed, fed to livestock, and lost through waste after harvest. The 1949 production is estimated at 51,900,000 bushels. On the basis of these averages it is estimated that about 22,300,000 bushels would be sold and the farm household would consume 16,600,000 bushels.

The Department has no price-support program for figs. It has announced a program under which diversion payments of 3 cents a pound will be made on up to 1,000 tons of Black Mission figs. These figs are being contributed voluntarily by producers to a surplus pool for disposition outside of normal trade channels.

Surplus removal programs have been undertaken for a number of deciduous fruits during the 1949 season. Fresh pears, apples, and prunes were purchased during August and September. Purchases of each of these fresh fruits were undertaken in an endeavor to improve market conditions then prevailing for these fruits. Purchases of these commodities were distributed under the school-lunch program and to eligible agencies and institutions and the rate of purchase was governed by the capacity of the outlets to utilize the fruit.

A total of 1,093 cars of Bartlett pears was purchased in California, Oregon, and Washington during the period August 2 through September 20, 1949. Purchases were made at the price of $2.15 per box f. o. b. shipping point. At the start of the program the purchase price was measurably above the then prevailing commercial market price, whereas at the termination of purchases the commercial market price had improved and, in fact, increased to a level above the purchase price.

There were 135 cars of Gravenstein apples purchased in California during the period August 2 through August 21, 1949, at $1.90 per box f. o. b. The California Gravenstein apple industry during the 1949 season adopted a series of rigorous marketing controls designed to improve prices to producers, and the purchases under this program were adapted to the marketing-control pattern established by the industry.

There were 75 cars of Italian prunes purchased in Idaho during the first 2 weeks in September. The purchases of this commodity were made at a price of $1.10 per one-half bushel basket f. o. b. shipping point.

In an endeavor to assist growers of peaches in the United States to market relatively abundant supplies of freestone peaches in the late producing States and of clingstone peaches grown on the Pacific coast, there were 937,210 cases of canned peaches purchased for distribution under the school-lunch program. Purchases of this commodity were made on an offer-and-acceptance basis, and the average price paid for all canned peaches was $4.06 per case delivered to destinations.

Purchases of fresh apples for distribution under the school-lunch program and to eligible agencies and institutions currently are being made by the Department. The purchase price at the present time is $1.70 per box or bushel, f. o. b. shipping point for specified varieties and sizes of fruit. Only U. S. No. 1 apples are being purchased, and the rate of purchase is geared to the capacity of the available outlets to utilize fresh apples. Purchases under this program were started during the week beginning October 10 and authorizations have been issued for purchases of over 2,000 cars during the first 6 weeks of operation of the program. Purchases are being made in 28 States and allocations to each State are based on the proportionate share of the total United States commercial production contributed by that State.

In an endeavor to assist the United States apple and winter-pear industries to regain their export outlets, the Department has issued an export-payment program under which is subsidy of 50 percent of the f. a. s. price, but not more than $1.25 per box or per bushel, is made to exporters for apples

or winter pears destined to the Economic Cooperation Administration and Western Hemisphere countries with the exception of Canada, Mexico, Cuba, and Venezuela. The eligible countries are those whose purchasing of United States apples and winter pears have been curtailed as a result of a shortage of dollar exchange. Copies of the announcements indicating the terms and conditions of these programs are enclosed.

Citrus fruits have been purchased in periods of surplus during the last few seasons to the extent that funds and outlets were available. These purchases were made under surplus-removal programs rather than price-support programs. Substantial purchases were made during the 1947–48 season when prices to growers were very low. Purchases during that fiscal year were equivalent to approximately 5,500,000 boxes of grapefruit and 3,300,000 boxes of oranges.

Prior to the severe freezes which occurred in the citrus-fruit-producing areas of Texas, California, and Arizona last winter the Department has instituted a purchase program for concentrated orange juice and a quantity of this product equivalent to about 1,250,000 boxes was acquired for use in school lunches. Purchase programs for citrus fruit were discontinued last season after these freezes since prices advanced materially. The Texas freeze resulted in very large losses of both fruit and trees in the Rio Grande Valley. As a result, a disaster area was designated and the Farmers Home Administration has made loans available to growers for rehabilitating and replanting groves. In addition to the purchase program during the 1948–49 season an export subsidy program was issued for citrus fruits. Under this program approximately 750,000 boxes (fresh equivalent) of oranges and grapefruit were exported to the Marshall-plan countries.

We are now giving consideration to the marketing situation for the 1949–50 citrus-fruit crop, the harvesting of which has just started. A large crop of oranges is expected but the grapefruit crop will be drastically reduced as a result of the freezes last winter. Texas grapefruit growers whose groves were not seriously damaged by the freeze should have a profitable season in 1949–50.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. LOVELAND,
Under Secretary.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) News]

COTTON PROGRAM

To the News:

I have read with interest the comment in your paper with reference to the 1950 Government cotton program. It seems strange that a mathematical problem so simple could be so fogged.

If the Government actually wants to cut the cotton acreage 23 percent—or any other percent—all that is necessary is to permit a cotton farmer to plant no more than 77 percent of his 1949 cotton acreage in cotton during the year 1950 and not permit any farmer to plant cotton in 1950 unless he planted cotton in 1949. In this way each cotton farmer would bear his just pro rata part of the reduction. Any other method is designed to give one group of farmers an advantage over others and to favor some particular section of the country.

Of course, a 23-percent cut in acreage does not mean a 23-percent cut in production. This acreage cut can easily be overcome by planting the best land in cotton, the use of fertilizer, insect control, and more intensive cultivation methods. The only sure way to reduce the cotton crop is to limit the amount of cotton which can be marketed. The proper method is to let supply, demand, and price, control the crop. This method, of course, is not designed to create jobs for political employees.

NEIL THOMASON.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
January 13, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of December 5 in which you ask for the definition of various types of farmers.

Generally speaking, an individual could be identified as several kinds of farmer depending on his experience and the products he was producing; that is, one man could be a cotton farmer, peanut farmer, rice farmer, and dairy farmer. If you refer to his eligibility for allotments or quotas the requirements are listed in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. A copy of a compilation is enclosed.

We believe our PMA committeemen and other employees who might be called upon to make a decision can make the proper identification of the various types of farmers.

Sincerely,

A. J. LOVELAND,
Under Secretary.

LONG BRANCH, TEX., *January 10, 1950.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LINDLEY: I am writing in regard to the cotton acreage. I think it is working a hardship on myself as well as the other farmers. I own a farm of 110 acres and am allowed only 10 acres in cotton. If there is anything you could do in regard to getting the cotton acreage raised it would sure help many farmers in this county.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. CARIKER.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 17, 1950.

DEAR SECRETARY BRANNAN: I quote the pertinent part of a letter I have received from Mr. O. H. Moseley, route No. 1, Ben Wheeler, Tex.:

"I am near 70 years old and have planted cotton as a principal crop most of my life. I have been too old and crippled to work and plant anything the past few years. During the war and some years since neither labor nor tenants were obtainable. During that period I raised a few cattle. Not many. I am too crippled to do that now, and I am not permitted to vote in the cotton program nor allowed any acreage for 1950 in order to induce either labor or tenant to work my farm for 1950. I can see no fairness in such edict even if I were an ardent believer in all Government programs, and feeling the way I do about such programs, it is a bitter pill to swallow, I can tell you.

"I am an old man and haven't much longer to remain in this world, and it will make little difference to me personally if the farms are confiscated by Government, but it hurts me to think that my children and grandchildren are to receive such inheritance."

I will welcome any suggestions you may have. Mr. Moseley will appreciate any help you can give him.

Sincerely,

LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress.

ARP, TEX., *January 16, 1950.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LINDLEY BECKWORTH: We are poor farmers. We work hard doing war work in the war and bought us a little farm of 50 acres and just as we got our house built my husband had a break-down and was sick for 4 years, and try to farm last year the first time since we bought the land. I had to go to the hospital on July 17 and that bill was $614. The insects eat our cotton and we only got five bales, so that did not near pay us out, and this year they don't want to let us plant any cotton, and the land is too poor to raise any feed on, and my husband is not able to get a job since he is too old, and there are no jobs this way anyway. I pray, if you can do anything to help us, only get 10 acres. We may could get by somehow. With him sick like he is it about to run him crazy for we don't want to have to sell the place and nowhere to go.

Yours truly,

MRS. GRADY SAWYER.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., January 16, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of January 3 with which you enclosed a letter from Mr. Zan R. May, Joaquin, Tex.

It seems that Mr. May has filed an application for review of his 1950 cotton-acreage allotment and marketing quota with the Panola County committee. We have no way of knowing how much increase, if any, the review committee will grant Mr. May at the time his hearing is conducted. The review committee will be governed by the same regulations and instructions in considering appeals as State and county committees were required to follow in establishing original farm allotments.

We expect to conduct review-committee hearings in east Texas counties during February and early March.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Production and Marketing Administration Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, January 20, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I am replying to your letter of December 19, 1949, in which you asked if the situation reported for Arkansas by Mr. R. L. Compere, the State director of the Selective Service System, was accurate over the United States. Mr. Compere reported that the areas of Arkansas where the soil was least productive sent a higher percentage of its farmers to work in war plants.

As you know, the loss of people from farms during World War II was, in part, to the armed services. Numerically, the much greater out-flow was of farm people who moved to nonfarm areas and took nonfarm jobs. Statistics are not available to provide a break-down between those who took jobs in war plants and those who found employment at other types of nonfarm jobs.

With respect to the inductions of men directly from farms into the armed forces, the deferment policies followed under the Tydings amendment were administered for a part of the war period on the basis of the war unit criteria with respect to size of farm. This operated in the direction of more deferment of farm workers of military age on the more productive and larger-size farms. Conversely males of military age on inadequate-sized farms failed to meet the deferment criteria in greater proportions. There were probably many instances when the implementation of this policy was less than perfect, but in general, the Selective

Service System did get relatively more men from smaller and less productive farms than from the larger or more productive farms.

With regard to the civilian net out-migration from farms during the war years, the information is much less direct as to the type and size of farms from which the workers left. The available evidence suggests that, by and large, out-migration from farms occurred at somewhat heavier rates in regions and areas where the proportion of the farm population living on small, marginal, or subsistence types of farming units was great; that is, from areas in which population pressure was greatest.

As data that may be relevant to your general problem, I am enclosing estimates of the changes in the farm population by States during the 5 years preceding January 1945. These figures cover persons of all ages and both sexes, but the decrease in the total farm population during World War II gives some idea of the relative impact of the war on the agricultural manpower situation in the different parts of the country. Arkansas and the three other States of the West South Central had sharper rates of decrease in the farm population than were experienced anywhere else in the United States.

The losses in farm population shown in the attached table for the war period have, in part, been recouped since the end of the war. For the United States as a whole, the farm population at the beginning of 1949 was 27,776,000 compared with 25,190,000 in January 1945.

Sincerely yours,

K. T. HUTCHINSON,
Assistant Secretary.

Farm population changes, 1940–45, United States, major geographic divisions and States

Area	Farm population		
	1940	1945	Percent change, 1940–45
	Thous.	*Thous.*	
United States	30,269	25,190	−16.8
New England	617	604	−2.1
Maine	175	169	−3.4
New Hampshire	70	70	
Vermont	105	101	−3.8
Massachusetts	146	151	3.4
Rhode Island	17	16	−5.9
Connecticut	104	97	−6.7
Middle Atlantic	1,772	1,543	−12.9
New York	724	635	−12.3
New Jersey	142	122	−14.1
Pennsylvania	906	786	−13.2
East North Central	4,589	3,886	−15.3
Ohio	1,077	905	−16.0
Indiana	808	701	−13.2
Illinois	968	808	−16.5
Michigan	862	704	−18.3
Wisconsin	874	768	−12.1
West North Central	4,676	4,016	−14.1
Minnesota	908	774	−14.8
Iowa	924	842	−8.9
Missouri	1,117	907	−18.8
North Dakota	325	285	−12.3
South Dakota	305	268	−12.1
Nebraska	495	429	−13.3
Kansas	602	511	−15.1
South Atlantic	6,025	5,011	−16.8
Delaware	46	41	−10.9
Maryland	244	208	−14.8
Virginia	981	857	−12.6
West Virginia	530	456	−14.0
North Carolina	1,650	1,391	−15.7
South Carolina	911	723	−20.6
Georgia	1,360	1,076	−20.9
Florida	303	259	−14.5
East South Central	5,238	4,250	−18.9
Kentucky	1,250	1,034	−17.3
Tennessee	1,265	1,043	−17.6
Alabama	1,352	1,059	−20.5
Mississippi	1,391	1,114	−19.9
West South Central	5,008	3,723	−25.7
Arkansas	1,102	836	−24.1
Louisiana	846	632	−25.3
Oklahoma	921	678	−26.4
Texas	2,139	1,577	−26.3
Mountain	1,102	1,016	−7.8
Montana	174	143	−17.8
Idaho	200	181	−9.5
Wyoming	72	66	−8.3
Colorado	249	211	−15.3
New Mexico	176	158	−10.2
Arizona	113	129	14.2
Utah	103	113	9.7
Nevada	15	15	
Pacific	1,242	1,141	−8.1
Washington	333	308	−7.5
Oregon	253	236	−6.7
California	656	597	−9.0

Estimates by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

HALLETTSVILLE, TEX., *January 14, 1950.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR SIR: We note through the papers that the peanut acreage for 1950 has been greatly reduced again; this is going to work an awful hardship on the small peanut grower, due to the fact that the cut last year in this county cut quite a few of the growers to such small acreage.

We think that it should be so provided that there be a small minimum number of acres, per farm possibly 6 or 7 acres, and also in each county where the allowable peanut acreage to the farmer is so small that he does not use the allotment, it could be transferable to other farm or grower that was planting his small allotment.

We think such a policy would keep many little peanut growers carrying this as one of their projects to help them make their living and have a balanced all-around farm income for the whole year.

We believe that this provision should be written into the law and to insure its passage, we think petitions should be addressed to the Congressman of each district by the growers located therein.

We submit this for your consideration.

Yours truly,

O. B. SOKOL.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., January 18, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: The Cotton Branch of Production and Marketing Administration has referred to this office a letter dated December 15, 1949, to you from Mr. W. I. Crew and wife of Route 2, Grand Saline, Tex. We received a copy of this same letter in December and replied on December 22, 1949. Mr. Crew had requested your assistance in securing a 1950 cotton allotment for his farm.

According to available information, the farm had no cotton history in 1946, 1947, or 1948. Consequently, under existing legislation, it was not possible to establish a group I or regular cotton allotment during November or December of last year. The farm is probably eligible for a group II or new farm allotment, and therefore Mr. Crew should contact his county PMA committee soon and apply to them for a group II allotment. It is probable that such an allotment can be established before March 1, at which time he will be advised by the Wood County committee.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

DEAR LINDLEY: Am returning the material you sent me.

Thanks a lot for your help. One of my families are going to move. My gin customers are coming to me every day from around Big Sandy and Gladewater telling me they are out of the farming business if something isn't done. I have a $20,000 gin at Starrville that would like to let the United States Government have for $4,000 as I won't need it any more.

Your friend,

OLIN WEAVER.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., January 19, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letters of January 4 and 11 with which you enclosed copies of letters dated December 30 and January 5 from Mr. J. O. McCreight, of Yantis, Tex. Mr. McCreight had requested your assistance in securing larger cotton allotments for Wood County farms.

As stated in previous letters, amendatory legislation now being considered by the Congress will, no doubt, help 1950 farm cotton allotments in nearly all east Texas counties. However, it is my opinion that existing cotton legislation should be completely rewritten for the 1951 crop year to provide for the making of farm cotton allotments in diversified counties on the basis of average farm cotton history rather than on the basis of a percentage of cropland in such farms. This method of making allotments is being used successfully in peanut, wheat, and potato programs in this State. It was the method that Department of Agriculture spokesmen recommended to the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. I believe that it will correct nearly all of the inequities that have occurred in making 1950 farm cotton allotments in the specified counties.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., January 19, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letters of December 29, 30, 31, 1949, and January 7, 9, 11, 1950, in which you enclosed copies of letters from the following:

Mr. Oather Yarbrough, route 4, Wills Point, Tex.

Mr. Henry A. Godwin, Grand Saline, Tex.

Mr. W. H. Hopson, route 3, Ben Wheeler, Tex.

Mr. S. C. Huff, route 1, Ben Wheeler, Tex.

Mr. Arlie E. Hollowell, route 3, Grand Saline, Tex.
Mr. E. J. Hale, route 3, Grand Saline, Tex.
Mr. F. P. Boulter.
Mr. J. R. Hanson, route 7, box 53, Tyler, Tex.
Mr. Monroe Arnold, route 3, box 323, Tyler, Tex.
Mr. C. C. Garrett, route 1, box 70, Tyler, Tex.
Mr. W. L. Pettigrew, Grand Saline, Tex.

In each instance the writer had requested your assistance in securing a 1950 cotton acreage allotment for his farm.

As we understand the 11 letters, it was not possible for the State and county committees to establish group I or regular cotton allotments because there was no cotton history during one or more of the years 1946, 1947, or 1948. Therefore the farmer should contact his local county PMA committee soon and file an application for a new grower or Group II cotton allotment for 1950. Each county committee has reserved a small portion of the total county allotment for use in establishing allotments for farms on which there was no cotton history during the 3 years mentioned above. In all probability, new grower cotton allotments can be established by March 1, after which farmers who have applied will be notified.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

PINE GROVE FARM,
Ben Wheeler, Tex., January 21, 1950.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: My tenant had 5 acres of cotton last year—1948—which was the only cotton raised on my farm in several years. As the law now stands, if I get any cotton acreage it will have to come out of the new grower's allotment which will be but an acre or so, maybe none.

This is not fair. It seems to me that those who have not had the profit of raising cotton the last several years should be given a chance now and besides, during the war my farm produced war crop. If you can, please advise James Hodge, secretary ACA, Canton, to give me at least 6 acres.

B. E. YOUNGBLOOD.

Mr. Speaker, incidentally, I wired Mr. B. F. Vance as to whether or not he had made a survey of Texas to determine how many genuine cotton farmers might be compelled to quit growing cotton in 1950. I enclose his answer to my wire.

COLLEGE STATION, TEX., *January 16, 1950.*
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Retel January 16: Have not made survey on genuine cotton farmers as present legislation requires determinations only for farms.

B. F. VANCE.

Mr. Speaker, I include some communications I have received from other areas:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Raleigh, N. C., January 16, 1950.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Attached herewith is information which you requested in your letter of January 10, 1950.

If we can be of any further assistance to you in the future, please feel free to call upon us.

Very truly yours,

G. T. SCOTT,
State Director, Production and Marketing Administration.

Summary by counties of additional acreage allotment required to provide every farm with a 1950 cotton allotment equal to (1) 70 percent 1946–48 plantings, (2) 50 percent highest planted 1946–48, (3) larger of (1) or (2), and (4) estimated acreage that might be released

FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, HERBERT C. BONNER, WASHINGTON, N. C.

County	Additional acreage for 70-percent average, 1946–48	Additional acreage for 50-percent highest planted 1946–48	Higher of 70 percent of 3-year average or 50 percent of highest planted	Estimated acreage for reallocation
Beaufort	26.8	13.3	27.0	0
Camden	9.3	53.6	59.4	0
Chowan	18.2	19.7	37.7	25.0
Currituck	15.4	20.0	3.0	0
Gates	272.2	151.5	308.7	26.0
Hertford	426.6	362.7	582.5	35.0
Hyde	0	0	0	0
Martin	119.5	166.3	197.3	10.0
Pasquotank	7.9	2.4	8.3	0
Perquimans	6.0	21.6	27.6	0
Pitt	450.9	224.4	504.6	0
Tyrrell	0	263.6	1.0	0
Washington	1.9	6.0	6.0	50.0
Total	1,354.7	1,245.1	1,762.9	146.0

SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, JOHN H. KERR, WARRENTON, N. C.

Bertie	743.2	288.1	741.0	100.0
Edgecombe	1,216.0	536.0	1,405.0	50.0
Greene	913.5	398.6	984.3	0
Halifax	697.5	251.1	863.7	0
Lenoir	459.4	65.6	492.4	0
Northampton	0	71.7	71.7	0
Warren	299.2	97.2	399.6	0
Wilson	1,424.6	576.8	1,561.4	0
Total	5,753.4	2,285.1	6,519.1	150.0

THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, GRAHAM A. BARDEN, NEW BERN, N. C.

Carteret	29.3	171.9	172.1	0
Craven	10.8	10.6	21.4	0
Duplin	941.0	361.5	1,002.9	0
Jones	21.5	83.4	104.9	0
Onslow	2.8	257.0	257.0	0
Pamlico	14.2	8.5	22.7	0
Pender	0	0	0	0
Sampson	3,083.9	745.1	3,336.8	0
Wayne	2,139.6	983.4	2,428.7	0
Total	6,243.1	2,621.4	7,346.5	0

FOURTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, HAROLD D. COOLEY, NASHVILLE, N. C.

Chatham	0	1.7	1.7	50.0
Franklin	1,025.2	154.0	1,122.7	0
Johnston	2,617.4	765.7	2,861.2	0
Nash	3,495.6	1,795.9	3,594.8	0
Randolph	0	.8	.8	0
Vance	236.0	170.0	272.0	0
Wake	613.7	449.7	863.7	0
Total	7,987.9	3,337.8	8,716.9	50.0

FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, THURMOND CHATHAM, WINSTON-SALEM, N. C.

Caswell	0	0	0	0
Forsyth	0	0	0	0
Granville	101.1	118.1	17.0	193.1
Total	101.1	118.1	17.0	193.1

SIXTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, CARL T. DURHAM, CHAPEL HILL, N. C.

Alamance	1.0	0	1.0	2.0
Durham	27.7	0	27.7	4.0
Guilford	0	0	0	50.0
Orange	0	0	0	0
Total	28.7	0	28.7	56.0

Summary by counties of additional acreage allotment required to provide every farm with a 1950 cotton allotment equal to (1) 70 percent 1946–48 plantings, (2) 50 percent highest planted 1946–48, (3) larger of (1) or (2), and (4) estimated acreage that might be released—Continued

SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, F. ERTEL CARLYLE, LUMBERTON, N. C.

County	Additional acreage for 70-percent average, 1946–48	Additional acreage for 50-percent highest planted 1946–48	Higher of 70 percent of 3-year average or 50 percent of highest planted	Estimated acreage for reallocation
Bladen	131.5	182.3	278.5	0
Brunswick	7.7	5.4	12.4	0
Columbus	295.4	267.8	393.0	10.0
Cumberland	1,381.7	368.0	1,559.7	0
Harnett	3,477.9	994.3	3,695.8	0
New Hanover	4.0	3.0	4.5	0
Robeson	5,053.0	953.0	5,231.0	0
Total	10,351.2	2,773.8	11,174.9	10.0

EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, C. B. DEANS, ROCKINGHAM, N. C.

Anson	2,232.8	420.0	2,421.1	50.0
Davidson	0	20.7	0	25.0
Davie	28.2	89.1	106.3	50.0
Hoke	1,519.7	410.7	1,602.4	0
Lee	.7	45.8	46.3	0
Montgomery	309.6	204.1	365.2	10.0
Moore	326.0	291.0	422.2	0
Richmond	1,909.0	651.7	2,067.1	0
Scotland	3,693.6	1,163.7	3,904.1	25.0
Union	903.6	617.8	1,258.5	500.0
Wilkes	0	0	0	0
Yadkin	0	0	0	130.0
Total	10,923.2	3,914.6	12,193.2	790.0

NINTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, R. L. DOUGHTON, LAUREL SPRINGS, N. C.

Alexander	53.5	22.1	64.2	0
Cabarrus	900.0	401.8	1,100.9	0
Caldwell	.1	.5	.5	0
Iredell	63.4	168.4	223.7	0
Rowan	308.0	285.0	488.0	25.0
Stanly	11.6	49.2	49.2	0
Total	1,336.6	927.0	1,926.5	25.0

TENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, HAMILTON C. JONES, CHARLOTTE, N. C.

Burke	0	12.3	12.3	0
Catawba	134.3	107.7	179.2	0
Lincoln	1,407.0	535.0	1,611.0	0
Mecklenburg	1,525.1	75.1	1,806.9	0
Total	3,066.4	730.1	3,609.4	0

ELEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, A. L. BULWINKLE, GASTONIA, N. C.

Cleveland	7,159.4	1,696.4	7,516.0	0
Gaston	604.7	387.2	892.5	0
Polk	304.8	30.0	315.3	0
Rutherford	3,252.1	945.3	3,437.1	0
Total	11,321.0	3,058.9	12,160.9	0
State total	58,467.3	21,011.9	65,456.0	1,420.1

GREENWOOD, S. C., *January 19, 1950.*
Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Greenwood County needs 3,000 additional cotton acreage to keep genuine cotton farmers and cotton tenants farming. Proposed amendment would help if farmers actual-planted acreage used. If adjusted acreage figures used, amendment would be worthless.

R. P. HIGGINS.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
State College, N. Mex., January 12, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
United States Representative,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In response to your request of January 3, we are listing below by counties, the 1942 cotton allotment, actual cotton acreages in counties for 1947 and 1948 as estimated by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and the 1950 cotton-acreage allotment. The 1950 cotton allotment for counties does not include the PMA State committee reserve for new growers.

County	1942 cotton allotment	1947 cotton acreage, BAE	1948 cotton acreage, BAE	1950 cotton allotment
Chaves	26,322	83,500	49,600	36,961
Curry	1,024	----------	100	84
De Baca	59	----------	40	41
Dona Ana	36,588	66,200	72,600	53,537
Eddy	25,733	27,800	38,000	27,974
Grant	24	----------	----------	44
Harding	240	----------	----------	44
Hidalgo	433	700	2,800	2,418
Lea	1,277	6,000	18,000	15,367
Luna	2,172	6,700	12,600	10,205
Otero	548	580	700	671
Quay	2,649	600	5,100	4,809
Roosevelt	18,633	12,750	11,260	8,533
Sierra	855	2,000	2,300	2,107
Socorro	51	10	200	185

We could have complied with your request sooner but your letter was addressed to Santa Fe, N. Mex., instead of State College.

Very truly yours,

V. G. BARTON,
Administrative Officer, State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Berkeley, Calif., January 12, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your letter dated January 3, 1950, addressed to the Production and Marketing Administration in Sacramento, Calif., requesting information regarding cotton acreages and allotments in California has been referred to this office for reply.

Attached is a table containing the information by counties as you have requested.

Very truly yours,

E. H. SPOOR,
Chairman, California PMA Committee.

California cotton statistics

County	Cotton acreage allotments			
	1942	1947 [1]	1948 [1]	1950
Fresno	87,385	139,000	221,000	169,318
Kern	77,505	143,000	216,000	165,487
Kings	41,566	78,000	109,900	88,164
Madera	51,260	46,050	65,400	50,106
Merced	28,710	18,000	25,800	19,767
Tulare	91,440	109,000	168,000	128,712
Stanislaus	1,272	50	60	46
San Benito	180	0	60	46
Imperial	8,508	9	80	922
Riverside	12,299	2,891	3,660	4,047
San Bernardino	98	0	40	31
San Diego	36	0	0	0
San Joaquin	42	0	0	0
Total	400,537	536,000	810,000	626,646

[1] Total planted acreage—Cotton allotments were not in effect for 1947 and 1948.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Hugo, Okla., January 20, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
United States Congressman,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In answer to your letter of January 16, 1950, we wish to advise that we held out the full amount the law allowed for cotton adjustments which was 15 percent of the county allocation.

It is very doubtful if the 70-percent amendment would benefit any of our farmers.

We need 2,000 acres to make the necessary adjustments. We believe if the release-and-reapportionment law can be effected these adjustments can be made from the farms of farmers who have allotments but who will not plant any cotton.

Yours very truly,

W. A. MORRISON,
Chairman, Choctaw County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Gainesville, Fla., January 18, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Reference is made to your letter of January 13.

The Florida State PMA Committee set aside as a reserve the full 10 percent of the State allotment permitted by law. We requested every county committee in cotton counties to set aside the full 15 percent permitted by law. Everyone of the committees, without exception, did so.

In 14 counties out of the 20 cotton counties of the State of Florida all of the county committee's 15 percent plus all that could be spared from the State reserve was required to meet the mandatory small-farm provision. Six counties had a very small acreage (12 to 457) left for adjustments to larger farms after meeting the small-farm minimum. After supplementing county reserves that were inadequate for this purpose, we have 362 acres left in the State reserve for new farms. We estimate that there will be approximately 1,000 new farm applications.

Our total State allotment is 41,570 acres of which 11,374 acres (in addition to their computed allotment) was required to meet the mandatory small-farm provisions.

The cropland factor approach was also a source of many inequitable allotments for the larger farms and you can readily see from the above that neither the State nor the county committees had no possible way to remedy the situation.

Yours very truly,

R. S. DENNIS,
Executive Officer.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Gainesville, Fla., January 23, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Mr. H. G. Clayton, director, agricultural extension service, University of Florida, has requested that we furnish you a record by counties of the additional acreage required to give eligible old grower cotton farms in Florida:

1. Fifty percent of the highest cotton acreage in the years 1946–1948 (highest acreage to include war-crop or veterans credit).
2. Seventy percent of the average acreage of cotton grown in the years 1946–1948 (war-crop credit excluded).
3. Larger of item 1 or 2.

These estimates were recently compiled and a record of such estimates is attached.

Please note that our estimate for the 70-percent provision referred to in item 2 above does not include war-crop credit. No estimate has been compiled on that basis under the 70-percent proviso.

Yours very truly,

R. S. DENNIS,
Executive Officer.

County	Florida State summary of additional cotton acreage required to provide each farm with—		
	50 percent of highest planted cotton acreage including war-crop credit for 1946, 1947, or 1948	70 percent of average acreage of cotton grown in 1946, 1947, 1948 (war-crop credit excluded)	Larger of item 1 or 2 (farm basis)
DISTRICT 1			
Bay	1.7	0	1.7
Calhoun	2.5	4.1	5.6
Escambia	302.9	220.6	336.8
Gadsden	0	0	0
Holmes	314.9	356.0	455.3
Jackson	480.0	269.7	530.4
Jefferson	98.3	89.5	129.5
Leon	73.9	76.1	112.3
Liberty	0	0	0
Okaloosa	164.0	108.8	201.9
Santa Rosa	481.4	278.2	566.4
Walton	262.7	180.5	325.2
Washington	31.5	11.6	36.6
DISTRICT 3			
Columbia	14.5	0	14.5
Hamilton	90.8	72.6	113.0
Lafayette	0	0	0
Madison	322.4	214.4	376.4
Suwannee	37.4	1.9	37.4
Taylor	0	0	0
DISTRICT 5			
Alachua	5.0	.8	5.0
State totals	2,683.9	1,884.8	3,248.0

LIVINGSTON, ALA., *January 18, 1950.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The county committee of Sumter County held out only a small number of acres—not 1 percent—using the BAE figures cut our acreage so drastically that nothing seemed to help.

The proposed 70 percent of actual planted acreage in 1946–48 would satisfy our farmers. As the status now is many tenant farmers will have to move and find work at something they have never done before.

While the farmers believe some control is necessary, they do not think the drastic cut imposed is necessary.

Sincerely yours,

H. V. HUDSON,
Chairman, County Committee,
Sumter County.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Baton Rouge, La., January 17, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will acknowledge your letters date January 3 and

January 10 requesting the following information:

1. 1942 county cotton acreage allotments;

2. Acreage planted to cotton by counties in the years 1947 and 1948;

3. The 1950 cotton acreage allotments for counties; and

4. The additional acreage that would be needed to give each cotton farm a 1950 allotment equal to the larger of 70 percent of the average acreage planted to cotton on the farm in the years 1946, 1947, 1948 or 50 percent of the highest acreage planted to cotton including credit for war crops in any one of the above noted 3 years.

The enclosure contains the information requested. The acreages planted to cotton for the years 1947–48 represent BAE estimates. The additional acreage required to raise each farm's allotment to the 70–50 provision is an estimate based on a 20-percent sample.

If there is any further information that you need, please advise us.

Sincerely yours,

L. A. MULLIN,
Chairman, State PMA Committee.

	1942 allotment	BAE 1947 planted acres	BAE 1948 planted acres	1950 allotment	Additional acreage required to increase farm allotments to larger of "70 or 50 percent"
Acadia	27,812.7	19,400.0	20,900.0	21,862.0	123.7
Allen	5,164.8	730.0	1,010.0	2,498.8	25.5
Ascension	976.9	370.0	630.0	764.2	0
Assumption	0	0	0	0	0
Avoyelles	36,833.2	26,800.0	34,400.0	30,384.3	139.1
Beauregard	3,499.0	210.0	250.0	566.7	0
Bienville	44,336.4	13,100.0	15,500.0	15,389.0	24.0
Bossier	44,487.4	36,600.0	40,900.0	32,985.3	363.4
Caddo	71,847.5	63,000.0	68,000.0	54,765.4	722.3
Calcasieu	5,187.5	330.0	500.0	1,087.2	11.0
Caldwell	10,395.0	6,600.0	8,600.0	6,545.3	106.1
Cameron	4,707.9	1,060.0	1,350.0	1,670.8	20.4
Catahoula	18,259.5	15,000.0	18,000.0	14,384.8	246.7
Claiborne	56,027.2	30,300.0	27,800.0	96,555.8	238.1
Concordia	16,997.3	12,400.0	15,500.0	12,307.1	48.9
DeSoto	50,423.1	23,000.0	24,900.0	20,876.8	171.7
East Baton Rouge	7,850.5	990.0	1,130.0	2,273.6	8.8
East Carroll	32,905.1	35,200.0	42,500.0	52,932.5	181.5
East Feliciana	14,364.0	7,700.0	7,700.0	8,463.1	33.4
Evangeline	32,235.8	20,200.0	22,200.0	24,608.1	157.0
Franklin	59,521.9	65,500.0	72,000.0	57,568.8	471.1
Grant	10,179.8	6,350.0	7,050.0	5,988.0	39.6
Iberia	2,508.5	1,820.0	2,720.0	2,566.2	8.7
Iberville	1,064.5	550.0	750.0	1,051.4	0
Jackson	14,075.6	1,830.0	2,480.0	2,954.0	10.8
Jefferson Davis	8,341.7	1,170.0	1,240.0	4,212.1	23.6
Lafayette	31,457.8	25,200.0	29,400.0	25,170.6	94.7
Lafourche	1,202.7	420.0	500.0	379.0	0
La Salle	3,121.5	500.0	700.0	875.3	5.5
Lincoln	39,272.4	15,700.0	12,100.0	14,784.4	176.4
Livingston	2,879.9	290.0	440.0	679.8	1.0
Madison	25,670.0	24,100.0	27,200.0	22,289.4	216.8
Morehouse	39,192.4	35,000.0	44,100.0	33,957.1	574.6
Natchitoches	51,484.2	41,500.0	50,000.0	39,455.9	320.6
Orleans Group	38.5	10.0	10.0	8.0	
Ouachita	24,344.9	20,400.0	22,800.0	18,312.2	505.1
Pointe Coupee	17,788.5	12,700.0	15,300.0	13,394.5	341.8
Rapides	29,569.6	19,900.0	23,400.0	19,023.1	291.1
Red River	33,647.9	23,700.0	26,800.0	21,804.0	274.6
Richland	52,420.0	54,000.0	65,000.0	50,432.3	382.3
Sabine	22,274.6	5,400.0	6,600.0	7,133.4	82.3
St. Charles	2.9			0	
St. Helena	7,522.1	1,940.0	2,420.0	3,382.5	4.2
St. James	2.4	0	10.0	3.5	0
St. John	0	0	0	0	
St. Landry	58,537.0	50,000.0	55,000.0	47,110.9	221.2
St. Martin	11,967.0	9,700.0	13,700.0	12,085.4	150.9
St. Mary	217.0	0	0	55.0	0
St. Tammany	2,547.3	310.0	420.0	681.4	2.5
Tangipahoa	9,132.6	1,330.0	1,860.0	2,940.8	32.8
Tensas	29,562.2	28,800.0	30,300.0	24,966.0	387.0
Terrebonne	0	0	0	0	0
Union	36,254.9	13,300.0	13,200.0	15,740.1	85.5
Vermilion	22,592.3	9,750.0	9,750.0	15,278.4	165.9
Vernon	10,074.0	1,190.0	1,930.0	3,439.4	11.1
Washington	21,830.8	8,150.0	8,800.0	11,011.8	32.8
Webster	37,058.7	14,800.0	15,800.0	14,719.0	201.1
West Baton Rouge	1,574.5	1,220.0	1,910.0	1,448.9	1.3
West Carroll	32,474.7	24,400.0	33,600.0	25,988.4	181.5
West Feliciana	6,507.9	2,370.0	3,420.0	3,489.8	3.1
Winn	10,781.4	1,710.0	2,520.0	2,995.4	17.2
Total	1,253,007.4	838,000.0	957,000.0	838,297.0	7,940.3

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Natchitoches, La., January 16, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of January 12, 1950, this is to advise that the Natchitoches Parish PMA Committee held a 9-percent reserve for adjustments. A 15-percent reserve could have been held.

The committee did not hold the full 15-percent reserve because they realized that it would be difficult to make an equitable distribution before allotment notices, showing the computed acreages, were mailed to the farmers.

It is believed that a much better job of distribution could have been made of the reserve that was held if we could have mailed the farmers a notice of the computed allotment and then have allocated the reserve at a later date. In this way, we would have been able to help some of the hardship cases that came to our attention later.

As to the enclosed amendment, if the 70-percent minimum were based on BAE figures, we would get about 1,365 acres; however, in many cases, the reported figures were reduced below the actual average in order to come within BAE figures.

We could take care of most of our hardship cases with 3,000 additional acres.

A frozen-acreage provision would help the situation here quite a lot. If we could pick up unused acreage from now until April 30, 1950, we could get enough acreage to help many of our hardship cases.

Yours very truly,

H. L. SISSON,
Parish Administrative Officer.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Jonesboro, La., January 20, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of January 16, 1950, concerning 1950 cotton-acreage allotments.

Before our committee obtained a factor to apply against the cropland of each cotton farm we reserved the full 15 percent allowed us to reserve. The suggested amendment enclosed with your letter would give us about 50 additional acres.

Our parish needs about 100 acres of additional acreage to keep genuine cotton farmers and genuine cotton tenants farming.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. DAVIS,
Secretary, Jackson Parish PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Decatur, Ill., January 18, 1950.

Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Reference is made to your letter of December 13, 1949, which was addressed to Springfield, Ill., and consequently was delayed in reaching this office.

Originally the State committee reserved the full 10 percent in setting up cotton-acreage allotments. Each of the two counties reserved a full 15 percent. However, in order to comply with the 5-acre minimum requirement, we found it necessary to use the 15-percent reserve in each county and also all of the State's 10-percent reserve except 70 acres in one county and 90 acres in the other. This small reserve was held for appeals and corrections.

Very truly yours,

HARRY M. COMBRINK,
Acting Chairman, Illinois PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION,
Forsyth, Ga., January 23, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In answer to your inquiry dated January 16, 1950, the following is submitted:

1. The county committee reserved the full percent it could reserve.

2. The committee reserved 15 percent of the total county allocation.

3. The amendment attached, if approved, would be of no benefit to this county.

4. If this county had 50 acres, with no strings attached, we could satisfy every cotton farmer in the county.

For the Monroe County committee:

HUGH W. MERCER,
County Administration Officer, Monroe County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Jackson, Miss., January 16, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is with reference to your letter of January 13 requesting information relative to the percentage of the State cotton allotment withheld as a State committee reserve.

Including the acreage set up by the Cotton Branch as a reserve for small farm increases, our State committee withheld 3.33 percent of the State allotment as a State committee reserve. According to Public Law 272, there were four specific items for which the State committee could withhold acreages as a reserve. These are as follows:

1. For trends.
2. For abnormal conditions affecting the planting of cotton.
3. Acreage for new farms.
4. Acreage for small farm increases.

No reserve was withheld on the State basis for trends. After a study of available data it was the opinion of the committee that a 4-year average represented about as direct a trend as any other trend formula that could have been worked out.

For abnormal conditions affecting the planting of cotton 0.56 percent was withheld. All of the adjustments for abnormal conditions were made in consideration of overflow conditions along the Yazoo River prevailing during the planting season in the counties involved. The adjustments were based on acreage data furnished by United States Army engineers and Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

For new growers, 1.09 percent of the State allotment was withheld. This amount was estimated to be about one-half the needs for new growers in the State. County committees were required to withhold approximately one-half of the acreage that was estimated to be needed in each county for new growers. It was felt that this procedure would, in the long run, have a tendency to require county committees to screen applications for new growers closer than they might if all of the allotment for new growers was held out on the State level.

For small-farm increases, 1.68 percent of the State allotment was withheld. This acreage was the same amount that the Cotton Branch set up as a minimum that could be used for small-farm increases and, if not used for such purposes, would be "frozen." Therefore, the State committee did not withhold any additional acreage for small-farm increases because at the time the State committee withheld its reserve it was felt that this amount would be sufficient to provide the necessary increases for small farms as required by law.

No additional amount was withheld by the State committee as a State reserve because it was the understanding of the committee that it had withheld all that was allowed under the law—that is, for the four purposes specified in the act—even though it was realized that a maximum of 10 percent was authorized where it could be justified.

Very truly yours,

T. M. PATTERSON,
Executive Officer.

MONTICELLO, MISS., *January 18, 1950.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Lawrence County Cotton Committee did not reserve the full percent that could have been reserved. We reserved only 12 percent of the official county allotment, due to the fact that our acreage allotment was so small.

The amendment setting up 70 percent of the farmers actual acreage in 1946, 1947, 1948 would alleviate our troubles if the individual farmer received 70 percent of his actual planted acres in 1946–48.

Lawrence County needs additional acres of cotton to keep genuine cotton farmers and genuine cotton tenants farming. An additional 1,000 acres is needed for the county under the present set-up to justify the needs of the cotton farmers.

If additional acres are not given to this county many owners and tenants who have been depending on cotton for their only income will be forced to divert to some other means of making a living or lose their property.

Very truly yours,

DUDLEY O. MILLER,
Chairman, Lawrence County Committee, Production and Marketing Administration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARSHALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the magazine America.

Mr. GORSKI (at the request of Mr. ADDONIZIO) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD with reference to H. R. 6769, a bill pertaining to an increase in loans to the farmers.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LESINSKI addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HEFFERNAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Brooklyn Eagle paying tribute to Rabbi Abraham Mayer Heller.

Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include therein a newspaper article and also an article prepared by him for a newspaper.

Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 hour, following the regular order of business and any other special orders previously entered, on the 15th of February, the fifty-second anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine* in Habana Harbor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a citizen of his State.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, how long can respect for our State Department be maintained, and how long can confidence be retained in it when the head of that Department still hugs to his bosom a former employee and official of that Department who now stands exposed as an unquestioned betrayer of his country?

How long can respect for and confidence in our Supreme Court be maintained when one of its Justices is the man who sponsored this convicted betrayer of our country, and helped to place him in position where he could betray it?

How can there be a feeling of assurance that the American people can look for straightforward and constitutional decisions when questions are presented to the Supreme Court for determination which involves conflicts between communistic philosophies on the one hand and American principles on the other, when two out of the nine members of the Court endeavored to save this betrayer of our country from his just punishment?

This is the same Court which has been overruling established decisions, and insinuating into the body of our laws, by a process which might be termed "judicial legislation" new doctrines taken from the Communist Party line.

This is the Court where cases are now pending seeking to overthrow additional decisions, and upset established practices by the substitution of new and radical doctrines also taken from the Communist Party line philosophy.

On January 24 I called attention to the fact on the floor of this House that Frankfurter and Acheson, who have consistently upheld Alger Hiss and others of his stripe, are still occupying positions of power in our Government. I stated then, and I repeat now, that the conviction of Hiss for his betrayal of America to the Communists is but a scratch on the surface.

It is only a small part of the clean-up which is going to have to be made if we expect to save our country and our Government.

Our Government should be purged, root and branch, of all who aid and abet, directly or indirectly, those whose loyalty to our Government is even doubtful.

Birds of a feather flock together, and our Government should be cleansed of all those who countenance to any degree treason and disloyalty to the Government.

GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, 70 years ago today one of the most distinguished men in military history was born in my district in the city of Little Rock. When little Douglas MacArthur appeared at the home of Colonel and Mrs. Arthur MacArthur, perhaps, no one in the little city dreamed that he would achieve the great fame that has come to him in this generation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am glad to join with the gentleman from Arkansas in calling attention to the general's birthday. In 50 years as a soldier he has received 43 decorations and 10 campaign ribbons. He started in as an aide under President Theodore Roosevelt and now has the colossal job of work in Japan. He is a great statesman, a great soldier, and a Christian gentleman.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. He was the No. 1 man in his graduating class at West Point.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I felt that the House would want me to call attention to the fact that this is the general's birthday and to acknowledge appreciation of his monumental service to our country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] has expired.

EDUCATION OR TRAINING OF VETERANS

Mr. McSWEENEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 447), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2596) relating to education or training of veterans under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (Public Law 346, 78th Cong., June 22, 1944). That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an expression of an outstanding American, Mr. Justice Kirk, of the Appellate Court of Illinois.

SECRETARY OF STATE ACHESON

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the statement made by the Secretary of State yesterday did not surprise me. It may, however, be terrifying to the people of this country. The Secretary seems to be completely oblivious of the gathering storm of public indignation which, when it breaks, will probably sweep his little Kremlin clean.

ALGER HISS—TREASON AT YALTA

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if Alger Hiss would only speak up now and tell the entire story, in my opinion, he could unmask a cabal of treachery to this country, the like of which America has never known.

A great many men have wanted to know how the Committee on Un-American Activities ever found Whittaker Chambers. They learned from other ex-Communists what he had been doing. The committee subpenaed Chambers, and when he came and laid the facts before them, Hiss was brought to trial.

They took something like a year to try the case in New York, and spent about a million dollars of the Government's money. The jury convicted Hiss without a dissenting vote.

I agree with what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has said, and I agree with what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] has said. Our country has never been in more danger from within than she is today. For God's sake, let us protect America.

Let the Committee on Un-American Activities investigate the treason at Yalta, where the victory our boys had won was turned over to Communist Russia—the worst enemy our Christian civilization has ever known.

As I pointed out, a day or two ago, President Roosevelt was a sick man, both mentally and physically, at the time of the Yalta Conference; but the conspirators seemed to be wide awake and on the job.

At this point, I am inserting a letter from the senior investigator of the Committee on Un-American Activities telling how Whittaker Chambers was discovered and brought before the committee to give testimony that led ultimately to the conviction of Alger Hiss.

The letter referred to follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, January 26, 1950.

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RANKIN: In response to your telephonic request of today for information on how the Committee on Un-American Activities first gained knowledge of Mr. Whittaker Chambers, the following facts contained in the records of the committee are set forth:

The Committee on Un-American Activities in early 1948, through confidential sources, obtained considerable information concerning Mr. Chambers' Communist affiliations and possible Communist underground operations. In April 1948, in connection with a case under investigation by the committee, two investigators interviewed Mr. Chambers in New York City. During the interview, Mr. Chambers acknowledged former membership in the Communist Party, and identified Nathan Witt, John Abt, Lee Pressman, Alger Hiss, Donald Hiss, Victor Perlo, Charles Kramer, Henry Collins, and Harold Ware (deceased) as having been members of a Communist apparatus in Washington, D. C., for the express purpose of infiltrating the Government.

The committee continued its investigation of this alleged Communist apparatus and several months thereafter uncovered Elizabeth Bentley, a self-confessed ex-Communist and courier for an espionage unit operating within the Government in Washington, D. C. Testimony regarding espionage activities within the Government involving approximately 30 individuals was given before the Committee on Un-American Activities by Miss Bentley on July 31, 1948. Among those identified by Miss Bentley were Charles Kramer and Victor Perlo, who had previously been identified by Mr. Chambers to members of the investigative staff as members of the Communist Party. Mr. Chambers was subpenaed to testify before the committee on August 3, 1948, to corroborate in part the testimony of Miss Bentley and to give additional testimony concerning Communist infiltration of the United States Government. In his testimony, Mr. Chambers identified Mr. Alger Hiss along with the other individuals he had named earlier to the investigators.

In subsequent hearings, Mr. Alger Hiss denied that he had ever been a member of the Communist Party or had participated in an underground Communist apparatus. Information developed in the hearings before this committee eventually led to the indictment of Mr. Alger Hiss in New York City and to his subsequent conviction for perjury in his testimony before the grand jury in New York City.

It is hoped that the above information satisfactorily answers your request.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS J. RUSSELL,
Senior Investigator.

THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to urge the membership of the House of Representatives, through you as Speaker of the House, to advise the President of the United States that we, the duly elected representatives of the people, feel that the President should

immediately invite Mr. John L. Lewis and the representatives of the coal-mine operators to the White House for the purpose of allowing the President to appeal to both sides to agree to terms under which the mining of coal may be restored to normalcy—at least until the coal supply above ground has reached the point where the health and safety of the citizens of this Nation are not imperiled—while arbitration is carried on.

The Director of the Bureau of Mines has informed the President that coal stocks are at the danger point. The President has steadfastly refused to use the instruments given to him by the Congress to deal with the situation. It is now imperative that all of us recognize our oaths and ask that the President—however reluctant he may be—use his great office to protect the inherent rights of the citizens of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has found itself divided on most issues since we reconvened in January, but I sincerely believe that on this plea to the President we should all find a common meeting ground.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CHURCH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JONAS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE SHORTAGE OF COAL

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include resolutions dealing with the coal situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of the President to the fact that Nero fiddled while Rome burned.

Within the last 24 hours Dr. James Boyd, head of the Bureau of Mines, one of the administration's fact-finding agencies, has advised the President and the country that there is a national emergency because of the lack of coal, that the people are suffering, and that the economy of the country is suffering and will be disastrously affected if present coal conditions are permitted to continue. What more does the President want before he is convinced that it is his duty—if not his pleasure—to use the Taft-Hartley law which the Congress has provided to put an end to this coal shortage? It seems that everybody but the President already knows there is a shortage of coal.

My good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] has just suggested that some days ago he went to the White House in person and asked that the President call in John L. Lewis and the coal operators and urge them to get together and compose their differences. The gentleman from Illinois is still of the opinion that this should be done. Mr. Speaker, that will only mean more delay—time is of the essence. The country wants something done now, not next week or next month. We have another cold spell in Michigan, and our people are getting desperate.

I am just in receipt of a message from the city of Monroe, Mich., including official resolutions depicting what is happening in that city of 22,000 so far as fuel coal is concerned. Just some more evidence as to actual coal shortages throughout the Nation. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas despite rationing and curtailment of coal deliveries for 6 weeks, Monroe coal merchants are running short of coal, householders' bins are nearly empty in many cases, and the few shipments of coal reaching Monroe are insufficient to meet mounting demand; and

Whereas surveys reveal that if the present shortage continues the entire local coal supply may be exhausted within a few days, leaving a large proportion of homes in this community without means of heating and wholly at the mercy of severe weather; and

Whereas efforts to replenish supplies and build up a margin of safety are rendered fruitless by the national shortage, stemming from coal strikes and 3-day workweeks, and by the facts as reported in the press that other communities throughout the State and in other States are in a like dilemma: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Monroe City Commission, That a local emergency exists in that the public health and welfare is endangered by the critical shortage of coal; be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States be informed of the emergency herein declared and respectfully requested to take such action as he may by law be empowered to take to relieve the same and the causes thereof; be it further

Resolved, That the contents of this resolution be communicated to Michigan Representatives in both Houses of Congress, and to the Governor of the State of Michigan.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FENTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four separate instances and in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. CLEVENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND ALGER HISS

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the shocking statement "I do not intend to turn my back on Alger Hiss," made by Mr. Dean Acheson, yesterday at a press conference, which he called as a high official of the Federal Government, the Secretary of State, illustrates again what has been the curse of this administration and its predecessor, personal government.

Mr. Acheson as an individual has a perfect right, of course, to choose as his cronies, whoever he wishes, and stick to them as he wishes; and I respect his determination as an individual to stand by anybody who has been a good friend of his. But as the Secretary of State, he is not just an individual. He has loyalties and responsibilities that must transcend any loyalties he may have as an individual. It is no longer Dean Acheson and Alger Hiss; it is the Secretary of State of the United States and a man who betrayed a trust, acting as an enemy of the United States. If the Secretary of State does not intend to turn his back on such a man, duly convicted in our courts of perjury regarding the most heinous of all crimes, treason, then a responsible Congress and the people of the United States must demand that the President of the United States turn his back on Mr. Dean Acheson as his Secretary of State.

WAGES IN THE SUGAR INDUSTRY

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time when we are hearing so much about wage-and-hour legislation I think it is appropriate to again call attention to what is taking place under the Sugar Act. Our majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, I am sure will remember that when we extended the Sugar Act he took a leading part in seeing that labor was included in the act. We do not need more legislation; all we need is some recognition of the fact that labor is labor, including sugar production. I realize that the rural population of this country is only 20 percent of the total population, but surely they are subject to the same labor-legislation benefits as other groups. As long as we maintain a minimum wage of 25 to 32 cents an hour under the Sugar Act, just so long will I believe that this administration is not too wholeheartedly interested in minimum wages.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on General MacArthur at 70.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a magazine article appearing in an English magazine Truth and in the other some remarks of Mr. GWINN, of New York.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include an editorial in each.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

[Mr. VURSELL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DEAN ACHESON

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I have heretofore asked that we get a new Secretary of State. I do not approve of the actions of the present incumbent. I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] and the gentleman from Minnesota, WALTER JUDD, in reference to the State Department.

Mr. Speaker, from the things that have happened in China and other countries in the world, I do not know of anyone who has worked more for the interest of Mr. Joe Stalin than our Secretary of State, Dean Acheson. I think if Joe Stalin wants a new secretary of state we can spare Dean Acheson to the advantage of our country's welfare. No greater bomb can be thrown at our security than his defense and esteem for Alger Hiss, who was convicted by the courts of our land as a perjurer.

THE SUFFERING OF THE INDIANS OF MONTANA

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I had a long distance telephone call last night from Mr. Hugo Aronson, a man I have known for years and whose statement can be relied upon. He told of the severe cold weather in Montana, the temperature averaging from 30° to 50° below. In addition, on the Blackfeet Reservation there has been snow until the roads and trails are blocked.

Last summer eastern Montana suffered a serious drought, along with a grasshopper infestation. The result is that on the Fort Belknap, Fort Peck, Rocky Boy, Northern Cheyenne, and Blackfeet Indian Reservations there is great suffering.

My friend visited the Blackfeet Reservation yesterday and he found Indian families without food and fuel; they were actually tearing up the floors in their cabins to use as fuel.

I personally visited these reservations in December and know of the dire situation that faces these Indians if adequate relief is not provided.

On the Fort Belknap Reservation, the income per family last year was only $350. On the Fort Peck the feed supply for livestock was only 25 percent of normal. The result is not only low income from the reservations, but also fewer jobs, and when there was a job, it was only short-time work. Therefore, the Indians have not been able to provide for themselves as they would normally.

Food and fuel are disastrously short. There is need for relief funds, hospital funds, food, and fuel.

The regional director, Mr. Paul Fickinger, is authority for the State, and reports funds are exhausted and 2,700 Indians need immediate help. Havre, Miles City, Forsyth, and other Montana cities have sent supplies and have tried to help in this difficult situation.

These Indians are wards of the Federal Government; we have assumed the responsibility for their welfare. There is terrific need and suffering.

On my return to Washington early this month, I called this situation to the attention of the Indian Bureau. Time and again I have emphasized the need for help. I shall ask the Appropriations Committee for additional relief funds.

I believe this is a matter that the Congress should know about. It is not the kind of a situation we want to have in this United States.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SADLAK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SPREAD BETWEEN FARMER AND CONSUMER

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I received this morning some very interesting comments derived from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics concerning the squeeze that the farmers of the Midwest, the food producers of this Nation, are now undergoing.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture summarizes the price spreads between the farmers and the consumers by computing the annual retail cost of a market basket of food for a family of three average consumers together with the distribution of this cost between the farmer and the marketing system. At the prices prevailing in July 1948, the annual retail cost of this market basket for three people would have been $712.

In October 1949 the same quantity of food could be purchased for $637. During this period when the retail cost of an annual food supply for a family of three was falling $75, the farm price of this food fell $69, while charges made for services performed after the commodities left the farm declined only $6.

THE LATE RICHARD T. BUCKLER

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a news item.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a sad mission here today. I report to you the death of a former Member of the House and my predecessor in Congress, Richard T. Buckler, who passed to the great beyond last Monday at his farm home near Crookston, in Polk County, Minn. It is with a special feeling of sadness that I make this announcement since I served Mr. Buckler for 8 years as his secretary and assistant.

Many of the older Members of the Congress remember "Dick" Buckler when he served here in the Seventy-fourth, Seventy-fifth, Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses. They will recall his down-to-earth speeches here on agricultural questions and his fighting heart when it came to protecting the farmers of his district and the Nation.

It has been my pleasure and privilege to serve the Ninth District of Minnesota as his successor. He retired voluntarily from Congress and active public life because of his health and age. His service and work long will be remembered in the hearts of his old associates here and the many thousands of his friends and sup-

porters in the Ninth District and the State of Minnesota.

Richard T. Buckler was born in Coles County, Ill., and in 1904 came to Polk County, Minn., where he has operated several sections of land successfully.

He was elected for his four terms here as a Farmer-Labor Representative and at one time was the only Member of that party in the House. While here, he made an enviable record, particularly on farm legislation. His advice and counsel were invaluable, indeed, to many of the men who served with him when it came to writing and debating laws relating to agriculture.

He had reached the age of 85 and lived a long and useful life as a member of the Minnesota Senate for 12 years; an active member of the Farm Bureau and Farmers Union since they were organized; State chairman of the Farmer-Labor Party, appointed by the late Governor Floyd B. Olson in 1924; and then elected to this House for four consecutive terms.

Mr. Buckler is survived by two sons and four daughters. Our deep sympathy is extended to them.

Funeral services are being held today in Crookston. Although we cannot be at those services in person, we are there in spirit, sadly remembering an old friend and regretting the passing of an outstanding public servant and a great Representative in this Congress.

Local mention was made in the Washington Evening Star in its issue of Tuesday, January 24, 1950.

The news article follows:

RICHARD T. BUCKLER DIES; FORMER HOUSE MEMBER

Richard T. Buckler, 85, a Farmer-Labor Party Representative from Minnesota who served four terms in Congress from 1935 to 1942, died yesterday on his farm in Crookston, Minn.

Mr. Buckler, who was born in Coles County, Ill., held numerous township and local school-district offices in Polk County, Minn., for 30 years. He had served as a State senator from Polk County for three terms before his election to the Seventy-fourth Congress on November 6, 1934.

Long known as a friend of the farmer and active in Farm Bureau and Farmers' Union organizations for years, he was a strong advocate of old-age pensions, the bonus, a central bank, and price fixing for farm products. He represented the Ninth Minnesota District in Congress. Mr. Buckler is survived by two sons and four daughters. Funeral services will be held Thursday in Crookston.

Mr. Buckler's biography as shown in the Congressional Directory for the Seventy-seventh Congress will be of interest at this time.

It follows:

Richard Thompson Buckler, Farmer-Labor, R. F. D., Crookston, Minn.; born in Coles County, Ill.; attended the common schools; engaged in farming in Andover Township, Polk County, Minn., since 1904; has held numerous township and local school-district offices in the past 30 years; served as State senator from Polk County for three terms, 12 years; active in Farm Bureau and Farmers Union organizations for many years; married on October 20, 1891, to Addie Ball, at Charleston, Coles County, Ill.; six children—five daughters and one son; member of Eagles lodge and the Baptist Church; elected to the Seventy-fourth Congress on November 6, 1934, receiving 41,822 votes and a plurality in 12 of the 15 counties in the district over Ole O. Sageng, Republican, 27,522 votes, and Martin O. Brandon, Democrat, 25,210 votes; in the election on November 3, 1936, Representative Buckler was elected to his second term in Congress by an increased vote and an increased plurality over 1934; he received a total vote of 48,265, compared to his Republican opponent's 31,181, and his Democratic opponent's total of 20,165; Mr. Buckler's plurality over the Republican nominee, Elmer A. Haugen, was 17,077, about 3,000 votes greater than his plurality 2 years previous; he secured a plurality in 14 of the 15 counties in the district, losing only Otter Tail County, the home county of his two opponents, where he lost to the Republican nominee by 3,180 and defeated the Democratic nominee, Martin O. Brandon, by 2,062; in Mr. Buckler's home county of Polk he received a plurality over the Republican nominee of 5,516 votes, and a margin of 6,571 over the Democratic candidate; was reelected to his third term by a comfortable margin over his Republican opponent and by 23,592 votes over the Democratic candidate, carrying 12 of the 15 counties in the district; has the distinction of being the only candidate running in the State of Minnesota carrying the Farmer-Labor label to win election and in face of the fact that the Farmer-Labor candidate for Governor lost the district by approximately 18,000 votes; in 1940 Congressman Buckler was reelected and again holds the distinction of being the only Farmer-Labor Party labeled candidate to win in the State of Minnesota in the 1940 elections; his 4 terms of 2 years each will give him a total of 8 years of Ninth District service which is the second longest in the history of the Ninth Congressional District of Minnesota, only Halvor Steenerson, also of Crookston, serving for a longer period.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleague from Minnesota in paying tribute to a fine gentleman who has just passed away, Richard Buckler.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I would like to join also as a Member from the State of Minnesota in paying eulogy to a grand old man who served the State of Minnesota and his constituency with a lot of courage, and a lot of work, and I know that the people of Minnesota will mourn his passing.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I also had the privilege of serving with Mr. Buckler when he was in the House of Representatives. He was a grand American, and we extend our sympathy to his family.

Mr. HAGEN. I thank the gentleman.

DISPENSING WITH DISCHARGE DAY BUSINESS, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 13

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, for many years it has been the traditional policy of Congress not to have a session, or at least to transact no important business which would require a roll call, on Lincoln's Birthday. On that day a great many Republican dinners will be held all over the country. I believe this year there will be about 2,700 Lincoln Day dinners. Practically every Republican Member of the Congress has at least one and some have four or five speaking engagements.

It happens that the next 21-day discharge day is Monday, February 13, which complicates our situation. The Members must know now in order to arrange their schedules, whether or not we are going to have important business on that day. Therefore, may I inquire of the gentleman from Massachusetts if he can enlighten us as to what we might expect, and perhaps he might be able at this time to make a unanimous-consent request to dispense with the business in order on that day?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is my understanding that the gentleman from Massachusetts, the minority leader, is making this request as the leader of his party?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am, at the request of a great many of the Republican Members.

Mr. McCORMACK. We all recognize that it works both ways. When we have our special days the same consideration is extended to the Members on the Democratic side by the Republican leadership and the Republican Members.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I say that we are only too happy to comply with such requests.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a very basic situation that confronts the two political parties. Recognizing that, I personally think the only thing that can be done and should be done is to dispense with the business in order on the next discharge day, because each political party has to respect the responsibilities that devolve upon the other. I join in the statement of the distinguished minority leader that it has been the custom for years, no matter which party is in control of the House, for each party to recognize the responsibilities of the other. We on this side have our Jackson-Jefferson Day dinners, and during the Eightieth Congress time was allowed the Democratic Members to make the speeches that were attendant on such occasions.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HUBER. Inasmuch as if Abraham Lincoln were alive today he would be a Fair Dealer, I shall offer no objection to the request the gentleman intends to make.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have some doubts about the gentleman's assumption with regard to Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. McCORMACK. Thoroughly concurring with my friend from Ohio, but not desiring to make that an issue at the moment, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the business in order on the next discharge day, Monday, February 13, be dispensed with.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, of course, the Members understand that this will delay any possible action under the 21-day rule for 2 weeks. I wonder whether the unanimous-consent request could not be changed so that we could take up the business in order on discharge day on the Tuesday following Monday, the 13th.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I say to the gentleman that Members could not get back from the west coast by the following day.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Perhaps the request could be made for later in the week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I really do not think the arrangement would prevent any legislation from getting to the floor before the session is over.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I further ask the gentleman from Massachusetts what the program will be for tomorrow and Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. The Committee on Rules has reported out a rule today on House Joint Resolution 398, relating to cotton- and peanut-acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. The rule provides for 3 hours of general debate. I am programing this bill for tomorrow, but want to inform the House that consideration of the bill on tomorrow will be confined to general debate. The bill will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule on Monday. I have a further agreement with the gentleman from Masschusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], that if there is any roll call on the bill on Monday, either on a motion to recommit or on passage of the bill, the roll call will take place on Tuesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am in accord with that understanding.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, that would require the unanimous consent of the House. Rather than wait until Monday, Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent that if on Monday, on a motion to recommit, if such a motion should be made, or upon the passage of the resolution (H. J. Res. 398), there is a roll call vote to be taken, the roll call will take place on the following day, Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DELANEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FISHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson.

CONGRESSIONAL MEMBERS SHOULD AVOID RUMORS, HEARSAY, AND GOSSIP AND STICK TO FACTS IN SPEECHES

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the reason I am taking this time to speak extemporaneously is that I feel impelled to again speak out against what I believe to be an erroneous habit and attitude here on the floor of this great Congress.

For instance, just a few minutes ago one of the distinguished Members of this House, having served here many years ably and well, spoke in such terms and language that it clearly would indicate to the American people that he believed, and was trying to get across to his colleagues in this Congress and the American people, that Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, was directly or indirectly aiding Joe Stalin. Yet, I am dead sure that this distinguished Member from Pennsylvania knows in his own heart and must carry consciously in his mind that he had no intention of even inferring that our State Department would consciously do anything to aid Joe Stalin in his political or economic philosophies.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the language he used would clearly indicate through the press and over the wires that a Member of Congress was charging our State Department with being an aid and an assistant to Joe Stalin.

This, under the circumstances of the present world situation, does clearly add to confusion; to fear; to suspicion; to ill will; to national and even international misunderstanding as to what the facts really are. For, I say to my colleagues, that the distinguished gentleman uttered his intemperate words without basis in law or fact to substantiate his untimely and unwarranted remarks. And so it goes.

Granting that we have congressional immunity in what we say; granting that we are free to say what we wish on the floor of this Congress as Members of Congress without fear of libel or slander, this does not justify us in being any less diligent in sticking to the facts and the law and the truth than we would have our own constituents be in our respective congressional districts; does it? Why should we take liberties on the floor of this House in speaking of any matter when it is only sounds and rumor and gossip and "political dishwater"? Yes, even though most of us are candidates for reelection, even though the two-party system thrives and lives, partially at least, on account of the desire of those in the majority to stay in the majority, and those in the minority party to become the majority party, this does not justify members of either party in relating as facts or truth anything which is known to them to not yet be established as facts or as the truth.

A certain Good Book, many years ago, advised us to not be intemperate. This applies to speech as well as to personal habits. It most emphatically applies to us Members of Congress in these strenuous days of world anticipation, misunderstanding, stresses, and strains. Let us, therefore, be factual and temperate in our speeches and in what we say and in what we do. As Representatives of the American people, let us so conduct ourselves in our speeches from the floor of this Congress that the American people will consider us as examples of temperate speech and of temperate attitudes toward one another in our speeches. And let the two great political parties only enumerate and enunciate that which is founded in truth and facts; that which can be substantiated.

I said it before, in 1946, and I say it again: What we here say many times goes out over the Nation and over the world. By repetition it becomes garbled and exaggerated and even more extremely intemperate and destructive of truth and veracity. Millions of folks think and believe and repeat what we here state as the gospel truth. And those who are already inclined to be lacking in temperate speech and temperate mental attitudes toward their fellow citizens or rival political parties are given a further handle and circumstances to strengthen their intemperate attitudes and speeches and relationships.

Gentlemen of this House, let us by our daily words and conduct add to the sum total of our privilege and obligation which we especially have to strengthen the sinews of our American way of life. As democracy depends on an intelligent and well-informed participating electorate at the grass roots, so the American electorate depends upon us, as Members of Congress, both the House and the Senate, to be consciously temperate, truthful, accurate, and of careful and considerate speech in everything we say.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, to be conscious of having done less than substantially this, is to fail in one of our greatest obligations to the American people who look to us to only say and to only do that which has first been weighed and not found wanting, both in speech and in conduct. In this manner the sinews of our Nation will be made whole where lacking and will be made strong where weak.

On Tuesday, March 19, 1946, when I was a Member of the Seventy-ninth Congress, I said in part as follows, and my observations on that occasion will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 10, page A1507. Mr. Speaker, this viewpoint, which I this day urge to your attention, again emphasizing, and again reemphasizing, the same existing thing which I extemporaneously gave on March 19, 1946.

Following herewith are a few of my sentiments on that date:

My point is that too often Members state as facts matters they only hear about, through rumors, inaccurate, incomplete reports, and clearly erroneous reports. Why not wait until we know what the fact is

before we speak out words which sound around the world?

What we as House Members say should be so carefully weighed and verified before we say it that no person will be misled or misguided because of what we have here said.

We have a peculiar responsibility for uttering words which should only sound in terms of accuracy in fact and law.

Granting that we have, and must have, certain privileges of speech as Members of Congress, the careless or thoughtless use of this may well result in an abuse of it—if it results in misinformation to the people of our own great Nation or of the world. I do not insinuate that any Member would knowningly mislead or misstate—but, if Members state as facts those things which are not just as stated, then the result of making report, based on rumor, hearsay, gossip, ill will, or intolerance, is weakening rather than strengthening to our national sinews. The dissemination as a fact of that which is not already verified to be in fact and truth is starting a chain of report throughout the Nation which cannot but weaken our democratic processes.

What is the truth about it? What are the basic facts? Even if we do not make a 1-minute talk the first time a newspaper or a radio commentator reports this or that, it would be safer for our international relationships if we did not so promptly condemn or castigate other nations, when an opinion given is based on first, an incomplete report, or rumor, or partisanship, or other factor which should cause us to pause and carefully consider before we utter words which can never be recalled.

What is said on the floor of this House makes toward the attitude of other nations and of their governments toward us as a nation. And, toward our President and our Senate and our Department administrators, and our Cabinet officers.

What do you suppose the thinking of foreign peoples is about the sincerity and efficiency of our two-party system of government, if they base their opinions upon the harshly spoken, ill-considered words frequently uttered against the efficiency and, in condemnation of the so-called bureaucracy of our Government?

In heat of debate, condemnation, unjust criticism, unfounded attack, unwarranted accusations, are said to often be made. Should we not seek to weigh our words most carefully, bearing in mind that what we say about the functioning of our own political parties and about our own form of government, is heard around the world?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

THE FAIR EMPLOYMENT BILL

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House, particularly those who have inquired of me from day to day as to the consideration of a rule in the Committee on Rules and the many who are interested in the passage of the fair-employment bill, are entitled to know what transpired in the Committee on Rules today with regard to it.

You will recall that on Wednesday, January 18, the Committee on Rules deferred action and a vote on granting a rule on this important bill by reason of the absence of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. It was agreed then that a vote on a rule would be taken Tuesday, January 24, and all members of the committee were formally notified as to the meeting on that day. Two members of the committee were absent at this second meeting, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], and it was urged that a vote be postponed until these members were present. A vote, however, was taken which resulted in a 5 to 5 tie and thereafter, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] made a motion for its reconsideration at today's meeting.

Today, however, we were again subjected to further delaying tactics of the type which have become chronic whenever the opponents of this bill are confronted with the necessity of going on record for or against bringing it to the floor.

Due to the unavoidable absence of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] because of illness, his Republican colleague—with the silent but joyous approval of their Dixiecrat colleagues—insisted that the matter should again lay over until the full membership of the committee could be in attendance. They insisted that if I forced a vote for a rule on the FEPC bill today they would be obliged to vote against it.

So once more—the third time—committee action is deferred on this bill—in which millions of people are interested, of which a majority of the voters of the Nation have signified their approval in recent elections, and for the enactment of which both the Republican and Democratic Parties stand pledged in their 1948 platforms.

I, of course, intend no reflection upon the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], for whom I have the highest regard, when I point out the eagerness with which his Republican colleagues seized upon his absence as an excuse for further delay. As far as they are concerned one excuse is as good as another if it will keep the FEPC bill from coming to a vote.

It is a strange thing, however, that Mr. WADSWORTH'S absence was not invoked to delay action upon any other matter before the committee today.

For instance, House Joint Resolution 398, which will increase cotton acreage in the 1950 cotton season by 1,400,000 acres and will cost the Government hundreds of millions of dollars. Notwithstanding the Republicans' hypocritical cries for economy they voted for a rule for this bill and sent it to the floor for action of the whole House. Could it be, as some persons are beginning to suspect, that the unholy alliance of the GOP and Dixiecrats was at work in the strange coincidence of these two events?

Is it a possibility that there was an understanding between these strange bedfellows and that the Republicans voted for a rule for the cotton resolution, so dear to the heart of their southern friends, in exchange for delaying action against FEPC?

I wonder. And the people are beginning to wonder about these goings on.

But, to quote the Republicans' own great Lincoln whom they will proclaim on February 12, but whose wisdom they choose so often to ignore, "You can't fool all of the people all of the time."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances, and to include letters, newspaper articles, and editorials.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PHILBIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

REPUBLICAN BALL CARRIERS FOR 1952 SHOULD BE "IKE" AND SINATRA

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. W. E. Britt, of Longmont, Colo., recently had this to say in its public writer's column of the Denver Post:

As E. P. Gallup, of Denver, said a few days ago, we must pray for a patriotic leader. Last month General Eisenhower said that the common people ought to stop thinking about pensions and get back to a "beer and hot dog" diet. Therefore, we should infer that Ike is a jolly fellow and a regular guy. He also said, "If all that Americans want is security, they can go to prison." This is a strong assertion by a strong man. The Republicans in 1952 should have attractive candidates. I suggest that the ticket be Eisenhower and Sinatra.

Not a bad idea, my friend—not a bad idea.

AMENDING THE HATCH ACT

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 1243, an act to amend the Hatch Act, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mrs. NORTON, Mr. HARRISON, and Mr. LECOMPTE.

PROMOTION OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II IN THE FIELD SERVICE OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. DELANEY, by direction of the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 448, Rept. No. 1546), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 87) relating to the promotion of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SINCE I CANNOT PICK MY DISEASES, PLEASE LET ME PICK MY OWN DOCTOR

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, among the many letters I have received from my constituents on the issues of the day, there is one that really conveys a message in a few words.

The author of the letter is against socialized medicine and states her opposition in these few words:

I can't pick my diseases, but would like very much to have the privilege to pick my own doctor.

In my opinion the author of this statement echoes the sentiments of millions of American citizens.

PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE RULES COMMITTEE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, mention was made a moment ago by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], chairman of the Rules Committee, that no consideration was given this morning to a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the committee took no action on reporting FEPC legislation, because of the absence of one of its members.

I would like to state that I personally made that motion to reconsider after voting against reporting of that legislation early this week, because of the absence of two of the minority members on the committee. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] is now ill and in the hospital this morning. He has been ill since last Thursday when he had to leave the floor. He requested me and other members of the Rules Committee, as well as the chairman, not to take up that particular question until he would be able to be here. He stated he would know within 2 or 3 days whether he will be able to be here early next week, and indicated that if his illness should be of long duration he would not press his request that no action be taken until his return.

So I think, out of fairness, I should state the understanding was reached this morning that the Rules Committee would meet on Tuesday, and if it is found that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] cannot return to the committee within a short and reasonable time, that the matter will not be held up further awaiting his presence.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Rules, I am very anxious to pay deference to the request of any member of that committee for postponement of the consideration of any legislation. I was especially glad at other times to protect the interests of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], who was unavoidably absent when important votes were to come up. But I do regret that when I was unavoidably detained at home and was trying to get here to vote on the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] to change the rules of the committee, no deference was made to my being absent, and I was not allowed to register any vote in opposition.

I hope the members of the committee will pay to the other members of the committee the same deference that we are glad to pay to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

PROXY VOTES IN COMMITTEE

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, would it not be within the rules of the House for the Committee on Rules to permit a member to give his proxy to another member so a vote could be had on an important matter in which the whole country is interested?

The SPEAKER. That is a matter for the committee to determine.

The Chair may make this statement: He served on one committee for 24 years, and never was a proxy voted on that committee, because the present occupant of the Chair always voted against it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. The rules of the House are the rules of every committee of the House, I, as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, have taken the position that since the rules of the House forbid voting by proxy, under the same rule a member cannot vote by proxy in the committee. Am I right or not?

The SPEAKER. Committees have always been permitted to decide that question.

Mr. RANKIN. The rule states that the committees shall be governed by the rules of the House; that the rules of the House shall be the rules of every committee, and I do not believe a committee can change its own rules to permit absentee voting.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is going to hold as did Speaker Longworth, that it is a matter for the committee itself to determine.

TAXATION OF LIFE-INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 371, relating to the income taxes of life-insurance companies for 1948 and 1949; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 1 day, that it be confined to the bill, and that the time be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 371, relating to the income taxes of life-insurance companies for 1948 and 1949, with Mr. GORE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of House Joint Resolution 371 is to correct the statutory formula for the taxation of the income of life-insurance companies. This is stopgap remedial legislation. It is made necessary by the fact that the formula which was enacted in 1942 to determine the taxable income of life-insurance companies has proven wholly unrealistic. Under existing law no tax has been due from any company on its life-insurance investment income for the years 1947 and 1948, and probably none will be due for 1949. The proposed legislation would end the free ride

and would make life-insurance companies pay their fair share of the tax burden which presently bears so heavily on individuals and corporations with taxable incomes.

Although the proposed legislation is retroactive, it does not come as a surprise to the life-insurance companies. For more than 2 years the representatives of the life-insurance industry and the Treasury have been holding conferences in an endeavor to work out a formula which would correct this situation. I should state, in fairness to the industry, that its representatives recognized the need to correct the formula and have shown every evidence of earnest cooperation. The result has been that this proposed legislation is acceptable to 95 percent of the industry. It has likewise the approval of the Treasury and the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. It is the result of a unanimous report of the Subcommittee on Taxation of Life Insurance Companies of the Committee on Ways and Means. It is reported out of Ways and Means with only one dissenting vote. I doubt if any such complex and technical legislation has ever had such unanimity of approval, especially where it will cost the life-insurance companies in the neighborhood of between $90,000,000 and $93,000,000.

Before I take up the technical aspects of the bill, permit me to give you more of the background. The taxation of life-insurance companies has offered a special problem, which has long been recognized. Since the Revenue Act of 1921 special provisions of the income-tax law have applied to life-insurance companies. In the forepart of the last decade, although the business of life-insurance companies had risen by leaps and bounds, the revenues derived from taxes on the profits of these companies were growing smaller. In 1940 Federal revenues from taxation of life-insurance companies had declined to $738,000, or one-tenth of 1 percent of their net investment income. It was apparent that a new approach had to be made. Thus came about the formula in the present law, which I am told was suggested by the insurance companies. In the first year of its operation this new formula, in 1942, produced $27,000,000 in revenues, in 1943 and 1944 approximately $35,000,000 each year, in 1945 the revenues dropped to $24,700,000, in 1946 $21,800,000 and in 1947, 1948, and 1949 the formula failed utterly of its purpose and no income taxes under the formula were payable to the Government by the life-insurance companies. Today we face the issue whether the life-insurance industry, with assets approaching $60,000,000,000 and an annual net income of $1,500,000,000 shall be permitted to escape tax-free during those years.

As I have previously indicated, the overwhelming majority of the insurance companies are willing to bear their fair share of the expense of maintaining the Government under which they exist and prosper. They do not want to be placed in the position of being a big, prosperous industry, not contributing its fair share of the cost of government. Besides their own patriotic impulses, it is sound business judgment from the public-relations viewpoint.

Of course, there are some companies that are selfish and short-sighted. They do not want to pay any taxes if they can avoid it. They seek to take advantage of a defective formula legislated by Congress, on the representation of the industry. They overlook completely—and for their own tax-dodging purposes—that the representatives of the insurance industry have been in conference with the Treasury on this very subject for over 2 years, in an honest endeavor to reach a solution of the problem. Every life-insurance company in the country was aware of the situation and the industry was advised by the Treasury that, as prudent business practice, it should provide for a taxable contingency during that period. The loudest wail is from the Equitable Life Assurance Society of New York, with admitted assets as of December 31, 1948, of $4,900,000,000, with an increased surplus of $38,800,000. As a policyholder in Equitable, I do not feel too happy having my insurance company duck and dodge and weave in and out in an attempt to escape its fair share of the expenses of our Government. I am a taxpayer and it burns me up to have to pay income taxes on my moderate income for 1947, 1948, and 1949, while the Equitable, with a battery of legal talent, seeks to avoid the tax because, forsooth, December 31 came before the Congress was able to enact the law.

Let us first consider how insurance companies are taxed—perhaps I should say, how they are not taxed—under existing law. All insurance companies are subject to the same tax rates as other domestic corporations. Complex problems are presented, however, in determining how much of the excess of receipts of an insurance company over current expenses is taxable income, and how much must be set aside as reserves for the payment of future claims.

In the case of life-insurance companies—and this applies to stock companies as well as mutuals—gross income since 1921 has been restricted to interest, dividends, and rents, and deductions are limited to those allocable to such income. In addition, a special deduction has been allowed against net investment income to take into account the commitments in the insurance contract made to policyholders that premiums collected in excess of current risks will be assumed to draw interest at a given rate.

Since insurance policies are written with the understanding that earnings on reserves will be added to the reserve fund to meet the ultimate contractual liability, it is proper that such allowances be made in computing taxable income.

The $64 question, however, is: How much is required to be set aside to meet potential claims and how much is income that should be taxed just as the income of other corporations is taxed?

The present formula was advocated by representatives of the life-insurance companies and was written into the Revenue Act of 1942. Under this formula, the special deduction—called the reserve and other policy liability credit—is computed, with but minor exceptions, as follows:

First, 65 percent of the contractual commitments of the company to policyholders are assumed to be at the arbitrary rate of 3¼ percent.

Second, the remaining 35 percent of the contractual commitments to policyholders are assumed to be whatever is the actual aggregate average experience of all the life-insurance companies.

APPLICATION OF THE 1942 RULES

At the time of enactment of the Revenue Act of 1942, it was not too unrealistic to assume that the companies needed 3¼ percent of their reserves to meet their policy-interest obligations. However, in recent years there has been a substantial decrease in the interest rates assumed by the companies on policy reserves. Consequently, although the life-insurance industry under the 1942 formula paid $27,500,000 in taxes in 1942 on net investment income slightly over $1,000,000,000, in 1947, 1948, and 1949 no taxes whatever are payable on annual net-investment income 50 percent greater than that for 1942.

CORRECTION OF THE 1942 FORMULA

The effect of House Joint Resolution 371, as amended by the committee, is to correct the 1942 formula by eliminating entirely the arbitrary and unrealistically high 3¼ percent assumed rate of contractual commitments to policyholders. Instead, the credit ratio would be calculated entirely on the basis of the average experience of the industry in the preceding year for all outstanding contracts of insurance. A technical exception would omit the experience of any company whose contributions to policyholders' reserves exceed its net-investment income.

The Secretary of the Treasury recommended stopgap legislation along the lines contained in House Joint Resolution 371, as introduced, to yield about $90,000,000 for 1948 and 1949. The committee, however, felt that it would be more equitable to spread the same approximate tax liability over the 3-year period, 1947, 1948, and 1949. We did not believe that any industry in any year should escape tax liability. The result of the committee amendment is to collect approximately the same amount for each of the three taxable years, 1947, 1948, and 1949 as was collected during the period when the 1942 formula was operating as it was intended to function.

OBJECTIONS TO HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 371

The suggestion has been made that the pending legislation should properly await the general tax-revision bill. However, the proposed solution is already being challenged as unconstitutional on grounds of retroactivity. Although the Committee on Ways and Means has carefully studied all relevant Supreme Court decisions, and is convinced that such charges are unfounded, the committee does agree that there should be no unwarranted delay in correcting the mistake in the Revenue Act of 1942.

The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means introduced House Joint Resolution 371 on the same date that he received the recommendations of the

Treasury Department. Two days later a subcommittee, of which I was chairman, was appointed to study the problem during the adjournment of Congress. The pending measure is based upon the recommendations of that subcommittee.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF RETROACTIVE INCOME TAXES

No Federal income tax has ever been held invalid on the ground that the tax was retroactively imposed. Taxpayers have, on a number of occasions, contended before the Supreme Court that the retroactive application of an income tax constituted a deprivation of property without due process of law and therefore was prohibited by the fifth amendment. In every case the Supreme Court held that the retroactivity involved did not offend the due-process clause of the fifth amendment.

Nearly all of the acts of Congress imposing an income tax have had some degree of retroactivity. The practice started nearly 90 years ago when the act of August 5, 1861, taxed income received during the entire calendar year 1861. The joint resolution of July 4, 1863, imposed an additional tax on incomes received during the calendar year 1863. This additional tax was imposed after the taxes for 1863 had already been paid at the rates established by an earlier act. In *Stockdale* v. *Insurance Companies* (20 Wallace 323), the Supreme Court said with respect to the validity of the retroactive tax imposed by the joint resolution of July 4, 1864:

> The right of Congress to have imposed this tax by a new statute, although the measure of it was governed by the income of the past year, cannot be doubted. * * * no one doubted the validity of the tax or attempted to resist it.

The act of October 3, 1913, applied to income received after March 1, 1913. The retroactivity of the tax was held valid in *Brushaber* v. *Union Pacific Railroad* (240 U. S. 1). The Revenue Act of 1918, which was enacted into law on February 24, 1919, applied to income received during 1918. Many other examples of similar retroactivity of the revenue acts could be cited.

An important exercise by the Congress of its power to impose retroactive income taxes can be found in the Revenue Act of 1936 which was enacted on June 22, 1936. On January 6, 1936, the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Butler* (297 U. S. 1), held that the processing taxes levied by the Agricultural Adjustment Act were invalid. Many processors had been unjustly enriched in that, not having paid the processing taxes, they had nevertheless passed the taxes on to their purchasers. The Revenue Act of 1936 imposed the so-called windfall tax on such unjust enrichment and the tax was retroactively made applicable to taxable years ending in 1935. Thus, the 1936 act reached back and taxed, in the case of a taxpayer having a fiscal year beginning February 1, 1934, and ending on January 31, 1935, the income resulting from unjust enrichment for a taxable year which began more than 23 months prior to the date of the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1936. The retroactive imposition of the windfall tax was held valid in the case of *White Packing Co.* v. *Robertson* (89 Fed. 2d 775).

The most recent important case of the Supreme Court on the validity of a retroactive income tax is *Welch* v. *Henry* ((1938) 305 U. S. 134). The case involved an act passed in 1935 by the legislature of the State of Wisconsin, imposing a tax on corporate dividends received in 1933. Under the Wisconsin income tax existing during 1933, certain corporate dividends were exempted from tax. The 1935 act imposed an income tax, at graduated rates, on the dividends received in 1933 which were not taxed in 1933. The taxpayer received some $12,000 of the exempt type of dividends in 1933. He filed his income-tax return for the year 1933 during 1934, at which time he had no intimation that he would later be called upon for a tax upon the dividends. He contended that the tax imposed in 1935 was invalid on the ground, among others, that the retroactive tax violated the due process clause of the fourteenth amendment. The supreme court of Wisconsin held the act valid and the decision was affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States. Justice Stone, speaking for the Court, said in part:

> The objection chiefly urged to the taxing statute is that it is a denial of due process of law because in 1935 it imposed a tax on income received in 1933. But a tax is not necessarily unconstitutional because retroactive. * * * Taxation is neither a penalty imposed on the taxpayer nor a liability which he assumes by contract. It is but a way of apportioning the cost of government among those who in some measure are privileged to enjoy its benefits and must bear its burdens. Since no citizen enjoys immunity from that burden, its retroactive imposition does not necessarily infringe due process, and to challenge the present tax it is not enough to point out that the taxable event, the receipt of income, antedated the statute.
>
> * * * In each case it is necessary to consider the nature of the tax and the circumstances in which it is laid before it can be said that its retroactive application is so harsh and oppressive as to transgress the constitutional limitation.
>
> * * * We cannot assume that stockholders would refuse to receive corporate dividends even if they knew that their receipt would later be subjected to a new tax or to the increase of an old one. The objection to the present tax is of a different character and is addressed only to the particular inconvenience of the taxpayer in being called upon, after the customary time for levy and payment of the tax has passed, to bear a governmental burden of which it is said he had no warning and which he did not anticipate.
>
> Assuming that a tax may attempt to reach events so far in the past as to render that objection valid, we think that no such case is presented here. * * *
>
> The equitable distribution of the costs of government through the medium of an income tax is a delicate and difficult task. In its performance experience has shown the importance of reasonable opportunity for the legislative body, in the revision of tax laws, to distribute increased costs of government among its taxpayers in the light of present need for revenue and with knowledge of the sources and amounts of the various classes of taxable income during the taxable period preceding revision. Without that opportunity accommodation of the legislative purpose to the need may be seriously obstructed if not defeated.

The Supreme Court has never attempted to define a boundary line beyond which Congress cannot retroactively impose an income tax. The boundary line, wherever it may be, must necessarily be vague. Each case must be judged, as the courts have done in the past, on its own merits, rather than by a fixed rule of metes and bounds. A particular income tax imposed under one set of circumstances may be held valid when applied retroactively X number of years, while another income tax, under different circumstances, might very well be held arbitrary and capricious when applied retroactively the same number of years. The problem resolves itself simply to an answer to this question: Has the Congress in retroactively imposing a particular tax under the circumstances in which it is laid acted unfairly and in an arbitrary and capricious manner?

Tested by the standard just stated, there is no doubt that House Joint Resolution 371 does not offend the fifth amendment. It proposes to tax the life-insurance companies for the years 1947, 1948, and 1949 on income which escaped taxation during those years; income which Congress had every intention of taxing when it enacted the Revenue Act of 1942. Certainly the dire need at this time of the Government for revenue is sufficient justification for the Congress to now impose on the life-insurance companies the tax on income for 1947, 1948, and 1949 which quite fortuitously escaped taxation due to the operation of the defective formula. It could hardly be contended by the life-insurance companies that a retroactive correction by the Congress of the formula is harsh, oppressive, or unjust. It can fairly be stated, I am sure, that the life-insurance companies have been embarrassed by the fact that the 1942 formula produced no revenue for the Government from the insurance companies for the years 1947, 1948, and 1949, years in which other taxpayers were paying heavy taxes resulting from the costs of World War II and its aftermath. I am confident that the life-insurance industry, almost unanimously, and the Supreme Court, if the question is ever presented to it, will agree that the retroactive correction of the formula in the manner proposed by House Joint Resolution 371 is consonant with justice and will impose no hardship upon the life-insurance industry.

In addition to the charge of unconstitutionality, the joint resolution has been criticized because it continues the principle of computing the reserve and other policy liability credit on an industry-wide basis, rather than on the experience of the individual company. Since the purpose of the resolution is to correct—not completely rewrite—the 1942 formula, it would be neither fair nor practical to thresh out anew, in the short time available, the issue that was then resolved in favor of taxation on an industry-wide basis.

This issue, as well as the question whether life-insurance companies should include in the tax base underwriting income and income from other sources, in addition to a larger share of net investment income, will, I trust, be considered

in the preparation of the tax-revision bill.

Meanwhile, Mr. Chairman, it is my solemn conviction that House Joint Resolution 371, as amended, provides a constitutional, equitable, and practical stopgap solution of a serious error in the present formula for the taxation of life-insurance companies.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I congratulate the gentleman on his intelligent and logical exposition of a quite complicated and technical problem. I am sure it will come as a shock to the taxpayers of the country to know that these insurance companies which have been making such huge profits have escaped without the payment of a single cent in taxes during the last 3 years.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I am glad to join in the commendation made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and congratulate the gentleman from New York who served as chairman of the subcommittee which devoted a great deal of time and effort on this very difficult subject and which presented a unanimous report to the Committee on Ways and Means. I think the subcommittee has done a tremendous job in handling this difficult problem. May I ask the gentleman to emphasize one point, namely, that this is in the nature of emergency and stopgap legislation and that it is contemplated the Committee on Ways and Means will give further study and consideration to this subject with a view to reporting and recommending permanent legislation on the subject; is that correct?

Mr. LYNCH. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. COOPER. It is thought by the subcommittee that this is the best way to handle the problem as it is now presented, and the subcommittee in its report has recommended that further study and consideration be given the question so that permanent legislation may be worked out in connection with the revision of the revenue laws that the Ways and Means Committee is expected to soon undertake.

Mr. LYNCH. That is quite correct. The recommendation of the subcommittee was that this should be considered only as stopgap legislation, and that we should go further into the question when the full committee met on the discussion of the revision of the entire tax law.

Mr. COOPER. I concur in the opinion expressed by the gentleman, and I think this is a splendid resolution and should receive the unanimous approval of the House.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman has made a very fine statement. I would like to ask him this: This situation whereby the life-insurance companies have paid no tax was not the result of any conniving on their part or any deliberate attempt to escape taxes, was it?

Mr. LYNCH. I do not think they had any such thing in mind. I think when they submitted their proposal in 1942 as I understand it was submitted by them, it was checked by committee tax experts, and it was thought at that time that the proposal would work out. The fact of the matter is it did work out very well for the first year or so.

Mr. CURTIS. Could it be said that the situation which arose was not one that the Congress intended or was striving for; that the Congress had shown no desire to give any special privilege to the life-insurance companies?

Mr. LYNCH. I think it is quite definite that the Congress never had any intention that any special consideration would be shown to the life-insurance companies whereby they might escape any income taxes.

Mr. CURTIS. If there was any error in connection with this whole matter, anything that could have been avoided, it is the fact that perhaps Congress did not act quite as quickly as it might, and now we have to resort to something that we do not like; that is, the retroactive feature?

Mr. LYNCH. I think the Congress has acted as promptly as it could under the circumstances, for the reason that this matter was called to the attention of the industry in the fall of 1947. The industry itself had gone to the Treasury Department at approximately the same time, because they were fearful of the situation that they saw was arising. All during 1947, 1948, and 1949, they tried to work out with the Treasury some solution of this complex problem, to determine just exactly what was taxable income. When that could be determined, of course, the rates applicable to other corporations would follow:

Mr. CURTIS. At one time, something over a year ago, the committee was considering this subject, and at that time the Treasury suggested that we wait. Is that not true?

Mr. LYNCH. The Treasury had submitted a proposal to the Committee on Ways and Means when Mr. Knutson was chairman. Then I understand that the industry asked if they might not check back with the Treasury again on the legislation which was being proposed, and as a result of that the Treasury Department withdrew its recommendation so as to give further consideration to the viewpoint of the life-insurance industry.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, when the tax-revision bill passed the House of Representatives in the Eightieth Congress, and when it was being prepared in our committee, the Under Secretary of the Treasury did withdraw his recommendation, suggesting that we pass the subject at that time? Is that not correct?

Mr. LYNCH. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Following the line of questioning by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], in calling this stopgap legislation, will it leave it necessarily for the Congress at some subsequent date to pass legislation which is again retroactive?

Mr. LYNCH. No; I do not believe it will, because if we are able, as I hope we will be, although there may be some difficulty about it, to hold the necessary hearings and develop legislation for a new tax bill, then, of course, there will not be any necessity for any retroactivity. On the other hand, if we are not able to do it, the subcommittee has recommended that this legislation be extended in 1950—in the event that we are not able to agree upon permanent legislation in the general tax bill that will be taken up.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am afraid I did not make my question clear. What I want to know is whether it will be necessary to pass retroactive legislation embracing the period covered by this resolution? In other words, does this resolution take care of all contingent liabilities of the insurance companies effectuated in their tax returns for the period covered in the resolution?

Mr. LYNCH. All life-insurance companies; yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what I mean, the companies covered by the resolution.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I wish to understand the gentleman clearly, if he will indulge me a moment.

Mr. LYNCH. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. As I understand the question, the gentleman from Michigan is asking of the distinguished gentleman from New York, chairman of the subcommittee that worked on this problem, it is whether if this resolution is passed and this approximately $93,000,000 of revenue to the Government is paid by the life-insurance companies for the years 1947, 1948, and 1949, whether legislation subsequently considered and reported by the Committee on Ways and Means is likely to cover those same 3 years for these life-insurance companies; is that the question?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is exactly my question.

Mr. LYNCH. I think that when we have passed the pending measure that is all there is to it. This will be permanent legislation insofar as the years 1947, 1948, and 1949 are concerned.

Mr. CRAWFORD. One other question, if the gentleman will permit. Did the gentleman and his committee find that the insurance companies covered by this resolution have, generally speaking, set forth the necessary reserves to take care of this liability?

Mr. LYNCH. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, they have been conscious enough of the pending situation to take care of that?

Mr. LYNCH. Unquestionably so.

Mr. CRAWFORD. To the extent, therefore, that the companies did set aside such reserves in anticipation of this legislation's becoming law, they are clean after December 1, 1949; is that correct?

Mr. LYNCH. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman has very clearly stated the situation that now exists, in that by operation of the formula included in the Revenue Act of 1942 it has resulted that the life-insurance companies have not been required to pay an income tax for the last 3 years. I will ask the gentleman if it is not true that to some extent at least a contributing factor to that situation was the general lowering of interest rates throughout the country?

Mr. LYNCH. That is correct.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. I am not going to take any time on this bill, but at this point I would like to interpose an observation and elicit from the gentleman an expression as to whether he agrees with my statement. Is it not true that where the welfare of the insured people of this country is concerned, especially in the matter of life-insurance beneficiaries, Congress is loath to risk any possibility of the impairment of the financial status or solvency of the insurance companies? Back in 1942, therefore, it was agreed to adopt a certain formula which would impose and capture a certain amount of taxes but provide a deduction taking into account the obligations of the insurance companies to build up reserves to meet liabilities to the beneficiaries of the insured without any question of doubt?

Mr. LYNCH. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, what has gone wrong is partially the formula which was agreed to and adopted and which became legal for this period of time. The formula plus a lowering of interest rates brought about a condition which permitted the insurance companies to retain a volume of profits far in excess of what was needed as a legal reserve to secure the payment of all obligations to policyholders.

Since this has developed, the insurance companies in good faith have made a clean breast of it to the Treasury Department. The Treasury Department presented the matter to the committee. The committee went into it further. We have presented here at this time what the gentleman once told me was about the equivalent, or it so appears to me as a layman, of what is termed in court procedure a consent agreement or a consent decree. The Congress is now asked merely to validate it and make it applicable to the years 1947, 1948, and 1949.

Subsequent and permanent legislation will require the most thorough consideration of this problem so as to be sure that we skim off every dollar that is not necessary for the solvency of legal-reserve companies.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Was there anything shown before the committee which would compel the insurance companies—I think this has been answered indirectly—to increase their premium charges against policyholders in order to maintain their solvency and necessary reserve which the law requires as a result of the tax provided by the pending bill?

Mr. LYNCH. There has been no suggestion by those with whom we met, and we discussed this matter with the representatives of 95 percent of the insurance companies that it would in anywise affect the solvency of any company.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I wish to pay my respects to the chairman of the subcommittee upon which I had the honor to serve. The conferences were conducted with great tact and in a spirit of absolute friendliness. The officials of the insurance companies representing the larger part of the insurance business of this country were present. They went into conference with their respective boards and the legislation here is the result practically of almost unanimous agreement, certainly as far as 90 percent of the companies are concerned.

It is very vital for us to be careful, of course, in the consideration of legislation of this character and the subcommittee was careful. The full committee listened with great patience and interest to the report of the subcommittee. When you realize that there are something like 191,000,000 life-insurance policies in this country, 109,000,000 of which constitute industrial insurance policies, you must come to a realization that it affects a great many people and their future security. So the subcommittee was very circumspect, as was the full committee, in the consideration of this temporary legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the administration would like to create the impression in the mind of the public that our great life-insurance companies have sought by sharp practice to escape their just burden of Federal taxes. It is not the fault of the life-insurance companies that they failed to earn taxable income for 3 years under the law. I shall point out why the legislation embodied in House Joint Resolution 371 as amended is necessary at this time.

It is true that no life-insurance company paid any income tax on the income from its life-insurance operations for 1947 and 1948. Under existing law the same thing would occur for 1949.

Yet, as everyone knows, the life-insurance business is one of the great businesses of the country. At the end of 1948 the assets of the 584 legal-reserve life-insurance companies of the United States were worth over $55,000,000,000, and their total investment earnings—to say nothing of underwriting income—amounted to $1,500,000,000 in 1948. During this period the surplus and contingent reserves of these companies increased substantially for some of the large companies, financial giants, these increases amounted to many millions of dollars.

There was nothing reprehensible about the failure of these great and small life-insurance companies to pay income taxes for these years. It was all in accordance with the law. For 1947 and 1948 deductions allowed by the law to each company exceeded the net investment incomes, so there was no income left to tax. The same situation will exist for 1949. Yet, to almost anyone it would seem a very strange thing that this great industry should earn no taxable income for 3 years. It would seem that there must be something wrong with a law that produced such an extraordinary result.

There is something wrong with the provisions of existing law, which have remained unchanged since they were enacted as part of the Revenue Act of 1942.

Every life-insurance company must set aside a large part, usually more than 90 percent, of its net investment income to maintain its reserves and meet its other obligations to its policyholders. Under existing law each company is allowed to deduct a percentage of its net investment income, representing that part of its net investment income needed for its policy obligations, and taxes at the ordinary corporation rates are payable on the balance. The percentage is determined and proclaimed each year by the Secretary of the Treasury, and is the same for all companies. The percentage is derived in accordance with a formula provided in the law, on the basis of data of the entire industry for the preceding year. It was because the formula contained an element which did not change, although conditions in the industry changed, that it became unworkable. The percentage for 1947 and 1948 became more than 100 percent, so that the deduction for each company exceeded its net investment income, and there was nothing left to tax.

The important element in the formula is the reserve earnings rate, intended to reflect the average or normal rate of interest used by the various companies in computing their reserves. Under existing law this rate is a composite of a fixed rate, 3¼ percent, weighted 65 percent, and the actual average rate of all the companies for the preceding year, weighted 35 percent. For 1942 and 1943 this was about right, since the actual average rate of the 50 largest companies for 1941 was 3¼ percent. But in succeeding years, as the rate earned on their investments declined, new policies were issued by most companies on the basis of an interest rate of 2½ percent or even 2 percent. By 1947, therefore, the average reserve rate for all companies was no longer 3¼ percent, but slightly less than 3 percent. The continued use of the fixed 3¼ percent rate thus allowed the companies to deduct, with respect to their policy obligations, more—on the average—than they were actually obligated to set aside.

This resolution would correct that situation, by substituting for the fixed 3¼ rate the actual average reserve interest rate for all companies for the preceding year. The representatives of the life-

insurance industry told the members of the subcommittee of which I was a member that the various companies wanted to pay a fair tax. They admitted that the industry had income which would reasonably be viewed as taxable income for 1947, 1948, and 1949. All that this resolution, House Joint Resolution 371, does is to impose the taxes that should have been imposed, under the general theory adopted in 1942, for those years.

As has been well brought out on the floor here, the real difficulty was not due to any irregularity on the part of the insurance companies. They were absolutely honest in this. They had no income under the formula to tax. After working with the Treasury and finally working with our subcommittee, they came in voluntarily, a great majority of them, and were anxious to pay in something like $90,000,000 or $93,000,000 in taxes. I think they are entitled to just praise for their liberality if you want to put it that way, and their wish to stand in proper relationship to the public. I do not think they are subject to criticism. I think they should be commended, because under the 1942 law, as I say, they had no net income in 1947, 1948, and probably in 1949, and they could have insisted on their right not to be taxed. However, they are here, and they have cooperated with the subcommittee, under the fine leadership of the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this resolution will be passed without serious opposition.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LYNCH. I agree with the gentleman entirely when he states that there was no thought on the part of the industry to get away with taxes originally. They had not paid any taxes for 1947, 1948, and 1949, for the sole reason that under the present law they were not required to do so.

Mr. REED of New York. That is the answer. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. They could not pay any tax because their earnings were down so far that they were barely able to maintain the reserves necessary to protect the policies.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman is not entirely correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. They were down in earnings because the Government has appropriated most of the sources of investment for the insurance companies, and the Government has become the loaning agency of the country rather than the insurance companies and banks and the other financial institutions.

Mr. REED of New York. I did not care to get into any political discussion at all, but I am telling you now that with the venture capital drying up in this country it is very fortunate that the insurance companies can loan to industry and to the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am not especially proud of the fact that I find myself in disagreement with my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee. I am glad that there is no problem of morals or honesty or integrity involved between us, so that we will not fall out in debating the issues now before us. I am sorry to say that I cannot go along, but I am proud to say that I have good reasons that satisfy my own conscience and justify my actions.

In the first place, I would have you know that the insurance companies do not manifest as much unanimity with reference to this bill, as the former speakers have indicated. I maintain that there are many large insurance companies opposed to this measure. The insurance business, as we all know, is a great business. I do not know but that it is the greatest business in the country. I expect there are a million insurance collectors and salesmen of all kinds in this country and practically everybody has one or more insurance policies. This is a big business. I repeat, do not let us get the idea in our minds that all the insurance companies are in favor of this measure. They are not.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. As I understand it, there are about 72,000,000 policyholders in the United States.

Mr. JENKINS. There are millions of policyholders.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. The Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. is the largest insurance company in the world and it has 33,000,000 policyholders with $9,000,000,000 plus in reserves.

Mr. JENKINS. I am glad to have the contribution of the two gentlemen because what they say bears out my statement that this is a great business.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes, I cannot refuse to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. LYNCH. I just want to say in answer to the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] that the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. is one of the companies in favor of this legislation.

Mr. JENKINS. While we are talking about the companies that are not in favor of this legislation, I have cited you a few that I mentioned in my report which is appended to the report of the committee. Among those named are some of the largest insurance companies in the country and I think one of them is the largest company in the great State of Ohio. They are bitterly opposed to this legislation, not because they do not want to pay taxes, not because they stand under any cloud of any kind, moral or otherwise—they have done their part. They say that this formula favors some insurance companies and does not do justice to others. You know that one of the cardinal principles of taxation is that taxes must be just. They must be fair; they must be general in their application. This program does not meet all of those tests, because there are too many insurance companies that are opposed to this program, which proves that many of those directly interested in the matter are not satisfied. Of course, I do not want to stand here now and say to you that the policyholders of all these companies are liable to lose. That is not a condition precedent to taxation. We do not have to wait until people break up in order to hold them liable for taxes. We do not tax people until they go into bankruptcy. A man does not have to show that he is not a bankrupt in order to escape having to give up all he has to pay taxes. Taxation is a science and it is a science built on a solid foundation. It is American. Nobody loves to pay taxes but people and corporations usually pay what they justly owe. But if we pass this law today we levy a tax on companies for 3 years back. We try to collect from people who we know do not lawfully owe anything. If Congress can do that to insurance companies then it can do that to you and me. If we can go back and levy taxes on these insurance companies for 3 years back, which they did not owe, then I will leave it to anyone who supports this bill to say whether we could not do that to every corporation.

Did these insurance companies owe the tax in 1947? Was there any statute which made them liable? Was there any statute which made them liable in 1948 or 1949? They were not liable. Now you go back and say, "We are going to tax you. We are going to make you pay." Why did you not make them pay then? It has been said here that it was because Congress did not act quickly enough. I will tell you why they did not make them pay then. It was because the Treasury had written out a formula and the formula did not carry through. The companies did not owe the money. They did not have anybody to whom they could have lawfully paid the money. Besides, if they had tried at that time to pay any taxes, and if they had offered to pay taxes which were not taxes any policyholder could have enjoined them because they did not owe any taxes and they could not lawfully pay out company money for something that the company did not owe.

Let us just have the understanding that this is not a measure on which all the insurance companies are in harmony and have agreed to. A big segment of the companies do not favor this program.

Mr. Chairman, this proposed legislation comes in as the recommendation of a subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means. I do not want to burden you with any of my own philosophies, but I have never been in favor of subcommittees of the Committee on Ways and Means. I will show you why we ought not to have subcommittees of the Committee on Ways and Means, because everything that the Committee on Ways and Means does has a Nation-wide effect. The business of some committees is largely local. Public Works, for example. That committee ought to have a subcommittee to go out to Buffalo, for

instance, to determine whether a bridge or a post-office building ought to be built there and of course three or four of the members could go out and get the facts and save the time and expense of having the full committee go. But everything that the Way and Means Committee does is of Nation-wide effect and has Nation-wide application and every member on the committee should study every subject before the committee for decision. Every member of that committee should be present when testimony is being taken and any definite decision is to be made. You could not have a finer chairman of a subcommittee anywhere in this world than the chairman of the subcommittee that handled the matter before us. There is no finer man in the House than the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH], the chairman of this subcommittee. Nobody loves and respects him more than I do. But what did his subcommittee do? Three members were appointed from the Republican side, and I understand two of them were not able to attend very much. I do not know how many Democrats were present on the subcommittee. But let us look at the work of the subcommittee. Let us take this Resolution 371. This subcommittee came out with a big report and they recommended Resolution 371. But after the full committee came back, the subcommittee changed front and struck out all of Resolution 371 and gave us another with entirely different language in it.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he gets too far afield?

Mr. JENKINS. I am not far afield, but I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FORAND. I think, in justice to your Republican colleagues on that committee, your statement should be corrected. You said two of them were never there.

Mr. JENKINS. I said I thought two of them were not able to be there much. If I am wrong I am willing to acknowledge it; I understand that they were away.

Mr. FORAND. Another point I think the gentleman should bear in mind is that he could have been a member of that subcommittee if he had not turned down the opportunity.

Mr. JENKINS. I am not objecting to that at all. For years I have objected to all subcommittees of the Ways and Means Committee, because they work out just like this. We do not work well that way. We work fine in the whole committee when we all work together, as a whole committee.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. The subcommittee acts simply as the agent of the full committee?

Mr. JENKINS. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. Does not the full committee then pass on the matter before the committee report is made, and is it not the report of the full committee and not the report of the subcommittee that we are considering?

Mr. JENKINS. Certainly it is. That is academic. Everyone knows that. But let us just take a moment to see what is in this resolution that is before us.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I just wanted the record to be perfectly clear. The subcommittee on our side was never absent except one man whose brother died and he just could not come.

Mr. JENKINS. I am sorry if I have done an injustice to anybody.

Mr. REED of New York. I just wanted the record to show that no member of the subcommittee on the Republican side was absent for a minute except the one whose brother died.

Mr. JENKINS. I may be wrong but that is what I understood. But in any event, if you had all been there, if every member of the committee had been there and you brought out the resolution, why did you not stick to it? If your work had been so thorough, why, after the whole committee met, did you change it all around? Let us see how difficult it is to understand what the subcommittee did and even what the full committee did when they reported out this bill. Let me read you one section of the formula in this bill after all the changes were made. This is the way it reads:

(1) In general: Except as provided in paragraph (2), the figure shall be computed in accordance with the following formula: The ratio which a numerator comprised of the aggregate of the sums of (A) 2 percent of the reserves for deferred dividends, (B) interest paid, and (C) the product of (i) the mean of the adjusted reserves at the beginning and end of the taxable year and (ii) the reserve earnings rate bears to a denominator comprised of the aggregate of the excess of net incomes computed without any deduction for tax-free interest, over the adjustment for certain reserves provided in subsection (c).

That is the kind of language we are dealing with—the most complicated language you can think of, and we bring it and want it passed as a simple little stopgap. Now, my friends, you say this is just a stopgap. You say you are going to take it up again for final revision in this session of the Congress—we have only 2 or 3 months in this session—why make this a stopgap today, something that nobody understands and about one-third of the insurance companies do not want and object to? Why make a stopgap of this? Why do you not go back and take it up and do it right? I am going to move to recommit this bill at the proper time and send it back to the whole committee where we can consider it carefully. The subcommittee did not have any public hearings. There is no record of what any Congressman said before the subcommittee nor what any insurance company man said. How do you expect this House to act on this important matter with only the brief explanations that we make on this floor today? We should not be here with this bill today. Why do we not tax insurance companies just like we tax everybody else? Tax them on their earnings. These insurance companies can tell how much they have earned; they can tell what their surplus is; they can tell what tax they should have paid if there was any law in effect taxing them in 1947, 1948, and 1949. I will tell you this, the insurance companies escaped because the Treasury missed its guess; its formula wore out. The Treasury prepared a formula in 1942 that lasted for only 3 years. In 1947 it ran out. It lost its applicability. It was not continued. Why were they not smart enough in the meantime to come to the Ways and Means Committee and demand legislation that would correct the situation? It just simply ran out, and now we have the situation of insurance companies that did not owe a dime in 1947, did not owe a dime in 1948, legally, nor in 1949.

You say that they came in and wanted to pay. Very well. There are two principles of taxation that I do not like.

I do not like for our Government to hold out its hat and let people come and put in that hat just what they want to put in. That is not taxation. That is accepting charity. That kind of a system is not an incident of sovereignty. We are a great sovereign Nation; we can tax whomsoever we please and make them pay. But when a man does not owe legally it is not right for the Congress to accept taxes as a gift. It is not right to pass a law going back 2 or 3 years and make a company pay what it does not owe. You say we have done that previously; I do not know when we have done that. We have done this, we have gone back a year or two and reduced taxes, and we have gone back when there were some continuing contract or circumstances that joined the past with the present. But now you are going to adopt the principle of making people come in and pay when they do not owe and there is no continuing implied contractual agreements. You should not hold out your hat to them and say for them to come and pay what they want, that you will just estimate it at $90,000,000 and let them go free. If they owe money they owe and ought to pay and have the money with which to pay; if they do not owe they ought not to be taxed. That is my issue. I do not represent the insurance companies in any way. They talked to me like they did, I expect, to every other Congressman on the committee. Two or three years ago they said, "We ought to be paying." I know the general counsel of one of the biggest insurance companies. He said to me: "We ought to be paying." And he and I tried to fix up a piece of legislation, but we found it was not a very easy thing to do. A very serious legal proposition was involved and I gave it up.

Let me throw this out to you from the standpoint of practical politics: If you pass this bill today, which you are going to do, it goes right over to the other body and they will use it as a vehicle on which to attach the repeal of the excise taxes. That is a subject that, by the Constitution, belongs to the House of Representatives and ought to be taken up in the House of Representatives by the Committee on Ways and Means; but just as surely as this bill goes over to the other body they will take the tax program away from the House of Representatives. We ought not to permit that to happen. I

do not want to do that. That is one of the principal reasons for my being opposed to the passage of this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. JENKINS. That is one reason why, just purely as a matter of political expediency and parliamentary preference, we should mind our own business and hold this thing within our own jurisdiction. Now, let me go along just a little further and speak about the new formula they propose in this bill.

In the first bill that the subcommittee reported they went back only to 1938. The subcommittee held no public hearings on the bill; they had no hearings at which all the insurance companies could come in; there are no printed hearings from which we can get enlightenment, and, as I started to say, we have not had anything like a complete digest of this whole program, and no explanation of this new formula that they provide. The first resolution recommended by the subcommittee only went back to 1948. This new formula goes back to 1947. One of the finest statements I heard anybody make on this matter was made by one of the experts who is sitting back there behind the chairman. He made a statement giving us the legal decisions with reference to this retroactivity program to tax people for years when they were not taxable. He said that he thought perhaps the decisions would support this program as far back as 1938, but he was very uncertain that it would hold for 1947; in fact he was inclined to be certain that it would not.

What is going to happen to this legislation if we pass it? In the first place, we feed it over to the other body and they will take the tax program away from us. In the second place, it is going to get into the courts; our great committee is going to feed it into the courts. That is all there is to it. If this bill is recommitted to the Ways and Means Committee we can avoid this disastrous course that the bill will take if it is passed. The Treasury has a fine corps of expert tax men. The Ways and Means Committee has the finest tax experts in the country. I know they can perfect a formula which will answer the purpose and will keep this legislation from the courts.

I am not going to be a party to sending this entire matter to the courts when there are about one-third of the insurance companies not satisfied with it. Also I do not want to surrender the right given us by the Constitution to handle taxes. I know our great chairman, every time anybody suggests that we send something over to the other body and let them perfect it, in his innate consciousness he rebels against the suggestion. Nobody wants to do that. I am sure I do not want to do it.

These are some of my reasons for opposing this legislation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If an insurance company refused to pay this retroactive tax, that insurance company may take this matter into the court and knock out the law.

Mr. JENKINS. Yes, and I am confident that it will be in the courts as soon as it passes and enforcement is attempted against some of these insurance companies. Again I say I hope we send this resolution back to the Ways and Means Committee where I feel sure this whole matter may be adjusted satisfactorily.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I wish to express, as a member of the subcommittee which handled this legislation, my sincerest thanks for the diligence and the very competent manner in which our chairman, Judge LYNCH, of New York, conducted the conferences which led to the reporting of this bill. It has been said here that no public hearings were held but, in my humble opinion, the manner in which this matter was investigated is far superior to the holding of public hearings.

Our chairman invited all of the insurance companies to come to Washington, not for hearings but to sit around a conference table with the members of the subcommittee and discuss this subject. Much may be said for that manner of conducting legislative business especially tax matters.

A large proportion of the companies, practically every one of the big companies, had their men here, usually the vice president, treasurer, or general counsel. The whole subject of life insurance taxation was thoroughly discussed.

Here is what has happened: Instead of taxing a life-insurance company just as you do every other corporation in the land, the Congress and the Treasury Department have tried to provide a formula whereby their legal reserves may be perfectly supported and perfectly protected. All of us who know anything about life insurance appreciate that some life-insurance companies operate on a 2 percent legal reserve, or 2½ or 2¾ or 3, some up to 3½, which means that in figuring the premium to be collected from the policyholder they figure they will earn say 3½ percent, in the instances of companies that are on a 3½-percent reserve basis, on that premium and that 3½ percent will be credited to the reserve so that when the policy contract matures they will have sufficient money to pay it off. Congress tried to protect all these companies, many of them on different reserve bases. There had to be a formula.

Now, the formula which has been in effect previously was one which was suggested by the actuaries and counsel of the various companies, through their life-insurance association, to the Treasurer of the United States, and the Treasurer, after many conferences with them, agreed on that formula. It worked well for a few years, but in the case of Government bonds, in which many companies invest their money largely, the interest rates were lowered. Interest and advance charges have been lowered. Rates of interest paid on savings deposits have been lowered, so that we find in 1 year one little southern life-insurance company, with less than four-tenths of 1 percent of all the life insurance in force, was paying 30 percent of all the tax paid by all of the life-insurance companies. Now, anybody knows that is getting out of step. That is just about as far out of step as my good friend, whom I love very much, the gentleman from Ohio, when he says that of this committee, which is composed of 25 members, all are out of step except him.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I do not think the gentleman will claim that all the members of the Committee on Ways and Means were ever together at any time on the discussion of this matter.

Mr. CAMP. Well, in the vote taken on the bill I would like to say that there was only one dissenting vote, and that was the vote of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. That does not show that all other 24 members were there and voted.

Mr. CAMP. I do not know what the attendance that day was, but our committee has a pretty good attendance, you know.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Under the Reorganization Act you could not report it out unless a majority were there, anyhow.

Mr. CAMP. That is right.

Now, let me go further about this formula. These companies, as you know, all have experts known as actuaries. And, they are experts; they are among the most efficient experts in the world. American life insurance stands preeminent as one of the great businesses of the world, and American life insurance companies are the largest and the greatest. I am, as an American, proud of our life insurance companies, and we have confidence in them. Their actuaries said this formula will work. But, lo and behold, other matters over which they had no control, and none of us had any control, happened. The war came on. Billions of dollars in Government bonds were issued and interest rates were lowered all over the world. Then the formula did not work. In 1947 these same Treasury officials who had been meeting with them wrote to these companies and said, "Look here, under this old formula you are not going to pay any taxes at all this year. We must adjust the formula." Now, the reason that two years passed, 1947 and 1948, during which no taxes were paid was

because these actuaries and these general counsel had never agreed to a new formula. Many conferences had been held. When our subcommittee, under the able leadership of Judge LYNCH, got together, and we called them before us, he said, as Uncle Remus said of his rabbit, "Now, gentlemen, we are 'obligeed' to climb a tree now. We have to tax our life insurance companies."

The gentleman in opposition has said that 25 percent of the life-insurance companies are opposed to this formula we have here today. Why over 95 of them were represented at the conference and agreed to it, and the only ones that are not in favor of this resolution and this stopgap formula are two or three companies who did not seem to want to agree to it because they did not want to pay the taxes. Let it be said to the credit of the life-insurance companies that this great industry walked into those conferences and said, "Yes, we should pay taxes and we are willing to pay them."

Mr. Chairman, when taxes are as high as they are in this country at this time, every last segment of our economy ought to pay its just and even share of them, and that goes for any competitive business. Not only should we enact this stopgap legislation affecting life-insurance companies but we should enact, at this session of Congress, other stopgap legislation which will impose an even and a just tax on every company and every corporation and every businessman in this land that is in business competition with somebody else who is paying taxes.

I say that this bill under consideration today is in line with the main thought in the President's tax message of the other day. Let us collect taxes evenly and justly as we go along.

Nobody contends that life-insurance companies are not in the most respected of all businesses, that of conserving estates so as to protect the dependents of the men and women of this country. Nobody wants to tax a life-insurance company any more than its just and proportionate share. The life-insurance business is one of the largest segments of American business economy. Its earnings are low but they are steady. If that segment is untaxed, there are many other segments of business which likewise would have the same right to be considered for less taxation.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, may I say that this subcommittee's work was one of the most pleasant I have ever had any part in. It was one of the most efficient jobs ever done by a subcommittee. As far as attendance was concerned, everybody who did not have some real, genuine reason for being absent was present at all of the meetings. A thorough investigation took place. Our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New York, Judge LYNCH, deserves very much credit for having done a very splendid job.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I do not think I ever saw a tax bill which provided for a retroactive tax. Do I understand that the gentleman bases the constitutionality of that on an agreement with the life-insurance companies? I did not quite understand what he was driving at.

Mr. CAMP. It is not uncommon to pass a tax bill providing for a tax on income of a previous year. There are many instances of that. Such legislation has been before the Supreme Court many times. In one instance one of the States taxed in 1 year the income of the previous year of certain corporations, and that act was held to be constitutional on the ground that during that year they had been in correspondence and in conference trying to reach an agreement as to what would be a just rate of taxation. This is the case of *Walsh* v. *Henry* (305 U. S. 134).

Mr. HALE. Here you have 2 years.

Mr. CAMP. We have 2 years, but as the committee report will show, the Treasury and the officials of the insurance companies have been in conference and making a steady effort all along to agree on the formula. Ninety-five percent of the life-insurance companies know that, and they all came in and agreed to it. If they take it to the Supreme Court, this committee has ample authority, and we have sound reason to believe that the Court will hold it constitutional, just as it has done in previous cases.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I wish the gentleman would explain the language in the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury which was contained in the report on page 18, a little below the middle of the page.

Mr. CAMP. The gentleman will have to read it to me, because I do not have the report here.

Mr. HINSHAW. If the gentleman will permit, I will read it. It is a letter dated October 10, 1949, that was last fall, in which he says:

> Unless this legislation is enacted promptly, I am concerned that revenue from this industry may be irretrievably lost for 1948 and possibly also for 1949.

Does that mean that to have gone over into this fiscal year or calendar year that we probably have lost legally the revenue from 1948, which of course could be paid in 1949, and that this bill because it goes beyond that back to 1947, may not be held constitutional by the Supreme Court under the ex post facto rule?

Mr. CAMP. In my opinion that means, and I may point out we investigated that question thoroughly after receiving that letter, that it is legal and it will be collected and that the courts will uphold us in this legislation. With the advice and assistance of counsel, we have come to that conclusion.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman is inclined to believe, however, is he not, that the question of the constitutionality of the act, if passed, will be taken to the Supreme Court?

Mr. CAMP. I understand from what the gentleman from Ohio said that one of the companies which never agrees to anything intends to take it up. But, of course, every law we have ever passed in the Congress has been carried up to the Supreme Court. When people do not want to pay taxes, they will fight until the last ditch.

Mr. HALE. Does not the gentleman agree certainly with the fact that although there was a steady flow of correspondence back and forth between certain life-insurance companies and the Treasury Department that would not be binding on any company which did not happen to be involved in the correspondence?

Mr. CAMP. The gentleman may not know it, but they have an association of life-insurance companies to which most all of the companies belong and it was through that association and its general counsel that the Treasury was doing its work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the record is quite clear at the moment, so I want to repeat the most important part of our consideration of this bill, which is that at no time did the life-insurance industry or any of the companies in the life-insurance industry in any respect violate any law that the Congress passed with respect to their liability for payment of income taxes. They have been meticulous, as a matter of fact, and have paid all the taxes for which they have been legally and properly liable.

The reason for this legislation is, as has been explained, that under the formula under which the tax liability on life-insurance companies was imposed, passed in 1942, there today is no liability upon the life-insurance companies for the payment of any income tax. That situation has existed since the year 1947. So that for 1947 and 1948 and doubtless for 1949, no life-insurance company in the United States, regardless of the amount of money it may have made on its investment, would owe money to the Federal Government in the form of income tax.

The owners of the great life-insurance companies are the people of the country. They are your neighbors and mine. In general, as expressed by their representatives before the subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means studying this problem, they recognize a public responsibility for the payment of some part of their earnings which arise from investments in the form of taxes to the Government. They express a willingness, yea, a desire, to pay their fair share of the cost of doing business in the United States.

At the same time, they were not rushing forward eager to accept any formula offered to them, nor were they rushing forward with the money in their hands, saying, "Take this money." But they were looking to the future, with an eye on the past, seeking to work out with the committee and with the Treasury some proper formula under which the life-insurance industry might be taxed for the years past and for the future. After well-conducted hearings, if I may be pardoned for making that statement, being a member of the subcommittee,

after these well-conducted hearings we did reach an agreement which applied to liability for the years past, but which does not in itself constitute a formula for the future. It is that formula which has been reduced in the resolution now before us, that we on the committee call upon this body to adopt this afternoon.

Under that formula the life-insurance industry, to be distinguished from the individual companies, will be responsible for the payment of taxes in the aggregate of about $93,000,000. This represents a tax, not upon the premium that you or your neighbor might pay to the insurance company, not directly upon that, but upon investment income; that is, earnings that the life-insurance company secures as a result of investing funds from its reserves and elsewhere, in Government bonds and other proper legal investments in our country. A formula is applied to that investment, and the tax liability is determined. Every company within the industry pays on the basis of that formula, as applied to its earnings. It is interesting to note that with respect to the tax liability of life-insurance companies, they are considered as a unit, as a Nation-wide industry, and that no individual company is considered alone in determining its liability, based upon any formula. After a Nation-wide percentage liability has been determined, that applies to every company within the industry, and a tax is levied on the basis of our usual corporate income-tax laws. It is unlike the average corporation within your district, which is considered individually and as a unit. Frankly, I do not know that I approve of this Nation-wide approach. I have been advised that the insurance industry prefer the Nation-wide approach rather than the individual-company approach, but it does seem to me that when this Congress, through its appropriate committee, considers this type of legislation for the future, we should examine carefully into the wisdom and advisability of continuing to tax life-insurance companies on a Nation-wide-industry basis rather than considering each company upon its own individual status.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. The question I would like to have you explain is, If this is in the nature of an income tax that has not been paid, why did not the statute that applies to corporations apply to these companies?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Because they were excepted from the general income tax laws. Special sections were drawn and passed to apply to life insurance companies.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is that what this statute is?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. This applies to the life insurance industry. Under the formula, which is still the law, there is no tax liability imposed upon these companies. Our purpose is to adopt a new formula, a new plan, by which the tax liability will occur upon life insurance companies for 1947, 1948, and 1949.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is based on the net income that they made from their investments?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Yes, what amounts to the net income from their investments. This is arrived at after taking their earnings from their investments and deducting their expenses and applying certain other criteria that I cannot go into now.

Mr. JENKINS. I would remind the gentleman from California that if this law should be supported by the Supreme Court there would be no reason in the world why the Treasury and Congress could not pass retroactive tax laws on any corporation at any time.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. There is quite a distinction in this instance, the distinction being that back in 1947 when it became apparent that under the formula there would not be any liability on life-insurance companies, they were notified by the Treasury Department that efforts would be made to change that formula; so the insurance companies, or the insurance industry, was put upon notice that the Congress recognized that that great industry would be and should be responsible for the payment of some taxes for the years 1947, 1948, and 1949. Throughout those very same years the Treasury has been working with the insurance industry, and today we are considering the culmination of their efforts.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. HALE. Have the courts ever passed on the constitutionality of taxing life-insurance companies on a different basis than other corporations?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I cannot answer that.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. LYNCH. They are not taxed on a different basis than other corporations. The whole question involved is: What is their taxable income? The rates are the same as for other corporations. The thing that we must be very careful about is not to include as taxable that part of their income which is necessary to meet the commitments made under their policies, and that is where the difficulty comes. It is not a question as to the rate of tax; the question is, What is their taxable income?

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman is quite right. Because of the technicalities of the life-insurance business a formula is needed to arrive at their net income. Once the net income is determined it is taxed at 38 percent like the income of other corporations.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I believe this legislation is highly desirable, and I call upon the members of this body to give it their support.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS].

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, normally I am opposed to any sort of retroactive law. In this particular instance I think it is entirely proper, and I want to briefly express the reasons why I think that is so.

Like the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], I was not a member of the subcommittee, but because this retroactive feature was in it, I immediately took note of it when it came before the full committee, and I read the report with some care. Let us see just briefly what the facts are.

In the first place, as to the method of taxing insurance companies: The money derived by life-insurance companies from the premiums assessed against policyholders all goes into the reserves with which to meet the obligations of policies as they mature. But, that forms a trust fund which is invested, maybe in real-estate loans, maybe in bonds, or otherwise, and the income thus derived from the trust fund is the income you deal with in assessing the income tax. But even a portion of that income is set aside to add to reserves.

All right. Now, the law of 1942 was set up out of necessity of supplying a yardstick of taking this income from investment, and so on, and determining what goes to reserves, and what remains as a profit that is taxable. What happened? That formula, by 1947, because of changes in the economic picture that I will not take the time to try to discuss, reached the point where it would result in the insurance companies paying no income tax, not because they had not made any earnings but because the formula set up for determining taxable earnings would no longer work.

This is what happened. This is why the retroactive feature of the law is all right. When the situation became evident in 1947 the Treasury called the insurance companies' attention to it. The Treasury began a study to see what could be done and made a report in February 1948.

Here is what happened, and I refer you to page 6 of the report of our committee. Certain insurance-company executives came up here and conferred with Secretary Snyder. A meeting was held on February 19, 1948, between him, Mr. Wiggins, Under Secretary, and some of these insurance-company executives. At a subsequent meeting held on February 25, 1948, those officials requested that the Treasury defer the publication of the study. Why? In order that the industry might have a chance to study the results and to confer further in regard thereto. Then we find that later the Secretary of the Treasury recommended to the Committee on Ways and Means that something be done about several matters of this nature, and recommendation No. 11 reads:

11. Income of life-insurance companies. It is recommended that the present method of computing the taxable income of life-insurance companies under sections 201, 202, and 203 of the code be revised so as to more

clearly and equitably reflect the taxable income of such companies. A detailed proposal for carrying this recommendation into effect is now in course of preparation.

What happened then? I am quoting now from the report:

Your committee considered the above list of items as well as other matters, in executive session in May of that year, and item 11—

Which is the insurance tax feature quoted above—

was withdrawn in view of the request which had been made by the executives of the life-insurance companies for further time in which to study the Department's views.

Now, they came in and made that study and now for the first time after the study the Committee on Ways and Means has opportunity to bring a bill of this nature before the Congress. So the delay was not occasioned by any failure on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury or the committee or the Congress, but in deference to the life-insurance companies. Certainly, they cannot come in now, having been notified to retain their reserves, that something like this would be brought in and say, "You are going back retroactively and taking in the reserves." They have been on notice all the time.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the explanation the gentleman has given may hold up in the courts, as he suggests. May I ask the gentleman this question, in order to enlighten me and perhaps other Members of the House? There are both stock companies and mutual companies. I take it that this legislation applies only to the stock companies and not to the mutual companies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield four additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COMBS. It applies to all life-insurance companies.

Mr. HINSHAW. How can the mutual company be said to have made earnings when it has no reserves?

Mr. COMBS. I do not want to go into a discussion of life insurance. I do not pose as an expert on that question. This is the point, however: The profits the mutual companies make go back to the policyholders instead of to formal stockholders. That is about the only difference. They do make net income which ought to be taxed.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is not that to be considered an excess payment?

Mr. COMBS. I do not care what it is considered; they make profits.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBS. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. The point I wanted to make when the gentleman was talking about the dickering between the insurance companies and the Treasury is, the truth of the matter is, that the insurance companies were dickering with the Treasury on the formula that they themselves had suggested and that was accepted by the Congress in 1942.

Mr. COMBS. That is correct.

Mr. FORAND. The record will prove that the Treasury Department had its own formula that it was proposing, which the Treasury thought at that time was the better of the two formulas. However, because the life-insurance industry was unanimous in demanding this particular formula that now is the law, the Treasury said they would have no objection to it. So what we are actually doing is correcting, with the consent of the insurance companies, a mistake that the insurance companies and not the Treasury Department made back in 1942.

Mr. COMBS. Certainly that is true. I join others in saying that the insurance companies by and large have done a fine job. I think the subcommittee that handled this bill did a fine job, the members of both parties. I think this is a sound measure. The only question that could be raised about the validity of this levy would be as to the third year back there, 1947. I think it will stand up all right. But in any case, the longer we wait for this legislation, the more risk we run, depending on how far back we go in recovering back taxes. Going back 2 years has already been sustained by the courts.

It is in a little different category than other forms of legislation.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Did the testimony indicate that if the insurance companies pay this retroactive tax back to 1947 it will not have an effect upon the value of the premiums and the investments of the policyholders?

Mr. COMBS. I was not a member of the subcommittee, but my understanding is that it will not endanger in any way the investments. What about that, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. LYNCH. That is correct.

Mr. COMBS. The chairman of the subcommittee says that is correct, that it will not in any way endanger the policies.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I do not mean endanger them, but will it reduce their holdings? Will it reduce the percentage paid on the investment?

Mr. LYNCH. The information that we had on that score from the representatives of all the companies was to the contrary, that it would have no effect on the value of their policies.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Was any consideration given in the committee to making the tax apply for this taxable year for the whole amount that was due, instead of making it retroactive?

Mr. LYNCH. Yes; we considered that, and we felt that that probably would not be good for the industry and probably would not be good for us in trying to get the money that we thought should come in, for it would put too much of a burden, so we thought, and so the industry thought, on 1950.

Mr. COMBS. The life-insurance companies want good will. They realize the necessity for it and they do not want to be put in the class of tax dodgers and would like to pay their taxes for these 3 years.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Did the committee give any consideration to the establishment of a precedent in retroactive tax collection?

Mr. LYNCH. Yes; and we do not think there is any precedent established in this case.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I was rather surprised by the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota, my good friend [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]. I was not a member of the subcommittee handling this particular problem, but I am reliably informed, as has been said here by the chairman of the subcommittee in his opening remarks in the debate, that 95 percent of the insurance industry are satisfied with this legislation and that there is practically only one insurance company that is not.

Furthermore, that every insurance company with whom they came in contact, and they had lengthy consultations and conferences and meetings with representatives of the two great life-insurance associations of the country, agreed that they should pay taxes. Every insurance company in those associations agreed. I am surprised that the gentleman from Minnesota would stand up in the well of the House and perhaps put a fear in the heart of many policyholders throughout the country that this action by the Congress of the United States might endanger the payment of their policies because that is not true at all. The insurance companies certainly have enough intelligence and enough good representatives to present to the committee any objections they would have. I am certain every insurance company would champion the protection of its policyholders. I just want the committee to know that, Mr. Chairman, and I want the committee to know furthermore that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is presenting an argument that even the representatives of the insurance companies never advanced for one moment. So I hope the policyholders of the country will have no fear that this will have any effect on their policy.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Since the gentleman mentioned my name I have asked him to yield for this observation. Of course I said in my remarks I felt the insurance companies should pay taxes provided they kept up the reserves required by law. But there must be somebody here at least, and I am sure the gentleman agrees with me, who will look out for the interests of the 78,000,000 policyholders in the country.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is just my point. Does not the gentleman think the insurance companies themselves would have made representations if there was any possibility of any effect whatsoever on the reserves? Certainly they would have, because we have to give the great insurance companies of the United States

credit for wanting to protect the policyholders.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think they should, but it is our duty here in Congress when we have legislation of this kind before us to also protect the life insurance policyholders of the country who are depending upon the trusts that they have created to protect their dependents.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

STOPGAP LEGISLATION FOR LIFE-INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. Chairman, I introduced House Joint Resolution 371 on October 10, 1949, in order to terminate the exemption of life-insurance companies under the corporate income tax. Under the resolution as introduced eight percent of the net investment income of each company would have been treated as its taxable income in 1948 and 1949. This would have produced $90,000,000 additional revenue for the 2 years combined.

Immediate action seemed essential because the exemption of this large and profitable industry was the unanticipated result of a formula for determining the taxable income of life-insurance companies adopted in 1942. This formula, which at the time of its adoption had the support of both the Treasury Department and the representatives of the life-insurance companies, defined taxable income as the excess of the revenues received from the companies' investments over the presumed requirements of their policyholders' reserves. The net income so defined, was subject to the same rates of tax as other corporations.

The 1942 formula was peculiar in two respects. First, the percentage of investment income which was taxable was the same for every firm in the industry. Second, the taxable percentage was fixed largely on the assumption that the policyholders' reserves required a return of 3¼ percent. To a lesser extent the percentage was determined on the basis of the actual average contributions to policyholders' reserves in the industry during the preceding year.

As a result of the 1942 legislation the tax paid by life-insurance companies increased from $1,190,000 in 1941 to $27,427,000 in 1942. There was a further increase to $34,482,000 in 1943, but thereafter the tax paid declined steadily. In 1947 and 1948 no tax was due at all and, I have been informed, probably no tax will be due in 1949. This was the result of the combination of a declining yield on insurance-company investments and the use of a formula based primarily on the assumption that policyholders' reserves required a return of 3¼ percent per year. In spite of the continued increase in the amount of the industry's investment income, the resulting overstatement of the proportion needed to finance the contributions required by policyholders' reserves gradually reduced and finally eliminated the taxable income of the life-insurance companies.

This is an important and profitable industry. It is not right that it should go untaxed, especially when the country as a whole is bearing an unusually severe burden of taxation.

The inequity of the exemption of the industry was apparent immediately and notice was given in 1947 by the Secretary of the Treasury that a revision of the formula used to define the net income of life-insurance companies was in order. This proved to be a very difficult and time-consuming task. In developing a new formula the Treasury consulted with representatives of the industry. A diversity of views appeared and the resulting discussions lasted from the autumn of 1947 until the summer of 1949. No generally satisfactory answer having been developed up to that time, the Treasury Department and the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation recommended the enactment of stopgap legislation to terminate this unpremeditated tax exemption pending a final solution to the problem. The Secretary of the Treasury suggested temporary legislation in a letter to me dated August 16, 1949. Opposition on the part of some companies to the proposal contained in his letter produced further delay, but on October 10, 1949, the Secretary wrote me a second letter confirming his previous recommendations. On the same day I introduced House Joint Resolution 371.

Objections to the resolution were raised by the representatives of a number of the companies. Some believed that the decision to tax 8 percent of investment income was arbitrary and wished to substitute a percentage related either to the experience of the industry as a whole, or the experience of the individual company. Others objected to the imposition of a tax on income received in 1948, arguing that retroactive taxation was unfair.

These objections led to the appointment on October 12 of the subcommittee whose report, entitled "The Income Taxation of Life-Insurance Companies," was recently made public. Under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from New York, the Honorable WALTER A. LYNCH, this subcommittee held a number of meetings with representatives of the industry in general and of the particular companies which had taken exception to the resolution. The subcommittee concluded that immediate stopgap legislation was in order, but believed that it should differ somewhat from House Joint Resolution 371 as originally introduced. There were two principal differences between the original resolution and the subcommittee's proposal. First, instead of taxing a flat 8 percent of net investment income, the taxable percentage would be determined by reference to the average experience of the industry in the preceding year. Second, in addition to imposing a tax based on income received in 1948 and 1949, there was to be levied also a tax based on income received in 1947, the year in which the 1942 formula ran out and in which discussions concerning the revision of this feature of the income-tax law were begun.

The amendments of House Joint Resolution 371 proposed by the subcommittee had the support of the vast majority of the life-insurance companies. Because a tax would be imposed for each of the years in which the 1942 formula had produced no tax liability, the industry would be relieved of a certain amount of embarrassment and bad public relations resulting from its tax-free status. The fact that net income for tax purposes was to be defined in terms of the average experience of the industry was attractive to a great majority of the companies which had long advocated this approach as the basis for a long-run solution.

From the point of view of the Government the amended version of House Joint Resolution 371 is acceptable because it is expected to produce about the same, or possibly a little more, revenue than the resolution originally introduced, and because much of the controversy which the original resolution might have produced will be avoided. This is desirable because the proposed legislation is of a stopgap character and quick action is essential. Moreover, the form which this resolution takes in no way sets the pattern for the permanent method of defining the taxable income of life-insurance companies which is to follow.

In accordance with its status as stopgap legislation, the amended resolution applies only to the years 1947, 1948, and 1949. It is hoped that during the current session of Congress the Committee on Ways and Means will be able to bring forward a satisfactory permanent solution. Should this prove impossible, it will be necessary to introduce, at a later date, a second resolution extending to 1950 the formula used in the amended version of House Joint Resolution 371 or establishing some other basis for a 1950 tax. It is my sincere hope that this will not be necessary. I have every expectation that the work done by the Treasury and by our own staff is sufficiently well advanced so that a permanent solution can be brought forward in a comparatively short time.

Representatives of certain companies have taken strong exception to the retroactive aspect of the resolution. I do not believe that their arguments are well founded. From the beginning, the industry has been fully aware that its exemption from the income tax could not be justified on grounds of equity, particularly when the tax burdens borne by others were so severe. Moreover, representatives of the industry have been discussing the problems arising out of the failure of the 1942 formula ever since the autumn of 1947, and they were warned at that time that the revised formula might be applied to the year 1947. It seems to me that the equity of the case is all in favor of the retroactive feature of the proposed resolution.

The constitutionality of the resolution also seems clear. A considerable number of our income tax laws have been given retroactive application, and in no case has this resulted in their being held unconstitutional. We have before us also the decision of the United States Supreme Court in *Welch* v. *Henry* (305

U. S. 134), dated November 21, 1938, the opinion being written by Mr. Justice Stone. Here the Supreme Court upheld an income tax imposed by the State of Wisconsin in 1935 upon dividends received in 1933 which had previously been exempt. The Court stated:

A tax is not necessarily unconstitutional because retroactive. * * * Taxation is neither a penalty imposed on the taxpayer nor a liability which he assumes by contract. It is but a way of apportioning the cost of government among those who in some measure are privileged to enjoy its benefits and must bear its burdens. Since no citizen enjoys immunity from that burden, its retroactive imposition does not necessarily infringe due process, and to challenge the present tax it is not enough to point out that the taxable event, the receipt of income, antedated the statute.

Representatives of certain other companies have taken exception to the fact that the percentage of investment income which is taxable under the resolution is determined on the basis of the average experience of the industry rather than that of the individual taxpayer. This objection raises a difficult and basic question of policy and the request has been made that hearings be conducted on the resolution in order to permit a thorough exploration of the question at issue. No such hearings have been held because, as I have pointed out repeatedly, this is merely stopgap legislation applying to a period already past; a tax constructed in accordance with a principle embodied in existing legislation. You may be assured that when the Committee on Ways and Means considers permanent legislation it will explore thoroughly the desirability of substituting a tax based upon the experience of the individual firm for the industry average approach. You may be assured also that the committee will review the question whether investment income alone is the appropriate tax base for life-insurance companies and will investigate thoroughly the possibility of imposing the tax on a broader base. For that purpose public hearings will be very much in order. However, time does not permit and logic does not require such hearings for the purposes of the resolution now before you, which is stopgap legislation only and which applies the principles contained in existing law to taxable years that are already closed.

I urge the immediate adoption of the amended version of House Joint Resolution 371 because I believe that it will eliminate an unforeseen and unjustifiable series of tax exemptions, because it will bring in $93,000,000, or more, of additional tax revenue at a time when it is sorely needed, and because it will provide the Committee on Ways and Means with a breathing spell during which it may consider carefully the appropriate long-run solution to the problem of defining the taxable income of life-insurance companies.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 202 (b) and section 203 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the reserve and other policy liability credit of life-insurance companies) are hereby amended by adding at the end of each the following new sentence: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, the figure to be used in computing the reserve and other policy liability credit for taxable years beginning in 1948 and 1949 shall be 0.92."

SEC. 2. Every life-insurance company subject to the taxes imposed by section 201 of the Internal Revenue Code shall, after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution and on or before the 15th day of the third month following the close of the month in which falls the date of such enactment, make a return for its taxable year beginning in 1948 with respect to the taxes imposed by such section 201 (determined with the amendments made by the first section of this joint resolution). The return required by this section shall constitute the return for such taxable year for all purposes of the Internal Revenue Code; and no return for such taxable year, with respect to the taxes imposed by section 201 of such code, filed on or before the date of the enactment of this joint resolution shall be considered for any of such purposes as a return for such year. The taxes imposed by section 201 of such code for such taxable year (determined with the amendments made by the first section of this joint resolution) shall be paid on the 15th day of the third month following the close of the month in which falls the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, in lieu of at the time prescribed in section 56 (a) of such code. All payments with respect to the taxes of such taxable year imposed by section 201 of such code under the law in effect prior to the enactment of this joint resolution, to the extent that such payments have not been credited or refunded, shall be deemed to be payments on account of such taxes determined with the amendments made by the first section of this joint resolution.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That (a) the second sentence of section 202 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended to read as follows: 'This figure shall be based on such data with respect to life-insurance companies for the preceding taxable year as the Secretary considers representative and shall be computed as follows:

"'(1) In general: Except as provided in paragraph (2), the figure shall be computed in accordance with the following formula: The ratio which a numerator comprised of the aggregate of the sums of (A) 2 percent of the reserves for deferred dividends, (B) interest paid, and (C) the product of (i) the mean of the adjusted reserves at the beginning and end of the taxable year and (ii) the reserve earnings rate bears to a denominator comprised of the aggregate of the excess of net incomes computed without any deduction for tax-free interest, over the adjustment for certain reserves provided in subsection (c).

"'(2) Special rule for 1947, 1948, and 1949: In the case of the taxes imposed for a taxable year beginning in 1947, 1948, or 1949, the figure to be used for such year shall be computed as provided in paragraph (1) except that—

"'(A) in computing the product required under clause (C) of paragraph (1), there shall be used, in lieu of the reserve earnings rate, the average rate of interest assumed in computing life-insurance reserves. Such average rate shall be calculated in the manner provided in the second sentence of section 201 (c) (4); and

"'(B) if the Secretary, in computing the ratio, finds that the net effect of including the data with respect to any life-insurance company is to increase the numerator more than it increases the denominator, he shall limit the net change in the numerator resulting from such inclusion to the net change in the denominator resulting therefrom.'

"(b) Section 203 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by striking out 'figure' and inserting in lieu thereof 'applicable figure.'

"(c) The amendments made by this joint resolution shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946. The Secretary of the Treasury shall, within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, determine and proclaim in accordance with the provisions of section 202 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by this joint resolution, the figures to be used by life-insurance companies in computing their reserve and other policy liability credits for taxable years beginning in 1947, 1948, and 1949.

"SEC. 2. Every life-insurance company subject to the taxes imposed by section 201 of the Internal Revenue Code shall, after the date of the Secretary's proclamation required by section 1 (c) of this joint resolution and on or before the 15th day of the third month following the close of the month in which this joint resolution is enacted, make returns for its taxable years beginning in 1947, 1948, and 1949 with respect to the taxes imposed by such section 201 (determined with the amendments made by the first section of this joint resolution). The return required by this section for any taxable year shall constitute the return for such taxable year for all purposes of the Internal Revenue Code; and no return for such taxable year, with respect to the taxes imposed by section 201 of such code, filed on or before the date of such proclamation shall be considered for any of such purposes as a return for such year. The taxes imposed by section 201 of such code (determined with the amendments made by the first section of this joint resolution) for each such taxable year shall be paid on the 15th day of the third month following the close of the month in which this joint resolution is enacted, in lieu of at the time prescribed in section 56 (a) of such code. All payments with respect to the taxes for each such taxable year imposed by section 201 of such code under the law in effect prior to the enactment of this joint resolution, to the extent that such payments have not been credited or refunded, shall be deemed to be payments made at the time of the filing of the return required by this section on account of the taxes for that year determined with the amendments made by the first section of this joint resolution."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Page 6, after line 7, insert:

"SEC. 3. Effective on and after the first day of the first month which begins more than 20 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution—

"(a) the tax imposed by section 1700 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (tax on admissions);

"(b) the tax imposed by section 1700 (b) of such code (tax on permanent use or lease of boxes or seats);

"(c) the tax imposed by section 1700 (c) of such code (tax on sales of tickets outside box office);

"(d) the tax imposed by section 1700 (e) of such code (tax on cabarets, roof gardens, etc.);

"(e) the tax imposed by section 1710 (a) (1) of such code (tax on dues or membership fees);

"(f) the tax imposed by section 1710 (a) (2) of such code (tax on initiation fees);

"(g) the tax imposed by section 2400 of such code (tax on jewelry);

"(h) the tax imposed by section 2401 of such code (tax on furs);

"(i) the tax imposed by section 2402 of such code (tax on toilet preparations);

"(j) the tax imposed by section 3268 of such code (tax on bowling alleys, billiard and pool tables);

"(k) the tax imposed by section 3406 (a) (10) of such code (tax on electric light bulbs and tubes);

"(l) the taxes imposed by section 3465 (a) of such code (taxes on telegraph, telephone, radio, and cable facilities); and

"(m) the taxes imposed by section 3469 of such code (taxes on transportation of persons, and on seating or sleeping accommodations in connection with such transportation);

shall be determined without regard to the war tax rates specified in section 1650 of such code.

"SEC. 4. For the purposes of section 1657 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to floor stocks refunds on electric light bulbs) and of section 1658 of such code (relating to the application of the effective date of rate reduction in the case of telephone, telegraph, etc., services), the term 'rate reduction date' means the first day of the first month which begins more than 20 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

"SEC. 5. Effective with respect to articles sold on or after the first day of the first month which begins more than 20 days after the date of enactment of this joint resolution:

"(a) Section 1651 of the Internal Revenue Code (retailers' excise tax on luggage, purses, handbags, toilet cases, etc.) is hereby repealed.

"(b) Section 2402 (b) of such code (tax on sale of toilet articles to barber shops and beauty parlors) is hereby repealed.

"(c) Subsection (d) of section 3404 of such code (manufacturers' excise tax on musical instruments) is hereby repealed.

"(d) Paragraph (3) of section 3406 (a) of such code (manufacturers' excise tax on electric, gas, and oil appliances) and paragraph (6) of such section (manufacturers' excise tax on business and store machines) are hereby repealed.

"(e) Section 2400 of such code (tax on jewelry, etc.) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'The tax imposed by this secton shall not apply to articles sold at retail for less than $25.'

"(f) Section 3406 (a) (4) of such code (manufacturers' excise tax on photographic apparatus) is hereby amended by striking out '25 percent' and insertng in lieu thereof '10 percent,' and by striking out '15 percent' and inserting in lieu thereof '10 percent.'

"SEC. 6. Effective with respect to amounts paid on or after the first day of the first month which begins more than 20 days after the date of enactment of this joint resolution:

"(a) Subchapter E of chapter 30 of the Internal Revenue Code (tax on transportation of property) is hereby repealed.

"(b) Section 1850 (a) of such code (tax on safe deposit boxes) is hereby amended by striking out '20 percent' and inserting in lieu thereof '10 percent.'"

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the pending bill. If the gentleman desires, I will reserve it for the time being.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would appreciate the gentleman doing so.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit a unanimous-consent request. This amendment repeals the wartime excise-tax rates on such articles as furs, jewelry, luggage, toilet preparations, lubrication oils, gasoline, tires and tubes, automobile trucks and busses, automobiles and motorcycles, parts and accessories, electrical energy, electric, gas, and oil appliances, light bulbs and tubes, radio sets and phonographs, phonograph records, musical instruments, mechanical refrigerators, air conditioners, matches, business and store machines, photographic apparatus and sporting goods, and so forth. I ask that the amendment be considered as read.

I have introduced this amendment to give the House an opportunity to vote now on repeal of the wartime excise taxes which are stifling business and costing people jobs. The House Ways and Means Committee has acted with amazing speed to bring to the floor so quickly this bill to carry out President Truman's proposal of January 23, involving increased income taxes of insurance companies.

However, the President also, in that very same message, asked for reductions in certain wartime excise taxes, in a sort of latter-day confession that perhaps those of us who had been demanding action for one long year were right after all. It occurs to me that would be both proper and fitting, in view of the speed with which this bill has been brought to the floor of the House, if we adopted as an amendment my proposal to repeal the wartime excise taxes immediately.

This amendment repeals the wartime rates on such items as jewelry, electric-light bulbs and tubes, luggage, including women's handbags; furs, admissions, toilet goods, including such essentials as baby oils; cable, radio, and telegraph messages; telephone tolls and local telephone bills; transportation of persons and of freight; cameras and photographic equipment. It exempts barber shops and beauty parlors from any tax on toilet articles. It repeals the manufacturers' excise tax on electric, gas, and oil appliances, including stoves; the tax on musical instruments, business and store machines; and it reduces the tax on safe-deposit boxes.

Certainly my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle could have no objection to carrying out this part of the President's revised program if they have no objection to considering the bill now before us.

I realize that there are certain inconsistencies which confront them. The President is committed to increases in taxes, not decreases. The bill before the House increases taxes, and therefore I can understand the reasons for the haste in rushing it to the floor. My amendment would reduce taxes, which might explain the fact that there is no hurry on the part of the administration to have it reported to the House.

My measure to return excise taxes to their prewar levels was introduced on February 2, 1949, and I might add that it has been bottled up in the Ways and Means Committee by the administration ever since. These wartime rates were specifically designed to retard sales. Any businessman affected by these taxes will tell you that they are retarding sales, losing the Federal Treasury revenue, and causing employers who have no desire to do so to lay off workers. I am certain that the President, who is already responsible for 1 year of delay, would not wish, if he thought about it, to be responsible for further delay, further loss of jobs and further harm to business.

These wartime excise taxes have reached the point of diminishing returns. At this very minute, small-business men, operators of small stores, and other businesses will tell you that since the President's message, the American public has stopped buying goods upon which these excise taxes are still levied. There is sound reason to believe that if these burdensome taxes were repealed, sales of the taxed commodities would promptly soar and that the revenue from both personal and corporate sources would increase in amount sufficient to offset the reduction in excise revenue. Therefore, I urge the Members of the House, both Democrats and Republicans alike, to support this amendment today so that we can remove this needless burden from the back of the American economy. I cannot believe that the Democratic leadership of this House would care to share with President Truman the responsibility of further postponement of this vital step to which millions upon millions of Americans subscribe. Here is a test of good faith, and we on the minority side of the aisle do not intend to let the American people down.

Mr. Chairman, some do not appreciate the failure to eliminate these taxes are contributing to a slump in business. Stores are selling less. Stocks are accumulating. People are waiting for Congress to give this long-wanted relief. This causes fewer orders to the factories and contributes to curtailments and unemployment.

You say people are not refusing to buy. Let me give you the facts.

In December 1949 there was a slump in revenue from the manufacturers' sales taxes of 15.7 percent over the sales of December 1948. The retail excise taxes were off 18.8 percent in December 1949 over the previous year.

That is a serious decline. It means, if continued, a loss of revenue of $450,000,000. And I am afraid January figures will be worse.

The Treasurer's report, which will be out in a day or two, which has just been compiled by the Treasury Department, shows that furs, for illustration, brought in revenue of $9,875,698.34 in December 1948 and this year only $6,737,983.88. That is a terrific decline.

Jewelry revenues declined from $19,245,000 to $15,964,000.

Every item that bears an excise tax or a retail tax has decreased, with the single exception of automobiles which show the only increase.

I believe, from these facts, we should pass these excise-tax reductions today.

I ask for this legislation not only in the interest of the concerns that are engaged in these various activities, but I ask it above all in the interest of the people who work, the people who are finding that their employment is gone, finding that they are out of jobs. The loss to the country works two ways: Not only do we

have a loss of income from the failure of the goods to flow but also, through putting people out of work in the shops, we are crowding the unemployment rolls. This means the Government is obliged to pay many millions of dollars to the unemployed workers. I predict the passage of this amendment would mean a financial gain to the country.

I sincerely hope the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee will not press his point of order. Democrats and Republicans alike have voiced their approval of this legislation. I ask for its passage so that the economic conditions of this country will not become worse than they are today.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. If the Republicans had been elected to power in 1948, this would have been done long before this.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It was part of our program. We expected this to be tax reduction bill No. 2, the first is already a law, passed over the veto of the President.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman's proposal is in the interest of the consumers of the United States, who are now paying for the high cost of Government through these taxes on the goods they buy.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is absolutely correct. This amendment will help bring about lower prices. Let me illustrate how transportation taxes enter into living costs. On a carload of fruit shipped from California to New York City, over $24 in taxes is paid on the freight charges alone. These charges are an important factor in high prices.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. I cannot let go unchallenged the statement just made by the gentleman from Ohio, that if the Republicans were in control this would have been out of the way, because after all it was the Republican Party that struck from the tax code the termination date on these excise taxes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I did not want to get into a partisan argument here, but the gentleman knows well that action was approved by the President of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Further reserving the point of order, Mr. Chairman, may I say that I have no objection to this extension of time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. When did the distinguished minority leader first introduce his bill to repeal these taxes?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I introduced it last February or March.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the gentleman's proposal include photographic businesses?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. They are in this list for relief if the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. CHURCH. Those businesses were required during the war to convert to the munitions business.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I say these taxes in the first instance were not proposed as revenue measures. They were to discourage travel on the railroads; they were to discourage people from talking too much on the telephone; they were to discourage people from going into industries where the demand for goods was not fully in accord with the war effort. That is the main reason these taxes were imposed. The war is over now, and we should put the people back on a peacetime basis as far as excise taxes are concerned.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. They were certainly not imposed for the purpose of not having more babies, but baby oil was included in the items taxed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not know how that particular item got in there. I would not be too familiar with that.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I am.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does not the gentleman know that there was a termination date for the levying of these excise taxes, and that when the gentleman from Massachusetts was Speaker the Republican Congress wiped out that termination date and made these taxes apply for an indefinite period?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I could answer that quite easily, but I will yield to the able and distinguished top expert, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] to answer.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is the fact, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. REED of New York. I am very happy to answer the gentleman's question. The President of the United States not only sent the bill up to the Committee on Ways and Means, but in his acceptance message he urged that we do away with this termination date because he said that with the slowing up of business we could not afford to lower the revenue, and the Republican Party, cooperating with him, did away with the termination date.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does the gentleman mean to say that the Republican Congress listened to President Truman?

Mr. REED of New York. Therefore the responsibility is on the administration. It has been on the administration and that is where it has remained.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman means that the Republican Party, having the majority, certainly wanted to do away with the termination date.

Mr. REED of New York. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will check, he will find that there were only 356 Members in the House against the proposition, so you probably voted for it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. May I say to the gentlemen, to keep the record straight, that I did not. I voted to sustain the President's veto when he vetoed that message. So the responsibility must rest on the leadership of the Republican Party, and I think they ought to assume that responsibility.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that bill was probably passed at a time when we had more confidence in the President and his intentions than we do at the present time. We wanted to make certain our first tax bill did not hurt the revenues of the country.

The bill gave full tax relief to 7,000,000 small-tax payers; it aided the aged people and it gave every taxpayer a percentage of relief. It gave the country an impetus which brought about the first balanced budget in 18 years and at the same time an era of great prosperity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the point of order, I want to make a very brief statement. The memory of the gentleman on the other side is exceedingly short. The gentleman from Massachusetts, of course, never having been a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, cannot be expected to know much about the history of the excise-tax legislation. But the memory of the distinguished gentleman from New York, the ranking minority member, and others who have given similar expressions, is so exceedingly short on this question that I must try to make a few brief remarks to set the record straight. The fact is that the President of the United States sent his message to the Congress at the beginning of the Eightieth Republican-controlled Congress, recommending a 1-year extension of the existing excise taxes. The Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress disregarded the recommendation of the President of the United States, declined to follow that recommendation, and struck out the termination date for excise taxes which was then in existing law. So their action made these taxes permanent, and they have continued until now. Of course, that is the fact of the case and everybody at all familiar with the record knows that that is true.

With respect to the remarks made by some gentlemen that these taxes were never imposed for revenue purposes, again their memories are very short and they are very much in error. When

these excise-tax increases were considered for war purposes, all of them, with the exception of a few, were imposed solely and only for revenue purposes. During that consideration, Mr. Leon Henderson, who was then head of OPA, recommended about 8 or 10 excise taxes to curtail civilian consumption, and the committee only accepted about 3 or 4 of those recommendations.

So that this long list of excise taxes had no relation to that phase of the subject, but they were imposed for revenue tax purposes. I now yield briefly to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman from Tennessee will recall that we introduced a tax bill and spent much time on the tax bill known as the Knutson bill. The gentleman will recall that that bill was enacted into law. It was vetoed by the President and we had to go through the bill three different times and each time the President vetoed it. When it came to the final test we overruled the President's veto with the help of the Democratic Members on your side.

Mr. COOPER. That bill was vetoed not because of the excise-tax treatment, but because of certain income-tax provisions.

Mr. REED of New York. But you used all the time, some of which could have been devoted to the question of excise taxes.

The President wanted them all considered together.

Mr. COOPER. The fact is that some of us begged and pleaded with certain Republican Members to give some consideration to excise-tax relief, instead of giving so much relief to the high-income-tax brackets.

Mr. REED of New York. Seventy-one percent of that bill was for people in the low-income group. The gentleman from Tennessee will recall that the President stated "selfish interests were behind the tax reduction of the Eightieth Congress." Let us see what the tax-reduction bill of the Eightieth Congress actually did.

It increased personal exemptions and credits for dependents from $500 to $600 for all taxpayers and thereby removed 6,000,000 taxpayers from the tax rolls. Did this show a selfish interest or an attempt to provide relief for all taxpayers? The President opposed this.

It placed husbands and wives in the non-community-property States on the same basis for Federal income-tax purposes as husbands and wives living in community-property States. Can this be said to be a selfish interest? The President opposed this.

It provided an additional income-tax exemption of $600 to persons over 65. This was an effort to provide for old people whose main source of income came from business and annuities and who, because of their age, were no longer able to continue in the working force. Was this demanded by selfish interests? The President opposed this.

It gave the blind people an additional exemption of $100, increasing the special exemption for blind from $500 to $600. Was this demanded by selfish interests? The President opposed this.

It granted percentage reductions in tax to all taxpayers ranging from a 12.6-percent reduction in the first bracket to a top 5-percent reduction in the higher brackets. In fact, of the total relief provided in the tax-reduction bill, over 71 percent went to persons with income under $5,000. Was this reduction demanded by selfish interests? The President opposed this.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, we are not serving any good purpose by prolonging this discussion now, because the excise-tax subject is to be considered by the Ways and Means Committee at an early date.

Certainly, in making the point of order, I do so in the interest of orderly procedure. It is not intended to reflect any views that I may entertain on the excise-tax subject. I have felt all along that some of those taxes should be repealed and certain others should be reduced. But we now have under consideration an income-tax bill relating only to the subject of income taxes of life-insurance companies. Certainly, the amendment proposed by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] seeking to amend the excise-tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code is not germane to the pending bill.

On the ground that it is not germane to the pending bill, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire to speak to the point of order?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes; Mr. Chairman, I respect the judgment and the parliamentary knowledge of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], but I feel that he errs in his contention. In my judgment, the amendment is in order. This is a tax bill. True, it is a tax-increase bill, but when a tax measure is on the floor, I believe amendments to decrease as well as increase are germane. This proposal has been made a part of the President's message. Therefore, I submit it is germane to consider all of the tax proposals of the President's message. Let us give the consuming public consideration as well as the Treasury.

Certainly, if we are thinking of the general welfare of the people, we should yield the doubt in favor of the best interests of the people.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GORE). The Chair is ready to rule.

The Committee of the Whole has under consideration House Joint Resolution 371 and a committee amendment thereto, to which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] has offered an amendment. The gentleman from Tennessee has made a point of order against the amendment to the amendment on the grounds that it is not germane. The Chair has examined the text of the resolution, the committee amendment, and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. House Joint Resolution 371, and the committee amendment thereto, deals with the Internal Revenue Code in one particular, to wit, the income-tax liability of insurance companies. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts deals with sundry and different parts of the Internal Revenue Code.

The fundamental test of germaneness, according to the precedents of this body, is that a proposition submitted must be akin and relative to the particular subject matter to which the proposition is offered as an amendment.

The Chair holds——

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is not proper to interrupt the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair trusts the gentleman from Nebraska will permit the Chair to finish the statement on his ruling.

The Chair feels that this fundamental test of germaneness is not met by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. Therefore, the point of order is sustained.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, what little I have to say is directed primarily to the chairman of the subcommittee that presided over the hearings on this resolution.

I would like to have one matter cleared up, which is ambiguous, in my mind.

On page 4 of the committee report, I find the following:

> Representatives of the industry have expressed a strong preference for the resolution as amended. This preference appears to be based in part upon the fact that under the amendment a tax liability would be established for each of the years in which no liability accrued under existing law.

I can illustrate the question that I wish to propound to the Chairman, who is a very fine lawyer and a highly respected Member of this House, by taking one of my own policies as an example. I have eight or nine policies of life insurance. One of them is a paid-up policy in a mutual company. I have not the policy here and have not read it lately, but it was my understanding when I took out that policy for $2,500, which is now fully paid up, that my beneficiaries would receive from the insurance company for the premiums that I paid, $2,500 upon my death and in addition thereto receive the earnings represented by the money that I paid as premiums and the dividends which I left with the company to buy paid up insurance. In other words, my heirs would get the full amount of the face value of the policy and in addition the full amount of the proportionate earnings of my premiums.

According to the report on the resolution under consideration there was not any liability for taxes in 1947, 1948, and 1949. I do not see how Congress, even if the directors of the life insurance company want to do it, can deprive policy holders of a certain part of the moneys in the trust to which their contract entitles them. I would like to have that question answered. Just because the insurance companies' officers say they are perfectly willing to pay taxes, does not give them any legal right, as I see it, to carve out money that the policyholders have already earned when there was no tax due on the company's earnings. This money the policy holders are entitled to under their policies.

Mr. LYNCH. I do not believe that is what they have done. I do not believe it is up to them to say whether or not they are going to pay; it is up to the Congress of the United States. We impressed that very strongly on them. But here is a point that I believe the gentleman overlooked, that the policy the gentleman mentioned does not provide that all the earnings of the premiums shall apply to the policy when it becomes due. Every policy of insurance that I know of provides that the policyholder shall get such part of the earnings as the board of directors or board of trustees may determine. I think that is fundamental insurance law. In this particular instance what the insurance company executives have done was not to give away any of the money of the policyholders but to determine the formula by which the earnings should be taxed. They themselves came in and helped us work out the committee formula. They could come in and help us or they could stay away, but we were the ones who asked for their suggestions so that their policyholders would not be hurt. I feel that we have worked out a good formula, and the reason I say so is because when you get 95 percent of the industry to agree that the formula we worked out is fair, then it must be fair, and it should be accepted by the House.

Mr. JOHNSON. I thank the gentleman, but it does not fully satisfy my mind on the matter, and I would like to make another comment. I do not want to be critical, because I think that the formula principle of taxation in the case of insurance companies is a good principle. As I remember the terms of the policy, having left all my dividends in the company it now would have a face value of about $3,815.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON. If there were no tax due, how could they take the money that I have earned under the contract and pay it for a liability that was not due or in existence when I paid the money? The gentleman has not fully answered that.

Mr. LYNCH. The question, it seems to me, is quite clear. There is no liability under the present law, but we are passing this law so that there will be a liability, and we have done it time and time again in other cases. In the 1936 Revenue Act we went back 28 months. But the present situation is entirely different from that case.

Mr. JOHNSON. Does not the gentleman believe that in this case there is a contract? The policy is the contract. Congress cannot pass a law that impairs the obligation of contracts that people have legally executed, such as the life-insurance contract I am referring to.

Mr. LYNCH. We are not compelling them to break any contract. They will distribute such earnings as are not needed to meet their expenses. This tax is one of the expenses of the insurance companies and it is necessary to help support the Government.

Mr. JOHNSON. Not for those past years, when there was no obligation to pay these taxes. The very law on the books then was such that nothing was due on my life-insurance contract on the company that wrote it.

Mr. LYNCH. At least, that is my understanding of it. That is what we have in the bill and that is what I hope will go through.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman has propounded a very serious query. In the case cited by the gentleman, here is what the company will have to do, and this is what I tried to bring out: They will have to get money out of some other fund and put it in a fund to cover the gentleman's purposes. In going into some other fund they will lay themselves open to an injunction from any policyholder.

Mr. JOHNSON. They are impairing a contract that I have with a company.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman does not contend that the mutual insurance companies would obligate themselves to pay money first to the policyholders before paying taxes?

Mr. JOHNSON. The gentleman knows that the taxes were not due for several years past, but now by this resolution we are going back and creating an obligation at a time when there was none under existing law. That is in the report. The point I am making is they are by this resolution compelled to pay taxes that were never due, thereby violating their contract with me.

Mr. EBERHARTER. They are not violating their contract. Taxes are due before they pay anything to the mutual policyholders. We are making this act retroactive and we are basing it upon decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not think the gentleman gets the point I have been trying to make.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I feel I would be derelict in my duty and in my responsibility to my constituents and to the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee if I did not at this time make a statement. We are under a great responsibility since the ruling of the Parliamentarian or the Chair that this proposed excise-tax amendment is not in order. There is a terrific buyer's strike going on in this country.

Fifty members of the Republican Party introduced bills in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress to reduce excise taxes. Many of those bills were sent down to the Treasury and an adverse report came back on each one of them, which means opposition by the President to excise-tax relief. That is a matter of record in the Committee on Ways and Means.

In view of the alarming conditions that exist in the field of excise taxes, I feel it is the duty and responsibility of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, our splendid chairman, fine statesman that he is, in this crisis, in this emergency, to immediately call a meeting of the Ways and Means Committee and report out an excise-tax bill forthwith, to take care of this excise situation instead of involving it in a general tax bill which it is proposed to consider before they touch excise taxes, and which will not come up until next Thursday. The hearing on taxes on Thursday next will have nothing to do with excise taxes. At that time Secretary Snyder will go into the matter of tax revision, not excise relief. Now is the time when we ought to act, when the country is facing a difficult situation that requires immediate action. I urge that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means meet this excise-tax situation and meet it forthwith.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHURCH: Page 6, after line 7 insert the following new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. If any insurance company which was placed in receivership and its business operated by another insurance company as a separate fund under a management contract approved by the court having jurisdiction of the receivership, for the benefit of the policyholders of such company in receivership, and the management contract has, pursuant to its terms, terminated and final distribution and accounting made to the policyholders with the approval of the proper State supervisory officials, then the tax imposed by this joint resolution, insofar as it applies to the business operations for the years 1947 and 1948 of any such separate fund so terminated, shall not apply."

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the committee will accept this amendment. The problem to which it relates is an extremely complicated one, and has many ramifications. It may be that the language of my amendment is not technically perfect, but this can be ironed out either when the bill is before the other body or in conference.

This bill imposes a tax on insurance companies retroactively for the years 1947, 1948, and 1949. There are, however, cases where an insurance company has represented the business of a defunct insurance company as a separate fund. It administered the business under a management-fee contract for the benefit of the policyholders of the defunct company. All of the profits and earnings were turned back to the policyholders to reduce the liens against their policies.

Under the terms of the bill as it now stands, the tax would be imposed against the income received in connection with these separate funds. Inasmuch as the fund has been distributed and an ac-

counting made, there is no way by which the company can charge the fund for the tax or in any way recoup it.

All that my amendment purports to do is to eliminate any additional tax liability as imposed by this bill in just such cases as this. It is my understanding that there are only two such cases; that of the Washington National Insurance Co., which administered the National Life fund of the defunct National Life Insurance Co., and that of the Lincoln National Life Insurance Co. of Fort Wayne, Ind., which administered the so-called Royal Union fund.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LYNCH. I wish to state to the gentleman that this matter did not come up before the subcommittee. It only came up within the last few days. As I understand, there is only one company involved, or possibly two. But, in any event, we have been making a study of the matter, and from our study it seems that there is a great deal of merit to the amendment that the gentleman has proposed. While I am not so certain that the language carries all the details or that it is the way we would finally like to have it, I wish to say that the committee will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation dawned on me out of a clear sky, and it is, perhaps, presumptuous of me to talk about it. But I am profoundly disturbed about this legislation, and it seems to me it is quite wrong in principle. I am not at all satisfied with the defense that has been given to the legislation by the members of the subcommittee, although I do not doubt that they worked very diligently on the matter.

I happen to be the holder of several insurance policies, and I learned last week for the first time from the President's message that those corporations were not subject to any income tax for their incomes in 1947, 1948, and 1949. That was owing to a sort of a freakish situation which probably was inequitable, but the fact remains that no tax accrued due from those corporations.

The gentleman from North Carolina, the distinguished chairman of the committee, said this morning that no honest man would plead the statute of limitations in defense of a just debt. No doubt. But there is no just debt here. There was no debt at all. As I understand, the justification urged for a retroactive tax is that the life-insurance companies themselves agreed that they were unduly lucky, and would be willing to pay taxes, and the association representing the companies has apparently indicated a willingness to pay the tax. I do not think that is enough.

It does not seem to me that the president or the treasurer or the board of trustees of a life-insurance company, in which I happen to have a policy, has any right to agree with the Treasurer of the United States to make gifts to it, or to pay taxes not due. Of course, when the corporations pay taxes that are not due, they do in effect make gifts. I am not suggesting that the $93,000,000 which these corporations would pay in taxes would really endanger the safety of the policies which I hold or the safety of the policies which other people hold. But certainly the insurance companies would be giving away property of the policyholders which they have no right to give away.

I have not seen the cases at all, and it is rather interesting to note that in the report on this bill not a single case is cited to show the constitutionality of a law imposing a retroactive tax on earnings way back 3 years ago. Even if there be constitutional precedent for such an extraordinary legislation it seems to me thoroughly unwise. Why cannot the distinguished Committee on Ways and Means go back and say that the tax rate which I paid on my income in 1948 was not high enough, and boost that?

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. To the extent that they spent money for taxes not due, they carved that much out of your policy, that you have paid for.

Mr. HALE. Of course they did, there is no question about it. It is very significant that no member of the Committee on Ways and Means and no member of the subcommittee has controverted that point.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. May I compliment the gentleman on bringing out the fact that it applies to retroactive taxes of one type, and it might apply to another type such as the income tax. If it applies to the income tax generally, it may go back to the year when we first started that tax in the United States.

Mr. HALE. If you go back retroactively to the year 1947, why should you not go back to 1927 or 1917? Why should you not even go back and impose a tax for the period before the income-tax amendment to the Constitution was adopted?

Mr. FULTON. That is exactly right.

Mr. HALE. My father back in the nineties did not pay any tax on his income at all. What are you going to do about that?

Mr. FULTON. May I ask this further question: If there is no limit on the retroactivity of it, either as to kind or variety or as to time, you are opening up a whole Pandora's box by this amendment. Then, if you make an exception between bankrupt companies and others, you have another unreasonable difference.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, following up a bit on the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], some of us have been pressing long and hard to get some action or indication from the Treasury Department as to their attitude on excise taxes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] made the statement that all of the Republican bills had been reported adversely. I introduced a bill, House Resolution 4489, on May 3. A request was made of the Treasury Department by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means for a report. I called the Committee on Ways and Means last night to find that there is no report back yet on my bill, although the request is on record as of May 5.

With that type of service from the Treasury Department, I think you will realize that members of the Committee on Ways and Means are seriously handicapped in making an accurate study and an accurate determination of the attitude or the views of the Treasury Department on bills that we have introduced in this field. The time is here now when we need that action, that indication, that help, and that cooperation from them if we are to approach the excise-tax field with any degree of understanding.

I cannot give you any break-down or any estimate of the cost of my bill from their point of view, and I expected such information last May, when we requested the report from the Department.

It is my appeal at this time that we get better cooperation than that from the Treasury Department in the excise study we are going into in the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4489 is in the automotive field, a field that I consider very fundamental, one that reaches to the pocketbook of practically every American in some form or other. It is of far-reaching importance. I want the Treasury Department's cooperation and the attention of the majority side of the Committee on Ways and Means to a thorough study immediately on repeal of excise taxes in that particular field.

In my view, the emergency Federal automotive excises must be included in any plan for tax adjustments at this session.

There is no question that Congress imposed these only as temporary taxes to raise funds needed in an emergency. The emergency is over, Congress should now keep it promise to repeal these taxes.

The States are embarked on one of their largest road-building programs that must of necessity rely in great part upon the motor-vehicle use taxes for the required financing. The vehicle owner should no longer be subjected to the duplication of this type of taxation, brought about through the Federal Government's invasion of this field.

These Federal taxes—levied on gasoline, oil, tires, tubes, parts, accessories, and new vehicles—are contributing to the critical financial problems of city transit companies. In some cases, these taxes no doubt make the difference between black ink and red ink; present fares, or increased fares. They are contributing to the financial problems of the whole motor-carrier industry.

This is just one example of the present effect of these imposts, which put an

unfair burden on everyone who uses highway transportation. Because they represent an important part of the cost of a new car, bus, or truck, they make purchase that much more difficult. When they are levied on replacement parts, the Federal Government is in effect placing a tax on hardship.

Through these taxes, the man who must use automotive transportation to earn his living or to supply his customers is required to pay more general taxes to the Federal Government than another who does not. This is particularly true of the farmer.

H. R. 4489 provides for the repeal of these excises and end this injustice. The Federal automotive taxes are taxes on necessities, not on luxuries. The time definitely has come to repeal them.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to impose the strict rules of the House during this debate, but we have had a rather wide range of debate on something that is not involved in the pending legislation at all.

So, Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the committee amendment.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Will opportunity be given to offer other amendments to this bill?

Mr. COOPER. Does the gentleman from New York have an amendment to the pending amendment?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I have an amendment at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. COOPER. Then, Mr. Chairman, may I suggest the gentleman from New York offer it now.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object——

The CHAIRMAN. There is no unanimous-consent request pending before the Committee at the moment.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I understood there was an amendment pending, and then there was a unanimous-consent request made upon which there was no ruling. I reserved the right to object, and now another amendment is being offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not understand that a unanimous-consent request was submitted. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York, to offer his amendment.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: "Strike out everything after the enacting clause."

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, may I say at the outset I think the distinguished minority leader made one of the most constructive proposals this afternoon for reducing taxes that has yet been made. I want to go a step further and say that it was a great regret to me when the President in his tax message to the Congress did not dwell on the repeal of the excise taxes on cameras and photographic equipment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I quite agree with the gentleman in that regard and it is a definite indication that the President, in making these recommendations, did not have consideration for the thousands of people employed in that industry in the gentleman's district as well as in my own district.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. May I say to the gentleman that in his district in Rochester and in mine in Binghamton the camera and photographic equipment manufacturers resent this unfair tax.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The gentleman is not speaking on the amendment.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will get around to that, if the gentleman will let me.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I commend the gentleman for his statement that the excise taxes on the industry of photographic instruments should be taken off or at least reduced.

It was definitely a higher tax than most of the other people had to pay to require these people to convert their very unique industry to the war effort during wartime. They want to have a reduction and not necessarily to wipe out the taxes.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes, as I understand it in the President's message regarding taxes there were two categories in which he placed these excise taxes. One was the communication and transportation tax group which he recommended be taken off, and the other included the photographic equipment and cameras which was referred to as the manufacturers' tax, and that he recommended being kept on. I think it was a mistake. I think we should take off all these taxes. Insofar as the city of Binghamton goes, my home city, there are some 8,000 Ansco workers who are really suffering from this 25-percent increase in camera prices due to the tax because this increases the prices of photographic equipment generally.

Our headaches began in the Ansco Corp. when the Government took over the corporation and brought the Robert Heller experts in to do a job on it. They did a job on it all right. They threw out nearly 1,000 employees. They were paid a mighty fat fee for their engineering ability. They were supposed to use the meat ax here and there; and, for your information, the Robert Heller "experts" are now being sought to do the same job on Congress. They are going to attempt to cut here and there in the legislative department, and if you do not watch out they will cut about half the Representatives of this House off the docket. So you have got that to consider. After what happened to the Ansco employees, you can draw your own conclusions, because so many were lopped off their pay roll. It has raised hob in the city of Binghamton, and there is a great deal of unemployment there, due to the fact that these "experts" came in there and just about ruined the whole show.

Mr. CHURCH. I believe the President overlooked this matter. I think he still intends that that tax be included by way of reduction.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Well, whatever it is, it is time the House got busy and took off these excise taxes, and that we put real pressure on the President to go along with the plan.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. We are always glad to hear the distinguished gentleman from New York. He is always very interesting. I find him very magnetic, and I thoroughly agree in part with what he has said. I would like to see all of these excise taxes removed, but I am sure my friend from New York would not stop there, and will agree with me that when we repeal them entirely, or in part, that we should raise the revenue some place else.

Will the gentleman go along with me on that?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will not the gentleman answer me?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. All I want to see is the 25 percent taken off the price of cameras, so the folks in my district can have a job. I would like to see the Ansco Corp. employed to the peak.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it was not my purpose to speak on this bill, but I decided to say a few words.

I am supporting the measure. In doing this I am not unmindful of the fact that it is a retroactive tax. The committee in its deliberations gave attention to certain court decisions dealing with the right of the Congress or any other taxing body to levy a tax, retroactively. I sincerely hope that this Congress never attempts to see how far it can go in a retroactive tax. I believe it is a bad principle that we should stay away from. The corporations of the country and individuals of the country have a right to know when their books are closed, what their taxes are, and that subsequent transfers, adjustments, settlements, and payments are not disturbed because they did not know what their tax liability was.

I think in defense of this bill, however, it should be stated that, generally speaking, the element of surprise or lack of knowledge that there would be a tax liability does not exist. This situation which has arisen was not the result of any conniving or scheming on the part of the insurance companies. Neither was it something that the Congress anticipated. Since it did arise it has been the subject of constant discussion and negotiation.

Certainly, I do not believe that the committee intends to convey the idea that officers of a life-insurance company could consent to taxation; that you can have voluntary taxation. That is not the situation. These men were called in, and conferences were had for the purpose of discussing the mechanics, the ways and means and methods of placing a tax on them, comparable with what the rest of our business economy carried. The bill is here not because of the companies' request of acquiescence, or because of their consent; it is here because of the power of the Federal Government to levy a tax. I believe that whenever possible we should refrain from the levying of retroactive taxes. If it ever is permissible from a moral standpoint this is probably one such instance, but even at that it is something we do not like and to which we should not resort. I very reluctantly go along, because I believe it is about the best we can do to work equity in this particular situation.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. In respect to the retroactive feature, what is the basis upon which the committee chose to make the tax retroactive?

Mr. CURTIS. That is the year in which the existing formula was such that no liability accrued.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am somewhat a believer in this retroactive law, for as I understand this case we have a situation where a law put on the books ceased to function. There was from a moral standpoint a tax liability; insurance companies proceeded to set up contingent reserves on their balance sheets to take care of the liability as, when, and if determined by the Congress. They have kept those reserves ready to pay a tax as, when, and if the Congress said so. This proposition is here by substantial agreement of the insurance industry; that is, those affected under this bill have come forward, you might say, to carry their fair share of the tax liability of citizens of this country. If that be the situation, wherein do we violate any rule against retroactivity?

Mr. CURTIS. That is the situation and I doubt if we have actually violated any such principle, but we should proceed with caution, because it is not a sound principle of legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 371, relating to the income taxes of life-insurance companies for 1948 and 1949, had directed him to report the resolution back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. JENKINS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JENKINS moves to recommit House Joint Resolution 371 to the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to correct the formula used in computing the income taxes of life-insurance companies for 1947, 1948, and 1949."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on House Joint Resolution 371 may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. LYLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 451, Rept. No. 1547), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. JOHNSON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by General Hershey.

Mr. LOVRE and Mr. CELLER asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM FRIDAY TO MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow, Friday, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON] is recognized for 1 hour.

THE HISS CASE—A LESSON FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time during my service in this body that I have imposed upon the membership by asking for a special order for the purpose of addressing the House. I have done so on this occasion because I feel that I have a solemn responsibility, both as a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities and as a Member of this House to lay certain facts concerning the case which led to the trial and conviction of Alger Hiss for perjury before the Members of the House and the American people.

This case and the implications which arise from it involve considerations which affect the very security of this Republic. This Nation cannot afford another Hiss case. It is essential therefore that we recognize the seriousness of the crime involved, the extent and scope of the conspiracy of which Mr. Hiss was a member, the reasons for failure to bring

that conspiracy to light until it was too late to prosecute those involved for the crime they had committed, and the positive steps which we can and must take now to guard against such a situation in the future.

In discussing the case, I shall go into some detail, particularly with respect to that period during which the Committee on Un-American Activities was conducting its investigation and its hearing. I believe that a presentation of these details will enable the Members of the House to reach their own conclusions as to what lessons the American people should learn from this tragic experience.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. Before the gentleman goes into the question of the details, and as to what should be done, I should like to ask the gentleman whether or not he would consider the bill that I introduced last year, on January 24, to be one which might have been helpful in bringing to justice those who did violate the laws, which provides that the running of the statute of limitations applicable to any offense committed by an individual who is an officer, agent, or employee of the United States, shall be suspended during any period that such individual holds the office, position, employment, or appointment that he held at the time the offense was committed?

Mr. NIXON. I think there is no question but that such a bill would have been of great assistance in this case. In fact, later on in my remarks one of the legislative recommendations which I intend to endorse is a bill which would extend the statute of limitations in espionage cases from 3 to 10 years. It is along the line, of course, which the gentleman has presented.

Mr. JACOBS. Would the gentleman agree that the statute of limitations should be suspended as to an offense committed by any man in public office until after he is out of public office, and particularly any offense that pertains to misfeasance or malfeasance in office?

Mr. NIXON. I do not think there is any question about the validity of the gentleman's position.

Mr. JACOBS. I have such a bill that I introduced in January of last year.

Mr. NIXON. Let me say at this point that I would appreciate it if the Members of the House would allow me to proceed with the balance of my remarks without interruption. I shall be glad to yield at the conclusion for any questions which you may have.

This story began in 1948, on July 31. On that date the Committee on Un-American Activities began its investigation into Communist espionage within the Federal Government. The witness who appeared that day was Elizabeth Bentley. She testified before the committee for several hours during the day, both in executive session and in public session, and she named a number of Government employees who, during the war, she said, turned over to her confidential and secret Government documents. That testimony had a tremendous impact upon official Washington. There were charges and countercharges, denials that the testimony was true. The committee, as a result, called in a number of the individuals Miss Bentley had named and gave them the opportunity to give their side of the case. Some of them persisted in their denials, but the majority of them, when they came before the committee, followed the line of refusing to answer any questions covering Miss Bentley's charges on the ground that any answer that they would give to the questions might tend to incriminate them.

On August 3, just a week after Miss Bentley appeared, the committee called before it a witness we thought might be able to corroborate some of her testimony. Up to this time all we had was Miss Bentley's testimony about the espionage ring she said she worked with. No other member of the ring had broken, and consequently it was only her word against the word of some who denied the charges and others who refused to answer questions on the basis of self-incrimination.

I mention this because the charge has been made on several occasions that Mr. Chambers on his own initiative came before the Committee on Un-American Activities and asked for the opportunity to testify so that he could smear Mr. Hiss in a public forum. That was not the case. The committee went to Mr. Chambers. We had learned that he had made charges many years ago, in 1939, to the officials of this Government concerning Communist activities among Federal employees in the period between 1934 and 1937. Consequently we subpenaed him to appear before the committee for the purpose of seeing whether he could corroborate Miss Bentley's testimony in any respect.

This was the first time any member of our committee had had the opportunity to see Mr. Chambers. We saw before us a man who was not, at first appearance, a very impressive witness. He spoke in a very low voice. On several occasions the chairman had to ask him to raise his voice so that the members of the press and the members of the committee could understand what he said. But the charges he made were of a most serious nature.

He said he had been a Communist until 1938 and that from 1934 to 1937 it was his assigned duty to work with a ring of Communist Party members who held positions in the Government. He named some of the people who were members of the ring. He named others at later sessions of the committee, when we went into the matter in greater detail.

Among the people he named that day were Alger Hiss and Donald Hiss, who had held high positions in the State Department, Lee Pressman, the former general counsel of the CIO; Nathan Witt, the former secretary of the National Labor Relations Board; John Abt, a former Labor Department attorney, Henry Collins, who was with the State Department, and Harry Dexter White, an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury at the time he left Government service.

I mention only a few of the names because it serves to give you an indication of the importance of the people Mr. Chambers said were members of his group.

The day after Mr. Chambers testified we received a request from Mr. Alger Hiss to appear before the committee for the purpose of denying the charges. Let us lay the stage for Mr. Hiss' appearance.

Mr. Chambers was a man of considerable standing. He was one of six senior editors of Time magazine and, according to the information we received before he testified, one of the most able and respected men on the Time staff.

Mr. Hiss was the president of the Carnegie Foundation for International Peace. You know his phenomenal record in Government service. I do not need to go into that. Mr. Chambers had charged that Mr. Hiss had been a Communist between 1934 and 1938. He had denied the charges and asked for the opportunity to be heard. The committee granted him that opportunity.

Mr. Hiss appeared before the committee for the first time on August 5. He said in effect two things: First, that he was not and had never been a Communist; and second, and this was his first mistake, that he had never known a man by the name of Whittaker Chambers. When shown a picture of Chambers he said he could not recognize it as anybody he might have known.

I remember he looked up at the chairman, who was presiding that day, Mr. MUNDT, of South Dakota, now a distinguished Member of the other body, and said, "If this is a picture of Mr. Chambers he is not particularly unusual looking. He looks like a lot of people. I might even mistake him for the chairman of this committee."

At the conclusion of Mr. Hiss' testimony that day, those of you who were there, and I see a number of you in the Chamber today, will remember the great impression he made upon the committee, upon the press, and upon those who were there as spectators. I would say that 90 percent of those who were in the committee room were convinced that Mr. Hiss was telling the truth. They were convinced that he was not a Communist, and they were further convinced that he was telling the truth when he said that he did not know Mr. Chambers.

Immediately after the public hearing the committee went into an executive session, and at that point the Hiss-Chambers investigation was almost dropped. It was almost dropped because most of the members of the committee felt that Mr. Chambers must have either been mistaken as to the identity of the man he had named, or that he had concocted this story in order to destroy Mr. Hiss because of some sinister motive that had not been apparent when he had testified before us.

Mr. Stripling, the chief investigator of the committee, and I had some doubts. I do not say that to indicate that we had any greater ability to analyze the evidence than the other members who attended the hearing. But by reason of certain conduct of Mr. Hiss on the stand, we felt at least that we should investigate further to determine whether or not Mr. Hiss or Mr. Chambers was lying on the critical issues. We knew we could

not establish which man was telling the truth on the issue of whether Mr. Hiss was a Communist because unless we could get somebody else to break who was a member of the same ring, it was simply Mr. Chambers' word against Mr. Hiss'. But on the question of whether or not Mr. Hiss knew Mr. Chambers, that certainly was a simple issue of fact the truth or falsity of which could be established by corroborative evidence. As a result, we did a very simple and obvious thing. We went to New York City on August 7, subpenaed Mr. Chambers and put him under a grueling cross-examination for a period of 3 hours, during which time we went into the most intimate details of his relationship with Mr. Hiss.

I point this out because this was the first time that such an investigation had been made, despite the fact that it was back in 1939 that Mr. Chambers had made these same charges and had made them in even greater detail to Mr. Berle, who was then in the State Department.

As we asked Mr. Chambers these questions we got forthright answers, one after another, and when he completed his testimony we came to the conclusion that either Mr. Chambers knew Mr. Hiss, or that he had made a very careful study of Mr. Hiss' life and as a result of that study, had been able to answer the questions. To give you an indication of how thoroughly we went into the matter, these are some of the questions we asked:

"What was his nickname?

"Did they have any pets?

"What was his hobby?

"What kind of car did he have?

"What houses did he live in while you knew him?"

I remember one question particularly. When we asked what Mr. Hiss' hobby was, Chambers said:

Mr. and Mrs. Hiss were both amateur ornithologists. They used to get up early in the morning and go to Glen Echo, out the canal, to observe birds. I recall once they saw to their great excitement, a prothonotary warbler.

We knew from that answer alone that one person could not know such intimate details about another unless he had known him some time in his life.

We returned to Washington and began what at the outset seemed to be the almost impossible task of checking the accuracy of the information Mr. Chambers had given us. It was particularly difficult because we could get no assistance whatever from the intelligence agencies of the Government due to the President's freeze order.

It was essentially a team operation. The acting chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], had the complete cooperation and assistance of each of the committee members, including the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDOWELL], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VAIL], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], all of whom spent literally hours analyzing and developing the evidence. The committee staff, under the direction of the chief investigator, Mr. Robert Stripling, worked on a round-the-clock basis. The committee's director of research, Mr. Benjamin Mandel, did particularly effective work in suggesting penetrating questions to be put to the witnesses.

We checked the houses where Mr. Hiss had lived. We checked motor-vehicle registrations and transfers. We even checked dog kennels in Georgetown trying to establish the truth or falsity of Chambers' answers.

The story checked out in every detail where corroborative evidence was available. We then concluded that we had enough evidence to ask Mr. Hiss to come before us again and explain if he could how Mr. Chambers could know these things about him.

On August 16 Mr. Hiss came before us again this time in executive session. We went right down the line asking him the very same questions we had asked Mr. Chambers. We got the same answers. So at the conclusion of that testimony we said, "Mr. Hiss, we have asked Mr. Chambers these questions and he has given us the same answers that you have given us. Tell us now how it is possible for a man you do not even know to know these intimate things about you."

Mr. Hiss still had not come to the point where he could or would admit that he had known Mr. Chambers. But he said he had once known a man by the name of George Crosley, to whom he said he had rented his apartment in Washington early in 1935 and who had welshed on the rent. He had also given him an automobile, ridden to New York with him on one occasion, and Crosley, his wife and child had spent several days in his home with him and Mrs. Hiss. But he did not think Crosley could be Chambers and he did not know Crosley to be a Communist.

The obvious thing to do then was to confront these two men, since we had diametrically opposing stories, and since it was apparent that both men must know each other, in view of the testimony we had. The confrontation took place in room 1400 of the Commodore Hotel, New York City. I will describe what happened briefly to indicate to you why the committee came to the conclusion that there were some very grave doubts about the story Mr. Hiss had told in his first appearance before the committee on August 5.

We brought Mr. Hiss into the room first and seated him in a chair. We then had a committee investigator bring Mr. Chambers into the room from behind him and had him sit on the sofa opposite Mr. Hiss. During the time Mr. Chambers was entering the room, Mr. Hiss, who had said he would like to see this man who had made these charges against him, stared straight ahead. He did not turn around once to look at Mr. Chambers as he entered the room.

Then we had the two men rise. I said:

Mr. Hiss, can you identify this man as anybody you have ever known?

Mr. Hiss said:

I wonder if you could have him speak.

I asked Mr. Chambers to state his name and his business. Mr. Chambers answered. Mr. Hiss rose from his chair, advanced on Mr. Chambers, and demanded that he open his mouth wider and also go on talking. Mr. Chambers tried to do so and Mr. Hiss raised on tiptoe and peered into his mouth. Then he said:

Mr. Chairman, was his voice when he testified before the committee pitched in a lower key?

Mr. McDowell said it was about the same. Mr. Hiss said:

Would you ask him to read some more?

I happened to have handy a copy of Newsweek magazine, which I handed to the senior editor of Time magazine, and he read from that.

Mr. Hiss then said that Chambers' teeth looked different and that he would not want to identify him as Crosley until he checked further.

I asked Mr. Chambers if he had ever had any work done on his teeth, and he said he had some bridgework done in the front of his mouth.

We thought certainly Mr. Hiss would admit then he had known Mr. Chambers as Crosley. But no. He said:

I wonder if you could give me the name of the dentist who did the work.

I said:

Do you mean you would have to have a man's dentist tell you just what he did to his teeth in order to identify him as somebody you once knew?

At that point Mr. Hiss changed the subject, and eventually, about 30 minutes later, he finally admitted that Chambers was the man that he had once known as Crosley. But he continued to deny that Chambers was known to him as a Communist, or that he was a Communist or that there was anything at all to the charges which Chambers had made.

We returned to Washington and called in Lee Pressman, John Abt, Henry Collins, and Nathan Witt. They all refused to answer questions on the ground of self-incrimination when we asked them if they knew Chambers or Hiss.

On August 25 we brought Chambers and Hiss together again in a public session in Washington. As a result of that public confrontation, public opinion concerning the truth or falsity of the charges which Mr. Chambers had made, began to change. Because of that change Mr. Hiss was placed in a position where he felt he had to vindicate himself.

This is the way he went about it. At the confrontation scene on August 16, in New York City, he had dared Mr. Chambers to make his charges in public so that he could sue him for libel. Mr. Chambers went on a radio program, Meet the Press, on August 27. He was asked whether Mr. Hiss was a Communist. Without relying upon the perfect right that he had to say that he had answered that question before the committee and was under no obligation to repeat it publicly and run the risk of a suit, Mr. Chambers answered, "Mr. Hiss was a Communist and may still be."

One week, two weeks, three weeks passed and Mr. Hiss still had not filed suit. Finally, an editorial appeared in the Washington Post, a newspaper which had been very favorable to Mr. Hiss editorially and extremely critical of the

committee for conducting any hearings at all on the Chambers' charges. But this editorial took Mr. Hiss to task and said that in view of the fact that he had dared Mr. Chambers to make his charge publicly, and he had proceeded to do so, it was now up to him to bring the suit, lest the implication be left that there might be some truth in what Mr. Chambers had said. Finally the suit was brought and a chain reaction was started which was to crack the case wide open.

On November 17, 1948, Mr. Hiss' attorneys took Mr. Chambers' deposition in Baltimore, and in that deposition Mr. Hiss' attorneys were to make their greatest mistake.

They asked Mr. Chambers to produce any documentary evidence that he might have which would establish that Mr. Hiss and he were Communists together. Mr. Chambers produced a thick envelope containing four pages in Mr. Hiss' handwriting and a great number of typewritten documents which he said had been typed on Hiss' typewriter. These documents contained excerpts and summaries of scores of confidential and secret State Department messages.

Now, mark this date, because it is extremely important. This was November 17. That very same day, Mr. Alexander Campbell, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division, was called by counsel for both sides to come to Baltimore to pick up the documents. Two weeks later on the 1st day of December, a very interesting United Press dispatch appeared in the Washington Daily News. This article said in effect that the Justice Department was going to drop the Hiss-Chambers case for lack of evidence and that unless some new evidence was presented the Department would not be able to determine which man was lying.

Now, understand, the dispatch quoted Justice Department sources. And the Department at that time had had in its possession for 2 weeks what Mr. Murphy, the prosecutor in the Hiss trial, has so well called the immutable proof of espionage; page after page after page of confidential, secret State Department documents, some in the handwriting of Mr. Hiss, and others typed on his typewriter. Yet the article said the Justice Department was going to drop the case for lack of evidence.

It was at this point that the Committee on Un-American Activities came back into the picture. Mr. Stripling and I went to Westminster, Md. We questioned Mr. Chambers; we asked him if it were possible that he might have some additional evidence which might bear upon this case in view of the fact that the Justice Department was going to drop it. He was shocked when he learned of this proposed action. He told us that he had been told not to talk about what had happened at the deposition hearing in Baltimore on November 17, but we were able to gather from the conversation with him that some new development in the case had occurred on that date, so when we returned to Washington, D. C., I ordered that a subpena be served upon Mr. Chambers for any other documents that he might have.

As a result of that subpena being served upon him, we obtained the so-called pumpkin papers, 5 rolls of microfilm, containing photostatic copies of literally scores of confidential and secret documents from the State Department and the Bureau of Standards. With this evidence in our possession, we were able to force the matter into the open by convincing the Justice Department that unless it did proceed with its investigation the Committee on Un-American Activities would have to conduct its own investigation of the case.

The rest, of course, is history. Mr. Hiss was indicted on December 15, 1948. The first trial ended in a hung jury, eight for conviction and four for acquittal. Then came the second trial and the guilty verdict reached last Saturday, in which the jurors found Mr. Hiss guilty of perjury in denying that he had turned over these confidential Government documents to Mr. Chambers.

In relating the facts of this case, it has not been my purpose to attempt to convince you that the verdict against Mr. Hiss was justified. There has been too much of a tendency to look upon this case as simply a dramatic conflict between two striking and powerful personalities, Mr. Hiss on the one side and Mr. Chambers on the other.

Whether Mr. Hiss was to be found guilty of the technical crime of perjury with which he was charged was not primarily important as far as the security of the Nation is concerned. What is important is that we not allow the conflict between these two men to obscure the broader implications of the case. This is not a simple case of petty larceny where a common thief sold stolen documents to the highest bidder. This is a case involving far-reaching implications going to the very security of our country, and it is essential that each and every American citizen recognize those implications for what they are.

In the first place, the conspiracy which existed was amazingly effective. Chambers turned over to the Committee and the Justice Department hundreds of pages of confidential and secret documents from the State Department and other Government agencies. The theft of documents in this quantity would in itself be sufficient to cause us grave concern. But Chambers testified that on at least 70 different occasions the members of his espionage ring had obtained a similar amount of documents for transmittal to Soviet agents.

Some State Department apologists have attempted to belittle the gravity of the crime on the ground that the documents were not important. An indication of their importance is that today, 10 years after they were taken from the State Department, three of them have still not been made public because the State Department claims that to make them public would be injurious to the national security of this country.

Even more pertinent on the matter of the importance of the documents is the testimony of Mr. Peurifoy, Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Security, and Mr. Sumner Welles. Both testified that a foreign agent having in his possession even one of the many documents which Chambers turned over to the Government could have broken our secret code. This meant, in other words, that the foreign agents who obtained these documents from Chambers broke the American code and were reading all of our confidential communications with foreign governments during that critical period immediately preceding the Hitler-Stalin pact.

The second point we should not forget is that a great number of people other than Mr. Hiss were named by Chambers as being members of his espionage ring. A run-down of the various positions held by the members of the ring indicates the effectiveness with which the conspiracy was able to infiltrate into vital positions, both in Government and in industry. Mr. Chambers' contacts included: Four in the State Department; two in the Treasury Department; two in the Bureau of Standards; one in the Aberdeen Arsenal; a man who later became general counsel of the CIO; one in the Picatinny Arsenal; two in the Electric Boat Co.; one in the Remington Rand Co.; and one in the Illinois Steel Co.

It is significant that the individuals named, almost without exception, held positions of influence where they had access to confidential and secret information. The tragedy of the case is that the great majority of them were American citizens, were graduates of the best colleges and universities in this country, and had yet willingly become members of an organization dedicated to the overthrow of this Government.

At this point I should like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House some facts which have been published in the papers but which have not received the attention they should. Some people still have the idea that all we have in this case is Mr. Chambers' word against Mr. Hiss, and the documentary evidence. But, you will recall that in both the first and second trials, another member of the ring, who was a State Department employee, confessed, as Mr. Chambers has confessed. His name was Julian Wadleigh. You may have read his confession which appeared in serial form in the Washington Post. Mr. Wadleigh admitted that for a period of over a year, approximately every 2 weeks, he walked out of his State Department office with a brief case full of confidential and secret State Department documents. He would meet Mr. Chambers or the other agent who had been assigned to him at the time on a street corner and he would hand him the brief case.

That night the documents would be microfilmed, and the following morning he would meet him at another rendezvous point, pick up the brief case, take it back to the office, and put the documents in the files so that they would not be missed. Mr. Wadleigh's admission was important primarily because it had the effect of taking the case out of the realm of fantasy and provided solid corroborative evidence to back the Chambers' story.

Among the other individuals that Mr. Chambers testified were members of his

Communist apparatus was Harry Dexter White, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. You will recall that shortly after Mr. White's appearance before the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1948, he passed away. Immediately the critics of the investigations charged that the Committee on Un-American Activities was responsible for his death because we had given credence to the completely unfounded and, note this, undocumented charges that had been made against him by Whittaker Chambers and by Elizabeth Bentley. In fact, even today, a member of the faculty of a great New England college is delivering a series of lectures in which he is taking the committee to task for ever conducting any investigation into Mr. White's loyalty.

When Mr. Chambers testified before the committee, in 1948, he stated that Mr. White was not a member of the Communist Party but that he was ideologically in sympathy with the party's objectives. In the second trial, which has just been concluded in New York, Mr. Chambers was questioned further about Mr. White and declared in open court that Mr. White was a source of information for the Soviet espionage ring and that he, Chambers, had received various documents from White which he turned over to Soviet espionage agents.

Since December of 1948, I have had in my possession photostatic copies of eight pages of documents in the handwriting of Mr. White which Mr. Chambers turned over to the Justice Department on November 17, 1948. I had intended to say nothing about these documents, but since Mr. Chambers testified that he did receive documents from Mr. White, I think the public is entitled to see and consider the evidence.

These facts have definitely been established:

First. A Government handwriting expert, Mr. Harold Gesell of the Veterans' Administration, has established that the documents were in Mr. White's handwriting.

Second. Mr. Chambers, a confessed espionage agent, had the documents in his possession.

Third. A substantial portion of the information contained in these documents was of a confidential nature.

I have the photostats here on the rostrum. Any of you who would like to examine them upon the adjournment of the House today is welcome to do so.

Let me read just one excerpt from this document which may be of interest to you:

> We have just agreed to purchase 50,000,000 more ounces of silver from China. China will have left (almost all in London) about 100,000,000 ounces of silver. Her dollar balances are almost all gone.

I discussed this excerpt with a man whose judgment I value in analyzing such documents, and he informed me that that information in the hands of individuals who desired to embarrass the Chinese Government would be almost invaluable.

Then to give you an indication of the scope of the matters covered, let me read just one sentence which appears at the bottom of one of the pages:

> Secretary reading Red Star Over China and is quite interested.

The Secretary of the Treasury then, of course, was Mr. Morgenthau.

The full text of the papers which were in Mr. White's handwriting follows:

> January 10, 1938: Taylor tried to press the Secretary (indirectly through Feis to Hull to Secretary) to hurriedly accept an offer from Hungary of settlement of her $2,000,000 debt to United States Government. The payment offered was trivial. Secretary refused to be hurried and said did not want to establish a pattern on these international debt settlements without considering the whole problem. The fact that the Hungarian amount involved was trifling was no reason to accept this offer as it raised matters of principle, precedent, policy, etc.
>
> (What is behind Taylor's, and possibly Feis', desire to press M into a debt-settlement arrangement of that character at this time? Why didn't Taylor try to convince Secretary directly instead of surreptitiously via Feis?)
>
> January 9, 1938: United States Naval Captain Ingersoll will remain in London until English want to communicate anything to us with respect to Japan boycott or exchange controls. He is to act solely as an agent of communication and not discuss matters. English are not now interested in economic boycotts against Japan. Some incident may develop which will lead them to be desirous of our cooperation. We are likely to act alone only if unusually bad incident occurs such as another Panay incident.
>
> Japan, according to Colonel Strong, has increased greatly its storage facilities for oil. Tanks built underground with two layers of thick cement and air space between as protection against bombing.
>
> Reported yesterday through private Japanese banking connection (unknown but supposed to be important) that J. will not declare war on China for some time at least.
>
> Secretary reading Red Star Over China and is quite interested.
>
> Japan's dollar balances in United States are not declining much. They are about $50,000,000 dollars.
>
> Purchases of Japanese goods by * * * are decreasing sharply while our exports to those countries are increasing.
>
> State Department believes British moves toward Italy and Germany will reduce substantially European fear of war in the near future.
>
> If Japan repeats another incident like the Panay incident, Treasury machinery is all ready to embargo Japanese imports into United States and freeze her dollar balances. This was done at the President's orders. It remains unknown outside of Treasury.
>
> We have just agreed to purchase 50,000,000 more ounces of silver from China. China will have left (almost all in London) about 100,000,000 ounces of silver. Her dollar balances are almost all gone.
>
> Bullitt just called to Secretary (copy not available) comments by Herriot, Blum, Reynaud to him. Herriot says if he were Premier he would quickly strengthen ties with U. S. S. R. and reassure Czechoslovakia that France will at once come to her military aid if Germany enters Czechoslovakia. He also stated that if U. S. S. R. goes to aid of Czechoslovakia she would cut through Rumania's resistance like butter and would also go through quickly Latvia, Estonia against their wishes. Herriot doesn't think there is any chance, however, of his becoming Premier.
>
> Reynaud believed the solution of French economic situation is to permit a sharp drop in the franc. Also to form a national cabinet that would include all elements. Blum claims he doesn't want to be Premier at this time.
>
> Marchandeau tried feebly to get England and United States to agree to support the franc. (Not the slightest chance.) The prospects of continued depreciation of franc are very strong.
>
> I have heard nothing as to Captain Ingersoll's mission in England beyond my earlier explanation. So far as the Treasury is concerned he is supposed to be there in case of another incident with Japan. In that event he would serve as secret liaison man between England and the United States unknown to anybody as to the nature of his mission. Chamberlain turned us down at the time of the *Panay* incident when we asked him whether he would cooperate with us in placing exchange restriction against Japanese operations in case we decided to do so. But another Knatchbull incident may bring them around.
>
> State Department was eager to accept Hungary's debt offer and sold idea to Secretary Marshall and the President. But Congress doesn't want to begin debt negotiations with Hungary. The Van Zeeland report was not taken seriously here.
>
> (Via Cochran) Bachman of the Swiss National Bank said (February 15, 1938) that the Japanese have recently put out a feeler to some of his banks for a loan for industrial development in Manchukuo. "However, his bankers had not sufficient interest in such a proposition even to submit it to the National Bank for consideration and possible approval."
>
> "Schacht impressed me—and some of my friends also—as finding some hope in the Van Zeeland report as a basis for a possible approach between German and the British and the French.
>
> "Schact said he positively did not know what had taken place at the meeting between Hitler and Schuschnigg."

The third point we should bear in mind is that the conspiracy was so effective, so well-entrenched and so well-defended by apologists in high places that it was not discovered and apprehended until it was too late to prosecute those who were involved in it for the crimes they had committed. There were several occasions during the past 10 years on which, if vigorous action had been taken, the conspiracy could have been exposed and its effectiveness destroyed.

The tragedy of this case is summed up right in the charge itself, because what was this man charged with? With stealing documents? With passing them to a foreign agent? No. He was charged with perjury, for lying when he said that he did not turn over these documents. The reason is that neither Mr. Hiss nor Mr. Wadleigh nor any of the people who were engaged in this activity and who turned over documents, even if they were to admit it today, can be prosecuted under the laws of the land, because the 3-year statute of limitations has lapsed and it is too late to do anything about the crime they have committed.

How did such a situation develop? Let us look at the facts and the record.

Three days after the Hitler-Stalin pact, Mr. Chambers in the company of Mr. Isaac Don Levine went to A. A. Berle, then Assistant Secretary of State in charge of security, and laid the facts concerning the conspiracy before him. He

told Mr. Berle, in fact, considerably more about the individuals involved than he told the Committee on Un-American Activities in his first appearance before us on August 3, 1948.

What was done? Mr. Berle says that he checked with Dean Acheson and Felix Frankfurter on the charges concerning the Hiss brothers. I quote from the answer he received from Acheson as Mr. Berle related the conversation to the committee:

> Acheson said he had known the family of these boys from childhood and could vouch for them absolutely. I further found that Mr. Justice Frankfurter would give them exactly similar endorsement. You have therefore a chain of endorsements from the men for whom they had worked.

In any event, the net result was that Chambers returned to New York and never heard from Berle or any other Government official concerning the charges he had made until 1943.

What was done by Mr. Berle or anybody else in authority to establish the truth or falsity of the very serious charges which Chambers had made? Did he question Hiss? Did he question Chambers? Did he confront the two? The only people who can tell us what was done are the high officials in the Government who were aware of the charges. We do know, in any event, that as far as the individuals named by Chambers were concerned, the only thing that was done to them was to promote each one of them eventually to higher positions of power and influence within the Government.

The failure of the administration to act at that time has been justified in some quarters on the ground that only recently have the people of this country become fully aware of the nature and seriousness of the Communist threat and that it is not fair to use hindsight in criticizing the actions of people in years past when the Communist threat was not recognized as it is today. This argument has some justification insofar as the period of the war is involved. But it is significant to note that at the time Chambers made his charges to Mr. Berle, the Soviet Union was an ally of Hitler Germany, and in effect, therefore, an enemy along with Germany of all the free peoples of the world including the people of the United States, and the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt so characterized it. There therefore was no excuse whatever for failure at least to investigate the Chambers' charges and to see that the individuals named were "quarantined" so that they would not be in a position to furnish information to a potential enemy of this Nation. In that connection, it is significant to note that information furnished to the Soviet Union during the Hitler-Stalin pact might well have been transmitted by the Russians to their Nazi allies.

In 1943, representatives of the FBI visited Chambers at his farm in Westminster, Md., and he told the story in detail again to them after he had called Mr. Berle and received permission to do so. In can be assumed that this information was made available to officials of the Justice Department and to whatever other agencies whose personnel were directly involved in that they had been named by Chambers as members of his apparatus. Again, however, no action was taken by our officials to establish the truth or falsity of the Chambers' charges.

Let me say at this point that I am not critical of the administration or of the officials who were involved for failing to prove that the Chambers' charges were true, but I am critical of their failure to investigate those charges or at least to go so far as to bring the two principal characters in the story together as the Committee on Un-American Activities eventually did.

It was after 1943, that Mr. Hiss was Secretary of the Bretton Woods Conference, went to Yalta with President Roosevelt and acted as Secretary of the UN Conference at San Francisco. It is inconceivable that those who were responsible for appointing him to these high positions, where he had the opportunity to do untold damage to his country by transmitting confidential information to the Soviet Government which they could use in their negotiations with us, were not aware of the charges which had been made.

It will be claimed that at this time we were allies of the Soviet Union and had no reason to suspect that they would engage in espionage against us. But let me say at this point that there is no question whatever but that the top officials of our Government were aware of the fact that the Russians were engaging in espionage activities against us even while they were our allies. The testimony of General Groves before the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1948 on that point is significant. I quote the testimony:

> Mr. STRIPLING. General Groves, did you ever report the efforts of the Russian agents to obtain information regarding atomic development to the President of the United States?
>
> General GROVES. Yes.
>
> Mr. STRIPLING. When was that?
>
> General GROVES. It would have to be in 1944. It was contained in a report to the President which President Roosevelt read in my presence and the matter was discussed with me. This was just before he left for Yalta. It was brought to the attention of President Truman in the first report that was made to President Truman after he took office, which was as soon after his taking office as the Secretary of War could make an appointment, and on that occasion the written memorandum was read by Mr. Truman.

In other words, concrete information concerning Communist espionage activities in this country was in the hands of both President Roosevelt and President Truman and still no action was taken to check the Chambers' charges against officials who held high positions in the Government at that time.

I am sure that some Members of the House are wondering why the FBI which received information concerning the various charges in 1943 was unable to take any direct action leading toward prosecution and exposure of the individuals involved.

At this point, I think it would be well to outline the duties of the FBI as distinguished from the Enforcement Division of the Department of Justice. The FBI is solely an investigatory body. It has no power to subpena witnesses, to bring them together for purposes of confrontation against their will, or to prosecute individuals that the Bureau may feel deserve prosecution.

It is a fact-gathering agency and once the facts are laid before the Enforcement Division of the Justice Department, its responsibility is ended. Consequently, no blame can attach to the FBI for failure to expose the facts of this case. The FBI has no power to make public the findings of its investigations except when called upon to do so in a court of law. Responsibility, however, does lie with those officials of the Government who had access to the FBI reports, and who failed or refused to institute an investigation which would lead to prosecution and conviction of those involved.

In answer to the charge that they were lax in investigating and prosecuting the members of the conspiracy, some administration officials have stated that the Chambers' charges were completely unsubstantiated and that there was no reason to take his word against that of the individuals he had named. I have information which bears on that point which I would like to present to the House at this time.

You will recall the Canadian Atomic Espionage case which resulted in the trial and conviction of nine members of the Soviet espionage ring in that country in less than 1 year's time after the charges had been made against them. Incidentally, the prompt action on the part of our neighbor to the north is in sharp contrast to the humiliating failure of our Government to take any action whatever in this country against the individuals involved in wartime espionage for the Soviet Union until it was too late to prosecute them for the crimes they had committed.

When the Canadian case came to public attention, it was universally assumed that there would be a similar prosecution in this country. It is common knowledge that Canadian officials expected that our Government would take such action. Since the major facilities for developing the atomic bomb were located in the United States rather than in Canada, it would be apparent to anyone that the Soviet Union would direct its major espionage activities against this country.

In spite of these facts, no action of any type has been taken, except for the disclosures made by this committee in 1948 involving scientists at the University of Chicago and the University of California, who were charged with engaging in espionage and most of whom pled self-incrimination when they came before the committee.

Let me say at this point a word about the plea of self-incrimination in regard to the Canadian espionage case. I have often been asked the question at public meetings and by Members of this House as to why the Committee on Un-American Activities is not able to proceed like the Canadian Royal Commission. The Canadian Royal Commission, has been universally commended and justifiably

so for the effective manner in which it investigated and brought to trial and conviction the members of the Canadian atomic espionage ring. But there is one significant difference that I should like to bring to your attention today.

You will note that on several occasions I have pointed out that many of those who were named as being members of espionage rings, when they came before the committee or before the grand jury and were asked about their activities answered by saying, "I refuse to answer the question on the ground that any answer I give to the question might tend to incriminate me." Let me say on that point, I do not see how a no answer—"No"—to a question as to whether a person engaged in espionage activities could incriminate anybody. But, be that as it may, the Canadian Royal Commission was not confronted with that difficulty. Under the Canadian War Secrets Act, no individual who was charged with a crime involving the national security could hide behind the self-incrimination plea. The Canadians who were so charged were compelled to answer questions, and that is one reason for the great success of the Canadian investigation.

Now, returning to the case at hand statements have been made, but until now not confirmed, that at the time of the Canadian exposé Igor Guzenko, the Soviet code clerk, who turned over information to the Canadian Government which resulted in the trials and convictions had been questioned by intelligence agents of the United States and had furnished information dealing with espionage activities in this country.

I can now confirm that statement. Shortly before the first trial of Mr. Hiss, I learned that a secret memorandum, dated November 25, 1945, dealing with Soviet espionage in the United States and prepared by an intelligence agency of this Government, was circulated among several key Government departments and was made available to the President. I said nothing at that time about the information which was contained in the memorandum because I did not want to take action which might influence the trial one way or the other. Now that the trial is over, I believe that the country is entitled to the information.

I quote directly from that memorandum:

> Igor Guzenko, former code clerk in the office of Col. Nicholi Zabotin, Soviet military attaché, Ottawa, Canada, when interviewed by a representative of this Bureau and officers of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, stated that he had been informed by Lieutenant Kulakov in the office of the Soviet military attaché that the Soviets had an agent in the United States in May 1945 who was an assistant to the then Secretary of State, Edward R. Stettinius.

Note the date of this memorandum, November 1945. Note the position held by the individual alleged to be the Soviet espionage agent—assistant to the Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius. Mr. Hiss was an assistant to Mr. Stettinius at the Yalta Conference in February of 1945.

I have here Mr. Stettinius' book, Roosevelt and the Russians. If you read the book you will find eight different references to Mr. Hiss.

On page 36 it appears that Stettinius reviewed with Hiss and others the following:

First. Establishment of a European high commission.

Second. Treatment of Germany.

Third. The Polish question.

Fourth. Relation between UNRRA and the Soviet.

Fifth. Rights of Americans on control commission of Bulgaria, Rumania, and Hungary.

Sixth. Iran.

Seventh. China.

Eighth. Turkish Straits question.

Ninth. International trusteeship.

Page 49: Stettinius had a discussion with Hiss and others on the political and economic situation in Italy.

Pages 83 and 84: Stettinius met Hiss and others "to review our proposals for the conference agenda."

Page 103: Hiss is mentioned as sitting behind the President at the Yalta Conference.

Page 137: Stettinius and Hiss met to "go over notes for the afternoon meeting of the three leaders."

Page 138: At the above meeting, Hiss was sitting behind the President.

Pages 195 and 196: Alger Hiss is mentioned as a member of a subcommittee which included Gromyko, which was at work preparing a report.

Page 238: Stettinius "asked Hiss to do a quick summary of the State Department memorandum on the trusteeship."

I will not read further; I think the facts speak for themselves.

Note the source of the information which I have quoted from the memorandum. This is not idle back-fence gossip; this information came straight from a representative of the Soviet Government itself. There is one thing that I have learned in my service on the Committee on Un-American Activities, and that is that the Communists will lie about almost everything but they do not lie to each other about the members of the espionage and underground organizations of which they themselves are members.

They know who their people are.

What was done when this shocking information came to the attention of the officials of our State Department, and the President of the United States? You would think now that Mr. Hiss would be confronted with Mr. Chambers and that the mystery would be cleared up, but instead Mr. Hiss continued to serve in high positions in the State Department until he resigned in January 1947 to take a position as head of the Carnegie Foundation for International Peace. In that connection it is significant to note that when trustees of the Carnegie Foundation questioned Mr. Hiss' former associates in the State Department as to his suitability for that position, he received completely unqualified recommendations on all sides. There was no hint whatever that any question had been raised concerning his loyalty to this Nation.

To complete this story of inexcusable inaction upon the part of administration officials to attack and destroy this conspiracy, let me review briefly the conduct of the President and the Department of Justice during the investigation of this case by the Committee on Un-American Activities. On August 5, the day Mr. Hiss first appeared before the committee and denied the charges which had been made against him, the President threw the great power and prestige of his office against the investigation by the committee and for Mr. Hiss by declaring that the hearings of the committee were simply a "red herring."

In other words the "red herring" statement was made in direct reference to the Alger Hiss case.

That same day, he issued a Presidential directive which ordered all administrative agencies of the Government to refuse to turn over any information relating to the loyalty of any Government employee to a congressional committee. This meant that the committee had to conduct its investigation with no assistance whatever from the administrative branch of the Government. Included in this order was, of course, the FBI, who, by reason of that fact, was unable to lend assistance to the committee.

The most flagrant action, however, was yet to come. As I have already stated, the day Mr. Chambers turned over documentary evidence in the handwriting of Mr. Hiss, together with typewritten documents which were later established to be written on his typewriter, the Justice Department was immediately notified and the material was on that day, November 17, turned over to Alexander Campbell, head of the Criminal Division of that Department. The various participants in the deposition were directed in the interests of national security to keep silent on the whole matter. I have before me the previously mentioned United Press dispatch which appeared on December 1 in the Washington Daily News. Let me read from it directly:

> HISS AND CHAMBERS PERJURY PROBE HITS DEAD END
>
> The Justice Department is about ready to drop its investigation of the celebrated Alger Hiss-Whittaker Chambers controversy, it was learned today.
>
> Department officials still have under study the question of a possible perjury prosecution. But officials said privately that unless additional evidence is forthcoming, they are inclined to forget the whole thing.
>
> One Department source said that on the basis of available evidence, officials in charge of the case believe it would be unwise to take it before a grand jury.

What happened during that critical 2-week period between November 17 when the papers were turned over to the Justice Department and December 1 when this article appeared?

I have learned from personal investigation that no agents of the Department of Justice even approached Mr. Chambers during that period let alone questioned him about the highly important evidence which he had turned over to the Justice Department. In view of the story which appeared on December 1, stating that the Justice Department was ready to drop the investigation for lack of new evidence, the only conclusion

which can be drawn when this fact is coupled with the Department's failure to conduct an investigation during that 2-week period is that it was the intention of the Department not to make an investigation unless they were forced to do so.

As a result of having in its possession the microfilm documents, which we obtained on December 2, the committee was able to force the Department to institute an investigation and the result was the eventual indictment of Mr. Hiss by the Federal grand jury. It is significant to note that even as late as December 5, members of the committee learned from an unimpeachable source that Justice Department officials before proceeding with further investigation of Mr. Hiss were considering the possibility of indicting Mr. Chambers for technical perjury due to his failure to tell the whole story when he first appeared before the committee and the grand jury. For that reason, I publicly stated on that same day that if the Department should proceed in that manner, it would in effect mean that Mr. Hiss and the others named by Mr. Chambers as being members of an espionage group could not possibly be proceeded against due to the fact that the principal witness against them would be an indicted perjurer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LYLE). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACY], is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON], to conclude his remarks.

Mr. NIXON. Even during the first trial of Mr. Hiss, there was reason to wonder whether the administration was desirous of presenting the strongest possible case against him. It is to the eternal credit of Mr. Murphy and Mr. Donegan, and their staff, that they put on their case as effectively as they did, in spite of the fact that high Government officials before and throughout the trial threw the weight of their influence behind the defendant. Mr. Murphy often must have wondered whether or not the Government which he represented was behind him or against him during the trial.

The President had referred to the case as a "red herring" and did so even after the indictment. The Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, before his confirmation, declared his friendship for Mr. Hiss and the implication of his declaration was that he had faith in his innocence. Two justices of the Supreme Court, Mr. Frankfurter and Mr. Reed, in an unprecedented action, appeared as character witnesses for Mr. Hiss. Judge Kauffman, who presided at the trial stepped off the bench and shook hands with these defense witnesses, one of many of his actions during the trial in which he showed his obvious bias for the defendant. The wife of the former President of the United States, Mrs. Roosevelt, on several occasions during the two trials, publicly defended Mr. Hiss in her news columns. Among the high Government officials who testified in his behalf were Mr. Philip Jessup, then President Truman's ambassador at large in Europe, and now the architect of our far-eastern policy; the Governor of Illinois, Mr. Stevenson; Judge Wyzski, of the United States District Court, Boston; Judge Magruder, chief justice of the circuit court of appeals, Boston; and Francis B. Sayre, Assistant Secretary of State.

I have mentioned the individuals who have come to Mr. Hiss' defense, because this is an outstanding example of how effectively the conspiracy was concealed and how far it was able to reach into high places in our Government to obtain apologists for its members.

Why was it that administration officials persisted in their refusal to act through the years, even when substantial evidence of espionage activities was brought to their attention? A number of reasons have been suggested for this failure.

It has been said that the Soviet Union was an ally of the United States and that therefore we should take a charitable attitude toward those administration officials who failed to act when the evidence was presented to them. But Mr. Chambers first presented his information to Mr. Berle during the period of the Hitler-Stalin pact when it could not be said, under any stretch of the imagination, that the Soviet Union was an ally of this country. Nor can anyone possibly justify the obstructive policies followed by administration leaders even as late as 1948 when the Committee on Un-American Activities was attempting to bring all the facts out into the open and when our announced national policy was to contain communism abroad if not at home.

On the other extreme, there are some who claim that administration officials failed to act because they were Communist or pro-Communist. I do not accept this charge as a fair one as applied at least to the great majority of those officials who could and should have acted on the evidence which was laid before them through the years.

The reason for their failure to act was not that they were disloyal, but this in my opinion makes that failure even more inexcusable.

What was happening was that administration leaders were treating the reports of Communist espionage on a "politics-as-usual" basis. It is customary practice for any administration, be it Republican or Democrat, to resist the disclosure of facts which might be embarrassing to that administration in an election. This is a statement of fact though, of course, I do not mean to justify that practice, regardless of the nature of the skeleton in the political closet.

Because they treated Communist infiltration into our American institutions like any ordinary petty political scandal, the administration officials responsible for this failure to act against the Communist conspiracy rendered the greatest possible disservice to the people of the Nation.

It is essential that we learn the tragic lessons which the Hiss case has so vividly portrayed, and develop a policy which will reduce the possibility for the existence and successful operation of such a conspiracy in the future. I have some recommendations to make along those lines, most of which are not new, but which I reiterate because I feel that they are essential to our national security.

First. Above all, we must give complete and unqualified support to the FBI. and to J. Edgar Hoover, its chief. Mr. Hoover recognized the Communist threat long before other top officials recognized its existence. The FBI in this trial did an amazingly effective job of running down trails over 10 years old and in developing the evidence which made the prosecution successful.

I note in the papers this morning that the National Lawyers Guild has again launched an all-out attack against the FBI. The character of the guild is well illustrated by the fact that 5 of the lawyers for the 11 convicted Communists in New York City, who were cited by Judge Medina for contempt of court because of their disgraceful conduct, are prominent members of the Lawyers Guild. Let me say just this: That when the National Lawyers Guild or any similar organization is successful in obtaining an investigation of the FBI and access to its records, a fatal blow will have been struck against the protective security forces of this Nation. I am sure that the Members of the House will join with me in resisting such an attack and in supporting the finest police organization which exists in a free Nation today. [Applause.]

Second. Time will not permit me to discuss all the steps which should be taken in the field of legislation if we are adequately to control and expose the Commuuist conspiracy in this country. But the very least that should be done during this session of Congress is to extend the statute of limitations on espionage cases from 3 to 10 years. The fact that an espionage agent is able to conceal his activities so effectively that he is not apprehended until after the statutory period had elapsed makes the crime even more infamous and serious in nature. Our present laws are totally inadequate to deal with the new types of espionage which have been developed so effectively by the Communists.

Third. The Committee on Un-American Activities should receive the wholehearted support of the House. It is well recognized that had the committee not been in existence, the Hiss conspiracy might never have been exposed.

Let me say at this point that I know the Members of this House are aware of the fact that membership on the Committee on Un-American Activities should not be sought by any person who desires to avoid probably the most unpleasant and thankless assignment in the Congress. I trust that Members from both sides will join together in supporting that committee and its members in the years to come, and in seeing to it that it gets the authority and the funds to conduct honest, intelligent, and fair investigations of Communists and other subversive groups in his country.

Fourth. It is necessary that we completely overhaul our system of checking the loyalty of Federal employees. Mr. Hiss would have passed the present loyalty tests with flying colors. The loyalty checks are based primarily on open affil-

iations with Communist-front organizations. Underground Communists and espionage agents have no open affiliations and it is therefore almost impossible to apprehend them through a routine loyalty investigation under the President's order. Serious consideration should be given to changing the entire approach under the loyalty order and placing the program on a security risk rather than loyalty basis. In this way, where there is any doubt about an individual who has access to confidential information, that doubt can be resolved in favor of the Government without the necessity of proving disloyalty and thereby reflecting on the character of a possibly loyal but indiscreet Government employee.

Fifth. Most important of all, we must develop and put into effect an extensive educational program which will teach the American people the truth about communism as well as the truth about democracy. The tragedy of this case is that men like Alger Hiss who come from good families, are graduates of our best schools, and are awarded the highest honors in Government service, find the Communist ideology more attractive than American democracy.

This is a serious reflection on our educational system, and it is essential that we remedy the situation if we are to survive as a free people. The statement of Mr. John Foster Dulles when he commented upon the Hiss verdict last Saturday is particularly pertinent:

> The conviction of Alger Hiss is human tragedy. It is tragic that so great promise should have come to so inglorious an end. But the greater tragedy is that seemingly our national ideals no longer inspire the loyal devotions needed for their defense.

Five years ago, at the time of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference in 1944, when Alger Hiss served as director of our secretariat, the number of people in the world in the Soviet orbit was 180,000,000, approximately the population of the Soviet Union. Arrayed on the anti-totalitarian side there were in the world at that time, in 1944, 1,625,000,000 people. Today there are 800,000,000 in the world under the domination of Soviet totalitarianism. On our side we have 540,000,000 people. There are 600,000,000 residents of United Nations countries which are classified as neutral, such as India, Pakistan, and Sweden. In other words, in 1944, before Dumbarton Oaks, Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam, the odds were 9 to 1 in our favor. Today, since those conferences, the odds are 5 to 3 against us.

The great lesson which should be learned from the Alger Hiss case is that we are not just dealing with espionage agents who get 30 pieces of silver to obtain the blueprint of a new weapon—the Communists do that, too—but this is a far more sinister type of activity, because it permits the enemy to guide and shape our policy; it disarms and dooms our diplomats to defeat in advance before they go to conferences; traitors in the high councils of our own Government make sure that the deck is stacked on the Soviet side of the diplomatic table.

America today stands almost alone between communism and the free nations of the world. We owe a solemn duty, not only to our own people but to free peoples everywhere on both sides of the iron curtain, to expose this sinister conspiracy for what it is, to roll back the Red tide which to date has swept everything before it, and to prove to peoples everywhere that the hope of the world lies not in turning toward totalitarian dictatorship but in developing a strong, free, and intelligent democracy.

THE ALGER HISS CASE

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, as my colleague from California stated that he had not asked for the privilege of the floor since his incumbency in the Congress, may I point out that the same is true of me. I would not ask for the privilege of the floor unless I felt the seriousness of the present situation and I will put my colleagues at ease at the beginning by stating that so much has been said on this subject and said so beautifully that I am going to adhere pretty much to the notes that I have made and therefore you need not expect to be detained too long.

Mr. Speaker, after listening to my colleague's address to this House, there can be left little doubt in the minds of those within the sound of his voice, that he has rendered the kind of service to our country these confusing and complicated times we are enduring sorely require. Had it not been for the tenacity of a Representative from the State of California, RICHARD M. NIXON, coupled with his unusual mental ability and supplemented by his thorough knowledge of the law, a broad scale cover-up might have been effected in a far-reaching and important case that could lead others into taking such further advantage of our Constitution and laws as to bring even so powerful a Nation as ours under the control of the strange and evil ideologies that now threaten the world.

To another Representative, the gentleman from Wisconsin, FRANK B. KEEFE, a distinguished lawyer from the State of Wisconsin, we are indebted for an exhaustive address delivered in this House on July 18 of last year upon the subject of the conduct of Judge Samuel Kaufman in the Alger Hiss trial. No one could have heard that without many misgivings as to the manner in which that judicial proceeding was conducted. Both before and after that date last July, I put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD comments regarding Judge Kaufman and quoted editorials showing the type of support being accorded him by the Communist press in the city of New York. For what I had to say I was taken to task by the Washington Post, in whose columns as well as in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I made prompt response.

I am proud to be a Member of this House, representing as it does by population a Nation that has brought more health, welfare and happiness to a greater number of people than any other ever on the face of this globe. While we have Members like Representatives NIXON and KEEFE, and, of course, there are many others, we can rely upon the exercise of such prerogatives as we individually possess toward letting in the light of day on whatever the people of this Nation should know about the workings of their Government.

Not a lawyer myself, I can only bring to the problem in hand the layman's point of view, but I am sure that I can do so the better for having heard the judicial phases of this intricate case dissected by the two able lawyers to whom I have just referred and of whom our colleagues and fellow citizens have every right to be proud.

After weeks of trial, a jury of respectable American citizens, eight of them women, and therefore natural guardians of home firesides and our traditional American social system, have found Alger Hiss guilty of perjury.

The conviction of Hiss for perjury in this criminal action is the equivalent of convicting him of betraying his country's secrets. Even Hiss defenders will concede his perjury consisted of lying about the fact that he acted as a link in the Communist spy network. Why did not Hiss admit this instead of lying about it? He knew that if he lied under oath he would be subjecting himself to severe penalties for perjury. He also knew that the charges were susceptible to proof because he was confronted with the witnesses and the documents necessary to establish the case. On the other hand, he knew that he could tell the truth without fear of prosecution since any action was barred by the statute of limitations. Why then did he lie? I submit that the only logical conclusion is that he lied not to protect himself, but to protect others. By lying Hiss deliberately and wilfully placed himself in jeopardy. The truth could not have hurt him. However, it might have implicated others still active in Russian espionage who could be brought to justice. Of course, if Hiss wished to stand trial for espionage, he could do so by waiving the statute of limitations. However, in the light of his past actions it would be foolish to assume that he will do so.

No more important verdict than the Hiss conviction has been reached in our day, its repercussions resulting from the forthright act of 12 good and true Americans will be world-wide. If this conviction serves notice to the world that the American people are on guard against Communism, and that they propose to invoke their laws to protect themselves from enemies from within and without, no longer will the American people temporize with, or listen to, the fellow travelers who have been hiding behind a mask of so-called liberalism while pulling Soviet Russia's chestnuts out of the fire. Fellow travelers—intellectually sympathetic, who worked with Hiss, are now on notice that their turn would probably be next.

Squealing and discomforted left-wing columnists, like splinters from the Communist trunk, are left-handedly coming to the rescue of Hiss by advising true Americans not to make an issue of his conviction. These columnists of the far left who seem to be inspired by the acts of men in high places in our Republic, have never been noted for the constructive interest that they have taken in preserving our form of government. For many years, these true Americans have been the target for their smear. Now

that Hiss, one of their pets, has had the mask torn from his face by due process of law, these left-wingers have the cynical nerve to admonish these true Americans not to talk about the outcome of the trial, not to make an issue of it, and not to feel the natural sense of relief that the perfidy of this individual has been exposed. It should be remembered that our legal constitutional processes carefully surround anyone accused of a crime, and guarantee that they shall receive a full and fair trial by a jury of American citizens. The authors of our Constitution in their wisdom made no place for such columnists in our judicial system.

Apropos of these columnists, I should like to refer to a syndicated item appearing in a local paper in my own home district, which closes with this:

I have the feeling that it will not win * * * much popularity among the rank and file of voters. It is too deeply mortifying to most Americans to be reminded of the unhappy era when faith fell away and, more important, there will be a persistent doubt whether Hiss received a fair trial in the present atmosphere when guilty accusers seek to unload their burden of guilt by public accusation. President Truman, talking, in his state of the Union message, about what a strong and free America can do came much closer to the temper of today.

What a sorry spectacle this Hiss matter has become. When his treacherous perfidy was first revealed, the President of the United States called it a red herring. I said then in connection with the red-herring statement by President Truman, way back on August 14, 1948:

I do not have to be told that words alone may not constitute treason under section 3, article 3, of the Constitution of the United States and that this section when it refers to giving aid and comfort to the enemies of the Nation, means literally a nation, or its nationals, with whom we are actually at war.

But I have said recently, and I say again today, that the statement that the inquiry concerning communistic activities and undercover work is only a red herring to distract public attention from other events, is treasonable in spirit and effect as giving aid and comfort to potential enemies of the United States.

True, we are not actually at war, but it is true also that war could develop and a state of war come to exist between the United States of America and the U. S. S. R. before those who hear these words have had their breakfasts tomorrow morning.

I go further—I say that in this manner President Truman, after the fashion of some of the muddled thinking of the day, unwittingly used the prestige of his high office on behalf of one of his country's enemies. President Truman should reread his oath of office. When he made his "red herring" statement, he edged dangerously close to the impeachment area. The President has also stated that Communism in this country was merely a "bugaboo" and that he does not believe that there will ever come a time when anyone will really want to overturn it. By thus attempting to minimize the seriousness of the situation with which we are confronted and by ridiculing the efforts of honest-to-God Americans working for the best interests of this country, the President sets the pattern and style for a "head in the sand" attitude toward Communism which merely makes more difficult the task of bringing to the bar of justice those who seek to betray our country.

During the recent Hiss trial the press reported that a defense witness, a psychiatrist named Binger, stated in 1948 that "the bugaboo of Communism" was "spreading a state of neurotic anxiety in the United States" and that this bugaboo was "fanned largely by big business." It is this type of irresponsible thinking which plays directly into the hands of our enemies.

And what of Secretary Acheson, who has known for years about the oft-circulated accusations concerning Alger Hiss? And what does he mean by his statement of yesterday that he does not intend to turn his back on Hiss? The American people are entitled to know. Mr. Acheson has just humiliated the American people by openly favoring the policy of appeasing Soviet Russia by giving comfort to the Chinese Reds. What is the new Acheson doctrine? Is it the Truman doctrine? Is it for containment of Communism? When we have spent thirty-three billions since the close of the fighting war, mainly for containing Communism in western Europe while the reverse policy has been in effect in the Far East where the Communist numbers have increased from under 200,000,000 to close to a billion. This was distinctly set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a week ago Monday by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, LAWRENCE H. SMITH. Are we failing in unified American doctrine? Is the administration split apart or is it just some more muddled thinking?

And to pursue the verities still further, we have the spectacle of Associate Justices of the United States Supreme Court, of one of whom Hiss was a protege, appearing as character witnesses in the trial. And now we come to one of the most ironical items in the entire Hiss mess. Roving Ambassador Philip Jessup, now in the Far East, gathering facts and conclusions upon which to base recommendations for the conduct of our affairs with the Communists, was a character witness for Hiss in his second trial. One must ask just how naive these men are who sit in high places in our country. I do not accuse them of being fellow travelers, but it is obvious that a lot of fellows have been traveling with them.

What a national tragedy—a trusted bright young man who sat with Roosevelt, Stalin, and Molotov—this trusted bright young man, who posed smilingly with Molotov at the counsel table in San Francisco during the period when the United Nations was having its birth pains, is now dishonored and a felon.

But a thing far more tragic is the fact that those entrusted with the duty of formulating our foreign policy and protecting us from Communism abroad cannot even protect us from Communist activity going on under their very noses. And even when it is pointed out to them by competent authority, they either refuse to believe it or seek to excuse it.

The effrontery of some of these officials in trying to help Hiss escape justice has been beyond the bounds of ethical procedure. But what of the unconvicted Hisses? It is the solemn duty of the Congress, with its far-reaching powers, to resolutely investigate and bring to the bar of justice and compel them to face the obloquy their acts have brought down upon them. As I said many years ago in connection with the New York State Legislature, it is the duty of a legislature not only to make the laws but to investigate to determine the effectiveness of such laws, to see if these laws are doing the job that was intended. The Hiss conviction is good—a much-needed start on the regulation and punishment of those who seek to betray their country. His fangs have been pulled, but we must continue ceaseless quest to pull those of other vipers who have been nursing at our bosoms.

Let us find out who is responsible for these conditions which have been so properly mentioned here today. Who are they?

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DAVENPORT asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes tomorrow following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 25. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 27, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1163. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of $313,163,000 and contract authorization in the amount of $87,650,000, together with certain proposed provisions and an increase in a limitation pertaining to existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 456); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1164. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report pursuant to section 5, Public Law 657, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 902, 41 U. S. C. A. 106–n); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1165. A letter from the Office of the Secretary of State, transmitting the second annual report of claims paid by the Department of State during the calendar year 1949 pur-

suant to provisions of section 404 of the Federal Tort Claims Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1166. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of proposed transfer of vessels pursuant to section 1 of the act of August 7, 1946, chapter 804 (60 Stat. 897); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1167. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report on foreign excess property disposal pursuant to section 404 (d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 6743. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, and title IV of the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1540). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McSWEENEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 447. Resolution for consideration of S. 2596, an act relating to education or training of veterans under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (Public Law 346, 78th Cong., June 22, 1944), without amendment (Rept. No. 1541). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 448. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 87, a bill relating to the promotion of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 1546). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LYLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 451. Resolution for consideration of H. J. Res. 398, joint resolution relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. 1547). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 34. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 1542). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 36. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 1543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 39. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 1544). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 42. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1545). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3462. A bill for the relief of Walter J. O'Toole; without amendment (Rept. No. 1548). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 6998. A bill to exempt from the tax on transportation of persons amounts paid for the transportation of Boy Scouts and Scouters to the National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America to be held at Valley Forge, Pa.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 6999. A bill to declare that the United States hold certain lands in trust for the Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 7000. A bill to authorize the issuance of certain public-improvement bonds of the Territory of Hawaii and to confirm and ratify Act 63 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii 1949, relating to the Hawaiian Civilian Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILES:

H. R. 7001. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'SULLIVAN:

H. R. 7002. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, so as to permit the return under such section of property which an alien acquired, by gift, devise, bequest, or inheritance, from an American citizen; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 7003. A bill to repeal excise taxes on business and store machines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7004. A bill to repeal excise taxes on sporting goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 7005. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 7006. A bill authorizing an appropriation for the construction of a high school and junior high-school building at Blackfoot, Idaho, for district No. 55, Bingham County, embracing the southeast portion of Bingham County and including the Fort Hall Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 7007. A bill relating to funds apportioned to States under the Federal Aid Road Act and the Federal Highway Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 7008. A bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 7009. A bill to repeal the proviso against the filling of the vacancy in the office of district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 7010. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 with respect to the definition of the employment relation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 7011. A bill to provide that compensation of a Federal officer or employee shall be subject to State tax only in the State where he is domiciled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. J. Res. 404. Joint resolution designating the 6th day of January of each year as Haym Salomon Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 180. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress with respect to the elimination of weapons of mass destruction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. Res. 449. Resolution directing the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit information relating to the internal revenue which is derived from income taxes on tips and gratuities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. Res. 450. Resolution to amend the rules of the House to require the yeas and nays in the case of final action on appropriation bills; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, relating to repeal of the Federal tax on the transportation of persons between the Territory and the mainland United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 7012. A bill for the relief of Anna Ellero and Clara Ellero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7013. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yae Bennett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7014. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Selma Weissblum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 7015. A bill for the relief of Emma Dumas, Anna M. Daigle, Glen LeMaster, John Luke, Nettie Mallinger, C. A. Seavey, Sandra Sinkola, and Charles Young, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 7016. A bill for the relief of Peter and Margaret O'Donnell and James P. and Arlene R. Shannon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 7017. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Edgar S. Bigman; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 7018. A bill for the relief of Luigi Dini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 7019. A bill for the relief of Aenny Blank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 7020. A bill for the relief of Oldrich and Maria Pavlousek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 7021. A bill for the relief of Arnold Horowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 7022. A bill for the relief of Nissim Salim Tawil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1734. By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Cheswold, Del., containing 28 signatures, supporting legislation which would prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1735. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the chairman, New Orleans Rent Advisory Board, New Orleans, La., recommending that Federal rent control be extended beyond the expiration date of June 30, 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1736. Also, petition of A. Holmes and others, Local 802, American Federation of Musicians, New York, N. Y., requesting that House bill 4453 (FEPC) get priority; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1737. Also, petition of American Legion, Department of Texas, Austin, Tex., recommending that the area of Resaca de los Palmas be declared neutral territory for the purpose of exchanging flags and banners; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1738. Petition of Mrs. Neil Morton and 16 others, in favor of a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1739. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Bradenton Townsend Club, No. 1, Bradenton, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1740. Also, petition of Cassadaga Townsend Club, No. 1, Cassadaga, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1741. Also, petition of the president, Daytona Beach Club, No. 2, Daytona Beach, Fla., requesting passage of House bills No. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1742. Also, petition of Trailer Park at Sarasota, Sarasota, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1743. Also, petition of Fifth Congressional District Council of Townsend Clubs, Ormond, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1744. Also, petition of I. C. Ellis and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1745. Also, petition of N. A. Simmons and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1746. Also, petition of Daniel N. Norton and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1747. Also, petition of William Joyce and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1748. By Mr. HART: Petition of the Hudson County (N. J.) Bar Association, urging support and strengthening of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1749. Also, memorial of the city of Newark, N. J., favoring adoption of civil-rights bill; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1750. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the General Assembly of Rhode Island, memorializing Congress with relation to the United States constitutional amendment on equal rights for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1751. By Mr. JUDD: Petition of Mrs. Astrid M. Roach and other citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., urging consideration and support of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2428, and a Senate counterpart of that measure; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1752. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition of several residents of Schenectady, N. Y., advocating passage of legislation to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages over the radio and in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 27, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we mingle our praying breath with these timeless words: Praise God from whom all blessings flow. We thank Thee that nothing seen or unseen can separate us from Thy divine love.

Blessed Lord, make plain the path of duty that we may understand that life needs the discipline of work to make it great and good. O give us the faith that shall bear unmoved the cares of toil, and shall murmur not when the chastening rod is heavy. Look with mercy upon our historic institutions and blot out all strife, all antagonisms, and all factions which threaten our social order and the stability of our people.

"Whenever man oppresses man beneath
the liberal sun,
O Lord, be there; Thine arm make bare;
Thy righteous will be done."

For the sake of Him who became poor that we might become rich. Amen.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 20]

Abbitt	Chiperfield	Fulton
Allen, Ill.	Chudoff	Gamble
Arends	Clemente	Gary
Auchincloss	Cole, Kans.	Gilmer
Barden	Cole, N. Y.	Gorski
Barrett, Pa.	Corbett	Granahan
Beall	Coudert	Green
Bennett, Fla.	Davenport	Gwinn
Blackney	Davies, N. Y.	Hall,
Bland	Davis, Tenn.	Edwin Arthur
Boggs, La.	Dawson	Hall,
Bolling	Dingell	Leonard W.
Breen	Dollinger	Halleck
Brown, Ga.	Donohue	Hand
Buckley, N. Y.	Douglas	Hays, Ohio
Bulwinkle	Doyle	Hébert
Burdick	Durham	Heller
Burton	Ellsworth	Hinshaw
Byrne, N. Y.	Elston	Hobbs
Case, S. Dak.	Engel, Mich.	Hoffman, Ill.
Cavalcante	Fallon	Holifield
Celler	Fellows	Hope
James	Nixon	Scott,
Javits	Norblad	Hugh D., Jr.
Jonas	Norton	Scrivner
Judd	O'Toole	Scudder
Keating	Pfeifer,	Secrest
Kee	Joseph L.	Shafer
Kelly, N. Y.	Pfeiffer,	Short
Kennedy	William L.	Sikes
Keogh	Philbin	Smathers
Kilday	Phillips, Tenn.	Smith, Kans.
Kirwan	Plumley	Smith, Ohio
Klein	Poulson	Stanley
Kunkel	Powell	Taber
Lane	Price	Taylor
Latham	Quinn	Thomas
Lichtenwalter	Rabaut	Underwood
Lynch	Redden	Velde
McCulloch	Rees	Vorys
McMillan, S. C.	Richards	Wadsworth
Macy	Rivers	Wagner
Marcantonio	Rogers, Fla.	Walsh
Marshall	Rogers, Mass.	Weichel
Miller, Nebr.	Roosevelt	Werdel
Monroney	Sadlak	Whitaker
Morgan	Sadowski	White, Idaho
Morrison	St. George	Withrow
Moulder	Saylor	Wolcott
Multer	Scott,	Wood
Murphy	Hardie	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 285 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4692. An act to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. O'CONOR, and Mr. WILEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2911. An act to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Col. Charles H. Bonesteel as executive director of the European Coordinating Committee under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, without affecting his military status and perquisites.

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S DENTAL HEALTH DAY

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Joint Resolution 184, authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim February 6, 1950, as National Children's Dental Health Day, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 4, strike out "and directed."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Bob Considine.

Mr. HARRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ADDONIZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mrs. WOODHOUSE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a résumé of the Hoover report.

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Montgomery Messenger.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. Leonard W. Trester. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $191.34, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the coal shortage and include telegrams.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include correspondence.

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Louis Johnson.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include information about war claims.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on February 2, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislation program today, and following any special orders heretofore entered, and also on Wednesday and Thursday next, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes, so that I may put in the RECORD the 1-minute speeches I have accumulated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I have received a telegraphic message of vital importance. It comes from one of America's most distinguished educators, Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins, of the University of Chicago. This is its text:

As chancelor of the University of Chicago and chairman of the Committee on Federal Aid to Medical Schools of the American Association of Universities, I want to bear urgent witness to the critical and immediate need of the medical schools of this country. President Conant's recent statement on the precarious financial condition of Harvard Medical and Public Health Schools is applicable in my opinion to every school in the country training personnel for the professions concerned with health. The cost of providing instruction of high quality for doctors and other medical personnel far exceeds the funds available from tuition and other sources.

Without operating funds, schools will be unable to maintain current enrollments—already dangerously low—and improve present standards of instruction. Public support in the form of Federal funds is essential if schools are to fulfill their public responsibility, providing enough well-trained personnel to meet the health needs of the Nation. Whatever action may be taken on any other aspect of providing adequate health services, the country cannot afford to let existing shortages of trained health personnel increase in severity. I therefore urge your efforts toward prompt passage of H. R. 5940, feeling convinced that in its present form the bill affords adequate protection of academic and administrative freedom while providing reasonable control of the expenditure of public funds.

The signature is that of Dr. Hutchins, a man noted for disinterest in the unnecessary.

This telegram, it seems to me, is final testimony to the irresistible pressure building up in the medical schools of this country. The statement of President Conant, of Harvard, to which Dr. Hutchins refers, is a cry for help from a university that is among the Nation's richest and best endowed. Each one of you know how much more desperate is the plight of the medical schools in your own States.

The distinguished gentlemen from Michigan know what is happening at Wayne, Michigan State, and the University of Michigan. Every Massachusetts Representative must know the dire straits of the schools there. This is a universal and far-reaching problem, one that goes not only to the present welfare of our great medical schools but to the health and well-being of America's citizens of today and tomorrow.

AMENDING AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 451 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and at this time yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 451 makes in order the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 398, a joint resolution from the Committee on Agriculture relating to cotton- and peanut-acreage allotments. Its immediate consideration and enactment are necessary and of great importance to the Nation.

This resolution does not propose new legislation. It simply seeks to accomplish what good administration would have done without additional legislation—give the farmer a fair deal. It seeks to put back into the law what has been deleted by either a complete misunderstanding by the administrators or utter disregard of the intent and letter of the law and its proper application.

It was never the intention of Congress that inequities and hardships should follow the enactment of the quota law. It was passed to insure a reduction in cotton production, to insure a minimum surplus, and a fair and reasonable price. The cut, as provided in Public Law 272 was about 7,000,000 acres. Had such a cut been fairly and evenly distributed, there could have been little legitimate complaint. The cut was not fairly and evenly distributed. A Nation-wide reduction of about 23 percent is not evenly distributed when thousands of farmers are forced, under the terms of Public Law 272, to cut their cotton acreage 80

to 90 percent. A cotton farmer who has been planting 300 acres to cotton annually has not received his fair share when allocated 57 acres for 1950. Not only can he not eat or live under such terms but he will lose his equity in his land and must turn away his tenants, his partners in business.

A law, any law, which forces thousands upon thousands to suffer the hardship of hunger and bankruptcy can hardly be justified. This amendment will most certainly relieve many of such an unbearable hardship.

House Joint Resolution 398 provides for the allocation of additional acreage—approximately 1,400,000—to the cotton farmers of America. It is a 1-year emergency measure calculated to correct gross inequities and hardships which have arisen from the administration of the cotton quota law—Public Law 272—enacted last August.

The resolution provides that cotton farmers shall have a cotton-acreage allotment of no less than 70 percent of the average planted in 1946–47–48, including war crops, to cotton, or 50 percent of the highest planted in any one of such years.

There is a proviso to limit the allotment to not to exceed 40 percent of the acreage on such farms which are tilled annually or in regular rotation. It further provides authority for the redistribution of allocated acreage which is not planted and is voluntarily surrendered by the owner or operator of the farm. The resolution also provides small additional acreage for peanuts.

The establishment of quotas results in hardships under the most favorable circumstances, but it is particularly harsh at this time. The cost of production for the farmer is at an all-time high. The prices he pays for all that he buys are well above parity. At a time when the hourly wage of the Nation goes up by virtue of a Federal law, the income of the farmer unfortunately is falling by virtue of a Federal law.

The application of Public Law 272, as interpreted and administered, has resulted in severe—unduly severe—hardships. These are actual, not imaginary, hardships.

It surely must cause many of you who have not been closely associated with this problem to wonder why we find ourselves faced with this difficulty. The excellent report filed by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] to accompany House Joint Resolution 398 discusses the factors involved. There are many, namely: lack of accurate information on acreage planted during past years; lack of experienced farmer-administrators at the county level; and, in my personal judgment, a complete misunderstanding or disregard by the Department of Agriculture of the intent of Congress in enacting Public Law 272.

With few exceptions, the farmers—the victims—were not in any respect at fault in this tragic mix-up. But no matter the villain, this amendment will permit any farmer whose acreage is below the minimum, irrespective of the reason, to be brought up to the 70–50 minimum, limited by 40 percent of his acreage which is tilled annually or in regular rotation. As the committee report so ably says:

> The additional acreage which may be required for this act of simple justice will be a small price for the Nation to pay for continuation and vindication of the principle that sound soil-conservation practices shall be considered in the allotment of quotas.

The problems involved are peculiar to the Cotton Belt, but the effects are not confined to regions alone. The entire Nation feels the pinch on agricultural income. This is not a bill to benefit only the cotton States. No part of the Nation can fail to benefit by its enactment. No part of the Nation can but suffer if it fails in passage. While no one can rightfully say that it will cost the Government a single penny, it can be said with all certainty that it is a measure to add more than a billion dollars to the agricultural income—income that will be spent for the products and goods of America, in every State in the Union.

It means added business for the constituents of all of you. It means food, shelter, and clothing for those of thousands of us.

I earnestly request your support of this rule and this bill. You and your people live in partnership with the farmer. His prosperity is yours; his poverty you share. No politics is involved, only cold economics. This Congress is conscious of the truth that millions of the jobs of nonfarm workers are directly dependent upon billions of farm income. It would be reassuring to the Nation to see an overwhelmingly favorable vote on this measure. The rule provides for ample debate and for any germane amendment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman stated that if the Department had carried out the quota law as it was intended to be carried out by the committee and the Congress that we would not have had this difficulty. I wish the gentleman would, if he can, explain wherein they have failed to carry out the intent of the Congress.

Mr. LYLE. I would be very happy to do so, but I made a rather lengthy statement on the floor of the House on February 6, which I would like for the gentleman to read, if he would. I went into it at some length, and it would take about 20 minutes to do that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I did read it, of course, and I know about it, but I thought for the benefit of the House the gentleman would like to do that now.

Mr. LYLE. I am afraid it would take a little while, but I shall take it up in general debate.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 21]

Abbitt	Halleck	Philbin
Allen, Ill.	Hand	Phillips, Calif.
Arends	Hart	Phillips, Tenn.
Auchincloss	Hays, Ohio	Plumley
Barden	Hébert	Poulson
Barrett, Pa.	Heller	Powell
Beall	Hobbs	Price
Bennett, Fla.	Hoffman, Ill.	Quinn
Bland	Hope	Rabaut
Boggs, La.	James	Redden
Bosone	Javits	Rees
Breen	Jennings	Ribicoff
Brown, Ga.	Jonas	Richards
Buckley, N.Y.	Keating	Rivers
Bulwinkle	Kelly, N.Y.	Rogers, Fla.
Burdick	Kennedy	Rogers, Mass.
Burton	Keogh	Roosevelt
Byrne, N.Y.	King	Sadlak
Case, S. Dak.	Klein	Sadowski
Cavalcante	Kunkel	St. George
Celler	Lane	Saylor
Clemente	Latham	Scott, Hardie
Cooley	Lemke	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Corbett	Lichtenwalter	Scrivner
Coudert	Lodge	Scudder
Davies, N.Y.	Lynch	Secrest
Davis, Tenn.	McCulloch	Short
Dawson	McMillan, S.C.	Simpson, Pa.
Dingell	Macy	Smathers
Dollinger	Marcantonio	Smith, Kans.
Donohue	Marshall	Smith, Ohio
Durham	Miles	Stanley
Ellsworth	Miller, Calif.	Stigler
Engel, Mich.	Miller, Nebr.	Sutton
Fallon	Monroney	Taber
Fellows	Morgan	Taylor
Fernandez	Morrison	Underwood
Fulton	Moulder	Vorys
Gamble	Multer	Wadsworth
Gary	Murdock	Wagner
Gilmer	Murphy	Walsh
Gorski	Nelson	Weichel
Granahan	Nixon	Werdel
Green	Norblad	Whitaker
Gwinn	Norton	White, Idaho
Hale	O'Toole	Wilson, Okla.
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Wolcott
Hall, Leonard W.	Pfeiffer, William L.	Wood
		Zablocki

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 286 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AMENDING AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] has explained, House Resolution 451 makes in order House Joint Resolution 398, with 3 hours of general debate.

The measure has been reported from the Committee on Agriculture, after some emergency sessions and hearings, to relieve a situation that has developed as a result of the so-called trial run of the 1949 Agricultural Act. I know of no opposition to the rule on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Dean Acheson has the right, as an individual, to his own personal viewpoint. But as Secretary of State and a public official, I think he has made a grave and serious error in publicly expressing himself as he did on the Alger Hiss case.

His sympathy for Hiss evidences his thinking and Dean Acheson by his public pronouncement has forfeited his right to continue in this high office of Government as our Secretary of State representing the American people.

Therefore, in view of the fact, that his thinking is contrary to the wishes of the American people, he has lost any confidence and value he has had as our Secretary of State and his resignation is in order.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, on January 17, I called the attention of the House to a coal-shortage situation in Minnesota and the Northwest. I urged the President to take immediate action to restore coal production in order to relieve suffering of American citizens who are short of fuel under cold subtemperature conditions. The President has refused to act. He states that no emergency exists, although his chief of the Bureau of Mines advises that the situation is critical.

Mr. Speaker, the coal-supply situation in many communities in my congressional district has become extremely critical. The emergency is here and the people in need of coal cannot understand the reason for the failure of the President to act. He is the only official who has the authority to act with dispatch. I fully understand and recognize, Mr. Speaker, as you stated last Friday, that President Truman won the last election and secured a Democratic Congress. I concede that he won the election. But that does not give him any right to play politics with human misery and suffering.

I have had several long-distance telephone calls within the past 24 hours from citizens in various communities in my district telling me about the coal shortage. The temperature last night at Rochester, Minn., went down to 27° below zero. I made a survey today in Rochester, which most of you know is a medical center, and found that of the 36 hotels in that city, about half of them are virtually out of stoker coal. These hotels are mainly used by sick people from all parts of the world, who have come to the Mayo Clinic for treatment. They must have warm rooms in the present subzero weather and it takes coal to provide the heat.

I checked with the coal dealers in Rochester and found they only had 12 tons of stoker coal on hand today. They have two carloads of coal on the way, but there is uncertainty when it will arrive from the coal fields of Illinois, and this small quantity will only last 2 days, if rationed out.

Something must be done, and the President of the United States is the only one that can do it. If he does not recognize that there is an emergency, I can assure him that there is a critical emergency in my congressional district and elsewhere in the Northwest, where they are now having subzero temperatures. In other communities they are also short of stoker coal. Our schools in some sections will be closed down by February 1 unless coal is received. That is true of Northfield, Minn. In other areas many families will be without coal within a few days.

If the President has inherent powers under the Constitution that he desires to exercise, instead of functioning under the law passed by the Congress, then he should exercise that power to get people back to work in the coal mines to produce in full production so as to save the people in this country from the suffering and misery which will occur as the result of these coal shortages.

The time to act is now, before it is too late. I again call upon the President of the United States to function in his executive capacity in accordance with the Constitution, because we are in need. If he does not act immediately he will have to take the consequences.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the able gentleman from Texas who brought about the favorable action on this rule in the Committee on Rules has explained the bill. Consequently I do not think it is necessary for me to explain the rule or elaborate on the bill. However, I am obliged to call attention to some significant and important facts relative thereto.

The resolution before us was introduced on January 21, and the request for a rule was made before the Committee on Agriculture had a printed bill.

The bill came in while the committee was in session; the ink was still wet. At the same time, the lengthy report on this resolution was brought in while the Committee on Rules was in session considering the rule now before us. Of course, due to conditions which prevail in the Committee on Rules and due to the persistence of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE]—and I do not blame him because he claims there are some inequities as to the allocations of acreage—he expressed the desire to bring about equity and justice to those who have been discriminated against in the allocation of cotton acreages.

Consequently I feel he performed his duty as he saw it, and expressed the point of view of his constituents. But right here I wish to say, if there were any discrepancies or if anyone has suffered, it was not due to the Congress, because we passed a bill last year upon the recommendation of many capable gentlemen on the Committee on Agriculture, to allegedly alleviate the then existing inequalities.

Now, a rule has been granted upon the persistence and insistence of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] and others, notwithstanding that we had pending an application for a rule for over a period of 3 years on the FEPC—the Fair Employment Practice Commission bill. For 4 weeks I have been endeavoring to my very utmost to secure a rule on it. By everything that is right, that rule had precedence.

But, due to a coalition and a friendly understanding on the part of some of the gentlemen from the South, the West, and some of my Republican reactionary friends who seem to cooperate and have been able to cooperate with them, a rule was granted without even giving me a chance to read the bill or read the report, as I said before. Of course, one of the gentlemen said that I would not understand it anyway, because it was a complicated resolution.

Oh, I did read it and examine it, and I understand it and I know what it means.

Mr. Speaker, the American people will wonder, and have a right to wonder, about the insincerity of the Republicans, who, day in and day out, preach economy and complain of the huge public debt and not only oppose but vote for these additional millions of dollars that will be saddled on the backs of the taxpayers.

However, I myself understand the underlying reason, it being that the coalition between the Republicans and Dixiecrats is working, and God help the country if it continues in force. The Republicans voted with the Dixiecrats for the increase of 1,400,000 acres of cotton in return for their votes against FEPC. That is obvious.

They feel they can hide or cover up the duplicity and double-dealing, but I feel that notwithstanding their ingenuity and ability to distort facts, they will be unable to make it stick.

The additional tax burden involved in this cotton-acreage increase will inure to the benefit of 11 States, 5 of which have alined themselves with the so-called Dixiecrat Party—States like Alabama, Georgia, Texas, Arkansas, and South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, indeed we do have some big cotton planters, because only in yesterday's paper I read of one cotton planter who sold his 1949 crop for $1,400,000. Surely he and other large operators were not discriminated against.

I have been informed that the committee is working on a so-called permanent program—that this is only for the year 1950—so I felt this matter should go over until they were ready to present their permanent program. They demanded immediate action, naturally feeling that the less the membership knew about the great cost involved in this bill, the easier it would be for them to pass it. It is indeed strange that these gentlemen, urging and forcing this legislation, which assures them six or seven times as great a price for cotton as they received under a Republican administration, and though they get six to seven times more for their crops today, oppose at all times any wage increases to our workingmen. Their claim is that labor is receiving from 50 to 100 percent greater wages than before. However, we did force through this House the minimum-wage bill.

Oh, the inconsistency! I repeat—what inconsistency and unfairness on their part.

Though the Democratic Party, under the leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and now under President Truman, through progressive legislation, brought about the greatest prosperity our country has ever enjoyed—especially to the South—prosperity they never dreamed could be theirs—they thrive upon opposition to the President's program and policies for more liberal legislation; and this in violation of the Jeffersonian concept of equal rights to all and special privileges to none.

Mr. Speaker, for 42 years I voted for every agricultural bill. No one can justly charge me with prejudice or that I have not had the interest of the farmer and agriculture at heart or that I am prejudiced against the cotton grower. Why, I recollect that due to the tremendous surplus of cotton which accumulated during Republican regimes, when cotton could not be sold at 4½ cents or 5 cents a pound, I purchased, not for profit but to aid the growers, 500 bales of cotton, notwithstanding the fact that no cotton was grown in my district or in my State.

Personally I feel that the Department of Agriculture, which has done so much for the farmer these last 18 years, should have been given an opportunity to adjust the discrepancies in allotments—taking away from the huge operators, who farm from 1,000 acres and up, the small amount necessary to do justice to the operators who have been unfairly treated by the county and State organizations.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Now that the gentleman does understand it and knows what it means, I am sure he will be willing to support it?

Mr. SABATH. Well, it is not as bad as the first bill that you introduced. It is for 1 year. My objection is not as great to this, but I object to the haste with which it has been forced through the committee, notwithstanding other important legislation in which a vast majority of the American people are interested. The FEPC bill has been sidetracked under one pretense or another for the last 4 weeks, and this bill given priority as I said previously. That is what I object to. The unfair tactics and agreements that seem to be had between you gentlemen representing some of the cotton States and your Republican friends—you, yourself, are all right once in a while. You vote with us. But very few of the others do.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, and to make the RECORD factual, the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman COOLEY, appeared before the Committee on Rules, Thusday morning, and informed the committee that he had received a letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. K. T. Hutchinson, under date of January 26, 1950, stating that—

> On the basis that the reported resolution is an emergency measure for 1 year only designed to authorize the correction of certain gross inequities which have resulted from the application of the provisions of Public Laws 272 and 439, Eighty-first Congress, the Department is in favor of its enactment.

The reference is to the bill presently before us, namely, House Joint Resolution 398.

Now then the able chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, although reading the first paragraph of the letter above referred to, has failed to point out what the Acting Secretary of Agriculture had to say with reference to the undesirable provisions of this joint resolution. Yes, the Department of Agriculture is in favor of the enactment of this joint resolution. However, they also state that their recommendation is based "on an understanding that you intend to reconsider Public Law 272 with the object in mind of rewriting the cotton-acreage-allotment provision of the law in a manner which will not require similar emergency measures in the future. The history of emergency amendments for correcting inequitable cotton-acreage allotments is that the additional acreage alloted is always over and above the amounts considered necessary for proper adjustments of supplies to demand."

In connection with further less desirable provisions of the joint resolution, the Acting Secretary of Agriculture calls attention to section 2, providing for farmers who have allotments in excess of what they desire to plant in 1950 to voluntarily surrender such allotments to the county committee for reapportionment to other farms in the county. The Acting Secretary states that this will not actually reduce the amount of cotton that would be otherwise planted in 1950. He states that the provisions of section 1 "will give all farmers who request it the larger of 70 percent of the 3-year average acreage planted or regarded as planted to cotton or 50 percent of the highest acreage planted or regarded as planted to cotton in any one of such 3 years, even though no acreage is surrendered by other farmers in the county. The counties that will benefit the most from surrender and reapportionment of unused cotton-acreage allotments are those counties which have the most generous allotments in relation to the acreage of cotton which is being currently planted in such counties."

Thus, the Acting Secretary states, counties and States in which little or no acreage would be released or reapportioned under section 2 will be at a disadvantage to those in which considerable acreage is released and reapportioned since the acreage so released and reapportioned would be used in establishing future State and county cotton-acreage allotments. "This could lead to major problems in the future in establishing State and county allotments." But the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] failed to read this part of Mr. Hutchinson's statement to the committee on Thursday.

The Acting Secretary of Agriculture plainly stated that additional acreage of at least 1,400,000 acres would be allotted under the provisions of section 1 of this bill, as I pointed out before:

> The estimated additional cost represented by additional CCC loans ranges from $90,000,000 to $120,000,000. The estimated additional cost in connection with the administration and application of this resolution is $2,000,000.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, when one reads from a letter he should state all the provisions contained therein, since the Department of Agriculture is not wholeheartedly in favor of this legislation. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to state to my colleagues who have not fully cooperated in the passage of liberal and progressive legislation recommended by President Truman and the administration, that if they continue to pursue their unholy alliance and coalition with the Republicans, surely the people of the country will react in the forthcoming elections by electing a Democratic majority in fact and not in name only.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the conviction of Alger Hiss renews one's appreciation of the American system with its independent judiciary. Americans are grateful for independent courts and fearless and courageous prosecutors.

The conviction of Alger Hiss is a conviction of a great many men in high places, both living and dead, who have steered this Nation in the course designed by our enemies.

The sad state of affairs in the world today is the result of Communist strategy within our Government.

We need a Secretary of State whose first and only loyalty is to the United States of America.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter from the Member from New York, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, which I shall read in part:

> MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: I have filed Discharge Petition No. 21. On Wednesday, January 25, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon or as soon thereafter as possible, I will read on the floor the names of those Republicans who indicate that they will or will not sign Discharge Petition No. 21 to discharge my FEPC bill, H. R. 4453.
>
> Failure to reply to this letter will indicate that you are opposed to FEPC. I will so note on the floor next week. Therefore, kindly reply before 11 a. m., Wednesday, February 1, 1950. * * *
>
> You may use the enclosed post card or call my office.

I assume, Mr. Speaker, that identical letters have been sent to all Republican Members. I do not know how they feel about this assumption of power by the Member from New York, but I resent it. I had given some thought to signing this petition but this letter has definitely changed my mind. Certainly the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] does not exhibit the tolerance that should be expected from a man who seeks legislation which he claims will promote tolerance and better understanding among races.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. In just a minute.

This high-and-mighty attitude hardly befits the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] as a Member of Congress or as a minister of the Gospel. If I read the Good Book correctly, we should not judge

others too harshly or take unto ourselves all the virtues in existence. I want to say emphatically that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] shall not speak for me on FEPC or any other issue.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. My answer to him was "No," and I signed my name to it.

Mr. SHAFER. My answer to it was to file it in the vertical file, if you know what I mean.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful for this time.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of misunderstanding about how the little farmer is taken care of. I have heard time and time again, and some of my colleagues tell me likewise, that there is a 5-acre minimum. This just is not the case. I ask you to listen to a colloquy that took place on August 3, 1949, when the bill came before the House, a colloquy between the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], who is an authority on this matter, and me:

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask some of the Members who are sponsoring this bill this question. It is in the form of an assumption, but I think a very real assumption.

Assume that a veteran 25 or 26 years of age never did anything except grow cotton on a cotton farm until 1942 when he went into the Army; assume he remained in the Army until 1946; assume that he took GI training to be a mechanic for 2 years and while doing so he did not farm; assume that he owns a 60-acre cotton farm which has had no cotton on it since 1942; assume that today he loses his job and goes back to that cotton farm which has not had cotton grown on it since 1942. The question is: Will he be privileged to get 5 acres of cotton?

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. PACE. That depends, and I have tried to explain it to the gentleman, that depends entirely upon the State PMA Committee of the State of Texas, and the county PMA committee in which that farm is located. He can, and will very likely get considerably more than 5 acres. It depends upon the amount of acreage the State committee allocates to that county for new farms. If the State committee gives the county, for example, 500 acres for new farms, every acre of it must go to new farms. Then, in addition to that 500 acres, the county committee may reserve 10 percent that can be used for new farms. So the allotment could be identical with like farms in the same area.

Mr. BECKWORTH. May I ask this further question: However, is it true or is it not true that the definite 5-acre minimum applies to him?

Mr. PACE. It does not.

The bill that we passed on August 3 did not provide for a 5-acre minimum for a genuine cotton farmer, as the man I have described, for one who grew cotton until 1942 at which time he owned a cotton farm and entered the service. It does not provide a 5-acre minimum and the record does not so show.

Mr. Speaker, the time is at hand when we should try to be fair to the small farmer, the man who is out there trying to feed his family and trying to make a decent, honest living. If any kind of control bill does not take care of that person in a fair and square manner, the bill is not just, the bill is not sound in that respect, because in my judgment, it cannot endure.

I trust that the Members of the House in their deliberations concerning this important measure will undertake to be fair to the kind of veteran I have referred to, a man 26 years of age who grew cotton, for example, until 1942 but did not have the privilege of growing it again until, we shall assume, 1949.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has stated that existing law does not provide for a minimum of 5 acres for a farmer; is that correct?

Mr. BECKWORTH. For the kind of cotton farmer I have described.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. One who has been in the service and came out.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Yes. The cotton acreage law means if you were not on the farm in 1946, 1947, and 1948, regardless of whether you never did a thing in the world except grow cotton before and since, you are classified as a new cotton farmer. Yes, you are told you are a new farmer. You are new like a lawyer Member of Congress who serves in Congress for 10 years would be a new lawyer if it were written into the law that such a Member of Congress would be regarded as a new lawyer rather than an old lawyer, because of his service in Congress and therefore his being away from the practice of law.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. If the gentleman should be defeated, no matter how long he had been a Member of Congress, he would not remain a Member of Congress for 3 years after his defeat, and a man who quits farming cotton does not remain a cotton farmer just because he may have grown cotton at sometime in the past. I think we are quite liberal in this cotton law as we consider a man a cotton farmer for three full years after he quits growing cotton.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Does the gentleman regard himself as a lawyer? Does he think he should be privileged to practice law when he goes back to Waco whether he is defeated or not?

Mr. POAGE. I may go back to the practice of law if I am defeated, but certainly I am not practicing law now, and do not hold myself out as a lawyer. I am a Member of Congress now. Surely at any given date a man cannot claim to be engaged in every trade, profession, or business in which he may have at one time or another engaged.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Would the gentleman be a new lawyer?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, I am afraid I would be a new lawyer were I to try to go back to the practice. I would be without clients just as the man who has not grown cotton for 14 years is without a cotton allotment.

Mr. BECKWORTH. That may be the gentleman's conception of businesses and occupations in this country. I submit that just because a fellow has been in business, we shall say, as a merchant for 20 years, gets out and remains out 3 years, this does not mean he is not a merchant or businessman. I submit that a man who has been a dentist we shall say for 20 years and ceases to be for 3 years is no reason why he is not still a dentist and I believe my colleagues here accord to that statement fairness.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 22]

Abbitt	Halleck	Quinn
Allen, Ill.	Hand	Rabaut
Arends	Hart	Redden
Auchincloss	Hays, Ohio	Rees
Barden	Hébert	Richards
Barrett, Pa.	Hedrick	Rivers
Bates	Heffernan	Rogers, Fla.
Beall	Heller	Rogers, Mass.
Bennett, Fla.	Hobbs	Roosevelt
Bland	Hoffman, Ill.	Sabath
Boggs, La.	Hope	Sadlak
Breen	James	Sadowski
Brown, Ga.	Javits	St. George
Brown, Ohio	Jenison	Saylor
Buckley, N. Y.	Jonas	Scott, Hardie
Bulwinkle	Keating	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Burdick	Kee	Scrivner
Burton	Kelly, N. Y.	Scudder
Byrne, N. Y.	Kennedy	Secrest
Case, S. Dak.	Keogh	Sheppard
Cavalcante	Kirwan	Short
Celler	Klein	Simpson, Pa.
Chudoff	Kunkel	Smathers
Clemente	Lane	Smith, Kans.
Cole, Kans.	Latham	Smith, Ohio
Corbett	Lichtenwalter	Spence
Coudert	Lodge	Stanley
Davies, N. Y.	Lynch	Stigler
Davis, Tenn.	McCulloch	Sutton
Dawson	McMillan, S. C.	Taber
Dingell	Macy	Taylor
Dollinger	Marcantonio	Thomas
Donohue	Marshall	Towe
Durham	Miles	Underwood
Ellsworth	Miller, Nebr.	Van Zandt
Engel, Mich.	Monroney	Vorys
Engle, Calif.	Morgan	Vursell
Fallon	Morrison	Wadsworth
Fellows	Moulder	Wagner
Fernandez	Multer	Walsh
Fulton	Murphy	Weichel
Gamble	Nelson	Werdel
Gary	Norton	White, Idaho
Gilmer	O'Toole	Wier
Gorski	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Wood
Granahan	Pfeiffer, William L.	Woodhouse
Green	Philbin	
Gwinn	Phillips, Tenn.	
Hale	Plumley	
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Powell	
Hall, Leonard W.	Price	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and eighty-three Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COTTON- AND PEANUT-ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 398, relating to cotton- and peanut-acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 398, relating to cotton- and peanut-acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with Mr. SMITH of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from North Carolina will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from Minnesota for 1½ hours.

The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] could give me any additional time? I would like to have a little more than 5 minutes, if possible.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I can tell the gentleman a little later.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, in August last year when this bill came before the Congress I very definitely stated it was not a bill which would work equitably for many people in the business of growing cotton. I remember very definitely it was stated that the bill had been unanimously reported by the subcommittee, that it had been unanimously reported by the full committee and that it was the desire of the group that it be undisturbed. It was not disturbed although several of us did offer several amendments. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] and I offered certain amendments; however, the bill remained undisturbed. At this point I desire to pay particular tribute to the gentlemen from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] for the great amount of time and effort he has given the subjects of cotton, wheat, and corn crops. His service on the Agriculture Committee in conjunction with his sincere interest in the welfare of Oklahoma and United States farmers has put him in a position to fully understand the problems of our farmers. He has had the vision and courage to try to do something about their plight as has been shown in the past by his offering amendments last August 3 when the cotton bill passed the House.

I have never been one to forecast, but, in my opinion, if it is not disturbed more than it has been disturbed by the amendments that are before us today, it will have to be disturbed some more in the future because it still lacks a great deal so far as helping many people who need help in the worst way, and as they should be helped. I am not trying to place the blame on anybody. I have never been a person who tries to blame anyone, but I do believe in endeavoring to bring about corrections.

I read with much interest a letter that the Department of Agriculture, signed by Secretary Brannan, wrote to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN]. He indicated the Farm Bureau wrote the bill and that the Department of Agriculture did not want to take credit for it. To me that was a very peculiar position for the Department of Agriculture to take. If the Department of Agriculture had been trying very hard to change the original bill, the one passed August 3, it is inconceivable to me that there would have been a unanimous report by the full Committee on Agriculture. It is inconceivable to me that the Department of Agriculture fighting the bill could not have gotten one member of the Committee on Agriculture to oppose the bill actively on the floor of the House, certainly to the point of advocating correction. So I do not attach too much significance to the fact that the Department of Agriculture did not have a great deal to do with the writing of this bill. Indeed, if the Department opposed the bill, it was very quietly.

Mr. Chairman, when you control crops you are in fact controlling income. Make no mistake about that. We are in fact controlling the income from the crops controlled. The only way, then, that a program of income control has a chance to endure is for it to be fair.

According to a study the Census Bureau made some 10 years ago, seven-eighths of the cotton farmers was getting 50 percent of the cotton income and one-eighth was getting the other 50 percent. Let me repeat that according to a census study back in 1940, announced a little later, seven-eighths of the cotton farmers was getting 50 percent of the cotton income and one-eighth was getting 50 percent. If the facts could be ascertained now, I believe it would be considerably worse. I hope not. I repeat again, in a controlled crop program the thing that we all should strive for is fairness.

Another factor that has not had the consideration it deserves, as I view it, is the fact that there has been a great war since 1942, a war that disrupted many agricultural areas including mine. I will tell you how much it disrupted my area. We live for example not far from Texarkana, Tex., where there was located a giant ordnance plant during the war, and it is still there. Many of our people went to that plant to work. I wrote to officials at Texarkana recently and asked them how many fewer jobs they have there now than they had at the height of their employment. I was informed some 7,500.

We hear a lot about trends. There is one trend, though, that has not been mentioned frequently. There has been a trend away from the farm, but since the war was over there has been a trend back to the farm.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I repeat, there was a trend away from the farms, and then there was a trend back to the farms, and many of these people, home owners, some of them have come back—and I have letters that I have put in the RECORD from time to time—only to find that they have little or no acreage allotment. They are even allocating some of my people nine-tenths of 1 acre of poor land. That is in the RECORD, too. That is nine-tenths of 1 acre, not 9 acres, but nine-tenths of 1 acre of poor land.

Another very interesting word that is often used is the word "reserve." You know it sounds awfully good but reserve can have a peculiar meaning or implication. If I have a penny in my pocket I have a reserve, and if I have $100,000 I have a reserve. The important thing is whether or not the reserve is adequate, and in most of the counties in the section where I live, or in many of them, I should say, the reserve was completely inadequate, so inadequate that in one county, for example, which is not in my district, according to a letter that is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, they have 1,000 farms with three-hundred-and-some-odd acres to distribute between them, and yet you have a reserve of three-hundred-and-some-odd acres. According to this bill, and I have seen the figures, not many more acres, proportionately, will that county receive. It still has a reserve, but the adequacy of that reserve certainly is questionable.

There are two ways to put people off of the farm. One is not to give the fellow any allotment, and the other is to give him such a small allotment that he cannot stay on the farm. A good many people in my section are getting allotments so small that it will be impossible to stay on the farm if the letters I am receiving are correct—letters which are in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I want to bring one important issue to you right there. You drive 400 fellows from the farm because of the inadequacy of the allotment, and then see if they can vote on the cotton referendum this fall. The answer is that they cannot, being driven away from the vocations that they want to follow, vocations they have followed throughout the years, excepting the war period and the lease period—the three basic years—yes, vocations they have followed throughout their lives. I repeat, they cannot vote in the cotton referendum this fall.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to include certain communications I have received in regard to cotton:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS,
Columbia, Mo., January 19, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I am returning to you herewith the material on the cotton

county estimates and cotton allotments for Missouri.

You are advised that I have not received a copy of the Cooley amendment and the Production and Marketing Administration officials state that they have not made an attempt to make calculations under this amendment by counties since there is still question as to what the final law will be. However, I am of the opinion that the amendment would raise the Missouri cotton allotment from some 25,000 to 50,000 acres.

Very truly yours,

ALFRED C. BRITTAIN,
Agricultural Statistician in Charge.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS,
Columbia, Mo., January 10, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: There is enclosed herewith a mimeographed sheet which shows acreage of cotton in cultivation in Missouri for the years 1945 through 1948 inclusive. We do not publish the data for the minor counties which represent very small acreages.

The table below shows cotton allotments for the seven major cotton counties of the State for years 1942 and 1950:

County	1942	1950
	Acres	*Acres*
Butler	16,587	19,214
Dunklin	86,248	90,309
Mississippi	34,646	30,452
New Madrid	94,167	122,546
Pemiscot	109,551	127,158
Scott	20,056	18,325
Stoddard	37,414	41,965
Other	7,870	4,832
State	406,539	453,706
Small farms	----------	+7,976
New growers	----------	+1,157
Total	----------	462,839

Very truly yours,

ALFRED C. BRITTAIN,
Agricultural Statistician in Charge.

Missouri cotton: Planted acreage, planted yield, and production

District and county	1945			1946		
	Acreage in cultivation July 1	Yield per planted acre	Production 500-pound gross weight bales	Acreage in cultivation July 1	Yield per planted acre	Production 500-pound gross weight bales
District IX:	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*
Butler	11,100	306	7,100	13,000	295	8,090
Dunklin	61,000	326	41,600	77,500	476	77,200
Mississippi	30,400	271	17,200	16,600	500	17,400
New Madrid	54,200	269	30,530	80,000	331	55,400
Pemiscot	80,000	386	64,500	118,000	509	125,000
Scott	15,000	275	8,600	16,000	321	10,800
Stoddard	15,000	309	9,700	21,000	235	10,390
Total	266,700	321	179,230	342,100	426	305,190
All other [1]	1,300	283	770	2,900	298	1,810
State total	268,000	321	180,000	345,000	425	307,000

District and county	1947			1948		
	Acreage in cultivation July 1	Yield per planted acre	Production 500-pound gross weight bales	Acreage in cultivation July 1	Yield per planted acre	Production 500-pound gross weight bales
District IX:						
Butler	22,000	333	15,300	23,000	383	18,400
Dunklin	99,500	322	66,900	112,000	467	109,400
Mississippi	24,000	433	21,750	35,500	473	35,200
New Madrid	131,000	270	74,050	156,000	388	126,800
Pemiscot	141,000	313	92,460	156,800	464	152,050
Scott	18,500	351	13,600	23,000	373	18,200
Stoddard	41,000	288	24,660	52,000	392	42,700
Total	477,000	309	308,720	558,300	430	502,750
All other [1]	4,000	272	2,280	4,700	330	3,250
State total	481,000	309	311,000	563,000	430	506,000

[1] Includes in district VIII: Bollinger, Carter, Howell, Laclede, Ozark, Ripley, Taney, and Wayne Counties. District IX: Cape Girardeau County.

ALFRED C. BRITTAIN,
Agricultural Statistician in Charge.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Sulphur, Okla., January 20, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our PMA cotton committee reserved the full amount in our county. Your amendment would not help our county allotments any. The only legislation that would help us would be an amendment giving us power to transfer unused allotments over to cotton farmers who would use this allotment.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM W. MANSFIELD,
PMA Administrative Officer,
Murray County.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Poteau, Okla., January 19, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is to reply to your letter of January 16, 1950, requesting information on the establishment of cotton allotments in Le Flore County, Okla.

The county and community committees reserved the maximum 15 percent and used it for upward adjustments. The enclosed amendment which you send us would give Le Flore County 680 acres additional allotment if based on BAE figures. The BAE figures in this county were only 60 percent of the farmers' reported acres. This amendment would add considerable acreage if based on farmers' reported acreage. It is estimated that 1,000 additional acres is needed in this county to prevent hardships on genuine cotton farmers and tenants.

It is estimated from our contact with farmers that more than 1,000 acres would be released and could be reapportioned.

Yours very truly,

A. H. MILLER,
Chairman, Le Flore County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Stigler, Okla., January 20, 1950.

Re Haskell County, Okla.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Haskell County committee held the maximum reserve of 15 percent of the county allotment for adjustments. It is our opinion that the county committee could have done a better job of distribution had they been permitted to have held even more.

The proposed 70 percent of the 3-year-average amendment would give this county some 650 additional acres. This acreage will not be of any great help because it would not fall on farms where the real problem exists. Having had to conform with BEA acreages for the base years eliminates any substantial help on the 70-percent basis.

Fifty percent of the high-planted year, 1946, 1947, 1948, would add some 1,200 acres to our county allotment. The greater portion of these acres would reach farms which have been rather heavily cut.

What we should most prefer for our county needs would be the privilege of releasing and reapportioning existing cotton acreage in this county. We have no criticism to offer for the allotment that has been given to the county. What we most need is a flexible method of distribution.

Our 1942 cotton allotment was 19,000-plus acres. Our 1950 cotton allotment is 11,000-plus acres.

We appreciate your concern of the marketing-quota problems, and shall gladly and promptly answer any inquiry you might make of us.

Yours very truly,

WM. HARDIE CABLER,
County Administrative Officer.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., January 23, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference is made to your letter of January 17 from Mr. John A. Cariker, of Long Branch, Tex. Mr. Cariker had requested your assistance in securing a larger allotment for his farm.

Under existing cotton legislation there is nothing that we can do here or in the county office to increase the farm allotment. Amendatory legislation now being considered by the Congress will, no doubt, increase his farm allotment as we expect such legislation to increase many farm allotments in all counties in the State.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., January 23, 1950.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of January 16 with which you enclosed a copy of a letter from Mr. Hubert W. Peden, Edgewood, Tex. Mr. Peden had complained about a 1950 cotton allotment for his farm and also stated that he and many other farmers in his community were not permitted to vote in the cotton marketing quota referendum held on December 15, 1949.

As I understand Mr. Peden's letter, he had not produced cotton on his farm in 1946, 1947, or 1948 and there was no indication that cotton war crops were produced instead of cotton in 1946 or 1947. Consequently, under existing legislation the county committee could not establish a group I or regular farm cotton allotment. Mr. Peden should apply to his county committee for a group II or new farm cotton allotment as soon as possible. We expect to complete the determination of new farm cotton allotments around March 1, after which time he will be notified.

Section 343 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by Public Law 272, Eighty-first Congress, provides that if marketing quotas are proclaimed for the 1950 crop (of cotton) farmers eligible to vote in the referendum held with respect to such crop shall be those farmers who were engaged in the production of cotton in the calendar year of 1948. This requirement of law, of course, resulted in Mr. Peden's being ineligible to vote in the referendum as he did not produce cotton in 1948, and his local referendum committee was correct in refusing to permit him, as well as others in the community who did not produce cotton in 1948, to cast a ballot.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., January 23, 1950.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of January 17, 1950, in which you quoted a portion of a letter from Mr. O. H. Moseley, of route 1, Ben Wheeler, Tex. We also have your note of January 21 with reference to a copy of a letter from K. T. Hutchinson, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, to you regarding Mr. Moseley's eligibility to vote in the referendum. Mr. Moseley had complained about the cotton-acreage allotment for his farm and also that he was not permitted to vote in the cotton-marketing-quota referendum conducted on December 15, 1949.

As I understand Mr. Moseley's letter, he had not produced cotton on his farm in 1946, 1947, or 1948, and there was no indication that war crops were produced instead of cotton in 1946 or 1947. Consequently, under existing legislation the county committee could not establish a group I or regular farm-cotton allotment. Mr. Moseley should apply to his county committee for a group II or new farm-cotton allotment as soon as possible. We expect to complete the determination of new farm-cotton allotments around March 1, after which time he will be notified.

Section 343 of the AAA Act of 1938, as amended by Public Law 272, Eighty-first Congress, provides that if marketing quotas are proclaimed for the 1950 crop (of cotton) farmers eligible to vote in the referendum held with respect to such crop shall be those farmers who were engaged in the production of cotton in the calendar year of 1948. This requirement of law, of course, resulted in Mr. Moseley's being ineligible to vote in the referendum as he did not produce cotton in 1948, and his local referendum committee was correct in refusing to permit him to cast a ballot.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., January 25, 1950.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to the following letters which you recently forwarded to the Department for information concerning 1950 cotton-acreage allotments:

Zen R. May, route 2, Joaquin, Tex., December 17, 1949.

W. M. Taylor, route 2, box 181, Gladewater, Tex., December 14, 1949.

W. H. Boynton, Mount Sylvan, Tex., December 21, 1949.

R. T. Wilkinson, Mount Vernon, Tex., December 14, 1949.

Fred Hamilton, route 3, Henderson, Tex., December 28, 1949.

J. O. McCreight, Yantis, Tex., December 30, 1949.

J. D. Maloney, route 4, Henderson, Tex., December 14, 1949.

Walter Young, route 1, box 52, Tatum, Tex., December 14, 1949.

The legislation under which the 1950 national cotton acreage allotment was apportioned to States, counties, and farms is specific as to the manner in which the apportionments shall be made. The regulations and instructions, with respect to establishing county and farm acreage allotments for 1950, which have been issued to the State and county Production and Marketing Administration committees, who are directly in charge of establishing farm cotton acreage allotments in their respective States and counties, conform to the provisions of the applicable laws.

Enclosed is a statement, together with sufficient copies for each of the above-mentioned persons, which sets forth, in general, the procedure for establishing farm acreage allotments for the 1950 crop of cotton under the existing legislation and the regulations issued by the Secretary in connection therewith. If, after they have studied the statement, they have further questions as to how the cotton acreage allotment for their farm was established, we suggest that they discuss the matter with their respective local county PMA committee.

Sincerely yours,

K. T. HUTCHINSON,
Assistant Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1950.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letters of November 14 and 17, 1949, in which you inquired as to whether the fact that proportionately more people left farms which had been producing peanuts and cotton in certain counties than from other counties to go into military service or into defense work, was considered in the adjustment of peanut- and cotton-acreage allotments and the allocation of reserves for such allotment crops.

In your letter of November 14, referred to above, you quoted a paragraph from your letter of October 14, 1949, as follows:

"During the war quite frequently a boy went into the Army when the farm he was working did not have enough food units to keep him on the farm. The shortage of food units on a given farm occasionally meant the boy would leave the farm or the man with a family would leave the farm to go into the Army or perhaps to a defense plant. To what extent was consideration given to these facts in the adjustment of cotton quotas?"

The letter which we received from you dated October 14, 1949, stated:

"During the war quite frequently a boy went into the Army when the farm he was working did not have enough food units to keep him on the farm. The shortage of food units on a given farm occasionally meant the boy would leave the farm or the man with a family would leave the farm to go into the Army or perhaps to a defense plant. To what extent was consideration given to these facts in the adjustment of quotas?"

Your notation at the bottom of such letter reads:

"I'd like an explanation of the point system used."

You will note that the letter from you dated October 14, 1949, made no mention of cotton or peanut quotas, and since it appeared to have reference to selective-service matters the letter was, therefore, referred to the Director, Selective Service System, for reply. We notified you of such referral in our letter dated October 26, 1949.

In regard to whether consideration can be given to the factor mentioned in your letters of November 14 and 17, 1949, and restated in the first paragraph of this letter, we wish to point out that Public Law 272, Eighty-first Congress, provided a procedure for apportioning the national cotton allotment to States which did not deal with this matter in a direct way; however, section 344 (e) thereof does provide that the State may reserve not to exceed 10 percent (15 percent in Oklahoma) of its State acreage allotment which shall be used to make adjustments in county allotments for trends in acreage, for counties adversely affected by abnormal conditions affecting plantings, or for small or new farms. Following through on that part of the legislation regarding abnormal conditions affecting plantings, the following paragraph is quoted from the cotton procedure issued to State committees:

"Abnormal conditions affecting plantings: In considering adjustments in county allotments for this factor, the State committee should take into account (a) abnormal weather conditions, such as floods and droughts at planting time which affected plantings during one or more years of the base period (this applies only where plantings were affected); (b) conditions in counties in which a number of farms are being returned to cotton production or are increasing the acreage in cotton after having been out of production or having been on a reduced level of cotton acreage because such farms were used in connection with air bases, defense plants, and other wartime activities; (c) abnormal reduction in cotton acreage because of an unusual movement from farms in the area or county to war industries or into the armed forces as compared with such movements in other areas; and (d) any other abnormal conditions which adversely affected plantings in the area."

The Texas State PMA Committee reserved approximately 128,000 acres of the State cotton-acreage allotment, of which about one-sixth was apportioned to counties of your congressional district thus raising the county cotton-acreage allotment approximately 18 percent for adjustments for ab-

normal conditions adversely affecting plantings in that area.

Under section 344 (f) (3) of Public Law 272, Eighty-first Congress, county committees may reserve not to exceed 15 percent of the county cotton allotment, a part of which may be used for adjustments for abnormal conditions of production on farms. The extent to which county Production and Marketing Administration committees may have given consideration to such factor is one which we have no way of appraising at this level.

With respect to peanuts, you will recall that during and immediately following the war there was an acute shortage of fats and oils. During this period farmers, at the request of the Government, greatly expanded their peanut acreages to meet our needs for edible oils. As a result, instead of a reduction in peanut production because of the diversion of farm labor to the armed services and to war plants, there was an expansion in all of the peanut-producing areas. As to individual farms, notwithstanding the fact that peanuts were classified as a war crop, the regulations issued for the establishment of acreage allotments followed the provisions of Public Law 12 and provided that as to a farm for which a 1942 allotment had been established and on which the peanut acreage during 1945, 1946, or 1947 was unusually low or on which during these years no peanuts were grown because the owner or operator was in the armed services, a normal acreage for the farm should be determined for the year involved and used as one of the factors in establishing the 1948 and 1949 allotments. The normal acreage was required to be determined on a consideration of the acreage of peanuts customarily grown on the farm, the tillable acreage on the farm available for the production of peanuts, and the acreage of peanuts produced on farms similar with respect to peanut production.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. LOVELAND,
Under Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference is made to your letter of January 5, 1950, requesting a draft and explanation of a bill which would amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for each cotton farm an acreage allotment of not less than 50 percent of the sum of the acreage planted in cotton in 1937 and the acreage diverted from cotton production in 1937 under the agricultural conservation program, but such allotment not to exceed 40 percent of the cropland for the farm.

The attached draft of a bill contains substantially the same language as that which appeared in section 344 (h) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, prior to the revision of that section by Public Law 272, Eighty-first Congress. The so-called 50–40 provision, as it was applied in establishing cotton-acreage allotments for the 1942 crop of cotton, added approximately 1,100,000 acres to the acreage which was allotted under other provisions of the act. The total acreage allotted for the 1942 crop of cotton was in excess of 27,000,000 acres. We are unable to furnish an estimate at this time of the additional acreage which would be added by the attached bill if it were enacted into law.

In connection with the attached draft, it is to be noted that a majority of the cotton farms in the Nation are at present made up of tracts of land which are different from the lands in the farm when the 50–40 provision was last applicable. Administration of the drafted provision would, therefore, be an extremely complex and time-consuming job for the county Production and Marketing Administration committees. Further, it is quite likely that in some of the counties the necessary records are not available.

The attached draft has been prepared to be effective first with respect to the 1950 crop of cotton. This has been done on the assumption that you would desire it on that basis.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary.

A bill to amend the cotton marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended

Be it enacted, etc., That section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(m) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, the cotton-acreage allotment for 1950 and each subsequent year for any farm receiving an allotment under subsection (f) (1) shall be increased by such amount as may be necessary to provide an allotment for the farm of not less than 50 percent of the sum of the acreage planted to cotton in 1937 and the acreage diverted from cotton production in 1937 under the agricultural conservation program, as determined for each farm in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not operate to raise the allotment for any farm above 40 percent of the acreage on such farm which is tilled annually or in regular rotation, as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary. The additional acreage required under this subsection shall be in addition to the national acreage allotment and the production from such acreage shall be in addition to the national marketing quota."

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This acknowledges receipt of your original letter dated December 15, 1949, and mailed December 16, 1949, and a carbon copy of the same letter forwarded to us under date of December 19, 1949.

It is recognized that, through the application of the provisions contained in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, including amendments made by Public Laws 272 and 439, Eighty-first Congress, inequities and hardship cases have arisen in establishing farm cotton-acreage allotments for 1950. We feel that some practical means of alleviating these conditions should be provided soon, at least before the cotton-planting season is advanced.

Department representatives have recently appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture with respect to a number of proposals regarding proposed changes in the existing legislation, particularly the one originally introduced by Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY as House Joint Resolution 384, which is somewhat similar to that mentioned in your letter.

Sincerely yours,

K. T. HUTCHINSON,
Assistant Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., January 23, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of January 9, with which you enclosed a copy of a letter from Mr. S. V. Blasingame, Box 103, Wills Point, Tex. Mr. Blasingame commented at length regarding 1950 cotton allotments in Van Zandt County and referred to the larger cotton allotments determined for Kaufman County farms.

No doubt amendatory legislation now being considered by the Congress will increase cotton allotments for farms in Van Zandt County. However, under existing cotton legislation, county cotton allotments are required to be computed and adjusted under a rather strict formula. As a result it is not possible for county allotments to be determined in a manner that each will have approximately the same cropland percentage factor unless each county had devoted approximately the same percentage of its cropland to cotton during the years 1947 and 1948.

There is a possibility that Van Zandt County should be divided into two administrative areas for the purpose of establishing farm cotton allotments. We have not investigated the possibility, since all of our time was taken in establishing administrative areas in 12 other Texas counties last October prior to the determination of 1950 farm cotton allotments. We intend to conduct an administrative area investigation in about 15 other Texas counties this summer; and if it is revealed that this device for making farm cotton allotments in such counties is needed, it will be used for the 1951 program.

It is my opinion that for diversified counties farm cotton allotments should be determined primarily on the basis of the average cotton history during the 3 years immediately preceding the year for which the farm cotton allotment is being made. In this manner farm allotments will generally be in direct proportion to the amount of cotton acreage that each farm has contributed to the county history. This method of making allotments is now being used successfully in the peanut, wheat, and potato programs. Also, it would mean that administrative area determinations as proposed by Mr. Blasingame would not be necessary.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., January 19, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of January 6 with which you enclosed a copy of a letter from Mr. R. G. Maclin, route 2, box 82, Mineola, Tex. Mr. Maclin requested your assistance in securing a larger cotton allotment for his farm.

There is no indication in the letter that county and community committeemen have not established the 15-acre allotment in accordance with regulations and instructions issued from this office. However, if Mr. Maclin is dissatisfied with the allotment, he should file an application for review with the local PMA secretary at Quitman, Tex. A

duly constituted review committee will review the determination of his cotton allotment to see that it is fair and equitable and that it was determined properly.

There is a possibility that amendatory legislation now being considered by the Congress will increase his cotton allotment but I can make no commitment since I do not know the provisions of the legislation that may be passed.

I regret that under the circumstances there is nothing that we can do here to increase the farm cotton allotment.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., January 19, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of January 16 with which you enclosed a copy of a wire from Martha Hamlett, Henderson, Tex. Mrs. Hamlett had requested your assistance in securing a larger cotton allotment for her farm.

There is no indication in the letter that county and community committeemen have not established the 8-acre allotment in accordance with regulations and instructions issued from this office. However, if Mrs. Hamlett is dissatisfied with the allotment she should file an application for review with the local PMA secretary at Henderson, Tex. A duly constituted review committee will review the determination of her cotton allotment to see that it is fair and equitable and that it was determined properly.

There is a possibility that amendatory legislation now being considered by the Congress will increase her cotton allotment, but I can make no commitment since I do not know the provisions of the legislation that may be passed.

I regret that under the circumstances there is nothing that we can do here to increase the farm cotton allotment.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., January 19, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of January 2, with which you enclosed a copy of a letter from Mr. Fred Hamilton, Route 3, Henderson, Tex. Mr. Hamilton had requested your assistance in securing a larger cotton allotment for his farm.

There is no indication in the letter that county and community committeemen have not established the 10-acre allotment in accordance with regulations and instructions issued from this office. However, if Mr. Hamilton is dissatisfied with the allotment, he should file an application for review with the local PMA secretary at Henderson, Tex. A duly constituted review committee will review the determination of his cotton allotment to see that it is fair and equitable and that it was determined properly.

There is a possibility that amendatory legislation now being considered by the Congress will increase his cotton allotment but I can make no commitment since I do not know the provisions of the legislation that may be passed.

I regret that under the circumstances there is nothing that we can do here to increase the farm cotton allotment.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., January 19, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of January 9 with which you enclosed a copy of a letter from Mrs. Marvin Gray, route 4, box 72, Henderson, Tex. Mrs. Gray had requested your assistance in securing a larger cotton allotment for her farm.

There is no indication in the letter that county and community committeemen have not established the 8-acre allotment in accordance with regulations and instructions issued from this office. However, if Mrs. Gray is dissatisfied with the allotment she should file an application for review with the local PMA secretary at Henderson, Tex. A duly constituted review committee will review the determination of her cotton allotment to see that it is fair and equitable and that it was determined properly.

There is a possibility that amendatory legislation now being considered by the Congress will increase her cotton allotment, but I can make no commitment since I do not know the provisions of the legislation that may be passed.

I regret that under the circumstances there is nothing that we can do here to increase the farm cotton allotment.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., January 18, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of December 31 in which you quoted pertinent portions of a letter from the Upshur County PMA Committee.

I regret that we have been unable to reply to this and many other letters received from you during the last 2 weeks. We have been very busy with several allotment programs, both in national conferences and in conferences with county committees and, as a result, have not had the time nor the personnel required to reply promptly and fully to your letters.

We have no way of knowing in this office whether Upshur County needs an additional 2,000 acres or 10,000 acres of 1950 cotton allotment. In all probability the proposed amendatory legislation now being considered by the Congress would result in more than 2,000 acres of cotton allotment being available for apportionment to farms on which owners and operators have complained to the county committee.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Athens, Ga., January 20, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will acknowledge your communications of January 13 and 14 in regard to the State committee reserve for cotton and information concerning the effect of the proposed 70–50 amendment.

In retaining an acreage from the State allotment to be used by the State committee for the purposes outlined in the 1950 cotton regulations, the Georgia State PMA committee withheld 100,000 acres, or approximately 7.1 percent of the State allotment. The reason for not withholding the full 10 percent was simply that it was determined that 100,000 acres were all that were needed to fulfill the various needs in the State. Twenty-five thousand seven hundred and thirty acres of the State committee reserve were used for trend adjustments; 47,251 acres were set aside from the State reserve for new farms for 1950. This acreage from new farms on a percentage basis appears large, particularly for a tobacco and peanut State; however, the State survey in regard to the possible number of new farms indicated that the reserve actually withheld was needed to effect new allotments of any consequence for 1950. It should be realized that the acreage set aside for new farms is done so at the expense of the old grower, but on the other hand, if an insufficient amount is available for this purpose, it results in such small allotments to the individual farms that in the end, the acreage is more or less wasted. The State committee attempted to reach a point that would not affect the individual old cotton grower and still be in a position to grant new farm allotments which would warrant the production of cotton on new farms.

Twenty-seven thousand and nineteen acres were reserved to be allocated for farms entitled to the minimum allotments or for small-farm increases. This acreage was in addition to the 22,381 acres directed to be set aside for this purpose by the Cotton Branch of the Department of Agriculture. We might add that in the State the amount of the small-farm increases used was approximately 6,000 acres in addition to the 2 acreages above, as estimated by the Washington office and this office.

The information by counties as requested in your communication of January 14 is not available. It was furnished the Cotton Branch earlier in the month. The State totals, however, were for the 70–50 provision, 43,790 acres, not including war-crop credits in the 70-percent portion. The estimated acreage that would be released for reapportionment for the State was 38,230 acres.

Very truly yours,

T. R. BREEDLOVE,
Chairman, State PMA Committee.

California cotton—crop of 1950—relating to proposed acreage allotments

[Date prepared, Jan. 17, 1950, by R. E. Blair]

Counties, valleys, or districts	Planted acreage data and calculations								
	1946	1947	1948	3-year sum	3-year average	70 percent of 3-year average	Highest year of 3	50 percent of highest year	Highest of either calculation
San Benito			60	60	20	14	60	30	30
Stanislaus County	32	50	60	142	47	33	60	30	33
Merced County	10,230	18,000	25,800	54,030	18,010	12,607	25,800	12,900	12,900
Madera County	38,000	46,050	65,400	149,450	49,817	34,872	65,400	32,700	34,872
Fresno County	84,900	139,000	221,000	444,900	148,300	103,810	221,000	110,500	119,500
Kings County	57,000	78,000	109,900	244,900	81,633	57,143	109,900	54,950	57,143
Tulare County	79,700	109,000	168,000	356,700	118,900	83,230	168,000	84,000	84,000
Kern County	88,300	143,000	216,000	447,300	149,100	104,370	216,000	108,000	108,000
San Bernardino County			40	40	13	9	40	20	20
Total Riverside County	829	2,891	3,660	7,380	2,460	1,722	3,660	1,830	1,830
Total Imperial County	9	9	80	98	33	23	80	40	40
State total [1]	359,000	536,000	810,000	1,705,000		397,833	810,000	405,000	409,368

[1] $582,000 equals 70 percent.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, January 20, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your two recent letters requesting information on production of cotton, by counties, for an average cotton year in a prewar period.

I believe that the year 1939 is about as good an example of an average cotton year in a prewar period as is available. I am, therefore, sending you a series of tables which include the acreage of cotton in cultivation July 1, the yield per planted acre, and the production of cotton by counties for the year 1939.

Sincerely yours,

K. T. HUTCHINSON,
Assistant Secretary.

Cotton: Planted acreage, planted yield, and production

District and county	1938			1939		
	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales
ALABAMA						
District I:	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*
Colbert	30,910	287	18,500	31,510	162	10,600
Fayette	21,770	254	11,500	23,170	152	7,100
Franklin	26,220	262	14,300	25,700	115	6,100
Lamar	24,860	263	13,600	27,210	169	9,500
Marion	26,140	216	11,800	28,010	114	6,300
Total	129,900	257	69,700	135,600	143	39,600
District II:						
Lauderdale	43,500	289	26,100	45,490	154	14,400
Lawrence	48,240	318	32,100	50,160	224	23,300
Limestone	60,470	341	42,900	60,550	254	32,000
Madison	77,390	319	51,400	79,030	229	37,500
Marshall	46,520	384	37,300	48,150	404	40,400
Morgan	42,980	326	29,200	43,720	277	24,900
Total	319,100	329	219,000	327,100	255	172,500
District IIa:						
Bibb	11,130	211	4,900	11,440	103	2,400
Blount	32,520	326	22,200	32,670	304	20,600
Chilton	26,800	199	11,100	23,080	155	7,400
Cullman	50,300	405	42,100	51,950	382	40,700
Jefferson	8,430	251	4,400	8,200	174	3,000
Saint Clair	16,600	246	8,500	16,650	217	7,500
Shelby	13,220	233	6,400	13,270	184	5,100
Walker	16,700	252	8,700	16,840	169	5,800
Winston	15,000	272	8,500	16,140	168	5,600
Total	190,700	294	116,800	190,300	250	98,100
District III:						
Calhoun	26,630	218	12,100	25,970	220	12,300
Cherokee	33,630	309	21,700	35,100	350	25,400
Cleburne	12,690	261	6,900	12,820	193	5,100
De Kalb	43,520	369	33,600	45,110	421	39,100
Etowah	28,530	302	18,000	28,010	341	19,600
Jackson	34,400	294	21,100	34,780	300	21,700
Total	179,400	303	113,400	181,800	328	123,200
District IV:						
Greene	27,010	166	9,300	29,230	108	6,300
Hale	36,220	178	13,300	36,020	99	7,400
Marengo	50,210	158	16,500	46,160	96	9,000
Pickens	36,190	228	17,200	36,490	165	12,300
Sumter	32,560	156	10,500	33,130	91	6,000
Tuscaloosa	37,410	227	17,600	36,670	157	11,600
Total	219,600	185	84,400	217,700	119	52,600
ALABAMA—continued						
District V:	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*
Autauga	27,600	226	13,000	27,830	164	9,400
Dallas	60,210	197	24,700	61,880	108	13,800
Elmore	37,860	252	19,800	40,630	219	18,300
Lowndes	27,920	192	11,200	27,700	139	7,900
Montgomery	33,210	200	13,700	29,550	195	11,800
Perry	37,180	141	10,900	36,740	66	5,000
Wilcox	26,220	183	10,000	28,370	77	4,500
Total	250,300	198	103,300	252,700	136	70,700
District VI:						
Chambers	38,320	137	11,000	34,570	141	10,100
Clay	18,400	225	8,700	17,850	145	5,200
Coosa	11,740	192	4,700	11,130	134	3,100
Lee	35,480	139	10,300	34,000	157	11,100
Macon	42,170	202	17,600	40,990	185	15,500
Randolph	30,420	245	15,500	30,150	181	11,200
Russell	34,310	167	11,800	30,220	115	7,000
Talladega	37,900	253	19,800	38,290	187	14,500
Tallapoosa	29,460	194	11,900	28,460	193	11,400
Total	278,200	193	111,300	265,600	164	89,100
District VII:						
Baldwin	5,350	278	3,080	5,120	107	1,100
Choctaw	16,340	188	6,400	16,440	97	3,300
Clarke	18,300	194	7,420	19,260	91	3,600
Mobile	4,650	329	3,160	4,590	123	1,200
Washington	4,860	223	2,240	4,960	113	1,100
Total	49,500	216	22,300	50,400	100	10,300
District VIII:						
Butler	30,330	242	15,200	30,160	154	9,600
Conecuh	23,540	272	13,400	27,930	136	7,500
Covington	37,800	255	20,000	39,670	121	9,800
Crenshaw	31,930	257	17,100	31,560	183	11,800
Escambia	17,650	332	12,200	18,580	142	5,400
Monroe	36,450	276	20,800	38,700	138	10,600
Total	177,700	267	98,700	186,600	145	54,700
District IX:						
Barbour	36,470	204	15,400	39,300	113	8,900
Bullock	31,500	162	10,700	29,010	116	6,900
Coffee	39,360	240	19,500	38,930	113	9,100
Dale	22,500	232	10,900	22,130	77	3,500
Geneva	37,050	288	22,200	38,880	103	8,300
Henry	30,060	251	15,700	32,200	137	9,200
Houston	47,790	288	28,600	49,800	151	15,600
Pike	39,870	229	19,100	41,950	146	12,700
Total	284,600	240	142,100	292,200	123	74,200
State total	2,079,000	250	1,081,000	2,100,000	182	785,000

[1] Based on planted acres less acres removed to meet Agricultural Adjustment Act allotments.

Cotton: Planted acreage, planted yield, and production—Continued

District and county	1938			1939		
	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales
ARKANSAS						
District I:	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*
Other [2]	740	186	280	690	229	320
Total	740	186	280	690	229	320
District II:						
Baxter	2,110	207	890	2,350	196	960
Cleburne	13,960	216	6,290	14,000	193	5,640
Fulton	5,120	190	2,040	5,240	206	2,200
Izard	12,640	200	5,290	12,780	224	5,890
Marion	1,740	196	710	1,430	219	660
Sharp	10,420	210	4,560	11,040	229	5,170
Van Buren	10,530	184	4,020	10,980	157	3,490
Other [3]	3,850	195	1,560	3,740	187	1,440
Total	60,370	202	25,360	61,560	201	25,450
District III:						
Clay	40,530	305	25,760	42,530	403	35,560
Craighead	67,050	383	53,340	70,850	403	58,700
Greene	34,260	337	23,660	37,420	403	31,190
Independence	21,820	239	10,900	22,150	266	12,210
Jackson	54,120	268	30,330	54,760	300	34,040
Lawrence	33,260	279	19,260	35,120	297	21,570
Mississippi	185,480	504	194,850	190,750	535	211,080
Poinsett	56,820	433	51,300	62,490	462	59,580
Randolph	19,770	245	10,120	19,840	324	13,350
White	49,980	233	24,370	51,610	226	24,310
Total	563,090	379	443,890	587,520	413	501,590
District IV:						
Crawford	8,300	173	2,970	7,640	251	3,980
Franklin	9,280	136	2,630	7,880	173	2,800
Johnson	7,950	176	2,920	5,960	284	3,530
Logan	20,240	203	8,590	20,560	197	8,450
Polk	4,640	144	1,380	4,440	184	1,700
Pope	30,360	158	9,990	26,040	189	10,260
Scott	7,630	170	2,710	7,540	193	3,030
Sebastian	10,170	181	3,820	10,200	193	4,010
Yell	32,850	203	13,870	31,890	215	14,200
Total	131,420	179	48,880	122,150	205	51,960
District V:						
Conway	37,030	216	16,690	38,160	174	13,800
Faulkner	44,810	237	22,100	47,010	202	19,630
Garland	1,850	157	600	2,290	184	880
Grant	8,100	201	3,350	8,030	154	2,550
Hot Spring	9,010	181	3,370	9,310	196	3,660
Perry	9,860	225	4,560	10,320	182	3,880
Pulaski	41,060	343	28,950	41,280	268	22,760
Saline	3,450	220	1,580	3,600	180	1,350
Total	155,170	252	81,200	160,000	207	68,510
District VI:						
Arkansas	13,580	258	7,300	15,060	217	6,800
Crittenden	104,120	471	101,470	103,610	492	105,730
Cross	46,400	384	37,010	48,440	404	39,530
Lee	58,130	345	41,660	61,300	336	42,160
Lonoke	75,700	293	45,970	75,400	231	35,820
Monroe	38,600	292	23,430	41,920	261	22,750
Phillips	73,910	353	54,350	74,880	366	56,940
Prairie	17,350	257	9,250	17,970	271	10,090
St Francis	75,600	390	61,120	72,180	381	56,630
Woodruff	42,850	304	27,020	45,860	302	28,280
Total	546,240	360	408,580	556,620	353	404,730
District VII:						
Hempstead	43,790	173	15,800	42,620	234	20,400
Howard	21,300	138	6,130	19,550	207	7,890
Lafayette	36,280	194	14,560	34,440	269	19,320
Little River	27,330	186	10,570	26,390	260	14,020
Miller	43,840	203	18,520	39,020	281	22,730
Montgomery	4,480	131	1,220	4,040	171	1,440
Pike	9,630	108	2,160	8,440	159	2,760
Sevier	9,750	127	2,580	9,800	189	3,740
Total	196,400	175	71,540	184,300	245	92,300
District VIII:						
Bradley	16,100	215	7,200	16,300	242	8,220
Calhoun	13,640	206	5,860	14,050	196	5,690
Clark	22,100	193	8,870	21,720	226	10,150
Cleveland	23,940	191	9,520	23,160	179	8,600
Columbia	49,080	170	17,160	49,680	182	18,290
Dallas	9,730	201	4,070	10,490	168	3,600
Nevada	29,810	173	10,750	29,310	180	10,970
Ouachita	16,320	173	5,790	15,410	192	6,150
Union	23,250	171	8,240	23,610	219	10,600
Total	203,970	183	77,460	203,730	196	82,270

District and county	1938			1939		
	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales
ARKANSAS—continued						
District IX:	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*
Ashley	40,400	228	19,190	39,420	338	27,640
Chicot	50,040	251	25,320	51,350	327	34,360
Desha	49,510	316	32,370	50,860	302	31,660
Drew	26,550	226	12,470	25,440	264	13,890
Jefferson	93,710	353	68,420	93,660	278	52,730
Lincoln	47,390	345	34,040	49,700	248	25,590
Total	307,600	302	191,810	310,430	292	185,870
State total	2,165,000	300	1,349,000	2,187,000 [4]	313	1,413,000

District and county	1932			1933 [4]		
ARIZONA						
District V:						
Maricopa	67,800	265	37,430	94,000	319	55,930
Pinal	24,500	263	13,430	33,300	292	15,420
Total	92,300	264	50,860	127,300	313	71,350
District VII: Yuma	11,700	373	9,090	15,000	331	8,970
District IX: Graham	9,000	443	8,310	16,500	471	14,250
All other [5]	1,000	356	740	2,200	311	1,430
State total	114,000	290	69,000	161,000	330	96,000

District and county	1934			1935		
District V:						
Maricopa	85,000	390	69,410	103,200	381	82,260
Pinal	23,000	388	18,700	27,900	370	21,580
Total	108,000	390	88,110	131,100	379	103,840
District VII: Yuma	13,000	467	12,720	14,000	484	14,140
District IX: Graham	8,400	617	10,840	9,200	570	10,970
All other [5]	6,600	386	5,330	5,700	508	6,050
State total	136,000	410	117,000	160,000	405	135,000

District and county	1936			1937		
District V:						
Maricopa	129,100	424	114,550	185,800	486	188,680
Pinal	42,000	420	36,950	66,460	492	68,330
Total	171,100	423	151,500	252,260	488	257,010
District VII: Yuma	14,000	440	12,900	14,980	396	12,410
District IX: Graham	14,000	595	17,450	19,000	668	26,550
All other [7]	8,900	491	9,150	12,760	639	17,030
State total	208,000	438	191,000	299,000	501	313,000

District and county	1938			1939 [1]		
District V:						
Maricopa	122,530	445	113,900	111,720	492	114,470
Pinal	49,020	464	47,600	46,230	544	52,540
Total	171,550	450	161,500	157,950	507	167,010
District VII: Yuma	7,680	334	5,370	5,560	390	4,530
District IX:						
Graham	12,460	668	17,400	14,520	576	17,470
Pima	9,620	509	10,230	9,440	592	11,640
Total	22,080	599	27,630	23,960	582	29,110
All other [7]	1,690	424	1,500	1,530	423	1,350
State total	203,000	462	196,000	189,000	512	202,000

District and county	1932			1933 [8]		
CALIFORNIA						
District V-A:						
San Joaquin County	125	352	92	----------	----------	----------
Stanislaus County	75	351	55	500	301	265
Merced County	10,700	391	8,723	14,500	385	11,259
Madera County	12,800	521	13,910	24,300	472	22,308
Fresno County	23,000	516	24,766	45,800	506	44,941
Kings County	9,200	470	9,013	19,900	509	18,520
Tulare County	25,600	477	25,454	45,600	490	44,232
Kern County	35,000	578	42,174	58,200	570	67,551
Total District V-A	116,500	511	124,187	208,800	508	209,076

[2] Includes the following counties in district I: Boone, Newton, Washington.
[3] Includes the following counties in district II: Searcy, Stone.
[4] 1933 yield based on planted acres less acres removed in reduction program.
[5] Includes the following counties: District IX, Greenlee and Pima.
[7] Includes the following counties: District II, Mohave for 1937 and 1938; district IX, Cochise, Gila, Greenlee, Pima, and Santa Cruz for 1936 and 1937, Cochise, Gila, Greenlee, and Santa Cruz for 1238 and 1939.
[8] Based on planted acres less acres removed in 1933 reduction program.

Cotton: Planted acreage, planted yield, and production—Continued

District and county	1932			1933 [8]		
	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales
CALIFORNIA—continued						
District VIII:	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*
Riverside County:						
Coachella Valley	600	487	609	1,000	340	709
Palo Verde Valley	4,460	349	3,249	8,558	314	5,087
Total Riverside County	5,060	365	3,858	9,558	317	5,796
Imperial County:						
Imperial Valley	150	181	57	2,070	157	624
Bard Valley	2,250	262	1,231	2,530	330	1,517
Total Imperial County	2,400	257	1,288	4,600	250	2,141
San Bernardino County	40	460	38	42	429	38
Total district VIII	7,500	331	5,184	14,200	296	7,975
State total	124,000	500	129,371	223,000	495	217,051

District and county	1934			1935		
	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales
District V-A:						
San Joaquin County	10	240	5	----------	----------	----------
Stanislaus County	1,151	332	798	730	296	452
Merced County	11,900	481	11,945	10,400	396	8,607
Madera County	22,400	540	25,255	24,400	500	25,478
Fresno County	46,800	529	51,690	47,100	488	48,054
Kings County	23,000	623	29,917	18,000	544	20,451
Tulare County	49,300	553	56,942	56,100	511	59,943
Kern County	52,000	653	70,871	48,500	642	65,007
Total, district V-A	206,561	574	247,423	205,230	532	227,992
District VIII:						
Riverside County:						
Coachella Valley	1,200	604	1,514	1,700	477	1,694
Palo Verde Valley	10,600	333	7,362	8,000	367	6,134
Total, Riverside County	11,800	360	8,876	9,700	386	7,828
Imperial County:						
Imperial Valley	4,500	81	762	2,700	233	1,312
Bard Valley	2,100	456	1,999	2,350	404	1,985
Total, Imperial County	6,600	200	2,761	5,050	313	3,297
San Bernardino County	39	503	41	20	740	31
Total, district VIII	18,439	303	11,678	14,770	362	11,156
State total	225,000	551	259,101	220,000	520	239,148

District and county	1936			1937		
	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales
District V-A:						
San Benito County	----------	----------	----------	200	5	2
San Joaquin County	7	429	7	50	480	50
Stanislaus County	1,193	261	650	2,050	227	972
Merced County	22,200	470	21,833	44,200	467	43,150
Madera County	45,000	541	50,853	77,500	541	87,670
Fresno County	81,300	550	93,455	135,000	554	156,394
Kings County	37,200	612	47,555	66,500	612	85,108
Tulare County	82,200	628	107,858	144,000	612	184,097
Kern County	78,200	646	105,646	122,000	630	160,699
Total, district V-A	347,300	589	427,857	591,500	581	718,142
District VIII:						
Riverside County:						
Coachella Valley	1,800	477	1,796	3,100	472	3,055
Palo Verde Valley	13,760	261	7,510	15,800	286	9,446
Total, Riverside County	15,560	286	9,306	18,900	317	12,501
Imperial County:						
Imperial Valley	3,900	258	2,102	8,670	198	3,595
Bard Valley	3,200	367	2,452	4,800	368	3,693
Total, Imperial County	7,100	307	4,554	13,470	259	7,288
San Bernardino County	40	325	27	70	314	46
San Diego County	----------	----------	----------	60	183	23
Total, district VIII	22,700	293	13,887	32,500	292	19,858
State total	370,000	571	441,744	624,000	566	738,000

District and county	1938			1939		
	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales
CALIFORNIA—continued						
District V-A:	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*
San Benito County	----------	----------	----------	20	34	7
San Joaquin County	5	300	3	29	400	24
Stanislaus County	665	377	524	511	309	296
Merced County	22,720	512	24,179	19,980	508	20,970
Madera County	46,200	573	55,092	45,000	593	55,910
Fresno County	85,000	571	98,845	74,800	640	99,059
Kings County	24,700	531	26,997	32,800	667	44,986
Tulare County	86,000	617	108,592	81,800	635	105,525
Kern County	77,000	696	99,984	68,740	773	108,878
Total, district V-A	342,290	602	414,216	324,350	654	435,655
District VIII:						
Riverside County:						
Coachella Valley	1,300	700	1,697	1,045	539	1,168
Palo Verde Valley	5,500	314	3,463	4,510	368	3,444
Total, Riverside County	6,800	384	5,160	5,555	400	4,612
Imperial County:						
Imperial Valley	5,000	382	3,724	2,630	220	1,204
Bard Valley	1,850	348	1,346	1,400	378	1,096
Total, Imperial County	6,850	373	5,070	4,020	275	2,300
San Bernardino County	38	605	48	65	431	59
San Diego County	22	41	2	----------	----------	----------
Total, district VIII	13,710	378	10,280	9,650	348	6,971
State total	356,000	593	424,496	334,000	645	442,626
FLORIDA						
District 1:						
Holmes	10,190	203	4,250	9,840	83	1,733
Jackson	15,470	176	5,610	14,220	76	2,292
Jefferson	3,390	101	689	3,000	65	415
Other [9]	30,320	187	11,699	29,782	68	4,313
Total	59,370	182	22,248	56,842	72	8,753
District 3:						
Madison	6,330	110	1,416	7,290	62	969
Other [10]	9,350	84	1,616	6,343	65	876
Total	15,680	94	3,032	13,633	63	1,845
Districts 5 and 8: Other [11]	6,950	49	720	3,525	54	402
State total	82,000	154	26,000	74,000	70	11,000
GEORGIA						
District VI:						
Bulloch	31,730	235	15,580	31,490	242	15,690
Burke	61,940	181	21,740	63,070	237	36,800
Candler	11,600	185	4,470	11,950	215	5,320
Columbia	11,980	137	3,170	11,250	258	5,910
Effingham	3,600	204	1,530	3,640	152	1,130
Emanuel	35,080	140	10,150	37,140	225	17,190
Glascock	9,240	209	3,740	8,500	296	5,090
Jefferson	35,430	176	12,970	37,020	249	18,940
Jenkins	23,700	184	8,890	24,360	287	14,320
McDuffie	14,650	161	4,890	14,380	256	7,520
Richmond	9,590	173	3,310	9,420	274	5,300
Screven	30,530	228	14,060	32,610	274	18,330
Warren	22,490	211	9,310	19,610	313	12,510
Total	301,560	187	113,810	304,440	263	164,050
District VII:						
Calhoun	9,720	216	4,240	9,170	152	2,850
Clay	8,660	225	4,040	9,000	151	2,690
Decatur	7,150	161	2,390	5,920	75	910
Dougherty	4,900	178	1,800	3,710	154	1,190
Early	25,090	252	13,120	25,350	148	7,680
Grady	5,970	246	3,060	5,260	146	1,580
Miller	9,220	261	4,960	8,800	128	2,330
Mitchell	23,320	232	11,220	23,690	126	6,080
Randolph	20,550	210	8,870	19,420	118	4,620
Seminole	7,450	255	3,920	7,000	122	1,760
Stewart	10,660	173	3,750	10,300	96	2,010
Sumter	23,970	207	10,200	22,900	231	10,830
Terrell	21,010	288	12,620	18,410	240	9,030
Thomas	9,950	209	4,340	8,270	129	2,170
Other [12]	24,940	164	8,390	22,440	105	4,800
Total	212,560	228	96,920	199,640	149	60,530
District VIII:						
Ben Hill	9,410	211	4,070	8,740	163	2,950
Berrien	6,200	210	2,690	5,650	161	1,860
Brooks	14,450	219	6,450	12,800	151	3,960
Coffee	11,850	188	4,660	9,470	107	2,100
Colquitt	26,650	238	13,210	24,620	170	8,650

[8] Includes the following counties in district 1: Bay, Calhoun, Escambia, Gadsden, Gulf, Leon, Liberty, Okaloosa, Santa Rosa, Wakulla, Walton, and Washington.
[10] Includes the following counties in district 3: Baker, Columbia, Dixie, Hamilton, Lafayette, Nassau, Suwannee, and Taylor.
[11] Includes the following counties: district 5: Alachua, Bradford, Citrus, Flagler, Gilchrist, Hernando, Hillsborough, Lake, Levy, Marion, Orange, Pasco, Polk, Putnam, St. Johns, Seminole, Sumter, Union, and Volusia; District 8: Brevard.
[12] Includes the following counties: district VII, Baker, Lee, Quitman, and Webster.

Cotton: Planted acreage, planted yield, and production—Continued

District and county	1938 Acreage in cultivation, July 1	1938 Yield per planted acre [1]	1938 Production, 500-pound gross weight bales	1939 Acreage in cultivation, July 1	1939 Yield per planted acre [1]	1939 Production, 500-pound gross weight bales
GEORGIA—continued						
District VIII—Continued	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*
Cook	4,920	259	2,670	4,630	192	1,820
Crisp	16,940	239	8,450	17,500	226	8,200
Dooly	30,150	216	13,450	32,940	248	17,050
Irwin	15,830	205	6,780	14,670	171	5,160
Lowndes	6,530	226	2,950	6,090	142	1,740
Telfair	14,360	145	4,230	13,490	120	3,310
Tift	10,160	265	5,610	9,900	187	3,820
Turner	11,660	199	4,790	9,420	152	2,930
Wilcox	22,820	190	8,960	24,610	199	10,100
Worth	24,940	234	12,180	24,090	164	8,130
Other [13]	8,010	165	2,740	6,000	122	1,500
Total	234,880	216	103,890	224,620	180	83,280
District IX:						
Appling	7,390	140	2,140	6,220	138	1,770
Bacon	4,140	133	1,150	3,020	134	840
Evans	5,860	233	2,840	5,800	199	2,380
Pierce	4,340	132	1,200	2,870	161	950
Tattnall	9,070	206	3,870	8,900	177	3,250
Toombs	16,000	147	4,870	15,860	156	5,220
Wayne	5,320	170	1,890	4,760	162	1,590
Other [14]	5,030	106	1,110	3,750	109	840
Total	57,150	169	19,070	51,180	159	16,840
State total	2,064,000	201	852,000	1,989,000	225	915,000
LOUISIANA						
District I:						
Bossier	41,500	263	22,300	41,700	345	29,100
Caddo	69,600	298	42,800	65,916	379	51,405
De Soto	44,900	200	18,700	47,474	253	24,006
Red River	32,100	241	15,800	31,560	282	18,313
Webster	32,300	197	13,100	31,900	216	14,200
Total	220,400	248	112,700	218,550	307	137,024
District II:						
Bienville	38,400	189	15,100	40,380	213	17,510
Caldwell	9,200	281	5,330	9,450	318	6,130
Claiborne	52,700	191	20,300	52,570	217	23,300
Jackson	11,740	204	4,980	12,100	217	5,360
Lincoln	35,450	213	15,700	35,600	216	15,700
Ouachita	22,800	287	13,400	22,900	299	14,030
Union	31,900	217	14,400	33,150	238	16,200
Winn	9,030	228	4,290	9,250	211	4,022
Total	211,220	215	93,500	215,400	232	102,252
District III:						
East Carroll	32,550	391	26,300	33,211	413	27,902
Franklin	56,700	349	40,800	58,300	344	41,300
Madison	25,100	414	21,500	26,650	410	22,446
Morehouse	37,500	337	26,200	38,800	408	32,600
Richland	52,900	339	37,500	54,170	329	36,503
Tensas	28,550	340	19,900	28,919	408	24,009
West Carroll	30,100	318	19,900	30,700	393	24,900
Total	263,400	352	192,100	270,750	378	209,660
District IV:						
Natchitoches	47,000	302	29,290	47,800	319	31,300
Sabine	18,700	182	7,030	18,300	231	8,650
Vernon	7,300	202	3,000	6,860	235	3,330
Total	73,000	261	39,320	72,960	289	43,280
District V:						
Avoyelles	31,420	351	22,900	33,800	400	27,200
Catahoula	16,850	297	10,420	17,600	353	12,400
Concordia	16,500	286	9,800	16,200	347	11,500
Evangeline	29,200	326	19,800	30,200	401	25,000
Grant	7,800	253	4,100	8,100	314	5,210
LaSalle	2,400	217	1,060	2,340	261	1,250
Pointe Coupee	15,800	365	12,000	15,800	309	10,110
Rapides	25,900	309	16,500	26,800	398	22,100
St. Landry	54,000	343	38,600	55,000	363	41,400
Total	199,870	326	135,180	205,840	370	156,170
District VI:						
East Baton Rouge	6,160	184	2,364	5,050	118	1,230
East Feliciana	13,700	224	6,360	13,000	141	3,800
Tangipahoa	7,170	251	3,750	7,150	212	3,043
Washington	20,400	291	12,220	20,570	238	10,000
West Feliciana	5,800	164	1,950	5,300	162	1,771
Total	53,230	242	26,644	51,070	190	19,844

District and county	1938 Acreage in cultivation, July 1	1938 Yield per planted acre [1]	1938 Production, 500-pound gross weight bales	1939 Acreage in cultivation, July 1	1939 Yield per planted acre [1]	1939 Production, 500-pound gross weight bales
LOUISIANA—continued						
District VII:	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*
Acadia	24,130	373	18,560	25,100	414	21,400
Allen	4,070	260	2,130	3,970	289	2,380
Beauregard	2,620	231	1,160	2,000	253	1,042
Calcasieu	4,430	236	2,130	3,780	217	1,689
Cameron	4,270	249	2,166	3,775	268	2,084
Jeff Davis	7,340	272	4,150	6,590	306	4,170
Vermilion	18,950	317	11,800	18,560	325	12,280
Total	65,810	316	42,096	63,775	344	45,045
District VIII:						
Lafayette	28,640	332	19,800	29,940	322	19,840
St. Martin	9,630	385	7,720	10,900	310	6,586
Total	38,270	345	27,520	40,840	319	26,426
All other [15]	14,800	228	6,940	14,815	175	5,299
State total	1,140,000	287	676,000	1,154,000	315	745,000
	1936			1937		
MISSISSIPPI						
District VI:						
Chickasaw	27,000	263	14,800	28,200	339	19,970
Clay	22,500	285	13,400	24,800	248	12,810
Kemper	30,500	245	15,600	34,400	261	18,750
Lowndes	34,000	281	20,000	39,000	243	19,760
Monroe	49,500	274	28,300	57,200	296	35,340
Neshoba	37,500	275	21,600	41,700	342	29,790
Noxubee	40,000	296	24,700	46,100	233	22,420
Oktibbeha	16,800	265	9,310	18,100	298	11,250
Winston	25,000	269	14,000	28,400	284	16,840
Total	282,800	274	161,710	317,900	282	186,930
District VII:						
Adams	12,500	313	8,160	14,100	362	10,650
Amite	28,200	236	13,900	30,800	320	20,590
Claiborne	15,700	256	8,390	17,700	357	13,200
Copiah	25,000	262	13,700	27,800	301	17,480
Franklin	11,300	296	6,990	13,000	314	8,530
Hinds	65,000	249	33,800	70,800	333	49,260
Jefferson	15,200	320	10,200	16,700	388	13,530
Lincoln	28,600	263	15,700	34,100	334	23,740
Warren	16,500	319	11,000	19,700	382	15,690
Wilkinson	11,000	275	6,330	12,500	322	8,410
Total	229,000	268	128,170	257,200	337	181,080
District VIII:						
Covington	25,000	290	15,100	29,900	302	18,830
Jeff Davis	28,500	280	16,700	30,600	362	23,100
Lamar	10,000	251	5,240	12,400	279	7,220
Lawrence	20,300	261	11,100	22,500	309	14,520
Marion	25,600	229	12,200	29,200	305	18,590
Pike	26,000	229	12,400	28,400	333	19,750
Simpson	25,500	289	15,400	28,200	349	20,560
Smith	26,000	296	16,100	27,800	406	23,540
Walthall	31,800	253	16,800	38,800	357	28,870
Total	218,700	265	121,040	247,800	338	174,980
District IX:						
Clarke	16,100	273	9,170	18,700	285	11,120
Forrest	6,100	252	3,210	6,950	285	4,130
George	4,500	261	2,450	5,100	281	2,990
Jasper	23,000	257	12,300	25,100	343	17,940
Jones	28,500	293	17,500	33,300	337	23,450
Lauderdale	24,200	248	12,600	26,900	276	15,500
Newton	31,000	251	16,300	34,200	315	22,450
Perry	5,300	244	2,700	6,600	268	3,700
Wayne	15,200	227	7,210	18,300	231	8,830
Total	153,900	259	83,440	175,150	299	110,110
All other [16]	11,300	227	5,360	13,850	266	7,690
State total	3,010,000	304	1,911,000	3,449,000	374	2,692,000
	1938			1939		
District I:						
Bolivar	170,060	393	137,710	171,620	446	155,780
Coahoma	109,340	437	98,170	109,750	460	104,120
Quitman	63,890	432	56,520	65,470	471	63,660
Tallahatchie	69,070	428	61,150	72,240	415	61,100
Tunica	62,360	477	61,760	64,530	511	67,230
Total	474,720	425	415,310	483,610	457	451,890

[13] Includes the following counties: district VIII, Atkinson, Clinch, Echols, Jeff Davis, and Lanier.
[14] Includes the following counties—district IX: Brantley, Bryan, Charlton, Chatham, Glynn, Liberty, Long, McIntosh, and Ware.
[15] Includes the following counties: district V, west Baton Rouge; district VI, Livingston, St. Helena, St. Tammany; district VIII, Assumption, Iberia, Iberville, St. Mary; district IX, Ascension, Jefferson, Lafourche, Orleans, St. Charles, St. James, St. John.
[16] Includes the following counties: district IX, Green, Hancock, Harrison, Jackson, Pearl River, and Stone.

Cotton: Planted acreage, planted yield, and production—Continued

District and county	1938			1939		
	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales
MISSISSIPPI—continued						
District II:	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*
Benton	13,260	309	8,410	13,290	171	4,750
Calhoun	21,060	264	11,440	20,290	113	4,800
DeSoto	51,180	361	37,950	51,940	308	33,360
Grenada	19,430	225	8,870	19,080	169	6,710
Lafayette	23,310	293	13,670	24,500	134	6,890
Marshall	38,150	293	23,030	41,700	149	12,790
Panola	53,070	318	35,000	55,750	234	26,390
Tate	32,780	366	24,430	33,150	246	16,550
Yalobusha	17,530	276	9,960	18,630	147	5,600
Total	269,770	312	172,760	278,330	205	117,840
District III:						
Alcorn	21,190	288	12,650	18,980	140	5,570
Itawamba	21,670	194	8,730	23,130	105	5,030
Lee	40,460	287	23,720	39,840	129	10,720
Pontotoc	30,240	289	17,570	29,910	121	7,350
Prentiss	22,940	256	11,950	25,000	93	4,840
Tippah	23,530	301	14,660	23,210	138	6,720
Tishomingo	15,490	258	8,300	15,550	150	4,830
Union	25,440	328	17,070	24,290	135	6,840
Total	200,960	278	114,650	199,910	125	51,900
District IV:						
Humphreys	63,280	370	47,960	63,740	398	50,920
Issaquena	22,510	324	14,650	22,090	312	13,540
Leflore	94,670	360	70,650	97,750	472	94,100
Sharkey	38,510	416	33,080	41,070	408	33,580
Sunflower	168,390	363	125,780	167,300	409	139,540
Washington	115,550	367	86,170	111,710	421	97,140
Yazoo	66,690	317	43,090	68,930	332	47,030
Total	569,600	361	421,380	572,590	408	475,850
District V:						
Attala	30,870	200	11,820	28,720	220	12,770
Carroll	28,910	207	11,780	28,100	241	13,600
Choctaw	11,530	220	5,020	13,760	120	3,080
Holmes	60,900	298	36,980	61,270	338	42,060
Leake	29,040	277	15,860	28,730	286	17,130
Madison	55,040	276	31,160	58,020	273	31,600
Montgomery	17,030	195	6,780	18,210	182	6,740
Rankin	22,980	244	10,960	21,810	296	13,010
Scott	22,490	289	13,110	22,350	307	14,090
Webster	15,960	243	8,000	17,700	113	4,070
Total	294,750	256	151,470	298,670	282	158,150
District VI:						
Chickasaw	24,260	241	12,130	26,300	107	5,900
Clay	18,460	221	8,420	20,950	76	3,220
Kemper	27,480	215	12,040	26,960	119	6,570
Lowndes	31,020	225	13,590	28,970	149	8,980
Monroe	43,820	254	23,000	46,580	155	15,110
Neshoba	35,690	297	20,950	36,390	219	16,390
Noxubee	34,600	191	13,430	34,260	134	9,470
Oktibbeha	14,040	198	5,600	16,330	67	2,090
Winston	24,130	271	13,120	23,890	177	8,690
Total	253,500	238	122,280	260,630	143	76,420
District VII:						
Adams	11,340	214	5,010	10,720	214	4,800
Amite	24,960	275	13,880	25,980	248	13,020
Claiborne	14,740	255	7,690	13,730	235	6,550
Copiah	21,110	237	10,050	20,710	192	8,090
Franklin	9,980	223	4,420	10,160	214	4,460
Hinds	62,490	251	29,640	57,800	253	28,950
Jefferson	14,510	243	7,270	14,580	237	7,060
Lincoln	27,640	244	13,340	25,890	206	10,780
Warren	13,360	319	8,840	14,630	282	8,260
Wilkinson	10,530	195	4,180	10,480	181	3,920
Total	210,660	249	104,320	204,680	232	95,890
District VIII:						
Covington	22,310	298	13,680	24,170	235	11,840
Jeff Davis	29,520	266	15,590	28,880	243	14,030
Lamar	8,770	327	5,830	9,790	155	3,120
Lawrence	19,530	273	10,390	18,670	225	8,740
Marion	24,300	333	16,140	25,220	205	10,450
Pike	23,990	286	13,210	23,270	210	9,850
Simpson	24,410	290	13,890	24,660	274	13,560
Smith	24,770	323	16,030	26,250	296	15,650
Walthall	29,330	319	18,720	29,940	237	14,460
Total	206,930	300	123,480	210,850	237	101,700
MISSISSIPPI—continued						
District IX:	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*
Clarke	13,020	231	6,230	14,490	108	3,180
Forrest	4,560	321	2,980	5,600	139	1,620
George	3,830	299	2,380	4,220	109	960
Jasper	21,780	280	11,910	22,300	200	9,340
Jones	24,240	344	17,130	26,570	222	12,110
Lauderdale	19,350	221	8,880	21,460	108	4,620
Newton	29,000	275	15,490	30,200	221	13,260
Perry	4,420	276	2,450	4,970	115	1,150
Wayne	12,350	249	6,380	13,470	129	3,630
Total	132,550	276	73,830	143,280	171	49,870
All others [18]	8,560	258	4,520	9,450	128	2,490
State total	2,622,000	320	1,704,000	2,662,000	291	1,582,000
MISSOURI						
District IX:						
Butler	9,630	296	5,930	11,340	400	9,470
Dunklin	77,340	436	70,280	82,750	482	83,280
Mississippi	30,400	487	30,770	31,990	614	40,860
New Madrid	90,700	439	82,070	91,770	592	113,400
Pemiscot	104,300	508	110,230	105,780	587	130,240
Scott	15,580	290	9,420	16,840	500	17,540
Stoddard	30,300	408	25,600	34,260	558	39,910
Total	358,250	450	334,300	375,730	556	434,700
All other [19]	3,750	214	1,700	4,270	255	2,300
State total	362,000	447	336,000	380,000	552	437,000
	1940			1941		
District IX:						
Butler	13,390	409	11,430	15,690	441	14,350
Dunklin	86,280	467	83,970	88,180	511	93,760
Mississippi	35,820	467	34,810	34,900	660	47,730
New Madrid	100,690	417	87,530	101,480	598	126,325
Pemiscot	110,070	512	116,470	109,000	543	123,000
Scott	18,640	408	15,840	19,600	480	19,490
Stoddard	44,450	376	34,960	45,300	515	48,690
Total	409,340	452	385,010	414,150	550	473,345
All other [19]	4,660	309	2,990	4,850	265	2,655
State total	414,000	451	388,000	419,000	546	476,000
	1936			1937		
NORTH CAROLINA						
District VIII:						
Anson	36,400	281	21,400	35,300	264	19,500
Cabarrus	16,000	192	6,430	16,000	301	10,100
Cleveland	51,300	277	29,800	60,700	445	56,500
Gaston	15,500	200	6,500	17,600	333	12,200
Lincoln	20,800	238	10,400	22,800	425	20,200
Mecklenburg	27,700	180	10,400	26,200	350	19,200
Montgomery	5,370	249	2,800	6,070	321	4,080
Moore	3,540	252	1,870	3,880	325	2,640
Richmond	15,100	254	8,040	18,400	293	11,300
Stanly	10,700	279	6,250	10,700	328	7,350
Union	42,500	304	27,000	47,500	281	27,900
Total	244,910	255	130,890	265,150	344	190,970
District IX:						
Bladen	7,240	303	4,600	9,700	317	6,440
Cumberland	24,600	308	15,800	31,500	310	20,500
Duplin	10,600	314	6,970	14,500	287	8,720
Harnett	23,900	366	18,300	29,100	406	24,700
Hoke	20,000	403	16,900	24,300	398	20,300
Onslow	2,400	249	1,250	3,500	312	2,280
Robeson	58,100	346	42,100	66,600	372	51,900
Sampson	45,000	367	34,500	49,900	353	36,300
Scotland	26,100	351	19,200	32,000	365	24,400
Total	217,940	350	159,620	261,100	359	196,040
All other [20]	37,640	268	21,160	44,660	315	29,470
State total	973,000	293	597,000	1,111,000	336	780,000

[18] Includes the following counties: district IX, Greene, Hancock, Harrison, Jackson, Parl River, and Stone.
[19] Includes in district VIII, Bollinger, Carter, Howell, Laclede, Ozark, Ripley, Taney, and Wayne; district IX, Cape Girardeau.
[20] Includes the following counties: district I: Caldwell, Wilkes, and Yadkin; district II: Alamance, Caswell, Durham, Forsyth, Granville, Guilford, Orange, Person, and Vance; district III: Pasquotank and Tyrrell; district IV: Burke and McDowell; district V: Alexander and Randolph; district VI: Carteret, Craven, Hyde, and Pamlico; district IX: Brunswick, Columbus, New Hanover, and Pender.

Cotton: Planted acreage, planted yield, and production—Continued

District and county	1938			1939		
	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales
NORTH CAROLINA—con.						
District II:	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*
Franklin	19,910	166	6,210	14,700	156	4,730
Warren	16,570	172	5,920	15,010	216	6,710
Total	36,480	169	12,130	29,710	187	11,440
District III:						
Bertie	9,480	130	2,510	5,920	148	1,810
Camden	1,880	226	880	1,760	191	700
Chowan	3,660	150	1,140	2,610	151	820
Edgecombe	25,220	155	8,030	20,490	146	6,210
Gates	5,070	185	1,940	3,750	140	1,090
Halifax	38,180	150	11,900	31,420	152	9,910
Hertford	5,680	189	2,220	3,450	131	930
Martin	6,120	110	1,300	3,230	108	730
Nash	23,340	162	7,830	17,580	201	7,310
Northampton	25,710	156	8,280	23,440	164	8,070
Perquimans	4,905	185	1,900	3,890	165	1,340
Total	149,245	156	47,930	117,540	159	38,920
District IV:						
Polk	5,060	261	2,730	4,800	332	3,280
Rutherford	24,880	312	16,200	23,780	391	19,100
Total	29,940	304	18,930	28,580	381	22,380
District V:						
Alexander	3,365	278	1,960	3,660	379	2,890
Catawba	12,545	300	7,850	12,740	420	10,990
Chatham	5,380	120	1,340	2,840	160	940
Davidson	2,475	301	1,560	2,460	298	1,520
Davie	4,825	285	2,880	4,930	349	3,560
Iredell	20,135	331	13,900	21,200	465	20,330
Lee	4,810	225	2,230	3,650	256	1,950
Rowan	14,720	312	9,580	15,030	432	13,430
Wake	20,140	139	5,770	11,670	162	3,900
Total	88,395	256	47,070	78,180	368	59,510
District VI:						
Beaufort	4,240	110	970	1,400	101	290
Greene	8,150	127	2,100	6,360	121	1,620
Johnston	40,340	164	13,700	34,230	224	15,900
Lenoir	8,790	126	2,260	4,620	181	1,740
Pitt	12,720	105	2,740	8,850	94	1,730
Wayne	26,480	139	7,630	19,060	225	8,900
Wilson	18,740	172	6,640	12,850	116	3,080
Total	119,460	146	36,040	87,370	183	33,260
District VIII:						
Anson	31,200	228	14,700	29,730	343	21,000
Cabarrus	12,841	261	7,020	12,710	299	7,890
Cleveland	51,050	368	38,800	50,700	495	51,700
Gaston	13,960	339	9,900	14,480	385	11,500
Lincoln	18,750	356	14,000	18,070	459	17,400
Mecklenburg	23,070	252	12,100	22,970	319	14,900
Montgomery	4,830	121	1,220	3,150	222	1,440
Moore	3,330	148	1,020	1,830	270	1,020
Richmond	13,325	166	4,560	10,990	313	7,080
Stanly	9,790	221	4,400	8,250	240	4,080
Union	40,400	253	21,100	40,850	351	29,160
Total	222,546	277	128,820	213,730	380	167,170
District IX:						
Bladen	7,260	149	2,150	4,840	184	1,820
Cumberland	23,740	201	9,890	20,740	272	11,700
Duplin	9,660	172	3,410	6,200	241	3,060
Harnett	26,100	263	14,100	21,720	342	15,300
Hoke	17,730	293	10,900	18,670	397	15,200
Robeson	52,440	174	18,600	50,730	303	31,500
Sampson	41,130	187	15,900	31,110	301	19,400
Scotland	25,380	198	10,400	24,810	344	17,600
Total	203,440	204	85,350	178,820	314	115,580
All other [21]	34,494	165	11,730	20,070	209	8,740
State total	884,000	213	388,000	754,000	294	457,000
OKLAHOMA						
District III:						
Osage	5,240	288	3,130	7,100	241	3,520
Pawnee	4,420	272	2,490	7,200	198	2,960
Tulsa	6,270	309	4,020	8,200	182	3,080
Wagoner	27,130	284	16,100	31,900	220	14,150
Total	43,060	287	25,740	54,400	216	23,710
OKLAHOMA—continued						
District IV:	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*
Beckham	87,620	130	22,400	84,000	124	21,510
Blaine	13,240	173	4,790	22,800	123	5,840
Custer	19,010	104	3,890	23,600	108	5,250
Dewey	8,840	118	2,140	16,400	104	3,520
Roger Mills	45,140	87	7,850	35,000	99	7,230
Washita	87,710	137	24,400	97,000	146	29,450
Total	261,560	125	65,470	278,800	126	72,800
District V:						
Canadian	10,040	189	3,950	15,200	163	5,100
Cleveland	10,920	213	4,860	12,700	169	4,390
Creek	28,630	251	14,700	31,100	192	12,000
Grady	59,180	152	18,800	66,100	137	18,910
Kingfisher	3,010	136	850	5,200	106	1,150
Lincoln	23,020	226	10,800	29,100	144	8,590
Logan	9,690	196	3,830	14,500	149	4,390
McClain	41,050	199	17,100	44,500	150	13,960
Okfuskee	37,220	260	20,200	40,200	167	13,790
Oklahoma	8,030	258	4,270	9,900	196	4,070
Payne	7,340	238	3,640	10,200	234	4,940
Pottawatomie	21,930	181	8,050	22,900	152	6,810
Seminole	20,250	181	7,230	19,500	139	5,500
Total	280,310	204	118,280	321,100	157	103,600
District VI:						
Haskell	18,670	171	6,680	19,500	165	6,740
Hughes	29,900	221	13,800	30,100	144	9,100
McIntosh	41,820	220	19,200	44,200	179	16,600
Muskogee	46,210	222	21,400	52,500	190	20,690
Okmulgee	31,570	279	17,700	35,200	156	11,170
Pittsburg	26,010	187	10,100	28,700	177	10,340
Sequoyah	18,340	192	7,230	18,000	213	8,030
Total	212,520	219	96,110	228,200	175	82,670
District VII:						
Caddo	91,760	165	31,500	99,400	174	35,370
Comanche	30,710	122	7,790	34,600	66	4,680
Cotton	34,890	126	9,130	44,300	50	4,490
Greer	76,720	91	14,500	71,500	103	15,030
Harmon	60,130	103	12,700	53,900	93	10,460
Jackson	97,140	105	21,100	103,400	96	19,950
Kiowa	71,410	81	11,600	83,000	83	14,220
Tillman	95,410	163	32,000	105,200	144	31,200
Total	558,170	122	140,320	595,300	111	135,400
District VIII:						
Atoka	10,660	135	3,010	9,500	148	2,900
Bryan	40,930	141	11,800	40,800	150	12,380
Carter	16,120	105	3,380	14,700	90	2,650
Coal	12,610	156	4,100	12,800	146	3,860
Garvin	39,780	146	11,980	40,500	127	10,770
Jefferson	43,330	147	13,260	43,000	80	7,140
Johnston	14,950	148	4,600	12,800	167	4,400
Love	22,080	126	5,780	21,800	115	5,200
Marshall	13,140	150	4,100	13,100	153	4,090
Murray	7,580	155	2,450	7,600	127	2,010
Pontotoc	17,140	161	5,740	16,500	119	4,090
Stephens	37,410	124	9,650	37,200	80	6,010
Total	275,730	140	79,850	270,300	118	65,500
District IX:						
Choctaw	20,760	146	6,270	20,300	177	7,350
Latimer	2,590	128	670	2,600	160	870
LeFlore	27,370	206	11,780	28,100	203	11,820
McCurtain	31,570	188	12,180	29,900	225	13,900
Pushmataha	5,000	94	980	4,100	131	1,100
Total	87,290	177	31,880	85,000	200	35,040
All other [22]	14,360	185	5,350	21,900	161	7,280
State total	1,733,000	158	563,000	1,855,000	138	526,000
SOUTH CAROLINA						
District I:						
Anderson	77,600	282	45,600	79,800	358	58,550
Cherokee	28,400	281	16,500	27,600	343	19,650
Greenville	50,600	321	33,100	47,500	352	34,220
Laurens	45,500	264	25,000	43,800	334	29,970
Oconee	25,100	255	13,400	25,100	326	16,770
Pickens	23,600	261	12,800	22,400	346	16,100
Spartanburg	74,500	278	43,100	74,900	322	47,440
Union	20,600	203	8,700	21,100	215	9,100
Total	345,900	276	198,200	342,200	333	231,800

[1] Includes the following counties: district I: Caldwell, Wilkes, and Yadkin; district II: Alamance, Caswell, Durham, Forsyth, Granville, Guilford, Orange, and Vance; district III: Currituck, Pasquotank, Tyrrell, and Washington; district IV: Burke and McDowell; district V: Randolph; district VI: Carteret, Craven, Hyde, Jones, and Pamlico; district IX: Brunswick, Columbus, New Hanover, Onslow, and Pender.

[2] Includes the following counties: district I: Beaver, Ellis, Harper; district II: Alfalfa, Garfield, Grant, Kay, Major, Noble, Woods, Woodward; district III: Craig, Delaware, Mayes, Nowata, Ottawa, Rogers, Washington; district IV: Adair, Cherokee.

Cotton: Planted acreage, planted yield, and production—Continued

District and county	1938			1939		
	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales
SOUTH CAROLINA—con.						
District II:	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*
Chester	26,400	263	14,300	26,000	313	16,750
Fairfield	17,000	224	7,900	16,900	315	10,730
Kershaw	33,800	193	13,400	32,800	310	20,640
Lancaster	22,900	213	10,000	20,900	344	14,660
York	39,200	226	18,400	38,400	302	23,200
Total	139,300	223	64,000	135,000	314	85,980
District III:						
Chesterfield	42,100	220	19,200	42,000	345	29,900
Darlington	33,400	211	14,700	34,900	371	26,040
Dillon	25,700	259	13,900	25,500	387	20,470
Florence	29,600	207	12,400	30,000	294	18,300
Georgetown [23]						
Horry [23]						
Marion	11,900	215	5,400	10,900	350	7,900
Marlboro	48,000	221	21,900	47,800	407	40,380
Williamsburg	27,200	286	16,200	28,900	292	17,340
Total	217,900	230	103,700	220,000	354	160,330
District IV:						
Abbeville	26,500	206	11,200	26,300	306	16,100
Aiken	44,100	231	20,600	40,700	357	29,880
Edgefield	18,900	290	11,300	18,700	399	15,270
Greenwood	21,500	178	7,750	19,100	290	11,330
McCormick	11,600	170	4,050	10,900	300	6,630
Newberry	26,500	238	13,100	26,000	340	17,980
Saluda	19,100	241	9,500	18,300	402	15,210
Total	168,200	225	77,500	160,000	344	112,400
District V:						
Calhoun	25,000	282	14,500	24,700	408	20,800
Clarendon	31,600	272	17,900	34,600	315	21,450
Lee	37,500	274	21,400	38,400	435	34,530
Lexington	20,600	238	10,000	19,100	369	14,640
Orangeburg	82,800	300	51,400	81,600	376	62,730
Richland	15,700	171	5,600	13,800	318	9,040
Sumter	41,200	246	21,100	46,100	412	38,850
Total	254,400	269	141,900	258,300	383	202,040
District VIII:						
Allendale	17,400	245	8,600	17,200	329	11,500
Bamberg	21,800	218	9,900	21,600	326	14,650
Barnwell	31,100	234	15,200	31,100	372	24,020
Beaufort [23]						
Berkeley	10,300	229	4,800	10,300	206	4,320
Charleston	1,850	161	620	1,620	128	420
Colleton	16,800	200	7,000	15,500	228	7,330
Dorchester	13,000	237	6,450	12,600	240	6,260
Hampton	14,600	229	6,900	14,700	238	7,140
Jasper	3,050	152	970	2,900	136	800
Total	129,900	225	60,440	127,520	291	76,540
All other	7,400	145	2,260	4,980	187	1,910
State total	1,263,000	248	648,000	1,248,000	342	871,000

District and county	1936			1937		
	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales
TENNESSEE						
District I:						
Dyer	46,000	328	31,500	56,000	374	43,700
Lake	33,100	372	25,700	34,500	434	31,300
Lauderdale	38,100	335	26,700	44,500	409	38,000
Obion	22,300	221	10,300	23,000	320	15,400
Shelby	75,000	251	39,300	94,000	301	59,200
Tipton	55,500	338	39,200	70,500	425	62,500
Total	270,000	306	172,700	322,500	371	250,100
District II:						
Carroll	28,500	221	13,100	30,700	299	19,200
Chester	15,000	236	7,410	17,000	326	11,600
Crockett	31,000	324	21,000	35,100	411	30,100
Fayette	64,000	225	30,100	74,000	299	46,200
Gibson	50,600	274	28,900	63,300	359	47,400
Hardeman	28,200	219	12,900	32,000	301	20,100
Haywood	49,000	275	28,200	57,800	359	43,300
Henderson	25,500	247	13,200	29,000	323	19,500
Henry	12,500	216	5,640	13,700	275	7,900
McNairy	25,200	260	13,700	28,700	328	19,700
Madison	42,000	249	21,900	46,400	326	31,600
Weakley	17,500	237	8,650	19,300	285	11,500
Total	389,000	252	204,700	447,000	330	308,100

District and county	1936			1937		
	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales
TENNESSEE—continued						
District III:	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*
Benton	6,620	197	2,720	7,810	257	4,190
Decatur	7,950	179	2,970	9,500	237	4,710
Hardin	15,800	181	5,960	18,500	236	9,120
Lawrence	25,000	249	13,000	33,000	314	21,600
Wayne	4,300	187	1,680	5,780	254	3,070
Other [24]	1,030	283	590	1,510	275	860
Total	60,700	212	26,920	76,100	274	43,550
District IV:						
Giles	17,000	161	5,710	17,300	271	9,770
Lincoln	16,800	184	6,470	19,200	345	13,800
Rutherford	16,700	114	3,960	16,500	248	8,540
Other [24]	5,600	158	1,850	6,700	272	3,800
Total	56,100	154	17,990	59,700	288	35,910
District V: Other [24]	10,400	157	3,375	15,100	296	9,330
District VI:						
McMinn	5,200	172	1,860	5,600	304	3,550
Polk	4,750	219	2,170	5,700	337	4,010
Other [24]	8,850	178	3,285	11,300	273	6,450
Total	18,800	187	7,315	22,600	297	14,010
State total	805,000	257	433,000	943,000	336	661,000

District and county	1938			1939		
	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales
District I:						
Dyer	43,040	420	37,600	44,840	389	35,500
Lake	30,820	491	31,600	29,300	476	28,600
Lauderdale	37,140	411	31,600	37,280	428	32,900
Obion	17,020	304	10,800	16,660	346	11,900
Shelby	67,480	301	41,900	70,890	303	43,500
Tipton	51,750	369	39,300	51,750	402	43,200
Total	247,250	376	192,800	250,720	381	195,600
District II:						
Carroll	25,250	276	14,500	24,520	290	14,700
Chester	14,610	284	8,670	13,515	236	6,650
Crockett	29,060	374	22,200	29,425	330	20,200
Fayette	63,740	259	34,500	59,100	222	27,200
Gibson	47,430	335	33,000	43,670	309	28,100
Hardeman	28,730	254	15,000	24,740	208	10,700
Haywood	47,030	349	34,100	50,120	294	30,500
Henderson	25,030	270	14,100	22,205	271	12,500
Henry	11,460	220	5,270	10,190	245	5,200
McNairy	24,320	288	14,600	24,400	193	9,700
Madison	38,810	293	23,400	39,000	248	20,000
Weakley	12,590	266	6,960	11,945	244	6,050
Total	368,060	296	226,300	352,830	262	191,500
District III:						
Benton	5,370	240	2,700	5,650	216	2,530
Decatur	7,160	227	3,390	7,080	179	2,620
Hardin	13,450	230	6,490	14,040	145	4,150
Lawrence	24,490	303	15,500	24,900	201	10,300
Wayne	4,510	267	2,510	4,740	150	1,460
Other [25]	930	281	550	840	171	300
Total	55,910	266	31,140	57,250	181	21,360
District IV:						
Giles	13,080	264	7,220	13,330	204	5,600
Lincoln	14,810	277	8,570	15,240	285	9,000
Rutherford	10,890	278	6,300	10,770	300	6,670
Other [25]	3,790	282	2,210	3,710	262	2,030
Total	42,570	274	24,300	43,050	262	23,300
District V: Other [25]	11,260	292	6,860	12,375	302	7,650
District VI:						
McMinn	4,760	199	1,980	4,250	253	2,230
Polk	4,040	282	2,380	4,275	320	2,840
Other [25]	8,150	250	4,240	8,250	265	4,520
Total	16,950	243	8,600	16,775	276	9,590
State total	742,000	318	490,000	733,000	297	449,000

[23] Included in "All other", but not in district totals.

[24] Includes the following counties in district III, Dickson, Hickman, Humphreys, Lewis, Perry, and Stewart; district IV, Bedford, Cannon, Davidson, De Kalb, Marshall, Maury, Moore, Williamson, and Wilson; district V, Coffee, Franklin, Grundy, Marion, Sequatchie, Van Buren, Warren, and White; district VI, Blount, Bradley, Hamilton, Knox, Loudon, Meigs, Monroe, Rhea, and Roane.

[25] Includes the following counties in district III: Dickson, Hickman, Humphreys, Lewis, Perry, and Stewart; district IV: Bedford, Cannon, Davidson, DeKalb, Marshall, Maury, Moore, Williamson, and Wilson; district V: Coffee, Franklin, Grundy, Marion, Sequatchie, Van Buren, Warren, and White; district VI: Blount, Bradley, Hamilton, Knox, Loudon, Meigs, Monroe, Rhea, and Roane.

Cotton: Planted acreage, planted yield, and production—Continued

District and county	1938			1939		
	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales
TEXAS						
District I–N:	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*
Armstrong [25]						
Briscoe	24,200	139	6,860	23,800	74	3,580
Carson [25]						
Castro	10,500	90	1,960	12,000	110	2,690
Deaf Smith [25]						
Floyd	47,500	217	20,800	49,200	109	10,860
Gray	7,170	100	1,490	4,780	66	650
Hale	69,900	149	21,600	72,700	131	19,800
Hansford [25]						
Hemphill [25]						
Hutchinson [25]						
Lipscomb [25]						
Moore [25]						
Ochiltree [25]						
Parmer	21,500	64	2,740	17,700	144	5,330
Randall [25]						
Roberts [25]						
Swisher [25]						
Other	19,400	123	4,880	19,900	90	3,705
Total	200,170	147	60,300	200,080	113	46,615
District I–S:						
Andrews [25]						
Bailey	67,300	100	14,000	49,900	147	15,200
Cochran	40,900	74	6,330	25,000	98	5,130
Crosby	88,900	221	40,700	93,400	128	24,400
Dawson	124,000	181	46,100	94,100	217	41,500
Gaines	14,100	69	1,990	7,000	81	1,180
Glasscock [25]						
Hockley	133,000	140	38,000	112,900	146	34,000
Howard	68,900	118	16,700	61,100	135	16,600
Lamb	137,000	157	43,200	130,500	182	48,600
Lubbock	181,000	183	67,300	171,000	177	63,300
Lynn	148,000	175	53,800	151,100	186	57,100
Martin	59,000	118	14,600	45,400	174	15,900
Midland	20,900	45	1,970	11,400	142	3,380
Terry	83,100	76	13,200	63,900	171	22,700
Yoakum [25]						
Other	15,890	39	1,290	10,700	122	2,720
Total	1,181,990	148	359,180	1,027,400	167	351,710
District II:						
Baylor	22,200	136	6,280	30,700	84	5,220
Borden	13,200	157	4,430	13,700	141	3,950
Childress	67,600	104	14,200	62,700	62	8,050
Coleman	67,700	57	8,080	62,700	96	12,400
Collingsworth	77,100	129	20,800	76,700	116	18,500
Cottle	70,200	150	21,800	66,800	101	13,500
Dickens	57,700	231	27,700	55,900	100	11,700
Donley	43,600	149	13,500	39,700	127	10,500
Fisher	95,000	164	32,200	99,100	110	22,200
Foard	20,200	176	7,340	26,200	170	9,250
Garza	38,400	171	13,100	38,000	168	12,900
Hall	87,400	150	27,300	89,800	74	13,700
Hardeman	54,600	130	14,700	55,900	116	13,300
Haskell	107,000	171	37,200	116,100	97	22,500
Jones	136,000	120	33,400	139,700	85	24,600
Kent	24,900	196	10,100	29,000	81	4,800
King	10,200	141	2,980	10,130	104	2,180
Knox	66,700	179	24,600	72,400	106	16,000
Mitchell	72,600	153	23,100	71,200	123	18,000
Motley	42,500	175	15,400	43,300	92	8,040
Nolan	43,800	87	7,790	42,600	114	9,920
Runnels	110,000	111	25,200	107,100	83	18,200
Scurry	73,000	163	24,200	69,100	126	17,800
Stonewall	39,700	170	13,700	41,800	96	7,990
Taylor	62,600	63	8,220	63,100	93	12,000
Wheeler	53,100	126	13,800	45,900	93	8,840
Wichita	19,400	158	6,060	23,500	141	6,570
Wilbarger	70,200	215	31,400	73,200	193	29,400
Total	1,646,700	144	488,580	1,666,030	106	362,010
District III:						
Archer	5,060	62	620	7,460	32	500
Brown	16,000	49	1,620	14,500	99	2,910
Callahan	15,100	65	2,040	14,800	115	3,500
Clay	35,000	154	11,000	36,920	62	4,740
Comanche	15,700	31	930	9,600	84	1,650
Eastland	6,060	24	280	3,200	84	560
Erath	30,100	25	1,550	18,400	80	3,030
Hood [25]						
Jack	6,510	76	980	5,390	58	660
Mills	10,800	31	670	7,830	84	1,360
Montague	19,400	105	4,180	17,800	78	2,840
Palo Pinto	5,650	84	950	3,900	81	640
Parker	10,000	41	840	5,540	106	1,190
Shackelford [25]						
Somervell [25]						
Stephens [25]						
Throckmorton	8,580	75	1,340	13,900	33	920
Wise	15,200	111	3,470	13,600	110	3,050

[25] Included in "Other" counties and in district totals.

District and county	1938			1939		
	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales	Acreage in cultivation, July 1	Yield per planted acre [1]	Production, 500-pound gross weight bales
TEXAS—continued						
District III—Continued	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*
Young	24,000	84	4,170	29,300	48	2,900
Other	19,560	49	1,930	15,540	84	2,560
Total	242,720	74	36,570	217,680	74	33,010
District IV:						
Bell	116,000	157	37,200	117,900	135	32,700
Bosque	35,900	88	6,440	36,600	110	8,190
Collin	125,000	237	60,900	130,200	246	65,200
Cooke	33,900	161	11,200	37,400	144	10,800
Coryell	54,600	86	9,690	56,500	114	13,100
Dallas	78,500	199	30,800	74,200	225	34,000
Delta	49,500	254	26,000	47,700	297	28,700
Denton	54,700	186	20,900	58,000	167	19,600
Ellis	175,000	200	71,700	173,900	210	75,900
Falls	124,000	186	47,500	122,900	150	38,200
Fannin	105,000	241	51,500	105,100	240	52,500
Grayson	86,800	213	38,500	89,900	196	35,700
Hamilton	30,000	74	4,540	26,400	104	5,690
Hill	152,000	162	51,000	158,000	172	54,400
Hunt	130,000	217	58,500	134,800	209	56,400
Johnson	67,200	115	15,700	66,900	173	22,800
Kaufman	109,000	185	41,600	111,900	188	42,800
Lamar	88,500	212	37,400	95,800	229	40,400
Limestone	121,000	144	36,100	118,700	144	35,200
McLennan	150,000	140	42,800	149,700	148	45,200
Milam	103,000	182	38,600	101,900	137	28,800
Navarro	162,000	167	55,100	160,000	163	53,500
Rockwall	30,400	216	13,500	32,200	240	15,300
Tarrant	23,200	149	6,760	21,400	178	7,800
Williamson	152,000	198	62,000	152,200	127	39,200
Total	2,357,200	181	875,930	2,380,200	178	862,080
District V:						
Anderson	35,600	167	12,100	37,700	167	13,000
Angelina	14,000	222	6,400	13,600	264	7,500
Bowie	49,500	209	21,300	49,600	205	21,200
Brazos	33,700	242	16,900	33,900	250	17,600
Camp	12,100	169	4,240	13,100	133	3,650
Cass	52,300	181	19,500	56,100	161	18,500
Cherokee	47,000	154	14,600	45,100	178	16,700
Franklin	16,700	168	5,830	17,700	170	6,140
Freestone	44,800	137	12,600	46,300	152	14,300
Gregg	10,000	148	3,090	9,950	147	3,010
Grimes	39,600	218	17,500	40,000	205	17,000
Hardin	180	158	60	140	187	60
Harrison	57,100	167	19,800	62,300	176	21,700
Henderson	45,900	181	17,100	46,000	179	16,600
Hopkins	66,100	185	25,400	71,200	186	27,100
Houston	62,500	196	25,200	61,200	195	24,700
Jasper	3,590	160	1,180	3,540	209	1,540
Leon	34,600	168	12,100	34,700	163	11,800
Madison	27,700	172	9,790	28,800	167	9,940
Marion	12,700	124	3,160	13,100	149	4,000
Montgomery	6,610	191	2,580	6,680	168	2,340
Morris	15,000	195	6,050	16,000	127	4,190
Nacogdoches	39,200	147	11,900	37,900	181	14,100
Newton	2,360	127	610	1,850	184	700
Panola	43,400	152	13,700	44,200	157	14,200
Polk	12,500	211	5,480	13,400	288	7,680
Rains	19,200	170	6,730	19,500	174	7,080
Red River	59,200	192	22,500	59,600	214	26,200
Robertson	70,700	186	25,700	64,300	167	22,300
Rusk	58,400	127	14,800	55,900	143	15,500
Sabine	9,740	165	3,300	10,600	204	4,430
San Augustine	15,000	163	5,070	16,000	209	6,810
San Jacinto	9,860	216	4,380	9,700	263	5,240
Shelby	45,000	170	15,900	42,500	215	18,700
Smith	60,900	143	17,600	58,600	153	18,500
Titus	23,500	172	8,410	23,200	162	7,780
Trinity	13,800	187	4,920	12,600	232	6,100
Tyler	3,110	204	1,320	3,170	243	1,610
Upshur	32,900	157	10,500	33,300	148	10,300
Van Zandt	72,400	162	24,300	75,700	170	26,400
Walker	18,100	191	7,110	18,200	173	6,470
Waller	13,400	225	6,200	15,000	250	7,660
Wood	36,000	167	12,300	35,500	151	10,900
Total	1,345,950	174	479,210	1,357,430	180	502,210
District VI:						
Brewster [25]						
Culberson [25]						
Ector [25]						
El Paso	30,000	640	39,700	31,100	755	47,400
Hudspeth	7,490	431	6,720	8,360	452	7,670
Jeff Davis [25]						
Pecos	5,230	239	2,570	5,720	342	3,860
Presidio [25]						
Reeves	5,820	270	3,270	6,040	288	3,410
Terrell [25]						
Ward	8,680	319	5,770	9,270	338	6,400

Cotton: Planted acreage, planted yield, and production—Continued

District and county	1938 Acreage in cultivation, July 1	1938 Yield per planted acre [1]	1938 Production, 500-pound gross weight bales	1939 Acreage in cultivation, July 1	1939 Yield per planted acre [1]	1939 Production, 500-pound gross weight bales
TEXAS—continued						
District VI—Continued	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*
Other	3,401	114	810	2,490	324	1,670
Total	60,621	468	58,840	62,980	554	70,410
District VII:						
Bandera [26]						
Blanco	1,040	101	210	1,270	103	270
Burnet	17,900	113	4,190	17,000	117	4,120
Coke	17,800	85	3,100	13,700	74	2,090
Concho	39,700	64	5,090	35,700	79	5,710
Crockett [26]						
Gillespie	1,350	97	270	1,660	107	370
Irion [26]						
Kendall [26]						
Kerr [26]						
Kimble [26]						
Kinney [26]						
Lampasas	12,200	45	1,130	11,000	114	2,590
Llano [26]						
McCulloch	44,400	45	4,170	39,400	93	7,450
Mason	3,400	36	260	1,740	104	380
Menard [26]						
Reagan [26]						
Real [26]						
San Saba	17,000	50	1,750	14,800	124	3,680
Schleicher	9,250	91	1,720	8,400	48	840
Sterling [26]						
Sutton [26]						
Tom Green	46,700	114	10,970	43,400	80	6,990
Uvalde [26]						
Other	7,281	59	740	5,130	101	1,058
Total	218,021	75	33,600	193,200	90	35,548
District VIII:						
Aransas [26]						
Austin	36,000	211	15,300	32,500	232	15,300
Bastrop	38,400	125	9,770	37,400	83	6,300
Bee	37,600	99	7,800	27,700	95	5,380
Bexar	21,500	164	6,480	21,600	20	920
Burleson	51,100	216	22,800	49,400	239	24,400
Caldwell	53,100	162	17,600	52,200	79	8,600
Colorado	30,500	119	7,030	26,500	170	9,220
Comal	4,870	110	1,090	4,540	35	320
De Witt	54,300	147	15,400	49,300	85	8,660
Fayette	59,400	168	19,500	55,600	134	15,200
Goliad	24,200	122	5,670	21,200	81	3,540
Gonzales	50,800	164	17,300	51,900	75	8,000
Guadalupe	62,800	166	21,300	63,900	44	5,490
Hays	20,200	154	6,390	20,400	79	3,370
Karnes	89,400	130	23,200	85,300	41	7,060
Kleberg	13,800	169	4,350	12,500	130	3,340
Lavaca	60,100	173	21,000	52,600	100	10,600
Lee	24,800	132	6,540	23,500	116	5,530
Medina [26]						
Nueces	166,200	232	74,900	152,200	254	79,300
Refugio	18,000	190	7,080	18,300	265	9,940
San Patricio	113,000	253	57,300	102,900	295	62,000
Travis	68,500	154	21,900	65,300	103	13,700
Washington	52,500	210	21,800	51,800	212	22,200
Wilson	24,100	141	6,990	26,200	31	1,650
Other	4,520	124	1,140	3,320	220	1,453
Total	1,179,690	178	419,630	1,108,060	147	331,473
District IX:						
Brazoria	19,600	211	7,060	17,300	196	6,705
Calhoun	19,500	179	7,090	20,100	274	11,400
Chambers [26]						
Fort Bend	85,200	212	37,400	79,250	221	36,205
Galveston [26]						
Harris	16,300	180	6,000	16,200	156	5,110
Jackson	28,400	179	10,400	29,300	181	10,800
Jefferson [26]						
Liberty	7,580	176	2,720	7,170	200	2,910
Matagorda	17,700	231	8,200	17,800	237	8,720
Orange [26]						
Victoria	35,200	147	10,500	32,500	149	9,750
Wharton	74,000	208	31,800	83,100	237	40,100
Other	2,677	189	1,050	2,800	165	930
Total	306,157	197	122,220	305,520	213	132,630

District and county	1938 Acreage in cultivation, July 1	1938 Yield per planted acre [1]	1938 Production, 500-pound gross weight bales	1939 Acreage in cultivation, July 1	1939 Yield per planted acre [1]	1939 Production, 500-pound gross weight bales
TEXAS—continued						
District X	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Bales*
Atascosa	23,500	100	4,770	23,300	37	1,770
Brooks [26]						
Cameron	73,200	263	37,500	58,200	275	31,831
Dimmit [26]						
Duval	24,700	71	3,680	24,400	84	4,180
Frio [26]						
Hidalgo	101,000	212	40,200	80,000	230	38,300
Jim Hogg [26]						
Jim Wells	43,400	150	12,400	39,000	109	8,920
Kenedy [26]						
La Salle	4,560	85	800			
Live Oak	34,600	121	8,330	32,300	78	5,190
McMullen [26]						
Maverick [26]						
Starr	23,000	63	3,010	19,500	70	2,760
Webb [26]						
Willacy	69,200	259	37,300	51,050	205	21,707
Zapata [26]						
Zavala [26]						
Other	26,621	73	3,950	27,670	64	3,704
Total	423,781	181	151,940	355,420	162	118,362
State total	9,163,000	165	3,086,000	8,874,000	157	2,846,000
NEW MEXICO						
District III:						
Curry [27]						
DeBaca [27]						
Harding [27]						
Quay [27]						
Roosevelt [27]						
Total				9,900	121	2,467
District VII:						
Grant [27]						
Hidalgo [27]						
Luna [27]						
Sierra [27]						
Socorro [27]						
Total				2,790	453	2,606
District IX:						
Chaves				24,690	507	25,737
Dona Ana				33,850	710	50,042
Eddy				24,020	412	20,651
Lea [28]						
Otero [28]						
Other				750	307	497
Total				83,310	560	96,927
State total				96,000	512	102,000
VIRGINIA						
District IX:						
Brunswick	6,700	151	1,990	5,350	200	2,200
Greensville	7,710	145	2,220	6,280	190	2,480
Mecklenburg	5,280	159	1,700	4,290	280	2,540
Nansemond	5,040	165	1,660	3,720	142	1,110
Southampton	9,690	120	2,320	8,030	163	2,745
Sussex	2,940	129	750	2,500	155	810
All other [29]	4,640	149	1,360	2,830	186	1,115
State	42,000	144	12,000	33,000	188	13,000

District and county	1940 Acreage in cultivation, July 1	1940 Yield per planted acre [1]	1940 Production, 500-pound gross weight bales	1941 Acreage in cultivation, July 1	1941 Yield per planted acre [1]	1941 Production, 500-pound gross weight bales
District IX:						
Brunswick	6,100	313	3,980	5,110	300	3,200
Greensville	5,690	415	4,920	6,850	420	5,960
Mecklenburg	7,100	306	4,460	5,700	290	3,440
Nansemond	2,480	435	2,280	3,800	436	3,420
Southampton	6,430	428	5,770	8,900	430	7,970
Sussex	1,770	353	1,310	2,580	350	1,880
All other [29]	3,430	319	2,280	3,060	336	2,130
State	33,000	364	25,000	36,000	374	28,000

[26] Included in "Other" counties and in district totals.
[27] Included in district total.
[28] Included in "other" counties and in district total.
[29] Includes the following counties: district V: Amelia, Chesterfield, Prince Edward; district VI: New Kent; district VIII: Charlotte, Halifax, Lunenburg, Nottoway, Pittsylvania; district IX: Dinwiddie, Isle of Wight, Norfolk, Prince George, Princess Anne, Surry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the efforts of the committee to correct the inequities existing in the present Cotton Quota Act. However, I do wish that the committee could have adopted further remedies which I suggested to the committee prior to the adoption of the act last summer, and at the time the original bill was passed several months ago.

I appeared before the committee some time ago and recommended further changes.

If you will remember, I originally recommended that no individual farmer should be cut below 70 percent of his 1943 acreage, or below 85 percent of his 1942 planted acreage. However, this amendment was not adopted. I later recommended that a longer base period be employed, and urged that no individual farmer be reduced below 70 percent of the average of the years 1941 to 1948, inclusive, and that he be allowed to plant at least 50 percent of the 1949 acreage.

I also recommended that in each instance farmers be allowed to swap cotton- and wheat-acreage allotments at the county and State levels to the extent that such transfers did not exceed the county and State allotments.

I also recommended that more consideration be given to statements of the farmers as to the acreage planted, and not to rely wholly on BAE-estimated figures.

I have previously stated to your committee that I felt the law should have been based more on a historical base rather than a cropland base. Cotton census records are available every fifth year. It was taken in 1946 for the year 1945. Crop-insurance records are available for the years 1942 to 1949, inclusive.

I should like to give you some actual down-to-earth examples as to how the present program would actually work at the grass-roots level. I have had many years of farming experience myself, and have had frequent meetings with various farm groups. I was a member of the House Agricultural Committee for three terms.

As an example, if a farm had been planted to cotton for the last 50 years, including the years 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1949, if the crops in 1946 were destroyed by hail, in 1947 by grasshoppers, and in 1948 by drought or sandstorms, and there was no cotton standing on July 1 of those years, he would not likely receive any allotment, and under the present act would be disqualified from voting for the cotton referendums. This inequity should be corrected. Farmers residing side by side will have allotments varying so greatly that it will lead to dissatisfaction.

In southwestern Oklahoma we have a 74,000-acre irrigation area, which presents a separate problem. In the bill passed several months ago a provision was included to provide that new irrigation sections, particularly California, New Mexico, and Arizona, could plant 95 percent of their 1948 acreage. A similar provision allowing farmers to plant 50 to 70 percent of their 1949 acreage in my irrigation section would be quite helpful, especially in view of the fact that wheat was planted in 1948 and it proved to be uneconomical to spend the large sums of money for water rent to produce wheat. A provision could be adopted that would not take the acreage away from the dry-land farmers.

In many of the counties in southwestern Oklahoma we practice diversification. The farmers planted in 1-, 2-, or 3-year cycles. In many instances they planted wheat in 1946, 1947, and 1948 on land that is ordinarily used for cotton. Because of the lack of rainfall, grasshoppers, rust, extreme heat, hail, and so forth, and because of seasonal changes, farmers have had to diversify in that area.

Although it might appear on its face, figuratively speaking, that Oklahoma has been well provided for, that is not true. Actually, the individual farmer in many areas is cut unbelievably low. Many farmers who received allotments in the State are not interested in growing cotton. Yet, many other farmers need this cotton acreage. There does not appear to be any inducement for farmers to surrender acreage.

Oklahoma is one of the largest cotton-producing areas. Twenty years ago we produced much more; in fact, we were at one time the largest cotton-producing area in the United States, and had the second largest acreage.

Many farmers have purchased farms with a view of raising cotton in 1949, 1950, 1951. They will have no allotment, and this will work a great hardship on them. By all means, let us adopt a provision that would allow those who planted cotton in 1949 to plant at least 50 percent of the acreage in 1950. Many of these are veterans, and have gone into debt for machinery and equipment

Again, may I call your attention to the fact that some may inquire, "Why did you go out of cotton?" Our area has not gone out of cotton production. We merely diversified between cotton and wheat, and occasionally raise oats, barley, grain sorghums and tame grasses, but we must have cash crops in order to survive.

I wish to compliment the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] who has worked so diligently to encourage the committee to advance the resolution to adjust some of the inequities. He is conscientious and really understands the problems. Both he and I issued warnings several months ago, which have come to pass. I know the members of the committee are conscientious and have the desire to do that which is best. However, the figures on paper do not always work out at the farm level in reality as they should.

I feel that the provision in the committee amendment limiting acreage under this act to 40 percent of the tillable land should be stricken. I also feel that the frozen acreage that is released should be given to the county and State committees to be reallocated to adjust inequities in addition to any acreage that individual farmers will receive under the committee amendment, which would provide that farmers receive at least 70 percent of the average of the 1946, 1947, and 1948 acreage, or 50 percent of the highest acreage of any one of the three years, whichever is the greater.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield to the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows very well that the bill itself authorizes State committees to reserve cotton acreage for the purpose of adjusting inequities. It also authorizes the local committees to reserve at the county level 15 percent, altogether almost 25 percent of the acreage could be reserved by the State and local committees. The gentleman knows that; does he not?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes, Mr. COOLEY.

Mr. COOLEY. If that was not done, it certainly is not any fault of ours.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I am glad that you brought that up, Mr. Chairman, because Oklahoma is the one State that took advantage of every opportunity your committee afforded it under the act. The State committee set aside the full 15 percent, and the county committee set aside the 10 percent, yet these set-asides were not sufficient to meet the inequities in Oklahoma by any means. Our State and county committees are not to blame.

I realize that we will have a large carry-over; therefore my farmers and I are for the program in order to maintain good prices and benefit by conservation practices. However, it will not be nearly as large as it was some years ago. The carry-over as of July 31, 1950, is expected to be about 8,000,000 bales. Here is a table of the cotton carry-over from 1938 to 1948, inclusive:

Carry-over, beginning of season

Year beginning August—	*Bales*
1938	11,533,000
1939	13,033,000
1940	10,564,000
1941	12,166,000
1942	10,640,000
1943	10,657,000
1944	10,744,000
1945	11,164,000
1946	7,326,000
1947	2,530,000
1948 [1]	3,082,000

[1] Preliminary.

As a result of ECA and the Marshall plan, many countries are recovering, and will have mills and factories in operation that can use more cotton. The populations of the United States and the world are increasing faster. The average life span has been lengthened several years. Many new uses have been found for cotton, and furthermore, we might have droughts, depressions, and crop failures in the future. We should have a reasonable stock pile of cotton. Consequently I am not as perturbed about a surplus.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting House Joint Resolution 398 because I believe it is about the best compromise that can be worked out if the cotton producers are to benefit by its enactment for the 1950 crop year.

The bill under consideration does not go quite as far as my bill, H. R. 6671, in that I felt no farm cotton-acreage allotment established for the 1950 crop in conformity with the law and regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture, should be less than 75 percent of the average acreage planted to cotton or regarded as planted to cotton under Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress, on the farm in 1946, 1947, and 1948, or 55 percent of the highest acreage planted to cotton or regarded as planted to cotton under Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress, inasmuch as the bill under consideration proposes a 70–50 formula.

I have always contended that if our price-support program is to survive, acreage allotment must prevail. However, we should be very careful in passing legislation so as to avoid inequities because, in most instances, such inequities affect the economy of the community.

Having surveyed my own district, I know that many of the small farmers, especially tenant farmers, will be forced out of the cotton-producing business unless they are given some relief. For that matter, many of the larger cotton producers in my district have been so drastically reduced that it will be impossible for them to produce cotton profitably.

If both Houses of the Congress pass House Joint Resolution 398, I hope that the Agriculture Committee, in its wisdom, will see fit to continue its study of this far-reaching program. If it is established that there are gross inequities after the amended act becomes effective, then something should be done to alleviate the condition before another crop year.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I wish at this time to express my sincere appreciation to the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], to the vice chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], and to each member of the Committee on Agriculture for their untiring efforts and their devoted interest in aiding in the solution of a problem that has arisen since the passage of the marketing quota and acreage allotment law during the last session of this Congress. Many inequities have arisen since the passage of that law which were absolutely unforeseeable on the part of any Member of Congress.

I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 398, a resolution to amend the marketing quota and acreage allotment law. However, I sincerely hope that this resolution may be amended in certain particulars, and which I consider to be perfecting amendments.

At the outset, I wish to state that I am absolutely opposed to any form of acreage allotment on any crop because it is nothing more than a further governmental control and regimentation of agriculture. However, I can appreciate why many Members of this Congress feel the necessity for some form of control over production of cotton if the farmer continues to expect a high-parity support price for his commodity.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of California. Does not the gentleman mean a fair guaranty? He does not mean a high guaranty but a fair guaranty. Is that not correct?

Mr. HARE. The gentleman is correct. I used the word "high" colloquially speaking. In my opinion 100 percent of parity is only a fair guaranty and we have only a 90 percent of parity support price.

In my opinion, most of the cotton farmers are willing to accept a reasonable reduction in their cotton acreage from the average acreage they actually planted in the years 1946, 1947, and 1948. I use the word "actually" advisedly because I do not mean that they are willing to accept a reduction in acreage from the figure which the Bureau of Agricultural Economics estimated the farmers planted in cotton for the years mentioned above.

The allotment law passed during the first session of the Congress bases the State and county acreage allocations on BAE figures. The State BAE figures are just about as correct as can be had. However, the BAE estimates for each individual county are in many instances far from correct. At the same time, I recognize that many farmers overreported their actual plantings because when the records were compiled recently, the farmers' reportings indicated acreage approximately 25 percent in excess of the acreage actually planted. But, the point I wish to make goes to the essence of what I consider the primary difficulty with the existing law and in my opinion the proposed resolution does not correct the same. That is, the existing law and the proposed resolution base State, county, and individual allotments on BAE estimates. This should not be the case. State, county, and individual allotments should be based on actual acreage planted to cotton or regarded as planted to cotton under Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress, during the years 1946, 1947, and 1948. The actual acreage planted by the individual farmers could easily be determined by the local county PMA committee and if such farmers should be dissatisfied, they should be afforded the right of appeal to the State PMA committee. If such was the law, I feel sure that a more equitable individual distribution of cotton acreage would be had. On Monday, when amendments will be in order, I propose to introduce an amendment to the resolution before us that will insure the procedure mentioned above. I do not think that the resolution follows such procedure, even though some Members think it does.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. That is exactly what that language in the law does now. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. HARE. Does not the resolution provide that the acreage will be allotted in accordance with the BAE figures?

Mr. ALBERT. If the farmer is dissatisfied with his allocation he can go before the appeal board and prove his acreage.

Mr. HARE. That is the same old story. They have been doing that. They did it this year and it has not proved satisfactory in the slightest degree.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman have any other method of arriving at a fair-acreage allotment than the method which was used by the Department? The Department took into consideration the reported acreage by the farmers and took the BAE figures.

Mr. HARE. And they adjusted them, too.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; they adjusted them. What would the gentleman suggest when the fact is that the acreage reported by the farmers exceeded the national-acreage quota actually planted by almost 30 percent?

Mr. HARE. I would suggest that the county committee investigate each individual farmer and let the county committee determine what his actual planting was rather than have the Department of Agriculture tell the farmer what he planted and what the county planted.

It is impossible to perfect an acreage-allotment law within 1 year and that is especially true in this case because the acreage estimates on which any new allotment law must be based are entirely inaccurate. This is a trial and error proposition and we might as well recognize it as such.

Another inequity in the present law but which, in my opinion, the resolution before us corrects is the one regarding what is commonly known as frozen acreage. That is, there are a number of farmers, dairy farmers and the like, who received an acreage allotment which they did not want at all or which was in excess of that which they desired. Under the existing law there is no provision permitting the release of that acreage in order that it may be redistributed to others who desire it. Consequently, many thousands of acres will not be planted which the Congress intended to be planted. I think the proposed resolution corrects this inequity, and I sincerely hope that those farmers who have such acreage will cooperate with the program in order that their neighbors may receive an acreage allotment to their best interest.

Another inequity in the existing law but which the proposed resolution does not correct is that marketing quotas and acreage allotments affect all cotton the staple of which is 1½ inches or less.

Through November of 1949, approximately 58,000 bales of long-staple cotton were imported into this country. Most of this cotton came from Egypt, India, and Peru. A great portion of it was of a staple length of 1½ inches or more. Yet a great portion of it was of 1 7/32- and 1¼-inch staple length. There are many areas in this country that can produce cotton with a staple length of 1¼ inches, and it is more profitable to do so because the price of such cotton is approximately 50 cents per pound. In view of the fact that we are importing such a large

amount of that type of cotton, I think that the existing law should be amended so as to provide marketing quotas and acreage allotments on cotton, the staple of which is 1 7/32 inches or less. I propose to offer an amendment to that effect on Monday.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the chairman of the committee or some other member on the majority side who is interested in this legislation should take some time to explain the bill. That has not been done. I do not know what reason there can be for holding back on a full explanation of the resolution. May I ask my distinguished chairman the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], if he proposes to explain the resolution of which he is author?

Mr. COOLEY. I am sure the gentleman knows the resolution will be fully explained. The reason I yielded to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] is that he wrote me a letter weeks and weeks ago and has seen me time and again asking me for time. I wanted to let him know that I was doing the very best I could and I yielded time to him first. The same is true as to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM]. We are now coming to the point where some of the members of the committee will speak, and I am sure the gentleman will hear a full explanation of the resolution from now on.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will let the gentleman proceed to explain the bill. This is an important measure. I think we ought to have a full and complete explanation from those who understand the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think there should be a larger audience present to hear the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-four Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 23]

Abbitt	Chudoff	Gamble
Allen, Ill.	Clemente	Gary
Arends	Cole, Kans.	Gilmer
Auchincloss	Corbett	Gorski
Barden	Coudert	Granahan
Barrett, Pa.	Davenport	Green
Battle	Davies, N. Y.	Gwinn
Beall	Davis, Tenn.	Hall,
Bennett, Fla.	Davis, Wis.	Edwin Arthur
Bland	Dawson	Hall,
Boggs, La.	Delaney	Leonard W.
Bolling	Dingell	Halleck
Breen	Dollinger	Hand
Brown, Ga.	Donohue	Hart
Buchanan	Douglas	Hays, Ohio
Buckley, N. Y.	Durham	Hébert
Bulwinkle	Eaton	Heller
Burdick	Engel, Mich.	Herter
Burton	Engle, Calif.	Hobbs
Byrne, N. Y.	Fallon	Hoffman, Ill.
Carroll	Fellows	Hope
Case, S. Dak.	Fogarty	Jackson, Calif.
Cavalcante	Forand	James
Celler	Fulton	Javits
Jenison	Morton	Scott,
Jenkins	Moulder	Hardie
Jennings	Multer	Scott,
Johnson	Murphy	Hugh D., Jr.
Jonas	Norton	Scrivner
Kean	O'Toole	Scudder
Keating	Patman	Secrest
Kee	Pfeifer,	Shafer
Keefe	Joseph L.	Short
Kelley, Pa.	Pfeiffer,	Simpson, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.	William L.	Smathers
Kennedy	Philbin	Smith, Kans.
Keough	Phillips, Tenn.	Smith, Ohio
Kirwan	Plumley	Stanley
Klein	Powell	Stockman
Kunkel	Price	Sutton
Lane	Quinn	Taber
Latham	Rabaut	Taylor
Lichtenwalter	Ramsay	Thompson
Lodge	Redden	Tollefson
Lynch	Rees	Underwood
McCulloch	Ribicoff	Van Zandt
McMillan, S. C.	Richards	Vinson
Macy	Rivers	Vorys
Marcantonio	Rogers, Fla.	Wadsworth
Marshall	Rogers, Mass.	Wagner
Michener	Roosevelt	Walsh
Miles	Sabath	Welchel
Miller, Nebr.	Sadlak	Werdel
Monroney	Sadowski	White, Idaho
Morgan	St. George	Wickersham
Morrison	Saylor	Wood

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 398, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 269 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, the big issue on the bill before us at the present time is the basic philosophy of how individual cotton allotments shall be made to the farms. The law which was passed by this Congress not too long ago was based on the philosophy of total crop land, that is, allotting a farmer the amount of cotton that he should plant based on his total acreage of farm land, tilled land, that is.

I said when the hearings were being conducted on that bill that the allocations should have been made to the farms on the basis of history, the actual plantings of cotton, and I recommended that the years 1947, 1948, and 1949 be used, but that the acreage of 1949 on those farms should not be used to the extent that it exceeded 1948.

I still contend that is a just and equitable way to make farm cotton allotments, because it will bring the least interference with the lives of the cotton farmers of this country. What happened? The committee went on and, over my protest, incidentally, adopted a bill which allocates this cotton acreage on the basis of the total amount of land a man owns, or tills, rather than what he has been planting to cotton. Let us look at the situation of a little 40-acre farmer. By the way I want to point out, too, that in the relief which is provided under the resolution we are now considering, there has been placed a limitation of 40 percent, based on the total amount of land that the farmer owns or tills. I contend that is wrong and I am going to offer an amendment to strike it out at the proper time. That was not in the provisions which were in the resolution when the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture convened here in December.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. It is not based on 40 percent of the amount of land that that farmer owns, but it is based on the tillable land, is it not?

Mr. WHITE of California. For all practical purposes that is the same thing. There is very little difference. Of course you do cut out orchards and vineyards but for all practical purposes when you get down to tillable land it is all the real farming land that the man owns. I am glad the gentleman made that observation, but still it is the same thing when you get right down to cases.

Mr. Chairman, again I want to refer to the man with 40 acres. Even under the relief offered in this resolution, if we do not strike out the 40-percent provision a man with a total of tillable acres—thanks to the gentleman from Oklahoma—with a total of tillable acres amounting to only 40 acres, could not plant more than 16 acres. The big man who has plenty of money can buy a lot of extra land and add it onto his farm and he comes out with his big acreage of cotton. It is not fair, it is not equitable, and it is basically wrong to distribute on that basis licenses to do business, you might say, because after all these farmers, or at least most of them, are in effect small-business men. When you begin distributing licenses to do business on the amount of capital a man has, there is no sense to it. It is basically wrong. It is just as though when the gas and light companies come before the respective State commissions for licenses, if the State commission follows the philosophy of this 40-percent limitation of cropland procedure, the Commission could very well grant them their licenses, based on the amount of capital they have instead of on the amount of services that they have been rendering in the gas and light field.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Then I am sure the gentleman would also oppose the amendment which has been suggested by the American Farm Bureau Federation which would make the 40-percent provision applicable to adjusted acres, rather than to the actual acres on the farm.

Mr. WHITE of California. I oppose that more bitterly than I do the 40-percent provision which is in this Cooley resolution now before us. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that. Incidentally, if I may say so, too, I think the 40-percent provision we have in this resolution was the result of Farm Bureau pressure which was exerted during and subsequent to the December meeting. I do not sympathize with the Farm Bureau's activities at all in doing what I call sticking their nose into this legislation. The Farm Bureau, I think, had a great deal to do with the writing of the

last bill and injecting into that bill their philosophy of cotton allotments based on cropland instead of cotton history which is what caused all this trouble we are now facing.

Now, we have by the Cooley resolution which is now before us, provided this relief, by putting farm cotton allotments on a semihistorical basis, and, as I said before, the Farm Bureau comes along with this 40-percent cropland limitation, in order to revert back to the cropland allotment procedure, which is the thing which caused the trouble in the first place.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. When the hearing was held yesterday before the Rules Committee on an application for a rule, I asked the question whether a man could be cut more than 30 percent, as I understood the bill was explained, and I received the reply that he could not be cut beyond 30 percent.

Mr. WHITE of California. That was a mistake. He can be cut up to 60 percent.

Mr. COLMER. I understand from the gentleman's statement that if a man had a farm of 100 acres and he planted only 20 acres in cotton, that he could not be cut more than 30 percent.

Mr. WHITE of California. In that case he could not, but if a man had 40 acres which he was planting all in cotton, he could be cut 60 percent under this Cooley resolution now under consideration.

Mr. COLMER. And if he had 100 acres and he was planting all to cotton, he could be cut as much as 60 percent?

Mr. WHITE of California. That is right. Even if he had only 40 acres, and that is all the land he had, and was planting the whole 40 acres to cotton, he could be cut 60 percent under this bill, reducing his cotton acreage to 16 acres.

Mr. COLMER. I understand the gentleman is going to offer an amendment to cut that out?

Mr. WHITE of California. I am going to offer such an amendment, and I hope the distinguished gentleman will support it.

Mr. COLMER. Unless I get further information, I certainly shall.

Mr. WHITE of California. I am glad to hear that. I want to say that I have had considerable assurances from many Members from cotton areas that they will do likewise.

Now, if I may, I would like to dwell for a moment on the supply and demand situation. Many of my friends from the cities have come to me in alarm and said, "Well, what about the increased production that is going to be brought about by the additional production provided under this resolution which we are now considering?"

There is nothing to be alarmed about in the amount of cotton we have on hand. Even with the adoption of this resolution, and with the increased production that would come from it, it is assumed we will still have only 8,000,000 bales of cotton carried over at the end of the coming season. Now, that is not alarming. That is below the average of the last 10 years. I might say to you that it is normal. After all, if you are going to have a healthy condition in the cotton business, you must have what is known as a normal carry-over because the mills cannot just go out and take any kind of cotton. They must have a certain grade and staple. In order for the mills to get their requirements, we used to say before the last war that it took a 5,000,000-bale carry-over to supply the ordinary demand. That is something that many people do not realize.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. We have more than the normal carry-over on hand now, have we not?

Mr. WHITE of California. Well, it is less than the 10-year average.

Mr. GAVIN. How many bales of cotton do we have on hand now?

Mr. WHITE of California. I cannot quote you the figures right this minute, but under this legislation it will be 8,000,000 bales at the end of the season.

Mr. GAVIN. That is more than the normal carry-over, is it not?

Mr. WHITE of California. No; it is not. It is less than the 10-year average carry-over.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one-half minute.

Mr. Chairman, I suggested that some member of the committee, the chairman or someone selected by him, should explain the bill. The first sentence of section 1 of House Joint Resolution 398 states:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1928.

Section 3 begins:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of section 363 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1928.

Section 4 states:

> Notwithstanding any provision of law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield myself another half minute.

Section 5 states:

> Notwithstanding any other provisions of law.

I would like to have the chairman of the committee or someone designated by him to explain the bill, because I am sure the membership of the House would like to really hear what these "notwithstandings" mean that are contrary to existing law. I trust that the chairman will go ahead with an explanation of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, after long and careful consideration by able and distinguished members of a subcommittee and later by all of the members of the Committee on Agriculture, the cotton-quota law of 1949 was brought before the House. You will recall it met with little or any opposition. Early in January, realizing that the cotton-quota law had to be rewritten, I appointed a cotton subcommittee and designated the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] as chairman of that subcommittee. Frankly, I do not believe that any bill which has been before our committee received more careful consideration and over a longer period of time than the cotton-quota law of 1949. We were faced with a rather unusual and uncertain situation. No cotton-quota program had been in effect since 1942 and we were woefully lacking in pertinent information; but notwithstanding that, we set about to provide the necessary control machinery which would enable farmers to bring production somewhat nearer in line with reasonable consumer demands. Laboring under very difficult circumstances, we did the very best we could to write a law which would be fair and equitable.

Many important factors could not be evaluated properly. We had no way of knowing the ultimate effect of the provision which was made for the protection of the little farmer. We had no way of knowing the far-reaching and ultimate effect of the provision which was made for the protection of farmers who had diverted their acreage from cotton to the production of war crops. The change from a historic base to the cropland approach was likewise responsible for many of the difficulties encountered. Actually, I do not believe that any Member of Congress did know or could possibly have known the final result which would be accomplished. Neither do I believe that anyone in the Department of Agriculture knew or could have known the full and final effect of all of these uncertain factors. Believing, however, that fair and equitable results would be achieved, we reported the bill and urged its approval. In the war-crop provision we were only keeping faith with cotton farmers who had voluntarily diverted their acreage from the production of cotton to the production of a more essential commodity. The bill was highly technical and contained many provisions and gadgets which were provided in an effort to take care of particular situations and trends. Special consideration was accorded the State of California and another provision was inserted to protect the farmers of Oklahoma. When the bill came before the House, you will recall that after a very brief explanation, I yielded almost all of the time to the distinguished and able chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]. I am sure that all of you will agree that the bill was well and fully explained and that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] gave the explanation in superb fashion. Certainly, none of us intended for the law to result in hardships or inequities; but all of us thought and believed that the burdens of the law would fall evenly upon those who were expected to contribute to the reduction program.

It was not until the law was actually put into operation that we discovered that the program would be unfair and

that it would actually result in hardships. When the program was applied and the little-grower provision and the other provisions of the law had been put into operation, we realized the full force and effect of the action which had been taken. The matter was first called to my attention by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP], who had received a telephone call from a friend of his who had advised him concerning the operations of the mechanics of the law when actually applied in the field. Upon receiving this information from the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP], I called officials of the Department of Agriculture to my office for a conference. I conferred with an official of the Legal Branch, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the Cotton Section, and others. Much to my surprise and to the surprise of other members of the committee, the information which had been passed on to us by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP] was unfortunately substantially correct. Our committee then conferred further and finally decided to try to amend the Agriculture Act of 1949 which was then pending in the Senate so as to increase county reserves from 10 percent to 15 percent. That amendment was offered in the Senate, retained in conference, and became a part of that law. But even this additional provision did not prove sufficient to take care of the situation, and we still find it necessary to make further provisions.

In the quota law of 1949 we provided an acreage reserve of 10 percent of the State allotment and with the amendment which I have just mentioned a reserve of 15 percent of the county allotment, which together amounted to almost one-fourth of the allotted acreage. This reserve acreage should have been used in adjusting allotments and in eliminating inequities, but unfortunately some of the State committees and some of the county committees reserved only a very small part of the acreage which we intended should actually be used in bringing about a fair and equitable distribution of the acreage among farmers. Some States reserved as little as 3 percent, and some county committees made no reservation at all. As a result, while most of the farmers are satisfied with their allotments, a large number of farmers are not only dissatisfied but are distressed over the fact that they might be forced to reduce their acreage as much as 75 or 85 percent—a reduction which was certainly not even remotely contemplated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time for the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself six additional minutes.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and the members of the Committee on Agriculture of the House for the painstaking care with which they have handled this particular subject. As a result of the bill which was passed last year there were certain inequities. The committee has attempted to alleviate these inequities. I shall support House Resolution 398 because I think it will alleviate the present situation. I urge its immediate adoption because of the cotton planting which is going to take effect within the next 60 days. I think we should work with dispatch for the early enactment of this legislation.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Several gentlemen have referred to inequities. Will the gentleman tell the House what those inequities are?

Mr. COOLEY. I will try.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WHITE of California. Would it not be advisable when the gentleman refers to inequities to be rectified by this resolution to say that he is referring to inequities as between the farmers and not as between counties and States?

Mr. COOLEY. Oh, yes. There is no inequity at the State level or the county level. All inequities come about because within a county after consideration had been given to the little grower and to the war-crop provision, and they were faced with having to make a reduction, there was no acreage there to give to these people, to the farmers who should have been entitled to an acreage allotment.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. What percentage would the 5-acre farmer and the 15-acre farmer comprise of the whole of the cotton farmers?

Mr. COOLEY. I cannot give the gentleman accurate information in that regard. That is one thing that was uncertain at the time we passed this legislation. When a large group of farmers who planted under 5 acres are not required to make any contribution at all and another group only a slight contribution, a lot of acreage would be involved.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman has spoken of protecting the small farmer. I think he means by that the small landowner. Is it not true that the small tenant farmer has been forced to leave the farm and go to the city because of the provisions of this bill we passed last year?

Mr. COOLEY. I was going to say that the larger farmer or the person who had traditionally been planting a larger percentage of his crop in cotton has been forced to take a larger reduction. The larger farmer in North Carolina or Georgia, after all, is just so many tenant farmers. It has had a very devastating effect in some sections where land is cultivated by tenants.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand the gentleman, under the act of 1949 they took care of the small farmers, the 5-acre and the 15-acre farmer, and they used up most of the cotton allocation or acreage in making that distribution. The purpose of this bill, as I understand the gentleman, is to take care of the larger farmers who have tenants so that they can get more cotton land on which to plant cotton?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows that was not our intention. We intended in good faith to see that this reserve be used to adjust inequities; but the lack of uniformity resulted because we had given wide discretion to the local committees, believing that the local committees could be well trusted to administer the law. Unfortunately a lot of the members of the committees had never had any experience with control programs and instead of making the necessary reservations and making the necessary adjustments, they disposed of the acreage by passing it out uniformly. It does have the effect the gentleman mentioned. It is going to increase the acreage, the total over-all acreage, a minimum of 1,400,000 acres, but I feel that is well justified in the name of justice and fair play because none of us intended that this law should work a hardship on any tenant or any citizen. We thought it was going to fall evenly and uniformly on all farmers, tenants included.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman knows that it was the intent of the committee writing the act of 1949, with an allotment of 21,000,000 acres, that it would take care of all of these situations that the gentleman has mentioned. Now, why has not the Department down here given orders to the county and the State committees to make this distribution?

Mr. COOLEY. I know exactly what the gentleman has in mind. I think the gentleman knows that we intentionally gave the discretion to the local committees in the States and in the counties. Now, I am not going to complain because the administration did not direct those committees in the exercise of that discretion, and had Mr. Woolley or Mr. Trigg or Mr. Brannan ordered the committees to act uniformly in all circumstances and situations, the gentleman and I would be the first to complain. But I do not think we could complain about the administration here in Washington. The trouble came about back home, and I am not questioning the good faith of the local committees, because I think they did what they thought was right under the circumstances.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. As the gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE] indicated a moment ago, the difficulty occurred when we got down to the individual farmer after the allocation had been made to the counties. There we saw how it actually applied to the individual farmer, and we saw these inequities develop. The question arose about the BAE figures and adjusted figures. Will the gentleman, or someone on the committee, explain just how this resolution will work, because we have heard so much about the Secretary of Agriculture not doing this or that? I think the record should be made clear just what this resolution will do and how it will work on an individual-farm basis.

Mr. COOLEY. I compliment the gentleman from Arkansas for meeting here with us last fall and upon his great interest in the cotton farmer and in the success of this measure.

Mr. HARRIS. I, too, want to commend the gentleman and his committee for taking immediate action in this matter to correct the situation.

Mr. COOLEY. While I am anxious for every provision of the pending resolution to be explained fully and while I would be very glad to explain each and every section and the effect of it, I prefer not to yield myself any more time but rather to yield to other members of the committee, all of whom are thoroughly familiar with all of the facts and circumstances involved and with all of the provisions of this resolution. I am especially anxious for the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], chairman of the subcommittee, to have ample time to discuss this very important matter. I conclude by saying that cotton-planting time is now at hand. None of us should be willing to tolerate the very deplorable situation which is now confronting many of the cotton farmers of the Nation and all of us should be anxious to correct and to alleviate the inequities and hardships which will result in the event this resolution is not enacted.

Before the referendum was held on December 15, I conferred with the members of my committee and with officials of the Department and we explored every possible avenue in the hope that relief might be afforded which would obviate the necessity of legislation but after conferring for many long hours we all concluded that an amendment to the law was necessary. I therefore announced that I would introduce a resolution, substantially in the form of the resolution now before the House, and I further stated that I would do all I could to secure its passage. Notwithstanding the lack of uniformity in allotments and notwithstanding the hardships which might be involved, the cotton farmers of the Nation, having faith in the Members of their Congress, voted favorably in the referendum. I hope, therefore, that this resolution may be passed in its present form and I urge every Member of this House to vote for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT].

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I think there is a lack of understanding about what is referred to as the inequities in this program. I want to use one illustration that can be applied, I think, in every county in east Texas, and probably the entire State. Likely similar illustrations can be found in any cotton-growing county in the United States.

There is one man who has been planting cotton in the river bottom on the Trinity River in my home county for 35 or 40 years. He has been planting between 400 and 600 acres of cotton per year. Under the allocation to that farm under present law he is going to be allowed to plant about 68 acres for the year 1950.

Now, what does that mean? It means that the 8 to 12 families who have been living on that farm helping to grow 400 to 600 acres of cotton per year; who have profited when the price was good and suffered when the price was bad; who have stayed with the landlord who has carried them through good times and bad; it means that a majority of those families are going to have to get off of the cotton farm and into another business, unless that cotton farm can be allocated some additional acreage for 1950. Now, that is one illustration.

Another illustration is that there are numbers of small, independent farmers who live in my section of the State—and I think it is true throughout the entire Cotton Belt—who grow anywhere from 10 to 25 or 35 acres of cotton on their own farm. It may be good land or poor land; the yield may be high or it may be low; but, that is their business, that is their stable source of income. Under the allocation of cotton acreage given them under present law, those farms are cut down to the point where the man who previously grew 10 acres of cotton now will be able to plant only 4 or 5. The 25- or 30-acre man is reduced down to where he may be allocated 10 or 12 acres. You cannot make a living in the cotton business in the country where I come from on any such a cut as that. That is an illustration of the inequities we are talking about in this program.

My interest in this matter, as well as the interest of every other man who wants to do equity, is to provide in this bill here a floor below which we do not reduce that man who has to make his living growing cotton, because he does not have time between now and planting time to get into any other kind of agricultural production that he can make a living from in 1950.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman feel that the resolution before us does not take care of the situation he has mentioned?

Mr. PICKETT. I do not believe it is going to do everything that is needed, but I would rather have a little bit of something than a whole lot of nothing. So I am going to support this proposal.

I want to ask a question of somebody who helped write this bill. You have restrictions in here that provide that no farm shall be allocated less than 70 percent of the land actually planted to cotton for the three base years or not less than 50 percent of the highest planted in any one of those 3 years. Is that the correct statement, in principle, of what you are writing?

Mr. COOLEY. That is, and war crops will be taken into consideration in connection with both provisions, the 70-percent and also the 50-percent provision.

Mr. PICKETT. One thing that has tangled this situation up so badly is that we had to resort to BAE figures. Is it the intent and purpose of this provision we are considering here now to take this 70 percent and the 50 percent, including war-crop figures, and apply it to the land, or are we still going to have to resort to BAE figures?

Mr. COOLEY. We provide for the right of an appeal by any farmer who is dissatisfied. To use an illustration, suppose a man has been given his allotment based on a history of 60 acres, and he ends up with say 35. They readjust that by giving him 70 percent of the 60 acres, or 42.

Mr. PICKETT. I understand what the chairman of the committee is driving at, and I can answer it.

Mr. COOLEY. Then when he goes before the review committee, he can actually offer the proof to change the original figures upon which the original allotment was made.

Mr. PICKETT. I understand that. Can the chairman tell me whether we are going to have to use BAE figures to appeal from? If it does mean that, that is not going to help the situation much. The reason is BAE figures may be reasonably accurate on the national and State level, but they do not apply to the amount of acreage as actually planted on the farm.

Mr. COOLEY. You appeal from the BAE figures.

Mr. PICKETT. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. Then you go to the appeal committee and prove that the BAE figures are wrong.

Mr. PICKETT. There is another question I would like to ask. When you get over here to the point where you are going to permit voluntary reallocations, is the man who is going to voluntarily permit the acreage he does not want to plant in 1950 to be reallocated by the county committee to some farmer in that county who does want to plant the acreage going to lose his credit in the 1951 allocations?

Mr. COOLEY. The farmer himself loses the credit.

Mr. PICKETT. That is a different provision than that you had written in your tentative draft on the day this group met before your committee back earlier in January.

Mr. COOLEY. The provision is now different from what it was in the original resolution. Under the provision now, the farmer who voluntarily surrenders the acreage gives it up; but if it is reallocated on a certificate to some fellow in good faith who promises to plant it, then that acreage remains in the county, if in future years the 1950 acreage is used in the program.

Mr. PICKETT. Yes; but does the farmer who permits his acreage to be

reallocated in 1950 lose all his right to any acreage at all in 1951?

Mr. COOLEY. No.

Mr. PICKETT. All right. Then it is the intention that if he voluntarily reallocates his acreage in 1950 he still gets his percentage of the factor in 1951?

Mr. COOLEY. No, no; by surrendering it he contributes to the county allotment in the subsequent year and he participates in the larger county allotment just as the others do.

Mr. PICKETT. Will he be considered a new farmer in 1951?

Mr. COOLEY. No; he would not be considered a new farmer.

Mr. PICKETT. He would be considered a cotton farmer just the same as though he had planted his 1950 acreage?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee which wrote the cotton law of 1949.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I should first like to comment briefly on the last question propounded by the gentleman from Texas. It should be remembered that in order to maintain your history as a cotton producer you are required to plant cotton in only 1 of 3 years. The planting on the farm during the 1 or the 2 or the 3 years is important for two reasons only. One is when you plant it on your farm you naturally give the county credit for it and bring that into the county allotment. Secondly, you cannot be allotted more than what you have been planting in the past with some specific exceptions. Consequently under section 3 of the bill, I might say to the gentleman from Texas, the provision is that if an allocation has been made to a farmer who does not intend to plant cotton, either in part or in whole, he may surrender that acreage back to his local county committee for reallocation to other farms within the county. It may then be allocated to other cotton farms in that county on the application of a producer that he has not received an adequate allotment and that he intends to plant the additional acreage if it is allotted to them. That means that such of the surrendered acreage as is allotted to other growers and is planted within the county, the county will get credit for it in future years and thus preserve that acreage for the county.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Georgia yield for a question?

Mr. PACE. I yield very briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. PICKETT. Let us assume that this man who, in 1950, permits his acreage to go to the county committee and suppose he is allocated 10 acres, where does he stand in 1951 with reference to those 10 acres?

Mr. PACE. He will stand, I might say, almost where he was before. There is but one farmer who cannot afford to surrender his 1950 cotton allotment and that is the farmer who did not plant cotton in either 1947 or 1948 because in that case 1950 is his third year and he must plant that allotment or else be classed as a new producer in 1951. But if he has planted cotton in 1948 or 1947 and is given a 10-acre allotment, he can surrender every acre of it and if some other farmer plants it he and his county will be in identically the same position in 1951 as he is in today.

Mr. Chairman, may I go back a little, because I think to fully understand this new law you ought to have a very brief statement of what has been the law for the last 10 or 11 years. The original Cotton Quota Act was passed in 1938. I should like to say it has been amended many times. Those of you who have any feeling of complaint about our asking for these amendments so soon after the new law was passed should understand that the Committee on Agriculture will be here often. The act of 1938 was amended many times. This will also be amended. It is no more and can be no more than trial and error when you are dealing with millions of people and when your records are somewhat inadequate than an attempt to write a law which will be as satisfactory to as many people as possible. It is impossible at any one time to write a perfect law. The chances are you will put wheat under quotas next year. If so I dare say that the wheat producers will be here next year, or perhaps later this year, asking for amendments to the wheat laws which have been on the books for years. There is a chance that corn will be put under quotas next year. I dare say that 30 days after corn is put under quotas they will come in here asking for many amendments to the law. Why? Because you are dealing with a changing scene. You are dealing with so many millions of people. Consequently, there cannot be anything but trial and error.

I think on the whole we produced a good bill. We did it with all the information we had. There had been no quotas since 1942. We had no farm records. We had no county records. We had no national records. We did the best we could. Maybe we were wrong. Maybe we were right. You have all complained about the bureaucrats in Washington. You have all talked about regimenting the farmers, and maybe with some merit. When we drew this law, as best we could, we provided that the Secretary of Agriculture should allocate to each State its fair proportion of the national acreage allotment for cotton under a formula set out in the law. Having done that, he was through with it. We then moved all the authority down to the State, down to the county, down to the home people. That is where we placed it. We placed in them the discretion, we placed in them the administration of the law.

Why are we here? We are here because the law was passed late in the session. We are here because it is a new law. The Department itself had difficulty in preparing regulations in time. We are here because they had no records of cotton acreage since 1942. They were not accumulating records. We are here because the farmers themselves, who constitute your PMA committees, at least 50 percent of them, had never administered a program of this character. They were new in office. Many of the administrative officers themselves were new, and had not had any experience with quota programs. They did not do a good job, in some instances, down at the farm level. As I told you, the old law had been amended many times. The old law was full of these gadgets. The old law provided, for instance——

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-one Members are present; not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 24]

Abbitt	Hall,	Powell
Arends	Leonard W.	Price
Auchincloss	Halleck	Quinn
Bailey	Hand	Rabaut
Barden	Hart	Rains
Barrett, Pa.	Hays, Ohio	Ramsay
Beall	Hébert	Redden
Bennett, Fla.	Heffernan	Rees
Bentsen	Heller	Ribicoff
Bland	Herter	Rich
Blatnik	Hinshaw	Richards
Boggs, La.	Hobbs	Rivers
Bolling	Hoffman, Ill	Rogers, Fla.
Bolton, Ohio	Hope	Rogers, Mass.
Breen	James	Roosevelt
Brown, Ga.	Javits	Sabath
Buchanan	Jennings	Sadlak
Buckley, N. Y.	Jonas	Sadowski
Bulwinkle	Judd	St. George
Burdick	Kearns	Sanborn
Burke	Keating	Saylor
Burton	Kelley, Pa.	Scott, Hardie
Byrne, N. Y.	Kelly, N. Y.	Scott,
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Hugh D., Jr.
Cavalcante	Keogh	Scrivner
Celler	Kirwan	Scudder
Chudoff	Klein	Secrest
Clemente	Kunkel	Shafer
Cole, Kans.	Lane	Sheppard
Corbett	Latham	Short
Coudert	LeFevre	Simpson, Pa.
Crosser	Lesinski	Smathers
Davies, N. Y.	Lichtenwalter	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Tenn.	Lodge	Smith, Ohio
Dawson	Lynch	Stanley
Delaney	McCulloch	Stockman
Dingell	McMillan, S. C.	Sutton
Dollinger	Macy	Taber
Donohue	Marcantonio	Taylor
Doughton	Marshall	Thomas
Douglas	Mason	Tollefson
Durham	Miller, Md.	Towe
Eaton	Miller, Nebr.	Underwood
Ellsworth	Monroney	Van Zandt
Engel, Mich.	Morgan	Vinson
Engle, Calif.	Morrison	Vorys
Fallon	Morton	Vursell
Feighan	Moulder	Wadsworth
Fellows	Multer	Wagner
Forand	Murphy	Walsh
Fulton	Norton	Weichel
Furcolo	O'Toole	Werdel
Gamble	Patman	White, Idaho
Gary	Patten	Wier
Gilmer	Pfeifer,	Wigglesworth
Gorski	Joseph L.	Wood
Granahan	Pfeiffer,	Woodhouse
Granger	William L.	Worley
Green	Philbin	
Gwinn	Phillips, Tenn.	
Hall,	Plumley	
Edwin Arthur	Poulson	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 398, and finding itself without a quorum, he directed the roll to be called, when 254 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. At the time the Committee was interrupted by the point of order of no quorum, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] had 3½ minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Georgia 10 additional minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, that I may ask the majority leader a question?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the majority leader if he has anything to contribute to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday will be a continuation of the bill now under consideration, under the 5-minute rule, if the general debate has been disposed of today, as it is hoped.

Tuesday, H. R. 3001, the admission of aliens of certain skills.

Wednesday, Calendar Wednesday.

Thursday and Friday, H. R. 616, which provides for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States; and S. 88, amending section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act.

Any conference reports that may come in, of course, will be brought up.

If there are to be any changes made, I will advise the gentleman from Massachusetts and the House just as soon as I possibly can.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank you.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman resumes discussion of the bill will he yield for a consent request?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the right to extend their remarks on the bill under consideration immediately following the speech of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, at the time of the interruption I had mentioned the fact that in the old law were provisions which we commonly referred to as gadgets, which assured each county of not less than 60 percent of its 1937 planted and diverted cotton acreage, each farm not less than 50 percent of the 1937 planted and diverted acreage, and other provisions. These were the provisions which resulted in building up the acreage to an extent that under the old law the Secretary was limited to a minimum national acreage allotment of 27,500,000 acres of cotton. Naturally, no one, when the farmer has been planting less acreage than that, wanted to stay under a law which would require him to allocate 27,500,000. That was one of the principal reasons why it became necessary to rewrite the act. Those gadgets, those provisions, had caused much trouble. The Department of Agriculture, the Secretary, his predecessor, now Senator ANDERSON, and all the members of this committee realized that it was necessary to get rid, if possible, of these numerous gadgets in the old law. We did that, we wiped them out completely. But at the same time we realized that it was impossible to sit in Washington and meet every situation at the farm level. The committee thought that it would be better to provide for State and county reserves so that, when you gave my State of Georgia a million acres of cotton, for example, the State committee could reserve in its hands and distribute to the counties as much as 10 percent of the State allotment to meet the situation where there had been a trend in the production of cotton in one part of the State as distinguished from another, for meeting special allotments to new farms, and for building up the allotments for small farms. That was one provision. The other provision was that when the county received its allotment, say, of 10,000 acres of cotton, that the county committee could reserve 15 percent, which in that instance would be 1,500 acres, to be specially allocated within the county for the purpose of bringing about an equitable distribution of the cotton allotments after the original allotment had been made on a cropland basis, for hardship cases, new and small farms.

We retained in this law the principle of allocating cotton acreage according to a percentage of cropland. We did it for several reasons; the first was that it had been law; since 1938 cotton allotments had always been made on the basis of a percentage of the cropland; secondly, the Department, the committee, and no one else had any records on which to make an allocation purely on the basis of history, that is, exactly how many acres had been planted on each farm. No records were kept during the war, none had been kept from 1942 through 1948. The Congress through the years has worked to advance the cause of soil conservation by the rotation of crops; and, frankly, this committee is committed to the principle that it is not a healthy thing for a man to devote his entire farm or the major portion of it to the continuous cultivation of cotton. That was one of the persuasive reasons for the committee to retain the cropland factor.

What happened? Why are we here? We gave the State committees the authority to retain 10 percent of the State allotment to take care of the conditions I have mentioned. Some of the State committees did. Others in their wisdom did not.

We gave the county committees the right to reserve 15 percent to take care of hardship cases and to bring about some uniformity, taking into account the past production of cotton on the farms. Some of them reserved the 15 percent, some of them reserved 10 percent, some of them reserved 5 percent, and some in their wisdom reserved zero percent.

It is largely in the areas where the reservation by the county and State committees was not up to the full amount authorized by law that these complaints have arisen. You may say, "Well, that is a matter of local administration and they should bear the burden." No; that is not the fault of the cotton grower. It was a new law. There were many new committees. They were farmers charged with a responsibility which was new to them. I am quite sure that for the most part they did an honest job, the best they could, but in many instances they brought about gross inequities.

Mr. Chairman, the complaints became general throughout the cotton area. In November the complaints started. There was unrest, there was discontent. The State of Texas had been brought under what we know as the California gadget when the committee had no intention of bringing that State under the gadget and had been told it would not come under it. There was revolt throughout the State of Texas. There were serious complaints in other areas.

Our distinguished chairman became concerned, I became concerned, as to whether this discontent was sufficient to defeat a referendum. Let us see about that. In my judgment, a defeat of the referendum or failure to approve the quotas on cotton would have had two consequences.

First, it would have wrecked the economy of the South. It would have had the effect of striking the price of cotton from 30 to 15 cents a pound. In my State and in many of the other States of this Nation you cannot today produce a pound of cotton for 15 cents. It would have wrecked the whole economy of the Cotton Belt.

Secondly, the Government owns 3,750,000 bales of cotton in which it has invested approximately $150 or $160 a bale. If the referendum had been defeated, it would have had the effect of striking the price of cotton from 30 to 15 cents a pound and your Government, in effect, would have lost overnight from $75 to $100 per bale on 3,750,000 bales of cotton, beside the additional losses that would have been sustained on the loan cotton they had taken and are taking under the 1949 crop. So, if the referendum had been defeated, our Government alone could have lost as much as $600,000,000 besides wrecking the economy of the cotton-producing States.

Our chairman became concerned and called us to Washington in a special meeting. We came here. We looked into the question. We heard the complaints. Many Members of Congress from the cotton-growing States met us here. As a result of that meeting we issued a public statement in the name of the committee—the chairman did—that so far as the cotton farmers of this Nation were concerned we realized there were inequities that had been brought about and at the convening of the Congress we would immediately ask the Congress to take prompt action to correct those inequities. We stated that our recommendations would be what you will find in section 1 of this resolution; that is, that every producer would receive a cotton-acreage allotment of not less than 70 percent of his average cotton acreage in 1946, 1947, and 1948, and not less than 50 percent of his highest plant in any one of those years.

That responsibility is not yours and I do not intend to put it upon you. The responsibility is that of the committee you have charged with the task of writing this legislation. Personally, I think the action of our committee here in early December before the referendum on December 15 contributed to the vote in the

referendum. Frankly, for my part, we are completely obligated now to carry out the statement we issued before the farmers voted, realizing the consequences of a defeat of the referendum. The farmers marched to the polls on the 15th day of December, and approximately 90 percent went down the line, voted for quotas, and many of them with cotton allotments which they knew were not fair or equitable, for the reasons I have stated, and they now turn to the Congress and I, in their behalf, turn to you to fulfill what I consider an obligation which is no more, thank goodness, that being fair and equitable among all the cotton growers of the Nation.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman knows that I have worked diligently on this matter for some time, and met with the Committee on Agriculture trying to help meet and solve this problem. I want to commend the gentleman for the splendid effort and the hard work that he has devoted to the subject. I believe the pending resolution will improve the existing situation, although I realize the time is very limited, and I hope the gentleman will have an opportunity to point out the improvements contemplated under this resolution as against the present program.

Mr. PACE. I thank the gentleman. I will undertake to do that now, and I must express my appreciation to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] for the help he has given our committee and the tireless efforts he has made to bring about a fair and equitable distribution of the cotton acreage to all cotton farmers.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CAMP. I have followed the gentleman very closely, and I am very glad to hear him say that he feels that it is the desire of Congress, especially his committee, to carry out and give the farmers what they were told they would get before they voted on the act. Now, the gentleman says that this resolution undertakes to give them at least 70 percent of their cotton acreage.

Mr. PACE. Seventy percent of the 3-year average?

Mr. CAMP. Yes. I note in the bill there is this provision:

Provided, That this section shall not operate to increase the cotton-acreage allotment of any farm above 40 percent of the acreage on such farm which is tilled annually.

Mr. PACE. I can explain the views of the committee on that, and realize the gentleman's deep interest in that subject.

Mr. CAMP. Well, I just want to ask this question. Please explain this. Under that section will it not, in many instances, result in a farmer getting from 40 to 50 percent of the cotton he has been planting?

Mr. PACE. Unquestionably it will have that result, if that farmer has devoted a very high percentage of his total cultivated land—not the adjusted acreage, but his total cultivated land in cotton.

Mr. CAMP. That is right.

Mr. PACE. But the committee feels that the county in which that farmer lives—say it is my home county, Sumter County, Ga.—has already received its full quota under the allocation, there is no complaint here about State allotments and very few complaints about county allotments; but my county has already received every acre it is entitled to. Now we propose under this resolution to give it a little more to meet these hardship cases, and we say, when we add this acreage and give this producer a special allotment of more acreage, that we feel no obligation to give him an allotment that will put more than 40 percent of his entire farm in cotton, and, to do so would add hundreds of thousands of more acres to the land planted in cotton. We must stop somewhere.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. PACE. May I say further to my distinguished colleague that that 40-percent provision has been in the law since 1938. It is nothing new in the law. We picked it up out of the old law, and we have continued the same language word for word, that is, the language of the old law.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. I would like at this time to register a complaint, if none has been registered, insofar as the county acreage is concerned. Now, I would like to inquire of the gentleman, because I have very great respect for his judgment, as I think he is the most well-posted man in this Congress on agricultural matters——

Mr. PACE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARE. Is it his opinion that under the proposed resolution now before us that the allocations of acreage to the individual farmers and to the counties will be made on the actual acreage they plant or on BAE's statistics?

Mr. PACE. I will have to answer rather briefly because of the limitation of time. It is recognized that in many instances the BAE figures are not accurate. The BAE figures were never intended for use under a quota system. It is admitted that all they are is the best the Department can get through the years from the hands of a few people in each county. Now we have provided in this resolution that any farmer who is dissatisfied with the allotment he gets, by reason of his base acreage or for any other reason, may, within 15 days after the approval of this resolution, file an appeal to the review committee, having in the meantime, if he desired, gone to his county committee to try to get relief, and if he cannot get it there, to go to the review committee and submit such proof as he has to show that his base acreage is wrong, and if it is found to be wrong, then it is the duty of the review committee to adjust it and give him an increased allotment.

Mr. HARE. I appreciate the gentleman's observation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that the reason the difficulty has arisen over the question of BAE figures and actual planted acres and adjusted figures is the fact that there are no BAE figures on the individual farm?

Mr. PACE. None whatever.

Mr. HARRIS. It applies to the county and the State, not to any of the individual farms?

Mr. PACE. You have almost the exact acres on a national basis, you have almost correct figures on a State basis, you have rather good figures on a crop-reporting district basis, but when you pass that point, which is some 8 or 10 counties, and get down to the county and the farm level, it is entirely a matter of estimates and of speculation. But that is all they had.

Mr. HARRIS. That is where the county committees had the difficulty in trying to adjust the present law.

Mr. PACE. That is one reason we are here today. That is all the record they had, and they did the best they could.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Georgia had no idea that I was going to ask him to yield to make the observation that I am about to make.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], as we all know, is not only one of the best-liked Members of the House but one of the most valuable Members of the House on all types of legislation coming before this great body of which we are all proud to be Members.

In addition, from the angle of agriculture, he is probably one of the outstanding experts of the country. We all thoroughly respect him as a gentleman and as a legislator, we value him as a friend, and we have deep respect for him for his honest and frank discussion of agricultural matters not only today but throughout the years.

I am very sorry to hear, and I hope the people of his district will prompt him to change his mind, that he has decided not to seek reelection again. In these trying days we need trained and experienced legislators to help meet not only the problems of our country but the grave problems of the world. I am not going to ask the gentleman from Georgia to make any observation because he had no knowledge that I was going to make these remarks, but I do hope, for whatever value my observation may be to the people of his district, that they will realize that he is deeply respected and admired by his colleagues of both parties throughout the entire country. While he comes from a congressional district in Georgia, he enjoys the respect of the Representatives of all the congressional districts of the country, north, east, south, and west. I hope the people of his district, as they have exercised sound judgment and wisdom in the past in

electing him to this body, will exercise sound judgment and wisdom in urging, in fact, demanding that he run and be reelected again.

Mr. PACE. Of course, the gentleman knows I am most grateful for his comments.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this amendment which we are considering here today is of the utmost importance and urgency to the cotton farmers of my district, the Fifth District of Tennessee. It would be impossible to describe the consternation which prevailed generally in my district—but especially in three counties, Lincoln, Giles, and Franklin Counties—when the cotton-acreage allotments were announced and made known last fall.

The cotton farmers of my district were cut in amounts far greater than the national average—and far greater than cotton-producing sections comparable and adjacent. The financial loss which these producers stand to experience unless some changes are worked out in the law will be so far out of proportion to other producers as to constitute unfairness and discrimination under the law.

I should like to cite an example of the discrimination which has developed under the present statute. The three counties of my district which have been hardest hit by the new acreage allotments are all adjacent to the State line of Alabama. Riding along on the highways it would be impossible to tell from the terrain and general type and quality of the crops when you have crossed the Tennessee line and entered the State of Alabama. This entire region of my district is as much a part of the Cotton Belt as any other section of the South. The region of my district of which I speak and the adjacent region in Alabama are all in the basin of the Elk River and for many years the farmers there have based their entire farm economy on cotton crops.

Yet, under the cotton-acreage allotments, the cotton farmers in this area specifically, and my district generally, have been dealt with most drastically and have been given extremely low allotments while their neighbors across the State line who raise the same crop on the same kind of soil have been given a much higher allotment. The low allotments presently authorized will play havoc with the cotton farmers in my district—but just as important as that, these farmers of the Fifth District are the victims of unequal treatment under this program.

It is only fair and just and right, in order to end these inequities which have developed under this program, that an amendment be made to the Cotton Acreage Allotment Act which not only will increase the acreage allotment for the cotton farmers of the Fifth District of Tennessee—but provide them with equal treatment to comparable and adjacent areas in other States.

I am supporting this amendment here today in the belief that it may provide the relief that is so greatly needed in this connection for our cotton farmers. The bill may not provide all the relief desired but it will certainly help. If we do not do something here today for these cotton farmers we are going to see many cotton producers both large and small hurt financially to a great extent. To allow this situation to prevail is to invite conditions of bad times which is not in the interest of the South or of the Nation as a whole.

I sincerely trust that the House here today will move in the right direction to correct this situation—action cannot be delayed because these farmers have a right to know what to expect far enough in advance of the planting season to give them an opportunity to plan ahead. Action is needed and action without delay is imperative.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I am twice honored to say a few words on this resolution. It is an honor to follow my great friend, the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] to whom you have given such a hand this afternoon, and second, to speak on a general plan of acreage control wherein the producer enters into programs voluntarily.

To begin with, I want to disqualify myself as an expert on cotton. As a member of this subcommittee, as my subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] will tell you, I missed very few meetings if it were at all possible to attend. The problems that face us on cotton-acreage control are exactly the same problems and contain all the elements which will face us when we begin to talk about curtailing wheat acreage. They are exactly the same problems that our friends from the Corn Belt will have when they come into the Well of the House and say, "We must have some type of a corn-acreage-control program.

So I am not surprised and I do not think a single Member of the House should be surprised, even if he comes from the city, that the Committee on Agriculture is here today to change or amend this law. To me the surprise is that we are asking so few changes. We are trying to legislate from the top. We are planning rules and regulations which will affect the farmer at the individual end of the production line of food and commodities. How can you expect a legislative body such as we are to set up regulations such as we are now considering without getting into difficulties? So there is not anything unusual about this resolution. We will encounter many more difficulties as we proceed with acreage-control legislation. This House for the next 5 or 10 years, undoubtedly, will be working on the individual problems concerning the various commodities that we produce. We are only beginning. We should support the experts, who have labored long hours over the detailed provisions in this legislation. Let me pay a compliment here to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]. No man has worked harder. No one has worked longer hours than Mr. PACE on this legislation. When we came to work on wheat-control acreage the cooperation we had from this gentleman was 100 percent. Why? Because he represents agriculture in all its broad amplifications. The House can ill afford to lose the services and the wide experience of such men as Congressman PACE.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of California. I heartily concur in what the distinguished majority leader said. While I may be called upon in the future to buck the gentleman from Georgia on certain things in legislation, I want everybody to know I consider him one of the finest gentlemen I have ever known and probably the greatest authority on agriculture that has ever graced the Halls of the Congress.

Mr. HILL. May I say to my friend, the gentleman from California, that he and I disagree considerably, but we come from a territory where we understand what we mean by bucking and getting bucked off. This afternoon as I sat and listened to the arguments of the Congressmen of Texas, I was happy to see them scrapping amongst themselves. It all adds up to progress.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I am delighted to yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. PICKETT. Let it not be understood that we are scrapping with each other; we are scrapping for each other and for the cotton farmers of America.

Mr. HILL. Might I also add to the statement of my good friend that they are all for this resolution, strange as it may seem, because this is the first step in correcting some of the errors we are bound to make on legislation.

To begin with, we are the only Nation in the world that ever bankrupted its farmers by overproduction. We better learn to live with surpluses. I testified before the Committee on Rules yesterday, and one of the things I said—and I insist it is correct—is that we should not be focusing our attention on the surplus. We should be directing our attention to the disposition of surpluses. That is our job. We can produce the commodities. We know that, but our Department of Agriculture should put its most competent men to work developing programs for the sale and distribution of surpluses. This, gentlemen, they certainly have not done.

Let me give you an illustration on cotton. I am not sure of these figures, but I am sure that at one time we had about 44,000,000 acres of cotton. Today, under this bill, which we passed in 1949, we set cotton acreage up as 21,000,000 acres. That is quite a reduction. That is quite a curtailment. What are you going to do with the little farmer? Put him out of business? That is exactly what you will do if you reduce acreage too drastically. We must take into consideration that a cut from 44,000,000 acres of cotton down to 21,000,000 is a real cut.

Another thing: No more important testimony was ever given before any committee of this House on agriculture than was given by my chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], yesterday before the Rules Committee.

Listen to his statement. I can quote him almost word for word. He said that if we carried out our acreage reduction, as proposed by the Secretary of Agriculture, we will take out of cultivation in these United States 30,000,000 acres of agricultural land. Does that mean anything to you? It means something to every man, woman, and child in the United States. Thirty million acres in a block is larger than the State of Maine. Yet we stand in the well of this House and legislate on acreage reduction as if it were a casual matter when really it may mean total collapse of our economic system if carried to extremes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we can get into difficulties. We are still not legislating for agricultural production when we pass bills and pass rules and regulations. I will tell you who legislates for agricultural production permanently, absolutely, and eternally, and that is Mother Nature in person. She still controls the seasons.

I want to include in my remarks a report from one of my papers which just came in, running under an editorial. Do you know what they said? Here it is:

STATE FACING DROUGHT THREAT

Experts said today that Colorado would have drought or near-drought conditions next summer unless we have a wet late winter and spring.

None would actually predict the weather for the coming months, but all were agreed that the dry fall and early winter was bad.

Only one official was optimistic about the moisture and crop conditions.

Paul Swisher, State agriculture commissioner, said "It's beginning to look pretty bad. I've just been on the western slope, where it's pretty dry and we're beginning to get some wheat damage in the eastern part of the State. There's not enough snow cover in the mountains."

Daniel I. J. Thornton, Gunnison County rancher and Republican State senator, said, "There's a danger of a water shortage if the snow continues short. It's not so bad high in the mountains, but it might be bad lower down near Paonia or Hotchkiss."

William White, Pueblo County rancher and businessman, said "It's dry as hell. Look at what happened at Colorado Springs. Moisture is a whole lot shorter than a year ago. Crops are blowing out east of Pueblo."

Larry Miller, Rogen rancher said, "if we get spring moisture, we'll be okay. If we don't it'll be bad."

All agreed that the wettest part of the winter was yet to come—in February and March.

Floyd K. Reed, statistician with the United States Agriculture Department in Denver, was optimistic.

"I don't take the pessimistic view yet," Reed said. "You tend to overlook the fact that we never get much moisture this time of year. One of our reporters in the driest part of the State said the wheat was fine."

The United States Weather Bureau in Denver called last fall "extremely dry."

"November was one of the driest on record," the recorder said.

A comparison of snow figures around the State shows less snow on the watersheds than last year. "It's some below normal," the recorder said.

The mountain sides in Colorado are literally ready to explode and burn up. Eight men recently lost their lives in a brush fire near Colorado Springs, Colo. You would think it was serious if any of these men were your relation.

Mother Nature will determine whether or not we will have surpluses. We ought to be happy that we have more cotton than we can use; that we have more corn than we can use; and more pork than we can use. We should build a program of selling the surpluses. The Department of Agriculture proposes nothing worthwhile in offering giveaway programs of surplus farm commodities. Sales promotion holds the solution.

I issued a release which I will place in my remarks to show that I am afraid of some of these men who have charge of the disposition of surplus commodities through this period when we have been creating surpluses are not qualified for the important position they now hold.

The release is as follows:

The Department of Agriculture announced yesterday a so-called new pricing policy for the sales abroad of food surpluses owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is quite clear that the announcement does not constitute a new policy, but rather continues the do-nothing approach that has been Brannan technique from the beginning. In building up stocks and surpluses, accompanied by mounting storage charges, and waste through spoilage, Secretary Brannan is not only ignoring the specific directions of Congress but is responsible for the waste of hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money.

During the last session, the Congress directed the Secretary of Agriculture to give particular attention to the establishment of a program for the disposal of accumulated surpluses of food and agricultural commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Specific authority was written into law authorizing the distribution of any of the surpluses to State, county, or local welfare agencies, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs with those agencies assuming transportation and handling costs. The Secretary of Agriculture was also authorized to sell any surpluses in export markets at any price he could obtain or could justify.

Yesterday's announcement does not constitute a program and will not result in the movement of any substantial quantities of our surpluses. Inasmuch as the Commodity Credit Corporation has invested over $3,000,000,000 in food and agricultural stocks and is seeking another $2,000,000,000 in borrowing authority to carry out price-support programs already announced, I believe that Secretary Brannan and the officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation should be the subject of a full and far-reaching investigation. I am requesting the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee to immediately set dates for hearings.

Mr. Chairman, I insist this is no answer to the surplus problem.

It is time we put first things first, Mr. Chairman. There are hundreds of millions of starving people in the world today. I, for one, say that you cannot send money to any country that has a notion to go Communist, and in any way contain communism. The very best program that this Nation could use to block and stop the growth of communism is to assist in providing full stomachs. Plenty of food for poor people from our surpluses certainly would create a feeling of appreciation for our American system.

We know we can produce the food.

Two men were in my office this morning, and they were talking about this very bill. Do you know of what these gentlemen complain? They are afraid that the Department of Agriculture will not allot them the permit to produce an acre of cotton or an acre of peanuts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes to conclude the fine speech he is making.

Mr. HILL. Regardless of the fine speech the gentleman says I am making, I am merely trying to set out the facts that we face. Let us go back to what I was talking about. The Department says to these farmers, "You cannot produce peanuts, you cannot produce cotton, you cannot produce any products that you want to produce, because you have no history of previous production." We have made provision for such cases. But the law has not been properly interpreted. I call your attention to the fact that in great areas of the West, we are bringing in land for cultivation, new lands, and no man can tell what the production may be or what useful commodities may be produced on those lands. These are factors we must think about as we legislate. Let no one be surprised if we come in with other amendments, for we are not dealing with a static situation, and the law is not final in its present form.

I am going to read quickly what certain basic prices were as of January 1, 1948, and give the percentage that represents to the price of last November (New York wholesale prices). For instance, oats per bushel were $1.52 in 1948; last November they were selling for 76 cents a bushel, off about 50 percent. Corn went down from $2.95 a bushel in 1948 to $1.17 as of November 5, 1949, off about 60 percent. Wheat dropped from $3.20 to $2.10, off 33⅓ percent. Cotton per pound dropped from 40 cents in 1948 to 30 cents, off 25 percent. Lard was off 74 percent, and cottonseed oil was off 67 percent; yet some Members tell the House that the farmer is swimming in money, that the banks in agricultural sections are full of money and that the farmer has never had such good times as he is now enjoying. Those statements are only partially true. The figures I have read to you cannot be disputed.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Are the prices the gentleman quoted prices at the table of the consumer or prices on the farm?

Mr. HILL. I did not mention that, but the prices were New York wholesale prices. I was speaking of wholesale prices in New York.

Let me close by quoting further from economic trend line studies; and this goes back to the beginning of my remarks:

The forces of nature are uncontrolled and uncontrollable. The farmer, like the animals and birds, tamed and untamed, has learned to adapt himself to Nature's fickle face.

Before the Nation is another generation older, we will have received again a lesson we have already been given many times and

which we have ignored, namely, that in dealing with agriculture we must reckon first, not with farmers, not with consumers, not with plans for a welfare state, but with that great and all pervading force called nature. Great and strong and pervasive as the influence of the United States Department of Agriculture may be in agriculture, it cannot deal directly with the natural forces that give to and take away from the farmer. Only the men who can walk into the fields and feel the warmth or the wetness of the soil, who can rub heads of wheat between their hands and know its readiness for harvest, who can perform the exacting farm tasks wth consummate skill—only these men can take from nature the abundance that nature is presently being induced to give. It should never be forgotten that our present bounty rests on the agricultural ability of millions of farmers. Unexercised and unencouraged under the cold statistical stipulations of a bloodless bureaucracy, this ability to produce abundantly could in one uninstructed farm generation become only a poignant memory.

Drastic reductions in farm production are long overdue, but the actual cutting back of individual farm crops and products must be done by the farmers themselves. They alone can trim agricultural production as a unit without injuring any part of its efficiency and without destroying its expansibility. Contraction attempted on a piecemeal basis by the Department of Agriculture, based solely on statistical compilations, can only work incalculable harm to what is undoubtedly our greatest national asset.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has again expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have great interest in this resolution because of two facts. First, it does deal with the economy of the great South of this country, and, second, I agree with the gentleman from Colorado that this is a forerunner of what we face in crops which are grown in the central West, in the irrigation and reclamation areas of the far West, as well as some of the other sections of the country.

I have been studying this report and resolution very religiously so as to try to be able to think through some of the situations we will have to deal with as other legislation comes before us under these so-called crop controls which are coming up over the horizon so rapidly in this country.

I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture two or three questions in order to bring us a little better up to date on some of this cotton development. First, what is the greatest number of bales of cotton the Commodity Credit Corporation has ever owned at any one time and the approximate date it was owned by the Corporation and how was that substantially disposed of?

Mr. WHITE of California. In answer to the gentleman's question, 11,000,000 bales in 1939. The way it was disposed of was through the normal channels of trade. I think that can be proved by the fact that previous to our entry into the war the amount of cotton that the Government held August 31, 1941, was only 6,000,000 bales, which was within a million bales of the normal 5,000,000-bale carry-over that prevailed previous to World War I.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman from California pointed out to us earlier in the afternoon that the normal carry-over was something like 8,000,000 bales. Do I understand him to say that prior to the war the normal carry-over was about 5,000,000 bales?

Mr. WHITE of California. That was the normal carry-over at that time. If I may correct the gentleman, I said that the 8,000,000 bales was not the carry-over but it was less than the 10-year average carry-over in the recent past 10 years.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Taking the average 10-year carry-over from 1939 to 1949, as I understand the gentleman, he says that was approximately 8,000,000 bales?

Mr. WHITE of California. No; the average is more than that. The 8,000,000 bales is what we estimate will be on hand at the time of the coming season if the Cooley resolution is adopted.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What was the carry-over at the end of the last cotton year?

Mr. GATHINGS. The carry-over as of August 1, 1949, was 5,287,000 bales.

Mr. CRAWFORD. 5,000,000-plus?

Mr. GATHINGS. 5,287,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What was the production for the crop year of 1949?

Mr. GATHINGS. It is estimated at 16,034,000 bales.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then, as of December 31, or we will say at the end of the harvesting season, you had in sight approximately 21,000,000 bales of cotton?

Mr. GATHINGS. That is correct, 21,321,000 bales. The estimated domestic consumption would be 8,000,000 bales, estimated export 4,500,000 bales, making a total of 12,500,000 bales to be consumed here and abroad. If you deduct that 12,000,00 from the August 1 carry-over, together with the 1950 crop, 21,321,000, there will be a carry-over on August 1, 1950, of only 8,821,000 bales.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Those are the figures I wanted to get into the RECORD. Here we are dealing with further estimates of consumption and exports.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, may I say for the benefit of the committee in general that all of those figures are outlined on page 14 of the report.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wanted to get them in the debate. We are dealing here with some very far-reaching estimates. Suppose domestic consumption fails by two or three million bales, or suppose exports fail by two or three million bales?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then everything is very much up in the air. Now, what will cause those estimates to not materialize? What will substantially cause them to not materialize? Well, that gets us into some of the discussions prompted by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL]. Personally, I have never felt that we had any surplus of agricultural goods in this country. As these tonnages pile up, it simply shows that we have passed the market; that we did not take the market and put this production into the market for consumption at the time the market was flowing, and that gets you into trouble whether you are an individual farmer or engaged in a farming industry; whether cotton, wheat, corn or what not. These breaks in farm prices have been quoted by the gentleman from Colorado; they are staggering. You are running into a drop in national income of about 20 billion dollars under last year, because we have about a three-billion-dollar drop in gross agricultural income as the result of these declines in prices, and you can practically calculate that for each dollar drop in gross farm income you are going to have a five- to seven-billion-dollar drop in national income.

Now, what causes these things to occur? We have built manufacturing wages up in this country on a level where you will either maintain a high wage for the farmer or the farmer will not buy the manufactured goods, and the cotton-estimate figures, such as have been read into the RECORD, will not materialize. Your surpluses will appear because you do not have the market for them. You do not have the market internally because the cost of them gets so high that the people who are actually producing the goods actually cannot afford to buy them, just as England has done in recent years, in which she took herself out of the world market. I do not know of any country on earth where the process of taking itself out of the market, internally and externally, is progressing any faster than here in the United States. If I wanted to destroy a country, I would engineer around to where I could get some forces at work inside of that country which pushed up their cost of manufacture, resulting in an increase in the cost of the selling price, and I would let that destructive influence work, and certainly somebody has done a job of perfection here in the United States, and it is beginning to kick back on us. What would have happened in the last 2 or 3 years if we had not taxed the people of this country something like thirty billion in order to give the goods away in the other parts of the world? There is a great deal involved in this resolution and I hope under the 5-minute rule that we can discuss it much further than at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

SPECIAL PRIVILEGE FOR THE FEW AT THE EXPENSE OF THE MANY

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, let us analyze this proposed special-privilege legislation. For many years the Federal Treasury has been called upon to provide millions upon millions of dollars under a multitude of cotton legislative acts. Before the war, under crop controls, Federal funds given the farmers as payments were based on submission to the controls. During the war, with the controls suspended, the cotton farmer was a free producer. The

reduction in the acreage or production is necessary for several reasons:

First. Is that normal exports are pretty much out of the picture, year after year export subsidy has been paid or else the cotton has been given away altogether.

Second. A near embargo on imports has been erected to prevent importations as only the 135,000 bales of short staple cotton can be imported. Evidently our cotton friends vote for reciprocal trade treaties, but for the other fellow.

Third. The cotton crop has gradually come under the mass production right in the face of a reduced market. Cotton-picking machines have intensified the social problems involved. Thirty thousand people are without jobs in one California cotton valley today.

Fourth. The present law, alloting 21,000,000 acres, will provide about 3,000,000 bales more than is needed for domestic need and for exports and carry-over, according to the PMA. The Department seemed to think 18,000,000 acres were sufficient. These 3,000,000 bales represents some $450,000,000.

Fifth. The Cooley resolution, according to the PMA, will provide at a minimum estimate of the PMA an additional 750,000 bales, which will mean a minimum of another $112,500,000 out of the United States Treasury. This is in addition to the $450,000,000 worth of cotton estimated to be produced where its only home apparently will be found by giving it away.

Sixth. Cotton farming is a sick industry. It has taken enormous amounts of the taxpayers' money to support the program. It evidently will require other untold millions to provide funds to keep King Cotton in the style it wishes to be supported. There will surely be a shortage of funds for supporting the other 95 percent of American agriculture.

Seventh. The cotton people are faced with a serious problem. They face a declining demand for their product. They most assuredly are faced with a rural social problem. The people who have lived and made a living on these 6,000,000 acres are faced with a serious problem. Are you going to solve it by providing a 90-percent parity support for 70 percent of the production on a million or a seven and one-half million dollar cotton farm? Are we to solve it by providing the little producer a quota of 2½ bales or 5 acres and the big operators a quota or an allotment of 1,000 to 3,000 bales? As serious as this problem is on this cotton section, the facts are that cotton farmers are not asked to face problems as serious as some other farm groups face. Did you ever figure out how many public funds will be needed to support the cotton on the Clayton-Anderson seven and one-half million dollar California farm?

Eighth. Let us spend a few minutes to see what is taking place in the other 95 percent of American agriculture. What is to become of the people living on the 10,175,000 acres of land that the wheat farmer has been asked to reduce his acreage on? What is to become of the corn farmers on the 11,350,000 acres that corn is being reduced? How about the bean farmer with the 370,000 acres removed from the bean acreage? How about the rice farmer with the 249,000 reduction in acreage?

Ninth. How about the fifteen to twenty million acres of land that the dairy farmer will not need due to the invasion and infiltration of vegetable oils in the production of the synthetic dairy products? Where will the quarter of a million dairy farmers that have already been eliminated by the vegetable-oil interests really find a job? Three million dairy cows have already been eliminated. These unneeded cotton growers cannot be shifted to the dairy business because this administration is putting dairy farmers out of business faster than it can put them into the dairy business.

Tenth. How about the acreage displaced by the importation of competitive agricultural products? These imports of competitive agricultural products represented over $1,530,000,000 during the past fiscal year without adding the fur imports. Does this replace twenty-five or thirty million acres of domestic land?

My opinion is that while this cotton situation is serious, it is not as serious as these other agricultural groups must face. With a program under the present law that will take $450,000,000 out of the Federal Treasury for 3,000,000 bales of cotton for which there isn't any use or demand, it should be evident that there is no reason to provide another $112,500,000. When one realizes that all the import duties on all articles and products imported represents but from $380,000,000 to $450,000,000 a year, it is evident that it does not make sense to spend an equal amount on a program for one crop—cotton. Remember cotton needed for domestic consumption does not represent over 5 percent of the national farm income. The time has arrived when we should recognize that all of agriculture is entitled to the same legislative consideration. Last fiscal year we imported over $497,000,000 worth of livestock products, including over 532,000 head of live cattle on the hoof and gave away over $500,000,000 worth of cotton. This just does not make sense.

There isn't any use of wasting time and energy in writing or talking about any economy program or paying any attention to the report of the bipartisan Hoover Commission and then turn around and vote to add $112,500,000 to the public debt as a result of this special-privilege legislation.

If cotton is to be provided a half-billion-dollar annual subsidy, then a straight across-the-board subsidy would cost 20 times as much, or 10 billions per year. This will be a sure method of destroying the support program.

The prewar agricultural program was upside down, and this is a continuation of this same formula. The production of soil-depleting crops are and have been stimulated by special-privilege legislation. This special-privilege legislation included direct payments and subsidized exports not accorded the other agricultural products. The program has lost sight of the family-sized farm as a basis of a healthy agricultral economy. The program provided over one-fourth million dollars to one wheat grower and over three-fourths million dollars to one cotton-farming outfit. While this was happening, the little farmer and, in fact, the average farmer, in some cases, has been asked to produce less and less. The Eighty-first Congress even raised the direct AAA subsidy to the big producer to $2,500, after years of effort that had made us lower this subsidy to $750.

While much talk is in the air about cutting the ECA by a billion dollars as an indication of interest in economy, it surely does not make economic sense to unnecessarily spend other billions of dollars in subsidizing agricultural products for which there is no market or need, and which cost fifteen to twenty million per month for storage charges.

I believe in a support program. I believe in one based on common sense—one that makes economic sense. The support program is comparable to the unemployment insurance in the industrial area. It all comes from the people.

I would not oppose this or any other bill without a constructive substitute. Constructive proposals are: (1) To extend wage-and-hour legislation to agricultural labor; (2) to extend social security to the rural people; (3) to provide unemployment insurance to farm labor comparable to unemployment insurance for other groups; (4) to discontinue the legal or illegal importation of foreign labor with the resulting social-unemployment problem. This especially applies when millions of Americans are now unemployed. (5) Support should be confined to farmers and not to speculator interests. We need a farmer program and not a landowners' program.

If the above were put into effect, the family-sized farm would have some chance. If the big operator can get a guaranteed support price for his produce, use temporary labor, shift this labor over to the relief rolls, and get a $2,500 subsidy under any disguise, overproduction can be expected to continue.

The embarassing surpluses are now being created by a conparatively few large operators. These surpluses are now costing the taxpayers millions of dollars to accumulate and in storage charges. The storage charges are from $15,000,000 to $20,000,000 per month, according to the A. P. These unneeded surpluses are responsible for the unnecessary social problems. The sooner we legislate for the benefit of the average farmer, and the general welfare of our people, the quicker this problem will be solved. The present cotton law supports the big operator for a 1,000- or 3,000-bale crop, while the small operator is limited to 2½ bales or 5 acres.

This legislation is a step backward. Cotton already has a mandatory support of 90 percent of parity in the 1949 act, has special-privilege legislation, which they have always had, and which is not extended to other more important crops and agricultural products. Some of these other more important crops haven't any mandatory supports whatsoever and some 75 percent of parity. Eggs in many sections today are bringing 39 percent of parity as an example. We should have a constructive approach and treat all of the agricultural groups equally and forget the special-privilege sectionalism

that is so apparent today and includes this resolution.

I wish to state to my colleagues that our former colleague the Honorable Henry Steagall of Alabama made the greatest contribution to agricultural legislation that has ever been provided by any Member of Congress in my memory. Mr. Steagall was not thinking or legislating on a narrow sectional basis. He broadened the agricultural horizon of agricultural legislation. It was not his proposal to up the cotton support to 92½ percent of parity and provide less for other agricultural products. That was put in by Senator Bankhead.

I repeat that when Mr. Steagall and his committee revamped the Gore proposal and passed the amendment to the Price Control Act, he provided the only straight-across-the-board legislative proposal ever enacted by any Congress. His attitude, his broadminded approach not only provided the foods and fiber for the war but he also looked ahead and put in the 2-year-after-the-war protection. This of course was followed by the Hope bill which bill was in effect the same as the Steagall approach.

We have an international wheat agreement. The wheat is to have a two-price system. The wheat that goes into the world wheat pool is to be lower in price. The allotment to the pool is a cushion to protect the American people in case of a disastrously small crop. Why not an international agricultural agreement proposed by the FAO and men by Mr. Albert Goss of the Grange?

The days of duties and reciprocal-trade treaties should give way to the international agricultural agreement approach.

Cotton, with its 90 percent of guarantee should be satisfied, without promoting a new gadget. This should be most apparent when eggs are 39 percent of parity in the Midwest, and the poultry industry was a $3,000,000,000 industry in 1948, or providing over 10 percent of the Nation's farm marketings. This is twice the amount of the value of the cotton crop needed for domestic consumption.

Let us not continue to pour millions upon millions of dollars into and for an upside-down uneconomic program as exemplified by this cotton resolution.

In conclusion, may I state that if any Member wishes to ruin the support program, wishes to waste funds on a program that is contrary to the CCC attitude, and wishes to support special-privilege legislation for any crop or commodity, that is a responsibility he must assume. My only purpose, as a member of the committee, has been and is to present the facts. That is my responsibility and I assume this responsibility and will not act as a schoolboy, trying to blame someone else for everything that happens.

My position on this resolution remember is based on the testimony of the Agricultural Department and is not influenced by any partisan or sectional considerations.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to introduce a slightly discordant note into what is going on here, but I am surely opposed to this resolution. All it does is add insult to injury.

Before I start, I do not want anybody to get the impression this has anything to do with the little controversy we had on oleomargarine, because I hope I am not of that temperament or that disposition.

I have here a speech I happened to run across the other day that I gave the first session I was here, in which I point out the same things I am going to try to point out today, except that today I hope to add some more ammunition to it.

At that time I called attention to the fact that we had an agricultural program that was upside down. We are pouring our millions and billions of dollars into a system of agriculture that just does not make sense. The amount of money that was funneled out to the different States was based on the kind of crops they happened to raise. I called attention at that time to the fact that one State had 11 percent of the so-called subsidy up to that time. This was nearly $400,000,000, and that the part that went back to the States was not based altogether on cotton by any means, because the wheat people had been just as big grabbers as the cotton people had been.

I can assure you there is no partisanship on my part. When this little horse trade is made and the wheat bill comes out, I will try to point it out to you again at that time.

I have a letter from one of my constituents who has an 80-acre farm. He says, "Dear friend, I have $360 of taxes on my 80-acre farm." I would just like to know why I should pour my money down this rat hole or any other rat hole.

You remember on the Hit Parade the last 3 weeks the first prize has always gone to "Dear Hearts and Gentle People." There seems to be a lot of goodness in the United States left, or else it would not be at the head of the parade all the time. That is the spirit in which I approach this issue here today.

My point is that we have an upside-down agricultural program. We are asked to take a step backward. I do not know any reason in the world that I would want to add to the public debt or be a party to adding between one-hundred and one-hundred fifty million dollars to that public debt. I will be glad to yield to anybody to tell me why I should when I have a constituent with an 80-acre farm that is farming his own farm and is not farming the United States Treasury, and paying $360 in taxes a year.

For many years the Federal Treasury has been called upon to provide millions upon millions of dollars under a multitude of cotton legislative acts. Before the war, under crop controls, Federal funds given the farmers as payments were based on submission to the controls. During the war, with the controls suspended, the cotton farmer was a free producer. The reduction in the acreage or production is necessary now for several reasons.

You should remember that the cotton people have not kept their house in order as the tobacco people have. They just kind of went merrily along during this whole period. This control operation should have been put in operation 3 or 4 years ago.

As a Republican, I do not like to have to take the position today that I have to defend the Department of Agriculture, but the things I am going to say here are in defense of the Department of Agriculture and the position they have taken on this legislation. The proposal first was for 18,000,000 acres of cotton. They raised it to 21,000,000. I did not think it was going to cost $450,000,000 to produce that much worth of cotton we did not have any use for, or I do not think I would have voted for it at that time. But I surely do not want to be in a position now of adding another one-hundred or one-hundred-fifty million dollars to this loss the United States Treasury must take.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRFSEN. I believe instead of 18,000,000 acres the officials of the Department said 16,000,000 acres. I checked that today with Mr. Wooley.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. At least in the testimony I heard 18,000,000 acres was the figure. That is all I know and that is what I obtained from the hearings. Normal exports of cotton are pretty well out of the picture. About the only market we have now is to give it away. If any Member here who wishes to give away a half a billion dollars' worth of cotton as we have during the last year and import $497,000,000 worth of livestock and livestock products it is his responsibility. Remember, that today we are considering a crop which is a special privilege crop. We are considering a crop that has reciprocal trade treaties for the other fellows, since only 135,000 bales of short staple cotton can come into the United States. Cotton has 90 percent of parity support under the present law. But how about the rest of agriculture? Some of them do not have any mandatory supports whatsoever. Before anybody gets too many buckets full of tears around here what do they think about the 39 percent of parity and 20 cents a dozen for eggs in the Midwest at this very hour?

The poultry industry is twice as important as the cotton industry, insofar as domestic needs are concerned.

Now the cotton crop is scheduled to come under mass production right in the face of a reduced market. The cotton picking machines have intensified the social problems involved. It is reliably reported by the Christian Science Monitor that 30,000 people are without jobs in one California cotton valley today. The present law allowing 21,000,000 acres will provide 3,000,000 bales more than is needed for domestic needs; and for exports the carry-over, according to the PMA. I will yield to anyone who says that is not what the PMA says. That is their testimony. The Department seemed to think 18,000,000 acres was truly sufficient and that these 3,000,000 bales represented $450,000,000. It looks as if not many people know how much $450,000,000 is any more.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I know he wants the record to be straight.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman always wants the record straight.

Mr. WHITE of California. Three million acres does not give 3,000,000 bales. The production of cotton is only slightly over half a bale to an acre.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Allowing 21,000,000 acres will provide about 3,000,000 bales more than is needed for domestic needs, exports and carry over. That is what I stated and that is what the PMA stated.

Mr. WHITE of California. For domestic needs the gentleman is speaking about now.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Oh, yes, I said that before. The record will show that. I was reading what it said. I was reading my own writing.

Mr. WHITE of California. While the gentleman has yielded to me, will he allow me to make this observation? The gentleman speaks about the tremendous cost.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will yield to the gentleman for a question. I cannot yield to the gentleman for anything else except a question.

Mr. WHITE of California. Then I will ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. WHITE of California. Does not the gentleman know that the cotton program has not cost the taxpayers of this Nation a penny, but has shown a profit of $150,000,000?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That statement does not make sense. Cotton cost the American taxpayer over $500,000,000 last year. I presume we have not even a public debt either.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman from California knows the reason the Commodity Credit Corporation is not showing a loss is because the taxpayers have footed the bill under ECA which has purchased the cotton to give it away.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman approve of the ECA? Did not the gentleman vote for the Marshall plan?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman did not vote for the appropriation.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman admits he was in the minority.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am telling the gentleman, if the gentleman from Wisconsin will permit, there is no use trying to fool ourselves, the taxpayers have footed the bill, whether it has been through the ECA or otherwise.

Mr. COOLEY. Do you say that you voted to create an obligation and then voted against the appropriation?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That does not enter into the discussion at all. The taxpayers have to pay to get rid of the cotton and the tobacco also.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not yield any further, Mr. Chairman.

5. The Cooley resolution, according to PMA, will provide a minimum of an additional 750,000 bales, which will mean a minimum of another $112,500,000.

That is the testimony of the Department of Agriculture. In the wheat bill last fall, the wheat acreage was increased to what was supposed to be a 2,000,000-acre increase, but it ended up with a 4,000,000-acre increase. This cotton gadget may do the same thing, too.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield for a question, or if you have any correction to make.

Mr. COOLEY. Is the gentleman, by any chance, afraid that if we reduce the cotton acreage we might go into the dairy business?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I have the answer to that in here, but I will give it to you ahead of time. You cannot go into the dairy business because your committee and your administration has put and is putting dairy farmers out of the dairy business faster than you can put them in. You have already eliminated 3,000,000 dairy cows by promoting the production of 900,000,000 pounds of oleo and other synthetic dairy products. We have 242,000,000 less dairy cows than we had 15 years ago.

Mr. COOLEY. But the gentleman does have some apprehension that this might occur?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Oh, no; no.

Mr. COOLEY. Then why do you object?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Because you are wasting public money.

Mr. COOLEY. The fact of the matter is that on the basic commodities, the Commodity Credit Corporation has made millions of dollars in profit.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I just yielded for a question and not an answer. I have not said the CCC had lost any great amount on cotton but that the United States Treasury, the taxpayer, has lost untold millions. I have not finished one page yet. Let me go along here. Let me finish one page at least.

In other words, the present law requires $450,000,000 for cotton that we do not have any use for except to give it away. Let us get that straight. You do not need to tell me I voted for it, because I know it; but I did not know that it would be that much or I would not have voted for it. This is in addition to the minimum of $112,500,000 of cotton that is to be produced under this Cooley resolution.

Sixth. Cotton farming is a sick industry, and the sooner they wake up to it and start farming their farms and stop farming the United States Treasury the better off they will be and the better off the United States Treasury will be. In the country I come from they farm the farms first, and then if they can get a little out of the United States Treasury, all right, but they do not make it their main ambition in life to see what they can get out of the United States Treasury. The average subsidy is around $50 per year.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. WORLEY. I know the gentleman is for a support price on cotton and other basic commodities. We were wondering over here what is the latest support price for the great dairy industry which the gentleman so ably represents.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I never admitted that the so-called basic commodities were really basic. The support for cotton and wheat and these special privileged crops is 90 percent, mandatory. The support on dairy products is from 75 to 90 percent, if they follow the law. The support on hogs which is three times as important as cotton has not any mandatory support whatsoever.

Mr. WORLEY. Do they not follow the law?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Eggs at 20 cents per dozen and 39 percent of parity does not sound as if anyone is working at following the law too religiously.

Mr. WORLEY. Somebody said they were given more than the law allowed last year.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I state that they did not follow the law last year. They frisked Wisconsin out of $25,000,000 to $50,000,000 because they did not follow the law last year. I will not say anything now until milk gets below 75 percent of parity. The law is 75 to 90 percent of parity for milk and its products.

Mr. WORLEY. But you say that to support basic agricultural commodities is a special interest?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am not weak-minded enough to think that you have basic commodities in corn, cotton, rice, and tobacco, because they are not basic, in my book. Cotton only represents 5 percent of agriculture. The Agriculture Committee spends 95 percent of its time talking about it and the other 5 percent of its time dreaming about it, I guess. The reason I say that is this: The United States does not need over 8,000,000 bales of cotton, according to PMA, for domestic use; $150 a bale is $1,250,000,000. Five percent of the $30,000,000,000 total agricultural marketings for 1948 is $1,500,000,000. Therefore, what cotton is needed in the United States does not represent over 5 percent of American agriculture. Poultry represents 10 percent of American agriculture, and you are paying them 39 percent of parity for eggs in the Midwest today. They got 77 percent of parity even in the old bad days when Mr. Hoover was defeated for President. Incidentally, eggs were 20 cents a dozen then as they are today in the Midwest.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It has taken an enormous amount of the taxpayers' money to support the cotton program. Evidently it will require other untold millions to provide funds to keep King Cotton in the style to which he has become accustomed. Yet they are going to take many millions more to keep King Cotton living in the style they wish him to live in. There will surely be a shortage of funds for supporting the other 95 percent of agriculture if most of the funds are to be spent on cotton and other misnamed basic commodities that do not when added together equal one-fourth of American agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the point of no quorum I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 398, relating to cotton- and peanut-acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VURSELL (at the request of Mr. HILL) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. WOLCOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address made by Dr. John A. Hannah, president of the Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVENPORT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

WASHINGTON REPORTING

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the House of Representatives, by a vote of 236 to 183, prevented a small oligarchy of seven Members from determining what future legislation could be voted upon by the House.

It sounds fantastic that any such tiny group of men would attempt to push democracy back to the ice age. And it sounds even more unbelievable that for a time it looked as if they would succeed. It was only with a unified drive to stem this undemocratic tide that democracy was saved for the elected representatives of the American people.

On its surface the issue was a simple one. The Rules Committee of the House of Representatives wanted the House to pass a resolution to permit it to determine what bills would be allowed on the floor for vote. It said in effect that it knew better what was good for the country than the other 423 Members of the House. The Rules Committee consists of 12 members, 8 Democrats and 4 Republicans. A simple majority of seven would, in effect, control the legislation of the House of Representatives.

It is a tribute to HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, my colleague in Congress from Pittsburgh, that this sinister effort failed. Not only did he play a key role in preventing Congress from backsliding but it was he who was originally responsible for stripping the Rules Committee of its 50-year life-and-death hold on Congress. His colleagues on the Hill now hail him as the man who returned democracy to the House and fought to maintain it when it was challenged.

When the Eightieth Congress ended its do-nothing activities and the people elected President Truman in 1948, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman EBERHARTER, was concerned that the Rules Committee would sit on vital legislation in the Eighty-first Congress. Even before the new Congress convened, he organized a committee of seven Congressmen to function as the Informal Rules Reform Committee. He knew that something would have to be done to force the Rules Committee to return to its original function as traffic director of legislation. Through the years it had acquired policy-making power and not only determined when bills would be brought up for a vote, but what bills would be brought out.

Following a thorough investigation the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman EBERHARTER, came up with a satisfying solution to the autocracy of the Rules Committee. It is this: When any of the 19 standing committees of the House reports out a bill, the Rules Committee has only 21 days in which to schedule debate on that bill by the full House. If the Rules Committee does not act within the 21 days, the committee chairman originally reporting out the bill can obtain recognition from the Speaker of the House to have his fellow Congressmen debate the measure.

The Eberharter solution to the 50-year problem of the all-powerful Rules Committee passed the Democratic Party caucus on January 1, 1949, and was approved by the House of Representatives on January 3, 1949, by a vote of 275 to 142.

The net effect of the Eberharter law was twofold. The Rules Committee went back to being a traffic manager for legislation, requiring only four uses of the 21-day rule. One of these dealt with the anti-poll-tax bill and the other with the river and harbor measure. But as the Eighty-first Congress put on age, a small brush fire within the Rules Committee finally burst into flames. Committee resentment grew and by the time the second session of this Congress convened, nine of its members plotted to do away with the Eberharter law and win back their old authority.

This required the Herculean effort of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman EBERHARTER, to thwart their plan. I worked alongside him to arouse the Members of the House of the significance of the issue. And today, with the issue settled, I am proud of Pittsburgh for electing a man of the caliber of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, HERMAN EBERHARTER, to Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of California and Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WAGNER (at the request of Mr. WELCH), for 1 day, on account of official business.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2911. An act to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Col. Charles H. Bonesteel as Executive Director of the European Coordinating Committee under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, without affecting his military status and perquisites; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes, p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 30, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1168. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of $354,453,000 and contract authorization in the amount of $15,000,000, together with certain proposed provisions and increases in limitations pertaining to existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 455); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1169. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1951 involving an increase of $308,874,294 and public-debt authorization in the amount of $50,000,000 for various agencies in the executive branch and the District of Columbia, all in the form of amendments to the budget for the said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 457); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4684. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917 and subsection (a) of section 338 of the Nationality Act of 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 1549). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio:

H. R. 7023. A bill to incorporate the Blue Star Mothers of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota (by request):

H. R. 7024. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1949; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7025. A bill allowing a credit against the additional estate tax for inheritance, estate, legacy, or succession taxes paid to any State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHEELER:

H. R. 7026. A bill to provide for the collection and publication of statistics on and establishing standards, grades, and classifications of naval stores and an inspection service therefor, preventing deception in transactions in naval stores, regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 7027. A bill to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EATON:

H. R. 7028. A bill to enable the President to obligate funds heretofore appropriated for assistance in certain areas in China until June 30, 1950; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. R. 7029. A bill to terminate the war tax rate on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 7030. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. J. Res. 405. Joint resolution to establish a National Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. Res. 452. Resolution requesting the State Department to furnish full and complete answers to certain questions relating to the foreign policy of the United States in the Far East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 7031. A bill for the relief of Oscar L. McCallen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 7032. A bill for the relief of Heronie Filmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 7033. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Vercauteren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McSWEENEY:

H. R. 7034. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Melanoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 7035. A bill for the relief of Hisako Sakata Ikezawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 7036. A bill for the relief of A. H. Clement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. R. 7037. A bill for the relief of Reginald Wynne Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1753. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition of 19 residents of Schenevus, N. Y., advocating passage of legislation to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages over the radio and in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1754. By Mr. POLK: Petition of Rev. W. Eudell Milby, pastor, Bethel Church of the Nazarene, Clermont County, Ohio, and residents of Bethel, for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1755. Also, petition of Mrs. Lucy Meranda, president of Bethel Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and many residents of Brown and Clermont Counties, Ohio, for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1756. Also, petition of Mrs. Ethel Seaman, president, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and members, of Peebles, Adams County, Ohio, for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1757. Also, petition of Mrs. O. G. Bond, president, Scioto County Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Ohio, and its members, for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1758. Also, petition of Rev. W. James Gilson, pastor, Bethel Baptist Church, Clermont County, Ohio, and residents of Bethel, for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1759. Also, petition of Rev. Edward H. Jones, pastor, Bethel Methodist Church, Clermont County, Ohio, and residents of Bethel, for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 30, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord of all life, in the white light of Thy searching we would pause at the day's threshold to examine our inner desires and motives; that in this temple of democracy we may stand with pure hearts and clean hands. May we be saved from the dangers that lurk in warped judgments and in narrow loyalties.

Inspire and guide with the spirit of understanding these Thy servants, the few among the many lifted by their fellows to high pedestals of power and influence in a great and crucial day. May their counsels so laden with possibilities to affect this stricken generation add to the world's store of good will, and may their words be for the healing of the nations. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

DENNIS CHAVEZ, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 26, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 184) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim February 6, 1950, as National Children's Dental Health Day.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 371) to correct the formula used in computing the income taxes of life-insurance companies for 1947, 1948, and 1949, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 184) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim February 6, 1950, as National Children's Dental Health Day, and it was signed by the Vice President.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HICKENLOOPER was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for a period of 10 days, and Mr. FLANDERS was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SPARKMAN was excused from attendance at the session of the Senate tomorrow.

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MCKELLAR, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Appropriations and all subcommittees thereof were authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the session.

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Finance were authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Maybank
Anderson	Hill	Millikin
Benton	Holland	Morse
Bricker	Hunt	Mundt
Bridges	Ives	Murray
Butler	Jenner	Neely
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Kefauver	Robertson
Chavez	Kem	Russell
Connally	Kerr	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Darby	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Langer	Sparkman
Douglas	Leahy	Stennis
Downey	Lehman	Taylor
Dworshak	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	Long	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	Lucas	Thye
Ferguson	McCarran	Tobey
Frear	McCarthy	Tydings
Fulbright	McClellan	Watkins
George	McFarland	Wherry
Gillette	McKellar	Wiley
Graham	McMahon	Williams
Green	Magnuson	Withers
Gurney	Malone	Young
Hayden	Martin	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me so I may make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to submit petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and present other routine matters for the RECORD, without debate, and without the Senator from Michigan losing the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

MRS. OSA J. PETTY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Mrs. Osa J. Petty (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DONATIONS BY THE NAVY DEPARTMENT TO NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, a list of institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

CLAIM OF HANOVER WOOLEN MILLS CO.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the claim of the Hanover Woolen Mills Co., of Hanover, Ill., together with the administrative decision thereon (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOURS OF WORK AND OVERTIME FOR CERTAIN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to remove certain inequities by fixing the hours of work and overtime compensation practices in the case of certain employees of the United States, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON OPERATION OF TRADE-AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operation of the trade-agreements program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Vice Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commission for the fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

TORT CLAIMS PAID BY FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by the Agency for the period January 1, 1949, through December 31, 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF THE CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

Two letters from the vice president and comptroller of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of receipts and expenditures of the company, and a comparative general balance sheet, both for the year 1949 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the National Association of Credit Men, of New York, N. Y., favoring the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on reorganization of the executive departments of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Resolutions adopted by the Sarasota Townsend Club No. 1, of Sarasota, and a mass meeting of the Fifth Congressional District, at Orlo Vista, both in the State of Florida, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 2181, providing old-age insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 2181, providing old-age insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Manchester (N. H.) Young Republicans, relating to conditions in the Far East; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Messinian Benevolent Association and its ladies' auxiliary, the Daughters of Messinia, of New York, N. Y., relating to the return to Greece of certain abducted children; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the South Carolina Chapter of the National Academy Associates, of Columbia, S. C., relating to the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the Iowa State Dental Society, University District, and the Farrell Chamber of Commerce, of Farrell, Pa., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. GREEN:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution memoralizing Congress with relation to amending the Federal Social Security Act with the purpose of extending the coverage and benefits thereof to include municipal employees

"*Resolved,* That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby requested to use their efforts to amend the Federal Social Security Act with the purpose of extending the coverage and benefits thereof to include municipal employees; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state be and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING—PETITION

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a petition signed by Helen A. Thomas and sundry other citizens of West Barrington and Riverside, R. I., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 1847, to prohibit the transportation of alcohol beverage advertising in interstate commerce.

There being no objection, the petition was received, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We respectfully request that you use your influence and vote for the passage of a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio, covered by bill S. 1847. The most pernicious effect of this advertising is the constant invitation and enticement to drink. The American people spent $9,640,000,000 for alcoholic beverages in 1947 as compared with $7,770,000,000 in 1945. During the same time there was a corresponding increase each year in crime, juvenile delinquency, broken homes, deaths and injuries due to intoxicated drivers. There is every reason why this waste of money and of human values should not be increased but rather greatly decreased.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1950. A bill to reimburse the Fisher Contracting Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1244);

H. R. 4106. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service

of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1245); and

H. R. 4387. A bill to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Treasury Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 1246).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 469. A bill for the relief of Catherine A. Glesener; with amendments (Rept. No. 1247).

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John J. Sheehan, of New Hampshire, to be United States attorney for the district of New Hampshire;

John Joseph Hickey, of Wyoming, to be United States attorney for the district of Wyoming;

Everett W. Hepp, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 4, district of Alaska, vice Harry O. Arend (resigned);

Adrian W. Maher, of Connecticut, to be United States attorney for the district of Connecticut;

Henry L. Hess, of Oregon, to be United States attorney for the district of Oregon;

Louis F. Knop, Jr., of Louisiana, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Louisiana; and

Earl R. Burns, of Wyoming, to be United States marshal for the district of Wyoming.

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Bernard J. Flynn, of Maryland, to be United States attorney for the district of Maryland.

By Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Henry Robert Bell, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Tennessee.

By Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Matthew B. Welsh, of Indiana, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Indiana, vice B. Howard Caughran, term expired.

By Mr. McKELLAR (for Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina), from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Several postmasters.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 2938. A bill for the relief of Voula Taloumis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2939. A bill providing for the conveyance of the site of old Fort Hancock in Bismarck, N. Dak., to the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 2940. A bill to consolidate the health activities of the Government, to provide a program of national health insurance in order to make available to low-income groups medical services of the highest possible quality and in the greatest possible volume, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 2941, to amend ch. 37 of title 18, U. S. C., relating to espionage and censorship, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN (by request):

S. 2942. A bill for the relief of Paul D. Banning, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MAYBANK introduced Senate bill 2943, to liberalize the lending policies of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and of the Federal Reserve Banking System in favor of independent small-business enterprises; to adjust the registration provisions of the Securities Exchange Act, as amended, in order to enable independent small-business concerns to issue securities at a reasonable cost; to develop the productive facilities of the national economy; to further the interest of independent small-business enterprises; to provide for the appointment of a Small Business Coordinator; and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2944. A bill for the relief of Roscoe Rice; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 2945. A bill to authorize the apportionment of retirement pay in certain cases; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2946. A bill to establish a Presidential Honors Board; to provide for the conferral of awards to be known as the Presidential Medal of Honor, the Presidential Medal of Achievement, and the Presidential Medal of Recognition; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. LUCAS introduced Senate bill 2947, to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, in order to provide more effective financial assistance for small business, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 2948. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Clara Whitesell, to certain lands;

S. 2949. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to James Chief, to certain lands; and

S. 2950. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Ogala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. GURNEY):

S. 2951. A bill to admit Mrs. Erna Tvedt to the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE RELATING TO ESPIONAGE AND CENSORSHIP

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend the statute of limitations in peacetime espionage cases and ask unanimous consent that a brief statement which I have prepared on the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Wisconsin will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2941) to amend chapter 37 of title 18, United States Code, relating to espionage and censorship, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY ON ANTI-ESPIONAGE BILL

The Nation has followed with deep attention the developments in the Alger Hiss case. One of the factors which the American people have noted is that the statute of limitations ran out, so that the Government was unable to prosecute Mr. Hiss for actual deeds of espionage, but had to content itself with trying him for perjury.

I personally feel that it is ridiculous that we should have the present 3-year statute of limitations on peacetime espionage cases. In wartime, of course, espionage is a capital offense, and there is no such statute of limitations whatsoever. Security legislation has been sent up to the Congress and has been pending before us for some time which would extend the peacetime limit indefinitely. I believe that this subject merits the most sympathetic attention and the promptest possible action on the part of the Congress. Since, however, previous security legislation has been of a very broad and complicated nature, I personally have attempted to focus attention on this single issue of statute of limitations and have accordingly drafted a very simple bill which merely makes the statute 6 years rather than 3 years.

If, however, my colleagues feel that the statute should be made so as to run indefinitely, that would be perfectly all right with me. The big challenge is, however, to enact some statute immediately which will remedy the present situation.

We must recognize that in the atomic age we cannot use "horse and buggy" legal weapons against saboteurs and spies. The Federal Bureau of Investigation must be given the finest possible legal instruments to do its vital job, and I believe that one such instrument is the bill which I am introducing today.

SMALL BUSINESS COORDINATOR

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for the appointment of a Small Business Coordinator in the Executive Office of the President and I ask unanimous consent that a sectional summary of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The coordinator would be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The bill is one of the results of a study of the needs of small-business men by the staff of the Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee.

The appointment of a Small Business Coordinator is designed to give relief to those small-business men who are finding it increasingly difficult to obtain necessary information which would enable them to participate in the huge volume of Government contracts. The coordinator will be directed to assist the President in the coordination of the activities of all executive agencies in furtherance of the interests of independent small-business concerns. The bill further directs that existing facilities and personnel of executive agencies shall be used to the fullest extent practicable.

The bill is being introduced and recommended to the Senate as a result of constant association with and investigation of one of the hindrances to small-business men with which the subcommittee has been concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the summary presented by the Senator from South Carolina will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2943) to liberalize the lending policies of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and of the Federal Reserve Banking System in favor of independent small-business enterprises; to adjust the registration provisions of the Securities Exchange Act, as amended, in order to enable independent small-business concerns to issue securities at a reasonable cost; to develop the productive facilities of the national economy; to further the interest of independent small-business enterprises; to provide for the appointment of a Small Business Coordinator; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The sectional summary of the bill presented by Mr. MAYBANK is as follows:

SECTIONAL SUMMARY OF BILL ESTABLISHING A SMALL BUSINESS COORDINATOR

SECTION 1

(a) Establishes in the Executive Office of the President a Small Business Coordinator at an annual salary of $15,000.

(b) Provides that the Coordinator shall assist the President in the coordination of the activities of the executive agencies in furtherance of the interests of small-business concerns.

(c) To the fullest extent practicable, the Coordinator shall utilize the facilities and personnel of other executive agencies.

He may appoint, not to exceed six deputies, specialists, or other experts, at not to exceed $14,000 per annum for one of such, and not to exceed $12,000 per annum for the other five.

(d) To the fullest extent practicable, the Coordinator shall utilize the facilities of the small-business advisory boards in the Federal agencies, and he may utilize the services of Federal and, with their consent, State, regional, and local agencies.

SECTION 2

The Coordinator is directed, whenever and to the extent that he determines such action necessary—

(1) With the cooperation of existing agencies, to make a complete study of the productive facilities of independent small-business enterprises, and to develop a definite criterion to determine what is an independent small-business enterprise, and to recommend to the Congress the enactment of a clear definition of small business that will be uniformly interpreted by all executive agencies.

(2), (3), (4) To assist independent small-business enterprises to obtain a fair share of Government contracts and to cut through bureaucratic red tape in doing so.

SECTION 3

The Coordinator will consult with Federal, State, and local agencies, with independent small-business enterprises and associations thereof with a view to recommending to the Congress appropriate legislation designed to further the interests of independent small-business enterprises, including, but not limited to—

(1) the offering of more liberal terms by the RFC in respect to loans to independent small-business enterprises;

(2) the adaptation of section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act to the present credit needs of independent small business;

(3) the adjustment of the SEC Act and regulations to the problems of independent small business;

(4) the revamping of the Federal-income-tax structure in order to foster the growth of small business;

(5) the development of a system of Government insurance at reasonable rates to relieve independent small business of the financial hardships caused by the shortage of dollars in foreign countries;

(6) the formulation of a program to insure that independent small business obtain its fair share of Government contracts.

However, the bill states that the above activities are to be carried out in a manner consistent with our traditional national system of free enterprise. The bill states that the Congress is fully aware of the fact that the eventual success of independent small business is dependent upon its ability to compete in the market place and that the Government should limit its endeavors to the removal of barriers which impede small business in its efforts to compete fairly and equitably with larger business of equal benefit to the national welfare.

SECTION 4

Provides for a detailed report every 90 days to be forwarded by the Coordinator to the President, Senate, and House.

SECTIONS 5 AND 6

Usual technical provisions authorizing appropriations and providing a separability clause for constitutional interpretation.

FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE SYSTEM AND SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, today at the request of thousands of New York policemen, firemen, teachers and other State employees, I submit amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 6000) to extend and improve the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System, to amend the public-assistance and child-welfare provisions of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes, which would exempt public employees already covered by a retirement system from inclusion in the old-age-pension provisions of the Social Security Act.

Under the present provisions of H. R. 6000 all these public employees could be blanketed under the Federal-old-age-pension system if two-thirds of those voting, in a specially held election, were to cast their votes for such an arrangement.

The policemen, the firemen, teachers and other public employees have demonstrated to me an almost unanimous unwillingness to run the risk of losing the systems under which they now operate, by election or any other means. They have asked that they be completely exempted from Federal coverage.

H. R. 6000 sets up a complex provision for Federal-State compacts to effectuate the transfer of the coverage to the Federal Government. However, I am strongly inclined to agree with the policemen and firemen that if they are already protected, and adequately so, and do not wish to be included in the Federal Government system, Federal legislation on this subject would be extraneous and possibly dangerous.

I shall urge the Senate Finance Committee to consider and approve the amendments which I am submitting. I can see very little justification for including these people if they do not wish to be included. I do not think the Federal Government should be in a position of forcing, or urging people to be covered by Federal pension systems if they believe themselves to be adequately covered—and are in fact so covered—by existing local systems.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments submitted by the Senator from New York will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to make a short statement, and I should like to have all Senators present listen to it. When unanimous consent is granted that Senators may present matters for the RECORD, without debate, Senators may merely present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and resolutions, and present matters for the RECORD without speeches or without debate. That limitation is a portion of the unanimous-consent agreement. I call that fact to the attention of all Senators, because if Senators are going to make speeches in connection with every bill they introduce, or other matter presented, a very long time will be consumed. I merely call that lim'tation to the attention of all Senators.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield so I may propound a question to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator from Illinois by his remarks mean that no explanation of a matter proposed to be inserted in the RECORD shall be made?

Mr. LUCAS. Let me make a brief statement in reply to the Senator from Nevada, if I may do so without violating any of the proprieties or jeopardizing the rights of the Senator from Michigan, who now has the floor. In other words, after bills and joint resolutions have been introduced and other matters presented for the RECORD, a Senator can secure the floor and speak as long as he wants to. I would not even object to a short explanation being made in connection with a bill, but I will say that if short explanations are indulged in it will not be long before long explanations are made, and before we know it much of the time of the Senate will be consumed which, under a unanimous-consent agreement of this kind, should not be consumed.

The Senator from Michigan has the floor, and he was gracious enough to yield to me in order that I could present a unanimous request to allow all Senators to present matters for the RECORD and introduce bills, and so forth, at this time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. As I understand, it is admissible under the rules and under the present unanimous-consent agreement for Senators who wish explanations of bills they present to appear in the RECORD in connection with the presentation of bills merely to ask unanimous consent that such explanations be inserted in the RECORD at the time the bills are presented.

Mr. LUCAS. That has been done, and it can be done under such a unanimous-consent agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair regards it to be his duty to enforce the provisions of a unanimous-consent agreement entered into by the Senate, not only in respect to matters of a sort with which we are now dealing, but with respect to other matters, although now and then the Chair does not feel that he should crack down on Senators who have brief statements to make about matters they are presenting. A unanimous-consent request of the nature of the one just made, when agreed to, does bar explanations or speeches on bills introduced or other matters presented for the RECORD.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN METHOD OF ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. FERGUSON submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6073) to amend section 501 (b) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 371) to correct the formula used in computing the income taxes of life-insurance companies for 1947, 1948, and 1949, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION BUILDING—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on January 25, I introduced a bill (S. 2923) to authorize the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to acquire or construct, with its own funds, a building within the District of Columbia suitable for the Corporation.

The Banking and Currency Committee is today completing hearings on a FDIC bill of which this language was a part. It was the unanimous opinion of the members of the subcommittee that although they favor the acquisition of the building, under the authority of the Reorganization Act a matter such as the authorization of a building within the District of Columbia should be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be appropriately rereferred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and the Committee on Banking and Currency is discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and it will be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES AND FORMER EMPLOYEES OF NAVAL ORDNANCE PLANT, POCATELLO, IDAHO—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on March 11, 1949, S. 1224, for the relief of certain employees and former employees of the Naval Ordnance Plant, Pocatello, Idaho, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A report was requested from the Government agency involved in this legislation which is now before the committee.

S. 1224 was considered at the regular meeting of the committee held Monday, January 30, 1950, and on motion of Senator LANGER, with the approval of the committee, it was determined that the subject matter of the above-mentioned bill is one that comes more properly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary I request that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of S. 1224, and that it be referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF DELMAS C. HILL, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF KANSAS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, February 7, 1950, at 1:30 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Delmas C. Hill, of Kansas, to be United States district judge for the district of Kansas. Judge Hill is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOHN F. X. McGOHEY TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, February 7, 1950, at 1:30 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. John F. X. McGohey, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York. Judge McGohey is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ROBERT L. TAYLOR TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, February 7, 1950, at 1:30 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Robert L. Taylor, of Tennessee, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Tennessee. Judge Taylor is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT AT ANNUAL MEETING OF UNITED SERVICE FOR NEW AMERICANS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on January 15, our eminent presiding officer, the Vice President of the United States, made a speech on displaced persons and on displaced-persons legislation, before the annual meeting of the United Service for New Americans, Inc., at the Hotel Astor, New York City. It was a fine speech, a noble speech from a noble heart, dealing with problems which call for a great heart. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, I am greatly pleased and complimented that I was invited to participate in the discussion which is being carried on here today by the United Service for New Americans. It is a subject in which I have been interested for many years, even before the beginning or the end of World War II, and particularly since the conclusion of that great catastrophe. I suppose nobody will dispute the fact that World War II left in its wake a devastation, uprooting—physically, morally, mentally, socially, and politically—among populations all over the world which bequeathed to us one of the great problems of all times. And that is the problem of so readjusting the people of the world in their relationships, in their outlook upon life, in their opportunity to fulfill the destiny of man, as he was created in the beginning in the image of Almighty God, in order that from one generation to another man may hope to rise a little above the level and status of the preceding generation.

World War II went a long way toward destroying civilization. It did destroy the works of art, architecture, the stability of social responsibility in a sense, in vast areas of the world. And now the problem that faces mankind, not only here, but everywhere is to find some formula, reasonable and practicable, that will not only prevent the repetition of such a great disaster to the people of the world, but may set them on the permanent highway toward peace and understanding, cooperation, and working together so that ultimately bigotry and intolerance and hatred out of which wars and suffering usually flow may be at least assuaged, if not abolished, from the world. So, I cannot too greatly emphasize the work which is being

done by the United Service for New Americans. Without this coordinated service, without this voluntary, and in many cases unrequited, toil under a formal organization that makes it practicable, there would be utter frustration, not only in undertaking to observe and enforce the law, desired to bring about a partial solution of this problem, but among those who are fortunate enough to reach this country, fortunate enough to escape the displaced-persons camps, to escape the atmosphere and the foundation and the environment of the hatred and intolerance and want in these countries which are involved, and any other countries to which they may have gone—temporarily or otherwise.

So, I congratulate this great organization, this great group of men and women who are in a sense going among the people, if not physically, at least theoretically, preaching the gospel to all creatures—the gospel of peace, the gospel of economic security, the gospel of fairness, of opportunity and of humanity, which it is. Now, I recognize the difficulties which face the American people and I am not unaware, of course, of the prejudices which in recent years have grown up against the admission of too many people into this country to the extent that our own economy would be endangered and our security would be jeopardized. That danger and fear has been intensified by the differences now existing throughout the world and the ideology which men follow. But I entertain no such fear on account of the program of the Displaced Persons Act, or of the United Service for New Americans or any other program, voluntary or otherwise, initiated and carried on by the fine, high type of character of the people who are engaged in this work and try to do something for the world.

Now, you are, of course, familiar with the fact that following the war the question had to be dealt with by the Congress, because under our migration laws and under the quota system, it was impossible for many of the most worthy of these refugees to find refuge in the United States. The quota system may be necessary, and it has been adopted by the policy of the Congress, under ordinary conditions. But a quota system does not always result in the admission of the best people into this country, especially after a world crisis. Many of these people who have been herded into camps escaped their own countries into which they were turned and which they left in order that they might escape the very conditions which they found intolerable in the homes of their fathers.

I have been in some of these DP camps in Europe. I have seen the type of men and women who were there. All of them, in all camps and in all countries, had the same high level of character and desirability. I have been in these camps in Germany. I have seen men, women, and children who came from Russia, who came out from Russia because they were unwilling to live under the intolerable conditions, and they have not been willing to go back because they were unwilling to submit themselves to the sort of regimentation and circumstances in which they were compelled to live there. I have seen the remains of the people who were the special object of Hitler's hatred. He tried to destroy and obliterate and exterminate these people, and nearly succeeded.

I have been in those camps, where I saw children being taught the lessons of history and many of them, in my judgment, are people that can become good citizens of the United States. I have seen these refugees in Italy and other countries. I had seen them in Austria 2 years ago. I have been in the DP camps in Germany, Austria, and in one or two instances, in Italy, and I have been inspired by the devotion, and sincerity, and the character of these people who are not willing to go back and are looking forward to the approach of the day when they may expect to leave.

In order to solve that problem, in a sense temporarily, the United States has contributed to the International Refugee Organization, to which reference has been made, $70,000,000 a year out of the taxes of the people and more than $200,000,000 altogether. As long as this problem faces us and as long as it faces the UN, which cannot abandon it in good faith, it is desirable that the problem be solved for these DP's who are worthy of resettlement, and that they be allowed to resettle in this country insofar as it can be done under the law, and wherever else it may be done, under the laws of other countries. Looking at it purely from the standpoint of practicality, it is related to the expenses of our Government, and at this time the expenses of our Government are important matters to be concerned about, that they are settled as promptly as possible and that they may be resettled in this country among our own people who want them.

The President, as you know, asked the Congress, in the effort to help solve this problem, to amend the immigration law to allow 400,000 of these displaced persons to come into the United States. A great many people thought he meant 400,000 a year. He meant no such thing. He meant a total of 400,000 people. The matter was debated in the Eightieth Congress bitterly. It was debated in the atmosphere of what was then a crisis in the disposition of these persons and in the world's attitude toward them. It was debated with more or less heat among those who desired to have liberal and to accept the responsibility of civilization and of Christianity in its fullest sense, but instead of enacting a law to permit 400,000 persons to come into this country, Congress rather grudgingly permitted 205,000, only half the number recommended by the President.

The President signed this bill, not because it was adequate, not because it was in accordance with his recommendations, but as he stated at the time he signed it because it was the only thing he could get at that time and it was a step in the right direction, though including prejudicial restrictions which have been unfair to many of those entitled to come into this country. In the judgment of the President—and I agree with him completely—it was particularly prejudicial to Catholics and Jews, and there were no grounds in the history of this country to justify such discrimination against them. But the law did recognize, however, our obligation, so far as it went. It was an acknowledgment of our leadership, at least of our participation among other nations in that leadership designed to lift the hope of these unfortunate people, many of whom I have seen myself trudge the highways of Europe, not knowing when night fell where they might rest their souls. Not only did the law, as far as it went, recognize our national obligation toward these people, it also established for them a quota system which is applicable to immigration generally. It did something else. It provided for the protection of our interests and our people and our social and political institutions by undertaking to protect our country against the infiltration of subversives who may take advantage of the law to try to come here. As far as the law went, forgetting for the moment the unfair and unjust discrimination to which the President called attention, the law was a step in the right direction, and, of course, it did serve a good purpose to that extent.

Now, the problem is its extension to increase the numbers which would be permitted to come in. The President, in his annual message and in other recommendations since the problem arose, has recommended 400,000 refugees, DP's, be admitted into this country. He did it in 1948; he did it again in 1949. He did it on January 4, 1950, in his annual message a couple of weeks ago. Now, the House of Representatives responded in the Eighty-first Congress to the recommendation of the President. It did not respond fully by accepting 400,000, but reduced the number to 339,000. (Just why they fixed it at 339,000 and not 340,000 I do not know. Another thousand would not have hurt much.) Now, that bill is before the Senate. I am not going into the parliamentary situation, because I may have to pass on it as President of the Senate, and I do not wish in any way to forecast what problem might arise and what my decision would be in such a situation. The Committee on the Judiciary did not act upon it. The Senate became impatient and was on the verge of voting on a motion to discharge the committee when the committee met and voted the bill out without recommendation and placed it on the calendar. It was taken up and debated for a week or so, and by a vote of 36 to 30 recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary with the instructions to report it back by the 25th of January 1950. That day will soon approach.

The Senate may have an opportunity at an early date to give it further consideration. Of course, the Senate can amend the bill to include the entire 400,000 if it sees fit, raising the figures in the House bill. Compromises are always necessary in legislation where there is determined opposition, and I am not in a position to say whether the Senate will increase the number or not. I am not any longer a Member of the Senate. I have no vote except in the case of a tie, and any vote in the case of a tie is only effective if I favor something that is being voted on, because a tie vote defeats any proposition that is being voted on, since all matters must receive at least a majority. Therefore, my vote as President of the Senate counts for nothing on a tie vote unless I am in favor of it, and a vote in the affirmative gives it a majority of one vote.

But I can say this, and I say it because I believe it is in accordance with the facts: If the Senate had been permitted to vote on that bill in the last session, or if it is permitted to vote on it at this session, it will overwhelmingly adopt a new bill increasing the number which may come here and removing the restrictions and discriminations that are now in the present law.

Reference has been made here to the various criticisms and charges—I think the speaker who is an honored member of the Commission has adequately dealt with them (Henry Rosenfield, DP Commissioner), and I do not feel it necessary to reiterate and repeat, except I do wish to say this: There have never been in my judgment, in the whole history of the United States, a more careful piece of machinery of inspection and investigation than is now in effect in regard to the administration of these displaced persons in the United States. Our Army, through its counter-intelligence service, all of our consuls abroad who have to pass upon visas, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Justice, the Immigration Service, everywhere—here and elsewhere—and many others which I might mention, are a part of this screening process. I do not know how there would be any better system of investigation by which it could be determined that those who are permitted to come are entitled to come. And none of these services, none of these agencies, none of these organizations, whether they are governmental or voluntary, either approve of or permit anybody to come under the displaced-persons program who either is now, or ever has been, a member of the Communist Party, who now is, or ever was, a Nazi or a Fascist. They just can't get in. Now there are recesses in the brain in which opinions and convictions sometimes are harbored that nobody knows anything about, because there is no mirror by which you can look into a man's mind to tell what he is thinking. There are phrenologists who pretend to know that, but I

have always doubted it. It might be possible that out of 205,000 people, out of 400,000, somebody now and then might slip in who was not the sort of person we wanted to be amalgamated into the citizenship of the United States.

This program has been endorsed by so many organizations, and its administration has been helped by the cooperation of these organizations to such an extent, that I do not entertain any fear as to the character, the loyalty, or those who are permitted to come.

I do not believe the great Catholic Church, the Council of Churches of Christ in America, which is the Protestant organization of the churches of the United States, that the Synagogue Council representing the Jewish Synagogue in this country, that the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, which is always anxious and alert to protect the interests of their people and who are now within their organization fighting for the elimination of all subversive elements within their organization—would endorse either the enactment or the perpetuation of a law that under its administration or provisions would undermine the foundations of American liberty, American democracy, and American humanity.

I am among those, and have been all along, who have actively supported the recommendation of the President and am doing so now. I express the hope that before this Congress shall act, before it adjourns, before this law shall have expired, and before we are confronted with the inhuman proposition that nearly a quarter of a million worthy men, women, and children who are worthy of American citizenship are to be stranded and again huddled anywhere in Europe because of our prejudice and unwillingness to take them in and make them not only good citizens of America, which they want to be, but good citizens of the world, which they have a right to be.

We are faced with a great duty, a great obligation. Whether we wanted it or not, the leadership of the world has, in many respects, been placed in our hands.

Destiny had something to do with it. Fate had something to do with it. The unification of the world from the standpoint of physical connections, the interdependence of men and women upon other men and women of other communities, of one country and state upon another country and state, and one nation upon other nations—have centered the responsibility of leadership and guidance in the people of the United States. It is a tremendous obligation. It is a tremendous challenge to our ability and our willingness to help preserve the institutions out of which come freedom of the soul, freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of the press, and all the freedoms which we have cherished for a century and a half, to which have been added other freedoms and other desires for freedom—freedom from want and freedom from fear. Some poet has beautifully said, "He who stoops to lift the fallen does not stoop but stands erect." That is true of organizations no less than men. It is true of voluntary organizations, it is true of states, it is true of nations, it is true of governments which are the expression of organized society, the only organization that has the power to enforce its decrees, and the only one to which the people may look in carrying out their will for themselves and for their fellow men.

I wish for this organization the satisfaction and pride of eminent success, and I hope it will increase its activities and maintain its standing and its integrity, as it has until this hour, until this great humanitarian problem of rescuing human souls has been completely accomplished; and that out of it may grow, some day, perpetual peace and harmony among all the peoples of the world, and if we can make any contribution to this without regard to politics, religion, race, color, or national origin, those who become the beneficiaries of our activities will thank Almighty God that there were such men and women as those who are now contributing to this great result.

ASSISTANCE TO SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BENTON

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator BENTON at the annual banquet of the Norwich (Conn.) Chamber of Commerce, January 28, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KEFAUVER AT ROOSEVELT DAY DINNER

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him January 28, 1950, in Louisville, Ky., at a meeting of Americans for Democratic Action, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN AT CONCERT BY THE ARMY BAND

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at a concert on January 25, 1950, by the Army Band, in honor of Pennsylvania, which appears in the Appendix.]

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him under the headline, "Happenings in Washington," on January 30, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ALL-AMERICAN CONFERENCE AGAINST COMMUNISM

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by himself relative to the All-American Conference Against Communism, resolutions adopted by the conference, and an article thereon published in the New York Times of January 30, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CRISIS IN THE DISPLACED-PERSONS PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY HARRY N. ROSENFIELD

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Crisis in the Displaced-Persons Program," delivered by Harry N. Rosenfield, Commissioner, Displaced Persons Commission, on January 15, 1950, before the annual meeting of the United Service for New Americans, Inc., New York City, which appears in the Appendix.]

FREEDOM ISN'T FREE—ADDRESS BY MAURICE R. FRANKS

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Freedom Isn't Free," delivered by Maurice R. Franks, president of the National Labor-Management Foundation, before the Fighters for Freedom, at Knoxville, Tenn., on January 20, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON BILL TO RESTRAIN UNREASONABLE ACTIONS OF LABOR MONOPOLIES

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD editorials from the Washington Evening Star, the New York World Telegram and Sun, and the Tampa Morning Tribune, commenting on Senate bill 2912, introduced by him, to restrain unreasonable actions of labor monopolies, which appear in the Appendix.]

MOROCCO VIOLATES TREATY IN WAR ON AMERICAN TRADERS—EDITORIAL FROM SATURDAY EVENING POST

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Morocco Violates Treaty in War on American Traders," published in the Saturday Evening Post of January 28, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

TEMPEST IN THE A. & P. TEAPOT—ARTICLE BY A. G. MEZERIK

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Tempest in the A. & P. Teapot," written by A. G. Mezerik, and published in the January 15, 1950, issue of Sales Management, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RED PERIL OF THE NATIONAL DEBT—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS STAR-TIMES

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Red Peril of the National Debt," published in a recent issue of the St. Louis Star-Times, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEPLETION ALLOWANCES—TAX REVISION REPORT OF NATIONAL MINERALS ADVISORY COUNCIL

[Mr. MCCARRAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the National Minerals Advisory Council's Report on Tax Revision, submitted to the Secretary of the Interior on December 7, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHY SHOULD AMERICAN SOLDIERS LIVE LIKE PIGS?—ARTICLE BY DANIEL A. POLING

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Why Should American Soldiers Live Like Pigs?" written by Dr. Daniel A. Poling, and published in the February 14, 1950, issue of Look magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOVERNMENT SILVER PURCHASES—ARTICLE FROM THE DESERET NEWS

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Government Silver Purchases and Sound 'Hard Money' Policy," published in the Deseret News, Salt Lake City, Utah, January 25, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

SECRETARY ACHESON'S POLICY FOR CHINA—ARTICLE BY DOROTHY THOMPSON

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Policy Advanced by Acheson for China Declared 'So Extremely Comfortable,'" written by Dorothy Thompson, and published in the Washington Evening Star, which appears in the Appendix.]

A CUT FOR SOLDIERS' HOME—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. HENDRICKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Cut for Soldiers' Home," published in the Washington Times-Herald, January 30, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXCHANGE OF AMBASSADORS WITH IRELAND

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, last week I was glad to read that the State Department had seen fit to exchange Ambassadors with the State of Ireland, whereas previously we had been represented by a Minister. I have felt

that this move should have been made before, and on April 13 last I wrote to the Secretary of State, as follows:

We have in this country a great many Americans of Irish descent and I believe that the time has come when serious consideration should be given to making the Legation in Ireland an Embassy and having this country represented not by a Minister, but by an Ambassador.

I wish to have printed immediately following my remarks an editorial entitled "Old Friends," from the Boston Pilot of Saturday, January 28, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLD FRIENDS

Much of the news that comes out of the State Department these days is of such a disquieting nature that it is refreshing to read that amid the pressure of all sorts of other problems we have seen fit to exchange Ambassadors with the young state of Ireland. While we have had it pointed out to us with almost monotonous regularity by Mr. Dean Acheson that this kind of recognition does not imply any sort of approval of the government so recognized (as in the proposals on Spain), we cannot help feeling that in this case at least the exchange of Ambassadors merely makes clear a sympathy of long standing. It is almost like an international handshake in an old friendship.

Ireland represents for us today not just one more member of the family of nations but a Christian and distinctly Catholic state in a world where the principles upon which it has been founded need vital reassertion. How in the spirit of the holy year was Ireland first among nations to grant a special amnesty to prisoners. In an age when political considerations are used as a basis for repressive measures against minorities how Ireland stands out as a land of freedom and tolerance. When other nations refuse to allow the mention of God in official documents and discourage religious observances Ireland proclaims His Sovereignty in the very opening words of her constitution. We do well surely to join hands with a people so fully conscious of the presence of God in the affairs of men.

The Pilot particularly rejoices in being able to take notice of an event which has been the object of the strivings of so many generations and the ideal of so many valiant hearts. The history of the struggles of Ireland toward independence are intimately associated with the history of this journal and some may well say that the Pilot itself may take some credit for the goal that has been attained. Whatever may be said on that point, the Pilot can say today that all nations will benefit by the spirit of Christian policy that the traditions of Ireland will make fresh in the exercise of international relations.

TRIBUTE TO BRIG. GEN. JULIUS KLEIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared on the subject of one of the distinguished soldiers whose appointment we confirmed in the National Guard last Thursday.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, Mr. WILEY's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, on page 956 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 26 is a list of many distinguished soldiers whose appointments the Senate confirmed to various units of our armed forces establishment. Among the able men so confirmed for appointment, as brigadier generals in our National Guard, was one whom I should like to devote a few moments on. Ordinarily I would not single out any single individual out of so large a roster of citizen-soldiers, but I do think the facts in this particular instance merit special attention.

Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, who was confirmed to that National Guard rank as of November 10, 1949, is not a constituent of mine, nor is he a resident of my State, rather he is a resident of our neighbor State of Illinois. I do, however, want to mention some of his fine qualifications because I think they exemplify the best in America's tradition of citizen-soldiers who have sprung to arms in the defense of their beloved Nation when the call of duty has come. We know that throughout our country men like him are giving of their time and energy to participate in National Guard units and in other elements of our vital reserve components.

General Klein has met the Nation's enemy in two wars. His conduct was equally brilliant in both. In the Second World War he distinguished himself both as a brilliant administrator and as a combat officer, commanding troops in several invasion battles. In commenting on Julius Klein's record, the former Secretary of War, Robert P. Patterson, said: "I cannot say too much for the caliber of his work. He is an officer of marked ability and notable vigor. I am sure he is thoroughly qualified for Federal recognition in his present rank and post."

Mr. President, I should like to give you an idea of Julius Klein's singular relationship with the rank and file in the Army. Serving as a full colonel in the Pacific, under the command of the great General MacArthur, General Klein always spoke of himself as "the GI with the eagle on the shoulder patch." He is still a GI. His attitude will never change, even though the shoulder patch has changed into one bearing a star.

When as the newly elected national commander of the Jewish War Veterans, he became the spokesman for 800,000 Jewish war veterans, Julius Klein promised to lead this great veterans' organization into further services of the principles of American democracy. Under his leadership, the Jewish War Veterans grew in stature and did indeed expand its usefulness far beyond even its fine effort in the past.

So, this citizen-soldier, a stanch patriot and anti-Communist leader, has been a credit to the Nation, a credit to the Army, and a credit to the Jewish faith to which he has been devoted throughout his entire life. He has been prominent in public life long before he joined the Army, which was prior to the Japanese sneak attack on Pearl Harbor. When the war came to an end, and his ability as a public-relations consultant was needed by the then Secretary of War, Robert P. Patterson, Julius Klein put aside his own personal interests and continued to serve the country in the capacity of special assistant to the Secretary of War.

I am, indeed, gratified, Mr. President, to see that Julius Klein's past service to his country and future usefulness are recognized by the Federal Recognition Board.

Good luck to him and to our great National Guard.

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield 5 minutes to me, to permit me to make a brief statement, with the understanding that by doing so he will not lose his right to the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That can be done only by unanimous consent.

Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Wyoming may proceed, if the Senator from Michigan will yield for that purpose.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, the voluntary health insurance bill, introduced by me earlier today, is designed to provide a program of prepaid national health insurance with broad coverage to low-income groups of our people at a minimum premium. This bill carries no compulsory features and thus does not, in any sense of the word, socialize the health professions.

Health is, without question of a doubt, the most important aspect of our individual lives. Since the medical profession hold in their hands the health of the Nation and, through the health of the Nation, influence our ability to prosper, to pay taxes—yes, Mr. President, even to wage war—it is proper and necessary that jurisdiction over and direction of the health of the Nation rest with the profession. Therefore, the bill establishes a department of health, with Cabinet status. Surely the health of the people of the United States is as important as in other nations where health does have a cabinet post.

Since health is such a specialized service, it seems prudent to prescribe certain qualifications for the Secretary of the Department of Health, namely, that he shall be a professional health worker who has been active in the practice of medicine or dentistry, and who shall have had broad experience in the field of medical or dental education, and also, insofar as possible, in order to obviate the possibility of the health services being politically exploited, to provide further qualification that "the Secretary of Health shall have held no political office in any political party."

The bill provides that the Secretary of Health and the Under Secretary of Health, as well as five Assistant Secretaries of Health, shall be appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate.

The Assistant Secretaries of Health shall respectively head, first, the Bureau of Medical and Hospital Care; second, the Bureau of Public Health Practices; third, the Bureau of Children's Welfare; fourth, the Bureau of Research; fifth, the Bureau of Staff Services.

This bill closely follows the Hoover Commission's report on reorganization of the health services, the exceptions being in establishing Department of Health on a Cabinet level, and in excluding the Veterans' Bureau and armed services.

In order to accomplish a positive plan for prepaid health insurance for the low-income groups and to satisfy those leading the on-rushing campaign for compulsory health insurance, a national health insurance board is provided. This Board, as well as administering the national health-insurance program, is charged with the extension of medical and health services to rural shortage areas, and to farmer experimental health cooperatives by means of grants and loans. The Board is given wide latitude in determining the terms and conditions of personal health insurance, for the obvious reason that to include specifically the terms of health insurance in writing legislation is impossible, impracticable, and can be determined only by extensive actuarial studies and experience.

The National Health Insurance Board will be composed of five members, including the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, to represent the medical profession, and four members appointed by the President, with the advice of the Senate, as follows: One shall represent hospital associations, one shall represent dental associations, and two shall represent the public at large. While not spelled out in the bill, they should, of course, be thoroughly trained in the field of health and accident insurance.

Since the primary objective of this bill is to make available prepaid health insurance to the low-income groups, families whose gross income is in excess of $5,000 are made ineligible. While not sufficient or adequate in all cases, prepaid health insurance is available to this group of families from private sources. Seventy-nine percent of the families would be eligible to purchase Government health insurance, since only 21 percent of our families have annual incomes above $5,000.

It is deemed unwise to provide health insurance with a deductible feature in an amount above $5, for the reason that any amount above $5 would, in all probability, preclude its purchase by the low-income group, and I am undecided whether even a $5 deductible feature should be provided for. However, some small deductible amount should be authorized, to discourage unnecessary visits to physicians and dental offices, using their time which should be available to those seriously in need of such services.

In presenting this bill to the Congress, I am quite aware that it does not do all things for all people. However, my observations in the Congress, as well as my mail pertaining to health insurance from all over the country, and hundreds of editorials from the Nation's press, firmly convince me that we cannot preserve the freedom of the practice of medicine and dentistry, that we cannot keep the professions uncontrolled and unregimented, and that we cannot maintain our American free and independent practices of these professions by simply denouncing compulsory health or state medicine—whichever one may wish to call it—by a continued stand-pat opposition.

Compulsory health insurance has been, in some form or other, before the Congress now for 11 years. The demand for changes in our methods of affording medical services is gaining momentum each succeeding year. In the United States today we have, without question of a doubt, the best physicians, dentists, nurses, and hospitals that the world has ever known in all history. To these professional health workers go the credit for increasing the life span of our people from 35 years, when this Nation was founded, to 67 years, as of today; 65 for men and 70 for women. This has been accomplished under our present form of medical practice. Surely no one questions the skill and professional attainments of the health services in the United States, but only wishes to make them available to those not now receiving such health services.

My views incorporated in this bill are the result of 16 years' active practice of one of the professions affected, 3 years in legislative, and 14 years' experience in the executive branch of Government. I think I know whereof I speak, and I have only one thought in mind in introducing this bill, namely, to make better health services available to all the people of this great Nation. It is clearly evident that the professions must come forward with an alternative to compulsory health insurance, or socialized medicine will ultimately follow, with lay direction and control.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan for yielding to me.

INTEGRATED STEEL MILL FOR NEW ENGLAND—STATEMENT OF DR. ALFRED C. NEAL

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, on Friday Dr. Alfred C. Neal, vice president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, appeared before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report and gave a lucid and well-reasoned appeal in behalf of securing an integrated steel mill for New England.

For the past 2 years, Gov. Sherman Adams, of New Hampshire, has devoted considerable time and energy toward the possibility of acquiring a steel plant for the very suitable area around Portsmouth, N. H. In that effort, he organized the New Hampshire steel project, headed by Eugene Whittemore, and composed of many other outstanding New Hampshire citizens. The New Hampshire congressional delegation has cooperated with Governor Adams and his steel committee in its efforts, and I believe that Dr. Neal's statement of last Friday bolsters their case with facts and figures. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate as a part of my remarks the entire statement of Dr. Neal.

I might note, Mr. President, that certain of the exhibits offered by Dr. Neal in his testimony before the joint committee are not suitable for reproduction in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD since they are maps and graphic charts. However, I would ask the proper official to be sure to print such text and other material as is found to be applicable to these maps and charts.

Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent to have incorporated into the RECORD at the conclusion of Dr. Neal's statement an editorial from the New Hampshire Sunday News of January 29 which relates to the same subject.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY ALFRED C. NEAL, VICE PRESIDENT AND DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH, FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF BOSTON, ON BEHALF OF THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL STEEL COMMITTEE

I am making this statement as a member of and economist for the steel committee of the New England Council. To save your time, I shall cover only the most important points in the statement itself. I shall introduce at appropriate points exhibits in support of the points that I make.

We propose to show:

1. That New England's steel-using industries—despite the fact that they accounted for almost three-quarters of the growth in manufacturing in New England since prewar—are seriously handicapped by the cost and supply of steel now available to them.

2. That New England, eastern New York State, New York City, and northern New Jersey would be relieved of the handicap of high-cost steel by the establishment of an integrated steel mill in New England.

3. That there is a close relationship between these two points and the recent increases in the price of steel.

The establishment of an integrated steel mill would make it possible for this area to participate more fully in the Nation's economic growth during the years to come and would further make it possible for this area to absorb a much larger volume of imports and so contribute more fully to meeting the requirements of our present international position.

To demonstrate that New England and the territory adjacent to it are currently handicapped by the cost of steel, and to demonstrate further that this cost handicap can be removed by the establishment of an integrated mill, it will be necessary to prove the following points:

1. That steel users in New England and the territory adjacent to it are presently under a cost handicap in their steel supply.

2. That there is sufficient market to justify the establishment of an integrated steel mill with a capacity of approximately one and one-quarter million tons of ingots. This is the size mill that we are advised would be necessary for efficiency for the type of products most needed by the market.

3. That the cost of making steel at such an integrated mill in New England and the profits that might be derived from such a mill would, on the basis of the estimates available, justify investment in it.

4. That conditions unrelated to the cost handicap of steel consumers, the market advantage of the New England and adjacent area, and the cost and profitability of the proposed mill have so far prevented the establishment of this mill in New England.

THE COST HANDICAP FOR NEW ENGLAND STEEL CONSUMERS

I shall now take up each of these points in turn, beginning with the present position of steel consumers in the New England area. It should be understood at the outset that New England and the area adjacent to it is an area of deficit steel supply. There is not in this area any integrated steel mill and there is very little nonintegrated steel production. The types of steel which bulk largest in the consumption of the area must be brought in from outside. The nearest mills are those at Sparrows Point, Md.; Buffalo, N. Y.; and Bethlehem, Pa. Since the mill at Bethlehem does not make products with which we are most concerned, for practical purposes we can concentrate upon the sources of supply at Sparrows Point, Buffalo, and points farther away.

Steel consumers in New England and the adjacent territory must buy their steel from these mills and pay freight from them to their own consuming points. These freight rates put New England consumers at a decided cost handicap. For example, it costs with today's freight rates $10.20 per ton to bring steel from Sparrows Point to New Haven, Conn.; $11.60 from Sparrows Point to Worcester, Mass.; and $12.60 from Sparrows Point to Manchester, N. H. Similarly it costs $12.20 per ton to bring steel from Buffalo, N. Y. to New Haven; $12.40 from Buffalo to Worcester; and $12.60 from Buffalo to Manchester. Since it is impossible for mills located at Sparrows Point and Buffalo to supply all of the steel that New Englanders consume, much of the steel moves in from the Pittsburgh district and the rate for freight alone from Pittsburgh to New Haven is $13.60 per ton; from Pittsburgh to Worcester, $15; and from Pittsburgh to Manchester, $15.20. I am submitting as exhibit A a table showing freight rates from the principal producing points which I have mentioned to a selected list of consuming points in New England.

What are the effects of cost handicaps of such size upon New England's steel-consuming industries? I am introducing as exhibit B a series of cases showing the reaction of typical New England steel consumers to this situation. Let me read you excerpts from these cases which are more fully described in the exhibit.

One employer of 1,500 stated recently that his board of directors is giving continuing consideration to abandoning their two existing plants in New England with a view to moving to Ohio.

Another employer of 8,000 workers said, "If a New England steel mill is built, our company will undoubtedly be able to continue in New England; if not, we will have to move much nearer the center of our Nation."

An employer of 750 stated that the present delivered cost of steel and iron is so high that in all probability within 2 years he would have to move the operations of one of his companies to the Middle West in order to keep the business healthy.

An official of another company employing over 6,000 workers said that any future expansion will be made in other parts of the country because their raw materials—iron and steel—cost so much in New England.

Another company employing 1,000 workers stated that if a steel mill is established in New England, the company would probably stay in business here, but if it is not, the company will either have to close up or move somewhere else. This company spends more than $1,000,000 a year on steel.

Another relatively small company estimates that a New England mill would mean a saving of about $1,000,000 annually to it.

It would be interesting and convincing to have these businessmen who are squeezed by high steel costs to tell their story to your committee. They will not do that, nor will most of them openly support the movement to obtain a New England mill because, as one told us recently, "We live by the grace of God and the Grace of Bethlehem Steel."

I believe that the freight costs that I have quoted, together with the reactions of typical New England steel consumers, demonstrate that this area suffers a severe cost handicap in steel at the present time for lack of an integrated steel mill to support its metalworking operations. It should be remembered that when we are discussing the metalworking operations in New England we are talking about businesses which employ 40 percent of the manufacturing wage earners in the region, or more than half a million people.

If we assume that an integrated steel mill were established in New England and that it sold its products at the same price as present suppliers now charge, how much would consumers in this area save? For purposes of the discussion, since we must consider freight rates from somewhere, let us assume that the mill is established at New London, Conn.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I wish to interpolate here to note that Dr. Neal made it clear that New London, Conn., is only used as an example. He stated that Portsmouth, N. H., has an unusually desirable site, and he has figures available to show comparable differentials for Portsmouth.

To use the same cities as we used before as examples, consumers in New Haven who now buy from Sparrows Point would save a minimum of $5.40 per ton; those who buy from Buffalo would save a minimum of $7.40 per ton, and those who buy from Pittsburgh would save $8.80 per ton. Consumers in Worcester who buy from Sparrows Point would save $5.80 per ton; those who buy from Buffalo would save $6.60 per ton, and those who buy from Pittsburgh would save $9.20 per ton. Consumers in Manchester who buy from Sparrows Point would save $4.60 per ton; those who buy from Buffalo would save $4.60 per ton; and those who buy from Pittsburgh would save $7.20 per ton. The savings would extend into New York City, Newark, and Jersey City. These consumers would save from 40 cents a ton on shipments from Sparrows Point up to $4.40 a ton on shipments from Pittsburgh. (The freight rates that I have used in these calculations appear in exhibit A.)

I have used for these calculations rail-freight rates. A check on trucking rates indicates that the savings on truck shipments for points close to the mill would be somewhat higher than those indicated. We have also checked water transportation rates and find that savings in line with those shown for rail shipment would result to the points mentioned which could be reached by water shipment.

I think I have presented enough evidence to show that New England steel consumers are presently under a substantial cost handicap because of their distance from integrated steel mills; that this cost handicap threatens the normal economic growth of the region, and that it can be removed if steel could be made as economically in New England as it is made at mills now supplying steel consumers in the area.

THE MARKET FOR A NEW ENGLAND STEEL MILL

When the members of the Steel Committee first approached steel companies on this project, they were told by almost all that New England probably did not have a market sufficiently large to support an integrated steel mill. Most of the companies approached offered to give us such assistance as they could to determine the size of the market that might be available to a New England mill, because the industry itself was not sure of its facts on this point. Doubt as to the size of the market set the first task for the committee.

The easiest method of determining how much steel of various types was consumed in the area that might be supplied by a New England mill was to ask the steel companies supplying this area to tell us how much they shipped into it. A questionnaire calling for this information in such detail that it would be reasonably useful to the steel industry was drawn up and submitted for study and comment to three of the major companies supplying the New England-New York-New Jersey market. Two of these suppliers refused flatly to give us the information which they said was necessary to determine whether a mill could be supported by the market, and the third gave us an equivocal answer which we interpreted to be a refusal. Fortunately, there have been published three studies which provide the basis for determining what the market for steel is in this New England-New York-New Jersey area.

The first of these, which covered only part of the products and part of the industry, was published by the Senate Small Business Committee; the second by Iron Age, a trade publication; and the third, which was issued only a few weeks ago, was made by the Bureau of the Census. There are considerable differences among these studies. The Iron Age study gives New England and the adjacent New York and northern New Jersey markets a total finished steel consumption in the metalworking industries of almost 6,000,000 tons. The more recent study by the Census Bureau, which covers carbon steel only, cuts this total down to about 3,500,000 tons. To use the most conservative basis possible for estimating the market, I shall use the recently publish Census Bureau figures to determine whether there is a market sufficiently large to justify an integrated steel mill, but with the qualification that the census figures understate the size of the market.

Obviously an integrated mill cannot make all products. We therefore confine ourselves to carbon steel products which might be made economically in a moderate-size mill having approximately 1,125,000 tons of ingot capacity and a comfortable operating rate of about 850,000 tons of finished steel. The local market in which a New England mill would have a freight advantage consists of the New England States, eastern New York State, New York City, and the Newark-Jersey City area. This market, in which a New England mill located at New London could deliver steel cheaper than any present competing mill, is shown on the map labeled "Exhibit C," which is based upon a study by the division of traffic research of the New Haven Railroad.

The biggest item consumed by the metalworking industries in this market consists of flat-rolled products. According to the Census Bureau figures, nearly 1,100,000 tons of sheet and strip were consumed by the metalworking industries in this market in 1947. In addition, there were consumed in this market more than 300,000 tons of plates. This gives us a total of flat-rolled products of more than 1,400,000 tons or one and seven-tenths times the comfortable operating rate of a flat-rolled products mill in the territory in which the New England mill would enjoy a positive freight advantage over any competitor.

In addition to the local market, there is a market for flat-rolled products in Florida, Texas, and the Pacific coast which could be economically reached by back hauls of ships now delivering lumber, sulfur, fertilizer, cotton, and other products to New England. This coastal market in which a New England mill could compete uses 663,000 tons of sheet and strip and 472,000 tons of plate in its metalworking industries alone. There is available further an estimated market of 100,000 tons of silicon sheet and strip which might be made by the New England mill, and a total export market of 662,000 tons in countries bordering on the Atlantic Basin.

If there is any fear that even this tremendous market of over 3,250,000 tons of flat-rolled steel in the metalworking industries alone could not support a New England mill, it is worth indicating that one or more bar mills could be added to supply carbon steel bars to a market which totals 481,000 tons in New England and the adjacent New York-New Jersey territory and close to 800,000 tons if Florida, Texas, and the Pacific coast were added. A detailed description of these markets is presented in exhibit D.

It is worthy of note in connection with the market, first, that these figures represent considerable underestimate because customers buying less than 50 tons per annum are not included, as well as for the reasons stated on the first page of exhibit D, and second, that the New England part of this market is not only growing at faster than the national rate, but that the establishment of a new integrated steel mill, with consequent savings to consumers, could be expected to accelerate that growth rate. On the basis of the acceleration of the growth of the metalworking industries which occurred in the 1930's in the area served by the Sparrows Point mill, which was greatly expanded at the beginning of that period, it is possible to estimate that the New England market alone would grow by approximately 450,000 tons per year between now and 1960—that is, in the next 10 years. (See chart 3 of exhibit D.)

Further evidence of the size of this local market for a New England mill can be gained from exhibit E which shows the heavy concentration of the metalworking industry in New England, New York, and New Jersey. This area, which accounts for nearly 20 percent of the Nation's population and nearly one-quarter of its income, produces substantially more than these proportions of many metal products. For example, it accounts for 97 percent of those employed making typewriters, 88 percent of those in cutlery, 71 percent in textile machinery, 65 percent in nails and spikes, 57 percent in wiring devices and supplies, 51 percent in ball and roller bearings, 44 percent in wire drawing, 41 percent in radios and related products, 40 percent of the machine tools, 39 percent in blowers and fans, 37 percent in general industrial machinery, 36 percent in

special industrial machinery, and 34 percent in ship and boat building.

It is to be noted that this area does not have nearly the proportion of the automobile industry that its income and population would lead us to expect. It accounts for only 9 percent of the motor vehicle body and parts industry. It is also well short of its proportion of the heating and cooking appliance, boiler, and other industries using flat-rolled steel.

I submit that the establishment of an integrated steel mill in New England will result in a sizable expansion in some of these metalworking industries and that the growth potential in steel consumption of 450,000 tons per year within 10 years which I have referred to is not unrealistic.

It may be argued by some that the figures on total tonnage of steel consumed in this market disguise the great diversity of the market in the New England and adjacent territory. Careful explorations indicate that the diversity of this market is ably served by speciality steel mills and warehouses which buy the products of integrated mills and either further process and finish them or break them down into the small orders which the thousands of customers in the area require. In other words, a major market for an integrated New England mill would consist of the larger size orders placed by large consumers, speciality mills, and warehouses serving customers in the market area.

I believe that it is safe to conclude that there is sufficient market to justify the establishment of an integrated steel mill in New England, and that this market is of such a nature and has such a potential for growth that a New England mill of 1,250,000 tons of integrated capacity might find it desirable to expand after it had been in operation for a few years.

COSTS FOR A NEW ENGLAND MILL

Most of the members of the steel committee orginally were of the opinion that steel could not be made in an integrated steel mill in New England at competitive costs. At first sight the prospect for such a mill appeared discouraging. New England has neither iron ore nor coal or sufficient quality and in sufficient quantity to support an integrated mill. It is axiomatic that for an economic location for a steel mill it is necessary to satisfy two out of three requirements: coal, iron ore, and markets. Careful study by John E. Kelly, the committee's consultant, however, indicates that the physical location of iron ore and coal is less important than its economic location.

When he studied the possibilities of ocean transportation in large vessels of both iron ore and coal he found that we could obtain iron ore from Seven Islands, Quebec, the shipping point for Labrador ore, at an ocean transportation cost of slightly under $1 per gross ton, and that coal could be brought from Norfolk, the shipping point for southern West Virginia coal, for slightly over $1 per ton. In effect both coal and iron ore are economically closer to New England than they would be if there were deposits located within its territory only a few hundred miles apart. Further evidence of the economy of steel making on the coast is provided for the profitable operation of integrated mills both to the north at Sydney, Nova Scotia, and to the south at Sparrows Point, Md.

Some of the best coking coal in the country can be landed in New England in the types, qualities, and quantities used by an integrated mill at a delivered cost of no more than $10 per net ton. We find further that it is likely that we can obtain Labrador ore delivered in New England at $5.70 per gross ton, and that until the Labrador ore is available we can obtain Newfoundland ore currently being used to make steel in Nova Scotia and England at a landed cost of not over $6 per gross ton. Other sources of ore are also available at comparable costs. We believe that these delivered costs of raw materials would compare very favorably with those at Bethlehem Steel's Sparrows Point plant and would probably be somewhat lower than the costs at Pittsburgh. Admittedly our coal is a little more expensive, but Labrador ore would be cheaper and of a higher grade.

A third important raw material is scrap. Scrap is used for about 50 percent of the metal made in open-hearth furnaces, and about half of this 50 percent is purchased. In scrap, New England would have a decided advantage. New England is a surplus scrap-producing area. (See exhibit F.) In years of high activity like 1947 and 1948 it had a net shipment of scrap out of the territory of more than three-quarters of a million tons. An integrated steel mill of the size contemplated would take only about one-third of this excess supply of scrap and therefore New England would continue to be a surplus scrap-producing area. The present price structure for scrap would not be materially altered by the establishment of an integrated mill, and on the present price structure for scrap there would be a saving to a New England mill of about $7 a ton as compared with a Sparrows Point mill, of about $9 a ton as compared with a Buffalo mill, and of about $10 a ton as compared with a Pittsburgh mill. The reason for these savings is that the price of scrap in New England is worked back from the nearest buying mills to New England by deducting the freight costs to ship from New England to the nearest integrated steel mills.

There is an ample supply of limestone available in New England and in nearby New Brunswick, Canada, which could be delivered at the mill at costs in line with current costs at other producing centers. We estimate a delivered cost of $2 per ton.

We have made the most careful cost estimates possible using prices of raw materials mentioned earlier and conversion costs presently being realized by the most efficient units of the steel industry, units which we could duplicate and improve on in New England. Using Labrador ore and the other raw materials just described we estimate a cost of pig iron of under $24 per ton.

In a flat-rolled products mill making plates and hot and cold rolled sheet in a combination that would be supported by the market, we would have average costs of finished steel using Labrador ore at about $57 per ton. At today's prices we estimate conservatively that we would obtain an average selling price, or realization per ton, of approximately $90 on the combination of products which could be made and sold by a New England mill.

I am introducing in exhibit G the build-up of manufacturing costs and gross sales used in the pro forma profit and loss statements which I shall discuss later.

THE FINANCING PLAN

Before I discuss the profitability of the mill I should like to outline a financing plan which has been suggested for it. When various members of our committee first discussed this project with leading steel companies they were told that the principal difficulty in building a mill today would be the high construction costs and the difficulty of raising the money to build a mill at today's construction costs. We knew from the outset that an integrated mill built today would cost probably twice as much, or more than twice as much, as existing mills. From a bookkeeping point of view such high construction costs would impose a heavy burden upon the mill for depreciation, interest, and return on stockholders' capital.

To meet this problem a novel financing plan has been suggested. I mention it here and I use it in the calculations of the profitability of the mill not necessarily because the steel committee advocates it, but as an indication of how far New England might be willing to go in cooperation with an established steel company to assist that company to set up an integrated mill in New England. This financing plan has been endorsed by four of New England's governors in principle, but whether it could be established in practice would depend upon whether suitable arrangements could be made between a steel company and one of the States in New England. Our committee has offered its assistance to any company wishing to enter into such negotiations.

The financing plan involves the use of a State authority similar to authorities now in operation in various parts of the country in the field of housing, ports, airports, and turnpikes. A large part of the financing—in our example we have used two-thirds—would be done by a State steel authority. The steel authority would for all practical purposes own the steel mill built to the specifications of the steel company and would lease the mill to a New England steel corporation. The New England steel corporation would obligate itself to pay a rental to the steel authority which would cover interest and amortization. The New England steel corporation on its part would put up approximately one-third of the cost, an amount which would supply working capital and certain equipment and so would have a substantial investment in the project on its own account. In our example we have assumed that the steel corporation would have an investment of $80,000,000 out of a total capital investment of $240,000,000.

I should like to repeat again that this example merely works out in terms of figures a proposal which has been widely discussed and does not purport to represent what might actually be used because that is a matter that can be determined only by negotiations between the steel company interested in building a New England mill and the State interested in setting up a steel authority. The plan is analogous to the sale and lease-back arrangement now widely employed by life-insurance companies, with the difference that a State steel authority stands in the place of the life-insurance company.

PROFITABILITY OF AN INTEGRATED NEW ENGLAND STEEL MILL

The estimates of profits of a New England steel mill are based upon the following assumptions:

1. That the mill could be built for $240,000,000, including working capital;

2. That $160,000,000 of this total would represent investment by a State steel authority which could raise this sum by borrowing at an average rate of 1¾ percent;

3. That $80,000,000 represents an equity investment in a New England mill, one-half of which would be supplied by an established steel company and one-half by the public;

4. That the New England steel corporation would pay a rental on the plant owned by the State steel authority which would cover interest at 1¾ percent and which would amortize the authority's investment over a period of 25 years, amortization being at a rate which varies with operations. (See exhibit H.)

For the purpose of measuring the performance of this mill we have set up pro forma profit and loss statements for 10 years which cover operations from 70 percent of ingot capacity to 100 percent of ingot capacity, and which average 82 percent over the 10-year period. (See exhibit I.) This average operating rate is slightly better than the industry average over the last 36 years and is, we feel, justified by the fact that a flat-rolled products mill is not subject to such wide fluctuations in operation as the

average mill in the industry, and by the further fact that mills in deficit steel producing areas show a better operating rate than the average. This judgment has been confirmed by operating steel company executives.

On the basis of these assumptions, using today's costs and prices, the mill would be profitable. Using the 10-year average figures, on the basis of gross sales of slightly more than $69,000,000 per year, the mill would have a manufacturing profit of $25,354,000, would take as much for general administrative and selling expenses as comparable mills, would pay a rental which covers interest and amortization on the authority's investment, would charge as much depreciation as comparable mills now charge, would pay its property taxes and its Federal and State income taxes, and would average over the 10-year period a net profit after taxes of $6,260,000 per year.

Over the 10 years of operations, this profit would provide an average return of 7.8 percent on its stockholders' investment and 9.1 percent on sales. It should be noted that because of the rapid amortization, the return on stockholders' investment improves with the passage of time under the conditions assumed. None of these figures includes a profit of approximately $500,000 per year which could be realized from the sale of by-products.

Twenty-five years is a conservative period for amortizing such a new mill. Obviously, the mill would be more profitable with a longer amortization period. For example, if 50 years were used instead of 25 and interest averaged 2 percent (because longer-term securities would be used), other conditions being the same, the average return on stockholders' investment would be 9.9 percent and that on sales would be 11.4 percent. Whether a longer period than 25 years might be used would depend upon the extent to which the State desiring the mill wished to depart from conventional financial practices to serve the purpose of stimulating employment and income, reducing its relief and social service cost, or other public purposes.

It would appear from these calculations, using the somewhat novel financing plan that has been suggested, that a New England mill could be operated profitably. We believe that the suggested financing plan answers the argument earlier advanced by representatives of the industry that it would be almost impossible to obtain the money to build the mill, or if the money were obtained that the mill could not be profitable at today's construction costs.

WHY HASN'T THE STEEL INDUSTRY BUILT A NEW ENGLAND MILL?

It may reasonably be asked, if the mill would be as profitable as we have estimated it to be, Why hasn't some steel company come forward and entered into negotiations to finance and build the mill along the lines that have been suggested? We have talked to a number of steel companies about this possibility. We have as yet not covered in our conversations all the companies that might be interested in the mill. Such conversations as we have had have been conducted in a businesslike way, in confidence and without publicity. I would be violating our own pledge of confidence if I were to disclose the names of the companies that we have talked with and the individual reactions that they have had to our proposal. In view of the fact that we are currently carrying on conversations with some companies and intend to carry on conversations with others, I should not like to jeopardize our excellent chances of obtaining this mill by disclosing confidential information. However, I do think it is both safe and proper to make certain generalizations regarding the reactions of the companies with whom we have talked.

Our conversions have been guided by the principle that any company that might be interested in a New England mill should be willing to put up a substantial investment. We have suggested that an established steel company should put up $40,000,000 to $50,000,000 of its own money. Obviously there are not many steel companies in the country that have $40,000,000 or $50,000,000 in cash or could raise that much in today's capital market.

The reactions of the companies that we have talked to follow a similar pattern. These companies have for many years been planning their modernization and expansion programs. Most appear to have them well under way or nearing completion. It should be realized that discovery of the Labrador ore is a new development. It became generally known only in the summer of 1948. It represented a factor which, I believe, had not been taken into account in the modernization and expansion programs of most companies in the industry.

Evidence that we have indicates that the steel industry has a certain amount of difficulty in raising the money required for carrying out its own long-planned modernization and expansion programs. Consider the alternatives faced by the companies with whom we have talked. They are already committed to heavy programs of capital investment to improve the competitive position of their existing mills. In some cases we found that the companies were hard pressed to raise enough money to complete their existing modernization and expansion programs. The expenditure of $50,000,000 to complete their own program might save a stockholders' investment of $300,000,000 to $600,000,000 when competition becomes tough again. If they were to divert $50,000,000 to a New England mill, regardless of its profitability, they might be sacrificing or endangering the interest of their stockholders in their existing properties.

We are convinced, gentlemen, that it is not the lack of profitability of a New England mill which has deterred the companies with whom we have talked from bringing a mill into this area. One major stumbling block has been the lack of free capital to take advantage of the opportunity.

In addition to this obstacle, however, there is considerable evidence of another stumbling block. The companies that we have talked to have generally been fairly large. Each has had to consider in its calculation whether in establishing a New England mill it would not be competing with its other operations. The competition would be both direct and indirect. First, to the extent that they were now selling steel in New England and the adjacent market from other mills of their own company, they would be cutting their own mills out of the market. More important than that, however, has been the consideration of indirect competition. They have been selling to large customers located in the territory adjacent to their present mills. They realize that the establishment of an integrated steel mill in New England to serve one of the richest market areas in the country, accounting as it does for nearly one-quarter of the Nation's income, would offer a strong magnet to some of their customers to establish fabricating facilities in the territory adjacent to the New England mill, or to expand fabricating facilities already located there. They would therefore face the possibility of losing sales to customers in the territory of their present mills by establishing a New England mill. That possibility, looked at from our side, is part of our opportunity.

I believe that these have been the major considerations involved in the decisions made by some of the companies to whom we have talked not to participate in the New England venture. I state these conclusions not in criticism, but simply as my own best understanding of the facts. I state them the more readily because prospects of success in our search are still very good.

THE CONSUMERS' STAKE IN MILL LOCATION

The major reason why steel companies do not have the capital available both to modernize their own facilities and to enter into ventures like the New England steel mill is that they have made inadequate provision for depreciation through no fault of their own. The other side of the argument, which I mentioned earlier, that steel companies had made to us to the effect that construction costs were too high today to justify a new mill, is the fact that existing plants in the steel industry in most cases are carried on the books at preinflation costs and are depreciated on the basis of these original costs. Conditions not of the industry's making or of our making have raised enormously the cost of building or replacing steel-mill facilities. The industry has been and is currently modernizing—and that is another word for replacing—its facilities. It has not obtained enough from its depreciation allowances to carry out its modernization (replacement) program. It is therefore forced, I believe, to charge consumers in the price of steel an amount sufficient to permit it to raise the funds necessary to carry out a considerable part of this modernization (replacement) program.

Now, from an economic point of view, provision should have been made in the past for funds with which to replace or modernize facilities. The consumers of the past should have financed today's modernization program. Instead, the consumers of today and of the future must finance these modernization programs. Solely upon my own responsibility, I should like to raise this question. If consumers, through circumstances not of their own making and in fact through circumstances largely beyond the control of all of us, are in effect financing a very large part of the steel industry's modernization and expansion program, should not the consumers of steel have a considerable voice in where the money for that modernization and expansion program is spent? Spending money derived from retained earnings—which in turn were derived from the prices at which steel is sold—for the purpose primarily of protecting past investments in what may be uneconomic locations, can hardly be considered to be rewarding to the consumer who puts up the money in the form of the higher prices that he pays for steel. If steel consumers in our territory were paying higher prices for steel today and could foresee in the future the establishment of a mill in their territory which would save them in freight the amounts that I indicated earlier—$5 to $9 a ton and more—then I think that they would feel that the sacrifice that they were making by paying the higher prices for steel would be rewarded later. They could see cheaper steel in the future in return for more expensive steel today. But as matters now stand and as they will remain until a New England mill is established, they simply see higher prices for steel today and the prospect that in the future they will either have to move or go out of business. Consumers have no voice in the decisions as to where these sums will be spent which are being raised by virtue of higher prices. It is for that reason that I welcome this opportunity to present to this committee this statement of the facts as we see them. If our opportunity to participate in the economic growth of the Nation in which this committee is interested is jeopardized by decisions with respect to steel prices and steel plant location, then I think that our situation becomes a matter of public concern.

I should like to conclude with a few words about this movement for a New England steel mill. In some quarters our effort has been characterized as a political campaign

to obtain something that was economically unjustified. I should like to introduce two exhibits which I think will prove the contrary. One, exhibit J, is a list of the names of the members of the New England council's steel committee. The men on this committee, like all New England council members, are doing what they believe to be a public service for the region in which they live and have their businesses. They can hardly be called promoters because so far as I know none of them is expecting to make a promoter's profit out of the establishment of a New England mill. They are not paid for their work on this committee. They certainly cannot be called politicians because all but one hold no political office and the one who does was elected to a political office after he became interested in this project, and he was elected, by the way, on the Republican ticket. The second exhibit (exhibit K) is a chronology of the development of the New England steel project. It began in 1946. None of the money that has been spent on it so far consists of public funds. It is a privately financed undertaking. In view of the importance of this project to the future growth and prosperity of our region, it should not be at all surprising to find that holders of political office in and from New England support the movement, and I am glad that they do.

Let me finish by making a small observation about New England's present economic position. Our region over the years has made great contributions of men, talent, capital, and taxes to develop other areas of the country. We have even contributed whole factories to the less industrialized parts of the country. We have not made all these contributions happily, but we have made them. In seeking an integrated steel mill we are not seeking to take anything away from any other region but only to take advantage of a new opportunity available to us, an opportunity which may help us to lay a firm foundation for our further economic development. If we are to have an expanding economy in this country, each region must take advantage of the opportunities available to it. We are trying to do that in New England. If we are to have satisfactory international economic relations, each region and each area of the country must take advantage of those opportunities available to it to use profitably and efficiently those goods which it can obtain more cheaply abroad than it can obtain at home. In seeking an integrated steel mill, therefore, the New England Council's Steel Committee is trying to do its bit to insure an expanding and prosperous economy in the Nation and to improve our international economic relations. Its motives, gentlemen, are not parochial and selfish. Its purposes, as I understand them, are the same as those of your committee.

I appreciate your time and attention.

Iron and steel freight rates

To—	From Pittsburgh, Pa.		From Sparrows Point, Md.		From Buffalo, N. Y.		From New London, Conn.	
	Cents per 100 pounds	Dollars per ton	Cents per 100 pounds	Dollars per ton	Cents per 100 pounds	Dollars per ton	Cents per 100 pounds	Dollars per ton
Bridgeport, Conn	68	13.60	48	9.60	61	12.20	28	5.60
New Haven, Conn	68	13.60	51	10.20	61	12.20	24	4.80
Springfield, Mass	72	14.40	54	10.80	58	11.60	32	6.40
Worcester, Mass	75	15.00	58	11.60	62	12.40	29	5.80
Providence, R. I	76	15.20	61	12.20	67	13.40	25	5.00
Boston, Mass	76	15.20	62	12.40	63	12.60	34	6.80
Hartford, Conn	70	14.00	53	10.60	61	12.20	25	5.00
Portland, Maine	80	16.00	70	14.00	70	14.00	44	8.80
Manchester, N. H	76	15.20	63	12.60	63	12.60	40	8.00
Newark-Jersey City	62	12.40	42	8.40	58	11.60	40	8.00
New York City lighterage	62	12.40	42	8.40	58	11.60	40	8.00
New York Harlem River							36	7.20

Source: Tariffs No. P. RR.-ICC-2820; P. RR.-ICC-2334; P. RR.-ICC-2299.
Courtesy New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., freight rate department.

TYPICAL EXAMPLES OF HARDSHIP DUE TO THE PRESENT NEW ENGLAND STEEL SUPPLY SITUATION

(Confidential memorandum prepared by Charles Kellogg, New England Council)

(Listed below, without company names or other identifying information, are typical cases reflecting the disadvantageous position in which existing New England plants find themselves with reference to the cost and delivery factors of their chief raw material, steel.)

1. The president of a drop-forging company, employing 1,500, whose products are sold throughout an area extending at least as far west as Chicago, stated recently that his board of directors is giving continuing consideration to abandoning their two existing plants in New England with a view to moving to Ohio. This man stated that since the abandonment of the basing-point pricing system, his company has paid $487,000 for inward transportation of hot-rolled carbon bars, and outward transportation of completed forgings and finished machined products. A large part of his market is in the Detroit area. He further stated that delivery schedules of raw materials, almost entirely steel, were unsatisfactory and made production control difficult. On top of the above figure of $487,000, this company's president had determined that another $300,000 additional cost resulted largely from their present location, with respect to distance from their markets.

In discussing the possible establishment of a New England steel mill, he stated that such an achievement would constitute an event of the greatest importance to his company, and that he was wholly in favor of the New England steel mill. He has expressed his company's interest by a substantial contribution to the financing of the council's endeavors.

2. The manager of the New England division of a large national concern, with several plants, employing over 8,000 workers, expressed great enthusiasm for the development of steel-production facilities in New England. He put it this way: "Now, we're at the end of the line; we have to ship all our raw materials in, manufacture it, and then ship the products back. If a New England steel mill is built, our company will undoubtedly be able to continue in New England. If not, we will have to move much nearer the center of our Nation. I don't favor such a move, and yet our costs are so high here that we might have to abandon all our New England plants."

3. The president and principal owner of a screw machine products company making screws, nuts, bolts, and rivets, and employing 650 people, said that he figures it costs him $105,000 more to conduct his present business where it is now located than if he conducted the identical business in Indiana. He stated that he has made comprehensive studies of what would be required to move his machinery and equipment out of New England, and that, together with the cost of building a new plant, the total cost would be so high that, from a dollar-and-cents point of view, it would be better to liquidate his business completely.

4. The president and general manager of a company making metal stampings and automobile accessories and employing 800 people directly, is also president of another company whose products are iron castings, electric steel castings, and carbon alloy castings, capitalized at more than $1,000,000 and employs 750 people. He states that the present delivered cost of steel and iron is so high as to seriously endanger a profitable operation. Some months ago this man said that in all probability within 2 years he would have to move the operations of the first-mentioned company to the Middle West in order to keep the business healthy.

5. The president of a company employing 3,500 workers whose products include a wide range of electrical and nonelectrical household appliances, thermos bottles, cutlery products and others, stated that his concern annually consumes in excess of 10,000 tons of sheet and strip steel, steel castings, and iron. While giving no specific estimate of the additional cost of conducting their present business in New England, this man expressed serious interest in and support of the New England Council's drive to bring about the establishment of a local steel mill. He said that the local availability of iron and steel would mean a great deal to his concern because of considerably lower inward transportation charges.

6. The treasurer of a machinery manufacturing concern with 6 plants in 5 of the New England States, capitalized at more than $30,000,000, and employing 6,125 workers, stated that although the company intends to stay in New England, he feels that any future expansion will be made in other parts of the country because their raw materials—iron and steel—cost so much in New England. As an example of this company's thinking, the treasurer, who happens in this case to be the top executive, stated that they had at one time seriously considered the purchase of an existing blast furnace in eastern Massachusetts in order to try to reduce their raw-material cost. Like the companies mentioned above, this concern has contributed financially to the special steel fund of the council.

7. The plant manager of one unit of an international concern, making a wide range of heavy industrial equipment and tools, stated that he was very much in favor of the establishment of an integrated steel plant anywhere in New England as it would undoubtedly benefit their New England plant.

From other sources, the writer has been told that this plant's location is at present probably uneconomic because of its distance from both its raw material supply and the other plants of the same company for which it makes component parts. This plant is one of northern New England's largest iron and steel consuming units. It employs 1,000 workers, in a community with only 6 other small manufacturing industries, and having a total population of about 15,000.

8. Although not directly comparable, the following case may be pertinent. The eastern division of a national steel company has three fabricating plants in New England and employs more than 4,000 people. These plants make a wide variety of parts as follows: steel rods and wire, high and low carbon rods, wire screening, poultry netting, perforated metals, card clothing, industrial wire cloth, nails and brads, springs, link fence, wire rope, electric welded fabrics, and heavy hardware. The New England manager for this company stated that for extremely adverse labor conditions in his company's plants elsewhere and because conversely the economic climate in New England was so

much more favorable, the company was considering abandonment or sale of its other properties, and substantial expansion of its New England operations.

In discussing the integrated steel mill proposal with this representative of the New England council, their man stated that if a steel mill were built in New England it would in all probability help this company substantially to expand in New England.

9. The vice president of a metal stamping company employing 400 advises that it uses from 2,500 to 5,000 tons of steel per year, and that on this they are paying $10 per ton more in freight alone than they would have to pay if there were a mill in New England within 100 miles. This means an extra cost to them of $25,000 to $50,000 per year.

If they could save a difference like this they say that they could get more orders, offer additional jobs, and show great savings to their customers.

10. A textile machinery company employing 2,500 and using about 2,500 tons of steel annually states that it is paying close to $10 per ton more for steel than it would have to pay if there were an integrated mill in New England.

11. A hardware concern employing 1,000 says that if a steel mill comes to New England, it will stay in business. Otherwise, this company will close or move. It buys over a million dollars' worth of steel per year now and can hardly break even. It expects to expand if a steel mill is established in New England.

12. A chain manufacturing company employing 750 uses about 50,000 tons of steel per year. It estimates its present freight disadvantage on steel at $10 per ton.

MARKET FOR A NEW ENGLAND STEEL MILL

More than 3,400,000 tons of carbon-steel sheets, strip, plates, and bars, and silicon-steel sheets and strip were consumed in 1947 by the metalworking industries in the market areas of the United States most readily accessible from a deep-water New England steel mill. (See attached table I.) The total of 3,400,000 tons does not include exports or use in construction, mining, farms, public utilities, railroads, governmental units, and other nonmanufacturing uses.

Almost 3,000,000 tons of that total were in bars and in those flat-rolled products which could be made by a New England mill whose plate-making facilities were limited to sizes and gages which could be produced by a sheet mill.

Other prospective markets for the products of a New England steel mill would increase the total:

1. Direct sales to customers in the nonmetalworking industries, such as railroads, utilities, mines, farms, construction, governmental units, and the oil industry. (Consumption of this type is not included in our figures.)

2. Sales to specialty steel mills in the market area for finishing and delivery to customers outside the market area.

3. Domestic markets in which a New England mill would not have a natural advantage, but where salesmanship and customer relationships would produce sales.

4. Export sales to eastern Canada and maritime provinces, to Central and South American, to Africa, and to other areas. (See tables II and III.)

5. Growth of the metalworking industries in New England and the other natural market areas, as a result of—

(a) Normal growth of the sort which has taken place in New England during the past 20 years.

(b) The extra growth which would result from the more rapid expansion of existing metalworking plants and the more rapid establishment of new plants after enlargement of the area's steel-making capacity. (See charts II and III.)

Since the New England area would still be a net importer of steel, the operating rate of a New England mill would tend to be higher and somewhat more stable than that of a steel-exporting area. (See chart IV for the operating records of other areas during periods of depression or recession.)

Consumption of steel mill shapes and forms in metalworking industries, 1947

	Tons
Maine	70,968
New Hampshire	32,332
Vermont	18,433
Massachusetts	764,498
Rhode Island	64,321
Connecticut	534,083
New York City [1]	794,599
Newark-Jersey City [1]	933,659
Utica and Albany [1]	258,628
Export from New York (1946)	1,179,359
Total	4,660,880

[1] Industrial area.

Sources: Steel consumption—Census of Manufactures, 1947; exports—Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army, Pt. 2, 1947.

TABLE I.—*Market in the metalworking industries for selected products of a New England steel mill*

[In thousands of tons]

Market area	1947 consumption by the metalworking industries,[1] selected carbon-steel products			
	Total	Sheet and strip	Plates	Bars
Connecticut	329	223	20	86
Maine	23	4	7	12
Massachusetts	445	239	64	142
New Hampshire	23	15	3	5
Rhode Island	36	9	4	23
Vermont	11	3	2	6
Total, New England	867	494	100	273
New York City [2]	464	309	58	97
Newark-Jersey City [2]	397	215	100	82
Albany [2]	120	33	67	20
Utica [2]	58	42	7	9
Total, New England and adjacent	1,906	1,093	332	481
Florida	40	16	17	7
Texas	419	185	133	101
Pacific coast	954	432	323	199
Total, accessible market—(carbon-steel products)	3,318	1,726	804	788
Additional market for silicon steel sheet and strip in and adjacent to New England [3]	100	-------	-------	------
Total for products and markets listed above	3,418	-------	-------	------

[1] Does not include consumption of specialty steel mills in the market areas indicated except to the extent that their products are consumed by other metalworking industries in these areas.

[2] State totals allocated to market areas within the States, based on Iron Age study and Senate Small Business Committee Report, Changes in the Distribution of Steel, 1940–47.

[3] Minimum estimate. Geographical break-down not available.

NOTE.—Detail may not add to totals because of rounding.

Source: Census of Manufactures, 1947.

TABLE II.—*Exports of selected carbon-steel products from the United States by area of destination, 1948*

[In thousands of tons]

Area of destination	Total selected products	Hot-rolled and cold-rolled sheets [1]	Hot-rolled strip	Plates [2]
Canada and Newfoundland	256	167	33	56
Europe	236	48	6	182
South America	99	60	9	30
Central America and Caribbean	40	21	2	17
Africa	31	26	1	3
Total, Atlantic Basin area	662	322	51	289
All other areas	72	49	3	20
Total, all areas	734	371	54	309

[1] Does not include galvanized sheets.

[2] Other than boiler plate of which 29,000 tons were exported in 1948.

NOTE.—Detail may not add to totals because of rounding.

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census.

TABLE III.—*Proportion of United States production exported—selected steel products, 1936–48*

[Quantities in thousands of tons]

PLATES

Year	Production	Exports	Percent exported
1948	[1] 7,000	309	4.4
1947	6,746	530	7.9
1946	4,434	471	10.6
1945	7,246	188	2.6
1944	13,123	306	2.3
1943	13,119	686	5.2
1942	11,800	403	3.4
1941	6,200	384	6.2
1940	4,323	602	13.9
1939	3,102	261	8.4
1938	1,920	224	11.7
1937	3,632	412	11.3
1936	2,830	99	3.5

SHEETS (HOT-ROLLED AND COLD-ROLLED)

1948	[1] 16,800	371	2.2
1947	16,451	569	3.5
1946	11,889	483	4.1
1945	12,068	742	6.2
1944	10,339	781	7.6
1943	9,403	700	7.4
1942	9,199	795	8.6
1941	13,603	429	3.2
1940	11,706	477	4.1
1939	10,032	269	2.7
1938	5,795	205	3.5
1937	8,780	286	3.3
1936	7,835	140	1.8

STRIP (HOT-ROLLED)

1948	[1] 3,300	54	1.6
1947	3,027	107	3.5
1946	2,466	84	3.4
1945	2,543	85	3.3
1944	2,593	126	4.9
1943	2,125	105	4.9
1942	1,901	93	4.9
1941	2,540	[2]	----------
1940	2,078	[2]	----------
1939	1,827	[2]	----------
1938	1,154	[2]	----------
1937	3,243	[2]	----------
1936	3,612	[2]	----------

[1] 1948 production approximate.

[2] Not available.

Source: Metal Statistics.

(Chart I omitted.)

CHART II. THE EFFECT OF EXPANDED LOCAL STEEL-MAKING CAPACITY [1] UPON THE METAL-WORKING INDUSTRIES

Percentage of total United States employment in the principal metalworking industries in Maryland and the Philadelphia industrial area [2] 1929 and 1939

	Percent
1929	3.95
1939	5.31

Percentage of total United States employment in leading metalworking industries in Maryland [2] 1919–39

	Percent
1919	1.12
1921	1.38
1923	1.21
1925	1.34
1927	1.30
1929	1.24
1931	1.54
1933	1.53
1935	1.27
1937	1.36
1939	1.51

[1] From 1930 to 1938 the steel-making capacity of Bethlehem's Sparrows Point mill was increased by 1,360,000 tons. The Sparrows Point proportion of total United States capacity increased from 2.7 percent to 4.1 percent. Between 1920 and 1930 the capacity at Sparrows Point had increased from 2.1 percent to 2.7 percent of United States capacity. (Source: American Iron and Steel Institute.)

[2] Slightly different groups of industries have been used in the two comparisons because of changes in census classifications and incomplete data. The differences do not affect the general pattern of the data.

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census.

(Chart III omitted.)

The trend of ferrous metal receipts in New England during the last 20 years has been to increase at a rate of about 1.5 percent a year. The upward trend in the United States as a whole has been at a rate of about 1 percent a year. New England's proportion of metal receipts has grown.

A continuation of the past trend of normal growth would produce an average annual increase of approximately 14,000 tons in the New England consumption of the products mentioned above. By 1960 the consumption trend for these items would have increased by 182,000 tons.

The increased capacity of the Sparrows Point mill of the Bethlehem Steel Co. during the 1930's contributed to a greater growth of the metalworking industries in the Baltimore and Philadelphia industrial areas than in the country as a whole (chart II). The growth trend for steel consumption in these areas from 1929 to 1939 was apparently about 4 percent a year—3 percent above the national average.

The establishment of a steel mill in New England would stimulate extra growth of the metalworking industries in the region through both extra expansion by existing firms and the more rapid establishment of new firms. If the extra increase were 3 percent a year, which is the maximum that could reasonably be expected, the consumption trend for the specified items would increase by 42,000 tons a year. By 1960 the trend would have increased by 546,000 tons.

The lines plotted above show the maximum and minimum growth trends for the New England metalworking market for these products. The most probable trend which would accompany a new mill would lie somewhere between the maximum and minimum lines.

Actual consumption would fluctuate above and below the trend as industrial activity varied over the business cycle, just as it has in the past.

(Chart IV omitted.)

Tons of scrap iron and steel originated and terminated in New England

[Carload traffic, 1940–49]

Year	Tons originated	Tons terminated	Net railroad tons outflow	Year	Tons originated	Tons terminated	Net railroad tons outflow
1940	525,374	238,989	286,385	1948	1,059,077	289,749	769,328
1941	689,122	220,421	468,701	First quarter	199,566	63,432	136,134
1942	1,093,303	257,226	836,167	Second quarter	296,787	80,595	216,192
1943	1,060,606	232,618	827,988	Third quarter	256,572	73,315	183,257
1944	915,740	174,870	740,870	Fourth quarter	306,152	72,407	233,745
1945	896,153	180,796	715,357	1949:			
1946	698,580	187,891	510,689	First quarter	262,348	88,286	174,062
1947	1,043,550	253,830	789,720	Second quarter	123,980	49,870	74,110

Source: Interstate Commerce Commission, Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics; Research and Statistics Department, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston.

Number of persons employed in major steel-consuming industries in New England, New York, and New Jersey in 1947

Industry	New England		New England, New York and New Jersey		United States	
	Number of employees	Percent of United States total	Number of employees	Percent of United States total	Number of employees	Percent of total
Motor-vehicle bodies and parts	5,690	0.9	57,467	8.8	653,160	100
Aircraft and aircraft engines	26,732	13.6	49,325	25.1	196,878	100
Radios and related products	17,946	10.0	73,366	41.1	178,595	100
Ship and boat building	12,051	8.1	50,528	33.8	149,655	100
Metal stampings	10,578	8.0	26,263	19.9	132,011	100
Refrigeration machinery	6,183	4.8	15,386	11.9	129,290	100
Motors and generators	9,281	7.3	29,039	22.9	127,012	100
Heating and cooking appliances, n. e. c.	4,014	3.6	15,484	14.0	110,475	100
Cutting tools, jigs, fixtures, etc.	17,914	20.2	25,140	28.3	88,898	100
Valves and fittings	8,556	10.7	14,011	17.5	80,075	100
Structural and ornamental products	2,318	2.9	12,433	15.6	79,678	100
Hardware, n. e. c.	21,794	28.5	31,452	41.1	76,537	100
Electrical control apparatus	5,208	7.2	18,814	26.0	72,330	100
Machine tools	23,146	32.8	28,646	40.5	70,657	100
Boiler shop products	2,531	3.7	7,608	11.0	68,979	100
Special-industry machinery, n. e. c.	12,621	18.5	24,224	35.6	68,063	100
Machine shops	4,788	8.2	11,730	20.2	58,160	100
Wirework, n. e. c.	5,810	10.2	14,127	24.9	56,842	100
Wire drawing	11,958	21.7	24,089	43.7	55,079	100
Metalworking machinery, n. e. c.	3,827	7.0	13,839	25.2	54,988	100
Textile machinery	33,430	62.4	37,999	70.9	53,583	100
Ball and roller bearings	19,456	37.3	26,529	50.9	52,174	100
Bolts, nuts, washers, and rivets	11,157	22.7	14,633	29.7	49,235	100
Tin cans and other tinware	1,070	2.3	9,295	19.8	46,890	100
Electrical appliances	8,561	19.3	11,382	25.7	44,371	100
Sheet-metal work	2,172	5.1	9,143	21.4	42,643	100
Wiring devices and supplies	11,319	29.5	21,995	57.3	38,367	100
Iron and steel forgings	3,036	8.3	6,005	16.4	36,724	100
Transformers	10,645	29.1	13,869	37.9	36,635	100
Hand tools, n. e. c.	7,851	22.0	13,983	39.2	35,668	100
General industrial machinery, n. e. c.	4,927	14.3	12,805	37.3	34,335	100
Screw-machine products	4,363	15.3	7,522	26.4	28,492	100
Typewriters	12,859	48.3	25,802	97.0	26,604	100
Primary metal industries, n. e. c.	2,001	9.0	5,597	25.3	22,135	100
Cutlery	8,444	41.7	17,816	88.0	20,248	100
Motorcycles and bicycles	2,598	16.6	3,747	24.0	15,615	100
Blowers and fans	3,721	25.2	5,789	39.1	14,794	100
Edge tools	2,887	32.7	3,423	38.8	8,828	100
Nails and spikes	2,188	57.5	2,463	64.7	3,805	100
Total	365,631	11.7	792,768	25.4	3,118,517	100
Population, 1947	9,139,000	6.4	27,931,000	19.5	143,414,000	100
Income payments to individuals, 1947	$12,943,000,000	6.8	$44,819,000,000	23.7	$189,212,000,000	100

Source: Census of Manufactures, 1947.

Manufacturing profit for a New England steel mill—case II—using Labrador ore; selling prices at levels of Jan. 3, 1950

[Based on operation at 85 to 90 percent of ingot capacity]

Product	Per ton			Monthly			Annual		
	Estimated cost	Estimated selling price [1]	Estimated manufacturing profit	Tons	Gross sales	Manufacturing profit	Tons	Gross sales	Manufacturing profit
Plates	$52.80	$78.00	$25.20	5,000	$390,000	$126,000	60,000	$4,680,000	$1,512,000
Hot-rolled sheets	53.80	82.00	28.20	25,000	2,050,000	705,000	300,000	24,600,000	8,460,000
Cold-rolled sheets	59.80	97.00	37.20	40,000	3,880,000	1,488,000	480,000	46,560,000	17,856,000
Total	57.16	90.29	33.13	70,000	6,320,000	2,319,000	840,000	75,840,000	[2] 27,828,000

[1] On basis of 20 percent heat-treated steel.

[2] Does not include estimated net profit of $500,000 on sale of byproducts.

Percentage of manufacturing profit to sales—36.7 percent.

Schedule of rental payments for a New England steel mill

[Based on $160,000,000 debt to Authority at 1¾ percent average interest and 25-year amortization at variable rate [1]]

Year	Principal beginning of year	1¾ percent interest on outstanding principal	Amortization			Total rental	Principal end of year
			Operating rate	Percent	Amount		
First	$160,000,000	$2,800,000	(70)	3.0	$4,800,000	$7,600,000	$155,200,000
Second	155,200,000	2,716,000	(80)	4.0	6,400,000	9,116,000	148,800,000
Third	148,800,000	2,604,000	(90)	5.0	8,000,000	10,604,000	140,800,000
Fourth	140,800,000	2,464,000	(100)	6.0	9,600,000	12,064,000	131,200,000
Fifth	131,200,000	2,296,000	(90)	5.0	8,000,000	10,296,000	123,200,000
Sixth	123,200,000	2,156,000	(80)	4.0	6,400,000	8,556,000	116,800,000
Seventh	116,800,000	2,044,000	(70)	3.0	4,800,000	6,844,000	112,000,000
Eighth	112,000,000	1,960,000	(70)	3.0	4,800,000	6,760,000	107,200,000
Ninth	107,200,000	1,876,000	(80)	4.0	6,400,000	8,276,000	100,800,000
Tenth	100,800,000	1,764,000	(90)	5.0	8,000,000	9,764,000	92,800,000
10-year average		2,268,000	(82)	4.2	6,720,000	8,988,000	

[1] Rates for 25-year amortization (on initial principal): Ingot rate 91-100, 6 percent; ingot rate 81-90, 5 percent; ingot rate 71-80, 4 percent (normal, based on 36-year industry rate); ingot rate 61-70, 3 percent; ingot rate 0-60, 2 percent.

Reduction of principal in 10 years—$67,200,000. At that rate, principal retirement in 24 years.

Net profit for New England steel mill using Labrador ore; selling prices at levels of Jan. 3, 1950, first 10 years at assumed ingot rates

[Dollars in thousands]

Item	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	10-year average
Assumed ingot rate (on 1,250,000-ton capacity)	70	80	90	100	90	80	70	70	80	90	82
Gross sales	$58,990	$67,410	$75,840	$84,270	$75,840	$67,410	$58,990	$58,990	$67,410	$75,840	$69,099
Manufacturing cost	37,346	42,674	48,012	53,350	48,012	42,674	37,346	37,346	42,674	48,012	43,745
Manufacturing profit	21,644	24,736	27,828	30,920	27,828	24,736	21,644	21,644	24,736	27,828	25,354
Less:											
G. a. and s.[1]	2,065	2,191	2,275	2,528	2,275	2,191	2,065	2,065	2,191	2,275	2,212
Rental (interest [1¾ percent] and amortization)	7,600	9,116	10,604	12,064	10,296	8,556	6,844	6,760	8,276	9,764	8,988
Depreciation [2]	3,437	3,437	3,437	3,437	3,437	3,437	3,437	3,437	3,437	3,437	3,437
Property taxes [3]	240	240	240	240	240	240	240	240	240	240	240
Total	13,342	14,984	16,556	18,269	16,248	14,424	12,586	12,502	14,144	15,716	14,877
Net profit before taxes	8,302	9,752	11,272	12,651	11,580	10,312	9,058	9,142	10,592	12,112	10,477
Federal income tax (38 percent)	3,155	3,706	4,283	4,807	4,400	3,919	3,442	3,474	4,025	4,603	3,981
State income tax [4]	187	219	254	285	261	232	204	206	238	273	236
Total income taxes	3,342	3,925	4,537	5,092	4,661	4,151	3,646	3,680	4,263	4,876	4,217
Net profit after taxes	4,960	5,827	6,735	7,559	6,919	6,161	5,412	5,462	6,329	7,236	6,260
Net return on stockholders' investment ($80,000,000) percent	6.2	7.3	8.4	9.4	8.6	7.7	6.8	6.8	7.9	9.0	7.8
Net profit (after taxes) to sales percent	8.4	8.6	8.9	9.0	9.1	9.1	9.2	9.3	9.4	9.5	9.1
Net profit (after taxes) per ton of finished products	$7.59	$7.80	$8.02	$8.10	$8.24	$8.25	$8.28	$8.36	$8.48	$8.61	$8.18

[1] Variable percentage of sales, based on operating rate (70-percent rate, 3.5 percent; 80-percent rate, 3.25 percent; 90-100-percent rate, 3 percent).

[2] Estimated at $2.75 per ton of annual ingot capacity of 1,250,000 tons, the rate currently charged on comparable operations; $1,800,000 may be taken as depreciation at 4½ percent on stockholders' $40,000,000 investment in plant and equipment; the remaining $1,637,000 may be taken as maintenance and repairs.

[3] Assuming site near New London, Conn., $12 per $1,000 valuation on $20,000,000, 50 percent of stockholders' $40,000,000 investment in fixed plant and equipment.

[4] 3 percent on net taxable income before Federal tax, by formula that makes effective rate 2¼ percent.

THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL, IRON AND STEEL COMMITTEE, 1950

Chairman: Frederick S. Blackall, Jr., president and treasurer, the Taft-Peirce Manufacturing Co., Woonsocket, R. I.

Vice chairman: Richard L. Bowditch, president, C. H. Sprague & Son Co., Boston, Mass.

Secretary: Ray M. Hudson, New England Council, Boston, Mass.

Maine: John S. Chafee,[1] vice president in charge of manufacturing, Saco-Lowell Shops, Biddeford.

New Hampshire: His Excellency Sherman Adams,[1] Governor of New Hampshire, Concord.

Vermont: Robert F. Patrick, treasurer, G. S. Blodgett Co., Inc., Burlington.

Massachusetts: Roger C. Damon, vice president, First National Bank of Boston, Boston; Brig. Gen. Georges F. Doriot, Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, Boston; Robert M. Edgar,[1] assistant to the president, Boston & Maine and Maine Central Railroads, Boston; Hon. Robert F. Bradford, Palmer, Dodge, Gardner, Bickford & Bradford, Boston; H. Frederick Hagemann, Jr., president, Rockland-Atlas National Bank of Boston, Boston; H. F. McCarthy, vice president, New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, Boston; Dr. Alfred C. Neal, vice president and director of research, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, Boston; Robert P. Tibolt,[1] vice president, Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates, Boston; John F. Tinsley,[1] president and general manager, Crompton & Knowles Loom Works, Worcester.

Rhode Island: Robert G. Ashman, president, Newman-Crosby Steel Corp., Pawtucket; Fred C. Tanner;[1] vice president and general manager, Federal Products Corp., Providence.

Connecticut: Maurice H. Pease, vice president and general manager, the Stanley Works, Bridgeport; F. R. Hoadley, president, Farrel-Birmingham Co., Inc., Ansonia.

[1] Council officer or director.

[1] Council officer or director.

A STEEL MILL FOR NEW ENGLAND—HIGHLIGHTS OF THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL'S ACTIVITIES

1. November 1946: President Richard L. Bowditch proposes to executive committee of the New England Council an economic research program to determine if a New England steel plant would be warranted. Preliminary work begun.

2. March 1947: Mr. Bowditch first publicly urges New England as the logical location of a steel plant to be supplied from overseas mines.

3. September 1947: The New England Council retains Econometric Institute, Inc., to study the possibilities of establishing an integrated steel plant in New England.

4. June 1948: The Econometric Institute, Inc., reports to the council that New England has the markets, the labor, and the metal scrap to justify expansion of its existing nonintegrated steel production, and that new developments should be carefully studied.

5. June 1948: Thirty-five officers and directors of the council journey to Canada to discuss matters of mutual economic interest with governmental and business leaders of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland.

6. July 1948: The Federal Reserve Bank of Boston and New England Council join in a study of the impact of the basing-point decision on important New England industries.

7. August 1948: The council and bank receive from Mr. John E. Kelly, mining consultant, a detailed report of the status of the recently discovered iron-ore deposits in Labrador and Quebec, and current progress in their development.

8. December 1948: The council appoints a New England iron and steel supply committee to study carefully all elements and available facts bearing on this subject. First meeting held.

9. January 1949: Steel committee members begin exploratory conversations with top executives of major American steel companies.

10. January 1949: Mr. Kelly renders completely documented Canadian ore survey to the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston.

11. April 1949: Continued contacts with steel executives.

12. June 1949: With new information available, the steel committee, under Chairman Frederick S. Blackall, Jr., retains Mr. Kelly's professional engineering services.

13. July 1949: Mr. Kelly receives cordial cooperation from Canadian mining interests and visits Ungava ore deposits in Labrador and Quebec; also Newfoundland iron mines.

14. August 1949: Under leadership of Chairman Blackall, Mr. Kelly and Dr. Neal of Federal Reserve bank begin direct negotiations with chief executives of several major basic steel companies.

15. October 1949: Several coastal communities in New England organize study groups to prepare local site and resource data.

16. January 1950: Dr. A. C. Neal, research economist on steel committee, testifies before joint congressional committee on the economic report, concerning the economic feasibility for manufacture of steel in New England, and the region's need for a local source of steel.

[From the New Hampshire Sunday News, Manchester, N. H., January 29, 1950]

WE HAVE NO FRIENDS

New England has no friends.

The rest of the country regards this section as an economic and cultural backwater, inhabited by a race of coupon clippers living off the proceeds of wealth inherited from New Bedford whalers.

The Federal Government thinks of us as a hotbed of reactionary Republicans, entrenched State Street financiers and wrongheaded Yankee dirt farmers living off the sweat of a great mass of exploited immigrant mill workers.

The Government's idea of how to treat New England is to establish discriminatory freight rates in behalf of the South and West, bring lawsuits against some of our most prosperous and stable industries (i. e., United Shoe and Scott-Williams) entice away others through Federal subsidies lavished on Puerto Rico and the TVA region, and keep up a series of harassing maneuvers against our power companies. Meanwhile, New England, which continues thrifty and prosperous despite its enemies, is a principal source of the very tax moneys which the Government hands out to the shiftless and the indigent in other parts of the country.

Insult is heaped on injury by trust company panjandrums who make their headquarters in New England and operate on New England wealth, but who rarely, if ever, invest any of their New England money in New England enterprise.

Like the Federal Government which they so bitterly criticize, the moguls of State Street prefer Puerto Rico to Maine as an outlet for swollen treasures in their bursting coffers.

Now comes United States Steel, and others of the combine known as Big Steel, to interpose the ponderous weight of their technological and financial opinion between New England and its legitimate aspirations for a share in the steel industry.

Pittsburgh, it appears, is threatened. Pittsburgh is the great bastion and redoubt of those carefully contrived processes whereby Big Steel piles up unprecedented postwar profits while blandly arguing that it is necessary to raise prices still higher.

Pittsburgh makes more than a third of the country's steel, but as the Boston Herald observes, "much of its market is miles of high freight rates away." Notes the Herald:

"Even if the basing-point system should be restored, a large chunk of the steel-production capacity down there is an economic anachronism. Whenever there is a slackening on steel demand, it is the Pittsburgh plants that slip off most in production, while the outlying plants, in Chicago, Sparrows Point, and Birmingham, maintain a better record.

"They know down there that steel decentralization is in the cards, that Pittsburgh cannot forever exist as a surplus production area. They know that a big steel plant in New England will take away a rich market. They want to continue to ship to Indiana steel to be fashioned into refrigerator cases to be shipped to Springfield, Mass., to be made into refrigerators. They want to continue to supply the steel for subassemblies to be freighted later to New England automobile assembly plants in a transportation maze of production. It is Pittsburgh steel against New England. So the fight is on."

And so the spokesmen of Big Steel inform Congress that a steel mill in New England—where the conversion from soft goods to hard goods has doubled the region's share of national steel consumption—would be uneconomic. Admiral Ben Moreell, of Jones & Laughlin, echoing United States Steel's Mr. Fairless, tells the congressional committee that after exhaustive surveys of the New England situation, his company concluded that a New England plant would involve greater risk and a lower return than if Jones & Laughlin put the money into improvement of existing plant.

All of which may be true, from Big Steel's viewpoint, but only if its precious status quo can be preserved.

New England could help to kick over that status quo.

New England, any day now, might get good and sick of this business of having no friends, among either the self-styled conservatives or the self-styled liberals.

It might decide to do this steel job on its own, just as it has done everything else on its own, since the era of the New Bedford whalers.

One method—which now needs careful reexamination in the light of Big Steel's attitude—has been suggested by Governor Adams, Lawrence Whittemore, and a strong group within the New England council.

This method involves a plan of public financing which is both spectacular and risky—the so-called industrial authority plan, whereby funds are raised through public subscription, backed if necessary by the full faith and credit of the States. It involves also, if a suggestion by Mr. Whittemore is adopted, large loans by the Federal Government.

The Big Steel boys shudder at this latter suggestion. They are for free enterprise so long as it isn't too gol-durned free. They abhor Government participation.

So do we. As our readers know, we have been hesitant about endorsing the plans of Governor Adams and his colleagues.

We've been especially cautious since President Truman came out in the open and told the steel planners of the New England Council that the Federal Government looked with high favor on the idea of a New England steel mill, and would do all it could to help. Mr. Truman, it will be remembered, is the chap who not long ago threw a powerful fright into Big Steel with the suggestion of a yardstick steel mill, patterned after the TVA power yardstick.

But the attitude displayed by Big Steel, in its testimony before Congress, puts matters in a new light. The time has arrived, possibly, for a little honest soul-searching by those who have at heart the real interests of New England.

How much longer can we afford our fine spirit of autarchy and independence, in the face of cutthroat competition from such diverse quarters as Big Steel and the Fair Dealers? How much longer can we look down our long blue noses at the go-getters and free Federal spenders in rival sections, while our shoes and textiles are snowed under by Government-abetted competition, both domestic and foreign, and our brightest prospects—the mushrooming hard-goods industries—are mortally endangered by discriminatory high costs imposed arbitrarily on such basic ingredients as transportation and raw materials?

The administration free spenders obviously are simply pining to get into this New England steel picture. No doubt their motives are political. But there are enough Republicans on the scene, like Governor Adams, to insure that the political credit will be spread around, and that even if Federal funds are employed, they are used in a businesslike manner.

The New England steel mill could, in fact, be made a truly nonpartisan and nonpolitical venture. It could constitute a novel experiment in the employment of public finance to establish a privately operated basic industry essential to the health and growth of these secondary industries—all privately owned—which are New England's best hope for the future.

Most of us would go into such a project with our fingers crossed. Most of us would prefer to see the job tackled as an adventure in pure private enterprise. But if it just can't be handled that way, well—a lot of us are determined that New England isn't going to be made the national sacrificial goat forever.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON WEDNESDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to announce for the RECORD that, following the vote on the pending legislation, on Wednesday afternoon, I shall then move the consideration of bills on the calendar, and we shall start with the beginning of the calendar and go through to the end.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN METHOD OF ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the heart of the resolution now pending before the Senate lies in the following proposals:

First. The electoral college and the office of elector would be abolished as being obsolete.

Second. The electoral vote, 531, would be retained in order to preserve as nearly as Senate Joint Resolution 2 makes possible the equality of the States and to maintain the relative voting strength of the States.

Third. The counting of electoral votes by the whole unit for the winning candidate in each State would be abolished, in favor of a distribution of electoral votes among candidates according to their popular votes.

Fourth. Rival presidential candidates would share the electoral votes of each State in proportion to their total popular vote therein. Since electors are eliminated, the popular-vote totals would simply be certified by State officials to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate.

Fifth. Each presidential candidate would be credited with the aggregate total of his proportionate shares of electoral votes in all the States.

Sixth. A provision that a candidate having a plurality of the electoral votes, even if it fell short of a majority, would be substituted for the present majority requirement in electing a President.

For the most part, past discussions of this and similar constitutional amendments have dealt principally with the evils of the electoral college system. What is necessary is that we make a fresh and independent study of the related question of what effect the proposed change may have on the future of American politics. The subject is far more complicated, I am fearful, than the sponsors of the resolution seem to recognize. The whole pattern of the American system is certain to be altered.

It is very important to find out what direction the change may take. Progress is change, but all change is not progress.

My colleague, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], on the floor of the Senate, May 16, 1934, in discussing another proposal for a change in the electoral system, said:

> I realize that the spirit of innovation is upon the land. I do not complain of that. I have supported many of the innovations. I realize that many problems demand new answers, and I am not afraid of them. Let us proceed courageously with whatever statutory innovations are necessary in the face of the crisis of the time, but let us not innovate needlessly. Let us by statutory innovation innovate where the situation requires it, but only in the last and final necessity when there is no other recourse let us be innovates upon the Constitution of the United States.

I so heartily agree with this that I repeat the words of my distinguished colleague. I appreciate the spirit of reform, and shall here state my approval of some of the reforms which are proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 2. At the same time, I vigorously oppose other features of the resolution, because I believe them unwise and even dangerous to the American system of government.

I believe reforms must be handled with great care, when logic indicates they may easily go beyond the evils of the day to create other evils possibly greater than those intended to be cured. I do not favor constitutional amendments based on speculations impossible to appraise with reasonable surety as to the outcome, and I trust the people of the United States share this view. It is of tremendous significance that the amending clause of the Constitution, article V, reads:

> The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution.

I repeat, whenever Congress "shall deem it necessary." There is sufficient warning, in those four words, that the amending process is not to be based on anything but the most certain causes and foreseeable effects.

We are apt to speak more about the evils in our system and less about the strength and the good in it. Ours has been the one outstanding Government under a written Constitution federating sovereign states into a federal government. We have been successful from the beginning with a two-party system. We have maintained the principle of majority rule with the protection of the rights of the minorities.

Our elective system has demonstrated its good qualities, notwithstanding the weakness of the electoral college, and we stand in the world today as the No. 1 Nation. Our economic position in the world is not the result of chance. It is the result of a political philosophy and of an economic system under our Constitution. Unless we can see in the future what a new system will bring us, we should not change to an unknown, unchartered course.

The pending resolution has commanded great popular appeal. First, it has the benefit of a distinguished bipartisan sponsorship. This bipartisan sponsorship would tend naturally to suppress any fear that either major party might be placed at a marked advantage or disadvantage as a consequence of its operation. Second, the resolution capitalizes on the common belief that the electoral college, as such, serves no useful purpose in our elective system. We are all familiar with caricatures of the electoral college as a bearded, outworn individual. This impression has probably attracted many supporters who have failed to grasp or to search out the full implications of the further changes proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 2.

ABOLITION OF THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

The first feature of this resolution is to abolish presidential electors and the electoral college. The names of the Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates themselves would be placed upon the ballots, and the people would vote directly for their choices. That is true in many States today.

The reasons for this change are set forth fully in the majority report of the committee. Although it has served us well for 150 years, the electoral college has never operated as originally planned by the framers of the Constitution. The sponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 2 point out that it is an inconvenient, expensive fiction, maintained only in form. Moreover, without achieving the grand design expected of it by the founding fathers, the presidential-elector system may now be used to create uncertainty and confusion in presidential elections. In view of those considerations, and despite the fact that it has rendered no disservice, the electoral college might well be abolished, as Senate Joint Resolution 2 proposes to do. Such a reform would provide an assurance against a reversal of popular will, which might occur if members of the electoral college failed to heed their instructions. That seems to be the one thing which is emphasized more than anything else, namely, that an elector, when he comes to cast his vote is not bound to cast it according to the instructions of the voters, but may use his own discretion.

As I have said, a great deal of support for the pending resolution has come from a popular belief that it is devoted only to this worth-while reform. Getting rid of outworn machinery invariably meets with quick approval, and the idea of having it become universal practice for the people to vote directly for the candidates of their choice has strong appeal.

Senate Joint Resolution 2 benefits from these readily understandable and acceptable proposals. But if it were equally as well known that the resolution contains other elements of reform, with revolutionary consequences to the political welfare of the country, I am sure there would be serious concern about approving the resolution in its present form. Mr. President, that is the burden of my argument here today.

I am greatly distressed that a proposition as fundamentally important as the one before us has excited so little attention. We are here acting upon a change in the basic law of the land. Moreover, it is a change in one of the cardinal features of the Constitution, the elective system, and despite any contrary impressions, it is an involved change. It is a very significant thing that there was scarcely anything in the Constitutional Convention which gave our founding fathers more difficulty, and about which they took more pains, than the business of electing the Chief Executive. The considerations that were at work then are multiplied by the knowledge that today the office of President of the United States is beyond question one of the most important in the world. In anything which touches upon the methods of selecting the individual to exercise that office, we cannot proceed too deliberately, for we cannot afford to stumble.

I urge that the electoral college can be abolished and provisions made for direct voting for Presidential candidates by name, without going beyond desirable reform into unwise and dangerous changes in the American political system.

ELECTION BY PLURALITY

The resolution also provides the President and Vice President shall be chosen by a simple plurality of electoral votes instead of the present majority requirement. The purpose is to eliminate recourse to elections by the House of Representatives and by the Senate respectively, as is now required when candidates for President and Vice President fail to obtain an electoral majority.

The idea of improving upon the method of congressional referendum in cases where no clear electoral-vote majority is gained from the popular vote undoubtedly represents a desired reform. The possibility of throwing an election into the House, where voting is on a State basis, with no reflection of popular choice, has long been held a weakness in the elective system.

But reform is one thing; radical change is quite another. To pass over from a requirement that a candidate must receive a majority of electoral votes to his election by simple plurality is indeed such a radical change.

The fathers of this country took special care to see that a person elected as President attained a clear majority of the total electoral vote. They knew the evils which arise when a Chief Executive assumes office, backed only by weak support of a plurality of the total electoral vote.

It is true, I know, that on 12 occasions a President of the United States has been elected without having had a majority of the popular vote. The present President is one of these minority Presidents. But rather than improve upon that situation, the proposal to elect by plurality is almost certain to perpetuate it. The condition will be perpetuated because it is a certain invitation for many parties to enter the field, if a plurality only is required. That means a break-down of the two-party system as we know it. While that two-party system is unknown to the Constitution, it is one of the most constructive features of American government. It may be put forward that we have succeeded in maintaining the desirable two-party system because parties have had to remain large and coordinated in order to secure the electoral majority required in the Constitution.

To illustrate the consequences which might follow from a plurality rather than a majority requirement, it would be possible for a candidate with a totalitarian philosophy to be elected President, with only 30 percent of the popular and electoral vote, even though bitterly opposed by 70 percent of the people voting for three or more other candidates.

This is by no means a remote possibility. Wherever plurality decisions are provided for as in Senate Joint Resolution 2, there is an ever-present tendency toward minority control. A well-organized, compact minority may easily prevail over scattered, divided majorities. We saw this in the field of corporate control, when small, compact minorities gained dominance over a corporation even when

the minority had 10 percent or less of the stockholder vote. We see it in the field of labor organization. How is it thought the Communists gained control over the United Electrical Workers, CIO? Was it because the thousands of loyal American union workers wanted Communist control? By no means was that a reason. A small Communist minority, knowing exactly what they wanted, used the union election machinery to gain control over the unorganized majority of the union membership.

Furthermore, it is never enough to say that a possibility is remote when a failure to guard against such a possibility may be fatal. The supporters of representative government must win every battle; their opponents need only one victory and it is over for the future.

Merely because the present procedure for congressional referendum is unsatisfactory, we should not abandon all protection against the plurality election of extremists who are opposed by a large majority of the people.

PROTECTION OF THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

It is not alone the election of unpopular extremists against which we should guard, however. We must guard against any break-down of the two-party system which has served America so well. Any break-down of the two-party system would bring on what my able and distinguished colleague [Mr. VANDENBERG] in 1934 called the continental curse of European politics, namely, multiple parties, bloc government, group control, minority administration of the affairs of the people.

Mr. President, it has recently been reported in the press that in the next Greek election there will be 86 parties.

I only wish that I might digress here to dwell at length on the qualities of the two-party system. That system represents a vertical alinement of interests which isolates the lunatic fringes and permits the shadings at the center to move forward effectively. It represents a concentration of responsibility, where we can affirm on the one hand and deny on the other. Any break-up of party solidarity means a diffusion of responsibility which deprives the people of an opportunity to speak effectively on any issue.

It is perhaps the best commentary on the importance and durability of the two-party system that this country has known 70 political parties in its history, each of which has elected at least one Member of Congress. But each one, and in a very short time, disappeared or was absorbed in one of the two major parties. This did not happen by luck or chance. The electoral system itself had much to do with it.

The only possible alternative to the two-party system is government by coalition, which is common in Europe. That is divided responsibility, with authority centered only temporarily in a ministry. Because the ministry possesses no other responsibility, it must of necessity also possess the power to dissolve the legislature, so that any issue upon which the government divides may be sent directly to the people for decision. Our Constitution does not make such a provision, and we do not want it, for we prefer to substitute the discipline of effective party responsibility.

I might observe here that the Democratic Party must soon face up to this matter of party responsibility. It is only a matter of time before the people are going to demand an accounting for the divided responsibility which exists within that party. When that day comes, there will be a regeneration of political rivalry, particularly in the South, which no artificial device, such as Senate Joint Resolution 2, could promote. The people's demand for party solidarity and undivided responsibility assures genuine two-party competition.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, so long as we maintain and do not tamper with the two-party system, any need of avoiding the eventuality which occurs when a Presidential candidate fails to obtain a majority of the electoral vote would be rare. But if there is a need to improve upon the present method of congressional referendum, I think there is a far better solution than by-passing it completely by requiring only an electoral plurality.

I have prepared an amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 2 which I now send to the desk, Mr. President, and which I will explain at a later time, before we vote on the pending business. In brief, this amendment would correct any defects in the electoral-college system and would preserve and strengthen the constitutional provisions for congressional referendum in Presidential elections.

PROPORTIONAL COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTES

Senate Joint Resolution 2 provides that in recording a State's electoral votes, they shall be credited to respective candidates in proportion to their popular votes in each State, and then totaled for each candidate for the Nation as a whole.

This is the most revolutionary and the most controversial of the changes proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 2. As sponsors of the resolution freely admit, this proportionate division of electoral votes will work decided changes in voting habits, in the make-up of the political party system as we know it in this country, and upon the conduct of Presidential election campaigns.

Under the present system, commonly called the unit rule, the candidate receiving the most votes in each State receives the whole of the State's electoral vote. Further, he has to get an absolute majority of all electoral votes in the Nation and more than any other candidate to win the Presidency.

Senate Joint Resolution 2 proposes to abolish this system, and in its place to divide up the electoral votes in each State in the proportions indicated by the popular vote. A radical candidate who had no hope of election in one or a group of States under the present system could add up all his electoral votes in all 48 States, under Senate Joint Resolution 2, and make a strong showing. He would not need a majority to win. A plurality—merely one vote more than the next highest candidate—would be enough under Senate Joint Resolution 2. Then, if there were three or four candidates in the field, a radical candidate with 30 percent of the vote could become the Chief Executive.

The intention of a proportional counting system is to reflect mathematically the popular will. Such a perfect reflection is not possible under our Federal system. Regardless of population, each State is assured one electoral vote for each Representative from the State in the House of Representatives, and two additional votes signifying its equality with all other States in the Senate.

Mr. President, under the present system, if the population of a State were to be reduced to 5,000 people, that State, under the federated principle, would have three electoral votes, because it would be entitled to one Representative in the House of Representatives and two Senators on the floor of the Senate.

The result is that only 82 percent of the electoral vote represents population, while 18 percent is assured to the States regardless of population by reason of the fact that each State has two Senators.

The situation is further complicated by the fact that no electoral vote represents actual popular voting as such. In States where actual voting is high, an electoral vote counts for many times the popular vote in a State where the turnout of popular votes is low. I shall show the effect of this later on in my argument.

PROPOSAL AFFECTS FEDERALIZATION

Given the electoral system as a necessary corollary of federalization, and barring the difference between States in voting intensity, those who want to see the popular vote most accurately reflected might be expected to espouse a system of direct voting for President and Vice President, whereby the gross popular vote in the Nation would be counted alone. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who is the principal sponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 2, has put forward such a proposal in the past, and I believe still favors it, although his feeling would be, as he remarked in the hearings, "One war at a time." He is a realist, and he has written that "to eliminate the credit given for Senators (that is, the two extra electoral votes), or to eliminate any electoral allotment to each State would destroy any possibility at all of electoral reform."

I agree with that. The system of government which we have is a federated system. The various parts have kept together. It has been successful because it has been a federated system. The fact that the great State of New York has only two votes in the Senate, and the State of Wyoming or Montana, let us say, with a very small population, also has two votes, is what helps to keep us together as a federated Union. If we wipe out what cements the States together as a federated Union, Mr. President, we will find to our regret that the federation has been weakened, and possibly even dissolved. In other words, sponsors of direct popular election run head on into the expression of sovereignty by the federated States which wish to preserve the privileges and status accorded them under federation.

Finding it impossible to break down the resistance built up by the federated principle, Senate Joint Resolution 2 seeks to cross the privileges accorded in federation and installed in the electoral vote with another system for representing popular will by proportionate counting of the electoral votes. In other words, Mr. President, what they wish to do is to cross the two systems. The electoral votes are retained, but counting by State units is abolished. The paradox in that result is that by indirection the States are required to surrender their sovereignty over the disposition of their own electoral votes.

A change in the American political system so far reaching as this is bound to produce strong arguments for and against the wisdom of the change. Fortunately, I believe the hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 2 are about the most complete the Congress has ever had on proposals of this nature. Opposing points of view are aired more exhaustively than ever before, although even fuller exploration may be desired. The point I wish to emphasize, however, is that most of the arguments offered in these hearings are speculative, because it cannot be known in advance what changes will be worked in voting habits, in political parties, and in the conduct of presidential elections. The sponsors of the resolution and the majority report take the view that all the proposed changes will be beneficial, with no ill effects on the American system of government.

Mr. President, I cannot agree with these conclusions. It is my considered judgment that the arguments and conclusions which have been set forth by the sponsors and adopted in the majority report rest too heavily on doubtful speculations. It is my further considered judgment that until the implications and consequences of this radical change in counting votes can be more definitely appraised, this part of the resolution should be disapproved, and it should not become an issue upon which the legislatures might vote.

THE CONSTITUTION SHOULD NOT BE AMENDED ON A SPECULATIVE BASIS

It is well to repeat that, while all progress is change, not all change is progress. The wise man does not discard the old for the new until he is reasonably certain that the new will be an improvement, without harmful effects. Reason and logic simply do not support the conclusions which its sponsors draw from Senate Joint Resolution 2. The framers of the Constitution took exceeding care to make the amendment process difficult in order to discourage amendments on frivolous or speculative grounds. They knew the great importance of stability in law and tradition. They most assuredly were of the opinion that the Constitution should not be amended on any speculative basis.

While the facts and arguments in the hearings speak for themselves, it may be useful for those who must act on this important question if I comment upon the principal points raised by the speculations on this change in the country's political system.

Throughout the hearings there was much speculation on the prospective advantages and disadvantages likely to accrue to one political party or another from proportionate sharing of electoral votes. The interest so aroused is natural and wholesome.

Thus, whether the Republican Party may gain more from a sharing of electoral votes in the South than it loses by sharing its areas of strength in the North, or whether the Democratic Party may find it more to their liking to surrender strength in the South for possible gains elsewhere, are certainly questions for these parties to consider carefully. Whether both major parties can afford to accept a device which may easily transfer their strength to third and fourth parties is also something they may rightfully consider in view of the great advantages of a two-party system.

The hearings contain much speculation on this point, worthy of careful study. With a century of remarkably stable political tradition behind them, in which political power has been shared by the two major parties in fairly even balance, they may wish before making radical changes, to give some weight to the notable quotation in the Federalist Papers on the spirit of injustice to the effect that "No man can be sure that he may not be tomorrow the victim of that by which he may be a gainer today."

Mr. President, I do not oppose this change because of any fear of adverse consequences to any particular political party or interest. I stand upon the broader ground of the effect radical change will have upon the American political system as a whole. My opposition goes straight to the wisdom in reason and logic of dividing up the electoral vote as proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 2. I find no values to be gained, and many to lose by it. In some respects, I see great harm possible in making so vital a change in our political system when the consequences cannot be fully appraised. This is not a change which once made can be easily undone if found unwise. As we all know, for sound reasons it has been made difficult to amend the Constitution.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 2 FOSTERS MINORITY ELECTIONS

Those who favor proportional sharing of a State's electoral vote emphasize the point that it will eliminate or at least minimize the possibility of a president being elected without a majority, or even a plurality of the popular vote. This is an absurdity. The very basis of Senate Joint Resolution 2 is plurality election. On its face the resolution makes possible the election of minority candidates.

In discussing the matter of an election by plurality, I have observed that "minority" Presidents have not been uncommon. This comes largely from another fact upon which I have commented, that electoral votes, while representing population generally, except for the two senatorial votes, do not represent popular voting. In one State, for example, an electoral vote may represent more than 130,000 popular votes, while in another it may represent less than 12,000 popular votes.

Nothing in Senate Joint Resolution 2 guarantees a more equitable balance, because the factors which make for this inequality go far deeper than mere political rules. It is a principle argument advanced on behalf of Senate Joint Resolution 2 that it would tend to lessen that inequality.

Admittedly, some of the disparity might be removed by the division of the electoral votes, but other factors, such as the difference caused by allotting two senatorial votes without reference to population, would remain to create disparities under the proposed scheme. Moreover, new causes for minority Presidents are quite possible under the proportionate sharing of electoral votes.

As a matter of fact, it has been effectively demonstrated by opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 2 that the possibility of a minority President is a probability when the solid South is considered relative to the rest of the country. That situation cannot be changed, short of a radical shift in the voting habits of the South.

To illustrate, normally solid Mississippi, with nine electoral votes might give one party an electoral advantage of 8.5 votes, when they are counted proportionally. This margin might be gained by a popular plurality of 172,000. In Michigan, as a State which is typically more evenly divided and with a greater election turn-out, it would take a popular plurality of approximately 980,000 votes for the opposite party to offset the electoral advantage in the single State of Mississippi.

Let me repeat that. Under the proposed amendment of the Constitution a popular plurality of approximately 980,000 votes would be required for the opposite party to offset the 8½ electoral votes which would result to the advantage of the other party in the single State of Mississippi by a popular plurality in that State of 172,000 votes. Would the adoption of the amendment proposed by the joint resolution cure such an evil? No, Mr. President.

I am aware of the argument that statistics based on general elections in the South should not be relied upon, because a greater number of ballots is cast in primaries. Is it not reasonable to assume, however, that the great number of primary votes which are not cast in the general election are a reservoir of strength for the principal party? That being so, any greater turn-out in the general election would merely aggravate the unbalance in the electoral vote under proportional counting.

The sponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 2 insist, of course, that voting habits everywhere, and particularly in the South, would be so radically changed as to bring about a state of balance. The chance to get electoral votes, say the sponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 2, offers an incentive to Republicans, for example, to campaign and make headway in the South. But is not the relatively small number of votes necessary to capture a southern State's electoral votes also an incentive for the Republicans to move into the South? Has not that incentive always been there, and have the

Republicans ever been able to take advantage of it?

These matters of prospective changes in voting habits are pure speculation, incapable of proof or demonstration. But it is worth while to consider this argument further.

If proportional sharing of the vote in the solid South offers an incentive for Republicans to make progress there, why would not the chance for electoral votes on a sharing basis offer incentives to minority groups all over the country, since the Republican Party is nothing more nor less than a minority party in the South.

When sponsors of the resolution wish to appeal to Republicans, they cite the chance for them to get electoral votes in the South. But when critics point out that the same incentive is held out to minority groups elsewhere and everywhere, the sponsors pooh-pooh the idea. They can hardly have it both ways.

PROPORTIONAL COUNTING FOSTERS MULTIPLE PARTIES

I firmly believe the proportionate sharing of electoral votes is a direct encouragement to the growth of multiple parties. As I have discussed this possibility in another connection, such a prospect carries grave implications. It would mean an end to the two-party system which has been so instrumental in preserving political stability and responsible government. In its place would come splinter factions and multiple parties which have plagued and retarded representative government wherever they have appeared.

Under the present unit system, minority political groups, usually advocating extreme views, rarely attract enough votes to capture the electoral vote of a State. At most, they can swing their voting strength between the two major parties. Sponsors of the resolution deplore this nuisance value of minority parties and pressure groups. I can see considerable good in them to the two-party system. Their inability to gain electoral votes under the unit rule deprives them of incentive to remain compact and to grow as individual parties. At the same time, their limited voting strength is enough to cause ferment in the major parties which are forced to clean house, and adopt new ideas to gain the aid of minority groups. The result is to prevent fragmentation into multiple parties with all its attendant evils and to preserve and to invigorate the two-party system. Under the resolution, these minority groups will have an incentive and opportunity to grow on their own. I believe that is exactly what would happen if the amendment were ratified, and became the supreme law of the land.

Their share of electoral votes in each State and accumulated total across the Nation would provide a score card for their progress. The shining goal would be to divide and conquer the major parties by splintering. The resolution makes this easier and attractive because it requires only a plurality of electoral votes to win. Minorities need not bid for a majority. With enough independent factions on the voting scene, a compact minority group of 40 percent or less in electoral vote can gain a major victory. Why do the sponsors of the resolution deny this possibility when they freely admit that the sharing of electoral votes offers an incentive for the major parties to campaign in each other's strongholds, such as the Democratic South and let us say Republican Maine? What makes them think that dissatisfied voters will turn only from one major party to the other when electoral votes, essential to victory, offer them incentives? Even the existing unit rule has permitted a demonstration of what dissatisfied voters may do. When southern voters in the 1948 election became dissatisfied with their own Democrat Party, they did not turn to the Republican Party, but set up a third independent group, the Dixiecrats.

EXPERIENCE IN THE 1948 ELECTION

How, in the face of this clear demonstration of exactly what southerners will do, can the sponsors of this resolution persist in the claim that only the two major parties will share the votes of the South? How can southerners support this resolution in the belief that it will strengthen the Democrats or, at the most, encourage Republicans, when the 1948 election proved otherwise.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURRAY in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator has asked why we in the South think this proposal would strengthen the two-party system and would not lead to the formation of third parties or splinter parties in the South.

Our idea is that under the system here proposed, if put into effect, both political parties, instead of conceding or marking off the electoral votes of the South, would fight for and work for votes in the South just as they do in the pivotal States, and therefore the problems of the South and of States in a similar situation would receive more consideration by the platform writers and policy makers of the two major political parties. Likewise, the voters of the South and of other sections of the country would find better representation and a stronger voice in the programs and policies of the two major political parties, and consequently would stay with those two major parties.

In my opinion—and my opinion is different from that of the Senator from Michigan—inevitably that would be the result of the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 2 and the adoption of the constitutional amendment it proposes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I answer the Senator by saying that what he has just stated is a speculation which has been disproved by actual fact. The actual fact is that in 1948 when the South disagreed with the Democratic Party, some of the Southern States bolted the Democratic Party at the convention. Did they come over to the Republican Party? Oh, no, Mr. President. Instead, they formed their own party, a splinter party, the Dixiecrat Party. There is the fact; that is what happened.

Mr. President, anyone who is aware of the voting habits of the South must know that the Southern States are not going to join the other major political party. They demonstrated that beyond any question in the 1948 elections, when they formed a splinter party.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does not the Senator believe it is a fact that the platforms and programs of both the major political parties are written, to a considerable extent, in order to attract the voters of the so-called pivotal States, and that, so far as relates to the South and certain other States which historically have gone either one way or the other, the platform writers and policy makers of the two major political parties in framing the platforms are not so much concerned with them as they are with the problems and conditions of special groups in the pivotal States? Is not that one of the reasons why the Republican Party has not made greater headway in the South?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I do not think that is the reason, so far as the South is concerned. I think the Senator from Tennessee knows of a much better reason for the situation in the South.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does not the Senator from Michigan agree, having worked intimately with the Republican National Committee, that usually the masterminds of the two political parties before the election separately decide which States are worth working for? In other words, they decide that certain States will go Democratic in any event, so that there is no use in doing anything in them, for instance, perhaps in Tennessee or South Carolina; while, on the other hand, the Democratic high command may think Georgia or Alabama will be Democratic in any event, so there is no use in putting on any election campaign in those States or in particularly considering their problems in connection with the writing of the platform. So the battlefield finally dwindles down to some 11 or 12 States where ordinarily the votes are close. Does not that occur?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the Senator is correct in regard to the writing of the platforms, but I think it will be found that the platforms are written having in mind the centers of population and the centers of property, as well as individuals. If we are to continue to have a two-party system, then we shall have to do just what the parties have been doing in the past. If we are to develop the same philosophy that France has developed, then we will have the Central States with a platform and a party, the Eastern States with a platform and a party, the Southern States with a platfrom and a party, the far Western States, even the Mountain States, with their platform and their party; and then we shall have parties such as a farmers' party, a labor party, a business party; and the first thing we know we shall be electing a President of the United States with as little as 25 percent of the popular vote, because under this proposed elective system all a successful candidate will need will be a plurality of the votes; and the one who could rally the largest popular vote under such a split situation would become President of the United States.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not wish to infringe unduly upon the Senator's time by going into detail regarding the matter now under discussion. I expect to answer the Senator's argument later this afternoon.

But I wish to say that the strengthening of our presidential election system by having two real national, Nation-wide parties, is one of the principal reasons why I have been so much interested in the pending joint resolution.

I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that in most of the States, the governors and other State officials are elected on a plurality basis. Yet we have seen less development of so-called splinter parties or third parties or minority parties in the States of the Union than we have in the Federal Government under the electoral-college system. This leads the junior Senator from Tennessee to the conclusion that the people of the Nation believe in, appreciate the value of, and wish to sustain the two-party system, and are not going to support multiple parties, as have the French people. That is evidenced by the fact that throughout the United States there have been so few splinter parties in State elections.

However, if we ever develop a system whereby all sections of the country are considered by the two major political parties, then we shall have a strengthening, not a deterioration, of the two-party system.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I cannot agree that that is the reason why the State elections have not led to the formation of splinter parties. I think a State is dominated by what occurs in the national scene. In each of the States the important election is the presidential election; it overshadows all other elections. The presidential election is very definitely the largest, most important election. Therefore, the parties line up behind the candidates for Senator and Representatives and the presidential candidate. That is what keeps the States from developing splinter parties, whereas the adoption of the proposed plurality counting method would have the opposite effect.

If southerners open the door to minority parties, they will not be able to confine party allegiance to the two major parties and to the Dixiecrat Party. Throughout the Nation today there are threats to our political system as a result of other parties which wish to take over. Splinter parties are already on the horizon. And nowhere is the ferment more active than in the South. Strong minorities are growing there. Open the door for them with Senate Joint Resolution 2, and radical parties will rise up to plague both major parties, if not to destroy the two-party system altogether.

The present electoral system forces radicals to temper their actions and work within the two-party system. Senate Joint Resolution 2 turns them loose and gives them a strong incentive to build their own strength. Then, by only a plurality requirement, it gives a radical minority an easy chance to dominate the majority.

Let us consider, Mr. President, what Representative WRIGHT PATMAN said on this subject. He saw what was going to happen, and I wish to quote what he said. He is an outstanding student of American Government, and is one southerner who has seen this thing clearly. At page 181 of the Senate hearings, he has put his finger on the key by saying:

> What attracted my attention about this resolution was not what was being said in its favor, but the failure of certain groups to express opposition to it. In other words, I wondered why the left-wingers or the communistic groups did not say something about it. I also wondered why the ultraconservative, reactionary, Fascist-minded groups did not express opposition to it. I concluded that possibly each minority group felt like it was a step in the direction of giving them an opportunity to elect a President. If this resolution is adopted and ratified by the States, it will be the most heartening news minority groups have received in a long time. It will then be possible for minority groups to be recognized by actually receiving electoral votes of their own, which has not been possible in the past.

THE "DISFRANCHISED VOTER" ARGUMENT

Sponsors of the resolution make much of the disfranchisement of voters under the present system. They speak of votes being lost, or counted for the opposition. But, under their resolution, a plurality winner may have only 40 percent or less of the electoral votes. What of the defeated majority, with 60 percent of the votes? Are their votes not lost, too, or considered as counted for the minority winner? As a matter of fact, I cannot become excited over the argument of lost votes. It seems to me to be only an appeal for popular support for the resolution, an appeal without real substance in reason and logic. In every election where there can be but a single winner, all votes cast for the losing candidates can be said to be lost. Sponsors of the resolution would merely transfer the lost votes so-called from the State to the national level. In truth, no votes are lost when validly cast in an election. They are counted toward whatever the final decision is, whether it be the unit of an electoral majority or the plurality of electoral votes, and if found insufficient to win, they have simply exhausted their power as votes.

This is well understood under the present system and accepted as a normal part of the political machinery, because an electoral majority is always necessary in order to win. But under the resolution, would minority voters be satisfied to lose if, together, they received 60 percent of the vote, while the plurality candidate took office with only 40 percent of the vote? Would they not claim that giving them a share in the electoral vote was equally inequitable, if this share became lost at the national level? Would they not clamor for more effective minority representation? This is where the whole idea of proportional representation arises under the resolution. Witnesses at the hearings did not claim that the resolution is itself an example of proportional representation. They did not have to be told humorously by the sponsors that a single executive cannot be divided into proportional parts. But they claim that the sharing of electoral votes among candidates for President, in order to give each minority a voice, is the first step toward full proportional representation in the Congress and in the Government.

THE BEGINNINGS OF BLOC GOVERNMENT

Third parties, given the incentive of a chance to elect a President, will maintain their identity by putting up full slates for Congress. It is this which in the end will give us bloc government. Minorities, given a voice, will not be satisfied when their voice is canceled out or lost, as it would be under the proposed scheme. Their dissatisfaction will mount further, if a plurality winner receives only 40 percent of the total electoral vote. They will then demand full proportional representation in the Congress and on Government boards and commissions, just as the two major parties do now, because they are too strong to be ignored. We have certain laws now providing that the two major parties shall have representation on commissions and boards. If such a thing becomes possible under the law, and if it occurs, as it seems indicated it will, the demand will be that other minorities, and lesser minorities, have such representation. It is at this stage that proportional representation, as in France and other parts of Europe, is likely to flower from Senate Joint Resolution 2. And wherever proportional representation, so-called, is at work, government has been plagued, confused, and weakened. The existing system of counting electoral votes has avoided that. It has preserved the two-party system, by which Government has been held stable and responsible.

THE WEAKENING OF FEDERALISM

I see also in abandonment of the unit rule for recording electoral votes a decided weakening of the principle which created and held together the Federal Union, namely, the preservation of the independence of the States.

To be sure, the proposal of sharing electoral votes does not go so far as would direct election by popular vote, which would altogether wipe out State lines in Federal elections. But while the State's electoral votes are preserved in the new scheme, their allocations by proportions does represent a definite weakening of federalism. As I have indicated earlier, a requirement that a State's electoral votes be broken up by proportional allocation is nothing but a surrender of the State's sovereign rights over that bloc of votes.

A sharing of electoral votes would leave the small States smaller than ever in influence, and the large States greatly reduced in proportion. Nevada's influence, for instance, would be reduced from an assured electoral vote of three to a minute fraction, depending on the closeness of the popular vote. In 1948, Delaware's place in the electoral vote would have been a nullity. In Michigan, a typically close popular vote would reduce the State's electoral influence from 19 to a fraction of 1. To illustrate, a popular plurality of 50,000 in Michigan would result in the State's having a net influence

upon the electoral result of just one-half a vote. In other words, of a total popular vote of more than 2,000,000, Michigan, having gone one way by a majority of 50,000, would in effect have a vote in the electoral college of one-half vote only.

What does this do to the principle of giving populous States a voice comparable with their weight in population, taxation, and economic and social activity? I have remarked that some of the sponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 2 have indicated no hesitancy in their willingness to go the whole length toward direct popular Federal election. They have been held back only because of the practical impossibility of getting the idea approved by States which jealously guard their independent status. They want to to take one step at a time, and Senate Joint Resolution 2 is a good step in the direction of obliteration of States lines, at a time when it seems obvious to all that the spread of Federal power at the expense of States is already far-reaching.

FEDERAL CONTROL OF ELECTIONS WOULD FOLLOW

This weakening of the States gives rise also to serious question of whether complete Federal control of elections might not legally and logically follow. Have those who believe in States' rights considered this question? For instance, if a candidate is to receive credit, by constitutional provision, for the proportion of popular votes cast for him, as provided by Senate Joint Resolution 2, could he not demand that in order to receive complete credit nationally, a State should be required to place his name on the ballot? The States now jealously guard their prerogative to control the ballot. But how can they maintain this position after they have accepted the idea that a candidate with popular votes is entitled to a share of electoral votes?

A candidate could make an unanswerable argument against any State law that would keep him off the ballot. He could say that the Constitution, as amended by Senate Joint Resolution 2, guaranteed him a share in electoral votes in proportion to his popular vote. But the election machinery of Illinois, or New York, or Mississippi is contrived to keep his name off the ballot, and thus to deprive him of his popular vote? That was done in 1949, in the case of Mr. Wallace, in the State of Illinois. This, in effect, would deprive him of his share of electoral votes which the Constitution, the highest law of the land, guarantees him. How can he be guaranteed a right by the Constitution and then be deprived of its fruits by State law? How can he be given a benefit and be deprived of the means to enjoy it? Under the present system, the States are masters in their own house. Under Senate Joint Resolution 2, State lines are wiped out. Elections for President become national operations with a candidate's rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

I feel certain the courts will say that if the Constitution guarantees a candidate a share in electoral votes proportionate to popular votes, he has to be given a chance to go into every State in search of popular votes, whatever State laws provide to the contrary. With arguments like this, the pressure for Federal control of election laws will be irresistible.

Sponsors of the resolution declare they have no intention of altering State election laws, but how can they so confidently eliminate the future pressures which their resolution, in plain logic, is bound to generate. On the face of their own resolution, they are already altering State laws when they propose to force a division of electoral votes.

THE POSITION OF SENATOR NORRIS

Before I conclude, Mr. President, I would like to draw upon the testimony of one of the great advocates of electoral reform in the past. I refer to the late Senator George Norris, of Nebraska.

In the Seventy-third Congress, Senator Norris introduced Senate Joint Resolution 29. As introduced, that resolution was identical with Senate Joint Resolution 2 of the Eighty-first Congress, except that the latter provides, when there is a tie for the highest number of electoral votes, the candidate having the greatest popular vote will be declared elected. The Norris resolution also provided that where the votes cast in any State for any candidate amounted to less than 1 percent of the vote for President in that State, that candidate's votes would be disregarded in the counting. It will be noticed he was afraid of a so-called "splinter" party's going below even the 1 percent vote.

In particular, the resolutions are identical in their provision for a division of a State's electoral vote in proportion to popular vote, which is called a dominating feature of Senate Joint Resolution 2.

After consideration by the Judiciary Committee of the Seventy-third Congress, of which Senator Norris was the ranking minority member and former chairman, the Norris resolution was reported to the Senate, stripped of that provision for proportional counting of electoral votes. In other words, they took away from that resolution the real meat and it is sought to be reinstated in the pending resolution.

The version which was reported would have installed the so-called unit system of counting a State's electoral votes as a part of the Constitution. It introduced the novel feature of requiring that a candidate have only 35 percent of the electoral vote, instead of a majority, to be elected President. This is a refinement of the mere plurality requirements in the current resolution.

In other words, the late Senator Norris and those who were with him in sponsoring the resolution thought they might bring about a split into splinter parties so that a President could be elected with less than 35 percent of the electoral unit of votes.

In explaining this abandonment of the proportional voting scheme, the late Senator Norris said on the floor of the Senate on May 16, 1934:

> The committee, after a great deal of discussion, concluded, I think with practical unanimity, that it would be unwise to permit a proportional vote to be cast according to the number of votes that a candidate received in a particular State. I myself became convinced that to permit the division of the vote of a State between different candidates in proportion to the total vote in a Presidential contest would be injurious in the end.

Senator Norris went on further to say:

> While I believe that is a sound position; that in theory it is perfect; and that we ought to have such a system; in the first place we could not get it adopted because, in my judgment, the States would never ratify it, and that was also the judgment of the committee.

This was George Norris warning the Senate and the people with regard to what he had proposed and what this joint resolution proposes. He said:

> In the next place, it would be a very great inducement to fraud all over the country. Every fraudulent vote that was put into a ballot box in Philadelphia—

I do not know why he selected Philadelphia, but he said:

> Every fraudulent vote that was put into a ballot box in Philadelphia would be counted in the selection of a President of the United States, whereas under present conditions its effect stops within the State of Pennsylvania.

In other words, he wanted the vote cast in a State to remain in the State and to speak only for the State, and not for the other States of the Union, and not to be able to dilute legitimate votes cast in another State.

I read further from what Senator Norris said:

> If a State is one-sided in an election, as that State usually is, in the final result there would be no harm, but everywhere in the United States, if the proportional voting system were adopted, as this amendment originally provided, there would be an inducement to have cast as many fraudulent votes as possible.

NORRIS REPUDIATED PLURALITY AND PROPORTIONAL COUNTING PROPOSALS

The Norris resolution was further amended on the floor to require a majority, instead of 35 percent, of the electoral vote to elect a President.

Senator Robinson asked Senator Norris, who had offered this further amendment:

> The Senator has become convinced it is better not to permit an election by popular vote of what may be termed a minority candidate?

Senator Norris replied, "That is true."

In short Mr. President, we have the testimony here of one of the great reform advocates of the past repudiating precisely the two points in Senate Joint Resolution 2 against which I have raised objection, namely plurality elections and proportional counting of electoral votes.

There, Mr. President, was an example of a truly liberal mind in operation. Senator Norris believed he saw the need for a fundamental reform. He proposed it. When its weaknesses were impressed upon him, he altered it. The significant thing is that the weaknesses which he came to recognize and which he withdrew were exactly the two great weaknesses of the Senate joint resolution which is now before the Senate.

SUMMARY

Mr. President, I mean no reflection upon the sincere purposes of those who sponsor Senate Joint Resolution 2, but advocates of reform suffer constantly from undernourished foresight. They are so taken with current evils and so

confident they have the specific cure, that they resolutely refuse to believe the reform--or what they propose as a reform—in other words, a change—will go beyond what they plan for it. They are sure it will stop exactly where they want it to stop.

In the case of Senate Joint Resolution 2, the sponsors believe there will be no more lost votes, and no consequences if lost votes are not made completely effective by full proportional representation. They believe a plurality requirement in place of a majority electoral vote will not produce minority Presidents. They see no rise of splinter factions and minority parties, although they provide direct and powerful incentives for the growth of such groups. They naively believe their proposal will open up the "solid" South only to Republicans and not to many minority parties outside the major parties, and will permit only the Democrats to share in Republican strongholds and not other parties. They believe that a further weakening of the Federal principle by Federal guaranties to candidates of a share in electoral votes will not lead to further Federal invasion of State election procedure. They feel that because they set up a very limited form of proportional representation, no drive to make it completely effective at the congressional and governmental level will ever materialize.

For my own part, Mr. President, I would not dream of changing the fundamental law of the land on the basis of any such optimistic speculation.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask as to the effect of voting directly for the President and Vice President and counting the proportionate votes for each. With three or more candidates for office, it is very rarely the case that a third party would cast a majority of the votes.

Mr. FERGUSON. I would say it could have this effect: If a candidate had any strength at all in the various States he might make a sufficient number of electoral votes so that the third-party candidate and one of the others would actually have a majority of the electoral votes and elect a minority President. If we expand that to four or five candidates, which was the case in one of our past elections, the vote might be thrown to a minority President. Mr. Wilson was a minority President.

Mr. MALONE. One further question. Has there been an analysis made of the history of the votes for Presidents to indicate how often that might have happened, in other words, throwing the election to a candidate who would not otherwise have been elected?

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has already put that information into the RECORD. Here is the answer which is given by the sponsors in that connection: We cannot go according to past elections, because there would be a change in the habit of the voting population by virtue of this joint resolution if the constitutional amendment it proposes should finally be adopted.

If we were to apply the proposed amendment, as I have stated, to the State of Michigan, it would be found that the State of Michigan cast more than 2,000,000 votes. The Republican Party won the election in 1948 by a majority of approximately 50,000 votes. Michigan has 17 Representatives and 2 Senators. There would be 9¼ electoral votes for the Democratic candidate, Mr. Truman, and 9¾ electoral votes for the Republican candidate, Mr. Dewey; in other words, there would be a variation of half a vote.

Let us take some of the Southern States. There we find a variation of eight or nine votes, or only slightly less than whatever their number of electoral votes may be, because the election is one-sided. The claim is made that all we, as Republicans, have to do is to go to the South, campaign there, and build up the Republican Party.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator from Michigan for his answer.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Has the Senator completed his remarks?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to ask the Senator five or six questions.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be glad to have the Senator ask them.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator does not think, does he, that it is a bad thing to have a President elected by a plurality?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do think it is a bad thing.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator think it was bad that Abraham Lincoln was elected, although he received only 39 percent of the popular vote?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think it is better for a candidate to receive a majority.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator think it was a bad thing that 12 Presidents in our history, including Wilson, Cleveland, Harrison, Garfield, and Truman, were elected by a plurality of the popular vote?

Mr. FERGUSON. I still think it was a bad thing. I think it would have been much better if they had received a majority. As the Senator has said, Abraham Lincoln was elected with only 39 percent of the popular vote. The Senator can see how a third, fourth, or fifth party can put up a candidate and elect a President when only 25 percent of the people want him as President and 75 percent do not want him.

Mr. LODGE. If 25 percent of the American people want to be Socialists, 25 percent want to be Democrats, 25 percent want to be Republicans, and 25 percent want to be Communists, does the Senator think there is any law or any constitutional amendment that can stop them from taking those positions if they desire to do so?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; but I hope we can guard against exploitation by a determined, compact minority. Where there is a two-party system, and those in one party range in their political views from one extreme to the other, and those in the other party, which is the majority party, we will say, also represent a wide range of thought, it is much better to have people working in the party, follow the platform of the party, so that there can be party responsibility, than it is to have them broken down into various splinters and have them become independent, and, therefore, have no party responsibility whatever. I say that if the desire is to increase the Socialist vote in America, or to have the Socialist Party become a strong party, or if the desire is to have the Communists become a strong party, and not be trying to infiltrate into the other parties, the kind of proportional representation proposed by the joint resolution would bring about such a condition.

Mr. LODGE. There is no Senator here who is less anxious to build up the Socialist Party or the Communist Party than is the junior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. FERGUSON. I realize that.

Mr. LODGE. It is precisely for that reason that I am one of those proposing this amendment to the Constitution, because I think such a constitutional amendment would enhance and invigorate the two-party system, and reduce the influence of splinter parties, which in the last election threw the whole State of New York to Mr. Dewey, although he did not have a majority of the popular vote. But I shall debate that later.

Mr. FERGUSON. I can understand why the Senator feels that Mr. Dewey, for example, not having a majority of the popular vote, should not have had the electoral votes of New York. I can understand that, but cannot agree with it.

Mr. LODGE. I am not objecting to Mr. Dewey getting any votes. I am objecting to Henry Wallace having as much influence as he had in the last election, and I contend that the proposed system would cut him right down to size.

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe that Mr. Wallace would have become a permanent fixture in the United States, so far as elections were concerned, if the proposed system had been in effect.

Mr. LODGE. I think he would have evaporated much more quickly if the proposed system had been in effect, because in that campaign his ability to determine the outcome gave him his power and influence, and the pending proposal would reduce the power and influence of any third party.

Mr. FERGUSON. I feel just the opposite would be the result.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to ask the Senator a question about the amendment he proposes. Does not his amendment write the all-or-nothing-rule system into the Constitution, where it now does not exist?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. LODGE. Would not that change the State election laws? I heard the Senator objecting to changing State election laws. Would not that amendment require a tremendous change in State elections laws?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. LODGE. It seems to me that if that were in the Constitution, the States would have to change their election laws to conform with the unit-rule system, which is not now in the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. But it is the practice, the unit rule has been the practice.

Mr. LODGE. But it is not in the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator is so solicitous about not requiring the States to change their laws, I should think he would not make a proposal such as he has suggested, which would impose an additional Federal obligation on the States.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not understand that it would require any change in State laws. It has been the system, proven in practice.

Mr. LODGE. The practice.

Mr. FERGUSON. It has been the practice, and it therefore involves no unforeseeable consequences.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator's amendment provides that Congress, voting individually, would settle elections in which no candidate received a majority.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. Would the Senator have the Members of Congress pledged?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. LODGE. Would they vote their own personal ideas?

Mr. FERGUSON. There would undoubtedly be a plank in the platform of the Republican Party, or the Democratic Party, or of whatever party to which the Members of Congress belonged, that they would vote, if ever required to vote in the Senate and the House in a joint session, for the President nominated on the particular ticket upon which they were elected.

Mr. LODGE. So that if a Democratic President and a Republican Congress were elected in the same election, then the Senator would have the Republican Congress choosing a Republican, although he had not received as many votes as the other candidate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; and I think that would be a good thing, because the people would have spoken, through their respective districts, and in case of a minority and not a majority, the Congress would name the President, because that would represent the popular vote.

Mr. LODGE. But the same voters will often vote for the candidate of one party for President, for the candidate of another party for Senator, and if a Senator were given the right to vote as he desired, that would be running exactly counter to what the citizen might want, taking the whole presidential election away from him, setting up a new body to decide presidential elections, completely removed from the popular will.

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely wish to say that those who vote for a different candidate for President than the one for whom they vote to be Senator they do not understand the American system of Government. It is no reflection upon them, but they do not understand they are confusing any prospect for action on issues.

Mr. LODGE. There are many Senators on this floor—of whom I happen to be one, and I daresay the Senator from Michigan is another—who were elected to the Senate at the same election when a Democratic President was also being elected, and I shall never admit that the people who elected me did not understand the American system.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan was not elected in the State of Michigan when a Democratic President was elected, but that is beside the point.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Massachusetts was elected by the voters of Massachusetts in 1936, when a Democratic President was being elected, and it seemed to the Senator from Massachusetts, and apparently seemed to a plurality of the voters in Massachusetts, that that was a perfectly American and a perfectly consistent thing to do.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator also think that the people really intended to elect a Republican, and that they wanted him in the Congress?

Mr. LODGE. They intended to elect a Democratic President. Franklin D. Roosevelt carried the State, according to my recollection, by 170,000, whereas I carried it by 140,000. There were 310,000 people who voted for a Democratic President and a Republican Senator. Why is not that perfectly American?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is perfectly all right, if that State desires a Republican Senator and a Democratic President. That is perfectly all right.

Mr. LODGE. Under the Senator's amendment, if the Congress settled the result of the presidential election, there would be a Republican Senator bound by the Senator's own system to vote for a Republican candidate for President, even though the people had voted the other way.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question.

Mr. LODGE. I shall be glad to reply.

Mr. MALONE. As I understand the system the Senator has advocated under his joint resolution, it would take away any possibility of a State voting as a unit. In other words, the electors who vote for a Democratic President or a Republican President join with the electors of other States to make up the majority or the minority, whatever it may happen to be, for the respective person for whom they vote. In other words, there would be no such thing, from then on, as a State voting as a body for a President.

Mr. LODGE. If the people of a State vote unanimously for a certain candidate for President, that candidate gets all the electoral votes of the State. But if 80 percent vote for one candidate and 20 percent vote for another, then candidate A gets 80 percent of the electoral vote and candidate B gets 20 percent of the electoral vote.

Mr. MALONE. I was merely seeking to call attention to what the Senator had in his mind when he introduced this principle. Of course, when we elect the governor of a State, or elect a Senator or a Representative, he is elected by a majority of the people of a State.

Mr. LODGE. Usually a plurality. Election by a plurality is the usual rule in American electors for Senators, Governors, mayors, and most other officers.

Mr. MALONE. Of course, choice by majority is the rule.

Mr. LODGE. No; choice by plurality is the rule.

Mr. MALONE. Sometimes there are three candidates for governor in a State, but where there are two, as there usually are, a Democratic and a Republican candidate, the one who gets the largest number of votes is elected.

Mr. LODGE. That would be true in any system when there are simply two candidates. In such case there is certain to be a majority for one candidate. It is when there are three or more candidates that there begin to be pluralities.

Mr. MALONE. That is true. What I intended to have the Senator from Massachusetts clarify, but we were slightly diverted from it is the point that adoption of the amendment would take away from the State the opportunity of expressing itself as a State through a majority.

Mr. LODGE. No. The State would express itself if a majority of the voters of the State voted a certain way. That fact would receive accurate expression in the electoral vote. But the unit rule is done away with. That is correct. If the State has 10 electoral votes, and 60 percent of the vote of the State were to go to candidate A and 40 percent to candidate B, then candidate A would receive 6 electoral votes and candidate B would receive 4 electoral votes. All 10 would not go to candidate A.

Mr. MALONE. Then the first statement the Junior Senator from Massachusetts made is not correct. The last statement is correct. The last statement is that if there are two candidates for President, and one of them receives 30 percent of the vote, we will say, that percentage of the vote is counted for him.

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. And there is no such thing as unanimity in a State's vote for President.

Mr. LODGE. The unit rule of all or nothing is done away with; that is correct unless, of course, the voters of a State cast their ballots unanimously for one candidate.

INVOCATION OF EMERGENCY PROVISIONS OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, John L. Lewis is playing with the President and the American people as a cat plays with a mouse. One day he pounces upon us and allows no soft-coal production at all. The next day he releases his grasp slightly and allows limited production to

trickle through. Then he pounces again with all fours.

By these tactics he is menacing the general welfare of the American people in the dead of winter. The national emergency which he has precipitated may be summed up by the following facts:

The normal over-all coal supply above the ground is 50,000,000 tons.

The supply above the ground today is about 20,000,000 tons.

In the most recent 2 weeks' period Lewis has allowed the production of 12,500,000 tons.

In the same period consumption has totaled 22,500,000 tons.

Consumption is outrunning production at the rate of a net loss of from 500,000 to 700,000 tons a day.

At the present rate of production and consumption all reserves would be consumed in about a month.

While the over-all reserves, if equally distributed, would be enough to last for a month, assuming the present rate of production, they would last about 2 weeks if production should be completely stopped. Yet, the reserve in the hands of the retailers is only about 1,000,000 tons and, if equally distributed, would supply the country for 2½ days. With cold weather now forecast throughout the East as well as the North and West, we may easily have a critical situation in a period of hours.

Such reserves as remain are so scattered that human suffering will be extensive long before the reserves are completely exhausted.

The Interstate Commerce Commission on December 23 found, as a result of the coal shortage, that the ability of the railroads to perform their service and duties in the interest of the public and the commerce of the people is seriously threatened.

Subsequently, on January 4, the Interstate Commerce Commission found that an emergency exists requiring immediate action—with respect to curtailment of railroad operations—in all sections of the country.

This curtailment of rail transportation has already affected the dispatch of the United States mail.

It is obvious to all that if the Lewis tactics are allowed to continue steam operations on railroads, other vital industries, power plants, and so forth, will be brought to a virtual standstill within a relatively few days.

The shortage of fuel in the worst of the winter months would extend to the homes and domestic routines of millions of families, and the shortage of fuel and power will extend even to hospitals and other institutions vital not only to the general welfare but literally to the health of the Nation as well.

The existence of an emergency has been recognized by National Labor Relations Board Counsel Denham, who has proceeded in the only way he could by requesting the court action in the situation from the standpoint that Lewis is engaging in an unfair labor practice.

Denham is to be commended for the courage he displayed in the absence of any manifest interest by the President. But even if his move is a proper one under the law, it is likely the suffering will be deadly before action can be taken under the ordinarily slow processes of Federal courts.

In the face of all this, the President has said no emergency exists, and still stubbornly refuses to take the immediate action that only the President can take.

Director of the Bureau of Mines, Dr. James Boyd, differs with the President as to whether an emergency in coal exists. In testifying before the Senate Labor Committee on January 25, Dr. Boyd said:

> Unless there is an immediate resumption of substantially increased coal production the national economy, health, and welfare is now or soon will be imperiled.

Under the circumstances, to delay declaration of a national emergency until the last lump of coal is burned might be politically expedient, but humanely it certainly would be an anticlimax.

Something has changed the mind of the President about when an emergency in coal shortage exists.

In an Executive order of March 23, 1948, issued by the President as a result of a Lewis strike, the President found that it was "affecting a substantial part of an industry engaged in trade and commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, and in the production of goods and commerce, which strike, if permitted to continue, will imperil the national health and safety."

That is what Mr. Truman said on March 23, 1948.

When the President made that finding there were 45,000,000 tons of coal above the ground. Now there are little more than 20,000,000 tons. Then he set up a commission to determine the facts preliminary to action under the national-emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. Today no commission has been established and the President has said he did not think anything was needed.

On April 3, 1948, the commission confirmed the President's views, the President ordered the Attorney General to seek an injunction to stop the strike, and the injunction was granted—all in the same day. That is how serious the emergency was at that time. On that day in April 1948, when the worst of the winter was over, there were 40,000,000 tons of coal above ground. Today, with the worst of the winter ahead, there is little more than 20,000,000 tons above the ground.

Despite the statement attributed to the President that he had never used the Taft-Hartley Act, an official compilation by the Library of Congress shows that he has invoked the act on seven different occasions, as follows:

First. Atomic energy dispute, March 1948.

Second. Meat-packers dispute, March 1948.

Third. First bituminous-coal dispute, March 1948.

Fourth. Long-line-telephone dispute, May 1948.

Fifth. Maritime dispute, June 1948.

Sixth. Second bituminous-coal dispute, June 1948.

Seventh. Longshoremen's dispute, August 1948.

Perhaps the President was erroneously quoted. Perhaps the statement was inadvertent. But, in any event, the fact that he has not used the Taft-Hartley Act since August 1948 is significant.

Whether or not it is due to some secret election campaign agreement with labor leaders, implied or otherwise, it is a fact that the President has not invoked the Taft-Hartley Act since his active campaigning for reelection in 1948 really started.

Under our constitutional form of government, the Congress makes the laws and the President must execute them, and any President who refuses to enforce the law as enacted by Congress is undermining the constitutional processes of our Government.

The Taft-Hartley Act imposes upon the President the constitutional duty of invoking the national emergency provisions of that law when he finds there is a national emergency.

It is a matter of record that responsible agencies and officials of the Government have officially found that a national emergency has arisen by virtue of the intolerable behavior of one labor leader who has time and time again set himself above the Government of the United States.

Everybody in the country except the President and the labor leaders knows that a national emergency exists.

The Supreme Court of the land has upheld the action taken as a result of the President's previous invocation of the Taft-Hartley Act against Lewis.

Under the circumstances, I am submitting a resolution stating officially that the Senate of the United States knows an emergency exists, and that it is calling upon the President to perform his constitutional duty in behalf of the people of the Nation.

This is a Senate resolution, which, under the rules of the Senate, I request to lie on the table. This means that the Senate, by a majority vote, can take up such a resolution for consideration. The fact that action on the joint resolution recently introduced by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and other Senators, for the purpose of declaring that an emergency in the coal supply exists was indefinitely postponed by the Labor Committee, warrants the submission of a Senate resolution, which can be taken up quickly without reference to committee.

The adoption by the Senate of a resolution that an emergency does exist, while without legal effect, will have a profound influence as expressing the majority sentiment and judgment of the Members of the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit the resolution, which I ask to be printed and lie on the table, and to be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 221) was received and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

> Whereas the President of the United States on March 23, 1948, signed Executive Order 9939 creating an emergency board under the Labor-Management Relations Act,

1947, in connection with the strike in the bituminous coal-mining industry taking place at that time; and

Whereas stocks of bituminous coal as of March 23, 1948, were approximately 45,000,000 tons of coal based on official Bureau of Mines figures, representing approximately 31 days' forward supply; and

Whereas stocks of bituminous coal today are approximately 20,000,000 tons based on best available Bureau of Mines figures, representing only a few days forward supply; and

Whereas the present serious shortage of bituminous coal has already been recognized by public bodies, including the Interstate Commerce Commission, which has restricted coal-burning passenger service locomotive mileage by 33⅓ percent; and

Whereas Dr. James Boyd, Director, Bureau of Mines, United States Department of the Interior, nearly a week ago, on January 25, 1950, testifying before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, said: "Unless there is an immediate resumption of substantially increased coal production the national economy, health, and welfare is now or soon will be imperiled"; and

Whereas the President has effectively invoked the national emergency provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, in seven instances as follows: Atomic energy dispute, March 1948; meat packers dispute, March 1948; first bituminous-coal dispute, March 1948; long-line telephone dispute, May 1948; maritime dispute, June 1948; second bituminous-coal dispute, June 1948; and longshoremen's dispute, August 1948: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President of the United States shall invoke the national-emergency provisions (secs. 206–210, inclusive) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, in the current strike in the coal industry.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE ON THE EQUAL-RIGHTS AMENDMENT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 1 or 2 minutes so I may make a brief statement, and ask to have several insertions made in the RECORD?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, since the Senate has acted on the joint resolution proposing the so-called equal-rights amendment to the Constitution, I do not wish to take the time of the Senate to discuss the subject now, but I do wish to make clear that, while entertaining doubts regarding the legal effect of the proposal, nevertheless, I favor submitting it to the State legislatures for consideration.

Mr. President, I was absent from the Senate on official business last Wednesday, January 25, when the vote was taken on Senate Joint Resolution 25, the resolution proposing a constitutional amendment declaring that "equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex." If present, however, I would have voted in favor of submitting the proposed amendment to the States, in view of the fact that both party platforms have declared in favor of that step and in view of the rejection of the substitute measure, proposing a commission to study and report on the nature and extent of discriminations based on sex and declaring it to be the national policy that there should be no distinctions based on sex "except such as are reasonably justified by differences in physical structure, or by maternal function."

Eminent jurists and lawyers have raised serious questions about the amendment. Thus, a group of them, including deans and professors of law of 21 leading law schools, has endorsed a statement which in part reads as follows:

If anything about this proposed amendment is clear, it is that it would transform every provision of law concerning women into a constitutional issue to be ultimately resolved by the Supreme Court of the United States. Every statutory and common-law provision dealing with the manifold relation of women in society would be forced to run the gauntlet of attack on constitutional grounds. The range of such potential litigation is too great to be readily foreseen, but it would certainly embrace such diverse legal provisions as those relating to a widow's allowance, the obligation of family support and grounds for divorce, the age of majority, and the right of annulment of marriages, and the maximum hours of labor for women in protected industries.

Not only is the range of the amendment of indefinite extent but, even more important, the fate of all this varied legislation would be left highly uncertain in the face of judicial review. Presumably the amendment would set up a constitutional yardstick of absolute equality between men and women in all legal relationships. A more flexible view, permitting reasonable differentiation, can hardly be regarded as the object of the proposal, since the fourteenth amendment has long provided that no State shall deny to any person the equal protection of the laws, and that amendment permits reasonable classifications while prohibiting arbitrary legal discrimination. If it were intended to give the courts the authority to pass upon the propriety of distinctions, benefits, and duties as between men and women, no new guidance is given to the courts, and this entire subject, one of unusual complexity, would be left to the unpredictable judgments of courts in the form of constitutional decisions.

This statement, after briefly examining the impact of the amendment, concludes that:

The basic fallacy in the proposed amendment is that it attempts to deal with complicated and highly concrete problems arising out of a diversity of human relationships in terms of a single and simple abstraction. This abstraction is undoubtedly a worthy ideal for mobilizing legislative forces in order to remedy particular deficiencies in the law. But as a constitutional standard, it is hopelessly inept. That the proposed equal-rights amendment would open up an era of regrettable consequences for the legal status of women in this country is highly probable. That it would open up a period of extreme confusion in constitutional law is a certainty.

Because of these serious legal questions, it seemed to me that the next logical step in the struggle to eliminate outmoded, unfair, and unnecessary discriminations based on sex was to conduct a detailed study, on the basis of which the Congress and the legislatures of the States could take informed action. For that reason, I joined in sponsoring in this Congress the so-called status bill, Senate bill 1430, the substance of which was offered but rejected as a substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 25.

The Senate adopted the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], providing that "rights, benefits, or exemptions now or hereafter conferred by law upon persons of the female sex" shall not be impaired by reason of the earlier declaration in the amendment that equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex. I felt that these two propositions were, in large part, contradictory; and therefore I recorded my position against the so-called Hayden amendment.

An editorial in the Washington Post for Sunday, January 29, sums up the matter thus:

EQUAL RIGHTS

Although the Senate has approved the proposed constitutional amendment to give women equality of rights under the law, the vote was far from a victory for the advocates of the equal-rights amendment. On the contrary, it was a qualified victory for the many outstanding women's organizations that have made a splendid fight against it. For by amending the proposed constitutional amendment so as not to impair any rights, benefits, or exemptions conferred by law upon persons of the female sex, the Senate has made it comparatively innocuous and rather meaningless. At the same time it has alienated those forthright supporters of the original amendment who want to sweep away all laws intended for the protection of the weaker sex and put women on a basis of absolute equality with men under the law. Since the amendment in its present form is unacceptable to many of the equal-rights advocates, and since the amendment in any form would antagonize many of the States, we conclude that the chances of its eventual ratification are negligible.

As we have repeatedly pointed out, and as Senator LEHMAN said in course of the debate on the pending amendment, discrimination against women growing out of prejudice or custom can never be abolished by constitutional mandate. Moreover, attempts to compel the States to modify discriminatory laws would create endless litigation and legal confusion. That is why we have favored passage of the women's status bill, which declares that the policy of the Federal Government shall be to abolish distinctions based on sex, except such as are reasonably justified by differences in physical structure or by maternal function. That bill also calls for a presidential commission to study the problem and make recommendations for any required changes in Federal and State laws. The States would remain free to accept or reject such recommendations, but in our opinion that would be much more amenable to suggestions than to efforts to compel compliance with a constitutional mandate affording no practicable guide to purposive action.

We hope that the fight for the equal-status bill will be carried on with increased vigor. For it provides a practicable and reasonable method of dealing with the problem of legal discrimination without jeopardizing the efficacy of protective social and economic legislation essential for the protection of women in industry and in the home.

Mr. President, in closing let me say that it is my hope that the States, if the House should join in Senate Joint Resolution 25, will carefuly study the probable effect of the amendment. As an aid to that consideration, I believe it would be wise to enact Senate bill 1430, the status bill, so that the Congress and the States may be fully informed on this subject.

I thank my good friend, the Senator from New Jersey, for permitting me to make this statement at this time.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN METHOD OF ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I propose to resume the discussion of the unfinished business, Senate Joint Resolution 2, the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the election of President and Vice President.

Mr. President, this subject is a very important one. The issues presented in this debate have confronted the United States ever since the time of its founding and the establishment of its method of electing a President and Vice President through the use of the electoral college.

When the time comes to vote on the amendment under our constitutional processes, I wish it were possible for all the people of the country to have the benefit of the splendid presentation made to the Senate by our distinguished colleague the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] when he opened this debate, and also to have the benefit of the splendid presentation on the other side of the question made by our colleague the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

In connection with the effort to solve these problems, no one would presume to state dogmatically what would happen under a given set of circumstances. Inevitably, if we are suggesting a change in the process of electing the President and Vice President of the United States, we shall differ in our views in regard to what will be the effect of the proposed change, and no one can be sure exactly how the people will react to the proposals if put into effect.

But, Mr. President, I shall try to present an orderly statement of what I feel is the main issue in this matter, which has brought me to the conclusion that I should support Senate Joint Resolution 2.

Mr. President, the able Senator from Massachusetts already has stated his reasons for introducing the pending joint resolution. He has done so in an admirable and comprehensive statement, based upon years of intensive study—and in that connection I emphasize the word "years."

I may say, Mr. President, that I have been connected with Princeton University for some time, and the subject now before us has been considered by the university's department of politics. Although there are differing views, I think I am safe in saying that at least those in our institution who have studied this matter feel that this is the most practical approach which has been suggested in a great many years in regard to improving what we feel are the deficiencies in our present use of the electoral college.

I also call attention to the fact, as the RECORD shows, and as the Senator from Massachusetts pointed out, that the Brookings Institution, which is a research institution, as all of us know, came to a similar conclusion, and felt that the pending proposal was the best practical suggestion which had been made for improving some of the defects in our present system.

So I have no apologies to make for supporting the joint resolution, although I give great credit to, and have great respect for, the judgment of such distinguished colleagues of mine as the Senator from Michigan, who has just made such an able presentation.

Mr. President, without going into great detail myself, I simply wish to indicate why I have become an enthusiastic cosponsor of this measure, and I should like to emphasize certain aspects of it which seem to me to be of overriding importance.

I wish to say here that the Senator from Michigan seems to be concerned that the adoption of this new procedure will break down our two-party system. I say without reservation that if I thought there were any danger of that; I would be opposed to the joint resolution. I think that nothing in the United States of America is more important than our two-party system.

Our present system of presidential elections is based partly on the Constitution and partly on a great historical development which took place outside the Constitution, namely, the rise of the American two-party system. I shall try to indicate that I believe the proposed constitutional amendment will strengthen, not weaken, the two-party system.

It is well known that the two-party system was entirely unforeseen by the founding fathers; indeed, Washington and others of our early leaders repeatedly warned against what they considered the baneful growth of factions in the body politic. Washington even went so far as to be afraid of a two-party system; but, above all, he did not want factions in the body politic. Nevertheless, our young Republic was immediately faced with the practical problem of organizing our political activity in such a way as to give expression to conflicting interests without allowing those interests to throw us into a state of anarchy. The practical solution which we found to this problem was the great two-party system, which we have had almost throughout our history, and which we still cherish today.

Mr. President, this two-party system, which grew up within the broad terms of our Constitution, is an essential part of our priceless American heritage of freedom. As we have progressed from a limited suffrage to our present principle of universal adult suffrage, this system has afforded us a mechanism through which every citizen can express his voice—let me emphasize that point—and can exert his personal weight and influence, in a practical way, on the public affairs of his community, his State, and his Nation. It has meant that a channel was always open, through the minority party, for the free and effective expression of opposition. The two-party system is the heart of the organization of our democratic process.

Yet there is one respect in which the practices of this system have tended to nullify the system itself. I refer to the unit rule, under which all the electoral votes of each State are awarded to the Presidential candidate winning a plurality of the votes in the State. In my opinion, the abolition of this unit rule is the outstanding merit of the constitutional amendment proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 2.

Of course, I should point out that the distinguished Senator from Michigan takes issue at that point. That is the one thing the Senator from Michigan does not want to see happen, namely, the abolition of the unit rule.

It is not difficult to understand how the unit rule came into being. Political parties, like businesses, are in competition with each other. We all know how in industry, competition often tends to destroy itself, as one contending party succeeds in establishing a monopoly. We have long recognized that monopolistic practices are contrary to the public interest, and we have developed antitrust laws to hold them in check.

The unit rule in presidential elections is essentially a monopolistic rule. Our parties early discovered the convenience of offering in each State a single slate of electors, pledged to vote in the electoral college for the party's presidential candidate. Under this system, the whole party slate either wins or loses, and the electoral vote of the whole State goes to either one candidate or the other; it is never divided between the candidates, no matter how close the popular vote for President in the State may be.

The result is that in any State where one party holds a clear and certain majority, this rule completely nullifies the party contest for the Presidency. It creates a presidential monopoly for the majority party in that State. So in all the States—some of them predominantly Republican, some of them predominantly Democratic—the competitive two-party system has virtually ceased to exist.

The Senator from Massachusetts has already ably indicated the evil effects of this situation. He has stressed the stay-at-home attitude of voters in the safe States, who know very well that the Presidential election result is a foregone conclusion which their votes cannot change. He has noted that party activity during Presidential campaigns in these States is practically nil. He has noted that the Presidential candidates themselves are never nominated from these States and never bother to visit them during campaigns. The picture in these States is one of complete apathy and indifference. The people of these safe States stand completely outside the process of electing a President, although the President represents them as well as all the other people of the country. They are fast becoming what may be called political backwashes, areas of political stagnation. I submit that in this age, when democracy is at stake throughout the world, such a development is profoundly serious. Let me note in passing, it is my judgment that this situation has much to do with the small percentage of votes in relation to the number of those eligible to vote. We found in elections over a number of years that that was true. In the elections of 1948, 90,000,000 people were eligible to vote, only 45,000,000 of whom actually voted. The actual percentage was

something like 49.5 of the total number of people eligible to vote. In my judgment, that is partly due to the fact that we have the division of so-called safe States, States in which people think their votes will not make any difference. It is my feeling that Senate Joint Resolution 2 proposes an amendment which goes directly to the heart of this evil. Just as our antitrust laws recognize that the people cannot afford to tolerate the economic stagnation of business monopolies, so this amendment would recognize that our free American people cannot afford the political stagnation of party monopolies in any of our States. It would open up the whole length and breadth of the United States to the healthy competition of our two great political parties. No longer would it be possible for a safe State to deliver its due number of electoral votes to one Presidential candidate without a single important campaign speech in favor of either candidate having been made in that State. No longer would a Presidential election day come and go in these States without causing even a ripple of interest among the voters. Even if the strength of the minority party in such a State were only 10 percent, that 10 percent would be worth contending for because it would be reflected in the final outcome. Our Presidential campaigns, instead of being concentrated in a few pivotal States, would be spread throughout the country, turning areas of stagnation into areas of real vitality.

We all know as a practical matter—and I served on the Republican National Committee for a time, so I know the practical side of this question—that before an election, we think in terms of States which are the ones in which it is most worth while to put forth our efforts. There are certain States we cannot get, anyway, so why waste time and money on them? Consequently, the people of those States are left out of the picture so far as active interest in the campaign is concerned, and it is little wonder they do not go to the polls.

I feel so strongly on the question of a larger percentage of our people voting in elections that I have even considered the possibility of exploring legislation which has been enacted in certain countries, of which I think Australia is one, where either an incentive to vote is provided by law, or a penalty for not voting is provided by law. I merely say in passing, if I am correct in my figures, Australia has raised its percentage of people voting from somewhere in the low fifties to between 85 and 90 percent, since the enactment of the law, and the people of Australia feel that they have improved the democratic processes.

But let me emphasize that the abolition of the unit rule would improve our electoral process not only in the so-called sure States, but in every State of the Union. The inequities of the present system are well known. It entirely fails to register minority sentiment in any State, and instead gives the leading candidate the votes not only of his own supporters but of his opponents as well. That is the effect of the present system. It enables third parties, by turning the balance of power in close States, to exercise an influence out of all proportion to their strength, and even to decide the outcome of the election. My friend, the Senator from Michigan, made the point that we would probably be giving incentives to third parties and fourth parties and other minority groups to come forward and make trouble. I feel that under the present system minorities become strong enough in pivotal States frequently to swing an election, when they should not have that exaggerated power. And this distortion of the will of the people confronts us with the danger of electing a minority President who received fewer popular votes than his opponent.

There is not a doubt in my mind that a system containing all these inequities and dangers should be changed. But the question remains whether the pending measure which I am supporting offers the best solution.

There are some—notably the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has also offered an amendment on the subject—who suggest that the best cure is to go all the way to election of the President and Vice President by direct popular vote. This solution would eliminate not only the electoral college and the unit rule, but the whole system of electoral votes as well. I do not share the view that that is the proper approach.

Direct popular election of the President is an appealing idea from a theoretical point of view, but I cannot accept it because I believe it does unnecessary violence to the Constitution. The electoral votes of each State correspond exactly to the State's representation in the two Houses of Congress. Since this includes two Senators regardless of population, the effect is to give a disproportionate strength to the less populous States. But, Mr. President, this effect was the deliberate intention of the framers of the Constitution, who wanted a truly Federal Constitution. It seems directly from the great compromise by which all the States were given equal representation in the Senate. It was this compromise which actually saved the Federal Convention of 1787 and made possible the adoption of the Constitution. Without it, quite possibly we would never have become a single nation. I therefore suggest that it is the part of wisdom and also the part of sound principle under our Federal system, to leave this traditional principle intact. I agree therefore with the distinguished Senator from Michigan in his emphasis on that particular point. I think he is entirely correct; it would be a mistake to move over into the direct election of Presidents, ignoring the State break-down.

The pending measure wisely does just that. It preserves the principle of electoral votes, and in so doing I think it faithfully preserves the spirit of our fundamental law. In fact, this measure does not acutally propose to abrogate any important provision of the Constitution as it is now written. It would, to be sure, do away with two relatively minor provisions, both of which are, as the Senator from Massachusetts has shown potentially very dangerous, namely, the rubber-stamp electoral college—and who does no know that our electoral college is merely a rubber stamp?—and the illogical provision for election of the President and Vice President by Congress where no candidate receives a majority of the electoral vote. Heaven forbid that we should ever have to have an election by Congress under the system now prevailing.

But the most important effect of the abolition of the unit rule is that it strikes not at the Constitution itself but at a political practice sanctified only by habit. In what we do today, we are not dealing with constitutional principle. Under present laws we are perpetuating a practice which nullifies and frustrates the working of our great two-party system, because, as I have tried to point out, it simply puts some of our States into an area of political stagnation. Thus I think it is accurate to say that Senate Joint Resolution 2 proposes to spell out, in terms of modern actuality, a procedure on which the framers of the Constitution had nothing to say because in their time our party system was unknown and unforeseen. We are dealing with something which has grown up since the Constitution was first framed.

Some may ask whether the proposed amendment, if ratified, would benefit the Democrats or the Republicans. Fortunately, Mr. President, I do not think any of us has sufficient prophetic powers to answer that question with any confidence.

The Senator from Michigan in his able address said that those of us who are proponents of the resolution were speculating as to what might happen under certain conditions. I return the answer to the Senator by asking whether he was not speculating in his address as to what might happen in the way of the dire effects he predicted with respect to minority groups. For my part I feel that this is no time for the close calculation of party advantage. I agree wholeheartedly with the observation of the Senator from Massachusetts, in his opening address, when he said: "Our parties exist to serve the people and have no other excuse for being."

Therefore I suggest that, in considering the pending measure, it is our duty to ask ourselves—not "Is it good for the Democrats?" or "Is it good for the Republicans?" but "Is it good for the American people?" For the reasons I have stated, I believe the answer is "Yes". In my judgment the proposed amendment would be a major step in releasing the pent-up vitality of our American democracy.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope the Senate will pass the joint resolution by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The distinguished Senator has been discussing minority representation under the amendment, suggesting that a candidate with but very few votes compared to the majority number of votes cast might become President.

I should like, respectfully, to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If the distinguished Senator will pardon me, I am not quite clear what he meant by his statement. I was not suggesting that a candidate who received very few votes could become President. My own guess is it would never happen, if our parties were alive and on the job. I do not think a minority candidate could grab the Presidency under any conceivable set of circumstances.

Mr. LUCAS. Perhaps I misunderstood the Senator's statement. As I recall, he was objecting to the argument advanced by the distinguished Senator from Michigan along that line. In other words, if I followed the Senator correctly, it was the Senator from Michigan who said "splinter" parties might be developed throughout the country. Under the proposed amendment I can envision a case, where, for example, 26 percent of the vote of the people might elect a President. Does the Senator agree with me about that?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It is mathematically possible, and it would be a challenge to the organization of further parties.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. It is not only mathematically possible, but it would be practically possible under the present system. It has happened 12 times.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator may be correct about that. But what I wanted to ask the Senator was whether or not he is familiar with the amendment offered by the able Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] which provides:

> The person having the greatest number of electoral votes for President shall be the President, if such number be at least 40 percent of the whole number of electoral votes; and if no person have at least 40 percent of the whole number of electoral votes, then from the persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three on the list of those voted for as President, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President.

It seems to me that amendment may have some merit, in answer to the argument made by the Senator from Michigan and I was wondering whether the Senator from New Jersey had considered it or whether the Senator from Massachusetts had considered it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey permit me to comment on that?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I would be opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina, for two reasons, first, that it would continue the almost universally condemned method of having the House of Representatives voting for a President, with each State casting one vote.

Mr. LUCAS. I also object to that. I am dealing only with the 40-percent provision. I think the resolution offered by the Senator from Massachusetts is much better, so far as the proper representation is concerned. I was only questioning the argument made by the Senator from Michigan with respect to splinter parties which might arise. It seemed to me, as I read the Johnston amendment, that it might have some merit in curing that defect.

Mr. LODGE. If I may, I should like to complete my comment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Under our present system, it is possible for the person receiving less than a majority of the votes to be elected. It has happened in the cases of Presidents Polk, Taylor, Buchanan, Lincoln, Hayes, Garfield, Cleveland, Harrison, Wilson, and Truman.

There has never been any complaint, and no one has ever been able to point to any harm which has come from the fact that Abraham Lincoln was elected with 39 percent of the votes. It seems to me that the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina addresses itself to something which Senate joint resolution 2 leaves entirely alone. Under our present system a President might be elected by less than a majority of the votes, and under the proposed joint resolution that could still occur. There is nothing inherently wrong about that. Senate Joint Resolution 2 does not essentially change the present system insofar as plurality of the popular vote is concerned.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not think I quite agree with my friend from Massachusetts. I think if the joint resolution should become law it would encourage minority parties. Henry Wallace ran for the Presidency of the United States last year. Under this proposed resolution he would have received a number of electoral votes, because of the considerable popular vote he received. On the other hand, he received, under our present system, no electoral votes whatsoever. It is not very much encouragement to a splinter party to continue if it does not receive any electoral votes. A number of persons may look for an opportunity to say, "I ran for the Presidency and received one electoral vote. I want to pass that information down to the family to show that I was a candidate for the Presidency at one time, and that I did receive a vote for the Presidency of the United States." I think it would encourage splinter parties, which I do not particularly like, in view of what I know about them in some other areas of the world.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to say to the Senator from Illinois that if I thought that would be the result, I would be in grave doubt; but I do not think it will be the result. I agree that some persons like headlines, but I do not think we are going to be faced with that situation.

Mr. LUCAS. Everyone has been speculating about what is going to happen, and I thought I would put in my two bits worth.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. In 1934 the late Senator Norris sponsored a similar resolution containing a provision for 35 percent of the vote; in other words, that a candidate had to receive at least 35 percent of the vote. The Johnston amendment provides for 40 percent of the vote.

But I think the distinguished Senator from Illinois has hit the nail on the head. Everyone is speculating; and when we have to speculate we should not amend the Constitution to provide for a great contingency such as that which is being provided for here. We should be more sure of the outcome. We are now speculating about changing the habits of voters.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to say, in answer to the distinguished Senator from Michigan, that if we take that position I cannot see any possibility of ever making any change whatsoever, because any proposed change will have to deal with speculation as to what may happen in the future. Any possible change in our system of electing a President would be bound to produce speculations as to the result in its effect on the people. I do not share the fear which the distinguished Senator from Michigan has mentioned.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I may say to my friend from New Jersey that if speculating as to the future were a very bad thing, we never would have had a Constitution at all. If we are never going to vote for any legislation because it might involve speculation as to the future, we shall not have much legislation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. We never would have had the United Nations.

Mr. LODGE. That is correct. We might as well look back and confine ourselves to legislation concerning cemeteries. That would be about the only thing left for us to do.

Of course, the Senator is quite correct in saying that under the proposed system Henry Wallace, using the 1948 figures, could come out with 9.4 electoral votes, and he and his adherents would be entitled to whatever satisfaction they could get from that great and glorious fact. But over against that we must put the fact that Wallace and his party were influential in throwing the whole vote of the State of New York to Dewey, and, I think, the State of New Jersey, also——

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Let me correct the Senator in that connection. I think we carried the State of New Jersey in an entirely whole-hearted Republican vote.

Mr. LODGE. At any rate, I think the Senator from Illinois, in making up his mind on this matter, should carefully weigh the rather transitory advantage which a third party would receive, due to the publicity and the little burst of newspaper prestige that would come from nine electoral votes. It seems to

me the thing which really makes a political organization great is its actual influence and power. That is a far greater help to splinter parties than giving them the little bit of prestige which the Senator has mentioned. I hate splinter parties as much as does the Senator from Illinois, and I am giving up most of my waking hours to endeavoring to make our parties more effective and I think Senate Joint Resolution 2 eliminates any chance that a splinter party can throw the whole vote of a great State one way or the other.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Massachusetts may be correct. I may be overemphasizing the situation, but I am seriously interested in the Johnston amendment.

I am glad to know that the late Senator Norris introduced in the Senate a similar proposal when he was a Member of the Senate, providing for 35 percent of the whole number of electoral votes. I am only attempting to make an argument against the increase in the number of parties which may exist in this country. I know what the situation is in Greece, in France, and in other nations. If we should have a dozen or 15 parties represented in the Senate or in the House of Representatives and should have to form three or four different coalitions before we could finally have an organization, we would not have any stability or responsibility in government for the American people. I seriously believe that this is a move in that direction. How much of a move it is I cannot say, but I believe it is much more serious than is the situation under the present system, in view of the things I have pointed out.

I do not want the Senator from Massachusetts to misunderstand the Senator from Illinois, because I believe I am in sympathy with what he is trying to do. I believe that the electoral college should be abolished. I think it is out of date. It is of the horse-and-buggy age, so to speak. But at the same time we should be rather careful in what we do when it comes to tampering with the Constitution of the United States. What I hope to do in my limited way, if I can, insofar as my vote is concerned, is to avert a multiple-party system. Having taken merely a brief look at the Johnston amendment, it appeared to me that it had merit. If the former able Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Norris, at one time had a similar view, I am more convinced than ever that I am right, because I had great respect for his opinions. Certainly no more liberal gentleman served in the United States Senate than the late great Senator from Nebraska, George W. Norris.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I will add just a word, and then yield the floor. I agree, of course, with the sentiments expressed by the distinguished majority leader in opposing the principle of multiple parties. It is my judgment that nothing could be worse. If our main parties function as effectively as I think they can, they will both be strengthened, in my judgment, under Senate Joint Resolution 2.

I yield the floor.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield for that purpose?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Maybank
Anderson	Hill	Millikin
Benton	Holland	Morse
Bricker	Hunt	Mundt
Bridges	Ives	Murray
Butler	Jenner	Neely
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Kefauver	Robertson
Chavez	Kem	Russell
Connally	Kerr	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Darby	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Langer	Sparkman
Douglas	Leahy	Stennis
Downey	Lehman	Taylor
Dworshak	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	Long	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	Lucas	Thye
Ferguson	McCarran	Tobey
Frear	McCarthy	Tydings
Fulbright	McClellan	Watkins
George	McFarland	Wherry
Gillette	McKellar	Wiley
Graham	McMahon	Williams
Green	Magnuson	Withers
Gurney	Malone	Young
Hayden	Martin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEFAUVER in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall leave the pending business for the time being, and take a few moments on a different subject.

I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to introduce a bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, in order to provide more effective financial assistance for small business, that the bill be properly referred, and that it also be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2947) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, in order to provide more effective financial assistance for small business, introduced by Mr. LUCAS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) (1) of section 4 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That in order to encourage small business the Corporation is authorized to give management skills, past earnings, and prospective earnings consideration over security in the form of collateral, in the making of loans either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section for the purpose of establishing new business enterprises or for meeting the long-term capital requirements of existing small-business enterprises. The Corporation shall make direct loans pursuant to the foregoing proviso only in those cases where loans cannot be consummated in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions."

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) (2) of section 4 is amended by adding before the period at the end of the first sentence thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That any loan made under section 4 (a) (1) for the purposes set forth in the proviso in paragraph (1) of this subsection as amended may be made for such period exceeding 10 years as the Corporation may deem proper for the encouragement of small business."

SEC. 3. Subsection (b) (3) of section 4 is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That such participations by the Corporation may amount to 90 percent of the loan outstanding at the time of the disbursement, in the case of loans made for the benefit of small business enterprises in pursuance of the authority set forth in the proviso in subsection (b) (1) of this section as amended. In order to encourage loans in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions under the proviso in subsection (b) (1) of this section as amended, priority shall be given to private lending institutions over the Corporation against the assets of borrowers for the satisfaction of such loans made thereunder."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am introducing a bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act for the purpose of encouraging small business enterprises in the United States.

The independence of small business and its continuing development and expansion have always been of primary interest to me. During the previous session of Congress, in July of last year, the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee [Mr. MAYBANK] introduced Senate bill 2344, to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act. A short time later I prepared an amendment to Senate bill 2344 which contained the same provisions which are in the bill which I am now introducing. At that time I discussed my amendment with the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, and he agreed that such an amendment should be introduced.

It soon became clear that our crowded legislative program would not permit the consideration of Senate bill 2344 before adjournment. Consequently I withheld my amendment, intending to offer it during this session.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. As I remember, it was last August or September when the distinguished Senator from Illinois brought the amendment up, but because of the crowded condition of the calendar and because the Committee on Banking and Currency had before it housing legislation and other emergency legislation, we were unable to hold hearings at that time.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from South Carolina is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I hope the calendar will not be crowded after the next 2 weeks. This week and next week the committee is disposing of the FDIC legis-

lation and the pending housing legislation. It will be a pleasure for me, as chairman of the committee, to ask that immediate hearings be held on the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, which I believe should result in legislation which will mean so much to the smaller business interests and smaller firms. I assure the Senator from Illinois of my full cooperation and support for the purposes sought by the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. I am very grateful to the Senator from South Carolina for his kind remarks. I assure him that at the earliest opportunity I shall be glad to appear before the Committee on Banking and Currency and present my views on this important measure.

Rather than propose these changes in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act as an amendment to another bill, I am now offering them as a separate bill. In view of the fact that the President in his state of the Union message emphasized the necessity for a small-business program, I am of the opinion that a separate bill restricted to the problems of small business should be immediately submitted to the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator refers to the RFC legislation, I assume.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEFAUVER in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, let me say that I am in thorough agreement with the Senator that the needs of small business should continue to be examined, because it is almost impossible under the existing RFC legislation to make adequate provisions for many small, new firms if they must repay the entire loan in 10 years. This is particularly true of those going into businesses and industries in which the field is rather largely in the hands of a few large firms, in view of the added diffculties which are then presented.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. The bill which I have introduced would permit loans to small-business enterprises to be made for periods longer than 10 years.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Illinois that the bill should be considered as a matter concerned with small business as well as a matter affecting the powers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the President of the United States in his state of the Union message called our attention to the problems of small business in these words:

> We must * * * provide aids to independent business so that it may have the credit and capital to compete in a system of free enterprise.

He went on to say that he hoped to submit to Congress—

> A series of proposals to strengthen the antimonopoly laws, to assist small business, and to encourage the growth of new enterprises..

I am introducing this bill now, realizing fully that although it may not be the complete answer to all the problems of small-business enterprises, yet it will enable the committee to begin work without delay in examining into the many problems of small businesses.

By beginning now, considerable headway can be made, so as substantially to assure the enactment at this session of small-business legislation along the lines suggested by the bill and in accordance with the recommendations which will be forthcoming from the President.

The most vital needs of small business today are tax relief and access to capital. The President in his message to Congress on January 23 recommended that small businesses with corporate incomes between twenty-five thousand and fifty thousand dollars be given tax relief. He recommended also in his message that the carry-forward provisions for losses incurred by businesses be extended from 2 to 5 years. This would unquestionably provide considerable tax relief to small-business enterprises, and I am certain this Congress will grant such relief, through proper legislation.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator, if it is in order for me to do so at this time, whether he intends to introduce such proposed legislation in regard to the 5-year carry-forward period for business losses and also in regard to tax relief for firms having corporate incomes of between $25,000 and $50,000 annually.

Mr. LUCAS. The bill I am now introducing does not do so, but I am calling this matter to the attention of the Banking and Currency Committee, in view of the fact that I am discussing several ways and means of helping small business. I am confident that the Banking and Currency Committee or some other proper committee will handle the tax-relief question in due course.

Mr. MAYBANK. What concerns me in that respect is that of course proposed tax legislation comes from the Finance Committee, as the Senator from Illinois well knows.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Unfortunately, the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee in connection with such matters does not extend to questions dealing primarily with tax legislation. I wish to assure the Senator of my full cooperation, and, of course, I am in thorough accord with the ideas of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] relative to the need for appropriate tax legislation to aid small business. But such legislation would normally come from the Finance Committee.

Mr. LUCAS. I am fully aware of the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee. I am merely suggesting these points as some of the subjects to be considered by the proper committee at the present session of Congress.

Mr. MAYBANK. I think some of the most important subjects to be considered are the means of enabling such firms to amortize their loans on a better basis, to obtain the benefit of a more equitable corporate-tax schedule, to spread their losses over an ensuing 5-year period for tax purposes, and to be permitted a more rapid depreciation allowance for new equipment in computing taxes, because certainly in those fields a great need for improvement exists.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is entirely correct. I may say that I am a member of the Finance Committee; and in consultation with the distinguished chairman of that committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], I was advised that he is in constant touch with the chairman of the House of Representatives' Ways and Means Committee, Representative DOUGHTON, of North Carolina. I think we shall receive from the House of Representatives a program which will take care of the question I am now discussing more or less collaterally, as my bill does not deal with tax matters.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand what the distinguished Senator has said, and I am happy to know that the Senator from Georgia and Representative DOUGHTON, the chairman of the respective committees of the Senate and the House dealing with the revenue, will give consideration to these tax matters as soon as possible, because a proper treatment of them is essential.

I may say to the Senator from Illinois that we hope to report, we from the subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee on Federal Reserve matters, a measure dealing with the FDIC either this week or next week.

Testimony has been given by witnesses appearing before the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who is the chairman of that subcommittee, and other Senators, including the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], that an increase in the guaranty from $5,000 to $10,000 will make more money stay in the small banks, so that the small banks in the country areas and in the smaller communities will have additional funds to lend. Every witness who has testified before the subcommittee has said that such a provision will help the small-business men in such places. In other words, there will be that much more insurance available to depositors in banks in these areas, making it unnecessary to deposit local money in banks in the larger centers in order to obtain adequate insurance protection.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may comment on what the Senator from South Carolina has just said?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In the bill which the Senator has introduced, and upon which we hope to complete action in the committee this week, provision is made for a mutual plan of insurance of deposits in insured banks. The present policy is resulting in overloading the reserves a little at the present time.

There has been no loss in 5 years, and only a small loss in 14 years; and the bill contemplates a dividend of 60 percent to the banks. That will be of considerable help to small business. Three-fourths or more of all the banks are small banks.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank both Senators for what they have said. Their statements are a clear indication of the fact that the Banking and Currency Committee is interested in small business; and I congratulate the committee and its members.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wonder whether the Senator has any idea in mind regarding small-business loans. We have had some difficulty in connection with that matter. As the Senator knows, we have discussed it in the committee. For example, we have discussed the question of where a distinction can be drawn between big-business loans and little-business loans. It is a problem of very practical application, and in the committee we have to deal with it.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall discuss that as I proceed with my remarks. That problem is an important one, but I have not yet reached it in my discussion.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The junior Senator from Nebraska is also intensely interested in small business, and is in complete sympathy with the observations made by the distinguished majority leader, namely, that two of the problems are relief from taxes and accessibility to loans.

I wish to remind the distinguished Senator that although I appreciate the fact that part of the program will be taken care of if the proposed legislation is enacted in the form in which the distinguished majority leader suggests, yet only one phase of these problems is covered by the bill, namely, loans.

The discussion and colloquy had here on the floor of the Senate in regard to taxes opens up another broad field. If the bill is properly referred, it will go to the Banking and Currency Committee, I think; I believe that the distinguished majority leader will agree with me as to that. If other proposed legislation deals with taxation, it will be referred to the Finance Committee. In such case, two standing committees will be considering problems affecting small business; and those committees will deal with those problems in their own separate ways. I think that example completely demonstrates the need for either a standing legislative committee or a special committee to consider all the problems of small business.

After making that statement, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader whether, as majority leader, he proposes to bring before the Senate, either before this measure comes up for consideration or later, a measure proposing the handling of the very specialized problems of small businesses.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator's question is pertinent to the discussion which is now proceeding in the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. If not, I wish to make it so.

Mr. LUCAS. In reply, let me say that I think it was Wednesday of last week that I called a conference of the Democratic Members of the Senate, doing so for the sole purpose of having a discussion of the joint resolution now on the calendar, along with all other pieces of proposed legislation relative to or affecting small business.

There is a feeling on our side of the aisle among a number of Senators that if a committee having to do with small business is to be created, it should be a special committee similar to the committee of which the Senator was chairman in the Eightieth Congress. Other Senators feel differently about it. Others feel there should be a standing committee. Still other Senators feel that the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency is the proper place for the handling of small-business matters. Because of a slight illness, I was unable to attend the conference, but there was a very frank and fair discussion in the conference, and I may say to the Senator we are going to take up the matter before very long and dispose of it one way or the other upon the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another observation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate deeply the very affirmative statement of the majority leader. By the way, I have already stated on the floor of the Senate that, whether provision is made for a special committee or a standing committee, and regardless of who submits the resolution, I shall support it. I am convinced that if small business is to receive aid, all its problems should be referred to a single committee which could formulate a complete program and make appropriate recommendations for legislation. So I say to the distinguished majority leader, while I am very glad indeed that the particular bill which he sponsors and which, as I understand, relates to the subject of loans, has been introduced, yet it seems to me it would be well if a standing legislative committee, or a special committee, if a legislative committee cannot be agreed on, is proposed to be created, to have that subject debated along with the measure which has been introduced. In the final analysis, I think, those of us who are interested, either in having a special committee or a standing committee, would at least be able to try to convince other Members of the Senate that all small-business matters should be handled by one committee. I should like to see such a proposal brought to the floor of the Senate, if possible, and as soon as possible.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to make my position a little clearer with respect to small business, in view of the fact that the distinguished minority leader has raised the question as to when the resolution now upon the calendar may be considered. The Senator from Nebraska and all other Senators who are familiar with the Legislative Reorganization Act understand that under it practically all special committees were outlawed. In the early days, under the Legislative Reorganization Act, in attempting to carry out the letter and spirit of the act, the Senator from Illinois opposed continuation of the Special Committee on Small Business. At the time, or perhaps before that, I think the Senator from Nebraska agreed that probably the end of the year would mark the end of the Small Business Committee as a special committee. Since that time, the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Florida have offered a resolution seeking to set up a small-business committee, and to make it a permanent standing committee of the Senate. A number of Senators object to that proposal because of the conflict of jurisdiction among the various committees, and the question of the appropriate reference of measures which come before the Senate. Arguments to that effect will be heard when it comes to the floor of the Senate.

I should like to make my position clear as I have been misunderstood and misquoted by certain persons who are interested in small business. I am not speaking now of Senators, but of persons outside the Senate, who have charged me with a lack of interest in the small-business men.

Mr. President, I happen to live in a small-business community. I live in a small city of about 4,500 population, and consequently I have been with small-business people all my life. I have never been affiliated with big business. But I have always been interested in the fellow in the drug store on the corner, in the grocery store in the middle of the block, and in the other small fellow who was having a somewhat serious time financially in trying to get along. Later in my remarks I shall make suggestions for legislative action directly in the interest of these very small-business people.

The bill which I am introducing today concerns itself primarily with the problem of long-term capital.

I should like to state now what is contained in this bill. After that I shall review in more detail the problems which I consider small business to be facing and the extent that this proposal will remedy them.

I want to make it clear at the outset that this bill is not being introduced to offer help to unsound, inefficient, or fly-by-night business enterprises, but rather it is being offered to give capital assistance to efficient businessmen at times when such assistance may be urgently needed.

This bill in effect authorizes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to guarantee up to 90 percent, loans made by private banking institutions to individuals and small enterprises for the purpose of encouraging the growth of new enterprises on a sound basis and for the purpose of providing existing small

business firms with long-term capital when it is needed and when it cannot be obtained from any other source.

Mr. President, I should like to have those who are listening to my address to give particular attention to this. The Corporation in making funds available under this bill is authorized to give management skills, past earnings records, and prospective earnings consideration over collateral security. It is specifically provided that the Corporation shall make direct loans only in those cases where loans cannot be consummated in cooperation with banking and other lending institutions.

Mr. President, I may be seeking the reinstatement more or less of what was considered to be good at one time, among banks, that is, a character loan. It is no longer possible to obtain a character loan in my section of the country, because of reservations which at the present time hedge about the banking laws. In other words, it is necessary for the borrower to furnish adequate collateral—sometimes consisting almost of his right eye—before he can obtain a loan from a bank. The disappearance of the character loan is not particularly the fault of the banks. Following the depression, when 75 percent of the country's banks were in bankruptcy, Federal and State officials surrounded the banks with laws designed to protect depositors. I remember a certain man in my community who borrowed $1,000 at the bank. On the endorsement of a friend of his. That was in the early days, when character loans were being made.

This particular man before any principal was due paid $500 on the $1,000 note. The banker said to that borrower, "From now on you can get $5,000 on your own credit in this bank." That is a character loan. The banker believed in that individual; he believed he had integrity, ability, and energy to do the things that would make him succeed, and the banker was willing to take a chance.

That, Mr. President, is what I have in mind with respect to some of the small business concerns of the country.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Does the Senator suggest a maximum and minimum limit, or would it be merely a question as to the character of the business? I am sorry that I was not able to be present when the Senator began his speech.

Mr. LUCAS. For a proposal such as this to be of essential assistance to small business, it must not be hemmed in with arbitrary restrictions. An arbitrary limit on the amount of a loan might result in aid being denied when it was most needed. If the ceiling were set at a reasonable and adequate level, of course, it would not have this effect. The desirability of such a restriction and the level at which it should be placed are questions which should be considered by the Banking and Currency Committee after thoroughly studying the capital requirements of small business. We can be sure, in any event, that the loans generally will be moderate, as the bill confines assistance to small-business enterprises.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator. I am sorry I interrupted him.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad the Senator asked me the question. I am interested also in small-business enterprises which are looking for loans up to, say, $5,000. The number of business enterprises needing a small amount of capital to put them over the hump at the right time is amazing. Later in my remarks I shall discuss these smaller loans more fully.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand the explanation, it is necessary that such authority be given to the RFC on the theory that a borrower cannot obtain a loan from a banking agency. This question has come up previously in connection with requests for loans. As I understand the mechanics of the proposal, the RFC would underwrite loans up to a certain percentage. I think the Senator has mentioned a maximum of 90 percent. Is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the loans originate as they now originate?

Mr. LUCAS. They would.

Mr. WHERRY. But the percentage is boosted, is it not?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Let us assume that a State law prevents a bank from making a character loan. Would it be the thought of the Senator to make it possible to make a direct loan without underwriting it through the State bank?

Mr. LUCAS. We could not change the laws of a State.

Mr. WHERRY. No. But let us consider a small-business man who has an opportunity to borrow through a State bank. He probably could go to the RFC and be referred to a national bank, but even national banks are operated under certain restrictions, and a character loan is not a basis for credit.

Does the measure provide that the RFC may make a direct loan without underwriting it, or would it still have to underwrite a proposal coming from a State bank or a national bank; and would that foreclose the applicant from getting the loan?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator asks a very interesting and important question with respect to this proposed legislation. It is something to which I hope the Banking and Currency Committee will give thorough consideration. I am attempting to leave the responsibility for the loan in the community in which the individual resides, in order to give the bank or financial institution interested the opportunity, first, to make the loan, with the guaranty of the RFC back of it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am delighted that the distinguished Senator from Illinois has brought up this subject. Such a provision has been greatly needed in the interest of small-business men. I wanted to ask the Senator if his proposal would be somewhat in the nature of aiding small-business men, such as the FHA offers to persons who want to build houses. The Government would guarantee a certain line of credit, provided the small-business man met certain requirements made by the local lending institution which would then participate in the loan.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I can see that raising the amount up to 90 percent would be a distinct advantage to the applicant, because it would increase his chances of financing the loan over a long period. But I suggest to the distinguished Senator that there will be much conflict as to what can be done with a loan coming to a Federal or State bank, where the basis is that of a character loan, because, certainly, under the State banking laws of my State, certain requirements have to be met. I agree with the Senator from Illinois that those requirements certainly do not include a character-loan provision. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator whether he would provide that the borrower might go directly to the RFC and not have to go through a State or National bank, which has an entirely different basis for credit than that on which a character loan is made.

Mr. LUCAS. Under my bill the loan would not be altogether a character loan. There would certain collateral assets. I assume that the borrower would have enough to satisfy the 10-percent requirement of the bank, and probably more. The guarantee feature, plus the assets which the borrower will offer for security should be sufficient to assure the soundness of the loan and thereby meet the requirements of most State laws. Because of the fact that management skills, prospective and passed earnings are considered, the loans will have many of the qualities of the character loan. This is as it should be in view of what the small, energetic businessman is compelled to suffer at times with respect to obtaining a loan.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to belabor the point and I do not want in any way to inject arguments into the Senator's speech.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad the Senator has asked the question, because he is raising some very important points.

Mr. WHERRY. On last Thursday the Committee on Rules and Administration provided for an appropriation of $50,000 for a subcommitee to investigate the type of loans which the RFC has been making, on the theory that the desired amount of collateral was not behind the loans.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not think the resolution to investigate RFC which has anything to do with the subject of small-business loans. I think it relates to an investigation of large business loans.

Mr. WHERRY. Whether they be small or large loans, the evidence presented was that the RFC was making

loans in direct opposition to banks which could not make the type of loan which the RFC was making. For that reason we felt we should see how the RFC was acting.

I have received more applications regarding this type of loan in the past year than I have received during the entire time I have been a Member of the Senate. Applications are coming in, and this will clarify to a great extent, certainly, some of the loans. I hope the Banking and Currency Committee will consider these observations when the proposed legislation is brought before the Senate, because I think there is a complete conflict as to the type of loan which can be made.

Mr. LUCAS. Insofar as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is concerned, my experience has been that the small-business man, whom I am trying to help, has been unable to get needed loans.

As I move along in my address, I shall indicate that I am not so sure that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is the proper instrumentality to do what I want done. That is another matter that can be worked out by the Committee on Banking and Currency. I do not know anything about what they are going to investigate. I should want to know something about that before I would, as majority leader, approve the resolution.

I make that statement now because I have confidence in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, though I do not think they have been sufficiently liberal with the small-business men. That has been my chief complaint.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the particular legislation now proposed would in no sense injure the local banks. It would assist the local banker.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the idea exactly.

Mr. THYE. He would be able to accept the paper offered by and do business with the local young businessman, so that it should be an asset and assistance to the local banks.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is absolutely correct. Our aim is to leave money in the community, and try to give the banker a little leeway, a little opportunity, so that money which is now loading down the banks all over the country may be loaned to small-business men who need help. The banks recognize the need, but they cannot give the help, because of restrictions under which they operate.

If they have restrictions which prevent their assisting small-business men—and most of them have—there is no question that the Federal Government should cooperate with the banks and, between them, provide assistance to small-business men throughout the country.

Mr. THYE. It will help the young man who is not eligible to come in under some veterans' assistance or rehabilitation program.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. There are many young men in the communities who have no way of becoming established in business, and are not qualified or eligible to come under the veterans' acts, and in such a case a young man is absolutely lost. He may have worked on the farm during the war years, which was a patriotic endeavor, but he is not now eligible to come in under the veterans' acts.

Mr. LUCAS. He may be the type of energetic, industrious businessman that the people in the community would like to see helped, but unless he can get money from a personal source he cannot obtain it at all, if he does not have the collateral to put up to secure the $2,500 or $3,000 or $5,000 which he needs for his business undertaking. Under this bill the banker would be permitted to make the decision in the first instance. The banker would be given the first lien on the young man's collateral, so that the bank would be taking no chance whatever. The Federal Government might accept a slight risk. It might lose money on some loans, but at the same time the Federal Government, in recognizing the ability, the integrity, and the industry of certain groups throughout the United States, would be helping small business. What little the Government might lose would be made up many times through an increase in our national wealth and Government revenues.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, it would present an opportunity something like that afforded under the Homestead Act after the Civil War. The homestead lands are gone, but in this case governmental assistance would be afforded to enable a man to establish himself in a small business.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to express my personal congratulations to the Senator from Illinois for taking the leadership in introducing legislation of the character he is proposing. I know that the Senator from Illinois was busily studying this problem at the last session. As a matter of fact, I understood at that time that he was about to introduce some such bill.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. He was delayed only by a feeling that it should be given further consideration—and because, of course, he had a few problems on his hands about that time.

I believe it may be appropriate for me to add, Mr. President, that the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, by authority of a special statute which was passed last year, conducted a special study of investments. In the course of the study we held hearings, and I can say without any qualification that it seemed to me that the biggest problem presented was that with which the Senator's bill now deals.

The Department of Commerce, through its special Division on Small Business, sent its whole advisory group of small-business men to the committee, and they testified before the committee. This group was headed by a businessman from Chester, Pa. The group contained among its members a banker by the name of Bimson, from Arizona, and it presented a form of legislation which was designed to provide insurance of business loans after the type of FHA insurance. They were not altogether satisfied with the text of the bill which was presented, and some additional work has been done. We had a very stimulating suggestion from Dr. A. D. H. Kaplan, of the Brookings Institution, who testified at length about the need of fiscal legislative policy along this line.

The committee report is now in process of formulation. I hope it will be presented to the Congress before the end of the week. It will contain references to the very type of legislation which the Senator proposes and also to some of the other suggestions which have been made.

One of the serious difficulties, it seemed to me from the presentation made before the committee, was the difficulty of a small-business outfit in a comparatively small town obtaining term loans, because local banks with their limitations cannot tie up their capital in sufficient sums to take care of all the local business opportunities which are presented in the communities. The result has been that unless big business concerns, great national businesses upon the one hand, or great national financial institutions on the other, are disposed to look at such a loan the applicant cannot get the money. He cannot get it from his local bank because of perfectly normal obstacles. He cannot get it from the large financial institutions because of other obstacles. But already, as a result of the discussion which has proceeded, there is a growing comprehension of the problem. The insurance companies, on the one hand, are seeking ways and means of making their reservoirs of capital more available to the little fellow. The Chase National Bank recently made an announcement on the subject.

Now that the Senator has introduced this bill, I hope the Committee on Banking and Currency will immediately tackle the problem. I am sure they will, and knowing the members of the committee as I do, I feel that they will be very glad to cooperate with the Senator from Illinois and all others who are trying to provide the capital by which we can increase the production of the United States.

Again I wish to thank the Senator from Illinois for his initiative.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am deeply appreciative of the contribution made by the able Senator from Wyoming. As every Member of the Senate knows, the Senator from Wyoming has been conscious of this problem for a long, long time. I am sure he and the members of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report can be of considerable help in offering constructive suggestions to members of the Banking and Currency Committee at the proper time. To the solution of the problem of giving aid to the small-business concerns of the Nation we can all help.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. For the benefit of the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Wyoming I wish to say that this morning I introduced a bill to create a Coordinator of Small Business, to be appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation. During the past year many amendments designed to aid

small business have been placed on appropriation bills and other bills in Congress, but no attempt has been made to place anyone in charge of such proposed aid. If a Coordinator were appointed he could be of assistance to small-business concerns in their dealings with the War Department, the Navy Department, various other departments of the Government, and particularly the ECA. As it now is, it is difficult for small-businesss concerns to get in touch with the various governmental departments. Such a coordinator should report to Congress the results of his operations. He could see to it that small businesses were afforded an opportunity to bid on various projects or items by giving them notice of what was needed, and by proper advertisements, and other appropriate measures.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, the guaranty provisions in this bill utilize the present procedures of the RFC. The RFC participates with private lending institutions in making loans. The private lending institution makes the full loan with an understanding that at a later date it may call upon the RFC to take up a certain percentage of the unpaid balance. This bill authorizes the RFC to take up as much as 90 percent of the loans outstanding which have been made under the terms of this bill.

I have included a clause which provides that the private lending institution in the case of these loans will have priority against the assets of the borrower for the satisfaction of the debt. It appears to me that such a provision is necessary to assure the proper operation of the program. If such a provision were not in the bill private banks might hesitate to cooperate in these loans, as the 10 percent which the RFC did not take up might in numerous cases amount to a considerable sum of money which lenders would hesitate to risk in loans not fully secured with collateral. This problem is solved by giving the private institution first priority against the borrower's assets.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish in any way to delay the Senator in his presentation. I wish him to make a full explanation of his bill. When the proposed legislation is considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency perhaps some amendments may be suggested, considered, and acted upon. The argument now advanced by the majority leader should convince all of us that it is doubtful whether the objective we have in mind would be accomplished by the provisions of the bill. After all, private lending agencies must comply with State laws and Federal banking laws in the matter of the risks involved in making loans. The Senator well knows that the Farm Credit Administration was set up to take care of loans to farmers of the nature he is now speaking of to be made to businessmen. After every effort has been made to obtain money from private sources and from other agencies which are held to strict accountability, the Farm Credit Administration is allowed to make loans on doubtful risks.

The Senator's bill provides that the RFC may take care of some such loans. Perhaps the Banking and Currency Committee may recommend some other agency to do so. The bill would authorize the RFC to increase its participation, which I think could be done, even though loss were incurred. But certainly that would be done in direct opposition, I believe, to many State laws affecting private agencies or in opposition to Federal banking laws. I hope when the distinguished Senator presents the bill to the committee it will take that point into consideration, otherwise it seems to me we open up the field for the RFC to make any type of loan it cares to make regardless of requirements which have heretofore attached to the RFC.

Mr. LUCAS. No; the Senator is wrong about that. I have included in the bill a clause which provides that the private lending institution in the case of these loans will have priority against the assets of the borrower for the satisfaction of the debt. The borrower may not have the collateral up to, say, 50 or 60 percent, which the banks require. He may have 30 percent collateral. In cases I cited a moment ago the borrower may have little or no collateral aside from a good reputation for being a hard-working man, who may want to establish a small gas station on the corner. He could pledge the assets of the gas station, so far as that is concerned. He could mortgage the station to the bank. Those would be the assets upon which the bank would have the first lien. I do not see any difficulty in the way the bill is drawn, and if there is any, we can straighten it out in the course of the hearings.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. With reference to that particular point, I want to see if I understand the able Senator from Nebraska, correctly. As I gather from what the Senator from Nebraska has said, his point is this: If we make enabling provision for the RFC to participate in these loans on a character basis, in other words to make character loans, then if in some State there is a law forbidding a State bank to participate in a loan on that basis, the small-business man who seeks a loan from a State bank would be left out in the cold. I wonder if I am correctly interpreting what the Senator from Nebraska said.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. What I had in mind was that certain State laws do not recognize the character of a man as being an asset which can be used as such in the making of a loan. State laws require certain collateral to be furnished in connection with the making of loans. If a man wishes to make a loan, but does not have the required collateral, though he does have good character, his application, State-wise, would be denied. When the RFC is authorized to underwrite a loan in which the character of the individual is taken into consideration along with the credit or security he can furnish as collateral, which is not, however, sufficient collateral for the loan, it seems to me the small applicant would be precluded because even though a participation by the RFC up to 90 percent were to be taken in the loan—a provision with which I am in agreement—yet because of State law requirements and Federal banking requirements the small applicant could not obtain from a State bank the loan he wished to obtain.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield to me further?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I want to be certain that I have correctly understood the able Senator from Nebraska, because I think there is merit in the statement he has just made. Certainly that is a matter which the members of the Banking and Currency Committee should take into consideration when the measure is before the committee. If I understand correctly then, the Senator from Nebraska would recommend that we include in the bill a provision that if, for any reason, because of any requirement in State law or Federal banking law, an applicant might be denied a loan jointly participated in by the local bank and the RFC, the RFC could make the whole loan?

Mr. WHERRY. That is the only way I can see it can be done. I do not say I would write in such a provision. I have not studied the measure sufficiently to make a definite statement. But unless we propose to extend to the RFC the privilege of making loans as they please on a character basis, an applicant of the type we are considering, will be denied the very privileges sought to be accorded by the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I commend the Senator from Illinois for introducing the proposed legislation. It is something I have long felt was needed. The Senator may remember that last year, along with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] I introduced a bill providing for several things, of which a similar plan was one. As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I certainly pledge my own support to the effort to enact legislation which will be effective. I, too, hope that the able Senator from Illinois will consider very carefully the recommendation by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that the RFC be empowered to make direct loans when necessary to effectuate the purpose intended.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I should like first to answer the colloquy which has been going on between the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

I have never overlooked collateral security, but I have not placed all the emphasis on collateral security. I hope that the individual who applies for a loan may have some collateral security. If he does, I want the bank to have a first lien upon such collateral security, to take

care of the 10 percent of the loan in which the bank is interested. However, I call attention to one provision in the bill, which reads as follows:

The Corporation shall make direct loans pursuant to the foregoing proviso only in those cases where loans cannot be consummated in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions.

As I see it, that provision would solve the problem. I do not wish to be placed in the position of saying that the Federal Government should become an agency to lend money to every Tom, Dick and Harry who may come along with any kind of proposal. It will be noted that at the outset I definitely stated that I was not interested in inefficient, fly-by-night organizations to be set up by one or two businessmen for the purpose of trying to get a loan directly from the Federal Government. That situation must be scrutinized with the utmost care. I am interested only in that man who, because of bank restrictions and conditions over which he has no control, is unable, even though he is fully qualified in management ability, to get into a small business which might provide for himself and his family.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me make this observation, because now the distinguished Senator has come to the meat of the problem which we had before us in the Small Business Committee. The only way we can accomplish the purpose which the Senator seeks to accomplish, when there is no collateral, is to make a direct loan. I certainly do not wish to vote that authority to the RFC at this time, because I feel that there should be participation, so long as we have State laws and Federal laws governing certain types of loans. That is where the impact comes. I am glad to hear what the Senator from Illinois has stated. There may be deserving cases in which such loans should be made. If they can be made, well and good, but that is the reason I raised the point which the able Senator has so ably discussed. Probably I should have waited until he had finished his speech, because I see that there is a provision in the bill for direct loans when private lending institutions cannot participate.

Mr. THYE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator for yielding. The last statement made by the able majority leader in explaining the bill answers the questions which I had in mind. I think he has set forth sufficient safeguards to make certain that the RFC does not bypass the bank; but in the event State laws tie the banker's hands so that he cannot do anything, the bill is broad enough to assist in taking care of the needy cases.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I must leave the Chamber for a few moments. I, too, am very much pleased that the majority leader has introduced this bill and is giving his attention to this problem. We guarantee bank deposits, I believe, up to $5,000, and the Senator from Illinois knows the success achieved in stemming the terrible deflationary tide with the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

I admit that these analogies are not exactly in point, but it seems to me that anything we can do which will lend stability to the small businesses of this country should be a matter of prime concern to every Senator. Connecticut is predominantly a State of small businesses. There is a need for soundly conceived financing and for plans to encourage small business. I share with the Senator from Illinois his determination not to set up a mechanism by which many unworthy people could milk the Treasury. That is not the Senator's purpose, I know; rather, it is the promotion of sound small business, which literally is the backbone of the free-enterprise system. I congratulate the Senator on his approach.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

Another provision in my proposed bill would permit the Corporation to extend maturity dates on loans made under its terms for periods longer than 10 years. This is in accord with the President's recommendations.

I should like at this time to discuss the problems of small business generally. A program which will assure the continued independence and development of small-business enterprises must take into account three different segments of our small-business economy.

First, there are the one and a half million enterprises in which no more than three people are employed and which probably account for as many as 10 percent of the business work force. The capital assets of the business firms in this group do not average more than $5,000 to $10,000.

Secondly, there are those thousands of new business ventures which are born every year. The mortality rate among these new ventures is extremely high, as they are frequently started in a climate wholly unconducive to their continuing existence. The President made specific reference to this group in his State of the Union message.

Finally, there is the group of firmly established business enterprises, employing in numerous instances several hundred workers. It is this group which is in need of long-term capital, and it is this group which has received the attention of most of the recent studies on small business.

A comprehensive program for the encouragement and preservation of small business in America should consider all three of these groups. The bill which I have introduced should considerably encourage the growth of new business enterprises and also assist the group which needs long-term capital.

Studies of small-business problems over the past few years by congressional committees and private organizations show that a large segment of small business is seriously in need of long-term capital which is not available today from private sources. Many private banking institutions as a general policy prefer short-term loans with maturity dates of less than a year. This is not a criticism of the private bank, as its primary concern must be the security of the deposits of its patrons. However, such a policy deprives small business firms of a source of long-term capital. This statement is in line with the suggestion which was made a few moments ago by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Commercial lending institutions require high interest rates on moderate loans to small business. These interest rates are sometimes two- and threefold the rates of interest paid by large borrowers, even though the risk may be greater in the case of the larger borrower than it is in the case of the small business enterprise.

In any case private capital is available only when loans are perfectly secured against loss. Such security, even if it is available, frequently leaves the borrower with his assets so encumbered that he is unable to obtain working capital. This fact discourages small business firms from borrowing either for the purpose of expanding or for the purpose of instituting more efficient processes.

Investigations have shown that in many instances in an effort to become more efficient small business enterprises have so encumbered their assets in securing long-term loans that they were then unable to obtain working capital in order to put to work their new efficient processes.

This bill which I have introduced would remedy this problem. Established business firms would be able to obtain long-term loans without mortgaging every last dollar of their assets. This would leave them with unencumbered assets sufficient to secure working capital loans. The natural result would be to stimulate private banking business in the making of loans for working capital.

It is a well-known fact that small business firms cannot obtain capital by the marketing of their securities. Underwriters' fees amount up to as much as 20 percent. The records of the Securities and Exchange Commission show that a very small percentage of registered stocks of small companies are finally marketed. Underwriters are hesistant to deal in unknown securities, and the public is reluctant to purchase them. There is clearly a need today for a program along the lines of the one which I am proposing in this bill.

Whenever a Government program is proposed providing for the guarantee of loans, the question always arises as to which is the proper Government agency to administer the program. It is my view that the RFC is adequately organized to handle such a program, although I recognize that other agencies of the Government may also be qualified. This is a matter to which the Banking and Currency Committee should give serious study. It is for this reason that I am introducing this bill at an early date in this session.

The second group of small businesses, which any comprehensive program must consider, are those new business enterprises which are started every year and which fail at an extremely rapid rate. If we are to preserve small business as a healthy part of our economy, we must take steps toward assuring a climate

more conducive to the success of new business enterprises.

Ours is a growing society. The population of the United States has practically doubled in the last 50 years. During this same 50 years, trends have generally been toward concentration in business enterprise. Small business as an institution must be able to keep pace in this growing society. It must be able to withstand the trend toward concentration and it must be able to expand at a pace sufficient to supply the services and products demanded by our growing population. In his State of the Union message the President made this statement:

> As our national production increases, as it doubles and redoubles in the next 50 years, the number of independent and competing enterprises should also increase.

The bill which I am introducing takes cognizance of this problem. It will permit loans for such enterprises when there is an economic justification and when there is reasonable assurance that such an enterprise will be successful.

Other programs which can be instituted, and which should be thoroughly investigated by the committee, would promote these new enterprises and also would benefit all of small business. One such program would provide for technological studies in the development of new products at reasonable costs. Small-business enterprises today are unable to maintain experimental laboratories. In this respect they are at a serious disadvantage in competing with large-business corporations.

The United States Government has vested rights in many thousands of patents, acquired during the war, which might be used by small-business firms. The Smaller War Plants Corporation at one time undertook to encourage the use of these patents by small-business enterprises. I am not sure that we did the right thing when we let the Smaller War Plants Corporation expire. Perhaps in the interest of small business we should have kept it as an independent agency.

Consideration should be given now to the possibility of having the Government technically develop these patents to the point where they might be used profitably by small business. This might be accomplished by the Bureau of Standards.

It is generally recognized also that small business enterprises are in need of a central source of information on Federal and State regulations and production and marketing methods. There should be closer cooperation between the Commerce Department and private business groups on a regional basis in providing a clearing house for such information. This suggestion is in line with the bill which the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee introduced earlier today.

The last point under a comprehensive small-business program which I should like to discuss briefly is the assistance needed by the one and one-half million enterprises employing only a few individuals, but accounting for one-half of our business firms. I do not conceive that the bill I am introducing will substantially assist this group. The need of these businessmen is for small amounts of working capital ranging from $500 to $2,500. These funds are needed in order that they may take advantage of discounts on purchases. The failure to obtain these discounts leaves them in a bad competitive position.

Many of these firms are now obtaining this working capital from local banks. This is as it should be. Many of these firms, however, cannot obtain funds from local banks because of banking policies or for other reasons. Where this is the case, these very small enterprises must mortgage every last dollar of their assets or resort to mortgaging their accounts receivable, at interest rates ranging around 20 percent.

This problem might be approached through the Federal Reserve System. That organization should be in a position to encourage short-term loans, at reasonable interest rates, by private banks. We might here consider allowing the Federal Reserve to use a portion of its surplus to guarantee such small loans made by private banks. I urge the committee to give consideration to this problem as it affects a very large portion of our small business economy.

This bill does not change the aggregate amount of loans which the RFC is authorized to have outstanding. Such a change might be necessary for the proper administration of the terms of this bill. However, such a change involves many policy considerations, and should receive the serious consideration of the committee.

The bill which I am introducing is directed toward remedying the problem of supplying long-term capital to small business. I am hopeful that under its provisions, assistance can be given to new business enterprises.

This bill is based upon the concept that our problem is primarily one to be solved through private capital. The lending powers of the RFC are to be employed only where private financing is unavailable.

I have submitted suggestions, outside the provisions of this bill, which I believe should be seriously considered. They relate to programs for making working capital available to the very small business enterprises, making information available to all small businesses, and providing technological research in the interest of these firms. All these problems should be studied thoroughly by the committee.

I firmly believe that through a program such as this, we can vitalize free American enterprise and open up new horizons. We might truly say that this will be a point 4 program for America.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask a further question. In the event the proposed legislation is not considered favorably, can the Senator tell me what provisions of the present RFC legislation are preventing small business from getting the loans which big business is able to get today?

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot answer that question. I assume that if the RFC wished to exercise the broad discretionary powers it now has, it could almost do, by means of the 90 percent provision alone, what we are attempting to do by means of all the provisions of this bill. But the RFC has not done so. We must bring to the attention of the Government generally the attitude of Congress in regard to loans to small business. This is in line with the President's statement in his State of the Union message. He is just as much interested in seeing something done along this line as are the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree that raising the participation up to 90 percent would be most helpful in some cases. I also agree that extension of the time in which to make repayment would be helpful, of course. I hope, however, that if the legislation now proposed or any other measure on the subject is not reported favorably, after due consideration, some thought will be given to what is apparently the discrepancy or discrimination existing in such cases. For instance, we read about loans being made to large operators; but under the present set-up we never read about loans being made to small operators. It may be that legislation on the subject will not be enacted. It seems to me, as has been stated here, that small business should receive treatment equal to that received by big business under the legislation now on the statute books. In the event that remedial legislation on the subject is enacted, I believe that small business should be placed on equal footing with businesses which happen to be able to obtain loans from the RFC, as big businesses now can do.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN METHOD OF ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly on the pending joint resolution to change the method of counting the electoral votes in the election of President and Vice President. I am joined as one of the sponsors of this measure, along with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who introduced the joint resolution, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. I joined in the sponsorship of this joint resolution because I have long felt that some improvement was badly needed in connection with the method of election of President and Vice President of the United States.

I know that the advantages of the change have been very fully and very thoroughly discussed. The able Senator

from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the chief sponsor of the joint resolution, made a masterful presentation on the opening day of the debate. I know that practically all the points I might think of have already been developed. However, I desire to take a few minutes to state my position, as being unequivocally in favor of the passage of the joint resolution by the Senate. I hope it will be passed also by the House of Representatives, that the amendment will go to the States, that it may be ratified by the States, and may become part of the Constitution.

The electoral college has never functioned in the manner intended by those who devised the plan of electing the President and Vice President. Instead, there has developed or grown up in this country a two-party system. It is a system of nominating candidates for President, of the two parties going into the respective States in the campaign, of counting the votes in the respective States under the unit rule, and of counting those votes in the mythical electoral college, which is supposed to meet every 4 years for the selection of a President and a Vice President.

When those who wrote the Constitution devised the electoral system, it was their idea that electors, independently selected in the various States, would actually meet, and, exercising their independent judgment, would select for President and for Vice President the two best men they could find in the United States. We of course know that that system did not last very long, and that instead of having the whole United States from which to select, they were in effect limited in each case to two candidates, those put forward, respectively, by the two great political parties. They knew, before they went into the supposed meeting, what the outcome would be.

The people throughout the country, throughout the years, have recognized the weaknesses of the so-called electoral college, and the need of some change, but for some reason we have never been able to effect a change. There have been many proposals of different types, but I believe the proposal contained in the pending joint resolution is the best that has yet been suggested. I think it is fair. I cannot see how it would work to the advantage of any party, any section, or any person. I think it is realistic in the manner in which it proposes to have the votes counted. Credit is given to the votes in the respective States, on a proportionate basis; yet there is preserved and maintained the integrity of the several States in the spirit of the compromise agreement which was reached in the Constitutional Convention, whereby the States are given in the electoral college as many votes as they have Members in the two Houses of the Congress combined. Under the joint resolution that system would be maintained, yet in every State the division of electoral votes as between the candidates would be determined by the number of votes actually received by the candidates within the State.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Alabama yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee, who for a long time has been an advocate of reform of this kind. In the House of Representatives, I remember the interest the Senator from Tennessee always manifested in the effort to bring about some change in our method of electing a President and a Vice President.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator. The Senator from Alabama and I, along with the Senator from Massachusetts, Representative GOSSETT, and many others, have been working on the problem and thinking about it for a long time. The Senator said he did not feel that this plan would work to the advantage of either political party. I am certain, however, the Senator meant to say that, while it would not work to special advantage, or give one party an advantage which it does not now have over the other, yet, on the other hand, it would work greatly to the building up and strengthening of both our major political parties on a Nation-wide basis, in every section of the United States. Does not the Senator feel that that would be one of the chief advantages of the proposed new system?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; and I am glad my friend, the Senator from Tennesssee, interrupted me, because I certainly did not intend to say it would not be advantageous to the parties. I meant it would give neither party an unfair advantage over the other; that is what I really meant.

Yes, Mr. President, during the years there have developed in this country certain one-party sections. I come from an area which is a one-party section. It is a part of the country which is always looked upon as being safely Democratic. What is the result? First of all, consider our general elections. Very few people go to the polls to vote in a general election. We might as well not have a general election in most of the Southern States, because it is a foregone conclusion as to how the vote is going to be cast. Through the passage of the pending resolution, and the adoption of the constitutional amendment putting into effect this method of electing, or of counting electoral votes, there would be an incentive for every person in every State to go to the polls, because his vote would count just as strongly and would be given just as much weight as the vote of anyone in the most doubtful or most closely contested State.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield further to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I was very much impressed with the observation of the Senator that the proposal, if put into effect, would help bring out a much larger vote in all the States in all sections of the United States. I wanted to ask the Senator whether he did not think it of equal importance that, in addition to bringing out a large vote, and resulting in more people exercising their right of franchise, we would have in all sections of the United States the great educational value and benefit of political campaigns? In the Senator's State of Alabama, and almost to the same extent in my State of Tennessee, it is very infrequent that the candidates of the major political parties or any of the principal speakers of those parties come to our States for the purpose of discussing the issues of the campaign, and so the citizens of the South, and likewise the citizens of other sections, which have either been marked off or conceded to one or the other of the political parties, lose that great educational value which is so necessary in a democracy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the able Senator from Tennessee is my closest neighbor, senatorially speaking. We live near each other. We served together in the House for approximately 10 years, and I think he must have acquired a very fine method of anticipating what I am going to say, because he has certainly brought out the very next point which I was going to mention, which is that we miss completely the whole presidential campaign.

Mr. President, I am 50 years of age. During that 50 years—while I cannot remember all the way back, I can remember back to 1908 when Mr. Taft was elected President—I have never seen a presidential candidate in the State of Alabama, with one exception. In 1928 I drove from my home town, Huntsville, to Stevenson, Ala., which is near Chattanooga, in order to see the train of the presidential candidate come through a small corner of Alabama on its way to the State of Tennessee. Tennessee had gone Republican in 1920, and because it had created a doubtful status for itself, the presidential candidate was going to Tennessee to make a speech. There was no need of his coming to Alabama. He did not come there, and no other presidential candidate has ever spoken in the State of Alabama.

That is true, Mr. President, of many of the so-called one-party States throughout the country, not only in the South, but in New England and in the Middle West. There are many States in the Union which are known as one-party States. The result has been that not only do they not have an incentive to vote, as the Senator from Tennessee has so well pointed out, but also they miss completely the educational part of a presidential campaign. In a certain sense it may be said that they are almost disfranchised in the election of a President and Vice President of the United States.

Mr. President, I think the passage of the joint resolution and the adoption of the amendment it proposes would change that situation, and we would have an election which would be truly National-wide. We would have an election which would be carried into every State of the Union. We would have an effort exerted by both the major parties to get out every voter possible.

I have often said, as have any other persons, that we need a two-party system in the South and in every State of the Union. We shall not have a two-party system in the South until some in-

centive can be given to persons, who may believe in the other party's doctrines, to vote their convictions. Under present conditions their votes simply do not count. I think they should be given an incentive to vote. I believe that is true in every section of the United States and in every State of the Union.

The fact of their being doubtful States, sure States, and "solid" sections has created a condition which was not intended by the founding fathers and which is not for the good of our parties or of our Government. I refer to the natural tendency of each party to limit itself in the selection of Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates to those States which are in the doubtful column and those States which, if won, can deliver, under the present unit system, a large block of votes.

I believe it was contemplated under our form of government that there should be considered eligible and available for those great offices of leadership in the United States every person, regardless of whether he came from one State or from another, a large State or a small State, a one-party State or a two-party State. Yet, under the present system, our parties are almost of necessity narrowed down to a relatively small part of the United States in the selection of the candidates who shall bear their respective banners. If the amendment proposed by the pending resolution should be written into the Constitution it would change that situation and would give us what I believe would be a better chance at republican government in the United States.

There is only one other point I wish to make. I am sure it has been stressed. It is stressed in the report. I refer to the growing tendency of relatively small pressure groups to exert a tremendous and even a dangerous power over the selection of candidates and the election of those candidates to the high offices of President and Vice President.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. There has been considerable discussion as to the effect on our two-party system. Some contend it would tend to weaken the two-party system and to increase the power of splinter parties. I should like to ask the Senator to comment on that matter and the effect which this proposal would have on the vigor and general health of our two-party system.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator has asked that question. I believe it would tremendously help and strengthen the two-party system. I personally believe in the two-party system. I do not want the time ever to come in this Nation when we have a multiplicity of parties. I think one of the great weaknesses besetting France today is the multiplicity of parties and the difficulty of forming a government, because always there has been the necessity of having a coalition of various parties, and no one party was responsible for the Government. I hope that condition shall never prevail in this country. I think the passage of the resolution and the subsequent adoption of the amendment would strengthen greatly the two-party system and would tend to defeat the development of splinter parties. I do not think a splinter party would have the ability to obtain a toe-hold such as it now has. A splinter party has a chance at this time, because, operating in a large State, such as New York, which has the largest single block of votes in the electoral college, a small minority can very often swing an election one way or the other.

I may be wrong, but I think I have heard many persons say that had it not been for the apparent ability of a third party to change the results in New York State at the last election there probably never would have developed the third party which was headed by Mr. Henry Wallace. I do not know whether that is true. I suppose no one knows. It is bound to be speculative. But we do know that the distinct possibility was held out to a small group that they might swing the great State of New York, and, perhaps, one or two other great States, and thereby might become the balance of power in the United States. That was the encouragement and incentive to a splinter party, if we want to apply that term.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Ordinarily, in the case of third parties or splinter parties, is not the apparent effort—and frequently the publicized effort—not to put forward what they believe in, with the expectation of winning or doing some good to their own party, but is it not primarily for the purpose of defeating an enemy party and thereby getting the election thrown into the House of Representatives and creating as much confusion as is possible?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I think that is bound to be true, and I think the motive of so-called pressure groups quite often is to apply as much pressure as is possible to each of the major parties in order to place themselves as nearly as is possible into a position of holding the balance of power.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is not that done by virtue of the fact that in the history of senatorial elections and elections of governors in the various States, since the beginning of our party system, there have been fewer third parties, or splinter-party efforts, insofar as senatorial elections and gubernatorial elections are concerned, than there have been in presidential elections under the electoral-college system?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think that is true. In concluding, Mr. President, let me say that I have studied very carefully the proposal under discussion. I have studied it, I will say in all frankness, as a Democrat. I have studied it as one who comes from a solid Democratic section. But most of all I have studied it as one who is interested in orderly, efficient, and sound government in the United States. I believe that if the proposed amendment shall be added to the Constitution it will make for better, cleaner, purer elections. I believe it will make for better and abler party platforms. I believe it will make for a better informed electorate, because it will serve to carry the campaigns to all corners of the Nation. Most of all, I believe it will make for better government, better legislation, better performance generally.

Mr. President, because I believe these things, I am supporting wholeheartedly the pending joint resolution.

CONTRIBUTION TO UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (H. DOC. NO. 459)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the authorization of a contribution by the United States to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East. The communication from the President and the draft of proposed legislation will be referred to the Commitee on Foreign Relations and printed in the RECORD.

The communication from the President and draft of proposed legislation were referred to the Commitee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 30, 1950.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
President of the Senate of the United States.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am transmitting herewith for the consideration of the Congress a draft of proposed legislation to enable the United States to participate in and contribute to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East. This agency has been established by the General Assembly of the United Nations to deal with the problems created by the displacement of hundreds of thousands of persons as a result of the recent hostilities in Palestine.

The work of the agency will be to carry out the recommendations of the economic survey mission for the Middle East, appointed by the United Nations. This Survey Mission, under the chairmanship of Gordon Clapp, was directed by the United Nations to study the economic dislocation created by the conflict in Palestine and to recommend measures to reintegrate the Palestine refugees into the economic life of the area. Its recommendations are an example of the kind of development and planning which is essential to the economic growth and improvement of underdeveloped areas. The mission in this survey has taken into account the human and natural resources of the region in which these refugees find themselves, and has recommended a program of economic activity which will be of lasting benefit to these areas and to the standard of living of peoples who live there.

Our aid is needed to put this program into effect and to help the refugees and the inhabitants of these areas in the Middle East to achieve greater productivity through the steps recommended in the report of the mission.

In my inaugural address, I stressed the importance, in the interests of our foreign policy, of economic development of underdeveloped areas. In such a case as this, where relief for refugees is essential, it is advantageous to combine the relief program, with the beginnings of longer range economic development.

Point-4 legislation and legislation for the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees are complementary. There is no overlapping in the request for funds for the two programs.

The immediate reason for the establishment by the United Nations of the economic survey mission to the Middle East was the hope that through an economic approach it might be possible to facilitate a peace settlement between the Israel and the neighboring Arab states. The problems of Palestine and her neighbors are complicated by the continuing plight of over three-quarters of a million persons who left their homes during the conflict in Palestine, and are now refugees in the neighboring lands. Homeless and without work, these people cannot care for themselves. The nations now giving them asylum are themselves unable to care for them. For some time to come they will remain dependent on others for their support.

In response to an appeal from the General Assembly of the United Nations for relief funds, made in December 1948, I recommended to the Congress that the United States should bear up to one-half of the cost of a relief program which was estimated to cost $32,000,000 for a 9-month period. The Congress appropriated $16,000,000 for this purpose. Our contribution has been more than equaled by the contributions of 32 other countries. The fund thus raised has been stretched to its limits and is now exhausted.

The United Nations Economic Survey Mission has recommended a combined relief and public-works program, and has estimated the cost of this program at $54,900,000 for an 18-month period beginning January 1, 1950.

This program is significant in its practical approach to our objectives of economic development in underdeveloped areas. The areas in question have unrealized economic potentialities but require technical assistance from abroad to assure their development. The projects proposed will be complete in themselves, representing intensive development in small areas, and have been so selected that they can be brought to completion by the middle of 1951. They will result in lasting economic benefits.

In illustrating what can be done with limited resources of soil and water by the application of modern engineering and agricultural techniques, these projects should point the way to further development not only in the countries where they are carried out, but in neighboring countries as well. The successful completion of this program should go far in furthering conditions of political and economic stability in the Near East. At the same time the proposed program, while costing little more than direct relief, looks to the end of the direct relief program of the United Nations in the Near East, and to ultimate solution of the refugee problem.

I believe that it is appropriate that the United States should continue to bear one-half the cost of this program. I, therefore, recommend that the Congress authorize and appropriate $27,450,000 for an 18-month period. I trust that other nations which have contributed to the program in the past will be equally generous in the future.

The importance of a substantial United States contribution to this program is very real. Not only is it consistent with the humanitarian spirit of the American people; it is also in our national interest to help maintain peaceful and stable conditions in the Near East.

It is with these considerations in mind that I recommend to the Congress the early enactment of legislation to enable the United States to take its part in this program of the United Nations.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Joint resolution for the authorization of a contribution by the United States to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of State is hereby authorized to make contributions from time to time before July 1, 1951, to the United Nations for the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, established under the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations of December 8, 1949, in amounts not exceeding in the aggregate $27,450,000, for the purposes set forth in the said resolution.

SEC. 2. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed $27,450,000 to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, to make advances to the Secretary of State, not to exceed in the aggregate $8,000,000, to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution. From appropriations authorized under subsection (a) of this section, there shall be repaid to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, without interest, the advances made by it under authority contained herein. No interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in implementation of this section.

SEC. 3. (a) The provisions of sections 301, 302, and 303 of the act of January 27, 1948 (62 Stat. 7), are hereby made applicable with respect to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East to the same extent as they apply with respect to the government of another country: *Provided*, That when reimbursement is made by said Agency, such reimbursement shall be credited to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized for paying the compensation, travel expenses, and allowances of any person assigned hereunder.

(b) Departments and agencies of the United States Government are authorized, with the approval of the Secretary of State, to furnish or procure and furnish supplies, materials, and services to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East: *Provided*, That said Agency shall make payments in advance for all costs incident to the furnishing or procurement of such supplies, materials, or services, which payments may be credited to the current applicable appropriation or fund of the department or agency concerned and shall be available for the purposes for which such appropriations and funds are authorized to be used.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN METHOD OF ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I had desired to have recognition at this time in my own right, but the hour is late, and if I could be recognized at the beginning of the session tomorrow by unanimous consent, I should be glad to speak at that time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the junior Senator from Tennessee that he have the right to speak tomorrow when the Senate convenes? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. KEFAUVER. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 31, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 30 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

George W. Whitehurst, of Florida, to be United States district judge for the northern and southern districts of Florida to fill a new position.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of colonel, under the provisions of Private Law 352, Eighty-first Congress:

Kenneth D. Nichols, O17498.

Col. Elvin R. Heiberg, O16378, for appointment as professor of mechanics, United States Military Academy, under the provisions of Public Law 449, Seventy-ninth Congress, June 26, 1946, and section 520 (a) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of lieutenant colonel, under the provisions of the act of June 10, 1949 (Public Law 96, 81st Cong.):

Melecio M. Santos, O14683.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress, and Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress:

To be majors

Lorenzo R. Berry, MC, O279792.
Silvia Cortesi, WAC, L904048.
William G. Dunnington, MC, O333305.
Harold E. Opsahl, MC, O330406.
Nick Perlmutter, MC, O930142.
Sanford M. Vaughan, MC, O395934.
Wilhelm A. Zuelzer, MC, O484406.

To be captains

Walter J. Bolbat, DC, O477483.
Paul F. Brookshire, Jr., MC, O440311.
William D. Bumsted, DC, O1786096.
John D. Dimichele, MC, O1704772.
John R. Ervin, MC, O1785785.
Donald G. Fahy, MC, O1718476.
Milton Flocks, MC, O412320.
Gus J. Furla, MC, O1767230.
Longstreet C. Hamilton, MC, O1735272.
Warren S. P. Henderson, MC, O1786624.
Stanley Karansky, MC, O423605.
John M. Lukeman, MC, O1724769.
Robert W. Parvin, MC, O404988.
Martin A. Pfotenhauer, MC, O470118.
Henry P. Rosack, MC, O423100.
Robert J. Rowan, DC, O477609.
Walter A. Schoen, Jr., MC, O1766680.
Leonard K. Schreiber, DC.
Edward H. Stiesmeyer, DC, O1766061.
Bruce D. Storrs, MC, O425964.

To be first lieutenants

Clarence L. Anderson, MC, O963365.
Joseph J. Asta, MC, O960846.
Lorenz L. Beuschel, VC, O938999.
Heath D. Bourdon, MC, O965833.
George J. Charlebois, Jr., VC, O1785428.
Raymond C. Clark, Jr., DC, O1717134.
Richard J. Deegan, JAGC, O383820.
Austin H. Doren, MC, O963728.
William C. Dunckel, Jr., MC.
Richard H. DuPree, MC, O962912.
Charles V. L. Elia, VC, O1775597.
Jack D. Fetzer, MC, O963268.
Ralph W. Flinchbaugh, DC, O945347.
John T. Flynn, VC, O1784862.
Fred F. Foxx, DC, O673135.
Robert B. Greiner, VC, O1745729.
Donald E. Guy, VC, O933073.
Carlos B. Harmon, DC.
Russell C. Harrison, MC, O962179.
Frederick H. Hartwig, MC, O961947.
John T. Hayes, ChC, O931276.
Donald L. Howie, MC, O948537.
Daniel W. Hubbard, VC, O1716505.
Robert D. Hume, Jr., MC, O1717394.
Robert T. Jensen, MC, O964251.
Edward Jones, DC, O1178847.
Herbert A. Keith, DC, O959928.
Harold B. Lawson, ChC, O949086.
William T. Lee, DC.
Francis P. Martin, MC, O968434.
Robert B. Mattes, DC.
Robert C. McCord, VC, O1785299.
Ora H. McKenney, Jr., ChC, O546033.
Walter G. McLeod, ChC, O502334.
Martin S. Oster, VC, O939012.
Elwin R. Prather, VC, O386789.
Joseph S. Quigley, VC, O1725228.
Robert J. Reed, JAGC, O392414.
Albert M. Richards, MC, O963144.
Harry C. Robertson, DC, O945350.
Donald E. Schwartz, DC, O959927.
Donald J. Summerson, MC, O935461.
Adolphus G. White, DC, O960090.
David C. White, MC, O965831.
John O. Wilson, VC, O1745608.

To be second lieutenants

Betty J. Baumgartner, WAC, L1010008.
Beverly E. Bochman, ANC, N792562.
Helen J. Buzzetti, WAC, L1010013.
June L. Chambers, ANC, N792074.
Joan M. Check, ANC, N792077.
Jean M. Clawson, ANC, N792226.
Jeanette M. Confort, ANC, N792570.
Fred H. Diercks, MSC, O954634.
Gloria J. Favors, ANC, N804040.
Margaret E. Hallam, ANC, N785293.
Adrian D. Mandel, MSC, O533784.
Pettrina M. Mead, ANC, N792346.
Marilynn M. Minton, ANC, N779710.
Marguerite E. Moeller, ANC, N792217.
Ralph W. Morgan, MSC, O453617.
Evelyn K. Mullins, ANC, N792576.
Carlos E. Newton, Jr., MSC, O1534828.
Sylvia M. Paret, ANC, N799650.
Florence L. Pettey, ANC, N764781.
William S. Rooney, MSC, O958932.
Helen M. Slater, ANC, N792167.
Virginia M. Sulpizio, ANC, N769885.
Patricia A. Thrush, ANC, N792099.
Phyllis J. Verhonick, ANC, N786871.
Rebecca L. Williams, WMSC, R2518.

The following-named Distinguished Military Students in the Regular Army of the United States effective January 1, 1950, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as Distinguished Military Graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Charles B. Arbogast, Jr.
Lowell A. Aitken.
Charles G. Avery, Jr.
Stewart M. Baker, Jr.
Cyrus W. Bassett.
William A. Beddoe.
David R. Blakelock.
William S. Bouldin, O954671.
Hal B. Brazil, O968024.
Edward D. Brown, Jr.
Samuel F. Burt.
James C. Busson, O970928.
Edwin T. Carroll.
Robert L. Chamberlain.
Fred R. Champion, O975750.
Lodwrick M. Cook, O974145.
Richard A. Cope, O970927.
Edward V. Crawford.
George J. Crowe, O969439.
James A. Daley.
Jack E. Darling, O968042.
Gordon B. DeLashmet.
James R. Dilts.
John Dissek, Jr.
Logan B. Dixon, Jr.
John J. Douglas.
Robert J. Douglas.
William L. Durham.
Lewis V. Edner, O973275.
Arthur J. Elian, O958584.
Ronald L. Ellison.
Henry H. Emerson.
Grover C. Ethington, Jr.
John G. Faulkner, O954134.
Pelham L. Felder III.
Robert A. Finney, Jr.
John E. Foerst.
Charles R. Fullmer.
Paul P. Gotowicki, O949902.
Horace R. Grant, Jr.
Calvin E. Green.
Kuhl C. Green.
Joseph E. Greene.
Frederick H. Griswold.
Melvin G. Gross.
John H. Haddock, Jr.
Mickey T. Haggard, O968019.
James F. Hamilton, O975751.
Wallace R. Hansen.
James M. Hanson, O955494.
Hugh M. Hardaway.
Errol E. Hayes, Jr., O971596.
Robert M. Hill.
Lawrence J. Hockman, O970921.
Morris D. Hodges, O957478.
Wilford J. Hoff, Jr.
Lester E. Hopper, O966348.
George C. Horton, O968228.
Ernest O. Houseman, Jr.
William C. Howton, Jr.
Boyd L. Hulse, O954080.
Charles M. Hunter.
Tom P. Hutcheson.
Arthur C. Jacobson, Jr.
Calvin P. Jorgensen.
George E. Kaso.
William H. Kastner.
George L. Kelley.
Donald E. Kenney, O970291.
Gerald L. Kotter.
William S. Laney.
James A. Lanier, O974580.
Royce E. Lapp.
Joseph S. Leszczynski.
James E. Longsdorf.
Max F. Lorence, O974336.
Paul R. Lunsford.
Wayman H. Lytle.
Frederick M. MacGregor, Jr., O978721.
Harry J. Mack.
Raymond A. Marks, O953796.
Karl L. Martin, O945761.
Doyle J. Matthews.
Walter L. Mayo, Jr.
Charles E. Mayrand.
William C. McCorkle.
Donald G. Meyer, O958154.
Charles G. Mitchell, Jr.
Charles S. Moody, Jr.
Carl E. Morris, O978690.
William B. Neal.
Wesley G. Nichols.
Rene J. Nickels.
John M. Norton.
Robert T. Ojendyk, O956619.
Frank M O'Quinn, O971383.
Howard W. Overstake.
Minor Peeples, Jr.
John A. Peterson.
Ellis A. Phillips.
Ernest E. Phillips, Jr.
Robert F. Phillips.
Edwin M. Pilczuk
Bobbie J. Pinkerton.
James V. Pogue.
Robert E. Polewski, O947930.
William M. Preston, O947800.
William W. Privett, O971675.
Benjamin H. Purcell.
Bert R. Purgatorio, Jr., O971384.
Quentin D. Quigley, O949948.
Fred M. Ramos, O953992.
Reuben Rose.
Wesley C. Scarborough.
Philip D. Sellers.
Stanton E. Sill.
Howard J. Simpson.
Phillip B. Smith, O970904.
Joe B. Sullivan, Jr.
Karl F. Stark, O957539.
Robert K. Swisher.
Lawrence Tassie.
Robert R. Taylor, O954455.
Charles E. Thomann, O974409.
Holcombe H. Thomas.
Hal E. Tindall, O968051.
William F. Turner.
Eugene P. Walter, O970611.
William A. Wells.
Joe D. White, O968238.
Edward T. Williams.
John T. Wood, Jr., O954464.
Clayton L. Wretlind.
Robert A. Yoder.
Donald J. Zimmerlin.

The following-named distinguished military students in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, effective January 1, 1950, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Thomas J. Muldowney.
George C. Stein.

The following-named distinguished military students in the Regular Army of the United States effective June 15, 1950, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Herbert E. Agnor, Jr., O970582.
Peter L. Akers, Jr.
Raymond W. Albright, Jr.
John T. Alexander.
Ace Allen.
Bernard J. Alley.
Charles N. Allgood.
Bernard J. Ambrose, O971865.
Paul K. Andersen.
Charles H. Anderson, Jr.
E. Preston Andrews, Jr., O978036.
Frank Andrul.
Charles R. Armstrong.
Clarence C. Armstrong, Jr.

George H. Arnold.
Alfred F. Aronson.
Carroll Aslaksen.
Orazio J. Astarita.
Eugene R. Aten.
John D. Attaway.
Walter O. Bachus.
Edmund A. Bacigalupi.
James E. Bagley.
Joaquin Balaguer-Rivera.
Keith M. Baldwin.
Mark C. Balkcom.
Arnold L. Bamburg.
William M. Barnes.
Thomas H. Barnett, Jr.
Samuel J. Bateman, Jr., O971258.
Robert B. Beaumont.
Zebulon V. Beck, Jr.
David A. Beckner.
Robert E. Belford.
Charles W. Bell.
Warren G. Bender.
Rodney G. Benson.
Frank S. Berall.
Esai Berenbaum.
Lyle C. Berner.
Edward B. Berninger.
William T. Berry.
Donald G. Bickmore.
Jack D. Billingsley.
Harry S. Bingham.
Lorne S. Black, O971057.
William C. Black III.
Julius W. Bleker III.
John B. Blount.
William A. Bocchino.
Paul O. Boghossian, Jr.
Donald E. Bohnett.
Paul R. Bolin, O970394.
Jesse B. Bolling.
Carl D. Bolson.
Robert M. Boyer.
John L. Brammer.
Robert C. Bransfield.
John B. Bristow.
Frank R. Britton, Jr.
Harry J. Brockman.
Albert B. Brown, Jr.
David M. Brown.
Herbert T. Brown, Jr.
William J. Buchanan.
Carrol W. Bufford.
Wiley L. Bullard.
Robert E. Bundy.
Dudley T. Bunn.
Emanuel Burack.
Charles D. Burch.
Lloyd L. Burke, O965718.
Ellwood W. Burkhardt, O978032.
Gary L. Burton, Jr.
Robert A. Busse.
James W. Byrd.
William F. Byrd, O958396.
James V. Caffrey, Jr., O971588.
Sam L. Calhoun.
Graham P. Callum.
Luis R. Canetti-Gonzalez.
Louis S. Caras.
Leonard J. Carlson, Jr.
William B. Carlton.
Baldwin R. Carr.
Thomas W. Carr.
Joe T. Carrejo.
Fredrick C. Cazin, Jr.
Elliott Chaitt.
Robert G. Chamberlin.
Lee J. Chegin.
Donald Chirafisi.
Ralph T. Clark.
Paul G. Clarke, Jr.
Alexander B. Cleary.
Frank A. Cleland.
Joseph W. Cockerhan.
Carroll F. Cogan.
Jacque D. Cohen.
Joseph T. Coleman, Jr.
Joe H. Collier.
Jack B. Collins.
Joseph E. Collins.
Lester L. Collis.
Edward J. Comolli.
Keith G. Comstock.
James P. Connick, Jr., O968242.
Bernard J. Conroy, O970598.
Dale J. Cook.
Claude W. Cooper.
John Covach.
John E. Cowden.
Robert L. Coxe, O972889.
Clayton Craft, O978223.
William H. Craig, O958327.
Harry Cramer.
Louis Cramer.
David A. Crane.
Harry C. Crews, Jr.
Robert F. Croxton.
Robert G. Cunningham.
Newell H. Curtis, Jr.
Roland E. Curtis.
John N. Dale.
Earl E. Daly, Jr.
William M. Daly.
Melvin H. Damon, Jr.
Alvin R. Daniels.
Harold O. Danielson, O974801.
Raymond A. Dault.
Carroll C. Davis.
David H. Davis.
Emmett I. Davis, Jr.
Harvey C. Day, Jr.
Charles E. Deitz.
William L. Devane.
Russell G. DeWitt.
Adrian J. Dick.
Pierre J. Dolan.
Philbert C. Doleac, O968243.
George M. Donovan.
Robert G. Dorsey.
J. T. Dotson.
Mark H. Doty, Jr., O974904.
Thomas W. Downes, Jr.
Carl W. Dreyer.
Grover A. DuBose.
Winston A. Duchow.
Raynald D. Dufour.
James E. Dunley.
Herbert W. Echelmeier.
Edward H. Effertz.
Raymond L. Eggert, Jr.
William E. Eicher.
Sidney N. Einhorn.
Charles C. Elledge.
William B. Erb.
Thomas B. Eustis.
Robert T. Evans.
Wayne B. Fagg.
Raymond L. Farmer.
John D. Feehan.
Victor R. Feicht.
Maurice L. Fenderson.
Richard Ferguson.
Herbert A. Fincher.
Burton B. Finigan.
Emil Fisher, Jr.
Eugene T. Fitzgibbons.
Tyler H. Fletcher.
Charles D. Ford, Jr.
Earl R. Fore.
Richard F. Fox.
Edward L. Fronczak.
Appleton Fryer.
Billy T. Gaddis.
Leonce E. Gaiter.
Carl L. Galliher, Jr.
George R. Ganung.
Robert W. Garber.
James M. Garrison, Jr.
Paul L. Gaurnier, O970714.
Thomas H. Gause.
Richard J. Gavin.
Allen A. Geiger.
Thomas M. Gemmell.
Richard E. George, O978097.
Ross J. Gibson.
James I. Gifford, Jr.
Dewayne E. Gilbert.
George A. Gilbert, Jr.
Elbert E. Gilder, Jr.
George T. Gilman.
John L. Gilman.
Pascal P. Glenn, Jr.
William D Glover.
Siebert J. Goldenstein.
Theo H. Golding.
Daniel J. Gormley.
Lloyd L. Goulder, Jr.
George T. Graham.
Willis B. Graham.
Robert L. Grandle.
William A. Green, Jr.
Robert A. Greenberg, O980922.
Milton S. Greenwald.
James F. Greer.
Kenneth R. Greider.
John T. Gressette III.
Joel W. Griffith, O967939.
Samuel E. Griffiths.
Niles E. Grosvenor.
Stephen F. Grover.
James B. Gudikunst.
Norman E. Hafen.
Frederick X. Hallway.
Warren E. Hammond.
Thomas R. Handy.
Charles W. Hanlon.
Marcus W Hansen.
Howard S. Hardcastle.
Arthur B. Harris.
Brady R. Harris.
Louis A. Harris.
Francis H. Hart, O978017.
Joseph M. Hartnett.
Warren E. Hatcher.
Lawrence K. Hay, Jr.
Eugene B. Hayden, Jr.
Andrew L. Haynes.
Hall G. Haynes.
Jimmie C. Hays.
Franklin K. Hazen, Jr.
Je M. Helt.
Billy J. Henderson.
James M. Henderson.
John K. Henderson.
Ralph G. Henley.
Clarence T. Hewgley.
Paul D. Heyman, O968059.
Richard A. Hickland, O955194.
David A. Hicks.
Douglas J. Higgins.
Eduardo Hilera-Rozas.
Gene H. Hill.
Jack K. Hinman.
Clifford W. Hodgkins.
Eugene F. Hoffmann.
Louis L. Holder.
John M. Holko, Jr.
Robert B. Hoppe.
Clifton A. Horn, Jr.
James C. Horne.
Kenneth B. Howe.
Robert L. Howell.
Donald H. Huffine.
Donald W. Huffman, O970581.
Charles W. Hulburt, O978718.
Samuel W. Hull.
Arthur Humphreys.
George A. Hunter, Jr.
John S. Hunter.
Verne I. Hutchinson.
Jack D. Hyer.
Robert E. Ingalls.
George H. Isley, Jr.
Arthur W. Jasper.
Donald D. Jenkins.
Richard W. Jensen.
Eivind H. Johansen.
Robert F. John.
Donald E. Johnson.
James H. Johnson.
Luther W. Johnson, O960589.
Norman G. Johnson.
Rolston Johnson.
Clinton D. Jones.
James D. Jones.
Joseph L. Jones.
Kirk A. Jordan, O975739.
Allan F. Jose.
J. Walter Joseph, Jr.
Jon A. Jourdonnais.
August W. Kallmeyer.
Alvin E. Kaping, O970032.
Edward L. Karn, Jr.
Albert F. Kee.
Arthur R. Keeley.

William R. Keenan.
Morris J. Keller.
Claud M. Kellett, Jr.
Franklin E. Kelley, O970920.
Johnny W. Kelley, O965902.
William N. Kelt.
James G. Kennedy.
Joseph L. Kennedy.
John R. Kenyon.
Robert F. Kessler.
Dewey H. Kim.
Armand M. King.
James E. Kingman.
Robert G. Kingsbury.
Ludie E. Kinney, Jr.
Ben B. Kirkland III.
Harold Kitson, Jr.
Richard D. Kitt.
David Kladivko.
Rudolph J. Klein, Jr.
Melvin E. Kling.
Richard J. Knopf.
James H. Koelling.
Roger A. Krause.
John G. Kreuer.
Ernest E. Kritzmacher.
Robert E. Kroesch.
Gordon D. Krum.
Robert D. Kubeja.
John B. Kuiper.
Mark C. Kury.
Harold O. Kuuttila.
James D. Labor.
John H. Lafferty.
Donald M. Laffoon, O972120.
Robert M. LaFollette.
Louis L. Landers.
William D. Lane.
Lee R. Larkin.
William M. Larrabee.
Donald W. Larson, O971879.
Stuart H. Lassetter.
Thomas R. Laube.
Kenneth D. Lawless.
Eugene G. Lawley, Jr.
Andrew L. Lawrence, Jr.
William H. Lawrence.
Hassel K. Lawson.
Richard H. Lee.
Harvey A. Legate, Jr.
Robert E. Legate.
Edwin A. Lehman.
Ralph M. Leighty.
Carl A. Leishman.
Merrill M. Lemke, O977639.
Robert J. Leavitt.
Leonard L. Lewane.
William C. Lewis.
James H. Lilly.
William J. Lindberg.
Samuel M. Lindsay II.
John J. Link.
Charles H. Lively.
Gale C. Livengood, O970916.
Russell L. Long.
William E. Long.
Robert W. Looby.
Michael E. Lorenzo.
William P. Lowry.
Paul T. Lundstrom.
Lon U. Lutz.
Arthur P. Lux.
James A. Lyons.
Angus H. Macaulay, Jr.
William S. MacMeekin.
Thomas H. Maddox.
John W. Main, O974906.
Edward S. Maj, O971861.
Gardner H. Marchant, Jr.
Charles B. Marion.
Patrick G. Markham.
Jack R. Marsh.
Elmer C. Martin.
Stanley B. Marx.
George Mason.
Wallace E. Mathes, Jr., O970603.
George A. Mattison III.
Pope McCorkle, Jr.
Joseph L. McCoy, O953797.
Edmund McCullough.

Daniel J. McDonald, Jr.
John J. McDowell.
Ralph L. McDowell.
Duncan D. McDuffie.
Harold S. McGay.
John E. McGee, Jr., O965710.
John J. McGuire.
Alexander C. McKeen.
Luther M. McLeod, Jr.
Wilbur G. McMahan.
Walter W. McMahon.
Arlen A. McNeil.
Charles H. Meacham.
Terrence S. Meade, O978762.
William H. Meanor.
Charles R. Means.
Robert C. Meisel.
Billy J. Mendheim.
Lawrence C. Mendive.
George M. Mercer.
Leonard S. Mercia.
William W. Metcalfe.
William J. Metzger.
Robert W. Michell.
Paul G. Milbee.
George A. Millener, Jr.
James I. Miller.
Glenn W. Million.
Howard L. Miskelly.
Gwinn N. Mobley.
David H. Mock.
Charles B. Modisett.
Fred J. Moore.
George R. Morgan.
John J. Morgan, Jr.
Billy M. Morrow.
Robert L. Morrow.
Leonard J. Morse.
Paul J. Motiska, Jr., O970912.
James H. Motz, Jr.
William R. Muir.
William T. Mundy, Jr.
Clark C. Munroe.
Jimmy D. Myers.
David B. Mylchreest, O955193.
Nicholas R. Nave, Jr.
Barney K. Neal, Jr.
Oliver J. Neslage, Jr.
Virgil E. New.
Robert N. Nicholson.
Ernest A. Nordon, Jr., O955188.
Max E. Norman.
Kenneth E. Northup.
Jack W. Nurney, Jr.
Paul F. Oberleitner, O970910.
Roy E. Obluda.
Emmett J. O'Brien.
Jose E. Olivares, Jr.
Douglas S. Oliver.
James S. Oliver, O978102.
Michael J. O'Rourke, Jr.
William C. Overman, Jr.
Merrill R. Owen.
Don A. Palmer.
William D. Palmer, Jr.
Zacharias G. Panagiotakis.
James M. Paris.
Emmett B. Parker, Jr.
Joseph E. Parker, Jr., O968523.
William L. Parker.
George L. Parsons, Jr.
Sam G. Pate.
William E. Patrick.
Thomas C. Penn.
Paul J. Perecko.
Vincent J. Perricelli, Jr.
James H. Petersen.
Daniel A. Peterson.
Raymond E. Phares, O979144.
Clifford J. Phifer, O971266.
Lawrence C. Pitman, Jr.
Walter H. Pogue, Jr.
George J. Polick, O971267.
Calvin M. Poole.
Ewell G. Pope, Jr.
Vernon R. Porter.
Howard C. Potts.
William F. Price.
James C. Pruitt, Jr.
Calvin K. Quayle.
John E. Ramsey.

Earle D. Randall.
William W. Raper, Jr.
Alfred J. Raskin.
Eugene A. Ravizza.
Henry W. Rawlings.
Lynn R. Raybould.
Walter W. Reed.
Thomas W. Reese.
Joseph E. Reger.
Wallace L. Reimold, Jr.
Gouch C. Reinhardt.
Rollin S. Reiter.
Douglas A. Reniger.
Robert E. Rennerbaum.
Laurie E. Rennie.
Wayland W. Rennie.
John W. Reynolds, O972893.
Nolan C. Rhodes, O970080.
Norman L. Rhodes.
Nehemiah E. Richardson.
Thomas N. Richmond.
James P. Ricker.
Harry P. Rietman.
Tillman A. Riewe.
Luke F. J. Riley, Jr., O970592.
Radames Rivera-Vazquez.
William P. Rivers.
George L. Robbins.
Kenneth P. Roberts.
Douglas R. Robertson.
Frank D. Robie.
Donald L. Robinson.
William C. Robinson.
Thomas E. Rodgers, Jr.
Vincent J. Romano, O971637.
Jean R. Rondepierre.
Harry R. Ross.
John E. Ross.
Walter L. Roy.
Willis C. Royall, Jr.
Murray Rubin.
Robert O. Rushing.
John M. Sakowski.
John P. Santry.
Alfred G. Sapp, O966939.
Wayne B. Sargent.
Paul S. Sather, O974180.
Richard D. Scamehorn.
Harry E. Schaaf, Jr., O973283.
Albert A. Schmidt.
Howard E. Schneider.
Walter L. Schwaar.
Anthony W. Schwab.
Malcolm M. Schwartz, O972894.
William H. Schwarz.
Darrell E. Seasor.
Robert A. Seelye.
James D. Sehorne, Jr.
Ralph P. Selch.
Roy R. Severin.
Donald J. Shannon.
Harold W. Shear.
Arvil L. Short, Jr.
Joseph D. Shroder.
Jerry A. Shuman.
Nathan C. Sibley.
Jack R. Siewert.
William A. Sigman.
Thomas R. Silk, Jr.
Richard D. Simmering.
Anthony J. Skardina.
Julian H. Skinker, Jr.
George B. Skinner.
Clarence E. Skoien.
George J. Sloan, Jr.
Richard A. Sloan.
Dwight W. Smith.
Hansel Y. Smith, Jr.
James D. Smith.
William B. Smith.
Herbert F. Somermeyer.
Charles A. Sorenson.
James D. Spangler.
David R. Spencer, O968527.
Richard A. Spencer.
Robert E. Spiller.
Robert H. Spilman, O964844.
Harry W. Spraker, Jr., O971838.
John L. Squires, Jr.
Kenneth L. Stahl.
Richard W. Statham.

Thomas E. Steiner.
John C. Steinmetz.
John K. Stewart.
Warren F. Stewart, O978723.
Harold A. Stieve.
Gustav Stolz, Jr.
William W. Storch.
Ivan M. Storer.
Carroll D. Strider, O956588.
Samuel D. Stroman.
Duane A. Strother.
Darwin D. Talafuse.
Phillip E. Talley, Jr.
Lester K. Tate.
Lloyd E. Tatem, O971592.
Franklin R. Taylor.
Geronimo Terres, Jr.
Myron M. Thomason.
John H. Thomson.
Raymond R. Thomson.
George E. Thurmond.
Philip W. Tiemann, Jr.
Edward L. Timmerman.
William R. Todd.
Lawrence J. Trachy.
Thomas E. Tracy.
William E. Tragert.
William D. Turley.
James W. Vance.
Jack Vanderbleek.
Robert D. Vanderslice.
Frank D. Vasington.
Salvatore J. Vento.
Willard M. Vickers.
Louis L. Vise, Jr.
Thomas K. Waddell, O949373.
David E. Wade.
Luther G. Walker.
Paul S. Walker.
Glenn F. Walkup.
Harold C. Walraven, Jr.
James J. Walsh.
Robert F. Wanek.
Bynum P. Ward.
James F. Warnock, Jr.
John W. Warren.
William M. Warren.
Duane E. Warrick.
Walton M. Watkins.
James R. Watson.
John E. Weaver.
John V. Webb.
Warren J. Weber.
George H. Wedgworth.
Earle M. Welch, Jr., O972629.
Frank M. West, Jr.
Orville M. Weston, Jr.
Vorin E. Whan, Jr.
Herbert W. Wheeler.
Harry E. White.
William E. White.
Franklyn M. Whitney.
Calvin D. Wible.
Arthur Wilkinson.
Don J. Williams.
Edwin S. Williams, O955783.
Francis L. Williams.
Leroy L. Williams, Jr.
Louis Wilson.
Robert J. Wilson.
Clark L. Wingate.
William C. Winlock.
Cecil E. Wise, O979118.
John M. Wood.
Thomas A. Wood.
Richard T. Woodman.
Ronald Woodrow.
Glenn H. Woods, Jr.
Robert E. Wright.
Raymond H. Young.
George W. Younkin.
Dale W. Zadow.
Earl R. Zamzow.
Calvin E. Zongker.

The following-named distinguished military students in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1950, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Ralph H. Paulick
Roger S. Reid
Vernon H. Wold

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

Joe W. Akins.
Alfred L. Allen, O1686829.
Theodore P. Alvarez, O385882.
Melvin C. Anderson, O2008370.
Edward C. Anderton, O550423.
Edward J. Appel, O430350.
Andrew J. Armstrong, O1054896.
Edward F. Astarita, O1540878.
Claude V. Bache, O2044598.
William R. Barwick, Jr., O390309.
Kenneth R. Beard, O1999270.
Thomas F. Begley, O554260.
Jerry B. Bolibaugh, O538712.
Julius L. Bragg, O964752.
John A. Brenner, O537845.
Lawrence S. Brice.
Richard M. Brown, O977869.
William A. Brown, O1339606.
William J. Browning, O968023.
Thomas W. Buchanan, O390320.
Kenneth R. Bull, O1325968.
Martin J. Burke, Jr., O445755.
Donald F. Burr, O554643.
Matthew W. Busey III, O517648.
Thomas A. Callagy, O528464.
Miguel A. Candal, O1327930.
Richard A. Carlson, O956725.
Ircel L. Carter, O516874.
Donald E. Chamberlain, O537510.
Norman P. Chandler, O1118861.
Julius E. Clark, Jr., O386464.
Richard L. Clarkson, O1040895.
Charles C. Clayton, O446021.
John D. Coleman, Jr., O408290.
John J. Conrado.
Paul M. Crosby, O1100936.
Ralph H. Cruikshank, O1329567.
Galen L. Curry, O465086.
Robert L. Danilavez, O968484.
Oscar F. Danner, Jr., O979330.
Carlos L. Davila-Coca.
Dan W. Davis, O541575.
William J. Dawson, Jr., O1299511.
Anthony C. DeBellis, O1177360.
Donald R. de Camara, O812060.
Louie W. Donoho, O2208561.
Warren S. Ducote, O411978.
William L. Durrant, Jr., O1284483.
Frank H. Earle, O1019037.
George R. Edwards.
Max Etkin, O1037477.
Thomas H. Farrington, O1309475.
John O. Ford, O1109294.
John Frech, Jr., O978642.
Calvin R. Freeman.
John L. Fuller, O443938.
Benjamin F. Gibbons, Jr., O1341876.
Floyd S. Gibson, O546734.
James M. Glauber, O964348.
James H. Gordon, O1166273.
Arthur P. Gregory, O429883.
Allen J. Grieger, O549452.
Leonard F. Griffin, O441288.
Marion I. Guest, O462643.
Ralph S. Gustin, O540513.
Kenneth R. Haas, O957442.
John D. Hale, Jr., O535750.
William C. Hall, O970975.
Richard L. Hammel, O949640.
Charles D. Hargreaves, AO868509.
William S. Hawkins, O534088.
Robert T. Heder, O405421.
David P. Heekin, O453825.
Joseph H. Heiker, O964130.
Thomas B. Hobson, Jr., O791426.
John A. Hollingsworth, O968391.
Hermon F. Holt, O968028.
Willard V. Horne, O436573.
Cecil R. Huff, O829995.
Edward F. Irick, Jr., O390561.
Henry A Jeffers, Jr., O413410.
George W. Johnston, AO1846932.
Lawrence M. Kellam, O1081279.
Joseph C. Kiefe, Jr., O546281.
Leonard H. Kushner, O526975.
William M. Lipsey, O1286515.
Charles H. Long, O964618.
Raymond A. Love, O968456.
Frank P. Lovett, Jr., O947918.
James L. Lucas, Jr.
George W. Mainer, O2020434.
James E. Marshall, Jr., O415890.
Charles A. Matlach, O956230.
Henry H. McCurley, O445774.
Daniel B. McKay, Jr.
Ray A. McKinsey, O524579.
Ulmer L. McNeill, O971692.
Wallace N. McNicol, O1540863.
George D. Merrall, Jr., O542581.
George H. Meyer, O968014.
Edward D. Middleton, Jr.
Herman J. Miller, Jr., O957904.
Robert B. Miller.
Clifford E. Mize, O418722.
Donald W. Moak, O971375.
Aldo A. Modena, O970555.
Charles W. Moffett, Jr., O1019603.
Virgil C. Moon, O968227.
Donald G. Moore, O1323344.
John T. Morgan, Jr., O1342342.
Francis X. Munisteri.
George M. Nagata, O2033031.
Harry Newman.
Charles E. Nix, O971516.
Maurice B. Nussbaum.
Andrew R. O'Connor, O967450.
Van C. Oxner, Jr.
William O. Parker, O723511.
Theodore R. Pickett, Jr., AO1849729.
Jack T. Pink, O2058375.
Joseph R. Pirkl.
Wilbur F. Price, O1328636.
Frank D. Proctor, O1340803.
Robert D. Pryor, O971634.
John H. Rafferty, Jr., O550148.
John F. Regan, O576019.
John W. Reynolds, O27736.
George M. Richardson, O443150.
John A. Richbourg.
Ernest P. Robinson, O958300.
Francis C. Rosser, O453347.
Harry P. Schoen, Jr., O1042426.
Adrian Scott, O423473.
James H. Sellers, O1945486.
Jack B. Shanahan, O1294027.
Claude O. Shell, Jr., O535950.
Robert Sherman, O1560567.
Henry Simon, Jr.
Bartholomew P. Smith, O404006.
Charles D. Smith, Jr., O408348.
Delbert D. Spahr, O405307.
Americo W. Spigarelli, O534134.
J. Wayne Staley, Jr., O1047338.
Richard C. Stanton, O956776.
Rufus C. Streater, O977651.
David A. Teener.
Addison Terry, O957960.
William J. Tropf, Jr., O1047366.
Richard D. True, O1100805.
Jack K. Tuthill, O555984.
Billy M. Vaughn, O956215.
Caleb R. Vincent, O524014.
Frank C. Vondrasek, Jr.
Frederick E. Wadley.
Gerhardt H. Weber, O1334787.
Donal C. Wells, O1950307.
William J. Whelan, O1549173.
Adna G. Wilde, Jr., O535943.
Harry E. Williams, O1579306.
Robert W. Williams, O449018.
Charles H. Wills, O945701.
William A. Wise II, O1184610.
Hiram M. Wolfe III, O460589.
Marion M. Wood.
Kenneth Y. Wright, Jr., O975141.

[NOTE.—These persons were given recess appointment on November 2, 1949, November 5, 1949, November 16, 1949, November 23, 1949, November 25, 1949, and December 1, 1949.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 30, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our Lord, surely our lines are fallen into pleasant places, Thou hast possessed us of a land flowing with milk and honey, but Thou who holdest our destiny in Thy hand, teach us that the glory of any people is in the moral and spiritual fiber woven into the Nation's heart.

Father of mankind, keep us in the realization that our assignment to this Chamber means a large privilege and opportunity. Grant that we may put our intelligence, our power of will, and our strength of moral earnestness into our every task and decision. In an ease-loving day, do Thou disturb our country's complacency and make us alert to every threatening force. Help us to build for peace rather than for war; for brotherhood rather than divisions, cherishing above all else the glorious destiny of our free land. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 25]

Barrett, Pa.	Hall,	Philbin
Bland	Edwin Arthur	Potter
Boggs, La.	Hall,	Powell
Bonner	Leonard W.	Price
Boykin	Hand	Rabaut
Brown, Ga.	Heffernan	Redden
Bulwinkle	Heller	Rees
Burdick	Hobbs	Rhodes
Burton	Hoffman, Ill.	Ribicoff
Canfield	Jonas	Rivers
Case, N. J.	Jones, N. C.	Rogers, Fla.
Chatham	Kee	Rogers, Mass.
Chudoff	Kelly, N. Y.	Roosevelt
Cole, Kans.	Keogh	Sabath
Coudert	Kirwan	Sadlak
Crosser	Klein	Sadowski
Curtis	Lane	Scott, Hardie
Davenport	Lanham	Scrivner
Davies, N. Y.	Latham	Scudder
Davis, Tenn.	Lichtenwalter	Shafer
Dawson	Lynch	Shelly
Dingell	McConnell	Smathers
Dollinger	McGuire	Smith, Kans.
Donohue	Macy	Smith, Ohio
Eberharter	Marshall	Stanley
Engel, Mich.	Michener	Stockman
Feighan	Monroney	Taylor
Fellows	Morgan	Vorys
Fernandez	Morrison	Wadsworth
Fulton	Moulder	Walsh
Furcolo	Nixon	White, Idaho
Gary	Norton	Wier
Gilmer	Pfeifer,	Withrow
Granahan	Joseph L.	Wolcott
Green	Pfeiffer,	Young
Gwinn	William L.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 328 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 27, 1950, was read and approved.

PRESIDENT McKINLEY'S BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was President McKinley's birthday. As you know, for more than 20 years the Ohio delegation in Congress has observed this event by making short addresses on this floor and by passing carnations around. The carnation was his favorite flower and for many Ohioans it is the State flower. I am glad to see today that many of the Members on the Democratic side are wearing the carnation.

It might be interesting for you to know that one of McKinley's stanchest friends was a Democrat from Texas, Roger Q. Mills. He and McKinley worked together for many years on the Ways and Means Committee on programs for the best interests of the country.

I might further say, just by way of more or less a matter of personal interest, that Mr. McKinley's greatest work, we think, was done here on the floor of the House. More important was his work here on the floor than his work as governor or President. His service on the field of battle in the War Between the States was very creditable.

A little incident has come out of his military service that will be very interesting. Much of his military activities were carried on in the Shenandoah Valley, and he naturally got acquainted with many privates and officers in the Confederate Army in that section. Just about the close of the War Between the States he was elected to membership in the Masonic lodge in Winchester, Va., and every officer in the Masonic lodge who was present at his initiation had been an officer in the Confederate Army. They thought that was a great compliment to him to be worthy and a greater compliment to them for their chivalry and fairness.

Although that was a great controversy, it shows how manhood and character were recognized by the officers and men of the contending forces.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to extend their remarks about President McKinley may do so at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

THE LATE PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, down through the history of our constitutional government is a long line of outstanding men who served as Chief Executive of our country; all men of integrity; all men of honor; all men of deep patriotism and love for our country, without regard to party; and all men who served their country while they occupied that office to the best of their ability.

In this generation of America's contributions to not only the strong Presidents of our country, but to the great men of all times, is the late, lamented Franklin Delano Roosevelt. If he were alive, today would have been his sixty-eighth birthday. Most of us who are here today knew him personally, because we served while he was President of the United States.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was one of the great constructive figures of the known history of man. As we study history, we find two lines of outstanding figures, one on the destructive side of life, and the other on the constructive side of life. Franklin D. Roosevelt was one of the outstanding figures in history on the constructive side of life. Without regard to whether one agreed with his policies and his views, I know that each and every one of my colleagues have a deep respect for his memory, and that all Americans equally have a deep respect for his memory.

It is only fitting and proper that, as in the case of the late President McKinley, a great American, we should pause today to pay tribute to the memory of the late President who served during this generation, a man of deep faith, a man of intense religious feeling, a man who had love of God and love of country in his heart, a man who loved his fellow man, and who exemplified to the furthest extent humanly possible the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God. It is only fitting and proper that we pause today to pay tribute to the memory of that great man, the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and services of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, today is the anniversary of the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt 68 years ago.

This date of January 30, already of national and world-wide importance, is one which will come to be more and more significant in America's calendar of observances as time goes on. For, with the passing of the years, historic perspective will lend a truer evaluation of the greatness of the late President.

We of this generation are perhaps too close to the events of this era to assay President Roosevelt's full stature in accurate proportion to the whole sweeping panorama of America's progress and its contribution to the advance of civilization as a whole. We leave that timeless estimate to the historians of the ages.

For ourselves, we cherish the greener memories of the man as we knew him: his inspiring leadership, his love of humanity, his high ideals, and his courageous striving to attain those ideals.

It has been said that the divine providence who guides our destiny has always produced, in every crisis this Nation has faced, the right man to lead and to guide us. Such was the fortuitous advent of Franklin Roosevelt to the Presidency of the United States.

Who can forget his inauguration that bleak March day in 1933 when he flung into the teeth of despair his ringing challenge that "the only thing we have to fear is fear itself"?

From that very beginning, when he lifted up the spirits of a people who were bowed down, he carried us along the path of confidence to high achievement.

Such was the exuberance of the man, so great was his faith in our democratic principles and in our inherent and potential strength, that he stirred our spirit to the level of his own. He renewed our courage and restored our morale. He revived us from despondency.

Without this moral stimulation, recovery from the black depression of the early thirties would not have been possible. All of the delicate, artificial mechanisms of economics would not have sufficed alone to feed the starving, to make jobs for the unemployed, to restore profits to business.

It seems to me that it was President Roosevelt's unique gift and power to be able to give hope to the suffering that, above all, endeared him to the multitudes. All of us in our lifetime suffer in some way or other; a private grief, a physical ailment—but something. Franklin Roosevelt, as a young man, was the victim of infantile paralysis. Yet he overcame his infirmities sufficiently to rise to the highest office in the land.

He emerged from his ordeal physically handicapped but mentally and morally strengthened. It was something of this inner strength that shone in his personality and exuded from his whole being, which he was able to communicate to the men and women—and yes, particularly, to the children of the United States.

He personified and symbolized to millions of people the human struggle for survival against odds, and the ability to overcome handicaps, whether they be physical weaknesses, economic poverty, racial or religious prejudice, or political heresy. So, in that broad sense, in which he captured the imagination of a people and endeared himself to them, Franklin Roosevelt was a minister to our national soul.

But one who thus raises hopes runs the grave risk also of creating a vast disillusionment if he fails to fulfill those hopes. In the case of President Roosevelt, happily for the people, for the Nation, and for the world, the hopes he engendered were brought to fruition.

President Roosevelt lived up to his promises. He fulfilled his pledges; he demonstrated, to the amazement of other types of politicians, that good government is good politics; and he became the first man in the history of this country to be four times elected by the people to the highest honor within their power to bestow.

It is possible he may be the only President to achieve that honor because, as you know, the Congress has approved and submitted to the States a proposed amendment to the Constitution to limit a President to two successive terms, and this has been ratified by 23 States.

The influence of Franklin D. Roosevelt lives on today. In April it will be 5 years since he passed away at Warm Springs, Ga., nearby the healing site that was established through his efforts to aid the victims of polio.

No more fitting tribute is paid his memory than the establishment of his annual birthday as a special time for remembering those afflicted with this disease. In death, as in life, he still gives inspiration to the cause of aiding your fellow men—helping those in need, lifting those who have fallen—restoring to the individual that dignity which proclaims we are all made in the image of God.

The political strife, the partisan differences, the debated issues during the heyday in office of Franklin D. Roosevelt have been swept into the past on the currents of time.

On the shore, in the wake of the tide, remain the clean and glittering solid rocks of achievement, the innovations and reforms, milestones of social justice, political democracy, and economic freedom for all.

That the heritage which President Roosevelt bequeathed to the people is treasured by his successor and by the Democratic Party today was eloquently demonstrated in this House by President Truman in his state of the Union message.

The greatest homage which can be paid the memory of the late President is the continuation in practice of those principles for which he fought throughout his life.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, the 30th of January in this year of 1950 would have marked the sixty-eighth anniversary of the birthday of the greatest figure living in our time and one of the greatest of all time if Franklin D. Roosevelt had been spared to see this day.

With the advent of the midcentury mark, historians, journalists, chroniclers, and commentators have busied themselves with the publication of lists of the outstanding men of the preceding 50 years. In every one of these lists the name of our late beloved President has led all the rest. It has recently been tabulated that since his death a short 5 years ago, more than 100 books have been written about his astounding career, his life, his habits, and his philosophy.

The fascination of the man is a natural magnet for the biographer, the political analyst, and the historian. The material in these volumes is an outstanding story of history, and many more must needs be written before all of the facets of the great character of Franklin D. Roosevelt are made known by historians.

To those who knew him, however, to those who personally felt the impact of his genius, no accumulation of written words can ever be substituted for the warm friendliness, the deep understanding, the impressive vigor, and the genuine love which emanated from his vibrant personality.

It is characteristic of the man that so personal a thing as his birthday anniversary should now be a day of dedication to the humanitarian cause of relief from suffering and physical pain. This is as it should be, because if any one quality of Franklin Roosevelt's character took precedence over the others, it was that intangible but endearing quality of his humanitarianism. This quality, I believe, was the outgrowth of his religious faith, his great courage, and the magnitude of his physical and spiritual strength.

It was the basis of his political philosophy and his conception of government as an instrumentality for the service of man. His whole program of social legislation was aimed at the elimination of the cancers of fear, want, poverty, social injustice, physical suffering, and human indignity from the body politic.

Both in war and in peace, his primary concern revolved continually around the rights of man as an individual and as a member of society, and he acted with resolution on the principle that the salvation of the world lay in recognition and effectuation of the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God.

Time and the perspective of history will undoubtedly delineate the true picture of Franklin D. Roosevelt. No future research, however, can add a cubit to his stature in depicting what we already know of his vivid imagination, his bold courage, his diligent mind, his insatiable curiosity about the welfare of his fellow men, and the global range of his interests. With all of his multitudinous preoccupations, his greatest virtue was that he had a deep, abiding, and genuine love of people as people.

On this his birthday anniversary, may his great and generous soul rest eternally in peace.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is a wonderful idea each year on this day to interrupt our regular procedure and business of the day to pay homage to the memory of a great leader, whose name will remain immortal in the history of this country and in the annals of present-day civilization. This is the sixty-eighth anniversary of the birth of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt. He was not merely a dynamic leader of his people, but a great force for peace among all peoples in the world.

His tireless efforts for the welfare of all mankind are known throughout the world. It is all still so fresh in our minds and so vivid, that it is difficult to believe he has not been with us for almost 5 years. But just as his memory lingers and will continue to linger with us for many years to come, so will his ideas and ideals be a guiding light to us and we shall feel the effects of his work and accomplishments for a long time.

On the occasion of the anniversary of his birthday, I believe no better tribute can be paid to his memory than prompt ratification by the United States Senate of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. If Franklin D. Roosevelt were alive today, I have no doubt that he would be one of the strongest advocates for outlawing this unspeakable crime as a major blot on our civilization.

Furthermore, I am certain that, as a great reformer and advocate of human

progress, he would have urged immediate adoption of this convention whereby for the first time in history, nations would bind themselves in solemn covenant to assure that the barbarism of exterminating millions of people on racial, religious, or national grounds, which has so recently shocked the world, would never again occur.

Ratification and adoption of the Genocide Convention will be a milestone in the progress of civilization. The United States has always prided itself in being a force for human progress and constructive effort, particularly in recent years, and I am therefore hopeful that our country will also lead the way in ratifying this convention.

Before the memory of the recent horrifying genocidal acts has faded from the minds and conscience of man, let us take appropriate and positive action to outlaw the crime of mass murder of whole nations and peoples. Many nations are waiting for the United States to show the way. In so doing, we shall best honor the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt, a great leader of his people, whose very name is today a symbol of world peace and human progress.

PRICING PRACTICES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1008) to define the application of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to certain pricing practices, insist upon the House amendment, and ask for a further conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. PATMAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to serve notice that tomorrow morning I shall make a preferential motion to send the bill to further conference.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. That motion is not in order in the House?

The SPEAKER. That motion will be in order because the bill has been to conference and disagreement has been reported.

Mr. RANKIN. Does it require a two-thirds vote?

The SPEAKER. No; a majority vote.

ARMY ENGINEERS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I have been tremendously disturbed by the hearings that have been released from the Appropriations Committee indicating that the Chief of the Army Engineers has estimated that the cost in the fiscal year 1951 for certain rivers and harbors and flood-control projects, including flood control on the Mississippi River, will be increased $583,000,000 over the figures that were sent up here for the fiscal year 1949. Some estimates of the cost of individual projects have in that period been multiplied by five. This is one of the most terrific increases I have ever heard of, when a project is appropriated for in one year and then in the next year the estimate of cost is increased.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JACKSON of Washington (at the request of Mr. GRANGER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert an article.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Attorney General.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

PROPOSED NEW CURRENCY DESIGN

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, on January 23 I introduced a bill (H. R. 6931) to provide for the issuance of currency of a new design and color, in exchange for our present currency, as a means of detecting violations of the Internal Revenue Code and the tariff laws of the United States, to rectify and correct other situations which have arisen, as it is believed that the Russians may have our dies and are printing American dollars. This bill would make any such bogus or counterfeit currency void as well as be most helpful in apprehending the holders of the currency recently stolen in the brazen and dramatic Brink robbery in Boston.

It is estimated that of the approximate 29 billions of dollars we have in circulation today, some five to ten billion dollars are in safety-deposit or lock boxes, much of which is being hoarded in seclusion for tax-evasion purposes. I have discussed this matter with the attorney general's office, Internal Revenue, the Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, local bankers and others. The figures I have just given to you have been verified by these inquiries. I trust that the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold hearings on this bill and I hope they will report it out favorably, thus directing the Secretary of the Treasury to correct situations that are unfair and which are an injustice to every honest taxpaying American citizen.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman state what it is, or let the Chair see the matter of which the gentleman complains? The Chair does wish that Members who intend to rise to a question of personal privilege would let the Chair have some notice of their intention.

Mr. RANKIN. I rise to a question of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker, on one of the most stupid, asinine, and exaggerated articles that I have ever seen written about a human being which appears on the eighth page of the Washington Daily News of today and in other Scripps-Howard newspapers throughout the country.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not yet know the matter on which the gentleman claims his question of personal privilege.

Mr. RANKIN. I will be glad to have the Chair read the article.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would at least like to see the article so that the Chair can know whether or not the gentleman is presenting a question of personal privilege.

After looking over the article hastily, may the Chair inquire of the gentleman what part of the article he objects to?

Mr. RANKIN. All of it, from the headline on down. It is written for the purpose of discrediting your humble servant.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman think there is anything in this which reflects upon him as a truthful man, or upon him in his representative capacity?

Mr. RANKIN. I think that is the purpose of it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not see it that way. There is argument on the other side of the question and the Chair is sure that all Members of the House understand it is not necessary for their colleagues to rise to a question of personal privilege to defend themselves against any article which criticizes them.

Mr. RANKIN. As I said, Mr. Speaker, it is one of the most asinine and stupid smears that I have ever seen written about a Congressman. All I want is an opportunity to answer it.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Mississippi may proceed for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this article starts out with the heading "Representative RANKIN is very generous—with Government money." It goes ahead and accuses me of introducing bills which would cost the Government $125,000,000,000.

It ignores the fact, and does not give the Congress the information, that the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs usually introduces, "by request," the bills presented by the various veterans' organizations, many of which of course are duplications.

This article is published to try to mislead the country and to discredit the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I am chairman, by discrediting me.

The bills that we will report from our Committee on Veterans' Affairs this year will not cost half as much as the money that has been poured down the rat holes of Europe, Asia, Israel, Africa, and Japan, at the expense of the taxpayers of the United States—including the veterans and their children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks with reference to the Sabine watershed, notwithstanding the fact that the time will cost $382.62.

Mr. MULTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GORSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo.

Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks which he intends to make later in the day and include certain extraneous excerpts.

Mr. PRIEST asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement on electoral college reform, by the former member from California, Mr. Lea.

Mr. BREHM (at the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. MASON (at the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement on Federal-State relations to education, made by Dr. James K. Pollack, late of the Hoover Commission and head of the department of political science of the University of Michigan.

ALGER HISS

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Acheson in making his impassioned declaration of loyalty to Alger Hiss referred his critics to the Gospel of St. Matthew in the twenty-fifth chapter.

There is much other excellent material in the gospel according to St. Matthew which the Secretary might have cited. For example, in chapter 6, the evangelist reports a sermon preached upon a mountain and in verse 24 he quotes Jesus as saying, "No man can serve two masters: For either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other."

The people of the United States are now led by the Secretary's own words to believe that he will hold to Alger Hiss who has been convicted of perjury, but everyone knows that his crime was of a treasonable character. Will not a man who publicly professes such devotion to a proven traitor despise his other master, the United States? He has lost a continent by coddling the friends of communism. His refusal to face the consequences of the Hiss verdict is of the same quality as his refusal to face the consequences of Mao Tze-tung's conquest of China. Such usefulness as he has had has now terminated. The country expects him to resign. He should do so before causing us further embarrassment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

THE OIL INDUSTRY

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, oil producers in the Pennsylvania grade crude-oil fields are greatly alarmed, and rightfully so, over the President's recent statement concerning the depletion provision in the income-tax law.

This proposal would crucify the stripper oil fields of the Nation, and its enactment would end the oil-producing business in hundreds of communities where stripper wells make their daily contribution to the national oil supply.

I will vigorously oppose, as will other Members of this body, any attempts to make any change in the present law.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House that our Government at the present time is permitting the importation of approximately 750,000 barrels of foreign oil a day; this flood of oil is working a tremendous hardship on the stripper fields and independent producers. It becomes increasingly evident the administration is endeavoring to deliver another crippling blow and impose another undue burden on the producing industry; particularly the small independent producer who has already been affected by decreased production, by sharp price cuts during the past year, by increased taxes, increased labor and material costs, and an increase on everything that enters into the production of oil.

In my district, the oldest of the oil-producing areas in the United States, there are thousands of these small wells. Operators are diligently striving to apply methods, as they get the capital to do it, which will prolong the life of the small wells, and thus help to provide for the national needs. In Pennsylvania, New York, West Virginia, and Ohio there is produced between 50,000 and 60,000 barrels daily of the highest grade lubricating base oil. It is my opinion that only because of this depletion allowance has this field been able to exist.

Mr. Speaker, the depletion provision in the law has existed in one form or another since there was a tax on incomes. Successive Congresses, without regard to party majority control, have reviewed the depletion allowance and have found it sound in principle and in amount. It has been agreed that the effect of the provision was to aid in the discovery and development of oil and gas. Without it the producer would find it necessary to sell his capital assets and wind up his business. In my district and throughout my State, wells would be abandoned by the thousands in a short time if the administration's proposal should be accepted. The great and nationally important secondary recovery programs of the producers would be ended. Hundreds of millions of barrels of oil have been recovered under such programs that otherwise would be lost forever.

It would result in not alone a loss of oil to the Nation, but a loss in income taxes and would throw thousands out of work who are dependent upon stripper fields for their livelihood.

It would appear that the administration is trying to write off the stripper oil fields of the Nation as an economic casualty at a time when the small operator is struggling to exist. It seems the harder the people in the oil-producing business work, the more they risk, the more hazards they take to produce oil to meet the needs and demands of the Nation, the harder some Government bureaucrat works to think up a plan to stymie his efforts. To follow the recommendations of the administration would put a road block in the way of the stripper producer which would eventually put all stripper fields out of business. There should be no change in this law.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I agree 100 percent with my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]. We must protect these oil producers.

SECRETARY ACHESON'S FRIENDSHIP FOR HISS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans must have been shocked when they learned that Dean Acheson, our Secretary of State, had resorted to quoting the Bible to explain his reasons for his continued friendship for Alger Hiss, convicted of perjury about his giving of aid to ungodly Communist Russia and her henchmen, who deny Christ, and threaten everyone every place in this world who so much as dares publicly mention the word of God.

Mr. Speaker, our present Secretary has not only insulted every Christian in the world by quoting the Good Book in his support of Alger Hiss, but also our flag, the symbol of Christian constitutional Americanism, and everything for which it stands, has been dragged in the mire. Now I ask in all seriousness, why and how much longer will the State Department, with the apparent blessing of the White House, be permitted to give aid and comfort to the enemies of our liberties here as well as beyond our shores, while the deadly dagger of communism is stabbed in the hearts of decent people and nations all over the world?

Surely our President must be well aware of the fact that our Secretary of State must above all else have the full confidence and respect of the representatives of other Christian peace-loving people of the world in order to now foster, create, and perpetuate a strong

family of nations pledged to insure lasting peace and to protect and defend our Christian civilization against ruthless, barbarian, communistic aggression. Hence, it must be plain to every thinking person everywhere that Dean Acheson has by his recent utterances and avowed continued friendship for Alger Hiss rendered himself entirely helpless and ineffective to carry on the great responsibility of the office of Secretary of State of these United States of America.

Therefore, as a Representative of the American people and in all sincerity and humbleness, I respectfully urge our President to immediately request the resignation of the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, as on the disposition of this matter will rest our destiny and world peace.

THE ALGER HISS CASE

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the Alger Hiss case is an infamous page in history. In it we see how the Communists have gnawed away at the pillars of our Government, like termites eating away the foundation of our home. The high respect in which we have held the State Department is destroyed. The light of suspicion will be thrown on every act of the Department in the future.

Since the Hiss red herring was snagged by the House Un-American Activities Committee, I wonder how many more Communist sympathizers are hidden in the State Department.

Hiss is only an individual. But he had all of the great advantages our country has to offer. He was given the greatest of opportunities to serve his country during a crucial period in its history. He followed the wrong path.

This case, which has had all of the benefits of our broad system of justice, has been decided. Hiss, like all others who would destroy all that is good, is finished.

Our country has been alerted. Other Hisses must go regardless of the close friendship expressed for them by the Secretary of State.

THE ALGER HISS CASE AND VERMONT

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I feel constrained to say to those Members who have rather scornfully referred to the fact that Alger Hiss undertook to get a change of venue and be tried in Vermont, by reason of the fact that he was a summer resident there, that the insinuation and the implication that Vermont is saturated with Communists is unfair and is not true.

THE ALGER HISS CASE

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, our present Secretary of State has proved himself of poor judgment in the choice of friends; he has also proved himself not very adept in his choice of quotations from the Bible. How anyone can compare the perjurer, Alger Hiss, to the poor, needy, and unfortunate whom we have been told to care for in the name of Heaven, is more than I can see.

There is, however, one apt quotation that might be brought home to our Secretary of State and others, and that is this one from St. Matthew: "Depart from Me, ye that work iniquity."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper clipping.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address given by John W. Haynes, chairman of the Tax Foundation.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD concerning the relief of Indians in Montana.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of dead animals on our highways.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. CARROLL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mrs. DOUGLAS (at the request of Mr. CARROLL) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RIEHLMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

ALGER HISS

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I hold no brief for Alger Hiss or any other person who may be convicted of disloyalty to this great Government; however I would like to ask just who prosecuted and who convicted Alger Hiss? It was this Democratic administration.

The Republicans are so devoid of leadership and issues that they content themselves with hissing Hiss. If his conviction is sustained by the higher courts and he is eventually imprisoned, it will be no reflection on the President of the United States.

If it is found that Alger Hiss was disloyal to President Truman, we must remember that Benedict Arnold was disloyal to the Father of Our Country, George Washington.

DR. JAMES SHERA MONTGOMERY, CHAPLAIN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 453).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately following his resignation as Chaplain of the House of Representatives, James Shera Montgomery be, and he is hereby, appointed Chaplain emeritus of the House of Representatives, with salary at the basic rate of $2,350 per annum, payable monthly, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided by law.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD, and I also ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the subject of Dr. Montgomery.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing so nice in life as to meet a person with a fine mind. A person's name is one of identification, a person's racial origin is a matter of accident of birth, a person's color is the accident

of birth, and a person's religion is a matter of his own conscience. In my journey through life the accident of birth plays no part, in my opinion, of my fellow man. Difference of religion is one which I thoroughly respect, and all I ask is that others respect my right to my conscience and to my right to exercise of it. In my journey through life what I like to analyze is the minds of people that I meet, and when I meet a person with a nice mind he is nice, no matter what his name might be, and no matter what his racial origin might be, or his color, or religion.

One of the nicest men, one of the most influential minds constructively that I have met in my journey through life to date is our beloved chaplain, about to become our chaplain emeritus, Dr. James Shera Montgomery. I think it might well be said that he and Mrs. Montgomery have truly led a blessed life. Born 87 years ago, in 1862, 67 years a minister, an ambassador of God on earth; 30 years, short a few months, chaplain of this great body, he has left his imprint upon the mind of everyone who knew him in the past and who knows him now. Time passes, and in his life the time has arrived when the strain of active work can only be maintained by him under great difficulty and at the expense of his health.

You and I, recognizing the great man that he is, and the love that we have for him, the justification for our action will soon be to adopt unanimously the resolution that I have the honor to offer. You will note that he is chaplain emeritus; not chaplain in retirement. I might say that you will note that we are placing him in the chaplain emeritus status of this House with practically the full salary that he is now receiving; a justifiable consideration on our part.

I know that he and Mrs. Montgomery will derive great pleasure during the remaining years of their lives in the action of confidence that the House has evidenced by the adoption of this resolution. My hope and prayer is that God, in His infinite wisdom, will bless them both with many future years of happiness together. I know, no matter how long Dr. Montgomery lives, that he will be carrying on in that wonderful way of his; an inspiration to all whom he meets, doing to the maximum extent possible, in accordance with his faith and as a spiritual leader, the work of God on earth.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I join with my good friend, the distinguished majority leader, in support of this resolution. It is a resolution that tells of our esteem, our respect, and our admiration for a great man, a man who for years has taught the gospel of the Lord. His prayers here have been an inspiration to all of us who have been privileged to hear them. I am very happy to join in support of the resolution.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, to paraphrase the words of Abraham Lincoln, "Four score and seven years ago there was brought forth on this continent," today we can aptly apply those words to the birth of a man who has devoted himself to the spiritual leadership of this great legislative body. Hundreds of men have listened to him as his voice has been raised to Almighty God in supplication and in prayer.

Born during the fratricidal struggle in this great country, he has witnessed the most trying years of our national history. His faith has remained firm and steady, broad and tolerant. He has helped to inspire every man and woman who has come under the guidance of his leadership.

Now he retires to the quiet life of meditation and reflection and, under his own vine and fig tree, I know he will be comforted, inspired, and enheartened by the token of respect and esteem that is given him here today.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I do not believe that in the long history of this body there has been one who has labored here that has exercised so profound an influence for good upon his coworkers, his fellows, as has our sweet and gentle friend who now changes somewhat his relationship to this body.

Mr. Speaker, this good man has erected in the hearts of his associates an altar where each may worship. Wherever he goes or whatever he does, I believe it to be the desire of this House that the love of his fellows follow him. It is the prayer of all that the blessings of the Good Master continue to shower upon him.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. It was my privilege to know a little something about the preparation of this resolution. On behalf of all the Members of this House on both sides, I thank the distinguished leader on the Democratic side and the leader on the minority side and the Speaker, because these three men are entirely responsible for giving us an opportunity to do this fine thing that we are about to do—pass this resolution.

Mr. McCORMACK. I should like to include all the Members, because we are simply the conduit of the wishes of all the Members of the House. I appreciate the remarks made by my friend from Ohio, but I want the RECORD to show that the entire membership of the House were aware of or sensed that this event was going to happen, and they all concurred in it.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The distinguished majority leader has said there is nothing nicer than to meet a man with a nice mind. If there is anything nobler, it is a man with a fine spirit. Our beloved Chaplain is such a man. To me, the most impressive thing about him is not that he opened our sessions with inspiring prayers, which is the official and expected function of a chaplain, but that he has been a chaplain, in fact, to each one of us individually. The many associations and conversations we have had with him here on the floor and elsewhere have made as great a contribution to us personally and to the spirit of this body as have the beautiful prayers of adoration, aspiration, and devotion in which he has led us, challenging us and helping us to be the kind of Christian servants that the Representatives of this Christian Nation ought to be.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Dr. Montgomery lives in the same apartment building in which we reside. I have a few lines in mind which expresses my feelings toward Dr. Montgomery:

Oh, the comfort, the inexpressible comfort,
of feeling safe with a person,
Having neither to weigh thoughts nor words,
But pouring them all right out, chaff and
grain together,
Confident that a faithful hand will take them
and sift them, keep what is worth
keeping,
And with the breath of love and kindness
blow the rest away.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, having twice had the very distinguished honor of nominating the gentleman to whom we pay our respective tributes today as retiring Chaplain of the House of Representatives, I say I have done it on both occasions with the genuine feeling that here is a man who preaches to us—who talks to us; who leads us by his example in that he says, "Do not do what I say, but do as I do."

That as we all of us always know he has everywhere exemplified. He was, has been, and always will be, as Pope has said, "a minister, but a man."

Mr. McCORMACK. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the road to eternal and earthly happiness is to live close to God and to follow and obey His law. Dr. and Mrs. Montgomery have lived a happy life on earth and, while I am not the Judge, I am sure their eternal life will be favorably acted upon. They have led a happy life because they have both lived close to God.

Mr. RAYBURN. Dr. Montgomery has been with us a long time, during which he has endeared himself to us all—a man of high character, splendid ability, a man of God, a great soul. I feel a deep personal loss in his going. May his days be happy ones and his path an easy one.

"SILENCE, A HARD ARGUMENT TO BEAT"

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, our gentle, lovable, helpful Chaplain, the Rev. James Shera Montgomery is to become our Chaplain Emeritus of the House of Representatives.

It is difficult to add to the fine tributes already spoken for his labors among us. As much as any minister I have ever

known, he has fulfilled that prayer of St. Francis of Assisi:

Lord, make me an instrument of Thy peace;
Where there is hatred, let me sow love;
Where there is injury, pardon;
Where there is doubt, faith;
Where there is despair, hope;
Where there is darkness, light;
Where there is sadness, joy.

As has been mentioned, Dr. Montgomery's services as active Chaplain have not ended with the daily prayer that has opened sessions of the House. He has moved among us from day to day with a word of greeting, a word of cheer, a word of inspiration, friendly but never obtrusive.

I recall one day when the House was in a stormy mood. It was a question whether the debate was making votes or changing minds on either side of the issue that was up. Speeches were running toward personalities. Chaplain Montgomery happened to be seated beside me. I commented upon the fact that a certain member was holding himself pretty well under fire.

"My preacher father," Chaplain Montgomery remarked, "had a saying that went like this: 'Silence is a hard argument to beat.'"

I have been grateful for that observation many times.

"Silence is a hard argument to beat."

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I could not let this occasion pass without expressing my love and respect for our retiring Chaplain, Dr. James Shera Montgomery, who, for the past 29 years, has presided over this body as House Chaplain. As he retires, all of us wish for him real peace and contentment to which he is so greatly entitled, and that life will hold in store for both him and Mrs. Montgomery many, many enjoyable days together.

It is doubtful that Dr. Montgomery really understands just how great his influence has been over the many members of Congress who have been privileged to listen to his daily prayers. His prayers were always meaningful, sincere, and helpful. One of the things that has always attracted me to Dr. Montgomery has been the real glow of radiance on his face as he closed his eyes in prayer to Almighty God. One could understand and even visualize his nearness to the Master as the words came forth from the very depth of his heart. I might add that I hope it is not only my privilege but the privilege of all other Members of this House to live as near to their God as Dr. Montgomery has lived. Without doubt, there must today ring in the ears of the Chaplain the words of the Master when he said, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Dr. Montgomery's service of 29 years to the House of Representatives is deeply appreciated by us all. I heartily join with all other Members in unanimous passage of the present resolution.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is my great privilege to join in the tribute that has been paid our beloved Chaplain and to herein set forth my deep personal appreciation of the inspiration and moral stimulus I have had from the guidance he has given us during my brief membership in this House.

In this day when material things are too often exalted to the exclusion of religious truth it has been good to have been able to start each day with a word of spiritual encouragement from this great man. That his prayers have been selective indicates the care with which he daily sought to fit his appeal for divine help to the problem at hand, and I am sure that no legislation has been enacted that is not better for having had written into it a portion of that human charity which he has so consistently recommended.

The life a man lives and the evidences of great character are the qualities which wield influence far beyond the power of the spoken word, and I am sure that all of us in the Congress are not only better public servants but are in fact better men for having had the opportunity to travel a part of this life's journey with this great Christian gentleman. May the God to whom he has shown such constant devotion continue to guide and protect him and his beloved helpmate as they relax from their labors and enjoy a bit of well-earned rest.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

RESIGNATION OF CHAPLAIN

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

JANUARY 30, 1950.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SPEAKER: It is with regret that I submit herewith my resignation as Chaplain of the House, to take effect February 1. Due to the condition of my health this becomes necessary.

Allow me to assure you of my great appreciation of our long associations through these years; they will remain in my grateful memory while time passes by. The Congress will always be very near to my heart; may generous blessings of a loving Father abide with each and every Member, officer, and employee is my prayer.

Ever faithfully yours,
JAMES SHERA MONTGOMERY.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF REV. BERNARD BRASKAMP AS CHAPLAIN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 454).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Rev. Bernard Braskamp, of the District of Columbia, be, and he is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 398, relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 398 with Mr. SMITH of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time and obtained unanimous consent to speak out of order because I feel it necessary, at the earliest possible moment, to correct some misinformation which has been given to the American people recently.

I refer to the reports which have been published in the public press of a speech made by one of my colleagues, the Honorable FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR., in New York on Saturday night.

When I first read this report I was a little disturbed and perhaps a little irked and angry over it. At that time I thought that I should take the floor for perhaps a longer period.

I attempted to reach the gentleman from New York this morning to tell him I would take the floor today, and failed to find him at his office. I was told that I could reach him at Murray Hill 8-3200 in New York, about noon or this afternoon today. So, I have been unable to reach him to tell him that I was going to comment on his speech and this press article.

Then, a little later this morning, I discussed the whole matter with one of his colleagues and friends, who said to me, "Clarence, if I were you I would not let Junior's speech concern me too much. You should be big-hearted and magnanimous in your actions. You should realize that this young man has been in Congress only a short time; and that he has not been in attendance at too many sessions of the Congress and he has, therefore, not had the same opportunity to know just what goes on in the Congress that many of us have who are more regular in our attendance. So you should not be too critical of him, because perhaps he has obtained his information as to what is going on in the Congress in a second-hand way by reading warped reports in the papers, rather than through first-hand information in the Halls of Congress."

That gave me cause to stop and think. I realized, as the gentleman told me, there is grave concern among many of the friends of this fine young man, Mr. ROOSEVELT, over the fact that he is not here as much as they would like to see him. So I decided I had better check up to see whether that was a legitimate reason for not being too critical of him.

I checked this morning, and I find that on 129 roll calls in the House between the time he entered it and January 27, Mr. ROOSEVELT was absent on 69 roll calls, or failed to respond, and answered on only 60 roll calls; that on 65 roll calls on important measures in that period of time, he voted on only 30, and was absent 35 times when the roll was called, or at least failed to answer.

So I do not want to be too critical of the gentleman. I just want to set him right, if I may.

In his speech he commented on FEPC. Incidentally, he does not give the Republican Membership of the House, who voted the same way he did on the 21-day discharge rule, any credit whatsoever; therefore that was entirely a victory of his particular group within the Democratic Party, he claimed. I am sorry that the gentleman did so.

He saw fit to attack a former great Senator from Massachusetts, Henry Cabot Lodge, claiming that he torpedoed somebody or other in some administration or other. I cannot help but feel it was not in good taste for him to attack the dead. There have been times when I have had the urge to say some things about certain deceased persons, but I have resisted the impulse because of the feeling that it was an indelicate thing to do. I hope the gentleman will not do such a thing again.

Then he gets down to where he talks about me, and that is why I am here. I quote from the New York Times, which quotes him:

> Next, Senator TAFT's campaign manager, one Mr. CLARENCE BROWN of Ohio, who only the week before had pledged to the Civil Rights Mobilization Conference in Washington that he would vote FEPC out of the Rules Committee, forgot to practice what he preached and voted with four Dixiecrats only last Tuesday against the FEPC coming out of the Rules Committee.

Before I comment on that I should like to read the next sentence:

> Mr. ROOSEVELT referred only indirectly to his dispute with Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr.

There are several misstatements of fact in that report. I would like to advise the gentleman, and I am advising him here and now on the floor of the House, despite the fact that he is absent, only because I do not want to permit this misinformation to go further—that, first of all, I am not Senator TAFT'S campaign manager. I am a candidate myself out in Ohio; and while I am very strong for the Senator and am proud to say that in my opinion he will be reelected overwhelmingly next November, I am not his campaign manager. I hope, therefore, that the attempt to involve Senator TAFT in House activities will come to naught.

Second, I have never been called upon, or never had the opportunity to appear before the Civil Rights Mobilization Conference in Washington or anywhere else; and, therefore, I have made it no pledges. I have not, to my knowledge, received any letters, and I am sure that I have not personally answered any letters from this organization.

Then, I wish to call attention to the fact that the press of the country carried the story as to why I voted as I did against reporting FEPC from rules; and I am sure the gentleman from New York would not want a great moral issue such as FEPC brought to the floor of this House through subterfuge or trickery. I, as the ranking Republican member on the committee present that day, tried to protect two of my Republican associates on that committee in their right to be heard and their right to participate and their right to vote on that important question. The gentleman from New York failed to say that such had been explained on the floor and that I later had made a motion to reconsider so as to keep this FEPC bill alive for further consideration by the Rules Committee at an early date.

I think also he has failed to mention here that I have voted for a great deal of civil-rights legislation in the past and that I did vote to report a FEPC bill in a previous Congress, so as to send it to the floor. The gentleman should further understand that I have always reserved the right, not only on this FEPC bill, but on every other bill, to vote on it when it reaches the floor according to the dictates of my own conscience, and according to my own discretion and best judgment.

I hope the gentleman will stand corrected and that he will be just a little more careful in the future in referring to the actions taken by Members of this House.

In conclusion, if I may be permitted, let me speak just a few words of general political philosophy. I would like to say to all of the Members of the House that after 35 years of experience in public office and a long term of service in this House, I am convinced no one can learn the rules of procedure for this House in any New York night club. I am also convinced from my political experience, and I want to say this to all of you as good advice, that no one can solve any of these great social and legislative problems which confront us through nocturnal meditations on Fifty-second Street. We can solve them only by staying on the job right here.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I hope the membership will bear with me for a few minutes so that I may get one or two fundamental problems involved in this legislation clearly before the House.

It has been suggested that this legislation is complicated and that it is technical. So it is as to the details. But the basic principles involved in this legislation are not complicated.

When we speak of farm legislation, most people think of what is known as the price-support program, which is not before the House today. The only question before the House today is the question of allocating acreage and production between the various growers of cotton and incidently to the growers of peanuts. It is solely a question of dividing the production that is to be allowed between those who are in the business of growing cotton. This bill does not involve price supports.

There are those who feel that the basic farm legislation—that is, price-support legislation—is solely for the benefit of farmers. They are wrong. Obviously the immediate effect of price support is to help the farmers but, clearly, it provides markets for the mills and factories and employment for the laboring man, thereby stabilizing the economy of the entire Nation; and it is upon that fact that we are justified in supporting such legislation.

We come then to the question of the allocation of cotton acreage. For whose benefit do we allocate acreage? Do we do it for the benefit of the cotton farmer? Why, certainly not. Every cotton farmer would be delighted if he could grow all he could plant to cotton and get a good price for it. We limit the acreage a farmer may plant to cotton. We limit the acreage of peanuts or of any other farm crop primarily for the benefit of the taxpayer. That is who we are trying to protect in all acreage-limitation legislation. Acreage allotments and marketing quotas are primarily for the benefit of the American taxpayer, not primarily for the benefit of any farmer or group of farmers. They are imposed so that there may be a reasonable limitation upon the obligation of the Government under the support program which is so essential to our entire economic welfare. So when we come to you with a program to limit the production of any farm crop, remember that we are not coming as special pleaders for farmers, but as advocates of moderation in the expenditure of public funds.

We came to you last summer with a proposal to limit the production of cotton from more than 27,000,000 acres, actually planted last year, so that it could not exceed 21,000,000 acres in the year of 1950. That is a substantial reduction.

At the same time we provided a substantial reduction in legal maximum, because had we not passed that bill last summer the law as it then stood, provided that the Secretary of Agriculture could not cut the cotton acreage below about 27,400,000 acres. So we cut 6,400,000 acres off of the legal maximum cotton acreage that the farmers of the United States could grow. That is a very substantial cut. If you will think in terms of industry—of cutting General Motors by any such percentage, or cutting the wages of any great group of workers in this country by any such percentage, you will readily appreciate the tremendous cut that has been given the production of the cotton farmers of this Nation. And this cut in production came along with a declining market, because remember that the price of cotton has gone down. Remember that the parity price of cotton has gone down and as parity goes down the support price goes down. The actual market price of cotton has already dropped approximately 25 percent in the last 3 years, and now the cotton farmer is taking a cut in production of approximately that amount. Surely everybody must agree that the cotton farmer is paying a rather high price for his price support. Very

few other farmers take any such reduction in return for the support of their prices. No group of workers take such a cut in their hours of employment in return for their minimum wage. Surely in view of the sacrifices that the cotton farmer is making to justify the price-support program, no fair-minded citizen would want the acreage allotments or the marketing quotas on cotton to be unfair or inequitable. If the operation of the law either through defects in its drafting or its administration results in an injustice to some farmers, I am sure that every Member of this House would want to correct those injustices just as far as we can.

Certainly we did not write a perfect law, I am sure; neither was it administered by supermen. It was administered by ordinary men just like you and I, and it did result in many inequities. In my own State a large part of the injustice resulted from what I consider to be a misinterpretation of the law we wrote. I speak as one representing the great State of Texas that has more than one-third of the total cotton acreage of America. In that State, through some kind of fumbling—I do not want to charge anybody with anything more serious; therefore I say through somebody's fumbling—there was imposed a formula that no one had thought could be imposed; which the subcommittee had been assured would not be imposed, but it was imposed after 10,000 acres of cotton were snatched out of clear air and added to our 1948 acreage so as to allegedly bring us 93 acres—93 out of 10,300,000 more acres under the formula known as the California gadget. Texas, a third of cotton-producing America, was arbitrarily placed under this formula which denies to our State all credit for the war crops our farmers had grown, in reliance on the promise of our Government to count such crops as cotton.

During the war the Government asked farmers who would otherwise have been required to go back into cotton to hold their allotments, not to plant cotton but instead to plant crops which were considered to be of greater immediate value to the war effort. These were known as war crops. This Congress by what is known as Public Law 12 promised the farmers that if they would stay out of cotton, they would lose no advantage in future years. The shift from cotton to war crops was particularly heavy through a great strip of Texas extending from the Gulf coast to the Red River and embracing particularly the country known as the Redlands, the Blacklands, the Cross Timbers, and the South Texas Prairies. The bill we passed last fall made specific provisions for credit for these war crops. I had insisted on that.

It also had a provision which stated that "notwithstanding any other provision of law," the Secretary should give each county credit for all of the war crops grown in the county. I think this provision clearly prevailed over any gadget or formula, but the Department held otherwise and held that Texas was entitled to no credit. We do not contend that our State is entitled to any more acres. We realize that the acres already allotted us are substantially the same from a State-wide standpoint as the acres we would receive had the law been properly interpreted, but it makes a tremendous difference as to where those acres go within the State. Had the counties that shifted to war crops been given credit for their production, there would have been a much more even distribution of cotton over the State. As it is, there are counties in Texas that have a factor as small as 1.6 percent. That means farmers in these counties can plant only 1.6 acres in cotton out of each hundred acres they have in cultivation. There are something like 50 counties in the State that have a factor less than 10 percent. That means that in these counties nobody can afford to grow cotton. There are probably 25 counties, possibly a few less, that have county factors of more than 50 percent. That means that in these favored counties anyone who is a cotton grower can put more than half of his land in cotton and must follow cotton with cotton in order to plant his allotment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman, of course, is talking about the quota law of 1949 which this resolution seeks to remedy.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that under this resolution the situation complained of would be substantially alleviated and hardships will be prevented.

Mr. POAGE. I think if this resolution passes as it is brought before this House, and with the amendments that might be desirable, that it will give very substantial relief, and it is for that reason that I urge you to support this resolution which will, in the first place, assure to every cotton farmer 70 percent of his average plantings for the basic 3 years, 1946, 1947, and 1948. The resolution now also provides that every cotton farmer will get 50 percent of the highest acreage he planted in any 1 of those 3 years. I hope that we would be well advised to eliminate that, not that I would like to eliminate it, but because I feel that we must keep the acreage added by this bill just as low as possible. This is a bill to relieve hardship, not a bill to enable people to make substantial money. We must keep it as low as possible, else we cannot expect to receive widespread support. It is for that reason that we have limited the new acreage authorized by this measure to 40 percent of a man's tilled acres, under any circumstances.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I would like to add to what the distinguished gentleman from Texas has stated, that not only was there no intention on the part of our committee or any member of our committee that the so-called Memphis agreement or California gadget would apply to his State, but both the gentleman from Texas and I had been assured that that would not be done.

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly right. We had positive assurance that Texas would not fall under that formula, but they turned right around and brought us under that formula.

I again direct your attention to the provisions of the bill. This bill provides that each cotton farmer may have at least 70 percent of his average plantings during the base period, not to exceed 40 percent of his total tilled acres. This 40-percent provision is a limitation on our generosity. It is to protect the taxpayers by making sure that this bill will not be used to do more than relieve those now suffering with unfair allotments. It is written in the same words we used under the old law. This wording was in the law in 1938 and remained there till 1949. We put them back as a limitation to protect the taxpayer, not to protect the farmer, but to see to it that the man who must pay the bill will not be called upon to support an unreasonably large acreage. We ask only that those farmers who have been seriously discriminated against, those farmers who have been cut so low that they cannot stay in business, be given an opportunity to have just a minimum to stay in business. We are not asking that anybody make any substantial money out of this bill.

This resolution does not take any acres away from anybody, and it does not propose to give any acres to anybody except those who are now suffering, who have taken a cut of more than 30 percent of their average plantings, and we believe that that is not asking too much of a reasonable House. We should pass it with all dispatch. Impossible as it may seem to some of my northern colleagues, cotton planting has already begun in the lower valley of Texas. We should act at once.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

UNIFICATION, THE NAVY AIR POWER, AND THE MARINE CORPS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the attention of the House is called to an article of vital interest to all those who desire to understand some of the issues underlying the current conflicts over our national military policies.

The article to which reference is made was printed in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Volume 95, Page A6266, under the extension of remarks of the Honorable CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas, entitled "Sea Power and a National General Staff," and written by Lt. Col. J. D. Hittle, United States Marine Corps. The article first appeared in the October issue of the Naval Institute Proceedings. Because it was carried in an issue of the RECORD just prior to adjournment, there were many who probably missed it. Permit me to call your attention to this article and commend it to your attention, for I consider it one of the most significant studies of the problem of top-level direction of our armed forces that has yet appeared.

This article is of unusual interest and importance as it sets forth the reasons why adoption of a national—or supreme—general staff system would lead

to inevitable disaster in our country. With careful attention to historical fact, the author relates the manner in which the supreme general staff of Germany served as the means by which the Army and the Air Force were able to combine their efforts to bring about the destruction of German sea power. It will not take any imagination on the part of the reader to see that there is a clearly discernable similarity between what happened to the German Navy under a supreme general staff and what many thoughtful persons contend is happening to United States naval power at the present time when the naval element almost invariably is in the minority position where issues arise in a meeting of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Readers will also find much food for thought in the author's careful explanation of how a supreme general staff system in this country will mean the end of a naval air arm and the end of a Marine Corps capable of carrying out the duties assigned to those elements by Congress in the National Security Act of 1947. Although a national general staff has been and still is strongly supported by some high Army and Air Force persons, the House of Representatives has traditionally and, in my opinion, correctly rejected such proposals for establishing a Prussian-type national general staff, as such an agency would be alien to our democratic form of government and unresponsive to our requirements of national security. After reading this article, it would seem that Members of the House will feel a deep satisfaction in the realization that it was largely through the efforts of the House that the National Security Act of 1947 and the amendments in 1949 pointedly rejected the Prussian-derived proposals of those who would impose such a politically dangerous and militarily inefficient staff system on our Nation. Also, after reading this article, I hope that Members will find reason to be more determined than ever to ascertain whether or not our defense officials are actually at the present time proceeding with the development of a de facto national general staff in violation of the specific provisions of the National Security Act. That such a supreme general staff is now being developed would seem to be a logical interpretation of the testimony of certain high officers before the Armed Services Committee during its hearings last October.

There is another reason why this article is of more than passing interest. Lt. Col. J. D. Hittle, United States Marine Corps, is unusually qualified to write about a national general staff system, as he is a widely recognized military historian and writer. Among his works is the standard text on staff history, a book entitled "The Military Staff—Its History and Development."

Nor can Sea Power and a National General Staff be brushed aside—as many would like to do—as an oblique attack on unification. In the first place, the article pointedly supports the action of this Congress in its decision to prohibit the establishment of a supreme staff system. In taking such a stand, the author is helping explain why members of Congress were correct in their insistence on such provisions in the National Security Act. Such an attitude on the part of a professional military man is a reassuring discovery, particularly at the present time when there is unremitting pressure to have Congress abandon our war-proven American-developed military concepts, substituting therefor the inferior ideas and methods of our defeated enemies.

It was my privilege to be chairman of the House Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments at the time that committee was charged with writing the National Security Act of 1947. As former chairman of that committee I can say that I know of no other person in the armed forces who worked harder or who contributed more than did Lieutenant Colonel Hittle to the cause of constructive unification of the armed forces. And by constructive unification I mean that kind of unification we hoped for in passing the National Security Act of 1947, a unification that would bring genuine economy and efficiency under a system that would be in complete harmony with our form of government and our peculiar security requirements, a kind of unification that would be characterized by all elements of the armed services willingly accepting the decision of Congress as to the functions each would perform in making its contribution to a more effective national security. Constructive unification did not mean the kind of a so-called unification that would be used as the instrument for effecting the destruction of our balanced naval power based upon strong naval aviation and a powerful Marine Corps capable of discharging the functions assigned by Congress in the National Security Act of 1947; nor did it mean the kind of a unification that would lead to eventual establishment of a de facto national general staff.

For these reasons, and many more, the article, Sea Power and a National General Staff, is again committed to the attention of all members of the House.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I am wondering how it happens that the Committee on Agriculture brings out a bill of this enormous size without any published hearings that might be available to the membership during its consideration?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will yield to the chairman of my committee for an explanation.

Mr. COOLEY. I shall be very glad to explain it.

We regard this as emergency legislation, due to the fact that cotton planting time is near at hand. Had we taken the time to have extended hearings we probably could not have gotten it passed in time to be of any benefit. We did extend an invitation to every Member of Congress to come to the committee room for the purpose of discussing proposed changes in the quota law.

There was no real demand from any farm organization to appear, because apparently all farm organization men know and did know that this law had resulted in many inequities.

May I say to the gentleman that in the consideration of the quota law of 1949 perhaps more consideration was given to that one bill than any other bill that has been before the committee in a decade. The gentleman who is now addressing the House was a member of the subcommittee and I am sure will substantiate the statement I have just made. Nothing could have been accomplished by holding hearings, because I think we had all the information before us that was needed.

Mr. TABER. The thing that disturbs me more about it is that the rule was granted on Thursday and the bill was taken up on Friday. If the hearings had been sent to the Government Printing Office on Thursday they would have been available on Friday.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I recollect it, no reporters were present to make a transcript of the testimony that was given to the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much distressed to be forced into a position where I must oppose this legislation. I voted against the reporting of the bill in the committee and I am opposing the bill now. I am disturbed, nevertheless, because I have been on the committee a good long time, I have worked with the gentleman from the cotton areas, and I have generally concurred in all of the proposals and ideas they have had for legislative consideration with reference to cotton and the other commodities.

I do not think there is a single man on the committee from the cotton areas who will get up and say now that for the last 23 years I have ever opposed any cotton legislation they have proposed in the committee. If there is a Representative from the cotton area who will now say that I have opposed him in the committee or on the floor on cotton proposals, I would like to hear it.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WORLEY. I doubt if anyone can say that, but we think that is too good a record for the gentleman to break this late in the game.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman, who is not only a distinguished Member but has the reputation of being the handsomest man in the House of Representatives. I have high regard for him.

There is such a thing as an individual or group of individuals having their cake and eating it too. That is what we are running into in this legislation. The Committee will be interested in knowing that we have approximately 21,300,000 bales of cotton on hand. That is the cotton report issued by the Department of Agriculture to be released today. Approximately 8,000,000 bales of cotton are used in domestic consumption. It is es-

timated that 5,000,000 bales of cotton will be exported. I think that figure is a little high. But that makes 13,000,000 bales. That leaves approximately 8,000,000 bales for a carry-over into the next crop year. Officials of the Department of Agriculture appeared before our committee and stated that the production of cotton for 1950 should be on an acreage of between 16,000,000 and 18,000,000 acres, instead of 27,000,000 acres which was the acreage in 1949. I was on the cotton subcommittee. We sat for weeks and weeks on this cotton-quota law to determine—in other words to let the cotton boys write the cotton-quota law. I sat there and agreed with them. They had a lot of difficulty in agreeing amongst themselves, but they finally agreed that instead of having the 18 million acres recommended by the Department of Agriculture they would raise the ante so that there would be 21,000,000 acres for the 1950 cotton crop. Now they come before the House and ask to have that increased by 1,500,000 acres. That will give you a total of 22,500,000 acres, which is a reduction of only four and a half million acres or so from the acreage last year. The additional acreage will produce between eight hundred and nine hundred thousand bales of cotton additional.

Mind you, we are going to have about 8,000,000 bales of cotton in this country as a carry-over. The Department of Agriculture estimates that they will have in the current year approximately 6,000,000 bales under Government ownership and loan. Then we will go to work and raise a large crop in 1950. If we have the same weather conditions as we had last year or if they produce, let us say, an average of 300 pounds to the acre, that will give a total of 13,500,000 bales of cotton for 1950. Then you add the 8,000,000 bales carry-over and you still have 21,500,000 bales in the 1950–51 crop. So, you are just exactly where you were to start with.

The extra 8,000,000 bales of cotton will be in the hands of the United States Government. We have enough on hand so that they would not have to plant more than ten or twelve million acres of cotton this year to take care of the exports and safe domestic requirements.

This year we have a 90 percent of parity support price for cotton. That also goes for wheat and other basic commodities. This is the last year we will have 90 percent of parity support for cotton under the old formula because with the tremendous supplies we now have on hand and with what will be produced in the coming crop year, parity will go to 80 percent of parity under the old formula for the 1951 crop unless we pass legislation to revise it.

Therefore, this increase in acreage will mean that the Government will be the owner of at least 8,000,000 or 9,000,000 bales of cotton which some people, of course, think is the proper thing to do. The Government's investment in this cotton will be around $1,200,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. In view of the colloquy between the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from New York about there being no hearings, I would like to know whether or not the Department of Agriculture has issued a report on this bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I understand that the Secretary of Agriculture wrote a four-page letter, that I have not had an opportunity to see. The only letter I saw was a letter that appeared in the paper, from the Secretary to Mr. Klein, accusing Mr. Klein or the Farm Bureau of writing the cotton-quota law of last year. I take issue with that, because I sat on the cotton subcommittee, and I think our chairman will bear me out that the cotton-quota law was written by members of the Committee on Agriculture, who were interested in cotton production.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman entirely.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. So the Farm Bureau did not have a thing to do with writing the law, although the Secretary says that Mr. Klein, of the Farm Bureau Federation, wrote the law. The Committee on Agriculture wrote that cotton-quota law—after the members on the committee from the cotton area composed their differences and wrote the quota provisions of the cotton-quota law of 1949, which we are now told is not satisfactory. The small farmers, by and large, have gotten their quotas, but there has been a larger cotton acreage in some areas which produce a substantial portion of the cotton.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. The statement has been made that the need for this legislation is due to the failure of administration of the other act. Who was responsible for the mismanagement? Can the gentleman answer that?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, I do not know. It has been rumored around that the act has not been administered according to the intent of Congress. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE], who made the statement on the rule the other day, made that statement. I do not like to say anything about the Secretary of Agriculture and his men in the Department. They are probably trying to do the best job they can, but I am satisfied that if they would carry out the act of 1949 according to the intent of Congress, and according to the intent that we had in the Committee on Agriculture, there would be no need for this legislation today.

Now, I just want to say another word about cotton. In all the years that I have been a member of the Committee on Agriculture I have wanted to keep the cotton farmers prosperous. I have taken the same attitude toward the tobacco farmers, the wheat and the corn farmers, but we have not had the same consideration from gentlemen who are representing those areas as we have accorded to them. I refer in particular to the devastating damage that they have done to the great dairy industry of this country, where we have several million dairy farmers who are literally being put out of business. We are cut down on our dairy products market in the country. We are hemmed in through that great-Midwestern area. With a cut in the corn acreage and with a cut in the wheat acreage and not being able to produce cotton or tobacco in our area, we just cannot produce anything. So I hope that my friends from the South, who may be somewhat critical of me because I am taking the position that I am today in opposition to this legislation, will have a little more consideration for our great dairy industry, rather than try to hog everything for themselves. They know they are in a business that is gradually going out of business, and I have every sympathy for them. I want to have a proper workable agricultural program in this country. I want to do my part for the cotton farmers of the United States, and I will do that whether we have a Democratic administration or a Republican administration. I ask the same consideration from them when they consider agriculture in other areas.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question with respect to corn. If in the commercial corn area where we face an anticipated reduction in acreage of approximately 20 percent whether the reduction will be on a percentage basis such as is being done here?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois that the same proposition was brought up and considered by the committee before this resolution was reported. Certainly, the gentleman knows that I cannot speak for the House Committee on Agriculture, but I may say for myself that if it becomes necessary for legislation to be enacted which will enable the corn growers to cope with the situation—and I believe I speak for other members of the committee likewise—that we will consider the matter immediately, just as we did with regard to wheat. We first had a provision in this resolution dealing with wheat; and when the resolution was introduced by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] I immediately appointed a subcommittee, and the problems facing the wheat farmers are now being considered by a subcommittee. I would expect to do the

same think if a similar situation arose with regard to the corn farmers.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that a death blow was struck at the buying power of the hog farmer, the dairy farmer, and the poultry farmer when the last agricultural bill was passed? And also when the oleo bill was passed? This reduces the buying power for cotton goods which the South is so much interested in.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is no question about that.

Mr. JENSEN. And so we are likely to have a carry-over even higher than the gentleman from Minnesota expects?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The carry-over, whatever it is, will go into the hands of the Government and there is where it will be, excepting the amount that is exported and will be paid for by the American people and given away to other countries through the ECA.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. HOEVEN. I am glad the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] propounded the question he did to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, as to just what treatment we might expect if problems arise as to the corn acreage allotment or even the soybean acreage allotment. Let me confirm what the chairman stated here on the floor of this House, that if such problems arise, the Committee on Agriculture, according to my understanding, will give such problems immediate consideration. Am I correct?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is entirely correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield for a brief question.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee if we are to understand by this colloquy that this is just the prelude to bringing in bills which will increase the corn acreage and the wheat acreage as well as the cotton acreage?

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly not. The Members on that side were addressing themselves a moment ago to the question of a reduction in corn acreage rather than an increase.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It is not confined to wheat?

Mr. COOLEY. No; the increase involved in this bill resulted from inequities which came about through the law we passed in 1949.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. We are not to expect then, that this is a prelude to additional corn acreage and additional wheat acreage?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield.

Mr HOEVEN. So there will be no mistake let me say that as far as the corn area is concerned the corn acreage allotment program has not as yet been broken down to the county and township levels. We do not know at this moment whether we are going to have any problems or not, perhaps not; but if we do, it is the understanding that such problems will have the immediate consideration of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, my good friend from Minnesota, and he is a good friend of mine, the gentleman who next to the former chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], is the ranking member of the committee, left the impression with this group that there is a great amount of surplus cotton on hand today. He estimated that there would be 8,000,000 bales of cotton on hand on August 1, 1950. The gentleman's estimate is correct. There are expected to be on hand on July 31, the start of a new year, 8,021,000 bales of cotton.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to page 14 of the House report where you will see what the cotton carry-over is in various years. In 1938, at the time that the Agricultural Adjustment Act was passed, there was a carry-over of 11,533,000 bales; in 1939, 13,033,000 bales; in 1940, 10,564,000 bales; and 1941, 12,166,000 bales. So by looking at this report it can be readily ascertained that the 8,000,000-bale estimate on August 1, 1950, would not be an excessive carry-over because we went into the war in 1941 with a carry-over of 12,166,000 bales.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. But in those figures we are showing a decrease in the carry-over, which the gentleman, I am sure, will agree is a desirable trend?

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes. May I say to the gentleman that in the bill we passed in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress we provided that acreage will be limited in 1951 to that number of acres estimated by the Department of Agriculture, which would result in the production of 1,000,000 bales less than the domestic consumption plus exports for that year. So in future years we would deduct 1,000,000 bales from the carry-over each time under the law now on the statute books, which is most reasonable and proper.

Let me call attention to why we are here. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture called us to Washington on the 12th day of December for the purpose of doing something about these inequities that exist. What were these inequities? Here they are. I hold in my hand some letters. Here is a man who says he has 261 acres of cropland, and he gets 30 acres of cotton. Here is a man who has 160. He gets only 32 acres of cotton to earn a livelihood. Here is another letter from a man who has 12 acres on one farm and 59 acres on another in cultivation. He gets 5 acres of cotton. Here is another small farmer who says he had planted 50 acres in 1946 to cotton, 55 acres in 1947, and 63 acres in 1948. He is given 5 acres of cotton. Here is another letter from a man who has a 160-acre farm. One hundred and ten acres of cotton were planted in 1949, 100 acres in 1948, 95 acres in 1947. He is given an allotment of 36.2 acres. Here is a letter from a large farmer who has 1,001 acres of cotton. That was in 1947. In 1948 he had 1,030 acres and in 1949, 1,150 acres. He gets an allotment of 485 acres, a reduction of about 70 percent. These low allotments are the result of the percent of cropland approach to the problem and, further, because the county committees did not reserve enough of the 15-percent reserve to remedy these hardships. I hope this resolution is passed with a minimum of delay.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, may I call attention to the statement on page 2 of the report that it never was the intention of the Congress that any inequities, no matter how small, should result from the application of the cotton-quota law. The purpose of this resolution is to authorize insofar as possible action to remedy these inequities.

The gentleman from Minnesota made the statement a minute ago that if Public Law 272 had been administered according to the intent of Congress there would be no need for this legislation. I think by that statement he has admitted that there is a need for this legislation.

I am in favor of controlled acreage for our cotton. I realize that we must have a reduction in acreage. If I thought that this resolution would permit an acreage which would exceed the 21,000,000 acres authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture, in conformity with Public Law 272, I would not want to support this resolution.

I do know that there is a need to adjust the inequities that have come about through the administration of Public Law 272. I do know that under the administration of that law—and it was not the intent of Congress—that we have allocated to many farmers in my district, as well as in all the cotton districts throughout the United States, acreage that is not going to be used. I do think that with this resolution which we will vote on here that there will be an opportunity for a reallocation and for those acres to be used by the farmers who need them very badly.

Most every Member has indicated here the great reduction that has been taken by farmers; in many cases a 70-percent reduction. We know that the statement was made that we expected a national reduction of 23 percent of their acreage from last year. We do know, and I have it in my district, that farmers are being cut more than 60 to 70, and in some cases having a cut of 80 percent. Now, that was not the intent of Congress. We can largely correct most of these inequities by adopting House Joint Resolution 398.

No doubt, when it is in order, various amendments will be offered to this resolution. While many of us might not

agree entirely with the percentage figures and some of the other minor provisions which have been included in this resolution, and would favor some of the provisions which were omitted from the original Cooley amendment, I think we must appreciate the fact that at least a majority of the members of the Committee on Agriculture have agreed on the provisions which are included in this proposal and which I am willing to accept in the belief that it will not only clarify but will serve to implement the intent of the original legislation which is now Public Law 272.

I realize it is confusing to Members who are not familiar with the problems which exist in a cotton-producing area to understand why all the Representatives from cotton-producing districts are not in entire agreement on legislation which will correct the inequities which are being brought to your attention. Suffice to say the problems are not identical in every State. In fact, it would be practically impossible for the farmers in any one county to agree on a formula which would serve their individual purposes 100 percent. By the referendum vote last December an overwhelming majority of the cotton farmers have indicated their approval of a cotton-allotment and marketing-quota program in order to enjoy the benefits of price supports, and generally speaking, I believe that an overwhelming majority realize that we must limit the 1950 planting to an acreage which will not exceed 21,000,000 acres. I believe that the legislation which we are considering here today will accomplish this goal.

I want to also call this to your attention, that a lot of people do not want to help the big planter. I am not here talking for the big planter. I am talking for those renters and sharecroppers who are living on these big plantations. I have one friend who has about 79 families living on his farm. These people are renters. That man has been planting about 80 to 90 percent of his acreage in cotton. However, he is in a county which has had a comparatively small percentage of the total county acreage in cotton, and the percentage in that county is only 16 percent, which means that there will be approximately 50 families on that 1 plantation who are going to be dislocated and who will have to try to seek some other place on which to live, and that is going to be hard to find, because they are cotton farmers.

I am in favor of a controlled acreage. I am in favor of reducing the national acreage, but I do say that this law is necessary to correct the inequities which presently exist.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, I was distinctly surprised and very sorry to hear my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] say that he was going to oppose this bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think the gentleman was in the committee when we had the vote on it, and I think he will say that I voted against it.

Mr. WORLEY. The gentleman is correct; the gentleman voted against it, but I thought by this time he would have seen the error of his ways.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And I did so with a great deal of reluctance because of my great admiration for the gentleman from Texas and his associates.

Mr. WORLEY. I appreciate those words very much.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a perfect bill by any means. There is no way in the world, and there are not enough brains in the Committee on Agriculture or in the House or in the Department of Agriculture to write a bill which will be completely equitable and fair to all sections and all growers of the cotton industry. In fact, there is no way in the world that you can write a bill that is going to be perfect so long as it involves, as it must necessarily do, an acreage reduction.

Experience has shown that the first bill passed by the Congress was not perfect, but it certainly was not because the Subcommittee on Cotton, so ably headed by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], did not do its utmost in the consideration of the bill. That group worked for many weeks hearing witness after witness. All who wanted to be heard had the opportunity. This bill now before us is not perfect. For example, I have 28 counties in my congressional district, about 15 of which grow cotton. Although this bill will add approximately 34,000 acres to those 15 counties, at the same time at least 4 of those counties have stated repeatedly that the only way we could care for their problem would be to allow 10,000 acres additional to each one of those counties. If you allot 10,000 acres additional for each of 15 counties, you allot 150,000 new acres. If exception were made in this instance then every other county in the country would be entitled to the same consideration.

We must keep the amount of cotton acreage as low as we can keep it, and still be as fair to all cotton growers as we can be, without running the risk of bankrupting the Government. Ninety-one percent of the people who grow cotton in this country said they were willing to trust the Government to work out the fairest program possible. They said in effect that in exchange for price supports they would be willing to accept acreage allotments and trust our Government to work out as fair a program as could be devised.

This legislation on cotton is just a forerunner of what is going to come in connection with corn-acreage allotments, wheat-acreage allotments, and all other acreage-allotment problems in connection with other agricultural commodities enjoying price supports. In the original cotton-acreage-allotment bill we attempted to put the administration as close to home as it was possible to place it. I do not say the fault was entirely in the act itself or in the administration of the act. It seems to me it was a combination of both.

May I say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that I deeply regret to see the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], retire from Congress. In about 9 years of service in this body I have never seen anyone who worked harder, not only on cotton, but on all other agricultural bills, than the gentlemen from Georgia. I know he worked himself virtually to the point of exhaustion on this particular measure. I hope that his constituents will not let him quit, but will send him back for many years to come.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who early saw that the operation of the act which we passed last fall was going to be most disastrous to that whole section of the cotton South where the first cotton was planted in this country and where the cotton gin itself was invented.

For instance, in my district one of the counties of which leads the State of Georgia in the production of cotton—it is always either first, second, or third in the State—is a county in which the average size farm is less than 50 acres. These farmers plant considerably more than half of their land to cotton. They cannot plant peanuts. That right was taken away from them in the Peanut Act. There is no other crop to which they can turn except poultry and dairying in a small way, which they have done.

In the summer, when I was at home, I went to the Farm Bureau meetings. These men were anxious and earnest. They asked me what was going to happen. Were the price guaranties going to continue, the price-support program? I said, "Yes; it will, if the farmers of this country vote crop control." "Well, how much reduction do they suggest that we make in 1950?" I said, "They tell me around 23 percent." So when the election was held 91 percent of the cotton farmers of this country voted for these controls. Now they confront me with the result of that law. Many of them have been cut 60 percent in their acreage.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Has the gentleman undertaken to find out how many additional acres will go in each of the counties in his district under the terms of this resolution?

Mr. CAMP. I understand that some of the counties in Georgia, where they planted what they call war crops, will get more cotton acreage than they had last year. Here is the whole trouble in the law. Please listen to me. I am pleading here for small farmers and in many instances small colored tenant farmers. The last day I was in Georgia a friend called up and said he had a tenant that he felt should be taken care of. He had been with him for 18 years. He was loyal and honest. He did not have enough cotton acreage to give him any land to work. He asked me if I could help him.

I moved him onto my farm and put him in a vacant house that I had there. This thing is serious. I do not worry so much about the big farmer. He can cut his acreage and do something else with his land. That is not going to hurt him too much. But I am talking about the small farmers now. They have divided the acreage all right on the basis of the State. The State of Georgia gets as much cotton as she should plant. They have allocated it to the counties all right. My county, Coweta County, had 26,830 acres in 1948 and it has about that many acres for this year. But here is the trouble. They do not allot this acreage on a historical basis. They allot it to the land. Hundreds of these farms have changed from cotton lands to pasture lands. Many of them have been fenced in and they are in grass now. They give the owner of such land, let us say, 12 or 15 acres, to plant in cotton. He does not want to plant any cotton and does not intend to plant any cotton and he will not plant any. I went into a store in Georgia recently to make a purchase just before I left. The man said, "Do you want to plant my cotton acreage?" I said, "I cannot if I wanted to. You cannot transfer it." He said, "I do not know why they gave it to me. They gave me 20 acres here and I did not plant any at all last year or the year before."

This amendment will permit these people to turn their cotton allotment into the committee and have it redistributed. There is only one question about it. You know these bills have too many ifs, ands, and buts and provisos in them. They have one here which provides that no man can plant more than 40 percent of his farm in cotton. If you have a man down there with 20 acres of land and he has been planting 16 acres in cotton, under this provision he could not get but 8 if somebody wanted to give them to him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I want to say I favor this amendment, but there will be an amendment offered to strike out that 40-percent provision. Let us strike it out. It is not going to hurt the general purpose of the resolution, and it will help these little people that I am pleading for here today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, as so many of us have emphasized since the opening of this session of Congress, it is imperative that the Cotton Acreage Allotment and Marketing Quota Act be amended to correct gross inequities that unexpectedly developed.

This need is imperative because farmers are now making arrangements for this year's planting. Many are in a highly disturbed situation, and I think justifiably so.

I am supporting this resolution and urge my colleagues from all sections of this great country of ours to join us in correcting the inequities that exist which no one intended or expected when this Congress passed the act last year. I cannot emphasize too strongly to you the urgent need in order to carry out the intent of this Congress to be fair and honest to the producers of cotton of this country when we provided for acreage controls which was urged upon us and recognized by everyone as an absolute necessity.

I have been much interested in the many justified inquiries from Members from the nonproducing cotton areas of the country as to how it appeared that we are faced with the present situation and so many farmers find themselves in such a precarious position and unfairly penalized. Before the war controls were invoked under authority of Congress and by the vote and approval of the cotton producers. Such controls were approved by the farmers annually until 1942. At that time we were engaged in a world conflict and as it was not necessary controls were lifted in 1943. During the war we did not have surplus production. Our production was needed and utilized and made its contribution to the winning of the war.

Since the war we continued to have a large volume of exports and only during last year, 1949, did we start to realize surplus production again.

We have had many highly important adjustments to make which were inevitable following the war. For 4 years now these adjustments have been undertaken as necessary. Everyone understands that it takes time to adjust any highly involved economy in our productive programs.

In our agricultural program, cotton is one of the most important factors. It is basic to our agricultural economy. Just as controls were determined necessary before the war to prevent enormous surpluses of cotton wrecking the cotton economy, it became obvious a year ago that the country was going to be faced with the same serious surplus problem.

This was recognized by the cotton producers themselves. It was recognized by all who manifested an interest in the welfare of the farmer. We have a surplus from 1948 but not serious. In 1949, we find that the farmers planted nearly 27,000,000 acres in cotton. Seven million acres more than was planted on the average in the years from 1944 to 1948 when no controls were in effect. Consequently, we find ourselves now with a surplus of about 8,000,000 bales of cotton.

Because of this situation, the Congress at the request of the cotton producers and others appropriately considered the reestablishment of cotton acreage allotment and marketing quotas. It was thought that such legislation was needed as an essential part of a well-rounded agricultural program to provide a proper balance between supply and demand of agricultural commodities.

This viewpoint was adopted and urged throughout the country because it is necessary to maintain a more adequate price support so that the farmers may have a more adequate price for cotton products.

In discussing this fundamental problem with the farmers of my district, I find that they definitely understand that we could not continue the planting of more than 26,000,000 acres of cotton annually in the United States and producing more than 15,000,000 bales—continuing to build up great surpluses—without destroying the cotton market and the economy of the cotton farmers.

Therefore, the Congress last year provided for the reestablishment of controls by acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

It was generally believed and I personally had the impression that we were providing for a reduction in acreage generally of about 23 percent, from approximately 26,000,000 to 21,000,000 acres. If the act had worked out in actual practice as was intended and the reduction been general throughout the cotton-producing area many hundreds of farmers would not have now found themselves in such a desperate situation. I thought the reduction under this approach would generally provide for the 20 or 25 percent. The farmers thought it would work that way and so accepted it. Most everyone believed that it was the most equitable and fair approach. However, I will say to you, my colleagues, in all candidness, it just did not work out that way.

I can say, Mr. Chairman, with the same degree of assuredness, that an effort was made to see that equity did prevail. The Congress did not approach it lightly, but after the Agricultural Committee had made a very serious attempt to provide an act that would bring about a general reduction.

This I want to emphasize as the intention of Congress which is stated in the report on page 2. It says:

> It was never the intention of Congress that inequities, no matter how few, should result from application of the cotton-quota law and the purposes of this resolution—

That is, the one before us now—House Joint Resolution 398—

> is to authorize insofar as possible, action to remedy those inequities.

Under the 1938 Agricultural Adjustment Act, the historical approach to acreage allotment was authorized. From experience, it was thought that there was need for substantial revision.

In reestablishing controls under the act in the last session of Congress, a definite approach was made which is known as the cropland apprpoach. That is a percentage of the total tillable cropland of the county.

This policy was approved only after the committee had made a careful and thorough study and was led to believe that it would be more acceptable. It was what generally became known here as the Memphis agreement, which was worked out at a belt-wide cotton conference held in Memphis in April 1949.

I make this explanation to show you, my colleagues, the reason this situation has developed as it has now showing the necessity for this resolution which I ask your support of.

This so-called Memphis agreement was preceded by several regional meetings as I understand and as recorded in the hearings by cotton producers. At the conference in Memphis, the House Committee on Agriculture participated in the

hearings. Producers throughout the area participated. Committees, farm organizations, individuals all were present and helped to work out this plan so we were advised and the hearings so reveal.

Following this meeting in Memphis, the committee in Congress held hearings. The steering committee of the belt-wide cotton committee appeared and supported the program which was adopted. The steering committee represented farm organizations and producers so they claimed throughout the Cotton Belt area. Many farm organizations appeared before the committee urging this approach.

Mr. H. L. Wingate, who is chairman of the steering committee for the belt-wide cotton conference testified on behalf of the committee. The entire committee was presented with him and introduced. Mr. Wingate is also president of the Georgia Farm Bureau Federation. Mr. Harvey Adams, of the Agricultural Council of Arkansas, was a member of the committee.

Mr. Walter Randolph, president of the Alabama Farm Federation, testified on behalf of the American Farm Bureau Federation. Mr. R. E. Short, from our State of Arkansas, vice president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, appeared in behalf of the program. Other farm organizations testified before the committee to the effect that the cropland approach would be the most equitable method. They claimed they represented all cotton producers throughout the cotton-producing areas.

Therefore, this program was presented to Congress with wide support and I say there was no intention to do gross inequity to any cotton-producing farmers.

The allocation program on a National and State scale was naturally on a historical basis. Allocations to counties were made on a historical basis but the inequities resulted when the cropland method was applied within the county to the individual farmer.

Therefore, in reestablishing cotton controls the Agricultural Committees and the Congress considered these two methods: The historical formula, based on history of planting by the farmer, and the cropland formula. By this formula a factor is applied within each county by the percentage of cotton production within the county for the years of 1946, 1947, and 1948, to the total tillable cropland within the county as determined by reports of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

For example, a county with say 100,000 tillable cropland acres has according to BAE reports a history of cotton production for the years 1946, 1947, and 1948 of 12,000 acres. This would mean 12 percent on an average of the total cropland of the county was planted to cotton during these years giving that county a factor of 12 to 100.

In other words, a producer in one county with 100 acres of cropland having the percentage factor of 12 would have an allocation of 12 acres. A producer in an adjoining county with 100 acres of cropland with a percentage factor of 24 would have 24 acres. In another county a producer with 100 acres with a percentage factor of 48 would get 48 acres. These three examples—if the farmers had been producing, say, 60 acres each year out of their cropland, the first would have a reduction of 80 percent, the second a reduction of 60 percent, and the third a reduction of 20 percent.

The Agricultural Act of 1938 provided a form of cropland approach which was found after brief experience to be wholly inadequate to give the most equitable program. After a short trial amendments were provided and the historical formula was developed.

It is also true at that time we had fairly accurate figures on acreage of the individual farms which made it a more satisfactory formula. We have no accurate figures because we have not had controls for several years. Naturally this further aggravates the difficulty.

In my opinion, however, the cropland approach is not the best and most satisfactory way. In fact, I think it is morally wrong if applied to counties. The Department of Agriculture has contended that from years of experience it cannot work satisfactorily and from my study of this problem, I am in accord with that view. No doubt it would have worked some better had there not been such a divergency of views and unfortunately I fear some feeling among certain groups.

For example, there is no reason why a farmer with 100 acres or any number of acres in county X with a 47-percent county factor should be permitted under similar circumstances, identical situations, to have several times as much cotton as the grower with 100 acres, the same history and everything, in county Y with a 10-percent factor. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the producers in the counties with the highest percentage factors are given the advantage, an unfair advantage, over the producers in counties with low factors.

If the cropland formula is to be used it ought to apply State-wide as it is considered the allocation to the States are as equitable as possible, which is based on the historical formula.

Because this advantage is obvious to the high-factor counties, is it no surprise that generally the producers in those counties are expressing their satisfaction with this plan.

It appears to me that the historical formula would have been much better and certainly more equitable as it would not only be effective with the National allocation, the State allocation, and the county allocation but apply to the individual farms as well. Each farmer then would have his percentage reduction, which was believed by me, and I think the Congress, to have been our intention when this act was adopted last year.

To further aggravate this problem, a difference in BAE acreage and acreage reported by the farmers developed. As I have said heretofore, the figures of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics—BAE—apply to the State and county. There are no BAE figures on the individual farm. Because of this difference, I am thoroughly convinced that the inequities became much greater in many instances.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress provided in the act for a reserve of 10 percent to the State and 15 percent to the counties. Authority was given to the State and county committees to adjust these inequities with the reserve. I am sure because of the general inequitable developments, the county committees in a great many instances determined no better way than to make this reserve acreage uniform to the cotton producers. In any event, it is so obvious that it has not worked out right.

The Allotment and Quota Act was passed in the latter part of the session last year. When we returned to our districts in October, the farmers began to get information as to its application to the individual farm. It was brought to my attention and I could hardly believe that there could be so many instances in the applicability to the farm where such gross inequities would occur. After meeting and discussing with many of my farmers and investigating this matter on the local level, I immediately became convinced it was only fair, honest, and just that it be corrected. I went to the State office in Little Rock. After conferring with them and finding the dilemma that existed there, I came on back to Washington. The first of December I met with the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], chairman of the committee, and the officers and staff members of the Department of Agriculture. Many others throughout the cotton-producing areas also saw how the situation was and a serious effort was made to correct it.

This was just a few days before the referendum when the farmers were to vote on whether or not, by a two-thirds majority, controls would be invoked. Under the act, we left this determination to the farmers. There was grave apprehension that if this matter was not resolved more equitably, that the farmers would vote against the controls and I think rightly so.

It was, therefore, proposed that the very able chairman, Mr. COOLEY, would introduce a resolution and we would make an effort to see that no farmers would be reduced by more than 30 percent of his actual planting for the years 1946–48.

The chairman called his committee to meet here in Washington a few days later. The committee met, being convinced that something must be done, approved and announced that a resolution would be sponsored and immediately when the session opened, to provide that no farm, notwithstanding other provisions of law, should be reduced more than the higher of 30 percent of their actual planting of these base years or 50 percent of any one of the years 1946, 1947, 1948.

Announcement was made of the action of this great Agricultural Committee of the House. It was carried on the front page of the papers throughout the country just before the referendum.

The cotton farmers went to vote with that promise and assurance of such effort to make these adjustments.

In the referendum the farmers voted overwhelmingly for controls, realizing the necessity of doing something to prevent the destruction of the economy of

the South. I am thoroughly convinced, Mr. Chairman, that they voted overwhelmingly for this program because this committee gave the assurance through the press the day before. We, therefore, are committed not only as a responsibility now but an obligation that we owe. I know if we maintain fair play with the farmers they will likewise cooperate in a program that is deemed best for all the country and not merely one section.

I want to highly commend, Mr. Chairman, this committee in its effort to carry out the responsibility and commitment. There is some difference of opinion as to this or that amendment. This will all be resolved under the 5-minute rule, but the committee has done, I am sure, the best it can and deserves the support of this House. I cannot too strongly urge your favorable consideration.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, naturally, I favor the adoption of this resolution. Ever since the allotments of cotton acreage were made last fall the farmers of my district have been muchly concerned about the inequalities and inequities of these allocations. Therefore, upon my return to Washington the first of this year I discussed this problem with the chairman of the House Agricultural Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and a number of the members of that committee in an effort to correct the original bill by appropriate resolution insofar as possible. Many other Members from the Cotton Belt have also been disturbed, and, as a result, the Committee on Agriculture in the House has brought forth this resolution.

When this resolution, House Joint Resolution 398, was first reported out of the committee, I contacted the State authorities in Mississippi, requesting them to advise me what, if any, relief this proposed legislation would give the cotton farmers of my congressional district. I was furnished this information by Mr. T. M. Patterson, executive officer, Production and Marketing Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, Jackson, Miss. According to Mr. Patterson, the 16 counties would receive increased acreage allotments, as follows:

County	Additional acreage required to furnish each county with—			Estimated number of frozen acres released
	70 percent of 1946, 1947, 1948 average actual cotton acreage	50 percent of 1946, 1947, 1948 highest planted cotton acreage	Higher of 70 percent or 50 percent provision	
Covington	499.5	169.5	510.0	500.0
Jefferson Davis	127.0	39.5	162.5	2,000.0
Lamar	285.0	216.0	324.0	100.0
Lawrence	121.0	196.5	230.0	350.0
Marion	449.5	186.5	531.0	800.0
Forrest	47.0	35.5	59.0	225.0
George	15.0	0	15.0	100.0
Greene	3.0	16.5	19.5	150.0
Hancock	0	0	0	43.4
Harrison	0	0	0	78.1
Jackson	0	0	0	5.0
Jones	773.5	415.0	880.5	500.0
Pearl River	0	0	0	50.0
Perry	10.5	2.5	13.0	150.0
Stone	58.5	0	58.5	140.0
Wayne	160.0	3.0	163.0	500.0

While I am disappointed that this resolution does not grant greater and further relief, I must recognize that it does help out in this rather difficult situation. Therefore, I shall support the legislation.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed with the 40-percent provision of the bill.

When members of the House Agricultural Committee were before the House Rules Committee seeking a rule on this legislation I asked the direct question if, under the resolution, any farmer could be cut more than 30 percent, and I was told that, under the resolution, no farmer could be cut less than 70 percent of his 1946, 1947, and 1948 average; but the debate has disclosed that, under the 40-percent provision of the resolution, it shall not operate to increase the cotton-acreage allotment of any farm above 40 percent of the acreage on such farm which is tilled annually or in regular rotation. I am, therefore, constrained to support the White amendment which would cut this 40-percent provision out of the bill. Mr. Chairman, we all realize that the production of cotton must, of necessity, be curtailed if we are to continue to receive governmental price support, but I am sure that we, also, further realize that this must be a gradual process and that the economy of the South will not stand too drastic a reduction. Certainly, it cannot stand any further reduction than that proposed under the provisions of the bill as amended by this resolution.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, you have heard from many of the representatives from the cotton-producing States as to their objections to the law establishing 1950 cotton acreage allotments, and on December 19, 1949, I attended a meeting of PMA officials and other interested parties in my home town from the three largest cotton-producing parishes in my district—St. Landry, Evangeline, and Acadia—and it was the opinion of those present that it was essential that certain changes be made in the law to cure the inequities and in order not to demoralize the industry. The group felt that farmers having more allotment than they want should be permitted to release part or all of their allotments to the PMA county committee for reapportionment to other farms which the county committee determines received inequitable allotments.

The group also thought that the acreage released should be considered released for 1 year only and that for the purpose of establishing acreage allotments in 1951 and subsequent years the acreage released in 1950 by a farm should be considered the same as acreage planted to cotton in 1950 on that farm.

This change in the law would not increase the national acreage allotment but would, in the opinion of those attending the meeting, provide a more equitable distribution of the national allotment.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that from all of the suggestions and debate here on the floor that the new bill which will be finally agreed upon will go just as far as it is possible to cure the inequities in the program, and while the new bill will not be perfect, it will include provisions to take care of the greatest number of complaints which have been voiced by those who have preceded me.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of House Joint Resolution 398 is to remedy certain inequities which have resulted from cotton- and peanut-quota laws. It has never been the intention of Congress to pass legislation which would impose undue and unnecessary hardships upon any group of American citizens. Yet, such unfortunate circumstances have arisen under the existing quota laws which were enacted by this body last year. Unless we act immediately, many farmers will be thrown into a state of despair and destitution.

I was in my district some 6 or 8 weeks ago, when the farmers began receiving their peanut and cotton quotas for 1950. During my tenure in Congress I have never seen any one circumstance, or even a group of circumstances, bring forth such an outburst of indignation. Never have I received as many letters and calls pleading for assistance. These pleas—these earnest appeals—are not without foundation. They are made by honest, sincere, hard-working Americans who ask only that their one means of livelihood not be taken from them. These appeals come from black and white alike.

Let me give you a brief picture of the outlook for my section in 1950. Agriculture predominates—there is very little industry. The major—generally speaking, the only—cash crops are peanuts and cotton. The 1950 quotas reduced peanut acreage for local farmers by 31.2 percent—almost one-third. This is in addition to a cut of 11 percent in 1949. Thus, in 2 years, the farmer has been compelled to reduce the production of his principal cash crop—peanuts—by almost one-half.

To further aggravate his position, the State cotton acreage was cut about 14 percent for the coming year. On the surface, this seems to be equitable and in line with the Government's attempt to maintain parity prices; but, looking further, quite the opposite is revealed.

Had the 14-percent reduction fallen upon all alike there would be no squawk. Such is not the case. The existing law does not treat all farmers alike. Some counties within the State receive a much greater cut than 14 percent. Others might have received less. The discrepancies within the counties are even greater. For example, some farmers who have abandoned the plow and turned to cattle are given cotton acreage which, of course, they have no need for. Others, who have always been big cotton planters, are receiving cuts of nearly two-thirds of last year's acreage.

Early in December, while visiting a small community within my district, a tenant farmer approached me with his quota problems. I do not remember just how many acres he has under cultivation, but I do remember that he has a wife and eight children to support. I have known him for some time—he has a good reputation and is known for his ability to work. His cotton acreage for this year has been cut from 18 acres to approxi-

mately 7.4 acres, almost 60 percent, and with his peanut acreage cut nearly in half, I challenge any man present to show how that farmer can support his family on the money he will net from farming this year under such conditions. This is only one instance. There are others too numerable to mention.

The picture is not so dark for the large landowner. Though he, too, has been cut severely, he can take care of himself by decreasing the number of tenants on his land—and that is exactly what he is doing. Most all of such landowners with whom I have talked say they are cutting off half their tenants in order that the other half will have enough acreage to provide a living.

Now, what are these cast-offs going to do? They are permitted to stay on the land, but how will they live? They have no cotton and peanut acreage, though they have been growing these crops all their lives. Yes; they could move, but where would they go? The same situation prevails in most of the other agricultural areas, so they could not migrate to other farms. An unbalanced economy precludes a movement to nearby cities. Any migration to highly industrialized areas would be impossible, first, because these people are unskilled laborers; secondly, there is no demand for such labor at this time. If assistance is not given through the passage of this resolution, then the Government will find itself feeding these farmers through the more expensive alternative of relief agencies before many months have elapsed.

These people cannot be held responsible for the plight in which they find themselves. The truth of the matter is that they were making progress toward diversified farming when war broke out in the early 1940's. At that time they were urged to return to high peanut and cotton yields. They responded with full knowledge that a reduction would be forced in the postwar years. After the war when we returned to controlled acreage and support prices, the farmers expected a gradual and uniform decrease in acreage. They expected, and were promised, an equitable system of quotas. This was our intention in passing the 1949 quota law. We were acting in the utmost good faith, yet unforeseen injustices have arisen. Last Friday my esteemed friend, the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman PACE, clearly outlined how such injustices have come about.

This resolution is a corrective measure. Its provisions will allow any farmer to bring his cotton acreage up to the minimum set out under the 1949 quota law. That minimum would be either 70 percent of his average over 3 years—1947, 1948, 1949; or 50 percent of any one of these years, so long as it does not exceed 40 percent of his cultivatable acreage. Granting that this adjustment will add a relatively small acreage to the national allotment, reliable estimates show that the acreage actually planted will not exceed the original national acreage allotment of 21,000,000 acres. Therefore, the national cotton acreage for 1950 would, in all probability, still be 23 percent below the 1949 acreage.

Section 5 of the resolution is designed to give relief to certain peanut-producing States. In establishing minimum State allotments, a few States were forced to take more severe cuts than others, and substantially in excess of the national reduction. This hardship is corrected by providing that the 1950 allotment for any State will not be reduced by a percentage greater than that by which the national acreage is reduced below the 1949 allotment. It is estimated that this will require adding only about 100,000 acres to the national allotment.

There is one other point that I would like to impress upon you. The effect of the existing law does not stop with the farmer. The banks in my area are in a state of consternation with regard to farmers' loans. A goodly portion of their business comes from this source. Colloquially speaking, they furnish many farmers on a yearly basis. They cannot furnish those who have little or no acreage for cash crops. Hence, they are shaking their heads when approached by these customers. With no money, no acreage, and no future under present laws, these farmers are turning to Congress—their last hope—with a prayer for justice.

I reemphasize, this is an emergency measure. The welfare of human beings is at stake. It is imperative that we take immediate action. Let us not break the faith of our farming friends.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] such time as he may desire.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of House Joint Resolution 398 is to relieve hardships which have become manifest in the application of Public Law 272 of this Congress, throughout the cotton belt. The cotton provisions of this bill seek to do this in two different ways. Section 1 of the bill would allow farm cotton acreage allotments for the 1950 crop to be not less than the larger of 70 percent of the average acreage planted to cotton or regarded as planted to cotton under the war-crop provisions of Public Law 12 on the farm in 1946, 1947, and 1948 or 50 percent of the highest acreage planted to cotton or so regarded as planted during any 1 of these 3 years. The relief thus granted is further limited by a proviso to the effect that the cotton-acreage allotment of no farm shall exceed 40 percent of the cultivated land of such farm.

In order that those farmers who have not heretofore filed a notice of appeal regarding the cotton history on their farms for 1946, 1947, and 1948 may reopen this question, section 3 of the bill allows 15 days after the passage of this act for this purpose. This provision of the bill is necessary for two reasons. In the first place county committees were required to make their reports of cotton land in their respective counties conform to BAE estimates. The attention of the committee has been called to numerous instances in which arbitrary reductions were made by county committees in order to meet this requirement of the Department of Agriculture. In the second place, when notices of allotments were sent out to farmers, few, if any of them, knew that relief of the kind afforded by this resolution would be forthcoming. The result was that a large number of farmers undoubtedly failed to go to the trouble of filing notices of appeal. Had they known that relief of the kind contemplated here might be forthcoming, undoubtedly, many appeals would have been made by farmers able to prove what their cotton history actually was during the years contemplated by this measure.

Section 2 of the bill provides for the release and reallocation of acreage in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary. Such released acreage must be used first to provide the allotments authorized by section 1 of the act. Any remaining acreage may be used in amounts determined by the secretary to be fair and reasonable for other farms in the same counties receiving allotments which the Secretary determines to be inadequate. Such surrendered acreage shall be credited to the State and county in future years unless hereafter otherwise provided by law. The provision which was contained in the previous resolution introduced by the chairman of our committee and in a resolution which I had heretofore introduced, allowing credit to the farm from which such acreage was released, has been depleted from the present resolution.

So far as I have been able to ascertain, just about everybody connected with the cotton business in my State, including State and County Production and Marketing Administration committees, farm organizations, associations of ginners and processors, and growers, had hoped from the beginning that any bill which might finally pass the Congress would vest simply authority in county committees to reapportion allotments voluntarily surrendered by growers who did not desire to plant all or any part of them. I have been advised by every section of the cotton industry of Oklahoma that were this authority given, Oklahoma could live within its present allotment and would not require its share of the additional bonuses contemplated by this measure.

There is a reason for this. In Oklahoma, State and county committees have reserved the full 15 percent allowed under the present law to take care of hardship cases. It is generally understood that it was the failure of State and county committees to make these reservations that has prompted the request for legislation of this kind. It has also been suggested that had this been done in all parts of the belt, no further relief would be necessary. I doubt that statements to this effect are true. I say this because Oklahoma committees did administer this law in accordance with the intention of Congress. Still, we have had brought to our attention innumerable cases of hardships, particularly in counties where the county factors were unusually small. In all of these instances consistent cotton growers have been severely crippled in their operations. Yet, I am advised on the best of authority that all such inequities could be eliminated if

county committees were simply authorized to reallocate released allotments.

Section 2 of this bill does not go far enough in this direction. As construed in the committee report it virtually restricts the authority of county committees to reallocate any acreage beyond that needed to meet the requirements of section 1 to any farm not classified as a new farm.

I sincerely hope that before this measure is finally enacted, section 2 will be liberalized to give county committees broad authority to reallocate acreage so as to satisfy the needs not only of new farms but of consistent cotton growers. I hope also that as an incentive to growers who do not desire to plant their allotments this year, the law, as finally enacted, will authorize such growers to be given credit for the acreage thus released for future allotment purposes.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inform the Members of the House of a very interesting happening in the disposal of surplus commodities. It seems that two of our colleagues from Pennsylvania have been doing a very fine job in their areas in securing surplus potatoes for the families of the miners who are on strike and who are destitute. When they went to the food depot to see the potatoes they found two carloads of apples. So they hurriedly put in a request for the apples to be distributed to these same families; and they were informed that the apples were under consignment to the free-lunch program at Winchester, Va., the apple capital of the world.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Do I understand that the Department of Agriculture is sending surplus potatoes and other food to the miners who are on strike over in Pennsylvania?

Mr. CORBETT. That is correct. They are releasing right now potatoes to the families of those miners.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. By what authority of law are they doing that?

Mr. CORBETT. I cannot answer, but they have received permission from the proper persons here and the aid has gone through the local agencies, in most cases the Salvation Army, which has been handling the distribution.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Is that not the explanation, and the answer to the question propounded by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], that they are not making the food available to the families but to agencies?

Mr. CORBETT. Well, it all ends up with the food being distributed to the families.

Mr. COOLEY. That is specifically provided for in the law we passed last fall.

Mr. CORBETT. Regardless of the merits of that law, I do not want the point to be skipped that in Pennsylvania we are now shipping surplus apples to the apple capital of the United States, Winchester, Va.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I just wanted to agree with what the chairman said. That is permissible under the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, it is a little difficult for me to understand why there should be opposition to this legislation. I realize there are some Members from the cotton area who feel that the House should go further than this bill goes in attempting to remedy some of the inequities which have arisen under this act and the way it has been administered. But I think we all recognize that this is purely an emergency measure; that it is late; that we can only pass legislation which can be administered under a program which can be worked out in a hurry, and that we cannot at this time, in this hurried fashion, attempt to correct all of the difficulties which may have arisen under the administration of this act. This measure is a sincere attempt, and I hope a fairly effective attempt, to do away with as many of the injustices that have arisen under this act, as it is possible to do in emergency legislation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield briefly.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Some of us would like to know why the views of the Department of Agriculture have not been given to the House on this matter. I understand there is a four-page letter from the Secretary which does not appear in the hearings and there is no attempt, to my knowledge, to bring it before the membership.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the committee to reply.

Mr. COOLEY. I intend to bring that letter to the attention of the House at the earliest opportunity. Let me point out the fact that the Department does approve of this legislation. I did not receive this letter until at the moment we were appearing before the Committee on Rules. The letter will be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In today's RECORD?

Mr. COOLEY. In today's RECORD.

Mr. HOPE. I may say that it is my understanding that the Department of Agriculture approved of this legislation. This approval was expressed by a representative of the Department at the time the bill was under consideration. But at that time we did not have a specific letter under the signature of the Secretary. The Department was consulted, however, and its views were presented to the committee at the time the matter was under consideration.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. A little later, if the gentleman will permit me to proceed.

Statements have been made to the effect that passage of this legislation would cost some money. Such statements are predicated entirely on the idea that it may result in an increased cotton acreage, and that it may result in some increased yield which, in turn, may result in the Federal Government's having to make more loans upon cotton than would be the case otherwise. It may happen or it may not happen. And if it does happen will not necessarily suffer a loss. No one knows what the cotton crop is going to be this year, but I call attention to the fact that this bill in connection with the bill which we passed last fall reduces the cotton acreage of this country by several millions of acres; it reduces the cotton acreage of this country below what it was 20 years ago by more than 50 percent. You cannot do those things all at once. We are dealing here not with bales of cotton, not with acres of land; we are dealing with human beings, with people who have to make a living on the land. You cannot regiment them or control them beyond a certain limit. I do not want to try to do it. I know injustices have occurred under this legislation, and I want to see every effort made that we can make at the present time to correct those injustices. I fail to see how others representing different areas of the country, for instance, the dairy section, can very well complain about this legislation, because dairy farmers are not operating under any restriction, they are operating under a program which provides for a mandatory support on dairy products, but there are no restrictions upon the acreage of crops they can plant for their dairy cattle; there is no restriction upon the number of dairy cows they can milk, or the amount of milk or other dairy products they may sell; yet they have practically the same mandatory price support provisions that are contained in the bill for commodities which are under restrictions. It is very likely that we are going to have in this session legislation dealing with other crops which are under restrictions, in an effort to make it possible for farmers to go along with those programs without being injured. We have not had restrictions since 1942 upon any crops except tobacco and peanut. During that time tremendous changes have taken place in acreage and production of all of our field crops. Farmers were asked to change the character of the crops which they produced; and, in order to win the war, they did so and they did so gladly. Now we are getting back to normal times. We cannot do it all at once; we are trying to do it gradually and with as little harm as possible to the individual farmer living out on the land and who must make his living on the land.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to call to the attention of the Members of the House

a letter dated January 26 from the Secretary of Agriculture as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1950.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, House Agriculture Committee,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. COOLEY: This is in response to your request for the Department's recommendations concerning House Joint Resolution 398, relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. The purpose of these amendments is to correct inadequate and inequitable allotments for a number of farms that have resulted in carrying out the provisions of Public Laws 272 and 439, Eighty-first Congress.

On the basis that the reported resolution is an emergency measure for 1 year designed to authorize the correction of certain gross inequities which have resulted from the application of the provisions of Public Laws 272 and 439, Eighty-first Congress, the Department is in favor of its enactment. However, the Department's recommendation is based on an understanding that you intend to reconsider Public Law 272 with the object in mind of rewriting the cotton acreage allotment provision of that law in a manner which will not require similar emergency measures in the future. The history of emergency amendments for correcting inequitable cotton acreage allotments is that the additional acreage allotted is always over and above the amounts considered necessary for proper adjustments of supplies to demand.

The basic principle involved in House Joint Resolution 398, particularly with reference to providing minimum 1950 farm cotton acreage allotments of not less than the larger of 70 percent of the average acreage planted or regarded as planted to cotton on the farm during the years 1946, 1947, and 1948, or 50 percent of the highest acreage planted or regarded as planted to cotton on the farm during such 3-year period, is a straightforward and practicable means of alleviating hardship cases now in existence because of the 1950 cotton acreage allotment established for such farms.

The committee's attention is called to some of the less desirable provisions of the resolution. Section 2, providing for farmers who have allotments in excess of what they desire to plant in 1950 to voluntarily surrender such allotments to the county committee for reapportionment to other farms in the county, will not actually reduce the amount of cotton that would otherwise be planted in 1950. The provisions of section 1 will give all farmers who request it the larger of 70 percent of the 3-year average acreage planted or regarded as planted to cotton or 50 percent of the highest acreage planted or regarded as planted to cotton in any 1 of such 3 years even though no acreage is surrendered by other farmers in the county.

The counties that will benefit most from surrender and reapportionment of unused cotton acreage allotments are those counties which have the most generous allotments in relation to the acreage of cotton which is being currently planted in such counties. For example, one county planted only 750 acres of cotton in 1948 and under the provisions of the law has an initial 1950 acreage allotment of 4,295 acres. Obviously, it will be quite easy for the farmers in such areas to release allotments and thereby retain credit for such county for subsequent years. On the other hand, a county having planted 21,100 acres of cotton in 1948 and having an initial 1950 acreage allotment of only 15,601 acres, which is a very substantial reduction from 1948, will have little, if any, cotton acreage allotments to release.

Counties and States in which little or no acreage would be released or reapportioned under section 2, will be at a disadvantage to those in which considerable acreage is released and reapportioned since the acreage so released and reapportioned would be used in establishing future State and county cotton acreage allotments. This could lead to major problems in the future in establishing State and county allotments.

If section 1 is enacted into a law as written in the resolution, the Department plans to use the acreage planted or regarded as planted to cotton on the farm as determined by the State and county committees which was used in computing farm acreage allotments under the current provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, including the provisions of Public Laws 272 and 439, Eighty-first Congress.

Based on available information, an additional acreage of at least 1,400,000 acres would be allotted under the provisions of section 1. The provision relating to reopening allotments to appeal to review committees will add a substantial number of additional allotted acres to the minimum 1,400,000 acres previously estimated. The estimated additional cost represented by additional CCC loans ranges from $90,000,000 to $120,000,000. The estimated additional cost in connection with the administration and application of the provisions contained in the resolution is $2,000,000.

The difficulties encountered by the use of the cropland as a primary basis in establishing farm cotton-acreage allotments were clearly written in the history of the legislation and the administration of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. When the act was first enacted in February of 1938, no provision was included for establishing minimum cotton-acreage allotments for farms except for some of the smaller ones. Regulations and instructions were prepared for the administration of the original provisions of the act and were applied in some counties. Immediately it was noted that the same type of inequities about which many complaints are now being heard with respect to Public Law 272 likewise resulted when the original provisions of the act of 1938 were applied in these counties. A minimum farm allotment provision based on history to remedy such inequities, which provided that no farm would receive an allotment of less than 50 percent of its 1937 planted plus diverted cotton acreage up to 40 percent of the land tilled annually or in regular rotation on the farm, was enacted in April of 1938. This amendment, as well as the provision now proposed in this resolution, relies on cotton-acreage history in order to have satisfactory allotments established. In 1938, when the cropland-factor approach did not work satisfactorily, we had the actual measured acreage of cotton and cropland for each farm for each year in the base history.

Thus, the cropland approach for establishing farm cotton-acreage allotments did not work in 1938, when accurate farm data were available. It did not work for 1950, when reported farm data formed the basis for determining basic data for individual farms. Accordingly the underlying cause of inequitable allotments was the use of cropland as a primary basis for apportioning county allotments to individual farms.

Section 5 provides for minimum State peanut acreage allotments. On November 30, 1949, a national peanut marketing quota of 643,000 tons for the 1950 crop was announced. This quota would result in a national acreage allotment of 1,933,835 acres for 1950. However, Public Law 272, Eighty-first Congress, provides that the 1950 national acreage allotment shall be not less than 2,100,000 acres. The provisions of section 5 would increase the national acreage allotment to 2,200,194 acres. On the basis of the 5-year normal yield, the 100,194 additional acres would produce 33,315 tons of peanuts. Since these would not be required for use in domestic edible channels, they would be delivered to CCC and would have to be crushed for oil and meal. The additional loss to CCC as a result of this additional acreage is estimated from $3,500,000 to $4,000,000. This provision is intended to lessen the reduction in acreage required of certain States by virtue of provisions of Public Law 272 and further illustrates the consequences of legislation requiring producers in one area to make a greater reduction than that expected of producers in other areas.

Although certain difficulties will arise as pointed out in this report in administering the provisions of the resolution, the Department offers no objections to its enactment since remedial legislation is urgently needed to provide relief. However, this type of legislation should not be continued for future years but in lieu thereof the basic legislation should be revised to apportion the county cotton allotments to farms primarily on the basis of recent cotton acreage history, giving due weight to sound land use, agricultural conservation, crop-rotation practices, etc. To do otherwise will necessitate reenacting next year this type of a provision to again provide relief.

Sincerely yours,

K. T. HUTCHINSON,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of House Joint Resolution 398, amending H. R. 272, of the Eightieth Congress, setting up a program of crop-acreage allotments. While I do not think the resolution will entirely solve the problem that has arisen in the administration of the acreage-allotment law, I think it will go a long way toward eliminating the inequities that have resulted from the administration of the law.

The statement has been made repeatedly by members of the Committee on Agriculture, that the crop-acreage-allotment law as passed by the Eightieth Congress took care of the small farmer. In this connection, I think we should distinguish between the small land owner and the small tenant or share cropper who does not own his land. It may well be that the law as originally passed does take care of the small land owner who was growing cotton during the years 1946, 1947, and 1948. I am sure, however, that it has not had this result as far as the small share cropper and tenant are concerned. As a matter of fact, it has had the result of driving many of these small farmers off the farm and into the cities to become a charge on the public-welfare agencies of the cities or to wander from place to place seeking employment. This is true because of the unforeseen results that have followed the attempt to put the law into effect. This is true because the larger land owners who operate their farms with tenants or share croppers have received such heavy cuts in acreage, sometimes as much as 80 to 85 percent, that they

have been unable to keep the tenants on their land.

I am sure when we voted for the original act that none of us anticipated any such a result. To me it is a powerful demonstration of the fact that it is difficult for the planners to substitute their plannings for the laws of supply and demand. Do not misunderstand me, I know that a certain amount of long-range planning on the part of the Government is necessary if we are to keep our economy on an even keel and make it an ever-expanding one. In the first place, let me say that I believe in the price-support program and I fully realize that if the Federal Government is to support prices, we must have some means of controlling the crops upon which price supports are to be paid. And what I say is not in any sense in criticism of the Committee on Agriculture and especially of the subcommittee which devoted long hours to hearings and gave the best of its thinking in the drafting of the act. The act was drawn, as the committee has said, after a period of time during which we had no price-support program and no control over the crops planted. For that reason, the Department of Agriculture had no definite figures and data upon which the committee could base the acreage-control law.

But after all, it seems to me that the effect which this bill has had certainly in its application to cotton acreage, should be a warning to us that even with all of the information from statistics it is possible to obtain, nevertheless, it is very, very difficult to foresee all the results of any planning we may do. This should warn us to interfere as little as possible with known economic laws as we seek to legislate for the benefit of all segments of our complicated and complex agricultural and industrial economy.

While it may see at first blush that the adoption of this resolution will increase the total acreage of cotton planted for the coming crop year, this will not necessarily be the effect since so much of the previous allotment is "frozen," so to speak, due to the fact that it has been made to farmers who do not intend to plant cotton. Past experience has shown that efforts to recover any such frozen acreage are, as a rule, not very effective. Consequently, this resolution even with the elimination of the 40-percent provision will not result in the planting of any more acreage than was at first contemplated under the original act.

Unless this resolution is adopted, it is going to mean real suffering in my district and the dislocation of our entire farm economy. Therefore, I urge the early adoption of the resolution after the elimination of the 40-percent clause and even if the 40-percent clause is not stricken, the resolution should be adopted.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, on Friday last when this measure first was brought before the House for consideration, I was pleased to speak briefly in the interest of this proposed amendment to the Cotton Acreage Allotment Act and to urge strongly that approval be given to this legislation without delay. I cannot too strongly emphasize the urgency of this situation and the tremendous burden of financial loss which threatens hundreds of farmers in my district, the Fifth District of Tennessee, unless adjustments are made in the present statute.

The committee failed to take conclusive and affirmative action on this proposal at the last meeting and I rise again to reassert the urgency of the cotton acreage situation and imperative need for immediate action.

Within the Fifth Tennessee District, there are several counties which may be classified as major cotton-producing counties—counties which are as clearly and definitely a part of the so-called Cotton Belt as any section of the South. The economy of these counties is largely dependent on and based upon the production of cotton. The counties of Franklin, Giles, and Lincoln Counties, of my district border upon the State of Alabama and are predominantly cotton-producing counties.

While the situation is similar in this concern for all three counties, for the sake of brevity at this time, I should like to cite figures affecting only Lincoln County to illustrate the tremendous inequities which have developed in the operation of the cotton-acreage quota program.

The Quota Act has established for Lincoln County, Tenn., a cotton factor of 12.4—that is, as we know, an allowance of 12.4 acres of cotton in 1950 based on the 1946, 1947, and 1948 average acreage planted in cotton. That will mean that an average acreage of an estimated 23,126 acres, will, this year, be cut to 13,894 acres—this is a cut of 39.9 percent.

The national cotton-acreage cut, as we know, amounts to approximately 21.9 percent. Thus, Lincoln County, with a cut of 39.9 percent has suffered a forced reduction in cotton acreage which is 17.9 percent greater than the national average. Further than that, the same county has suffered a reduction 25 percent greater than the average for the State of Tennessee—which has an average reduction under the present program of approximately 14 percent. No wonder the farmers of Lincoln County voted against continuation of the present cotton-acreage program—the only county in Tennessee that so voted in the recent cotton referendum.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to further illustrate the inequities under the present program I should like to cite a few other figures. As I indicated a moment ago, Giles, Franklin, and Lincoln Counties in the Fifth District of Tennessee, all border upon the State of Alabama.

I have cited the figures affecting Lincoln County, Tenn., which has a 1950 cotton factor of 12.4 percent, allowing for a total acreage of 13,894 acres.

Madison County, Ala., has been given a 1950 cotton factor of 30.66 allowing a total of 34,352 acres while Limestone County, Ala., has been given a 1950 factor of 28.66 allowing a total of 32,113 acres.

The above figures, Mr. Chairman, illustrate how unfair and unequal the system has proved under operation. Lincoln County, Tenn., Madison County, Ala., and Limestone County, Ala., are all adjoining counties, each having similar land, all being in the basin of the Elk River. Yet, because Madison and Limestone Counties are in Alabama and therefore considered to be in cotton-producing areas, they are given more than twice as much cotton acreage as Lincoln County, Tenn.—the same conditions prevail also for the other two counties of my district which border upon the State of Alabama—Franklin and Giles Counties. It seems to me unfair in the highest degree that the boundary of a State line should be allowed to work such inequities as has resulted in the case which I have been pleased to cite by way of illustration. The lands are the same, the crops are the same.

It is not my intention to take the time of the committee to great length—and I believe that the illustration which I have given offers definite proof of the inequities which exist under this system. We see how it is possible for the entire economy of a prosperous county to be put in the position of being completely upset and ruined through the operation of a particular statute. The loss for one county in my district alone will run to approximately $1,000,000 unless some changes are made in the present program.

Again may I say that the present resolution may not provide all the relief desired, but it is certainly a step in the right direction and should be adopted.

I earnestly urge that we act now to revise the law in this respect—these cotton farmers must be allowed to know what is in store for them well in advance of the planting season to make their plans for a crop. Delay would be disastrous. Let us act now, decisively and affirmatively, on the proposed amendment to bring some measure of relief to these hard-pressed cotton farmers.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, first I want to express my appreciation for the very fine statement which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], just made in support of this resolution. As his statement indicates, he has never confined his service to the great wheat area which he represents. On the contrary, he has for years labored hard for the benefit of all of agriculture, not just a part of it. We are grateful for his fine service. Those of us who come from cotton areas also appreciate the interest which has been manifested in this matter by the Members who live outside the cotton sections of the South, Southwest, and far West.

It has been inferred that no hearings were conducted on the pending resolution. Such is not the case. I would like to have the Members bear in mind that this is a piece of legislation dealing with an extreme emergency. When the emergency came to the surface last fall the chairman of our committee called our subcommittee to Washington to consider the problem. At that time we conferred with and sought the counsel of officials in the Department of Agriculture. Immediately preceding this conference the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, in a speech made in Memphis before a meeting of Production and Marketing Administration officials, specifi-

cally stated that emergency legislation was needed for the purpose of correcting inequities.

My chairman has just referred to the Secretary's letter endorsing the resolution before us. Some questions have been asked about it. Therefore, I would like to quote from the letter:

On the basis that the reported resolution—

He is speaking with regard to the resolution now before the House.

On the basis that the reported resolution is an emergency measure for 1 year designed to authorize the correction of certain gross inequities which have resulted from the application of the provisions of Public Laws 272 and 439, Eighty-first Congress, the Department is in favor of its enactment.

Mr. Chairman, that should lay aside once and for all any question in the mind of anyone as to whether or not this resolution has the support of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I did not understand whether the gentleman said there were or were not hearings on this measure?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am getting to that. We conducted hearings but they were informal. We had a hearing in December. I have already referred to that. We gathered in Washington in January. On many, many occasions since January 3 the subcommitee was in conference with Members of Congress, representatives of the Department, representatives of the Farm Bureau, and many individuals. During one morning in the committee room I would say there were at least 65 Members of Congress present, many of whom expressed their views and all of whom had the privilege of expressing their views had they so desired.

Not less than four or five officials of the Department of Agriculture met with the subcommittee time after time and expressed their views. Now with the assistance, advice, and counsel of all of these people, farmers, the Farm Bureau, the Secretary of Agriculture, his assistants, and Members of Congress, it cannot be said that this resolution resulted without hearings. This matter has been well considered. It will help. It is not perfect. It represents a compromise of views. We know that inequities have resulted and many people will seriously suffer this year unless you pass this resolution. The committee commends it to your serious consideration and urges its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

All time has expired. The Clerk will read the resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, including amendments made by Public Law 272, Eighty-first Congress, and Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress, no farm cotton acreage allotment established for the 1950 crop in conformity with the law and the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture shall be less than the larger of 70 percent of the average acreage planted to cotton or regarded as planted to cotton under Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress, on the farm in 1946, 1947, and 1948, or 50 percent of the highest acreage planted to cotton or regarded as planted to cotton under Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress, on the farm in any one of such three years. if the owner or operator of the farm applies in writing for the allotment authorized by this section and certifies that the acreage allotment will be planted to cotton: *Provided*, That this section shall not operate to increase the cotton acreage allotment of any farm above 40 percent of the acreage on such farm which is tilled annually or in regular rotation, as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary. The additional acreage required to be allotted to farms under this section shall be in addition to the county, State, and National acreage allotments proclaimed by the Secretary of Agriculture for the 1950 crop of cotton, and the production from such acreage shall be in addition to the national marketing quota for such crops. The additional acreage authorized by this section shall not be taken into account in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, it is said that this is a piece of emergency legislation. I do not know whether it is or not. Certainly, up until this point, no one has been hurt by the present law.

About a year ago most of the metal mines of the country were closed. It was said that it was due to the decrease in the price of metals. As the result of the closing of the mines, the miners were laid off, and you people who know anything about mining know that these people own their own homes, they are men of middle age, and it is impossible for them to change their employment.

As a result of that disastrous event there was legislation introduced in the Congress by a member of the Committee on Public Lands, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE]. There was also legislation introduced in the other body. That was introduced for the purpose of meeting an emergency that was real. That legislation was sent to the Committee on Rules. It is still there slumbering and gathering dust.

You talk about an emergency. What do we have here? We have a piece of legislation that has hurt no one as yet, but it takes precedence over a piece of legislation that has been before the Committee on Rules since last October, and no action has been taken upon it. I would like to know what kind of justice this is. We have thousands of miners in this country who are walking the streets, out of work, and the reason we did not get this rule out of the committee was because they said it would cost $80,000,000. It will not cost one-tenth of what this legislation will cost which we are considering today.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Does the gentleman contend that the fact that we have this bill on the floor today is in any wise interfering with the passage of the bill in which he is interested?

Mr. GRANGER. I am not saying that at all. I will say to the gentleman that is beclouding the issue. I am telling you what is a fact and what consideration we have had from the Committee on Rules. There are many members on the Committee on Rules that are tremendously interested in this piece of legislation, and we are interested in other legislation, and we think it is unfair to come here with a bill that will cost $1,000,000,000, likely, under the guise that the other bill would cost the taxpayers some money.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. Does the distinguished colleague on the Committee on Agriculture realize that there are more of us interested in cotton legislation than the few on the Committee on Rules; that they are not the only ones in the United States of American that produce cotton and that they are not the only ones that represent cotton districts, and that actually the members on the Committee on Rules have a very minor part in the cotton production in the United States; in fact, half of the cotton produced in the United States is produced in Texas and California.

Mr. GRANGER. I do not yield further. That is beside the point. That is not what I am talking about. I am not accusing the Committee on Agriculture of doing anything it should not do, but I do say that this is a situation on which we expect to get some cooperation from the Rules Committee, we hope very early, because a tremendous emergency exists in the mines of the country. The men are out of work. They have used up all their unemployment compensation. The situation is desperate. We want something done about it.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKETT. The gentleman states that under the present law in allocating cotton acreage no one is hurt.

Mr. GRANGER. "Yet," I said. No one is hurt yet.

Mr. PICKETT. May I say to the gentleman that he probably is not accurately informed, because I can tell him that a good many people are already hurt because of the low cotton factor and acreage allotment that is being made all over the country. The reason for it is that preparation has to be made in December and early January to take care of the tenants that work these cotton crops. The farm-implement dealers and other suppliers of the necessary equipment that goes into the making of a cotton crop are not able to sell their implements, and everything else that goes into the economic factor toward making a cotton crop is already hurt by this low allotment.

Mr. GRANGER. I agree with everything the gentleman said.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POULSON. The gentleman is bringing out the point that if it is fair for one it certainly is fair for another industry to be treated that way?

Mr. GRANGER. That is what I have been trying to put across—the fairness of this thing. This is a situation with which we are confronted. You are going to have wheat up here the next time, and maybe corn.

Mr. RANKIN. Before the gentleman gets away from that situation, will he yield for a question?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Would the enforcement of the Taft-Hartley law help any?

Mr. GRANGER. No; this is a case where the miners did not go on strike. It is a case where the mines closed because the owners claim they could not operate because of the prices paid for ore. It has nothing to do with the Taft-Hartley Act.

Now we are facing the music. Sometimes Congress has to face the facts we are called upon to face today. We are going to have it in wheat, we have it in cotton, and we may have it in corn. Of course, if we do that we are going to go down the line and include everybody.

In this instance, if it were not for a case such as we have in Texas I would be against this legislation, because I believe that in Texas there has been some maladministration that needs to be rectified. I am willing to go for the bill because of that feature in it, but some of these days we will have to face up to these things. We should not be forced into the position where every time someone complains we increase the acreage to satisfy complaints of a small minority, as we are doing in this legislation. In this time of economy, of course, this bill today will cost the taxpayers a lot of money.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Can the gentleman tell us how much it is going to take out of the pockets of the wage earners of this country if this bill is passed?

Mr. GRANGER. I do not know that I could say, and I do not know that there are any actual figures that could be quoted on that score. There are a lot of "ifs" in any estimate. As I understand it, the cotton program this year, at the minimum, might cost close to three-quarters of a billion dollars.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The average production of cotton is supposed to be something like 300 pounds to the acre; is that right?

Mr. GRANGER. Three hundred and fifty or three hundred and sixty pounds, I think.

Mr. TABER. Suppose we take 300 pounds as the figure. With a million and a half additional acres in production, that would be about 900,000 bales, and at 90 percent of parity that would be something like $144 a bale, which would be $130,000,000, according to my figures.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. Is it not also fair to say—and I know my friend always wants to be fair as well as my friend here—that it might not cost the Government anything?

Mr. GRANGER. Yes; there is always that possibility. As I said, there are a lot of "ifs" in it. I would not say what it is going to cost, but it could cost some money.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of California. I know the gentleman from New York did not intend to create a false impression. According to his figures, if he had placed the decimal point correctly, it would be $130,000,000.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to go along with this legislation. I think it is necessary in this one particular which I have mentioned. I just know that sometimes we have to stand up and face the facts of this situation and not be stampeded every time we get a letter from somebody who is dissatisfied with his acreage allotment. I can assure everyone that the Secretary of Agriculture is in favor of and advocates the passage of this legislation.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I also ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I want to clear up the atmosphere here a little bit today. First of all I wish my distinguished colleague from Kansas would read the law we passed last year. He will find that the dairy products do not have 90 percent of parity support, but instead have from 75 percent to 90 percent. So I hope to get the record straight in that respect. It is not a question of the dairy industry. It is nothing new so far as I am concerned. As I said Friday, when I presented a table which I had prepared in 1940. Let us get out of the Cotton Belt here altogether. Under that table the State of Kansas and the State of Wisconsin for years had been the sixth and seventh agricultural States in the Nation. Up until 1940 Kansas had around $175,000,000 or $180,000,000 either for growing or not growing, something I never could figure out which, and never could be sure, and the State of Wisconsin had some forty-and-some-odd-million dollars. There is not that much difference between the two States. The difference is in the kind of agriculture that they had. One congressional district in Texas, one in Kansas, and one in Iowa each had a subsidy equal to what the whole State of Wisconsin had received. This is a livestock against an anti-livestock attitude and that is all this is a part of right here today. The cotton people are faced with a serious problem. They face a declining demand for their product and very surely face a rural social problem. But the people who have lived and made a living on these 6,000,000 acres are most assuredly faced with a serious problem. But are you going to solve it by providing a 90 percent parity support for 70 percent of the production on a million or a seven and one-half million dollar cotton farm Or are we going to solve it by providing the little producer a quota of 2½ bales or 5 acres and the big operators a quota or an allotment of 1,000 to 3,000 bales? As serious as this problem is on this cotton section, the facts are that cotton farmers are not asked to face problems any more serious than all the rest of the farmers face.

Did you ever figure out how much of the public funds will be needed to support the cotton on the Clayton-Anderson seven and one-half million dollar California farms? That gives you an indication of one of the troubles of the whole agricultural program.

We have been talking for the little fellow but we have been putting him out of business. That is the objection I have had to the agriculture program since the day I arrived here, and even before. In fact, I maintain it has been nothing but a landowners' program. The little get smaller and the big get bigger. If we keep on this road we have been going for the past 10 or 15 years, it will not be too long before the land of this country will be owned by too few people.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield for a question.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is just what the trouble is. They are talking about tenant farmers on these large plantations. Is there anything in this legislation to prevent the owner of these large plantations from securing machinery and putting all this land into cotton and doing away with the tenant farmer altogether?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Of course not.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is what they have done in a great many areas.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Now, what is going to become of the people who live on 10,000,000 acres of land that the wheat is going to be cut back or the 11,000,000 acres of corn that will be cut back? But that is the kind of an agricutural economy we have had for the last 16 years—corn, cotton, and wheat. It does not make sense to continually pour out public funds, year after year, for these soil-depleting crops, and spend a million or more dollars for exports—they have a subsidy on exports year after year, and all we are doing now is going back to what we had in 1939. In August 1939 when we had 54-cent wheat and paid 27 cents per bushel as an export subsidy and 8-cent-plus cotton, and so on down the line. If it makes sense to subsidize the shipment of $500,000,000 worth of cotton and at the same time import $497,500,000 worth of livestock and livestock products, as we did in this last fiscal year, then there is no use for any agricultural colleges in the United States. You might as well cut out all

appropriations. This is livestock versus the kind of economy that is going to ruin the country; asking the public to roll out money in order to carry on that kind of economy.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes. I will yield to my friend from Missouri because I feel sorry for him. On Saturday night I heard over the radio from Wheeling, W. Va., that they wanted to sell their chickens for $2.95 per hundred. Missouri is a great chicken State. I feel sorry for my friend to try to explain that to his people.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I will be brief. I would just like to ask the gentleman, If our agricultural program is wrong and always has been wrong, what does the gentleman suggest to take the place of it?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Well, that is a good question, and I sure have worked at it, and I will give it to you right now.

I sat around here for the first year or two. I was not very hard to get along with. There was a man came along by the name of Henry Steagall, of Alabama, a man who had made more contribution to American agriculture than any Congressman in the history of this country. It is just too bad he has not been with us, because Mr. Henry Steagall did not say, "Oh, we have got to talk about corn and cotton and wheat," which is less than 25 percent of American agriculture; but Henry Steagall produced legislation that took support right straight across the board. There is no one man who ever made more contribution to agriculture than Mr. Steagall made so far as legislation is concerned.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. I want to sympathize with the gentleman from Wisconsin. He has not been hard to get along with, but he has been taking some kicking around in the Committee on Agriculture. The recent passage of this so-called oleo bill does not set very well with him and many of us. If you people want to have your hearts torn out, I wish you would go to the gentleman's office and see "Old Rosy," with crepe hanging over her horns and a sign on there which says, "Weep not for me but for those who would destroy me." That is something that is the matter with some parts of the agriculture program. People who are supporting this legislation now, wanting it in such a hurry, might think for a moment that they have stabbed in the back one of the greatest industries in this country—the little-business man who has a dairy outfit who is liable to be destroyed, or at least he thinks so.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is a livestock approach, it is not only for the dairy industry. The dairy is only a little over 20 percent of the national farm income. The remainder is beef, hogs, eggs, poultry, and sheep, all that go with them. Remember now, that eggs in the Midwest today are bringing but 39 percent of parity. I never heard of baby chicks selling for $2.95 a hundred before either.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. In just a moment.

I have not criticized this bill because when I criticize I want to have something constructive to offer in its place. I would not oppose this or any other bill without a constructive substitute. My constructive proposals are: One, to recognize the fact that the rural people of this country are Americans and are entitled to the same laws that govern the rest of the people. That sounds simple, but why do we not do it? Why do we not extend wage-and-hour legislation to agricultural labor? Now, would not that be terrible if we should do that? We know one of our great labor organizations, the A. F. of L., has been trying to do that ever since I have been here in Congress. My colleague, the gentleman from Utah, knows the situation with reference to sugar beets. He made the fight for it. We could not get it properly considered by the committee; it had to wait until it came to the floor to be amended, and when the amendment was offered to include labor in the beet fields, he took one of the leading parts in that fight.

I would extend social security to rural people. Can anyone tell me why we should not when we are doing it for everybody else? We have a real problem in the matter of farm labor, a problem of employment caused by the large operators, not by the small farmer at all, but the large operator who pulls people in legally or illegally at the time of harvest and then dumps them on the community after the harvest is over.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. We gave the opponents a lot of time even on my side.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Can anyone tell me why we should not deal with this problem created by these big employers of farm labor who bring employees into this country legally or illegally to help them harvest the crops, but when the harvest is over expect the community to support the labor on the relief rolls? Does that make good sense? Should the support be provided the small farmers instead of the speculative interests? What we need is a farmers' program, not a land owners' program. If we had one we would have fewer embarrassing surpluses. These embarrassing surpluses are made by a comparatively few people.

Now, I have been here many years and most of you know my views. I am speaking today of problems of the rural people of this country and pleading for the genuine farmers, the small farmers, not the speculators. You protect the other groups and expect Uncle Sam and the taxpayer to foot the bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. As I understood the gentleman last week when he made the first part of his statement, he said that he had been making this fight for some 8 or 10 years. I assume that the gentleman is rather at odds with the present program and that he is proposing a different program. Can the gentleman tell us the number of his bill so that we might make a study of it?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I shall be very glad to answer that in all humility. I supported the Steagall bill and the Hope bills. They were sufficient if administered correctly. The Committee on Rules is not the only place where they bottle things up, and if I could only get my bills out of the Committee on Agriculture I would not worry about the Committee on Rules. I will answer the gentleman by saying that if he is on the committee he knows that the only Hope bill that came out in the Eightieth Congress was just exactly the same as this: Corn, cotton, and wheat. How about H. R. 6514 to support five bales of cotton and bushels of wheat? No consideration yet?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Did the gentleman support the bill he just referred to?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It was the same as the Steagall bill; I do not see why I should not.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Did the gentleman support the agriculture bill last year?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Support the Hope bill? Yes; after the livestock supports were included but not before.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The 1949 act.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That was a matter of taking a little mouthful instead of not getting anything at all. It was not a case of my liking it. Of course, I could take 10 minutes to explain that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman refers to a 75-cent minimum for farm labor. Does he mean by that those who are doing productive work on the farm, not just the hired man?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I did not mention the amount. I was referring to a comparable minimum wage. I did not make any particular statement on amount. They are entitled to a minimum wage comparable to what everyone else is accorded in the United States. That is my position.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would the gentleman have that arrangement, whatever the arrangement is, made before so that the farmer knows he will get that wage before he prepares the seedbed, before he plants, before he cultivates, before he harvests and before he goes to market with his stuff? I raise that question because in the case of manufactured goods the collective-bargaining agreement does provide the wage before the worker goes

through the time clock office on the way to the factory and the farmer is entitled to the same protection from the Congress of the United States if you are going to give that to organized labor in the factory. I think that is the point the gentleman is making.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. If this bill is to go into effect, the family-sized farm should have a chance. There is the subsidy of $2,500 provided to the large operators. During the last session, the hearts were beating for the little ones, so they upped it to $2,500 again.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I do not suppose the gentleman was inferring that the sugar-beet industry was paying less than the 75-cent minimum wage?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I did not say they were. I used that as an example. There is the letter from the Department of Agriculture, and I do not want anyone to say I am criticizing Mr. Brannan, but a Secretary of Agriculture fixed it from 25 to 32 cents an hour.

Mr. Chairman, I have never met the author of this article which appeared in one of our oldest agricultural publications, the Country Gentleman. I happened to note this article yesterday. The remarks I have made about the cotton resolution, that will exact another $5 bill from each American family this year for a crop we have no possible use for, surely coincides with the thoughts expressed in this article. Why are several countries ahead of us in the use of the most protective diets? The article is as follows:

[From the Country Gentleman of April 1949]

WE CAN'T TAKE CHANCES ON TOMORROW'S MEALS

(By H. E. Babcock)

Soon after the Eighty-first Congress settled down to work, I spent a week in Washington looking it over. There are too many men in Congress to get acquainted with each one, so at the end of my stay I resorted to a stockman's device. Mentally I ran them through a cutting chute and sorted them according to their qualifications to vote on farm and food legislation.

My first cut was less than a score of Senators and Representatives who seem to me to have a grasp of the over-all farm and food problems confronting the Nation. My second cut showed up 40 or 50 captive Congressmen—fellows whose thinking is entirely dominated by the problems of the districts or States they represent.

The balance—I'll call them confused Congressmen—includes a great majority of the Members of both Houses. Mostly these are men of fine ability and the best of intentions. But they are completely mystified by the numberless and contradictory demands of farmers and consumers.

Nor is this vast unhappy majority being helped out much by the national farm organizations. They, too, are split, both among and within themselves. Only by Herculean efforts are the heads of these organizations able to hold a working majority of their members in anything resembling a line.

With conditions as chaotic as this, there is an obvious need for spelling out a few fundamentals for a national farm and food program which will be in the interests of everyone. Country Gentleman has recognized this need by publishing a statement by Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan in its January issue, and in the March editorial, Price Supports Don't Make a Farm Program. Now I have my opportunity.

I shall begin by laying down the commonsense premise that a population soon to number 150,000,000 human stomachs can't take chances on tomorrow's meals. I suggest that we accept this principle as a basic test of all future farm and food legislation.

I'll even go a step further. Does the proposed program hold out hope of more Americans eating better? If it doesn't, it's not in the national interest and should not be written into law. I repeat that 150,000,000 people can't take chances on tomorrow's meals.

Surely no one can quarrel with this start. But there is a lot of farm and food legislation due to come before the Eighty-first Congress which will not square with this ideal. Some of it will be proposed by the captive Congressmen backed by powerful commodity and regional farm lobbies. Some of it will be put forward by individuals at the moment more interested in socializing agriculture than in our future food supply. These individuals would like nothing better than to cross 6,000,000 farmers off the list as private business managers. If they cannot do this any other way, they are prepared to buy them off with public funds.

It is going to take statesmanship, clear thinking, and stout courage on the part of the administration and Congress to stand up against these drives by the representatives of special interests and the subtle foes of private enterprise.

If we can agree on better meals for more Americans as a national long-time goal, it is only common sense to describe such meals in terms everybody can understand in order to secure maximum public acceptance of the goal. In previous articles in Country Gentleman I have done this.

The foods for such meals (when they are available at reasonable prices) are found in any well-stocked home refrigerator on any Saturday night, anywhere in the United States. They are the milk, meat, eggs, butter and cheese, and fresh fruits and vegetables with which most American housewives like to prepare the meals they serve. Any American family which eats free choice from a well-stocked home refrigerator certainly should be well nourished, happy, and content.

A second premise is that a nation with a growing population and the task of selling its philosophy of free enterprise to the rest of the world cannot afford to eat at the expense of its soil. Mere soil conservation is not enough for America. We must actually increase the productivity of our land. If we don't do this, there is no chance over the long pull of maintaining even our present dietary standards, much less of improving them. Fortunately, thousands upon thousands of farmers know how to do this job and are doing it.

Summarizing, I offer two guiding principles for everybody's farm and food program:

1. It must provide an ever-increasing American population with an ample supply of the foods we like best and which are best for us—the refrigerator foods.

2. These foods must be produced by the kind of farming which will build up soil productivity as well as conserve it.

As a security measure (I will discuss this later) we also must so farm and eat that we maintain at all times a substantial food reserve against war or natural disaster.

Only by the wise management of our food-producing livestock can we develop such a program. Under our system of farming, even soil fertility depends to a great degree on our animal population.

The ratio between our domestic livestock and our humans is one of the most important figures in our so-called way of life. How much food-producing livestock should there be behind the family refrigerator?

In an endeavor to get at some answer to this question I appealed to the chief of the USDA's Bureau of Agricultural Economics. As I expected, his staff already had a figure in which all food-producing livestock (including milk cows and laying hens but excluding horses and mules) was annually reduced to a hog-equivalent. I asked the Bureau to compare this figure on an annual basis with our population figures. My object was to see if it would be possible to keep track of the balance between our food-producing livestock and our human population. While this may come to be known popularly as a hog-man ratio, it must never be forgotten that the hog-equivalent figure includes the all-important dairy cow and laying hen as well as meat animals.

The Bureau came up with some most interesting comparisons. In 1919–20 we had 1.67 head of productive livestock to one human being. In 1934–35 this hit a low of 1.27. At the present time the ratio is estimated to be 1.41 hog-equivalents to one man.

For myself, I need no more accurate measure of the progress being made in working out a satisfactory farm-and-food program for everybody than this ratio. As it inches upward, we shall have well-stocked family refrigerators, improving soil fertility, and the kind of food stock pile we need for national safety. If it goes the other way, we shall be headed for a poverty-standard of eating.

I am convinced that there is only one way for us to stock pile any substantial amount of food—on the hoof. No better storage bin has ever been devised than the flexible hide of a steer or a dairy heifer. It is storage which also can be eaten if necessary. As we expand the numbers and weight of our livestock, we achieve everything the ever-normal granary ever tried to accomplish, including support of grain prices.

Actually, no country's livestock population should be a stationary thing. Traditionally, it operates as a cushion between our human population and the land. When good crops are produced, the bulk of them (normally over four-fifths of our cereal production) is naturally taken up by an expanding livestock population. Then, in the event of war or other disaster, we have a reservoir of high-quality, nutritious food just when we need it most. Killing the livestock releases the cereals and other foods that animals were eating for direct human consumption as we need them.

Stock-piling grain in dead storage is quite another thing. To go into storage at all, more has to be paid for the grain than the owners of livestock are willing to buy it for. The natural adjustment that would be made by feeding it to livestock thus is stopped in its tracks and the surplus is frozen. This is a bad thing for everyone.

Once in storage, the grain overhangs the market and becomes a football for politicians and the pressure boys. It costs money to hold it in storage and keep it in condition. Even then, the grain tends to deteriorate in nutritive quality. Finally, the whole economy is denied the turnover of this wealth in improving its standards of living.

In the long-time farm-and-food program which I am suggesting, grain in dead storage is a stand-by factor. Experience has indicated the normal carry-overs of grain that we should expect to maintain. The prudent livestock man will naturally attempt to protect himself. Our stored grain, in addition, should be sufficient to protect and to encourage the livestock producer who operates in regions where weather brings wide fluctuations in crop yields and the threat of liquidation of his herds because of lack of feed.

What really counts in dealing with big crops and building useful stock piles of food is our produtive livestock population. Let

farmers on their own move the present ratio of 1.41 hog-equivalents to one man up to, say, 1.75 to 1, and we shall have improving soil fertility and a better supply of foods for the home refrigerator. The alternative is simple: an ever-increasing amount of grain in dead storage, acreage controls, progressive regimentation of 6,000,000 farmers, and finally no market for—refrigerators.

Now for some positive ideas for producing better meals for more Americans. The first step in implementing such a program is to manage our food-producing livestock to the maximum advantage of the human population. This is a job we have never tackled squarely.

We have been dealing with it in sections. We have veterinary schools for the health protection of animals. We have divisions in our experiment stations studying animal genetics. We have others dealing with the growing of forage for livestock, and still others with barn and feed-lot nutrition. But nowhere in the United States do we have an institution which brings together and correlates all these programs for the preservation and improvement of our domestic food-producing animals.

A few such pace-setting institutions are badly needed. I seriously propose for the consideration of some of the leading land-grant universities the establishment of schools or institutes of animal agriculture, the purpose of these institutions being to deal with our food-producing livestock population as a whole and to bring together for the teaching of graduate students who are destined to become skilled in the management of livestock all we know about the preservation and management of this basically important part of our way of life.

I am reliably informed that at least one leading land-grant university is considering setting up just such a school.

As a second positive step I feel that the great mass of publicly supported agricultural research should be inventoried and reviewed. This review should be by a committee representing all the people. Perhaps the National Research Advisory Committee might do this job.

Primarily, such review should seek to determine whether or not the public dollar appropriated for research in agriculture and food is being spent in the right proportions. Is enough aimed at the problems of our animal agriculture; or is too much of it devoted to fringe production, to specialty crops and the like?

Such a review should extend clear down to the State experiment stations. If it turns out as I expect it may, that we need to spend more research money to learn how to control animal diseases, breed them better, feed them cheaper and make better utilization of the food they produce, then this money should be made available. Or better still, it should be saved from projects which are not as fundamentally important.

As a third step, in putting a long-time farm-and-food program into effect we must cancel out, gradually but thoroughly, all those activities of Government which work against an expanding livestock industry with all the benefits it can bring to our standard of living.

It is at this point that our present conception of price supports must be brought into focus. It is at this point, too, that our ways of supporting soil conservation and soil building must come under critical study.

The above are complicated activities. Some of them are sired by socialism. Others are the children of pressure groups. All these devices must be kept under continuing review and constantly challenged to see if they are in accord with a long-time program of soil building, an expending livestock population, and better meals for more Americans.

For these are the three objectives toward which our economy must move. Actually, I think the question of whether our agriculture shall remain in the hands of free farmers or be State-managed, important as it is, is secondary to the question of how well we want to eat in the future. Which system will fill the most home refrigerators? That is what we all want to know, because we all have stomachs.

Realistically, this is the question now before the Eighty-first Congress. But in my opinion neither the Administration nor Congress but the market place eventually will answer this question.

If 150,000,000 Americans become sufficiently sold on the importance of the kind of meals they like best and is best for them, they won't kick in the long run on paying 6,000,000 farmers well to grow these meals. But this supposes two developments: (1) that through mass education and mass selling the American people will buy the ideal of good nutrition, and (2) that 6,000,000 farmers will be left free enough to apply their courage, their ingenuity, and their proved ability to produce cheaply adequate quantities of the foods for such nutrition—the refrigerator foods.

If we can gradually straighten ourselves out to a point where everybody appreciates the health, energy and social satisfaction of good eating; and farmers—principally through keeping more livestock—can get set to provide what the market really wants, we shall be on our way.

Consumers can be sold on the idea of paying fair prices for the foods they like best and which are best for them. Dairymen, poultrymen and livestock feeders under such circumstances will be willing to pay fair prices for grain. Remember that right now they provide four-fifths of the grain market. And, finally, the whole Nation will be safer because it is preserving its soil fertility and maintaining as it goes along a food reserve, the best which possibly can be devised, against war or natural disaster.

While actually the kind of farm and food program I have sketched should be self-sustaining because of the great flexibility which is inherent in our food-producing livestock population, let us suppose that we run into such a depression that too many of our 150,000,000 can't buy an adequate diet.

If this happens, then it seems to me that through school lunches and other diet subsidies which may be devised we can deal much more effectively with the emergency than we can if we try to meet it by shutting off production of food by acreage controls with resultant restriction of livestock numbers and, finally, State management of farming.

It must never be forgotten that over the long pull it is the suction of the market place on the food supply which determines the pay farmers get for raising food.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE of California. On page 2, in line 8, after the word "cotton", strike out the colon, insert a period in lieu therof, and strike out the balance of line 8 and all of lines 9, 10, 11 and 12.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Before he discusses his amendment I would like the gentleman to discuss a misstatement that was made a minute ago of the burden this program might impose on the taxpayers. Nobody wants to give a misunderstanding to the House. I understand how easy it is to make miscalculations when you are trying to do it in a hurry. I do think that we should make it perfectly plain that you cannot spend a billion dollars buying the product of even 2,000,000 acres of cotton and this does not add 2,000,000 acres of cotton anyhow.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I want to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], if it is his inclination to cut off debate or will the rest of us who have amendments have time to discuss our amendments?

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly I have no desire or intention to unduly restrict debate. The gentleman will have an opportunity to introduce his amendment and to speak on it. We should realize that there are some limitations to our time. I am not going to object to any further extension at this time, but if they become too numerous I may have to.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The reason I ask that question is that I undertook to offer some amendments in August, and I remember very distinctly that I was not privileged to explain some of the amendments which I had. Certainly I trust, within reasonable limitations, I shall have that opportunity today.

Mr. COOLEY. Within reasonable limitations I am sure the gentleman will have the opportunity.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I hope so.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. As I understand under the most generous figures that the Department could suggest, that this bill would result in the planting of more than 1,400,000 acres; that was the testimony before us; was it not?

Mr. WHITE of California. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. And of that sum 400,000 acres came in under the 50-percent gadget, leaving approximately 1,000,000 acres otherwise; that is right, is it not?

Mr. WHITE of California. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. And the actual average production in the United States is approximately half a bale per acre; is it not?

Mr. WHITE of California. That is right again.

Mr. POAGE. And if you take half a bale per acre on 1,000,000 acres, that would be half a million bales.

Mr. WHITE of California. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. The support price on cotton is a little less than 30 cents; is it not?

Mr. WHITE of California. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. With a 30-cent support price, you get only $150 a bale; do you not?

Mr. WHITE of California. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. At $150 a bale on half a million bales of cotton it could not amount to but $75,000,000, could it?

Mr. WHITE of California. That is correct. And, I make the further point, if the gentleman will allow me, that even if the money is loaned by the Government, it is not necessarily lost. The cotton program stands at a $200,000,000 profit as of this date.

Mr. POAGE. Exactly. If they spend $150 a bale on each bale that could possibly be produced, certainly the Government is not going to lose $150 a bale as the gentleman so well pointed out, and for the past 10 years it has not lost a single dollar per bale.

Mr. WHITE of California. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. There is no possibility that they could lose $150, and even if they did, it could only be $75,000,000. And, even with all of that, is it not further true that the bill as it now stands, the law as passed last year, provides a minimum of 21,000,000 acres of cotton which can be planted?

Mr. WHITE of California. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. And is it not further true that the Department of Agriculture estimates that even with this bill, with all of the gadgets in it now, that we still will not plant the 21,000,000 acres this coming year and instead of actually increasing anything, it will still wind up with less acreage planted than the present law authorizes for planting?

Mr. WHITE of California. That is right.

In explanation of my amendment, Mr. Chairman, I want to say this, that the 40 percent crop-land provision in this bill, which my amendment would strike out, was not in the original Cooley resolution when the subcommittee on cotton met here in December and the farmers voted without this limitation in there, and I submit that it is not fair, it is not right, it is not equitable that this should be now crammed down their throats. It certainly is a limitation placed upon the acreage that was promised to those farmers when they voted 90 percent in favor of this program.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is, of course, correct, and the gentleman also realizes that we liberalized the 70-percent provision by making it applicable to acres of cotton regarded as planted under Public Law 12.

Mr. WHITE of California. That is true, but that would not help the man who had been planting all of his land in cotton. The little fellow who has 40 acres all planted in cotton would, under the limitation you have put in the bill, be cut to 16 acres. I fought it in the committee and I have fought it here. It is not right, and my amendment would remove that injustice.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman has been fighting constantly. I will say to the gentleman that I am not wedded to the idea, but it was placed in the bill and it is now in the bill. I am sure there are Members in the House who will agree with the gentleman and I am likewise certain there are other Members here who will take the opposite view.

Mr. WHITE of California. I agree with the gentleman, there will be plenty on both sides.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. This 1,400,000 acres contemplates the bill if the gentleman's amendment is adopted, because we had no estimate after the 40 percent was put in.

Mr. WHITE of California. That is correct. I should like to point out that the Department of Agriculture's letter in regard to this legislation is highly critical of the cropland approach which this 40-percent provision reinstates. The bill as originally conceived in the House Subcommittee on Agriculture in December was based on the historical basis, in order to give relief to these people who had been hurt by putting it on the county factor basis, which is the cropland approach, and which caused all this trouble. Now they have come in here and stuck this 40-percent provision in which reverts back to the very cropland procedure which I tried so hard to get away from, and which the Department of Agriculture opposes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. If I understand the observation made by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the estimate that this bill would add 1,400,000 acres to the plantings of 1950 was made without the 40-percent limitation.

Mr. WHITE of California. That is right.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Can the gentleman tell us what the estimate will be with the 40-percent limitation in it?

Mr. WHITE of California. I am sorry I cannot. I have tried in vain to get those figures, and I have not been able to get them. However, it naturally should be less. That is a point that has been made.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman will yield further, is it not a further fact that the original resolution was amended to take into consideration irrigated land which was not actually planted to cotton but that was planted to other crops at any time during the crop year? I thought the Department of Agriculture had cleared that up for the gentleman to his satisfaction.

Mr. WHITE of California. That is not my complaint at all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COOLEY. I know it is not, but that was the gentleman's complaint until it was satisfied.

Mr. WHITE of California. That was one of my complaints.

Mr. COOLEY. In other words, the gentleman will admit we have satisfied one of his complaints?

Mr. WHITE of California. One of my complaints has been satisfied, and I thank our distinguished chairman for that, but this is the same proposition the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP] was talking about here a while ago. He knows the situation. He knows that the little farmer is being discriminated against. Certainly, this is only temporary legislation. The relief that is asked for here is asked for on a historical basis. So why put back in here a provision which throws it onto the cropland basis, and which caused all the trouble in the first place? If we are going to have a cropland basis, let us have it in the permanent legislation, not in this temporary legislation.

I should like to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL], my distinguished colleague from the minority side, if it is not his understanding that the farmers in California are in favor of the removal of this 40-percent limitation.

Mr. WERDEL. As far as I have heard, that is correct.

Mr. WHITE of California. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Can the gentleman tell us how much more it will add to the cost of this measure, to come out of the taxpayers of this country, if this provision is eliminated from the bill? What is the difference in dollars and cents?

Mr. WHITE of California. I am sorry I do not have the exact figures, but it is not a considerable sum when compared to the total relief that would be afforded under the 70-percent and 50-percent provisions.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman does concede that to eliminate this provision would make this bill cost something more than it would with the provision in it?

Mr. WHITE of California. Undoubtedly it would, but I call the gentleman's attention again to the fact that this provision was not in there when the farmers voted, and it is a fraud by the United States Government to have them vote with that assumption and then turn around and pass legislation which knifes them.

Mr. KEATING. Does not the gentleman feel that we should have the exact facts about the cost of this measure before us before we are asked to involve our Government in the sums of money contemplated by such a measure, or by his amendment?

Mr. WHITE of California. I will give the gentleman this much definite information: It certainly would not exceed $25,000,000.

Mr. KEATING. That is a great deal of money out in my section of the country.

Mr. WHITE of California. It certainly is, but it was committed to the farmers when they voted on the acreage-quota referendum.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, I wish to say I shall support the resolution because a little acreage for some exceedingly poor farmers who need it in my section will do some good. But I shall not try to convey the idea to my people back home and to the people of Texas that this will help in a measurable way the ones who probably were hurt the most as a result of this legislation. I have some PMA letters from counties which I received, in which I asked them how a 70-percent amendment and a 50-percent amendment, as originally proposed, would help in their respective sections. I want to read the answers to some of those inquiries. One of them comes from the county of Shelby, which is not in my district. It says:

The county set aside 1,045 acres as a reserve for new grower cotton allotments. We have in Shelby County 2,242 farms which come under this above classification. It is estimated that 50 percent of these farms will apply for a new grower allotment, and, mind you, not by any means are those all new growers. They are simply people who did not grow cotton in the base years 1946, 1947, and 1948. Many of these are veterans who have returned home.

Now, what have you according to the situation today? A thousand acres to distribute among 1,100 applicants. The important thing is how many additional acres will this resolution give that county. At the most, it will give them, according to information sent me January 6, 1950, by Mr. Vance, our State committee PMA chairman, 995 acres—995 acres added to a thousand will mean that the county of Shelby, which is not in my district, will have about 2,000 acres to distribute to about 1,000 or 1,100 farmers—amounting to 2 acres apiece of not very fertile land. If you think that is a square deal, you have a right to your own conclusion.

Here we have another county, Harrison County. Their communication is dated January 3. The PMA office wrote me and said:

Under the 1950 allotment formula up to 300 and 400 farmers will be forced to cease farming, as their acreage is too small to obtain credit. Under the 70-percent provision they will get 749 acres. They will get 768 acres under the 50 percent. At the most, 1,214 acres. One thousand two hundred and fourteen acres of poor land will not go very far toward taking care of 300 or 400 families.

I talked to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] a moment ago. I have a letter from his county committee in Pike County, which is in the State of Arkansas. They say:

Under the 1950 allotment program 200 farmers stand a good chance to be driven off their farms.

I asked him how much they will get under this, and according to his information, they will get some 50 additional acres.

I have a letter from Smith County, Miss. Incidentally, I am going to put all these letters in the RECORD. Some already are in the RECORD. They say that 200 farmers stand a good chance to be driven from the farm. How much additional acreage does Smith County get? According to some figures which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] obtained, they get 369 acres under the 75-percent provision, 124 acres under the 50-percent provision, and at the most 392 acres.

We have other counties. We have one down here which is not in my district—Trinity County. Here is what they say in their letter:

We have 175 acres of cotton to be distributed to new grower cotton farms. To date there have been at least 320 applicants for this acreage. The applications for the acreage are from farmers who shifted during the war to other crops and GI's returning from the war.

That is, they have under the present situation 175 acres to distribute to 320 farmers.

How much do they get under this new amendment? They get 103 acres under the 70 percent; they get 321 acres under the 50 percent; and, at most, 340 acres.

I have a note here from Forsyth, Ga. I asked them for a comment on the 70-percent and 50-percent provisions. "What good will this amendment do your county?" The letter that comes to me from Forsyth, Ga., says this:

The amendment attached, if approved, would be of no benefit to this county.

I do not know whether they are right or wrong, but that is what they say.

Let us see what we find from Rusk County, in Texas, with reference to the 70-percent and the 50-percent provisions. These figures are very pertinent. Here is what they say:

If Resolution 384 goes through as now written, it will be very damaging to the farmers of Rusk County. A 20 percent sample of the 2,550 farms receiving allotment was tabulated with the following results—

This was written January 10—

1,347½ acres would be the increase, of which 160 farms would receive less than 1 acre and 295 farms would receive the balance. This would leave 2,095 farms receiving less than their original 1950 allotment.

I read that letter to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], and he thought it was wrong. I sent it to our State committee chairman. He said as far as he could see it was correct. I hope it is not correct, but I fear it is correct. I repeat, I trust it is not correct.

I have a letter from Sabine County. What does it say? The letter was written January 3:

What this county needs is additional acreage for established allotments of new farm operators who have been released from wartime jobs and have no other ready means of livelihood. We have 115.3 acres and approximately 250 farmers have requested this acreage.

What does this amendment do? It gives them 196 acres under the 70 percent; it gives them 157 acres under the 50 percent; and, at most, 240 acres.

I have a letter from Natchitoches Parish, La. The letter was dated January 4:

There may be about 300 farm families in Natchitoches Parish displaced because of reduction of acreage.

This bill, according to figures I have put in the RECORD, gives them 320 additional acres under the plan which gives them most.

We have a county that Mr. REGAN, my colleague, represents. As I understand, it was drastically cut. If the figures that Mr. Vance gave me are correct with reference to that county, under the 70-percent provision, it will get 396 more acres; under the 50-percent provision, 1,211 more acres; and, at most, up to 1,343 acres.

I have another friend down in another section of Texas. He is what you call a big farmer. The county is Willesy. Under the 70 percent, that county gets 1,906 more acres. Four hundred and thirty acres under the 50-percent provision, and 1,949 acres at the most.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I shall yield in just a moment.

Here is what I want to say to those here today. I submit that although an attempt has been made to be helpful, we are falling far short in helping the group of people who need help most. Do not tell me that these people, many of them, are not genuine cotton farmers. They are people who may not have been there in 1946, 1947, and 1948, but many of them, with the exception of the time which they spent in the war, and with the exception of the time they spent at war plants, and perhaps 2 years after the war closed, have farmed all of their lives. Do you think that is a good thing? Do you think it is justified or that it is a good type of economy to deny genuine cotton farmers the right to have a crop? That, in my opinion, is what is occurring under the provisions of the legislation originally passed in August 1949, and it will not be cured to any great extent in many cases by that which we are passing today.

Mr. Chairman, under most of the letters herewith I am placing the number of additional acres which would be required for the respective counties. I refer to the (1) 70-percent plan, (2) the 50-percent plan, (3) higher than 50 percent. I believe my figures are reasonably accurate and indicate in the main how many additional acres the counties would get.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Center, Tex., January 6, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congressman of Third District of Texas, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of January 3, 1950, in which you quote a portion of Mr. B. F. Vance's letter in regard to a reserve set aside by the county committee for adjustment purposes, I wish to advise:

In answer to the first question as to how many acres the county committee reserved for old farms which have not been growing cotton recently, and the second question, "How many new farms", we wish to say that new farms and old cotton farms, as well, are put under one classification as "new grower" farms. These farms are eligible to apply for a "new grower" cotton allotment. The county committee set aside 1,041 acres as a reserve for "new grower" cotton allotments.

We have in Shelby County 2,242 farms which come under the above classification. It is estimated that approximately 50 percent of these farms will apply for a new grower allotment.

We hope that this information will clarify these questions for you.

Very truly yours,

JOHN A. KIMMEY,
Secretary, Shelby County PMA.

Shelby County, 781 acres, 70 percent; 676 acres, 50 percent; 995 acres, higher.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Marshall, Tex., January 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I would like to reply to your letter of December 23, 1949, on cotton allotments with answers to each question in sequence.

The 1942 Harrison County allotment was 75,000 acres. We believe if we could distribute the unused 1950 allotment we would have 1,500 to 2,000 acres to distribute.

If we can allot unused acres not many genuine cotton farmers would have to abandon farming although some larger farms might drop some tenants before their allotments are corrected.

War crop credits in this county amounted to approximately 2,000 acres.

Under the 1950 allotment formula up to 300 and 400 farmers will be forced to cease farming as their acreage is too small to obtain credit.

The Negro farmers with large families on farms with 20 to 50 acres of cropland are the hardest hit by this method of calculating allotments.

Yours very truly,

WALCOTT S. BLACK,
Administrative Officer,
Harrison County, PMA.

Harrison County: 749 acres, 70 percent; 768 acres, 50 percent, 1,214 acres, higher.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Hemphill, Tex., January 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

SIR: In answer to your questionnaire of December 23, 1949, the following information can be furnished:

The official cotton allotment for Sabine County was 2,920 acres.

Final allotment was 3,272.7 acres.

If we could distribute the unused 1950 allotment in this county we would gain approximately 100 acres. Very little of this would come from genuine cotton farmers who could not continue to farm because of small allotments, but from small farms being taken out of cultivation.

The type of war-crop credits being talked about would probably help this county very little.

Probably 12 families may be compelled to cease cotton farming because of allotments. Most of these will be tenants.

What this county needs is additional acreage for establishing allotments on new farms having operators who have been released from wartime jobs and having no other ready means of livelihood. We have only 115.3 acres for the purpose, and approximately 200 farmers have requested this acreage on that many farms.

There are also many GI's who were not operators of farms when called into service because they were still unmarried boys with no family responsibilities.

These boys were able to purchase farms in 1948 and 1949 and are now able to cultivate them.

Because of acreage history they can get no cotton, except new allotments. Can they be helped?

Thanks for your interest.

Yours truly,

HARRIS H. MINTON,
Secretary, Sabine County PMA.

Sabine County: 196 acres, 70 percent; 157 acres, 50 percent; 240 acres, higher.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Henderson, Tex., January 4, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
United States Congressman,
Third District,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letters of December 23, 29, and 30, 1949, requesting information on the 1950 cotton allotment situation in Rusk County.

There was set up in this county a reserve of 1,349.7 acres to distribute to new growers. We now estimate that between 900 and 1,000 farmers will request this acreage. The demand for farms with any kind of cotton allotment is enormous.

We estimate that there will be approximately 200 farms with 2 or more tenants and only enough cotton allotment for 100 of them. Also, there probably will be over 100 farms with 1 tenant who will be forced to cease farming under the present 1950 allotment formula.

Texas probably has enough acres if it could be redistributed more equitably between counties and also within the county.

Trusting this information will be of use to you and with best wishes, we are,

Respectfully yours,

E. D. MANSINGER,
Chairman, Rusk County
PMA Committee.

Rusk County: 639 acres, 70 percent; 933 acres, 50 percent; 1,364 acres, higher.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Tyler, Tex., January 3, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of a few days ago, in which you requested information relative to the cotton allotment situation in Smith County, the following is submitted.

1. 1942 Smith County cotton allotment: 58,000 acres.

2. Number of acres we would have to redistribute, if the unused 1950 allotment could be used. It is estimated that about 1,000 acres would be released by farmers for redistribution.

3. Number of acres that would come from genuine cotton farmers who cannot continue to farm because of too little acreage. It is doubtful if any acres would be released by such farmers, as they would merely reduce the number of tenants on the farm, so that a reasonable crop could be had by each tenant.

4. War crop credit: Smith County would receive about 3,000 additional acres if this credit were granted.

5. Number of genuine cotton farmers that will be forced to quit farming in Smith County due to the 1950 cotton allotment formula (including tenants). It is estimated that at least 500 will be forced off of farms due to insufficient cotton acreage.

Hoping this to be the desired information, and should additional information be needed don't fail to call on us.

For the county committee:

DAN G. OWEN,
Secretary, Smith County PMA.

Smith County: 319 acres, 70 percent; 680 acres, 50 percent; 829 acres, higher.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Carthage, Tex., December 29, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will acknowledge your letter of December 19, 1949, requesting certain data relative to cotton allotments in Panola County, Tex.

In comparing 1950 with 1942 allotments we note that Panola had an allotment of approximately 52,700 acres in 1942 and 17,367 for 1950. These figures include the allotment for new growers also.

You ask about release and reapportionment of unused cotton acreage allotment. We expect very few acres from this source. We estimate 150 for the county. Farmers anticipate changes in procedures and fear that the surrender of cotton allotment may affect any future allotment that would be established on the farm.

We are in bad shape on new grower farms (those who did not grow cotton in any of the years 1946, 1947, or 1948); 1,300 such farms, and only 1,000 acres to distribute. Of this 1,300, at least 400 will apply for a portion of this acreage.

I hesitate to estimate the number of tenants that will be without homes as a result of the small allotments in this county. The big move will start in the spring and after Congress has considered giving some relief. They still have hopes that something better will come their way. No doubt the gentleman from Wills Point, Tex., was about right in his estimates. For example, in Panola County, in 1942, 0.3145 percent of the cropland was allowed for cotton while in 1950 only 0.1398 percent is allowed.

We appreciate your interest and will gladly furnish any additional information upon request.

With kindest regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

T. L. VINCENT,
Administrative Officer, PMA, Panola
County, Tex.

Panola County: 515 acres, 70 percent; 1,396 acres, 50 percent; 1,570 acres, higher.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION,
Forsyth, Ga., January 23, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In answer to your inquiry dated January 16, 1950, the following is submitted:

1. The county committee reserved the full percent it could reserve.

2. The committee reserved 15 percent of the total county allocation.

3. The amendment attached, if approved, would be of no benefit to this county.

4. If this county had 50 acres, with no strings attached, we could satisfy every cotton farmer in the county.

For the Monroe County committee:

HUGH W. MERCER,
County Administration Officer, Monroe County PMA.

I was reading Sunday the remarks of Representative EVINS, of Tennessee. He referred to some of his counties. As I understand, Franklin County, Tenn., would set 379 acres, 70 percent; 429 acres, 50 percent; 464 acres, higher; and Lincoln County, Tenn., would get 8.5 acres, 70 percent; 919 acres, 50 percent; 919 acres, higher.

Mr. Chairman, please note some information from other States:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Natchitoches, La., January 4, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of December 24, this is to advise that the 1942 cotton-acreage allotment for Natchitoches Parish, La., was 50,233.7 acres.

If we could distribute the unused 1950 allotments to other farms within the parish, I believe that we could pick up between 2,500 to 3,000 acres. I do not think that any of this acreage will come from genuine cotton farmers who cannot continue to farm because of the reduced acreage.

I am not familiar with the type of war-crop credit that is being talked about; therefore I cannot answer this question.

There may be about 800 farm families in Natchitoches Parish displaced because of reduction of acreage.

As to the acreage to be distributed to old farms which have not grown cotton recently and to new farms which have recently come into production, we do not have any acreage in the parish for this purpose.

I understand that there are 35,000 acres set aside at the State level to take care of new-grower allotments.

We believe that if we can pick up unused acreage and distribute it to farms where additional cotton acreage is needed, many of our problems will be solved. Cotton-acreage allotments have been computed for quite a few farms where no cotton at all will be planted in 1950.

If you are in need of any additional information on this subject or any other phase of the PMA program at the parish level, please feel free to call upon me at any time.

Yours very truly,

H. L. SISSON,
Parish Administrative Officer.

Higher: 320 acres.

MURFREESBORO, ARK., *January 4, 1950.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Pike County is not a genuine cotton county as is no doubt the area which you represent. Few renters are in this county. Each owner cultivates his own small farm but the allotment for more than one-half of the farms is less than 5 acres.

The allotment for 1942 was 6,750 acres. The additional acreage with the distribution of the unused 1950 allotment could be well 500.

No genuine cotton farmer will pool his allotment but will cut his renters from 5 to 2 or 4 to 2.

The war-crop credit would not help this county very much.

There will be at least 200 farmers compelled to quit farming because of the 1950-allotment formula.

To old farms without allotment and "new farm," I have 50 acres. I have 200 requests for cotton allotments. This would mean at least 600 acres.

Thanking you for your interest and wishing you the best of success in your untiring efforts, I remain,

Yours very truly,

REEDER DILDY,
County Administrative Officer.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Raleigh, Miss., January 4, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. BECKWORTH: Reference is made to your letter dated December 24, 1949, in regard to some information you need concerning the cotton allotment. This information is as follows:

1. The allotment for Smith County in 1942: Approximately 23,000 acres.

2. Additional unused 1950 allotment that could be distributed: 700 acres.

3. Of this unused acreage, this amount will come from genuine cotton farmers who cannot continue to farm because of too little acreage: 200.

4. Number of war-crop credits which is being talked about which will mean more acres to Smith County: 100 acres.

5. Number of genuine cotton farmers in Smith County that might be compelled to cease to farm in Smith County under the 1950-allotment formula: 200.

6. Number of acres to be distributed to farms which have not grown cotton recently including new farms: 350.

Yours very truly,

ELLIS E. ROBINSON,
County Administrative Officer,
Smith County PMA.

Three hundred sixty-nine acres, 70 percent; 124 acres, 50 percent; 392 acres, higher.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Groveton, Tex., January 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress, Third District, Texas,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH: This is with reference to your letter of inquiry, date of December 12, 1949, on the cotton situation in Trinity County. We have 175 acres of cotton to be distributed to new grower cotton farms. To date there has been at least 320 applicants for his acreage. The applicants for the acreage are from farmers who shifted during the war to other crops, and GI's returning from the war. A few of the applicants, approximately six to eight, are people who have been working in defense industry, but have returned to the farm because they are too old and are being laid off from work, due to their age.

Several applicants are tenants from the farm having allotments so low the landlord will work the entire crop of cotton; example, tenant owning 80 acres of land, approximately 45 acres in cultivation, has worked peanuts (for market) and cotton on the adjoining farms for the years 1946, 1947, 1948, and feed crops on his own farm. Under the present law the tenant is a new grower and the landlord has a small allotment, which necessitates the tenant requesting new-grower allotment.

To clarify the situation in this county, we would like to point out that in 1942, 1,400 farms were growing cotton, compared to 516 allotment farms in 1950. You can imagine the number of requests this office will have for new grower allotments.

May I make a personal observation and state that we are 12 months behind on cotton. Everyone realizes there is a surplus of cotton, due to bumper crops in 1949, thereby necessitating a reduction in acreage. However, if we, or the farmers, have to accept a drastic reducton, the buying power of the farmer will be reduced so much that industry, labor, etc., will be affected to such an extent as to drive our country back to a depression.

In a recent meeting with the local merchants in our small town, everyone, without an exception, has already felt the effects of this program. The farmers are holding their money and doing without everything except the absolute necessities.

I wish that you, as well as Mr. PICKETT and the others, could be in our office and get the reaction of the farmers that visit this office. Then you would have a clearer picture of the whole situation. The farmers are not as critical as you would expect, but are disturbed.

It is hard for us to write the story as it actually is in our county, but hope this will help you in your fight for better farm programs. Please call upon us for any information you need and we shall work day and night to supply you with the information.

Very truly yours,

FRANK N. CATES,
Secretary, PMA, Trinity County.

Trinity County: 627 acres, 70 percent; 1,316 acres, 50 percent; 1,442 acres, higher.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Athens, Tex., January 18, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Henderson County reserved 1,450 acres of its official county allotment, all but 334 acres were used in adjusting 5- to 15-acre and other farms.

The chief concern of the committee is new-grower allotments as you see we only have 334 acres for this purpose, which will only be a drop in the bucket when distributed among 1,000 new growers.

We think you could relieve the situation in east Texas if you could get a price support on dry black-eyed and cream peas. Understand the State of California has one on black-eyed beans, which is the same as our peas.

The county committee concurs with Houston County in that the amendment will not help this county if we have to use the BAE acreage for the county. I am enclosing copy of a letter we sent Tom Pickett.

If we can be of further help, please advise.

Yours sincerely,

RAYMOND G. MAGERS,
Chairman, PMA Committee of
Henderson County.

Henderson County: 599 acres, 70 percent; 3,404 acres, 50 percent; 3,454 acres, higher.

At this point I desire to include some additional letters and one table:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Henderson, Tex., January 10, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
United States Congressman, Third District, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will acknowledge your letter of January 6, 1950, relative to the cotton allotments in Rusk County. We also received a copy of House Joint Resolution 384.

The copy of Judge Selman's telegram attached to your letter states the situation in Rusk County the same as it applies to Houston County. If Resolution 384 goes through as now written, it will be very damaging to the farmers of Rusk County.

A 20-percent sample of the 2,550 farms receiving an allotment was tabulated with the following results:

One thousand three hundred and forty-seven and one-half acres would be the increase, of which 160 farms would receive less than 1 acre and 295 farms would receive the balance. This would leave 2,095 farms receiving less than their original 1950 allotment.

This penalty to the bulk of the cotton farms would be a direct result of an arbitrary adjustment of the planted history by the county committee in order to meet the figures of the BAE.

We have 2,105 other farms which do not have a planted history for 1946, 1947, or 1948 but many of them did grow cotton in 1949. There is a reserve of 1349.7 acres set up for new growers. We have over 100 applications for "new grower" allotments and more coming in every day. It is estimated there may be as many as 900 in all.

Respectfully yours,

B. A. DINWIDDIE,
Secretary, Rusk County PMA.

Mr. Chairman, according to some figures I have taken from records of the Department of Agriculture and from the 1949 Texas Almanac, a publication of the Dallas Morning News, some very interesting county cotton acreage comparisons exist in Texas. In 1942 the cotton acreage allotment of some 14 east Texas counties I refer to was 720,501; the 1950 cotton acreage allotment of the same 14 counties is 225,953 acres—less than one-third of the number of acres they had in 1942. The 1940 total population of the 14 counties was 494,004. They have more people now, I would estimate. The 1949 Texas Almanac shows the 14 east Texas counties to have some 43,127 farms.

I think it can be shown, on the other hand, there are counties in Texas individually having in them considerably less than 100,000 people and individually less than 2,500 farms that have more allotted cotton acreage than all the 14 counties with their over 40,000 farms and almost one-half million people—whereas the latter counties referred to individually had less than one-fourth of the cotton acreage then allotted the 14 counties in 1942.

At this point I desire to include a table which I feel is reasonably accurate based on the sources referred to:

Some cotton allotment comparisons

County	1950 cotton allotment (acres)	1942 cotton allotment (acres)	Population, 1940	Number of farms
Wood	10,404	42,003	24,360	2,431
Van Zandt	36,387	84,486	31,155	4,432
Upshur	10,169	40,496	26,178	2,856
Smith	16,595	74,680	69,090	5,313
Rusk	23,762	71,397	51,023	4,294
Panola	17,367	52,883	22,513	2,540
Gregg	3,108	14,537	58,027	1,460
Camp	6,941	16,395	10,285	1,300
Anderson	14,516	45,761	37,092	3,096
Cherokee	15,440	57,695	33,970	4,490
Henderson	12,542	53,337	31,822	2,896
Houston	26,758	71,291	31,137	3,884
Nacogdoches	12,704	48,001	35,392	2,854
Grimes	19,260	47,539	21,960	1,864
Total	225,953	720,501	494,004	43,127

CARTHAGE, TEX., *January 5, 1950.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress, Third District of Texas, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will answer your letter of December 23, 1949, regarding proposed legislation to relieve the deplorable situation that cotton growers in Panola County, Tex., find themselves. No doubt the same conditions exist in most of east Texas, parts of Arkansas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Alabama, Georgia, and the northern part of Mississippi. In referring to these areas, I have in mind sections of the country where poorer land and smaller farms are located. They were populated with people, both colored and white, with limited education, small incomes, large families, and low credit ratings. Then the war came and age groups affected by selective service could not be deferred because of insufficient units on these small farms. For economical and patriotic reasons those rejected for military service went to nearby shipyards, defense plants, and other employment necessary to the war effort and even to large farms in other sections of the country where farming is carried out on a mass-production scale. Rising prices made it necessary that they earn more money than could be expected from a small farm.

After the war was over these farmers did not readily return to the farm for economical reasons. This resulted in little or no cotton history on many farms in Panola County during the base period—1946–48. In fact 1,300 of the 2,860 farms in this county have no cotton history. Many of these farm people that we refer to have returned to their farms now, because industries are catching up with orders and this labor is no longer needed. Since industry is not obligated to pay men they don't need, these people must be allowed the privilege of earning a living and farming is all they know. This county has only 1,000 acres of cotton allotment to give these nonhistory farms and if one-half of this 1,300 apply for an allotment, there will be less than 2 acres of cotton allowed for each farm. On these 1,560 history farms in Panola County, most of them will be allowed less than 14 percent of their cropland for a cotton allotment—the county factor is .1398. This situation makes many farmers unreasonable to talk to and you can hardly blame them. Their normal farm life was interrupted by the war and they became displaced persons for such period and it will take time, even a longer period of time, for their readjustment than most any other industry. By comparison, farmers were allowed over 31 percent of their cropland for a cotton allotment before the war.

You asked about the proposed 70–50 amendment for the sections of the country that we mention, but I doubt if very much relief can come from this amendment. In this country it was necessary to make severe downward adjustments in cotton acreages reported by the farmer, to come within BAE estimates. These adjustments had to be made on an individual farm basis and when the farmer complained he was told that such adjustment would not affect his cotton allotment because at least 1 of the 3 years 1946, 1947, or 1948 had been left reasonably high. We told him wrong if the 70–50 amendment is passed and many appeal cases will result.

You asked what provisions would be needed to give some relief. I will say an amendment as follows would give us much relief and not take too much additional cotton acreage: (1) Irrespective of the county factor, the cotton allotment on any history farm shall not be less than 75 percent of the highest acreage reported by the farmer to be planted to cotton in 1946, 1947, or 1948 but not to exceed 30 percent of the cropland on the farm. (2) Grant additional cotton acreage to the county committee for distribution to extreme hardship cases including nonhistory farms. (3) Allow unused cotton acreage to be returned to the county committee for redistribution to other farms.

This is what I think about the situation in general. We are dealing with the same farmer who grew cotton for 5 and 6 cents per pound in the early thirties. That is why they voted for marketing quotas on December 15, 1949, and not because they were satisfied with their newly established allotment. They do have hopes, however, that some relief will be offered when Congress meets in January. Mr. BECKWORTH, I believe you will agree, it's no time for any one to be trying to place the blame on the other fellow for criticizing or grabbing glory. The welfare of many people are affected and cannot be helped by "passing the buck." I have confidence in Congress and the Department of Agriculture working out a program fair to the areas of the country that I mention.

Be assured of my sincere appreciation for your personal interest in this subject. With kindest regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

T. L. VINCENT,
Secretary, Panola County PMA.

HENDERSON, TEX., *January 10, 1950.*

Mr. BECKWORTH.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you in regard to my farms. I have 278.02 acres of cultivated land and five tenant houses and they did not give me any land to work in cotton. It looks like I ought to have got some acres. Everybody around me got some acres but me. I would like for you to tell me how to get some land so the tenants can grow some cotton, if they don't get some it is going to be the worst depression that has been in this part of section for many years.

If there is any way you see to help me, will appreciate it.

Your friend,

H. E. PRICE.

JANUARY 11, 1950.

Mr. B. F. VANCE,
Production and Marketing Administration, Department of Agriculture, College Station, Tex.:

Please wire me immediately why you reserved only 3.7 percent for State reserve cotton acreage rather than 10 percent for reserve.

LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress.

Note why no higher percentage was reserved by the State committee:

COLLEGE STATION, TEX., *January 11, 1950.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Less than 10 percent of State cotton allotment was reserved by committee for the reason that it was felt that the amount reserved was enough to take away from the stable cotton-producing area of Texas. Details relative to studies made by committee too voluminous to wire.

B. F. VANCE.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Tyler, Tex., January 10, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: About 300 to 400 additional acres would be given to Smith County if the 70-percent amendment were added. This is taking into consideration that we were required to adjust downward the reported acreage to get within the BAE figures. If the actual farmers' reported acreage were used as a basis it would greatly help this country.

The number of acres that we have to distribute to old cotton farms which grew cotton first since the war in 1949 is 600 acres, new farms will have to draw their allotment from this same 600 acres. There are 5,600 farms in this county. Only 2,190 of these were eligible to draw a regular cotton allotment. This leaves about 3,400 to draw their allotment from the 600 acres.

Up to the present time we have about 300 requests for this acreage, each day adds a good many more, and it is estimated that we will have at least 500 requests for this acreage by the time we are required to quit taking applications.

Trusting this to be the desired information, I am,

Sincerely,

DAN G. OWEN,
Secretary, Smith County PMA.

THE CAIN BANKING CO.,
Winnsboro, Tex., January 26, 1950.
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AGENCY,
Quitman, Tex.

GENTLEMEN: It is indeed very seldom that I am so aroused to the extent that I write a letter of this sort, but from actual facts that have come to my attention in the past weeks, I cannot but write and express my personal views concerning this new agricultural allotment program.

Let me give you a concrete example of the situation as it exists in Wood County: Yesterday a man came into my office, who started farming last year, and will in all probability need assistance in making a crop this year. He is a good man, and has a good credit rating with us. Yet this man is allowed no cotton allotment, and no peanut allotment on his place for the year 1950.

As a banker, I feel that it is my duty to make funds available to good farmers on a sound, conservative basis. My question, then, is this: How can I help the community and how can I help the farmers when in the beginning I know that it is impossible to hope for any repayment of a loan on such conditions. My second question is this: Is the government lending agency going to take care of farmers who are burdened by this limited acreage allotment? My third question is this: How is one of our east Texas farmers going to produce, and how is he going to live?

I am aware of the fact that this letter will in all probability create no adjustment of the many inequalities; yet I urge you to consider it, and if necessary forward it to the persons who control and promulgate your rules. I want my protest to be recorded.

Yours very truly,

MALVIN CAIN.

BEN WHEELER, TEX., *January 13, 1950.*
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned farmers in the Ben Wheeler area of Van Zandt County, Tex., hereby protest the cotton program as passed to apply to 1950 acreage allotments.

We feel that the quota for this section of this county is inadequate for the maintenance of decent living standards.

We further object to its arrangements whereby it cuts the scale of acreage too low for new farmers and farmers who, on account of the war and postwar labor shortages, and the planting of wartime crops, were unable to plant their usual cotton acreage for a period of several years prior to the census taken to determine the acreage allotments for this area. A large number of our farmers are not represented or permitted to participate in the regulation of this measure as it is now set up; and

We respectfully request that you use every facility at your command to work this measure into more equitable and desirable form.

Respectfully,

O. H. Moseley, W. H. James, H. I. Brooks, G. R. Preston, L. Pinkerton, S. O. Cooper, H. A. Land, J. T. Butler, Tom Jenkins, N. A. Urvier, A. J. Burnett, J. E. Howell, H. J. Adrian, W. G. Gilchrist, C. R. Stouford, Joe Palmer, F. A. Easley, J. T. Parsons.

BEN WHEELER, TEX., *January 13, 1950.*
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned farmers in the Ben Wheeler area of Van Zandt County, Tex., hereby protest the cotton program as passed to apply to 1950 acreage allotments.

We feel that the quota for this section of this county is inadequate for the maintenance of decent living standards.

We further object to its arrangements whereby it cuts the scale of acreage too low for new farmers and farmers who, on account of the war and postwar labor shortages, and the planting of wartime crops, were unable to plant their usual cotton acreage for a period of several years prior to the census taken to determine the acreage allotments for this area. A large number of our farmers are not represented or permitted to participate in the regulation of this measure as it is now set up; and we respectfully request that you use every facility at your command to work this measure into more equitable and desirable form.

Respectfully,

John N. Huff, Ollie Hall, J. E. Smith, Jack Hancock, C. D. Briggs, G. H. Mullins, O. B. Biggs, E. E. Leine, R. S. Miller, C. M. Handcock, J. E. Wallace, A. G. Oxford, C. L. Youngblood, O. R. Cade, G. M. Martin, J. F. Allen, L. C. Moor, A. G. Cole, J. S. Grisham, M. L. Ayres, J. P. Mayon, C. Myers, E. Myers, Arch Johnson, Bishop Beasley, Homer Hixon, A. C. Pope, A. L. Norton, E. H. Brown, J. O. Fletcher, J. L. Fletcher, M. E. Jones, Bonteel Jones, I. H. Slaughter, J. D. Brown, Sr., J. D. Smith, Bon Leybrand, T. B. Thornburgh, F. F. Watts, J. F. Sides, H. A. Reynolds, J. E. Davidson, J. B. Coker, James O. Jenkins, W. B. Jenkins, Jack Stanger, Billy Moseley, G. T. Clarke, C. T. Gray, T. D. Stangor, Hubbard Palmer, Leroy Walker, L. P. Davidson, B. L. Stevens, G. R. Beggs, A. L. Clark, A. F. Butler, C. R. Peaney, H. C. West, Roy Spencer, M. H. Huddle, C. R. Cotton, Raymond Cotton, N. E. Hardwick, J. R. McCraw, W. G. Gilbert, C. F. Ayers, L. D. Ayers, John L. Jones, Clyde Friess, D. R. Thornburgh, J. E. Thornburgh, J. Y. Lane, W. J. Johnson, Ardeon Hallman, J. B. Hardwick, C. H. Love, H. L. Love, W. H. Minburn, N. R. Cantrell, A. B. Pyros, L. F. Hines, R. M. Eling, Howard Preston, J. J. Hopp, S. H. Ruske, T. T. Hines, Tommy Jack Hines, W. S. Byrd, L. J. Veazey, C. L. Clark, Ralph Stanfarb, W. H. Phillips, M. A. Reid, C. B. Rector, A. S. Rector, V. E. Stringer, C. W. Shaw, J. J. Hobbs, Jr., W. E. Fountain, Billie J. Beggs, Ray Stone, A. C. Phillip, R. J. Hilburn, A. W. Hall, J. V. Thornbush, Al Smith, W. H. Walker, W. L. Jackson, J. F. Love, W. L. Jones, P. P. Russell, A. C. Heard.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 14, 1950.

DEAR SECRETARY BRANNAN: I note several cotton States, including Texas, did not reserve the 10-percent cotton acreage their States offices could have reserved.

Did the Department of Agriculture advise these State committees to reserve the amounts reserved? Did it advise them not to reserve the amounts reserved? Was the Department consulted on this?

Please have the proper person call me when this is received.

Regards,

LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 28, 1950.

DEAR SECRETARY BRANNAN: If a cotton farmer in a cotton county is given the allotment of 10 acres this year, 1950, and under the Cooley resolution releases it—the Cooley resolution now being considered—the House will he be assured the same 10 acres next year is he desires it, assuming the cotton acreage in his county remains the same? Will he be allowed to vote if he grows no cotton in 1950 or has no interest in any cotton that is grown in 1950?

I'd like this information on the Hill, if possible, before the vote comes on the resolution.

Regards,

LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

P. S.—Would he be regarded as a new cotton farmer in 1951?

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Nashville, Tenn., January 19, 1950.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: We are enclosing a summary by counties of the probable acreage required under certain provisions of the proposed legislation quoted in your letter of January 10, 1950, in which you requested this information.

We shall be glad to furnish you with any further information that we have available.

Very truly yours,

CARL FRY,
Chairman, State PMA Committee.

County summary of total additional acreage required—Re 50- and 70-percent provisions of proposed legislation

	Additional acreage required based on adjusted acreage		
	Under 70-percent provision	Under 50-percent provision	Under higher 50- or 70-percent provision
Bedford	0	0	0
Benton	14.5	17.5	19.0
Blount	0	0	0
Bradley	171.9	119.0	203.1
Cannon	0	0	0
Carroll	1,525.0	2,953.5	3,623.5
Chester	211.0	33.5	212.5
Coffee	69.0	70.5	84.5
Crockett	599.5	190.0	621.5
Davidson	2.7	0	2.7
Decatur	224.5	857.5	892.0
DeKalb	0	0	0
Dickson	0	0	0
Dyer	930.0	446.5	1,065.5
Fayette	168.5	183.0	290.0
Franklin	379.5	329.0	464.5
Gibson	255.0	220.0	420.0
Giles	1,714.0	1,574.5	2,036.5
Grundy	0	0	0
Hamilton	15.9	76.3	83.1
Hardeman	1,855.0	3,856.0	4,103.5
Hardin	615.0	302.5	731.5
Haywood	2,011.0	1,274.0	2,614.5
Henderson	928.5	336.5	965.5
Henry	93.0	80.0	135.5
Hickman	0	12.5	12.5
Humphreys	0	0	0
Knox	0	0	0
Lake	1,775.0	0	1,775.0
Lauderdale	0	0	0
Lawrence	1,786.5	3,166.0	3,868.0
Lewis	0	20.0	20.0
Lincoln	8.5	919.0	919.0
Loudon	0	0	0
McMinn	44.3	6.5	44.3
McNairy	2,855.0	1,343.0	3,078.0
Madison	980.0	167.5	1,045.0
Marion	81.2	112.6	120.6
Marshall	88.0	117.5	117.5
Maury	0	2.5	2.5
Meigs	41.7	21.5	46.7
Monroe	2.0	7.5	9.5
Moore	0	10.0	10.0
Obion	1,499.5	1,117.0	1,805.0

County summary of total additional acreage required—Re 50- and 70-percent provisions of proposed legislation—Continued

	Additional acreage required based on adjusted acreage		
	Under 70-percent provision	Under 50-percent provision	Under higher 50- or 70-percent provision
Perry	0	0	0
Polk	20.0	51.4	52.5
Rhea	0	0	0
Roane	0	0	0
Rutherford	263.0	266.0	360.0
Sequatchie	0	0	0
Shelby	29.5	24.0	53.5
Stewart	0	0	0
Tipton	557.0	56.0	590.5
Van Buren	0	0	0
Warren	14.9	34.1	36.3
Wayne	59.0	347.0	353.5
Weakley	2,732.5	2,896.0	3,180.0
White	0	0	0
Williamson	8.5	0	7.0
Wilson	0	0	0
State total	24,629.6	23,617.4	36,095.8

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Nashville, Tenn., January 19, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your communication of January 13, 1950, regarding the State committee reserve under the 1950 cotton marketing quota program, we desire to inform you that the State committee withheld 10 percent of the State acreage allotment for distribution to counties on the basis of historical trends in acreage, abnormal conditions affecting plantings, small farms, and applications for new farm allotments. All of this reserve has been distributed to cotton counties with the exception of that for new farm allotments which will be distributed after February 15, which is the closing date for applications for new farm allotments in Tennessee.

We believe that this reserve has been adequate from a State basis.

Very truly yours,

CARL FRY,
Chairman, State PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letters, one of which was dated January 3, 1950, two January 4, 1950, one January 5, 1950, and one January 13, 1950, with which you enclosed a copy of a telegram which you had received from Mr. Roy Selman, county judge of Crockett, Tex., dated January 3, 1950. You will note these telegrams are all exactly alike and were transmitted to us under five different memorandums on the dates described above.

Each of the inquiries is relative to the use of Bureau of Agricultural Economics data in the determination of cotton acreage allotments. Section 301 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, provides that:

"The latest available statistics of the Federal Government shall be used by the Secretary in making the determinations required to be made by the Secretary under this Act." (7 U. S. C. 1940 ed. 1301 (c), February 16, 1938, 52 Stat. 43.)

Therefore, we have in accordance with the law used the latest available statistics of the Government in the determination of cotton acreage allotments.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, January 24, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Your note of January 9 to the President with which you enclosed a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 3 has been referred to us for consideration.

I find that we have already given you our comments on the present cotton-acreage-allotment law, and our Solicitor and Acting Director of our Cotton Branch have discussed corrective measures with you.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., January 20, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of December 29, 1949, with reference to a letter you received from Mr. Forrest Gilbert, Rural Route No. 3, Grand Saline, Tex., concerning acreage allotments on cotton and peanuts.

It appears that the farm in which Mr. Gilbert is interested is not eligible for an old grower cotton allotment under the provisions of Public Law 272 because there was no cotton planted on the farm in 1946, 1947, and 1948, or regarded as planted in 1946 and 1947 under Public Law, 12. If Mr. Gilbert wishes to grow cotton on his farm in 1950, he should contact his county PMA committee and make application for a new farm cotton allotment. The State committee has established March 1, 1950, as the final date for applications for new farm allotments to be filed with the county committee, with the county committee having the privilege of setting an earlier closing date. In view of this, we suggest that Mr. Gilbert contact his county committee within the near future.

Under legislation contained in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, 1950 peanut acreage allotments are at this time being established by county PMA committees for farms on which peanuts were picked or threshed in one or more of the years 1947, 1948, and 1949. If Mr. Gilbert's farm did not have peanuts picked or threshed in any of these 3 years and if he wishes to apply for a new farm peanut allotment for 1950, he should contact his county PMA committee within the near future.

The producer indicates in his letter that he may possibly desire to plant peanuts for feed purposes. You may possibly wish to advise him that there will be no restriction in 1950 on the acreage of peanuts planted and hogged-off.

With reference to the eligibility of farmers to vote in the cotton referendum held December 15, 1949, it may be pointed out that farmers eligible to vote in this referendum were those engaged in the production of cotton in the calendar year 1948.

We hope that we have made the matter clear to you. When we can be of further service to you, please advise.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., January 19, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of January 6 with which you enclosed a copy of a letter from Miss Cora Johnson, Longstreet, La. Miss Johnson had requested your assistance in securing cotton allotments for Panola County farmers.

As you know, 1950 farm cotton allotments have been determined in strict accordance with regulations and instructions issued by the Secretary of Agriculture. These are based on public laws passed by the Congress. Consequently, there is nothing that the State committee can do to increase farm allotments except as the Congress may provide in amendatory legislation. I believe suggestions made in my letter of this date, if enacted into law, will provide considerable relief, particularly in east Texas counties where small allotments have been established.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING, ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., January 19, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of January 7 with which you enclosed a copy of a letter from Mr. B. B. Rabb, Point, Tex. Mr. Rabb suggested an alternate method of apportioning county cotton allotments to eligible farms in the county.

The suggestions made for making farm cotton allotments are substantially the same as those included in my letter of this date which was in reply to your letter of December 30. I believe the proposal has considerable merit, particularly for east Texas counties. It is also approximately the same proposal that was made by the Department of Agriculture spokesmen at the time recommendations were made to the first session of the Eighty-first Congress on ways and means of making farm cotton allotments.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., January 19, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of January 10 with which you enclosed a copy of a letter from Mr. A. M. Mainer, route 3, Carthage, Tex. Mr. Mainer had requested your assistance in securing a larger cotton allotment for a neighbor's farm.

There is no indication in the letter that county and community committeemen have not established the 5-acre allotment in accordance with regulations and instructions issued from this office. However, if the neighbor of Mr. Mainer is dissatisfied with the allotment he should file an application for review with the local PMA secretary at Carthage, Tex. A duly constituted review committee will review the determination of the cotton allotment to see that it is fair and equitable and that it was determined properly.

There is a possibility that amendatory legislation now being considered by the Congress will increase the cotton allotment referred to above, but I can make no commitment since I do not know the provisions of the legislation that may be passed.

I regret that under the circumstances there is nothing that we can do here to increase the farm cotton allotment.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., January 19, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of January 11 in which you quoted a pertinent portion of a letter from Mr. J. Perrin Willis, box 5, Rusk, Tex. Mr. Willis had suggested an alternate method of making farm cotton allotments.

I do not agree with the suggestion made by Mr. Willis. Instead, it is my opinion (for diversified counties) that the county cotton allotment be apportioned among farms primarily on the basis of the average cotton history during the 3 years immediately preceding the year for which the cotton allotment is being made. Secondary factors of cropland, work stock and equipment, labor and adaptable soil, of course, need to be injected into this method of apportioning the cotton allotment. I do not recommend that this suggestion be extended to straight cotton counties where the percentage of cropland method in apportioning the county allotment is satisfactory and workable. In this manner, State and county committees will have considerable latitude in making farm cotton allotments and in minimizing the percentage reduction in average cotton acreage on small farms. Also, at the same time, small cotton farmers will have made a contribution to the national reduction in cotton acreage.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., January 20, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of January 10 regarding cotton legislation and acreage allotments.

The Department does not have available by counties data as to the additional cotton acreage that would be required or allotted under the present proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

K. T. HUTCHINSON,
Assistant Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 20, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of January 7, 1950, requesting information regarding tobacco acreage allotments for 1942 and 1950 for all counties in the United States growing tobacco.

Marketing quotas were in effect in 1942 and are in effect for 1950 for flue-cured, burley, fire-cured, and dark air-cured tobacco. Quotas are in effect for Virginia sun-cured tobacco for 1950 for the first time. We are enclosing a tabulation by States and kinds of tobacco showing the total acreages allotted in 1940 through 1949.

The total tobacco acreages allotted in each State in 1950 will vary from those for 1949 by kinds of tobacco approximately by the following percentages: Flue-cured tobacco, increase 1 percent; burley tobacco, decrease 10 percent; and fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco, decrease 13 percent. The total acreages allotted in each county are not available. However, it is hoped that the enclosed tabulation by States and kinds of tobacco will serve your need.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH S. TRIGG,
Administrator.

Tobacco acreages allotted by States and by kinds, 1940–49

State and kind	1940 acreage	1941 acreage	1942 acreage	1943 acreage	1944 acreage	1945 acreage	1946 acreage	1947 acreage	1948 acreage	No. 1949 allotments	1949 acreage
Flue-cured:											
Alabama	453	445	487	489	588	516	568	560	487	171	511
Florida	13 598	13, 673	15, 168	16, 169	19, 893	21, 526	24, 634	25, 863	18, 746	7, 407	20, 008
Georgia	73, 224	73, 659	81, 053	85, 860	106, 907	110, 115	124, 153	124. 111	90, 995	29, 384	96, 447
North Carolina	508, 557	511, 224	564. 378	602, 220	733, 836	747, 578	839, 121	828. 121	602. 235	120, 254	635, 879
South Carolina	85, 003	85, 054	94, 244	99, 027	122, 463	125, 095	141, 341	142, 068	103, 836	25, 155	109, 895
Virginia	77, 375	77, 604	85, 892	91, 687	111. 440	113, 658	127, 408	126, 042	91, 701	23, 903	96, 717
Total	758, 210	761, 659	841, 222	895, 452	1, 095, 127	1, 118, 488	1, 257, 225	1, 246, 765	908, 000	206, 274	959, 457
Burley:											
Alabama	157	162	161	167	218	232	128	108	86	60	64
Arkansas	85	82	84	99	115	108	127	105	102	102	104
Georgia	121	138	135	106	139	113	119	101	103	155	120
Illinois	34	36	12	37	54	62	51	41	37	42	36
Indiana	10, 436	9, 732	10, 233	12, 076	16, 509	16, 435	14, 467	12, 114	11, 804	9, 394	11, 975
Kansas	433	451	344	509	660	598	454	366	335	117	342
Kentucky	260, 306	261, 352	265, 183	299, 927	394, 700	409, 790	376, 996	311, 953	308, 155	143, 795	311, 598
Missouri	5, 458	5, 155	5, 499	6. 331	8. 093	8, 231	7. 402	5, 945	5, 711	2, 131	5, 673
North Carolina	7, 850	7, 139	8, 022	10, 188	15. 132	15, 578	14, 198	12, 833	12, 872	15, 999	13, 049
Ohio	13, 074	12, 068	12, 124	15, 555	21. 014	21, 496	18, 934	15, 714	15, 418	10, 800	15, 567
Oklahoma	7	5	8	9	10	12	8	5	5	1	5
Pennsylvania							12	6	5	3	3
South Carolina	97	98	98	99	91	15	18	15	14	27	11
Tennessee	62, 180	61, 791	63, 723	76, 000	108, 014	111, 649	102, 062	89, 984	89, 369	84, 580	90, 422
Virginia	10, 429	10, 535	9, 016	12, 935	18, 092	18, 615	17, 015	15, 005	14, 920	15, 437	15, 112
West Virginia	3, 938	4, 020	4, 053	4, 703	5, 992	5, 954	5, 344	4, 346	4, 256	4, 102	4, 176
Total	374, 605	372, 764	378, 695	438, 741	588, 833	608, 888	557, 335	468, 641	463, 192	286, 745	468, 257
Fire-cured:											
Illinois	(1)	14	15	10	(1)	(1)	11	11	7	2	6
Kentucky	(1)	33, 151	33, 415	36, 081	(1)	(1)	46, 877	46, 333	30, 961	11, 451	26, 342
Tennessee	(1)	35, 176	33, 775	36, 400	(1)	(1)	47, 290	47, 799	31, 797	9, 824	26, 846
Virginia	(1)	15, 976	13, 730	16, 191	(1)	(1)	23, 436	21, 973	14, 577	8, 052	12, 337
Total	(1)	84, 317	80, 935	[2] 88, 682	(1)	(1)	117, 614	116, 116	77, 342	29, 329	65, 531
Dark air-cured:											
Illinois	(1)	13			(1)	(1)					
Indiana	(1)	379	382	391	(1)	(1)	444	361	252	231	245
Kentucky	(1)	30, 777	30, 989	33, 763	(1)	(1)	41, 198	37, 627	28, 836	21, 433	26, 074
Missouri	(1)	7	7	6	(1)	(1)		11	8	3	7
Tennessee	(1)	4, 633	4, 403	5, 103	(1)	(1)	6, 266	5, 740	4, 347	4, 661	3, 871
Total	(1)	35, 809	35, 781	[2] 39, 263	(1)	(1)	47, 908	43, 739	33, 443	26, 358	30, 197
Grand total	1, 132, 815	1, 254, 549	1, 336, 633	1, 462, 138	1, 683, 960	1, 727, 376	1, 980, 082	1, 875, 261	1, 481, 977	548, 706	1, 523, 442

[1] Marketing quotas not in effect.
[2] Quotas terminated for 1943 prior to harvest.

COLLEGE STATION, TEX., *January 13, 1950.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: As requested in your wire of January 12, I am attaching a listing sheet showing a distribution of the 1950 State cotton acreage allotment and the State committee reserve of 290,207 acres. The State committee reserve represents 3.8 percent of the total State allotment.

The State committee reserve was required to be used for (1) adjusting computed county allotments and upward trend in cotton planting, (2) abnormal conditions affecting cotton plantings, (3) for assisting county committees with the establishment of fair and equitable allotments for farms whose indicated allotments were between 5 and 15 acres, (4) for assisting county committees with the making of 1950 new farm allotments, and (5) to assist county committees with the making of minimum farm allotments of not less than the smaller of 5 acres

or the highest cotton history of the farm during the years 1946–48.

The adjustment in county allotment for abnormal conditions affecting cotton plantings was the most difficult one since it required that consideration be given to (a) all types of weather conditions affecting cotton plantings in 1947 and 1948, (b) soil crusting in irrigated areas, (c) production of designated war crops instead of cotton in 1947, (d) disproportionate movement of farm operators and farm labor to off-farm employment as between counties, and (e) other minor abnormal conditions affecting one of more counties.

The State committee formula for use in distributing the State reserve is as follows:

1. Trend: For counties and administrative areas where the 1948 actual planted cotton acreage exceeds the 1947–48 average planted acreage by more than 10 percent, an allotment adjustment for such trend was computed as the product of (a) the increase in 1948 acreage over 1947 acreage and (b) 0.0904686.

2. Abnormal conditions: For counties and administrative areas where the 1947–48 average planted acreage is less than the 1941 planted acreage, an allotment adjustment for abnormal conditions of production affecting cotton plantings was computed as the product of (a) the decrease in planted acreage from 1941 to the 1947–48 average and (b) 0.0904686.

3. Five- to fifteen-acre allotment farms: For assisting county committees with the adjustment of allotments for 5- to 15-acre allotment farms, 50 percent of the amount of acreage used for this purpose under the 1942 allotment program (but not less than the smaller of 5 acres or the amount actually used under the 1942 program), except that an additional 1,204 acres was allocated to McLennan County, 859 acres to Hill County, and 214 acres to Coryell County above the amounts specified for use in determining fair and equitable allotments for such farms that will be comparable with allotments established for other similar farms in the communities in these three counties.

4. Group II: For assisting county committees with the establishment of group II (new grower) allotments in 1950, these amounts were allocated:

(a) For counties with official 1950 allotments of less than 1,000 acres, 25 acres, but not more than 25 percent of such official allotment.

(b) For counties with official allotments of 1,000 acres or more but less than 3,000 acres, 50 acres.

(c) For counties with official allotments of 3,000 acres or more but no more than 5,000 acres, 75 acres.

(d) 19,613 acres to certain counties in which substantial acreages of land in farms were devoted to cotton and other crops for the first time in 1949, on the basis of the amount of such cropland of record in the State office.

5. Small-farm increases: The remaining amount of such 3.8 percent State reserve to be added to the State reserve of 5,287 acres, which amounts of allotment are to be used for providing minimum acreage allotments for small farms in all counties.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of January 30, 1950]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

TUNG NUTS AND HONEY

If you are a bit bemused by all the bellowing about the welfare state, it is a good idea to look into the present status of national farm policy. Here is where you can see how state economic planning may really work in America, simply because state planning has advanced further in this particular economic sector than in any other.

Because of Federal farm support prices, a very high proportion of all the major crops of this country now pass through the hands of a Government agency, the Commodity Credit Corporation. The CCC makes loans on, or purchases outright, everything from cotton and wheat to blue lupine seeds. It controls vast storage facilities, deals actively on the commodity exchanges, and offers farm products for exports. Secretary of Agriculture Brannan has just asked that the CCC's capital be increased by $2,000,000,000.

Nor does the Government stop at subsidizing the farmers under the cover of the CCC's highly philanthropic banking and trading operation. The Government is also empowered to exercise a considerable measure of control over the acreages of each crop that the farmers may plant.

The first thing you discover when you venture into this vital area of national policy, is that this is the happy hunting ground of special interests. Last year, for example, Secretary Brannan very nearly succeeded in getting an administration-approved farm bill through the Senate. At the last minute, however, he was defeated by his great enemies, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the previous Secretary of Agriculture, now the strongest man in the Senate Agriculture Committee, Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico.

How was this great defeat administered to Brannan? The answer is simple. The Brannan-approved bill did not offer support prices to tung nuts, honey, and pulled wool. The Senators from the honey, tung-nut and pulled-wool States were easily made to see how vital it was for these commodities to be subsidized by the taxpayer. Honey, tung nuts, and pulled wool went into Senator ANDERSON's bill. And Senator ANDERSON's bill passed instead of Secretary Brannan's.

Behind all the present clamor for and against the Brannan farm plan, the same sort of process operates on a much larger scale. The principles of the Brannan plan are very simple.

Instead of the present disguised subsidies, farmers are to be paid on open subsidies in the form of "production payments," whenever crop prices fall too low. Instead of being stored, or even destroyed, the subsidized farm products are to be sold on the open market for what they will bring, and eaten by the taxpayers. And because profits will thus be guaranteed to farmers, much more effective Government controls are to be imposed on acreages planted.

It is not the purpose here to say whether the Brannan plan is, or is not a good plan. What needs to be pointed out, rather, is the extreme hypocrisy that pervades the whole debate about this great issue.

The American Farm Bureau, for instance, bitterly denounces the plan as socialistic. But the Farm Bureau is led by Allan B. Kline, who was spotted for Secretary of Agriculture in the Dewey administration. The Farm Bureau is also controlled by large farmers. And one of the original Brannan plan's best features was a clause aimed at the present shocking situation, in which large farmers are given enormous annual presents by the American Treasury.

When the potato support-price mess was at its worst, for instance, more than one "farmer" in Aroostook County, Maine, was getting above $500,000 annually from the Government for his factory-farmed crop. Such "farmers" made profits of $250,000 a year or more. To end this nonsense, Brannan proposed to put a ceiling value of $25,000 on the crops that would be eligible for subsidy from any one farm. This was socialism, and aroused natural indignation.

The other really impelling objection to the Brannan plan is the increase of Government controls over farmers. But even the most conservative Republicans in Congress now accept the rule that our farmers must be guaranteed profits. If the farmers are to be guaranteed profits, but not controlled, the temptation will be irresistible to increase output until there is a hopeless glut of every crop, and the whole system collapses in chaos. In short, firm farm controls are the essential price of guaranteed farm profits. And if controls are to be honestly attacked, subsidies must be attacked, too.

From all this a conclusion perhaps arises. The real danger of state planning in the American society lies less in the fallibility of the planners, than in the power of special interests in the Congress, and in the widespread belief that you can have your cake and eat it, too.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF CENSUS,
Washington, January 6, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is to confirm answers to the questions you discussed yesterday with Mr. Ray Hurley, Chief, Agriculture Division of this Bureau.

According to the 1945 census there were 601,273 farms with 9 acres or less of cotton harvested. These farms with 9 acres or less of cotton harvested produced a total of 2,386,668 bales of cotton or an average of 3.97 bales per farm. If these farms were limited to a maximum production of 4 bales each, then the maximum total cotton production on such farms would be 2,405,092 bales. As we have pointed out, we do not know how many of these 601,273 farms produced more than 4 bales of cotton in 1944. If it could be assumed that there are now 1,500,000 farms producing cotton and that the same proportion of these 1,500,000 farms as in 1944 grew 9 acres or less of cotton, then 740,700 farms would have 9 acres or less of cotton. If each of these 740,700 farms were limited to a maximum production of 4 bales each, the maximum total production of such farms would be 2,962,800 bales.

According to the United States Department of Agriculture, approximately 32,200 farmers producing Irish potatoes were eligible for the price-support program in 1948. In 1944 there were 2,105,757 farmers producing Irish potatoes. The 32,200 farmers eligible for the price-support program is equivalent to 1.5 percent of all farmers harvesting potatoes in 1944. It should be noted that a large number of farmers producing potatoes grew them for use only on the farm. In 1944 only 432,923 farmers reported 1 acre or more of potatoes harvested.

Please let us know if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP M. HAUSER,
Acting Director, Bureau of the Census.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the most constructive provision in the pending bill is the 40-percent provision that the gentleman from California seeks to strike. As has been observed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] and by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], chairman of the committee, there is nothing new about that 40-percent provision; that language was contained in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

When asked as to what this amendment would cost, the gentleman from

California, not once but twice, declined to state, but finally said that it might cost $25,000,000. Permit me to say that I asked the Department what it would cost or how many acres would be added, and my opinion is that $25,000,000 is just the beginning, as the Department would not even give me a guess, much less an estimate.

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee at this time as to whether or not the 40-percent provision of the pending bill involves the determination just as the determinations have been made by the Secretary of Agriculture under the act of 1938, as amended. I would like an answer for the information of the House.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Agricultural surpluses hang like a pall over agriculture; they are a burden today to the Federal Treasury. During the year 1948 the amount of the advances by the Commodity Credit Corporation reached the staggering total of approximately $3,500,000,000. Just a few days ago the Secretary of Agriculture recommended to Congress that the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation be increased by $2,000,000,000. Agriculture is profoundly interested in the preservation of the integrity of the laws under which, beginning with the act of 1938, the farmers have prospered. I know that inequities and injustices under the act of 1949 have developed. The purpose of this bill is to provide for a correction of these inequities and discriminations. Some say that the fault is with the county committees. Others say that the fault is with the State committees. Under the act, provision for reserved acres was made. The acres should have been reserved to correct inequities. However, the Department of Agriculture is not without blame. My understanding is that all adjudications by the county committees and by the State committees had to be approved by the Department of Agriculture. The Department and the committees must share the blame. I agree with the report of the Agriculture Committee that the mistakes were of administration; but no matter who made the mistakes, they should be corrected. These mistakes can be corrected by reducing the 70 percent to 60 percent and by eliminating the 50-percent provision of the bill. I would have favored an amendment as to the regulations, but the statement of the chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], as well as the undisputed intent of the House, makes such an amendment unnecessary.

No additional acres that are not absolutely essential to remove inequities and injustices should be added.

Those who advocate the 70-percent as well as those who advocate the 50-percent provision of the bill maintain that the 21,000,000-acre allotment was made and that the Department guessed that some one and one-half to two million acres would not be planted. This was one reason for the 21,000,000-acre limitation. The committee and the Congress knew that it was not contemplated that 21,000,000 acres would be planted. The addition of 1,402,000 acres would increase the acreage to be planted and that increase would be over the acreage that it was contemplated would be planted under the act of 1949.

I favor substituting 60 percent for 70 percent, because 60 percent, with slight differences, has obtained in the previous administration of the law. The 50 percent would result in inequities. It would favor the grower and the region where new lands have been taken in. The advocates of the 50 percent, under the guise of aiding the little man and the veteran, are in reality promoting the interests of the new lands that have been brought into cultivation. The average planted acres for the 3 years is fair. The selection of 1 year would be most unfair.

We have heard a lot about the little man and the big grower. Whenever you eliminate the 40 percent for the 40-acre man who grew cotton with the 40-acre provision in 1942, you eliminate it for the 4,000-acre owner who has gone into cotton in the last few years, whether the 4,000-acre owner lives in the lower Mississippi Valley or in the valleys of California. The average of 3 years rather than the 50-percent high of 1 year is fair and just to all whether the growers or acreage be large or small. The veteran believes in equality. The small owner believes in justice.

I advocate the substitution of 60 percent for 70 percent and the elimination of the 50-percent provision, because as best I can ascertain it will reduce the additional acreage from 1,402,000 to around 800,000 or 900,000 acres, and at the same time provide for the elimination of injustices. I want to remove inequities but I want to prevent surpluses. Such a program is for the general benefit of all cotton growers.

The committee, in 1949, after almost a year, reported and Congress finally passed a bill that I think is generally satisfactory. The mistakes in administration should be corrected. I believe that if the pending bill is amended as I have recommended additional acres will be provided that will amply correct the mistakes.

In speaking with respect to cotton, I have in mind the long-range program. Of course, a program for 1950 that is fair is important but, in view of there being no control since 1942, it is imperative that the existing surplus be increased no more than absolutely necessary on the one hand and, on the other hand, that these surpluses should be reduced as fast as possible. I repeat the act passed some months ago is generally fair. Errors have been made by the committee. The report of the committee admits that they were largely mistakes of administration. It is no answer as I have said, to say that the county committees and the State committees had discretion. Their allotments had been approved by the Department of Agriculture in Washington. The fault was either with the act or with both of these agencies, and probably both with the act and both of these agencies. The pending bill will increase the allotment by 1,402,000 acres. The farmers, when they voted for the program in December 1949, knew that the allotment was 21,000,000 acres.

As I have stated, the constructive feature of the pending bill is the 40-percent provision. I understand that the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture will be determined under the regulations that have heretofore been made in accordance with the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. The author of the pending bill, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], agrees with this interpretation. Otherwise, I would offer an amendment that the regulations must be in accord with the act of 1938, as amended.

I am in sympathy with the real purpose of the bill. I believe that injustices can be removed by substituting 60 percent for 70 percent and by eliminating the 50-percent provision in the bill.

The amendment to eliminate the 40 percent would defeat the very purpose of the pending bill. Neither the Department nor any responsible individual or organization has attempted to estimate how many additional acres would be added by the elimination of the provision. It was in the act of 1938 as amended. It is being interpreted now and will be interpreted in the future as provided by the act of 1938 as amended. The provision has been tried. It has been tested. The pending amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to reiterate that this is a 1-year bill. It is a temporary bill. Also it cannot be clearly considered unless the admission is again pointed out that the difficulties we are in are administration failures. The fact is that a bill which was believed to be well drafted at the last session of the Congress has been interpreted to mean other things than the Congress intended in two outstanding examples; one, in regard to the war acreage which is a part of the Texas problem, and, second, the fact that the State cotton committees were not instructed as to their powers and what they should do.

It also should be pointed out that the admission has been made that if the bill as drafted had been made to function as intended practically all of the difficulties we are now in might have been alleviated.

The fact is, however, that when the cotton acreage went to the States, some of the committees, not being properly advised as to the powers of the State committees to withhold acreage, went ahead and allocated that acreage and determined the county factors. The acreage is out. It cannot be reallocated. I for one would like to see more acreage come down through the bill with proper instructions to the committees so that we can see just what is faulty with last year's bill at the end of this growing season. But we are not getting that opportunity in this legislation.

I am supporting this legislation and I am supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr.

WHITE] for several reasons. It is a 1-year bill, necessitated by an administration failure. The bill concedes of the discovery of hardship cases at the local level. The county committees could have withheld 15 percent, and the State committees another 10 percent. In my State this means 166,000 acres, only 20,000 of them earmarked for any purpose, but all the rest of which could be used in the discretion of the committee at local level to aid hardship cases. If you think that is not beneficial to the little man you are wrong because there is where the protection was in the last bill. That is, for the little farmer through local committees.

In this bill, the limitation is already there for the 70 percent of the average of 1946, 1947, and 1948 or 50 percent of the largest growing of 1946, 1947, and 1948. Then the 40-percent provision is in there which to me just cements into the law for another 1 year the failure of the county and State committees to withhold enough acreage which would have brought the county factors down and would have left in my State of California 166,000 acres to help the small growers. But when you pass this bill the small grower will still be in the same position. He cannot get above 40 percent by reason of the difficulties created by the failure of administration, and as long as it is an administration failure, then it seems to me we should admit that here. We should take care of the people who have been hurt by that failure and who are now forbidden by law to plant cotton.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WERDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that if this amendment does not prevail, it will limit the 40-percent factor in all of the counties which are now under 40 percent, and those counties with more than 40 percent throughout the country will have more than 40 percent of their total cropland, but yet the further inequity will prevail reducing the other counties below the 40-percent factor?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] if he will assist me in analyzing the statement that I have prepared and shown here on the chart. Over the week end I advised with a widow lady in my county of Richmond, N. C., on her cotton acreage allotment.

On this board you will see that she grew in 1946, 1947, and 1948, 225 acres of cotton each year; 60 acres of wheat each year; 50 acres of corn each year, and 15 acres of other crops each year; or a total of 350 acres of cropland cut out of a total acreage of 366. She has been allotted only 80 acres of cotton for 1950. On this farm are located 10 families employing 35 tenants. On the basis of this present cut she has notified five of those families that they would have to leave, or an equivalent of half of the tenant population.

My good friend, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER], stated some moments ago that there was no suffering going on. I wish to point out to the gentleman that these serious inequities, as represented in this actual case represent much present suffering. These displaced tenants are even now coming to our county welfare offices and the State and the Federal Government must and they even now are taking care of many of these displaced tenants.

I asked the lady represented by the illustration how much additional cotton acreage she would need in order to maintain all of these families on this farm. She said she could get by if she was awarded 125 acres.

Now I want to ask the chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] to tell me, on the basis of this illustration, just how much acreage of cotton she would be allowed under the pending resolution.

Mr. PACE. Under the pending resolution the farm would receive an allotment of 140 acres, which would be 40 percent of her total tilled land of 350 acres.

You understand that this lady's home county has already received its fair portion of the national allotment, and the committee is building that up, and the committee bill simply says that when you increase it to 70 percent, we will not increase it beyond 40 percent of the cropland.

Mr. DEANE. I wish to thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I support the pending resolution, since based upon this lady's actual statement, and I feel it is representative of most growers. She could protect her tenant population and give them full employment if she is awarded 125 acres. I repeat, I feel that the actual case history is characteristic of most of the farms where large numbers of tenants are being displaced.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. May I ask the gentleman this question? Under the formula that he has explained here to the House, how much has she been allocated for 1950 under the present act?

Mr. DEANE. She has been allocated 80 acres.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WHITE of California. Suppose the lady had only 40 acres which she had been planting, all in cotton, does not the gentleman realize that under the 40-percent limitation she could not plant but 16 acres?

Mr. DEANE. In answer to the gentleman, there is a growing feeling on the part of those of us interested in the southern cotton grower that he must diversify on a larger scale. But I return to the subject of these displaced tenants. These particular families have been growing cotton in this community for 40 years, at least the greater number of them. They are completely displaced. They are not familiar with any other occupation. As we think in terms of displaced persons from Europe, we must not overlook the growing number of displaced persons in this country. I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that for every 100 acres of cotton crop land that is removed from production at least 25 people are going to be without employment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Does not the gentleman's argument boil down to this, that he is asking the Federal Government to take over a relief activity which should be the responsibility of the community concerned?

Mr. DEANE. No, I do not agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman has made some very fine remarks and has been very helpful to those of us who are not from the Cotton Belt. I particularly commend the gentleman from North Carolina for pointing out that this is a human problem, that people will be unemployed and will have to go on relief unless this bill is passed. Would not the gentleman say in response to the gentleman from New York that this is not a relief question? If we pass this bill and it is properly administered, we will keep people from going on relief.

Mr. DEANE. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. CARROLL. May I commend further the gentleman from North Carolina, whose votes have always been on the side of human beings. It would seem to me, when those people who come from the Cotton Belt can now see this real problem that confronts them, can they not see these other problems that confront human beings in other areas of the country? It would seem to me that this ought to open their minds more than any one measure to the fact that if we do not give this relief there are no industries to which these people can go. Therefore, they will go on relief. They should have some concern for the other industrial areas of this Nation, instead of voting as they do on many important issues.

Mr. DEANE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. In answer to the gentleman from New York, is it not a fact that this situation has been the result of a Federal law, and a Federal law ought to change it? These people should not

be thrown by Federal act onto the mercy of the local communities.

Mr. DEANE. The gentleman is correct. I think this will be found. As you study a great many of the cotton growers, the individuals who are growing 200 to 300 acres of cotton, you find they are going to make every possible effort to maintain the tenant population. I know I have talked with several outstanding farmers, and in many cases they indicate that regardless of the cut they would try in some way to maintain their tenants' employment. I do not agree with the philosophy of the gentleman from New York who made the statement a moment ago, because we are either going to help them in their employment by recognizing the need for this adjustment in acreage or we are going to pay for it through charity and our welfare programs.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Does the gentleman happen to know how many additional acres of cotton will be provided this county? What is the county?

Mr. DEANE. I do not have the figures. All I can say is I trust the House will adopt this resolution promptly, because the longer we debate it the more serious will become the problem because our cotton farmers must prepare their land and make plans for the approaching season.

Mr. BECKWORTH. What county is this?

Mr. DEANE. My county is Richmond.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the person he has in mind would be satisfied with a 125-acre allotment?

Mr. DEANE. She stated if she was awarded an allotment of 125 acres she could maintain her entire tenant population. I talked also with the manager of her farm and he confirmed this position.

Mr. COOLEY. Under the resolution as now drawn with this provision in it she will get an allotment, not of 125 acres, but of 140 acres?

Mr. DEANE. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there has been some talk about people not planting the entire acreage that they will be given this year. But do not fool yourselves on that score because cotton will be their most profitable crop which they can plant in 1950 under the 90-percent support program and the 22,400,000 acres will be authorized if this bill passes, together with the allocation made under last year's act will all be planted to cotton. When the Department of Agriculture or someone on our committee says that they will only plant nineteen or twenty million acres, why, they are just fooling themselves. This lady, whose case we saw illustrated, said that she would be satisfied with 125 acres. She had 225 acres last year and if she is given 140 acres you can be sure that she will plant the entire 140 so that she will have more work for her tenants and profit for herself.

There is another point that has been brought out here, and that is that this would only cost the Government, if it cost anything, $75,000,000. The cotton production in 1948 was 312.5 pounds per acre. Last year it was 285.8 pounds per acre. I recognize the fact that the 10-year average was 254 pounds to the acre. But if we have comparable weather this year, and I am satisfied that with the additional fertilizer they are putting on the land we can probably get the average of 1948 and 1949, which would be about 300 pounds to the acre, it would cost the Treasury about $120,000,000 if the Government is forced to buy all of this cotton.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. PACE. I am sure the gentleman does not want to leave that statement stand in the RECORD. It does not necessarily mean that the Government will lose $120,000,000 if it makes a loan on that much cotton, does it? We know that the Government made a profit of $200,000,000 on its loan cotton.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Of course, we might have a crop failure, too, and it might be a blessing to have this amount of cotton on hand. But the gentleman knows eventually you have to get rid of the cotton. You can keep it for a number of years, but you have to get rid of it and the only way we are getting rid of about 3,000,000 or 3,500,000 bales of cotton a year is through the ECA. The ECA gets its money from the taxpayers of the country. That is why it can be said that the Commodity Credit Corporation shows a profit. Is not that correct?

Mr. PACE. The Commodity Credit Corporation certainly cannot take the losses of the ECA expenditures. Nobody expects that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No, but the ECA gets its money from the taxpayers through the Treasury. ECA buys cotton from the Commodity Credit Corporation and then gives it away to other countries. When that program comes to an end, when no money is appropriated for ECA to buy this cotton, then the gentleman will admit we will have a real problem in this country.

Mr. PACE. Then the cotton and wheat growers and all the other farmers of this Nation are going to be in trouble; yes, sir.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right and that is the problem we have to face.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly the gentleman does not object to the ECA money being spent for cotton and other agricultural commodities, does he?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; I want that money spent for cotton and tobacco and other commodities produced in this country rather than to have the money appropriated and given to England and some of these other countries to buy cotton, cheese, wheat, and bacon and other products in other parts of the world outside of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say something about the dairy situation, in view of what my good colleague, the gentleman from Kansas, said.

There is no restriction on the production of milk, but there is a restriction upon the marketing of milk and dairy products throughout the United States. We are producing too much milk in the Middle West. That milk must go into cheese and butter. Limitations have been placed upon the marketing of milk and cream in the United States. In the first place, Congress put through the milk marketing agreement and orders, back in 1937, which built up trade barriers between sections of the country. That action stopped the surplus-producing areas of milk from shipping milk and cream into those areas where we have the heavy consumption.

The other restraint is this oleo legislation which is gradually taking away the butter market from dairy farmers, and after June 30, 60,000,000 pounds of butter will be imported under a duty of 7 cents per pound. These three acts on the part of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations will rapidly liquidate the great dairy industry of the Midwest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] has expired.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. What is the pending amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The pending amendment is a pro forma amendment to strike out the last word.

Mr. HARRIS. Have we voted on the amendment offered by the gentleman? I have been here right along and I did not think we had.

The CHAIRMAN. It is still pending. This is an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, dealing with the situation in regard to the cropland approach to farm cotton allotments, as compared with the historical approach, I want to read an excerpt from a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, which was written within the last few days. It deals very pointedly with that subject. I am quoting from the letter:

> The difficulties encountered by the use of the cropland as a primary basis in establishing farm cotton acreage allotments were clearly written in the history of the legislation and the administration of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. When the act was first enacted in February of 1938, no provision was included for establishing minimum cotton acreage allotments for farms except for some of the smaller ones. Regulations and instructions were prepared for the administration of the original provisions of the act and were applied in some counties. Immediately, it was noted that the same type of inequities about which many complaints are now being heard with respect to Public Law 272 likewise resulted when the original provisions of the act of 1938 were applied in these counties.

Now, if that is not a condemnation of the cropland procedure, I do not know what it is.

He says further:

Basic legislation should be revised to apportion county cotton allotments to farms primarily on the basis of recent cotton acreage history.

Now that is certainly a repudiation of the 40 percent limitation which my amendment seeks to strike out.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Of course, the gentleman knows that he and I must sooner or later face that situation in the committee. You get your State allotment on history and you get your county allotment on history.

Mr. WHITE of California. That is all right for permanent legislation, but this is temporary legislation.

Mr. PACE. How does it strike the gentleman to let it stay like it is and then let each county and each State determine whether the allocation shall be by cropland or by history?

Mr. WHITE of California. Well, we could discuss that at the time, but at the moment I think this should be stricken out of this temporary legislation, because, after all, we are dealing with complaints from farmers all over the Nation. We told them that this 40 percent would not be in there and yet it was put in. It is a fraud on the farmers.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Who told them that it would not be in there?

Mr. WHITE of California. The committee issued a press release in which the provisions of the relief were clearly outlined. It was done for the express purpose of informing those farmers just what the situation would be.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman made the statement that the gentlemen's committee has told the farmers that the 40 percent provision would not be in the bill. The gentleman knows that I made no such statement. The gentleman knows that I introduced the bill in exactly the same form it was——

Mr. WHITE of California. I am not criticizing the gentleman from North Carolina. He has acted in good faith all the way through. I did not mean any reflection on him.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. How much additional acreage will the knocking out of this 40-percent provision give the State of California? Has the gentleman got those figures?

Mr. WHITE of California. No; I am sorry I have not got them. But I know of several cases that are directly affected, and they are little people. I have complaints; in fact, I have a petition on it over in my office.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman said that the Government perpetrated a fraud in this matter. Will the gentleman say who in the Government perpetrated the fraud?

Mr. WHITE of California. I did not say that the Government had perpetrated a fraud; I said that it would be a fraud if we left this provision in the legislation, and I have moved to strike it out. I therefore ask all the Members to support my amendment to keep from perpetrating a fraud upon the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. I want to commend the gentleman for introducing this amendment. This provision ought to be stricken out. As a matter of fact, a press release was issued and it was sent out to the American cotton farmers and showed exactly what would be provided.

Mr. WHITE of California. The gentleman is absolutely right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE], a member of the committee, would strike out the proviso in the resolution limiting all farms to 40 percent of the total tillable cropland on the farm, notwithstanding the previous provision assuring that no farm shall be reduced less than the larger of 70 percent of the average acreage planted to cotton or regarded as planted on the farm 1946, 1947, and 1948, or 50 percent of the highest acreage planted in any one of three such years.

I am supporting the amendment. I believe it is fair; I believe it is right; I believe it to be more equitable. I say this because I think that if we are going to have the cropland approach to this problem it is inequitable for one county to have 47 percent of its total tillable cropland production in cotton and other counties to have but 40 percent. It just is not right for one county in my State, Mississippi, as represented by my distinguished, lovable, and able colleague, from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS], a member of this distinguished committee, to have 47 percent of its cropland and for Union and many other counties throughout the United States with less than 40 percent to be limited to 40 percent; but that is what is being attempted.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. I agree with the gentleman wholeheartedly that if one county in the Cotton Belt gets 47 percent that all counties should, that neither Union County nor any other county should be damaged by being forced to take but 40 percent.

Mr. HARRIS. If this provision remains in the bill it penalizes the county with the low factor in favor of the county with a high factor. I regret to be forced to disagree with the distinguished gentleman whose work I appreciate very much, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. But I honestly believe he is wrong. This is a Farm Bureau amendment and continues inequities instead of correcting them as they should be.

Mr. Chairman, I think one thing that has brought this matter back to us at this time is that we have not understood generally how it actually worked when applied to the individual farm. The broad policy appears to be all right for the proper acreage reduction. We understood it on a national basis, on the State level, and its application to the county, but when it got to the individual farms the trouble started; there is where we failed to understand its application. I think for the record and information we should know now just how this is going to work and how it will be administered. I talked to Mr. Woolley about it with a view of learning how this law would be administered, and I shall be glad to include in the RECORD, following these remarks, a letter which I received from him advising just how it would be administered if passed as it is now before us reported by the committee.

Let me carry this just a little farther, using the example stated by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE], as he has outlined here on this chart. Mrs. A has a total cropland production of 350 acres. I do not know what her factor is, but it gives her 80 acres allocation to cotton for 1950.

If this resolution were to be adopted, it is my understanding, and this letter from the Department of Agriculture bears out my statement, that the present listings will be used. The farmer will be notified what his present listing is. If he has 100 acres he will be notified of that 100 acres allotment and the 70 or 40 percent, if this is maintained, limitation. The farmer will be notified as to what his crop will be under the present listing, applying the 70–40 percent, as this resolution provides. He will also be notified at the same time that if he is satisfied that will be the end of it. That is his allotment.

If he is not satisfied he may come to the county office and file in writing an appeal with the county committee within 15 days. The county committee will refer it to a review board, which board will be from outside and come into that county for the purpose of hearing his case. Then the review board will say to Mrs. A.: "You have shown here that you are entitled to more than 80 acres. If that can be shown, we will give you 70 percent of your average planting for 1946, 1947, 1948 or 50 percent of any one of such years whichever is the larger is it is not more than 40 percent of the total cropland." This will be an independent board before whom the farmer can go and show and prove that he is entitled to have.

The additional question comes up as to whether or not the reported acres of the farmer will be used or the adjusted BAE acres will be used. Under this review or request for review, if she can show the BAE figures are not correct, the review board will correct her allotment accordingly and give her what the resolution says, the larger of 70 percent of the actual planting of the years 1947, 1948, and 1949 or 50 percent of any one

of these years if within the 40 percent limitation of total cropland.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 30, 1950.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HARRIS: This will confirm our conversation Friday afternoon about the plan the Department of Agriculture intends to follow in carrying out that part of House Joint Resolution 398, provided it becomes law, with respect to notifying farmers of their new allotments.

It is our intention to use the present data on the listing sheets as to the average production of cotton for the 3 years, 1946, 1947, and 1948, or regarded as planted to cotton, and derive what 70 percent this figure would be. From the same source we would determine what 50 percent of the highest planted or regarded as planted would be for one of those three years. This information would then be included in the notice to all producers whose allotments would be raised thereby with further information that if they were dissatisfied with their base, they could likewise appeal this information. The appeal would be to a review committee composed of farmers outside the county in which their farm is located. The notice would indicate that to obtain the additional allotment it would be necessary to file an application at the county office with a certification of intention to plant the additional acreage. All other producers who had received an allotment in excess of 70 percent of the average of the 3 years, 1946, 1947, and 1948, or 50 percent of the highest planted in one of these years would not be given any special notice. However, each county committee would be instructed to publicize the fact that the law permitted an appeal from the base acreage and indicate the procedure that should be followed in filing the appeal.

It is my understanding that the foregoing is in accordance with the desires of the House Agriculture Committee.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK K. WOOLLEY,
Deputy Administrator.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let it be known that the committee as such is not supporting this amendment. It is true that some members of the committee did meet in Washington in December and without having an opportunity to go into all of the details suggested that they wanted to give to the farmers certain relief which this bill carries. These members did not tell the farmers of the United States that they had at that time written in all of the details of the legislation. They simply outlined the type of relief that they would attempt to secure.

When we considered the entire matter we found we were getting into some rather deep water. As I said a while ago, the purpose of cotton allotments and all other allotments is to protect the taxpayers, not to protect the cotton farmer, but to protect the United States Treasury from having to pay out too much money.

We have been rather liberal, in my opinion, in the bill we have brought before you. We have sought to take care of all of the real hardship cases. There will be some we cannot take care of. I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], has described some. I do not know how you can take care of those in this emergency legislation. It is not however necessary to give a man a cotton allotment on 70 percent of all the land each farmer owns in order to take care of hardship cases.

Let me give you a personal illustration. In 1934 we had this kind of provision in the law. That is, we had no limitation. In 1934 I was farming a section of land in Texas. Adjoining me was a section of land which was as identical to mine as two pieces of land could be. Since 1929 I had been growing about 200 acres of cotton, about 200 acres of wheat and about 200 acres of feed, being the most reasonable rotation I knew on that kind of land. The neighbor who owned the section adjoining me had been planting 600 or more acres in cotton every year. When they gave out allotments they gave him 300 acres of cotton and they gave me 102 acres. I did not feel it was fair then, I do not feel it is fair today. The men who created this cotton problem in 1934 and the men who created it in 1949 were the men who were planting cotton to their doorsteps. They were the men who brought cotton "history" to their counties, it is true, but it is equally true that they were and are the men who brought a cotton surplus to our country and who brought cotton acreage control to their neighbors. I cannot agree that such planters should be rewarded for bringing about the conditions which imperil every cotton farmer in the country and which impose a burden on every taxpayer, and yet the man who has planted a very large part of his land in cotton in the past is the only man who could benefit by this amendment.

The man who was planting all of his land in cotton—he is the man who created the cotton problem. It was not the little farmer who was planting only a portion of his land in cotton; it was not the big farmer who was diversifying and rotating his crops who caused this surplus. It was the cotton hog. I am not going to pin any medals on his breast.

The gentleman from California now comes before us representing a district of the largest cotton farms in the United States. He asks us to give those people the right to plant 70 percent of their entire acreage provided only that they have in the past planted all their acreage in cotton and saying that it would be unfair to cut them down to 40 percent of their total acreage. The gentleman suggested that we must give them the right to plant 70 percent.

Now, in the name of all that is sound, is that fair to the taxpayer? Is that fair to the farmer who has diversified his crop? Is that good farming practice? Can any man say that when you have to follow cotton with cotton, to plant your allotment, that you are following sound farming practices? I submit that sound cotton farming in California, Texas or Arkansas would suggest that a man not plant cotton on the same land more than once in about every three years, and that he plant something else in the meantime. Now, if we are going to try to care for the man who has followed the practices that our Department of Agriculture has suggested, and who has sought to institute a sound and balanced farming program, then let us give the acreage to the man who is really suffering and not give it to the man who has been planting all of his land in cotton over a long period of years.

Let us, my friends, give consideration to whether the man has followed sound farming practices. Can you justify using Government money to support a program of unsound farming practices? Can you justify a program of using Government money to plant 70 percent of any man's land, in cotton? I do not think you can.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. May I inquire of the Chairman when the Republicans will be heard on the subject of cotton?

The CHAIRMAN. Any time that the members of the committee do not seek recognition and the gentleman does.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas would have you think that there was a difference between a man that farms a big farm, using tenants on his farm, and a man who lives on his farm and owns 20 acres of land. There is no difference under the shining sun whether a man owns 2,000 acres of farm land and has 10, 15, or 20 families on his farm or whether that man owns a farm consisting of 40 acres. A tenant family farms just like a man who owns his own land. Just because he is a sharecropper or tenant he deserves the same treatment.

The gentleman from Texas is a fine man, an excellent and learned legislator. I am amazed at his argument. I have never heard the gentleman from Texas do a thing like that, or make a demagogic statement.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. I will ask the gentleman, knowing the State of Arkansas as he does, suppose in the Delta area they have been planting cotton, as they have for the last 100 years, and built up a wonderful history, and suppose in western Arkansas where I live, that one farm has been planting cotton for 100 years, a farm consisting of 2,000 acres, is there any more reason why that man over in western Arkansas should not receive 70 percent, or at least as much, based on the history of that farm, as the man who lives in the Delta area?

Mr. GATHINGS. Let me answer the gentleman.

Mr. TACKETT. One more thing.

Mr. GATHINGS. Just a moment now. The gentleman will have plenty of time. There will be no difference under the hardship cases of any county. The bill would take no acreage away, however it is intended to help those who are trimmed drastically in all counties the same way.

Mr. TACKETT. I will have to do it now, because I may never get the floor again.

Mr. GATHINGS. There is no difference whatever. As a matter of fact if you come from Pike County, as the gentleman does from the adjoining county of Howard, you will get the same percentage as they do in any other county. You get that now. It is a question of administration of the act solely and exclusively. We grow cotton in eastern Arkansas in a big way, that is true.

Mr. TACKETT. In eastern Arkansas you will get 40 per cent and over in western Arkansas, unless the amendment offered by the gentleman from California is adopted, my farmer of 2,000 acres is not going to get 40 per cent. I want to be sure that the farmers in my area are accorded the same treatment as those in any other section of the country.

Mr. GATHINGS. This bill seeks to do equity to all counties throughout the cotton growing States, but the farmer must apply in writing to his county committee stating that he had received an inequitable allotment.

Let me say here and now that cotton trends ought to be considered in any legislation this Congress passes. In one county in the southwestern section of Arkansas a county agent said, "I hope to the Lord that I live to see the day that there is not an acre of cotton ever planted in this county, because the farmers can make more money out of something else." They had gone out of cotton. The trend has gone over to where, the land being fertile and rich down in the delta, there is a type of staple grown that the trade demands. You do not go into the loan as on this cheap grade of cotton raised in the hills, you get a buyer for your product.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of California. I should like to correct the statement of the gentleman from Texas that California has 35,000-acre cotton farms. There is a corporate farm out there that has 35,000 acres, but it has only 10,000 acres in cotton. Under this bill, with the 40-percent minimum knocked out, as I propose in my amendment, they could plant but 70 percent of their cotton, and it would be 7,000 acres, which would be one-fifth of their total land. They have hundreds of families on those farms. I hold no brief for the big farmers, I am talking about the 40-acre fellow. It would cut his throat, figuratively speaking. He could plant but 16 acres.

Mr. GATHINGS. The 40-percent provision should not have been incorporated in this bill, it is detrimental to all sizes of farms. I fought this 40-percent proposal in the committee and I am fighting it now.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKETT. The gentleman made reference a moment ago, purely inadvertently, to something about demagoguery. Will not the gentleman correct that before he leaves the floor?

Mr. GATHINGS. I will say I have never heard the gentleman from Texas ever make a demagogic statement. That is what I said. I would not think that any man would object to a person marrying any woman he desired, even if she weighed 300 pounds. That is a privilege we have in America. We cannot and should not attempt to regulate the size of his farm or the size of his home, or his business. That is why our forefathers came to America. We are entitled to freedom of choice and freedom of opportunity as well as any other right accorded a free people. Let us preserve those heritages.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, the slogan I have taken for the year is "Be nifty and thrifty in fifty." If we do that, how are you going to pay all these subsidies? Think it over.

That is not the question that is so much in my mind right now, as to paying all these subsidies to the cotton farmers, as it is a letter I got this morning that might be interesting to all you cotton-farmer Congressmen. It is a resolution from the Pennsylvania Society of Arizona. I never heard of it before today. It reads as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the State of Arizona faces a grave emergency because of lack of water which threatens to undermine the State's economy by forcing out of production one-third of the State's agricultural lands; and

Whereas to overcome this threat, the only remaining source from which supplemental water is available is from Arizona's share of water from the Colorado River; and

Whereas legislation has been introduced in the Congress of the United States, now designated as S. 75 and H. R. 934 and H. R. 935, the passage of which will preserve, without reduction, our present acreage and provide a needed supply of hydroelectric energy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Pennsylvania Society of Arizona (representing over 500 former Pennsylvanians now residing in or adjacent to Phoenix, Ariz.), this 12th day of January 1950 at Phoenix, Ariz., That we wholeheartedly endorse the above-designated legislation and exhort the people of Arizona to continue their unified efforts until success is assured; now, be it further

Resolved, That the Pennsylvania Society of Arizona urges the congressional delegation from Pennsylvania to act favorably on the above legislation when it comes before them for a vote and that a copy of this resolution be sent to each and every Member of the Pennsylvania delegation in the Congress of the United States.

PENNSYLVANIA SOCIETY OF ARIZONA,
CLYDE J. COATES, *President.*
PATAICIA BENTZ, *Secretary.*

I never knew there was a Pennsylvania Society of Arizona. They say it represents about 500 people in the State. I wonder what percent of the population that is in Arizona?

The bills referred to in the resolution seek to do just the opposite of what you are trying to do now. You are trying to take land out of cultivation. They want to build a dam on the Colorado River that will put into cultivation a great many thousand acres. It may be well for Arizona to put this land into cultivation, but it will cost from one and a quarter to one and a half billion dollars, a tremendous sum of money. Where will you get such big money? I got the information in reference to this bill after I saw what was coming here from the Pennsylvania Society of Arizona. That disturbed me, so I inquired. It is going to cost $1,250,000 to $1,500,000 to construct that dam. After you construct that dam, the ground which it would put into cultivation will cost you $1,600 an acre. Now, get that—$1,600 an acre. After you get the land in cultivation then the land will be worth about $200 an acre. If that is not a good way to make money for Arizona, then I do not know anything. A terrible thing to do considering the country. But here is the sad part about it. When you have Members of Congress of both bodies with the predicament that our country is in today advocating the construction of such new projects as this, there is something wrong in Denmark and something wrong with the men who are advocating it. They know our country today is in the red $256,000,000,000. I am sorry the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] is not in the Chamber at the moment, because I wish he were here. He was here earlier, but is not on the floor at the present time. But think of it. It is going to cost $1,250,000,000 to put the land under cultivation, which will then cost you $1,600 an acre, and after you get the land it will be worth $200 an acre. Is not that asinine? It will be more cotton land to subsidize. Terrible!

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. POULSON. And they are going to raise cotton on that land?

Mr. RICH. Yes; that is why it is of such interest to the cotton boys. And that is the reason why it is in the interest of the cotton boys to help me and you kill the bill before it is made a law. I am trying to nip it in the bud. I am going to nip every proposition in the bud that I can on the floor of the House that is as wrong as this bill is at this time. The thing that gets me is that the Pennsylvania Society of Arizona wants the Pennsylvania Congressman to vote for it. I am telling you right now I do not propose to vote for it. I am going to fight it all I can.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from California, to whom I might say, it is going to take water away from you, too.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Yes; I know. The gentleman has not heard from the Pennsylvania Society in California. When he hears from them they will not be raising cotton on that land, but they will be raising a lot of hell in California.

Mr. RICH. I hope they win in California.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania always wants to know where we are going to get the money. It is a good question. But in this instance the gentleman wants to know whether we are going to be repaid. The $1,250,000,000 which will be spent to make land cultivable which will be worth $200 an acre will also produce public power which will in time repay this money.

Mr. RICH. Do you need the power down there now? Do you need the acreage down there now? I say "No; a thousand times no." You cotton farmers want more acreage in Arizona now to raise cotton and put the people in Texas out of the cotton business and put the people in Alabama out of the cotton business and the people in Tennessee, yes, and Oklahoma, too, out of the cotton business. You have asked us to subsidize you now, so you cotton Congressmen should not spend this money to increase cotton acreage when you want to take cotton land out of cultivation. It does not make sense; it is not sound. Be nifty and thrifty in fifty.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I probably will not take the full 5 minutes. I just rise to ask two questions, which I realize are indications of support of this amendment. I am not absolutely certain I am going to vote for it, but I think I will.

In the first place whether a direct promise was made or not, if an implied promise was made to the farmers before they voted that there should not be any 40 percent limitation in this resolution, would that not be in the nature, as the gentleman from Texas just suggested offhand of a contract? Why should we violate that? If we want to put that limitation in, let us put it in later, but not now. Let us advise the farmers that we are going to do it before doing it and give them a chance to pass on it. After asking that question, is this not a sound and correct approach? It is sound and logical to assume that every business in our fine society more or less establishes a custom and practice over a period of years and evidently the cotton industry has established a practice both on the part of the little fellows and the big fellows, of planting about what would be within the economy of that particular area or that particular section of the country. Now we are cutting them down to 70 percent, in the first instance, of what they established as good practice. Why complicate it and put more gadgets in? Why not leave it at 70 percent? They ought to have 100 percent, but it seems we cannot if we are to have controlled prices. But why not let them have 70 percent? Why put in something else?

Now, I think there is no man in this House who has worked any harder than I have since I have been here—I have been here only 3 years it is true, but I have worked night and day since being here for what I believe is for the interest of the common man. I have not sent out a speech since I have been here; not one. Of course I may some time but as I see it now I do not intend to send one out. Also, I suppose there will be no notation made in the press of what I am saying. So I am not speaking for the press nor publication of any kind. But let me say this, that while I have been for what I believe is for the interest of the common man, I want to ask what is wrong with being fair with the big man? You cannot substitute anything for fairness. You say this may be helpful to the big man. Suppose it is. Should we not be fair with him? There is nothing wrong with that. You cannot properly substitute for fairness on any occasion. I say to you that unless we are fair we will lose the respect of our people.

Then just this thought and I conclude: In addition to the two questions I have raised what I am afraid of is that there will be thousands of our farmers—not just a few, but thousands of the fellows who are just barely able to stay on the farm, who will be discriminated against by this 40-percent limitation of the tilled annual acreage provision.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman mentioned 70 percent; just give him 70 percent. Is it not a fact that the national average reduction was estimated to be 20 percent or about 22 percent?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, sir. It was estimated, as I understand it, that the average reduction would be 22 percent. We have reduced him 30 percent, and then you come along with another gadget and reduce him some more. You complicate it. Why complicate it? Why not make it a simple reduction of 30 percent?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. This 23 percent reduction is over the 1949 acreage. Actually there is a smaller reduction over the 1946, 1947, and 1948 average.

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, I believe that is correct. I do not believe this cotton program is going to cost Uncle Sam one thin dime. You cannot take the history of the cotton program and say there is any reasonable expectation that it is going to cost Uncle Sam anything.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I have doubt that it will cost anything, but the gentleman understands it is six of one and a half dozen of the other; that the more we add on now, the greater the cut will be next year and the year after that. That is to say, under the permanent law, under the formula, the more cotton that is produced now the further down he must cut it next year and the next year.

Mr. MORRIS. That of course is true. But should not we wait until we notify them before we cut?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. For the sake of clarification, I want to ask a couple of questions. The intricacies of this cotton legislation are a little difficult for some of us to understand. I know the Members want to be helpful. There seems to be a pretty general idea that the cost of this bill, if enacted, will be somewhere around $150,000,000. The answer was made to me by the gentleman from Utah, when I put the question, that it might be three-quarters of a billion dollars, but I believe that the consensus is that it would be $150,000,000. If we enact this amendment offered by the gentleman from California, I assume that will increase that figure somewhere around $25,000,000.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I will be glad to yield, if I am wrong or if you will clarify it.

Mr. SUTTON. According to the Department of Agriculture, provided the Government buys all this cotton, that will be $90,000,000 to $120,000,000—if the Government takes it all over.

Mr. KEATING. I am correct, am I not, in saying that even without the enactment of this law, the Government is going to have about 8,000,000 bales of cotton on hand? Is not that correct?

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of California. The figures given by the gentleman from Tennessee, it should be understood, represent the amount of money which the Government will have invested in cotton; it is not necessarily a loss.

Mr. KEATING. No; but they will have the cotton on hand; the Government will have it.

Mr. WHITE of California. That is right, but there has never been any loss in the cotton program from the time of its inception to the present; in fact, there has been a $200,000,000 profit.

Mr. KEATING. That is by shipping a lot of the cotton overseas; that is a matter of bookkeeping.

Mr. WHITE of California. I wish the gentleman would tell me just what we would have done in World War II without the 11,000,000 bales of cotton we had on hand.

Mr. KEATING. I am not questioning that; the gentleman apparently does not understand the point I am making. I am trying to clarify some of the matters which, in my judgment, should have been in the report. This report is singularly silent about the cost of this measure and I would like to get a few of these matters cleared up.

In addition to cotton, we have here an item which has not been discussed at all; peanuts. I see that peanuts are in for a little ride in this bill. Can some member of the committee tell me how much the enactment of section 5 of this bill relating to peanuts is going to take out of the pockets of the taxpayers and the wage earners of this country?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. My recollection is that the estimate is $3,500,000. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] can probably give the gentleman more accurate information than I on the subject of peanuts; but it is something in the neighborhood of 2 or 3 million dollars; and that is not any loss to the taxpayers and to the workers of this country, as pointed out a moment ago by the gentleman from

California [Mr. WHITE]. It is difficult for me to understand all this excitement about losses. Certainly, there are some potential losses involved, but cotton is still good collateral. We now have on hand a supply that is less than the average for 7 out of the last 10 years; so it is not a gift or gratuity that is being handed to the cotton farmers; it is not a bounty, because we contend that cotton is now worth $150 a bale, and hereafter will always be worth $150 a bale. If we sustain the price, cotton will not sustain a loss.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman's program boils down to this; that the cotton subsidy and the peanut subsidy that are in this bill will not result in any eventual loss to the Government provided the price of cotton and peanuts stays up; but if the production of these products, stimulated by such measures as this, is increased to the point where the price does not stay up, then the taxpayers and the wage earners of this country have got to pay any loss entailed by the overproduction of cotton and peanuts.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. PACE. In order that the gentleman may fully understand the situation, let me state that during the war the peanut acreage was built up to 3,300,000 acres. Last year under the quota program that was cut to 2,650,000; this year it has been cut to 2,100,000. Our acreage has already been cut from 3.3 to 2.1 but this cut involved an inequity in area between Alabama and Texas, and this provision is to correct that situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand, the pending amendment is the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Can the Chair advise us how many other amendments are pending?

The CHAIRMAN. Only eighteen.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT].

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I realize that there are a lot of amendments pending and a lot of Members wish to be heard on this particular amendment, but I do not know of a section that is more interested in the cotton allotment matter than the Fourth Congressional District of Arkansas which I have the honor to represent. I think it is important that I give you some idea of the feelings of my people concerning the issue covered by this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, is it fair that a man who has a farm with a cotton history of 100 years not be given the same rights as the man with a cotton history of a similar number of years in some other section of the same State? It cannot be anything but fair that my neighbor over there in my congressional district be given, based upon number of years or the history of his farm, the same rights and justice as the man who happens to live in some other place in my State.

Here is what I am getting at. In my congressional district there is a farm, we will say, with 2,000 acres of cotton land. That farmer has been planting it for 100 years. Unless the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE] is adopted, this cotton farmer will, in effect, be permitted to plant only 40 percent of his tillable acreage in cotton. That is too great a reduction—more than this Congress or the Department of Agriculture intended. With the adoption of this amendment, there would still be a 30 percent reduction, which is sufficient. I think that the amendment which the gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE] has offered should be adopted.

The people over in my area will be drastically hurt unless that amendment is agreed to. May I say very frankly I do not think this piece of legislation that has been introduced is going to do a lot of good anyway. It is not going to relieve a lot of farmers in my district. We have been telling them we are going to do something for them, but they will find themselves on the same hook they were on a couple of months ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal here today as to how much additional money the resolution now under consideration will cost the Government. To the gentlemen so concerned, it is my impression that they are taking counsel of their own fears. I would admonish them to remember the scriptural passage that sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. A few minutes ago, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] made a very enlightening statement to the effect that originally the Congress and the farmers of this country were under the impression that their acreage would be cut approximately 20 percent. When the vote was taken on December 15, many of them were still under that impression. Now we are asking for a cut of 30 percent. Do not misunderstand me. That is a 30-percent cut from the acreage actually planted and not from the acreage alloted to a county by the bureau of agricultural estimates. I know of no farmer who is not willing to take a 30-percent cut in the acreage which he actually planted in 1946, 1947, and 1948. Of course I am referring to farmers whose acreage was not substantially reduced during the war years. Most every farmer realizes that he must make a reduction in cotton acreage in order to prevent a greater surplus of cotton. He further realizes that we must prevent a surplus of any enormity if we continue to have a fair parity support-price program. So I sincerely hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be adopted.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman know that every cotton farmer had his cotton-acreage allotment in his possession long before the vote on December 15 and knew exactly what his allotment was going to be?

Mr. HARE. That was supposed to be the case but many did not.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman say to the Members or wish to leave the impression with the House that these farmers voted in ignorance of what their actual allotments were?

Mr. HARE. Many of them did; that is true.

Mr. COOLEY. Well, I would like to have the gentlemen send the names to me, because they were issued officially and mailed to me. I never heard of such a complaint.

Mr. HARE. The gentleman well knows that I did not make a list of them because I had nothing and he had nothing to do with the actual making of the allotments. Congressmen don't administer the law. But I had numerous complaints to that effect during the period following the vote and until I returned to Washington on January 3.

It is incumbent on this Congress to act immediately in order that the farmers of this country may be protected and, by their protection, we insure economic prosperity to the textile employee, the storekeeper, the filling-station operator, the banker, and all mankind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the chairman and the Committee on Agriculture for bringing in House Joint Resolution 398.

On page 1 of their report the committee states that this resolution is a "1-year emergency measure," designed to authorize the correction of certain gross inequities and elimination of hardships which have appeared in the application of the cotton-quota law enacted at the last session of Congress.

May I say not only inequities and misapplications, but iniquities as well. May I also state that the same inequities and hardships apply to the wheat quota as misapplied by the Secretary of Agriculture. I am sure that the committee will also straighten out those inequities in the very near future.

This very morning I received a number of letters complaining particularly over these inequities and iniquities. Here is a farmer with 800 acres under cultivation in western North Dakota, and about the only thing they can raise as a cash crop because of weather conditions is wheat. Here is a family of seven and yet the wheat allotment out of 800 acres is only 250 acres. This will not be suf-

ficient to take care of the family and pay real-estate taxes.

May I also state to the able chairman of the Agriculture Committee that the time has arrived to enact a real farm bill. A bill that will give the farmers cost of production for that part of their products consumed domestically. Do that for the principal agricultural commodities and then no subsidies will be necessary. Then the Government will not have to subsidize any farmer but the farmers will help bail the Government out of the six hundred and sixty-three billions that it now owes, including future commitments and obligations.

I sincerely hope that when the chairman of the Agriculture Committee gets through with straightening out the inequities and the iniquities, and the misapplications by the Secretary of Agriculture of Public Law 272, that then he will take up H. R. 1686, the bill that I have introduced to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in agricultural products.

Here is H. R. 1686:

A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in agricultural products; to prevent unfair competition; to provide for the orderly marketing of such products; to promote the general welfare by assuring an abundant and permanent supply of such products by securing to the producers a minimum price of not less than cost of production; and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Agricultural Equality Act of 1949." The term "agricultural product" as used in this act shall mean any and all kinds of poultry, livestock, and any farm product of the soil, and any product or byproduct thereof, produced in the United States, in an unmanufactured or unprocessed state, which the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine, on the basis of available statistics, having a farm value in excess of $30,000,000 during the preceding marketing year. The word "producer" as used in this act shall mean the original producer of agricultural products as above defined.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture shall ascertain and determine for each year the average cost of production to the farmers of each such agricultural product. Such average cost of production shall be determined after public hearings, participated in by the representatives of farmers' organizations and by other interested parties. It shall include depreciation and soil depletion and all items of cost, including production expenses, interest, taxes, wages of farm and family labor, a return of 4 percent on farm property equity, and compensation to the average farm operator equivalent to the average weekly earnings of the industrial worker as found and determined by the Secretary of Labor.

(b) The Secretary shall determine, prior to the beginning of each marketing year for each basic grade, staple, classification, or quality of each of such agricultural products, an average-cost-of-production price, at the principal interior primary markets or centers of distribution, which shall be equal to the average cost of production of such agricultural product as determined under this section.

(c) The Secretary shall also calculate, and take into consideration, the average yields and production during the previous 5-year yeriod in determining the average-cost-of-production prices. If necessary, in order to carry into effect the purposes of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall further ascertain and allow an equitable differential against varying transportation costs to different markets and shall establish appropriate zones or classifications therefor.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture shall annually ascertain, determine, and designate the beginning and the ending of the marketing year for each such agricultural product and shall estimate the volume of production for the current year of each such agricultural product. He shall also annually prior to the production or planting season estimate with respect to each such agricultural product (1) the quantity and percentage of the total volume marketed from farms that is required for domestic consumption and warehouse reserve and which is to be distributed in the current of interstate commerce; (2) the quantity and percentage to be distributed in intrastate commerce affecting the price of the portion to be distributed in the current of interstate and foreign commerce; (3) the quantities and percentages remaining for foreign commerce and export.

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture shall, annually, prior to the beginning of the calendar year or prior to the beginning of the marketing year of each of such agricultural products make proclamation and announcement of such determination of such average-cost-of-production price for each basic grade, staple, classification, or quality of each of such agricultural products. Such cost of production shall be the minimum price for that portion of each such agricultural product domestically used, consumed, or stored. He shall also recognize and allow the usual and customary price differentials now or hereafter recognized and established in the channels of trade on grades, staples, classifications, or qualities of each such agricultural product.

In case there is no recognized basic grade, staple, classification, or quality for any such agricultural product, then the Secretary, after public hearings, participated in by representatives of farmers' organizations and other interested parties, shall promulgate a basic grade, staple, classification, or quality for such agricultural product. He shall announce the date when such minimum prices are to take effect and they shall continue in effect during the marketing year. He shall, at the same time, announce the estimated production and domestic consumption and warehouse reserve. He shall, also, announce the total quantities and percentages of such agricultural products that are to be held for foreign commerce and export.

(b) Domestic price: After the beginning of the marketing year, for any such agricultural product, which begins July 1 in 1949, all dealers, manufacturers, millers, elevator operators, processors, packers, butchers, ginners, compressors, and other agencies dealing in interstate or foreign commerce shall pay to the producers of such agricultural products not less than such average-cost-of-production price, subject to differentials allowed under subsection (a) of this section, determined and proclaimed as aforesaid, for such percentage of each delivery of any grade, staple, classification, or quality of such agricultural product as is estimated for domestic consumption, or storage for domestic consumption.

(c) Licenses: No dealer, manufacturer, miller, elevator operator, processor, packer, butcher, ginner, compressor, or other agency engaged in the business of dealing in or handling any agricultural product in interstate or foreign commerce shall operate as such dealer, manufacturer, miller, elevator operator, processor, packer, butcher, ginner, compressor, or agent dealing in or handling such agricultural product without first procuring from the Secretary of Agriculture a license pursuant to such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe in accordance with the provisions of this act: *Provided,* That no license shall be required of any producer under the provisions of this act for selling, disposing of, handling, or storing any agricultural product produced by him: *Provided further,* That the provisions of this act shall not apply to poultry or livestock shipped from one State into another for working, breeding, or production on a farm or for raising, feeding, fattening, finishing, or conditioning for market prior to the sale for consumption in the regular channels of trade.

(d) Surplus receipts: Whenever the world price on the quantities and percentages of any such agricultural product remaining for export is lower than the cost-of-production price on the domestic consumption and warehouse-reserve quantities and percentages, then, when any producer of any grade, staple, classification, or quality of any such agricultural product shall deliver any such agricultural product to any dealer, manufacturer, miller, elevator operator, processor, packer, butcher, ginner, compressor, or any other agency dealing in or handling such product in interstate or foreign commerce, such purchaser shall pay to the producer the cost-of-production price on the domestic consumption and warehouse-reserve quantities and percentages as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture and the world price on the quantities and percentages for export: *Provided, however,* That each individual producer of any such agricultural product shall be entitled to market at the cost-of-production price a quantity of any such product produced during the marketing year in an amount not to exceed $1,000.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall cause to be issued to such dealer, manufacturer, miller, elevator operator, processor, packer, butcher, ginner, compressor, or any other agency dealing in, or handling such product in interstate or foreign commerce, producers' receipts in triplicate showing on their faces, when filled in by the purchaser, the grade, staple, classification, or quality and quantity and the percentage of such agricultural product, as proclaimed by the Secretary of Agriculture to be the percentage and quantity that is required for domestic consumption and warehouse reserve, and the grade, staple, classification, or quality and quantity and the percentage remaining for export.

Every dealer, manufacturer, miller, elevator operator, processor, packer, butcher, ginner, compressor, or any other agency dealing in or handling such product in interstate or foreign commerce, shall fill out such receipts so as to show accurately the amount of such product purchased from the producer, the amount for domestic consumption and warehouse reserve, the cost-of-production price paid, the amount purchased for export and the world price paid to the producer. Such receipts shall be signed by the purchaser and countersigned by the seller, and one copy shall be retained by the purchaser, and one delivered by him to the producer, and the third copy shall be mailed by registered mail at the end of each month to the Secretary of Agriculture at Washington, D. C., or such other post-office address as the Secretary may designate.

In the case of cotton any producer may dispose of his domestic consumption and warehouse reserve quantity and percentage and may, at the same time, keep or store his export quantity and percentage, properly earmarked for identification. Such producer, if he decreases his production or the production under his control, may, in the following marketing year, sell or dispose of such earmarked export quantity, or cotton of the current crop, to any dealer, ginner, compressor, or other agency, engaged in the business of dealing in or handling such cotton, as the cost-of-production price, to an amount equal to the quantity and percentage he would be allowed to sell for domestic consumption and warehouse reserve if he produced the same quantity of cotton as he produced in the previous year.

Such producer shall be required to file a reasonable and sufficient bond with the Secretary of Agriculture, through the dealer, ginner, compressor, or other agency, engaged

in the business of dealing in or handling such cotton, to the effect that he will not sell, or permit to be sold or disposed of, directly or indirectly, any of such export quantity and percentage in the domestic market during the marketing year in which it is harvested.

SEC. 5. (a) Marketing of surplus: No dealer distributor, manufacturer, corporation, or cooperative corporation, person, firm, or association, of whatever nature, engaged in export of foreign commerce, shall, whenever the world price on the quantities and percentages remaining for export, of any agricultural product named in this act, is lower than the cost-of-production price on the domestic consumption and warehouse reserve quantities and percentages, buy, sell, exchange, or otherwise acquire or dispose of any such product intended or designated for export without first procuring from the Secretary of Agriculture a license pursuant to such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe in accordance with the provisions of this act.

Every such dealer in foreign trade and export shall be required to file a reasonable and sufficient bond with the Secretary of Agriculture to the effect that he will not sell, or permit to be sold or disposed of, directly or indirectly, any such export quantities and percentages in the domestic market, and to the effect that no part, whether manufactured or unmanufactured, whether processed or unprocessed, will be sold for distribution in the domestic market. The domestic market shall mean the continental United States and its Territorial and insular possessions.

No dealer, distributor, manufacturer, corporation, or cooperative corporation, person, firm, association, miller, elevator operator, processor, packer, butcher, ginner, compressor, or any other agency dealing in or handling such export products in interstate or foreign commerce, shall buy, sell, exchange, acquire, or dispose of any such agricultural product produced, bought, manufactured, processed, or acquired by him for export, except to a licensed buyer engaged in the business of foreign trade and export.

(b) Such dealer, distributor, manufacturer, corporation or cooperative corporation, person, firm, or association engaged in export of foreign commerce may sell at or above the world price export quantities and percentages of any agricultural product to any processor or manufacturer for processing or manufacturing into finished or semifinished and manufactured or semimanufactured products: *Provided however*, That such processor or manufacturer be first required to file a reasonable and sufficient bond with the Secretary of Agriculture to the effect that such finished or semifinished or manufactured or semimanufactured product or any byproduct thereof will not be sold or disposed of directly or indirectly for domestic consumption or warehouse reserve. Such finished or semifinished or manufactured or semimanufactured product together with any byproduct shall be exported to foreign markets unless the Secretary upon investigation finds that there no longer is an exportable surplus and that some or all of such products or byproducts are needed for domestic consumption and warehouse reserve.

(c) Adjustment of supply to demand: If the quantity and percentage estimated for domestic consumption and warehouse reserve should be insufficient by reason of flood, drought, pestilence, or other calamity, or for any other reason, to supply the demand for domestic consumption and warehouse reserve, then the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to supply such shortage out of export quantities and percentages, still owned by the producers, at the cost-of-production price, plus storage and expenses. If, however, the quantity and percentage estimated for domestic consumption and warehouse reserve is more than sufficient, then the Secretary shall allow the same for domestic consumption and warehouse reserve the following year and shall reduce by an equal amount his estimate for domestic consumption and warehouse reserve.

REGULATIONS

SEC. 6. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to prescribe regulations for carrying out the provisions of this act. The regulations prescribed pursuant to this act shall include among other things requirements with respect to the issuance of licenses to dealers, manufacturers, millers, elevator operators, processors, packers, butchers, ginners, compressors, and other agencies engaged in the business of dealing in or handling such agricultural products in interstate or foreign commerce, systems of accounts, auditing of accounts to be kept by licensees, submission of reports by them and the entry and inspection by the duly authorized agents of the Secretary of Agriculture of the place of business of such licensees.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall upon request furnish to all persons required to have a license under this act, such information as may be necessary or appropriate for carrying out the provisions of this act.

PENALTY FOR VIOLATION

SEC. 7. Any dealer, manufacturer, miller, elevator operator, processor, packer, butcher, ginner, compressor, or other agent dealing in or handling any agricultural product in interstate or foreign commerce, who violates the provisions of this act by knowingly and willfully paying less than the average-cost-of-production price determined and proclaimed by the Secretary of Agriculture, or violates any other provisions of this Act, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $5,000 or imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 8. Any agricultural product, now owned or hereafter coming into the possession of the Government of the United States, or any department or agency thereof, shall be conclusively deemed to be exportable surpluses, and shall be disposed of only in accordance with the provisions of this act providing for the disposal of export quantities and percentages.

SEC. 9. In order to carry out the purposes of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed that whenever he finds, upon investigation, that the world price, computed in United States currency, of any foreign agricultural product or substitute, in its processed or manufactured or in its unprocessed or unmanufactured state, is below the cost-of-production price of any competing domestic agricultural product, in its processed or manufactured or in its unprocessed or unmanufactured state, to notify the Secretary of the Treasury thereof. It shall thereupon become the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to levy and collect upon such foreign competing agricultural product or substitute notwithstanding that such agricultural product or substitute may have been originally produced in the United States or in any of its possessions, in its processed or manufactured or in its unprocessed or unmanufactured state, when imported from any foreign country into the United States or any of its possessions, a duty equal to the difference between the world price and the cost-of-production price of such product, plus 5 percent of such cost-of-production price.

SEC. 10. Until further action by Congress the following agricultural products as defined herein shall come under the provisions of this act: Milk, butterfat, corn, beef cattle, veal calves, lambs, sheep, goats, hogs, wool, mohair, wheat, cotton, eggs, oats, chickens, tobacco, potatoes, cottonseed, barley, soybeans, oranges, apples, wool, grain sorghums, beans, turkeys, tomatoes, sweet sorghums, peanuts, grapes, peaches, rice, sugar beets, sweetpotatoes, flaxseed, lettuce, strawberries, pears, grapefruit, onions, peas, snap beans, celery, lemons, rye, cabbage, and sugarcane.

SEC. 11. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture, on or before January 1 of each year after January 1, 1950, to report any agricultural product as herein defined and not included under the provisions of this act, that had a farm value in excess of $30,000,000 the previous year, to the chairman of the Agricultural Committee of both the House and the Senate. He shall state, in such report, the average market price paid to the producers for such product or products during the previous year, and shall state the cost-of-production price of such product or products if they had been under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 12. This act shall apply to agricultural products, as herein defined, as may be owned by the producers or as may be grown, produced, and harvested during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1949, and all subsequent years.

SEC. 13. For the purpose of expediting the sale and distribution of any agricultural product under the provisions of this act, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to make loans to any dealer, manufacturer, miller, elevator operator, processor, packer, butcher, ginner, compressor, or other agency engaged in the business of dealing in or handling any agricultural product on that percentage of any such agricultural product as is designated for domestic consumption and warehouse reserve. The amount of any such loan on any such product shall not exceed, together with interest, the cost-of-production price as determined under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 14. No penalty shall be imposed or license canceled, under the provisions of this act, until the person to be fined, or whose license is to be canceled, has been found guilty of violating the provisions of this act by a United States district court.

SEC. 15. All acts or part or parts of acts in conflict herewith are hereby repealed. Nothing, however, herein shall be held to repeal, amend, or modify the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 16, secs. 590a–590h, 590i, 590j–590q); sections 201 or 202 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 7, secs. 1291, 1292); the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 7, secs. 1501–1519); or section 32 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 7, sec. 612c).

SEC. 16. If any provisions of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision, shall not be affected thereby.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, there was a question asked by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] whether a promise was made to farmers that no 40-percent provision would be included in this resolution. I would like to answer that question, being a Member of the subcommittee that wrote the bill on cotton.

No promise was made to anyone on any provision. In December some of the Members of the cotton subcommittee came to Washington; some did not. It was not an executive session of the subcommittee, so no promise was made to any cotton farmer in the United States of America that the 40-percent provi-

sion would be or would not be included in the bill; in fact, I believe I am correct in this, and if not, the Chairman will correct me if I am wrong that in his original resolution the 40-percent provision was not contained therein, but after Members of Congress came over to our committee and testified—and there were about 60 Members present, they suggested that this provision be inserted in the resolution. It was also suggested by the Department of Agriculture. So, at their suggestion this 40-percent provision was added. In the subcommittee on agriculture I voted against this 40-percent provision, but now I see that I was wrong, and the reason it is wrong is because it is a promise to the people that next year we will have this 40-percent proviso excluded. With all due respect to my able colleague, the gentleman from California, this will take cotton away from Alabama, away from Arkansas, and away from Oklahoma, and add to California's quota. I do not blame my able colleague from California, for he is doing a wonderful job for the farmers out there. But, that is exactly what this will do.

It is a matter of doing one of two things, my friends. We are supposed to allot this cotton acreage. Do you want additional cotton or do you want to reduce the yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. If this 40-percent limitation is stricken from the bill, of course additional acreage will be added and the financial responsibilities of the Government to that extent will be increased. The information we have indicates that with the 40-percent limitation in the bill, approximately 100,000 fewer acres of cotton will be needed to bring the reductions up to 70 percent of the average number of acres planted in the years 1946, 1947, and 1948, or to 50 percent of the highest acreage planted in any 1 of the 3 years, allowing in both instances for such acreage as might have been diverted to war crops. This provision is definitely a limitation on the other provisions, through which we hope to elminiate hardships and inequities. To plant 40 percent of the cleared and tillable land in one crop, year in and year out, certainly would not be compatible with our ideas of good farming.

As just pointed out by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON], no promise was made with regard to this limitation either expressly or by implication, other than to the extent that the expression of one thing is the exclusion of another. Nothing whatever was said about the 40-percent provision, but it is deemed to be in the interests of good husbandry and proper soil-conservation practices and in the rotation system. It seems to me that to strike it out would carry with it some implication to the effect that we were not so much interested in the rotation of crops and in good soil-building and conserving practices.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not true that this 40-percent provision in the identical words that it is carried now has been in the law since 1938?

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is correct. It seems to me this limitation should remain in the bill, in view of the fact that we did liberalize the 70-percent provision when we permitted diverted acres to be considered in the final acreage allotment.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of California. May I ask the gentleman how on earth a soil-conservation matter can be involved in a 1-year emergency program?

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly it can be involved. It is just a matter of degree. There is no reason why a man with 2,000 acres of land, as stated in the illustration used a moment ago, should be permitted to plant 1,400 acres of cotton on that land, because it is not good farming to engage in such practices. So I insist that this amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The White of California amendment was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITE of California) there were—ayes 21, noes 56.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WICKERSHAM: On page 2, line 2, after "1948" insert, "or 70 percent of the average acreage planted to cotton or regarded as planted to cotton under Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress, on the farm in 1940, 1941, and 1942."

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent at this time that when the vote is taken on my amendments, the amendments be reported again. I will use my time now, Mr. Chairman, to explain 4 very brief amendments. I want to state that I intend to support H. J. Res. 398; however, this resolution would be greatly improved with the adoption of the amendments which I am offering.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, one of these amendments is very brief. It provides a base of 70 percent of the years 1940, 1941, and 1942, which were the last years marketing quotas were in effect. During those years the farmers and the PMA committees have the records and it would be fair to the certain areas which diversify. The other amendment would provide that you could not cut a farm below 50 percent of the 1949 acreage. In the areas which have diversified so greatly, as in western Oklahoma, even though on paper Oklahoma apparently has a good acreage, in the areas which I represent, many of the farmers are cut from 75 percent to 100 percent, even though they failed to grow cotton only 3 years out of the last 50.

Many of our farmers in Oklahoma farm 3 years to cotton and 3 years to wheat, and further diversify by planting grain sorghums and types of legumes.

The other amendment would provide that the individual farms have some incentive to give up their allotments. In subsequent years it would return the allotment to the individual farms.

The fourth and final amendment, Mr. Chairman, would aid certain areas, similar to the manner in which California, New Mexico, and Arizona were aided last year. It would aid certain areas, such as mine, which will not come into cotton production until 1949 because the year they came into production, in 1947 or 1948, they had to grow wheat. They found it uneconomical to grow wheat. The amendment would provide that the Secretary might reallocate to those particular areas the 350,000 acres which are not going to be used under the provisions of this bill, but which would have been used under the original act, which areas do not have adequate acreage allotments.

In my particular area we have 74,000 acres which have come under irrigation in the last 2 or 3 years. These acres cannot raise wheat economically or profitably. They will not be permitted to raise cotton. They must raise one of the two commodities. This amendment would permit the Secretary to allocate a cotton allotment to that area, which allotment would not be deducted from the dry-land farmers.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call your attention to some letters which I will read for the information of the Members, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
Arapaho, Okla., January 16, 1950.

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Member of Congress,
Seventh District,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WICKERSHAM: We have your letter of January 6 in which you ask for our suggestions as to changes that we would like to see here in Custer County.

We have just returned from a State convention at Oklahoma City and all of the members of the county committee and the county administrative officer attended. Mr. J. H. Vowell, chairman of the Custer County PMA committee, was chairman of the Committee on Allotments and Marketing Quotas. I am attaching a copy of the report made by the committee to the convention. The county committee and myself have checked it over carefully and the recommendations made in the report is what we would recommend for Custer County.

We would like to call to your attention particularly to the first sentence in the report with reference to using only crop history and be adjusted by the county committee in establishing all kinds of allotments, instead of using a formula system as has been used in

establishing the 1950 cotton acreage allotments. We can see where the formula system would work in maybe one or two States in the Nation, that is where the principal crop is cotton and the same percentage of the cropland on the farm is planted to cotton each year, but it will not work in a mixed crop area such as Custer County or Oklahoma.

We would also like to call to your attention particularly to paragraph 7 of the report which recommends that a reapportionment system be set-up for each commodity. That is we would like to see a provision in the law whereby a farmer that did not plant a portion of his allotment that year, be so that he could release that part of the allotment in order that it could be reallocated by the county committee on farms where additional allotment can be planted. Some of such cases would be to veterans that have had to rent farms that have no crop history; to farm operators that have changed farms where conditions do permit the planting of this commodity but the farm is not eligible for an allotment; and to increase allotments where other hardship conditions exist.

We wish to thank you for your letter and wish to advise that the information that we have given you is only a suggestion, but we do feel that the enactment of this provision would improve the farm program in this county.

Very truly yours,

RUSSELL E. DILL,
County Administrative Officer.

COMMITTEE NO. 3—ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS

A majority of the committee members felt that crop acreage history should be the basis of establishing farm allotments for all commodities and recommended that county committees be given considerably more latitude in making adjustments. They felt that the present reserves available to the county committees were not adequate to provide equitable allotments. There was some feeling among committeemen from the wheat area that possibly cropland ratio factor approach might be better for establishing wheat allotments than the history basis.

The committee was in unanimous agreement that an acreage planted in excess of the allotment of any commodity should not become a part of the history from which allotments are to be determined in future years.

The committee was of the opinion that a total soil-depleting allotment for each farm should be established and that the acreage classified as cropland which was in excess of the total soil-depleting allotment would be the soil-conserving base for the farm and that the application of approved practices on this land as well as compliance with the special allotments would be a condition of eligibility for price support. The approved practices to be determined by the Department.

The committee declined to make any recommendation on a joint compliance provision.

The committee recommended that any person who knowingly overplanted the allotment for any commodity would not be eligible for ACP practice payments.

The committee favors the use of the same base period for determining farm allotments for all commodities.

It was the consensus of the committee that we should always have a release and reapportionment provision for all commodities as a means for the county committee to adjust inequities in farm allotments.

The committee felt that a person who released his acreage allotment should retain his eligibility and be credited with a planted acreage equal to the acreage released and the person to whom the apportionment of this acreage is made will not be credited with the planted acreage for the purpose of determining future allotments. The acreage is to be released to the county committee for use in the county.

The committee was very anxious that the allotments should be distributed in such a way that substantially all the county allotment would be planted since our share of the national allotment will be reduced in proportion to the decrease in our acreage history.

In order that the county committees will not be obliged to establish allotments on idle farms and on farms on which no land is available for the production of the commodities, the committee believes that a "tillable acreage available" provision should be made for use of the county committee in establishing allotments for all commodities.

The committee was in favor of continuing the use of the present strict interpretation of the definition of a farm.

It was the opinion of the committee that a uniform policy should be adopted in all counties for determining new farm allotments for all commodities so that the same treatment will be given to all producers in all counties.

The committee favored the continued use of the 3-year eligibility period.

The committee was unanimous in their opinion that the eligibility for price support on one commodity should depend on compliance with allotments for all other commodities.

The committee recommended that penalty on excess be based on the actual production from the excess acreage.

The majority of the committee members were opposed to 1,000-pound exemption provision for cotton.

The committee recommended a 3-acre minimum allotment for all producers eligible for peanut allotment. This acreage to be in addition to the National, State, and county allotment.

The committee thought that the final date for determining the tillable acreage available for peanuts should be between the 1st and 15th of July.

TALOGA, OKLA., *January 16, 1950.*

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR VICTOR: I will try to give you some of our problems on administering the farm program at the county level.

I am for the farm program and controlled production, for I believe acreage control is the only way we can hope to continue to receive fair prices for our farm commodities.

The system set up for wheat-acreage allotments, based on actual history on the farm, worked very nicely, and we feel it was fair to everyone. Ninety-five percent of the farmers are satisfied with their wheat allotment; however, when it comes to cotton, it is a different thing.

With cotton allotments based on cropland instead of history, in lots of cases a farmer who has had cotton only 1 year in the 1946–48 period gets more allotment than his neighbor who has had cotton every year, which won't work satisfactorily. Also, the war-crop credit on cotton works to a disadvantage. In Dewey County, there are 155 farmers that received cotton allotments, to which they are not entitled, through war-crop credits alone. This works a hardship on the cotton farmer who received very little allotment and who is a consistent cotton grower.

We feel in our county that something should be done to eliminate war-crop acreage, and the cotton acreage be given to the cotton farmer who derives his family income from cotton.

I also feel that if a farmer doesn't intend to use his cotton allotment, it should be permissible for him to turn it in at the county office to be redistributed.

I know you are anxious to do everything in your power to help us farmers, which we appreciate.

Very truly yours,

W. T. (TOM) MATTHEWS.

GRIMES, OKLA., *January.*

DEAR WICKERSHAM: I am writing you in regards to the cotton allotment.

We have rented a place a half section of land.

It's got 162 acres of cultivation and its got only 29 acres of cotton and I paid $400 a year for it.

It will take about 7 or 8 acres to make a bale. It's going to be hard for me to pay $1,600. It wouldn't raise wheat and I wish you would consider that and see if you can help me get more cotton than what the bankers require is more cotton and I have to fertilize that.

I have a big family and I am afraid if I don't get more cotton I will have to leave the farm.

Your truly,

DAVE ELIFRITS.

ELK CITY, OKLA., *January 26, 1950.*

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM.

Dear Sir: I am writing you in regard to my cotton allotment. I am a small farmer and have 80 acres of land with 73 acres in cultivation. They set my allotment at 19½ acres. I filed a protest with the county committee so I got notice yesterday to meet with the committee today at Sayre to see about it and met with them and they cut me 4 acres more which leaves me with only 16½ acres. To begin with, they allotted me 26 acres for wheat, which I didn't want and they say they can't take it back. There are lots of farmers that have wheat acreage and they don't want it. There are lots of farmers who have cotton acreage that they don't want. Now I am asking you why Congress won't release all this acreage and have it redistributed. Beckham County is in an uproar about this. How can I make a fair living on 16½ acres of cotton? I have always been for the New Deal. Have been a Democrat all my life. Have stood by you and the national administration, I have been living here for 49 years. Have served in several different ways in helping the Government. So now then if there isn't something done about these allotments, I am through with the present set-up.

The boys at Sayre tell me their hands are tied unless Congress acts on the matter. If you were here and heard the farmers in general express themselves, you would certainly be surprised, and if things are not ironed out, the Democratic Party is going to be hurt bad in the next election.

Please excuse the long letter as it was the shortest way I could get the facts before you. Would be very glad to hear from you as to how you stand.

Thanking you, I remain very truly,

O. O. LYRIG.

ALTUS, OKLA., *January 24, 1950.*

The Honorable VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WICKERSHAM: The cotton allocation program has reached a point in this area now where there is little hope for new growers to participate on a large enough scale to justify the operations of growing cotton.

There are 836 farmers in Jackson County who do not have cotton allocated for their farms. It is estimated that 70 percent of these farmers would like to grow cotton. There are many other farmers whose maximum planted acreage during the period of 1945 to 1948 limits their cotton acreage to a particularly low percent of their total farm. The three cases for which we are including

figures will best illustrate the problem of these men.

On the farm operated by W. H. Luderson, the acreage planted to various crops during the history years for cotton are as follows: On this quarter section of land in 1941 there were 30.6 acres of cotton; 23.6 acres of wheat; 40.4 acres of grain sorghum; 15 acres of barley; 17.6 acres of peas. Since that date the farm has been operated entirely as a wheat farm. In 1945 there were 139 acres of wheat and the same acreage reported in 1946, 1947, and 1948. The 1942 crop allotment included 50 acres of cotton and 20.8 acres of wheat. This particular case represents many similar ones that have come under the irrigation program during the past year.

Another case where the farmer has no cotton acreage has a cropping history as follows: In 1941 there were 69.2 acres of cotton; 16.2 acres of wheat; 10.7 acres of oats; 50 acres of barley; 83.5 acres of alfalfa; and 50 acres of green manure. In 1945 there were 196.1 acres of wheat; 83.5 acres of alfalfa. In 1946, 187 acres of wheat; 16 acres of oats; and 76.5 acres of alfalfa. In 1947 there were 207 acres of wheat; 72.5 acres of alfalfa. In 1948 there were 207 acres of wheat; 72.5 acres of alfalfa. In 1949 there were 155 acres of cotton; 199 acres of wheat; 40 acres of oats; and 40.5 acres of alfalfa. In 1942 this farm was allocated 98.4 acres of cotton; 25.4 acres of wheat. There is no cotton allocated for 1950, and this farm is another farm that came under irrigation in 1949.

The last case that we included for your consideration is a dry-land farm. On this quarter section in 1941 there were 35 acres of cotton; 12.2 acres of wheat; 31.3 acres of grain sorghums; 75 acres of alfalfa. In 1945 there were 16.2 acres of cotton; 32.4 acres of wheat; 29.9 acres of grain sorghum; and 75 acres of alfalfa. In 1946 there were 66 acres of wheat, 12.5 acres of grain sorghum, and 75 acres of alfalfa. In 1947 there were 10.6 acres of cotton; 66 acres of wheat; 1.9 acres of grain sorghum; and 75 acres of alfalfa. In 1948 there were 66 acres of wheat; 75 acres of alfalfa. In 1949 there were 17.5 acres of cotton; 66 acres of wheat; 70 acres of alfalfa. In 1942 this farm was allocated 53 acres of cotton and 11.2 acres of wheat. This farm was allocated 10.6 acres of cotton for 1950.

These cases are representative of the farmers who have low cotton acreage allocated and farmers who have none. It is this type farmer in this area who feels inequality in the cotton acreage program. These cases are called to your attention to see if the forthcoming legislation can be adapted to increase cotton acreage for these farmers.

Anything you can do to help these cases will help many farmers in this part of the country.

Your very truly,

D. H. TRENT,
Chairman, Cotton Growers' Committee.

HOLLIS, OKLA., *December 4, 1949.*
Congressman VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR VICTOR: It hasn't been my policy to be calling on my Congressman in the past for assistance, but I am asking a little favor of you. If it is in your power to do anything about it, I will appreciate it very much.

Last year I moved on a place here, north of Hollis, that has been planted to wheat only 4 years, therefore, there is no cotton allotment on it. I have 100 acres of cotton on it this year but, of course, that does not count anything on next year's.

I am told that there is quite a number of acres set aside for new-grower allotments. Mr. Jones, the head of the AAA in this county tells me that I am due consideration for a part of that allotment and he went with me before the county committee but they won't do anything about it saying I got a nice wheat allotment and am not entitled to any cotton.

I have always tried to diversify my crops and not go the one-crop route, and I feel that it is no fault of mine that there has not been cotton on the land before and if this new-grower allotment does not affect me, how would I ever go about building up a cotton allotment not getting to plant any? I have always complied with the Government program and do not ask anything that is unfair or unjust. I have offered to yield part of my wheat allotment in order to have a mixed crop but they tell me I can't do that. So if you will look into this for me, I will appreciate it very much.

I am wishing for you and yours a very merry Christmas and if at any time I can be of any help to you down here, will be glad to do so.

Sincerely yours,

EDD DUDEK.

MAYFIELD, OKLA., *January 14, 1950.*
Representative VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR VIC: I've gotten more information since writing you, that I'm sending. I could write Stillwater committeemen but feel that you can do more, quicker.

Last spring I didn't sign up on the AAA program. It didn't suit me because money required to finance it would raise taxes. The talk was if a big '49 crop was made some kind of program would be necessary, so I reduced my cotton acreage.

The Sayre record shows that instead of the county committeemen sending someone out to get the number of acres I had in cotton they just put down a zero.

In '46 their record shows I had 40 acres of cotton and 93 acres in cultivation.

In the latter part of '46 and first of '47 I broke up approximately 18 or 20 acres that I planted in cotton the following 2 years making approximately 25 acres.

Now that I haven't a wheat allotment or other money crops, I need 35 or 40 acres in cotton.

My farm hasn't very good pasture, so cattle aren't advisable except a few dairy cows.

My total amount of tillable land is about 112 or 115 acres.

Respectfully yours,

FRANK LYON.

NATIONAL FARM LOAN ASSOCIATION
OF SAYRE,
Sayre, Okla., January 13, 1950.
Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR VICTOR: Was just thinking about the farm program, and in my talks with various farmers have decided that a change should be made immediately in the farm program to provide an opportunity for farmers who have wheat allotments but don't want them to turn them back to the AAA office and also the many farmers who got cotton allotments but do not want them to do likewise.

This should be done in this manner as many cotton farmers have wheat but don't want it and many wheat farmers have cotton but don't want it; let the wheat farmer turn in his cotton, the county committee would pool these acres and divide it up with the cotton farmers who wanted a larger cotton allotment—giving preference first to the cotton farmer that had turned in his wheat allotment. The wheat acres could be handled on the same basis when the 1951 crop is allotted.

I know many farmers that have cotton acres but will not plant it and these acres should be in production. Most of these who don't plant cotton are wheat farmers and would be glad to cooperate in a program as set up on the above basis.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM D. LAKEY.

ELK CITY, OKLA., *January 17, 1950.*
Congressman VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Due to the fact that my allotment for cotton is so small, I decided to write and see if you could help in any way.

Here is my problem: In Beckham County—SE¼ sec. 16, township 11, range 22—I've rented 160-acre farm; 135 acres of work land, which will raise only grain and cotton.

I've gone to the triple A office and they told me I was supposed to get 51 acres of cotton, but when I got my acreage it was only 7 acres.

I have a family of five to support. Two of my children are in school. My rent is $550 cash rent. Now how can I make a living for my family and pay my cash rent?

Will you please try and help me get my cotton allotment raised? If only you could only help me get it raised to 30 acres, it sure would help me.

Sincerely yours,

J. P. KIRK.

CANUTE, OKLA., *January 21, 1950.*

DEAR SIR: This is in regard to the new farm plan for 1950. I am a young farmer, with a wife and four children to support on a small farm of 80 acres in the heart of cotton country in western Oklahoma. It appears that the Government, through this farm plan, is going to take my means of livelihood from me. Here are the details, as brief as possible:

I have been opposed from the beginning to all price supports, all or part of parity, and of course to any controls that hinder a farmer's freedom. When my county committee issued work sheets to the farmers with questions concerning how much cotton, corn, wheat, oats, etc., was planted for the past several years I stood on my rights and refused to cooperate or have anything to do with it. I let it be understood that as long as it was voluntary—which it was at the time—I wanted none of it but that if it was voted in and of course became compulsory I would then sign up, not willingly but of necessity in order to raise cotton and sell it, cotton being by far the greatest cash crop on my farm and all others in this community.

I did just that as soon as it was voted and passed in the referendum December 15. However, because the plan was unfairly written, in the first place, and unfairly administered, in the second, all the cotton acreage that was allocated to my county was allotted to the individual farmers the first time around, leaving none to settle cases like mine and the appeals. Up to this time I have received no cotton allotment. I have been to see the county committee and chairman several times since I signed up after the referendum, and they say there is nothing they can do. I believe they have applied for more acreage from the Government to settle the appeals. I have been planting about 20 acres to cotton and must have about that much this year.

Under this farm plan and the system of allotting cotton acreage, the farmer who has been planting the most of his land to cotton the past 3 years gets the biggest allotment. And the farmer who has been planting sweet clover and raising his own feed and cutting down his cotton acreage to do that has to take a cut along with the rest. In other words, the farmer who has been hogging cotton and has created our surplus is the one that benefits the most from this plan. Is there anything you can do to help me.

Respectfully yours,

ESTIS L. JOHNSON.

ELDORADO, OKLA., *October 17, 1949.*

DEAR FRIEND VICTOR: We knew before receiving your letter that heaven and earth are being moved to give Altus irrigated lands

more cotton acres. (Some millionaire bankers and land grabbers are interested there.)

But that doesn't change the fact that wheat farmers in southwest Oklahoma have been sold down the river in the allotments. All my land has been devoted to wheat for 3 years but I am cut 36 percent. Some States have only 12-percent cut, some have 25 percent, and different adjoining farms have varying cuts from their historic base and the principle of the historic base is 100 percent rotten. Every farmer should be permitted to place all his land in a base of whatever crop he wishes to grow, and then have the same rate of reduction on every farm in the Nation, regardless of how high it may be. It seems Congressmen and Senators just can't understand the situation. Maybe we can speak in your language about November 1950.

Very truly yours,

T. A. ROBINSON.

ALTUS, OKLA., *November 12, 1949.*

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Mangum, Okla.

DEAR MR. WICKERSHAM: Relative to our discussion on cotton-acreage allocation for the irrigation project in Jackson County, we wish to inform you that the provisions of the recent Public Law 272 have not given us any relief on our problem of curtailed cotton acreage.

The letter that Mr. Hutchinson sent to you further confirms the information we had received from Members of Congress and Senate that we might expect relief from the 15 percent of cotton acreage, which can be held by the State and county PMA offices for adjustments of hardship cases. In our meeting on November 3 with the State PMA committee, their interpretations on this particular part of the law still left us without consideration farmers feel is due them on the irrigation project.

The thing that is happening on this project can best be illustrated by using one farm as an example. On a 320-acre farm there has been no cotton planted previous to 1949 during the period on which cotton-acreage history is based. In 1949, there were planted 150 acres of cotton. There have been 80 acres of alfalfa during 1946, 1947, and 1948, which may be used in lieu of cotton acreage. Wheat has been the principal crop, however, on this farm, and the 1950 acreage allocation is 155 acres.

As we have stated before, wheat is not favored as an irrigated crop, because it does not pay enough through increased production to offset the costs of irrigation and related costs of land preparation and increased machinery operation. The very maximum acreage that could be planted on this 320 acres to cotton in 1950 will be 48 acres, provided there had been any cotton history on the land during the years of 1946, 1947, or 1948. The main reason that cotton was not grown during these years was because irrigation was not available. In 1949, water was first available for irrigation and 155 acres were planted to cotton this year.

We believe, as we have been informed by our Congressmen, that the 15 percent of acres held by State and county committees would go a long way in alleviating our situation next year. We have not received any consideration due to irrigation, however, from the State PMA committee.

Is there anything you can do to help us?

Yours very truly,

D. H. TRENT.

ELK CITY, *Okla., January 1, 1950.*

Congressman WICKERSHAM,
Washington, D. C.

CONGRESSMAN: I am writing you in regard to the way some of us farmers have had our cotton acreage allotted.

At the present time I am only farming 113 acres, since the allotment before the war was lifted I have been raising from 70 to 95 acres, no wheat on this plot of land, the balance in grain sorghums. Now, I have been allotted 1 acre of wheat and 42.8 acres of cotton. How can we small farmers continue to operate on reductions as this? Some of my neighbors were allotted more cotton acreage this year than they have ever planted in the past. I have been to my county office twice about it, but can't get anything done about it. Please tell me if there is any way you can help me secure more cotton acreage.

Yours truly,

ORBIE L. GIBBINS.

MARTHA, OKLA., *January 20, 1950.*

Mr. H. P. MOFFITT,
Executive Officer, Production and Marketing Administration,
Stillwater, Okla.

DEAR SIR: I have this date received a reply from the county PMA committee in regard to my appeal for reconsideration of cotton acreage allotment on my farm (county serial No. C–107). This appeal was based primarily on the fact that an error was made in recording cotton history on my farm for the year 1948. There was about 47 acres of cotton planted on this farm in 1948 which was not shown in this history. No consideration was given for this since the allotment was not changed from the original allotment of 12.2 acres, for the quarter section. If the calculations were made properly according to law, the average would have been more in proportion to the required acreage to make the farm operate on a paying basis.

Reference is made to section 344, paragraph (f) (2) and (3), of the cotton acreage and allotments and marketing quota law, Eighty-first Congress. Also to paragraph (g) (2). To my knowledge the survey required by paragraph (i) was not made, thus the discrepancy in acres planted in 1948.

It is respectfully requested that this allotment be further reviewed in view of the following facts:

1. This farm was purchased by me in 1947 to produce cotton.
2. The farm was already seeded to wheat when purchased.
3. Cotton was planted as soon as possible.
4. County records do not show 1948 cotton.
5. The allocated acres will not produce sufficient net income to cover irrigation assessments, taxes, and interest, since it is a proven fact that in this area that wheat will not give the return under irrigation that cotton will.

Respectfully,

NELSON DOUGHTY.

ALTUS, OKLA., *September 22, 1949.*

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I am interested in the cotton acreage for Oklahoma since I am just a small farmer in Jackson County. I would like for Oklahoma to keep it's quota of acreage and not a bit more. I hope it will be possible to do a little shifting so that all of Oklahoma's acres will grow cotton. In Jackson County would be a good place to shift unwanted cotton acres from other counties.

JOHN CHENAULT.

ELDORADO, OKLA., *September 19, 1949.*

DEAR FRIEND VICTOR: I am sure you know what the Agriculture Department means by the term, "historic base." I have been trying to say to you, that, in many instances in our section, this historic base serves to confiscate our wheat lands.

I have planted all my land in wheat for the last 3 years, but I have a 36-percent reduction due to historic base, because I formerly planted some cotton. Here at Eldorado the farmer with an all-wheat historic base is required to reduce 23⅓ percent while just across the river, in Texas, they have to reduce only 16 percent. And their situation as to soil and farming practice is exactly like here. Because of this injustice to plant all their land to wheat and that will make a rotten situation.

I repeat you don't know how mad we are.

Yours truly,

T. A. ROBINSON.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.,
December 27, 1949.

Congressman VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I own a farm in your district from which the rent is my income. I am 72 years old. We, the tenant and I, have been planting most of it in cotton, especially since the allotments were removed in 1943.

Now the PMA has alloted us only about 40 percent of the amount we have been planting since 1943. A cut of 60 percent seems very unfair to me when the talk was for a 20-percent cut on the acres planted in recent years. Does it seem fair to you?

What can you do about it?

Sincerely yours,

MRS. IDA CAMPBELL.

BLAINE COUNTY ABSTRACT CO.,
Watonga, Okla., December 24, 1949.

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
United States Representative, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

We are writing you regarding the reduction in the cotton acreage for 1950, and while we have no objections to the reduction in the acreage to be planted as a matter of fact think this is a good thing, but we do want to join with the balance of the cotton growers in objecting to the manner in arriving at the allotments.

We find in our case that the cotton allotment on our land has been reduced on an average of approximately 75 percent, and this makes it almost prohibitive for the cotton farmer to make a living as a lot of the land growing cotton is not adapted to any other money-making crop.

We find that in a number of cases where the farm is largely a wheat farm they have been allotted a small cotton base and in talking with them, this cotton base is so small and due to the fact that they are set up and equipped for wheat farming only that they do not intend to plant any cotton on their allotment for cotton which will mean that this allotment will not be used in 1950 and referring particularly to Dewey County, Okla., where we have 320 acres, 129 acres is in cultivation, we have been allotted a 60-acre wheat base and 9.5-acre cotton base and this is a sandy type of soil and not adapted to good wheat growing and which cuts this farm down to a nonpaying farm unit.

In talking with one of your PMA supervisors in Dewey County, Okla., he advises that a majority of the cotton growers are very much dissatisfied with their allotment and he advises, in discussing this with him, that if the law could be changed and he thought that it should be, so that the reduced cotton acreage could be distributed to the farms adapted to cotton growing and eliminate the allotment to the wheat farm on which the farmer did not desire any cotton allotment, that the cotton farmer would receive sufficient cotton allotment to take care of his needs and not increase the allotted cotton acreage or production, in other words if the present cotton allotment would be so distributed to those desiring to raise cotton this could be done, if the law would so permit, without increasing the allotted cotton acreage.

It is true that the vote on this carried by a large majority but in a large number of cases those voting for the allotment have not received their 1950 allotment at the time of voting and did not fully understand the situation, which facts can be verified by your PMA supervisors as the cotton farmers have been coming in to their offices in droves

protesting their allotment since the election.

It all comes down to this, that if the law will be rewritten so that your PMA supervisors can allot the cotton allotment to the farmers desiring and who will use it and eliminate the allotments to those that have no intention of planting cotton, the situation will be well taken care of and we urge your assistance and cooperation in adjusting this very serious situation among the farmers, retroactive to the 1950 crop.

Yours very truly,

E. T. HOBERECHT.

SAYRE, OKLA., *December 20, 1949.*

Mr. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Mangum, Okla.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you to see if you can help me on my cotton acreage allotment. There is 135 acres in cultivation on this place. I only have an allotment of 20 acres of cotton. The land is light. It will make an average of one-fourth to one-third of a bale per acre. I can't get by on that. This place is located 8 miles west of Elk City of 66 highway one-fourth north. This is the John Davalt farm. He runs a dairy. He served stuff and grazed it. He didn't plant any cotton at all. He died a year ago last march. I rented the place for crop rent from Mrs. Davalt. If you can help me I will appreciate it.

I need 35 or 40 acres to get by on land as light as this is.

Yours truly,

R. W. HYSMITH.

P. S.—They gave me a wheat base but this land won't grow wheat.

OLUSTEE, OKLA., *December 27, 1949.*

The Honorable VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to complain of the cotton allotment I received. My farm of 160 acres (149¾ acres in cultivation) received an allotment of 35 acres.

I received 70 acres wheat allotment, but owing to weather conditions will not be able to sow the 70 acres in wheat. That leaves me 35 acres of cotton. The rest of the place to be planted in whatever I may. There will be no support price. I feel that this is a grave injustice as I owe $5,000 on farm. Taxes and interest to pay and only 35 acres of crop in supported prices. Grain sorghums, barley, and oats will not have a support price. Besides interest, there are 6 in family and living costs are high.

If I can't get more than 35 acres in cotton I surely will lose my farm. I am too old to make a living for my family as a laborer. No one wants to hire a man 60 years old.

Please do something about this cotton restriction.

It looks as if a bunch of cheap politicians will run the farmer into the hole and ruin him.

Yours truly,

C. M. KEITH.

ALTUS, OKLA., *January 6, 1950.*

The Honorable VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WICKERSHAM: Many of the farmers in Jackson County, and particularly the farmers on the irrigation project, are desirous of a more favorable cotton acreage program than Public Law 272 and 439 provided. We nave been informed that Congress is working on new legislation and feel confident that the new legislation will give us relief from the situation we have at the present time.

There are 840 farmers in Jackson County who have received no cotton acreage; more than 200 of this number own land on the irrigation project. An example of a specific case can best illustrate the hardships that many farmers find themselves with at this time.

On a 320-acre farm there has been no cotton planted previous to 1949 during the period on which cotton acreage was based. In 1949 there were planted 155 acres of cotton. There were 80 acres of alfalfa grown during 1946, 1947, and 1948, 40 acres of which was planted during this period. Wheat has been the principal crop on this farm, and the 1950 acreage allotment for wheat is 155 acres. Wheat is not well suited as an irrigation crop, because it does not pay enough from increased production to offset the costs of irrigation and related costs of land preparation and machine operation.

This farm has received no cotton acreage for 1950, although the county allocation has been put out to growers and consists of 67,123 acres.

The main reason that cotton was not grown during the years of 1946, 1947, and 1948, was because irrigation was not available. In 1949, water was first available for irrigating this tract of land, and 155 acres were planted to cotton.

Anything that you can do to help the farmers in this area under circumstances as described here will be deeply appreciated.

Yours very truly,

D. H. TRENT.

APPEAL

ELK CITY, OKLA., *December 31, 1949.*

DEAR MR. WICKERSHAM: I am a 23-year-old veteran that has a 160-acre upland farm rented, crop rent of 96.4 acres are broke out.

The last 2 years I have been running from 75 to 80 acres of cotton so I could pay for my tractor. I got a GI loan to buy it and had only 2 years to pay for it. My payments were around $1,200 apiece so you can see that my payment and a living is all that I have made.

My landlady (Barbara Simons) has been a widow woman for the last 3 years and she has six small children from the age of 4 to 16.

With them living on the farm so that they can have a few corn, meat hogs, chicken, and rent from 70 or 80 acres of cotton they can have a decent living.

Now that we have a 19-acre wheat and 30-acre cotton allotment and where so many people are depending on 96.4 acres of upland farming land for a living we can't make ends meet. Could you tell me how I could get my cotton allotment raised 20 or 30 acres?

Mrs. Simons and I have tried the triple A office. They said everybody was treated alike, but we have to make a 160-acre upland farm do what some people make a section of bottom land do. If I don't get more cash crops so I can make part of her living and one for myself, these allotments are going to put boys like myself out of business. I really need that cotton I asked for.

Sir, why is it that a man with $50-a-week salary can buy a seven or eight thousand dollar home with a 100-percent FHA or GI loans, and boys like myself couldn't buy a farm for love or money? Could I buy one of these homes in town and farm? As you know, there is a big oil play here and farms are high.

The farm is in Beckham County and is 4 miles north of Elk City, Okla. The serial number of this farm is A172.

Thank you.

NEWELL WEBB.

FARMERS UNION COOPERATIVE GIN,
Snyder, Okla., January 20, 1950.

VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR VICTOR: Enclosed find petition which was gotten up by F. M. Jack, Adrian H. Richardson, and myself on cotton allotments. We are also sending one of the same to Senator KERR, one to Senator THOMAS, and also one to Congressman ALBERT, because of his status on the Agriculture Committee. These may not help any, but the producers in this particular territory really need some help on these allotments, and anything you can do will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

H. V. SCHOONOVER.

Subject: Cotton acreage allotment for Jackson County, Okla.

Farmers in Jackson County are disturbed over the prospects for cotton-acreage allocation. A reduction of cotton acreage will handicap farmers in paying for land and costs of farming operations. The acreage-allotment program as it is understood today will seriously impair the farming economy.

The cotton-cropping history of Jackson County during the 5 years preceding 1949 will be used as the base for figuring acreage allocations. This period is not fairly representative of the county's cotton history. During this 5-year period there was a large change from cotton to wheat production. The change was due to a shortage of labor and because farmers were asked to produce foods needed for the war. The records of the PMA office show us the cotton-acreage trend in the county. We have no accurate record for years not listed.

In 1941 there were 82,096 acres of cotton.
In 1943 there were 97,000 acres of cotton.
In 1944 there were 96,500 acres of cotton.
In 1945 there were 82,279 acres of cotton.
In 1946 there were 77,750 acres of cotton.
In 1947 there were 76,277 acres of cotton.
In 1948 there were 66,641 acres of cotton.
In 1949 there are 88,129 acres of cotton.

The wheat acreage during these years fluctuated inversely in about the same proportion:

In 1944 there were 117,500 acres of wheat.
In 1945 there were 160,000 acres of wheat.
In 1946 there were 188,000 acres of wheat.
In 1947 there were 207,000 acres of wheat.
In 1948 there were 210,000 acres of wheat.
In 1949 there were 215,000 acres of wheat.

The relatively large cotton acreage in 1949 is in part a second crop on wheat land, which accounts for the large acreages of both cotton and wheat this year. The county's wheat acreage allocation for planting this year is 152,385 acres. There are 365,000 acres of cropland in the county. Labor and machinery shortages forced a reduction in the cotton-cropping program in the county. When the veterans returned and in many cases took over farming units, their plan was to grow cotton for a cash crop to purchase machinery, land, and to start them in the farming business.

To Whom It May Concern:

We farmers in Jackson County, Okla., understand that cotton acreage allocations are to be made on the cotton- and war-cropping history for the 5-year period prior to 1949. The AAA Act of 1938, in effect with amendment changes, does not recognize the changes in agriculture of this area.

We feel that 25 percent of our land should be allocated for cotton production. Prior to 1949 our cotton acreage was small, and wheat acreage large. Wheat was grown extensively during the war, because of a labor and machinery shortage for cotton production.

We hereby petition for adjustments in cotton acreage for the irrigation project to enable us to pay the added costs of farming under irrigation. We also petition for acreage adjustments on dry land where changes from cotton to wheat were made through necessity.

We petition that all cotton growers participate on an equal basis in any concessions made for this area in adjusted cotton acreage.

The cotton-acreage controls next year will make it impossible for veterans in some cases to pay out the increased costs of farm land and the high operation costs of farming. It has already become evident that

land prices will follow the cotton acreage on any farm in this area. It is our understanding that crops classed as war crops will be allowed to stand in lieu of cotton in the base period on which acreage will be figured for allocation. Wheat is not in the war-crop category. Wheat served a dual purpose during the war years, providing pasture for 50,000 beef cattle each year and producing 1,400,000 bushels of wheat for food. These conditions affect the major part of Oklahoma, and irrigation farmers have a special problem.

Irrigation land on the Altus-Lugert project will be assessed for the first time next year whether or not water is used, this in view of cotton-acreage allocations. The first year irrigation was available made it possible for farmers on the north end of the project to increase their cotton acreage in 1946. Each year since then as water has become available to users in lower regions of the project, progressively more cotton has been grown. This year there is a larger acreage due to the ability of the Bureau of Reclamation to turn water to all of the farm land included in the district. In 1946, 63 percent of the irrigated acreage was in cotton. In 1948, 44 percent was in cotton. When the entire acreage in the project finally is under water assessment, no less than 25 percent of the acreage should be used for cotton production. Of the 47,700 acres that are certified at this time as irrigable, approximately 11,000 acres are seeded to cotton. But farmers feel that under irrigation on this project it will be necessary for them to grow between twelve and fifteen thousand acres of cotton annually in order to establish a sound crop-rotation system to develop their farms to the best interest of the entire country. Because wheat has been a principle crop during the past 8 years, the wheat acreage allotment is considered excessive from an irrigation standpoint. Wheat does not respond to irrigation as cotton or other of the crops that may be available for use in a rotation planting program. The wheat allotted to the irrigation project exceeds 30,000 acres for 1950. Cotton acreages under the new program based on past production will be too low for balanced farming with irrigation.

There are inequalities in the crop-allocation program that have not been satisfactorily changed by the law recently passed to amend the AAA Act of 1938. Although there were minor changes in the law, they do not recognize the complete change that has taken place on the irrigation project since the 1938 act was in operation. The entire agricultural economy has changed from dry land farming to irrigation farming. There have been large expenses to farmers for land preparation and increased operating costs with irrigation. It will be necessary for the successful development of this project that a well diversified crop rotation system be established as soon as possible. Diversified farming is recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture as essential to a sound farm program. It will be impractical for less than one-fourth of the irrigable acres to be used in the growing of cotton. Cotton has been grown here for many years and is well adapted to this particular locality. The acreage has been limited in the past by lack of labor and water. Other cash crops and specialties will grow here, but the marketing outlets for these crops are extremely limited and have not been developed. For developing market outlets years of planning and work will be necessary. If one-fourth of the irrigated acres can be utilized for the production of cotton, one-half of the project could be developed for the production of forage crops and other livestock feeds. There will still be one-fourth of the land for growing other crops that will be needed to develop a well diversified production program. If we have a shorter acreage for cotton than the amounts asked for, the economy will be seriously handicapped, the sound development of the project will be retarded, veterans and other men who are trying to buy land on the irrigation project will be unable to pay the costs of irrigation. It is unlikely that they will even be able to finish paying for the land. The costs of construction, operation, and maintenance will destroy any benefits that could be received from irrigation in this area of the country. There have been private irrigation developments in this area that are faced with the same production problems as irrigation farmers on the reclamation project.

We believe that there is a solution to these problems that will not affect the plan of the 1938 AAA Act to curtail cotton production for the United States. If there are frozen acres in Oklahoma, we ask that such acreage be administered by the State and county PMA committees, and reallocated to growers who will use such acreage for actual production. If this plan is not feasible, then we believe that a different period of years for figuring the cotton-cropping history should be used that better represents the long period history of cotton production in Oklahoma.

We are not asking favors for minority groups, but do believe that the concessions we have requested will benefit all farmers in Oklahoma.

We have discussed these problems with our county and State PMA committees and it is with their permission and at their suggestion that we present these problems to you, because the farmers of Jackson County need relief from a situation that threatens the farm economy. Your help in alleviating the situation is asked for in good faith and will be deeply appreciated. Cotton growers of Jackson County elected the following committee to present this case: D. H. Trent, chairman, Altus, route 2; Clark McWhorter, Blair; Drue W. Dunn, Altus; Forrest Schnorrenberg, Altus, route 3; D. L. Jones, Eldorado; Carl Ross, Duke; John Davis, Altus; John Miller, Headrick, route 1; W. A. Nugent, Blair; E. I. Yates, Elmer, route 1.

If there is further information that will be helpful to you in this case, contact any of the committeemen who represent their communities in this matter.

A. B. Paine, 1024 East Elm, Asa B. Ferguson, box 228, Altus; H. H. Howell, Olustee; Lloyd L. Crain, Harold H. Vinyard, J. R. Stoup, John E. Chennault, William Vandiver, Mich Elliott, Jack Ward, W. H. Jameson, Ben Martin, W. H. Luderson, R. E. Crockett, E. I. Yates, H. G. Jones, route 2, Altus; C. B. Booker, Headrick, route 1; Harvey Gentry, Fred Caves, route 4, Altus; Joel Ross, box 17, Duke; T. R. Wilson, route 2, Olustee; R. L. Mitchell, box 242, Blair; C. D. Feltz, route 2, Altus; J. R. Haws, C. G. Cinstelber, route 2, Olustee; John M. Davis, Altus; A. L. Bryan, 1301 North Hudson, O. T. Freeman, Jack Mills, route 2, B. Earle Cole, route 1, H. S. Garrison, route 1, Altus; H. C. Garrison, route 1, Headrick; W. O. Burch, route 1, T. O. Burch, 1617 North Lee, T. H. Lippoldt, 419 North Grady, Ray R. Castle, 1100 North Hudson, W. M. Maley, J. N. Walker, route 2, H. D. Zumbro, route 1, Roy Kizziar, Frank Smith, route 2, Charles A. Nichols, Fred Walker, A. B. Smith, Altus.

ELDORADO, OKLA.

DEAR SIRE, HA: I guess you noticed that I didn't put my return address on the envelope. I didn't want the rest of the people in Washington being jealous of me writing to you. Please don't tell them that I wrote to you and not to them.

Well, this letter has a purpose. When you see a ——— dash that means "drat" or "dratted." Well, this ——ed farm program has me down to 60 acres of wheat on one-half section of land. That is too ——— much land to be out. I have no ——— cotton base except 22.9 acres in 1945, that divided by 4 years to get my average yearly quota leaves nothing 0, or a cipher with rim knocked off. Now if I knew that I wouldn't get anything to raise for money, I would have tried to make my living according to R. A. Tillman, route 3, Eldorado, Okla. I don't know whether you know it or not but you have to make money to pay taxes with or go to the pen to say nothing of the expense of running the thing. Now, I know of one neighbor (man, wife, and child) who have 650 acres wheat. He also will have a cotton acreage. He and hired hand cut about a thousand acres in 9 days plowing. Do you reckon they can live on that much? I have another neighbor (man, wife, and two children). They have 80 acres. They will get 29 acres wheat, some cotton. Do you reckon they can live on that much?

Now, I was one of these nuts that tried to kindly carry the prewar program through the war years and am now fixing to get cut. What will people besides veterans do that have land and homes to pay for do?

Respectfully,

R. A. TILLMAN.

P. S.—Do you think I should have 50 acres cotton?

OFFICE OF COURT CLERK,
Hobart, Okla., December 16, 1949.

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Congressman, Seventh Congressional District, Hobart, Okla.

DEAR SIR: It is not my purpose to burden you with matters that can otherwise be taken care of; and, too, I feel sure you receive other letters of a similar nature. I would like at this time to give you a brief outline of my allotment on the West ½ of the Northwest Quarter of Section 3, Township 8 North, Range 15, WIM, Washita County, Okla. I purchased the above-referred-to tract October 11, 1949, through the Indian Department, the title of which is being prepared at this time. So far as the records are concerned, in Washita County, there is no evidence of ownership as of yet, as it takes quite a while to go through the procedure and get the title back. This title has passed the Concho subagency and the general office at Anadarko and has been forwarded to Washington for approval. When this allotment program was called to my attention, I became concerned about the matter for the reason that I am at a loss as to how long this program will carry over and what effect it will have on the production of the money crop, as this purchase was made principally with borrowed money.

Upon investigation, I find that my allotment was 19.7 acres of cotton, and 7 acres of wheat, making a total of 26.7 acres of cotton and wheat combined, from the total of 66 acres in cultivation, which is approximately 40 percent of the tillable land. I think this allotment is a ridiculous figure, inasmuch as the land in question is a cotton farm. I also find a variation in the percentage allowed different people. A tract of 80 acres in the same county has, I understand, as high as 35 to 38 acres of cotton allotment alone.

I do not know what can be done about this, but I know of no other way of giving you the facts other than writing you as I am doing. In the first place, the 90 percent of parity, in my opinion, is a little unfair to start with. It sems to me that a farmer should be allowed 100 percent parity in order to keep on an even keel with economic conditions; however, if it is necessary for us to make a sacrifice in order to protect the economic conditions of our country, I am certainly willing to accept the 90 percent as it stands. But I am not willing to accept the ridiculous allotment that was granted to me as I mentioned above.

I sometimes wonder what our Agricultural Committee is doing and what they think will happen to the 60 percent of feed that we would be forced to produce according to the allotment as set out above. In my opinion, there would be so much feed in that particular area that one could hardly give it away.

If there is anything that you can do about this matter, it will be greatly appreciated.

Yours respectfully,

O. L. FREEZE.

ALTUS, OKLA, *January 24, 1950.*

The Honorable VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WICKERSHAM: The cotton-allocation program has reached a point in this area now where there is little hope for new growers to participate on a large enough scale to justify the operations of growing cotton.

There are 836 farmers in Jackson County who do not have cotton allocated for their farms. It is estimated that 70 percent of these farmers would like to grow cotton. There are many other farmers whose maximum-planted acreage during the period of 1945 to 1948 limits their cotton acreage to a particularly low percent of their total farm. The three cases for which we are including figures will best illustrate the problem of these men.

On the farm operated by W. H. Luderson, the acreage planted to various crops during the history years for cotton are as follows: On this quarter section of land in 1941 there were 30.6 acres of cotton; 23.6 acres of wheat; 40.4 acres of grain sorghum; 15 acres of barley; 17.6 acres of peas. Since that date the farm has been operated entirely as a wheat farm. In 1945 there were 139 acres of wheat and the same acreage reported in 1946, 1947, and 1948. The 1942 crop allotment included 50 acres of cotton and 20.8 acres of wheat. This particular case represents many similar ones that have come under the irrigation program during the past year.

Another case where the farmer has no cotton acreage has a cropping history as follows: In 1941 there were 69.2 acres of cotton; 16.2 acres of wheat; 10.7 acres of oats; 50 acres of barley; 83.5 acres of alfalfa; and 50 acres of green manure. In 1945 there were 196.1 acres of wheat; 83.5 acres of alfalfa. In 1946, 187 acres of wheat; 16 acres of oats; and 76.5 acres of alfalfa. In 1947 there were 207 acres of wheat; 72.5 acres of alfalfa. In 1948 there were 207 acres of wheat; 72.5 acres of alfalfa. In 1949 there were 155 acres of cotton; 199 acres of wheat; 40 acres of oats; and 40.5 acres of alfalfa. In 1942 this farm was allocated 98.4 acres of cotton; 25.4 acres of wheat. There is no cotton allocated for 1950, and this farm is another farm that came under irrigation in 1949.

The last case that we included for your consideration is a dry land farm. On this quarter section in 1941 there were 35 acres of cotton; 12.2 acres of wheat; 31.3 acres of grain sorghums; 75 acres of alfalfa. In 1945 there were 16.2 acres of cotton; 32.4 acres of wheat; 29.9 acres of grain sorghum; and 75 acres of alfalfa. In 1946 there were 66 acres of wheat, 12.5 acres of grain sorghum, and 75 acres of alfalfa. In 1947 there were 10.6 acres of cotton; 66 acres of wheat; 1.9 acres of grain sorghum; and 75 acres of alfalfa. In 1948 there were 66 acres of wheat; 75 acres of alfalfa. In 1949 there were 17.5 acres of cotton; 66 acres of wheat; 70 acres of alfalfa. In 1942 this farm was allocated 53 acres of cotton and 11.2 acres of wheat. This farm was allocated 10.6 acres of cotton for 1950.

These cases are representative of the farmers who have low cotton acreage allocated and farmers who have none. It is this type farmer in this area who feels inequality in the cotton-acreage program. These cases are called to your attention to see if the forthcoming legislation can be adapted to increase cotton acreage for these farmers.

Anything you can do to help these cases will help many farmers in this part of the country.

Yours very truly,

D. H. TRENT,
Chairman, Cotton Grower's Committee.

ELDORADO, OKLA.

DEAR FRIEND VICTOR: I am still aching about the historic base along with all your farmers. That base is made a part of the title to every farm and we all know false records have been submitted for some farms and no records on others. It would be confusing and impractical to permit farmers to change bases every year but he should have that privilege at stated intervals or when a farm changes owners or tenants. If some young Member of Congress would make a fight for that principle and then run for Senate, he would pile up a vote down here in Seventh District. I know what our farmers are thinking.

We appreciate your faithful service.

Very truly yours,

T. A. ROBINSON.

ELDORADO, OKLA., *December 5, 1949.*

DEAR MR. WICKERSHAM: You asked me to write you about the agriculture problem that I had. (60 acres of wheat, no cotton base, etc., with 100 acres out on my farm.) You remember the conference that we had in Hoggars office that day? I was seeking more wheat acreage in preference to cotton base and if I could get cotton base, I desired to swap it for additional wheat allotment. It seemed that nothing could be done short of an act of Congress to change it. (According to the committee.)

Well, it sure looks like I was penalized for being honest. If I'd been a —— crook and submitted my wheat acreage as from fence to fence, I'd had a decent allotment.

I told them if I could get a decent allotment, I thought maybe I could go bear hunting. But since I was cut to 60 acres, I was scared to go as I might be mistaken for a bear (bare). Anyway, a fellow would be bared if he did. In order for you to understand the situation that it puts a small fellow in, I will construct 1950 program, 60 acres wheat, which the Government said my acreage yield was—

Seven bushels per acre by $2 per bushel equals $14 per acre, minus putting $3, equals $11.

Four plowings at $1 each equals $4.

Seed and treatment, $2.75.

Sowing, 75 cents.

Total, $7.50.

Seven fifty from $11 leaves $3.50.

Three dollars and fifty cents by 60 acres equals $210, less hauling to town, less expense of loan, less what else. Oh yeah, wait 3 weeks to 3 months for your $210 loan to get back. Please don't laugh. That is a heck of a mess. Well on the outland put 35 acres oats.

Certified seed, $2.80 bushel by 53 bushels (1½ per acre), equals $140.40.

Plowing four times at $1 equals $4.

Sowing, 75 cents.

Cutting, $3.

Hauling, shoveling, and labor, oh heck, what's the use?

Say put the rest in milo which would be more expense than the other. Well, nobody wants such as that. It's $4.60 cut here now. So why should a dealer buy it when he couldn't sell it to somebody who already has some of the stuff? And if you couldn't sell it, you would have to buy something to store it in. And if you store it, you'd have to feed it to hogs or something and they are too cheap to feed, etc., on through the night.

I suggest that all farmers on the small farms be paid a pension so they can pay taxes.

Respectfully,

R. A. TILLMAN.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, amendments to the cotton-quota law are necessary to correct inequities and to eliminate hardships which are developing in connection with acreage allotments to cotton farmers. In a large number of cases the allocations under the program are obviously inequitable and unfair, and the result, if the situation is not improved, will inevitably be that many farmers and their tenants will lose their means of livelihood, unemployment will increase, and the original purpose of the quota bill will be defeated.

No amendment is going to provide the remedy sought if the acreage cut for individual farmers amounts to more than 30 percent of the average planted during the years, 1946, 1947, and 1948. I am very hopeful that the measure now before the House will, if enacted, go far toward solving the problem. This measure, to succeed, must provide additional acreage to adjust 1950 allotments to bring them up to a minimum of whichever is the largest of 70 percent of the average cotton acreage planted on a farm in 1946, 1947, and 1948 or 50 percent of the highest acreage planted on the farm in any of those 3 years. There is properly a provision in the measure which permits farmers to surender voluntarily to their county committees acreage allotted to them which they do not intend to plant in 1950. Authority should also be given to county committees to make equitable adjustments between acreage figures of the BAE and those of farmers themselves.

While I recognize that the supply-and-demand situation in cotton requires quotas for the 1950 crop if Government price supports are at 90 percent of parity are to be maintained, I am certain that the House will want to prevent drastic inequities resulting from application of the cotton-quota law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments now at the Clerk's desk may be printed in the RECORD at this point so that we may have an opportunity to see them in the morning.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE of California: On page 2, line 10, strike out the figure 40 and insert in lieu thereof the figure 50.

Amendment offered by Mr. WICKERSHAM: Page 2, line 5, after the word "years", insert "or 50 percent of the acreage planted to cotton or regarded as planted to cotton under Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress, on the farm in the year 1949."

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Page 1, line 9, strike out "70" and insert "60."

Amendment offered by Mr. HARE: On page 2, line 8, after the colon and before the word "provided," insert the following: "*Provided*, That the allotment to each farm shall be determined by the county committee, subject to review in accordance with section 3 of this resolution, on the basis of satisfactory evidence submitted by the producers."

Amendment offered by Mr. WICKERSHAM: Page 3, line 14, after the word "State" strike out "and county" and insert a comma and "county and the individual farms which so surrendered such farm acreage allotments."

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: Page 3, following line 229, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 2A. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any farmer who shows to the satisfaction of the Secretary that he has been directly engaged in the growing of cotton as his principal means of support during the years 1946, 1947, 1948 as a renter, either as a cash tenant, share tenant, or sharecropper, and that through no fault of his own the land which he has been farming is no longer available to him for farming purposes shall, if he obtains other farm land to rent or farm for which no 1950-cotton allotment has been established, be eligible to receive for such land a cotton allotment in 1950. Such allotment shall be established on the same basis as allotments are established for other farms in the county on which cotton was not planted in 1946, 1947, or 1948, except that the acreage required to provide the allotments authorized under this section shall be in addition to the county, State, and National acreage allotments proclaimed by the Secretary of Agriculture for the 1950 crop of cotton and the production from such acreage shall be in addition to the national marketing quota for such crop."

Amendment offered by Mr. REGAN: Insert the following new section 5 after section 4 and renumber succeeding sections:

"SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the cotton acreage allotment of any new 1949 cotton farm which was completed for planting prior to March 29, 1949, by clearing, plowing, and cultivating the land and was planted to cotton for the first time in 1949 and which was not planted to any crop prior to 1949, shall be not less than 30 percent of the acreage on such farm which was planted to cotton in 1949."

Amendments offered by Mr. BECKWORTH. Page 4, after line 6, insert the following:

"SEC. 5. Section 346 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(f) The penalty provided for in this section shall not apply with respect to cotton produced by any person who is recognized by the county committee as being a cotton farmer if his total acreage does not exceed 5 acres.'"

And on page 4, line 7, strike out "SEC. 5." and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 6."

Page 4, after line 6, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 5. Section 346 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(f) The penalties provided for in this section shall not apply with respect to cotton produced by any veteran of World War II who is recognized by the county committee as being a cotton farmer if his total production of cotton does not exceed 5 acres. As used in this subsection the term 'veteran of World War II' means a person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after December 7, 1941, and before September 3, 1945, and who has been honorably separated from such service.'"

And on page 4, line 7, strike out "SEC. 5." and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 6."

Page 4, after line 6, insert the following:

"SEC. 5. Section 346 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(f) The penalties provided for in this section shall not apply with respect to cotton produced by any veteran of World War II who is recognized by the county committee as being, a cotton farmer if his total production of cotton during the year in which such cotton was produced did not exceed an amount equal to four standard bales of 500 pounds gross weight. As used in this subsection the term "veteran of World War II" means a person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after December 7, 1941, and before September 3, 1945, and who has been honorably separated from such service.'"

And on page 4, line 7, strike out "Sec. 5." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 6."

Page 4, after line 6, insert the following:

"SEC. 5. If marketing quotas are proclaimed for the 1951 crop of cotton, farmers eligible to vote in the referendum held with respect to such crop shall be those farmers who were engaged in the production of cotton in the calendar year of 1950 and those cotton farmers who surrendered the cotton acreage allotments to their farms for 1950. As used in this section the term 'cotton farmer' means a person recognized by the county committee as being a cotton farmer."

And on page 4, line 7, strike out "Sec. 5" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 6."

Page 4, after line 6, insert the following:

"SEC. 5. If marketing quotas are proclaimed for the 1951 crop of cotton, farmers eligible to vote in the referendum held with respect to such crop shall be those farmers who were engaged in the production of cotton in the calendar year of 1950 and those veterans of World War II whose farms received cotton-acreage allotments for the 1950 crop but who are found by the county committee to have been unable to engage in the production of cotton in the calendar year of 1950 because of the smallest of the cotton acreage allotments to their farms for the 1950 crop. As used in this section the term "veteran of World War II" means a person who served in the active military or naval strvice of the United States on or after Devember 7, 1941, and before September 3, 1945, and who has been honorably separated from such service. And on page 4, line 7, strike out "Sec. 5." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 6."

Page 4, after line 6, insert the following:

"SEC. 5. If marketing quotas are proclaimed for the 1951 crop of cotton, farmers eligible to vote in the referendum held with respect to such crop shall be those farmers who were engaged in the production of cotton in the calendar year of 1950 and those farmers whose farms received cotton acreage allotments for the 1950 crop but who are found by the county committee to have been unable to engage in the production of cotton in the calendar year 1950 because of the smallness of the cotton acreage allotments to their farms for the 1950 crop."

And on page 4, line 7, strike out "Sec. 5," and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 6."

Page 4, after line 6, insert the following:

"SEC. 5. If marketing quotas are proclaimed for the 1951 crop of cotton, farmers eligible to vote in the referendum held with respect to such crop shall be those farmers who were engaged in the production of cotton in the calendar year of 1950 and those persons recognized by the county committee as being cotton farmers."

And on page 4, line 7, strike out "SEC. 5." and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 6."

Page 4, after line 16, insert the following:

SEC. 6. Section 359 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(f) The penalty provided for in this section shall not apply with respect to peanuts produced by any person who is recognized by the county committee as being a peanut farmer if his total acreage does not exceed 2 years.'"

Amendment offered by Mr. SYKES: Page 4, line 16, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 6. Any part of the peanut acreage allotted to individual farms in any county for 1950 under the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustments Act of 1938, as amended, which will not be planted to peanuts and which is voluntarily surrendered by the owner or operator of the farm to the county committee shall be deducted from the 1950 allotments to such farms and shall be apportioned, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary to other farms in the same county. In any subsequent year, unless hereafter provided by law, acreage surrendered under this section and reallocated pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary shall be credited to the State and county."

Amendment offered by Mr. WICKERSHAM: Page 4, line 16, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 6. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may, in his discretion, allot not to exceed 350,000 acres to new irrigation areas, which were normally cotton producing areas in 1940, 1941, and 1942, but which areas have inadequate cotton allotments under the present act due to the fact that other basic crops were planted in said areas during 1946, 1947, and 1948, which crops were found uneconomical to produce in said area."

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether we have arrived at the point where some of my amendments are applicable. I would like an opportunity to be heard on them.

The CHAIRMAN. We are still on section 1.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, is the bill open to amendment at any point, or just to section 1?

The CHAIRMAN. We are considering section 1.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE:

On page 1, line 9, strike out the words "the larger of."

And on page 2, lines 2, 3, 4, and 5, strike out the following words: "or 50 percent of the highest acreage planted to cotton or regarded as planted to cotton under Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress, on the farm in any one of such 3 years."

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes out the provision giving 50 percent of the highest acreage planted in any one of the 3 years. It will also strike out something more than 400,000 acres, according to an estimate of the Department of Agriculture and according to the figures presented by several of the Members this afternoon; it will probably strike out three-quarters of the total acreage added by this bill.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman has fully redeemed himself by offering this amendment.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman. This amendment will reduce materially the acreage that this bill would add to the national allotment. If you want to try to confine this bill to a measure to give real relief to those who are being destroyed by any act of Congress or interpretation of the Department of Agriculture, or both, then you should vote for this amendment.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of California. What would happen to the man who just came home from the war in 1948 and planted for the first time?

Mr. POAGE. He would get 70 percent of his average plantings during the base period, not to exceed 40 percent of his total cultivated land.

Now, if you want to give a reward to those who have just now developed large acreages of cotton, those who have planted large acreages one year and not consistently followed it, those who have been in and out of the cotton business, then you keep the 50-percent provision. But the 50-percent provision does not help anybody unless he has been planting practically all of his land to cotton or unless, as I said, he is an in-and-outer.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. The gentleman has been a very strong advocate of soil conservation.

Mr. POAGE. I believe very strongly in soil conservation.

Mr. SUTTON. He advocates not following the advice of the Department of Agriculture in the crop rotation provision if he strikes this out.

Mr. POAGE. No, I do not think so; because that man who has been planting all his land in cotton 1 in 3 years and all of his land in soil-conserving crops, or even any crops other than cotton on the other 2 out 3 years, has just as good history as the man who has followed the advice of the Department and planted one-third of his land in cotton every year. He still has a base of 33⅓ acres. He has got an average of 33⅓ planted during the base years, just the same as if he had planted one-third of his land in cotton every one of the 3 years. It works out exactly the same as if you had been following the more common practice of soil conservation, and if this man you speak of actually rotates his whole farm on a 3-year basis he will come out just as well as the man who divides his land every year.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. COOLEY. How much acreage will be involved in the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. POAGE. Something over 400,000 acres taken out, if we pass this amendment. The estimates given by some of the Members here indicate it would be even more than that. Whatever it is, it is very obvious that it is now going to go to the in-and-outer and not to the man who is the regular cotton farmer, or it is going to the man who has always planted a very large acreage and who caused our cotton problem. If he has followed a 3-year rotation of his entire farm with cotton plantings only 1 year out of three like the gentleman from Tennessee describes, then he has got an average that is just as high as if he had followed the practice of planting only one-third of his land in cotton each year.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of California. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that he is including in those "outers" the boys who fought to save this country and who could not get out of the Army in time to plant.

Mr. POAGE. No; there has been no fighting done for this country in the last 3 years. The history of the "outers" is confined to 1946, 1947, and 1948; and there was not anyone fighting for this country in those years. Those boys were here; if they wanted to plant cotton they had the opportunity; if they did not get in the program then they have no right now to come along and say that we ought to break down the program and give them 400,000 acres, and increase the Government's liability by that much. We made provision last fall for an allotment to the boy who was prevented by military service from establishing a cotton history.

The question is very simple: Do you want to maintain a substantial reduction in the national cotton acreage, with reasonable adjustments for those cotton farmers who cannot be expected to make a living for their families under present regulations, or do you want to make this a grab bag? If you ask for too much for the man with one big year, may you not jeopardize the proper needs of the man who had grown a reasonable amount of cotton each year, and who is definitely dependent on cotton for the support of his family?

I would, of course, be glad if we could give every man the right to produce all the cotton he wants to produce, but since we know that we cannot do that and at the same time support the price, let us not get so interested in the cotton speculator who plants when he thinks his neighbors are going to reduce and who relies on something else when he thinks cotton will not be profitable that we are unable to get relief for the man whose children are not going to have shoes unless he can get a reasonable percentage of the cotton he has planted year after year.

The 50-percent provision jeopardizes this whole bill. It will endanger its passage in the House and certainly it will slow down its passage in the Senate. Our farmers need relief and they need it now. They are planting cotton in south Texas today. We cannot afford to slow up the passage of this bill. We cannot afford to take a chance on having it defeated. As our good friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], said, I would rather have a part of something than all of nothing any day in the week, and I know that the 70-percent provision is of far more importance to far more real cotton farmers who have always depended on cotton than is the 50-percent provision. I think that if we were to strike the 50-percent provision, we would have no trouble promptly passing the bill through both Houses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope it is understood that we are now considering legislation that has the small farmer, the medium-sized farmer and the large farmer on the hook. You gentlemen have been planning their economy. At the present time they cannot plant without penalties. You have just voted down an amendment by my colleague from California, Mr. WHITE, which would have protected the little farmer.

Up until last year it was generally understood that this Government wanted people to plant cotton. People throughout the whole United States, but primarily in the West, took their life savings, went out and leveled land, and put down water wells. I would say that 99 percent of them were small farmers. So let us not think we are fooling anyone but ourselves when we talk about 2,000 acre farms. The thing you are talking about now is the farmers throughout the country who for the last 10 years have been put on the hook with a planned economy by this Congress. Call it socialism if you want to, but you are telling them, as they were told by administrative interpretation of the act passed last year, that they are out of business, that they cannot pay their banker.

The gentleman from Texas, whom I admire very much—and I know he has far more experience than I in both agriculture and legislation—should realize, and I cannot refrain from telling him so, that there are some very competent people in California who have their own idea about what constitutes good farming practice. It is probably just as good practice if a man wants to rotate crops to do it on a four-year, a three-year, or even a two-year basis just as good practice as it is to rotate a fractional part of his land every year. If I were a small farmer and wanted to devote 20 acres of my farm to cotton this year, 20 acres to melons next year and 20 acres to maize or some other crop on the third year, that would be considered by many to be good farming practice.

But now you are voting against the people you have on the hook, after you put them on the hook by legislative inducement and penalties. The administration admits that their difficulties result from an administration failure. I have heard members of the committee say that the Department of Agriculture failed to interpret the congressional intent and the intent of the committee. Now, go ahead; but when you do, let it

be known here and now that this administration while saying it supports a bill is not supporting it for the small growers of this country. That so-called administrative failure under the 1949 act is the result of inefficiency or lack of attention or deliberate misinterpretation of congressional intention by the Department of Agriculture. They cannot relieve themselves of this burden by passing the buck to State committees who are the political appointees of this administration and the salaried employees of the Department of Agriculture. If this bill even in its present form is filibustered in the Senate, we will see then where the administration stands on it.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WERDEL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WHITE of California. The gentleman came to Washington when the subcommittee on cotton had its meeting to try to alleviate the situation which arose under the existing legislation. He is familiar with the fact that the 50 percent figure was included in the implied promise that went out in the press release of that time. If we vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], we would be breaking that implied promise, is that not correct?

Mr. WERDEL. I know of no implied promise. I am speaking for people who will be destroyed by the proposed amendment without notice. I want it pointed out that a paternalistic executive department intends that destruction after inducing them to invest their savings and make improvements on lands which are now not to be cultivated because of planned economy.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. WERDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. It is also a fact this amendment was offered in the Committee on Agriculture and was defeated there. I hope it will be defeated on the floor.

Mr. WERDEL. I am not speaking for the Committee on Agriculture. The resolution is a result of a star chamber meeting of a subcommittee. Those of us who crossed the continent were not permitted to attend while the resolution was being discussed for the alleged reason that we were not members of the Agriculture Committee. I discovered later that members of the subcommittee had met on Sunday afternoon in the office of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] which meeting was adjourned to the office of the Secretary of Agriculture at 5 p. m. on that Sunday afternoon. I have been reluctant to say these things until the present hour. I think the time is now here when the small farmer outside of the Old Cotton South should understand that he is expected to make a political contribution to the Fair Deal planned agriculture economy which will be financially destructive to himself.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POAGE) there were—ayes 22, noes 28.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 398 relating to cotton and peanut-acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, had come to no resolution thereon.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 816, Eightieth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. HARDY, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, and Mr. GAMBLE.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 816, Eightieth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. JACKSON of Washington, Mr. PRICE, Mr. PLUMLEY, and Mr. BEALL.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 301, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. KEOGH and Mr. TOWE.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 183, Seventy-sixth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mrs. WOODHOUSE and Mr. MACK of Washington.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to include in the extension of the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole a letter from Mr. Frank K. Woolley, Deputy Administrator, Department of Agriculture, dated January 30, 1950.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include an article appearing in the Country Gentleman.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include two editorials.

Mr. LEMKE (at the request of Mr. HOPE) was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include a bill.

Mr. TALLE (at the request of Mr. HOPE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Des Moines Register.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) on account of illness.

To Messrs. GARY, FERNANDEZ, CANFIELD, and COUDERT (at the request of Mr. CANNON) for January 30 and 31, on account of official business of the Committee on Appropriations.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim February 6, 1950, as National Children's Dental Health Day.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim February 6, 1950, as National Children's Dental Health Day.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, January 31, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1170. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the second report of the Secretary of Defense, covering expenditures for the fiscal year 1949, in compliance with the National Security Act of 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1171. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "For the authorization of a contribution by the United States to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East" (H. Doc. No. 459); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 6553. A bill to provide for the promotion of carriers in the rural delivery service in recognition of longevity of service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1550). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KARST: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 6603. A bill to provide that certain service performed in the custodial service and in the mail equipment shops of the Post Office Department shall be credited toward promotion to the meritorious and longevity grades established for the postal field service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1551). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 7038. A bill to name the dam to be constructed on the Chattahoochee River at Columbia, Ala., the Henry Steagall Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 7039. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for widows of certain former Federal employees who had rendered 30 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H. R. 7040. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act to require that the identity of recipients of financial assistance under such act and the amount of such assistance be made a matter of public record; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 7041. A bill to credit, for purpose of promotion to the meritorious grades, certain service performed by employees of the postal field service transferred from one position to another within the service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 7042. A bill relating to the manufacturers' excise tax on trailers used in connection with passenger automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 7043. A bill to provide for the granting of an easement for a public road or public toll road through the wildlife refuge located in Princess Anne County, Va.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 7044. A bill to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 7045. A bill to amend Public Law 622, Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 777, second session, an act to provide for the payment of pension or other benefits withheld from persons for the period they were residing in countries occupied by the enemy forces during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. J. Res. 406. Joint resolution directing the Civil Aeronautics Board to procure an amendment to the Warsaw Convention, with reference to limitation of liability on oversea travel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 407. Joint resolution to provide for the calling in by the Secretary of the Treasury of all outstanding paper and note United States currency in all amounts, and for the reissuance of new paper and note currency in place thereof in new and different colors for each denomination; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 7046. A bill for the relief of C. W. Jacobs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLTON of Maryland:

H. R. 7047. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tomo Nonque Rosevear III; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. R. 7048. A bill for the relief of Joseph L. Sheets; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 7049. A bill for the relief of Julius Elzas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 7050. A bill for the relief of Louie Gam Yean; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7051. A bill for the relief of Erna Hahn and her minor sons, Erwin Hahn and Theo Heinrich Hahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 7052. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of T. G. Egan Refractory Engineering Co., Inc., against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 7053. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Maulden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 7054. A bill for the relief of Mieko Miyazaki Malloy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1760. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution memorializing Congress with relation to amending the Federal Social Security Act with the purpose of extending the coverage and benefits thereof to include municipal employees, passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations at the January session, A. D. 1950, and approved by the Governor on January 24, 1950; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1761. By the SPEAKER. Petition of Mr. and Mrs. Harry Conner and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1762. Also petition of Sarasota Townsend Club No. 1, Sarasota, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1763. Also, petition of Mr. Afton H. Hammond and others, Sarasota, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1764. Also, petition of Fifth Congressional District Townsend Clubs mass meeting, Orlo Vista, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1765. Also, petition of Maude M. Gibson and others, Orlo Vista, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1766. Also, petition of Mrs. Marie Boyes and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1767. Also, petition of Mr. Thomas C. Baker and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 31, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who art our refuge and strength, we commit ourselves and our Nation to Thee. In these fear-haunted days when violent and vicious forces violate every cherished right which mankind has slowly won, may even ruthless tyranny with its false promises reveal the spiritual glory of true democracy as in Thy name it anew sets up its banners.

Upon all who here labor with full purpose of heart for the purification of public life, for the removal of all that betrays and denies the creed of universal freedom we profess, let Thy blessing rest. Bring us to a golden tomorrow for all Thy children, when the shared plenty of the good earth shall wash the slums of the world into vague, unhappy memories. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 30, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MYERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	Lodge
Anderson	George	Long
Benton	Gillette	Lucas
Brewster	Graham	McCarran
Bricker	Green	McCarthy
Bridges	Gurney	McClellan
Butler	Hayden	McFarland
Byrd	Hendrickson	McKellar
Cain	Hill	McMahon
Chapman	Holland	Magnuson
Chavez	Hunt	Malone
Connally	Ives	Maybank
Cordon	Jenner	Millikin
Darby	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	Mundt
Douglas	Kefauver	Myers
Downey	Kem	Neely
Dworshak	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Knowland	Pepper
Ecton	Langer	Robertson
Ferguson	Leahy	Russell
Frear	Lehman	Saltonstall

Schoeppel	Thomas, Utah	Wherry
Smith, Maine	Thye	Wiley
Smith, N. J.	Tobey	Williams
Taft	Tydings	Withers
Taylor	Vandenberg	Young
Thomas, Okla.	Watkins	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LONG was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the next several days.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. GRAHAM, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary holding hearings on bankruptcy legislation was authorized to meet this afternoon from 2 p. m., during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to submit petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and present routine matters for the RECORD, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON STOCK-PILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Chairman of the Munitions Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to section 4 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, Public Law 520, Seventy-ninth Congress, a report on the stock-piling program and a confidential statistical supplement (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman and members of the Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Seventh Semiannual Report of the Commission, dated January 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

CONDEMNATION OF ALLEGED STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF STATE ACHESON ON ALGER HISS CONVICTION

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi condemning the alleged statements of Secretary Acheson pledging loyalty to Alger Hiss and memorializing Congress to investigate the Department of State and other departments of government, and take such action to rid such departments of all persons who do not measure up to the strictest test of loyalty to the United States, and I ask unanimous consent that I may comment on the resolution for a minute and a half.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD, and, without objection, the Senator from Mississippi is recognized for a minute and a half. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I take this occasion to call attention to the reference the resolution makes to utterances of the Secretary of State, Hon. Dean Acheson, in connection with the conviction of Alger Hiss, as well as to the statements made by Mrs. Roosevelt, an influential citizen of the country and an American delegate to the United Nations.

Mr. President, individuals can adopt whatever position they desire in connection with this matter, but the American public has no sympathy with the unrepentant Alger Hiss. The American people do have sympathy and respect, however, for the man who went into the Garden of Gethsemane and purged and cleansed and purified himself, Whittaker Chambers—a patriotic and contrite man—whose magnificent action in the interest of his country has been measured by the sacrifices that it cost him to atone for his misdeeds and whose only reward is that he can stand on his Maryland farm and look into the face of the rising sun and say: "At long last, thank God, I am an American."

Yes, my sympathy in this case lies not with the unrepentant Alger Hiss but with Whittaker Chambers, a man who sacrificed position, emoluments, and high station to help eradicate the foul nest of treason which he, and only he, could expose and eliminate.

Yes, Mr. President, the apostasy of Whittaker Chambers from communism was a noble act that symbolizes the soul-searching of true greatness.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I am on the side of that New York jury, composed of 12 good men and women, who when confronted with the highest type of evidence known to criminal law—the testimony of a repentant accomplice corroborated by documents and physical facts—did the only thing under God's Heaven they could do. They did their duty and vindicated American jurisprudence throughout the world.

Yes, Mr. President, there are two sides that men can take; but when the history of this troublesome era is written, I venture to say that it will be Whittaker Chambers who will receive the charity and respect of his fellow men which he has so honorably earned and which he so richly deserves.

The resolution of the House of Representatives of Mississippi, presented by Mr. EASTLAND, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Resolution 11

Resolution condemning alleged statements of Secretary Acheson pledging loyalty to Alger Hiss and memorializing Congress to investigate the Department of State and other departments of Government, and take action to rid such departments of all persons who do not measure up to the strictest test of loyalty to the United States

Whereas the peace, happiness, liberty, and freedom of the people of the United States, and the world at large, are seriously threatened by the gradual but steady march of communism directed from the Soviet Comintern in Moscow; and

Whereas this country has expended billions during the past 4 years and continues to expend billions annually to stop the advance of this deadly enemy to God and to liberty in western Europe and other parts of the world; and

Whereas this gripping monster is well established in the United States, having spread its tentacles until they have invaded some of the departments and institutions of our Government, including the high and important Departments of State, as evidenced by the disclosures and convictions in the trial of Alger Hiss; and

Whereas reports of what happened at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam, the sudden change of policy toward China, the unprecedented spectacle of two justices of the Supreme Court of the United States leaving the bench of that august Court to testify as a witness in behalf of one accused of disloyalty to his country and on trial for perjury committed in connection therewith, reinforced by public statements of the Secretary of State and other high officials in support of the accused, and now after two trials and convictions of Alger Hiss of perjury and dishonesty growing out of the charge against him of disloyalty to his country, we witness the shocking and unprecedented statement of the Secretary of State, proclaiming that he is loyal to Hiss as his friend and will stand by him, notwithstanding the fact that he has been convicted of perjury, and proven to be disloyal to the United States by giving aid to a foreign country whose ideologies, policies, and way of life are violently opposed to those of this country and all other freedom-loving countries of the world, and whose rules have declared there is no room in this world for communism and a government of free enterprise, liberty, and freedom such as exists in the United States, therefore, one or the other must be destroyed; and

Whereas for all true Americans, loyalty to country comes first and should be placed above all others, and no man failing to measure up to this test should be entrusted with important affairs of this Government, whether he be an employee or officer, and this is more especially true in the case of one occupying the high and important position of Secretary of State: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi—

That the reported position and statement of Secretary Acheson in relation to Alger Hiss and his conviction, if true, is hereby condemned as a dangerous precedent to the security of this Nation and unbecoming of the occupant of the high and responsible position of Secretary of State.

That the Congress of the United States is hereby petitioned and urged to forthwith make a thorough and searching investigation of the personnel of the Department of State and other departments of the Federal Government, including the judiciary, and that summary action be taken to rid these departments of all persons, from the highest to the lowest in rank, who do not measure up to the strictest test of loyalty to this country.

That copies hereof be forwarded to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Senators and Representatives from Mississippi in the Congress of the United States, and to the press.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LONG:

S. 2952. A bill for the relief of Willard Cheek and Louise Cheek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 2953. A bill for the relief of Franz Karl Brouwn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2954. A bill for the relief of Agnes Biro and Anna Biro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2955. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Corps Band at the Wisconsin State Convention of the Marine Corps League to be held in Green Bay, Wis., June 16 to June 18, inclusive, 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 2956. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, by providing for treble damage actions; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 2957. A bill for the relief of Esther Abravanel Acriche; and

S. 2958. A bill for the relief of Alexander M. Lidorikis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM, 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Utah submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 71), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 1,000 additional copies of the hearings conducted before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on S. 1106, S. 1456, S. 1581, and S. 1679, Eighty-first Congress, first session, parts 1 and 2 of the National Health Program, 1949. Such additional copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS RELATING TO UTILIZATION OF FARM CROPS

Mr. GILLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 222), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 900 additional copies of the hearings held before a subcommittee of said committee relative to utilization of farm crops.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN METHOD OF ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LUCAS submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MUNDT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate Joint Resolution 2, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

THE FOREST SERVICE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I submit three amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 5839) to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes, which is now on the Senate Calendar. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments together with a press statement by me explaining the purpose and effect of the amendments, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments submitted by the Senator from Wyoming will be received, printed, and lie on the table, and, without objection, the amendments and statement presented by the Senator from Wyoming will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The amendments submitted by Mr. O'MAHONEY are as follows:

On page 9, beginning with line 11, strike out through line 9 on page 10 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 12. Of the moneys received from grazing fees by the Treasury from each national forest during each fiscal year there shall be available at the end thereof when appropriated by Congress an amount equivalent to 2 cents per animal-month for sheep and goats and 10 cents per animal-month for other kinds of livestock under permit on such national forest during the calendar year in which the fiscal year begins, which appropriated amount shall be available until expended on such national forest, under such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, for (1) artificial revegetation, including the collection or purchase of necessary seed; (2) construction and maintenance of drift or division fences and stock-watering places, bridges, corrals, driveways, or other necessary range improvements; (3) control of range-destroying rodents; or (4) eradication of poisonous plants and noxious weeds in order to protect or improve the future productivity of the range."

At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

"SEC. . (a) (1) To provide national forest grazing permittees means for the expression of their recommendations concerning the management and administration of national forest grazing lands, a local advisory board shall be constituted and elected as hereinafter provided for each national forest or administrative subdivision thereof whenever a majority of the grazing permittees of such national forest or administrative subdivision so petitions the Secretary of Agriculture. Each elected local advisory board existing for such purpose at the time of the enactment of this act, and recognized as such by the Department of Agriculture, shall continue to be the local advisory board for the unit or area it represents, until replaced by a local advisory board or boards constituted and elected as hereinafter provided.

"(2) Each such local advisory board shall be constituted and elected under rules and regulations, consistent herewith, now or hereafter approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, and shall be recognized by him as representing the grazing permittees of the national forest or administrative subdivision thereof for which such local advisory board has been constituted and elected.

"(3) Each such local advisory board shall consist of not less than 3 nor more than 12 members, who shall be national forest grazing permittees in the area for which such board is constituted, elected, and recognized. In addition, a wildlife representative may be appointed as a member of each such board by the State game commission, or the corresponding public body of the State in which the advisory board is located, to advise on wildlife problems.

"(4) Each such local advisory board shall meet at least once annually, at a time to be fixed by such board, and at such other time or times as its members may determine, or on the call of the chairman thereof or of the Secretary of Agriculture or his authorized representative.

"(b) Upon the request of any party affected thereby, the Secretary of Agriculture, or his duly authorized representative, shall refer to the appropriate local advisory board for its advice and recommendations any matter pertaining to (1) the modification of the terms, or the denial of a renewal of, or a reduction in, a grazing permit, or (2) the establishment or modification of an individual or community allotment. In the event the Secretary of Agriculture, or his duly authorized representative, shall overrule, disregard, or modify any such recommendations he, or such representative, shall furnish in writing to the local advisory board his reasons for such action.

"(c) (1) At least 30 days prior to the issuance by the Secretary of Agriculture of any regulation under this Act or otherwise, with respect to the administration of grazing on National forest lands, or of amendments or additions to, or modifications in, any such regulation, which in his judgment would substantially modify existing policy with respect to grazing in national forests, or which would materially affect preferences of permittees in the area involved, the local advisory board for each area that will be affected thereby shall be notified of the intention to take such action. If as a result of this notice the Secretary of Agriculture shall receive any recommendation respecting the issuance of the proposed regulation and shall overrule, disregard, or modify any such regulations, he or his representative shall furnish in writing to the local advisory board his reasons for such action.

"(2) Any such local advisory board may at any time recommend to the Secretary of Agriculture, or his representative, the issuance of regulations or instructions relating to the use of national forest lands, seasons of use, grazing capacity of such lands, and any other matters affecting the administration of grazing in the area represented by such board."

At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

"SEC. . The Secretary of Agriculture in regulating grazing on the national forests and other lands administered by him in connection therewith is authorized, upon such terms and conditions as he may deem proper, to issue permits for the grazing of livestock for periods not exceeding 10 years and renewals thereof: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed as limiting or restricting any right, title or interest of the United States in any land or resources."

The statement presented by Mr. O'MAHONEY is as follows:

PRESS STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

Following conferences with Forest Service officials and representatives of livestock interests using the national forests for grazing purposes, which started during the closing weeks of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress and continued during the recess and early weeks of the second session, a program designed to improve grazing conditions and administration of the national forests has been agreed upon.

First is the establishment by Executive order, printed in the Federal Register of January 25, 1950, of a National Forest Advisory Board of Appeals to advise the Secretary of Agriculture on appeals to him from the decisions of the Chief of the Forest Service involving any public use of the national forests. This board shall be comprised of five members from any agencies within the Department of Agriculture except the Forest Service. It will be the duty of this board to consider each appeal on its merits and furnish its advice and recommendations to the Secretary.

Conferences which I arranged last week between the Forest Service and a committee of stockmen representing cattle and sheep permittees, I am happy to say, have resulted in agreement on three additional important proposals, which I introduced today as amendments to H. R. 5839, the Granger bill, to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service.

The first amendment is a substitution for section 12 of the above bill and provides that of the grazing fees collected in each national forest, 2 cents per animal-month for sheep and 10 cents per animal-month for other kinds of livestock, when appropriated by Congress, shall be available for range improvements in such forest, such as artificial revegetation, the collection and purchase of seed, construction or maintenance of drift or division fences, bridges, corrals, driveways, and other range improvement, and the control of rodents and the eradication of poisonous plants, to protect and improve the forest ranges.

The second amendment proposes a new section to the bill which establishes a local advisory board of not less than 3 nor more than 12 permittees for each national forest or administrative subdivision thereof when requested by a majority of the grazing permittees. This amendment uses the identical language proposed in a bill, S. 33 of the Eightieth Congress, by Senator MCCARRAN, of Nevada, to establish local advisory boards to provide national forest grazing permittees a means for the expression of their recommendations. These boards are to be elected by the permittees and recognized by the Secretary of Agriculture as representing the grazing permittees of the national forest for which they are elected. A wildlife representative may also be appointed to such board by the State game commission to advise on wildlife problems. These boards are to meet at least once a year at a time fixed by the boards, and at other times determined by the members, or on call of the chairman, or of the Secretary of Agriculture. On the request of any affected party, the Secretary shall refer to these advisory boards for advice and recommendations concerning terms, renewals, and reductions in a grazing permit or the establishment or modification of an individual or community allotment. If the Secretary of Agriculture does not follow such recommendations, he would be required to furnish the local advisory board, in writing, with his reasons. At least 30 days prior to the issuance of any regulation by the Secretary of Agriculture concerning administration of grazing on national forests which modify existing policy or affect the preference of a permittee in the area, the local board for such area will be notified of the intention to take such action and be called upon for recommendations, and these boards may also at any time make recommendations to the Secretary concerning the administration of grazing, seasons of use, grazing capacity, and similar matters in their area.

The third amendment, which I introduced, authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to issue grazing permits and renewals for periods not exceeding 10 years.

I feel that the conferences between Chief Lyle F. Watts and Assistant Chief C. M. Granger, on behalf of the Forest Service, and the committee of stockmen have been most successful. They have formed a pattern of cooperation between the Forest Service and the livestock industry which augurs well for the future.

J. B. Wilson, secretary, Wyoming Wool Growers Association; F. E. Mollin, secretary, American National Live Stock Association; Vernon Metcalf, Nevada; J. M. Jones, secretary, National Wool Growers Association; Floyd Beach, permittee, Uncompahgre Forest, Colo.; Clarence Currey, permittee, Roosevelt Forest, Colo.; Everett Shuey, secretary, Montana Wool Growers Association; Louis Horrell, chairman, Joint Livestock Committee; Frank Mockler, cattle permittee, Wyoming; Radford Hall, assistant secretary, American National Live Stock Association; and John Noh, chairman, forestry committee, National Wool Growers Association, were among the members of the livestock committee who have been working diligently upon this matter here in Washington for the past 2 weeks. I feel that they have done an excellent piece of work.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in addition to the foregoing three amendments, I also submit several technical amendments to House bill 5839, which were all discussed with Chief Forester Watts and his staff, and have the approval of the Forest Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

LETTERS PATENT OF WILLIAM R. BLAIR—NOTICE OF HEARING ON H. R. 577

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, February 16, 1950, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on H. R. 577, to correct possible inequity in the case of a certain application for letters patent of William R. Blair. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee by Tuesday, February 14, so that a schedule can be prepared for those who wish to appear and testify. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR].

ADDRESS BY RUSSELL W. DAVENPORT IN PRESENTING AWARD TO DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Let Us Keep the Faith," delivered by Russell W. Davenport in presenting to the Displaced Persons Commission the annual award of the Association of Immigration Lawyers, at New York City, on January 28, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL OLD-AGE PENSIONS—STATEMENT BY WILLIAM H. MCMASTERS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by William H. McMasters, of Massachusetts, before the Senate Finance Committee on January 28, 1950, on the subject of national old-age pensions, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEGLECT OF CHRISTIAN REFUGEES OF PALESTINE—ARTICLE BY DOROTHY THOMPSON

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Whole of Christendom Neglecting Christian Refugees of Palestine," written by Dorothy Thompson, which appears in the Appendix.]

NONDISCRIMINATION IN IMMIGRATION AND EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES—EDITORIAL FROM MAGAZINE GOODWILL

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on the subject of civil rights and nondiscrimination in immigration and employment practices, published in the January 1950 issue of the magazine Goodwill, which appears in the Appendix.]

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Time for Bickering," from the Washington Star of January 30, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE AIRCRAFT DISASTER AT WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT ON NOVEMBER 1, 1949

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and received leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated November 10, 1949, from 16 Bolivian pilots and aviation instructors to the Eastern Air Lines dealing with the airplane disaster which occurred at the Washington National Airport on November 1, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISPLACED PERSONS—ARTICLE BY VIRGIL M. MCCLINTIC

[Mr. JENNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding displaced persons, by Virgil M. McClintic, publisher of the White County Democrat, which appears in the Appendix.]

BASING-POINT LEGISLATION—LETTER FROM 76 ECONOMISTS

[Mr. DOUGLAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter regarding basing-point legislation from 76 economists of the American Economics Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED CHANGE IN METHOD OF ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order entered at the time the Senate took a recess yesterday, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is entitled to the floor and is recognized.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am very happy to associate myself with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and other Senators who are sponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 2, to submit a constitutional amendment proposing a change in our electoral college system.

This subject was discussed at great length in the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives while I had the privilege of being a Member of that body, and I joined with Representative GOSSETT, of the State of Texas, in the

sponsorship of a similar joint resolution. I have the very firm conviction that this resolution is one of the best steps for the preservation of our two-party system and for orderly party government in the United States. I believe that this joint resolution should be enacted because it represents what the people for a long time have been thinking they were doing.

Our history is one of reposing more and more responsibility of governing with the people themselves. This has been accomplished by several amendments to the Constitution. The twelfth amendment, adopted 146 years ago, recognized that people should have more responsibility in selecting the President and Vice President. The thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments extended more duties of citizenship to the people and gave citizenship to many people.

By the seventeenth amendment, the responsibility for the election of United States Senators was transferred from the agents of the people, the members of the State legislatures, to the people themselves. This is a direct precedent for the present issue. This evolution continued when, by the nineteenth amendment, the responsibility of citizenship by franchise was properly extended to American women. Finally, the people claimed more timely control of their elected representatives by ratifying the twentieth, or lame duck, amendment.

The next step in logical sequence is to enable the people to decide whether they are now ready to assume more power and responsibility in the election of the President and Vice President.

The framers of the Constitution seemed not fully to trust the ability of of the people to choose these officials; but by a process of education and exercise of citizenship, the people have rightfully been taking more power into their own hands in connection with the selection of Federal officials. The present question is whether the Congress is now of the opinion that the American people are capable or incapable of having more power in choosing whom they want to be President and Vice President. Certainly, they should be permitted to say whether they wish to take on that responsibility by being permitted to ratify or reject the proposed amendment.

In recent elections, we have seen electors threaten to ignore their moral obligation to vote the wishes of the people who elected them. This was actually carried out in one case. This moral obligation, in my opinion, should be made a legal mandate.

Most American voters think they are voting for the President of their choice when they mark their ballot for the electors designated to cast the electoral votes of their party. Of course, this is not the true situation. The Constitution should be amended to render their feeling about this matter a reality. It seems to me that when for more than a hundred years the people have had the opinion that they are electing their President and Vice President, the Constitution ought to be brought up to date, to put into effect what they think, and have a right to think, they are actually doing.

The possibility that a tragic aftermath may follow the unpopular selection of a President by the electoral college or the House of Representatives has been called vividly to our attention by the 1944 and 1948 elections. Nor is the recognition of the threat to our tranquillity only current.

Chancelor Kent and other students of government pointed out years ago that if we ever experience a revolution or serious difficulty under our system of government, it would probably stem from our method of electing a President.

In this age of rapid media of communication and possession of pertinent information I think we should give our people the opportunity of amending our Constitution to cause the electoral votes to be cast more nearly in proportion to the popular vote. Democracy demands it.

The great advantages of this proposal have been outlined very eloquently and fully by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and other Senators who have interested themselves in this legislation. Very briefly, the points which particularly appeal to me are:

First. The proposal offers protection against a source of real potential danger which stems from the present possibility that the candidate receiving a minority of the popular vote would receive a majority of the electoral vote. This has already happened three times.

Second. It ends the present system whereby the winner in every State effectively gets credited with all the votes, including those which were cast against him.

Third. It ends the present practice of concentrating Presidential politics on those States having the largest population and consequently on the voting minorities in those States.

Fourth. It spreads the presidential campaign and any subsequent presidential political activity into all the 48 States, and spreads the benefits and emoluments of the Federal Government more fairly into all sections.

Fifth. It tends, therefore, politically speaking, to break up so-called solid or one-party areas.

Sixth. It preserves completely the rights of the small States (who still retain the two-vote credit for their two Senators.)

Seventh. It recognizes that the electoral-college system has never functioned as originally conceived by the framers of the Constitution. The so-called electoral college has become a rubber stamp—and an inaccurate rubber stamp at that.

Eighth. It discourages the tendency to select presidential nominees only from among the residents of those States having a large electoral vote.

Ninth. It avoids the possibility, exercised in 91 cases, that State legislatures might intervene and deprive the people of their rightful voice in the selection of the President.

Tenth. It eliminates the need for throwing a presidential election into the House of Representatives where each State, regardless of size, has only one vote. Of course, on one occasion the security of the Nation was threatened by virtue of having an election thrown into the House of Representatives.

Eleventh. It dispells the illusion that a relatively close election was in fact a landslide.

Twelfth. It prevents individual electors from casting votes because of whim or impulse. Under our proposal the electoral vote is retained simply as a counting device.

Thirteenth. It gives our citizens a legal voice in the choice of the President, instead of a mere expression of preference, as under the present system.

Fourteenth. It confers no partisan or sectional advantage.

Mr. President, first of all, the present system is neither fair, honest, accurate, certain, nor democratic. Let me give a few historic illustrations:

In 1912 Woodrow Wilson, with 42 percent of the popular vote, received 82 percent of the electoral vote. In 1936 Roosevelt, with 60 percent of the popular vote, received 98 percent of the electoral vote. In 1940 he received 54 percent of the popular vote and 84 percent of the electoral vote. In 1924 John W. Davis received 6,000,000 popular votes which brought him no electoral votes, while from 2,000,000 other popular votes he received 136 electoral votes. In 1932 Hoover received 15,800,000 popular votes, but over 13,600,000 of them brought him no electoral votes. In 1912 Wilson received 1 electoral vote for each 14,500 popular votes, while Taft received only 1 electoral vote for each 435,000 popular votes.

Second. An undue influence is given to minorities by the present system.

In 1884, in the State of New York, Cleveland got 563,084 votes while Blaine got 562,001 popular votes. A bare 1,000-vote majority in popular votes gave Mr. Cleveland all the electoral votes of the great State of New York. Thus, a change of 600 votes in New York would have elected Blaine President. As has been stated, should a similar situation again arise, as well it might, the Communist Party in the State of New York alone could determine who was to be President of the United States.

Third. Three Presidents who have taken office had a smaller popular vote than did their opponents—Adams in 1824, Hayes in 1876, and Harrison in 1888.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Is it not true, also, that in the case of the Hayes-Tilden campaign, and in the case of the Cleveland-Harrison campaign, no candidate had a majority, and the man who eventually became President did not even have the largest plurality?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I believe the distinguished Senator is correct about that. In the election in 1876, to which the Senator refers—the Hayes-Tilden contest—Hayes polled 4,036,000 votes, and Tilden polled 4,300,000 votes. Yet Mr. Hayes had one more electoral vote, as I remember, than Mr. Tilden had, and was elected President, although Hayes

received 264,000 less popular votes than Tilden received.

In 1824, 460,000 popular votes were cast. Andrew Jackson led his nearest opponent, John Quincy Adams, by about 50,000 votes; but because he lacked a majority over his three opponents, Jackson's election was thrown into the House of Representatives. As a result of the manipulations of Henry Clay, Adams—the minority choice—was elected over Jackson for President.

In 1876 occurred the famous Hayes-Tilden contest, which we have been discussing. In that election, 8,336,883 popular votes were cast. Of these, Hayes polled 4,036,298 and Tilden 4,300,590. But because of the archaic electoral-college system, Hayes had a margin of one electoral vote which gave him the Presidency, even though he had received 264,292 less votes than Tilden. In this case, only wise counsel, to which Tilden patriotically contributed by his course of moderation, prevented uprising and possible violence.

In 1888, Grover Cleveland lost the Presidency in spite of the fact that he received more popular votes than Benjamin Harrison. In this election 12,000,000 popular votes were cast. Cleveland received 5,556,543, while Harrison got 5,175,582. Again the minority candidate took office due entirely to the illogical operation of the electoral-college system.

Mr. President, I have enumerated the reasons why many of us think the proposed system will do much to improve our Government and party responsibility. I wish to be a little more specific and to elaborate on two or three of the reasons I am interested in this proposal.

A principal one, from my viewpoint, is that the adoption of the proposed constitutional amendment would result in the establishment, on a Nation-wide basis, of the two-party system. Under the present system, if any candidate wins by a plurality of one, the entire electoral vote of the State goes to that candidate. The minority therefore has no voice in the election of the President. The result is that the Democratic and the Republican national organizations—and we all know this to be the case—fight out every Presidential election in a relatively few States. The Republicans tend to mark off the solid South. The Democrats concede that certain New England and Western States will be in the column of the GOP; and virtually no campaign is carried on in those States, which are conceded by either party. The people of the States in the solid South and of the other States which have been marked off do not really participate in the election, because it is understood how the voting in those States will go.

Under the proposed system, the campaign would be carried on in every State, and the issues would be discussed, and every citizen would actually participate in the workings of our democracy.

Yesterday, Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] was discussing the fact that in the State of Alabama, where he has lived for 50 years, he has never seen a candidate for President of either of the two principal political parties. That situation is generally true throughout the South. It certainly would be in the interest of better government if the issues of the Presidential campaigns could be discussed by the candidates and by the leading political speakers for the various parties in all the States of the Union. The present situation undoubtedly has something to do with the fact that so few people in the States actually exercise their right of franchise. In some States the number has been as low as 8 or 9 percent in a general election. The difficulty is, of course, that in the South the Republican Party, and in certain of the New England States the Democratic Party, feel there is no use in their making an effort; that they would not have a chance of winning in any event; and, that it is a hopeless fight. But under the system we now propose, by which every vote in such States would count just as much as every vote in some of the so-called pivotal States, we would see a regeneration of interest in both the political parties in all the States of the Union.

Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has stated that he fears that if this proposal is put into effect, it might result in the formation of a larger number of third or so-called splinter parties. In my opinion it would have exactly the reverse effect. In that connection, I think it is well for us to consider why we have had third or splinter parties.

In the first place, the American people are dedicated generally to the two-party system. They recognize that the best way to operate a democratic form of government is under a strong two-party system, with one party in control of the Government and determining the program and the policies, and the other party being constructively critical of the acts of the majority, trying to improve the program and trying to put forth a better program, so as to capture the votes in the next election, and thereby gain control of the Government.

The general history shows that one of the reasons for the coming into being of third or so-called splinter parties is the feeling in certain sections of the country that the major parties have not given due consideration and due hearing with respect to the problems of those sections, and for that reason they have broken off from the two dominant parties to form parties of their own. That has happened frequently in the history of our country. I think what happened in the last election may be taken as a very good example of why third parties are formed. Certain groups of people in the South felt they were not given proper consideration in the drafting of the Democratic platform. They therefore withdrew, to form the States' Rights Party, not with any hope or expectation of gaining the Presidency, but as a protest against what they felt was an inadequate hearing and consideration by the party. The Progressive Party operated as a separate party because it wanted to register a protest, not with any idea of actually winning the Presidency. This has been true of most of the third-party movements in this country.

I am firmly of the belief that if the two dominant political parties were to feel that they had to make a fight for votes in all sections of the country, and that the votes in South Carolina for the Republican and Democratic parties would count as much as would votes in any of the so-called pivotal States, full hearing and consideration would be given to the particular problems and difficulties and to the position of the people of that State; and similarly, throughout the United States. The election would no longer be dominated merely by the way people voted within a very few States.

Third parties generally have originated, also, not with the idea of winning a substantial number of electoral or popular votes, but with the ambition and aim of wreaking vengeance on one or other of the political parties, and possibly with an ambition to throw the election into the House of Representatives, in which event they would try to see that the party with which they were particularly angry did not receive a sufficient number of votes on a State-by-State basis; which is the way the States vote when an election is thrown into the House of Representatives.

I remember very vividly the arguments used during the last campaign by many of the leading southern newspapers which were supporting the States' Rights efforts. The principal basis upon which people were urged to vote the States' Rights ticket was not the hope of making any great showing or in the belief that there was even a remote chance of obtaining a sufficient number of electoral votes to elect a President. I remember that all the newspapers and a great many of the campaign orators who were supporting the States' Rights movement said the hope was that they would receive a sufficient number of electoral votes to prevent either the Democratic or the Republican Party from obtaining a majority, and that it would therefore throw the election into the House of Representatives, in which event the States' Rights electors would then be in a position to determine the election in the House of Representatives, one way or the other. That was also the burden of the literature distributed by some of those who were supporting the Progressive Party.

Mr. President, Dr. Edward M. Sait has written a very excellent book on American parties and elections. He observes at some length that the real basis and background for most of the third-party efforts are as I have stated them—that is, they are inspired by a desire to get even with those who may have slighted them, or to get even for the lack of recognition given to a particular idea or position in a given section of the country. For instance, speaking of third parties, under the heading, What Dissent Accomplishes, Dr. Sait says:

> Their importance depends, however, not so much upon the size of the popular vote as upon its distribution. When the vote is drawn chiefly from one of the major parties and concentrated in certain States it may disturb that party's combination of sectional interests and even affect the result of a presidential election. Thus Polk won New York and the Presidency in 1844 because the in-

significant Liberty Party drew votes from Henry Clay; and Taylor likewise in 1848 because the Free Soil Party drew votes from Lewis Cass. It is possible that Cleveland won New York and the Presidency in 1884 because the Prohibition Party drew votes from James G. Blaine.

It has been said, and I think correctly, that if proper consideration were given to the problems and viewpoints and interests of all sections of the country, there would be a lessening of interest in third parties.

Another thing which has contributed to efforts to create third parties is that in times past certain sections of the country have felt that they had not been fully recognized in the matter of appointments to the President's Cabinet and to other high offices in the Government. It is certainly true that geography plays a very important part in the selection of high officials in the executive branch of the Government. It is only natural, and it always has been, that if those sections which the party in power feels to be safe, regardless of what happens, are not given proper consideration in the selection of Cabinet members, they may become the places where the result of the next election will be decided.

Furthermore, we must all recognize that, merely as the result of our human nature, the emoluments and benefits of Federal projects that might be approved have an important bearing, and that the result of the election or the political situation in a given part of the country may depend to some extent upon the amount of stress or importance given to certain projects.

The pending resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 2, would in my opinion result in a fairer distribution of appointments in the executive branch of the Government throughout the United States. There would not have to be any particular bid to this or that section. Moreover, it would result in a fair distribution of financial emoluments in the way of projects, public improvements, and things of the sort, in which the people are interested.

It was stated by the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] that he felt, if the proposed system were adopted, there would be many minority parties, and the ballot would be crowded with the names of persons running for President, because the fact that they might get one or two electoral votes or a percentage of an electoral vote, instead of receiving merely a certain number of popular votes would afford some encouragement to them. I submit, Mr. President, that if anyone wanted to run for office on the basis of making a showing before the American people—and undoubtedly certain persons have run for the Presidency on the basis of showing what they could do in the way of getting votes—he could make just as much of a showing by the popular votes he obtained. If he got, let us say, 1,000,000 votes or 1,500,000 votes, the showing he made would be just as impressive as if he obtained one, two, or two and a half electoral votes. It is the number of popular votes which a candidate gets that would count in the case of one who wanted to run for office merely for the purpose of showing his ability to get votes. There would be that encouragement.

Then, Mr. President, the States would still determine the method to be followed by a candidate who wanted to get on the ballot in a particular State. In many States a petition containing quite a large number of names is required. The State would still have control of that situation, so as to prevent persons getting on the ballot merely for the purpose of running for some office. But the real test and, I think, the real proof that the passage of the resolution and the adoption of the amendment would not result in as many third parties or splinter parties as there now are is in a comparison of the third parties and splinter parties which have existed in presidential elections in the past with cases in which the electoral-college system has been used and with the number of parties and candidates in the various States in elections for Senators and governors, where, in general elections, the person receiving the highest number of votes is elected Senator or elected governor under the laws of the various States.

Mr. President, I have here the Gallup Political Almanac for 1949, showing the history of presidential elections and senatorial elections. It will be observed that in the year 1948 there were, under the electoral-college system, eight parties having candidates on a Nation-wide basis in the presidential election. This, of course, has resulted in many States listing the numerous electors, so that the ballots have been very confusing.

In the State of Tennessee and, perhaps, in most of the other States, the electors of all the various candidates are listed on the ballots. I can think of no State, and statistics do not show any State, in which, under the plurality system, in the election of a Senator in a general election, there were more than three or four parties, or more than three or four candidates running for the office of Senator.

In the year 1940, in the presidential election, there were candidates of five political parties. In 1936 there were seven political parties. In 1932 there were eight political parties with candidates in the field. In 1928 there were seven political parties. In 1924 there were approximately 14 political parties, but they worked out consolidations so that only 8 were represented on the final ballot. In 1920 there were seven political parties.

In examining the various campaigns for the Senate during those years it will be found that if a person wanted to run for office merely for the purpose of making a showing he could get his name on the ballot very easily, or if the various parties wanted to have candidates merely for the purpose of making a showing in a senatorial election, they could get their candidates' names on the ballot. I think it will be found that in no State and in no year have there been as many candidates for the office of United States Senator as there were parties in a general election under the electoral-college system.

Mr. President, it has been stated that this proposal would infringe upon the sovereignty or the rights of the States. It should be emphasized that the constitutional amendment proposed by the resolution in no way disturbs the jurisdiction and authority of the States over franchises and elections. The proposed amendment in no way interferes with State sovereignty or the rights of States to specify the qualifications of voters or the manner in which they shall vote or have their votes counted. It leaves the ballot boxes entirely within the control of the States.

As I pointed out earlier, the right of a State to require whatever it may wish with reference to a candidate's name being put on a ballot in the particular State is not disturbed.

Some persons have claimed — and there are some amendments offered in that connection—that the amendment proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 2 does not go far enough. They concede that the electoral college should be abolished, that it has not functioned as was intended by the founding fathers, and that in an effort to give greater power to the people we should elect Presidents on a Nation-wide basis by popular vote instead of dividing the electoral votes in proportion to population in the various States.

There are, of course, many answers to that particular argument. To do away with the electoral vote and substitute instead a direct popular vote would make national campaigns a matter of complete national control. It would do away altogether with State lines in presidential elections. It would reduce voting within the States to the lowest common denominator. For example, the State of Georgia has an 18-year voting age. All States, to be on a parity with Georgia, would have to reduce their voting age to 18 years under an absolute, direct popular vote.

Again, under such a system, sectionalism would be aggravated rather than lessened. In a sectional controversy it would become a contest of gathering up the greatest volume of votes in a particular area for the purpose of out-voting some other particular area. Furthermore, the direct popular vote would open up the small-State large-State controversy. As a practical matter, no such amendment would ever secure ratification by the necessary number of States because relatively small or sparsely settled States far outnumber the others. Those States would not give up the slight advantage they have through the number of electoral votes accorded them under the Constitution.

Mr. President, in conclusion, let me say that this proposal has been very extensively discussed in the high schools and colleges throughout the United States during the past 2 years. During last year it was the subject of high-school debate under the auspices of the association which tries to direct, guide, and make suggestions for high-school debating societies. The question has been widely discussed in the editorial columns of newspapers all over the United States. Generally the press and

the people have a feeling that if we are to have a sound democracy, something must be done toward revitalizing our two-party system so as to give the voters a choice as between parties and to place the two-party system on a national instead of on a sectional basis. I can think of nothing more important for the welfare of the Nation than bringing about that situation. In the opinion of most of the students of government, political scientists, and editors of newspapers, as well as other persons who are well informed on public affairs, the passage of this resolution and the adoption of the amendment it proposes would be the greatest step that could be taken toward that end. It is a question which has been very fully presented to the American people. All the polls have shown that the people, regardless of political parties, favor this proposal. So, in the interest of giving the people themselves an opportunity, through proper constitutional means, of strengthening the Federal Government and the two-party system, I feel that the Senate and the House of Representatives should submit this constitutional amendment to the States, and I urge the Members of the Senate to do so.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. As I understood the distinguished Senator, he said the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 2 would have a tendency to eliminate or to minimize splinter parties. I wonder if the Senator would be good enough to explain the theory which is behind his philosophy.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I shall be very happy to. That is my very definite opinion. Undoubtedly the statistics show that there are always more candidates for President in the various States, under the electoral-college system, than there are candidates for the Senate. The election of a President, of course, is under the electoral-college system, while the election of a Senator is under a plurality system.

The particular reasons why I think that would be the result are that third parties have always grown up, first, because of the feeling of the people in a particular section of the country that in the two principal parties they were not given a full hearing or consideration of their particular problems, but rather were ignored because the leaders of the party felt it did not make much difference what happened in that section, for they would either get the votes anyway, or could not get them in any event; so they did not have to give much consideration to that section. That according to all the text books, is the principal reason for the development of third parties in the history of our country.

That attitude, of course, would be much less pronounced, if not entirely eliminated, if the proposed amendment to the Constitution were put into effect, because a vote in any State, South Carolina or Mississippi, for instance, would count just as much as a vote in one of the pivotal States, and both parties would fight just as hard for the votes. So necessarily they would be very anxious to consider and to take into account the problems of the people in all sections.

The second great reason for the creation of third parties, according to the political scientists and historians, is the desire to wreak vengeance on the party which a group of people feel has done them injustice. They feel that they have been wronged by one or the other of the political parties, and they are going to see what they can do by trying to pull enough votes away from the party at which they are angry in order to throw the election into the House of Representatives. That was the advertised purpose of the States' Rights Party in the last general election. That was the burden of a great deal of the literature which was disseminated. So of course that reason would be removed.

The third reason for the formation of third parties has been the feeling on the part of a certain section that it has not been recognized in the appointment of top administrators or Cabinet members in the executive department, or that it has not been recognized in connection with some public improvement, or perhaps in programs which might be good for farming interests, or fishing interests, or for mining interests, and therefore a third party is formed.

I am certain that under the proposed system full consideration would be given by both political parties to such particular interests in all sections, although they would not reach the same solution, of course. Therefore we would have the people all over the country coming into one or the other of the two principal political parties.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the distinguished Senator, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the pending joint resolution, and ask that it be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 1, it is proposed to strike out the word "the" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

On the 6th day of January following the election, unless the Congress by law appoints a different day not earlier than the 4th day of January and not later than the 10th day of January the.

On page 3, line 10, beginning with the words "the person" strike out all down to and including line 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

The person having the greatest number of electoral votes for President shall be President, if such number be at least 40 percent of the whole number of such electoral votes. If no person have at least 40 percent of the whole number of electoral votes, then from the persons having the two highest numbers of electoral votes for President, the Senate and the House of Representatives, sitting in joint session, shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. A majority of the votes of the combined authorized membership of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall be necessary for a choice.

On page 3, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate and the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate and the House of Representatives may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.

On page 3, beginning with line 20, strike out all down to and including line 22, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of section 1, article II, of the Constitution, the twelfth article of amendment to the Constitution, and section 4 of the twentieth article of amendment to the Constitution, are hereby repealed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to say a word or two with respect to the amendment. I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

It seems to me that this amendment would give considerable strength to the joint resolution sponsored by the Senator from Massachusetts and other Senators proposing a constitutional amendment providing for the abolition of the electoral college.

In the first place, the first part of the amendment specifically says:

On the 6th day of January following the election, unless the Congress by law appoints a different day not earlier than the fourth day of January and not later than the tenth day of January.

That specifically gives to the new Congress coming in, rather than the old Congress which is voted out on November 5, the right to make the determination. To me that is a very important point, because certainly the new Congress coming in on January 5, rather than the old Congress, which is voted out on November 5, should have the power and the right to do the things set forth in the proposed constitutional amendment.

The situation I have in mind is that between November 5 and January 6 a defeated President could call a special session of the old Congress and, unless the amendment offered by me were adopted, the old Congress could act before the new Congress was sworn in on January 6.

The next point involved is in line with the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], which provides that—

The person having the greatest number of electoral votes for President shall be the President, if such number be at least 40 percent of the whole number of electoral votes.

As was stated yesterday, in my opinion this amendment if agreed to will help do away with the formation of so-called splinter parties. I think the amendment provides a safeguard and should be added to the proposed constitutional amendment.

It will be noticed that in my amendment it is provided that—

If no person have at least 40 percent of the whole number of electoral votes, then from the persons having the two highest numbers of electoral votes for President, the Senate and the House of Representatives sitting in joint session shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President.

Yesterday we talked about persons having the three highest numbers of electoral votes cast for President. My amendment proposes to change that so as to cover only the persons having the two highest numbers of electoral votes for President. I believe that is an improvement because under my amendment there can be no deadlock in voting with respect to the selection of the President, for if there are only two from whom to make the selection, it is inevitable that a majority vote will be had by either one or the other of them.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader a question. As I understand the amendment, one of its provisions is that the successful candidate shall receive at least 40 percent of the electoral votes.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. There has been considerable debate regarding this matter, and this is one of the points concerning which I have tried to reach a decision as to whether the so-called Lodge amendment will eliminate splinter parties or whether it may be conducive to the creation of splinter parties.

In view of the fact that the Senator from Illinois has offered an amendment providing that the successful candidate shall receive at least 40 percent of the entire number of electoral votes, with the idea that such a provision may eliminate so-called splinter parties, is there any doubt in the Senator's mind that the constitutional amendment proposed by the joint resolution as introduced will create splinter parties?

Mr. LUCAS. I debated that point yesterday, and said that in my opinion it possibly would produce splinter parties.

On the other hand, it seems to me my amendment would have a tendency to cure that defect, if there is that defect in the so-called Lodge amendment. Of course, that is speculation upon my part, just as the opinions of other Senators were speculative. But I believe it is permissible speculation in this case.

Since the Senator from Nebraska has raised that question, I should like to interject into the debate the thought that there is another way in which splinter parties can be minimized, namely, by the action of the individual State legislatures. I wish to state for the RECORD what has happened in the State of Illinois with respect to the formation of third parties overnight, so to speak. Some 4 years ago the Illinois Legislature passed a bill which provides that before a new party can get on the ballot in Illinois a petition must be circulated, and the petition must have, as I recall, 25,000 signatures, 50 counties of the State must be represented among those signatures, and each of the 50 counties must be represented by the signatures of at least 200 registered and valid voters, in order to make the petition valid as a whole.

That law was tested in the last campaign by Henry Wallace, when he ran for President of the United States. The petition filed by him in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Illinois was objected to, and the canvassing board of the State of Illinois sustained the objection. Appeals were taken, finally reaching the Supreme Court of the United States. The Supreme Court held that the Illinois law was constitutional. I bring this into the debate only to show that if State legislatures are as troubled about splinter parties as I know a number of Senators are, including the Senator from Nebraska and myself, there is a method which can be employed, and which has been declared constitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States, which will almost prohibit a third party from sprouting unless it has a tremendous amount of strength throughout the Nation, from getting on the ballot in a State. I should say that any new party which springs up and which can comply with the provisions of the Illinois law, is entitled to just recognition. At the same time, under that law the two-party system is well protected.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I should like to inquire of the able Senator from Illinois whether Illinois also has a requirement, other than the method he has indicated; in other words, whether there is also a different requirement, one by which candidates of a third or other party, can be permitted to have their names placed on the ballot. I speak of a requirement based on the number of votes cast in a previous gubernatorial election. In the State of New York there is a requirement that, in order to retain its place on the ballot, a party's candidate for governor must have received a minimum number of votes. As I recall, this number is 50,000 votes. We also have the petition method for the same purpose.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. We also have such a law in Illinois. But the new law, passed 4 or 5 years ago, pertains particularly to new parties, not to parties which have been in existence in the past and have been able to comply with the 5-percent provision.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me say that New York has a similar law, as I have indicated; but as an alternative requirement, the State of New York requires that no party can have the name of its candidates appear on the State-wide ballot in a subsequent election unless its candidate for governor in the previous election has received a minimum number of votes.

Mr. LUCAS. We have a similar law in Illinois.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader whether he can tell us how he arrived at the 40-percent requirement. I do not mean that the requirement should be arrived at on a statistical basis, but I am wondering what impact the requirement of 40 percent of the electoral votes would have on the proposed constitutional amendment. Would it have a tendency to discourage the achievement of the purposes for which the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts made such a forceful argument, or would party workers be encouraged to become active in elections, regardless of that requirement?

Mr. LUCAS. I think it would definitely encourage, rather than discourage. I think it certainly would encourage favorable votes for the resolution on the floor of the United States Senate, and that is the main thing we are interested in just now.

Mr. WHERRY. If that be the case, then I suppose the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is in accord with this amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. I have talked informally with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts about the amendment, and I think he is about ready to tell the Senate and the country that he will accept it.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield now to the Senator from Massachusetts to permit him to reply.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, let me say to my able friend, the Senator from Illinois, that Senate Joint Resolution 2, as reported and as now before the Senate, does not touch, one way or another, the essentials of the present system, insofar as concerns candidates who receive a plurality of the popular vote. We did not seek to change that part of the present system because we did not think it had worked badly in the past. It is true that there have been 12 Presidents who have received only a plurality, rather than a majority, of the popular vote. The names of those 12 Presidents have been stated for the RECORD. They include Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, and Harry S. Truman. It has never been apparent that there was anything wrong or dangerous about having a man become President if he had received a plurality of the popular vote, rather than a majority of the vote. In this amendment we were trying to cure the defects which caused the system to work badly; we were not trying to touch anything which had worked well. For that reason, we did not include this provision.

But I think this provision is a good one. In my opinion, it puts a floor under the situation. I believe it settles once and for all any doubt in anyone's mind in regard to whether this proposal will increase the danger of the formation of splinter parties. Certainly when it comes to a final decision between two candidates, before a new Congress, the

splinter parties will be completely eliminated.

I have said many times on this floor in the last few days that I do not consider that Senate Joint Resolution 2, as it stands, encourages splinter parties. On the contrary, I think it discourages them, because it removes the great power they have had in the past to throw the entire vote of a State one way or the other. But the amendment which the Senator from Illinois offers certainly conclusively and utterly sweeps away any doubt which might exist in anyone's mind as to whether the proposal encourages splinter parties, and, so, for all those reasons, speaking for myself, I am very glad to accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I very much appreciate the Senator's remarks, but this is the first time—and I have listened to most of the debate, though not all of it, but have read what I did not listen to—it seems to me, a doubt is raised as to splinter parties. I again ask, why should 40 percent be decided on? If 40 percent will encourage workers and will eliminate splinter parties, why not raise it to 45 percent or to some other percentage? If it is going to encourage workers to fix it at 40 percent, and if it will not encourage splinter parties, why stop at 40 percent?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. WHERRY. I am merely asking the question.

Mr. LODGE. There is of course an obvious answer. I am not the author of the amendment. The Senator from Illinois can doubtless defend it better than can I, but there is one answer which occurs to me. It is that if the percentage becomes too high, every election will end in the House of Representatives.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. If I may continue for a moment on that point, I may say I am not so much worried about what the Congress would do, but all I am trying to find out is what will happen in the event the amendment is adopted. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further? I am talking in his time.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to yield further to the minority leader.

Mr. WHERRY. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has contended that it will eliminate splinter parties, and therefore, that is one of the reasons why we should pass the resolution. What has been bothering me is the question of splinter parties. Some say the proposed constitutional amendment will prevent or discourage splinter parties; others say it will create splinter parties. As I read the testimony, and as I read the observations made, that is one problem. Now comes the amendment to establish a floor of 40 percent. It seems to me it is sensible, in the way in which it is framed, but to my mind it immediately raises a doubt that it may create splinter parties. The force of the amendment, to me, is not so much its effect in taking out of the hands of Congress the decision of an election as its effect in stopping splinter parties from coming in under certain pressure. They should not thereby win an election. Therefore, a ceiling of 40 percent is suggested.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will yield, I think I can explain to my able friend from Nebraska why it is that the proposed amendment would make it more difficult than it has ever been in our history to have splinter parties. In fact, after listening to the Senator from Nebraska on the floor in the past few days, it seems to me the amendment is exactly the thing that will take care of all the doubts expressed by him, because it brings it down to a choice between the two highest candidates; and if we are going to have that kind of choice, where is there any opportunity for a splinter party? If the amendment of the Senator from Illinois does not take care of the doubts of the Senator from Nebraska, I do not know what will. In fact, when I decided to express my approval of the amendment, I had in mind in part the Senator from Nebraska, because I thought the amendment embodied a provision which would bring his wholehearted acceptance of the proposal.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield so that I may reply to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. LUCAS. I am very glad to have the Senator respond, if he can.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean, if I am physically able, or mentally able?

Mr. LUCAS. I mean if the Senator can answer it.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not trying to answer anything, because I did not ask the question with an idea of getting into a discussion about the merits of the joint resolution or the force of the amendment. I deeply appreciate the observations made by the Senator from Massachusetts, to the effect that he had me in mind when he accepted the amendment. It is one of the highest compliments ever to have been paid me on the floor of the Senate.

I think, however, my question will be repeated by a great many party workers. I think it is a very direct question. I may say to the distinguished majority leader that the fact he offers the amendment indicates to me there is some apprehension about splinter parties. Until this moment, I was led to believe that the constitutional amendment as proposed by joint resolution would be conducive to the elimination of splinter parties; in fact, I was going along on that theory. We now have an amendment which says, "In order to erase any doubt from your mind, we will provide a floor of 40 percent of the electoral vote."

Mr. LODGE. Surely the Senator from Nebraska does not object to my trying to meet his criticism.

Mr. WHERRY. Not at all.

Mr. LODGE. Even though I do not think his criticism is well founded.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has a perfect right to do that. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has a right to endeavor to meet my criticism. However, I did not rise at this particular time to criticize anything. Believe it or not, I am open-minded on the question of the passage of the resolution. But I certainly felt that the presentation by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts was made on the basis that the joint resolution introduced by him would eliminate splinter parties. We now have an amendment offered by the distinguished majority leader to raise the floor to 40 percent, which I think will accomplish the purpose for which the majority leader has offered it.

My next question was, Why make it 40 percent? Was that too much of a penalty? Was it too high a floor? How was the 40 percent determined? If 40 percent is conducive to the elimination of splinter parties, why not increase the percentage? That seems to me to be a very simple question.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Nebraska may offer an amendment, if he desires, to increase the percentage. Forty percent seemed to be a reasonable figure. I think the Senator from Massachusetts answered the question a moment ago. It is possible to place the percentage so high that every election will go to the House of Representatives. We are trying if possible to get away from contests in the House of Representatives.

I am offering the amendment on the theory that it will eliminate the rise of splinter parties. That is the reason for it. The Senator from Massachusetts believes that his joint resolution as originally introduced is sufficient, and that it will not encourage splinter parties. I have some apprehension about that. I believe the amendment is in the right direction, at least, and I believe it to be a proper and a constructive amendment, and that it can in nowise impair the basic proposition involved in the original joint resolution of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, there has been some skepticism about what is going to happen to the joint resolution. My good friend from Nebraska said a moment ago he was open-minded about my amendment. When the Senator is open-minded about a proposition of this kind, it makes me a little bit skeptical. I hope he will close his mind in the direction of supporting my amendment, because he and I are attempting to do the same thing.

There is no point in the Senator from Nebraska asking why it should have been 39 percent or 41 percent or 42 percent, or some other percentage. That is not the point. He and I are trying to accomplish the same thing. The Senator from Massachusetts, although he does not believe our criticism to be valid, is nevertheless attempting to meet the criticism by accepting the amendment. I feel satisfied that when the Senator from Nebraska goes over the amendment carefully and studies it, he will go along with me, because he is always anxious to cooperate, even on important problems; and this is an important problem.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to assure the distinguished majority leader that, as usual, I am ready to cooperate with him. I think that is evidenced by the good faith of my actions on the Senate floor during the time the Senator from Illinois has been the majority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. I would not go that far.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope the Senator will go as far as he can.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sorry to have interrupted the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. It was the Senator from Illinois who raised this point in my mind as to the growth of splinter parties, and his amendment now raises a doubt in my mind. I thank him for offering the amendment and for his observations on it. I have wondered if the figure which the Senator from Illinois has placed in his amendment was arrived at because of some showing made by some splinter party or some combination of parties. I should like to know why he selected the figure of 40 percent. I wondered whether it might be higher or lower and still accomplish the desired purpose.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know that I can answer any further than I have done already. I think the question has been answered two or three times. I should like to recall to the memory of the Senator from Nebraska that the late Senator Norris offered an amendment providing for 35 percent. It was discussed yesterday by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. But either 35 or 40 percent would cover the situation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief observation. I think it is generally recognized that there should be reform in the procedure of electing a President of the United States. I think reform is overdue. I generally favor the objectives of the pending amendment. I think it would probably give a more complete, full, and fair expression of the American people in making their choice for President. I am one of those Senators, and there are others in this body, who have some apprehension with regard to the provision that whoever shall receive the most votes shall become President of the United States. I feel that there should be some floor established. I cannot definitely foresee any time in the future when possibly 25 percent, 21 percent, or 31 percent, for instance, would elect. But, certainly, in the enactment of basic law in amendments to our Constitution we should try to anticipate every contingency which could arise.

I think this is a very safe provision. I do not know whether the percentage should be 40 or 41, or what should be the floor established, provided we can know that below a certain percentage the sentiments and expressions of the people of the country cannot name a President of the United States.

I think this amendment is a safeguard, and I am very pleased that the majority leader has offered it. I understand that the able author of the resolution is willing, although he thinks it is perhaps unnecessary, to accept the amendment.

If the distinguished majority leader will yield further, I should like to say that with this further amendment I can support the resolution. I had serious doubts about it, but I think that in its general purpose and objective it will be quite an improvement and a progressive step in the manner of choosing a President of the United States.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. In a moment. I thank the Senator from Arkansas for the contribution he has made. It is a good one. I wholeheartedly agree with him that there should be a figure of at least 40 percent. If this amendment is agreed to and the voters of the country are aware of the provision, as they will be, it will have a tendency to keep the two-party system instead of making it possible to have a dozen parties. I can see how 11 percent of the votes might elect a President of the United States. That possibly will never happen, but if we should follow in this country what has been done in other countries, such as France and Greece, we would have a very bad situation. In Greece I understand there are 80 parties. It can be understood what would happen if that situation should occur in this country. There might be 10 or 12 different parties in the House and Senate. There would be no majority; there would be instability; there would be no responsibility; there would be a general disintegration of the American system of Government. I think my amendment would be a great protection against such a situation.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I shall yield first to the Senator from Michigan. He has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this is not the same kind of amendment which was offered in 1934. It still provides for a plurality. I think the Senator has adopted the method which I proposed yesterday, that the Members of the Senate and of the House should vote in case of a deadlock. I have always thought that was a good thing.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the method provided for in the amendment. It is different from the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. FERGUSON. It is the same as that which the Senator from Michigan proposed in his amendment. But I do not think it meets the real nub of the situation, because it allows the splintering of parties down to 40 percent. We would be going across State lines and determining the unit vote on the national plane, which, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Michigan, would mean that we would be bound to have splinter parties. We would be bound to weaken party organizations, and the issues which make parties would be narrowed down. Under the present two-party system there is a broad issue, a national issue, or a group of issues, so that we have something for the various sections of the Nation on which the voters can come together and decide on a President.

I shall have something further to say on the question at a later time.

Mr. LUCAS. I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for permitting me to make some observations. I had intended to emphasize the point to which the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] just referred, in connection with lodging in the Congress the decision on any election in which no candidate has received as much as 40 percent of the votes cast.

With reference to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, I should like to ask the able Senator a question. On the basis of his amendment, how large a vote does the Senator from Illinois consider to be required in electing a President from the two highest candidates? Is the required number 266, which is a majority of the combined membership of the two Houses, or is it something else? The Senator from New York thinks this is an important point.

Mr. LUCAS. The amendment reads:

> A majority of the votes of the combined authorized membership of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall be necessary for a choice.

I would say it would take 266 votes.

Mr. IVES. In that connection, Mr. President, the Senator from New York would like to observe that that is in the language in the statute which provides the method for adopting the Presidential reorganization plans, under which a majority of the authorized membership of each House of the Congress is required. That is where the language comes from, as I understand, and I think it should be definitely understood that in voting for the pending proposal that is what we have in mind, 266 votes.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not think there can be any doubt about that, and I am glad the Senator from New York raised the question. The amendment as originally offered would not have had that effect. That was discussed with the Senator from Massachusetts yesterday. The Senator from New York is right in his conclusion as to what this section of the amendment means. In my judgment it means 266 votes.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York thanks the able Senator from Illinois, and if the Senator from Illinois will yield another moment while the Senator from New York makes another observation——

Mr. LUCAS. I yield the floor.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York does not desire to have the Senator yield the floor, because the Senator from Massachusetts and I may desire to ask the Senator from Illinois questions. If the Senator will keep the floor for a moment until I make a statement, I will appreciate it. It deals directly with the observation just made by the Senator from Illinois.

Regarding the matter of splinter parties—and I only wish the able Senator from Nebraska were present—I represent a State where there probably is as much trouble with splinter parties as is to be found in any other State in the Union. After looking at the amendment as it is now amended, with the safeguard of 40 percent, I am satisfied that there will be no more incentive for splinter parties in the State of New York than now exists, under the present statutes.

I desire to point out, however, that no matter what kind of change we make in our constitutional procedure dealing with the question of the election of President and Vice President, we are not going to find absolute perfection. It is going to be a matter of trial and error. It seems to me the test we should apply in this connection is primarily this: Is the proposed plan better than what we now have? With the additional safeguard—or these safeguards as they really are—I believe this is a distinctly better procedure than anything which to my knowledge has thus far been proposed and it is a vast improvement over the present constitutional provision.

I thank the able Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. I yield, if the Senator wishes to ask a question.

Mr. LODGE. I do not desire to ask a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Then I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Yesterday, in the course of his able address, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] argued that when people in the South decided to leave the Democratic Party they did not go to the Republican Party, but that they went to the Dixiecrat Party, and he asserted in a very emphatic way that that is exactly what happened in 1948.

Following the able Senator's remarks I made a little study, and I found that in the Southern States Governor Dewey received 1,867,189 votes, and Thurmond received 1,003,769 votes. In other words, of the total number, Dewey got 65 percent and Thurmond got 35 percent. Dewey received 863,420 more votes in the Southern States than did Thurmond in in spite of the fact that the Republicans had very little organization in those States, and had no incentive whatever to get out the votes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I do not agree with the Senator at all. The Republicans made a very vigorous campaign in many States. In others they did not. I do not know what States the Senator has included. Did he include the 11 Southern States?

Mr. LODGE. I included Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia, Tennessee, and Kentucky.

Mr. TAFT. Kentucky I would hardly count. We usually count Kentucky as a border State. Leaving out Kentucky, the situation was entirely different in the several States. In some States Thurmond was not even a candidate.

Mr. LODGE. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. In other States Dewey was not, for practical purposes, a candidate. Therefore the Senator cannot draw any over-all conclusion from the results in the 11 Southern States.

Mr. LODGE. I think I was as much justified in drawing a conclusion my way as was the Senator from Michigan in drawing a conclusion his way.

The Senator from Michigan said yesterday, "What did they do? They went to the Dixiecrats," as an argument for contending that if Senate Joint Resolution 2 were enacted, the Republicans would get no benefit. I was as justified in making the opposite assertion as he was in making his. Facts are facts, and the fact is that in the States I have named, Dewey received 863,420 more votes than did Thurmond. That is a fact. The Senator from Ohio cannot gainsay facts. Certainly if the proposed amendment were in the Constitution, the Republicans would be much better organized in the South than they are now, and they would have a much greater incentive to work and get out the vote than they have now. That, it seems to me, is an argument.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table to which I have referred be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Analysis of the Dewey-Thurmond vote in 13 Southern States, 1948 elections

State	Popular vote	
	Dewey	Thurmond
Alabama	26,713	132,073
Arkansas	40,236	34,987
Florida	180,837	84,208
Georgia	69,992	81,730
Louisiana	63,647	176,827
Mississippi	3,661	109,133
North Carolina	220,693	63,224
Oklahoma	268,817	----------
South Carolina	5,337	93,143
Texas	281,673	104,126
Virginia	172,649	42,426
Tennessee	191,396	72,192
Kentucky	341,540	9,700
Total	1,867,189	1,003,769

Dewey received 863,420 more votes than Thurmond in these States. In other words, Dewey got 65 percent and Thurmond got 35 percent.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator feel that if this proposed amendment were added to the Constitution it would be necessary for the Federal Government to pass election laws which would provide that every candidate for President should file in every State in the South, for instance? Would not that be required, necessarily, in order that any advantage might accrue from the point of view of the Republican Party? In effect, is not the Senator urging that we have a Federal law permitting the Republican Party to go on the ballot in every State, and regulating from Washington the manner in which all national elections for President shall be conducted, from the time of the primary until the final election?

Mr. LODGE. No; I do not think so. The Senator from Michigan asked the same question, on March 11, 1949, as appears on page 71 of the hearings. This was the question of the Senator from Michigan:

> If a constitutional amendment were adopted, guaranteeing electoral votes to every candidate according to popular votes, would candidates be likely to argue that States must put them on the ballot since Presidential elections are now Federal and not State contests? In other words, would Federal regulation of Presidential elections be likely to follow, to protect the right of the candidate to his share of the popular vote? Why grant him an electoral share if States can keep him off the ballot?

The answer which I gave was as follows:

> This question rests, in my opinion, upon a misunderstanding of what the proposed constitutional amendment provides. Section 1 states that—
>
> "Each person for whom votes were cast for President in each State shall be credited with such proportion of the electoral votes thereof as he received of the total vote of the electors therein for President."
>
> This simply provides how the electoral votes will be counted. It does not, as the question implies, "guarantee" electoral votes to any candidate. It merely provides that if he receives popular votes in a State, he shall be credited with a corresponding proportional share of the electoral vote of that State. There is no more reason to believe that candidates will demand inclusion of their names on State ballots under the procedure here recommended than under the present system. The phrase in the question which reads: "since Presidential elections are now Federal and not State contests" is somewhat misleading. Elections under the proposed reform are "Federal" only in the strictly limited sense that the electoral votes which a candidate receives in a State where he failed to command a plurality of the popular vote are added to the electoral votes received in other States. But the State control of election laws is completely untouched.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator feel, however, that we would be obliged to move into a State like South Carolina, for example, and pass laws to compel the State to permit the Republicans to place candidates on a fair ballot and receive fair treatment?

Mr. LODGE. What does the Senator mean when he says "move in"?

Mr. TAFT. By Federal law, by Federal legislation.

Mr. LODGE. No.

Mr. TAFT. Absolutely. If we are going to give effect to a proposal to abolish the one-party State, I cannot imagine how we can permit South Carolina, or North Carolina, for that matter, to continue practices in which they now indulge and which for all practical purposes preclude the Republicans from voting in those States. Since every additional vote will count if the Senator's proposal is adopted, will we not be forced to enact Federal legislation which will

give every party the right in every Southern State to be represented on the ballot fairly and squarely, so that every party can obtain every vote to which it is entitled?

Mr. LODGE. We are not proposing to abolish the one-party State. We are not proposing to do that.

Mr. TAFT. Well——

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator permit me to finish?

Mr. TAFT. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. What we are proposing to do under the constitutional amendment is to create an opportunity for the people to do away with one-party States if they want to, and if they want to badly enough, I presume they can exert sufficient pressure in the State legislatures to make whatever changes in the State law are necessary. I do not at all understand the reasoning of the Senator from Ohio, or his suggestion that the Federal Government will have to move in on the Southern States. I think that is very farfetched.

Mr. TAFT. The Republican Party received about 3 percent of the vote in South Carolina. Why? Because of the way the ballot is set up.

Mr. LODGE. No.

Mr. TAFT. I have received many applications from South Carolina urging us to make efforts to have proper Republican representation on the ballot. There has not heretofore been any great incentive because of the feeling that probably nothing can be accomplished, and the Republicans cannot carry South Carolina anyway. But if every vote is going to count, it seems to me Federal legislation will be required in order to see to it that every State gives a fair deal to every candidate for President of any of the leading parties.

Mr. LODGE. The reason we do not carry South Carolina is not because of the way the ballot is set up.

Mr. TAFT. I merely suggest that is the reason why we receive only 3 percent of the vote.

Mr. LODGE. I do not think that is the reason at all. I think the reason why we do not do better in South Carolina is because everyone knows our case there is hopeless, for even if we do make every effort to get out the vote, the effort is wasted because the additional vote that is thus gotten out will not be added to what the Republicans receive elsewhere.

I think that to say that the result could be changed if a Federal law were written, as the Senator suggests, is similar to attempting to cure a man of the smallpox by rubbing his face with facial cream. I think that would be treating the shadow for the substance.

Mr. President, yesterday some discussion occurred as to the question of the plurality of the popular vote. I have already placed information in the RECORD, which was printed the other day, showing that there have been elected 12 Presidents who received only a plurality rather than a majority of the popular vote: Polk, Taylor, Buchanan, Lincoln, Hayes, Garfield, Cleveland, Harrison, Cleveland, Wilson, Wilson, and Truman.

Since that time, in response to questions by certain Senators I have examined the figures of the 1948 election in States where the candidate who carried 100 percent of the electoral vote of the States did so with less than a majority of the popular vote. In response to the questions which have been asked of me I ask unanimous consent to have the table published in the RECORD. I may say that the list includes California, Florida, Indiana, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Tennessee, and Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Without objection it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

In the following 11 States in the 1948 presidential election, the candidate who carried the State did so with less than a majority of the popular vote:

State	Total popular vote	Popular vote for candidate carrying the State	Percentage of popular vote
California	4,021,538	1,913,134	47.6
Florida	577,643	281,988	48.8
Indiana	1,656,214	821,079	49.6
Louisiana	416,336	204,290	49.1
Maryland	596,735	294,814	49.4
Michigan	2,109,609	1,038,595	49.2
New York	6,177,337	2,841,163	46.5
Ohio	2,936,071	1,452,791	49.5
Oregon	524,080	260,904	49.8
Tennessee	550,283	270,402	49.1
Virginia	419,256	200,786	47.9

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, in considering the proposed constitutional amendment we should look backward and consider the facts as they are. As I understand the Senator, if the amendment had been in effect, and the plurality method had been used, the result might have been different. But on the basis of the actual facts and the actual populations of the States, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator a question. Would the results really have been any different in the election of a President if the proposed amendment to the Constitution sponsored by the Senator from Massachusetts had been the procedure whereby the election would have been decided?

Mr. LODGE. Of course, in every presidential election the result would have been different. It is simply inconceivable that it could not have been. The candidate might even have been a different candidate. Certainly the issues would have been different, and certainly the conduct of the campaign would have been different.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Perhaps the Senator misunderstood my question. I do not believe he answered the question I asked him. I am assuming that the electors who were elected in the presidential election would have gone to the electoral college and voted in accordance with the way the people voted. All I am asking is, if the formula under the constitutional amendment proposed by the Senator had been in existence, let us say, back in 1860, how could there then have been any difference in the vote that was cast in the electoral college if it had been cast under the so-called Lodge amendment, rather than under the machinery then and now in existence?

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator mean, assuming the people had voted the same way?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. I do not think they would have voted the same way. I think that would be as unusual as five royal flushes in a row. It is simply incredible to me that that could happen. But if the Senator wants to take the new rules and apply them to the figures of old games——

Mr. WHERRY. Would it even have made any difference in the conduct of the presidential election?

Mr. LODGE. Yes, I think it might have, because the electoral votes are computed on so many for each Representative in Congress, and then two for each Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. The electoral votes which represent the Representatives are computed on the basis of population, and not on the basis of voters. This is a Government of the people, by the people and for the people, not a Government of the voter, by the voter and for the voter, which is sometimes lost sight of. Then, of course, two votes for each Senator are added, and they have no relation to population. Therefore, in a State in which the vote does not come out, there could very well be such a situation that the electoral vote would be different from the popular vote.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand the Senator's answer is that it would be different because if the constitutional amendment which the Senator has proposed had been in operation there might have different candidates, there might have been more work done, and all that.

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. With which I agree. That might be true. But that really does not answer my question.

Mr. LODGE. Take the Tilden-Hayes election, for instance, in which the result would have been different if we assume the people had voted the same way. I think Tilden would have been elected.

Mr. WHERRY. I think the people would vote the same way. The Senator has not answered my question.

Mr. LODGE. Very well. The question is not fundamentally a very intelligent one though, because it assumes a condition which would not exist. But let us assume it. I say yes, in the Hayes-Tilden election Tilden would have won under the proposed system, assuming the popular vote would have gone the same way as it did in the actual election.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am, of course, interested in getting out all possible votes. That is my business, too.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator mean votes for the proposed constitutional amendment tomorrow?

Mr. WHERRY. I am referring to the votes of the people.

Mr. LODGE. Is the Senator with me or against me?

Mr. WHERRY. I will say that I enjoyed very much the presentation made by the Senator, and I was very much interested in the argument he made that the proposed constitutional amendment would help to get voters out, and would eliminate splinter parties. I think his argument on that point was very forceful and very ably presented.

Mr. LODGE. I did not say it would eliminate them.

Mr. WHERRY. I understood the Senator to say that instead of increasing it would tend to decrease splinter parties.

Mr. LODGE. I think it would tend to decrease splinter parties.

Mr WHERRY. I so understood the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. I do not think the Senator will find that I said it would eliminate splinter parties. I said if the people want to have a splinter party badly enough there is no system that can stop it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I will accept the statement the Senator now says he made. I think we understand each other, that there would be a tendency to decrease splinter parties under the so-called Lodge amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I was rather surprised earlier today when the distinguished majority leader submitted an amendment to place a floor under the electoral votes. I think his amendment is conducive to bringing about the very thing he is apprehensive of, that is splinter parties. That is number one. Number two——

Mr. LODGE. It is impossible for me to answer more than one of the Senator's questions at a time.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not asking the question now.

Mr. LODGE. Is the Senator making a speech?

Mr. WHERRY. No. The Senator asked me if I was interested in voting for his measure. I said I was interested in getting out all the votes of the people for President. I am interested in that. I am certainly for any plan that will translate the will of the people into the accomplishment of the purpose for which they cast their ballots. What I am called upon to do, as one who is attempting to resolve the differences of opinion, is to find whether the proposed procedure will be better than the present procedure. That is what I am trying to ascertain. In furtherance of that objective, I asked a very simple question. Based upon the actual facts and the actual votes, I ask the Senator if there would have been any difference in the election of a President if his plan had been in effect?

Mr. LODGE. I say "Yes."

Mr. WHERRY. The answer which the distinguished Senator gives me is that we cannot assume such a situation.

Mr. LODGE. But if we do assume it——

Mr. WHERRY. Before I vote on the joint resolution, for the information of the Senator, now that he has raised the question, I want to be pretty well satisfied that we are not going to lose——

Mr. LODGE. Who is not going to lose?

Mr. WHERRY. I want to be pretty well satisfied that the American people are not going to lose, and that their votes will actually count if any change is to be made. That is the point I am trying to get to.

Mr. LODGE. I will repeat my answer. If we assume that the popular vote would have been identically the same as it was—which to me is a fantastic and impossible assumption—my answer is "Yes," that the final result would have been different in a number of cases.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator cite a case in which it would have been different? I have examined the record back to 1860, and I cannot find a case in which there would have been any change in the result.

Mr. LODGE. The only case I can think of is the Hayes-Tilden election, in which Tilden would have won over Hayes if the proposed system had been in effect.

The point I seem unable to convince the Senator about is that that is of no consequence. It does not make any difference.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh; yes. It would make a great deal of difference. If the Senator could say to me that we would not lose ground by this procedure——

Mr. LODGE. Who is "we," may I ask?

Mr. WHERRY. The voters. I am speaking for the voters.

Mr. LODGE. I was wondering to whom "we" referred.

Mr. WHERRY. If the distinguished Senator does not like the personal pronoun, I will strike it out and say that the junior Senator from Nebraska says he feels that the people, the voters, want to be clear on this question. I am trying to represent one of the States——

Mr. LODGE. And the Senator is doing it very well.

Mr. WHERRY. May I finish my statement? A moment ago the Senator was complaining about being interrupted before he finished. I should like very much to complete my statement.

Mr. LODGE. I am delighted to have the Senator do so.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to be sure, in translating the will of the people of Nebraska into action, that we are not going backward, but are going forward.

The only way I can resolve some of these differences is to examine history in an effort to determine what may happen in the future. I agree with the Senator that, of course, under a different procedure there might have been a difference in the result. There might have been different candidates. There might have been more effort. All those things are speculative. I must assume that the same effort would have been made and that the same vote would have been cast, in attempting to arrive at a conclusion as to whether or not there would have been a different decision in the vote under the proposed system, as compared with the present procedure. In some instances the same candidate might have been elected under the procedure which the distinguished Senator has proposed.

Mr. LODGE. Let me repeat what I said. If we assume that the popular vote would have been cast in the same manner as it was cast, and if we assume that under the proposed system it would still have been the same—which is a fantastic assumption—the final result would have been different in a number of cases.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. LODGE. I am through.

Mr. HOLLAND. As a preface to my question, I should like to say that I think the Senator has made a real contribution to this debate by placing in the RECORD the list of 11 States which, in the 1948 presidential election, gave their entire electoral vote to the presidential candidate of their choice, merely upon a plurality basis. That is, in none of those 11 States did the successful candidate or the successful party have a majority of all the votes cast.

I should like to comment to the Senator that in my judgment his list shows clearly how Nation-wide that situation is. For example, the Pacific Coast States of California and Oregon are in that list. Among the Southern States are the States of Florida, Louisiana, Tennessee, and Virginia. In none of them did the successful party or the successful candidate have a majority of the popular vote.

Among the border States there was the State of Maryland. Among the Midwestern States, three great States, Indiana, Michigan and Ohio, fell within that classification.

To complete the coverage of the Nation by regions, the Atlantic State of New York is in that group.

I also invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that in the list of States are States which went for each of the three leading candidates for President. One State went for Governor Thurmond of South Carolina. Of the other States in the list, some went for Governor Dewey of New York and some for President Truman.

So it seems to me that the list clearly shows that we need not be afraid of plurality voting, because certainly we have been practicing just that. It also shows that no one can tell in advance who will be the beneficiary and who will be injured by the adoption of a saner, safer rule. After all, the question is—and ought to be—What is a safer, saner, more democratic rule than the one which is now part of our Constitution?

The question which I wish to ask is this—and it is addressed in part to the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts and in part to the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska—Does not the Senator believe that if the minimum figure of required plurality for election of

40 percent, as provided in the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and accepted, as I understand, by the Senator from Massachusetts, were made any larger, by its very size it would then contribute to the invitation to splinter parties to come into the picture? Is not the 40-percent figure about as sound a figure as could be arrived at, so as not to contribute to the invitation to splinter parties to come into the picture in any given election?

Mr. LODGE. I think that is the correct answer. I think the figure of 40 percent is about right. I suppose someone could make an argument for 41 percent; but it seems to me that, broadly speaking, 40 percent is just about the right figure.

Let me say that before the Senator from Florida asked his question he made what seemed to me to be a very able statement in his analysis of the figures and his demonstration of the fact that they were national in character and covered all parts of the country. I believe that his contribution is well worth while.

As the able Senator from Florida says, plurality voting is used in all the States of the Union. We vote by plurality for President. We vote by plurality for Senators, governors, Representatives, and all sorts of local officials. That system never gets us into any trouble. It is an extraordinary thing that in the consideration of the proposed amendment the question which has occupied most of the discussion relates to that part of the system which works best. Twelve Presidents have been elected by plurality. States cast 100 percent of their electoral votes by plurality, and yet no one ever complains about it.

I am not afraid of plurality voting. I am not bothered by the thought that Abraham Lincoln received only 39 percent of the popular vote. However, I recognize that there are Senators who are disturbed about it. I think the amendment of the Senator from Illinois is good. We did not place that provision in the joint resolution originally, first, because we thought the system was working well in that regard. We were trying to confine our amendment entirely to those parts of the Constitution which were not working well. The amendment of the Senator from Illinois places a floor under the required plurality. It would make it practically impossible for splinter parties to have a decisive influence. Moreover, I think it would tend to draw Senators to the support of the joint resolution who otherwise might not support it. I am enough of a realist, and I have been in the Senate sufficiently long to appreciate that we must defer to the views of other Senators. If there are doubts in the minds of other Senators, even though I may not share such doubts, I am going to try to do something to dispel them, even though I may not think they are justified.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an additional comment?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Speaking only for the junior Senator from Florida, I am particularly pleased with that part of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] which would get away from one of the potential abuses of the twelfth amendment to the Constitution, which, of course, would be repealed by the pending amendment.

That abuse was that in the event the election were thrown into the Congress, there would be provisions that the election of the President be made by the House of Representatives, whereas the election of the Vice President would be made by the Senate. There is always, of course, the chance and the opportunity that those Houses might be controlled by different parties, which would mean that in such case the twelfth amendment would not have done away at all from the very abust it was primarily intended to correct, namely, having a President and a Vice President from opposing parties and of opposing political philosophies.

Therefore, I strongly approve the amendment which, in the event the election came to Congress, would throw the election of the President and the Vice President into the hands and upon the consciences of the same group, namely, the combined Houses of Congress, the House of Representatives and the Senate. I think that is an additional means of getting away from some of the confusion, which has always been present since the twelfth amendment has been added to the Constitution.

Mr. LODGE. I am glad the Senator thinks that is the effect of the amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I inquire who has the floor?

Mr. LODGE. I have the floor, but I have finished.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; with the consent of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator consider that this proposed amendment to the Constitution would have a tendency to permit the Federal Government to invade the control of the States over election laws? Under the proposal a candidate would be given credit for all popular votes recorded for him. Does it not follow he could demand that his name be put on the ballot in any State? The States say they have control over whose name goes on the ballot. But if the Constitution guarantees him the end credit for all votes cast in his favor, would not the courts say the Federal Government should also assure him the means, which is to say placing his name on the ballot?

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the Senator is basing his question on a false premise. I have never heard anyone contend that the States have full power over the election of President, Vice President, and other Federal officials. The debates have customarily been based upon section 2 of article I of the Constitution, which has to do solely with the qualifications of electors.

But I call the attention of the distinguished Senator—and equally call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, because this provision of the Constitution seems to have been overlooked by both of them in their able arguments—to the fact that section 4 of article I of the Constitution has always, since the foundation of the Nation, provided that—

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

So there has never been any contention upon this floor, so far as I have heard, that the Federal Government does not already have authority under the Constitution in any matter that vitally affects it and its welfare and which falls within the provision I have just quoted; and I think both Senators have overlooked that provision of the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, then I should like to have the Senator reply to this question: Has not it been contended that the poll tax could not be removed by the Congress of the United States because it is purely a matter for local elections?

Mr. HOLLAND. Exactly, and that is where the Senator has fallen into error. He is confusing the poll-tax situation with the more general provisions of section 4, article I. The poll-tax situation has always been based upon section 2, of article I, which contains, among other things, a provision with respect to Members of the House of Representatives, and then the following language:

> And the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

That provision has no relation to anything else except the qualification of electors, and that provision is repeated in the seventeenth amendment, in those identical words.

If I may call the matter to the attention of the two Senators—I am sure it is already known to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts—the same provision is contained, in identical words, in the proposed constitutional amendment which now is before us and is being debated. It is already the only provision that is twice, in identical words, contained in the Constitution of the United States; and if the Congress in its wisdom sees fit to submit this proposed amendment, and if it be adopted by the required number of States, then for the third time will the Constitution, by provisions written into it—one at the beginning of our Government, one in 1913, and one at whatever time in the future this amendment be adopted—contain that provision, which certainly means that the qualification of electors, and that only, is completely left to the laws of the States.

But the Senator is assuming what I think is unsound, namely, that that provision goes further than the matter of the qualification of electors.

If the Senator will but read section 4 of the same article I of the Constitution, he will see, I think, what is very

manifest, namely, that the founding fathers in their wisdom retained in the Congress the power to change matters affecting the times, places, and manner—which I think means the method—of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, in the event it is necessary to protect those vital Federal matters.

I may say in closing that if the Senators will examine the case books, they will find that cases have been up, under this section—section 4—as distinguished from section 2, and have been subjected to scrutiny and analysis by the Supreme Court of the United States, which has in several cases specifically upheld the power of Congress to act under section 4. But section 4 and section 2 are entirely different, and do not relate to the same subject matter.

It was that which I called to the attention of the two distinguished Senators, because it seems to me they may have overlooked it in the debate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. However, as I understand, the Congress has not exercised its power to regulate the method of holding elections, as a general proposition. The Senator from Florida and other Senators from the South certainly have objected to having the Congress do so.

My suggestion is that if this amendment is adopted, there will be a much greater incentive to do so. That necessarily must be so.

Not only that, but it seems to me we must then act under the provision of the Constitution in section 2 of the fourteenth amendment, namely—

> But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President—

And so forth—

> is denied any of the male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, * * * the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State.

Certainly, from all the evidence, the voting in the South is away below the representation. The evidence in the Bilbo case showed clearly that the deterrent to the voting of Negroes in Mississippi was such that practically none of them voted or dared to vote.

It seems to me that if we become interested—as we must, if this amendment is adopted—in every single vote cast, then inevitably the Congress will enact national legislation to regulate the voting, doing so in such a manner that every person of voting age in every State in the southern part of the country will have an absolute, clear, and free right to vote in the way he or she wishes to vote. It appears to me that will be the inevitable result of the adoption of the amendment. I do not say it would not be a good result, but I merely want to suggest to the Senator that I think it would be the inevitable result, if the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I do not feel that that is the inevitable result, at all. I think the Senator, again, is forgetting that he is dealing with a subject matter which has nothing in the world to do with section 2 of article I of the Constitution, which relates solely to the qualifications of electors.

On the matter of the general exercise by Congress of its rights and prerogatives under section 4 of article I in case of elections, I think the Senator, upon examining the statutes, will find he is mistaken in his statement that the Congress has not exercised jurisdiction in that field, because, to the contrary, in the matter of providing for the distribution and membership of the House of Representatives, and in the matter of providing what shall be done in the event a State does not itself redistrict when it gets more or has fewer Representatives, and in many other matters affecting the election of Federal officers, the distinguished Senator will find, as I recall, that the Congress has acted under section 4 of article I of the Constitution. It would not be anything new for the Congress to have to act under that section, if it felt there was a need to do so. I think the Senator has confused the present issue with section 2 of article I of the Constitution.

In his last remarks, I fear that he confuses the present issue with that arising under the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution. While that is a very interesting subject to discuss, and one which I shall be glad to discuss at any appropriate time. I think it has no relation at all to the pending matter. I think if the Senator reexamines it he will find it provides an entirely different sort of remedy from the one which he had in mind.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator feel that section 2, the fourteenth amendment, distinctly modifies the general provision that the States shall prescribe the qualifications of electors?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not. I think it has to do solely with the permitting of all the male inhabitants of the State to vote upon equal terms, without discrimination. And I specially call the Senator's attention to the fact that the seventeenth amendment, adopted in 1913, reaffirms in the same original words the principle that the States control the qualification of electors.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the distinguished Senators from Massachusetts and Tennessee, and other Senators, have already covered the substance of the proposed amendment very thoroughly. I do not propose to go over the substantive material. There are one or two points I hope to make. I merely want to say in beginning that, I favor the resolution, for many of the reasons which have already been given by other speakers. Of course it is not my business to advise nor even be concerned with how the minority party might win elections, but it seems to me rather difficult to understand the reluctance of certain members of the minority party to accept changes in our electoral system, when I think back over the experience they have had in the last 20 years.

Mr. WHERRY. Eighteen years.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Eighteen years. On principle, it would seem to me that some change could not make the system any worse, and possibly might make it a little better.

The reasons for adoption of the present system of permitting electors to select a President no longer exist. It is well known that the system has not worked in the way that it was intended since the earliest days of the Constitution. The fact that the people needed no supermen to register their votes has been apparent for a long time, and, indeed, until very recently it was rarely doubted that an elector was obliged merely to act as a dummy in registering the wishes of a majority of his State.

It is apparent that the present system is outmoded; but if this is not reason enough for a change, it should also be noted that it is unfair and inaccurate. It nullifies the votes cast for a candidate in each State where that candidate loses. It can and has resulted in the defeat of a candidate against the will of a plurality of the voters; and although this may still be possible, theoretically, under Senate Joint Resolution 2, the dangers of its occurring are very substantially lessened.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Why does the Senator think the danger would be lessened? We have in the hearings the example of the 1900 McKinley-Bryan election. In spite of McKinley's getting 52.8 percent of the total vote and a majority of 850,000, which was a large majority at that time, equivalent to about 3,000,000 today, Bryan would have won under this system, although he had a minority of the popular vote. How can the Senator say it in any way eliminates the possibility of electing a President contrary to the popular vote?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I say it is possible theoretically, but I think when it is applied——

Mr. TAFT. It is not theoretical. It actually happened, or would have happened, in 1900. It is not merely theoretical. There it is, on the books.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I said that under this system it is still possible theoretically to have it happen, but it is less likely to happen, I think. I believe the examples set forth in the hearings would indicate it is less likely to happen than under the existing system. Of course, the reason for its being still possible is due to the retention of the significance of Senators; that is, the representation by two Senators from each State, no matter how small the State. It is true that in a State like Nevada, taking the extreme case, and in similar States, it is weighted in favor of those States. As a practical matter, I think the Senator will

admit if that element in the electoral college were eliminated, there would be not one chance in a thousand that any such amendment would be adopted.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not admit it for a moment. That is not the thing that makes it possible to elect a man contrary to the popular vote. But this proposed new system would give a tremendous advantage to the one-party State as opposed to the larger States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not understand that, that the amendment would give a tremendous advantage to a one-party State over what it has now. How is that so?

Mr. TAFT. It would have an advantage over the larger States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No, the Senator said a one-party State.

Mr. TAFT. Take for example the McKinley-Bryan election. In that election, McKinley, who came from Ohio, carried Ohio by a substantial majority. Under Senate Joint Resolution 2, he would get 12 electoral votes in Ohio; Bryan would get 10.4. In other words, the State of Ohio would weigh in the general national election 1.6 electoral votes in favor of McKinley. On the other hand, the State of South Carolina, a much smaller State, with only 9 electoral votes, would have given McKinley .6, and would have given Bryan 8.4, thereby giving a majority to Bryan of 7.8 electoral votes from the State of South Carolina, because it was a one-party State and cast a very small vote, as compared to 1.6 electoral votes for the entire State of Ohio. And today, in Ohio, I should think 125,000 would be a substantial majority, if we carried the State by that much. Mr. Dewey as a matter of fact carried it by 12,000 in 1944. He lost it by 7,000 in 1948. Very well. Supposing we carry it by 125,000. We get 1 electoral vote net—13 for us, 12 for the Democratic candidates.

On the other hand, take the State of Georgia, where the vote is about 3 to 1. They have less than half the population of Ohio. They have 12 electoral votes instead of 25, and they vote them 9 to 3, so they get 6 net votes for the Democratic candidate. A one-party State has an influence on the election out of all proportion to its population or to the vote which it casts. That is why they can entirely upset the popular majority, and why they would have upset the McKinley-Bryan election in 1900, and have elected Bryan instead of McKinley.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is saying "a one-party State." Under a system which is proposed by the amendment I do not think we would continue to have one-party States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In a moment. The Senator from Ohio, and other Senators, who have been critical, not only in this instance, but every time there has been a discussion about conditions in the South, have always looked at the vote in the general election, which is not an accurate criterion by which to judge the voting strength of the South. It is quite true that while they are not one party, one party is predominant; it has been for quite a number of years; and the people do not vote in the general elections simply because there is no particular point in their doing so. But I think the record in my State will show, for example, that if there were a point in voting in the general election, even now, without any further development, approximately a third of the votes would immediately go to the minority party. At the present time there is no point in their voting either for State officers or for local officers.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But the primary vote in July is extremely hotly contested, and the number of votes relative to the number of qualified electors is very favorable, compared with any other State. Yet those figures are always ignored when Senators come to assess the situation in the Southern States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, McKinley received more than a third of the votes in Arkansas in 1900. But the question I am raising is as to the tremendous weight given to a one-party State as against a larger State in which the votes in the past 20 years have, in general, been very close. It would apply just as much to the State of Vermont. I do not believe the Senator from Arkansas could convince me that if this amendment is agreed to, the Democrats will receive any more votes in Vermont than they receive at this time. I do not think we can change the situation simply because we have a different system of elections. A one-party State simply grows up that way. Nearly everyone in the State joins a particular party, and once it has reached that point, it is very difficult to change the situation. Yet such a one-party State has a weight in determining an election far out of proportion to its size or importance. For instance, the State of Georgia, with a population of less than half that of Ohio, would have an infinitely greater influence in the election of a President than would some two-party State. I can see why the Southern States should be in favor of the amendment, if they do not object to the Federal Government's running their elections, because, unquestionably, it will give them a greater choice in the Democratic Party. It will be more valuable to the Democratic Party. I should think this system would be so exceedingly important to the Democratic Party that there would no longer be any danger of divisions among the Democrats of the South.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator from Ohio wishes to discuss the subject on that basis, let me say, as I said in the beginning, in view of the experience of the past 18 years, it seems to me the Senator would be willing to take a chance in the hope that some change might be made in the existing situation. I am not particularly advocating it in order to enable the Republicans to have at least an outside chance to win an election. I agree that because small States have two Senators, with no relation to the population, to that extent the proposal is weighted in favor of the small States——

Mr. TAFT. But that is not different from the present situation. I do not criticize that provision at all. But it gives tremendous weight to a small one-party State as against a large State in which the parties are approximately equally divided.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is assuming that the pattern of voting in a State will not change. Take, for instance, my own State, or the State of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. I am informed that the population of Florida has increased nearly 30 percent in 10 years and that a large part of that increase is due to the fact that northern Republicans have moved to that State for various purposes—because they are able to, because taxes are lower, or for other reasons. In all likelihood, they are not going to take an active part in politics, because it would be fairly hopeless. They may become Democrats if they are inclined to take part in politics. I know of many persons who have come to my State and have said, "There is no use being a Republican. The Republican Party does not even have candidates." Therefore, they have become Democrats.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator has made reference to the State of Florida, which I represent, but he was not on the floor when, a few minutes ago, the Senator from Massachusetts introduced a list of States which gave their electoral votes in the 1948 election for President—by a plurality vote rather than by a majority vote. There were 11 such States, and the State of Florida was one of them. The Democratic Party did not cast the majority of all votes cast in the 1948 election in Florida, but, notwithstanding that fact we received the entire electoral vote of Florida. It seems to the junior Senator from Florida that it is not unfair or undemocratic for many thousands of Florida citizens, who may belong to parties other than the party to which he belongs, to have some opportunity to register, in a practical way, in an election of President and Vice President, their choice for those offices. It seems to me that the hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of Democrats in the great State of Ohio may be safely allowed an opportunity to have their votes counted in the final tabulation in an election of a President and Vice President. It seems to me a more democratic pattern is set up under the proposed amendment to register the real choice of the people.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Florida for his contribution.

I desire to make one further observation. It has been said that the amendment would give an undue advantage to a State which is predominantly of one party. I would say that the present system permits of an undue influence. Take New York as an example. The entire 47 electoral votes go one way, which may represent a difference of only two or three hundred thousand popular votes.

I do not think there is anything fair about that as being representative of the will of the people.

The idea has been created that no one can aspire to the Presidency if he does not come from New York, or Ohio, or Virginia, or——

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator include Missouri in the list?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will say to the Senator from Ohio that I do not recall any candidate from Missouri having been originally nominated. One of the reasons for that is the situation which I have just been discussing. The Senator from Ohio well knows that the present President of the United States first became President through the death of a President. Could anyone imagine that a person from New Mexico could be nominated? Yet a good man from New Mexico should be available presidential material. This amendment would certainly make it possible for such a man to be considered. Today we have to look only to a few States, as a practical matter, for presidential material.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am very much inclined to go along with the Senator's position on this amendment, except that it seems to me that, lurking somewhere in the field of possibilities, is the danger that by taking this action we might contribute to the growth of splinter parties all over the country, resulting in the destruction of our two-party system, even in those areas of the Nation in which there is now a strong two-party system. Having in mind that perhaps the authors of the resolution might accept an amendment which would eliminate the danger on that point, I am offering an amendment to page 3 which would limit the counting of the electoral votes in Washington to the two candidates in each State who receive the largest percentage of votes in their respective States.

If the Senator will yield for that purpose, I should like to send my amendment to the desk.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All I can say is that I have not heretofore seen the Senator's amendment. I firmly oppose more than two parties. I have thought about how the problem could be met, and the Senator may have the answer. The only thing that troubled me was the question of the transition. The junior Senator from Ohio said it might come about under the present circumstances. Some very thoughtful persons have suggested that there may be a new party to take the place of the Republican Party. That might not be a bad thing.

Mr. MUNDT. I believe the Senator from Ohio referred to a new party to take the place of the Republican Party, with the so-called Dixiecrats of the South, merging them into some so-called phalanx for freedom.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. A little over 100 years ago the Republican Party was formed out of the remains of the Whigs, and I think the "Know Nothings" or "Free Traders," and several other parties, so that in the new party there was a multiplicity of others. It lasted 4 or 5 years, then there were two parties. The only thing that bothers me is that we do not want a restriction so that there can be no change, because the change when the Republican Party was formed was healthy. I think it was a good thing that the Republican Party grew out of that situation. That is the only observation I desire to make on that point.

Mr. MUNDT. I share the Senator's concern that we leave the door open for new parties to try out their wings, and for that purpose to merge or change. Their planks can grow into a third party which will eventually eliminate one of the other parties. It was for that reason that I sought to insert this amendment at the point where the votes are to be counted, in what was formerly the electoral college, which will now be in the Congress of the United States.

It would leave full opportunity in the various States for a multiplicity of parties, but permit only the two which obtain the greatest percentage of votes to be registered in the final count in Washington for the selection of a President.

I think we should have some safeguard. I can think of nothing more calamitous that could occur than to have a splinter party framework develop in this country. I am sure the Senator agrees with that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think multiple parties work well at all. As I see it, the two-party system is much the best for the country. I would see no objection to the amendment, but some of those who have given much greater thought to this subject than I have should consider it. However, if it would achieve the purpose aimed at, it is a very worth-while amendment.

Mr. President, the present system can and does result in exaggerating the importance of minority pressure groups, who, because of strict discipline or fanatical interest in a particular issue, may hold a balance of power all out of proportion to their numbers, or to the justice of their cause.

In case it is not enough that the system is outmoded, unfair, and inaccurate, it should also be noted that it is, in these times, potentially dangerous. Any political campaign for the presidency during periods of international tension has certain hazards in matters of foreign policy and national defense. This fact was recognized during the last campaign, as both candidates found it necessary to reassure our friends and our enemies that our policy in these matters generally would be continuous. Yet there was the ever-present danger that the normal uncertainties would be increased by the possibility that the election would be indecisive—that some several months later the issue would be decided in the House of Representatives. There was the additional danger, even though the election was decisive one way in form, that, in fact, the will of a plurality would have been thwarted—that we would have an Executive exercising tremendous powers without the concurrence of a plurality of his people.

In these days it is necessary that our Government have the power and ability to act immediately in an emergency. This is not merely a matter of form, nor of compliance with the required constitutional and statutory devices. It is that, and the knowledge that a President represents the will, and has the backing, of the people of his country, as expressed by a decisive election. Without an effective expression of the people's will, as is possible under the present system, it is not at all difficult to imagine a President too reluctant to act in times of crises, or, if he does act, a people unwilling to support him.

Of course, we cannot remove all the dangers of elections at crucial periods—there are always uncertainties as to what a change may mean. We prefer these dangers, as necessary elements of our system of government, which, we believe, ultimately strengthen us. However, we can remove uncertainties which are not essential to democratic processes, and we can strengthen those processes to make certain our decisions.

The system proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 2 has been compared with proportional representation, as practiced in France, and which has so weakened the French Government. The systems are similar, of course, in that the votes cast for a candidate who loses in a particular State are nevertheless counted for him in determining the over-all result of the election. The conclusion has been drawn, because of this similarity, that we shall encourage the formation of a multitude of parties, as has been brought about in France.

Proportional representation, when applied to the election of a legislature may lead to such a result. In periods of great controversy, where there are widely divergent views on national policy, by giving representation to all possible views, there results a legislature which is so perfectly representative of each divergent view that it is most difficult to find a common meeting ground on any course of action. There is such a multiplicity of represented opinion that there is one opinion which can be made effective.

The reason why proportional representation results in multiple parties is that those parties are founded in the certain knowledge that almost any policy which has appeal for any appreciable number of people will get them some representation, some voice in the government, and therefore some power in it.

If we apply this reasoning to the election of a single officeholder, we can easily see that it is not applicable. A candidate for that office must still get a plurality of all the votes cast; the votes which he receives as losing candidate within a State get him no power unless he obtains a plurality of all the votes. The acquisition of power in government is in no way affected by assuring a candidate that the votes cast for him will be counted for him.

Therefore, if Senate Joint Resolution 2 will lead to the formation of multiple parties, it will not be because of any similarities to proportional representation.

I doubt that the change in itself will result in the immediate building of a two-party system in each State. Much of this depends upon local, county and State organizations, contesting for local,

county and State offices. The system would not materially affect this dependency, and by the same reasoning the creation of third parties would not be aided in this respect. But the system will be a step strengthening two-party government, as it will extend presidential campaigns to all States. Eventually, presidential campaigns in each State may result in effective local organization in all States.

Our two parties, generally, have been so alined as to prevent violent swings of the pendulum of government from blind reaction to extreme radicalism. We have thereby followed a generally moderate, but progressive course through the years. Lately, however, the pressure of minority groups has tended to minimize this effect, until we have been threatened, or at least greatly influenced, by minority groups. These groups, when they operate within the two-party system, as well as when they operate as third parties, derive their power, not from their strength in numbers, or from the general appeal of their cause, but from those peculiarities of the present system which enable them to swing a far greater number of votes than they may have.

The argument has been made by the opponents of this resolution that the splinter parties—such as Henry Wallace's in the last election—will be encouraged by reason of the fact that they will gain electoral votes, in addition to the popular votes they now receive. I cannot see that it is any encouragement to receive only an electoral reflection of the actual popular vote. Furthermore, this argument ignores the only reason for the present existence and power of splinter parties—that they are now, under the present system, able to exert an undue influence by reason of their ability to swing the entire electoral vote of a State away from one candidate. Or that they may be able, under the present system, to throw the election into the House of Representatives. It is this power, which they now may have, under favorable circumstances, that endangers the present system. Senate Joint Resolution 2 takes away this power, and thereby discourages splinter groups.

It has been our experience that third parties generally do not seek to stand on their own feet, seeking power through their own merits. Rather they attempt to negate the wishes of a majority, by the exercise of a veto power. The adoption of this proposal, while it will not destroy third parties—it will require them to come out in the open, and to seek power upon the basis of their true appeal. They would obtain no more, and no less than they are entitled to.

The question arises, of course, if our present system is defective why not abolish the electoral vote entirely and elect our President by a direct popular vote? I think the system proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 2 is not only more likely to be adopted but that it is better.

Senate Joint Resolution 2 extends and perfects our present system, making it workable, accurate, and democratic, in accordance with the basic compromise which resulted in the Union. Direct popular election would break down one of the intricate facets of this compromise. As the Brookings Institute has observed, Senate Joint Resolution 2 "preserves the compromise between the large and small States that permitted the adoption of the Constitution and the formation of a more perfect Union and leaves the States free to determine the qualifications requisite for voters." On the other hand, direct popular election is entirely inconsistent with this theory. I believe this to be so, because I cannot conceive of the States being permitted to qualify whomever they please, regardless of age or literacy or any other proper qualification, in order to throw undue weight to its voting population in a contest with other States. The promotion of sectional rivalries under such a system is obvious.

We have a conflict of theories in our entire system of government. On the one hand we theorize that the source of power derives from the people, that the people, in the exercise of their rights in government, should be accorded equal voice. This is the principle of pure majority rule, and to achieve perfection in its operation it would require, not only actual equality, but uniformity of interest. In recognition of the imperfections man, and to protect that other source of power, the States, the Constitution effected a series of compromises between the theories of States' rights and pure majority rule. A system of checks and balances was built up, not only in restraint of powers to be exercised by the Federal Government, but as to who would exercise those powers. Thus we have a House of Representatives, determined upon the basis of population; and we have a Senate, as a balance to that popular representation. This same fundamental compromise is the basis for the provision of electoral votes in the same numbers as there are representatives and Senators.

The greatest danger to our institutions today lies in the concentration of power, totalitarianism—the very evil which our system of checks and balances, of which the electoral vote is a part, is designed to check. There is a corresponding danger in the abuse, by a minority, of those rights designed to protect it. The classic example, of course, is the tactics of communism. When in power, the Communists ruthlessly suppress minority rights. When not in power they, perhaps just as ruthlessly, adopt every possible disruptive tactic.

Under Senate Joint Resolution 2 we effect a compromise between these two extremes, we lessen the disruptive ability of minorities, yet we protect them from the absolute power of the majority by retaining the electoral vote.

There are still great variations in the economic, educational, and cultural patterns of this country, from State to State, and region to region, which still need the protection which our system of checks and balances gives. There is danger of geographical concentration of power, following lines of population, just as there are dangers in any other form of concentration of power. These are geographical—State and regional—considerations, having little or no relation to the population of those geographical divisions, which are desirable of representation, not only in the Congress, but in the system of electing a President.

We protect this diversity of interests, by our constitutional system and by our two-party government, in such a manner that our Government is rarely perfectly representative of any of its people, in all its programs, but is generally the common meeting ground of a great number of its people. This system of checks and balances, of which the electoral vote is a part, is the result of basic compromise, and is, itself, properly to be used as a lever of compromise, avoiding extremes, and requiring our people and our Government to pursue a course that is fair to the country as a whole. We are not changing this system by Senate Joint Resolution 2, but rather we are attempting to make it work better, to be more expressive of its underlying concept. We are attempting to perfect a part of the great compromise which made our federation successful.

Mr. President, it has been mentioned on the floor of the Senate that because we adopted a resolution last year which called for the appointment of a committee to study the over-all problem perhaps we should delay action on the joint resolution. I do not subscribe to that idea at all. I think this particular joint resolution has already received long consideration, both in the House and in the Senate, and I hope the Senate will proceed to pass the joint resolution now so that it can be sent to the House and receive early action in that body.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if no other Senator wishes to speak at this time, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

George V. Allen, of North Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Yugoslavia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

John M. Cabot, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Finland;

Gerald A. Drew, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, now United States representative on the United Nations Special Balkan Committee, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan;

H. Merle Cochran, of Arizona, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister,

to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of the United States of Indonesia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Avra M. Warren, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Pakistan, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Ely E. Palmer, of Rhode Island, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Conciliation Commission for Palestine which was established by resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations December 11, 1948, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Jefferson Patterson, of Ohio, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Special Balkan Committee established by the General Assembly of the United Nations October 21, 1947, vice Gerald A. Drew;

Mrs. Olive Remington Goldman, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Commission on the Status of Women of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years;

Mark A. May, of Connecticut, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1953, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified (reappointment);

Justin Miller, of California, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1953, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified (reappointment);

Lewis Clark, of Alabama, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be the representative of the United States of America on the United Nations Advisory Council for Libya;

Charles S. Reed 2d, of Ohio, and sundry other officers and persons for promotion and appointment in the diplomatic service; and

Glen A. Abbey, of Wisconsin, and sundry other Foreign Service officers for promotion in the diplomatic service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward W. Barrett, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION FOR THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE FOUNDING OF PORT-AU-PRINCE, REPUBLIC OF HAITI

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Shaw Young, of New York, to be United States Commissioner to the International Exposition for the Bicentennial of the founding of Port-au-Prince, Republic of Haiti.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of United States attorneys.

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of United States attorneys may be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of United States marshals.

Mr. HOLLAND. I make the same unanimous-consent request with respect to the confirmation of the nominations of United States marshals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of United States marshals are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HOLLAND. I make the same unanimous-consent request with respect to the confirmation of the postmaster nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

RECESS

Mr. HOLLAND. If there be no further business to be transacted at this time, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 1, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 31 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

Surgeon to be senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

Daniel J. Daley

Senior assistant surgeons to be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major):

Richard H. Linn — Wayland J. Hayes, Jr.
David D. LeGrand — Clarke W. Mangun, Jr.

Dental surgeon to be senior dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

Donald J. Galagan

Senior assistant sanitary engineers to be sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of major):

O. John Schmidt — Joseph A. Boyer
Kenneth C. Lauster — Ross W. Buck

Senior assistant pharmacist to be pharmacist (equivalent to the Army rank of major):

Joseph P. Crisalli

Nurse officer to be senior nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

L. Dorothy Carroll

Assistant nurse officer to be senior assistant nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of captain):

Norma Russell

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 31 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Edward W. Barrett to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION FOR THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE FOUNDING OF PORT-AU-PRINCE, REPUBLIC OF HAITI

John Shaw Young to be United States commissioner to the International Exposition for the Bicentennial of the Founding of Port-au-Prince, Republic of Haiti.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Everett W. Hepp to be United States attorney for division No. 4, district of Alaska.

Adrian W. Maher to be United States attorney for the district of Connecticut.

Matthew B. Welsh to be United States attorney for the southern district of Indiana.

Bernard J. Flynn to be United States attorney for the district of Maryland.

John J. Sheehan to be United States attorney for the district of New Hampshire.

Henry L. Hess to be United States attorney for the district of Oregon.

John Joseph Hickey to be United States attorney for the district of Wyoming.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Louis F. Knop, Jr. to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Louisiana.

Henry Robert Bell to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Tennessee.

Earl R. Burns to the United States marshal for the district of Wyoming.

POSTMASTERS

CONNECTICUT

John F. Heneghan, Hartford.

MISSISSIPPI

Debbie W. Miller, Lauderdale.

WEST VIRGINIA

Morris L. Meadows, Baileysville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 31, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, at this noonday moment we look backward in gratitude and forward in confidence, for we know that Thou art the same today as Thou wert yesterday.

As we onward walk the paths of duty, do Thou endow us with stout hearts and open minds. Stimulate us with that faith that greets the dawn rather than the setting sun; faith in Thee, in our fellow men, and in the ultimate triumph of all things right. Dismissing past regrets and future fears, send us forth on errands of mercy and good will; then we shall have the restful satisfaction that comes to those who have borne wisely and well their part. Fill us with large sympathies for others, and bless us with complete trust in Thy goodness, and Thine shall be the glory forever. Through Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JANUARY 25, 1950.

The SPEAKER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy for the year 1950: Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER, Hon. JAMES B. HARE, Hon. T. MILLET HAND.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

S. O. BLAND, *Chairman.*

UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JANUARY 30, 1950.

The SPEAKER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Public Law 301 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy for the year 1950: Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER, Hon. DONALD L. O'TOOLE, Hon. ALVIN F. WEICHEL.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

S. O. BLAND, *Chairman.*

COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 398, relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 398, with Mr. SMITH of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read through section 1 of the bill. Are there further amendments to section 1?

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE of California: On page 2, line 10, strike out the figure "40" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "50."

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment be limited to 10 minutes, 5 minutes for the proponent and 5 minutes for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, I will make my remarks very brief, inasmuch as we debated this matter yesterday quite thoroughly. This amendment is one which would certainly not require very much of an expenditure in addition to the estimate which has been provided by the Department of Agriculture covering the cost of this resolution. It is a very small matter insofar as funds are concerned. This 40-percent restriction which is now in the resolution attempts to tell the farmer that he shall not plant cotton but once in 3 years on his total land. I think that is wrong. I think it is perfectly good husbandry to plant cotton every other year. That is just what this 50-percent amendment would allow. On that basis, Mr. Chairman, I submit that the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like the membership to understand the meaning of the amendment. For 10 years or more the cotton-quota law has contained a provision that no allotment to a farm should exceed, under the old law, 40 percent of the cotton planted and the cotton diverted in 1937. That was found wise. After giving each State, including the State of Georgia and the State of California and other States, all of the cotton that they are rightfully entitled to as their fair portion of the national quota and after the counties have received their full share we are coming now, due to some inequities which have arisen, and adding to them, giving every grower up to 70 percent of his 3-year average or 50 percent of his highest planting in either 1946, 1947, or 1948.

In its wisdom, the committee limited that by saying we will build you up to 70 percent, but not beyond 40 percent of your entire cultivated acreage on your farm.

The gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE] now proposes to strike that 40 percent and say that we can give him up to half of his entire cultivated land on his farm.

It was estimated by the committee that the 40-percent limitation would cut off of the 1,400,000-acre estimate otherwise added between one hundred and two hundred thousand acres. There has been no estimate made as to what the effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California would be, but certainly it would add additional acreage over and above what the 40 percent would do.

We think the bill now provides rather liberal contributions, due to the inequities. Therefore, I am quite sure it is the view of a majority of the committee that this amendment should not be approved.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. Certainly, I yield.

Mr. WHITE of California. The gentleman stated that the 1938 law provided for 40 percent of the 1937 planting. Does he not mean 50 percent?

Mr. PACE. No, sir. The old law was that no county would be given less than 60 percent of the 1937 planted and diverted and no farm would be given less than 50 percent of the 1937 planted and diverted, but that this amendment should not increase the allotment to the farm greater than 40 percent of the cultivated land.

Mr. WHITE of California. That is correct.

Mr. PACE. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, he says that in this instance it shall not be less than 50 percent of the cultivated land. I think the resolution as submitted is well balanced, and respectfully ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. Certainly I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am in accord with the gentleman's views that this amendment should be defeated. But will the gentleman explain to the House about the minimum acreage that a cotton farmer can get. Is that 5 acres that he is allowed? There is some misunderstanding about it.

Mr. PACE. The new law is exactly the same as the old law since 1938, namely, that any farmer who has been growing 5 acres or less of cotton will suffer no cut whatever. He will be given an allotment for the full amount that he has been growing, up to 5 acres. Then the law further provides that for those who have 5 acres up to 15 acres they shall get an additional, special allotment to build them up toward 15 acres; the idea being that it will take something in that range, between 5 and 15 acres, to give a man acreage comparable with his needs. I hope that covers the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has already been fixed. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

All time on the amendment having expired, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARE: On page 2, line 8, after the colon and before the word *"Provided"* insert the following: *"Provided,* That the allotment to each farm shall be determined by the county committee, subject to review in accordance with section 3 of this resolution, on the basis of satisfactory evidence submitted by the producers."

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment be limited to 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, this amendment is what may be considered as a clarifying amendment. It is recognized that the State of Texas has been subjected to what is commonly known as the California clause. It is further recognized that the acreage allotted to the State of Texas was subjected to the clause because the phrase "actually planted" was used in the original law. It is further recognized that the Bureau of Agricultural Economics statistics are inaccurate. It is further recognized that the reason we are here now is because of maladministration of the law; that is, not in accordance with the intent of this Congress.

The purpose of this amendment is to place the responsibility where it lies, particularly to permit the county committees to allocate acreage to each individual farmer in accordance with the legal evidence which he can submit to such committee with regard to the acreage he actually planted in cotton during the basic years. There is nothing hard to understand about the amendment; in fact, it is easy to understand; it just places the responsibility with the county committee, deprives the Department of Agriculture of the responsibility of saying "You planted so much," and saying to the county committee instead: "You determine how much the farmer planted."

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman's purpose by this amendment is to try to simplify the business of making appeals.

Mr. HARE. That is absolutely true; that is, to place the responsibility on the county committee which can determine the case of each individual farmer.

Mr. FISHER. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, and I am sorry I did not hear it read, it has reference to what he hopes will prove to be a more accurate way of arriving at the actual acreage rather than depending on the BAE statistics.

Mr. HARE. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. FISHER. I recall that in the debate 2 or 3 days ago it was stated that the present method was based upon estimate and speculation.

Mr. HARE. That is true.

Mr. FISHER. It is true because the BAE does not have the record of the actual plantings. Is that correct?

Mr. HARE. That is true.

Mr. FISHER. Therefore, inevitably, under such a program there would be some injustice produced because of the fact that the BAE does not and cannot have the statistics in the small localities of each State.

Mr. HARE. That is true.

Mr. FISHER. And the gentleman's amendment proposes to correct that by giving the county committees some control or jurisdiction over determining the amount of acreage the individual farmer is entitled to.

Mr. HARE. That is true. I think it is recognized that the Department of Agriculture cannot effectively and accurately determine what the farmer has actually planted, and I propose to give that responsibility to people who do know.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HARE. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. FISHER. I wish to point out for the record that in the area from which I come there are probably half a dozen counties in which very careful surveys have been made mostly by the county committees with respect to the accuracy of the BAE figures; and in a number of them it has turned out to be a matter of pure speculation when compared with the actual known facts. The BAE figures are from 25 to 35 percent under the actual plantings. That is not a matter of speculation, but a matter of known fact.

Mr. HARE. I can cite the gentleman a specific instance, the instance of a man in a neighboring county to mine. When he received his particular acreage allotment he went to the county committee, showed them his crop-insurance receipts where he had planted 75 or 80 acres of cotton and paid insurance on it, but the BAE adjusted figures indicated he did not do that. They indicated he planted only 35 or 40.

If we do not specifically state the procedure to be followed and definitely define the responsibility of each administrator, then we can only expect some bureaucrat in the Department of Agriculture to foul up the program in order that the socialistic Brannan plan will have a greater appeal because the farmers will be disgusted with the present program.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina undoubtedly has mentioned an important problem and equally undoubtedly the committee has dealt with it. If the Members will turn to page 1129 of yesterday's RECORD, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] inserted there a letter from the Deputy Administrator of the Production and Marketing Administration in which he sets out in detail exactly how this problem is going to be handled.

There is some complaint about the BAE figures in some counties. It is set out there that under this resolution when a cotton farmer's allotment is fixed he will be mailed a notice. The notice states:

> If you are not satisfied with this allotment, either from the base acreage or from the percentage standpoint, you can enter an appeal.

Then a public notice will be given every other farmer in the county who does not get an increase in acreage that he might file an appeal.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be unkind to the committees in my State or in South Carolina or anywhere else, but here is the story. You can take it as you like. The Department of Agriculture and this committee have some concern about letting any county committees control this situation. Why? We are now saying to X county that we are going to give the farmers of that county an additional acreage to build them up to 70 percent of their past history. We are going to add that to what they now have. What is going to be the inclination of some county committeemen? If you will study what has been done in the last 90 days you know what can happen.

The county committee men will say: "Well, here, we are going to get something extra. We will revise these bases and these other figures and instead of bringing 5,000 more acres into this county we will bring 25,000 more in. It does not take anything from anybody. We are going to reach out and get it and add that much more."

The system here is that if your BAE figures are not right we are not going to let that county committee decide it, but we are going to let a review committee composed of members of committee members from the surrounding counties settle it. We are going to let the whole group of that area determine whether or not the BAE estimates are correct. If the farmer goes before the review committee, and, as the gentleman from South Carolina says, has proof to show that the BAE estimates on the base acreage are incorrect, they will be corrected and additional acreage will be added. But I appeal to the gentleman from South Carolina, I appeal to the Members of the House, in the name of orderly administration do not put this temptation into the hands of your respective county committees where they will without cost to anybody just reach up and get more 70's, more 70's, and still more 70's until the additional acreage under this resolution will not be 1,400,000 but will likely be three or four million acres added on.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. I think the gentleman may be taking a little counsel of his fears because I think he recognizes as I stated before that we are here because of maladministration in the Department of Agriculture. The only thing I am intending to do or trying to do is to spell out in the law just what the Department of Agriculture in its procedure will do.

Mr. PACE. I may say to the distinguished gentleman that the Department itself has spelled it out in the form of a letter to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, which he put in the RECORD, and he says in detail exactly how they are going to correct these BAE estimates, and I hope it suits the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; it does suit the gentleman from Arkansas. And is it not a fact that the difference in the proposal of the gentleman from South Carolina and the method of administration by the Department is the fact that a committee outside of the county will determine it, and under his amendment the local county committee will determine it.

Mr. PACE. The statement of the gentleman from Arkansas should be significant, because no one has complained more bitterly than the gentleman from

Arkansas has about the incorrectness of these BAE estimates, and when he says that the letter from the Department satisfies him, it certainly ought to satisfy everybody else in this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, first, I wish to say that this is a most propitious time and I cannot permit the opportunity to pass without saying a few words in tribute to the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], who has announced his intention to retire from the Congress at the expiration of his present term.

Mr. Chairman, speaking for myself and all of my constituents, the people of Louisiana, and I am sure I might say for all of the South and all of the other agricultural States of the United States, it is with deep regret that we have learned of the intention of our esteemed colleague and friend.

Mr. PACE came to the Seventy-fifth Congress in 1937, and while it was not possible for him to become a member of the Committee on Agriculture at that time, coming from an agricultural State and being intensely interested in matters pertaining to agriculture, it was not long before he attained his desire to be transferred to the Committee on Agriculture.

From that time on, due to his ability, his interest and knowledge of agricultural problems, his study and hard work and devotion to the subject, he rapidly advanced on the committee until last year he became the ranking majority member of the Agricultural Committee.

Mr. PACE was so well informed on all matters pertaining to agriculture that many of the Members sought his counsel and advice, which he ungrudgingly gave, and since I have been a Member of Congress I have called upon him many times for information and advice and he never failed to advise and assist me in my work, and, representing an agricultural district, his guidance was most helpful and greatly appreciated.

Mr. Chairman, in the retirement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], his State, the Congress, and the Nation will lose a faithful and able legislator; agriculture will lose a learned and devoted champion, and especially we, the younger Members of the House will lose a true and solicitous friend, one who was never too busy to advise and help us.

Mr. Chairman, at this time, this country can ill afford to lose men of the type, character, and ability of such men as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], chairman of the Public Works Committee, who is also retiring this year.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARCADE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, as the next door neighbor and friend of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] and speaking for all of the people of our State, I express the hope that the gentleman may be induced to change his mind and continue his service here in this House where he is so badly needed.

Mr. LARCADE. I hope so, too.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARCADE. I yield to the gentleman from Lousiana.

Mr. BROOKS. As a Member of the House who came here during the same Congress which saw the beginning of the congressional career of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], I wish to join with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE], in his kind remarks with reference to STEVE PACE. I think he has been one of the most valuable men in the House of Representatives, and he certainly has been a tower of strength to Louisiana agriculture. I join with my friend from Georgia [Mr. COX] in the hope that he will reconsider and remain with us.

Mr. LARCADE. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARCADE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, as a new member on the great Committee on Agriculture, who has had the honor of serving on two important subcommittees presided over by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] I would like to say that he is the best example I have ever met of the fact that in Congress and elsewhere hard work and ability pay dividends.

Mr. LARCADE. I agree with the gentleman fully.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARCADE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I should just like to add my own personal and humble evaluation of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] whom I regard as one of my closest personal friends, who served here with me throughout these past 16 years. He is a valuable man. It is to be hoped that he will reconsider, because we in this House can ill afford to lose a man of the ability he possesses.

Mr. LARCADE. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, secondly, on yesterday I commented upon a meeting of cotton farmers held in my district, and submitted their recommendations in regard to amendment of the cotton-acreage-allotment law, and this morning I am in receipt of a further communication from my district and State on the subject, and wherein it is stated that—

> At the last State committee meeting we discussed the subject of inequitable cotton allotments that have been established on a number of Louisiana farms under the present law. We also discussed the relief that might be afforded by different proposals for amending the present law. We have just received a copy of House Joint Resolution 398, introduced by Mr. COOLEY on January 17, 1950. This resolution provides for increasing allotments to those farms which have in the past planted a large percentage of their cropland to cotton. For the sake of brevity we will call this the 70–50–40 provision. It will correct a number of the inequities under the present law but will not correct inequities existing on a substantial number of other farms.
>
> In the last State committee meeting we considered the case of a farmer who has 40 acres of cropland and only a 5-acre allotment. This farmer is just getting started in farming and is buying his farm through the Farmers Home Administration. This case is typical of quite a number of farmers which county committees believe are entitled to additional allotment.
>
> Mr. COOLEY's resolution does provide for the release of acreage allotments by farms which have more than they want but this released acreage must first be used to offset any increase in acreage allotments in the county because of the 70–50–40 provision. Then if there is any released acreage left after this has been done it may be used to correct inequities in allotments on other farms in the county. There are parishes in every section of Louisiana which will not be able to get farmers to release enough acreage to offset the increase in allotments provided by the 70–50–40 provision. These parishes will, therefore, have no acreage to reapportion to other farms. On the other hand a number of the parishes in the State will be able to obtain more released acreage than is needed to offset the increases because of the 70–50–40 provision and more than they will need to distribute to other farmers in the parishes which have inequitable allotments. We had hoped that the present law would be amended in a manner that would permit that part of the released acreage in any parish in excess of the needs of the parish to be transferred to other parishes which might need the acreage. In past years when farmers released acreage allotments they did not need, half of this released acreage stayed in the parish and half was turned in to the State committee. The State committee allocated its share of this released acreage back to the parishes in accordance with the need for the acreage.

Mr. Chairman, while I am certain that the Committee will resolve this matter under consideration to the best interests of all concerned, I am submitting the views of my constituents for your consideration, and I have full confidence in the decision which will be made to correct the problem to the fullest extent possible at this time.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee has just rejected an amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE], the purpose of which was to fix the responsibility for the determination of the amount of acreage allotted to the individual farmer in the hands of the county committee.

I think the amendment, had it been adopted in proper form, would have achieved the purpose of eliminating probably the grossest of the inequities that have crept into the allocation of acreage under the existing law. However, that amendment has been rejected. Therefore, may I ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] a question in reference to the determination of the allocation under the bill as it now reads?

On page 2, line 5, appears the phrase "if the owner or operator of the farm applies in writing for the allotment authorized by this section and certifies that

the acreage allotted will be planted to cotton."

What character of notice, if any, is the man who does not have the amount of acreage that this proposal here intends to give him going to get in order that he may make the application for the acreage that he will be allotted if this proposal becomes law?

Mr. PACE. That is covered by the letter I referred to, inserted by the gentleman from Arkansas. In the first instance, the committee will look to its records and see, for example, that the distinguished gentleman from Texas has only 50 percent of his 3-year average. They will then automatically mail to the gentleman from Texas as a cotton grower, if he should be, a notice that "according to our records you are entitled to an increased allotment of so many acres to bring you up to 70 percent. If you will come to this office and file a request for it with a declaration of intent to plant it, it will be allocated to you."

Mr. PICKETT. Will that notice go to every man who under the proposal we now have will get an increase in his acreage up to the point of the 70 percent or the 50 percent of his plantings?

Mr. PACE. That is true. The man who does not get an increase does not get that individual notice, but Mr. Woolley has agreed to direct the county committee to give wide publicity to the fact that the person who does not get an increase, if he is dissatisfied with his base acreage or allocation, may file an appeal immediately to the review committee. We have tried as best we know how, staying within the limits of reason, to correct the situation which has so greatly disturbed the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true, so that we may perfectly understand what the situation is, that the notice will go out to the individual farmer on the present listing, which generally is the BAE figures?

Mr. PACE. I said as much.

Mr. PICKETT. One further question: Under the terms of the resolution that is now pending, does not the county committee have the authority, if this becomes law, to make a determination in its own right of any amount of increase that the individual farmer is entitled to, and then send him a notice advising him that is the amount of acreage the committee figures he is entitled to, and invite him to come in and get it corrected by calling their attention to the fact that it is not correct, and appealing from it, if that be the case?

Mr. PACE. Certainly the local committee has the right to correct errors. It is contemplated that will be done. But it is not contemplated the local committee can make a wholesale revision of the base acreage in that county. It must be done by individual farms, and it must be done under the general supervision—get this straight, please—of the State committee. In every instance the action of the local committee is subject to review by the State committee.

Mr. PICKETT. Then you have a double-barreled review under this resolution, one by the review committee provided under section 3 of the bill, and the other by the State committee.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman did not follow my language closely. The action by the local committee is subject to review by the State committee. The action by the review committee is final.

Mr. PICKETT. I think the gentleman did not accurately follow my language because we do have two reviews on it, one of the county committee and one of the individual's allocation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that the way it will actually work under this resolution—the county committee must certify to the individual farmer 70 percent of his actual planting as listed in the office as his eligible allotment for the year?

Mr. PICKETT. That is my information concerning it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, there probably never has been in the history of the American Congress such a flood of propaganda directed against any piece of legislation affecting only one section of the country as has been directed against the central Arizona project, represented by S. 75 and H. R. 934. Members of Congress have been deluged with letters, newspaper and magazine articles—all expensive to disseminate, all cleverly written and most of it highly fallacious—intended to poison the minds of the Members against this pending legislation. In spite of this opposition, S. 75 has been amended and reported favorably.

The Bureau of Reclamation has made an exhaustive study of all phases of the central Arizona project and has found it feasible in every respect, and has recommended its authorization and construction. The Secretary of the Interior has so recommended.

The best engineers in the West favor this project. The Colorado River Basin States Committee, made up of outstanding authorities in the Western States, has spent many years studying California's objections and has taken positive action, finding against all of the California contentions. This authoritative committee adopted on October 2, 1947, a statement of principle refuting the California contentions and upholding the Arizona views.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the remarks of one of our Members who undoubtedly has been misled by the aforesaid propaganda. I am reading now from page 1130 of yesterday's RECORD in the first column near the bottom of the page. This is from the remarks of Congressman RICH, of Pennsylvania. I read:

> But think of it. It is going to cost $1,250,000,000 to put this land under cultivation, which will then cost you $1,600 an acre, and after you get the land it will be worth $200 an acre. Is that not asinine?

Mr. Chairman, if true, it is asinine. However, that one column contains more mathematical inaccuracies than I have ever seen on a printed page. The gentleman from Pennsylvania seems to pay no attention to decimal points or ciphers. A careful inspection of this speech will show that he has misplaced one or two or three ciphers as if they mean nothing. Where did he get this information?

Talk about putting cotton land in Arizona under irrigation at a cost of $1,600 which will afterward be worth only $200 an acre. He asks, "Is this asinine?" I'll say that is asinine, but I am sorry to say the asinine part of it, Mr. Chairman, is that the gentleman does not know his facts. He does not have his figures correct. If you consider a multiple-purpose project such as the central Arizona project is, and take the total cost of the project, of which irrigation is only one phase, and divide the number of acres to be watered into the total cost of the project and ignore the other features of the project, of course you get an asinine result. That may be mathematics but it is distorted and twisted.

I want to say to you southern gentlemen that we do have some surplus cotton in Arizona. Also we have been growing it on land which is included in the Arizona project bill, H. R. 934. But if we had had sufficient water in Arizona we would not have to plant so much of that land to cotton. Why not? Mind you, we grow vegetables, such as head lettuce, carrots, broccoli, cauliflower, and similar products, to say nothing of citrus, and grow them in a season when most of this country is covered with snow.

How many of you produce dates? Arizona produces 2,000,000 pounds of dates annually. It is a milion-dollar industry annually with us. Where in your State does the date palm flourish? When the Shah of Persia came to Arizona a few weeks ago, we took him out to Col. Dale Bumstead's ranch, west of Phoenix, and he got dates and other fruit that he could never eat from his own soil in Persia; better dates than grown any place in Arabia.

Most of our irrigation production yielding greatest revenue in that southwest country is not competitive. I heard a distinguished gentleman from Michigan say one time: "MURDOCK, I was amazed when I saw what you were producing down there, but what amazed me most was that it was not in competition with anything we grow in Michigan."

I said to the Congressman: "I would like to have you say that on the floor of the House. I have been trying to impress that fact."

Give us water for that land—Arizona's own water out of the Colorado River—and we will not grow cotton. We want to get away from cotton. We will grow crops that will bring in much greater revenue, and thus you will not be both-

ered with Arizona irrigated cotton land in any of these reclamation bills.

I earnestly request that the Members of this House do not permit themselves to be misled by the steady barrage of false and misleading propaganda to which they are being subjected, and I further request that each Member of this House study the record and familiarize himself with all of the above matters. I feel confident that any impartial mind studying this matter will recognize the truth and the soundness of Arizona's position.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this measure to increase cotton-acreage allotments is an improvement over the present law.

But I want to warn the Congress now that you are starting out on a dangerous policy of regimenting the farmers of this country.

You have already virtually made a closed shop of peanut growing. The farmers of your districts as a rule cannot grow peanuts and sell them on the open market, unless they have been growing them for that purpose heretofore. As a result, you note a scarcity of them everywhere.

You have made a closed shop of tobacco growing, in order to raise the price of tobacco, and at the same time you have placed on embargo on exporting tobacco seed. It is a penitentiary offense to ship tobacco seed out of the United States. Here is the law; let me read it to you. It is—

unlawful to export any tobacco seed and/or live tobacco plants from the United States or any Territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof, to any foreign country, port, or place, unless such exportation and/or transportation is in pursuance of a written permit granted by the Secretary of Agriculture. Such permit shall be granted by the Secretary only upon application therefor and after proof satisfactory to him that such seed or plants are to be used for experimental purposes only.

SEC. 2. Any persons violating any of the provisions of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

You do not propose to have those people in foreign countries raise their own tobacco. The program seems to be to ship tobacco to foreign countries and pay for it out of the so-called Marshall plan—the Bevin plan—that is, out of the American taxpayers' pockets.

Now you are starting in to regiment the rest of the American farmers—beginning with the small cotton farmers.

No man in this Congress has worked harder than I have for the small farmers of this country. I do not hesitate to say that no other 10 men in this House have done more to electrify the farm homes of this country than I have—to extend to the farmers the benefits of cheap electricity.

Now Congress has embarked upon a program of regimentation that I fear will drive thousands of them from their fields.

Oh, I know some of you will say that this program has held cotton up. It did not do anything of the kind. It held it down. If cotton had gone to its normal value, as wheat did, in recent years, it would have gone to 75 cents or a dollar a pound.

Not a single one of you who has spoken on this measure has even referred to the currency, to the circulating medium of the United States, to the amount of money in circulation.

Prices, in a free country, are governed by two things: The volume of the Nation's currency multiplied by the velocity of its circulation.

In 1914, when cotton was 11 cents a pound, we had $3,450,000,000 in circulation.

In 1928, when cotton was 20 cents a pound normally—and I know what I am talking about, because I investigated the manipulation on the exchange at that time, and cotton went back up to 20 cents a pound and stabilized there. At that time we had less than $5,000,000,000 in circulation.

On August 31, 1949, we had $27,392,000,000 in circulation or more than five times as much as we had in 1928 when cotton was 20 cents a pound.

If the Government had kept its hands off the supply of cotton and off the cotton market, in my opinion it would have gone to 75 cents or a dollar a pound, at the time when wheat went to $3.75 a bushel and prices of other commodities reached a similar level.

No, you are regimenting the cotton growers, and I fear it will bring ruin to many little cotton farmers.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. For a question only.

Mr. WHITE of California. I should like to say to the gentleman that the public power group——

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, I know what the gentleman is going to say; I will answer that at the proper time. I know the Power Trust does not like my attitude on public power, and on rural electrification.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does the gentleman advocate the abolition entirely of the price-support program?

Mr. RANKIN. My opinion is that the so-called price-support program has had the effect of holding the price of cotton down instead of holding it up.

Human liberty is worth more than a fictitious price for cotton that somebody down in the Department of Agriculture from Pike's Peak proposes to fix.

Remember that this is but the beginning. I see now that they propose to fix the acreage of soybeans.

Then they propose to fix the acreage of wheat.

Now they are proposing to fix the acreage of corn.

Next they will tell you how many cows you can milk, how many eggs you can sell, how many chickens you can sell, how many beef cattle you can raise, how many hogs you can kill, how many potatoes you can raise.

This is one of the most dangerous programs of regimentation that we have ever embarked upon; and I am afraid it will result in doing the farmers more harm than good.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. This will be all right for those who have got some cotton, but where are you if you do not get in? And that is the trouble, there are many people who are not getting enough to earn a living out of this thing.

Mr. RANKIN. I see some of the fellows who have been raising the most sand here for this proposition are fixed all right; their counties have been raising over a hundred thousand bales of cotton.

The greatest thing in America is American freedom, American liberty; and if you let the price of cotton rise to the economic level justified by the circulating medium they will get more out of it in the long run than they will by regimenting them and driving the little farmer out of his field for the benefit of the man who farms by proxy.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. PACE. How, then, does the gentleman account for the fact that in his great State of Mississippi a larger percentage of the farmers voted for this program than in any other State?

Mr. RANKIN. Because they were told that this was the only way they could get a reasonable price. They were misled into it.

I am not in favor of making a closed shop of the peanut-growing industry.

I am not in favor of making a closed shop of the tobacco-growing industry.

I am not in favor of making a closed shop of the cotton-growing industry.

I am not in favor of driving the little man from his farm.

I am not in favor of making a closed shop of the soybean-growing industry.

I am not in favor of making a closed shop of the dairy industry.

I am not in favor of making a closed shop of the chicken-growing, or the egg-growing, or the livestock-growing industry.

In my opinion you are starting out on a program that is going to lead to the place the old British Empire has reached, the very depth of socialistic regimentation.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of California. The gentleman is a lawyer, is he not?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. WHITE of California. Is not the law a closed shop?

Mr. RANKIN. No; you can get in court; I will take the gentleman into court any time he wants to go. All he has to do is to stand an examination to get licenses to practice law.

I call attention to the fact that Fresno County, the home county of the gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE], produced 336,140 bales of cotton last year,

or about 40 times as much as was produced by the average county in the average cotton-growing State.

I am protesting against what I think is a dangerous trend, and I think that when the folks realize what all this means there will be a reaction in this country that will wake the Congress up to a realization of the fact that the American people still believe in constitutional government.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. For 3 or 4 days now we have been working on what I call an un-American freedom bill, and I congratulate the gentleman for calling this a most important thing. This freedom is more valuable than regimentation.

Mr. RANKIN. Human freedom is more valuable than an extra acre of cotton for one man which is taken away from another.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. TACKETT. May I say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I am in accord with his statements. It will not be over 4 or 5 years, once we start on this road, when the farmer will be told exactly how many chickens he can raise, how many eggs he can grow, how many cows he can milk; it will not be long before the farmer's freedom is gone.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. The gentleman made a statement at the beginning of his discussion that there is a penalty for shipping tobacco seed out of the United States. Does the gentleman mean that they penalize a person for sending tobacco seed out of the country?

Mr. RANKIN. They send him to the penitentiary. I have just read you the law.

Mr. REES. Where does the gentleman get that idea?

Mr. RANKIN. Congress passed a law here to that effect.

Mr. REES. When was that?

Mr. RANKIN. In 1940.

Mr. REES. Then it is about time to repeal it.

Mr. RANKIN. That is up to Congress.

Mr. REES. Let us offer a bill to repeal that.

Mr. RANKIN. Any Member can do so.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Regardless of the soundness of the gentleman's views, having gone along with a control program as long as we have, does the gentleman intend to vote for this resolution?

Mr. RANKIN. I said that this resolution is an improvement over the present law.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact there has been a bill introduced by me in the Congress several times to repeal this embargo on tobacco seed because I do not like to see them deceive the good women voters and all those other people.

Mr. RANKIN. I am more interested in protecting the liberties of the American people than I am in tobacco seed.

I am simply pointing out the extreme dangers of embarking upon a program of regimentation that may result in the destruction of that liberty and freedom our people have enjoyed for the last 300 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that this attack on the farm program should go unnoticed. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] seems to overlook the fact that during the war we substantially increased production and expanded our agriculture. Production was geared to the wheels of war, and our farmers did a magnificent job. In fact, the world was amazed by the accomplishments of the American farmer, who with less labor, less machinery, less fertilizer, and less land in production broke all past records. In this transition period from war to peace, all segments of our economy have made major adjustments. We are now trying to provide the machinery which will enable our farmers to reduce production so as to bring production in line with reasonable consumer demand.

I want it clearly understood, and I have said this in every part of my own district—I hate and despise the very thought of regimenting farmers and of controlling American agriculture. I hope for the day when the farmers of our Nation can plant freely in the spring and harvest abundantly in the fall, with the knowledge and satisfaction that the products of their toil may be sold profitably in the market places of the world. I regard crop control only as a necessary expedient; it is not a solution to the problems which are now plaguing American agriculture. A real solution will only be found when we are able to expand our markets either at home or abroad for the products of our fields. At the present moment, however, every intelligent person knows that but for the support program, accompanied by the control program, the farmers of this Nation would today be in bankruptcy. If control of cotton had been defeated on December 15 in the referendum which was held that day, the support price on cotton would have dropped from 90 percent of parity to 50 percent of parity, or $50 a bale. As pointed out here on Friday, and in the course of the debate on this resolution, the Government will soon have on hand from 8,000,000 to 9,000,000 bales of cotton. Had cotton dropped $50 a bale, the Government would stand to suffer a loss of from $400,000,000 to $450,000,000, to say nothing about bankrupting the cotton farmers of the Nation and destroying their purchasing power.

It is easy to cry out about regimentation, but the farmers of my district and State are not alarmed by such cries. The farmers of my district and State like this program, which enables them to control production and enables them to take advantage of the price-support program. On many occasions they have approved control programs with a vote of from 90 to 98 percent. They do not need anyone from Mississippi or from the west coast or from elsewhere to warn them about regimentation. They have common sense enough to know what they are doing, and they know full well that they are not being regimented.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Not at this time.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to read some facts to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman may read them later. These control programs and these support programs mean the difference between prostration and prosperity in the section of the country I come from. They have been approved in one referendum and plebiscite after another, and yet we hear them attacked. Now the newspapers say that this is a raid on the Treasury. That is an infamous charge; it is a false statement. It is not a raid on the Treasury. This is an effort on our part to right a wrong which has been done unwittingly to the cotton farmers of this country. No one in this House ever contemplated that this law would result in such inequities and in such unfair treatment. All of us did the best we could to provide machinery so that the burden would fall evenly and uniformly upon the cotton farmers of the country, and yet we found out when the mechanics were set in operation in the field that injustice was being done here and there and throughout the Cotton Belt.

This is an effort to do justice, and that is the only reason it is here. There is not a man on my committee that is actuated by any desire to increase the acreage of cotton. We have already reduced it by law from 27,000,000 acres to 21,000,000 acres, and even with this amendment nobody would suggest that we will exceed the 21,000,000-acre minimum provided in the law.

When we can provide machinery which will bring about an equitable and a fair reduction, then the farmers of the cotton country are perfectly willing to take the gaff and to reduce production and to keep on reducing production until we can dispose of the surpluses now hanging over the market. We do not even now have a dangerous oversupply of cotton. It is less than we have had on hand in 7 out of the last 10 years. It is far less than we had when we went into World War II, and the Government has not lost one red copper cent on this cotton program, newspapers to the contrary notwithstanding. Today we have a profit in excess of $200,000,000 and a reserve set aside to take care of potential losses which might be involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: On page 1, line 9, strike out "70" and insert "60."

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 10 minutes, with 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. BROOKS. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I am anxious that the very excellent record with respect to cotton under the Agricultural Adjustment Act be maintained. One of the best ways to promote the continuance of that record is to prevent, as far as possible, the accumulation of surpluses in peacetime which cannot be disposed of as readily as they were disposed of in time of war.

The resolution under consideration provides that not less than 70 percent of the acreage, according to its terms, for the 3 years mentioned should be planted to cotton. I offer an amendment to substitute for that 70 percent 60 percent.

The Committee on Agriculture was very fair. The chairman invited all of the Members of Congress from the Cattle Belt to appear before it prior to reporting this bill. I repeat here what I said to the committee, that in view of the past history of the agricultural program, and particularly cotton, in view of the fact that 60 percent, with modifications, obtained under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, it does occur to me that the fundamental purpose of this bill to correct and ameliorate injustices and hardships can be accomplished by continuing the program substantially as it has been administered for some years prior to 1942, when allotments were removed on account of war.

There is no occasion to incur the danger of increasing present and future surpluses by increasing the 60 percent that has heretofore obtained to 70 percent. It is estimated by the Department of Agriculture that this bill will add 1,400,000 acres to the allotments already made. While the bill stipulates that these additional allotments are only for 1950 and shall not be considered in the future determination of allotments, permit me to say that even a temporary allotment once made will plague the Congress and plague the Department in future adjustments of those allotments.

Inasmuch as there is nothing in the debates, and nothing in the report of the committee on this bill, to indicate that 60 percent of the 3 years mentioned will not provide for the hardship cases, I do urge that to protect the long-range view of the cotton program we profit by the experiences of the past and not take a chance further to increase the surpluses that may result in the destruction not only of the cotton program, if surpluses continue to pile up, but all of the programs of other agricultural products.

I therefore urge that this amendment to substitute for the 70 percent the 60 percent that has substantially obtained heretofore be adopted because I believe that if the House adopts it it will provide substantially for the alleviation of all hardship cases that have been brought to the attention of either the Committee on Agriculture or of the House in the debates. Just as surely as 1,400,000 acres will ameliorate the conditions generally, this provision for 60 percent will ameliorate substantially all the hardship cases and will materially reduce the acreage to be added by the preceding bill.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Would the gentleman be willing to make this provision retroactive to the allotments that have already been issued?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would not. Provident farmers, good farmers, are making their preparations and have been making them since the 1st of January 1950 and since the harvesting of the 1949 crops for the allotted crops of 1950. Where cotton is being planted in the Rio Grande Valley, where preparations are under way, throughout the cotton belt, where any good farmer has made his preparations for his crop of 1950, farmers will be further disturbed by this or any other legislation. The cotton program will be injured instead of helped by opening up all the allotments made under the act of 1949. The bill should be limited to hardship cases.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is an important amendment. Last fall before the referendum was held on December 15, I assembled the cotton subcommittee here in Washington in the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of discussing the problems involved and which would be involved in the event the referendum were lost. We explored every possibility within the framework of the law now on the books in an effort to alleviate the suffering and hardships and to prevent inequities.

After two or three different conferences about it, we concluded that it would be necessary to have legislative enactment, so as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture I issued a statement to the effect that when Congress convened I would introduce a resolution substantially in the form of the resolution now under consideration. That was done for the purpose of giving the farmers some assurances that the inequities would be eliminated as far as possible within the 70-percent provision.

I do not know and no one else will ever know to what extent that statement issued by the chairman of your committee influenced the decision of the farmers. But in an effort to keep faith with the farmers I believe the House should stand by and hold up the hands of our committee in bringing this 70-percent provision to the House for consideration. To reduce that 70 percent to 60 percent now would certainly be a breach of faith on my part and on the part of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] and the others who have seriously and conscientiously considered this matter and have assured farmers that something would be done to correct the situation.

I want to call your attention to one other thing. If the farmer's reported acreage had been accepted, a reduction of 29 percent in plantings was taken before we even started to reduce. Then we reduced that 23 percent, so over all the present program calls for a 52-percent reduction below reported acreage. Even under this bill a farmer may be reduced in his plantings 30 percent and under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] 40 percent. We have not asked industry to reduce its output to any such degree. We have not asked labor to cease work and to be idle 40 percent of the time without pay.

How can we in good conscience ask the cotton farmer to take such drastic action as is contemplated by the Whittington amendment?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. FISHER. Will the gentleman indicate what the general reduction is over the Nation in the cotton acreage?

Mr. COOLEY. Twenty-three percent.

Mr. FISHER. And if the 70-percent provision is put in here it would provide a 30-percent reduction and that would still be below the national average.

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. The 23-percent reduction is over the 1949 acreage and this 30-percent reduction is over the 1946–48 average which was far below the 1949 acreage. The reduction here is with respect to the 1949 acreage and is much more than 30 percent.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct. That means hardship for many farmers and it makes the reduction that much more severe.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. Is it not also a matter of fact that under this proposed amendment it will develop that the little man will have his throat cut and the big man will be helped?

Mr. COOLEY. I think it might tend to have that effect. It is an important amendment and especially important in view of the fact that the House Committee on Agriculture, as far as it was within its power to do so, has given the farmers the assurance that the committee would try to provide the 70-percent floor below which their acreage should not be reduced. To reduce it now below 70 percent I think would impose a general hardship. and would actually be cruel. Some people come here and say even under the present law, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], said a moment ago, we are driving the cotton farmers from the fields. You hear that in one breath and now another distinguished gentleman from Mississippi proposes to really drive them from the fields. I think when we call on them to make the reduction that is here contemplated that is about as far as we should go.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to say something in reference to the situation prevailing in my own State. I have heard the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] in reference to the farm program. I can go along to this extent. I believe our farm program is gradually moving into a crisis. I believe that these surpluses are gradually pushing us to the point where we must give thought for some change and perhaps some more drastic remedy, if it can be found to meet the situation which is piling up.

I read last night and this morning of the huge pile of potatoes being purchased by the Department of Agriculture, and of the dilemma of the Department as to whether or not it should color those potatoes blue to make them unpalatable or inedible; whether they should put them out in the frost and let them freeze and become nonedible; whether they should try to use them for cattle feed or for other purposes.

I read with a great deal of concern a statement which I knew to be a fact, that this Department has made every effort to sell those potatoes, even at the price of 1 cent per hundred pounds. Anybody who reads about that situation knows that we are moving into an agricultural crisis in this country. It may be only 1 year, it may be 2 years, or it may be 3 years before it comes, but just as sure as we sit in this Chamber day by day, this country is going to face an agricultural crisis, due to the enormous surpluses being piled up. We must face it either now or farther on down the road.

But, coming specifically to this bill, the thing that concerns me is not section 1, as much as it is section 2. The State of Louisiana, for a small State territorily, is unusual, I think, in reference to the fact that it has a large number of basic crops. For instance, there is sugar, rice, strawberries, sweetpotatoes, and, of course, cotton—all basic crops produced in large quantities in our State.

When this acreage was allotted to the various States and was then reallotted to the parishes in the State of Louisiana, it is my judgment that perhaps too much of the cotton acreage went to areas producing rice or sugar, or perhaps down in the coastal country, which produces muskrat furs, and industries of that sort, where it is not needed, and to little of it went into the cotton-producing areas of both south and north Louisiana, where it is needed. As a result, our cotton farmers are in trouble. Too many of them are being drastically reduced. But section 2, which covers the unused acreage, should give us some relief. It should allow us to take acreage from the noncotton production section of the State which produces rice and sugar and move that acreage over to the cotton-producing sections and give our people the relief which we need so badly.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. I agree with the point of view which the gentleman is expressing; but if he thinks section 2 does that, he had better study it again and read the report on it.

Mr. BROOKS. That is exactly what we need. We need an unfreezing of the frozen, unused allotments. This section should be amended so as to permit this to be done.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of California. As long as the gentleman gets the relief, he does not care from what source it comes, does he?

Mr. BROOKS. We want it from this particular bill, however, because we are in trouble.

Mr. WHITE of California. Under this bill, he would get relief under the 70-percent provision; but if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] prevails, it will be cut down by 10 percent.

Mr. BROOKS. I think I understand the gentleman's amendment, and I thank the gentleman very much for his observation in that respect.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Whatever may be said of the amendment, it will certainly reduce the surplus that the gentleman has mentioned, without doing an injustice to anybody.

Mr. HARRIS. Could the gentleman advise us how much it would reduce the surplus?

Mr. BROOKS. We are face to face with a critical situation. We have already authorized the allocation of the acreage, and we have passed the law which is inequitable. We have to get ourselves out of the hole we dug. This bill is the only means whereby we can do it at the present time. It will help to some extent. It is not perfect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may again be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, all of us close to the American farmer are sympathetic with the problems he is now facing in trying to regear his operations to a safe, peacetime basis. Under present circumstances, the farmer looks to Congress for help in doing this job. But as long as we continue to bypass the real problems the farmer is facing—as we are today in this discussion of the so-called injustice and inequities resulting from the cotton legislation enacted last fall—we are neglecting our responsibility to the American farmer and all of our people.

By itself, the acreage allotment is only a temporary remedy. Control always breeds trouble. When Congress provides no other measures to help farmers maintain their income, allotments only force farmers, first, to use more and more modern agricultural technology to increase yields on the allotted acreage; and, second, to plant larger acreages of crops not under allotment. The result is still surplus. The structure of the crop price-support program is not indestructible. As important as the crop price-support program is to the American farmer and to our whole economy, Congress should not lay the groundwork for its destruction by continually failing to recognize the root of evil of today's agricultural problems.

We can help the farmer permanently if we recognize the basic problems in agriculture and stop bypassing them. We can help the farmer maintain a high income without loading the Nation with crops the consumer does not want, and without huge expenditures by the Federal Government to purchase surplus crops in its price-support program. In addition, the help Congress can provide will enable farmers to speed up their soil and water conservation programs and cut out the waste of our precious topsoil, waste which is not only destroying the productive capacity of agriculture but which is contributing to flood damage, reservoir and water supply destruction, and a lower standard of living for all of our people.

This can be done cheaply, comparatively speaking, and easily—but only if we begin at the source of our trouble, with Mother Earth herself. Nature laid down certain laws for land use which we cannot ignore if we want our agriculture to remain productive. Present surpluses result from our ignoring these laws of nature. If all of our cropland were used in accordance with minimum soil- and water-conserving rotations, we would have at least 43,500,000 acres less of row crops, such as cotton, in the crop year of 1950. Minimum soil-conserving rotations and good land use would have put more of our cropland in grass, meadow, hay land, and woodland. Forage would have been produced for the production of livestock—more beef for the Nation's dinner table, instead of surplus crops.

Mr. Chairman, the No. 1 need of the Nation's farmer today is help to gear his production to meet all of the food and fiber needs of our people and at the same time help him to conserve his soil and water resources. This need can and must be met. Congress can help do its part by directing that $100,000,000 of the nearly $300,000,000 now being allot-

ed to farmers annually for conservation practices be used to help them regear their production to peacetime needs in addition to a $100,000,000 annual appropriation for that purpose.

H. R. 2368, the Soil Conservation Act of 1949, which I introduced last year, provides the guidance and legislative framework to provide assistance to farmers to help them correct the problems of surplus in certain crops. Land use conversion payments are provided which will encourage farmers to use more of their land now contributing to surplus for the production of crops for which there is greater demand.

By using $200,000,000 annually for land-use conversion payments, as provided in H. R. 2368 over 47,000,000 additional acres of land could be converted from soil-depleting crops to soil-conserving crops in the next 6 years. This would take a great part of the surplus pressure off of our crop price-support program.

Specifically, H. R. 2368 would use appropriated funds for conservation payments for three types of payments to farmers to encourage proper land use, land-use conversion, and conservation of our agricultural resources.

Class A payments are provided to avoid surpluses from overuse of the land. Payments would be made to assist farmers convert the use of their land that has been for the previous two or more years in grain, row, and other soil-depleting crops.

Class B payments would be made to help farmers defray the cost of applying certain permanent or semipermanent soil- and water-conservation measures. Generally, these class B payments would be made only once.

Class C payments would be made annually as an added incentive to encourage farmers to hold their topsoil through proper land use, and other recurring soil- and water-conservation practices.

There are other important segments to H. R. 2368 which time does not permit me to mention. The most important thing is, however, that the provisions of this bill do offer a solution to our present agricultural problems. Many Congressmen, organizations, and individuals agree with its purpose and contents. Many members of the House Agricultural Committee favor H. R. 2368.

The provisions of this bill would erase the problems encountered in the cotton legislation now in question. The corn and wheat surplus is also facing us. Corn farmers are now being asked to reduce corn acres by 20 percent.

And most basic of all, more of our soil and water resources would be held on the land where they can serve our people best.

I therefore urge that before Congress attempts to patch up this cotton legislation, it first deal with helping farmers convert the use of their land and apply effective soil- and water-conservation measures, both of which are in the first order of things to help farmers regear their operations to a peacetime basis.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. We are told that within the next few years we shall have to retire about 30,000,000 acres of land from the growing of crops that are now being produced. Does the gentleman have any idea as to what use we can make of those lands when they are retired from the production of crops now being grown?

Mr. JENSEN. Certainly. The gentleman knows that we have a shortage of grass lands; we have a shortage of hay land. Every farm in America should have 2 or 3 acres of woodland.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman means that these retired acres should go into dairy- or beef-cattle production.

Mr. JENSEN. That would be very fine, yes; because we have an undersupply. The oleo bill, of course, did not help this situation at all; it just hurt it in every respect.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Any part of the acreage allotted to individual farms in any county for 1950 under the provisions of section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which will not be planted to cotton and which is voluntarily surrendered by the owner or operator of the farm to the county committee shall be deducted from the allotments to such farms and shall be apportioned, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, to other farms in the same county receiving allotments to the extent necessary to provide for such farms the allotments authorized by section 1 of this act. If any acreage remains after providing such allotments, it may be apportioned in amounts determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable to other farms in the same county receiving allotments which the Secretary determines are inadequate. In any subsequent year, unless hereafter provided by law, acreage surrendered under this section and reallocated pursuant to applications and certifications filed in accordance with the provisions of section 1 shall be credited to the State and county.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask for the record, in order that we may understand just how this section will work in its application, the following question, and I should like to ask the chairman of the committee about a particular situation which, of course, would be applicable to all other cases. We have a farmer who has a 3-year average planting of 400 acres. He has total cropland of about 880 acres. He is in a low-factor county and received an allocation because of being in a low-factor county of 101 acres, which was 11.5 percent of his total cropland. In the adjustment out of the reserve the county committee allotted to him 66 acres in addition to his 101 acres which gives him at the present time an allocation of 167 acres. Under this resolution, he would be entitled to 70 percent of his planting in 1946, 1947, and 1948, which would be an average of 400 acres, resulting in 280 acres. That would be within the 40-percent provision of the total cropland. This man, incidentally, has 16 families on his farm and if he does not get some relief many of the families are going to have to move. They will join many other fine people, perhaps, and have to move to the city where many will finally wind up on the dole or relief rolls. You talk about helping the little man. Here is a case that is actually before the committee now.

What would be the actual working, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, of the 66 additional acres that were given to him in his adjustment?

Mr. COOLEY. I thought that in the illustration used he had already been given the 66 acres.

Mr. HARRIS. Had he not been given the 66 acres he would still have been entitled to the 280 acres under this resolution, which would be 70 percent of his average 3-year planting. Will the 66 acres be taken into consideration of the 280 acres that he will get under this resolution?

Mr. COOLEY. It will be taken into consideration.

Mr. HARRIS. In other words, the county committee will not reclaim that 66 acres in order to further correct inequities with other farmers in the country?

Mr. COOLEY. This resolution does not contemplate taking away any acreage which has heretofore been allotted, but the committee will take into consideration the adjustment which has already been made, which has tended to bring him up to his 70 percent, and if it has not brought him to 70, then it will give him acreage up to 70 percent.

Mr. HARRIS. In other words, the 66 acres was taken out of the county reserve to help correct the gross inequity done to this man.

Mr. COOLEY. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. The county committee will not get that 66 acres back to further correct existing inequities?

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman realizes that we cannot unscramble that egg. We would be here until Christmas making allotments if we tried to unscramble that egg.

Mr. HARRIS. I am not trying to unscramble the egg. I am trying to know what happens to the reserve and the maladjustment claimed by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. PACE. If the gentleman will let things stay where they are, to those that do not now have 70 percent we will give it to them. Period.

Mr. HARRIS. I am merely trying to clear up the matter so that the farmers will know where they stand when this resolution, if it is finally adopted, passes.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman has it cleared up, and I think his understanding is correct. No allotment will be recalled.

Mr. HARRIS. I did want that cleared up so that we will know what the situation is.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I do so for the purpose of getting a little information on section 2 of the bill, if I may have the attention of the chairman.

As I understand, section 2 provides that after an allotment of acreage is made to a cotton farmer, and he does not use all of his allotment, it can be

used by other farmers in the county through the operation of the county committee, if it is surrendered voluntarily to the county committee; is that correct?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Now, assuming that the farmer who has been planting 200 acres of cotton only received an allotment of 100 acres, and decided to plant 60 acres, that would leave 40 acres that he may turn over to the county committee. As I understand section 2, as it is written, if he does that, then the 40 acres that he surrendered he will lose altogether in future calculations.

Mr. COOLEY. That is correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I wanted to get that clear.

Mr. COOLEY. He will lose it, but if it is reallocated to another farmer who certifies that he intends to plant it, then the county does not lose it and it is considered in future calculations in determining the county allotment, but not the individual farmer.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. But the farmer himself loses that if he surrenders it voluntarily.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Suppose he does not use it and refuses to surrender it voluntarily, then he maintains his acreage allotment for next year?

Mr. COOLEY. He still does not have a vested interest in it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, as I understand, there has to be a voluntary surrender. What happens if he does not use the acreage allocation but refuses to surrender it?

Mr. COOLEY. It will remain as part of the history of his farm.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Exactly.

Mr. COOLEY. If he does not plant it, it is lost, anyway, unless he plants once in every 3 years. He can do that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. But he will not still have it for his 1951 crop.

Mr. COOLEY. No.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I do not know that the use of the word "loses" is entirely correct, because he does not lose anything if he planted cotton in one of the last 3 years. You do not have to plant cotton but once every 3 years.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I understand.

Mr. PACE. However, if he surrenders this acreage, it does not cost him a thing in the world, unless 1950 is the third year. But if he planted cotton in 1948, he can surrender this acreage, and it does not cost him, and he does not lose one inch. The only thing that would happen is that his county would lose that much history, because the cotton allocation is made on a percent of cropland.

The section here states:

In any subsequent year, unless hereafter provided by law, acreage surrendered under this section and reallocated pursuant to applications and certifications filed in accordance with the provisions of section 1 shall be credited to the State and county.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And taken away from the man who has voluntarily surrendered it.

Mr. PACE. It does not say the latter part; it says that the county and the State shall maintain the history of the acreage that is planted after being reallocated.

Mr. ALBERT. Is not this the situation: If the man does not intend to plant it, whether he surrenders it or whether he keeps it he loses that year's history. But, if he surrenders it, his county maintains that history. Is not that the situation? If he does not plant it, he loses his 1950 history.

Mr. PACE. The only time the farm history is significant is that he cannot ever get a greater allotment than he has been planting in cotton. He can plant 1 acre and maintain himself as a cotton grower, but that 1 acre would be all he would get if he did that for 3 years. But if he plants his entire allotment in 1 year, then he gets his percent of the cropland as everybody else does.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not think there will be any land surrendered, for the 1950 crop will be the most profitable crop that can be produced.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I would like some comment on this. If he surrenders 10 acres this year, 1950, and goes back to his county committee in 1951, assuming that the national acreage and the county acreage do not change in 1951, would he be privileged to get 10 acres in 1951?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman from Georgia has stated that he would be entitled to receive it.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I would like to have that answered specifically.

Mr. ABERNETHY. He would if he planted in either 1947 or 1948.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I hope every cotton farmer will now understand the situation.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 363 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, any farmer who is dissatisfied with his farm-acreage allotment for the 1950 cotton crop may, within 15 days after mailing to him of notice as provided in section 362 of that act, or within 15 days after the effective date of this resolution, whichever date is later, have such allotment reviewed in accordance with the provisions of said act.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: On page 3, following line 22, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 3A. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any farmer who shows to the satisfaction of the Secretary that he has been directly engaged in the growing of cotton as his principal means of support during the years 1946, 1947, 1948 as a renter, either as a cash tenant, share tenant, or sharecropper, and that through no fault of his own the land which he has been farming is no longer available to him for farming purposes shall, if he obtains other farm land to rent or farm for which no 1950-cotton allotment has been established, be eligible to receive for such land a cotton allotment in 1950. Such allotment shall be established on the same basis as allotments are established for other farms in the county on which cotton was not planted in 1946, 1947, or 1948, except that the acreage required to provide the allotments authorized under this section shall be in addition to the county, State, and National acreage allotments proclaimed by the Secretary of Agriculture for the 1950 crop of cotton and the production from such acreage shall be in addition to the national marketing quota for such crops."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the members of this committee are splendid gentlemen. They are able and have worked hard on this farm program. Notwithstanding that effort, the bill we passed we now find contains certain inequities insofar as the landowner is concerned. The resolution before you today is an attempt to correct those inequities insofar as the landowner is concerned. These changes are needed. The legislative committee gave me the opportunity of appearing before them in support of these changes. However, this resolution still makes no provision for the farmer who does not own cotton land or farm land. If the man has made his living all his life as a renter or a sharecropper, and if he is put off the land which he has been renting or sharecropping due to the fact that his landlord has had his acreage reduced, he is being put on the streets and the public highways; he is put on relief when there is no relief; he is put on social security when he is not covered by social security. I say to you in my little town there are people now who have worked all their lives growing cotton for a living. They know no other trade. They are dependent upon their ability to rent land with a cotton allotment. And because a man who owns the land does not have enough of an allotment for the tenants that he has retained, those people are deprived of a means of making a living, the means that they have followed all their lives, and they are being deprived of it by an act of Congress.

I have conferred with the Committee on Agriculture with regard to this deplorable state of affairs. They are here today trying to further relieve the problems of the landowner, and I am strong for the passage of this resolution. I have heard them come down to the well of the House and unintentionally refer to the fact that they are taking care of every cotton farmer. They are not. They are taking care of every landowner who farms cotton. I say that any bill or any Federal law which says to an American citizen, "Although you have farmed cotton all your life, and although you do not know how to do anything else for a living, today, because you cannot rent land or get land to work as a sharecropper; because you cannot do those things, you cannot plant a stalk of cotton in 1950."

The gentlemen on this committee are going to point out that if this amendment is adopted it will be hard to work out. That is true. I have no pride of authorship. I went to the committee and had the clerks work out this amendment in an effort to keep those things at a minimum. If this amendment is adopted, I say to the committee here and now that when it goes to the other body or when it is in conference, if it can be improved to try to bring about what I am seeking, then I welcome those additions.

But I say to you to the Members of the House, whether or not you are from cotton areas to investigate whether you should not adopt this amendment before you deprive many of our citizens of a right to make any kind of living. It is tough to reduce cotton acreage to the landowner. I know it is tough. The cotton farmers are going to try as much as they can to retain the tenants who have lived on their farms. But if the man has 30 tenants or 30 sharecroppers and by law we cut down his acreage and he reduces his renters to 25, what are the other 5 going to do? They cannot go to another landowner and get land to farm cotton. No, they cannot do that because he has had his acreage cut and he is having trouble taking care of the tenants he has.

Oh, we talk about FEPC and we talk about the Federal Government taking away the rights of the individual by saying who can work and who cannot. Is it not worse to say by Federal law that those who have been so unfortunate as not to have owned cotton land and who have worked at cotton growing all their lives as renters or sharecroppers shall not have the right to follow the livelihood that they have followed all their lives on even a reduced basis?

My amendment provides that any renter or sharecropper who has farmed cotton for the base period and who is forced off the land he has been renting and who cannot rent other land with a cotton allotment, may have land he does rent classified as a new farm and have not less than 5 acres of cotton.

The members of the legislative committee say this would be hard to work out. We must work it out for it is not right by Federal law to deprive our citizens of the right to follow the only work they know. This amendment does not tie the cotton acreage to the man rather than the land—but unless we recognize this inequity and do something about it such fact could lead to losing the whole program.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that while I was having lunch downstairs with Dr. Montgomery, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] took me to task on the figures I gave yesterday as to the cost of building that big dam in the Colorado River, $1,250,000,000, and the land that they would be able to irrigate to raise more cotton would cost $1,600 an acre, and after you got it you would only have land that was worth $200 an acre.

The gentleman from Arizona will find out that those figures are not very far off, when you come to take proper recognition of that legislation, if it ever comes to the floor. I hope it never passes this Congress.

I am very much interested in a news article from Springfield, Mo.:

NOT "HARMLESS SCREWBALLS," RESPONSIBLE OFFICERS THREATEN UNITED STATES SYSTEM, SAYS COTTON CHIEF

(By William J. Fox)

MEMPHIS, TENN., January 23.—It's not "harmless screwballs" but responsible officials who threaten America's free enterprise, the president of National Cotton Council said today.

Harold A. Young, of North Little Rock, Ark., told some 1,000 cotton men at the council's twelfth annual meeting here that officials conference rooms and congressional rostrums have replaced the soap box.

"The danger is no longer a matter of foreign political idealism, soap-box oratory, or amusing and harmless screwballs," he said.

"Ideas, plans, and programs once associated only with wild-eyed radicals on street corners have become serious proposals, aggressively pushed by groups and individuals who occupy positions of prestige and influence," he said.

"They are being introduced in our National Congress in the form of specific legislative proposals inspired and actively supported by high administrative officials."

Young said the cotton council must adopt as its goal better understanding between agriculture and industry "in their survival against the inroads of soft socialism and big government."

"Never has a cotton industry problem been more urgent," he said. "If today's trend is allowed to continue unchecked we undoubtedly shall awake one day to find ourselves existing in a socialistic state."

Young said the cotton industry needs mainly private initiative and customers with money.

"Given such conditions throughout the past," he said, "America has outproduced, outsold, and outconsumed every other nation on earth."

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert this article and two others in my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to secure that permission in the House.

Mr. RICH. Very well. I will put them in later if I can get that permission.

Then I want to call attention to this vast potato destruction that is under study. If you will read that article in the Washington Post this morning, how this administration is trying to figure out some way to destroy the potato crop, and then you see what the Department of Agriculture is doing, the man who wrote this article about the screwballs has something to consider. You Members of Congress have something to consider when you are talking about these subsidies and the way you are trying to handle the surpluses by paying the farmers to raise more potatoes, then figuring out how you are going to destroy them. Now you are trying to figure out how you are going to pay the farmers more money for not raising cotton. I wonder if your heads do not swirl around. I wonder what kind of gray matter is in the heads.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of California. Does the gentleman realize that the potato program which he is making so much noise about is one which was adopted by the Eighteith Congress?

Mr. RICH. Oh, you would like to say something about the Eightieth Congress. If you had not had that Eightieth Congress you would have been sunk long ago. You fellows who are trying to laud some of these other Congresses get up and laugh about that Eightieth Congress. That Congress has saved this country for a couple of years longer, but if you go on with the program you are trying to initiate, you are going into socialism, and nothing under God's heaven will stop you. You are on the socialistic road and the road to bankruptcy.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. You mentioned the fact that there is a move on foot to destroy potatoes. I think the gentleman would be very interested, and I think the membership of this committee would be very interested to know that probably not more than 2 percent of the potato producers received all of that money that you heard about.

Mr. RICH. Well, who got the money?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Only 2 percent of it.

Mr. RICH. Who got the money?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Two percent of the potato producers.

Mr. RICH. Who got the money? Your Government has lost it. You are squandering so much that you do not even know where it is going. Now, you had better wake up and get your eyes open, because you will be wrecked pretty soon if you do not.

[From the Washington Post of January 31, 1950]

VAST POTATO DESTRUCTION UNDER STUDY

(By John W. Ball)

The Department of Agriculture is considering engaging in the greatest deliberate wholesale destruction of food in history in the next few weeks.

The Commodity Credit Corporation, food-buying agency for the Government's farm price support programs, has to buy and get rid of around 50,000,000 bushels of late potatoes within that time.

It has tried several methods to dispose of them. It has offered them free to the national school-lunch program, which has taken all it can use; to Federal, State, and local public and charitable institutions, to local charities, and to the Indian Bureau, without success. It also has offered unlimited amounts to charities sending food to hungry areas abroad. It has offered to sell the potatoes at 1 cent a hundred pounds for export by commercial exporters—sacked in bags that alone cost 12 to 15 cents apiece.

ALTERNATIVES LISTED

The only alternative to destroying the spuds is to convert them to commercial alcohol, starch, cattle feed, or potato flour. This would cost an additional sum for shipping them to the plants for conversion.

Methods of destruction considered are soaking them with oil and burning them, soaking them with chemicals and coloring matter to make them unfit for human consumption, or dumping them where they will freeze and rot and later plowing them underground.

The farm law of 1949—sometimes called the Anderson Act for its author, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, former Secretary of Agriculture, directs CCC to support the price of potatoes at 60 percent of parity.

HAS SPENT $30,000,000

This means about $2.10 per 100 pounds, or roughly about $1.25 a bushel.

CCC already has spent about $30,000,000 on the 1949 crop. It still has to buy forty-five to fifty million bushels—about half in one county, Aroostook County, Maine.

Those already bought have been disposed of as follows:

About 1,800,000 bags (100 pounds) or 3,000,000 bushels, to direct distribution. This includes free disposal to the national school lunch, Government and charitable institutions.

About 8,200,000 bags or 13,600,000 bushels, sold at 1 cent per 100 pounds for livestock feed. In many cases the Government paid freight charges on this amounting to many times the total price it got.

About 2,000,000 bags to starch, glucose, and potato flour mills—also with freight subsidized by the Government.

Before it gets through CCC expects to lose between ninety-five and one hundred million dollars on the 1949 potato crop. This amounts to about $275,000 a day for each day of 1949—or $8,200,000 a month.

(This is about 50 percent more than the $62,000,000 cost of the entire legislative branch of the Government in 1949. It is about the same as the annual cost of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.)

Even at this terrific cost it is less than half the cost of a year ago. In the crop year ending last June it cost the taxpayers more than $225,000,000 to keep the domestic price of potatoes high. One result of the high prices was a reduced consumption. The per capita use of potatoes last year dropped to only 106 pounds—the lowest in history, and about 15 percent below recent years.

Last year millions of bushels of potatoes were converted to commercial alcohol and potato flour. Part of this was delivered to the armed services for use in occupied areas.

In carrying out the price-support program CCC is obeying definite orders of Congress. Up until a few weeks ago CCC estimated the potato program would cost around $60,000,000. However, the production of late potatoes was far greater than earlier estimates.

CCC agrees to take over the surplus potatoes whenever the growers are ready to deliver—limited only by its means of disposing of them. Recently, particularly in Maine, growers have offered delivery.

Their supplies had been held in the hope that they could get more than the Government guarantee on the open market. The greater production than expected, however, held prices down to about the price-support level.

Recently some of the potatoes are reportedly showing signs of deteriorating in farm storage. This has forced many farmers to offer them to CCC.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has expired.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. It has been very thoroughly explained by the very able members of the Committee on Agriculture, but I should like to point out to my fellow Members of the House how this legislation will remedy some of the inequities of the administration of the present law in my own district. The counties in my district are largely cotton and peanut growing sections and this bill is aimed directly at the evils in the present administration. For instance, there has been much demand made upon me that the present law is wrong in that it forbids the transfer of frozen acres. I mean by that, allotted-cotton acreage under the present law be released back to the county committee for reallocation. A number of my farmers have complained about such restriction and I am especially pleased that the committee has included such a corrective provision as is provided in section 2 of this bill.

We all realize that Congress did not intend to reduce cotton allotments more than 30 percent when it passed the bill last year. Yet I found to my sorrow that some farmers in my district had been reduced as much as 92 percent and most of them more than 50 percent. This slash in their acreage will cause them to be unable not only to pay their taxes on their farms but they simply will not be able, unless this bill is passed, to put shoes on their children's feet, and real poverty will once again exist in this section of our Nation.

I could speak at great length on this bill, pointing out its advantages. The members of the committee have very clearly described it and I believe that it is clear to us all that the purpose of this legislation is to give some relief to the farmers who need it the most. I do not say that we have entirely cured all the evils under the present administration, for surely under such large and extensive program some people will get hurt. It is inevitable. But I do believe that this is a step in the right direction and should be passed and I urge my fellow Members to join with those of us who are sponsoring this legislation and secure its early enactment.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a question in the minds of many Members of the House what position the Department of Agriculture has taken on this measure. That opinion was inserted in the RECORD on yesterday, I believe, by the chairman of the committee; but for the information of those who might not have read it and do not know the position of the Department, I should like to read a paragraph from a letter dated January 26, 1950, addressed to the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture from the Department of Agriculture. The second paragraph, which is the gist of the entire four-page letter, reads as follows:

On the basis that the reported resolution is an emergency measure for 1 year designed to authorize the correction of certain gross inequities which have resulted from the application of the provisions of Public Laws 272 and 439, Eighty-first Congress, the Department is in favor of its enactment. However, the Department's recommendation is based on an understanding that you intend to reconsider Public Law 272 with the object in mind of rewriting the cotton acreage allotment provision of that law in a manner which will not require similar emergency measures in the future. The history of emergency amendments for correcting inequitable cotton acreage allotments is that the additional acreage allotted is always over and above the amounts considered necessary for proper adjustments of supplies to demand.

As I say, the Department endorses this bill in its present form as emergency legislation. If it is materially amended, I do not know what position the Department might take. Which brings up the question of the amendment offered by the very able and distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. I cannot say that I disagree with the objective of his amendment, but I should like to know in the first place about how many more acres will be required if his amendment should be adopted.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. In answer may I ask the gentleman this: Would the gentleman need to know how many acres it would add to the total acreage before he would vote to deprive a man who had farmed cotton all his life, had nothing else he could do, deprive him of an opportunity to plant any cotton? Would the gentleman need to know how much acreage would be added?

Mr. WORLEY. I would certainly like to know.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am disappointed in the gentleman. I take it from his answer that he means that he would vote to deprive a large segment of the people of the United States in my area of a right to make a living in the only way they know how to make a living unless he knew how much cotton that would be.

Mr. WORLEY. As I said, I think I agree with the objectives of the gentleman's amendment; but the gentleman knows, as a matter of fact, that as responsible officials we are supposed to know what we are doing when we enact legislation.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right, but may I ask the gentleman——

Mr. WORLEY. If the gentleman will let me proceed, the point I am trying to make is how much study the gentleman has devoted to this proposition. Let me ask the gentleman this: What is a tenant? Is a tenant or share cropper a man who farms 1 acre, 10,000 acres, or how many acres?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not mean to reflect on the gentleman in the least—and it is a matter of judgment—but I would say that I have devoted fully as much time to working on agricultural problems since I have been in Congress as has the gentleman, if not more.

Mr. WORLEY. I would say the gentleman has devoted more time, and has done an excellent job as chairman of the Appropriation Subcommittee on Agriculture.

Mr. WHITTEN. And I may say further that there is no politics in this, for the folks who are tenant farmers and share croppers and renters do not even vote—that is, most of them do not; and the landowners in many cases are not interested in this type of legislation. But I do not want to walk down the streets of my town and see Tom Jones, Will Brown, or John Smith who has not got a decent home because of a law that we passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Mississippi this question: If his amendment is adopted what will prevent a landowner from moving more tenants off of the farm in addition to those who are admittedly displaced at the present time? Would this not be an opportunity, a golden opportunity I may say, for a landowner to remove even more tenants and thereby get more acreage for himself? I will be glad to cooperate with my friend in trying to work out a satisfactory solution for this group in the permanent cotton allotment bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. The bill now before us is in charge of the Committee on Agriculture. I started off by saying this amendment would make the bill hard to administer, I still insist that is true, but this bill is under the control of the gentlemen's committee and I dare say they can write around it such restrictions to prevent conniving between landlord and tenant to prevent what the gentleman points out. Let me say if the landlords keep all of the tenants that they have on their land, this amendment will not add 1 acre to the national total. It is only when the landlord puts them off that we give that tenant 5 acres of cotton, which might make 5 bales of cotton that might bring $750, which might give that tenant $370 on which to live for a whole year. That is precious little, and certainly you do not want to deprive him of that.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Has the gentleman tried to ascertain from the gentleman from Mississippi what acreage would be added to the cotton program in the event the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi prevails?

Mr. WHITTEN. I say again that if the landlords keep on their farms the tenants they now have or an equal number it will not add 1 acre.

Mr. COOLEY. How much would the gentleman reduce the production of cotton if he is going to keep everybody growing cotton as they are now?

Mr. WHITTEN. I realize we have to have some controls if we are to continue this program, but if we cannot have those two without putting on the public road a big segment of the population in a given area, we will have to find some other way to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, of course we would all like to see everybody keep their job. We would like to see all tenants cared for and given a chance to prosper. But this is a cotton-reduction program which 90 percent of the farmers voted in favor of. It is not what the House of Representatives did but what the cotton-producing farmers voted for themselves.

If this amendment were to prevail I would like to know what would prevent two landowners from swapping tenants and whether or not when the sharecropper or tenant moved over to the other friendly landlord he would bring additional acres in cotton quotas with him? Why, you would have the landowners bidding for tenants who had been given large quotas to come onto their place. Certain tenants would be carrying large cotton allotments in their pockets, which they could sell or deliver to any landlord.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I wonder if the author of the amendment would be willing to answer the gentleman's question. It is a very pertinent one.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes so that I may answer some of these questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am sorry to have to ask the gentleman to repeat his question.

Mr. SUTTON. What would prevent two landowners from trading tenants and what could prevent the tenants from bargaining their allotments? What would happen in that event?

Mr. WHITTEN. I pointed out a moment ago that this bill is in the control of the House Committee on Agriculture. Consideration is not yet completed. It is open to amendment. I am sure that in the event this amendment is adopted the gentleman and his committee will devote their attention to preventing such a thing as the gentleman pictures happening. All you have to do is to provide penalties, that they will lose their cotton acreage, or that they shall do certain other things.

Mr. SUTTON. Let me answer the gentleman's question.

We have carefully considered this cotton bill. We wrote it in the Committee on Agriculture. We have had under consideration this very amendment in the Committee on Agriculture. It was proposed to give an allotment to tobacco and wheat and all other commodities, and we found that a program of allotments on commodities produced, would be most inequitable to the landowners in America. We found that the only equitable way we can make allotments is to base them on the land. The Department of Agriculture, and the Members of the House of Representatives who testified before our committee, realize that that is the equitable way. You cannot let a man go around on the streets with an allotment in his pocket, because you would have all of the farmers bidding for him to farm their land, and that is exactly what we are trying to prohibit. The gentleman from Mississippi has studied this legislation and he knows he has the situation down in Mississippi of the tenant farmers and we are in sympathy with him, but at the same time we do not want to see inequities all over the country because of certain isolated cases.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to emphasize the point that the gentleman has just made, that the amendment now before the House is incompatible with the philosophy of these programs because, as the gentleman has just suggested, when these programs were written years ago consideration was given to the very proposition which has now been proposed, and it was deemed then that it was not feasible, and the allotments are now made to the farm and not to the farmer.

Mr. SUTTON. As it should be.

Mr. COOLEY. And he comes at this late date, because of a peculiar situation in Mississippi, and undertakes to change the basic philosophy of the whole program. I would like to say to the gentleman that this amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi would wreck this cotton program, and you might as well throw it out of the window.

Mr. SUTTON. You might as well discard the entire farm program relating to cotton, tobacco, and all other crops.

Mr. COOLEY. It would end the cotton program, there is no doubt about that. It would result in an unlimited supply of cotton, as he contemplated.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I asked for these additional 5 minutes in order that I might explain section 3. It was my amendment that was put in the resolution in the Committee on Agriculture. I offered the amendment because of hardship cases and because of the discrepancies in the BAE figures. I would like to make a statement for the RECORD to show the intent of the author of the amendment and the intent of the Committee on Agriculture so that there will be no misunderstanding by the Department of Agriculture when the Solicitor General interprets the bill. The purpose of section 3 of this bill is, in case any farmer thinks that the BAE figures, or figures that have been given to him by the county committee, are not correct, he will have 15 days after the resolution has been passed, or 15 days after notice has been sent out, to go to the county committee and present his claim that his allotment is wrong. Then after that he has the privilege of going to this reviewing committee, and if he has the proof that he is entitled to more acres than they have given him, then it is the intention of the author of this amendment and of the Committee on Agriculture that the Solicitor General of the Department of Agriculture will so interpret that this reviewing committee must mandatorily give to this farmer that to which he is rightfully entitled. It is not the intention of the author of the amendment, nor the Committee on Agriculture, that the county committee should have to refer to the State committee before the reviewing committee can give the relief due. I hope that the

intention of the author and the committee will be carried out by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Does not the gentleman admit that under the bill as it was passed before, and as it will be amended in the event the present resolution is adopted, that there will be many farmers who have farmed cotton all their lives, but who do not have the fortune of owning land, who will not have any way in the world of planting cotton?

Mr. SUTTON. To my personal knowledge, I do not know of anybody like that.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, is it not the purpose of this resolution to provide additional acreage not only to those who own and operate the land, but to those landlords who operate their lands by tenants?

Mr. SUTTON. That is definite.

Until we establish as a base 70 percent of what was planted on the average in 1946, 1947, and 1948, landowners are going to suffer the great hardships the gentleman has in mind.

There was a case cited on the floor yesterday by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE]. A lady stated she wanted only 125 acres and she would get 140. She could keep all of her tenants if she could get only 125. I think the gentleman from Mississippi will admit the same thing will apply to Mississippi as has applied to North Carolina.

I trust this amendment is defeated, because we have studied long this problem of giving the allotment to the man and letting him put it in his pocket, and we have decided it is not feasible and will not work. We hope this resolution as it now stands will be adopted by this Congress and by the other body, and that it will go out to alleviate the inequities that now exist.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on pending amendment close in 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, of course I am supporting the amendment offered by my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

You are not controlling cotton acreage in Brazil. Did you know that Brazil can grow more cotton than the United States?

You are not controlling cotton acreage in Argentina. Argentina can grow more cotton than all our Southern States.

You are not controlling the cotton acreage in Mexico, or Guatemala, or Bolivia, or Paraguay, or Chile, or any other of the South or Central American countries.

You are just kidding yourselves. You remind me of the man in Gulliver's Travels who spent his life, almost, trying to learn to extract sunbeams from cucumbers.

In 1920 the rest of the world outside of the United States grew only 8,000,000 bales of cotton. In 1947 they grew 15,000,000 bales.

When you started this regimentation back in 1933 you started a boom in the production of cotton abroad, and that is what you are doing now.

Let me get back to the little cotton farmer. You do not hear any row between the landlord and the tenant where I come from. The majority of the tenants in my county and the counties around me, especially the counties to the east and north of me, are white people. As a rule they are related to the landholder. Many of those little fellows will be driven from the fields unless this amendment is adopted.

The Negro tenants, many of them, will also be driven from the field. Of course, they can go to St. Louis, Detroit, Chicago, New York, or Philadelphia, and probably have a good time; I do not know. But I do know you are driving them from the cotton fields of the South.

We had a war a few years ago. Do you know who sent the largest percentage of their sons to that war of anybody in America? The white cotton farmers of the South. You levied a quota based on population. You took the white boys to do the fighting. You did not allow these little cotton farmers any exemption whatsoever, but you stripped the cotton farms of the white boys of the South, and now deny them the opportunity to work for a living.

A man, in order to have some money to pay his taxes and to buy his clothes and buy sugar and coffee and a few other things, must have something to sell. Yet you want to deny him the right to grow 5 acres of cotton when you know good and well, if this thing passes, there is going to be a boom in cotton production in South America. You are simply taking it away from your own people and you are not guarding against growing it abroad.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. This same cotton that is produced in South America, Brazil, and Argentina, that the gentleman is speaking of, is not under the control of the United States.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly not. That is what I am trying to tell you. You are driving cotton production out of the United States and by this regimentation increasing cotton production everywhere else in the world. I think this amendment should pass. If you do not pass it, you are going to throw thousands of little farmers, who have always been tenants, out of work. Many of them do not want to own land because, to be frank with you, some people would rather rent than try to own land in a great many areas.

So you are driving these people from the farms—the very farms that you stripped of their white boys to get men to do the fighting in the recent war.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, unquestionably the gentleman from Mississippi has touched on one of the most important phases of any control program, be it peanuts, cotton, or any other crop. The question is whether or not you are going to be fair with all, with everybody concerned—whether or not you are going to write a live and let live program. I submit that too often that kind of program has not been written. A good many of you read the Wall Street Journal. Here is an issue of the Wall Street Journal dated January 12. The headline says, "Rural unemployment—Controlling the peanut surplus creates big farm labor surplus—cuts in acreage forces out share-croppers and hired hands—Hits small town business."

That refers to peanuts. I do not think any of you would believe that Georgia is the hardest hit State so far as peanuts are concerned. We have in our section of Texas a group of people who, in my opinion, are hit much harder than those in Georgia with reference to peanuts, Oklahoma was hit hard. This story about wrecking the program is as old as the program itself. Every time a Member brings in an amendment undertaking to help the smaller fellow, as in the instance of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], it is alleged that the program will be wrecked. I say that if the program will wreck the homes of the kind of people the gentleman from Missisippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is talking about, you had better amend and change the program so that the homes of these people and the economic status of these people will not be wrecked—certainly until something else is available by which they can earn a living. Let us see what some of the farmers in Georgia might be saying about the current situation. I read from the Wall Street Journal again:

> Some farmers forced to fire families who have lived for years on their land are beginning to wonder about the system, however. Planter W. C. Adams comments: "I do not know how far the farmer can continue in this direction. One of these days he will come to the end of the row and balk like a Georgia mule."

I say to you that those of you who are truly interested in preserving the farm program—those of you who want to keep agriculture on a stable basis certainly should be interested in taking care of the kind of problem referred to by Mr. Whitten. I mentioned the county of Harrison yesterday where the PMA said in a letter to me that they will lose some 300 or 400 farmers. And they are not all tenant farmers I would say. Some of these people are farmers who bought little places expecting some security from those farms only to find out today that they have no peanut allotment or have no cotton allotment or if they have, that it is only nine-tenths of an acre or one acre or some such number

or fraction of an acre, which is meaningless.

Mr. Chairman, I enclose some communications about peanuts:

[From the Wall Street Journal of January 12, 1950]

RURAL UNEMPLOYMENT—CONTROLLING THE PEANUT SURPLUS CREATES A BIG FARM LABOR SURPLUS—CUTS IN ACREAGE FORCE OUT SHARECROPPER, HIRED HAND—HIT SMALL-TOWN BUSINESS—HAPPENING IN COTTON, TOO

(By James Flowers)

CAMILLA, GA.—Government acreage cutbacks are slashing crop surpluses—and creating a surplus of farm labor.

Here in the heart of peanutland you'll notice today that many a tenant farmer's house is standing vacant. In many another you'll still find the farmer's wife, and usually a swarm of children, but pappy is in town, looking for a job. He won't find one.

"This farm situation down here is going to leave not hundreds but thousands of people with nothing to do and no place to go," says Fred Hand, a planter who happens also to be speaker of the Georgia House of Representatives. "I had five tenant families on my farm last year. This year I will need only two. My peanut allotment has been cut from 528 acres to 278 acres in 2 years."

This rural unemployment is a byproduct of planning in Washington for the general welfare. The victims are Americans whom the planners would have probably labeled "underprivileged" even before they were thrown out of work—hired hands and sharecroppers mostly Negroes. They don't even get unemployment compensation.

The Agriculture Department decreed an average 22-percent reduction in all United States land sown to peanuts in 1949. For 1950 it has ordered a further 20-percent average slash from the planting permitted last year. Here in the Georgia-Florida-Alabama area which grows more than half the Nation's peanuts, these restrictions are giving a shock to the whole rural economy. Peanuts are only half of the story; cotton is being cut back, too. Tenants who have no work can't spend money in the small towns.

"Unemployment will certainly affect my ice and cold-storage business," says E. L. Butler, of Camilla. "I don't know how long we could stand a mass exodus of surplus labor. It may make ghost towns of the small communities of the South." The owner of a department store in near Pelham reports that a good number of his customers are failing to pay their bills when they come due, for the first time in years.

The migration from the farms is moving slowly because most displaced men have no clear idea of where they and their families can go. Sharecropper Willie J. Clark has moved to town and is looking for a job. If he doesn't strike any better luck than he has had so far, he says, he will head north "quick as the sap begins runnin'."

"Sho' don't know, sho' don't," says cropper Buddie Lee, asked about his plans. He complains that he was just beginning to make enough money to buy plenty of corn pone, black-eyed peas, and sowbelly for his young 'uns when he got "whacked back to nuthin'."

"Farm hands—young and old, black and white—come by our crushing plant every day or so looking for work," says T. B. Twitty, Jr., vice president of the Camilla Cotton Oil Co. "Wish we could help, but we just don't need any more labor."

THE PEANUT PLAN

Why have things been planned this way? Nobody in Washington, of course, had unemployment as his objective. The whole idea was to benefit the farmers.

Back in the 1930's goobers sold for as low as $20 a ton. But Congress, deciding that the nuts were one of the Nation's basic crops, legislated wartime and then postwar price support which today holds prices at about $210 a ton.

This has proved quite a production incentive. Output jumped from 1,395,000,000 pounds a year in the 1937–41 period to 2,388,000,000 in 1942–48, which closed the era of unrestricted planting. For a while the market could absorb this mammoth increase. Peanut butter was a substitute for meat on American tables when the latter was scarce, and foreigners were eager for proteins and oils at war's end. Exports boomed from just 1,000,000 pounds a year in 1937–41 to 763,000,000 pounds in 1948. Then came deflation of this market; latest statistics show only a sixth as many were exported during the third quarter last year as in the similar period the previous year.

Surpluses had begun to be troublesome even in 1948; the Government lost about $25,000,000 supporting prices. It came off no better on the 1949 crop despite the acreage cutback last year; more than a quarter million tons had to be purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation to prop prices.

The coming crisis was visible even in 1947; on a December day the Nation's peanut planters voted overwhelmingly in favor of granting the Agriculture Department authority to restrict their plantings. Last year the power was first used, and the crop was held to 1,853,000,000 pounds.

Because of convolutions in the law, the restrictions hit some peanut planters a lot harder than others. The 1950 reductions from 1949 acreage require that Louisiana farmers must choke their peanut acreage an average 38 percent, while those in Arizona are actually permitted a 139-percent increase. Even those in this region find their luck varies considerably; Georgia's cut is 20.1 percent; neighboring Florida is forced back only 12.7 percent; Alabama suffers a stiff 31.2 percent reduction.

The planters don't relish the curtailments, but few of them regret they have permitted it.

"Sure, I voted for crop control," says Drewry Ledbetter. "What else could you do? I remember the depression years." Like other planters, he is trying to soften the impact on his labor force. "I'm going to try and carry my tenants as long as possible, even though I only have enough work for half of them," he declares.

Some planters, forced to fire families who have lived for years on their land, are beginning to wonder about the system, however. Planter W. C. Adams comments: "I don't know how far the farmer can continue in this direction. One of these days he will come to the end of the row and balk like a Georgia mule."

Farm owners are attempting to shift to other kinds of agriculture, but these don't demand much labor.

"Most of the large planters will turn their lost peanut acreage into pasture and either increase their beef herd or try and get one started," says farm agent J. A. Mauldin. "The little operator doesn't have the acreage nor the money to do this so he'll try to truck farm a little with an extra patch of vegetables or maybe get a brood sow and try raising more hogs, since you can grow all the peanuts you want for feed. Then, too, a corn crop will be good for feed, roasting ears, and the market."

Says W. J. Sullivan, one of the largest planters in this area: "I had 35 cropper families on the place last year, but with my reduced allotment this year I had to let 10 families go. As for a new money crop, I already have about 140 head of cattle but cows are so high now I'm not going to venture any further. I plan to let a lot of my land lay idle."

Small operator Robert Shiver, who has let two of his three cropper families go, says, "I can't jump into cattle raising because it will take a heap of money. I'm going to try and grow into it though."

Bank president and planter E. J. Vann, Jr., says restrictions will be a death blow to many small farm owners, as well as to hired hands.

"Some land in this area will sell that ordinarily wouldn't, just because of these crop cutbacks," says Mr. Vann. "The really small operator who owns his farm may be forced to sell because he won't get enough acreage allotments to operate profitably."

Laments one small farmer whose allotment allowed him only 16 acres of peanuts for 1950: "I can't make it on that, and don't intend to try."

WHAT'S AHEAD FOR 1950?

(Excerpts taken from above article appearing in Farm and Ranch, January 1950 issue)

Peanuts: Price support for the 1950 crop will be down by only about half a cent a pound on the average—to about 10 cents. The minimum national acreage allotment for the 1950 crop is 2,100,000 acres. This allotment would reduce the picked and threshed acreage about a fourth from 1949. It indicates a crop this year of roughly 1,500,000,000 pounds, compared with 1,800,000,000 pounds last year and more than 2,000,000,000 in every year from 1942 through 1948.

Soybeans: With production of cottonseed, flaxseed, and peanuts being reduced, a large acreage of soybeans will be needed to supply protein meal for livestock. Prices will hold close to 1949 levels. Price support for soybeans raised in 1950 will be only a little lower than for 1949.

Something like the above makes us feel that we should be permitted to grow peanuts for oil if wanted by farmers. Soybeans are supported and acreage not controlled.

Freight on the soybean meal to the Southwest will run about $20 per ton and peanut oil is far superior to other oils.

THE CAIN BANKING CO., INC.,
Winnsboro, Tex., January 26, 1950.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AGENCY,
Quitman, Tex.

GENTLEMEN: It is indeed very seldom that I am so aroused to the extent that I write a letter of this sort, but from actual facts that have come to my attention in the past weeks, I cannot but write and express my personal views concerning this new agricultural allotment program.

Let me give you a concrete example of the situation as it exists in Wood County: Yesterday a man came into my office, who started farming last year, and will, in all probability, need assistance in making a crop this year. He is a good man, and has a good credit rating with us. Yet this man is allowed no cotton allotment, and no peanut allotment on his place for the year 1950.

As a banker, I feel that it is my duty to the community to make funds available to good farmers on a sound, conservative basis. My question, then, is this: How can I help the community and how can I help the farmers when in the beginning I know that it is impossible to hope for any repayment of a loan on such conditions? My second question is this: Is the Government lending agency going to take care of farmers who are burdened by this limited acreage allotment? My third question is this: How is one of our east Texas farmers going to produce, and how is he going to live?

I am aware of the fact that this letter will in all probability create no adjustment of the many inequalities; yet, I urge you to

consider it, and if necessary, forward it to the persons who control and promulgate your rules. I want my protest to be recorded.

Yours very truly,

MALVIN CAIN.

NOVEMBER 17, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of October 2 requesting that we furnish you an example illustrating the dollars and cents cost to a producer who picks or threshes 11 acres of peanuts from a farm which has a 10-acre allotment for 1949.

Under the 1949 marketing quota regulations the penalty, in accordance with section 359 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, is collected upon a portion of each lot of peanuts marketed from the farm equal to the proportion which the acreage of peanuts in excess of the allotment is of the total acreage of peanuts on the farm. In administering this provision, a "percent excess" is determined and multiplied by the basic penalty rate to arrive at the "converted penalty rate" for the farm. This converted penalty rate is multiplied by the number of pounds in each lot which the producer sells to determine the amount of penalty.

The following example illustrates the method of determining the amount of the marketing quota penalty, assuming a yield of 500 pounds per acre (the approximate average yield per acre in your district):

EXAMPLE

1. 1949 allotment, 10 acres.
2. 1949 peanut acreage, 11 acres.
3. Excess acreage (item 2 minus item 1), 1 acre.
4. Percentage excess (item 3 divided by item 2) equals 9.1 percent.
5. Basic penalty rate (one-half of support price) equals 5.3 cents per pound.
6. Converted penalty rate (item 5 multiplied by item 4) equals 0.4 cent per pound.
7. Total production (assuming yield of 500 pounds per acre) (500 multiplied by 11) equals 5,500 pounds.
8. Total penalty to be paid (item 7 multiplied by item 6) equals $22.

However, it is equally important to point out that in addition to the marketing-quota penalty, none of the peanuts produced on the farm would be eligible for price support at 90 percent of parity. Instead of being assured of a price at not less than 90 percent of parity, the producer would have to offer his peanuts on the open market at whatever price buyers were willing to pay. The only guaranty that he would have under the price-support program would be that receiving agencies would purchase his excess peanuts only (the 500 pounds produced on the 1 acre excess) at the relatively low level of 54 percent of parity.

We regret that through error in our letter of August 23 we stated that excess peanuts were eligible for price support at 60 percent of parity. The law provides that the support price for excess peanuts shall be 60 percent of the full support price, which is equivalent to 54 percent of parity.

Sincerely yours,

K. T. HUTCHINSON,
Assistant Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., January 20, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your notation written on Mr. Hutchinson's letter to you dated November 17, 1949, regarding the marketing quota penalty on excess peanuts.

Following is the example you requested:

1. 1949 allotment, 2 acres.
2. 1949 peanut acreage, 11 acres.
3. Excess acreage (item 2 minus item 1), 9 acres.
4. Percent excess (item 3 divided by item 2) equals 81.8.
5. Basic penalty rate (one-half of support price) equals 5.3 cents per pound.
6. Converted penalty rate (item 5 multiplied by item 4) equals 4.3.
7. Total production (assuming 500-pound yield) equals 5,500 pounds.
8. Total penalty to be paid (item 7 multiplied by item 6) equals $236.50.

Sincerely,

A. J. LOVELAND,
Secretary.

HALLETTSVILLE, TEX., *January 14, 1950.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR SIR: We note through the papers that the peanut acreage for 1950 has been greatly reduced again; this is going to work an awful hardship on the small peanut grower, due to the fact that the cut last year in this county cut quite a few of the growers to such small acreage.

We think that it should be so provided that there be a small minimum number of acres per farm, possibly 6 or 7 acres, and also in each county where the allowable peanut acreage to the farmer is so small that he does not use the allotment it could be transferable to other farmer or grower that was planting his small allotment.

We think such a policy would keep many little peanut growers carrying this as one of their projects to help them make their living and have a balanced all-around farm income for the whole year.

We believe that this provision should be written into the law, and to insure its passage we think petitions should be addressed to the Congressman of each district by the growers located therein.

We submit this for your consideration.

Yours truly,

O. B. SOKOL.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., January 25, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of January 20 with which you enclosed a copy of a letter from Mr. O. B. Sokol, of Halletsville, Tex. Mr. Sokol made a number of suggestions regarding farm peanut acreage allotments.

It is true that the 1950 farm peanut-acreage allotments will be considerably smaller than 1949 allotments for the reason that the State allotment is about 29 percent smaller than the 1949 State allotment. The smaller farm allotments will, undoubtedly, make it difficult for some peanut farmers to continue to produce the crop. I have no suggestions to make as to provisions for release and reapportionment of peanut allotments and minimum farm peanut allotments. These two provisions are not included in current legislation for peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas. Such authority would need to be given by the Congress in the form of amendatory legislation.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., December 2, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of October 14 requesting information as to the base periods used for marketing-quota purposes for peanuts, wheat, and cotton, and an explanation of any differences in the base periods used for these commodities.

In the case of peanuts, the national marketing quota and acreage allotment is established pursuant to section 358 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which prescribes a base period of the 5 years preceding the year in which the marketing quota is proclaimed and the national acreage allotment established. For example, the 1950 marketing quota, which must be proclaimed by December 1, 1949, will be determined on the basis of the average quantity of peanuts harvested for nuts during the period 1944 to 1948, inclusive, adjusted for current trends and prospective demand conditions. The national marketing quota for 1950 will be converted to a national acreage allotment on the basis of the average yield per acre of peanuts in the 5 years 1944 to 1948, inclusive, with such adjustments as may be found necessary to correct for trends in yields and abnormal conditions of production affecting yields in such 5 years. (Due to the provisions of Public Law 272, 81st Cong., approved August 29, 1949, the 1950 national acreage allotment cannot be less than 2,100,000 acres.)

The national peanut-acreage allotment is apportioned to the peanut-producing States, pursuant to section 358 (c) of the act. This section provides for the use of a base period of the 5 years preceding the year in which the national allotment is determined. Therefore, the base period that would be used for 1950 would be the 5 years 1944 to 1948, inclusive.

The State acreage allotments are apportioned among farms in accordance with section 358 (d) of the act. The law does not prescribe a specific base period for use in determining farm-acreage allotments but provides generally that farm allotments will be based on the tillable acreage available for the production of peanuts and the past acreage of peanuts on the farm, taking into consideration the peanut acreage allotments established for the farm under previous agricultural adjustment and conservation programs. Regulations governing the establishing of 1950 farm peanut acreage allotments have not yet been approved. The regulations governing the establishment of 1949 farm peanut allotments provided for the use of a 3-year base period, 1946–48, inclusive. At the time these regulations were developed considerable thought was given to the advisability of using a 5-year base period rather than a 3-year base. It was decided that the use of the 3-year base period would be better from the standpoint of determining fair and equitable allotments. This decision was based primarily on the fact that accurate measurements of farm peanut acreages were not available for the years 1943–47, inclusive, and it would be difficult to obtain accurate reports from farmers for 4 or 5 years prior to the time the allotments were established.

The national wheat-acreage allotment is apportioned among States on the basis of the acreage seeded for production of wheat during the preceding 10 calendar years, with adjustments for abnormal weather and trends in acreage during such periods. The State acreage allotment is apportioned among counties in the State on the basis of the acreage seeded for production of wheat during the preceding 10 calendar years, with adjustments for abnormal weather and trends in acreage during such period and for the promotion of soil-conservation practices, and the county acreage allotment is apportioned among farms in the county on the basis of tillable acres, crop-rotation practices, type of soil, and topography, as indicated by the planting of wheat.

In the case of cotton the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, including amendments made by Public Law 272, Eighty-

first Congress, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, provides that the national acreage allotment for 1950 shall be not less than 21,000,000 acres. The act further provides that the national acreage allotment shall be distributed to the States on the basis of each State's share of a national allotment base of 22,500,000 acres computed and adjusted by the following steps:

(a) Calculate for each State the average acreage planted (or regarded as planted in 1945, 1946, or 1947 under Public Law 12, 79th Cong.) to cotton in the 4 years 1945–48, except that the average of the 5 years 1944–48 is to be used for any State which planted in 1948 more than 1,000,000 acres, but less than one-half its 1943 allotment.

(b) Add to the average acreage computed for each State under step (a) the estimated additional acreage required for increasing allotments for small farms to the smaller of 5 acres or the highest number of acres planted (or regarded as planted in 1946 or 1947 under Public Law 12, 79th Cong.) to cotton in 1946, 1947, or 1948.

(c) If, after steps (a) and (b) are taken, the acreage base for any State is less than the larger of 95 percent of the average acreage planted to cotton in 1947 and 1948 or 85 percent of the acreage planted to cotton in 1948, the State base computed under steps (a) and (b) must be adjusted upward so as to give the State such minimum acreage base.

(d) If the total of the acreage bases for all States determined under steps (a), (b), and (c) is more or less than 22,500,000 acres, an adjustment would be made on a pro rata basis for each State not receiving an adjustment under step (c) so as to provide a total national base of 22,500,000 acres.

The acreage allotments established for counties, less a reserve not to exceed 15 percent of the county allotment, would be apportioned to farms on which cotton was planted (or regarded as planted in 1946 or 1947 under Public Law 12, 79th Cong.) during one or more of the years 1946, 1947, or 1948 on the following basis:

(1) There will be allotted to each such farm the smaller of (a) 5 acres, or (b) the highest number of acres planted (or regarded as planted in 1946 or 1947 under Public Law 12, 79th Cong.) in any of the years 1946, 1947, or 1948.

(2) The remainder of the county acreage allotments will be apportioned to farms, other than those receiving an allotment under (1) (b) above, on the basis of a uniform prescribed percentage of cropland on each farm, excluding the acreage devoted to certain other crops specified in the act and nonirrigated lands in irrigated areas. No farm, however, will receive an allotment under this provision which will be in excess of the highest acreage planted (or regarded as planted under Public Law 12, 79th Cong., in 1946 or 1947) to cotton on the farm during any of the years 1946, 1947, or 1948.

The county reserve is to be used by the county committee for adjustments in allotments which are found to be out of line with allotments for other farms, taking into account land, labor, and equipment available for the production of cotton, crop-rotation practices, the soil, and other physical facilities affecting the production of cotton and abnormal conditions of production on such farms; and for establishing allotments for those farms on which cotton was not planted (or not regarded as planted in 1946 or 1947 under Public Law 12, 79th Cong.) in 1946, 1947, or 1948 on the basis of land, labor, and equipment available for the production of cotton, crop-rotation practices, the soil, and other physical facilities affecting the production of cotton. In counties where farm allotments of 5 to 15 acres are determined in (1) and (2) above, the act directs the county committee to set aside not less than 20 percent of the county reserve, if needed, to provide fair and reasonable allotments for such farms.

In view of the above provisions of the act, State and county committees are provided considerable latitude for establishing fair and equitable allotments for counties and farms.

The provisions with respect to the apportionment of allotments for different crops have been developed over a period of years by congressional action after extensive public hearings and recommendations from various groups. Presumably differences in the areas where the various crops are grown, conditions under which they are grown, and many other related factors influenced the congressional action that established the legislation which provides for different base periods to be used in establishing the allotments for different commodities.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. LOVELAND,
Acting Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, it is to be regretted that the pending House Joint Resolution 398 has provoked so much controversy and that the passing of this vital resolution has been unnecessarily delayed. Of course, our friends from the North who are espousing the cause of Fair Employment Practice Commission are entirely within their rights in using every delaying action possible. Surely there can be no comparison in the importance of the enactment of some sort of remedial crop legislation and the proposed enactment of such a visionary scheme as that embodied in the proposed Fair Employment Practice Act.

Personally, I am keenly interested in any measure pertaining to agriculture. My district traditionally is an agricultural as well as a great industrial district. In observing the correspondence and from conversations with my colleagues, it is apparent that those of my district are not as disturbed about the pending situation as they are in other sections of the country. The fact that I have received very little complaint does not mean that there may not be those who will suffer under the Agricultural Adjustment Act as amended in the last session of Congress or at least through the interpretation of said act by the Department.

It is natural that we have our varied views about what is best to do under the circumstances. Manifestly, something along the line of the provisions contained in the pending resolution should be adopted, and that without delay. Dealing with crop quotas is an involved subject. It would be humanly impossible to write a law which would please everyone. We simply must keep our cotton surplus down as low as possible. We must not drive bona fide farmers from the farm to further complicate unemployment in our cities and more congested areas. During the consideration of this measure I have voted for several of the amendments proposed thereto with the hope of perfecting and providing the very best possible remedy under the law.

Let us get on with the business at hand and pass this resolution, making it clear that it is the duty of the Congress to write the law and that the administrative departments should diligently seek to carry out the expressed wishes of the lawmaking body.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] is recognized.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, of course the committee recognizes that there is a human problem, not only in marketing quotas but in nearly every activity in life. We even considered in committee the advisability, in making allotments, of taking into account the number of people in the family. I am sure I could present a forceful argument that a man with 8 or 10 children should have a larger cotton allotment than a man with no children or with 1 child. The only thing about it is that in the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] we have already, as best we could, taken care of exactly the situation he mentions. We provide for new farm allotments under the legislation. The State of Mississippi, a great cotton State, receives an allotment of 2,295,000 acres, which is not too much for the State. Under the law, the State committee of Mississippi, that is the State PMA committee of three or five men, could have reserved 10 percent of that 2,300,000 acres for new farmers.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I am sorry; I cannot yield right now.

The State committee of Mississippi could have reserved 230,000 acres to do this job, if they had wanted to. More than that, every county in the State of Mississippi could have reserved 15 percent to do this very job for new farmers. I mean to say that under the law, in the great State of Mississippi, and my State the same way, they could have reserved over 500,000 acres of cotton land to take care of this situation, if they thought it was entitled to that much consideration. Instead of reserving 500,000 acres, how much did Mississippians themselves reserve? They reserved only 25,000 acres to take care of all new-farm allotments.

Now, you work your own will here. That is all I want to say about this amendment. I do not know whether it is wise to throw this temptation in men's faces or not. The gentleman's amendment says only one thing: "If a tenant is put off of a cotton farm without his being at fault—

All right, let us take JOE BRYSON and myself. You cut me to 70 percent. All in the world I have to do to my tenants is to go to them and say, "They have cut me to 70 percent. I want all of that myself. You will have to get off."

Under this amendment, they can go to JOE BRYSON'S farm and get some more cotton land. Joe says to his tenants, "You get off. I need what I have. You go to PACE'S farm and get some land and an allotment of your own."

All we would have to do would be to change tenants, and it would not be any 50 or 70 percent that we would get. It could be two or three hundred percent, as much cotton as was planted in the base years.

The question is, Do we want to adopt an amendment here that will put in front of every cotton farmer in the United States the temptation that "all I have to do is to run my tenants off and

go and get some tenants from another farm, who have been growing cotton, and then each of them will get an additional cotton allotment to grow cotton on my farm"? In my judgment, no man alive can make an estimate of what this amendment will add. I will say it adds somewhere between 100,000 and 5,000,000 acres of cotton land. In fact, it could almost completely double the national allotment. There is no Member of this House for whose ability and integrity I have greater respect than I have for the gentleman from Mississippi. I admire him very highly, but he should not come here and throw this thing at us and say, "The responsibility now is yours to work it out." I cannot work it out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITTEN) there were—ayes 8, noes 38.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for 1950, the State committee may apportion to the county committees in counties or administrative areas with a final allotment factor of less than 35 percent, not more than 50 percent of the State reserve so as to establish farm allotments which are fair and reasonable in relation to the past acreage planted to cotton or regarded as planted to cotton under Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress, on the farm.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object to this request, but I hope no other similar requests will be made, for we are anxious to conclude action on the pending resolution.

Mr. GAVIN. I remind the gentleman from North Carolina that I have already spoken to the gentleman and requested his permission to speak out of order.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Pennsylvania made such a request.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not object to these two requests, but I shall hereafter object to anyone's speaking out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York asks unanimous consent to speak out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time because I wish to answer publicly a letter which I received from one of our colleagues. I had hoped he would be on the floor, but as he gives me the deadline of Wednesday, February 1, to answer his letter, I am obliged to speak today.

My colleague has worked very long and very diligently for passage of H. R. 4453 which I understand he has introduced and reintroduced many times. I have the utmost sympathy with his efforts and objectives. I believe in FEPC. All my people know my stand. I believe it conforms to the Constitution of the United States. It has been put into effect in New York State under the governorship of Thomas E. Dewey and a Republican-controlled legislature and has worked, so far as I know, as satisfactorily as any legislation can work that is humanly conceived.

However, I object to the rather threatening tone of my colleague's letter and am sorry to see he finds it necessary to adopt such language. The last sentence of his letter reads:

Failure to reply to this letter will indicate that you are opposed to FEPC. I will so note on the floor of the House next week.

I have signed petitions in the past and expect to do so in the future. I will never sign because I have been threatened. I am answerable only to the people of my district and I have always kept them fully informed on my votes and positions on all legislation before this House.

I have the utmost sympathy for anyone who feels that he is discriminated against. My distinguished colleague said recently on the floor of this House that he could not aspire to become governor of his and my great State.

I, too, am discriminated against in a like manner. On account of my sex I have gone as far as I can go, politically. I, too, cannot aspire to become governor of the great State of New York. That is no reason for bitterness or threats. I would like to give one piece of advice to all of my colleagues. That is, that you catch more flies with sugar than with vinegar.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, to revise and extend my remarks, to speak out of order, and that my remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GAVIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that I cannot continue along the line of levity with which the gentleman who just preceded me indulged. But I have an announcement to make which I believe is of interest to every Member of the House.

President Truman has just made a public announcement that he has ordered the Atomic Energy Commission to proceed in the research and development of the so-called hydrogen bomb, the superbomb which you have read so much about in the paper. This decision, of course, had to be made by the Commander in Chief of the United States as to direction. It is a decision which is fraught with the most terrible portent for the human race. In my opinion, unless an equally challenging statement is made at this time to the people of the world to obtain international control of this weapon, which is estimated to be from 10 to 1,000 times greater than the A-bomb in destructive capacity, then it will make little difference as to the cotton-acreage allotment that we are so concerned with today in this House.

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REGAN: Insert the following new section 5 after section 4 and renumber succeeding sections:

"SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the cotton-acreage allotment of any new 1949 cotton farm which was completed for planting prior to March 29, 1949, by clearing, plowing, and cultivating the land and was planted to cotton for the first time in 1949, and which was not planted to any crop prior to 1949, shall be not less than 30 percent of the acreage on such farm which was planted to cotton in 1949."

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not ask for 70 percent or 60 percent or 40 percent, but it has for its purpose taking care of some pioneer farmers throughout our western part of the country who last year, with full confidence in our Government that we would continue in the farming program, put land in cultivation for the first time. They find this year that they are going to be limited to 9 percent of the acreage that they put in cultivation for the first time last year which was planted to cotton.

It so happens that this land is peculiarly adapted to the growing of cotton, and it is not adapted for growing other crops. They find that when a man put in 100 acres of land last year into cotton for the first time that as the amendment read when it was plowed, cleared, and cultivated for any crop. They put in 100 acres, and this year get about 9. That would not give them enough income to pay the interest on their debts and to make a living on their 100 acres of land. This amendment would permit those farmers to put in as much as 30 percent of their land that they put in cultivation for the first time last year into cotton. It does not mean a great deal in the national set-up in the cotton acreage program. I have discussed this with the members of the committee. It has been discussed thoroughly with the Department of Agriculture by those interested. I am sure they are all in sympathy with the program. It is not going to make a vital difference in the total set-up of the United States, but it does assume a great importance to those few farmers who are coming under this provision of this amendment.

I might add that this is not confined to a selfish interest of my district or State alone, but it would have an effect on six of the States of the West—California, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, Missouri, and Oklahoma. All have some acreage that would come under the provisions of this amendment. It is a small request to make. I hope the Members of the House will give it unanimous support.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman certainly has a justifiable amendment, in my opinion. I venture to say there is no section of the country where cotton is grown that is harder hit than the areas to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. REGAN. I thank the gentleman from Texas. He is eminently correct.

I might add that a good percentage of the farmers affected adversely under the present law and who will be benefited by this amendment are veterans. The present bill, which I expect to support, does not, however, give them any relief. I think the committee regrets that it was not so provided in the original drafting of the bill.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. I shall support the gentleman's amendment. The gentleman says the increase is comparatively trivial, but can he indicate the approximate amount of increased acreage that would result?

Mr. REGAN. I could fairly say, but my colleague from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN], has secured a lot of figures on that, and I believe he will follow me with a brief discussion of this amendment. I will leave the figures to him, because he has the latest reports.

Mr. FISHER. I understood it was comparatively little.

Mr. REGAN. The gentleman is correct.

I hope that when the time to vote comes the Members will give this amendment their full support, because it certainly is a meritorious one, and I am sure the committee and the Department of Agriculture so consider it.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment, and ask unanimous consent that my remarks follow those of my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I know that the Members of the House are tired. I know you have been discussing cotton for 2 days and have turned down, without exception, every amendment which has been proposed. But I want to tell you now we have one more amendment, an amendment I feel is a just and honest amendment, an amendment that is being proposed to you today which has a definite price tag on it. It is not going to say to us that we will plant hundreds and hundreds of thousands of acres of cotton, but a figure from the Department of Agriculture which will tell us how much cotton will be planted. We have a situation here of men coming back from the services in 1946 and probably taking a year to decide what they were going to do and then borrowing the money and buying their farms. In many cases their first crop came in 1949. They found the old cotton farms were too high in value and they had to go out and buy brushland. After clearing it, at great expense to themselves, they planted their cotton. In my section of the country, in the Rio Grande Valley, they planted it before the law was ever passed, excluding 1949 from future quotas. Now, they find they have a quota of 8, 9, and 10 percent, a quota that they cannot live under. We are asking by this amendment that they be given a quota of 30 percent, not as much as the old farmer, no, because that does not seem to be the intent of the Congress, but enough for them to live on, to meet their mortgages and pay their debts. When we talk about these farmers voting for future legislation on cotton supports, these farmers who planted in 1949 did not get to vote on the future cotton support legislation. The figure I have received from the Department of Agriculture as to how many acres will be covered by this amendment is a total of 84,768 acres of cotton that will be planted by this amendment. I tell you that is not the full total, because those 1949 planters that will get a 1950 quota have a quota now of 8 or 10 percent. When you deduct that from that figure, you have a net increase in acreage, by this amendment, of approximately 55,000 acres. Fifty-five thousand acres to save some farmers from financial ruin.

I believe the House should support this amendment. I think it is a fair and honest amendment.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of California. I want to say to the gentleman that all the way through the deliberations of the Committee on Agriculture I have consistently fought against eliminating 1949 from consideration in cotton quotas. I think the gentleman's amendment is entirely justified, and I hope the House will support it.

Mr. BENTSEN. I thank the gentleman very much.

Further, I would like to say it will be said that this amendment does not solve all of the inequities. That is true. There are people who did not plant cotton before 1949, but planted other crops. We did not put that in the amendment because I do not know how much acreage it would take. We have tried to give you a sound amendment that would save as many people as possible from economic bankruptcy. I say that the question of inequity is not as bad on those people as it is on those who planted for the first time in 1949, who cleared and planted their lands, because those lands which had crops prior to 1949 obviously could grow other crops and could do it economically or else they would have planted cotton prior to that time. But these soils are soils that have a high salinity content. Most of those lands can grow economically no other crop than cotton. So if you refuse them an equitable quota, a quota under which they can live, you condemn many of those men to economic bankruptcy.

I do not wave the flag just for the veterans today, because there are other farmers who are included, but I want to help those men, many of them who fought for their country and who were not home and who did not arrive home soon enough to establish a historic quota. I want to see them get a decent quota in 1950. I ask you to give them a quota that they can live under. I ask you to support a fair and honest amendment, an amendment that has a definite estimate by the Department of Agriculture of the amount of acreage that it will take.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of California. A representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars appeared before the Committee on Agriculture in support of the very type of legislation that the gentleman is asking for.

Mr. BENTSEN. I thank you. I have also been solicited by many members of the veterans' organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] has expired.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 5 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman. The persistent, able, patriotic, and fearless efforts of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and the work of J. Edgar Hoover and his FBI forces, the ablest fact-finding organization in the world, brought to light the treasonable acts of Alger Hiss in stealing from the secret files of the State Department and turning them over to a Russian spy ring. There would have been no exposure of Hiss and he would not have been indicted, tried, and convicted for perjury in denying his treasonable conduct but for the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the FBI. After 21 hours' deliberation, the jury composed of eight women and four men, all good and lawful citizens, convicted Alger Hiss of perjury on each of the 2 counts in the indictment on which he was tried, and on Wednesday, January 25, the judge before whom he was tried, Judge Henry W. Goddard, sentenced him to 5 years' imprisonment in the penitentiary.

Six hours later Hiss, the former adviser of President Roosevelt, and intimate friend and long-time associate of Secretary of State Acheson, was defended and pronounced innocent by Acheson.

This unprecedented action on the part of the Secretary of State in proclaiming his friendship for and his confidence in Hiss brought widespread demands that a congressional investigation be made to determine if the Hiss influence still lives in the State Department.

It can safely be said that it does yet live in the State Department, because Dean Acheson is the head and front of that Department, and if ever there existed on this earth two souls with but a single thought, two hearts that beat as one, if there is to be found anywhere in the world two of a kind, two birds of a feather, two intellectual, moral, political twins, we have them in the persons of Dean Acheson, our Secretary of State, and his friend, Alger Hiss.

Out of Acheson's own mouth and by his own words, we are driven to these conclusions.

When Dean Acheson's appointment as Secretary of State was being considered by the Senate Committee on Foreign

Relations, Acheson, although Hiss had then been exposed and indicted for the charge on which he was convicted, testified with reference to his friendship for Hiss that he, Acheson, did not "lightly give his friendship and did not lightly withdraw it."

Acheson's statement that despite the conviction of Hiss he would not turn his back on him which was termed "fantastic" in Senate debate, was uttered by him at his press conference in emotional tones. Here is what he said:

I should like to make it clear to you that whatever the outcome of any appeal which Mr. Hiss or his lawyers may take in this case, I do not intend to turn my back on Alger Hiss.

By these words Dean Acheson served notice on the American people and on the United States Court of Appeals to which the Hiss case will go from the district court in New York, and upon the Supreme Court of the United States that he, Acheson, will utterly disregard the findings and opinions of these courts as he flouts the verdict of the jury and the action of Judge Goddard in approving the jury's verdict, and in sentencing Hiss to the penitentiary for 5 years.

Acheson did not stop with his own approval of Hiss but undertook to justify the action of Hiss in betraying his country and in perjuring his soul and blistering his lips with a lie by quoting the words of the Saviour.

Acheson did this immediately after Judge Goddard declared that the penalty which he inflicted on Hiss, and I quote, "should be a warning to all that a crime of this character may not be committed with impunity." Every lawyer knows that when Hiss was found guilty by the jury, and the verdict was approved by Judge Goddard, the presumption of the innocence of Hiss disappeared and that his guilt was established.

Acheson stated that regardless of the fact that all the courts might hold Hiss guilty, he, Acheson, "would not turn his back on Hiss." Acheson then further said, and I quote:

I think every person who has known Alger Hiss or has served with him at any time has upon his conscience the very serious task of deciding what his attitude is and what his conduct should be. That must be done by each person in the light of his own standards and his own principles. For me, there is very little doubt about those standards or those principles. I think they were stated for us a very long time ago. They were stated on the Mount of Olives and if you are interested in seeing them, you will find them in the twenty-fifth chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew beginning at verse 34.

Evidently Acheson, in refering to the twenty-fifth chapter of St. Matthew, beginning with verse 34, had in mind the words of Jesus on the last judgment:

34. Then shall the King say unto them on his right, Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundations of the world:

35. For I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger and ye took me in:

36. Naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me.

37. Then shall the righteous answer him, saying Lord, when saw we Thee an hungered, and fed Thee; or thirsty, and gave Thee drink:

38. When saw we Thee a stranger, and took Thee in: or naked, and clothed Thee:

39. Or when saw we Thee sick, or in prison, and came unto Thee:

40. And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto Me.

These words are a far cry from the conduct of Hiss. It may be that Acheson felt that the jury in finding Hiss guilty had done it unto Acheson.

In thus seeking to "steal the livery of Heaven, to serve the Devil in," Dean Acheson overlooked the fact that the Devil himself, when it suits his purpose, quotes the Scripture.

In the fourth chapter of this same Gospel by St. Matthew we read:

Then was Jesus led up of the spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the Devil.

2. And when He had fasted 40 days and 40 nights, He was afterward an hungred.

3. And when the tempter came to Him, he said, If Thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread.

4. But He answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.

5. Then the Devil taketh Him up into the holy city, and setteth Him on a pinnacle of the temple.

6. And saith unto Him, If Thou be the Son of God, cast Thyself down; for it is written, He shall give His angels charge concerning Thee; and in their hands they shall bear Thee up, lest at any time Thou dash Thy foot against a stone.

7. Jesus said unto him, It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.

You can now understand why from all over the land there is a demand by the people of this country that Secretary of State Acheson should be fired by President Truman. He is impudent, incompetent, inept, supercilious and a failure in the office he holds. His attitude and his words are without a parallel in all the history of our country. We will never get rid of the disloyal element in the State Department until President Truman gets rid of Acheson.

In the face of the complete collapse of all our prestige and influence on the continent of Asia, certain editorial writers and commentators are undertaking to make the people of this country believe that Acheson is a man of great ability, and they actually tell us that he is increasing in stature.

In the light of his utter failure, he is a Lilliputian in stature, and by his own words and proclaimed friendship with men like Alger Hiss, he has demonstrated his utter unfitness for the office he now holds.

Not only is this country on the run in Asia, but within the past few days we have again been confronted with the humiliation of a renewal of the German blockade of our forces in Berlin. We seized a building in that portion of Berlin which our forces occupy and then hurriedly turned it loose when the Russians began to hold up train and truck service into and from that city.

Dean Acheson might read with profit the words of St. Paul in the seventh verse of the sixth chapter of Galatians:

Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.

The Secretary of State has sown to the wind. He is reaping the whirlwind of an outraged public opinion.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN] and I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, every cotton farmer has known for 6 or 8 years that a control program on cotton would eventually become necessary, that if a support price should continue to be available controls would finally have to be invoked. But the producers could not accurately foresee just when the control program would be placed into operation.

In 1948 farmers did not know when there would be a control program. There are a number of producers who went out into the new areas, broke up the sod land and began to produce cotton. Many of them did not get it planted in 1948, but they first planted cotton in 1949. This amendment by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN] would give a measure of relief only to the people who placed land under cultivation under those circumstances. It would not give them a 30-percent factor. It would give them only 30 percent of the land they actually planted in cotton, which is a very minimum amount.

The amendment is not subject to misinterpretation. The meaning is clear.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few observations about the pending measure. I am not now speaking of the pending amendment for growers on new land.

The present law is not perfect. It must be improved from time to time. Even if a law should be perfect, inequities would develop in the administration of the law. Producers in several of our west Texas counties have been especially hard hit by the present law. They have felt the inequities which have developed and they have every right to seek relief. I have in mind a cotton-producing county in west Texas with a cotton factor of only 12 percent. The pending measure will no doubt be of assistance to the producers in such a county. I know that the Committee on Agriculture is trying to be helpful in a very difficult situation.

And the situation is difficult. The pending measure will bring about a condition in counties which have a factor of less than 40 percent where some producers will have larger allotments percentagewise than their neighbors. Generally speaking, cotton producers do not like that. A great majority feel that each cotton farmer in the county should have the same percentage of his cotton land allotted to cotton. Everyone will recall that the so-called 40–50 amendment in the old law was a sore spot in many communities despite the fact that in some instances it served a good purpose.

Let us hope that the pending measure which is designed to take care of unusual situations and be of some assistance in righting special cases of hardship may achieve its purpose without doing injury to the over-all cotton-acreage program. In my opinion, it is impossible to know with complete certainty just what action Congress should take at this time, especially in view of the fact that the new cotton program has been in operation for such a short time.

Let me say to the Committee on Agriculture that in my opinion the farmers of the Nation appreciate the diligent efforts which they have made in behalf of agriculture. Generally speaking, the congressional district which I represent has fared much better than some other areas, but even so, four or five counties in my area have very low and inadequate allotments and producers are confronted with a serious situation. I have felt it my duty to be of every possible assistance to them.

I realize that there is no perfect answer to the problems of agriculture.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Do I understand that the growers of the gentleman's district will profit by this amendment?

Mr. MAHON. Speaking of the Regan amendment, a few will. It would mean probably a few thousand acres to my district. A few of the producers on new land who have allotments of about 9 percent would profit. But, of course, the factors in the counties in my congressional district range from 12 to 58 percent. Most of the counties and producers in my congressional district have reasonably good cotton factors. My concern now is to be helpful to producers who are in difficulty.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman spoke of certain counties in his district; I was wondering if Dawson County, which now has an allotment of 228,000 acres, or if Lubbock County, which now has an allotment of 248,000 acres, or Lynn County, which now has an allotment of 203,000 acres, would get additional allotments under this amendment.

Mr. MAHON. I do not know, personally, but I think a few would. However, a very limited amount of new land was placed in cultivation in the three counties in late 1948 or 1949. In the counties adjoining Dawson or near to Dawson County that have a factor of 15 percent, 20, and 12, a few farmers in those counties would profit from the Regan amendment. And these low-factor counties are desperately in need of relief. In these counties both the old and new growers should be afforded relief. I grant you that under the bill which the committee itself presents they will get some limited relief.

Mr. PACE. But on the whole, the gentleman is pretty well satisfied with the situation; is he not?

Mr. MAHON. I would say that the cotton producers in three-fourths of the counties which I represent are pretty well satisfied with the situation and they are grateful for the work of the House Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Gladly.

Mr. ABERNETHY. When did the people start clearing this land?

Mr. MAHON. In 1947 or 1948. It takes a little time to grub and clear it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Did they not clear it with notice that there was a cotton law on the statute books at the time which was subject to being reinvoked by the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. MAHON. They thought the law would be rejuvenated, but under different circumstances, because no 27,000,000-acre allotments as provided in the old law would be tenable under the new law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may proceed for two additional minutes in order that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to ask the gentleman how we would identify what would be known as a new 1949 cotton farm in view of the fact that farms, although they are not new and have been in cultivation for many, many years have not been planted to cotton in the years 1946, 1947, and 1948, but were planted to cotton in 1949. They were considered new under the bill we passed last year. How does the gentleman define them now?

Mr. MAHON. The amendment is very clear on that; it is very simple. The amendment states:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the cotton acreage allotment of any new 1949 cotton farm which was completed for planting prior to March 29, 1949, by clearing, plowing, and cultivating the land and was planted to cotton for the first time in 1949, and which was not planted to any crop prior to 1949, shall be not less than 30 percent of the acreage of such farm which was planted to cotton in 1949.

As I interpret the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN] it is very clear what a new farm is. But the gentleman has a very important point. For example, a man wants to change his farming practice. He wants to get out of livestock, he wants to get out of wheat, or he wants to get out of cotton. The gentleman raises a very pertinent question, but it is not a criticism of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. The amendment applies only to land cleared and put in cultivation for the first time in 1948 and 1949.

Mr. HARRIS. I am not criticizing the amendment. I am wondering why a person who would be caught in a situation such as the gentleman has described would be any different from a man who owns land that had been in cultivation prior to 1949 and had no history in 1946, 1947, and 1948.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which is now before the committee and which is identified as the Regan amendment. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] have expressed some of the thoughts which I had, in support of the amendment; so I will confine my remarks to the statement that I think it would be a dangerous thing for agriculture if we permit the thought of monopoly to creep into the control and regulation of agriculture in the United States.

I represent an area which grows a small amount of cotton. When you gentlemen from the South speak of thousands of acres, there is nothing like that involved in my support of this particular amendment. I do know of several areas, one of them in my district, in which many farmers are returned veterans and who were making a kind of history which we felt was necessary at the time the cotton farmers were making the history which brought them under the Cooley bill without this amendment.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Does the gentleman realize there are 128,000 acres reserved for just such actual cases in the State of Texas?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. There may be, but I may also tell the gentleman that it has been difficult to get any of the reserved acres used in the area of which I speak; therefore, if we are to depend upon an interpretation by the Department of Agriculture in order to put the benefits of the bill without amendment into effect, then we are leaning upon a very weak reed. The interpretation has not been available with the original act, so an amendment of this kind becomes an increasing necessity.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WHITE of California. I want to make it perfectly clear that the gentleman from Alabama is apparently under a misapprehension. The reserve cannot be used for 1949 farms, which is what we are talking about now.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Does not the gentleman from California have to go further and say that 700,000 acres in Texas could have been reserved for new farms and these are classed as new farms?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman will remember that I do not live in Texas, the gentleman will also remember that I am speaking of newer areas in Texas or California or elsewhere, particularly from my own personal knowledge in California, which are being affected by the monopoly in agriculture. These areas are allotted no peanut land, these areas have had no potato land, these areas have had no wheat land, and now, under the bill, without the Regan amendment, these areas have no cotton land. The cotton reduction has been 81 percent in the area I am talking about and while this might mean only about 800 acres in the area of which I spoke, the amendment, nevertheless, should be adopted.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to a communication which I received from the Department of Agriculture dated January 27. With reference to this pending amendment, and speaking about the amendment, Mr. Woolley, Deputy Administrator of the Production and Marketing Administration, has this to say:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 27, 1950.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
United States House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. COOLEY: This is in reply to your telephone request of this morning with respect to the Department's views on a proposed amendment to House Joint Resolution 398. The proposed amendment will read as follows:

"SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the cotton-acreage allotment of any new 1949 cotton farm which was completed for planting prior to March 29, 1949, by clearing, plowing, and cultivating land, and was planted to cotton for the first time in 1949, and which was not planted to any crop prior to 1949, shall not be less than 30 percent of acreage of such farm which was planted to cotton in 1949."

It is our feeling that such an amendment would be unfair to other old growers in the same county which had a county factor of less than 30 percent, and also to other 1949 growing areas, particularly where the farm had been cleared in 1947 or 1948 and devoted in those years to a dry-land crop, such as grain sorghums, and on which new wells had been placed for the growing of cotton in 1949 for the first time. Such farms, under the language, would be excluded. In other words, the farmers for which the amendment is designed were raising sheep or cattle prior to 1949 and wanted to go into cotton. Farmers in other areas were growing grain sorghums prior to 1949 and wanted to go into cotton. Giving relief to one group and not to the other would be manifestly unfair. This does not mean that the Department is suggesting that the amendment be revised to include the latter group, because if such action is taken it would probably result in thousands of additional acres being allotted in 1950 which cannot be justified.

It is impossible to relieve all inequities by an amendment at this time without, in effect, permitting all producers to raise as much cotton as they would desire. Many inequities will have to be straightened out next year through legislative and administrative devices.

In view of the foregoing, the Department does not believe it would be wise to include the amendment suggested.

Very truly yours,
FRANK K. WOOLLEY,
Deputy Administrator.

That is the position of the Department of Agriculture, and in concluding my remarks I would like to reemphasize the fact that in the State of Texas, as has just been said by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], more than 700,000 acres of land could have been reserved for new growers. The chairman of the State Committee, I think it was, urged our committee to provide a reservation of acreage, and we finally made the reservation, and then he only reserved about 3 percent for the very purpose that the gentleman, who is now asking for additional acreage, mentioned.

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. REGAN. Is it not also true that the Department does not favor the pending resolution?

Mr. COOLEY. No, sir. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] just read into the RECORD a letter to me by the Acting Secretary of Agriculture in favor of the pending resolution.

Mr. REGAN. Are they not opposed to the addition of any acreage?

Mr. COOLEY. No; the Department is in favor of adding on the amount of acreage required to eliminate these inequities.

Mr. REGAN. Those 700,000 acres that the gentleman says might have been allocated to Texas were not allocated, and that is not the fault of the farmers we are trying to help.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right, it is not the fault of the individual farmer, but it is certainly the fault of the committee in failing to carry out the intent and the purposes of the law.

Mr. REGAN. Does the gentleman not agree that those farmers are entitled to some consideration at this time?

Mr. COOLEY. I sympathize with them very much, but they are not entitled to any more consideration than other farmers who perhaps have peculiar situations. If this amendment is adopted, I am sure it will be followed by every conceivable amendment to take care of veterans and others who returned from the war and who had not gone in the cotton-growing business before 1949, and there will be nc end to the burdens to be added.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I want to say in defense of the chairman of the Texas State PMA Committee, who did ask that we put in this bill 10 percent State reserve, that he thought with this 10-percent State reserve he could take care of all of these injustices just now described. I talked with him just as lately as last Friday, and he explained again, as he has several times, that the reason the State committee in Texas did not use the full 10 percent was that Texas was by design or inadvertence placed under the California gadget whereby we were not given credit that we had been promised for the war crops, resulting in the fact that more than 50 counties in Texas now receive a county factor of less than 10 percent. Mr. Vance explained, and I can understand his position, that he simply did not have the heart and the State committee did not feel justified in going into a county that had a 6 percent county factor or 1.6 percent county factor, as one of the counties has, and taking from those people that had practically no allotment at all, even that which they had, to give it to somebody in some other part of the State. Had he not been drawn under this California gadget, I have no doubt that the Texas State committee would have used this reserve and would have corrected these inequities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and three Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 15 minutes, 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON].

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate my esteemed colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN] on offering this amendment.

I come from a district which has no cotton except probably that which is in the drug store or the hospital, but we are going to have to vote on this bill. Apparently there is a necessity for regulating the amount of cotton to be grown in this country.

We know that the big problem we have confronting us today is farm surpluses and taxation. When we vote on this, we want to know that it is going to be fair.

It has been but a few years ago that we heard probably some of the Members who today have been discussing this bill so freely rise on this floor and talk about how we should raise more food and fiber. The head of our administration has been advocating the same thing.

It has taken the veterans 2 or 3 years to get started. The reason they started in 1949 was that they could not get started immediately upon their return. If you were to ask me what my opinion is at this time, it seems to me that they have arranged a bill which is taking care of the farmers who were in the business during the wartime, who were raising crops that were needed at the time, such as peanuts and the like, and now they

are allowing them to come back and raise cotton and crowd out the veterans.

I think this amendment is nothing else but a fair attempt to bring equity to this resolution, and I certainly advocate its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, I regret to find myself on the other side of the fence from the distinguished committee that is doing so much to help my own community.

This amendment has equity on its side.

While home during the holidays a lady called me to tell me that her husband had died and left her some brush land, and that last year she had gone to the expense of clearing that land, spending more than $60 an acre, and had planted it to cotton.

Under the present regulation and interpretation she gets no acreage at all for cotton. There are many, many people under similar circumstances who will suffer irreparable harm unless some type of amendment such as this is passed. I say to the Committee that I do not want this amendment at the expense of House Joint Resolution 398 for I am convinced that it will do more for the agricultural economy of America.

This is a problem, however, that ought to be recognized in fairness to many people who have gone to great expense putting land into cultivation. It is different from an old farm which was cleared many years ago and which has not been cultivated to cotton for 10 or 20 years. Today I would say it will cost between $60 and $100 an acre to clear brush and to plow land and put it into cultivation. Many people have that type of investment in their land today and have no way of getting that investment back unless they can have an allotment of acreage for cotton. This is a very difficult problem and I want, with all the sincerity at my command, to commend this splendid committee for the consideration they have given to this bill. It means food, clothing, and shelter for thousands of people whom I represent. I am deeply grateful to you, but this amendment raises a problem which cannot be pushed aside lightly; to do so will result in injury to people who need your consideration. Perhaps 30 percent is high considering the factors in other counties, but if this general amendment passes, it will be below the general level. I hope you will seriously consider this amendment.

You gentlemen of the Committee realize what the problem is and you realize we are trying to be unselfish in our views. You realize also that unless we bring this to your attention and insist on its adoption we would be doing an injustice to hundreds of people whom we represent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MILES].

Mr. MILES. Mr. Chairman, being of the old school, which thought that demand and supply was the basis on which to establish prices, I am just a little at a loss to know what to advocate sometimes. But we have strayed away so far from that point I doubt if we could find our way back. It has become necessary, of course, to find some other formula. I want to say in behalf of the people of New Mexico that we cannot grow cotton out there unless we have water and unless we have irrigation in some form. The development of the Conchas Dam in the last few years has put a great deal of land under cultivation. These people have prepared their land to plant the cotton. A great many of them did not get to plant until 1949. Unless this amendment goes through, I do not see how they will have an opportunity to come under this and to benefit in any way.

Also in the last few years there have been shallow wells discovered in some parts of the country where irrigation has made it possible to grow cotton. These people have gone to expense in preparing their land and buying the machinery and planting cotton. If they are going to be put in this situation, they will not be able to recover any of the expenses they have been put to unless they are able to grow some cotton.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, the 1949 cotton acreage plantings were eliminated from the base years for a specific purpose. That purpose came to light back in the fall of 1948 when it became necessary for the Secretary of Agriculture to consider whether or not quotas and acreage allotments would be imposed for the year 1949. The supply was such that by only a few thousand bales did the Secretary avoid declaring quotas for 1949. That being the case, farmers throughout the entire Cotton Belt believed that quotas and acreage allotments were almost definitely certain for the year 1950. Therefore, it was reasonable to assume, and the assumption was correct, that cotton farmers throughout the belt would materially increase their plantings in 1949. They looked to 1949 as the last year of free and unlimited plantings with high supports. Realizing, too, that the acreage to be later allotted would be based to a large degree on history, the urge existed to plant the fence corners in cotton in 1949. This would have been disastrous. Almost everyone agreed that plantings for 1949 should, therefore, be taken out.

It was the opinion of the Committee on Agriculture that if 1949 plantings were eliminated an acreage race would be avoided. Therefore, we brought a bill to the House, and this House and the Senate adopted it, and the President signed it. Now, I do not think it is fair, after notice has been served on all cotton growers, including the old growers, if you please, that we should now come along and give credit only, by this amendment, to the new growers of the western areas, whereas the old growers themselves have been barred from taking credit for the 1949 plantings.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield.

Mr. BENTSEN. Do you remember the effective date of that law?

Mr. ABERNETHY. No; I do not remember the effective date, but I do remember that the newspapers, as early as October 1948, carried considerable information that 1949 plantings should and more than likely would be eliminated.

Mr. BENTSEN. Does the gentleman know that my crops were planted in my district before the effective date of the law?

Mr. ABERNETHY. That might be true. Farmers all over the belt were similarly affected. However, there was considerable notice in the press that 1949 plantings would not be taken into account. By the pending amendment you would give the so-called new farmers of the West 30 percent of their 1949 plantings whereas the counties might have a factor of not more than 10 or 15 percent. That certainly is not fair.

Furthermore, there are thousands of farmers throughout the Cotton Belt who have not grown cotton but who today would like to have and are demanding cotton acreage. This amendment gives them no acreage. Why should they be treated differently. So far as cotton is concerned, their farms also constitute new farms. Why eliminate every old farm in the Cotton Belt just because it has not grown cotton? If the amendment is to be adopted then certainly it should be redrafted to include the old farms which have no cotton history.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] has expired.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE] is recognized.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize again my support of the Regan amendment. I want to point out to the Members that the people in the district represented by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] have, in effect, been subjected to an ex post facto law. We all know that is against the spirit of the Constitution of the United States, which plainly says that no ex post facto law shall be passed.

The effective date of Public Law 28, which eliminates the 1949 cotton acreage from consideration in establishing quotas, was February 28, 1949, long after many thousands of acres had been planted in the gentleman's district.

I submit to you that it is unfair, inequitable, and unjust to allow people to expend their personal fortunes, in many cases young veterans, to the full extent of their capital, in the preparation of this land and the buying of equipment, and then turn right around and pass this ex post facto law—in spirit at least—and completely confiscate the property of those people. It is not right and I hope the Regan amendment will be adopted.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Notwithstanding the views of the committee, has not the gentleman supported amendments that would tend to increase allotments?

Mr. WHITE of California. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but would he repeat his question?

Mr. COOLEY. Has not the gentleman supported, actively, amendments which have been proposed to this bill, the purpose of which would be to increase acreage?

Mr. WHITE of California. My answer to that is "No; I have not."

Mr. COOLEY. Has the gentleman opposed any of them?

Mr. WHITE of California. Certainly I have; I voted against the Whitten amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. The Whittington amendment was to cut the acreage down.

Mr. WHITE of California. No; the Whitten amendment would increase the acreage.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] claimed that it would decrease acreage.

Mr. WHITE of California. No; the gentleman from Mississippi wanted more acreage.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman mean the Whittington amendment or the Whitten amendment?

Mr. WHITE of California. Whitten.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman voted against that?

Mr. WHITE of California. I voted against that.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman want this program to be fairly put into operation?

Mr. WHITE of California. I certainly do.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman heard me read the letter from the Department which said that this amendment would result in even greater inequities than now exist.

Mr. WHITE of California. I did not so understand the letter or interpret it.

Mr. COOLEY. That is what it said.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me say first that I hope no one thinks it is a pleasant task to come here and oppose these amendments. It would make me feel so much better if I could recommend their adoption. Let me say, secondly, that I hope no one here thinks this is a veterans' amendment. The remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON] would leave the impression that this is just a group of veterans trying to get help, but the gentleman from Texas made no such statement. There are veterans and nonveterans involved here; on 50, 60, or 70 percent of the cotton farms of the Nation there is a veteran involved. When you affect the rights of one you affect the rights of the others.

Here is the issue, Mr. Chairman; I feel very deeply about this proposal. The first day of the last session of Congress a bill was introduced to outlaw new cotton acreage planted in 1949. Here are the figures: In 1948, 23,148,000 acres were planted in cotton; in 1949, 27,359,000 acres were planted in cotton. In other words, over 4,000,000 extra acres of cotton were planted in 1949. That was outlawed, we passed a special act last year that it would not be counted. We now are asked to open the door to 1949, not for the farmers across this Nation who planted the 4,000,000 extra acres, but for one little area that they say will take only 50,000 acres to satisfy. For my part, you may do as you please, but if we are going to open the 1949 door and take 1949 cotton acreage into account, then on my bended knees I ask you to open the door wide and let every farmer across this Nation who planted this extra 4,000,000 acres in 1949 get credit for it.

Here is the story: These gentlemen came before our committee in February. Never have we had a more earnest witness than the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN]. They brought these growers here and they told us they were going to clear all this land and they wanted a special allotment. That was in February 1949. We told these gentlemen that we were going to put in the bill a provision to take care of them, that we were going to give the State of Texas, the State committee, the right to reserve 10 percent of the allotment made to that State. Here are the figures: The State of Texas has already received a cotton-acreage allotment of 7,637,000, more than one-third of all the cotton acres of this Nation. The Texas committee had the right—hear me, please—the Texas committee had the right to reserve 763,000 acres to take care of what? Wait a minute, to take care of what? Trends and new farms, and every one of these new farms that you are now asked by this amendment to make a special allotment for can be considered as new farms. They tell us that as new farms they have already gotten from 8 to 10 percent of what they put into cotton in 1949. I dare say this is as liberal or a more liberal allotment than any other new farm in any State in the United States.

What are you doing on top of that? This is a piece of permanent legislation these gentlemen are proposing. They propose here that regardless of how you cut cotton acreage in years to come, it does not make any difference how low you make it, down to 12 or 15 million acres for the Nation, this particular group will always get 30 percent of what they had in cotton in 1949.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BENTSEN. Does the gentleman agree that at the present time we are considering new legislation and that that will outmode this particular legislation?

Mr. PACE. The gentleman has not come in here with a 1950 amendment. He has come here with a piece of permanent legislation and if we write it in then it is in there and it will take lots and lots of work to ever get it out. It would be a piece of permanent legislation, I repeat, and should not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BECKWORTH:

Page 4, after line 6, insert the following:

"SEC. 5. Section 346 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(f) The penalty provided for in this section shall not apply with respect to cotton produced by any person who is recognized by the county committee as being a cotton farmer if his total acreage does not exceed 5 acres.'"

And on page 4, line 7, strike out "SEC. 5" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 6."

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, in presenting the point of order I wish, first, to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that this is a temporary 1950 emergency resolution which says at the outset "that, nothwithstanding the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, including Public Law 252," these changes shall be made for the year 1950.

We submit, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment now offered by the distinguished gentleman from Texas is an amendment to amend Public Law 272. It is permanent legislation. It would change the eligibility, among other things, of those who shall participate in a cotton referendum.

We submit, Mr. Chairman, it is not germane or relevant to the pending resolution and, therefore, should not be considered at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the gentleman from Texas like to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this legislation which we have proposed here today definitely has the effect of amending the legislation pertaining to cotton-acreage allotments, and therefore the amendment that I have offered, which is along the same line, is germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The amendment which was offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] provides that section 346 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, is amended by adding to the end thereof the following, and so forth.

House Joint Resolution 398 now before the Committee provides for a modification of certain provisions of existing law for 1 year, of a temporary nature. The pending resolution does not amend numerous features of existing law and is of a temporary character. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas proposes to amend existing law, and if adopted, would become permanent law.

The Chair is, therefore, constrained to rule that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas is not in order to the pending resolution, and sustains the point of order.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BECKWORTH:

Page 4, after line 6, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 5. Section 346 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(f) The penalties provided for in this section shall not apply with respect to cotton produced by any veteran of World War II who is recognized by the county committee as being a cotton farmer if his total production of cotton does not exceed 5 acres. As used in this subsection the term "veteran of World War II" means a person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after December 7, 1941, and before September 3, 1945, and who has been honorably separated from such service.'"

And on page 4, line 7, strike out "SEC. 5." and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 6."

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his point of order to give me an opportunity to discuss this amendment for 5 minutes?

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, if I may, I will withhold the point of order.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I am deeply grateful that the gentleman saw fit to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I would just like to make the announcement that our committee is meeting next Tuesday, February 7, to consider any permanent changes in the law.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I think that is very timely.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to say on August 3, 1949, when I was undertaking to offer some of these amendments, and when I did not have much time to discuss them, I said there would be many changes made. I am happy to say that on October 19, when I could not get one moment of time to repeat the seriousness of our problem I said there would be a lot more changes made. The gentleman from Wisconsin, Representative MURRAY, yielded to me for brief observations. I say to this House today in spite of the fact that a lot of work has been done on this legislation, in spite of the fact that some of you feel it is a pretty good piece of legislation, that many more changes are going to be made.

Why do I say that? Because this falls far short in treating fairly many of the cotton producers of this whole Nation. You know, I was interested a while ago in what was said about Dawson County. I did not mean to mention Dawson County. Dawson County has less than 20,000 people. Dawson County has about 1,400 farms. Fourteen east Texas counties that have, however, half a million people, with 43,000 farms, received less cotton allotment than that one county. I do not envy the good people of that county. I am glad they are prospering; I want them to prosper in the future. However, in all fairness the people of my section deserve to have a living—this legislation to endure must be on a live and let live basis. Contrast 43,000 farms with 1,200 farms. Contrast 20,000 people with almost half a million people, and you see why I contend this legislation is going to be changed, and it is going to be changed a whole lot.

The amendment I offered, and which I regret was ruled out on a point of order, would simply give a small farmer 5 acres of cotton.

I have often wondered why the great Committee on Agriculture of the House and the Committee on Agriculture in the Senate devote as little time as they do on the question of minimums for family-sized-farm operators. I do not say these committees have never considered minimums, but I never have seen a great deal of evidence that there has been any unusual effort made to guarantee to genuine family - sized - farm operators enough acreage of peanuts and cotton to be assured of the privilege to continue to farm. In my opinion this problem will have to be given much more attention in the future than it has been given in the past.

I read into the RECORD yesterday a list county by county showing conditions that exist in certain east Texas counties. One county has a thousand farms among which to distribute a thousand acres. What will be the plight of those poor farmers that are run off because they get but an acre apiece? They must seek relief—relief which today does not exist for them. Another tragic thing which relates to them, as I understood it, is, in the main, they will not even be privileged to vote in the cotton referendum this fall.

I think the Committee on Agriculture does have a significant job to perform in rewriting this cotton-acreage legislation, because there are literally thousands of these people in the South. I was interested in the plea that was made here a while ago for a relatively few people in about four or five counties in Texas at the most. You would have thought that was indeed a serious situation, and it is exceedingly serious—I voted to help the people of Reeves and Willacy Counties and counties similarly affected—but where they were talking about hundreds, or only a very few thousand people, this refers to literally tens of thousands of people.

In the section from which I come, I repeat, as I put in the RECORD and no one has sought to challenge it, there are thousands of people who will be thrown off the farms—by no means are all of these from Texas.

I have a letter here from a banker, who says that a good man came into his bank wanting a loan. He has no peanuts and has no cotton allotted to him. He doubtless is told, "You grow something else." Yes, they tell him to grow something that is likely not to have price support. That is what you are telling these people to do. I submit it is unfair. I submit that it is unjust. I submit that it is unsound, and ultimately will not prevail in such a form.

I desire to include other communications:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
Washington, January 6, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is to confirm answers to the questions you discussed yesterday with Mr. Ray Hurley, Chief, Agricultural Division of this Bureau.

According to the 1945 census there were 601,273 farms with 9 acres or less of cotton harvested. These farms with 9 acres or less of cotton harvested produced a total of 2,386,668 bales of cotton or an average of 3.97 bales per farm. If these farms were limited to a maximum production of 4 bales each, then the maximum total cotton production on such farms would be 2,405,092 bales. As we have pointed out, we do not know how many of these 601,273 farms produced more than 4 bales of cotton in 1944. If it could be assumed that there are now 1,500,000 farms producing cotton and that the same proportion of these 1,500,000 farms as in 1944 grew 9 acres or less of cotton, then 740,700 farms would have 9 acres or less of cotton. If each of these 740,700 farms were limited to a maximum production of 4 bales each, the maximum total production of such farms would be 2,962,800 bales.

According to the United States Department of Agriculture, approximately 32,200 farmers producing Irish potatoes were eligible for the price-support program in 1948. In 1944 there were 2,105,757 farmers producing Irish potatoes. The 32,200 farmers eligible for the price-support program is equivalent to 1.5 percent of all farmers harvesting potatoes in 1944. It should be noted that a large number of farmers producing potatoes grew them for use only on the farm. In 1944 only 432,923 farmers reported 1 acre or more of potatoes harvested.

Please let us know if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,
PHILIP M. HAUSER,
Acting Director,
Bureau of the Census.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., January 6, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your note requesting information on the number of farmers reporting cotton production of four bales or less.

As the Director of the Census indicated in his letter, there has been no tabulation of cotton farmers classified by the number of bales produced more recent than that prepared on the basis of data from the 1940 census of agriculture.

The 1945 census of agriculture was taken by the Bureau of the Census, not the Department of Agriculture. This is true for the earlier agricultural censuses as well.

A special tabulation of the number of cotton farmers classified by the number of bales produced was prepared on the basis of data for 1939 from the 1940 census of agriculture. There was no such tabulation prepared from the 1944 data obtained in the 1945 census of agriculture.

There was, however, a tabulation of cotton farms classified by the number of acres of cotton harvested from the 1944 data. This tabulation indicates that there were 593,790 farms which reported less than 10 acres of cotton harvested. Total production of cotton on these farms was 2,347,216 bales or an average of 3.95 bales per farm.

This is not, of course, an accurate estimate of the number of farms on which cotton production amounted to four bales or less. Undoubtedly, some farms with high yields produced more than four bales or less than 10 acres, while other farms with low yields undoubtedly produced less than four bales on more than 10 acres. These are, however, the only data available since 1939 that shed any light on the question you raise.

Sincerely yours,

H. T. HUTCHINSON,
Assistant Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, January 13, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of December 5 in which you ask for the definition of various types of farmers.

Generally speaking an individual could be identified as several kinds of farmer depending on his experience and the products he was producing: i. e., one man could be a cotton farmer, peanut farmer, rice farmer, and dairy farmer. If you refer to his eligibility for allotments or quotas the requirements are listed in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. A copy of a compilation is enclosed.

We believe our PMA committeeman and other employees who might be called upon to make a decision can make the proper identification of the various types of farmers.

Sincerely,

A. J. LOVELAND,
Under Secretary.

GILMER, TEX., *January 27, 1950.*

DEAR SIR: I am writing you in regards to this cotton acreage. I planted 16 acres last year and they haven't given me any yet for this year. And I wish you would do something about it—if you possibly can. As I have been to the office three times and signed a little piece of paper and all they do is growl and say they will see what they can do. Lindley, you know how a little old sandland farmer is, he has got to have a little cotton in. I want to cooperate if possible but looks like I just can't.

Yours respectfully,

JIM DAVIDSON.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., November 21, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your memorandum of November 17 regarding the application of the provision of Public Law 272, Eighty-first Congress, in the determination of State and county allotments where cotton plantings were adversely affected during base years.

As we understand the law referred to above, no provision is made for adjusting State allotments for abnormal conditions affecting cotton plantings within the State. However, the law does provide for the State committees to adjust county allotments for abnormal conditions affecting cotton plantings with the provision, of course, that any upward adjustments must be offset by downward adjustments in other counties. The State committee in considering this problem had to give weight to (1) abnormal weather, (2) insect damage, (3) soil crusting in irrigated areas, (4) abnormal movement of farm labor to war industries, (5) an abnormal drafting of farm labor into the armed services, and (6) the production of war crops instead of cotton during the base years that were used in computing county allotments. These factors that affect cotton plantings are, of course, difficult to measure and it is more difficult to perform a satisfactory adjustment in county allotments to reflect each of them properly. Therefore, the State committee adjustment was made with this formula:

If the 1947–48 average acreage of cotton planted in a county was less than the 1941 acreage of cotton planted, the allotment adjustment was computed to be the product of such difference and 0.0904686.

The application of this formula to east Texas counties did result in substantial adjustments, in some instances amounting to as much as 25 percent of the county allotment computed in the Washington office.

The law referred to above and the Secretary's regulations do not provide for consideration of abnormal conditions affecting cotton plantings on a farm basis except as these relate to the owner or operator serving in the armed forces during 1946 or 1947.

You are assured that consideration has been given to the provision of law on both the county and farm basis in all Texas counties. Additional information needed will be gladly furnished on request.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., December 21, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
United States Representative,
Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of December 15 in which you have quoted part of a letter from someone who claims that his county did not get credit for cotton war-crop acreages in the distribution of the State cotton allotment to counties and that BAE cotton-acreage estimates for some counties are not correct.

When the provisions of Public Law 272, Eighty-first Congress, were applied to State acreages and State war-crop credits, it was determined that the 1950 State cotton allotment would be on the basis of 95 percent of the 1947–48 actual average acreage of cotton and, consequently, the State received an allotment of 7,637,029 acres. As the solicitor has interpreted the law, county cotton allotments must be computed on exactly the same basis as the State cotton allotment was computed. Therefore the 1945 and 1946 county cotton acreages, as well as the 1945, 1946, and 1947 county war-crop credits were not used in the computation of county allotments.

During the summer of 1949 all farmers were requested to report crop acreages and land uses for their farms for each of the 4 years 1945–48. The total of the reported cotton acreages for each year exceeded the BAE estimate of county acreage standing on July 1 in nearly all counties in the State. The State total of such reported acreages exceeded the BAE acreage of cotton an average of 32 percent for the 4 years 1945–48. Consequently, it became necessary to reduce reported cotton acreages for overstatement and so that the total thereof for all farms in each county would conform with official acreages that the Department of Agriculture is required to use in the administration of the cotton program. The adjustment of reported acreages was necessary so that the farm cotton war-crop credits could be more accurately computed for the years 1945, 1946, and 1947.

In view of the above conditions that the State and county committees were required to follow, it will not be possible for us to reconsider the county cotton allotment for this county.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., December 5, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of December 2 in which you refer to a letter from a Panola County farmer who complains regarding the 1950 cotton-acreage allotment for his farm.

The statements made by this farmer are substantially correct except that he does not know how much adjustment, if any, will be made in his indicated farm cotton allotment by county and community committeemen. As a rule, most county committees have reserved 10 to 15 percent of the county allotment for use in increasing computed farm allotments for farms on which there is justification for more allotment in view of the land, labor, equipment, and need for additional acreage.

Public Law 272 provides for the apportionment of the county allotment (less a small reserve acreage) on the basis of a uniform percentage factor of the cropland in each farm. The farm allotment computed with the percentage factor is limited by the highest cotton history of the farm in the 3 years, 1946–48.

The letter received by you indicates that this farmer was expecting his allotment to be figured on the basis of a percentage reduction from his 5-year average acreage of cotton planted. This approach to farm allotments is, of course, not provided for in the law and often results in a misunderstanding of the percentage of cropland approach to farm allotments.

It is true that the percentage of cropland factors for many west Texas counties are much higher than the percentage of cropland factors for east Texas. This variation is due to the fact that for an average west Texas county more than 50 percent of the total cropland in the county was planted to cotton in the years 1947 and 1948, while in an average east Texas county, less than 15 percent of the cropland in the county was planted to cotton in these 2 years. On the basis of history the reduction in allotments for the two areas is practically identical.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., December 8, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
United States Representative,
Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of December 5 with reference to a suggestion that minimum 1950 farm cotton allotments equal to 20 percent of the farm cropland be established.

Several proposals have been advanced by various States to amend Public Law 272, Eighty-first Congress, that would provide for a minimum 1950 farm allotment. The one proposed by Southeastern States would provide that no farm would have a 1950 allotment of less than 70 percent of the 1946–48 average acreage of cotton standing on July 1. We feel that the minimum allotment provision should be such that no farm would receive a 1950 allotment of less than 50 percent of the highest acreage of cotton standing on July 1 of the years 1946, 1947, or 1948. No doubt others will advance the proposal that no farm have a 1950 cotton allotment of less than a specified percentage of the farm cropland after other allotment crop acreages have been deducted.

We much prefer the 50-percent proposal or a similar simple proposal since it would

be more easily explained to farmers and understood by those who were affected.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., December 8, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
United States Representative,
Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your wire of December 5 regarding the Texas reserve cotton allotment.

Originally 3 percent of the State allotment, or 229,111 acres, was set aside for use in adjusting county allotments for trends in cotton plantings, abnormal conditions affecting plantings, for small farms and for new farms. All of this reserve was allocated, except for about 2,000 acres, prior to the time that county committees were notified of official allotments. We anticipate using the remaining reserve for correcting errors in instances where county committee reserves would not be sufficient. It has been our experience that for the fiscal year of a large program, a small reserve is needed by the State committee so that undue hardship will not result.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., December 9, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
United States Representative,
Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of December 6 in which my assistance was requested in providing for the release and reapportionment of 1950 farm cotton allotments and in getting more consideration for war-crop acreages that were produced instead of cotton in the years 1945, 1946, and 1947.

Public Law 272 passed by the Eighty-first Congress does not contain a provision for the release or reapportionment of 1950 farm cotton allotments. Consequently the Secretary, as well as State and county committees, are not in position to use the release and reapportionment provision. It is our understanding that original drafts of the cotton-marketing quota law did contain a provision for release and reapportionment, but when the conference committee reported out the bill that became law, the release and reapportionment provision was not included. Therefore, the Solicitor and the Secretary feel that they cannot agree to the inclusion of such provision in the Secretary's regulations since the Congress did not include such provision in the final draft of the bill.

In connection with war-crop acreages, the Solicitor has ruled that the Texas allotment and all county allotments must be computed on the basis of 95 percent of the 1947–48 average acreage of cotton to conform with the provisions of Public Law 272. Here again the Secretary, as well as State and county committees, cannot give any additional credit for war-crop acreages since it is felt that the law is specific with respect to treatment of war-crop credits in the determination of State and county allotments.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., December 13, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of November 25 in which you quoted a portion of a letter from Mr. R. C. Miller, Orange Grove, Tex., regarding cotton-acreage allotments.

The formula for apportioning the national cotton-acreage allotment to States, the State allotment to counties, and the county allotment to farms was developed in accordance with the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. In reply to your letter of October 29 we furnished you in considerable detail an interpretation of the allotment formula. At the same time we informed you that, when the formula was applied, it was determined that Texas would receive its portion of the national cotton allotment on the basis of 95 percent of the average acreage actually planted to cotton in 1947 and 1948. This gave Texas a larger allotment than would have been received under the other provisions. We also informed you that the State acreage allotment for cotton, less a reserve of not to exceed 10 percent of the State allotment, is required to be apportioned to counties on the same basis as to years and conditions as is applicable to the State. Therefore, the allotment for Texas, less the State reserve, is required to be apportioned to counties on the basis of 95 percent of the average acreage actually planted to cotton in 1947 and 1948. In apportioning the county allotment to farms, however, the act provides credit for war crops planted in lieu of cotton in 1946 and 1947 as determined by the PMA county committee.

We assure you that the Department officials responsible for the administration of this legislation are in every respect following the specific provisions of the act as written. Also the various measures left to the discretion of the Secretary are being administered within the standards and guides contained in the legislation and in the light of the Department's past experience with similar programs.

The law is very specific with respect to the manner in which allotments are to be made and we are without authority to change its provisions.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH S. TRIGG,
Administrator.

Mr. Chairman, note the letters I include from farmers:

CANTON, TEX., *January 12, 1950.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I have a wife and four children. I was raised on a farm. After spending 2 years overseas in the Navy during the war I came home to start farming for myself. I've done very well up until now. I bought a place this last November through the Farmers Home Administration, but I am going to lose it unless you help me. The farm consists of 161 acres and sold for $9,900. The land has been laying out for several years and therefore I cannot get either a cotton or peanut allotment. It is very good cotton land and I am a cotton farmer. I worked part of the land last year and made about one-half bale of cotton to the acre. Could you tell me what to do? If I lose it, the Government will never buy me another farm. I am sure to lose it unless you can help.

Yours truly,

JOHN T. ATHERTON.

CARTHAGE, TEX., *December 6, 1949.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LINDLEY: I know that you are a busy man and for that reason I have made it a point not to bother you during your stay in Washington, but there is a matter of great importance facing all east Texans that I want to discuss with you briefly.

East Texas has never been looked on as a cotton-producing area, and as a result our interest is not considered when it comes to formulating cotton-control programs. On the other hand cotton has and still is one of the means of providing the requirements of life for those living on farms here in Panola County. Farmers are now faced with a grave problem if the cotton-control program which is now being considered goes into effect.

One reason we are having a control program is because we have a surplus of cotton, but the little 3-to-10-bale farmer of this county had nothing to do with the surplus we now have. It has been brought about by the 100-to-1,000-bale farmer, and, if I understand the program, he will not be affected as will the little man here. My idea about any program that has to do with the national economy should be a fair and just one for all those who participate in it.

Prewar, we had farmers in Panola, and it is the same all over east Texas, who worked small farms and most of their farm income was from small cotton acreage. During the war they left the farms to go into the shipyards and war plants because they could make more money. All this is past history now, and they have returned to the farm to find out that because they did not work large cotton acreage during the past few years that they are not qualified to work the same acreage as before. In some cases I have talked to farmers who state that they would like to farm but that it takes money to farm and that the proposed farm-control program as now explained to them would not permit the planting of a cash crop to assure them a living.

I understand that we are to have only about 21,000,000 acres to be planted in cotton next year. Why not find out what percent this is of the total tilled acreage and if it is 20 or 30 percent then allow each farm that amount of cotton. In many cases it would not be planted as all farmers do not want cotton and if they did not then we would have just that much less to worry us next year. Give all an equal chance and leave it up to the individual to decide if he wants cotton or not. If the farmers the country over raised as little cotton as do the farmers of Panola County then we would not be faced with cotton-control programs. Even at that they should be allowed to have their just share.

Not only has it affected the farmer but the merchant as well. His business is suffering now and will suffer more next fall if farmers do not have some type of cash crop. Any time you cut the farmers' income off you cut off the merchants because farmers have always spent what they have made, but if they do not have it, then they cannot spend it. This would be a sure way of bringing about a recession or depression. To have a better condition I think the income from cotton should be spread out and not confined to a select few. These farmers who have by overplanting during the past few years brought about a surplus of cotton have made more money than at any time before so why should not they be penalized like the man who did not plant at all or but little?

I may be talking through my nose but this matter has to do with the future welfare of all farmers of this and many other counties of east Texas and, in my way of thinking,

should come in for its just share of consideration. Personally I do not intend to plant 1 acre of cotton but I have about 500 acres of farmland and if I did want to plant some cotton I should be given that right. It so happens that I have not had any cotton on my farm for the past few years and I am told that I could not plant any cotton if I wanted to.

I could say much more but the more I say the less likely it will be read, so I will call it a day by saying that you have always taken problems of east Texas to heart and I am sure you will be in there punching on this matter. Seriously, though, Lindley, this is more than a laughing matter and just this week we are carrying out a program of democracy beats communism but the farmers cannot wholeheartedly take part in it when they are being discriminated against as they are in this cotton-control program.

Thanking you for any and all consideration you may see fit to give the above, I beg to remain,

Sincerely yours,

FORREST E. ROBERTS.

GRAND SALINE, TEX., *December 12, 1949.*
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR LINDLEY: I did not plant any cotton in 1946, 1947, or 1948. This year I had a crop and bought a tractor. I have to make special application before I will get to grow any cotton. I owe on my tractor and won't be able to pay for it according to the allotment. I have had the cotton land all the time. I don't think I should be penalized now because I didn't grow cotton the past 3 years.

There are a lot of people around me who are in the same shape I am in. It has been beneficial to our farms and to the price of cotton for us to let land lay out. To restrict the allotment to the last 3 years will certainly penalize the farmers in Van Zandt County. We are wondering if you can help. We have either let our land lay out or have utilized it for something else. We don't see why we can't grow cotton the same as the man who did not diversify and who did not sacrifice in order to reduce the cotton acreage in the first place.

We have already done what the Government is trying to force farmers to do now. We should not be penalized for voluntarily doing that which the Government is now forcing upon us. The fellow who should be favored, instead of favoring him, the Government is penalizing him.

Since 1942 I have been in bad health and couldn't farm until this year. Instead of renting, I let my land lay out. Now I am being penalized because of the bad condition of my health from 1943 to 1948.

Sincerely yours,

OSIE L. SWAIN.

P. S.—I am also informed that those who did not grow cotton in 1946–47–48 will not be allowed to vote in an election scheduled December 15 in the marketing-quota referendum.

MOUNT SYLVAN, TEX., *December 21, 1949.*
Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR LINDLEY: Your letter received. Was glad to hear from you in regard to our cotton allotment here in Smith and adjoining counties. I do hope that Congress will make some kind of relief for the east Texas farmers when they meet in January. What is going to become of the tenant farmer? They have taken the very smallest acreage that east Texas ever had to figure the acreage by. I have a farm that had planted 20 acres of cotton in 1948, 1947, and 1946. Will be allowed nine-tenths acre in 1951. Everybody can't go in the cattle business, potato, and watermelons. I do not understand why they are cutting east Texas out on the cotton business.

Lindley, I am going to depend on your doing your best to get Congress to modify this law so that east Texas country can have their just rights.

Hoping you a merry Christmas and a happy New Year.

Your friend,

W. H. BOYNTON.

GRAND SALINE, TEX., *December 26, 1949.*
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Washington, D. C.

KIND FRIEND: I am writing you in regard to our farm program.

To me it seems unjust, as I have 435 acres of land, and 300 acres of this is cropland. When World War II came on all of the tenants left my farm and went to airplane factories and shipyards, and me, not being able to rent any of my land, I went into the stock business a year ago. I was forced by my health to go out of the stock business, so I began to try to rent my land, and in 1949 I did succeed in getting some of my land worked. However, now they tell me because I failed to have any cotton and such like in 1946 and 1947 I am not eligible for any cotton. I do think that they have promised me 4 acres of cotton, and, as you know as a farm boy, I cannot rent my land without some cotton acreage. I do not believe that it was the intention of Congress for all of this land to lay out.

Lindley, as you know, this is my only source of income to exist, and I was wondering if anything can be done at this late hour, so I thought it best that you should know how this set-up is going.

Hoping that you and your family are enjoying the best of health, I am

Sincerely yours,

HENRY A. GODWIN.

GRAND SALINE, TEX., *December 27, 1949.*
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you in regard to my cotton allotment.

I borrowed the money to buy my farm and tractor through the FHA. I can't pay for this without any cotton. The only 3 years that I did not plant cotton was in 1945, 1946, and 1947.

I raised truck and feed. I have one neighbor who got 9 acres. He has not planted any cotton in 10 years. There is plenty of that over the county.

I hate to bother you with this letter, but I sure would appreciate it if you could help me get some cotton.

I have supported you in every campaign that you have made.

Hoping to hear from you soon.

Your friend,

E. J. HALE.

BEN WHEELER, TEX., *December 26, 1949.*
Mr. BECKWORTH.

DEAR SIR: I am a farmer, have farmed in Van Zandt County all of my life, and am 36 years old. Was raised on a 495-acre farm here in this part of the county. My father sold our farm in 1937 and have rented ever since. You might say I was raised in the cotton patch. In the past 3 years I have lived on a place where the landlord worked in town, but he is going to work his place himself next year (1950), so I bought a nearby farm of 460 acres—some 175 in cultivation in 1942. It had 57 acres of cotton allotment in 1941. It had planted 54 acres of cotton on it. (I owe for most of it.) But for the past few years (as the owner was old) he leased it to a man who put cows on it and did not farm it. The place where I have been working has an allotment on the record of my farming, but I have not got any allotment on the farm I bought, where I am moving, because it had no cotton on it in the past 3 or 4 years.

We are calling for help for farms which do not have allotments while others have allotments. Mr. BECKWORTH, the only fair way is to treat everybody alike. I am a farmer. If my neighbor is allowed a certain percent of his cultivation acres, I want the same percent of my cultivation acres. If a cotton renter has to move on a farm where there has been no cotton previously, he can't get any cotton; therefore, he cannot borrow money on his crop. If we don't get the same percent of our cultivation acres of allotment on cotton as our neighbor (who probably doesn't have to change farms), there certainly will be unrest and dissatisfaction.

You cooperation and help will be appreciated.

Yours truly,

S. C. HUFF.

DECEMBER 22, 1949.
Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I am writing you this letter in behalf of the farmers of East Texas. I shall use myself for example: I live 12 miles east of Tyler on a 175-acre farm. I have farmed all of my life except for the 2 years spent in World War I. During the years 1946, 1947, 1948 I did public work. This year I went back to farming. I have 165 acres in cultivation of which I planted 20 acres to cotton.

The new law which was voted into existence prohibits me from planting any cotton because I haven't any cotton history.

I went to the triple-A office to enter my application for the allotment of the cotton acreage. I was informed that there would be only an acre or so; therefore, I withdrew my application. I have no alternative but try to get a public job, unless I grow cotton regardless of the law.

I am obligated to my family. I have a daughter in college, which I had hopes of seeing finish. I believe that if our lawmakers had experience in farming we would have better laws for the interests of the farmers.

As I see the situation they are penalizing the wrong man, they should penalize the man planting 3,000 acres instead of the man with only 30 acres. The large planter is causing the surplus, not the one that has only a minimum number of acres. Seems to me that the lawmakers are too busy taking care of the big producers and not giving the small producer any consideration at all.

Don't you believe that there is discrimination in this law? In your honest opinion don't you believe it is unconstitutional? The farmers do not need a dole, what they need is a dependable market.

I shall expect you to do the utmost in your power to relieve us of these difficulties. To support my family properly I shall need at least 20 acres of cotton.

Cordially yours,

F. P. BOULTER.

BEN WHEELER, TEX.
L. BECKWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you to see if you can help me get some cotton acreage on this place.

I live on the Paul Gigier place, and it has about 175 acres in cultivation. I raised cotton on this place this year. The 1949 cotton crop was the first cotton crop since 1941. I had 23 acres this year and made 9 bales of cotton. If I could be allowed about 20 acres this year I could make it fine.

I have eight children at home and I have to feed and clothe them.

There are several farmers around me that were allowed good cotton acreage, and yet they haven't planted any cotton in 10 or 12 years.

The banks will not loan money if you don't have some cotton acreage. I have plenty of security to put up to the bank but they will not loan any money unless you have a cotton crop.

Mr. BECKWORTH, I need some cotton acreage bad, and I will deeply appreciate your cooperation.

Yours truly,

W. H. HOPSON.

P. S.—I have no other means of supporting my family other than raising cotton. Thank you.

GRAND SALINE, TEX.,
December 23, 1949.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

DEAR SIR: I did not get any cotton acreage for the year of 1950. I wonder just why. Seems to me like it was an unfair thing. They tell me it was because I did not have cotton in 1946, 1947, 1948.

I had truck crops and seems they did not give me credit for any war crops. Way things are going to be next year we may not be able to sell truck stuff, and we have a farm to pay for. I am expecting you to do all you can to help me get an allotment. I think each farm should have a few acres; don't you?

We have 112½ acres and 75 acres in cultivation and are not allowed any cotton at all.

I appreciate whatever you can do to help me.

ARLIE E. HOLLOWELL.

GRAND SALINE, TEX.,
December 15, 1949.

Mr. BECKWORTH,
Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR SIR AND FRIEND: Us farmers are greatly disturbed over this cotton allotment. We are in favor of governmental control of cotton acreage, but us little farmers are not in it at all. I have a little 100-acre farm. Have been in bad health for 5 years. 1947 and 1948 I didn't have 1 acre on my place in cotton, so I am not allowed to vote, or have any cotton either. I am wondering if our Government has completely turned on us little farmers. It seems like the ones that owns thousands of acres of wheat and cotton lands are fully protected. Has our Government forgot the Golden Rule and have they forgot equal rights to all men, special privileges to none?

I have one neighbor who has bought a tractor and the farm he owns didn't have any cotton on it at all in 1947 and 1948. So what is he to do? He is not allowed but very little cotton, if any. I have several neighbors in the same shape. They are poor, hard-working people and good people.

Mr. BECKWORTH, can you get Congress, you and Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. JOHNSON, to have this cotton allotment changed some so the little farmers can live through it? If the farmers all have to plant cabbage, potatoes, tomatoes, and sweet corn for living, there won't be any market for it.

Hoping there can be something done and with best wishes.

W. I. CREW AND WIFE.

GRAND SALINE, TEX., *December 16, 1949.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Gilmer, Tex.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I imagine you are hearing from quite a few dissatisfied cotton farmers about Government control of acreage. They are all for price supports, however. I see no possible way of having price support without some kind of production control, but the method of determining allotments is very unfair. If we had a law that would prevent a man planting more than 50 percent of his acreage to cotton and preventing planting cotton 2 years in succession on the same land, we would have very little need for price support and no need for any other control of cotton production and such a law would be fair to everybody. Furthermore such a law would be justified as a soil-conservation measure.

If this suggestion meets with your approval, will you please give it your immediate attention at the coming session of the Congress?

Very truly yours,

HOMER E. TUNNELL,
A Retired Cotton Farmer.

Mr. Chairman, note at this point the answer to the Tunnell letter:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., December 28, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of December 22, with which you enclosed a copy of a letter from Mr. Homer E. Tunnell, a retired cotton farmer of Grand Saline, Tex. Mr. Tunnell had suggested that the cotton-acreage allotment and marketing-quota program should prevent a farm allotment in excess of 50 percent of the cropland and should require the rotation of cotton acreage each year.

In general, we agree with the suggestion that a farm allotment should not exceed 50 percent of the cropland in the farm. However, some exceptions need to be made, especially for small farms where a larger acreage of cotton needs to be produced in order that the people depending on the small farm for a living can have sufficient cash-crop acreage for this purpose. Also we agree with the suggestion that cotton acreage should be rotated on the farm each year, but do not feel that such a provision need be written into law. It is the job of the Extension Service, Soil Conservation Service, and others who work with farmers to show that crop rotation is desirable and profitable.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Newton, Tex., December 30, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: The following information is in reply to your request of December 19, 1949:

County cotton-acreage allotment for 1942, 4,096.7 acres. County cotton-acreage allotment for 1950, 714.2 acres.

Since the county allotment for 1950 is so small it is felt that only a small acreage of perhaps 50 would be released for reapportionment.

Our allotments are all very small, which means that landlords who farm themselves will not be able to have any tenants. If each acre of war crops were considered as an acre of cotton, our allotment would probably double, which would be quite a relief over the present situation.

Under the present law we will have an estimated 75 farmers who will not be able to grow any cotton because of the lack of an acreage allotment.

Yours very truly,

T. H. INMAN,
Chairman, Newton County PMA Committee.

TEXARKANA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Texarkana, Ark.-Tex., January 17, 1950.

Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of January 3, requesting information on how many fewer jobs are in our locality than were here at the height of the war employment, we have now received this information from the employment bureau.

They advised there are about 7,500 fewer people working in this area now than there were during the peak of the employment during the war. We trust the above answers your inquiry; but if we can be of further service, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Sincerely yours,

L. E. GILLILAND,
Manager.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I make against this amendment now offered by the gentleman from Texas the same point of order that was made against his previous amendment, as they are both identical in form. They seek to amend the same section. They relate to the same section of the permanent law. I say this amendment is not germane to the pending resolution.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I make the same observation here that I made a while ago. I would like to ask the Chair how many parts of the Agricultural Act a given resolution would have to amend in order to be germane?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would meet that question when it arose, if it did arise. This is temporary legislation. For the reasons stated in the previous ruling, the point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for 1950, the peanut acreage allotment for any State shall not be reduced by a percentage larger than the percentage by which the 1950 national acreage allotment is below the 1949 national acreage allotment. The allotment for any State shall be increased to the extent required to provide such minimum State allotment and such acreage required shall be in addition to the national acreage allotment. The additional acreage authorized by this section shall not be taken into account in establishing future acreage allotments.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIKES: Page 4, line 16, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 6. Any part of the peanut acreage allotted to individual farms in any county for 1950 under the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustments Act of 1938, as amended, which will not be planted to peanuts and which is voluntarily surrendered by the owner or operator of the farm to the county committee shall be deducted from the 1950 allotments to such farms and shall be apportioned, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, to other farms in the same county. In any subsequent year, unless hereafter provided by law, acreage surrendered under this section and reallocated pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary shall be credited to the State and county."

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Agriculture has done a good job with a very difficult subject. It deserves credit for helping the farmers as much as it has. I wish it had gone further with relation to cotton and

peanuts, and in an effort to provide additional help. I offer an amendment, which I hope the committee will not object to. The amendment is intended to help in a small way the peanut producers of the country.

I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered does not provide for one additional acre of peanuts—not one. It does provide for the voluntary surrender of unused acreage allotments of peanuts during 1950 and for their reallocation within the respective counties. It is purely temporary. It is limited to 1950 in its application. It follows the same procedure generally as set out for the surrender of cotton-acreage allotments in an earlier section of the bill, except that it applies only to 1950.

I submit if the recapture and reallocation of unused allotments is good for cotton, it certainly is good for peanuts. If this amendment is rejected, we will not have another opportunity to help the peanut producers during 1950 because time will not allow it. I understand the committee is going to attempt to bring in a peanut bill later. I want you to realize, however, that this is the last day of January. It soon will be time to plant. Unless we do what we are going to do to help the peanut producers in this measure they can get no benefit during 1950.

The thing I have proposed actually would do but little for them. But it would help. I have had many communications from peanut producers. I have talked to many peanut producers who have asked that we at least do this much. As I said, it does not provide for any additional acreage above that the Department of Agriculture anticipated and above that allocated. It does provide for the surrender and reallocation voluntarily under regulations prescribed by the Secretary for unused allotments during this year. I think it is true that the problems of the peanut producer are as great or greater than those of the cotton producer. I would like to point out one or two salient reasons.

Peanut production was expanded tremendously during the war and the expansion materially helped the war effort. This expanded production became an important factor in the economy of the area. Many of these producers are now cut loose without allotments or with very small allotments. Yet they depend more now than during the war upon peanuts.

Here is another. Peanuts must be picked by machine. Yet, there are many small allotments of peanuts, nine-tenths of an acre, for instance. A man with an allotment of nine-tenths of an acre cannot get a picker to harvest his crop. You cannot afford to run a picker into a man's farm to perform the operation of picking his peanuts unless you have 2½ or 3 acres as a minimum.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I note the gentleman's statement that this does not call for any more peanut acreage. Can the gentleman tell us how much this will cost in dollars and cents?

Mr. SIKES. No; I cannot tell you how much it will cost in dollars and cents. I say it will not provide for any more peanut acreage, because it simply provides for the shifting of acreage within the allotment already prescribed. It will cost a little more money because of the fact that some more acreage will be planted which otherwise would not be planted. But it stays within the allotment prescribed by law, and it will help these hardship cases which otherwise would be seriously aggravated by failure to do something for the peanut producers.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. In presenting this amendment, is the gentleman prompted by the fact that inequities exist in the allocation of peanut acreage?

Mr. SIKES. Of course there are inequities in the allocation of peanut acreage. There are inequities in all allotment programs. But beyond and above that fact is the fact that we have men who have such small acreages of peanuts that they cannot make a living without a little help, and I am trying to give them that help.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] has expired.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include some letters.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the bill pending before the House today will, in my opinion, if enacted, correct thousands of inequities in the recent Cotton Acreage Quota Act. I am not certain that the inequities were the fault of the act or the administration of the act. However, I do know that we have thousands of cases in my district where farmers are drastically treated under this act. I am certain the Members of Congress and the farmers are fully aware of the fact that we have a surplus of cotton and are perfectly willing to take a reasonable acreage reduction. However, we do not care to stand idly by and see the farmers who have hundreds of tenants dependent upon them thrown completely out of the cotton business. My personal opinion is that a 30-percent acreage reduction is all the personal economy the farmer can stand at one time without throwing his farming operations completely out of line.

I am enclosing a few letters and wires from some of my constituents which I feel some of the Members of the House might care to read:

"Whereas it is a well-established fact that the main source of income in Lee County is derived from cotton, and that the entire economy of Lee County revolves around the production of cotton; and

"Whereas it was understood by the farmers of Lee County that it would be necessary to cut the cotton acreage approximately 20 percent; and

"Whereas the farmers of Lee County were willing to have their acreage cut by the said 20 percent if it were necessary to maintain the proper price level for cotton; and

"Whereas in allotting the cotton acreage for Lee County for the year 1950 said acreage has been based on figures as compiled by the Bureau of Agriculture Economics, which figures are grossly in error and are resulting in the acreage in Lee County being actually cut from 35 to 40 percent instead of the proposed 20-percent reduction; and

"Whereas it is apparent to even a casual observed that the cotton acreage in Lee County has been much greater than the figures as shown by the Bureau of Agriculture Economics: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Lee County Production Marketing Association Convention in body assembled*, That—

"1. We earnestly and unanimously request the proper authorities to immediately take steps to review the figures compiled by the Bureau of Agriculture Economics and to adjust the 1950 cotton acreage in Lee County in accordance with the actual acreage planted over the period of the last 5 years.

"2. That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK, and Congressman JOHN L. McMILLAN, with the request that they immediately take steps to accomplish this purpose."

I certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the resolution unanimously passed by the Lee County Production Marketing Association Convention assembled December 8, 1949.

C. B. PLAYER,
Chairman, Lee County Production Marketing Association Convention.

PAGE & CADORETTE,
Lake View, S. C., November 23, 1949.

Hon. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McMILLAN: For a number of years the USDA has been advocating better cotton gins. They have contended that poor preparation of cotton has caused a lot of low-grade cotton to accumulate in the country. The average ginner in our part of the country has worked for years trying to improve his machinery and have a modern gin plant, and most of them have succeeded in so doing. Many ginners have spent large amounts of money modernizing their plants and most of them have gone in debt to do so.

Recently when USDA planned the present cottonseed-purchase program, they forgot all about the ginners. They set up the program which allowed the ginner $1.50 per ton commission for handling the seed when even the oil mills have always allowed $3 per ton commission, even in the days of the depression. In this same program USDA made no allowance for shrinkage or loss in transit which will be far above the allowed commission. They also allowed ICC rates for transporting the seed to Government warehouses but made no provision for loading or unloading the seed.

The ginners have made a practice for years of making only a small charge for the actual ginning process, but have always received a fair commission for handling the seed. I agree that this condition should not prevail, but it has been practiced for years over a large part of the Cotton Belt.

It seems that the program was drawn up very hurriedly and with not enough consideration. I also realize that this is only an emergency but if the ginners are not reimbursed for their cooperation in this program they will have operated at a loss for the year.

I wish you would please look into this matter and see if there is anything that can be done.

Sincerely yours,

PAGE & CADORETTE,
B. L. PAGE.

(Copies to Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK, Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON.)

LAKE VIEW, S. C., *November 1, 1949.*
Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am objecting to the falsification of records as are being established concerning the 1950 cotton allotment for the county in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration of Dillon County and in the South Carolina statistical records for 1950 cotton allotment for the county in Columbia, S. C.

The AAA of Dillon County on Form CN-337 claim that my farm serial No. 801 (28.8 acres, cleared) planted an average of 6.8 acres cotton for years 1941, 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1948. The same farm for the above-mentioned years was allotted an average of 4.5 acres tobacco with no other allotted crops. The records show that 6.9 acres (1941), 9 acres (1945), 12 acres (1946), 11 acres (1947), and 13 acres (1948) were planted; or an average of 10.4 acres for the above-mentioned years. The above represents a 34.5-percent cut in cotton from the actual acreage planted.

The AAA of Dillon County on Form CN-337 claim that my farm serial No. 7392 (31.5 acres, cleared) planted an average of 7.4 acres cotton for years 1941, 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1948. The same farm for the above-mentioned years was allotted an average of 5.4 acres tobacco with no other allotted crops. The records show that 10 acres (1941), 10 acres (1945), 10 acres (1946), 9.4 acres (1947), and 10 acres (1948) were planted; or an average of 9.9 acres for the above-mentioned years. The above represents at 25-percent cut in cotton from the actual acreage planted.

The AAA of Dillon County on Form CN-337 claim that my farm serial No. 9556 (58.7 acres, cleared) planted an average of 13.1 acres cotton for years 1941, 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1948. The same farm for the above-mentioned years was allotted an average of 10 acres tobacco with no other allotted crops. The records show that 10.4 acres (1941), 16.3 acres (1945), 16.3 acres (1946), 22.8 acres (1947), and 20 acres (1948) were planted; or an average of 17.2 acres for the above-mentioned years. The above represents a 24-percent cut in cotton from the actual acreage planted.

It is generally understood that the Secretary of Agriculture has asked for 20-percent cut in cotton acreage for 1950. If the above farms are cut an additional 20 percent it will be an over-all cut of 47.8 percent. I am willing to accept the 20-percent cut, but the 47.8-percent cut will not be fair nor equal.

Yours very truly,

THOMAS B. SCOTT.

(Copies to Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.; Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.)

BISHOPVILLE, S. C., *December 15, 1949.*
Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I notice through our county paper that you are meeting with the House Agriculture Committee in regard to the present farm program stating that you are in favor of cutting no one farmer more than 30 percent. I wish to advise that they have cut me to the bone. I have on this farm two families of eight to nine in each a four-horse farm of 101 acres open land in cultivation.

They have given me only 27½ acres to plant in cotton and I have no tobacco or peanut allotments, depending on the cotton as my sole money crop. I have planted an average of 55 acres on this farm for the past 5 years—1944-48—and under the farm program of 1941 they allowed me 40 acres of cotton on the place.

However, it takes four mules to handle this amount of land. I advised one of these families unless I am allowed more cotton acreage I would have to let him go, but he is begging with tears in his eyes to stay on. What am I to do? I can't advance practically nothing to live on.

On account excessive rains didn't make half a crop this year and didn't pay out of debt, and I don't see how I can get along with less than 10 acres to plow, and this would be more than 30-percent cut.

Account of age and health I am not physically able to convert my place to hog or cattle farming, and I hope that you can handle situation for the betterment of a small farmer as myself. Thanks.

Yours very truly,

J. L. SHEALY.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Bishopville, S. C., October 31, 1949.
To All Lee County Cotton Farmers:

Enclosed you will find a form showing where adjustments have been made in the data that you turned in for your farm. These figures might show a reduction in the cotton acres you reported.

The reason for these changes is that Congress so wrote the law that the total county cotton acreage for 1947 and 1948 determines the county allotment for 1950, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics acreage data for these years is official and departmental regulations require that farm acreage be adjusted so the total equals the BAE figures. The law further states that the farm allotments for 1950 will be determined by a percentage of the total cultivated land on a farm with provisions for small farms, and allotments not to exceed the highest planted acres in the last 3 years.

After studying the situation, the Lee County committee decided that Lee County and each farm in Lee County would receive the same 1950 cotton allotment whether or not these adjustments were made, but that if the adjustments were not made, that the county allotment might be held up and work undue hardship on all cotton farmers. Therefore, with these facts available the county committee decided to adjust these figures with the understanding that they do not reflect the true acreages on any farm and with the further understanding that they will not affect what allotments any farmer might receive, and that if at any time in the future the adjusted figures could affect the allotments that the adjusted figures are to be considered untrue and original figures turned in by the farmer be reverted back for individual consideration.

Very truly yours,

T. F. CLYBURN.
R. E. MCLENDON.
M. G. MCDOWELL.

THE SENATE,
STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
Columbia, October 3, 1949.
Congressman JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: Mr. Wayne Gamble is a farmer who has 29 families living on a plantation of 1,200 acres of cleared land. On these 1,200 acres he has only 8½ acres of tobacco allotment, which is about one-eighth acre for each family, or about thirteen one-hundredths acre (two rows) to each person on the land. Among this number of people are 7 veterans with their families.

The Government program of the cotton allotment will allow him only 237 acres of cotton for the 1,200 acres for the 29 families of 147 people. That is about 1⅔ acres to the person. There are 7 veterans and their families among this group, allowing 2 acres of cotton to each veteran and his family.

Most of these people are poor farmers who can do nothing but farm. This year they made about one-quarter bale to the acre, because of excessive rains and boll weevils. If this man's farm is not adjusted with the AAA program, the people will not be able to meet the necessities of life the coming year.

I know that the control program might be a necessity, but in this case 147 people cannot make a livelihood on 237 acres of cotton and 8 acres of tobacco.

Please see if you can't do something to relieve this situation.

Yours very truly,

Senator E. W. CANTWELL.

PAWLEYS ISLAND, S. C., *December 28, 1949.*
Hon. J. L. MCMILLAN,
Florence, S. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I have planted from 10 to 40 acres of my 78 acres of farm land to cotton each year for the past 25 years.

While I am a firm believer of letting supply and demand take its own course, and at the same time I want the laws of our country obeyed to the letter.

I have received notice from the county AAA office allotting me 5 acres to plant for crop year 1950.

I have taken the allotment given with the county trustee. They claim they have arrived at the allotment face from their instructions from Washington, D. C.

There must be some misunderstanding if it's necessary to reduce 1950 cotton acreage by 25 percent or more. I should be allotted as much as 10 or 15 acres for 1950 planting. Hoping you will give the matter some consideration.

Respectfully,

G. F. PARKER.

BISHOPVILLE, S. C., *January 4, 1950.*
Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
House Office Building:

Proposed amendment copies which you sent to Tom Clyburn and W. P. Baskin, Jr., will not help Lee County or South Carolina according to figures which United States Department of Agriculture intends to use. Department of Agriculture intends to use BAE figures which under proposed amendment would help other States but would not help South Carolina and would confuse and antagonize our farmers much more than present law. Please wire this committee any developments which would help this area.

TOM CLYBURN,
R. E. MCLENDON,
M. G. MCDOWELL,
Lee County PMA Committee.

AUGUSTA, GA., *December 13, 1949.*
Representative MCMILLAN,
Florence, S. C.:

Protesting the cotton allotment I say the following: I live in South Carolina. Have a farm in Saluda County. Production acreage 1945, 65 acres; 1946, 50 acres; 1947, 48 acres; 1948, 45 acres; 1949, 90 acres. I received my allotment today for 1950 as 17⅒ acres. This reduction is bankruptcy. See if you can't get the proposal put in force proposed by the Texas Cotton Growers' Association at Wichita Falls. I am in favor of a reduction in cotton acreage but not to this extent.

JNO M. CARROLL.

JOHNSTON, S. C.

MARION, S. C., *December 9, 1949.*
Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The present cotton-control law is grossly unfair and unjust and needs immediate modification, or the rulings of the Department of Agriculture need harmonizing.

I am a very small farmer; have only 91 acres of cultivated land. So, when I write, I am writing as one of the little farmers the administration is always talking about. I

am going to vote for crop control December 15. But I want to show you how unfair this law is to me and my tenants. I have five in my family, and had 26 tenants or persons living on my farm in 1949. I now have cut this number for 1950 to 15 persons. In 1944 I planted 34 acres of cotton; in 1945, 32 acres; in 1946, 30 acres; in 1947, 35 acres; in 1948, 35 acres; in 1949, 39 acres. My 1950 allotment is 14.4 acres. I have a tobacco allotment of 14.9 acres. I have always had a surplus of grain and other crops. I have read in the papers that we were to get a 20-percent cut, which I think is fair. In fact, I am perfectly willing to a 30-percent cut, but my cut is approximately 60 percent. And that seems to me to be absolutely out of line with common sense or reason of any kind. I think you should devote some time to having proper changes made in this law.

There is no criticism of the local PMA office or the PMA committeeman, the trouble is in Washington and needs correcting. I hope you will give your immediate, careful consideration to improving this situation.

Yours truly,

WILBUR S. WHITE.

SCRANTON, S. C., *December 14, 1949.*

Mr. JOHN L. MCMILLAN.

DEAR SIR: I just wish to say I am a farmer of Florence County, at least had been, but it looks like my right to farm has been taken away. I wish to say I had my hands employed for 1950; had advanced some to them. I had a 5-horse farm, planted 25 to 30 acres of cotton; five families on my farm. I received my allotment for 1950 December 11. They gave me 3.1 acres to plant. I want someone to tell me how I am going to farm on 3 acres of cotton for five plows. I have just been reading about some are talking of reshaping the allotment. I would be glad if they could arrange to give every farmer so many acres per plow. I have talked to four farmers with two plows; they got 5 acres. I run five plows and got three. I will have to sell some of my stock and turn off some of my hands. Now they are asking me to vote for cotton. I cannot vote for anything, knowing it is against me. I guess you know how some people are treated around Florence. I say get men that will do the right thing or have nothing. One man showed me his allotment. He has one mule. He got 3 acres. Hope you can help do something when you get back next month.

With best wishes,

V. G. WARD.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in bringing the cotton resolution to the floor of the House, we were prompted to do so because of inequities which exist at the farm level. I think that phase of the program has been discussed adequately. In putting this peanut provision in, we sought to correct inequities at the State level in two States, the State of Alabama and the State of Texas which, unfortunately, were being required to take a reduction substantially below that which was required at the national level.

The purpose of the pending amendment can be but one thing, and that is to increase the production of peanuts, to increase the growing of peanuts, at a time when we have more peanuts than we know what to do with. If it were justified on the ground that some inequity has been done, and the gentleman from Florida was seeking to relieve that situation, it would be quite different, but when the purpose of this is to increase the production of peanuts, which is contrary to the peanut quota law which we have in effect, it is a different proposition.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. How many additional acres of peanuts will the provisions in the bill permit?

Mr. COOLEY. About 100,000 acres.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. So that is in addition to the quotas that were established by the act of 1949?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right. In other words, the limitation in the quota law of 1949 was 2,100,00 acres, and to take care of the State levels in Alabama and Texas about 100,000 acres more will be needed, and will be added by this resolution.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. How can my amendment increase the acreage allotment of peanuts?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman did not understand the question asked by the gentleman from Minnesota. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] had reference to the provision which is already in the resolution. The gentleman's amendment will not increase the allotted acreage, but the purpose of it is to increase the planted acres.

I have not received a single communication from a single peanut farmer indicating any inequity in the control program. Neither have I received any indication from any farmer who has received a peanut acreage allotment that he would voluntarily surrender that acreage and permit somebody else to plant it.

Mr. SIKES. I have received communications from both sides, but what I want to ask my friend is, If it is good to surrender the unallocated allotments on cotton land for reallocation, why is it not equally good to do the same thing with reference to peanuts?

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman wants my own views about the matter, I am frank to confess that it is nothing on earth but window dressing. That is all it is. What difference does it make whether it is taken out of the air or taken from frozen acreage?

It is all window dressing; it sounds all right to say you are reallocating it so as to bring the man up to 70 percent, but you are going to bring him up to 70 percent anyway. The reason for that provision I think is quite obvious, but the reason for the cotton resolution has a sound justification, and that is that we had wide shifts in the production of cotton; and you, I am sure, realize the importance of the war-crop factor, the diversion program. That in itself has brought about a bad situation.

Mr. SIKES. Then we would like the same kind of window dressing for peanuts. But let me ask, does not your argument apply equally to the man who went into peanut production as a result of the war needs?

Mr. COOLEY. If a man diverted from cotton to peanuts, soybeans, or any other war crop, he was given credit and he was entitled to cotton acreage for such diversion; but that is not so as to peanuts. Where you were growing peanuts you did get credit for cotton. So in the peanut-cotton area you have a rather unusual situation, and as a result of it some of the peanut-cotton growing areas have not been forced to make a contribution to the reduction in cotton.

Mr. SIKES. I am reluctant to take the gentleman's time. But I know that people in my district, and I hear from people in other districts, tell me they are seriously hurt by the present system and they are asking for at least this measure of relief. Let me say again, this is the only chance I foresee to help them this year. I believe what I ask is fair by any standard.

Mr. COOLEY. But they do not say they are unfairly treated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation, as I understand it, is only temporary, stopgap legislation in an attempt, as the chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina says, to remove certain inequities at the farm level that have occurred in the administration of the present cotton allotment law.

There is a situation in my own section that is not sufficiently met by this bill. Some amendments have been voted down that would have helped. I want to call attention to it now in view of the fact that the committee will shortly work on a more permanent type of legislation. I have a telegram here sent me by a group of five banks in one county, Shelby, in my district. The telegram is as follows:

TIMPSON, TEX., *January 24, 1950.*

Judge J. M. COMBS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Very urgent that adjustment be made in current cotton acreage allotment set up for east Texas. This is area of largely small farmers and we cannot lend sufficient sums for subsistence of farmers on present allotments of four to seven acres. Tomato yields and prices always uncertain and cotton is still important to us. This should take priority over other matters now before Congress as time is short for crop planning. May we have your help in this important matter? Please answer.

THE COTTON BELT STATE BANK,
TIMPSON FARMERS STATE BANK,
CENTER STATE GUARANTY BOND BANK,
CENTER FIRST STATE BANK,
TENAHA TEXAS STATE BANK, *Joaquin.*

Here is a peculiar situation existing at the farm level in certain sections in nine counties of my district, an inequitable situation. It is a region of small farms owned by the people who live on them. When the war broke out a very large percentage of those people went to the armed services and the rest went to the defense plants of the area where I now live. The result was that in the county of Shelby alone, where I grew up, a county of many small farms, the production of cotton dropped from over 30,000 bales per year to less than 3,000 during the war. Those boys came back. I met with 300 of them back in November. Some had been in college. Others had been unable to obtain any Govern-

ment loans to buy farms until the law was changed last year. Many are just now acquiring little farm homes, but they cannot get an acre of cotton allotment under the present law. Several have written me that they would have to surrender their little farms because of that. They are just getting started. Some are going into stock raising, and poultry, and things like that, but they have to have a period of time to establish their stock and to get something to sell. Now I fear they are going to be denied, by the application of this law, any cotton allotment. The bill will bring a measure of relief to those people who have continued farming cotton—and there are some, of course, in those counties that have; they will get a little relief out of it. But I fear people planting cotton for the first time will not.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBS. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Provision was made in the quota law of 1949 for new growers, and had the acreage been reserved, as contemplated by the law, new growers could have been given allotments; but, unfortunately, it was not done. That, however, was not a weakness of the law or a weakness of administration here in Washington; it was a weakness elsewhere.

Mr. COMBS. In other words, it was at the State level; is that right?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. COMBS. Whatever the reason, I know what the result has been throughout the east Texas region that I know so well. The telegram I have just placed in the RECORD from the banks of Shelby County shows the grave injustice that is being done the farmers of the area. I take it from what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] says that the State and county committees in Texas can grant substantial relief to small cotton farmers, when this bill becomes a law—both those who have been growing cotton and those who wish to plant for the first time—particularly young ex-soldiers. Like their forebears before them they want a little farm they can call their own. It is a pretty harsh thing when they cannot get a little cotton allotment to make enough income in cash to pay the installments on the farm home that they have bought. It is a serious situation, and I want the committee to consider it very carefully in the more permanent legislation it brings in. I shall support this resolution because it will bring some measure of relief to many farmers who need it, but I regret exceedingly it is not going further and meet the problem more adequately.

I realize it is a peculiar situation that does not exist everywhere and that the committee trying as hard as it may cannot reach all inequities in hasty legislation. But even so, I wish this bill went further than it does.

I hope the members of the great Committee on Agriculture of the House will give special study to reaching this situation because it would not take a great many acreage allotments to do it—and it is sorely needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I merely want to straighten out the RECORD. A moment ago during the debate our distinguished chairman mentioned the fact that I had been voting for amendments all day to increase the cotton acreage under this legislation we are considering at this time. I want to point out to him that I have voted for only two amendments, the one I offered myself and the one offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN].

I am sure that our distinguished chairman would want to correct the RECORD, and while I am on my feet I should like to point out that insofar as cotton acreage is concerned I was one of the members of the Subcommittee on Cotton who voted to limit the cotton acreage to 20,000,000 acres instead of the 21,000,000 acres that was finally brought out.

I would be glad to have the chairman correct that impression if he would kindly do so.

Mr. COOLEY. I am delighted to correct the impression if I left the impression the gentleman had voted against all of them. I asked him if he had not voted for amendments which would increase the acreage to be planted to cotton. I am perfectly willing to agree that the gentleman did in committee favor reducing the minimum acreage from twenty-one to twenty million. But what we are trying to do here is to get a fair basis upon which to make future reductions, certainly a fair basis for 1950; then the subcommittee handling the cotton problem will give further consideration to the matter, as indicated by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take 5 minutes which is allotted to me nor will I ask for additional time to try to sway this great body that has been sitting here so patiently throughout this debate. I regret that the great Committee on Agriculture, so ably chairmaned by the gentleman from the great State north of the great State of South Caroline has languished and brought forth a mouse on this problem. However, the committee has done something. Even though in your languishing you have delivered to us this poor little emaciated mouse, I shall try to help you nurture it and get it through. I am very much like the man who got his hand in a lion's mouth. He cannot do anything else and he cannot do anything more, if you catch the point.

My farmers are starving by the thousands. Mr. Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, to whom I pay my respects, you at least have started in the right direction and, as my distinguished friend from Texas, another great State of this Union, has so ably observed, you are going to reappraise this situation later on, and when you do, bring forth just a little larger animal, and we will be glad to help you on its way to the fulfillment of the prophecy mentioned for its ultimate future. We have to save these farmers because, brother, they are headed for the boneyard, and mine are no better off than yours. They cannot live on promises. But, at least you brought forth something and I hope it will do some good somewhere down the line.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SIKES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN (after counting). One hundred and fifteen Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending resolution conclude in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate on this resolution all day yesterday and so far today. I have watched to see what the effect of it would be. I feel that I should call attention to what I believe is in sight. It looks to me as if the cotton part of this resolution will cost the country $130,000,000, at least, and the peanut part of it from twenty-five to thirty million dollars. The country is going to be faced with a similar bill relating to wheat and corn, and maybe something else, and before we get through with the operation of amendments it is going to add an additional cost of three hundred and fifty or four hundred million dollars besides this resolution.

Presently, as far as I can figure from what I have heard during the debate, there will be a surplus of from six to eight million bales of cotton in addition to what is set up here. There will be four hundred to five hundred million bushels of surplus wheat if we have as large a crop as we anticipate compared with the crop of last year. There will be a very large surplus of corn, potatoes, and of many articles of agricultural production. As a result of this, the President has indicated that he intends to ask for $2,000,000,000 additional borrowing power for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Before we get through with this operation, the losses the country will have to pay—and I pray to God that we will not be bailed out by another war to wipe out the losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation—are going to be so high that,

added to the budget estimate the President has submitted to us, the total will be a staggering figure, and our debt will show an increase which will be a burden beyond all possibility of carrying.

I hope that as we come to vote on these things we will realize that, as we extend these authorities, as we increase these probable losses, we are creating such losses that they will break down completely all of these agricultural programs. We are not doing the farmer, for whom we pretend to do these things, a bit of good.

I wish the House, as it approaches a vote upon this measure, would bear in mind where we are heading and what is going to result in the long run from this kind of an approach to the problem. I recognize that there are certain individual injustices that have not been taken care of by the reservations that were made, but those reservations are nothing as compared with the distress we will bring upon the farmer by overloading these programs in such a way as to contribute very largely to the distress that will come from uncontrolled inflation and the inability of our people to meet the situation with which we are confronted.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished neighbor from New York has given us something to think about. The Federal Treasury is not a bottomless pit out of which we can continue to syphon off money to subsidize this, that, or the other part of our economy, without facing a day of reckoning.

We have been hearing a lot about cotton, cotton, and more cotton. It certainly is not neglected nor abused so far as the Economic Cooperation Administration is concerned, nor anywhere else, for that matter. I note, from a recent report from the ECA that, of the $3,622,300,000 spent for food and agricultural products to be sent to the western European countries, nearly 25 percent, or $861,300,000, was spent for cotton. In December last year, ECA spent $174,000,000 for all food and agricultural products, of which $85,000,000, or nearly half, was for cotton.

There has been a lot of talk here about the Commodity Credit Corporation not losing any money on cotton. Of course, that is not the equivalent of saying that the cotton program has not cost the taxpayers any money. It is all a bookkeeping transaction designed to make the cotton story sound plausible. When all this cotton is shipped overseas, the Commodity Credit Corporation is credited with the value of it, which makes the cotton transactions on the books of that agency look profitable, or at least, free from loss.

But let us not fool ourselves by that argument into thinking that the pay envelopes of the workers of this country are not being generously tapped to subsidize the cotton interests. Every time we stimulate the production of cotton and extend the subsidy on it, by legislation like this bill, we increase the temptation and pressure to ship more and more cotton overseas, and for the Government to buy more and more of it for that purpose. The money to do that can come from only one place, and that is the pay envelopes of the workers who pay the taxes in this country.

Like my colleague from New York, I shall vote against this bill and against any other measure brought before us by the Committee on Agriculture, designed to provide hand-outs for one small group of our citizens, like the cotton and peanut farmers here involved, and which will eventually put these very farmers, and others who follow the same Pied Piper, in the strait-jacket of complete regimentation and control.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, he reported the joint resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN moves to recommit House Joint Resolution 398 to the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN) there were—ayes 33, noes 71.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question being taken; and there were—yeas 136, nays 239, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]

YEAS—136

Andresen, August H.	Hand	Murray, Wis.
Angell	Hays, Ohio	Nelson
Auchincloss	Heffernan	Nicholson
Beall	Herter	Norblad
Bishop	Heselton	O'Brien, Ill.
Blackney	Hinshaw	O'Hara, Ill.
Boggs, Del.	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Hara, Minn.
Bolton, Ohio	Hoffman, Mich.	O'Konski
Breen	Holifield	O'Toole
Brehm	Holmes	Patterson
Brown, Ohio	Huber	Pfeiffer, William L.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hull	Poulson
Byrnes, Wis.	Irving	Quinn
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson, Calif.	Rees
Chesney	James	Ribicoff
Chiperfield	Javits	Rich
Chudoff	Jenkins	Riehlman
Church	Jennings	Rogers, Mass.
Clemente	Jonas	Rooney
Clevenger	Judd	Sadlak
Cole, N. Y.	Kean	St. George
Corbett	Kearney	Sanborn
Cotton	Keating	Saylor
Dague	Keefe	Scott, Hardie
Davis, Wis.	Kelley, Pa.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Delaney	Kilburn	Scrivner
D'Ewart	Kunkel	Short
Dollinger	Latham	Simpson, Pa.
Eaton	LeFevre	Smith, Wis.
Ellsworth	Lesinski	Taber
Elston	Lichtenwalter	Tauriello
Fenton	Linehan	Tollefson
Fulton	Lodge	Towe
Gamble	McCarthy	Van Zandt
Gavin	McCulloch	Velde
Gillette	McDonough	Vorys
Golden	McGregor	Vursell
Goodwin	McMillen, Ill.	Wagner
Gordon	Mack, Ill.	Weichel
Gorski	Macy	Wier
Graham	Martin, Mass.	Wigglesworth
Green	Mason	Withrow
Gwinn	Merrow	Wolverton
Hale	Miller, Md.	Yates
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Miller, Nebr.	
	Morgan	
	Multer	

NAYS—239

Abbitt	Cole, Kans.	Harden
Abernethy	Colmer	Hardy
Addonizio	Combs	Hare
Albert	Cooley	Harris
Allen, Calif.	Cooper	Hart
Allen, La.	Cox	Harvey
Andersen, H. Carl	Crook	Havenner
Anderson, Calif.	Crosser	Hays, Ark.
Andrews	Cunningham	Hébert
Arends	Davenport	Hedrick
Aspinall	Davies, N. Y.	Heller
Bailey	Davis, Ga.	Herlong
Baring	Davis, Tenn.	Hill
Barrett, Wyo.	Deane	Hoeven
Bates	DeGraffenried	Hope
Battle	Denton	Horan
Beckworth	Dingell	Howell
Bennett, Fla.	Dolliver	Jackson, Wash.
Bentsen	Donohue	Jacobs
Biemiller	Doughton	Jenison
Blatnik	Douglas	Jensen
Boggs, La.	Doyle	Johnson
Bolling	Durham	Jones, Ala.
Bolton, Md.	Eberharter	Jones, Mo.
Bonner	Elliott	Jones, N. C.
Bramblett	Engle, Calif.	Karst
Brooks	Evins	Karsten
Bryson	Fallon	Kearns
Buchanan	Feighan	Kee
Buckley, Ill.	Fisher	Kelly, N. Y.
Buckley, N. Y.	Flood	Keogh
Burdick	Fogarty	Kerr
Burke	Forand	Kilday
Burleson	Frazier	King
Burnside	Fugate	Kirwan
Burton	Furcolo	Kruse
Camp	Garmatz	Lane
Cannon	Gathings	Lanham
Carlyle	Gore	Larcade
Carnahan	Gossett	LeCompte
Carroll	Granahan	Lemke
Celler	Granger	Lind
Chatham	Grant	Lovre
Chelf	Gregory	Lucas
Christopher	Gross	Lyle
	Hagen	Lynch

McConnell	Perkins	Stefan
McCormack	Peterson	Stigler
McGrath	Philbin	Sullivan
McGuire	Phillips, Calif.	Sutton
McKinnon	Phillips, Tenn.	Tackett
McMillan, S. C.	Pickett	Talle
McSweeney	Poage	Teague
Madden	Polk	Thomas
Magee	Preston	Thompson
Mahon	Price	Thornberry
Mansfield	Priest	Trimble
Marcantonio	Rains	Underwood
Marsalis	Ramsay	Vinson
Marshall	Rankin	Walter
Martin, Iowa	Reed, Ill.	Welch
Miles	Regan	Werdel
Miller, Calif.	Rhodes	Wheeler
Mills	Richards	Whitaker
Mitchell	Rivers	White, Calif.
Morris	Rodino	Whitten
Morton	Rogers, Fla.	Whittington
Moulder	Roosevelt	Wickersham
Murdock	Sasscer	Williams
Murphy	Secrest	Willis
Murray, Tenn.	Shelley	Wilson, Ind.
Nixon	Sikes	Wilson, Okla.
Noland	Simpson, Ill.	Wilson, Tex.
Norrell	Sims	Winstead
O'Brien, Mich.	Smathers	Wood
O'Neill	Smith, Kans.	Woodhouse
O'Sullivan	Smith, Va.	Worley
Pace	Spence	Young
Passman	Staggers	Zablocki
Patman	Stanley	
Patten	Steed	

NOT VOTING—57

Allen, Ill.	Fernandez	Plumley
Barden	Ford	Potter
Barrett, Pa.	Gary	Powell
Bennett, Mich.	Gilmer	Rabaut
Bland	Hall,	Redden
Bosone	Leonard W.	Reed, N. Y.
Boykin	Halleck	Sabath
Brown, Ga.	Harrison	Sadowski
Bulwinkle	Hobbs	Scudder
Canfield	Kennedy	Shafer
Case, N. J.	Klein	Sheppard
Cavalcante	Mack, Wash.	Smith, Ohio
Coudert	Meyer	Stockman
Crawford	Michener	Taylor
Curtis	Monroney	Wadsworth
Dawson	Morrison	Walsh
Dondero	Norton	White, Idaho
Engel, Mich.	Pfeifer,	Wolcott
Fellows	Joseph L.	Woodruff

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Brown of Georgia against.

Mr. Bennett of Michigan for, with Mr. Halleck against.

Mr. Case of New Jersey for, with Mr. Hobbs against.

Mr. Dondero for, with Mr. Fernandez against.

Mr. Canfield for, with Mr. Gary against.

Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Gilmer against.

Mr. Meyer for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Wadsworth for, with Mr. Harrison against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Boykin against.

Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Smith of Ohio for, with Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Redden with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Monroney with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Cavalcante with Mr. Wolcott.
Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Michener.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Ford.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Plumley.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Fellows.
Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Mack of Washington.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Scudder.
Mr. Walsh with Mr. Stockman.

Mr. LEMKE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COMBS asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made earlier in the day and include a telegram.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOLLINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks made this afternoon and include two articles.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a set of resolutions.

Mr. KUNKEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GWINN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in one to include a speech by Senator BYRD and in another a speech by Hamilton Fish.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Hon. JOHN DAVIS LODGE before the National Women's Republican Club.

Mr. RIEHLMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of excise taxes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. VELDE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter addressed to him.

Mr. REED of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Uncle Sam's Untapped Millions," from the February issue of the American magazine, written by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit fixed by the Joint Committee on Printing and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $191.34.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. ELSTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Cincinnati Times-Star of January 25.

Mr. NIXON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HORAN (at the request of Mr. HOPE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio speech.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. WILSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BURTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson at the Roanoke Chamber of Commerce annual dinner meeting on January 25, 1950.

Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter in each.

Mrs. DOUGLAS (at the request of Mr. SHELLEY) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a speech.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, among the many major concerns of this present session of the Congress is that of effecting economies in government without impairing the efficiency or the services of the several divisions and bureaus. Proper economy is a necessity. The problem then is when and where to cut.

Many of the proposed reductions emanate from the report on the executive branch of Government made by the Hoover Commission. Some of the bills presented to the House based on the recommendations of this Commission have given me a lot of concern and much study of the conditions which the legislation seeks to cure. I am more and more concerned with that part which relates to the Veterans' Administration and the details of administering the vast program which directly affects some 19,000,000 veterans of our American wars and their families.

The legislation proposed, based on the recommendations of the Hoover report, would practically dismember that one agency which now functions as a single center for all veteran matters. Most of us remember the chaos that followed the end of the First World War when the veterans' affairs were scattered out over a half dozen bureaus. It was to cure

such a situation that the Veterans' Administration, gathering all matters of compensation, pension, medical and hospital care, insurance, and other interests into a single division under a Director who is directly responsible to the President, was created.

It is proposed to take away from the Veterans' Administration all medical and hospital services, which would be taken over by a new medical bureau called the United Medical Administration, farm out the job of hospital construction to the Department of the Interior, set up an entirely new Veterans' Insurance Corporation to handle the World War I Government life insurance and the World War II national service life, and to put the loan-guaranty program under the GI bill in some subdivision of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

It seems to me that by milking down the Veterans' Administration, stripping it of its vital functions, and scattering its parts to other agencies—two of them brand new—that we are turning the pages backward. The effect, as I see it, would set the veteran right back to the place in the 1920's when he was shunted from bureau to division and back again. And I fail to see how economies can be brought about, or the efficiency improved, by the creation of new bureaus and corporations; conversely, I can see increased cost in personnel, administration, and what not.

I am very strongly of the belief that the improvement in services—and improvements are needed—and savings in costs can best be made within the framework of the existing Veterans' Administration. I do not believe that it is the part of economy or in the interest of veterans as a whole to abandon the Veterans' Administration to a limited program of paying compensation and pensions.

In my opinion, it would be a grave mistake to dismember the Veterans' Administration as presently constituted.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

CHANGE IN COLOR OF CURRENCY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 6 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on August 22, 1947, I asked the Secretary of the Treasury by letter to change the color of our paper money and to have different colors for different denominations, and to change the note currency. I felt that it would greatly facilitate the purchase of tickets, payments in restaurants, and other business transactions, and prevent errors which ticket agents tell me they find in making change for the people buying tickets. The restaurant people have told me the same thing and other salesmen and women and also people in banks.

I also felt, Mr. Speaker, that it would bring into taxation a great deal of bad money, shall I call it, gangster money—money hidden by Communists and other subversive groups that has been in hiding, where the owners at the present time pay no taxes. It would very much relieve the situation today where people are so tremendously taxed, and, as I fear, will be further taxed.

When I was in Boston on Saturday, Boston was very much exercised over the $1,500,000 Brink robbery, and the people told me that if my colored-currency plan could go into effect at once it would be a very simple matter to find the people who stole the money from Brink's.

The Brink robbery took place some weeks ago and it is the talk of the Nation that the robbers have not been found yet. I think my plan has very much merit and I do not believe there is anything against it. I talked with the Treasury Department in August, and prior to that in 1947. And many times since 1947 and the present time. I did not receive an answer from the Treasury Department until November 5. Legislation is not necessary, because, as you will remember, Mr. Mellon in 1929 changed the currency at that time in the matter of size and in other ways. It can be done by executive order by the Secretary of the Treasury. I have talked with the Secretary of the Treasury on numerous occasions. I have talked with Mr. Hall, head of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and all those concerned with the change of our currency.

I introduced a bill on November 2, 1948, to provide for the calling in by the Secretary of the Treasury of all outstanding paper and United States currency, in all amounts, for the reissuance of note paper and currency in place thereof in new and different colors for different denominations. I have a bill before the House at the present time. I have asked the Banking and Currency Committee for a hearing. Many benefits will be derived from the issuance of new United States currency and note paper in place of the old currency.

I have the feeling, Mr. Speaker, that there is no very real objection on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury or on the part of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing to changing the color of the currency and possibly the size.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is what they did in Russia and Germany and a great many other countries. Does the gentlewoman think we should do what they are doing in Russia?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I do not think it would be following Russia in the least. It has been done, and done more than once in our own country. It was done in 1929. We were not following Russia then, or in other instances when the size and color of our currency was changed. Recently I have been looking at some of the currency used years ago. There were many sizes and colors. It works very well in Canada and it has worked well in other countries. The gentleman can get no communistic tinge from this. As a matter of fact it would help the United States to find the Communists. In many instances their money is hidden money. This legislation would bring it out of hiding in the United States.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What color would the gentlewoman have for the new money?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Different colors. It could follow the same system as our United States postage stamps so that it would be easier for those who are making change. It would give them two chances to be correct. I know that one day I gave a $10 bill to a taxi driver for a $1 bill. He wanted to return it to me, but I remonstrated with him and told him to keep it. He had been very kind on many occasions. So I made a mistake. Others have made mistakes in making change.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sorry to hear that the gentlewoman has made a mistake.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think we all make mistakes. I do not think any of us is perfect except the good Lord.

I earnestly hope that a change will be made in the present color of our currency. It is very important to catch the robbers and the tax evaders. It is very important to bring out all of this money that has been kept in hiding and on which no taxes are being paid, so that we can collect taxes on it. It is very important to give people every opportunity to be accurate in money transactions. I refer the Members of the House to a very clear analysis I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 2, 1948, page 938. Many editorials have been written in approval of my resolution and I have received many approving letters.

REORGANIZATION OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Now, Mr. Speaker, in another speech I would like to speak on the report of the Hoover Commission on the reorganization of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. Speaker, members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs who listened recently to the statements of the national commanders of the four great veterans' organizations—the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the AMVETS—were deeply impressed with one salient fact, forcibly emphasized in each commander's statement: The veterans' organizations are irrevocably pledged to a

campaign of opposition to the Hoover Commission recommendations as they pertain to the Veterans' Administration.

Never in all of the years I have been working with the various veterans' organizations have I seen such a unanimity of thought, such a joining of hands, as it were, against what these veterans feel is an attempt to socialize veterans' affairs.

Especially vehement was the statement of National Commander George N. Craig, of the American Legion. He said:

> It is because the principal and the entire structure of veterans' services built upon it are in imminent danger of destruction that the American Legion stands side by side with our brother organizations here today.

He emphasized the Legion's interest in and support of any program that would make for real economy in the Government's discharge of the Nation's obligations to its 19,000,000 veterans. The Legion, he stated, realizes that improvements can be achieved in the operations of the present Veterans' Administration, but, he added:

> It believes very strongly that such improvements in services and savings in costs can best be made within the existing framework of the Veterans' Administration.

Commander Craig outlined clearly his organization's objections to the drastic recommendations of the Hoover Commission. He was followed and supported by National Commander Clyde A. Lewis, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, who especially scored the Hoover Commission recommendation that all Government medical treatment and hospitalization, including veteran hospitals, be consolidated under a central hospital and medical agency.

National Commander David M. Brown, of the Disabled American Veterans, told our committee that his organization is particularly opposed to those sections of the Hoover report which would destroy the identity and status of veterans, as veterans. He called attention to an "organized and well-financed campaign under way to sell the American people on the adoption of the Hoover reorganization proposal in its entirety. In communities all over this Nation, citizens' committees are urging that the Hoover Commission Report on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government will bring about efficiency and economy in Government. It is safe to say that many of these people have never read the Hoover Commission report and do not have the slightest conception as to what it contains."

Harold Russell, national commander of the AMVETS, that fast-growing young organization of World War II veterans which this Congress chartered in the Eightieth Congress, endorsed the statements of his colleagues in censuring the Hoover Commission report, and specifically stated that his organization believed "that if this Hoover Commission report were implemented the result would not be economy and efficiency, but additional costs and drastic cuts in service to the veterans."

I hope that every Member of this House of Representatives will take the time to read and study these Hoover Commission recommendations as they pertain to veterans. Most of you will be as shocked and alarmed as I was when the whole picture unfolded before me. To show you just what is contemplated in the way of socialization and disintegration of existing benefits to our war veterans I want to take the time to go over the more important changes suggested in that report.

Let us look first at the Hoover plan for a proposed United Medical Administration. Those of you who have been in Congress for several terms remember the long, arduous fight we made to build up the Veterans' Administration hospital and medical system. Today it is universally hailed by civilian medical leaders as an outstanding medical system. Veterans' Administration hospitals and medical personnel are among the finest in America and thousands of veterans will testify to the excellence of the care and treatment received from these services.

Under the Hoover plan there would be established a United Medical Administration into which would be consolidated most of the large-scale activities of the Government in the fields of medical care, medical research, and public health. The proposal would limit the use by veterans of the Nation's hospital plant established for them by making these facilities available to additional groups, principally armed-forces personnel and their dependents, and merchant seamen.

I ask you to recall the confusion, the wastefulness, and the suffering experienced by our veterans when the activities which are now the function of the Veterans' Administration were scattered throughout different departments of our Government. The compensation and insurance programs were administered by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance of the Treasury Department, the vocational rehabilitation of the war-service disabled was administered by the Federal Board of Vocational Education, and the medical and hospital care of the service disabled was the responsibility of the United States Public Health Service. It was a serious situation. Veterans found it difficult to obtain the prompt and sympathetic treatment which the Congress and the country intended they should receive. In April 1921 the President appointed an impartial committee to make an investigation of the administration of these laws. The committee recommended the creation of a single agency to care for veterans and their problems. The report of this committee, ably headed by the Honorable Charles G. Dawes, later Vice President, is so pertinent, so applicable at this time, when it is proposed to return to the old order, as to justify the inclusion here of its two concluding paragraphs:

> It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the present deplorable failure on the part of the Government to properly care for the disabled veterans is due in large part to an imperfect organization of governmental effort. There is no one in control of the whole situation. Independent agencies, by mutual agreement, now endeavor to coordinate their action, but in such efforts the joint action is too often modified by minor consideration, and there is always lacking that complete cooperation which is incident to a powerful superimposed authority. No emergency of war itself was greater than is the emergency which confronts the Nation in its duty to care for those disabled in its service and now neglected.
>
> The summoning of this committee by you is an earnest to the country that you are convinced of the vital nature of this problem and that you are determined to secure a prompt and effective solution thereof. The man to whom this important mission is entrusted by you will receive in the performance of his arduous duties the wholehearted and enthusiastic support and cooperation of all veterans and all other patriotic Americans. No Cabinet officer or assistant secretary burdened with other duties should be the one to whom the man charged with the welfare of the disabled saviors of our country should report. He should report directly to the President. His place should be held in the public esteem as one of the greatest honors that the President can bestow, as the service he can render should be of untold value to the Nation.

Congress then enacted Public Law No. 47, Sixty-seventh Congress, approved August 9, 1921, which established an independent bureau under the President to be known as the Veterans' Bureau. At a later date, in 1930, Congress went further and created what is now known as the Veterans' Administration, bringing under its jurisdiction the Pension Bureau, the National Home for Volunteer Soldiers, and the Veterans' Bureau as a single agency.

That is the structure the Hoover Commission recommends be disintegrated and scattered, under the guise of efficiency and economy. It needs no stretch of the imagination to visualize the effect of such a move. The policy of charging the administration of veterans' benefits to a single agency is the best method for attaining efficiency and economy. Picture, if you will, the tremendous duplication of the records of each individual veteran that would be necessary under the new order so that complete consideration might be given to each type of claim. Perhaps this is best expressed in a paragraph from the report of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to the President's Advisory Committee on Management Improvement, on January 17, 1950. General Gray wrote:

> Many practical reasons exist to support the conclusion that the present integrated system of operation under a single agency is the best method for attaining efficiency and economy in the administration of veterans' programs. For example, it has been found necessary in the administration of various types of benefits to associate the records of each individual veteran so that complete consideration may be given to each type of claim, thus insuring greater protection to the Government as well as the claimant in testing the accuracy and sufficiency of proof in connection with claims for more than one benefit. These records also contain certain information which may be needed to determine entitlement to several benefits provided by law. It is not possible to determine in advance for what purpose certain information may be needed at some future time, and,

accordingly, it is necessary that all evidence in each individual folder be retained for possible future use. Separation of the benefit programs for veterans would require the submission by claimants of duplicate items of evidence to each separate agency. Moreover, a tremendous volume of day-to-day reference between the independent agencies would be required.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is the picture as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs paints it if the Hoover Commission recommendations are carried out.

Let us return for a moment to that phase of the Hoover plan that deals with hospitals and medical care. In 1946, Congress established by law, in the Veterans' Administration a Department of Medicine and Surgery whose functions are "those necessary for a complete medical and hospital service to be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs pursuant to law, for the medical care and treatment of veterans."

This separate set-up constitutes the most forward step made by the medical branch of the Veterans' Administration in its history. It enabled the Department of Medicine and Surgery to attract into its career service the highest type of men and women to meet its responsibilities. At the present time there are about 115,000 employees engaged in the medical and hospital program. In this Eighty-first Congress we passed a law which raised the salaries of these medical employees in order that the department might meet the competition offered by outside practice in other Federal services. Now the individual doctors, dentists, and nurses consider their association with the Department of Medicine and Surgery as something to look at with pride. That is the status we want continued.

The Hoover Commission report also recommends the transfer to a proposed Building Construction Service in the Department of the Interior of the responsibility for the preparation of plans, award of contracts, and supervision of major construction projects, including Veterans' Administration hospitals. Just prior to World War II the Veterans' Administration, in collaboration with the Federal Board of Hospitalization, developed a construction program designed to meet the World War I peak load of veterans' hospitalization. Before this program could be completed World War II began, and while some beds were added through new construction, no large construction programs were undertaken due to the difficulty in obtaining materials that were urgently needed in the war effort. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 authorized and directed the Administrator and the Federal Board of Hospitalization to complete the construction of additional hospital facilities for war veterans. A study of the existing situation was made, and as a result there were developed and the President approved construction and expansion programs which would have provided an additional 55,106 beds.

In January 1949, the President in his budget message directed that the program he had previously authorized be curtailed by approximately 16,000 beds. In order to effect this, he approved the cancellation of 24 hospital projects and the reduction in planned capacity of 14 additional hospitals. The rescission in contract authorizations by reason of this reduction amounted to $237,000,000. Congress, however, has repeatedly refused to approve this reduction in hospital construction and the contract authorization of $237,000,000 has been reinstated in the appropriation bills. Further than this, we have now a bill pending upon the calendars of the House that directs the construction of these 16,000 bed facilities. Under the Hoover plan the proposal to turn over the responsibility for Veterans' Administration hospital construction the Department of the Interior would divorce the close working relationship between those who construct and those who design to meet medical requirements as well as those who are responsible for maintenance and betterments, a relationship that exists to a high degree in the Veterans' Administration at the present time. For many years past the Veterans' Administration has developed a group of highly qualified architect-engineers who have, by long experience and intimate knowledge of the program, become expert in the care of veteran patients. This smooth-working organization would be broken up and discarded under the Hoover recommendation.

Still another recommendation of the Hoover Commission, and one which has drawn severe criticism from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, is the proposal to create a Veterans' Life Insurance Corporation. In the opinion of the Administrator such a change would not add any impetus to better service to policyholders or economy in operation. General Gray has pointed out his grave doubts as to the legality of such a move as it would be a breach of faith with policyholders as well as a breach of contract which the Supreme Court on the principle of *Lynch* v. *United States* (292 U. S. 571), would hold to be beyond the power of Congress. Even if the plan were limited to future insurance with a separate fund therefor it would be contrary to the policy of the Government of defraying extra-hazard and administrative costs through appropriation.

Aside from all that, it is my own conviction that the creation of a Veterans' Life Insurance Corporation would not only disrupt an existing organization that is just beginning to function efficiently after one of the most trying periods of its existence, but it would create another huge bureaucratic agency the cost of which would grow and grow and grow. Our Committee on Veterans' Affairs had made a complete and comprehensive study of the Insurance Division of the Veterans' Administration and has in preparation a number of measures aimed at the development of more efficiency and at greater economy of operation. Some idea of the size of this Insurance Division can be gained when it is noted that at the present time over 7,500,000 insurance policies are in force, representing a value of about $42,000,000,000. Surely this is a most lucrative and luscious plum to dangle before the eyes of those who would expand the bureaucratic scope of our Government. It is not difficult to foresee the results of such a move.

Another recommendation involves the transfer of the loan guaranty activities of the Veterans' Administration under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Why such a change should be made is difficult to see, for there seems to be no sound reason for it. The veterans' loan program is designed to give preferential treatment to veterans. What better agency to accomplish this can there be than one primarily interested in the welfare of veterans? The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has recommended against the adoption of the proposal.

Besides the three major recommendations of the Hoover Commission discussed above, there are three others which involve certain structural changes in the Veterans' Administration.

Three of these six recommendations will require legislation. The most controversial of these—the one that proposes to merge the medical activities of the Veterans' Administration into a United Medical Administration, which would contain most of the present medical activities and facilities of the Federal Government—is contained in H. R. 5182, now pending before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, while its companion bill—S. 2008—is pending before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Pending before our Committee on Veterans' Affairs are two measures—H. R. 5171 and H. R. 5288—which would create the Veterans' Insurance Corporation. No action has been taken on either of the latter bills and none is scheduled. It is assumed that legislation will be introduced at the request of the President to carry out the recommendations involving the transfer of the loan-guaranty activities. Such a bill would be referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The other three recommendations for certain structural changes in the Veterans' Administration would not require legislation and can be made within the judgment and discretion of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs or by decision of the President.

To impress upon your minds the magnitude and importance of this vast department of service to our veterans, which the Hoover Commission would break up and scatter throughout other agencies of our Federal Government, I want to quote from General Gray's report to the President's Advisory Committee on Management Improvement on that phase of the matter. It follows:

The Veterans' Administration administers some 300 laws potentially providing benefits for about 19,000,000 living veterans, as well as dependents of deceased veterans. The great majority of these veterans are former members of the military and naval forces who served in time of war. The benefits afforded include disability compensation, pensions, vocational rehabilitation, and education; the guaranty of loans for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property; readjustment allowances for veterans who are unemployed; national service and United States Government life insurance; death and burial benefits; ad-

justed compensation; emergency officers' retirement pay; hospital and out-patient treatment and domiciliary care. The Veterans' Administration also administers the insurance article of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, for persons in the active military service.

The Veterans' Administration now operates 133 hospitals and domiciliary centers. In addition, it has 12,000 beds under contract in non-Veterans' Administration hospitals. With these facilities, it provides medical care for a daily average of 107,000 veteran patients. Its program for the construction of a total of 67 new hospitals, together with the closing of semipermanent hospitals taken over from the military will adjust the total capacity to approximately 131,000 permanent beds.

It provides out-patient medical and dental care for more than 2,500,000 veterans annually. Treatments total approximately 6,000,000 a year. In addition, approximately 7,400,000 physical and dental examinations are completed annually.

It makes monthly compensation and pension payments to 2,300,000 living veterans and to the dependents of 645,000 deceased veterans.

It pays for the education and training of 2,500,000 veterans, including the payment of subsistence allowances totaling approximately $2,123,000,000 annually.

It has 7,500,000 life-insurance policies in force, with a total face value of $42,000,000,000.

It has guaranteed approximately 1,800,000 home, farm, and business loans for veterans.

It has as wards 245,000 incompetent veterans, minors, and other incompetents, whose estates have an estimated value of $260,000,000.

It certifies more than 6,700,000 checks each month.

It receives 170,000,000 pieces of mail annually.

It maintains over 190,000,000 administrative and veterans' records.

It operates 13 district offices, 70 regional offices and 498 other field offices to bring its services to veterans and their dependents.

It has a working force of 185,500 full-time employees and part-time personnel equivalent to an additional 5,100 full-time employees; 116,000 of the full-time personnel and substantially all of the part-time employees are engaged in providing medical, hospital, and domiciliary care for veterans.

In several respects, the Veterans' Administration differs from other Federal agencies. One significant attribute is the fact that the head of the Veterans' Administration is vested with broad authority to organize and reorganize the agency in accordance with such changes as may be indicated by experience, and to adopt and alter methods of operation for the purpose of achieving maximum efficiency in rendering service to veterans. This centralization of responsibility and control is a natural outgrowth of unsatisfactory experience by the Government with the previous division of responsibility for veterans' benefits among different agencies, and it likewise eliminates the difficulties which flow from a plan of organization by which bureau chiefs within an agency enjoy a degree of power preventing the head of the agency from carrying out a consistent over-all policy.

Another distinctive attribute of the Veterans' Administration is the fact that it is engaged, exclusively, in providing services for a definite class or segment of our population. Moreover, the benefits thus provided are manysided and consist of a variety of programs with independent characteristics. * * * The plan of organization of the Veterans' Administration is likewise different from that of other agencies in that it consists largely of an integrated field operation distributed on a geographical basis, designed to provide veterans' benefits directly at the local level.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that I am very much opposed to the report of the Hoover Commission. I think it was prepared largely by persons who knew nothing about the structure of the Veterans' Administration and little, if anything, about veterans' affairs. I remember very well when the consolidation took place, when war risk was in one place and the Medical Section was under Public Health, and other divisions were in other departments. There was chaos; they did not have the files; they could not coordinate the care of the veterans or rehabilitation of the veterans with the medical services; they could not do any of the things that they ought to do as a unit for the veterans.

Then there was the Medical Service. Great effort was made to have a fine Medical Service, to establish it on such basis that it could be a career for doctors who went into it, to have it of a character to induce them to go into the service. I believe I can safely say today that the Veterans' Medical Service is the finest in the country, the finest in the world. They have very fine doctors, and nurses, and consultants, and specialists. They have very fine hospitals.

Then there was the building program. Under the Hoover Commission recommendations, the building would be transferred to the Interior Department. They made no provision for special building for the veterans. And another thing, in the President's message, Mr. Speaker, the President said that all the nonservice veterans would get their benefits under the general welfare program. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you know that many of the non-service-connected veterans are having careful examinations in hospitals and out of hospitals and often, very often, they become service-connected from a non-service-connected status. It would be manifestly unfair to put the veterans in hospitals with the civilians. In the matter of hospitals, the civilians and men even in prisons would compete with our veterans for beds.

I am wholeheartedly opposed to their report on the veterans, and I understand that the Hoover Commission has made no effort to press it. It looks as if the report never even got action in a committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has again expired.

THE HISS CASE

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, the statement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER], appearing in the RECORD of yesterday, on page 1095, is typical of the desperate attempt administration forces are making to hide the facts of treachery and espionage rampant among President Truman's bureaucracy.

Let me ask this question. If it had not been for the Un-American Activities Committee of the Eightieth Congress, and my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON] especially, would Hiss have ever been prosecuted? The answer is "No." Any person with common sense knows that this committee, operating under threats of reprisal and red-herring propaganda, literally forced prosecution of Alger Hiss. Further than that, President Truman and the Department of Justice had access to the facts of the Hiss treachery within their knowledge and control and could have prosecuted him on actual charges of sedition or espionage over 10 years ago if they had wanted to.

No, Mr. HUBER, the administration you are trying to defend must take sole responsibility for these New Deal chickens now coming home to roost—and what a sorry-looking mess of birds they are.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN TAXES RELATING TO OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 1, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1172. A letter from the Chairman, Munitions Board, transmitting the semiannual report to the Congress on the stock-piling program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1173. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, transmitting the second annual report of the District of Columbia Armory Board, pursuant to section 10, Public Law 605 of June 4, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1174. A letter from the vice president and comptroller, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Cos., transmitting a comparative general balance sheet of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1949; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1175. A letter from the vice president and comptroller, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Cos., transmitting a statement of receipts and expenditures of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1949; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1176. A letter from the president, Capital Transit Co., transmitting a report covering operations of Capital Transit Co. for the caldar year 1949, with balance sheet as of December 31, 1949; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1177. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to remove certain inequities by fixing the hours of work and overtime compensation practices in the case of certain employees of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1178. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Osa J. Petty"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1179. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a report of all tort claims paid by this agency for the period January 1 through December 31, 1949; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1180. A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting the report of the Potomac Electric Power Co. for the year ended December 31, 1949; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HAGEN: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Part 2, minority views on H. R. 2945. A bill to readjust postal rates; without amendment (Rept. No. 1452). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BECKWORTH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 378. A bill to amend section 25 of the Interstate Commerce Act to require certain common carriers by railroad to install and maintain communication systems and to establish and observe operating rules, regulations, and practices to promote safety of employees and travelers on railroads, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1558). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6077. A bill to clarify the status of inactive members of the Naval Reserve relating to the holding of offices of trust or profit under the Government of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1569). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1151. A bill to amend the act establishing grades of certain retired noncommissioned officers; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1570). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 485. An act for the relief of Joyce Violet Angel; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1552). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 753. An act for the relief of Sisters Antoinette Cometti, Mary Gibin, Angela Pelosin, Emma Ghisleni, Elisabetta De Caterin, and Onorina Franzina; without amendment (Rept. No. 1553). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1166. An act for the relief of Toriko Tateuchi; without amendment (Rept. No. 1554). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1487. A bill for the relief of Lt. (SG) Giacomo Falco; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1555). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4747. A bill for the relief of Louise Ahting; without amendment (Rept. No. 1556). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6345. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Raymond Schaffer, Jr., and Barbara Ann Schaffer; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1557). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 736. An act for the reimbursement of Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1559). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 777. An act for the relief of Calvin D. Lynch & Son; W. Thomas Lockerman; Sudlersville Supply Co.; George C. Moore and H. A. Moore; J. McKenny Willis & Son, Inc.; Hobbs & Jarman; C. S. Thomas; and Royse R. Spring; without amendment (Rept. No. 1560). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1019. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of personal injuries sustained by Carl J. Freund and Pauline H. Freund, his wife, of Seattle, Wash.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1561). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1048. An act for the relief of Saul Phillips; without amendment (Rept. No. 1562). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1088. An act for the relief of Milton Buechler; without amendment (Rept. No. 1563). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1096. An act for the relief of Abe Lincoln and Elena B. Lincoln; without amendment (Rept. No. 1564). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1353. An act for the relief of G. H. Lazarus, Jr., and Jesse F. Bewley; without amendment (Rept. No. 1565). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1534. An act for the relief of Harry Comber; without amendment (Rept. No. 1566). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1924. An act for the relief of the estate of William Walter See; without amendment (Rept. No. 1567). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2119. An act for the relief of the Alamo Irrigation Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1568). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 7055. A bill to provide uniform longevity promotional grades for the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 7056. A bill to authorize the construction of a new post office at Baldwyn, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7057. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) with respect to the computation of estimated costs of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction in the case of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts and other nonprofit educational institutions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 7058. A bill to amend laws relating to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 7059. A bill to create a National Cemetery Commission for the consolidation of national cemetery activities within one civilian commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 7060. A bill to authorize the reimbursement of certain naval attachés, observers, and other officers for certain expenses incurred while on authorized missions in foreign countries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WAGNER:

H. R. 7061. A bill to exempt from customs duty the carillon of the Convent of the Transfiguration, Glendale, Ohio; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FURCOLO:

H. R. 7062. A bill to aid in the use, conservation, and development of the natural resources of the New England States and to establish the New England Resources Survey Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 7063. A bill to provide for a 25-percent increase in the annuities and pensions payable to railroad employees and to their survivors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. J. Res. 408. Joint resolution to amend the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, giving nonprofit veterans' organizations administration of temporary veterans' housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. J. Res. 409. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim February 3 of each year as Dorchester Day for the observance and commemoration of the deaths and the heroic act of Chaplains Clark V. Poling, George L. Fox, John Patrick Washington, and Alexander D. Goode; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 455. Resolution to amend rule XIII of the House rules; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 7064. A bill for the relief of Christian & Co., Inc., of Pittsburgh, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:
H. R. 7065. A bill for the relief of Kazuko Miyama Akana and Chang King Akana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 7066. A bill for the relief of Miss Setsuko Amano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 7067. A bill for the relief of Min Fujito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 7068. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ben Fukunaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 7069. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ryu Dong Souk Ham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 7070. A bill for the relief of Kuraichi Honke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 7071. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Masa Iyoki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 7072. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Young Ja Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 7073. A bill for the relief of Koto Kogemi Kitsu and Jeannette Akemi Kitsu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 7074. A bill for the relief of Hiroko Fujiwara Matsuoka and Mimiyo Matsuoka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 7075. A bill for the relief of the wife and child of Alvin Moa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 7076. A bill for the relief of Mokutaro Murakami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 7077. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Seiko Fujihara Murata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 7078. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eiko Yamada Nagatoshi and her son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 7079. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gin Shibasaki Okafuji; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 7080. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aki Oseto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 7081. A bill for the relief of Yoichi and Uto Takara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 7082. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Isamu Tarasawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 7083. A bill for the relief of Toriko Tateuchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 7084. A bill for the relief of Yoshiko Ishii Teves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 7085. A bill for the relief of Sachiko Urushibara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 7086. A bill for the relief of Setsuji Yamashita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 7087. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Akiko Haneishi Yamato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 7088. A bill for the relief of Koichi and Setsu Yokogawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 7089. A bill for the relief of Ichi Yoshioka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:
H. R. 7090. A bill for the relief of Max Fischer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:
H. R. 7091. A bill for the relief of John George Papailias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:
H. R. 7092. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Karry Wakefield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:
H. R. 7093. A bill for the relief of Marie Burger and Josef Burger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY:
H. R. 7094. A bill for the relief of Kazuyo Dohi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER:
H. R. 7095. A bill for the relief of Rosette Selina Romano, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:
H. R. 7096. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Salome Holland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1768. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary-treasurer, Puerto Rico Free Federation of Labor, San Juan, P. R., relative to the fair labor standards amendments of 1949 and voicing the sentiments of Puerto Rican labor with respect to wages, working and social conditions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1769. Also, petition of Ambassador V. K. Wellington Koo, Chinese Embassy, Washington, D. C., relative to a statement signed by 221 members of the Legislative Yuan of the Republic of China relating to the war with Communist China and international Communist aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1770. Also, petition of C. E. Roberts and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1771. Also, petition of Mary Ann Anstett and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1772. Also, petition of Mrs. Ellen M. Hart and others, Orlovista, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1773. Also, petition of Josie B. Gardner and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received for the fourth calendar quarter of 1949.

To carry out the provisions of the Lobbying Act, three forms were printed and used in making detailed statements (Form A), registrations (Form B), and filing quarterly reports (Form C).

Section 308 (b) requires the printing of information received and filed. Forms B and C, upon which this information was submitted, are reproduced as follows:

FORM B

REGISTRATION (IN DUPLICATE) WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE UNDER THE LOBBYING ACT

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name _____
Business address _____

INFORMATION REQUESTED FROM PERSONS REGISTERING

(1) The name and address of the person by whom employed:
(1) _____
(2) In whose interest he appears or works:
(2) _____
(3) The duration of such employment:
(3) _____
(4) How much he is paid and is to receive:
(4) _____
(5) By whom he is paid or is to be paid:
(5) _____
(6) How much he is to be paid for expenses:
(6) _____
(7) What expenses are to be included:
(7) _____
See form C for quarterly report to be filed.

OATH OF REGISTRANT

[Omitted in printing]

Form C

QUARTERLY REPORT OF PERSONS REGISTERING UNDER LOBBYING ACT TO BE FILED, IN DUPLICATE, WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name _____
Business address _____
Employed by _____
Address _____

INFORMATION REQUIRED IN QUARTERLY REPORT

Each such person so registering shall, between the 1st and 10th day of each calendar quarter, so long as his activity continues, file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and Secretary of the Senate—

(1) A detailed report under oath of all money received and expended by him during the preceding calendar quarter:
(1) _____
(2) To whom paid:
(2) _____
(3) For what purposes:
(3) _____
(4) The names of any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which he has caused to be published any articles or editorials:
(4) _____
(5) The proposed legislation he is employed to support or oppose:
(5) _____

OATH OF REGISTRANT FILING QUARTERLY REPORT

[Omitted in printing]

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were received for the fourth calendar quarter 1949, and filed, using Form B, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space, the questions in Form B (see above) are not repeated. Only the answers to questions are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

Allen, W. L., 5913 Georgia Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, International (A. F. of L.),

5913 Georgia Avenue, Washington, D. C. (2) The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, International (A. F. of L.). (3) During 2-year term of office as international president; term expires October 1951. (4) Receives annual salary of $7,500 as international president. None of said amount is allocated for any particular duties. (5) The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, International (A. F. of L.). (6) Is reimbursed for out-of-pocket, incidental expenses. (7) Out-of-pocket, travel, and hotel expenses; has office at union headquarters and is furnished secretarial and clerical assistance.

American Pulpwood Association,[1] 220 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) The association is a voluntary unincorporated association, not for profit, and is composed of producers, suppliers, and consumers of pulpwood within the United States. Its principal objective is the promotion of the welfare of the industry at large and protection of its interests. It is principally concerned with improved logging, production, and transportation methods, conservation of resources, betterment of operations, safety and fire-prevention programs, development of mechanical equipment and other problems peculiar to the industry which it represents. Its only concern with legislation or legislative action of any character arises when some legislative proposal is made which appears to have some direct effect upon the industry, its members, or their business and operations. Such occasions rarely arise but when they do the association acts by itself and is not, therefore, employed by anyone in the ordinary sense of that word. (2) The association works solely in the interest of the pulpwood industry in the United States as represented by its membership. (3) As above stated, the association is employed by no one. Such legislative activities as it may undertake will presumably be continued, when and as the need therefor is apparent, as long as the association's organization continues to exist. (4) The revenue of the association is derived entirely from dues and assessments collected from its members. It is not conducted for profit and no part of its income inures to the benefit of any member. Its funds are used exclusively for the objectives above described, only a small portion being allocated from time to time for legislative activities as the actual necessities of each individual problem may require. No specific contributions are received for such purposes nor any specific appropriations made therefor, all such expenses being charged, as made, against the general funds of the association. (5) See answer to item 4. (6) See answer to item 4. (7) The expenses paid or incurred by the association in legislative activities consist generally of that proportion of its secretary's compensation of $13,000 annually as the time devoted by him to such activities bears to his total working time, together with the out-of-pocket expenses of the secretary in such activities. There are also the expenses of holding meetings from time to time and the rarely occasional publication and distribution of educational and informative literature. There may be other expenditures of an unusual or emergent character which are not possible of general classification.

Robert J. Bishop, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Atlantic Union Committee, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) Atlantic Union Committee. (3) One year. (4) $750 per month. (5) Atlantic Union Committee. (6) Actual expenses incurred in official business of the committee. (7) Official business travel and hotel bills; tips and entertainment, such as occasional dinner or luncheon.

Brashear, Harry R., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (2) See (1). (3) Permanent employee, no definite term. (4) Salary at the rate of $13,008 per annum, no part of which, however, is paid for activities covered by Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (5) Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc. (6) Actual expenses incurred in connection with association activities will be reimbursed. (7) See (6).

Brinckerhoff, H. E.,[1] 220 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) American Pulpwood Association, 220 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (2) The pulpwood industry in the United States as represented by the membership of American Pulpwood Association. (3) At the pleasure of the board of directors of American Pulpwood Association. (4) That portion of his annual compensation of $13,000 as is represented by the proportion which his working time devoted to activities covered by the Lobbying Act in any year shall bear to his total working time in such year. No fixed sum can be estimated in advance. (5) American Pulpwood Association, 220 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses paid or incurred while actually engaged in activities covered by the Lobbying Act. No accurate estimate can be given in advance. (7) Traveling and hotel expenses, subsistence, meeting space, luncheons, cab hire, and other expenses incidental to group meetings and conferences held in connection with activities covered by the Lobbying Act and the preparation and editing of literature pertaining thereto.

Coles, Marvin J., Ingoldsby, Coles & Wright, attorneys, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) We are employed as attorneys by the Committee for Promotion of Tramp Shipping Under American Flag in Foreign Commerce, 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Committee for Promotion of Tramp Shipping Under American Flag in Foreign Commerce. (3) Indefinite. (4) Registrants will be paid a retainer fee and additional compensation dependent upon the work done. (5) Same as (1); companies comprising the membership of this committee contribute to its chairman, who in turn pays to us our legal fees. (6) Registrants will be reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenditures. (7) Long-distance telephone and telegraph charges, mimeographing, printing, entertainment, travel, payments to associate counsel and economist.

Collet, M. H., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Employed since 1944 as a forest engineer and assistant to a vice president in the wood department of West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) Employer named above. (3) Permanent. (4) A salary which does not in any way depend upon activities, if any, that might be deemed subject to the Lobbying Act. (5) Employer named above. (6) Reimbursed for reasonable expenses incurred by registrant while working for the above employer away from New York City. (7) Travel and personal living expenses incurred by registrant while working for the above employer away from New York City. Registrant denies and reserves the right to contest (1) the applicability of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act to his activities and (2) the constitutionality of said act if it should apply to his activities.

Crosby, Caresse,[1] 2008 Q Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Myself. (2) Women of the World Against War. (3) Indefinite. (4) Zero. (5) Not paid or to be paid. (6) Actual expenses will be paid for as incurred out of funds contributed to the organization, Women of the World Against War. (7) Office, travel, legal, secretarial, publicity, and all ordinary expenses.

Danielian, N. R., Mayflower Office Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, Mayflower Office Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) $1,500 per month. (5) Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association. (6) Out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Travel, taxis, business lunches.

Dow, Fayette B., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) I am senior partner of the law firm, Dow, Lohnes & Albertson, 600 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (2) I am and have been for many years a special attorney in Washington for the American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (3) Indefinite. (4) Of my total income as attorney for the American Petroleum Institute, I believe $1,000 would amply cover all time which may be devoted to Federal legislation in the course of a year. (5) American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (6) Not specified but will be confined to wholly incidental out-of-pocket expenses, such as travel, telephone, telegraph, etc. (7) Incidental, out-of-pocket expenses only, see (6) above.

Ellison, Newell W., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Ray W. Britton, 1416 Cherry Street, Erie, Pa. (2) See No. (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) No fee yet determined. (5) See No. (1). (6) Not yet determined. (1) Usual disbursements customary in legal work.

Engel, Leon J., 20 Hopkins Place, Baltimore, Md. (1) J. Engel & Co., Inc., 20 Hopkins Place, Baltimore, Md. (2) Jewelry Industry Tax Committee. (3) Indefinite, since January 1949. (4) No compensation. (5) [Blank.] (6) [Blank.] (7) Out-of-pocket expenses only.

Ernst, Morris L., and Harriet F. Pilpel, 285 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Committee Against Discrimination on Small Catalog Postage Rates, 285 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) Committee Against Discrimination on Small Catalog Postage Rates. (3) The employment of Morris L. Ernst and Harriet F. Pilpel is terminable at will. (4) The retainer agreement between the committee and Morris L. Ernst and Harriet F. Pilpel provides for a fee of $10,000. Possible additional compensation dependent upon time spent and outcome. (5) The Committee Against Discrimination on Small Catalog Postage Rates consists of Condon Bros., seedsmen, Rockford, Ill.; W. Atlee Burpee Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; Walter Field Co., Chicago, Ill.; Alden's, Inc., Chicago, Ill.; National Bellas Hess, Inc., Kansas City, Mo.; Lane Bryant, New York City; Jackson & Perkins Co., Newark, N. Y.; Vaughn Seed Co., Chicago, Ill.; Peter Henderson & Co., New York, N. Y.; and Max Schling, Inc., seedsmen, New York, N. Y. (6) Reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Traveling, hotel, long-distance-telephone calls, etc.

Foley, Frank J., 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Rederiaktiebolaget Advance, Mariehamn, Finland; Abtiebolaget Helsingfors Steamship Co., Ltd., Helsingfors, Finland; Kouran Laiva O/Y, Vaasa, Finland; Vaasan Laiva O/Y, Vaasa, Finland; Kuurtanes O/Y, Vaasa, Finland; Rederiaktiebolaget Peggy Thorden, Helsingfors, Finland; Aktiebolaget Roslagen, Stockholm, Sweden; Gustaf B. Thorden, Uddevalla, Sweden. (2) Same as (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) Amount earned under normal attorney-client retainer. The fee will be computed on the basis of time expended. (5) Same as (1) and (2). (6) Expense as incurred. (7) Traveling, telephone, and telegraph.

Fowler, Robert E., Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Seadrome Patents Co., Inc., 2143 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (2) Seadrome Patents Co., Inc. (3) Four months from November 1, 1949. (4) $250 per month. (5) Seadrome Patents Co., Inc. (6) [Blank.] (7) All out-of-pocket

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

expenses which it is believed will be limited to travel expenses and telephone costs.

Fulton, Wallace H. (1) National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., which is a registered securities association pursuant to section 15A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, and its 2,734 members who are registered brokers and dealers with the Securities and Exchange Commission under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. (3) Indefinite. The undersigned is executive director for the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. (Resolution of Board of Governors of National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., setting forth duties is attached hereto.[2]) (4) The undersigned is paid as executive director for the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., and not specifically for any legislative activities. An estimate of compensation based upon a projected estimate of time to be expended which could reasonably be anticipated at this time would not exceed a maximum of $2,500 annually. (5) National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. (6) Indefinite. (7) Out-of-pocket disbursements.

Garstang, Marion R., 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Milk Producers Federation, formerly National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Milk Producers Federation. (3) Indefinite, no fixed term. (4) $8,000 per annum to cover all services for the Federation including such services, if any, as are rendered in connection with lobbying. (5) National Milk Producers Federation. (6) To be reimbursed for all actual expenditures. (7) All expenses incident to the work of the Federation.

Graham, Mrs. Aubry Lee, 305 North Oak Street, Falls Church, Va. (1) American Library Association, John Mackenzie Cory, executive secretary, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) Membership of the association and the library profession. (3) Indefinite. (4) $250 per month (for half-time). (5) American Library Association. (6) Approximately $100 per month plus limited travel expenses as authorized and needed. This is for total operation of office; probably not more than one-third is applicable to legislative activity. (7) Stenographic (part-time); telephone; postage and office supplies.

Griswold,[1] Lyman D., 311 North Douty Street, Hanford, Calif. (1) Kings County Committee for Fair Cotton Allotments, Hanford, Calif., an informal association of cotton farmers in Kings County, Calif. (2) Approximately 700 cotton farmers in Kings County, Calif. (3) Indefinite; probably several weeks. (4) Fee of $150 per diem, retaining fee $1,000. Paid on account $1,755. For expenses also. (5) Kings County Committee for Fair Cotton Allotments who has raised money by voluntary contributions. (6) All actual expenses, travel, hotel, meals, telephone, telegraph, tips. (7) See above.

Harper, Elsie Dorothy, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations. (3) Annual. (4) $1,700 annually. (5) National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations. (6) $1,360. (7) Stenographic help, travel, printing, stationary, postage, telephone, and telegrams.

House, Robert B., Jr., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) New Process Co., Warren, Pa. (3) Indefinite. (4) No specific compensation for these services. Covered by general contract of employment as associate counsel with Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross. Compensation under said contract will not be increased or affected by these services or this registration. (5) Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross. (6) No fixed amount. Registrant will be reimbursed for ordinary expenses incurred. (7) Transportation, communication, and similar out-of-pocket expenses.

Hoyt, Kendall K., 1226 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Federation of Private School Associations, 2601 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Same. (3) Indefinite. (4) $2,500 per year for part time, minimum. (5) National Federation of Private School Associations. (6) Indefinite. (7) Duplicating, mailing, research, etc.

Hudson, Minor, 444 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Seadrome Patents Co., Inc., 2143 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (2) Seadrome Patents Co., Inc. (3) Four months from November 1, 1949. (4) $250 per month. (5) Seadrome Patents Co., Inc. (6) [Blank.] (7) All out-of-pocket expenses which it is believed will be limited to travel expenses and telephone costs.

Johnson,[3] Willard, general secretary, United States Committee for a United Nations Genocide Convention, 381 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1501, New York, N. Y. (1) None. No person receives any remuneration for working with this committee. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.] (6) [Blank.] (7) [Blank.]

Jones, Day, Cockley & Reavis (a partnership engaged in the general practice of law), 1759 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio, and 1135 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) The M. A. Hanna Co., Leader Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) The M. A. Hanna Co. (3) Registrant law firm acts, and for a number of years has acted, as general counsel for the above client. During the course of this general representation, registrant law firm has occasion to work on legislative matters of interest to this client. (4) No fixed compensation. The amount of compensation for which registrant will bill its client in connection with legislative work will, in accordance with registrant's customary practice, depend principally upon the amount of time spent and the type of services performed in connection with such work. (5) The M. A. Hanna Co. (6) No fixed amount. In accordance with its customary practice registrant firm will bill the M. A. Hanna Co. for reimbursement of the ordinary and necessary expenses incurred in the course of its representation of the client. (7) Ordinary and necessary expenses incurred specifically with reference to legislative work, including travel, telephone and telegraph, hotels, printing and postage, etc.

Jones, L. Dan,[4] 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Independent Petroleum Association of America. (2) See (4). (3) See (4). (4) In regard to my registration pursuant to the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, this is to advise that as of October 1, 1949, my salary was increased in the amount of $1,200 per annum. (5) See (4). (6) See (4). (7) See (4).

Kennedy, Miles D., 734 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (2) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws, child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations, the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; and the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the National Convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion. (3) Beginning January 1, 1950. (4) $12,000 per year. (5) The American Legion (national organization). (6) Reimbursed for actual traveling expense and incidental expenses of about $30 monthly. (7) Travel and such items as taxi fare, meals, phone calls.

Lester, George B., 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) As a partner of Oliver and Donnally, attorneys with offices at 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, and Continental Building, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) The National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (3) Indefinite. (4) $7,500 approximately is annual share of partnership income for legal services for the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks. Not more than 15 percent of this is for purposes mentioned in the Lobbying Act. (5) Oliver and Donnally. (6) The registrant is reimbursed for all legitimate expenses such as travel, hotel, and meals. (7) All necessary expenses of the character indicated above.

Lindsey, John W., National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. (2) National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., which is a registered securities association pursuant to section 15A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, and its 2,734 members who are registered brokers and dealers with the Securities and Exchange Commission under the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934. (3) Indefinite. The undersigned is counsel for the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. (Resolution of Board of Governors of National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., setting forth duties is attached hereto.[2]) (4) The undersigned is paid as counsel for the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., and not specifically for any legislative activities. An estimate of compensation based upon a projected estimate of time to be expended which could reasonably be anticipated at this time would not exceed a maximum of $1,500 annually. (5) National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. (6) Indefinite. (7) Out-of-pocket disbursements.

Lunn, Richard D., 20 Elm Street, Auburn, Maine. (1) Colonial Airlines, Inc., 630 Fifth Avenue, New York City. (2) Colonial Airlines, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) Undetermined. (5) Colonial Airlines, Inc. The registrant does not believe that his activities in connection with Colonial Airlines fall within the terms "attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation" as used in the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. However, this registration is being filed because of the uncertain interpretation of that act. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Necessary telephone, telegraph, traveling, printing and stenographic, and such other similar expenses as may be authorized.

Lynch, Daniel A. (member of the firm of King & Lynch), 366 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) National Association of

[1] Registration with Clerk only.
[2] Not printed. Filed in Clerk's office.
[3] Registration with the Secretary only.
[4] Amended registration.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Stevedores, 90 West Street, New York, N. Y. (2) National Association of Stevedores. (3) Duration undetermined. (4) Paid to date, $4,200; receive $200 every month plus any additional amount agreed upon; none agreed upon to date. (5) National Association of Stevedores. (6) Actual. (7) Hotel, meals, transportation.

McAdams, William D. (public relations), 261 Constitution Avenue. (1) Whitaker & Baxter, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) American Medical Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) $3,600 per quarter, fee. (5) Whitaker & Baxter, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (6) Transportation expenses only as incurred. (7) Transportation only.

McCart, John A., American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Federation of Government Employees, James G. Yaden, president, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) American Federation of Government Employees. (3) Permanent. (4) $5,000. (5) American Federation of Government Employees. (6) Travel expenses. (7) Taxi fares to and from Capitol.

McEnerney, Edward B., National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York City, N. Y. (2) National Economic Council, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) $380 per month. (5) National Economic Council, Inc. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Incidental expenses.

Mattox, William H., 1224 I Street, Sacramento, Calif. (1) Ladlords of America, Sacramento, Calif. (2) Property owners and small taxpayers to establish a maximum tax limit to be placed on the Federal Government so that the combined Federal, State, city, and county taxation shall not exceed a total of 25 percent of the individual or corporate net income; and that no tax budget shall exceed more than 5 percent of the total appropriated the preceding calendar year. (3) Till completed. (4) Not over $185,000. (5) Landlords of America and taxpayer groups and property owners in the small-income brackets to be formed and organized nationally, to be listed as organized. (6) Not exceeding $12,000 (included in item (4). (7) Organizational expense included in item (4) total.

Meacham, Holland E., University Club, Washington, D. C. (1) Slick Airways, Inc., P. O. Box 6268, San Antonio, Tex. (2) Slick Airways, Inc. (3) I have been with Slick Airways over 2 years and am to be in Washington during the first 6 months of 1950. (4) $7,200 per year. (5) Slick Airways, Inc. (6) To be reimbursed for proper out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Transportation, office expenses, and entertainment for company benefit.

Mermey, Maurice, of the firm of Baldwin and Mermey, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Bureau of Education on Fair Trade, an Illinois corporation; New York address: 205 East Forty-second Street; Chicago address: 205 West Wacker Drive. (2) In behalf of said corporation, the Bureau of Education on Fair Trade. (3) No specified time: In all events for the period or duration of the program which is estimated to last for 3 years. (4) The sum of $2,000 per month as compensation for services rendered. (5) By the said corporation, the Bureau of Education on Fair Trade. (6) Such expenses as are advanced by applicant and approved by the officers of the corporation. (7) General operating expenses—such as printing, stenographic help, traveling, and others incidental to the services rendered by public-relations counsel.

Mopsick, Harry, 100 North Wood Avenue, Linden, N. J. (1) The registrant is self-employed. (2) The registrant is interested in the extension of rent control. He also appears in the interest of the Union County Federation of Tenants' Leagues (New Jersey) and the New Jersey Tenants' Council and the National Tenants' Council. (3) The registrant is not employed by any persons or group in interest. (4) The registrant does not believe that his activity comes within the purview of the Lobbying Act, and files this registration solely to avoid the penalty of the act and with full reservation of all rights. (5) Registrant does not receive any financial remuneration. (6) Registrant pays his own expenses. (7) See (6).

Myers, Abram F., Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Council of Motion Picture Organizations, an informal conference committee consisting of the representatives of 10 organizations in the motion-picture industry. (2) Council of Motion Picture Organizations, representing all branches of the motion-picture industry. Subject: Excise tax on theater admissions. (3) Second session of the Eighty-first Congress. (4) All services to the Council, except clerical services, are donated. My only compensation is from Allied States Association of Motion Picture Exhibitors, one of the 10 constituent members of the council. (5) See (4). (6) Reimbursement for expenses actually incurred, no fixed amount. (7) Travel, telephone, telegraph, clerical help, printing, mimeographing, miscellaneous office expense.

National Retail Dry Goods Association,[1] 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York 1, N. Y. (1) Not employed to influence legislation. (See supplemental statement attached.[2]) (2) In the interest of the retail craft. (See supplemental statement appended.) (3) The association's existence is perpetual. (4) The association will annually appropriate such sum for legislative activities, including expenses thereof and the compensation of legislative representatives as its finance and budget committees establish with the approval of the board of directors. The association receives no funds from its membership specifically allocated for legislative activities. On occasion, however, and subject to the approval of the board of directors the association may invite voluntary contributions from members of the retail craft specially interested in a specific legislative proposal. In such event, the association's legislative budget will be supplemented by any contributions so received, and such contributions and their disbursement will be fully disclosed in appropriate reports in accordance with the provisions of the act. (5) The membership of the Association pay membership dues predicated upon their annual sales volume. Such dues are in no way related to legislative activities. (6) See (4) and (5), above. (7) Compensation of legislative representatives, traveling, hotel bills, printing and mailing, telegraph and telephone, indicated in form C simultaneously filed herewith.

Nemitz, Donald F., 211 Columbia Building, Fourth and Main Streets, Louisville, Ky. (1) Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 211 Columbia Building, Fourth and Main Streets, Louisville, Ky. (2) Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky. (3) Indefinite. (4) $125 per month as secretary of the Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky. (5) Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky. (6) Necessary travel expenses. (7) Necessary taxi expenses.

O'Hara, Donald C., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Fayette B. Dow, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (2) American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (3) Indefinite. (4) I am an attorney in general practice. I am paid by Fayette B. Dow for various legal work. I believe that the sum of $600 can properly be assigned to the work I expect to do in the preparation and presentation of information relating to excise taxes and provisions of the Internal Revenue Act affecting petroleum or its products. (5) Fayette B. Dow. (6) Out-of-pocket expenses, if any. (7) Out-of-pocket incidental expenses, if any.

Page, Getty, 128 Merchants Row, Rutland, Vt. (1) Vermont State Medical Society, 128 Merchants Row, Rutland, Vt. (2) Vermont State Medical Society, 128 Merchants Row, Rutland, Vt. (3) From June 1949, indefinitely. (4) Annual salary for all activities, including lobbying, $4,000. (5) Vermont State Medical Society. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Telephone, telegrams, postage, transportation, meals, and room.

Palmer, C. L., M. D., 8101 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) The Medical Society of the State of Pennsylvania, committee on public-health legislation, 8104 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa. (2) The Medical Society of the State of Pennsylvania. (3) Fifteen years. (4) $9,480; includes chairmanship of following committees: committee on public-health legislation, committee on rural medical service, State healing arts advisory committee, and advisory committee to the bureau of vocational education. One-fifth of salary estimated as pertaining to public-health legislation. (5) The Medical Society of the State of Pennsylvania. (6) Is paid for travel expenses, including transportation, hotel, meals, and tips. Varies from year to year. Difficult to state sum to be paid for expenses. Trip to Washington several times a year. (7) See (6) above.

Parker, Charles A., executive director, National Aviation Trades Association. (1) National Aviation Trades Association. (2) National Aviation Trades Association membership, comprised of State chapters which are made up in turn of persons and companies engaged in airport operations, flying training, air-taxi operations, aircraft and products sales, agricultural activities of aerial dusting, etc., and miscellaneous aviation activities. (3) One year, with renewal to be considered. (4) Salary was agreed upon at $7,500 if it can be collected, which depends upon the general response of the membership after some revisions in the NATA set-up. (5) By NATA from moneys received from State chapters, miscellaneous advertising, and subscription income. (6) No determined amount. Travel and other at whatever the amount comes to at the time. (7) Travel and entertainment.

Peek, Merl B., 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Reclamation Association, Merl B. Peek, assistant secretary-manager, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (2) National Reclamation Association, comprising 17 western reclamation States. (3) Permanent. (4) $6,000 annually. (5) National Reclamation Association. (6) Maximum of $4,000 per year for travel and out-of-pocket expenses not to exceed $500 per year. (7) See copy of constitution of the National Reclamation Association, attached.[2]

Poole, Rufus G., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Western Conference National Park Concessioners, 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (2) Same as answer to (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) The employment is an ordinary attorney-client relationship, with compensation to be determined. (5) Western Conference National Park Concessioners. (6) Reimbursement for actual expenses. (7) Telephone, telegraph, taxi, travel, and miscellaneous office.

Radner, William; Zito, Frank J.; Donoghue, Robert F., Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Coastwise Line, 150 Sansome Street, San Francisco, Calif. (2) Coastwise Line, 150 Sansome Street, San Francisco, Calif. (3) Indefinite. (4) Reasonable compensation, hereafter to be determined. (5) Coastwise Line. (6) Actual disbursements. (7) Travel, long-distance communications, etc.

Reed, Otie M., 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Milk Producers'

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Federation (formerly National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation), 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Milk Producers' Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Indefinite; no fixed term. (4) $8,000 per annum, to cover all services for the Federation, including such services, if any, as are rendered in connection with lobbying. (5) National Milk Producers' Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (6) To be reimbursed for all actual expenditure. (7) All expenses incident to the work of the Federation.

Schaeffer, Alexander L., Anoram, N. Y. (1) None received; spent $19.45. (2) Newspaper and periodicals and postage vendors. (3) General information. (4) None. (5) The right to work, the right to strike, abolishment of the closed shop, and the enactment of legislation making it unlawful for any individual, group, or organization to impose or levy a royalty tax on any commodity or service.

Smith, Howard J., 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) Central Arizona Project Association, Wayne M. Akin, president, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (2) Central Arizona Project Association, Phoenix, Ariz. (3) Indefinite. (4) $750 per month. (5) Central Arizona Project Association, Phoenix, Ariz. (6) Actual and necessary expenses, car mileage, plane and train fare, room and board, when engaged in travel in interest of work of the association. (7) All expenses listed above and any additional expenses which may occur in connection with work of the association.

Sullivan, Bernard & Shea, a law firm of which the partners are John L. Sullivan, Lawrence J. Bernard, and John E. Shea, 914 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Braniff Airways, Inc., Capital Airlines, Inc., Chicago & Southern Air Lines, Inc., Colonial Airlines, Inc., Delta Air Lines, Inc., Mid-Continent Airlines, Inc., Northeast Airlines, Inc., Northwest Airlines, Inc., Piedmont Airlines, and Southern Airlines. (2) The clients listed in (1) above. (3) Six months beginning January 6, 1950. (4) $30,000 to be paid at the rate of $5,000 per month beginning in January 1950. Nothing has been paid to date. (5) Clients mentioned in (2) above. (6) Will be reimbursed for necessary out-of-pocket expenditures. (7) Necessary telephone, telegraph, and travel expenses.

Sullivan, Bernard & Shea, a law firm of which the partners are John L. Sullivan, Lawrence J. Bernard, and John E. Shea, 914 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Thomas D. Griffin, 105 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill., acting for an informal group of licensed small-loan companies affected by section 501 (b) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code. (2) Clients mentioned in (1) above. (3) Indefinite. (4) Reasonable fee to be determined and paid when employment is terminated. (5) Clients mentioned in (1) above. (6) Fee will include reimbursement for out-of-pocket disbursements. (7) Telephone, telegraph, and travel expenses, and fees for necessary professional assistance.

Sullivan, Gael, 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Theater Owners of America, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (2) Theater Owners of America, Inc. (3) Annual contract, starting June 1, 1948. (4) Nothing in addition to annual salary. (5) Theater Owners of America, Inc. (6) Transportation and hotel bills. (7) See (6) above.

Sutherland, A. D., attorney at law, 104 South Main Street, Fond du Lac, Wis. (1) Bankers Farm Mortgage Co., 84 South Macy Street, Fond du Lac, Wis.; F. A. Carlton, 135 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) Bankers Farm Mortgage Co. by contract is to get legislative relief and pay the original bondholders moneys received from legislative relief in accordance with terms of said contract. (3) To 1956. Five percent if legislative relief is obtained and the bonds are paid. (5) The above. (6) Expenses are to be paid by the Bankers Farm Mortgage Co. if approved prior to being incurred. (7) Travel, court costs, printing, etc., if necessary. A typewritten form similar to the above had been previously filed with this Clerk.

Tawney, James A., 504 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo. (2) Grain and Feed Dealers National Association. (3) Employed on annual salary-rate basis. (4) Annual salary (gross) in payment for all types of legal services, $5,100. (5) Grain and Feed Dealers National Association. (6) Actual itemized monthly. (7) Transportation and incidental miscellaneous.

Taylor, Margaret K., 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Milk Producers Federation, formerly National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Milk Producers Federation. (3) Indefinite; no fixed term. (4) $8,000 per annum to cover all services for the federation, including such services if any, as are rendered in connection with lobbying. (5) National Milk Producers Federation. (6) To be reimbursed for all actual expenditures. (7) All expenses incident to the work of the federation.

Tobler, H. Willis. (1) National Milk Producers Federation, formerly National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Milk Producers Federation. (3) Indefinite; no fixed term. (4) $7,700 per annum to cover all services for the federation including such services, if any, as are rendered in connection with lobbying. (5) National Milk Producers Federation. (6) To be reimbursed for all actual expenditures. (7) All expenses incident to the work of the federation.

Vernon, Weston, Jr. (1) Registrant is a member of the law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y., which firm is retained by the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States for professional services. Registrant does not believe he is subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. (2) The Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States. (3) See (1). (4) It is impossible to determine in advance (prior to filing of Form C for a given quarter) what portion of professional services rendered for the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States might be attributable to registrant's Federal tax legislative work. Such work comprises only an incidental and minor part of registrant's duties. (5) See (1). (6) The firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley will be reimbursed for actual out-of-pocket expenses incurred by any member or associate of the firm. (7) See (6) above. Usual disbursements customary in legal work.

Walter, Paul W., general counsel. (1) National Association of Private Schools, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Private trade and vocational schools who are members of the association. (3) Indefinite. (4) $2,000 paid. Future payments dependent on time devoted to work for client, including routine professional representation as well as any lobbying activities. Not included in report are fees paid by individual members of association for legal, nonlobbying, professional services. (5) National Association of Private Schools. (6) Reimbursement only for actual personal expenses incurred. No amount specified. (7) All expenses incurred as general counsel for association, i. e., transportation, communications, entertainment, etc.

Weismann, Walter S., Jr. (1) American Airlines System, including American Airlines, Inc., and American Overseas Airlines, Inc., both of 100 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., and 1437 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) American Airlines System (see (1) above). (3) Indefinite. (4) Employed permanently as assistant to the vice president of American Airlines and receive annual salary of $9,000. Only a portion of time devoted to legislative matters, for which I receive no additional compensation. (5) American Airlines, Inc., and American Overseas Airlines, Inc. (6) Reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Meals, taxi fares, and incidentals.

White, John C., Fulbright, Crooker, Freeman & White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) New York Cotton Exchange, 60 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Exchange and its members. (3) For fiscal year ended June 30, 1950. (4) $5,000 per annum retainer for departmental and congressional representation. (5) New York Cotton Exchange. (6) Actual expenses incurred. (7) Telephone, telegraph, traveling expenses.

Whitelaw, H. Leigh. (1) National Committee for Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (2) National Committee for Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes. (3) Indefinite. (4) To be negotiated based on time. (5) National Committee for Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes. (6) Out-of-pocket disbursements for long-distance telephones, travel, etc. (7) See (6).

Whitten, Elton B. (1) Board of directors, National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Rehabilitation Association. (3) Permanent. (4) $7,800 per annum for all services. (5) National Rehabilitation Association, Inc. (6) $2,400 per annum for all expenses. (7) Travel, and other miscellaneous expenses.

Wild, Claude C., Jr., 605 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association, 308 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla. (2) Same as (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) Annual retainer fee of $7,200, but only one-fourth of this is for work in connection with legislative matters. (5) Same as (1). (6) Reimbursed for actual out-of-pocket expenditures. (7) Taxi fares and reimbursement for expenses while away from home.

Williams, Myers & Quiggle, a law partnership consisting of the following partners: Paul F. Myers, Martin W. Meyer, John E. Skilling, J. C. Peacock, and Robert H. Myers, 817 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Estate of Eleanor E. Rice, 405 Land Title Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (2) Same as (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) We are to receive $25,000 if and when the joint efforts of ourselves and the estate's local attorneys result in allowance of a claim for refund heretofore filed. (5) Same as (1). (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Wilson, J. B., McKinley, Wyo. (1) Wyoming Wool Growers Association, McKinley, Wyo. (2) The wool growers of the United States. (3) Is employed by the Wyoming Wool Growers Association as secretary on an annual basis. (4) $6,000 per annum. (5) Wyoming Wool Growers Association, McKinley, Wyo. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Transportation, hotel, meals, phone, telegraph, stenographic expense, taxicabs.

Wyatt, Wilson W., Wyatt, Grafton & Grafton, Marion E. Taylor Building, Louisville, Ky. (1) National Committee for Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Same as (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) Not yet determined, and none has been received. (5) Same as (1). (6) Usual out-of-pocket expenses will be reimbursed. (7) Customary expenses such as telephone, telegraph, hotel, transportation, and the other usual travel and office expenses.

Ziegfeld, Robert Lindley, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Lead Industries Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) Lead Industries Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) Such a small part of the work is devoted to presenting the industry's views on legislation that it is impossible to segregate the amount paid and received for

this purpose. (5) Lead Industries Association. (6) The amount to be paid for expenses for presenting the industry's views on legislation as compared with total expenses would vary and would be extremely small, probably not exceeding $50 maximum in any month. (7) Telephone, telegraph, taxies, postage, stationery, etc.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were received for the fourth calendar quarter, 1949, and filed, using Form C, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space the questions in Form C (see p. 1233) are not repeated. Only the answers are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

Adams,[3] Lynn, 1624 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the National Committee for Mental Hygiene, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $881 (began work for this year on September 1, 1949). (2) Various creditors, telephone company, plus personal salary. (3) Office and travel expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) Mental health.

Adams, Lynn, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; the National Committee for Mental Hygiene, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $278.61. (2) Transportation, hotel, etc. (3) Travel expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) Mental health.

Adkerson, J. Carson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; self. (1) Received, $250; expended, $271.87. (2) Various. (3) General expenses. (4) None. (5) Interested in any legislation having to do with manganese or strategic minerals.

Alifas, Nels Peter, District No. 44, International Association of Machinists, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,000.06; reimbursed to the extent of $10 for legislative expenses during quarter. (2) Taxi drivers and operators or eating and refreshment places. (3) Lobbying, i. e., supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and, incidentally, organized labor in general. Not more than 10 percent of time spent on this work. (4) Have not caused articles to be printed in newspapers, periodicals, or magazines in the sense that space has been paid for. Have been interviewed on legislative matters by reporters from the weekly papers, Labor, The Machinist, and local newspapers. (5) All legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees, and, occasionally, organized labor in general.

Allman, Roy G., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Self. (1) Received $200 as fees; expended approximately $100 per month. (2) Transportation, taxies, telephone, cables, postage, entertainment. (3) Private bills and to promote bills to pay Americans for damages received as a result of war in the Far East. (4) None. (5) Private bills and to pay Americans for war damages.

American Council on Human Rights, Elmer W. Henderson, director,[3] 1130 Sixth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See attached sheet.[2] (2) See attached sheet.[2] (3) See attached sheet.[2] (4) [Blank.] (5) Civil-rights legislation.

American Nurses' Association, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Less than $50. (2) Edith M. Beattie, chairman of American Nurses' Association Special Committee on Federal Legislation. (3) Postage, telephone, transportation, miscellaneous. (4) The American Journal of Nursing is the official publication of the American Nurses' Association. Through the medium of the American Journal of Nursing, membership is kept informed of pending legislation affecting nurses, nursing, or health by means of editorials or signed articles. (5) Legislation pertaining to health, nurses, or nursing.

Amundsen, Paul A., secretary-treasurer, the American Association of Port Authorities, Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $600 salary (October 1 to December 31). (2) Self. (3) Salary. (4) Independently employed as editor of World Ports, a monthly trade journal. (5) Merely keeps membership advised on legislative developments for their own individual or collective action, with recommendation. Tidelands, Government reorganization, legislative changes in Merchant Marine Act known current interests.

Ansberry, T. Peter, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; See attached statement.[2] (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employers—none in above quarter; see attached statement.

Ansberry,[3] T. Peter, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; S. H. Kress & Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.; McCrory Stores Corp., 1107 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; W. T. Grant Co., 1441 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; McLellan Stores Co., 55 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.; J. J. Newberry Co., 245 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.; H. L. Green Co., Inc., 902 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) Services in connection with pending wage-and-hour legislation. (4) None. (5) Registrant is retained in connection with pending wage-hour legislation by the group named, for the purpose of informing, advising, and counseling them concerning the progress, interpretation, constitutionality, and legal effect of pending wage-hour and related legislation, including amendments currently proposed or which may be proposed, insofar as such legislation affects the vital interests of the variety chain stores named and of the consuming public which they serve. This undertaking will also include, if necessary, advising and assisting them in supporting or opposing legislation affecting those interests by all proper and legitimate means. Registrant does not believe that any of his activities including those named herein fall within the term "attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation" as used in the Federal regulation of the Lobbying Act. This registration is being filed because of the uncertain interpretation of that act.

Ansberry, T. Peter, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; S. H. Kress & Co., McCrory Stores Corp., W. T. Grant Co., McLellan Stores Co., H. L. Green Co., Inc. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) See report for previous quarter.

Anthony, Richard H., the American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See schedule A.[2] (2) See schedule A.[2] (3) See schedule A.[2] (4) See schedule A.[2] (5) See schedule A.

Apsey, Lawrence S., Raytheon Manufacturing Co., Foundry Avenue, Waltham, Mass. (1) None. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) H. R. 577.

Aring, Hector M., 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C., Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See original registration form for complete explanation. No other contributions received. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Opposed to appropriation for cotton subsidy under section 32 of the Agriculture Appropriations Act, 1947, tax legislation, labor legislation, amendments to the Clayton Act.

Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., Consumer Mail Order Association of America, Box 1025, Joplin, Mo. (1) $1,000 received by Arnold, Fortas & Porter on account of legal fees. (2) Telephone, telegraph, railroad, taxi fares, mimeographing, photostating, and other actual expenses have been advanced by the firm of Arnold, Fortas & Porter in the amount of $489.55 which has been billed to the Consumer Mail Order Association. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Oppose H. R. 195 (now Public Law 363) and similar bills.

Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., the Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $380.41 has been advanced by the firm of Arnold, Fortas & Porter and billed to the Western Union Telegraph Co. Payment has been received as of this filing of the amount of $64.50 of the above, leaving outstanding $315.91. $131.07 has been received which was reported as outstanding in the last quarterly report. (2) Telephone, telegraph, railroad, and taxi fares in the amount of $380.41 of which $64.50 was paid during this quarter (see above). (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation involving the company's operations, particularly measures repealing the 25-percent excise tax on domestic telegraph messages.

Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) See statement filed March 1, 1949, and letter dated January 3, 1947, on file. (2) Same as (1). (3) Same as (1). (4) None. (5) Same as (1).

Associated Third Class Mail Users,[3] 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Income, $1,025; expenses, $3,365.89. (2) Gertrude M. Boland, Scott G. Rigby, John Smith, Joseph F. Hintersehr, plus miscellaneous operating expenses. (3) The general purpose of the association is to foster more efficient use of third-class mail by those enterprises employing the use of it. (4) None. (5) All legislation relating to postal laws and regulations.

Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See attached statement. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) See (1). (5) The registrant is not employed to support or oppose any proposed legislation. Reference is hereby made to paragraph 2 of the registrant's registration statement on Form B, which paragraph is hereby made a part hereof.

Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (see attached list of membership).[2] (1) See Form A. (2) See Form A. (3) See Form A. (4) The association publishes the Casualty and Surety Journal. Also issues releases to insurance trade press and to papers and periodicals of general circulation, such releases being mainly concerned with accident-prevention problems. (5) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.

Aulsbrook, Knight G., 236 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Construction Men's Association, 82 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y. (1) No funds received; $96.40 unreimbursed expenditures. (2) [Blank.] (3) Travel to and from New York, taxicab fares, postage, photostating, telephone tolls, and telegrams, $96.40. (4) None. (5) H. R. 6000, H. R. 5615, H. R. 6026, first session, Eighty-first Congress.

Austern,[3] H. Thomas, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; British Columbia Packers, Ltd., Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. (1) No money received or expended during third quarter of 1949. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting Canadian fisheries.

Austern, H. Thomas, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; British Columbia Packers, Ltd., Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. (1) No money received or expended during fourth quarter of 1949. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting Canadian fisheries.

Awalt, Clark & Sparks, a law partnership, consisting of the following partners: F. G.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[3] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[3] Filed for third quarter 1949.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[3] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

Awalt, Samuel O. Clark, Jr., Raymond Sparks, and W. V. T. Justis, 822 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See attached detailed statement.[2] (2) See attached detailed statement.[2] (3) Expenses for transportation and communication, also other purposes, as listed in the attached statement.[2] (4) None. (5) See attached detailed statement.[2]

Ayer, N. W., & Son, Inc.,[3] a Delaware corporation, and Marvin Murphy, a vice president thereof, and Raymond C. Baker and Oscar Leiding, employees thereof (collectively herein called registrant), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. (1) Supplementing its quarterly report for the third quarter of 1949, registrant states that on December 31, 1949, N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc., Marvin Murphy, Oscar Leiding, and Raymond C. Baker, as an employee of N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc., will discontinue all activities described in registrant's amended registration, dated April 28, 1949. Consequently, registrant hereby withdraws and terminates its said registration under the Lobbying Act, effective as of midnight December 31, 1949. This supplemental report is filed subject to the reservations contained in the amended registration, dated April 28, 1949. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Ayer, N. W., & Son, Inc., a Delaware corporation, and Marvin Murphy, a vice president thereof, and Raymond C. Baker and Oscar Leiding, employees thereof (collectively herein called registrant), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. (Final report. See letter of termination.[3]) (1) N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc. (Ayer), received from National Association of Electric Companies, $14,129.41 for compensation and out-of-pocket expenses (see (2)). The only money received or spent by registrants Marvin Murphy, Raymond C. Baker, and Oscar Leiding was for out-of-pocket expenses. (2) Traveling expenses, telephones, telegrams, mimeographing, postage materials, prints, clippings, messengers, and miscellaneous expenses, totaling $1,810.62. (3) The amounts described in (1) and (2) were received or expended by Ayer in the performance of its services in advising on public relations and in connection with publicity affecting the industry, as described in registration dated April 28, 1949. (Neither the services nor the expenditures involved lobbying within the meaning of the Lobbying Act.) (4) None. (5) None.

Babcock, Charles E., Route 4, Box 73, Vienna, Va.; National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Receives salary of $1,000 per year expenses and salary payable monthly; during the quarter ended December 31, 1949, received $249.99. (2) No one within the meaning of Law No. 601; all was salary. (3) None (as above). (4) The Junior American, the official journal of the junior order (see above). (5) Immigration, naturalization, and deportation; free public schools; other legislation of interest to the order.

Bailey, C. Lloyd, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary, October, November, December, $1,075; travel expense, $145.10. (2) Various. (3) To assist members of the Society of Friends and others with information about certain legislative issues and concerns of the society being considered by the Congress and to interpret the basic testimonies of the society to our elected and appointed representatives. (4) A news letter is sent to a limited number of subscribers and Friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, foreign relief, aid to refugees, protection for racial minorities, support for the rights of conscience, opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Bailey, Frazer A., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant believes that $3,750 represents the amount of his salary received from the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., during the fourth quarter of 1949 which is allocable to legislative activities. (2) No expenditures except for taxicabs and similar items. (3) See item (2). (4) None. (5) During the past quarter supported amendments to laws relating to the merchant marine, such as the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. Foreign Military Assistance Act, 1949, and Panama Canal tolls.

Baldinger, Mary Alice, 4607 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Civil Liberties Union, 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Part-time work, October 1 to December 31, 1949, $188.70; expenses, same dates, $47.87. (2) Expenses involved travel, transportation, office supplies, etc. (3) Same as (2). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation affecting civil liberties.

Baldrige, H. M., United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C., and 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $2,000 per month or $6,000 for the quarter; no money expended on any legislative activity. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) No legislation at present nor none contemplated.

Ball, Joseph H., 1713 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) During the quarter for which this report is made registrant received only his salary and expenses. The portion of registrant's salary applicable to activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration under Public Law No. 601 is estimated to be less than $1,250. The portion of registrant's expenses applicable to activities in furtherance of any object necessitating such registration is estimated to be less than $23. (2) No expenditure except taxicab, meals, railroads, and similar out-of-pocket expenses. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) The registrant is employed as vice president of the Association of American Ship Owners and is not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. During the period for which this report is filed, the registrant did, however, support, advocate, or oppose certain bills to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and certain provisions of certain appropriation bills.

Barber, Hartman, Room 301, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Brotherhood Building, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. Total salary for quarter, $1,393; total expenses for quarter, $665. (2) None. (3) Travel and hotel expenses, telephone and telegram, notary fees and postage. (4) None. (5) All legislation directly or indirectly affecting labor in any manner whatsoever, especially railroad labor.

Barger, Harry S., 606 National Union Building, Washington, D. C.; National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary of $1,683.32 and reimbursement of $15.81 for expenses. (2) Expenses for miscellaneous office supplies to sundry concerns. (3) [Blank.] (4) None (5) None during the quarter.

Barker, Richard B., 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N. Y. (1) No funds received. Expenses: November 28, 1949, telephone call to Rochester, N. Y., $1.69; December 1, 1949, telegram to New York, N. Y., 88 cents. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) Not applicable. (5) Excise tax on photographic materials.

Barker, Richard B., 306 Southern Building; The Haloid Co., Rochester, N. Y. (1) No funds received. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) Not applicable. (5) Excise tax on photographic materials.

Barnes, James M., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. See original registration statement containing names of 18 companies,[2] (Advance Aluminum Castings Corporation et al.) (1) The sum of $3,750 has been received during the quarter October 1, 1949, through December 31, 1949. The companies contributing such $3,750 are as follows: (See attached sheet[2]). (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Extension of Social Security to all gainfully employed including a method of covering the self-employed appropriately.

Barnes, James M., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., Kingsland Underwriters Group, Agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To provide for completion of payments to Americans holding adjudicated awards of the Mixed Claims Commission.

Barnett, Arthur R., National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $3,375 as an officer and employee of the National Association of Electric Companies, and reimbursements of $498.80 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all duties and assignments, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, air lines, telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs, book stores, and stationers. (3) Transportation, $6.28; hotel and restaurants, $322.38; telephone, $1; taxis, $50.25; book stores and stationers, $3.20; gratuities and miscellaneous, $115.69. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which I am an officer and employee, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Barta, A. K., the Ethanol Committee, 810 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $496.09. (2) [Blank.] (3) Travel, miscellaneous, and subsistence expenses. (4) None. (5) Bills relating to the nonbeverage use of ethyl alcohol.

Barta, A. K., the Proprietary Association, 810 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received during quarter, $891.15; expended, $349; salary, $542.15. Salary reported is for proportionate time devoted to Federal legislation. (2) Various. (3) Taxis, travel, subsistence, and miscellaneous for quarter, $349. (4) None. (5) All bills affecting the proprietary medicines industry endorsed or opposed by the Proprietary Association.

Bartlett, John Stanton, National Association of Federal Career Employees, 712 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Government Employees Exchange. (5) Representative KLEIN'S H. R. 2446.

Bass, Frank E., legislative-Federal relations division of the National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expenses, $212.25. (2) Air lines, hotels, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lodging, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5)

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[3] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Bauer,[6] Charles J., Building Owners and Managers Association of Metropolitan Washington, Room 517, Barr Building, 912 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) BOMA Letter (bimonthly newsletter). (5) I was not employed to support or oppose any proposed legislation. I was employed as permanent secretary of Building Owners and Managers Association of Metropolitan Washington, with duties including appearance at public hearings on legislative and regulatory matters of direct concern to the association.

Beirne,[6] Joseph A., Communications Workers of America (CIO), 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expenses: $2,682.41; salary: $3,300. (2) Normal living expenses plus railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform to the normal functions of my positions with the Communications Workers of America, none of which were related to legislative activities. (4) None. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the Communications Workers of America or its divisions.

Beiter,[5] Alfred F., National Custom Service Association, 8503 Longfellow Place, Chevy Chase, Md. (1) Registrant received regular salary shown in registration statement. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) [Blank.] (4) The Customs Service News is the official publication of the National Customs Service Association. Through its medium, membership is kept informed of pending legislation affecting customs employees. (5) Have appeared before congressional committees to present views of the association on legislation affecting customs employees.

Bell, C. Jasper, 904 Bryant Building, Kansas City, Mo.; Anderson T. Herd, West Palm Beach, Fla.; S. A. Markel, care of Markel Services, Richmond, Va.; Mrs. Rose Porter Carden and George A. Carden, Jr., administrators of the estate of George A. Carden, Sr., deceased, care of O. M. Ruebhausen, 20 Exchange Place, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received; no money paid out. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) The Carden and Herden claim arising out of the sale of seven Austrian ships to the United States (H. R. 4064).

Bell, Jones & Taylor (a partnership consisting of Luther K. Bell and O. A. Taylor), 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.; S. H. Kress & Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.; McCrory Stores Corp., 1107 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; W. T. Grant Co., 1441 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; McLellan Stores Co., 55 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.; J. J. Newberry Co., 245 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.; H. L. Green Co., Inc., 902 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Rose's 5–10–25-Cent Stores, Inc., Henderson, N. C.; Eagle Stores Co., Inc., 101 North Graham Street, Charlotte 2, N. C.; W. W. Mac Co., 101 West Thirty-first Street, New York, N. Y.; Charles Stores Co., Inc., 370 Seventh Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Total receipts, $11,907.57; in addition registrant received proportionate share of the annual retainer from S. H. Kress & Co. and McCrory Stores as stated in the registration statement on Form B; total expenditures, $4,521.78. (2) See statement attached.[2] (3) See statement attached.[2] (4) None. (5) See answer to question 2 of registration statement on Form B.

Benson, Ernest H., national legislative representative, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary at rate of $12,000 per annum; no expense account. (2) Ernest H. Benson. (3) Activities in connection with legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly or indirectly affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.

Benson,[5] Judd C., 1718 Union Central Life Building, Cincinnati, Ohio; National Association of Life Underwriters. (1) See registration form B. No expenses other than reimbursement of telephone tolls. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Life Association News, 11 West Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (5) See registration form B. Registrant is paid no salary by, and does not hold office in, registrant National Association of Life Underwriters for purpose of Public Law 601. Items of interest during dates cited were amendments to Social Security Act.

Berckes,[5] Herbert C., secretary, Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 Canal Bank Building, New Orleans, La. (1) Received for services as secretary, $750; expended for travel expense, $2,018.63. (2) Various. (3) Legislation. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the southern pine lumber industry.

Berge, Wendell, 1002 Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Associated Third-Class Mail Users, Inc., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: $2,000 (fee paid in fourth quarter); expenditures: $45.20 (to be reimbursed by the employer). (2) Commercial interests such as taxicabs, railroads, telephone companies, public stenographer, notary public, etc. (3) Taxi travel locally, railroad travel, telephone, notary fees, etc. (4) The case against increasing third-class postal rates, statement in opposition to section 5 of H. R. 2945, Eighty-first Congress, April 1949. (5) Increase in third-class postal rates.

Berger, Raoul, Suite 1116, Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Werner Droesse, care of American Engineering & Sales Co., 111 West C Street, Wilmington, Calif. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Bill H. R. 3570 for the relief of Mrs. Clara Raffloer Droesse.

Bergin, Preston B., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $400 salary, $31.65 expenses. (2) Taxi drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and meals. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor revision, social-security law revision, inflammable fabric legislation.

Bernard, William S., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 303 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Square Deal for DP's, the American Federationist, December 1949. (5) H. R. 4567.

Bison, Henry, Jr., Tyre Taylor, 1112 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,581.27 expenditures for living purposes only. (2) See (1), above. (3) See (1), above. (4) None. (5) Legislation favorable to the maintenance of the free-enterprise system.

Black, James C., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Republic Steel Corp., Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Portion of usual compensation possibly attributable to activities within scope of act (estimated), $600; reimbursement of such actual and out-of-pocket expenses as may possibly be within scope of act (estimated), $500. (2) Reimbursed expenditures paid to hotels, restaurants, golf clubs, telephone and telegraph companies, railroads, air lines, taxicab companies, florists, etc. (3) To defray the expenses of advancing interests and affairs of my employer. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose legislation, but I am interested in such legislation as affects my employer.

Blanchard,[6] Helen, 1034 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.; Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary of $1,110; received $829.84 to reimburse actual expenses incurred. (2) Living expenses in Washington: hotel, meals, cab drivers, $562.29; railroad and air lines, $267.55. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) CIO News and the Advance. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national security, peace, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Bodary, D. A., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo. (1) Annual compensation of $6,000 and $12 per diem for expenses: hotels, meals, etc. (2) D. A. Bodary. (3) As national legislative and general representative, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, my duties include handling of legislative matters and handling and progressing of grievances and other activities of my organization. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of the Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America.

Bodfish, Morton, United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) [Blank.] (4) Only the customary materials found in our trade papers, in our trade-association periodicals, and in our trade-association bulletins: Savings & Loans News, December 1949, Top Management's Role. Directors Digest, November 1949, Advertising for New Savings (condensed from Confidential Bulletin October 7, 1949); December 1949 the True Test of Liquidity (condensed from Confidential Bulletin November 2, 1949) and Additional Advances for Home Improvement (condensed from Confidential Bulletin November 2, 1949). (5) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership and particularly helpful to savings and loan associations and cooperative banks in carrying out their thrift and home-financing objectives and oppose legislation detrimental to home ownership and these institutions.

Boggs,[5] Maywood, 825 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.; International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders and Helpers of America, 570 New Brotherhood Building, Kansas City, Kans. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. No money expended for the purpose of attempting to influence passage or defeat of any legislation. Total salary for quarter: $2,700. Total expenses for quarter: $1,902.65. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Incidental to other duties which take major portion of my time, all legislative proposals of concern to labor generally.

Bohannon, John N., Asheville, N. C. (1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.); Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York City, N. Y. (1) Personal remuneration, including expenses, during the preceding calendar quarter, $1,500. Money expended, see (3) below. (2) See (3) below. (3) Personal subsistence, transportation, routine, and other customary expenses, only. Also see (6) form B, heretofore filed. (4) None. (5) Any legislation that might affect producing, gathering, transportation, distribution, or sale of natural gas.

Bolz, Sanford H., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., American Jewish Congress, Inc., 1834 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $125 for services under Public Law 601 (based on annual retainer for all legal services rendered, of which not over $500 per year is allocable to legislative activity); expended $3.80. (2) $2.80, taxicab fares in Washington, D. C.: $1, notary fees re filing forms C quarterly reports. (3) Same as (2). (4) Civil Liberties Bulletin for November 1949, issued by National Civil Liberties Clearing House, article on summary of status of legislation in the field of civil

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.
[6] Filed with the Clerk only.

liberties and civil rights at end of first session; Washington Post and New York Times, letters to editors re FEPC recommendation, published December 12 and December 17, respectively. (5) Legislation designed to implement the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights; to keep separate church and state; to liberalize immigration laws; to prohibit group libel; to investigate denazification policy.

Bonamarte, Robert F., Sr., 429 Continental Building (formerly the Investment Building), Fleet Reserve Association, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the armed forces of the United States, and legislation affecting veterans of the United States.

Borkin, Joseph, 1017 Ring Building, Washington, D. C., American-Indonesian Corp., 40 Wall Street, New York City, N. Y. (1) No activity this quarter. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) See (1). (5) See (1).

Borkin, Joseph, 1017 Ring Building, Washington, D. C., Federation for Railway Progress, 1430 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No activity this quarter. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) See (1). (5) See (1).

Bourg, Clarence J., 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; American Sugar Cane League, main office, New Orleans, La.; Farmers and Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association, main office, Saginaw, Mich. (1) $226.10 has been received and expended in connection with legislation and other contacts with the Government, of which not more than one-fourth has been expended in connection with legislation, such as taxicab fares about Washington and an occasional lunch when Congress is in session. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Sugar Bulletin, of New Orleans, La.; Sugar Beet Journal, of Saginaw, Mich. (5) Any legislation affecting the domestic sugar industry.

Bowden, R. B., 608 Hibbs Building, Washington, C. D.; the Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants' Exchange, St. Louis, Mo. (1) For refund, traveling expenses, $639.81; for salary and annual bonus gift, $5,500. (2) No travel expense or salary used for lobbying purposes. (3) No salary or traveling expense used for lobbying purposes. (4) None so far as known. (5) Legislation generally affecting grain and feed trade members of our association. No specific legislation in last quarter of 1949.

Boyd, H. B., United States Beet Sugar Association, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Interested in legislation affecting sugar, but not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation.

Boyd, William R., Jr., American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See attached schedule [2] for answers to items (1) to (5). (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) See (1). (5) See (1).

Bradford, Ira P., 1108 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) The undersigned has neither received nor expended any money during the quarter, September through December 1949, for the purposes as defined in section 307 (a) (b) of Public Law 610. My activities have consisted wholly of the maintenance of an information service for my company. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Interested generally in legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Bradley, Otis T., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; Guaranty Trust Co., of New York, as trustee of the several trusts described as the Frances G. Phipps trust, Herbert Sanford Ward trust, Sarita E. Barclay trust, and Colville Herbert Sanford Barclay trust, under indenture dated December 24, 1913, and various indenture supplemental thereto made by Charles H. Sanford, 140 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) The employment is for the purpose of attempting to secure an amendment to the Federal Gift Tax Acts involving gifts in trust and the effect for gift-tax purposes of the surrender by the grantor of a retained power to alter the disposition of the property but not in any way beneficial to himself, and the employment is expected to continue until such amendment is either secured or rejected.

Brady, Joseph E., Brewery Workers International Union, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Oppose dry legislation.

Brewbaker, James M., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Continental (Investment) Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary, $2,375; expenses reimbused by employers, $789.56; expenditures, $789.56. (2) Expenses paid to various restaurants, hotels, taxicabs, railroads, and airlines. (3) Traveling, attending meetings to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) All bills affecting the following subjects: National labor policy, portal-to-portal wage claims, tax laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, control of atomic energy, Federal subsidization of research, patents, and trade-marks, wartime control powers, and revision of the SEC and RFC Acts.

Bright,[3] O. O., 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Southern Pine Industry Committee, New Orleans, La. (1) Salary, $1,200; expenses, $69.95. (2) To various hotels, cab drivers, etc. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the lumber manufacturing industry.

Bright, O. O., 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Southern Pine Industry Committee, New Orleans, La. (1) Salary, $1,200; expenses, $40.73. (2) To various hotels, cab drivers, etc. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the lumber manufacturing industry.

Brightman, Melvin H., Dairy Industry Committee, 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,000 salary as executive secretary of the Dairy Industry Committee. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To observe legislation possibly affecting the dairy industry.

Brinegar, David F., Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) $222.08. (2) Hotel keepers, transportation agencies, merchants, restaurateurs, and others. (3) For goods and services. (4) None. (5) S. 75 and H. R. 934, 935.

Britton,[3] Earle R. (employed by American Federation of Labor), 3235 Wilmot Street, Columbia, S. C., and Washington, D. C. (1) Time spent in Washington August 22–26, expenses and travel, $153.29; time spent in Washington September 21–28, expenses and travel, $169.71. In addition to expenses my salary is $80 per week. (2) Hamilton Hotel, Seaboard Air Line Railway, and long-distance telephone. (3) Actual travel and necessary expenses thereto. (4) The South Carolina Labor News, Columbia, S. C. (5) Legislation for the common people.

Brockenbrough, Eugene W., Institute of Shortening and Edible Oils, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received regular salary shown in registration statement; none of his activities concerned the purposes set forth in Public Law 601, section 307 (a) and (b). (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation concerning or affecting fats and oils.

Brooding, Milton E., California Packing Corp., 101 California Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) An annual salary is received by registrant from the employer, California Packing Corp., for all duties performed by him, of which not to exceed about $4,000 per annum is devoted to activities covered by the Lobbying Act. The allocable portion of this amount, applying to the fourth quarter, 1949, is estimated to be about $1,200. Total expenses incurred during this quarter, of which an indeterminable amount applies to activities covered by Public Law 601, are as follows: Transportation, air lines, railroads, auto, $529.66; hotels, restaurants, incidentals, $830.94; total, $1,360.60. (2) Railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) Travel, entertainment, and incidental expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) Proposed legislation affecting food processing and related activities.

Brooks, A. E., 2202 Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth, Tex.; American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico, Cook Building, Mexico, D. F. (1) Expenses, $207.23. (2) American Airlines, $163.48; Washington Hotel, $12; taxi fare, $6.90; meals and tips, $18; telegram, $1.90. (3) Round trip to Washington, $168.48; hotel bill, $12; taxi, $6.90; meals and tips, $18; telegram, $1.90. (4) None. (5) To exempt from income taxes income derived from sources abroad by nonresident United States citizens actively engaged in a trade or business abroad.

Brooks, William F., National Grain Trade Council, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary and expenses received during period amounted to $4,153.17, of which less than $5 was spent for any purpose covered by the act. (2) Taxicab fares, no one of which was in excess of 50 cents. (3) Transportation. (4) None other than weekly newsletter published by employer. (5) Legislation affecting agriculture in general and the grain trade in particular.

Brown,[3] Edgar G., National Negro Council, 1717 Euclid Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $325 membership contributions; expended, $615.79. (2) Various. (3) Printing, publicity and advertising, postage, telephone and telegrams, railroad transportation. (4) None. (5) President's civil-rights legislation, FEPC, antilynch, anti-poll-tax, nonsegregation and nondiscrimination amendments to pending measures of housing, education, health, etc.

Brown, Edgar G., National Negro Council, 1717 Euclid Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $430 membership contributions; expended, $621.84. (2) Various. (3) Printing, publicity and advertising, etc. (4) None. (5) President's civil-rights legislation, FEPC, antilynch, anti-poll-tax, and nonsegregation and nondiscrimination amendments to pending measures of housing, education, health, etc.

Brown, Frederick E., Continental Building, Washington, D. C.; Eastern Meat Packers' Association, Inc. (1) La Roe, Brown & Winn, law firm, received from the Eastern Meat Packers' Association, Inc., $1,500, total of monthly payments for general legal services, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) S. 56, H. R. 2734, Brannan farm plan, imports of Polish hams, livestock subsidies, H. R. 4538.

Brown, Frederick E., National Independent Meat Packers Association, Continental Building, Washington, D. C. (1) La Roe, Brown & Winn, law firm, received from the National Independent Meat Packers Association, $4,500, total of monthly payments for general legal services, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) S. 56, H. R. 2734, Brannan farm plan, imports of Polish hams, livestock subsidies, H. R. 4538.

Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald (Wendell Lund, a partner in this firm, performs no service under this arrangement and does not participate in the fee), Washington Loan and Trust Building, Ninth and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Flectric Cos., 1200 Eighteeth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $7,500.30;

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[3] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

[3] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

expended $9,030.38. (2) See attached sheet.[2] (3) See attached sheet.[2] (4) None. (5) Any legislation that might affect the members of the National Association of Electric Cos.

Brown, Paul W., Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Traveling expense funds, $271.35; circulars, $4,103.80. (2) Hotels, air lines, railroads, taxis, restaurants, telegraph company, telephone company, Richter-McCall & Co., R. R. Donnelley & Sons. (3) Personal transportation and living expenses while traveling. Cost of producing circular reporting to customers contemplated size and weight restrictions in the present legislation before Congress. (4) Circulars, as described above. (5) Not employed to support or oppose legislation. As company operating executive responsible for transportation costs, am interested in postal rate legislation.

Brown, Russell B., Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary previously reported, plus the following expenses which might be considered within the scope of the act, $40. (2) See (3) below. (3) Taxi fares. (4) My normal duties include periodic reporting to members of the association on pending legislation. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. My duties include that of maintaining surveillance of legislation which might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the association.

Bryans, William A., III, 1044 Gas and Electric Building, Denver, Colo.; Public Service Co. of Colorado, 900 Fifteenth Street, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Registrant is of counsel for Public Service Co. of Colorado and in that connection, as a part of such employment, is opposing proposed legislation for appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation for the construction of certain electric power transmission lines in the State of Colorado.

Bryson, Jack, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary received, $6,280.79; expended, $6,280.79. (2) To self. (3) For personal and family needs. No sums received or expended in connection with activities covered by act. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the motion-picture industry.

Buchanan,[5] Thomas G., Jr., room 517, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Civil Rights Congress, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received no pay during third quarter, 1949, from national New York office of Civil Rights Congress; received $60 from Washington chapter of Civil Rights Congress; received $60 from National Committee To Defeat the Mundt bill, 930 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Personal expenditures. (3) Miscellaneous expenses, including transportation, purchase of papers and periodicals, phone calls, etc. (4) CRC legislative bulletin, distributed to chapters of the organization. (5) Supported House Resolution 60, H. R. 115, H. R. 21, H. R. 22, H. R. 23, H. R. 2050; opposed H. R. 1002, H. R. 1430, H. R. 3342.

Buchanan, Thomas G., Jr., room 517, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Civil Rights Congress, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received during fourth quarter, 1949, for expenditure subject to Lobbying Act. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) See (1). (5) See (1).

Buck, Mrs. J. L. Blair, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.; General Federation of Women's Clubs. (1) October, November, December 1949; $968.31 travel and miscellaneous expense in connection with work of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. (2) See question (1). (3) See question (1). (4) General Federation Clubwoman and State Federation magazines. (5) Not employed for pay. The president of the General Federation supports or opposes legislation and asks the organization membership to do likewise, when authority for such action has been provided through the adoption of a resolution in national convention.

Buckman, Henry Holland, consulting engineer, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.; Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla. (1) Received from Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla., for professional services, pro rata, $1,350; for reimbursement for long-distance telephone calls and miscellaneous expenses, pro rata, $141.63; expended, pro rata, for long-distance telephone calls and miscellaneous expenses, $141.63. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. and others, all of Washington, D. C. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, taxicab fares, and miscellaneous petty-cash expenditures. (4) None. (5) Interested in all legislation relating to river and harbor works, flood control, and other water use and conservation. Specifically interested in all Department of the Army civil functions appropriations bills.

Buckman, Henry Holland (consulting engineer), 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.; the Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J. (1) Received from the Vulcan Detinning Co., of Sewaren, N. J., for professional services, pro rata, $800; for reimbursement for long-distance telephone calls, pro rata, $18.47; expended, pro rata, for long-distance telephone calls, $29.08. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C. (3) Long-distance telephone calls. (4) None. (5) Interested in all legislation relating to tin, detinning, tin smelting, steel, and related subjects, including S. 1433, H. R. 2585, S. 1342, H. R. 3524, and House Joint Resolution 324.

Bugbee, George, American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Quarterly salary, $5,374.98; reimbursement for travel, $1,576.75. (2) Various air lines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals, and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4) Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association; trustee, the journal for members of hospital governing boards. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Building Products Institute, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) See attached sheet.[2] The Building Products Institute is an organization devoted to economic research and analysis of trends in construction, disseminating its findings to those interested in the construction industry and to the public. However, in view of certain provisions of the regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946 concerning what constitutes "principal purpose" and the phrase "to influence directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of any legislation," etc., we are filing this form giving a full disclosure of the information required under the act. (2) See attached sheet.[2] (3) See attached sheet.[2] (4) Construction trends, press releases, and certain economic studies. (5) Proposals which may affect the producers of building materials.

Bulow, William J., Jr., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; American Nurses Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received, none; money expended, $11.75. (2) Various transportation, telephone, and telegraph companies and United States post office. (3) Customary business expense for transportation, telephone calls, telegrams, and postage. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to nurses, nursing or health, in which the American Nurses Association is interested.

Bulow, William J., Jr., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received, $4,000; money expended, $50.40. (2) Various transportation, telephone and telegraph companies and United States post office. (3) Customary business expense for transportation, telephone calls, telegrams, and postage. (4) None. (5) Postage rate legislation.

Bundy, William P., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Northwest Horticultural Council, Wenatchee, Wash. (1) This representation is carried on jointly with Howard C. Westwood. Mr. Westwood's financial statement gives the amounts received and expended, to whom paid, for what purposes, and the replies to the other items on this form. January 1, 1950, Messrs. Howard C. Westwood and William P. Bundy have withdrawn as representatives of the Northwest Horticultural Council. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Bunje,[5] Ralph B., Western Cotton Growers Association of California, Agricultural Labor Bureau of the San Joaquin Valley, Inc., 2044 Mariposa Street, Fresno, Calif. (1) In addition to regular salary from Western Cotton Growers Association of California and Agricultural Labor Bureau of the San Joaquin Valley, as reported on Form B, filed in January 1949, received expenses reimbursements of $1,393.32, which might be construed as relating to legislative activity. (2) United Air Lines, $324.19; railways, $378.65; Hotel Statler and Wardman Park Hotel, $235.75; meals out, entertainment, taxi fare, $329.40; telephone and telegraph, $125.33. (3) Expenses to and from Washington, D. C., and while there connected with legislative activity. (4) None. (5) Cotton-allotment legislation.

Bunje, Ralph B., Western Cotton Growers Association of California, Agricultural Labor Bureau of the San Joaquin Valley, Inc., 2044 Mariposa Street, Fresno, Calif. (1) In addition to regular salary from Western Cotton Growers Association of California and Agricultural Labor Bureau of the San Joaquin Valley, as reported on Form B, filed in January 1949, received expense reimbursement of $685.62, which might be construed as relating to legislative activity. (2) United Air Lines, $324.19; Hotel Statler, meals out, entertainment, taxi fare, telephone and telegraph, etc., $333.43. (3) Expenses to and from Washington, D. C., and while there connected with legislative activity. (4) A report to cotton growers of California. (5) Cotton-allotment legislation.

Burdick, Roy D., 310 Wallace Building, Little Rock, Ark.; Dierks Lumber & Coal Co., 1001 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Mo. (1) Retainer fee, $900; expenses, $118.05; total, $1,018.05. (2) Various parties, $118.05. (3) Travel and office expenses. (4) None. (5) Authorization of and appropriations for a flood-control project on Little River, Okla. and Ark.

Burger,[5] George J., room 810, 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $6,544.54 from operating Burger Tire Consultant Service, publishing National Independent, and as vice president in charge of legislative activities, Washington office, National Federation of Independent Business. Disbursements, $4,565.19. (2) General office expenses. (3) Publications, weekly bulletin, travel expenses. (4) National Independent, Burger Tire Consultant Service, weekly bulletin. (5) Tire bill, antitrust legislation, all legislation affecting independent business.

Burger, George J., room 810, 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $5,259.68 from operating Burger Tire Consulting Service, publishing National Independent, and acting as vice president in charge of Washington office of National Federation of Independent Business, Inc. Expended $4,715.69 for general office expenses. (2) General office expenses. (3) Publications, weekly bulletin, travel expenses. (4)

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

National Independent, Burger Tire Consultant Service Weekly Bulletin. (5) Tire bill, antitrust legislation, all legislation affecting independent business.

Burke, Edward R., 314 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Hawaii Statehood Commission, Honolulu, T. H. (1) Received $5,000 annual retainer, year 1950. (2) No expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Support of all legislation for statehood for Hawaii.

Burnham, George B., 111 First Street NE, Washington, D. C.; various stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 5653 College Avenue, Oakland, Calif. (1) The sum of about $343.72 was received from numerous stockholders from October 1 to December 31, 1949, to be used on lobby work. The same amount was expended during that period. (2) G. B. Burnham. (3) Salary of secretary, printing and mailing literature, and other miscellaneous expenses to promote favorable interest in bills S. 1910 and H. R. 4985, to amend the antitrust laws. (4) None. (5) Supporting bills S. 1910 and H. R. 4985, to amend the antitrust laws.

Burr, Robert M., National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Allocated salary and pay roll overhead received. (2) None. (3) None (see 2 above). (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation to remove excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, electric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, and electric fans.

Burrows, Orrin A., International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL, 1200 Fifteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,936.97 (salary for October, November, and December, 1949). (2) None. (3) None. (4) The Electrical Workers Journal. (5) All legislation affecting the electrical workers in particular and labor in general.

Butler, Eugene J., National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Washington, D. C. (1) $2,350 salary for 3 months. (2) $552.88 paid to various persons for printing, postage, transportation, meals, long-distance telephone calls and hotels. (3) Salary for 3 months. Printing, postage, transportation, meals, long-distance telephone calls and hotels. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting religion, charitable, and educational institutions and organizations.

Caffey,[5] John W., Wine Institute, 830 Southeastern Building, Greensboro, N. C. (1) No expense incurred other than transportation to and from Washington, D. C., together with hotel bills. (2) Eastern Air Lines and Mayflower Hotel. (3) To pay personal expenses incidental to trip to Washington for purpose of conferring with Members of the House and Senate. (4) None. (5) Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Carpenter, Austin W., New York Associated Businessmen, Inc., Sherburne, N. Y. (1) No money received or expended for lobbying purposes during quarter covered by this report. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) [Blank.]

Carter, Albert E., 1026 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Received $3,000 as compensation; reimbursed $626.71 for expenses; advanced $1,114.40, which will be reimbursed as follows: Munsey Real Estate Co., $525; travel; incidentals, $5.65. (2) To Munsey Real Estate Co. and various persons. (3) Rent, travel, and incidentals. (4) [Blank.] (5) Retained to represent the company before administrative agencies and commissions and on legislative matters affecting the company's interest.

Carter,[7] Asa L., 325 Ashland Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa., petitioners and their due successors and joining associates at and after War Department file No. 7040, April 7, 1933 (287 U. S. 619), extended to all abutters on B-lines duly and precisely mapped herein. (1) I received and expended only $111.17, costs and disbursements herein divided; petty cash, clerical work, searching records, and addressing mail, $57.15; and for postage, printing, telephoning, bus and carfares, etc., $42.02. (2) It was paid to postmasters, printers, public service companies, and standard clerical help at Pittsburgh, Pa. (3) For the purpose of furthering sentiment for a Rainhill prize for the best B-line antidrag way (antifriction wheels) electric big inch pipe train locomotive and train booster (regenerative stop start) for major heavy freight, maximum 2 miles and minimum time and freight rate. (4) I publish nowhere except by first-class mail to abutters and contributors and their due and immediate representatives. (5) Everything for or against B-line respectively. I include that set forth in last two quarter reports also. Supplement (for 1949) House bills 5867, 6117, 6119, and 6281.

Carter, Clarence B., Railroad Pension Conference, P. O. Box 798, New Haven, Conn. (1) $10.88 for phone calls and telegrams. (2) Clarence B. Carter. (3) Phone calls and telegrams. (4) Railroad Pension Conference Bulletin. (5) Passage of S. 1826 and H. R. 4123.

Carter, Jack, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $400 per month as salary minus social-security and withholding taxes; $14.90 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

Carver, Leslie O., associate general counsel, National Paint, Varnish, and Lacquer Association, 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary at the rate of $7,000 per annum for performance of regular and usual duties incidental to my employment. Expenses for travel, hotel, subsistence, and incidentals totaled $81.87, $1 of which was spent for activities contemplated by the act. (2) Taxi drivers. (3) Transportation between Washington office and the Capitol. (4) None. (5) Conference for purpose of expressing interest in smog-control legislation and tendering cooperation of our scientists.

Case, Fox, 815 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; national education committee, American Medical Association; 1 La Salle Street Building, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary same as reported on form B. A total of $436.18 received to cover out-of-pocket expenses during the last quarter. The attached fourth quarterly report, 1949, completes my assignment and employment, April 15, 1949, to November 30, 1949, as Washington, D. C., correspondent for the national education committee, American Medical Association. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad Pullman Co., taxies, bus, streetcars; Washington, Chicago, Harrisburg, Pa., and Baltimore, Md., hotels, restaurants, cafes; Western Union; apartment business phone; pay-station phone; local and long-distance calls; newspapers, magazines, Congressional Record; postage stamps; miscellaneous, various individuals in nominal amounts. (3) Transportation, $231.48; hotel rooms, meals, $108.72; telegrams, telephones, $32.22; extra file and mail clippings, newspapers, magazines, $36.58; postage stamps, $1.98; miscellaneous, tips, etc., $15.20. (4) None. (5) Any legislation pertaining to compulsory health taxation.

Case, Ralph H., 889 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Sioux Tribe of Indians, Cheyenne River Reservation, S. Dak., under attorney's contract approved May 20, 1948, by Commissioner of Indian Affairs (Oahe Dam project), Cheyenne Agency, S. Dak. (1) Receipts, none; expenditures, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 5372 and S. 1488.

Case, Ralph H., 889 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Sioux Tribe of Indians, Standing Rock Reservation, N. Dak. and S. Dak., under attorney contract approved May 12, 1949, by Commissioner of Indian Affairs—Oahe Dam project, Fort Yates, N. Dak. (1) Receipts, None. Reimbursable expense incurred under attorney's contract: Telegram, $2.16. (2) Western Union. (3) Communication. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5372 and S. 1488.

Case, Ralph H., 889 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; three affiliated tribes, Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., under attorney's supplemental contract approved December 10, 1946, by Commissioner of Indian Affairs—Garrison Dam project, Elbowoods, N. Dak. (1) Receipts, $1,000, compensation for services rendered under attorney's contract for period July 1 to September 30, 1949; expenditures, $1.35 reimbursable expense (telegram) and $3.37 reimbursable expense (photostats in connection with conferences re House Joint Resolution 33). (2) Western Union and Photostat Co. (3) Communication; use in conferences. (4) None. (5) House Joint Resolution 33 (Public Law 437) and Senate Joint Resolution 11.

Casey, D. E., American Taxpayers Association, Inc., 419 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received as salary $2,649.99. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None specified.

Casey, Joseph E., Committee for Equalization of Tobacco Taxes, suite 701, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2016, which provides for a fair and equitable tax on cigarettes depending upon the price at which these cigarettes are sold.

Caskie, Maxwell, Reynolds Metals Co., 417 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No expenditures. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) None this quarter.

Cates,[5] Larry, 1185 National Press Building, Air Line Pilots Association, 3145 West Sixty-third Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received, $1,861.57; expended, $232.50. (2) Various companies and business firms for transportation, communications, gasoline, oil, airplane operation, miscellaneous entertainment, meals, hotels, tips, and incidental expenses. (3) Travel and all expenses in connection therewith, taxi, telegraph, telephone, etc. (4) Air Line Pilot. (5) All legislation concerning aviation safety and hours, wages, and working conditions of pilots on our commercial air lines.

Cates, Larry, 1185 National Press Building, Washington, D. C., Air Line Pilots Association (as Washington representative), 3145 West Sixty-third Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received, $1,946.02; expended, $317.25. (2) Various companies and business firms for transportation, communications, gasoline, oil, airplane operation, miscellaneous entertainment, meals, hotels, tips, and incidental expenses. (3) Travel and all expenses in connection therewith; taxi, telegraph, telephone, etc. (4) Air Line Pilot. (5) All legislation concerning aviation safety and hours, wages, and working conditions of pilots on our commercial air lines.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

[7] Report for third quarter filed with the Secretary of the Senate only.

Chace, William E., The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Continental Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $20 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Fertilizer News, Fertilizer Review, Agronomic Notes and Pasture Progress, all published by the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., Washington, D. C. I prepared an article, published in the fiftieth anniversary edition of Anderson (S. C.) Daily Mail, on the history of the fertilizer industry in South Carolina. (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eighty-first Congress as H. R. 2756, H. R. 855, and H. R. 3045.

Chamblin, Walter, Jr., 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Manufacturers, 14 West Forty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts, salary $6,250; expenses in Washington reimbursed employer, $1,216.59; expenditures in Washington, $1,216.59. See attached statement.[2] (2) Expenses paid to hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company, trade associations, and clubs. (3) Attending meetings and making speeches to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) Bills affecting national labor policy, tax laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, Federal subsidization of research, patents and trade-marks, control powers, foreign aid, Federal housing, Government competition with business and such other matters as may affect industry.

Cherry, L. Byron, General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Inasmuch as I have not done, and do not plan to do, any further work in this connection, I hereby withdraw my registration. Accordingly, this is to advise you that I will have no occasion to file any further reports unless, of course, I should at some future time engage in any activity which would require reregistration and the filing of reports in accordance therewith. Since registrant did no work on legislative matters during this period, no portion of registrant's salary allocated to this matter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Christman,[5] Elisabeth, National Women's Trade Union League of America, 317 Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $595 salary as secretary-treasurer of the National Women's Trade Union League. Legislative work is only one phase of the program of the league. My work is predominantly administrative, but a small percentage of my time is spent in activities in furtherance of our legislative program. (2) No money expended except for an occasional taxi fare. (3) [Blank.] (4) Life and Labor Bulletin, the league's monthly publication. (5) Testified at the hearings in support of the bill for the extension of labor education service.

Clarke, David R., 120 S. La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; National Metal Trades Association, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $250. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting manufacturers generally.

Clorety,[5] Joseph A., Jr., American Veterans Committee, Inc. (AVC), 1200 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary of $7,500 per year for position of national vice chairman of the American Veterans Committee plus not more than $5 per month for expenses in connection with legislative work. (2) Joseph A. Clorety, Jr. (3) To execute duties as national vice chairman of the organization, of which not more than 10 percent involve activities under the Lobbying Act. (4) AVC Bulletin. (5) Legislation relating to international, domestic, and veterans' affairs in accordance with national platform of the American Veterans Committee.

Cohn,[5] Marcus, American Jewish Committee, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Marcus Cohn. (2) Marcus Cohn. (3) During a typical month, the registrant devotes a maximum of 5 percent of his time to matters which may possibly be regarded as embraced in section 308 (a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. The figures set forth for the months of July, August, and September 1949, are based upon that percentage. Salary, $93.75; travel, $5.66; telephone, $10.45; office and miscellaneous expenses, $24.96. (4) I have supplied information to the general press on immigration and other matters in which the American Jewish Committee is interested. (5) Legislation dealing with immigration and the President's civil-rights program.

Cohn, Marcus, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; the American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Marcus Cohn. (2) Marcus Cohn. (3) During a typical week, the registrant devotes a maximum of 5 percent of his time to matters which may possibly be regarded as embraced in section 308 (a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. The figures set forth for the months of October, November, and December 1949, are based upon that percentage: salary, $93.75; travel, $4.18; telephone, $15.70; office and miscellaneous expenses, $41.91. (4) I have supplied information to the general press on immigration and other matters in which the American Jewish Committee is interested. (5) Legislation dealing with immigration and the President's civil-rights program.

Colborn, Miss Fern M., Division of Social Education and Action, Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church, United States of America, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) No expenses incurred during this period. (2) [Blank.] (3) Lobbying in the interest of social legislation on which the Presbyterian General Assembly has taken action. (4) Social Progress (magazine), special bulletins. (5) Same as (3).

Coleman, Russell, National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Continental Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $50 may be allocable to attempt to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Fertilizer news, Fertilizer Review, Agronomic Notes, and Pasture Progress, all published by the National Fertilizer Association, Inc. I issued, in the customary manner, one press release regarding the visit to this country by the United Kingdom fertilizer manufacturing team, but am unable to give the names of newspapers in which it was published. (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eighty-first Congress as H. R. 2756, H. R. 855, and H. R. 3045.

Coles, Marvin J, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; committee of attorneys and accountants representing: Keystone Shipping Co., Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc.; American President Lines, Ltd.; Grace Line, Inc.; Mississippi Shipping Co., Inc.; Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc.; Paco Tankers; Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc.; United Mail Steamship Co. Registrant does not directly represent any of these companies. (1) During the past calendar quarter no money has been received; expenditures have been a total of $24.14. (2) Telephone company, taxicab companies, restaurants, etc. (3) Long-distance telephone charges, luncheons, transportation, etc. (4) [Blank.] (5) The committee by which registrant is retained is seeking clarification of the effect of section 9 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 in computing the depreciation base for vessels affected by that section.

Coles, Marvin J., 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; New York Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association, Inc., 18 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y. (1) During past calendar quarter registrant received legal fees from the New York Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association, Inc., in the amount of $600 and reimbursement for expenses in the amount of $192.91. (2) Printer, telephone company, restaurants, taxicab companies, etc. (3) Expenditures have been $94.81 for printing a brief, and the balance for incidental matters such as long-distance telephone calls, lunches, and transportation. (4) [Blank.] (5) Registrant has been employed as attorney to present to the Congress and to the governmental agencies concerned information concerning American-owned foreign freight forwarders and use of their services under the foreign relief programs.

Coles, Marvin J., 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Dichmann, Wright & Pugh, Inc., Western Union Building, Norfolk, Va. (1) During the past calendar quarter registrant has received no legal fees from Dichmann, Wright & Pugh, Inc.; out-of-pocket expenditures have been $14.24. (2) Payments have been made to the telephone and telegraph companies, taxicab companies, etc. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, transportation, etc. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation concerning the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels.

Colgan, Howard O., Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) See (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the city of New York.

Colgan, Howard O., Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) See (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Compton, R. T., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Continental Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary, $3,750; expenses reimbursed by employer, $901.46; expenditures, $901.46. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company, etc. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business, such as travel, meals and hotel accommodations, and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social security, research, patents, and investments.

Comstock, Boyd, legislative assistant, legislative-Federal relations division, National Educational Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $660, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; on leave without pay November 1 to December 16; estimated for legislative service, $132; expenses, $9.80. (2) Self (salary). Expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lodging, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash; NEA Journal (articles therein); informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Condon, Arthur D., 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; S. H. Kress & Co., McCrory Stores Corp., W. T. Grant Co., McLellan Stores Co., J. J. Newberry Co., H. L. Green Co., Inc. (1) $175.67 received for expenses from his firm and paid-for transportation and long-distance-telephone calls. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) See statement attached to report for previous quarter.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.
[8] Filed for second quarter, 1949.

[5] Filed for third quarter 1949.

Condon, Arthur D., 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; see attached statement.[2] (1) $300 for expenses for 6 days in Panama. (2) Hotel bill and transportation. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employers; none in above quarter. See attached statement.[2]

Cone, D. C., room 307, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Annual compensation for 1949, $6,120. (2) D. C. Cone. (3) As vice president and part-time national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America covering all service rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislative matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, and particularly the interests of the employees represented by the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America.

Cone, John C., Pan American Airways, Inc., 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) During the quarter ended December 31, 1949, I have not received or spent any funds in connection with legislation. (2) None received or spent in connection with legislation. (3) Same as above. (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose legislation but may be concerned with any legislation relating to aviation which may be pending.

Conn,[5] Donald D., Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) During the calendar quarter July 1 to September 30, 1949, my salary from the association was $7,500. The time spent in Washington in this period were the days of September 8, 9, 10, and 11, 1949. Expended, $168.47. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) None.

Conn., Donald D., Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) During the calendar quarter October 1 to December 31, 1949, my salary from the association was $7,500. The time spent in Washington in this period were the days of October 21, 22, 23, December 17, 18, 19, and 20, 1949. Expended, $319.73. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) None.

Conroy, Eugene J., the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Cooper, J. Milton, room 544, Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Money received: This is the usual attorney and client relationship. It is difficult to allocate what part of this employment may be subject to the act and, therefore, the entire compensation for the quarter is reported, to wit: National Coal Association, Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C., $3,000; National Lime Association, 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (retainer fee previously reported). (2) No money expended. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the client.

Cooperstock, John, 30 Bellingham Avenue, Revere, Mass.; Veterans' Association Federal Employees, Naval Ship Yard, New York, Lenruth Hall, Waverly and Myrtle Avenues, Brooklyn, N. Y. (1) None. (2) Self. (3) Support or oppose veterans' preference legislation when on official business and ordered by the association. (4) None. (5) None this quarter.

Cortright, Frank W., National Association of Home Builders, Suite 1116, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See rider attached.[2] (2) Paid out in cash to taxes, restaurants, hotels, telephone and telegraph companies, etc. (3) Transportation, telephones, telegrams, tips, etc. (4) See rider attached.[2] (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation, but I am the executive vice president of the trade association of the home-building industry. In that capacity it is incumbent upon me to supervise, among other things, the work of the association's legislative department. The function of that department of the association is to follow all legislation affecting the home-building industry; to advise the membership of the association of all such legislation; and to make known to the public and to the Congress the opinion of the membership on all such legislation.

Costello,[5] John M., 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.; The American League for an Undivided Ireland, Charles T. Rice, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York City, N. Y. (1) Received as fees for services, $750; received as reimbursement for expenditures, $769.20. (2) Government Printing Office, $688.39; Capitol Hill Press, Truman Ward, $65.35; the C. & P. Telephone Co., $15.46. (3) Government Printing Office for reprints of speeches and excerpts from hearings, Capitol Hill Press for printing stationery and letters, telephone company for long-distance tolls. (4) Congressional Record. (5) Any legislation which may tend to effectuate the unification of all Ireland into a united nation.

Costello, John M., 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.; American League for an Undivided Ireland, care of Charles T. Rice, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York City, N. Y. (1) Received as fees for services, $1,000; reimbursement for expenditures, $102.14. (2) Truman Ward, $25; C. & P. Telephone Co., $12.75; Hotel Commodore, New York, $26.19; miscellaneous, $6.20; Pennsylvania Railroad, $31. (3) Truman Ward, printing letters; Hotel Commodore expense, October 24 and November 18; Pennsylvania Railroad, two trips to New York; miscellaneous for meals, tips, etc.; C. & P. Telephone Co. for long-distance tolls. (4) Congressional Record. (5) Any legislation which may tend to effectuate the unification of all Ireland into a united nation.

Counihan, Donald M. (attorney at law), 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Harnischfeger Corp., Milwaukee, Wis. (1) Retainer of $1,050 and no expenses covering both legislative and nonlegislative services. (2) Donald M. Counihan. (3) Personal services to the above-named client. (4) None. (5) Anything pertaining to business of client, particularly housing legislation.

Courtney, John J., 843 Continental (formerly Investment) Building; John Ii Estate, Ltd., Honolulu, T. H. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 4989.

Covinton, J. Harry III, 701 Union Trust Building (final report, see letter of termination[2]); American Smelting & Refining Co., 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received none; expended in connection with all matters for client, $107.06. (2) Telephone expense, $1.38; miscellaneous, $90.27; travel expense, $15.41. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) Appropriation for continuation of drainage tunnel by Bureau of Mines at Leadville, Colo.

Cowan, Nathan E., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Steelworkers of America (CIO), 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Salary, $1,875 (October, November, December 1949); expenses, $920 (October, November, December 1949). (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cabs, etc. (3) [Blank.] (4) Union News Service and CIO News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Cox, Langford, Stoddard & Cutler,[5] 1210 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; California Texas Oil Co., Ltd., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm receives compensation from California Texas Oil Co., Ltd., for professional services billed from month to month on an hourly time-charge basis. None of the services performed and billed during the calendar quarter ending September 30, 1949, involve any services of such a nature as to be subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, and no payments were received for any services of such a nature. (2) See answer to (1) above. No payments were made to anyone for services in connection with any pending legislation during the third quarter of 1949. (3) See answers to (1) or (2) above. (4) None. (5) Bills dealing with acquisition, allocation, transportation, or other regulation or control of materials and products used or marketed by California Texas Oil Co., Ltd.

Cox, Langford, Stoddard & Cutler, 1210 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; California Texas Oil Co., Ltd., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm receives compensation from California Texas Oil Co., Ltd., for professional services billed from month to month on an hourly time-charge basis. None of the services performed and billed during the calendar quarter ending December 31, 1949, involve any services of such a nature as to be subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, and no payments were received for any services of such a nature. (2) See answer to (1) above. No payment were made to anyone for services in connection with any pending legislation during the fourth quarter of 1949. (3) See answers to (1) and (2) above. (4) None. (5) Bills dealing with acquisition, allocation, transportation, or other regulation or control of materials and products used or marketed by California Texas Oil Co., Ltd.

Cox, Langford, Stoddard & Cutler,[5] 1210 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Overseas Tankship Corp., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm receives compensation from Overseas Tankship Corp. for professional services billed from month to month on an hourly time-charge basis. None of the services performed and billed during the calendar quarter ending September 30, 1949, involve any services of such a nature as to be subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, and no payments were received for any services of such a nature. (2) See answer to (1) above. No payments were made to anyone for services in connection with any pending legislation during the third quarter of 1949. (3) See answers to (1) and (2) above. (4) None. (5) Bills dealing with acquisition, allocation, transportation, or other regulation or control of materials and products used or marketed by Overseas Tankship Corp.

Cox, Langford, Stoddard & Cutler, 1210 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Overseas Tankship Corp., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm receives compensation from Overseas Tankship Corp. for professional services billed from month to month on an hourly time-charge basis. None of the services performed and billed during the calendar quarter ending December 31, 1949, involve any services of such a nature as to be subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, and no payments were received for any services of such a nature. (2) See answer to (1) above. No payments were made to anyone for services in connection with any pending legislation during the fourth quarter of 1949. (3) See answers to (1) and (2) above. (4) None. (5) Bills dealing with acquisition, allocation, transportation, or other regulation or control of materials and products used or marketed by Overseas Tankship Corp.

Coxe, W. W., Norfolk & Western Railway Co., 801 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter 1949.

(1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) [Blank.]

Cramer, G. C.,[5] Southwestern Division No. 20, CWA-CIO, 1122 Paul Brown Building, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Received daily per diem expense allowance of $15 during the period from August 3 to August 9, 1949 and August 29 to September 1, 1949 for a total expense of $169.10 for the heretofore mentioned periods. (2) G. C. Cramer. (3) Visiting and talking with Senators and Representatives of the United States Congress. (4) None. (5) Minimum wage legislation.

Crampton, Charles J., 700 Insurance Building, San Antonio, Tex., State Tax Association, Post Office box 2559, Houston, Tex. (1) Received $142.82 in payment of expense account for last quarter, none of which is believed to to within the scope of this act. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To bring about constructive cooperation between community-property and common-law States for the development of a plan of tax equalization which will afford an equitable basis for income, estate and gift taxation in the Federal tax structure. To support complete retroactive repeal of the 1942 estate and gift tax amendments as they apply to community-property States in an unfair, discriminatory, inequitable manner. We have supported and will continue our support of the American Bar Association's recommendation for tax equalization.

Crawford, William A., Railroad Association of Georgia, 545 Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga. (1) No money received or expended for any lobbying activities. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) None.

Crowley, Leo J., 922 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo., the Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, 509 Seventeenth Street, Denver, Colo. (1) No money received or expended during the preceding calendar quarter in connection with influencing the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting railroads operating in and having trackage in the State of Colorado.

Cullinane, Leo, National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,999.98 received as straight salary. Total of $496.50 was reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenditures for such expenses as taxicabs, lunches, telephone calls, etc. made on or in behalf of the interest of the organization. (2) [Blank.] (3) Money expended for taxicabs to and from Hill (approximately $50) and to other Government departments. Lunches with Congressmen to discuss certain proposed legislation ($10). (4) None. (5) Equality of taxes between private enterprise and cooperatives and other tax-exempt organizations; public expenditures, Government corporations, labor relations or any legislation affecting small business.

Cullum, Robert M., Committee for Equality in Naturalization, 302 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary totaling $500. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation to provide that privilege of becoming naturalized citizen of United States shall not be denied or abridged because of race.

Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Export Lines, Inc., 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $1,800; none expended. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) None. (5) All proposed legislation relating to maritime and shipping matters.

Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American President Lines, Ltd., 311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Received $1,800; none expended. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) None. (5) All proposed legislation relating to maritime and shipping matters.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Farrell Lines, Inc., 26 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $1,800; none expended. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) None. (5) All proposed legislation relating to maritime and shipping matters.

Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Grace Lines, Inc., 10 Hanover Square, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $1,800; none expended. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) None. (5) All proposed legislation relating to maritime and shipping matters.

Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street, NW., Washington, D. C.; Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc., Box 2879, Tampa, Fla. (1) Received $1,800; none expended. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) None. (5) All proposed legislation relating to maritime and shipping matters.

Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; United States Lines, 1 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $1,800; none expended. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) None. (5) All proposed legislation relating to maritime and shipping matters.

Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Bernard L. Peyton, Prettybrook Road, Princeton, N. J. (1) None. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5045, H. R. 5398, H. R. 5268.

Cuneo, John C., P. O. Box 1054, Modesto, Calif.; the Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Townsend Plan, Inc., $1,275.67; less deductions at source and thus not available for expenditure, $381.04; total available for use in California, $894.63; sale of exchange membership cards to membership in California, $129.25; total available for operations in California, $1,023.88; received from California operations by John C. Cuneo for personal use as drawings during period, $1,020. Disbursements, $1,752.89. (2) See detailed statement attached.[2] (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) Support of the Townsend plan, current legislative bills H. R. 2135 and H. R. 2136.

Curtiss, Ralph E., 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; retained by Associated Tavern Owners of America, Inc., 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis. (1) Received: Retainer for October, November, December, at $150, $450; per diem charge for trip to Chicago, 3 days, at $75, $225; reimbursement for actual expense, $124.42; total, $799.42. Expended, $124.42. (2) Railway company, telephone company, hotel. (3) Railroad fare, hotel, meals, telephone. (4) ATOA News (monthly publication of the association). (5) Any legislation affecting tavern industry.

Daley, William L., 817 Continental Building, Washington, D. C.; National Editorial Association, 222 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Receipts and expenditures on behalf of the National Editorial Association, $1,085.38. (2) Telephone, telegraph, taxicabs, office-supply companies, railroads. (3) Reimbursement for expenses, transportation, and communication, $260.38. (4) Analytical articles in bulletins and official publications of National and State publishers' associations; also trade papers of publishing industry. (5) Measures affecting the press.

Dameron, William V., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Ninth Street and Mount Vernon Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Damon, Eugene J., St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co., chairman, Missouri Railroad Committee, 906 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Danaher, John A., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn.; the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., Akron 17, Ohio. (1) $900 for services rendered as attorney for the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 1412 and S. 640, H. R. 5690 and H. R. 5691.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Danaher, John A., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn.; the Fuller Brush Co., Hartford, Conn. (1) $3,000 for all services performed as attorney for the Fuller Brush Co. of Hartford, Conn. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $6.90; Pennsylvania Railroad Co., $47.62. (3) Long-distance telephone calls and travel. (4) None. (5) As attorney for the Fuller Brush Co., appearing in favor of extension of social security to all gainful employment, including a method of covering the self-employed.

Danaher, John A., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn.; B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio. (1) $900 for services rendered as attorney for the B. F. Goodrich Co. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 1412 and S. 640, H. R. 5690 and H. R. 5691.

Danaher, John A., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn.; Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,000 per month for the months of October, November, and December 1949. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $3. (3) Long-distance telephone calls. (4) None. (5) S. 2022 or H. R. 5327, each of which would repeal the suspension of the import tax on copper.

Danielian, N. R., Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, Mayflower Office Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $2,408.71 received from Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association; $1,500 as retainer and $908.71 for traveling and out-of-pocket expenses. (2) Approximately $300 to Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey for gasoline, oil, etc.; $81 to American Airlines; $26.46 to Northwest Airlines. The rest for living expenses while traveling, and for taxis, stamps, phone calls, etc. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) The principal purpose of engagement by the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association is to foster and increase trade for the products of manufacture, agriculture, natural resources and any and all other forms of commerce between the ports of the Great Lakes, its tributaries and waterways of the world. In connection with this object, respondent supports the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for the development of navigation and power.

Daugherty, Paul J., 820 Huntington Bank Building, 17 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio; Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation dealing with social security, business, taxation, and other matters of interest to our organization.

Davies, Aled P., American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary received from American Meat Institute, $2,076.96; travel expenses when out of Chicago, including lodging, meals, taxicabs, entertainment, transportation, telephone, and telegraph, $246.01. (2) Various railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and telephone and telegraph companies. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting specifically the meat-packing industry.

Davis & Gilbert (a partnership), the Best Foods, Inc., 1 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Expenditures: $61.91 for transportation, meals, lodging, telephone and telegraph expenses. Receipts: Registrant reimbursed in part by Best Foods, Inc., during quarter for afore-mentioned expenditures and will be reimbursed by said company for entire sum thereof. Registrant received from Best Foods, Inc., usual equal monthly installments of its annual legal fee of $35,000 which fee registrant has received every year

for many years. (2) To air lines, cabs, hotels, restaurants, telephone and telegraph companies. (3) Travel to and from Washington, D. C., living expenses in Washington, D. C., and telephone calls and telegrams. (4) None. (5) Registrant is not and was not employed specifically for the purpose of supporting or opposing any pending legislation nor was registrant employed specifically for purposes set forth in first sentence of section 308 (a), Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. Registrant is paid yearly retainer for acting as legal counsel to Best Foods, Inc., and, in addition to registrant's major duties as such counsel, registrant presented the cause of the company in respect to legislation affecting margarine which is one of the many products manufactured by that company.

Davis,[5] Harry C., Independent Taxi Owners' Association, Inc., 1735 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $700. (2) Presentation, Inc., Sauls Lithograph Co. (3) For printing of pamphlet explaining objectives of proposed legislation. (4) [Bank.] (5) H. R. 4281; S. 1909.

Davis, John H., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for October, November, and December 1949, $3,300. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Washington situation, a weekly mimeographed newsletter of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Davis, Sherlock, 1117 Barr Building, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; United States Cuban Sugar Council, 136 Front Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. During the preceding calendar quarter registrant has not engaged in any activities covered by section 308 (a) of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act and, accordingly, has received no funds and made no disbursements for the purposes covered by the act, but is filing this report for purposes of record (annual salary reported on Form B). (2) No one. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Dawes, Bourbon, Hotel Association of Washingon, D. C., 1331 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,875; expenses, $3.20. (2) Taxis and transportation, $3.20. (3) Operating expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting District of Columbia hotels.

Dawson, Clarence E., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.

Dawson, Clarence E., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Dawson,[5] Joseph Martin, Joint Conference Committee on Public Relations, Baptists of United States, 1628 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No special contribution from any source, but amount deducted from our general fund received from the conventions for the support of this office. Amount expended, $110. (2) Western Union for telegrams, post office for stamps for mailing copies of news letter, Report From the Capital. (3) Federal aid to education. Congressmen received letters concerning displaced persons legislation which were prepared and mailed by Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons without expense to this office. (4) Watchman-Examiner, The Churchman, Christian Century, Christian Advocate, Presbyterian Life, Alabama Baptist, Arizona Baptist Beacon, Arkansas Baptist, California Southern Baptist, Capital Baptists, Florida Baptist Witness, Christian Index, Illinois Baptist, Western Recorder, Baptist Message, Maryland Baptist, Baptist Record, Baptist New Mexican, Biblical Recorder, Baptist Messenger, Baptist Courier, Baptist Standard, Baptist and Reflector, Religious Herald. (5) None.

Deegan, Thomas J., Jr., 4500 Chrysler Building, New York, N. Y.; Federation for Railway Progress, 1430 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Traveling expenses, $1,026.04; salary, $3,333.36, as president of the federation. (2) Various hotels and transportation agencies for traveling expenses. (3) Travel expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

DeGroot, E. H., Jr., 924 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.; Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See statement attached.[2] (2) See statement attached.[2] (3) See statement attached.[2] (4) See statement attached.[2] (5) See statement attached.[2]

Dempsey, Wallace G., Covington, Burling, Rublee, O'Brian & Shorb, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) See attached sheet.[2] (2) See attached sheet.[2] (3) See attached sheet.[2] (4) None. (5) Legislation approving settlement of a claim of Finland for compensation for Finnish vessels requisitioned in 1941–42.

Denning, William I., 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Magazine Publishers, 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,875 was received as retainer for services plus $98.74 reimbursements for personal expenses in connection with work for the association. (2) William I. Denning. (3) For general legal representation in Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) Not called upon during quarter in connection with any legislation.

Dickerman, John M., National Association of Home Builders, Suite 1116, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See rider (1) and "Statement A" attached.[2] (2) Paid out in cash to taxis, restaurants, hotels, telephone and telegraph companies, etc. (3) Transportation, telephones, telegrams, tips, hotel rooms, etc. (4) News releases are sent to the Associated Press, INS, UP, and other national newspaper wire services by the Association for publication in subscriber papers and magazines, some of which releases may contain material deemed to affect legislation directly or indirectly. Neither the Association nor I have any means of ascertaining a complete list of the publications utilizing such releases. The Association publishes a weekly news letter called the Washington Letter and a monthly magazine, the Correlator, containing material of interest to the membership, including information on legislative matters. (5) All legislation affecting the home-building industry.

Disbrow, Walter L., Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, October, November, and December 1949, $1,336.19; expenses, October, November, and December 1949, $59.30. (2) Walter L. Disbrow. (3) To represent members of the Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government. (4) Quarterly Retirement News Bulletin. (5) All legislation affecting civil-service retirement and United States Employees Compensation Act.

Disney,[5 9] Wesley E., Western Oil and Gas Association et al., 434 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Western Oil and Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif., $1,500; Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., $833.33; American Potash and Chemical Corp., Trona, California, $5,000. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Natural Gas Act amendments; percentage depletion for borax.

Disney, Wesley E., Independent Natural Gas Association of America et al., 434 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) See attached.[2] (2) The expenses itemized are for local taxi, long distance telephone calls, and for expense of trips to association meetings, all reimbursed by the associations after expenditure. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Natural Gas Act amendments; attention to legislative matters affecting oil and gas industry; percentage depletion for granite.

Dodge, Homer, 1244 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $600 salary and $225 expenses. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., postmaster, Superintendent of Documents, and others. (3) Telephone service, postage, public documents, rent, and minor office expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Dodson, Philip F., 729 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Paul W. Sampsell, trustee of Shannahan Bros., Inc., bankrupt, 111 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) None since original registration. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To provide relief because of certain losses under war contracts.

Donald, W. J., National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Allocated salary and pay roll overhead, $2.63. (2) None. (3) None (see (2) above). (4) None. (5) Legislation to remove excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, electric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, and electric fans, and legislation with respect to the amendment of the Labor-Management Relations Act.

Donnelly, James L., 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation of general interest to manufacturers.

Dorsett, J. Dewey, Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in this act. Registrant has estimated, however, that $75. received by registrant during the fourth quarter of 1949 might come within scope of act as registrant understands act has been interpreted by the Department of Justice. Registrant does not believe he has engaged in any activities in this quarter within the purview of this act. Registrant has expended no money in this quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Your New Safety Responsibility Law, appearing in November Fieldman. (5) Registrant doubts that he is employed to support or oppose legislation. However, on very infrequent occasions he has supported or opposed legislation as it specifically affects capital stock casualty insurance and surety companies.

Dorson, C. L., Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,147.84; expenses, $18.35. (2) C. L. Dorson. (3) To represent members of the Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government. (4) Quarterly

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[9] Amended quarterly report.

Retirement News Bulletin. (5) All legislation affecting civil-service retirement and United States Employees Compensation Act.

Dougherty, John E., the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary: $665.81 per month, which is paid for all the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation; $57.60 was expended by me as expense money during the fourth quarter of 1949 for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. In addition to this amount, I also received $518.40 for expenses incurred in connection with other duties performed for the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. which have no relation to the purposes covered by this act. (2) Various transportation companies, restaurants, garages, communication companies, etc. (3) $57.60 was expended by me as expense money during the fourth quarter of 1949 for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interest of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Dougherty, Robert E., National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,500; expenses, $160.09. Only part of the sums expended in the course of duties have to do with legislation. (2) Local hotels, restaurants, transportation, phone calls, tips. (3) Local hotels, restourants, transportation, phone calls, tips. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the lumber manufacturing industry.

Dow, Fayette B., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Committee for Pipe Line Companies, Box 1349, Tulsa, Okla. (1) The Committee for Pipe Line Companies was organized to represent, as occasion may arise, in Washington, before departments of the Government, including Congress, the petroleum pipe lines that are regulated by Interstate Commerce Commission under the Interstate Commerce Act. The committee is not proposing or advocating any changes in existing laws. Deponent believes that in the period covered by this quarterly report he has taken no action that comes within the provisions of the Lobbying Act. Deponent believes that of his total compensation for all services rendered to the Committee for Pipe Line Companies $500 would be a fair apportionment for any services which might be considered to be within the provisions of the Lobbying Act. In the quarter ending December 31, 1949, deponent received $27.43 reimbursement for August and September 1949, expenses covering postage, telephone, and miscellaneous items. None of the foregoing items deponent believes relate to activities within the scope of the Lobbying Act. (2) See (1). (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) No legislation is proposed by Committee for Pipe Line Companies, deponent's employer. The committee is opposed to S. 571 which would make it unlawful for oil companies to own and operate pipe lines.

Dowd, M. J., Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif. (1) For fourth quarter of year 1949: Salary, $960 per month; incidental traveling expenses, $412.18. (2) The salary is regular compensation for my full-time employment as Consulting Engineer for Imperial Irrigation District on irrigation, power, drainage, and related matters. Expenses represent reimbursement to me for personal travel, hotel and subsistence expenses. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to the Colorado River and affecting Imperial Irrigation District.

Dresie,[5] Grey, 202 Bitting Building, Wichita, Kans.; Kansas Independent Business Men's Association, 205 Orpheum Building, Wichita, Kans. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) The Friendly Dollar. (5) Tax equality.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

Dresie, Grey, 205 Orpheum Building, Wichita, Kans.; Kansas Independent Business Men's Association, 205 Orpheum Building, Wichita, Kans. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) The Friendly Dollar. (5) Tax equality.

Drysdale, Robert M., Jr., Federation for Railway Progress, 1430 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,500.08; traveling expenses, $738.57. (2) Various hotels and travel agencies for traveling expenses. (3) Travel expenses. (4) November 1949 issue (Vol, III, No. 9) Railway Progress. (5) Repeal of excise tax on transportation. H. R. 378 (railroad communications).

DuBois, Ben, the Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn. (1) The Independent Bankers Association was not active in Washington during the last quarter of 1949. There is nothing for the association to report. My salary as secretary remains the same as per the last report. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Du Brul, Stephen M., 11-162 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.; General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich. (1) See statement attached.[2] (2) See statement attached.[2] (3) See statement attached.[2] (4) None. (5) Registrant has supported Federal legislation consistent with and opposed Federal legislation inconsistent with the position on such legislation taken by Mr. C. E. Wilson, as president of General Motors Corp., in testifying before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Eightieth Congress, as per statement attached in previous quarterly report dated April 11, 1949.

Dudley, Henry A., 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American International Underwriters Corp. and other insurance companies associated in the American International Company, Inc., group, retains our law firm, a partnership doing business as law offices. Paul V. McNutt, to represent them generally in all legal matters. (1) No money has been received or expended by affiant for the purpose of supporting or opposing legislation during the preceding calendar quarter. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Dunn,[5] William M., Communications Workers of America, CIO, 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expenses, $829.44; salary, $2,166.66. (2) Normal living expenses plus railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform the normal functions of my positions with the Communications Workers of America, none of which were related to legislative activities. (4) None. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the Communications Workers of America or its divisions.

Dushane, Matthew, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Seafarers International Union of North America, 105 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Salary received for all work connected with Government agencies and department including legislation and other labor matters totals $7,800 for the year 1949 (this includes withholding and social-security taxes. Expended $40 in connection with registrant's work on legislation during last quarter. This amount was not reimbursable by the international union. (2) [Blank.] (3) Outside telephone calls, taxies, meals, and entertainment. (4) The Seafarers Log and the West Coast Sailor. (5) All legislation affecting the general welfare of merchant seamen and legislation of interest to members of unions affiliated with the Seafarers International Union of North America.

Dwyer, Joseph L., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter 1949.

(1) Salary previously reported. Expenses reimbursed by employer, $1,149.22. (2) Various railroads, hotels, restaurants, retail stores, taxicabs, telephone companies, Government Printing Office, Hickey Bros. (3) Administrative, traveling and incidental expenses, newspapers, periodicals, cigars, cigarettes, etc., meals and entertainment. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting petroleum and its products, or natural gas.

Eccles,[5] John B., 1105 D Street SW., Washington, D. C.; Royal Typewriter Co., Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) No moneys received during preceding quarter. (2) No moneys paid during the preceding quarter. (3) [Blank.] (4) No articles were published. (5) Typewriter legislation embodied in Treasury and Post Office Appropriations Act.

Eccles, John B., 1105 D Street SW., Washington, D. C.; Royal Typewriter Co., Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) No moneys received during preceding quarter. (2) No moneys paid during the preceding quarter. (3) [Blank.] (4) No articles were published. (5) Typewriter legislation embodied in Treasury and Post Office Appropriations Act.

Edelman, John W., 910 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.; Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,615.32 salary; $670.13 to reimburse actual expenses incurred; $71.80 of this amount for expenses incurred in Washington, remainder for expenses outside of Washington. (2) Railroads, hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, bus companies, air lines. (3) Personal expense and travel. (4) Textile Labor, CIO News, Labor Press Associates. (5) Support legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Edelsberg,[5] Herman, 1003 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Anti-Defamation League of B'Nai B'rith, 212 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) For activities covered by the act approximately 5 percent of salary, $125; actual expenses for fares, telephone, etc., approximately $15. (2) To various persons who provided actual taxi, telephone, postage, meals, etc., services. (3) Transportation, telephone, postage, meals, etc. (4) ADL Bulletin. (5) The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith is an educational organization whose primary purpose is to promote better human relations among Americans. Incidental to this purpose, registrant supports legislation which promotes the civil rights of all Americans, and opposes undemocratic discrimination against any Americans.

Edelsberg, Herman, 1003 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Suite 601, 212 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) For activities covered by the act approximately 5 percent of salary, $125; actual expenses for fares, telephone, etc., approximately $15. (2) To various persons who provided actual taxi, telephone, postage, meals, etc., services. (3) Transportation, telephone, postage, meals, etc. (4) ADL Bulletin. (5) The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith is an educational organization whose primary purpose is to promote better human relations among Americans. Incidental to this purpose, registrant supports legislation which promotes the civil rights of all Americans, and opposes undemocratic discrimination against any Americans.

Ehlers, Joseph H., room 409, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW.; American Society of Civil Engineers, 33 West Thirty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) From the American Society of Civil Engineers (plus salary), $8. (2) Taxicabs, postage. (3) Transportation, $3; postage, $2; miscellaneous, $3. (4) Civil Engineering (monthly magazine of the

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

American Society of Civil Engineers). (5) Legislation affecting professional engineers, National Science Foundation, etc.

Eliason, Courtleigh W., 9–252 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.; General Motors Corp., General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) See statement attached.[2] (2) See statement attached.[2] (3) See statement attached.[2] (4) None. (5) Registrant has supported Federal legislation consistent with and opposed Federal legislation inconsistent with the position on such legislation, taken by Mr. C. E. Wilson, as president of General Motors Corp., in testifying before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Eightieth Congress, as per statement attached to a previous quarterly report dated April 8, 1949.

Elliott, John Doyle, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.; Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary of $60 per week and $30 per week allowance for traveling expenses when occupied with work away from location of residence. (2) Fares, mileage, hotel, and meal expenses when occupied with work away from location of residence. (3) Contacting Townsend clubs and other organizations and citizens in the interests of the Townsend plan. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2135, first session, Eighty-first Congress, generally known as the Townsend plan.

Ellis, Clyde T., National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary (3-month period ending December 31, 1949), $3,450; expense accounts, $503.66; total, $3,953.66. (2) To self for salary and reimbursement for meals, hotel, tips, and transportation, $3,953.66. (3) Travel incident to members meetings, board of directors meetings, etc. (4) Rural electrification. (5) Legislation effecting the growth and welfare of rural electric cooperative corporations, public power, and public-utility districts, and legislation affecting public-power developments where they would in turn affect the rural electric cooperative corporations, public power, and public-utility districts.

Ellison, Newell W., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; H. C. Bohack Co., Inc., Metropolitan and Flushing Avenues, Brooklyn, N. Y. (1) None received and $339.94 expended during the previous quarter for incidental expenses, such as long distance telephone calls, postage, and taxicab costs. (2) Telephone company, post office, and taxi operators. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Legislation seeking amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act so as to curtail the present exemption for retail establishments.

Ellsworth, Charles K., Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 300 Hibbs Building, 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,500; expenses, $92.50. (See attached comment.[2]) (2) Expense money paid out only to restaurants and cab drivers. (3) Covered in (1). (4) Have no records of any such publications. (5) Not employed to oppose or support legislation. Have been assigned by Hill & Knowlton, Inc., to prepare educational information and material showing consequences of measure proposing to remove Federal restrictions on the manufacture and sale of yellow oleomargarine.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; general counsel, American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Services this quarter have not involved the supporting or opposing legislation. At the request of the association legal analyses and opinions are rendered from time to time on legislation affecting public power.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; special counsel for Colorado River Board of California and Six Agency Committee, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) $6,336.84 representing fees for legal services of this office and in California in connection with matters affecting California's interests in the Colorado River; of this amount $326.84 was reimbursement of expenses; $5,336.84 of the total figure was paid by the Six Agency Committee and $1,000 by the Colorado River Board. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Work related to conferences with Federal Government departments and agencies of the State government. Conferences with members of the California congressional delegation regarding matters affecting California's right in the Colorado River expected to be before the next session of Congress.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; attorney for Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif. (1) $2,146.24 representing legal fees for services and expenses of this office and in California in connection with power and water contracts, conferences with Government departments, etc., and consultation with respect to legislation expected to be considered by the new session of Congress. Of this amount $46.24 represented reimbursement of expenses. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telegraph and telephone companies, suppliers of office materials, etc. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Work done related mainly to litigation and departmental conferences. Conferences with California congressional delegation regarding matters affecting Imperial Irrigation District expected to be considered by the next session of Congress.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; special counsel, Department of Water and Power, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) $2,300 representing legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with power and water contracts, conferences with Government departments, litigation, and consultation as to legislation expected to come before the Eighty-first Congress. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telegraph and telephone companies, suppliers of office materials, etc. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Work done related mainly to litigation and departmental conferences. Conferences were held with California congressional delegation regarding matters of interest to department of water and power expected to come before next session of Congress.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; special counsel for Water Resources Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif. (1) None. Services as special counsel are loaned by the Water Project Authority of the State of California, which pays a fee of $500 per month. See report under that employment. (2) See No. 1 above. (3) See No. 1 above. (4) None. (5) Work mainly related to conference with Government departments. Conferences with California congressional delegation regarding rivers and harbors and flood-control authorization bills expected to arise before the next session of Congress.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; attorney for Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif. (1) $1,500, the entire amount of which represents legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with Central Valley power and water questions. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telegraph and telephone companies, suppliers of office materials, etc. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Work mainly related to conferences with Government departments, conferences with California congressional delegation regarding Central Valley matters expected to arise before the next session of Congress.

Engel, Leon J., J. Engel & Co., Inc., 20 Hopkins Place, Baltimore, Md. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Jewelry-trade publications. (5) [Blank.]

Ennis, P. Bateman, 844 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Antivivisection Society of the District of Columbia, post-office box 4271, Washington, D. C. (1) No moneys were received from the Antivivisection Society of the District of Columbia during the preceding calendar quarter and no moneys were expended by affiant on behalf of the Antivivisection Society for the District of Columbia during the preceding quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Senate bill 1703.

Fahy, Kathleen (Mrs. Jack B.), American Parents Committee, 132 Third Street SE, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $307.50, expended $307.50. (2) Various. (3) Entertainment, travel, and miscellaneous expense. (4) Parents' Magazine and School Management. (5) National child-research bill, National School Health Services Act, National Science Foundation, appropriations for United States Children's Bureau, Federal aid for education, pediatrics education bill, public-school survey and construction bill.

Fakler, Herman, 847 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) I received $5,500 salary as an officer of the Millers' National Federation. I am not employed specifically to engage in activities described in section 307 of title 3, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. During the last quarter I devoted no time to such activities and made no expenditures. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Farrington, Charles J., National Coal Association, 804 Southern Building., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,595.48, salary and expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) Taxi, telephone, meals. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting the coal business.

Farshing, Donald D., Management Planning of Washington, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,300 gross salary received, $115.50 expended. (2) Transportation, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Transportation and other out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Ferguson, Abner H., 1139 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street,

Chicago, Ill. (1) October 1, 1949 to December 31, 1949, telephone calls, telegrams, and taxicabs, $29.41; general retainer as Washington counsel, less than half of work in connection with legislation, $2,250; total, $2,279.41. (2) American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Western Union Telegraph Co., and taxi drivers. (3) Charges for services rendered. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting savings and loan associations and general mortgage lending.

Ferguson, John A., Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,080 (allocated). This salary also shown in report of the Independent Natural Gas Association of America. Expenses (allocated), $176.95. (2) Reported as disbursements by Independent Natural Gas Association of America. Miscellaneous, including taxis, tips, luncheons, etc., $176.95. Not for Members of Congress, but for industry people, members, membership prospects. (3) See (2). (4) Regular natural-gas news publications. (5) [Blank.]

Ferris, Muriel, League of Women Voters of the United States, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received, $1,312.50; received and expended, carfare to and from Capitol and travel, $8. (2) None expended in carrying on work except for carfare and travel. (3) Carfare and travel only. (4) Trends in Government, Member magazine, publications of the League of Women Voters of the United States, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (5) I am principally employed to inform league members on legislative matters; secondarily to influence legislation. For legislation, see league platform adopted by national convention, 1948, attached.

Fifer,[5] Russell, American Butter Institute, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Expended, $253.06. (2) To hotels, air lines, etc., for services rendered. (3) Normal business and traveling expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) General farm legislation affecting the butter and dairy industry.

Filer, Harry L., the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) Salary, $5,300. (See statement attached to original registration.) No expenses. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employer.

Finucane, James, National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Compensation at the annual rate of $3,800; expenses received during quarter, $110.23. (2) Expenses for newspapers, books, transportation, and other incidentals. (3) For newspapers, books, and transportation. (4) Peace Action and various newspapers using NCPW releases and various letters to editor; also Fellowship. (5) To support peace legislation.

Fisher, Lewis H., National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $600. (2) Various individuals and corporations. (3) Taxi and street cars, $14.20; office help, $150; four meals, $13.23; postage, $5; rent, $120; telephone, $25; taxes, $4.75. (4) Annuitant, quarterly publication. (5) Civil retirement and relative matters.

Fitzgerald, Bernard M., Washington Loan & Trust Building, Ninth and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington, D. C., and National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, $1,500; expenses, reported by registrant, Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Any legislation that might affect the members of the National Association of Electric Companies.

Fitzpatrick, F. Stuart, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Chamber of Commerce of the United States. (1) Received: Salary, $3,875; expenses, $22.50. Expended: Luncheons, $22.50. (2) Hotel Statler. (3) Necessary normal expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the general field of public works, city planning, urban redevelopment, and housing.

Fleming, Roger, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 109 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $1,298.12 expended. (See item (6) of Form B, filed May 1948.) (2) Taxis, air lines, railroads, restaurants, hotels. (3) Transportation, meals, lodging. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Economic Cooperation Administration, acreage allotments, Commodity Credit Corporation charter, reciprocal-trade agreements, Federal aid to education, rural housing, rural telephones, health, displaced persons, amendments to Clarke-McNary Act, postal rates, rural roads, amendment of section 7 of Clayton Act, international wheat agreement, social-security amendments, amendments to Agricultural Act of 1948, amendment of Food and Drug Act, extension of Bankhead-Flannagan Act to Puerto Rico, amendment of Air Commerce Act to apply to animal and plant quarantine, construction of Prairie du Chien (Wis.) municipal dock and wharf, FAO site, point 4.

Flinn, W. G., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Ninth Street and Mount Vernon Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Foley, Frank J. (Rederiaktiebolaget Advance et al.), 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See attached sheet.[2] (2) See attached sheet.[2] (3) See attached sheet.[2] (4) None. (5) Legislation approving settlement of a claim of Finland for compensation for Finnish vessels requisitioned in 1941–42.

Forbes, E. F., Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., room 304, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Salary, $5,000.04. (2) Personal use only. (3) Personal use only. (4) None. (5) Not employed to proposed or oppose legislation. This work is only incidental to the regular work of the president and general manager of the association.

Ford, Mrs. J. A., 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C., Townsend Plan for National Insurance, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Hotel and travel expenses extra (approximately $30 per week when away from home). Expenses on all itineraries. (2) Hotels and transportation, meals. (3) Above. (4) The Townsend National Weekly. (5) H. R. 2135, H. R. 2136, S. 2181, bills to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys.

Ford, John B., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) A fair proportion of my salary allocable to lobbying is $50 per month ($150 for the quarter). I have not expended or received any other money for lobbying purposes. (2) To me. (3) Compensation for personal services. (4) I caused no articles or editorials to be published relating to legislation. (5) Legislation affecting the American merchant marine; numerous bills amending the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

Fort, J. Carter, Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) For all services rendered to the Association of American Railroads, legislative and nonlegislative, as outlined in Registration Form B, filed December 1946, registrant received salary during the fourth quarter of 1949 at the rate shown in such registration, as amended by the supplement thereto filed January 10, 1948, and received in addition $592.03 as reimbursement for all traveling expenses in connection with such services while away from Washington and all reimbursable business expenses in Washington such as cab fares, business meals, etc. Of the salary received, $8,445.83 is estimated to be assignable or allocable to legislative activities. Of the aforesaid expenses, $435.08 is estimated to be assignable or allocable to legislative activities. The legislative activities referred to include those with respect to bills and measures registrant is called upon to study, analyze, etc. but which are neither supported nor opposed by him. (2) The expenses above shown as assignable or allocable to legislation were paid to various hotels, restaurants and clubs in Atlanta, New Orleans, Houston, San Francisco, Portland, Denver, Kansas City, St. Paul, Chicago and St. Louis, to dining cars while traveling between those points, etc. (3) Traveling expenses while away from Washington, lodging, meals, taxies, etc., and such expenses in Washington as business meals, taxies, etc. Passes were used for rail transportation and, accordingly, no expenses was incurred in that connection. (4) None. (5) Generally, to support all legislation which the railroads believe to be in their interest and in the interest of a sound national transportation policy and to oppose all legislation which they believe to be contrary to such interests. In addition to the support of and opposition to particular measures, the legislative work during the quarter consisted of the study and analysis of measures in order to determine the possible effect on transportation interests. For reference to particular measures, see the answer to item (5) in registrant's Form C report covering the third quarter of 1949, which by reference is incorporated into this report.

Foster, Charles E., Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, October, November, December (including bonus), 1949 (after taxes and social security), $1,653.90; expenses, same period, $47.05; total, $1,700.95. (2) Charles E. Foster, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) See No. (1) above. (4) DAV semimonthly. (5) Legislation affecting service-connected disabled veterans, their families, and the survivors of deceased service men and women.

Foutz, Dave, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Veterans Organizations Council of Altadena, 2235 North Lake Avenue, Altadena, Calif. (1) Money received, $645.50; money expended, $645.50; operations closed on October 15, 1949. (2) Dave Foutz: Salary, $300; living expenses, $120; hotel, $115; stenographic, $100; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. (3) Foutz's salary and living expenses; secretarial duties, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. (4) None. (5) Housing amendments of 1949. Operations on legislation stopped on October 15, 1949.

Fowler, Robert E., Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received from Seadrome Patents Co., Inc., 2143 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa., $500. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) S. 1009, a bill to authorize the Coast Guard to construct an experimental nonpropelled seadrome ocean station.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Fox, Melvin J., Committee for the International Trade Organization, 816 Twenty-first Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, October 1 through December 31, 1949, $2.125; travel expenses, October 1 through December 31, 1949, $61.15. (2) No entry. (3) No entry. (4) No entry. (5) House Joint Resolution 236, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Trade Organization.

Franklin, L. S., director, National Tax Relief Coalition, Box 401, Greensboro, N. C. (1) Received for October, November, December, 1949, $505. (2) L. S. Franklin, director, salary per quarter, $375; upkeep, automobile, at 6 cents per mile, 1,400 miles, $84; printing and mailing bulletin, $46; total expense per quarter, $505. (3) [Blank.] (4) Bulletin on taxation. (5) Tax relief and less spending.

Frederick,[5] John H., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $1,061.19. See attached.[2] (NOTE.—All of the expenses included in this submission will also be shown in the quarterly filing of the Transportation Association of America.) (2) John H. Frederick. (3) Retainer fee, incidental expenses at Washington, and travel away from Washington. (4) None. (5) None.

Frederick, John H., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $1,324.21. See attached.[2] (NOTE.—All of the expenses included in this submission will also be shown in the quarterly filing of the Transportation Association of America.) (2) John H. Frederick. (3) Retainer fee, incidental expenses at Washington, and travel away from Washington. (4) None. (5) None.

Fuller, George M., National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) October, $404.09; November, $158.81; December, $443.49. (2) Miscellaneous. (3) Entertainment and transportation. (4) None. (5) Oppose any legislation inimical to the interests of the lumber industry and support any legislation which would be helpful to it.

Fyffe & Clarke (David R. Clarke, John Harrington, Albert J. Smith), Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $360. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting manufacturers generally.

Gage, Charles E., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the American Tobacco Co., Inc., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None, but see copy of statement attached filed with Form B, on February 24, 1949. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Galvin, M. J., 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.; Minnesota railroads, St. Paul, Minn. (1) None. (All of the undersigned's clients as listed on his registration have paid the expenses reported herein, and the undersigned's salary, on the ratio of the mileage which they have within the State of Minnesota. Amount paid is the same as that expended.) (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Gammons, Earl H., Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., Warner Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $152.10. (2) Restaurants, hotels, and incidental expenses. (3) Entertainment and out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Gardner, Morrison & Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; the Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., 143 Liberty Street, New York, N. Y.; Agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; and other holders of awards of Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, World War I. (1) None received. Approximately $62.30 expended for travel, telephone calls, etc. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to World War I awards, such as H. R. 6074, Eighty-first Congress.

Garey & Garey,[5] 63 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; Michigan National Bank, Lansing, Mich. (1) Received from Michigan National Bank, $1,115.84. (2) Mayflower Hotel, for hotel bills in Washington, D. C., $394.03; American Airlines for airplane transportation, Washington to New York, $132.49. Eugene L. Garey, for meals, traveling expenses, telephone, tips, etc., $554.39; Edward Miller, for mimeographing services, $34.93. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) Proposed amendments to banking law.

Garstang, Marion R., National Milk Producers Federation (formerly National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation), 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary for the quarter, $1,949.98; expended, 75 cents. (2) Taxi fare. (3) See (2). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Garvey, Francis J., American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Francis J. Garvey, salary, January 1 to December 30, 1949, $9,000. (2) Francis J. Garvey, reimbursement for expenses (January 1, 1949, to December 30, 1949), $2,462.18. (3) Travel expenses in connection with legislative matters, railroad and plane fares, meals, entertainment, hotel rooms, taxicabs, local transportation. (4) The Journal of the American Dental Association. (5) To present the views of the American Dental Association as fixed by action of its house of delegates and board of trustees, with regard to Federal legislation affecting the health of the American people, particularly dental health, and legislation which affects directly or indirectly the practice of the profession of dentistry.

Gavitt, Frank, Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc., 10 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) We are retained as public relations counsel for Schenley Industries, Inc., at a fixed fee of $3,000 per month, plus disbursements. For the period covered by this report, such fee amounted to $9,000. Salaries of employees working full time on general public relations for Schenley Industries, Inc., including work on legislative matters, and expenses of specialty departments of Carl Byoir & Associates, $18,787.78. Expenses for telephone, telegraph, and messenger service, $85. Expenses for mimeographing, mailing, and distribution of stories and pictures relating opposition of Schenley Industries, Inc., to the present rate of Federal excise tax on distilled spirits, $215. (2) Salaries and bills payable as indicated as No. 1, above. (3) Reimbursement of expenses incurred as indicated above in opposing the present rate of Federal excise tax on distilled spirits. (4) Stories or pictures were distributed at one time or another during the period covered by this report to every press association (and distributed by them to every daily newspaper), major radio network, and liquor trade publication in the United States. (5) Incidental to our engagement as public relations counsel for Schenley Industries, Inc., we have worked with Schenley in opposing the present rate of Federal excise tax on distilled spirits.

Geary, Paul M., National Electrical Contractors Association, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No expenses incurred and no money received other than salary originally reported on form B, filed May 22, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) None. (4) None. (5) No special legislation under consideration.

Geaslin, Bon, 1740 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala. (1) No expenditures made during this quarter. No money received for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) I am not engaged for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any particular legislation by the Congress of the United States, but as an incident to my position as general counsel of the Waterman Steamship Corp., I am interested in legislation affecting the United States merchant marine; civil aeronautics, and transportation generally, and frequently support or oppose legislation dealing with those subjects.

Gebhard,[5] Mrs. Paul, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Division of Social Education and Action, Presbyterian Church, United States of America, Board of Christian Education, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) No expenses incurred during this period. (2) [Blank.] (3) Lobbying in the interest of social legislation on which the Presbyterian general assembly has taken action. (4) Social Progress (magazine), special bulletins. (5) Same as No. 3.

George, J. M., H. K. Brehmer and C. S. McMahon, law firm of George, Brehmer & McMahon, the Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn. (1) (a) None; (b) $1,500 for general legal services without regard to Federal legislative matters paid by the Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn. (2) (a) To hotels, restaurants, railroad companies, telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs, and minor personal service; (b) retainer retained by selves. (3) (a) For traveling expenses actually paid out; (b) for retainer for general legal services to client. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2945, S. 1103, H. R. 6000.

George, J. M., H. K. Brehmer, and C. S. McMahon, constituting the partnership of George, Brehmer & McMahon, National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn. (1) (a) None; (b) $3,000 for general legal services without regard to Federal legislative matters, paid by the National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn. (2) (a) To hotels, restaurants, railroad companies, telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs, and minor personal service; (b) retainer retained by selves. (3) (a) For traveling expenses actually paid out; (b) for retainer for general legal services to client. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2945, S. 1103, H. R. 6000.

George, Leo E., National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,500.03; travel expenses, $200; general organization expenses (not legislative), $200. (2) Travel expenses include hotels, meals, and minor incidental expenses due to attendance at local and State meetings, conferences, and conventions. (3) Expenditures for hotels, meals, and incidental expenses are an actual reimbursement for cash expended for such purposes in connection with attendance at meetings, conventions, etc. (4) The Union Postal Clerk, the Federation News Service Bulletin, the Federation Press Service. (5) Support of measures designed to improve and strengthen the civil service; improve the civil service retirement system; improve the hours, wages, and conditions of post office clerks, and to improve the postal service.

Gibson,[5] John S., Sibbett Building, Douglas, Ga.; St. Marys Kraft Corp., St. Marys, Ga. (1) $750. (2) $750, being $250 for each month of the quarter, for retainer fee or salary to John S. Gibson, as per contract and agreement. (3) Said $250 per month is a

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

[5] Filed for third quarter 1949.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

retainer fee paid the undersigned as an attorney and not as a lobbyist. During the quarter reported for I had no contact of any sort or nature with anyone for any business other than my law practice and no activity of any nature or kind in said quarter as a lobbyist. (4) None. (5) An authorization for appropriation for certain dredging in North River, Ga., and St. Marys River, Ga., and Fla., which was given No. 827 by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, War Department, Washington, D. C.

Gibson, John S., Sibbett Building, Douglas, Ga.; St. Marys Kraft Corp., St. Marys, Ga. (1) $937.57. (2) $750, being $250 for each month of the quarter, for retainer fee or salary to John S. Gibson, as per contract and agreement. (3) Trip to Washington, D. C., on October 5 and 6, 1949: Hotel, $23; transportation, $73.57; food, $11; incidentals and entertainment, $80. (4) None. (5) An authorization for appropriation for certain dredging in North River, Ga., and St. Marys River, Ga. and Fla., which was given No. 827 by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, War Department, Washington, D. C.

Giddings, Ernest, assistant director, legislative Federal relations division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,507.50, which covers both legislative and non-legislative activities; estimated for legislative services, $301.50; expenses, $256.95. (2) Self (salary). Expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lodging, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Gilbert, C. C., Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn. (1) $1,725 received as salary as secretary, Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Such legislation as may be of interest to or affecting industry generally.

Gilchrist, Thomas B., Jr., Bleakley, Platt, Gilchrist & Walker, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Elisabeth von Elverfeldt, who is a client of the above-named law firm, of which I am a member, Hotel New Weston, Madison Avenue and Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Neither he nor the said firm has received and expended any moneys in connection with such employment. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Bill H. R. 1848, entitled "A bill to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act."

Glazier, William, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Salary, $1,235.04; expenses, $259.98. (2) Expenses include those in Washington as well as air transportation and living expenses while out of town. (3) See (2). (4) The Dispatcher, publication of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO. (5) To support all legislation of interest to American workers and longshoremen and warehousemen specifically; oppose undemocratic legislation.

Glazier, William, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Union of Maritime Cooks and Stewards, CIO, 86 Commercial Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) No salary or personal expenses; $450 or $150 per month received toward cost of office operations. (2) See No. (1). (3) See No. (1). (4) The Voice, publication of the National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, CIO. (5) To support all legislation of interest to American workers and maritime workers specifically; oppose all undemocratic legislation.

Goddard, Livingston, 4500 Chrysler Building, New York, N. Y.; Federation for Railway Progress, 1430 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,350 as secretary-treasurer of the federation; traveling expenses, $141.99. (2) Various hotels and transportation agencies for traveling expenses. (3) Travel expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Goodman,[5] Leo, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,500; expenses, $450.37. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) CIO News, Autoworker. (5) Rent control, housing, and community development and planning.

Goodman, Leo, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,500; expenses, $818.08. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) CIO News, Autoworker. (5) Rent control, housing, and community development and planning.

Goodwin, William J., The Loch, Rosslyn, N. Y.; Chinese News Service, Inc., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts: October 11, 1949, Chinese News Service, $5,000; October 17, 1949, Chinese News Service, $6,000; total receipts, $11,000. Expenditures, $2,783.28. See attached sheet.[2] (2) See attached sheet.[2] (3) See attached sheet.[2] (4) None. I furnished the various news services and certain newspapers with material relation to Nationalist China but do not know to what extent this information was used. Several newspapers have printed articles making reference to my activities as the lobbyist for Nationalist China. (5) Any legislation which affects Nationalist China.

Gordon, Spencer, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received from the American Institute of Accountants October 20, 1949, $9,500 fees from August 31, 1948, to August 31, 1949, and $258.13 for reimbursement of disbursements for telegraph, telephone, and other expenses to August 31, 1949. Small amounts expended to telephone and telegraph companies. (2) Small amounts to telephone and telegraph companies. (3) Telegrams and long-distance telephone calls. (4) The Journal of Accountancy and the Certified Public Accountant. (5) Advancing the interests of the accounting profession in reference to bills relating to practice before Government agencies and practice before the Tax Court.

Goss, Bert C., Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received no money other than salary as vice president of Hill & Knowlton, Inc., plus essential travel and entertainment expenses. I estimate that less than 10 percent of my time for the 3 months ended December 31 (and less than $500 of my salary for that period) may be allocated to matters directly or indirectly concerned with legislation, though it is not possible to maintain an accurate account since my firm serves numerous clients and the interests of each in legislation vary to an extreme. I estimate that of my travel and entertainment expenses for the 3 months ended December 31, 1949, less than $150 was expended for purposes that might be interpreted as subject to being reported under this law. (2) Paid to taxicabs and restaurants. (3) For travel to and from the Capitol, for luncheons and dinners for committee personnel and Congressmen, etc. (4) Supervised issuance of numerous press releases. Maintain no record of publication. (5) Not employed specifically to support or oppose legislation. Interested in legislation affecting aviation, Federal regulation of oleomargarine, steel plants, and in other legislation affecting interests of clients of Hill & Knowlton, Inc.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

Gourley, Lawrence L., 902 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $3,375 retainer. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Bills affecting the public health.

Graham, Mrs. Aubry Lee, 305 North Oak Street, Falls Church, Va.; American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary received, October 1, 1949, through December 31, 1949, $750; other expenses of the office are being reported directly to you on Form A by the headquarters office, who do the bookkeeping. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) ALA Bulletin, Library Journal, and any other newspapers or magazines who use material from the Washington office. Since we do not subscribe to a clipping service, we do not know who they are. (5) Any legislation affecting American Library Association members and/or the library profession.

Grant,[6] Robert A., 624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind.; the Ethanol Committee, 810 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,669.70 received. Expended during preceding quarter for travel, hotel, meals, taxies, and incidentals, $313.81. (2) Railroad, hotel, meals, taxis, and incidentals. (3) Same. (4) None. (5) Bills relating to the nonbeverage use of alcohol, including H. R. 3978 and H. R. 6477.

Gray, David G., Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation. My duty was to watch the program of legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Green,[5] Angus, American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts: $1,668.89 salary, plus $469.92, reimbursement of the expenditures referred to in Nos. (2) and (3) below. (2) Transportation and communications services, post offices, hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) Travel, living and business expenses connected with employment. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting shipping industry which concerns employer.

Greene, Ernest W., 731 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Post Office Box 2450, Honolulu, T. H. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation.

Greenstreet,[6] M. F., national secretary, Greenbeck Party, 1917 Claremont Avenue, Independence, Mo. (1) Total expense, $23.15. (2) Various. (3) Office expenses. (4) Equalitarian Bulletin, $10.50 per article, Dorothy the Sunshine Girl, about pensions, etc. The Coming Conflict on Religion and Economics. (5) Money and pension reform.

Griffith, H. McAllister, National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $2,175; expenses, $69.35. (2) Expense money paid to railroad, hotel, taxis, restaurants. (3) Normal expense of trip. (4) National Economic Council's Action Report, National Economic Council Letter. (5) To support all legislation promoting the prosperity and independence of the United States, preservation of its free social and economic system and the kind of government set forth in the Constitution of the United States. To oppose all legislation contrary to the foregoing, including proposals not on their face Communist or Socialist but which are being promoted in the interest of eventual transformation of the United States into a Socialist, Communist, or welfare state.

Grimes, Weston B., 436 Bowen Building, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) Received (includes office,

[5] Filed for third quarter 1949.
[6] Filed with the Clerk only.

travel and general expenses totaling $3,248.51) $9,498.53; expended (for purposes designated in the Lobbying Act), $1. (2) Taxicabs. (3) For taxicabs to and from the Capitol. (4) None. (5) Legislation concerning agriculture, commodity exchanges, international commodity agreements, and export-import controls.

Groom, B. E., secretary,[5] North Dakota Tax Equality Committee, 11½ Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak. (1) Contributions: January to April 1, $260; April to October 1, $7,146; total contributions, $7,406. See attached for expenditures.[2] (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Tax equality.

Groom, B. E., secretary, North Dakota Tax Equality Committee, 11½ Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak. (1) Contributions: January 1 to October 1, $7,506; October 1 to January 1, 1950, $5,164.06; total contributions for year, $12,570.06. See attached for expenditures.[2] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) All shown in statement 2. (5) Tax equality.

Haas, Frank E., the Association of Western Railways, 204 South Canal Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) During the fourth quarter of 1949 this registrant was not assigned to and did not engage in activity in connection with Federal legislation or covered by the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act and thus received no compensation and incurred no expense subject to report hereunder. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Haddock, Hoyt S., CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) None. No legislative activities participated in during quarter. CIO Maritime Committee financial statement attached.[2] (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) NMU Pilot. (5) Support legislation in favor of merchant seamen and oppose legislation detrimental to them.

Hadley, Harlan V., 830 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.; Automobile Manufacturers Association, 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) None, other than one-quarter of the annual compensation of $2,500 as set forth in supplemental registration (Form B) filed April 9, 1948. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Federal tax (excise) legislation, materials-control legislation, and such other legislation as the association may hereafter from time to time indicate.

Haines, Samuel P., 4407 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Twenty Percent Cabaret Tax Committee, 171 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) See Exhibit A, attached.[2] (2) See exhibit B, attached.[2] (3) See exhibit B, attached.[2] (4) None. (5) Reduction or repeal of the 20-percent excise tax applying to dine-and-dance rooms of hotels.

Hale, William C., Tennessee Eastman Corp., Kingsport, Tenn. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Revisions in the Tariff Act, draw-back regulations.

Halfpenny, Harold T., Committee To Remove Discriminatory Automotive Excise Tax, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $122.23. (2) See attached.[2] (3) To amend for clarification purposes section 3403 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Hallbeck, E. C., National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,656.65; legislative expenses, October, November, December, 1949, $708.35; transportation expenses, October, November, December, 1949, $168.55; general organization expenses, not legislative, $103.54. (2) Legislative expenses include meals, streetcar, taxi, hotel, and other traveling expenses incident to attendance at meetings and conferences excepting transportation, plus expenses for meals, taxi, and entertainment of guests at Washington, D. C., $702.35. Transportation: Southern Railroad, $38.48; Pennsylvania Railroad, $6.21; American Airlines, $123.86. (3) All expenses except transportation are an actual reimbursement for cash expended for the purposes stated. (4) The Union Postal Clerk, the Federation News Service Bulletin, the Federation Press Service. (5) Support of measures designed to improve and strengthen the civil service; improve the civil service retirement system; improve the wages, hours, and conditions of post-office clerks, and to improve the postal service.

Hamlet, Harry G., Retired Officers Association, 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $750. No part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action. (2) Expended, nothing. (3) See (1) above. (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Harmanson, L. James, Jr., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,774.98. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Washington Situation, a weekly mimeographed newsletter of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Harper, Elsie Dorothy, National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $425; expenses, $280. (2) Elsie Dorothy Harper. (3) Presenting to the President, the Cabinet, and both Houses of Congress (a) the opinion on subjects related to (5) below, of the convention of the Young Women's Christian Association held triennially and (b) the opinion of the national board of the Young Women's Christian Association in line with actions taken by the convention. (4) Legislation related to international security, social and economic justice, education, health, and civil liberties. (5) [Blank.]

Harper, Robert E., managing director, National Business Publications, Inc. (an association of publishers of trade, technical, scientific, and professional periodicals), 1001 Fifteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C. (1) For such ordinary expenses as cabs to and from Capitol Hill, luncheons and other courtesies, $93.56. (2) Various cab drivers and personnel of restaurants on Capitol Hill, etc. (3) See (1) above. (4) NBP Report official association newsletter circulated to association members). (5) That which affects postal rates of controlled-circulation periodicals published by members of the above-named association. (Such activity is but a small portion of his year-round duties as managing director.)

Harris, Winder R., 441 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received: Office expense, $102.18; personal expense, $252.88; total, $355.06. Expended: Office expense, $102.18; personal expense, $252.88; total $355.06. (2) Various. (3) Office and personal expenses. (4) None. (5) None in quarter for which report is made.

Hart, Merwin K., National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $800; expenses, $95.44. (2) See attached rider.[2] (3) See attached rider.[2] (4) Economic Council Letters Nos. 224, 224A, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229. (5) To support generally all bills favorable to private enterprise and to oppose all bills believed to be hostile to private enterprise.

Hart, Stephen H., 350 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.; National Livestock Tax Committee, Cooper Building, Denver, Colo. (1) During the quarter, the National Livestock Tax Committee paid to me a per diem of $50 for office work and $100 out-of-town for actual time spent in study, advice, conferences, and correspondence concerning general livestock tax questions including the analysis of the present provisions of the Internal Revenue Code and current rulings and decisions concerning Federal taxation of livestock operators. Such activities also included work in connection with the position of the National Livestock Tax Committee toward amendments to the Internal Revenue Code concerning capital gains on sale of breeding livestock and the deduction of ranching expenditures. It is impossible to determine what part of my services related to this legislative problem, but it is my opinion that none of my activities during the preceding quarter could be interpreted as lobbying. During the quarter a total of $875 for legal services was paid to me for all my activities and services. I was also reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses in the amount of $195.43. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Harter, Dow W., 412–414 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; the B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio. (1) Received annual retainer from the B. F. Goodrich Co. for all services as its Washington counsel. Allocation of amount paid for my services between legal and legislative activities is not feasible. Amount received during the fourth quarter of 1949, $1,875. In addition, received reimbursement for long-distance telephone, travel, taxicab fares, and out-of-pocket expense. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) The B. F. Goodrich Co. is interested in legislation relating to the maintenance of facilities for the production of an ample supply of synthetic rubber in the United States for commercial and national defense purposes. It is interested in various proposals now under study by Congress for a long-range rubber program for this country. It is also interested in the repeal of the present excise taxes on tires and tubes, and in other legislative proposals which come before Congress from time to time.

Hawkins, Paul M., 1405 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $2,049.99, only a small fraction of which was for lobbying activities; $209.34 expenses, only a small fraction of which was expended for lobbying activities. (2) Taxicabs, railroads, restaurants, hotels, air lines. (3) Transportation, meals, rooms. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation affecting the hotel industry.

Haynes, Kit H., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for October, November, and December 1949, $1,625.10. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Assists in the preparation of Washington Situation, a weekly mimeographed newsletter of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives; also prepares farm news releases at irregular intervals and special reports at irregular intervals. Such reports are distributed to members of the national council, news services, radio networks and stations, and miscellaneous persons who have requested inclusion on mailing list. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Hays, Joseph H., the Association of Western Railways, 204 South Canal Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) During the fourth quarter of 1949 this registrant was not assigned to and did not engage in activity in connection with Federal legislation or covered by the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act and thus received

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

no compensation and incurred no expense subject to report hereunder. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Hazen, John C., 808 Kass Building, 711 Fourtenth Street, Washington, D. C.; National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Meals, $17.85; telephone bills, $42.82. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Excise-tax legislation.

Hebert, Felix, Associated Factory Mutual Fire Insurance Companies, Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Amendment to Internal Revenue Code.

Heberton, K. W., 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary of $860 per month, which is paid for all services, only a part of which concerns legislation. Out-of-pocket travel and incidental expenses, $122.63. (2) Taxi drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and luncheons. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the interests of the Western Union Telegraph Co.

Hecht, George J., 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.; American Parents Committee (without salary), 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $24.30; expended $24.30. (2) Various. (3) Railroad fare, etc. (4) Parents' Magazine and School Management. (5) National child research bill, National School Health Services Act, National Science Foundation, appropriations for United States Children's Bureau, Federal aid for education, pediatrics education bill, public-school survey and construction bill.

Heiney, Robert B., National Canners Association, 1739 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,877.49 as one-quarter year's salary as assistant to secretary, National Canners Association, for all work performed; $33 has been received as reimbursement for expenses incurred. (2) Taxi fares and miscellaneous expense, $33. (3) See above. (4) National Canners Association Information Letter. (5) Opposing marketing orders on commodities for canning, and changes in the export provisions of Federal food and drug law. Generally following all legislation affecting canning industry.

Henderson, Joseph D., American Association of Small Business, 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La. (1) Salary of $6,000 per year; this quarter, $1,500. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Official monthly publication of the American Association of Small Business, the Small Business Review; routine news releases; weekly column entitled "Minding Your Own Business." (5) To support any legislation for the good of the people, particularly that beneficial to small business; to oppose any legislation to the detriment of the people, particularly that detrimental to small business.

Hendrickson, Roy F., National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, 723 Kass Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Expended $1.55 for taxi fares. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Co-op Grain Quarterly; Grain Producers News. (5) Any legislation that may affect grain producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to market their produce.

Hensel, Robert E., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, made no expenditures during the quarter ended December 31, 1949, in connection with the proposed legislation described in item (5) hereof on behalf of the American Tobacco Co. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Tax legislation extending the 85-percent dividend received credit to dividends from resident foreign corporations to the extent that such resident foreign corporations derive income from United States sources.

Herndon, Maurice G., 1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received or expended during preceding calendar quarter. Status of registrant the same as stated in original form B and accompanying letter of explanation, filed March 6, 1947. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) American Agency Bulletin, monthly publication of the National Association of Insurance Agents (tear sheets attached). (5) [Blank.]

Hess, Amiel Edgerton, Lustron Corp., 4200 East Fifth Avenue, Columbus, Ohio. (1) None. Note that my place of employment is changed. Lobbying activity totally discontinued, and I request that my name be withdrawn from the approved list. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Hester, Ewart A., law offices of Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, October, November, and December, $2,500; no expenses incurred for this quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) See supplementary statement, paragraph 2, attached to Form B, filed by me January 9, 1948. H. R. 2428, H. R. 2433, H. R. 6111, H. R. 6604, S. 978, S. 1847.

Hewes & Awalt, a law partnership, consisting of the following partners: Thomas Hewes, F. G. Awalt, Samuel O. Clark, Jr., Harold E. Mitchell, Raymond Sparks, Henry L. Shepherd, John S. Murtha, Maxwell M. Merritt, and W. V. T. Justis, 93 Elm Street, Hartford, Conn., and 822 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The filing of this report is not to be taken as an admission that the Federal regulation of lobbying Act is applicable. This registrant received during the fourth quarter of 1949 the sum of $1,666.67 from the National Association of Electric Companies for services performed prior to dissolution on September 30, 1949, having been to that date general counsel of the association. This registrant also received during the fourth quarter of 1949 the sum of $7.24 in reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses, such expenditures having been made during the third quarter of 1949 and reported on Form C for that quarter. This is the final report for Hewes and Awalt. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which this firm was counsel until dissolution on September 30, 1949 (and of which the new firm of Awalt, Clark & Sparks became general counsel on October 1, 1949), is to provide the members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on all problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association, therefore, is interested in any and all legislation that might affect its members directly or indirectly as going business concerns.

Hibben, Robert C., International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barry Building, Washington, D. C. (1) One-fourth of annual salary reported in original registration. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation that may affect the ice cream industry.

Higgins, Mary, secretary-treasurer of the Philippine-American Committee, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 412A, Washington, D. C. (1) None since October 3, 1949, which was shown in last listing. (2) See statement attached.[2] (3) See statement attached.[2] (4) None. (5) No legislation is now pending but I am the secretary-treasurer of the Philippine-American Committee, the aims of which committee are set forth in attached statement.[2]

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 300 Hibbs Building, 725 Fifteenth St. NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See attached.[2] (2) See attached.[2] (3) See attached.[2] (4) Have no records of such publication. (5) Not employed to oppose or support legislation. Are retained to prepare educational information and material.

Hill, Thurman, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Kansas Independent Oil and Gas Association, 513 Beacon Building, Wichita, Kan. (1) $1,500 paid on September 22, 1949. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To oppose imports of crude oil into the United States in excess of 5 percent of the market demand.

Hinders, Justin, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) See attached itemized statement.[2] (2) See attached itemized statement.[2] (3) See attached itemized statement.[2] (4) Attached list[2] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Hinman, Ray C., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received: Salary, $1,250 (this represents one quarter of the amount of registrant's annual remuneration which is attributable to the performance of duties which are subject to the Lobbying Act); reimbursement for traveling expenses, $109.30; total, $1,359.30. Money expended (in connection with duties related to the Lobbying Act), $109.30. (2) Railroads, air lines, taxis, hotels, restaurants, telephones, and tips. (3) Normal traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Hobbie, Edgar V. H., National Milk Producers Federation, formerly National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary for the quarter, $2,100; expended, $27.45. (2) Taxicabs. (3) Taxi fares. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Hoffmann, Frank N., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) $1,333.32 (2 months only, 1 month on strike), $1,900 (2 months only, 1 month on strike). (2) Hotels, railroads, air lines, restaurants, cab drivers, etc., for expenses. (3) Personal expenses and travel in and away from Washington. (4) Column entitled "Keep an Eye on Congress" in monthly publication of United Steelworkers of America, Steel Labor. (5) Support legislation authorized by the convention and executive board of the United Steelworkers, and by the convention and executive board of the national CIO; oppose legislation contrary to the stand of these organizations.

Hogg, Robert L., American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary (19 days), $1,301.50; expenses (travel, hotel, meals, telephone, taxi, and other similar incidental expenses), $885.33. (2) Railroads, pullman, and air line, $404.13; hotel, $140.44; meals and tips, $251.70; telephone and telegraph, $35.17; taxi, luggage, porters, and miscellaneous, $55.89; total, $481.20. (3) Same as (2). (4) None. (5) None. (See exhibit attached to form "B.")

Hollister,[5] R. F., Independent Bankers Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve District, 802 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) Money received, salary, $1,800; money ex-

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

pended, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Federal legislation controlling bank holding companies.

Holman, Charles W., National Milk Producers Federation, formerly National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See attached schedule. Gross salary for the quarter, $4,125; expended $1.50 for taxi fares. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Hood, J. M., president, the American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary received from the American Short Line Railroad Association, $5,000. Expenses incurred for account of the American Short Line Railroad Association and for which reimbursement has been or will be made, $1,186.12. Impossible to accurately allocate either salary or expenses, but carefully calculated estimate is that 5 percent of salary, $250, and 10 percent of expenses, $118.61, total $368.61, expended for purpose of influencing legislation. (2) Expenses paid to hotels, clubs, transportation, and communication companies. (3) For travel and entertainment in connection with the furtherance of the legislative program of the 326 common carrier by rail members of the American Short Line Railroad Association. (4) Proceedings of 1949 annual meeting, copy attached. Legislative program for 1950, copy attached. (5) Legislation affecting member lines of the American Short Line Railroad Association. (See Legislative Program, copy attached.)

Horton,[6] Jesse V., Continental Hotel, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Postal Supervisors, P. O. Box. 2013, Washington, D. C. (1) None, except personal salary, $1,875. (2) Expended for personal living costs only. (3) [Blank.] (4) The Postal Supervisor, Washington, D. C. (5) Legislation affecting supervisors in the postal service.

Hosking, Floyd J., 1329 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Corn Industries Research Foundation, 3 East Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $2.06 as miscellaneous expenses (see below). (2) Notary public, $2; postage, 6 cents. (3) Notarizing quarterly report, postage. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Houston, William J., 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Federation of Government Employees, 4824 Kansas Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary received $1,875, expenses $500. (2) Landlady, taxes, grocery stores, service stations, restaurants, miscellaneous, tips, postage supplies, etc., banks, savings bonds. (3) Bank account, Government savings bonds, food, gasoline and oil, meals taken out, taxi cabs, incidental living expenses, rent and taxes. (4) None. (5) Pay legislation for Federal employees; support any other proposed legislation beneficial to Federal employees; oppose any which would adversely affect them.

Howard,[5] S. H., 1328 Evergreen Avenue, Milvale, Pa.; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) None. No legislative activities. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Howard, S. H., 1328 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pa.; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Howe, Harold K., 2480 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Institute of Laundering, Box 1187, Joliet, Ill. (1) Received $3,025 as salary and $440.71 as reimbursement for general expenses. (2) Various. See answer to question (3). (3) Miscellaneous and incidental, including local transportation, lunches, gratuities, committee-meeting expenses, and other incidental expenses of Washington office, American Institute of Laundering. (4) Not applicable under section 308 (a). (5) I am interested in all legislation affecting the laundry industry and the members thereof. My primary function as to legislation is to report status, prospects, etc., to my employer the American Institute of Laundering. See also, letter attached to registration Form B, which is made a part hereof.

Howe, Robert E., Jr.,[5] 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since July 1, 1949, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $2,500 and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $552 a total of $3,052. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal every-day living expenses such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Howe, Robert E., Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since October 1, 1949, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $2,500 and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $552 a total of $3,052. (2) No sums in any am unt have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal every-day living expenses such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Hoyt, Kendall K., 1226 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; National Federation of Private School Associations, 2601 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $625; expenses, $64.53; total, $689.53. (2) Of the expenses, $51.21 was paid for mimeographing to Bates Duplicating Co., Inc., Washington, D. C. The remaining $13.32 was for stamps and office supplies. (3) Mimeographing and mailing press releases and bulletins to member schools. (4) Unknown. Press releases may have been basis for sundry news items. (5) S. 2596 and any other legislation affecting private schools. (Note.—This registrant does not think his activities in the fourth quarter of 1949, when his work for the federation started, constitute lobbying but this report is filed as a matter of form.)

Hudson, Minor, 444 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Seadrome Patents Co., Inc., 2143 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Received $500. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) S. 1009, a bill to authorize the Coast Guard to construct an experimental nonpropelled seadrome ocean station.

Hudson, Minor, Geoffrey Creyke, Jr., and Andrew A. Lipscomb, doing business as Hudson, Creyke & Lipscomb, 444 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Dora Fruman, 735 South Third Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) $2,500 received as fee in the matter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 1637, a private bill for the benefit of Mrs. Dora Fruman, which became law on October 25, 1949, Private Law 339, Eighty-first Congress.

Huff, W. T., Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc., 806 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Regular salary, as previously listed, plus $130.05 in expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) Transportation, meals, documents, telephone, and telegraph. (4) None. (5) Duties are to analyze bills which might affect air transport industry for company management. Support all those beneficial to industry.

Huntress, Carroll B., 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y.; National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Carroll B. Huntress, vice president, Republic Coal & Coke Co., 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y., acting as chairman for the National St. Lawrence Project Conference, without compensation and for reimbursement of expenses. (2) Railroads, hotels, $1,425.75; New York Telephone Co., $40.94; newsstands, $6.50; for luncheon meetings, $128.75; United States Post Office, $1.55. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) House Joint Resolution 53, Senate Joint Resolution 99.

Huschke, Henry A., Agricultural Limestone Institute, 1415 Elliot Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) It is estimated that $250 of my salary during the previous quarter is allocable to legislative activities. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Any legislation that might affect the agricultural limestone industry such as H. R. 5268.

Hushing, W. C., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for months of October, November, and December, $2,210; expenses for October, November, and December, $244.65. (2) Taxi drivers, phone company (when away from office), and messengers. (3) As stated in No. 2. (4) None. (5) Affecting labor.

Hutson, John B., Suite 719, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Tobacco Associates, Inc., Raleigh, N. C. (1) Salary at the rate previously reported on form B, which registrant filed as a matter of information to the Congress, although of the opinion that he does not come within the purview of the act (Public No. 601, 79th Cong.). (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See attachment.[2] (2) See attachment.[2] (3) See attachment.[2] (4) None. We issue regular informative bulletins and news letters to members. (5) Any legislation concerning natural gas.

Ingles, William, 1624 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See schedule 1 (A) and 1 (B) attached.[2] (2) See schedule 1 (B).[2] (3) Normal office operating expenses. (4) Unable to state. A distribution of editorial material has been made to a list of 370 newspapers and writers. (5) Legislation affecting industry.

Jackson, Charles E., National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 228 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Jobe, William T., National Association of Ice Industries, 1706 L Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Employed on a full-time annual basis as general counsel for the National Association of Ice Industries at a salary of $10,800 per annum. I have received my regular monthly salary for the past calendar quarter of 1949. Pursuant to the requirements of Public Law 601, I have expended no money. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Joers, Peter D., Mountain Pine, Ark.; Dierks Lumber & Coal Co., 1006 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Mo. (1) No moneys received or expended for the purpose of lobbying. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4)

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

[6] Filed with the Clerk only.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[Blank.] (5) I am against construction of the Millwood Dam as outlined in the 1945 Flood Control Act and favor upstream dams in its place. I am a vice president and a director of our company and am receiving a fixed salary which has no bearing on the above.

Johnson, Elmer, president, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The sum of $800.30 was received during the fourth quarter of 1949. (2) None. (3) Fee of $225 per month; $125.30 to cover transportation, meals, and entertainment. (4) The Annuitant. (5) In support of any measure designed to improve the Federal retirement system.

Johnson, George H., American Institute of Laundering, South Chicago Street and Doris Avenue, Joliet, Ill. (1) I receive no money from the American Institute of Laundering apart from my regular salary as compensation for my services as vice president and reimbursement for the actual expenses incurred on trips in traveling on institute business. Of the total amount received, it is estimated that not more than $500 could, even under broadest interpretations, be attributed to activities possibly within the scope of the Regulation of Lobbying Act. My expenditures include only those actually incurred for travel on AIL business. No such expenditures occurred during the past quarter which could, even under broadest interpretations, be attributed to activities possibly within the scope of the Regulation of Lobbying Act. (2) My expenditures for traveling are paid to usual recipients, such as common carriers, hotels, restaurants, telephone and telegraph companies, etc. (3) The purpose of such expenditures is to defray the cost of hotel lodging, transportation, meals, etc. (4) Miscellaneous reportorial or informational bulletins issued to members of the American Institute of Laundering. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose legislation, but I am interested in legislation affecting laundry owners.

Johnson, Gilbert R., Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Pro rata of annual retainer as legal counsel (including 8 percent increase effective September 1, 1948) as set forth in my letter of April 9, 1948, amending initial registration dated January 10, 1947. No expenses were incurred during this period. (2) Retainer to self. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) During this quarter I have given attention to legislation relating to Great Lakes shipping as part of my work as legal counsel for Lake Carriers' Association. I do not consider that I am engaged for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation and this report is made without prejudice to that position.

Johnson, Jerry P., Terminal Refrigerating & Warehousing Corp., Fourth and D Streets SW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Johnson, Vernon A., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif. (1) Received a total of $3,342.79, all from the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. Of this amount, $2,750 was salary and $592.79 was expenses. Expenses are itemized as follows: $4.76 for auto travel, $2.20 for auto parking, $547.63 for entertainment, and $38.20 for taxi fares. (2) Various taxicab companies, hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) In the course of normal business activities. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting aviation.

Johnson, W. D., room 312, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Order of Railway Conductors, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (1) January 1949 annual compensation of $8,500. (2) W. D. Johnson. (3) As vice president and national legislative representative of the Order of Railway Conductors of America, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislative matters. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor; generally employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act and particularly the interests of various classes and crafts of railway employees represented by the Order of Railway Conductors of America.

Johnson, Walter R., National Association of Attorneys General, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for August and September 1949, $3,000; expenses, $1,162.91. (2) Registrant. (3) Transportation, $213.36; hotel, $61.05; miscellaneous, $43.50; meals, $845; total, $1,162.91. (4) None. (5) To confirm and establish titles in States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries.

Jones, Bascom F., Tennessee Railroad Association, 930 Broadway, Nashville, Tenn. (1) During the said quarter I have neither received nor expended any money in connection with Federal legislation and have caused no articles or editorials to be included in any publication. I have spent no days in Washington during the quarter for the purpose of discussing with Senators and Representatives the merits of proposed legislation. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) None.

Jones, J. M., National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) Salary, $2,100. (2) [Blank.] (3) No lobbying expense for fourth quarter 1949. (4) The National Wool Grower (Coeditor, J. M. Jones). (5) [Blank.]

Jones, L. Dan, Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary previously reported plus the following expenses which might be considered to be within the scope of the act, $15. (2) See (3). (3) Taxi fares. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. My duties include that of maintaining surveillance of legislation which might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the association.

Jones, Lyle W., 1737 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Small Business Men's Association, Akron, Ohio. (1) $600 monthly less withholding tax and social security tax; $274.05 personal expenses, October, November, and December, 1949. (2) Lyle W. Jones. (3) Luncheons, taxicabs, travel, and miscellaneous expenses. (4) Pulling Together, monthly bulletin, National Small Business Men's Association. (5) [Blank.]

Jones, Rowland, Jr., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,000; expenses, $228.75. (2) Restaurants and cab drivers. (3) Food and transportation. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revison, labor revision, social security law revision, inflammable fabric legislation.

Jones,[5] Walter J., care of W. C. Hushing, room 607, A. F. of L. Building, Washington, D. C.; Canal Zone Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council, Balboa, C. Z. (1) Salary for July, August, and September, $2,550; expenses for July, August, and September, $2,550. (2) Hotels, service stations (gas, oil, etc.), cab drivers, railroads, phone company, cable company messenger services, landlords (rent), secretarial expenses, air transportation. (3) As stated in item (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the Panama Canal employees.

Jones, Walter James, room 607, 901 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Canal Zone Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council, Balboa, C. Z. (1) None; off the pay roll when Congress is not in session, October, November, and December. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Kane, John E., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received regular salary as previously reported in Form B heretofore filed pursuant to act; expenses reimbursed by employer $494.54. (2) Various taxicab companies; restaurants; hotels, other service establishments. (3) Administrative expenses; transportation; meals, etc. (4) None. (5) Matters affecting the petroleum industry and its customers.

Kane, John E., District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $590.75 as treasurer of District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee. The sum of $590.75 expended on behalf of committee during quarter. (2) See schedule A attached.[2] (3) See schedule A attached.[2] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the sale and distribution of petroleum products in the District of Columbia.

Keefe,[5] Thomas J., American Road Builders' Association, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Road Builders' Association salary (3 months ending September 30, 1949), $1,875.00; expenses reimbursed, $348.29. (2) To self for salary and reimbursement for meals, special events, transportation, postage, telephone, etc. (3) Routine duties as an executive and consultant for the American Road Builders' Association. (4) None. (5) None.

Keefe, Thomas J., American Road Builders' Association, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Road Builders' Association salary (3 months ending December 31, 1949), $1,875.00; expenses reimbursed, $380.85; total, $846.07. (2) To self for salary and reimbursement for meals, special events, transportation, postage, telephone, etc. (3) Routine duties as an executive and consultant for the American Road Builders' Association. (4) None. (5) None.

Keehn,[5] Thomas B., 1751 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches, 289 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,305, salary; $200, expenses. (2) Money paid to self for salary and expenses such as railroad fare, food, taxis. (3) To cover living expenses and special expenses allowable within expense account. (4) Social action, legislative action service. (5) Same as material filed October 1946 indicates—especially displaced persons legislation, housing, Federal aid to education. More time spent on education of constitutents than on opposing or supporting legislation.

Keesling, Francis V., Jr., 315 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.; city and county of San Francisco, City Hall, San Francisco, Calif. (1) $3,000 retainer; $1,543.91 reimbursement for travel, subsistence, secretarial, stenographic, telephone, telegraph, and postage expense. This also covers services concerning matters before the various executive departments, in addition to legislative matters of interest to the city and county of San Francisco, and includes expenses at Washington, D. C., San Francisco, and elsewhere. (2) No payments made except as set forth in (1) above. (3) In connection with various legislative matters of interest to the city and county of San Francisco. (4) None. (5) Legislation of interest to the city and county of San Francisco, including housing, slum clearances, payment in lieu of taxes, release of Federal properties, repeal or reduction of excise taxes, Trans-Bay Bridge, civil defense and economic mobilization, ship construction and repair, Navy and civil function appropriations, and

[5] Filed for third quarter 1949.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[5] Filed for third quarter 1949.

other matters of interest to the city and county of San Francisco.

Kendrix, Moss H., legislative assistant, Legislative Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,200, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $240; expenses, $104.48. (2) Self (salary); expenses: Hotels, railroads, air lines, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lodging, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash. NEA Journal (articles therein). Informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Kennedy, Harold L., 203 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.; the Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio. (1) Received 3 months' salary and it is estimated that $500 should be allocated to lobbying activities; expended, $4. (2) 10 taxi fares at 40 cents. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) All proposed legislation that might affect the oil and gas industry.

Kennedy, James A., American Cable & Radio Corp., 67 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) I have been for several years vice president and general attorney of American Cable & Radio Corp., which owns the Commercial Cable Co., All America Cables & Radio, Inc., and Mackay Radio & Telegraph Co., all engaged in the international-telegraph business. In said capacity a part of my duties has been to appear in hearings, conferences, and other governmental meetings in Washington. My company has directed me as an incidental part of my duties to speak to Members of Congress and other governmental agencies in favor of legislation which would permit the merger of telegraph companies engaged in international traffic. I have not, and do not expect to receive any additional remuneration for this service above my previous salary. Neither have I made nor do I intend to make any contribution for the purposes designated in paragraph 307. It is not the principal purpose of my employment to influence legislation, nor do I receive my compensation principally for the purpose of influencing legislation. The Lobbying Act would appear inapplicable; however, if this declaration is not sufficient, I will be glad to furnish any further information desired. My salary is the same as heretofore reported, no part of which is for the purpose of influencing legislation. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) As an incidental part of my ordinary work I am supporting legislation which will permit the merger of Western Union cable properties into my company's system, if such is necessary, or legislation which will authorize the merger of international-telegraph companies.

Kenney, James F., 1002 Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Associated Third Class Mail Users, Inc., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Any fees are paid to the law firm of Posner, Berge, Fox & Arent, which employs registrant. This work is part of regular duties of registrant for which a salary is paid. (2) See quarterly report of Mr. Wendell Berge filed this date. (3) See quarterly report of Mr. Wendell Berge filed this date. (4) None. (5) Increase in third-class-mail postal rates.

Ketcham, Ronald M., 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) For the period October 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949; $2,025 regular compensation plus $300 Washington expense allowance. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None during the fourth calendar quarter of 1949.

Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc.,[5] 411 Seventh Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Main & Co., First National Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Received from Main & Co., $731.67. (2) Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc., $731.67. (3) Postage, production, and services. (4) News releases sent to the Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh Post Gazette, Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, Wall Street Journal, New York Times, Associated Press, United Press, International News Service, and general distribution to Washington news and radio correspondents. (5) The Incentive Income Tax Plan, a program of income tax revision prepared by Frank Wilbur Main and other partners in Main & Co., certified public accountants, with headquarters office in Pittsburgh.

Ketchum, Omar B., Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,000 per month as salary minus social security and withholding taxes; $75.60 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combatting of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the National Encampment and the National Council of Administration.

Killen,[5] Mrs. Marcella F., 3925 Chicago Avenue, Minneapolis, Minn.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (1) No money received or expended in connection with legislation during tenure of employment with Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen as assistant public relations representative, which terminated September 10, 1949. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

King, Joseph T., suite 302, the Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; Robert N. Hawes. (1) $1,950 salary and $788.67 expenses. (2) Restaurants, cab drivers, hotels, railroads, pullman companies, porters. (3) Meals, taxi fares, and tips while traveling on official business; business luncheons, entertainment. (4) National Affairs Reports and Bulletins. (5) Legislation directly affecting the retail building-supply dealers, such as Fair Labor Standard Act, wage and hour legislation, housing legislation, tax legislation, freight rates, price and allocation controls.

King,[5] Karl V., attorney at law, 409 Boston Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) No money received; employed on a contingent basis. (2) See attached compilation.[2] (3) Collecting information for the use of Congress, and living expenses and entertainment while engaged in this work. (4) None. (5) To support private bills for the purpose of supplying Basques as sheepherders to the sheep industry.

King,[5] Rufus G., Jr., law offices, Norman M. Littell, 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; 20 bands of Mission Indians of southern California; address care of Adam Castillo, president, Mission Indian Federation, San Jacinto, Calif. (1) None received. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) No specific legislation, but registrant is to represent the above Mission Indian bands as requested at any hearings when legislation affecting them is being considered.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

King, Rufus G., Jr., law offices, Norman M. Littell, 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; 20 bands of Mission Indians of southern California; address care of Adam Castillo, president, Mission Indian Federation, San Jacinto, Calif. (1) None received. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) No specific legislation, but registrant is to represent the above Mission Indian bands as requested at any hearings when legislation affecting them is being considered.

King, Thomas H., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No remuneration received for lobby activities. (2) No remuneration received or expended for lobby activities. (3) No remuneration received or expended for lobby activities. (4) None. (5) Legislation for development of military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security.

King, Williford I., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City; Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc. (1) During the past quarter, I received an overall of $2,878.97, net, including salary and expenses. (2) I am not a disbursing officer and have made no payments for the Committee for Constitutional Government by whom I am employed. (3) [Blank.] (4) Upwards of 40 newspapers carry King's Comments, a syndicated weekly column in which I express freely my personal views concerning current economic problems. (5) Not employed for this purpose, but, at my own discretion, I oppose legislation which I believe to be antisocial and favor that which I believe to be socially beneficial.

Kittrell, W. H., 303 Empire Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.; Melben Oil Co., Benedum-Trees Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Fee, $3,000; expenses repaid, $1,108.37. (2) American Air Lines, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.; Western Union; Southwest Bell Telephone Co.; cab; tips; meals; car rental and usual traveling expenses. (3) Travel and telephone expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting oil industry, particularly tidelands.

Klepinger,[6] Robert F., 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc., 17 West Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $155 and $5.45 for telephonic expense during October 1949. (2) Registrant. (3) As local counsel and to advise with respect to advocacy of or opposition to proposed legislation affecting, or of interest, said committee. (4) None. (5) See (3), supra.

Kline, Allan B., 109 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 109 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $318.85 expended (see item (6) on form B filed January 1948. (2) Taxi fares, train fares, hotel, and restaurants. (3) Transportation, lodging, and luncheon conferences. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Economic Cooperation Administration, acreage allotments, Commodity Credit Corporation charter, reciprocal trade agreements, Federal aid to education, rural housing, rural telephones, health, displaced persons, amendments to Clark-McNary Act, postal rates, rural roads, amendment of section 1 of Clayton Act, International Wheat Agreement, social-security amendments, amendments to Agricultural Act of 1948, amendment of Food and Drug Act, extension of Bankhead-Flannagan Act to Puerto Rico, amendment of Air Commerce Act to apply to animal and plant quarantine, construction of Prairie du Chien (Wis.) municipal dock and wharf, FAO site, point 4.

[6] Filed with the clerk only.

Kline, Robert E., Jr., 322 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Washington Counsel for Kirlin, Campbell, Hickox & Keating, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) (a) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation; (b) legislation to clarify meaning of section 9 of Merchant Ship Sales Act, 1946.

Kneipp, Leon F., 3700 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Organization of Professional Employees of United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. (1) Only money received was in compensation for services rendered during months of October, November, and December 1949, at the rate of $100 per month. (2) No money paid to any person, company, corporation, or otherwise during this period. (3) [Blank.] (4) None, other than small publication OPEDA published by organization for issuance to its members, a part of which consists of a letter from the executive officer apprising members of current developments in supjects of interest. (5) Measures relating to interests of Federal professional employees: pay, per diem, classification, retirement, auto mileage, annual and sick leave, disability compensation, civil service, and other like subjects; also the establishment of more progressive and effective criteria in relation to professional qualifications, working conditions, and service to the public.

Knowles, Burt L., the Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) See statement filed by the Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., dated March 1, 1949, and letter dated January 3, 1947, on file. (2) None. (3) Same as (1) above. (4) None. (5) Same as (1) above.

Koch, Robert M., National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc., 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) It is estimated that, as executive secretary of the National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc., $500 of my salary represents that part of my time covered by Public Law 601 during the fourth quarter of 1949. This was all disbursed for personal living expenses. In addition, I received $8 for reimbursement for taxis and carfare in connection with legislation of interest to members of the association. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation directly or indirectly affecting the agricultural limestone industry.

Krebs, Alfred U., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant believes $166.66 a month to be a fair allocation of his salary for the fourth quarter of 1949 to the activities referred to in form B. (2) No expenditures except for taxicabs and similar items. (3) See item (2). (4) None. (5) During the past quarter registrant supported certain amendments to the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

Kreutz, Oscar R., executive manager, National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW, Washington, D. C. (1) $5,000 salary and $3,732.31 special expense. Approximately 10 percent of my time was devoted to legislative matters so that $500 of my salary would be allocable. Of the special expense items, none of it could be construed as applicable. (2) None expended by me. (3) None expended by me. (4) National Letter and National Savings & Loan Journal. (5) [Blank.]

Krueger, A. H., 847 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) During the quarter October-December 1949, I was paid my regular salary of $2,149.98 by the Millers' National Federation (trade association) for various services most of which are not related to the activities described in section 307, title 3, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. Section 307 activities, if any, would be incidental in relationship to my regular employment and no amount of my salary is specifically allocated for such activities. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation. Future activity, if any, for the purpose of this report is dependent on proposed legislation which might affect the wheat flour milling industry.

Kruse, Herman C., Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Salary for quarter, $3,000 for all services to employer, only a small part of which pertained to legislation; reimbursement of hotel, travel and incidental expenses for quarter, $520.72. (2) Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., $156.83; air lines, $162.09; restaurants, telephone, and telegraph companies, taxies, and incidentals, $201.80. (3) Hotel, travel, and incidental expenses as stated above. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting water and power projects, flood control, and reclamation.

LaChapelle, Lloyd, Michigan Division 43, Communications Workers of America (CIO), 510 LaFayette Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) $929, includes $100 per month union salary for 3 months; expenses, $264.64. Received from Michigan Division 43, Communications Workers of America. (2) Normal living expenses plus railroads, air lines, hotel, restaurants, taxicabs and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform the normal functions of my position with the Communications Workers of America, and Michigan Division 43, none of which is related to legislative activities. (4) None. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the Communications Workers of America, or Michigan Division 43.

Lacques, Paul H., Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received various sums during the quarterly period (October, November, December 1949) at various times (none of which amounted to $100) a total of $124.42 from Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston. (2) Railroad companies; hotels and clubs. (3) Transportation; accommodations, meals, telephone and telegraph charges. (4) None. (5) H. R. 6061 and H. R. 6053.

LaFrance, Francis X., Esq., Swan, Keeney & Smith, 911 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.; Narragansett Brewing Co., New Depot Avenue, Cranston, R. I. (1) $300 in full for services for 1949. This will be my last report since I am no longer retained for this purpose by Narragansett Brewing Co., of Cranston, R. I. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 257, any corelative bills and any amendments thereto.

Landa, Alfons B., 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; S. H. Kress & Co., McCrory Stores Corp., W. T. Grant Co., McLellan Stores Co., H. L. Green Co., Inc. (1) $53.82 received for expenses from his firm and paid for transportation and long-distance telephone calls. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) See statement attached to report for previous quarter.

Lane, John F. (by Joseph G. Butts, Jr.), c/o Gall and Lane, attorneys; American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill.; 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received as legal fees and reimbursement for disbursements, $1,627.60; expended, $21.60. (2) Expenditures paid to telephone, telegraph, transportation, etc., companies. (3) Telephone, telegraph, local transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) Retained in a usual attorney-client relationship as Washington counsel for the American Institute of Laundering and as such are interested in all legislation affecting laundries.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, 2737 Devonshire Place, Washington, D. C.; National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West Eleventh Avenue, Gary, Ind.; American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 11 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.; Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) From National Patent Council as retainer, $1,500; from American Fair Trade Council as retainer, $1,000; and in addition $59.88 in payment of expenses incurred in attending annual meeting in New York; Trinity Improvement Association for rental and other expenses and clerical help, $750; no expenditures but small sums for postage and office supplies, and as hereinafter recited. (2) $416.70 to Woodley Park Towers, Washington, D. C. (3) Rental, garage. (4) None. (5) Those I represent are nonprofit organizations, and I serve in an advisory capacity. Their purposes are principally educational with reference to the objectives of their organizations, and I keep them advised with reference thereto concerning legislative proposals and governmental programs.

La Roe, Wilbur, Jr., Continental Building, Washington, D. C.; Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc. (1) La Roe, Brown and Winn, law firm, received from the Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., $1,500, total of monthly payments for general legal services, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) S. 56; H. R. 2734; Brannan farm plan; imports of Polish hams; livestock subsidies; H. R. 4538.

La Roe, Wilbur, Jr., Continental Building, Washington, D. C.; National Independent Meat Packers Association. (1) La Roe, Brown and Winn, law firm, received from the National Independent Meat Packers Association, $4,500, total of monthly payments for general legal services, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payments made to any other person. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) S. 56; H. R. 2734; Brannan farm plan; imports of Polish hams; livestock subsidies; H. R. 4538.

Laugherty, R. R., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Railway Employees' department, A. F. of L., 608 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $1,500; expenses, $750; no money expended except for personal maintenance. (2) Room, taxi fare, postage, telephone and telegraph, cleaning and pressing, and meals. (3) Necessary living, transportation, and communication expense. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting and detrimental to railroad employees.

Lavelle, William, Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,458.34; expenses, $1,597.15. (2) Hotels, airlines, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) CIO Legis-Letter. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Lawrence, John V., American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his amended report of August 15, 1949. He expended a total of $10.60. (2) The money was paid to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate Office Buildings, and to clerks and cashiers for lunches at restaurants. (3) The money paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office as indicated in (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the trucking industry.

Lawrence, Joseph S., M. D., American Medical Association, 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., (headquarters, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.). (1) Receipts: Salary, October 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, $3,750; retirement savings bonus, $5,000; reimbursement for AMA expenses reported October 3, 1949,

$167.44; AMA expenses, October 3, 1949, to December 31, 1949, $910.61; total receipts, $9,828.05. Expenses, $1,132.97. (2) Various. (3) Travel, conferences, hotels, local transportation, meals. (4) None. (5) Bills relating to public health endorsed or opposed by the section of the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association or the principles espoused by that body.

Laylin, John G., 701 Union Trust Building (final report, see letter of termination[2]); American Smelting & Refining Co., 120 Broadway, New York. (1) Received: None. Expended in connection with all matters for client, $107.06. (2) Telephone expense, $1,38; miscellaneous, $90.27; travel expense, $15.41. (3) Long distance telephone calls, transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) Appropriation for continuation of drainage tunnel by Bureau of Mines at Leadville, Colo.

Laylin, John G., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Rederi A/B Pandia, Marehamn, et al. (1) See attached sheet.[2] (2) See attached sheet.[2] (3) See attached sheet.[2] (4) None. (5) Legislation approving settlement of a claim of Finland for compensation for Finnish vessels requisitioned in 1941–42.

Layne, A. Alvis, Jr., 1002 Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Associated Third Class Mail Users, Inc., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Any fees are paid to the law firm of Posner, Berge, Fox & Arent, which employs registrant. This work is part of regular duties of registrant for which a salary is paid. (2) See quarterly report of Mr. Wendell Berge filed this date. (3) See quarterly report of Mr. Wendell Berge filed this date. (4) The Case Against Increasing Third-Class Postal Rates; statement in opposition to section 5 of H. R. 2945, Eighty-first Congress, April 1949. (5) Increase in third-class postal rates.

Lea, Clarence F., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $1,991.08. See attached.[2] Note: All of the expenses included in this submission will also be shown in the quarterly filing of the Transportation Association of America. (2) Clarence F. Lea. (3) Retainer fee, incidental expenses at Washington and travel away from Washington. (4) None. (5) None.

League of Women Voters of the United States, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant has received no contributions for the purposes designated in subparagraph (a) or (b) of section 307, Public Law 601. Expenditures: Salary and carfare, $1,320.50. (2) Muriel Ferris, salary and carfare. (3) As indicated in (1). (4) Trends in Government and member magazine, both published by registrant. (5) See program of the League of Women Voters of the United States, previously filed.

Lee, Ivy, and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.; United States Cuban Sugar Council, 136 Front Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See appended statement I.[2] (2) See appended statement I.[2] (3) See appended statement I.[2] (4) See appended statement II.[2] (5) Registrant advises the United States Cuban Sugar Council on public relations matters pertaining to sugar legislation relating to the Sugar Act of 1948.

Lee, James R., 731 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,904.86 salary and expenses for October, November, and December, 1949. (2) Various. (3) Transportation, telephone, office expense, meals, secretarial services, etc. (4) None. (5) Any legislation concerning the members of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Leopold,[10] Joseph F., 937 National City Building, Dallas, Tex.; self; also on retainer by National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received only $500 per month retainer from National Tax Equality Association and refund of actual out-of-pocket expenses for travel, etc. (2) Paid no money or anything of value to anyone, except normal travel expense to railroads, airlines, and for hotels, meals, etc. (3) For expenses only as above. (4) None except where reported by local press following an address before convention or business group. (5) Tax equality in general; no specific legislation.

Lewis, C. Huffman, 1525 Slattery Building, Shreveport, La.; Union Producing Co., United Gas Pipe Line Co., United Gas Building, Shreveport, La. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Proposed amendments to Natural Gas Act as incidental to general law work. See testimony before Senate subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Eighty-first Congress, first session.

Lewis, George J., Union Station, Lexington, Ky.; Kentucky Railroad Association (for fuller details see Form B, filed by me on June 3, 1947), Louisville, Ky. (1) No moneys received; none expended. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Employed to support legislation favorable to the railroad industry and to oppose legislation detrimental to that industry.

Lewis, John R., 1108 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) The undersigned has neither received nor expended any money during the quarter September through December 1949 for the purposes as defined in section 307 (a) (b) of Public Law 610. My activities have consisted wholly of the maintenance of an information service for my company. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Interested generally in legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Libby, Frederick J., executive secretary, National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,174.98; expenses, 336.07; total, $1,511.05. (1) Expenses for railroad tickets, hotels, taxis, porters, telephone and telegraph, service, postage, and miscellaneous expenses when away from Washington. (3) Speaking trips, attending conferences, meetings, etc. (4) Peace Action, monthly news bulletin of the National Council for Prevention of War. (5) Supports, in pursuance of the purposes of the organization, legislation which promotes peace and opposes legislation which, in our judgment, leads to war.

Liljenquist,[5] Blaine L., Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1415 K Street, NW., Washington, D. C., E. F. Forbes, president, Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Received quarterly salary of $2,125 plus $667.14 for expenses of operating the Washington office, of which $85.81 was expended in the interest of legislation. (2) Various. (3) Taxi fares, meals, and miscellaneous expenses. (4) Bulletins to the members of the Western State Meat Packers Association, Inc. (5) Legislation affecting the livestock and meat packing industry.

Liljenquist, L. Blaine, 1415 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., E. F. Forbes, president, Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Money received during fourth quarter, 1949 was $2,125 in salary plus $642.59 as reimbursement for expenses in operating Washington Office, of which $21.02 was expended on legislation. (2) Various. (3) Mimeographing, taxi fares and miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) I am interested in legislation which directly or indirectly affects the livestock and meat packing industries.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

[10] Filed with the Secretary only.

Litschert, Robert G., National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $2,250. as an employee of the National Association of Electric Companies, and reimbursements of $584.95 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all duties and assignments, only a part of which salary and expenses was for the purposes described in section 308(a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, taxicab companies, telephone and telegraph companies, book stores and stationers. (3) Transportation, $125.70; hotels, $25; meals, $274.70; telephone, $29.55; publications, $18.45; miscellaneous, $111.55. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies of which I am an employee is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The Association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Littell,[5] Norman M., 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Navajo Tribe of Indians, residing in Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, and Colorado; address of superintendent, Window Rock, Ariz. (1) For quarter ending September 30, 1949; received $1,875.00 as legal retainer for services as General Counsel from May 8 to August 7, 1949; $688.69 for reimbursement of travel expenses of General Counsel and $167.73 as reimbursement for miscellaneous expenses of General Counsel. (2) To employees of registrant's law office, including stenographers, etc. (3) Form legal services in connection with Navajo business. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation, but registrant is to represent the Navajo Indians as requested at any hearings when legislation affecting the Navajos is being considered.

Littell, Norman M., 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Navajo Tribe of Indians, residing in Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, and Colorado; superintendent, Window Rock, Ariz. (1) For quarter ending December 31, 1949, received $1,875 as legal retainer for services as general counsel from August 8 to November 7, 1949. (2) To employees of registrans's office, including stenographers, etc. (3) For legal services in connection with Navajo business. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation, but registrant is to represent the Navajo Indians as requested at any hearings when legislation affecting the Navajos is being considered.

Littell,[5] Norman M., 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; 20 Bands of Mission Indians of Southern California; address c/o Adam Castillo, president, Mission Indian Federation, San Jacinto, Calif. (1) None received. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) No specific legislation, but registrant is to represent the above Mission Indian bands as requested at any hearings when legislation affecting them is being considered.

Littell, Norman M., 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; 20 Bands of Mission Indians of Southern California; address c/o Adam Castillo, president, Mission Indian Federation, San Jacinto, Calif. (1) None received. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) No specific legislation, but registrant is to represent the above Mission Indian bands as requested at any hearings when legislation affecting them is being considered.

Little, Walter J., 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles; Southern Pacific Co.; Northwestern

[5] Filed for third quarter 1949.

Pacific Railroad, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif; Union Pacific Railroad, 422 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles; and Western Pacific Railroad, 526 Mission Street, San Francisco. (1) Received from Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, Southern Pacific Co., Union Pacific Railroad, Northwestern Pacific Railroad, and Western Pacific Railroad: compensation, $279; reimbursement for expenses as shown below, $68.34. (2) Hotel Mark Hopkins, San Francisco, Calif., $68.34. (3) Meals and lodging. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the railroads.

Littlepage, John M., 832 Continental Building, Fifteenth and K Streets, Washington, D. C.; the American Tobacco Co., Inc., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None (see attached statement[2] which was filed with registration statement). (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Locke, Gordon C., Committee for Pipe Line Companies, 632 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Total compensation received $3,375, for all activities, including those which have no relation to Federal legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation that might affect the oil industry as related to petroleum and petroleum products pipe lines.

Lodge, F. S., the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Continental Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $25 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eighty-first Congress as H. R. 2756, H. R. 855, and H. R. 3045.

Lofgren, Charles E., Fleet Reserve Association, Continental Building, Fifteenth and K Streets, NW, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,500, salary; $600, expenses. (2) $1,500 salary, expended for personal living expenses; $600 expenses, including air transportation and expenses, connection 3-week visit to branches of Fleet Reserve Association on Pacific coast. (3) As above. (4) Naval Affairs magazine, official publication of Fleet Reserve Association. (5) Personnel and veteran legislation pertaining to the National Military Establishment.

Lord, Day & Lord, 1216 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York. (1) No money received or disbursed in the fourth quarter of 1949. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation having relation to World War I claims.

Lorence,[5,6] Walter E., private consulting practice, 3937 Livingston Street, NW, Washington, D. C. (1) See attached sheet.[2] Report for third quarter was delayed due to overlap of receipts and expenditures in third and fourth quarters, while working on the same projects. (2) Money received to self; money expended to railroads, utility companies, hotels, taxis, etc. (3) Legal-engineering consulting services, examinations, surveys and reports. (4) [Blank.] (5) In the interest of navigation and flood-control projects in the Ohio Valley, including H. R. 5472, Eighty-first Congress, first session.

Lorence,[6] Walter E., private consulting practice, 3937 Livingston Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See attached sheet.[2] (2) Money received to self; money expended to railroads, utility companies, hotels, taxis, etc. (3) Legal-engineering consulting services, examinations, surveys, and report. (4) [Blank.] (5) In the interest of navigation and flood-control projects in the Ohio Valley, including H. R. 5472, Eighty-first Congress, first session.

[2] Not printed. Filed in Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.
[6] Filed with the Clerk only.

Love, Richard H., Judge Advocates Association, 312 Denrike Building, Washington, D. C. (1) For services of Richard H. Love as executive secretary, $2,650; for expenditures for rent, secretarial hire, printing, postage, and office maintenance, etc., $4,779.72. (2) Landlord, secretary-stenographer, printer, stationer, mailing service, post office. (3) Maintenance of national offices of association. No direct expenditures for lobbying activity. Activity of association limited to advising members of developments, soliciting their views, and making composite views of membership known to Congress at public hearing. (4) 1. Judge Advocate Journal, December 1948, June 1949, October 1949 issues. 2. Copy of proposed Uniform Code of Military Justice and Questionnaire, April 1949. (5) Legislation affecting military justice—the functions, administration, and operation of the legal departments of the armed forces and agencies related to national security.

Lucas, James C., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $200, salary. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retail industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor-law revision, social-security law revision.

Lunn, Dr. Carl E., 1501 West Washington, Phoenix, Ariz. I employ myself for a living, donating time and money to help the aged citizens. Technically, by Townsend Plan, Inc.; 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) No salary. I donate. Received $97.37 from commission on dues on memberships. This goes toward incidental expenses—I donate balance. (2) Post office for postage, some printing, etc., of notices about local club meetings, mostly in behalf of strictly local interest. (3) In behalf of the needy senior citizens, mostly. Also in behalf of Townsend plan, H. R. 2135. (4) None. Any space for notices donated by newspapers. (5) Support Townsend plan.

Lunn, Richard D., 20 Elm Street, Auburn, Maine; Colonial Airlines, 630 Fifth Avenue, New York. (1) None for the purpose of influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None (4) None. (5) None.

Lynch,[5] Daniel A., member of the firm of King & Lynch, 366 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.; National Association of Stevedores, 90 West Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $200 per month for a total of $600. (2) Daniel A. Lynch. (3) Attorney at law for legal representation. (4) America. (5) Any legislation for benefit or which may be to the detriment of National Association of Stevedores, including H. R. 858.

Lynch, Daniel A., of the firm of King & Lynch, 366 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.; National Association of Stevedores, 90 West Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $25,796.76 received, $396.76 disbursed. (2) Telephone company, railroad, air lines, motels, etc. (3) For transportation costs, hotel expenses, and telephone calls. (4) [Blank.] (5) The fees mentioned above covered all legal services to National Association of Stevedores up to December 31, 1949, including legal services in connection with Public Law 177.

Lynn,[6] A. L., Island Creek Coal Co. and Pond Creek Pocahontas Co., Guaranty Bank Building, Huntington, W. Va. (1) See attached statement,[2] (2) Railroads, taxi operators, hotels, restaurants, telephone and telegraph companies, and recipients of miscellaneous expenditures. (3) Travel, hotel accommodations, meals, telephone and telegraph, and miscellaneous. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose specific legislation. I am interested generally in all legislation affecting the coal industry

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.
[6] Filed with the Clerk only.

such as taxes, labor, transportation, government controls, government expenditures, hearings concerning monopolistic practices, etc.

Lynn, John C., 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 109 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $693.12 expended (see item (6) of form B, filed December 1948). (2) Taxis, airlines, railroads, restaurants, hotels. (3) Transportation, meals, lodging. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Economic Cooperation Administration, acreage allotments, Commodity Credit Corporation charter, reciprocal trade agreements, Federal aid to education, rural housing, rural telephones, health, displaced persons, amendments to Clark-McNary Act, postal rates, rural roads, amendment of section 7 of Clayton Act, international wheat agreement, social-security amendments, amendments to Agricultural Act of 1948, amendment of Food and Drug Act, extension of Bankhead-Flannagan Act to Puerto Rico, amendment of Air Commerce Act to apply to animal and plant quarantine, construction of Prairie du Chien (Wis.) municipal dock and wharf, FAO site, point 4.

Lyon, A. E., executive secretary, Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. No money expended for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation. Total salary for quarter, $3,000. Total expenses for quarter, $634.30. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Incidental to other and varied duties which comprise the major part of work, all legislative proposals of concern to labor and railway labor in particular.

McBride, Jonas A., 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary of Jonas A. McBride, vice president and national legislative representative, $2,500; salary of stenographer, $1,111.62; printing and supplies, $66.52; office rent, $270; personal expense, $1,310.68; telephone and telegraph, $57.99; postage, $30. (2) Salary to Jonas A. McBride and Glenn C. Russell, stenographer. Printing and supplies to various printers and stationery firms. Rent to Labor Newspaper, 10 Independence Avenue. (3) For maintenance of office of national legislative representative of Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. (4) Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen's Magazine, December 1949. (5) All legislation affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

McCarthy, Frank J., the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,600 per month, which is paid for all the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation; $100 was expended by me as expense money, during the fourth quarter of 1949, for taxicabs, meals, automobiles, expenses, and incidentals. In addition to this amount, I also received $994.25 for expenses incurred in connection with other duties performed for the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., which have no relation to the purposes covered by this act. (2) Various transportation companies, restaurants, garages, communication companies, etc. (3) $100 was expended by me as expense money, during the fourth quarter of 1949, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interest of the Pennsylvania Railroad.

McCaskill, James L., Department of Higher Education, National Education Association of

the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,757.50, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative services, $100; expenses, none. (2) Self (salary only). No expenses. (3) No expense incurred. (4) College and University Bulletin. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all its areas.

McCloskey, Bryson deHaas, Post Office Box 1657, Washington, D. C.; self in the interest of 40,000,000 youth and allied interests, 1316 L Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money has been received for this purpose—expenditures shown have been made by the undersigned from his personal funds totaling $34.86; for postage, $10.41; printing, $18.10; envelopes, $1.85; typing, $4.50; for letters to members of the Democratic National Committee. (2) Postage, $10.41, to United States post office; printing, $18.10, to Cooper-Trent, 2629 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va.; envelopes, $1.85, to Stockett-Fiske Co., 910 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.; typing, $4.50, to Vivian Barrett, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) To present a program to the members of the Democratic National Committee. (4) Publix Patriot, monthly. (5) (a) Yearly detailed public reports of funds secured by all philanthropies; (b) investigate big-business methods and their paid agents—low-cost auto; (c) philanthropies big-business-controlled monopolies; (d) investigation of United States Post Office Inspection Department as big-business agent; (e) investigation and action to protect small businesses.

McClure, Warren C., Box 207, Camden, Ark.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

McDonald, Angus H., 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All major pending legislation.

McDonald,[5] E. L., 524 Governor Building, Portland, Oreg.; the Townsend Plan, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Gross for quarter 1949, $1,115.69. (2) [Blank.] (3) Living costs and travel. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2135, the Townsend plan.

McFarland,[5] Rev. A. J., the Christian Amendment Movement, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (1) Salary, $750; expense, travel, board, room, etc., $500. (2) Salary to self for home expenses; other for various expenses incurred in travel. (3) Explained above. (4) The Christian Patriot, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.; the Covenanter Witness, 108 Boswell Avenue, Topeka, Kans. (5) A Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

McFarland, Rev. A. J., the Christian Amendment Movement, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (1) Salary, $750; expenses, $300; total, $1,050. (2) Salary to home for upkeep; expenses for travel (car and train, bus, etc.), lodging, meals, etc. (3) Answered above. (4) The Christian Patriot, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.; the Covenanter Witness, 1209 Boswell Avenue, Topeka, Kans. (5) An amendment to the Constitution of the United States, proposing that this Nation devoutly recognize Christ as Saviour and King.

McGough, Richard, Washington Railroad Association, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash. (1) Salary as stated in original registration; expenditures in connection with Federal legislation; none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting transcontinental railroads operating in the State of Washington.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

McGrath, Thomas Edward, 4012 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Taxpayers of the United States of America, United States Treasury. (1) Approximately $165. (2) Thomas Edward McGrath. (3) In behalf of the Taxpayers of the United States of America, meaning the Nation's welfare. (4) For a fee, none; soliciting press support, pro or con, innumerable. (5) It's my desire to cover, pro or con, all legislation before each current Congress. I emphasize the need of the Clerk of the House and Secretary of the Senate in carrying out paragraph (b), section 308 of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, that the lobby law does not fizzle out in a farce. If the lobby law dies, let it die as it was born, via Congress and President, over my vigorous protests and petitioning, per first amendment, Constitution of the United States of America. Amen.

McGrath, Tom J., Fuels Research Council, Inc., 324 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Regularly retained by Fuels Research Council, Inc., for services having no relationship to legislative matters. During fourth quarter of 1949 performed no services which might be classed as legislative. (2) No payments. (3) [Blank.]. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting competitive fuels.

McKercher, M. C., the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None received, none expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None this quarter.

McKiernan, George F., Geo. F. McKiernan & Co., 1056 West Van Buren, Chicago, Ill. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Postal-rate legislation.

McKinley, Royce B., National Grain Trade Council, 723 Fifteenth Street, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,601.10, salary and expenses; no more than $5 expended for purposes within the act. (2) Taxicab fares, average 80 cents. (3) Transportation. (4) Weekly news letter published by employer. (5) Agricultural legislation, specifically legislation affecting the grain trade.

McLaughlin, Joseph V., general auditor, 923 Chestnut Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.; Railway Express Agency, Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received for full quarter $2,800 regular salary as general auditor, Railway Express Agency, Inc. (October 1 to December 31, 1949, on this assignment intermittently, $730.56). For traveling expenses, this assignment, $303.70. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, pullman. (3) Hotel, meals, pullman, fare, taxicabs. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2945, S. 1103, bills to readjust postal rates.

McMains, W. H., Distilled Spirits Institute, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary same as previous report. No expenses have been authorized or incurred for purposes listed under this act. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the industry represented to members, including such bills in the Eighty-first Congress as H. R. 5486 and S. 1847.

McMillan, Robert W., Management Planning of Washington, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,100, with less than one-twentieth of the time and services for which such compensation was paid being for activities which might conceivably be construed as coming within the purview of any of the provisions of title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; $95.05 reimbursement of expenses allocable to foregoing activities. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Transportation and other normal out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

McQuatters, Geneva F.,[5] 1917 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,249.98; expenses, $161.06. (2) Travel, postage, office supplies, telephone, and telegraph. (3) Travel, postage, office supplies, telephone, and telegraph. (4) The Independent Woman. (5) Support: Merit system, Women's Bureau appropriations, the equal rights amendment, Federal aid to public education, jury service for women, child-labor legislation, United Nations participation, world calendar, and equal pay for equal work. Oppose: Discriminations against women, compulsory health insurance.

MacCracken, William P., Jr., American Optometric Association, Inc., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) See attached sheet.[2] (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) See attached sheet.[2]

Mack, James Edward, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., National Confectioners' Association of the United States, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $2,000; reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses, $476.48. The latter figure is my total personal expenses, of which only a small undetermined part, if any, could be considered as spent for the purpose of influencing legislation. (2) Paid out in cash to taxis, restaurants, hotels, railroads, and telephone companies. (3) Travel, meals, telephone, and other miscellaneous out-of-pocket expenses. (4) Trade publications of the candy manufacturing industry. (5) Any legislation of concern to the candy-manufacturing industry.

Macleay, Lachlan, Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis Mo. (1) Total reimbursable expenses in connection with general work done for the Mississippi Valley Association, all reimbursed by association, $917.96. (2) Railroads, air lines, etc., $337.98; hotels and miscellaneous, $579.98. (3) Travel, subsistence, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) A portion of Mr. Macleay's time was used in regard to legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement, the American merchant marine, soil conservation, flood control, regulation of domestic transportation.

Macnamee, W. Bruce, National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G. Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $350 a month ($1,050 per quarter) allocable to legislative activities received from the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc.; $44.85 received for luncheon expenses ($21.50 October., $10.45 November, $12.90 December). (2) The undersigned. (3) See item 1. (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation.

Madaris, James B., 220 South Alfred Street, Alexandria, Va.; Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Magee, Miss Elizabeth S., the National Consumers' League, 348 Engineers' Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, part time, $750. (2) Elizabeth S. Magee. (3) Salary. (4) National Consumers League Bulletin. (5) Supporting minimum-wage legislation; extension of social security.

Maloney, Walter E., 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $45,000 in payment for services, less than 50 percent of which was paid for services covered by the Lobbying Act; expended none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Supported H. R. 858; S. 336.

Manasco, Carter, 3611 Greenway Place, Alexandria, Va.; National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Fee, $2,400; expenses, $62.25. (2) Meals, $35, to restaurants; cab fares, $24.80, to cab companies; $2.85 to

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., pay stations. (3) Meals, cab fares, and telephone calls. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting controlled business publications.

Manasco, Carter, 3611 Greenway Place, Alexandria, Va.; National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Fee, $2,600; expenses, $62.25. (2) Meals, $35, to restaurants; cab fares, $24.80, to cab companies; $2.65 to Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., pay stations. (3) Meals, cab fares, and telephone calls. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the bituminous-coal industry.

Marchbanks, Miss Modane, 901 Lincoln Tower, Chicago, Ill.; National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any margarine legislation.

Margolin, Olya, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,305 (gross, before income-tax deduction) in salary received from the National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York City, none of which was spent in connection with work; $45.31 received from above spent for carfare, postage, etc. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Not employed. (5) Not employed specifically to support or oppose any legislation, but for the purpose of securing information to be transmitted to headquarters for the preparation of educational and other material.

Mark, James, Jr.,[1] 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since July 1, 1949, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $2,500, and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $552; a total of $3,052. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal everyday living expenses such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Mark, James, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since October 1, 1949, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $2,500, and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $552; a total of $3,052. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal everyday living expenses such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Markham, Baird H., American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See attached schedule[2] for answers to items 1–5. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) See (1). (5) See (1).

Marks, Herbert S., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the Detroit Edison Co., 2000 Second Avenue, Detroit, Mich. Final report. See letter of termination.[2] (1) None of registrant's activities or expenditures for client during this quarter were in support of or opposition to any legislation; nor were any receipts from client in payment for any such work, except reimbursement for disbursements of $23.63 made during previous quarter in connection with support of legislation described in paragraph (5) below. (2) Telephone companies. (3) Communications. (4) None. (5) Registrant's general legal services to this client included services in connection with support of H. R. 858, to eliminate so-called overtime on overtime under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Marran, Donald J., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, made no expenditures during the quarter ended December 31, 1949, in connection with the proposed legislation described in item (5) hereof on behalf of the American Tobacco Co. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Tax legislation extending the 85 percent dividend received credit to dividends received from resident foreign corporations to the extent that such resident foreign corporations derive income from United States sources.

Marran, Donald J., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, did not receive or expend any sums during the quarter ended December 31, 1949. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Tax legislation proposing to amend section 116 (a) and section 1621 of the Internal Revenue Code, pertaining to United States citizens earning income from sources outside the United States and withholding required on such income.

Marsh, Benjamin C., executive secretary, People's Lobby, Inc., 810 F Street NW, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, $2,475.34; expenditures, $2,561.37. Benjamin C. Marsh, executive secretary, salary for July, August, September, and October, $600, less withholding tax, $56.40; total, $543.60; other expenditures below. (2) Arline Ryan, $372.40; Graphic Arts Press, $714; postage, $418.59; J. B. Stein, $165; withholding tax, etc., $125.97; Andrew Walker, $78.75; registration fee, $50; R. P. Andrews, $29.48; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $16.07; Addressograph Corp., $11.17; incidentials, $36.34. (3) Salaries and wages; rent; for publicity and clerical work; other for maintaining office and getting out material . (4) We have not caused any article to be published, but have sent material and releases to hundreds of papers. (5) Support attached program[2] and oppose that against it.

Marshall, J. Paull, 528 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; William J. Goodwin, The Loch, Roslyn, N. Y. (1) Receipts, October 17, William J. Goodwin, $1,000; expenditures, $15.05. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $12.98; post office, $2.07. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, stamps. (4) None. (5) Any legislation which affects Nationalist China.

Marshall, J. Paull, 528 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Magothy River Association, 908 St. Paul Street, Baltimore, Md. (1) Received $1,000 from Magothy River Association; expended, 62 cents. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. (3) Telephone call to Baltimore. (4) None. (5) Legislation involving construction of airport at United States Naval Academy.

Marston, R. B., director, Legislative-Federal Relation Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,220, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $444; expenses, $210.45. (2) Self (salary). Expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lodging, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Martin, Robert F., Vitrified China Association, Inc., 312 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No activities covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Masaoka, Mrs. Etsu, 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C.; Japanese American Citizens League, Anti-Discrimination Committee, 406 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) Money received was only monthly salary. Above-named party did not participate in any legislative activity. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.

Masaoka, Mike M., national legislative director, Japanese American Citizens League, Anti-Discrimination Committee, 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C.; Japanese American Citizens League, Anti-Discrimination Committee, 406 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) All moneys received include only monthly salary and expenses as explained in Form B, filed January 3, 1949. (2) Telegraph and telephone companies, taxicabs. (3) Information, contacts, transportation. (4) News stories in Japanese language and Japanese-American newspapers relating to work here are the only articles known to have been published because of our contacts with them. See accompanying list. (5) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.

Maslow, Will, American-Jewish Congress, 1834 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $112.50 for services under Public Law 601. In addition, received for services not under Public Law 601, $2,750. No moneys expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Law and Social Action, September-October 1949; Congress Weekly. (5) Legislation designed to implement the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights; to keep separate church and State; to liberalize immigration laws; to liberalize Senate rules; to prevent racial or religious defamation.

Mason, Walter J., the American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for October, November, and December, $2,210; expenses for October, November, and December, $143.50. (2) Taxi drivers, messengers, and phone company. (3) Cab services and phone calls. (4) None. (5) Affecting labor.

Mathews, John Clifford, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.; Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America for the Christian Amendment Movement, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) October–December 1949, salary received from J. S. Tibby, treasurer, $750; preaching fees to be applied on expenses, $135. (2) Salary used for personal and family expenses only. Expenses: Auto mileage, $44.37; telephone, $2.72; sent to J. S. Tibby out of expense funds on hand, $100. (3) Travel and work in behalf of House Joint Resolution 181. (4) The Christian Patriot and the Covenanter Witness, 1121 Buchanan Street, Topeka, Kans. (5) In support of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would recognize Jesus Christ, Saviour and Ruler of nations (H. J. Res. 181).

Mathews, P. H., Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) For services rendered to the Association of American Railroads as described in registration filed October 1, 1948, registrant received salary at rate reported therein. Registrant further received for reimbursement of expenses incurred during period October, November, and December 1949, the sum of $414.76. Such expenses were for taxicabs, business meals, hotels, tips, etc. (2) The expenses above shown were paid to various hotels, restaurants, taxicab

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

companies in Washington, Atlanta, New Orleans, Houston, San Francisco, Portland, Denver, Kansas City, St. Paul, Chicago, and St. Louis, and to dining cars while traveling between these points. (3) See item (1). (4) None. (5) Registrant has worked on various legislation pertaining to the railroad industry as a whole. Work was done in opposition to S. 1596, H. R. 378, Senate Joint Resolution 99, S. 211, H. R. 4978. Work was done in support of S. 1203, H. R. 2945, and S. 1008. Registrant has observed and studied various bills introduced during quarter. Attended certain hearings conducted under House Resolution 137.

Meeks, E. A., National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary only, $1,500 for quarter ending December 31, 1949. (2) E. A. Meeks. (3) Salary. (4) The Postmasters' Advocate, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Any legislation affecting postmasters.

Meredith, George F.,[6] National Alliance of Independent Business, 1010 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) National Alliance of Independent Business, $305. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To support all legislation for small and independent business that promotes fair competition and equal opportunity.

Messer, Ross A., National Association of Post Office Maintenance Employees, 512 Victor Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,500; expenses, $759.47, including postage, office supplies, box rent, postage mailing monthly publication and weekly news bulletins, and other necessary expenses for handling legislation and grievances. (2) [Blank.] (3) In support of all beneficial legislation for postal employees, and in handling grievances between the membership and the Post Office Department. (4) The Post Office Maintenance News and special news bulletins advising the membership as to legislative activities and other beneficial information. (5) All beneficial legislation for postal employees and post-office custodial employees in particular.

Middleton, P. Harvey, Railway Business Association, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) The only money received by me during the period from October 1 to December 31, 1949, was $5,000 in salary, gross. No part of this salary was spent in legislative activities. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) [Blank.]

Miles, Clarence R., Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received: Salary, $1,375; expenses, $164.15. Expenses:- Transportation, $68.93; telephone, $13.94; meals, $22; entertainment, $13.15; hotel, $46.13. (2) Railroad, taxi companies, telephone company, hotel and restaurants, and Public Relations Forum. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation of interest to business.

Miles, Harold M.,[5] Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) None for Federal legislation. (2) None paid. (3) None. (4) See attached list.[2] (5) To oppose H. R. 378 and S. 238, the communications bills.

Miles, Harold M., Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) None. (2) None paid. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Miles, Harold M., Southern Pacific Co., 65 D. C. (See attached statement.[2]) (1) See attached statement.[2] (2) Mayflower Hotel, United States Post Office, telephone and telegraph companies, local transportation facilities, stationers, food and beverage establishments. (3) For purposes within scope of the act: Total office rent, $600; taxi fares, etc., $9.60; telephone and telegraph, $52.84; office supplies and miscellaneous, $45.48. (4) Monthly article in Dallas magazine, official publication of Dallas Chamber of Commerce. (5) Legislation affecting flood control, water transportation, river and harbor improvement, appropriations, and taxes.

Miller, Charles C., 715 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.; Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) I have received from my employers, the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., for the quarter ended December 31, 1949, prorated on the basis of total expenditures for salary of self and secretary, and for office expense at the rate of 15 percent to cover time spent on legislative matters, a total of $810.51 and for travel expense in trips to Akron and New York in connection with legislative matters, prorated at 50 percent of total expenditures, a total of $257.62. (2) Salaries, self and secretary, $484.67; rent to Ring Building, $94.50; guest meals, $46.29; cabs, $7.10; telephone and telegraph, $62.55; printing and office supplies, $38.65; dues, subscriptions, and miscellaneous office expense, $45.47; postage, $24.18; tips and miscellaneous expenses, $7.10. Travel expenses: Fares, $114.89; hotel rooms, $18.90; personal and guest meals, $78.63; cabs and miscellaneous expenses, $45.20. (3) [Blank.] (4) Daily newspapers and trade journals, general coverage with statistics on industry production and consumption, and fact material on payments of excise taxes on tires and tubes. (5) Modification of excise tax on tires and tubes; legislation pertaining to rubber controls and plant disposal; any legislation which might have special interest to the rubber-manufacturing industry.

Miller & Hornbeck, 1708 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio; Wytana Cattle Co., Lewiston, Mont. (1) Receipts, $3,000. Expenses: Transportation, $72.54; telephone, $29.88; hotel bills, $148. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) In support of amendment to the Natural Gas Act of 1938—H. R. 1758 and S. 1498.

Milton,[5] Charles J., 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J.; the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None paid. (4) None. (5) [Blank.]

Milton, Charles J., Prudential Insurance Co., 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J. (1) $6,000 for services rendered the Prudential Insurance Co., during the year 1949, plus expenses paid to Pennsylvania Railroad, Eastern Air Lines, American Air Lines, the Shoreham and various restaurants in and around Washington, D. C., in the amount of $1,323.05. (2) See above. (3) Maintenance while in Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation, but to study legislation and to attend committee hearings and report thereon to client.

Mollin, F. E., American National Live Stock Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo. (1) Have had no special contributions for lobbying purposes. The association finances handled in normal fashion. My compensation as executive secretary for the American National Live Stock Association is $1,000 a month. In addition I received in January of 1949 a bonus of $1,000 for 1948. (2) No payments to anyone in connection with lobbying activities. No trips to Washington during fourth quarter. (3) [Blank.] (4) Our own official magazine, the American Cattle Producer. (5) [Blank.]

Molnar,[5 6] Joseph, 225 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 3593.

Molnar,[6] Joseph, Unemployed Service Association, 225 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 3593.

Montgomery,[5] Donald E., 1129 Vermont Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C.;International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, CIO (UAW-CIO), 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary, 13 weeks at $100, $1,300; subsistence, 13 weeks, $819; expenses, 13 weeks, $549.90; total, $2,668.90. This amount covers nonlegislative work as described under (4) in Form B, as well as legislative work. Legislative work accounts for less than half of total duties. (2) Subsistence, transportation, hotel, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) Auto Workers, Ammunition and Washington Report (UAW-CIO publications). Economic Outlook (CIO publication). Antioch Review. Labor and Nation. (5) Support all bills favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Mooney, William W., 406 Bernice Building, Tacoma, Wash.; Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Received $1,145 after old age benefits and withhold tax taken out by employer. Expended for travel over parts of State for hotel, food, car, bus, and taxi fares, $317.86. (2) The $1,145 paid to William W. Mooney; the $317.86 paid out of the $1,145 for travel expense such as hotel, car, bus, taxi, and incidentals while traveling over parts of the State, which is my job. (3) To create interest in the Townsend Plan bill now in Congress. Must visit clubs, help to build stronger clubs, create morale and inform the club members of action that is being taken in Congress or over the Nation pertaining to pensions for the aged. (4) Send in articles at times to be printed in the Townsend National Weekly of 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. Also write news letters and bulletins that are mailed to the different clubs over the State. (5) Employer to travel over the States of Washington and Idaho to create interest in the Townsend Plan, Inc., bill, H. R. 2135, now in Congress.

Moore, Chester B., Western Growers Association, 606 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Regular salary as managing director of Western Growers Association, plus traveling expenses. (2) To all regular accounts of my personal and business life. (3) [Blank]. (4) Western Grower and Shipper. (5) Am paid regular salary. Not directly employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. I do oppose or support any legislation of interest to our members.

Moore, Clayton, R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Fourth and Main Streets, Winston-Salem, N. C. (1) Actual expenses incurred, $70. (Salary same as stated in first quarter of 1949 report—for full-time services as associate counsel for the purposes fully set out in registration form.) (2) Hotel, meals, and phones, $55; transportation, $15. (3) Hotel rooms, meals, phone, travel, and cab expenses. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation affecting R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.

Mopsick, Harry, 100 North Wood Avenue, Linden, N. J. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None, with the exception of news stories as carried by the Associated Press and local newspapers. (5) Extension of Federal rent control.

Morgan, George W., Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) During the quarter for which this report is made registrant received only his

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.
[6] Filed with the Clerk only.

[5] Filed for third quarter 1949.
[6] Filed with the Clerk only.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.
[6] Filed with the Clerk only.

salary and expenses. The portion of registrant's salary applicable to activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration under Public Law 601 is estimated to be less than $1,250. The portion of registrant's expenses applicable to activities in furtherance of any object necessitating such registration is estimated to be less than $33.40. (2) No expenditures except for transportation, meals, and similar out-of-pocket expenses. (3) See item (2). (4) Copy of the only issues of any publication in which the registrant caused any article or editorial to be published during the quarter for which this report is filed is annexed hereto[2] and made a part hereof. (5) The registrant is employed as president of the Association of American Ship Owners and is not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. During the period for which this report is filed the registrant did, however, support, advocate, or oppose certain bills to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and certain provisions of certain appropriation bills and during such period the registrant also advocated legislation with respect to Panama Canal tolls.

Morgan, Gerald D., and Leonard J. Calhoun, constituting the firm of Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (a) Aluminum Research Institute, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.; (b) the Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 9 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.; (c) Avon Products, Inc., 80 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.; Beauty Counselors, Inc., 17108 Mack Avenue, Grosse Pointe, Mich.; Better Brushes, Inc., Palmer, Mass.; Stanley Home Products, Inc., Westfield, Mass.; C. H. Stuart & Co., Inc., Newark, N. J.; (d) National Rehabilitation Association, 1025 Vermont Avenue, Washington; (e) National Tax Equality Association, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) (a) $806, of which $56 was expended for telephone and telegraph service; (b) $1,005.25, of which $30.25 was expended for rail and air fare for travel to New York; (c) $600 from each company listed, or a total of $3,000. No expenses. (d) $450. No expenditures; (e) $1,514.25, of which $14.25 was expended for taxies and meals on trip to Chicago. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) (1) H. R. 5327, to extend to June 30, 1950, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap; (2) legislation providing for relief from the existing 20 percent retail tax on toilet preparations; (3) firm employed to advocate and support legislation providing for extending social-security coverage to all persons gainfully employed, and in connection therewith to advocate and support coverage of the self-employed persons, who market a company's products, as self-employed persons; (4) no particular legislation. The Association is interested in any legislation affecting the vocational rehabilitation program; (5) firm retained as Washington counsel for all legal matters affecting N. T. E. A., including legal aspects of various legislative proposals relating to taxation of cooperatives and other corporations enjoying tax exemptions or special privileges.

Morris Plan Corporation of America, the, 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None received, none expended. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) The corporation in its interests and in the interests of its stockholders opposes the adoption of bank holding company legislation in the forms represented by S. 829 and H. R. 3351 of the Eightieth Congress.

Morrison, Donald S., American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts: $5,500.03 salary, plus $437.64 reimbursement of the expenditures referred to in Nos. (2) and (3). (2) Transportation and communications services, hotel accommodations, restaurants, etc. (3) Travel and business expenses connected with employment. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting shipping industry which concerns employer.

Morrow, Giles, Freight Forwarders' Institute, 1220 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $3,000. In addition received $626.96 as reimbursement for expenses incurred in conducting institute business in Washington, New York, and Chicago. (2) Taxicabs, restaurants, and hotels in Washington, New York, and Chicago; Pennsylvania Railroad, American Airlines, and Eastern Airlines. (3) Local and interstate transportation, meals, and other traveling expenses, all incurred in connection with meetings and other business of the Freight Forwarders' Institute. (4) The ICC Practitioners' Journal (editor, Freight Forwarder Section). (5) Any legislation directly affecting the freight forwarding industry.

Morse, Henry Hoyt, 99 Pearl Street, Gardner, Mass.; Institute of Cooking and Heating Appliance Manufacturers, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) No money received. (2) No money paid. (3) No work undertaken. (4) Stove Builder. (5) None.

Mosier, Harold G., Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C.; the Glenn L. Martin Co., Middle River, Baltimore, Md. (1) See attached sheet.[2] (2) See attached sheet.[2] (3) See attached sheet.[2] (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting aviation.

Mougey, William J., 200 Hill Building, Washington, D. C.; General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) Registrant is filing this quarterly report merely to avoid any technical claim of violation of the act for failure to file report. (4) None. (5) None.

Munro,[5] Walter J., Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Munro, Walter J., Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) No money received or expended in connection with legislation.

Murph, Daniel S., the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Continental Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $25 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Fertilizer News, Fertilizer Review, Agronomic Notes, and Pasture Progress, all published by the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., Washington, D. C. (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eighty-first Congress as H. R. 2756, H. R. 855, and H. R. 3045.

Murphy, Dr. Emmett J., chiropractor, 5737 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Chiropractic Insurance Co., Webster City, Iowa. (1) Salary, $100 a month. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Journal of the National Chiropractic Association. (5) All legislation adversely affecting or discriminating against National Chiropractic Insurance Co. and its policyholders.

Murphy, Ray, Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in this act. Registrant has estimated, however, that $75 received by registrant during the fourth quarter of 1949 might come within scope of act as registrant understands act has been interpreted by the Department of Justice. Registrant does not believe he has engaged in any activities in this quarter within the purview of this act. Registrant has expended no money in this quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Registrant doubts that he is employed to support or oppose legislation. However, on very infrequent occasions, he has supported or opposed legislation as it specifically affects capital stock casualty insurance and surety companies.

National Association of Real Estate Boards, its realtors, Washington committee, and its public-relations department, Chicago and Washington headquarters. (1) Schedule attached.[2] (2) Schedule attached.[2] (3) Schedule attached.[2] (4) Attached list[2] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) All legislation affecting real estate.

National Association of Stevedores, 140 Cedar Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See schedule A–1 attached.[2] (2) See schedule 2 attached.[2] (3) H. R. 858. (4) None. (5) None.

National Federaltion of Independent Business,[5] Washington office, 714 Bond Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Total receipts for Washington office, $6,630.03; total disbursements, $6,630.03. (2) General office expense. (3) Salaries, rent, retainer fee, telephone and telegraph, postage and office supplies, bills before Congress, publicity. (4) The Mandate, official publication of the National Federation of Independent Businesses, Inc. (5) Antitrust law enforcement. All laws affecting small business.

National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money received for lobbying activities. Expended, $71 on behalf of the association in regard to legislative activities. (2) Allocation of general office expenditures and salary of employees. (3) See (1) and (2). (4) None, except regular news bulletin of association and special letters to membership only. (5) Opposing S. 1008, a bill to amend the Robinson-Patman Act; opposing S. 2190, a bill to amend the Robinson-Patman Act.

National Postal Committee for Books (see registration for statement of membership of committee), room 305, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts: Contribution from American Book Publishers Council, Inc., $1,273.23. Expenditures: William E. Buckley, New York, N. Y., $18; American Book Publishers Council, New York, N. Y., $1,204.83; Messrs. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, New York, N. Y., $26,638.92; William J. Bulow, Jr., Washington, D. C., $4,337.35. (2) See answer to question 1. (3) William E. Buckley for mailing expenses; to American Book Publishers Council for messenger service, mailing charges, and other services rendered; to Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens and to William J. Bulow, Jr., for professional services and disbursements as attorneys. (4) None. (5) The committee opposes unfair increases in postal rates and discrimination in postal rates.

National Renderers Association,[5] 1424 K Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See attached tabulation.[2] (2) See attached tabulation.[2] (3) See attached tabulation.[2] (4) None. (5) None.

National Renderers Association, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See attached tabulation.[2] (2) See attached tabulation.[2] (3) See attached tabulation.[2] (4) None. (5) None.

National Retail Dry Goods Association,[5] 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See attached rider.[2] (2) See attached rider.[2] (3) See attached rider.[2] (4) The association's special bulletin, its Washington news letter, and its bulletin, News From Washington. (5) The association is not employed to

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

support or oppose legislation. However, the legislation with which this activity was and is concerned was LIFO and wage-hour legislation.

National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts amount to $375 for the printing and distribution of the booklet "This Is LIFO." (2) Expenditures: Compensation of legislation representative, John C. Hazen, 1008 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., $1,250; expense by Mr. Hazen, $237.20; total, $1,487.20. (3) See (5). (4) The association's special bulletin; its Washington news letter, and its bulletin, News From Washington. (5) The association is not employed to support or oppose legislation. However, the legislation with which this activity was and is concerned is LIFO and wage-hour legislation.

National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Approximately $500 of officers' salaries and $201.20 of National Letter expenses may be applicable. (2) Oscar R. Kreutz, executive manager of the league (salary). Batt, Bates & Co., Inc. (for National Letter). (3) Salary; printing and distributing National Letter. (4) National Letter and National Savings and Loan Journal. (5) [Blank.]

Nau, Carlton L., American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No expenditures. (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) None. (5) None.

Neal, William S., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment (Continental) building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,894.24 of which $519.24 is expense money. (2) Expense money paid to railroads, hotels, taxicab owners, and similar firms and persons. (3) Money expended for attendance at meetings, Congress of American Industry, lunches, dinners, incidentals. (4) NAM News. (5) The NAM program embracing labor regulatory legislation, basic principles of Labor-Management Act, tax revision and reduction; economy in government, maintenance of patent system, for National Science Foundation, opposed to Office of Technical Services in part, for freight absorption legislation, for ECA, opposed to ITO, opposed to price fixing and compulsory allocations.

Neel, Samuel E., 1001 Fifteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.; Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) See attached sheet.[2] (2) See attached sheet.[2] (3) See attached sheet.[2] (4) Washington News letter, published bi-weekly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; letter to members, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; the Mortgage Banker, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America. (5) Matters affecting the mortgage banking industry.

Nelson, G. W., Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank]. (3) [Blank]. (4) [Blank]. (5) No money received or expended in connection with legislation.

Nelson, George R., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Ninth and Mount Vernon Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $750, September 30, 1949, to December 31, 1949; expenses, $150, September 30, 1949, to December 31, 1949. (2) Personal. (3) Personal. (4) None. (5) None.

Nelson, Herbert U., 1737 K Street, NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Reimbursement by employer for travel expenses and per diem, $1,893.20; salary, 20 percent of time devoted to legislative activities, $1,250; total, $3,143.20. (2) See attached itemized statement.[2] (3) See attached itemized statement.[2] (4) Attached list [2] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.

Nemitz, Donald F., Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 211 Columbia Building, Fourth and Main Streets, Louisville, Ky. (1) No money was received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Neumann, Harold F., New Jersey Associated Businessmen, Inc., 112 Bowers Street, Jersey City, N. J. (1) Receipts, $214.61; expenditumes, $214.61. (2) Various. (3) Telephone calls, postage, typing and mailing, attending annual meeting in Chicago. (4) About 65 newspapers in New Jersey, which I have sent the same news releases to. I have no way of knowing which of the papers printed the releases. (5) Any laws or proposals adversely affecting business.

Nixon,[5] Russ, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.; United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,060; expenses, $300. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers, etc. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel. These expenses cover both legislative and nonlegislative activity. (4) UE News, New York Compass. (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Nixon, Russ, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.; United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,060; expenses, $30. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers, etc. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel. These expenses cover both legislative and nonlegislative activity. (4) UE News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Noble,[5] William R., National Retail Farm Equipment Association and National Retail Hardware Association, 1028 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Out-of-pocket expenses, $115.85. (2) Public transportation, telephone company, restaurants, and hotels. (3) Taxi fares, phone calls, luncheons, and hotel. (4) Farm Equipment Retailing, Hardware Retailer. (5) Have taken position on wage-and-hour legislation, taxation matters, and several minor bills.

Noble, William R., National Retail Farm Equipment Association and National Retail Hardware Association, 1028 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Out-of-pocket expenses, $62.65. (2) Public transportation, telephone company, restaurants, and hotels. (3) Taxi fares, phone calls, luncheons, and hotel. (4) Farm Equipment Retailing, Hardware Retailer. (5) Have taken position on wage-and-hour legislation, taxation matters, and several minor bills.

Noffsinger, J. S., executive secretary, National Council of Business Schools, 2601 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise, so as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest, as I may be advised.

Noffsinger, J. S., director, National Council of Technical Schools, 2601 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise, so as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest, as I may be advised.

Noffsinger, J. S., director, National Federation of Private School Associations, 2601 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $8,315 during the preceding calendar quarter; expended $3,705.06 with primary intent of influencing legislation. (2) S. I. Posner, Washington, D. C. (attorney for NFPSA) received $1,249.98 as retainer and $615.44 as expenses. District Lithographic Co., Washington, D. C., $452.20 for printing bulletins. Batt, Bates & Co., $256.58 for mailing and postage. Plymouth Printing and Duplicating Service Co., $282.84 for mailing and postage. Western Union, $442.66 for telegrams. C. & P. Telephone Co., $405.36 for phone bills. (3) The above funds were spent primarily to keep the 7,000 private schools in the United States informed regarding the status of various bills before Congress relating to the training program of GI's—especially regarding bill S. 2596. (4) None. (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise, so as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest, as I may be advised.

Noffsinger, J. S., Director, National Home Study Council, 2601 Sixteenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise, so as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest, as I may be advised.

Norgord, Christian P., 1617 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; the American Humane Association, Albany, N. Y. (1) Per diem, $592.25; expenses, $103.69; total, $695.94. (2) To railroads and local transportation companies in Washington and for lodging and subsistance. (3) As stated in (2). (4) None published. (5) H. R. 4667, H. R. 2886, S. 1821, H. R. 4737, H. R. 5208, H. R. 994, S. 1703.

Notarianni, Alfred E., Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts none. No specific compensation for these services. Covered by general contract of employment as associate counsel with Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross. Compensation under said contract will not be increased or affected by these services or this registration. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) None. (5) All proposed legislation relating to maritime and shipping matters.

Nyce, Peter Q., 1266 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money received and none expended. (2) None paid. (3) None paid. (4) None. (5) Legislation pertaining to lands of the United States.

O'Brien, John, 1 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; Arabian American Oil Company, 200 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Fees and expenses, $2,579.84. (2) No expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Proposals to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the taxation of domestic corporations doing business in foreign countries. My representation with respect to such proposed legislation terminated as of December 31, 1949.

O'Brien, John, 1 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; Riegel Textile Corp., 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $234.01, reimbursement of disbursements previously made, consisting of expenditures for transportation, meals, lodging, and telephone; expenditures, telephone, $5.94. (2) New York Telephone Co., $5.94. (3) Same as (1). (4) None. (5) Proposals for relief of work-glove manufacturers on account of payments made in settlement of controversy with Office of Price Administration.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

O'Bryan, Paul A., 600 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; National Fur Industry Tax Committee, 101 West Thirtieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Total fee of $3,000 for months of October, November, and December 1949; total expenditures of $68.89. (2) Railroads, airlines, hotels, taxicab operators. (3) General travel expense. (4) None. (5) To reduce excise tax on furs.

O'Connor, Edward H.,[6] Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary received during quarter, $3,000; remibursement for traveling expenses, $497.67. (2) Paid out $$497.67 in traveling expenses to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, and miscellaneous items of personal expense. (3) For personal traveling expenses of the undersigned incurred in carrying out my work for the Insurance Economics Society of America. No moneys expended during this quarter for lobbying activities. (4) Insurance Economics Surveys, our own monthly publication. (5) S. 5 and its companion House bills, H. R. 345 and H. R. 783; also H. R. 782, H. R. 2893, H. R. 6000, S. 1106, S. 1456, S. 1581, S. 1679.

O'Dunne, Eugene, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $2,500 compensation (making total of $5,000 for calendar year 1949); $22.47 expenditures. (2) [Blank.] (3) Taxi, telephone, mimeographing, and miscellaneous; $22.47. (4) None. (5) S. 1965 in first session, Eighty-first Congress; H. R. 1211, H. R. 5089, and H. R. 5091 in first session, Eighty-first Congress.

O'Hara, Bart W., secretary-treasurer, Colorado Associated Businessmen, Inc., 335 Symes Building, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation that may be designed to bring about tax equality concerning corporations.

Oliver, Fred N., 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; senior partner, Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., and 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Estimated $262.50 from the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks. (See appendix.[2]) Our firm is also counsel for the Railroad Security Owners' Association. There was no legislative work for that organization during the past quarter. (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) None. (5) No legislative work of any character during the last quarter.

O'Malley, Gerda T.,[5 6] Illinois Traffic Division 14, CWA, CIO, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. (1) $252.81. (2) Hotel, railway fare, telephone, and meals. (3) Reimbursement for actual expenditure. (5) Labor legislation pertinent to telephone workers.

O'Neal, Sam, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received fees amounting to $2,500 for the 3-month period; expended approximately $100 for taxicabs and other incidental expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation pertaining to postal rates and regulations.

O'Neal, Sam, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Power Distributors' Information Committee of Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth and Market Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn. (1) Received fees of $1,875 for the 3-month period; expended approximately $100 for miscellaneous expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation pertaining to public power.

O'Neill, John E., general counsel, 604 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Small Brewers' Association, 188 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received from Small Brewers' Association for salary as its general counsel the sum of $4,999.98, plus reimbursement for actual office, travel, and incidental expenses. (2) Retained for personal use; none disbursed to others. (3) No moneys received or expenses incurred or paid incidental to attempt to influence legislation. (4) None. (5) To support legislation of benefit to small brewers, in particular H. R. 2433 and S. 978.

Ottinger, Mrs. Julia M.,[6] Tennessee WCTU, 1939 Cowden Avenue, Memphis, Tenn. (1) Balance forwarded, $2.58; received from State treasurer, Mrs. E. F. Glasgow, $25; total, $27.58. (2) Post office, the Letter Shop, and national legislative department, 30 cents, total $11.85; balance forwarded, $15.73. (3) Postage, mimeographing, and petition blanks. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation seeking to reduce or prohibit the possession, use, or sale of intoxicating liquors.

Oxholm, Mrs. Theodor, volunteer worker for Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Expenditures, $40.10. (2) Railroad fare, $17.55; hotel accommodations, $11; meals, and taxis, $11.55. (3) Trip to Washington, D. C., November 29–30 to attend conference of national organizations planning for 1950 White House Conference on Children. (4) [Blank.] (5) Federal legislation affecting children and child welfare.

Palmer, Robert S., Colorado Mining Association, 204 State Office Building, Denver, Colo. (1) $480.21 traveling and actual expenses while in Washington. Registrant an attorney and State official on special work for basic industry of his State (mining). Evidently not under the act. (2) Mayflower Hotel, $192.76; stenographic services, $46; telephones and telegrams, $15.62; sundry restaurants, cabs, and incidental items, $196.50; American Air Lines, $29.33. (3) Reimbursement for expense. (4) Mimeographed leaflets. (5) Measures affecting mining and welfare of my State.

Parel, James Donald, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 109 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $210.09 expended. (See item (6) of Form B, filed December 1946.) (2) Taxis, railroads, restaurants, hotels. (3) Transportation, meals, lodging. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Economic Cooperation Administration, acreage allotments, Commodity Credit Corporation charter, reciprocal trade agreements, Federal aid to education, rural housing, rural telephones, health, displaced persons, amendments to Clark-McNary Act, postal rates, rural roads, amendment of section 7 of Clayton Act, International Wheat Agreement, social security amendments, amendments to Agricultural Act of 1948, amendment to Food and Drug Act, extension of Bankhead-Flannagan Act to Puerto Rico, amendment of Air Commerce Act to apply to animal and plant quarantine, construction of Prairie de Chien (Wis.) municipal dock and wharf, FAO site, point 4.

Parker,[5] James Perkins, National Association of Private Schools, executive offices, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See attached statement[2] and amended statement[2] filed. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Association news letter, distributed to members of the association. (5) Any legislation relating to private schools.

Parker, Lester S., 1615 Oakley Avenue, Topeka, Kans.; Communications Workers of America, CIO, 611 Pickwick Building, Kansas City, Mo. (1) None received or expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) To support all prolabor legislation; to oppose all antilabor legislation.

Paterson,[5] Chat, Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) One-fourth salary received, $937.50; one-fourth reimbursement for travel, miscellaneous, expenses, $37.50; total, $975.26. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) The President's national health program.

Patterson, Belknap & Webb, 1 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; the American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received; expended, $43.95. (2) Eastern Air Lines; taxis, telephone company. (3) Transportation expenses and telephone charges. (4) None. (5) As counsel, for the purpose of obtaining an amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act, whereby alien property in this country formerly owned by persons under persecution by an enemy government, in cases where the owner is dead and left no heirs, may be turned over to organizations for the relief of survivors.

Patton, James C., 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C., and 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; National Farmers Union (Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America), 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All major pending legislation.

Paul,[6] Randolph E., (a partner in the law firm of Paul, Weiss, Wharton & Garrison), 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass. (1) Receipts, none; expenditures, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None relating to the subject below. (5) An amendment to eliminate section 131 (b) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Payne, Albert Alford, Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,875; expenses, $397.78. (See attached[2]). (2) See attached.[2] (3) See attached.[2] (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Peer, George Sherman, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for October, November, and December 1949, $1,249.98. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Washington Situation, a weekly mimeographed news letter of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Peil,[5] Edward V., Communications Workers of America, Division No. 23, 759 North Milwaukee Street, Milwaukee, Wis. (1) $63.62 for transportation, Milwaukee to Washington and return; $53.30 for board and lodging while in Washington, D. C. (2) Transportation to Capital Airlines, lodging to Annapolis Hotel. (3) Visiting Congressmen and Senators on minimum-wage bill. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the Communications Workers of America or any of its divisions.

Peterson, William J., Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 704 Insurance Building, Madison, Wis. (1) Received my regular salary as general manager for the Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, for which I perform my regular duties as chief administrative officer of the chamber, which said duties were related only incidentally to Federal legislation. Aside from my regular salary nothing was received nor spent for the purposes of influencing Federal legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Such

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.
[6] Filed with the Clerk only.

legislation affecting business and industry generally as I may be instructed to give attention to from time to time.

Petty, Don, National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $3,750 received for services as attorney for the National Association of Broadcasters for quarter ending December 31, 1949; $939.34 received from the association as reimbursement for business expenses for same period. (2) Various railroads, air lines, taxi companies, communications companies, hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) The amounts set forth in (1) above were received and/or expended in carrying out my normal duties as general counsel handling all of the legal affairs of the National Association of Broadcasters, only a small part of which duties directly or indirectly involved Federal legislation. (4) None. (5) None. I am interested in any legislation, Federal or State, which may affect the radio-broadcasting industry.

Pierson, Albert T., the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) Salary, $1,815, and no expenses; no part of salary chargeable to lobbying work. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employer.

Pike, Albert, Jr., Life Insurance Association of America, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $22.69. (2) Expenditures confined to expenses paid by employee for travel, meals, lodging, and miscellaneous out-of-pocket expenses. (3) See answer to (2). (4) None. (5) Employed only to scrutinize Federal legislation which might affect the welfare of life-insurance policyholders and annuitants.

Pillen, Herbert G., 1339 Green Court NW., Washington, D. C.; Controlled Circulation Newspapers of America, Inc., 5309 Hamilton Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $500 for services; $161.34 for miscellaneous expenditures, as reimbursement. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad, $24.97; Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, $103.82; membership fee in American Trade Association Executives, $11.66; balance telephone and telegraph and postage charges. (3) As indicated above. (4) None. (5) Phases of social-security amendments, postal-rate bill.

Pittman & Roberts, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners Association, Austin, Tex. (1) Receipts: Four monthly retainers at $1,000, $4,000. Expenses: Notary fee, 50 cents; taxi fares, $41.70; telephone, $22.36; Chatterbox Club, $41.50; Waldron Flowers, $34.40. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) In support of amendment to the Natural Gas Act of 1938, H. R. 1758 and S. 1498.

Poole, Rufus G., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; employed by Bell, Jones & Taylor, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York City; the principles whom Bell, Jones & Taylor represent are S. H. Kress & Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York City; McCrory Stores Corp., 1107 Broadway, New York City; W. T. Grant Co., 1441 Broadway, New York City; McLellan Stores Co., 55 Fifth Avenue, New York City; J. J. Newberry Co., 245 Fifth Avenue, New York City; H. L. Green Co., Inc., 902 Broadway, New York City. (1) $2,000 on account of legal fees and $4.65 on account of expenses. (2) Taxi fares in the amount of $4.65 were advanced by registrant and billed to and paid by Bell, Jones & Taylor during the fourth quarter. In addition, telephone, taxi fares, special stenographic, and other actual expenses in the amount of $95.19 advanced by registrant during third quarter were billed to and paid by Bell, Jones & Taylor during fourth quarter. (3) Taxi fares. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation with respect to Fair Labor Standards Act.

Poole, Rufus G., 1825 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Automobile Dealers Association, 1026 Seventeenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,500 on account of legal fees and $36.44 on account of expenses. (2) Telephone calls, taxi fares, and miscellaneous office expenses in the amount of $32.01 advanced by registrant during the third quarter were billed to and paid by National Automobile Dealers Association during the fourth quarter. In addition, telephone calls, taxi fares, and meals expenses in the amount of $36.44 were advanced by registrant and billed to and paid by National Automobile Dealers Association during the fourth quarter. (3) Telephone calls, taxi fares, and meals. (4) [Blank.] (5) Labor legislation affecting retail automobile dealers.

Poole, Rufus G., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Western Conference National Park Concessioners, 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) $236.25 on account of expenses. (2) Telephone and telegraph expenditures, taxi fares, other transportation expenditures, and other actual expenses in the amount of $236.25 were advanced by registrant and will be billed to and paid by Western Conference National Park Concessioners. (3) Telephone calls, telegrams, taxi fares, air transportation, and meals. (4) [Blank.] (5) Wage-and-hour legislation affecting concessioners in the national parks.

Pope, Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; California Fruit Growers Exchange and California Walnut Growers Association, both of Los Angeles, Calif.; Northwest Nut Growers of Dundee, Oreg.; California Almond Growers Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.; and California Grape and Tree Fruit League, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Receipts, $2,974.68; disbursements, $18.35. (2) Western Union, $1.63; postage, $5.72; Batt Bates Co., $11; total, $18.35. (3) Telegrams, postage, and mimeographing. (4) None. (5) Same as October.

Posner, Stanley I., 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.; National Institute of Diaper Services et al. (1) Kex National Association: Fees, none; expenses, $123.60. National Institute of Diaper Services: Fees, $1,249.98; expenses, $433.69. Institute of Industrial Launderers: Fees, $1,500; expenses, $1,269.30. Linen Supply Association of America: Fees, $1,500; expenses, $341.17. National Council of Technical Schools: Fees, none; expenses, none. National Council of Business Schools: Fees, none; expenses, none. National Federation of Private School Associations: Fees, $1,249.98; expenses, $615.44. (2) Miscellaneous commercial accounts. (3) Taxis, railroad, mimeographing, telephone, telegrams, and similar purposes. (4) Mimeographed bulletins of Linen Supply Association and Institute of Industrial Launderers. Also Linen Supply News and Industrial Launderer. (5) Labor legislation on behalf of Linen Supply Association, Institute of Industrial Launderers, National Institute of Diaper Services. Veterans' training program on behalf of National Council of Technical Schools, National Council of Business Schools, and National Federation of Private School Associations.

Poston, Robert R., 734 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $625 monthly salary, less withholding and social-security taxes; $43.44 reimbursement for travel and expenses to Hartford, Conn.; $8.20 incidental expenses (taxis). (2) Robert R. Poston. (3) Incidental expenses and travel as listed under (1) above. (4) The American Legion Magazine, New York, N. Y.; the National Legislative Bulletin, Washington, D. C. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; and the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discrminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Poulton, James E., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Ninth and Mount Vernon Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Powell, Bolling R., Jr., 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American International Underwriters Corp. and other insurance companies associated in the American International Co., Inc., group retain our law firm, a partnership doing business as Law Offices Paul V. McNutt, to represent them generally in all legal matters. (1) No money has been received or expended by affiant for the purpose of supporting or opposing legislation during the preceding calendar quarter. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Powell, E. Henry, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.; partner, Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, and 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant devoted none of his time during the quarter to purposes mentioned in the Lobbying Act and, therefore, none of his compensation is attributable to such purposes. He received $76.64 from the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks through Oliver & Donnally as reimbursement for actual expenses of traveling performed in preceding calendar quarter. (2) See (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) Any legislation which the mutual savings banks have a legitimate interest in supporting or opposing.

Prentice, Howard A., 1329 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Tinkham & Tinkham, 3 East Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $2.06 as miscellaneous expenses. (2) Notary public, $2; postage, 6 cents. (3) Notarizing quarterly report, postage. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Press, William H., Washington Board of Trade, 204 Evening Star Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,000 salary, $341.60 expenses. (2) Miscellaneous taxi and transportation, $184.70; miscellaneous luncheons, $48.22; miscellaneous expenses of visitors, $59.99; miscellaneous travel expenses, $35.69; Christmas gifts, $13. (3) Normal operating expenses. (4) Releases sent to Washington Post, Times-Herald, the Evening Star, Washington Daily News. (5) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia.

Pretzman, Allen I., 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio; Scioto-Sandusky Conservancy District, 553 East Town Street, Columbus, Ohio. (1) $82.40. (2) Transportation (TWA), $41.70; meals, $17.30; Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., $15; miscellaneous, $8.40. (3) Trip to Washington, D. C., for conference with Director of the Bureau of the Budget. (4) None. (5) In support of appropriation of funds for Rocky Fork flood-control project, Ohio.

Pritchard, E. Anthony, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Lead Co., 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) All money received by this registrant was for salary and expenses in connection with his duties as assistant to the manager of the Washington office of the National Lead Cc. Impossible to segregate amount for legislative activities. Only $15 was expended during fourth quarter 1949 on legislative work. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Western Union Telegraph Co., various garages, taxicabs, and restaurants. (3) Telephone calls, telegrams, transportation, and meals. (4) None. (5) Legislation effecting the operation of the National Lead Co., including the manufacture and sale of its products.

Proctor, Harry E., attorney at law, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $3,500 paid the registrant as salary by Oliver & Donnally. (2) No expenditures. (3) None. (4) The registrant contributed articles for the October, November, and December issues of Mutual Savings Banking, a trade publication of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks. (5) The registrant studied, analyzed, and reported upon a number of bills pertaining to banks, savings and loan associations, taxes, railroads, veterans, and housing.

Producers Council, Inc., 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Exhibits A through C attached.[2] The Producers Council, Inc., is an organization established in 1928. The purpose as stated by the charter of incorporation are attached hereto as exhibit D.[2] In view of the uncertain interpretation of certain provisions of the Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946 concerning what constitutes "principal purpose" and the phrase "to influence directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of any legislation, etc.," we are filing this form giving a full disclosure of the information as required under the act. (2) See item 1 above. (3) As indicated by items on attached exhibits.[2] (4) Technical Bulletin, Producers' Council News, press releases, and certain informative, economic, and technical studies. (5) None.

Proffitt, George W., National Apartment Owners Association, Inc., 730 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $200 per year (approximate). (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Rent control and public-housing legislation.

Purves, Edmund R., executive director, the American Institute of Architects, 1741 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None except salary for this period, which amounted to $3,750. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation in relation to the architectural profession.

Putt,[10] C. J., the Achison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans. (1) None preceding calendar quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None preceding calendar quarter.

Quaal, Ward L., Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Although only a portion of his activities came within the purview of the Lobbying Act, registrant reports herewith all receipts and expenditures. Receipts, gross salary, $3,791.62 ($541.66 on Octber 1, October 18, November 2, November 17, December 1, December 16, and December 31).* Expenditures reimbursed by employer, $1,353.93 ($202.54 on October 1, $143.17 on October 18, $249.36 on November 2, $246.28 on November 17, $49.64 on December 1, $138.66 on December 16, and $324.28 on December 31). (2) Expenditures paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph companies, trade associations, clubs, etc. (3) For expenses incurred in course of employment as director of CCBS, such as travel, meals, and entertainment. (4) None. (5) S. 491 and H. R. 4004, to limit the power of broadcast stations to duplicate clear channels.

Quigley, Frank, 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $656.91. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad, Washington to New York and return, $24.68; Southern Railway, Washington to Atlanta, Ga., $33.29; Metropolitan Club, Washington, D. C., $79.12; Belmont Plaza Hotel, New York, $11.92; and to taxicabs, hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) Conferences with representatives of telephone industry and others regarding matters of general information and public relations. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2960 (Mr. POAGE), S. 1254 (Mr. HILL et al.), as introduced and any legislation primarily affecting Bell Telephone companies including war-excise taxes on communications.

Quinlan, William A., Associated Retail Bakers of America et al., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (See exhibit B, attached.) (1) See exhibit A,[2] attached. (2) See exhibit A.[2] (3) See exhibit A.[2] (4) Gave information and suggestions to Bakers' Weekly and Bakers' Helper; also prepared press releases for various trade papers, and association bulletin material. (5) Legislation if any which may be of interest to clients employing the undersigned on general retainers.

Radner, William, Frank J. Zito, Robert F. Donoghue, Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; Coastwise Line, 150 Sansome Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at present.

Radner, Zito & Donoghue (the firm members and associates are William Radner, Frank J. Zito, Odell Kominers, Robert F. Donoghue, J. Franklin Fort, Mary L. Schleifer and William F. Ragan), 529 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; Pacific Maritime Association (formerly Waterfront Employers Association of the Pacific Coast), 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) $750, representing compensation at the rate of $250 per month, October-December 1949. (2) Radner, Zito & Donoghue. (3) Compensation for work done by firm members or associates. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting maritime industry, particularly in relation to wage-and-hour law.

Raesly, Leon, Leon Raesly Organization, Inc., 1218 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,100 and assigned under agreement to Leon Raesly Organization, Inc. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) S. 2068 and S. 2069.

Ragland, Edward F., Associated Tobacco Manufacturers, 104–105 Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None, but am interested in any legislation affecting tobacco industry.

Rains,[6] Alan T., United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 2017 S Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Various articles have been prepared and published in trade periodicals, association yearbooks on marketing subjects, none dealing specifically with legislative matters. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation.

Ramsey, DeWitt C., Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Nothing received except salary and expenses, no part of which was paid for activities covered by Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. No expenditures. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

Ramsey, Donald J., Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See schedules A[2] and B.[2] (2) See schedule A.[2] (3) See schedule A.[2] (4) Silver news letter. (5) Legislation affecting the silver-using industry.

Ramspeck, Robert, Air Transport Association of America, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received no compensation other than regular salary, $5,750, for calendar quarter. Expended 80 cents. (2) Taxicab fare. (3) Transportation to United States Capitol. (4) None. (5) Legislation for the proper advancement of the air-line industry in the public interest. Specific legislation suported and opposed during this quarter, H. R. 5356, amendment of Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 subjecting Air Carriers to Wage-Hour Provisions.

Rankin, J. Lee, Beghtol & Rankin, a partnership, 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation designed to bring about equality of taxation between private business and cooperatives.

Ray, L. S., 2015 Ranier Drive, Silver Spring, Md.; The Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars(1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $250. (2) Myself. (3) Salary. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting disabled emergency officers.

Reck, Jacob, National Beauty and Barbers Manufacturers' Association, National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Repeal of tax on cosmetics sold at retail and used in beauty and barber shops.

Reckord, Milton A., National Rifle Association, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No activity whatever from date of last report to this date. This is my final report. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Rector, Stanley,[5] Unemployment Benefit Advisers, Inc., 506 Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C. (1) $5,000 as salary for third quarter for duties as legislative director of Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc. (2) No money paid except for expenses, for which I am reimbursed. Expenses reported by employing corporation. (3) [Blank.] (4) The Adviser. (5) Social security and related legislation.

Reed, Otie M., National Milk Producers Federation, formerly National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington. (1) Gross salary for the quarter, $1,949.98; expended $42.30 for taxi fars. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Reeves, Albert L., Jr. (final report, see letter of termination[2]); C. Jasper Bell, 904 Bryant Building, Kansas City, Mo. (1) None. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) None. (5) H. R. 4064, a private relief bill (Carden & Herd).

Albert L. Reeves, Jr. (final report, see letter of termination[2]) (acting on behalf of Bernard Peyton and Bernard Peyton, executor, estate of Anne Peyton, deceased, Prettybrook Road, Princeton, N. J.); Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) Not ap-

*In connection with registrant's gross salary reported in the quarterly report filed July 11, 1949, registrant received a gross total of $541.66 on May 9, May 23, June 4, and June 16, rather than $541.82.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[10] Filed with the Secretary only.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[6] Filed with the Clerk only.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

plicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5045, H. R. 5398, H. R. 5268.

Albert L. Reeves, Jr. (acting on behalf of United States Lines, Farrell Lines, Inc., American President Lines, Ltd., American Export Lines, Inc., Grace Lines, Inc., Lykes Brothers Steamship Co., Inc.); Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, none. No specific compensation for these services. Covered by general contract of employment as associate counsel with Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross. Compensation under said contract will not be increased or affected by these services or this registration. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) None. (5) All proposed legislation relating to maritime and shipping matters.

Reeves, Albert L., Jr., Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5564, a private relief bill (Wilcox Electric Co.).

Reilly, Gerard D., 1401 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $7,867.01. No expenditures. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Bills relating to the Labor-Management Relations Act, including S. 249 and H. R. 2032.

Reilly, Gerard D., Tower Building, 1401 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Pond Creek Pocahontas Co., Huntington, W. Va. (1) Received from Pond Creek Pocahontas Co. of Huntington, W. Va., $250 retainer as labor consultant, for which legislative work is incidental, and expended $13. (2) (a) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $11.40; (b) Taxis, $1.60. (3) (a) Long distance calls and wires, (b) local transportation. (4) None. (5) Bills relating to Labor-Management Relations Act including S. 249 and H. R. 2032.

Reilly, Gerard D., Union Employers Section, Printing Industry of America, Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) I did not do any legislative work for Union Employers Section, Printing Industry of America, during the past quarter and therefore I assume that it is unnecessary to file form C. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) (See (1). (5) See (1).

Reinhold, James P., 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary for fourth calendar quarter 1949, same as reported on form C filed by me January 10, 1949, for services as representative of president of the A. T. & S. F. Railway Co. No money was received or expended by me during fourth calendar quarter for purposes covered in the act. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interest of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.

Rhodes,[10] Hubert M., 3308 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1342 East Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis. (1) Registrant is a regular employee of the Credit Union National Association, Inc. and receives no additional compensation for service on legislative work. The amount received and expended by him was $7.10. (2) Telephone calls, 20 cents; notary public, 50 cents; fares to various taxicabs, $6.40; total, $7.10. (3) Telephone calls to Congressmen, trips to offices of Congressmen, and notarizing lobbying report for quarter ended September 30, 1949. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting credit unions.

Rice, Richard M., Wisconsin Associated Businessmen, Inc., 231 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting business.

[10] Filed with the Secretary only.

Richards, D. D.,[6] 1238 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Mail Order Association of America, 1061 West Thirty-fifth Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None specifically.

Riepma, Siert F., National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any margarine legislation.

Rigby,[5 6] Scott G., Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $346.84. (2) [Blank.] (3) $334.34 traveling expenses; $12.50 entertainment. (4) None. (5) All legislation relating to postal laws and regulations.

Riggle, John J., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for October, November, and December 1949, $2,125.98. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Foreign Trade Memo, a mimeographed résumé of foreign trade regulations and activities of the Federal Government; distributed to members of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. Legislative Digest, a mimeographed résumé of action taken on bills introduced in Congress; distributed to members of National Council of Farmer Cooperatives only. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Riley, George D., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for October, November, and December, $2,210; expenses for October, November, and December, $94.40. (2) Taxi drivers, phone company, when not at office, and other incidentals. (3) Same as in No. 2. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting labor.

Rising, E. W., 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Western Beet Growers Association, Great Falls, Mont.; National Water Conservation Conference, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) (a) Western Beet Growers Association, Great Falls, Mont., $603.94; (b) National Water Conservation Conference, Philadelphia, Pa., $1,019.49. (2) (a) E. W. Rising's personal time, $315; stamped envelopes, $25.72; railroad fare, $178.76; office rent, $30; telephone, $0.50; hotel rooms, meals, and miscellaneous traveling expenses, $53.96; (b) stenographer, $759.57; printing, $61.60; postage, $86.03; telephone, $32.77; stationery, $72.28; cab fare, $0.80; Western Union, $6.44. (3) (a) In connection with information service furnished members on matters of interest to growers of sugar beets; (2) in connection with information service furnished members on development and conservation of natural resources and in preparation for national conference held at Chicago, Ill., September 21 to 23, 1949. (4) None during the last quarter of 1949. (5) (a) Legislation of interest to growers of sugar beets; (b) legislation in connection with development and conservation of land and water resources; tidelands legislation; and regional and valley authorities.

Risser,[5] Donald A., 2404 North Seventy-first Street, Milwaukee, Wis.; Communications Workers of America, Division 23, 759 North Milwaukee Street, Milwaukee, Wis. (1) No activity. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the Communications Workers of America or any of its divisions.

Rivers,[5] T. E., National Recreation Association, 315 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) During the quarter ending September 30, 1949, I neither received nor expended any funds. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.
[6] Filed with the Clerk only.

Rivers, T. E., National Recreation Association, 315 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) During the quarter ending December 31, 1949, I neither received nor expended any funds. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Robb, George Mackay, 121 Warner Avenue, Syracuse, N. Y.; Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Advanced as expense money from Dr. A. J. McFarland, $20; advanced as expense money from J. S. Tibby, treasurer, $73.53. (2) United States Post Office for postage, $84.75; stationery items, $1.12; express, $6.10; telephone and telegrams, $12.21. (3) Above expenditures represent the cost of steering 31 sets of broadcast records concerning the proposed Christian Amendment to upwards of 80 radio stations in Pennsylvania, New York, and the New England States in October and November 1949. Program contained on said records was broadcast as a public service, and we did not have to pay anything for the time. (4) None in any publications. Broadcasts were given in some 80 radio stations, as indicated above in item 3. (5) House Joint Resolution 181, which proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States making a divine acknowledgment.

Robbins, Paul H., National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 Fifteenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary $500, and expenses $50, for October, November, December 1949 for attention to legislative matters. (2) Regular office and travel expenses. (3) As executive director, National Society of Professional Engineers. (4) American Engineer; Legislative Bulletin, National Society of Professional Engineers. (5) All legislation affecting the welfare of professional engineers.

Roberts,[5] Dr. R. Orman, Temple Methodist Church, 1290 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) From Temple Methodist Church, regular salary, $1,150; from Temple Methodist Church, for expenses, $555.40. (2) Room hotel, $230; telephone, $23.91; meals, etc., $215.45; railroad and pullman fares, $85.04; to R. Orman Roberts, salary, $1,150. (3) [Blank]. (4) None. (5) This concludes my activities and is my last report.

Rogers,[5] R. L., Communications Workers of America (CIO), Northwestern Division, No. 45, 2202 Douglas Street, Omaha, Nebr. (1) Expenses, $485.50; salary, $618.14. (2) Normal living expenses plus railroad, air line, hotel, restaurants, taxis, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform the normal functions of my positions with Communications Workers of America (CIO) Northwestern Division No. 45, none of which were related to legislative activities. (4) None. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the Communications Workers of America (CIO) within Northwestern Division No. 45.

Rogers, R. L., 2202 Douglas Street, Omaha, Nebr. (1) Expenses, $62.41; salary, $78. The fourth quarterly report is being filed at this time for the reason that effective this date, November 14, 1949, I am no longer serving as a lobbyist. (2) Normal living expenses plus railroad, air line, hotel, restaurants, taxis, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform the normal functions of my positions with Communications Workers of America (CIO) Northwestern Division No. 45, none of which were related to legislative activities. (4) None. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the Communications Workers of America (CIO) within Northwestern Division No. 45.

Rogers, Watson, president, National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money received for lobbying activities specifically. Paid an

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

annual salary for serving as president and chief administrative officer of the association. No money expended during the last quarter. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Rowe, Roland H., United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 400 Continental Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money was received or expended by the undersigned for the purpose of influencing Federal legislation except $27 (9 hours estimated, at $3 per hour) as part of annual salary of $5,780 received by the undersigned as vice president and secretary of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., allocable to the preparation of the following documents in which Federal legislation was advocated, opposed or mentioned, or other activity; Bulletins, news letters, letters to or conference with Members of Congress and others on S. 1008 (basing-point bill), S. 2190 (amending brokerage clause of Robinson-Patman Act), FEPC legislation, taxing untaxed grocery co-ops, repeal of margarine taxes. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Washington News Letter and other releases of United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc. (5) Any and all legislation that affects the welfare of wholesale grocers.

Rudy, John Forney, National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $100 received as salary from National Federation of American Shipping during fourth quarter 1949 allocable to legislative activities; and $136.96 for lunches and entertainment. (2) Restaurants and dining rooms. (3) Lunches and entertainment. (4) None. (5) As director of public relations am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation.

Rule, Gordon W., Committee for World Travel, Inc., room 427, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money received or expended during the preceding calendar quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) See memorandum attached to Form B on file in your office.

Rule, Gordon W., Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass., room 427, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $280 fee and $4.70 out-of-pocket disbursements for work done for the company. In addition $2.16 has been expended for telephone calls. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Retained in connection with a proposed amendment to the Internal Revenue Code relating to the foreign tax credit.

Rule, Gordon W., room 427, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Miss Cathryn A. Glesener, 1126 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) None received. Following amount expended for notary and taxicabs, $7.40. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Retained in connection with private companion bills S. 469 and H. R. 3325 of the Eighty-first Congress for the relief of Miss Cathryn A. Glesener.

Rumely, Edward A., Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) I receive my salary, commissions, and expenses, as reported on earlier Form B. The corporation has reported its disbursements separately on Form A. (2) Disbursements were corporation disbursements and are reported separately on Form A. (3) [Blank.] (4) We never pay to have news articles printed but issue news releases, some of which are reprinted, and of these I have no record. (5) I am not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing legislation. Sometimes the committee trustees take a stand for or against an issue (on legislation) where they think a constitutional principle is involved. Then I distribute educational material on the question.

Rush, Charles J., Washington Real Estate Board, 1417 K Street NW, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $708.32 per month as executive secretary. (2) None paid out. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Measures affecting the ownership and operation of real estate.

Russell, Francis M., National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 724 Fourteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C. (1) $263.25 expended for matters relating to legislation. (2) See (3). (3) Telephone and telegraph, taxi fares, entertainment. (4) None. (5) As a part of registrant's duties as vice preseident in charge of Washington office of National Broadcasting Co., Inc., including operation of the company's radio stations in Washington, registrant may engage in activities relating to legislation affecting radio communication companies.

Russell, Horace, 7 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.; United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received retainer at the rate of $11,000 per annum, only a small portion of which is for legislative activity. Incurred no expenses. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Contents of Legal Bulletin of the United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (5) Legislation affecting the savings and loan business.

Ryan, M. O., 1405 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary for quarter, $3,550. October 1 to December 31, 1949, including total personal expenses for taxis, lunches, and dinners, phones, etc., in Washington, D. C., were $714.63, of which insignificant amount was for activities related in any way to lobbying. (2) Taxis, Washington restaurants and hotels. (3) Transportation, lunches, and dinners. (4) Organizational bulletins for American Hotel Association. (5) Any legislation affecting hotel industry.

St. Clair,[5] Labert, Stran Steel Division, Great Lakes Co. et al., 2633 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received from Stran Steel Division, Great Lakes Steel Co., Detroit, Mich., $1,875; National Automobile Dealers Association, Washington, D. C., $1,250; International Paper Co., New York City, $3,750. (2) See (1). (3) Fees for personal representation. (4) None. (5) Anything of interest to clients.

Sands, Charles E., 4211 Second Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, 528 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) $2,720, salary and expenses; only a portion of my time is devoted to legislative work. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) We support all labor legislation on the A. F. of L. program, oppose all antilabor legislation as opposed by A. F. of L.

Sasuly, Elizabeth, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Food, Tobacco, Agricultural and Allied Workers Union of America, CIO, 158 North Twentieth Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Salary, $337.50 (for months of October and November 1949; on leave as of December 1, 1949); expenses, $662.19 (see above explanation). (2) Air lines, railroads, hotels, and restaurants while traveling, taxi fares, etc. (3) See (2). (4) FTA News, publication of Food, Tobacco, Agricultural and Allied Workers Union of America, CIO. (5) Support all legislation advancing the interests of organized labor and the American people generally; oppose undemocratic legislation against their interests.

Sasuly, Elizabeth, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, CIO, 431 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $375 (for months of October and November 1949; on leave as of December 1, 1949); expenses, $30 (see above explanation). (2) Air lines, railroads, hotels and restaurants while traveling, taxi fares, etc. (3) See (2). (4) The Union, publication of International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, CIO. (5) Support all legislation advancing the interests of organized labor and the American people generally; oppose undemocratic legislation against their interests.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

Saunders, Stuart T., Norfolk & Western Railway Co., 801 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va. (1) Have received $35 from Norfolk & Western Railway Co., Roanoke, Va., for reimbursement of expenses, all of which was expended during the preceding calendar quarter. These expenses were incurred in Washington, D. C., on November 2 and 3, 1949. (2) Carlton Hotel (restaurant) and Occidental Restaurant, Washington, D. C.; taxicab companies; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.; tips, etc. (3) Food and other incidental expenses. (4) None. (5) Proposed canalization of Big Sandy River and its tributaries in States of Kentucky and West Virginia.

Saylor, Richard D., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Lead Co., 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) All money received by this registrant was for salary and expenses in connection with his duties as manager of the Washington office of the National Lead Co.; impossible to segregate amount for legislative activities. Only $30 was expended during fourth quarter, 1949, on legislative work. (2) Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Co., Western Union Telegraph Co., Weaver Bros., Inc., Chas. G. Stott & Co., Inc., various garages, taxicabs, and hotels. (3) Office rent, telephone service, telegrams, office supplies, transportation, and meals. ((4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the operation of the National Lead Co., including the manufacture and sale of its products.

Schell, S. D., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) As an over-all annual average, approximately $300 for the quarter of total salary may be averaged as allocable to matters relating to pending legislation. (2) No expenditures during the quarter with respect to any legislative matters. (3) No expenditures. (4) None. (5) Have continued interest in all legislation relating to development and maintenance of a strong, privately owned American merchant marine.

Schoen, Paul W., Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, post-office box 692, Valdosta, Ga. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Forestry legislation applicable or affecting private timberland owners.

Schoene, Freehill, Kramer & Davis, a law partnership composed of Lester P. Schoene, Joseph H. Freehill, Milton Kramer, and John F. Davis, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) None received or expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) All written materials are delivered to the client and dissemination is entirely in the client's control. (5) Railroad retirement and unemployment-insurance matters.

Schoenhals, E. L., Tax Equality League of Utah, 915 Kearns Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) Received from Tax Equality League of Utah for use of my law office, stenographic services, traveling, telegrams, air express, secretarial services, phone, luncheon, etc., $292.56. (2) To my secretary, Jean Mullen; for office rent; United Air Lines; Western Union; Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph; etc. (3) To maintain my office, receive phone calls from members, and carry on correspondence with members of the organization; to travel. (4) Deseret News, Salt Lake Tribune, and Salt Lake Telegram have carried news items only, no paid advertising. (5) To obtain tax equality.

Schulberg, Hilliard, Washington (D. C.) Retail Liquor Dealers' Association, Inc., 840 Woodward Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D C. (1) Received $1,500,

salary, October-December; $108.59 reimbursed for expenses, October-December. (2) Hilliard Schulberg. (3) Salary and expenses. (4) Letters to the editors of the daily papers, association bulletins. (5) Legislation pertaining to the alcoholic-beverage industry in the District of Columbia.

Scott, Jack Garrett, National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No receipts except annual retainer for general legal services as shown in registration statement; no expenditures for legislative purposes. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Generally all legislation affecting the intercity motorbus industry.

Scott, John W., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Harvey B. Jacobson et al. (1) None other than salary received at the total monthly rate of $300 from Harvey B. Jacobson. No expenditures made. (2) Does not apply. (3) Does not apply. (4) None. (5) As previously stated in my registration statement. (NOTE.—The firms of McMorrow, Berman & Davidson, Victor J. Evans & Co., Patrick D. Beavers, and John N. Randolph are attempting to cancel contracts of employment with me, and they are not currently paying me any sum of money.)

Scott, Vernon, and Schuler, Loring A., constituting the partnership of Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, organization and industry counselors, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The firm of Scott & Schuler received $1,666.66 from National Associated Businessmen, Inc., as retainer fee. The amount of $21 was spent for purposes that might fall within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Taxi drivers. (3) For taxicabs in going from National Associated Businessmen, Inc., office to House and Senate Office Buildings and the Capitol. (4) Hardware consultant and contractor. (5) Legislation causing the Government to engage in business activities in competition with private companies and legislation dealing with the taxation of various types of business corporations.

Scott, William C. (report as attorney for American Nurses' Association), 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; American Nurses' Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts: $3,111.54 for legal fees and disbursements paid to Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens for services by firm as counsel in all capacities. Expenditures: No expenditures for legislative purposes during said period. (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) No articles or editorials relating to legislation during the above period. (5) Legislation relating to nurses, nursing, or health, on which the American Nurses' Association has taken a stand, including the question of amendments to the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.

Scott, William C. (report as attorney for National Postal Committee for Books), 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts of firm of Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, of which I am a member, are reported in the report of Mr. Ethelbert Warfield. Expenditures: Taxicab fares, $1.55. (2) To various taxicab companies. (3) For transportation. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to postage rates on books.

Sears, W. J., 715 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.; Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) I neither engaged in any legislative activity during the quarter ended December 31, 1949, nor incurred any expenses for that purpose. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Excise tax on tires and any legislation which might be introduced relative to controls on rubber.

See, Harry, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) No money received or expended in connection with legislation.

Selby,[5] John A., member of law firm of Baker, Selby & Ravenel, 730 Fifteenth Street, Washington, D. C. (1) Baker, Selby & Ravenel, the law firm of which I am a partner, is employed by the Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., on an annual basis. The services that we perform are general and they include representation for the association before such Government agencies as the State Department, Department of Agriculture, Department of Commerce, War Assets Administration, Bureau of Internal Revenue, etc. We receive for such services an annual retainer of $5,000, payable quarterly. No portion of any payment received from the association has been or can be readily allocated to such services as we have rendered on matters relating to legislation in which the association is interested. (2) There have been no disbursements by me or the other members of the law firm of which I am a member, of moneys received under our contract of services with the Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc. (3) [Blank]. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the cigar industry.

Selvage & Lee (in Washington, Selvage, Lee & Bledsoe, 1730 I Street NW.), 1 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y.; National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Fee of $6,000 plus expenses as shown below. (2) Printing, mimeographing, postage, telephone, press clippings, traveling expense, supplementary staff, etc., $7,020.56. (The above items were billed to the National Association of Margarine Manufacturers and reported by them in their quarterly report.) (3) Publicity and lobbying actively in connection with the repeal of discriminatory legislation affecting margarine. (4) We did all within our power to disseminate information favorable to margarine and to the legislation which would remove unfair restrictions on margarine but cannot say categorically that we caused any articles to be published or any radio comment. (5) As above.

Shaw, A. Manning, Brown, Land & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, $3,650, Expenses reported by registrant Brown, Land & Fitzgerald. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Any legislation that might affect the members of the National Association of Electric Companies.

Shaw, Mark R., 114 Trenton Street, Melrose, Mass.; National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NE., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, covering 6-month period, $1,200; traveling expenses, $108; total, $1,308. (2) Railroads, gas stations, hotels, restaurants. (3) Travel to speaking dates, committees, conferences, Washington office. (4) Bulletins of the NCPW, Boston Herald. (5) Universal military training, Peacetime selective service, Military aid to Europe and China (oppose); economic aid to Europe and Asia, admission of more displaced persons, (favor); other measures related to issues of war and peace.

Shepherd, Bruce E., Life Insurance Association of America, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $35.95. (2) Expendituress confined to expenses paid by employee for travel, meals, lodging, and miscellaneous out-of-pocket expenses. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) Employed only to scrutinize Federal legislation which might affect the welfare of life-insurance policyholders and annuitants.

Shield, W. Lee, American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

[5] Filed for third quarter 1949.

Shields, Robert H., United States Beet Sugar Association, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None; report subject to the qualifications stated in my registration of February 7, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Interested in legislation affecting sugar but not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation.

Shryock, Col. T. J., Remington Rand, Inc., 1615 L Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See (5). (2) See (5). (3) See (5). (4) None (5) I have engaged in no legislative activities during the months of October, November, and December 1949.

Sifton, Paul, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, CIO, 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary, $1,200; expenses, $1,130.61; total, $2,330.61. (2) Subsistence, transportation, hotel, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) The Auto Worker. (5) Support all bills favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Sifton,[5] Paul, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of Americafi CIO, 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary, $1,200; expenses, $1,281.42; total, $2,481.42. (2) Subsistence, transportation, hotel, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) The Auto Worker. (5) Support all bills favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Simon, William, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.; The Council for Clarification of Pricing Practices, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money received during prior quarter except as reimbursement for expenses as itemized in answer to question (2). No disbursements (not including normal office overhead of registrant's law firm) made during quarter except as reimbursed and shown in answer to question (2). (2) To Mayflower Hotel (including long-distance calls from Washington), $414.91; to railroads for transportation, $472.36; to air lines for transportation, $249.44; to Illinois Bell Telephone Co. and Western Union for telephone calls and telegrams from Chicago, $283.86; to miscellaneous travel expenses (meals, taxicabs, etc.), $261.88; to Berger & Wagoner for photostat work, $8.60. (3) See (2). (4) Registrant has made several speeches on the subject of competitive freight absorption and good-faith competition which have been reproduced in whole or in part by others but never at his request, direction, or suggestion. Registrant has reproduced speeches by him but not for publication in any publication. (5) Legislation permitting competitive freight absorption and delivered prices and good-faith competition.

Slipher, Stephen, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received and expended, 80 cents. Also received salary of $1,750, of which an estimated 40 percent ($700) is for legislative work. (2) Various taxis. (3) Transportation in Washington. (4) Assisted in preparation of certain items for confidential bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting housing, thrift, home ownership, and savings and loan associations.

Smart, Miss Elizabeth A., National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill. (1) Received $278.08. Received and paid out $425.74. (2)

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

Baltimore & Ohio and Pennsylvania Railroads, traveling expense; Mrs. Annalee Stewart; Government Printing Office; E. Morrison Paper Co.; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.; Nazarene Church; post office; Royal Typewriter Co.; Western Union; Congressman Bryson; drug store; Washington Post; cleaners and painters. (3) Railroad tickets; collecting information and writing a Washington letter; copy liquor laws and renewal subscription to Current Business; 1 quart ink, mimeo paper; phone and calls; letter opener; postage; repairs; telegrams; copies his speech; magazines and newspapers; subscription; doing over office; tips and Christmas presents. (4) The Union Signal. (5) Legislation dealing with alcoholic beverages, motion pictures, radio, children, women in industry, peace and international relations, narcotics, gambling, social hygiene, interracial relations.

Smith, Allen L., Louisiana Tax Equality Association, Inc., Post Office Box 1526, Baton Rouge, La. (1) No money received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To support any legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to improve basic taxation principles providing for removal of tax disparities between competitors.

Smith, Anthony W., Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Portion of salary allocable to legislative employment, $75. This is computed as stated in registration statement at $300 a year. Contributions by Congress of Industrial Organizations, totaling $832, see (2). (2) National Committee on Resources, 312 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C. (3) Salary received in compensation for legislative work as above. Contributions by Congress of Industrial Organizations to National Committee on Resources are for general purposes of the committee. (4) CIO News, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Forestry legislation, River Valley development, resource conservation.

Smith, Donald W. (report as attorney for American Nurses' Association), Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, attorneys for American Nurses' Association, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts of Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, with which firm I am associated, are reported in report of Mr. William C. Scott. Expenditures: Pennsylvania Railroad, $27.26; Hotel Carlton, $18.56; miscellaneous, $23.17. (2) Miscellaneous expenditures paid to various restaurants and taxicab companies. See also answer to question 1. (3) Pennsylvania Railroad for transportation; Hotel Carlton for room; miscellaneous expenditures for meals and transportation. (4) No articles or editorials relating to legislation during the above period. (5) Legislation relating to nurses, nursing, or health, on which the American Nurses' Association has taken a stand, including extension of social security, Federal aid to nursing education, and legislation to authorize commissioning of men nurses in the armed services.

Smith, Dudley, Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,250 monthly from the Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for the principal purpose of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for the purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Smith, Harold O., Jr., United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 400 Continental Building, Washington, D. C. (1) During the past quarter I did not have occasion to engage in any activities which I believe could be construed as lobbying. Serving full time as executive vice president of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., my activities are those of a trade-association executive and any contacts with Members of Congress are purely incidental to my many other activities in connection with trade-association work. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) In our association's bulletins and weekly news letters to members, we occasionally report on legislative matters affecting the trade. (5) No legislation in particular; any legislation in general affecting the interests of wholesale grocers.

Smith, Hilda W., National Committee for the Extension of Labor Education, 1508 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Articles sent out through Labor Press Associates; occasional newspaper articles. (5) Bill for a Labor Extension Service in the Department of Labor.

Smith, Howard J., Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) October salary, $750 per month plus travel expense, $201.79; November salary, $750 per month; December salary, $750 per month plus travel expense, $23.75. (2) Howard J. Smith, executive secretary, Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (3) Salary, travel expense, room, and board when engaged in travel in interest of work of the association. (4) The Case for Water in Central Arizona, Work for Water, California's Stake in Arizona's Share of Colorado River, What the Central Arizona Project Means to You. (5) Employed to support Senate bill 75 and House bills 934 and 935.

Smith, Lloyd W., Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary as reported on Registration Form B, and subsequently amended, for services as special representative of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. during the period October 1 to December 31, 1949. No money was received or expended for the purposes as defined in section 307 (a) (b) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) None. (3) In furtherance of duties described in Registration Form B, as subsequently amended, which involve legislation only incidentally and to a limited extent. Affiant states upon information and belief that none of his activity during the period covered by this report was within the scope of section 307 of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting interests of Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. Other duties for said company comprise the major part of this work.

Smith, Purcell L., National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $16,250 as president of the National Association of Electric Companies and reimbursements of $739.20 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all official duties, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in the act. (2) Various railroads, air lines, taxicabs, hotels, telephone and telegraph companies, and restaurants. (3) Railroad and transportation, $84.54; telephone and telegraph, $27.61; restaurants and other meals, $174.20; hotels, $22.80; gratuities and miscellaneous, $20.05; subscriptions, $410. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which I am president, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Smith, Ray E., Indiana State Medical Association, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) None. (2) See attached list.[2] (3) Postage, traveling expenses of committeemen, expense of meetings, printing, addressing, stationery, clerical assistance, telephone tolls, advertising, office supplies, and speakers' fees and traveling expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) All bills pending before Congress which would create national-health insurance.

Smith, Robert E., Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts, $1,757.50: expenditures, none, as per exhibit A,[2] attached hereto and made a part hereof. (2) As shown on exhibit A,[2] attached hereto. (3) As shown on exhibit A,[2] attached hereto. (4) None. (5) To support legislation which directly or indirectly is believed to be beneficial to holders of life insurance and their beneficiaries; and to oppose such legislation as is believed to be unfavorable to same.

Smith, Russell, 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All major pending legslation.

Smith, Sylvester C., Jr., the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Snyder, Calvin K., Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW, Washington, D. C.; 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $4,500; remibursement for expenses $1,274.55. (2) See attached.[2] (3) See attached.[2] (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Snyder, James D., Hotel La Salle, Chicago, Ill.; Illinois Legislative Committee, Room 1236, La Salle Street Station, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received, compensation, 3 days at $50, $1.50; expenses, $121.08. (2) Various. (3) Hotel, pullman, meals, tips, and miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the interests of the Illinois railroads.

Spence, Hotchkiss, Parker & Duryee, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. Expended, $483.75, in connection with attendance at board of governors' meeting on December 10, 1949, at Santa Barbara, Calif. (the attendance of the registrant at the meeting was required of him as counsel to the association and the expenses therefor, in the opinion of the registrant, do not fall within the terms of Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Cong.). (2) Various. (3) To cover expenses of trip. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

Spencer & Louisell, a law firm, 1712 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Peder Kristian Kristensen. (1) None; see (3). (2) None; see (3). (3) Payments made from time to time by Peter Kristian Kristensen to this firm on account of disbursements in law suit. This has nothing to do with Lobbying Act. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3410, Eighty-first Congress, first session, a bill for the relief of Peter Kristian Kristensen. This firm is his counsel in litigation.

Spencer, Lyndon, Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Stack, Thomas G., National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West One Hundred and Fourth Place, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $1,200. (2) Thomas G. Stack. (3) To have necessary legislation passed by Congress to give more adequate benefits to railroad employees under the Railroad Retirement Act. (4) Rail Pension News, publication of the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., September to December 1949, with 100,000 circulation; cost, $1,400, for printing and circulation to Congress and railroad workers.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

(5) S. 1379 and S. 1318 in Senate; H. R. 4282, H. R. 2741, and H. R. 2146, et al., in the House.

Starling, Howard M., 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in this act. Registrant has estimated, however, that $150 received by registrant during the fourth quarter of 1949 might come within scope of act as registrant understands act has been interpreted by the Department of Justice. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Registrant doubts that he is employed to support or oppose legislation. However, on very infrequent occasions he has supported or opposed legislation as it specifically affects capital-stock, casualty, and surety-insurance companies.

States, Hugh W., legislative department, National CIO, 718 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.; Flight Radio Officers, Local 505, San Bruno, Calif. (1) Received, salary, $1,830; expenses from flight radio officers' air safety organization, $71.17; expenses from transport workers' union, $982.38. (2) Various. (3) Food, lodging, incidental expenses, and family support. (4) TWU Express, CIO News. (5) S. 1768.

Stebbens,[10] Frank L., room 1025, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money received or expended by me for lobbying purposes. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation designed to tax like business organizations on a similar basis.

Steele, Raymond E., National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 228 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Stengle, Chas. I., American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F St. NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $12.60. (2) Taxi drivers. (3) To and from Capitol. (4) None. (5) To aid Government employee legislation.

Stewart, Annalee, (Mrs. Alexander Stewart), Women's Committee to Oppose Conscription, 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) No report for fourth quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Stewart, Annalee (Mrs. Alexander Stewart), Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1734 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) October-December 1949 totals: Travel $29.89; rent $126.75; meals $97.30; taxi-car fare $21.06; tips $3.95; secretarial help $12; telephone and telegrams $17.71; postage $11.50; laundry $12.20; magazines and papers $3.40. (2) [Blank.] (3) Actual living expenses while in Washington. (4) Four Lights. (5) Oppose universal military training and conscription measures and further control of domestic and international policies by the military; support legislation for improving domestic and international relations.

Stewart, Charles T., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary (50 percent of time devoted to legislative activities), $3,000; Reimbursement by employer for travel expenses, incidental expenses, and per diem, $507.41; total, $3,507.41. (2) See attached itemized statement.[2] (3) See attached itemized statement.[2] (4) Attached list[2] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.

Stockhausen, William E., 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; report as attorney for National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts of Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, with which firm I am associated, are reported in report of Mr. Ethelbert Warfield. Expenditures: American Airlines, $30.82; Hotel Carlton, $9; miscellaneous expenses, $9.66. (2) Miscellaneous expenditures paid to various restaurants and taxicab companies. See also answer to question 1. (3) American Airlines for transportation; Hotel Carlton for room; miscellaneous expenses for transportation and meals. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to postage rates on books.

Stockton, Kenneth E., American Cable & Radio Corp., 67 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) I have been associated with International Telephone & Telegraph Corp. in varicus capacities for many years and have been president of its subsidiary, American Cable & Radio Corp., for the past year and a half. This company has been negotiating with Western Union Telegraph Co. for the purchase of the latter company's cables, which negotiations have reached the point of necessitating several governmental approvals and possibly congressional action. Activities in the foregoing connection and with reference to possible merger legislation necessarily require my contact with Members of Congress and other Government officials. However, this is an incidental function under my duties for which I receive no additional remuneration above my regular salary. Neither have I made nor do I intend to make any contributions for the purposes designated in paragraph 307. It is not the principal purpose of my employment to influence legislation, nor do I receive my compensation principally for the purose of influencing legislation. The above-mentioned activities would not seem to come within the purview of the Lobbying Act; however, I have no objection to filing under the same and will furnish any further information if desired. My salary is as heretofore reported, no part of which is specifically for the purpose of influencing legislation. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) I have not been employed to support or oppose any particular legislation, but as president of the American Cable & Radio Corp., I favor and will urge the enactment of appropriate legislation which will permit my company or its subsidiaries to purchase Western Union cables under authority of an amendment to section 222 (c) (2) of the Communications Act.

Stoll, Edwin L., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $1,950 (only 50 percent of time, however, is devoted to legislative activities). Expenses incurred, $285.05. (2) See attached itemized statement.[2] (3) See attached itemized statement.[2] (4) Attached list[2] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Stone,[5] Mrs. Margaret F., National Women's Trade Union League of America, 317 Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Full salary $213.49, about half of which was paid me for legislative work. No money expended by me for legislative activity. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Life and Labor Bulletin. (5) See regular legislative program of league already on file with your office.

Stone, Mrs. Margaret F., National Women's Trade Union League of America, 317 Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Full salary $116.84, about half of which was paid me for legislative work. No money expended by me for legislative activity. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Life and Labor Bulletin, the league's official monthly publication. (5) See copy of league's legislative program filed with March report.

Stong,[5] Benton J., National Committee on Resources, 300 B Street, SE., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All pending legislation affecting conservation and development of resources.

Stong,[5] Benton J., Regional Committee for an MVA (Missouri Valley Administration) and National Farmers Union, 300 B Street, SE., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Valley authority and major pending legislation.

Stong, Benton J., 300 B Street, SE., Washington, D. C.; National Farmers Union; National Committee on Resources and Regional Committee for an MVA (Missouri Valley Administration); Farmers Union and Resources Committee, Washington, D. C.; Regional Committee for an MVA, 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All pending legislation affecting conservation and development of resources.

Stoudenmire, Sterling F., Jr., 1740 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala. (1) (a) A total of $2,400 was received as salary by registrant during this quarter, as compensation for employment as attorney for Waterman Steamship Corp. and subsidiaries. Only a very small portion of my time was spent in any activity relating to the purpose for which this statement is filed. (b) A total of $84.92 was received from Waterman Steamship Corp. and subsidiaries, which amount could possibly be allocable as expenses incurred in connection with the pose for which this statement is filed. (2) (a) Taxicabs, $1.50; (b) restaurant and cafes, $83.42; total, $84.92. (3) (a) Taxicabs and transportation, $1.50; (b) meals, $83.42. (4) None. (5) I am not engaged specifically "for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by Congress." My employment is as attorney in the legal division of Waterman Steamship Corp., and subsidiaries, and such employment requires a small portion of my time in supporting or opposing legislation which might affect the merchant marine, the operation of aircraft, or transportation generally. During the quarter for which this report is filed I was interested in and discussed with Members of Congress and others H. R. 5346, military appropriation bill for 1950, and H. R. 5856, and matters relating to Army civil functions bill.

Strachan, Paul A., American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) As national president, I am authorized to direct the development of programs to continually increase employment of handicapped persons, as well as improve all rehabilitation plans in their interest. My salary, $10,000 per year, has not been changed since making the last report. Only a part of this work deals with legislation. For attendance upon meetings, conferences, hearings, etc., for taxis and luncheons, etc., the past 3 months, I expended approximately $160. (2) No moneys have been paid to any person, to influence legislation. (3) [Blank.] (4) Bulletins to AFPH members and Members of Congress. (5) Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped: National Cerebral Palsy Act; National Epilepsy Act; National Leprosy Act; survey (census) of handicapped; repeal of prohibition debarring otherwise qualified

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[10] Filed with the Secretary only.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

amputee drivers from driving trucks or other vehicles in interstate commerce.

Strackbein, O. R., America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, and International Allied Printing Trades Association, 601 Carpenters' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: October–December 1949, $4,320; expenditures October–December 1949, salary to executive secretary, $3,150; salary to secretary of executive secretary, $910; expenses, $719.92; total, $4,779.92. (2) None paid to individuals. Character of expenses is listed below. (3) Rent, telephone, traveling expenses, office supplies, taxicab fares, several lunches a month with individuals, purchase of governmental publications, etc. (4) None. (5) Matters relating to tariffs, foreign trade, copyright, postal rate legislation, etc.

Strong,[5] Arthur D., Upper Mississippi Waterway Association, 1034 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) Salary, July 1, 1949, to October 1, 1949, $825; reimbursement for expenses, July 1, 1949, to October 1, 1949, $563.08; total, $1,188.08. (2) Arthur D. Strong. (3) Salary and reimbursement for traveling, hotels, entertaining, attending meetings, hearings, and conventions. (4) None. (5) Registrant is employed to support legislation relating to the improvement and development of navigable waterways in the upper Mississippi River, together with legislation relating to flood control, conservation, pollution, recreation, fish and wildlife, including all legislation that has to do with the development of water resources of the upper Mississippi River and its tributaries as this legislation relates to all types of public benefits. He is employed to oppose legislation detrimental to the above.

Strong, Arthur D., Upper Mississippi Waterway Association, 1034 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) Salary, October 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949, $825; reimbursement for expenses October 1 to December 31, 1949, $271.49; total, $1,096.49. (2) Arthur D. Strong. (3) Salary and reimbursement for traveling, hotels, entertaining, attending meetings, hearings, and conventions. (4) None. (5) Registrant is employed to support legislation relating to the improvement and development of navigable waterways in the upper Mississippi River, together with legislation relating to flood control, conservation, pollution, recreation, fish and wildlife, including all legislation that has to do with the development of water resources of the upper Mississippi river and its tributaries as this legislation relates to all types of public benefits. He is employed to oppose legislation detrimental to the above.

Sturgis, Arthur, Jr., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $200. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor revision, social security law revision, inflammable fabric legislation.

Sturrock, J. E., Texas Water Conservation Association, 207 West Fifteenth Street, Austin, Tex. (1) Salary for October, November, and December 1949, $1,800, less income taxes. Traveling and routine office expenses for October, November, and December 1949, $504.46. (2) $504.46 paid to bus and taxi companies, hotels, restaurants, and stores. (3) Covering transportation, meals, lodging, miscellaneous office supplies, and entertainment. (4) Texas Water Conservation Association bulletins and pamphlets and various analyses of bills pending in Congress. (5) Employed to support all legislation, both State and National, concerning the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas' land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies; to oppose all legislation creating Federal valley authorities and all legislation seeking to superimpose Federal control over the State control in the distribution of the State's water resources.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

Sullivan, Francis M., Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, October, November, December (including bonus) 1949 (after taxes and social security), $2,565.05; expenses, same period, $17; total, $2,582.05. (2) Francis M. Sullivan. (3) See No. (1). (4) DAV Semimonthly. (5) Legislation affecting service-connected disabled veterans, their families, and the survivors of deceased service men and women.

Sutlive, Carey R., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Continental Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary, $2,250.02; expenses reimbursed by employer, $649.67; expenditures, $649.67. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, etc. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business, such as travel, meals, and hotel accommodations, and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social security, research, patents, and investments.

Swanson, Walter S. J., National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 938 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. During the quarterly period just ended, he has expended no money and has made no payments to anyone in connection with any activities coming within the Lobbying Act. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Prepared articles for "Highway Highlights" and certain bulletins released by the National Highway Users Conference. (5) Within the general responsibility of my office, I have carried out the work outlined above. During the past quarter this has been solely confined to reportorial coverage of congressional activities dealing with Federal highway aid and highway taxation, the legislation in which I am interested. I have conducted no activity during the quarterly period coming within the purview of the Lobbying Act.

Switzer, John B., 70 North Thirteenth Street, Beech Grove, Ind.; Indiana Division No. 1 and No. 56, Communications Workers of America, CIO, 27 West Ohio Street, room 5, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) No activity. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Swomley, John M., Jr., National Council Against Conscription, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $64.35. (2) John M. Swomley, Jr. (3) Travel expenses between Washington and New York plus out-of-pocket expenses in Washington; expenses in connection with research and writing. (4) Fellowship. (5) I serve as director of the National Council Against Conscription on a volunteer basis to promote the achieving of the international abolition of conscription, world-wide disarmament, and the defeat of conscription.

Taylor,[5] C. Tracy, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; see rider B.[2] (1) See rider A.[2] (2) See rider A.[2] (3) See rider A.[2] (4) None. (5) Provisions of any labor-management-relations legislation affecting professional employees. Provisions of any legislation amending Fair Labor Standards Act in a manner affecting baking industry.

Taylor, C. Tracy, 1317 F Street NW., Washingtcn, D. C.; see rider B.[2] (1) See rider A.[2] (2) See rider A.[2] (3) See rider A.[2] (4) None. (5) Provisions of any labor-management-relations legislation affecting professional employees. Provisions of any legislation amending Fair Labor Standards Act in a manner affecting baking industry.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

Taylor, Edward D., Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 1903 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See statement attached.[2] (2) See statement attached.[2] (3) See item (2), statement attached.[2] (4) None except institute's regular weekly bulletin in which reference to proposed legislation affecting excise tax on business machines was reported. (5) Legislation to repeal the excise tax on business and store machines.

Taylor,[6] Hugh W., 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., 620 South Broadway, Lexington, Ky. (1) Amount received from Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association for salary, less social security and tax, $2,250; for expenses incurred, $200. (2) See attached statement.[2] (3) See attached statement.[2] (4) None. (5) Legislation which affects tobacco production and foreign trade in leaf tobacco.

Taylor, John Thomas, 734 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $500 salary semimonthly, less withholding and social-security taxes; $376.61 reimbursement for traveling expenses (October, November, December 1949), trips to Fort Worth, Trenton, Indianapolis; $13.40 incidental expenses (taxis, meals, etc.) October, November, and December. (2) John Thomas Taylor. (3) Expenses (traveling and incidental) as listed above under (1). (4) The American Legion magazine, New York, N. Y.; Legislative Bulletin, Washington, D. C. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws, child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations, the development of sound civil-aviation programs and policies; and the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Taylor, Margaret K., National Milk Producers Federation, formerly National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary for the quarter $1,949.98; expended $17.20. (2) Various. (3) Taxicab fares and telephones. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Taylor,[5] Russell J., United Shoe Workers of America, CIO, 917 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $80; expenses, $21; hotel, $12. (2) Russell J. Taylor. (3) Legislative representative, United Shoe Workers of America, CIO. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

[6] Filed with the Clerk only.

Taylor, Tyre, 1112 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received $3,000 as one-fourth of adjusted annual retainer by National Association of Retail Grocers. Expenditures as follows: (a) Adjusted regular office expense amounting to $364.55; (b) traveling expenses, $77.15. (2) (a) Landlord, secretary, postage, telephone, etc.; (b) Washington taxicab operators. (3) See (1). (4) National Grocers Bulletin (published monthly). (5) Repeal of margarine licenses taxes and other legislation of interest to independent retail food distributors.

Taylor, Tyre, 1112 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.; Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn. (1) Received $3,378.16 as one-fourth of adjusted annual retainer by Southern States Industrial Council. Expenditures as follows: (a) Adjusted regular office expense amounting to $362.03; (b) Research and technical assistance $1,581.27; (c) Travel expense, $77.15. (2) (a) Landlord, postage, telephone, etc.; (b) Henry Bison, Jr.; (c) Washington taxicab operators. (3) See (1). (4) Semimonthly News Bulletin of Southern States Industrial Council. (5) The general legislative program of the council with particular emphasis on legislation favorable to the maintenance of a free-enterprise system.

Teel, Donald, Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1516 Olds Tower Building, Lansing, Mich. (1) No money received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Legislation designed to have all business corporations taxed in the same manner and on the same basis.

Temple, Marjorie L., American Association of University Women, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Receive only salary. No money paid out. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Journal of American Association of University Women (quarterly); General Director's Letter (three or four times a year as program guide to branch officers). (5) Federal aid to education, ECA appropriations, displaced persons, repeal of oleo taxes, library bill, appropriations under Smith-Mundt Act.

Terrell, John U., room 207, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.; Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Received from Colorado River Association the sum of $2,566.65. (2) Expended for transportation, hotels, personal living expenses, personal salary, office and business expenses. (3) Public relations for above organization. (4) All wire services and newspapers serving California. (5) Support of House Joint Resolution 3 and Senate Joint Resolution 4. Opposition to H. R. 934 and S. 75.

Tharin, Whitney, executive secretary, National Potato Council, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Thatcher,[5] [6] H. K., 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; the American Beekeeping Federation, Roy A. Grout, president, Hamilton. Ill. (1) September 7, 1949, received $150. (2) H. K. Thatcher. (3) Fee for services rendered. (4) None. (5) To place commercial honey in the price-support list of any agricultural bill passed by the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

Theus, Harold C., Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,650 (salary at $550 per month). No specified amount for lobbying. (2) The landlord, grocer, taxi driver, etc. (3) Ordinary living expenses of self and family, transportation, taxes. (4) The Reserve Officer. (5) Legislation for development of military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.
[6] Filed with the Clerk only.

Thompson, Chester C., the American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary from the American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., $5,000 covering October, November, December 1949. (2) Miscellaneous expenses, $39.50. (3) Local transportation and miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting domestic water carrier and operator industry of the United States.

Thoré, Eugene M., Life Insurance Association of America, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) Expenditures confined to expenses paid by employee for travel, meals, lodging, and miscellaneous out-of-pocket expenses. (3) See answer to (2). (4) None. (5) Employed only to scrutinize Federal legislation which might affect the welfare of life-insurance policyholders and annuitants.

Tinney, William H., the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $558.31 per month, which is paid for all the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation; $55 was expended by me as expense money during the fourth quarter of 1949, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. In addition to this amount I also received $489.75 for expenses incurred in connection with other duties performed for the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., which have no relation to the purposes covered by this act. (2) Various transportation companies, restaurants, garages, communication companies, etc. (3) $55 was expended by me as expense money during the fourth quarter of 1949, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interest of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Titus, Mary, legislative assistant for local education associations, legislative Federal relations division, National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,312.50, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $262.50; expenses, none. (2) Self (salary). Expenses: Hotels, railroads, airlines, cabs, restaurants. (3) Lodging, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash; NEA Journal (articles therein); informative articles in State educational magazine. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Tobin, Fred A., 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, 222 East Michigan Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) My salary is $1,250 per month or $3,750 for quarter year. I do not incur any expenses in performance of legislative work. (2) Fred A. Tobin. (3) I am attorney representing the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers Union and its affiliated locals before the Interstate Commerce Commission and the National Labor Relations Board. Am the liaison representative between various Government agencies and international union and the affiliated locals.

The above includes general services of a nonlegislative nature pertaining to business and operation of International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals; also for part-time services in connection with legislation both Federal and State for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation Federal and State which may affect the interests of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals particularly in the field of labor law.

Tobler, H. Willis, National Milk Producers Federation, formerly National Cooperative Milk Producers Federations, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary for the quarter, $1,808.34; expended, $14.50. (2) Taxicab fares. (3) See (2). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Todd,[6] John H., 1037 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 586 Shrine Building, Memphis Tenn. (1) None for purposes covered by the act—other than expenses (such as taxi fares, telephone and telegraph, mimeographing expense, and postage) reimbursed by National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, which are included in its quarterly reports on form A. (2) Same as (1). (3) Same as (1). (4) The Cotton Trade Journal; the Cotton Digest. (5) No specific legislation.

Tool Owners Union, Inc., 1001 Fifteenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See attached sheet.[7] (2) See attached sheet.[7] (3) See attached sheet.[7] (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Townsend, Wallace, 306–311 Commercial National Bank Building, Little Rock, Ark.; Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., Shreveport, La. (1) October 13, 1949, $200 salary; November 10, 1949, $200 salary; December 10, 1949, $200 salary. (2) I spent no money on behalf of the company. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) The only legislation I have been opposing has been that which is designed to set up public power authorities to take over the privately owned taxpaying electric light and power industry.

Troester, Carl A., Jr., American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,812.50, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative business. Received for legislative service (5 percent of time), $90.62. (2) Self (salary and expenses). (3) Salary, lunches, transportation, tips. (4) The Journal of the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. (5) To support or oppose any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education, especially school health, physical education, and recreation.

Truitt, Paul T., National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $19.45. (2) Washington Hotel. (3) Entertainment (luncheon expense at meeting of members of NAMM's policy committee). (4) None. (5) Any margarine legislation.

Turner, Harold J., Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., Southern Pacific Co., and Union Pacific Railroad Co., 325 Henry Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) None on Federal legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any particular proposed Federal legislation. See statement A to my registration, Form B.

Turner, Philip C., Food Producers Council, Inc., 10 North Calvert Street, Baltimore, Md. (1) October 1949, salary, $226.50 net; November 1949, salary, $226.50 net; November 30, 1949, November expense, $52.29; December 1949, salary, $226.50 net. (2) Hotels and meals, $28.50; transportation, $23.79. (3) Expenses incident to travel. (4) None. (5) Taft-Hartley law.

Uhl, Gladys Beauchamp (Mrs. Alexander H.), American Parents Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Nothing received; nothing expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Parents Magazine and School Management. (5) National child research bill, National School Health Services Act, National Science Foundation, appropriations for United States Children's Bureau, Federal aid for education, pediatrics education bill, public-school survey and construction bill.

[7] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[6] Filed with the Clerk only.

Urheim, Bernard E., American Retail Coal Association, 858 First National Bank Building, Chicago, Ill. (1) $625, the proportion of salary chargeable to activities within the scope of the Lobbying Act, and $500 travel expense, paid by employer of registrant. (2) Registrant. (3) Salary and expense. (4) None. (5) Revision of Fair Labor Standards Act.

Van Osdol, Paul, Jr., Missouri-Kansas Businessmen's Association, Inc., 1210 Waltower Building, Kansas City, Mo. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation designed for taxing all business corporations on an equal basis. Although I doubt my activities constitute lobbying as defined in the act, since I occasionally write Congressmen or businessmen in behalf of tax legislation, I am filing regular reports nevertheless.

Vaughan, Wales, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Veterans Organizations Council of Altadena, 2235 North Lake Avenue, Altadena, Calif. (1) Money received, $200.50; money expended, $200.50; operations closed on October 15, 1949. (2) Wales Vaughan; Salary, $162.50; living expenses, $90; hotel, $48. (3) Vaughan's salary, living expenses, and hotel accommodations. (4) None. (5) Housing amendments of 1949.

Vernon, Weston, Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) See (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.

Vernon, Weston, Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See attached statement.[2] (2) See (1). Expense payments were made to the firm for hotel rooms, meals, transportation, postage, telephones, and miscellaneous expenses of registrant, and of members and employees of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley. (3) See (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) See (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States and of its policyholders.

Vernon, Weston, Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) See (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Viles, A. L., the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) No time devoted to legislative work. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation proposed or enacted which does now or may affect the rubber manufacturing industry.

Virkus,[5] Frederick A., Conference of American Small Business Organizations, Inc., 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Compensation, $3,000; expenses, $391.17. (2) American Air Lines, Wardman Park Hotel, Mayflower Hotel, taxi drivers, telephone company, telegraph company. (3) Expenses primary travel, some miscellaneous. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation or proposed legislation affecting small business.

Virkus, Frederick A., Conference of American Small Business Organizations, Inc., 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Compensation, $3,000; expense, $302.94. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad, Wardman Park Hotel, taxi drivers, telephone company, telegraph company. (3) Expenses primarily travel, some miscellaneous. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation or proposed legislation affecting small business.

Vitrified China Association, Inc.,[6] 312 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No activities covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Voorhis,[5 6] Jerry, the Cooperative League of the United States of America, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Walde,[10] W. Lowe, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1. (2) Notary public. (3) Notarizing Registration Form B. (4) None. (5) None at present time.

Walker, Jimmie, (voluntary) Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., Post Office Box 1329, 301–30 Millsaps Building, Jackson, Miss. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Tax equality among all business.

Waller,[5] Theodore, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C., United World Federalists, Inc., 7 East Twelfth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received from United World Federalists, Inc., for salary, $1,875 and for expenses, $557.57. (2) Various. (3) Travel expenses, etc. (4) World Government News. (5) Any legislation designed to strengthen the United Nations.

Waller, Theodore, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C., United World Federalists, Inc., 7 East Twelfth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received from United World Federalists, Inc., for salary, $1,875, and for expenses, $2,119.54. (2) Various. (3) Travel expenses, etc. (4) World Government News. (5) Any legislation designed to strengthen the United Nations.

Walter, Paul W., general counsel,[5] National Association of Private Schools, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From National Association of Private Schools, $2,000. (2) Retained; no payments. (3) Professional services rendered by registrant. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting trade and vocational schools.

Walter, Stephen M., National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $6,625.02 as an employee of the National Association of Electric Companies and reimbursements of $543.53 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all duties and assignments, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, taxicab companies, telephone and telegraph companies, book stores, and stationers. (3) Transportation, $86.35; hotels, $129.38; meals, $158.55; telephone, $35.50; publications, $22.40; miscellaneous, $111.35. (4) [Blank.] (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which I am an employee, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association, therefore, is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Walters, Thomas G., Government Employes' Council, A. F. of L., 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) As operations director, receives a monthly salary of $630, minus withholding tax and social-security tax; expended for personal living expenses. (2) Thomas G. Walters. (3) Salary received and expended for personal services as operations director of council; lobbying is minor and incidental. (4) Washington newspapers, international union publications, weekly council bulletins for the dissemination of organizational news, including legislation. (5) Favorable to Federal Government employees and opposition to adverse legislation.

Warfield, Ethelbert, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; report as attorney for American General Corp., 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J. (1) No receipts or expenditures with reference to legislative activities during said period. (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) None. (5) To oppose bills similar to S. 829 and H. R. 3351 (80th Cong.).

Warfield, Ethelbert, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; report as attorney for National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts: $26,638.92 received by firm of Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens for services and disbursements as counsel in all capacities from July 23, 1948. Expenditures: Hotel Carlton, $15; Louis Frey & Co., New York, N. Y. $1.22; New York Telephone Co., $28.89; United States Post Office, 70 cents. (2) See answer to question 1. (3) Hotel Carlton for room and meals; Louis Frey & Co. for photostats; New York Telephone Co. for telephone calls; United States Post Office for postage. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to postage rates on books.

Warfield, Ethelbert, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; report as attorney for Tin Processing Corp., Texas City, Tex. (1) No receipts during said period for legislative services. Expenditures: American Airlines, $15.41; Hotel Carlton, Washington, D. C., $5; New York Telephone Co., $2.38. (2) See answer to question 1. (3) American Airlines for transportation; Hotel Carlton for room (share); New York Telephone Co. for telephone calls. (4) None. (5) Legislation for permanent operation of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex.

Warner,[5] Milo J., 1631 Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio; the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J. (1) See exhibit No. 1 attached.[2] (2) See exhibit No. 1 attached.[2] (3) See exhibit Nos. 1 and 2.[2] (4) None. (5) See exhibit No. 2.[2]

Warner,[5] Milo J., 1631 Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio; the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J. (1) See exhibit No. 1 attached.[2] (2) See exhibit No. 1 attached.[2] (3) See exhibit Nos. 1 and 2.[2] (4) None. (5) See exhibit No. 2.[2]

Washington Taxpayers Association,[5] 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received, contributions from members of the association (none over $500), $455; moneys expended: Management fee of Rufus S. Lusk, 274; reimbursement Rufus S. Lusk for the following: Clerical services, $300; rent, $25; telephone, $25; postage, $3.84; miscellaneous expenses, $53.29; total, $681.13. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to association affairs. Of his time and efforts so devoted not more than 10 percent are applied to legislative activities, therefore the sum of $27.40 is allocated to those purposes. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fee, or in reimbursement of amounts expended by him for the association (see (1)). (3) See (1). (4) The following are names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent; registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received, contributions from members of the association (none over $500), $1,469.47; moneys expended: Management fee of Rufus S. Lusk, $300; reimbursement Rufus S. Lusk for the following: Clerical services, $900; M. R. Clark, services, $113.50; Troy M. Rodlun, professional services, $50; rent, $75; telephone, $75; postage, $71.70; stationery

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.
[6] Filed with the Clerk only.
[10] Filed with the Secretary only.

and printing, $141.75; miscellaneous expenses, $220.32; total, $1,947.27. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to association affairs. Of his time and efforts so devoted not more than 10 percent applied to legislative activities, therefore the sum of $30 is allocated to those purposes. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fee, or in reimbursement of amounts expended by him for the association (see (1)). (3) See (1). (4) The following are names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent; registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Watson, J. R., Mississippi Railroad Association, room 1, Illinois Central Railroad Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss. (1) No reportable receipts and expenditures. (No segregation of salary as between principal employment and possible incidental concern with matters of Federal legislation. The registrant is of the opinion that his activities for the period covered by this report do not fall within the scope of the Lobbying Act.) (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Annual employment, primarily for services not related to Federal legislation. Matters of Federal legislation are other and different from and only incidental to principal employment and purpose, but as an incident thereto, legislation pertaining to railroads in Mississippi. None within the period covered by this report.

Waybur, Bruce, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.; United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,060; expenses, $130. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers, etc. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel; these expenses cover both legislative and nonlegislative activity. (4) [Blank.] (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Weathersby, Newton Patrick, District No. 44, International Association of Machinists, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,499.94; $10 legislative expenses during quarter. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Lobbying; i. e., supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general. Not more than 10 percent of time spent on this work. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and occasionally organized labor in general.

Webb, William H., Robert F. Klepinger, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) [Blank.] (4) None in this connection. (5) Legislation to restore certain funds seized under the Trading with the Enemy Act, as amended.

Webb, William H., National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See attached schedule.[2] (2) Various individuals, corporations, and organizations, as indicated on attached schedule.[2] (3) As indicated in attached schedule,[2] and for miscellaneous office, personal and traveling expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) All laws and regulations needed to promote the maintenance and improvement of waterways, the development and protection of water transportation, etc.

Weingarten, J. W., 1004 Farnum Street, Omaha, Nebr.; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money received or expended by me during the quarter ending December 31, 1949, on account of lobbying activities. I received my regular monthly compensation described in last report for the duties of my office but neither received nor expended any money in connection with any lobbying activity. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting railroad business.

Weishaar, Wayne M., Aeronautical Training Society, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received quarterly salary of $300 and expended $2.50. (2) (a) Taxis, 50 cents; (b) notary public, $2. (3) (a) Transportation to Capitol; (b) acknowledging Lobbying Act reports for previous quarter. (4) [Blank.] (5) Supported Thomas amendment to H. R. 4177, S. 1150, and S. 2596 (Union Calendar 610). Opposed S. 1575.

Weismann, Walter S., Jr., American Airlines, Inc., and American Overseas Airlines, Inc., 1437 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since registering under the act on December 22, 1949, no time was devoted to legislature nor was any expenditure made. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) See (1). (5) See (1).

Weitzer, Bernard, 3147 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; The Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 50 West Seventy-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Money expended: Fare, $109.48; hotel bills (including room and meals), $37.05; taxi fares, $45.85; miscellaneous office expenses $19; postage, $7.60; telephone, $5.70 (from booths); salaries received by Bernard Weitzer, $1,500. (2) Plane, Eastern Airways, hotel, Surfcomber, various restaurants, various telephone booths, office expenses, various taxi drivers. (3) As indicated by the nature of expenses in (1). (4) The Jewish Veteran. (5) He is to support such legislation as will carry out the purpose of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America as expressed in the preamble to its constitution which follows and to oppose legislation which would tend to frustrate the purpose therein expressed. "To maintain true allegiance to the United States of America, to foster and perpetuate true Americanism, to combat whatever tends to impair the efficiency and permanency of our free institutions, to uphold the fair name of the Jew, and fight his battles wherever unjustly assailed, to encourage the doctrine of universal liberty, equal rights, and full justice to all men, to combat the powers of bigotry and darkness wherever originating and whatever their target; to preserve the spirit of comradeship by mutual helpfulness to comrades and their families; to cooperate with and support existing educational institutions, and establish educational institutions, and foster the education of exservicemen and our members in the ideals and principles of Americanism; to instill love of country and flag, and to promote sound minds and bodies in our members and our youth; to preserve the memories and records of patriotic service performed by the men of our faith; to honor their memory and shield from neglect the graves of our heroic dead."

Welliver, Edward M., American Trucking Association, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. He expended a total of $64. (2) The money was paid to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate Office Buildings, and to clerks and cashiers for lunches at restaurants. (3) The money paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office as indicated in (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the trucking industry.

Welsh, William E.,[3] secretary-manager, National Reclamation Association, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Total receipts for period, $8,659.25 (see schedrule I[2]); total expenditures for period, $8,502.83 (see schedule II[2]). (2) See attached schedules I and II.[2] (3) See attached schedules I and II.[2] (4) National Reclamation Association Bulletin (see enclosure[2]). (5) Amendment to Reclamation Project Act of 1939 and any other legislation affecting resources of the 17 Western States (see sec. 3, Purposes, first page, our constitution, enclosed herewith[2]).

Welsh, William E., secretary-manager, National Reclamation Association, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Total receipts for period, $12,627.54 (see schedule I[2]); total expenditures for period, $10,948.87 (see schedule II[2]). (2) See attached schedules I and II.[2] (3) See attached schedules I and II.[2] (4) National Reclamation Association Bulletin (see enclosure[2]). (5) Amendment to Reclamation Project Act of 1939 and any other legislation affecting resources of the 17 Western States (see sec. 3, Purposes, first page, our constitution, enclosed herewith[2]).

Westwood, Howard C., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Northwest Horticultural Council, Wenatchee, Wash. (1) Received $957.30; expended $457.30. (2) Various. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, teletype messages, transportation within the District of Columbia, and miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) This employment was an ordinary attorney-client retainer for the purpose of rendering general legal advice and assistance. Considerable time has been spent in the preparation of materials for presentation to Congress in support of proposed legislation to improve marketing conditions in the fruit industry during the postwar interruption in normal export marketing.

Wheeler, Burton K., 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Jacob Neubauer, Billings, Mont. (1) No contributions received this quarter. Incidental expenses for taxi fares, $2.90. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) To support the enactment of appropriate legislation to assist Mr. Neubauer, now residing in Montana, in the immigration of relatives from Germany.

Wheeler, Edward K., 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Commercial Pacific Cable Co., 67 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) The Commercial Pacific Cable Co., of New York, N. Y., has retained Edward K. Wheeler, for a remuneration of $750 per month, to act as special Washington representative and to assist the company in the collection of war damage claims. The nature of the employment necessarily involves conferences with the Navy Department, the State Department, and other agencies, and incidental thereto, support of the enactment of appropriate legislation which may be of assistance to the company. Incidental expenses for taxi fares, $4.20. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) To support the enactment of appropriate legislation to assist the company in the collection of war damage claims.

Whitaker, Clem, national education campaign, American Medical Association, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $4,449.56 for services and $1,925.44 as reimbursement for personal expenses. (See the attached statement[2] which is hereby made a part of this report and a part of the answer under each paragraph hereof.) (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Any legislation for compulsory health insurance.

Whitaker, Leone Baxter, national education campaign, American Medical Association, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[3] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

(1) $4,449.57 for services and $1,925.43 as reimbursement for personal expenses. (See the attached statement[2] which is hereby made a part of this report and a part of the answer under each paragraph hereof.) (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Any legislation for compulsory health insurance.

White, John C., care of Fulbright, Crooker, Freeman & White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.; American Cotton Shippers Association, Cotton Exchange Building, Memphis, Tenn. (1) No expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Reports have been given on legislation affecting the merchandising and exportation of cotton, such as S. 2522 and H. R. 5345. The association has supported extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and the ECA appropriation legislation.

White, Richard P., American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635–636 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts of salary, $2,875.12; expenses reimbursed by employers, $422.62. (2) Expenses paid to various airlines, railroads, hotels, clubs, restaurants, taxies, associations, etc. (3) Attending meetings of association committees, local associations, and payment for miscellaneous publications. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation affecting the nursery industry.

Whitehall, Albert V., 1756 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Quarterly salary, $2,374.93; reimbursement of travel expenses, $577.64. (2) Various air lines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4) Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association; Trustee, the journal for members of hospital governing boards. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Whitlock, Douglas, partner in the law firm, Sanders, Gravelle, Whitlock & Howrey, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Building Products Institute, Washington, D. C. (1) Total fee, $4,500, allocated $1,500 to legislative and $3,000 to legal and administrative; total expense, $7.70, allocated $2.50 to legislative and $5.20 to legal and administrative. (2) Various. (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) All legislation which may affect the producers of building materials.

Whyte, Louis E., Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $433.33 (allocated). This salary also shown in report of the Independent Natural Gas Association of America. (2) No expenditures. (3) None. (4) Regular natural gas news publications. (5) Any legislation concerning natural gas, we observe and make reports to members.

Wickenden, Elizabeth, 522 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.; American Public Welfare Association, 1313 East Sixtieth Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $1,220 (part time). (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) APWA letter to members. (5) Any legislation affecting public welfare administration.

Wiley,[3] Mrs. Harvey W., chairman of legislation, District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, 2345 Ashmead Place, Washington, D. C. (1) July, August, and September 1949. (A volunteer worker. No money received during the preceding calendar quarter.) (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) District of Columbia Federation magazine. (5) [Blank.]

Wiley, Mrs. Harvey W., chairman of legislation, District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, 2345 Ashmead Place, Washington, D. C. (1) October, November, December 1949, volunteer worker; no money received. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) Not employed for pay. A volunteer worker for the District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs. The District federation supports legislation which pertains to the welfare of the home and to the general welfare, after given authority through the adoption of resolution by the delegate body.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., Francis M. Goodwin, and Glen A. Wilkinson, a law firm practicing under the name of Ernest L. Wilkinson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (see attached statement[2]). (1) See attached statement.[2] (2) See attached statement.[2] (3) See attached statement.[2] (4) N. e. (5) See attached statement.[2]

Willenbucher, Franz Otto, Retired Officers Association, 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,650. No part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action. (2) Expended nothing. (3) See (1). (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Williams, Myers & Quiggle, a law partnership consisting of the following partners: Paul F. Myers, James Craig Peacock, Martin W. Meyer, John E. Skilling, and Robert H. Myers, National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No payment has been made but Williams, Myers & Quiggle expect to be paid at the per diem rate of $150 for each day of ordinary legal services rendered, subject to the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Williams, Myers & Quiggle is employed to oppose the passage of S. 2190, a bill to amend the Robinson-Patman Act.

Williamson, C. J. S., 421 Shoreham Building, 806 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; California State Chamber of Commerce, 350 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Salary at the rate of $8,000, or $2,000. Washington expense allowance at the rate of $1,600, or $450. (2) During the final quarter of 1949 none of my activities fell within the interpretation of Title 111, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Williamson, John C., Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $541.67 per month as salary minus social security and withholding taxes; $22.15 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the National Encampment and the National Council of Administration.

Willingham, Carl H., Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Chain Drug Stores, 4 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Oneida Ltd., Oneida, N. Y. (1) Received $4,000, expended $250. (2) Railroad, planes, trains, meals. (3) Travel. (4) None. (5) Excise taxes. Fair Labor Standards Act.

Wilson, E. Raymond, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary, October, November, December, $1,625; travel expense, $339.36. (2) Various. (3) Travel is for the purpose of attending yearly meetings, quarterly meetings, conferences of friends and other groups to interpret developments in national and international policy with special reference to legislation, and for other committee business. (4) A newsletter is sent to a limited number of contributors and friends about once a month. (5) Working for legislation including the admission of displaced persons, relief of Arab refugees, programs of relief and recovery, Federal aid to education, extension of civil rights, and more support of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. Opposition to conscription, the militarization of America, and the shipment of arms abroad.

Wilson, Everett B., Jr., Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $750 monthly from Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for principal purpose of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) Newspapers in Puerto Rico only. (5) None.

Wilson, Frank E., M. D., American Medical Association, 1302 Eighteenth Street NW.; headquarters, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) total receipts, $4,008.57; total expenses, $1,059.03. (2) Railroad, bus lines, air lines, hotels, telephone and telegraph companies, local transportation. (3) Travel, local transportation; hotels, tips, telephone, telegrams; meals, conferences. (4) None. (5) Bills relating to public health endorsed or opposed by the section of the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association or the principles espoused by that body.

Wilson, J. B., Wyoming Wool Growers Association, McKinley, Wyo. (1) Wyoming Wool Growers Association, McKinley, Wyo., paid salary, $1,500; expenses paid by National Wool Growers Association, $131.60. (2) J. B. Wilson, whose principal employment is as secretary of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association. Lobbying for or against legislation is a part of his duty, but not his principal occupation and for which he receives no additional compensation. His expenses, however, are paid by the National Wool Growers Association as a member of their legislative committee. (3) Expenses in Washington, D. C. (4) J. B. Wilson is secretary of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association and editor of the Wyoming Wool Grower, a semimonthly publication, published by the Wyoming Wool Growers Association for its members. (5) To support any legislation affecting wool-growing industry, including wool bills, support-price legislation, tariff, public-land legislation, etc.

Wingert, E. L., 1 West Main Street, Madison, Wis.; Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 119 Monona Avenue, Madison, Wis. (1) Received my share of fees paid my firm for general services as legal counsel for Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, involving mainly services unrelated to Federal legislation. Aside from that, received nothing for use in influencing Federal legislation; and expended nothing for that purpose. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Such legislation affecting business and industry generally as I may be instructed to give attention to from time to time.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[3] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

Winn., Arthur L., Jr., Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Continental Building, Washington, D. C. (1) La Roe, Brown & Winn, law firm, received from the Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., $1,500, total of monthly payments for general legal services, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) S. 56; H. R. 2734; Brannan farm plan; imports of Polish hams; livestock subsidies; H. R. 4538.

Winn, Arthur L., Jr., National Independent Meat Packers Association, Continental Building, Washington, D. C. (1) La Roe, Brown & Winn, law firm, received from the National Independent Meat Packers Association $4,500, total of monthly payments for general legal services, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) S. 56; H. R. 2734; Brannan farm plan; imports of Polish hams; livestock subsidies; H. R. 4538.

Winter, Everett T., 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Total reimbursable expenses in connection with legislative matters, $243.56, all reimbursed by Mississippi Valley Association; one round-trip Omaha to Washington, D. C. (October 12–22). (2) Air lines, $138.81; hotel and miscellaneous, $104.75. (?) Travel, subsistence, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to River and Harbor maintenance and improvement; the American Merchant Marine; soil conservation; flood control; regulation of domestic transportation.

Woodrum, Clifton A., president, American Plant Food Council, Inc., 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (Please refer to letter filed with original registration.) (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Woodson,[10] George W., 426 North Washington Avenue, Lansing, Mich. (1) I received 25 percent of the gross income from the State of Michigan, which amounted to $1,372.61 the last quarter of 1949, and I spent it as follows: Travel expense, hotel, meals, telephone, telegraph, and other business expense. (2) [Blank.] (3) As stated above. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2135 (the Townsend bill).

Woodul, Walter F., Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.; Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., et al. (1) Compensation, $3,000, and reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses for months of September, October, and November 1949 in the sum of $316.18. I expended in October, November, and December 1949 the sum of $295.57. (2) Various. (3) Transportation, $68.02; hotels, $38.70; meals, $75.40; entertaining, $43.36; and telephones, taxis, tips, and incidentals, $70.09. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting Texas railroads.

Woodward,[5] Albert Young, Signal Oil & Gas Co., 811 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) In addition to compensation as a regular employee of Signal Oil & Gas Co., received $994.28 in partial reimbursement for expenses itemized below. Included in reimbursement and expenses are items which were not directly or indirectly related to passage or defeat of legislation but which amounts are not readily segregated. (2) Telephone and telegraph companies, hotels, taxicab operators, garages, etc. (3) Telephone and telegraph, $70.26; transportation (including cabs, car allowance, mileage allowance, and parking), $240.75; meals, social and business engagements, $683.27; publications, stenographic, reportorial services, postage, express, notary fees, and miscellaneous, $243.96. (4) None. (5) In addition to general activities unrelated to legislation, observes, analyzes, and reports on the several items of legislation introduced in Congress affecting oil and oil operations.

Woodward, Albert Young, Signal Oil & Gas Co., 811 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) In addition to compensation as a regular employee of Signal Oil & Gas Co., received $746.43 in partial reimbursement for expenses itemized below. Included in reimbursement and expenses are items which were not directly or indirectly related to passage or defeat of legislation but which amounts are not readily segregated. (2) Telephone and telegraph companies, hotels, taxicab operators, garages, etc. (3) Telephone and telegraph, $31.92; transportation (including cabs, car allowance, mileage allowance, and parking), $87.65; meals, social and business engagements, $539.40; publications, stenographic, reportorial services, postage, express, notary fees, and miscellaneous, $87.46. (4) None. (5) In addition to general activities unrelated to legislation, observes, analyzes, and reports on the several items of legislation introduced in Congress affecting oil and oil operations.

Woodward, Guy H., 605 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.; Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 308 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla. (1) Attorney's retainer fee, $6,250, which amount includes compensation for services in connection with legislative matters in which the oil and gas industry is interested; expended, $7. (2) Taxi fares. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) Legislation with respect to which the oil and gas industry is interested.

Wootton, Edward W., Wine Institute, 900 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,000 salary and $600 general expenses received quarterly as manager of the Washington office of the Wine Institute; principal offices at 717 Market Street, San Francisco. (2) Received by the undersigned for all services as manager of this office, some of which services involve legislative activity. (3) See (1) and (2) above. No expenditures were made by undersigned to any other person for legislative purposes. (4) None. (5) Activity with reference to bills affecting California wine and brandy industry.

Wozencraft, Frank W., 605 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Independent Bankers' Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve District, Failing Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) $3,000, fees for services; $1,000 reimbursement for traveling, telephone, and telegraph. (2) Air lines, hotels, etc., in connection with travel involved; Western Union and telephone company. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) Bank holding company legislation.

Wright, Mrs. Leslie B., chairman of legislation, General Federation of Women's Clubs, 4620 Thirtieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) October, November, December 1949, subscription to Social Legislation Information Service, $15. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) Not employed for pay. A volunteer worker for the General Federation of Women's Clubs. The General Federation supports legislation which pertains to the welfare of the home and to the general welfare, after given authority, through the adoption of resolution by the delegate body.

Wyatt, Joseph M., 501 Keyser Building, Baltimore, Md.; District Cab Co., Inc., et al. (1) $1,500 received as per statement of April 8, 1949, filed with your office on Form B; expenses, $32.04. (2) Railroad fare, $11.04; meals (mostly on train), $16.50; cab fare, $4.50. (3) Transportation and meals. (4) None. (5) Regulation of taxicabs in District of Columbia.

Wyatt, Robert H., legislative-Federal relations division of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Actual expenses only $151.93. (2) Air lines, hotels, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lodging, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Yaden, James G., 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Federation of Government Employees, 4119 Illinois Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary received, $2,750 and expenses. (2) Taxes, grocery stores, service stations, merchants, restaurants, miscellaneous, for tips, postage, supplies, etc., banks and savings bonds. (3) Bank account, Government savings bonds, food, gasoline and oil, meals taken out, taxicabs, incidental living expenses, taxes. (4) The Government Standard. (5) Pay legislation for Federal employees; support any other proposed legislation beneficial to Federal employees; oppose any which would adversely affect them.

Yeaman, Addison, Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., 1600 West Hill Street, Louisville, Ky. (1) Registrant has received no moneys and has expended no moneys except his regular salary and traveling expenses, which were paid without regard to registrant's activities under the so-called Lobbying Act. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) H. R. 2016.

Young, Donald A., Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,458.33; expended, $19.74—transportation, $2.20; telephone, $17.54. (2) Taxi companies, telephone company. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation of interest to business.

Young, R. D., Rubber Trade Association of New York, Inc., 15 William Street, New York, N. Y. Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, title II, United States Code, sections 261–270, the writer registered on February 25, 1947, and subsequent thereto filed quarterly statements of receipts and expenditures for the period ending March 31, 1947. No activities have been engaged in by the writer which would fall within the purview of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act since the filing of the quarterly report referred to above, and, therefore, no additional reports have been filed, although the original registration was never withdrawn. It is possible that the writer may discuss legislation with some Members of the Congress during its present session, and if such be the case, the filing of quarterly reports will be resumed. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) See (1). (5) See (1).

Young, Robert R., 4500 Chrysler Building, New York, N. Y.; Federation for Railway Progress, 1430 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Railway Progress, volume III, No. 8, October 1949; volume III, No. 9, November 1949; volume III, No. 10, December 1949. (5) None.

Zimmerman & Norman, 111 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.; Marquette Cement Manufacturing Co., 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money was received and no money was expended during the preceding calendar quarter within the scope of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) Not applicable. (5) None of the legal services rendered during the preceding calendar quarter falls within the scope of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act.

Zook, John D., 17 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio; Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation dealing with social security, business, taxation, and other matters of interest to our organization.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1949.

[10] Filed with the Secretary only.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, midst thronging duties and confused issues, in the quiet of this moment of prayer we would make our souls the sanctuary of Thy spirit. Make plain to our understanding that our legislative enactments and our economic adjustments in themselves cannot bring social salvation, except as they clear the way for that spiritual strength without which we labor in vain, without which all else is as futile props against a decaying house that the Lord hath not made. Make us alive and alert to the spiritual values which underlie all the struggle of these epic days as on the anvil of vast issues there slowly takes shape the new and better world that is to be. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 31, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Lucas
Anderson	Gillette	McCarran
Benton	Graham	McCarthy
Brewster	Green	McClellan
Bricker	Gurney	McFarland
Bridges	Hayden	McKellar
Butler	Hendrickson	McMahon
Byrd	Hill	Magnuson
Cain	Hoey	Malone
Capehart	Holland	Martin
Chapman	Humphrey	Maybank
Chavez	Hunt	Millikin
Connally	Ives	Morse
Cordon	Jenner	Mundt
Darby	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Douglas	Kefauver	O'Conor
Downey	Kem	O'Mahoney
Dworshak	Kerr	Pepper
Eastland	Kilgore	Robertson
Ecton	Knowland	Russell
Ferguson	Langer	Saltonstall
Flanders	Leahy	Schoeppel
Frear	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Fulbright	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Sparkman	Thye	Wiley
Stennis	Tobey	Williams
Taft	Tydings	Withers
Taylor	Vandenberg	Young
Thomas, Okla.	Watkins	
Thomas, Utah	Wherry	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is absent on public business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

FREER TRADE AND CURRENCY CONVERTIBILITY IN EUROPE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 seconds to make a statement about ECA.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Virginia is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, a very important and vital meeting of OEEC is now in progress in Paris. ECA is represented there by Mr. Paul Hoffman, who is urging the members of OEEC to adopt a plan for freer trade and for currency convertibility. In my opinion the plan for freer trade has encountered great difficulties, and I am not hopeful for its success. The plan for currency convertibility does not appeal to Great Britain because of her obligations to the sterling-area countries. But a plan for currency convertibility on the continent of Europe is practical, and, in my opinion, is very essential. So I wish to state that, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I should be glad to vote to earmark a portion of our future ECA aid to help support what might be termed a continental currency clearing union to facilitate trade among those nations of western Europe which we are endeavoring to rehabilitate. I frankly express the fear that unless some plan to lighten the burden of present trade restrictions can soon be worked out our tremendous expenditures for the rehabilitation of western Europe will end in failure.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report, including the reports of the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, for the fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON LEASES BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on leases of property by the Department of the Army, as of December 1, 1949 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CENSUS OF GOVERNMENTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the conduct of a periodic census of governments (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CREDIT REPORT OF BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual credit report of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Branch of Extension and Credit, Department of the Interior, fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON STUDY OF EFFICIENCY RATING SYSTEMS

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commission's study of efficiency rating systems in the Federal service (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated by the committee for the period July 1 to December 31, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Board for the year 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SUMMARY OF ANNUAL REPORT OF FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a summary of the annual report of the Agency, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN INDIAN CLAIMS

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the settlement of the claims of P. A. Lewis, Zenophon Jones, and Eddie Warrior, on the relation of the Creek Freedmen Association, and Marguerite J. Underwood, on the relation of an identifiable group of Choctaw and Chickasaw petitioners et al., against United States of America (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF WAGE AND HOUR AND PUBLIC CONTRACTS DIVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

A letter from the Administrator, Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Divisions for the year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO.

A letter from the president of the Potomac Electric Power Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the company for the year ended December 31, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF CAPITAL TRANSIT CO.

A letter from the president of the Capital Transit Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the company for the calendar year 1949, together with a balance sheet as of De-

cember 31, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ECONOMIC AID TO KOREA—COMMUNICATION FROM AMBASSADOR JOHN M. CHANG

The VICE PRESIDENT. In his capacity as President of the Senate the Chair has received a communication from John M. Chang, Ambassador from Korea to the United States, relating to further economic aid to Korea. If there be no objection, the Chair will ask that the communication be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Puerto Rican United Independent Sugar Cane Colonos of Camuy, Hatillo, Quebradillas and Isabela, of Camuy, P. R., relating to the sugar industry in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The petition of Bernice Wallus, of Hartford, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to extend the provisions of the social-security law; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Almo Seaton, of Independence, Mo., praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan, providing old-age insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by Maj. James A. McKenna, Jr., Post, No. 199, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House bill 4617, to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Edwin C. M. Dickey, a citizen of the United States, relating to his case, No. 197 MSC, now pending before the Supreme Court of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Worcester (Mass.) District Dental Society, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The memorial of Mrs. Ernest Dorr, of Gladwin, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 1103 and House bill 2945, to readjust postal rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by owners and active farmers, and other interested citizens of the United States, assembled at Clarksville, Tenn., favoring the enactment of legislation to effectuate the plans of the Corps of Engineers for the development of the Cumberland River; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the Executive Board of the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, of Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring the enactment of legislation to liberalize the displaced-persons law, etc.; ordered to lie on the table.

THE SOCIALIZED STATE—RESOLUTION BY AMERICAN NATIONAL LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a special resolution recently adopted at the American National Livestock Association Convention at Miami, Fla., relating to the socialized state, and I request that the resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There impends today a threat to our country and the freedom of its citizens which so menacingly overshadows the future that we, American cattlemen of all shades of political belief, feel it our duty to speak out in unmistakable terms.

This threat lies in the fact that our country—without conscious choice on the part of its people—is rapidly and unmistakably drifting toward the consummation of a false concept—the socialized state.

Tokens of this danger are everywhere and undeniable. The growing power and expansion of wasteful government; the colossal public debt; the heavy burden of taxation; the malicious attempt to substitute an artificial economy for the natural economy which alone can function in freedom; the gradual assumption by the State of financial responsibility for every hazard incident to life—hazards which should be personally met and borne by every human being who has the instinctive will to survive and the inherent impulse to be free; the arraignment of economic and social groups, one against the other; and numerous other conditions and proposals similarly inspired and equally false.

Government produces nothing and has no means by which to support these false and destructive theories except by exacting from its citizens the fruits of their labors.

The course the Government is now taking, unless it is promptly reversed, must inevitably lead to national bankruptcy. In a vain effort to prolong a specious sense of security, more similar expedients will be applied until we become mere numbers in a completely socialized state: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the American National Livestock Association in convention assembled at Miami, Fla., January 5, 1950, reaffirm our solemn conviction that the future health, strength, and prosperity of our country depends on the reestablishment and maintenance of free and competitive enterprise and hereby pledge ourselves as individuals and as an association to diligently and actively work toward this objective and toward the defeat of the falacious philosophies that are beguiling our country into socialism.

CLEAR RADIO CHANNEL FOR MARKET INFORMATION AND REPORTS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions adopted by the Texas Sheep and Goat Raisers Association, at its annual meeting in November, 1949, and the National Wool Growers Association, at Denver, Colo., relating to clear radio channels for market information and reports, in rural areas.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CLEAR-CHANNEL RESOLUTION OF THE TEXAS SHEEP AND GOAT RAISERS ASSOCIATION

We reiterate our previous stand in favor of clear channel broadcasting stations and higher power on clear channels for adequate service to rural areas; and we furthermore request that the State Department be instructed by the proper authority to maintain a firm position to protect the rights, radiowise, of the United States against further inroads by other North American countries.

CLEAR-CHANNEL RESOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL WOOL GROWERS ASSOCIATION

The radio furnishes an important source of needed information to the ranchers, supplying them with market information and reports, weather reports, and other helpful news.

It has come to our attention that there is a move under way to break down clear-channel high-power stations which serve rural areas, we are reliably informed the State Department is discussing treaties with Cuba, Mexico, and possibly other countries which might result in the surrender of vital clear channels.

We favor the retention of clear-channel high-power broadcasting stations. We insist the State Department be instructed to maintain a firm position to protect the radio rights of the people of the United States.

DEFENSE OF FORMOSA—RESOLUTION OF MILITARY ORDER OF WORLD WARS, WISCONSIN CHAPTER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a fine letter received from a dear friend and distinguished attorney of Wisconsin, Mr. Saul O. Arnold. Mr. Arnold's letter reports that the local chapter of the Military Order of the World Wars on Thursday night, January 26, adopted a resolution dealing with the critical Formosa problem. I believe that the text of the resolution will be of interest to my colleagues because they appreciate as do I the fact that America has suffered a staggering reversal in the Far East and the time is long overdue for decisive steps there on the part of United States foreign policy.

I have previously commented on the Senate floor the importance of getting the judgment of such great military leaders on the scene as Gen. Douglas MacArthur who, according to all reports, has recommended a far more vigorous program for defense of the Far East than the State Department has thus far approved.

The suggestion made by former President Hoover and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] relative to the defense of Formosa is one which has stimulated the thinking of our entire American people on this question. I personally believe and have so stated that military experts should long ago have been sent to Formosa to consult with the Chinese Nationalist Government at the very minimum. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution as sent to me by Mr. Arnold be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas each member of the Military Order of the World Wars has assumed the obligation to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom and democracy for God and country; and

Whereas the principles of communism are at war with the principles of the Military Order of the World Wars, as laid down in the preamble to its constitution; and

Whereas the principles of communism are atheistic and antagonistic to all established religions; and

Whereas no country in the world today is under the domination and control of Communist Russia, except through treachery, deception, armed revolution and bloodshed; and

Whereas the citizens of countries under the domination and control of Communist Russia are deprived of the right of religious freedom and the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and

Whereas the Communists are now in control of China; and

Whereas there is grave danger of Formosa becoming dominated and controlled by the Communists; and

Whereas the fall of Formosa to the Communists would imperil the security of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Government of the United States promptly fortify the island of Formosa and occupy said island with American troops and take such other steps as may be necessary in order to prevent Formosa from being captured by the Communists; be it further

Resolved, That former President Hoover and the Senators and Congressmen who have advocated the immediate defense of Formosa be commended for their forthright and courageous position.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 2959. A bill for the relief of Nicolas Drujinenko-Nicolaie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah (by request):

S. 2930. A bill to remove certain inequities by fixing the hours of work and overtime-compensation practices in the case of certain employees of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. MALONE introduced Senate bill 2961, for the relief of Magdalena L. Jardeleza, Jr., which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 2932. A bill for the relief of Dr. Adolf Prochazka and his daughter, Helena Prochazkova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2963. A bill to authorize the reimbursement of certain naval attachés, observers, and other officers for certain expenses incurred while on authorized missions in foreign countries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2964. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act so as to exempt from the provisions thereof natural-gas companies all of whose operations are conducted within the same State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2965. A bill for the relief of George Pantelas;

S. 2966. A bill for the relief of Heinrich Karl Stade; and

S. 2967. A bill for the relief of Henricus F. J. Sleddens, his wife, Elizabeth, and his daughter, Sylvester; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 2963. A bill for the relief of Chen Hua Huang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 2969. A bill to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

MAGDALENA L. JARDELEZA, JR.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Magdalena L. Jardeleza, Jr., whose mother, Artiemichie Magadena Jardeleza, is an American citizen, and whose father, Magdalena L. Jardeleza an alien. The son entered the United States September 2, 1945, as soon as hostilities were over. When he reached the age of 21 it was his prerogative to declare whether he wanted to be a United States citizen or a Filipino citizen. However, the war was still on and it was a physical impossibility for him to come to the United States. Mr. Jardeleza is a law student at George Washington University, and even though he is over 21 years of age, his only means of support are his parents. It would be a financial burden on his parents to support him in school anywhere away from home.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2961) for the relief of Magdalena L. Jardeleza, Jr., was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Magdalena L. Jardeleza, Jr., of Washington, D. C. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Magdalena L. Jardeleza, Jr., shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

SEC. 2. In the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Magdalena L. Jardeleza, Jr., shall be considered as having been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of the Republic of the Philippines.

DISPOSITION AND PRINTING OF EXECUTIVE JOURNALS OF SENATE

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 223), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized to dispose of, by whatever method he may deem appropriate, the following documents (except file copies) in his possession; and the injunction of secrecy now in effect upon any of such documents is hereby removed:

Printed copies of the Executive Journals of the Senate together with indexes, for certain years for the period from December 1, 1901, to December 31, 1948, as follows:

Volume 33, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session.

Volume 34, Fifty-seventh Congress, second session, including special session of the Senate convened on March 5, 1903.

Volume 35, Fifty-eighth Congress, first, second, and third sessions, including special session of the Senate convened on March 4, 1905.

Volume 36, Fifty-ninth Congress, first session.

Volume 37, Fifty-ninth Congress, second session.

Volume 38, Sixtieth Congress, first session.

Volume 39, Sixtieth Congress, second session, including the special session of the Senate convened on March 4, 1909.

Volume 40, Sixty-first Congress, first session.

Volume 41, Sixty-first Congress, second session.

Volume 42, Sixty-first Congress, third session.

Volume 43, Sixty-second Congress, first session.

Volume 44, Sixty-second Congress, second session.

Volume 45, Sixty-second Congress, third session.

Volume 46, Sixty-third Congress, first session, including special session of the Senate convened on March 4, 1913.

Volume 48, Sixty-third Congress, third session.

Volume 50, Sixty-fourth Congress, second session.

Volume 52, Sixty-fifth Congress, second session, including separate index.

Volume 53, Sixty-fifth Congress, third session.

Volume 55, Sixty-sixth Congress, second session.

Volume 56, Sixty-sixth Congress, third session, including separate index.

Volume 57, Sixty-seventh Congress, special session of the Senate convened March 4, 1921.

Volume 59, Sixty-seventh Congress, second session, including separate index.

Volume 60, Sixty-seventh Congress, third session.

Volume 64, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, including special session of the Senate convened March 4, 1925, including separate index.

Volume 66, Seventieth Congress, first session, including separate index.

Volume 68, Seventy-first Congress, first session, including special session of Congress convened March 4, 1925, including separate index.

Volume 70, Seventy-first Congress, special session of the Senate convened July 7, 1930.

Volume 71, Seventy-first Congress, third session.

Volume 74, Seventy-third Congress, first session, including special session of the Senate convened March 4, 1933.

Volume 75, Seventy-third Congress, second session, including separate index.

Volume 76, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session.

Volume 77, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session.

Volume 78, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session.

Volume 79, Seventy-fifth Congress, second session.

Volume 80, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session.

Volume 81, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session.

Volume 82, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, including separate index.

Volume 83, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session.

Volume 84, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session.

Volume 85, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session.

Volume 86, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

Volume 87, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session.

Volume 88, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, including separate index.

Volume 89, Eightieth Congress, first session, including separate indexes.

Volume 90, Eightieth Congress, second session, including separate indexes.

SEC. 2. The Executive Journals of the Senate (except the original and file copies), together with indexes, for the following years, shall, when printed, be disposed of by the Secretary as provided in the first paragraph of this resolution; and, when printed, the injunction of secrecy now in effect upon any of such documents is removed:

Volume 47, Sixty-third Congress, second session.

Volume 49, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, including separate index.

Volume 51, Sixty-fifth Congress, first session, including special session of the Senate convened on March 5, 1917.

Volume 54, Sixty-sixth Congress, first session, including separate index.

Volume 58, Sixty-seventh Congress, first session, including separate index.

Volume 61, Sixty-seventh Congress, fourth session.

Volume 62, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, including separate index.

Volume 63, Sixty-eighth Congress, second session.

Volume 65, Sixty-ninth Congress, second session.

Volume 67, Seventieth Congress, second session.

Volume 69, Seventy-first Congress, second session, including separate index.

Volume 72, Seventy-second Congress, first session, including separate index.

Volume 73, Seventy-second Congress, second session.

Volume 91, Eighty-first Congress, first session, with part of index.

SEC. 3. Hereafter, not more than 50 copies of the Executive Journal for a session of the Congress, including the documents designated in the foregoing section, shall be printed.

CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS—AMENDMENT

Mr. TYDINGS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1498) to amend the Natural Gas Act, approved June 21, 1938, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATIONS OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the President of the United States has sent to the Senate the nominations of members of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The names of the nominees are: William B. Crawley, of Alabama; Knox T. Hutchinson, of Tennessee; Elmer F. Kruse, of Ohio; Albert J. Loveland, of Iowa; Frank K. Woolley, of Indiana; and Ralph S. Trigg, of New Mexico.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has set 10 o'clock a. m. on Friday, February 3, for the hearing on the nominations. The nominees will be present before the committee if available. Anyone who desires to be present, either for or against any nomination, will be welcome to attend the committee hearing at 10 o'clock on Friday in the committee room of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in the Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF GEORGE W. WHITEHURST TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN DISTRICTS OF FLORIDA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, February 9, 1950, at 10 a. m. in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. George W. Whitehurst, of Florida, to be United States district judge for the northern and southern districts of Florida to fill a new position. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR BEFORE THE NEBRASKA RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION

[Mr. SALTONSTALL, on behalf of Mr. WHERRY, asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, before the Nebraska Reclamation Association, at Grand Island, Nebr., January 26, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

PUBLIC WELFARE NEEDS OF NORTH CAROLINA—STATEMENTS BY GOVERNOR SCOTT AND COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC WELFARE ELLEN WINSTON

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD statements by Hon. W. Kerr Scott, Governor of North Carolina, and Ellen Winston, Commissioner of the North Carolina State Board of Public Welfare, dealing with the public-welfare needs of North Carolina, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE GOVERNMENT'S SOCIAL-SECURITY SYSTEM—EDITORIAL FROM OMAHA WORLD-HERALD

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The I O U Fraud," published in the Omaha World-Herald of January 26, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

POTATOES WITHOUT GRAVY—ARTICLE BY FERN THOMAS

[Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Potatoes Without Gravy," written by Fern Thomas and published in the Mars Hill View, of Mars Hill, Maine, of January 19, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATORIAL CANDIDATE IN INDIANA—EDITORIAL FROM THE PALLADIUM-ITEM AND SUN-TELEGRAM

[Mr. JENNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Confused as to Loyalties?" from the Palladium-Item and Sun-Telegram of Richmond, Ind., which appears in the Appendix.]

THREAT TO OIL EXPLORATION—EDITORIAL FROM OIL CITY (PA.) DERRICK

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Threat to Oil Exploration," published in the Oil City Derrick of January 26, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NATIONAL DEBT—EDITORIAL FROM CHRISTIAN UNION HERALD

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The National Debt," published in the Christian Union Herald for January 29, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ATTITUDE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE TOWARD ALGER HISS

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Mississippi Legislature Rebukes Acheson" published in the Washington Times-Herald of January 28, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR FOREIGN POLICY—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW HAMPSHIRE MORNING UNION

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Our Foreign Policy," written by Betty Knowles Hunt and published in the New Hampshire Morning Union of January 13, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLICY OF APPEASEMENT OF COMMUNISM IN THE EAST—EDITORIAL FROM THE CONCORD MONITOR

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "By Default Again," published in the Concord (N. H.) Monitor of January 6, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

YOUNG REPUBLICANS SHOW SOUND JUDGMENT—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW HAMPSHIRE MORNING UNION

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled 'Young Republicans Show Sound Judgment," published in the New Hampshire Morning Union of January 25, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

VISIT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO TO PANAMA CANAL ZONE—EDITORIAL FROM THE STAR OF PANAMA

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, last month the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], visited the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone generally in connection with certain legislative proposals pending in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. During that visit, the Senator from Colorado had occasion to meet with various officials of the Panamanian Government as well as prominent businessmen. The Senator from Colorado was interviewed by the local press during the course of which he

emphasized the mutuality of economic and political interests of Panama and the United States.

Shortly after the Senator from Colorado left Panama, there appeared in the oldest and most respected of Panamanian newspapers, the Star of Panama, a very interesting editorial with respect to the Senator's visit. Because I believe that this editorial will be of great interest to Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD, both in its original Spanish as well as in an English translation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the body of the RECORD, in its original Spanish and in English translation, as follows:

[From La Estrella de Panama, 19 de Enero de 1950]

VISITA CONSTRUCTIVA

El Senador norteamericano, EDWIN C. JOHNSON, ha sintetizado su análisis de la situación nacional en una declaración que recalca cuatro puntos esenciales: estabilidad política, transportes, comunicaciones y nuevas industrias.

Como prólongo ha dejado establecido el Senador EDWIN C. JOHNSON y nos parece oportuno dejar constancia de ello, mejores relaciones con Panamá, "ya que nosotros las necesitamos tanto como ustedes las necesitan". Es atinado esto. A Panamá le interesan, le han de preocupar en cada instante, las buenas relaciones con los Estados Unidos. Pero igualmente, en la misma proporción, ha de interesar y preocupar a los Estados Unidos la cordialidad de esas relaciones con Panamá. Si conveniente es para Panamá tal estado de comprensión, conveniente resulta para los Estados Unidos.

El primer punto para la autenticidad del entendimiento entre los dos países lo fundamenta el Senador JOHNSON en la estabilidad política. Confiesa el caballero que las noticias publicadas en su país le habían creado un prejuicio: la no existencia de esa estabilidad política en Panamá. Pero he rectificado plenamente: "la estabilidad política existe. Puede asegurar enfáticamente y en forma de convencido que Panamá disfruta de una estabilidad política firme".

He aquí un hecho concreto y trascendental que cristaliza en las palabras del Senador.

El segundo punto que le parece indispensable al Sr. JOHNSON para el progreso de Panamá, para sus buenas relaciones con Estados Unidos, es un mejor sistema de transportes. Mejores carreteras y mas amplio el sistema de carreteras. Advierte este buen amigo de Panamá que hay en el Istmo varios caminos buenos, muy buenos, pero se necesitan muchos más. Como complemento del sistema de transportes mencionó el Sr. JOHNSON mejores comunicaciones de todo orden. Por último indicó la urgencia de crear buenas industrias en esta tierra. Piensa el amable norteamericano que la industria debe ocupar el puesto principal en el sistema económico de Panamá.

Es sugestivo y alentador lo dicho por el Senador EDWIN C. JOHNSON. Piensa que el porvenir de Panamá es brillante y apoya su idea en la valiosa posición que nos ofrece el destino, así como en el ansia de mejoramiento que pudo apreciar en los panameños.

No se trata en este caso de la intromisión de un personaje extranjero en la política o en el desarrollo de otro pueblo. El Senador JOHNSON, buen amigo de Panamá, no ha incurrido en lo que la ciencia política califica de intervención. Lo que nuestro ilustre huésped ha ofrecido es sencillamente una opinion abierta, sincera, noble, en torno a lo que significa Panamá y lo que puede constituir su progreso. Sabidos es que todo buen amigo tiene el deber de hablar con franqueza a su vecino más próximo. Que se hable de lo que se ve, que se juzgue, cimentando en hechos el juicio, lo que en Panamá ocurre, no traduce intervensión en los asuntos propios. El consejo leal, la palabra afectuosa, constituyen guiás, constituyen demostración de buena voluntad, constituyen sincera y humana preocupación.

Por eso nos place lo que ha expresado el Senador EDWIN C. JOHNSON y nos parece oportuno depar constancia de ello.

(Translation)

[From the Star of Panama, January 19, 1950]

A CONSTRUCTIVE VISIT

The North American Senator, EDWIN C. JOHNSON, has synthesized his analysis of the national situation in a statement which stresses four essential points—political stability, transportation, communications, and new industries.

As a prologue Senator JOHNSON has established better relations with Panama and it seems opportune to us to carry out this idea, "since we need them as much as they need them." This is absolutely right. Panama is interested and is preoccupied every instant in maintaining good relations with the United States, but in the same way the United States must be interested and preoccupied in cordial relations with Panama. If it is helpful for Panama to have such a state of understanding, it will also result helpful for the United States.

The first point for the complete understanding between these two countries, Senator JOHNSON stresses, is political stability. The gentleman confesses that publicity in his country had given him the prejudiced idea of the nonexistence of political stability in Panama. But he has corrected this erroneous impression greatly—"political stability exists."

This is an intuitive and definite act crystallized in the words of the Senator.

The second point that seems necessary to Senator JOHNSON for the progress of Panama and its friendly relations with the United States is a better transportation system. Better highways and additional highway systems are needed. This good friend of Panama says that there are on the island several good roads, very good—but that more are needed to complete the transportation system. Senator JOHNSON mentions better communications of all kinds. Finally he indicated the need for creating good industries in this country. This amiable North American believes that industry should occupy the first place in the economic life of Panama.

What Senator JOHNSON has said is courageous and helpful. He thinks that the future of Panama is brilliant and he bases this prediction on the valuable geographic position in which fate has placed this country, and he bases it also on the desire for betterment which he could appreciate in every Panamanian.

We are not here speaking of the meddling of a foreigner in the politics or development of another country. Senator JOHNSON, good friend of Panama, has not ventured into what political science calls "intervention." What our illustrious guest has offered is simply a frank opinion—sincere—noble—as to what Panama signifies and in what ways she may progress. It is well known that all good neighbors have the right to speak with frankness to their nearest neighbors, to speak of what they see. To judge what is happening in Panama by carefully selected deeds is not intervention in our affairs. Legal advice, kind words are guide posts. They demonstrate good will, and sincere and human concern.

REDUCTION OF 20-PERCENT WARTIME TAX ON THEATER ADMISSIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me relative to the reduction of the 20-percent wartime tax on theater admissions.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared on the subject of reduction of the 20-percent wartime tax rate on theater admissions. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this statement be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

GIVE THE AX TO THE NUISANCE TAX ON THEATER ADMISSIONS

Mr. President, ever since the end of the war we have been faced with this question: When would Congress meet head-on the problem of the obsolete wartime rates on excise taxes? When would it give the ax to the nuisance tax? We made a promise to the American people that when the war was over, we would indeed reduce the wartime rates. Too often, the promise of the American Government has been broken to our people and I, for one, feel that there is such a thing as keeping one's promise and maintaining the integrity of Uncle Sam.

WILEY TAX-REPEAL BILL

'Way back in February 1949, I introduced a comprehensive excise-tax-repeal-bill, paralleling that introduced by the distinguished leader of the House minority, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts. This bill proposed a reduction in the wartime rates on theater admissions, furs, jewelry, dues, cosmetics, baby lotions, photo equipment, electric-light bulbs, etc.

For one solid year, the Democratic majority in the Congress has sat on this proposal for reduced excise taxes. The Democratic majority has piously pleaded that "the Government's financial situation would not permit these taxes to be cut." At the very same time, however, these very members of the Democratic majority contradicted themselves by bringing forward suggestions to expend additional billions of dollars in socialized medicine and other dangerous experiments.

The pattern is clear. The more Congress spends money, the more difficult it will be, if not impossible, to attempt to reduce excise and other taxes.

PRESIDENT OMITTED THEATER TAX REDUCTION

Now with the start of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, President Truman has at last gotten on the tax-cut bandwagon and has urged repeal of some of the nuisance taxes. He omitted, however, theater taxes and other taxes from his list of levies to be reduced. At the same time he coupled his suggestion with a plea he knew Congress would definitely not fulfill, a plea for increased taxes in other categories. The President announced he would veto any excise tax repeal bill unless it simultaneously provided for an additional billion dollars in corporation, estate, gift, and other taxes.

Now Mr. President, we have a right to ask the Democratic majority in the Senate and House, "Whom do you think you're kidding? Do you really want these excise taxes repealed? Or is it a phony offer of the administration to repeal these excise taxes only in the event other taxes are increased? Is that appeal strictly fake because you know Congress will refuse to raise the already heavy taxes on American business?"

PEOPLE SUPPORT TAX REPEAL

In previous issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I have attempted to show the grassroots sentiments of the American people in opposition to various types of excise taxes. I have reprinted the spontaneous letters sent to me from druggists, from jewelers, from photographers, from beauty shops, and from many other businesses and professions which find themselves hamstrung by these nuisance burdens.

MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY HAS SUFFERED FROM EXCISE TAXES

At this time I should like to invite attention to the American motion-picture industry which has been tremendously hard hit by the 20-percent wartime excise taxes on admissions. And by the industry, I am not referring to the producing end in Hollywood primarily, but rather to the little fellows, to the little motion-picture house operators in my own State of Wisconsin and throughout the Nation.

These men have always cooperated, as has Hollywood itself, in patriotic drives. Right now they are helping in the March of Dimes infantile paralysis campaign. Who can forget during the war years their grand cooperation in the various conservation campaigns? No one can accuse the motion-picture industry of failing in its responsibility to the American public in our hours of greatest need.

FINE PATRIOTIC RECORD OF ENTERTAINMENT INDUSTRY

As a matter of fact, the entertainment industry in America, as a whole, has always led the way in charity efforts, in civic campaigns, and so on, giving of time, talent, money, and facilities unstintingly. Yes, the motion-picture industry has a few black sheep (or red ones) and for whom I have nothing but contempt. Those black sheep have been well publicized. But I dare any man to cite any industry which doesn't have an equal number or larger number of questionable individuals who have stepped beyond the ethical line.

But, now, on this direct issue of excise taxes on admissions, it is a fact that the number of movie patrons has declined in considerable part because of this nuisance burden. We are aware, of course, of other factors which may have partly accounted for the decline, such as television, etc.

HOW CAN INCOME TAXES BE PAID WHEN INCOMES DECLINE?

What the Administration does not seem to understand is that conditions which serve to reduce the revenue which a private business receives—that such conditions reduce by just that amount the tax base on which Uncle Sam can collect income taxes. How, in heaven's name, can a motion-picture operator in a town of 10,000, or 20,000, or 30,000, pay income taxes to Uncle Sam if he finds his house partly deserted much of the operating time because people are tired of paying through the nose a wartime rate—20 percent—rather than 10 percent or nothing in excise taxes? Already half the States and many local governments are taxing admissions, too.

CHICAGO MOVIE CONFERENCE RESOLUTION

I have in my hand a resolution which was adopted by the conference committee of the motion picture industry last August in Chicago, urging repeal of this excise tax. The organizations represented at that meeting included five exhibitor associations with members in virtually every one of the Nation's 3,000 counties, all 3 of the producer associations, and all the crafts and guilds in Hollywood which are members of the Motion Picture Industry Council, the Trade Press Publishers, the Motion Picture Association of America, and the Society of Independent Motion Picture Producers.

Obviously, the ones who are hurt the most by this nuisance wartime rate are the little fellows, who can least afford to be hurt. Yes, not only they but the employees in motion-picture houses.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the text of the resolution adopted by the Chicago conference and sent to me by Mr. Ned E. Depinet, chairman, be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD followed by quotations from letters and telegrams received by me from theater owners throughout Wisconsin.

I had written to them a special report on theater owners' problems and had invited their reactions. The response was immediate and gratifying. To a man, the theater owners responded with endorsement of my effort to rid their industry and other industries of this tax burden.

WHAT WILL RESULT FROM PENDING BILLS?

Now, a tax-cut amendment to H. R. 3905 is pending before us in the Senate, and the House Ways and Means Committee is starting hearings on its end. But what actual results will occur? Will there be more delays, more pious promises, more excuses? The little men and women of America await the answer—the little men for whom the the Administration pretends such affection but whom it insists on soaking and socking with these nuisance taxes.

Resolution unanimously adopted August 31, 1949, at the Chicago conference of the following motion-picture industry organizations: Allied States Association of Motion Picture Exhibitors; Independent Theater Owners Association; Metropolitian Motion Picture Theaters Association; Motion Picture Association of America; Pacific Coast Conference of Independent Theater Owners; Society of Independent Motion Picture Producers; Theater Owners of America; Trade Press Publishers; and the Hollywood Motion Picture Industry Council composed of Association of Motion Picture Producers, Hollywood A. F. of L. Film Council, Independent Motion Picture Producers Association, Independent Office Workers, Screen Actors' Guild, Screen Directors' Guild, Screen Writers' Guild, Society of Motion Picture Art Directors.

Be it resolved, That this conference of motion-picture industry organizations goes on record for immediate repeal of the wartime excise tax on admissions.

It was the solemn promise of our Government that wartime excise taxes would be lifted at the end of the war. This promise to the American people has not been kept. It should be redeemed now.

Continuation of this tax is harmful to the whole economy. It is a drain on purchasing power. It hurts the consumer.

Repeal of this levy would be one of the best and fairest ways to put increased purchasing power in the hands of all people.

The Congress should not adjourn without providing this needed relief.

We respectfully call upon our Representatives and Senators in Congress to take action without delay.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM WISCONSIN

A theater owner in Manitowoc writes:

"Thank you for your statement on the tax bill you proposed, re cutting back wartime excise tax rates to peacetime levels. I am very much interested. It is a hardship on small businesses like ours. Anything you are doing for us in this matter is greatly appreciated."

The owner and manager of Plymouth, Wis., theaters stated:

"Please accept my thanks for your help in legislation relating to the peculiar problems of the motion-picture-theater business. Your special report arrived this morning and was read with interest."

From the largest city in Wisconsin—Milwaukee—comes this message:

"We wish to thank you for your informative special report of September 15, 1949, and we have noted your interest in our business affairs.

"It is becoming more apparent that something must be done to convince the administration, and then to have laws legislated by the Congress not only to lower the tax on amusement admissions, but to eliminate this type of taxation entirely.

"By taking a direct percentage of the gross sales of any business, without consideration of the operating expense in any way, will in a short time be disastrous. The gross excise tax is certainly a vicious vampire, and it will soon place its victims in such a weakened position that only a miracle could bring about their recovery.

"On the basis of our investment, which is in a 1,200-seat theater, for the first 6 months of 1949 we have operated at a net loss of $4,095.35, while paying to the Federal Government $8,847.02 in amusement admissions tax. We have found that with this situation existing that our existence as an enterprise is being threatened, for regardless of our operating loss the tax on our gross admission sales is in no way lowered. And we feel that something must be done soon to correct this situation."

From a leader in Fond du Lac of a vital motion-picture-exhibition organization:

"I am heartily in accord with your idea on admission taxes. I know that Congress is aware of these tax problems and what it means to our business."

From Sparta, Wis.:

"As small-town exhibitors we feel that the passing of this (tax cut) bill will be a benefit to the people of our community, as well as the millions of other people who attend the movies. We know that the movies are the cheapest and, in many cases, the only form of entertainment that some people have, so naturally we try to give them as much for their money as we possibly can."

From Dodgeville, Wis., a telegram comments:

"The movies are the common man's entertainment, and we feel he should no longer be expected to carry this part of the tax burden."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to make an announcement with respect to the program that will be followed after the Senate votes upon the pending business at 3 o'clock this afternoon. Following the vote on the joint resolution and the amendments thereto we will then proceed to the call of the calendar, beginning with the first bill and going through until the last one.

Mr. WILEY. Today?

Mr. LUCAS. Following the vote on the joint resolution and the amendments thereto, which will be some time shortly after 3 o'clock this afternoon we will then proceed to call the calendar from the beginning to the end.

Tomorrow it is planned to proceed to the consideration of House bill 4080, Calendar No. 481, a bill to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War. The bill has been reported from the Committee on Armed Services.

Following that we shall proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2440, Calendar No. 926, a bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate has before it Senate Joint Resolution 2. There is no limitation of time so far. No vote is to be had prior to 3 o'clock. From 1 o'clock on the time is equally divided. From now until 1 o'clock, if any Senator desires recognition, he may rise and announce it. The Chair is not inviting requests for recognition, but he will exercise the authority conferred upon him by recognizing any Senator who desires to be recognized.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as we all know, we are presumed to vote at 3 o'clock this afternoon on the pending joint resolution. Apparently no Senator desires to speak on the resolution. If that is the situation, and there is nothing to do, the Senator from Illinois will move that the Senate take a recess until 3 o'clock.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Seven Senators have expressed to me the desire to be heard in favor of Senate Joint Resolution 2. None of them seems to be in the Chamber at this precise moment.

Mr. LUCAS. It is rather strange, after we have a quorum call, and the business to be transacted deals with the vote to be taken this afternoon, that seven Senators who are vitally interested in this measure are not present to proceed to make speeches upon it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to announce to the Senate that there are on the calendar two bills of Nation-wide importance. One deals with the military public-works program, which has been well screened. The bill contains only about 20 percent of the requests, consisting only of those in the high priorities. It has been on the calendar for about 8 months.

A bill dealing with the uniform code of military justice has been on the calendar for a year. If no Senator is prepared to speak on the unfinished business, I shall be very glad to take up either of these bills in the interim, because the national defense picture is something that may not wait forever until we consider it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no objection on my part if the distinguished Senator from Maryland can obtain time to present his arguments on the bills to which he refers. Then after the vote on the unfinished business we could proceed to dispose of those bills in one way or the other. There will be no objection from me.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a moment ago I made an announcement as to the program. I do not believe that either the Senator from Nebraska or the Senator from Maryland was present. I stated that after the vote at 3 o'clock we would then proceed to call the calendar, and that following that we would make the unfinished business House bill 4080, Calendar 481, a bill to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War. If there is no business to be transacted between now and 3 o'clock, it seems to me that we might temporarily lay aside the pending resolution and take up House bill 4080, and do some work in the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Could we not resume consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 2 at 1 o'clock? I think there are a number of Senators who desire to speak, but who understand that the speaking time begins at 1 o'clock, because of the way the unanimous-consent agreement is written. According to the unanimous-consent agreement the time between one and three is to be divided between the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and myself. I think the reason Senators are not prepared to speak at this time is that they believe that 1 o'clock is the time when the closing arguments will begin. Could we not lay aside the unfinished business for half an hour and resume consideration of it at 1 o'clock? I believe that a number of Senators are under the impression that that is the time to be present to make the brief closing arguments.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the unfinished business were temporarily laid aside, Senators could get time to speak while the other measure was pending, and if it were not disposed of before 3 o'clock it would go over. That would not stop Senators from speaking. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the time between 1 o'clock and 3 o'clock is to be controlled. My thought is that one of these bills could be disposed of in not to exceed an hour. It has been on the calendar for 8 months. It seems to me that the world is in such shape that if these military projects have a special import—and I believe many of them have—it might be wise for us to try to save civilization by strengthening our defenses. Otherwise, it will make no difference what kind of amendment to the Constitution we may adopt, if there is to be no country here to take care of.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I am in favor of saving civilization. I believe that Senate Joint Resolution 2 would accomplish a great deal toward saving civilization and improving it. I am for national defense. I am usually for anything the Senator from Maryland is for. Would his suggestion alter the arrangement whereby the Senator from Michigan and I control the time beginning at 1 o'clock?

Mr. TYDINGS. Not if there are speakers. If there are no speakers, we can proceed with the consideration of one of the bills to which I refer. If there are speakers prepared to discuss Senate Joint Resolution 2, I have no objection to their proceeding.

Mr. LODGE. Would it be in order at 1 o'clock to ask for the regular order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The order which has been entered can be changed only by unanimous consent. Under the order, the time between 1 o'clock and 3 o'clock is divided between the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. The time is to be controlled by them. Of course, they can yield to Senators who wish to speak upon any subject; but unless that order is changed, automatically the time between 1 o'clock and 3 o'clock is controlled.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LODGE. If a Senator is discussing another subject, and the hour of 1 o'clock arrives, will it be in order for me to ask for the regular order and request that consideration of the pending question be resumed?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He would automatically have to suspend his remarks, unless some Senator having control of the time yielded to him further so that he could continue.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think I can solve this situation, so far as the unanimous-consent agreement is concerned, as regards the time between 1 and 3 o'clock today. Unanimous consent would be required to change that order, and at this time I cannot give such consent. However, I have no objection to having the distinguished Senator from Maryland take any time he has now from 12:30 to 1 o'clock on any of these bills.

But certainly I would not wish to enter into a discussion of any of them, because I have already been notified by several Senators that they wish to be here. So I would object until a quorum call is had. If unanimous consent is requested to set the order temporarily aside, I would wish to have those Senators present, so that they could either object to or approve such procedure.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, from long experience in the Senate I realize that the next half hour will be consumed by debating whether to take up the bill. Therefore I shall save time by withdrawing the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senate Joint Resolution 2 is before the Senate, and is open to amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if no Senator desires to speak upon the pending joint resolution at this time, I shall move that the Senate take a recess until 1 o'clock.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, what would be the objection to having the military public works bill considered by the Senate for the half hour between now and 1 o'clock, at which time, if it were not disposed of, the existing order would come into play.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that is exactly the statement and the request I made, with the exception that I do not

want a vote to be taken on the bill at this time. I would certainly insist on carrying it over until after 3 o'clock. Otherwise we would have to have a quorum call so that all Senators who are interested in the bill could be present and could hear the debate, and then take up the bill after 3 o'clock.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, we have just had a quorum call. Are we always to wait for Senators who do not respond to quorum calls? Are we to wait for them until it is convenient for them to come to the Senate?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to make this brief response: Some Senators who are vitally interested in this bill are not on the floor of the Senate at this time.

Mr. TYDINGS. Why could they not be called on the telephone?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not see any objection to having the Senator from Maryland speak on the bill, anyway.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not wish to speak on the bill until it is before the Senate. Otherwise to speak on the bill would simply be wasted effort. If we can pass a measure that is vital for the defense of the country and can do so in the next 30 minutes, there is no objection, so far as I know. The bill comes to the Senate with the unanimous approval of the committee, on which there are six Republicans and seven Democrats. The bill has been on the calendar for 7 months. I have tried to have it considered time and time again. The safety of America depends to a large extent upon keeping up our defenses.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to say that I wish very much to cooperate with the distinguished Senator from Maryland, but I submit to him that unanimous consent has been given in regard to the time when the bill will come up, namely, Thursday afternoon, as I understand, or after the calendar is called today. I submit to the Senator that the only fair way to proceed is either for him to begin discussion of the bill in the time allotted to him or else get all the interested Senators on the floor, to debate the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. We have a very full calendar and a very important session, with a large deficit looming for the coming year, and with the prospect of having but one appropriation bill, to which numerous amendments will be offered, and on which considerable debate will be had. It seems to me to be a very bad practice to hold up the business of the Senate and of the country because some Senator is not on the floor, after a quorum call, in view of the entire situation which confronts us.

Certainly it is the duty of Senators to be in the Senate Chamber. In my long service I have never asked that a measure go over because I could not be in attendance in the Senate; and sometimes I was caught with engagements which were most embarrassing, which took me away when I wanted to be here.

I think the practice of objecting to the consideration of bills, following quorum calls, because certain Senators are absent, is most obnoxious to the democratic processes, and should be abandoned.

Senators should be present to transact the business on the floor of the Senate; and I protest this kind of practice in the democratic process of procedure in the Senate of the United States. It is our business to be here, to take up any kind of proposed legislation when time to do so is available. To waste an entire hour on nothing, in my opinion, is atrocious.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before I yield the floor, let me say that I find that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is now in the Chamber, and desires to speak on the pending joint resolution. So it will not be necessary to take a recess until 1 o'clock.

I wish to subscribe wholeheartedly to what the Senator from Maryland said a moment ago. We have ready on the calendar a large number of bills, many of which are important. Many of them have been reported favorably and unanimously by various committees. Yet each time we have a call of the calendar, many of such bills have been objected to by some Senator. Of course, that is perfectly within the right of Senators. However, I wish to make one observation, which is not in the nature of a threat or anything of the sort: Some days ago I said we had a certain amount of business to do. We are going to get it done, regardless of the fact that this is a campaign year or regardless of anything else. If any Members of the Senate believe they are going to slow down the operation of the Senate because this is an election year, and if they intend to try to have this session of Congress end without the passage by Congress of a certain amount of legislation which the Democratic Policy Committee believes is absolutely necessary and indispensable to be enacted, then such Senators have another guess coming, because we will do just what we did last year, Mr. President: We will stay here, if the Senator from Illinois has his way, until we get things done.

Now I yield the floor to the Senator from South Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from South Carolina yield, to permit me to make one brief observation?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator to do so with the understanding that he will not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes, I wish to have that understanding.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, no one is more in harmony with the suggestion just made by the majority leader than I am, so far as concerns completing the program. I can assure the majority leader that, as we have done in the past, Senators on this side of the aisle are ready to take up measures as the majority leader announces them and as he will announce them for consideration on the floor of the Senate.

Now we are carrying out the program exactly as the majority leader has announced it on the floor of the Senate. If that program is to be changed, I submit that under unanimous-consent agreements the only fair and honorable thing to do is to give Members of the Senate notice that the change has been made, and give such notice before a change is made in the procedure under the unanimous-consent agreement or order. As minority leader, I shall insist upon doing so, because I think that is fair and protects every Member of the Senate, regardless of whether he is in attendance upon a committee or wherever he may be. That is all I am requesting.

I wish to assure the majority leader that the minority stands ready at any time to proceed with any program the Senator from Illinois announces, but when it is once announced, I think it ought to be carried out to the letter, or else that plenty of time be given, in order that Senators may be placed on notice and may be present to consider the other measures when a change is made.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield for 1 minute?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield, if I may do so without losing the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am going to take 30 seconds only, but I want to protest against the suggestion of postponing proposed legislation because Senators are absent. Their absence is absolutely no excuse for the nonconsideration of important legislation at this session of the Congress. I do not think important legislation ought to be considered when we are rushed with a multitude of bills, in the last 2 months of the session. We now have time, and it is the business of Senators to be on the floor of the Senate and to act on the bills, if they are interested in them. I shall protest every postponement in the future that is based on the fact that some Senator is absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina has the floor.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN METHOD OF ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I desire to make a few remarks in behalf of Senate Joint Resolution 2, introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] on January 5, 1949.

The resolution proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States abolishing the electoral college, and providing for the counting of electoral votes for the President and Vice President in proportion to the popular vote.

Proposals of this kind have been before the Congress since 1797, only 10 years after the Constitutional Convention itself. The resolution before the Senate today is similar to Senate Joint Resolution 200 of the Eightieth Congress, which was reported favorably by the Judiciary Committee on May 3, 1948.

Extensive hearings have been held on the joint resolution. I am sure every Senator will find in the printed hearings a wealth of argument in behalf of the adoption of this constitutional amendment. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts presented to this body, on January 25, a most comprehensive and detailed analysis, together with the pros and cons, of Senate Joint Resolution 2, and also a résumé of history leading up to the present discussion of this proposed amendment.

I shall, therefore, confine my remarks to certain facts which I consider of prime importance to the country as a whole and also to my beloved section, the South.

It is indeed gratifying to me that the first proposal for such a constitutional amendment was made by a South Carolinian, Representative William L. Smith, on January 6, 1797. I am interested in seeing that this resolution is given favorable consideration for a number of reasons, several of which I shall discuss in detail.

The electoral college permits and invites irresponsible control and domination by small organized minority groups within the large pivotal States. These groups have become more and more politically conscious. In many instances they have no political alinements, or philosophy as such, but are simply up for sale to the highest bidder. To encourage economic, racial, and religious group consciousness and group action, as I see it, is a dangerous, undemocratic practice.

We have recently become alarmed over the activities of the Communist Party in the United States. Only last year I had the privilege of joining with the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] in sponsoring a bill, S. 2311, designed to halt the rapid progress of this party in the United States. It, along with other minority groups, has its greatest following and influence in the large political States.

Mr. President, we, in the South, highly resent the fact that both parties will spend a hundred times as much money to get the Negro vote in Harlem and that the vote of a Negro there is worth a hundred times as much on the national political scene as the vote of a white man from South Carolina.

We do not believe it is fair or honest or democratic to place such a high premium on such a few votes because they happen to be from a section in Chicago, Detroit, or New York.

Political parties and political bosses can never resist the temptation of making undue appeals to minority groups whose votes mean the balance of power and the election of Presidents.

Let me quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 25, pages 883–884, a section of the discussion by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, regarding what he calls the "pressure group evil," as follows:

> Now, let me come to what I call the pressure-group evil. One of the most serious charges against the unit-rule aspect of our present system is the undeniable fact that it not only permits but actually encourages and invites the domination of presidential campaigns by small, organized, well-disciplined minority or pressure groups within the large so-called pivotal States. These pressure groups may or may not be organized into splinter parties with candidates of their own in the field, but whether they go under a party label or whether they simply operate as a bloc of votes, their influence is frequently a key factor in determining whether all of a State's electoral votes will go to one or the other of the major party candidates.
>
> The fact that pressure groups do hold a balance of power in States where the contest between the two major parties is close—and I call attention to the situation in New York State in the 1948 election, where Henry Wallace's party certainly exercised very great power—is an evil of the unit-rule system that has far-reaching but understandable effects. It causes both of the major parties to give undue attention to the demands and programs of relatively unimportant groups or factions. Because of the strategic position which these groups may occupy, even though in the over-all national scene the particular group may not be numerically important, they may be the vital pivot upon which a large bloc of electoral votes will turn. Hence, the major parties feel it necessary to make large concessions and enter strong bids for their support.

And again from the speech of the Senator from Massachusetts appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 25, on page 885, is the following:

> It would discourage the prevailing tendency to nominate presidential candidates only from among the residents of those States having a large electoral vote. The danger and detriment to the general welfare is obvious when the field of presidential possibilities is so restricted. The whole Nation should be the field from which to select Presidents.

I am quoting from the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts, because he comes from a large State. Were I to make a similar statement, it would be said, "The Senator from South Carolina is speaking thus because he comes from a small State." I continue the quotation:

> It would effectively and substantially reduce the undue influence which balance-of-power minority, pressure, or "splinter" factions exercise in the large pivotal States and the big cities. No longer would these groups be capable of swinging large blocs of electoral votes—and perhaps the election. These factions, if they enter the arena of presidential politics at all, would have to do so purely on the basis of their own merit. They would be no stronger than the number of votes actually cast for them. Because their numbers are small, they would in all probability receive little national attention. Their frequently assumed role of pivot in key States would no longer give them their presently exaggerated importance.

The amendment, Mr. President, would follow the present provision of the Constitution in leaving the question of the qualifications of voters to the States. It would require no uniformity of qualifications as among the different States. This provision is highly important to me because I thoroughly detest and will fight against any invasion of States' rights in any form.

In the past and at the present time, presidential campaigns are not prosecuted in the nondoubtful or strongly one-party States. Neither of the major parties is sufficiently concerned to wage an educational or constructive campaign in these States because they know that they either are certain to win, or they do not have a chance to win. This situation has resulted in unfair distribution of projects in certain one-party States.

I believe that under the amendment proposed by the pending resolution all the States would gain more recognition for their outstanding men as possible candidates for President and Vice President.

The objective under the present system is to choose someone from a highly doubtful State or a highly populated State because of the desire to capture the full electoral vote of that State.

Mr. President, there was what I consider one major pitfall in the present resolution, in that it provided for the election of the President and Vice President by mere plurality of the popular vote. I do not believe that a nominee should be named to the highest office in this land to rule with the broad and extended powers that, of necessity, under certain conditions, must be granted to this office by the Congress, unless he has received the endorsement of at least 40 percent of the voters of the Nation. It would have been possible under this resolution for minority parties to take control of the government while having received only 25 percent of the popular vote cast. I agree that history has shown us that it is possible to elect a man to the highest office in this land with as little as 39 percent of the popular vote. In this connection, however, it must be remembered that it has been agreed that under the present system the popular vote means very little, and that the electoral vote elects the President. The present requirements are that a nominee must receive a majority of the electoral vote.

I had offered an amendment to the pending resolution which provided that if a nominee to the office of President did not receive at least 40 percent of the

whole number of electoral votes, then the House of Representatives would choose, as provided under the present system, the President and Vice President. I am happy to learn that yesterday the authors of the resolution agreed to a similar amendment offered by the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] providing that if a nominee did not receive at least 40 percent of the whole number of electoral votes, then from the persons having the two highest numbers of electoral votes for President, the Senate and the House of Representatives sitting in joint session should choose immediately, by ballot, the President.

I am confident that this amendment is an adequate safeguard and will do away with the formation of so-called splinter parties.

It is my earnest hope that this resolution and the Lucas amendment will be favorably acted on by the Senate body this afternoon, because I believe it will do a great deal of good for our Nation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I recently asked the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] if it would be permissible if, during the time scheduled for debate, I might have 10 minutes of the time allotted to the Senator from Michigan, and he has informed me that that is possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time will not be divided and allotted until 1 o'clock.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have sent to the desk an amendment which I intend to offer. It is in the nature of a substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 2, which is a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, providing for the election of the President and the Vice President. My amendment would strike out the resolving clause of Senate Joint Resolution 2 and the text of that resolution, and would insert in lieu thereof my provision for the direct election of the President and the Vice President of the United States by popular vote.

I want at the outset, Mr. President, to pay my tribute to Senate Joint Resolution 2 as a definitive step in the direction of greater democratization of our electoral process. It is in that vein that I shall support that amendment, should the substitute amendment which I propose be defeated and the Lodge amendment comes to the floor for a vote. It is my profound feeling, however, that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts is thoroughly inadequate. The brunt of the case against the present method of electing a President and a Vice President is that it allows a candidate to be chosen President of the United States even though he did not receive approval by popular vote. I suggest, therefore, that those who realize the dangers to democratic institutions in America arising from such a defect in our basic law should join with me in support of the amendment which I propose to offer, since under the provisions of the Lodge amendment it would still be possible for a candidate for President of the United States to be defeated for office even though he should receive a majority of the popular vote.

Both the procedure as it now exists, and the procedure as it would exist should the Lodge amendment be enacted, would permit a minority President to be elected. I realize that such a contingency would be far less likely under the Lodge amendment than under the present system, and that is why I would support it. But if one of the arguments used by the proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 2 is that the present system may conceivably result in a minority President, then I say we should be formulating a constitutional provision which would eliminate once and for all any possibility of a minority President.

There is no reason, Mr. President, why one American should have a vote which counts for more than that of a fellow-American. To prevent a citizen in New York or California or Pennsylvania or Ohio or Minnesota from having a vote equal to his fellow-American in Nevada or Delaware, or any other similar citizen, is not only inequitable, but violates the democratic process. The Lodge amendment does not eliminate this fundamental inequity in that it would give, on the basis of the 1948 election statistics, a voter in Nevada as much weight as four in Colorado, or five in Pennsylvania, or almost eight in California. This is due to the fact that the Lodge amendment, even though it abolishes the electoral college—a desirable end—continues to count electoral votes by States. The amendment I propose, Mr. President, would give every American an equal vote with his fellow American regardless of the State in which he may reside.

The present constitutional defects in the method of electing the President and the Vice President of the United States have clearly been demonstrated during the course of the hearings before the Judiciary Committee on Senate Joint Resolution 2, and they are supported by the report of that committee, Report No. 602, and ably presented by the Senator from Massachusetts on the floor of the Senate.

From the very beginning of our constitutional development, Mr. President, our present electoral system was under severe attack by advocates of democratic practices. During the days of the Constitutional Convention, Madison and Benjamin Franklin chose to speak for a direct election of the President of the United States, and agreed to the electoral college system under protest. Since that day, repeated efforts have been made to democratize our presidential election procedure. The first annual message of President Andrew Jackson on December 8, 1829, declared: "To the people belongs the right of electing their Chief Magistrate." He declared that "the first principle of our system is that the majority is to govern," and urged an amendment to the Constitution. He said:

> In this, as in all matters of public concern, policy requires that as few impediments as possible should exist to the free operation of the public will. Let us then endeavor so to amend our system that the Office of Chief Magistrate may not be conferred upon any citizen, but in pursuance of a firm expression of the will of the majority.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the time from now on is to be controlled by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. The Chair understands the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] yields 10 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to ask at this time if it would be possible for me to have 10 minutes of the time allotted to the side of the Senator from Massachusetts under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. LODGE. I shall be glad to grant the Senator that much time, although the time is now getting short.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the arrangement, the Senator from Minnesota will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, history has demonstrated that the fears expressed by our fathers were well founded. An analysis of a few incidents in American history suffices to demonstrate the basic defects of our present constitutional system. Three Presidents of the United States have been elected to office in spite of the fact that they received a smaller popular vote numerically than did their opponents. I refer to the election of President Adams in 1824, President Hayes in 1876, and President Harrison in 1888.

In the election of 1824, the American people faced the choice of electing Andrew Jackson, his nearest opponent, John Quincy Adams, William H. Crawford, or Henry Clay. There were four candidates in the field, and because of that fact the leading candidate, Andrew Jackson, who led his nearest opponent, John Quincy Adams, by about 50,000 votes, nevertheless lacked a majority over his three opponents. In view of the fact that no candidate received a majority vote, the election was thrown into the House of Representatives under the terms of our Constitution. In the House of Representatives, intrigue and manipulation took place and, as a result, John Quincy Adams, the minority choice, was elected President of the United States, in spite of the fact that Andrew Jackson received 50,000 more votes out of the 460,000 votes cast.

The Hayes-Tilden contest of 1876 was another illustration of our constitutional electoral college defect, Mr. President. Mr. Hayes received 264,292 votes less than Tilden. The total for each was 4,036,998 votes cast for Hayes, and 4,300,590 for Tilden. This time, because of the fact that under our Constitution the people of the United States do not elect the President of the United States, Hayes was elected President through securing a majority of one vote in the

Electoral Commission which was created to settle the contest in 1876.

Again in 1888 Grover Cleveland was defeated for President, even though he received more popular votes than Benjamin Harrison. The vote in this election was 5,556,543 for Cleveland, and 5,175,582 for Harrison, with a total of 12,000,000 votes cast. This, too, was due to the operation of the electoral-college system.

Again I wish to recall the fact that at the time of the debates on the Constitution, and during the period of the Constitutional Convention, the gentleman who was often referred to as the Father of the Constitution, James Madison, was a strong proponent of direct election of the President. The man who might well be classified as the philosopher and conciliator of the Constitution, Benjamin Franklin, was likewise a strong proponent of popular election of the President. One of our Presidents, who served with distinction, and was known to represent the people's will, in fact, who was often spoken of as having a mandate from the people, Andrew Jackson, in his first message to the Congress in his first term as President proposed the direct election of the President as a means of democratizing the American election process.

The electoral-college vote is no indication of the popular vote. The requirement for the electoral college was written into the Constitution in an era, Mr. President, which was fearful of popular rule, and is an attempt to substitute a rule of the elite for a rule of the majority. Even this plan of our constitutional fathers, however, never operated as it was originally intended. In fact, the electoral college has not resulted in a rule of the elite in any sense; it has, in fact, resulted, on occasion, in the rule of a minority without any particular virtue attached to it, and has on other occasions merely meant election by tabulation, however imperfect.

The American people, Mr. President, have a right to elect the President of the United States. In my opinion, that right is not only borne out by the logic of our democratic processes but it is also testified to by those who have been the authors and the creators of our constitutional system.

The American people must be given a legal voice and the right ultimately to decide who the President of the United States should be. The constitutional amendment which I propose, Mr. President, is designed to do just that. It is designed to take one more step toward enlarging the area of choice for the American people and toward greater democracy.

It is in line with the same kind of advance on the democratic front as the direct election of United States Senators. The original Constitution provided for the selection of Senators by the legislatures of the respective States. It became the determined will of the American people that Senators should be elected by direct popular vote, and it appears to me that a maturing democracy would wish to see the Chief Magistrate, who occupies the highest office in the gift of the people, the most important office in the world, elected by a majority vote of the election constituency.

The electoral college cannot accurately reflect the wishes and preferences of the American voters. I have already described in detail the three flagrant illustrations of the thwarting of American popular will in presidential elections. There are other illustrations, however, which lead to conclusions equally as critical of our present Constitution. In 1912 Woodrow Wilson received 82 percent of the electoral vote, but he received only 42 percent of the popular vote. Here, indeed, was a relatively close election, but to read the electoral vote would create an illusion that the election was in fact a landslide. In this election Woodrow Wilson received 1 electoral vote for each 145,000 popular votes, and Taft received only 1 electoral vote for each 435,000 popular votes.

In 1923 John W. Davis received 6,000,000 popular votes from which he received no electoral votes. From 2,000,000 other popular votes, however, he received 136 electoral votes. The same disparity took place in 1932, when out of the 15,800,000 votes cast for Herbert Hoover, more than 13,600,000 of them brought no electoral votes. In 1936 Franklin Roosevelt received 98 percent of the electoral vote, even though he received only 60 percent of the popular vote.

Here we have illustrations, Mr. President, of 6,000,000 voters in the 1924 election whose votes for John W. Davis did not count, and never earned for him any electoral votes. And again in 1932 13,600,000 Americans, Mr. President, found that their votes did not count, and they in turn gave their candidate, Herbert Hoover, no electoral votes.

Mr. President, we are told that since the electoral college is but a formality, why not preserve that formal identification with the age of our fathers? The electoral college, however, is not a mere formality. It is a stark reality. Like the human appendix, the electoral college is useless, unpredictable, and a possible center of inflammation. It stands constantly in the minds of Americans as a threat to popular rule. The influence of the electoral-vote system is always found in a presidential campaign from the prenomination stage until the final returns are in. So long as the Constitution remains unchanged on this vital issue, the possibilities of the popular will being ignored, the possibilities of confusion, remain ever present.

I digress for a moment to point out that the two major political parties in considering a potential candidates for the office of President and for the office of Vice President frequently give more consideration to the area the individuals come from than as to the capacities or the abilities they might have or possess to serve as Chief Executive and as Vice President. In other words, the key States of which we often speak, in which a large electoral vote is available, have been a controlling force in the prenomination stage of political party conventions, and in political determination for the strategy of an election. Likewise the electoral-college system continues to plague the Nation with what may well be called a one-party system. Those who wish to register their objection to a particular administration in some areas of the country find it practically impossible to do so because of the inability to count a vote, for example, in some of the Southern States, for the Republican Party. It is not exactly my purpose to plead the cause of strengthening the Republican Party to undue power, but it appears to me that if a man wishes to vote for an opposition candidate in an election, he should have his vote tallied, and his vote should mean something.

The American people have a right to elect their President by direct popular vote, just as they now enjoy the right to elect their governors by direct popular vote. For the past 160 years we in the United States have made a steady march toward greater and greater democracy by the election process. By developing a political party system, we transformed the electoral college from a college of the elite to a political tabulator, even though our history is still replete with proof that it frequently is an inaccurate tabulator.

I may go back into the American history again to point out, Mr. President, that the American electoral-college system, as it was originally conceived, was an effort to remove the office of the Chief Magistrate from the popular control of the American people. The electoral-college system was even an effort to remove it from what might be called partisan conflict. After the first President, Washington, we had the development of a two-party system. At the time of the election we had the so-called Federalists who composed the one party in the original election of George Washington. Following his second term the Jeffersonian Democrats lined up against the so-called Federalists. The Federalist Party later faded out of the picture. Remnants of it became the Whig Party which at a still later stage became the Republican Party.

The political-party structure in America was a unique means developed by the American people in their desire for popular rule to eliminate the effectiveness of the electoral-college system as it had been originally intended.

Again I wish to call the attention of our colleagues who are with us on the floor at this hour that the men who were primarily responsible for the structure of our constitutional system, the men who played the greatest part in it, those whose names we remember with the greatest respect as members of the Constitutional Convention, James Madison and Benjamin Franklin, were the chief proponents of the direct election of President. So let no one say the proposal I submit is a new idea. Let no one feel that it is a departure which goes beyond the intent and the purpose of the creators of the Constitution, because, in fact, the electoral-college system was considered at its best to be a miserable compromise at the time it was incorporated into the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. I fully agree with everything the able Senator from Minnesota has said. I favor his amendment. But I fear that if it should be adopted, the resolution itself would be defeated. Can the Senator allay my apprehensions on this point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, first of all, I may say to my good friend, the Senator from West Virginia, that the junior Senator from Minnesota is not even of the opinion that his amendment is going to be adopted. However, I wish it could be adopted, because I think it provides an appropriate way of conducting elections for the offices of President of the United States and Vice President of the United States. I recognize that the proposal for the direct election of the President has been fought over and been the subject of contest in American history for years. I feel that my amendment offers an approach we need to be considering and working on.

I have told many of my colleagues on the floor of the Senate that should my amendment be defeated, it is my intention to support the so-called Lodge amendment, because I think it is a step in the right direction. I think it represents definitive progress. I recognize that we sometimes have to inch along when some of us would like to gallop along. I am perfectly willing to make that kind of a compromise. But I feel that as we make compromises we ought to state the principle around which compromises should be determined. In other words, to compromise on the basis of the electoral system is not a compromise. That is no compromise at all. The electoral-college system in its very beginning was at its best a miserable compromise in an almost impossible situation. It resulted from a problem in the Constitutional Convention which almost wrecked the convention.

Therefore, I have two purposes in presenting the amendment. First of all, it is my purpose to appeal for support and ask the Members of the United States Senate to line up behind the principle of majority rule, to line up behind the principle of direct government by the consent of the governed, and to get behind the principle of popular rule. I recognize that the possibilities of favorable action are very limited. I realize some of the practical difficulties we encounter in this sort of debate. However, I think it is important that we understand what the true principle in a democratic society ought to be. The true principle is, first, majority rule with a clear definition and respect of minority rights as protected by law. Under the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Minnesota every vote will count; all the minority votes will count and all the majority votes will count.

Mr. President, there is hardly any system of electing a President which, theoretically at least, is more undemocratic than the electoral-college system, which literally throws away millions of votes of citizens who have just as strong convictions as to the rightness of their decision as the majority that may be demonstrated by the electoral college.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will say to the Senator that I have only 2 minutes remaining in which to complete my statement. If I can conclude my statement in less than 2 minutes, I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Very well. I shall wait.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as I have stated, the American people have a right to elect their President by direct popular vote, just as they now enjoy the right to elect their governors by direct popular vote. For the past 160 years we in the United States have made a steady march toward greater and greater democracy. By developing a political-party system, as I pointed out, we transformed the electoral college from a college of the elite to a political tabulator, even though our history is still replete with proof that it frequently is an inaccurate tabulator. By constitutional amendment we extended the right of franchise to our women. By constitutional amendment we have strengthened our democratic process further by providing that Senators of the United States should be elected by the people and not by State legislatures.

We have been continually reasserting our faith in democracy by proclaiming that the people themselves have the right to rule themselves; that they have the right to elect their representatives and their leaders; that we place our faith in the judgment of the people more than in the judgment of any elite. Here indeed is the essential lifeblood of democracy which distinguishes it from any form of totalitarianism.

I may say at this time that once Theodore Roosevelt was asked a question about the principle of majority rule. He made an answer to the effect that in the long run any majority will make fewer mistakes than any selected minority. Personally and congenitally it is impossible for me to understand how the elite can feel that somehow or other some people, by reason of some strange quirk of their personality or geographical situation, have a greater insight into how to be the masters or how to govern other people. The American people have the right to elect the President of the United States. More than any other public official, he is all the people's representation. To perpetuate a system under which a minority candidate can be elected President of the United States is to negate the people's will. I urge the Senate to approve my amendment and allow the people of the United States, though constitutional ratifying conventions in the States, to decide this issue.

Mr. TAFT. Has the Senator's time expired?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think there is about a half minute left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President—

> New occasions teach new duties;
> Time makes ancient good uncouth;
> They must upward still, and onward,
> Who would keep abreast of truth.

All who approve this wise New England doctrine; all who yearn for political reform; and all who believe in government by the people should be deeply grateful to the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] for having introduced the pending joint resolution and for having, with the industry of the busy little bee, the persistence of the English bulldog, and the patience of a hundred patriarchal Jobs, brought to the day and hour of senatorial decision his praiseworthy proposal to deliver the Nation from the antiquated nuisance known as the electoral college.

Mr. President, the eminent Scottish philosopher, David Hume, in his essay on the rise of arts and sciences, included a profound observation which is adopted as a text for my remarks. These were Mr. Hume's relevant words:

> To balance a large state or society, whether monarchical or republican, on general laws, is a work of so great difficulty that no human genius, however comprehensive, is able by the mere dint of reason and reflection to effect it. The judgments of many must unite in the work; experience must guide their labor; time must bring it to perfection; and the feeling of inconveniences must correct the mistakes which they inevitably fall into in their first trials and experiments.

The object of Senate Joint Resolution No. 2 is to terminate certain hardships arising from mistakes made by the famous fifty-five who, on the 14th of May 1787, assembled in Philadelphia to revise the Articles of Confederation.

The constitutional amendment which the resolution proposes would, if ratified, consummate these reforms:

First, abolish the ghost office of presidential elector and confirm the right of the people to elect the President and Vice President of the United States.

Second, eliminate the undemocratic and curiously circumscribed power of the House of Representatives to umpire presidential elections deadlocked because no candidate had received a majority of the electoral votes. It would require elections to be decided on the basis of the highest number of electoral votes received. In the unlikely event of an electoral-vote tie, the decision would be in favor of the recipient of the largest number of popular votes.

Third, it would annul the unit rule under which, in most States, all the electoral votes are awarded the candidate who receives a plurality of the popular vote. The amendment would require the electoral vote to be apportioned in accordance with the popular vote. The candidate who had the greatest number of such votes would receive the greatest number of electoral votes, but he would not receive them all.

SOME OF THE EVILS OF THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

On no problem did the Convention of 1787 expend more time and effort than

on that of devising a suitable method of choosing a President. With no provision of the Constitution did its authors express greater satisfaction than they voiced concerning the method finally devised for selecting the Chief Executive of the Republic. As Hamilton pointed out in the Federalist, it was the only part of the great charter which was not condemned by its opponents. But history proves that since the days of Hamilton this clause of the Constitution has created many difficulties. Every political signboard proclaims that it is now, and if not modified, will continue to be a grave menace to our domestic tranquillity and peace.

The constitutional scheme provided for the selection of the President by what is commonly called the electoral college. It was assumed that each State would choose as its members of the college men of mature wisdom and experience who, animated only by pure patriotism, would make the proper choice. The critical fact is that these electors were supposed to exercise their individual judgment without regard to the popular will. The average person was not deemed capable of deciding questions of great public importance. To each State was reserved the right to choose its electors by any method it saw fit to adopt.

In accordance with these generally accepted views colleges of this type were twice created and on both occasions the Presidency was awarded to the immortal Washington.

In 1796 the third college was elected, largely on party lines; and the fourth, in 1800, was elected entirely on such lines. From then until now the members of the College of Sages have, in general, been denied all independence of action. Yet for a hundred and fifty years we have been saddled with the old and outmoded procedure whereby the voter's choice is expressed through men who ordinarily have little more than average intelligence, experience, and education and who, in any event, are pledged in advance to vote for a designated candidate.

Although comparisons are always odious, and sometimes dangerous, I nevertheless venture to compare the electoral college to the vermiform appendix. In ages past it may have served a useful physiological purpose, but now it constitutes a peril to life and a menace to health. Just as appendicitis may be either acute or chronic, so also the political appendicitis to which the electoral college may give rise may take the form of either a mild attack or a fatal peritonitis.

That danger is real and not academic. The elector is not legally bound to vote for the candidates of his party for President or Vice President. He may, if he chooses, utterly ignore the mandate of the people.

This very perversion of democratic justice actually occurred as recently as 1948.

The electoral-college appendix also gives rise to a multitude of other serious ailments. In many States the people vote not for President but for a long list of electoral candidates. Hundreds of thousands of voters have been disfranchised as a result of the errors they made in attempting to use the confusing ballots containing the electors' names. It has also happened that ineligible electors have been chosen—with the result that their votes for President and Vice President were invalidated. What confusion, what misfortune might result if invalidated electoral votes should determine the election or defeat of a presidential candidate.

And what greater misfortune might result if 531 relatively inexperienced, untrained electors were, in fact, called upon to exercise their independent judgment in selecting a President This could easily occur if a successful candidate became incapacitated before the electors met to cast their votes.

The proposed amendment, if ratified, would eliminate all these complications and dangers by abolishing the fictitious, fossilized office of presidential elector.

An additional objective of the resolution is that of improving the method of electing the President in the event no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes. Such deadlocked elections are now thrust into the House of Representatives, which chooses the President from among the three leading candidates. Each State delegation has one and only one vote. Consequently, 25 such States votes could settle the election in the House.

Under this procedure all States, regardless of differences in population, are given equal power in electing the President. The popular will may thus be wholly ignored. It was notoriously thwarted in 1824, when the House chose John Quincy Adams in preference to Andrew Jackson.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). The time allotted to the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts graciously yield me five additional minutes?

Mr. LODGE. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. NEELY. I thank the Senator sincerely.

Mr. President, not less dangerous is the circumstances that the House itself might become deadlocked, with the appalling result that even in a time of crisis the country might be without a Chief Executive.

The amendment would entirely eliminate this danger. The candidate having, not a majority, but the greater number of electoral votes, would be declared President. If the result of this procedure should be a tie, then the Presidency would be awarded to the candidate for whom the greatest number of popular votes had been cast.

THE EVIL OF THE UNIT RULE

The final nuisance which the resolution is designed to abate is the unit rule. At the present, in all but a few States, the entire electoral vote is awarded to the candidate who receives a bare plurality of the popular vote. In many of the States the candidate who obtains a plurality of a single vote wins all his State's electoral votes. Popular disfranchisement is the shocking consequence of this procedure. And the result may be the election of a President by a minority of the voters, or the election of a candidate who has more electoral votes, but fewer popular votes than his leading opponent.

It is regretfully realized that it is beyond the scope of the resolution to make the election of a President by a minority an absolute impossibility. This desirable impossibility can never be assured except by the nullification of the great compromise under which each State, regardless of its population, is granted a bonus of two electoral votes.

The complete expression of the principle of popular sovereignty is a consummation worthy of universal desire. In every State in the Union, whether its population be great or small, a vote should be a vote—and no more. A constitutional amendment providing for the election of the President and Vice President by the direct vote of the people instead of by the indirect device of allocating the electoral votes of the various States would command my unhesitating support. But, for obvious reasons which need not be stated, I fear that the pending measure would be defeated if it were amended so as to include this desirable reform. Doubtless it could be persuasively argued that every reformation should wear the garments of perfection from the moment of its birth till the end of its days. Nevertheless, in this case, as in a thousand others, "heaven is not reached at a single bound."

In my opinion, the resolution, notwithstanding its minor imperfections, proposes a notable improvement in the existing system. The modification would, in practice, almost, if not entirely, eliminate the chance that a presidential candidate who receives the largest number of electoral votes would be declared President over an opponent who has polled a larger proportion of the popular vote.

The unit rule, as it now operates, encourages the selection of presidential candidates from a few "pivotal States." In the distant past, the South supplied the nation with a number of distinguished Chief Executives. But in recent years, it has not provided a single major party candidate for President. In this important matter New England has approached the low level of the States south of the Mason and Dixon's line. These regions are certainly not lacking in men and women who possess presidential qualifications. These should not be deprived of a chance to serve their country in the highest of all official capacities.

The unit rule provides minority groups in doubtful States political power disproportionate to their voting strength. In these States it increases the possibility of corruption and deprives the people of the "safe" States of the benefit of vigorously contested elections.

Mr. President, the proposed constitutional amendment would, if ratified, either wholly eliminate or greatly minimize all the evils we have mentioned and a number of others which we do not have time to discuss. Under the amended Constitution, every vote for President or Vice President would count. No longer would millions of voters be deprived of

their right to support the candidate of their choice.

Campaign battles would be fought in every State in the Union. The entire country, and not just doubtful States, would become the reservoir of Presidential candidates. And the excessive influence which balance-of-power minority factions now exercise in the large pivotal States and the great cities would be ended. The various groups in these States and cities would, like others, be obliged to wage their political warfare on merit and not on the basis of strategic geographical location.

At this critical hour, when the world is menaced by a ruthless power which has no regard for constitutional forms or individual rights, it is especially important that we increase our efforts to strengthen our constitutional structure so as further to extend and safeguard popular sovereignty.

All too often a defect in a dam is repaired only after a disastrous flood.

All too often an appendix operation is performed too late to save the patient's life.

The constitutional infirmities which the resolution seeks to remedy are of structure and not of detail. The afflictions are malignant, not benign. The time to operate is now. Next year may be too late.

The heavy responsibility of attempting to amend the Constitution is duly recognized and thoroughly understood. We know that the founding fathers intended that amendments should not be undertaken without mature consideration and adequate investigation, and then only in accordance with the dictates of clear conscience and sound judgment.

Nevertheless I plead for this amendment on the grounds of common necessity, common sense and common service, and support my appeal with the following observations of the illustrious Thomas Jefferson:

> Some men look at constitutions with sanctimonious reverence and deem them like the Ark of the Covenant, too sacred to be touched. They ascribe to the preceding age a wisdom more than human and suppose what they did to be beyond amendment. I knew that age well; I belonged to it and labored with it. It deserves well of its country. It was very like the present, but without the experience of the present; and 40 years of experience in government is worth a century of book reading; and this they would say themselves, were they to rise from the dead. I am certainly not an advocate of frequent and untried changes in laws and institutions * * * but I know also, that laws and institutions go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times. We might as well require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy, as civilized society to remain ever under the regime of their barbarous ancestors.

Two years before his death, Jefferson wrote this immortal postscript:

> Nothing, then, is unchangeable but the inherent and unalienable rights of man.

Mr. President, let us promote these cherished rights by promptly adopting the resolution before us. Let us speed the achievement of its lofty objectives to unshackle popular suffrage, invigorate men's rights, fire their ambitious, extend their political horizons and inspire them to see and think and act for themselves.

After the passage of the resolution and the ratification of its proposal, we can justly, proudly, and truthfully proclaim that popular government in the United States has, at last, been ceremoniously and certainly crowned and sceptered and enthroned.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I favor the passage of Senate Joint Resolution No. 2, as introduced by the able junior Senator from Massachusetts, for himself and other Senators. I do so, based upon reasons he has so forcefully expounded.

The electoral-college system is an anachronism today, as outmoded as the horse and buggy of yesteryear in this era of supersonic speed. Whatever purpose it may have served in years gone by, it is considered by citizens today to be a roundabout, thoroughly unsatisfactory and unreliable procedure for insuring exact selection in the highest office of our Government.

That it has several times resulted in the selection of a candidate receiving less than a majority of the popular vote is valid argument for a change. The fact that the operations of the electoral-college system are a complete mystery to the vast majority of our citizens offers further sound reason for bringing the presidential-election processes more closely into line with common sense and businesslike procedures.

Through the years, the citizens of the country have been at the mercy of the chosen electors who have been bound, not by directives founded in the laws of the land, but by political considerations entirely. The proposed constitutional amendment would remove any possibility of a complete disregard of the expressed choice of the voters.

This amendment would restore to millions of voters, particularly in States where either party is greatly in the minority, their right of Presidential franchise, so to speak. Today there is small incentive to any voter in such areas to go to the polls, because of the certainty that his or her vote would not be reflected in any way whatsoever in the returns.

Anything that can be done to interest more people in exercising their voting privileges will strengthen democratic processes and make for a more healthy governmental situation. This result I believe Senate Joint Resolution 2 would help to accomplish. Furthermore, it also would make less likely the present danger that a candidate receiving the largest popular vote might well fail to attain to the highest office in the land because his opponent, by slim majorities in a few more populous States, could attain a greater electoral-college total, despite his smaller popular vote.

By correcting this situation, I confidently believe we would attract additional millions of voters to the polls for Presidential elections. When one remembers the pitifully small proportion of voters who have cast ballots in some recent Presidential-election years, any move to improve this situation would be decidedly worth while. There can be little doubt that the adoption of this constitutional amendment would accomplish many desired and desirable results.

For these reasons, I favor the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington will support Senate Joint Resolution 2 for a number of reasons, from among which he wishes to offer the following for consideration by his colleagues.

I hope the joint resolution becomes the law of the land, because I was born in the South and received my college education in the State of Tennessee, because I have lived most of my life in the State of Washington and throughout the Pacific Northwest, because I believe in the right and opportunity to freely compete, and because I am a Republican who has a tremendous pride in and respect for the political party to which I belong.

Mr. President, as one who began his life in the South as a member of a family which came first to Virginia more than three centuries ago, I am fully conscious of the unlimited promise which that great area possesses, and I am keenly aware of its serious and outstanding obstacles and weaknesses. To my mind, the South has not yet realized its possibilities, because under the protective cloak of a one-party system it continues to live in the past. The passage of Senate Joint Resolution 2 would create, almost overnight, a vigorous and alert two-party system below the Mason and Dixon's line. Southerners would be required to choose sides and to make a choice as between alternatives presented to them by both Democrats and Republicans.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. Does not the Senator think that such a consummation would be a blessing to the American people?

Mr. CAIN. The substance of everything I shall say in approximately 5 minutes will be in support of the feeling just expressed by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. President, southerners would be stimulated to rid themselves of the disappointing degree of political apathy and indifference which the record proves they still have. The passage of Senate Joint Resolution 2 would return the Southern States to the Union. This would be good for the South, as every intelligent and self-respecting southerner knows; and the resulting good would

bring added strength, stamina, and vigor to the United States of America.

The passage of the joint resolution would help to create a dynamic Republican Party in the sovereign State of Washington, which I represent in the Senate. I think it proper to speak frankly about my political hopes for the resolution which is before us. The Republican Party in my own home State has distressingly lost in recent years some of its will and desire to wage vigorous war with the opposition. Because my party at home has lost all the electoral votes for years, too many have made up their minds, even though the margins of loss have been narrow, that the electoral votes are lost forever. The passage of Senate Joint Resolution 2 would either restore the Republican Party in Washington State to a position of authority or cause it to go practically out of business. The determination of what ought to happen to the political parties in the State of Washington would be vested where it belongs, in the hands of the people, if the resolution before us prevails.

As an American who believes in free competition, I am strongly in favor of the resolution. Its passage would provide the Republican Party, for the first time in its history, with an opportunity to present its program and its candidates to all the people of the country. For decades, the Republican Party has not even bothered to lay its case before the people who live in certain States of the Union.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time allotted to the Senator from Washington has expired.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield me an additional minute?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator an additional minute.

Mr. CAIN. Tragically, the Republicans have thought that no progress could be made within the Southern States. Even more tragically, the Democrats have paid no attention to the citizens in these same States, because the Democrats have concluded logically that the southerner only had one way in which to go. Competition is the only medium through which progress and health and growth can be guaranteed. The passage of the joint resolution will justify the possession of the rights and opportunities for every American citizen, for the first time since the fashioning of a nation on this continent.

I stand strongly for the passage of this resolution, Mr. President, because I am a Republican. I believe in my party and in its principles. I am not basically concerned with the results of future elections in America. My chief concern is with that character of machinery which will permit my party and its candidates to be heard. If my party fails to produce the right candidates, or if it fails to write a program which our people want or think they want, my party is not entitled to be victorious. All my party has a right to want is an even chance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one concluding sentence?

Mr. LODGE. I yield one more minute to the Senator.

Mr. CAIN. I am convinced that the passage of the pending resolution will be good and beneficial for the Southern States, for the West, for the Nation. It goes without saying that what is good for America is good for politics generally and for the Republican Party to which the junior Senator from Washington belongs.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, there have now been four speakers on the side of the proponents. I should be glad to let the Senator from Michigan put on some of his speakers at this time, if he desires to do so.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not wish to proceed. If the Senator can use some of his time for other speakers, I shall appreciate it.

Mr. LODGE. I have already put on four speakers. I want to save some time in which to sum up. But I will yield to the Senator from New Jersey for 2 minutes, if he desires to speak at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I addressed myself to this subject 2 days ago, and do not propose to repeat the arguments I made at that time. I tried to point out then that it was my conviction the proposed joint resolution would strengthen the two-party system in America. Today I wish to confine my concluding remarks in the space of 2 minutes to one single argument which in my opinion is of transcendent importance.

The able Senator from Massachusetts, who has led the forces seeking to submit this amendment to the people, has himself stated my main argument in these words:

> It spreads the Presidential campaign and any subsequent Presidential political activity into all the 48 States.

That is the preponderant argument, for the joint resolution, it seems to me, if we are to increase the vitality of our political system.

I submit, Mr. President, that on that score alone the Congress should vote overwhelmingly to submit this proposed amendment to the legislatures of the 48 States.

We are faced here with a question of the vitality of our democracy. We are proud in our country of the fact that every qualified citizen is entitled to vote. We are continually urging that voters come to the polls on election day to exercise this most precious political right. And yet we know that, under the present system of Presidential elections, in many States the choice between the candidates of the two major parties is a foregone conclusion. There is no real political contest. A Democrat in Maine or a Republican in South Carolina, for instance, knows that his vote for the Presidential candidate of his choice will be a wasted vote. There is little wonder that such a voter, as often as not, stays home on election day. Let me at this point call attention to the fact that in the last Presidential election, with nearly 90,000,000 eligible voters, only 45,000,000 exercised the franchise. That represents a very critical situation.

Senate Joint Resolution 2 proposes an amendment which, for the first time, would give some meaning to the right of these minority voters to vote for the office of President. They would know that their votes would be counted in the final outcome. As a result, for the first time we would find that the Presidential campaign was a vital contest, not simply in a few pivotal States but in every State of the Union.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute more?

Mr. LODGE. I yield 1 minute more.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, this is no time for the close calculation of political advantage. I have no idea whether in the long run the proposed amendment would benefit the Democratic Party or the Republican Party. I am frank to say I feel it would benefit the Republican Party, of which I am a member; but I do not know. But, no matter which party we adhere to, all of us as Americans have a profound stake in the vitality of our democracy. I am convinced that the proposed amendment would improve its vitality by giving real meaning to the votes of each and every American, everywhere in the land.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes at the present time. I merely wish to summarize certain of the things I have said previously on the pending subject.

There is a misconception that the amendment provides for popular vote in the elections of President and Vice President of the United States. The popular-vote idea was not pursued originally in the Constitution because of the thought that it was necessary to federate into one union the various sovereign States. The framers of the Constitution thought so favorably of the idea of federation that they were willing to provide for the election of President by a system which did not recognize popular voting. The idea was to give to every State at least three electoral votes, one for each Senator and each Representative in Congress. Whereas all States must have at least one Representative, provision was made that each State should have at least three representatives in the electoral college. It was carried further. It was provided that if no candidate received an electoral majority and an election were thrown into the House of Representatives, there again the unit rule would be recognized. It would be recognized that each State was entitled to at least one vote, which would place each State upon an equal footing. The sole reason for that was the idea of trying to make and preserve a Federal union.

The Senator from Michigan has not advocated and does not now advocate retaining the electoral college. He does not advocate the idea that a member of

the electoral college can vote in a different way than that decided by the people of his State when they elected him. There is no doubt that direct popular vote is in theory the best way of electing the President and Vice President of the United States. The Senator from Michigan would go along with that idea if the electors in each State were of equal qualifications. If the United States Congress could establish the qualifications for voters, and if they were the same in each State, in theory, the ideal situation would be achieved. But, at the same time, I must recognize, as I believe the people will recognize, that the smaller States will see in that kind of a popular vote the taking away from them of their sovereignty. I am satisfied that great difficulty would be experienced in obtaining approval of three-fourths of the States for such a procedure.

Mr. President, I have proposed an amendment which I believe would abolish the electoral college and the old idea, which some persons call the horse-and-buggy idea, of the right of an elector to vote other than the way the people in his State instructed him to vote. I believe we should move forward and have a better system.

I ask that there be inserted at this place in my remarks the amendment to which I refer.

There being no objection, the amendment proposed by Mr. FERGUSON was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 2, line 18, after "election", insert "or a subsequent election provided for in this paragraph."

On page 3, beginning with line 4, strike through line 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The person having the greatest number of votes cast for President in a State shall be credited with the total number of the electoral votes of such State; except that, if no person may be credited with such electoral votes by reason of a tie in the number of votes cast for President, a subsequent election for President shall be held in such State at such time as the Congress shall direct. The person having a majority of the whole number of such electoral votes for President shall be President. If no person has such a majority, then from the two persons having the highest numbers of electoral votes for President the Senate and the House of Representatives sitting in joint session shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. A quorum for this purpose shall consist of a majority of the combined membership of the Senate and the House of Representatives and a majority of the votes of the Members voting, each having one vote, shall be necessary for a choice."

On page 3, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

"The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate and the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have developed upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate and the House of Representatives may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them."

On page 3, beginning with line 20, strike out all down to and including line 22 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of section 1, article II, of the Constitution, the twelfth article of amendment to the Constitution, and section 4 of the twentieth article of amendment to the Constitution, are hereby repealed."

Mr. FERGUSON. The amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Michigan seeks to preserve the reform features whose results can be ascertained, and to remove those which are based on purely speculative consequences.

The pending resolution seeks to eliminate the electoral college. I think that should be done, as my amendment will demonstrate.

Second, the resolution seeks to remedy the situation which occurs when an election is cast into the House of Representatives, where a vote is taken by States and without regard to popular will. I accept that purpose, but I propose to do so in a manner which I believe would protect the best interests of the Nation.

The Lodge resolution would remedy the situation by completely bypassing a congressional referendum. It does so by eliminating the requirement that a candidate must have a majority of the electoral vote and substituting a mere plurality requirement.

The amendment offered by the junior Senator from Michigan would remedy the situation by preserving the majority rule and by providing that whenever a candidate fails to receive a majority of electoral votes, the House and Senate shall sit in joint session and vote individually upon the candidates. The joint session would correspond in numbers to the number of electoral votes and would more positively reflect popular will than would the existing voting procedure which is limited to ballots by States. In other words, every State would have the total number of votes that would equal the number of its Senators and Representatives. There can be no doubt that on such an important occasion every Senator and every Representative would be in his seat, and there would be a vote of all those who were actually able to be in their seats, so that there would be a majority of the 531 Members.

My amendment would eliminate completely the provision for proportional counting of electoral votes and its certain invitation to the rise of multiple parties.

I cannot too strongly emphasize to the Senate and the people the desirability of preventing or discouraging the rise of multiple parties, because they would constitute a curse coming down upon this great Nation. Think of the situation in Greece. The Greek people are trying to solve their problems; but in their coming election there will be 86 different parties, resulting in coalitions to the point where it will be impossible to place responsibility. In America it has been 2-party responsibility which has protected the stability of our political system.

I submit that the proposals of the junior Senator from Michigan would cure the great bulk of the weaknesses in the present elective system, and would not depart into experiments laden with threats to the stability of our political system which are inherent in Senate Joint Resolution 2.

Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois, the distinguished majority leader [Mr. LUCAS] has offered an amendment to the Lodge resolution which provides that a candidate must receive 40 percent of the electoral votes instead of a mere plurality. .

It also provides that should no candidate receive 40 percent of the electoral vote, a constitutional majority of a joint session of the Congress shall elect a candidate.

The proposal does not affect the proportional counting of electoral votes provided in Senate Joint Resolution 2.

This is a refinement of the plurality requirement. As such it is a recognition of my argument that proportional counting as provided in Senate Joint Resolution 2 is likely to invite splinter parties. The proposal is merely to set up a minimum requirement for their strength. In other words, the distinguished Senator from Illinois, by his amendment, says that, in his opinion, the passage of the resolution and the adoption of the constitutional amendment it proposes would cause the splintering of parties and the splintering of responsibility.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time allotted to the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I allot to myself five additional minutes.

The undeniable fact is that 40 percent is still a mere plurality and is short of a majority.

The argument against this proposition was succinctly covered in the debate on the Senate floor in 1934. As I have recounted before, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, the late Senator Norris, had proposed an election reform which in the first instance embodied the proportional counting scheme. That feature of the proposal was eliminated in committee. As it came from the committee the proposal contained a provision quite similar to that of the Senator from Illinois, that a candidate be required to have 35 percent of the electoral vote. On the floor Senator Norris moved to have the provision stricken out and a majority requirement substituted. He recognized that any provision for a mere percentage of the electoral vote, instead of a majority, would wreck the whole political system of America. He recognized that provision was not being made for popular vote. Oh, yes, we can shout and say we are for popular vote. I have heard that said on the floor of the Senate, and that Senate Joint Resolution 2 provides for a popular vote. In truth that is not the fact.

The proponents of the joint resolution recognize the counting of two Senators and more Representatives, and the provisional voting under the unit rule, except that they divide them across State lines.

On the floor Senator Norris moved to have that 35-percent provision stricken, and a majority requirement substituted.

Senator Robinson asked Senator Norris at that point:

The Senator has become convinced that it is better not to permit an election by popular vote of what may be termed a minority candidate.

Senator Norris, true liberal that he was, repudiated his earlier proposal by answering simply, "That is true." It cannot be said that Senator Norris was thinking only in terms of horse-and-buggy days. He had looked at both sides of the issue and made his decision in terms of what he considered best for the national interest.

Mr. President, any proposal which requires less than a majority is an invitation to minority elections. By opening the door further to multiple parties, with a proportional voting scheme, their intrusion is inevitable.

In brief, Mr. President, the proposal of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] affects only one of the two principal objections I have recorded against Senate Joint Resolution 2, and that only partially. It modifies the plurality requirement, but in that respect goes only part way, for it leaves a requirement still considerably short of a majority. It does not touch at all the second evil of Senate Joint Resolution 2, the proportional counting scheme, which is certain to enter a wedge into the two-party system and introducing the curse of multiple parties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time allotted the Senator has expired.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to modify my substitute. I ask that beginning with line 14, page 2, everything be stricken out after the word "have," down to line 18, and that there be substituted the words "such qualifications as shall be prescribed by the Congress."

I also ask unanimous consent that on page 4, line 24, after the word "have," there be stricken out the words "the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature," and that there be substituted therefor the words "such qualifications as shall be prescribed by the Congress."

I also ask unanimous consent to have the entire section 7, which sets forth what should be done in case of a tie, entirely eliminated, and that on page 7 the figure "8" be changed to "7," and the figure "9" be changed to "8."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will send his proposed changes to the desk, they will be noted.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am offering the substitute because I am conscientiously and firmly convinced that the American people ought to have the right to vote for President and Vice President of the United States by direct vote. Senate Joint Resolution 2 does not so provide. It merely abolishes the electoral college, as such, in name, but as a matter of fact the people themselves still would not be voting directly for President and Vice President.

Mr. President, we elect our school boards, we elect the mayors of our towns, by direct vote of the people. We elect the Governors of the States, the Members of the House of Representatives, and United States Senators, by direct vote of the people, and I know of no reason why we should not elect the President of the United States by direct vote of the people.

The pending measure, Senate Joint Resolution 2, does not eliminate political games. A group of Republicans a few months before election could still get together in a smoke-filled room and nominate some man whom the people of the country did not want. A few days later the Democrats could meet and nominate another man of the same character. Then the big business interests, which had nominated those two men, neither of whom was desired by the rank and file of the people of America, would proceed to campaign for the men they had nominated. The only choice the people would have would be to vote for one or the other.

Under my substitute any man or woman who desired to run as a candidate for President of the United States could do so. There could be a direct primary in June, and whoever was the high candidate in the Republican Party or in the Democratic Party would be the nominee of the party, just as is done in the case of governors at the present time. Then in the month of November the two men chosen by the rank and file of the people would be the two candidates, with the result that the people would have nominated in a primary election the Democrat or the Republican they would choose to be President.

Mr. President, that is not the only provision of the substitute. It provides also that an independent group, if they could get one-half of 1 percent of all the people who voted in the last presidential election, could nominate a man to run independently.

I ask, Mr. President, is it not true that in the last election, and in the election 4 years before that, those in America who were opposed to war had absolutely no chance to vote for a candidate who shared that opposition? Some may say there was no interest in the question, but I remember that when Burton K. Wheeler spoke in Los Angeles, 108,000 people attended the meeting where he spoke. It was a meeting called by those who were opposed to the United States entering World War II.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time allotted the Senator from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I merely say, in conclusion, that I hope my substitute will prevail.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] does not seem to be on the floor at the moment.

To summarize what I have previously said, the heart of Senate Joint Resolution 2 lies in two provisions:

First. Division of a State's electoral votes among candidates on the basis of their popular votes, allowing each candidate to total up his shares regardless of State lines. This substitutes a sharing system for the present unit system, but it does not provide for the popular election of President as is provided in the substitute of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Second. Substitution of a plurality instead of majority requirement in the election of the President.

The Senator from Massachusetts and I agree on abolishing the electoral college, but we differ sharply on what are likely to be the consequences of the two radical changes I have mentioned, which he would make in our political system. My views can be stated briefly in five points.

First. Dividing up a State's electoral votes among all candidates would result in multiple parties. The present unit rule discourages the growth of minority parties. They are forced to work with either one of the two major parties. Senate Joint Resolution 2 gives them the incentive and machinery to preserve their identity, to build up their strength, as they wait for the day to take over. In time, the two-party system would be destroyed. It would foster and stimulate those people who have a single issue and desire to create a political party representing a single issue.

Mr. President, as I have stated before, and I cannot emphasize it too strongly, for it represents the great value of the two-party system, the existence of the two parties causes to be shaded into one or the other of the parties various, diverse views, multiple enough to represent the ideas of the great mass of the citizens. It is under such a melting process that there is developed a great political party which has been able to stand the test and elect Senators and Representatives through these many years. Yes, Mr. President, on occasions we have had 70 other parties spring up. But they have lasted for only a very short time because of the necessity for persons holding various opinions to go into a great party where they can be represented in a national election and on a national basis.

The South would be the first section of the country invaded by radical minorities, and the North would soon be infected. Even if Democrats are blind to this fate, Republicans cannot afford to let it happen, because multiple parties are against the national interest.

Second. Multiple parties at the presidential level would soon build up slates at the congressional level. Eventually they would demand proportional representation in Congress, on boards and commissions, in the courts. The end result will be bloc and coalition government with all its dangers. We shall not be blind to what is happening in other countries because of coalition governments. We should be warned that a real danger would exist even here in America if we were to have a coalition government.

Third. Under Senate Joint Resolution 2, States lose immediately their control over their electoral vote. Small States would be reduced to zero influence, and the voice of large States would be cut in two, with no recognition for their weight in population, taxation, and eco-

nomic importance. We are not dealing only with a method of counting votes but with a complicated political system.

Those were the things which caused our forefathers to look so carefully at this thing and act as they did.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). The time which the Senator from Michigan has allotted to himself has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. I allot to myself five more minutes.

Fourth. Eventually all Presidential elections would be federalized. The Constitution cannot guarantee a candidate a share in electoral votes, without following through to guarantee him the right to get on State ballots, so that he can have the means of getting those votes. Either by Supreme Court decision or by minority pressures, the States would be forced ultimately to surrender their control of elections to the Federal Government.

Fifth. The plurality provision will result in more, not less, minority Presidents. Senator LODGE says plurality elections now prevail in States and localities. This is true only on the surface, not in substance. With few exceptions, pluralities always result in a final choice between the two major parties, because the present system discourages minority parties. Third parties are small and of little account. Even if the Senator from Massachusetts were correct, plurality winners are confined to single States and small localities. The Nation at large is not endangered by a minority choice. His resolution makes minority Presidents a constant possibility on the national level. A candidate with as low as 30 percent of the vote could become President. Under the proposed amendment to the Lodge resolution the percentage would be 40 percent.

I do not think this would be good for the Nation. Therefore I would urge that the so-called Lodge resolution be defeated.

Mr. President, because it is so appropriate to the present moment, I wish to read now from a speech delivered by Abraham Lincoln:

> But we must not promise what we ought not, lest we be called on to perform what we cannot; we must be calm and moderate, and consider the whole difficulty, and determine what is possible and just. We must not be led by excitement and passion to do that which our sober judgments would not approve in our cooler moments. We have higher aims; we will have more serious business than to dally with temporary measures.

Mr. President, I repeat the words "We must not promise what we ought not, lest we be called on to perform what we cannot."

We should not promise the people of the United States that the proposed constitutional amendment will not bring vast and undesired changes simply because we assume they will not. We should not tell the people we will give to them the right to vote directly for President, or say that the voter in Michigan is on the same basis as the voter in Mississippi or in New York, because that is not the fact. We would still retain the unit rule, dividing it after it crosses the State line, but retaining the unit rule vote.

Mr. President, this is not a measure which would provide for a popular election of President of the United States, and the public should not be misled into believing that it is such a measure.

Does the Senator from Massachusetts wish to speak at this time?

Mr. LODGE. I am saving some time for myself to conclude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts controls 15 minutes. The Senator from Michigan controls 25.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to oppose the joint resolution, principally on the one ground, that it would give a tremendously disproportionate weight to one-party States. It may perhaps be possible to change the situation in one-party States; but, as a general proposition, it is very difficult to change a one-party county or a one-party State, and whether it can be done is entirely conjectural. A one-party State would have infinitely greater weight under the so-called Lodge resolution than it has under the present system.

Under the present system it is said that the State of New York, for instance, with a large vote which has to go all one way or another, has a somewhat disproportionate influence. I think that can be argued. But certainly it is not so disproportionate as the result would be if the constitutional amendment were adopted, by reason of the number of one-party States in the United States. Adoption of the constitutional amendment, which is held forth as being a measure providing for return to popular vote, will do exactly the opposite thing. In view of the present conditions in the United States, it is far more likely that under the proposed method we may elect a President who has actually a minority of the popular vote than it is under the system now in operation.

I quite agree that the present system is not ideal. I would be perfectly willing to have the problem studied and try to work it out in the best possible manner, but certainly the amendment proposed by the joint resolution would not accomplish the purpose intended. We should not hastily amend the Constitution of the United States, for such an amendment will probably remain in force for another 150 years, as the Constitution itself has. If we are going to amend it at all we ought to endeavor to make it just as perfect as possible.

Personally I would be willing under some circumstances to vote for a resolution based simply on the popular vote. Certainly that would be logical and reasonably defensible. I believe that the alternatives proposed by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] have one fault. They leave to the State the determination of the number of electors, being the same number as under the State legislature procedure. That means, for instance, that a State would get much greater weight in a straight popular vote by reducing the age from 21 to 18 and adding a number of electors.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. That has been amended.

Mr. TAFT. Then I may vote for the Senator's amendment. There is that possible fault. There is a logical basis for it, but this system is not a system of popular vote.

The clearest evidence that such cases not only could occur but that they have actually occurred appears on page 179 of the record. There it is shown that in the 1900 election William McKinley had a total popular vote of 7,219,000, and Bryan had a total popular vote of 6,358,000. That gave McKinley 52.8 percent of the popular vote. Yet under the Lodge proposal Bryan would have been elected in 1900, although he got only 47.2 percent of the popular vote.

So certainly this is not the ideal system. The result I have described can happen, and it would have happened, in my opinion, if this system had been in effect. In the case to which I have referred, under the electoral-vote system, McKinley got 292 electoral votes and Bryan 155. Under the proposed amendment, McKinley would have gotten 214 electoral votes and Bryan 218.

I have made calculations, which I shall ask to have inserted in the RECORD, with relation to the effect of the different systems.

In analyzing the election of 1900 as it would have counted under the Lodge resolution, we find that Bryan had an electoral majority in approximately 16 States. Of those, 11 States were in the extreme South. He got 42.8 percent of the electoral votes in those States. He got 4½ percent in the five or six States he carried in the North. McKinley, from all the other States together, got only 41.8 percent.

In other words, certain States have a tremendous electoral vote majority. Take a State like Mississippi. In that election Mississippi had a weight of seven electoral votes, whereas the State of Ohio, which was McKinley's home State, had a weight of only 1.6 electoral votes.

It can be clearly seen what would happen today in the case of Ohio. We have a total of 25 electoral votes. If we carry the State of Ohio by 125,000, we are doing a pretty good job. As a matter of fact, the vote is so close that Dewey actually carried the State of Ohio in 1944 by 12,000 votes out of 3,000,000 votes, and he lost it in 1948 by 7,000 votes. I do not know the Willkie majority but it was not so large as 125,000. In that case those votes would be divided—13 Republican and 12 Democratic. We would get a weight of one vote in the electoral college.

Take the State of Georgia. If we run through the record of votes in Georgia, the comparison is much more than 3 to 1. Assuming that it is 3 to 1, Georgia has 12 electoral votes, with a population

considerably less than half the population of Ohio. The vote would probably be divided 9 to 3. That means that Georgia would have a weight of six in the electoral college, or six times as much as the State of Ohio. We might conceivably have three. Our majority might go to 250,000, but it is not likely.

It is also rather interesting in that general situation to note the facts in connection with the 1940 election. Suppose the election had been conducted under the general plan of the Lodge resolution. In the electoral-college vote Mr. Roosevelt got 127 electoral votes from the 11 Southern States and 240 from the Northern States, a total of 367 votes. He got about twice as much from the South as from the North. But when we calculate the vote under the Lodge resolution we find that his majority is 77 from the Southern States and 34 from the States he carried in the North. In other words, the Southern States would have twice as much influence in the election of a President, from the Democratic standpoint, under the proposed system than they have had under the present system. That might be a highly desirable result to some.

I mention this factor only to indicate that this is not a scientific system. It is a system based on a theory which has no relation to the actual popular vote, so far as I can see, or only a very small relation. It gives a much greater influence to a one-party State. The same thing may be said of Vermont or perhaps Nebraska and Kansas, as compared with any of the larger States.

Secondly, the Lodge amendment gives much greater influence to a vote in a State which has a small vote. In other words, today, so far as the present record is concerned, anyone voting in the South under the Lodge amendment would have four times the influence that I have in voting in Ohio.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. That is not quite true of the State of Tennessee, which has a strong Republican organization. In that respect, it has much more the character of a Northern State.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator have the percentages for all the States?

Mr. TAFT. I have a great many figures.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to have the Senator put them in the RECORD.

Mr. TAFT. I intend to place in the RECORD everything I have before me.

It seems to me clear that if we are to perfect the system, we should perfect it. I would be very much in favor of the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], which proposes to establish a commission to study the entire question as scientifically as possible, to see if there cannot be found a system which can be adopted by the Congress and by the States, a system which will give a direct reflection of the popular vote. If the pending joint resolution fails of passage, I hope the Senator from Rhode Island will press his resolution, because I think improvements should be made. But certainly I do not think we should step out of the frying pan into the fire. We should not step out of a situation in which some States have perhaps a little more influence than others and enter one under which other States will have much greater influence. We should not step into a situation which a voter in one State will have a great deal more influence than a voter in another State. That certainly is the condition which would arise under this joint resolution.

On the whole I think we ought to consider a long time before we give up the State unit system. Our campaigns have been conducted on a State basis. On a State basis we know what we are doing. The ultimate effect of votes on what happens in the Nation is a long way off. We have conducted our campaigns in this country on a State basis, and we have got them down to the people, where the people can consider the issues, by conducting them on a State basis. We must do it anyway. We must elect Senators, Representatives, and all the State officers on a State basis. We must carry the election by a majority if we wish to elect those officers. It seems to me that if we want to have a real campaign influence, we ought to consider a long time before we leave the State basis, if we are to consider the States at all. Of course, the joint resolution gives consideration to the States, and then adopts a system of proportional representation imposed upon the State system.

The theory that we ought to go to a system of a national majority and have a straight popular vote is perfectly sound. We can do that if we wish. But if we are to maintain the States, if the States are really to elect these officers, if we are to give each State a certain number of electoral votes based upon population, regardless of how it votes, regardless of whether it has two parties, and regardless of whether the people of the State care to vote or not, it seems to me that every campaign ought to be fought out on a State basis.

In my judgment, if the proposed commission is to consider the question, it ought to give great weight to the fact that we have established a union of States. We have always based everything on a union of independent States. All our elections are based upon the State unit. I think we would make a great mistake if we were to abandon that system, unless such a course seemed to be the only solution. Certainly I do not think we should have a hybrid cross such as would be the result of the joint resolution. The joint resolution would in no way cure the evils in the present electoral system.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wish to refer very briefly to an amendment which I have proposed to Senate Joint Resolution 2. The amendment deals with just one phase of the situation, namely, the desirability, as I see it, of maintaining in this country the two-party system which has worked to the advantage of freedom and to the advantage of everyone in this Republic of ours.

It seems to me that if this proposed legislation is enacted, even with the Lucas amendment included in it, it will be a tremendous inducement for a great many so-called splinter parties to develop, with the result of fragmenting to a number of small, aggressive, but highly irresponsible parties, the votes of the people of this country for President.

The joint resolution as proposed states, on page 3:

> Each person for whom votes were cast for President in each State shall be credited with such proportion of the electoral votes thereof as he received of the total vote of the electors therein for President.

Mr. President, apparently recognizing that such a provision would certainly spread the votes, in the electoral counting, among perhaps 15 or 20 candidates for President, the sponsors of the joint resolution have accepted an amendment, suggested by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], which would work in the direction of meeting that problem, because it points out that if a candidate for President shall receive less than 40 percent of the total number of electoral votes, the selection of President would then be made from among the two candidates receiving the highest numbers of votes.

The difficulty seems to me to be that such a provision would not sufficiently meet the problem, because up to the 40-percent margin, at least, in the electoral college the votes cast for every candidate for President all over the country would be counted, and that would constitute a "go" sign for sectional parties, for parties based on some local ideas or individual points of view, or on some occupational, vocational, or social consideration.

I do not think we dare tamper with the bipartisan system which has existed in this country for a century and a half and has demonstrated that it can provide a greater degree of freedom and opportunity than can either the one-party systems in the world or the multiple-party systems in Europe.

Mr. President, one of the great plagues in the world to day is the fact that so few of the countries of the world have been able to develop and maintain a two-party system. For that reason, I have offered an amendment which would meet that challenge directly by providing, on page 3, in line 9, that—

> And only the computations of the two candidates in each State having the largest percentage of the votes cast for President shall be counted in determining the total electoral votes received by each candidate.

Mr. President, under that amendment, within the States there could be as many candidates for President as the people of the States desired, and there could be as many political parties as the people of the States cared to certify; but only the two candidates receiving or registering the greatest number of votes would have their electoral votes counted at the central tabulation here in Congress. Without my amendment, I believe the Lodge amendment would operate to encourage one of the greatest dangers existing to the maintenance of our freedom, namely, the possibility that irresponsible splinter parties, which might be very aggressive, but highly irresponsible, would divide among themselves a large portion of the votes cast by the people of the country for President.

Mr. President, one reason why we have succeeded in doing what Europe has failed to do is that under the electoral college system we have not had votes chalked up for three or four or five Presidential candidates. The amendment I now propose to the joint resolution would continue the same kind of discouragement for such splinter parties; and when the final decision was reached, we would announce to the world that the decision was between candidate A, who received the greatest number of votes in the electoral counting, and candidate B, who received the next highest number of votes. We would not highlight to the world that there were also candidates C, D, E, and F, representing splinter parties, thus encouraging the development of a multiplicity of minority parties throughout this country.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the amendment I propose to the joint resolution will be adopted, in the interests of safeguarding our two-party system which would otherwise be placed in serious jeopardy should the Lodge proposal be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I do not believe I shall require that much time.

I do not rise to attempt to convince the Members of this body, but merely to state the reasons for my vote today.

I wish to state that I shall vote today in favor of the joint resolution, if it is properly amended.

I have always been opposed to the idea of the electoral college, which I think is undemocratic.

Originally I thought the joint resolution sponsored by the Senator from Massachusetts, for himself and other Senators, would tend in the direction of doing away with the electoral college. However, after giving the matter a great deal of study, I have arrived at the conclusion that the opposite would be the case.

Therefore, I intend to support the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota, providing for popular election. If that amendment fails of adoption, I intend to vote against the joint resolution.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does either the Senator from Massachusetts or the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Oklahoma for that purpose?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I understand that I have 17 minutes remaining. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has 17 minutes remaining, so the Parliamentary Clerk informs the Chair.

Mr. LODGE. I believe it is customary for the proponents to close the debate. So I should like to be recognized 17 minutes before 3 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will be a matter to be arranged between the two Senators who are to divide the time.

Mr. LODGE. I think more Senators have spoken on the side of the proponents than on the side of the opponents.

I understand that the Senator from Michigan still has 5 or 6 minutes remaining, if he desires to use them.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not desire to use any more time at this time.

Mr. LODGE. I do not care to do anything at this time, either. But I give notice that at 17 minutes to 3 I should like to be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has no discretion in that matter. That is a matter to be arranged between the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LODGE. I shall wait; and in 5 minutes I shall seek recognition. I understand that under the rule I can receive recognition.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there are some statistics to which I should like to refer, and which I should also like to have placed in the RECORD.

In the election of 1908, which was between Taft and Bryan, according to the actual result Taft won by 321 electoral votes to approximately 160. Under the Lodge joint resolution, if it had applied at that time, Taft would have won by three electoral votes, although he received 54½ percent of the total popular votes. I do not know at what point the break occurs, but, again, that is because of the excessive influence of one-party States. I should like to have those statistics placed in the RECORD.

I should also like to have printed in the RECORD the results of the elections of 1900, 1908, 1912, 1940, 1944, and 1948, as calculated under the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 2.

I should also like to have printed in the RECORD a recalculation of the election of 1944. On the assumption that Dewey received 10 percent more votes than he did in every State, the same number being deducted from the votes received by Roosevelt, Dewey then would have carried the popular vote by 780,146. He would have had 50.4 percent of the popular vote. But he would have lost the election under the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 2; Roosevelt would have won 278 to 247, a substantial majority.

I present these statistics for the RECORD to show that the joint resolution, while advanced as an effort to give greater effect to popular votes, actually will do nothing of the kind; and under present conditions it is far more likely that a "minority" President would be elected than it is under the present system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State	1900 election					1908 election					1912 election					1940 election					1944 election					1948 election					Current electoral votes
	Electoral votes, S. J. Res. 2		McKinley plus North	Bryan plus North	Bryan plus South	Electoral votes, S. J. Res. 2		Taft plus North	Bryan plus North	Bryan plus South	Electoral votes, S. J. Res. 2		Taft plus North	Wilson plus North	Wilson plus South	Electoral votes, S. J. Res. 2		Willkie plus North	Roosevelt plus North	Roosevelt plus South	Electoral votes, S. J. Res. 2		Dewey plus North	Roosevelt plus North	Roosevelt plus South	Electoral votes, S. J. Res. 2		Dewey plus North	Truman plus North	Truman plus South	
	McKinley	Bryan				Taft	Bryan				Taft	Wilson				Willkie	Roosevelt				Dewey	Roosevelt				Dewey	Truman				
Alabama [1]	3.9	6.7	----	----	2.8	2.7	7.9	----	----	5.2	1.0	8.4	----	----	7.4	1.6	9.4	----	----	7.8	2.0	8.9	----	----	6.9	2.0	----	----	----	----	11
Arizona	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	.4	1.3	----	0.9	----	1.1	1.9	----	0.8	----	1.6	2.4	----	0.8	----	1.8	2.1	----	0.3	----	4
Arkansas [1]	2.8	5.1	----	----	2.3	3.4	5.1	----	----	1.7	1.8	5.0	----	----	3.2	1.9	7.1	----	----	5.2	2.7	6.3	----	----	3.6	1.9	5.6	----	----	3.7	9
California	4.9	3.7	1.2	----	----	5.6	3.3	2.3	----	----	.1	5.5	----	6.4	----	9.1	12.7	----	3.6	----	10.8	14.1	----	3.3	----	11.8	11.9	----	.1	----	25
Colorado	1.7	2.2	----	0.5	----	2.3	2.4	----	0.1	----	1.3	2.6	----	1.3	----	3.1	2.9	0.2	----	----	3.2	2.8	0.4	----	----	2.8	3.1	----	.3	----	6
Connecticut	3.4	2.5	.9	----	----	4.2	2.5	1.7	----	----	2.5	2.7	----	.2	----	3.7	4.3	----	.6	----	3.8	4.2	----	.4	----	4.0	3.8	0.2	----	----	8
Delaware	1.6	1.3	.3	----	----	1.6	1.4	.2	----	----	1.0	1.4	----	.4	----	1.4	1.6	----	.2	----	1.4	1.6	----	.2	----	1.5	1.5	----	----	----	3
Florida [1]	.7	2.9	----	----	2.2	1.1	3.2	----	----	2.1	.5	4.2	----	----	3.7	1.8	5.2	----	----	3.4	2.4	5.6	----	----	3.2	2.7	3.9	----	----	1.2	8
Georgia [1]	3.7	8.7	----	----	5.0	4.1	7.1	----	----	3.0	.6	10.7	----	----	10.1	.9	10.2	----	----	9.3	2.1	9.8	----	----	7.7	2.2	7.3	----	----	5.1	12
Idaho	1.4	1.5	----	.1	----	1.6	1.1	.5	----	----	1.2	1.3	----	.1	----	1.8	2.2	----	.4	----	1.9	2.1	----	.2	----	1.9	2.0	----	.1	----	4
Illinois	12.6	10.7	1.9	----	----	14.7	10.5	4.2	----	----	6.4	10.2	----	3.8	----	14.1	14.8	----	.7	----	13.4	14.4	----	1.0	----	13.8	14.0	----	.2	----	28
Indiana	7.6	7.0	.6	----	----	7.3	7.0	.3	----	----	3.5	6.5	----	3.0	----	7.1	6.9	.2	----	----	6.8	6.1	.7	----	----	6.4	6.3	.1	----	----	13
Iowa	7.5	5.1	2.4	----	----	7.2	5.3	1.9	----	----	3.2	4.9	----	1.7	----	5.7	5.2	.5	----	----	5.2	4.8	.4	----	----	4.8	5.0	----	.2	----	10
Kansas	5.3	4.6	.7	----	----	5.2	4.3	.9	----	----	2.0	3.9	----	1.9	----	5.1	3.8	1.3	----	----	4.8	3.1	1.7	----	----	4.3	3.6	.7	----	----	8
Kentucky	6.3	6.5	----	.2	----	6.2	6.5	----	.3	----	3.3	6.3	----	3.0	----	4.7	6.3	----	1.6	----	5.0	6.0	----	1.0	----	4.6	6.2	----	1.6	----	11
Louisiana [1]	1.7	6.3	----	----	4.6	1.1	7.6	----	----	6.5	.4	7.7	----	----	7.3	1.4	8.6	----	----	7.2	1.9	8.1	----	----	6.2	1.7	3.3	----	----	1.6	10

[1] Southern State.

State	1900 election					1908 election					1912 election					1940 election					1944 election					1948 election					Current electoral votes
	Electoral votes, S. J. Res. 2					Electoral votes, S. J. Res. 2					Electoral votes, S. J. Res. 2					Electoral votes, S. J. Res. 2					Electoral votes, S. J. Res. 2					Electoral votes, S. J. Res. 2					
	McKinley	Bryan	McKinley plus North	Bryan plus North	Bryan plus South	Taft	Bryan	Taft plus North	Bryan plus North	Bryan plus South	Taft	Wilson	Taft plus North	Wilson plus North	Wilson plus South	Willkie	Roosevelt	Willkie plus North	Roosevelt plus North	Roosevelt plus South	Dewey	Roosevelt	Dewey plus North	Roosevelt plus North	Roosevelt plus South	Dewey	Truman	Dewey plus North	Truman plus North	Truman plus South	
Maine	3.7	2.1	1.6	----	----	3.8	2.0	1.8	----	----	1.2	2.4	----	1.2	----	2.6	2.4	0.2	----	----	2.6	2.4	0.2	----	----	2.8	2.1	0.7	----	----	5
Maryland	4.1	3.7	.4	----	----	3.9	3.9	----	----	----	1.9	3.9	----	2.0	----	3.3	4.7	----	1.4	----	3.8	4.2	----	0.4	----	4.0	3.8	.2	----	----	8
Massachusetts	8.7	5.7	3.0	----	----	9.3	5.4	3.9	----	----	5.8	6.4	----	.6	----	7.9	9.0	----	1.1	----	7.5	8.4	----	.9	----	6.9	8.8	----	1.9	----	16
Michigan	8.1	5.4	2.7	----	----	8.7	4.5	4.2	----	----	4.1	4.1	----	----	----	9.5	9.4	.1	----	----	9.3	9.5	----	.2	----	9.3	9.0	.3	----	----	19
Minnesota	5.4	3.2	2.2	----	----	6.5	3.6	2.9	----	----	2.3	3.8	----	1.5	----	5.2	5.7	----	.5	----	5.2	5.8	----	.6	----	4.4	6.3	----	1.9	----	11
Mississippi [1]	.9	7.9	----	----	7.0	.7	9.0	----	----	8.3	.2	8.9	----	----	8.7	.1	8.6	----	----	8.5	.2	7.9	----	----	7.7	.2	.9	----	----	0.7	9
Missouri	7.8	8.8	----	1.0	----	8.7	8.7	----	----	----	5.3	8.5	----	3.2	----	7.1	7.8	----	.7	----	7.3	7.7	----	.4	----	6.2	8.7	----	2.5	----	15
Montana	1.2	1.7	----	.5	----	1.4	1.3	.1	----	----	.9	1.4	----	.5	----	1.6	2.4	----	.8	----	1.8	2.2	----	.4	----	1.7	2.1	----	.4	----	4
Nebraska	4.0	3.8	.2	----	----	3.8	3.9	----	0.1	----	1.7	3.5	----	1.8	----	4.0	3.0	1.0	----	----	3.5	2.5	1.0	----	----	3.3	2.7	.6	----	----	6
Nevada	1.1	1.9	----	.8	----	1.3	1.4	----	.1	----	.5	1.2	----	.7	----	1.2	1.8	----	.6	----	1.4	1.6	----	.2	----	1.4	1.5	----	.1	----	3
New Hampshire	2.4	1.5	.9	----	----	2.4	1.5	.9	----	----	1.5	1.6	----	.1	----	1.9	2.1	----	.2	----	1.9	2.1	----	.2	----	2.1	1.9	.2	----	----	4
New Jersey	5.5	4.1	1.4	----	----	6.8	4.7	2.1	----	----	2.9	5.8	----	2.9	----	7.7	8.2	----	.5	----	7.8	8.0	----	.2	----	8.0	7.3	.7	----	----	16
New Mexico	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1.0	1.3	----	.3	----	1.3	1.7	----	.4	----	1.9	2.1	----	.2	----	1.7	2.2	----	.5	----	4
New York	19.1	15.8	3.3	----	----	20.7	15.9	4.8	----	----	12.9	18.6	----	5.7	----	22.6	24.4	----	1.8	----	22.2	18.4	3.8	----	----	21.6	21.2	.4	----	----	47
North Carolina [1]	5.0	5.9	----	----	.9	5.5	6.5	----	----	1.0	1.4	7.1	----	----	5.7	3.4	9.6	----	----	6.2	4.7	9.3	----	----	4.6	4.6	8.1	----	----	3.5	14
North Dakota	1.9	1.1	.8	----	----	2.4	1.4	1.0	----	----	1.3	1.7	----	.4	----	2.2	1.8	.4	----	----	2.2	1.8	.4	----	----	2.1	1.7	.4	----	----	4
Ohio	12.1	10.5	1.6	----	----	11.7	10.3	1.4	----	----	6.4	9.8	----	3.4	----	12.4	13.6	----	1.2	----	12.6	12.5	.1	----	----	12.3	12.4	----	.1	----	25
Oklahoma	----	----	----	----	----	3.0	3.4	----	.4	----	3.5	4.7	----	1.2	----	4.6	6.3	----	1.7	----	4.4	5.6	----	1.2	----	3.7	6.3	----	2.6	----	10
Oregon	2.2	1.6	.6	----	----	2.3	1.4	.9	----	----	1.3	1.7	----	.4	----	2.3	2.7	----	.4	----	2.8	3.1	----	.3	----	3.0	2.8	.2	----	----	6
Pennsylvania	19.4	11.6	7.8	----	----	26.0	12.0	8.0	----	----	8.5	12.3	----	3.8	----	16.7	19.2	----	2.5	----	16.9	17.9	----	1.0	----	17.8	16.4	1.4	----	----	35
Rhode Island	2.4	1.4	1.0	----	----	2.4	1.4	1.0	----	----	1.8	2.0	----	.2	----	1.7	2.3	----	.6	----	1.7	2.3	----	.6	----	1.7	2.3	----	.6	----	4
South Carolina [1]	.6	8.4	----	----	7.8	.5	8.4	----	----	7.9	.1	8.6	----	----	8.5	.1	7.6	----	----	7.5	.4	7.0	----	----	6.6	.3	1.9	----	----	1.6	8
South Dakota	2.3	1.6	.7	----	----	2.4	1.4	1.0	----	----	----	2.1	----	2.1	----	2.3	1.7	.6	----	----	2.3	1.7	.6	----	----	2.1	1.9	.2	----	----	4
Tennessee [1]	5.4	6.4	----	----	1.0	5.5	6.3	----	----	.8	2.9	6.3	----	----	3.4	3.6	7.4	----	----	3.8	4.7	7.2	----	----	2.5	4.4	5.9	----	----	1.5	12
Texas [1]	4.6	9.5	----	----	4.9	4.1	13.4	----	----	9.3	1.8	14.5	----	----	12.7	4.4	18.6	----	----	14.2	3.8	16.4	----	----	12.6	5.7	15.0	----	----	9.3	23
Utah	1.5	1.4	.1	----	----	1.7	1.2	.5	----	----	1.5	1.3	0.2	----	----	1.5	2.5	----	1.0	----	1.6	2.4	----	.8	----	1.8	2.2	----	.4	----	4
Vermont	3.1	.9	2.2	----	----	3.0	.9	2.1	----	----	1.5	1.0	.5	----	----	1.6	1.3	.3	----	----	1.7	1.3	.4	----	----	1.8	1.1	.7	----	----	3
Virginia [1]	5.3	6.6	----	----	1.3	4.6	7.3	----	----	2.7	2.0	7.9	----	----	5.9	3.5	7.5	----	----	4.0	4.1	6.9	----	----	2.8	4.5	5.3	----	----	.8	11
Washington	2.1	1.7	.4	----	----	2.9	1.6	1.3	----	----	1.5	1.9	----	.4	----	3.2	4.7	----	1.5	----	3.4	4.5	----	1.1	----	3.4	4.2	----	.8	----	8
West Virginia	3.3	2.7	.6	----	----	3.7	3.0	.7	----	----	1.7	3.4	----	1.7	----	3.4	4.6	----	1.2	----	3.6	4.4	----	.8	----	3.4	4.6	----	1.2	----	8
Wisconsin	7.2	4.3	2.9	----	----	7.1	4.8	2.3	----	----	4.2	5.3	----	1.1	----	5.8	6.0	----	.2	----	6.0	5.8	.2	----	----	5.6	6.1	----	.5	----	12
Wyoming	1.8	1.2	.6	----	----	1.7	1.2	.5	----	----	1.0	1.1	----	.1	----	1.4	1.6	----	.2	----	1.5	1.5	----	----	----	1.4	1.5	----	.1	----	3
Total	217.3	217.2	43.0	3.1	39.8	230.8	226.9	53.4	1.0	48.5	113.8	246.7	.7	57.0	76.6	214.6	313.3	4.8	26.4	77.1	223.8	294.7	9.9	16.4	64.4	221.4	257.8	7.0	16.4	29.0	531

[1] Southern State.

Recalculation of the election of 1944: On the assumption that Dewey had received 10 percent more votes than he did in every State (the same number being subtracted from Roosevelt)

	Hypothetical popular vote		Electoral vote, present system		Electoral vote, S. J. Res. 2	
	Republican Dewey (1)	Democrat Roosevelt (2)	Republican Dewey (3)	Democrat Roosevelt (4)	Republican Dewey (5)	Democrat Roosevelt (6)
Alabama [1]	48,994	194,464	----	11	2,200	8,734
Arizona	61,916	75,297	----	4	1,796	2,188
Arkansas [1]	69,906	142,610	----	9	2,952	6,021
California	1,664,262	1,837,267	----	25	11,800	13,025
Colorado	295,604	207,458	6	----	3,480	2,460
Connecticut	429,580	396,093	8	----	4,130	3,808
Delaware	62,422	62,491	----	3	1,491	1,494
Florida [1]	157,537	325,055	----	8	2,608	5,384
Georgia [1]	62,158	262,536	----	12	2,268	9,600
Idaho	110,151	97,385	4	----	2,112	1,868
Illinois	2,133,245	1,885,548	28	----	14,784	13,076
Indiana	963,480	693,814	13	----	7,488	5,382
Iowa	601,994	445,149	10	----	5,710	4,220
Kansas	486,306	243,248	8	----	5,296	2,648
Kentucky	431,693	433,344	----	11	5,467	5,489
Louisiana [1]	74,525	274,789	----	10	2,130	7,860
Maine	170,977	125,088	5	----	2,884	2,110
Maryland	322,244	286,195	8	----	4,232	3,760
Massachusetts	1,013,485	943,161	16	----	8,256	7,696
Michigan	1,152,865	998,457	19	----	10,260	8,588
Minnesota	580,158	537,122	11	----	5,665	5,247
Mississippi [1]	4,116	158,141	----	9	2,052	7,903
Missouri	837,293	731,238	15	----	7,980	6,975
Montana	102,479	103,240	----	4	1,976	1,988
Nebraska	362,868	200,258	6	----	3,864	2,130
Nevada	27,072	27,162	----	3	1,497	1,500
New Hampshire	120,908	108,671	4	----	2,104	1,892
New Jersey	1,057,469	891,740	16	----	8,608	7,264
New Mexico	77,757	74,320	4	----	2,040	1,952
New York	3,286,412	3,030,378	47	----	24,449	22,546
North Carolina [1]	289,471	501,083	----	14	5,124	8,862
North Dakota	130,389	88,290	4	----	2,368	1,604
Ohio	1,740,523	1,412,533	25	----	13,800	11,175
Oklahoma	351,366	369,607	----	10	4,860	5,110
Oregon	247,902	226,098	6	----	3,096	2,820
Pennsylvania	2,018,559	1,756,974	35	----	18,585	16,170
Rhode Island	135,836	163,007	----	4	1,812	2,176
South Carolina [1]	5,002	90,146	----	8	384	6,976
South Dakota	148,902	83,174	4	----	2,564	1,432
Tennessee [1]	220,342	288,676	----	12	5,172	6,780
Texas [1]	210,568	802,462	----	23	4,209	16,031
Utah	107,680	140,299	----	4	1,732	2,256
Vermont	78,680	46,667	3	----	1,881	1,116
Virginia [1]	159,767	227,752	----	11	4,521	6,446
Washington	397,858	450,605	----	8	3,712	4,208
West Virginia	355,101	360,495	----	8	3,968	4,024

[1] Southern State.

	Hypothetical popular vote		Electoral vote, present system		Electoral vote, S. J. Res. 2	
	Republican Dewey (1)	Democrat Roosevelt (2)	Republican Dewey (3)	Democrat Roosevelt (4)	Republican Dewey (5)	Democrat Roosevelt (6)
Wisconsin	741,985	582,960	12		6.648	5.220
Wyoming	57,113	44,227	3		1.691	1.309
Total	24,206,920	23,426,774	320	211	247.706	278.523
	(22,006,278)	(25,602,505)				

NOTE.—Columns (1) and (2) show revised popular vote. Columns (3) and (4) show revised electoral vote under present system. Columns (5) and (6) show revised electoral vote under S. J. Res. 2.
Dewey revised plurality, 780,146; percentage of total vote, 50.4 percent.

Mr. LUCAS rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Have we run out of something to do, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will be glad to recognize any Senator desiring recognition.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to be recognized.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure we would be delighted to hear from the Senator from North Dakota, in order to keep the Senate going.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does either Senator allot time to the Senator from North Dakota? [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, if I cannot get any time, I shall not talk.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is a little unusual to find two good Republicans on the other side of the aisle who are somewhat in disagreement as to who should speak. As a general rule, all Republicans are at all times very anxious to take the floor and to speak on a moment's notice. It is somewhat strange to find such silence manifested by the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no disagreement. There merely is no agreement.

Mr. LUCAS. It is the same thing. No disagreement is no agreement, I take it. There is something wrong.

Mr. HUNT rose.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HUNT. I should merely like to say it is a most unusual situation in the Senate of the United States when no one cares to talk. I might utilize the time by telling of the grandeur of the Teton Mountains of Wyoming. [Laughter.]

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I understand I have 17 minutes remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. I should first like to express my position on the amendments which are pending. I intend to support the Lucas amendment, which I think embodies the best features of the amendments proposed by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. It provides that if no candidate shall receive 40 percent of the vote, then the new Congress shall vote on the two highest nominees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests, in view of the fact that 2 or 3 minutes elapsed with no volunteers, that if we overrun the time, we shall have to divide the lapsed time between the two sides.

Mr. LODGE. I still have 16 minutes, have I not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. I shall vote for the Lucas amendment and oppose the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from South Carolina.

Before the war, I sponsored legislation for a direct popular election of the President, and while I have never ceased to believe that this would be a desirable change, I realized some years ago that from a practical standpoint it is utterly impossible of accomplishment, because it diminishes the relative importance of the smaller States in a Presidential election. But I would not want it to appear that I oppose the direct popular election. I shall vote for the Langer and Humphrey proposals, but I want to emphasize that my prime objective is the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 2, which, in the light of all the facts, is by far the best solution of the problem.

Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio referred to the resolution of the able Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], which provides for a study of the whole question of the Presidential succession. I think evidently the Senator from Ohio was unaware of the fact that that resolution has passed the Senate and is now in the House, and that it was expressly stated in the report of the Committee on Rules and Administration that the resolution was in no sense of the word to be regarded as a substitute for or an excuse for delay on Senate Joint Resolution 2. The Senator from Ohio says the proposal embodied in Senate Joint Resolution 2 would not accurately reflect the popular vote, that it would not be an improvement over the present system in reflecting the popular vote. All I can say in response to the Senator is, in that respect, he puts himself squarely in collision with no less an authority on governmental matters than the Brookings Institution, which is on record in the hearings as saying that the adoption of the amendment would make practically impossible a situation in which a candidate having a majority of the popular vote would fail to receive a majority of the electoral votes. That is what the Brookings Institution says.

Then the Senator from Ohio speaks about the difficulty of changing the situation in a one-party State. He goes along on the theory that if a State or a county or other area has always voted a certain way in the past, it is always going to vote a certain way in the future. How anybody who observes politics in America can entertain that idea is beyond my comprehension. Massachusetts used to be a Republican State in Presidential years. New York used to be a Republican State in Presidential years. Illinois used to be a Republican State in presidential years. California used to be a Republican State in Presidential years. See what happened to them in 1932, 1936, 1940, 1944, and 1948. Can anyone say, then, there is no such thing as a change in the political habits of the American people?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. LODGE. I yield once, but I will not yield oftener, because my time is limited.

Mr. TAFT. I merely want to suggest to the Senator that those States are Republican States, if the Republicans fight for them. They have not changed from Republican into Democratic States. [Laughter.]

Mr. LODGE. If they are Republican States, they have a very strange way of showing it. [Laughter.] They showed their republicanism by voting Democratic in every single election since 1932. [Laughter.] If that is the kind of republicanism which satisfies the Senator from Ohio, he is welcome to it. It is not the kind of republicanism that satisfies the junior Senator from Massachusetts. I want a better kind of republicanism than that. I want a republicanism that wins and that really gives the Democrats some competition.

Then the Senator says that if we were to take the system set forth under Senate Joint Resolution 2 and apply it backward to elections of the past, the results would be changed, and that Bryan would have been elected in 1900 instead of McKinley. Of course, it is utterly useless to take the new system here proposed and apply it backward to the scores of old games, and therefore all the figures which the Senator from Ohio so laboriously put into the RECORD are a complete and utter waste of time, because it is utterly inconceivable that if this system had been in effect people would have voted the same way. The campaigns would have been conducted

differently. The issues would have been different, and probably the candidates themselves would have been different. So there is utterly no use in taking this system and applying it backward. It is like the "floogie" bird which flies backward and sees only where he has been, and does not see where he is going.

Then, the Senator suggested that if in the past the electoral votes of Ohio were split 12 and 13, then Ohio would only have 1 vote. That, however, is not at all true. Under the system proposed by this amendment to the Constitution the 12 Republican electoral votes in Ohio would be added to the Republican votes which would be obtained in other States; the 13 Democratic votes, let us say for example in Ohio, would be added to the Democratic votes in other States. They would not merely cancel each other and leave the State with but one vote. It would mean that the people of Ohio would get representation all the way, and the people who are in the minority in Ohio would have their votes counted.

Mr. President, I should like to rebut the argument of the Senator from Michigan for a moment. He says:

> It would be possible for a candidate with a totalitarian philosophy to be elected President, with only 30 percent of the popular and electoral vote, even though bitterly opposed by 70 percent of the people voting for three or four other candidates.

This is exactly as much of a possibility under the present system as it would be under Senate Joint Resolution 2. In any case, it is completely taken care of and the possibility is eliminated by the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

The Senator from Michigan says:

> A well-organized compact minority may easily prevail over scattered, divided majorities.

This is always a possibility where the majority is weak, stupid, and divided and is neither encouraged nor hindered by Senate Joint Resolution 2, as originally drawn, but it is made almost impossible by the Lucas amendment.

The Senator from Michigan says:

> We must guard against any break-down of the two-party system which has served America so well.

To this I say a hearty amen. I believe that Senate Joint Resolution 2 is the best action we can take to enhance and fortify the two-party system. If the two-party system is as good as the Senator from Michigan says it is, why does he not want to extend it to the whole country and let the people of the South have the benefit of the two-party system?

The Senator from Michigan says:

> The intention of a proportional counting system is to reflect mathematically the popular will. Such a perfect reflection is not possible under our Federal system.

It is true that a perfect mathematical reflection is impossible, but Senate Joint Resolution 2 is a vast improvement over the present system in that respect and gives a very practical and workable approximation of a mathematical reflection of the popular vote.

The Senator from Michigan says:

> By indirection, the States are required to surrender their sovereignty over the disposition of their own electoral votes.

What sovereignty, I should like to ask? Look at the elector in Tennessee, whose constituents voted Democratic, but who went ahead and voted the Dixiecrat ticket, simply because it suited his purpose to do so, and because he was not legally bound to do otherwise. If it is possible to have one of these "free wheeling" electors, or two or three of them, to vote as they please, why is it not possible to have 200 or 300? The whole system of electing the President would then be subverted.

The Senator from Michigan says:

> The point I wish to emphasize however is that most of the arguments offered in these hearings are speculative because it cannot be known in advance what changes will be worked in voting habits and political parties and in the conduct of Presidential elections.

Obviously, all arguments regarding future legislation are speculative. We, who are sponsoring this amendment, are frank enough to admit it. We also add the thought that the whole Constitution of the United States rested on a guess as to the future and on a speculation as to human nature. Moreover, we wish to underline the fact that the opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 2 are resting their whole case on a speculation—the speculation that political currents do not change.

Their whole position is that what has happened in the past will happen in the future. If history teaches us anything, it is that history does not repeat itself.

The Senator from Michigan goes on to say:

> Those who favor proportional sharing of the States' electoral vote emphasize the point that it will eliminate or at least minimize the possibility of a President being elected without a majority or even a plurality of the popular vote. This is an absurdity.

Mr. President, he may consider it an absurdity; but, if he does, he will find himself in collision with the Brookings Institution, which stated in a letter dated May 27, 1948, that Senate Joint Resolution 2 "will practically eliminate the chance that a President will receive a majority of electoral votes in spite of the fact that his opponent polled a majority of the popular vote."

That, I think, is pretty conclusive evidence.

The Senator from Michigan says:

> I firmly believe that proportionate sharing of electoral votes is a direct encouragement to the growth of multiple parties.

It is my firm belief that the reverse is true. Under the present system, the splinter party has the opportunity of influencing the result. Remember what happened in the last election when the Wallace party was so influential that it, in effect, threw two States to Governor Dewey. That would be utterly impossible under the proposed system. The thing that makes a party grow in power and influence is results, and a third party could not achieve results under the system which I propose. To me the small electoral-vote credit is not a significant thing when it is stacked up against the fact that no longer would any small party be able to throw the whole vote of a great State.

Mr. President, it seems to me that we have here a great opportunity to do something negative and something positive. Negatively, we protect the American people against many dangers which are inherent in the present system. As someone once said, the electoral college is like the vermiform appendix in the human body. Ordinarily it does not cause any trouble, but every now and then it can become infected and expose the whole body to political peritonitis. There are pitfalls which could create a situation in which we would not know who was our President, and the right of a man to be President would be in doubt. It would cause great turmoil and unrest in America.

On the positive side it would remove the obstacle which now stands in the way of the development of the two-party system in America. I say to my fellow Republicans that they must never let the impression go out to the country that they do not trust the voters. They must never let the impression go out that the success of the Republican Party in the future hinges on some kind of a trick or machine or device. I say we should be willing to meet the Democrats in fair competition, and if we win it will be because we deserve to win. I think we can win only on that basis. If we turn our backs on this proposal because we think it will hurt the Republican Party or because we think that the same thing will happen in 1950 or 1960 as happened in 1916 and 1920, of course, the people will lose confidence in the party.

Mr. President, I conclude with this word: In his criticism of the proposal the Senator from Michigan said in his concluding remarks that we should recommit the resolution for further study.

Mr. President, it does not need to be recommitted to any committee of the Congress, because it has been studied in the Congress for 102 years. I would say, Mr. President, let us recommit it for study to the State legislatures. Let us send it to the 48 State legislatures. Certainly it is an issue on which the members of the State legislatures have a right to pass. So I plead with Senators to pass this resolution and let it go to the States, so that the people can decide for themselves whether they want to extend the two-party system in America.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan has 2 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this is a very serious question. The Senate should not send to the legislatures anything which it has not perfected. The proposed constitutional amendment cannot be amended after the joint resolution has been passed. The legislatures cannot amend it. They must pass on it as it is presented to them.

I want to say, again, Mr. President, that the resolution does not give to the people of the United States the right to a popular vote for the President of the United States. No one is contending

that the Republican Party is trying to manipulate the machinery in order that it may receive more votes. What we want to do is to see that the people at some time get the right to vote in popular elections for the President and Vice President of the United States. The mere fact that we have crossed one system with another system and have a hybrid does not give to the people of the United States the right to vote.

Therefore I say, again, that under Senate Concurrent Resolution 14—the Green resolution—time can be spent on perfecting a proposal, so that when a proposed constitutional amendment does go to the State legislative bodies the people will be able to speak clearly on this great question. If the joint resolution is to be passed, it should be perfected as proposed in the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Morse
Anderson	Hill	Mundt
Benton	Hoey	Myers
Brewster	Holland	Neely
Bricker	Humphrey	O'Conor
Bridges	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Butler	Ives	Pepper
Byrd	Jenner	Robertson
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Chapman	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kem	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Kilgore	Sparkman
Darby	Knowland	Stennis
Donnell	Langer	Taft
Douglas	Leahy	Taylor
Downey	Lehman	Thomas, Okla.
Dworshak	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	Lucas	Thye
Ecton	McCarran	Tobey
Ferguson	McCarthy	Tydings
Flanders	McClellan	Vandenberg
Frear	McFarland	Watkins
Fulbright	McKellar	Wherry
George	McMahon	Wiley
Gillette	Magnuson	Williams
Graham	Malone	Withers
Green	Martin	Young
Gurney	Maybank	
Hayden	Millikin	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The first question is on the amendment of the committee, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 9, after the word "disregarded", it is proposed to strike out "unless a more detailed calculation would change the result of the election."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 1, it is proposed to strike out the word "The" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

On the 6th day of January following the election, unless the Congress by law appoints a different day not earlier than the 4th day of January and not later than the 10th day of January, the.

On page 3, line 10, beginning with the words "The person", strike out all down to and including line 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

The person having the greatest number of electoral votes for President shall be President, if such number be at least 40 percent of the whole number of such electoral votes. If no person have at least 40 percent of the whole number of electoral votes, then from the persons having the two highest numbers of electoral votes for President the Senate and the House of Representatives sitting in joint session shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. A majority of the votes of the combined authorized membership of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall be necessary for a choice.

On page 3, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate and the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate and the House of Representatives may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.

On page 3, beginning with line 20, strike out all down to and including line 2? and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of section 1, article II, of the Constitution, the twelfth article of amendment to the Constitution, and section 4 of the twentieth article of amendment to the Constitution, are hereby repealed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois desire to have his amendments voted on en bloc? They embrace several different proposals.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask that they be voted on en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I call up my substitute, providing for a direct election by the people of President and Vice President. I ask that it be read by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator desire to have the amendment read in full?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause and to insert the following:

That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of 4 years, and, together with the Vice President chosen for the same term, be nominated and elected as hereinafter provided.

"SEC. 2. The official candidates of political parties for President and Vice President shall be nominated at a primary election by direct vote of the qualified voters who are members of the respective political parties in the several States. The time of such primary election shall be the same throughout the United States, and, unless the Congress shall by law appoint a different day, such primary election shall be held on the first Wednesday after the first Monday in June in the year preceding the expiration of the regular term of President and Vice President. Persons voting in primaries for candidates for President and Vice President in each State shall have such qualifications as shall be prescribed by the Congress.

"The names which shall appear in each of the States on the primary ballots for candidates of the respective political parties shall be only of those persons who shall have filed petitions at the seat of the Government of the United States with the Secretary of State. Such petitions shall be valid only if filed at least 60 days prior to the day of primary election and if signed by qualified voters in any or all of the several States, equal in number to at least one-tenth of 1 percent of the total number of popular votes cast throughout the United States for all candidates for President (or, in the case of the primary election first held after the ratification of this article, for electors of President and Vice President) in the most recent previous Presidential election.

"SEC. 3. Within 30 days after such primary election, the chief executive of each State shall make distinct lists of all persons of each political party, for whom votes were cast, and the number of votes for each such person, which lists shall be signed, certified, and transmitted under the seal of such State to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the Secretary of State, who shall open all certificates and count the votes. The person receiving the greatest aggregate number of popular votes of any party for candidate for President shall be the official candidate of such party, throughout the United States, for President; and the person receiving the greatest aggregate number of popular votes of any party for candidate for Vice President shall be the official candiate of such party, throughout the United States, for Vice President.

"SEC. 4. In the event of the death or resignation of the official candidate of any political party for President, the person nominated by such political party for Vice President shall be the official candidate of such party for President. In the event of the death or resignation of the official candidate of any political party for Vice President, a national committee of such party shall designate a candidate for Vice President, who shall then be deemed the official candidate for Vice President of such party, but in choosing such candidate the vote shall be taken by States, the delegation from each State having one vote. A quorum for such purpose shall consist of a delegate or delegates from two-thirds of the States, and a majority of all States shall be necessary to a choice.

"SEC. 5. The electoral-college system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States is hereby abolished. The President and Vice President shall be elected by the people of the several States as shall be determined by direct vote of the qualified voters at a general election. The time of such election in each State shall be the same throughout the United States, and unless the Congress shall by law appoint a different day, such election shall be held on the first Wednesday after the first Monday in November in the year preceding the expiration of the regular term of the President and Vice President. The voters in each State shall vote directly for President and Vice President and shall have such qualifications as shall be

prescribed by Congress. The names of candidates officially nominated in primaries as herein provided, and in addition the names of any independent candidates, shall appear in every State upon the official ballot for the offices of President and Vice President, but names of any such independent candidates shall so appear only following the filing with the Secretary of State of the United States, at least 60 days prior to the day of the election, of petitions signed by qualified voters in any or all of the several States, equal in number to at least one-half of 1 percent of the total number of popular votes cast throughout the United States for all candidates for President.

"SEC. 6. Within 30 days after such election, the chief executive of each State shall make distinct lists of all persons receiving votes for President and all persons receiving votes for Vice President, and the number of votes cast in such State for each, which lists shall be signed, certified, and transmitted under the seal of such State to the seat of the Government of the United States directed to the President of the Senate. The Congress shall be in session on the 6th day of January, or if such day shall fall on Sunday on the 7th day of January, and on that day the President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted. The person having the greatest aggregate number of popular votes for President shall be President, and the person having the greatest aggregate number of popular votes for Vice President shall be Vice President. No person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the United States.

"SEC. 7. The Congress shall have power to provide by appropriate legislation for methods of determining any dispute or controversy that may arise in the counting and canvassing of votes for President and Vice President in any such primary or general election. The places and manner of holding such primary or general election shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations. The Congress and the several States shall have concurrent power to prevent fraud and corrupt practices in connection with such primary or general elections.

"SEC. 8. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States as provided in the Constitution."

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to terms of office of President, and providing for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President, and for election of such candidates, by popular vote."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is absent on public business, and if present would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 60, as follows:

YEAS—31

Benton	Gillette	Morse
Brewster	Gurney	Neely
Bricker	Hendrickson	Pepper
Butler	Humphrey	Schoeppel
Cain	Ives	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Jenner	Taylor
Darby	Kilgore	Wherry
Donnell	Knowland	Withers
Douglas	Langer	Young
Downey	Lodge	
Ferguson	McCarthy	

NAYS—60

Aiken	Holland	Mundt
Anderson	Hunt	Myers
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Kefauver	Robertson
Chapman	Kem	Russell
Connally	Kerr	Saltonstall
Cordon	Leahy	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Lehman	Sparkman
Eastland	Lucas	Stennis
Ecton	McCarran	Taft
Flanders	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McKellar	Thye
George	McMahon	Tobey
Graham	Magnuson	Tydings
Green	Malone	Vandenberg
Hayden	Martin	Watkins
Hill	Maybank	Wiley
Hoey	Millikin	Williams

NOT VOTING—5

Ellender	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Hickenlooper	Long	

So, Mr. LANGER's amendment in the nature of a substitute for the joint resolution was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the several States, as provided in the Constitution:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of 4 years, and together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected as provided in this Constitution.

"The electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States is hereby abolished. The President and the Vice President shall be elected by a direct vote of the people of the United States, and the choice of the people of each State for President and Vice President shall be determined at a general election held in such State.

"The Congress shall determine the time of such election, which shall be the same throughout the United States, and unless otherwise determined by the Congress, such election shall be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November in the year preceding the expiration of the regular term of the President and the Vice President. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

"SEC. 2. Within 30 days after such election, or at such time as the Congress shall direct, each State shall make distinct lists of all persons receiving votes for President and all persons receiving votes for Vice President, and the number of votes cast in such State for each, which lists shall be signed, certified, and transmitted sealed to the seat of Government of the United States directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all certificates and the votes shall then be counted. The person having the greatest number of votes for President shall be President.

"The person having the greatest number of votes for Vice President shall be Vice President. No person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the United States.

"SEC. 3. In the event that it is shown by such certificates that the two or more persons having the highest number of votes have also received an equal number of all the votes cast for President, then, from these persons the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President, each Member of the House of Representatives having one vote. A quorum for this purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Representatives, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. If the House of Representatives shall not choose a President whenever the right of choice shall devolve upon that body, before the 20th day of January next following, then the Vice President elect shall act as President, as in the case of the death or other constitutional disability of the President.

"SEC. 4. In the event that it is shown by such certificates that the two or more persons having the highest number of votes have also received an equal number of all the votes cast for Vice President, then, from these persons the Senate shall choose the Vice President. A quorum for this purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice.

"SEC. 5. Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of section 1, article II, of the Constitution and the twelfth article of amendment to the Constitution, are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 6. This article shall take effect on the 30th day of January following its ratification.

"SEC. 7. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LANGER, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is absent on public business, and if present would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 63, as follows:

YEAS—28

Benton	Humphrey	Morse
Bricker	Ives	Neely
Cain	Jenner	Pepper
Chavez	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Darby	Langer	Taylor
Douglas	Lehman	Withers
Downey	Lodge	Young
Gillette	McCarthy	
Hendrickson	Magnuson	

NAYS—63

Aiken	Hayden	Mundt
Anderson	Hill	Myers
Brewster	Hoey	O'Conor
Bridges	Holland	O'Mahoney
Butler	Hunt	Robertson
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Chapman	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Kem	Sparkman
Donnell	Kerr	Stennis
Dworshak	Leahy	Taft
Eastland	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McClellan	Thye
Flanders	McFarland	Tobey
Frear	McKellar	Tydings
Fulbright	McMahon	Vandenberg
George	Malone	Watkins
Graham	Martin	Wherry
Green	Maybank	Wiley
Gurney	Millikin	Williams

NOT VOTING—5

Ellender	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Hickenlooper	Long	

So Mr. HUMPHREY's amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I call up the amendment which I have at the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 9, it is proposed to strike out the period and add the following language:

And only the computations of the two candidates in each State having the largest percentage of the votes cast for President shall be counted in determining the total electoral votes received by each candidate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is absent on public business.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 67, as follows:

YEAS—23

Brewster	Capehart	Dworshak
Bricker	Darby	Ecton
Butler	Donnell	Ferguson
Gurney	Malone	Smith, Maine
Hendrickson	Martin	Vandenberg
Jenner	Millikin	Watkins
Kem	Mundt	Wherry
McCarthy	Schoeppel	

NAYS—67

Aiken	Humphrey	Neely
Anderson	Hunt	O'Conor
Benton	Ives	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Cain	Kefauver	Russell
Chapman	Kerr	Saltonstall
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Knowland	Sparkman
Douglas	Langer	Stennis
Downey	Leahy	Taft
Eastland	Lehman	Taylor
Flanders	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McCarran	Thye
George	McClellan	Tobey
Gillette	McFarland	Tydings
Graham	McKellar	Wiley
Green	McMahon	Williams
Hayden	Magnuson	Withers
Hill	Maybank	Young
Hoey	Morse	
Holland	Myers	

NOT VOTING—6

Chavez	Hickenlooper	Long
Ellender	Johnson, Tex.	Murray

So Mr. MUNDT's amendment was rejected.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have on the desk an amendment which I ask be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed on page 2, line 18, after "election" to insert "or a subsequent election provided for in this paragraph."

On page 3, beginning with line 4, strike out through line 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

The person having the greatest number of votes cast for President in a State shall be credited with the total number of the electoral votes of such State; except that, if no person may be credited with such electoral votes by reason of a tie in the number of votes cast for President, a subsequent election for President shall be held in such State at such time as the Congress shall direct. The person having a majority of the whole number of such electoral votes for President shall be President. If no person has such a majority, then from the two persons having the highest numbers of electoral votes for President the Senate and the House of Representatives sitting in joint session shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. A quorum for this purpose shall consist of a majority of the combined membership of the Senate and the House of Representatives and a majority of the votes of the Members voting, each having one vote, shall be necessary for a choice.

On page 3, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate and the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate and House of Representatives may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.

On page 3, beginning with line 20, strike out all down to and including line 22 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of section 1, article II, of the Constitution, the twelfth article of amendment to the Constitution, and section 4 of the twentieth article of amendment to the Constitution, are hereby repealed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would call the attention of the Senator from Michigan to the fact that two of the provisions of the Senator's amendment are identical with the provisions included in the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, which was agreed to previously.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask to withdraw those two provisions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment, without the provisions which the Senator wishes to withdraw, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. The amendment, as modified, read as follows: On page 2 line 18, after "election", insert "or a subsequent election provided for in this paragraph."

On page 3, beginning with line 4, strike out through line 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

The person having the greatest number of votes cast for President in a State shall be credited with the total number of the electoral votes of such State; except that, if no person may be credited with such electoral votes by reason of a tie in the number of votes cast for President, a subsequent election for President shall be held in such State at such time as the Congress shall direct. The person having a majority of the whole number of such electoral votes for President shall be President. If no person has such a majority, then from the two persons having the highest number of electoral votes for President, the Senate and the House of Representatives sitting in joint session shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. A quorum for this purpose shall consist of a majority of the combined membership of the Senate and the House of Representatives and a majority of the votes of the Members voting, each having one vote, shall be necessary for a choice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], as modified.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is absent on public business, and if present would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 71, as follows:

YEAS—20

Brewster	Ferguson	Mundt
Bricker	Gurney	Schoeppel
Bridges	Jenner	Taft
Butler	Kem	Watkins
Capehart	Langer	Wherry
Darby	Malone	Young
Donnell	Martin	

NAYS—71

Aiken	Hoey	Morse
Anderson	Holland	Myers
Benton	Humphrey	Neely
Byrd	Hunt	O'Conor
Cain	Ives	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Connally	Kefauver	Russell
Cordon	Kerr	Saltonstall
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Downey	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Leahy	Sparkman
Eastland	Lehman	Stennis
Ecton	Lodge	Taylor
Flanders	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McCarthy	Thye
George	McClellan	Tobey
Gillette	McFarland	Tydings
Graham	McKellar	Vandenberg
Green	McMahon	Wiley
Hayden	Magnuson	Williams
Hendrickson	Maybank	Withers
Hill	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—5

Ellender	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Hickenlooper	Long	

So Mr. FERGUSON'S amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. TAFT and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is absent on public business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 27, as follows:

YEAS—64

Aiken	Holland	Myers
Anderson	Humphrey	Neely
Benton	Hunt	O'Conor
Cain	Ives	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Chavez	Kefauver	Russell
Connally	Kerr	Saltonstall
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Downey	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Langer	Sparkman
Ecton	Leahy	Stennis
Flanders	Lehman	Taylor
Frear	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	Lucas	Thye
George	McCarran	Tobey
Gillette	McClellan	Tydings
Graham	McFarland	Vandenberg
Green	McKellar	Wiley
Hayden	McMahon	Williams
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Withers
Hill	Maybank	
Hoey	Morse	

NAYS—27

Brewster	Dworshak	Millikin
Bricker	Ferguson	Mundt
Bridges	Gurney	Robertson
Butler	Jenner	Schoeppel
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Capehart	Kem	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Watkins
Darby	Malone	Wherry
Donnell	Martin	Young

NOT VOTING—5

Ellender	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Hickenlooper	Long	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum being present, more than two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, Senate Joint Resolution 2 is passed.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. LUCAS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as previously announced, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar. I therefore move that the Senate proceed to a call of the calendar, starting with the first order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator mean the consideration of measures to which there is no objection?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first order of business on the calendar.

DEMONSTRATION OF PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICE—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 130) to provide for the demonstration of public-library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities was announced as first in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator desires to make a speech, I think I would prefer to make mine first, if I may. I withhold my objection.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will, I shall appreciate it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is proceeding under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. HILL. I regret that the Senator from Ohio has exercised his right to object to the consideration of the bill and its passage at this time. The bill was reported at the last session of the Congress. It was the first bill reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare when the Eighty-first Congress convened a year ago last month, in January 1949. It has been on the calendar during all this time, some 12 months. I merely wish to give notice that I shall seek the very first opportunity possible to move to proceed to the consideration of the bill, in order that the Senate may consider it and may have an opportunity to pass it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to state my reason for objecting to the bill. This is another State-aid bill. It would move the Federal Government into the library field. I have supported a fair number of Federal-State aid bills, but it seems to me that such legislation should not be enacted unless the need is absolutely clear and absolutely proved.

If I remember correctly, the bill under discussion provides for an annual grant of $40,000 of Federal money to every State. If States are not able to provide $40,000, it seems to me the assistance should not be given by the Federal Government. It is a trivial matter, but it moves the Federal Government into a new field of activity. It is another extension of bureaucratic influence to which I think most people are opposed. From time to time when projects become of tremendous importance and the need becomes great I believe we should, and properly do, move into the field of Federal aid to States, but it does seem to me that the need should be clear beyond any question of doubt before we assume an additional Federal obligation, no matter how small.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being heard, the bill will go over.

BILLS AND OTHER MEASURES PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 206) relating to the immigration status of the lawful wives and children of Chinese-treaty merchants was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 45) for the relief of the owners and operators of certain gold mines which were closed or the operations of which were curtailed by War Production Board Limitation Order L–208 was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 110) to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor was announced as next in order.

Mr. DONNELL. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The Chair would suggest that Senators who object to bills identify themselves to the Chair. That is the orderly way in which to proceed.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the objection to Senate bill 110, Calendar No. 76, was made by me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thanks the Senator from Missouri for making that announcement.

The bill (S. 734) to provide for the appointment and compensation of counsel for impoverished dependents in certain criminal cases in the United States district courts was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia objects. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2660) to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota objects, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 878) to provide certain benefits for annuitants who retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, prior to April 1, 1948, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33) suspending legislative budget pending further study was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio objects, and the concurrent resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1086) for the relief of the Dixie Margarine Co., a Tennessee corporation, of Memphis, Tenn., was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Over.

Mr. TOBEY. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey was the first Senator to object. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 478) for the relief of Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas asks that the bill go over. Therefore the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1464) to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to marketing agreements and orders was announced as next in order.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I object to Senate bill 1464, Calendar 397.

Mr. THYE. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1393) to promote the national defense and to contribute to more effective aeronautical research by authorizing professional personnel of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to attend accredited graduate schools for research and study was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection of the Senator from Kansas, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1955) to authorize certain persons to accept decorations tendered to them by the United Kingdom for services rendered the Allied cause during World War II, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota objects. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 595) relating to the internal security of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On request of the Senator from New Jersey, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 458) to provide for a survey of physically handicapped citizens was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On request of the Senator from New Jersey, the bill will go over.

The bill (S. 91) to provide for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the United States from lynching, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HILL, Mr. McCLELLAN, and Mr. RUSSELL rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] objects, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 12) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4080) to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard, and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, that is the bill which will be considered on Thursday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1946) to establish a permanent National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection of the Senator from Illinois, the bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 108) to reduce expenditures in Government for the fiscal year 1950 consistent with the public interest was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am constrained to ask that that joint resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3946) to promote the national defense and to contribute to more effective aeronautical research by authorizing professional personnel of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to attend accredited graduate schools for research and study was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That bill is identical with Senate bill 1393, to which objection was made, and which was passed over; so House bill 3946 will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1498) to amend the Natural Gas Act, approved June 21, 1938, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois objects, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1165) to provide relief for the sheep-raising industry by making special quota immigration visas available to certain alien sheepherders was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 58) to amend the Senate rules by creating a standing Committee on Small Business was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3368) to amend sections 356 and 365 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to increase the maximum sum allowable by the court of the assets of a decedent's estate as a preferred charge for his or her funeral expenses from $600 to $1,000," was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On request of the Senator from North Dakota, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1490) to permit investment of funds of insurance companies organized within the District of Columbia in obligations of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On request of the Senator from North Dakota, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 843) for the relief of S. M. Price was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection of the Senator from Kansas, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3905) to amend section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On request of the Senator from North Dakota, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1606) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to determine the validity of titles to lands acquired in the administration of the reclamation laws was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. I object and ask that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota objects. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 660) to amend the act of June 27, 1944, Public Law 359, and to preserve the equities of permanent classified civil-service employees of the United States was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas objects, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1031) amending Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, providing for the welfare of coal miners, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection of the Senator from New Jersey, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1976) for the relief of Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, Mrs. Raul Valle Antelo, Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, Mrs. Otto Resse, and Mrs. Hugo Soria was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I object and ask that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas objects. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1681) to prohibit the picketing of courts was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I object and ask that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota objects. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1837) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey asks that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2294) to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I object and ask that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware objects. The bill will be passed over.

EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT ALLOWANCE BENEFITS TO SERVICEMEN—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1741) to extend the unemployment allowance benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 for a period of 2 years was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On request of the Senator from Kansas, the bill will be passed over.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas withhold his objection, to allow an explanation of that bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I withhold my objection so the Senator from Florida may make an explanation of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, this bill was reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare as a modification of the President's proposal. The President recommended that the unemployment compensation available to veterans be extended for another 12 months' period, because a great many veterans who were coming out of school under the GI bill of rights, because of the dislocation of employment which has occurred in many parts of the country, were actually in need of this assistance.

All the bill does is to make those benefits which veterans previously might have drawn, available to them if they need them now.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that the consideration of this measure resulted in affording some factual data to refute some of the unfair criticisms levelled against the veterans. Only about 7 percent of the veterans altogether drew the allowances they might have drawn, and only about 50 percent applied for any benefits whatsoever.

But the thing I should like to emphasize is that under this bill the veteran would have to draw the benefits available under State law first before he could draw any Federal compensation or assistance whatever. Then, of course, if he should not draw from the State sufficient to make the amount $20 a month, in case he is unemployed, then he could draw the difference from the Federal program.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The law has expired now for a period of more than 6 months. There has been no particular complaint about that, has there?

Mr. PEPPER. I would not say there has been no particular complaint about it. I think a great many veterans have suffered the same disadvantage that any unemployed man suffers. They have not marched on Washington, and I am glad they have not. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that a great many veterans in the country have during that course of time been unemployed, and have not had these benefits available to them.

The bill does not propose a permanent extension of the program; merely an extension for a 12 months' period as recommended by the President. It must also be remembered that the first payments must come under the State laws, and that State standards would apply. That is, if under the State law one had to remain unemployed for a week before he could draw anything, that principle would apply, whereas it did not apply under the previous Federal legislation.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not true that the law expired 6 months ago and that no payments have been made for the past 6 months?

Mr. PEPPER. The law expired at the end of the last fiscal year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

CLAIMS OF AMERICAN NATIONALS AGAINST FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4406) to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over. I object to its present consideration.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a short time?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I will gladly withhold my objection.

Mr. GREEN. I regret very much that objection is made. The bill would make it possible for the claimants against Yugoslavia to get their share of the sums agreed upon between the two Governments toward settlement of the differences. The bill was passed by the House of Representatives. It came to the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Hearings were held, and I was directed by the committee to report the bill favorably, which I did. It has been on the calendar since last July.

The amount involved in the settlement, $17,000,000, is in the hands of the United States Government and ready to be paid over. The claimants, American citizens whose property was taken, many of whom are in distressing circumstances, are urging that they be allowed to receive their share. The State Department is very anxious to pay it. It seems too bad that they cannot receive their money. Objection has been made previously, and is now made again. I wish that some basis for the objection might be stated, because I have not heard what it is.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I sincerely regret that the Senator from New Jersey still feels constrained to ask that the bill go over until the next call of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Rhode

Island that if the bill is not passed on the next call of the calendar, I will accommodate the distinguished Senator and the Committee on Foreign Relations by moving to have it considered at an early date.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I should like to add one further thought. Our Government has an interest in this money. If the settlement made by a foreign government for war claims is not carried out, it will be very difficult for the State Department to negotiate other settlements with other governments. If these agreements cannot be carried through when once they are negotiated, we shall be in considerable difficulty.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is very apparent that we are not going to make any progress with the call of the calendar. We are now on the fourth page of bills, page 9 of the calendar, and not one bill has been passed. I proposed to begin the call of the calendar from the beginning primarily because of what the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] said the other day in a colloquy which I had with him, namely, that he thought a number of bills would pass on the call of the calendar without much debate.

In view of the lateness of the hour, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be discontinued up to the point where the previous call of the calendar ended, on October 19, 1949. If we can begin on page 14 of the calendar and take up the new bills which have been reported since the convening of Congress for the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, perhaps we can make some progress in getting those bills through.

Mr. MORSE, Mr. KILGORE, and Mr. LANGER addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois asks that the call of the calendar be suspended up to Calendar No. 1219, beginning where the previous call of the calendar ended.

Does the Senator from Illinois yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this is the first opportunity we have had in this session of Congress to make a record on the calendar in the order in which the bills appear on the calendar. I think the record should be made. I think it is only fair to those of us who are interested in bills on the calendar to find out who objects to them, so that between now and the next call of the calendar we can communicate with the objectors in respect to their objections. Therefore I feel constrained to object to the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard. The next bill on the calendar will be stated.

BILLS AND OTHER MEASURES PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2886) to provide for the killing of starlings in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 48) to amend title 28, U. S. Code, sec. 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges traveling while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their official stations, and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at the rate of 7 cents per mile was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2432) restoring to tribal ownership certain lands upon the Colville Indian Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, may I inquire who objected to the bill with relation to the Colville Indian Reservation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] objected.

The bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 806) authorizing the erection of a monument to Sacajawea, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. I object.

Mr. GURNEY. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 384) to authorize the Commissioner of Public Buildings to convey to the Temple Methodist Church, a nonprofit corporation, of San Francisco, Calif., a portion of the federally owned building known as 100 McAlister Street, San Francisco, Calif., and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1758) to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A Senate bill on the same subject was objected to earlier. This bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1439) to provide for assistance to State agencies administering labor laws in their efforts to promote, establish, and maintain safe workplaces and practices in industry, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to ask when it may be possible to obtain a few minutes for the consideration of this bill. I think it would not require more than 30 minutes, or an hour, to discuss the bill and pass it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I cannot answer the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. The only reply I can make, which I hope will satisfy him, is that I shall take it up at the next meeting of the Democratic policy committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the Senator.

The bill (S. 2246) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 5327) to continue until the close of June 30, 1950, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 62) creating a Joint Committee on Lobbying Activities, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask that the concurrent resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4584) to provide for disposition of lands on the Cabazon, Augustine, and Torres-Martinez Indian Reservations in California, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have an amendment to offer. I offer an amendment, on page 3, line 3, commencing with "All wells", to strike out down to the word "district" in line 8, on page 3.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator wait a moment, so as to permit the Chair to state the parliamentary situation? It seems that some amendments were agreed to on a prior call of the calendar. An amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is pending.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2440) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over. I understand that this bill is to be the order of business on Thursday.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, with relation to Calendar No. 926, Senate bill 2440, I should like to address an inquiry to the distinguished majority leader. Is this bill set for early consideration?

Mr. LUCAS. In reply to the Senator from Florida, I will say that I made the announcement earlier in the day that we would probably take this bill up on Friday of this week.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

The bill (H. R. 2166) to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their official station, and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at a rate of not exceeding 7 cents per mile was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A Senate bill on the same subject, Calendar No. 825, Senate bill 48, has already been passed over. This bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1390) to authorize the conveyance to the State of California of easements for the construction, operation, and maintenance of a toll highway crossing and approaches thereto over and across lands of the United States in the vicinity of San Francisco Bay, Calif., and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, my colleague from California [Mr. DOWNEY] has asked that this bill go over. While it is my bill, I ask that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1596) to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into special agreements for certain switching service by railway common carriers, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader what was done with Calendar No. 596, Senate Resolution 58?

The VICE PRESIDENT. All bills and other measures called thus far on the calendar have gone over.

Mr. WHERRY. In my own time, I should like to ask what was done with Calendar No. 596, Senate Resolution 58?

Mr. LUCAS. It was passed over.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me inquire who objected to the present consideration of that measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois asked that it go over, and it went over.

The question now is, is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 1596, Calendar No. 951?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 17) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands to certain settlers in the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, Nev., was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico objects. The bill goes over.

The bill (H. R. 6070) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (H. R. 5647) to prohibit the picketing of United States courts was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 240) to stimulate the exploration, production, and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals, and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (H. R. 133) to amend section 2 of the act approved June 20, 1936, entitled "An act to extend the benefits of the Adams Act, the Purnell Act, and the Capper-Ketchum Act to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 139) for the relief of Guilermo Chacartegui was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I understood an amendment was to be offered to the bill. If the bill is not amended, I must object to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is reported without amendment. In view of the statement of the Senator from Kansas, the bill will be passed over.

THE FOREST SERVICE—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5839) to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that three amendments are to be offered to this bill. I wonder whether I am correct in that understanding.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Nebraska is quite correct.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if I may advise the minority leader, let me say there was objection to the bill the last time the calendar was called. At the present time, there are at the desk some amendments to the bill. I understand that if the amendments are adopted, they will remove the objections to the bill.

All the information which I have been able to gather indicates that the amendments are acceptable not only to the sponsors of the bill but also to the Forest Service, and we think the Forest Service would approve the bill as thus amended. Certainly I would not object to the adoption of the amendments.

The Senator from Wyoming offered the amendments, and he was one of the original objectors. Likewise, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] had raised objections, but I am quite sure his objections will be removed by the amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have already stated that I wish to reserve the right to object.

In view of the explanation given by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, if the amendments can be brought before the Senate and if they are agreeable to the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Minnesota, I shall have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, first, is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WATKINS. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah objects, and the bill goes over.

JOINT RESOLUTIONS AND BILLS PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 58) providing for a rehearing in the matter of the Bellows Falls Hydro-Electric Corp. (project No. 1892), known as the Wilder Dam project, and a review of any order of the Federal Power Commission therein was announced as next in order.

Mr. LODGE. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts objects, and the joint resolution goes over.

The bill (H. R. 4815) to provide for medical services to non-Indians in Indian hospitals, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. LANGER. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 2197) to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended (59 Stat. 526, 666, 61 Stat. 130), to vest in the Export-Import Bank of Washington, the power to guarantee United States investments abroad, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MAYBANK. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina objects, and the bill goves over.

The bill (H. R. 1161) to provide for the conversion of national banking associations into and their merger or consolidation with State banks, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 250) to authorize the Federal Security Administration to assist the States in the development of community recreation programs for the people of the United States, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 2195) to authorize the Palisades Dam and Reservoir project, to authorize the north side pumping division and related works, to provide for the disposition of reserved space in American Falls Reservoir, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under objection of the Senator from New Jersey the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 2006) to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 with respect to Federal savings and loan associations was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 2034) to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, relating to practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should like to offer an amendment to the bill at the next call of the calendar. Meantime I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 501) repealing section 202 (e) of the Sugar Act of 1948 was announced as next in order.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Upon objection of the Senator from Massachusetts, the bill will go over.

The bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas objects, and the bill will go over.

The bill (H. R. 5731) to discharge a fiduciary obligation to Iran was announced as next in order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (H. R. 3480) to authorize the Commonwealth of Kentucky to use for certain educational purposes lands granted by the United States to such Commonwealth for State park purposes exclusively was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to confer with the two Senators from Kentucky in regard to the bill between now and the next call of the calendar. Therefore, I ask that the bill go over at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon objects, and the bill goes over.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let the joint resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia objects, and the joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 6073) to amend section 501 (B) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 211) to amend the act entitled "An act to create the Inland Waterways Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the mandate and purpose of Congress as expressed in sections 201 and 500 of the Transportation Act, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1924, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York objects, and the bill goes over.

TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION OF YOUTH OFFENDERS — BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2609) to provide a system for the treatment and rehabilitation of youth offenders, to improve the administration of criminal justice, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I am delighted to explain the bill.

The bill comes from the committee as a clean bill, without amendment, by reason of the fact that every district judge of the Federal courts, all circuit judges, the American Bar Association, the Lawyers Guild, the national legal societies, the Grange, and the other agricultural organizations have conferred regarding the bill and are favorable to it.

The bill will cost the United States, at the beginning, not to exceed $85,000 a year. At the end of probably 3 years, the cost may increase to $185,000.

The bill will not be compulsory in any sense of the word; but it will give the judges of trial jurisdiction the right to refer the case of any prisoner under 24 years of age, who is not a habitual offender, to the Department of Justice, for complete study in the penal and other institutions of the United States now in existence, to determine whether the person is a criminal or whether the situation in his or her case is a curable one, before sentence is passed.

As I have said, the bill has the unqualified endorsement of the American Bar Association, the Lawyers Guild, the Grange, the Farm Bureau, I believe; I distinctly remember that it has the approval of the American Legion. All those organizations had representatives appear before the committee and testify in favor of the bill. Numerous judges testified in favor of the bill, including the Conference of Senior Circuit Court Judges.

For the past 6 or 8 months we have tried to have the bill acted upon. Objection has been made, but only by the Senator from Colorado, who I understand has withdrawn his objection.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it is inconceivable to me that the provisions of the bill can be administered at a cost of only $85,000, and I should like to have more time to study the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection, the bill goes over.

RESOLUTION AND BILLS PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 187), favoring a review of the policy of dismantling German industrial establishments was announced as next in order.

Mr. LEHMAN. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection of the Senator from New York the resolution goes over.

The bill (H. R. 4569) authorizing the transfer of Fort Des Moines, Iowa, to the State of Iowa was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection of the Senator from Oregon, the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 1728) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HILL. I object.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objections are heard, and the bill will be passed over.

EXEMPTION FROM TARIFF DUTIES OF CERTAIN METALLIC IMPURITIES IN TIN ORES

The bill (H. R. 2585) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for exemption from duty of certain metallic impurities in tin ores and concentrates when such impurities are not recovered was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it is a very simple bill. It proposes to amend a section of the Tariff Act which already permits certain metallic elements in ores, which are imported in connection with gold and other materials, when those elements are impurities that are not recovered, to come in free of duty. In this case it applies only to tin. When tin is imported, if there are other mineral elements which are not recovered at all, then there is no duty imposed on the mineral elements which are brought in but not recovered as separate ores.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5486) to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to permit the use of additional means, including stamp machines, for payment of tax on distilled spirits, modify loss allowances for distilled spirits, for the transfer and redistillation of spirits, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota objects, and the bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FIREARMS ACT

The bill (H. R. 6212) to amend section 5 of the Federal Firearms Act, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

QUORUMS OF COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES—AMENDMENT OF RULE 25

The resolution (S. Res. 180) to amend rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate with respect to a quorum of committees and subcommittees, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LUCAS. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this resolution is designed to take care of the question of a quorum being present in committees when sworn testimony is to be taken and perjury may be committed. It is to prevent perjury. The committee believes it has met the problem in the proper way. The Senator will remember there is presumed to be a quorum present. That had been the usual rule, until the Supreme Court decided otherwise. Now, for the purpose of taking sworn testimony, any committee can determine the size of the committee at a hearing, and, when it is so determined, may also determine the number required to be present. Then, if a witness gives false testimony, under such circumstances, he is guilty of perjury.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if his statement implies that it will be necessary to have a quorum in order to report a bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. The resolution merely has to do with the procedure before committees in order to cover the question of perjured testimony.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That subsection (3) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"(3) (a) Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this subsection, each standing committee, and each subcommittee of any such committee, is authorized to fix the number of its members (but not less than one-third of its entire membership) who shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of such business as may be considered by said committee, subject to the provisions of section 133 (d) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

"(b) Each standing committee, and each subcommittee of any such committee, is authorized to fix a lesser number than one-third of its entire membership who shall constitute a quorum thereof for the purpose of taking sworn testimony."

PAYMENT OF COMPENSATION TO EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR DULLES

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 203) to pay compensation for a certain period to employees of former Senator John Foster Dulles, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, in line 7, after the numerals "1949", to insert "or for so much of such time through November 30, 1949, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator John Foster Dulles for service in his office who were carried on the Senate pay roll on November 8, 1949, salary for the period November 9, 1949, through November 30, 1949, or for so much of such time through November 30, 1949, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 8, 1949.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR EMPLOYMENT OF ASSISTANTS BY COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The resolution (S. Res. 205) was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (g) (2) (D) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 16, 1950, and ending on February 15, 1951, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution (which shall not exceed $15,000 for studying intergovernmental relations with the States and municipalities or $18,000 for studying relations with international organizations) shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

AUTHORIZATION FOR EMPLOYMENT OF ASSISTANTS BY COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS IN STUDYING OPERATIONS OF GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES

The resolution (S. Res. 206) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or any other duties imposed upon it, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1950, and ending on January 31, 1951, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, in addition to any unexpended balance under S. Res. 52, Eighty-first Congress, first session, agreed to February 10, 1949, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL FOR OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF THE SENATE

The resolution (S. Res. 207) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate, in equal monthly installments from January 1 to June 30, 1950, to the official reporters of Senate debates and proceedings the sum of $6,000 for the employment of additional office personnel.

TRANSFER OF FUNDS TO THE TOWN OF CRAIG, ALASKA

The bill (H. R. 322) to transfer funds to the town of Craig, Alaska, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUGUST MICHELA

The bill (H. R. 746) for the relief of the legal guardian of August Michela, a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN W. WAGNER

The bill (S. 1059) for the relief of John W. Wagner was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John W. Wagner, of Browning, Mont., the sum of $1,000, in

full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for certain improvements belonging to him which were located on tribal lands of the Blackfeet Reservation which were acquired by the Bureau of Reclamation on August 13, 1915: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

FRANCIS W. DODGE

The bill (S. 1146) for the relief of Francis W. Dodge was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Francis W. Dodge is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the amount of the overpayment of salary received by him, as a temporary employee in the postal service at Goffstown, N. H., from July 1, 1946, to the date when it was determined that the rate properly payable to him was 5 cents per hour less than the amount he had been receiving. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any postmaster or other disbursing officer of the Post Office Department or postal service, the overpayment to the said Francis W. Dodge during the time specified shall be considered to have been authorized.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1529) for the relief of Amy L. Hefington was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I ask that the bill go over for the purpose of further study.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made by the Senator from New Jersey. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1677) for the relief of Erik H. Lindman was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I ask that the same course be taken in respect to this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

TERM OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, OREGON

The bill (S. 2314) to provide for holding a term of the United States District Court for the District of Oregon at Eugene was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence of section 117 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows: "Court shall be held at Medford, Klamath Falls, Pendleton, Portland, and Eugene."

EDWARD C. RITCHE

The bill (S. 2385) for the relief of Edward C. Ritche was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edward C. Ritche the sum of $8,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him as a result of an accident which occurred when the automobile in which he was a passenger was struck by an automobile being driven by Byron Goodall while in the course of his employment with the United States Immigration Service in Chicago, Ill., on July 20, 1938; the said Edward C. Ritche having obtained a judgment for $8,000 against the said Byron Goodall in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, on account of such injuries: *Provided,* That the said Edward C. Ritche shall furnish to the Secretary of the Treasury satisfactory evidence of the relief of the said Byron Goodall from liability for the payment of such judgment: *Provided further,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

DICK WALOOK ET AL.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 587) for the relief of the estate of Dick Walook, Alfred L. Woods, and Edward Kimoktoak, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, line 4, after the word "of", to strike out "$263.75" and insert "$166.25,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3532) for the relief of Mrs. Sirvart Arsenian was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to have the bill go over for further study.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

FREMONT RIDER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1863) for the relief of Fremont Rider, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That, upon application filed by Fremont Rider, of Middletown, Conn., within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury an amount not exceeding the sum of $10,216.52, said sum representing the amount owing to Fremont Rider from the United States as a result of the purchase by him from the United States of tracts 2 and 3 of the St. Joseph's Bay Military Reservation, Fla., such tracts having been erroneously represented by the United States as containing 1,636 acres, whereas the actual acreage as revealed by topographical maps issued recently by the United States Geological Survey is only approximately 1,100 acres: *Provided,* That the payment of such sum to the said Fremont Rider shall be in full settlement of all of his claims against the United States, including the use by the Government of a portion of his property at St. Joseph's Bay Military Reservation during the years 1942 through 1947, as well as the cutting of certain timber thereon.

SEC. 2. Upon receipt of the certification as authorized in section 1 of this act, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Fremont Rider a sum equal to the amount so certified.

SEC. 3. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF THE CLARK FUNERAL HOME

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2070) for the relief of the Clark Funeral Home, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the word "from", to strike out "his home in Hundred, W. Va.", and insert "Waynesburg Hospital, Waynesburg, Pa.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Clark Funeral Home, Hundred, W. Va., the sum of $300, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for services in connection with the transportation of Monard G. Snider, a veteran, from Waynesburg Hospital, Waynesburg, Pa., to the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Hines, Ill., on February 19 and 20, 1949: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALEX MORNINGSTAR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1423) for the relief of Alex Morningstar, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments: On page 1, line 4, after the word "pay", to insert "out of the fund to which the money order otherwise would be chargeable,"; in line 9, after the word "rendered", to strike out "invald" and insert "invalid"; and after line 10, to strike out "Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated" and insert "Sec. 2. The Treasurer of the United States is authorized and directed to pay out of the fund to which the check

otherwise would be chargeable", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to pay out of the fund to which the money order otherwise would be chargeable, to Alex Morningstar, of 125 Summer Street, Boston, Mass., upon receipt of money order No. 39159, the sum of $100, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for the amount of such money order held by Mr. Morningstar and rendered invalid by the fact it contains more than one endorsement.

SEC. 2. The Treasurer of the United States is authorized and directed to pay out of the fund to which the check otherwise would be chargeable, to the said Alex Morningstar, upon receipt of United States Government check No. 7601, the sum of $41, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for the amount of such check held by Mr. Morningstar, payment having been refused on the ground that in accepting such check he failed to obtain the endorsement of the payee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REIMBURSEMENT OF THE STEBBINS CONSTRUCTION CO.

The bill (S. 1769) to reimburse the Stebbins Construction Co. was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. May we have some information as to the nature of the bill? What is the amount of the reimbursement?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the original bill provided that the case be referred to the Federal District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma. The case arises out of the failure of the Irrigation and Reclamation Department to furnish this concern with steel and other materials for use in the construction of an irrigation project in southwestern Oklahoma. The company had the contract; the war came on, and the Government could not furnish the material. As a result of the failure of the Government, of course, no payment was made. The company made certain demands for payment, but could not secure payment, whereupon the bill was introduced to take the case into the Federal district court. The committee has recommended, instead, that it be sent to the Court of Claims. The matter will there be investigated, if the bill passes. If judgment is rendered by the Court of Claims, the matter will then go to the Treasury Department for payment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1769) to reimburse the Stebbins Construction Co., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after "United States", to strike out "District Court of the Northern District of Oklahoma" and insert "Court of Claims", and on page 2, line 4, after the word "Company", to insert a colon and *"Provided,* That the passage of this act shall not be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the Government of the United States", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render findings of fact as to the amount of loss, if any, sustained by Stebbins Construction Co., Tulsa, Okla., Reclamation Bureau contract No. 12–r–15914 arising out of and attributable to the alleged failure of the Government to supply materials as provided for in said contract.

The court shall cause such findings to be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money not otherwise appropriated, the amount set forth in said findings to the Stebbins Construction Co.: *Provided,* That the passage of this act shall not be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the Government of the United States.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

C. L. LEFFINGWELL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1933) for the relief of C. L. Leffingwell, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That (a), notwithstanding the provisions of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 806), the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to pay, out of the appropriation otherwise available for the reimbursement of expenses incurred in traveling and moving household effects by employees of the Railway Mail Service of the Post Office Department, to the persons named in subsection (b) hereof, such amounts for expenses as were incurred by them in connection with their transfer from one duty station to another on orders of officials of the Surface Postal Transport Division between the dates indicated following the names of each of such persons: *Provided,* That the amounts to be paid shall in each case be subject to administrative determination by the Post Office Department and audit by the General Accounting Office: *Provided further,* That no part of the respective amounts authorized to be paid by this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to, or received by any agent or attorney on account services rendered in connection with the claim of any person hereinafter named, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

(b) James H. Barrow, for expenses incurred between December 3, 1945, and July 23, 1947; Walter L. Robinson, Jr., for expenses incurred between April 20, 1947, and November 3, 1947; Allyn W. Reimund, for expenses incurred between July 24, 1947, and November 25, 1947; Walter E. Patterson, for expenses incurred between July 6, 1947, and November 9, 1947; Harold L. Marsh, for expenses incurred between February 3, 1947, and June 3, 1947; Malcolm R. Clark, for expenses incurred between August 14, 1947, and December 16, 1947; Marshall B. McRee, for expenses incurred between October 12, 1947, and February 13, 1948; Charles L. Leffingwell, for expenses incurred between July 28, 1947, and March 3, 1948; Eugene Attkisson, for expenses incurred between November 23, 1947, and October 1, 1948.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of C. L. Leffingwell and others."

DAVIS GROCERY CO.

The bill (S. 2339) for the relief of the Davis Grocery Co., of Oneida, Tenn., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Davis Grocery Co., of Oneida, Tenn., the sum of $5,184.26; in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for subsidy as a class 2 meat slaughterer (permit No. P–63–076–1) during the period 1943 through 1946: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person, violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

BAGGETT TRANSPORTATION CO., INC.

The bill (S. 947) for the relief of the Baggett Transportation Co., Inc., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Baggett Transportation Co., Inc., Birmingham, Ala., the sum of $5,898.94. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said company against the United States on account of damage to and loss of use of truck No. 75, owned by said company, as a result of a collision between such truck and a United States Army truck on United States Highway No. 78, near Muscadine, Ala., on November 6, 1943. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

WALTER TEBO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2520) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Walter Tebo, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to sell the trust allotment No. 110 of George Tebo, Jr., deceased, Winnebago allottee, described as the east half of the northeast quarter of section 9, township 26 north, range 8 east, sixth principal meridian, Thurston County, Nebr., containing 80 acres, conveyance to be made by deed or the issu-

ance of a patent in fee to the purchaser and to disburse the proceeds of such sale to Walter Tebo for his benefit.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the sale of certain allotted devised land on the Winnebago Reservation, Nebr."

INVESTIGATION OF BANKING AND CREDIT

The resolution (S. Res. 218) continuing the authority for investigation of banking and credit legislation, small business and economic stabilization, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to withhold my objection, if the Senator wants to make a statement.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, this resolution does not ask for any funds except those which were allotted by the Committee on Rules and Administration, which have not been expended, to carry on the work which we are now doing in connection with a certain investigation. We do not have the money to pay the employees after the 15th of February. It has been requested by the ranking Republican member of the committee. We did not send the resolution to the Committee on Rules and Administration, because we filed exactly what the Senator from Nebraska last year asked us to file, and we do not intend to do anything except what we told the committee we would do, and that is what we are now doing.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I have 5 minutes?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator from South Carolina has concluded.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, I did not use 5 minutes. I do not intend to make a speech on the subject, except to say that the resolution was approved long ago by the former Audit and Control Committee, and was approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration last year, authorizing certain persons to be paid for their work in certain investigations. We have never used one dime to cross the authority of another standing committee. We have merely proceeded with what the Committee on Rules and Administration last year advised us to proceed with. I was told that it was not necessary to go back to that committee, because we were asking for no money whatsoever. All we ask is to pay the persons who have been doing the work.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in the report filed by the Senator from South Carolina——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is a unanimous request of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not objecting to the purpose of the investigation. I was one who joined unanimously in reporting the resolution when it was originally presented. I do not want the RECORD to show, nor do I want my remarks to be interpreted as showing, that I am opposing the purpose of the resolution at this time. I do say, however, that I feel that the resolution should have gone to the Committee on Rules and Administration, because it is my contention, and it is stated in the report, that there has been expended a total of $24,770.90. The report states that the committee, through the systematic practice of economy, such as making use of the regular committee staff, has succeeded in curbing expenses. Then the report goes on to say that the committee desires the right to spend the balance of the money to complete the investigation, which means, to my mind, that they are asking for the right to continue the committee and to reappropriate the money which is unexpended.

In order to keep the record clear, I should like to have the resolution referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, because it provides for money to be reappropriated out of the contingent fund. I should like to have the committee pass on it, and then have the resolution placed back on the calendar.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. In a moment. Inasmuch as it has to do primarily with small business, I would not mind continuing it temporarily. I want to comply with the request of the distinguished Senator, but I think other resolutions on the subject should be brought before the Senate for final determination prior to extending the committee for another year. If there is no intention of bringing up any such resolution I should be happy to go along with the resolution presented by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator if he desires to change the date from the 15th of February to the 15th of March. It is now the first day of February.

Mr. WHERRY. If the distinguished Senator will have the resolution referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, I shall agree to try to work it out with him so that the payments will be made.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, it is not up to me to refer it to a committee. I understood that it was not necessary to refer it to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Nebraska is technically correct. The resolution involves a charge on the Senate over which the Committee on Rules and Administration would have jurisdiction. It would have been the part of wisdom to have the resolution follow the same course as would any other resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

Mr. MAYBANK subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask that Senate Resolution 218 be taken from the calendar and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I may say I have had the opportunity of discussing the resolution with the distinguished chairman of that committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I understand that the Committee on Rules and Administration is to meet next Wednesday.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. At the regular meeting of the committee on next Wednesday we can discuss the matter with the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. At the request of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], Senate Resolution 218, continuing the authority for investigation of banking and credit legislation; small business and economic stabilization, Calendar No. 1246, is referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to withdraw my objection to the consideration of Calendar No. 1139, Senate bill 501.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Suppose we continue through the calendar, and return to the item which the Senator has in mind.

The clerk will call the next bill on the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

EASEMENT FOR THE CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF A CERTAIN SEWER PIPE LINE

The bill (S. 2507) to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to grant to the East Bay Municipal Utility District, an agency of the State of California, an easement for the construction and operation of an interceptor sewer pipe line, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not think I have any objection to the consideration of the bill, but in order to have it in the RECORD for future reference, I wonder if my friend from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] will make a brief statement, so that I may be sure that my action does not conflict with my general policy of objecting to the giving away of Federal property.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I introduced this bill on August 29, 1949, at the request of the East Bay Municipal Utility District, and it was reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on January 26. It provides for two easements or two strips of land, 20 feet wide

each, one extending a distance of 739.37 feet northerly from Tynan Avenue, and the other extending a distance of 926.84 feet southerly from Tynan Avenue, for the purpose of constructing a sewer. The bill has the approval of the Maritime Commission and it has been favorably reported by the committee. I understand it involves merely an easement and that the Maritime Commission property will be able to use the ground over the sewer easement.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and for future reference, I want to say that I shall not raise an objection to the consideration of the bill, for these reasons: First, the sewer which will be constructed will serve Federal interests as well as municipal and State interests, and therefore, the Federal Government will receive benefits from its construction. Second, the Government's interest in the use of the surface of the ground is in no way interfered with. Third, the reversionary rights of the Federal Government are protected by the bill. Therefore, because I do not think it in any way violates the general principle which I have consistently insisted upon, namely, that Federal property shall not be given away without reasonable compensation therefor, I shall not raise any objection to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2507) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States Maritime Commission is authorized to grant and convey to the East Bay Municipal Utility District, an agency of the State of California, without cost to the said utility district, and subject to such terms and conditions as the United States Maritime Commission may deem proper, a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, operation, renewal, replacement, and repair of an interceptor sewer pipe line or pipe lines within (a) a strip of land twelve and one-half feet wide extending a distance of nineteen hundred and eighty-two and eighty-five one-hundredths feet along the southern boundary of lands comprising a part of the Maritime Alameda Shipyards, Alameda, Calif., and (b) two strips of land twenty feet wide each, one extending a distance of seven hundred and thirty-nine and thirty-seven one-hundredths feet northerly from Tynan Avenue and the other extending a distance of nine hundred and twenty-six and eighty-four one-hundredths feet southerly from Tynan Avenue, both lying along the easterly boundary of lands comprising a part of the Maritime Alameda Shipyard, Alameda, Calif., and contiguous to the westerly boundary line of the Central Pacific Railway Co. right-of-way, metes and bounds descriptions of such strips of land being on file with the United States Maritime Commission.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS RELATING TO CROP PRODUCTION

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 198) increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in its investigation of matters relating to crop production, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, on page 2, line 10, to strike out "subcommittee" and insert "committee", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the subcommittee authorized by Senate Resolution 36, Eighty-first Congress, first session, hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-first Congress, $38,000 in addition to the amount and for the same purposes as specified in said resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That section 3 of Senate Resolution 36, Eighty-first Congress, first session, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the duly authorized subcommittee is authorized during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable and with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of all agencies in the executive branch of the Government. The expenses of the subcommittee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The resolution (S. Res. 208) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-first Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946, as increased by Senate Resolution 175, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to October 13, 1949.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS INVESTIGATION

The resolution (S. Res. 217) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare through its subcommittee appointed pursuant to Senate Resolution 140 (Rept. No. 827) (Rept. No. 894), Eighty-first Congress, agreed to August 15, 1949, is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $108,000 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for the same purposes.

INVESTIGATION OF OPERATIONS OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND ITS SUBSIDIARIES

The resolution (S. Res. 219) to investigate the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I object to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator withhold his objection until I can make an explanation?

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I regret very much that the majority leader wishes to withhold his approval of the resolution. For the information of the Senate let me say that the Committee on Banking and Currency approved the resolution, the subcommittee approved it, and the Committee on Rules and Administration approved it unanimously.

Last year the Commission studying the organization of the executive branch of the Government, commonly called the Hoover Commission, in its report No. 8 stated:

> We recommend (a) that the Congress review the power to make direct loans (excluding the two minor activities mentioned above), taking into account the problems of economy, efficiency, and integrity; (b) that in nonemergency periods the Congress place restrictions on direct loans in order to insure that the normal channels of credit are utilized to the maximum extent possible or alternatively provide for the guaranty of loans made by private or other established agencies.

A few days ago the majority leader introduced a bill regarding loans to small business by the RFC. One of the particular problems that concerns the committee is the tendency in recent months for the loans of the RFC to go to big business in the way of large loans.

For the information of the Senate I cite a few statistics. Of loans amounting to over $500,000 in 1934, in the depth of the depression, the RFC's share was $3,320,000. For the year 1949, the loans under $500,000 amounted to 166 million as compared to 181 million for loans over $500,000. As to smaller loans, as against $181,000,000, in 1949 the amount was $166,000,000. There is a decided tendency on the part of the RFC in recent months to increase the loans in the larger brackets.

As chairman of the subcommittee, with the responsibility of reviewing the activities of the RFC, I submit that it is necessary that we have some staff work done. Last year, without any staff work, I had some hearings on a few specific loans, such loans as that to Lustron, the Waltham Watch Co., and the Northwest Air Lines, involving the application of the policy established by Congress. It is my private, personal opinion that the RFC board during the last year has not interpreted the legislation as it was intended by the Congress. I know of no way to ascertain the facts other than by a provision such as that made by this resolution, that is, provision for a staff to go to the office of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and make an intelligent and adequate survey of the facts relating to these loans. I certainly have not the time to do it.

It seems to me that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is one of the most important agencies of the Government. It has the power to make a loan such as that with which we are familiar, the Kaiser-Frazer loan. I do not wish to go into the details of that, but it was a loan of $44,000,000. Such loans do not go through the congressional appropriating procedure. Here is a board consisting of five men, appointed by the Executive, which has the power to make direct loans to individuals or to individual corporations of as much as $44,000,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I hope the Senator from Illinois will not object.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

RELIEF OF OFFICERS OF CERTAIN TERMINATED WAR AGENCIES

The bill (H. R. 4387) to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Treasury Department, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4106) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is a bill to reimburse 62 named individuals for personal property losses which they sustained as a result of war conditions while they were engaged in duties abroad as officers and employees of the State Department, or of agencies subsequently absorbed into the State Department. The total amount involved is $161,007.

The claims fall into two general groups: First, those resulting from bombings, lootings, or confiscation of property by enemy military or civil authorities; second, those resulting from damage or pilferage while in transit.

Each of these claims has been carefully reviewed by a special board set up by the Secretary of State, and responsibility for the correctness of the claims is assumed by this board, which consists of the Assistant Secretary of State for Administration, the legal adviser, and the Chief of the Division of Foreign Service Administration.

As originally presented to the Department, these claims totaled more than $247,000; and the Department has scaled them down to $161,000, by eliminating items believed to be excessive in value.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FISHER CONTRACTING CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1950) to reimburse the Fisher Contracting Co., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 10, after the word "contracts", to insert a proviso as follows: *"Provided, however,* That no allowance shall be made for any loss sustained on account of the pouring of concrete during the period between June 1, 1946, and September 30, 1946, if the court shall find that Fisher Contracting Co. requested and was granted permission to perform such work during said period for the convenience of the company", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona to hear, determine, and render findings of fact as to the amount of loss, if any, sustained by Fisher Contracting Co., of Phoenix, Ariz., under Reclamation Bureau contract No. 12r-15535 arising out of or attributable to the alleged failure of the Government to supply materials as provided for in said contracts: *Provided, however,* That no allowance shall be made for any loss sustained on account of the pouring of concrete during the period between June 1, 1946, and September 30, 1946, if the court shall find that Fisher Contracting Co. requested and was granted permission to perform such work during said period for the convenience of the company.

SEC. 2. The court shall cause such findings to be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money not otherwise appropriated, the amount set forth in said findings to the Fisher Contracting Co.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I desire to object to the consideration of that bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator object?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is there objection to Senate bill 1950?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Yes.

CATHERINE A. GLESENER

The bill (S. 469) for the relief of Catherine A. Glesener, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to have this measure go over until the next call of the calendar, for further study.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over. That completes the calendar.

PROVISION FOR RESEARCH AND STUDY BY PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert to Calendar No. 412, Senate bill 1393, so that I may make a brief explanation of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to read a letter in my 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Kansas. I now read from a letter I received on December 5:

There are pending before the Senate two bills, S. 1393 and H. R. 3946, either of which would authorize professional personnel of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to attend accredited graduate schools for research and study. Both of these bills have been passed over on the Consent Calendar because of objections entered on behalf of the Republican Policy Committee. The passage of this legislation is important and urgent to the business of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and it would be of real help if you were to see fit to move to bring either bill before the Senate for action shortly after the beginning of the next session of Congress. * * *

The security of the United States depends in large measure upon our ability to keep, not only abreast, but ahead of other nations in technological advancements in aircraft.

The importance of air supremacy in any future war cannot be overemphasized—for convincing proof, we have but to look back briefly upon the events of World War II. With the advent of supersonic flight, the role of aviation in the Nation's security and safety takes on a new significance. We are entering upon an era where the whole concept of military strategy in warfare is being changed—where the way is open for any Nation to attain technical supremacy in supersonic airplanes if it is willing and able to make the necessary effort.

I will skip some of the letter in order to comply with the 5-minute rule.

During the past several years, a number of the NACA's most promising young scientists have left their positions in order to obtain advanced academic degrees. Many of these employees have not returned to the NACA upon completion of their studies because of more lucrative offers from other sources. Needless to say, the loss of such promising young men has a detrimental long-range effect upon the Nation's progress in aeronautical research.

* * * * *

The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is charged by the Congress with the responsibility for conducting basic scientific research in aeronautics with the primary goal of improving military aircraft.

* * * * *

S. 1393 * * * (is) designed to remedy this situation. Under the provisions of either bill, the NACA could grant to selected professional employees a leave or leaves of absence (not to exceed 1 year in total) to pursue advanced research or study in fields closely related to the NACA's research program.

Mr. President, in light of this letter—as there is a limitation on the time I do not have time to read the entire letter—and because of the importance of the subject, and the request of NACA, and the fact that a similar bill passed the House, I am wondering if the Senator from Kansas might not feel inclined to withdraw his objection.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Maryland that I am not in a position to do that at this call of the calendar. Because the bill allows leaves of absence from the Government with pay, which is a departure from the existing general legislative authority granted departments, there was some question raised with the Senator from Kansas. I should be very happy to try to work out the matter before the next call of the calendar.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator. But let me say to him that the bill gives to the employees of the NACA only the same rights now enjoyed in all the other departments of the Government where research specialists are employed. It gives no rights that the other departments do not already have. The letter so states, although I do not have sufficient time to read it all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas still object?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Yes. I shall be glad to go over the matter with the Senator from Maryland and other Senators to see if we can work it out before the next call of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas objects.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to make a comment or two with respect to the bill which has just been discussed by the Senator from Maryland. In view

of the serious condition in which the United States finds itself in a very turbulent world, it seems to me that when a bill is reported unanimously from the Armed Services Committee, after its members have given the bill due and careful consideration, the Senator who desires to make objection to such a bill should make an objection only of a serious nature. Real reasons should be assigned for making objections to measures involving the national defense. I think Members of the United States Senate must be a little more serious and give a little more careful thought to bills of this nature. I merely mention that in passing.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to point out to all concerned—and I am sure my colleague on the committee, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] will bear me out—that it is quite difficult at times for the members of the Armed Services Committee to give the complete picture of all these matters to the Senate because much of the testimony is off the record. But today I am going to do it, if the Senator from Illinois will yield to me for a moment or two.

Senators have heard about the hydrogen bomb. They have read that it is probably a pretty big bomb. We will have to have airplanes large enough to carry it. That requires research. In order to secure the necessary information the men engaged in such research have to go where experiments are being conducted in the schools and colleges and laboratories of America, for no planes can be built without the approval of this organization. We are losing time. We lost time on the wind tunnel legislation.

Mr. President, I dislike to have to make these statements on the floor, but what we are doing is selling America down the river when such bills are objected to time after time. The Senator from Maryland is not in a position to come on the floor and lay the information before the Senate because much of it is so classified that he cannot do so. Yet, I am compelled to do it today, in order to show that the passage of the bill is necessary for the national defense.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to say most respectfully that as a member of the Committee on Armed Services I support what the Senator from Maryland has said. I respect the work the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] are doing on the calendar. I have the utmost regard for their conscientiousness of purpose, but I know that very careful consideration was given to this bill in the committee.

I agree with what the Senator from Maryland has said, that the bill represents an effort to give to the personnel who are engaged in research and building up new inventions in connection with airplanes the best possible opportunity to become educated at the places where they can go to receive instruction to enable them to carry out the necessary work. That is the important purpose of the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree completely with what the Senator from Illinois has stated, that when a committee of the Senate, especially a committee such as that headed by the Senator from Maryland, makes a unanimous report on a bill, consideration should be given to it.

Irrespective of what kind of bomb is under consideration, whether it be the atom bomb, or the other one about which people are now frightening us, we are always going to have to discuss such things so long as we do not have international good will.

Another bill was objected to this afternoon, I wish to say to the Senator from Illinois. That bill was Senate bill 501 repealing section 202 (e) of the Sugar Act of 1948. It is Calendar No. 1139. That bill was reported unanimously from the Committee on Finance, by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who heads that committee. Passage of that bill will have greater effect in doing away with the danger from bombs such as the Senator from Maryland has in mind than anything we can do. We are being asked to do something because we are being frightened by the bomb that may be developed. Passage of the bill to which I refer would do something to prevent such frightening things. We should do something to make it unnecessary to scare the people with stories of the bomb. The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has withdrawn his objection to Senate bill 501. I hope that before the day is over we will consider that bill. The passage of that bill and other similar bills will promote good will, and will obviate the necessity for building tremendous airships and bombs. Passage of such legislation will bring about international good will. As I said, the bill was reported unanimously from the Committee on Finance. Then we shall be getting down to brass tacks. Then we shall not be scared. We shall be acting like human beings, instead of trying to scare people. I hope that before the session is over, inasmuch as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has withdrawn his objection, the bill will be passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] has the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know he has.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall be glad to accommodate the Senator from New Mexico at the proper time, and he can call up the bill to which he refers. Certainly if the repeal of section 202 of the Sugar Act would do anything to help get rid of the hydrogen bomb, I am for it immediately. We can take up that question as soon as we finish what we are doing at the present time. I certainly do not want to push any measure to the front without due consideration, but I do know that the Armed Services Committee probably has more important obligations and responsibilities at this particular time than has any other committtee.

Let me say to the Senator from Maryland, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] who is a member of that committee, that any time the Senator from Maryland believes any one of the bills from his committee is essential to the national defense and needs immediate consideration, I shall be glad to move to take it up, if we cannot pass it on the call of the calendar. That is the reason why, in a moment, I shall move to take up House bill 4080, which is a bill reported from the Armed Services Committee. I shall also move to take up another bill reported by that committee, because we have not been able to get them through on the call of the calendar.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I believe that Senators who check the financial aspects of bills render a great service to the country; but let me say, in the best of feeling, that I believe they ought to be a little more tolerant about national-defense bills than they are about the usual run of bills, particularly when the national-defense bills are unanimously reported from a committee consisting of six Republicans and seven Democrats.

Many of these bills are of vital importance. We have heard testimony on many phases of national defense, which the Senate itself has never heard, and which no other committee in the Senate has heard.

Time is important. Every invention and novelty in aviation comes through the board of scientists whom we have employed. There is a terriffic turn-over in that organization. I know that my friend from Kansas, who wants to protect the finances of the country, would not have objected had he had all the information. I ask that hereafter Members of the Senate not apply the dollar test too closely to matters which might affect the welfare and safety of the Nation. Delays in connection with many national-defense bills are very damaging to the whole defense picture.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Some reference has been made to delay which has been experienced by the committee. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that there is no disposition on the part of the senior Senator from Kansas to delay anything in connection with the national defense. However, I may say to the Senator from Maryland, with all due humility, that it is somewhat difficult to understand why many things in connection with some of these matters are considered to be such grave secrets when one can read about them in the daily newspapers and listen to descriptions of them over the air almost any day in the week.

I think we have an obligation to Members of the Senate. I should have much preferred to have this discussion take

place when more Members of the Senate were in attendance this afternoon during the call of the calendar. I assure the Senator from Maryland that I have no disposition to delay any measure dealing with the national defense. But when Senators come to those of us who are trying to discharge a responsibility and say that they want to check into this or that, I think we are duty-bound to respect the views and wishes of such Senators.

I well understand that the majority leader, the Senator from Illinois, can obtain a call of the calendar for consideration of a particular measure almost at will. I want him to be able to do so in connection with these emergency measures. I see no reason for unnecessary delay.

Some questions have been raised with respect to some of the measures which have been objected to. I think the questions are meritorious. Perhaps in the eyes of the Senator from Maryland they are not so important as they are to some other Senators. I will cooperate in every way. I am sure that all Senators on this side of the aisle will cooperate. No Senator has any higher regard for the safety and welfare of the country than has the Senator from Kansas. I do not believe that a delay of 3 or 4 days or a week would entail the damage to which the Senator from Maryland refers. I sincerely hope not.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. This bill has been on the calendar for a long time, and it has been objected to several times in the past. Today it was objected to without the Senator from Maryland even having an opportunity to make an explanation of it. This is a bill of transcendental importance, and Senators objected to it without even giving the Senator from Maryland the courtesy of an opportunity to make an explanation. There is no pork in it. There is nothing in it that affects me. I have no more pride in it than has anyone else. But it does seem to me that when a bill affecting the national defense is called on the calendar it should not go over on the objection of one Senator, without some explanation.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I wish to say to the Senator from Maryland that I have no desire to be discourteous. I listened to many objections on the part of other Senators. A Senator has the right and the privilege to ask for an explanation, and I think it would be somewhat rude on the part of the objecting Senator not to grant the request for an opportunity to make an explanation. I assure the Senator from Maryland that I would have been most happy to do so at that time.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I said a moment ago, I admire Senators who wish to keep a check on the finances of the country. I think, though, that they might be a little more tolerant with some of these military bills than with the run-of-the-mine bills.

There are many bills with respect to which we cannot go into a complete or detailed explanation. In view of the importance and urgency of these bills, and the fact that we have so little time in which to take them up, and in view of the explanation which has been made, I ask the distinguished Senator from Kansas if he does not feel that in view of what I have said, we can pass this bill this afternoon.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that personally I would have no serious objection unless there were objections on the part of other Members of the Senate who noted their objections at the time the bill was called up and who are not now present. They might not now object if they were present.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I assure the Senator that there would be no objection. We have very strong Republican representation on the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I wish there were more of them.

Mr. TYDINGS. There are fine men on the committee, men who cooperate to promote the defense of America. When a bill is unanimously reported from that committee, it has gone through the sieve and has been screened to the highest degree. I take my hat off to Senators who serve with me on that committee, because they have one single purpose, and that is the promotion of the defense of the United States. I hope the Senator will withdraw his objection. This is an important bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I quite agree with what the Senator from Maryland has said. On the other hand, I think that the point raised by the Senator from Kansas is perfectly sound. On the call of the calendar there are many times when several Senators will rise to make objection. I do not happen to think that they would have objected to this particular bill.

The bill was reported from our committee by unanimous vote. The majority leader has stated that he will be glad to move to take up the bill. That would be the orderly procedure. I am sure that with the explanation given by the Senator from Maryland it will pass the Senate in 15 minutes tomorrow when it is called up. I think there is some danger, on calls of the calendar, in going back over the ground.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. In answer to the query made by the Senator from Maryland, let me say that I shall be very glad to withdraw my objection with the distinct understanding that if it becomes necessary the Senator from Maryland will explain to distinguished Members of this body some of the matters about which they may have been fearful. That may not be necessary. In view of the explanations heretofore made, and the urgency expressed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, I am willing to withdraw my objection, and probably in a degree not fulfill exactly the letter of my responsibility.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator withdraws his objection. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1393) to promote the national defense and to contribute to more effective aeronautical research by authorizing professional personnel of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to attend accredited graduate schools for research and study, reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to keep the record straight in regard to the bill.

It has been said that this bill is of transcendental importance. In looking over the record of military bills, I find that this bill was reported in May of last year. Subsequently, two other measures, House bill 4080, Calendar No. 481, and Senate bill 2440, Calendar No. 926, have been reported, on June 10 and August 15, respectively.

Now the majority party has chosen in its wisdom to make the latter two bills the unfinished business, ahead of Senate bill 1393, Calendar No. 412, which the distinguished Senator from Maryland says is of such great importance. So I should like to have the RECORD show that Senate bill 1393 could have been made the unfinished business, ahead of House bill 4080 or Senate bill 2440.

I am entirely in favor of Senate bill 1393; and I have no objection whatsoever to it. But, Mr. President, I think the responsibility in these matters should be placed on the shoulders of those who supposedly are carrying the burden of the responsibility for conducting the business of the Senate. Before any question is raised in regard to objection by the minority, I think the distinguished Senator from Maryland should look to the majority leader and should ask him why the bill was not made the unfinished business, in view of its importance, instead of the two bills I have mentioned.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say that it never occurred to the Senator from Maryland that there would be the slightest objection to the bill, or at least no objection which a brief explanation would not remove.

There was considerable difference of opinion regarding the other two bills. Therefore, it was assumed that this bill would be passed after a short explanation was made, because there was no difference of opinion regarding it.

I have made explanations of the bill several times before, when objection was made to it on the call of the calendar. Objection was made last May. This is January. The bill should have been passed 6 months ago, in the interest of every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should like to say that, judging from my short experience in this body, it is not safe for one to assume anything.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, at the end of the bill to insert:

SEC. 6. The total of the sums expended pursuant to this act, including all sums expended for the payment of salaries or compensation to employees on leave, shall not exceed $50,000 in any fiscal year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, there is a corresponding House bill on the calendar. The Senate bill, as now amended, places a limitation of $50,000 in any fiscal year on this work. The House bill contains no provision of limitation.

I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3946, the corresponding measure.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3946) to promote the national defense and to contribute to more effective aeronautical research by authorizing professional personnel of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to attend accredited graduate schools for research and study.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I now move that all after the enacting clause of the House bill be stricken, and that there be inserted, in lieu thereof, the text of the Senate bill, as amended, including the limitation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 3946) was read the third time and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 1393 will be indefinitely postponed.

REPEAL OF SECTION 202 (E) OF THE SUGAR ACT OF 1948

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, when Senate bill 501, Calendar No. 1139, was reached during the call of the calendar, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] objected. Since that time he has withdrawn his objection. I now ask unanimous consent that we revert to that bill on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I most respectfully object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, again referring to the fine remarks of the majority leader of the Senate, I would respectfully call to the attention of this body the report of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] on this bill. It reads in part as follows:

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 501) repealing section 202 (e) of the Sugar Act of 1948, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment, and recommend that the bill do pass.

GENERAL EXPLANATION

Section 202 (e) gives authorization to the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce the amount of sugar which might be allocated to an importing nation under the Sugar Act if the Secretary of State should find that that nation denies fair and equitable treatment to the nationals of the United States, its commerce, navigation, or industry.

This section has been widely interpreted in other countries as a threat of economic sanctions by the United States should it be dissatisfied with any action by a sugar-exporting country with respect to United States interests of any kind. This section was originally approved by the Congress upon the recommendation of the Department of State. It has been interpreted as being inconsistent with the conviction and policy of the United States that relations with other countries should be conducted on a basis of friendly negotiation and mutual agreement. Repeal of this section would be a reaffirmation by the Congress of this fundamental United States policy.

Upon the recommendation of the Departments of State, Commerce, and Agriculture your committee agrees that this section should not be included in the Sugar Act of 1948 but does not abandon its conviction that the Government of the United States should seek by friendly negotiation and mutual agreement with other countries to secure fair and equitable treatment to the nationals of the United States, its commerce, navigation, or industry.

The views of the Departments of State, Commerce, Interior, and Agriculture are expressed in the following communications received by your committee.

An excerpt from one of the communications is as follows:

Since the repeal of the subject section would appear to be primarily in the interest of international good will and since the existence of section 202 (e) is of very doubtful importance to American commerce, this Department has no objection to its repeal by the enactment of S. 501.

CHARLES SAWYER,
Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, says the following, in his letter:

Since the Department has responsibility under the quota system to make available adequate supplies of sugar for consumption in continental United States, section 202 (e) is of concern to the Department only insofar as it affects that responsibility.

The State Department sent a letter to the Senator from Georgia, the letter being signed for the Secretary of State by Charles E. Bohlen, counselor. That letter reads in part as follows:

In view of the fact that the intent of this section of the act has been widely misunderstood and that circumstances under which the use of this section might be considered desirable now appear remote, the Department perceives no objection to its repeal.

So, Mr. President, the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, as reported by the chairman of the Finance Committee, who has reported the bill, favor its enactment.

If enactment of the bill is considered desirable by all those agencies of our Government, I certainly hope there will not be objection by any Senator to the present consideration and passage of the bill. In all sincerity, I ask the Senator from Massachusetts not to lend aid to any interests which would attempt to "sell out" the good will of the United States, or take action at the expense of a little country like Cuba.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Some responsible citizens of Massachusetts have written me personally, objecting to the bill. I do not know its merits or demerits; but as I understand the purpose of the call of the calendar, it is to allow further consideration of matters of this kind.

I am not venomous in my position in this matter. If the Senator from New Mexico wishes to consider my position in that spirit, he may do so, of course; but in objecting to the bill at this time, I am simply doing my duty to my constituents in Massachusetts.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I do not at any time question the sincerity or purpose or motives of the Senator from Massachusetts. I am merely stating that it is about time that we give something other than lip service to the good-neighbor, good-will policy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard to the request of the Senator from New Mexico.

NOTICE OF ADDRESS BY SENATOR McMAHON ON THE PRESIDENTIAL DECISION TO BUILD THE HYDROGEN BOMB

Mr. McMAHON. I understand it is not considered good practice to request unanimous consent to be recognized on a succeeding day. Therefore, I shall not do so. But I should like to advise the Senate that I shall seek recognition as soon as possible tomorrow, for the purpose of addressing Members of the Senate upon the Presidential decision to build a hydrogen bomb, and to speak about certain of the implications which I see resulting therefrom.

CODIFICATION OF THE ARTICLES OF WAR

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4080, which is Calendar Order No. 481.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4080) to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard, and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4080) to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Article for the Government of the Navy and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, my amendments lettered B to Z to House bill 4080, which is the unfinished business, together with explanations of the amendments.

There being no objection, the amendments and the explanations thereof were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT B

On page 106, beginning with line 21, strike out all down to and including line 23 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(12) 'Judge advocate' shall be construed to refer to all officers of the Regular Army or Air Force appointed in the appropriate Judge Advocate General's Corps, and all nonregular officers of any component of the Army or Air Force of the United States on active Federal duty assigned to the appropriate Judge Advocate General's Corps by competent orders."

On page 119, beginning with line 18, strike all down to and including line 20 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) General courts-martial, which shall consist of any number of members not less than five;".

On page 127, beginning with line 22, strike out all down to and including line 6 on page 128 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"ART. 26. Law member of a general court-martial.

"The authority convening a general court-martial shall appoint as a member thereof a law member who shall be a judge advocate or a law specialist or an officer who is a member of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State of the United States and who is certified to be qualified for such duty by The Judge Advocate General of the armed force of which he is a member. No person shall be eligible to act as a law member in a case in which he is an accuser or a witness for the prosecution or has acted as investigating officer or as counsel in the same case."

On page 138, beginning with line 12, strike out all down to and including line 23 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"ART. 39. Sessions.

"Whenever a general or special court-martial is to deliberate or vote, only the members of the court shall be present. All other proceedings, including any consultation of the court with counsel, shall be made a part of the record and be in the presence of the accused, the defense counsel, and the trial counsel."

On page 147, beginning with line 17, strike out all down to and including line 3 on page 148 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) The law member of a general court-martial and the president of a special court-martial shall rule upon interlocutory questions, other than challenge, arising during the proceedings. All rulings shall be made in open court and recorded. Any such ruling made by the law member of a general court-martial upon any interlocutory question other than a motion for a finding of not guilty, or the question of accused's sanity, shall be final and shall constitute the ruling of the court; but the law member may in any case consult with the court, in closed session, before making a ruling, and may change any such ruling at any time during the trial. Unless such ruling be final, if any member objects thereto, the court shall be cleared and closed and the question decided by a vote as provided in article 52, viva voce, beginning with the junior in rank."

On page 12, line 11, strike out "officer" and insert in lieu thereof "member."

On page 128, line 17, strike out "law officer" and insert in lieu thereof "law member."

On page 139, lines 5, 13, and 16, respectively, strike out the word "officer" and insert in lieu thereof respectively the word "member."

On page 148, line 5, strike out "officer" and insert in lieu thereof "member."

EXPLANATION

H. R. 4080 as reported abolishes the law member who has been a most useful member of Army courts martial since 1920 and substitutes for him a figurehead "law officer." The proponents have convinced the Armed Services Committee that the change is a desirable one on the theory that the law officer is analogous to a judge. In its report the committee stated (S. Rept. 486):

"Article 26 provides the authority for a law officer of a general court martial. Under existing law the Navy has no law officer. The Army and the Air Force do have a law officer for general courts martial who, in addition to ruling upon points of evidence, retires, deliberates, and votes with the court on the findings and sentence. Officers of equal experience on this subject are sharply divided in their opinion as to whether the law officer should retire with the court and vote as a member. In view of the fact that the law officer is empowered to make final rulings on all interlocutory questions of law, except on a motion to dismiss and a motion relating to the accused's sanity, and under this bill will instruct the court upon the presumption of innocence, burden of proof, and elements of the offense, it is not considered desirable that the law officer should have the voting privileges of a member of the court. This is consistent with the practice in civil courts where the judge does not retire and deliberate with the jury."

It is significant that those witnesses who are really familiar with the administration of military justice under the present army system have uniformly scoffed at the analogy. I quote from the statement of the Judge Advocate General of the Army:

"2. Limitation on the powers of the law member.

"Article 26 creates the position of a 'law officer.' This officer, unlike the law member appointed pursuant to article of war 8, is not a member of the court. He may rule on interlocutory questions, instruct the court as to the presumption of innocence, and assist the court in preparing the formal findings after the actual findings have been made, but he is deprived of his vote and excluded from the closed sessions of the court. This results in the loss of legal experience and learning during the most critical stage of the proceedings and deprives the court of legal guidance at a time when it most urgently requires such guidance. The requirement of the Kem amendment that a law member be a lawyer and that he participate in all proceedings of a court martial is regarded by all who have had experience in the administration of military justice as the most significant improvement since automatic appellate review. The limitation on the effectiveness of the law member will result in miscarriages of justice both to the detriment of accused persons as well as to the detriment of the interests of the Government."

The only argument for the change which I have been able to discover advanced by the proponents of the bill is that it is desirable to have the law member's instructions appear upon the record. I have no objection to that. The present Manual for Courts-Martial requires that the law member's instructions be given in open court.

Professor Morgan, for whom I have a great deal of esteem, justified this provision to the House Armed Services Committee as follows:

"The charge which he gives them will be on the record—everything that he gives in open court will be on the record. When they go back to deliberate they are like a jury and there is no particular record with reference to that.

"The law member, when he retires with the court, may make any kind of statement to them. And it has been stated—I would not say on how good authority—that frequently when he went back there why he said, 'Of course the law is this way but you fellows don't have to follow it'" (hearing on H. R. 2498, p. 607).

I doubt if any lawyer law member ever said a thing like that. The presence of the law member in the closed sessions is infinitely more likely to prove a deterrent against the expression of such a sentiment by anyone.

The analogy between the proposed law officer and a civilian judge is more apparent than real. For example, he rules subject to objection to any member of the court on the question of a motion for a finding of not guilty under article 51. Suppose that he has ruled, as a matter of law, that the prosecution has not proved a prima facie case and a member objects to his ruling. Under the proposed code the court closes—excludes the law officer, and votes on this legal question. The law officer cannot explain his ruling, defend it, or vote to sustain it. Although under Article of War 31 such a ruling by the present law member is also subject to objection at least he can defend his ruling against the argument of a member who may not be well versed in the law. I don't believe this change which makes the law member a mere figurehead is defensible.

Col. Frederick Bernams Wiener, who is a prolific writer on military law, told the House committee:

"Colonel WIENER. Yes. In that connection, I think that the provision to remove the law officer from the deliberations would be very, very detrimental. Now, when you remove him for deliberations, and I have in mind that he is disinterested, and that he is a lawyer and that is a reform for which we are indebted to the Elston bill—by taking him out you take out of the deliberations the one man who can make the most helpful contribution to the deliberations. That, I know, is obvious to any lawyer or any other officer who has sat on any court martial and had the assistance of a trained-law member.

"I cannot help but think that the provision removing the law member from the deliberations was not the product of anyone who ever sat on a court, when you consider, gentlemen, that all the grief and all the difficulties and all the confusion, and all the mix-ups to which Mr. ELSTON and his committee listened 2 years ago resulted from ignorance rather than wickedness. It was mostly ignorance.

"That gap was plugged by insuring that the law member had to be a lawyer. Now you remove him just when he is able to do the most good. It is the analogy, gentlemen, of the jury trial, but the law officer does not have the judge's power. It is wholly a false analogy. It is a jury trial without the safeguards. It is an importation from the English practice and it is always dangerous, gentlemen, to transplant instructions. In England the members of the court are officers, military officers. The judge advocate is a barrister, a civilian, not a military man. The judge advocate sits there in his barrister's gown and wig. He instructs the court. Here

we have never had that sort of thing. He is a civilian. He does not sit down with officers.

"Here you are proposing to make that law officer a member of the military forces. He is not a civilian. Why shouldn't he sit down with the court and give them the additional assistance which his legal knowledge enables him to give? I think this notion of taking the law member out of the court just at the time when they are about to perform their most important function is the most retrograding step in this bill."

Lt. Col. Thomas H. King, national judge advocate of the Reserve Officers' Association told the House Committee:

"Now the question of the law member sitting with the court. To me it is inconceivable that the law member not sit with the court. We talk about endeavoring to take from command authority the right to control a court. But what do we do? We take the one man who is certified by the Judge Advocate General as qualified to sit on a court and take him out of it.

"He is the one man who is not subject to command influence if there is any, because he has been especially certified to sit as the law member of that court or the law officer or whatever his title may be.

"To us who have tried a few of these cases—and I had the experience in February of trying one under the Elston bill—it was one of the greatest pleasures I had, to have a law officer sitting up on that court who knew what he was doing. While we did not agree as to every point, we had a very capable man. And while the result of the case was not to my total satisfaction, I left that courtroom with a definite feeling that a fair break had been given to the accused."

To me it is quite obvious that the law officer set up by article 26 is far from being a judge. A judge can direct a verdict of not guilty without having a member of the jury object and override him. He can sentence the accused; he can set aside a verdict as being against the weight of the evidence and he can grant a new trial. Without those powers he is no more than a referee or an umpire. I can think of no better safeguard to insure that a case be judged by the evidence and not by passion or suspicion than to have the law member present in the closed sessions of the court. I suspect that Professor Morgan and the Armed Services Committee have been sold a bill of goods by the services which does not now have a law member. I suspect that the Navy is willing to provide for the appearance of due process by accepting a figurehead law officer, but it does not want a legal conscience present in the closed sessions of the court to deter the expression of sentiments such as Professor Morgan attributes to an anonymous law member. I agree with General Green that it is highly doubtful that a lawyer law member ever said a theory like that. Although I have not seen the Senate Armed Services Committee hearings, I understand that General Harmon, the Judge Advocate General of the Air Force agreed with General Green. The view of the two services which have had experience with law members has greater weight with me than the patently fictitious theory that a figurehead law officer performs the functions of a judge. My amendment B is calculated to restore the law member to the position which he now holds under the Kem amendment to the Selective Service Act.

AMENDMENT C

On page 107, beginning with line 19, strike out all down to and including line 22.

On page 107, strike out line 7 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"The following persons are subject to these articles and shall be understood as included in the term 'any person subject to this code.'"

On pages 107 and 108, renumber all succeeding paragraphs in article 2.

On page 109, beginning with line 9, strike out all down to and including line 16 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) Subject to the provisions of article 43, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the several district courts of the United States to try and punish according to the applicable provisions and limitations of this code and the regulations made thereunder—

"(1) any person charged with having committed an offense against this code while in a status in which he was subject to this code which status has been terminated;

"(2) any person of the Reserve component of the armed forces for an offense against this code committed while such person is on inactive duty training authorized by written orders which are voluntarily accepted by such person;

"(3) retired personnel of a Regular component of the armed forces who are charged with having committed an offense against this code and who are entitled to receive pay."

On page 108, beginning with line 22, strike out all down to and including line 7 on page 109 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(12) In time of war or national emergency, subject to the provisions of any treaty or agreement to which the United States is or may be a party, all persons within an area leased by or otherwise reserved or acquired for the use of the United States which is under the control of the Secretary of a Department and which is without the continental limits of the United States and the following Territories: That part of Alaska east of longitude 172 degrees west, the Canal Zone, the main group of the Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, except insofar as these articles define offenses of such nature that they can be committed only by military personnel."

EXPLANATION

Article 2 (3) of H. R. 4980 extends military jurisdiction to "Reserve personnel while they are on inactive duty training authorized by written orders which are voluntarily accepted by them, which orders specify that they are subject to this code."

Article 3 (a) continues military jurisdiction with respect to persons who have been separated from the service.

This seems to me unwarranted. The civilian components bitterly oppose these extensions of military jurisdiction. My amendment is substantially that proposed by General Green, The Judge Advocate General of the Army. His statement to the Armed Services Committee is an honest expression of a reasonable military man who is opposed to the extension of military power over the civilian population.

1. Extension of military jurisdiction over civilians.

"It has long been recognized that nonmilitary persons who travel and serve with an army in the field must be subject to the discipline of the army, else their conduct can seriously affect the security and discipline of that force. Consequently, such persons have been subject to military laws since the Articles enacted by the Continental Congress. When, however, there is no exigent need for the exercise of military jurisdiction over civilians, Congress has been very zealous to preserve civilian jurisdiction.

"Insofar as Army and Air Force personnel are concerned, articles 2 (3) and 3 (a) of the code extend military jurisdiction over persons not now subject to it. I believe this is unnecessary and the inevitable result will be public revulsion against its exercise. It has been my experience that, no matter how just and fair the system of military justice may be, if it reaches out to the civilian community, every conceivable emotional attack is concentrated on the system. This is as it should be. The framers of the Constitution recognized that civilians should be tried by civilian courts and they established a military system of courts for the Army and Navy. I recognize that reservists on inactive duty training may commit offenses, perhaps serious ones. I also recognize that many serious offenses committed by persons subject to military law are not detected until the person is separated from the service. I do not advocate that such persons should go unpunished. I merely suggest that you confer jurisdiction upon Federal courts to try any person for an offense denounced by the code if he is no longer subject thereto. This would be consistent with the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

"Article 3 (a) is particularly unworkable. It provides that, subject to the statute of limitations, any person charged with having committed an offense against the code, punishable by confinement of 5 years or more and for which he cannot be tried in a Federal or State court while in a status in which he was subject to the code, shall not be relieved from amenability to trial by courts martial. The question as to whether he can be tried by a Federal or State court for the offense becomes a jurisdistional one. It may be hard to decide. In *United States* v. *Bowman* (260 U. S. 94) the Supreme Court held that any offense directly injurious to the Government for which Congress provided no territorial limitation may be tried by a district court no matter where the offense is committed. Whether a particular offense comes within this limited category is a fit subject for debate among lawyers. It may not be settled except by the Supreme Court. It is not a proper subject for determination by a court martial. If you expressly confer jurisdiction on the Federal courts to try such cases, you preserve the constitutional separation of military and civil courts, you save the military from a lot of unmerited grief and you provide for a clean, constitutional method for disposing of such cases."

I quote from the statements of representatives of the Reserve components before the House committee.

Mr. John J. Finn, representing the American Legion:

IV. JURISDICTION

"The American Legion calls attention to the expanded jurisdiction conferred upon military courts in the proposed code. It may be that such is necessary. If atomic warfare comes, there is the distinct probability that within a few hours after commencement of hostilities, all activities in America would be subject to martial or military law. All people would then become subject to the proposed or a similar code. At least military commissions would take the place of civil courts.

"There has been of late a seemingly increasing inclination to widen the jurisdiction of military authority. In the past, Congress has zealously guarded the distinction between the civilian and the military indicated as essential by the writers of the Constitution.

"The military has not always been content to remain within constitutional or statutory limits in this regard. Witness the cases of *Duncan* v. *Kahanamoku* (327 U. S. 304); *United States ex rel Hirshberg* v. *Cooke* (17 U. S. Law WK. 4223); *Rosborough* v. *Rossell* (150 F. 2d 809).

"The American Legion is certain that the majority of those in the military and naval service intend to carry out their assigned tasks with the American spirit in mind and within limits imposed by statute and the Constitution. However, wherever an authority is granted, there will always be some who will take advantage thereof and abuse it; some through ignorance, and a smaller number through arbitrary willfulness.

"With this in mind, it is the position of the Legion that the proposals in H. R. 2498 in regard to jurisdiction should undergo the

close scrutiny of all concerned before passage.

"It may be that with its better facilities for obtaining information, because of world conditions, and possible defects in the present codes, the Congress will believe it proper to enlarge the jurisdiction as proposed or confer it to a greater extent.

"In order to provide for temporary situations, and to correct the present codes, however, we should not surrender so much of our liberties that our form of government may or will be endangered.

"If Congress, in its wisdom, decides it is necessary to widen jurisdiction, it is believed that professionally trained lawyers should administer the code. There is an almost vital necessity to provide an adequate and foolproof system of review. If jurisdiction is to be enlarged, it behooves us to enlarge the powers of the boards that are to review the actions of military courts and not so to circumscribe the activities of such boards that they are or can be rendered impotent in time of emergency or hysteria."

Col. Melvin Maas, national president of the Marine Corps Reserve Association:

"Colonel MAAS. That these articles apply to Reserve personnel who are voluntarily on inactive duty training authorized by written orders.

"Now, gentlemen, to personalize this again, at the request of the Marine Corps I organized a Reserve wing staff 6 months ago. I am in command of that wing staff. We are a volunteer organization.

"We receive no pay. We do not wear uniforms. The Government furnishes no quarters. We meet once a month, in civilian clothes, for 2 hours, and we study military matters. Under this proposal, if I should happen to make a remark that was considered derogatory of the President or of the Cabinet or of the Congress, anytime within 3 years I can be ordered back to active duty for some alleged remark I made in my civilian capacity and held indefinitely without my own consent for court martial.

"Now, gentlemen, if you want to destroy the Reserves we are building up, that will be a fine section to leave in the bill.

"Now, we are in complete agreement that Reserves when they are on actual active duty should be subject to the same code as all Regulars. But, gentlemen, it is going far afield to apply it to the ROTC and to apply it to Volunteer Reserves. This could actually apply to a man in his own home studying a correspondence course, gentlemen.

"If some neighbor stopped in and he made some remark that might be interpreted as being critical of the President, he might be called to account 2 or 3 years later, when he did not even remember of such a remark being made. Gentlemen, that is a very dangerous provision.

"It is unnecessary and unworkable and in my opinion will cast reflection upon your whole bill and it will have a tendency to destroy your Reserve—your Volunteer Reserve. It is just inconsistent with our whole fundamental concept, gentlemen.

"Mr. RIVERS. Is this the first time such a thing has been proposed?

"Colonel MAAS. Why of course it is the first time that such a thing has ever been considered.

"Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Larkin seems to dissent from that statement.

"Mr. BROOKS. We will hear from Mr. Larkin later. By the way, I have heard Mr. Larkin discuss this and I think the committee, too, is entitled to his views. He is a witness later on, is he not?

"Mr. SMART. On a section-by-section reading of the bill for amendments, Mr. Larkin will explain the position of the National Military Establishment on all sections.

"Mr. RIVERS. What is the situation with regard to that prohibition now, as the law exists today?

"Colonel MAAS. Well, to the best of my knowledge—and I have had very extensive experience for 32 years in the service and the Reserve—there is no restriction about my making any comments.

"Of course I do not expect to commit any acts that would be detrimental to the Military Establishment. But if, when I am sitting down in private quarters merely studying military subjects, every remark is to be subject to court martial, why it does not become very attractive to give my time to training myself further.

"I do not think my views are any different than a million other young—younger men.

"You know, gentlemen, this almost smacks of attempting to impose thought control in this country. Now I do not have any question about it. I say when a Reserve is on active duty and performing military duty he ought to be subject to all laws.

"But think very carefully before you extend it to ROTC and extend it to volunteer training units.

"Gentlemen, on page 6, article 3, subsection (a)—you must have some limitation on the time in which personnel can be ordered to active duty for a trial by court martial. If you are going to retain the provision that the Reserves are subject to it, you have to put some other limitation than 3 years.

"It is unfair to call a Reserve in as late as 3 years later and say '3 years ago you made a remark about the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of Defense or the President or some Congressman.'

Lieutenant Colonel King, national judge advocate, Reserve Officers' Association:

"The next point—and with that I am going to finish—is the question of making Reserve officers in inactive status, that is on inactive duty training, subject to the Articles of War. To me it is a gag if it were applied not as intended, not as these people say they think it should be put into effect, but within the letter of the law.

"Suppose I come in to my commanding officer—Colonel Wiener—for a drill 10 minutes late and I have said something down here that he did not like or the Department did not like. Well, they can court martial me, put me on an active duty, and hold me because I was 10 minutes late as the excuse. It is a dangerous thing.

"I personally have no objection to being tried by a court martial, because I am convinced that you get just as fair a break there as you do with any civilian court in the country. And with the requirements for an investigation under article of war 70, or whatever it is in the Elston bill, you have to have an experienced investigator and they do not kid with you. They get the facts.

"They get them by means that we do not approve, that the defense lawyer will get up before the court and scream his head off about, but they really get the facts and if you are guilty, I think they get you.

"And I think also if you are not guilty they are less likely to convict you.

"As to this business of influence of courts, my personal experience in Europe was a very unique one. I sat as a claims commission and not as one having to do with military justice. I tried several thousand cases. And I had an office next door to the president of our general court.

"We are very good friends. And I tell you that even if the staff judge advocate did try to influence him, he had the courage of his convictions, and I think most of them did because they were good officers.

"They had the courage of their convictions to do what they thought was right. Some of them may not have, but we also have civilians who do not have the courage of their convictions.

"So, gentlemen, with those four things, we really feel that the military being experienced in the military and the Navy officers being experienced in Navy activities, should be the ones to make the decision, with a definite limitation as to the manner in which these people are appointed. I like the Elston bill.

"I fought for it. I think this committee did a magnificent job in preparing it. I think they came out with something good."

These are samples of the views of the Reserve components. I think they are reasonable. I see no reason for extending military jurisdiction over civilians. I concede that Reserve personnel on inactive duty may be guilty of serious offenses and that serious offenses are frequently not brought to light until the culprit has been separated from the service. No one, except the offender perhaps, would argue that such offenders should go untried and unpunished, but there can be no objection to according civilians a right to a trial by jury and trial by a civilian court. The chairman of the subcommittee of the House of Representatives, when confronted with a similar proposal, questioned whether the Federal courts would have jurisdiction over offenses committed outside their district. I submit that title 18 of the United States Code is full of penal statutes denouncing acts committed on the high seas and elsewhere in the special territories and maritime jurisdiction of the United States. We are all familiar with the treason trials where offenses were committed in Germany or Japan and tried in United States district courts. The Supreme Court in *U. S.* v. *Bowman* (260 U. S. 94), held that a Federal court had jurisdiction to try a conspiracy to defraud the United States where the conspiracy was committed on foreign soil. Title 18, United States Code, section 3238, provides for venue in such cases; 18 United States Code, 3238, provides as follows:

"The trial of all offenses begun or committed upon the high seas, or elsewhere out of the jurisdiction of any particular State or district, shall be in the district where the offender is found, or into which he is first brought."

There is nothing unconstitutional about my amendments; on the other hand, there is grave doubt as to the constitutionality of the provisions of article 3 (a) under the fifth amendment. Are these cases arising in the land and naval forces, or are they causes? A case, as I understand it, arises when a prosecution is instituted, a cause, when an offense is committed. Have courts martial the power to try a person who is a civilian when the case arises. I suggest we avoid the grave constitutional doubt by adopting this amendment.

With respect to retired personnel a different problem arises. Although they are merged with the civil population they are still a part of the armed forces. They are now subject to military law although it is contrary to the policy of the Army to try them, except for the most serious offenses. My amendment would leave their status as it now is, except that it would give the Federal courts concurrent jurisdiction to try them for offenses against the code.

Article 12 (a) as originally proposed by the Morgan group attempted to confer military jurisdiction over all persons in leased bases, such as the British base in the West Indies, in time of peace as well as war, for all sorts of offenses, military offenses as well as offenses of a civil nature. I made my views known to the House committee and told them that the provision is contrary to executive agreements entered into with the British and Philippine Governments and that, moreover, it was contrary to international law. In an attempt to meet the criticism, the House committee amended the section by providing that it be "subject to the provision of any treaty or agreement to which the United States is or may be a party or to any accepted rule of international law." Other than the fact that this is putting the cart before the horse, I wonder whether every

officer exercising special court-martial jurisdiction is going to know about all treaties, executive agreements, and rules of international law.

The proponents of the bill have consistently stated that it was patterned after 34 United States Code 1201. This statute was extremely well drafted by thoughtful draftsmen. In part, it provides:

"In addition to the persons now subject to the articles for the government of the Navy, all persons, other than those persons in the military service of the United States * * * which is within an area leased by the United States which is without the territorial jurisdiction thereof and which is under the control of the Secretary of the Navy, shall, in time of war or national emergency, be subject to the articles for the government of the Navy, except insofar as these articles define offenses of such nature that they can be committed only by naval personnel."

This statute is consistent with and declaratory of international law in that it limits this extraordinary jurisdiction to—

1. Offenses other than purely military ones, and is operative.

2. Only in time of war or national emergency.

To my way of thinking, the salient applicable rules of international law should be stated right in the statute so that no one need be confused or have any doubts thereon. Otherwise we will run into international complications every time some irritated junior officer attempts to exercise military jurisdiction in peacetime over a resident of a foreign island who has no connection with our forces other than that he might reside in a leased area, for some such offense as disrespect to a commissioned officer. The limitation pertinent to treaties and agreements is not objectionable and might do some good.

AMENDMENT D

On page 116, beginning with line 5, strike out all down to and including line 18 and insert in lieu thereof the following.

"ART. 14. Delivery of offenders to civil authorities.

"(a) When any person subject to this code, except one who is held by the military authorities to answer, or who is awaiting trial or result of trial, or who is undergoing sentence for a crime or offense punishable under this code, is accused of a crime or offense committed within the geographical limits of the States of the Union and the District of Columbia, and punishable by the laws of the land, the commanding officer is required, except in time of war, upon application duly made, to use his utmost endeavor to deliver over such accused person to the civil authorities, or to aid the officers of justice in apprehending and securing him, in order that he may be brought to trial.

"(b) When, under the provisions of this code, delivery is made to the civil authorities of an offender undergoing sentence of a court martial, such delivery, if followed by conviction, shall be held to interrupt the execution of the sentence of the court martial, and the offender shall be returned to military custody, after having answered to the civil authorities for his offense, for the completion of such court-martial sentence."

On page 121, lines 1 and 2, strike out "and may adjudge any punishment permitted by the law of war."

On page 130, beginning with line 12, strike out all down to and including line 16.

On page 130, line 17, strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(a)".

On page 130, line 25, strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(b)".

On page 179, beginning with line 16, strike out all down to and including line 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"ART. 98. Noncompliance with procedural rules or provisions for turning over offenders to civil authorities.

"Any person subject to this code who willfully fails to enforce or comply with any of the requirements of articles 14, 30 through 34, or 37 shall be punished as a court martial may direct."

EXPLANATION

Article 14: The present seventy-fourth article of war makes it mandatory in time of peace for military authorities to hand over to the civilian authorities a man charged with an offense by civilian authorities, unless the accused is being held by the Army for a military offense. In the Navy though surrender of such a person is discretionary here again the Navy's view won out. There isn't any good reason why the civil authorities in the United States should not exercise their jurisdiction over all citizens whether they be civilians or soldiers. This statute making discretionary whether a criminal should or should not be turned over to civil authorities grants a license for misprision of a felony at the whim of any local commander. I can see no reason for the invasion of the sovereignty of States and I recommend that we stay within the law as it is now administered by the Army. Let us avoid conflict between the State authorities and military authorities and not leave matters such as these to vague discretion.

In order to preserve the punitive provisions of article of war 74, I am expressly making it a part of article 98 of this code—now compliance with procedural rules. That article as proposed by the National Military Establishment and passed by the House is a remarkable piece of legislation. It provides among other things:

Any person subject to the code who * * * knowingly and intentionally fails to enforce or comply with any provisions of the code regulating the proceedings before, during, or after trial of an accused; shall be punished as a court-martial may direct.

I ask the many lawyers in this body how they would like to practice law or sit as judges in a jurisdiction with a penal statute like this. To be sure, to be criminal a procedural error must be intentional. But everyone is presumed to know the law; ignorance of the law is no excuse and intent is something which the court may infer from the circumstances. Intent is sometimes easier to prove than to disprove. The implications of the article are startling. The proponents say innocently in their commentary:

"Paragraph (2) is new, and is intended to enforce procedural provisions of this code, for example, article 37 (unlawfully influencing action of court) and article 31 (compulsory self-incrimination)."

And it is on this line that the proposed article is urged throughout the hearings and reports. It is supposed to put teeth in article 37, a very good section indeed taken directly from article of war 88 of the Kem amendment to the Selective Service Act of 1948. That article is supposed to forbid an appointing authority from censuring, reprimanding, or admonishing a court or any member or counsel thereof with respect to the findings or sentence adjudged by the court or with respect to any other exercise of its or his functions in the conduct of the proceedings.

Now article 98 is supposed to put teeth into this statute—and so it does provide a means to punish the appointing authority who censures or reprimands a court with a "skin letter." But it also has teeth in the back of its head. Although the convening authority may not censure or reprimand any court member or counsel, he is in fact encouraged to prefer charges against them for any procedural error. Now let us limit this dangerous article so that it may not be used as a device to circumvent the very abuse it was intended to correct. Let us limit its application to violations of those articles which are intended to insure prompt and proper disposition of cases and to the provision forbidding the unlawful influence of courts with respect to their judicial functions.

My amendment is substantially the one proposed by General Green. In support thereof he said:

"The amendment is calculated to put teeth into the requirement of the code for prompt and proper disposition of cases and for the provision forbidding the unlawful influence of courts without destroying the freedom of exercise of their judicial functions of courts, counsel, and reviewing authorities. I am afraid that, as written, article 98 would make it possible to punish any member of a court or counsel for the slightest procedural error. It might authorize commanders who are forbidden to censure, reprimand, or admonish courts prefer charges against its members or personnel for such errors as the improper admission or exclusion of evidence, improper action on a challenge, or for finding an accused guilty of an offense not necessarily included in that charged."

Any flagrant violation of other procedural rules, like those for which a lawyer might be disbarred, may be prosecuted under article 134, the general article.

When the hidden implications of article 98 become generally known, I doubt that many young lawyers will seek legal careers in the armed forces.

Amendment D also strikes out of article 18 the power of a general court martial to "adjudge any punishment permitted by the law of war." This particular power is not now in article of war 12 and somehow general courts martial have been able to get along without it. The article already confers upon such courts the power to adjudge any punishment not forbidden by the code, including the penalty of death when specifically authorized by the code. This should certainly suffice the punitive powers of general courts martial without importing new and unknown factors like the law of war. I have searched in vain the hearings before the House committee for an intelligent explanation of what is to be gained by the addition to the punitive powers of a general court martial. (See pp. 958 and 959 of the hearings.) The House committee adopted the language in spite of the doubts, because it was assured that it was in the present Articles of War. I can assure you that it is not.

Lastly my amendment D proposes to strike out of the bill article 29 (a), which provides:

"(a). No member of a general or special court martial shall be absent or excused after the accused has been arraigned except for physical disability or as a result of a challenge or by order of the convening authority for good cause."

Now at first blush that does not appear unreasonable. It certainly is the duty of every member to be present at every session of the court unless he is excused by the convening authority or challenged. If he is not, he is absent without leave from his place of duty and can be punished for violating article 86. But the matter I object to is that the article may make the presence and accounting for each member a jurisdictional prerequisite. If in the course of a long and difficult trial one of the members were to fail to appear, under the section the whole proceedings

might well have to be disapproved on jurisdictional grounds despite the fact that more than the minimum number of members now required were present throughout the trial. Emergencies happen in the military service whereby the interest of the Nation might require that a member be excused from the court for other vital duties although the convening authority who might be 1,000 miles away could not be reached. Are we going to force the administration of military justice into a strait-jacket of technical jurisdictional requirements which will impair not only the administration of justice but also the operation of the force. Gentlemen, I assure you that the section adds nothing to the law or practice now in effect except a reason for disapproving proceedings on artificial jurisdictional grounds.

AMENDMENT E

One page 116, beginning with line 20, strike out all down to and including line 13 on page 118 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"ART. 15. Commanding officer's nonjudicial punishment.

"(a) Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, any commanding officer may, in addition to or in lieu of admonition or reprimand, impose one of the following disciplinary punishments for minor offenses without the intervention of a court martial, unless the accused demands trial by court martial—

"(1) upon officers and warrant officers of his command:

"(A) withholding of privileges for a period not to exceed 1 week; or

"(B) restriction to certain specified limits, with or without suspension from duty, for a period not to exceed 1 week; or

"(C) if imposed by an officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction, forfeiture of not to exceed one-half of his pay per month for a period not exceeding 1 month;

"(2) upon other military personnel of his command:

"(A) withholding of privileges for a period not to exceed 1 week; or

"(B) restriction to certain specified limits, with or without suspension from duty, for a period not to exceed 1 week; or

"(C) extra duties for a period not to exceed 1 week, and not to exceed 2 hours per day, holidays included; or

"(D) reduction to next inferior grade if the grade from which demoted was established by the command or an equivalent or lower command; or

"(E) if imposed upon a person attached to or embarked in a vessel, confinement for a period not to exceed seven consecutive days.

"(b) The Secretary of a Department may, by regulation, place limitations on the powers granted by this article with respect to the kind and amount of punishment authorized, and the categories of commanding officers authorized to exercise such powers."

On page 121, line 25, beginning with the comma, strike out all down to and including the word "appropriate" on page 122, line 6.

One page 126, line 21, after the word "shall", insert a comma and the following: "without his consent."

One page 126, line 24, beginning with the comma, strike out all down to and including line 5 on page 127.

EXPLANATION

Article 15, nonjudicial punishment: This article is presumably patterned somewhat after the so-called disciplinary power of the commanding officers under article of war 104 of the Kem amendment. Under the article, commanding officers of companies or higher units may impose such punishments as admonition or reprimand, withholding privileges, extra fatigue duty, or restriction to specified limits upon enlisted persons. None of these punishments may be given for a period longer than 1 week from the day imposed. In addition certain commanders may also impose a forfeiture of one-half of a month's pay on officers and warrant officers. Now there is no court martial involved here, but in the Army and Air Force the statute gives every person who considers himself innocent the right to refuse to accept disciplinary punishment and demand a trial by a court martial instead. This is eminently fair. Disciplinary punishment under the Articles of War is relatively minor and is a marvelous way to straighten out a soldier who misbehaves without impairing his usefulness by a stiff court-martial sentence. But if he thinks that he is being unjustly accused of an offense he can demand and get his day in court. That's the way our police courts work—it's the American system of fair play even for minor offenses.

Now that is not the system in the Navy. There is no limit on minor punishments such as withholding of privileges and extra duty, in addition, the Navy also now has confinement for 10 days, confinement on bread and water for 5 days, and solitary confinement for 7 days. Despite the fact that these relics from the log of Captain Bligh are infinitely harsher than the punishment authorized without trial in the Army, the Navy does not give an accused the right to a day in court. The accused is simply haled before the master of the ship at a ceremony known as captain's mast and without being given an opportunity to demand a trial, he may be given 7 days' solitary confinement, or an unlimited amount of time swabbing a deck.

Apparently the Navy won this round, too, when the code was being drafted. This harsh Navy system was adopted with but minor modification—but more detrimental to morale than this harshness is that the unfairness inherent in arbitrary punishment without the right to a day in court was also adopted—subject to departmental regulations. This, the proponents say, will enable the Army to keep its system, and I add, the Navy to keep its harsh and unfair system. I have no doubt that Mr. Gray will leave the Army system as it is—but we must not forget that there once was a Secretary of War, Mr. Stanton, whose harshness and arbitrariness is a matter of history. Would a Secretary like Mr. Stanton hesitate for 1 minute to adopt a harsh and arbitrary system of disciplinary punishment if authorized by statute?

It is true that the House ameliorated some of the harsh features of the bill initially introduced and the Senate committee improved it still more. The confinement features and the bread and water was limited to shipboard. I can agree that aboard a ship confinement may occasionally be necessary for disciplinary purposes because restriction alone is not much of a punishment to a person who cannot leave a ship in the middle of the ocean. I propose to leave them this power. But I see no reason why confinement on bread and water for as much as 3 days should be left in the bill. Neither can I see why the minor punishments should be extended to 14 days instead of 7 days.

The feature I object to most in the bill before you, however, is the denial of the right to demand trial unless the Secretary by regulation grant that trial. That is so abhorrent to my sense of fair play that I cannot support it. My amendment leaves things pretty much as they are in the Army and Air Force today except that confinement for 7 days is still authorized for offenses committed by persons embarked upon vessels.

I don't think this will destroy the Navy. I am reminded of the opposition of many naval officers to the abolition of flogging 99 years ago. Somehow the Navy survived.

My position is that, if a man commits an offense for which a more severe punishment than that authorized now in the Army is appropriate, he ought to be tried by a court.

The changes this amendment proposes for article 20, Summary courts martial, are intended to make it consistent with my changes to article 15. A summary court martial is one officer. He acts somewhat like a police court judge except that he also acts as prosecutor and defense counsel as well. He can adjudge confinement for 1 month, hard labor without confinement for 45 days, restriction for 2 months, and forfeiture of two-thirds pay for 1 month.

This article as reported gives every person except those who have been permitted to refuse nonjudicial punishment the right to demand trial before a higher court where he would be entitled to a defense counsel. He could also receive a more severe punishment before a higher court. I have read with interest the comments of General Green with respect to article 20. He said:

"I do not believe it wise to give every accused the absolute right to demand trial by a higher court than a summary court martial. The punitive powers of such higher courts are greater and it is frequently to the advantage of an accused to stand trial before a summary court martial rather than before a general or special court martial. The right to demand trial by a higher court should be reserved to noncommissioned officers, but less well informed soldiers should be protected against their own folly."

He proposed leaving the right to demand trial before a higher court to departmental regulations.

This is one place where I must depart from the views of the general, whose other comments impress me as being extremely sound. In view of the summary nature of such a court, and particularly in view that no defense counsel is provided or authorized, I believe every soldier should have the right, if he desires, to demand a trial before the higher court. It may or may not be folly; he may or may not receive a higher sentence, but perhaps with a defense counsel he may have a much better chance of getting an acquittal than before one officer who is the prosecutor, defense counsel, and judge all in one. I do not agree with General Green that rank or experience should be a criterion affecting this right.

This amendment also guarantees to enlisted persons the right to have soldiers sitting on the court which tries him. This is now the law under the Articles of War as amended by the Kem amendment last year. It has worked remarkably well, I am informed, and I gather from the data collected in the House hearings that soldiers definitely desire the privilege of making an election whether or not they want enlisted persons on the court. The bill as reported whittles down this right by providing that enlisted men may be tried by an all-officer court if "eligible enlisted persons cannot be obtained on account of physical conditions or military exigencies." This strikes me as a patent attempt to circumvent the provision the Congress enacted last year. Certainly enlisted persons should be more plentiful than officers and be more readily available than officers. As I understand it, the excuse is that members of the same unit are not eligible to sit as members of the same court. A unit is defined as "any regularly organized body as defined by the secretary of a department, but in no case shall it be a body larger than a company, a squadron, or a ship's crew, or than a body corresponding to one of them.

When asked on the floor of the House why the exception was made, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee replied that it was calculated to take care of isolated outposts and the crews of small vessels. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Maryland just how small the crew of the U. S. S. *Missouri* or the carrier *Midway* is? Now, I understand that the Navy does not very often have a trial aboard a ship. Usually they wait until they reach a base. They can get all sorts of eligible enlisted men on a base. If they must have a trial aboard a vessel, is it so tremendously difficult to get some eligible enlisted persons from another vessel? Let us not whittle away substantial rights on the basis of specious arguments.

AMENDMENT F

On page 129, beginning with line 1, strike out all down to and including line 22 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Any person who is appointed as trial counsel or defense counsel of a general court-martial shall, if available, be a judge advocate or a law specialist or an officer who is a member of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State of the United States.

"(c) In any case referred for trial before a general or special court martial in which the officer who is appointed as trial counsel shall be a judge advocate or a law specialist or an officer who is a member of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State of the United States, the defense counsel appointed by the convening authority shall be one of the foregoing.

"(d) In any case referred for trial before a general or special court martial in which the conduct of the prosecution devolves upon an assistant trial counsel who is a judge advocate or a law specialist or an officer who is a member of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State of the United States, and neither the defense counsel nor any of his assistants or individual counsel present is one of the foregoing, the proceedings will be adjourned pending procurement for the conduct of the defense of a defense counsel who is one of the foregoing, unless the accused expressly consents to proceeding with the trial in the absence of such legally qualified defense counsel."

EXPLANATION

This amendment deals with the provision of article 29 which requires that both trial counsel and defense counsel before every court martial must be members of a State or Federal bar and must be certified as qualified by the Judge Advocate General. My first impression was that this was desirable. However on studying the comments of two men who have studied the problem from both the theoretical and practical standpoints I have changed my mind. Let me quote you General Green's comments:

"3. Mandatory requirement for legal qualification of counsel.

"Article 27 requires that the trial counsel and defense counsel of each general court martial must be a qualified lawyer and certified to be competent to perform his duties by the Judge Advocate General. If their assistants are to perform in any capacity other than in a merely clerical one, they too must be so qualified under article 38.

" AW 11 of the Kem amendment now provides that if the trial judge advocate is a lawyer, the defense counsel must also be a lawyer. This is a fair rule and corrects many of the defects in the former system justly criticized by the public and the legal profession. In the Army we now have approximately 6,000 general court-martial cases per year. In time of war we have many more. I would say that fully 70 percent of these cases involve extremely simple issues which can be adequately and fairly tried by line officers. I would like them tried by lawyers, it is true, but the difficulty of procurement of sufficient lawyers to provide at least 3 for every 1 of 6,000 general court-martial cases is enormous. If I am to certify each one as qualified I will have to satisfy myself that he is qualified to try any kind of a general court-martial case, not just a simple a. w. o. l. or desertion case which rests on a morning report. I can't just certify every lawyer no matter what his trial experience or criminal-law background may be. If bar membership were the only qualification necessary, why would Congress require me to certify the lawyer's qualification? Where can I find lawyers so qualified in sufficient numbers to try 6,000 cases a year? Unless I find them, the few lawyers I have will have to try the cases, simple and difficult, to the exclusion of all other duties which may be more important to the Government than the trial of simple cases which could as effectively be tried by line officers—or lawyers learning military justice. The indievitable result will be long delays in the disposition of cases pending the procurement of three lawyers at the right time and place. Some cases are long and difficult. While a team of three lawyers is trying a case which takes weeks to try—many accused whose cases could be disposed of in an hour or less will be waiting in a guardhouse until their cases can be reached. I don't think this is the result you want to attain. I don't think it's necessary because there will be a trained and experienced law member on the court to see that the rights of the accused are protected in even a simple case. In addition, the review of the staff judge advocate and automatic appellate review will protect the accused's substantial rights against the errors of counsel. The practical difficulties of the article could be ameliorated if you gave the accused, at his option, the right to be defended by a lawyer provided by the appointing authority even though the trial judge advoate is not a lawyer. I would also have no objection if the requirement of the proposed article 27 were limited to cases in which the death penalty or confinement in excess of 10 years might be adjudged."

Now I want to quote the testimony of Col. Frederick Bernams Wiener, a former Assistant Solicitor General, a Reserve officer, and a writer on military justice matters:

"Colonel WIENER. Yes, sir. I come to article 27 (b) of the bill, which makes lawyers mandatory for trial counsel and defense counsel of all general courts martial in the three services. The requirement in the present bill, article of war 11, is that if there is a lawyer for the prosecution, there must be one for the defense. The present bill also makes that requirement for special courts-martial equality; that is written into the new manual for the Army and the Air Force.

"I think it is entirely proper when you have a lawyer for the prosecution that you ought to have one for the defense, although I think it is also fair to point out that the Federal Constitution doesn't require that sort of thing in the States. There has been a persistent drive to get the Supreme Court to hold that the fourteenth amendment requires a State to provide counsel for an indigent prisoner in all circumstances; and up until now that attempt has failed. The cases are *Betts* v. *Brady* (316 U. S.) and *Butt* v. *Illinois* (332 U. S.).

"The Supreme Court has never gone that far.

"While the equality provision is sound and makes for a greater fairness, the mandatory provision for lawyers for defense counsel and prosecution in every general court martial, such as this bill provides in article 27 (b), is, in my judgment, unnecessary and thoroughly impractical.

"Now, I will document those characterizations.

"It is unnecessary because a lot of your cases that go before general courts are really police-court cases. A man goes a. w. o. l. for more than 6 months. That is prima facie desertion and it is going to be tried by general court.

"A soldier steals a watch worth $50. That is a general court case.

"Now, I used to think, why is it necessary to try petty thieves by general court martial in the service? The answer is that nothing so quickly disrupts the morale as a sneak thief in a barracks. Even if he just takes a pack of cigarettes, you have to stamp that out. Cases like that, desertion, the simple cases of disobedience of orders, the simple larcenies, those are not cases that require two trained lawyers on both sides.

"In fact, in time of peace, in the British Colonial courts, cases like that are prosecuted by police officers and sometimes even by the native police sergeants. You just don't need a law school education to try or defend that kind of a case.

"It is worse than unnecessary; it is impractical. You cannot get, in time of peace, the number of lawyers that this bill would require. You cannot get them for the services. I can speak on that with some degree of assurance because last summer I was on duty, active duty in the War Department, and one of my assignments was to study the problem, the personnel problem for the Judge Advocate General's Department of the Army under the provisions of the Elston bill. Where would they get the lawyers in time of peace to be permanent commissioned career officers of the Army to try every case by general court?

"Mr. ELSTON. How would you draw a distinction between what is and what is not a serious case?

"Colonel WIENER. I would leave it as you have it in the present bill, 'if available,' and leave it to the good judgment of the staff judge advocate to decide whether he needs a lawyer on both sides. After all, the normal run of cases never reaches the commanding general except for the final approval. It is handled by the staff judge advocate.

"Now, if I have a case of murder and I am staff judge advocate, I will see that a lawyer prosecutes and, of course, that means I have to get a lawyer to defend. On the other hand, if it is a simple desertion, or someone just told the officer that he wouldn't go out and dig the ditch, you can get any bright young lieutenant. In time of war, I agree it is a horrible shocking waste of military manpower to take a line officer for those details. In time of war, you can get all the lawyers you want. In time of peace, you just cannot get the lawyers. Now, the lawyers in the Army are almost as difficult to get as doctors are. They just don't come.

"Congress has done nothing to make the career of the regular judge advocate more attractive. As of the first of this year, they cut his pay by taking away the tax exemption. They have given him a single promotion list, but that list doesn't give him any faster promotion than he had since the Officer Personnel Act was passed. It is just extremely difficult to get the lawyers you need.

"Now, if you make it a mandatory requirement that everybody who prosecutes a desertion case at every Army post in the United States, at every naval base in the United States, at every Air Force base in the United States, where are you going to get those lawyers in time of peace as permanent career people?

"Mr. HARDY. You may have a practical difficulty involved there, but aren't you running a right serious risk that the accused may not get justice out of the thing, and there may be an element of prejudice involved?

"Colonel WIENER. No, sir; and I will tell you why: Because if you have a lawyer for the prosecution, you still have to have a lawyer for the defense. If you have a layman for the prosecution, that is, a young infantry officer, a young artilleryman, a young non-

flying Air Force officer, you have a similar person on the defense. You don't run into any danger. An ordinary desertion case, what is there to it?

"Mr. HARDY. How do you distinguish as to who is going to distinguish between the ordinary desertion case and one that may be somewhat involved?

"Colonel WIENER. The staff judge advocate because before he recommends that the case go to trial, he has seen the transcript of evidence, or it is a simple case of putting in a report and showing the apprehension a year later.

"Mr. HARDY. I have had several cases in my own district where I don't think justice was reaped out to them, and there was at least one lawyer on the court.

"Colonel WIENER. I am saying in time of peace, with this bill, you won't get the lawyers. What are you going to do if you don't get the lawyers to try these cases? Either you can't get them tried or they all get out on habeas corpus later. You are up against a practical problem. Where are you going to get the lawyers for your peacetime armed services to try and defend every case by general court martial?

"If, by making the career sufficiently attractive, by raising the pay, by giving them even more promotion rights, and so forth, you do attract that kind of lawyer, is it a good use of your military dollar?

"Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Colonel, you said a minute ago you had to have lawyers in certain cases.

"Colonel WIENER. Yes.

"Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Like murder cases.

"Colonel WIENER. Yes.

"Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Why couldn't those same lawyers handle the larceny cases?

"Colonel WIENER. Because the lawyer you get to try the murder cases normally processes claims, reviews boards, and does other legal work, and you get him to try one case. You can't get him to try all the general court-martial cases tried in the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

"Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I could conceive of a larceny case being a very serious case.

"Colonel WIENER. There is no question about that.

"Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. It seems to me a man's rights in a larceny case, especially a grand larceny case, should be protected equally as well as in a murder case.

"Colonel WIENER. My point is, wher you have a grand larceny case, you have the man who is the PX steward, you have the money missing from the safe, you have the money found under his mattress, I say, as a matter of experience in reviewing and handling those cases, you don't need a lawyer to prosecute that PX steward.

"Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Haven't you a good many involved cases of law come up when grand larceny cases come up?

"Colonel WIENER. Yes, but ever since the amendment to the ninety-third article last year, which took out the distinction between larceny and embezzlement, most of those are gone. The easiest way for a thief to get loose in the Army, before the Elston bill, was to commit an offense that was on the borderline between larceny and embezzlement; and if the staff judge advocate guessed one way, that it was larceny, and the board of review guessed the other way, that it was embezzlement, the fellow went scot free. That has been stopped. 'He that takes what is not his'n; he shall certainly go to prison.'

"When the case is not simple, it is up to the staff judge advocate. You don't need a lawyer to try it. Where are you going to get these lawyers? I had to study the problem last summer, and you just can't get the lawyers; and when you can get them, when you can get these thousands of lawyers for the armed services just to try what really are police court cases, are you really spending your military dollar wisely; when, as I understand it, one of the real problems on the 70-group Air Force is that it is going to cost an awful lot of spending money.

"So that to make this a mandatory requirement in time of peace that every general court-martial case has got to have two lawyers on prosecution and defense, it is not necessary; it is not practical. Now, in wartime it is different. In wartime, lawyers are literally a dime a dozen; any and every lawyer wants to get into the service; and it is a shame to take a doughboy, who ought to be training his platoon, or an artilleryman, who ought to be studying up on the tables, and make him try cases. Use the lawyers for that in wartime.

"To make it mandatory in time of peace, you are going to make it impossible for these cases to get tried. With your shortage of lawyers, we haven't got the lawyers, and here we have all these cases, and we have to try them by special court, which frequently will defeat this bill.

"Mr. BROOKS. Colonel, let me ask you a question on that point. What would you think of handling it as it is handled ordinarily in civilian courts, permit the accused, the defendant to ask for counsel when he wants it, and the court to appoint it?

"Colonel WIENER. Well, the Army has been way in advance of that for years. Ever since 1920, anybody appointing a general or a special court has had to appoint defense counsel. In a number of respects, you know, the 1920 Articles did much more for an accused than the civil courts did. They always gave him counsel. It may not have been the most competent counsel, but he had someone there to speak for him. Civil courts didn't always do that. It gave him a transcript of the record; and until the court reporter bill, about 1943, you never got that in the civil courts unless you could pay for it; and they gave him automatic appellate review in every case; and the civil courts didn't give you that.

"I have been in Federal courts down in Alabama. I was trying a case in Anniston once. The case ahead of mine involved some bootleggers. The 'revenoor' was on the stand, the witness against them; the defendant would take the stand in his own behalf; no transcript; charge to the jury; the jury would come out, bring back the verdict; the man had no lawyer, except someone such as the young fellow the court would appoint, no record, and, of course, he couldn't take an appeal.

"Now, the fellow tried for desertion in the Army system would have had a lawyer, would have had a written record, and would have had his record reviewed on appeal by trained people, without his asking for it or without his spending any money. So that the accused, under the Army Articles of War, has had a great many safeguards.

"I am just saying, gentlemen, the present provision of the Elston bill, 'if available,' yes. If you have the lawyers, by all means, use them. If you have a lawyer on the prosecution, you have to balance the thing and make the odds fair by having one for the defense.

"Mr. BROOKS. By the same token, in civilian courts, if you get into a local city or local court, they don't provide lawyers for each defendant.

"Colonel WIENER. The Constitution says, as now interpreted in *Betts* v. *Brady* and *Butts* v. *Illinois*, that the State doesn't have to furnish them. The Federal Government said that the sixth amendment does require it.

"Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. A great many States have to furnish them in capital cases and not in noncapital cases.

"Colonel WIENER. Oh, yes; and my point is, when you have a case that the staff judge advocate feels a lawyer should prosecute, you have to have a lawyer for the defense.

"Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. In all civil cases that I have seen tried in Alabama, there is always a defense counsel appointed to represent the defendant, if he cannot retain one himself.

"Colonel WIENER. Since 1938, *Johnson* v. *Zirks*, (304 U. S.), they had to appoint them; but nobody ever supposed so before.

"Mr. ELSTON. They always appoint them in Ohio, in the Federal courts and State courts, too. Any person indicted by a grand jury gets counsel appointed by the court if unable to employ counsel; and in Federal courts they are always appointed for any person charged by indictment or information.

"Mr. BROOKS. That is more or less the general rule. In local city courts, municipal courts, that rule doesn't obtain in certain areas I know.

"Mr. ELSTON. Of course, there is no provision in the military code for the appointment of counsel in summary court-martial cases, and police court more or less corresponds to summary report.

"Colonel WIENER. All I am doing is urging you gentlemen not to put into effect as a strait-jacket a requirement which isn't necessary, in fact, and which, in time of peace, would just make it utterly impossible. I mean, you are going to have to appropriate money to hire these lawyers to try GCM cases.

"Mr. ELSTON. Don't you think an accused person is entitled to counsel in any case wherein he may receive a dishonorable discharge upon conviction?

"Colonel WIENER. He gets counsel.

"Mr. ELSTON. Well, he may.

"Colonel WIENER. He gets counsel.

"Mr. ELSTON. He does get counsel, but you are saying that——

"Colonel WIENER. And he gets a lawyer if the man prosecuting him is a lawyer. All I am saying is, don't make it mandatory for the services to provide lawyers on both sides of every general court case.

"Mr. ELSTON. In any general court-martial conviction, there can be a dishonorable discharge?

"Colonel WIENER. That is correct.

"Mr. ELSTON. So how does it help the accused any if neither side has a lawyer?

"Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Suppose he is tried on hearsay testimony or just any kind of testimony?

"Colonel WIENER. Well, in the first place, the lay trial judge advocate trying a case will prepare his case sufficiently that he doesn't get hearsay in. In the second place, under the Elston bill you have a trained lawyer as law member who will rule out hearsay; and in the third place, you have his rulings reviewed by the staff judge advocate and by the board of review; and the rule in military law is that failure to object doesn't constitute a waiver. So that in actual practice the possibility of a man going out on hearsay testimony, getting a D. D. on hearsay, is so remote as to not be a possibility.

"Oh, it may have happened once; yes. We have had a Federal judge go to jail for bribery. That doesn't mean we can impugn the integrity of the judicial system.

"Gentlemen, you are going to have to appropriate an awful lot of money to supply the lawyers that will be necessary to run the simple cases, desertions, and the small larcenies, and the disobedience cases, if this bill goes through.

"Now, I would like to turn to the judicial council of three civilians. I don't think it is sound; I don't think it is necessary; and I think it is wholly self-defeating; and I will document those characterizations.

"In the first place, you don't provide for Senate confirmation. You don't give fixed terms. The result is that these people will be subject to all sorts of pressure; personal pressure, political pressure.

"Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. What article are you discussing now?

"Colonel WIENER. Article 67.

"Mr. ELSTON. I think, Colonel, it is going to follow, as a matter of course, if this is adopted, the committee will recommend a certain term and confirmation by the Senate. I am only speaking for myself, but I know in all probability, no member of the committee would want to leave anything as indefinite as that.

"Mr. BROOKS. You needn't worry, the Senate will put it in.

"Colonel WIENER. All right, assuming they do. You are setting up a specialized court instead of a court of general jurisdiction; and you are staffing it with civilians. Now, the fact of the matter is—and I think we should face it frankly—that the appointments to the specialized courts of our judicial system haven't attracted the same sort of talent that the courts of general jurisdiction have attracted. Some of our experiences with the United States Commerce Court have been rather unfortunate.

"However, I think the basic difficulty is the notion that this court shall be composed of civilians. I suppose, simon-pure civilians. I don't know whether, under these provisions, a Reserve officer would be deemed contaminated by his prior service or present status, and so not eligible for this civilian court. But, more important, you take three civilians, three high-minded civilians, learned in the law, and they have the powers that it is proposed to give them in this bill, and first, they come up against a case like that of Gen. Fitzjohn Porter, who wasn't too successful at the Second Battle of Bull Run or, certainly, for the benefit of the chairman, the Second Battle of Manassas."

My view, after reading the foregoing, is that the provisions of the mandatory lawyer provision will delay trials to such an extent that it will work a tremendous hardship on most accused persons. I would like the armed forces to procure the necessary lawyers first, before we enact the proposed provision. If they get the lawyers, I'll be all for it—but let us hold this is abeyance until such time as they have the lawyer. The present system requiring equalization on each side is satisfactory and fair enough. My section (d) plugs any loophole that may have existed under the Kem amendment, by requiring that if an assistant trial judge advocate who is a lawyer conducts the case, the officer conducting the defense must also be a lawyer unless the accused waives his right to such counsel. I might say that this comes out of paragraph 6 of the present manual for courts martial which plugged the hole left by the statute.

AMENDMENT G

ART. 28. Appointment of reporters and interpreters.

Under such regulations as the Secretary of the Department may prescribe, the president of a court martial or military commission or a court of inquiry shall have power to appoint a reporter, who shall record the proceedings of and testimony taken before such court or commission. Under like regulations the president of a court martial, military commission, or court of inquiry may appoint an interpreter who shall interpret for the court or commission.

EXPLANATION

This amendment was proposed by General Green in his testimony before the Armed Services Committee. I quote his comment:

"The proposed article 28 of H. R. 4080 provides that the convening authority, instead of the president of the court, shall have power to appoint the reporter and interpreter. This provision may prove cumbersome with respect to courts sitting at a great distance from the headquarters of a convening authority. The need for an interpreter or a change in reporters may arise suddenly during the course of a trial. It is most convenient to vest the power to appoint reporters in some authority on the spot and not in someone who may be 500 miles away."

It seems obvious to me that if the commanding general of the army with headquarters in Chicago appoints a court martial to sit at Fort Francis P. Warren, Wyo., it is absurd to get his specific authority for any change in court reporters which may be necessary or to hire an interpreter during the course of the trial. My amendment is consistent with the present Articles of War. Has anyone ever heard of one instance where there has been alleged an abuse of the power of a president of the court to appoint a reporter or an interpreter? Because of small errors like this in the bill as reported, I am convinced that no one who has had any real experience in the administration of military justice had a hand in drafting this bill. The Military Establishment should have drawn upon the knowledge and experience of those who are daily occupied in the dispensing of military justice before approving these changes. By analogy, the situation is similar to one in which the Military Establishment would approve a code for the Medical Corps in all services, minutely describing the procedure to be followed in performing the most delicate operations, and approving such a code drawn up by armchair strategists who were not experienced in daily medical practice.

AMENDMENT H

On page 140, beginning with line 3, strike out all down to and including line 21 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Except as otherwise provided in this article, a person shall not be liable to be tried by court martial for desertion in time of peace or any of the offenses punishable under articles 119 through 132, inclusive, if the offense was committed more than 3 years before the charges therefor are referred for trial.

"(c) Except as otherwise provided in this article, a person shall not be liable to be tried by court martial for an offense committed more than 2 years before the charges therefor are referred for trial, nor may he be punished under article 15 for an offense committed more than 2 years before the imposition of such punishment.

"(d) Periods in which the accused was absent from territory in which the United States has the authority to apprehend him, or in the custody of civil authorities other than Federal civil authorities, or in the hands of the enemy, shall be excluded in computing the period of limitation prescribed in this article."

EXPLANATION

This amendment deals with the statute of limitations, article 43. The bill as reported has 2 pages devoted to the statute of limitations but, if the sleepers are considered, there isn't any statute of limitations left.

Under article of war 39, applying to the Army and Air Force, the statute of limitations stops at a very definite point, arraignment. Under article 43 of the Uniform Code it stops, of all places, when sworn charges are received by an officer exercising summary court-martial jurisdiction. This is a very nebulous stage of the proceedings and there is really nothing to prevent such charges from simply resting on ice, for years perhaps, before someone decides to bring them to trial—especially when the witnesses for the defense have disappeared. It's an open invitation to fraudulent back-dating of charges—and it eliminates any certainty on the part of an accused as to what his rights under the statute of limitations may be. I have examined the House hearings and I find that there is an enormous amount of confusion on the subject. See pages 1031–1046; 1264–1265. I think I detected a lack of sympathy for the basic idea of a statute of limitations. Now if you want to abolish the limitations let's do it frankly and openly—I think there's a sound reason for limitations and our civilian practice makes liberal use of it.

I think the Judge Advocate General of the Army knows whereof he speaks on the subject. This is what he said:

"Article 43 (b) of H. R. 4080 provides a 3-year statute of limitations for peacetime desertion, felonies of a civil nature, and frauds against the Government. The time when the period of limitation will stop running is made the time when sworn charges are received by an officer exercising summary court-martial jurisdiction. Under article of war 39 the time when the statute stops running is arraignment.

"In the Army an officer exercising summary court-martial jurisdiction frequently exercises special or general court-martial jurisdiction. He may be a field artillery battalion commander, or he might be an army commander. Under article 43 (b), H. R. 4080, such an officer might receive charges appropriate for trial before a higher court which he has authority to appoint. He is under no duty to forward them to anyone else. He might simply decide that the charges do not merit trial and file them. Such charges might later be resurrected. Since officers exercising summary court martial are not courts of records with dockets, time stamps, etc., which civilian lawyers are accustomed to in the office of clerk of a court of record, I believe that the proposed statute of limitations is fraught with danger of serious abuse. I prefer that the statute of limitations stop running at a more definite stage of the proceedings. I believe that reference for trial is such a definite stage. It must come after an investigation into the nature of the charges and the available evidence, after consideration of the staff judge advocate, and after the determination of the responsible commander that there should be a trial. This is consistent with the Federal statute of limitations which stops running after the indictment is found or the information is instituted (18 U. S. C. 3282).

"It has been contended in favor of article 43 (b) that stopping the running of statute of limitations at arraignment might prevent the bringing of a fugitive to trial. I believe that article 43 (d) provides ample safeguards for the contingency. Furthermore, there is no reason why a case cannot be referred for trial even though the accused is a fugitive. It cannot be tried until he is found, it is true, but it is better to keep it in suspension after an investigation than before."

As I read the testimony of the proponents before the House committee I see that it is supposed to be a compromise between Army and Navy practices. In the Navy the statute runs when charges are preferred, but under Navy practice charges are not preferred until after there is an investigation. In the Army there is an investigation after charges are forwarded to an officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction. So it seems to me that the compromise, if any, was to shove back the time when the statute stops running to a point before the point where the Navy's statute now stops running. If we adopt General Green's suggestions embodied in my amendment we will leave the stopping point about where it now is in the Navy and exactly where it is in the Federal courts. It will be a definite point, not subject to abuse or fraud.

My amendment to 43 (d) is also based on General Green's suggestions.

"Article 43 (d) of H. R. 4080 attempts to define 'manifest impediment' to amenability to military jurisdiction provided in article of war 39. It would include periods during which the accused is in the custody of Federal authorities. I believe this is unjust, since he would be amenable to military process if the United States desires to make him so amenable. Accordingly, I recommend that periods during which an accused is in Fed-

eral custody be not excluded from the running of the statute of limitations."

AMENDMENT I

On page 141, beginning with line 23, strike out all down to and including line 11 on page 142, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

ART. 44. Former jeopardy.

No person shall, without his consent, be tried a second time for the same offense; but no proceeding in which an accused has been found guilty by a court martial upon any charge and specification shall, as to such charge and specification, be held to be a trial in the sense of this article until the findings of guilty have become final after review of the case has been fully completed; nor shall any proceeding which has been terminated before findings on the general issue be held to be a trial in the sense of this article unless evidence on the general issue has been received by the court martial and the hearing has been terminated for a reason other than manifest necessity in the interest of justice.

EXPLANATION

Article 44. Former jeopardy: (c) This section added by the Senate committee is intended according to the report to cover the precise factual situation presented by *Wade* v. *Hunter* (336 U. S. 684). It is, however, badly drawn, and in view of the failure to punctuate the section, makes it difficult to determine whether dismissal or termination by the convening authority would constitute a trial only where such action is taken for failure of available evidence or witnesses—or whether the phrase is intended to modify motions of the prosecution only. In any event this provision would freeze into the law the mechanical concept of jeopardy expressed in *Cornero* v. *United States* (48 F. 2d 69). This view was expressly rejected by the United States Supreme Court in the Wade case:

"The district court viewed the record as showing that the only purpose of dissolving the court martial was to get more witnesses. This purpose, the district court held, was not the kind of 'imperious' or 'urgent necessity' that came within the recognized exception to the double-jeopardy provision. See *Cornero* v. *United States* (48 F. 2d 69). We are urged to apply the Cornero interpretation of the 'urgent necessity' rule here. We are asked to adopt the Cornero rule under which petitioner contends the absence of witnesses can never justify discontinuance of a trial. Such a rigid formula is inconsistent with the guiding principles of the Perez decision to which we adhere. Those principles command courts in considering whether a trial should be terminated without judgment to take 'all circumstances into account' and thereby forbid the mechanical application of an abstract formula. The value of the Perez principles thus lies in their capacity for informed application under widely different circumstances without injury to defendants or to the public interests" (*Wade* v. *Hunter*, supra, 691).

The Supreme Court unambiguously adopted the rule of the Perez case:

"The rule announced in the Perez case has been the basis for all later decisions of this Court on double jeopardy. It attempts to lay down no rigid formula. Under the rule a trial can be discontinued when particular circumstances manifest a necessity for so doing, and when failure to discontinue would defeat the ends of justice. We see no reason why the same broad test should not be applied in deciding whether court-martial action runs counter to the fifth amendment's provision against double jeopardy" (*Wade* v. *Hunter*, supra, 690).

My amendment would clearly adopt the broad rule of the Wade case, applicable to all interruptions of a trial by court martial and not freeze it inartfully to the specific factual situation of that case.

AMENDMENT J

On page 150, beginning with line 5, strike out all down to and including line 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) Each general court martial shall keep a separate record of its proceedings in the trial of each case brought before it, and such record shall be authenticated by the signature of the president and the trial counsel. In case the record cannot be authenticated by the president and trial counsel, by reason of the death, disability, or absence of either or both of them, it shall be signed by a member in lieu of the president and by an assistant trial counsel if there be one, in lieu of the trial counsel, otherwise by another member of the court."

EXPLANATION

My amendment to article 54 (d) preserves the method of authenticating record of trial now used in the Army and the Air Force.

The bill as reported provides that the president and "law officer" shall authenticate records but under article 38 the trial counsel prepared the record. He ought to be in a better position than any one to know the accuracy of the record. Therefore he ought to authenticate it along with some member of the court. This could be the president or the law member. I have chosen the president consistently with the law as it is today.

AMENDMENT K

On page 152, beginning with line 9, strike out all down to and including line 23, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) Under such instructions as the Department concerned may prescribe, any sentence to confinement adjudged by a court martial or other military tribunal may be carried into execution by confinement in any place of confinement under the control of an armed force: *Provided*, That any sentence to confinement which includes dishonorable discharge or dismissal not suspended and any sentence to confinement adjudged against a civilian may be carried into execution in any penal or correctional institution under the control of the United States or a Territory, district, or possession thereof. Persons so confined in a penal or correctional institution not under the control of an armed force shall be subject to the same discipline and treatment as persons confined or committed by the courts of the United States, or of the Territory, district, or possession of the United States in which the institution is situated."

EXPLANATION

Article 58. Execution of confinement: Under the present article of war 42 a convicted accused may be sent to a Federal penitentiary only for serious offenses for which confinement in excess of 1 year is authorized by title 18 of the United States Code or the law of the District of Columbia. Other offenses are punishable by confinement in a disciplinary barracks or guardhouse. This bill (art. 58 (a)) provides that, subject to departmental regulation, any accused, no matter what his offense might be, and no matter how long his sentence to confinement, or whether accompanied by a bad-conduct discharge or not, may be confined "in any penal or correctional institution under the control of the United States, or which the United States may be allowed to use."

This means that any soldier, convicted of a short absence without leave, or disrespect to an officer can be sent to a United States penitentiary, or correctional institution with all the opprobrium and lasting effect upon his reputation that penitentiary confinement incurs. Penitentiary confinement is recognized by the Supreme Court as "infamous punishment" (*Ex parte Arlson*, 114 U. S. 417; *Parkinson* v. *U. S.* (121 U. S. 281); *U. S.* v. *DeWalt* (128 U. S. 393)). In the case of Medly, petitioner (139 U. S. 169) the Supreme Court said that the disgrace of confinement in a penitentiary pending execution of the death penalty was adding to the punishment in violation of the ex post facto provision of the Constitution, when imposed in a case where the defense was committed at a time when the law provided for confinement in a county jail pending execution. That's how serious penitentiary confinement is regarded by the Supreme Court, yet the armed services want to confine soldiers there even while they remain soldiers.

But this is not the worst feature of the article. What are these places "which the United States may be allowed to use"?

Would they include State chain gangs, foreign prisons, Devil's Island, perhaps? Certainly they would if the State or foreign government allows the military authorities to use them. Now it may be said that the draftsmen had no such intent in mind. I will agree to that—but the road to hell is paved with good intentions. If we give the services this power some commander some day will abuse it.

Perhaps the proponents will argue that foreign prisons cannot be used because under article 12 no member of the armed forces may be placed in confinement in immediate association with foreign nationals.

But if they are placed outside the custody of an armed force they cease to be persons subject to this code and they are no longer members of the armed forces under article 2 (7).

I propose to strike the authority to confine anybody in any State or foreign prison, and authorize confinement only in Federal places of confinement or those under the control of territory, district, or possession of the United States. I also propose that any persons who are no longer soldiers, that is, those who have been dishonorably discharged, may be confined in such a Federal institution and that others remain in the hands of the armed forces in disciplinary barracks, rehabilitation centers and similar places where they can be rehabilitated as soldiers.

AMENDMENT L

On page 155, beginning with line 12, strike out all down to and including line 18, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) If the convening authority or confirming authority disapproves a sentence or when any sentence is vacated by action of the board of review or judicial council and the judge advocate general, or by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the disapproving or vacating authority may, except where there is lack of sufficient evidence in the record to support the findings, order or authorize a rehearing, in which case such authority shall state the reasons for disapproval or vacation."

On page 156, after line 4, insert the following: "No sentence of a court martial shall be carried into execution unless it has been approved by the convening authority."

On page 156, beginning with line 19, strike out all down to and including line 5 on page 157, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Where the sentence of a special court martial as approved by the convening authority includes a bad-conduct discharge the record shall be forwarded to the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction over the command for action under articles 61 and 64 as in the case of a record of trial by general court martial. If the sentence as approved by an officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction includes a bad-conduct discharge, whether or not suspended, the record shall be forwarded to the appropriate Judge Advocate General to be reviewed by a board of review."

On page 157, beginning with line 12, strike out all down to and including line 11 on page 166, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"ART. 66. Appellate review in the Office of The Judge Advocate General.

"(a) Board of review; judicial council: The Judge Advocate General shall constitute, in his office, a board of review composed of not less than three judge advocates or law specialists. He shall also constitute, in his office, a judicial council composed of three general or flag officers who are judge advocates or law specialists: *Provided,* That the Judge Advocate General may, under exigent circumstances, detail as members of the judicial council, for periods not in excess of 60 days, judge advocates or law specialists of grades below that of general or flag officers: *Provided further,* That the general counsel of the Treasury may detail as members of the board of review of the Coast Guard civilian members of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State of the United States, and he may detail as members of the judicial council of the Coast Guard law specialist of grades below that of flag officer or civilian members of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State of the United States, whenever the Coast Guard is not operating as a part of the Navy.

"(b) Additional boards of review and judicial councils: Whenever necessary, the Judge Advocate General may constitute two or more boards of review and judicial councils in his office, with equal powers and duties, composed as provided in the first paragraph of this article.

"(c) Action by board of review when approval by President or confirming action is required. Before any record of trial in which there has been adjudged a sentence requiring approval or confirmation by the President or confirmation by any other confirming authority is submitted to the President or such other confirming authority, as the case may be, it shall be examined by the Board of Review which shall take action as follows:

"(1) In any case requiring action by the President, the Board of Review shall submit its opinion in writing, through the judicial council which shall also submit its opinion in writing, to the Judge Advocate General, who shall, except as herein otherwise provided, transmit the record and the board's and council's opinions, with his recommendations, directly to the Secretary of the Department for the action of the President: *Provided,* That the judicial council, with the concurrence of the Judge Advocate General, shall have powers in respect to holdings of legal insufficiency equal to the powers vested in the board of review by subparagraph (3) of this paragraph.

"(2) In any case requiring confirming action by the judicial council with or without the concurrence of the Judge Advocate General, when the Board of Review is of the opinion that the record of trial is legally sufficient to support the sentence it shall submit its opinion in writing to the judicial council for appropriate action.

"(3) When the board of review is of the opinion that the record of trial in any case requiring confirming action by the President or confirming action by the judicial council is legally insufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, or the sentence, or that errors of law have been committed injuriously affecting the substantial rights of the accused, it shall submit its holding to the Judge Advocate General and when the Judge Advocate General concurs in such holding, such findings and sentence shall thereby be vacated in accord with such holding and the record shall be transmitted by the Judge Advocate General to the appropriate convening authority for a rehearing or such other action as may be proper.

"(4) In any case requiring confirming action by the President or confirming action by the judicial council in which the board of review holds the record of trial legally insufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, or the sentence, and the Judge Advocate General shall not concur in the holding of the board of review, the holding and the record of trial shall be transmitted to the judicial council for confirming action or for other appropriate action in a case in which confirmation of the sentence by the President is required under article 70.

"(d) Action by board of review in cases involving dishonorable or bad-conduct discharges or confinement for 1 year or more.—No authority shall order the execution of any sentence of a court martial involving dishonorable discharge not suspended, bad-conduct discharge not suspended, or confinement for 1 year or more unless and until the appellate review required by this article shall have been completed and unless and until any confirming action required shall have been completed. Every record of trial by general or special court martial involving a sentence to dishonorable discharge or bad-conduct discharge, whether such discharges be suspended or not suspended, and every record of trial by general court martial involving a sentence to confinement for 1 year or more, other than records of trial examination of which is required by subsection (d) of this article, shall be examined by the board of review which shall take action as follows:

"(1) In any case in which the board of review holds the record of trial legally sufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, and confirming action is not by the Judge Advocate General or the board of review deemed necessary, the Judge Advocate General shall transmit the holding to the convening authority, and such holding shall be deemed final and conclusive.

"(2) In any case in which the board of review holds the record of trial legally sufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, but modification of the findings of guilty or the sentence is by the Judge Advocate General or the board of review deemed necessary to the ends of justice, the holding and the record of trial shall be transmitted to the judicial council for confirming action.

"(3) In any case in which the board of review holds the record of trial legally insufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, in whole or in part, and the Judge Advocate General concurs in such holding, the findings and sentence shall thereby be vacated in whole or in part in accord with such holding, and the record shall be transmitted by the Judge Advocate General to the convening authority for rehearing or such other action as may be appropriate.

"(4) In any case in which the board of review holds the record of trial legally insufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, in whole or in part, and the Judge Advocate General shall not concur in the holding of the board of review, the holding and the record of trial shall be transmitted to the judicial council for confirming action.

"(e) Appellate action in other cases: Every record of trial by general court martial the appellate review of which is not otherwise provided for by this article shall be examined in the office of the Judge Advocate General and if found legally insufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, in whole or in part, shall be transmitted to the board of review for appropriate action in accord with subsection (d) of this article.

"(f) Weighing evidence: In the appellate review of records of trials by courts martial as provided in these articles the Judge Advocate General and all appellate agencies in his office shall have authority to weigh evidence, judge the credibility of witnesses, and determine controverted questions of fact.

"ART. 67. Branch offices.

"Whenever the President deems such action necessary, he may direct the Judge Advocate General to establish a branch office, under an Assistant Judge Advocate General who shall be a general or flag officer who is a judge advocate or law specialist, with any distant command, and to establish in such branch office one or more boards of review and judicial councils composed as provided in article 66. Such Assistant Judge Advocate General and such board of review and judicial council shall be empowered to perform for that command under the general supervision of the Judge Advocate General, the duties which the Judge Advocate General and the board of review and judicial council in his office would otherwise be required to perform in respect of all cases involving sentences not requiring approval or confirmation by the President: *Provided,* That the power of mitigation and remission shall not be exercised by such Assistant Judge Advocate General, but any case in which such action is deemed desirable shall be forwarded to the Judge Advocate General with appropriate recommendations.

"ART. 68. Review by United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

"(a) In any case transmitted to them for action pursuant to article 66 or article 70, in which an issue of uniformity of interpretation or construction of the code may arise, the President, the Secretary of a Department, or the Judge Advocate General is authorized to certify the record of trial to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia for action pursuant to this article, prior to taking action thereon pursuant to article 70 or article 66, respectively.

"(b) Under such rules of procedure as it shall prescribe the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia shall review the records in any case certified to it pursuant to subsection (a) of this article.

"(c) In any case reviewed by it, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia shall act only with respect to the findings and sentence as approved by the convening authority and only with respect to the issues raised by the authority who has certified the record to it. It shall take action only with respect to matters of law.

"(d) When the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia is of the opinion that a record of trial is legally sufficient to support the findings of guilty in whole or in part, it shall transmit its opinion in writing to the authority who has certified the record to it for completion of action pursuant to article 66 or article 70.

"(e) When the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia is of the opinion that a record of trial is legally insufficient to support the findings of guilty and the sentence in whole or in part, such findings of guilty and such sentence or such part of a sentence shall thereby be vacated. If the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia sets aside the entire sentence, it may, except where the setting aside is based on lack of sufficient evidence in the record to support the findings of guilty, authorize a rehearing. Otherwise, it shall order that the charges be dismissed, if the court has authorized a rehearing, but the convening authority finds a rehearing impractical, he may dismiss the charges.

"(f) (1) The Judge Advocate General shall appoint in his office one or more officers as appellate Government counsel, and one or more officers as appellate defense counsel who

shall possess the same qualifications as a law member under the provisions of article 26.

"(2) It shall be the duty of appellate Government counsel to represent the United States before the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in any case transmitted to such court under the provisions of this article, when directed to do so by the Judge Advocate General.

"(3) It shall be the duty of appellate defense counsel to represent the accused before the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in any case transmitted to such court under the provisions of this article.

"(4) Whenever a case is transmitted to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia under the provisions of this article it shall be the duty of the Judge Advocate General to notify the accused that the case has been so transmitted and such notification shall be given promptly in order that the accused may have an opportunity to select civilian counsel to represent him before such court. The accused shall have the right to be represented before the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia by civilian counsel, if provided by him.

"ART. 69. Advisory Council on Military Justice.

"There is hereby established in the National Military Establishment an Advisory Council on Military Justice which shall consist of not more than five members who shall be appointed from civilian life by the Secretary of Defense. No person shall be eligible for appointment to the Advisory Council on Military Justice who is not a member of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State. The council and the Judge Advocate Generals of the armed forces shall meet at least twice annually to make a comprehensive survey of the operation of the code and to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives and to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Departments the number and status of pending cases and any recommendations relating to uniformity of sentence policies, amendments to this code, and any other matters deemed appropriate.

"ART. 70. Confirmation.

"In addition to the approval required by article 64 and subject to the provisions of article 68, confirmation is required as follows before the sentence of a court-martial may be carried into execution, namely:

"(a) By the President with respect to any sentence—

"(1) of death; or

"(2) involving a general or flag officer: *Provided*, That when the President has already acted as approving authority, no additional confirmation by him is necessary;

"(b) By the Secretary of a department with respect to any sentence not requiring approval or confirmation by the President, when the Judge Advocate General does not concur in the action of the judicial council;

"(c) By the judicial council, with the concurrence of the Judge Advocate General, with respect to any sentence—

"(1) when the confirming action of the judicial council is not unanimous, or when by direction of the Judge Advocate General his participation in the confirming action is required; or

"(2) involving imprisonment for life; or

"(3) involving the dismissal or reduction to the lowest enlisted grade of an officer other than a general or flag officer; or

"(4) involving the dismissal or suspension of a cadet or midshipman;

"(d) By the judicial council with respect to any sentence in a case transmitted to the judicial council under the provisions of article 66 for confirming action.

"ART. 71. Powers incident to power to confirm.

"The power to confirm the sentence of a court-martial shall be held to include—

"(a) the power to approve, confirm, or disapprove a finding of guilty, and to approve or confirm so much only of a finding of guilty of a particular offense as involves a finding of guilty of a lesser included offense;

"(b) the power to confirm, disapprove, vacate, commute, or reduce to legal limits the whole or any part of the sentence;

"(c) the power to restore all rights, privileges, and property affected by any finding or sentence disapproved or vacated;

"(d) the power to order the sentence to be carried into execution;

"(e) the power to remand the case for a rehearing under the provisions of article 64."

On page 167, beginning with line 8, strike out all down to and including line 19, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

On page 166, strike out line 12 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"ART. 72. Suspension; vacation of suspension."

On page 166, before line 13, insert the following:

"(a) The power to order the execution of a sentence of a court-martial shall include the power to suspend the whole or any part thereof, except that a death sentence may not be suspended. The authority which suspends the execution of a sentence may restore the person under sentence to duty during such suspension; and the death or honorable discharge of a person under a suspended sentence shall operate as a complete remission of any unexecuted or unremitted part of such sentence."

On page 166, at the beginning of line 13, strike out "(a)" and insert in lieu thereof "(b)."

On page 166, at the beginning of line 20, strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)."

On page 166, in line 25, strike out "article 71 (c)" and insert in lieu thereof "subsection (e) of this article."

On page 167, at the beginning of line 4, strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d)."

On page 167, after line 7, insert the following:

"(e) No order of suspension of a sentence shall be vacated unless and until confirming or appellate action on the sentence has been completed as required by articles 66 and 70.

"ART. 73. Petition for a new trial.

"At any time within one year after approval by the convening authority of a court-martial sentence which extends to death, dismissal, dishonorable or bad-conduct discharge, or confinement for one year or more the accused may petition the judge Advocate General for a new trial on grounds of newly discovered evidence or fraud on the court. If the accused's case is pending before the board of review, the judicial council or before the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the Judge Advocate General shall refer the petition to the board, council, or court, respectively, for action. Otherwise, the Judge Advocate General shall act upon the petition."

On page 169, line 13, strike out "or" and insert after "affirmed," "or confirmed."

On page 169, line 16, strike out "or" and insert after "affirmation," "or confirmation."

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

"SEC. 16. The President is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, three additional circuit judges for the District of Columbia circuit. Accordingly, title 28, United States Code, section 44 (a), is amended to read as follows with respect to such circuit:

"'Circuits: *Number of judges*
District of Columbia..... Nine'"

On page 153, between lines 4 and 5, strike out numbers 66 through 72, inclusive, and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"66. Appellate review in the Office of the Judge Advocate General.
67. Branch offices.
68. Review by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia
69. Advisory council on military justice.
70. Confirmation.
71. Powers incident to power to confirm.
72. Suspension; vacation of suspension."

EXPLANATION

Amendment L preserves the present system of appellate review now used in the Army and Air Force, but provides that for the sake of uniformity of interpretation and application, question of interpretation or construction may be certified to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

The present system of automatic appellate review is a unique feature in the Army and Air Force system of justice which accords to every person accused of a serious offense rights which no other judicial system, civil or military, does. Perhaps it would be well to explain it at this time. Let us trace a case from its beginning until its final disposition.

An offender is apprehended and charges are prepared against him after a preliminary investigation. These charges are forwarded to his regimental commander who orders a fair and impartial investigation. At the investigation the accused has a right to be represented by counsel furnished him by the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction. He can cross-examine witnesses for the Government and introduce his own. The report and recommendations of the investigating officer and the views of the regimental commander together with the charges and the allied papers then go to the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction. The latter refers the charges and all papers to the staff judge advocate for advice, whether the case warrants trial or whether the charges should be dismissed. Assume then that the charges are referred for trial and a trial is had and results in a conviction. The verbatim record must then be carefully reviewed by the staff judge advocate who prepares a review in writing for presentation to the reviewing authority. Many cases are dismissed at this and earlier stages for a multitude of reasons. If the staff judge advocate finds the record legally sufficient to support any sentence of bad-conduct discharge or worse, and the record is approved by the reviewing authority, it goes to a board of review in the Judge Advocate General's office.

If the board of review holds the record of trial bad—and the Judge Advocate General agrees, the case is ended right there.

If the board holds the record good and the Judge Advocate General agrees that it is, the reviewing authority can order the sentence into execution, except that every very serious case like a case involving a death sentence, a life sentence, dismissal of an officer or a case involving a general officer must also be confirmed. The confirming authority in cases of death sentences is the President. In other cases it is the judicial council consisting of three general officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps acting together with the Judge Advocate General.

Now let us suppose the Board of Review holds a case good, and the Judge Advocate General disagrees. He then refers the case to the Judicial Council, even though it is not one of the serious cases which goes to the Council automatically. If the Judicial

Council and the Judge Advocate General are in disagreement then the question is resolved by the Secretary of the Department.

Now all these agents are independent judicial bodies removed from command influence. The Board of Review and the Council have minds of their own and if you take the trouble to examine the various volumes of reports in which the opinions of the Board of Review are collected, you will find no evidence of command influence over their actions.

This system of checks and balances, except for the Judicial Council, was the capstone of military justice during World War II. Now there has been a lot of criticism of the system of military justice, mostly about excessive sentences and command influence at the lower levels. There has been no criticism of the system of appellate review. It is this system, which evoked a grudging tribute from the critical Vanderbilt committee. That committee reported:

"The Army system of justice in general and as written in the books is a good one; * * * it is excellent in theory and designed to secure swift and sure justice; * * * the innocent are almost never convicted and the guilty are seldom acquitted."

The committee found some faults and made certain recommendations, most of which were enacted into law last year. The abuses dealing with excessive sentences and command influence have been corrected in the Kem amendments and in the new manual for courts martial.

Unfortunately the bill now before you chips away and whittles away some of the rights for which the Senator from Missouri fought so valiantly last year. Its worst overall feature is that it destroys the checks and balances which insure justice to the accused and to the Government.

Now to emphasize the point, it is to be borne in mind that under the Kem amendment and under the bill before us, the appellate agencies in the Judge Advocate General's office have extraordinary powers which are rarely exercised by appellate courts. They have the power to weigh the evidence, judge the credibility of witnesses and determine controversial facts.

Instead of a system of checks and balances, the uniform code before you makes the Board of Review the final and only appellate agency to consider questions of fact. Under article 66 (c) it is given absolute discretion to approve any such findings or sentences or parts of sentences only what it determines should be approved. If it acts on the facts, or on policy or anything other than law, its determination is final and conclusive. Neither the Judge Advocate General nor the accused can appeal any question other than one of law to the Court of Military Appeals. Of course, the accused can always petition for a review, but under article 67 (d) the Court of Military Appeals would be precluded from considering it.

Now there goes your system of checks and balances—all up in smoke, predicated upon a notion that a copy of our usual civilian system of appeals is better. And there goes the unique feature of automatic appellate review, because now the person who secures a dismissal or a life sentence must perfect an appeal, probably hire a lawyer, and petition the Court of Military Appeals for a review in the hope that the clerk who considers his petition will grant him one, whereas under the Kem amendment he is guaranteed automatic consideration by the board of review, by the judicial council, and by the Judge Advocate General in every case.

I urge you not to make this retrograde step. Leave the appellate system as it is in the Army and Air Force and give it also to the Navy. Then you will have uniformity. Now to insure uniformity of interpretation, let the Judge Advocate General, or the Secretary, or the President certify particular cases in which there may be conflicting views or one requiring interpretation of the statutes to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

Those are essentially the recommendations of General Green, except that he would prefer to set up a court of appeals consisting of the three Judge Advocate Generals and the general counsel of the Treasury. There is a great deal of merit in his proposal, but the drive of civilian review is so great that I feel there must be some merit in it too. Rather than set up another specialized court, I would rather see those cases go to a United States court in whom all concerned can have confidence—not into one which must, by statute, be constituted on the basis of political consideration. I have never before heard a proposal like that contained in article 67 (a) (1) that "not more than two of the judges of such court shall be appointed from the same political party." Political considerations, one way or the other, have no place in the appointment of a judicial body for the armed forces.

Although my amendments do not follow altogether General Green's views, I would like the Senate to hear the views of the one man in the Government who has had the most widespread and over-all experience with a military system of appellate review.

"4. Powers of the Board of Review.

"Article 66 (c) provides in part that the Board of Review 'shall affirm only such findings of guilty, and the sentence or such part or amount of the sentence, as it finds correct in law and fact and determines, on the basis of the entire record, should be approved.'

"Under articles 66 and 67 the determination of the Board of Review is final as to any matter other than a question of law. The latter is subject to appeal to the Civilian Court of Military Appeals either by the Judge Advocate General or the accused. This in effect authorizes the Board to disapprove or mitigate legal sentences which have been approved by responsible senior commanders. It authorizes them to consider other than legal matters in determining what part of a finding or the sentences, should be approved. For example, a board may consider that a given order which an accused is charged with having violated is unwise, and that therefore, on the basis of the entire record, a finding should be disapproved. This makes possible an unwarranted invasion of the command prerogative and would authorize the Board of Review to substitute its judgment on military policy for that of the commander in the field. This determination under the proposed bill would be absolutely final. I could not appeal that case to the Court of Military Appeals because the Board's determination would not be based on a question of law.

"Under the present case load in my office I have six boards of review. I may soon need more. Under the proposed bill I would need even more. The members are bright, well qualified, and conscientious military lawyers. They have experience both as soldiers and as lawyers. Many of them are relatively young. They function well in determining legal sufficiency of records and in weighing evidence. They have not all, however, attained the wisdom in matters of policy which comes with experience and age nor have they all attained the instinctive familiarity with military matters which comes with many years of experience with troops. The powers which article 66 gives them have heretofore been exercised by the confirming authority, i. e., the President, the Secretary or the Judicial Council, and the Judge Advocate General—all of whom have far greater responsibility with respect to the accomplishment of the military mission than do the boards of review. I believe it unwise to entrust such sweeping powers to such relatively younger officers or civilian employees (as authorized by the code). I must use younger officers on these boards—because I can't concentrate all my older and wiser heads in Washington. Some of them are needed in the overseas theaters and other commands where difficult military legal problems arise. And even in Washington I have to use senior officers to head my claims, military affairs, contracts, procurement, and patent divisions. Under the proposed article 70 I would have to provide an undetermined number of my ablest appellate officers as appellate government and defense counsel to represent the Government and the accused before boards of review and before the Court of Military Appeals. In spite of the fact that the proposed bill will increase somewhat the number of cases to be examined by a board of review, the Judge Advocate General will have to reduce the number of boards because of the especially high qualifications these extended powers will demand and because the increased demand for the services of my most qualified officers to fill other positions. This too will delay the disposition of cases.

"The bill proposed by Professor Morgan's committee had a remedy for this provision—it authorized the Judge Advocate General to refer a case to another board of review if he was dissatisfied with its holding. This was somewhat unjudicial and the House committee struck it out—wisely, I think. It did, however, point out the extremely critical problem. Some judicial remedy should be provided. I urge you to leave the power to commute and consider nonlegal matters with a confirming authority and to authorize the Judge Advocate General to dissent with the board and refer any case to a higher confirming authority or a Military Court of Military Appeals. This brings me to my final major point of disagreement.

"5. Civilian Court of Military Appeals.

"At the outset I would like to state that I am in accord with the underlying principle of article 67g which provides for a continuing study of military justice, matters to be conducted by a body of eminent jurists in conjunction with the Judge Advocate Generals of the services and annual report to the responsible Secretaries and the Congress. The remarkable accomplishment of the Vanderbilt committee clearly demonstrates the usefulness of such a study. It provides helpful liaison with the legal profession. It would ultimately lead to further perfection of the system of military justice.

"But with respect to a wholly Civilian Court of Military Appeals I cannot agree. Military justice is a field of the law which requires not only a thorough familiarity with criminal law—but also experience and training in military matters. You would not entrust a complicated patent problem to a tax lawyer who was not thoroughly familiar with the engineering or other technical matters involved no matter how good a tax lawyer he might be. The capstone of the system of military justice should consist of those military lawyers who are most highly experienced and trained both from a military and a judicial viewpoint; both as soldiers and as judges. The legal services of the Army, Navy, and Air Force have produced such judges and are ideally organized to produce more such judges. This requirement can't be met merely by providing that the Civilian Court of Military Appeals will consider only questions of law. Every lawyer knows that questions of fact and questions of law cannot be separated in airtight compartments. Military law in itself embodies hundreds of complicated problems of status arising out of customs of the service as well as statute and regulation.

"In the files of my office there is a case of a corps artillery group commander who was tried for the willful disobedience, before the enemy, of a division commander's orders to go into a particular position with his battalions and stay there. In the heat of the battle his group left that position. He contended that he was going to an alternate

position from which he could more effectively accomplish his mission. Among the issues in the case was the question of whether he was attached to the division or merely supporting it. This involved both a question of fact and of military law. If he was merely supporting the division, to what extent did the division commander have authority to order him to stay in a position which he considered poor; if he was attached, to what extent did the group commander have discretion in exigent circumstances to leave a position given him by the division to go to another one of his own choosing?

"These are all problems which required a thorough and detailed knowledge of tactical organization, the legal effect of a corps' standing operating procedure, and customs of the service in general. What special qualifications do civilians without extensive military experience have to determine such questions? I can cite you many such cases. For instance, is an air base several hundred miles from a target "Before the enemy"? And consider the purely military legal problem presented by *Wade* v. *Hunter* as to whether military exigency constituted imperious necessity with respect to former jeopardy. These are problems which ultimately would be resolved by the Court of Military Appeals.

"Is there a need for such a court? Has the administration of military justice broken down at the appellate level? I submit that there has been no such failure. The opinions and holdings of the boards of review since their creation in 1920 constitute one of the most comprehensive bodies of criminal reports in the United States, reports which compare favorably with those of both Federal and State appellate courts. The remarkable success of the military appellate system is attested to by the fact that, out of more than 200 habeas corpus cases arising since World War II only one accused has been released from confinement as the result of final court action on his petition. The grounds upon which the one exception was released was overruled by the Supreme Court of the United States 2 weeks ago in *Humphrey* v. *Smith*. I am proud of that record.

"Under our present system the most serious cases such as those involving death sentences, life imprisonment, cases involving general officers, and cases extending to dismissal of officers go automatically to the Judicial Council created by the Kem amendment for confirming action. Other cases where either the Judge Advocate General or the Board of Review believes that confirming action should be taken in the interest of justice may also be referred to the military Judicial Council. The case load is sufficient to keep the Council busy but not enough to create a bottleneck. Under the proposed bill only death cases and cases involving general officers will go to the Court of Military Appeals automatically but each accused will have a right to petition for review by that court. I think it has been estimated that in peacetime in 85 percent of 14,000 cases, or in almost 12,000 cases, the accused will have a right to petition the Court of Military Appeals for review. I think it fair to assume that a substantial percentage of those 12,000 accused will exhaust their remedy. Although only a small percentage of those cases may result in review, the task of considering the petitions themselves will be enormous. If the Court of Military Appeals of three judges gives the consideration which each petition deserves it is self-evident that substantial and deleterious delays will occur.

"I think I have demonstrated that there is no need for further review for legal sufficiency of records after military appellate review. Under the uniform code there is unquestionably a need for uniformity of sentences and uniform interpretation. Our present system is working well in the Army, and as far as I know, in the Air Force. It can be extended, with modification perhaps, to fit the needs of the other services. It preserves to each service the control of individual cases within the service. I recommend that our system be preserved. In order to provide for uniformity of sentences and of interpretation I would suggest that there be established in the National Military Establishment a military Court of Military Appeals composed of the Judge Advocate Generals of the services. Their function, together with a civilian advisory body, should be to recommend uniform policies of punishment and improvements in the administration of military justice. To provide for uniformity of interpretation, each Judge Advocate General should be empowered to certify any case for legal determination by the entire Court of Military Appeals whenever uniform legal interpretation is required.

"The proposal I make would preserve the advantage of completely automatic appellate review for all cases of the same class—which is perhaps the most important right of an accused in the military service and which is not accorded him by civil jurisdictions. It also preserves to all appellate agencies the power to weigh evidence and determine controverted questions of fact which are powers not generally exercised by civil appellate courts and which afford to an accused person rights which no other judicial system does. It would preserve the significant reforms in the administration of military justice made since 1920. Finally, by retaining the military judicial council created by the Kem amendment it would provide a career incentive which will attract able lawyers to the military service to perform the many functions which the bill requires."

I will now explain briefly each article contained in amendment L:

Article 63. Rehearings: This has been left as proposed by the committee except for changes in terminology consistent with articles 66, 68, and 70.

Article 64. Approval of the convening authority: The only change in this article as reported is to clarify that no sentence may be executed unless approved by the convening authority. The other requirements are set forth in articles 65, 66, and 70. This was taken from 47d.

Article 65. Disposition of records after review by the convening authority: Paragraph (h) spells out the requirement that in addition to the approval by the convening authority, record of trial by special court martial which is approved include a bad conduct discharge, must also be approved by the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction and be treated in every respect like a record of trial by general court martial. I have stricken the provision for advisory review by a board of review before the convening authority acts. Since the record must go back to a board of review before the bad conduct discharge is executed after the reviewing authority approves it I can see no reason for two trips to Washington. As I see this system, the board of review will be too busy to do the job of staff judge advocates. Since there is no such provision under article 61 with respect to general courts martial such special time-wasting provision with respect to a special court-martial record seems foolish to me.

Article 66. Appellate review in the office of the Judge Advocate General: This is almost identical to article of war 50 of the Kem amendment now in force in the Army and Air Force. There has been added to the cases requiring automatic appellate review any case in which there is adjudged confinement for 1 year or more whether accompanied with a bad-conduct discharge or not.

Article 67. Branch offices: Is the same as article of war 50 (c) which provides for the establishment of branch offices with boards of review and a judicial council in a distant command. It is to be borne in mind that death sentences cannot be confirmed by the branch office but must be sent to Washington for confirming action of the President. Theater commanders no longer have confirming powers.

Article 68. Review by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia: This article preserves to each service an appellate system similar to that now in effect in the Army and Air Force. In the interest of uniformity, the President, the secretary of a department, or a judge advocate general are authorized to certify any case referred to them for confirming or appellate action to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, if a question of uniformity or interpretation of the statute shall arise. The court will consider questions of law only, since other questions are fully covered by the ordinary appellate review and confirming action. It will have final authority to disapprove findings or sentences in whole or in part. If it holds any finding or sentence legally sufficient, it shall return the record to the authority who certified the case for completion of confirming or appellate action.

Article 69. Advisory Council on Military Justice: This article will provide a confirming study on the administration of military justice by a body of eminent jurists in conjunction with the Judge Advocate General such as that provided for in article 67g of the bill as reported. This is the only desirable feature of the article 67 as reported.

Article 70. Confirmation: This is substantially the same as article of war 48. It provides confirmation of the more serious sentences as follows:

1. A sentence to death involving a general or flag officer may be confirmed by the President before it can be carried into execution.

Sentences involving life imprisonment, dismissal, or reduction to the ranks of an officer, or dismissal or suspension, a cadet or midshipman will be confirmed by the Judicial Council and the Judge Advocate General. If the Judge Advocate General and the Council disagree the sentence will be confirmed by the Secretary of the Department concerned.

Other cases which either the Board of Review or the Judge Advocate General has transmitted to the Council in the interest of justice or because of a disagreement may be confirmed by the Council alone unless it is not unanimous, or unless the Judge Advocate General desires to participate in the confirming action, in which event his participation is necessary.

Article 71 lists the powers incident to the power to confirm; they include the power to approve, confirm, or disapprove the whole or any part of a finding of guilty or a sentence. It includes the power to commute sentences; restore rights, privileges, and property affected of a finding or sentence disapproved or vacated; the power to order the sentence to be carried into execution; or to remand a case for rehearing.

Article 72. Suspension, vacation of suspension: This has been clarified to show that any authority competent to order the execution of a sentence, that is the reviewing authority of the confirming authority, may suspend a sentence, or part of a sentence, except a death sentence when that authority takes his action. It also provides that the death or honorable discharge of a person under a suspended sentence operates as a complete remission of the unexecuted portion of the sentence.

Section 16—at the end of the bill—provides for the creation of three additional judges to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to take care of the additional business that court will have as a result of article 68, and to relieve the pressure of work of that court with respect to its other matters.

Amendments M to Y inclusive: The next group of amendments deals with the punitive articles. These are the articles which denounce and define offenses. This, after

all, is the meat of any penal code—everything else is procedural. In spite of their enormous importance the punitive articles appear to have received the least consideration of any body which has considered the bill. It is obvious from the glaring errors which appeared in the bill when first introduced that Professor Morgan's group considered these articles very hastily. In the original proposal voluntary manslaughter was apparently not an offense. This the House committee corrected in part. We next come to the consideration given by the House committee. The records of the hearings show that the punitive articles—all 45 of them—were considered on one Saturday afternoon. There were able lawyers on that committee. They saw several of the more glaring defects and hastily corrected them. The hearings show that the representatives of the National Military Establishment were utterly confused when searching questions were directed at them with respect to the few articles considered in detail. Nevertheless, only a few hours were devoted to this important article and many a grievous error was overlooked. Now, I do not maintain that my amendment will correct every error. For all I know there are many other sleepers in these articles. I think they should be considered very carefully indeed by people who know and understand criminal law. But if you want the bill to become law in a hurry, the amendments I am proposing will correct many of the mistakes of substantive law which the bill as reported contains.

I have not proposed an amendment to article 134, the general article, because it is drawn substantially in the same words as article of war 96. The construction of the article which appears in the Manual for Courts Martial is not, however, the one cited by the committee in its reports.

That article provides:

"Though not specifically mentioned in the code, all disorders and neglect to the prejudice of good order and discipline in the armed forces, all conduct of a nature to bring discredit upon the armed forces, and crimes and offenses not capital, of which persons subject to this code may be guilty, shall be taken cognizance of by a general or special or summary court martial, according to the degree of the offense, and punished at the discretion of the court."

Now what are these crimes and offenses, not capital. The President's interpretation in the Manual for Courts Martial, following the ancient construction placed upon the article by the Judge Advocate General for many years stated:

"Crimes or offenses, not capital, which are referred to and made punishable by article 96 include those acts or omissions not made punishable by another article which are denounced as crimes or offenses by enactments of Congress or under the authority of Congress and made enforceable by Federal civil courts.

"State and foreign laws are not included within the crimes or offenses not capital referred to in article 96 and violations thereof may not be prosecuted as such except insofar as State law becomes Federal law of local application under title 18, United States Code, section 13. On the other hand an act which is a violation of a State law or a foreign law may constitute a disorder or neglect to the prejudice of good order and military discipline or conduct of a nature to bring discredit upon the military service and so be punishable under the first or second clause of article 96."

Now the committee's report, based on erroneous information contained in the House hearings states:

"This will permit the punishment of disorders and neglects to the prejudice of good order, and military discipline in the armed forces, and all conduct of a nature to bring discredit upon the armed forces. It will also authorize trial by court martial for violations of State and Federal crimes which are not enumerated as offenses under the code."

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Maryland whether the committee means that State law is now included in the "crimes and offenses not capital clause" and if so, what consideration moved them to upset the ancient administrative construction? Conceivably the President did not impute to Congress an abdication to State legislatures of its constitutional power to make rules for the government of the Army and Navy?

We must bear in mind that violation of a State law is not punishable by a Federal court martial as such; it is punishable only if the act or omission is actually prejudicial to good order and discipline or if it tends to bring discredit upon the service.

AMENDMENT M

On page 177, line 3, after the word "who" insert a comma and the following: "being inferior in grade."

EXPLANATION

Article 91. Insubordinate conduct toward noncommissioned officers: My amendment makes it clear that this article deals with insubordinate conduct of a subordinate toward his superior. It was proposed to the committee by General Green. This is what he said:

"The addition of the words 'being inferior in grade' is intended to make the article consistent with its title: 'Insubordinate conduct toward noncommissioned officer.'

"Without the proposed amendment it would be possible to construe the article as follows:

"'Any warrant officer * * * who * * * willfully disobeys the lawful order of a * * * noncommissioned officer * * *; or treats with contempt or is disrespectful in language or deportment toward * * * noncommissioned officer * * * while such officer is in the execution of his office shall be punished as a court martial may direct.'

"It is not believed that the committee intended to punish under this article a warrant officer for disrespect to a corporal."

AMENDMENT N

On page 179, lines 13 and 14, strike out "except as provided by law" and insert in lieu thereof "willfully and without authority of law."

EXPLANATION

Unlawful detention of another: This, too, was proposed by General Green for the following reasons:

"The proposed amendment inserts the word 'willfully' as describing the offense denounced. It is believed that the amendment will prevent prosecution for merely technical violations of the code pertaining to apprehension, arrest, or confinement. It will require that the act be done with unlawful intent."

AMENDMENT O

On page 192, beginning with line 6, strike out all down to and including line 10 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Any person subject to this code who, with intent to commit a felony therein, breaks and enters, in the nighttime, the dwelling house of another, is guilty of burglary and shall be punished as a court martial may direct."

EXPLANATION

This deals with article 129, burglary.

This is one on the Senate committee for the House version was considerably more sensible.

The committee's version is:

"Any person, subject to the code who, with intent to commit an offense punishable under article 118 through 128, inclusive, breaks and enters, in the nighttime, the dwelling house of another, is guilty of burglary and shall be punished as a court martial may direct."

This limits burglary to breaking and entering at night with intent to commit one of the following, but no other, offense:

1. Murder.
2. Manslaughter.
3. Rape and carnal knowledge.
4. Larceny and wrongful appropriation.
5. Robbery.
6. Forgery (whoever heard of anyone breaking and entering with intent to forge).
7. Maiming.
8. Sodomy.
9. Arson
10. Extortion.
11. Assault.

But what about the person who breaks and enters a dwelling in the nighttime with intent to commit malicious destruction (18 U. S. C. 1363 and art. 109 of the Code). He is not guilty of burglary—even though malicious destruction is a felony under 18 United States Code 1363. See 18 United States Code 1 for a definition of a felony. There must be hundreds of other felonies not included in the restrictive definition. Then bear in mind what the restrictive definition does to murder defense in article 118. Under that article an unlawful homicide committed while perpetrating a housebreaking (example—breaking and entering a dwelling in the nighttime with intent to commit malicious destruction or breaking and entering a warehouse with intent) would under article 118 (4) and articles 119 (C) (2) as presently phrased, be guilty of involuntary manslaughter only. The law reports are full of cases to the contrary. On the other hand, the person who breaks and enters a dwelling with intent to commit forgery would be guilty of murder if an unlawful homicide occurs. I cannot follow the logic of this.

The House committee changed the Morgan group's proposal to "with intent to commit a criminal offense therein." The Senate committee went back to the Morgan proposal which, in my opinion, has little merit. I suggest we follow the common law which required only the intent to commit a felony, felony being a term which varies with the course of history and experience of mankind. The present definition is too limited in scope and unnecessarily excludes the breaking and entering a dwelling in the nighttime with intent to commit one of the many felonies (18 U. S. C. 1) not denounced in articles 118 through 128 of the Code.

AMENDMENT P

On page 180, between lines 3 and 4 insert the following:

"(1) misbehaves himself; or."

On page 180, renumber all succeeding paragraphs.

On page 180, line 22, after "ance" insert a comma and the following: "consistent with his duty and mission."

EXPLANATION

ART. 99. Misbehavior before the enemy: This amendment is one proposed by General Green in his testimony. He commented:

"The foregoing amendment adds the general provision contained in article of war 75 'who * * * misbehaves himself.' (1) This term has long been construed as making culpable under the article any conduct by an officer, or a soldier not conformable to the standard of behaviors before the enemy set by the custom of our arms. It has been used to punish flagrant misconduct before the enemy not specifically denounced elsewhere in the same article. In view of its long established construction I recommended its retention in the code.

"Section (10) has been amended to make it clear that it is not intended to compel a soldier or commander to abandon a mission of paramount inportance in order to render relief to troops, etc., who may be in distress. For example, it is standard instruction to infantrymen that they must continue to advance during an attack without stopping

to render aid to the wounded. Such functions are left to medical aid men."

AMENDMENT Q

ART. 118. Murder.

Any person subject to this code who unlawfully kills a human being with malice aforethought is guilty of murder and shall suffer such punishment as a court martial may direct, except that if found guilty of premeditated murder he shall suffer death or imprisonment for life as a court martial may direct.

EXPLANATION

Murder: The article attempts to define murder, but departs both from the common law definition and from that of 18 United States Code 1111.

As defined in MCM, 1949, and in 18 United States Code 1111:

"Murder is the unlawful killing of a human being with malice aforethought."

The definition of the proposed article retains the requirement that the killing be unlawful by prescribing that it must be without justification or excuse, although the usual construction of "unlawful" is without legal justification or excuse. In lieu of the requirement that it be accompanied by malice aforethought, the article prescribes, in the alternative, four states of mind or intents:

1. A premeditated design to kill; or
2. An intent to kill or inflict great bodily harm; or
3. Engaging in an act which is inherently dangerous to others and evinces a wanton disregard of human life; or
4. Engaging in the perpetration or attempted perpetration of burglary, sodomy, rape, robbery, aggravated arson.

The first alternative sufficiently supplies the necessary element for premeditated murder for which the mandatory punishment is death or life imprisonment. The other three supply some, but not all, of the instances which have in the past been deemed sufficient to show malice aforethought. For example, there is omitted "intent to oppose force to an officer or other person lawfully engaged in arresting, keeping in custody, or imprisoning any person, dispersing an unlawful assembly, suppressing a riot or affray, or otherwise keeping the peace, provided the offender has noted that the person killed is such officer or other person employed."

Intent to commit a felony inherently dangerous to life has been traditionally regarded as proof of malice aforethought. This article limits the felonies which might be considered as involving malice to the ones specified. The selection is not particularly logical. An unintentional killing in the perpetration of a housebreaking would be involuntary manslaughter, whereas such a killing in the perpetration of a burglary would be murder. Considering that the distinction between burglary and housebreaking might be only as to whether the unlawful entry was effected a few minutes before or after sunset, the danger of overly close definition in a punitive statute becomes readily apparent.

My proposed amendment is the Federal definition of murder as defined in 18 United States Code 1111.

AMENDMENT R

ART. 119. Manslaughter.

(a) Any person subject to this code who unlawfully kills a human being in the commission of an intentional act inherently dangerous to life, done in the heat of sudden passion brought about by adequate provocation or in good faith upon, but in manifest excess of, the authority of law or apparently lawful superior order, is guilty of voluntary manslaughter and shall be punished as a court martial may direct.

(b) Any person subject to this code who unintentionally kills a human being in the commission of a culpably negligent act or in the commission of an act wrongful in itself but not inherently dangerous to life is guilty of involuntary manslaughter and shall be punished as a court martial may direct.

EXPLANATION

Article 19. Manslaughter: The present article as reported is a distinct improvement over that initially proposed by the National Military Establishments in that it at least defines voluntary manslaughter. General Green, however, proposed some changes in the improved version, as follows:

"As to voluntary manslaughter, the proposed amendment to article 119 does away with the necessity for definition of the phrases 'intent to kill' appearing in the article as presently drawn. It will be noticed that the proposed definition of voluntary manslaughter follows that set forth in paragraph 180a, MCM 1949. Voluntary manslaughter is homicide which would be murder were not the malice aforethought ordinarily implied from the doing of an act likely to result in death excusable because of adequate provocation (*Commonwealth* v. *Webster* (5 Cush (Mass.) 295)).

"The proposed definition of involuntary manslaughter has also been taken from paragraph 180a, MCM 1949 and is considered to be a most modern and complete definition of that crime. See *Lee* v. *United States* (112 F. 2d 46, and 40 C. J. S. p. 868 (and cases there cited)), to the effect that homicide unintentionally committed in the perpetration of an act not inherently dangerous to life, though the act be a felony, is not murder but at most involuntary manslaughter. The act must, of course, be wrongful in itself (malum in se). It is thought that the requirement in the article as presently written that the act be one 'directly affecting the person' is misleading and perhaps too restrictive."

I think it would be well also to incorporate into the definition of voluntary manslaughter one recognized by the courts but which is seldom found in statutes—namely, the killing in good faith by use of excessive force by a soldier or a military policeman in manifest excess of the authority of law or apparently lawful superior order. Such a case might arise where a guard shoots an escaping prisoner whom he should have been able to recapture without such force.

AMENDMENT S

ART. 121. Larceny and wrongful appropriation.

Any person subject to this code who, knowingly and with intent to deprive the true owner permanently of his proprietary interest, wrongfully appropriates personal property to the use of a person other than the true owner without such owner's consent, or with his consent obtained by false pretense, steals such property and is guilty of larceny, and shall be punished as a court-martial may direct; but if the appropriation is committed with intent to deprive the true owner only temporarily of his proprietary interest, he is guilty of wrongful appropriation and shall be punished as a court martial may direct. Whether the property initially came lawfully or unlawfully into the hands of the person appropriating it shall be immaterial with respect to these offenses.

EXPLANATION

Larceny: This is a slight improvement over that passed by the House in that it does not brand as a thief the person who appropriates property without to deprive the owner permanently of his property. However, as long as it seems to be the trend of modern legislators to abolish the distinction between larceny, embezzlement, and other forms of theft, I do not see why we burden this article with the manner in which the thief initially gets his hands on the stolen property. Why do we bother with trespass, withholding, or obtaining, the beginnings of a wrongful appropriation. Let us concern ourselves with the end result.

1. If all forms of theft are to be combined in one definition, it would seem completely unnecessary to inquire whether the thief initially came by the property as a result of taking (common law larceny), withholding (presumably embezzlement), or obtaining (presumably obtaining by false pretense). It should be sufficient if, whatever the original means of acquisition, he thereafter, with the requisite intent, wrongfully appropriated it to the use of one other than the true owner without such owner's consent, or with his consent if obtained by false pretense. This point is tacitly admitted in the new subsection (2).

2. Throughout the definition there is an indication that one may commit larceny by taking, etc., from the possession of the true owner (the person who has the immediate and exclusive right to possession) or of any other person, even though there is no intent to deprive the true owner and even though the true owner consents. Thus, one who wrongfully took property from a thief with intent to return it to the true owner would, under this definition, be guilty of larceny. Such a person might be guilty of an incidental breach of the peace, but he certainly should not be held guilty of larceny. Of course, with respect to pleading, any person with a possessory (special) interest may be alleged to be an owner, even though he be a thief himself. But this is simply a matter of pleading, the purpose of which is merely to identify the property stolen, which matter should properly be treated in the manual and should have no place in the definition of the substantive offense of larceny.

3. With respect to the element of intent in the article as presently drawn there would seem to be no real difference between an intent to deprive, an intent to defraud, and an intent to appropriate. Obviously, all are an intent to deprive. Fraud, in the sense of the crime of obtaining, is covered in my proposal by way of negativing consent when obtained by false pretense.

4. The words "article of value of any kind" following the words "personal property" indicate that disseisin and adverse possession of real property may be larceny.

There seems to be little point in the armed services in question of law of real property. In this connection, my proposed definition would cover property severed from the realty by the thief, for the reason that once the property is severed it becomes personal property and when it is then moved or otherwise made the subject of a wrongful exercise of dominion, it is "appropriated."

The amendment I am proposing is an extension of the definition of that crime in paragraph 180, Manual for Courts Martial, 1949. It includes all forms of theft; larceny, embezzlement, obtaining by false pretenses, and knowingly receiving stolen property. The word "appropriate" is well known to the military and has often been defined to comprehend various forms of wrongful use of property of another without regard the property initially came lawfully or unlawfully in the hands of the person appropriating it (article of war 99; article for the government of the Navy 19).

AMENDMENT T

ART. 122. Robbery.

Any person subject to this code who, with intent to steal, wrongfully takes personal property from the person or in the presence of another, against his will, by violence or intimidation, is guilty of robbery and shall be punished as a court martial may direct.

EXPLANATION

Article 122. Robbery: This article greatly increases the type of intimidation which can supply the element of intimidation in robbery.

The proposed article would make "fear of immediate or future injury to his person or property or the person or property of a relative or member of his family or of anyone in his company" sufficient intimidation to establish robbery. By failing to qualify the nature of the property contemplated, the article makes a threat to destroy some inconsequential item of personal property sufficient for intimidation in robbery.

The true test is that the intimidation, be it a threatened injury to the victim's property or that of a relative, is of sufficient gravity to warrant giving up the property demand by the assailant. My proposed amendment omits the unnecessary and dangerous part of the definition of robbery.

AMENDMENT U

ART. 123. Forgery.

Any person subject to this code who, with intent to defraud or injure another—

(1) falsely makes or alters any writing of a public or private nature, which might operate to the prejudice of another; or

(2) passes, utters, offers, issues, or transfers such a writing as true and genuine, knowing it to be so made or altered;

is guilty of forgery and shall be punished as a court martial may direct.

EXPLANATION

Forgery: This amendment is proposed by General Green in his appearance before the committee. His comments were:

"The definition of this crime as presently set forth in article 123 is much too narrow insofar as it states that the instrument 'would, if genuine, apparently impose a legal liability on another or change his legal right or liability to his prejudice.' There is no reason for requiring that the instrument might operate to the legal, as distinguished from other, prejudice of another. False instruments which tend to impair or impede a governmental function have been held to be subjects of forgery. *Head* v. *Hunter* (141 F. 2d 449, 451). The proposed definition is taken from section 22–1401 of the Code of the District of Columbia."

AMENDMENT V

ART. 126. Arson.

Any person subject to this code who willfully and maliciously sets fire to or burns any building or structure, movable or immovable, is guilty of simple arson and shall be punished as a court martial may direct; but if the building is a dwelling or if the life of any person in the building or structure is put in jeopardy, he is guilty of aggravated arson and shall be punished as a court martial may direct.

EXPLANATION

Article 126. Arson. Paragraph (b) defines and denounces simple arson as the malicious burning or setting on fire the property of another except as provided in subdivision (a). Presumably the setting on fire of any personal property—no matter how insignificant in value—and no matter whether it be a shelter, a chair, or a bundle of old newspapers would constitute arson.

This article is much too broad.

My amendment deletes so much of the definition of arson as indicated that the crime may be committed by burning any kind of property. The definition I suggest follows generally that contained in 18 United States Code 81.

AMENDMENT W

ART. 127. Extortion.

Any person subject to this code who, verbally or in writing, threatens to accuse another of a crime or offense or threatens an injury to the person or property of another, with intent thereby to obtain anything of value or to compel any person to do an act against his will, is guilty of extortion and shall be punished as a court martial may direct.

EXPLANATION

Article 127. Extortion: In proposing this amendment, General Green commented:

"The definition of extortion as presently written in Article 127 does not set forth the type threats which the law considers of a sufficiently grave nature to warrant a conviction of extortion, and does not mention intent to make a person do an act against his will, which is generally considered to be a sufficient intent. See section 22–2305, District of Columbia Code; Massachusetts General Laws, chapter 265, section 25.

AMENDMENT X

ART. 128. Assault.

(a) Any person subject to this code who, with unlawful force or violence, attempts to do bodily harm to another or puts another in reasonable fear of immediate bodily harm is guilty of assault and shall be punished as a court martial may direct.

(b) Any person subject to this code who, intentionally or through culpable negligence, unlawfully applies force to the person of another by a material agency, mediately or immediately, is guilty of assault and battery and shall be punished as a court martial may direct.

(c) Any person subject to this code who commits an assault with a dangerous weapon or other instrument or force likely to produce great bodily harm, or commits an assault with specific intent to do great bodily harm, is guilty of aggravated assault and shall be punished as a court martial may direct.

(d) Any person subject to this code who commits an assault with intent to commit any felony is guilty of felonious assault and shall be punished as a court martial may direct.

EXPLANATION

Article 128. Assault: The proposed definition of assault is taken from paragraph 180k, Manual for Courts Martial, 1949.

Article 125 (b) of the present draft restricts assault with intent to do bodily harm (not with a dangerous weapon) to cases where bodily harm is actually committed. There seems to be no warrant for this restriction and the proposed amendment follows 18 United States Code 113 (c).

The proposed amendment adds felonious assaults (assaults with intent to commit any felony). Such assaults are denounced in 18 United States Code 113 (a) and (b). The Morgan report states that such assaults were intentionally omitted from the code because they were actually attempts. This is thought not to be the law, for a person can assault another (for example, a watchman en route to his place of employment) with intent to commit a felony (for example, a housebreaking) without having gone far enough with respect to the intended felony to constitute an attempt to commit it.

My amendment also includes a definition of assault and battery which I believe to be an appropriate offense for inclusion in the code. The definition was taken from the Manual for Courts Martial.

AMENDMENT Y

On page 200, line 12, after the word "any", insert "nonjudicial."

EXPLANATION

Article 140. Delegation by the President: In explaining to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives the intention of the draftsmen with respect to the article, Mr. Larkin stated:

"I think, despite the authorization the President cannot delegate judicial acts, perhaps even legislative acts. So it is effective only to the extent that it is an administrative act.

"I think they have to be studied on a case-by-case basis as they come up.

"But it was the desire of the Bureau of the Budget to provide an appropriate flexibility in the future if it appears that it is desirable for the President to delegate some of his duties under the code" (Hearings on H. R. 2498, p. 1260).

In *Runkle* v. *United States* (122 U. S. 543, 556) the Supreme Court held that the President could not delegate his judicial function. Its reason was clearly stated to be that the law under which he acted did not permit such delegation. Speaking of a court martial, the Supreme Court stated:

"To give effect to its sentence it must appear affirmatively and unequivocally that the court was legally constituted; that it had jurisdiction; that all statutory regulations governing its proceedings had been complied with. * * *

"There can be no doubt that the President, in the exercise of his Executive power under the Constitution, may act through the head of the appropriate executive department. * * *

"Here, however, the action required of the President is judicial in its character, not administrative. As Commander in Chief of the Army he has been made by law the person whose duty it is to review the proceedings of courts martial in cases of this kind."

I emphasize that the Supreme Court said by law—and not by any inherent constitutional power—but simply by statute.

"This implies that he is himself to consider the proceedings of courts martial in cases of this kind. This power he cannot delegate. * * * And this because he is the person, and the only person, to whom has been committed the important judicial power of finally determining upon an examination of the whole proceedings of a court martial, whether an officer * * * shall be dismissed * * * as punishment for an offense with which he has been charged and for which he has been tried."

Now the proponents implied that if this section were construed as applying to judicial acts of the President it would be unconstitutional. I'm not a lawyer but I do not so construe the Runkle case. To me it clearly implies that if we pass a statute authorizing the President to delegate his judicial functions—that will be the law and we cannot complain if he exercises the power by delegating to anyone he sees fit the power to approve or disapprove death sentences. Now if we don't want him to delegate his judicial function we had better say so clearly and unambiguously right in the statute. Even if the proponents were right in their construction of the effect of the law I see no reason why the Congress should enact a statute of doubtful constitutionality and wait for the Court to construe it consistently with the Constitution and with common sense.

My amendment effects what Mr. Larkin said was intended.

On page 206, between lines 12 and 13 insert the following new sections:

"JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS FOR THE NAVY

"SEC. 14. (a) There is hereby established in the United States Navy a Judge Advocate General's Corps which shall consist of one Judge Advocate General with the rank of rear admiral, one assistant with the rank of rear admiral, three other officers with the rank of rear admiral, and an active list commissioned officer strength to be determined by the Secretary of the Navy, but such strength shall not be less than 1½ percent of the authorized active list commissioned officer strength of the United States Navy, and in addition warrant officers and enlisted men in such numbers as the Secretary of the Navy shall determine.

"(b) (1) Regular Navy officers shall be permanently appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the Navy in the commissioned officer

grades of rear admiral, captain, commander, lieutenant commander, lieutenant, and lieutenant (junior grade). The names of commissioned officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the Navy below the grade of rear admiral shall be carried on the judge advocate's promotion list. The Judge Advocate's promotion list shall be established by entering thereon the names of qualified officers of the Navy who make application to transfer to such corps and whose applications are approved by the Secretary of the Navy. The names of all such officers shall be entered on such list without change in their order of precedence on the existing promotion list. The authorized numbers in each of the several grades in the Judge Advocate's promotion list shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, but the members thus authorized shall not exceed the following percentages of the total strength authorized for that list: 8 percent in the grade of captain, 14 percent in the grade of commander, 19 percent in the grade of lieutenant commander, 23 percent in the grade of lieutenant, and 36 percent in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade): *Provided*, That numbers may be authorized for any grade in lieu of authorization in higher grades: *Provided further*, That this provision shall not operate to require a reduction in permanent grade of any officer now holding a permanent appointment.

"(2) Officers whose names are carried on the Judge Advocate's promotion list of the Navy shall be promoted to the several grades as now or hereafter prescribed for promotion of promotion-list officers generally and the authorized numbers in grades below captain on such list shall be temporarily increased from time to time in order to give effect to the promotion system now or hereafter prescribed by law for promotion-list officers.

"(3) Within the authorized strength of the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the Navy additional officers may be appointed by transfer of qualified officers of the Navy, or by appointment of qualified Reserve naval officers or qualified civilian graduates of accredited law schools. Those originally appointed in the Regular Navy in the Judge Advocate General's Corps shall be credited with an amount of service for the purpose of determining grade, position on promotion list, permanent-grade seniority, and eligibility for promotion as now or hereafter prescribed by law.

"(c) The Judge Advocate General of the Navy shall, in addition to such other duties as may be prescribed by law, be the legal adviser of the Secretary of the Navy and of all officers and agencies of the Department of the Navy; and all members of the Judge Advocate General's Corps shall perform their duties under the direction of the Judge Advocate General.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Judge Advocate General, the Assistant Judge Advocate General, and flag officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the Navy shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the Navy who are recommended for such positions by the Secretary of the Navy. Upon the appointment of an officer to be the Judge Advocate General or Assistant Judge Advocate General with the rank of rear admiral, he shall at the same time if not then holding permanent appointment in such grade be appointed a permanent rear admiral of the Regular Navy.

"JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS FOR THE AIR FORCE

"SEC. 15. (a) There is hereby established in the Regular Air Force a Judge Advocate General's Corps which shall consist of one Judge Advocate General with the rank of major general, one assistant with the rank of major general, three officers with the rank of brigadier general, and an active list commissioned officer strength to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, but such strength shall not be less than 1½ percent of the authorized active list commissioned officer strength of the Regular Air Force, and in addition warrant officers and enlisted men in such numbers as the Secretary of the Air Force shall determine.

"(b) (1) Regular Air Force officers shall be permanently appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the Air Force in the commissioned officer grades of major general, brigadier general, colonel, lieutenant colonel, major, captain, and first lieutenant. The names of commissioned officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the Air Force below the grade of brigadier general shall be carried on the Judge Advocate's promotion list. The Judge Advocate's promotion list shall be established by entering thereon the names of qualified officers of the Air Force who make application to transfer to such corps and whose applications are approved by the Secretary of the Air Force. The names of all such officers shall be entered on such list without change in their order of precedence on the existing promotion list. The authorized numbers in each of the several grades in the Judge Advocate's promotion list shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force, but the numbers thus authorized shall not exceed the following percentages of the total strength authorized for that list: Eight percent in the grade of colonel, 14 percent in the grade of lieutenant colonel, 19 percent in the grade of major, 23 percent in the grade of captain, and 36 percent in the grade of first lieutenant: *Provided*, That numbers may be authorized for any grade in lieu of authorization in higher grades: *Provided further*, That this provision shall not operate to require a reduction in permanent grade of any officer now holding permanent appointment.

"(2) Officers whose names are carried on the Judge Advocate's promotion list of the Air Force shall be promoted to the several grades as now or hereafter prescribed for promotion of promotion-list officers generally and the authorized numbers in grades below colonel on such list shall be temporarily increased from time to time in order to give effect to the promotion system now or hereafter prescribed by law for promotion-list officers.

"(3) Within the authorized strength of the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the Air Force additional officers may be appointed by transfer of qualified officers of the Air Force, or by appointment of qualified Reserve Air Force officers or qualified civilian graduates of accredited law schools. Those originally appointed in the Regular Air Force in the Judge Advocate General's Corps shall be credited with an amount of service for the purpose of determining grade, position on promotion list, permanent-grade seniority, and eligibility for promotion as now or hereafter prescribed by law.

"(c) The Judge Advocate General of the Air Force shall, in addition to such other duties as may be prescribed by law, be the legal adviser of the Secretary of the Air Force and of all officers and agencies of the Department of the Air Force; and all members of the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the Air Force shall perform their duties under the direction of the Judge Advocate General.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Judge Advocate General, the Assistant Judge Advocate General, and general officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the Air Force shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps who are recommended for such positions by the Secretary of the Air Force. Upon the appointment of an officer to be the Judge Advocate General or Assistant Judge Advocate General with the rank of major general, he shall at the same time if not then holding permanent appointment in such grade be appointed a permanent major general of the Regular Air Force."

AMENDMENT Z

On page 206, line 14, strike out "14" and insert in lieu thereof "15."

On page 209, line 9, strike out "15" and insert in lieu thereof "16."

EXPLANATION

Amendment Z: This amendment creates a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Air Force and in the Navy. There is considerable to be said for the proposition that the act of June 25, 1948 "To provide for the administration of military justice within the United States Air Force, and for other purposes" incorporated for the Air Force not only the Articles of War but also "all other laws now in effect relating to the Judge Advocate General's Department, the Judge Advocate General of the Army, and the administration of military justice within the United States Army." Under this statute it may be argued that the provisions of the Kem amendment relating to a Judge Advocate General's Corps are applicable to the Air Force. The Air Force, however, has seen fit to pick one part of the Kem amendment and disregard others. My amendment would require each of the services to operate under this feature of the Kem amendments which the Congress saw fit to accept last year over the emphatic objection of the War Department and the Army. I think the considerations, pro and con, were aptly stated by the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives on July 22, 1947, in reporting on H. R. 2575, Eightieth Congress, which later became law as the Kem amendment:

From Report No. 1034, House of Representatives, first session, Eightieth Congress:

"Should an independent Judge Advocate General's Corps, with a separate promotion list, be established?

"The War Department opposes the establishment of a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps; however, our committee, favors such a corps. It is important to note that every organizational representative and every individual who testified before the committee except War Department witnesses, not only favored but urged the establishment of a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps with a separate promotion list.

"Under present law command has an abnormal and unjustified influence over military justice. In opposing our decision the War Department stresses the necessity for preserving proper discipline and for giving line commanders authority which is commensurate with their responsibility. We fully agree that discipline is of the utmost importance and must be preserved; however, we feel equally certain that in the administration of military justice there is a point beyond which the considerations of justice are paramount to discipline. Under present law and under this bill, as amended, command has abundant authority to enforce discipline. It refers the charges for trial, convenes the court, appoints the trial judge advocate, law member, and defense counsel who must now be qualified personnel of the Judge Advocate General's Department and, after the trial reviews the case with full authority to approve or disapprove the whole or any part of the sentence.

"We contend that command should ask for nothing more in the furtherance of discipline. At the conclusion of a trial, under the present system, the same officers who conducted the case return to the command of a line officer who has full authority over their efficiency ratings, promotion recommendations, leaves, and duty assignments. These officers, many of whom have families

and have chosen the Army for a career, would be less than human if they ignored the possibilities of such influence. We contend that those who are charged with the impartial administration of military justice must have sufficient freedom of judicial determination to meet the responsibility.

"During the course of the lengthy hearings by the Legal Subcommittee, it became apparent that it was the majority desire to establish a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps with a separate promotion list. The Under Secretary of War, Hon. Kenneth C. Royall, and Lt. Gen. J. Lawton Collins requested the opportunity to be heard in opposition to such a provision. Both of these witnesses appeared before the subcommittee and ably presented the views of command officers in opposition to a Judge Advocate General's Corps. In spite of this testimony by these able and respected witnesses, the subcommittee was still of the opinion that a separate corps should be established. When the matter was brought before the full committee for final action, the Secretary of War, Hon. Robert P. Patterson, and the Chief of Staff, Hon. Dwight Eisenhower, requested that they be permitted to appear before the full committee in opposition to a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps. Even though the request was unusual and was at variance with the established procedure of the committee in its consideration of subcommittee reports, the request was granted and both the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff appeared before the committee and voiced their strenuous objections to the curtailment of the clemency power in the Office of the Secretary of War, and the establishment of a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps. As hereinbefore stated, the clemency power was restored to the Secretary of War; however, the full committee endorsed the action of the subcommittee in voting to establish a Judge Advocate General's Corps with a separate promotion list.

"The use of the term 'independent Judge Advocate General's Corps' has been rather loose and has resulted in some unfortunate and unjustified conclusions. The primary mission of every member of the armed forces of the United States is the winning of battles in wartime and the preparation to win them in peacetime. Regardless of their technical status in the armed forces, members of the Judge Advocate General's Department or Corps have that same primary mission and we do not intend that it shall be changed. Judge Advocate officers are properly members of the War Department team and while the duties of their assignments are necessarily noncombatant in nature, it seems wholly unjustified to say, as has been done, that they are less interested in the primary mission of the Army than any other member of the armed forces.

"It has been said that this is another attempt to establish special privileges for another professional group. Nothing could be further from the truth. During the entire hearings which began on April 18 and were not concluded until the latter part of June, no member of the subcommittee nor any witness who appeared before it gave the slightest intimation that he was interested in legislating for lawyers as a class. As a matter of fact, there is a shortage of qualified legal talent in the Army, and it seems inevitable that if we are to attract qualified personnel into the Judge Advocate General's Department that we must do more than has been done heretofore. The Vanderbilt committee states that approximately 25,000 lawyers applied for duty with the Judge Advocate General's Department during the war and it remains a fact that a very small percentage of these lawyers were accepted. Many lawyers preferred not to serve in the Judge Advocate General's Department because of its unusual susceptibility to 'command.' The evidence was undisputed that many line commanders declined to use such legal talent as was available to them in matters of military justice and even went so far as to reprimand those lawyers who made an honest attempt to serve the cause of justice in military trials. Even if a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps is established, the Army will have great difficulty in obtaining qualified personnel to staff such a corps. The Army will find itself in somewhat the same position as it now finds itself with respect to doctors. They are in great demand in civilian life, and it is certain that the emoluments of civil practice exceed those offered by the Army. Some inducement must be offered to retain the qualified officers now on duty and to attract qualified graduates of our law schools into the service. The present condition does neither.

"The Secretary and the Chief of Staff have criticized a separate promotion list for the Judge Advocate General's Corps, stating that it is contrary to the basic provisions of H. R. 3830, the promotion bill, which was recently passed by the Armed Services Committee and the House. It is admitted that there are humps in certain grades in the Judge Advocate General's Department; however, any objective study of this matter will reveal that the same situation exists in other branches of the service, particularly the Air Corps. It is important to note that it is not mandatory that the Secretary of War fill all grades under the promotion bill. He may do so at his discretion, and it is inconceivable that he would take any action in this respect which was not uniform throughout the other branches of the service.

"It seems apparent that 'command' considers the Judge Advocate General's Department to be composed of a nonprofessional group, whereas we are of the opinion that the Judge Advocate's Department must be a professional group, specially trained in order that it may properly perform its function. We have been reliably informed that approximately 90 percent of the field work of the Judge Advocate's Department consists of matters relating directly to military justice and that more than 50 percent of its work in Washington is of the same nature. Another considerable function consists of the investigation and adjustment of claims. It can hardly be expected that unqualified personnel can handle these assignments. If they could, this subject would not be before us today.

"The Secretary states that the creation of a separate corps of the Judge Advocate's will not decrease the load on combat officers. We think that the creation of a separate corps would inevitably result in lessening the burden on combat officers. It is an indisputable fact that throughout the war the trial judge advocates, law members, and defense counsel, in addition to officers who investigated claims, were largely drawn from officers of the line. This resulted in those officers having a dual function and the testimony before our committee made it very apparent that the added function of military justice and claims was held to be of secondary importance.

"It is difficult to determine the costs which would be incurred by the enactment of this legislation. The War Department has estimated that the enactment of H. R. 2575 would require a total of 937 officers and a comparable number of enlisted men, at a cost of $3,200,000. Since the War Department endorses this bill, it is assumed that, if enacted, adequate qualified personnel will be provided as rapidly as they become available. Our amendment proposes a corps of 750 officers, and warrant officers and enlisted men in such numbers as the Secretary of War may determine. In any event we are of the opinion that the establishment of a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps would cost no more than the enactment of the original provisions of H. R. 2575.

"We are now on the threshold either of universal military training or of the maintenance of a professional army at least five times larger than that maintained before the last war. The future Army, no matter how it may be raised, will be composed of the physically fit youth of the country. The first contact with any judicial system for the overwhelming majority of these young men will be their experience with the administration of military justice. We believe that it is our duty, so far as lies within our power, to see that the system to which they are exposed is reasonably designed to achieve justice. The system now in effect cannot guarantee the desired result.

"Except for the committee amendment relative to the establishment of a Judge Advocate General's Corps with a separate promotion list, the War Department favors the enactment of this legislation as is evidenced by the letter from the Secretary of War which is hereto attached and made a part of this report. The Armed Services Committee favors the enactment of the proposed legislation, as amended."

The reasons advanced in 1947 with respect to the Army are equally applicable today to the other services.

Amendment A is a composite of amendments B to Z in the form of a complete substitute bill.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Oscar M. Jonas, of Milwaukee, Wis., to be collector of internal revenue for the District of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Lewis Clark, of Alabama, to be representative of the United States of America on the United Nations Advisory Council for Libya.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Mrs. Olive Remington Goldman, of Illinois, to be representative of the United States of America on the Commission on the Status of Women of the Economic and Social Council.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ely E. Palmer to be representative of the United States of America on the Conciliation Commission for Palestine.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Jefferson Patterson to be representative of the United States of America on the Special Balkan Committee established October 21, 1947.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Mark A. May to be a member for a 3-year term.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Justin Miller to be a member for a 3-year term.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of H. Merle Cochran to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of the United States of Indonesia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Avra M. Warren, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Pakistan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George V. Allen to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Yugoslavia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of Ministers in the diplomatic service.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the nominations of Ministers and routine appointments in the diplomatic service be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation in each case.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, February 2, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 1 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Oscar M. Jonas, of Milwaukee, Wis., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Wisconsin, to fill an existing vacancy.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 1 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

UNITED NATIONS

Lewis Clark to be the representative of the United States of America on the United Nations Advisory Council for Libya.

Mrs. Olive Remington Goldman to be the representative of the United States of America on the Commission on the Status of Women of the Economic and Social Council for a term of 3 years.

Ely E. Palmer to be the representative of the United States of America on the Conciliation Commission for Palestine.

Jefferson Patterson to be the representative of the United States of America on the Special Balkan Committee established by the General Assembly of the United Nations October 21, 1947.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

Mark A. May to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information, for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1953, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

Justin Miller to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information, for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1953, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

H. Merle Cochran to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the United States of Indonesia.

Avra M. Warren to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Pakistan.

George V. Allen to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Yugoslavia.

Gerald A. Drew to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan.

John M. Cabot to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Finland.

TO BE CONSULS GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Glenn A. Abbey
Charles S. Reed 2d
Edmund A. Gullion

TO BE CONSULS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Weldon Litsey	Fred M. Wren
Leslie Albion Squires	Edward W. Mill
Richard A. Poole	Frederick T. Merrill
Randolph Roberts	Thomas C. M. Robinson
Antonio Certosimo	
Harold E. Hall	Joseph E. Wiedenmayer
Robert W. Harding	
Harris R. Hungerford	R. Clyde Larkin
Richard E. Kleinhans	Thomas G. Murdock
Hyman Bloom	Wilson E. Sweeney
William Kane	Robert E. Ward, Jr.

TO BE A VICE CONSUL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Miss Nancy H. MacLennan

TO BE SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Richard H. Sanger	Woodbury Willoughby
C. Edward Wells	Murray M. Wise
Eugene H. Clay	H. Gerald Smith

TO BE A CONSUL AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Angier Biddle Duke

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain-elect, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast revealed Thyself as a prayer-hearing and prayer-answering God, we humbly beseech Thee to teach us how to pray.

Grant that daily we may enter into an intimate communion with the God of all grace whose wisdom never errs and whose strength never fails.

Make us sensitive and responsive to the leading of Thy spirit in our high vocation of finding the way of blessedness and peace for our own beloved country and all mankind.

Inspire us with such integrity of character and conduct that we may stand before Thee and our fellow men, unafraid and unashamed.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CHAPLAIN OF THE HOUSE

The Reverend Bernard Braskamp, D. D., Chaplain-elect, presented himself at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 27]

Baring	Hall, Leonard W.	Plumley
Bennett, Mich.	Hart	Potter
Bland	Hobbs	Price
Bonner	Huber	Redden
Bosone	Jennings	Reed, N. Y.
Brown, Ga.	Kean	Sabath
Bulwinkle	Kearns	Sadowski
Burke	Kennedy	Shafer
Canfield	McDonough	Smith, Kans.
Chiperfield	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Ohio
Christopher	Mason	Stockman
Coudert	Meyer	Velde
Curtis	Miller, Md.	Vursell
Davies, N. Y.	Monroney	Wadsworth
Dawson	Morrison	Walsh
Dondero	Moulder	White, Idaho
Engel, Mich.	Murphy	Wigglesworth
Engle, Calif.	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Wood
Fellows	Phillips, Calif.	Woodruff
Gary		
Gilmer		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 372 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, this is Calendar Wednesday. I make a point of order against the transaction of any business except the call of the committees.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman objects to any extension of remarks or any other business except the call of the committees.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I move that Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. On this particular motion a two-thirds vote is necessary, is it not?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS) there were—ayes 28, noes 138.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and one Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 104, nays 272, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 28]

YEAS—104

Abbitt	Fugate	Poage
Abernethy	Gathings	Preston
Albert	Gore	Priest
Allen, La.	Gossett	Rains
Andrews	Grant	Rankin
Barden	Gregory	Regan
Bates	Hardy	Rich
Battle	Hare	Richards
Beckworth	Harris	Rivers
Bennett, Fla.	Harrison	Rogers, Fla.
Bentsen	Hays, Ark.	Sikes
Boggs, La.	Herlong	Sims
Bonner	Hoffman, Mich.	Smathers
Boykin	Jennings	Smith, Va.
Brooks	Jones, Ala.	Stanley
Bryson	Jones, Mo.	Sutton
Burleson	Jones, N. C.	Taber
Burton	Kerr	Tackett
Camp	Kilburn	Teague
Cannon	Kilday	Thomas
Carlyle	Lanham	Thompson
Chelf	Larcade	Thornberry
Colmer	Lucas	Trimble
Cooley	Lyle	Vinson
Cooper	McMillan, S. C.	Wheeler
Cox	Mahon	Whitaker
Davis, Ga.	Miles	Whitten
Davis, Tenn.	Mills	Whittington
DeGraffenried	Murray, Tenn.	Williams
Doughton	Nicholson	Willis
Elliott	Norrell	Wilson, Tex.
Evins	Pace	Winstead
Fernandez	Passman	Wood
Fisher	Peterson	Worley
Frazier	Pickett	

NAYS—272

Addonizio	Clemente	Goodwin
Allen, Calif.	Clevenger	Gordon
Allen, Ill.	Cole, Kans.	Gorski
Andersen, H. Carl	Cole, N. Y.	Graham
Anderson, Calif.	Combs	Granahan
Angell	Corbett	Granger
Arends	Cotton	Green
Aspinall	Crawford	Gross
Auchincloss	Crosser	Gwinn
Bailey	Cunningham	Hagen
Barrett, Pa.	Dague	Hale
Barrett, Wyo.	Davenport	Hall,
Beall	Davies, N. Y.	Edwin Arthur
Biemiller	Davis, Wis.	Hall,
Bishop	Deane	Leonard W.
Blackney	Delaney	Halleck
Blatnik	Denton	Hand
Boggs, Del.	D'Ewart	Harden
Bolling	Dingell	Harvey
Bolton, Md.	Dollinger	Havenner
Bolton, Ohio	Dolliver	Hays, Ohio
Bramblett	Donohue	Hedrick
Breen	Douglas	Heffernan
Brehm	Doyle	Heller
Brown, Ohio	Durham	Herter
Buchanan	Eaton	Heselton
Buckley, Ill.	Eberharter	Hill
Buckley, N. Y.	Ellsworth	Hinshaw
Burdick	Elston	Hoeven
Burke	Engle, Calif.	Hoffman, Ill.
Burnside	Fallon	Holifield
Byrnes, Wis.	Feighan	Holmes
Carnahan	Fenton	Hope
Carroll	Fogarty	Horan
Case, N. J.	Forand	Howell
Case, S. Dak.	Ford	Hull
Cavalcante	Fulton	Irving
Chesney	Furcolo	Jackson, Calif.
Chiperfield	Gamble	Jackson, Wash.
Christopher	Garmatz	Jacobs
Chudoff	Gavin	James
Church	Gillette	Javits
	Golden	Jenison
Jenkins	Michener	St. George
Jensen	Miller, Calif.	Sanborn
Johnson	Miller, Nebr.	Saylor
Jonas	Mitchell	Scott, Hardie
Judd	Morgan	Scott,
Karst	Morris	Hugh D., Jr.
Karsten	Morton	Scrivner
Kearney	Moulder	Scudder
Keating	Multer	Secrest
Kee	Murdock	Shelley
Keefe	Murray, Wis.	Sheppard
Kelley, Pa.	Nelson	Simpson, Ill.
Kelly, N. Y.	Nixon	Simpson, Pa.
King	Noland	Smith, Kans.
Kirwan	Norblad	Smith, Wis.
Klein	Norton	Spence
Kruse	O'Brien, Ill.	Staggers
Kunkel	O'Brien, Mich.	Steed
Lane	O'Hara, Ill.	Stefan
Latham	O'Konski	Sullivan
LeCompte	O'Neill	Talle
LeFevre	O'Sullivan	Tauriello
Lemke	O'Toole	Taylor
Lesinski	Patman	Tollefson
Lichtenwalter	Patten	Towe
Lind	Patterson	Underwood
Linehan	Perkins	Van Zandt
Lodge	Pfeiffer,	Velde
Lovre	William L.	Vorys
Lynch	Philbin	Vursell
McCarthy	Phillips, Calif.	Wagner
McConnell	Phillips, Tenn.	Walter
McCormack	Polk	Weichel
McCulloch	Poulson	Welch
McGrath	Powell	Werdel
McGregor	Price	White, Calif.
McGuire	Quinn	Wickersham
McKinnon	Rabaut	Wier
McMillen, Ill.	Ramsay	Wigglesworth
McSweeney	Reed, Ill.	Wilson, Ind.
Mack, Ill.	Reed, N. Y.	Wilson, Okla.
Mack, Wash.	Rees	Withrow
Madden	Rhodes	Wolcott
Magee	Ribicoff	Wolverton
Mansfield	Riehlman	Woodhouse
Marcantonio	Rodino	Yates
Marsalis	Rogers, Mass.	Young
Marshall	Rooney	Zablocki
Martin, Iowa	Roosevelt	
Merrow	Sadlak	

NOT VOTING—55

Andresen, August H.	Flood	Murphy
Baring	Gary	O'Hara, Minn.
Bennett, Mich.	Gilmer	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Bland	Hart	Plumley
Bosone	Hébert	Potter
Brown, Ga.	Hobbs	Redden
Bulwinkle	Huber	Sabath
Byrne, N. Y.	Kean	Sadowski
Canfield	Kearns	Sasscer
Celler	Kennedy	Shafer
Chatham	Keogh	Short
Coudert	McDonough	Smith, Ohio
Crook	Macy	Stigler
Curtis	Martin, Mass.	Stockman
Dawson	Mason	Wadsworth
Dondero	Meyer	Walsh
Engel, Mich.	Miller, Md.	White, Idaho
Fellows	Monroney	Woodruff
	Morrison	

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Brown of Georgia and Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Canfield against.

Mr. Hobbs and Mr. Gilmer for, with Mr. Kean against.

Mr. Bland and Mr. Gary for, with Mr. Huber against.

Mr. Redden and Mr. Bulwinkle for, with Mr. Murphy against.

Mr. Chatham and Mr. Meyer for, with Mr. Celler against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Hart with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Sasscer with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Crook with Mr. Miller of Maryland.
Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Macy.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Walsh with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Monroney with Mr. Short.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. August H. Andresen.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

Mr. SPENCE (when the Committee on Banking and Currency was called). Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6743) to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, and title IV of the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6743, with Mr. TRIMBLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the first reading of the bill will be dispensed with.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I object to dispensing with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, is amended by adding the following new section after section 5 thereof:

"SEC. 5A. No member of a Federal home loan bank shall make or purchase any loan at any time when its cash and obligations of the United States are not equal to such amount as the Home Loan Bank Board shall by regulations prescribe: *Provided*, That such amount shall not be less than 5 percent or more than 15 percent of the obligation of the member on withdrawable accounts or, in the case of any member insurance company, such other base as the Board may determine to be comparable. The Board is authorized in said regulations to prescribe from time to time different amounts, within the limitations hereinbefore specified, for different classes of member institutions, and for such purposes the Board is authorized to classify such members according to type of institution, size, location, rate of withdrawals, or such other basis or bases of differentiation as the Board may deem to be reasonably necessary or appropriate for effectuating the purposes hereof. Failure to comply with the provisions hereof shall constitute ground for removal from membership. This section shall be effective 6 months after the date of its enactment."

SEC. 2. Section 6 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, is amended by the addition of the following new subsection:

"(1) Within 1 year after the enactment of this amendment, each member of each Federal home loan bank shall acquire and hold and thereafter maintain its stock holding in an amount equal to at least 2 percent of the aggregate of the unpaid principal of such member's home mortgage loans, home-purchase contracts, and similar obligations, but not less than $500. Such stock in excess of the amount hereby required may be purchased from time to time by members and may be retired from time to time as heretofore. One year after the enactment of this amendment, each Federal home loan bank shall retire and pay off at par an amount of its stock held by the Secretary of the Treasury equivalent to the amount of its stock held by its members in excess of the amount required to be held by them by the

first two sentences of subsection (c) of this section immediately prior to the enactment of this amendment and annually thereafter each Federal home loan bank shall retire an amount of such Government stock equivalent to 50 percent of the net increase of its stock held by members since the last previous retirement: *Provided*, That none of such Government capital shall at any time be retired so as to reduce the aggregate capital stock, reserves, surplus, and undivided profits of the Federal home loan banks to less than $200,000,000: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any provision of this subsection, nothing in this subsection shall limit or affect the operation of subsection (g) of this section."

SEC. 3. Subsection (g) of section 11 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(g) Each Federal home loan bank shall at all times have at least an amount equal to the current deposits received from its members invested in (1) obligations of the United States, (2) deposits in banks or trust companies, (3) advances with a maturity of not to exceed 1 year which are made to members or nonmember borrowers, upon such terms and conditions as the Board may prescribe, and (4) advances with a maturity of not to exceed 1 year which are made to members or nonmember borrowers whose creditor liabilities (not including advances from the Federal home loan bank) do not exceed 5 percent of their net assets, and which may be made without the security of home mortgages or other security, upon such terms and conditions as the Board may prescribe."

SEC. 4. Section 11 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(i) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized in his discretion to purchase any obligations issued pursuant to this section, as heretofore, now, or hereafter in force and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds of the sale of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as now or hereafter in force, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as now or hereafter in force, are extended to include such purchases. The Secretary of the Treasury may, at any time, sell, upon such terms and conditions and at such price or prices as he shall determine, any of the obligations acquired by him under this subsection. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such obligations under this subsection shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States. The Secretary of the Treasury shall not at any time purchase any obligations under this subsection if such purchase would increase the aggregate principal amount of his then outstanding holdings of such obligations under this subsection to an amount greater than $1,000,000,000. Each purchase of obligations by the Secretary of the Treasury under this subsection shall be upon such terms and conditions as to yield a return at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the making of such purchase."

"(j) Notwithstanding the provisions of the first sentence of section 202 of the Government Corporation Control Act, audits by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of a Federal home loan bank shall not be limited to periods during which Government capital has been invested therein. The provisions of the first sentence of subsection (d) of section 303 of the Government Corporation Control Act shall not apply to any Federal home-loan bank."

SEC. 5. Section 402 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by the addition of the following new subsection:

"(h) After the effective date of this subsection the Corporation is authorized and directed to pay off and retire annually at par an amount of its capital stock equal to 50 percent of its net income for the fiscal year, unless the Home Loan Bank Board by resolution shall determine that a smaller amount shall be retired. Such payments shall be made promptly after the end of each fiscal year (beginning with the first fiscal year which begins after the date of enactment of this subsection) until the entire capital stock is retired. In lieu of any and all unpaid dividends, whether for any present, past, or future period, on its capital stock, all of which dividends are hereby waived, the Corporation shall pay to the Secretary of the Treasury, promptly after the end of each fiscal year (beginning with the first fiscal year which begins after the date of enactment of this subsection) a return on the average amount, at par, of its capital stock outstanding during such fiscal year at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the sixth month of such fiscal year. The retirement of such capital stock shall not affect the applicability to said Corporation of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended."

SEC. 6. Section 402 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by the addition of the following new subsection:

"(i) The Corporation is authorized to borrow from the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to loan to the Corporation on such terms as may be fixed by the Corporation and the Secretary, such funds as in the judgment of the Home Loan Bank Board are from time to time required for insurance purposes, not exceeding in the aggregate $750,000,000 outstanding at any one time, and the Corporation hereafter shall not exercise its borrowing power under the first sentence of subsection (d) of this section for the purpose of borrowing money from any other source: *Provided*, That each such loan shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the making of such loan: *Provided further*, That nothing in this subsection shall prevent the Corporation from issuing debentures in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of section 405. For the purposes of this subsection the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds of the sale of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as now or hereafter in force, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as now or hereafter in force, are hereby extended to include such loans. Any such loan shall be used by the Corporation solely in carrying out its functions with respect to such insurance. All loans and repayments under this subsection shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States."

SEC. 7. Subsection (a) of section 404 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out "one-eighth" where it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "one-twelfth."

SEC. 8. Subsection (b) of section 404 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is repealed and stricken out.

SEC. 9. Subsection (c) of section 404 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is redesignated subsection (b) and amended to read as follows:

"(b) If an insured institution has paid a premium at a rate in excess of one-twelfth of 1 percent of the total amount of the accounts of its insured members and its creditor obligations for any period of time after June 30, 1949, it shall receive a credit upon its future premiums in an amount equal to the excess premium so paid for the period beyond such date."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] for 1 hour.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it gives me sincere pleasure to say a few words in behalf of this bill. It is a highly meritorious bill and I hope its virtues will not be clouded or its passage imperiled by collateral issues. The savings and loan associations and the building and loan associations are fine American institutions. They are as American in spirit as the dome of this Capitol or the Declaration of Independence. For years they have served a most useful purpose in making this land of ours a land of home owners. Nothing brings greater strength to our Government—nothing so stabilizes our economy, as the home. If you are going to fight subversive or sinister influences, the most effective way to fight them is to see that the American people are home owners. The savings and loan associations have, to a great extent, accomplished that purpose. The district I represent is largely a land of individual home owners. I believe the savings and loan associations are more entitled to that credit than any other agency or influence. It is a fine way for a man who does not have the ready cash to buy a home. These institutions are managed by men who usually seek no profit, and often they have no salaries. They are local institutions that have a local pride and a civic interest. They are more than financial institutions, in a sense. They are social institutions. The people come in once a week to pay their dues, and sit around the table with the directors and talk over their problems. It is a safe way to build a home, too, because the building and loan associations will see that the man puts his house on the lot he owns, and see that it is surveyed. They will see that the main contractor will have paid his bills and that he has paid the subcontractors, the material men, and mechanics in order that they may have no liens upon the property.

So I say that nothing we could do to strengthen our Government and its institutions could be more effectively done than to encourage such institutions as these.

About $14,000,000,000 of the people's money is invested in homes through these institutions at the present time. The depositing members' money is loaned to those who desire to build homes. They encourage thrift and frugality, and they encourage all the virtues that accompany them—home ownership, and thrift, and the things that go with it, that make our people strong.

So I say, when you help the savings and loan associations, you are helping our Government. The savings and loan

associations for a long time have been paying substantially more than the banks for insurance in the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. They have been paying one-eighth of 1 percent, while the banks have been paying one-twelfth of 1 percent for insurance to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The banks say they have a diversity of investments, which makes them strong, but the savings and loan associations have the very best of all investments, the security of a mortgage on a man's home, which involves the height of real credit and great moral responsibility. So I say that the savings and loan associations should have their premiums reduced for insurance to at least one-twelfth of 1 percent, as provided in this bill, the same as the banks now pay.

Three times we have passed a bill in this House providing for that purpose. The last bill was reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency unanimously, and was passed by the House under unanimous consent and is now in the Senate. That provision is again incorporated in this bill, because once before a provision for a reduction in the premium was passed by both the Senate and the House and presented to the President, and it sustained a pocket veto.

While there was no veto message, I understand it was vetoed because no provision was made for the retirement of the stock of the Federal home-loan banks owned by the Government, and the retirement of the Government-owned stock in the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. Provision for the retirement of that stock is made in this bill, and I am confident that if this bill passes it will receive the approval of the President, and that this much-needed and deserved reduction in the premiums of the savings and loan associations will become a reality.

With the amendments in this bill we have also provided a financial system for these worthy institutions very similar to the Federal Reserve System which has been provided for the commercial banks of the United States. The Federal home-loan banks are a reservoir of liquid resources and credit for these institutions. We have provided in this bill a Government support for the Federal home-loan banks of $1,000,000,000 by which their securities can be purchased by the Treasury of the United States up to that amount, thus furnishing a liquidity to these institutions that will strengthen them in times of emergencies. There is also in the bill a provision requiring the maintenance of a certain percentage of liquidity by the savings and loan associations under the supervision of the Home Loan Bank Board. It is the same provision made in the Federal Reserve Act with reference to time deposits in the commercial banks. The Federal Reserve Act provides for a liquidity reserve on time deposits of a minimum of 3 percent and a maximum of 6 percent. This bill originally provided for the liquidity of savings and loan associations under the discretion of the Home Loan Bank Board of a 5-percent minimum and 15-percent maximum. We have reduced that requirement to 4-percent minimum and 8-percent maximum, which we believe is ample to maintain the liquidity to permit the depositor when he needs his funds to withdraw them in reasonable time. It will give a stability to these institutions which they otherwise have not had. It is true that the average liquidity of the savings and loan associations throughout the United States is now about 19 percent, but there is a wide variation in the liquidity, there is no uniformity, and under the rulings of the Federal home-loan bank a level of liquidity may be maintained for all these institutions that will permit withdrawing members to obtain their money in a reasonable time.

There is also incorporated in this bill a provision that the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation may borrow from the Treasury in time of need $750,000,000; this, together with a little over $200,000,000 which they now have, will make a backlog of $1,000,000,000 which will give them a stability they otherwise have not had, and which will have a psychological effect upon the shareholders just as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has had upon depositors in banks.

We think that when you have passed this act you will have brought to these institutions a stability, and will have strengthened them and will have better equipped them to continue the useful services that they are now furnishing and will continue to furnish to the American people.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I have just had an opportunity to casually look this bill over and from my observation of it there seems to be a billion dollars made available to these institutions according to page 5 and $750,000,000 according to page 7, a total of $1,750,000,000.

Mr. SPENCE. It would provide Treasury support for these institutions in case of an emergency.

Mr. TABER. Are they having any trouble in taking care of legitimate demands upon them at this time?

Mr. SPENCE. It is very much analogous to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. They have a billion dollars surplus now that they can use. They also have a borrowing authority from the Treasury of $3,000,000,000 if they should use it. Maybe they will never use it. These people may never use it. But it gives a security to them, it has a psychological effect, that I think will be very beneficial.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 29]

Anderson, Calif.	Bulwinkle	Celler
Bennett, Mich.	Burdick	Chatham
Bland	Byrne, N. Y.	Chesney
Blatnik	Canfield	Cooley
Bosone	Cannon	Coudert
Brown, Ga.	Carroll	Crook
Crosser	Marshall	Redden
Curtis	Martin, Mass.	Reed, N. Y.
Dawson	Mason	Sabath
Dondero	Meyer	Sadowski
Engel, Mich.	Miller, Md.	Shafer
Engle, Calif.	Monroney	Short
Gary	Morrison	Smith, Ohio
Gilmer	Morton	Stigler
Gore	Moulder	Stockman
Hobbs	Murdock	Teague
Huber	Murphy	Vinson
Jackson, Calif.	Pace	Wadsworth
Kean	Pfeifer,	Walsh
Lesinski	Joseph L.	White, Idaho
Lynch	Plumley	Wier
McDonough	Potter	Woodruff
Macy	Poulson	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TRIMBLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6743) to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, and title IV of the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 364 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, the legislation before the Committee this afternoon relates to certain operations of the Federal Home Loan Bank System and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. As one who has been actively identified with the building and loan business in my State for more than 25 years and is reasonably familiar with the activities of the building and loan associations, I want to say that I am wholeheartedly in support of the general objectives contained in this piece of legislation.

Those of you who were not present to hear the splendid exposition of this bill made by the chairman of the committee, who, without notes or memoranda, made one of the finest expositions of this bill that could possible be made, missed a real treat. The chairman of the committee voiced some very homely American sentiment with respect to home ownership in this country and did it in a magnificent manner. Because I was impressed by the statement of the distinguished chairman of this committee, I deemed it advantageous at this time to call his attention and the attention of the other Members of Congress to the fact that perhaps some of the administrative and executive agencies of the Government do not share his ideas as to the virtues of home ownership.

As proof of that situation I call your attention to the fact that one of the most widely read pieces of literature distributed by the Government is a publication known as Your Child From Six to Twelve, which is one of the infant-care series published by the Children's Bureau of the Federal Security Agency. It has a very wide circulation throughout the entire country. Most of you have perhaps sent that pamphlet out to your constituents, but I doubt if very many

Members of Congress have taken it upon themselves to read it meticulously to see what is in it. I confess that up to a short time ago I fell in that category myself. But I read this thing last fall carefully and I was simply amazed at the subtle propaganda contained in this document that finds its way into most of the family homes of America.

Let me call your attention to just one paragraph in this pamphlet which relates directly to the speech made by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency this afternoon. The writer starts out with the statement:

> Each kind of society builds a whole set of rules that are considered important enough to be taught children at their mother's knee. Many of these ways of life are second nature to us. Children grasp and follow most of them without any special training. We are not always conscious of our role as interpreters of what is good in our way of life and what is worth passing on. If certain practices are accepted in our community we assume sometimes without judging or weighing them that they are a full part of our culture. We drive on the right-hand side of the road without stopping to think whether there is any good reason for it. Many people set their hearts on owning a home, although home owning has ceased to be the sign of a stable family that it once was. There is a lot to be said for the heritage of a family, a region or a country's traditions that grew up long ago were reasonably original, but when we cling to them long after conditions have changed, they may hinder further progress and adjustment.

Then without quoting further, may I say that this book which is here for everybody to read, contains a long statement indicating that due to the progress of this country, the old idea of home ownership is a relic of the horse-and-buggy days and that we must now look forward to Government homes, Government ownership, Government sponsorship in the home-owning field all over this country instead of clinging tenaciously to this element of our life that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency said was characteristic of America as the Declaration of Independence through the operation of building and loan associations throughout this country that are dedicated to protecting, preserving, and expanding individual home ownership as against the idea of collectivism in the ownership of homes through ownership by the Government itself.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Does the gentleman think, in order to encourage home ownership, that they ought to be exempt from taxation?

Mr. KEEFE. Well, I do not care, may I say to the gentleman, to get into any academic or other discussion of that particular subject. That is related to another feature.

The thing I am trying to do is to call attention to this: Here we have had a most splendid exposition of home ownership from the chairman of this great committee, and yet there is going out and has gone out all over this country subtle propaganda of the character I have indicated that is intended to destroy the traditional idea of home ownership that the chairman of the committee so beautifully and artfully described in his discussion here this afternoon.

May I say to you that this thing, along with a lot of other things that appear in that pamphlet, did not escape the notice of the subcommittee of which I happen to be a member. A hearing was held, from which I have quoted in part, in which these matters were brought to the attention of the head of the Federal Security Agency and the head of the Children's Bureau, and if I were to go on and quote many of the other items of propaganda that appear in that pamphlet you would be just as shocked as I am sure they were when it was called to their attention. In fact, Mr. Ewing, the Federal Security Administrator, I am sure, was distinctly shocked to find in the publication sent throughout the country over his signature statements of policy that he disapproved of. We were advised yesterday that that booklet is now, by reason of the action of the subcommittee in calling it to their attention, being completely revised, and that new publications that are sent out perhaps will not contain such offensive material as has been contained in that publication in the past.

I am calling your attention to the fact that we are working at cross purposes, when one ideology is stressed in connection with this legislation so splendidly by the chairman of the committee, only to find his feet cut out from under him, if you please, by propaganda that is emanating from an executive agency of the Government. I want to say that I wholeheartedly concur in the statement made by the chairman of the committee as to the purposes of this bill, and I hope that it will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the President's decision yesterday to set into motion the development of the hydrogen bomb—a decision to which there seems little alternative—has placed us on a knife edge of history. With almost equal ease, we could fall either into mass destruction, or into a condition of active peace, instead of our present condition of inactive war.

In my opinion, it is not enough merely to decide whether or not to go ahead with the production of the bomb. We must also decide what the bomb means, and what we intend to do with it. We must make it unmistakably clear to the world, with more than a sentence or two of lip service, that we recognize fully the responsibility we have assumed, and that we intend to use this new creation in whatever way we can to bring about a firmer peace.

We are about to bring about an immense advance in the awful science of human destruction through the marshalling of all our scientific know-how. Our job now is to marshal all the statesmanship at our command. We must devise the political advances necessary to keep pace with science and to protect mankind from this and other destructive weapons.

After using the atomic bomb in order to hasten the end of World War II and bring peace, this Nation undertook a careful examination of its responsibilities to the world arising out of its possession of the bomb. Two committees were established, headed respectively by Secretary Acheson and David Lilienthal, and made up of scientists and statesmen of the highest stature. They were directed to bring together scientific and political facts in appraising the effect of our new weapon upon the world. Many of these men actually participated in the creation of that weapon; men such as Dr. Conant, Dr. Oppenheimer, and General Groves.

The Baruch plan conveyed our responsibilities to the world. It was a plan to make the atomic bomb the controllable possession of all nations together. It was not a political plan. It was based on hard scientific facts that could not be compromised if effective international control was to be achieved.

I firmly believe that our obligations have not been changed in the slightest by our decision to develop the hydrogen bomb. If anything, they have increased.

In my opinion, we can make it most clear to the world that our faith is good and our intentions peaceful by announcing that we are still prepared to submit, along with all other nations, to the scientific conditions necessary to effective international control of the hydrogen bomb. We must make it clear that our offer is at all times open to any nation willing to face the scientific facts. That is our minimum responsibility to the world. But is that the end of our responsibility?

The hydrogen bomb is a destructive force of new proportions—as new as were the proportions of the atomic bomb when it was first exposed. In my opinion, if we are to know clearly what our obligations to the world consist of, we must appraise as quickly as possible, but with the same care used in studying the atomic bomb in 1946, the effect this weapon might have upon us and other nations. I hope that scientists and statesmen of the highest stature will once more be brought together for that very purpose.

The very existence of such a tremendous destructive force suggests that these men will have to consider a very different world from that in which we have always lived. For example, in the Atlantic Pact nations of the Western World have seen fit to vest a certain measure of their sovereignty in a common defense organization. It seems to me highly probable that the immensely greater destructive force of the hydrogen bomb will dictate that all nations vest even a greater degree of their freedom of decision in an international government.

As a further example; the atomic bomb has succeeded in preventing the outbreak of a hot war, but has left the world living in armed camps. If the camps should come to possess hydrogen bombs, even this condition of an armed truce might well become intolerable. What should be our course of action if a part of the world should fail to accept participation in a scheme of international control of hydrogen energy? That may well be the No. 1 question confronting our scientists and statesmen in the hydrogen age.

I sincerely hope that our preoccupation with the threat of military aggression or with the superiority of the hydrogen bomb will not allow the free world to lose sight of that other imminent threat: social aggression. We have learned all too clearly that communism does not rely on military aggression for its growth: it feeds on human misery and discontent. I hope that the free world, with the United States at its head, will not cease to do everything within its power to eradicate those conditions.

It has been said that no nation has a right to assume the responsibilities associated with such a destructive weapon. But as long as the knowledge for making this bomb is available to man, these responsibilities must one day fall to one nation or another. The President has chosen to have them fall upon a government responsible to its people, with a tradition and a deep-seated aversion to war or violence as a means of settling issues. He chose this rather than leaving open the possibility that the responsibilities might fall to a nation ruled by 13 men accountable to no one but themselves.

As we assume the tremendous responsibility of this new undertaking, we must so conduct ourselves as to leave no doubt that we are actuated by high moral and ethical principles. The peoples of the world will be judging us by these high standards.

We are now faced with the greatest test to which democratic government has ever been put. This may be the last opportunity the statesmen will have to catch up with the scientists. This may be our last chance to avoid a third world war.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to my good friend from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I compliment the gentleman from Washington on making the statement he has just made in relation to the President's order to go ahead with the construction of the hydrogen bomb. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. If he is not in a position to answer it, of course he will not do so. Can the gentleman give the Members of the House any idea as to just how much more destructive the hydrogen bomb is than the atomic bomb?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I will answer in this way: The proposed hydrogen bomb is analogous to the development from TNT to the A-bomb. Any nation which gets a stock pile of these bombs will have the means by which human life in the great cities of the world can well be disposed of in a very short time. I think that is what we should bear in mind as we move into this new undertaking. I only hope that our people both at home and abroad will try to learn to live as world citizens must live if mankind is to survive.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I am pleased to yield to my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I wish to add to the statement of the gentleman from Montana my own commendation for the very excellent statement the gentleman from Washington has made. It seems to me that the emphasis is rightly placed by the gentleman upon the moral elements which this situation presents. I had the pleasure of hearing the gentleman from Washington present his views to the Committee on Foreign Affairs when that committee held hearings on House Concurrent Resolution 64 which as I understand it embodies the basic ideas which the gentleman has expressed today, the idea that would lead us to a world made secure by a system of law and order based upon the principles of justice and administered by international tribunals which recognize and apply those principles. I think in a situation like this in which some sense of terror and some fears have grown out of the announcement it is well for the voice of an influential Member of the Congress to be raised in behalf of those principles. I am sure the Members of the House have heard the gentleman with great interest and with great appreciation of this emphasis.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I heard the gentleman from Wisconsin make a statement with respect to a Government bulletin issued by the executive department in which it was disclosed that the author of the bulletin did not believe in home ownership. The pamphlet stated that home ownership was relegated to the horse-and-buggy days. It recalled that I have the privilege of being a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency to study the question of housing in Europe.

While in London we talked with the Ministry of Health, with the London County Council on housing, and other important officials with respect to the attitude of the English in connection with housing.

I had had the idea that to an Englishman his home was his castle. I had felt that the homes of the English were the bastions of freedom.

We were told, however, by the Socialist officials that the people of England were not now interested in owning their homes; that the people of England wanted to be mobile, in order that they might move at will from one part of their tightly packed island to another; that the people of England were interested only in renting houses, and that those houses should be owned by the Government. We were told that in England today not a single house could be built by a private individual or a private corporation. All houses, all homes, all buildings in which people are housed, are now built, constructed and owned by the Central Government or by the municipal government. I do not believe the people of England have changed. They seem just as interested in their houses as before the advent of the Socialist government. How long they will retain their attitude will depend upon their resistance to the propaganda fed to them by the planners.

A great general has stated that our danger today is not a revolution by force and violence. Our great danger today is a revolution of ideas, and it will come upon us quietly.

So I compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] for finding this pamphlet prepared by the executive department. It contains the incubation of germs of a creeping paralysis stifling the idea of home ownership.

In connection, Mr. Chairman, with this particular bill, when it was considered by the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] asked that there be included in the record of the hearings a statement concerning the trend of home ownership in this country since 1890. On page 29 of the hearings you will find an interesting table. Beginning with 1890 the non-farm-home ownership in this country amounted to 36.9 percent. In 1947 the non-farm-home ownership had risen to 52.6 percent. To me this was indeed gratifying, that the people of this country, at least, believe that in home ownership the people will find liberty and freedom. They will continue to believe it unless they are subjected to propaganda from evil sources.

So this bill brought before the committee today is an effort to retain home ownership, is an effort to retain the construction and building of homes under our system of free enterprise.

So it is highly important that we examine the bill to determine what it provides, particularly if it is presented to increase or enhance the authority of the Executive we must examine it critically to determine whether or not it will tend to take from the people our traditional idea of home ownership and freedom.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-seven Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 30]

Bailey	Burdick	Dawson
Baring	Burke	D'Ewart
Bennett, Mich.	Byrne, N. Y.	Dondero
Biemiller	Canfield	Engel, Mich.
Bland	Celler	Engle, Calif.
Bolling	Chatham	Fellows
Bosone	Chesney	Fisher
Brehm	Christopher	Gary
Brown, Ga.	Coudert	Gilmer
Buckley, Ill.	Crook	Gore
Bulwinkle	Curtis	Granger

Hébert	Monroney	Shafer
Hobbs	Morrison	Simpson, Pa.
Huber	Morton	Smith, Ohio
Jennings	Murdock	Smith, Wis.
Kean	Murphy	Steed
Kennedy	Nixon	Stigler
King	Pfeifer,	Stockman
Kirwan	Joseph L.	Vinson
Lesinski	Potter	Wadsworth
McDonough	Rabaut	Walsh
Macy	Ramsay	Whitaker
Martin, Mass.	Rich	White, Idaho
Meyer	Sabath	Whitten
Miller, Md.	Sadowski	Woodruff

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TRIMBLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 6743, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 357 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE] has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this bill reminds me of a Chinese dish, called sweet and sour. It has some sweet things in it and it has some things which to me are very sour. One of the sweet things was passed by this House three times. That was a reduction of the insurance premium paid by associations for insurance of their accounts. It reduced the insurance premium from one-eighth of 1 percent on those accounts insured to one-twelfth of 1 percent.

The executive department in control of this legislation—and I say "control" advisedly—incorporated that sweet thing in this bill with other sections not so palatable. One of those sections provides for a statutory liquidity provision. The statutory liquidity provision has been hotly contested and hotly debated by the people in the industry for many years, and now the provision is presented to the House. Its sour taste is sweetened by the proposal to reduce premiums. It provides that by statute the building and loan associations shall maintain a liquid position equal to from 4 to 8 percent of the member's obligation on withdrawal accounts. Heretofore the associations have maintained their liquid positions according to the discretion of their boards of directors, under State and Federal supervision.

The savings and loan associations over the entire Nation now hold in cash and Government bonds, as of December 31, 1948, 19 percent of their total private withdrawable capital. In addition, each association has a very important secondary liquidity in the form of unused credit at its Federal home-loan bank. By regulation these banks restrict advances to their member institutions, so that they will have an unused credit equal to at least 50 percent of their total borrowing capacity.

The actual borrowing capacity of the member savings and loan associations now exceeds 90 percent of the total borrowing capacity. This is 43 percent of their total withdrawal capacity. So, Mr. Chairman, today the savings and loan associations are maintaining liquid positions far in excess of the statutory requirements provided for in this bill. Many of the managers of the associations and many of the people expert in the knowledge of the workings of these associations feel that a statutory requirement of liquidity is not good. They say the reason is, first, that a statutory requirement may eventually become the maximum requirement. Managers may reduce their liquid assets in the association down to that provided in the statute.

In addition, while this bill provides for a reasonably low liquidity, it is the beginning of a new concept of Federal control. For the first time, the Congress is substituting its judgment for that of the board of directors of the institution. If this provision is adopted, it is an entering wedge to permit some future Congress to raise the requirements to such an extent that many sound institutions would be seriously handicapped.

The liquidity of a given institution is a matter of sound discretion and cannot be subjected to inflexible statutory regulation.

The associations are all under close supervision by Federal and State authorities. These supervisory authorities may, at any time, criticize and force a revision of the liquidity of any given association.

This so-called floor is, therefore, entirely unnecessary.

Thus, by Government control these institutions will be brought under a freezing process and may not be able to operate in the freedom of private enterprise.

Mr. Chairman, in order to obtain a favorable vote upon this bill providing for a rigid statutory liquid requirement there has been provided a sweet part, this being the reduction of the insurance premium. In addition another sweet morsel has been added known as the backstop provision.

The so-called backstop section provides that the Secretary of the Treasury may purchase obligations of the Federal Home Loan Bank System in an amount not greater than $1,000,000,000.

In addition, the Treasury is authorized to lend to the Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation up to $750,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Many saving associations would like to have this reserve upon which to draw in time of need. At the present, however, it is probably only a psychological benefit. If we face a great depression some such provision may be required, but it is now dangled as bait to secure support for the statutory liquidity requirement.

It is true that similar provisions are found in the banking law. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has the same Federal support, so it may be proper that these particular things be done if we set up a statutory requirement for liquidity. But, Mr. Chairman, my complaint is that we find the Federal Government coming in and saying to these associations: "If you want a reduction of your insurance premiums, you must thus go along with us on these other provisions."

Mr. Chairman, I find myself in disagreement with some of the provisions of this bill. I therefore do not believe I can support it. I hope you will consider this bill carefully before you pass it; I hope you will examine it from the points of view that I discussed in my opening statement. That you examine it to determine whether it furthers the regimentation of business by government. I am quite sure there is that possibility.

Each of us who is interested in the continuation of home ownership and private enterprise in this country must realize that the creeping paralysis of socialism does not necessarily come by a quick overturn of government but may likewise come by piecemeal acquisition of power and control by the Government.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr COLE of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. REES. Does the gentleman think it may be possible to amend this bill so as to comply with the suggestions, especially with respect to the question of reducing the insurance? The gentleman agrees with me, I believe, that we could reduce the insurance.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. That we can do and should.

Mr. REES. Could we not amend this bill by striking out these provisions to which the gentleman disagrees and then pass the legislation?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I think the gentleman and I will each have an opportunity and will do the best we can along that line.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, I hope every Member of the House will read the article in the Washington Post this morning reporting on Secretary of Agriculture Brannan's request of a congressional committee for guidance in disposing of the present potato surplus.

It seems to me to be altogether fitting and proper, Mr. Speaker, that Secretary Brannan should ask the Congress for guidance in disposing of these surplus potatoes, for the simple reason that Mr. Brannan almost got down on his knees and begged this Congress to change the present law which forces the Secretary to buy up potatoes so that they are subject to rotting. This ridiculous situation of potatoes rotting in storage is clearly the fault of the Republican- and Farm Bureau-dominated coalition which last summer defeated the Pace bill containing the so-called Brannan trial run on potatoes. If the Brannan plan had been in effect on potatoes this year, the present surplus stock of potatoes would have been eaten by the consumers of this country at a price somewhat cheaper than the present support price. The growers' subsidy under the Brannan plan would certainly have cost far less than

the total loss which is sustained through the complete destruction of these surplus potatoes. The taxpayer pays the bill either way, but he pays twice under the present plan; once as a taxpayer and again as a consumer in paying a higher price. Why not at least give the consumer a break and put the Brannan plan into effect on potatoes?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did Mr. Brannan or anyone else ask the consent of Congress to import potatoes from Canada?

Mr. WHITE of California. That has to do with a treaty. It has nothing to do with Mr. Brannan.

Mr. GROSS. Or how to destroy the other crops?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and one Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, our good friend from California [Mr. WHITE], the cotton gentleman, or the gentleman who grows cotton at a profit—perhaps that is more accurate—has been yelling about potatoes. I do not know why unless it is that he wants the money that has been paid out for potatoes, eggs, corn, and the rest of the subsidies, or an equal amount to be put into cotton payments. From what he said the other day it might be argued he does not want any of the fellows in Texas or in that section of the country to grow cotton. It must all be grown in California.

I am in favor of the gentleman's program to a certain very limited extent and in a certain way. Some of my folks have been going out to California to get that pension. They have a lot of them out there, good Republicans, too, and I hope in time they do a job on some of my friends from California and send a solid Republican delegation to Congress. But after they got so many people from the East and Middle West out there, what did they do to some of them? They took a part of the pension away from them and now a few have not enough money to get back home. I might be in favor of an appropriation to get them back to good old Michigan if they want to come.

It has been very interesting to hear these statements of the folks who are all in favor of FEPC. The President is in favor of it but apparently only if it does not apply to him. You all got that little card from Texas, did you not, the answer to the FEP program of the President where he is quoted as saying, "No son of a baby is going to tell me who I can hire or fire." The statement was made when complaint was made about the character or reputation of one of the men he has around him. Guess I did not quote the President exactly—he said s. o. b., which I take to mean "son of a baby."

Then we have the Member from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS]; she was here a moment ago. She is all out for FEP, too, and to demonstrate her sincerity about it, she practices it where it will do the most good. She has a fine colored secretary or a fine competent colored girl over there in her office. That ought to show her sincerity and to get her many votes. But yesterday around noon the Member from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] was down on the other floor below coming out of that restroom. A young lady was in a hurry on the way in. They met practically in the doorway, but the lady from California says: "This rest room is for Congresswomen only." Though the young woman was in a hurry, she turned back—making a polite apology.

Discrimination? Or was it segregation? A restricted area? Discrimination—not because of race or religion but because of lack of official status. Discrimination—because one was a Member of Congress- the other was not. Nondiscrimination is one thing in theory—something else again in practice.

Now, I do not hire anyone just to have a diversified citizenship or religious belief or conglomeration of color in my office. I had a girl who was an Episcopalian. I am a Lutheran myself. I had a girl who was a Catholic and I had a Jewish girl; a Methodist also. Race, creed, state of origin, never bothers me at all; maybe I do not have religion enough. Maybe if I did, it would bother me not at all. I think the gentleman from New York hit the nail on the head the other day when he said that the politicians wanted FEPC as a political issue. I recall when we had this swimming pool trouble here last summer in Washington and the administration shut the pools because the races did not mix quite as well as they should. I offered a suggestion; in fact, I put in a bill to give one pool to colored people, one to white people, and one for mixed use. But I did not get anywhere. None of the bills I ever put in do. [Applause.] I think that is fine; that is about the only applause I ever got. And, I will say this, you fellows do not vote in my district, so it does not make much difference to me. And I will also say this to you applauding gentlemen, I imagine you are all supporters of these labor bosses—not the labor men, rather the labor bosses, how are you going to like it when your telephone service is cut off as is threatened today? I suppose that is the same group over there doing that applauding who voted for the four freedoms for all the world, the same group that votes for legislation here in America to make it pretty hard next week when you ring your telephone or take off your receiver to get anybody to answer; the same outfit that votes for legislation which up in Michigan when it gets cold weather, leaves the folks without any coal. They cannot even heat the food they have. That is the outfit which is back of the President in his refusal to enforce the Taft-Hartley Act in the coal strike and that is the result of their policy. Look in the paper this morning: 60 Chrysler office workers want to go to work. They cannot get in. Pickets keep them out. A regular union practice—a practice which is a violation of law—a violation of a Michigan statute which the Democratic governor permits to go unpunished. I say you ought not to be proud of the legislation that denies to the American workingman the right to work.

Mr. WHITE of California. That is your bill, is it not?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My labor bill? Do you refer to a labor bill that I introduced here some 10 years ago, under which honest American citizens could go to work without being clubbed over the head? You keep on having these goon squads rioting and cracking the men's heads, as they have been, and they will get their heads cracked. What you are asking for is civil war, and if you keep people unemployed and beat them up when they try to go to work they will follow the procedure laid down by the goon squads as the people did in California in the early days. The people who want law and order will get results, and there will be shooting, perhaps hanging as in the old days, and that is bad. I am not advocating that, so do not say I am, but that is what you are asking for if you keep on along the lines some labor bosses are following; violence begets violence. You backed John L. Lewis, you backed up Harry Bridges when he was tying up the shipyards, and here is what you get in the end. Defiance of law, and the courts, a harbor of refuge for the Communists.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, not just now.

MY COUNTRY FIRST

I want to tell you a little bit about the people of Michigan, not in my district, but the adjoining district, PAUL SHAFER'S district, the third. Our people are much alike in their thinking. There is a project out there—I do not know who started it but could make a fair guess—to spend some Federal money on the Kalamazoo River which runs through Paul's district and through my district. They do not really need it, but it is an opportunity to get a little Federal dough. So, somebody from Michigan and a few New Dealers—and I wonder what your Governor of Michigan is going to do when they keep the people from going to work in violation of the law—the Governor, Brother Williams. Will he do anything? Probably not, except to encourage them a little bit.

Now, about this money. Do you know what our people say? They say they do not need it for flood control. There is a picture. I want the gentleman from California to look at it. See, the house is all flooded. The river water is 2 feet deep around and in the house. Now, do not get it dirty on the edge. Now, when that picture came to the desk——

Mr. WHITE of California. I just want to say this to the gentleman. He is talking about John L. Lewis and Harry Bridges. John L. Lewis is a Republican,

as the gentleman is, and Harry Bridges is a third-party member. The gentleman is not talking to us Democrats.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right. John claimed to be a Republican one time; but his UMW gave some $500,000, did it not, to the Roosevelt campaign? We have a few of those fellows on our side, and we cannot help it, but you have a majority of them. That is the trouble with your party. At the moment your president is the political captive of Murray and his crowd.

When that photo came to the desk, a girl in the office said, "Oh, oh, you are going to catch it now." She had not read the letter which came with it. They have been after me in the Kalamazoo paper out there because I was opposing this development. Listen to this letter now. It comes from the owner of the flooded house and yard. It shows the kind of people we have in Michigan, especially the western half of Michigan. This is directed to me, dated January 26.

I read:

Attached hereto is a picture of my home in Comstock taken April 8, 1947, by a photographer from the Kalamazoo Gazette. At that time there was 10 inches of water in my house, and the cost to me was $409.67 in cash outlay.

I tell you this to show that I have some knowledge of floods on the river at Kalamazoo from first-hand information.

In spite of what you might suppose, I am with you 100 percent in your position on this matter, that the expenditure of some three to ten million dollars for an alleged flood-control program is entirely unjustified at this time. That sum of money would pay for all the damage that has been caused in the past 50 years and will be caused in the next 50; it would buy all the property along Portage Creek in Kalamazoo and make it into a park.

Now, get this:

I had lived in Comstock for 40 years when I built my home where I did; I knew that once in a blue moon I might be flooded out; I built a house without a basement; with cement floors, and one that would suffer as little damage as any house could. I built it where I did because I wanted to live right there; if I were flooded out for a week every year, I'd still want to live there.

We can't have economy unless we economize and one of the ways to do it is to vote against just such schemes as this one. I'm for you.

See? There is an American who is willing to forego a private personal advantage for the country's good. God grant there were more of them everywhere—if there were and they spoke out we would not now be bankrupt as a nation in both money and principles.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I cannot. The gentleman would just tell a story.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WAGNER].

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to support this fine piece of legislation. Back in my home district of southwestern Ohio the building and loan associations have long been recognized and numbered among the most valuable assets of the community.

It is very easily realized that without these fine institutions many a home owner of today would never have been able to have become such. The building and loan associations were founded in the various neighborhoods and communities for the purpose of encouraging thrift.

Our associations in my home town of Cincinnati have had an outstanding record among lending institutions in this country of ours. I am proud of their efforts. It was my good fortune to be assistant district counsel for the Home Owners' Loan Corporation in its inception in my community. The cooperation of the building and loan institutions in assisting distressed home owners to hold on to their investment and protect their homes at that time was remarkable.

I am happy to inform this body that I have the honor of being a director and counsel for the McHenry Avenue Loan and Building Association, one of these fine institutions.

The backbone of this Nation is the American home and it is a pleasure to support legislation encouraging and assisting these people who have done so much to contribute to the home life of the American of today.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it is very hard to tell these days what kind of legislation the committee is going to bring in. When the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency was on the floor I asked him a couple of questions designed to find out what was the need for some of the provisions in this legislation. Now I find after going over the legislation myself and over the report that on pages 4 and 5 the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized in his discretion to purchase any obligations issued by Federal home-loan banks up to $1,000,000,000. There is already authority which has never been used according to what I understood the chairman of the committee to say to loan these banks $3,000,000,000. I just do not understand the idea.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. I was not referring to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. I compared it with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which insures bank deposits, and said that authority to borrow $750,000,000 by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation was comparable with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which had a Treasury support of $3,000,000,000 behind it. I was not referring to any of these institutions in this bill when I mentioned the $3,000,000,000.

Mr. TABER. I understood the gentleman to say that they had authority to now borrow $3,000,000,000.

Mr. SPENCE. No, no; I did not say that.

Mr. TABER. They have no authority at all?

Mr. SPENCE. I did not intend to say anything like that. If I said that, it is clearly in error. I have no recollection of saying that. I was comparing it with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, in which the deposits of the banks were insured, and said that that Corporation had the authority to borrow $3,000,000,000 from the Treasury.

Mr. TABER. These corporations all have to contribute toward some kind of a reserve, do they not?

Mr. SPENCE. The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation has assets of $213,000,000 now, and I do not think they will ever have to borrow this money. It is a psychological thing which gives confidence to the people who have deposited their money. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has never borrowed any of the $3,000,000,000 they are authorized to borrow. The people know it is behind them, and it gives stability to the institutions and confidence to the people which otherwise they would not have.

Mr. TABER. How should it be necessary without any situation presenting itself which would require us to set up authority in the Secretary of the Treasury to buy their obligations up to a billion dollars.

Mr. SPENCE. If times of stress came along it would be necessary. Now, it would not be necessary at all, but if times of stress came, it might be necessary to buy their securities.

Mr. TABER. With the funds that the home-loan banks already have, they would be able to take care of any shock and if any reserve were necessary it would be time enough for us to take care of that when the need arose.

Mr. SPENCE. I do not think so. I think if times of stress should come, this authority should exist in order that it may be used immediately.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman thinks that we should give them this authority to be used way off in the future just like that. Frankly, I am sorry I cannot agree with the judgment of the gentleman.

Mr. SPENCE. I do not think that they will ever have reason to borrow it, but the simple fact that it is there and people know it is there will give them assurance that the money will be repaid. If a great disaster should befall the financial structure of America, the money which is behind them now would be but a drop in the bucket. We all know that. It is the assurance of the people that they can get their money which has given stability to these institutions and confidence to the American people. I hope it will never be used. I do not think it will be used.

Mr. TABER. The American people do not need anything of that kind to have confidence in the institutions. Up in my territory they already have that, and they do not even belong.

This item of $750,000,000 for insurance purposes is another item that frankly there has not been any occasion arise where it was necessary to have anything of that kind. It does seem to me that we are going far afield in setting up these two funds of $1,750,000,000 which can be taken out of the Treasury without any review by the Congress, as to whether or not it is necessary. It seems to me we should not do such a thing at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-three Members are present; not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 31]

Bennett, Mich.	Gary	Norton
Bland	Gilmer	Pace
Bosone	Gore	Pfeifer,
Brown, Ga.	Granger	Joseph L.
Buckley, Ill.	Hardy	Plumley
Bulwinkle	Hart	Potter
Burdick	Harvey	Ramsay
Byrne, N. Y.	Hébert	Redden
Carroll	Hobbs	Sabath
Cavalcante	Huber	Sadowski
Celler	Jennings	Shafer
Chatham	Kean	Short
Chesney	Kennedy	Simpson, Pa.
Chiperfield	Lesinski	Smith, Ohio
Christopher	Lynch	Steed
Coudert	McDonough	Stockman
Crook	Macy	Vinson
Curtis	Martin, Mass.	Wadsworth
Davies, N. Y.	Meyer	Walsh
Dawson	Miles	Werdel
Dondero	Miller, Md.	Whitaker
Douglas	Monroney	White, Idaho
Engel, Mich.	Morrison	Wigglesworth
Fellows	Murphy	Woodhouse
Fogarty	Nixon	Woodruff

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TRIMBLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 6743, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 357 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], I ask unanimous consent that he may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 6743 represents an important step forward in the Government's program to provide a stable reservoir of credit for savings and home-financing institutions throughout the Nation. This bill provides a number of improvements in the basic law passed in 1932.

The importance of the Federal Home Loan bank system and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to our economy has been demonstrated beyond question during the past 18 years. Sixty-five percent of all the savings and loan asociations in the United States now are members of the Federal Home Loan Bank System. These associations hold 13 billions of dollars in assets—more than 90 percent of the total assets of such institutions throughout the Nation. Forty-six percent of the savings and loan associations in the Nation are members of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and these insured institutions hold more than $11,000,000,000 in assets.

Mr. Chairman, all of us remember the tragic conditions which led to the creation of the Federal Home Loan Bank System and the Federal Savings and Loan Corporation during the depression. We know that it is essential to provide a national pool of credit for savings and loan associations, and to provide a system of insurance for their assets.

H. R. 6743 extends the principles of existing law by establishing liquidity requirements for the savings and loan associations and providing for Treasury support of Federal home loan banks and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. These changes in the present law are highly desirable.

The great majority of savings and loan associations have recognized the need for maintaining a sufficient degree of liquidity to allow their funds to be reasonably available for withdrawal by shareholders. In my opinion, however, the establishment of liquidity requirements by statute, would provide a necessary protection for shareholders, even though this provision would have little effect upon the operations of most savings and loan associations at this time.

The establishment of liquidity requirements also is a necessary accompaniment of the provision in H. R. 6743 which would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase Federal home-loan-bank obligations up to a maximum of $1,000,000,000. Such assurance of Government support has been provided for the commercial-banking system through the Federal Reserve Banks and for the farm-credit system through the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. There is no reason why it should not be extended to the savings and loan associations through the Home Loan Bank Board.

There is no immediate need for Government support in this field. The powers granted by H. R. 6743 would be standby powers. Nevertheless, it is essential that we authorize these support powers so that the Government may be able to act quickly in the event of an emergency. As a matter of fact, the authorization of such support powers probably would tend to prevent an emergency situation from developing.

More adequate protection of shareholders also is provided in H. R. 6743 through the provision authorizing the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to borrow up to $750,000,000 from the Treasury. This authority is similar to that presently held by the Federal deposit insurance system. It is essential to provide such protection to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

H. R. 6743 recognizes the needs and obligations of the savings and loan associations, of their shareholders, and of the public. The associations are required by the bill to maintain a reasonable degree of liquidity. In return, the Government provides assurance of support in the event of an emergency. The legislation establishes standards and protections which already are in effect for the commercial-banking system, the farm-credit system, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. H. R. 6743 is in the public interest and it should be passed.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS].

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] had the floor, he was reading a letter wherein the writer said that he had built his house where he wanted to build it and did not care whether it was wiped away every year by the floods. I asked him to yield for a question. All I wanted to know was, was the letter written by a constituent or by a "duck"?

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I was inspired to ask for this time because of the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan. I do not now see him on the floor and I regret it. I would much prefer that he were here because I wanted to see if I could clarify, in his mind, some of the difficulties we folks over on our side are experiencing. In regard to our position upon certain issues that come before the Congress the gentleman from Michigan should realize that it is only natural that we are all the product of our environment and we do frequently see things differently, as we have a right to do, in this country. I think these differences are explained, to a great extent, by that sage remark that was made by our colleague from Pennsylvania, the immediate past chairman of the Republican National Committee, Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. He said that the Republican Party was constituted of the very best people in this country; cultured folks. Of course, since they have taken all the best people of the country, he figures there is no one but riffraff left for us Democrats. Consequently, we often see things in a different light than does the gentleman who associates only with the best and most cultured people.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to our distinguished leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, you are expressing what you think the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., thinks?

Mr. JACOBS. Naturally. I am trying to explain what must have been in the mind of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. Of course, sometimes people go through a metamorphosis. I usually refer to it as going through "the metamorphosis of gold," which seems to put at least a thin veneer of culture on some folks. The gentleman had considerable to say about our friend, John L. Lewis. You know, Mr. Lewis has been a labor leader for a great many years and he has done pretty well in the business, so he became a Republican.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. Not at this time. A few years ago, Mr. Truman was sort of checking Mr. Lewis up on some of his an-

tics. It seemed that blood, even political blood, is thicker than water. Our Republican friends had to send those two great missionaries, the present minority leader of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to bail him out. You remember how they got the welfare fund all fixed up with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] as the public trustee of the welfare fund. Then it turned out later, of course, that being of the best people, the salary had to be pretty good. It was $35,000, plus the emoluments of the office of Senator from New Hampshire.

So, in all businesses and occupations there are people who get out of line. We find that even some of the best and most cultured people get out of line on the GOP side, as well as the alleged riffraff over on our side.

That brings us up to another thing. I would like to address myself to my southern colleagues for a moment. There is a lot of talk about a combination between our southern colleagues and the Republicans. So I want to point out to my southern friends that the gentlemen who sit over here on the Republican side always have someone like the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] get up and make a speech, like he did a moment ago, in opposition to FEPC, that is simply bait. But let me ask my southern friends where were our Republican friends when the anti-poll-tax bill came around to the floor of this House last year? In other words, I want to show my southern friends that this combination benefits the Republican side almost exclusively, because when you folks are interested in their help they are like the little man who was not there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. JACOBS. Those who were here voted against you folks on that issue. So actually what they expect you to do is to support them on their issues and they always run out on you folks.

I am also reminded by the gentleman from Michigan, who is constantly talking about New Deal measures, and so forth, of the comment that has often been made on this floor. I mean the Republican opposition to killing little pigs. I have never seen so much mourning in all my life as my Republican friends have experienced over the demise of these little pigs which were killed a few years ago. I have never known of any kinfolks to mourn so long over the loss of their loved ones as my Republican friends have mourned over the death of these little pigs.

I do want to comment on another matter before I sit down. The gentleman talked about FEPC. He tells you that those who are for FEPC take their position purely for political reasons. You see, these best and most cultured folks are also possessed of occult powers. You cannot fool the gentleman from Michigan; no, sir. He is a mind reader. But I want to draw a parallel. The gentleman from Michigan was very strong for the Taft-Hartley law, which outlawed boycotts; in other words, the gentleman from Michigan was in favor of a law that would outlaw boycotts on commercial institutions—that is all right, that is good legislation—the best and most cultured folks are for it, according to him—but if we attempt to outlaw a boycott against a human race, that is bad legislation. In fact, our friends are so in love with the Taft-Hartley law that the other day when the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] was talking about the plight of miners who were unemployed because of the depressed price of metals he was asked by my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] if the Taft-Hartley law would not cure that evil. If there was nothing else done on that day, which you remember was devoted almost exclusively to the playing of political ping-pong, as today is being devoted, it will go down as a red-letter day in this Congress. They did finally discover one thing that the Taft-Hartley law would not cure. The fifth gospel was proven to be slightly imperfect.

Recently the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], for whom I have a great affection, was criticizing my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT]. He said the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] accused the late Senator Lodge of thwarting President Wilson's attempt to enter our country in the League of Nations. The gentleman from Ohio said our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] attacked a dead man, and he said that that was something that no man should do. That is in keeping with Mr. BROWN's generous nature, and I know he means and practices what he says. I want to say this: The gentleman from Ohio is a top leader of the Republican Party. I hope that his comment and Christian advice, being uttered as it was upon the birthday of our great wartime President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, yes, I sincerely hope that his fellow Republicans will follow his advice and example and that this marks a departure of tactics on the part of the Republican Party, generally in attacking the dead, and particularly the great man on whose birthday those words were uttered.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. In just a moment.

I will say that, if that marks a departure in those tactics of attacking the memory of a great man, then I congratulate the gentleman for the speech that he made.

I now yield to my colleague from Connecticut.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the gentleman. I would just like to say that I am the grandson of the Senator to whom the gentleman from Indiana referred. I have not attacked Congressman ROOSEVELT's father. Let me also say that Mr. Lewis is a curious kind of Republican, since he contributed $500,000 to the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. JACOBS. Oh, he went through the metamorphosis of gold after he made that contribution. In fact, I know a lot of folks who have gone through that metamorphosis since Mr. Roosevelt was first elected to the Presidency, because we have enjoyed considerable prosperity since that time. I know a lot of such people who were on their uppers, who were down to cloth. They were having a doggone tough time getting along. And they were Democrats back in 1932, and they were strong Democrats. But, like Mr. Lewis and a lot of other folks, they began to get out of the woods since then, and when they got far enough out of the wilderness they became the best and most cultured people and then a lot of them became Republicans; not all of them, but some, including Mr. Lewis.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Are we still debating H. R. 6743?

The CHAIRMAN. Apparently so.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER].

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. PATTERSON. I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana if when he was referring to Mr. Lewis he was not thinking about a lucrative practice? Just a short time ago I recall reading in the newspaper that certain Members of this House had a lucrative practice in labor law. Is that true?

Mr. JACOBS. May I have the time to answer?

Mr. PATTERSON. If the gentleman from New York will yield.

Mr. JACOBS. I would be very happy if you will yield a couple of minutes to me so that I may have time to answer this question.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. After my time has expired.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. The gentleman from Indiana has referred to John L. Lewis and to other people who went through a change. Does not the gentleman agree with me that the Truman administration has gone through more changes than any other administration in history?

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, as a new Member I have not taken the well of this House very often. It seems to me that new Members of Congress might learn a lot by doing a great deal of listening and perhaps less talking. But I cannot help taking the floor at this time when my distinguished colleague from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] has apparently raised a number of questions here which are outside of the bill we are discussing.

One of the matters he raised was FEPC. I should like to point out to the gentleman that as Republicans we do not do so much talking but we act, and I should like to point out also that there are 10 States that now have a FEPC or antidiscrimination laws in regard to employment. I am proud to say that my

State of New York was one of the first. We enacted that law in 1945 under a Republican Governor, Thomas E. Dewey.

We have had some great governors in New York State. In that State prior to 1942 for 20 years we had Democratic governors, including the great Governor Alfred E. Smith, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Sr., Governor Lehman, and Governor Poletti, but none of those gentlemen were ever able or ever made the attempt to enact an antidiscrimination law. It was up to the Republicans to do that and we did it.

In 1945 New Jersey under a Republican administration enacted a similar law. In 1945 Wisconsin under a Republican administration enacted a similar law. In 1945 Indiana under a Republican administration enacted a similar law. Massachusetts was perhaps a little more liberal under a Democratic governor and a Republican legislature because that State in 1946 enacted such a law. Connecticut in 1947 under a Republican administration enacted that law, as did Oregon in the same year. Washington with a Republican governor and a Republican senate and a Democratic house in 1949 enacted that law and finally, Mr. Chairman, in 1949 New Mexico and Rhode Island under Democratic administrations saw fit to do the same.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress has been democratically controlled for a good many years. If you are really serious about what you want to do or in what you are trying to lead us to believe you want to do, you will quit all of these parliamentary tactics and get down to brass tacks and we on this side of the aisle will vote for FEPC.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I listened with considerable interest to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS]. Now, he referred to some matters that I felt I ought to comment on. He shelled the woods and he also covered the waterfront, so it takes a good deal of latitude to talk about the various and sundry matters that he seemed to be finding fault with.

Now, we will begin with the attack he made on one of my constituents. Mr. John L. Lewis is a very distinguished constituent of mine. I love my constituents, and they have tolerated me for a good many years; and when anybody gets on the floor of the House and proceeds to lambast one of my constituents, I feel called upon to make some slight remarks in their behalf.

I do not know how many of you know Mr. John L. Lewis. Personally, he is a very courteous and nice gentleman. I get along fine with him. In public, now, he does jump on me and gives me a right smart woolin' sometimes. But, we understand each other pretty well, you know, and I try to be kind to him, and I do not think he even votes against me down in my district. So, I do not feel like this attack on my constituent ought to go unanswered.

Now, let me say this to you: It has been said he has been a Democrat and he has been a Republican, and maybe he has been a mugwump, and he might have been an American Laborite. But, that is his privilege. That is what this United States of ours is. A fellow has a right to belong to any party he wants to and change it every day, as he changes his shirt, if that is his desire. So, I do not think my friend ought to criticize my constituent John L. for that.

Now, I will tell you all the trouble about John L. It is not John L. Lewis. Everybody jumps on John L. Lewis because he does this and he will not let you have coal. Is it John L. Lewis' fault? No, indeed. The fault lies right here in the Congress of the United States. If you had the courage to do it, this Congress could enact a bill today that would put John L. Lewis out of business, and everyone of you knows that. Do not stand up here and criticize John L. Lewis for what John L. Lewis is doing. John L. Lewis is doing the things that this Congress has given him a charter and a permit to do over the years. John L. Lewis is operating the most disastrous monopoly in this country. He has been doing it for years, and you know he has been doing it, and you sit here complacently, and when I bring a bill up to stop that sort of thing, I cannot get it out of the committee of which the distinguished gentleman from Indiana is a member. Oh, no. He will get up and criticize John L. Lewis, but when it comes to passing a bill that will correct the evils, oh, no, we could not do that; we might step on the toes of Mr. Philip Murray; maybe we might step on the toes of Mr. William Green. That would never do in a Democratic Congress.

Now, my friends, let us consider this, because this is a serious question. In the enactment of your monopoly laws, you specifically exempt labor unions from the operation of monopoly laws. All you have to do is take that act and just take your pencil and strike out the exemption of Mr. Lewis and the rest of his cohorts from the monopoly laws of this country, and you have cured the whole situation. Then my friend from Indiana will not have to get up here any more and abuse Mr. John L. Lewis. No, there is no use in using that whipping boy. All my friend from Indiana has to do is introduce such a bill and get it out of your committee and get this House to pass it and then see if there is enough courage over in another body to pass it over there, and get the President to sign it. Of course, that might be a little difficult, but my friend from Indiana stands well with the administration, and I am sure that if he went down there and laid before the President the facts I have laid before you now, that all you have to do is take a pencil and mark out three lines in the bill, and you have cured the whole situation, we would not have to sit here and use the time of this Congress talking about Mr. John L. Lewis, my distinguished constituent.

I will pass from that question.

My friend from Indiana undertook to reprimand the Republican side and reprimand us southern Democrats, because, he said, we had a combination. He wanted to tell us the Republicans were not the friends of us southern fellows. I have known that all the time, but what has disturbed me is that the Democrats are not the friends of us southern fellows.

Let me ask you in all seriousness, who has kept the Democratic Party alive in the bad times? Oh, it is very well to come down here when the Democrats are in power and when you can exert some influence and get some patronage, and so forth, and talk about "We are the Democratic Party," but who kept the Democratic Party alive in the bad times? It was the South. You would not have any Democratic Party today if it had not been for the loyalty of these Southern States.

Now you turn upon the southern people for the purpose of getting a few votes—that is all, and you know it—for the purpose of getting a few votes from a few minority groups, that probably you are not going to get, anyway. You are willing to cut the throats of the people who kept your party alive through the years.

As for the Republicans being our friends, of course, they are not our friends. Who said they were our friends? Have they not had the same plank in their platforms over the years that the New Deal Democrats have recently adopted in the last couple of platforms to try to toll away these minority groups from the Republican Party?

No, we down South do not have any friends. We have to stand up here and sometimes resort to filibusters, even, to try to keep you people from imposing upon the southern people things that you know and we know just do not comport with the traditions of the South and cannot work and will not work, and neither race wants them to work.

My friends, stop and think about a few of these things. Stop and think about this FEPC, that both sides of the aisle are trying to force on a helpless southern people.

This is not anything new. People have been raising in this Chamber the question of racial prejudice and using the southern people as a whipping boy for a hundred years. It is not anything new.

I wonder if the time is ever going to come when this Congress will sit down seriously and reflect upon a return to the fundamentals, refer once in awhile to the great Constitution given you by your forefathers, and go back to that great document. There was a reason for every line, every word, every comma, and every period in it. Let us go back to fundamentals a little bit.

They call me a reactionary. I am proud to be a reactionary when I stand upon the principles that George Washington and Thomas Jefferson and the rest of those great patriots stood on when they created this Nation. Let us go back to some of their principles and find out what this Constitution is all about.

Do you know that your powers in this Congress are limited?

Do you know that the States under the Constitution have reserved unto themselves all the rights of government that are not specifically given to the Congress? And where have you wandered away? Is there anything in the whole field of legislation or appropriation which this Congress has hesitated to enact on account of that Constitution? What right has the Congress to appropriate the tax money of the people of the United States for things which the Constitution does not authorize? You do it every day and you have done it day after day and time and again with many of my Republican friends, to my deep regret, voting for them. We have done those things day after day and year after year and Congress after Congress until the Treasury of the United States is not only bankrupt, but worse than bankrupt.

All of you who are within the sound of my voice know it. But do we hear anybody get up and talk about that? Oh, no. We will talk about the FEPC and how much money we are going to give to this group and what appropriation we are going to make for that group in the hopes that it is going to get you some votes in the next election. Do you think the American people have sunk so low that their votes can be bought and sold on the barrel head with the people's money?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS]. I presume to appear as a witness in rebuttal.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, in the 3 minutes I have allotted to me I perhaps can do no more than answer the question which the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON] asked me. That was about my law practice before I was elected to Congress.

First of all you will note I say my law practice before I was elected to Congress because I had the notion when I was elected to Congress that my duty was here and that my attention should be undivided. Therefore, I closed my law practice and am not in the practice of law now. I do not know how many men in this Chamber can say that they have no other interest than their duties as a Congressman. I can say so. I can also say in reference to campaign funds that I never took a dime from anyone. I financed myself. That brings me to the question the gentleman asked me as to whether or not I had enjoyed a lucrative law practice. I did. I am not ashamed of it. Whether it was right or wrong, I had the people in my district and in the State of Indiana thinking I was a pretty fair lawyer. Thinking so, they paid money for my services—and I took the money. It is a sort of a profit motive, I would like to point out to my Republican friends—and I thought you were for it. But of course I might be mistaken. Maybe they are not for the profit motive except for themselves. Maybe it makes a difference.

Personally, I believe in a man being compensated for his services. I made a good deal of money practicing law, not only in the labor practice—I had been substantially out of labor law practice for a period of about 3 years before I was elected to Congress. I found I could make more money representing other people, if you want me to tell the truth about it—and being a believer in the profit motive, as you folks proclaim to be, I had more or less veered toward those clients who could pay bigger fees. I did not do too badly. I can imagine that the gentleman is a very avid reader of Westbrook Pegler because he is the one that gave publicity to the fact that I had made some money practicing law.

Some of his statements are accurate and some are inaccurate. But that does not matter. He said I made $300,000 in 2 years. That is not accurate—I regret to say. One of my colleagues said, "Why do you not sue him for libel?" I said, "Shucks, that is not libel." And it would not be libel to say some of the best and most cultured people made that much. My Republican friends who admire Pegler apparently think that they have a monopoly, not only on the idea of free enterprise, but on the right to make a profit.

When Pegler got to saying things that were not correct—I just want to tell you Republicans something about the author that you read so avidly—I went back to 1936 and found where Westbrook Pegler had advised the Communist Party on June 19, 1936—you get a copy of the Communist Daily Worker and you will find it there with his picture and all—he advised the Communist Party to come out under a new front and call themselves the People's Party. Well, I made that public and like Fulton Lewis, Jr., who once switched to Calvert's, Pegler let up on me and switched back to the Roosevelts as an almost steady diet.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, my position with the Banking and Currency Committee has no senority to give it prestige. My seat in the committee is deep in the well. In the well are four liberals from large, urban centers, who were washed here by the people in the elections of 1948 and who take seriously the mandates of their constituents. I think all of us in that well are for this bill that we are more or less discussing today, because it offers to translate the dream of a home, owned by the people living in that home, to a reality.

I should not have spoken today unless I had been moved and puzzled by the eloquence of my learned, distinguished, and beloved friend from Wisconsin. I wish to believe that he did not intend the implications of his remarks. The lips may have been giving language to something perhaps that was in his heart, but knowing so well the generous and lovable personal attributes of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin this I cannot accept. But when the distinguished gentleman, whether intending it or not, placed an aspersion upon people, good, honest, decent men and women who lived in homes that they did not own, then I felt that I had to speak.

I have the privilege now of calling the attention of the House to a statement just issued by a great American woman, Mrs. Katharine F. Lenroot, Director of the Children's Bureau of the Federal Security Agency. This is the statement, just issued:

> The Children's Bureau is a strong believer in the values of the American tradition of home ownership, but we would not want to be in the position of saying that the people who cannot own their own homes cannot have a stable home life.

My colleagues, many of my constituents do not own their homes. I would say the most of them do not. Are we to accept the concept that one who does not own the roof under which he lives and rears his children is less possessed than others more fortunate of love of country and a desire to build, through family and community life, this society of ours into the greatest society of contentment and God-fearing people that the world has ever known?

Why does my beloved colleague from Wisconsin assail the noble Katharine Lenroot and her coworkers in the Children's Bureau for holding before the eyes of the parents of America that while ownership of home is certainly the laudable desire of every American family, nevertheless it is the character of the family life within the home, and not who holds the title to the physical property that counts?

If it be propaganda to suggest that it is the warmth and strength of virtuous family life that contribute to the healthy upbringing of children, and not who owns the deed to property, then must my distinguished friend and colleague from Wisconsin dismiss as just another bit of propaganda the Sermon on the Mount.

Certainly we liberals from the North are for this bill, because, as our great chairman has so well said, it offers a substantial help to people who desire to own their homes. We dream of the day when every American family may be domiciled under a roof owned by that family. But, unfortunately today, in the great city of Chicago, from which I come, most of the men, women, and children are living under roofs that are rented. Many of them do not have the money to buy a home.

I think that my father was as patriotic and fine a man as ever lived, and no nobler character ever lived than my mother. I was born under a roof that was a rented roof. All the years of my youth I spent as a child under a rented roof. When I was married, a young man in the same position as most young men in America, I had no home that I owned to go to. I rented my roof. I do not intend to remain silent when the implication of words uttered on this floor are that love and virtue and all the other ennobling qualities of human character are not distributed equally to those who have and those who have not.

The day will come when every American family will have its own home. That is the goal for the attainment of which we are dedicated. Our sincerity we proved in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress when we provided not

only for slum clearance and public housing, but for extensive and exhaustive research to bring actual home ownership within the reach of all. Our sincerity we are now proving in the Banking and Currency Committee in our work on proposed legislation to bring the kind of housing all Americans should have within the reach of the one-third of our population in the middle-income group.

But until the day is actually here, and every American family does have its own home, I hope that my colleagues who have opposed in this Eighty-first Congress everything that we have endeavored to do to reach the goal will refrain from further reflection upon those who live under rented roofs.

In closing may I say to my friends from the South: I find you, my colleagues from Dixieland, fine, warm-hearted, sincere men. As men and as friends, I have great admiration for you; I have affection for you. I know how great have been the contributions of the South to democratic causes; but you cannot understand that those of us who are coming down here by the will of the generation of today represent a new concept, or an old concept in new form, that there must be no boycott of a race, that there must no place be permitted to rear itself the ugly head of discrimination, and that all humankind shall have equal opportunity in these United States, and that in all of this we are as sincere as sincerity itself. Everyday the brotherhood of man comes closer. The period of man's inhumanity to man has reached the end of an epoch. The responsibility that has come to us with world leadership commands that the customs and the thinking of a dead-and-buried era shall be discarded.

I have no doubt that soon the chivalrous spirit of a great Southland, which gave us Jefferson and Jackson and so much that has enriched the lives of the common people of America, will show itself with all its brilliant force on the side of a democracy marching forward, a democracy purified because no longer has it the taint of cruel discrimination.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, it may seem peculiar, but I am going to try to speak to the bill and attempt to clear up some of the uncertainty and confusion that seems to prevail in respect to this bill.

The Home Loan Bank System, headed by the Home Loan Bank Board, was set up under President Hoover back in 1932. It was set up for the purpose of making available a system of home-loan banks which might operate in the discount and purchase of real-estate paper similar to the manner in which the Federal Reserve banks operate in respect to commercial and other loans. It will be remembered that at that time there was a tightening in respect to the real-estate market. The home-loan banks were set up for the purpose of creating a situation where the banks could liquidate enough of their real-estate holdings to make an expansion of home building credit possible.

Under the Home Loan Bank Board there is set up the home loan banks and Federal savings and loan associations which were later set up, and State building and loan associations may come into this system. Let us compare the system to the Federal Reserve in another respect, that all of the members of the Federal savings and loan associations must be members of the system in the same manner as all national banks must be members of the Federal Reserve System. All of the State-chartered building and loan associations may become members of the system in the same manner that State banks may become members of the Federal Reserve System. Now, to prevent withdrawals from the banks, as a means of recreating confidence in the banks and as a very material influence toward the stability of the American economy, back in 1933 we set up the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation which insured the deposits in all banks that participated, whether they were Federal or State banks.

A comparable agency has been set up under the Home Loan Bank Board known as the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation insures what you may call the deposits in Federal building and loan associations and in State building and loan associations. They are not called deposits. So that there will not be too much confusion we may refer to them as deposits. They insure up to $5,000 of the certificates the same as the FDIC insures the first $5,000 of deposits in banks.

When the FDIC was first set up it was set up to insure only $2,500, and the banks, in order to have their deposits insured, paid a premium rate of one-eighth of 1 percent. Later the coverage was increased to $5,000. Later on the FDIC insurance premium was reduced from one-eighth of 1 percent to one-twelfth of 1 percent.

When the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation was set up we provided a coverage of $5,000 and we provided the same rate of premium as then had to be paid for FDIC, one-eighth of 1 percent. This bill reduces that premium of one-eighth of 1 percent to one-twelfth of 1 percent. That has been done by this House before. The bill was passed almost unanimously on one, perhaps two occasions. There should be no controversy in regard to that. It gives them the same but no more advantage than the banks have in respect to their premiums.

There was a discrepancy and a decided disadvantage to the savings and loan and building and loan associations, an inconsistency when viewed in light of the FDIC. The building and loan associations and the savings and loan associations were under the law susceptible to an assessment to make up losses over and above the capital and resources of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. No comparable provision was contained in any of the FDIC Acts.

To further bring the two acts and the services into harmony we have removed that, and instead of that provision we have provided a comparable liquidity on the part of Federal savings and loan associations and the member building and loan associations which if they were banks would be called reserves. The reserves of banks vary according to whether they are in Reserve cities or so-called country districts. We have provided in this bill that in lieu of the provisions in respect to assessments we require a certain amount of liquidity. The bill as introduced provided for a liquidity at the discretion of the home-loan bank of from 5 to 15 percent. That seemed to be a little bit out of balance with the reserve requirements that the banks had to maintain, so the committee, as a committee amendment, reduced that amount to from 4 to 8 percent.

In the third case we bring the two acts into closer harmony and remove some of the so-called discriminatory provisions. Up to the present time the Federal Government has not participated in any manner in respect to the Federal Savings and Loan Corporation assets, and the meeting of their liabilities, but the Federal Treasury can, under the law, participate up to $3,000,000,000 in losses chargeable against the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

In keeping with the ratio of obligations between the banks and the savings and loan associations, we have set a ceiling on that figure of $750,000,000, so that in addition to the $239,000,000 of capital and reserve the Federal Government theoretically could, put $750,000,000 into the fund to prevent losses, and perhaps save our economy, because so much of our savings depoits are invested in home loans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We felt that if anything serious happened to the home-loan market that there would be a decided influence upon the stability of our economy, and that if it were good business, and it is not denied that it is good business, to have a cushion of $3,000,000,000 behind FDIC obligations, it was just as good business and perhaps better to have a cushion of $750,000,000 behind the Federal Savings and Loan Inurance Corporation.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Should not the FDIC cushion be expanded by increasing the amount of insurance from $5,000 to $10,000, in the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think there are bills being drafted, if not introduced, to do that, and I can assure the gentleman that we will give very sympathetic consideration to the proposals.

Now, we have discussed here today another provision in the bill which has to do with $1,000,000,000 which the Federal Treasury may make available. That is in respect to the purchase of the assets of the Federal Home Loan Banks, and in order to get that $1,000,000,000 there is a further cushion against the liquidity of the savings and loans, and building and loan associations. Home-loan banks may sell to the Treasury this paper which they

have. Now, have in mind that these mortgages are secured by real estate only; that these associations cannot make loans other than real-estate loans. Against any of the loans or purchases which the Treasury makes up to this $1,000,000,000 the Treasury will have as security for any part of that $1,000,000,000 the homes which are being purchased by the American citizens, which I personally consider to be the best security which the Federal Treasury could possibly acquire. The only possible loss to the Federal Treasury lies in such a collapse of our economy as to virtually be the end of the American system of government.

The end of the American system of government will come in other ways. It will not come in consequence of this bill because if there was ever a free-enterprise bill it is this bill.

This bill provides for the creation of private capital with which to build homes, and removes, in proportion as we make this credit available, the threat of direct Government loans, which in themselves might cause such serious influence on our economy as to make it impossible to preserve the American way of life.

I am very strongly for this bill because I think it is the American way of building homes, and I hope the House will support the bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is a fact, is it not, that this bill was reported unanimously by the committee?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not know whether or not all the members were there, but I think it was a unanimous report.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eight Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman. I am today introducing a bill which I believe will effect significant economies and will in no way impair the benefits of the individuals concerned. Moreover, it will correct inequities in the treatments among individuals who are trained as career officers of our armed forces.

As a result of a study by the Government Operation Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, it has been found that it is currently costing the Federal Government an amount in excess of $285,000 a year to insure Annapolis midshipmen under the national service life-insurance program.

During the past 3 years, fortunately, there have occurred only two deaths at the United States Naval Academy. This mortality rate is typical of the experience over the past two decades. For the United States Government to continue to pay an amount over a quarter of a million dollars annually to provide NSLI protection for Annapolis midshipmen when the mortality experience of these men is far below normal risk appears to be a most unnecessary expenditure of Government funds.

These midshipmen are subject to flight-training activities and are contributing much to the military potential and subsequent national defense of the United States. I am in complete accord with the desire of the Congress that these men be granted insurance protection.

Therefore, I am offering a bill which would amend section 13 of Public Law 729 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. This legislation will provide for a lump-sum payment of $10,000 to the survivor or survivors of any midshipmen who die while enrolled at the United States Naval Academy.

By this action, a significant saving of Federal funds can be effected. The Navy has requested an appropriation of $277,000 for fiscal 1951 for the payment of premiums to the NSLI fund. This figure does not include administrative costs of either the Navy or the Veterans' Administration. Under this legislation cost for providing the protection to the survivors of midshipmen can be reduced to an estimated $30,000. This figure is most liberal and does not take into account the increased efficiency in administration which would result. Savings would, therefore, be at least $247,000 for fiscal 1951 and at least that amount every year thereafter.

Another provision of this bill would correct inequities which now exist between benefits being provided midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy and the cadets at West Point and the Coast Guard Academy. Under existing statutes cadets at West Point and the Coast Guard Academy are not granted any insurance protection and have been declared ineligible to apply for national service life insurance even on a personal, self-paying basis because these cadets are not on active duty. The bill which I am today introducing would also provide a lump-sum survivor payment of $10,000 in the event of death of any cadet enrolled at the United States Military Academy or the United States Coast Guard Academy. I am confident the Congress desires that this discrimination be removed.

Although my bill would provide coverage for many more individuals than are now insured, I am convinced that the cost to the Government will be less than one-fifth the amount currently required to provide national service life insurance protection for Annapolis midshipmen alone.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I have listened, as I am sure all the Members of the House have, to the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] in behalf of this legislation with appreciation and approval. I am sure all of us and the people throughout America have such an outstanding appreciation of our local building and loan associations that none of us would lose the opportunity to say some kind word in behalf of this great enterprise that has functioned so splendidly throughout our country. I am sure that the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan, and well stated it was, is shared by all Members of the House, and that this bill will be speedily enacted into law.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I am sure there is no substantial opposition to this bill. We have no further requests for time and I ask that the Clerk read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, is amended by adding the following new section after section 5 thereof:

"SEC. 5A. No member of a Federal home loan bank shall make or purchase any loan at any time when its cash and obligations of the United States are not equal to such amount as the Home Loan Bank Board shall by regulations prescribe: *Provided*, That such amount shall not be less than 5 percent or more than 15 percent of the obligation of the member on withdrawable accounts or, in the case of any member insurance company, such other base as the Board may determine to be comparable. The Board is authorized in said regulations to prescribe from time to time different amounts, within the limitations hereinbefore specified, for different classes of member institutions, and for such purposes the Board is authorized to classify such members according to type of institution, size, location, rate of withdrawals, or such other basis or bases of differentiation as the Board may deem to be reasonably necessary or appropriate for effectuating the purposes hereof. Failure to comply with the provisions hereof shall constitute ground for removal from membership. This section shall be effective 6 months after the date of its enactment."

Committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out the figure "5" and insert the figure "4."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out the figure "15" and insert the figure "8."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE:

Capitalize the first letter of each of the words "home loan bank" where such words appear as follows: Page 1, line 6; page 2, line 20; page, 3, line 4; page 3, line 10; page 3, line 16; page 3, line 24; page 5, line 22; page 6, line 2.

And on page 5, line 2, strike out the quotation marks at the end thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 6 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, is amended by the addition of the following new subsection:

"(1) Within 1 year after the enactment of this amendment, each member of each Federal home loan bank shall acquire and hold and thereafter maintain its stock holding in an amount equal to at least 2 percent of the aggregate of the unpaid principal of such member's home mortgage loans, home-purchase contracts, and similar obligations, but not less than $500. Such stock in excess of the amount hereby required may be purchased from time to time by members and

may be retired from time to time as heretofore. One year after the enactment of this amendment, each Federal home loan bank shall retire and pay off at par an amount of its stock held by the Secretary of the Treasury equivalent to the amount of its stock held by its members in excess of the amount required to be held by them by the first two sentences of subsection (c) of this section immediately prior to the enactment of this amendment and annually thereafter each Federal home loan bank shall retire an amount of such Government stock equivalent to 50 percent of the net increase of its stock held by members since the last previous retirement: *Provided,* That none of such Government capital shall at any time be retired so as to reduce the aggregate capital stock, reserves, surplus, and individed profits of the Federal home loan banks to less than $200,000,000: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding any provision of this subsection, nothing in this subsection shall limit or affect the operation of subsection (g) of this section."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 19, strike out "(I)" and insert "(1)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Subsection (g) of section 11 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(g) Each Federal home-loan bank shall at all times have at least an amount equal to the current deposits received from its members invested in (1) obligations of the United States, (2) deposits in banks or trust companies, (3) advances with a maturity of not to exceed 1 year which are made to members or nonmember borrowers, upon such terms and conditions as the Board may prescribe, and (4) advances with a maturity of not to exceed 1 year which are made to members or nonmember borrowers whose creditor liabilities (not including advances from the Federal home loan bank) do not exceed 5 percent of their net assets, and which may be made without the security of home mortgages or other security, upon such terms and conditions as the Board may prescribe."

SEC. 4. Section 11 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(i) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized in his discretion to purchase any obligations issued pursuant to this section, as heretofore, now, or hereafter in force and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds of the sale of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as now or hereafter in force, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as now or hereafter in force, are extended to include such purchases. The Secretary of the Treasury may, at any time, sell, upon such terms and conditions and at such price or prices as he shall determine, any of the obligations acquired by him under this subsection. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such obligations under this subsection shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States. The Secretary of the Treasury shall not at any time purchase any obligations under this subsection if such purchase would increase the aggregate principal amount of his then outstanding holdings of such obligations under this subsection to an amount greater than $1,000,000,000. Each purchase of obligations by the Secretary of the Treasury under this subsection shall be upon such terms and conditions as to yield a return at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the making of such purchase."

"(j) Notwithstanding the provisions of the first sentence of section 202 of the Government Corporation Control Act, audits by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of a Federal home loan bank shall not be limited to periods during which Government capital has been invested therein. The provisions of the first sentence of subsection (d) of section 303 of the Government Corporation Control Act shall not apply to any Federal home loan bank."

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I do this, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of asking the majority leader if he can inform the House with reference to the program for the balance of the week and any other information that he may have available.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, I will be glad to do that.

The Committee on Rules has reported out a rule on the oleomargarine bill, to take it from the Speaker's desk and send it to conference. That will be the first order of business tomorrow.

Then the next order of business will be H. R. 3001, the admission of aliens of certain skills. That was programed for yesterday, but on account of the cotton acreage quota bill not being finished, we were unable to take it up.

Then there is H. R. 6616 and S. 88, which were on the program for Thursday and Friday. Probably one of them will not be taken up. We can put one of them over until Monday.

While I am not prepared to give the program for next week, I may say that the Far Eastern Economic Aid Act of 1950 will be taken up on Tuesday.

I can also state that the Calendar of Committees will be called on Calendar Wednesday. But outside of these two matters I am unable to state what else may come up.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. I wish to inquire from the distinguished majority leader whether there will be any further program this afternoon, assuming the pending bill is disposed of?

Mr. McCORMACK. That, of course, is a matter within the control of the House. I know of none. I assume that those of us who are anxious to have an FEPC bill brought up sometime are satisfied with the fact that one committee has been disposed of on Calendar Wednesday. I cannot speak for others, but I assume that when the Committee rises and this bill is dosposed of, the gentleman from Kentucky will move to adjourn, but adjournment is within the wisdom and judgment and subject to the will of the House.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman understands, of course, that there are some of us who are not so anxious for the FEPC bill to come up. That was the purpose of the inquiry. The leader usually sets the score pretty well here.

Mr. McCORMACK. Not on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. COLMER. I still think he does.

Mr. McCORMACK. I assume that the gentleman is satisfied in that two committees have not been called today. The proponents of FEPC while not satisfied are contented that one committee has been called; so I assume that while there is not complete happiness on either side, there is a general feeling of harmony and contentment.

Mr. COLMER. So far as this side is concerned we would be perfectly willing to adjourn when action on the pending bill is completed.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. Let me say that when the pending bill is passed, and I hope that will be soon, when the House has taken official action on the pending bill, I shall move to adjourn. It would be an act of futility to stay in session any longer unless we desire to punish ourselves, and I doubt if we have any wish to do that.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's observation is consistent with what I assumed the gentleman would do. Are there further inquiries, I may ask the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Inasmuch as this is rather important, FEPC legislation was mentioned a moment ago, that I should state for the information of the House that the FEPC bill was not called up in the Committee on Rules today because of the absence of the chairman and one other member, and because of the promise made by the gentleman who now addresses the House to the chairman that he would be protected during his absence in his right to vote on that important measure.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say that I hesitate to enter into the intricacies of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Was the word "trickery" or "intricacy"?

Mr. McCORMACK. "Intricacy."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. Section 402 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by the addition of the following new subsection:

"(h) After the effective date of this subsection the Corporation is authorized and directed to pay off and retire annually at par an amount of its capital stock equal to 50 percent of its net income for the fiscal year, unless the Home Loan Bank Board by resolution shall determine that a smaller amount shall be retired. Such payments shall be made promptly after the end of each fiscal year (beginning with the first fiscal year which begins after the date of enactment of this subsection) until the entire capital stock is retired. In lieu of any and all unpaid dividends, whether for any present, past, or future period, on its capital stock, all of which dividends are hereby waived, the Corporation shall pay to the Secretary of the Treasury, promptly after the end of each fiscal year (beginning with the first fiscal year which begins after the date of enactment of this subsection) a return on the average

amount, at par, of its capital stock outstanding during such fiscal year at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the sixth month of such fiscal year. The retirement of such capital stock shall not affect the applicability to said Corporation of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 6, line 9, after the word "year", insert a period and strike out the balance of the sentence.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the passage of this bill and I am sure after the long day that we have given our undivided attention and labor to this particular piece of legislation everybody will now be willing to go along and pass this very good bill that the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has been so patient in giving us time to consider thoughtfully.

The amendment I have offered is a serious amendment and I hope it will be adopted. This insuring company that insures the deposits of these home loan and building associations provided originally that the Government should supply a capital of hundreds of millions of dollars. We voted that money out of the Treasury. This bill provides that from now on and in due time the corporation shall use 50 percent of its net earnings to pay back into the Treasury of the United States the money that the Treasury put up. That is a fine idea and I am sure we are all for it. I am sure that if we can get any money back out of any of these Government corporations everybody wants to do so. I am for it down to that point.

But there is a little gimmick in this thing. I refer to the proviso which reads "unless the Home Loan Bank Board by resolution shall determine that a smaller amount shall be retired."

That in effect just repeals what you have done in the first part of the sentence. In other words, they are required to pay back 50 percent of their earnings to the Federal Treasury unless the Home Loan Bank Board says, "No, you need not pay it back." What is the use putting it in at all if you are going to put that gimmick in it?

Let us get as much money back into a crippled and depleted Treasury as we can.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. It is rather difficult to make any argument against the gentleman's amendment. Personally I have no objection to his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. Section 402 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by the addition of the following new subsection:

"(i) The Corporation is authorized to borrow from the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to loan to the Corporation on such terms as may be fixed by the Corporation and the Secretary, such funds as in the judgment of the Home Loan Bank Board are from time to time required for insurance purposes, not exceeding in the aggregate $750,000,000 outstanding at any one time, and the Corporation hereafter shall not exercise its borrowing power under the first sentence of subsection (d) of this section for the purpose of borrowing money from any other source: *Provided,* That each such loan shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the making of such loan: *Provided further,* That nothing in this subsection shall prevent the Corporation from issuing debentures in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of section 405. For the purposes of this subsection the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds of the sale of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as now or hereafter in force, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as now or hereafter in force, are hereby extended to include such loans. Any such loan shall be used by the Corporation solely in carrying out its functions with respect to such insurance. All loans and repayments under this subsection shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States."

SEC. 7. Subsection (a) of section 404 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out "one-eighth" where it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "one-twelfth."

SEC. 8. Subsection (b) of section 404 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is repealed and stricken out.

SEC. 9. Subsection (c) of section 404 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is redesignated subsection (b) and amended to read as follows:

"(b) If an insured institution has paid a premium at a rate in excess of one-twelfth of 1 percent of the total amount of the accounts of its insured members and its creditor obligations for any period of time after June 30, 1949, it shall receive a credit upon its future premiums in an amount equal to the excess premium so paid for the period beyond such date."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 8, line 1, after the word "the", insert the words "Secretary of the."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: In section 204 (g) after the word "corporation" and preceding the last sentence insert a new sentence as follows: "It shall be unlawful for any member of the Federal Home Loan Bank to advertise that its deposits are insured by the Federal Treasury or that it is federally insured or to make any similar statement other than that it is a member of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it is understood, of course, by the House that this Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation is a corporation incorporated for the purpose of insuring deposits, which is a very good thing. It insures deposits up to $5,000 in these home-loan banks. Section G of the original act undertakes to provide that there shall be no deceptive advertisement by these building associations as to who insures their deposits; in other words, their deposits are not insured by the Government. They are insured by a corporation which gets its assets partly from the Government and partly from premiums that it charges for the purpose of this insurance. But, the practice has grown up throughout the country of using this expression, and I quote from an advertisement of one of these associations: "Savings up to $5,000 federally insured."

Now, the evident purpose of that is to lead the public to think that these deposits are insured by the Federal Treasury, which is not the case. There is a section in the original act which undertakes to take care of that but it is not quite broad enough to cover this particular kind of advertising I am talking about. But, the original act does endeavor to guard against false advertising.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Are they not insured by the FDIC?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No. They are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

Mr. RABAUT. Well, that is the same thing, is it not?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No.

Mr. RABAUT. Is that a Federal corporation?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It is incorporated by the Government, yes; and the Government furnishes the capital.

Mr. RABAUT. Where does the capital come from?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The capital came out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. RABAUT. Well, is that not straining at something?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No. If the gentleman will just permit me to answer.

Mr. RABAUT. I do not quite understand it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, the gentleman will not keep quiet long enough for me to answer.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Virginia if the deposit insurance that is granted to the so-called depositors in the building and loan associations does not have the same Federal protection that the depositors in the bank have.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. They are two different corporations.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. But they have the same Federal sponsorship.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes. The national banks are required to have a sign in their banks stating that they are members of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Now, if the building associations were required to do the

same thing, there would be no deception, that is, if they merely said, "We are members of the Federal Home Loan Insurance Corporation." But, that is not what they do. They say, "We are federally insured" or "Our depositors are federally insured," which they are not.

Mr. RABAUT. What do the banks say?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The banks say, "We are members of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation."

Mr. RABAUT. What do they say in their advertising?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have never seen any advertising that they are federally insured, and if they did, they should not be permitted to do that.

Mr. RABAUT. Well, they do.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Then they should be prohibited from doing that.

Mr. RABAUT. The reason I am speaking about that is that what one of the groups does the other group ought to be permitted to do, and we should not be championing a bankers' bill here when we know they are absolutely different.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. They should both be put on the same level. If any bank has ever advertised that way, I have never heard of it. But, it is universal, so far as I have seen, for this kind of advertisement to come from the building associations, and it makes people think that they are insured by the Federal Government, which is not the case. I think it is not exactly truthful, at the same time, and ought to be corrected.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment we have not had an opportunity to discuss or consider. It has never been presented to the committee. It is a far-reaching amendment. I think it springs from the natural antagonism of some of the banks to the building and loan associations.

I know of no provision in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation law that would limit the banks as this limits the savings and loan associations. To prevent the savings and loan associations from saying anything about their insurance, which gives stability to the institutions and which attracts depositors, to say that they could not comment on it except to say they are members of the Home Loan Bank System—such a limitation of their authority and their right to advertise themselves properly, it seems to me, ought not to be adopted in this manner without any consideration and without any submission of this question to the committee or to the Congress except at this particular time. I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. NICHOLSON) there were—ayes 35, noes 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Add a new section to read as follows:

"That section 405 (a) of the National Housing Act as amended be amended by striking out '$5,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$10,000.'"

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether or not any consideration was given this amendment by the committee, but I have been reading the report of the committee and also the hearings. I have noticed that the executive manager of the National Savings and Loan League said this:

Still another matter that we respectfully suggest be considered by this committee is the increasing of the amount of an insured account from $5,000 to $10,000. In view of the decline of the purchasing power of the dollar since the Insurance Corporation was established in 1934, we think such increase is consistent, reasonable, and desirable.

As the Members know, when this act was passed, the deposits of depositors were insured up to $5,000. It seems to me if there are sufficient reserves, the amount should be increased from $5,000 to $10,000. I understand that similar consideration has been given to amending the Federal Deposit Insurance Act so as to insure deposits in banks up to $10,000. I believe we should insure the deposits in these building and loan and savings associations up to $10,000.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, while this matter has been discussed in the press, it is a matter which has never been considered by the committee. It is fundamental and of far-reaching effect. Certainly, some consideration should be given to an amendment of this importance.

However desirable a raise in the limits of insurance might be, this is certainly no way to adopt it. The departments ought to be considered and all the other questions involved should be carefully considered. It should be submitted to the committee and the committee should have a chance to study it. I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment should be defeated. For a good many years we have been considering the question of whether or not we should raise the coverage on the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to insure deposits up to $10,000. Of course, we have been thinking similarly about increasing it here. But this bill which we have before us is a very well-balanced bill. The provisions in respect to the liquidity of these associations has to be balanced against the possible and potential obligations. The potential or possible obligation at the present time is $5,000. In order to rebalance this bill, if the gentleman's amendment is adopted, then surely we would have to review again this whole question of reserves.

At the present time the building and loan associations and Federal savings and loan associations have no legal reserves. This bill provides these legal reserves and these reserves are predicated on the fact that the first $5,000 of the deposits are insured. If we are to raise the insurance up to $10,000, then of course we have to give consideration to increasing the reserve requirements in order that those banks might be liquid or else you might create by doing so an unknown amount of responsibility and obligation on the part of the Federal Treasury and the Federal Government to at least morally take care of these accounts. I hope sometime our committee can get to that to give full consideration to whether we should increase the coverage on the FDIC to $10,000. I believe we can have reasonable assurance that if that is done, then certainly with justice to the savings and building-loan associations we might safely do the same thing for them. But we have to know what the coverage would cost. We have to know actuarily where we are going. To adopt it at the present time might throw this whole program so out of adjustment that the President might feel obligated to veto the bill the same as he did a previous bill.

We have in mind also that in this bill we retire the stock. We have just adopted an amendment which makes it mandatory and leaves little or no discretion with the Home Loan Bank Board as to the manner in which this stock shall be retired into the Treasury. All of these things have to be balanced off against this amendment. I hope the Committee will defeat the amendment with the positive assurance that the committee is sympathetic to it and at an opportune time, at a time when we feel it can possibly be done, it should be done as a whole job and not as a piecemeal job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment, in view of the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I refer the members of the Committee to a statement by Mr. Kreutz, executive manager of the National Savings and Loan League, on page 26 of the hearings, in which he states as follows:

The loss experience of the FSLIC has been favorable and compares very well with that of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Using the latest available figures of both the FSLIC, we find that the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation's loss in receivership cases was $3.40 for $100 of assets of closed institutions, while the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation's loss in receivership cases was $13.26 per $100 of deposits.

The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation's loss in contribution cases was $8.60 per $100 of assets, while the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation's loss in mergers involving contributions or asset purchases was $2.51 per $100 of deposits of institutions in trouble.

The net losses of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation since its organization in 1934 amount to only 7.6 percent of its premium income and 4 percent of its gross income.

I agree with the gentleman from Michigan that it would upset the reserve picture, and I am happy that the gentle-

man from Tennessee has withdrawn the amendment.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Since the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has raised the point that you might be raising the limit of the guaranties of general bank accounts from $5,000 to $10,000, and the committee might possibly be favorable to that, may I ask if you know that the number of accounts in banks now guaranteed in many of the large banks is up to 93 percent in number?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. FULTON. The nearer you come to guaranteeing the total bank deposits of the country the nearer you are to a socialization of the banks and the nearer you are to Government management and ownership.

Mr. WOLCOTT. As long as the capital and reserves of the Corporation are raised by private subscription, which comes from the participating banks, there will be no danger. There is not any more danger than there is danger of socializing the life-insurance companies when the reserves of the life-insurance companies come from the payment of premiums. So long as we keep this on a voluntary, actuarial private-enterprise basis and private-capital basis, then there is not any danger of the socialization of this very important segment of our country, and I can assure the gentleman from Pennsylvania I will be watching for that just as much as he is.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan. It is hoped that before long the increasing of the limits of the insurance of banks and building and loan associations will be considered. We do not think that today is the proper time to embark on such a fundamental change in the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TRIMBLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6743) to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, and title IV of the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. LYLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 457, Rept. No. 1572), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto be, and the same is hereby, taken from the Speaker's table to the end that the Senate amendments be, and they are hereby, disagreed to and that the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses be, and the same is hereby, agreed to.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H. R. 6743) amending the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

FAR EASTERN ECONOMIC AID ACT OF 1950

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (S. 2319) to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to the Republic of Korea.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 458, Rept. No. 1573), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2319) to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to the Republic of Korea, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

THE HOOVER COMMISSION REPORT ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I have received many wires from veterans opposing that part of the Hoover Commission report involving veterans' legislation. Any change in the Veterans' Administration program of hospitalization must be viewed from the standpoint of better service to our disabled. The very proposal of the consolidation of hospital care for veterans with all other hospital programs of the Government is a complete reversal of our national policy of special treatment for veterans.

President Hoover himself in 1929 told us that increased efficiency and economy would be attained by the consolidation of all the different agencies dealing with veterans' affairs. Now the Hoover report recommends that we again take from the Veterans' Administration this most important function and transfer it to a new and tremendously large bureau to be called the United Medical Administration.

To me the most sacred duty of our Nation is the duty and privilege of providing for those who were disabled in the defense of our country. I believe this care can best be provided by the present agency, the Veterans' Administration, whose sole reason for existence is to provide to veterans the benefits to which they are entitled as set forth by the Congress.

I will support any worthy measure to increase the number and skill of doctors available to the Veterans' Administration. This would allow us to utilize the beds now vacant in our Veterans' Administration hospitals while many veterans need and merit hospitalization.

In the last session of this Congress I introduced H. R. 6150, which was designed to improve medical and dental services to veterans by permitting the Veterans' Administration to send its doctors and dentists to schools and hospitals to learn the newest techniques and discoveries.

I am opposed to transferring from the Veterans' Administration any of its duties or responsibilities to our disabled.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. BOSONE (at the request of Mr. GRANGER), for today, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. BLAND (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Virginia), for 1 week, on account of official business.

To Mr. BARING (at the request of Mr. RODINO), from 12 to 3 p. m. today, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 2, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1181. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the report and recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget with respect to the organization and operations of the Panama Canal and Panama Railroad Company, pursuant to House Report No. 1304, Eighty-first Congress (H. Doc. No. 460); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ordered to be printed.

1182. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revision of the budget for the fiscal year 1951 involving a decrease of $516,000 in an estimate of appropriation for the Civil Service Commission in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 461); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1183. A letter from the executive secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a report covering the contracts negotiated by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, pursuant to Public Law 413, Eightieth Congress, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1949; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1184. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the reimbursement of certain naval attachés, observers, and other officers for certain expenses incurred while on authorized missions in foreign countries"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1185. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of leases as of December 1, 1949, pursuant to Public Law 364, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1186. A letter from the president, Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting a statement of the business of the Washington Gas Light Co., together with a list of stockholders, for the year ended December 31, 1949; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1187. A letter from the United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the Seventh Semiannual Report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1946; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

1188. A letter from the Administrator, Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division, Department of Labor, transmitting the Annual Report of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions of the United States Department of Labor, for the year ended June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1189. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting the Eleventh Annual Report of the Civil Aeronautics Board, for the period July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1190. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report pursuant to the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946, showing that the proceedings under this act have been finally concluded with respect to the following claims: *P. A. Lewis, Zenophon Jones, and Eddie Warrior* v. *United States of America* (Docket No. 25) and *Marguerite J. Underwood* v. *United States of America* (Docket No. 39); to the Committee on Public Lands.

1191. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed report showing credit operations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1192. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to provide for the conduct of a periodic census of governments"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1193. A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a report containing a discussion of the problems, descriptions of the various efficiency rating systems in the Federal service, information concerning the operation and administration of these systems, and recommendations, pursuant to Public Law 429, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1194. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1949; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1195. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 8, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of report on the Arkansas River and tributaries, with a view to improvements for flood control on Illinois Bayou, a tributary of the Arkansas River in Pope County, Ark., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on June 21, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 2319. An act to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to the Republic of Korea; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1571). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LYLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 457. Resolution providing for the taking from the Speaker's table of the bill H. R. 2023, to the end that the Senate amendments be, and are hereby, disagreed to and that the conference requested by the Senate is hereby agreed to; without amendment (Rept. No. 1572). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 458. Resolution for consideration of S. 2319, an act to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to the Republic of Korea; without amendment (Rept. No. 1573). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 7097. A bill to provide that pensions shall be extended to the widows and children of deceased World War II veterans on the same conditions as they are now extended to the widows and children of deceased World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 7098. A bill to provide for the making of lump-sum payments in certain cases to survivors of cadets of the United States Military Academy, midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, and cadets of the United States Coast Guard Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 7099. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to improve credit services available to farmers seeking to change or diversify their farming operations or adjust and improve their farming practices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 7100. A bill to remove certain inequities by fixing the hours of work and overtime compensation practices in the case of certain employees of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 7101. A bill to amend section 3615 of title 18 of the United States Code to protect holders of liens against vehicles seized for use in violation of laws regulating traffic in liquor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 7102. A bill to provide for the disposition of war and veterans' housing under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7103. A bill to repeal excise taxes on electric-light bulbs and tubes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 7104. A bill fixing longevity retired pay of officers wounded in action; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7105. A bill relative to the promotion and pay of retired Army officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7106. A bill fixing rank of retired Army officer war veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 7107. A bill to provide for the payment of traveling and hotel expenses of the parents and/or wife to attend funeral of servicemen whose remains must be buried in a mass grave because of inability to identify same; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 7108. A bill authorizing the erection of a memorial to Army Chaplains George L. Fox, Alexander D. Goode, Clark V. Poling, and John P. Washington, who perished with the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and sacrificed their

lives for their fellow men; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WOOD:

H. R. 7109. A bill to amend section 3282 of title 18 of the United States Code to lengthen the periods of limitation applicable to certain offenses affecting, or which might affect, the national security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. J. Res. 410. Joint resolution establishing a Federal Motor Vehicle Commission for the purpose of making uniform, laws pertaining to operation, ownership and control of motor vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 456. Resolution to condemn the abduction of Greek children by Communist guerrilla forces and seek the return of these children to their homes and parents; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 7110. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the estate of Archangelo Straneri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 7111. A bill for the relief of Nicholas D. Nicolaie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 7112. A bill for the relief of Dr. I-Kua Chou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 7113. A bill for the relief of Augusta Burkett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 7114. A bill for the relief of John Joseph Griffin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 7115. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yae Bennett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 7116. A bill for the relief of Otto Berliner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 7117. A bill for the relief of Frederick Edmond Tomkins, Mary Ann Tomkins, and Edward Marshall Tomkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 7118. A bill for the relief of Ruby Thaw and Hla Sein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 7119. A bill for the relief of Harry E. Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 7120. A bill for the relief of Poldi Rossler Long, also known as Mrs. Long Tack Sam, and Sam Tack Long, also known as Long Tack Sam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1774. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition signed by 43 residents of North Branch, Mich., urging the impeachment or removal of Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, because of his statement in support of Alger Hiss, and replacement by a man not only capable but loyal to the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1775. By Mr. HOLMES: Petition of residents of the Walla Walla, Wash., area urging favorable consideration of legislation outlawing alcoholic-beverage advertising over the air and through the channels of interstate commerce, and bearing a total of 50 signatures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who in the toils and troubles of time hast set vistas of eternity in our hearts, we come in a high hour of human destiny solemnized by the tangled tragedy in which all our human life is caught. Help us in these trying days, rising above all that is base and small, to work together in glad and eager harmony for the honor, safety, and welfare of our Nation and of all the peoples of this stricken earth who will unite in mutual good will, determined to open the gates of a new life for all mankind.

Grant unto Thy erring and willful children moral control and a ruling passion for world brotherhood, lest the awful instruments of death and destruction now held in frail human hands scourge the planet and melt into brittle glass the fruitful earth. Make our lives as lighted windows of faith and hope amid the encircling gloom. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McMAHON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 1, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6743) to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, and title IV of the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 322. An act to transfer funds to the town of Craig, Alaska;

H. R. 746. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of August Michela, a minor;

H. R. 2585. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for exemption from duty of certain metallic impurities in tin ores and concentrates when such impurities are not recovered;

H. R. 4387. An act to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Treasury Department; and

H. R. 6212. An act to amend section 5 of the Federal Firearms Act.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McMAHON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Murray
Anderson	Hoey	Myers
Benton	Holland	Neely
Brewster	Humphrey	O'Conor
Bricker	Ives	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Jenner	Pepper
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kem	Schoeppel
Chapman	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Langer	Sparkman
Cordon	Leahy	Stennis
Darby	Lehman	Taft
Donnell	Lodge	Taylor
Douglas	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McCarthy	Thye
Ecton	McClellan	Tobey
Ferguson	McFarland	Tydings
Flanders	McKellar	Vandenberg
Frear	McMahon	Watkins
George	Magnuson	Wherry
Gillette	Malone	Wiley
Graham	Martin	Williams
Green	Maybank	Withers
Gurney	Millikin	Young
Hayden	Morse	
Hendrickson	Mundt	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent on public business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. THYE was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from February 3 through February 17.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FLANDERS was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate on Friday, February 3.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the sessions of the Senate commencing tomorrow and until the eighteenth day of February. I may say very frankly I am going to speak at certain Lincoln Day dinners. In addition to that, as a member of the Subcommittee on Federal Prisons, I plan to investigate certain prisons.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. McMAHON, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of

the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. O'MAHONEY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to sit this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McMAHON obtained the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me for an insertion in the RECORD?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. McMAHON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts for an insertion in the RECORD, but I should like to get my speech under way as quickly as possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Since the Senator from Connecticut has yielded to the Senator from Massachusetts, time might be saved if the Senator would yield now for the transaction of routine business.

Without objection, the Chair will recognize Senators for transaction of routine business, without the Senator from Connecticut losing the floor thereby.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

REPORT ON CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of December 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that no exchanges of lands were consumated during the calendar year 1949, under the provisions of the act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741, 43 U. S. C. sec. 869); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Piyoula Pantouli Ganat nee Piuoula Nicolas Pantouli from a report relating to aliens whose deportation was suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted to the Senate on January 16, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CONTRACT SETTLEMENT

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contract settlement by the Administration, for the period October 1 through December 31, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO.

A letter from the president of the Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the company, including a list of stockholders, for the year ended December 31, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi, condemning an alleged statement by Secretary of State Acheson on the Alger Hiss conviction, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See text of above resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. EASTLAND on January 31, 1950, p. 1146, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Concurrent Resolution 11

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to recognize the integrity of the States by enacting proper legislation to prevent Federal liquor licenses from being issued to any inhabitant of any State wherein the sale of intoxicating liquors is prohibited

"Whereas the State of Mississippi has indicated many times by vote of the electorate that it desires to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors; and

"Whereas the State of Mississippi has enacted and now has in effect laws accordingly; and

"Whereas the prohibition statutes are a proper exercise of the powers reserved to the States; and

"Whereas it is the duty of the Federal Government to recognize the integrity of States' rights in the proper exercise of their powers; and

"Whereas the sale of Federal liquor licenses to inhabitants of States wherein the sale of intoxicating liquors is prohibited clearly constitutes a violation of the sanctity of States' rights and impairs the States' efforts to enforce its laws: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the Senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact proper legislation to prevent Federal liquor licenses from being sold in any State wherein the sale of intoxicating liquors is prohibited.

"Resolved further, That the clerk of the house of representatives be directed to submit a copy of this resolution to each of the Senators and Congressmen representing Mississippi in Congress; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the presiding officers of the House of Congress and the United States Senate for reference to the proper committees thereof.

"Adopted by the house of representatives January 11, 1950.

"WALTER SILLERS,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the senate, January 26, 1950.

"SAM LUMPKIN,
"President of the Senate."

EXCISE TAXES ON CAMERAS AND PHOTOGRAPHIC MATERIALS—JOINT RESOLUTION OF NEW YORK LEGISLATURE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New York, dealing with excise taxes on cameras and photographic materials. This is an important and vital industry in New York, where more than half of all the Nation's production of these items is concentrated. The Legislature of New York State has a viewpoint which will, I hope, be taken into consideration.

The joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to repeal the excise tax on cameras and photographic materials

Whereas several industries in various parts of the country find that public consumption of certain articles and commodities has been reduced by reason of heavy Federal war-imposed excise taxes thereon; and

Whereas by reason thereof several industries have been forced to reduce production and lay off many of its employees; and

Whereas this condition has contributed and will materially contribute to the rising number of unemployed; and

Whereas unemployment leaves in its wake serious social and economic consequences and many who have been paying heavy war-imposed income taxes while employed, are transferred to relief and unemployment insurance rolls; and

Whereas during the war years the Federal war-imposed excise tax on cameras, photographic materials and equipment and on many other commodities was justified on the ground that it helped to discourage civilian consumption of such articles and commodities in order that they might be available to the war effort; and

Whereas there is no longer any justification for war-imposed excise tax on cameras and photographic materials and on many other commodities now subject to such tax; and

Whereas the camera and photographic industry and several other industries principally engaged in the production of articles which are subject to the Federal war-imposed excise tax find that by reason of the inability or unwillingness to pay such tax on such articles, the purchase and consumption of such articles has been greatly reduced and consequently these various industries have found it necessary to reduce production and discharge a substantial number of their employees, thereby adding to the unemployment load: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York call upon the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to repeal the provisions of law imposing an excise tax on cameras and photographic materials and on various other commodities in order to encourage production in the various industries and to stimulate increased employment; and be it further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress duly elected from the State of New York and that they be urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purpose of this resolution.

By order of the senate,

WILLIAM S. KING,
Secretary.

Concurred in without amendment.

By order of assembly,

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

JANUARY 24, 1950.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXCISE TAXES ON TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION SERVICES—RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Public Service Commission of North Dakota, relating to the repeal of the excise taxes on transportation and communication services.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Federal excise taxes on transportation and communication services were initially levied or greatly increased during World War II, as war measures, to help defray war costs then current and also, in the case of the tax on transportation of persons, to discourage unnecessary travel; and

Whereas more than 4 years have elapsed since the end of the war, and the special and urgent needs for the levying or increasing of such taxes no longer exists; and

Whereas there has been a substantial reduction in railroad passenger traffic during the last 2 years, with resultant unprecedented deficits in passenger-service operations, approximating 430 and 560 million dollars in 1947 and 1948, so that the public interest now requires that common-carrrier travel be encouraged rather than discouraged; and

Whereas in view of the changed situation respecting passenger travel the excise tax on such travel has reached the point of diminishing returns, since the Government is probably losing about as much revenue through decreased Federal income-tax payments, due to deficits in passenger operations, as it is gaining in excise-tax payments on such service; and

Whereas all such taxes place an undue burden on the long-distance user of transportation and communication services, and on sections of the country far removed from centers of population, for the reason that the tax is calculated as a percentage of the transportation or communication charge; and is discriminatory against public transportation agencies which must collect the tax and in favor of private carriage which is not required to: Therefore be it

Resolved by the North Dakota Public Service Commission, That we urge Senators WILLIAM LANGER and MILTON R. YOUNG, Congressmen WILLIAM LEMKE and USHER L. BURDICK, to introduce or support measures in Congress to repeal all excise taxes levied on transportation by common carrier of persons or property and messages transmitted by communication-service companies.

C. W. MCDONNELL,
President.
ERNEST D. NELSON,
Commissioner.
ELMER W. CART,
Commissioner.

Attest:

ELMER OLSON, *Secretary.*

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the bill (S. 2440) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 2970. A bill for the relief of Kazuko Kamada; to the Commitee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 2971. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land in Michigan to the State of Michigan for use in National Guard Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2972. A bill for the relief of Miss Tryntje Bierema; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. PEPPER):

S. 2973. A bill to raise the population limits with respect to places in which national banks may act as agents for insurance companies from 5,000 to 12,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2974. A bill to eliminate the requirement that widows of World War I veterans must have married such veterans prior to December 14, 1944, in order to qualify for compensation or pensions under laws administered by the Veterans' Admiinstration; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. O'MAHONEY introduced Senate bill 2975, to establish corporations to assist financial institutions in making credit available to commercial and industrial enterprises and to provide capital for such enterprises, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. WILLIAMS introduced Senate bill 2976, to repeal certain temporary provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, continuing high-level price support for basic agricultural commodities, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL) introduced Senate bill 2977, to provide support at 90 percent of parity for any crop of any basic agricultural commodity for which marketing quotas or acreage allotments are in effect, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2978. A bill to make available medical and hospital treatment to certain individuals who have had a minimum of 10 years service as civil officers or employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. LANGER also introduced Senate bill 2979, for the relief of Ellen Knauff, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. RUSSELL):

S. 2980. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cigar-wrapper type 61 tobacco and cigar-wrapper type 62 tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

S. 2981. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Merlinet Forgnone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ASSISTANCE TO COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL ENTERPRISES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish corporations to assist financial institutions in making credit available to commercial and industrial enterprises and to provide capital for such enterprises, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in full in the RECORD. I assume it will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Later in the day I shall address myself to the substance of the measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2975) to establish corporations to assist financial institutions in making credit available to commercial and industrial enterprises and to provide capital for such enterprises, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 13b. 1. Purposes: The purposes of this section, in the light of which its provisions shall be construed and applied, are:

"(a) To foster competition in the growth and development of small and independent enterprises of economic and social value by providing intermediate and long-term credit and capital to small and independent business enterprises that are unable to obtain such capital from the usual banking or other financial sources on reasonable terms and conditions, where repayment or retirement of such credit or capital may reasonably be expected on the basis of prospective earnings, and a market exists for the products or services of such enterprises.

"(b) The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce shall, in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph, determine the class or classes of small and independent business enterprises which are eligible for financial aid under this section. In determining whether an enterprise is a small or an independent business enterprise for the purposes of this section, there shall be considered the relative size and position of the business in relation to the trade or industry in which it is engaged, the size and nature of the area of its operation, the size and independence of the group supplying capital or holding ownership or control of the business, and the independence of its management; and no enterprise shall be considered to be a small or independent business enterprise which is affiliated through stock ownership or otherwise with any other enterprise in the same trade or industry which is determined to be dominant in the trade or business in which it is engaged.

"(c) To establish privately owned corporations within the Federal Reserve System, subject to the supervision of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, with authority to make loans and to provide capital to enterprises eligible therefor under the provisions of this section.

"(d) To encourage the growth of local industrial development corporations formed for the purpose of supplying venture capital for the development of new and useful products, services, or techniques by providing for limited financial participation in such corporations.

"2. Corporations authorized to make loans and invest in securities of small and independent business.

"(a) Corporations, not exceeding in number the total number of Federal Reserve banks and branches thereof, organized for the purpose of operating under this section, may be formed by any number of persons, but not less than five, and each of such persons shall be bona fide subscribers for shares in the corporation. Such persons shall enter into articles of association which shall specify the general terms and objects for which the corporation is formed and which may contain any other provisions not inconsistent with this section that the corporation may see fit to adopt for the regulation of its business and the conduct of its affairs.

"(b) Such articles of association shall be signed by all the persons intending to participate in the organization of the corporation and shall be forwarded to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System which shall file and preserve said articles in its office. Such articles of association shall specifically state:

"First. The name assumed by such corporation, which shall be subject to the approval of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

"Second. The place or places where its operations are to be carried on.

"Third. The place where its principal office is to be located, which shall be within the reserve district in which it is established.

"Fourth. The amount of its capital stock and the number and classes of shares into which the same shall be divided, all of which shares shall have equal voting rights.

"Fifth. The names and places of business or residence of the persons executing the articles of association and the number of shares to which each has subscribed.

"Sixth. The fact that the articles of association are made to enable the persons subscribing the same, and all other persons, firms, companies, and corporations, who or which may thereafter subscribe to or purchase shares of the capital stock of such corporation, to avail themselves of the provisions of this section.

"(c) The persons signing the articles of association shall duly acknowledge the execution thereof before a judge of some court of record or a notary public. Such articles shall be subject to approval by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System with the advice of the Secretary of Commerce. If the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System approves the articles of association, it shall issue a permit to begin business and the corporation shall thereafter become and be a body corporate, and, as such, and in the name designated therein, shall have power to adopt and use a corporate seal; to have succession for a period of 30 years unless sooner dissolved by the act of the shareholders owning two-thirds of the stock or by an act of Congress or unless its franchise becomes forfeited by some violation of law; to make contracts; to sue and be sued, complain, and defend in any court of law or equity; to elect or appoint directors as provided in this section, all of whom shall be citizens of the United States; and, by its board of directors, to appoint such officers and employees as may be deemed proper, define their authority and duties, require bonds of them, and fix the penalty thereof, dismiss such officers or employees, or any thereof, at pleasure and appoint others to fill their places; to adopt bylaws regulating the manner in which its stock shall be transferred, its directors elected or appointed, its officers and employees appointed, its property transferred, and the privileges granted to it by law exercised and enjoyed; and shall have the other powers set forth in this section.

"(d) The board of directors of each corporation organized under this section shall consist of nine members, of which three shall be appointed from the public by the Federal Reserve bank of the district in which the corporation has its principal office, with the approval of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and six by the holders of the capital shares of the corporation authorized and issued under the provisions of this section, provided that the holders of each class of shares shall have the right to elect directors in proportion to the number of each such class of shares issued and outstanding to the total number of shares of all classes, but not less than one director shall be elected by each class of stock. Not more than one director of a Federal Reserve bank may also be a director of a corporation in which such bank is a shareholder.

"3. Capital-stock provisions—borrowing power.

"(a) Shares of stock in the corporation shall be eligible for purchase by member banks of the Federal Reserve System, and in order to facilitate the organization of corporations under this section, the Federal Reserve banks may purchase and hold such shares, as herein provided, until acquired by member banks. Each member bank is hereby authorized, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, to acquire and hold an amount of such shares equal to 1 percent of the capital and surplus of such member bank. Each Federal Reserve bank is hereby authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to acquire and hold an amount of such shares not exceeding 1 percent of the aggregate of the capital and surplus of all of its member banks, but such Reserve bank shall, at the request of any member bank, and under regulations prescribed by the Governors of the Federal Reserve System, sell to such member bank the shares which the member bank is eligible to own, provided that no member bank shall own shares in more than one such corporation organized under this section.

"(b) Shares of stock in the corporation may be purchased by any nonmember bank, or by any financial institution, corporation, or individual, and the total number of shares which may be so purchased shall be determined by the corporation subject to the approval of the Governors of the Federal Reserve System, provided that no nonmember bank, financial institution, corporation, or individual shall at any time own shares in more than one such corporation organized under this section, nor more than 10 percent of the total outstanding shares of any such corporation.

"(c) Each corporation organized under this section shall have authority to borrow money and to issue its debentures, bonds, promissory notes, or other evidences of indebtedness under such general conditions as to security and such limitations as the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may prescribe, but in no event shall such corporation have liabilities outstanding at any one time exceeding the total amount of its paid in capital stock and surplus. Each member bank is hereby authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to hold an amount of any debentures, bonds, promissory notes, or other evidences of indebtedness issued by the corporation under this section equal to 10 percent of the capital and surplus of such member bank.

"(d) No permit to begin business shall be issued by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to any corporation organized under this section unless the paid in capital and surplus of such corporation shall equal $1,000,000 or more.

"4. Insurance and investment authority.

"(a) Subject to such rules and regulations as the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may prescribe, and as provided in this paragraph:

"(1) The corporation may insure banks against losses which they may sustain as a result of loans to or purchases of obligations representing loans to small or independent business enterprises as defined in paragraph 1 (b) of this section and eligible therefor. In no case shall insurance underwritten by the corporation under this paragraph exceed 10 per centum of the total amount of such loans or purchases of an insured bank, nor shall such insurance exceed 95 per centum of the aggregate amount of loans to or obligations of any one small or independent business enterprise. In addition to such insurance conditions as the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the corporation, or both, may prescribe:

"(A) Not more than $10,000 of loans or obligations of one small-business enterprise may be insured;

"(B) No insured loan or obligation shall be for a period longer than 5 years;

"(C) The rate of insurance premium and the interest rate on insured loans or obligations shall be fixed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System;

"(D) No audits or appraisals shall be required on insured loans or obligations but banks shall certify to the borrower's good personal and business reputation notwithstanding a lack of commercial assets, collateral, or security:

"(2) The corporation shall have authority to make loans with or without security to both small and independent business enterprises as defined in paragraph 1 (b) of this section, which are eligible therefor, or to purchase obligations of such enterprises, provided that applications for loans or purchases under this section shall be initiated through member banks or other banks or financial institutions cooperating with the corporation. Such loans or purchases may be made either directly or in cooperation with such banks or other lending institutions, through agreements to participate or by the purchase of participations, or otherwise, as the corporation may determine. Obligations acquired by the corporation under the provisions of this paragraph shall be for periods not exceeding 12 years, and no obligations maturing more than 12 years from the date of acquisition by the corporation may be acquired under this paragraph.

"(3) The corporation shall have authority to purchase common or preferred stocks, income bonds, or other capital shares of small and independent business eligible therefor under this section, provided that the amount invested by the corporation in such securities shall not exceed 20 percent of the combined capital and surplus and authorized indebtedness of the corporation:

"(4) The corporation shall have authority to purchase the capital shares of local industrial development corporations formed for the purpose of supplying venture capital for the introduction of new and useful products, services, or techniques, up to 5 percent of its capital and surplus.

"(b) The aggregate amount of obligations or securities acquired or for which commitments may be issued by the corporation under the provisions of this section which exceed the sum of $250,000 for any single enterprise eligible under the provisions of this section shall not exceed 25 percent of the combined capital and surplus and authorized indebtedness of the corporation.

"(c) The loans of any national banking association which are insured under this paragraph or which are purchased by the corporation or for which a commitment to purchase is issued hereunder shall not be subject to the limitations of section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, purchases of loans, or commitments to purchase, shall not be subject to the limitations of section 5200 of the revised statutes as amended.

"5. Miscellaneous provisions.

"(a) The provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, shall not apply to any

shares or obligations issued by the corporation nor to the issuance of shares or other capital subscriptions of any small or independent business enterprise which are acquired by the corporation under the provisions of this section, nor to transactions by any person in connection with any acquisition by the corporation of obligations or shares or any commitment to acquire them, nor subsequent to such acquisition, to any further sale, exchange, or other disposition by any person.

"(b) The corporation, its franchise, loans, and other assets, its capital stock, its surplus, its reserves, and its income, shall be exempt for a period of 15 years from the date of its charter from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or other taxing authority; except that any real property of the corporation shall be subject to State, Territorial, county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other real property is taxed.

"(c) Wherever possible the financing operations of the corporation shall be undertaken in cooperation with member banks of the Federal Reserve System or with other banks or financial institutions located where the applicant ordinarily carries on its business, and any initial investigation and servicing required for loans or purchases of securities by the corporation under the provisions of this section shall be handled through banks or other financial institutions on a fee basis.

"(d) The corporation shall make use, wherever possible, of the facilities of the Federal Reserve System, and of the Department of Commerce which are available for and useful to industrial and commercial businesses, and shall provide consulting and advising services on a fee basis, and shall have on its staff persons competent to provide such services. Subject to the supervision and direction of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System any Federal Reserve bank is authorized to act as a depository or fiscal agent for any corporation organized under this section. Every corporation organized under this section shall make annual reports of its operations to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in such form as the Board of Governors shall prescribe.

"(e) Every agreement to insure or to make a loan to or purchase the obligation of a small or independent business enterprise eligible therefor under this section, and every agreement to purchase common or preferred stocks, income bonds, or other capital shares of such enterprises shall provide that any such loan or obligation shall become immediately due and payable, and that any such shares shall become immediately redeemable if such enterprise shall, by reason of the sale of its stock, or assets, or otherwise, fail to qualify as a small or independent business as defined in paragraph 1 hereof; and no financial aid shall be provided under this section which would lessen competition in any trade or industry."

Mr. O'MAHONEY subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day I introduced a bill to establish a system of private capital banks. The bill was introduced shortly after the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] made a very memorable address to the Senate on the terrible dilemma which faces the United States and the world with respect to the use of atomic energy.

As I listened to what the Senator from Connecticut had to say, it occurred to me that the very best answer the people of America could possibly make to the spirit of Russian aggression would be to make certain that the capitalistic system worked in the United States, and produced a high level of prosperity and a high level of employment.

By what we do here to stabilize the high standard of living which has been developed in the United States we shall, I believe, more effectively answer than by any use of force the acts of the Soviet Union.

We are accused of capitalistic imperialism, and there are in many areas of the world people who are susceptible to that sort of propaganda. The answer to the propaganda is to make clear that our system is not an imperialistic system, but is indeed a system of popular sovereignty in which the masses of the people may continue to prosper.

The bill which I introduced will in fact have that effect, because it is designed to promote the flow of private capital to meet the great needs of our expanding economy.

With private savings at record levels throughout the country, the private enterprise system is starving for lack of debt and equity capital. This was the burden of the testimony received by the Investment Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report during its recent hearings. Many opportunities throughout the United States for the establishment of new businesses are going begging for lack of venture capital, and even established businesses have found it difficult to obtain necessary term loans needed for successful operation. "Blue chip" stocks in national businesses have been selling far below their earning value while large financial institutions and insurance companies have not only provided equity capital but have not even provided the debt capital that small business needs.

Because existing financial institutions have not provided the method by which little and local and independent business can expand, more and more pressure has been built up for the use of Government funds. The bill I am introducing today seeks to avoid any new expansion of Government credit. It provides for no grants in aid, for no Government support. It calls for no appropriations. Its purpose is to establish the corporate machinery within the Federal Reserve System whereby the savings of the people may be channeled safely and profitably for investment in the independent business enterprises which must be fostered if a private enterprise economy is to be enabled to expand successfully and soundly, yet rapidly enough to maintain the present high levels of production and employment.

The bill I am introducing today is the outgrowth of a suggestion made to the Joint Economic Committee by Dr. A. D. H. Kaplan of the Brookings Institution. It amends the Federal Reserve Act to provide for the creation of capital bank corporations, not to exceed in number the 36 Federal Reserve banks and branches now in existence. The stock of these banks may be purchased by member banks of the Federal Reserve System and by nonmember banks, or by any financial institution, corporation, or individual, but in order to facilitate the organization of these corporations, the Federal Reserve banks are permitted to acquire and hold an amount of the capital stock not exceeding 1 percent of the aggregate capital and surplus of all the member banks.

The incentive for investment in the stock of the new capital banks is provided by exempting the earnings of the banks from taxation for a period of 15 years. Thus, during that period, taxes would be paid only upon the dividends to stockholders. It is so important in the national interest to provide the stimulus to investment in the private economy that this exemption seems to be highly desirable.

The new banks would have three primary functions: First, the authority to make loans; second, the authority to invest in the equity securities of existing business; and third, the authority to insure the loans of commercial banks against losses arising from loans to small or independent business enterprises or from purchases of obligations representing such loans.

Eligibility for insured loans would not extend for more than 5 years nor exceed $10,000 for one enterprise. Under this provision, character loans could be insured. The amount of the insurance premium and the interest rate to be paid on insured loans would be fixed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The banks would have the authority to purchase both common and preferred stocks, income bonds, and other capital shares of small and independent businesses, but the amount to be invested in such securities is limited to 20 percent of the combined capital and surplus and authorized indebtedness. Authority is granted to purchase the capital shares of local industrial development corporations not to exceed 5 percent of the capital and surplus.

It is recognized that large loans are essential to profitable operation. They are permitted; but loans of this character which exceed the sum of $250,000 for a single business shall not in the aggregate exceed 25 percent of the combined capital and surplus and authorized indebtedness of the corporation.

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Secretary of Commerce are given the authority to define eligible small and independent business enterprises, but they are directed to take into consideration the relative size and position of a business in its trade or industry, the geographical area in which it operates, as well as the size and independence of the group supplying capital or holding ownership or control. Businesses which may be affiliated through stock ownership or otherwise—holding companies and the like—with any other business in the same industry are not to be regarded as eligible.

Each corporation is to have nine directors, of which three shall be appointed from the public by the Federal Reserve bank of the district in which it operates, but only with the approval of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. The other six are to be holders of the capital stock of the corporation and elected by the stockholders.

It should be emphasized that these capital banks are strictly privately owned corporations. They are placed within the Federal Reserve System and are made subject to the supervision of the Board of Governors of that System. Individuals and institutions purchasing the stock would have the assurance, therefore, that they would be soundly administered. Through the authority to insure small loans, they would provide cooperation and support for the existing banking system. Through the authority to make term loans, they would be able to finance sound little and local enterprises which cannot now obtain working capital because so many local banks do not have sufficient capital to meet the demand. Through the authority to purchase equity stocks, they would be enabled to provide the venture capital now so necessary to bring about the development of existing business opportunities.

In the drafting of the bill every effort has been used to make the system really sound so that it will attract private capital. That the need for a freer flow of private capital exists throughout the country has been made evident not only by the testimony before the investment subcommittee but also by representations which have been made to the Department of Commerce by bankers as well as small-business men. The bill will be referred to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and it is to be hoped that those who are interested in promoting and stabilizing the system of private property will come forward with any suggestions that may strengthen and improve the measure.

I am convinced that the present lack of investment capital results only from the fact that government has not provided the organization through which private capital may work to meet the demand. This bill is intended to provide that means.

Mr. President, I have prepared a summary of the bill, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF O'MAHONEY BILL TO MAKE PRIVATE CAPITAL AVAILABLE TO SMALL BUSINESS

This bill would establish capital banking corporations within the Federal Reserve System for the purpose of providing credit and equity capital to small and independent business. The facilities of the private-banking system of the United States and the capital of private banks would be used to meet the credit and capital requirements of the small- and independent-business man. No Federal appropriations guaranties or other forms of Federal financial systems are involved in this bill. The role of the Federal Government would be limited to that of ordinary supervision such as is usually exercised over banking institutions under existing laws. The bill is, in effect, a challenge to private banking and financial institutions to come forward and resume the traditional role of the local bank in financing small and independent local enterprise. As a result, it will be unnecessary for the Federal Government to expand its financing activities to provide this service which is vital to the continued growth and development of American free enterprise.

This bill takes the form of an amendment to the Federal Reserve Act and supplies a new section 13 (b) for the existing section that permits the Federal Reserve banks, under special circumstances, to make loans to business.

Paragraph 1 of the new section 13 (b) sets forth the purposes of the new section and provides standards for determining the class or classes of small, independent business enterprises eligible for financial aid under this section. The Federal Reserve Board and the Secretary of Commerce are authorized to issue regulations defining such business on the basis of the standards set forth in this section. It is recognized that the definition of small business presents too many difficulties to permit a detailed description in the statute itself. Accordingly, some discretion must be left to administrative agencies competent to deal with the question.

Paragraph 2 permits the establishment of capital banking corporations within each Federal Reserve bank and Federal Reserve branch district. Thus, 36 such corporations could be organized in the United States. These corporations would have all the usual corporate powers of private corporations. Each corporation would have nine directors, three chosen from the members of the public by the Federal Reserve bank with the approval of the Board of Governors, and six chosen by the stockholders. Not more than one director of the Federal Reserve bank would also be a director of the capital bank corporation.

Section 3 of the bill sets forth the manner in which the capital banking corporation shall obtain its own capital. Member banks of the Federal Reserve System will be permitted to invest up to 1 percent of their capital and surplus in the stock of the corporation. Similarly, the Federal Reserve banks themselves will be permitted to invest up to 1 percent of the capital and surplus of all member banks in the district. When requested by any member bank, the Federal Reserve bank will sell its shares in the capital of the new corporation to the member banks. Shares in the capital banking corporation may also be purchased by nonmember banks or other financial institutions, as well as by individuals, but no institution or individual may own more than 10 percent of the stock of each corporation.

To provide additional capital for its financing operations, the capital banking operation may issue its debentures or bonds up to the amount of its paid-in capital and surplus.

Paragraph 4 of the new section sets forth the financing powers of the new corporation. These financing powers are: 1. The power to insure banks against losses from small loans not exceeding $10,000; 2. The power to make loans or buy the obligations of any small or independent business from banks or other lending institutions; and 3. The power to purchase equity, securities, or other capital shares of small or independent businesses. The additional authority is given the corporation to purchase shares of local industrial development corporations which specialize in supplying venture capital. But this authority is limited to 5 percent of the capital and surplus.

The lending authority of the corporation is designed primarily to assist small business, and therefore, the amount of the corporation's assets which can be invested in loans or security purchases which exceed $250,000 in amount is limited. It is recognized, of course, that authority to make some large loans is necessary to provide the corporation with a sound portfolio of investments.

In order to provide incentives for the establishment of such capital banking corporations, and their assets, capital stock surplus, reserves and income are permitted exemption from Federal taxes for a period of 15 years.

It is recognized that such capital banking corporations must be in a position to provide not only money but also business guidance to small and independent business. It is contemplated, therefore, that the Federal Reserve Board and the Department of Commerce will collaborate to establish machinery within which the capital banking corporations will be able to provide such service.

In order to make sure that the activities of the corporations are confined to stimulating small and independent business rather than the mere financing of successful enterprises which already play a dominant role in any trade or industry, the proposed bill provides that when a small or independent business ceases to be eligible for financial aid under the terms of this section, any loans or securities in the hands of the capital banking corporations shall be called or redeemed.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN TEMPORARY PROVISIONS OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to repeal certain temporary provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill and an explanation thereof be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanation presented by the Senator from Delaware will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2976) to repeal certain temporary provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, continuing high-level price support for basic agricultural commodities, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (d) of section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (Public Law No. 439, 81st Cong.), and section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as added by subsection (c) of section 409 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, are hereby repealed.

The explanation of the bill presented by Mr. WILLIAMS is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF SENATOR WILLIAMS' BILL OF FEBRUARY 2, 1950, TO REPEAL CERTAIN TEMPORARY PROVISIONS OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, CONTINUING HIGH-LEVEL PRICE SUPPORT FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 provides price support at 90 percent of parity for the 1950 crop of any basic agricultural commodity, if marketing quotas or acreage allotments are in effect and marketing quotas have not been disapproved. Paragraph (2) of such subsection (d) provides price support at not less than 80 percent of parity for 1951 crops under the same circumstances. Repeal of these two paragraphs would make the sliding scales of support levels set out in subsections (a) and (b) of section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 effective immediately. The support level for tobacco whenever marketing quotas are in effect would, of course, continue to be fixed at 90 percent of parity by subsection (c) of such section 101; and any price support levels announced by the Secretary prior to repeal of paragraphs (1) and (2) would not be affected by such repeal.

Under section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 the parity price for any basic agricultural commodity during the 4-year period begining January 1, 1950, would be computed under the old parity formula or the modernized parity formula, whichever results in the high parity price.

Repeal of this section would make the new parity formula applicable to all commodities immediately. It would not, of course, affect any support prices theretofore announced by the Secretary.

ELLEN KNAUFF

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Ellen Knauff. This is related to a case in which the Supreme Court decided by a vote of 4 to 3 that the claimant could be deported without ever having been given a hearing by the Department of Justice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2979) for the relief of Ellen Knauff, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INVESTIGATION OF LEASING OF POST OFFICE QUARTERS, DETROIT, MICH.

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 224), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a thorough study and investigation into the leasing of post office quarters in and around Detroit, Mich., with a view to determining whether any favoritism or other irregularity has occurred. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

CODIFICATION OF ARTICLES OF WAR, ETC.—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4080) to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard, and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MORSE submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the committee amendment to House bill 4080, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6073) to amend section 501 (b) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BENTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5472, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6743) to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, and title IV of the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

DISPLACED PERSONS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of displaced persons broadcast by him over Station WSPR, Springfield, Mass., on January 22, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEHMAN AT ROOSEVELT DAY DINNER

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator LEHMAN at the Roosevelt Day dinner sponsored by Americans for Democratic Action, at the Hotel Shoreham, Washington, D. C., on January 27, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

LIMIT ON MEDICAL STUDENTS—ARTICLE BY BENJAMIN FINE

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "College Heads Assail Doctors for Limit on Medical Students," written by Benjamin Fine and published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of January 12, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CAREER OF FULTON LEWIS, JR.—ARTICLES BY CHARLES VAN DEVANDER

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a series of three articles dealing with the career of Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., written by Mr. Charles Van Devander and published in the New York Post on December 5, 6, and 7, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

LIQUOR ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—STATEMENT OF REV. GERALD B. WINROD

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the subject of liquor advertising in interstate commerce, prepared for presentation to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, by Rev. Gerald B. Winrod, of Wichita, Kans., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FEDERAL DEFICIT—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS GLOBE-DEMOCRAT

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Cause for Worry," published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GENOCIDE TREATY

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two letters addressed to him and one addressed to the editor of the Union Leader, Manchester, N. H., in regard to the proposed genocide treaty, which appears in the Appendix.]

OPINION BY MARVIN JONES, CHIEF JUDGE, UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS, IN PEDERSEN AGAINST UNITED STATES

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the opinion rendered by Hon. Marvin Jones, chief judge, United States Court of Claims, in the case of Pedersen against the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

TITLE TO SUBMERGED LANDS

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the question of ownership of submerged lands within State boundaries, addressed by Walter R. Johnson, special counsel, National Association of Attorneys General, to A. A. Carmichael, attorney general of Alabama, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEDICAL ECONOMICS—EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY DR. R. B. ROBINS

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an address on medical economics delivered by Dr. R. B. Robins, of Camden, Ark., before the section on general practice, Southern Medical Association, on November 15, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

A COWBOY'S VIEWS ON GOVERNMENT SPENDING

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the subject of Government spending, written by a cowboy, "Neckyoke Jones," and published in the South Dakota Stockgrower magazine of the issue of November 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE COAL SITUATION IN WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, owing to the seriousness of the coal situation in western Pennsylvania, and the permanent effect it may have on the coal industry, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a very timely editorial from the Washington (Pa.) Observer, entitled "Time Has Come To Save Coal Industry."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME HAS COME TO SAVE COAL INDUSTRY

Officials of the United Mine Workers and representatives of the coal operators of the Nation are scheduled to meet Wednesday, in Washington in an effort to negotiate a new contract for the coal industry.

To one sitting on the sidelines, the time has come for two important steps to be taken.

1. One is to save the coal industry.

2. The second is to rehabilitate the earning capacities of the miners.

Both, of course, are interlocking. One cannot be accomplished without making the other possible. But both must be attained or this district will suffer a severe blow, one of the most serious in its history.

Markets have been lost in such large proportions since World War II that the economy of this district at least has been hit. Retail coal dealers report that they have lost about half their customers during the period.

Retail dealers supply coal for the most part for homes and institutions.

But turning to coal on the part of thousands as means of providing heat for homes is only part of the story.

Even railroads are discarding steam locomotives. They are turning to Diesels and electrically powered engines.

Industries, because of the uncertainty of coal production and costs, have turned to other fuels.

There will be uses for coal, many of them. But the cream is being skimmed off the top. These reductions in the uses of coal will be felt severely if there is a gradual decline in our economy in the years ahead, which can be anticipated and is already felt to some degree.

If the incomes of the miners are to be at a desirable level, it is imperative that coal retain all its present markets and add new ones wherever possible.

The time has come, therefore, when it would seem that the important thing to be accomplished from the viewpoint of the miner is stability of income.

Can this be accomplished by increasing costs?

Such a program does not mean that the miner, in view of other costs, should be called upon to make undue sacrifices.

Most miners we believe would be satisfied with present conditions if they could be assured of steadier work.

Steadiness of income for the miners should be foremost in the thoughts of the negotiators of the unions and operators.

Value of coal lands in this district, Washington and Greene Counties, are sure to be depressed.

Much of the income for support of the services afforded by political subdivisions, especially schools in numerous districts, comes from the coal industry.

A large percentage of the revenue of Washington County is collected from the coal industry. This source of income is being impaired. Real-estate valuations are being increased to provide more revenue.

If the coal industry were to become impaired to a greater degree, other sources of revenue would have to be devised.

Some municipalities have adopted a wage tax.

All things considered, it would seem therefore that welfare of Washington County calls for stabilization of income of the miners and of the industry as a whole.

The time has come for dreams of power and political considerations to be discarded to save the industry locally.

THE HYDROGEN BOMB — SUGGESTIONS FOR CONTROL OF SUPERWEAPONS

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the President of the United States has now given orders to build the hydrogen bomb—to create, in deliverable quantities, those chunks of the sun technically known as thermonuclear weapons.

Mr. President, I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point the statement made by the President of the United States in making known his decision. I invite attention to the last sentence in that statement, wherein he said:

> We shall also continue to examine all those factors that affect our program for peace and this country's security.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> It is part of my responsibility as Commander in Chief of the armed forces to see to it that our country is able to defend itself against any possible aggressor. Accordingly, I have directed the Atomic Energy Commission to continue its work on all forms of atomic weapons, including the so-called hydrogen or superbomb. Like all other work in the field of atomic weapons, it is being and will be carried forward on a basis consistent with the over-all objectives of our program for peace and security.
>
> This we shall continue to do until a satisfactory plan for international control of atomic energy is achieved. We shall also continue to examine all those factors that affect our program for peace and this country's security.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, in line with the President's intention of continuing that examination, I shall make my remarks today with the hope that the thoughts which are expressed may be somewhat helpful in the situation.

The scientists feel more confident that this most horrible of armaments can be developed successfully than they felt in 1940 when the original atomic bomb was under consideration. The hydrogen development will be cheaper than its uranium forerunner. Theoretically, it is without limit in destructive capacity. A weapon made of such material would destroy any military or other target, including the largest city on earth.

The President's decision was dictated by the severe realities of the world which we inhabit today. He had no choice, and his decision under present circumstances is right.

American renunciation of the hydrogen bomb would mean embracing the folly of disarmament by example. Our friends abroad would shrink away from us, seeing that we had lost power to defend the United States, much less to help defend Europe. Kapitza, the great Soviet physicist, and German scientists imported into Russia are noted for their special competence in the technical problems relating to hydrogen weapons. Densely populated American cities are made to order for an explosive that will level hundreds of square miles. Communism suffered a defeat in prestige when our democracy completed the earliest atomic bombs, but this prestige defeat would be more than recouped, assuming that Russia were to complete hydrogen bombs soonest. Furthermore, if the Kremlin believes that it cannot outproduce us in ordinary atomic weapons—imagine calling the destroyers of Hiroshima and Nagasaki ordinary—its logical strategy is to excel in the thermonuclear field. All such factors as these serve to warn America against complacency.

Voluntary acceptance of the idea of being less well armed than other nations in this era of our greatest vulnerability runs completely counter to the traditions of our leaders—and, I might add, to good common sense. In my judgment, a failure to press ahead with the hydrogen bomb might mean unconditional surrender—in advance—by the United States to alien forces of evil.

But please note my insistence that we possess no monopoly upon the hydrogen-bomb idea. If we win the race to build this weapon first, it will be only a matter of time—and possibly a short time—before the Kremlin achieves success also. Let me warn, with all the solemnity at my command, that building hydrogen bombs does not promise positive security for the United States; it promises only the negative result of averting for a few months or years well-nigh certain catastrophe. Do not for a moment overlook the obvious—that Soviet Russia broke our atomic-bomb monopoly sooner than we had expected, and she would break any hydrogen-bomb monopoly we enjoyed with equal or greater speed. Mr. President, I have the idea that in discussing this subject we are dealing with something which is extremely important. We are plunged into a truly terrible arms race.

What are we going to do about it?

There are really, I suggest, no more than two broad policies from which to choose. One consists in resigning ourselves to a generation of waging the cold war—that is, striving endlessly to contain Russia's outward pressure, pouring out our substance to stay ahead in the weapons competition even after the Kremlin becomes armed with hydrogen bombs, and cherishing indefinitely the hope that Soviet tyranny will somehow see the evil of its ways and reform itself from within. Arrayed against the choice of such a policy is 5,000 years of recorded history, which teaches again and again and again that armaments races lead to war—under today's conditions, hydrogen war.

But even if this policy could enable us to avoid armed conflict for a whole generation, it would undermine and corrupt that which we prize more highly even than the absence of hostilities: I refer to liberty. How is it possible for free institutions to flourish or even to maintain themselves in a situation in which defenses, civil and military, must be ceaselessly poised to meet an attack that might incinerate 50,000,000 Americans—not in the space of an evening but in the space of minutes?

Consider what sustained fear does to the individual—especially to the individual enterpriser. It constricts his imagination, paralyzes his initiative, and even affects his personal morality. It constitutes the most subtle and potent of poisons. Consider the crushing burdens already imposed upon our private-enterprise economy. Consider, too, the restrictions on freedom already brought about by the atomic bomb and by its pressures upon us to accept loyalty checks, espionage counter measures, and widening areas of official secrecy. For a preview of the future if the armaments race continues, multiply the effect of these factors by something like 1,000 times—to allow for the 1,000-times greater energy release of the hydrogen bomb—and if you are candid and realistic, I believe you will find it is difficult indeed to see a dominant role for freedom in such a picture. To stay alive we will find ourselves more and more compelled to imitate the totalitarian rival.

The other broad policy which we may choose consists in moving heaven and earth to stop the atomic armaments race, to establish world-wide atomic peace, and to make possible atomic-created abundance among all men. In pursuing that policy we would tap to the roots the resources of our ingenuity and imagination; we would regard no suggestion as too startling or unconventional for careful consideration; and we would be guided, disciplined, and inspired by our code of ethics and democratic, peace-loving decencies.

It was from this kind of philosophy that we generated our original proposal for international control—a proposal which should constitute a source of pride to every citizen of our land. When the atom was split for destruction during the recent war, a transcendent moral problem came into being; and the responsibility for moral leadership on an equal order of magnitude rested upon us, since we had made the first bomb. There were those who advised us to advance no special or unusual peace plan, and who hewed to the same pseudo logic that now sees us waging the cold war for another generation. Fortunately, a wiser counsel prevailed and we rose to the moral challenge. We have written a page of history, Mr. President, that will live as long as history is read, and will reflect its glory upon those who formulated our program to serve God and mankind.

In essence we offered to share all that is good in atomic energy, and we asked only for the minimum safeguards, as operative upon ourselves as upon others, that would prevent the evil in atomic energy from being used to destroy us. We proposed that men of all countries, including Russians, come to America under the auspices of the United Nations and inspect our atomic activities and share in the control of our atomic raw materials and the operation of our atomic plants—all for the purpose of assuring themselves, to their own complete satisfaction, that we had honored our promise to exploit the atom for peace, and peace alone. Equally, we proposed that the same just and necessary protective measures be made effective throughout the globe.

More than 3½ years have elapsed since Bernard Baruch, as spokesman for the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, presented our official plan to the United Nations. He delivered one of the greatest addresses known to the English language, saying:

> We are here to make a choice between the quick and the dead.
>
> That is our business.
>
> Behind the black portent of the new atomic age lies a hope which, seized upon with faith, can work our salvation. If we fail, then we have damned every man to be the slave of fear. Let us not deceive ourselves: We must elect world peace or world destruction.

We may as well bluntly recognize, here and now, that in the ledger of life and death, the ledger of world peace and world destruction, there is only one entry on the hopeful side: the study, the improvement, and finally the endorsement of the American proposal by an overwhelming majority of the United Nations. On the death side of the ledger, on the side of world destruction, there have been repeated entries—a succession which began when Mr. Gromyko, as the Soviet delegate, stated that our plan is unacceptable either in whole or in part. For the sake of confusing world opinion, the Kremlin has retreated somewhat from that statement, using phrases too vague to define; but basically Mr. Gromyko's words reflect the Soviet attitude as accurately today as when they were uttered.

It is my intense conviction that our decision, born of necessity, to build the hydrogen bomb must be accompanied by the immediate initiation of a moral crusade for peace having far greater potential effect than any physical weapon, even chunks of the sun.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Before the Senator leaves the point he has just mentioned, I should like to inquire whether it is correct that our offer of 3½ years ago, the plan of Mr. Baruch, is still just as good today as it was when it was made.

Mr. McMAHON. I say to the Senator that because it was objectively right, because it was based fundamentally on the scientific facts which are inherent in this problem, the American plan, which now has ceased to be the American plan and is the plan of the United Nations, is as objectively correct today in its essentials as it was on the day when it was formulated.

Mr. President, if we should fail in the business of working in a crusade for peace, we would deal a severe blow both to our moral position and to our fervent hopes for a secure future. The people of the United States want harmony among nations infinitely more than they want a new bomb. A fresh proposal for atomic peace, as dramatic as it is sincere, impresses me as urgently desirable.

Yet, through Bernard Baruch's immortal address of more than 3 years ago, we have already undertaken one major peace effort—and it was unsuccessful in that today we remain as far distant from atomic agreement as when we started. Why did this honest peace effort fail to impact successfully upon all mankind?

The answer is obvious and may be summarized in three words: Russia's iron curtain. The people of Russia, thanks to the iron curtain, have been prevented from knowing the true and desperate nature of the atomic crisis. They have been kept from learning, due to the iron curtain, how we extend toward them the hand of friendship and offer a just atomic control plan for their protection and incalculable benefit as well as our own. Any information on the subject that reaches the Russian people is first twisted and distorted into the red focus of the Kremlin's official line.

We all know why the Soviet elite members maintain their curtain. It is because, using Churchill's phrase, "they fear our friendship more than they fear our enmity." A prison cannot be operated with too many doors and windows unguarded and unlocked. The men of the Kremlin do not want us to look in. Above all, they do not want their own people to look out. This explains not only the Soviet clinging to the curtain but also the Soviet rejection of an atomic inspectorate and other essential controls.

It is completely accurate to say that, in final analysis, Russia's iron curtain is responsible for our enormously reluctant decision to make hydrogen bombs, for the curtain prevents the Russian people from appreciating that we want and seek atomic peace; they, therefore, bring no effective pressure upon their rulers to accept atomic peace; the rulers maintain their absolute sway through popular ignorance; and the atomic armaments race rushes madly onward.

But though we may justly blame the iron curtain, we must also blame ourselves for failing to bring our message of peace and conciliation adequately to the attention even of those peoples who enjoy reasonably free access to information. Few of our own leaders have recognized that global control of atomic energy is the heart question of all foreign policy and that the German dilemma, the Austrian treaty, the status of Japan, and like matters are relatively insignificant compared to the overriding issue of whether or not more atomic weapons shall enter into existence with each month and year which passes.

If a new crusade for peace is not to miss its objective, as did the peace effort which we launched with such high hopes in 1946, we must not only crack the iron curtain and gain the ear of the Russian people, but we must also gain the ear of people on the near side of the barrier, including the many in our own country who do not yet grasp what is at stake.

We have spent $29,000,000 a year on what we are pleased to call the Voice of America. It should be called the whisper of America. We spend in this country over $30,000,000 a year to advertise cosmetics, and $29,000,000, I repeat, to sell the most precious commodity we have to sell—freedom, itself.

All over the world today—perhaps because listlessness and mediocrity have characterized our attempts to sell what America is, what America wants, and what America intends—there exists misunderstanding as to our attitude. The 30 years of vilification emanating from behind the iron curtain in Moscow have taken a toll on our reputation as a peace-loving and a peace-living Nation. There are millions of people abroad who observe our armaments expenditures and fail to grasp that these are for self-defense.

They should appreciate the truth, but they do not. We assume that our actual good intentions and actual good feelings must be known to them; but they see that we devote billions to guns, tanks, planes, and atomic weapons—and day and night the Communist propaganda machine hammers into them the theme that American armaments are designed for conquest. Even worse, they do not see—at least with the same clarity—the huge resources being diverted to munitions inside Russia; for the iron curtain conceals such activity and even enables Mr. Vishinsky to deceive multitudes by claiming that his country uses atomic energy to move mountains.

I advocate, Mr. President, a United States program of attention-arresting foreign broadcasts that would compare in size and scope to the Soviet effort along this line and that would genuinely deserve the name, Voice of America. I favor exploring the efficacy of printing

millions of leaflets for world-wide circulation, explaining a new United States proposal for atomic peace. We should publicly and repeatedly challenge the Kremlin to make known the terms of this proposal to newspaper readers and radio listeners inside Russia. We should publicly and repeatedly challenge the Kremlin to permit a meeting of the United Nations in Moscow itself, so that the trend of international discussions and our own sincerity would be more likely to enter the mental horizon of the average Russian.

There are other possible methods of creating a window in the iron curtain. Some have already been made known to the Senate; others will occur to us if we give the problem sufficient thought; all should receive the most painstaking scrutiny. At almost any cost we must assure that the Russian people have opportunity to consider, side by side, the atomic proposals of their own rulers and our atomic proposals, and that the Russian people act as part of the world jury which brings in a verdict covering this monumental issue.

There remains the question of what fresh atomic offer we should advance as means of igniting a moral crusade for peace. Recently some observers, quite properly conscious of the decisive position occupied by atomic energy, have argued that a board should be appointed, analagous to the one which prepared the famous American report in 1946, and that such a board shall take a new look at the entire control problem—especially with a view toward reevaluating the need for certain technical phases of what is now the United Nations plan. Yet the scientific facts surrounding the hydrogen bomb more than ever render necessary the general kind of technical program which the United Nations, after exhaustive study, has approved. More than ever it is true that an ineffective agreement would be worse than no agreement at all. More than ever there is no escape from strict control of raw materials, strict control of plants, and continuous inspection. We can enter into no scheme of a type which would only serve to mislead us and induce a false sense of security.

The new approach I have in mind is somewhat different. Although it flows from many weeks, and indeed months, of continuous reflection, I offer it only as an example of the bold steps which the Soviet atomic explosion, the shadow of the hydrogen bomb, and the pyramiding arms race should persuade us to consider.

We now spend about $15,000,000,000 annually for armaments. Why not offer to take two-thirds of this sum, or $10,000,000,000, and, instead of amassing sterile weapons, use it to foster peace throughout the world for a 5-year period? Why not offer to spread the annual $10,000,000,000 over three programs: President Truman's Point IV proposal, development of atomic energy everywhere for peace, and general economic aid and help to all countries, including Russia? Such a global Marshall plan might combine with the marvelous power of peacetime atomic energy to generate universal material progress and a universal cooperative spirit. In exchange for our own contribution of $10,000,000,000 annually, which we would save from the military budget, we would ask, first, general acceptance of an effective program for international control of atomic energy, and, second, an agreement by all countries, enforced through inspection, that two-thirds of their present spending upon armaments be devoted toward constructive ends. Administration of the annual $10,000,000,000 which we offered to make available for 5 years would be carried out through the United Nations.

Such a proposal, if advanced by our Government, might vividly bring home to all the world's population—in a manner far more successful than we have so far used—the profundity of our desire for peace. It would accomplish this result even if it accomplished nothing else. If the proposal were actually accepted, we would have concluded the cheapest monetary bargain in the history of the world; we would have probably saved mankind from destruction by fire; and we would have paved the way toward a new era of unimagined abundance for all men, based upon atomic energy constructively harnessed.

At present only one-third of the world's 2,200,000,000 people receive enough food to sustain life on a decent basis. The other two-thirds live continuously at the margin of starvation. Mr. President, it is atomic energy that opens up the vision of expanding material decencies until there is enough to go around for all, until every last hungry mouth is filled. Perhaps, through the expenditure of a few extra tens of millions of dollars we can conquer the riddle of photosynthesis and extract from the processes of plant growth a means of multiplying many times the world's food supply. Perhaps through atomic power for industry and agriculture we can transform the deserts of Africa, Asia, and the Americas into blooming crop-producing acres, and the arid hills of the world into gardens. It is almost impossible to overestimate what all-out concentration upon atomic energy for peace might accomplish in terms of remaking and improving the physical environment of mankind.

I might point out that we have already poured billions of dollars into foreign economic aid, asking nothing in return, and still Communist propaganda has blackened our motives in the eyes of millions of men. Here, in accordance with my suggestion, we would ask effective control of the atom and substantial disarmament—which every man and woman in the world has a right to expect without any further inducement on our part. Yet we would in fact provide further inducement, in the form of $10,000,000,000 annually for 5 years, as proof of our overwhelming will to peace.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

At the same time it goes without saying that we would provide no such funds unless they were associated with the measures needed to rescue humanity from hell on earth, control of the atom, and disarmament.

I suppose that my suggestions will be termed impractical or theoretical in some quarters. Before they are condemned, however, I would ask that whoever condemns them produce a better proposal.

I am willing to have my suggestions today judged against the background of Mr. Baruch's words spoken more than 3 years ago—words which I have quoted and which I now repeat:

> We are here to make a choice between the quick and the dead.
>
> That is our business.
>
> Behind the black portent of the new atomic age lies a hope which, seized upon with faith, can work our salvation. If we fail, then we have damned every man to be the slave of fear. Let us not deceive ourselves: We must elect world peace or world destruction.

Mr. President, I would write those words upon the heart and mind of every statesman in the world in the crisis in which we find ourselves today.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I have only a brief statement to make, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

This much, Mr. President, I would add: In 1945 and 1946, when our thoughts were focused upon the Hiroshima bomb, we enjoyed an opportunity to wage atomic peace that somehow, despite the magnificence and generosity of our proposal to the United Nations, we did not fully exploit. Our present concern with the hydrogen bomb furnishes a second opportunity. I do not think a third will be given us.

I believe that every morning each Member of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and each high official of the executive branch of this Government, should glance at the sun and reflect that what he sees there, millions of miles away, threatens to be recreated on this earth, in our own cities, in Washington, New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, and New Orleans. This is a time for soul-searching, for Nation-wide and world-wide debate, and for the launching and maintaining of that moral crusade for peace which alone can save us and lead mankind along the righteous paths of security, abundance, and liberty.

I now yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say to the very able Senator from Connecticut, who is the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee, that I think he has made a very great discussion of the subject on the floor of the Senate. For the purpose of clarifying the subject a little, I should like to ask one or two questions which I feel are entirely within the security surrounding this subject.

Does the Senator believe we can have adequate safeguards in the field of atomic energy unless there is a full inspection system established? I think the Senator has made that point in his remarks, but I should like to reemphasize it at this time.

Mr. McMAHON. No; we cannot have any security worthy of the name without a thoroughgoing inspection system. Of course, it was the realization of that

fact which brought it into the proposal. I think it should be emphasized, for I should like to say to the Senator from California that when we made our proposals they were not based on political considerations; they were based upon scientific considerations; in other words, the minimum safeguards which would make the proposals work.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is the Senator's viewpoint, is it not, that such inspection would have to cover both the field of so-called peaceful development of atomic energy and the field of weapon development? There have been some persons who have suggested that perhaps if we should permit inspection of one segment of the activity, that might suffice. Is it not the Senator's opinion that, because of the character of the subject with which we are dealing, there must be inspection from the raw material to the end product in all its processes?

Mr. McMAHON. I think the hyrdogen bomb only emphasizes and underwrites that necessity, for reasons which I would not go into at the moment, but which I know the Senator, being a member of the committee, can appreciate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The second question which I should like to ask the Senator, if he will further yield——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'CONOR in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield further to the Senator from California?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Assume for the moment that the Senator's proposal should be accepted by 99 percent of the nations of the earth, the one exception being the Soviet Union. Does the Senator believe it would be feasible in those cases to proceed to cut off $10,000,000,000 from the American defensive program for general distribution along the line the Senator has indicated, unless the Soviet Union itself should be a party to an agreement establishing adequate controls?

Mr. McMAHON. I think the Senator's question answers itself. I will say for the record, of course not. The only danger facing us today comes from the Soviet Union, which has refused during the past 3½ years to accept what all the rest of the other countries of the world HAS accepted. So, as I look at the world today, certainly from the point of view of an armed attack, it is only from the Soviet Union that such an attack could be envisaged.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has concluded his remarks, but before he takes his seat I desire to express my deep appreciation of the sincerity and the courage with which he has discussed the great problem which was the subject of his address. There is no greater problem in the world than the armament race in which we are now engaged, and I myself wish to thank the Senator personally for the valuable contribution he is making to public understanding of the gravity of the issue.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. TAYLOR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Speaking only for myself, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Connecticut for the extraordinarily brilliant and moving address which he has just delivered, an address of the highest statesmanship, permeated by Christian principles, the very essence of the Christian religion. I hope we may all study this address very carefully and give it our prayerful consideration. I express my deep sense of personal gratitude for what the Senator has said, and the pride I have in being a humble Member of this body, associated with him in the work of the Senate.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator very much. I now yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut on the statesmanlike address he has just made. In my opinion, if we had had more of this type of thinking beginning with the end of the war, and even before the end of the war, we might not be faced with the terrible dilemma which confronts us today.

I am hopeful that it is still not too late for something to be done. I feel that we have handicaps to overcome. The fact that the evil influence of Dillon, Read & Co. was largely responsible for shaping our foreign policy, and creating mistrust in many areas of the world, has placed us at a disadvantage; but I believe that with thinking in our country of the type just expressed in the splendid address of the Senator there is still hope.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the Senator places me in a somewhat difficult position, because he has complimented me, I know most sincerely, for what I have said, yet I cannot let go unchallenged his assertion that the foreign policy of the United States has been written by any banking firm, be it Dillon, Read & Co. or any other firm.

Mr. President, I am rather proud of the foreign policy of the United States of the past 5 years, when I contrast it with the policy I have seen elsewhere of rushing nations into slavery, taking away their liberties, destroying their economy, suppressing freedom. I cannot help contrasting such a policy as that with the work of the United States in the past 5 years, when every time we have raised our hand it has been a hand bearing gifts, not only material gifts of bread, but also we have stood up, as I see it, for the cause of liberty.

It was not from Dillon, Read & Co. that the opposition came to the proposal that was made on June 14, 1946. It came from Mr. Gromyko, and I state to my friend the Senator from Idaho, as I said in my address, that the Russians have not deviated from the position they took at that time by one jot or one tittle.

Mr. President, it was with no effort to exacerbate the already strained relations between the Soviet Union and ourselves that I rose to make this address. We cannot tolerate without speaking up the attack which I feel has been made by the Senator from Idaho on the sincerity of our position, and which does not help the cause of peace.

Mr. President, I regret the necessity of saying what I have said. I want peace. I want peace as much as does anyone in the world. I want it for myself, for my family, for my country, and for the whole world, and I have thought a good deal about what it will mean if there is a rent in the fabric of peace. But I say that, even more than that, I want freedom, and I hope that those who have suppressed freedom, wherever they have gone and wherever they are, will at last realize that in the light of the threat which has now been projected over the horizon of the world, they cannot continue to proceed in the course they have pursued during the past 3½ years.

I am hopeful that if we shall adopt the proposal I have suggested here today, it may tip the balance. I know that the peoples of the world to whom the proposal reaches can never again be in any doubt as to who is the potential aggressor against the peace of the world.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and express my deep appreciation to the Senator from Connecticut for his constructive, humane, and spiritual remarks, which go to the heart of the matter now so much in our thoughts. I know of no subject which is more vital at the present time than the one which has just been discussed with so much wisdom and foresight by the Senator from Connecticut. His address was a great address, and a great public document.

I agree with the Senator that we have no choice but to protect ourselves against possible attack by all practicable, legitimate means, and because of that it is our responsibility and our duty to keep ourselves just as strong as we possibly can.

On the other hand, I commend with all my heart the suggestion made that we allow no opportunity to pass when it will be possible for us to appeal to the conscience of the world, including the conscience of the peoples behind the iron curtain.

I believe the suggestion made by the Senator from Connecticut is one which should be given the closest, the deepest, the most sympathetic thought, in the hope that we can take steps which will assure our strong defense, and at the same time leave no stone unturned to bring about lasting peace and security throughout the world.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleague, the Senator from New York, in expressing deep appreciation to the senior Senator from Connecticut. Without taking time to express fully the practical import of the bold suggestion made by the Senator from Connecticut, I nevertheless wish to say that I think he has thrown out a challenge to the conscience of mankind.

After the First World War the United States of America rejected the League of Nations and failed the hopes of the peoples of the world. After the second World War the Soviet Union has by its actions blocked peaceful international procedures in the United Nations, and the Soviet Union has failed the humane hopes of the peoples of the world. Whatever else comes of the bold proposal made by my distinguished colleague from Connecticut, I hope that it will give momentum to the movement to strengthen the United Nations by amendments to its Charter designed to abolish the veto, strengthen the World Court, widen the responsibility of the Assembly of the United Nations, and provide for an international police force to prevent aggression and enforce peace in the world.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. In asking the Senator to yield, I desire to state first that the question which I should like to ask him are not in any sense animated by any disagreement with the President's view that the hydrogen bomb should be developed. I am not at all contesting or denying the validity of the conclusion of the President.

I should like to have in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time, if the Senator will be kind enough to respond to my questions, something of the basis—not the scientific basis but the legal basis, if you please—on which the President acted. I therefore should like to ask the Senator a very few questions along this line.

In order that my point may be perfectly clear, I should like to preface it with the statement that I have observed in the press from day to day references to the fact that the decision as to whether we should develop the hydrogen bomb was going to be made by the President alone. I observed in the statement, made by the President of the United States, the responsibility which he found resting upon himself and the conclusion at which he arrived. I ask the Senator from Connecticut in the first place, whether he placed in the RECORD the short three-paragraph statement of the President?

Mr. McMAHON. I did at the commencement of my address.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator. I should like to ask the Senator what is his understanding as to the basis which induced the President to think it was his legal responsibility to make this decision?

Mr. McMAHON. In the act under which the Atomic Energy Commission operates it is provided that the President shall determine from time to time the number of atomic bombs which shall be made, and shall give his decision to the Commission once a year. The Senator from Missouri has a copy of the act in front of him.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator for the record whether he is referring to section 6, subsection 2, which, omitting some preliminary matter, reads as follows:

> The Commission is authorized to—
> 2. Engage in the production of atomic bombs, atomic-bomb parts, or other military weapons utilizing fissionable materials, except that such activities shall be carried on only to the extent that the express consent and direction of the President of the United States has been obtained, which consent and direction shall be obtained at least once each year.

Is that the section to which the Senator referred?

Mr. McMAHON. I should think that would cover it. I should also say to the Senator that, of course, I feel the decision was primarily up to the President. As to its implementation, of course, the Congress of the United States must exercise its powers by way of appropriations, if in no other way. But I feel that the decision primarily was one which the President had to make under the law.

Mr. DONNELL. And the law to which the Senator refers is the portion of section 6 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 which I just read. I assume that that would have been the basis of the President's decision. But I observe, with some considerable interest and some question, that the President, as I read his statement, does not base it on that section of the law, but bases it instead on the responsibility which he has as Commander in Chief of the armed forces. I read to the Senator from Connecticut for his comment this portion of the statement of the President as reported in the Washington Post yesterday. The President said:

> It is part of my responsibility as Commander in Chief of the armed forces to see to it that our country is able to defend itself against any possible aggressor. Accordingly—

If I may interpolate, I understand he is stating that by reason of this responsibility. I resume reading from the President's statement:

> Accordingly I have directed the Atomic Energy Commission to continue its work on all forms of atomic weapons, including the so-called hydrogen or superbomb.

And then, if I may complete the President's observation so that it will be before us in its entirety at this point, the President further said:

> Like all other work in the field of atomic weapons, it is being and will be carried forward on a basis consistent with the over-all objectives of our program for peace and security.
>
> This we shall continue to do until a satisfactory plan for international control of atomic energy is achieved. We shall also continue to examine all those factors that affect our program for peace and this country's security.

So, I ask the Senator from Connecticut, most respectfully, whether he does not agree with me that the President in making this fateful statement, as it is termed by the Washington Post, and doubtless by others, did not assign the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 as the basis of the legal duty cast upon him, but took the position that he was acting as Commander in Chief of the armed forces, and that it was in accordance with his responsibility as such Commander in Chief that he was making this determination. Does not the Senator agree that that is the language of the President?

Mr. McMAHON. I would say in answer to the Senator from Missouri that the President of the United States had a legal right to make the decision he did, and I am happy that he had that legal right, because there was a great necessity for the decision being made. I shall not now engage with the Senator in a constitutional argument as to the President's powers under his authority as Commander in Chief. I should like to point out to the Senator that probably his point is now made by calling attention to the language that was used. But certainly the Senator will agree with me that the important thing is that the President had the legal right to make the decision he did make.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes, I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The query in my mind, which I shall mention in a moment, is along the line of whether the President has the power as Commander in Chief to make an ultimate decision of this kind independent of the action of Congress. Again, Mr. President, I may say, so there will be no misunderstanding on this proposition, that I am not disagreeing at all with the view taken by the President that the hydrogen bomb should be developed. But, as I understand the action taken by the President, as reported yesterday in the Washington Post, he did not purport to act by reason of the legal duty cast on him by the act of Congress, but upon what he considered to be his constitutional duty as Commander in Chief of the armed forces.

Mr. President, that leads me to ask the Senator from Connecticut whether he does not agree with me, as he has already stated in substance he does, that ultimately the decision as to whether the expenditures, which may be vast, in carrying forward the hydrogen bomb program, are dependent upon action by Congress, and that the President has no legal or constitutional power to bind the Government, without the consent of the Congress, to the expenditure of such funds? Does not the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. McMAHON. I do not agree with that statement. I will say to the Senator that the President acted in his capacity as Commander in Chief, to whom additional powers were given by the law to which the Senator has referred. He was given powers in addition to his constitutional powers. Of course, the President of the United States cannot order anyone to make anything if the money is not available with which to make it. The Appropriations Committee will be considering the appropriations of the Atomic Energy Commission, and if the Congress of the United States should vote to cut off all funds for all atomic

energy development and abolish the Atomic Energy Commission, I do not suppose there would be much the President could do about it.

On the other hand, he can order, and he has ordered, the Commission to go ahead to the limit of the money available for the purpose of research and development.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I have no doubt that under the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 the express consent and direction of the President must be obtained as a prerequisite to the authority of the Commission to engage in the production of military weapons utilizing fissionable materials. I should like to have noted in the record at this time, first, that in his statement the President did not say that he was relying upon this act of Congress. He based his action solely on his constitutional responsibility as Commander in Chief of the armed forces. Second, I should like the record to show that article I, section 9 of the Constitution of the United States provides:

> No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

Article I, section 1, provides:

> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in the Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives;

Article IV, section 3, provides:

> The Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

Mr. President, I simply want the RECORD to show—and I am sure the Senator will have no objection—that, while I have no disagreement with the finding of the President that the hydrogen bomb should be developed, I wish to make it perfectly clear that the ultimate power of providing the funds, if any, with which to carry forward this project rests, under the Constitution, in the making of appropriations according to law; and that the legislative power of the Government is vested not in the executive department but in the Congress of the United States.

This leads me, Mr. President, to ask the Senator a final question, if I may.

Mr. McMAHON. Before the Senator asks the question will he permit me to make a statement?

Mr. DONNELL. I shall be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. McMAHON. As to the last part of the Senator's statement, relating to the power of Congress over the purse, I have no doubt about that, nor has anyone else who knows anything about the Constitution. But the Constitution does constitute the President of the United States as the Commander in Chief. To the Commander in Chief the Congress of the United States gave certain additional powers. What were those additional powers? To authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to make atomic weapons and to make them only under his orders. We delegated that power.

Mr. DONNELL. That is correct.

Mr. McMAHON. When the President has made his decision as Commander in Chief I cannot see the great relevancy of the fact that he did not say, "Under section 6A I have this right." That is implied in his statement. He acts in accordance with the law. I cannot see the Senator's point.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I am sure that the announcement which appeared in the press to the effect that the decision as to whether or not we shall make hydrogen bombs will be made exclusively by the President, and that it will be made by him alone, was not couched in the official language of the President. At any rate, I am not undertaking to say that it was.

Mr. President, I have not the slightest objection in the world to the President's complying with the duties which are set forth in section 6 (a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1949. I have twice previously stated that I am not disagreeing with his viewpoint that the hydrogen bomb should be made. I am disagreeing with one inference which might be drawn from the statement that the decision will be made exclusively by the President. I am disagreeing with any conclusion that Congress is without power in the premise, because, as the Senator has correctly observed in his reference to the power of the purse string, that power does rest in the Congress of the United States.

May I ask the Senator whether he is able at this time to enlighten the Senate as to the approximate amount of money which will be required to carry on this program?

First I should like to refer to an interesting article by Alfred Friendly, published in the Washington Post yesterday. I should like to read a short excerpt from the article:

> The first published estimates of the probable cost, unofficial and only guesses based on undisclosed evidence, indicated an expense of from two to four billion dollars.

Mr. Friendly, the writer of the article, does not concur with that estimate. He says:

> This reporter believes, from current information, that Urey's estimate is too low. But he also believes it is far closer to reality than the two- to four-billion-dollar guess.
>
> As a working hypothesis, it seems safe to take a figure of cost as a few hundred million dollars.

Will the Senator be kind enough to tell us, if he is at liberty to do so, and if he can, what is the best available estimate at this time as to the expense which we may look forward to being confronted with in the development of this weapon, at least so far as the initial expense is concerned.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not feel that I can go into those figures today with the Senator. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, in executive session, has received some estimates as to the cost, both of development and production. I wish the Senator would "let me off," as the saying goes, from answering that question today.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to do so. I greatly appreciate the courtesy of the Senator and his frank responses.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It might be added that to disclose such figures may give an indication of the method to be pursued in the making of the bomb or bombs. Perhaps for that reason, if not for others, there is some need at the present time for keeping the matter restricted.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator very much. Perhaps he has better satisfied the Senator from Missouri than I have, although I am sure that the Senator from Missouri took my word for it.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, because I was momentarily engaged in conversation with another Senator, I did not hear the statement of the Senator from Colorado. Would he oblige me by repeating it?

Mr. MILLIKIN. If the Senator missed some of my pearls of wisdom, I shall be very glad to repeat them. I believe that at this time a disclosure of the amount of money required for this project could have the effect of disclosing the way in which we intend to proceed to make the bomb. Therefore, I believe there is some reason at this time for preserving some reticence on the subject.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I can readily appreciate the point. I understood the Senator from Connecticut to say that in his opinion the matter of appropriations would soon be before the Senate. Am I correct in that?

Mr. McMAHON. The hearings on appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission began in the House of Representatives about 2 or 3 days ago, in executive session.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator contemplate that the subject matter will be before Congress within a few weeks?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to observe that I think it is very timely that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, who probably knows more about the implications of atomic energy and the development of the bomb than does any other Member of Congress, should make this statement and give his viewpoint to Members of Congress and to the Nation. I feel that the proposal of the distinguished Senator deserves a great deal of consideration. I am glad that statesmen and deep thinkers like the Senator from Connecticut are considering additional ways and means by which we can exercise our position of leadership in the cause of peace.

I was very much impressed this morning, as I know the distinguished Senator was, with a cartoon by Herblock in the Washington Post, in which the ugly finger of the hydrogen bomb is shown pointing at a man carrying a brief case bearing the inscription "Democratic statesmanship," and the title of the cartoon is 'One of Us Is Going To Settle Things for a Long Time."

It is encouraging to see the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy taking the lead in trying to find ways to settle these problems by democratic statesmanship.

As the distinguished Senator from Connecticut knows, many of us have had the feeling that we should try to explore other lines of bringing the free people of the North Atlantic together in the interest of peace and security so that we can have more nearly an Atlantic Union than is provided by the Atlantic Pact. I hope the distinguished Senator from Connecticut feels that these proposals are worth exploring. In view of the fact that about 50 Members of the Senate of the United States have expressed, by the sponsorship of either the Atlantic Union proposal, the United World Federalist, or some of the other proposals, their unwillingness to rely upon the Atlantic Pact, a military pact, as an element of our foreign policy, I hope the distinguished Senator from Connecticut will help us to obtain consideration and action by the Senate upon some of these proposals.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator. I am on the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, which began this morning hearings on the various proposals which have been made. When the Atlantic Union proposal comes before the subcommittee for consideration—which will be on Friday, I believe—I hope the Senator will appear before the subcommittee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I should like to associate myself with what has been said in the address with which the Senate has been favored today by the Senator from Connecticut. It seems to me very heartening that the Senator should take pains to illuminate the subject at the present time, when all the people of our country are interested in it, and to give all the information he feels he is at liberty to give about the progress and purpose of the decision which has been reached by the President. I think there is no one better able, both in actual capacity and in the position he holds, to render that service to the people at the present time.

I know that the distinguished Senator from Missouri has indicated all the points of criticism he could find or which could be found by anyone in the address of the Senator from Connecticut, but I could not follow his criticism of the language the President used in announcing his decision. Apparently it was that the President did not give the proper source of the authority under which he issued the statement. The Senator said the President has certain constitutional authority and that other authority is given him by special legislation enacted by the Congress. Why the President should refer to the special legislation, in his statement, any more than he should refer to the Constitution of the United States as the source of his authority, I fail to understand.

However, if that is the only criticism which can be leveled at the substance of the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut, I think he is to be congratulated, because the Senators of the United States have an infinite capacity for pointing out holes in anyone's argument or lapses in correctness of expression.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES FOR WAR

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, during my visit home during the recess, I had occasion to contact many of the people of my State in regard to the very perplexing question of taxes and a balanced budget. On many of those occasions, I pointed out that the real problem of balancing the budget and the real problem of taxation in the United States rest not so much with governmental functions as such, not so much with criticism of what have loosely been termed "welfare measures," but with the great amount of money we spend for the stupid business called war, a business which the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] touched on today, by which he did a great service to the American people and to the Congress.

Approximately 73 percent of the present budget is for war or for things which have been caused by war or its adjuncts. In view of that situation, it seems to me that when we talk about balancing budgets, when we talk about taxation, when we talk about cleaning our financial house, probably we had better go to the corner where the dust is piled the highest.

Mr. President, along those lines, I present and ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, an excellent editorial entitled "The Warfare State—Not the Welfare State," published in the Progressive.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WARFARE STATE

The President's 1950–51 budget, second highest in the Nation's peacetime history, drew howls of protest from the conservative press and politicians. The $42,000,000,000 budget, and its $5,000,000,000 deficit, were blasted as "the bankrupting cost of the welfare state" and as "laying the bricks on the Socialist road to economic ruin."

Analysis of the budget shows how weirdly inaccurate such charges are. Nearly three-quarters of the budget's forty-two billions—72.4 percent to be exact—is earmarked for war, whether for past war, the present cold war, or preparation for future wars.

Item-by-item break-down of the recommended expenditures reveals that of every dollar of expenditure provided in the budget:

Thirty-one and nine-tenths cents will go directly for national defense.

Thirteen and two-tenths cents will pay interest on the national debt, most of it incurred in the two World Wars.

Fourteen and three-tenths cents will be disbursed in the form of veterans' benefits.

Eleven and one-tenth cents will be paid in international security grants to foreign nations.

One and nine-tenths cents are earmarked for atomic-energy development.

The total of these war and defense appropriations is 72.4 cents out of every dollar of Federal spending.

Conversely, the total of all Government activities which could be classified as welfare or social-service programs comes to 18.8 cents, of which aid to the aged, the blind, and the otherwise handicapped comes to 3.6 cents; other social-welfare and health services, 2.8 cents; purchase of housing mortgages, 2.3 cents; housing and slum clearance, 1 cent; aid to agriculture, 3.6 cents; rural electrification and rural housing, 1.6 cents; and subsidies to business, 3.9 cents.

Significantly, the last item is the largest but, of course, provokes the least outcry. These subsidies go to newspapers and magazines, the merchant marine, and air lines, all privately owned and operated for private profit.

We shall be watching with great interest when the economy bloc goes into action. We have no doubt that there is waste in the Federal establishment and that sound economies can be made without disturbing vital functions of the Government. But we're convinced that any genuine effort at economy must be made with the understanding that the budget finances a warfare state, not a welfare state.

CODIFICATION OF THE ARTICLES OF WAR

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4080) to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard, and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the consideration of House bill 4080, the unfinished business, and the debate on it, Mr. Felix Larkin and Mr. Robert Hadock may sit with me on the floor of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REDUCTION IN AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, yesterday the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, appeared before the Senate Agriculture Committee seeking its advice as to what action it would recommend the Department of Agriculture take in disposing of the 50,000,000 bushels of surplus potatoes. Mr. Brannan gave the committee two alternatives, namely—

First. To destroy them, which would mean the greatest willful destruction of food by any government in recorded history.

Second. To spend an additional $12,000,000 to $15,000,000 and (a) pay the freight and give them away to school lunch programs that cannot afford the cost of transporting them, and (b) give some away for industrial use.

What Mr. Brannan failed to emphasize to the committee yesterday was the fact that this 50,000,000 bushels of potatoes represents but a small percentage of the $3,500,000,000 worth of surplus commodities which the Department of Agriculture now has on hand. For instance, the inventory records on January 1, 1950, disclosed that they had on hand at that time commodities valued at a total of $3,645,129,317.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a table

showing the inventories of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of January 1, 1950.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tobacco, 367,258,290 pounds	$151,891,629
Cotton, 6,036,588 bales	955,109,372
Wheat, 465,226,944 bushels	996,719,026
Linseed oil, 394,827,620 pounds	111,337,600
Flaxseed, 13,943,222 bushels	88,344,527
Corn, 510,654,685 bushels	713,128,735
Dried eggs, 69,036,207 pounds (210,000,000 dozen)	89,317,233
Butter, 96,260,088 pounds	59,518,797
Wool, 69,403,900 pounds	53,510,467
Dry edible beans, 4,850,795 hundredweight	42,859,926
Barley, 24,626,019 bushels	35,088,096
Dried milk, 215,799,300 pounds	27,399,460
Other	320,904,449
Total	3,645,129,317

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the day is rapidly approaching when the Department of Agriculture is going to be confronted with a similar proposal of wholesale destruction of all these commodities. To complicate the situation further, the House yesterday passed a bill to add to this year's cotton crop from one to two million acres, and at the same time added an unspecified number of acres to this year's peanut acreage. The cotton and peanut farmers were assisted in this action by representatives of the wheat and corn areas, apparently with an understanding that their request, expected at a later date, for increased acreage on both wheat and corn will be supported by the cotton and peanut representatives. This action was taken notwithstanding the fact that today the Government already has on hand nearly $1,000,000,000 worth of cotton and nearly 75,000,000 pounds of peanuts.

It does not make sense for the Secretary of Agriculture to express concern over the situation with which he is now confronted, in that he apparently feels it necessary to recommend wholesale destruction of the commodities. The program of high, excessive support prices was enacted into law with the full support of the Secretary of Agriculture and the administration. The only criticism of the Anderson law which I heard from the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, at the time of its consideration, was that the support prices were not high enough.

The proposal of the Secretary of Agriculture to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was to the effect that we are confronted with two alternatives. One was, not only to give away the commodities, but the Secretary actually suggested paying additional money of the taxpayers in order to get the industrial users and exporters to take the excess commodities. The second proposal was to launch the greatest wholesale destruction of food the world has ever known. I disagree completely with the position taken by Mr. Brannan and the administration, that we are forced to make such a choice.

There is another alternative, one which will not only remove the necessity of wholesale destruction of food but also will save the taxpayers billions of dollars. In the long run, the American farmer will benefit from this proposal, because he will have a more realistic agricultural program. In my opinion, the only alternative we have is the immediate repeal of the existing 90-percent support for so-called basic commodities, accompanied by an immediate lowering of the support price of the nonmandatory commodities, which include potatoes.

My proposal is that Congress amend the Anderson Act as passed by the Eighty-first Congress by repealing, effective immediately, the 90-percent guaranty on the basic commodities and also by advancing the effective date of the flexible provisions of the act from January 1, 1952, to read effective immediately.

With that thought in mind, I am sending to the desk a bill and ask for its reference to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I urge that the Senate Agriculture Committee and the Congress give serious consideration to enacting this bill as a substitute for S. 2826, which is the bill under which the Secretary of Agriculture is asking an additional $2,000,000,000 authority.

The passage of the substitute bill would automatically provide for lower support prices for the crop year 1950 and would thereby eliminate the necessity of Congress approving the addition $2,000,000,000 requested under S. 2826. The savings under this bill, through the provision for lower support prices, would go far toward reducing the anticipated deficit of the Government for the next fiscal year.

The passage of the bill would eliminate many of the inequities now existing under the present law, through which one segment of our agriculture is being supported at artificially high levels, while in the East another group of farmers who are not being subsidized and who are buyers of the supported grains as commercial feeds, are being seriously penalized.

The passage of this bill would serve as a direct benefit to the American housewife, who would be able to purchase at lower prices some of the vast quantities of agricultural products which now are either being destroyed or withheld from the market.

The lower prices of food products would increase consumption and thus make it possible to reduce the heavy inventories through normal channels of trade, instead of the current suggestion of the Secretary of Agriculture of the wholesale destruction of good edible foods.

Repeal of the artificially high support prices at this time would prove in the long run to be of decided benefit to the western farmer. It would remove much of the adverse criticism which the farm program in general is getting from both consumer and taxpayer.

The passage of the bill would still leave a support program under most agricultural products higher than the level which the western farmer had been told to expect after the war period was over.

By advancing the date of the flexible support formula, it is estimated there would be a reduction in commercial dairy and poultry feed of from $15 to $20 per ton. This reduction in commercial feed costs is essential if we are to save two great farming industries in the East, namely, the dairy and the poultry industry, from inevitable bankruptcy. It is sheer folly to continue the policy of aiding one segment of agriculture by destroying another.

The eastern poultry farmers are confronted today with a situation which will force them out of business or into bankruptcy, due to the existing artificially high costs for commercial feeds resulting directly from the Government's high support program.

The eastern dairy farmer is just beginning to feel the pinch. He will in the near future be confronted with a situation comparable to that which exists today in the poultry industry, unless steps are taken in the immediate future to eliminate inequities under the existing farm price-support law.

The enactment of my bill would eliminate the necessity of Congress' granting the request of the Secretary of Agriculture for another $2,000,000,000 borrowing authority. This does not mean it would result in a net saving to American taxpayers of the full $2,000,000,000. However, it would unquestionably result in reducing the over-all cost of the agricultural program for the current fiscal year by at least 50 percent and it would stop the senseless destruction of food.

It would automatically eliminate the necessity for the adoption of strict acreage and production controls, in that the lower support price would remove much of the incentive for continued high production.

I recognize that the farm-subsidy program is only one of the many subsidies which are today in effect. Most of the subsidies are hang-overs of World War II. I think the time has come when the Congress should take affirmative steps toward a systematic reduction of all existing subsidies, both in industry and in agriculture.

The proposal of reducing and working toward a gradual elimination of Government subsidies is the most important constructive step which can be made toward achieving a worth-while reduction in our existing high cost of government.

The best form of Federal aid for the American farmer, or any other group, is a substantial reduction in the cost of Government, accompanied by a reduction in taxes.

I therefore urge that the Members of Congress join me in supporting the bill. Let us put a stop to the senseless and extravagant policy of destroying good, edible foods. At the same time, I urge them to join with me in removing American farmers from the political auction block.

Mr. WILLIAMS subsequently said: I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks a chart showing the existing support prices for the average of the 10-year period, and

also a comparison of the existing prices with the average prices for the 10-year period.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Support levels and 10-year average prices received by farmers on commodities now being supported by the Commodity Credit Corporation either under 1949 or 1950 price-support programs

Commodity	Unit	Support price (actual price) [1]	10-year average price received by farmers, 1940–49
Corn	Bushel	1.40	$1.16
Peanuts	Pound	.105	.0755
Rice	Bushel	1.78	1.80
Wheat	do	1.95	1.49
Dry edible beans	Hundredweight.	6.55	[2] 6.30
Dry edible peas	do	3.07	[2] 4.29
Potatoes	Bushel	.96	1.24
Sweetpotatoes	do	1.72	1.86
Cotton	Pound	.272	.225
Cottonseed	Ton	49.50	53.20
Wool, shorn	Pound	.423	.406
Tobacco, flue-cured	do	.425	[2] .363
Barley	Bushel	1.09	.98
Grain sorghums	Hundredweight.	2.09	1.88
Oats	Bushel	.69	.656
Rye	do	1.27	1.19
Soybeans	do	2.097	2.03
Tung nuts	Ton	60.00	[2] 79.30
Butter	Pound	.60	.498
Eggs	Dozen	.37	.366
Milk	Hundredweight.	3.07	([3])
Cheddar cheese	Pound	.31	.278
Turpentine	Gallon	.40	[2] .582
Rosin (grade N)	Hundredweight.	6.72	[2] 4.87
Flaxseed	Bushel	3.744	3.46
Hay and pasture seed:			
Clover:			
Alsike	Pound	.25	[2] .235
Ladino [4]	do	1.25	[2] 1.113
Red	do	.35	[2] .279
Sweet	do	.12	[2] .086
Grasses:			
Orchard [4]	do	.15	[2] .168
Sudan [4]	do	.05	[2] .045
Timothy [4]	do	.06	[2] .054
Northern Alfalfa	do	.32	[2] .284
Common Lespedeza	do	.16	[2] .194
Turkeys	do	.31	.291
Hogs	Hundredweight.	----------	15.20
January 1950	----------	14.90	----------
February 1950	----------	15.50	----------
March 1950	----------	16.20	----------

[1] Support levels listed are those most recently announced. 1949 support price listed if 1950 program not yet announced.
[2] 1939–48 average.
[3] Not available.
[4] Certified seeds only.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am sorry I did not hear more of the statement of the Senator from Delaware, but I am told he referred to potatoes, which is of course a matter very near my heart and one which is also vital to the interests of my State. I think this may be an appropriate opportunity to make clear in the RECORD what has developed with regard to the potato program during the past year.

We continually read in the press statements of the cost of the 1948 potato program. It was carried out under the terms of the 90-percent program, which was enacted into law during the war. As a result, 450,000,000 bushels of potatoes were produced in that year, and it cost the Government $225,000,000 to remove and to convert the excess potatoes, a figure which is constantly reiterated in the press. Both figures are accurate; there is no dispute regarding them. However, the critics of the policy, both in and outside the press, always seem to consider it unimportant to state that those interested in the potato crop were the ones who themselves not only proposed but urged that the support price for potatoes be reduced in the crop year 1949. That was the only major crop, on which such action was proposed.

I am happy that the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is present, so that if I make an inaccurate statement, I am sure he can correct me. The potato crop for 1949, under the decision of the Secretary of Agriculture, in the exercise of his authority given in the law, was fixed as 60 percent of parity. The figure 60 percent was reached by the potato growers of my own State and by potato growers throughout the country representing the National Potato Council, feeling that figure would be an assurance against the producers of potatoes facing again the tragic situation of the 1930's when potatoes were priced at 10 cents a bushel, and millions of bushels of them were dumped on the ground by the producers, as a total loss. It was felt that it would be a guaranty against a tragic situation of that character, and that, at the same time, it would tend to remove the marginal producers and would also discourage greater production for profit.

I very much doubt whether there are many places in the United States where potatoes can be produced at a profit, on 60 percent of parity. At any rate, that was the concept under which that floor was placed.

During the crop-year period of 1949, it has been estimated that the expense of the removal may run between $75,000,000 and $100,000,000. That certainly is very encouraging as compared with the previous year. It is the result of a crop production of approximately 400,000,000 bushels as against 450,000,000 bushels the previous year. In other words, the potato growers, in cooperation with the Department's allocation of acreage, have reduced their production by 50,000,000 bushels, somewhat more than 10 percent of the total crop. There are still more potatoes than the Nation is consuming at the present time. It is admitted now that the annual consumption of potatoes, in normal channels, is approximately 335,000,000 bushels. That figure is interesting as the basis of the program for the coming year. The program in the past year was supposed to produce 350,000,000 bushels, but it actually produced 400,000,000 bushels.

In justice to the State of Maine, I want to have it clear that we reduced our production by 10 percent, from approximately 73,000,000 bushels to 67,000,000 bushels, through the reduction in acreage which was requested. But I think it will be found that in the State of Maine there was a higher percentage of what are called cooperators than in any other State of the Union. There was approximately 80- to 90-percent cooperation, although cooperation meant simply limiting the number of acres planted and it was true that by increased fertilization and planting potatoes nearer together—not in the row, as has been so commonly stated, but planting the potatoes 6 inches apart instead of 9 inches apart—more potatoes were produced per acre, rising to an average of nearly 900 bushels per acre, which was a record production.

The tragedy of it was that our neighbors immediately across the line, in New Brunswick increased their potato production by 10 percent, as the result of finding that last year they could send nearly 10,000,000 bushels of potatoes into this country. There is now a surplus in the Maritime Provinces which will enable them to send to the United States between 15,000,000 and 20,000,000 bushels this year.

In part that situation is due to the reduced tariff provided in the trade agreement, and in part it is due to Canada's lower cost of production as a result of her different standards of living and wage scales.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. BREWSTER. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to state to the Senator from Maine that my criticism is not wholly against the potato program. Fifty million bushels of potatoes, while constituting a huge amount, represents only a small part of the large inventories of agricultural commodities which are now on hand. These heavy inventories will bring about such a situation, in the very near future, that we shall have to destroy these other commodities or give them away.

Only recently I received in my office from the Department of Agriculture a bulletin which pointed out that there had been imported during the past 11 months more than 5,000,000 bags of potatoes from Canada. This represents over 10,000 carloads of Canadian potatoes which were shipped into this country and sold on our markets to the American housewives. At the same time, and in the same mail, there was a notice to the effect that we are offering to sell potatoes for export only at 1 cent per hundredweight, which simply does not make sense——

Mr. BREWSTER. I can assure the Senator from Delaware that every intelligent citizen of Maine, and that comprises almost our entire citizenship, is opposed to permitting this situation to continue.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator from Maine that the farmers themselves were not the ones who encouraged this program. The potato farmers advocated, long before the Department of Agriculture did, a lower support price. The support price which is in effect today, is directly the responsibility of the Secretary of Agriculture himself. His only criticism of the Aiken bill or the Anderson bill, so far as I ever heard, was that the support price was not sufficiently high.

Today, under his utopian plan, he promises the farmers more money and at the same time promises the housewife lower prices, all without costing the

taxpayers any additional expense. Any sixth-grade child can tell you that just cannot be done.

Mr. BREWSTER. Answering the Senator's first statement, I am very grateful that the Senator has pointed out that comparatively insignificant sums are involved. While $10,000,000 or $12,000,000 is not insignificant in Maine, it is insignificant when we contemplate the gigantic amounts involved in the entire program. I asked the Secretary of Agriculture concerning it when he was before the committee, and, to my surprise, when I asked him about the amounts involved, not only the $3,000,000,000 now embarked in the Commodity Credit Corporation program and the $2,000,000,000 in addition which is requested, he also used the figure of $7,000,000,000. Perhaps the Senator from Vermont can clarify that. What it represents, I do not know.

Mr. AIKEN. The $2,000,000,000 included the major amount contemplated for the support of the 1950 crops.

Mr. BREWSTER. What is the $7,000,000,000 figure?

Mr. AIKEN. That is $4,750,000,000 which already had been made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation, plus the $2,000,000,000 which has been requested, making nearly $7,000,000,000. The Secretary was evidently using approximate figures.

Mr. BREWSTER. Can the Senator from Vermont tell me what would be the situation if we looked at it as a banking proposition, as to the value of the existing purchases of the Commodity Credit Corporation, if they were valued at the current market prices?

Mr. AIKEN. That is very difficult to tell.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. It depends upon whether we are going to value potatoes at $3.50 a bag or at 1 cent a bag.

Mr. BREWSTER. I presume we would use the domestic price.

Mr. KEM. Apparently it is impossible to dispose of them at the domestic price.

Mr. AIKEN. It is difficult to tell, because of changing values from week to week.

Mr. BREWSTER. Naturally the potato producers are rather resentful of the fact that they seem to have been singled out as constituting the worst problem in the situation. We are told that wheat and corn have had no loss. That was true during the war. The Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, [Mr. LUCAS], was generous and frank enough to admit last fall that we had a tremendously critical and serious problem in connection with wheat and corn, and it was my thought that it would be fair to ask what were the assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation at current prices, in order that we might know whether at this time we face a serious loss.

Mr. AIKEN. It is safe to say that the current value of those assets would be less than the cost to the Government, because there has been deterioration. We hear reports of weevily wheat, for instance, stored in boats instead of elevators.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not also true that the market value is materially less?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, that is true; for the wheat that cost the Government, say, $2.20 or $2.30 a bushel last year, considering the fact that it is a year old, and the millers will not buy old wheat if they can get new wheat, has probably deteriorated 30 or 40 cents a bushel.

Mr. BREWSTER. That would be 20 percent.

Mr. AIKEN. Approximately.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. I must take exception to what the Senator from Vermont said with respect to wheat. We have stored wheat for years and years. In fact, when World War II was coming upon us, we had large quantities of wheat that had been stored for years. So far as I remember, a very small percentage of that wheat ever spoiled, probably less than one-half of 1 percent. Wheat can be stored for years and years, and oftentimes the millers prefer older wheat. Presently, last year's wheat is selling to the millers at a premium over this year's wheat.

Mr. AIKEN. My information came from the millers, who said they preferred fresh wheat to old wheat.

Mr. BREWSTER. Let me ask the Senator from North Dakota what the carry-over is.

Mr. YOUNG. Between three hundred and three hundred and fifty million bushels. That is the estimated carry-over for the end of this fiscal year July 1. Personally, I do not think that is a big surplus. We have already spent more than $1,000,000,000 accumulating scarce war materials and the last session appropriated another $800,000,000 for the same purpose. Surely a reasonable carry-over of wheat is as necessary as some of these scarce materials such as castor oil which we are stock piling. I think a reasonable carry-over of food products is just as essential as carrying over some other products.

Mr. BREWSTER. What would the Senator from North Dakota say about the corn crop?

Mr. YOUNG. I am not so familiar with the corn situation as I am with wheat, but I do not think the present situation is bad. If there should be a big crop this year, as there was last year, there would probably be a sizable surplus.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the Senator from North Dakota think that with reasonable guarantees the shrinkage of wheat and corn would not exceed $12,000,000, which is the amount involved in the potato discussion?

Mr. YOUNG. There is some shrinkage in poundage. If wheat is put in storage at 60 or 58 pounds to the bushel, it dries out, and there is a little loss in weight, but there is not a loss in value; when wheat becomes dryer the weight per bushel increases resulting in a higher grade wheat which naturally sells for a higher price.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In reference to the question of the Senator from Maine as to the cost of the entire farm program, I too have been interested, but I have not been able to get an answer, except that I note that these products are being offered for export at an average discount of near 40 percent below cost. So that if we assume they are going to export these products—and I do not know how they will get rid of them otherwise—the loss will be about $1,500,000,000. If we destroy them as proposed by Secretary Brannan the cost will be more.

On the other hand, if we are to accept the assumption that we will be confronted with a war this year or next year, the disposition of these heavy inventories might very well turn out to be at a profit. But I am one who does not want to endorse here a farm program based upon a war every 15 years to bail us out. We need a peacetime farm program. The only thing that bailed the farm program out in the 1940's was the coming on of World War II.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maine will yield, the export price of wheat naturally is lower than the domestic price, because we entered into the international wheat agreement, which called for a price of $1.80 a bushel. I think it is to the interest of the chicken growers in Delaware to have a little surplus, because if we have a drought next year resulting in a short supply they will be paying much more for wheat.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The poultrymen in my State never have come to Congress and asked the Government to underwrite or subsidize their farm losses. For the last 3 months they have been taking losses greater than were ever experienced in Delaware for the past 20 years, and I do not except even the year 1932. They are going through a greater depression today than the farmers in the Midwest faced in 1932, yet these same farmers passed a resolution only last week saying they still are not asking the Government to bail them out. I wish the constituents of the Senators from the Northwest would take the same attitude, that they too would be willing to underwrite their own responsibilities. We cannot continue this present policy of supporting one segment of agriculture at high prices while completely ignoring another group of farmers.

Mr. YOUNG. I think it is a matter of record that the poultry producers of Delaware made their largest profits in 1932, and along about that time, when wheat was selling for as low as 28 cents a bushel.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Where did the Senator get his figures? I ask that because his statement indicates that he does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. YOUNG. Did not the poultrymen make larger profits?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is the Senator now asking a question?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am saying "No."

Mr. YOUNG. When was the period when they made their greatest profits?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The period when the farmers of Delaware made the most

money was the same period when the farmers of the Middle West made the most money, namely, during the war, and now that the war is over your western farmers are still insisting on higher than wartime prices.

Mr. YOUNG. Were not the poultry raisers of Delaware making a high profit when wheat was selling for 28 cents a bushel?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In 1932 they sold poultry for as low as 11 cents a pound. Our eastern farmers were not making money at that time, any more than you did. Today the Government is supporting wheat at $1.95. Yet the average price at which wheat sold for the last 10 years including the war years was only $1.49. That is around 25 percent higher than during the war years.

Mr. YOUNG. The cost of production is going up.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the farmers are not supposed to be guaranteed their cost of production plus wartime profits.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to know about how much wheat we are going to send abroad under the international wheat agreement.

Mr. YOUNG. I think our allotment was about 160,000,000 bushels.

Mr. AIKEN. One hundred and sixty-eight million bushels.

Mr. BREWSTER. How much are we sacrificing in the price, over what it was?

Mr. YOUNG. Forty cents a bushel presently.

Mr. BREWSTER. It would be about $140,000,000?

Mr. YOUNG. It would be about $80,000,000 which comes out of the Commodity Credit Corporation funds.

Mr. BREWSTER. The international wheat agreement, which is in connection with the wheat program, will cost us approximately $100,000,000?

Mr. YOUNG. I think that figure is substantially correct. It may run that much with Japan, Germany, or countries included in the recent deal.

Mr. WILLIAMS. After we get through with the export program, we will still have 400,000,000 bushels being held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, for which we have no market. If we continue these high support prices another 2 years we will have even more, unless we begin destroying surplus wheat as is now recommended for surplus potatoes.

Mr. YOUNG. All farmers should be working together, whether they be in Delaware, Iowa, or North Dakota. It is to the interest of the whole Nation to maintain the agricultural economy, and if for a year or two we have a problem regarding potatoes, it does not mean that we should abandon the program. It is to the best interests of the consumer, as well as of the producers, to keep an even supply of any food commodity at a fair price. I think the potato situation can be cleared up, but probably some different provisions in controlling production will have to be put into effect.

Mr. BREWSTER. I believe the Senator from Vermont rose.

Mr. AIKEN. I was rising to point out two things. The Senator from Maine suggested that the finger of scorn is pointed at the potato grower. I would narrow that a little, and say that now it is pointed at the Maine potato grower. Why potatoes have been moved from all the other States, and a great surplus permitted to remain in Maine all this time, is something beyond my understanding. It is also beyond my understanding why there has been no concerted movement to bring about the consumption of potatoes as there has been in the case of other commodities. But except for offering to turn them over to public institutions, or charitable institutions, I know of no concerted effort to move the surplus of potatoes, which amounts to about 1⅓ pecks per capita.

The other matter I desire to point out is that while the potato growers of Maine were reducing their acreage 10 percent, the Canadian growers were increasing theirs 10 percent, for the obvious purpose of shipping potatoes into the United States to take advantage of our market.

So far as I know, there has been no effort by the Department or by the administration this year to control the importation of Canadian potatoes, as there was a year ago. I do not know the reason for that. I do not know why a huge accumulation of potatoes has been permitted to remain in the State of Maine, when the surplus has been moved from most of the other States. I do not know why our Government looks complacently upon a 10-percent increase in potato acreage in Canada while insisting on a 10-percent decrease in potato acreage in the United States, knowing full well that the additional Canadian potatoes are coming into the United States to be sold on our market. I do not believe the administration as yet has given any satisfactory answer to that situation, which indicates that there might be a real attempt, a deliberate attempt, to discredit the laws which the Congress has passed.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I wish to make this comment to the Senator from Vermont. I wonder if he would agree with me that the best way to define such a method and such a program is by the word "cock-eyed"? Does he agree with me?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know whether I would say that or not. I believe that in the top flights of our Department of Agriculture we now have a political ambition which, if not controlled, will bring the agriculture of the United States crashing down to earth, and probably the whole economy with it in time.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I appreciate the contribution made by the Senator from New Hampshire. The situation certainly justifies very strong language, because 1 year ago, when Mr. Trigg, the head of the Commodity Credit Corporation—and I talked with him about the matter—found this influx of potatoes from Canada, he made such strong representations to the administration that within a single month, with unprecedented celerity, our State Department negotiated an agreement with Canada, unquestionably under the threat that if she did not agree to it, we would immediately exercise our rights of escape under the reciprocal trade agreement. Canada entered into that agreement by which she agreed not to ship any more potatoes into this country for table use, because we had 100,000,000 bushels surplus; and she further agreed that whatever potatoes she would ship in for seed purposes would be for use in certain months, and that they were to be certified to the certain areas, and guaranteed to be used for seed purposes only.

The implementation of that understanding was not all that could be desired, because when we came to test it, the State Department referred us to the Treasury Department, the Treasury Department referred us to the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Agriculture referred us to the Commodity Credit Corporation. By that time 9,000,000 bushels of potatoes had leaped the barrier and had come into the United States. But a serious and earnest attempt was made to meet the problem.

Now, the amazing thing is that this year, with the figures showing there would be a surplus in an undetermined amount in July of this year, according to my understanding the agreement has been abrogated. The Secretary of Agriculture was not clear whether they abrogated it or whether it terminated by its own terms. That is a matter which is not clear in the record. The fact is, however, that no effort of any character was made to stop the influx for this year. If the Department could do it last year it could do it this year.

Mr. TOBEY. Was there a time limit on the agreement?

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not think there was a time limit on it. I cannot state that accurately. But the Secretary of Agriculture himself—and I think this is significant—did not know when he came here Monday to testify. In other words, he had been so utterly uninterested in stopping the Canadian influx that he did not know whether the agreement was terminated, or whether it was terminable, or what had been done in regard to it. He did nothing to secure its reinstatement. I think he knew that Canada had a greater surplus this year than a year ago and that the influx would be much greater.

One other curious fact: Last year the Department estimated 250,000,000 bushels of potatoes as the amount desirable. This year, 1950, they have estimated the requirements at 335,000,000 bushels. A curious and a somewhat sinister fact emerges, that, under the reciprocal trade agreement with Canada, if at any time our production in this country is below 350,000,000 bushels, then the difference between that 350,000,000 bushels and whatever our total production is, may be sent into this country at the reduced tariff rate. In other words, our own Department of Agriculture has fixed a potato goal which would allow 15,000,000 bushels additional to come into this country at a 50-percent reduction in the tariff rate if they are successful in achieving their goal. I asked the Secretary what he was going to do about that. Apparently he had thought of it before, but he said, "We will talk with the State Department about it and see if they will not do something about it."

This is all consistent with the intimation by the Senator from Vermont that it is possible that a great deal of this was planned that way. I am not undertaking to defend the production of potatoes in this country. I am undertaking to say that an efficient and an economical and a prudent administration would have known many of these facts 6 months ago, and have submitted them to us, rather than have waited until now to bring the situation to our attention.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, may I respectfully make a suggestion? Does not the situation indicate clearly that the thing that is needful to do is for the Senator from Maine, GEORGE AIKEN—I am speaking now as Senators understand this problem—to sit down with Brannan and Trigg, and with the State Department officials who have jurisdiction, and get together to the point where they cannot pass the buck, so the responsibility can be pinned somewhere and in event responsibility can be fixed, we can say, "Thou art the man."

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the records are perfectly clear as to where the responsibilities lie. I think the Agricultural Committee was correct when it left the responsibility with the Secretary of Agriculture. I want to have it clear in the RECORD that the Secretary testified that under the law he has full authority—I should like to have the Senator from Vermont correct me if I am not correct—and that he also has the funds with which to convert these potatoes if he deems it to be advisable to do so. The question of the use of that money is a matter within his discretion.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator from Maine will permit, I should like to add that in the Commodity Credit charter bill enacted last June the President was instructed to appoint an advisory board of five persons to advise the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Secretary whenever he arrives at a situation where he feels that advice is desirable and necessary. That committee was appointed the same day the Secretary came before the Agricultural Committee. That was day before yesterday. Yet the Secretary suggested to us that the Senate Agricultural Committee—not the House Agricultural Committee, but the Senate Agricultural Committee—advise him what to do, thereby taking the props out from under the advisory committee which we had authorized to be set up for that very purpose.

Instead of going to this advisory committee he comes to the Senate Agricultural Committee and says that if we do not veto his proposal, he is going to destroy approximately 50,000,000 bushels of potatoes. Of course, that is not the business of the Senate Agricultural Committee. It is not the business of any committee of Congress. If we undertake, in detail, to apply the laws we pass, we will not only be exceeding our own jurisdiction, but we will be getting into trouble every day. I hope the Secretary, by making this suggestion, did not want us to get into trouble. That is an administrative responsibility purely and simply. We have given the Secretary ample authority to dispose of this potato crop. The potato-surplus situation could be relieved if the Secretary would put on a drive such as he did for fried chicken and other commodities, to bring about just a little added consumption on the part of each person, and if the administration would exercise its authority to shut out this excessive importation of potatoes from Canada.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont one question, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Missouri.

I hold in my hand the Legislative Daily Report of Government Affairs. It was issued on Wednesday, February 1. I read from it as follows:

> Senator AIKEN added that there was almost unanimous feeling by the committee that the problem of disposing of the surplus is an executive responsibility rather than a legislative function.
>
> Shortly after the committee's refusal to tell the Department what to do with the surplus, a spokesman for Secretary Brannan said the refusal amounted to a clear go-ahead signal to destroy the potatoes. He estimated that the 40,000,000 bushels of the 1949 crop will be destroyed. These will have been purchased by the Government as part of its program to support prices.

Is that interpretation of the action of the committee justified?

Mr. AIKEN. It certainly is not. The Secretary, at any time, had the right to ask us as individuals what we would recommend. He did not, at any time, have the right to ask a legislative committee to make administrative decisions. He would have been completely wrong in attempting to do so. The only purpose of such a request would be to place the responsibility for the things that go wrong on the Congress, rather than on the executive branch of the Government where it properly belongs. The executive branch of the Government would be right there to take credit for everything that goes right. I thought it was extremely presumptuous to expect a committee to do that. It is extremely significant that he did not ask the House committee for the same advice. I think it is a well-known fact that usually the House committee and the Secretary get along much better than do the Senate committee and the Secretary.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask the Senator from Vermont a question?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. The act authorizing the appointment of a board of directors for the Commodity Credit Corporation, and of an advisory board, was enacted at the last session, was it not?

Mr. AIKEN. That measure became law last June.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator know why the Secretary delayed the appointment of members of the board of directors and members of the advisory board until 2 or 3 days ago?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know. The appointments are made by the President, I suppose on the recommendation of the Secretary.

Mr. KEM. Is it possible that the Secretary did not feel himself in need of any advice during all the months which intervened between the passage of the act last June and the present time?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know what he thought. I believe that had the board been set up and functioning it could have been a help to him in a case of this kind.

Mr. KEM. He would have had a board officially authorized to give him advice on this subject, instead of coming to the Senate committee.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. Congress had already authorized a board for this specific purpose. Then, almost without notice, the Secretary asked the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to advise him.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator know of any law or custom which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to come to the Senate committee for advice as to whether or not he should take administrative action?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think there is any law. I do not think it is the custom.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator know why he came to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for advice as to the disposal of potatoes in Maine, any more than wheat in Kansas, Missouri, and North Dakota, or corn, cotton, or any of the other commodities that are on his hands?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know why he came. I am sure it was not because he thought the judgment of the Senate committee was better than his own, because many times he has expressed disapproval of the ideas of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. KEM. When he was before the Senate committee, did he ask for advice in connection with the disposal of any other surpluses except potatoes?

Mr. AIKEN. Not that I recall—and particularly Maine potatoes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, one other question arose. I note that the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is in the Chamber. I want to share with him a portion of the responsibility for this surplus. I have in my hand the report of potato production for the year 1949. I find that in Florida, according to the Government report, there was an increase from 3,745,000 bushels in 1948 to 5,428,000 in 1949, an increase in production of about 1,700,000 bushels, or approximately 40 percent. That was probably the result of good growing weather rather than any other factors which entered into the picture; but it did contribute in some measure to the resultant surplus, as Maine is the last State to market. While it is true that we raise only about 15 percent of the potatoes in the country, we have between 30 and 35 percent of the surplus, partly because we are the last State to go to market—all the others reach there first—and partly because of the Canadian importations, which are directly competitive with our own production. So we get the chief impact of this situation.

The thing which I should like to leave in the record clearly is that we have made substantial progress. That is what I like to think. The potato growers recognized that this situation could not continue. They asked for a reduction in the support price, which reduced the surplus by more than 10 percent last year. We

believe that it will reduce it by more than 10 percent this year, so we should be easily within reach of achievement of the goal of eliminating the cost of this support. By this change we have saved the Government $125,000,000 at the very least, and probably somewhat more.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator understand from the excerpt he has read from some publication that it is the present intention of the Secretary of Agriculture to destroy all potatoes he now has on hand?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is what it says. The statement says that the spokesman for Secretary Brannan stated that the refusal amounted to a clear signal to go ahead, and he estimated that 40,000,000 bushels would be destroyed.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator know what the Secretary meant when he spoke to the committee yesterday about the alternative of dumping of potatoes in the potato-producing districts and on the farms?

Mr. BREWSTER. The question is what method will be used. Before they heaped the potatoes in great piles and poured oil or something else on them, and the Government was accountable for the destruction. It was my understanding that this time they are considering asking each producer to dump them on his own land. That is what I have heard discussed, but I cannot speak authoritatively.

Mr. KEM. So that as much of them as possible could be used for food for livestock?

Mr. BREWSTER. They may still be used for livestock if there is no Government expense for transportation. Apparently that plan is not feasible for much of the amount.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that at his press conference this morning the President gave the Senator from Maine credit for the present deplorable situation in the potato market and for the large surplus which we have on hand, stating that the Senator from Maine was successful in adding a mandatory-support amendment to the bill. In view of that, I think I should state how the provision got into the bill. As is well known, the potato growers requested the Congress to reduce their support level from 90 percent, and from time to time they have so expressed their opinion to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Last year, when the Anderson bill was under consideration, a committee of three, including one man from Maine, one from Red River Valley, and one from North Carolina waited on me, and I presume on other Senators, giving their opinion as to what ought to be done. This committee of three asked to have the 60-to-90-percent support included in the Anderson bill. That support was included in the bill. I do not recall that the Senator from Maine proposed such an amendment to the Anderson bill itself. Perhaps he can refresh my memory. I believe it was a committee amendment.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct. The year before an amendment to include potatoes in the support was offered from the floor, but last year, in the Anderson bill, it was included by the committee. We had a meeting in the Agricultural Committee room, at which many Members of Congress and potato growers were present, and it was at the request of the growers that that was done. I appreciate the compliment of the President in suggesting that I am either omnipotent or omniscient, but I am afraid he gives me too much credit.

Mr. AIKEN. The Secretary reduced the support level for potatoes from 90 percent to 60 percent of parity, although he himself claimed 100 percent was necessary to afford the farmer a good living. He reduced it to 60 percent of parity and set the acreage for the producers to plant. In 1948 and 1949 the producers planted fewer acres than were requested by the Secretary.

Mr. BREWSTER. They reduced the acreage by 40 percent in the past few years.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not see how the potato growers themselves or the Senator from Maine can be held responsible for the present situation. I say that no determined effort on the part of the administration officials has been made to relieve the potato situation. It is apparent that the potato situation is being dramatized, with particular emphasis on the State of Maine, for a particular purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it not a fact that the only criticism the Secretary has ever made of the present farm-support program is that he wanted to give the potato farmers, the wheat farmers, and everyone else more money than they are now receiving? He is advocating 100 percent parity.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Had Congress accepted the recommendations of Secretary Brannan we would have on the books now a law which would cost the taxpayers several times more than the existing law.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is one of the aspects of the proposal which I think should be very carefully considered.

I should like to say at the moment to the Senator from Vermont that there is another curious aspect of this situation. Assuming the complete sincerity of the Secretary of Agriculture in wanting to make this program work, and appreciating that the potato problem was a serious one which had been much discussed, with the general surplus of potatoes coming over the horizon, and with the 40 percent surplus already existing in Florida, which is the first State where the potato market comes in, the Secretary of Agriculture inaugurated, last year, for the first time in the history of the mandatory support program; a support price for No. 2 potatoes and for size B No. 1 potatoes. Of course, that was very nice for the potato growers; they did not object to it. They were very happy if they could sell No. 2's and size B's. But if the Department of Agriculture was concerned about reducing the cost of the program to the Government and about disposing of the surplus, that was a rather curious decision. I raised the question last July, in a discussion of the matter on the floor of the Senate with the Senator from Vermont, when the potato crop was in process of being marketed. I asked why it was that, for the first time, the Department inaugurated such a policy. Could it be that the planners were framing the program in such a way as to be able to say, "Now we have 40,000,000 or 50,000,000 bushels of potatoes which we have to dump"? Could it be that they planned that, when they could see the Canadian potatoes coming on the market and when they knew there would be a large surplus?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I think the Senator knows that in the western areas, particularly in western North Dakota and Montana, we had a bad drought situation last year, and as a result there is a shortage of livestock feeds. I have received 20 or 30 telegrams from county agents in that area requesting surplus potatoes for livestock feed. Potatoes make very good feed. They are willing to pay at least a part of the cost of the potatoes. When used for such purposes, the potatoes are dumped on the ground, where they naturally dehydrate, making good livestock feed until late in the spring. That is a very good use of surplus potatoes. Certainly far better than dumping.

If the Secretary of Agriculture proposes to destroy the potatoes, when a good alternative use can be made of them, then I think criticism of him would be justified.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. The Senator heard the Secretary of Agriculture testify before the committee that in his opinion a reduction of the price is not a good way to control the production of a commodity.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. KEM. If that is the case, and since the Secretary of Agriculture believes that to be the case, does the Senator know why the Secretary reduced the support price of potatoes to 60 percent of parity?

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator from Missouri asked the Secretary of Agriculture that very question, and he found no adequate reply.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator from Maine know why he did it?

Mr. BREWSTER. No. I think our idea in reducing the support price was to discourage overproduction, and in evidence of that we submit the fact that it has made a very material progress, when it has eliminated 50,000,000 bushels already, or more than 10 percent; and

we believe that this year we shall see a further cut.

In other words, in the case of the one major crop whose producers are making a fine constructive effort to solve this problem, and who have made a great contribution in reducing the cost of the program, when we have eliminated in one year $125,000,000 of the cost, whereas up to a few years ago we estimated that it would cost only $50,000,000, we suddenly discover that, as a result of what the Department of Agriculture has done, the cost will be increased. Responsibility for a part of the increased cost—certainly at least $30,000,000 of the $100,000,000—must clearly be borne by the administration for dumping the Canadian potatoes on the market and for substituting the class B size and the No. 2's. That is the responsibility of the Department. If the Department had exercised any ordinary intelligence and ingenuity, it could have reduced the cost even more.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that of course the Senator from Maine understands that the cull potatoes were bought by the Government at the same price as that of No. 1 potatoes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; at 60 percent of parity. They did not buy them at a lower price, but at the full support price, although I think Congress had assumed that 60 percent of parity would be the price for No. 1 potatoes only. Certainly I had always assumed that to be the case.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, does the Senator know of any possible reason on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture for reducing the support price, if he did not believe that it would reduce production?

Mr. BREWSTER. It seems to me absolutely inconceivable, if that was not the purpose. He said he had adequate powers. Apparently he was exercising in good faith those he did have.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say that the Assistant Administrator of PMA, Mr. Lennartson, when he appeared before the Committee on Agriculture the other day to explain why the support price for eggs was not working, gave a very good explanation, namely, that the support being offered is not high enough to induce the dryers to take the eggs. However, it is significant that the Department has fixed the price of eggs at 75 percent of parity, rather than at 90 percent of parity, as was done last year.

When I asked him how they happened to arrive at 75 percent of parity as the support level, he said they felt that was the level which would bring the supply in line with the demand.

Mr. LANGER. Madam President, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair). The Senator from Maine has the floor. He can yield only for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to ask the Senator this question: In view of the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture has now recommended lower support prices for eggs and potatoes, in order to decrease the production, is it not logical to assume that if the support prices on all the commodities which are accumulating in the warehouses of the country are lowered, that this action would to a large extent solve the surplus problem and at the same time would save the taxpayers a large amount of money?

Mr. BREWSTER. Certainly in the potato field that has been demonstrated by the figures I have given, and we have been quite ready to be the guinea pig in connection with this matter. Although the other crops were continuing at 90 percent of parity as the support price, the potato growers, as the Senator from Vermont pointed cut, suggested and supported this idea of reduction in the support price, which has enabled us to make the progress to which I have alluded.

Now we hope that the producers of the other great crops of this country, who are equally concerned with this problem, will not be too critical of the efforts of the potato growers to meet this problem.

We believe that in this year, 1950, we may well be within sight of a goal or an objective that will cost the Government very little to achieve, and at the same time will give us production in line with the need.

Madam President, in this connection there is another item that is curious. There was in Maine a man who was canning potatoes. There may be some argument as to whether canning would impede the production of potatoes otherwise; but there is much to indicate that the canning of potatoes will supply a new field, because in many city homes it is not practical to keep potatoes. The man to whom I refer was canning potatoes, but the Government officials refused to sell the surplus potatoes to him at a lower price, although that would have been a very effective way to dispose of them. I think he was taking about two carloads of potatoes a week, but the officials refused to sell the surplus potatoes to him. He could not understand it at the time. Perhaps we can understand it now, in light of what has developed.

I wish to express my appreciation for this opportunity to make the record clear, so that at least Senators and Representatives and members of the press who may discuss this matter may have available the facts in regard to the factors which have contributed to this problem at this time.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article by Herbert Moore, dealing with the Aroostook potato situation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADVENTUROUS AROOSTOOK FARMERS HAVE SEEN BOTH PROSPERITY AND ADVERSITY

(By Herbert W. Moore, executive secretary, the Potato Industry Council of Maine, Inc.)

You have been reading much about the Maine potato industry in recent months. It has been the favorite subject for various political writers, who with little regard for the truth, have sought to create an exceedingly distorted and false picture of its way of life.

All of these writings have centered about the wartime price-support program which ceased to exist a year ago, and have given absolutely no recognition to the picturesque and romantic development of an industry which within the past century has transformed a bleak impenetrable forest land into the most concentrated, and most heavily mechanized agricultural area in New England.

Aroostook, a county the size of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and Rhode Island combined but with only 10 percent of its area cleared of timber, and its gigantic potato industry which each year harvests 15 percent of the total national potato production, is by reason of its unique development perhaps far more removed psychologically than it is geographically from the rest of New England agriculture.

As with the progress and development of our great Nation and its historic expansion from the Atlantic to the Pacific, the progress and development of the Aroostook potato industry has also centered around the railroad. In our case, however, the direction has been northward rather than westward and for the most part has taken place in the first half of the twentieth century.

AROOSTOOK'S WESTERN ATMOSPHERE

Since the Civil War Aroostook has been actively engaged in the production of potatoes but without adequate transportation facilities its potato production was converted in its entirety to the manufacture of starch for use in the New England textile industry.

With the coming of the railroads in the latter part of the nineteenth century however, the development of the Maine potato as a national delicacy began and it was only a matter of a few years before it assumed a commanding role in the life and diet of the entire population of the eastern seaboard.

Perhaps because of the nature of our growth, more analogous to the development of the West than of New England, a westerner would feel right at home in Aroostook. Instead of grain elevators beside the tracks, however, he would see potato houses. Since the direction of our growth has been northward he probably would find weather conditions more severe, but he would recognize the general atmosphere and feeling which permeates the area as distinctly that of the cattle country, the wheat country, or the irrigated country.

By reason of the nature of this industry which involves such tremendous financial risks as to stagger the imagination, there has developed a people who by virtue of their past experiences are hardy, adventurous, keen, and tenacious.

In fact, their willingness to take risks has resulted in the development of a production know-how that is without peer. Nor have they stopped there. With the same energy and aggressiveness, by means of self-imposed taxes, they are financing continual projects aimed at the betterment of storing and merchandising their great crop to insure the consuming public of superior quality at minimum cost.

LOSSES MIXED WITH PROFITS

Let's take a moment and review the financial history of Aroostook, where until now the potato has been king and where diversification has been very limited in scope. Here are the figures for the profit or loss that the average farmer received per barrel, charging all the costs and all the returns. These figures are exceptionally dependable as cost figures go. They were assembled by an impartial expert. They are based on hundreds of farms. Starting with 1926 the figures run like this; 1926, profit 78 cents a barrel; 1927, loss 9 cents; 1928, loss $1.40; 1929, profit $1.50; 1930, loss 44 cents; 1931, loss $1.06; 1932, loss 65 cents; 1933, profit 54 cents; 1934, loss 65 cents; 1935, profit 29 cents; 1936, profit 89 cents; 1937, loss 55 cents; 1938, loss 16

cents; 1939, profit 14 cents; 1940, loss 67 cents.

No wonder bankruptcy was general, that mortgage companies were desperately trying to get out. No wonder the potato country is inhabited by men more adventurous than the typical New England farmer, men who can take it. They have had to.

Since 1940 there have been the war and price support. The area has had a period of stability and relative prosperity heretofore unknown. The prosperity however has been much more modest than the most lurid stories that have gone out have led the general public to believe. Here are the profit figures for these years every one a profit, but a modest one: 1941, 43 cents; 1942, 70 cents; 1943, 31 cents; 1944, 34 cents; 1945, 95 cents; 1946, 53 cents; 1947, 53 cents. This, remember, is per barrel. A barrel is 3 bushels. To get the profit per bushel divide by 3.

Unfortunately, figures from this authoritative source are not available since 1947.

Nineteen hundred and forty-eight was a year of profits, the last year of operation under wartime legislation and the subject for so much publicity in recent months. The estimate for that year is 90 cents per barrel of merchantable potatoes (less than for the year 1936). In consumer's terms, one-half cent a pound. And that profit includes the Government payments that have been so widely advertised.

MOST OF FARMS SMALL

These 8 years constitute the only period for which there is authentic history of stable prosperity in the potato country.

To get an even more realistic picture of the degree of the prosperity of our area let us look for a moment at a typical farm.

It distinctly is not a big operation that has been pictured so widely. In Aroostook County, where 90 percent of Maine's potato acreage exists, there were 4,338 potato farmers in 1949. Of these only 21 had over 200 acres of potatoes, 90 more had between 100 and 200 acres, 4,227, or 97 percent, had less than 100 acres. Most of them less than 50. Nearly one-half of all the farms were limited to less than 20 acres. These farms are farmer-owned and operated with 95 percent of the growers actually living on the farms. True the ordinary farmer has lived a little better than usual these last few years. More of the houses are painted. The machinery on most of the farms is fairly modern and fairly adequate and much of it is paid for. Mortgages are smaller and in better shape. But the farmer still has to borrow money to buy his fertilizer and seed and pay the potato pickers. He hasn't gotten far enough ahead to finance his next year's operations by himself and there are seasons of the year when the financial shoe pinches pretty tight.

Even in the face of this, however, these farmers of their own initiative, sought the abandonment of high-level wartime price supports.

They did not want profits to be guaranteed by the Government. This is not the way the industry had been developed up here. Only through Yankee ingenuity and thrift had it survived the economic rigors of the past and it had no desire to radically change this position in the future.

It did recognize, however, that because of its very nature—an industry consisting of thousands of small growers—it did not of itself possess the machinery by which it could effect even a reasonable stability. Therefore, it decided to experiment with a new idea—that of letting Government provide the machinery whereby its economy could be brought more nearly into line with that of industry, labor, and other segments of agriculture in the area.

FIRE INSURANCE SUPPORT

They have thus come up with a fire insurance price support, the level of which will not even cover the farmer's costs. This experimental plan has just begun to operate in 1949, but it is too early to determine what all the effects will be. We do know this much, however: The 1949 crop will bring in less than two-thirds what the 1948 crop brought in despite a record yield. In 1949 the average farmer will go behind. He won't go down and out—not yet.

The ordinary farmer will dig into savings, if he has any. He will go further into debt if his credit will stand it. He will stop repairs and replacements and live partly on the depreciation of his buildings and equipment.

In 1950 the potato country faces a further cut in acreage—nearly 15 percent more. The 30-acre farmer therefore will become a 25-acre farmer. And price support will be lower still. It will not and cannot underwrite the stabilized moderate prosperity that Aroostook enjoyed for the first time in its life from 1941 to 1948.

That is the true picture of Aroostook.

EIGHTEEN POUNDS IN 1909—41 NOW

Where will we go from here? The next few years will tell us that. If our present experiments indicate still more controls and continued restrictions in acreage we will not be able to put up with it for long. At least not for what we are getting out of it now.

Then we shall try again.

We hear much talk about the Brannan plan, the features of which have been under study in this area for years but its practical operation has created many doubts in the mind of the farmer.

In any event, in the firm belief that a reasonably stabilized and a reasonably prosperous agriculture is a primary requisite for a healthy national economy and with bitter memories of the depressions in the past half century all of which started at the farm, the residents of Aroostook are earnestly seeking some means of maintaining some of the stability they have enjoyed for the past 8 years.

Many accusations have been made that price supports have caused high potato prices. True, potatoes cost somewhat more than they did several years ago, but so does everything else. It is interesting to note however that in the period 1909 to 1914 one hour of labor in industry would purchase 18.2 pounds of potatoes at the farm whereas in 1948, one hour of labor in industry would buy 41 pounds. And still we hear that potatoes are high priced.

We continue to hear also that the farmer is responsible for higher potato costs. This is not true. In years gone by, when potatoes were sold in bulk the housewife loaded herself down with potatoes when she went to market. Now storekeepers do not want to sell potatoes that way. They want them in small packages so that the housewife will have room to carry out other merchandise. The housewife also wants them that way for her own convenience in handling. Fancy packaging in small lots costs money. That is why even if we gave the potatoes away here at the farm the housewife would still pay anywhere from 1½ to 4½ cents per pound for them at her local store as a result of the costs of packaging, distribution and merchandising.

RAISING OF BEEF CATTLE

As far as 1950 is concerned, and with or without support, the only hope of fair returns is that by some miracle the national average yield per acre which has been mounting year by year should suddenly turn downward resulting a relative shortage of potatoes and prices well above support levels. There is a chance of that—a bigger chance than in recent years—but not big enough on which to pin very substantial hopes.

There is one other ground for hope in the potato country on the long-time basis. It doesn't promise much for the immediate future. It can't be done that fast. That is that the farmer will be able to expand the production of other farm products to supplement his potato sales.

He won't give up potato raising, unless he has to. But potato acreages are down and down permanently. The great increase in yields per acre—nearly doubled nationally—and the spectacular drop in potato consumption make old acreages entirely out of the picture. The Aroostook farmer now has more acres not needed for potatoes. With the lower returns from the potatoes he does grow he must put these idle acres to work if he is to survive.

At the present time the biggest development appears to be the expansion of dairying although the raising of beef cattle is also assuming considerable proportions.

We are not going to go out of the potato business, but rather will add other farm products to what potato business we have left. The combination seems a very sound one, and brings about a diversification never before experienced in the area.

That is our history and that is our story—certainly unique in modern New England history and certainly less remunerative than others would have you believe.

This past 50 years has seen our complete development and growth. Our troubles have been many, our heartaches great, but they have been overcome.

Our progress will continue to be governed by the adventurous, hard-headed and progressive thinking of our people and regardless of the obstacles we shall continue to maintain our place in the economic life of New England and the Nation.

PARITY PRICES FOR CERTAIN BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. YOUNG. Madam President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill. The bill is an amendment to the Anderson Act, and would make 90-percent supports mandatory for basic commodities, when farmers are under either acreage controls or quotas. This bill, if enacted into law, would prevent drastic cuts in the income of farmers. The lowered farm income of the past year may well, if continued in the future, bring on another depression far worse than the last one. I think the prevention of such a situation is to the best interest of the entire Nation and will even help materially in balancing future Federal budgets.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2977) to provide support at 90 percent of parity for any crop of any basic agricultural commodity for which marketing quotas or acreage allotments are in effect, introduced by Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOLEY, Mr. PACE, Mr. POAGE, Mr. HOPE, and Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

CODIFICATION OF THE ARTICLES OF WAR

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4080) to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard, and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice.

Mr. KEFAUVER obtained the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of my suggesting the absence of a quorum, it being understood that he will not thereby lose the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum, and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I desire to speak at some length in support of House bill 4080, as amended, which was reported favorably to the Senate by the Senate Committee on Armed Services on June 10, 1949. The bill, which was passed by the House of Representatives on May 5, 1949, is entitled "A bill to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the Disciplinary Laws of the Coast Guard, and to enact and establish a uniform code of military justice."

I desire to pay my very high respects, Mr. President, to the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who has worked long, and with his usual patience and ability, on this proposed legislation; to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]; to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who has taken a great deal of interest in the subject, and also to Mr. Mark H. Galusha, of the Senate staff, who has done a great deal of worth-while work in connection with this proposed legislation.

This is a most important bill, and I hope full consideration will be given to it by the Members of the Senate. Its purpose is to provide a new and better system of justice in the military forces of the United States. It was drafted by a special committee in the National Military Establishment, which was instructed by the late Secretary Forrestal to achieve three important objectives. He desired that there be a uniform code of military justice which would protect the rights of those subject to it, increase public confidence in military justice, and not impair the performance of military functions. Secretary Johnson has joined in urging the passage of the bill. Our committee is of the opinion that the proposed code more nearly achieves these objectives than does any other study that has been made.

Before I explain the general provisions of the bill now before us, I think it will be profitable for all Members to consider this new bill against the background of experience with the present court-martial systems.

As Senators well know, historians have traced the origin of military law to the armies of the Greeks and the Romans. Military law has existed side by side with civilian codes and statutes over the centuries. Our own military and naval codes derive more immediately from western European procedures as developed in England and on the Continent. Continental influence has been strong, and, as a consequence, our military law has always borne many striking resemblances to the civil law, as contrasted with the Anglo-American common law. Over the years, many rules and practices have been brought over from the common law, such as the presumption of innocence, the privilege against self-incrimination, and the common-law rules of evidence. The proposed Uniform Code makes a number of additional steps in this direction.

I shall not take the time to trace the development of British military law, but it was from this source that present court-martial systems of the Army and Navy were adopted. The Articles of War, first adopted by the Continental Congress on June 30, 1775, were copied from British articles of 1765. They were redrafted by John Adams and reenacted in 1776 and enacted again as Articles of War in 1806 pursuant to the section of the Constitution which provides that Congress may make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces. There was, thereafter, no formal revision of the Articles of War until 1874, and this was more a rearrangement and classification than an actual revision. A further rearrangement took place in 1916, but it was not until 1920 that the Articles of War were completely revised.

Many radical changes were made at that time to meet the objections of those who had criticized the existing code. The articles of 1920, as amended in 1931, 1937, 1942, and 1948, constitute the law of the United States Army and Air Force today.

As was the case with the early American Articles of War, the first American Naval Articles were compiled by John Adams, who based them on the British Naval Articles of 1749. The present Articles for the Government of the Navy were enacted by Congress on July 17, 1862. This statute consisted of the 1775 Articles revised and brought down to date and included the act of 1855 creating summary courts martial. In fact, the phraseology of many of the present articles is directly traceable to the British Articles of 1749. The Articles for the Government of the Navy have been amended several times since 1862, some of the most important amendments having been in 1893, 1895, 1909, 1916, and 1946.

While the present military and naval codes have a common origin and while in theory substance and administration they are fairly similar, there are, nevertheless, substantial differences between them, differences which are due to differences in operations and traditions of the services and due also to the fact that the great changes made in the Articles of War of 1920 were not incorporated in naval law.

The history of efforts to reform the court-martial systems of the services is almost as old as the Articles themselves. The major impetus to reform is well within our own memories and occurred principally after the two World Wars. As I have stated, a major reform occured in the Articles of War in 1920. This was due entirely to the pressure of criticism. The same type of criticism took place during and since World War II and, in response to it, the Army and Navy, both, introduced amendments to their basic statutes in the Eightieth Congress. These proposed amendments were largely the results of studies by a number of groups of prominent attorneys organized by the services themselves. It will be recalled that the Army had a post-war study of court-martial sentences by a committee headed by former Justice Owen Roberts and they also had a study of court-martial procedures by a committee of which Judge Arthur Vanderbilt was chairman. The Navy had committees under the chairmanship of Mr. Arthur Ballantine, Judge Matthew McGuire, and Mr. Arthur Keeffe.

All these various reports, which were made by these eminent committees after World War I, both as to Army and Navy courts martial, are very critical of the lack of uniformity in the two systems, the fact that men, even in the same service, but different theaters, have not been treated uniformly. The Government has gone to a great deal of expense in having these reports made, and reviewing all the courts-martial decisions. Of course, there has been a great deal of criticism and hard feeling, and a sense of unfairness of treatment on the part of many servicemen and their families who have had experience in courts martial.

The amendments proposed to the Articles of War were adopted, as you will recall, in Public Law 759 of the Eightieth Congress. In the Senate they became part of title II of the Selective Service Act by virtue of the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. The Senator from Missouri brought about many needed reforms in the amendment adopted in the Eightieth Congress, most of which, as I shall point out later, have been reincorporated and kept in the uniform code which is now before the Senate.

In this connection, it will be recalled that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], who has been greatly interested in this matter for years, urged a more comprehensive approach to the problem of court-martial reform. He did not feel it should be limited to the Army, but should include all the services. The Kem amendment in the Eightieth Congress being an amendment to the

Selective Service Act, applied only to the Army and to the Air Force, and not to the Navy.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] recommended that a single uniform code of military justice be drafted to end the continual piece-meal amendments to the Articles of War and the Articles for the Government of the Navy. He spoke to Secretary Forrestal, who was then grappling with the difficult problems of the first year of unification. Secretary Forrestal agreed that a uniform code of military justice was not only one of the most logical areas of unification in the Military Establishment, but was one of the most necessary.

As a result of these discussions, Secretary Forrestal constituted in June of 1948 an interdepartmental committee in his office, and directed that they draft a uniform code of military justice for all the armed services. He appointed as chairman of this group the distinguished legal scholar, Prof. Edmund M. Morgan, of the Harvard University Law School, who is one of the most eminent authorities on the law of evidence. In case any graduates of Yale or Columbia Law Schools might resent the fact that a Harvard man was selected, I might state that Dr. Morgan previously taught at both Yale and Columbia Universities.

The Morgan committee labored all last summer and fall and submitted to Mr. Forrestal in February of this year a draft of the Uniform Code.

The Morgan committee made an intensive study of the Articles of War and the Articles for the Government of the Navy and has not only succeeded in codifying the two laws, but, in many instances, has completely revised their provisions. That committee considered all the studies and recommendations that have been made in recent years and compiled an impressive bibliography of reference works. They faced a more difficult problem, however, than committees in the past in that in addition to making recommendations they were called upon to draft legislation and to do it on a uniform basis to apply to all services.

Mr. President, I have had an opportunity of examining the extensive findings and the report of the Morgan committee. It is one of the most remarkable studies and works I have ever seen. The committee considered every proposal and every viewpoint, and I think it has done a noteworthy work in getting together recommendations for a unified code, to which all the services have agreed, and which all the services recommend. I have here in my hand a copy of the Morgan report, which is only the report, not the testimony, and which is considerably thicker than a Sears, Roebuck catalog.

Heretofore, all studies have been made on a one-service basis and the many criticisms voiced against military law and procedures have not uniformly applied.

The Morgan committee, as I have said, was an interdepartmental committee. Mr. Gordon Gray, now Secretary of the Army, represented the Army. The then Under Secretary, John Kenney, represented the Navy, and Assistant Secretary Eugene Zuckert represented the Air Force.

Mr. Felix E. Larkin, general counsel of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, acted as executive secretary of the committee, and headed a working staff of some 15 lawyers from the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Judge Advocate Generals' offices of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Coast Guard.

Mr. Larkin, let me say, has devoted more than 2 years of study to this problem, and his assistance, both to the Armed Services Committee of the House and the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, has been a great contribution and of tremendous aid to us in the consideration of the pending bill.

This working committee gathered and processed all the material for the main committee.

The results of the work of this committee, exemplified by the proposed Uniform Code of Military Justice, are an outstanding accomplishment. Considering the difficulty of the subject matter, its complexity, and, in many cases, its highly technical nature, the committee achieved a remarkable degree of uniformity. Naturally, a number of the provisions are the result of a compromise and, naturally, there was no final agreement on a few of them and a decision had to be made by Secretary Forrestal.

I wish to say that in examining the attitude of the services on the various proposals which have been incorporated in the unified code which is here presented, there was agreement between the services on a remarkably large number of the proposals, I should say away above 90 percent. Only a very few had to be submitted to Secretary Forrestal for determination one way or another.

The bill was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, was carefully studied by them, and was approved by them as fully in accord with the program of the President. On February 8, 1949, Mr. Forrestal transmitted it simultaneously to the Senate and House, and it was introduced as S. 857 and H. R. 2498. Mr. Forrestal strongly supported the code, and Secretary Johnson has also informed our commitee of his strong support of the bill. He has listed this as urgent legislation in the interest of our National Defense Establishment, and in the interest of unification.

The House Committee on Armed Services, through a subcommittee, conducted extensive hearing for 6 days a week over a period of 5 weeks, during which time they heard a total of 28 witnesses. Their deliberations are contained in a transcript of 1,542 pages, a very full hearing, and the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee made much use of the extensive hearings and statements of witnesses before the Armed Services Committee of the House.

As a result of this consideration, the House committee made a number of amendments to the bill, and reintroduced the original bill in the form of a clean bill, which became H. R. 4080. This bill was favorably reported to the House of Representatives by a unanimous vote of the House Committee on Armed Services and after debate passed the House by a voice vote, almost a unanimous vote, on May 5, 1949.

Let me say that any bill of this complicated nature which receives the unanimous vote of the distinguished members of the Armed Services Committee of the House, which I believe is composed of 26 or 27 members, must have been formulated very carefully.

The Senate Committee on Armed Services then undertook extensive hearings, and, in addition to Senate bill 857, which was the original bill introduced by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, considered the House version, House bill 4080.

The committee heard witnesses from the major veterans organizations, the American Bar Association, the New York City Bar Association the New York County Lawyers Bar Association, and the War Veterans Bar Association. In addition, testimony was presented by numerous well-qualified witnesses and by representatives of the Department of Defense. The committee also had the benefit of Professor Morgan's views. He testified at considerable length and strongly supported the bill. The committee scrutinized with great care the entire code and carefully considered the amendments made by the House of Representatives. Since so much of the Code and so many of the House amendments seemed appropriate to us, it was decided to report to the Senate the House version of the bill, together with the amendments made by our committee.

The reason we did not use the House language, and why we did not strike out House language, when we had amendments to take the place of the House bill language, was that some rearranging and some substantial changes were made, so we decided to report the amendments together in lieu of the House bill, so that all the language of the House bill is stricken out.

In general, the amendments of our committee have been of a technical and clarifying nature. We have tightened the provisions on jurisdiction over persons who are subject to the code; we have scaled down some of the punishments that can be imposed by commanding officers as company punishment; we have increased the protections of double jeopardy; and we have redefined and clarified several of the punitive articles.

We have changed the tenure of the Court of Military Appeals, which is provided for in the bill.

We feel that a conscientious effort has been made by a large group of people who have worked a long time on this whole subject and, though necessarily not perfect, the code has a large number of advantages to recommend it. In that connection, I would like to quote from both Mr. Forrestal's letter of transmittal and a recent letter of Secretary Johnson.

Mr. Forrestal concluded his letter by stating:

I regard this proposed bill as an outstanding example of unification in the armed services. In my opinion, the proposed bill is

well designed to protect the rights of those subject to it, will increase public confidence in military justice, and will not impair the performance of military functions. Accordingly, I strongly urge its passage by the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Johnson's letter printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As you know, I requested Prof. Edmund M. Morgan to inform your committee of my support of the Uniform Code of Military Justice when he appeared before you on my behalf.

I would appreciate it if this letter is incorporated in the record of your hearings and the committee report, because I am anxious to reiterate my strong support of the uniform code.

The code was drafted and transmitted to the Congress before I assumed office. I have taken the time, however, to familiarize myself with its principal provisions and I concur in Mr. Forrestal's opinion that the code represents an outstanding example of unification in the armed services. In my opinion, the code provides a number of very desirable protections for the accused without interfering with necessary military functions. In addition it represents a great advance in military justice in that it provides the same law and the same procedures for all persons in the armed forces. By its terms, the same rights, privileges, and obligations will apply to Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard. I cannot emphasize too much the importance of this equality and the fact that I believe it will be an item which will enhance the teamwork and cooperative spirit of the services.

I am aware of the conscientious and objective work of your committee and the House committee. I know that the bill has been improved by these constructive efforts and I wish to express to you and the members of your committee my deep appreciation. In order that the benefits of the code may be available at the earliest possible time, I strongly urge its passage at the present session of the Congress.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the proposed code, for the first time in the history of the armed services in this country, provides a single law for the enforcement of discipline and the trial and punishment of offenders. It is uniformly applicable in all its parts to the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Coast Guard in time of war and peace.

The code is designed to supersede (a) the Articles of War, including the amendments contained in the Selective Service Act of 1948, (b) the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and (c) the Disciplinary Laws of the Coast Guard. As you know, there are at present no separate articles governing the Air Force or the Marine Corps. If passed, the code will be the sole statutory authority embodying both the substantive and the procedural law governing military justice and its administration. There will be the same law and the same procedure governing all personnel in the armed services. That this should be so is the settled conviction of most people, and I believe no argument is necessary to demonstrate its validity.

In the same way that all persons in this country are subject to the same Federal laws and triable by the same procedure in all Federal courts, so it will be in the armed forces. The original trial of an accused will be in a court of his own service, except in certain circumstances where he is a member of a force acting jointly with another. The departmental review will follow a similar course. But the procedure before trial, at the trial, and on review will be the same as if the case had occurred in any of the other armed forces. The final review on the law will be made by the same tribunal for all the Departments of the Military Establishment. The objective is to make certain not only that justice be done to the accused, but that there be no disparities between the services. A civilian lawyer will have no difficulty in conducting any case at any stage of the proceedings.

If adopted, the code will be the sole statutory authority for—

First. The infliction of limited disciplinary penalties for minor offenses without judicial action;

Second. The establishment of pretrial and trial procedure;

Third. The creation and constitution of there classes of courts martial corresponding to those now in existence;

Fourth. The eligibility of members of each of the courts and the qualifications of its officers and counsel;

Fifth. The review of findings and sentence and the creation and constitution of the reviewing tribunals; and

Sixth. The listing and definition of offenses, redrafted and rephrased in modern legislative language.

The code, while based on the revised Articles of War and the Articles for the Government of the Navy, is a consolidation and a complete recodification of the present statutes. Under it, personnel of the armed forces, regardless of the Department in which they serve, will be subject to the same law and will be tried in accordance with the same procedures.

Among the provisions designed to secure uniformity are the following:

First. The offenses made punishable by the code are identical for all the armed forces.

Second. The same system of courts with the same limits of jurisdiction of each court is set up in all the armed forces.

Third. The procedure for general courts martial is identical as to institution of charges, pretrial investigation, action by the convening authority, review by the Board of Review, and review by the Court of Military Appeals in all the armed forces.

Fourth. The rules of procedure at the trial, including modes of proof, are equally applicable to all the armed forces.

Fifth. The Judge Advocate Generals of the three Departments are required to make uniform rules of procedure for the boards of review in each Department.

Sixth. The required qualifications for members of the court, law officer, and counsel are identical for all of the armed forces.

Seventh. The Court of Military Appeals, which finally decides questions of law, is the court of last resort for each of the armed forces and also acts with the Judge Advocates General of the three Departments as an advisory body with a view to securing uniformity in policy and in sentences and in discovering and remedying defects in the system and its administration.

The code, of course, has its foundation in the Articles of War and the Articles for the Government of the Navy and incorporates a large number of the provisions of both of these statutes. In addition, it includes most of the provisions of the Articles of War as amended by Public Law 759 of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. President, in that connection let me say that the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] in many respects greatly improved the Articles of War, as I shall set forth later, by the amendment he offered to the Selective Service Act in the Eightieth Congress, which is known as the Kem amendment. The Armed Services Committee is greatly obligated to the distinguished Senator from Missouri for his suggestions to the bill, most of which have been adopted, and most of which were contained in his amendment to the Selective Service Act which was applicable to the Army and to the Air Force.

For example, the code provides—

First. For enlisted men on general and special courts for the trial of other enlisted men.

These are some of the amendments which were in the Kem amendment, and which were carried forth in the unified code.

Second. That officers be subject to trial by special courts martial.

Third. That censure or reprimand of the courts or their members by the convening authority is prohibited.

Fourth. That the accused have the right to counsel at pretrial investigation.

Fifth. That company officer punishment be extended to a larger class of officers.

The above provisions were not only retained, but are now applicable to all the armed services, whereas under Public Law 759 they applied to the Army and Air Force only.

Among the provisions designed to insure a fair trial are the following:

GENERAL COURTS MARTIAL

First. A pretrial investigation is provided, at which the accused is entitled to be present with counsel to cross-examine available witnesses against him and to present evidence in his own behalf. It has some features of preliminary hearing and some of pretrial discovery as used in the civil courts.

Second. A prohibition against referring any charge for trial which does not state an offense or is not shown to be supported by sufficient evidence.

Third. A mandatory provision for competent, legally trained counsel at the trial for both the prosecution and the defense.

Fourth. A prohibition against requesting any statement from the accused without warning, and against compelling self-incrimination, and against reception in evidence of improperly obtained statements.

Fifth. Provision for equal process to accused and prosecution for obtaining witnesses and depositions and a provision allowing only the accused to use depositions in a capital case.

Sixth. A provision giving an accused enlisted man the privilege of having enlisted men as members of the court trying his case.

Seventh. A provision whereby voting on challenges, findings, and sentence is by secret ballot of the members of the court.

Eighth. A provision requiring the law officer to instruct the court on the record concerning the elements of the offense, presumption of innocence, and the burden of proof.

Ninth. A provision for an automatic review of the trial record for errors of law and of fact by a board of review with the right of the accused to be represented by legally competent counsel.

Tenth. A provision for the review of the record for errors of law by the Court of Military Appeals. This review is automatic in the case where the sentence is death or affects a general or flag officer and is upon petition showing probable error of law where the sentence involves more than 1 year's confinement, with the right to be represented by competent counsel.

Eleventh. A prohibition against receiving pleas of guilty in capital cases.

SPECIAL COURTS MARTIAL

In addition to certain of the above provisions which also apply to special courts martial, there is provided as follows:

First. The trial counsel and defense counsel must be equally qualified.

Second. In cases where a bad-conduct discharge has been imposed, a full stenographic transcript must be taken and the case is reviewed in the same fashion as a general court-martial record.

Third. Peremptory challenge and voting by secret ballot is provided as in a general court martial.

Fourth. Review by judge advocate or legal officer is required.

SUMMARY COURTS MARTIAL

First. Provision is made for permitting an accused to refuse trial by summary court upon request.

Second. Review by a judge advocate or legal officer is required.

Among some of the provisions designed to prevent interference with the due administration of justice are the following:

First. The convening authority may not refer charges for trial until they have been examined by the staff judge advocate or legal officer and have been found legally sufficient.

Second. The staff judge advocate or legal officer is authorized to communicate directly with the Judge Advocate General.

Third. All counsel at a general court-martial trial are required to be lawyers and to be certified by the Judge Advocate General as qualified to perform their legal duties.

Fourth. The law officer—a competent lawyer—rules on all questions raised at the trial, except on a motion for a directed verdict and on the issue of the accused's sanity.

Fifth. The convening authority must not act on a finding or sentence of a general court martial without first obtaining the advice of his staff judge advocate or legal officer.

Sixth. The Board of Review, situated in the office of the Judge Advocate General and removed from the convening authority, is composed of legally trained men and reviews the trial record for errors of law and of fact.

Seventh. The Court of Military Appeals is composed of civilians and passes finally on all questions of law.

Eighth. When counsel appear before the Board of Review and the Court of Military Appeals, both parties must be represented by qualified lawyers.

Ninth. Censure by a commanding officer of a court martial or any member or officer thereof because of any judicial action of the court or any member or officer is forbidden and any attempt improperly to influence official action in any aspect of a trial or its review is prohibited.

The proposed legislation is presented in 15 section. Section 1 contains the Uniform Code, which is subdivided into 11 parts. Part I contains general provisions. Part II contains all of the provisions relating to apprehension and restraint. Part III pertains to nonjudicial punishment. Part IV sets forth the jurisdiction of courts martial. Part V prescribes the manner of appointment and composition of courts martial. Part VI prescribes pretrial procedure. Part VII prescribes trial procedure. Part VIII relates to sentences by courts martial. Part IX prescribes the provisions for appellate review. Part X sets forth the punitive articles, which define the various offenses. Part XI contains miscellaneous provisions. Section 1 of the bill contains 140 articles. These articles embrace all of the provisions of the proposed Uniform Code of Military Justice. The 14 remaining sections relate to the subject of military justice, but are not appropriately part of a code of military justice and are, therefore, not included therein.

I believe that a summary of the contents of each part of the Uniform Code will indicate to you the scope of this legislation and will enable me to high light for you those articles which are incorporations of present provisions and practices of the Army and the Navy, those which are incorporations of the amendment of 1948 to the Articles of War, and those articles which are new:

Part I of the code concerns itself with general provisions which are usually found in modern penal laws. This part contains, in addition to definitions, the general jurisdictional provisions of military law. There is little in this part which is entirely new.

Article 2 sets forth the persons subject to the code and, in general, reincorporates the provisions in the present law. A new provision worthy of comment is found in subdivision 3, which makes Reserve personnel while on inactive-duty training subject to court-martial jurisdiction. Under the Articles of War, Reserve personnel on inactive duty are not subject to military law at the present time. The Articles for the Government of the Navy, however, are applicable to members of the Naval Reserve when they are on active duty; authorized training duty, with or without pay; drill or other equivalent instructions or duty or while they are in uniform. The provision set forth in the code strikes a middle ground between the present lack of jurisdiction of the Army and the extensive jurisdiction of the Navy, but it was felt necescut down and restrict the broad jurisdiction of the Navy, but it was felt unnecessary to retain jurisdiction over Reserve personnel on inactive duty under circumstances where they are engaging in certain types of training—notably week end flight training or sea duty. Under present Reserve training programs, reservists frequently partake of inactive-duty training over week ends and during the course of that training use expensive and dangerous equipment. That refers to airplanes, tanks, and equipment of that sort. It is felt necessary that, under such circumstances, there be control over such training. To insure, however, that reservists on inactive duty are not generally subject to courts martial, this provision has been carefully drafted so that it will apply only when reservists are authorized to undertake such training by written orders which are voluntarily accepted by them and which specify that they become subject to the code. Some Reserve groups were alarmed that this would make them subject to the code when they attended monthly meetings or wear their uniform or receive correspondence courses. The jurisdiction is not intended to cover such occasions, and will not cover them, both because of the requirement that the orders be voluntarily accepted and because no such acceptance will be requested except in connection with duty which involves the use of dangerous and expensive equipment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have been following with interest the distinguished Senator's statement on the application of the jurisdiction of courts martial to reservists not on active duty. I would like to be sure, and I should like to have the RECORD state with certainty, just what is intended by that provision. Is it correct to assume that under the wording which is now included in the bill there is no intention whatever of covering within the jurisdiction of courts martial, reservists who, while required to wear uniforms during training, are not assigned to the handling of expensive and dangerous equipment?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am delighted that the able Senator from Florida has asked the question, because it is a subject which I think should be amplified to some extent.

Under the present Articles for the Government of the Navy, as the Senator so well knows, when a naval reservist wears his uniform to attend a meeting, for example, he is subject to the provisions of the Articles for the Government of the Navy. It is a very tight kind

of provision. The Army reservist, on the other hand, is not subject to such a provision. The proposal attempts to strike a happy balance between those two situations. The subject is covered both in the House committee report and in the report of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate.

I should like to read from page 10 of the House committee report:

Paragraph (3) is adapted from 34 U. S. C., section 855, and, in its present form, represents a committee amendment. It should be noted that before Reserve personnel can be subject to this code they must voluntarily accept written orders for inactive-duty training, which orders specify that they are subject to the code.

A similar provision is set forth in the Senate committee report. As chairman of the subcommittee, I wish to make it clear that reservists wearing their uniforms in a period of training or attending a course or a lecture, or something of that kind, are not intended to be covered by the code. It is intended that they be covered by the code only when they report for duty involving the use of dangerous equipment, such as an airplane. I think the Senator will agree that under such conditions reservists should be subject to the military code. They are given orders, and they must accept the orders in writing, specifying that they are subject to the code. If they do not accept the orders, they are not subject to the code.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Before I yield further, I should like to read into the RECORD an excerpt from the report of the Morgan committee on this subject:

Paragraph (3) is adapted from 34 U. S. C., section 855. The requirement that there be written orders is added for two reasons. First, the applicability of this code to personnel on inactive-duty training is desirable only with respect to certain types of training, such as week-end flight training, and the written orders will be used to distinguish the types. Secondly, the orders will be notice to the personnel concerned.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it fair to say that no such orders will be issued in the case of officers and men who are assigned to duty other than to air flight duty, of which the Senator has spoken?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should not like to limit it to air flight duty. I should say sea duty or duty requiring the use of dangerous and expensive equipment. However, I should say it would be principally air flight duty and sea duty.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it fair to say that such orders are not expected to be issued, nor required to be accepted, by personnel of the Infantry Corp, the Field Artillery Corps, the Anti-Aircraft Artillery, the Corps of Engineers, the Hospital and Sanitary Corps, or officers and men of various other corps other than the Air Corps and the Navy?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that it is my information, and I am sure the representatives of the Army, the Air Corps, and the Navy have so testified, that the Army did not expect to use it at all, or certainly not in the instances to which the Senator has referred; that the Air Corps expects to present written orders and to ask for their acceptance only in the use of airplanes in flight duty, and the Navy only in the case of sea duty.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. If I correctly understand the Senator's last answer, it is that there is no expectation on the part of the Army to make use of this feature of the law in any way whatever.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is my information.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand that the expectation to use it is confined to the Air Force and the Navy, and then only, in the case of the Air Force, when air flight duty is required, in the use of expensive and dangerous equipment; and in the case of the Navy, only when afloat, or in air fight duty in the use of expensive and dangerous equipment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is my understanding, and I shall say for the subcommittee that that is the testimony that was given to us, and that is the legislative history of the provision.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it correct that even when used in those cases, the order of the Air Force or of the Navy, as the case may be, must be brought to the attention of, and delivered to, the particular officer or enlisted individual who is involved, and must be accepted by him in writing before it is applicable to him?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask a question in regard to subsection (11) of article 2, to which the Senator has just made reference. It appears on page 108 of the bill. Am I correct in interpreting subsection (11) to mean that a wife who accompanies her husband, who is a member of the armed forces, to a point outside the continental limits of the United States, would be subject to this code?

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the wife accompanies her husband outside the continental limits of the United States and outside the Territories listed in subsection (11), on page 108, she will be subject to the uniform code as presented in this bill, just as she is subject to the military code today.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator whether any exceptions are made in respect to the Territories listed in the last three and one-third lines of the paragraph.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In line 17, on page 108, I think it would be clearer if the word "without" had been inserted between the words "and" and "the." I have no objection to an amendment to that effect.

Mr. KEM. Is it not necessary that such an amendment be made, if the interpretation the Senator has suggested be given to that paragraph?

Mr. KEFAUVER. With the permission of the Senator, I shall read the paragraph; it is short. I read now subsection (11) of article 2, on page 108 of the bill:

(11) Subject to the provisions of any treaty or agreement to which the United States is or may be a party or to any accepted rule of international law, all persons serving with, employed by, or accompanying the armed forces without the continental limits of the United States and—

And at that point the word "without" should be inserted—

the following Territories: That part of Alaska east of longitude 172° west, the Canal Zone, the main group of the Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

It is intended to except those Territories or at least all the Territories except where we have a force. The Aleutian Islands are not excepted. They are not excepted now. That is the reason for the reference to longitude.

Mr. KEM. The point I have in mind is this: Does not the Senator from Tennessee agree that in order to make that interpretation clear, it would be essential to insert in line 17 the additional word "without", or something to that effect? In other words, does the Senator mean that the committee intends to amend the language by inserting the word "without", in line 17? If that is done, it seems to me the interpretation the Senator places on the language there is correct. But in the absence of such a change, it seems to me it is at least doubtful whether such an interpretation will be correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I say to the Senator from Missouri that probably such a change would make the language clearer, although I did not think it was needed. But certainly I have no objection to it, and I agree with the Senator that it will make the meaning clearer.

So, Mr. President, I shall submit as a committee amendment the insertion of the word "without" between the word "and" and the word "the", in line 17, on page 108 of the bill.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate greatly the Senator's suggestion in that respect.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the amendment just referred to is made, should not a similar amendment be made in subparagraph (12), at the top of page 109?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct; it should be made in line 3, on page 109. On behalf of the subcommittee, I shall offer the same amendment at that point.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question which I hope will be a clarifying question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am delighted to yield to the able Senator from Massachusetts, who worked so long and who knows much more about this proposal than does the junior Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope the Senator's other statements are of greater veracity than his last one. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEFAUVER. The statement represents the conviction of the Senator from Tennessee about the matter.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My question is this: Some doubt has been raised, particularly by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, relative to civilians and the inclusion of civilians under subparagraphs (11) and (12) of article 2. It is my understanding that subparagraph (11), with the exception of the change from the word "territorial" to the word "continental," is the same language as that now contained in the Army code; that subparagraph (12) is now in the code of the Navy in wartime; that what subparagraphs (11) and (12) really do is to cover in peacetime, as well as in wartime, civilians who accompany the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force; and that it is necessary to include subparagraph (12) for application in peacetime as well as in wartime, for the Navy particularly, because of its trusteeship over some of the islands in the far Pacific, where there is no other code of justice. Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator is correct; that is a correct statement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So that when the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary argues that the matter should be brought to his committee because of these provisions, he is incorrect, in that they are already a substantial part of the present military code. Is that not correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is correct. That will be found in the report of the House committee, which, under the Ramseyer rule, was to report on the whole law as the law is to be amended, as the Senator well knows. On page 42 of the House report, subsection (d) of article 1, applies to the Army. Then there is, under the Ramseyer rule, a similar provision in the House report as to the Navy. I thank the Senator for clarifying that issue.

Article 3 represents a new provision in military law. It provides a type of continuing jurisdiction over persons who have been separated from military service or are on inactive duty, who, nevertheless, are charged with having committed offenses while in an active-duty status. Under the Articles of War, persons who commit serious crimes overseas, such as murder, theft of crown jewels, or mistreatment of American prisoners, or who commit a military offense in this country, may not be tried by court martial or in any court after they have been discharged from the service. Moreover, Army reservists may not be tried for such crimes after they go on inactive duty. In a recent Supreme Court case, the case of *United States ex rel. Hirshberg* v. *Cooke, Commanding Officer* (226 U. S. 210), it was held that a person discharged from the naval service cannot be tried by court martial during a subsequent reenlistment for a crime committed during the first enlistment, even though in this case it was 1 day only that he was out of the service. But the same principle would apply if he had been out of the service for 20 minutes only. Of course, the crime committed in the Hirshberg case was not discovered until after the reenlistment, and that, of course, could happen very readily.

By virtue of these inadequate provisions, a considerable number of persons were able to escape trial for serious offenses committed while in the armed services, and it was apparent to the Senate committe that this situation should be corrected. The House committee was of the same opinion. There is in the House hearings a great deal of discussion about abuses which have resulted from this holding by the Supreme Court. It was felt, however, that the jurisdiction of courts martial should not, in general, be extended to civilians, and for this reason the continuing jurisdiction provided over the types of cases I have described is limited to cases which fall, first, within the statute of limitations; second, which are not triable by Federal courts; and, third, which involve serious crimes calling for a sentence of at least 5 years. In other words, there is continuing jurisdiction only in those cases. This provision would, therefore, correct the inadequate jurisdiction heretofore provided and, at the same time, limit and restrict the jurisdiction to proper areas.

Article 4 is a noteworthy change for the Army and Air Force in that it provides that in cases where an officer is dismissed by the President without trial and in the event he is later exonerated he may be restored to active duty. Article 6 extends to the Navy the provisions passed by the Congress at the last session by the Kem amendment, requiring assignments for duty of judge advocates and legal officers to be subject to the approval of the appropriate Judge Advocate General and requiring consultation by convening authorities with staff judge advocates or legal officers in matters relating to the administration of military justice. It also emphasizes the independence of the staff judge advocate or legal officer in matters relating to military justice by authorizing him to communicate directly with the staff judge advocates or legal officers of superior or subordinate commands or with the Judge Advocate General himself.

Part II, which consists of articles 7 through 14, covers the general subject of apprehension and restraint. It is new only to the extent that the conflicting definitions of the terms used and the different processes have been simplified and made more orderly. Attention is drawn, specifically, to article 12, which continues the provision enacted by the Eightieth Congress prohibiting confinement of members of the armed forces with enemy prisoners.

Part III consists of one article only, article 15 which deals with nonjudicial punishment imposable by commanding officers. This is commonly called company punishment in the Army, and punishment at mast in the Navy. As will be noticed, the article lists all the punishments now so imposable by both the Army and the Navy, with certain modifications which I shall explain. The present practice of the Army differs from that of the Navy. The permitted punishments are different. That is necessary, of course, by virtue of their different operations. The Army practice has been to impose less severe penalties and to give the accused an option to demand trial by court martial. The Navy has imposed somewhat more severe punishments and has given the accused no option. This diversity in practice is due to two factors: first, men on shipboard are necessarily in a different situation with reference to freedom of motion and availability of replacement than men in camp; second, in the Navy mast punishment is imposed by the Captain, and a summary court necessarily consists of an officer inferior to him in rank, while in the Army such an incongruity in rank between a commanding officer and a summary court would be virtually unknown since the court normally would be appointed by a higher command. The committee concluded that these factors justified a difference in treatment. Consequently, article 15, first, subjects the imposition of these nonjudicial penalties to complete regulation by the President, and, second, gives the Secretary of each Department discretionary power to put additional limitations upon them and to provide for an option to the accused to demand a court martial. In addition, the committee felt that the more severe penalties of the Navy, involving confinement for 7 days and bread and water for 5 days, should be imposed only at sea where there is reason and justification for their application. For this reason, the language, as originally submitted, was modified and the imposition of bread and water was reduced from 5 to 3 days. One further provision of interest in this article is subsection (d) which strengthens the present system of appeals from nonjudicial punishment and permits reviewing authorities not only to remit the unexecuted portion of punishment, but to restore rights adversely affected.

Part IV in its article 16 creates three classes of courts martial—general, special, and summary. These correspond to the present courts in the Army. The special court martial under present Navy practice is called a summary court, and the summary court is called a deck court. The chief difference from the present Army provision is the requirement that a general court shall consist of at least five members and a law officer.

Most of the articles consist of a rewording and revision of provisions found at present in both the Articles of War and the Articles for the Government of the Navy. Article 17, however, is new in that it provides reciprocal jurisdiction of courts martial. By its terms, each armed force shall have court-martial jurisdiction over all persons subject to the Uniform Code. There is thus provided authority for an Army court martial to try either its own personnel or the personnel of the Navy, the Air Force, or the Coast Guard. It is felt that this provision is necessary in the light of unification and by virtue of the tendency to have military operations undertaken by

joint forces. Inasmuch as it is not possible at this time to forecast the different forms of joint operation which will take place in the future, the exercise of the reciprocal jurisdiction of one armed force over the personnel of other services has been left to the regulations of the President. In this way a desirable flexibility is attained which will enable the President to prescribe the types of operations in which reciprocal jurisdiction will be exercised. Of course, until the President authorizes reciprocal jurisdiction it cannot be put into effect, but in certain things like the MATS there were joint operations. I think it should be pointed out at this place, however, that even though the original trial may be conducted by another service, the review authority will be from the serviceman's own service.

Part V, which has to do with the appointment and composition of courts martial, includes articles 22 through 29. These fix the qualifications of the persons who may convene general, special, and summary courts and the persons who may serve on courts martial.

Articles 22, 23, and 24 continue the present practices of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Coast Guard in that they provide members of general, special, and summary courts martial be appointed by the President, the Secretaries of the three Departments, and certain commanding officers. This, as I have said, is a continuation of the present methods of selecting members of courts martial and is now provided in Articles of War 8, 9, and 10 and in Articles for the Government of the Navy 26, 38, and 64. I believe it is advisable at this point to stop and outline for the members of the Senate the controversy which exists in connection with the provisions of these three articles. Certain witnesses before our committe and the House committee opposed this method of selecting court members and claimed that it is the one serious defect of the Uniform Code, in that it enables a continuance of command control, which, in their opinion, deprives courts martial of their independence. The witnesses who espouse this viewpoint are representatives of some of the bar associations in this country. I may say, parenthetically, that the position of the bar associations on this subject is not unanimous. The New York State Bar Association, for instance, strongly supports the provisions as written. The critics of these provisions concede that the commanding officer should retain the right to refer charges for trial, select the trial counsel, and review the sentence after trial. They would, however, take away from the commanding officer the right to appoint the members of the court. In substitution therefor, they would have court members and defense counsel selected by a staff judge advocate from a panel of eligible officers made available and selected by commanding officers. It is their view that this method of selecting court members would remove the influence of the commanding officer over the members of the court.

The committee considered this proposal at great length, having heard a great deal of testimony on the subject, and rejected it. The House committee came to the same conclusions after considerable study. This idea of a panel of court members is not a new one. It was part of the Chamberlain bill for the reorganization of the Articles of War in 1919 and was proposed last year by the same bar association witnesses when Congress considered the Kem amendment, which became law as Public Law 759.

I know that representatives of many associations urged the Senator from Missouri to adopt the idea.

The Department of Justice opposes the idea of a panel of prospective court members on the grounds that it is impractical, unwieldy, and will not achieve the result claimed for it. The proposal was submitted to and considered by the Morgan committee and was rejected by them. Professor Morgan so testified before our committee. It is the position of the National Military Establishment that the uniform code has a number of added protections for the accused not found in the Articles of War or the Articles for the Government of the Navy which will guarantee a greater amount of justice and will provide a more legal proceeding which will effectively counteract any unwarranted command influence. They give a strong warning that completely divorcing command responsibility from command authority will impair military functions. We concluded that, recognizing necessary military participation, there were a sufficient number of protections in the bill to justify the present method of selecting courts.

Another thing which should be pointed out, Mr. President, is that of having a panel available for various courts martial, which would immobilize or take out of operation that number of officers and men. It would be unwieldy to have such a panel available for that purpose. It does not seem to add very much protection to have the commanding officer select the panel, in the first place, and then have members of the court selected from that panel. The committee could not see that it gave a great deal of protection. The other considerations outweigh it.

Article 25 provides for the service of enlisted men on courts which try enlisted men and follows the provisions of Public Law 759 of the Eightieth Congress. Article 26 provides for a law officer on general courts martial. It is generally agreed that every general court martial should have assigned to it an officer with legal training and experience who will make rulings on interlocutory questions and advise the court on matters of law. There has been some controversy, however, as to the status of this officer—as to whether he is to be a member of the court who retires and votes with the court on the findings and sentence, or whether he is to be more in the nature of a judge with completely independent functions.

Article 26 adopts the second view and provides for the appointment of what is called a law officer. He can neither vote on the findings and sentence nor retire with the court during its deliberations. In this way he differs from the law member now provided for in the Articles of War. He is an innovation for the Navy, which has never had either a law officer or a law member attached to its courts.

The judge concept, as contrasted with the member concept, has been supported by all the recent studies of the naval court-martial system. It was recommended by the House Military Affairs Committee in a study made of the Army system in 1946. It has been supported by many of the witnesses appearing before the Senate committee, including the witnesses for the bar associations. Just a few months ago it was fully adopted in Great Britain pursuant to a report of the Army and Air Force Courts-Martial Committee. There the law official did not have a vote, but prior to the report he was allowed to retire with the court during its deliberations.

There are two strong arguments for the system adopted in the bill. The first is that the withholding from the law officer of the functions of a juror makes him better able to carry out his judicial functions objectively. The second is that all instructions given by the law officer will be on the record and subject to review. This eliminates the situation in which, if erroneous advice on the law is given by the law member in closed session, there would be no record of the error on which to base an appeal.

In support of the member concept it has been said that the presence of a trained legal expert in the closed sessions is of great value in assuring that justice is done. In answer to this it should be pointed out that under article 51 the court will have the benefit of the law officer's instructions on the elements of the offense, the presumption of innocence, and the burden of proof, and that the same article does not prevent him from giving further instructions on other appropriate matters.

Article 27 contains one of the most important safeguards provided in this bill.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. As I understand, under article 26 the law officer is not permitted to retire with the other members of the court, or to vote. Is that correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

Mr. KEM. Under that provision, is not the court deprived of the counsel and advice of the law officer when it might be most needed?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say to the distinguished Senator that there are two views in regard to that question. The Navy has never had a law member or a law officer. Under the Army system, the law member would retire with the court and would advise the court and vote with it. So this is a compromise between the Navy procedure and the Army procedure, but it so happens that it represents the recommendation, I think, contained in most of the studies of persons who have gone into the problem.

Answering more directly the question of the distinguished Senator from Missouri, it seems to me that following the jury concept in the matter is a pretty safe thing to do. The law officer is distinguished from a member of the court,

and he must be a lawyer. He instructs the court on the record. If the court desires additional instructions it has a right to call him in, and the additional instructions are also on the record. The facts of the case are decided by the nonlegal members of the court.

There have been many complaints, as the Senator well knows, regarding the law member retiring with the court, with no record being made of what he says. Other persons feel that with his superior knowledge of the law he might unduly sway the members of the court against the person who is being tried.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator recall the testimony of Maj. Gen. Thomas H. Green, who was the Judge Advocate General of the Army when he appeared before the Senate subcommittee?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. KEM. The testimony to which I refer appears at page 257 of the hearings.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; I remember that he appeared before the subcommittee.

Mr. KEM. The portion of General Green's testimony to which I should like to invite the Senator's particular attention is as follows:

> The requirement of the Kem amendment that a law member be a lawyer and that he participate in all proceedings of a court martial is regarded by all who have had experience in the administration of military justice as the most significant improvement since automatic appellate review. The limitation on the effectiveness of the law member will result in miscarriages of justice both to the detriment of accused persons as well as to the detriment of the interests of the Government.

Does the Senator agree with that statement of Major General Green?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is the view of General Green, of course, but there is one point which I should make, namely, that the Kem amendment did not as a matter of fact require that the law member be a lawyer. It said, "if available."

Mr. KEM. Of course the amendment did not contemplate that the officers be directed to accomplish the impossible. If there were not a lawyer available, of course, they could not have one.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think that exception resulted in not having a lawyer as a law member, on the ground that he was not available, when many times a lawyer would have been available, but they did not want to have him serve.

Mr. KEM. But that is not in issue here.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is not in issue. This is merely getting a little closer to the civilian approach in court-martial proceeding. It approaches the judge idea. I think in its general tendency and general aim the pending bill, while not going overboard in attempting to adopt civilian technique, is an attempt to bring the system a little further into harmony with civilian methods. This method of having the law officer instruct, and what he says appear on the record, and not retire and not vote with the court, is exactly what is done in civilian trials before juries today.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator recall the language which Major General Green used in dealing with the proposed analogy between the law officer and a civilian judge?

I invite his attention to page 257 of the hearings, where it appears that General Green said:

> The analogy between the proposed law officer and a civilian judge is more apparent than real. For example, he rules subject to objection by any member of the court on the question of a motion for a finding of not guilty under article 51. Suppose that he has ruled, as a matter of law, that the prosecution has not proved a prima facie case and a member objects to his ruling. Under the proposed code the court closes—excludes the law officer—and votes on this legal question. The law officer cannot explain his ruling, defend it, or vote to sustain it. Although under A. W. 31 such a ruling by the present law member is also subject to objection at least he can defend his ruling against the argument of a member who may not be well versed in the law. I don't believe this change which makes the law member a mere figurehead is defensible.

Mr. KEFAUVER. This change does not make him a mere figurehead. General Green is wrong in saying that the law member cannot sustain his ruling.

Mr. KEM. He cannot sustain it when an important decision is being made by the court.

Mr. KEFAUVER. He certainly explains his ruling to the members of the court. He can be as emphatic as he desires. Of course, he cannot go into secret sessions and press the matter further.

Mr. KEM. How can he anticipate what course the argument and the discussion by the court will take when they retire?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I believe the Senator is talking about the facts of the case. Of course, if we are going to say that the position of the law member should prevail, that he ought to be able to retire with the board and argue with them in private, without what he says being on the record, in a closed session, we might as well abolish the other members of the court. At present he has only one vote in any event, and it seems that the general view of the Keeffe Board, and of all the other boards, is that we would have at least a better decision on the facts of a case if he acted as in the nature of a judge, rather than as a member.

Mr. KEM. Does not the Senator feel that the court is being deprived of the services of a law officer when the court most needs them?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It depends on the concept. It may be that the judge should retire with the jury and discuss the case during the deliberations. Perhaps courts martial really need a judge to help them decide a case. But we have never operated on that basis in civilian courts. The pending proposal tries to place courts martial on more of a civilian basis.

Mr. KEM. As General Green says, the analogy between the civilian court and the military court is more apparent than real.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say also that I have gone over the reports which have been filed relating to naval courts martial, in which there is no law member. There has not been a law member even to instruct on the law, not to say argue with the members when they are reaching their decisions, and they have accomplished justice just about as well as the Army and the Air Corps have under the present system.

Mr. KEM. I do not know about that. I think that all during the last war the Members of Congress received about as many complaints about the character of justice rendered in the Navy as in the Army.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to say to the Senator from Missouri—and I think the Senator from Tennessee will support me—that we discusesd this matter at great length in the subcommittee hearings. We discussed it with Professor Morgan, and I believe our feeling was, after hearing both sides of the argument, that it would be very much more helpful, and in the end would be fairer to the defendant and fairer to the court, to have a lawyer member outside and not going in with the court. The court could always get the legal point of view restated by the lawyer member if it so desired, and have it placed on the record. It was felt that with the new court of appeals, composed of civilians, up at the top, it would be very much wiser and fairer to have the legal side of the differences of opinion all on the record, than to have the lawyer member saying things in private to the court when they were giving the matter their consideration. It was that balance of judgment, the weighing of both those things, which made me, as one member of the committee, feel that the committee's report was correct.

Mr. KEM. Is the Senator proceeding on the theory that the advice and counsel of the lawyer member would be unsound, or that he would overpower the judgment of the other members of the court?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is on the same ground on which the distinguished Senator and I have never been permitted to serve on a jury, the idea being, as I understand it, that a trained lawyer sitting on a jury is likely to influence the jury. He may have different points of view from the judge who directed the jury, and therefore it is wise to exclude him. If we are to accept the analogy of the civilian court, I agree that is entirely so, but if we are going to accept that analogy, we would by the same token have to find many faults with the pending bill. I use that analogy in this instance because it was the thing which determined me as one member of the committee, and I think determined the judgment of the committee as a whole.

Mr. KEM. Is not the Senator like the devil who quotes Scripture to his purpose? Is he not insisting on the analogy when it serves his purpose and disregarding it entirely when it does not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator from Massachusetts can quote Scripture for any purpose, at any time, he is very happy.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I do not like to bear on the point unduly, but it seems to me that the experience which the Army had during the period in which the law officer, as he is termed now—or "law member," as it was in the other bill—was permitted to participate in the proceedings, was good. The testimony is that it was highly beneficial, and that it worked well in practice. Having tried that and found it good, I dislike to see the Congress abandon the principle and adopt something new and untried.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, there was controversy about this proposal. The committee did have some difficulty in reaching a decision. We hope the method we propose will work better than did the old method. We believe the one particular advantage our proposal has over the procedure whereby the law officer retires with the members of the court into executive session, is that whatever the law officer says will be on the record, so that the reviewing authorities may see what his attitude about the matter was and what he had to say about it. If the law officer retires into executive session with the members of the court, and talks back and forth with them, and votes with them, it is going to be very hard to have on the record his exact position, for purposes of the reviewing officers.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. The official position of the Army before the Morgan committee was that the law officer should be permitted to participate in the deliberations.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. KEM. And the official position of the Navy was to the contrary?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Navy has never had either a law officer or a law member.

Mr. KEM. And the position of the Navy was that the law officer should not participate in the deliberations.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have been advised that the Navy and Air Force both voted for a law officer.

Mr. KEM. The Navy's position was that the law officer should not participate in the deliberations after the court retired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think the Navy's position was that it did not want one in the first place.

Mr. KEM. But the Navy voted for one, the Senator says. After having accepted him, the Navy did not want him to participate. Is that correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Navy and the Air Force, as I have been advised, voted for the law officer concept.

Mr. KEM. Was it the position of the Air Force that the law officer, or law member, whichever the Senator may choose to call him, should participate in the deliberations of the court?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have been consulting with some of the staff with respect to the position taken by the Army and the Navy and the Air Force in the matter. I think I made a misstatement a little while ago. My present information is that the Army and the Air Force wanted a law officer to retire with and vote with the court.

Mr. KEM. Then the voting was 2 to 1 in the armed services, and yet the committee has accepted and adopted the view of the minority?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The vote was really 2 to 2, because the chairman of the committee voted with the Navy.

Mr. KEM. The committee did not give him the same weight as it did to the large number of officers in one of the branches of the armed services, did it?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Anyway, the services did stand 2 to 1.

Mr. KEM. Would it not be sounder for the Congress to adopt the view of the majority rather than the minority in this important matter?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the Senator from Missouri that this is a compromise between the concept, on the one side, of the Navy, which had no law member at all, and that of the Army and Air Force, on the other side, which have a law member. So the compromise provides a law officer for each of the services.

Mr. KEM. Is it not true that the Army and the Air Force both had had experience with the law member and knew what that procedure was like, and to what use the law member could be put, and they liked that procedure and wanted to continue it? The Navy did not know any thing about it and objected to that about which they knew nothing.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Navy had had experience without the law officer, and they thought they had gotten along very well on that basis.

Mr. KEM. The mere fact that the committee was sitting shows that the Navy had not gotten along too well.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to make a comment in connection with the question asked by the Senator from Missouri, and I hope it may be helpful. There were only two instances in the whole report, as I understand, where the services were not in unanimous agreement. In those two instances Secretary Forrestal made the decision. He made the decision after hearing both sides, and after listening to Professor Morgan. He made the decision in the way it came to the committee. The committee went through the same process again, discussed the question, and after having listened to the discussion and after having listened to the recommendations made by Professor Morgan, came to the same conclusion Mr. Forrestal had reached. That is my memory and my understanding regarding how we reached the decision. We did not reach it on the basis of the minority presentation. We reached it on the decision made by Secretary Forrestal, when there was a difference of opinion between the services.

Mr. KEM. Of course, Secretary Forrestal had recently retired from the position of Secretary of the Navy and was in the corner of the Navy, so to speak. He had had no more experience with the law member than the other representatives of the Navy. On the other hand, the representatives of the Army and the Air Force had seen the procedure in operation for something like a year.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say also to the Senator that the old Military Affairs Committee of the House had some time back recommended the law officer concept. That committee at that time had jurisdiction over the Army and the Air Force only. Anyway, the problem was one of the difficult problems with which the committee had to deal, and the provision in the bill represents the compromise arrived at.

Article 27 contains one of the most important safeguards provided in the bill. This is the requirement that both the trial counsel and the defense counsel in a general court martial case shall be lawyers. It is in line with the recommendations of the Keeffe Board and of the House Committee on Military Affairs and is a provision that has been strongly supported by the bar associations and favored in a poll of the members of the Judge Advocates Association. It was unanimously recommended by the Morgan committee.

The existing Navy law has no provision with respect to the qualifications of counsel and naval courts and boards, or regulations which govern the procedures before naval courts martial. It merely provides that the accused has a right to counsel. The Articles of War, as amended by the Kem amendment of 1948, provide that lawyers must act for the prosecution and the defense, but this requirement is binding only if lawyers are available. It has been held that the determination of the availability of the lawyers is a matter entirely within the discretion of the convening authority, a discretion which can be and has been abused.

This committee is strongly of the opinion that absolute requirement that legally trained counsel conduct the prosecution and defense is one of the strongest and, at the same time, most practical and workable guaranties that trials will be conducted in accordance with due process of law.

Part VI contains the provisions governing pretrial procedure, and, in the main, the articles in this part follow present Army practice as prescribed in the Kem amendment of 1948. Article 31, as amended by the committee, fully guarantees the privilege against self-incrimination and contains a provision requiring that an accused must be informed of this privilege before he is interrogated. Article 32 provides for an impartial investigation of charges before trial by general court martial is ordered. The accused has a right to be present at this investigation, to be represented by counsel, to cross-examine witnesses against him, to have witnesses questioned in his behalf, and to present anything he may desire in his own behalf.

This investigation has elements of both an indictment and a discovery proceeding. The formal collection and presentation of evidence serves as a basis for determining whether a general court martial should be ordered and thus prevents frivolous or unfounded charges from going to trial. At the same time, it gives the accused a more complete knowledge of the nature of the case against him, enabling him better to prepare his defense. Incidentally more protection is given to an accused in a court martial investigation than is given to a civilian in a grand jury investigation, because a civilian cannot be present when a grand jury deliberates and votes.

Part VII, articles 36–54, covers trial procedure and follows closely the present Army and Navy practices. A good many of the provisions, however, now make uniform a number of minor differences which have heretofore existed. Article 37 continues the provision passed by the Congress in 1948 prohibiting unlawful influence on the actions of court martial. The committee believed it most desirable to continue this salutary prohibition, which will do much to eliminate so-called command control.

Reverting again for a minute to the question of command control, it is believed that article 37, which was brought in by the Kem amendment, coupled with article 98, will be a most effective weapon against any interference with the independence of the court by a commander. Not only is a commander prohibited from admonishing or reprimanding a court or its members under the provisions of article 37, but it becomes a court martial offense for him to do so under article 98.

Article 41, which provides one peremptory challenge of members of general and special courts, follows present Army practice, but changes Navy practice, which heretofore had no provision for peremptory challenges. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that the Army won over the Navy on this change.

Another example of uniformity is found in article 51, which covers the question of voting and rulings. As set out by the provisions of the article, the law officer now becomes more nearly an impartial judge in the manner of civilian courts. In addition to ruling on interlocutory questions of law during the course of the trial, the law officer is now required to instruct the court, on the record, before it retires as to the elements of the offense and to charge the court on presumption of innocence, reasonable doubt, and burden of proof. In article 52, you will notice that the number of votes required for both conviction and sentence have been made uniform for all the services.

Article 44 deals with former jeopardy. The distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] wrote the committee a lengthy letter in which he made a great many suggestions. Some of his suggestions dealt with this subject, and many of them were adopted by the committee. The committee heard considerable objection to the jeopardy rules as they exist in the services today and has amended them in line with the recommendations of the Senator from Nevada.

This has been done in such a way as not to interfere with the highly desirable system of automatic review under which every court-martial case is reviewed for error by higher authority whether or not the accused requests it. Article 44, as amended, not only protects a person from being tricd twice for the same offense, but also makes it clear that a case which is terminated by the prosecution for failure of available evidence or witnesses shall be a complete trial in the jeopardy sense. In other words, in a court-martial proceeding, if the trial is merely called off or delayed because the prosecution believes it does not have sufficient witnesses and wants an adjournment in order to obtain additional witnesses, another trial would constitute double jeopardy. If the trial is called off because of imperious necessity—for example, because of the advance of the enemy or because of bombardment—to continue with the trial would not constitute double jeopardy. I believe the doctrine of imperious necessity under another name is recognized in civilian-court practice.

Part VIII, articles 55 to 58, deals with sentences and has nothing new in it except an authorization to the respective Secretaries to make regulations for carrying into execution any sentence of confinement in any correctional or penal institution under the control of the United States. This was drafted after consultation with the correctional branches to the services and its purpose is to make available more adequate facilities for rehabilitation of offenders.

Part IX, articles 59 to 76, provides for the appellate review of court-martial cases. It makes a number of innovations in which I am sure you will be interested. The present procedures of the Army and Navy differ widely. The chart in the center shows the Army procedure. The one in the rear shows the Navy procedure of appeal review, and the chart on the right shows the procedure provided for in the Uniform Code for all the services. It will be seen that the proposed procedure is very much simpler than the more complex ones now followed by the Army and by the Navy.

The Army system particularly is exceedingly complex. To the review by the convening authority and the Board of Review, further review was added in 1948 by Congress by a judicial counsel, composed of three general officers. The course of review for several types of cases is painstakingly spelled out in the Articles of War by reference to and in conjunction with the respective functions of approving and confirming authorities, and is difficult for the nonexpert to diagram or understand. The Navy system of review, on the other hand, is far more informal and, in the main, rests ultimately with the Secretary of the Navy. It provides a review by the convening authority, a review in the office of the Judge Advocate General and an additional review on sentence by the Bureau of Personnel and by a Sentence Review Board. The action of all these agencies, however, is advisory only. The Morgan committee felt obliged to devise a system that would be useful and practical for all services, and would be consonant with the plan of unification.

In essence, the appellate review proposed in the Uniform Code is as follows: There is an initial review by the convening authority covering law, facts, credibility of witnesses, and a review of the sentence. In this respect, it is in all essentials the same as the first review provided at the present time by both the Army and the Navy. Insofar as the convening authority has affirmed a finding or sentence against the accused, a review is provided by a Board of Review in the office of the Judge Advocate General of the Department of which accused is a member. This Board of Review is a counterpart cf the present Board of Review of the Army. As the amendment of 1948 provides, it reviews the record of the trial for law, facts, and sentence. To this extent, the Navy system is changed. Following this review, there is a review for errors of law by a single Court of Military Appeals composed of three civilians. It is apparent that such a tribunal is necessary to insure uniformity of interpretation and administration throughout the armed services. Moreover, it is consistent with the principle of civilian control of the armed forces that a court of final appeal on the law should be composed of civilians.

The result of this pattern for an appellate system will be that the appellate procedure will be strengthened by a greater centralization of authority in tribunals, rather than in individuals as at present. This appellate system also has the virtue of being less complex than the present systems and should result in greater protection for an accused. In general, it is patterned after the appellate system of the Federal courts, with the Court of Military Appeals closely following the procedures of the Supreme Court of the United States.

While some differences of opinion were expressed by the witnesses on the merits of the Court of Military Appeals, the preponderance of opinion was favorable. Several individuals and some of the reserve associations criticized the court as too civilian in nature and as accomplishing an unnecessary amount of unification. There was also a difference of opinion between the services themselves, with the Department of the Army registering a dissent to this type of court. On the other hand, the Navy, the Air Force, Professor Morgan, the bar associations, the AMVETS, the American Veterans Committee and a number of other witnesses strongly favor such a supreme civilian court of military law. The position of the proponents of this court is that it is necessary if the substantive and procedural law of the Uniform Code—which applies to all persons in the services—is to be uniformly interpreted. In addition, they see a need for a final authority on the law and feel that the present system—whereby the Secretaries of the Departments or the President are called upon to decide questions of law—is completely inadequate. In addition, they believe that a court of this character, with the prestige of a United States

Court of Appeals, will do a great deal to insure public confidence in the fairness of military justice. The House committee and our committee feel that a court of this character will result in major improvements in the trial of courts martial.

As originally drafted, the judges of this court were to be appointed by the President, after confirmation by the Senate for life. Our committee carefully considered this provision and felt that, since the court represents a new concept in military law, it was advisable to provide the appointment of the judges for a term of years, rather than for life. Accordingly, our committee amended the provisions relating to tenure and has made them similar to the Tax Court of the United States and some of the Territorial courts.

Part IX also provides in article 70 for appellate counsel to assure that the parties will be adequately represented before the boards of review and the Court of Military Appeals. These counsel are to be appointed by the Judge Advocate Generals with provision for the accused to have his own counsel. Article 72 provides for a hearing before the suspension of a serious sentence can be vacated. Both of these articles are new.

Part X covers punitive articles. In the main, the present punitive articles of the Articles of War and the Articles for the Government of the Navy are retained. There are, however, several interesting features of the proposed punitive articles. In the first place, there are set forth some general provisions normally found in modern penal laws and not heretofore contained in the Articles of War or the Articles for the Government of the Navy. These cover the definitions of a "principal," "an accessory after the fact," "attempts to commit crimes," "conspiracies," and "solicitations." You will notice as you study them that the punitive articles consolidate a number of offenses, in the same fashion as many other provisions are consolidated in the code. An example of this is the crime of desertion, which is now contained in article 85. The same material was heretofore found in Articles of War 28 and 58 and in Articles for the Government of the Navy 10, 4—paragraph 6—and 8—paragraph 21.

In addition, several offenses which were previously punishable under the general article are specifically set forth. One of them is designated as "missing movement," which is contained in article 87. This is an aggravated type of absence without leave and is designed to meet conditions encountered in World War II. The experience of World War II indicates that a large number of military personnel who were legitimately on leave or who left without permission returned after their unit or ship had moved or sailed. This misconduct caused so much trouble that it was felt necessary to make it a subject of a specific article. Article 105, entitled "Misconduct as Prisoner," is also new and provides for punishment of anyone subject to the code, who while in the hands of the enemy in time of war either for the purpose of securing favorable treatment for himself or while in a position of authority, mistreats others who are confined with him. You will recall that a number of instances of this type came to light after the war. They justify the enactment of this specific offense.

The last part, namely part XI, contains a number of miscellaneous articles such as those regulating the procedures before courts of inquiry, those providing for authority to administer oaths, and for complaints against superiors, and for redress for damage done to private property by members of the armed forces.

As I have already indicated, the remaining sections of the bill relate to military justice but are not appropriately part of the Uniform Code. I would like to comment particularly on two of them, the first is section 12, which provides for a petition to the Judge Advocate General for review of court-martial cases involving offenses committed during World War II. The Kem amendment of 1948 contained a similar provision but it was applicable to the Army and Air Force only. This section extends the right to such review to members of all the services.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator whether his committee has made a study of the business which would come before the Court of Military Appeals which is established by the bill, as provided at page 161.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes, the committee has considered that problem and has made some study of it.

Mr. KEM. In the course of a normal year in time of peace, how many cases would the court have to consider?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Cases will go to the Court of Military Appeals if the accused petitions to have the court consider his case or if cases are sent to the court by the Judge Advocate General.

When cases go to the Court of Military Appeals, they will do so only on questions of law, in other words, the situation will be analogous to that under the principle of a petition of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the United States.

The greatest number of the cases of course would be settled and disposed of before they ever reached the Court of Military Appeals; cases would go to that court only on matters of law or of military jurisdiction.

Mr. KEM. I understand that.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Considering the number of courts martial, the witnesses who testified before our committee, the Morgan committee, and the House committee, including those representing the three armed services, as I understand, were of the opinion that this court would be sufficient to handle the cases which would come before it.

Mr. KEM. I had no doubt that it would be sufficient; but my question was predicated on whether the court would have enough to do to keep its members busy, whether the bill would give the court jurisdiction sufficiently broad to keep three men busy throughout the year, in time of peace.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say that was one of the questions which arose and which caused the Senate committee to recommend that the terms of the three judges be not for life, but for a certain number of years, the idea being that after a certain amount of experience we would know fairly well whether there should be additional judges or fewer judges.

But the general feeling was that there would be sufficient work, or perhaps a little more than sufficient, for them to do, to keep them very busy; that probably 2,000 or 3,000 cases a year would come to them.

Mr. KEM. Of course, there is no way to estimate the number of writs of certiorari which would be granted.

Mr. KEFAUVER. There is no way to determine that now. It would be the privilege of an accused to apply for one. I suppose that if the court wished to take on more work, it could grant more writs of certiorari.

But we have no present way of determining how much work the court will have to do; I suppose the only way we can tell will be by experience.

Mr. President, one very worth-while section of the proposed code is that which requires the Court of Military Appeals to make to the Congress an annual report in which it will state the number of cases it has tried, the disposition of the cases, and its recommendations for improvement of the system. At the present time Congress does not receive annual recommendations or reports about military justice.

A second part of the bill relating to military justice, on which I should like to comment at this point, is section 13, which is related to the issue of whether or not officers in the legal branch of an armed force should be on a separate promotion list, or, to put it another way, whether a Judge Advocate General's corps should be created in each of the services. Such a corps was created in the Army by the Kem amendment. The bill before us maintains the status quo, which means that there will continue to be no such corps in the Navy or Air Force.

Members of the House who have been strong supporters of the corps idea have agreed that its operation in the Army should be tested further before creating a corps for each of the other services. At the same time, they feel that the bill should contain more specific requirements with respect to the legal qualifications of the Judge Advocate General. These requirements are incorporated in section 13 of the bill.

Our committee agrees that the operation of the corps in the Army should be evaluated over some further period, to determine whether or not it serves its purpose. I believe the corps has now been in operation since February 1, 1949.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Do I correctly understand that the bill provides for a separate Judge Advocate General's corps for the Army, but not for the Air Force or for the Navy? Am I correct in my understanding as to that?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The bill leaves the corps for the Army as is provided by the Senator's amendment of 1948.

Mr. KEM. The bill does not provide a similar corps for the Air Force or the Navy, does it?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It does not.

Mr. KEM. What is the justification for having a separate Judge Advocate General corps for the Army, but not for the other branches of the Military Establishment?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It was established separately at the time of enactment of the Senator's amendment. The amendment did not apply to the Navy or to the Air Force. The Navy has never wished to have a separate corps, and my information is that the Air Corps does not wish to have a separate corps. I think there is something about their operation which would make a separate corps less suitable for them than it is for the Army; at least, that is the way the other two services feel about the matter.

Mr. KEM. I may say to the Senator that it was intended that the amendment apply both to the Army and to the Air Force. I think the discussion on the floor at the time will show that the Members of the Senate, at least, understood that was the purpose and intention regarding the legislation then proposed.

But my question of the Senator is this: If a separate Judge Advocate General's corps is sound as an institution for the Army, why is not equally sound for the Air Force and for the Navy? On the other hand, if it is not sound for them, why should we go to the trouble and expense of establishing one in the Army?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is what we wish to find out; we wish to ascertain how it will work and whether it will meet all the expectations of the Senator or of some of those in the Army. It has been in effect in the Army only 1 year from yesterday, I believe. After a trial of it and after the passage of this unification bill, after we see how it works, if it works very satisfactorily, perhaps the Air Corps and the Navy will later wish to have a similar corps for themselves, and the Congress will give it to them.

Mr. KEM. I am surprised to hear the Senator say that, because I thought the justification for the unification bill was that there would be actual unification of the armed forces, and I thought that this bill is being presented to us as a unified code of military justice.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Actually, I think the matter of a separate corps should be handled as an amendment to the National Defense Act. That matter does not have much to do with military justice. I believe that the bill creating a separate corps for the Army was an amendment to the National Defense Act.

Mr. KEM. It was an amendment to the Selective Service law.

Mr. KEFAUVER. But the amendment stated that the National Defense Act should be amended so as to make that provision.

Mr. KEM. There is no reason why it could not be done in this bill, however.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; it could be done in that way. But, properly, it should come up when the National Defense Act is being considered for amendment, because it would amend that act, although it was offered to the selective service law.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Am I correct, I ask the Senator from Tennessee, when I say to the Senator from Missouri, that, particularly in the case of the Navy, the reasons the committee had for not extending this corps to the Navy were very practical ones, namely, that the Navy pointed out that a separate legal force would upset their whole arrangements and procedure with respect to officers, not only on shipboard, where, of course, general courts martial do not often occur, but also in their various land installations, which are generally very far apart. In such case the legal officer would have little work of this sort to do; and in order to utilize his services sufficiently he would have to be assigned other work, and so would any assistants he might have. In fact, if there were to be a legal officer for this purpose at such points, there would not be sufficient work for him and for his assistants to do to justify the establishment of a separate force.

In my opinion that is the reason why a separate corps should not be established in the Navy, although it is established in the Army. I believe we should wait to see how it will work in the Army. I ask the Senator whether that was the testimony?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; that was the testimony—in short, to wait to see how it will work.

I may also say to the Senator from Missouri that Public Law 759, the Kem amendment, at page 64, section 247, creates a separate corps. Section 8 of the National Defense Act, as amended, was amended in that way, and the corps was created. So actually this matter should come up in the consideration of an amendment to the National Defense Act; and I am sure that, after experience with this provision of the pending bill, it will.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator whether the reasoning of the Senator from Massachusetts as to the Navy would apply to the Air Force?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That was the position of the Air Force. They have fewer members, who are here and there, and not stationed so permanently as are Army forces. So they thought the conditions applicable to the Navy would apply to the Air Force. As I said before, our committee agreed that the operation of the corps in the Army should be evaluated over a further period to determine whether or not it serves its purpose. That purpose is to assure to legal officers and judge advocates an independence which will encourage a fair and objective exercise of their judicial functions. Whether, as a practical matter, an independent promotion list does this, or is the way to do it, is very much open to question. Much more important may be the provisions I have already mentioned which allow judge advocates in the chain of command to communicate directly with one another and which put the control of the assignment of staff judge advocates and legal officers in the hands of the Judge Advocate General. For these reasons our committee feels that consideration of the corps question—a question which is one of internal organization and relates to the National Defense Act rather than to the Uniform Code of Military Justice—should be postponed. Such a postponement will give Congress the benefit of the views of the judges of the Court of Military Appeals in the annual report prescribed in article 67.

As I have said before, we feel that a conscientious effort has been made by a large group of people who have worked a long time on this whole subject, and, though necessarily not perfect, the code has a large number of advantages to recommend it. It makes uniform the application of one law, substantive and procedural, to all persons serving in the armed services, and this, in itself, is a tremendous improvement over the present diverse systems in operation. In addition, it provides a large number of added protections, and meets, to a large extent, the criticisms that have been leveled against military justice over the years. It is a code that is drafted in modern legislative language, arranged in an orderly sequence, and should be far more understandable to laymen and to civilian lawyers, as well as to men learned in military law than the present statutes in this field.

On behalf of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, I strongly urge favorable action by the Senate on this bill.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for a furthur question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KEM. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to page 202 of the bill, and particularly to the section headed "Commanders' duties of example and correction," which reads, in part, as follows:

> All commanding officers and others in authority in the naval service are required to show in themselves a good example of virtue, honor, patriotism, and subordination; to be vigilant in inspecting the conduct of all persons who are placed under their command; to guard against and suppress all dissolute and immoral practices, and to correct, according to the laws and regulations of the Navy, all persons who are guilty of them.

Why is not that provision made applicable to the other branches of the armed services?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say to the distinguished Senator that this provision, or substantially this, has been in the Articles of War and in the Articles for the Government of the Navy for a long time.

Mr. KEM. We are here dealing with unification, are we not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Navy wanted to keep it. The Navy did not want it in the code, and the Army and the Air Force did not want it in the code, so it was put in as a general statutory provision.

Mr. KEM. Are we to take it that, generally speaking, those duties are to be placed on the Navy, because the commanding officers and others in authority in the other branches of the armed serv-

ices are not so well qualified "to show in themselves a good example of virtue, honor, patriotism, and subordination," and so they are not required "to be vigilant in inspecting the conduct of all persons who are placed under their command"?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Army and the Air Force did not feel they needed statutory provisions requiring them to do their duty, but the Navy had an additional and supplemental interest in the provision, and it is very anxious to keep it. It is separate and distinct from the code, and we thought it would do no harm. The Navy wanted it, and we put it in the back of the bill. It is not in the code. It is the code we try to make uniform.

Mr. KEM. Does it have any purpose in a unification law, a law that purports to apply uniformly throughout the armed services?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say to the distinguished Senator, it is not in the code. The code ends on page 200. This is a separate statutory provision in the back of the bill. The Navy has a sentimental interest in the provision that the others do not share. That is the situation.

Mr. KEM. It is a part of the same bill, is it not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; but it is the code that we are trying to make uniform.

Mr. KEM. Is it a part of the same bill?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; it is part of the same bill, but it is not in the Uniform Code.

Mr. KEM. Where does the Senator find in the bill anything indicating that the code ends before this provision is reached?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The articles of the code continue to the middle of page 200.

Mr. KEM. Where is the provision that indicates that to be so?

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the Senator will turn to page 104, beginning in line 13, he will note the following:

That a Uniform Code of Military Justice for the government of the armed forces of the United States, unifying, consolidating, revising, and codifying the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard, is hereby enacted as follows, and the articles in this section may be cited as "Uniform Code of Military Justice, article —."

That is section 1. What the Senator was reading is section 7 (c) of the bill, but that is not the code.

Mr. KEM. I did not understand the Senator's reference to the language which indicates the exclusion from the code of the part to which I referred. If the Senator will direct my attention to that language, I shall appreciate it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The particular language is that, beginning on page 104, in lines 17 and 18, "and the articles in this section may be cited as 'Uniform Code of Military Justice, article * * *'." It is section 1, and is followed by part 1, general provisions.

Mr. KEM. The articles in this section?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes. Then section 2 begins on page 200; so from 104 to the middle of page 200——

Mr. KEM. Where does section 1 begin?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Section 1 begins on page 104, line 13, of the bill, as proposed by the committee to be amended. The Senator will note that the House text is all stricken out down to line 13, page 104.

Mr. KEM. The bill is entitled "An act to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard, and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice." It does not say anything there about requirements of attendance on church or of proper subordination in the Navy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. If the Senator will permit me to complete my question, I shall appreciate it very much.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. KEM. It seems to me, if the Senator's position is that the bill covers more than a uniform code, the title should be amended. It is misleading.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The code is contained in section 1, following which certain statutory provisions are proposed to be enacted.

Mr. KEM. Should not the title be amended to show the inclusion of certain salutary admonitions to the Navy?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The title is rather broad, I think.

Mr. KEM. The title is, "An act to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard, and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice." Certainly no person reading it would get the idea that additional enactments with reference to the Navy were to be incorporated in the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Who has the floor?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, my answer to the Senator from Missouri would be that this bill is written as every other bill is written. In almost every bill the first section immediately follows the title, and it is called section 1. In this bill section 1 begins on line 13, page 104, and provides:

That a Uniform Code of Military Justice for the government of the armed forces of the United States, unifying, consolidating, revising, and codifying the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard, is hereby enacted as follows—

And so forth. Then we come to section 2, on page 200. Section 2 is a sort of catch-all. For instance, it is not necessary in the case of the Army, to take care of things that happen on the high seas. In the Navy the captain of a ship has always been supreme. He must be supreme. Therefore his conduct must be good. It seems to me that is a situation which applies particularly to the Navy. So the provision referred to by the Senator from Missouri is not a part of the code, for the technical reason that it is in section 2, and is not in section 1.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the question I want to ask the Senator from Tennessee is this: If we are going to lay down requirements as to virtue, honor, patriotism, subordination, dissolute and immoral practices, and so forth, why have we singled out the Navy?

Mr. KEFAUVER. One reason is that they have asked for it, and the other services have not. There are some things applying to the Navy which are a little different from things which apply to the Army and the Air Corps, and they are not a part of the code. This bill is an effort to get all these matters together in the same bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee if it is correct to say for the record that there is nothing in this bill which is applicable to the National Guard of the several States?

Mr. KEFAUVER. There is not, unless members of the National Guard are on Federal service.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator mean by his answer to state that the National Guard and no components of personnel thereof would be affected by or subject to any of the provisions of this bill until and unless they have been actually federalized?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Until they have been actually called or ordered to duty or training by the Federal Government.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That provision is found on page 107 of the bill. I thank the Senator from Florida for asking the questions.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I advised the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] earlier in the day that I would, at an early time, during the consideration of House bill 4080, move that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. The hour is too late, it seems to me, to present that motion at this time. I should not care to suggest the absence of a quorum now. Hence, I shall defer making the motion until the Senate reconvenes tomorrow. I shall, however, after the Senate reconvenes tomorrow, and at the earliest opportunity, move that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for consideration by that committee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the Senator's motion is not to be made tonight, I wonder if the exchange of correspondence between the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, can be inserted in the RECORD at this time. It might be of some enlightenment to the Members of the

Senate. Will the Senator from Nevada place that correspondence in the RECORD, or would he object if I should do so?

Mr. MCCARRAN. I have here a copy of my letter, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, addressed to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] on July 1, 1949. I do not have at hand the reply of the Senator from Maryland, but that can be furnished. I have also a copy of my letter of July 19, addressed to the Senator from Maryland on the same subject. If the Senator from Tennessee has the letter in reply to that, the correspondence can go into the RECORD so that it may become a part of the RECORD at this time in connection with my motion to refer the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary, if that is satisfactory to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; it is satisfactory to me. There will be included in the RECORD first, the Senator's original letter of July 1, the response to that letter dated July 13, and the reply of the Senator from Nevada dated July 19.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to including in the RECORD the correspondence referred to?

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
July 1, 1949.

Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: H. R. 4080, the so-called code of military justice, was reported to the Senate from the Committee on Armed Services on June 10, 1949.

In many of its provisions this bill deals with matters which I believe to be properly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; therefore, I believe it to be my duty to attempt to enforce what I consider to be the jurisdiction of the committee of which I have the honor to be the chairman. Therefore, I intend to move that the bill, H. R. 4080, be taken from the Senate Calendar and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

I hope you may feel it will not be necessary to oppose my motion, for I should like to have your cooperation in this matter.

I do not wish to burden you now with a detailed discussion of this question, but let me cite some of the more compelling instances of provisions in the bill which I feel should have the scrutiny of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Article 2 of the proposed new code of military justice makes it clear that those to whom the code applies (in addition to regular and volunteer personnel) include:

"(1) * * * all inductees from the time of their actual induction into the armed forces of the United States, and all other persons lawfully called or ordered into, or to duty in or for training in, the armed forces, from the dates they are required by the terms of the call or order to obey the same; * * * (2) Reserve personnel while they are on inactive duty training authorized by written orders which are voluntarily accepted by them, which orders specify that they are subject to this code; * * * (10) in time of war, all persons serving with or accompanying an armed force in the field; (11) subject to the provisions of any treaty or agreement to which the United States is or may be a party or to any accepted rule of international law, all persons serving with, employed by, or accompanying the armed forces without the continental limits of the United States and the following Territories: That part of Alaska * * *, the Canal Zone, the main group of the Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands."

The above provisions greatly broaden the scope of authority and jurisdiction of military courts. In fact, those civilians who would thus be brought within the jurisdiction of military justice appear to include Mr. McCloy and all personnel of the Allied military government, as well as, no one knows how many, persons in Hawaii, since article 5 provides that this code shall be applicable in all places.

Article 3 of the proposed code lays the jurisdiction to try former personnel for offenses committted while subject to the code, if they cannot be tried in the United States courts and if the sentence could be 5 years or more.

This provision, like the provision above referred to, is extremely important when it is realized the code does not provide for bond, arraignment, or any of the usual rights accorded to even the worst type of civilian defendant.

Article 76 of the proposed code seeks to make the administrative action taken final and binding upon all departments, courts, agencies, and officers of the United States.

This seems to me an extremely dangerous provision and subject to serious question on constitutional grounds. It is questionable whether an act of Congress could thus rob the Supreme Court of appellate jurisdiction. I do not believe all civilian courts should be closed to anyone with respect to all matters which may have been tried before a military tribunal or administratively determined by the military. I question the wisdom of conferring absolute finality upon the decisions of an alleged court, the members of which are subject to removal by an administrative officer.

I believe the above is sufficient to show the reasons for my conviction that this bill should have the most serious consideration of the Committee on the Judiciary before being enacted into law.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman.

JULY 13, 1949.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: This will acknowledge your letter of July 1, 1949, in connection with H. R. 4080, the so-called code of military justice bill, and informing me of your intention to move that this bill be taken from the Senate Calendar and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

You will recall our earlier conversations on this subject and your agreement that jurisdiction properly lay in the Committee on Armed Services. In view of this, I am surprised that you now feel the bill should be referred to your committee. Your letter of April 10, 1949, to me setting forth your recommendations with respect to H. R. 4080 created the impression in my mind that you desired the Committee on Armed Services, in the exercise of its jurisdiction, to consider your suggestions. As you know, a number of your recommendations now appear in the bill as amended by this committee. In addition, I am sure you are aware of the extent of the hearings in the House of Representatives and before this committee on this bill and the full consideration given to it. I hope that you will reconsider your intention of moving that the bill be taken from the Senate Calendar, and would like to briefly outline for you some of the considerations this committee had before it when it considered the articles you cite in your letter.

You mention that you feel that parts of the code deal with matters within the jurisdiction of your committee and you state, specifically, that you feel article 2 is such a provision. Your comment on article 2 is that it greatly broadens the scope of authority and jurisdiction in military courts. I think you will find that a close scrutiny of the present statutory provisions covering jurisdiction as found in the Articles of War and the Articles for the Government of the Navy disclose that article 2 is, to a large extent, a reincorporation of the present laws and there are no subdivisions of it which can be said to create new jurisdiction or broaden the present authority of either the Army or the Navy, or a combination of both of them. For instance, article 2, subdivision (1) is drawn from present Article of War 2, 10 United States Code, section 1473 (a) and section 12 of the Selective Service Act of 1948.

Article 2, subdivision (2), which reads, "Reserve personnel while they are on active duty training authorized by written orders," etc., is actually a restricted version of the authority heretofore provided for the Navy in 34 United States Code, section 855. Very close attention was given to this article. I am sure you are familiar with the extensive discussion in the House hearings and our hearings on that single subdivision. For your convenience, I here quote the present Navy jurisdiction and you will note that, by comparison with it, subdivision (2) greatly restricts the jurisdiction.

"S. 855. Naval Reserve, application of laws, regulations, and orders of Navy; disciplinary actions:

"All members of the Naval Reserve, when employed on active duty, authorized training duty, with or without pay, drill, or other equivalent instruction or duty, or when employed in authorized travel to or from such duty, or appropriate duty, drill, or instruction, or during such time as they may by law be required to perform active duty, or while wearing a uniform prescribed for the Naval Reserve, shall be subject to the laws, regulations, and orders for the government of the Navy: *Provided*, That disciplinary action for an offense committed while subject to the laws, regulations, and orders for the government of the Navy shall not be barred by reason of release from duty status of any person charged with the commission thereof: *Provided further*, That for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this section into effect, members of the Naval Reserve may be retained on or returned to a duty status without their consent, but not for a longer period of time than may be required for disciplinary action. (June 25, 1938, ch. 690, title III, p. 301, 52 Stat. 1180.)"

Subdivisions (10) and (11) are reincorporations of provisions found in the Articles of War and the Navy Statutes (see Article of War 2 (d), 10 U. S. C. sec. 1473, and see 34 U. S. C. sec. 1201). In this connection, further, I would like to point out that our committee considered the suggestions you made in your letter of April 30, 1949. I note that in your letter you suggested amendments to subdivisions (10) and (11) and I think that, as approved by our committee, they reflect your ideas. Furthermore, I think a close reading of subdivision (11) would result in the opposite construction of the language to the one apparently placed in your letter; to wit: jurisdiction is specifically not provided in the Canal Zone, the main group of the Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. In passing, I am positive that these subdivisions would not bring within the jurisdiction of courts martial a person in the position of high commissioner. The reason I take this position is that the language of article 2 is practically identical to Article of War 2, which has always been construed by the Federal courts and the military as follows. I quote from Court Martial Manual 329933, 7 bulletin, Judge Advocate General 125 (June 17, 1948):

"Under the provision of AW 2 (d), persons 'accompanying or serving with' the armies of the United States without the territorial jurisdiction of the United States are subject to the Articles of War. The word 'accompanying' first appeared in the code of 1916 (see General Crowder's remarks in Senate Report No. 130, 64th Cong., 1st sess., p. 37), but the jurisdictional phrase 'serving with' may be found in all the American military codes from the earliest times (1775 articles, art. XXXII; 1776 articles, sec. XIII, art. 23; 1806 articles, art. 60; 1874 articles, art 63) * * * In those cases, however, where a civilian has been held to have been 'accompanying' the armies, it appeared that he has either moved with a military operation or that his presence within a military installation or theater was not merely incidental but was connected with or dependent upon the activities of the armies or their personnel. He must, in order to come within this class of persons subject to military law, 'accompany' the military service in fact * * * Conversely, one may be 'serving with' the armies without accompanying them, as in the case of an employee of a military installation 'in the field in time of war' or 'without the territorial jurisdiction,' which is located near the employee's civilian residence and at which he performs his daily work, living as he would were he employed at some nonmilitary task in the locality (see SPJGW 1945/4990, 23 June and 2 July 1945, 4 Bull. JAG 223, and cases cited therein)."

Article 3 of the code provides, in general, for a continuing jurisdiction under certain circumstances where jurisdiction has previously attached and was segregated from article 2 for that reason, even though as you pointed out, it generally covers the question of jurisdiction. The problem encountered in connection with this article, and particularly subdivision (a) of it, concerns those types of situations where persons have committed offenses while serving on active duty in the armed services and who, thereafter, by virtue of some artificial situation, are unable to be tried either by courts martial or the Federal courts. In general, the classes of cases fall into three categories: (1) Reservists who go on inactive duty; (2) persons who are discharged from the service; and (3) persons who, although once discharged, reenter the service. A number of cases falling into these categories have taken place, and it has been found that no jurisdiction resides in any court to bring them to trial. Several cases of this kind received a considerable amount of publicity and you will undoubtedly remember them. For instance, a case falling in the category of reenlistment is the Hirshberg case in the Navy. You will recall that Hirshberg was captured by the Japanese and, after being rescued and returned to this country, was discharged from the Navy and on the same day reenlisted for a new term. There later came to light facts which warranted the charge that he had mistreated fellow-American prisoners while he was a Japanese captive for purposes of enhancing his own fortunes. The alleged acts, of course, occurred overseas, outside the jurisdiction of the Federal courts. The question of whether or not the Navy had jurisdiction to try him for these charges, where the discharge intervened—even though he was out of the service for 1 day only—was settled by the Supreme Court, which held that the Navy had lost jurisdiction by virtue of the discharge. Under these circumstances, no court—military or civilian—had jurisdiction to determine whether or not Hirshberg had committed a serious offense. I think it is noteworthy to point out that the Supreme Court's decision was based entirely on a lack of statutory authority and specifically did not involve a constitutional question.

Another case falling within one of these classifications was the Durant case, in which it was charged that Mrs. Durant, at one time a captain in the WAC, was implicated in the theft of the crown jewels of Hesse. Since the theft was committed in Europe, the civilian courts had no jurisdiction and the question of jurisdiction of the military courts was raised because the facts were not discovered, nor was the trial instituted, until Mrs. Durant was on terminal leave. You will recall, in this case, that it was held that the Army courts martial had jurisdiction, but it is clear that, if the referral for trial had been delayed for another 2 or 3 weeks, when her terminal leave would have expired, Mrs. Durant could not have been tried at all for a very serious crime of which she was ultimately convicted. Providing jurisdiction in this type of case, as this subdivision attempts to do, finds some precedent in the existing Articles of War and Articles for the Government of the Navy, which, of course, give a continuing jurisdiction over certain types of offenses committed while on active duty involving frauds against the Government. (See article of war 94, 10 U. S. C., sec. 1566, and article 14 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy, 34 U. S. C., sec. 1200.)

Insofar as reservists in inactive duty are concerned, I assume you have already noted from Thirty-fourth United States Code, section 855, that the Navy has jurisdiction over reservists who have previously committed offenses while on active duty.

It was for the purpose of covering cases of this type, over which there is no present jurisdiction, that article 3 (a) was drafted. It seems entirely fair that, within the statute of limitations, persons who have committed offenses should not gain an immunity or be excused by virtue of the administrative act of going off active duty or being separated from the armed forces. However, it was not intended to extend blanket jurisdiction over cases of this type, or to convey to military courts jurisdiction under these circumstances over every trivial offense. For that reason, the jurisdiction is limited to serious crimes only by virtue of the provision that the offense must call for a sentence of at least 5 years. In addition, it was felt that where the Federal or State courts have jurisdiction, such jurisdiction should not be disturbed, and there would be no justification in also giving it to the courts martial. For that reason, it is provided that the courts martial are to have jurisdiction only if the civil courts do not have it.

I note that in your letter of April 30, 1949, you make the comment that the enactment of article 3, as then written, would foreclose appeals to the civil courts in cases such as the Durant case. That case was not an appeal in the narrow sense of the word, but was a petition for habeas corpus, which, as you know, was denied. Article 3 in no way interferes with the right to seek habeas corpus. You make the same comment with respect to article 76 in your letter of July 1, 1949. This article is drawn almost word for word from article of war 50 (h), 10 United States Code, section 1522, and is a statement of the law as interpreted by the Federal courts. See *Humphrey* v. *Smith* (93 L. ed. 774 (Supreme Court 1949)); *Schita* v. *Cox* (139 F. 2d 971 (C. C. A. 8th 1944), certiorari denied, 322 U. S. 761); *Henry* v. *Hodges* (76 F. Supp. 698 (S. D. N. Y. 1948)). The reports of both the Senate and House Armed Services Committees specifically state that article 76 does not foreclose the right to habeas corpus in the Federal courts.

Based on the above analysis of the points you bring up, I think you can be satisfied that careful considerations of those items were given by the House and Senate committees. In addition, I think the explanation demonstrates that they contain no new material which would bring them within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

In my opinion, the whole subject of military justice is one which falls wholly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services. This opinion is based on my interpretation of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on the Judiciary as set forth in the Legislative Reorganization Act, and based on a long-standing precedent. You will find that in the last 50 years all matters on this subject have been considered as falling within the jurisdiction of the Committees on Armed Services or their predecessor committees. In the Eightieth Congress, the Committee on Armed Services had jurisdiction over the bills which ultimately became Public Law 759 and also over proposed amendments to the Articles for the Government of the Navy. Legislation on military justice has been before the Military Affairs Committees in 1912, 1913, 1916, 1919, 1937 and 1942.

In view of all these considerations, I hope you will not go forward with your intention of moving that the bill be taken from the Calendar. It is an extremely important step toward unification and provides for reforms in the court-martial system which should be enacted as soon as possible. I have received a letter from the Secretary of Defense in which he strongly urges its passage in the present session of Congress. My present feeling is that it should go forward at this time, and for that reason I would not like to be required to oppose your motion.

I would appreciate it if you would let me know your decision in this matter and would welcome your support of the bill.

Sincerely,

MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Chairman.

JULY 19, 1949.

Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I have your letter of July 13, with regard to the motion which I have advised you I intend to offer, to refer the bill H. R. 4080 to the Committee on the Judiciary.

I do, indeed, recall our earlier conversations on this subject. They began with discussion of resolutions pending before the Committee on the Judiciary for the investigation of military justice. You pointed out that similar resolutions were pending before the Committee on Armed Services, and that the committee was also working on a new code of military justice; and, as I recall it, you suggested that I allow the matter to rest with the Committee on Armed Services until you had concluded your deliberations on this bill, with the thought that then we could discuss the matter further.

In conformance with this agreement, the Judiciary Committee has taken no action on the resolutions pending before it for the investigation of military justice, and the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services to consider and deal with the bill H. R. 4080 has not been challenged. I am not challenging that jurisdiction now, and I have no intention of challenging it. All I am doing is asserting that the bill includes subject matter clearly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, and asking that now, after the Committee on Armed Services has had its say, the bill may be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for consideration of those matters which do lie within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

While it is true that, in a spirit of cooperation, I submitted to you, as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, a very lengthy letter expressing some of my personal views with regard to the bill H. R. 4080, it must be clear that this did not amount to action or consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary, and I cannot feel that the

opportunity given me personally to express my views, and the consideration given by the Committee on Armed Services to the views so expressed, should operate to divest the Committee on the Judiciary of its jurisdiction.

Because I know there is not and will not be any acrimony between us with respect to this matter, I do not wish to attempt a point-by-point traverse of your letter. However, in fairness, I believe I should make one or two comments.

Article 2, subdivision (3) may be a "restricted version of the authority heretofore provided for the Navy" but it cannot be denied that it expands jurisdiction to members of the Army and Air Force Reserve. Furthermore, one must bear in mind that, under article 3, such personnel may be recalled to duty without their consent for trial of offenses committed while on such duty with a questionable statute of limitations applicable and limited only (as to military offenses) by the 5-year sentence proviso. This latter limitation is in turn limited only by article 56 which grants the President authority (which he may delegate under art. 140) to prescribe limits.

In arriving at your conclusions with respect to subdivisions (10) and (11) of article 3, you have evidently not considered the decision rendered in *McCune* v. *Kilpatrick* (53 Fed. Supp. 80), where a civilian cook, hired to provide meals for a merchant-marine crew and armed guard, was held amenable to trial by court martial on charges of desertion, when he quit his job after learning that he was also supposed to cook for about 500 Army troops being transported overseas.

As to the Hirshberg and Durant cases, it can just as reasonably be argued that Congress should confer jurisdiction on civilian courts to try such cases as that we should further expand the authority of military tribunals.

The fact that extant laws provide or do not provide remedies for certain offenses is not the basic question here. It is rather the limit to which we have permitted or will expand the jurisdiction of military courts over the lives and fortunes of our ordinary citizens and nationals. There can be no denial of the power of Congress to confer jurisdiction on our inferior courts to consider all matters relating to military offenses. The pattern to be followed by military courts in times of emergency was set in Hawaii following December 7, 1941.

I do not doubt that careful consideration was given to every word of the bill by both the Senate and House committees, but I submit that the viewpoint from which the consideration is given is most important. Although the committee reports state that it was not the intention to foreclose petitions for writs of habeas corpus, I believe you will agree that the proposed language of the bill is clear and unambiguous and would, therefore, never be required to be interpreted by reference to the committee report. Under this language, even if it should be held that the writ might lie—which is doubtful—the action of a military court would not be subject to challenge, and therefore the writ could provide no real relief.

I cannot agree that "the whole subject of military justice is one which falls wholly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services." The Legislative Reorganization Act specifically commits to the Committee on the Judiciary jurisdiction over "judicial proceedings, civil and criminal, generally," and over "civil liberties." Where the rights and liberties of civilians are concerned, I believe the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary should stand unquestioned; and there is no doubt such rights are involved in the bill H. R. 4080.

I certainly do not wish to enter into a controversy with you over this matter; and I assure you that if the bill is referred to the Committee on the Judiciary it will be considered most promptly, and most promptly reported back to the Senate.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman.

DISPLACED PERSONS ACT OF 1948—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in compliance with a resolution of the Senate, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I reported to the Senate on January 25, 1950, with amendments, House bill 4567, to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

Notwithstanding the numerous issues and vast amount of factual material which necessitated extensive consideration and deliberation, I was determined that: First, there should be compliance by the committee with the resolution of the Senate, and second, there should be inserted in the bill amendments to strengthen the administration of the act. I am gratified that both of these objectives have been accomplished.

But, Mr. President, there remain for the consideration and decision of the Senate issues of great consequence to the welfare of this Nation, which I shall discuss in detail at a later date. Some of these issues are as follows:

First. Are we to embark on a course which will result in opening the floodgates of this Nation for the entry of untold millions of aliens from the turbulent populations of the entire world who are storming our portals for admission? Right there, may I again emphasize the fact that aside from the relatively few eligible war-displaced persons, all of whom will, by the expiration date of our present displaced-persons law, be resettled or repatriated, the number of persons in the world who are de facto displaced and who are potentially eligible under the constitution of the International Refugee Organization runs into the twenty millions, and the ranks of these persons are being swelled at an alarming rate.

Mr. President, notwithstanding the strong humanitarian implications, we cannot solve the problems of the world by mass immigration to the United States. To attempt to do so will be to transplant these problems here and superimpose them on our own gigantic social and economic problems.

Second. In determining the extent to which additional numbers of displaced persons should be admitted into the United States, should we consider the tremendous increase in the influx into the United States, both legally and illegally, of aliens from all over the world who are arriving on our shores in such numbers that our immigration officers are swamped with an overwhelming work load?

Third. What consideration, if any, should be given to the internal conditions in the United States? It is with reference to this issue, Mr. President, that I have today offered an amendment.

In the course of the last several months I have received not hundreds but thousands of letters from those who fought on the battlefields to protect this country, and who are even now seeking jobs and homes for themselves and their families. The well-knit, well-financed pressure groups that have flooded this country with propaganda designed to destroy our immigration system, purporting to speak for the American people, tell us that the employment and housing problems of our own people are not to be considered in this issue. I prefer, Mr. President, to listen to the real voice of America—the voice of the vast majority of the American people, thousands upon thousands of whom have expressed to me their increasing concern because of displacement of American citizens from jobs and housing by the hundreds of thousands of aliens who are arriving on our shores. Right there, may I say, as I have previously pointed out, that the Displaced Persons Commission in passing on job and housing assurances, required by the present law, has been validating blanket assurances for jobs and housing with no independent investigation to ascertain whether or not the jobs or housing actually exist.

Notwithstanding the stimulation of employment in the United States due to the unprecedented expenditures of this Government, both at home and abroad, unemployment in this country has increased over one and one-half million since the end of 1948, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated unemployment in July of 1949 to be 4,100,000, which was by far the highest unemployment figure in this country since 1942. The statistics in December 1949 reflect a temporary decline in unemployment to three and one-half million. The effect of one part of my amendment would be to prohibit the issuance of visas under the proposed Displaced Persons Act when the total number of unemployed in the labor force of the United States exceeded 4,000,000. In my judgment, this is the least we can do to protect the job of the American workingman.

I am aware of the fact, Mr. President, that generally the addition of several hundred thousand to the labor force will not appreciably affect the over-all statistics on unemployment, but it must be recognized that this is a marginal group of newcomers whose competition for job opportunities affects principally our own citizens in the lower income brackets. Beyond that—and I impress upon the Senate the earnestness of my contention—if we embark on a course of opening our doors to displaced persons other than the war displaced persons—the stream will become a river and the river will become a flood. If anyone in or out of the Senate takes issue with this contention, I invite his attention to the vilification to which I have been subjected by the pressure groups in my endeavors to maintain our protective immigration system against those who would destroy it.

In April 1949 it was estimated that 2,040,000 married couples were doubled up in dwelling units in the United States. Since that time it is probable that, due to housing construction, this number has been somewhat reduced. These statistics, as every Member of the Senate knows, are only an indication of the housing needs, both present and potential, of this country. Is it not, Mr. Presi-

dent, proper for the Senate to concern itself with this fact in considering legislation to add thousands upon thousands of families, in addition to the thousands who are coming under our general immigration laws, who will be seeking housing in this country?

The effect of another part of my amendment would be to prohibit the issuance of visas under the proposed Displaced Persons Act when the total number of married couples living doubled up in a household with another family exceeded 2,000,000.

Mr. President, I shall, when the bill is debated in this Senate, express myself forthrightly on each of the many issues, including the issue of the impact on our democratic institutions by unassimilable blocks of aliens with foreign ideologies. I have offered this amendment because I am convinced that, irrespective of the decision of the Senate on the other issues, it is essential as a minimum safeguard to protect the people of the United States of America.

Mr. President, I send the amendment forward, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full as a part of my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table, and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MCCARRAN is as follows:

At the end of the bill add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 16. (a) No visa shall be issued pursuant to this act, as amended, to any eligible displaced person at any time after 1 week immediately following the certification of a declaration, as provided in subsection (b) of this section stating that either (1) the total number of unemployed in the labor force in the United States exceeds 4,000,000 as estimated by the Secretary of Labor, or (2) the total number of married couples living doubled-up in a household with another family exceeds 2,000,000 as estimated by the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

"(b) During the month next following the month in which this section is enacted, and each month thereafter until July 1951, the Secretary of Labor shall certify and make public a declaration setting forth his estimate of the total number of unemployed in the labor force in the United States, and the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency shall certify and make public a declaration setting forth his estimate of the total number of married couples living doubled-up in a household with another family. The declaration so certified shall be published promptly in the Federal Register.

"(c) The term 'another family' as used in this section means the head of a household whether or not related to either member of the married couple. The term 'household' as used in this section means a house, an apartment, or other group of rooms, or a room that constitutes a dwelling unit."

CODIFICATION OF THE ARTICLES OF WAR

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4080) to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard, and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is going to move tomorrow that House bill 4080 be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. As a member of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, to which committee the bill was referred in the first instance, I shall support the motion of the Senator from Nevada, because it is my opinion that the bill should never have been referred to the Armed Services Committee in the first instance. The bill covers many basic questions involving the administration of justice in this country, and I see no reason why questions as to judicial right on the part of men in the armed services should be considered by any committee other than the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

My experience in connection with the bill further convinces me, Mr. President, that it ought to have been submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary in the first instance. I speak as a member of the Armed Services Committee, and as a member of the subcommittee of that committee which conducted hearings on the bill when I say I hope that tomorrow the motion of the Senator from Nevada will be adopted, because I should like to have the contents of the bill and the implications of the bill, insofar as the administration of American justice is concerned, considered by the Committee on the Judiciary. I happen to be one who believes that we should not draw the type of curtain between civilian and military justice that is drawn by this bill. I think the standing committee of the Senate which has jurisdiction over questions of the administration of American justice should have the bill assigned to it.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I wish to say at this time that if the Senate should decide tomorrow not to refer the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary for further study by that committee, which committee, in my judgment, is best versed in questions of the administration of justice, then I shall ask consideration of a series of amendments to the bill, which I now send to the desk and ask to have printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JENNER in the chair). The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I urge the Senate to give the most careful consideration to these amendments because although they bear my name, after all, they are not, in the main, the product of my pen; they are the result of very careful study and consideration which has been given to the problem of military justice by an appropriate committee of the American Bar Association.

I should like to say, Mr. President, that I think the interest of the American Bar Association and the demonstrated proof time and time again of its insistence upon setting up a sound system of American justice, should recommend to the Senate of the United States the most careful consideration of the amendments which I have sent to the desk.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I will yield in a moment.

I have conferred at length with members of the American Bar Association who have urged upon me the importance of seeing to it that certain changes are made in House bill 4080 before it is passed by the Senate. They have convinced me that those changes are necessary. Therefore, if the bill is not referred to the Committee on the Judiciary tomorrow, I shall want to speak, as briefly as possible, but as long as necessary, to see to it that a record in support of the amendments is made for the consideration of the Senate. I sincerely hope that because of the importance of the issues involved in the bill the Senate will not agree to proceed to any vote on the bill, at least tomorrow.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Oregon has offered amendments at this time, which he has asked to have printed and lie on the table. I am wondering—and I should like to ask as a matter of information—if the amendments were offered in the Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. MORSE. The subject matters of the amendments were offered. Representatives of the American Bar Association, as the record of the hearings will show, testified before the subcommittee. But the recommendation of the witnesses of the American Bar Association were not approved by the subcommittee.

Mr. LUCAS. What I was wondering was whether these specific amendments were offered to the committee as a whole, and whether the amendments were voted up or down in the committee room.

Mr. MORSE. The committee did not vote on them in their present form. But the record will show clearly that the objectives and principles of these amendments were before the committee for debate and consideration.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to have the floor in my own right.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think I have made clear the position I shall take on the motion made by the Senator from Nevada to refer the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary, and on the amendments, if that motion should fail.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, without delaying the Senate tonight, I wish to say to the Senator from Illinois, in response to his inquiry, that I, too, was a member of the subcommittee, and it is my feeling that if the Senator from Illinois will read in tomorrow's RECORD the speech of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], he will find the substance of the proposed amendments of the Senator from Oregon discussed, with their background. Although I agree with the Senator from Oregon that the amendments were not offered as such, the subject matter of the amendments, in general, if I understand what he intends to offer, was considered.

I should like to say in reply to the Senator from Oregon—and I do this because I too was a member of the subcommittee—that I hope the motion of the Senator from Nevada to refer the bill to the

Judiciary Committee will not prevail. I shall give my reasons in three sentences, so that the Senator from Oregon may have the answer very briefly in the RECORD.

Mr. President, the subject of military justice is one which falls wholly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services. This opinion is based on my interpretation of the jurisdictions of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on the Judiciary as set forth in the Legislative Reorganization Act, and based on long-standing precedents. It will be found that in the past 50 years all questions on this subject have been considered as falling within the jurisdiction of the Committees on Armed Services or their predecessor committees. In the Eightieth Congress, the Committee on Armed Services had jurisdiction over the bill which ultimately became Public Law 759, and also over proposed amendments to the Articles for the Government of the Navy. Legislation on military justice was before the Military Affairs Committees in 1912, 1913, 1916, 1919, 1937, and 1942.

For those reasons, very briefly, Mr. President, I shall vote against any motion to refer the bill to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief reply to my good friend from Massachusetts. I do not quarrel with the citation of precedents. I quarrel with the advisability of following those precedents, in view of the problems which have existed for decades with respect to military justice.

Mr. President, the very fact that in the past so-called military justice legislation has been considered by the Armed Services Committees of the Congress, instead of by the Judiciary Committees, is one of the reasons, in my opinion, I say most respectfully, why there have developed in this country really two sets of justice, so-called—one for civilian and another for military personnel.

From 1936 to 1939, as director and administrator I conducted a Nation-wide prison survey for the United States Department of Justice. I know, as a result of my experience in connection with that survey that it is high time—in fact, it is long overdue—that we bring about a uniformity of principle in the administration of criminal justice, covering both civilians and military personnel.

In my judgment some shocking conditions exist as the result of the two-system administration of justice in America. We should have great interest in a civilian who goes into uniform and is subject to the rules of military justice. The experiences which we developed in the last war were so shocking in some respects that we had to establish special clemency boards at the close of the war to rectify some of the grave injustices which developed in connection with the administration of military justice during the war.

As I shall say at much greater length when the debate proceeds, whether a man wears a uniform or a business suit, he is entitled to the protection afforded by the fundamental principles of American justice which I believe were contemplated when the Constitution was adopted.

Some of the excesses of the military in the administration of military justice in the history of this country are simply shocking. As a Member of the Senate I shall raise my voice in doing what I can to see to it that the basic principles of justice advocated by the American Bar Association are written into any court-martial bill passed by the Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, when the Senator from Illinois had this bill made the unfinished business, he was hopeful, from his discussion with members of the Armed Services Committee, that we might be able to conclude consideration of the bill today. It now seems, as the result of what my distinguished friend from Oregon has said, that we may not be able to finish the bill tomorrow. However, I hope that we can vote tomorrow at the earliest possible moment upon the motion which will be made by the Senator from Nevada, in order that we may ascertain what action the Senate will take upon the motion. If the motion should be defeated—and I am hopeful that it will be—we can then proceed to debate the amendments and the bill itself. I sincerely hope that we may be able to conclude the debate tomorrow. I do not like to hold the Senate in session late in the evening during the early part of the session, but I had what I thought was an almost absolute assurance that we could conclude consideration of the bill in not to exceed 2 days, or perhaps 1 day. However, I am not complaining about that, because I well recognize that every Senator has the right to speak as long as he desires upon any amendment or the bill itself.

I hope that my good friend from Oregon will debate his amendments as expeditiously as possible, with a view to attempting to finish tomorrow afternoon, or perhaps some time in the evening. I do not want to hold a night session, but I should like to see the bill passed, if possible, tomorrow. If we cannot, of course, we shall have to continue over until another day.

I have made an agreement with the Senators from California [Mr. DOWNEY and Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senators from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN and Mr. MCFARLAND] that we would take up on Monday a bill in which those Senators are very much interested. I am sure that they would not object to delaying that bill a short while so that we may conclude consideration of the pending bill if we must finish it on Monday. However, it is my sincere hope that we may be able to complete it tomorrow.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, February 3, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 2 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Paul L. Styles, of Alabama, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term expiring December 16, 1954.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the position indicated:

To be ensigns

Hal P. Demuth, effective January 5, 1950.
Merlyn E. Natto, effective February 25, 1950.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named persons, who were appointed in the United States Air Force under recess-appointment provisions during the last recess period of the Eighty-first Congress, for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947), and title II, Public Law 365, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947):

To be majors, USAF (medical)

Howard F. Currie, O269502.
Joseph J. Dobkin, O272455.
Julien M. Goodman, O386130.

To be captains, USAF (medical)

Frederick F. Ferguson, 141073 USNR.
Francis J. Smith.
Donald E. White, 175133 USNR.

To be captains, USAF (dental)

Russell H. Armstrong, O399441.
Charles J. Noga, O1705914.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (medical)

John C. Meyers, O961944.
Tom E. Nesbitt, O963149.
Donald M. Olson, O962729.
William F. Peterson, O1717502.
Robert S. Taylor, O1186224.
Lowell C. Walton, O1766407.

To be first lieutenant, USAF (dental)

William Z. Masters, O945450.

To be first lieutenant, USAF (veterinary)

Wilbert C. Nichols, AO367634.

The following-named persons, who were appointed in the United States Air Force under recess-appointment provisions during the last recess period of the Eighty-first Congress, for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

Eugene F. Calafato, AO1848182.
John H. Harrington, Jr., AO1852800.
William E. Harris.
William C. Josephson, AO1904679.
Gilbert L. Kendall.

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force, in the grade indicated with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947), and title II, Public Law 365, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947):

To be lieutenant colonel, USAF (medical)

Jesse K. Grace, AO310207.

To be majors, USAF (medical)

Kenneth E. Bray, O336952.
Rogers Hederick, O387430.
Malcolm C. McKaig, O357715.
Lewis H. Oden, Jr., O311864.

To be captains, USAF (medical)

Norman I. Condit, O1715041.
Stanley Lutz, Jr., O1746468.
Robert W. Merkle, AO476577.
Oscar W. Miller, O465709.
William H. Simpson, O1735079.

To be captains, USAF (dental)

Thomas R. Cole, O1755377.
Robert Lee Cooper.
Arthur S. Doran, AO1785513.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (medical)

Arthur R. Brownlie, Jr., O1766355.
William K. Douglas, AO1906117.
John M. Kohl, O963150.
Charles B. Marshall, Jr., O1746601.
Ignatius J. Stein, O1718011.
Robert H. Worthman, AO976823.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (dental)

Robert E. Hill, 503918, USNR.
Oliver J. Knoll.
John J. Stifter, 262475, USNR.
William L. Strong, O976015.

To be second lieutenant, USAF (Medical Service)

William E. Dye, O2037941.

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

Lester M. Adams, Jr., AO1851304.
George B. Alden.
Ray W. Alvord.
William R. Brown.
Thomas L. Bryant.
John K. Charles, Jr.
Dorsey E. Cole.
James C. Collier, Jr.
William D. Collier.
James C. Craig.
Louis W. Dawson.
Raymond H. L. Fritze.
Alfred M. Gibson, AO1904365.
Samuel S. M. Gillespie.
William A. Ginn, AO1846750.
Harold D. Hamner, Jr.
James R. Havron.
John D. Helms, AO1856890.
Arthur P. Hopkins.
Julian E. Jakes.
Peter C. Johnson, AO1904167.
Stephen J. Klos.
Billy Lee.
Mortimer J. Lewis.
Frank A. Limbocker.
Charles J. McCarthy.
Johnn T. Miller.
Lewe B. Mizelle, Jr.
Robert J. Myer.
Fred G. Perkins, AO1853632.
Walton F. Perrine, Jr.
Jacob S. Refson.
Richard C. Reinke, AO1847739.
Jack K. Robinson.
Alfred E. Ross, AO1847268.
Forrest V. Russell.
James A. Street, AO1847090.
Edward T. Thornton.
Glen C. Tomb.
Anderson J. Walters.
Bennett C. Wray.
Michael I. Youchah.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of commander in the line of the Navy:

Bess A. Dunn	Joy B. Hancock
Eleanor J. Durrett	Louise K. Wilde

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the line of the Navy:

Ralph E. McShane	Leon J. Huffman
Thomas B. Brittain	Harold A. Houser
Richard P. Glass	John M. Higgins
Clark L. Green	Edward A. Solomons

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950:

Aaron F. Adams	Joseph J. Lorfano, Jr.
Donald H. Anrep	Lloyd B. Lueptow
Wallace D. Arbuckle, Jr.	Joseph A. McClain III
	James R. McClure
Roland E. Aslund	Donavon B. McLeod
William F. Augustine	Richard B. Mahon
Joseph M. Barron	Roy T. Mantz
Eugene A. Bernard	Hubert A. Marlin
Donald L. Bush	William W. Martin
Thomas P. Butzen	Harry L. Merton, Jr.
Edward W. Byron	Robert A. Michaud
Ronald H. Caldwell	Robert E. Michell
Henry L. Chanaud	Joseph W. Mizula
Fred P. Clark, Jr.	Eugene H. Moller
Charles H. Clarke, Jr.	Philip S. Mumford, Jr.
John B. Cogdell	Raymond W. Myers
Jack E. Cooper	John J. Nussbaumer
Gerald E. Covington	Henry E. Otten
Putnam R. Day	James R. Parce
James J. Deegan	Gerald J. Parent
Vernon R. DeMois	James W. Parker
James M. Dennis	James V. Polosky
Bernard J. Dvorscak	Leo T. Profilet
Paul H. Edwards	Charles L. Putnam
Roald N. Eide	Herman J. Radtke
John D. Ellis	John R. Raef
Samuel C. Fall	John G. Redmond
James L. Fletcher	William P. Reyn
William G. Forster	Donald H. Reynolds
Jesse G. Forsythe, Jr.	William G. Rippey
William C. Frith	Donald E. Rosenquist
Kenneth L. Geitz	Howard E. Rutledge
William A. Gelonek	Daniel S. Saunders
Martin Goode	Philip S. Schultz
Perry T. Goodman	William L. Schulz
William E. Greeley	Richard J. Scukas
Robert A. Greenkorn	John A. Segala
George T. Gregory	Paul W. Shea
John R. Grinnell	Junious E. Shipman, Jr.
Lowell E. Gutknecht	
Richard L. Harrington	Joseph P. Short
Dale B. Harris	James R. Siler
Burton Henderson	Hubert W. Smith
James O. Hill	Neale S. Smith
Edward J. Hofstra	Joseph P. Smolinski, Jr.
Lindell A. Hunsley II	
William M. Imhoff	Harry A. Stolmeier
Rolf H. Joeschke	John W. Suydam
Dane L. Karns	Charles A. Taylor
Robert J. Kenyon	Guy T. Thrower
Roger N. Kersch	Troy E. Todd
John Kettlewell	Edward J. Tuma, Jr.
William R. King	Maurice A. Tuthill
Darrell D. Knight	John F. Vitcenda
Rudolf L. Kraus	David T. Wallace
James P. Kuchera	Robert A. Wallin
Philip Kuehl	Roland S. Warde III
James LeR. Lampson	Clarence A. Wethern, Jr.
Donald A. Lehman	
Theodore C. Llewellyn	Richard F. Wicker, Jr.

Midshipmen Billy C. Putman (Aviation) to be an ensign in the Navy from the 2d day of June 1950 in lieu of ensign in the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed to correct date of rank.

Donald W. Lindberg (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 2d day of June 1950.

Edward G. Smith (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Navy from the 2d day of June 1950, in lieu of ensign in Supply Corps of the Navy, as previously nominated.

Richard Kerdasha (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy.

The following named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

Robert S. Vaughan

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

John R. Bartholomew	Tomas C. Pablos
Ernest E. Davies	Adrian E. Sorenson, Jr.
Oscar W. Donnenfeld	

The following named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Frank L. Herbert, Jr.
Robert A. Howard

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Marjorie G. Faulkner	Ruth M. Pojeky
Mildred A. Grappe	Evelyn L. Rhodes
Mary A. Hunt	Lois V. Ulen
Donna M. Klute	

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grades and corps indicated.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment:

CAPTAIN, MEDICAL CORPS

Bennett F. Avery

COMMANDERS, MEDICAL CORPS

David H. Hersh
Donald G. Miller
Roger W. O'Neil

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS, MEDICAL CORPS

Edward D'Orazio
Benjamin F. Gundelfinger
Charles K. Holloway, Jr.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS, MEDICAL CORPS

David H. Hersh	Donald G. Miller
Arthur V. B. Miller, Jr.	Roger W. O'Neil

LIEUTENANTS, MEDICAL CORPS

Edward D'Orazio	Charles K. Holloway, Jr.
William E. Fraser	
Benjamin F. Gundelfinger	Robert H. Morrison

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE), MEDICAL CORPS

Marshall G. Morris, Jr.

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE), NURSE CORPS

Betty J. Biles
Louise M. Fidler

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy and the Naval Reserve on active duty, to the grades and corps as indicated subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

For permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Navy:

Sigmund Abraham, Jr.	Jerry W. Bates
Clayton R. Adams	Fred H. Baughman
Hershel L. Adams	George D. Bean
Robert A. Aiken	Frederick J. Bear, Jr.
Charles S. Alexander, Jr.	William F. Beatty
	James M. Beggs
Julian L. Alexander, Jr.	Ralph E. Behrends
	Francis J. Beitzer
Zeb D. Alford	John H. Bell
James B. Allen	Roy M. Bell
Thomas R. Allen	Roland M. Bendel
George E. Allison	Harry L. Benson
Mickelangelo Altieri	Joseph H. Benton
Lionel E. Ames, Jr.	John J. A. Berggren
Frank A. Anderson	Arthur C. Bigley, Jr.
Donald S. Apple	Paul T. Bishop
Charles E. Arnold	James R. Bjorge
David M. Arter	Charles H. Black
Alan Augenblick	Raymond L. Black
Jack F. Ayers	Ralph G. Blair
Francis W. Bacon, Jr.	William P. Blandy
Kenneth L. Baker	Lloyd S. Blomeyer
George F. Ball	Bernard N. Bloom
Earl D. Barondes	Charles H. Bloom
Richard W. Bass, Jr.	Daniel K. Bloomfield

James S. Bloomfield
Arthur K. Blough, Jr.
Robert O. Bonnell, Jr.
Duane D. Borgert
Paul V. Borlaug
Rodney E. Bornhop
Frank L. Boushee
Paul H. Bowdre, Jr.
John C. Bowers
Lee H. Boyd
Ross K. Bramwell
Benjamin Y. Brewster, Jr.
Jack H. Bridges
Charles C. Brisco, Jr.
Victor D. Brockman
Wharton H. Brooks, Jr.
Charles H. Brown
Richard E. Bryan
Robert C. Bryan
Edward G. Buck
Randall O. Buck, Jr.
Orval W. Buell
Donald P. Buhrer
Nathaniel W. Bullard
John Bunganich, Jr.
Alva D. Burkett
Hoyt N. Burns
Robert D. Buzzard
William J. Byrd
James E. Cahill
William J. Callahan
David W. Cammack
Donald D. Campbell
Charles E. Cantrell
Roger Carlquist
Dale E. Carlson
Warren E. Carman
Benjamin Carpenter, Jr.
William L. Carpenter
Herbert W. Carr
David C. Carruth
Robert C. Carter
Billie J. Cartwright
Richard E. Case
Robert S. Chadima
John L. Chelgren
Joseph R. Childers
Russell H. Christian
Karl J. Christoph, Jr.
William E. Clark
Frederic J. Clawson
Harold S. Clay
William H. Clegg
Robert F. Clement
William F. Clifford, Jr.
William A. Cody
Jack C. Coggins
Robert W. Cohan
Philip L. Collins, Jr.
Robert I. Conn
Daniel Connolly
Thomas A. Connor
Benjamin J. Conroy, Jr.
William E. Conway
Frederick D. Cook
Frank W. Corley
Paul T. Corrigan
Walter W. Cort, Jr.
Joseph D. Costello
Wayne H. Crawford
Robert E. Crispin
Robert W. Crouter
Harold W. Crozier
Frank L. Crump, Jr.
John D. Cumalat
Edward M. Cummings, Jr.
William E. Cunningham.
Joseph H. Curl
Robert S. Curl
Edwin M. Daley
Robert T. Darcy
Nello A. Darodda
Howard M. Davenport, Jr.
Cabell S. Davis, Jr.
Nicholas E. Davis
Walter A. Deandrade
Harvey L. Decker
Tyler F. Dedman
Harold P. Deeley, Jr.
George E. DeLong
Richard T. Dempsey
Richard J. Dermomy
Richard A. Derus
Donald P. Dick
Robert W. Dickieson
Eugene A. Dieckert, Jr.
Joseph E. Dierkes
William T. Dobson
Warren S. Dodd, Jr.
Walter J. Donovan
Robert C. Doxey
Robert M. Ducey
Peter Duncan
John A. Dunn
Robert H. P. Dunn
Robert E. Durfos
John C. Dyer
Paul J. Early
Burton I. Edelson
Charles S. B. Edmondson
George D. Edwards, Jr.
Maurice M. Edwards, Jr.
John E. Eilert
Claude P. Ekas, Jr.
Robert E. Endebrock
David L. English
Robert F. Ennis
Wesley D. Ennis
Philip W. Erickson
William Evans
John B. Fahey
John W. Fallon, Jr.
Harlow H. Falvesky
Robert R. Fargo
Gordon H. Farmer
Doc G. Faulkner, Jr.
Willard L. Felsen
William A. Feltovic
Richard W. Fenn
Lawrence A. Ferrara, Jr.
John B. Ferris, Jr.
John H. Fisher
Robert H. Flood
Albert O. Floyd
Walter B. Fowler
Frederick L. Foxton
David G. Foxwell
Isaac N. Franklin, Jr.
Peter H. Freeman
John C. Fry
John M. Frye
Jack D. Fuller
Harry C. Gaitskill 3d
Peter Galimitakis
James M. Gammon
Bruce B. Garlinghouse
Alan S. Garner
Joseph J. Garside
Irvin L. Gasser
Gene F. Gauthier
Michael Gaydos
Robert K. Geiger
Peter Gengor
Julian Gewin
George W. Gibson
James H. Gildard 3d
Donald T. Giles, Jr.
Joseph V. Godfrey
Peter J. Goldman
Charles Gonia
Benjamin Goodman, Jr.
Charles F. Gorder
Robert H. Gormley
Everett C. Gourlay
Robert F. Graves
Norman K. Green
Roger M. Gregory, Jr.
Robert J. Grimsley
Nicholas Guletsky
Sumner Gurney
Rowland I. Haines 3d
Robert F. Hale
Robert K. Hammann
Robert W. Hargarten
William D. Harkins
Richard B. Harris
James L. Harrison, Jr.
Donald P. Harvey
Arthur J. Haskell
Richard W. Haupt
James W. Hawthorne
Joseph R. Hawvermale
James T. Hayes
Kenneth G. Haynes
Thomas B. Hayward
Robert A. Hemmes
William E. Henson, Jr.
George A. Herbert
Russell G. Herron
Ivan Himmel
Harry J. Hinden
Arthur J. Hodder, Jr.
Richard A. Hoffman
Robert K. Hoffman
Bradley D. Hoffmann
Henry A. Hoffmann
Gordon M. Hogg, Jr.
David B. Holcombe
John P. Holland
Jack I. Holmes, Jr.
Robert T. Holmes
Jesse A. Holshouser, Jr.
Wallace C. Holton
William H. Hopkins
James M. Hornbrook
Norman T. Hornsby
Fred E. Horvath
Wallace J. L. Houde
William C. Hoyman
George E. Hubbell
Ira J. Hudson III
John C. Hufft
Arthur N. Hull
David H. Hunt
Reid H. Hunter
Ralph J. Jaccodine
Richard C. Jacobi
William H. Jagoe
William E. James
William E. Jarvis
Harry P. Jefferson
George G. Jeffries, Jr.
Harold W. Jesse
Joseph B. Jochum
Harvey J. Johnson
James H. Johnson
Robert W. Johnson
William N. Johnson
Charles W. Jones
Jack D. Jones
Robert S. Jones
William F. Jones
Glenn D. Jordan
Robert F. Jortberg
Herbert L. Joss
Robert A. Keagy
James D. Kearny
Edward T. Keating
Paul C. Keenan, Jr.
Bruce Keener III
Donald C. Kellersberger
James P. Kelley
Eugene F. Kelly
Ralph A. Kennedy
John S. Kern
Thomas G. Kilgariff
Owen K. King
Donald M. Kirkpatrick
Joseph M. Kitchen
Wilbur C. Klemm
John L. Kline, Jr.
Franklin C. Knock
Robert H. Koehler
Edwin H. Koester
Leonard R. Kojm
Robert P. Kolar
Frank C. Kolda
Richard E. Kosiba
Joseph Kovacs
Arthur L. Krasnow
Dale L. Kratzer
Andrew F. Kruzich
Francis X. Kuhn
Lee F. Kyle
Alphonse G. Lang, Jr.
Richard C. Lang
Judson D. Langston
Humphrey B. Lansden
Jerome E. Larson
John R. Lastova, Jr.
George R. Lathan
Henry B. Latimer
Joseph R. Laubach, Jr.
Kent W. Lawson
William H. Layman
Charles S. Leach
Edward F. Lebiedz
Harry B. Lee
John C. LeDoux
George R. Lemmon
Chantee Lewis
William S. Lewis
Walter R. Lewison
Robert A. Litke
George L. Little III
Thomas Longo
Donald H. Lucas, Jr.
William M. Luckie
Doyle W. Lynn
Eugene Lyon
Robert T. Maconie
Melville I. MacQuarrie
Francis F. Manganaro
John F. Mangold, Jr.
Lawrence D. Marsolais
Donald M. Martin
James K. Martin
Robert S. Marts
Andrew J. Mashaw
William M. Matthew
Richard C. Maurer, Jr.
John W. McAdams, Jr.
Robert P. McArdle
William J. McCabe
John A. McCamont
William J. McClain
Robert B. McClinton
John A. McCook
Wayne S. McCord
Kyle C. McCormick
Raymond K. McDannold
Carlton A. K. McDonald
David B. McDowell
William B. McGinty, Jr.
William L. McGonagle
William McKinley
Robert M. McLaughlin
Stewart H. McLean
William R. McMaster
Carey P. McMurray
John W. McNutt
James G. Measel
John B. Mencke
Gordon K. Meriwether, Jr.
Robert P. Metzger
Charles R. Miko
Robert L. Milholland
Grover C. Miller, Jr.
Robert H. Miller
Ross L. Miller
William J. Miller
Donald F. Milligan
Robert N. Mitchell, Jr.
William E. Monaghan
Albert J. Monger
Girard W. Moore, Jr.
Clifford L. Morgan
John T. Moriarty
Max K. Morris
Wilbur M. Morrison
Jack L. Morrow
Eugene W. Mulligan III
Richard E. Munly
Richard D. Murray
William G. Nealon
Norman J. Neiss
Perry W. Nelson
Roger M. Netherland
Paul R. Newcomb
Robert C. Newcomb
William C. Newell, Jr.
Samuel C. Newman
Oliver L. Norman, Jr.
William E. Nowers
George E. Nuber, Jr.
William E. Nylen
Charles H. Ogilvie
Corwin A. Olds
Lawrence A. O'Leary
Stephen J. O'Leary, Jr.
James C. Oliver, Jr.
Phil G. Olsen
Delbert A. Olson
Robert C. Olson
Albert G. Opitz
Neri Osborn III
James W. Osmer, Jr.
Eugene W. Ostlund
George R. Parish, Jr.
Harry Partridge, Jr.
Randolph F. Patterson
Samuel S. Pennock III
Anson C. Perkins
Dale S. Perry
Maurice A. Person
Kenneth E. Phillips
Edward B. Pickell
Jackson R. Pickens
Frank R. Pirkey
Clarence R. Plank
Richard Porter
Paul R. Powell
William L. Prange
Reuben P. Prichard, Jr.
John F. Pritchard
Joseph E. Puccini, Jr.
Howard M. Puckett
Robert E. Pyle
Henry P. Quick
Burton J. Rab
Jerome W. Rabinowitz
Robert N. Radtke
John E. Rasmussen
Charles F. Rauch, Jr.
Robert B. Rausch
Robert D. Rawlings
Benton E. Reams
Harold A. Redner, Jr.
William E. Reed
Donald H. Reese
William F. W. Reeve
Isaac P. Rehkopf
David R. Reilly
Wallace Rich
Donald W. Richardson
Robert G. Ricker
Baylor G. Riddell
Joseph M. Rideout III
William L. Rigot
Daniel P. Riley
Paul A. Riley
William D. Robertson, Jr.
Charles H. Rockcastle
Abraham Rockman
Ralph C. Rodgers
Duke J. Rose
Meyer H. Rose
Seymour N. Ross
Robert G. Roth
Russell A. Rowan, Jr.
James C. Ruehrmund
Paul E. Russell
Wallace L. Russell
Richard M. Ryder
Homer G. Sanborn III
Hugh A. Sanders
James E. Sanders
John B. Sangster, Jr.
Bayard T. Sansom
Earle W. Sapp
Glenn A. Savage
Donald Scheid
Robert K. Schenkel
James R. Schmoller
Walter T. Schultheis
Marvin C. Scoggins, Jr.
Robert L. Scott
Harold Scudder
Irwin H. Seligman
Lester L. Shade
John W. Sharp
William M. Shaver
Daniel F. Shea, Jr.
William L. Shea
Daniel N. Shockey
William J. Shoemaker
William E. Shorr
Edward A. Short
Kenneth L. Shugart, Jr.
Roy M. Signer, Jr.
Arnold L. Silverman
Willard E. Simon
Jonathan A. Sisson
James B. Sizer III
Harold F. Skelly
Robert W. Slater
Charles P. Smith
Deming W. Smith
Harold A. Smith
Robert P. Smith
Samuel T. Smith, Jr.
Francis M. Snyder
Richard L. Sonne
Walter Spangenberg, Jr.
Spiro Spirson
Warren L. Spry
Henry L. Staples, Jr.
Jason K. Stewart
Robert H. Stickel
James R. Stohl
Troy E. Stone
Richard A. Storr
Arthur E. Strauss
James T. Strong
Willard L. Strong
Jack M. Stuffebeam
Hubert B. Sturtevant, Jr.
Charles D. Summitt
David "H" Swenson, Jr.
Dean Taylor, Jr.
Charles B. Teal
Theodore R. Tenczar
Milford S. Terrass
Lee R. Thomas, Jr.
Robert K. Thompson
James Thomson
Paul E. Trejo
Glenn E. Trewet
Sebastian Trusso
Louis T. Urbanczyk, Jr.
Bruce W. VanAtta
John VanTol
Joseph M. Verlander
Jay J. Vermilya
Robert S. Vermilya
Frank J. Viehmann
John R. Virts
Russel A. Vollertsen
Cecil R. Vollmer
Dwight Wadsworth
Edgar F. Ward
Donald C. Warren
Jonathan R. Warren
Gerald A. Warnke
Douglas A. Washburn
John T. Waterman
Ronald D. Waugh
Joseph E. Weatherly, Jr.
Harold E. Weber
Robert M. Weidman, Jr.

Donald J. Weintraut
Edward F. Welch, Jr.
Alfred G. Wellons, Jr.
John T. Welsh
William G. Wepfer
David J. Werner
Curtis R. Wick
John G. Wick
John E. Wilkie
Thomas R. Wilkinson
Bernard P. Williams, Jr.
Charles I. Williams
Roy E. Williams
Henry H. Wilson
Kenneth E. Wilson, Jr.
Laurence W. Wilson
Robert D. Wilson
Robert E. Wilson
Gordon L. Wineman
Cornelius Winkler, Jr.
Eugene F. Witkowski
Robert H. Witten
Alan B. Wood
Andrew J. Yates
James L. Yates
McCaslin Yates
William K. Yates
Floyd F. Young
George T. Youngren
William L. Zedaker, Jr.
Louis J. Zeleznock
Randolph D. Zelov
John L. Zent

For permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

James R. Ahern
Thomas J. Allshouse
Harold R. Andrus, Jr.
Dwight L. Arnall
John R. Ashcom, Jr.
James H. Ashe III
James E. Ballard
Michael Bat
Allen F. Bauer
Howard Bauman
James M. Baumgardner
Bruce A. Benson
Carl I. Bergkvist
William Blanchard, Jr.
Thomas J. Boehm, Jr.
Joseph R. Bow
Anthony M. Bozich
William H. Brownell
Frederick C. Burgess
Wright A. Burnham
Herbert A. Burwick
Ralph A. Buswell
James C. Carroll
John A. Chapman II
Joseph H. Cheshure
Joseph H. Clasgens II
Darrell N. Coba
Fred L. Cofer, Jr.
Donald L. B. Combs
Ervin H. Cooper
James E. M. Coughlin
Harold Crain
Charles R. E. Deily
Forrest H. Doucette
James R. Doquette
Earl C. Dye, Jr.
Paul R. Ebling
Gordon M. Ehrman
William M. Emery
Richard B. Euchenhofer
Richard M. Evans
Calvin W. Fisk
Earl Foster
Nevin W. George
John D. Graziadei
Walter Grechanik
Paul F. Griffith
Lawrence D. Hagedorn
Donald R. Haines
Bobby L. Hatch
Millard F. Havener
Gail L. Heasley
Richard C. Heitmeyer
Max E. Hency
James D. Hereford, Jr.
Sheldon L. Hirsch
Leif A. Houkon
Simon J. Houlihan
Marvin S. Hutchison
Everett E. Karraker
Carroll R. Keyser
"J" Scott Kirkwood
John W. Kline
Francis A. Kocourek
Walter L. Kraus
Peter N. Kyros
Donald H. Lake
Earl F. Liebtag, Jr.
Raymond D. Lochner
Donald S. Macoy
Joseph L. Mahoney, Jr.
William F. Mangan
Uriel V. Manion, Jr.
Martin D. Marder
Alfred S. Maurstad
John W. McCabe
John McCullough
Thomas T. McGinnis
James D. McNeil
Lyman T. Mereness
David E. Moline
Robert F. Morison
Thomas F. Murphy, Jr.
Thomas F. Nealon
Maurice A. Notch
Roy S. Nunnally
Thomas J. O'Connor
Jack G. Odell
William C. Olin
Warren H. Ortland
James A. Ostiller
Joseph F. Ouellette
Jack M. Park
John S. Park
Thomas J. Pawlowski, Jr.
John L. Perschy
Paul J. Pflueger
Gordon W. Phelps, Jr.
George R. Pippin
Robert G. Pistner
Charles R. Pitchford
Stephen W. Plarr
John W. Porter
Richard L. Rainey
Raymond Ramer
Joseph A. Rebentisch, Jr.
Robert L. Reed
Harold H. Reichert
William J. Reynders
Francis Roche
Joseph C. Ryan, Jr.
John K. Ryder
Frank A. Saksa
Jackson L. Schultz
Claiborne T. Selden
John C. Shannon
Frank Simpson III
Charles R. Skord
Donald B. Small
Jack C. Smith
John T. Snyder
Richard A. Sodowsky
Monroe B. Sorge
Joseph E. Spalding
Samuel S. Stephens
Jackson B. Strange
Lawrence E. Sutherland, Jr.
Ernest L. Truax, Jr.
Edward J. Tuite
Wayne S. Upton
William S. Waldron
Willard H. Walker III
William D. Warne
Gerald H. Weyrauch
David W. Whelan
Richard D. Willey
Carleton R. Williams
Thomas J. Wills II
John A. Winslow
Harry I. Zankman

For permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Bradley L. Baker
Harry J. Baker, Jr.
John R. Bothwell
Robertson Buck
Charles C. Buik III
Charles W. Butler
Ossian R. Butterfield
Harold P. Cahill, Jr.
Allen E. Cooper
Beady P. Crass
Charles Curione
Robert D. Darrach, Jr.
Elliot A. Dewey
Robert C. Doerpinghaus
Archie E. Floyd
William W. Gentry
James I. Gibson
Charles C. Heid, Jr.
Dan L. Hirst
Norman J. Magneson
James A. Martin
Arley E. McCoy, Jr.
Joseph W. Neudecker, Jr.
William E. Nims
Henry F. Pager
Marshall V. Perry
Eugene L. Pickett
Eugene M. Portner
John W. Rasmussen
William F. Reed, Jr.
Edward R. Seibert
Nelson C. Simonson
Donald E. Smith
Alfred Stroh, Jr.
Richard W. Trompeter
Kenneth F. Ward
Lawrence M. White
Robert M. Wilson
William D. Wilson

For permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Margaret H. Adams
Bertha A. Alexander
Barbara L. Ambach
Ruth M. Arnic
Geraldine H. Baldey
Rose M. Ball
Annabelle Barnes
Mary F. Barrett
Dorothy M. Barry
Norma L. Bassett
Elaine H. Baumann
Martha Bernatitus
Eleanor C. Beste
Margery G. Bierma
Anna Birardi
Vivian Blasingame
Evelyn M. Bliss
Phyllis K. Bohn
Eleanor M. Brady
Mary E. Bramlet
Florence L. Bryant
Ambia L. Buckner
Anna J. Burlon
Sarah V. Callebs
Barbara E. Carmine
Margaret M. Carr
Helen E. Casterlin
Eleanor F. Clausner
Aurelia G. Clayton
Irene M. Connors
Margaret C. Connors
Joan E. Cordone
Dolores Cornelius
Mary M. D. Costello
Doris M. Cox
Wanda M. Crouse
Eleanore C. Culler
Margaret DeFilippo
Mary Deignan
Elizabeth M. DeRocco
Nora L. Dixon
Audrey M. Djerf
Shirley A. Dobbs
Patricia M. Doherty
Jane Dudinski
Helen S. Durant
Leokadra Dzikewicz
Virginia A. Eastin
Marion F. Eckert
Mary L. Eiermann
Jane L. Eldridge
Jean E. Ellis
Margaret E. Embry
Laura J. Emery
Constance R. Esposito
Ethel C. A. Eusebio
Florence E. Farrell
Marcella Faudree
Lenore S. Feagin
Agnes W. Felts
Evelyn M. Ferrence
Lois Finney
Martha Flanigan
Bella M. Fritz
Mildred Fugger
Jean L. Furst
Mildred G. Gangi
Josephine M. Glod
Naomi E. Gorman
Ferrell L. Greer
Melba L. Haggerty
Josephine L. Hart
Imogene Hathaway
Amalia Haule
Barbara J. Heine
Joyce J. Hoover
Madylon C. Hoover
Annie V. Hopple
Arline D. Houghton
Vila J. Hovis
Mary E. Howard
Ruth M. Humphrey
Ethel J. Humphreys
Helen K. Hunter
June G. Johnson
Martha J. Jones
Ruth B. Jones
Virginia P. Jordan
Helen D. Kahle
Mary Kalchik
Patricia A. Karn
Mary M. Ketter
Doris A. Kilpatrick
May E. Knudson
Violet Krisko
Irene Kulevich
Stella M. Lambros
Ira L. Lane
Margaret Lariviere
Mary E. Liljegreen
Virginia Luther
Floy G. Mangold
Jeanne H. Manning
Kathleen Marsh
Evelyn L. Marshall
Marie R. Martel
Hilda A. Martin
Ruth W. Martin
Jean R. Mathews
Elaine J. Matthews
Mary McCarthy
Margaret M. McDougle
Rose M. McGrath
Filomena M. Mele
Madeleine G. Messier
Jean A. Monnich
Geneva L. Moore
Adele B. Munson
Betty J. Murray
Mary A. Musielski
Norma F. Naegle
June E. Norman
Waldena O'Barto
Madaline A. O'Kane
Gizella Papp
Lola M. Paulie
Bessie M. Perry
Julia J. Peters
Anna Philipone
Wanda E. Pizorka
Sophie A. Podosek
Adelaid E. Quanstrom
Patricia L. Ratcliffe
Rosemary E. Reinhart
Ruth A. Repasky
Marjorie J. Revis
Mary M. Rhodes
Margaret R. Richards
Aileene F. Riggins
Elizabeth C. Riggs
Gloria V. Rizzo
Margaret A. Robinson
Agnes M. Ross
Mary R. Ruane
Elsie M. Rusnak
Margaret M. Ryan
Nellie P. Sebastian
Helen M. Sekin
Louise W. Sharp
Catherine T. Shields
Virginia M. Simicich
Lauda B. Sims
Mary F. Smith
Neita L. Smith
Veronica Smith
Nellie J. Smoogen
Margaret A. Smyth
Regina L. Solarz
Elizabeth J. Stapleford
Betty L. Stiles
Flora B. Sturm
Barbara L. Taurish
Betty L. Taylor
Esther M. Thompson
Norma J. Thompson
Eleanor Ulozas
Annette Urban
Dorothy J. Venverloh
Imogene L. Vesper
Esther J. Vought
Anna E. Wagner
Irene D. Walker
Helen F. Wallis
Josephine E. Walls
Kathleen E. Ward
Dorothy M. Watt
Helen M. Weber
Mary F. Williams
Alicia C. Wincek
Mary A. Wissler
Weece Wood
Farrace L. Worthy
Irene Wujcik
Mary A. Wylie
Dorthula P. Yodler

For permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Naval Reserve:

Robert W. Abel
Grady F. Abercrombie
Lawrence W. Adams, Jr.
Leslie Addicott, Jr.
William S. Aldrich
Charles E. Alexander
Henry A. Allain
Harold A. Armes
George E. Babin
Elmer D. Badgley
Edward W. Bassett
Charles B. Basye
Paul F. Bechard
Thaddeus R. Belsher
Kile Bigelow
Abraham L. Bird
Marcus K. Bitter
Logan C. Blackwell
George S. Bleifuss
Andrew J. Bodnar
Carl R. Bordlemay
Joseph Boroody
James V. Bower
Ralph J. Bradford, Jr.
Richard A. Brady
Albert D. Braeuninger
Stanley D. Brokhausen
James E. Brown
James P. Buckner
Charles D. Budeit
Stanley C. Bugbee
John C. Burgess
Wesley L. Burks
Borden J. Burleson
William A. Buttlar
John G. Carpenter
Lucien P. Caulkett, Jr.
Alfred N. Cave
Reginald R. Chojnacki
Charles C. Christiansen
Edward F. Christiansen
Gerald M. Clark
Lynn B. Clarke
Marvin Cohen
James E. Conn
Charles O. Conway
Joseph T. Council
Julius B. Cranston, Jr.
Alan L. Crawford
Caston C. Dalon
Donald R. Davenport
Richard G. Delozier
Henry M. Dibble
Edward G. Doane
Clarence M. Erickson
William G. Erickson
Randolph L. Eskew
Harry E. Ettinger, Jr.
Patrick M. Fant
Dwinal R. Farley
Alwyn L. Fox, Jr.
Richard J. Frainier
Raymond B. Frank, Jr.
Donald E. Frazier
John W. Gallimore
William S. Garvin
Orvis O. Gaughf, Jr.
Bernard K. Genetti
Robert A. Gibson
Richard A. Gosnell
Glenn M. Gray
Grover K. Gregory
Alvin H. Grobmeier
James R. Gwinn
James E. Halpin
James L. Hanley, Jr.
Kenneth L. Hansen
Willis D. Hanson
Henry J. Harling
Hilario L. Haro
Robert P. Harper, Jr.
Eugene G. Harris
William W. Harris
Albert P. Hawley
Thomas O. Helm
Frederick L. Highsmith
Ronald V. Himelick

Warren S. Hintz
Franklin H. Hoffa
Stanley V. Hubbard, Jr.
David L. Hughes
Richard T. Hunter
Robert E. Hunter, Jr.
William A. Jensen
Joseph P. Jones
Walter E. Jordan
James A. Kauflin
John R. Keegan
John L. Keenan
Russell V. Kennedy
Charles B. Kirbow
Charles F. Klees
Morgan C. Knowlton
Ralph A. Krause
Harry W. Krueger
James R. Langhofer
John Lavra
Robert F. Lawson
Joseph V. LeBlanc
William M. Lewallen
Russell A. Lewis, Jr.
Leo L. Linn
Glenn H. Lundell
Dick D. Mahaffey
George N. Maige
George H. Main
George D. Malhiot
John T. Marinkovich
Paul E. Marsh, Jr.
Gaston E. Mayes
Francis E. McBride
John P. McCann
Stanley M. McCoy
Jack G. McDonell
James W. McIlvaine
Patrick F. McInerney
Robert J. McMullin
Robert F. Meckoll
Sammie O. Midgett
Erkki O. Minkkinen
Theodore F. Misselwitz
Marion E. Morris
Darrell L. Mossburg
Frederick E. Munroe
Leo C. Murphy, Jr.
Charles W. Nagengast
James D. Nesbitt
Harry D. Ness
Carleton O. Nordling
William F. O'Donnell
Leo R. Olbu
Nelson N. Olson
Raoul M. Olson
Frederick N. Opel, Jr.
Robert D. Osborn
Billy W. Oslin
Jack E. Owens
George B. Palmer, Jr.
Thomas J. Patterson
Virgil V. Perkins
Daniel V. Peterson
Edward F. Phillips
Aloysius M. Powers
James E. Pugh
Henry K. Purnhagen
Jack B. Rader
Richard D. Rahm
Robert W. Range
Myron D. Ransom
Darold L. Reckling
Melville N. Reese
Joseph S. Reeves
Richard D. Renner
Albert W. Repovsch
Wallace J. Reynolds
Theodore L. Rivenburg, Jr.
James W. Roberts
Donald Rogers
Claude M. Ross
Ervin B. Rubey, Jr.
Alvin E. Rusche
Robert R. Saari
James C. Sapp
Roy L. Schark
Frederick F. Schloetzer
Edgar K. Schutz
Bruce B. Sheppard
Harry L. Sheppard, Jr.
Daryl H. Sim
Robert Smith
Frank H. Sobey
Robert W. Soergel
George G. Somers
Fred Sorenson, Jr.
Ronald H. Spradlin
Robert F. Stafford
Ernest W. Steelman
Roy W. Stine
Alfred L. Stingl
Meryl W. Stratton
Anton J. Straziar
Craig Stuck
Howard K. Swihart
Joe C. Tacker
Oliver F. Tarr
Robert M. Thompson
Cleedis D. Toone
Robert W. Totten
Joseph N. Tulino
Leonard Urban
Daniel P. Vaughan
Martin C. Voves
Douglas B. Walker
James E. Ward
Kermit W. Waters
Austin R. Way
William W. Weatherlow
Harland Weaver
Fred E. Whipple
Vernon C. Whitman
Robert C. Whitten, Jr.
Dale P. Williams
Donald L. Williams
Hal H. Williamson
Albert S. Wilson, Jr.
Hubert E. Wolff
Edward A. Woodard, Jr.

For permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps of the Naval Reserve:

David A. Grammer, Jr.

For permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Nurse Corps of the Naval Reserve:

Harriet S. Johnstone
Patricia J. Price

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary or permanent appointment to the grades and corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment:

COMMANDER, LINE

William J. Bennett, Jr.
Howard J. Bergman
Lawrence W. Black
William A. Collier
Daniel J. Corcoran
Will J. Davis, Jr.
Donald H. Dickey
Walter J. Fitzgerald
Randall D. Foster
Raymond W. Glasgow
Donald W. Griffin
Leonard R. Hardy
William H. Hudgins
Robert B. Hutchins
Norman G. Lancaster
William A. Leonard
Alfred R. Lyngby
Edward G. Magennis
John M. Maloney
Burton R. Manser
George F. O'Malley
Paul M. Owen
Gerald V. Reynolds
Rowland F. Schlegel
John E. Scrivner
Raymond D. Shryock
Leland P. Stallknecht
George F. Stearns, Jr.
Edward J. Taylor
J. Russell Verbrycke

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, LINE

Richard Bacharach
Earle Bennett
Charles A. Blocher, Jr.
Paul F. Borden
Fred Y. Boyer
Ralph K. Brandt
Roger L. Burum
Donald D. Chapman
Enser W. Cole, Jr.
Earl C. Collins
Harry J. Conway
Eugene N. Curtis
John T. Davies
Forrest M. Divine
Fordyce R. Downs, Jr.
Joseph A. Eddins
Arnold W. Eggen
Emmet M. Ferguson
Edwin D. Ferretti
Daniel Flynn
Dana P. French
Fred H. Frey
Donald L. Garver
David E. Glassman
John P. Gleeson
James W. Grant
Edward V. P. Horne
Wyman N. Jackson
Benjamin P. Jacobs
Frederic H. Kaul
Jack L. Kenner
James P. Kenny
James E. Keys
George P. Kurtz
Robert E. Lee, Jr.
George J. Leger
Carl E. Lundin, Jr.
Joseph B. McDevitt
Fred J. Madrigan
Francis X. Markey
"R" "A" Markham
Robert F. Milota
John A. Montgomery, Jr.
Howard N. Moore
William E. Neely
Kenneth S. Nelms
Robert F. Nuttman
Howard A. Patrick
Robert H. Rathbun
William T. Roddy
Thomas B. Root
Richard J. Selman
Morris M. Seydel
George S. H. Sharratt
Wilson J. Sweeney
Milton W. Thorpe
William H. Thornton, Jr.
Maurice J. Underwood
John (n) Van Ohlen
John E. Whyte

LIEUTENANT, LINE

George T. Boland
Willard D. Hoot
James N. Martin
Louis L. Milano

CAPTAIN, MEDICAL CORPS

William S. Lawler

COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS

Edward K. Allis, Jr.
Curtis Asher
Franklin L. Ashley
Louis P. Ballenberger
Felix P. Ballenger
Byron E. Bassham
Reginald V. Berry
Virgil A. Beuerman
John R. Bierley
John D. Boland
Robert R. Bonar
Sidney I. Brody
August R. Buerkle
Warner D. Bundens, Jr.
Bruce L. Canaga, Jr.
Maurice A. Canon.
Frederick B. Carlson
Byron D. Castell
Roland A. Christensen
Ralph L. Christy, Jr.
Robert F. Christoph
Robert E. Coker, Jr.
William S. Cole
Henry Colony
Robert A. Conard
John L. Conley
William M. Crafft
Eugene P. Cronkite
James B. Cummins
George W. Deyoe
James R. Dillon, Jr.
Robert E. Douglas
Gerald J. Duffner
Thomas L. Duffy
Charles H. Eaton
Erwood G. Edgar
Henry R. Ennis
Eugene L. Freitas
Roger H. Fuller
John A. Fusco
Richard A. Gaillard
Marvin L. Gerber
John T. M. Giannini
Charles H. Gilliland
Douglas J. Giorgio
Thomas F. Gowen
William J. Hall
Robert B. Hallborg
Wayne S. Hansen
Byron L. Hawks
Vernet H. Heinz
William W. Henderson
Moffitt K. Holler
Samuel H. Horton, Jr.
David F. Hottenstein
Joseph E. Humphries
J. Wilson Huston
Glenn D. Hutchinson
Rudolph D. Jacob
Leonard P. Jahnke
Richard E. Kelley
E. Richard King
Kenneth P. Knudston
Peter S. Kwiatkowski
Karl M. Lacer
John D. Langston
Watson B. Larkin
William C. Livingood
James H. Lockwood
W. Sayre Lummis, Jr.
William W. Manson
Henry W. Miller
Jerome A. Moore
Neal Morris
Ralph M. Mugrage
William C. Mulry
John M. Murphy
Bruce R. McCampbell
Carl M. McCandless, Jr.
Newell Nay
Philip L. Nova
Stanley J. Okulicz
Walter Patterson
Sherman M. Peabody
Robert Penington, Jr.
Philip B. Phillips
Joseph C. Pinto
Robert W. Reid
James L. Richardson
Lindsay R. Riddle
Emmett J. Riordan
Jacob J. Robbins
James A. Roberts, Jr.
William C. Roland
Gustave A. Roy
Frederick A. Ruoff
George W. Russell
Florian J. Santini
Max O. Sartori
Harold R. Scanlin
Robert F. Schugmann
John R. Seal
Vance E. Senter
John F. Shaul
Bruce M. Shepard
John T. Sill
Alan G. Simpson, Jr.
Clyde S. Stroud, Jr.
Robert E. Stutsman
Blake S. Talbot
Louis E. Tebow
Samuel V. Thompson
Wilson D. Tucker
William B. Turney
Joseph Vogel
Wayne W. Waters
George S. Watkins
James D. Wharton
Julian A. White
Earl G. Wolf
Edward M. Wurzel

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS

Jesse F. Adams
Robert G. Allen
Gustave T. Anderson
Thomas E. Atkinson, Jr.
Kenneth P. Bachman
Lawrence E. Banks
George C. Beattie
Edward L. Beckman
Richard G. Berry
Ervine S. Bills
Boyd K. Black
Sidney D. Bond, Jr.
Wade H. Boswell
Andrew F. Braff
Ralph K. Brooks
George C. Calderwood
Dwight A. Callagan
Robert M. Campbell
Earle G. Canfield
Manley J. Capron, Jr.
Frank A. Cerzosimo
John H. Cheffey
Donald R. Childs
Frank B. Clare
Gale G. Clark
Frank W. Cleary
Henry R. Cooper
Fred W. Cottrell, Jr.
Marvin D. Courtney
Philip D. Cronemiller
Edward L. de Wilton
Alvis B. Dickson
Joseph B. Dominey, Jr.
Robert C. Doolittle
Arthur R. Errion
Clyde J. Fairless, Jr.
Ralph E. Faucett
Lester W. Fix
Quentin J. Florence
Berwyn R. Force
Albin A. Galuszka
Francis G. Geer
Robert D. Gilliam
John E. Goebel
Maynard B. Gustafson
Clifford R. Hall
Walter F. Harrison, Jr.
Edward V. Heffernan
John H. Hege
Edmund M. Henderson
Thomas G. Hennessy
Howard W. Hill
Walter H. Jarvis, Jr.
Edward A. John
Walton L. Jones
Frank F. Kalchuk
James A. Kaufman
Dominic A. Kuljis
Richard B. Leander
Chester Lessenden
John Lingenfelder
Stanley J. Lloyd
Irvin H. Mattick
Albert L. May, Jr.
Romulus May
Russell M. Maynard
Robert F. Meeko
William W. Miller, Jr.
David Minard
Francis M. Morgan
James R. McArtor
John F. McCabe
Francis J. McMahon
David J. McMurray
Rudolph P. Nadbath
William I. Neikirk
Charles B. Newton
Caesar F. Orofino
David P. Osborne
John A. Pease
Daniel M. Pino
John J. Price, Jr.
Carl E. Pruett
John B. Reddy
Vorris M. Reist
Charles W. Reynolds
John J. Rieder
Harvey L. Rittenhouse
Wendell W. Robley
Robert L. Rouen
Merrill W. Rusher
Sarkis S. Sarkisian
Maurice Schiff
Nathaniel Sharp
Dean Schufeldt
Bruce H. Smith, Jr.
Milton M. Small
James M. Smith
William L. Smith
Robert A. Stalter
Herbert G. Stoecklein
John H. Stover, Jr.
William S. Stryker
Herschel C. Sudduth
Mervyn J. Sullivan
James N. Sussex
Edwin C. Sweeney
Robert E. Switzer
George H. Tarr, Jr.
Frank H. Thomas, Jr.
John W. Trenton
DeWitt S. True
George E. Vaupel
Philip H. VonFraenkel
Henry G. Wagner
Granville I. Walker
Dale B. Watkins
Harry A. Weiss
Frederick E. Wetzel
Scott Whitehouse
Lawrence A. Whoolery
David J. William, Jr.
Gerald E. Wineinger
Thomas D. Yocum
Albert J. Zuska

LIEUTENANT, MEDICAL CORPS

Lynn E. Anthony
Bruce F. Baisch
Robert E. Baker
David D. Bennett, Jr.

Victor G. Benson
Dallas E. Billman
Victor P. Bond
Carleton J. Brown
Robert L. Burdick
William L. Chapman
August P. Ciell
Louis A. Collins, Jr.
Richard B. Connor
Thomas C. Deas
James R. Dineen
Richard F. Dobbins
Adolphus W. Dunn
Wallace C. Ellerbroek
John G. Esswein
Robert J. Evoy
Robert J. Fahrner
Philip O. Geib
John S. Graettinger
Arthur A. Helgerson
Cyril J. Honsik
Newman A. Hoopingarner
Francis E. Hornbrook
John W. Howard
Jack T. Jones, Jr.
Roland W. Jones
John H. Killough
Robert L. King, Jr.
Joseph H. Lawson
James H. Lee, Jr.
Robert H. Lemmon
Charles W. Lewis, Jr.
Garner L. Lewis
William T. Lineberry, Jr.
Robert A. Loeffler
James C. Marr, Jr.
John J. Marra
Edward Martin, Jr.
Frederick W. Meyer, Jr.
John B. Miller
Charles J. Molnar, Jr.
Ramon A. Mouton
Richard D. Nauman
John M. Packard
Bernard H. Pender
Ernest S. Redfield, Jr.
Stanley E. Reese
Lewis G. Richards, Jr.
Charles E. Rogers
Robert E. Rowand
Anthony P. Rush
Henry Santina
Charles Savage
Henry A. Schlang
William E. Schumacher
Robert W. Sharp, Jr.
Julius H. Spence
Thomas W. Stewart
Ernest E. Trout
Fred A. Valusek
George T. VanPetten
Robert E. Walsh
James H. Watts, Jr.
Burton Willard
Jay D. Wilson
Sydner T. Withers

COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS

Richard Cobb
Paul F. Cosgrove, Jr.
James W. Haggard
George H. Henry
Alfred C. Jackson
Paul R. Lally
Homan L. Walsh
Ellis G. Youtz

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS

Emmett O. Barlie
Damon J. Barnett
Joe T. Brittain
Emmett M. Campbell
Stanley Christensen
Leo A. Fontaine
Simeon G. Higgins
Eddie M. Johnson
John A. Keefer
Henry C. Krueger
Leo C. Lemire
Milton A. Link
Emery L. Morton
Merrill H. Nichols
Preston W. Ogburn
Elsworth E. Richards
James J. Rush
Horace D. Sharon
John L. Warden
Robert H. Woodcock

LIEUTENANT, SUPPLY CORPS

Paul B. Akright
Edward J. Daley
Kral N. Keever
Ralph V. Romans
Richard T. Ryman
Frank H. Whitchurch

COMMANDER, DENTAL CORPS

John E. Carson
Willard R. McClellan
Harold N. Siemer
Richard F. Tuma

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, DENTAL CORPS

Ralph H. S. Scott

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Loren M. Lindquist

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Warren F. Cline
Harold D. Corn
Paul V. Flaherty
Clarence A. Grubb
Joseph V. Jones
Leir R. Larson
Chester A. Lewis
Eugene F. Martiny
Arthur F. Meeks
William A. Miller
John Nuckel, Jr.

LIEUTENANT, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Thomas J. McGhee

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Clifton K. Adams
Howard E. Allen
Paul L. Austin
Leslie E. Bond
Lester E. Boston
Alexander Bowdle, Jr.
Julian P. Breillatt
Harry Browdy
Herman H. Burton
Armand P. Chartier
Francis A. Chevrefils
Joseph W. Collins
Joseph M. Coltrell
Harry W. Combs, Jr.
Hubert L. Crain
Jeremiah V. Crews
William M. Dreitlein
Theon K. Eaton
Leo J. Elsasser
Oscar L. Etheridge
Clarence W. Feyh
Joseph E. Francisco
Irving Frontis
Stephen J. Gandy
William B. Gilmore
Charles L. Grady
Edward F. Haase
Heyward E. Hall
Charles R. Harvey
Floyd S. Haslam
William X. Heelan
Lawrence E. Hibbon
Stanley E. Hill
Lawrence L. Isert
Joseph J. Jacobs
John J. Joyce
James H. Keating
Marques E. Keizur, Jr.
Henry H. Laramore
Clifford R. Lawson
Arve Lee
Fred J. Lewis, Jr.
Ramon C. Lewis
Roy D. Lewis
Shelley L. Lewis
William C. Lewis
Robert G. Luckie
Francis E. Lusk
Edgar J. Maddox
Charles F. Mann
Adolph W. Meyers
Frank L. McLemore
Matthew J. Millard
Kenneth C. Norton
Vernon T. Moss
Arthur H. Nelson
Charles V. Quigley
William C. Pilkington
Clay E. Pittser
Warren F. Postel
Kenneth L. Price
Lawrence E. Pryor
Neblett M. Rhodes
Fred C. Roepke
Alfred E. H. Ruth
John M. Rutter
John Sant
Lawrence R. Shockley
Karl E. Schweinfurth
James P. Smith
Eugene Stevens
Earnest R. Stovall
Clarence B. Stuart
William S. Swofford
Andrew A. Taylor
Hugh M. Taylor
Herman B. Tidwell
Loy A. Wagner
John K. Waite
Francis L. Westbrook
Orin C. Western
Flavis A. Wilson
Percy C. Wilson
Marshall J. Wiltshire
Louie K. Witcofski
Oliver L. Young

LIEUTENANT, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Albert L. Andersen
Claude C. Cason
Wayne B. Hewitt
Charlie W. Lee
Samuel C. Marcus
Robert F. Rigg
Chester D. Worthen

LIEUTENANT, NURSE CORPS

Adelaide Atwood
Dorothy L. Auger
Louise Bareford
Elizabeth O. Bowie
Mary K. Brown
Gladys O. Bryant
Jessie V. Bucher
Anne J. Chelf
Ferne E. Dennison
Winifred T. Gewehr
Marie L. Goucher
Eunice B. Hall
Eleanor C. Hayes
Gladys L. P. Kennedy
Theresa B. Krier
Mildred M. Lankenau
Anne E. Larkin
Kathryn E. Lopartz
Ida Malaspina
Mary A. Moniz
Elizabeth O'Malley
Mary O'Neill
Margaret C. Pusel
Alice L. Quinn
Rose M. Martinsek
Marion L. Morgan
Angelene Rio
Bertha E. Rollings
Mary A. Rowan
Mildred K. Teass
Audrey J. Tryon
Dorothy M. Voorhorst
Claire M. Walsh
Marion E. Weden
Mary E. Whalen
Marion Wieck
Elizabeth Wolchick

The following-named officers for permanent appointment in the line:

CAPTAIN

Sanford B. D. Wood
Norman K. Roberts

COMMANDER

Parker E. Cherry
Curtis T. Youngblood
Herbert L. Ogden
Irving N. Klein
Luis V. Castro
George A. Sullivan
Lewis N. Evans
Wilfred A. Hearn
Harold J. Harris
George D. Sullivan
John Owen
James R. Carnes
Elmer N. Buddress
Lafayette E. Rogers
Joe H. Munster, Jr.
Herbert S. Schwab
Erik A. Johnson
Peter V. Dabbieri
Leo J. Meads
William B. Matney
George F. Stearns
William A. Collier
Thomas H. Humphreys, Jr.
Edwin H. Nichols
Charles T. Cole
Albert L. O'Bannon
Richard E. Ryan
Ralph T. Moloney
Frederick S. Albrink
Edmund J. Bodziak
Cecil R. Harrison
Mack K. Greenberg
Jack C. Davis

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Charles C. Smith
Louis S. Gard
Alvin C. Johnston
Dick M. Wheat
Howard H. Brandenburg
Harold H. Gearinger
Herbert B. Howard
Raymond V. Van Wolkenten
Henry E. Staley
Morris G. Duchin
Charles A. Rich
Robert H. Keehn
Herbert E. Ost
Francis X. Driscoll
Edward L. McDonald
Melvin A. Miller
James A. Potter III
Joseph A. Regan
Guilbert W. Martin
Robert E. Cummings
John W. Shields
Robert H. Hare
Earle C. Gordon, Jr.
Craig McKee
Herbert T. Schmidt
Mitchell K. Disney
Marvin P. Morton, Jr.
John F. Droz
Samuel R. Clarke
James A. Brough
Carlton F. Alm
Charles B. Kelly
William G. Neese
Richard C. Hunt
John D. Moroney
Daniel D. McLeod
Jerry R. Siefert
Charles Timblin
Hilbert S. Cofield
Walter J. Murphy
Max D. Wiviott
Charles A. Gearhart
Ira F. Reese
John C. Keatts, Jr.
Charles E. Rice, Jr.
Thomas E. Blade
George L. Gullette
David Bolton
Harold W. McKinney
Paul W. McEntire
Andrew M. Egeland
John C. Roberts, Jr.
Norris L. McComb
Benjamin H. Berry
Morris M. Seydel
James W. Grant
Donald L. Garver
John A. Montgomery, Jr.
William T. Roddy
Murl A. Larkin
Benjamin P. Jacobs
Malcolm J. Bradbury
Robert H. Rathbun
John P. Gleeson
William E. Neely
Paul F. Borden
Edward V. P. Horne
Charles A. Blocher, Jr.
Wilson J. Sweeney
Carl E. Lundin, Jr.
Saul Katz
John VanOhlen
Enser W. Cole, Jr.
John P. Gibbons
Earl C. Collins
Richard Bacharach
Emmet M. Ferguson
Forrest M. Divine
Ralph A. Groom
Roger L. Burum
Gale E. Krouse
John T. Davies
James T. Warns
Eugene N. Curtis
Daniel Flynn
Edwin D. Ferretti
Joseph A. Eddins
Richard J. Selman
Fred Y. Boyer
Harry J. Conway
Howard A. Patrick
Donald D. Chapman
Francis L. Forshee
Robert F. Nuttman
Thomas B. Root
Robert E. Lee, Jr.
Robert F. Milota
George P. Kurtz
Raymond A. Mazalewski
Jack L. Kenner
Warren C. Kiracofe
William H. Thornton, Jr.
George J. Leger
Kenneth S. Nelms
Joseph B. McDevitt
Frederic H. Kaul
Howard N. Moore
John E. Whyte
James P. Kenny
Fred H. Frey
George S. H. Sharratt
Ashton C. Miller, Jr.
Ralph K. Brandt
Thomas P. Smith, Jr.
Richard A. Markham
Fred J. Madrigan
Francis X. Markey
Earle Bennett
Harold Hutchinson
Arnold W. Eggen
Geoffrey E. Carlisle
Wyman N. Jackson
Dana P. French
Fordyce R. Downs, Jr.
James E. Keys
James L. Hughes, Jr.
Maurice J. Underwood
David E. Glassman

LIEUTENANT

Louis L. Milano
George T. Boland
Willard D. Hoot
James N. Martin

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., the Chaplain, offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, grant that this moment of prayer may be one of insight and of inspiration.

We pray that we may incarnate the spirit of our blessed Lord and bear testimony to the splendor of His ideals and principles as we strive to build a nobler civilization.

We humbly confess that in this high adventure we so frequently put our confidence solely in human wisdom and human ingenuity and fail to lay hold of those spiritual resources which Thou hast placed at our disposal.

May it be the passionate longing of our hearts to lead groping and struggling humanity out of darkness and confusion into the glorious light and liberty of the children of God.

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 322. An act to transfer funds to the town of Craig, Alaska;

H. R. 746. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of August Michela, a minor;

H. R. 2585. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for exemption from duty of certain metallic impurities in tin ores and concentrates when such impurities are not recovered;

H. R. 4387. An act to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Treasury Department; and

H. R. 6212. An act to amend section 5 of the Federal Firearms Act.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 587. An act for the relief of the estate of Dick Walook, Alfred L. Woods, and Edward Kimoktoak;

H. R. 3946. An act to promote the national defense and to contribute to more effective aeronautical research by authorizing professional personnel of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to attend accredited graduate schools for research and study; and

H. R. 4106. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 947. An act for the relief of the Baggett Transportation Co., Inc.;

S. 1059. An act for the relief of John W. Wagner;

S. 1146. An act for the relief of Francis W. Dodge;

S. 1423. An act for the relief of Alex Morningstar;

S. 1769. An act to reimburse the Stebbins Construction Co.;

S. 1863. An act for the relief of Fremont Rider;

S. 1933. An act for the relief of C. L. Leffingwell and others;

S. 2070. An act for the relief of the Clark Funeral Home;

S. 2314. An act to provide for holding a term of the United States District Court for the District of Oregon at Eugene;

S. 2339. An act for the relief of the Davis Grocery Co., of Oneida, Tenn.;

S. 2385. An act for the relief of Edward C. Ritche;

S. 2507. An act to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to grant to the East Bay municipal utility district, an agency of the State of California, an easement for the construction and operation of an interceptor sewer pipe line in and under certain Government-owned lands comprising a part of the Maritime Alameda Shipyard, Alameda, Calif.;

S. 2520. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted devised land on the Winnebago Reservation, Nebr.; and

S. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. REGAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICHARDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include an address delivered by Hon. Emmet O'Neal and a newspaper article.

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials appearing in the Louisville Courier-Journal.

Mr. HELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and to include extraneous matter in three.

Mrs. KELLY of New York asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, nearly one-half million of our fellow men in this Nation go down to the collieries to work. For the first 11 months of 1949 the friends of the Taft-Hartley law have upon their heads the blood of 534 of these our fellow men who went down to the collieries, never to return alive. In view of this, how Hitlerlike and macabre is the voice of the colossus from Winchester who calls on the President to invoke that infamous law against these fellow men and to "handle arrogant labor leaders like Governor Tuck did here in Virginia."

Verily, Mr. Speaker, the hand that handled the labor leaders in Virginia was (sic) indeed the hand of Tuck, but the voice that commanded the hand of Tuck was truly the voice of the colossus—Hitlerlike and macabre. It is the prototype of this colossus that is undermining democratic government by refusing to yield obedience to the limitations on States' rights contained in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution of this democratic Government. Men of honest minds rejoice in the sane decision of the President not to use the infamous Taft-Hartley law.

HOOVER COMMISSION

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently advocated the adoption of most of the Hoover proposals and shall continue to support the adoption of the remaining ones, which, in my opinion, will effect real economies and eliminate overlapping and provide for efficient consolidation. However, I wish strongly to protest the recommendations of the Hoover Commission relative to the proposals that would divide the functions of the Veterans' Administration. I have served overseas in combat in both world wars. As an ex-serviceman, I am familiar with the problems that the veterans are faced with in attempting to secure those benefits that the Congress has made available to them. After the First World War, I had the honor to represent my district in Congress. During those early postwar years, 80 percent of my correspondence consisted of requests from ex-servicemen enlisting my aid in securing proper adjudication of their claims. It was not an easy matter then, as all the records were centralized and the servicemen had not been adequately instructed on how to proceed. Under the present Veterans' Administration, aid to the servicemen is made more readily available through regional offices throughout the Nation. A complete file is kept on each veteran in a regional office near to his home. This procedure has resulted in more efficient service to the veteran—a great contrast in comparison with conditions after the First World War. The Hoover proposals would transfer the loan-guaranty activities of the VA to the Housing and Home Finance Agency. They would create a veterans' insurance corporation and would consolidate all veteran medical programs with those of other Government agencies into one united medical administration. This, in my opinion, would cause veterans' cases to lose their identities as such, in that a veteran's claim would not necessarily get the preference that it would be entitled to, and thus the intent of Congress in enacting specific veterans' legislation for the welfare of those who carried the brunt of the battles would be thwarted. Servicemen's welfare was sadly neglected in a matter of only a few years after the end of World War I. It would be a great catastrophe to allow these same conditions to prevail under the guise of economy. I firmly believe in real economy measures within the administration of

veterans' affairs that would not deny the veterans those benefits that Congress intended for them to have. By continuing to have a separate and complete Veterans' Administration, the people of the Nation can have a definite agency to turn to in order to find out how adequately the veterans are being taken care of. This separate organization would be fixed in the public mind as the agency charged with the responsibility of administering veterans' affairs. Should the various functions of the Veterans' Administration be dispersed amongst other governmental and primarily nonveteran agencies, there would exist not one agency that could be held responsible for, and held accountable to the American people for, the administration of veterans' affairs. I think that the Hoover proposals in this matter should not be adopted for the reasons given, but, instead, this same Commission should investigate the possibilities of reorganizing the various departments of the Veterans' Administration itself in relation to the entire administration of veterans' affairs in order to eliminate any overlapping or duplication of functions and the elimination of any waste. The intent of Congress should not be thwarted by any false economy moves when these economies can be made within the present set-up.

LINCOLN DAY BOX SUPPER

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand this morning a most peculiar and interesting newspaper clipping.

An advertisement in a Washington newspaper reads as follows:

Lincoln Day box supper, Uline Arena, Monday, February 6, 6:30 p. m. Everybody welcome.

Fred Waring and his Pennsylvanians, George Murphy and Robert Montgomery, joint masters of ceremonies.

Round and square dancing.

Admission tickets, $1 plus tax—complete chicken dinner box lunch, $1 additional.

Tickets available: 1115 National Press Building, 1604 Twentieth Street NW., Waters Travel Agency, 1603 K Street NW., telephones NA. 6280, CO. 8151.

What, oh, what, has become of the trumpeting elephant that was once the Republican Party? An ad for a Lincoln Day dinner without a mention of the Grand Old Party. I have not felt so old since Shirley Temple had a baby.

Could it be that Republicans have suddenly grown self-conscious of the deep rift between the philosophy of Lincoln and the moribund policies they pursue in narrowing circles? Could this be a new and modest humility? I doubt it.

It seems more likely that the motives here are of the pocketbook rather than the heart. It is just possible that the Republicans are interested in making money—that they are at last aware of the jeopardy in which the GOP places anything with which its name is associated.

One of the Nation's finest orchestras will be present. Two noted masters of ceremonies will keep things moving swiftly and smoothly. There will be round and square dancing for all—topped off by a dollar chicken dinner.

Why spoil it all with Republicans?

Blazon everybody welcome in your ads and hope that entertainment will do what Republican policies have not been able to do—win a large and appreciative audience.

And have people buy their tickets from travel agencies instead of party headquarters. I suggest a ticket agency in a moving firm's office might also be convenient to a large number of Republicans.

While I applaud the wisdom of this ad and the growing timidity of the minority party, I shed a single tear of farewell.

Gone is my youth when a wild elephant trumpeted through these halls to rescue Pauline from the perils of welfare legislation. In his place sits a titmouse.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Is the gentleman from Wisconsin to speak again?

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a bill he introduced.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include editorials.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the fishery activities under the Fish and Wildlife Service, notwithstanding the fact that it is estimated by the Public Printer to exceed two pages of the RECORD and cost $184.50.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Speaker, no nation is so great it can afford to forget solemn promises. Twice during the past 50 years American men and women have been called upon to crush the threat of aggressors.

We can never repay our debt to those who died and sacrificed that we might have freedom. We must not forget this obligation when all of us are searching for ways to reduce our Federal budget.

Thus far, I have voted for every reorganization bill based upon the Hoover Commission report. But the proposal to scatter the powers and functions of the Veterans' Administration lacks perception, is unjust to the veteran, and will not achieve economy.

We have promised the veteran adequate medical aid. Under this new proposal, he will not get it. We have promised the veteran specialized study and care in many of his problems. Under this new proposal, he will not get it.

I have confidence our President will spot this particular proposal as a backward move. It will not achieve economy—and more important, it will not be for the welfare of the veteran. As great as we are, we still must keep our pledges.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SUTTON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. YOUNG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short newspaper article.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. YOUNG asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Monday next after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

LINCOLN DAY DINNER

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, something has been said here this morning about the Republican box social which

is to be held next Monday night here in Washington, to the effect that it was a money-making affair. I can assure the people of the United States that when you charge $1 for admission and $1.20 for a chicken dinner in Washington, it is not the money-making affair that it is when they charge $100 a plate for a Jefferson day dinner. As far as the Republican Party is concerned, we have not forgotten the philosophy of Abraham Lincoln half as much as that part of the Democratic Party which has gone left wing and literally and completely forgotten and abandoned the philosophy and tradition of Thomas Jefferson, a man whom we all admire.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include some excerpts.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very interesting letter from one of my constituents to the Cleveland Press in the matter of paying his taxes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

THE COAL SITUATION

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, letters are pouring into my office from people of the Twenty-second District of Ohio urging that something be done about the coal situation. These letters tell many shocking stories, and reveal that the country is, indeed, facing an emergency as our coal piles grow smaller and smaller.

Most serious of all is the threat to the health of our people resulting from insufficient heat in homes and offices, and hot water to meet daily needs.

Not alone are many people without coal for their furnaces, but industries today are faced with having to curtail operations to meet the dwindling coal supplies. When power companies are without coal, power is cut off and all enterprise depending upon electricity is helpless. When industry is without coal, it must eventually shut down, throwing thousands of people out of work. Such things must not come to pass.

I am not assessing the reasons for the long inaction, I am merely citing the facts which grow increasingly serious. Action of some kind must come, and soon. The law is there, the power for the President to act is there. Unquestionably there must be reasons on both sides for the disastrous stalemate. It is difficult to understand that men will die on the field of battle but will not yield their prejudices, even though suffering be the result.

In the hope that some solution will be found immediately, I am adding my voice to those already raised in protest against this intolerable situation.

REPEAL OF WARTIME EXCISE TAXES

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, if Congress fails to proceed immediately to repeal wartime excise taxes, losses to business enterprises affected by these taxes will be enormous.

The wide publicity given to the subject has practically resulted in a buyers' strike. Many firms are operating at a loss; some have been compelled to go out of business, resulting in unemployment as well as great financial loss. I am reliably informed that the jewelry business in my district is down approximately 30 to 40 percent from 1946 and 1947. Other industries have suffered in varying proportions.

The losses to which I refer have by no means been confined to the so-called luxury items. Dealers in the more essential products are also concerned over these unfair and discriminatory taxes. As a particular indication of unfairness, it should be remembered that taxes on transportation and communications were not levied in the first instance to produce revenue. They were assessed solely to discourage wartime travel and to make all systems of communications more readily available for war purposes. Yet we are told by the President that before even these taxes can be repealed provision must be made for other taxes to take their place.

I challenge the right of President Truman to tell Congress he will veto any legislation repealing wartime excise taxes unless legislation to replace them is simultaneously enacted as a substitute. I quite agree that loopholes in our present tax structure should be thoroughly explored. However, this will take time if an effective job is to be done. The repeal of wartime excise taxes can be quickly accomplished. There is no reason whatever for joining both proposals in a single tax-relief bill. There is no valid excuse for further delay.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include three articles which I handed in yesterday.

Also, to extend my remarks and include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Samuel Pettingill. Sam Pettingill was one of the finest Members of Congress that I ever associated with, a Democrat from Indiana who believed in the teachings of Jefferson and carries them out to the best of his ability.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and to include excerpts.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include resolutions of the Farm Bureau from his home county.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HOOVER COMMISSION WITH REFERENCE TO VETERANS

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the various veterans' organizations in the country are objecting to one of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. They assert that this recommendation if carried into effect will work a severe hardship on disabled veterans and those needing hospitalization.

I want to commend the leaders of these organizations for the thorough study they have given to the subject before they announced their opposition to this one section of the Hoover report. I have read the statements made by the American Legion and other veterans' organizations on this subject and I feel they made a good case. It shall be my purpose to assist them in their efforts.

The people are strong for the recommendations made by the Hoover Commission and, likewise, they want to do justice to the veterans, especially those who are disabled and those who are in need of medical care and hospitalization.

I think Congress can work out a plan that will meet the wishes of the veterans and not seriously disturb the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

PENNSYLVANIA GROUND HOGS

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, this is ground-hog day. This is the day when the great marmot will be consulted by savants, far and wide, even as the ancients consulted their oracles, in order to receive his prognostications on what we may expect of the weather for the next 6 weeks. Should this eminent authority on atmospheric change see his shadow, he will return to his subterranean abode and 6 weeks more of winter weather can confidently be expected.

One of the outstanding institutions in my congressional district is that great public-spirited body known as the Slumbering Ground-Hog Lodge of Quarryville, which has its locale in the nationally known agricultural area of Lancaster County, Pa. This year the lodge is promoting the Ground-Hog Bowl—a national project—as preeminent among its many concerns for American development. It has also taken note that John

L. Lewis has raided ground-hog legend and now has his miners "hibernate" all but 3 days of each week. Incidentally, the lodge last year adopted Me and My Shadow as the musical score best expressing its aims and ideals.

Knowing as I do the traditions surrounding the Slumbering Ground-Hog Lodge and the unfailing accuracy of its prognosticator, I would be remiss in proper civic pride and my unquestioned congressional duty were I to fail to spike the canard being circulated by my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman LEON H. GAVIN, of our Nineteenth Pennsylvania District, who has attempted to assign to that puny and pusillanimous pig of Punxsutawney, which he has the effrontery to call a ground hog, qualities superior to those of the prognosticating patriarch of my district. The simple fact of the matter is that the Punxsutawney animal has become infused with rabbit blood and has become a very timid creature, indeed. It is actually so scary that when startled it plunges headlong into its burrow, with the result that it has to back out, thus considerably delaying its observation of the sun. On the other hand, the Quarryville ground hog — known among the Pennsylvania Dutch brethren as "der grosser grundsow"—is a fearless animal and constantly stands defiantly just inside the entrance to his cave so that he is immediately ready to observe the solar orb as it rises above the horizon and at once gives his prediction. In fact, his promptness and accuracy are so noted that the Weather Bureau maintains a direct wire to his station, whereas the Punxsutawney punk will have to wait until rural telephones are extended to his area under REA, which will probably be in about 50 years.

To conclude, may I confidently suggest that for accurate weather forecasts consult the Quarryville ground hog, and for a practical demonstration of the American way of life stop over for a look around Pennsylvania's Ninth District.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a great respect and high admiration for my very able and good friend and colleague, PAUL DAGUE, of the Pennsylvania delegation, and I might say that ordinarily it would be beneath my dignity to reply to the scurrilous attack that has been made on the one and only ground hog—the Punxsutawney ground hog who has been making unquestioned weather predictions for the past 100 years.

I resent the attitude taken by my very good friends CLARENCE BROWN and TOM JENKINS, of Ohio, on the Greenville, Ohio, ground hog. And my good friend, PAT SUTTON, of Tennessee, even had the audacity to discuss with me a Tennessee ground hog. Also my good friends, BROOKS HAYS and OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, tried to cut in for some publicity on their chuckship with the Arkansas hound dog.

To reply, I can best do so to these vociferous attacks on the Punxsutawney ground hog by bringing to the attention of the Members a wire I received from a very honorable citizen and distinguished doctor of great renown, Dr. F. A. Lorenzo, president of the Punxsutawney Ground Hog Club. Here is his wire:

> Since the Punxsutawney ground hog ascended the weather throne at Gobblers Knob nearly a century ago, petty, prevaricating pretenders with pediculosis have pecked peevishly at this position as premier prognosticator. Pay no never mind to the petulant pretentions of pestiferous, piebald pilgrims for piggeries parading as progeny of Punxsutawney's peerless prophet. Phooey on the philandering, puling peccaries. Also puf, phew, and pooh-pooh to the perfidious plagiarists.

OUR NATIONAL DEFENSES

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, who are we to trust for accurate information as to the state of our national security? When is the administration going to give us a true appraisal of our defenses?

The Secretary of Defense, in his annual report to the President and the Congress, issued just the other day, said:

> I am pleased to report to the President, to the Congress, and to the American people, that their defenses have never been in a more favorable condition in time of peace. The state of readiness of our armed forces and the military potential of our country are greater today than in any previous peacetime period in our Nation's history.

The Secretary of the Air Force yesterday declared, in effect, that we are at the mercy of the Communist military might. He declared that behind the iron curtain there is the ability to launch an atomic attack against any part of the United States, and that we have no sure defense against such an attack.

I am not in a position to question the accuracy of the statements of either of these men.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is: What is the state of our defenses?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MCGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an illustration of the effect of hidden taxes on the price the consumer pays for gas and electric ranges.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two editorials.

DEAN ACHESON

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, before Dean Acheson assumed the office of Secretary of State he took the following solemn oath of office:

> I do solemnly swear, I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter, so help me God.

Mr. Speaker, when some few days ago Secretary of State Acheson expressed his confidence in Alger Hiss despite the latter's conviction in a New York Federal court for perjury in denying he had given American secrets to Russian spies, he was not speaking for himself, but as Secretary of State of the Government of the United States. This reprehensible action on the part of Dean Acheson is definitely a violation of his oath of office and especially that part of the oath where he swore to defend the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic.

We all know that the members of our armed forces from the birth of this Nation, have taken the same oath that Dean Acheson took when he was entrusted with the affairs of the Department of State.

We recall the fate of Benedict Arnold when in the uniform of his country he sought to betray it to our enemy. Have you any difficulty in imagining the fate that would have befallen a comrade of Benedict Arnold who would seek to whitewash him after he was convicted of treason?

In my opinion, Alger Hiss is a twentieth century Benedict Arnold, and Dean Acheson in taking him to his bosom, reveals that he approves Hiss' disregard of the responsibilities and obligations of American citizenship.

If Dean Acheson lacks the decency to resign, and President Truman refuses to request his resignation, then it behooves Congress to impeach him. Too long has the cloak of suspicion shrouded the State Department and it is time that the American people assert themselves before it is too late.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LOVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LICHTENWALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by a former Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Our Fiscal Crisis—What Can We Do With It?" notwithstanding that it exceeded two pages of the RECORD and, according to the Public Printer, costs $205 to print.

THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, as every Member of this House well knows, the Marshall plan was sold to the public on the theory that it would promote economic cooperation between the western European nations; first, by giving immediate relief from the war destruction; and secondly, to place the countries involved in a position to reestablish themselves economically.

Of course, real economic progress in that particular area will never be accomplished until there is stability of currency as between the individual western European nations.

Some of these countries have earnestly sought to bring about a local currency union, thus making unnecessary bilateral agreements.

Now England comes along, although we have poured billions into that little country, and kicks over the traces and refuses to go along with the union on the grounds that she cannot take such a step until after the British general election.

The American taxpayer and other countries of western Europe are in no position to continually carry these loads and to throw additional billions of dollars into the effort while waiting for England to get her house in order. The western European countries should go along with the perfection of the local currency union and thus consolidate their economic effort and get on their way toward some stability. Even the old enemies—France and Germany—are going along and the union is to include the Benelux countries.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. FORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ANTIDISCRIMINATION LAWS

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER] called attention to the fact that there are 10 States in which so-called antidiscrimination laws are on the statute books. This indicates that we have a considerable experience which we can draw upon in terms of writing such a Federal law.

In that connection I recently asked the Legislative Reference Service to provide an analysis and a comparison of the committee bill H. R. 4453, of H. R. 6841, and of the Massachusetts law of 1946. I intend to include that in an extension in the Appendix so that those who are interested may examine it. I expect also to have the three annual reports of the Massachusetts Commission since its creation, and to include them in the Appendix so that we can see what is being done in one of our States in this field. I hope this material will be helpful to all of my colleagues who are interested in providing the best possible legislation in this connection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a joint resolution she is introducing today commemorating the one hundred seventy-fifth anniversary of Patriots Day in Massachusetts.

Mr. CHURCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include an address by Dean McBurney, and in the other a letter from a constituent.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials appearing in the Arkansas Gazette.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he delivered in Fredericksburg, Va.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ROONEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THE ARKANSAS DOG

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I am quite willing for my two friends, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN], to exhaust themselves in a verbal exchange over the relative merits of the groundhogs of Quarryville and Punxsutawney. But when the gentleman from Pennsylvania mentions the Arkansas hound dog, my hackles are up. It looks like the pursuit of the malevolent attack that was made more than a year ago by one of the gentlemen from Pennsylvania upon the Arkansas hound dog. Of course, the Arkansas hound dog is superior to this timid and capricious quadruped from Quarryville. The Arkansas farmer can always tell in the morning by the angle of the tail, by the tilt of the head, and by the way the hound dog sniffs the fragrant air in the piney woods what the weather will be. I would like to remind him that if all the hound dogs of Arkansas were one dog, he could stand on the highest peak of the Alleghenies and raise a howl that would blow the rings off the planet Saturn, and all the ground hogs of Quarryville and Punxsutawney could not cast a shadow across that hound dog's left hind leg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a table with reference to enemy property, notwithstanding the fact that it is estimated by the Government Printer to exceed 2 pages of the RECORD at a cost of $348.50.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

AID FOR NEEDY STUDENTS

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD..

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to bring to the attention of the House H. R. 5852, introduced last August by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO], which calls for extending loans to enable needy and scholastically qualified students to continue their education. This bill seeks to establish a Federal scholarship fund, which is to be used as a revolving fund for the purpose of extending loans to needy students. Such loans shall not exceed $1,000 per year for the first 4 years of study in an educational institution on the college level, and no more than $1,500 per year in a postgraduate institution. The loans are to be repaid in regular periodic payments over a 10-year term.

The Commissioner of Education will be required to make annual reports to Congress as to the administration of this act, when and if it becomes effective, and will be required to submit detailed information concerning the status of

this student fund. Incidentally, I am pleased to note that the bill contains a section which provides that there is to be no discrimination against applicants on racial or religious grounds.

I think the members of this House will be interested in the following information, submitted to me by Commissioner of Education Earl J. McGrath, on money loaned to students under Public Law 647, enacted by the Seventy-seventh Congress. Here are the Commissioner's figures:

Total amount of loans granted	$3,335,521.14
Total collections (principal)	$1,885,739.52
Total cancellations	$120,971.80
Balance due	$1,328,809.82
Interest received to date	$207,439.19
Number of students granted loans	11,044

He also informs me that, on the basis of past experience, the possibility for collecting the outstanding balance is very favorable. Many of the loans were deferred for several years on two grounds: First, during the period of military service of the borrower; and second, the establishment of the Veterans Administration's program of education. Final payments in many instances are due in 1952, but on some loans final payment many not come until some time later.

Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent record. Analysis of the figures discloses that almost 57 percent of the principal has been repaid, and if you add to that the interest received it comes to almost two-thirds of the original loans granted. This speaks very favorably for continuation of such loans on a wide basis as suggested in H. R. 5852. This is the kind of investment which will not only pay for itself in the long run, but from which this country will derive untold benefits and our youth will receive all possible aid and opportunities afforded by no other nation in the world.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, prompted by the remarks made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], I want to say that I despise the man that would betray his country. To defend Alger Hiss is to invite suspicion. The statement made by the Secretary of State to which reference has been made was an insult to the Nation, and made of him a legitimate target for the wrath and scorn of the patriot. Mr. Speaker, the State Department is now and for a long time has been suspect.

PROPOSAL TO ABOLISH THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, instead of going off at a tangent and attempting to amend the Constitution of the United States to abolish the electoral college, we had better get back to the Constitution and get this Government and every official of this Government back to the Constitution.

No wiser group of men ever gathered than that great body presided over by George Washington at Philadelphia that wrote the Constitution of the United States.

When you attempt to abolish the electoral college you are not going to improve anything, you are going to promote chaos and confusion in the various States.

There has never been a President elected, at least in the last 75 years, that there was not a Congress of his own party elected at the same time.

We have amended the Constitution too much now. We had better get back to those great fundamental principles advocated by George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, and the other great leaders of the past, quit trying to amend the Constitution, and put a stop to the Supreme Court's setting it aside.

While this amendment is ostensibly directed at the large States of the North, it would more than likely bring back the chaos and confusion of the reconstruction era to the Southern States—if not to all the smaller States in the North and West.

This proposal should be buried so deep that it will never be heard of again—at least, during this generation. The country is not suffering as a result of the electoral college. But it can suffer a great deal as a result of an unwise change.

From that standpoint, as Shakespeare says, we had better—

> Bear those ills we have
> Than fly to others that we know not of.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 457 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto be, and the same is hereby, taken from the Speaker's table to the end that the Senate amendments be, and they are hereby, disagreed to and that the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses be, and the same is hereby, agreed to.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 32]

Andrews	Jackson, Calif.	Potter
Bland	Kee	Redden
Bonner	Kelley, Pa.	Sabath
Bosone	Kennedy	Sadowski
Brown, Ga.	Kirwan	Scott, Hardie
Bulwinkle	Kunkel	Sikes
Byrne N. Y.	McDonough	Smathers
Celler	Mack, Wash.	Smith, Ohio
Chatham	Macy	Stigler
Chesney	Martin, Mass.	Vorys
Curtis	Meyer	Wadsworth
Gilmer	Monroney	Walsh
Gore	Morrison	White, Idaho
Granger	Murphy	Withrow
Hobbs	Patman	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 387 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was rejected.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 457, if adopted, will send the oleomargarine bill to conference. The bill passed the House of Representatives and subsequently passed the Senate with amendments. It is now on the Speaker's table. When an effort was made to take it from the Speaker's table and send it to conference, objection was heard.

Consequently, this uncommon procedure is necessary, that is, a resolution from the Rules Committee which, if adopted, will send the bill to conference.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Is the resolution passed by the Rules Committee?

Mr. LYLE. Yes. It originated in the Rules Committee and passed it.

The merits of this bill are not at issue at this time. It is a simple question of whether or not the House will move to take the bill from the Speaker's table and send it to conference.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] has explained the true situation that now confronts us.

There is no need of me speaking at length. I shall be brief. As far as I am able to learn there is little opposition to the resolution. We have had the subject of oleomargarine before us for a long time. Many speeches have been given for and against the provisions contained

in H. R. 2023. I see no reason for another lengthy discussion today. Let us send it to conference.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I recognize that this bill will be sent to conference. I felt that we should have a little time in the House to discuss the merits of the legislation before this liquidation of our great dairy industry in the United States begins. Therefore, yesterday I objected to sending the bill to conference by unanimous consent, in order to have time under the rule to discuss the legislation.

The Committee on Agriculture reported out a bill last year in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress which removed the tax from oleomargarine, but it prohibited the shipment of yellow-colored oleomargarine in interstate commerce. When the bill got to the floor it was amended, so that the legislation as it now stands and as it passed the House and Senate provides that oleomargarine can be colored yellow in imitation of butter, but the Senate put certain restrictions in the bill.

I am not only opposed to the rule, but I am opposed to the bill. If I had my way, and we had the votes to do so, the bill would be dead from here on.

It is possible that a good many Members of the House do not appreciate the significance of the legislation proposed by the oleomargarine industry. The fight is over the color yellow. The oleomargarine industry has been permitted to perfect a synthetic product which they claim is as good as butter. By regulation of Paul V. McNutt when he was Security Administrator, the industry was permitted to churn the vegetable oil in milk, to add butter flavor, and to put vitamins in it, so that they claim it has the same vitamin content as butter. Now they want to color it yellow to make oleo look like butter, and thereby perpetrate a fraud on the American people.

There are 28 oleomargarine manufacturers in the country. They are large manufacturers, which also manufacture soap, varnish and paint, because the cottonseed oil that goes into oleomargarine can be used for either purpose. As a matter of fact, oleo can be made, I think, out of fuel oil if they run it through the proper scientific process and it can also be made out of coconut oil.

Those of us who come from the Middle West, where we are engaged in producing large quantities of milk which cannot be sold as fluid milk, must of necessity put between 60 percent to 80 percent of our milk into manufactured products. We have been shut out of the large consuming markets of the country for our milk and cream. Therefore we must take our milk, if we are to continue to produce, and put it into butter and cheese and other dairy products. Our market is being restricted for the sale of these manufactured products and dairy farmers are finding it very, very difficult to continue in dairy farming. The bottom has dropped out in dairy farming.

The milk marketing agreements which were enacted here about 10 years ago have shut us out of these large consuming areas where we could furnish them with cheaper milk if we were permitted to ship our milk and cream into those areas. Under the reciprocal trade law, the President reduced the duty on butter from 14 cents to 7 cents a pound and put a quota of 60,000,000 pounds a year which can be shipped into this country from foreign countries. That lets more cheaply produced foreign butter come into our country at a time when our Government is supporting the price of butter. It is about comparable with the potato situation. The Government is supporting the price of potatoes and during the time that we are supporting the price of potatoes we are also supporting the price for the entire Western Hemisphere and potatoes are coming into this country to the tune of over 5,000,000 bushels in the last few months from Canada. They come here and sell their potatoes a little under the support price and our Government then goes out and buys more potatoes from Maine and other States. That is what we find has developed in the butter situation. The Government now owns over 100,000,000 pounds of butter. On top of that we are restricted out in our section by Government controls in our acreage on wheat and corn.

Most of our farmers, the dairy farmers of the country, are small farmers, operating family-size farms. They are restricted in their acreage and when they cannot go into the production of corn and wheat, of course, they cannot produce cotton and tobacco, why, they are just turned loose without any place to go. We are being liquidated out of the dairy business.

Some say this oleomargarine legislation will not hurt you. Just let me point out to you what it has already done. The per capita consumption of butter 10 years ago was 17 pounds in this country. It has now gone down to around 10 pounds per capita. Oleomargarine consumption has gone from about 2 pounds per capita up to approximately 6 pounds per capita. Oleomargarine has come in and taken the place of butter, a synthetic product, if you please, which is produced by 28 large manufacturers in the United States to the detriment of over 3,000,000 dairy farmers who are producing fluid milk for manufactured products and butter and cheese. Dairy farmers are gradually being liquidated. We have already lost over 3,000,000 dairy cows in this country because of this encroachment upon the spread market in the United States.

The only thing left for the oleo industry is the color yellow. That is what they are fighting to get here. We said that they could take any other color of the spectrum, but they say no, they want yellow to make their synthetic product look like butter. They expect, of course, to capture the market spread in the United States.

If you go up the street here right near the old House Office Building and visit the restaurants there you will find that three-fourths of those restaurants are serving yellow-colored oleomargarine today instead of butter, without any notice at all to their patrons. The patrons pay for butter. One of the proprietors of a restaurant which was serving oleomargarine, when I asked him, said that three-fourths of the restaurants in Washington today are serving yellow-colored oleomargarine, without saying anything to the patrons. The patrons pay for butter.

There are 300,000 public eating houses in the United States. The members of the National Restaurant Association told us that if the unrestricted sale of yellow oleomargarine is permitted, most of those restaurants, or at least three-quarters of them, will serve yellow-colored oleomargarine in place of butter. That further liquidates the dairy industry in the United States, because two-thirds of the milk that leaves the farms must go into butter, cheese, and other products.

I recognize it is futile for me to talk about the practical situation and how it affects so many farmers, because the Democratic Party has made this oleo legislation its No. 1 proposal to put through the Congress. On April 1 of last year it was a fine April-fool present for the dairy farmers, the Democratic yellow oleo bill. I think if you will look up the record, you will find that the farmers of the Midwest were the ones who contributed more to the election of Harry Truman than any other group in this country. When this bill finally becomes law under the signature of President Truman, I suppose there will be great joy among the Democrats for what they have done to millions of dairy farmers. I can assure the Democratic leadership that millions of dairy farmers will not forget.

I would like to see this rule defeated in order to defeat the bill which will liquidate thousands of small dairy farmers and perpetrate a fraud upon American consumers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] has expired.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 33]

Andrews	Chatham	Jackson, Calif.
Bland	Chudoff	Johnson
Blatnik	Curtis	Kelley, Pa.
Bonner	Dingell	Keogh
Bosone	Engle, Calif	Kirwan
Brown, Ga.	Gilmer	Kunkel
Bulwinkle	Gore	Lesinski
Burdick	Hart	McDonough
Byrne, N. Y.	Hébert	Mack, Wash.
Celler	Hobbs	Macy

Martin, Mass.	Redden	Van Zandt
Meyer	Reed, N. Y.	Vorys
Monroney	Ribicoff	Wadsworth
Morrison	Sabath	Walsh
Murphy	Sadowski	White, Calif.
O'Brien, Mich.	Scott, Hardie	White, Idaho
Patman	Sikes	Wilson, Ind.
Plumley	Simpson, Ill.	Withrow
Potter	Smathers	
Powell	Smith, Ohio	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 373 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER].

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, of course, like the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], I realize this bill will go to conference. I realize when I am whipped. There is nothing we can do about it now. However, I am sorry that it passed the House, I am sorry that it passed the Senate, and I am still opposed to it. If I knew of anything I could do to keep it from becoming a law I would certainly do it with the greatest of pleasure, but there is nothing we can do about it now that I can see, so I shall not try to argue against letting the bill go to conference. It would be futile.

As I said on the floor of this House before, oleomargarine is made from soil-depleting crops, and butter is made from soil-conserving crops. The need for soil conservation is a vital need in the country today. I do believe in soil conservation and not soil depletion. We hear a lot of talk everywhere about soil conservation. Folks are doing very little about it. Our soil experts in the United States and in our agricultural colleges and universities tell us it would take $1,500,000,000,000 per year to keep our soil from getting worse than it is, not to make it any better, but just to keep it as it is today.

We were generous here. Very generous. We appropriated $285,00,000 for soil conservation to do a $1,500,000,000 job. We are doing for soil conservation in 5 years what our soil experts say we should do every year. We are spreading lots of lime in the United States, but we would have to spread twice as much lime as we are spreading today in order to break even. It would take two tons of lime instead of one that we are spreading today to hold even the calcium content of our soil as good as it is. What I am trying to say is, we are removing by leeching, erosion, and crops every year twice as much lime as we are spreading. Thousands of acres of land in the United States are under the plow, which ought to be tied down by good grass sod, which is now so poor that it will have to be limed and fertilized and have a crop of sweet clover plowed down on it before it will even grow grass.

You know the oleomargarine industry is a great industry. I am not kicking about the boys from the South who want to see every use in the world made of their cottonseed oil and peanuts but they also should be concerned about their fast-vanishing soil. I want to call your attention to one thing. There is a great soap-manufacturing company in the city of New York, which is the greatest buyer in the United States of the fats and oils that come from the rendering plants where the carcasses that are picked up over the United States in every stage of decomposition are rendered. That soap company makes soap, and it also makes oleomargarine. I hope to God that they keep their troughs pointed in the right direction so some of that fat and oil which is rendered out of those half rotten carcasses does not get into the oleo. I am going to think of that every time I start to eat anything with oleo in it, wondering whether it is made of cottonseed oil and peanut oil or oil which is gotten out of these old rotten carcasses. I would like to know whether that is the case or not. I will keep thinking about it.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DAVIES of New York. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] A quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 34]

Andrews	Jackson, Calif.	Redden
Bailey	Jennings	Reed, N. Y.
Barden	Johnson	Ribicoff
Bland	Kelley, Pa.	Sabath
Bosone	Keogh	Sadowski
Brown, Ga.	Kirwan	Scott, Hardie
Bulwinkle	Kunkel	Smathers
Byrne, N. Y.	Lesinski	Smith, Ohio
Celler	Lichtenwalter	Smith, Va.
Chatham	McDonough	Thomas
Chudoff	McMillen, Ill.	Van Zandt
Curtis	Mack, Wash.	Vinson
Dawson	Macy	Vorys
Dingell	Martin, Mass.	Wadsworth
Gilmer	Meyer	Walsh
Gore	Monroney	White, Idaho
Hare	Morrison	Willis
Harris	Murdock	Wilson, Ind.
Hart	Murphy	Withrow
Hébert	Patman	
Hobbs	Potter	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 370 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, to start off with, I wish to assure my colleagues that I had nothing to do with this quorum call or any other quorum call this morning.

I have gone through all this battle in the last 2 or 3 years on this oleo bill. I have tried to stick to the facts. I have tried not to be personal with anyone. And, I am sure that, so far as I am concerned, I am just as good a friend of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] as the day the controversy started. This is not a personal matter, nor is this a sectional question. During all this time I have tried to approach the problem from, first, a scientific angle. I do not care who the man is in the Department of Agriculture or out. There is not a living soul that can say that through experiment it was ever proven that oleo is equal to butter. No one has ever tried to prove it except by using some phony experiment.

The second is from the nutritional angle. With all this new discovery in the last year or two that we have heard about, amino acids, that the doctors are talking to us about, I wonder how many people realize that these dairy products are one of the greatest sources of amino acids?

Then of course we have the economic question, that is always involved. Surely you can sell this oleo cheaper so long as we have a huge subsidy on vegetable oils. No one has disputed the fact that the oil ingredients of oleo have somewhere between 10 and 50 cents a pound subsidy. No one will dispute that. I cannot tell you exactly what it is, but there is no Member here or no one in the Department of Agriculture or no one in the United States who can say that these vegetable oils are not most heavily subsidized. This subsidy is from 10 to 50 cents a pound. Skim milk is provided the oleo manufacturer at less than one-half its relative value.

The newspapers that holler to high heaven about the subsidy programs and how much they cost are the same ones that have been supporting the production and use of this highly subsidized oleo. This applies even to as reliable a paper as the Christian Science Monitor. It is amusing to me to read some of the articles that have been in that great paper.

I do not want to say that we have an antilivestock position in our present Department of Agriculture. I would rather say it in a kinder way, that they have a pro-vegetable-oil complex. If the Agriculture Department had any great interest in the dairy industry, you would not have to have 60-cent butter and 12-cent dry skim milk, set up the way they have worked it out.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks here today to include a letter from the University of Illinois showing the relationship of the value of dry skim milk to butterfat.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION,
Urbana, Ill., October 24, 1949.

HON. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MURRAY: Dean Rusk has asked that I send you my views on the question raised in your letter of October 10.

Your stand on the relative value of milk fat and the nonfat solids in fluid milk has

considerable merit. Because of its superior flavor, greater ease of concentrating, and wider use, a higher market value has always existed on butterfat than upon the milk solids, not fat. Milk in early times was produced primarily for the cream that could be separated from it. The skim-milk portion was considered a byproduct and was often used for feeding livestock. In more recent times the existence of seasonal and sectional surpluses of milk has had a tendency to perpetuate this early conception of the relative value of the two classes of milk solids, fat and nonfat.

However, the results obtained by modern research workers, particularly those in the field of nutrition, have brought about a somewhat different conception of the relative value of milk fat and milk solids, not fat. Nutritionists now place much more emphasis upon the value of that portion of the milk that lies below the cream layer. The proteins of milk are of excellent biological value. The minerals needed for normal development of the body are more satisfactorily supplied by milk than by dietary calcium. Some of the more important vitamins of milk are water soluble and therefore are associated with the skim-milk portion.

The relative physiological fuel values of the fat and nonfat solids in milk can be calculated readily. For example, in 100 grams of 4-percent milk the fat present would supply 36 calories and the nonfat solids would supply about 33.5 calories. In other words, the fat and nonfat solids of average milk are approximately of equal value from a physiological fuel-value point of view.

A few years ago research workers at your own institution (University of Wisconsin) proposed a method for paying for milk which gave consideration to the percentage of nonfat solids present. One possible reason why such a proposal would not be widely accepted is the lack of a rapid, accurate method for measuring the nonfat solids present in milk.

The price-support plans of the Government were no doubt based upon the going price of butter and powder at the time they were put into effect. The price of these two products in turn is largely based upon the market's conception as to what the consumer will pay for them, coupled with the supply available. The supply of dried milk available depends in part upon how much surplus milk is being diverted into that channel. If the demand for milk for bottling, for ice cream, cheese, or evaporated falls off, more milk is separated for drying and more fat is available for churning. The market price of milk solids, not fat, whether these solids be in the form of sweetened condensed milk, concentrated skim milk, or dried milk, is set pretty largely by the extent to which the supply of these solids exceeds demand during the flush season. Buyers will lay in a supply at that time to take care of their needs for the period that lies ahead.

One important factor that tends to keep the price of milk solids, not fat, from coming closer to that of butter is the fact that they are competitive with other products as far as the food industry is concerned. In other words, the price must be kept low enough that dry milk can compete favorably with solids from vegetable sources.

Most food manufacturers who use dry-milk solids are operating on a rather narrow margin. If the price of dry milk were to be raised to a level nearer that of butter, many of these people would discontinue the use of dried milk. A considerable number of bakers, for example, use dry milk in their doughs. If the price of powder were to be raised to, we will say, 18 cents, many bakers would discontinue its use, even though the price of butter were dropped 5 cents, since bakers use very little butter in their products.

Therefore, it seems that, although the nutritionist can prove there should be less difference in the market price for the fat and nonfat solids contained in milk, the dictates of industry are otherwise. Unless the demand for milk solids, not fat, can be greatly increased over what it is today, the relative market prices of powder and butter will not likely change. If the price of powder is raised beyond what the industrial user thinks is a fair price, he will either discontinue its use or shift to cheaper competitive products.

Please advise if I can be of further service to you in this matter.

Yours very truly,

P. H. TRACY,
Professor, Dairy Technology.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The Agriculture Department provided 60 cents support on butter and 12 cents on dried skim milk. If you read this letter, and they are not my words, you will see that the relationship is wrong. There is no reason in the world why the people of this country should not be entitled to be provided on the basis of 50-cent butter if and when we had an administration that was not so provegetable oil. If the dried skim milk was supported at 20 cents per pound the butter could be supported at 44 cents per pound and still have the farmer receive the same price for his milk.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Has the gentleman ever heard the Secretary of Agriculture say anything in behalf of the farmers who produce milk for butter, in connection with this oleo legislation?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will say to my colleague from Minnesota, I do not want to——

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not a fact that he has not said a good word for it? Has he?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not want to get into that, but I will say I do not know how thoroughly he has ever studied the dairy industry, so I have always been kind of generous for that reason.

There is another angle in connection with this thing that has not been brought out at all. The other day here on the floor in considering the cotton bill there was something that happened. It happened in connection with two Representatives on this side of the aisle. One was the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the other was the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. They pointed out something in connection with that legislation that is involved in this legislation. It is the human angle that is involved. They indicated that we should think about people once in a while.

When this bill goes through, if we are not careful it will add 1,000,000 people to the unemployed of this country. Whether you like it or whether you do not, that is exactly what is going to happen. They cannot help it. At the present time 10 percent of the dairy industry has been destroyed by the vegetable-oil interests, and it will add another million people to the unemployment rolls of this Nation. Over 10,000,000 people are employed in the dairy industry.

I realize that the world changes, and I realize that in the old days the cartoons have shown the old Republican elephant sitting with the big fat cat sitting beside him. Now, in the last few years, that picture has changed. The poor old elephant has been shoved off his seat, and here we have the donkey sitting beside the fat cat now. Otherwise, no party will penalize the 2,500,000 American dairy farmers out. The biggest cartel, the biggest monopoly the world has ever known, the greatest and largest, and I might say the worst, fat cat in the history of the world would not be found sitting side by side with the Democrat donkey at this time.

We hear much about public health. While some are advocating a need for health legislation, others are out with hammers knocking millions of dairy cattle in the head and sending them to the slaughter pens. The dairy cow is the foster mother of the human race. Milk is the greatest single food known to man. The young, the middle-aged, and the aged should use more of milk and its products for the best health of our people. We should never forget that the dairy cow is the most efficient producer of protective food. She will, from a given amount of feed, produce twice as much human food as any other farm animal, and four times as much as some farm animals.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all in accord. We believe in the pure-food law. We do not believe in fraud. I am sure every Member of the House will agree with me that to permit the oleo people to color their product yellow is stealing a trade-mark. It is a fraud and a perpetration of a fraud upon the public. Who is interested in this fraud?

First there is the housewife. She is ashamed if she uses oleo to admit it to herself and she tries to deceive herself and her husband and her family and wants them to believe they are eating butter instead of oleo because they are ashamed to admit it is oleo. Just a case of self-deception. There must be something awfully rotten about oleo if you have to practice self-deception on yourself in order to satisfy your stomach and try to fool yourself. You should not try to do that. You should at least be fair and honest with yourself. No wonder that some husbands and children get indigestion because they fill their stomachs with fraud and deception. If you like oleo, you ought not to be ashamed of its color.

Next comes the housewife who wants to fool her guests. She wants her guests to think that she is giving them some butter when she is giving them oleo. I am sure you will agree with me that the average housewife should not practice fraud and deception upon her friends

and guests. It is wrong to do that. It is self-deception and it is deception upon your guests. If you want to use oleo, use it without deception. No one objects to that and your guests will think more of you in the end.

Then come the big boys who are going to make the millions and millions of dollars out of this fraud and deception by selling oleo to the public at the price of butter. I say to you I feel the Congress should not become a party to such a fraud. Let oleo stand on its own feet. We are in favor of all the taxes being taken off of oleo. We have no objection to that. But why should you take the trade-mark away from butter? It has always been known to have the natural color of yellow.

Some of you say occasionally it is made a little more yellow. Well, we have no objection if you make your oleo black or a little blacker. That would fit the situation because I understand Satan, the arch deceiver, has black garments. But you can dress it up in any way you wish as long as you do not practice deception and fraud. But please do not interfere with the butter's yellow trade-mark. It is wrong to take a trade-mark away from the people who have known it and used it for years and years and years.

If you do, in the long run you will hurt yourself. I do not believe the Congress should become a party and an accomplice before or after the fact of perpetrating a fraud for the benefit of a number of large corporations which have been taking the lead in this fight to grab the trade-mark of butter. I do not blame them if we are foolish enough to let them do that so that they can make their millions of profit.

Here are two letters. One from the Mandan Creamery & Produce Co. and the other from the Cudahy Packing Co. Study them carefully and you will see why this bill should never become a law.

MANDAN CREAMERY & PRODUCE CO.,
Mandan, N. Dak., January 8, 1949.

Hon. WILLIAM LEMKE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEMKE: I note, from the papers, that a new flood of bills have been introduced in Congress for the repeal of the oleo taxes and providing for the sale of colored oleomargarine. In the past 2 years there has been a great deal of ballyhoo, promoted by the cotton oil and cocoanut oil interests, which ballyhoo was picked up by a number of the Members of both Houses in Congress without much thought to the serious consequences resulting.

One little thing has been overlooked in all of the proceedings and in all of the news articles which I have seen, and that is the manner in which certain large interests are able to play both sides against the middle, placing the dairy farmer and the independent producer in a sad way when it comes to the support of dairying.

Did you know that the largest producers of oleomargarine in the country are also the largest producers of butter? National Dairy, through its Kraft affiliate; Swift & Co., Cudahy Packing Co., Wilson & Co., and many others, are active supporters of butter and dairy associations and, at the same time, are providing thousands and thousands of dollars for the promotion and sale of oleomargarine. These large members of the butter and dairy associations provide, through their contributions, a considerable control of the activities of those associations; they can, if they wish, prevent an amalgamation which will produce the most effective ammunition for the butter interests in a fight against repeal of oleo taxes.

The butter people have agreed to the repeal of oleo taxes, providing the Congress secures for butter its traditional markings and the use of the yellow color. Nine months of the year, here in North Dakota, butter contains natural carotin, which provides the yellow color. Three months of the year butter has lighter shades, sometimes being almost white. This is due to the fact that cattle are on dry feed, which produces little color. In other parts of the country—the South and the West particularly—where green feed is available the year 'round, butter has a year-round yellow color.

Why should oleo insist on adopting yellow as a color, except for the purpose of making it look like butter? The Pure Food and Drug Department allows them to add diacetyl and to churn oleo in skimmilk so that it may taste like butter, they allow them to add many units of vitamin A and D so it may have some of the vitamin properties of butter. If oleo is as good as butter and if the consuming public want oleo in preference to butter it can well stand upon its own merits and be sold as a white product; which it is after bleaching, or a dirty gray or tan, which it is before bleaching; instead of being marketed yellow so the public cannot tell it from butter.

It is time for the larger interests, who operate both as butter processors and oleo processors, to come in and tell the truth about millions of dollars they have spent to agitate, to the detriment of the dairy producer.

North Dakota dairy farmers have a big stake in this movement because North Dakota produces surplus milk, which must be made into butter if it is to be salable at all, and we must look to our Members in Congress to provide the people in the country with the truth if the dairyman is to be protected.

Yours very truly,
WALTON S. RUSSELL.

THE CUDAHY PACKING CO.,
Chicago, April 20, 1948.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Our company is engaged not only in the business of slaughtering, processing, and selling meat and meat products but also in the production and sale of butter and oleomargarine. We are, in fact, one of the largest manufacturers of margarine in the United States today. Our interest in the controversy over the present oleomargarine laws is therefore not one-sided. We stated in a communication to Congressman Anton J. Johnson, of Illinois, several weeks ago that we are not asking for repeal of any of the present laws relating to the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine. In our opinion, looking at the laws from the standpoint of the welfare of all segments of our economy, no change need be made. In order that you may know the reasons for our position we shall set them forth. They are as follows:

1. The present laws are not unfair or unjust.

(a) The dairy farmer is entitled to the protection of these laws. They protect his market for butterfat against unfair competition from an imitation product. Any businessman is entitled to protection against imitation of his manufactured merchandise.

(b) The consumer is not hurt by these laws.

The tax of one-fourth cent per pound on oleomargarine not colored yellow is small. The license fees which must be paid by the retailer, wholesaler, and the manufacturer are also small when passed on to the consumer, as they undoubtedly are. Applying the total of all these taxes to a family that consumes 3 pounds of oleomargarine per week, every week of the year (156 pounds per year), the total amount of taxes does not exceed 40 cents per year, less than 1 cent per week.

By comparison, the cost of adding vitamin A to oleomargarine is more than three times the amount of the tax, and the cost of advertising the leading brands of oleomargarine normally runs from four to seven times the amount of the tax.

There is no reason why oleomargarine cannot be served white, which is its natural manufactured color, but if the consumer desires to color it, modern packaging enables her to do so without waste of time or product.

Nor have the present laws had any detrimental effect on our national diet or nutrition. Our per capita consumption of fats has increased steadily during the past several decades, rising from 39 pounds in 1912 to 51 pounds in 1941. It declined slightly during the war, but since then has been rising again.

When all elements are carefully considered it can be stated with fairness that these margarine laws have helped the consumer rather than hurt him. Among other things, we can thank these laws for placing the oleomargarine industry on its "good behavior," and prompting it to use American produced oils and to improve its product to a point where it approximates the palatability and nutritional equivalency of butter.

(c) The oleomargarine industry has not been hurt by these laws. Over the past several decades sales have been on a gradually ascending curve. If any hurt has come to the oleomargarine industry it has been self-inflicted. During the past several decades the industry has encouraged rather than discouraged the consumer to take the time and trouble to color her oleomargarine yellow. All of the industry's advertisements have encouraged this practice. Had the industry, on the other hand, spent its millions of advertising dollars encouraging the consumer to serve oleomargarine white, she would probably have become accustomed to using it that way today.

Other industries in food, drugs, clothing, and shelter have gotten us to change our living habits without resorting to a complete imitation of competing articles and the oleomargarine industry could and should do the same without imitating the color of butter.

(d) Our general economy would be seriously affected by a change in these laws.

The uncertain benefits that might accrue to cotton and soybean farmers are so insignificant compared with the certain disastrous effects that would be produced for dairymen by reducing the tax on yellow oleomargarine that we should all pause and examine carefully the implications of these laws before tampering with them. In 1946 only two-tenths of 1 percent of farm income was attributable to oleomargarine. On the other hand, farm income from dairy products was over a hundred times farm income from items attributable to oleomargarine. Even if farm income attributable to oleomargarine were doubled or trebled it would be small, less than one percent. Even for farmers who raised only cotton, but 1.45 percent of their cash farm income in 1946 came from cottonseed oil used in oleomargarine. In the 10 leading cotton States income to farmers

from dairy products was 27 times as great as income from oleomargarine in the same year.

Farmers in certain States now raise soybeans. Taking this segment of the farming industry alone, but 5 percent of the income they enjoyed from soybeans came from oleomargarine in 1946.

To sum up, actually oleomargarine is not an important outlet for any farm product.

The following is an interesting extract from the booklet entitled "Oleomargarine and the Farmer" recently published by the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation:

"During 1946 American consumers spent over $2,000,000,000 for the primary edible fats—butter, lard, vegetable shortening, and oleomargarine. Out of this $2,000,000,000 of consumers' money the American farmer received over 60 percent or $1,231,747,000, which was divided as follows:

	Cash farm income in 1946
Butter	$638,011,000
Lard	429,647,000
Vegetable shortening	124,712,000
Oleomargarine	39,377,000
Total	1,231,747,000

"Historical facts prove beyond a doubt that the quantity or poundage of fats used by the average American consumer stays about the same from year to year. Fluctuation occurs in the per capita consumption of the individual fats but an increase in the consumption of one fat generally results in an offsetting decline in another."

Twenty-five percent of our dairy farmers depend largely upon the sale of cream for butter manufacture to maintain their dairy cows. If the oleomargarine laws were repealed over a million of this type of farmer would, in our opinion, be forced to sell most of his cows. The permanent reduction in this segment of our cattle population would affect not only our supply of milk and cream but also our supply of meat.

Inasmuch as butter traditionally has served as the outlet for all surplus supplies of milk after all other milk products (including bottled milk, ice cream, evaporated milk, dried milk, and cheese) have been supplied with their requirements, it is quite apparent that any action adversely affecting butter could create chaotic conditions in the supply and cost to the consumer of all other dairy products. It might well be that in the event that the price of butter were unduly depressed, bringing about substantially reduced production of milk in the over-all in this country, the price of bottled milk and all manufactured dairy products would at times be increased substantially to the consumer.

2. Butter alone is entitled to the yellow color because it alone is always naturally yellow—in varying shades thereof. It is morally entitled to make the claim: "Yellow is the 'trade mark' of butter." Oleomargarine, on the other hand, if processed from vegetable oils from American farms (as it is largely today) cannot be made a natural yellow. These oils are bleached, not because of the Federal laws, not because it is necessary to remove undesirable colors. There has been a great deal of misinformation and misleading propaganda put out on this subject and the record should be set straight.

3. The present 10-cent tax on the sale of yellow oleomargarine reduces the incentive for fraud and assists the Federal authorities in detecting the presence of any considerable quantities that might be palmed off as butter. The monetary incentive to sell yellow oleomargarine at the price of and in the guise of butter is unique in our economy. No other kind of product affords a parallel for comparison. With the quantities of butter sold being so huge and the price spread between butter and oleomargarine so wide, the incentive for fraud is unparalleled. Fraud would undoubtedly be practiced if the present laws were repealed. The frauds which existed when the sale of oleomargarine in this country was unregulated domonstrate this. Oleomargarine being more palatable and nutritious today, deception would be easier.

We should like to make clear at this point that in our opinion the regulatory tax on the retailer is scarcely necessary to effect proper regulation. It could well be removed.

4. Wherever large and healthy farm economies are in existence throughout the world, oleomargarine is under some form of government restriction and regulation. This is true of practically all of the countries of western Europe. In Canada its threat to a healthy economy is considered so serious that the sale of oleomargarine is completely prohibited. It is only during periods of high prices like the present that Canada ever seriously considers modification of its extreme position on oleomargarine.

5. It has been claimed that present oleomargarine laws are a misuse of the Federal taxing power. Actually, only by levying Federal taxes can the Federal Government effectively watch the sale of oleomargarine. The pure food and drug laws are helpless in this regard because they have no jurisdiction over intrastate traffic. However, the Revenue Department can and does enforce the present laws.

We hope that you will study the considerations involved in this butter-oleomargarine controversy and that your decision will not be based upon the exigencies or pressures of the moment, which are transitory.

Sincerely,

F. W. HOFFMAN,
President, Cudahy Packing Co.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly we are going to send this bill to conference. When this was first adopted on the floor of the House, I surprised some of you folks by showing you that you could make it in a triangular form just as easy as you could into a rectangle. I know that some of you doubted that, but it is true. There are absolutely no fears or suspicions on your part that cannot be dispelled if you think this through.

So the chairman or the gentleman promoting this measure accepted my amendment. We passed it and sent it to the other body. That change was accepted, but they went further and said that the four divisions of a pound of oleo in rectangular form containing a pound should be made into four triangle divisions. That is no trouble at all and it will not take any 2 or 3 years to prepare new machinery to prepare oleo in this shape. You can make it triangular form right now in the manufacturing plants by arranging proper cutting equipment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I was going to point that out. The gentleman mentioned Mr. Truitt, the head of the Oleomargarine Institute, who says that it will take 3 to 5 years to perfect the machinery to make oleo in triangular form. As a matter of fact, all they would have to do is to set a wire to cut it and they could do that in a couple of days.

Mr. HILL. It is the most foolish argument in the world to say they cannot do it. It will wrap up just as easily on a machine when it is a triangle form as it will when it is square.

The only reason they do not want to do this is because they want to sell oleo in cafes and restaurants as butter. This, Mr. Speaker, I am certain we do not wish to accomplish by or through this legislation.

We should insist that our conferees accept the triangular amendment as now written into the bill by the Senate.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand it will take only a year to make the hydrogen bomb, so I do not think it will take 3 years to make some machinery to cut this oleomargarine into triangles.

Mr. HILL. Of course it would not take 3 years. It would not take 30 days.

So I hope our conferees will insist on the Senate amendment that provides the triangular shape at the manufacturer's level.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] has expired.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the House that if we dispose of this rule today and dispose of the bill that was supposed to come up on Tuesday from the Committee on the Judiciary, and the next bill from the Committee on the Judiciary, which ought to be done, the other bill relating to bankruptcy would go over until next week, and I would be in a position where I could ask unanimous consent that when we adjourn today we adjourn to meet on Monday next.

I thought the membership of the House might be interested to know what was in my mind and what I hoped for.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I realize it may be rather futile to oppose the rule at the present time under the prevailing circumstances. However, I think the day will come when the Congress will rue the action it is taking, in helping to demoralize and liquidate our great dairy industry.

In that connection, I think it is worthy of note and of special interest to the Representatives of the State of New York in the Congress that only on yesterday the committee on agriculture of one house of the New York General Assembly reported unfavorably on a bill which would have removed the tax on oleomargarine in the State of New York. So, fortunately for the dairy industry, there are still some State laws prevailing which

will protect the great dairy industry. Some day the Congress of the United States may awaken to the fact that it is doing great injury to the dairy farmers of America.

I do hope that when the conference committee takes up the oleo tax repeal bill, the conferees on the part of the House will insist that the amendment requiring the sale of oleomargarine in triangular designs be retained in the bill. This will afford the only protection that the dairy industry will have in its competitive fight with the great oleomargarine monopoly.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does not the gentleman feel that the administration has a right to be proud of their victory which will result in putting the former meager earnings of 2,500,000 of the dairy farmers into the hands of 28 oleomargarine corporations?

Mr. HOEVEN. I do not know what position the administration is going to be in, first posing as the friend of the dairy farmers and then giving them this bitter medicine. I think the farmers of the Midwest at least have gotten to the point where they are going to stop, look, and listen.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] has expired.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa, in explaining the action of the New York State Legislature on oleomargarine is that, due to gerrymandering on the part of the Republican Party, the rural areas have far more representation in the State legislature than their population entitles them to. The city population in the State of New York outnumbers the rural population by several million people, but in the legislature the rural areas outvoted the urban groups by reason of the connivance heretofore mentioned.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, at least this delay yesterday afforded an opportunity for some of us, who do not believe anything is futile, to raise our voice again in protest against this legislation, in spite of the fact that this will no doubt go to conference.

I rise today because of the tremendous interest that I have not only in my own district and State but also in the great States abutting Minnesota. I spoke at length on this legislation not as coming from a dairy farm or dairy organization, but as a member of labor, because there are thousands and thousands of men and women in this Nation making a livelihood in the dairy industry; as a matter of fact, I might say there are 25 employed in the dairy industry to every one employed in the oleomargarine industry.

I wish to make this further comment, I listened to the discussion, the plea, and the argument advanced by those from the cotton States. Even though I come from a dairy district, as I listened to the argument, justified as it was in behalf of that great agricultural product so important in their economy, I recognized the factors involved. Fortunately, a sympathetic Congress knowing the problem and knowing that the economy of the South depended to a great degree upon the welfare of the cotton grower, passed helpful legislation. Those of us who come from the northern tier of States to the east and to the west have exactly the same concern with the dairy industry and see the need for some such resolution for that industry. I draw the analogy still closer: With the passage of this legislation we will face exactly the same chaotic condition that the cotton farmers of the South would have faced had they not been granted a revision of the cotton quotas, because in my State while we have prospered in the lumber industry, it has been exploited; while we have prospered in the flour industry, it has now gone to Buffalo. We now depend in our State, Wisconsin, and in adjoining States to a great degree, upon dairying. Dairying is the heart, the economic basis, of the stability of my section of the country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I had not anticipated taking any of the time of this committee, because I felt sure that the membership would go along and grant a rule on this bill about which there is some disagreement, send it to conference, and let us try to work out and bring back to the House a bill that is acceptable to both bodies.

There has been no public statement, but there have been some private suggestions that since it happens that the gentleman from Texas has gone into the dairy business himself in the last 6 months that I have changed my feelings about this margarine legislation. It happens that I have recently invested in a grade A dairy barn and some Jersey cows and hope to very shortly be in a position to help increase the Nation's supply of pure fluid milk, but this has not made me any less interested in doing justice to margarine. I have always felt and still feel that the American consumer was entitled to buy any wholesome food in any form that he wanted to buy it; that the housewife, and not some butter manufacturer, should decide exactly the form, the color, and the shape of margarine; that the housewife should have the opportunity to buy any food that she wants to as long as it is a pure, healthful food. I believe margarine to be that kind of helpful, pure, healthful food, and I think there is no reason that any industry, whether it is my industry, your industry, or that of somebody else, should be given a legislative monopoly to the exclusion of some other healthful and useful food. In the United States let us have actual freedom of enterprise; let us not use the power of the Federal Government to establish a monopoly for any group, or to deny to any other group the right to decide without bureaucratic interference just what people may buy with their own money.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Membership of the House has made up its mind to send this piece of legislation to conference.

I have no objection to tax-free competition of products in the United States, but I would be remiss in my duty, not only to my constituents, but to my country, if I did not call the attention of the Congress to the fact that in passing this so-called oleo bill they are placing in jeopardy a great and fundamental industry, and vitally affecting soil conservation in the United States.

Everyone knows that animal husbandry is the basis of good soil conservation. Oleo is made from products which are soil depleting. This Congress on one hand is subsidizing certain farm products, including cotton and cottonseed, and on the other hand laying out money for soil conservation. It is a case of its left hand not knowing what its right hand is doing.

If the dairy industry were subsidized, as is cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and other soil-depleting crops, proponents of this legislation might have a point against butter. In view of the circumstances, however, it seems to me that this Congress is prostituting itself to a money-mad monopoly of 28 oleo manufacturers, and I predict that the consumer in the long run will have no savings as a result of this bill, because this monopolistic group will immediately raise the price of their inferior product and gouge the public that much more.

The least that this House can do is to instruct the conferees to make sure that oleo in restaurants should be served in triangular shapes, so the customer will know whether or not he is getting butter.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following Members as conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. COOLEY, PACE, POAGE, HOPE, and AUGUST H. ANDRESEN.

EXPEDITIOUS NATURALIZATION OF FORMER CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 437 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on

the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6616) to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and at this time yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order consideration of the bill (H. R. 6616) to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy.

Most of the Members will recall that prior to the plebiscite in Italy we in this country through the press and through radio broadcasts asked all people of Italian extraction to write to their friends and relatives in Italy urging them to take part in the Italian election. As a result of this many of them did take part in the election and lost their American citizenship.

This bill seeks to restore their former citizenship, whether it was by birth or naturalization. It will not affect the immigration laws because it limits the number to those people who were formerly citizens.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The same situation has obtained to the same degree in connection with other countries where plebiscites have been held, as in Germany, Japan, and elsewhere, where previously the countries had been enemies of the United States before the war or during the war. Why is the bill limited specifically to Italy?

Mr. DELANEY. I think the chairman of the committee will be able to answer all of your questions on that point. Hearings were held and I understand that after considerable hearings this bill was reported almost unanimously.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Is it not a fact this bill will take care of those people who were only visiting at the time of these elections and were urged by persuasion or influence to vote with the idea of defeating the Communist forces of the country?

Mr. DELANEY. The gentleman is correct; only those people who were visiting and who are now in Italy and unable to return to this country.

Mr. TAURIELLO. They did not realize that they would lose their citizenship by voting in those elections; is that right?

Mr. DELANEY. That is right. We urged them to vote, but we did not say at that time that if they voted, they would lose their citizenship.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Is it not true that some of the people who lost their citizenship were people who owned property in the several States of the United States, and by losing their citizenship they are placed on a different taxing basis, and it works a great injustice to them?

Mr. DELANEY. The gentleman is correct. It also results in breaking up these families where one part of the family was in the United States and the other part visiting in Italy.

In calling up this bill today I am doing so in the hope of expediting the return to the United States of some three to four thousand Americans who lost their citizenship as a result of their devotion to democracy. These Americans were visiting in Italy in June 1946, or in April 1948, at which times critical elections were being held in Italy. Caught up in the heated struggle between the pro-Communist and pro-democratic forces in Italy, the visitors to Italy found themselves subjected to a combination of pressures which led them to believe their duty was to cast a vote in the elections.

The elections were thus not ordinary polls such as are held normally in most free countries every year; the elections in question were unique in more than one respect. Their singularity is such as to warrant an exception to our nationality laws—there is no likelihood of a repetition of the circumstances which occasioned the introduction of this bill.

The two elections in question were, first, the plebiscite in which Italians were called upon to cast a vote for or against the restoration of the monarchy. A vote against the monarchy was commonly regarded in Italy as a vote in favor of closer links with the western democracies.

The second poll was a national election, held in April 1948, for the purpose of seating members of the Chamber of Deputies. This was a hotly contested struggle in which the Communist Party and its collaborators pitted their strength against the prodemocratic political groups. A vote for the prodemocratic candidates was naturally regarded in Italy as a vote to bring Italy definitely and effectively within the coalition of western democracies.

In both cases the ballot cast by the individual Italian was weighed with consequences not only for his nation, but for the future of Europe and the peace of the world. The responsibility was a heavy one.

It was emphasized by three kinds of pressure, exerted on all Italians in an effort to bring all voters to the polls.

The first of these pressures was a legal one: the Italian election law compels all citizens to vote under penalty of certain civic disabilities. Second was the moral pressure, imposed by friends and neighbors, to make it clear that nonvoters would be singled out in their communities as civic slackers. Third was the unlawful pressure imposed by Communist Party supporters, who used threats and coercion to force Italians to the polls, in the hope of gaining votes for the Communist candidates.

There was, finally, the pressure of public opinion in the United States, expressed by the urgent appeals of columnists and radio commentators, whose efforts set in motion a great letter-writing campaign by Americans who had relatives in Italy. This campaign loosed a flood of a million personal letters to Italians from their American relatives or friends.

Influenced by all these factors, some three to four thousand Americans in Italy at the time of the elections went to the polls intending to aid democracy. Their good intentions brought them under the penalties of the Nationalty Act, and it is to save them from these penalties—loss of citizenship—that this bill was introduced.

Besides righting a wrong, passage of this bill will silence the Italian Communists who never tire of jeering at the Americans who voted for the sake of democracy, and now find themselves penalized because of their love for democracy.

Unless we lift this severe penalty, many families will be broken up, wives separated from their husbands, children from their parents. Americans who went to Italy simply to make a brief visit now find themselves unable to return to the United States, to their homes, to their businesses.

I think it should be clearly understood that this bill does not open a gap in our immigration laws. This measure will not start any flood of unrestricted immigration. On the contrary, the bill simply makes a fair and humane exception for some three to four thousand Americans whose concern for democracy brought on them an unexpected and extremely harsh penalty.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I have not learned of anyone who is opposed to this resolution; therefore I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 323 of the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1149), en-

titled "An act to revise and codify the nationality laws of the United States into a comprehensive nationality code," as heretofore amended, is hereby further amended by adding thereto the following paragraph:

"A person who, while a citizen of the United States, has lost citizenship of the United States solely by reason of having voted in a political election or plebiscite held in Italy after October 13, 1943, and before January 1, 1949, and who has not committed any other act enumerated in chapter IV of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, may be naturalized by taking, prior to 3 years from the enactment of this act before any naturalization court specified in subsection (a) of section 301, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335. Certified copies of such oaths shall be sent by such diplomatic or consular officer or such court to the Department of State and to the Department of Justice. Such persons shall have, from and after naturalization under this section, the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss. The illegal or fraudulent procurement of naturalization under this amendment shall be subject to cancellation in the same manner as provided in section 338."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, for the past several years a large number of private bills have been introduced for the relief of those people who lost their American citizenship because they voted in the Italian elections. After the Committee on the Judiciary had considered a number of these bills, it was determined to make an investigation for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not the situation indicated the need for over-all general legislation.

The committee conducted rather extensive hearings on this question, and last summer, when the special subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary made its investigation of several problems in Europe, it devoted about 8 days to an investigation of this particular situation in Italy. It has been determined that approximately 3,000 Americans, native-born Americans, if you please, lost their citizenship because they voted in the elections held in 1946 and in 1948, when the fight against communism was the issue.

Many hardships have resulted therefrom. These people have no way of returning to the United States except as quota immigrants, and with the Italian quota oversubscribed for upwards of 8 years, you can readily see how long it is going to take for most of these people to return to the country in which they were born. Significantly enough, between the end of the war and the time when the Italian Government ceased to require a visa to an American passport, nearly 89,000 Americans visited in Italy. Many of these people voted in these elections. Under the Nationality Act of 1940, section 401 (e), the mere fact that they voted, automatically deprived them of their American citizenship.

In Rome I met a man who comes from the Middle West. His father and his grandfather before him were born in the United States. He was visiting in Italy just before the war and was caught by the war and was unable to return to the United States.

When the drive started in 1946 to try to defeat the Communists, this man participated quite actively in that campaign. It was with a great deal of pride that he presented himself to the American consul in an attempt to obtain the necessary credentials in order to get back to the United States, and he announced that he not only had voted in the election but also campaigned very actively in that election. By doing so that man closed the doors on his returning to this middle western town in which he was born and where he was in business for a great many years.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McSWEENEY. I was in Italy 3 years in the Army and as director of welfare under the administration of American relief for Italy. I participated in urging these people to vote. I am party to the thing that caused their difficulty. May I say to the gentleman also that nobody in America probably will realize the tremendous struggle the Italian made, with all his poverty, to resist the tempting things the Communists were offering him at that time.

Mr. WALTER. There is no question about it. In addition to the very active part the American and the British armed forces played in these campaigns, there was the sort of pressure brought to bear on these people that just could not be resisted. For example, the names of the people who did not vote were posted in city halls. It was announced in public places that unless people voted they would be deprived of all government services, which of course meant ration coupons, and it meant that the Italian Government would not entertain any of their requests to have their papers put in shape so that they could return to the United States.

The tragic part of this whole situation comes from the fact that over 80 percent of the people affected were born in the United States. Under the law, if the person returns to the country of his nativity after he has been naturalized and remains there for 2 years, he loses his citizenship for that reason. This measure is therefore for the benefit almost entirely of native-born American citizens.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I have a constituent, who under very similar circumstances, and without anything remotely approaching moral turpitude, voted in an election held in Germany under the auspices of the American military government. I have introduced a bill which would relieve her of the penalties. It certainly seems to me that people who did the same thing in Germany that these people here contemplated did in Italy should be similarly relieved. Would the gentleman object to that?

Mr. WALTER. Not in the least, except that I do not believe an amendment should be placed on this measure. Our committee is aware of a small number of similar cases in countries other than Italy. Just recently the House approved a measure for the benefit of an American lady 83 years old who was visiting in England. She voted in one of the by-elections for a member of Parliament and, by so doing, lost her citizenship. I do not believe we ought to attempt in this measure to meet the situation the gentleman has described, because there cannot be many people involved. In this particular case, as I said, there are over 3,000.

But I do believe in those other elections, those cases should be dealt with as individual private bills in order that a complete inquiry can be made as to the activities of the person for whom relief is sought.

Mr. HALE. Is it not a fact that in the vast majority of cases of people who vote in foreign elections, they do so in good faith without any appreciation or knowledge of the penalty to which they may be subjected?

Mr. WALTER. I do not think there is any question about that. The gentleman might be interested in the background of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940. It was passed because large numbers of Americans of German descent were going to Germany in order to vote in the plebiscite on the Saar and we felt that by going over there to aid Mr. Hitler in taking over this territory those people should lose their citizenship. I do not suppose anybody could foresee at that time when just the opposite situation would prevail.

Mr. HALE. I will not offer any amendment to this bill if the gentleman can assure me that the position of people like my constituent who voted in some German election is receiving the active study of his committee and that his committee intends to report some legislation.

Mr. WALTER. Yes; I give the gentleman that assurance and if general legislation is not recommended for that particular type of case, then I assure the gentleman that if he makes out a proper case we will be very glad to report out a private bill because it is no different from other private bills of the same sort which have already been enacted into law.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the gentleman has brought out a very meritorious bill. I have a constituent who happens to be of Japanese blood, born in the United States. He was in Japan at the time the war broke out. He meticulously refrained from performing any act which might void his citizenship in the United States. However, under

similar circumstances to those when the United States military was calling for plebiscites and elections and all sorts of things he was persuaded, because he knew something about elections, if you please, to enter the scene and he did cast a vote, and is therefore refused reentry into the United States.

Mr. WALTER. If he was born in the United States and the only act committed which would deprive him of his citizenship was the mere voting, I am quite certain that the Committee on the Judiciary will be perfectly willing to grant that particular individual relief which he seeks.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. SADLAK. Is it not a fact that there would be no necessity for this legislation according to our nationality laws if these people who are citizens of the United States would not have performed this overt act of voting because of which they are being excluded?

Mr. WALTER. Yes; that is it, exactly.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Would this bill correct in any way the loss of citizenship which arose for any reason other than voting in one of these plebiscites as for example a combination of things such as having voted and at the same time earlier having joined the Italian Army to fight against the United States?

Mr. WALTER. It would not. This applies just to the mere fact of voting and nothing else, because there are many instances where people not only voted, but before that time had taken the oath of allegiance to a foreign power.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6616 refers to former United States citizens who voted in the Italian elections in 1946 and 1948, who, by their participation in either or both elections, forfeited their United States citizenship. Our subcommittee, under our chairman, the very able Member from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], investigated thoroughly the situation obtaining in Italy during the time of these elections.

It is understood that besides setting forth the right of qualified Italians to vote, the laws also state that each Italian should vote.

In the 1946 elections in Italy, pressure was brought by various interested groups, notably those of the left—partisans—to induce people to go to the polls. Such pressure was entirely outside of any legal or constitutional basis, and might be compared with organized campaigns such as have existed and will probably continue to exist in the United States, by political parties or certain organizations representing vested interests. In some instances, particularly in small communities where the identity of each individual is known, such pressure undoubtedly was effective. However, no legal sanctions could be threatened or enforced. Threats were made to do bodily harm, to fire nonvoters, or to take away their food-ration coupons. No instances are known where any such sanctions were ever carried out.

In the election of April 18, 1948, with the high stakes involved in the election, pressure was brought from both sides, that is, from the Communists and their sympathizers and from those who were interested in a democratic form of government. The campaigns originating in the United States played an important part. The Italian Government, which also was vitally interested in the outcome of the elections, is understood to have sponsored posters which appeared shortly before the election, stating that lists would be made of those persons who did not exercise their franchise, and that the failure to vote would then be inscribed in the person's good-conduct file. Again, in smaller communities, word was spread that food-ration cards might be withdrawn, that living quarters might be taken away, and that persons might lose their jobs if they did not vote. Such notices, though entirely illegal and not enforceable except by abuse of power, unquestionably were effective in the smaller communities.

The threats made undoubtedly placed many persons in a position of great embarrassment, even though they might not be classed in the category of threats to life and limb.

It is interesting to note that no cases have come to light where threats were carried out. No instances are known where entries were made in a person's good-conduct record, where ration cards were withdrawn, or where positions were lost as a consequence of nonvoting.

Dual citizens, that is, persons with both United States and Italian nationality, were faced at election time with the choice of voting, thereby ensuring their continued well-being in Italy, or not voting and thereby possibly incurring some unhappiness by manifesting loyalty to the United States.

Unquestionably many dual citizens voted because they felt it their duty to oppose the communistic ideology and to assist in the establishment of true democracy.

Recognizing the tremendous pressure that was exerted by the United States through its State Department and Members of Congress direct to Italian people in Italy, as well as the campaigns by newspapers in the United States requesting citizens here to write to their relatives in Italy to urge them to vote against the Communist Party in these elections, I feel that we should restore United States citizenship to these former dual citizens. It is my earnest belief that H. R. 6616 is a meritorious bill and I urge its passage.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me this is a meritorious and much-needed piece of legislation. On the same day that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, chairman of the committee, introduced this bill, I introduced a companion measure, H. R. 6617, which reads the same way.

These elections of 1948 in Italy were among the most important which were ever held in the world at any time. The issue was whether Italy would remain free or go Communist. That was of vital concern to the free peoples of the world everywhere. That the anti-Communist forces in Italy should prevail in this election was a matter of supreme importance to liberty lovers the world over.

For weeks before this election, over the air waves friends and relatives in this country were urging the Italians to vote in the election. I, as did the gentleman from Ohio, happen to have participated, albeit unwittingly, in bringing this about, because of having broadcast over the short-wave radio to Italy. Many of these people who were American citizens, then in Italy on business, visiting relatives, or otherwise engaged, took this plea a little too literally and went ahead and voted in this election. Of course, they did not have a right to do it. But neither did they think they were doing anything wrong.

Then, when they tried to come back to this country, they found to their chagrin and regret that they were denied the right to return to their native shores. It has broken up homes. It has caused all kinds of hardship among the people of this country.

The enactment of this bill will result in restoring to one roof many American families who were disrupted by this innocent, though mistaken, effort to advance the ideals and principles of freedom to which all of us in this body subscribe.

I hope this measure will be enacted.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Why does the measure go back to 1943?

Mr. KEATING. The elections in which these people voted were mostly held in 1946 and 1948. The chairman may be able to explain the reason for going back to 1943.

Mr. WALTER. If the gentleman will yield, that date is when Italy ceased to be an enemy and became a cobelligerent.

Mr. KEATING. As a practical matter, I believe that 1946 was the first election in which anyone did vote.

Mr. GROSS. How is this list compiled? Are you basing it upon the voting records in Italy, or what?

Mr. KEATING. It is based upon the records of those in Italy who actually voted in the elections, who were American citizens, and who improperly did so. Then, when they tried to come back here, that voting record prevented them from returning to this country.

Mr. GROSS. Is it possible that we are bringing back citizens who may have borne arms against the United States?

Mr. KEATING. As to bearing arms, that is covered by another entirely unre-

lated section of the law. It is not affected in any way by the legislation before us today.

That is not covered in the terms of this law. Any prohibition against restoration of citizenship on that ground would be completely unaffected by anything we do here today on this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Almost anyone could say they bore arms under duress in Italy, could they not, in 1943 and 1944?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] has expired.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, there are today in Italy native-born and naturalized Americans who no longer enjoy the privileges of American citizenship by virtue of the fact that several thousand of them had participated in the elections held in Italy since 1943.

It should not be difficult for us to recall that at the time of such subsequent elections, the United States and all freedom-loving peoples throughout the world had focused their attention on Italy primarily because the elections there were a contest of paramount importance determining whether the advancing tide of communism was to be checked or permitted to run rampant. The people of the United States were vitally interested in the outcome and accordingly took steps to do something about it. Messages through the medium of the radio, the cable, and the thousands upon thousands of letters were directed to the Italians urging that their ballots be cast in opposition to the growing menace that even now is ruthlessly attempting to spread its doctrine and dictatorial power to every corner of the earth.

The intensive campaign waged before the election gathered such force and momentum that it swept in the several thousand Americans who were then in Italy. It goes without saying that the presence of these Americans in Italy during so crucial a time constituted a service to the cause of freedom that can scarcely be measured. These Americans in their fervent desire to assist went all out and voted along with the Italians. This spontaneous act was prompted by their first-hand knowledge and experience with freedom here in the United States. It was perfectly natural for them to feel that they were doing the right thing for the embattled Italians opposing the Communists and, incidentally, for the United States, with the hope that the same undesirable situation might not be visited upon the Nation of which they were citizens. The discovery that they faced the loss of United States citizenship because of having voted in the Italian election came as a crushing shock when they were ready to return to the United States.

It is strangely ironical that the very act which was to help the Italians and the opponents of communism should in turn prove to be the means by which these unfortunate people would be denied the right to regain their status as Americans.

To rectify this unhappy situation, because a number of such cases affecting former Connecticut citizens had been called to my attention, I introduced a like bill, namely, H. R. 6781, providing for this same desirable relief to former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy. For no other reason than the overt act of voting in either or both of these elections, knowingly or unknowingly of the consequences, did these persons in the eyes of our immigration and naturalization laws forfeit their United States citizenship and expatriate themselves.

At present these expatriates cannot return to the United States. They face the unpleasant and long wait as immigrants, subject to a quota that is heavily oversubscribed for a number of years ahead.

I commend the chairman of the subcommittee whose bill we are discussing and congratulate the expeditious handling of this important legislation. I shall vote for this bill and urge its passage now in order that the return to our shores of these former citizens of the United States may be hastened and families reunited.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support H. R. 6616 and I trust it will be speedily enacted into law. A number of cases of American citizens who lost their cherished citizenship by having participated in the Italian elections in 1946 or 1948 have come to my attention, and I can personally testify as to the considerable hardship that has resulted for them, in addition to the loss of citizenship. It was believed that a heavy vote would assure the defeat of the Communists in these vital elections when the struggle between totalitarian and democratic forces in Italy was at its height, and strong pressure was brought to bear upon persons living in Italy to participate. The campaign was conducted both in Italy and the United States, and over a million individual letters were sent from this country to Italian residents. This combination of domestic and external pressures resulted in the highest percentage of votes ever cast in a democratic election, the Italian election of April 1948 which was the decisive factor in saving the country from communism. It is easy to understand how under the conditions that existed at the time these American citizens were prevailed upon to vote, not realizing that they would thereby expatriate themselves. They are now barred from returning to the United States and are separated from their families in this country. Parents are separated from their children; husbands from their wives; persons who were in Italy on short visits or on business are unable to return to their homes and places of business in this country. As the committee report points out, the unhappy fate of these former American citizens is being used for propaganda purposes by the Communists who lose no occasion to stress the irony of the position in which they have placed themselves by having supported the democratic forces in Italy. There is real necessity for providing for a solution of the problem, and I urge the passage of this bill to restore United States citizenship to these persons.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6616 affords a unique opportunity to the Congress to alleviate the harsh results of a good law, the application of which to a specific situation has produced unforeseen results. I refer to the application of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940 to the activities of American citizens who partcipated in a political election or plebiscite held in Italy after October 13, 1943.

The purpose of this bill is to restore United States citizenship, whether acquired by birth or naturalization, to persons who lost it solely through the operation of section 401 (e) by voting in Italy after that nation became a cobelligerent with the United States in 1943. The problem has been the subject of intensive study by a special subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary. In addition to careful consideration in this country, the special committee went to Italy to study the situation first-hand. Following the completion of its work the subcommittee issued a carefully considered House Report No. 1469 which I recommend to all Members for their consideration. The report points out that in the 1946 election and plebiscite strong pressure was brought upon voters by left-wing parties. To counteract this pressure influential American columnists and radio commentators prompted American citizens of Italian descent to induce their relatives to vote, and an intensive letter-writing campaign produced over a million individual letters, according to reliable estimates, from the United States to Italian voters. I can attest to the fact that this type of campaign had remarkable results for democracy. In some small measure I contributed to this result for I was one of the organizers of a letter-writing brigade, called the Good-Will Brigade which was made up of some 400 ex-GI's who volunteered their services in this effort. We used every possible avenue afforded us to urge the people in Italy to vote in order to save democracy in Italy. And they responded. No one will deny that the 1948 Italian election constituted an important factor in the ideological struggle between the totalitarian East and the democratic West. The special subcommittee came to the conclusion that this heavy vote could be attributed both to the political contingency during which Italy resumed, after almost 25 years, the exercise of the democratic rights of her people, and to the half-compulsory nature of the Italian election law.

Now, I do not wish to stress this factor of compulsion. However, in all fairness, you should be reminded that good standing, which was essential to the enjoyment of certain privileges and benefits, required the exercise of the franchise in the Italian election. Another factor which must be considered is that dual citizenship exists in Italy. There is no

provision in the Italian law that Italian citizens or their children who have lost their nationality by becoming naturalized in a foreign country automatically lose their Italian citizenship. According to the report, there is, moreover, no provision in the Italian statutes under which expatriated Italians must give notification of their change-of-citizenship status to the Italian Government, and, therefore, their names continue to appear on the list of voters.

In examining this problem, the two departments of the Government having jurisdiction over this matter—the Departments of State and Justice—have found that the obligation to vote, as established by the Italian law, cannot in itself be considered as actual compulsion and that, therefore, coercion and duress could not be invoked by the parties concerned as sufficient reason to present the operation of section 401 (e) against their interests. The Department of State, accordingly, has refused consistently the the granting of American passports to these native-born or naturalized American citizens who have voted in either the Italian election or plebiscite, holding uniformly that the applicants have expatriated themselves under the terms of the law. Technically their position is correct and is similar to that taken by the courts generally, for it is a well-settled presumption that each person knows the law.

This principle of law gives rise to difficulties. If it were once allowed, for example, in answer to any complaint of violation of the law to set up the defense of ignorance, then there must necessarily be gradations of ignorance and gradations of default, and a preliminary inquiry in each case as to whether such ignorance was real or assumed, culpable or innocent. One would be entitled to urge that he had never received any education at all; another, that he was about to study the law, but had not yet advanced sufficiently in his studies; a third, that he had made an effort to learn, but could find no sufficient teachers; a fourth, that he had to earn a living, or had no sufficient means, and so had no leisure to study; a fifth, that he had applied to the wisest person in his area, and had been misled by the information he had received; and a sixth, that he had made careful inquiry, and found the highest authorities equally wise and weighty on both sides, and was unable to decide which should be his guide. It might be asked, if such inquiries were permitted, what materials exist to enable any court or administrative agency satisfactorily to dispose of them. The interior of a man's mind is beyond the reach of inquiry. Courts and administrative agencies wisely abandon the impossible task, and treat all as incompetent to set up any such defense of ignorance of the law, leaving each to find out for himself, and in his own way, whatever he wants, and to take the risk of his want of knowledge.

Many of these citizens voted without knowledge of section 401 and the forfeiture that it would work. Congress, however, is not bound by this presumption that each person knows the law, and by amendatory legislation it can remove this extreme and harsh result which was unforeseen by many, if not most, of the citizens participating in these plebiscites and elections in Italy. I recommend the passage of H. R. 6616 as reported.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in supporting H. R. 6616, and I sincerely hope it will receive favorable congressional action as quickly as possible.

The Italian elections held in April of 1948 were among the most important in the history of the world. The forces of communism were hard at work in an endeavor to enslave the people of Italy and free peoples everywhere were concerned with the outcome.

For some time before the elections strong pressure was brought to bear upon countless persons living in Italy at the time to participate in the elections in an endeavor to insure the defeat of the evil forces of communism. It was believed that a heavy vote would bring about a democratic victory over the forces of totalitarianism. Therefore a campaign was started both in the United States and in Italy in order to engender enthusiasm for the democratic cause and over 1,000,000 cables and letters bombarded people in Italy, urging them to take part in the elections. Prominent columnists and radio commentators in America, Members of Congress, and other influential American officials took part in radio broadcasts directed to Italian voters, impressing upon them the imperative necessity for casting their ballots.

As the committee report states:

> It is due to the combination of all these moral, legal and political, domestic and external pressures that the Italian election of April 18, 1948, reached what is believed to be the highest percentage of votes ever cast in a democratic election—92 percent.

Approximately 5,000 American citizens, who at the time were in Italy on business or pleasure, had become fired with enthusiasm in an effort to assist the Italian fight for freedom. They cast their ballots, little realizing that in doing so they would expatriate themselves.

When they sought to return to the United States, they were dismayed to learn that they had lost their citizenship.

Many heartbreaking situations ensued thereafter. Parents were separated from their children, husbands from their wives, brothers and sisters from each other. Persons who had gone to Italy for short visits or on business found themselves unable to return home to their native land. I am personally acquainted with many such cases and with the hardships being endured by countless families. It is easy to understand the conditions under which these American citizens were prevailed upon to vote without realizing they would expatriate themselves by doing so.

The House Judiciary Committee has indicated that the plight of these unfortunate people is being used by the Communists for propaganda purposes to stress the irony of the position in which they placed themselves in an effort to support the democratic forces in Italy.

I believe that there is a real need for the passage of legislation which would remove this disability and permit these former American citizens to rejoin their friends and families here at home, provided they have had clean records during the period while they were out of the United States.

Congressional approval of this bill will alleviate much heartbreak and suffering and will restore to one roof many American families disrupted by this innocent, but mistaken, attempt to aid the cause of democracy and freedom.

I strongly recommend the passage of this bill and urge the enthusiastic support of my fellow colleagues in an endeavor to right this injustice.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, on October 12, 1949, I introduced a bill similar to H. R. 6616 to repatriate Americans who voted in Italian elections. To anyone informed, the history of conditions abroad, especially during the war years, gives ample support to this legislation.

Many persons, while citizens of the United States, without realizing the true import of their acts, and acting in all good faith, voted in Italian elections to help turn back the rising tide of communism. But, under the provisions of the Nationality Act of 1940, which became effective on January 13, 1941, they lost their American citizenship for so voting.

The passage of the act at this time had been given little space in the world press because of the emphasis on war news and communication facilities throughout the world were badly disrupted because of military considerations.

Thus it may readily be seen that these people were without notice of the serious consequences of voting in these elections, and it may be inferred that they certainly would not have so quickly given up their rights as citizens of the greatest country in the world, had they known of the passage of the act. Moreover, under the urgings of relatives and friends in the United States and others whom they considered well versed in international affairs they did what they thought was their duty to the Nation and the world.

The House has done well to take positive steps to correct the unjust situation with which these people are faced.

Mr. McGRATH. The passage of H. R. 6616 is merely keeping faith with the people of Italy. During the days when the Red horde of communism threatened to engulf that nation, we pleaded with the people of Italy to vote in their general election. The people responded nobly, and by the force of a free election, defeated communism. Over radio and by mail the people of Italy were urged by many outstanding citizens of New York City, notably the Honorable Generoso Pope, the Honorable Juvenal Marchisio, the Honorable S. Samuel DiFalco, and Mr. Mauro Romita, and thousands of others to vote against communism. Italians of American citizenship who were in Italy at that time responded

nobly and cast their vote for the democratic form of government. Unfortunately, because of that act under existing law they were expatriated. Today the voice of America again rings out and by the action of this House accomplishes the first step in restoring their citizenship and does simple justice.

I urge the passage of this bill and trust that the Senate will promptly concur in our action.

THEY ARE AMERICANS

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy indeed that this bill, which will provide a swift means of repatriation of American citizens who had the misfortune to lose their American citizenship without any such intention, is here before the House with the blessing of the respected Committee on the Judiciary, and under the sponsorship of the distinguished chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

I am one of those who believes that our immigration laws are too harsh and too rigid, and I am especially dubious of those expatriation clauses which place a special disability—in my opinion, in defiance of the Constitution—on naturalized citizens, in the Nationality Act of 1940. In conformity with my attitude, I have pending before the House H. R. 1915, which would repeal section 404 and the ensuing paragraphs.

However, the bill now under debate does not relate to these special disabilities, but to those clauses which bear with equal weight on all citizens, and which require an overt act to take away American citizenship.

URGED TO VOTE

One of those overt acts is voting in an election in a foreign country, which is, indubitably, an act of citizenship in any country. The injustice involved here lies only in the context of the act of voting. Eligible voters in several countries of Europe were urged by all our organs of opinion—radio, press, personal letters—to vote for democratic freedom as against an encroaching totalitarianism.

Unfortunately, American citizens in some countries, especially in Italy, took those admonitions very much to heart, and took part in popular elections, not realizing that by that act they were depriving themselves of American citizenship, even though they were American born and bred. Some of these citizens had been caught in Europe by the war, and were unaware of the provisions of the Nationality Act; others simply did not have the education to understand what they were doing.

This was most markedly true in the plebiscite in Italy.

EASY PROCEDURE SET UP

As a result of the barrage of propaganda through every channel, many American citizens, having no intention of renouncing American citizenship, and anxious only to help preserve a democratic government, cast votes in one or more of the Italian elections.

This bill enables such expatriated American citizens to restore their American citizenship by simple processes, either in a naturalization court or before American consular officers.

I am certain that the bill will pass, and I hope that every Member motivated by justice and mercy will support it.

I feel a vicarious pride in this bill, for I have had pending two joint resolutions which would suspend the operation of section 401 (e). One is a bill relating only to those who took part in the Italian plebiscite; the other is broader and would suspend the automatic expatriation of the act against any United States citizen who innocently and without intent of losing citizenship cast a vote in any election in Europe between September 1, 1939, and January 1, 1949.

The pending measure will take care of the most pressing cases which might have been remedied by adoption of either or both of my bills, and I am happy to accept H. R. 6616 in lieu thereof.

SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION

I believe that I do not violate the rule of germaneness if I take this opportunity to speak a good word also for another hopeful measure introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

I refer to H. R. 3001, which, we hope, will be taken up following disposition of H. R. 6616.

It is my belief that H. R. 3001 is the most intelligent contribution to our tangled mass of immigration laws in many years. I hope sincerely that it passes without dissent, and that it has an equally auspicious reception in the other House. The bill would introduce to our immigration statutes a principle of selective immigration. Since it is of limited scope in its terms, I cannot say it would replace the present discriminatory system; but it at least proposes a needed reform on which further revision may be based in a happy future.

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply interested in, and actively support, the bill before the House today, which will restore to their American citizenship the 3,000 or more native-born Americans who lost their citizenship because they voted in the elections held in Italy in 1946 and 1948 when the fight against communism was the chief issue.

Many injustices have been done these good people who rendered such valiant service to Italy and, incidentally, to all liberty-loving people in America and throughout the world, because the victory of the Christian Party in Italy was the greatest blow ever dealt communism. Instead of penalizing these patriotic people, I think we should give them a vote of thanks.

These people have no way of returning to the United States except by special act of Congress, unless they come in under the heavily oversubscribed Italian quota, which might involve months or even years of waiting. Besides righting the wrong that has been done them, by the passage of this bill, we will silence the Italian Communists who are continually jeering at these American citizens who voted to help preserve democracy in Italy and who were then penalized for their love of democracy.

During the summer recess of Congress, Congressman WALTER, of Pennsylvania, who sponsored this resolution, met a man in Rome who comes from the Middle West. His father and his grandfather before him were born in the United States. He was visiting in Italy just before the war and was caught by the war and was unable to return to the United States.

When the drive started in 1946 to try to defeat the Communists, this man participated quite actively in that campaign. It was with a great deal of pride that he presented himself to the American consul in an attempt to obtain the necessary credentials in order to get back to the United States, and he announced that he not only had voted in the election but also campaigned very actively in that election. By doing so that man closed the doors on his returning to this middle western town in which he was born and where he was in business for a great many years.

In the election of April 18, 1948, with the high stakes involved in the election, pressure was brought from both sides; that is, from the Communists and their sympathizers and from those who were interested in a democratic form of government. The campaigns originating in the United States played an important part. The Italian Government, which also was vitally interested in the outcome of the elections, is understood to have sponsored posters which appeared shortly before the election, stating that lists would be made of those persons who did not exercise their franchise, and that the failure to vote would then be inscribed in the person's good-conduct file. Again, in smaller communities word was spread that food-ration cards might be withdrawn, that living quarters might be taken away, and that persons might lose their jobs if they did not vote. Such notices, though entirely illegal and not enforceable except by abuse of power, unquestionably were effective in the smaller communities.

The threats made undoubtedly placed many persons in a position of great embarrassment, even though they might not be classed in the category of threats to life and limb.

It is interesting to note that no cases have come to light where threats were carried out. No instances are known where entries were made in a person's good-conduct record, where ration cards were withdrawn, or where positions were lost as a consequence of nonvoting.

Dual citizens, that is, persons with both United States and Italian nationality, were faced at election time with the choice of voting, thereby ensuring their continued well-being in Italy, or not voting and thereby possibly incurring some unhappiness by manifesting loyalty to the United States.

Unquestionably many dual citizens voted because they felt it their duty to

oppose the communistic ideology and to assist in the establishment of true democracy.

Recognizing the tremendous pressure that was exerted by the United States through its State Department and Members of Congress direct to Italian people in Italy, as well as the campaigns by newspapers in the United States requesting citizens here to write to their relatives ir Italy to urge them to vote against the Communist Party in these elections, I feel that we should restore United States citizenship to these former dual citizens. It is my earnest belief that H. R. 6616 is a meritorious bill and I urge its passage.

Some of these Americans are, no doubt, the mothers and fathers of children in America. If we had refused to pass the bill, we might have destroyed many homes in the United States. This would indeed be a tragedy because the Italians are a home-loving people, devoted to their families.

I represent a large part of the Italian population in Baltimore City. They are good Americans; they are honest, hard-working people. It is a real pleasure to represent them and I only wish all of our American people were as good citizens as my constituents who were born in Italy. They know how to appreciate the blessings of democracy and they never cease to express their love and devotion to their adopted country.

In order that everyone may know the meaning of the bill which I enthusiastically support, I quote the language of the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 323 of the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1149), entitled "An act to revise and codify the nationality laws of the United States into a comprehensive nationality code," as heretofore amended, is hereby further amended by adding thereto the following paragraph:

"A person who, while a citizen of the United States, has lost citizenship of the United States solely by reason of having voted in a political election or plebiscite held in Italy after October 13, 1943, and before January 1, 1949, and who has not committed any other act enumerated in chapter IV of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, may be naturalized by taking, prior to 3 years from the enactment of this act before any naturalization court specified in subsection (a) of section 301, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335. Certified copies of such oaths shall be sent by such diplomatic or consular officer or such court to the Department of State and to the Department of Justice. Such persons shall have, from and after naturalization under this section, the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss. The illegal or fraudulent procurement of naturalization under this amendment shall be subject to cancellation in the same manner as provided in section 338."

I will be delighted when the bill is passed by the House and in doing so we will keep faith with the people of Italy.

During the days when the Red horde of communism threatened to engulf that nation, we pleaded with the people of Italy to vote in their general election. The people responded nobly, and by the force of a free election, defeated communism. Over radio and by mail the people of Italy were urged by many outstanding citizens of America to vote against communism. Italians of American citizenship who were in Italy at that time responded nobly and cast their vote for the democratic form of government. Unfortunately, because of that act under existing law they were expatriated. Today the voice of America again rings out, and by the action of this House accomplished the first step in restoring their citizenship and doing simple justice.

I sincerely hope that this bill will be acted upon by the United States Senate in the near future in order that it may become law and that these Americans may come back to their families and their beloved country as quickly as possible.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: On page 2, strike out all of line 2 and in line 3 the words "Chapter IV of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN SKILLED ALIENS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 438, providing for the consideration of H. R. 3001, a bill to authorize the admission into the United States of certain aliens possessing certain skills, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3001) to authorize the admission into the United States of certain aliens possessing special skills. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half hour to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] and 5 minutes to myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill made in order by this rule is to facilitate the entry into the United States of a limited number of aliens and the members of their immediate families. The bill will permit the entrance of aliens whose services will be beneficial to the interests of our country. This bill will fill a long-needed want from the standpoint of immigration requirements. I know that in my District there has been request after request by business houses, professions, and industries regarding the possibility of admitting into this country aliens who have a particular craft or a particular skill in which there is a great scarcity in this country.

This legislation is limited to entry of 3,200 and will not in any way expand the quota. After the alien is here for a year the Attorney General and Commissioner of Immigration will make a complete investigation of the immigrant in regard to his progress with the employer under whose supervision he was brought in. The purpose of the investigation is to verify that the entrance of the alien was 100 percent legitimate.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary and was reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules. I believe there is no opposition to the bill.

Before I leave the floor I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], chairman of the subcommittee, and also the Judiciary Committee and its members not only for bringing out this piece of legislation but for bringing out the bill which we just passed giving citizenship to so many of these Italian boys who went over to Italy to aid in the fight against communism. I know in my district we have a great number of Italian boys who went to Italy and lost their American citizenship when they engaged in the elections and voted in their elections. Several of these boys have been requesting me to file special bills to reinstate their American citizenship. The bill just passed will automatically reinstate their citizenship.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to join with the gentleman from Indiana in congratulating the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], chairman of the subcommittee and the other members of the subcommittee as well as the members of the full committee in reporting out both these bills. The bill made in order by this resolution meets a very important situation that arises from time to time; furthermore, it will enable a lot of outstanding men possessed of genius but who are citizens of other countries, men who despise the way of life that the Communist ideology stands for, men who believe in the dignity of the individual, to enter the United States and make valuable contributions to the general welfare and the national defense of our country, scientists, scholars, and trained mechanics. It might afford a very excellent opportunity, particularly in the manufacture of submarines, to bring in the very persons who would be of invaluable assistance to our country.

In relation to the other bill I also join with the gentleman from Indiana in commending the committee, because that is not only humane legislation, but also it is just legislation.

Mr. MADDEN. I thank the majority leader for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the consideration of a piece of legislation which, in my opinion, is an extremely meritorious one. In fact it has been overdue for a considerable period of time. I know the members of the Committee on the Judiciary have had a very strenuous time in the past considering individual bills to meet the various situations that this piece of legislation would cover in a general way. As far as I know there is no opposition to the bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts now addressing the House introduced a similar bill or a bill of the same purport, is that correct?

Mr. HERTER. Yes. The gentlemen of the committee know that last year I introduced a bill almost identical with this one on which hearings were held. The bill reported out by the committee is an improvement on the bill that I offered in that it makes certain of the genuineness of the skills of these people coming in by permitting them to come in under a temporary visa and not making them permanent entrants into this country until the genuineness of their skills have been thoroughly determined in actual practice.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD on H. R. 3001 and H. R. 6616 at the point in the RECORD where those bills were considered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Foreign Skilled Personnel Admission Act."

SEC. 2. When used in this act, the term—

(a) "Board" means the Foreign Skilled Personnel Board created pursuant to this act.

(b) "Eligible foreign specialist" means a quota immigrant as defined in section 5 of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 155; 8 U. S. C. 205), who is seeking to enter the United States and whose services are urgently needed in the United States by the United States Government or any of its departments, agencies, or bureaus, or by a commercial, industrial, financial, educational, or health institution, firm, or corporation, from the standpoint of national defense, public security, or because of highly skilled technical, medical, or scientific training, experience, or ability of such person, such services being prospectively beneficial to the United States.

SEC. 3. A number of special temporary visas, not to exceed 3,200 in any fiscal year, shall be issued without regard to quota limitations to eligible foreign specialists, and their spouses and their unmarried children under 21 years of age, if accompanying or following to join them: *Provided*, That the admission of such eligible foreign specialists has been recommended to the Secretary of State and to the Attorney General by the Board.

SEC. 4. Any agency described in section 2 of this act, claiming the necessity of the admission into the United States of an eligible foreign specialist, may file with the Board a petition, in such form as may be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Board, requesting the permission to import such eligible foreign specialist.

SEC. 5. Upon basis of a finding that there is an urgent and special need for the services of an eligible foreign specialist specifically identified under the provisions of section 4 of this act, and that the same will yield a substantial benefit to the defense, or the security, or the economy, or the health of the United States, the Board shall recommend the temporary admission of such eligible foreign specialists to the Secretary of State and the Attorney General in a manner provided for by regulations to be promulgated by the Board.

SEC. 6. There is hereby created a board to be known as the Foreign Skilled Personnel Board which shall consist of seven members. The Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor shall each appoint one member of the Board. The members of the Board shall select a chairman from among their number for a term not to exceed two fiscal years.

SEC. 7. The members of the Board shall receive no compensation for their services as such, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Board. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums of money as may be necessary to enable the Board to discharge its duties. Within the limits of such funds as may be appropriated to the Board or as may be allocated to it by the President, the Board may employ necessary personnel without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and make provisions for necessary supplies, facilities, and services to carry out the provisions and accomplish the purposes of this act. It shall be the duty of the Board to formulate and issue regulations, necessary under the provisions of this act, and in compliance therewith, for the admission into the United States of eligible foreign specialists and the members of their families. It shall also be the duty of the Board to report, on July 1 of each year, to the Attorney General on the situation regarding the employment of eligible foreign specialists in the United States.

SEC. 8. If, at the expiration of 12 months immediately following the admission into the United States of an eligible foreign specialist, the Attorney General shall, upon application filed with the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization by the alien, find that such person has maintained the employment with the institution upon which application such person has been admitted into the United States, he is hereby authorized and directed to amend the record of such alien's temporary admission, and the records of admission of the members of his family admitted under the provisions of section 3 of this act, to show admission for permanent residence as of the date of their respective actual entry into the United States: *Provided*, That no change in employment which may occur by the written consent of the agency or institution importing the alien under the provisions of this act shall preclude such alien from having his record of admission amended according to the provisions of this section.

SEC. 9. Any person or persons who knowingly violate or conspire to violate any provision of this act shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not less than $500 nor more than $10,000, or shall be imprisoned not less than 2 or more than 10 years, or both.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, strike out lines 8 to 11, inclusive, and on page 2, lines 1 to 8, inclusive, and insert the following:

"(b) 'Eligible foreign specialist' means an alien, as defined in section 28, subsection (b) of the act of May 26, 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 168; 8 U. S. C. 224), who is seeking to enter the United States and whose services are urgently needed in the United States by the United States Government or any of its departments, agencies, or bureaus, or by a commercial, industrial, financial, educational, or health institution, or firm, or corporation, public or private, from the standpoint of national defense, public security, or because of highly skilled technical, medical, professional, or scientific training, experience, or ability of such person, such services being prospectively beneficial to the United States."

On page 2, strike out lines 21 to 25, inclusive, and on page 3, lines 1 to 4, inclusive, and insert the following:

"SEC. 3. A number of passport visas, not to exceed 3,200 in any fiscal year, may be issued to eligible foreign specialists as nonimmigrants under the provisions of subsection (2) of section 3 of the act of May 26, 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 154; 8 U. S. C. 203), and to their spouses and their unmarried children under 21 years of age, if accompanying or following to join them: *Provided*, That the passport visas issued to such spouses and unmarried children under 21 years of age shall be in addition to and shall not be included in the total number of 3,200 passport visas to be issued annually to eligible foreign specialists: *And provided further*, That the admission into the United States of such eligible foreign specialists shall have been recommended to the Secretary of State and to the Attorney General by the Board."

Page 3, line 20, after the word "agency", insert "or institution."

Page 5, strike out lines 16 to 25, inclusive, and on page 6, lines 1 to 8, inclusive, and insert the following:

"SEC. 8. If, at the expiration of 12 months immediately following the admission into the United States of an eligible foreign specialist, the Attorney General shall, upon application filed with the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization by the alien, find that such person has maintained the employment with the agency or institution upon which application such person has been admitted into the United States, he is hereby authorized and directed to amend the record of such alien's temporary admission, and the records of admission of the members of his family admitted under the provisions

of section 3 of this act, to show admission for permanent residence as of the date of their respective last entries into the United States: *Provided,* That no change in employment which may occur by the written consent of the agency or institution importing the alien under the provisions of this act shall preclude such alien from having his record of admission amended according to the provisions of this section: *And provided further,* That upon being notified by the Attorney General of the amendment of the record of admission of an eligible foreign specialist and the members of his family, admitted into the United States temporarily in accordance with the provisions of this section the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the requisite numbers from the immigration quota or quotas to which such foreign specialist and the members of his family are chargeable."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the committee on this bill, and especially to refer to page 4 of the report of the committee. On page 4 of the report of the committee there is this comment:

> Without making the provisions of H. R. 8001 retroactive, the committee has agreed to express its belief that the Secretary of State and the Attorney General in cooperation with the Foreign Skilled Personnel Board would have the opportunity, under the terms of this bill, to adjust the immigration status of such aliens, many of whom perform at this time very valuable work in the fields of education, medicine, national security and defense, technical progress, etc.

I am glad to say that it is the intent of the committee, as stated in this particular excerpt that I have read, that the Attorney General, in the administration of this act, will issue a special regulation or regulations. These regulations will cover the particular persons stated in this excerpt and will permit persons qualified as specialists, who are already in this country under various temporary permits, particularly students, and for example, nuns or people in religious orders engaged in educational pursuits, to remain in this country.

May I say further that I believe it is a good thing, because I feel it will make foreign students, who are now in the country learning certain specialties outlined in this bill, feel that there is a place for them in this country if they desire to remain. This provision assures them that they will not be summarily deported because they publicly made such an election or tried for permanent immigration when they are on a student status, but can remain here permanently when they have or succeed in obtaining such qualifications or special skills encompassed by this act. It is a pleasure to know the Members of the House Legislative Committee agree with this interpretation of the meaning of the provisions of the act.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, immigration to the United States has gone through two stages: First, when we sought immigrants to develop our country; the second stage came when we found that it was necessary to fix quotas so as to limit immigration.

However, during that period no attention was given to the needs of the United States. Immigration was on a basis of first come, first served, with the result that during the last few years there have been many private bills introduced for the purpose of permitting a particularly skilled person to come to the United States.

As an example of some of those bills, and our distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] will recognize this one, there is a Chinese scientist that Harvard University would like to have; there are institutions that require certain types of physicians; there is a Latvian loom maker who, if he could come to the United States, would be able to provide work for upwards of 300 American citizens.

A Greek textile engineer is under contract with a North Carolina firm, and if given permission to come to the United States will perfect some sort of an innovation in the work being done in that factory, and it is expected that will provide employment for upwards of 600 Americans.

The Koppers Co. in the State of Pennsylvania sought the services of a very distinguished scientist who had lived in Canada since he was 3 years old but, because he had been born in Austria, could not come to the United States except under the Austrian quota, which is oversubscribed for upward of 7 years.

This is the first attempt to give consideration to the needs of the United States in granting permission to aliens, citizens of other countries, to come to the United States. We believe it is the forerunner, perhaps, of legislation which will give that question greater consideration than it is intended to be given under this measure.

The over-all immigration will not be increased by this bill because with each of the people selected under this measure there will be the appropriate number deducted from the quota available to the country whence he comes. It will not in anywise increase the immigration.

As one of the members of the committee put it in a recent hearing, we will get a doctor instead of a bartender in the event that a doctor is needed.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I have two questions.

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McSWEENEY. First, it will not seriously compete with any definite skilled group in America? It will be a noncompetitive thing?

Mr. WALTER. It will not compete with any skilled group in America because the institution or firm desiring the services of this particular person will have to make out to this Board a case showing the need for the particular skills this proposed immigrant possesses, and the fact that a person possessing similar qualifications is not readily available in this country.

Mr. McSWEENEY. The second question is, if a man is in the profession of medicine or is an engineer, what have we in the country set up as a safeguard to be assured that this man is a capable doctor, say, and is practicing as he should practice, fulfilling the same requirements as we impose in the case of an American physician?

Mr. WALTER. Of course these people would have to meet the requirements of the several States. Just recently the Committee on the Judiciary reported a bill introduced by the distinguished minority leader. In that particular case the State of Massachusetts indicated that this man was qualified to practice medicine in the State of Massachusetts, and the institution to which he was attached certified that his services were badly needed and that if he was not continued in the position he then occupied the services rendered by the hospital would be very seriously affected. In each one of these cases there is the question, of course, of the ability of the alien to comply with the particular State licensing laws.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. I have been reading this bill very closely. I am very happy to go along and support it, because I think this would apply to a case in which I have been very much interested, the Rhode Island case, so called, regarding four or five Latvian specialists who are required for the operation of a plant at Woonsocket.

Mr. WALTER. Exactly. That is the type of immigrant that would come in under this measure, instead of the man whose name happens to be at the top of the quota list for Latvia for the moment.

Mr. FORAND. In other words, we are interested in doing some good for the community as a whole rather than for one individual?

Mr. WALTER. These skilled people are simply given a preferential status.

Mr. FORAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most unusual and important situations that has developed recently affecting a great industry of this country and the world, the jobs and livelihood of millions of people, to which I call your attention, was the action of the British Government on its trade and exchange practices on the imports of oil from other than British sources.

This proposal, which was announced by the British Government last December, placing an embargo on petroleum products from other than British sources has its further implications in other western European countries.

Such an unwise, untimely, and far-reaching announcement was initiated under the guise of saving British foreign-exchange resources. It is now obvious that it was actually designed to obtain long-term commercial advantages

for the British and British-Dutch oil companies at the expense of our American industry.

This pronouncement and act on the part of our British friends is in direct conflict with established policies in our efforts to help save the British economy and shows little appreciation in this instance for the tremendous aid made available since the war.

Such an embargo against imports of dollar oil is a further example of the economic barriers which have prevented full realization that was intended and expected with Marshall aid funds.

It is, therefore, not surprising to note the announcement just made that the British Government is submitting a new proposal that will ease such an embargo in a very limited way.

There scarcely could have been a more ill-conceived or untimely action than this original imposition of such an embargo at the very moment talks were going forward last December between our two countries on the general subject of trade and the specific subject of oil.

This is an intricate and important subject. It requires a most careful approach instead of such an impartial ill-considered act.

To be sure it is full of implications of governmental policy for Britain but the implications on our foreign policy and the threat of enormous and increased import surpluses in this country, endangering the health and strength of our own domestic industry and economy is certainly involved. It has a most important effect and impact on free world trade in petroleum products.

There is something about such an attempt that smirks in the darkness and needs to be brought to light. In fact, the entire question and all of the problems regarding the petroleum industry should be reviewed. This is the view of the members of our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who visited Europe last fall and studied this very question. Unfortunately, I did not get to make the trip but in view of this interest and the information received, the Petroleum subcommittee is preparing to conduct a further study of this subject that the facts may be brought to light and a proper solution to many of these problems determined.

No one has any quarrel with the British desire to balance their international payments, especially in terms of dollars. Our attitude in assisting in this desire is expressed in the European recovery program.

On the other hand, achievement of proper balance by precipitously cutting off imports of dollar oil can but have a far-reaching effect on the industry which has supplied a big portion of British trade. It seems not only precipitous, but obviously flinging our friendly assistance right back into our face.

It is a one-sided action during the time that we are asked for further tax money for ECA financing of the refineries, exploration, and facilities that will allow the British to supply their own needs in place of meeting part of them from us. The resulting supply of oil in the world markets can but have and in fact, is already having, a material effect on imports into the United States and our home industry.

We have already in this country since the war cut back approximately 1,000,000 barrels of oil per day and by further threats of continued imports there is no telling how much further it will be necessary to cut back our own production.

Two years ago, when the European recovery program was before the Congress your Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, conducted extensive hearings on the place of petroleum in the recovery program.

The committee issued a report at that time which was called to your attention. It emphasized that of the sixteen or seventeen billion dollars then proposed as the cost of the European recovery program, over one-fourth would be involved in oil and in facilities for producing and marketing oil products.

A large part of this money was proposed to be spent in making oil purchases directly. Large sums were proposed for building refineries in Europe for refining oil, principally from the Middle East. An additional sum was proposed for the exploration, development, and production of oil, principally by the British in the Middle East. Some of you may remember that I proposed an amendment during the consideration of the ECA bill designed to clarify this situation toward preventing just what has resulted in the last few weeks.

Last year, the committee heard the ECA Administrator, Mr. Paul Hoffman, on developments and the tremendous problems with which he was faced in connection with this part of the program. He explained the difficulties which they were encountering and that the financing of European refineries by ECA funds did present an enormous problem.

On the one hand it was desirable to save dollar-exchange resources; on the other hand, it was not desirable to overbuild refinery capacity with our own taxpayers' money to create oil-product surpluses on the world markets that in turn would mean further trouble, impose restrictions, and invoke embargoes.

At that time, the European nations were asking for more refinery capacity than necessary for their own needs. Mr. Hoffman appropriately directed further study. The European nations themselves made a further report last October.

I have supported the ECA program. I felt it was necessary to restore the economy of western Europe, devastated by the tragic war. I felt it was necessary to prevent continued Communist aggression and without it I firmly believe all of those countries would now be dominated by communistic ideologies.

However, I did not propose, and it was not so intended that economic windfalls develop and selfish advantages promoted, but here is an example of what happened. The ECA nations themselves, in their report in October, tremendously reduced their refinery plans. ECA officials told them they asked for more than they needed and they reduced their request to 45 percent.

Just what is the effect of this and other such plans?

I think the National Petroleum Council, composed of men from all phases of the American industry, established for the purpose of advising the Secretary of the Interior on petroleum matters, would be good authority. They recently had a meeting in Washington. In their report to the Secretary of Interior on the British embargo, they said:

> The data indicate that the British and British-Dutch oil companies are, and propose to continue, expanding their facilities to produce and refine oil in amounts substantially in excess of the amounts they could reasonably expect to sell on a competitive basis.

The Council concluded in its report to the Secretary:

> The British policies, if continued, could compel the petroleum industry of this Nation to surrender the international oil trade to the British, because the dollar markets of the United States could not possibly absorb sufficient imports to satisfy the concession obligations of the American-owned foreign concessions, without demoralizing the domestic industry with consequent serious injury to the domestic economy and national security.

I think this is a fair conclusion of the actual situation and accurately surmises what we might expect.

It can very well be pointed out also that these restrictions by the British work in two ways.

In the first place we traditionally have been exporters to Europe of refined products. By cutting us off quite naturally leaves such refined products on our home market. This further reduces production and curtails refining and further affects the economy by putting a lot of people out of work. In addition to reducing production beyond a safe measure for the best conservation practices, it reduces jobs, employment.

In the second place, by requiring that all of the crude oil coming to British refineries must come only from nondollar sources, this cuts off the only other important market American companies in Venezuela and the Middle East have except the United States. This can only mean more and more imports or curtailment of our American companies operating abroad.

We can take care of only so much imports and we should supplement our industry with appropriate and adequate imports. Going beyond the limit not only means a displaced industry here but in the curtailing of our American companies, operations abroad vitally affects our foreign policies and agreements we have with certain nations.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a simple question. Certainly as I say there is a place for oil imports in the home market but again there is a point beyond which imports will do untold damage to one of the most important industries in America.

There is little wonder that the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, has too just

announced that he is greatly alarmed over the situation.

Certainly the purchase of oil and oil products presents a current large requirement to the British of dollars which they desire in part to save. It is also true that immediate saving of dollars in the long term may mean a significant change in the complexion of the world oil picture.

Therefore, it is only proper that serious and deliberate discussions on such a vital topic continue and that actions be taken as the result of weighty consideration.

I think, and evidently the Secretary of State thinks, as well as the oil industry of this country, that someone in Britain acted very hasty in announcing such unilateral action last December.

Perhaps it was the same party who wrote the members of the British Commonwealth that "The Americans have, as expected, not gone beyond expressing regret at proposals" to substitute the surplus production by British companies for dollar oil imported into the sterling area. I have a copy of this letter, which I will include with the statement because it clearly sets out, I think, the full effect of the British proposals. It is an amazing and interesting statement. It was made in December which makes the announcement yesterday even more important. Evidently there must be a definite retreat from this frank position, recognizing the colossal blunder.

When our committee completes its investigation on this and the other problems in the field of petroleum, we will again advise the House and the Congress that you may know what is going on in the programs that we provide in the best interest for our people and our future security.

The following is a letter addressed to the east African government at Nairobi by the British Secretary of State:

DECEMBER 19, 1949.

OIL SUPPLIES

Following the meeting of Ministers in Washington in September, a special group of officials was formed in Washington to consider oil problems. In this group, United Kingdom representatives explained in detail how the dollar drain in oil arises and made it plain that in the immediate future United Kingdom would be obliged to adopt a policy of substitution in sterling for dollar oil to reduce the drain. In this it is hoped to secure the cooperation of sterling commonwealth countries.

2. Until recently cost of dollar oil which British companies had to buy in order to meet the gap between their supply and demand represented a dollar outgoing over and above the dollar expenditure incurred in producing their own oil. These "deficit" purchases—apart from speciality oils have now ended and in coming years it is expected that British companies' availability of fuel oil and possibly of other products will exceed their normal trade requirements. In the immediate future the surpluses are not expected to be substantial except in the case of fuel oil (which does not (repeat not) include gas oil or Diesel oil).

3. United States Government have now been informed of substance of proposals for substituting this surplus production by British companies for dollar oil imported into the sterling area by United Kingdom companies. The Americans have, as expected, not gone beyond expressing regret at proposals and steps have now been taken to put scheme into effect in United Kingdom and to obtain cooperation of dominion governments. It is now desired to arrange full substitution of sterling fuel oil for dollar oil at present imported into east Africa for inland consumption. It is not (repeat not) intended to substitute sterling oil for fuel oil imports destined for use in ships' bunkers.

4. By "substitution" is meant replacement of dollar oil imports by equivalent imports from British-controlled sources. It is not intended to interfere with United States companies' internal distribution business. For this purpose "dollar oil" means the oil which United States-controlled companies obtain from Standard (New Jersey) Standard Vacuum, Socony, Standard (California), Tex Oil Corp., and Caltex (or any of their associates such as Bahrein Petroleum Company). In this category there is not included oil which any of these American companies purchase and ship from British-controlled companies' sources, such as the Abadan and Curacao refineries.

5. United States-controlled companies would be left to decide whether they would make good the reduction in their imports of dollar oil by purchases from nondollar sources. Assurance has been given by British companies that they are in principle willing to sell their surplus fuel oil to American companies, but these arrangements can be left to commercial negotiations between British and American companies. Should an American distributing company decide to curtail its trade, British companies or, indeed, other American companies should have little difficulty in taking over the additional business. Anything more than minor curtailment of this kind appears unlikely judging by the attitude of the head offices of United States companies in the general discussions Ministry of Fuel and Power have had with them.

6. British companies are not expected to have any appreciable surpluses in the near future of products other than fuel oil. In the case of fuel oil, there will be more than enough available from British-controlled companies' production in 1950 to take the place of all dollar imports of fuel oil for inland consumption in the commonwealth. Failure to dispose of this fuel-oil output may well result in a reduction in British companies' output of other products. On this account and because of the important dollar saving that can be achieved United States-controlled companies importing into the United Kingdom have been informed of intention to introduce fuel-oil substitution in respect of all their imports from dollar sources as from the 1st of January 1950. I hope that the east African governments will be able to operate fuel-oil substitution from the same date, though some postponement may have to be accepted, e. g., to enable the companies to adjust their shipping programs.

7. United States companies with whom Ministry of Fuel and Power have discussed arrangements for substitution in the United Kingdom may be warning their subsidiaries in east Africa that similar arrangements may be applied to their imports.

8. I must leave it to the colonial governments to decide how substitution can best be administered. Should there be difficulty in controlling the source of fuel-oil imports by a system of cargo licensing, etc., it should be possible to ensure sterling origin on imports by ad hoc arrangements agreed with the companies on whom will rest the onus of proof.

9. Any fuel-oil imports by United States companies which are already being bought by them from British-controlled companies will, of course, rank as sterling oil, but oil supplied from Bahrein although invoiced in sterling ranks as dollar oil for the purpose of substitution, since Bahrein is fundamentally a dollar source.

10. Please inform me as soon as possible of the action being taken.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of the amendment.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me that I may ask a question of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] on January 25 introduced a resolution, a rather comprehensive resolution, intended to recommend a national fuel policy. Being a member of the subcommittee under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], I would like to ask at this time if the inquiry will be extended to include possibly the development of a national fuel policy?

Mr. HARRIS. Insofar as the discussions in the committee are concerned thus far, I do not believe there has been any intention up to this time to go into it any further than with reference to petroleum. I assume you are talking about electrical energy, coal, and all other phases of the fuel industry?

Mr. HESELTON. I am.

Mr. HARRIS. There has been no indication that such an extensive hearing and investigation will be undertaken. I think we will have our hands full, however, in going into the problems of the petroleum industry itself.

Mr. HESELTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make inquiry of the chairman of the subcommittee. Over a year ago I visited one of our nationally advertised clothing manufacturing concerns located in the city of Chicago. While there I was impressed by the operators of this plant with the scarcity of highly skilled hand tailors in that establishment. As I looked back over this large manufacturing room, I noticed that the men who were working in the coat-making section of this plant were all men from 60 to 75 years of age. I inquired of him as to why no younger tailors were available. He said that the young American boys did not care to go into that type of work; that they prefer to go into radio, automobile manufacturing, and other types of mechanical work, and that there was a great scarcity of hand craft, skilled tailors in the Nation, due to the fact that in times past most of our hand craft, skilled tailors came from foreign countries.

The question I wish to ask is this: Under the terms of this bill, would it be possible for highly skilled tailors to come in?

Mr. WALTER. Yes. Under section 5 the situation the gentleman is discussing is dealt with. In section 6, which has to do with the board, you will find the board is provided for which will pass on the question of whether or not these people actually are skilled, within the provisions of the law, and whether it is possible to obtain the services of people possessing similar skills in the United States. Very definitely, in the type of case the gentleman is talking about, people could be covered by this law.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to have that assurance, because I know that some of our great clothing manufacturing plants have in the last few years moved into Canada, just for the reason that they could not obtain the type of skilled employees they need. They have set up branch manufacturing plants in Canada, due to the foresight of the Canadian Government in making provision that such highly skilled people could come into Canada. I am glad to see that the bill provides for that, and I am heartily in support of it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has expired.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I am conscious, as I know most of the Members are conscious, of the dearth of physicians in the rural areas of this country. I wish to inquire of the very able chairman of the subcommittee which has reported this bill, whether or not this bill will permit the entrance into this country of doctors and physicians who may be brought to our rural areas, to serve our rural people with adequate medical service.

Can the gentleman from Pennsylvania answer the question as to whether or not doctors from Vienna, for instance, may be brought into this country to work in rural areas?

Mr. WALTER. The doctors may be brought here, of course, if they qualify under the State laws and are eligible to practice in the several States. I am sure the gentleman is concerned with the question of who would make the showing before the Board; that is, what legal entity could make the presentation requesting these services. I believe that if the gentleman examines the language on page 2, line 16, he will reach the conclusion that any corporation, public or private, may make the application. In the case the gentleman has in mind I should think that the commissioners of the county could make the application to the Board requesting permission to bring a certain doctor into that particular community.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Has any evidence been submitted to the gentleman's committee indicating that any doctor, lawyer, or dentist in Vienna, or any other European country, desires to come here under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. WALTER. Yes; as a matter of fact the committee just reported two private bills, one by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and the other by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] for the relief of two doctors who are in the United States attached to institutions in New York and in Massachusetts, who have been prevailed upon by the authorities of those institutions to attempt to remain here and continue the work they are presently engaged in.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, the gentleman stated that if a small community desires the services of a Canadian doctor, for example, that that community may through its county commissioners or its city government petition the Board created by this bill, and the Board will give consideration to such an application permitting him to come in under these circumstances so that this alien doctor will practice in that community; is that right?

Mr. WALTER. That is the intention of the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a good bill, and I am gladly supporting it for that very purpose.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. R. 301 which has been introduced by the able gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], chairman of the subcommittee. This bill will, I believe, afford necessary relief to cases such as one with which I am personally acquainted. This case involves two Burmese nurses who gave so much voluntary aid and assistance to our soldiers during the famous march of Bataan. Their ready and able and unselfish service made it possible to save many lives and to ease the pain of many of our soldiers.

Today these nurses are serving and studying under student visas in a hospital in New Jersey. However, they are always subject to deportation if they overstay, or will be compelled to leave when their time of visit expires. This would subject them to return to an unfriendly atmosphere.

I think this would hardly be gratitude for two heroines of the war.

They are skilled and their services are necessary. I believe that cases such as theirs would be covered by this bill—at least I am hopeful that it would be so. Therefore, I support it.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article stressing the great importance of the poultry industry in the State of Connecticut which this week is celebrating Poultry Week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas (at the request of Mr. HARRIS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF FEBRUARY 6, 1950

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute in order to ask my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, about the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday the Consent Calendar will be called, and we will take up the bill (S. 88) to amend section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act.

Tuesday: On Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called, and we will take up the bill S. 2319, the far eastern aid bill.

Wednesday is Calendar Wednesday.

I have no further program for next week to announce at this time except to say that, of course, should any conference reports be filed they are always in order. Any further program for the remainder of the week I will announce as quickly as I possibly can.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Can the distinguished majority leader give us any inkling of what might come up on Calendar Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads is the first committee on the call, that the next one is the Committee on the District of Columbia, and that the third is the Committee on Education and Labor. I have no definite knowledge. My interest in that day, of course, cannot be as direct as it is in other days, because what bills are called up on that day are matters that lie with the chairman of the committees. On last Wednesday, however, I was informed that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] had several bills that he could call up on Calendar Wednesday.

I assume that same situation will exist for next Wednesday. I am also informed that the Committee on the District of Columbia will probably have some bills.

That is the best information I can give to the gentleman at this time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM THURSDAY UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE SUBPENAING OF A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House and send to the desk a subpena which has been served on me and ask that it be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT—THE UNITED STATES V. HAROLD ROLAND CHRISTOFFEL, NO. 791–47, CRIMINAL DOCKET

The President of the United States to JOHN LESINSKI, House of Representatives Office Building, 429 Old House Office Building.

You are hereby commanded to attend the said Court on Monday, the 6th day of February 1950 at 10 o'clock a. m. to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the Minute Book(s) of the Committee on Education and Labor of the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses of the United States and not depart the Court without leave thereof.

Witness, the Honorable Chief Justice of said Court, the 1st day of February A. D. 1950.

[SEAL] HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By EDWARD J. SKEENS,
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 460) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Representative JOHN LESINSKI, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpena duces tecum to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to testify at 10 a. m., on the 6th day of February 1950, in the case of the *United States* v. *Harold Roland Christoffel* (No. 791–47, Criminal Docket); and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify but by the order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative JOHN LESINSKI is authorized to appear in response to the subpena duces tecum of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in the case of the *United States* v. *Harold Roland Christoffel,* at such time as when the House is not sitting in session, but shall not take with him the papers and records requested in said subpena; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena of the said court.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman for an inquiry.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, the question I would like to direct to the gentleman from Massachusetts and the membership of the House is the following: If there is documentary evidence in the possession of the House which may mean the difference between the establishment of the guilt or innocence of any person on trial, I do not think it will sit well with the American people for us to withhold that documentary evidence, irrespective of the character of the trial. A man is on trial. His liberty is at stake. Certain charges are made against him. The defendant applies to the court for a subpena duces tecum which is issued in the exercise of the discretion of the presiding judge. Here we now say in the House, "You shall not have this documentary evidence." If this documentary evidence establishes the innocence of the defendant, why should we withhold it? If, on the other hand, this documentary evidence establishes his guilt, again, why should we withhold it? I think we are establishing a very bad precedent here, and I say in furtherance of justice in our courts we should not withhold documents that will establish either the guilt or the innocence of any defendant, unless there happens to be something secret in these documents, the revelation of which might impair the security of the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say to the gentleman from New York, I do not know if he was here a few weeks ago when the House adopted a resolution permitting the records of the Eightieth Congress to be made available in accordance with the time-honored precedent that exists between the two branches of Government, the legislative and the judicial.

My friend from New York, I think, is proceeding upon a premise that does not exist. This resolution does not deny the records of the Eightieth Congress being made available. If the court finds that they are relevant, and the gentleman being a lawyer himself knows that, the question of the admissibility of evidence is a matter of law for the court to pass upon. Opportunity to examine the records has been given.

This resolution follows along the lines of another one, though he probably has forgotten it, but if he knew of it he would realize that the fears that he expresses are in no way involved. There is the resolution:

Whereas in the case of the *United States* v. *Harold Roland Christoffel* (No. 791–47, criminal docket), pending in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, subpena duces tecum was issued by the chief justice of said court and addressed to Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court on the 19th day of January 1950, at 10 o'clock antemeridian, and to bring with him certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpena duces tecum before mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as Clerk of the House; be it further

Resolved, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpena duces tecum then the said court through any of its officers or agents have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any documents or papers in possession or control of said clerk that the court has found to be material and relevant, except minutes and transcripts of executive sessions, and any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said clerk shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their file or custody under said clerk; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena aforementioned.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, then I would have no objection to the present resolution if the present resolution contained the same language. Your present resolution merely says, unless I am very much mistaken, that the gentleman from Michigan shall not produce these documents.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. And it stops there.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, but the documents of the Eightieth Congress are not in the possession of the gentleman from Michigan. They are in the possession of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and my friend knows that.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. All right. Why not state in that resolution, then, that if the court so decides on the materiality of this evidence——

Mr. McCORMACK. This resolution is directly related to the one I just read. They have to be considered together. Copies can be brought down by the Clerk if the court considers them to be material and relevant. We have already paved the way, if they will serve a subpena upon the proper person, who is the Clerk of the House of Representatives in connection with the records of the Eightieth Congress, and not the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The distinguished majority leader predicates this resolution, then, on the proposition that these documents are not within the control of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. McCORMACK. Not the documents of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LESINSKI. In explanation, may I say that the minutes were made available, as was reported by my clerk, to the attorneys in this case. After they reviewed and went all over the minutes of the Eightieth Congress, the papers were returned to the custody of the Clerk.

They were not in possession of the papers of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Every opportunity has been given to the attorneys for the defendant to see such records as are proper for them to see. Is that right?

Mr. LESINSKI. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. They should address the summons to the Clerk of the House. The gentleman from Michigan does not have possession of the records. We know that at the end of a Congress the Clerk of the House obtains possession and control of them. Therefore, we have done everything possible to cooperate with the defendant in presenting his case and to cooperate with the court. It is now a question for the court to pass upon the materiality and relevancy of the records.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. As a layman and, as a Member of the House, jealous of the rights and prerogatives of the Congress, I want to make this observation, and I invite the attention of my colleague [Mr. LESINSKI]. Appearing as a witness, if the question is presented to the gentleman with regard to whether or not a quorum was present, the gentleman should respectfully decline to answer the question and inform the court that this House is not beholden to the courts or in any way responsible to anyone outside its own membership. If that question was not raised in committee, it is out of order in the courts.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand, this resolution simply follows the precedents of the House?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. MICHENER. We had this same matter up and it was discussed very thoroughly in the last Congress, I believe. I think it was decided to the satisfaction of my friend from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]. May I ask him if that is not correct?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is correct. I see the point the majority leader is making. He contends that this subpena should be served on the Clerk of the House, who is the only person who has possession of the documents of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. And if they proceed in accordance with the previous resolution, it will be consistent with precedent.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Lowell Sun.

Mr. DAVENPORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and to include extraneous material in each.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

AGRICULTURE IN MIDCENTURY

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, at the midpoint of the twentieth century, the performances of the American economy, and particularly American industry, are justly acknowledged to be perhaps the greatest economic achievements of modern history. Yet, at the very time that industry and commerce are at their peaks, the public is vaguely conscious that American agriculture is again passing through a period of stress, change, and difficulty which threaten further crisis.

To Americans who live in the great consuming areas of America, in huge urban centers, I say, "Learn more about the farmer. Learn of his life, his work, his problems. Try to appreciate the effort he puts forth to help all of us to the highest living standards in history."

ENORMOUS PRODUCTIVITY OF AMERICAN FARMERS

While most Americans are aware of the existence of agriculture, it often seems that they have little understanding of its real problems or of the critical fundamental role that agriculture plays in creating economic strength and stability. Our world has been shaken by the coming of machines and mass production and is now dominated by the miracles of industry and science, to an extent without parallel in the past. But even in the midst of this tide of technology and the resulting immense growth of cities and factories, the basic economic interest of humanity is still to draw from nature the food and sustenance upon which life depends.

The city dweller casually takes for granted an apparently inexhaustible food supply. He seldom thinks of the long struggle with nature which stands back of the great variety, immense quantity, and high quality of the fruits, meats, grains, vegetables, dairy products, or other commodities of the farm which are so easily purchased in a store. But far from being able to live solely by industry, the modern city dweller is more dependent upon the farmer than in any previous era.

In 1790 a city person consumed surplus products of about 19 farmers. Today on an average, three or four city dwellers are fed from the surplus production of one farmer. (Reference: Smith, J. R., and Phelps, N. O., The Place and Nature of Agriculture, Industrial and Commercial Geography, Holt, N. Y., 1947, p. 380.) As recently as 75 years ago, the majority of our people lived on farms or in farm communities, and more than half of all employment was in agriculture. Today, only a fifth of the populace is attached to farms and less than a fifth of the gainfully employed work in agriculture.

AGRICULTURE IS BASIC IN AMERICAN ECONOMY

Despite their decrease in percentage of population, agriculturalists remain among the most fundamental group, the most decentralized, the most widespread. Farming reaches across a billion acres, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico. Farming is performed on a little less than 6,000,000 units, small and large. More than 28,000,000 people live on farms, 8,000,000 of them engaged directly in agricultural employment. (Reference: United States Census estimates.)

Even in the machine age, no nation can become commercially or industrially important until after it has developed sources of agricultural supplies. No nation can maintain its position for very long as an industrial leader unless its agricultural resources remain strong and productive.

Our own domestic agriculture is today the first and the basic resource of our national economy, after giving full recognition to the huge flow of goods in the world market. Factories must obtain much of their raw materials from agriculture. The population must be fed from the farmer's crops and livestock, and clothed from the wool and cotton which come from the farms.

Mines may be exhausted, industries outmoded, displaced, or transformed. But agriculture is continuously renewed. If well done it is a permanent resource, using Nature's laws of growth to replenish what is taken from Nature's store. In the long run, the firmest claim to strength, prosperity, and duration that our Nation or any nation has, is its soil. Its most important basic industry is agriculture.

The gulf of misunderstanding which today often prevents consumers from appreciating the place of agriculture, and the true service which the farmer renders to our national life, is the result of thinking that is influenced by the city-living and industrial employment which has become so important an activity of the American people. There is a loss of the realization that the land is the first of economic values, and farming the first of essential occupations. We have forgotten, as Ralph Waldo Emerson once said, that "the first farmer was the first man."

From this standpoint the greatest achievement of American economic history is the ability of so few farmers to feed and clothe so many. Only because of the tremendous strides in agricultural productivity in the last century it is possible today for a farm population representing only a fifth of the total to provide sustenance for 150,000,000 people and have something left over.

No other economy, no other group, has matched this accomplishment of American farmers. Because their efforts have been in the past so effective, the American people have been able to expand, to divert human energy to industry, to build great cities, and to become the most productive, richest, best fed, best clothed, best housed nation in the

world. We boast that we are better off than others. We should recognize what we owe to American agriculture. It is well to remember that without the human sustenance brought from the earth there can be no well-being in the cities.

MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT AGRICULTURE

This development is too often overlooked and conveniently forgotten by those who are mainly occupied with manufacturing, or whose lives are separated by the steel and concrete of the metropolis from contact with the land. Many American people having their roots in the soil tend to lose a clear grasp of the significance of agriculture to their well-being, and to underrate the degree to which their own welfare rests upon that of agriculture.

Thus, misled by impressions which they do not stop to examine, many housewives in the cities and a large part of the consuming public often blame the farmer for excessive food prices. They conclude without justice and without knowing the facts that farmers are gouging them, are growing rich at the expense of the Nation, or are receiving unearned and undeserved benefits.

There are many ways to answer this attitude, and a real need to correct it. Let the city family reflect upon the amount of effort which would be necessary if it were faced with the necessity of providing its own foodstuffs, the material for its own clothes, or even the transportation and distribution of these goods. But a farm family can still meet a large part of its basic needs independently, in a way that city folks cannot. It thus becomes apparent that in reality it is the consumer who enjoys the greater benefit of the exchange.

Modern farmers are not as completely self-sufficient as they were a century ago, or even 50 years ago. The efficient farmer today, producing enough to feed himself and also a number of city consumers besides, meets many more problems, much more complex, than his grandfather did in getting his products to the consumer.

If, for example, a housekeeper in the city buys a loaf of bread or a pound of meat, the price she pays includes not only the original price to the farmer who grew them. It also includes the cost of processing, storing, shipping, commission for wholesale merchants, and a reasonable profit to the grocer who serves her. These items of cost, and many more, must be met, not only to maintain efficient distribution of food, but to allow the farmer to be able to raise the food at all.

Out of every dollar that is spent for food generally much less than half actually goes back to the farmer. (Reference: Farmers in a Changing World, USDA Yearbook, 1940, p. 53 and following; also current 1949 bulletin.) What is more, this payment, small as it is, must suffice the farmer to buy the things he must have from industry to maintain himself and to meet the costs which go on regardless of his income. It is a fact that farmers receive, even in the best years, only a small percent of our national income. Often it is not enough to meet their minimum needs, their fixed costs, or the desirable level of consumption by themselves and their families of the products of industry.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I wish to congratulate the gentleman for the wonderful contribution he is making to the cause of agriculture. He said a moment ago that agriculture was the first industry in the world, and, of course, it will be the last. The gentleman represents one of the greatest agricultural States in the Union. I wonder if he would mention the problem of soil conservation and its importance to the permanency of agriculture? I am sure the gentleman is aware that in his own State of Iowa is one of the pioneer counties in soil conservation in the United States, namely, Marion County. It was one of the first and has gone further in the practice of soil conservation than any county in any State in the Union.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I thank the gentleman, my colleague from Iowa, for his statement. I will touch upon the question of soil conservation a little later in my remarks.

FARMER TAKES RISKS—ALWAYS

The revolution in industry and the impact of the machine age upon agriculture have created the so-called agricultural problem, which is, in fact, a host of related problems. To understand what is involved, it is necessary to have a clear idea of the essential difference between agriculture and industry. Unlike the manufacturer, the farmer must be a perpetual pioneer. He must take risks that he cannot control. He must produce over a relatively long period for a future market. He is unable to cut his losses or increase his gains by any immediate action once he has begun the process of production. Nature largely determines the course of agricultural output. The farmer may plant and tend his crops with care, raise them to full ripeness, and then lose the fruits of his labor overnight through a sudden change in weather or a drought.

The farmer cannot turn a switch and stop his corn from growing. He cannot speed the time it takes for a calf to grow and give milk or halt the cow from giving because prices have changed. He must plan his production ahead, often for several years.

The same conditions affect farmer's costs. Every year he must pay fixed costs in cash for taxes, interest, seed, fertilizer, equipment, repairs, fuel, and many other items. The prices he receives are sensitive to every change in demand, every fluctuation of supply. He is in direct competition with every other producer. The prices of farm goods are inescapably competitive and flexible.

The prices of the goods the farmer must buy are relatively inflexible, much less competitive, and usually much higher in proportion to what he receives. Moreover, the farmer is always subject to monopoly forces in other branches of the economy. When prices of industrial products are fixed at high levels through monopoly or rigid costs in industry, while farm products are sold competitively, the farmer cannot bargain on equal terms. If he sells in competition with other farmers to great distributing organizations that are in a position to pick and choose, to wait him out or go elsewhere, he cannot hold his bargaining position and is forced to sacrifice by taking what he can get at the moment.

As a result, the farmer may find that if he cuts production, the price gap between industrial goods and his crops remains and he is left with a smaller income. If he increases production his own prices may fall in a glutted market, and he is no better, but frequently worse off.

It is this inequality, this profound distinction between agriculture and industry that has produced a continuous crisis for the farmer throughout the last 30 years. It has been stated by a leading expert on the subject that in contrast to industry American farmers for the past generation have been compelled to sell their output almost continuously below the actual cost of production. (Reference: Zimmerman, E., World Resources and Industries, pp. 162–171.)

LOSSES SUFFERED BY AGRICULTURE

The truth of this statement is borne out by the memory of what the farmers have experienced since 1919. For agriculture, the great depression began in the price fall of 1920–21, immediately after World War I. Throughout the twenties the distress of farmers was reflected in mounting debts and mortgages, increasingly tight credit, a loss of agricultural purchasing power, and an inability to make the ends of costs and incomes meet, or even to stay near one another. That was certainly the plight of American farming in the fabulous twenties.

When a depression occurred in industry and finance in 1929, in large part caused by the years of agricultural distress, the meaning of these conditions became grimly evident. During the years from 1929 to 1933 the output of agriculture declined only 6 percent but the prices of farm products fell 63 percent; in no other field of activity was there a remotely similar behavior. In manufactures it was output which declined: 80 percent in farm machinery, 80 percent in automobiles, 83 percent in steel, while prices fell only 6 percent to 16 percent, or at most 20 percent. Failures and foreclosures, further loss of purchasing power, and despair of recovery were the farmer's share on an ever greater scale. (Reference: Zimmerman, E., World Resources and Industries, Harper, N. Y., 1938, pp. 161–170; Smith and Phillips, loc. cit.)

During World War II, responding to the pleas and needs of the Nation, and the cry of allied peoples for food, American agriculture produced magnificent crops efficiently, cheaply, and in unmatched variety and quality. It is a known fact that the average American family had more to eat, and ate better during the war years, than ever before. At the same time, our farmers produced

such an abundance of food that we had surpluses to share with our allies.

Now again in a postwar period, the economy is prosperous, but the difficulties of the farmer are increasing. There have been ominous warning signs of a renewal of the agricultural crisis. There is a growing gap between the prices of what the farmer sells and the machines, fuel, and necessaries he must buy to keep on producing.

In the Midwest, it has been estimated that farm prices have gone down for many products an average of 50 percent, while prices of some farm supplies have risen 25 percent within the postwar years. These opposing spirals are dangerous, a peril to the whole economy. (Reference: USDA indexes show that eggs and some other dairy products decline was more than this, in period September 1947 to September 1949, while farm machinery index went up nearly one-third.)

Here are some very interesting comments derived from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics concerning the squeeze that the farmers of the Midwest, the food producers of this Nation, are now undergoing.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture summarizes the price spreads between the farmers and the consumers by computing the annual retail cost of a market basket of food for a family of three average consumers together with the distribution of this cost between the farmer and the marketing system. At the prices prevailing in July 1948, the annual retail cost of this market basket for three people would have been $712.

In October 1949 the same quantity of food could be purchased for $637. During this period the retail cost of an annual food supply for a family of three fell $75. The farm price of this food fell $69. Charges made for services performed after the commodities left the farm declined only $6. Of the $75 decline in cost, the farmer absorbed $69.

It seems to me that the farmer is entitled to receive a dollar for every dollar's worth he sells, and get a dollar's worth for every dollar he spends.

One fact is emphatic, certain, and clear. A free and democratic society cannot afford to be indifferent or neglectful of the welfare of agriculture and the farmers. Such indifference or neglect risks the loss of a vital source of our strength, our future well-being, and our ability to remain a fortress of independence and freedom in the world.

CITY PEOPLE SHOULD KNOW MORE ABOUT FOOD PRODUCTION

To the men and women living in our great cities, I say again, "Learn more about the farmer."

The farmer is not to blame for the seemingly high prices you pay for food. His share is only a minor percentage of the final price to the consumer. Remember that the factory worker who packs food or the transportation worker who moves it to markets across the Nation, belongs to unions which obtain high wages. But the farmer is not organized in the same way. He receives for his labor, his patient and lengthy struggle with the elements and the soil, whatever supply and demand may bring.

If the farmer has no purchasing power, American factories lose a vast potential market. If the farmer is forced or permitted to live in depression, his situation influences the entire economy. In time it will undermine prosperity. Industry cannot remain prosperous while agriculture goes into bankruptcy. If the farmer is not given a genuine chance to establish his economic life on a sound basis, the banker, the manufacturer, the union member, and the office worker will in the years to come feel the effects of his loss. Towns, cities, and industry cannot flourish if the country, the land, and farming decay.

The well-being of the farmer and of the consumer in the city are inseparable links in the great chain of production. When both prosper, the whole economy goes forward, the standard of living rises, and the Nation's growth is assured. It is therefore the direct concern of the consumer to know, to aid, and to promote the farmer's interest as his own. The consumer should recognize the achievements of agriculture as benefits to himself. He should develop his own economic future by helping the farmer to do the same. Despite the changed position of agriculture in the modern era of science, industry, and urbanization, men must not forget the fruit of the land, and the work of the farm that sustains their lives.

A FARM PROGRAM SUGGESTED

There is a disagreement as to what ought to be done to meet the situation. A study of the whole matter has caused me to come to the following tentative conclusions for an agricultural plan which might be satisfactory and produce a rational and workable program for United States agriculture.

First. Commodity loans as practiced over the past decade or more are a proven way to support the prices on basic nonperishable commodities.

This plan has worked well and has very substantial support from the farmers themselves.

Second. The support of perishable commodities is a very difficult matter. Compensatory payments on important perishable commodities such as eggs, pork and butter seem necessary to prevent loss to the producer where no other method is feasible. Otherwise, the Commodity Credit Corporation finds itself holding perishable goods off the market at great expense for so long that they spoil and become worthless.

If price support is to be given to perishables, which was not contemplated in the beginning of the price-support program, then compensatory payments may be the answer as a last resort and as a temporary measure to cushion unreasonable price declines.

Third. Flexible price support should apply to both types of commodities, perishable and nonperishable. It is designed to bring about a balanced production and avoid excessive surpluses. Use of flexible price supports will minimize the necessity for compensatory payments for perishables, and will be a means of preventing overproduction of nonperishables, and help us to avoid police state controls.

Fourth. Present program consists principally of acreage controls with minimum soil conservation practices involved. The new program should re-establish and strengthen those conservation practices as begun in the period before the war.

This suggestion is quite different from the so-called Brannan plan. That proposal, it appears, promises "farmers, high prices; consumers, cheap food; and it isn't going to cost anybody" much.

The proposal would result in making mendicants out of farmers because their net income would be dependent upon Government hand-outs. It could not possibly mean cheap food unless the subsidies ran into many billions. Furthermore the controls that would result from high fixed prices would destroy the farmer's freedom of action and the payments bankrupt the Government. Instead, I am advocating compensatory payments on perishables as a supplement to the program already proven workable by experience.

I believe that this program will encourage the changing of feed grains into meat products.

OPPORTUNITY IN FARMING FOR YOUTH

Young men going into farming must have the same opportunities, the same sense of reward for hard work, and an equal chance to combat economic hazards on fair terms that are afforded to the young entrants into other fields. The American farmer has a right, indeed a prior claim, to a chance to build for the future on the foundations of a sound economic position, rather than on the economics of a struggle for survival against the overwhelming weight of industry.

To preserve the agricultural way of life, and to bring the bounty of its production to the full for the mutual interest of farm, industry, and consumer, this must be the goal of our policy. It will require the most complete nonpartisan cooperation, guided by a joint understanding of the meaning of agriculture, to achieve this aim.

But it must be brought about soon. If the farmer's destiny is destroyed, much of the hopes of freedom and representative self-government will be lost, too. By strengthening agriculture, by helping it to meet the intricate questions posed by a new age, this Nation can assure its own ultimate ability to master the tasks that lie ahead.

A WORD OF WELCOME TO VISITING JAPANESE LEGISLATORS

Mr. KRUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. KRUSE. Mr. Speaker, a group of visiting Japanese legislators will be present in Washington in the near future in connection with their trip to this country made for the express purpose of observing our democratic processes. In this connection I cannot help but note the recent demonstration wherein democracy failed of its purpose. I am referring to the action of some members of the Boston City Council in barring from their proceedings this visiting delegation. The action is regrettable, but I cannot help but note that certainly these gentlemen are witnessing at first hand the strange ways in which democracy works. Perhaps the action at Boston has served a purpose. Certainly it has focused our attention on the purpose of their visit, which purpose is commendable, indeed. It is altogether fitting that I call your attention to the fact that both the Governor and legislative body of Massachusetts have welcomed this visiting group. I applaud their action.

Surely it is for us at this time to demonstrate our faith and hopes that mankind will rededicate itself to those principles of justice and selflessness without which no lasting honorable peace can be attained.

It was my opportunity recently to visit Japan. While there I witnessed the unusual progress that has been made and particularly insofar as the political reorientation of the Japanese people is concerned.

Permit me to read to you from a letter which I have just received from Mr. Joseph Dodge, prominent financial advisor to General MacArthur. He proceeds as follows:

> In no nation has so much been accomplished with so little direct financial aid; Japan is the only nation that actually has done the things necessary to place its Government fiscal affairs under proper control, in contrast to the need to do so in other nations where it has not been done.
>
> When these factors are added to the political and strategic stake we have in Japan, it seems to me we should do everything within reason to maintain the financial stabilization and encourage the political and labor stabilization that has been achieved so far.

I subscribe to his statements.

As one who fought against the Japanese in World War II, as a legislator who recently returned to Japan in time of peace, and finally as a citizen, I wish to extend a word of welcome to these Japanese visitors and to wish them well in their sincere efforts to learn the ways of democracy. I feel certain millions of Americans share my sentiments.

(Mr. CARROLL (at the request of Mr. KRUSE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include extraneoous matter.)

THE FARMERS' PROBLEMS AND THE BRANNAN PLAN

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, I have just listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] in his discussion of the problems of the farmers. I was somewhat amazed, I must say, to hear him endorsing compensatory payments, that is, subsidy payments on perishable commodities, and then turn around and condemn the Brannan plan. I do not think anybody can be confused about that matter. I think everybody recognizes the thing which has been referred to in the press constantly of late as the Brannan plan is the compensatory payment feature on perishable commodities of the recent legislation offered in the House by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan.

The gentleman went on further, or perhaps it was earlier in his speech, when he made reference to the prices dropping from 1929 to 1933, dropping 36 percent on the things that the farmer sells, and production, mind you, only dropping 6 percent in the same length of time. Now, there is a perfect example of just how ineffective the Republican flexible price-support program is in controlling production. You have a perfect case where the prices went down and bankrupted all the farmers and bankrupted the whole country, and did the natural law of supply and demand stop the production? It did not. According to my Republican colleague's own figures, production kept right on.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that the only way American agriculture can get its house in order as industry does is to submit to controls. I am a farmer myself. I like freedom just as much as anybody, but I am telling you this: That I prefer regulation, if you will, to bankruptcy.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield.

Mr. DOLLIVER. In response to what my friend from California has said, I want it perfectly clear, so far as I am concerned, I do not want regimentation for our farmers. I also want it perfectly clear, and I tried to make it clear in my previous statement that I am opposed to the Brannan plan.

Mr. WHITE of California. I think the gentleman made that perfectly clear. I think it is apparent to almost everyone the only reason the gentleman and his party are opposed to it is that it has the name Brannan on it and that it has been advanced by the Democratic administration.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a litle bit further about this so-called flexible-price proposition which the Republicans have offered and which the Farm Bureau is sponsoring. To me it is not only flexible, it is collapsible. The parity formula itself is flexible. Just check up down here at the Department of Agriculture and you will find every single month the parity figure is different, which proves that it is flexible within itself even if the farmers got 100 percent of parity. And speaking of parity I wish they would change that word "parity" and eliminate it and just use the words "fair prices"—why is not the farmer entitled to 100 percent of fair prices? He has to sell his goods in an unprotected market, yet he buys in a protected market. He could buy Czechoslovakian shoes cheaper in this country, and many other things much cheaper if he did not have to pay an import duty. Industry is fully protected by an import tariff. Labor is fully protected from cheap goods from abroad; but the American farmer has no protection. Yet, when we want to give him a square deal and protect him with what I call fair prices—not parity; that word is too technical and most people do not look into it to see what it means. It means fair prices. I submit the American farmer is entitled to 100 percent fair prices.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I disclaim any representation of the Republican Party. I want to make that perfectly clear. I spoke in my own behalf, and made a tentative suggestion, which I hope may be considered when permanent legislation is considered for the benefit of the farmer. I am one of those who is inclined to think that farm legislation belongs in a category which is nonpartisan.

Mr. WHITE of California. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Because all of us who represent farming districts do not come from either one or the other of the parties, but each of us who represents an agricultural area has a sympathy, and I think perhaps an understanding of the problems of everyone else who represents an agricultural area.

Mr. WHITE of California. I agree with the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE] has expired.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 947. An act for the relief of the Baggett Transportation Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1059. An act for the relief of John W. Wagner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1146. An act for the relief of Francis W. Dodge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1423. An act for the relief of Alex Morningstar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1769. An act to reimburse the Stebbins Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1863. An act for the relief of Fremont Rider; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1933. An act for the relief of C. L. Lefingwell and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2070. An act for the relief of the Clark Funeral Home; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2314. An act to provide for holding a term of the United States District Court for the District of Oregon at Eugene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2339. An act for the relief of the Davis Grocery Co., of Oneida, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2385. An act for the relief of Edward C. Ritche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2507. An act to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to grant to the East Bay Municipal Utility District, an

agency of the State of California, an easement for the construction and operation of an interceptor sewer pipe line in and under certain Government-owned lands comprising a part of the Maritime Alameda shipyard, Alameda, Calif.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2520. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted devised land on the Winnebago Reservation, Nebr.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 322. An act to transfer funds to the town of Craig, Alaska;

H. R. 746. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of August Michela, a minor;

H. R. 2585. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for exemption from duty of certain metallic impurities in tin ores and concentrates when such impurities are not recovered;

H. R. 4387. An act to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Treasury Department; and

H. R. 6212. An act to amend section 5 of the Federal Firearms Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KRUSE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 6, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1196. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, pursuant to Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress, for the month of December 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1197. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the Annual Report of the Food and Drug Administration, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1949; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1198. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a request for the return of the case of Piyoula Pantouli Ganat, nee Piyoula Nicolas Pantouli, file No. A-6884459 CR 26731; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1199. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the twenty-second quarterly report on contract settlement, covering the period October 1 through December 31, 1949; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1200. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Amy Louisa Shier"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1201. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to the act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741, 43 U. S. C., sec. 869); to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 874. A bill to provide for the demonstration of public-library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1574). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 3105. A bill to extend the benefits of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to the Virgin Islands; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1575). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Select Committee on Small Business. Report pursuant to House Resolution 22, resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business; without amendment (Rept. No. 1576). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 7121. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law title 21 of the United States Code, entitled "Food and Drugs"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H. R. 7122. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to provide, for individuals who have completed 30 years of service or attained the age of 60, annuities equal to one-half of the average compensation received by them during their five highest years of earnings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAURIELLO:

H. R. 7123. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, in order to provide more effective financial assistance for small business; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 7124. A bill to reduce the rate of duty on imports of ruled glass used for photographic reproductions or engraving processes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 7125. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and authorize a stamp plan; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 7126. A bill to increase the fee for executing an application for a passport or a visa from $1 to $3; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 7127. A bill to prevent military personnel from replacing civilians in the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 7128. A bill to prevent military personnel from replacing civilians in the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 7129. A bill to provide for the determination of claims to enrollment on the rolls of the Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek, Seminole, Delaware, and Osage Tribes of Indians; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 7130. A bill to amend chapter 83 of title 18, United States Code, so as to make certain unsolicited merchandise nonmailable and the transmission thereof through the United States mails a criminal offense; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 7131. A bill to amend section 322 (b) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 7132. A bill making the 17th day of September in each year a legal holiday to be known as Constitution Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 7133. A bill to amend section 82 of the Hawaiian Organic Act relating to justices of the supreme court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 7134. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to authorize delivery of surplus potatoes and eggs to the States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 7135. A bill to amend Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress, cited as the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 7136. A bill to amend Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress, cited as the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 7137. A bill to amend Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress, cited as the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 7138. A bill to amend Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress, cited as the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 7139. A bill to authorize delivery of surplus potatoes acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation to needy persons in areas affected by industrial work stoppages; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. J. Res. 411. Joint resolution establishing a commission for the review of Federal criminal procedure for the purpose of studying and investigating the existing statutes and rules of criminal procedure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 412. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and celebration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of Patriots' Day for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. J. Res. 413. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the filling of vacancies in the Senate and House of Representatives in the event of a major disaster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLTON of Maryland:

H. Res. 459. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' gratuity and $350 funeral expenses to Mrs. Anna M. Backof, widow of Henry J. Backof, late an employee of the House; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, requesting Congress to recognize the integrity of the

States by enacting proper legislation to prevent Federal liquor licenses from being issued to any inhabitant of any State wherein the sale of intoxicating liquors is prohibited; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, condemning alleged statements of Secretary of State Acheson pledging loyalty to Alger Hiss and requesting Congress to investigate the Department of State and other departments of Government and take action to rid such departments of all persons who do not measure up to the strictest test of loyalty to the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, requesting Congress to repeal the excise tax on cameras and photographic materials; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 7140. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Osa J. Petty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 7141. A bill for the relief of T. L. Morrow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGEL of Michigan:

H. R. 7142. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in Lake County, Mich., to H. J. Gregory; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HULL:

H. R. 7143. A bill for the relief of Mark G. Rushmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KRUSE:

H. R. 7144. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jonina Helgadottir Sproat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 7145. A bill for the relief of Hanna Elias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1776. By Mr. HART: Petition of the committee on legislation of the New Jersey State Bar Association, recommending that judges of the Federal courts be selected on a bipartisan basis, that a plan for retirement of Federal judges should be adopted, and that Supreme Court Justices be prohibited from performing any duty outside the regular judicial duties of the office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1777. By Mr. KEARNEY: Resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York, memoralizing Congress to repeal the excise tax on cameras and photographic materials; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1778. By Mr. McGUIRE: Petition of the political committee of the Madison, Conn., chapter of the United World Federalists, Inc., asking full support of House Concurrent Resolution 64 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, in the belief that it will be an essential first step in the establishment of the rule of world law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1779. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Resolution of the Vermont State Board of Education, that the vocational rehabilitation of physically handicapped persons will best be carried on by continuation of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation in the Federal Security Agency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1780. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Edwin C. M. Dickey, Bath, N. Y., requesting review and retrial on matters pertaining to a former incompetent, Edwin C. M. Dickey, a soldier-veteran, against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1781. Also, petition of Richard F. Coombs and others, World War II postal employees, NFPOC, Local No. 753, Jeffersonville, Ind., requesting early enactment of a special rule on the veterans' credit bill, H. R. 87; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1782. Also, petition of the chairman, First National Bank of Clarksville, Clarksville, Tenn., endorsing the plans of the Corps of Engineers for the development of the Cumberland River and requesting that the Congress of the United States refuse to pass any legislation which will result in the changing of this plan; to the Committee on Public Works.

1783. Also, petition of John Paul Chapman and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1784. Also, petition of W. I. Crocker and others, New Smyrna, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1785. Also, petition of Mrs. T. J. Langford and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1786. Also, petition of Glenn E. Hart and others, Orlovista, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1787. Also, petition of Genevieve B. McGowin and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1788. Also, petition of James H. Parsons and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.